DSpace Institution	
DSpace Repository	http://dspace.org
Process Engineering	Thesis

2020-03-18

# ANAEROBIC CO- DIGESTION OF CAFETERIA LEFTOVER FOOD AND TOILET WASTES FOR BIOGAS PRODUCTION AND KINETIC EXPERIMENT

WAGAW, KEFALE

http://hdl.handle.net/123456789/10630 Downloaded from DSpace Repository, DSpace Institution's institutional repository

#### Master thesis

# ANAEROBIC CO - DIGESTION OF CAFETERIA LEFTOVER FOOD AND TOIL ET WASTES FOR BIOGAS PRODUCTION AND KINETIC EXPERIMENT

# BAHIR DAR INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, BAHIR DAR UNIVERSITY, BAHIR DAR, ETHIOPIA

## FACULTY OF CHEMICAL AND FOOD ENGINEERING FACULTY

JUN E, 2016

#### KEFALE WAGAW YIZENGAW

# ANAEROBIC CO - DIGESTION OF CAFETERIA LEFTOVER FOOD AND TOIL ET WASTES FOR BIOGAS PRODUCTION AND KINETIC EXPERIMENT

A thesis Submitted Chemical Engineering Department Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of Master of Science Chemical Engineering (Specialized Pinocess Engineering)

A Thesis Presenter Bahir Dar Instituteof Technology, Bahir Dar UniversityBahir Dar, Ethiopia

Supervised by Dr. Nigus Gabbiye

Bahir Dar

JUN E, 2016

BAHR DAR UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

FACULTY OF CHEMICAL AND FOOD ENGINEERING

THE UNDER SIGNED HEREBY CERIFIY THEY HAVE READ AND RECOMMEND TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDY FOR ACCPTANCE OF A THESIS ENTITILED ANAEROBIC CO-DIGESTION OF CAFTERIA LEFTOVER FOOD AND TOILET WASTES FOR BIOGAS PRODUCTION AND KINETIC EXPERIMENT :- BY KEFALE WAGAW YIZENGAW IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIRMENTS FOR THEDEGREE OF SCIENCE IN PROCESS ENGINEERING

DATE JUNE/2016

SUPERVISOR	NIGUS GABBIYE (PhD)
FACULTY DEAN	SOLLOMON WORKINEH (PhD)
INTERNAL EXAMINER	

EXTERINAL EXAMAINER

ATHUR: KEFALE WAGAW YIZENGAW TITLE: ANAEROBIC CO-DIGESTION OF CAFTERIA LEFTOVER FOOD AND TOILET WASTES AND KINETIC EXPERIMENT FACULTY: CHEMICAL AND FOOD ENGINEERING DEGREE MSc CONVOCATION: JUNE YEAR 2016

PERMISSION IS HERE WITH GRANTED TO BAHIR DAR INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY TO CIRCULATE AND TO HAVE COPIED FOR NONCOMMERTIAL PURPOSE AT ITS DISCREPTION, THE ABOVE TOTLE UPON THE REQUST OF INSTITUTION

#### SIGNTURE OF ATH UOR

THE AUTHOR RESERVES **O** THE PUPLICATIONS RIGHTS AND NIETHRER THE THESIS NOR EXTENSIVE EXTRACTS FROM IT MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCE WITHOUT THE ATHUOR WRITTEN ERMISSION

THE ATHUOR ATTESTS THAT THE PERMISION HAS BEEN OBTAINED FOR THE USE OF ANY COPY RIHTED MATERIAL APPEARING IN THIS THESIS (OTHER THAN BRIEF EXCRPTS REQUIRING ONLY PROPER AKNOLOGMENTS IN SCHOLARLY WRITING) AND THAT ALL SUCH USE IS CLEARLY ACKNOLOGED

# TABLE OF CONTENT

# Contents

List of tablesvii
List of figures
Nomenclatureix
Symbols and Abbreviationsix
Acknowledgmentx
Abstractxi
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION1
1.1 Anaerobic dige <b>ist</b> n1.
1.1.1 Biochemical process of anaerobic digestion
1.1.1.1 Hydrolysis2
1.1.1.2 Acidogenesis
1.1.1.3 Acetogenesis4
1.1.1.4 Metlanogenesis4
1.2 Statement of the problem5
1.3 Objective5
1.3.1 Genera objective
1.3.2 Speidic objective
CHAPTER TWO
2.0. LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1. Important operating parameters in AD process
2.1.1. Waste composition/volatile solids
2.1.2. Alkalinity
2.1.3. Temperature9
2.1.4. Carbon to nitrogen ratio (C/N)9
2.1.5. Retention (or residence) time10
2.1.6. Mixing10

2.1.7. Total solid content	
2.2. kinetic study of anaerobic-ctigestion	1.0
CHAPTER THREE	12
3.0 MATERIAL AND METHOD	12
3.1 Materials	12
3.2 Equipment	12
3.3 Experimental methods	1.2
3.3.1. Sample analysis	12
3.3.2. Experiments	14
3.4. Result analysis method	
3.5. Experimental procedures	15
3.5.1. Substrate collection and preparation	1.5
3.5.2. Experimental setup and description for temperature and waste ratio inv	vestigation16
3.5.3 Initial PH effect on ibgas yield	
3.5.3.1. Experimental setup and description	
3.6. Result analysis procedures	20
3.6. Kinetic Model of Anaerobic Digestion	20
3.6.1 Basic InpuOutput Kinetic Model Anaerobic Gdigestion	20
3.6.2 Model assumptions	20
CHAPTER FOUR	24
4.0 RESULTS AND DISCISSION	24
4.1 Substrate Characterization	24
4.1.1 Moisture content	24
4.1.2 Volatile solid content	25
4.1.3 BOD and COD of substrates	26
4.2. Effect of operation conditions on biogas yield	27
4.2.1 Effect of temperature on daily biogas yield	28
4.2.2. Effect of Substrate Ratio on Biogas Yield	29
4.2.3. Effect of Initial pH on Biogas Yield	

4.2.4 Significance test for correlation	31
4.3. Determination of Kinetic Parameters	34
4.3.1 Rate Constant, Activation Energy and exponential Factor Determination	34
CHAPTER FIVE	40
5.0. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	40
5.1. Conclusion	40
5.2. Recommendations	4.1
Appendix	42
Reference	49

# List of tables

Table 3.1: Experimental design on investigating the optimum temperatureasted ratio

Table 3.2: Trerage composition of organic compounds	21
Table 3.3: Balance of biochemical reaction used in this model	22
Table 4.1: Moisture content of wastes	25
Table 4.2: Sample volatile content of wastes	26
Table 4.3: BOD and COD of the substrate used for biogas production:	26
Table 4.4 Effect of temperature and feed ratio on biogas yield at retention time=30 days	27
Table 4.5: Methane production conversion at temperatures 20, 25, and 33	35
Table 4.6 Reaction rate constants at the given temperature	35
Table APP.1: Concentration of substrate and product at temperature of 25	42
Table app.2: Concentration of substrate and product with time at temperature of 20	42
Table APP.3: Concentration of substrate and product with time at temperature of 33	42
Table APP.4: 90% toilet waste: 10% leftover food <sup>®</sup> [ <b>2</b> ]0	43
Table APP.5:10% toilet waste and 90% leftover foodீ∉⊉0	43
Table APP.6: 50% toilet waste: 50% leftover food <sup>®</sup> [ <b>2</b> ]0	44
Table APP.7: 50% toilet waste: 50% leftover food <sup>®</sup> [ <b>3</b> 3	44
Table APP.8: 50% toilet waste: 50% leftover food <sup>®</sup> [ <b>2</b> 5	45
Table APP.9: 90% toilet waste: 10% leftover food <sup>®</sup> [ <b>3</b> 3	45
Table APP.10: 90% toilet waste: 10% leftover food ជን	46
Table APP.11: 50% toilet waste: 50% leftover food°ជ្រ3	46
Table APP.12: 50% toilet waste: 50% leftover food°భ25	47
Table APP.13: 10% toilet waste: 90% leftover food 🛱	47
Table APP.14: 90% toilet waste: 10% lefteovfood [25c]	48
Table APP.15: 10% toilet waste: 90% leftover food <sup>o</sup> [2]0	48

# List of figures

Figure 1.1: The anaerobic digestion pathway

Figure1. 2: Hydrolysis breaks down lactose, a polysaccharide, into galactose and glucose,	
monosaccharide	3
Figure1. 3: Hydrolysis of triglyceride results in glycerol and three fatty acids	3
Figure1. 4: Hydrolysis of protein involves breaking a peptide bond to separate amino acids	3
Figure1. 5: During Acidogenesis, bacteria produce acetate and butyrate. The fermentive pat	hway can
also produce other byroducts	4
Figure 3.1: Experimental setup of anaerobicdiggestion for temperature and waste ratio effect	
investigation	18
Figure 3.2: Experimental setup of anaerobicdiggestion for initial ph effect determination	21
Figure 3.3Basic inputoutput model of anaerobic batch reactor	22
Figure 4.1: Yeld of biogas with time [day]	30
Figure 4.2: The effect of temperature and wasate on the biogas yield	31
Figure 43: The effect of waste ratio on the biogas yield	32
Figure44: Biogas component concentration with time at 25oc	38
Figure 45: Plots of €n (1-Xme) versus time (day) at temperatures 20, 25 and 33oc	4 0
Figure 4.6: Plot of InK' versus 1/T for anaerobic cobgestion	43

# Nomenclature

Symbols and Abbreviations

A Weight of dried residue +crucible

AD Anaerobic digestion

ADM1 B	First anaerobic digestion model Weight of crucible
BOD BVS	Biological oxygen demand Biodegradable volatile solids
С	Weight of wet sample+ crucible weight
C/N COD	Carbon to nitrogen ratio Chemical oxygen demand
D DO	Final (dry) weight of sample Dissolved oxygen
FAS	ferrous ammoium sulphate
HRT	Hydraulic retention time
HW	Human waste
К	equilibrium rate constant
Km	biomas degradation rate
LOF	leftover of food
Μ	morality of FAS
Q	FAS used in blank sample
rmax	initial microbesconcentration
RVS	refractoryvolatile solids
VS	volatile solids
W	Initial (wet) weight of sample
WWTP	wastewatertreatment plant

# Acknowledgment

First of all I would like to thank GOD for giving me patience to accomplish my thesis work successfully. I am most grateful to my advisor Dr.Nigus Gabbye for advising and directing me throughout my thesis work

I am grateful to Bahir Dar Institute of Technology Bahir Dar University which provided scholarship for MSc study and for the financial support to tthiesis

It is mypleasure to thanks to my family and my wife Zemed workie for their parental lop geors used care during my study. Special thanks to more thanks to more thanks to more the support during thesis work

#### Abstract

Anaerobic digestion is a process in which microorganisms break down biodegradadstreates in the absence of oxygen. It can be used to treatour an organic wastes and recover-beindergy in the form of biogas, which contains mainly meane and carbon dioxide and three than egas can be used for lighting and cooking. Primarily, the substrates physico- chemical properties monotonic content, ash content, otal solid content, BOD and COD) error determined using standard methods. The result suggested that wd > pasta > Injera > bread > toilet waste errors of biogas yield in this work anaerobic digestion of cafeteria leftover food and toilet waste was carried out in a 5 L refates or the substrate of biogas and toilet waste was carried out in a 5 L refates or the substrate waste was carried out in a 5 L refates or to biogas and to biogas biogas and to biogas and to biogas biogas and to biogas biogas and to biogas biogas biogas and to biogas biogas biogas and the substrates biogas bioga

anaerobic digestee or a temperature range 20-33°C and initial pHof 4-9. During the experiments, the biogas production was recordensing water displacement methand by considering the ideal gas equation the concentration of methane was sulated A maximum volume of 995.9ml was recorded at 30 day retention time at initial pHof 7 and at y ambient temperature condition. The maximum cumulative biogas production was 4001ml at 2°sC and 10:90 toilet wastes to cafeteria leftover food ratio. The kinetic parameters of the anaerobic digrestion were investigated selected temperatures The degradation rate constant was determined in temperature of 2°sC and 3°sC. A pseudo first order kinetic model was proposed for tage aerobic digestion From Arrhenius equation the obtained values of activation energy and prexponential factor was 7262.279 J/MOL and 717.408J/MeSt pectively.

Key words: Co-digestion, Toilet waste, Cafeteria leftover food, Biogas, Kinetic model

#### CHAPTER ONE

#### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

#### 1.1 Anaerobic digestion

Anaerobic digestion is a process in which microorganisms break down biodegradable material in the absence of oxygen. Anaerobic distgien can be used to treat varisourganic wastes anrecover bie energy in the form of biogas, which contain mainly methane and carbon dioxide. Methane could be a source of renewable energy producing electricity in combined heat and power plants (Clemens et al, 2006).

Co-digestion is simultaneousigestion of homogenous mixture of two or more substrates. Traditionally anaerobic digestion was single substrate, single purpose treatment. Recently, it has been realized that anaerobic digestion as such become more stable when the verity of subsplatesaaphe same time is increased.

The most common situation is when a major amount of main basic substrates (e.g. manure of sewage sludge) is mixed and digested togethethwininor amounts of single oravity of additional substrates (Braun,2002). Theuse of cesubstrates usually improves the biogas yields from anaerobic digester due to positive synergisms established in the digestion medium and the supply of missing nutrients by the co-substrates (MateAlvarez et al, 2000).

Anaerobic digesters convert organic waste (agricultural and food waste, animal or human manure, and other organic waste) into energy (in the form of biogas). The benefits that the anaerobic digestion process provides are waste management, energy production, and fertilizer production. Anaerobic digestion can provide energy to those who do not already have it, or can produce clean energy as an alternative to carbon-intensive energy production. Energy provided to those who do not already have such as people livinign rural area andhose with different organic wastes enables them to accomplish more, and allows for a much higher quality of life. The fertilizer by-product is anotherbenefit that can add value to an anaerobic digestionsystem.

1

Once a feedstock is consumed by the anaerobic digestion process, the leftover material can be used as a soil additive to enhance crop production. In rural settings, this fertilizer is best used loally or on-site of the anaerobic digester. Biogas which is produce from anaerobic digestion often has methane, carbon dioxide, hydrogensulfide, ammonia, etand the bigas can be used for lightning according fueland even for generator.

1.1.1 Biochemical process of anaerobic digestion

There are four major steps antiaerobic digestion as shown in the figure 1 and describies detail in the following section

#### Figure 1.1 the anaerobic digestion pathway

#### .1.1.1 Hydrolysis

The first stepin the anærobic digestionprocess, hydrolysis is the cleavage of chemical bondsby the addition of water. The digester feedstock may be made up of many different components and materials, and thus there are many different versions of hydrolysis; carbohydrates, fats, and proteins are all broken down into smaller molecules by this initial step of anærobic digestion. In the case of a carbohydrate, polysaccharides (complex sugars) are broken down into mono**a**ccharide, proteins are broken down into amino acids and lipids are degraded into fatty acids

Figure 1.2 hydrolysis breaks down lactose, a polysaccharide, into galactose and glucose

In the case of lipids, usually triglycerides are split into three fatty acids and glycerol by the addition of three water molecules, as illustrated infigure 1.3.

Figure 1.3 hydrolysis of triglyceride result in glycerol and three fatty acid

In the case of protein peptide bonds are broken to separate amino acids

Figure 1.4 hydrolysis of protein involves breaking a peptide bond to separate amino acid

## 1.1.1.2Acidogenesis

Acidogenic bacteria degrade the products of hydrolysis into volatile fatty adds. Some hydrogen, carbon dioxide, and acetic add are also produced, which will skip the acidogenesis stage. Acidogenesis represents the portion of figure 1.5 in which bacteria produce acetate and butyrate (volatile fatty adds) from glucose.

# Figure 1.5 During acidogenesisbacteria produce acetate and butyratethe fermentive pathway can also produce other byproducts

## 1.1.1.3 Acetogenesis

In the third stepof an aerobic digestion, A cidogenic bacteria consume precursors and produce a cetate (acetic acid). One example of this process is the consumption of glucose, given in equation 1.1.

 $C_6H_{12}O_6 + 2H_2O = 2CH_8COOH + 2CQ + 4H_2$ ------1.1

#### 1.1.1.4 Methanogenesis

The final step of anaerobic dgestion is the formation of methane by bacteria called methanogens. For the most part, the biological process here is the breakdown of acetic add, given in equation 2, though other forms of the reaction can also produce methane via anaerobic digestion.

$$CH_3COOH = CH_4 + CO_2 - - - - - 1.2$$

# 1.2 Statement of the problem

Even though different higher institutions are planning toegete biogas from leftover foothe high organic acidhatureof cafeteria leftover food ubstrates supposed to low the biogas productivity. This need to be addressed by sing this substrate as a main substrate or ubstrate with toilet was team formulating ratio at which better yiel dould be obtained is the first intention of this tody.

At the same time, the biochemicaligestion kinetics, which is important for biogas plaesign is not investigated for the specific substrate

# 1.3 Objective

# 1.3.1Genera objective

The general objective of thiswork is the study of the co-digestion of an aerobic biogas production from cafeteria and toilet astefor design improvement.

# 1.3.2Specific objective

To determine phylocochemical properties of afeterial effover food and toilet wastes To investigate ffects of operating conditions (temperature initial pH and ratio of toilet wastes to cafeterial effover food for the anaerobic co-digestion on the yield of biogas To generate the reaction rade ta and develop kinet equation for biogas production for the anaerobic codigestion process of these specific substrates

#### CHAPTER TWO

#### 2.0. LITERATURE REVIEW

The International Water AssociatioAnaerobic Digestion Model 1 (ADM1) is one of the most comprehensive anaerobic digestion modes. The highly structured model includes multiple steps describing chemical and physical processes; it considers the four stepsof hydrolysis, acidogenesis, acetogenesis, and methanogenesis, and how those steps differ for input carbohydrate, proteins, and lipids.

According toKangle etal. (2012), anaerobicdigestion is the most promising alternative to disposal of wastes due to high energy recovery. The main objective of anaerdbic digestion is the degradation and destruction of organic substances, with consequent reduction of the odorous emissions and pathogens. This conversion is catalyzed by a population of bacteria that operate in synergy, catalyzing different chemical reactions, hence the metabolic pathways involved in the anaerobicdegradationare quite complex Hydrolysis is the rate-limiting step of the overall process degradation. In anaerobic digestion, co-digestion is the term used to describe the combined treatment of several wastes with complementary characteristics, being one of the main advantages of the anaerobic technology. Anaerobic digestion (AD) is aprocess by which microorganisms break down biodegradable material in the absence of oxygen. A great option for improving yields of anaerobic digestion of solid wastes is the co- digestion of multiple substrates. If co-substrates are used in anaerobic digestion system it improves the biogas yields due to positives synergisms established in the digestion medium and the supply of missing nutrients. Recent research on this topic is reviewed in the current paper. Special attention is paid to anaerobic co-digestion of animal waste, crop and crop residues, industrial sludge andmunicipal solid waste.

Researchers (Alemayehettal, 2014) on evaluation of biogas production from cafeteria leftover food items was to generate biogas, an alternative and viable source of biogas for household consumption in particular from substrates consists of leftover food collected from Bahir dar university student cafeteria and cow dung as a coubstrate. They have done the periment at aries reactor volums with 60 day hydraulic retention time and they measured the amount of biogas by taking only one reactorates ing displacement method and they got folloof biogas per ongram of substrate.

6

(Wu et al, 2013) developed a 3-D numerical simulation model based on conservation of mass, conservation of energy, and species transport that predicts biogas production from plug-flow anaerobic digesters. Their work uses a fist-order kinetic model that considers the atio of carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen of the feedstock.

Co-digestion of food waste and humaxceta for biogas production by ahunsietal, (2013) the investigation of their workwas design and construction of anaerobic digester from locally available raw material. By using this manufactured 40 liter anaerobic digester and 12kg of cafeteria leftover food and 3kg of toilet waste they produced 84,750 coord biogas this manufactures 5.65ml biogas per gram of sample work on at ambient tempered by expecting it was under mesophlic condition (22c-30.5°c). This work also investigate the distribution and species of microbes during anaerobic digestion, further they tried to investigate the distribution of micro organisms (Aerobes, Anaerobes, Fungind Methanogens) uring anaerobic digestion.

MSc thesis, 2(014) Enhancement of the Performance of Existing Biogas Plant in Amhara Region (Debretabor Prison) The paper focuses on the enhancement of the performance of the existing biogas plant in Debra Tabor Prison by exploring the main difficultiles. observesni the prison, there are excess dry wastes, human execration as well as food waste. These wastes armekecrate have the highest hydrocarbon composition, which can be converted to flammable organic component, to produce biogas. But these wastes and human exiecrate ave environmental mpact. Hence, biogas temblogy when properly utilized mproves the sanitary and health conditions of the the investigated that the input substrate ratios the main factor of biogas plant for well function

(Wu et al, 2013) also provides a review of many previous pieces of work. These include a model by Chen et al. that predicts gas production as a function of volatile solds, kinetic parameter, specific growth rate of bacteria, and temperature, but does not consider biochemical processes Hill used this model and a computer analysis to determine maximum volumetric methane production, but did not use kinetics model gas production over time. Other simple models address the effects of temperature, pH, nutrients, and toxins, but not kinetics of gas production based on biochemical reactions.

Complex modelssuchas ADM1 and a model produced by Minott include as many as 34 differential and algebraic equations or consider spatial dependence and fluid dynamics. But during this thesis work it was develop a model which predicts the gais produced with time by lumthe intermediate procease one step reaction

#### 2.1. Important operating parameters in AD process

The rate at which the microorganism grows is of paramount importance in AD process. The operating parameters of the digester must be controlled so **esha**nce microbial activity and thus increase the anaerobic digestion efficiency of the system. Some of the parameters are discussed in the following section.

#### 2.1.1. Waste composition/volatile solids

The wastes treated by AD may comprise a biodegradab**teriorfg**action, a combustible and an inert fraction, the biodegradable organic fraction includes kitchen waste, food waste and garden wastes. The combustible fraction includes slowly degrading lignocelluloses organic matter containing coarser wood, paper, **a**d cardboard as these lignocelluloses organic matter do not readily degrade under anaerobic condition they are better suited for waste to energy plants. Finally the inert fraction contains stones, glass, sand, metal, etchis fraction ideally should be removed, recycled or used as land fill. The removal of inert fraction prior to digestion is important as otherwise it increases digester volume and wear of equipment. The volatile solid in organic waste is measured as total solids minus the ash content, as obtained by complete combustion of the .fedente volatile solids (RVS).It is seen that knowledge of the BVS fraction of substrate helps in better estimation of the biodegradability of waste. Lignin is a complex organic material that is not easily degraded by anærobic bacteria and constitutes the refractory volatile solids (RVS) in organic matter. Waste characterized by high VS and low non-biodegradable matter are high potential for biogas production

#### 2.1.2. Alkalinity

Acid neutralizing or buffering capacity of a digester is termed as alkalinity. It is attained with the help of number of substance and is mostly described by the carb**birate** onate and hydroxide content of the digester (Chynoweth, 1987). Alkalinity in anaerobic digestion is also derived from the degradation of organic nitrogen containing compounds. Such compounds are amino acids and proteins.

8

During this degradation, amingroups are released which further lead to the production of ammonia which in its turnwill further react with carbon dioxide yielding alkalinity in the form of ammonium bicarbonate. According to speece et al. (1996) Automira et al. (2008) additionablkalinity can be generated from the metabolism of the microorganism in anaerobic digester. This type of alkalinity consists of the release of icents during the degradation of organic compounds.

#### 2.1.3. Temperature

Temperature is a principal environmentator affecting performance. It affects the physical and phyisco chemical propeties of compounds present in digester and the kinetics and the thermodynamics of biological process (Boe, 2006). There are mainly two temperature ranges that provide optimum digestion conditionsfor the production of methane; namely esophlic and thermophilic ranges. Mesophlic digestion takes place optimally around 308° c or at the ambient temperatures between 20to 45° c. Thermophilic digestions takes place optimally around 4° c to 57° c or at elevated temperatures up to 2006).

#### 2.1.4. Carbon to nitrogen ratio (C/N)

The relationship between the amount of carbon and nitrogen present in the feedstock is represented by the C/N ratio. It is very important process parameter of the process as a low ratio can cause ammonia inhibition where as high ratio will lead deficiency (Mattavarez, 2000). The adjustment of the ratio to be within the optimum range (230) can be achieved through the digestion of different waste streams (Monnet, 2003). Optimum C/N ratio in anaerobic digester is between 20 and 30. A high C/N ratio is an indication of rapid consumption of nitrogen by methanogens and results in lower gas production. On the other hand lower C/N ratio causeemonia accumulation and pH values exceeding 8.5, which is toxic to methanogenic bacteria.

## 2.1.5. Retention (or residence) time

Hydraulic retention timeH(RT) and solid retention time(SRT) whereHRT is the time that the fluid element of the feed remines in the digester. SRT is the time that refers to the residence of the bacteria (solids) in the reactor.

The required retention time of the completion of the AD reaction varies with differing technologies, process temperature, and waste composition.refleention time for waste treated in mesophlic digester ranges 10 to 40 days. Lower retention time is required in digester operated in thermophilic range. A high solid reactor operating in the thermophilic range has retention time to 30 dayslonathar(2014).

## 2.1.6. Mixing

The purpose of mixing in a digester is to blend the fresh material with digestate containing microbes. Also mixing prevents scum formation and avoids temperature gradients within the digester. However excessive mixing can disrupted microbes so slow mixing is preferred. The type of equipment and the amount of mixing varies with the type of the reactor and the solid content in the digester.

## 2.1.7. Total solid content

#### 2.2. Kinetic Study of Anaerobic Co-digestion

Mathematical models can serve as useful tools to deepen the understanding of complex systems, and t facilitate operation and design of the process. If the behavior of a system can be predicted, the production can be optimized and process failure can **b**eepted. More effective processes could lead to a better competitiveness for biogas as an energy carrier. Despite of these motivations modeling has rarely been applied on anaerobic digestion. The obstacles for introducing modeling to the industry are amongothers that the models of anaerobic digestion are complex and require extensive input data, and that the performance of the models on full scale processes has not yet be(**Bbstede**, et al., 2003) Anaerobic digestion has traditionally been treated black box system due to the complexity of the process. To facilitate design, system analysis, operational analysis and control, a mathematical model describing the processes is required.

The different purposes require different ranges of accuracymandel complexity. A complex, non linear model with focus on the biochemical reactions is well suited when the understanding of the process is important, e.g. for operational analysis or for research purposes. These models can facilitate optimization of operational stability and efficiency. When implementing metabeled control on a system, a linear and well parameterized model is needed with measurable key parameters as input signals. For design purposes, the model should focus on hydraulics aindependent (Batstone, 2006).

In defining conversionit was selected ne of the reactants as the basis of calculation and the test to other species involved in the reaction to this basis. In most instances it is best to choose the limiting reactant as the basis of calculatin. It was developed stoichiometry icrelationships and design equations by considering the general reaction

a A+ b B= c G+ d D-----2.1

The uppercase letters represent chemical species and the low**letters**erepresenstoichiometryic coefficients. Taking species as ourbasis of calculationwe divide the reaction expression through by the stoichiometric coefficient of species A, in order to arrange the reaction expression in the form

To put every quantity on a ,per mole of *Abj*asis,now we ask such questions as ,How can we quantify how far a reaction has progressed?•How we many moles of C are forméour every moleA consumed?*f* A convenient way to answer the specific store of the permote a parameter called nversion. The conversion XA is the number of moles of that have reacted per moleA offed to the system.

X A=Moles of A reacted/moles of A feed (H. Scott foger)

From the experiment the limited reactant is thetal volatile content of the feed substrate. From the digestion excess reactant was water.

The kinetic of biomass growth can be determined by measuring either substrate consumption or product (biogas) formation with time. Mathematical model was develophed describes biogas (methane) production with time.

# CHAPTER THREE 3.0 MATERIAL AND METHOD

#### 3.1 Materials

All chemicals use in this studyare analytical grades, obtained from aculty of Chemical and Food Engineering and Faculty of Civil and Water Resource Engineering at Bahir Dar Institute of Technology Bahir Dar University pH standard solution were used (for buffer solution preparation during H meter calibration) Sodium hydroxide (0.1 M, for pH adjustment), hydrochloriacid (0.1 M, pH adjustme), tap water (as raw material for an aerobied in the substrate of the substrate and the slup grameters uchas to determine the COD substrates

#### 3.2 Equipment

Plastic glucosebags( for biogas sample handling) O meter( to measure the dissolved oxygen in the sample before and after incubation) bottles (for sample handling for COD and BOD determination) incubator (to maintain the sample at dark condition) ven (for moisture content determination maintain the sample at constant temperation) ace(for ash content determination maintain the sample at constant temperation) ace(for ash content determination maintain the sample at constant temperation) glass tube airtight with one side water displacement volume measurement setup preparation) nch plastic pipe( for biogas transport from anaerobicco-digester to water displacement setup preparation) and safety clothes such as eye glass, glove, nose maakdcleaning agents such as one such as one such as the such as the same setup agents such as one such as the same setup agents such as one such as the same setup agents such as one such as the same setup agents such as one such as the same setup agents such as one such as the same setup agents such as one such as the same setup agents such as one such as the same setup agents such as one such as the same setup agents such as the same setup agent setup agent such as the same setup agent setup agen

## 3.3 Experimental Methods

# 3.3.1. Sample analysis

The physical and chemicploperties of the feed stock were aluated before and afterdigestion using standard methods (ASTMD2974). Parameters analyzed include tal solid content, total solid volatile content ash content, moisture content and also biologized and dwinkler method) and chemical oxygen demar (OpenReflux method).

#### 3.3.1.2. Total solid and moisture content :

Total solid and moisture content the cafeteria leftover food and toilet waste were determined in a typical experiment as follows. The substrates transferred to preweighed evaporating dish/crucible/ andweighed altogether using an electronic weighing balance and recorded. It was then dried in the driving oven by measuring the weight of the sample with two hours time intertribathe mass of the sample becomes constant. The expression for calculations ture content on wet basis is written in equation 3.1

Moist (µ1r@e%) = — " 10%2 ------3.1

The increase in the weight over that of empty dish represents the total solids. The lides abf wet sample were alculated using the following equation.

To as oliel—— " 100%% ------3.2

#### 3.3.1.3. Total volatile and ash content :

The moisture removed sample was removed from the furnace, cooled in dissector and weighed. The remaining solid represents the ash content and/otal volatilesolid content was determined as follows.

To tavbla tsiloeliel to taslo licolo netn"t \_\_\_\_\_ "10 %-----3.3

#### 3.3.1.4. The biochemical oxygen demand (BOD):

Oxygen content of the sample was determined using Winkler method (before and after incubation). The BOD level was computed using the initial and a fin (BOD5) concentration of dissolved oxyge The BOD was determined by comparing the DO level of the sample that was incubated in a complete darkness at 20 for five days.

BO5D[--] = (in tiaDIO DO5)" dilutifoanct-o-r---3.4

Dilutifœncter (\_\_\_\_\_) ------ 3.5

#### 3.3.1.5. The chemical oxygen demand (COD) :

Organic and oxidizable inorganic substances in the sample were oxidized by potassium dichromate on 50% sulfuric acid solution at reflux temperatu(**n5**0<sup>°</sup>C). Sliver sulphatewas used as a catalyst and mercuric sulphate was added to remove chloride interference. The excess dichromate was titrated with standard ferrous ammonium sulphate using orthophenanthroline ferrous complex as an indicator.

COD, mgO2/ = ( " )" " ------3.6

Molarotfy A S 0.04172 27, 0.25-3.7

#### 3.3.2.Experiments

# 3.3.2.1. Investigating the effect of temperature and mixing ratio of toilet and cafeteria wastes

Randomized actorial design was used for the anaerobic digestion. Two factors such as temperature and waste ratio (toilet waste: cafeteria waste) with three **lforel**emperature and waste ratio were used to screen out the maximum biogas yield at a fixed **uarrod** waste to water ratio by draulic retention time (1:1) and 30daystention time The levels of waste atio in percentwere 0:100, 10:90, 30:70, and 50:5090:10 and 100:0 and the levels of tepperature were 20, and 25c and 35c. One experimentwas done with replica of two. The mesophlicanaerobic digestion condition as selected to waster this study anaerobic condition condition condition condition condition condition as selected because the actual ambient temperature in Ethiopia is within this ramge also the anaerobic digesters which are already installed and the way of installing have no temperature controlling.system

#### 3.3.2.2. Initial P H determination and adjustment of substrates

Initial pH of substrate was determined using pH meter. Firsplttheneterwas calibrated at pH 4 and pH 7 using pH4 and pH7 buffer capsule. Then the pH meter was calibrated at this soluctionecause from literature it was referred that the pH of the toilet was te 4s52 (C.Guton; John, 201) and left over food 6.01 (Alemayehueta, 2014) that is why the instrument was calibrated these pH sto determine the actual pH of the substrate. After determining the actual pH of the substrate sodium hydroxide and hydrochloric acid were used to increase and decrease the pH of the substrate respectively to the require value.

# 3.4. Result analysismethod

# 3.4.1. Kinetic modelof an anaerobic co digestioProcess

Based on the experimental data, the volume of bi(**rgas** hane) at different time interval was recorded by water displacement method compares the conversion of methane was calculated using al gas equation Second, the rate constants at three temperatures were determined by plot (the fill) (for us time. Third, the preexponential factor and activation energy were obtained by plotting the logarithm of the rate constants (K') versus 1/perature of absolute temperature using the Arrhenius equation.

## 3.5. Experimental procedures

## 3.5.1. Substrateollectionand preparation

Subsrstrateas a feed for the digesterras collected from Bahirdar Institute of TechnologyStudent Cafeteria and fromDormitory toilets. The toilet waste was collected by diverting the toilet line from block No.61 at sampling timein morning. The sample was collected by the expert who had good knowledge and experience about safety. At the end of diverged pipe there **rtrats**lepsample collecting plastic material, which has sieve to pass the water and urine part through it.

After collecting enough amount of human waste it was transferred into the plastic handling equipment /baldy / and transported into the laboratories/baterethe experiment was conducted. In the same way the cafeteria leftover food was collected by the same expert and sample was collected by considering the presence of all food items such as Injera, bread, cooked pasta, cooked rice and onion peetsple he sa was taken during lunch time because at this meal time all food items are included at students menu.

Prior to the commencement of the experiment, the cafeteria leftover food was thoroughly homogenized manually to have particle size suitable for eaksgestion and then mixed evenly with toilet wastes. The mixture used was a combination of cafeteria leftover food (0%, 10%, 30%, 50%, 90% and 100%) and toilet wastes (100%, 90%, 50%, 30%, 10% and 0%). This substrate was further mixed with water in a 1:1 m/v ratio to make final 4.3 liters slurry that was fed to anaerobic digester. The experimente allowed runfor thirty days.

# 3.5.2. Experimentabetup and description temperature and waste ratio investigation

After characterizing the substrate ana ecrobigestion experiments with two replicasere performed in five liter cylindrical shape digesters. The experimental setup is preserfited ren 3.1. The substrate was introduced into the reactors cm lower than the full height to avoid over flooding. To the experimental setup is preserfited over flooding.

# Figure 3.1 Experimental setup of anaerobic codigestion for temperature and waste ratio effect investigation

The anaerobic digestion was nducted iranaerobic digester in batchise mechanisms bubstrate was fed into the digester arefully by mixing with equivalent amount of water.

After the substratevas fed in to the digesteit was homogenized using clean woodermaterial. Then porous non idjestible plastionaterial was added in to the digester, because is tknown that an aerobic digestion takes place due to the presence of microl bles robes inside the digester needed solid material with it and act accordingly increasing the exposed are ble tween bacteria and substrate crease the activity of microbes

The digester cover was closed by insuring the absence of gas leakage by using sealantsn **Then** ope safety value to removexygen already preseintside the digester for twenty four hours.

After a day the valve close decause intermediate opticate opticate

Finally the temperature as setby pressing the upper and lower key by inough the seton temperature control board The daily biogasamount generated as determined by reading the height difference the glass collector cylinde. The volume daily produced biogas was determined and the daily volumes for the thirty day retention time to get the total volume of biogas generated for on batch anaerobic digester from a specified amount of substrate.

Run	Temperature(Oc)	Ratio	Volume of biogas (ml)	ReplicaVolume of biogas (ml)	Average biogas volume [ml]
1	20	10:90			<u> </u>
2	25	10:90			
3	33	10:90			
4	20	30:70			
5	25	30:70			
6	33	30:70			
7	20	50:50			
8	25	50:50			
9	33	50:50			
10	20	70:30			
11	25	70:30			
12	33	70:30			
13	20	90:10			
14	25	90:10			
15	33	90:10			
16	25	100:0			
17	25	0:100			
Ratio is based on toilet waste: leftover food					

#### Table3.1: Experimental design on investigating the optimtemperature and waste ratio

The experimental design in table 3.1 describes the type of factors and their level. For comparison of eachsubstrate alonthe biogas production was conducted at the same temperatuble (25

## 3.5.3 Initial pH effect on biogas yield

## 3.5.3.1. Experimentabetup and description

In this experimental work there were two basietups: Anaerobicco-digestion setup and water displacement setup for biogas volume determinationsing locally available materials.

Anaerobic cedigestion setup was prepared by tak200 liter plastic digester which was bought from local market. The cover of the plastic digester which educed by using hot metal rod with the diameter of the pipe, which is 0.5 inch and insert the pipe in the drilled hole with for aeditherit was airtighted using glue. Water displacement setup was prepared by using the materials which is listed in the material section.

The quartz paint container was collected from our institute store and the quartz paint container was drilled at the position 0 cm bellow from the top of it with the diameter of water dischargesticpipe, 0.5 inch.

The quartz cover was drilled with glass tube diameter by using hot knife. Then exdet fiel container with tap water up to the drilled position meanwhile the glase trues fully filled with water.

The plastic piperom the top of the plastic digester was inserted inside the water filled glass tube up to a randomheight Finally it was checkedby filling of water in the quartz paint container up to over flow position.

Figure 3.2 experimental setup of anaerobic edigestion for initial pH effect determination

#### 3.6. Result analysis procedures

#### 3.6. Kinetic Model of Anaerobic Digestion

## 3.6.1 Basic InputOutputKinetic Model Anaerobic @-digestion

The purpose of this model is not to create entirely compressive model that takes all factors into account and predict biogas output to very high level of precisition we verthe models predict biogas output over time.

#### Figure 3.3 Basic inputoutput model of anaerobic batch reator

#### 3.6.2 Model assumptions

The initial assumptions of this model are given below

- ðü Production of intermediate species is negligible (the reaction is a one step)
- ðü The volume of anaerobic digester is constant, 5 liter.
- ðü Ideal bacterial conditions
- ðü Input substrate consist only C, H, N and O
- ðü Products of reaction include only  $G_{M}$  and  $NH_{B}$

In the simplest case of batch anaerobic digestere actant stat, carbohydrat endprotein are put into the digesterin batch Once in the digester protein, fat and carbohydrate break down into products  $\Omega_2$ , CH<sub>4</sub> and NH<sub>3</sub> at a rate based on reaction coefficients.

Some ofinput substrates donet break down all the way, and leave through the outlest amount that leaves instead of being broken down depends upon digesteresidence time of the feedstoakd other parameters

If the fractions of fat, protein and carbohydrates are known, the theoretical methane yield can be determined using the Buswell formula.

+ " - " - + - 2 = - " - + - + - 2 + - + - " - 4 + NH3 3.6

And also Hojlund Christensen investigated the average composition of organic compounds as shown table 3.2:

Compound	Elemental composition
Fat	C <sub>57</sub> H <sub>104</sub> O <sub>6</sub>
Protein	C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>7</sub> NO <sub>2</sub>
Carbohydrate	$C_{6}H_{10}O_{5}$

Table3.2: Average composition of organic compounds

Assuming the input substrate bea single compound by summing up the elemental composition of each compound, listed in table2. So the input substrate has the molecular form Cold H<sub>121</sub>O<sub>13</sub>N. Then

n" - " - +- =32.75 stoichiometry coefficient of water

-" - +- +-= 7.625 stoichiometry coefficient of carbon dioxide

- +- " - " -= 46 stoichiometry coefficient of methane

stoichiometry coefficient of ammonia

Rewriting the reaction equation

=1

 $C_{69}H_{121}O_{13}N + 32.75H_{2}O = 7.625CQ + 46CH_{4} + NH_{3}$ ------3.7

This reaction equation is not balanceothe above reaction equation was further balanced by using general reaction equation balancing approach.betweenced reaction equation is given bellow:

 $C_{69}H_{121}O_{13}N + 33H_2O = 23CQ + 46CH_4 + NH_3$ ------3.8

The biochemical reaction is balanced and can be applied to any input with known relative ratios of carbon, hydrogen, oxygeand nitrogen. The model asumes that these elements are the only components of the feedstock.

Components	Left	Right
Carbon	69	23+46=69
Hydrogen	121+66=187	46*4+3=187
Oxygen	13+33=46	23*2=46
Nitrogen	1	1

Table 3.3: Balance of biochemail reaction used in this model

The rate law of the anaerobic digestion for formove action can be expressed exputation.

Based on the above assumption

•  $rC_{69}H_{121}O_{13}N = K [C_{69}H_{121}O_{13}N]^{n} [H_{2}O]^{P} - - - 3.9$ 

Where [C<sub>69</sub>H<sub>121</sub>O<sub>13</sub>N] is the concentration of organic waste anhd [Q] that of water, nis order of anaerobic digestion with respect to organic wastel p is order with respect towater and K is the equilibrium rate constant. However due to the highwater to total volatile ratio, the change inwater concentration can be considered as contisted or if we used 1 (tm/v) organic waste to water ration average moisture content of the organic waster 2.226% and the average volatile content of organic waste is around 17% as a result change in the concentration of water is almost constant.

-r  $C_{69}H_{121}IO_{13}N = \frac{[}{} = K \bullet [C_{69}H_{121}O_{13}N]$  ------3.10

where k• is modified equilibrium rate constant,  $\neq [H_2O]^P$ .

The initial concentration of organic waste was determined based on the limited substrate which is total volatile content of organic waste he initial concentration of organic waste  $t=t_0$ ,  $[C_{69}H_{121}O_{13}N] = [(C_{69}H_{121}O_{13}N)_0]$  and at t=t,  $[C_{69}H_{121}O_{13}N] = [(C_{69}H_{121}O_{13}N)_f]$ . Then, the conversion of the organic waste (X<sub>C69H121O13</sub>) can be developed on mass balance as hownequation 3.1 below.

$$XC_{69}H_{121}IO_{13}N = 1" \frac{[( ) ]}{[( ) ]} -----3.11$$

From substitution of equation 3.11 n equation 3.10 and tegration and earrangement of equation 3.10 gives equation 32.

$$-\ln (1 - XC_{69}H_{121}IO_{13}N = """""" 3.12$$

The concentration of the product/ substrate cacabalated from ideal gasqueation as shown in equation 3.14 and 315.

 $XC_{69}H_{121}IO_{13}N = 1"$  \_\_\_\_ " " " " " " " " 3.14

Daily partial pressure of bioga(snethane)was calculated by sing equation 3.15 by taking literature value density, 0.93g/m<sup>3</sup>,methane density0.656kg/m<sup>3</sup>, carbon dioxide density1.977 kg/m<sup>3</sup> and ammonia density0.73kg/m<sup>3</sup> at 25<sup>o</sup>C (Basic Data on Biogas, 2nd edition, Sweden, 2/of 2/biogas and daily height lowered in gas collector cylinder.

Partiparlesucrfenetha⊫sedensictfynetha"ne "!!""" 3.15

# CHAPTER FOUR

# 4.0 RESULTS ANDDISCUSSION

# 4.1 Substrate Characterization

Substrates for the experiment wereobtained from Student cafeteria an Student dormitory toilets. All samples prepared were determine for their phylicochemical properties before charged into the anaerobicbio-digester. A simple kinetic model with lamped parameters was developed aligned to with experimental results.

Types of leftover meal in the cafeteriansidered in this studgre: Injera, bread, cooked pasta, cooked rice, onion peels and harmalade The composition of leftover food from student cafeters presented table 4.1.

Component	Composition (%)
Injera	50
Bread	20
Cooked pasta	13.6
Cooked rice	12
Onion peels	3.5
Marmalade	0.9

Table 4.1: Compone	ents present in	cafeteria I	eftover food
--------------------	-----------------	-------------	--------------

#### 4.1.1 Moisturecontent

The moisture content of the substrates obtained follow the protocol stated in section 3.3. presented in table4.1. As it can be seen in the tablet has the highest moisture content levtoilet waste has the lowest moisture content. From our input substrates relatively the ighest biogas yield can be achieved from toilet waste substrates to its high total solid content. It is known that substrates which are used as a biogas source should have enough amound bis degradable biomass, bigh solid content implies relatively much amount obiodegradable content of substrate.

Sample		Sample mass (gram)	Moisture content (%)
Cafeteria wastes	Bread	68.60	41.23
	Injera	64.51	38.60
	wot	6.58	72.810
	Pasta	32.31	33.86
Toilet waste		11.57	24.63

#### Table 4.1 Moisturecontentof wastes

So substrate with highotal solid content has high content of the acetic acidsourced as a result the substrates an bepriorities on their biogas potential as followicilet wastes > Pasta > Injera > bread watt.

But further ultimate analysisuch as volatile content determinations needed to strictly predict the biogas potential from the total solid contents of strate, becausement this fraction of total solid content digestible matter will be small.

### 4.1.2 Volatile solid content

For the determination of theolatile solid content of the substrate-dried of substrate sample was burnedin a furnaceat 550°C for two hours. The mass of these hwas measured using digital balance with precision of two decimal places. The entirevolatile solid contents assumed to the scape by this two hours burning and the escaped percentage of mass represents the tradeatile solid content determined by subtracting the shortent from total solid content of the sample.

Sample		Sample mass (g)	Total volatile Content(%)
Cafeteria wastes	Bread	40.32	13.25
	Injera	39.61	18.08
Toilet waste	wot Pasta	1.79 21.37 8.72	31.41 20.27 2.51

#### Table4.2 Volatile content of different wastes

The composition of the substrates interorfisional volatile contents presented intable 4.2. As it can be seen wot has hightotal volatile content; while toilet waste has low totalvolatile content. Since total volatile contentrepresents the biodegradable component of the sample during an **adjustic**, we can arrange the substrates based there is biogas potentially can be arranged based on their biogas producing potential watt > pasta> Injera > bread> toilet waste.

All compounds are decomposed to simple soluble molecules and all intermediate producats such alcohols, carbonic acid, and volatile fatty acids produced at acids produced atgeoridesis stage of anaerobic digestion is from volatile content of the substrate.

# 4.1.3 BOD and COD of substrates

Table4.3 BOD and COD of the substrate us for biogas production

No.	HW to LOF Ratio	BOD [mg/l]	Literature value [mg/	COD(mg/l)	Literature value [mg/l]
1	100:0	38	37-434	2590	610-18,550
2	90:10	45	>>	2350	>>
3	10:90	43	>>	3500	>>
4	50:50	35	>>	3150	>>
5	0:100	41	>>	3750	>>
_					

Ratio is based on toilet waste: leftover food

Source: for literaturealues J.Natan.sci.Coun.Sanka, 1993

Similarly the BOD and CODof the substrates of fed ratios were measured and resented intable 4.3. As it is seen in the table the value of the BOD and COD seems no direct relationship with the wastreatios. This implies both wastes have nearly similar biological oxygen dem a will be cafeteria leftover food and human waste compared with industrial wastes the value of BOD is small, this implies that sample has low amount of microbe be values of COD are moderate when it is more a with industrial wastes.

#### 4.2. Effect of operation conditions on biogas yield

Table4.4 Effect of temperature anfieled ration biogas yieldat retention time f 30 days

Run	Temperature(	Ratio	Volume of	Replica	Average biogas
Run	oC)	Railo	biogas (ml)	Volume of	volume [ml]
	00)		biogas (IIII)	biogas (ml)	
1	25	0:100	562812	4982.52	5305.35
2	20	10:90	1932.16	1901.97	1917.06
3	25	10 :90	4017.54	3985.08	4001.00
4	33	10:90	2226.43	2161.75	2194.09
5	20	30 :70	1546.64	171800	1632.32
6	25	30: 70	3687.28	334500	3516.14
7	33	30:70	1028.92	987.80	1008.36
8	20	50:50	1328.36	1513.36	1420.86
9	25	50:50	3486.94	3396. <b>3</b> 8	3441.66
10	33	50 :50	3351.09	2467.95	2909.52
11	20	70:30	2118.62	1938.26	2028.44
12	25	70:30	2113.43	3783.62	2948.53
13	33	70 :30	1028.92	987.82	1008.37
14	20	90 :10	966.08	966.88	966.44
15	25	90:10	3392.75	2177.41	2785.08
16	33	90:10	2245.425	1343.455	1794.44
17	25	100.0	2118.62	1938.26	2028.44

Ratio is based on toilestaste:cafeteria leftover food

The effect of temperature on the yield of biogas at diffesent/strateratios was presented table 4.4. As it is can be seein table 4.4, the cumulative biogas produced at specified temperatures from each ratio is highest at 25°C. From the table it can be also notice that the ratio of toilet to cafeteria leftover food has a maximum biogasyield at thirty day retention time.

The maximumaverage/olume of biogas produced at 25, 10: 90 toilet to cafeteria leftover food ratio for thirty day retention time from 2.15kg solid waste is 4001ml. The experiment from only cafetteria a

toilet waste was conducted 25 for comparison of the biogas potential and it was observed from the figure that the cumulative biogas volume from cafeteria leftover food is higher than the toilet waste alone

4.2.1 Effect of temperature orbaily biogasyield

#### Figure 4.1. The effect of temperature on biogas yield at 10:9(boilet to cafeteria)

The effect of temperature ortaily biogas yield was investigated threedifferent temperatures in mesophlic digestion conditions and at optimum substrateratio of thirty day retention timeThe yield of biogasis presented inigure 4.1. As it can be seen in the figure; the aerobic digestion is strongly dependent on temperature. At 20the yield of biogas was lower and as the temperature increase from 20°C to 25°C the biogas yield is not eased from 1917.065 to 4001 mT his implies that the kinetics and thermodynamics of microorganisms inside the dige stevery much sensitive temperature The cumulative biogas yield form 10:90(m/m) of toilet and cafeteria was the sensitive of temperature and 1194.088 mbt 20°C, 250 Cand 33°C respectively.

#### Figure 4.2 Effect of substrate ratio on biogas yield at t = 2 SC

The effect of substrateratios on daily biogas yield wais vestigated or a wide range of substrateratios in wet base a temperature 25°C and retention time of thirty day. As it can be seen figure 4.2 anaerobic digestion is strongly dependent her amount of affeteria leftover food in the sample As the amount of cafeteria leftover food with toilet was teincrease the yield of biogas production crease This is due **b** the low total volatile contend to toilet was tess when compared with cafeteria leftover f(see table 42). The average cumulative biogas yield at 25°C for thirty day retention time is 2028.44mJ 2785.0785ml, 3441.66n3 516.66ml,4001ml, and 5305.135ml for the range of substrate ration of (toilet was te to cafeteria leftover food 0:0, 90:10,50:50,30:70,10:90 nd 0:100 respectively

#### Figure 4.3 Effect of initial pH on biogas production at 10:90 waste ratio and t= 2 C

The daily biogas produced from organic fraction toilet and cafeteria waste for different solution, at ambient temperature wassesented in figure 4.3t is noted that the biogas production of toilet and cafeteria wastes was performed without inoculums effect. The production is maintainetheut000 days. Interestingly it wasobservedthat the biogas productiostartsat different for each phtreatment. As it can be seen the production stantser nine daysor pH = 4treated substratent fifteene daysfor pH=9 treated substratend afterfour daysfor pH=7 treated substratent is in agreement withresults reportedby Vedrenneet al 2005at similar solution pH of 4, 5.5 6, 7 and This demonstrates that he initial pH of the substrate is deliberately changes the activity of microisrgais retarded, because the population of bacteria was affected at is why heyield of biogas decreased seen from figure 3.3 the lag time at eachpH indicates theeffect of pHon microbe•s population time to complete the reaction and start their digestion activityAfter digestion thepH of the slurry was 6.02, 7.23 and 7.62 for initial pH of **7** and 9 respectively. Thismeans that there was buffering mechanism pH made the environment favorable to digestion.

The final volumes of biogas from 2.15 kilogram of cafeteria and toilet was take 995.9 mL, 694.14 mL 256.49 mL corresponding to the eaction condition of H = 7, pH = 4 and pH = 9 respectively. This suggested that pH is an appropriate start up condition for an aerobic -**cli**gestion of leftover cafeteria and toilet was te.

#### 4.2.4 Significancetest for correlation

Dependent Vari	able: volume				
Source	Type III Sum	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	of Squares				
Corrected Mode	26100895.836	14	1864349.703	8.886	.000
later end	152327176.56		152327176.56		000
Intercept	6	1	6	726.015	.000
Temp	17941888.299	2	8970944.149	42.757	.000
Sub	2409975.252	4	602493.813	2.872	.060
temp * sub	5749032.285	8	718629.036	3.425	.019
Error	3147191.928	15	209812.795		
Tatal	181575264.32				
Total	9	30			
Corrected Total	29248087.763	29			

Table 4.5 Tests of Betweer Subjects Effects

a. R Squared = .892 (Adjusted R Squared = .792)

The significance of temperature and substrate ratio was presented in table 4.5, which is the output of SPSS version 20. From the significance value can see bothemperature and the interaction of substrate ratio and temperature are significant at 5% levels.

Table 4.6 multiple comparisor f temperatures

Dependent Variable: volume

rval
ound
5968
4807
4226
9904
3451
1646
30 30 3. 1.

Based on observed means.

The error term is Mean Squa(ferror) = 209812.795.

\*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

The digester operating emperature has a significance effeor theyield of biogas As presente in table 4.6, when the edigestion temperature increase from 20 to 25 he mean difference is biogas volume is significant at 0.05 level while working the reaction aC 32 ther than 20Cthe mean difference of biogas production is not significate emperature increasing the reacti temperature from  $225^{\circ}C$  and decreasing from  $325^{\circ}C$  the mean difference of the bioga production is significant at 0.05 level.

#### Table 4.7 Multiple Comparisons of substrate ratios

Dependent Variable: volume

#### Scheffe

(I) substrate ratio	(J) substrate ratio	Mean	Std. Error	Sig.	95%Confide	ence Interval
		Difference (I			Lower	Upper
		J)			Bound	Bound
10:90	30:70	-93.9688	264.45718	.998	-1018.5208	830.5832
	50:50	-221.5247	264.45718	.948	-1146.0767	703.0273
	70:30	374.0428	264.45718	.736	-550.5092	1298.5948
	90:10	520.4883	264.45718	.453	-404.0637	1445.0403
30:70	10:90	93.9688	264.45718	.998	-830.5832	1018.5208
	50:50	-127.5558	264.45718	.993	-1052.1078	796.9962
	70:30	468.0117	264.45718	.554	-456.5403	1392.5637
	90:10	614.4572	264.45718	.298	-310.0948	1539.0092
50:50	10:90	221.5247	264.45718	.948	-703.0273	1146.0767
	30:70	127.5558	264.45718	.993	-796.9962	1052.1078
	70:30	595.5675	264.45718	.326	-328.9845	1520.1195
	90:10	742.0130	264.45718	.151	-182.5390	1666.5650
70:30	10:90	-374.0428	264.45718	.736	-1298.5948	550.5092
	30:70	-468.0117	264.45718	.554	-1392.5637	456.5403
	50:50	-595.5675	264.45718	.326	-1520.1195	328.9845
	90:10	146.4455	264.45718	.988	-778.1065	1070.9975
90:10	10:90	-520.4883	264.45718	.453	-1445.0403	404.0637
	30:70	-614.4572	264.45718	.298	-1539.0092	310.0948
	50:50	-742.0130	264.45718	.151	-1666.5650	182.5390
	70:30	-146.4455	264.45718	.988	-1070.9975	778.1065
Based on obse	rved means.					

Based on observed means.

The error term is Mean Squa(ferror) = 209812.795.

As in table 4.7 presents increasing the amount of toilet wasdecoreasing the amount of cafeteria leftover food in the sample has no significant effect on the mean differences of biogas production at 0.05 levels. But as seen in the table mean difference of biogas volume much amount of cafeteria leftover food and low amount of the toilet waste becomes significant enerally the substrate ratio has relatively has less significant effect than temperature on biogas volume.

#### 4.3. Determination of Kinetic Parameters

In this work the kinetic data was collected y volume measurement of the daily biogas volume using water displacement method which can provide real time monitoring of the **ceta**n. The biogas volume difference gives an indication of the conversion **v** blatile content fraction of organic compound to methane carbon dioxide and ammonia.

The conversion X(%) of methaneused in this work was monitored by measuring whether me of biogas at the specified time and varies temperatures based on ideal gasequation and the result of kinetic parameters was ported as follows

#### 4.3.1 Rate Constant, Activation Energy and Preexponential Factor Determination

It was considered thathe digestionis occurred in liquid phase and it is supposed microbes are used to initiate the digestion for the formation of metheaduring the course of eaction Table4.5 represents the fractional conversion of volatile content fraction of organic compounds in digestion time@odd@ys. The digestion temperatures were 20, 25 an C33 Those temperatures were selected since targetions condition is mesophlic and from section 2.2m2esophlic temperature range is-328 °c. The lower temperature level was selected to see the effect of temperature at this minimum temperature of the mesospheric digestion condition. On one handhe upper level of temperature <sup>o</sup>C3 is limited to the maximum temperature Bahir dar cityfound. This is to predict the biogas yield that we can get from installed digesters around the city since they have no temperature control mechanism with their design

The value of rateconstant was determined from the plotent  $(1 \in X_{me})$  versus time The result is presented figure 4.5 As it can be seen the plot yields a straight line with correlation coefficient from 0.9320.964 for the three (20, 25, 33 °C) temperatures considered in this work. The reaction rate constant (K•) with a lamp parameter model is obtained from the slop of pred of  $\in X_{me}$  versus time. The values are found to be 0.000290409 day for the range of temperature considered is Th suggests that first order kinetics can be used escribemethane generation of a feteria leftover food and toiletwaste (figure 4.5). The rate constants at each temperature and their corresponding correlation coefficient are listed in table 4.6The rate constants represent the measure of egiradation rate. The higherrate constant value plies the higher the biodegradability of the digester.

Digestiontime	X me		gestiontime X me			-In(1-X <sub>me</sub> )	)
	20°C	25°C	3 <b>°C</b>	20°C	25 °C	33°C	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2	0.10	0.161	0.012	0.105	0.176	0.012	
6	0.17	0.371	0.0304	0.186	0.463	0.0308	
8	0.246	0.458	0.0456	0.282	0.613	0.0466	
12	0.271	0.539	0.0517	0.316	0.774	0.053	
16	0.298	0.565	0.0608	0.353	0.832	0.0627	
18	0.344	0.607	0.064	0.422	0.934	0.066	
24	0.362	0.677	0.07	0.449	1.13	0.0725	
26	0.377	0.697	0.0822	0.473	1.19	0.0858	
28	0.393	0.72	0.085	0.499	1.27	0.0888	
30	0.407	0.739	0.0914	0.523	1.34	0.0958	

Table 4.8 Methane formation conversion at temperatures 20, 25, and 63

# Table 4.9Reactionrate constants at the given temperature

Temperaturek()	K•(1/day)	R <sup>2</sup>
293	0.0159	0.932
298	0.0409	0.964
306	0.0029	0.941

#### Figure 4.4 plots of -In (1-Xme) versus time [day]

#### 4.3.1.1.Michaelis €Menten model

Eventhough there are manyhemical and physical reaction takes place in an aerobic digestion process in four most important steps for biograps oduction manyintermediate products due to biochemical transformation reaction But here the whole system is lumped to one step reaction be are the model above sections. In section 4.3 it lwas tried to investigate and develop the model and validate the model by experimental data generated from the laboratory.

Further we fit the experimental results with Michaedinsenten equations and the lation of microbial population with methane product was investigated. Michaedinsenten developed that the rate of product formation is proportional to microbial growth.

The values of kinetic parametewsere estimated by conducting experiment and generating concentration € time data. The reaction rate data for the tree responding concentration € time data was generated by differentiated concentration € time data by using numerical methods. This method was become use of the data points in the independent variable is equally spaced. The result plotted graphically as shown a figure 45, so that the validity of kinetic model was tested and kinetic meters were stimated. As it is shown infigure 4.6the value of rateconstant was determined from the plot[OH4]/Reaction rate versus[CH4] plotting yield straight line equations with goodness of fit (correlation coefficient) ranging from 0.9320.964 at different temperatures with slope (Kimanges0.0667-1.601day<sup>-1</sup>.

This figure shows that first order kinetics can be usedletscribemethane generation of cafeteria leftover food and toiletwaste (igure 4.5). The rate constants at each temperaturate gefrom 0.081.565 and their corresponding correlations of ficient are 0.9280.993 listed in table 4.7 The rate constants represent the measure of biodegradation rate. The higher of rate constant value, the higher the biodegradability of the digesterWe can see in the theothe degradation rate of substrates is highly depending on temperature. The interaction of microbe with substrate is higher can be an added to at 33°C. And the initial concentration of microbes in was also following the same trend as substrate microbe•s interaction rate.

Kinetic model	Temperature	Reaction rat	te Correlation
	(°C)	constants	coefficients
Michaelis€	20oc	rmax=0.15,km=1.106	6 0.937
menten model	25oc	rmax=1.565,km=1.60	01 0.929
	33oc	rmax=0.08,km=0.667	7 0.993

Table 4.10kinetic	constants	and correlation	coefficients
-------------------	-----------	-----------------	--------------

# Figure 4.5 formation of methane vs.biodegradtion rate with methane concentration using Monod model

The activation energy folds anaerobic digestion reaction as calculated using Arrhenius equation 3.12 from the reaction rate constants shown in table 4.6. As it is shown in fig@rthe4.correlation coefficient ( $R^2$ ) 0.993 indicates a good linearity between lnK' and 1/T in the temperature range of 20 33°C. The value of activation energy and peexponential factor from figure 4.7 wa262.279J/MOL and 717.408 /MOL respectively. Therefore, the Arrhenius equation for the reaction rate and the reaction temperature (203°C) could be written as equation 4.1 and substituting the slope and the intercept it can be written as equation 4.2.

The activation energy for the naerobic digestion of diluted labaneh whey for biogas productivith temperature range (3327°C) was5242.333J/MOL [29].

Figure 4.6 plots of InK• versus 1/T for anaerobic cedigestion

In this work, the activation engy obtained for the anaerobio- digestion was higher than the value listed in the literature/Vedrenneet al, 2005).

# CHAPTER FIVE 5.0. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 5.1. Conclusion

Biogas production from cafeteria leftover food and toilet wastestwadiedin 5 liter anaerobic digester. The substrates useds an input for the experimentence categorized and prioritized according to their total volatile content fobiogas yield potential as: watt > pasta > Injera > bread > toilet wastEhis is based on the total volatile content.

The value of the digestion parameters Cafeteria leftover food to toilet waste ratiol 9 and digestion temperature 2°s for 30 day digestion retention time wias sestigate to give the maximum conversion 74 % within the given range operameters According to this study the highest amount of biogas (4.001 liter) was produced from 0.215 kgtorilet waste and 1.95 kgr cafeteria leftover.

The kinetic parameters were determined by generating the conversion of methane at different reaction conditions from the volume of biogas generated peratures: 20, 25, and 3°C were used to study the temperature dependency of rate constants the seconstants were determined at each temperature. The values of activation energy and pereponential factor were determined by fitting the reaction rate constants at different temperature Arrhenius equation From Arrhenius equation the obtained values of activation energy and prexponential factor were 7262.279 J/MOL and 717.408J/MO bespectively Then it was found that pseudo first order kinetic medwas proposed for an aerobic codigestion of cafeteria and toilet wastes.

# 5.2. Recommendations

This thesis workinvestigates the possibility of employinvoglume measurementethod of monitoring digestionprogress for an aerobic codigestion reaction According to all the results and observations, the key findings in this thesisted to the following deas for further considerations:

- Although the pseudo first order reaction kinetics was proposed by monitoring the methane concentration by volumeneasurement and methane concentration uisdeg lgas equation, study the methane concentration profile for thigestion progress using biogas analyzer leads to the general understanding.
- 2. The temperature effect at thermophilic anaerobic condition should be done to compare the yield and biogasquality.
- 3. The effect of digestion retention time on biogas yield sthole done further beyond 30 days.

# Appendix

TableAPP.1: Concentration of substrate and product at temperature of 25

Tableapp2: Concentration of substrate and product with time at temperature of 20

TableAPP.3: Concentration of substrate and product with time at temperature of 33

Date	Level[ml]	Volume of biogas[ml]
07/02/07	322	12.568
08	315	10.997
09	302	4.713
11	298	6.284
17	295	4.713
19	288	12568.
22	286	5683.142
23	283	4.713
24	282	1.571
25	279	6.284
26	274	7.855
29	273	1.571
30	268	7.885
02	266	3.142

Table APP 4 9% toilet waste: 10% eftover food [20°c]

Waste to water ratio= one

# TableAPP.5:10% toilet waste and 90% leftover fod@0°c]

Date	Level [ml]	Biogas volume [ml]
7/02/07	329	1.571
8	312	26.707
11	306	9.426
17	266	62.84
19	264	15.71
22	243	17.281
23	238	7.855
24	233	7.885
25	229	6.284
26	223	9.426
29	216	10.997
30	214	3.142
02	206	12.568
03	202	6.284

date	Level [ml]	Volume of biogas [ml]
7/02/07	323	10.997
8	315	12.568
11	313	3.142
17	309	6.284
19	307	3.142
22	306	1.571
23	304	3.142
24	303	1.571
25	302	0
26	299	1.571
29	298	4.713
30	298	1.571
02	296	3.142
03	296	0

#### TableAPP.6: 50% toilet waste: 50% leftover food [26]

Waste to water ratio= one

#### TableAPP.7: 50% toilet waste: 50% leftover food [36]

Date	Level[ml]	Volume of biogas produced [ml]
7/02/07	329	1.571
8	204	196.375
11	184	31.42
17	164	31.42
19	156	12.568
22	150	9.426
23	145	7.855
24	143	3.142
25	139	6.284
26	133	9.426
29	126	10.997
30	122	3.142
02	118	6.284
03	108	15.71

Date	Level [ml]	Volume of biogas produced [ml]
25/03/07	299	48.701
26	277	34.562
28	244	51.843
29	229	23.5655
01	204	39.275
02	193	17.281
03	179	21.994
05	165	21.994
06	157	12.568
07	153	6.284
08	145	12.568
10	137	12.568
12	126	17.281
13	124	3.142
15	119	7.855

#### TableAPP.8: 50% toilet waste: 50% leftover food [25]

Waste to water ratio= one

#### TableAPP.9: 90% toilet waste10% leftover food 33°c]

Date	Level [ml]	Volume of biogas produce
		[ml]
25/11/07	286	69.124
26	244	65.982
28	218	40.846
29	210	12.568
01	198	18.852
02	192	9.426
03	184	12.568
05	178	9.426
06	170	12.568
07	170	0
08	165	7.855
10	161	6.284
12	152	14.139
13	149	4.713
15	144	7.855

Date	Level [ml]	Volume of biogas produce [ml]
25/03/07	329	1.571
26	323	9.426
28	320	4.713
29	318	3.142
01	311	10.997
02	306	7.855
03	302	6.284
05	291	17.281
06	289	4.713
07	286	4.713
08	270	25.136
10	252	34.562
12	241	14.139

TableAPP.10 90% toilet waste: 10% leftover food3°c]

Waste to water ratio= one

# TableAPP.11 50% toilet waste50% leftover food [33c]

Date	Level [ml]	Volume of biogas produce
		[ml]
25/03/07	326	6.284
26	320	9.426
28	315	7.855
29	313	3.142
01	310	4.713
02	310	0
03	308	3.142
05	306	3.142
06	302	6.284
07	301	1.571
08	299	3.142

Date	Level [ml]	Volume of biogas produce
		[ml]
07/01/07	206	197.804
08	198	12.568
9	188	15.71
13	169	17.281
15	150	29.349
19	136	21.994
21	130	9.426
23	123	10.997
24	121	3.142
25	118	4.713
26	114	6.284
29	107	10.997
01	105	3.142
03	105	0

TableAPP.12 50% toiletwaste:50% leftover food 25°c]

Waste to waterratio= one

#### TableAPP.13:10% toilet waste: 9% leftover food [33c]

Date	Level [ml]	Volume of biogas produce [ml]
07/01/07	329	1.571
08	327	3.142
9	326	1.571
13	325	1.571
15	324	1.571
19	322	3.142
21	321	1.571
23	320	1.571
24	319	1.571
25	316	4.713
26	315	1.571

Date	Level [ml]	Volume of biogas produce [ml]
07/01/07	325	7.855
08	324	1.571
9	318	9.246
13	316	3.142
15	307	14.139
19	303	6.284
21	300	4.713
23	298	3.142
24	294	6.284
25	289	7.855
26	285	6.284
29	283	3.142
01	281	3.142
03	268	20.423
04	252	25.136

TableAPP.14 90% toilet waste: 0% leftover food 25°c]

Waste to water ratio= one

#### TableAPP.15 10% toilet waste: 9% leftover food [20°c]

Date	Level [ml]	Volume of biogas produce
		[ml]
07/01/07	296	53.414
08	275	32.991
9	257	40.846
13	247	12.568
15	240	14.139
19	225	23.565
21	219	9.426
23	214	7.855
24	209	7.855
25	204	7.855

#### Reference

- 1. Swedish Gas Centre: Basic Data On Biogas, 2nd Edition, Sweden, 2012
- 2. Dr. Amrit B. Karki, Prof. Jagan Nath Shrestha ,Mr. Sundar Bajg Asin, Renewald Source Of Energy Theory And Development, Nepal, 2005
- Teodorita Al Seadi, Dominik Rutz, Heinz Prassl, Michael Köttner, Tobias Finsterwalder, Silke Volk, Rainer Janssen, Biogas Hand Book, University Of Southern Denmark Esbjerg, Denmard, 2008
- 4. Agdag, O. N. And Delia Teresa Sponza. 2007. -Digestion Of Mixed Industrial Sludge With Municipal Solid Wastes In Anaerobic Simulated Land Filling Bioreactologynnal Of Hazardous, 2007
- 5. S. O. Dahunsiand U. S. Oranusi, -Digestion Of Food Waste And Human Excreta For Biogas Production, Covenant University, Ota, Nigeria, 2013
- Alemayehu Gashaw, Solomon Libs R.B Chavan Evaluation Of The Feasibility Of Biogas Production From Leftover Foods Of Bahir Dar University Students• Cafe Variame 3 Issue 5, 2014
- 7. Charles B. Niwagaba, Tatement Technologies For Human Faces And Urine, Doctoral Thesis Faculty Of Technology Makerere University ,Kampala, Uganda,2009
- 8. James M.Lee ,Biochemical Engineering ,Book, Washington State University,2001
- 9. V.Kirubakaran, V. Sivaramakrishnan S. Shanmugapriya ,Premalathacatalytic Kinetics And Mechanism Of Biogas Generation,India,2009
- 10. Dr. Saikat Banerjee, Dr. Amaleshsirkar, Determination Of Kinetic Parameters In Anaerobic Digestion Process Using Distille Wastes A Mathematical Approach Chemical Engineering Department, Haldia Institute Of Technology, Hala 267, India, 2012
- 11.\*K. M. Kangle., Kore S. V., Kore V. S., Kulkarni G. S., Recent Trends In Anaerobic Co Digestion: A Review, Department Of Environmental Science And Technology, Shivaji University, Kolhapur (Maharas
- 12. H. Scott Fogler Elements Of Chemical Reaction Engineering, Bdd India, 2004
- 13. Bani.Kheiredine, Kerroum. Derbal, Mossaab. Bencheichocine, Effect Of Starting Ph On The Produced MethanFerom Dairy Wastewater In Thermophilic Phase, Aljeria, 2014
- 14. K. M. Hangos, L T. Cameron, Process Modeling And Model Analysis, India, 2001

- 15. Liang Yu, Pierre Christian Wensel, Jingwei Ma And Shulin Cheathematical Modeling In Anaerobic Digestion (Ad)DepartmentOf Biological Systems Engineering, Washington State University, Pullman, Wa 99164, Usa,
- 16.G. Lyberatos, I.V. Skiadas, Modeling Of Anaerobic DigestioA Review, Department Of Chemical Engineering, University Of Patras, Grecee, 1998.
- 17. Maurie L.Albertson, Modification Of Anaerobic Digestion Model No.1 For Accumulation And Biomass Recycling, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, 2005
- 18. Jonathan Rea, Kinetic Modeling And Experimentation Of Anaerobic Digestion, Bachelor Of Science In Mechanical Engineering, Massachus Institute Of Technology, 2014
- Iginio Colussi, Angelo Cortesi, Vittorino Gallo, Adriana S. Rubesa Fernandez, Rosa Vitanza\*, Modeling Of An Anaerobic Process Producing Biogas From Winery Wastes, Italy, 2012
- 20. Ibrahim M.Abu Reesh, Kinetics Of Anaerobic Ditjes Of Labaneh Whey In Batch Reactor, Quator University, Quator
- 21. Elena Ficara Alberto Leva Sonia Hassan Francesca Malpe Andrea, Allegrini Gianni Ferretti, Anaerobic Digestion Models: A Comparative Study, Italy 2013
- 22. S. K. R. Yadanaparthi, Chen, B.Glaze, Anaerobic Coligestion Of Dairy Manure With Potato Waste, Iniversity Of Idaho, R&E Center, Twin, 2013
- 23. E.Jurado\*, G. Antonopoulou\*\*, G. Lyberatos, H.N. Gavala\* And I.V. Skiadas, ABassed Modeling Of Anaerobic Digestion Of Swine Manure Fibers Patende With Aqueous Ammonia Soaking, Athens, Greece, 2012
- 24. Kamm, B., Gruber, P. R, Kamm, M. (EdsBjogas From Waste And Renewable Resources, Germany2005
- 25. Octave Levenspiel, Chemical Reaction Engineering, Third Edition, Book, Oregon State University, 1999
- 26. Andig, Anaerobic Digestion Glossary Of Terms, 2012
- 27.T.Z.D. De Mes, A.J.M. Stams, J.H. Reith And G. ZeemMaethane Production By Anaerobic Digestion Of Wastewater And Solid Wastes
- 28. Arthur C.Guton; John Edward Hall, Text Book Of Medical Physiology ,2011

29. Ibrahim M.AbuReesh, Kinetics Of Anaerobic Digestion Of Labaneh Whey In A Batch Reactor, Qatar University, Doha, Qatar, 2014