

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

## Fertilizer value and greenhouse gas emissions from solid fraction pig slurry compost pellets

### This is the author's manuscript

*Original Citation:*

*Availability:*

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1655406> since 2021-09-02T11:40:11Z

*Published version:*

DOI:10.1017/S002185961700079X

*Terms of use:*

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

**FERTILIZER VALUE AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FROM SOLID FRACTION  
PIG SLURRY COMPOST PELLETS**

**Niccolò Pampuro<sup>a\*</sup>, Chiara Bertora<sup>b</sup>, Dario Sacco<sup>b</sup>, Elio Dinuccio<sup>b</sup>, Carlo Grignani<sup>b</sup>,  
Paolo Balsari<sup>b</sup>, Eugenio Cavallo<sup>a</sup>, Maria Pilar Bernal<sup>c</sup>**

<sup>a</sup>Institute for Agricultural and Earth Moving Machines (IMAMOTER), Italian National  
Research Council (CNR) - Strada delle Cacce, 73 - 10135 Torino (TO), Italy

<sup>b</sup>Department of Agricultural, Forestry and Food Sciences - University of Turin - Largo Paolo  
Braccini, 2 - 10095 Grugliasco (TO), Italy

<sup>c</sup>Department of Soil and Water Conservation and Organic Waste Management, Centro de  
Edafologia y Biología Aplicada del Segura, CSIC, P.O. Box 164, 30100 Murcia, Spain

\*Corresponding Author: Niccolò Pampuro, Tel: +39-0113977723; Fax: +39-0113489218;  
E-mail: [n.pampuro@ima.to.cnr.it](mailto:n.pampuro@ima.to.cnr.it)

## ABSTRACT

Conversion of pig slurry to pellets is a desirable fertilizer option for farmers who want to mitigate environmental pollution from slurry accumulation. The goals of the current investigation were to determine the fertilizer properties of pig slurry solid fraction (SF) pellets and to assess its potential to enhance soil properties in order to reduce ammonia ( $\text{NH}_3$ ) volatilization and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Various parameters influence SF-based pellet fertilizer effectiveness: bulking agent use during composting, pellet diameter sizing and soil application type (superficially or incorporated into the soil). Two composts from the same pig slurry SF obtained from a screw press separator were prepared: pig SF compost without a bulking agent (SSFC) and pig SF compost with wood chips as the bulking agent (wood chip compost (WCC)). For each compost type, pellets of two different diameters (6 and 8 mm) were produced. A mesocosm experiment, conducted with maize plants, was used to test the fertilizer value of the considered pellets. In total, three compost fertilizers – SSFC, WCC and nitrogen: phosphorus: potassium mineral fertilizer 15 : 15 : 15, plus one unfertilized control treatment – were applied at the same N rate (equivalent to 200 kg/ha) using two different methods (surface and soil incorporation). After 65 days, above-ground biomass, roots and soil samples were collected and analysed. Subsequently, a second mesocosm study was undertaken to measure  $\text{NH}_3$  and GHG emissions released from pellet fertilization. Ammonia volatilization was determined immediately after pellet application, while carbon dioxide ( $\text{CO}_2$ ), methane ( $\text{CH}_4$ ) and nitrous oxide ( $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ ) emissions were monitored for 57 days. Study results indicated that both pellet types were effective slow-release fertilizers for maize. Additionally, three actions seemed to make the nutrients contained in pig SF compost pellets more available to plants: addition of a bulking agent before com- posting, use of small diameter pellets and soil incorporation of the fertilizer.

**Key words:** composting; pelletizing; nutrient;  $\text{NH}_3$ ;  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ ;  $\text{CO}_2$ ;  $\text{CH}_4$ ; maize.

45

## 46 INTRODUCTION

47 In several European countries, intensive pig produc- tion systems produce high quantities  
48 of organic waste in limited and specific geographic areas. In Italy, the 6th Italian National  
49 Census of Agriculture (ISTAT 2012) indicates that the regions of Piedmont, Lombardy and  
50 Emilia-Romagna account for 90% of all pig breeding in the country (ISTAT 2012). In both  
51 Europe and Italy, slurry storage for subsequent land application is the predominant manure  
52 management practice, probably due to its simplicity, low cost and potential to reduce the  
53 total cost of crop production as a chemical fertilizer replacement (Kunz et al. 2009).  
54 However, the technique carries several environmental pollution risks: ammonia ( $\text{NH}_3$ ) and  
55 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions into the atmosphere, nitrate ( $\text{NO}_3^-$ ) leaching into  
56 groundwater and phosphorous (P) runoff into surface waters (Salazar et al. 2005; Rao et al.  
57 2007; Troy et al. 2013; Zhu et al. 2014; Vazquez et al. 2015). Consequently, the European  
58 Union and local authorities enforce regulations on application timings, distribution volumes  
59 and proper techniques to manage the potential environment fallout of high volumes of pig  
60 excreta generated in areas of its member countries (Berruto et al. 2013). At times, these  
61 rules have unintended consequences, as does the Nitrates Directive (EEC 1991) that  
62 restricts the animal manure nitrogen (N) application rate to 170 kg N/ha/year within defined  
63 Nitrate Vulnerable Zones. In this case, the mandate fails to permit manure disposal in many  
64 intensive livestock regions where cultivation occurs near farm facilities, increas- ing costs  
65 for storage and transportation.

66 Several techniques have been developed to better manage livestock slurries (Jørgensen &  
67 Jensen 2009). The separation of solid and liquid fractions (LFs) simplifies handling by  
68 decreasing its volume. The LF, which is rich in soluble N (Fangueiro et al. 2012), is generally  
69 applied in areas adjacent to the farm, while the solid fraction (SF), rich in nutrients and  
70 organic matter (OM) (Fangueiro et al. 2012) and containing less water, can be applied to

71 land at greater distances. According to recent investigations (unpublished data), the SF can  
72 be transported economically to fields up to 25 km from the livestock farm.

73 A promising approach to increase the benefits of pig slurry SF, as well as to create a  
74 potential new market for pig slurry-derived fertilizer, is to pelletize it. The densification  
75 process that occurs after composting increases the bulk density of SF from <500 to >1000  
76 kg/m<sup>3</sup> (Pampuro et al. 2013), which reduces transport, handling and storage costs (Kaliyan  
77 & Vance Morey 2009). Furthermore, Alemi et al. (2010) and Romano et al. (2014) showed  
78 that pelletizing homogenizes and further concentrates SF nutrients, thereby improving its  
79 fertilizing and amending actions.

80 However, the high moisture content (75–80%) of fresh SF does not make it suitable for  
81 pelletizing. In previous studies (Pampuro et al. 2014, 2016), turning windrow composting  
82 has been revealed as a simple and cheap method to reduce the moisture content of SF. As  
83 a consequence of the heat generated by composting, after only 72 days moisture can be  
84 lowered by 40%, hence the material is suitable for pelletizing.

85 For optimizing the composting, a bulking agent is added to SF. This makes it possible to  
86 adjust substrate properties such as air space, moisture content, carbon-to-nitrogen ratio  
87 (C/N), particle density, pH and mechanical structure, positively affecting the decomposition  
88 rate and, therefore, development of the temperature (Bernal et al. 2009). Lignocellulosic  
89 agricultural and forestry by-products are typical bulking agents when composting N-rich  
90 wastes such as animal manures (Bernal et al. 2009). Their low moisture and high C/N ratios  
91 can improve the benefits of animal manures (Nolan et al. 2011). The most commonly used  
92 materials are cereal straw, cotton waste and wood by-products (Ros et al. 2006; Bernal et  
93 al. 2009; Nolan et al. 2011; Santos et al. 2016).

94 The current work aimed to determine the fertilizer properties, as well as the potential benefit  
95 to improve soil properties and to reduce NH<sub>3</sub> volatilization and GHG emissions of pig slurry  
96 SF pellets. Different techniques for SF-based pellet fertilizer production, including addition

of a bulking agent for composting, preparation of different pellet sizes and use of different soil application methods, were investigated and tested within two separate mesocosm experiments to control environmental conditions.

Several hypotheses have been formed: (1) compost derived from pig slurry SF can have a significant short-term benefit as a fertilizer (not as an amendment only); (2) fertilizer properties of SF-based pellets are not compromised by the addition of a bulking agent for composting; (3) reducing pellet diameter increases the availability of nitrogen: phosphorus: potassium (NPK), and  $\text{NH}_3$  volatilization and GHG emissions simultaneously; (4) soil-incorporated pellets, as opposed to those applied superficially, reduce  $\text{NH}_3$  volatilization and GHG emissions while increasing nutrient availability.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### **Pellet preparation and characterization**

Two different composts were produced from the same SF obtained from a screw press separator. The pig SF compost (SSFC) was obtained by composting 6000 kg of pig SF, while the wood chip compost (WCC) resulted after composting 8000kg of the same pig SF with 2400 kg of wood chips processed from urban garden pruning residues. During WCC windrow preparation, materials were mixed thoroughly to achieve a theoretical C/N ratio equal to 30 (Bishop & Godfrey 1983), so as to optimize composting performance (Bernal et al. 2009). After the set-up, windrows were placed on a concrete floor and the process was monitored for 130 days. Each set consisted of two thermocouples placed at depths of 0.2 m (T1) and 0.6 m (T2) from the windrow surface. Daily air temperatures were monitored and recorded (Fig. 1). During the experimental period, windrows were turned six times (on days 7, 16, 28, 35, 50 and 71).

122 The two composts were pelletized to two different diameters ([Ø] 6 and 8 mm) by a  
123 mechanical pelletizer (CLM200E, La Meccanica Srl, Padua, Italy).  
124 A number of analyses were performed to characterize the four pellet types (two diameters  
125 of two compost types): pH, moisture content, dry matter content (DM), total organic carbon  
126 (TOC), total nitrogen (TN), ammonium nitrogen ( $\text{NH}_4^+\text{-N}$ ), nitric nitrogen ( $\text{NO}_3^-\text{-N}$ ), C/N, OM,  
127 cation exchange capacity (CEC), total phosphorous (expressed as  $\text{P}_2\text{O}_5$ ) and total  
128 potassium (expressed as  $\text{K}_2\text{O}$ ). The pH value was determined in a water-soluble extract 1 :  
129 10 (w/w) using a Hanna HI 9026 portable pH meter fitted with a glass electrode combined  
130 with a thermal automatic compensation system. Dry matter was calculated after drying at  
131 105 °C for 12 h and OM content by loss on ignition at 430 °C for 24 h (Navarro et al. 1993).  
132 Samples for TOC analysis were prepared by drying the samples at 105 °C for 24 h, followed  
133 by treatment with sulphuric acid to eliminate any inorganic C, with subsequent analysis on  
134 an elemental analyser (Carlo Erba Instruments). Total N and  $\text{NH}_4^+\text{-N}$  were determined using  
135 the Kjeldahl standard method. Nitric-N was determined by ion chromatography in a 1 : 20  
136 (w/v) water extract (Garcia-Gomez et al. 2002); CEC was determined by sodium chloride  
137 adsorption followed by the potassium nitrate displacement method (Silber et al. 2010). After  
138  $\text{HNO}_3/\text{HClO}_4$  digestion,  $\text{P}_2\text{O}_5$  was analysed by colourimetry and  $\text{K}_2\text{O}$  by flame photom-  
139 etry (Garcia-Gomez et al. 2002). Table 1 reports the main chemical characteristics (mean  
140 value of three replicates) for the pellets investigated.

141

#### 142 **Fertilizer value experiment**

143 A mesocosm experiment was set up in a controlled environment (22 °C) glasshouse to test  
144 the fertilizer value of the different pig SF-based pellets in a randomized complete block  
145 design with four replicates. The experiment included a total of ten treatments:  
146 (1) SSFC Ø 6 mm superficially distributed [SSFC 6 SUP]; (2) SSFC Ø 8mm superficially  
147 distributed [SSFC 8 SUP]; (3) SSFC Ø 6 mm mixed with the soil [SSFC 6 MIX]; (4) SSFC Ø

148 8 mm mixed with the soil [SSFC 8 MIX]; (5) WCC Ø 6 mm superficially distributed [WCC 6  
 149 SUP]; (6) WCC Ø 8 mm superficially distributed [WCC 8 SUP]; (7) WCC Ø 6 mm mixed with  
 150 the soil [WCC 6 MIX]; (8) WCC Ø 8 mm mixed with the soil [WCC 8 MIX]; (9) Conventional  
 151 mineral fertilization with NPK fertilizer (15–15–15) [NPK]; (10) unfertilized Control [CON].  
 152 Each experimental unit consisted of a plastic mesocosm pot (volume = 3·015 litre, diameter  
 153 = 160 mm, height = 150 mm) with small holes in the bottom for excess water drainage  
 154 containing clay–silty soil collected from the top 20 cm of the CEBAS–CSIC experi- mental  
 155 fields located in Santomera, Murcia Region (Spain). The soil was air-dried for 5–6 days and  
 156 sieved to <5 mm for the mesocosm experiment. For the soil characterization analyses  
 157 described above, soil was further sieved to <2 mm; results are reported in Table 2.  
 158 Each mesocosm was uniformly packed with 3 l of soil at a bulk density of 1350kg/m<sup>3</sup> (Wu et  
 159 al. 2011). Initially, all pots were moistened with deio- nized water to attain a 60% water-filled  
 160 pore space (WFPS). The water added to each mesocosm was calculated to supply 70% of  
 161 the water holding capacity (WHC), which corresponded to 670ml per pot. Thereafter, soil  
 162 water content was adjusted via a drip irrigation system (4 litre/min for 10 min) every 2–5  
 163 days as required for the crop. Mesocosms were fertilized manually (with SSFC or WCC or  
 164 NPK mineral fertilizer) at a consistent N application rate (equivalent to 200 kg/ha).  
 165 Depending on pellet composition, P and K were supplied as follows to the soil: 240 kg  
 166 P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/ha and 60 kg K<sub>2</sub>O/ha for SSFC; 255 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/ha and 110 kg K<sub>2</sub>O/ha for WCC; and 200  
 167 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/ha and 200 kg K<sub>2</sub>O/ha for NPK fertilizer. Maize (*Zea mays* L.) FAO 500 seeds were  
 168 then sown into the mesocosm pots at a density of two plants per pot. Plants grew for 65  
 169 days.  
 170 At the end of the trial, the above-ground biomass was harvested, roots were separated from  
 171 the soil and the soil was sampled. After washing both the above- and below-ground biomass  
 172 with tap and dis- tilled water (two times each), all were dried at 60 °C for 72 h and sub-  
 173 samples were milled to 0·5 mm for analysis and moisture content determination.



174 Soil pore water was sampled three times during the experiment (days 30, 60, 65) in the MIX,  
175 NPK fertilizer and unfertilized control treatments using FLEX-type 'Rhizon' soil pore water  
176 samplers (Rhizosphere Research Products, The Netherlands) inserted at the surface of  
177 each pot at approximately 45°. Soils were wetted to saturation (100% of their WHC) with  
178 deionized water 24 h prior to each pore water extraction to ensure soil solution equilibrium.  
179 Nitrogen concentration was assessed by automatic microanalysis. After  $\text{HNO}_3\text{--H}_2\text{O}_2$   
180 microwave-assistant digestion, P composition of the aerial parts was determined by  
181 colourimetry (Kitson & Mellon 1944) and K by flame photometry. Soil samples were analysed  
182 for nitrate ( $\text{NO}_3$ ) by ion chromatography in a 1 : 20 (w/v) water extract, while electrical  
183 conductivity (EC) and pH were evaluated in a water-soluble extract 1 : 10 (w/v). An automatic  
184 liquid sample analyser (TOC- V CSN + TNM-1 Analyser, Shimadzu, Tokyo, Japan) was  
185 used to measure soluble N in pore water. All chemical determinations were performed in  
186 duplicate.

187 Plant N utilization efficiency was calculated on the basis of the apparent recovery fraction  
188 (ARF) approach (Gunnarsson et al. 2010), according to the following equation:

189

$$190 \text{ ARF} = (\text{N uptake treatment} - \text{N uptake control}) / \text{TN added}$$

191 in which N uptake treatment is the total N uptake (mg/pot) of a fertilizer treatment at  
192 harvesting, N uptake control is the total N uptake (mg/pot) of the unfertilized control and TN  
193 added is the total N added to each pot (mg/pot). A similar calculation was done for P, but  
194 without subtracting P uptake of the control (Syers et al. 2008).

195

## 196 **Ammonia and GHG experiment**

197 A second mesocosm experiment, also of a randomized complete block design with four  
198 replicates, was set up to measure  $\text{NH}_3$  volatilization and GHG emissions. Nine of the ten

199 treatments described for the first experiment were included in this investigation; the 'NPK  
200 treatment' was omitted.

201 The experiment was carried out in glass jars (3.2 litre capacity). To mimic the plough layer  
202 (0– 30 cm) of the soil, all jars were filled with 1.5 kg of the same soil used in the first  
203 mesocosm experiment; they were also moistened with deionized water to reach 60% of  
204 WFPS (Subedi et al. 2013). Next, the soil was brought back to field density ( $1.35 \text{ g/cm}^3$ ; Wu  
205 et al. 2011), at which the headspace volume equalled 2000  $\text{cm}^3$ . The jars were then pre-  
206 incubated at 20 °C until the initial  $\text{CO}_2$  flux from soil re-wetting had subsided (10 days). After  
207 pre-incubation, jars were manually fertilized with either SSFC or WCC pellets with the same  
208 nutrient amounts as described in the first experiment. Thereafter, all jars were main- tained  
209 in a climate-controlled room at a constant 25 °C and air humidity of about 55%. The soil  
210 moisture content of each jar was maintained at 60% WFPS for 57 days via gravimetric  
211 adjustment every 2–3 days as required. No gas measurement was taken <12 h after an  
212 adjustment.

213 Ammonia volatilization was measured for 48 h fol lowing pellet application at 20 °C and at  
214 an air-flow rate of 2litre/min (Subedi et al. 2013) with a dynamic chamber system coupled  
215 with a photoacoustic trace gas analyser (PTGA, INNOVA 1412, LumaSense Tech).

216 Emissions of the main GHG produced from agricultural soils (i.e.,  $\text{CO}_2$ ,  $\text{CH}_4$  and  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ ) were  
217 measured from the jars three times weekly for the first 2 weeks after fertilization, then twice  
218 weekly for the following 3 weeks and once weekly for the last 4 weeks, for a total of 16 times  
219 during the 57-day period. Greenhouse gas fluxes were measured for each sealed jar using  
220 a gas-tight polyethylene lid equipped with two Teflon tubes (each 5 cm long) punctured by  
221 several small holes (0.5 mm diameter) to sample air from the entire headspace volume.  
222 Thirty millilitres of air was withdrawn by plastic syringe from the jar headspace at 0, 9 and 18  
223 min after jar closure. All samples were stored in airtight glass vials (12 ml Exetainer<sup>®</sup> vials)  
224 and analysed for  $\text{CO}_2$ ,  $\text{CH}_4$  and  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  concentrations within 24 h by gas chromatography

225 (Agilent 7890). The gas chromatograph (GC) was equipped with thermal conductivity, flame  
226 ionization and electron capture detectors for determination of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O  
227 concentrations, respectively. For each jar closure, concentrations of the three GHG were  
228 plotted over time and fluxes were calculated with a linear or polynomial model, depending  
229 on their specific accumulation pattern (Subedi et al. 2016). Cumulative emissions were  
230 estimated assuming a linear change in fluxes between adjacent sampling points.  
231 Total gaseous losses were expressed in CO<sub>2</sub>-eq using conversion factors of 1, 28, 265 and  
232 2.65 for CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and NH<sub>3</sub> (IPCC 2013), respectively.

233

## 234 **Statistical analyses**

235 One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to evaluate all investigated variables  
236 concern- ing plant, root, soil pore water, soil and cumulative NH<sub>3</sub> and GHG emissions. A  
237 Kolmogorov–Smirnov test was used to test normality of distribution; homo- scedasticity was  
238 verified with Levene’s test. For each variable, if treatment effect was statistically significant,  
239 the ANOVA was followed by the planned contrasts test. Nine contrasts were planned; first,  
240 the unfertilized control against all the fertilized treatments (all pellets + NPK); then NPK  
241 against all pellet-fertilized treatments (SSFC + WCC); subsequently, SSFC pellets against  
242 WCC pellets; afterwards, within each type of pellet (both SSFC and WCC) 6 mm diameter  
243 against 8 mm diameter; finally, (within each type of pellet and each diameter) surface  
244 application against soil mixed application. For apparent recovery (AR), only eight contrasts  
245 were realized, excluding the unfertilized control.

246 Statistical analyses were performed by SPSS soft- ware (IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows,  
247 Version 21.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.).

248

## 249 **RESULTS**

### 250 **Maize biomass and nutrient concentrations**

251 All plants in all treatments appeared healthy through- out the growing period and did not  
 252 show any sign of nutrient deficiency or toxicity at any time. Fertilizer treatments significantly  
 253 affected above-ground yield ( $P \leq 0.010$ ) and NPK concentrations ( $P < 0.001$ ), as well as root  
 254 production ( $P < 0.001$ ) and N concentration ( $P < 0.001$ ) (Table 3).  
 255 Table 4 shows that after 65 days all fertilized treatments produced significantly greater yields  
 256 ( $P < 0.001$ ) and NPK concentrations ( $P < 0.001$ ) relative to the unfertilized control, while no  
 257 other difference was sig- nificant for maize yield. Pellet-fertilized maize exhibited lower N  
 258 ( $-11\%$ ) and K ( $-9\%$ ) concentrations as opposed to maize fertilized with NPK mineral  
 259 fertilizer, probably resulting from the lower  $K_2O$  amount provided by the pellets v. the NPK  
 260 fertilizer (60, 110 and 200 by SSFC, WCC and NPK fertilizer, respectively). All treatments  
 261 produced similar TN levels.  
 262 Maize N and P concentrations were significantly ( $P = 0.009$  and  $P \leq 0.001$  for N and P,  
 263 respectively) influenced by characteristics of the pellet applied, as demonstrated by  
 264 increased N concentrations in WCC relative to SSFC. In the case of P, plants fertilized with  
 265 SSFC had the highest concentrations. A significant ( $P < 0.001$ ) rise in N concentration was  
 266 induced in WCC with smaller- as opposed to larger-sized pellets (6 v. 8 mm), although no  
 267 such effect was detected in SSFC. Application method significantly ( $P \leq 0.001$ ,  $< 0.001$  and  
 268  $\leq 0.001$  for SSFC 8, WCC 6 and WCC 8, respectively) influenced N concentration, as  
 269 evidenced by increased N concentrations when pellets were mixed into the soil as opposed  
 270 to surface-applied.  
 271 With regards to P and K, the higher P content in SSFC played a key role in increasing maize  
 272 P concentration, while the high K content in WCC did not produce such an effect on the  
 273 plant. Neither pellet application method nor dimension produced any important P or K effect.  
 274 Alternatively, if an effect was indeed produced, it might have been countered by different  
 275 interactions.

276 Apparent recovery of both N and P were affected by treatment (Table 5). No significant effect  
277 of pellet type relative to NPK fertilizer or of SSFC relative to WCC was detected. However,  
278 soil incorporation improved the AR of N in every tested situation and the same was observed  
279 for the small diameter relative to the large one. The AR of P was lowered by the use of  
280 pellets compared with mineral fertilizer and by WCC compared with SSFC. Soil incorporation  
281 affected the AR of P, but in dissimilar ways for pellet type and diameter. Small-sized pellets  
282 improved the AR of P only for SSFC, but not for WCC.

283 Root production ( $P < 0.001$ ) and N concentration ( $P < 0.001$ ) were affected significantly by  
284 treatments (Table 3), with all fertilized treatments producing a significantly greater root  
285 biomass ( $P < 0.001$ ) (Table 6) compared with the control. No significant differences were  
286 observed between mineral fertilizer and pellets. Root production was stimulated when no  
287 bulking agent was used in the composting process, an effect that was significantly greater  
288 when SSFC was mixed into the soil. Smaller diameter pellets also positively affected root  
289 production.

290 After 65 days, highly significant differences in root N concentration were observed  
291 comparing the unfertilized control with respect of all the other treatments ( $P \leq 0.001$ ). After  
292 the same period, root N concentrations were lower for pellet-fertilized treatments than for  
293 NPK treatment ( $P = 0.004$ ).

294

### 295 **Soil properties**

296 No significant differences were found in soil pH, while significant treatment effects were  
297 detected for  $\text{NO}_3^-$  ( $P < 0.001$ ) and EC ( $P < 0.001$ ) (Table 3). In particular,  $\text{NO}_3^-$  and EC  
298 increased after the application of NPK mineral fertilizer with respect to pellets (Table 7). Both  
299 soil properties were affected by the type of pellet supplied and, specifically, they increased  
300 in WCC treatment. In addition, pellet diameter had an important effect on  $\text{NO}_3^-$  and EC: in  
301 general, the highest values were observed with 6 mm pellets. Statistical analysis highlighted

that the superficial distribution promotes the increase of  $\text{NO}_3^-$  and EC. In all treatments investigated (Table 7), EC values were well below the limit for saline soil and, furthermore, soil in all the treatments can be considered non-saline (Bernal et al. 1992). Soluble-N analysed in soil pore water indicated an important effect of sampling time, with the lowest concentration at the end of the experiment in all treatments (Fig. 2). With respect to the treatments, results of NPK fertilizer at the first sampling was statistically greater ( $P < 0.001$ ) than the rest of the treatments, including unfertilized control.

309

### 310 **Ammonia volatilization and GHG emissions**

Ammonia volatilization was not detected from any of the treatments investigated (data not shown). Methane emission measurements were low and unaffected by the various treatments (data not shown), while the various treatments showed significant influence on  $\text{CO}_2$  ( $P < 0.001$ ) and  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  ( $P = 0.002$ ) emissions (Table 3).

During the 57-day incubation period, the unfertilized control showed the lowest  $\text{CO}_2$  emission (Table 8). No significant differences were found between SSFC and WCC treatments. However, across the SSFC treatments, significant differences ( $P = 0.007$ ) were observed between the two pellets diameter sizes, with higher  $\text{CO}_2$  emissions recorded for the smaller diameter pellet. Other differences were not significant.

All fertilized treatments exhibited cumulative  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  emissions significantly higher than the control ( $P = 0.002$ ) (Table 8). Cumulative  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  emissions were not significantly affected by pellet type or pellet diameter; however, the statistical analysis revealed that superficial distribution reduced  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  emissions.

### 324 **DISCUSSION**

Pig slurry SF has been investigated in its pelletized form after composting as a fertilizer for maize crop, a technique proposed to add agronomic value while mitigating the environmental risk of conventional SF pig slurry. A set of follow-on trials tested compost

328 type, pellet size and application method to identify optimizations of the technique. To this  
329 end, four hypotheses were developed. The first hypothesis tested whether compost derived  
330 from SF pig manure possessed a short-term significant fertilizer effect beyond that of its  
331 value as an amendment. The current investigation verified that the SF pig slurry pelletized  
332 compost fertilizers considered effectively increased maize biomass, NPK concentration and  
333 root N content, as well as residual soil nitrates and EC in all treatments fertilized with  
334 compost pellets, compared with the unfertilized control. The results obtained are consistent  
335 with the acknowledgement that composted SF pig slurry is an improved fertilizer product,  
336 mainly due to its large contribution of nutrients to plants, especially N and P (Pinamonti et  
337 al. 1997; Atiyeh et al. 2001; Garcia-Gomez et al. 2002; Perez-Murcia et al. 2006). However,  
338 lower N concentrations of aerial and root biomasses, K concentrations in maize plants and  
339 residual soil nitrates in all pellet-fertilized treatments v. the NPK mineral fertilizer treatment  
340 were observed. The results obtained highlighted that pelletized treatments provided lower –  
341 possibly even inadequate – amounts of K during the growing season relative to mineral  
342 fertilizer, a finding consistent with the lower yields produced in maize fertilized with compost,  
343 compared with mineral fertilizer (Businelli et al. 1990; Bazzoffi et al. 1998; Loecke et al.  
344 2004).

345 The results of the current investigation also confirmed that pig manure compost pellet  
346 fertilizers released N slowly when compared with standard NPK-soluble mineral fertilizer. In  
347 fact, the analysis of soil pore water during the experiment indicated a similar behaviour of  
348 soluble N (readily plant-available) in all pellet treatments, but the greater concentration found  
349 in the first sampling of NPK-fertilizer demonstrated the high solubility of the mineral fertilizer  
350 with respect to pelletized compost. At the end of the experiment, the results showed that  
351 soluble N was taken up by the crop in all treatments. As Ball et al. (2004) pointed out, the  
352 slower nutrient release of pelletized compost over time can act to reduce the risk of nutrient  
353 losses significantly. Efficiency of added N, as estimated through apparent recovery (NAR),

354 was not statistically lower for pellets than for NPK. This difference was not determined by  
355 different yield rather than by different N concentration in plant, determining an improvement  
356 of uptake in NPK treatment. Small diameter (6mm) pellets v. large (8 mm) pellets were  
357 shown to improve NAR values, which advances the notion that pellets did not threaten maize  
358 yield performances relative to mineral fertilizer, only that they may reduce the nutritional  
359 value of maize destined for feed purposes. It is also possible that the added N not used by  
360 plants and not present in the soil in mineral form at the end of the cropping cycle remained  
361 in the soil in stable pools as organic-N to improve soil fertility over time (Zavattaro et al.  
362 2016), or was lost through leaching or gaseous emissions. Nonetheless, the fact that mixing  
363 pellets (6 mm diameter) into the soil resulted in improved NAR values relative to surface  
364 application make the second hypothesis feasible for  $\text{NH}_3$  volatilization.

365 For P, the AR of applied fertilizer is usually low in the first cropping year following application,  
366 when as much 0·90 of added inorganic P has been shown to become unavailable for crop  
367 nutrition due to adsorption and precipitation (Malik et al. 2012). The results obtained in the  
368 current study followed this trend also, with a range of ‘very low’ AR values (from 0·10 to  
369 0·18). Even though statistical effects were identified, differences failed to permit conclusions  
370 on the fertilizer value of using pelletized com- posts for P nutrition.

371 The second hypothesis tested whether adding a bulking agent before composting failed to  
372 limit the fertilizer properties of SF-based pelletized composts. It too was verified. The results  
373 of the planned contrast test between SSFC and WCC highlighted that indeed no differences  
374 were found in plant yields, plant K concentrations, root N concentrations, or NAR values.  
375 Moreover, plant N concentration increased when WCC was applied, which suggested an  
376 improvement in availability of mineral N to plants. Increased maize root biomass was  
377 measured in SSFC relative to WCC, a result that might have been induced by lower nutrient  
378 availability and a subsequent increase in root allocation (Müller et al. 2000). The supposition  
379 of high availability of nutrients in WCC is further corroborated by increased residual soil



380 nitrates found after application of WCC instead of SSFC. These results demonstrate that the  
381 addition of a bulking agent during composting fails to reduce the fertilizer value.

382 The third hypothesis of the current study tested whether reduced pellet diameter resulted in  
383 increased NPK availability, as well as concurrently  $\text{NH}_3$  volatilization and GHG emissions.  
384 The hypothesis was partially verified. In the WCC treatment, the results of the planned  
385 contrast test of 6 v. 8 mm indicated that smaller diameter pellets induced increased plant N  
386 concentration and root production, in addition to soil EC, residual soil nitrates and NAR. The  
387 larger diameter increased plant P concentration alone. In SSFC treatment, the smaller  
388 diameter resulted in increased root production, soil EC and residual soil nitrates. Carbon  
389 dioxide emissions also increased, which others (Rochette et al. 2000; Balota et al. 2010)  
390 ascribe to the raised soil microbial activity when pellet diameter is smaller and the applied  
391 OM more degradable.

392 The last hypothesis postulated that incorporating compost pellets into the soil reduces  $\text{NH}_3$   
393 volatilization and GHG emissions and simultaneously increases nutrient availability. This  
394 hypothesis was partially verified. The planned contrast test of mixed v. surface application  
395 highlighted that incorporating pellets into the soil greatly affected plant N concentration, root  
396 production, NAR and soil residual nitrates (reduction). Following application, each of these  
397 measures demonstrated that plant N uptake was improved except in the case of root  
398 production. Considering GHG emissions, soil mixing did not affect  $\text{CO}_2$  emissions, but  
399 induced an increase in  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  emissions as expected from the higher contact of fertilizer with  
400 soil particles and enhanced microbial degradation (Velthof et al. 2003). Surface application  
401 played a different role in nutrient release dynamics by reducing nutrient availability to the  
402 plant, while simultaneously, increasing residual nitrates in the soil. This behaviour may be  
403 explained by late transfer of added N from the surface toward the soil (retarded or reduced  
404 solubilization of pellets) that was unmatched by plant requirements. Soil incorporation is the  
405 best technique to take advantage of the nutrients available from pellets.

## 406 **CONCLUSIONS**

407 Pelletized composted manure was shown to be an effective slow-release fertilizer for maize.  
408 The best technical options for its production include addition of a bulking agent before  
409 composting, using small diameter pellets and application with incorporation into the soil. The  
410 adoption of all these techniques results in the best availability of nutrients from pelletized  
411 composted pig manure for plant nutrition.

412

413 This work was carried out within the framework of the 'FITRAREF' project, funded by the  
414 Italian Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (GRANT NUMBER, DM29638/ 7818/10). The  
415 authors thank CEBAS-CSIC for the infra-structure and materials made available for the  
416 mesocosm experiments run during the stay of Dr Pampuro at the Department of Soil and  
417 Water Conservation and Organic Wastes Management of CEBAS-CSIC (financed by the  
418 Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness and the European Union through  
419 FEDER funds; CTM2013-48697-C2-1-R).

420

## 421 REFERENCES

- 422 Alemi, H., Kianmehr, M.H., Borghaee, A.M., 2010. Effect of pellet processing of fertilization  
423 on slow-release nitrogen in soil. *Asian J. Plant. Sci.* 9, 74-80.
- 424 Atiyeh, R.M., Edwards, C.A., Subler, S., Metzger, J.D., 2001. Pig manure vermicompost as  
425 a component of a horticultural bedding plant medium: effects on physicochemical properties  
426 and plant growth. *Bioresour. Technol.* 78, 11-20.
- 427 Ball, B.C., Mc Taggart, I.P., Scott, A., 2004. Mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions from  
428 soil under silage production by use of organic manures or slow release fertilizer. *Soil Use*  
429 *Manag.* 20, 287-295.
- 430 Balota, E.L., Machineski, O., Truber, P.V., 2010. Soil carbon and nitrogen mineralization  
431 caused by pig slurry application under different soil tillage systems. *Pesq. Agropec. Bras.*  
432 45 (5), 515-521.
- 433 Bazzoffi, P., Pellegrini, S., Rocchini, A., Morandi, M., Grasselli, O., 1998. The effect of urban  
434 refuse compost and different tractors tyres on soil physical properties, soil erosion and maize  
435 yield. *Soil Till. Res.* 48, 275-286.
- 436 Bernal, M.P., Roig, A., Madrid, R., Navarro, A.F. 1992. Salinity risks on calcareous soils  
437 following pig slurry applications. *Soil Use Manag.* 8, 125-130.
- 438 Bernal, M.P., Albuquerque, J.A., Moral, R., 2009. Composting of animal manures and  
439 chemical criteria for compost maturity assessment. A review. *Bioresour. Technol.* 100,  
440 5444–5453.
- 441 Berruto R., Busato P., Bochtis D. D., Sorensen C. G. 2013. Comparison of distribution  
442 systems for biogas plant residual. *Biomass and Bioenergy.* 52, 139-150
- 443 Bertora, C., Alluvione, F., Zavattaro, L., van Groenigen, J.W., Velthof, G., Grignani, C., 2008.  
444 Pig slurry treatment modifies slurry composition, N<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions after soil  
445 incorporation. *Soil Biol, Biochem.* 40, 1999-2006.

446 Bishop, P.L., Godfrey, C., 1983. Nitrogen transformation during sewage composting.  
 447 BioCycle. 24, 34-39.

448 Businelli, M., Gigliotti, G., Giusquiani, P.L., 1990. Applicazione del compost da RSU in  
 449 agricoltura. I: effetto sulla produttività del mais e destino dei nutrienti e dei metalli pesanti  
 450 nel vegetale (Application of urban refuse compost in agriculture. I: effect on maize  
 451 productivity, nutrient and heavy metal location in plants). Agrochimica 34, 454-466.

452 Fangueiro, D., Lopes, C., Surgu, S., Vasconcelos, E., 2012. Effect of the pig slurry  
 453 separation techniques on the characteristics and potential availability of N to plants in the  
 454 resulting liquid and solid fractions. Biosystems Eng. 113, 187-194.

455 Garcia-Gomez, A., Bernal, M.P., Roig, A., 2002. Growth of ornamental plants in two  
 456 composts prepared from agroindustrial wastes. Bioresour, Technol. 83, 81-87.

457 IPCC, 2013. Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working  
 458 Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change  
 459 [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia,  
 460 V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom  
 461 and New York, NY, USA, 1535 pp.

462 ISTAT – Italian National Institute of Statistics (2012). Preliminary results of the 6th general  
 463 census of agriculture. <http://censimentoagricoltura.istat.it> [accessed march 2013].

464 Jørgensen, K., Jensen, L.S., 2009. Chemical and biochemical variation in animal manure  
 465 solids separated using different commercial separation technologies. Bioresour. Technol.  
 466 100, 3088-3096.

467 Kaliyan, N., Vance Morey, R., 2009. Factors affecting strength and durability of densified  
 468 biomass products. Biomass Bioenerg. 33, 337-359.

469 Kitson, R.E., Mellon, M.G., 1944. Colorimetric determination of P as molybdovanado  
 470 phosphoric acid. Eng, Chem, Anal, Ed. 16, 379-383.

471 Kunz, A., Miele, M., Steinmetz, R.L.R., 2009. Advanced swine manure treatment and  
 472 utilization in Brazil. *Bioresour Technol.* 100, 5485-5489.

473 Loecke, T.D., Liebman, M., Cambardella, C.A., Richard T.L., 2004. Corn response to  
 474 composting and time of application of solid swine manure. *Agron. J.* 96, 214-223.

475 Müller. I., Schmid, B., Weiner, J., 2000. The effect of nutrient availability on biomass  
 476 allocation patterns in 27 species of herbaceous plants. *Perspectives in Plant Ecology,*  
 477 *Evolution and Systematics*, 3 (2), 115-127.

478 Navarro, A.F., Cegarra, J., Roig, A., Garcia, D., 1993. Relationships between organic matter  
 479 and carbon contents of organic wastes. *Bioresour. Technol.* 44, 203-207.

480 Nolan, T., Troy, S.M., Healy, M.G., Kwapinski, W., Leahy, J.J., Lawlor, P.G., 2011.  
 481 Characterization of compost produced from separated pig manure and a variety of bulking  
 482 agents at low initial C/N ratios. *Bioresour. Technol.* 102, 7131-7138.

483 Pampuro, N., Facello, A., Cavallo, E., 2013. Pressure and specific Energy requirements for  
 484 densification of compost derived from swine solid fraction. *Span. J. Agric. Res.* 11(3), 678-  
 485 684.

486 Pampuro, N., Dinuccio, E., Balsari, P., Cavallo, E., 2014. Gaseous emissions and nutrient  
 487 dynamics during composting of swine solid fraction for pellet production. *Appl. Math. Sci.*  
 488 8(129), 6459-6468.

489 Pampuro, N., Dinuccio, E., Balsari, P., Cavallo, E., 2016. Evaluation of two composting  
 490 strategies for making pig slurry solid fraction suitable for pelletizing. *Atmos. Pollut. Res.* 7(2),  
 491 288-293.

492 Perez-Murcia, M.D., Moral, R., Moreno-Caselles, J., Perez-Espinosa, A., Paredes, C., 2006.  
 493 Use of composted sewage sludge in growth media for broccoli. *Bioresour. Technol.* 97, 123-  
 494 130.

495 Pinamonti, F., Stringari, G., Zorzi, G., 1997. Use of compost in soilless cultivation. *Compost*  
 496 *Sci. Cult.* 5, 38-45.

497 Rao, J.R., Watabe, M., Stewart, T.A., Millar, B.C., Moore, J.E., 2007. Pelleted organo-  
 498 mineral fertilizers from composted pig slurry solids, animal wastes and spent mushroom  
 499 compost for amenity grassland. *Waste Manage.* 27, 1117-1128.

500 Rochette, P., Angers, D.A., Cote, D., 2000. Soil carbon and nitrogen dynamics following  
 501 application of pig slurry for the 19<sup>th</sup> consecutive year: I. Carbon dioxide fluxes and microbial  
 502 biomass carbon. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 64, 1389-1395.

503 Romano, E., Brambilla, M., Bisaglia, C., Pampuro, N., Foppa Pedretti, E., Cavallo, E., 2014.  
 504 Pelletization of composted swine manure solid fraction with different organic co-formulates:  
 505 effect of pellet physical properties on rotating spreader distribution patterns. *Int. J. Recycl.*  
 506 *Org. Waste. Agricult.* 3, 101-111.

507 Ros, M., Garcia, C., Hernández, T., 2006. A full-scale study of treatment of pig slurry by  
 508 composting: Kinetic changes in chemical and microbial properties. *Waste Manag.* 26, 1108-  
 509 1118.

510 Sahrawat, K.L., Keeney, D.R., 1986. Nitrous oxide emission from soils. *Adv Soil Sci.* 4, 103-  
 511 148.

512 Salazar, F.J., Chadwick, D., Pain, B.F., Hatch, D., Owen, E., 2005. Nitrogen budgets for  
 513 three cropping systems fertilized with cattle manure. *Bioresour. Technol.* 96, 235-245.

514 Santos, A., Bustamante, M.A., Tortosa, G., Moral, R., Bernal, M.P. 2016. Gaseous  
 515 emissions and process development during composting of pig slurry: the influence of the  
 516 proportion of cotton gin waste. *J. Clean. Prod.* 112, 81-90.

517 Silber, A., Bar-Yosef, B., Levkovitch, I., Soryano, S., 2010. pH-Dependent surface properties  
 518 of perlite: effects of plant growth. *Geoderma* 158, 275-281.

519 Subedi, R., Kammann, C., Pelissetti, S., Sacco, D., Grignani, C., Monaco, S., 2013. Use of  
 520 biochar and hydrochar to reduce ammonia emissions from soils fertilized with pig slurry. In  
 521 RAMIRAN 2013 - 15th International Conference. Versailles (France): 3-5 June 2013.

522 Subedi R., Taupe N., Pelissetti S., Petruzzelli L., Bertora C., Leahy J.J., Grignani C., 2016.

523 Greenhouse gas emissions and soil properties following amendment with manure-derived  
 524 biochars: Influence of pyrolysis temperature and feedstock type. *J. Environ. Manage.* 166,  
 525 73-83.

526 Syers, J.K., Johnston A.E., Curtin D (Eds), 2008. Efficiency of soil and fertilizer phosphorus  
 527 use. Reconciling changing concepts of soil phosphorus behaviour with agronomic  
 528 information. *FAO Fertilizer and Plant Nutrition Bulletin* (Food and Agriculture Organisation  
 529 of the United Nations: Rome, Italy.

530 Troy, S.M., Lawlor, P.G., O'Flynn, C.J., Healy, M.G., 2013. Impact of biochar addition to soil  
 531 on greenhouse gas emissions following pig manure application. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 60, 173-  
 532 181.

533 Vazquez, M.A., de la Varga, D., Plana, R., Soto, M., 2015. Integrating liquid fraction of pig  
 534 manure in the composting process for nutrient recovery and water re-use. *J. Clean. Prod.*  
 535 104, 80-89.

536 Velthof, G., Kuikman, P., Oenema, O., 2003. Nitrous oxide emission from animal manures  
 537 applied to soil under controlled conditions. *Biol Fertil Soils*, 37, 221-230.

538 Wu, Y., Huang, M., Warrington, D.N., 2011. Growth and transpiration of maize and winter  
 539 wheat in response to water deficits in pots and plots. *Environ. Exp. Bot.* 71, 65-71.

540 Zavattaro, L., Assandri, D., Grignani, C., 2016. Achieving legislation requirements with  
 541 different nitrogen fertilization strategies: Results from a long term experiment. *Eur. J.*  
 542 *Agron.* 77, 199-208.

543 Zhu, K., Christel, W., Bruun, S., Lensen, L.S., 2014. The different effects of applying fresh,  
 544 composted or charred manure on soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 74, 61-69.

545

546 **Table captions**

547 **Table 1.** Main properties of the two types of pellet included in the experiment.

548 **Table 2.** Basic chemical properties of the soil used in the experiment.

549 **Table 3.** Results of ANOVA of all measured variables. Significance of the treatment and  
550 Standard Error of the Mean (SEM) of the treatments.

551 **Table 4.** Effects of the fertilization treatments on maize production and nutrient content.

552 **Table 5.** Effects of the fertilization treatments on root production and its N content.

553 **Table 6.** Effects of the fertilization treatments on Apparent Recovery of N and P.

554 **Table 7.** Effects of the fertilization treatments on residual soil quality.

555 **Table 8.** Effects of fertilization treatments on CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions.

556



557 **Table 1. Main properties of the two types of pellet included in the experiment.**

Parameter	SSFC (Ø 6 mm and Ø 8 mm)		WCC (Ø 6 mm and Ø 8 mm)	
	Average	S.E.	Average	S.E.
Dry Matter (%)	85.4	0.7	84.6	0.4
Moisture (%)	14.6	0.7	15.4	0.4
pH	8.1	0.1	7.9	0.1
TN (%)	3.3	0.1	2.9	0.1
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> -N (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	672.0	10.5	495.8	17.7
NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> -N (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	1460.0	13.8	2390.0	13.8
TOC (%)	36.9	0.4	38.1	0.2
C/N	11.2	0.3	13.2	0.3
OM (%)	63.6	1.5	65.7	0.5
CEC (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )	70.9	1.7	79.5	4.2
P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> (%)	4.0	0.1	3.7	0.2
K <sub>2</sub> O (%)	1.0	0.1	1.6	0.1

558

559

560 **Table 2. Chemical properties of the soil used in the experiment.**

PARAMETER	AVERAGE	S.E.
pH	8.55	0.01
EC (dS m <sup>-1</sup> )	0.18	0.01
WHC (%)	31.50	1.02
CaCO <sub>3</sub> (%)	38.70	0.40
CEC (cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> )	10.50	0.50
OM (%)	0.88	0.03
TOC (%)	0.51	0.01
TN (%)	<0.01	<0.01
C/N	7.29	0.09
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> -N (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	10.8	0.80
Available-P (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	27.7	0.50

561

562

563 **Table 3. Results of analysis of variance (ANOVA) of all measured variables**

Parameters	Treatment P (f)	SEM
plant yield (g D.M. pot <sup>-1</sup> )	0.010	0.865
plant N (% D.M.)	0.000	0.065
plant P (g kg <sup>-1</sup> D.M.)	0.000	0.091
plant K (g kg <sup>-1</sup> D.M.)	0.000	0.819
root production (g D.M. pot <sup>-1</sup> )	0.000	0.123
root N (%D.M.)	0.000	0.068
soil NO <sub>3</sub> (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> soil)	0.000	0.3844
soil EC (μS cm <sup>-1</sup> )	0.000	3.936
soil pH	0.310	0.038
cumulative CO <sub>2</sub> (mg C-CO <sub>2</sub> m <sup>-2</sup> )	0.000	4.211
cumulative N <sub>2</sub> O (mg N-N <sub>2</sub> O m <sup>-2</sup> )	0.002	110.370
cumulative CH <sub>4</sub> (mg C-CH <sub>4</sub> m <sup>-2</sup> )	0.652	0.983

564

565     **Table 4. Effects of fertilization treatments on maize production and nutrient content**

In	Contrast			Plant yield (g D.M. pot <sup>-1</sup> )			Plant N (% D.M.)			Plant P (g kg <sup>-1</sup> D.M.)			Plant K (g kg <sup>-1</sup> D.M.)		
	1	2		Average 1	Averag e 2	P(F)	Averag e 1	Average 2	P(F)	Average 1	Averag e 2	P(F)	Averag e 1	Average 2	P(F)
ALL	CONTROL	vs	FERTILISED	12.57	16.31	0.000	1.28	1.91	0.000	1.60	1.98	0.000	27.92	34.74	0.000
FERTILISED	NPK	vs	PELLET	15.62	16.39	0.411	2.12	1.89	0.002	1.96	1.99	0.771	37.70	34.36	0.001
PELLET	SSFC	vs	WCC	16.93	15.85	0.088	1.82	1.95	0.009	2.10	1.87	0.001	34.17	34.56	0.498
SSFC	6	vs	8	17.52	16.34	0.181	1.83	1.81	0.731	2.19	2.02	0.069	34.08	34.25	0.834
SSFC 6	Surface	vs	Mixed	17.32	17.72	0.746	1.75	1.91	0.092	2.47	1.91	0.000	33.26	34.90	0.169
SSFC 8	Surface	vs	Mixed	15.25	17.42	0.087	1.64	1.99	0.001	1.96	2.07	0.390	36.11	32.40	0.003
WCC	6	vs	8	16.50	15.20	0.144	2.16	1.75	0.000	1.74	2.00	0.007	34.67	34.46	0.800
WCC 6	Surface	vs	Mixed	16.25	16.75	0.686	1.97	2.35	0.000	1.51	1.96	0.002	32.72	36.62	0.002
WCC 8	Surface	vs	Mixed	14.92	15.47	0.657	1.57	1.92	0.001	2.19	1.82	0.009	33.84	35.08	0.292

566

567

568 **Table 5. Effects of fertilization treatment on apparent recovery of nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P)**

In	Contrast			N Apparent Recover (% of added N)			P Apparent Recover (% of added P)		
	1		2	Average 1	Average 2	P(F)	Average 1	Average 2	P(F)
FERTILISED	NPK	vs	PELLET	86,0	75,3	0,051	15,4	13,3	0,002
PELLET	SSFC	vs	WCC	74,8	75,8	0,767	14,8	11,8	0,000
SSFC	6	vs	8	81,2	68,4	0,016	16,0	13,6	0,000
SSFC 6	Surface	vs	Mixed	44,4	92,5	0,000	12,4	14,8	0,008
SSFC 8	Surface	vs	Mixed	72,6	89,8	0,021	17,8	14,2	0,000
WCC	6	vs	8	98,6	53,1	0,000	11,4	12,2	0,165
WCC 6	Surface	vs	Mixed	37,3	68,9	0,000	13,1	11,3	0,036
WCC 8	Surface	vs	Mixed	80,0	117,1	0,000	9,8	13,0	0,001

569

570

571    **Table 6. Effects of fertilization treatment on root production and its nitrogen content.**

In	Contrast			Roots production (g D.M. pot <sup>-1</sup> )			Roots N (% D.M.)		
	1		2	Average 1	Average 2	P(F)	Average 1	Average 2	P(F)
ALL	CONTROL	vs	FERTILISED	1.37	2.04	0.000	0.77	1.04	0.001
FERTILISED	NPK	vs	PELLET	1.97	2.12	0.110	1.23	1.01	0.004
PELLET	SSFC	vs	WCC	2.33	1.90	0.000	1.04	0.99	0.304
SSFC	6	vs	8	2.55	2.11	0.001	1.11	0.97	0.060
SSFC 6	Surface	vs	Mixed	2.12	2.97	0.004	1.02	1.19	0.103
SSFC 8	Surface	vs	Mixed	1.85	2.37	0.000	0.87	1.07	0.053
WCC	6	vs	8	2.15	1.66	0.000	0.99	0.99	1.000
WCC 6	Surface	vs	Mixed	2.12	2.17	0.776	0.95	1.03	0.396
WCC 8	Surface	vs	Mixed	1.55	1.77	0.140	0.91	1.06	0.137

572

573

574  
575 **Table 7. Effects of the fertilization treatments on residual soil quality**

In	Contrast			Soil NO <sub>3</sub> (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> soil)			Soil EC (dS m <sup>-1</sup> )		
	1		2	Average 1	Average 2	P(F)	Average 1	Average 2	P(F)
ALL	CONTROL	vs	FERTILISED	6.72	11.15	0.000	0.304	0.318	0.002
FERTILISED	NPK	vs	PELLET	12.34	10.00	0.003	0.334	0.316	0.000
PELLET	SSFC	vs	WCC	10.60	11.40	0.004	0.311	0.321	0.002
SSFC	6	vs	8	11.81	10.39	0.030	0.335	0.308	0.000
SSFC 6	Surface	vs	Mixed	13.82	9.81	0.000	0.346	0.323	0.000
SSFC 8	Surface	vs	Mixed	12.42	8.35	0.000	0.312	0.303	0.095
WCC	6	vs	8	12.74	10.05	0.000	0.326	0.297	0.000
WCC 6	Surface	vs	Mixed	15.10	10.37	0.000	0.345	0.307	0.000
WCC 8	Surface	vs	Mixed	10.45	9.66	0.155	0.292	0.302	0.087

576

577     **Table 8. Effects of fertilization treatments on carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) emissions.**

In	Contrast			Cumulative CO <sub>2</sub> (mg C m <sup>-2</sup> )			Cumulative N <sub>2</sub> O (mg N m <sup>-2</sup> )		
	1		2	Average 1	Average 2	P(F)	Average 1	Average 2	P(F)
ALL	CONTROL	vs	PELLET	1212.9	1676.9	0.001	-1.48	14.08	0.002
PELLET	SSFC	vs	WCC	1740.2	1613.5	0.118	14.92	13.24	0.576
SSFC	6	vs	8	1902.6	1577.8	0.007	16.63	13.21	0.425
SSFC 6	Surface	vs	Mixed	1767.8	2037.4	0.097	4.13	29.13	0.000
SSFC 8	Surface	vs	Mixed	1554.0	1601.6	0.730	5.06	21.37	0.011
WCC	6	vs	8	1704.4	1522.8	0.113	12.60	13.87	0.765
WCC 6	Surface	vs	Mixed	1673.4	1735.3	0.695	0.63	24.57	0.000
WCC 8	Surface	vs	Mixed	1394.2	1651.3	0.113	5.55	22.19	0.010

578





579 **Figure captions**

580 **Figure 1.** Temperature trends (°C) recorded during the composting trial (daily average).


581 **Figure 2.** Concentration of soluble nitrogen in pore water soil at different treatment with  
582 pellets mixed with the soil, nitrogen: phosphorus: potassium (NPK) fertilizer and unfertilized  
583 control during the mesocosm experiment.

584



**Fig. 1. Temperature trends (°C) recorded during the composting trial (daily average).**

590



591

592 **Fig. 2. Concentration of soluble nitrogen in pore water soil at different treatment with pellets mixed**  
593 **with the soil, nitrogen: phosphorus: potassium (NPK) fertilizer and unfertilized control during the**  
594 **mesocosm experiment.**

595