


Waste Bioconversion through Composting: Microbiome Dynamics and Physicochemical Analysis



Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment

for the Award of Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Biochemical Engineering

by

JEETESH KUSHWAHA

SCHOOL OF BIOCHEMICAL ENGINEERING

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

(BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY)

VARANASI – 221005, INDIA

Roll No. 21011007

2024



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY (BHU) VARANASI

Varanasi – 221005, India

CERTIFICATE

It is certified that the work contained in the thesis titled **Waste Bioconversion through Composting: Microbiome Dynamics and Physicochemical Analysis** by **Jeetesh Kushwaha** has been carried out under my supervision and that this work has not been submitted elsewhere for a degree. It is further certified that the student has fulfilled all the requirements of the Comprehensive Examination, Candidacy, and SOTA for the award of **Doctor of Philosophy**.

Supervisor

Dr. Abhishek Suresh Dhoble

School of Biochemical Engineering

Indian Institute of Technology (BHU)

Varanasi 221 005



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY (BHU) VARANASI

Varanasi – 221005, India

DECLARATION BY THE CANDIDATE

I, **Jeetesh Kushwaha**, certify that the work embodied in this thesis is my own bona fide work and was carried out by me under the supervision of **Dr. Abhishek Suresh Dhoble**, from **July 2021 to October 2024**, at the School of Biochemical Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology (BHU) Varanasi. The matter embodied in this thesis has not been submitted for the award of any other degree/diploma. I declare that I have faithfully acknowledged and given credits to the research workers wherever their works have been cited in my work in this thesis. I further declare that I have not willfully copied any other's work, paragraphs, text, data, results, etc., reported in journals, books, magazines, reports dissertations, thesis, etc., or available at websites and have not included them in this thesis and have not cited as my own work.

Date:

Place: Varanasi, India

Signature of the student

CERTIFICATE BY THE SUPERVISOR

It is certified that the above statement made by the student is correct to the best of my/our knowledge.

Supervisor

Dr. Abhishek Suresh Dhoble

School of Biochemical Engineering

Indian Institute of Technology (BHU)

Varanasi - 221 005

Signature of Head of Department



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY (BHU) VARANASI

Varanasi – 221005, India

COPYRIGHT TRANSFER CERTIFICATE

Title of the Thesis: Waste Bioconversion through Composting: Microbiome Dynamics and Physicochemical Analysis

Name of the Student: Jeetesh Kushwaha

COPYRIGHT TRANSFER

The undersigned hereby assigns to the Indian Institute of Technology (BHU) Varanasi all rights under copyright that may exist in and for the above thesis submitted for the award of the Doctor of Philosophy in the School of Biochemical Engineering.

Date:

Place: Varanasi, India

Signature of the student

Note: However, the author may reproduce or authorize others to reproduce material extracted verbatim from the thesis or derivative of the thesis for the author's personal use provided that the source and the Institute's copyright notice are indicated.

*To my beloved late
grandfather and
grandmother, who always
supported and motivated
me at every step of my
life.*

Acknowledgement

Completing this thesis marks a significant milestone in my academic journey, but it would not have been possible without the support and contributions of numerous extraordinary individuals. While my name appears on the cover, this work results from collective effort, guidance, and encouragement from many people to whom I am deeply indebted.

First and foremost, I express my profound gratitude to my supervisor, **Dr. Abhishek Suresh Dhoble**, School of Biochemical Engineering, for his exceptional mentorship, insightful guidance, endless patience, and steadfast support throughout my research. His encouragement and expertise have been invaluable to successfully completing this work, and I am truly thankful for all he has done.

I am also deeply appreciative of the current Coordinator, **Dr. Pranjal Chandra**, and former Coordinator, **Prof. Vikash Kumar Dubey**, of the School of Biochemical Engineering, for providing the necessary facilities and resources to carry out this research. I extend my sincere thanks to all the faculty and staff members of the School of Biochemical Engineering for their support.

My heartfelt thanks go to my Research Progress Evaluation Committee (RPEC) members, **Dr. Prodyut Dhar** and **Dr. Sanjay Katheria**, for their insightful feedback and constructive suggestions, which greatly enhanced the quality of my work.

I would like to acknowledge the contributions of my laboratory colleagues, especially **Dr. Jyoti Rani**, **Mr. Kailash Pati Pandey**, **Ms. Madhumita Priyadarsini**, **Ms. Amisha Jurel**, **Mr. Yashpal Singh**, **Mr. Akash Bhattacharjee**, and **Ms. Unnati Gupta**. Their camaraderie and assistance have been crucial throughout this journey.

I am also grateful to the juniors in our lab, including **Mr. Saswata Acharya**, **Mr. Ankit Dixit**, **Mr. Atith Chitnis**, **Mr. Bhavesh**, and **Mr. Tarun**, for their contributions through their IDD and M.Tech. projects, which provided enriching discussions and brainstorming opportunities.

Lastly, and most importantly, I owe my deepest thanks to my family for their unwavering love, support, and belief in me. I also thank my late grandfather, **Mr. Mani Ram Kushwaha**, whose memory continues to inspire me. Their encouragement gave me the strength to persevere, and this achievement is as much theirs as it is mine.

Table of contents

List of figures	x
List of tables	xiii
List of abbreviations.....	xiv
Preface.....	xviii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1 Overview	1
1.2 Floral waste and its environmental impact.....	1
1.3 Rice straw and the challenge of agricultural residue management	2
1.4 Integrated perspective on floral waste and rice straw composting.....	3
1.5 Anaerobic digestate slurry as a composting inoculant	5
1.6 The problem statement.....	6
1.7 Scope of this study	7
1.8 Research objectives and thesis organization	9
Chapter 2 Literature review	11
2.1 Background	11
2.2 Composting phases and microbial dynamics	11
2.3 Design, operational, and technological innovations.....	12
2.3.1 Centralized composting system design.....	12
2.3.2 Centralized tunnel composting system design.....	13
2.3.3 Decentralized composting system design.....	15
2.3.4 Decentralized compost bin design.....	15
2.3.5 Decentralized rotary drum composter design.....	16
2.4 Physicochemical parameters and their dynamics.....	18
2.5 Analytical techniques for microbiome and physicochemical monitoring.....	21
2.6 Bacterial communities.....	22
2.7 Applications and implications for sustainable waste management.....	26
Chapter 3 Material and methods	28
3.1 Composter design.....	28
3.3 Sample collection and physicochemical parameter analysis.....	29
3.4 Flow cytometry analysis	30
3.5 Microbial analysis	30
3.6 Statistical analysis	32

Chapter 4 Exploring core microbiome diversity in digested versus raw manure impact on lignocellulosic waste composting	34
4.1 Background	35
4.1.1 Experimental design and setup	37
4.2 Results and Discussion.....	38
4.2.1 Physicochemical analysis	38
4.2.2 Alterations in the chemical composition and physical structure of rice straw	43
4.2.3 Flow cytometry analysis of microbial population	45
4.2.4 Hierarchical clustering of the bacterial and archaeal community	47
4.2.5 Microbial comparative analysis.....	50
4.2.6 RDA analysis of flow cytometry populations and physicochemical parameters.....	54
4.3 Limitations and future recommendations.....	55
4.4 Conclusion.....	56
Chapter 5 To evaluate the digestate and raw manure in floral waste composting, focusing on physicochemical properties and microbiome dynamics	58
5.1 Background	59
5.1.1 Composting materials	60
5.1.2 Experimental setup and design.....	61
5.2 Results and discussion.....	62
5.2.1 Physicochemical analysis	62
5.2.2 FTIR and BT-SEM analysis	66
5.2.3 Flow cytometry analysis of microbial population	69
5.2.4 Microbial community diversity assessment	71
5.2.5 Microbiome comparative analysis.....	74
5.2.6 Alpha and beta diversity analysis of bacterial community.....	77
5.3 Challenges and future prospects.....	78
5.4 Conclusion.....	79
Chapter 6 To investigate the effect of polyethylene terephthalate and polystyrene microplastics on microbiome dynamics during rice straw composting	80
6.1 Background	81
6.2 Sample collection	83
6.3 Experiment design.....	84
6.4 Physicochemical analysis.....	85
6.5 Extraction of microplastics.....	86
6.6 Flow cytometry analysis	87
6.7 Result and discussion	87
6.7.1 Influence of microplastics on physicochemical characteristics.....	87

6.7.2 Impact on humification.....	90
6.7.3 Alterations in the chemical composition and physical structure of microplastic ..	93
6.7.4 Impact on microbial communities	95
6.7.4.1 Microbial composition analysis.....	95
6.7.4.2 Microbial composition and core microbiome.....	99
6.7.5 Microbial flow cytometric fingerprint.....	106
6.8 Conclusion	109
Chapter 7 To conduct a techno-economic analysis of rice straw composting, evaluating its technical feasibility and economic viability.....	111
7.1 Background	111
7.2 Simulation of conceptual bioprocess for compost production	113
7.3 Minimum selling price	115
7.4 System output and performance	117
7.5 Conclusion.....	117
Chapter 8 Conclusion and future prospects	119
Annexure	123
References	126
List of Publications	147

List of figures

Figure 2.1. Detailed stages of the composting process: from initial decomposition to final maturation.....	12
Figure 3.1. Schematic representation of a lab-scale composting unit (scale may not be proportional)	28
Figure 4.1. (a) Temperature, (b) Moisture Content, (c) pH, (d) Electrical conductivity in composting of rice straw (RS) with cow dung (CD) and anaerobic digester slurry (ADS)....	39
Figure 4.2. (a) Nitrate (b) Phosphate (c) Total Volatile Fatty Acids (TVFAs), (d) Carbon /Nitrogen (C/N ratio) (e) Carbon and (f) Nitrogen in composting of rice straw (RS) with cow dung (CD) and anaerobic digester slurry (ADS).....	42
Figure 4.3. Pearson correlation analysis of physiochemical properties (a) anaerobic digester slurry (ADS), (b) cow dung (CD).....	43
Figure 4.4. Images of SEM micrographs of rice straw (RS) compost at day 0 (a, c) and day 60 (b, d) with cow dung (CD) at 50X and 10X, and rice straw (RS) at day 0 (e, g) and day 60 (f, h) with anaerobic digestate slurry (ADS) at 50X and 10X.....	44
Figure 4.5. FTIR spectra of ADSD0 (day 0), ADSD60 (day 60), CDD0 (day 0), and CDD60 (day 60).....	45
Figure 4.6. Autocorrelation plot for dissimilarity RMSD (2D) vs Delay.....	46
Figure 4.7. Analysis investigated the composition of bacterial abundance at genera level (a), phyla level (b), and archaeal communities (c), specifically the top 20 genera, before and after composting rice straw with cow dung (CDRS) and anaerobic digester slurry (ADSRS) as inoculum, compared to raw inoculum samples CD and ADS.....	48
Figure 4.8. Heatmap representing the shared microbial genera within the core microbiomes.....	50
Figure 4.9. Venn diagram showing the distribution of shared bacterial OTUs among the four samples: ADS and CD (day 0), and ADSRS and CDRS (day 60).....	51
Figure 4.10. Rarefaction curve for initial (ADS and CD) and mature compost (ADSRS and CDRS).....	52
Figure 4.11. RDA analysis correlating flow cytometry microbial populations and physicochemical parameters.....	55
Figure 5.1. (a) Temperature, (b) Moisture Content, (c) pH, (d) Electrical conductivity in aerobic composting of floral waste with cow dung (CD) and anaerobic digester slurry (ADS).....	63

Figure 5.2. (a) Nitrate (b) Phosphate (c) Total Volatile Fatty Acids (TVFAs), (d) Carbon /Nitrogen (C/N ratio) (e) Carbon and (f) Nitrogen in aerobic composting of floral waste with cow dung (CD) and anaerobic digester slurry (ADS).....	64
Figure 5.3. Pearson correlation analysis of physiochemical properties (a) anaerobic digester slurry (ADS), (b) cow dung (CD).....	66
Figure 5.4. Images of SEM micrographs of floral waste (FW) compost at day 0 (a, c) and day 60 (b, d) with cow dung (CD) at 50X and 10X, and floral waste (FW) at day 0 (e, g) and day 60 (f, h) with anaerobic digestate slurry (ADS) at 50X and 10X.....	68
Figure 5.5 FTIR Spectra of ADSD0 and CDD0 (Day 0 samples) compared to ADSD60 and CDD60 (Day 60 samples).....	69
Figure 5.6. Autocorrelation plot for dissimilarity RMSD (2D) vs Delay.....	70
Figure 5.7. Analysis investigated the composition of bacterial (a) and archaeal communities (b), specifically the top 20 genera, before and after composting floral waste with cow dung (CDFW) and anaerobic digester slurry (ADSFW) as inoculum, compared to raw inoculum samples CD and ADS.....	72
Figure 5.8. Core microbiomes heatmap illustrates microbial communities' shared genera in the core composition.....	75
Figure 5.9. Venn diagram showing the distribution of shared bacterial OTUs among four samples: ADS and CD at day 0, and ADSFW and CDFW at day 60.....	76
Figure 6.1. Variations in (a) Temperature, (b) pH, (c) Electrical Conductivity (EC), and (d) Germination Index (GI) throughout the composting process, where CK (control), PET (polyethylene terephthalate), and PS (polystyrene) are the treatments	88
Figure 6.2. Variations in humification and nutrient levels during the composting process: (a) Nitrate (g/kg), (b) Phosphate (g/kg), (c) Humic acid concentration (HA), (d) Fulvic acid concentration (FA), (e) Degree of polymerization (Dp), and (f) Humification index (HI).....	91
Figure 6.3. SEM micrographs of PET at Day 0 (i, iii) and Day 90 (ii, iv), and PS at Day 0 (v, vii) and Day 90 (vi, viii) at 50X and 10X magnifications.....	93
Figure 6.4. FTIR analysis of PS and PET Extracts at day 0 and day 90.....	94
Figure 6.5 Relative abundance of different bacterial (a) and archaeal (b) genera at the genus level in the initial inoculum (Day 0, ADS) and at the final stage (Day 90, CK, PET, PS).....	97
Figure 6.6. Heatmap shows the correlation of the top 50 genera within ADS, CK, PET, and PS.....	100

Figure 6.7 Heatmap represents the shared microbial genera across the core microbiomes.....	101
Figure 6.8. Venn diagram showing the distribution of shared bacterial OTUs across ADS (day 0), CK (day 90), PET (day 90), and PS (day 90).....	103
Figure 6.9. Rarefaction curves for samples ADS, CK, PET, and PS.....	106
Figure 6.10. PCA analysis correlating microbial populations from flow cytometry with associated physicochemical parameters.....	108
Figure 7.1. Simulation of conceptual bioprocess for compost production from agricultural residues using anaerobic digestate.....	113
Figure 7.2. Effect of price of compost on MSP.....	115
Figure 7.3. Tornado plot of MS sensitivity to productivity values (INR).....	116

List of tables

Table 2.1. Comparison of different inoculum sources for composting various types of waste.....	18
Table 2.2. Influence of microplastics on biological treatment processes.....	24
Table 4.1. Characteristics of inoculum and raw material.....	38
Table 4.2. Comparison of alpha diversity measures in samples.....	53
Table 5.1. Characteristics of inoculum and raw material.....	61
Table 5.2. Comparison of alpha diversity measures in samples.....	78
Table 6.1. Analysis of alpha diversity metrics among the samples.....	105

List of abbreviations

AD	Anaerobic Digestion
ADS	Anaerobic Digester Slurry
ADSD0	Anaerobic Digester Slurry Treatment on Day Zero
ADSD60	Anaerobic Digester Slurry Treatment on Day sixty
ADSFW	Anaerobic Digester Slurry Floral waste on Day sixty
ADSRS	Anaerobic Digester Slurry Rice Straw on Day sixty
AI	Artificial Intelligence
AIL	Acid Insoluble Lignin
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
ARD	Anaerobic Digestate Rice Straw
ASL	Acid Soluble Lignin
BOD	Biological Oxygen Demand
CD	Raw Cow Dung on Day Zero
CDD0	Cow Dung Treatment on Day Zero
CDD60	Cow Dung Treatment on Day sixty
CDFW	Cow Dung Floral Waste on Day sixty
CDRS	Cow Dung Rice Straw on Day sixty
CRD	Cow Dung Rice Straw
CH ₄	Methane
CHNS	Carbon Hydrogen Nitrogen Sulphur
CK	Control
CMC	Carboxymethyl Cellulose
CMCase	Carboxymethyl cellulase

C/N	Carbon/Nitrogen
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
COD	Chemical Oxygen Demand
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic Acid
Dp	Degree of Polymerization
EC	Electrical Conductivity
FA	Fulvic Acid
FAS	Ferrous Ammonium Sulphate
FCM	Flow cytometry
FOM	Fermented organic manure
FSC-A	Forward Scatter Area
FTIR	Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy
FW	Floral waste
GHG	Green House Gas
GI	Germination Index
HA	Humic Acid
HI	Humification Index
H ₂ O ₂	Hydrogen Peroxide
HDPE	High-Density Polyethylene
INR	Indian Rupee
K	Potassium
KBr	Potassium Bromide
LCB	Lignocellulosic Biomass
LDPE	Low-Density Polyethylene
LFOM	Liquid fermented organic manure

MANOVA	Multivariate Analysis of Variance
MSP	Minimum Selling Price
MPs	Microplastics
N	Nitrogen
NaOH	Sodium Hydroxide
OD	Optical Density
OTU	Operational Taxonomic Unit
P	Phosphorus
PBS	Phosphate Buffer Saline
PCA	Principal Component Analysis
PCR	Polymerase Chain Reaction
PERMANOVA	Permutational Multivariate Analysis of Variance
PE	Polyethylene
PET	Polyethylene Terephthalate
PHA	Polyhydroxyalkanoates
PP	Polypropylene
PS	Polystyrene
PVC	Polyvinyl Chloride
QC	Quality Control
QIIME	Quantitative Insights into Microbial Ecology
RDA	Redundancy Analysis
RS	Rice Straw
RMSD	Root Mean Square Deviation
S	Sulphur
SDG	Sustainable development Goals

SEM	Scanning Electron Microscopy
SSC-A	Side Scatter Area
TC	Total Carbon
TEA	Techno-economic assessment
TS	Total Solids
TVFAs	Total Volatile Fatty Acids
VS	Volatile Solids

Preface

Floral waste (FW) and agricultural residues like rice straw (RS) represent a significant portion of organic waste that contributes to environmental degradation, particularly through landfill emissions and greenhouse gas production. The conventional methods of disposing of these wastes, such as burning or dumping, exacerbate pollution levels and fail to capitalize on their potential as valuable organic matter for soil enrichment. Composting offers a scientifically supported and sustainable alternative to these methods, providing a way to recycle organic waste into nutrient-rich compost that can be reintroduced into agricultural systems, reducing the need for chemical fertilizers and improving soil health. This study investigates the composting of FW and RS, focusing on the microbial processes that drive the breakdown of organic matter and the role of different inoculants in enhancing the composting efficiency. Specifically, the research explores the use of anaerobic digester slurry (ADS) and raw cow dung (CD) as inoculum for the composting of FW. By comparing these two inoculants, the study aims to uncover their influence on microbial diversity, compost maturation, and nutrient availability. The results revealed that the microbial diversity and community dynamics varied significantly between the two inoculants. Notably, a marked increase in nitrate and phosphate concentrations was observed after day 40 of composting, attributed to the microbiome's role in driving the compost maturation process. In particular, *Bacillus* showed a notable increase in CD compost (63.35%), whereas *Streptomyces* exhibited significant growth in CD (129.5%) compost. Furthermore, FW composting facilitated the proliferation of archaea such as *Haloarcula* and *Haloferax*, which are effective at breaking down organic matter in high-salt environments, while reducing methane-producing archaea, indicative of favorable aerobic composting conditions. The composting of FW using CD showed an enhanced richness of microbial species, while ADS composting demonstrated greater diversity within the microbial community. This suggests that ADS, with its rich microbial flora, holds considerable promise

for optimizing the composting of FW, leading to more efficient organic matter breakdown and potentially improving soil quality when applied to agricultural fields. The study also explores composting as a method for managing RS, a common agricultural residue that is typically burned, contributing significantly to air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. Composting RS not only provides an alternative waste management solution but also results in valuable compost that can be used to enhance soil fertility. The research compares the performance of ADS and CD as inoculants in the composting of RS and highlights the critical role of microbial communities in optimizing the composting process. Key microbial taxa, like *Acinetobacter*, *Serratia*, *Bacillus*, *Flavobacteria*, *Pseudomonas*, and *Prevotella*, were found to increase significantly in mature ADS compost compared to CD. Additionally, archaea such as *Haloarcula* and *Haloferax* showed higher abundance in ADS compost, reflecting the positive influence of the digestion process on composting efficiency. The study found that ADS with RS compost exhibited higher microbial richness and diversity, as evidenced by higher Chao 1 and Shannon index values, suggesting that ADS promotes a more robust microbial environment conducive to faster composting and higher-quality compost. While the benefits of composting FW and RS are clear, the study also addresses the emerging issue of microplastic (MP) contamination in organic waste. MP, particularly polyethylene terephthalate (PET) and polystyrene (PS), were found to significantly disrupt microbial processes essential for RS degradation. PET and PS were selected based on their frequent presence in floral waste, might introduced through plastic packaging, synthetic ribbons, and decorative thermocol. These materials often enter composting systems unintentionally and degrade into persistent MPs, affecting microbial activity, delaying compost maturity, and reducing compost quality. Their inclusion in the study reflects real-world contamination scenarios relevant to decentralized composting systems. The presence of MP led to decreased microbial diversity and altered community structures, which affected the compost's physicochemical properties and delayed

its maturation. While it is recognized that all microorganisms possess the ability to respond to environmental stress, certain genera—such as *Bacillus*, *Pseudomonas*, and halophilic bacteria like *Halomonas*—are found to adapt under adverse conditions. Their increased presence in the MP-treated composts suggests a community shift favoring stress-resilient taxa in response to microplastic-induced contamination. This shift in microbial communities was reflected in lower nitrate levels, reduced humic acid content, and compromised germination indices in PET and PS treatments compared to control composts. Furthermore, MP contamination led to a significant reduction in unique operational taxonomic units (OTUs), which negatively impacted nitrogen cycling, increased salinity, and reduced compost stability. The findings highlight the need for effective strategies to mitigate the impact of MP on composting processes to ensure the sustainability of agricultural practices that rely on compost. By integrating advanced composting system designs with a focus on microbial dynamics and the challenges posed by MP contamination, this thesis offers a holistic approach to organic waste management. This research comprehensively assesses the role of different microbial inocula and emerging contaminants in the composting of agricultural and floral residues. Initially, core microbiome diversity in digested versus raw manure was explored to understand their compositional differences and influence on microbial dynamics during rice straw composting. Building on this, the same inocula were evaluated in the co-composting of floral waste, focusing on changes in physicochemical parameters and microbial succession. The study also investigated the impact of microplastic contaminants—specifically polyethylene terephthalate (PET) and polystyrene (PS)—on microbial structure and compost quality, reflecting real-world contamination scenarios. Finally, a techno-economic analysis was conducted to evaluate the technical feasibility and economic viability of rice straw composting under various treatment conditions. These integrated approaches offer valuable insights for optimizing composting systems and advancing sustainable organic waste management.