Artificial Intelligence formulated this projection for compatibility purposes from the original article published at Global Journals. However, this technology is currently in beta. *Therefore, kindly ignore odd layouts, missed formulae, text, tables, or figures.* 

# Prediction of Soil Nitrogen Depeltion in Crude Oil Contaminated Soil in Southern Nigeria

J. C. Agunwamba

Received: 15 December 2019 Accepted: 1 January 2020 Published: 15 January 2020

### 6 Abstract

3

4

Oil spillage is a major environmental threat in south south of Nigeria where most of oil 7 exploration and exploitation activities takes place. If this goes on unchecked or poorly 8 managed, it would lead to total annihilation of the ecosystem. The objective of this study is 9 to develop a model for the prediction of soil nitrogen depletion in crude oil contaminated soil 10 with time using regression analysis. Each sample containing 10kg of soil was artificially 11 polluted with 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, and 2.5 liters of crude oil (Bonny Light). The Soil Nitrogen 12 concentrations were determined using standard methods. Results shows that the 13 concentration of residual soil nitrogen in the soil for all the volumes of crude oil introduced 14 into the soil depleted significantly with time when compared to values obtained for the control 15 sample. The residual concentration in the control soil sample was about three times higher 16 than the concentration obtained for other samples. The results obtained from the derived 17 model were very close to the experimental value. The model is suitable for determining Soil 18 Nitrogen content in crude oil polluted site. 19

20

21 Index terms— crude oil, pollution, soil nitrogen, model, niger delta.

## <sup>22</sup> 1 Introduction

n Nigeria, oil spillage in the Niger Delta region, especially on Agricultural Lands, has been a significant issue of 23 concern both to the government and the people in the area. The outcome of this research work can serve as a 24 vital tool in resolving problems associated with oil pollution and bioremediation of affected lands. Oil has hostile 25 effects on the physicochemical properties of soils, plant and, animal community. Beyond 3% concentration, crude 26 oil has been reported to be increasingly deleterious to soil biota and crop growth. Unfortunately, available data 27 to manage the ecological spoils of the Niger Delta Region has been found inadequate. Though existing data 28 has found various uses in the Post spill management program of the affected ecosystem and communities, recent 29 advances have shown that such data has been specific to particular sites and incidences, predominantly because 30 of the nature of the crude oil contaminant and possible environmental modifications . 31

## 32 **2** I

33 Soil fertility is the result of the interaction between the biological, chemical, and physical properties of soil due 34 to soil type, land use, and effects of climate. Soil chemical properties are related to the supply of plant nutrients 35 that is essential for plant growth. Generally, oil affects the physicochemical properties in plant communities in 36 soil. Oil spill reduces crop yield, land productivity, and grandly decreases farm income. Observation shows that a 10% increase in oil spill reduces crop yield by 1.3% while farm income plummeted to 5% ??Odjuwuederhie et al., 37 2006). According to Shell 1996, half of the volume of the crude oil spill is due to the corrosion of aging facilities 38 mostly flow line. Another 21% happens in the course of operations to produce oil, while about 28% is due to 39 sabotage. The remaining 1% is mainly due to engineering and drilling activities. There have been numerous 40 reports on the impact of crude oil spill on farmland in the Niger Delta region ?? Osuji and Mathematical Models 41 can be used to predict the impacts of crude oil spill on the physicochemical properties of soil to reduce the 42

complaints about polluted farmlands. In predictive modeling, data are collected for relevant predictors (variables 43 that are likely to influence future behavior or results) followed by a model formulation, then predictions are 44

made, and the model is validated. The different approaches to deciding model validity include conceptual model 45

validation and operational validation ??Nwaogasi, 2006). A case in which n-control variables X 1, X 2, X 3 to 46 X n are involved a corresponding linear multiple regression equation is of the form?? = ?? 0 + ?? 1 ?? 1 + ??

47

 $2 ?? 2 + ?? 3 ?? 3 \dots +?? ?? ?? ?? 1.0$ 48

The regression coefficient for ?? 0, A 1 to A n can be obtained using Panel Data Computer Software. 49

#### 3 II. 50

#### Methods 4 51

They carried out the study over a period of sixteen (16) weeks using different containers measuring 17cm (height) 52

by 18.5cm (diameter). The study area is the research farm of the Federal University of Technology Owerri, located 53 in Owerri, Imo State Nigeria. The soils are derived from coastal plain sands called acid sands -Benin formation 54 (Orajaka, 1975 The soil used in the study was collected from the Federal University of Technology Owerri 55 (FUTO) Research Farm from 15cm to 20cm depth with a shovel. It was measured into containers and taken to 56 the laboratory for treatment (greenhouse treatment). 57

The soil was air-dried for two weeks and sieved through 2.0cm sieve. The soil samples labeled B, C, D, E, 58 F, each weighing 10kg were polluted with 0.5, 1.0, 2.0, 2.5 liters of crude oil (Bony light), respectively, and 59

thoroughly mixed on a polythene sheet and put in a labeled container. 60

Sample A was not polluted and was used as the control. To maintain the moisture content of the soil, 50cl of 61 62 water was sprinkled on each polluted soil sample at two weeks intervals.

The polluted samples were allowed to stay 14 days before the commencement of analysis. The representative 63 samples from (A, B, C, D, E, F) containers were taken at two weeks intervals to the soil science laboratory of 64

Department of Crop, Soil and Pest Management, School of Agriculture and Agricultural Technology, FUTO for 65 analysis to determine the fate of soil nitrogen nutrient with time at various levels of pollution with crude oil. The 66 concentration remaining after 14, 28, 42, 56, 70, 84, 98 and 112 days intervals were obtained. 67

Ten grams (10g) of air-dried soil sample was introduced into a dry 500ml macro-kjeldahl flask, and 20ml of 68 distilled water was added and allowed to stand for 30 minutes after a little swirling. 30ml of concentrated. H 2 69 SO 4 was annexed into the mixture and heated at low heat at the digestion stand. The mixture was allowed to 70 boil for five hours. The digest was transferred carefully to a clean 750ml flask, and 50ml of H 3 BO 3 indicator 71 solution was added and placed under the condenser of the distillation apparatus. As distillation commenced, 72

the condenser was kept cool below 30 o C, allowing sufficient cold water to flow through and to regulate heat to 73

minimize fronting and prevent suckback. 150ml distillate was collected, and the distillation process was stopped. 74 The Nitrogen (NH 4 -N) in the distillate was determined by titrating 0.01N standard HCl at 0.1ml intervals,

75 and as the color changes from green to pink. The percentage of Nitrogen (%N) content of the soil was read and 76 recorded. This process was repeated for various levels of crude oil pollution for the soil samples. 77

The Panel Data Computer Software called Stata 13 version was used to obtain the regression coefficients B 0 78 , B 1 , B 2 , B 3, and B 4 and the model equation for soil nitrogen using the data obtained from the laboratory. 79

The model equation for the soil nitrogen is expressed as: ?? ???? = ?? 0 + ?? 1 ?? ?????? + ?? 2 ?? ???? +80

#### **Results and Discussions** $\mathbf{5}$ 81

82 Table ??: The Variation of soil nitrogen values with time after pollution

83 Table ?? shows the soil nitrogen remaining in the soil after any given time (t = 14 to 112 days), for values of soil samples with crude oil pollution volume ranging from 0 to 2.5L per 10Kg of soil. The R 2 for the determination 84 of the proposed model is 0.9824, with a root mean square error of 0.06255, as shown in table ??. The root mean 85 square error is small; hence the adopted model fits (Chang, 2015). The P-value of 0.00 shows that there is a 86 strong relationship between soil nitrogen and concentration of crude oil spilled at any given time. The equation 87 for prediction of soil nitrogen fate in crude oil contaminated soil is therefore Nitrogen content of the soil at various 88 levels of crude oil pollution varied with time of pollution as shown in Fig. 2. In control (no crude oil added), soil 89 nitrogen increased with time of pollution up till sixty (60) days and remained almost constant till 112 days after. 90 Best soil nitrogen concentration at 60 days of pollution was 0.315%, with the fluctuation in value before and 91 after this time (60 days). This could be ascribed to Nitrogen transformation processes, especially mineralization 92 93 and immobilization (Catherine et al., 2004). At 0.5 liters (equivalent to 629 barrels per hectare), of crude oil 94 pollution, N concentration increased with time up till 70 days and then decreased, before a second increase at 95 112 days. The trend for the 1.0-liter rate of pollution was an increase to 84 days and a second decrease up to 96 112 days. Values of Nitrogen (N) for the 14, 28, 42, 84 and 112 days of pollution were 0.12, 0.13, 0.13, 0.14, 0.135% respectively. The nitrogen content at 1.5 liters of crude oil pollution increased with time up till 84 days 97 after pollution until a decrease from the 84 to the 112 days of pollution. Values of Nitrogen (N) varied as 0.12, 98 0.13, 0, 0.135, 0.129, 0, 0.132, 0.137, 0.140, and 0.136 at 14, 28, 42, 56, 70, 84, 98 and 112 days after pollution 99 respectively. Values of N at 2.0 and 2.5 liters of crude oil pollution increased with time of crude application.?? 100 = 0.1927 + 0.1124?? ?????? + 0.0009?? ???? -2.101

Fluctuations in Nitrogen (N) content with time for various crude oil pollution rates could be attributed to differences in Nitrogen mineralization and immobilization processes. Generally, soil nitrogen content, averaged over time of crude oil pollution, was three times higher at the control than other rates of crude oil pollution. The low concentrations of N at various crude oil application could be due to reduced microbial activity and depressed nitrogen mineralization, occasioned by toxic and damaging effects of crude oil on soil organism. This bad influence decreased with time of application resulting to improved nitrogen concentration with time.

# 108 6 Global

The percentage of soil nitrogen content at all levels of crude oil pollution with time was below 0.15%, which is the critical nitrogen limit for soils of southeastern Nigeria (Enwezor et al., 1990). This shows that despite crude oil pollution at various levels, the nitrogen content of the soil was low and could hardly sustain crop production. IV.

## 113 7 Conclusion

114 The impact of crude oil pollution on the physicochemical properties of soil about soil fertility in the Niger Delta

115 Region of Nigeria has been reviewed. Modeling of soil nitrogen in crude oil contaminated soil over a period was

<sup>116</sup> carried out. The soil nitrogen value for various crude oil levels of pollution increased with time being lowest at 14days.

	N 1					
Time						
(days)	0	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5
14	0.287	0.143	0.123	0.115	0.121	0.126
28	0.285	0.148	0.128	0.120	0.127	0.128
42	0.291	0.150	0.133	0.125	0.130	0.134
56	0.300	0.152	0.136	0.128	0.127	0.140
70	0.298	0.154	0.138	0.130	0.134	0.142
84	0.300	0.158	0.14	0.133	0.140	0.143
98	0.300	0.159	0.14	0.134	0.140	0.144
112	0.300	0.159	0.14	0.134	0.137	0.144

Figure 1:

117

 $<sup>^1 \</sup>odot$  2020 Global Journals Prediction of Soil Nitrogen Depeltion in Crude O<br/>il Contaminated Soil in Southern Nigeria

MODEL RESULTS				Number of Obs = 48		
source	SS	df	Ms	F(4, 43) = 599.75		
Model	0.172198	4	0.43049	Prob > F = 0.0000		
Residual	0.004704	43	0.00011	R- Squared = 0.9824		
Total	0.176902	47	0.00376	Adj R-Squared = 0.9808		
			Root MSE = 0.06255			
N	Coef	Std Err	t	P >  t	95% Conf.	Interval
Conc	0.112373	0.005989	18.76	0	0.100294	0.1244519
time	0.000414	0.000217	1.91	0.063	-2.3E-05	0.0008518
time <sup>2</sup>	-2.01E-06	1.68E-06	-1.2	0.237	-5.40E-06	1.38E-06
conc <sup>1/2</sup>	-0.27537	0.009769	-28.29	0	-0.29507	-0.25567
_cons	0.1927	0.006827	40.39	0	0.261974	0.2895091

 $\mathbf{31}$ 

Figure 2: Table 3 : Fig. 1 :



Figure 3: 102e?? ???? 2 + 0,

Figure 4:

1

).Samples

Figure 5: Table 1 :

## $\mathbf{4}$

Time/Day	Experimental Data (ED)	Predicted Value (PV)	Percentage Difference
7	0.119	0.122	2.50
14	0.1192	0.1248	5.10
21	0.1191	0.1270	4.40
28	0.1210	0.1260	4.10
35	0.1270	0.1310	1.50

Figure 6: Table 4 :

 $\mathbf{5}$ 

	TIME	COV	ED for	N	DV for N	07 Difference
			ED for .	IN	F V 10F IN 0.281146100	<sup>70</sup> Difference
Voor	14		0.207	0.901	0.201140199	2.039032249
Year 28 42 2020 56 70		000	0.200 0	0.291	0.280586603	-0.207122923 0.485675427 2.450208073
		0	0.300 0.	290	0.20900090	1.050861869
					0.292022387	1.050801802
10	8/ 08	0.0	0 300 0	300	0.294000439	1 225074084 1 002858043
()	04 90 119	0.05	0.300 0.	300	0.29032479 0.290991438	1.223074084 1.002838043 1.043866037 0.268103078
Vol-	112	0 0.0	0.300	0 1/18	0.142616615	0.653370589
ume	28 42	0.5	0.145 0.150	0.140 0.152	0 147231698	0.704961653
Xv	20 <del>1</del> 2 56 70	0.5	0.150 0.154	0.152 0.158	0.151057094	1 376844432
X	84 08	0.5	0.154 0.150	0.150	0.154002804	1.51872/677 0.120626///6
Ic_	119	0.5	0.100	0.100	0 1563388/1	0.338457064 + 0.540932135
5110	1/ 28	0.5	0.12300	0002	0 157795191	3 9/3833/26 / 090/92609
I V	14 20	0.5 0.5 1	0.12000	0001	0 158461854 0 15833883	5.545055420 4.050452005
er-		1			0.118149087 0.12276417	
sion		T			0.110140001 0.12210411	
I						
Globa	142	111	0.13300	0001	0.126589566	4.819875774 4.687294834
Jour-	56 70	1 1	0.13599	9997	0.129625276	4.441067734 4.765955445
nal	84 98	1 1.5	0.13799	9986	0.131871313	4.289767554 4.377631186
of	112	1.5	0.14000	0001	0.133327663	2.219496083 $2.447762651$
Re-	14	1.5	0.14000	0001	0.133994326	3.289551246 3.020902324
search	ne <b>2</b> 8 42	1.5	0.14000	0001	0.133871317	4.040488128 $4.259094149$
in	56 70	1.5	0.115	0.120	0.112447582	4.422214726 3.192116903
En-	84 98	1.5	0.125	0.128	0.117062658	
gi-	112	1.5	0.130	0.133	0.120888054	
neer-		1.5	0.134 0.	134	0.123923771	
ing					0.126169801	
0					0.127626151	
					0.128292814	
					0.128169805	
	14	2	0.121		0.116460115	3.751970786
	28	2	0.127		0.121075191	4.665207292
	42	2	0.130		0.124900587	3.922621935
	56	2	0.127		0.127936304	-0.737243726
	70	2	0.134		0.130182341	2.849001867
	84	2	0.140		0.131638691	5.972364094
	98	2	0.140		0.132305354	5.496176202
	112	2	0.137		0.13218233	3.516543661

Figure 7: Table 5 :

- 118 [Enwezor et al. ()] 'A review of soil fertilizer use in crops in Southern zone of Nigeria (in five volumes)'. W O
- 119 Enwezor, A C Ohiri, E E E J Opowaribo, Udo. Produced by the Fed. Min. of Agric. and National Research 120 1990.
- [Eneje et al. ()] 'Amelioration of Chemical Properties of Crude Oil Contaminated Soil using Compost from
  Calapoigonium Mucunoides and Poultry Manure'. R C Eneje , C Nwagbara , E G Umumarongie-Ilori .
  *International Research Journal of Agric. Science and Soil Science* 2012. 2 (6) p. .
- [Choron et al. ()] 'Bioremediation of a Crude Oil Polluted Soil by Application of Fertilizers'. M Choron , H S
  Sharifi , H Matamedi . Iran Journal of Environ. Health Science and Engineering 2010. 7 (4) p. .
- [Onwuka et al. ()] 'Determination of Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon (TPH) and same Ctions (Na + , Ca + and Mg 2+ ) in a Crude Oil Polluted Soil and Possible Phytoremediation by Cynodon Dactylon (Bermuda grass)'.
   F Onwuka , N Nwachoko , E & anosike . Journal of Environmental and Earth Science 2012. 2 (6) p. .
- [Uzoho et al. ()] 'Fertility Status under Land Use Types on Soil of Similar Lithology'. B U Uzoho , N N Oti , A
  Ngwuta . Journal of American Science 2007. 3 (4) p. .
- 131 [Osuji and Onojake ()] 'Field Reconnaissance and Estimation of Petroleum Hydrocarbon and Heavy Metal
- Contents of Soils Affected by the Ebocha-8 Oil Spillage in Niger Delta'. L C Osuji , C M Onojake . Nigeria
  Journ. Environ. Mgt 2006. 79 p. .
- [Orajaka ()] S O Orajaka . Nigeria in Maps: eastern states, Benin City ethiope publishing house. Pp, 1975. p. .
  (Geology in ofomata, GEK)
- [Okwuosha ()] Physico-chemical characterization of soil under the influence of gas flaring. A thesis submitted
  to the department of Crop and Soil Technology, S C Okwuosha . 2000. p. . Federal University of technology
  Owerri Imo State
- 139 [Osuji et al. ()] 'Preliminary Investigation of Mgbede-20 Oil Polluted Site in Niger Delta'. L C Osuji , D C
- [Nwaogazie ()] Probability and Statistics for Science and Engineering Practice, L L Nwaogazie . 2006. Porthar court Nigeria: Portharcourt press. p. . University of
- [Odjuwuederhe et al. ()] 'The Effect of Oil Spillage on Crop Yield and Farm Icrease in Delta State Nigeria'. I
  Odjuwuederhe, G Omoborand, D Adun, NF. J. Central Eur. Agric 2006. 7 p. .