



# Microbiological Status, Physico-chemistry and Plant Performance in Spent Lubricating Oil (SLO) Polluted Soils Amended with Spiked Organic Fertilizers

M. E. Ntekpe <sup>a</sup>, M. A. Ekpo <sup>a</sup>, U. U. Ndubuisi-Nnaji <sup>a</sup>,  
E. O. Mbong <sup>b\*</sup> and D. C. Udoidiong <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Sciences, University of Uyo, Uyo, Akwa, Ibom State, Nigeria.

<sup>b</sup> Department of Biological Sciences, Faculty of Natural and Applied Sciences, Ritman University, Ikot, Ekpene, Akwa, Ibom State, Nigeria.

<sup>c</sup> Department of Microbiology, Heritage Polytechnic, Ikot Udota, Eket Akwa, Ibom State, Nigeria.

## Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJAHR/2023/v10i4267

## Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/102653>

Original Research Article

Received: 15/05/2023

Accepted: 18/07/2023

Published: 01/08/2023

## ABSTRACT

Soil contaminations by spent lubricating oil (SLO) have been reported to be threatening as it can negatively impact soil macro/micro-flora, destroy the food chains, disrupt biogeochemical cycling of elements, thus reducing soil fertility/productivity, with attendant economic implications. This study evaluated the changes in microbial population and performance of plant in SLO polluted soils amended with different organic fertilizers. The fertilizers were produced from organic waste

\*Corresponding author: Email: mbongemem@yahoo.com;

materials using aerobic composting technique; pollution was simulated in potted soils; soil toxicity were determined using *Zea mays* L. as test crop; microbial counts and physicochemical properties of the test soils were determined using standard microbiological and chemical protocols respectively. Apart from significant ( $P < 0.05$ ) decrease in population of total heterotrophic bacteria (THB) and total fungal counts (TFC) ( $2.6 \times 10^8$  to  $6.1 \times 10^7$  cfu/g and  $2.3 \times 10^5$  to  $1.7 \times 10^5$  cfu/g respectively), and increase in populations of hydrocarbon utilizing bacteria (HUB) and hydrocarbon utilizing fungi (HUF) ( $7.3 \times 10^3$  to  $4.6 \times 10^4$  cfu/g and  $8.0 \times 10^3$  to  $1.7 \times 10^4$  cfu/g respectively) following contamination of soil with SLO at pollution level., results also revealed increase (improvements) in counts of all microbial groups at the end of remediation treatments. Mean microbial count in soils amended with different levels of fertilizer treatments (5%, 10%, and 15%) reflected a dose-dependent increase as follows:  $F_{t_2} > F_{t_0} > F_{t_4}$  for the 5% ( $3.7 \times 10^8$  cfu/g), 10% ( $9.2 \times 10^7$  cfu/g) and 15% ( $6.9 \times 10^7$  cfu/g) respectively. At 5% application, post remediation pH increased following the order:  $F_{t_0} > F_{t_2} > F_{t_4}$  (6.00, 5.34, and 4.90 respectively). The test crop, *Zea mays* L. recorded 100% and 62.5% germination in amended and unamended soils respectively. Leave length and chlorophyll index of *Z. mays* L. grown on remediated soils ranged between  $35.10 \pm 0.40$  –  $52.85 \pm 0.05$  (at 5% treatments);  $32.60 \pm 0.10$  –  $56.55 \pm 0.35$  (at 10% treatments); and  $35.35 \pm 0.15$  –  $42.45 \pm 0.25$  (at 15% treatments), compared with  $30.30 \pm 0.80$  –  $50.55 \pm 0.75$  (for PS) and  $18.05 \pm 0.85$  –  $25.50 \pm 0.70$  (for unamended CS). All test crops yielded except those grown on unamended soils. Conclusively, application of organic fertilizers to SLO polluted soils increased population of different groups of soil microbes, leading to increased breakdown of the pollutant and reduced soil toxicity.

**Keywords:** Spent lubricating oil; soil; environment; contaminants; pollution; bioremediation; germination.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Environmental stress resulting from various waste streams and petroleum products is a source of concern, especially in developing countries as it contaminates various ecosystems namely soil, water and air. Going by Bamiro and Osibanjo [1], Nigeria generates well over 200 million litres of spent lubricating (automobile engine) oil per annum. This waste oil, which rarely have any secondary application, is disposed unguardedly into gutters, water drains, open vacant plots and farms by auto mechanics and allied artisans [2], causing more widespread pollution than crude oil spillage [3].

Petroleum hydrocarbons are not easily degraded and can adversely affect soil productivity and cause different degrees of harm to microorganisms [4]. The entry of petroleum-based substances into the soil has caused a dramatic increase in soil organic carbon content, resulting in an imbalance between soil C content and N content [5-7]. This imbalance destroys the habitat for soil microbial life and changes the number and diversity of soil microbial populations [8,9]. Furthermore, microorganisms play a very important role in decomposition of plant and animal residues; participate in biogeochemical cycling thus, maintaining soil ecosystem functions and promote soil C, N, S, P, and other

nutrient [10]; and regulate soil material and energy cycle [11-13].

Moreso, petroleum oil contaminants contain potentially phyto-toxic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), as well as a vast array of heavy metals. According to Kirk et al. [14], in petroleum contaminated soils, plant growth is typically limited by nitrogen and phosphorus as a result of the overabundance of carbon from the petroleum hydrocarbons. They further stated that due to the hydrophobic nature of the contaminants, water and water-soluble nutrients are often limited. In the same vein, the effect of oil on seed germination has been shown to be inhibitory due to unfavourable soil conditions [15,16]. It was reported that upon drying, the soils contaminated with oil became too hard to allow germination. Also, the reduced oxygen content of the soil due to the blockage of pores in the soil and increased water stress on the seed imposed negative effects on germination. The impacts include loss of soil productive capacity, growing expanse of waste-lands, with its far-reaching economic implications.

Bioremediation is “a managed or spontaneous process, in which biological activities, especially microbial catalysis occurs on pollutants, thereby remedying or eliminating environmental contamination”. It also refers to the enhancement of the native capability of microorganisms by the

addition of oxygen and nutrients to the soil system to support biological growth and improve the degradation of contaminants [17]. It mainly involves biostimulation where organic or inorganic components were introduced to enhance indigenous microbial growth that directly degrades the contaminants. This study constitutes part of the search for an ideal bioremediation technology for petroleum polluted soils.

## 2. METHODS

### 2.1 Organic Fertilizer Production

Organic fertilizers were produced following the aerobic composting technique of Haydar and Masood [18]. Three composting pads (A, B, C) consisting of varying quantities of nitrogen-rich and carbon-rich organic materials in desired proportions, as described by George et al. [19], were constructed and spiked with 0%, 2% and 4% SLO respectively. All factors affecting composting process, viz: moisture content, temperature, pH, aeration/oxygen supply, and particle size were kept at optimum, according to the methods described by Parr et al. [20]; Ekpo and Ntekpe [21].

### 2.2 Microcosm Set-up / Field Test

The potency of produced organic fertilizers as amendment on SLO polluted soils was tested

through Randomized Complete Block Design experiment as described by Hadeel [22]. Bulk soil taken from an agriculture field was air-dried and filtered, by passing through a 2mm sieve. 300.0kg of the filtered soil was placed in a large polythene sheet. The soil was artificially contaminated with 10% (w/v) spent lubricating oil. 10% contamination was adopted to achieve severe contamination (pollution), because beyond 3% concentration, oil has been reported to be increasingly deleterious to soil biota and crop growth [23-25]. 8.0kg each of the polluted soil was placed in thirty one (31) clean dry perforated plastic containers of 9887.43cm<sup>2</sup> (approx. 9.89L) capacities; divided into four (4) groups (I, II, III, and IV) in triplicates as shown in Plate 1.

These polluted soil samples were allowed undisturbed for two weeks to stabilize. Groups I, II, & III were amended with varying quantities (5%, 10%, and 15%) of organic fertilizers C, A & B respectively. The moisture contents were adjusted to 60%, using tap water. Equal rates of tilling (three times a week throughout the duration of experiment) was used to provide the necessary aeration and mixing of nutrients and microbes with the contaminated soil, following the methods of Ayotamuno et al. [26]; Choron et al. [27]; Agamuthu et al. [25]. The remediation experiment lasted for ninety (90) days.



Plate 1. Polluted potted soil samples during remediation treatment

## 2.3 Laboratory Analyses

### 2.3.1 Physicochemical analysis

The soil samples were air-dried, crushed with mortar and passed through a 2mm sieve and stored in polythene bags prior to analysis. Soil physicochemical characteristics such as soil texture, pH, total organic carbon (TOC), total organic matter (TOM), Carbon/Nitrogen ratio, total nitrogen, total phosphorus, soil conductivity (EC) and heavy metals [vanadium (v), lead (Pb), nickel (Ni), cadmium (Cd), and chromium (Cr)] were determined before contamination, one week after contamination, and after remediation. Soil texture was determined according to Bouyoucos [28] while bulk density test followed the core method of Blake and Hartge as described by Ntekpe [29].

The pH of each sample was determined by means of glass electrode pH meter [30]. Carbon contents of the fertilizer samples were determined using the Walkely and Black [31]. Nitrogen contents of the fertilizer and soil samples were determined by the Kjeldhal method]. Phosphorus (P) was estimated using the Bray P-I method Jackson [32]; Bowman [33]. Exchangeable Cations ( $\text{Ca}^{++}$ ,  $\text{Mg}^{++}$ ,  $\text{K}^+$ , and  $\text{Na}^+$ ) were determined by flame photometry methods of AOAC [34]. Particle Size Distribution was determined by the hydrometer method as described by Udo et al. [35]. The Electrical Conductivity of the soil samples was determined using the Conductivity meter, after the method of AOAC (2005). Exchangeable acidity was determined with one normal potassium chloride solution following the methods of Udo et al. [35]. Organic Matter was determined by the dichromate wet oxidation method as described by Nelson and Sommers [36]. Effective Cation Exchange Capacities (ECEC) was determined by the method described by Klute [37]. The summation method described by Jackson (1979) was adopted to determine the effective cation exchange capacity.

### 2.3.2 Enumeration of microorganisms

Total Aerobic Heterotrophic Bacteria (TAHB) in organic fertilizers and soil samples at various intervals were enumerated by surface plating technique on nutrient agar fortified with nystatin (anti-fungal drug), as described by Cheesbrough [38].

Hydrocarbon utilizing bacteria (HUB) in the fertilizer and soil samples were enumerated using oil agar (OA) having the following composition: 1.8g  $\text{K}_2\text{HPO}_4$ , 4.0g  $\text{NH}_4\text{Cl}$ , 0.2g  $\text{MgSO}_4 \cdot 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$ , 1.2g  $\text{KH}_2\text{PO}_4$ , 0.01g  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$ , 0.1g NaCl, 20g agar, 1ml used engine oil in 1000ml distilled water, according to the method of Zajic, as reported by Agamuthu et al. [25]. The OA plates were incubated at 30°C for 5 days before the colonies were counted.

The fungal load in the organic fertilizer and soil samples were determined by surface plating technique, using Sabouraud Dextrose Agar (SDA), fortified with streptomycin to discourage bacterial growth, as described by APHA [39].

## 2.4 Agronomic Parameters

Plant toxicity test using maize (*Zea mays* L.) was conducted on the thirty (30) potted-soils laid out in Plate 1. Some growth parameters and yield of maize (*Zea mays* L.) were assessed. Relative chlorophyll content (chlorophyll index) of *Zea mays* planted on various treatment were determined by light transmittance/absorbance, using the FT Green LLC, USA chlorophyll meter, model: PN: 0131, SN: 0903-00100145 class B according to the methods of Huang et al. [40].

### 2.4.1 Statistical analysis

Treatment means were obtained from each groups and this value were subjected to two-factor analysis of variance to assess significant differences within and between the groups. Significant differences were separated using Least Significant Differences test (LSD). The statistical package for social sciences (SPSS, Version 18.0) was employed for this purposed as described by Okon, et al.[41] and Mbong, et al. [42].

## 3. RESULTS

### 3.1 Microbial Counts in Soils Receiving Different Organic Fertilizer Treatments during Remediation

Table 1 presents reports of the counts of various groups of microorganisms (including THBC, TFC, HUBC, and HUFC) obtained during the process of soil remediation in this study. Three types of organic fertilizers ( $\text{Ft}_0$ ,  $\text{Ft}_2$ , and  $\text{Ft}_4$ ) were applied differently, at three levels (5%, 10%, and 15%), and monitored for twelve (12) weeks. Samples were taken and analyzed bi-weekly.

### 3.2 Physicochemical Analysis of Soil Samples

This result, as presented in Table 2, showed significant variations in pH (5.45 to 4.70) between pristine and contaminated soil respectively. Other parameters measured, included N, K, Mg, Na, available P, organic C, exchangeable acidity, electrical conductivity (EC) and ECEC also showed variations.

### 3.3 Test Crop Response Analysis

The effects of SLO polluted soils amended with different organic fertilizers (Ft<sub>0</sub>, Ft<sub>2</sub>, and Ft<sub>4</sub>) at varying levels (5%, 10%, and 15%) on the germination percentage of *Zea mays* L. is presented in Fig. 1. The result shows an increase in germination percentage of *Zea mays* with increase in the quantities of fertilizer added to the spent lubricating oil polluted soils. Treatment of SLO polluted soils with organic fertilizers – Ft<sub>0</sub>, Ft<sub>2</sub> and Ft<sub>4</sub> showed significant increase ( $p < 0.05$ ) in the germination percentage. Also there were variations in germination percentage among the different levels of fertilizer application with the highest (100%) observed at 10% in all three organic fertilizers. The unamended spent lubricating oil polluted soil had the least germination percentage (62.5%).

There was significant  $p < 0.05$  increase in number of nodes of *Zea mays* in all the treatments amended with organic fertilizers in the study (Fig. 2). There was a proportionate increase in the number of nodes as the quantity of the fertilizer increased while there was a significant  $p < 0.05$  reduction in the number of nodes in maize grown on the contaminated soils (Sc) that receive no organic fertilizer treatment. Also, there were variation in plant heights (Fig. 3) among the different fertilizer application levels, but did not follow any direct proportion to the quantity applied. Plant heights in the amended soils were significantly higher than the unamended soil.

The leaf length of the *Zea mays* in the SLO polluted soils amended with organic fertilizer differed according to the type of organic fertilizer applied (Fig. 4). Generally, plants on soil amended with SLO-spiked compost presented longer leaves compared to those from soils amended with pristine compost. It was observed that the type/quantities of compost had

significant effect on the leaf length with the highest effect observed at 5% for Ft<sub>2</sub>, and Ft<sub>4</sub> (86.3±0.2cm and 78.1±2.6cm respectively), while Ft<sub>0</sub> recorded the longest leaves (82.9±2.6cm) at 10% application.

There was significant increase in the chlorophyll concentration in the leaves of *Zea mays* in all the treatments amended with organic fertilizers in the study (Fig 5). While there was a significant decrease in the chlorophyll concentration in the leaves of the *Zea mays* in the control (Sc), also there was variation in the chlorophyll concentration in the leaves of plants among the different fertilizer application levels, but did not follow any direct proportion to the quantity applied. Chlorophyll concentrations in the leaves of plants from the amended soils were significantly higher than those from the unamended soils (Sc).

The yield of *Zea mays* in all the treatments amended with organic fertilizers in the study (Table 3) also showed significant  $p < 0.05$  increase. While there was a Nil yield of the *Zea mays* in the 0g treatment (Sc) of organic fertilizer, i.e. the unamended polluted soils. The highest yield (186g) was recorded in plants from polluted soils amended with petroleum oil-spiked compost (Ft<sub>2</sub>) at 5% fertilizer application level. However, with the exception of plants from the unamended soils (Sc), all other treatments yielded fruits of varying cob sizes and total dry weight of cobs.

## 4. DISCUSSION

Soil health is naturally restored by the biodegradation activities of its indigenous microbial communities after pollution by petroleum hydrocarbons. However, rapid biodegradation depends on the population and types of microorganisms present in the impacted environment. Moreso, biodegradation of hydrocarbons can be enhanced through methods such as, biostimulation (addition of nutrients and/or other factors to promote the growth of indigenous microbes) or bioaugmentation (introduction of known hydrocarbon degraders to the system). Spiking of composting process was done to pre-expose microbes in the fertilizer to the expected contaminant and therefore boasts their ability to degrade SLO.

**Table 1. Mean microbial counts in soils receiving different organic fertilizer treatments during remediation**

Time (week)	Microbial Groups (cfu/g)	Microbial Counts per Fertilizer per Treatment Level										
		Controls		SctC (%)			SctA (%)			SctB (%)		
		S <sub>0</sub>	Sct <sub>0</sub>	5	10	15	5	10	15	5	10	15
0	THBC	2.6×10 <sup>8</sup>	6.1×10 <sup>7</sup>	2.8×10 <sup>7</sup>	2.9×10 <sup>7</sup>	3.2×10 <sup>7</sup>	2.2×10 <sup>7</sup>	2.8×10 <sup>7</sup>	1.9×10 <sup>7</sup>	1.2×10 <sup>7</sup>	2.3×10 <sup>7</sup>	1.6×10 <sup>7</sup>
	TFC	2.3×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.7×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.1×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.4×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.2×10 <sup>5</sup>	2.0×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.9×10 <sup>5</sup>	2.0×10 <sup>5</sup>	5.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.4×10 <sup>5</sup>	8.0×10 <sup>4</sup>
	HUBC	7.8×10 <sup>3</sup>	4.6×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.0×10 <sup>3</sup>	2.6×10 <sup>3</sup>	3.0×10 <sup>3</sup>	5.6×10 <sup>4</sup>	4.3×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.3×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.2×10 <sup>4</sup>	3.6×10 <sup>4</sup>	4.0×10 <sup>5</sup>
2	HUFC	8.0×10 <sup>3</sup>	1.7×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.1×10 <sup>3</sup>	1.3×10 <sup>3</sup>	2.0×10 <sup>3</sup>	2.9×10 <sup>4</sup>	3.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.8×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.4×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	6.0×10 <sup>3</sup>
	THBC	2.4×10 <sup>8</sup>	3.2×10 <sup>7</sup>	4.0×10 <sup>7</sup>	4.8×10 <sup>7</sup>	6.0×10 <sup>7</sup>	9.8×10 <sup>7</sup>	6.2×10 <sup>7</sup>	1.8×10 <sup>6</sup>	1.7×10 <sup>7</sup>	5.4×10 <sup>7</sup>	6.8×10 <sup>7</sup>
	TFC	2.0×10 <sup>5</sup>	6.3×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.2×10 <sup>5</sup>	2.8×10 <sup>5</sup>	2.4×10 <sup>5</sup>	7.4×10 <sup>4</sup>	4.3×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.4×10 <sup>5</sup>	2.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	4.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.1×10 <sup>4</sup>
4	HUBC	7.3×10 <sup>3</sup>	5.2×10 <sup>4</sup>	6.2×10 <sup>3</sup>	7.6×10 <sup>3</sup>	6.2×10 <sup>3</sup>	6.9×10 <sup>4</sup>	7.2×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.9×10 <sup>4</sup>	6.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	8.1×10 <sup>7</sup>
	HUFC	1.8×10 <sup>3</sup>	4.8×10 <sup>3</sup>	2.2×10 <sup>3</sup>	2.7×10 <sup>3</sup>	4.1×10 <sup>3</sup>	9.0×10 <sup>3</sup>	8.9×10 <sup>3</sup>	1.9×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.6×10 <sup>3</sup>	7.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	5.0×10 <sup>3</sup>
	THBC	8.8×10 <sup>7</sup>	1.6×10 <sup>7</sup>	1.4×10 <sup>8</sup>	9.0×10 <sup>7</sup>	1.1×10 <sup>8</sup>	1.6×10 <sup>8</sup>	8.2×10 <sup>7</sup>	1.6×10 <sup>7</sup>	1.2×10 <sup>8</sup>	7.0×10 <sup>7</sup>	5.0×10 <sup>7</sup>
6	TFC	1.9×10 <sup>5</sup>	2.8×10 <sup>4</sup>	4.4×10 <sup>5</sup>	5.0×10 <sup>5</sup>	5.2×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.3×10 <sup>5</sup>	3.5×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.0×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.1×10 <sup>5</sup>	2.5×10 <sup>4</sup>	8.0×10 <sup>3</sup>
	HUBC	5.4×10 <sup>3</sup>	1.2×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.2×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.5×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.0×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.1×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.6×10 <sup>4</sup>	3.5×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.0×10 <sup>5</sup>	3.1×10 <sup>5</sup>
	HUFC	3.8×10 <sup>2</sup>	1.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	4.1×10 <sup>3</sup>	5.0×10 <sup>3</sup>	7.6×10 <sup>3</sup>	1.1×10 <sup>4</sup>	6.7×10 <sup>3</sup>	2.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	4.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	4.6×10 <sup>3</sup>
8	THBC	6.7×10 <sup>7</sup>	1.0×10 <sup>8</sup>	1.6×10 <sup>8</sup>	1.8×10 <sup>8</sup>	2.0×10 <sup>8</sup>	1.9×10 <sup>8</sup>	1.2×10 <sup>8</sup>	1.5×10 <sup>7</sup>	2.0×10 <sup>8</sup>	8.2×10 <sup>7</sup>	4.2×10 <sup>6</sup>
	TFC	3.2×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.9×10 <sup>4</sup>	4.8×10 <sup>5</sup>	5.2×10 <sup>5</sup>	5.6×10 <sup>5</sup>	3.4×10 <sup>5</sup>	3.4×10 <sup>4</sup>	3.2×10 <sup>5</sup>	2.6×10 <sup>5</sup>	2.2×10 <sup>4</sup>	3.0×10 <sup>3</sup>
	HUBC	4.9×10 <sup>3</sup>	2.6×10 <sup>5</sup>	3.6×10 <sup>4</sup>	3.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.6×10 <sup>4</sup>	3.6×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.6×10 <sup>6</sup>	1.3×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.9×10 <sup>5</sup>	2.3×10 <sup>5</sup>	2.8×10 <sup>5</sup>
10	HUFC	1.8×10 <sup>2</sup>	2.3×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.4×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.5×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	4.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.8×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.1×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.6×10 <sup>4</sup>	4.4×10 <sup>4</sup>	7.0×10 <sup>4</sup>
	THBC	5.9×10 <sup>6</sup>	1.6×10 <sup>8</sup>	1.5×10 <sup>8</sup>	1.8×10 <sup>8</sup>	1.9×10 <sup>8</sup>	2.0×10 <sup>8</sup>	2.4×10 <sup>7</sup>	2.6×10 <sup>7</sup>	1.3×10 <sup>8</sup>	1.2×10 <sup>7</sup>	6.8×10 <sup>7</sup>
	TFC	2.8×10 <sup>4</sup>	9.2×10 <sup>3</sup>	4.2×10 <sup>5</sup>	5.0×10 <sup>5</sup>	5.2×10 <sup>5</sup>	3.3×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.6×10 <sup>4</sup>	3.0×10 <sup>5</sup>	2.8×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.3×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.1×10 <sup>4</sup>
12	HUBC	3.2×10 <sup>3</sup>	3.5×10 <sup>5</sup>	3.2×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.9×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.8×10 <sup>4</sup>	4.2×10 <sup>5</sup>	2.1×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.8×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.0×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.5×10 <sup>5</sup>	4.0×10 <sup>4</sup>
	HUFC	1.6×10 <sup>2</sup>	3.6×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.5×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.5×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.1×10 <sup>4</sup>	3.8×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.5×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.1×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.5×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	6.0×10 <sup>4</sup>
	THBC	6.4×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.2×10 <sup>7</sup>	8.0×10 <sup>7</sup>	9.2×10 <sup>7</sup>	9.0×10 <sup>7</sup>	3.7×10 <sup>8</sup>	1.8×10 <sup>7</sup>	1.9×10 <sup>7</sup>	1.4×10 <sup>8</sup>	8.9×10 <sup>6</sup>	6.9×10 <sup>7</sup>
12	TFC	2.3×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.8×10 <sup>4</sup>	3.0×10 <sup>5</sup>	3.2×10 <sup>5</sup>	3.8×10 <sup>5</sup>	6.0×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.8×10 <sup>4</sup>	8.4×10 <sup>5</sup>	4.2×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.1×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.1×10 <sup>4</sup>
	HUBC	1.8×10 <sup>3</sup>	1.5×10 <sup>5</sup>	3.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.4×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.6×10 <sup>4</sup>	3.8×10 <sup>5</sup>	3.0×10 <sup>5</sup>	8.2×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.8×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.0×10 <sup>5</sup>	3.0×10 <sup>5</sup>
	HUFC	1.6×10 <sup>2</sup>	1.6×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.1×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	5.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.1×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.0×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.1×10 <sup>4</sup>	3.9×10 <sup>3</sup>	8.0×10 <sup>4</sup>
12	THBC	4.1×10 <sup>5</sup>	5.4×10 <sup>6</sup>	6.0×10 <sup>7</sup>	7.8×10 <sup>7</sup>	7.4×10 <sup>7</sup>	2.9×10 <sup>7</sup>	1.4×10 <sup>7</sup>	1.2×10 <sup>7</sup>	3.0×10 <sup>7</sup>	5.6×10 <sup>6</sup>	4.2×10 <sup>6</sup>
	TFC	1.2×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.1×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.6×10 <sup>5</sup>	2.2×10 <sup>5</sup>	3.0×10 <sup>5</sup>	5.1×10 <sup>5</sup>	1.6×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.6×10 <sup>5</sup>	2.2×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.1×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.0×10 <sup>4</sup>
	HUBC	1.0×10 <sup>3</sup>	1.2×10 <sup>5</sup>	2.2×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.1×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.8×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.2×10 <sup>5</sup>	2.4×10 <sup>5</sup>	7.6×10 <sup>4</sup>	8.8×10 <sup>4</sup>	6.4×10 <sup>4</sup>	3.8×10 <sup>4</sup>
	HUFC	1.3×10 <sup>2</sup>	1.3×10 <sup>3</sup>	2.3×10 <sup>3</sup>	6.8×10 <sup>3</sup>	1.4×10 <sup>4</sup>	3.1×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.2×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.6×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.1×10 <sup>4</sup>	3.4×10 <sup>3</sup>	1.9×10 <sup>4</sup>

Key: S<sub>0</sub> = Pristine soil; Sct<sub>0</sub> = Polluted soil without any treatment (control); SctC = Polluted Soil amended with pristine organic fertilizer; SctA = Polluted Soil amended with organic fertilizer from 2% SLO spiked composting process; SctB = Polluted Soil amended with organic fertilizer from 4% SLO spiked composting process


**Table 2. Physicochemical properties of soil samples before contamination, after contamination, and during remediation with different organic fertilizers**

Parameter	Week	Samples											Textural Class		
		S <sub>0</sub>	Sct <sub>0</sub>	SctC (%)			SctA (%)			SctB (%)					
				5	10	15	5	10	15	5	10	15			
pH	0	5.45	4.70	4.70	4.70	4.70	4.70	4.70	4.70	4.70	4.70	4.70	4.70	-	
	4	5.40	4.40	5.80	5.76	5.90	4.38	4.00	4.34	4.62	4.45	4.50	4.50	-	
	8	5.42	5.00	6.68	6.00	6.70	5.80	4.80	4.83	5.02	5.12	4.80	4.80	-	
	12	5.44	4.90	6.00	5.67	5.66	5.34	5.18	4.80	4.90	5.00	4.67	4.67	-	
N (%)	0	0.26	0.04	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	-	
	4	0.20	0.06	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.12	0.10	0.09	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	-	
	8	0.16	0.07	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.18	0.12	0.11	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.07	-	
	12	0.17	0.07	0.14	0.13	0.14	0.21	0.12	0.13	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.07	-	
Exchangeable Bases (Cmol/kg)	K	0	0.10	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	-
		4	0.11	0.07	0.10	0.11	0.09	0.11	0.10	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.05	0.05	-
		8	0.09	0.05	0.14	0.15	0.14	0.16	0.12	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.06	0.06	-
		12	0.09	0.04	0.14	0.17	0.18	0.20	0.16	0.13	0.09	0.10	0.08	0.08	-
	Mg	0	6.28	3.10	3.10	3.10	3.10	3.10	3.10	3.10	3.10	3.10	3.10	3.10	-
		4	6.29	3.00	3.16	3.22	3.25	3.30	3.24	3.14	3.11	3.14	3.09	3.09	-
		8	6.22	3.06	3.28	3.37	3.39	3.63	3.37	3.26	3.14	3.21	3.12	3.12	-
		12	6.19	3.16	3.38	3.49	3.51	4.04	3.58	3.47	3.20	3.21	3.19	3.19	-
	Ca	0	5.40	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	-
		4	5.40	3.10	4.00	4.10	4.04	4.10	3.80	3.90	3.80	3.60	3.30	3.30	-
		8	5.30	3.10	4.20	4.10	4.06	4.30	3.80	3.70	3.40	3.40	3.30	3.30	-
		12	5.20	3.00	4.20	4.30	4.06	4.30	4.10	3.50	3.40	3.40	3.20	3.20	-
Na	0	0.11	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	-	
	4	0.10	0.05	0.08	0.11	0.09	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.06	-	
	8	0.11	0.06	0.10	0.12	0.10	0.11	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.07	-	
	12	0.12	0.09	0.10	0.12	0.10	0.12	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.08	0.08	0.08	-	
Available P (mgkg <sup>-1</sup> )	0	57.97	54.30	54.30	54.30	54.30	54.30	54.30	54.30	54.30	54.30	54.30	54.30	-	
	4	56.82	50.10	53.30	55.10	54.80	55.10	54.81	54.00	53.90	52.56	51.59	51.59	-	
	8	56.78	46.50	50.20	55.58	56.00	56.70	55.12	54.80	52.00	50.67	49.20	49.20	-	
	12	57.52	47.00	51.00	56.20	56.20	56.70	55.14	55.12	51.34	48.40	47.10	47.10	-	


Parameter	Week	Samples											Textural Class		
		S <sub>0</sub>	Sct <sub>0</sub>	SctC (%)			SctA (%)			SctB (%)					
				5	10	15	5	10	15	5	10	15			
Organic Carbon (%)	0	9.12	17.97	17.97	17.97	17.97	17.97	17.97	17.97	17.97	17.97	17.97	17.97	-	
	4	8.65	16.78	17.70	17.80	19.78	18.10	18.20	18.10	19.00	19.20	19.20	19.20	-	
	8	7.80	17.20	18.20	17.80	17.20	17.20	18.20	18.20	18.20	18.80	19.20	19.20	-	
	12	7.10	17.10	18.10	18.00	17.10	16.50	18.30	17.50	18.10	18.00	19.50	19.50	-	
Exchangeable Acidity (Cmol/kg)	0	1.86	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	-	
	4	1.75	1.42	1.42	1.48	1.48	1.52	1.46	1.46	1.47	1.44	1.42	1.42	-	
	8	1.75	1.43	1.43	1.52	1.46	1.58	1.46	1.48	1.46	1.45	1.40	1.40	-	
EC (ds/cm)	0	0.054	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034	-	
	4	0.045	0.032	0.035	0.037	0.038	0.042	0.036	0.036	0.035	0.034	0.032	0.032	-	
	8	0.044	0.032	0.037	0.038	0.039	0.046	0.038	0.038	0.037	0.036	0.035	0.035	-	
ECEC (Cmol/kg)	0	13.75	8.66	8.73	8.73	8.73	8.73	8.73	8.73	8.73	8.73	8.73	8.73	-	
	4	13.65	7.65	8.76	9.02	8.95	9.16	8.84	8.65	8.53	8.32	7.88	7.88	-	
	8	13.47	7.70	9.15	9.26	9.15	9.78	8.84	8.61	8.17	8.22	7.95	7.95	-	
	12	13.31	7.72	9.25	9.60	9.34	10.27	9.43	8.68	8.25	8.24	7.93	7.93	-	
Particle Size Analyses (%)	SA	Sand	63.20												
		Silt	19.14												
		clay	16.03												Sandy loam
	SB	Sand	66.20												
		Silt	19.16												
		Clay	16.55												Sandy loam

Key: S<sub>0</sub>= Pristine soil; Sct<sub>0</sub>= Contaminated soil without treatment; SctC = Contaminated soil amended with pristine fertilizer; SctA = Contaminated soil amended with 2% SLO-spiked fertilizer F<sub>2</sub>; SctB = Contaminated soil amended with 4% SLO-spiked fertilizer; SA = Soil particle size before contamination; SB = Soil particle size after remediation






**Fig. 1. Germination rate of *Zea mays* L. grown on SLO contaminated soil, amended with different organic fertilizers**




**Fig. 2. Growth of *Zea mays* L. grown on SLO contaminated soil, amended with different organic fertilizers**

Contamination of the study soil with spent lubricating oil (SLO), led to a marked decrease in the population of the different microbial groups, as observed in Table 1. This was due, in part to the toxic effect of oil on soil microorganisms, as well as by indirect effects connected with changes in the physicochemical properties of the soil, especially pH alteration. This observation agrees with those of Tang et al. [43] and Lang Arica-Fuentes et al. [44]. According to Tamames

et al. [45]; Bodelier [46], soil microbes are one of the most diverse on Earth with a very rich microbial pool. The composition of the community at a specific point in time depends highly on environmental conditions, such as pH, organic carbon content, redox potential, moisture, phosphorous and nitrogen content, while fewer influencing factors include the soil texture, temperature, plant community composition, and other biotic factors.



**Fig. 3. Height of *Zea mays* L. grown on SLO contaminated soil, amended with different organic fertilizers**




**Fig. 4. Leaves length of *Zea mays* L. grown on SLO contaminated soil, amended with different organic fertilizers**

However, despite the fall in populations of other microbial groups, hydrocarbon utilizing bacteria (HUB) and hydrocarbon utilizing fungi (HUF) counts increased markedly. This may be due to the overabundance of carbon from SLO, which provides alternative source of carbon for the growth of bacteria and fungi that can utilize it. This observation is in tandem with those of Ijah et al. [47], and Ekanem et al.[48], who reported

increased growth of hydrocarbon utilizing microorganisms in soil following spent engine oil contaminations.

Two weeks into the remediation experiment, it was observed that counts of all microbial groups increased significantly. However, the level of increase attained were treatment dependent. The general increase in microbial populations is due



**Fig. 5. Chlorophyll indices of 8 weeks old Zea mays L. plants grown on SLO Contaminated soil, amended with different organic fertilizers**

Key: SctC = Contaminated Soil amended with pristine compost (control); SctA = Contaminated Soil amended with compost spiked with 2% spent lubricating oil; SctB = Contaminated Soil amended with compost spiked with 4% spent lubricating oil; Sct<sub>0</sub> = Contaminated soil without any amendment; S<sub>0</sub> = Pristine Soil; CCI = Chlorophyll Concentration Index

**Table 3. Yield per treatment of Zea mays L. grown on spent lubricating oil polluted soil amended with different organic fertilizers**

Treatment Code	Treatment Rate (%)	Number of Cobs	Yield			Total dry Weight of Cobs (g)
			Big	Medium	Small	
SctC	5	4	-	1	3	150
	10	6	-	-	6	110
	15	3	1	-	2	150
SctA	5	3	-	-	3	62
	10	4	-	-	4	56
	15	5	-	1	4	154
SctB	5	4	1	-	3	186
	10	3	-	1	2	100
	15	5	-	1	4	160
Sct <sub>0</sub>	-	-	-	-	-	-
S <sub>0</sub>	-	4	-	-	4	120

Key:

SctC = Contaminated Soil amended with pristine compost  
 SctA = Contaminated Soil amended with compost spiked with 2% spent lubricating oil  
 SctB = Contaminated Soil amended with compost spiked with 4% spent lubricating oil  
 Sct<sub>0</sub> = Contaminated Soil without any amendment – negative control  
 S<sub>0</sub> = Pristine Soil – positive control

to biostimulation achieved by the addition of nutrient from the fertilizer, and aeration occasioned by routine tilling of the soil. Additionally, the increase in populations of

microbes in soil treated with SLO-spiked fertilizers may be due to bioaugmentation, since organic fertilizers from SLO-spiked composting process is believed to harbour higher counts of

hydrocarbonoclastic microorganisms, consequently polluted soils treated with spiked organic fertilizer recorded the highest counts of hydrocarbon degrading bacteria and fungi. This, expectedly, would lead to increased biodegradation of hydrocarbons in the treated sample

SLO pollution on the soil, as reported in Table 2, caused a reduction in pH, conductivity and phosphorus content respectively. These observations were similar to the findings of Akpoveta et al. [24]. Reduced pH portends increased acidity which constitutes a serious challenge in agricultural soils since most metal cations, including Hg, Cd, Cu, Ni, Pb and Zn, are readily soluble and available in the soil at low pH [29]. The resulting increased acidity possibly stems from the fact that hydrocarbons harbour many free cations which make them possess properties of a weak acid. As earlier reported by Akpoveta et al. [24], the reduced conductivity could be due to the non-polar nature of SLO resulting in a reduced ionic movement in the soil. Hydrocarbons can act as electron acceptors or oxidizing agents due to the presence of oxygen in them thus producing a reducing environment. This, possibly, may cause oxidation of free phosphorus in the soil to phosphates resulting in the reduced phosphorus content observed in contaminated soils.

The effects of spent lubricating oil polluted soils amended with different organic fertilizers at 5% (w/v) application rate on the germination percentage of *Zea mays* L (Fig. 1), shows an increase in germination percentage of test crop with increase in the quantities of fertilizer added to polluted soils. Treatment of polluted soils with different organic fertilizers showed significant increase ( $p < 0.05$ ) in the germination percentage. Also there were variations in germination percentage among the different levels of fertilizer application with the highest (100%) observed at 10% in all three organic fertilizers. The unamended spent lubricating oil polluted soil had the least germination percentage (62.5%). The low and delayed germination of *Zea mays* L. seeds observed in unamended (non-remediated) soils may be indicative of the degree of soil degradation. Ekundayo et al. [49] and Kirk et al. [14] reported that germination of seeds was delayed in petroleum oil polluted soils due to the phyto-toxic effect of hydrocarbons and oxygen shortage occasioned by blockage of soil pores by oil.

There was significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) increase in growth parameters of *Zea mays* in all the treatments amended with organic fertilizers in the study (Figs. 2-4). While there was a significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) decrease in growth parameters of the *Zea mays* in the 0g treatment ( $Sct_0$ ) of organic fertilizer, also there was variation in plant heights among the different fertilizer application levels, but did not follow any direct proportion to the quantity applied. Plant heights in the amended soils were significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) higher than the unamended soil.

The number of nodes (Fig. 2) and leaf length (Fig. 4) of the *Zea mays* in the spent lubricating oil polluted soils amended with organic fertilizer differed from each other according to the type of organic fertilizer applied. Generally, plants on soil amended with petroleum oil-spiked compost presented longer leaves compared to those from soils amended with pristine compost. It was observed that the type/quantities of compost had significant effect on the leaf length with the highest effect observed at 5% for  $Ft_2$  and  $Ft_4$  ( $86.3 \pm 0.2$ cm and  $78.1 \pm 2.6$ cm respectively), while  $Ft_0$  recorded the longest leaves ( $82.9 \pm 2.6$ cm) at 10% application. There was a proportionate increase in the number of nodes as the quantity of the fertilizer increased while there was a significant  $p < 0.05$  reduction in the number of nodes in maize grown on the contaminated soils ( $Sct_0$ ) that receive no organic fertilizer treatment.

There was significant  $p < 0.05$  increase in the chlorophyll concentration in the leaves of *Zea mays* in all the treatments amended with organic fertilizers in the study (Table 3). While there was a significant decrease in the chlorophyll concentration in the leaves of the *Zea mays* in the 0g treatment ( $Sc$ ) of organic fertilizer, also there was variation in the chlorophyll concentration in the leaves of plants among the different fertilizer application levels, but did not follow any direct proportion to the quantity applied. Chlorophyll concentration in the leaves of plants from the amended soils were significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) higher than those from the unamended soils ( $Sc$ ).

Moreso, Yield of *Zea mays* (Table 3) in all the treatments amended with organic fertilizers in this study also showed significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) variations. However, there were nil yields of the *Zea mays* in control ( $Sct_0$ ) soils. The highest yield (186g) was recorded in plants from polluted soils amended with  $Ft_2$  at 5% application level. However, with the exception of plants from the

unamended soils (Sc), all other treatments yielded fruits of varying cob sizes and total dry weight.

The principle that makes organic fertilizers useful and important in soil fertility maintenance is their impacts on soil nutrients supplies, moisture holding capacity and structural characteristics. Also there existed a positive correlation between the population of microorganisms in soil and the state of such soil. Higher population of microorganisms portends better soil conditions. This implies that a bubbling microbial population in soil led to increased degradation of the contaminant (SLO), with a corresponding detoxification of the soil. As observed in this study, *Zea mays* grown on soils with teaming populations of bacteria and fungi performed better in all indices. In this study, organic fertilizers applications successfully improve the fertility of soils. According to Bremner [50], soils are described as fertile if they have the capacity to supply, in the right quantities and proportions, all the essential nutrients (Nitrogen, Phosphorus, Potassium, Calcium, Magnesium, sulphur, Iron, Manganese, Zinc, Copper, boron, Molybdenum, Chlorine, Carbon, Hydrogen and oxygen) required by plants for healthy growth and development. In agreement with the findings of Murdinah et al [51]; Haydar and Masood [18], the produced fertilizers showed great capacity to boost the supply of key plant nutrients in soils.

## 5. CONCLUSION

Despite the high concentration of SLO in soil; its known toxicity, and slow rate of decomposition, the soil microbial community not only sustained its quantity but also adapted to the new quality of the environment. Interestingly, the bacterial communities of the study soils showed not only common patterns of response to SLO pollution but also similar biostimulation response following organic fertilizer treatment. SLO pollution of soils also impacted negatively on the soil physicochemical properties, including notable plant nutrients. This study demonstrated that soils heavily polluted by spent lubricating oil have the potential for biological restoration: the counts of bacteria and fungi increased in response to organic fertilizer treatments and surpasses those in unpolluted soils. Also, soil physicochemical properties and plant nutrients improvement correlated positively with increase in microbial counts in soils. The performance of *Zea mays* in this study affirms the phyto-toxicity nature of SLO and the hydrocarbon breakdown achieved by

increased microbial population in impacted soils. This suggests strongly, that spiking of composting process with low concentration of a certain contaminant would yield organic fertilizer that may be efficiently deployed as novel bioremediation strategy.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. Bamiro OA, Osibanjo O. Pilot study of used oil in Nigeria. Basel Convention Regional Coordinating Centre in Nigeria. 2004;1-62.
2. Echiegu EA, Amadi AS, Ugwuishiwu BO, Nwoke OA. Effet of Spent engine oil contamination on the soil properties in selected automobile mechanic villages in Enugu State, Nigeria. Environmental Quality Management. 2021;31(3):209 – 218.
3. Odjegba VJ, Sadiq AO. Effects of spent engine oil on the growth parameters, chlorophyll and protein levels of *Amaranthus hybridus* L. The Environmentalist. 2002;22:23-28.
4. Mambwe M, Kalebaila KK, Johnson T. Remediation technologies for oil contaminated soil. Glob J Environ Sci Manag. 2021;1:1–20.
5. He YJ, Zhou KP, Rao YX et al. Environmental risks of antibiotics in soil and bioremediation technology of contaminated soil. J Biol Eng. 2021; 37(10):18.
6. Zhang L, Zhao Q, Wu WN et al. Current status and prospect of bioremediation technology for petroleum-contaminated soil. Mod Chem Ind. 2018;38(1):5.
7. Wen GY, Zhao QZ, Ma HG et al. Research and application of high-efficiency and low-cost bioremediation technology for petroleum-contaminated soil. China Saf Prod Sci Technol. 2017;S1:5.
8. Zheng YM, He XS, Shan GC et al. Effects of petroleum contamination on bacterial communities in field and its feedback mechanisms. Environ Sci Res. 2021; 34(4):987-995.
9. Dong ZJ. Study of soil contamination law by seepage of an oil pipeline in loess area. Eng Surv. 2020;48(5):6

10. Pan F, Chen LH, Fa SJ et al. A study on the transport performance of the petroleum contaminants in soil of the Longdong loess plateau. *J Environ Sci.* 2012;32(2):410–418.
11. Iyobosa E, Zhu SF, Ning HJ et al. Development of a robust bacterial consortium for petroleum hydrocarbon degradation. *Fresenius Environ Bull.* 2021;30(3):2356–2367.
12. Kong LL, Wang XY, Gu MG et al. Analysis of factors influencing enhanced biodegradation of petroleum hydrocarbons by biochar. *Environ Sci Technol.* 2021;44(3):8.
13. Wang JD, Qu CT, Song SF. Temperature-induced changes in the proteome of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* during petroleum hydrocarbon degradation. *Arch Microbiol.* 2021;1:1–11
14. Kirk JL, Montoglis P, Klironomos J, Lee H, Trevors JT. Toxicity of diesel fuel to germination, growth and colonization of *Glomus intraradices* in soil and *in-vitro* transformed carrot root cultures. *Plant and Soil.* 2005;270:23–30.
15. Agbogidi OM. Response of six cultivars of cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp) to spent engine oil. *African Journal of Food Science and Technology.* 2010;1(6):139–142.
16. Adewole MG, Moyinoluwa DA. Effect of crude oil on the emergence and growth of cowpea in two contrasting soil types from Abeokuta south western Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Applied Science.* 2012;5(4):232–239.
17. Babak PS. An Introduction to Bioremediation, In: *Fungi as Bioremediators*, Editors: Ebrahim Mohammadi Goltapeh, Springer-Verlag Berlin. 2013;3–27.
18. Haydar S, Masood J. Evaluation of Kitchen Waste Composting and its Comparison with Compost Prepared from Municipal Solid Waste. *Pakistan Journal of Engineering and Applied Science.* 2011;8:26–33.
19. George T, Hilary T, Samuel V. *Integrated Solid Waste Management: Engineering Principles and Management Issues.* New York: McGraw-Hill; 1993. ISBN 978-0070632370.
20. Parr JF, Hornick SB, Kaufman DD. Use of Microbial Inoculants and Organic Fertilizers in Agricultural Production. In: *Soil – Microbial Systems.* Beltville: Laboratory Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Maryland, U.S.A. 2010;1–22.
21. Ekpo MA, Ntekpe ME. Microbiological and environmental changes during organic fertilizer production from solid wastes. *Agricultural Science Research Journal.* 2014;4(10):174 – 184.
22. Hadeel, Alkutubi. On Randomized Complete Block Design. *International Journal of Science: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR).* 2021;53(2):230–243.
23. Osuji LC, Egbuson EJG, Ojinnaka CM. Chemical reclamation of crude-oil-inundated soils from Niger Delta Nigeria. *Chemistry and Ecology.* 2005;21(1):1–10.
24. Akpoveta O, Vincent EF, Medjor OW, Osaro KI, Enyemike ED. Microbial Degradation and its Kinetics on Crude Oil Polluted Soil. *Research Journal of Chemical Sciences.* 2011;1(6):8 – 14.
25. Agamathu P, Tan YS, Fanziah SH. Bioremediation of Hydrocarbon Contaminated Soil Using Selected Organic Wastes. *Procedia Environmental Sciences.* 2013;18:694–702.
26. Ayotamuno MJ, Kogbara RB, Ogaji SOT, Pobert SD. Bioremediation of Crude Oil Polluted Agricultural Soil in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. *Applied Energy.* 2006;83:1249–1257.
27. Choron M, Sharifi HS, Motamedi H. Bioremediation of a crude oil-polluted soil by application of fertilizers, *Iran Journal of Environmental Health, Science, Engineering.* 2010;7(4):319 – 326.
28. Bouyoucos GJ. A recalibration of hydrometer for testing mechanical analysis of soils. *Journal of Agriculture.* 1975;43:434–438.
29. Ntekpe ME. Microbial Degradation of Solid Wastes for the Production of Organic Fertilizers using Cow Dung as Activator. M.Sc. Dissertation in Microbiology Department, Faculty of Science, University of Uyo, Uyo, Nigeria; 2014.
30. McLean EO. Chemical analysis. In: A. L. Page (ed.) *methods of soil analysis, Part 2 (Second Edition), Chemical and Microbiological Properties.* New York: ASA – SSSA Agronomy Monograph. 1982;199 – 224.
31. Walkely AJ, Black IA. Estimation of soil organic carbon by the chronic acid titration method. *Soil Science.* 1934;37:29–38.
32. Jackson ML. *Soil chemical analysis – advanced course – a manual of methods*

- useful for instruction and research in soil chemistry, physical chemistry of soils, soil fertility, and soil genesis (Revised 2<sup>nd</sup> Eds.)", M. L. Jackson; 2<sup>nd</sup> Eds., 11<sup>th</sup> Printing eds. ASIN#B003U5PRDW; 1979.
33. Bowman RA. A rapid method to determine total phosphorus in soils. Soil Science Society of America Journal. 1988;52:1301-1304.
  34. Udo EJ, Ibia TO, Ogunwale JA, Ano AO, Esu IE. Manual of soil, plant and water analysis. Lagos: Sibon Books Limited, Nigeria. 2009;64 – 81.
  35. AOAC. Official Methods of Analysis. The Association of Official Analytical Chemist. 18<sup>th</sup> ed. Ghathersburg: AOAC. Inc, United State of America; 2005.
  36. Nelson DM, Sommers LE. Total carbon, organic carbon and organic matter. In: D. L. Spark (eds.). Methods of soil analysis. Madison: Part Book Series 5, Wisconsin, USA. 1996;961- 1010.
  37. Klute A. Methods of soil analysis. No 9 Part I Physical and Mineralogical Properties. American Society of Agronomy Madison, Wisconsin; 1986.
  38. Cheesbrough M. District Laboratory Practice in Tropical Countries. Part 2, Cambridge Low-Price eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom; 2010.
  39. American Public Health Association. Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater, 20<sup>th</sup> ed., Washington D. C. USA. American Works Association, Water Pollution Control Federation; 1998.
  40. Huang S, Wu Y, Wang QL, Liu JL, Han QY, Wang JF. Estimation of chlorophyll content in pepper leaves using spectral transmittance red-edge parameters. Int. J. Agric and Biol Eng. 2022;15(5):85–90.
  41. Okon OG, Okon IE, Mbong EO, Eneh GDO. Mitigating of Salt induced stress via Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi (*Rhizophagus irregularis*) inoculation in *Cucurbita maxima* Duch. International Journal Molecular Biology. 2019;4(1): 30-36.
  42. Mbong EO, Ogbemudia FO, George UU, Okon JE. Modeling growth response of *Cucumis sativus* L. growing under spent engine oil contamination stress in an Ultisol. International Journal of Applied Research. 2022;8(4):150-154.
  43. Tang J, Lu X, Sun Q, Zhu W. Aging effect of petroleum hydrocarbons in soil under different attenuation conditions. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 2012;149:109–117.
  44. Lang Arica-Fuentes A, Handley PS, Houlden A, Fox G, Robson GD. An investigation of the biodiversity of thermophilic and thermotolerant fungal species in composts using culture-based and molecular techniques. Fungal Ecol. 2014;11:132–144.
  45. Tamames J, Abellán JJ, Pignatelli M, Camacho A, Moya A. Environmental distribution of prokaryotic taxa. BMC Microbiol. 2010;10:85.
  46. Bodelier PLE. Toward understanding, managing, and protecting microbial ecosystems. Front. Microbiol. 2011;2:1–8.
  47. Ijah UJJ, Safiyanu H, Abioye OP. Comparative study of Biodegradation of Crude Oil in Soil Amended with Chicken Droppings and NPK Fertilizer. Science World Journal. 2008;3(2):63–67.
  48. Ekanem JO, Ogunjobi AA. Hydrocarbon Degradation Potential of Bacteria Isolated from Spent Lubricating Oil Contaminated Soil. Journal of Environmental Management. 2017;21(5):973–979.
  49. Ekundayo EO, Emede TO, Osayande DI. Effects of Crude oil spillage on growth and yield of maize (*Zea mays* L.) in soils of Mid-western Nigeria. Plant Foods Hum. Nutri. 2001;56:313-324.
  50. Bremmer JM. Total Nitrogen. In: D. L. Spark (eds). Methods of Soil Analysis Part 3 – Chemical Methods. Madison, Wisconsin: SSSA Book Series 5, USA. 1996;1085 – 1122.
  51. Murdinah I, Rahmi K, Hermanto S. Application of bioactivators to produce organic fertilizer from seaweed processing waste. Journal of Applied and Industrial Biotechnology in Tropical Region. 2008;1: 1-4.