

Fwd: BIO_RT278

Oslan Jumadi <oslanj@unm.ac.id> To: hilda.karim@unm.ac.id Tue, Sep 27, 2022 at 4:35 AM

Dr. IR. HILDA KARIM, MP UNM <hilda.karim@unm.ac.id>

------ Forwarded message ------From: **ICOMSET Main Organizer** <icomset@fmipa.unp.ac.id> Date: Sun, 13 Jan 2019 at 17:11 Subject: BIO_RT278 To: <oslanj@unm.ac.id>

Dear Author,

Please find the file(s) attached. The reviewer comments is in doc file. Please pay attention to their comment.

As we will soon send all documents for publishing, please send us back your revised document before **Tuesday Jan 15**, **2019**.

Thank you

--Best Regards

Fitra Arya Dwi Nugraha

Reviewer Section, The 3rd ICOMSET 2018 The International Conference on Mathematics, Science, Education & Technology UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences Padang, West Sumatera, Indonesia

Oslan Jumadi, Ph.D., Prof Department of Biology Universitas Negeri Makassar JI. Dg. Tata Raya, Makassar Indonesia, 90224 https://publons.com/wos-op/researcher/1661764/oslan-jumadi

2 attachments

RT-278-Oslan Jumadi.docx

RT-278-Oslan Jumadi.docx 67K

REVIEW RESULTS International Conference on Mathematics, Science, Education and Technology (ICOMSET 2018)

PAPER ID: RT-278-Oslan Jumadi PAPER TITLE:.

Author(s) :

Afiliation :

A. Evaluation Objects

| Is the paper content original? | Yes |
|--|-----|
| Does the paper title represent its content? | Yes |
| Does the abstract reflect the paper content? | Yes |
| Is the research methodology or the approach of the problem | Yes |
| solving clearly described? | |
| Do the data presentation and interpretation valid and reasonable? | Yes |
| Do the use of tables and figures help to clarify the explanation? | Yes |
| Have the discussion and/or analysis been relevant with the results | Yes |
| of the study? | |
| Are the references used relevant? | Yes |
| Is the English satisfactory? | Yes |
| Is the paper prepare in full accordance with the IOP's Journal's | Yes |
| Author Guidelines | |

B. Recommendation (Please check appropriate box):

Publish as it is.

 \checkmark Publish with minor revision noted in evaluation statement.

Publish with major revision.

🛛 Reject.

C. Comments to Author:

1. Please correct the writing of your article according to the IoP Author Guidelines

strictly. For example, [number of literature], etc.. Please visit:

https://publishingsupport.iopscience.iop.org/author-guidelines-for-conference

proceedings/

D. Comments to Editor (optional):

Production of N₂O, CO₂ Gases and Microbe Responses in the Soil Amended with Urea Granulated Zeolite

OslanJumadi^{*1)}, Selvi Pagoga¹⁾, Rachmawaty¹⁾, Yusminah Hala¹⁾, St. Fatmah Hiola¹⁾, Hilda Karim¹⁾, ErnawatySyahruddin Kaseng¹⁾, Kazuyuki Inubushi²⁾

¹⁾Department of Biology, Faculty of Mathematics and Sciences
UniversitasNegeri Makassar. Jl. Daeng. Tata Raya, Makassar 90224. Indonesia
²⁾Graduate School of Horticulture, Chiba University. Matsudo, Chiba 271–8510. Japan

oslanj@unm.ac.id

Abstract. This research study aims to determine the production of nitrous oxide (N₂O), carbon dioxide (CO₂), the rate of ammonium-nitrate, microbe responses in soil following the addition of urea coated by zeolite under soil incubated. The result showed that urea granulated with zeolite in soil sample had a significant effect on the production of CO₂ and have no significant increase N₂O productions. Therefore, the addition of urea with zeolite seems to decrease the production of N₂O compared to urea alone. The concentrations of ammonium and nitrate during incubation time were significantly affected by the amended type of fertilizers. The availability of ammonium and nitrate in soil were increased by addition of urea zeolite 30%. The urea combined zeolite increases the growth of the fungi population, while population of ammonium oxidizer bacteria seems appeared lower in soil that amended with fertilizer compared to the control. The study showed that urea granulated with zeolite increased the time availability of soil nitrogen.

1. Introduction

Nitrogen (N) is an essential nutrient for plants and deficiency will affect the plantsgrowth. The transformation of N in the soil is part of the N cycle and its dependent on the activity of microorganisms. Soil N is available for plants in the form of ammonium (NH_4^+) and nitrate (NO_3^-) (Crutzen 1995; IPPC 2007). The nitrification is approcess oxidation of NH_4^+ to NO_3^- carried out by nitrifying microbial. This process willaffect the plant if their uptake of N slower than the nitrification because lack of efficiency and usage of N by plants, therefore that it can reduce crop production (Inubushi et al. 1996). The nitrification also has a negative impact, because it can produce secondary products in the form of nitrous oxide (N₂O) as greenhouse gases and NO_3^- as water pollution and also produces N₂O gas through denitrification has an impacton environmental quality because the oxidation of NH_4^+ to NO_3^- , which dissolves easily as pollution in groundwater. High concentration of NO_3^- in water can spur the growth of microbes, algae, plankton, and water quality (Yanai et al. 2003).

Efforts to slow the release of N from urea fertilizer can increase the efficiency of nutrient absorption by plants and reduce environmental pollution (Akiyama and Tsuruta 2002). One the effort to reduce the loss of N in the soil is to design urea fertilizer in the form of *slow release fertilizer*(SRF). Urea in form *slow release* formmembranous zeolitecan optimize the absorption of N by

plants, because SRF can control the release of N elements according to the time release and the amount needed by plants, and also maintain the presence of N in the soil (Ahmed et al. 2008). In addition, the amount of urea application with slow release in the field is smaller than the urea conventional (Jumadi et al, 2008). The aims of research are to determined rate N_2O , CO_2 gases productionand rate of nitrification as well as the number of soil microbes which treated with ureagranulated with zeolite as a slow release fertilizer.

2. Material and Method

Granulating urea with zeolite was carried out using the inclined pan granulator method. Soil samples were taken from the maize field area in Indonesia Cereal Research Institute, Maros. Soil was taken at 0-15 cm depth and after removing the visible of debris and sieved through a 2 mm mesh and then kept at 55% of water holding capacity for 7 days preincubation. (Jumadi et al. 2005). A weight of 40 grams of soil placed into a 150 ml bottle and then treated with:

- 1. Control (C) without nitrogen
- 2. Urea(U) = 8,96 N-mg
- 3. 10% Zeolite Urea (UZ10%) =9.9 N-mg
- 4. 30% Zeolite urea (UZ30%) = Urea Zeolite N-11.7 mg
- 5. 50% Zeolite Urea (UZ50%) = Urea Zeolite N-20.2 mg

 N_2O and CO_2 sample gases were taken on days of 7, 14, 21 and 28. Gas is taken from the bottle as much as 30 ml and then put into a vacuum bottle. Samples of gas in the vial then sent to the ChibaUniversity, Japan to be analyzed concentration of N_2O and CO_2 by gas chromatography (Shimadzu, GC14B) equipped with Electron Capture Detector (ECD) and Flame Ionization Detector (FID), respectively. Shortly after taking the gas, 10 gram of soil samples was extracted by adding 50 ml KCl 2M (1: 5) and then performed agitation for 30 minutes and filtered with paper AVANTEC 6. Analysis of NH $_4^+$ content was carried out by nitroprusside method (Anderson et al. 1989), while the content of NO $_3^-$ was done by hydrazine reduction method (Hayashi et al. 1997). The population of ammonium oxidizing bacteria is calculated by most probable number (MPN) methods, while the fungal population is standard plate count (SPC). The research design was a completely randomized design and all determinations were carried out in triplicate. Data were statistically analyzed by Tukey (p<0.05) methods using SPSS ver.20

3. Results and discussion

Soil sample used in this experiment has medium acidic characteristics (between pH 4.8) and the type texture was clay-loamy with C/N ratio 10. The production rate of gas nitrous oxide(N₂O) showed that no any significant change during the incubation time up to the 28th days of incubation, but in cumulatively urea (U) was the highest N₂O production (0.015µg-N g dry soil⁻¹)(Figure 1).

On the 28th incubation days the highest N₂O gas production in soil sample was urea (U) and urea with zeolite 50% (UZ50%) treatments as rate 0.004 μ g-N g dry soil⁻¹, 0.002 μ g-N g dry soil⁻¹, respectively. Meanwhile, the lowest gas production was in the control (C), urea zeolite 10% (UZ10%), urea zeolite30% (UZ30%), respectively.



Figure 1.Production of N₂O gas treated with a combination of urea and zeolite.

The highest carbon dioxide (CO₂) gas production was determined in UZ30% as 651,925 μ g-C g dry soil⁻¹ then followed by UZ 10%, U, C and UZ 50% as 579.8, 553.2, 479.2 and 298.7 μ g-C g dry soil⁻¹, respectively (Figure 2).



Figure 1. Production of CO₂ gas treated with a combination of urea and zeolite.

Addition of zeolite on urea was not having a significant effect on N2O gas production during incubation time. The highest total N2O gas production was determined at urea treatment without zeolite (U). It is possible that urea without zeolite does not resist the release of NH4+ as results of ammonification from urea, so that the nitrification process takes place with sufficient NH4+, therefore, resulting in the high production of N2O (Ahmed et al. 2008). The lowest N2O gas production was measured in UZ30% and UZ50% treatments; this indicates that the addition of slow release material in the form of zeolite could reduce N2O gas production. The presences of zeolite material temporary prevent the release of NH4+. This occurs because zeolite is binding NH4+. The lowest N₂O gas production was found in soil samples with control treatment. It was well understood that without nitrogen substrata the nitrification usually deceased, therefore N₂O gas was determined lowest at soil without amended of nitrogen (Jumadi et al. 2014).

On28 of incubations, the nitrate concentration decreased in the urea treatment, this was in line with the increase in N2O gas production on the same treatment. The possibility of this change is also possible due to denitrification that converts nitrate to N2O gas (Jumadi et al 2005).Park and Komarneni (1997) reported that zeolite erionite, clinoptilolite, chabazite, and phillipsite types have the capacity to store nutrients in the form of KNO₃ and NH₄NO₃ and thus have the capacity as slow-release fertilizers. Although in this study of the type of zeolite used has not been characterized. Urea coated with zeolite 30% or 50% can be proposed as composites for slow release fertilizer and reduce the production of N₂O gas in the soil, because it produces a total N₂O gas production lower than other treatments. Therefore, it is necessary in the future to do research on the type of zeolite used. Hence, zeolite used in this study has the capacity to suppress N₂O gas production and maintain NH₄⁺ in soils.

The research showed the highest NH_4^+ concentration and N_2O production were detected on the 7th day of incubation both on urea with or without zeolite. These also testify that urea hydrolysis and the nitrification process occurred on the first week after incubation. The rate of change in CO_2 gas production as results of the contribution of soil microbial respiration. Although, the treatment seems induced the production of CO_2 production. According to Ahmed et al (2008) zeolite can reduce CO_2 gas, due to it has property capacity to absorbed CO_2 gas.

The change of ammonium concentration in soil during incubation can be seen in table 1, which is showing that the seventh and fourteenth day the ammonium concentration showed a significant difference, the twenty-first and twenty-eighth day there were no significant changes. The highest ammonium concentration in 10% of urea zeolite (UZ10%), followed by urea (U) and 50% of urea zeolite (UZ50%), and urea zeolite30% (UZ30%). Application of urea with zeolite as a slow-release material gives a significant effect on NH₄⁺ and NO₃⁻ concentrations, the highest NH₄⁺ concentration was found on the seventh day of incubation of soil samples treated with zeolite. This is probably due to nitrification was just startingprocess and the availability of NH₄⁺. In the next weeks incubation, NH₄⁺ concentration decreased at 28 days of incubation time, while NO3⁻ concentration continued toraise up, particularly in urea (U) treatment. Therefore, the resultsalso showed that the fast change of NO₃⁻ from NH₄⁺ delivered by nitrification process. Nitrification is an aerobic process in which NH₄⁺ is oxidized to NO3⁻, this process occurs naturally in the environment and is carried out by groups of ammonium and nitrite oxidizing microbe (Li et al. 2002). Nitrification is an important step in the nitrogen cycle, where NH₄⁺ is the initial substrate of nitrification (Inubushi et al. 1996).

The results of the analysis showed that 30% UZ could control the rate of NH_4^+ seen in the second week, NH4 + concentration was still the highest compared to other treatments or other zeolite levels. According to Hadi et al 2008, the addition of nitrifying inhibitors and slow release agents such as poliflyn material on various types of clay soil showed effective in repressing the release of N₂O into the atmosphere and NO_3^- in the soil.

The study results also showed that UZ30% could control the rate of NH_4^+ which seen in the second week that the NH_4^+ concentration was highest compared to other treatments. According to Jumadi et al. 2008; Hadi et al 2008, the addition of nitrifying inhibitors and slow release agents such as poliflyn material on various types of clay resulted effectively in repressing the release of N_2O into the atmosphere and NO_3^- in soil.

Changes of NO_3^- concentration can be seen in table 2, which shows during the incubation period NO_3^- content in soil imposed by the addition of nitrogen. It was significantly different with soil without nitrogen amendment. Urea with Zeolite 10% as the highest concentration of NO_3^- in soil compared to other treatments (Table. 2).

On the 21^{st} after incubation, the highest population of ammonium oxidizing bacteria (AOB) was found in the soil without amended nitrogen (C) which was 9.97 x 10^4 cfu g dry soil⁻¹. While, soil sample wasadded urea zeolite 5% (UZ 50%) has the highest population of fungi as 3.1×10^4 cfu g dry soil⁻¹ (Table 3).

| Treatments | Incubationtimes | | | | Total |
|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------|
| | 7 | 14 | 21 | 28 | Production |
| Control (C) | 0.0001 ^a | 0.0000^{a} | 0.0001 ^a | 0.0001 ^a | 0.0003 |
| Urea (U) | 0.0013 ^{ab} | 0.0008^{b} | 0.0004 ^a | 0.0001 ^a | 0.0026 |
| Zeolite Urea (UZ10%) | 0.0018 ^b | 0.0007 ^b | 0.0002 ^a | 0.0001 ^a | 0.0028 |
| Urea Zeolite | 0.0010^{ab} | 0.0006^{ab} | 0.0004 ^a | 0.0001 ^a | 0.0021 |

Table 1. Average concentration of ammonium (NH $_4^+$ µg-N g dry soil⁻¹)with acombinationurea and zeolite treatment.

| (UZ30%) | | | | | |
|--------------|-----------|----------|---------|---------|--------|
| Zeolite Urea | 0 0012 ab | 0 0008 b | 0.00048 | 0.00028 | 0.0026 |
| (UZ50%) | 0.0012 | 0.0008 | 0.0004 | 0.0002 | 0.0020 |

The numbers followed by the same letter mean that there is no significant difference in the level of $\alpha < 0, 05$ Tukey.

Table 2. Average concentration of nitrate $(NO_3^-\mu g-N g \text{ dry soil}^{-1})$ with combinationurea and zeolite treatments

| Treatments - | Day after incubation | | | | Total |
|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------|
| | 7 | 14 | 21 | 28 | Production |
| Control (C) | 0.0000^{a} | 0.0002^{a} | 0.0000^{a} | 0.0002^{a} | 0.0004 |
| Urea (U) | 0.0005^{b} | 0.0013 ^b | 0.0011 ^b | 0.0005^{ab} | 0.0034 |
| Zeolite Urea (UZ10%) | 0.0004 ^b | 0.0012 ^b | 0.0011 ^b | 0.0012 ^{bc} | 0.0039 |
| Urea Zeolite (UZ30%) | 0.0006 ^b | 0.0013 ^b | 0.0013 ^b | 0.0015 ^c | 0.0047 |
| Zeolite Urea (UZ50%) | 0.0004 ^b | 0.0010 ^{ab} | 0.0011 ^b | 0,0015 ^c | 0.0014 |

The numbers followed by the same letter mean that there is no significant difference in the level of α <0, 05 Tukey.

The population of ammonium oxidizing bacteria in soil treated with urea and zeolite in 21days after incubation was lower than control (C), while the number of soil fungi in the control (C) was lower than soil that amended with urea and zeolite (Table.3). Addition of nitrogen to the soil seems to enhance fungal growth compared to the ammonium oxidizing bacteria themselves, although the population of AOB soil was not different. This result seems not support from the previous observation studies which showed that the addition of nitrogen increased the number of bacterial cells belonging to chemoautotroph including ammonium oxidizing bacteria (Jumadi et al. 2008b).

Addition of zeolite to granule urea has NH_4^+ retention potential and also suppresses N_2O gas production. Therefore, the study results howed an efficient release of NH_4^+ to soil and it has a potential as nutrient use-efficiency by plants. Although, its efficiency justification still needs a further research both laboratory and field scales.

| Trastmants | Ammonium Oxidizing Bacteria | Total Fungi | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Treatments | (cfu g dry soil ⁻¹) | (cfu g dry soil ⁻¹) | | | |
| Control (C) | 9.9 x 10 ⁴ | 1.8 x 10 ⁴ | | | |
| Urea (U) | $2.1 \ge 10^4$ | $1.5 \ge 10^4$ | | | |
| Zeolite Urea (UZ10%) | $1.8 \ge 10^4$ | 2.1×10^4 | | | |
| Urea Zeolite (UZ30%) | $5.8 \ge 10^4$ | 2.5×10^4 | | | |
| Zeolite Urea (UZ50%) | $5.7 \ge 10^4$ | 3.1 x 10 ⁴ | | | |

Table 3.The population of Ammonium Oxidizing Bacteria (AOB) and soilfungi insoil with a combination of urea and zeolite treatments (21st days after incubation).

4. Conclusions

Application urea with zeolite can suppress N_2O gas production, while the production of CO_2 gas enhances in soil samples. The combination of urea and zeolite could delaythe release of ammonium and nitrate. The addition of urea and zeolite in soil at 21 daysafter incubation enhanced the total population of fungi. However, the population of ammonium oxidizing bacteria seems decreased.

References

- Akiyama H. and Tsuruta H. 2002. Effect of chemical fertilizer form on N₂O, NO and NO₂ flux from an Andisol field. Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosyst. 63:219-230.
- [2] Ahmed, O.H., Aminuddin, H. and Husni M.H.A. 2008. Reducing ammonia loss from urea an improving soil-exchangeable ammonium retention through mixing triple superphosphate, humic acid and zeolite. *Soil Use Management*. 22:315–319.
- [3] Anderson JM and Ingram JSI.1989. Colorimetric determination of ammonium. In: Tropical Soil Biology and Fertility. ISSS, CAB International, Wallingford, pp. 42-43.
- [4] Bouwman AF, Van der Hoek KW, Olivier JGJ. 1995. Uncertainties in The global source distribution of nitrous oxide. Journal of Geophysical Research. 100 (D2): 2785-2800.
- [5] Crutzen PJ. 1995. On the role of CH4 in atmospheric chemistry: Sources, sink and possible reductions in anthropogenic sources. Ambio. 24: 52-55.
- [6] Inubushi K, Naganuma H, Kitahara, S. 1996. Contribution of denitrification and autotrophic and heterotrophic nitrification to nitrous oxide production in andosols. Biol Fertil Soils 23: 292-298.
- [7] Hadi A, Jumadi O, Inubushi K, Yagi K. 2008. Mitigation options for N2O emission from a corn field in Kalimantan, Indonesia. Soil Sci Plant Nutr. 54: 644–649
- [8] Hayashi A, Sakamoto K, Yoshida T. 1997. A rapid method for determination of nitrate in soil by hydrazine reduction procedure. Jpn J Soil Sci Plant Nutr. 68: 322-326 (in Japanese).
- [9] IPCC. 2007. Summary for policymakers. In: Climate Change 2007: The physical Science Basis. Contribution of working group I to fourth assessment report of IPCC. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, USA.
- [10] Jumadi O. Hala Y, Inubushi K. 2005. Production and emission of nitrousoxide and responsible microorganisms in upland acid soil in Indonesia. Soil Science and Plant Nutrient. 51 (5): 693-696.
- [11] Jumadi O, Hala Y, Muis A, Ali A, Palennari M, Yagi K, Inubushi K. 2008. Influences of chemical fertilizers and a nitrification inhibitor on greenhouse gas fluxes in a Corn (Zea mays L.) field in Indonesia. Microbes Environ. 23: 29-34.
- [12] Jumadi O, Hala Y, Anas I, Ali A, Sakamoto K, Saigusa M, Yagi K and Inubushi K. 2008b. Community structure of ammonia-oxidizing bacteria and their potential to produce nitrous oxide and carbon dioxide in acid tea soils. Geomicrobiology Journal. Vol. 25: p. 381-389.
- [13] Jumadi O, SF Hiola, Hala Y. 2014. Influence of Azolla (Azolla microphylla Kaulf.) compost on biogenic gas production, inorganic nitrogen and growth of upland kangkong (Ipomoea aquatica Forsk.) in a silt loam soil. Soil Science and Plant Nutrient. 60 (5), 722-730.
- [14] Li X, Inubushi K, Sakamoto K. 2002. Nitrous oxide concentration in an Andisol profile and emissions to the atmosphere as influenced by the application of nitrogen fertilizers and manure. Biol Fertil Soils 35: 108-113.
- [15] Park, M. and Komarneni, S. 1997. Occlusion of KNO₃ and NH₄NO₃ in natural zeolites.
- [16] *Zeolites*.**18**:171–175.
- [17] Yanai J, Sawamoto T, Oe T. Kusa K, Yamakawa K, Sakamoto K, Naganawa T, Inubushi K, Hatano R, Kosaki T. 2003. Spatial variability of nitrous oxide emission and their soil-related determining factors in an agricultural field. Technical Report, Atmospheric pollutants and trace gases. J. Environ. Qual. 32: 1965-1977.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education of Indonesia under a grant of competency Research (HibahKompetensi).