

6-2017

Odour reducing microbial-mineral additive for poultry manure treatment

Kajetan Kalus

Wroclaw University of Environmental and Life Sciences

Sebastian Opaliński

Wroclaw University of Environmental and Life Sciences

Devin Maurer

Iowa State University

Somchai Rice

Iowa State University, somchai@iastate.edu

Jacek A. Koziel

Iowa State University, koziel@iastate.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/abe_eng_pubs



Part of the [Agriculture Commons](#), [Bioresource and Agricultural Engineering Commons](#), [Chemical Engineering Commons](#), and the [Poultry or Avian Science Commons](#)

The complete bibliographic information for this item can be found at https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/abe_eng_pubs/894. For information on how to cite this item, please visit <http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/howtocite.html>.

Odour reducing microbial-mineral additive for poultry manure treatment

Abstract

Poultry production systems are associated with emissions of odorous volatile organic compounds (VOCs), ammonia (NH₃), hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), greenhouse gases, and particulate matter. Development of mitigation technologies for these emissions is important. Previous laboratory-scale research on microbial-mineral treatment has shown to be effective for mitigation of NH₃, H₂S and amines emissions from poultry manure. The aim of this research was to assess the effectiveness of surface application of a microbial-mineral treatment for other important odorants, i.e., phenolics and sulfur-containing VOCs. Microbial-mineral litter additive consisting of 20% (w/w) of bacteria powder (six strains of heterotrophic bacteria) and 80% of mineral carrier (perlite-bentonite) was used at a dose of 500 g·m⁻² (per ~31 kg of manure). Samples of air were collected in two series, 4 and 7 days after application of additives. An odor profile of the poultry manure was determined using simultaneous chemical and sensory analysis. Reduction levels of VOCs determined on Day 4 was between 31% and 83% for mineral adsorbent treatment and in the range of 9% and 96% for microbial-mineral additive, depending on the analyzed compound. Reduction levels on Day 7 were considerably lower than on Day 4, suggesting that the odorous VOCs treatment efficacy is relatively short. There was no significant difference between treatments consisting of microbial-mineral additive and mineral carrier alone.

Keywords

Odour mitigation, Poultry manure additive, GC-MS-Olfactometry, Volatile organic compounds

Disciplines

Agriculture | Bioresource and Agricultural Engineering | Chemical Engineering | Poultry or Avian Science

Comments

This is a manuscript of an article published as Kalus, Kajetan, Sebastian Opaliński, Devin Maurer, Somchai Rice, Jacek A. Koziel, Mariusz Korczyński, Zbigniew Dobrzański, Roman Kołacz, and Beata Gutarowska. "Odour reducing microbial-mineral additive for poultry manure treatment." *Frontiers of Environmental Science & Engineering* 11, no. 3 (2017): 7. The final publication is available at Springer via DOI: [10.1007/s11783-017-0928-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11783-017-0928-4). Posted with permission.

Authors

Kajetan Kalus, Sebastian Opaliński, Devin Maurer, Somchai Rice, Jacek A. Koziel, Mariusz Korczyński, Zbigniew Dobrzański, Roman Kołacz, and Beata Gutarowska

1 **Odour reducing microbial-mineral additive for poultry manure**
2 **treatment**

3
4 **K. Kalus*¹, S. Opaliński¹, D. Maurer², S. Rice², J. A. Koziel², M. Korczyński¹,**
5 **Z. Dobrzański¹, R. Kołacz¹, B. Gutarowska³**

6
7 ¹ *Faculty of Biology and Animal Science, Department of Environment Hygiene and*
8 *Animal Welfare, Wrocław University of Environmental and Life Sciences, Poland*

9 ² *Department of Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering, Iowa State University, USA*

10 ³ *Institute of Fermentation Technology and Microbiology, Lodz University of Technology,*
11 *Poland*

12 **Corresponding author's e-mail: kajetan.kalus@up.wroc.pl*

13
14 **Abstract:** Poultry production systems are associated with emissions of odorous volatile
15 organic compounds (VOCs), ammonia (NH₃), hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), greenhouse gases,
16 and particulate matter. Development of mitigation technologies for these emissions is
17 important. Previous lab-scale research on microbial-mineral treatment has shown to be
18 effective for mitigation of NH₃, H₂S and amines emissions from poultry manure. The aim
19 of this research was to assess the effectiveness of surface application of a microbial-
20 mineral treatment for other important odorants, i.e., phenolics and sulfur-containing
21 VOCs. Microbial-mineral litter additive consisting of 20% (w·w⁻¹) of bacteria powder
22 (six strains of heterotrophic bacteria) and 80% of mineral carrier (perlite-bentonite) was
23 used at a dose of 500 g·m⁻² (per ~31 kg of manure). Samples of air were collected in two
24 series, 4 and 7 days after application of additives. An odor profile of the poultry manure

25 was determined using simultaneous chemical and sensory analysis. Reduction levels of
26 VOCs determined on Day 4 was between 31 and 83% for mineral adsorbent treatment
27 and in the range of 9 and 96% for microbial-mineral additive, depending on the analyzed
28 compound. Reduction levels on Day 7 were considerably lower than on Day 4, suggesting
29 that the odorous VOCs treatment efficacy is relatively short. There was no significant
30 difference between treatments consisting of microbial-mineral additive and mineral
31 carrier alone.

32

33 **Keywords:** Odour Mitigation, Poultry Manure Additive, GC-MS-Olfactometry, Volatile
34 Organic Compounds.

35

36 **1 Introduction**

37 Global growth in poultry production, especially in Europe where Poland is the largest
38 producer of poultry meat within EU (2014) [1], is strongly linked with livestock odour
39 that has become a nuisance for people living in surroundings of poultry houses [2] as well
40 as a problem for animal health [3]. There have been many studies on methods for
41 mitigating emissions of livestock odour, however, most of the papers focus on the swine
42 production [4, 5]. Methods of emission mitigation from poultry manure are less studied.
43 The reported methods on mitigation of emissions from swine manure rely on addition of
44 different adsorbents to the manure, amendment with yeast strains, or use of filtration and
45 biofiltration beds [6, 7, 8, 9, 10]; however, there have been some evaluations of bacterial
46 additives [11, 12], mineral additives or air filtration [13, 14, 15, 16, 17] in mitigation of
47 emission from poultry manure. Research by Matusiak et al. [18] has shown that the
48 microbial-mineral litter additive (MMLA) consisting of mineral carrier and bacteria

49 powder can be effective at reducing NH₃, amines and H₂S emissions from poultry manure.
50 Nonetheless, more comprehensive assessment of the MMLA is needed for treatment of
51 odour-generating compounds such as phenolics and sulfur-containing compounds.

52

53 Thus, the aim of the study was to evaluate the effectiveness of an innovative MMLA in
54 mitigating emissions of odorous volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from poultry
55 manure under conditions simulating a typical poultry house environment (air
56 temperature, ventilation rate, stocking density, and amount of manure generated). Our
57 working hypothesis was that the MMLA treatment performs as well as other additives
58 previously reported for other key odorants of concern [18] and that the microbial
59 treatment significantly improves the performance of MMLA treatment mix.

60

61 **2 Materials and methods**

62 The research was carried out at the Air Quality Laboratory in the Department of
63 Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering at Iowa State University. Microbial-mineral
64 litter additive (six strains of heterotrophic bacteria on a perlite-bentonite carrier) [18] was
65 tested under laboratory conditions. The MMLA, consisting of a mineral carrier and
66 bacteria powder, was added topically to nearly fresh manure from laying hens in order to
67 reduce the emissions of odorous VOCs. The manure (with cake-like consistency) was
68 accumulated in a layers house for 3 days and used for the trials directly after collection.

69

70 **2.1 Experimental conditions**

71 The treatment containers (six 1 L glass jars, 64.5 cm² of surface area) were filled, on the
72 Day 1 of each trial with, 200 g of nearly fresh manure from laying hens mixed with water

73 (representing two weeks of manure accumulation). Additional water was added to the
74 manure (25 mL of water per 100 g of manure) to prevent the manure from drying out and
75 to facilitate manure homogenization. All treatment containers were simulating a scaled-
76 down surface of poultry manure (~4 cm of manure depth) with controlled airflow over
77 the surface matching regular ventilation conditions.

78

79

<Figure 1>

80

81 Airflow through the containers was 12 exchanges per h, which was lower than the airflow
82 expected in a typical poultry house (approximately 27 exchanges per h [19]) due to
83 apparatus limitations. This lower airflow provided higher concentrations of VOCs and
84 improved the sensitivity of gas measurements while simulating a more environmentally
85 adverse situation (e.g., lower air exchanges during cool season). The inlet air (~200
86 mL·min⁻¹) was filtered through an activated carbon scrubber and humidifier. The
87 temperature and relative humidity of the air were measured after the air passed through
88 the humidifier, and were respectively 22 °C and 99%. In a single trial 3.2 g of the MMLA
89 (which corresponds to the dose of 500 g of MMLA per 1 m²), consisting of an 80% (w·w⁻¹)
90 mineral perlite-bentonite carrier and 20% of bacteria powder, was added topically to
91 the manure in two treatment containers. Concentration of bacteria powder was adopted
92 on the basis of previous work [20]. Two treatment containers were treated with perlite-
93 bentonite carrier only (2.56 g) to evaluate the influence of the mineral absorbent (MA)
94 alone. Two treatment containers were control (200 g of poultry manure only). The trials
95 lasted for 7 days and were carried out 3 times.

96

97 2.2 Sampling and chemical analysis

98 Manual solid phase microextraction (SPME) with StableFlex 50/30 μm
99 divinylbenzene/Carboxen/polydimethylsiloxane (DVB/CAR/PDMS) fiber (Supelco,
100 Bellefonte, PA) was used for extraction of odorous compounds from the headspace inside
101 the treatment containers on Day 4 and Day 7 of each trial. An optimal sampling time of
102 30 min was determined during preliminary experiments, according to the procedure
103 described by Cai et al. [17]. The sampling procedure was as follows: airflow was stopped
104 for a single container by closing inlet and outlet of the treatment container, conditions
105 inside the treatment container were allowed to stabilize for 10 min and gas sampling was
106 conducted for 30 min. Collected gas samples were analyzed using a gas chromatograph
107 – mass spectrometry – olfactometry (GC-MS-O) (Microanalytics, Round Rock, TX,
108 USA). The GC-MS-O system components, acquisition software and basic GC oven
109 programs are described in detail by Cai et al. [21].

110

111 Odorous VOCs were tentatively identified on the basis of comparative analysis of the
112 determined mass spectrum and the National Institute of Standards and Technology
113 (NIST05) MS library. During the GC separation, aroma and odour intensity of individual
114 compounds were measured simultaneously, with the use of a sniff port and AromaTrax
115 10.1 software. Evaluation of air purification effectiveness was made on the basis of the
116 relative reduction value (RRV, %) determined for each tentatively identified odorous
117 VOC. The RRV was calculated similarly to the formula given by Cai et al. [17] as the
118 ratio of the difference between the control and treatments mean (of 6 replicates) peak
119 height counts of the tentatively identified odorous VOCs. Peak heights were used for

120 comparison instead of peak areas, to improve integration of asymmetric or low
121 chromatographic peaks.

122

123 2.3 Statistical analysis

124 Due to the high statistical dispersion, 180 outliers were removed from a total of 720
125 values using Q-Dixon test. Practically, the lowest and the highest measured peak height
126 for each compound, for each trial was an outlier. Data were tested for normality with
127 Shapiro-Wilk test and no set of values showed normal distribution. Statistical
128 comparisons between the treatments were done via Kruskal-Wallis test using GraphPad
129 Prism 5.04 (Prism for Windows, GraphPad Software Inc., La Jolla, CA). Differences
130 among treatment means were tested for significance using the Dunn's test. Differences
131 were considered significant at $P < 0.05$.

132

133 **3 Results and discussion**

134 A total of 15 VOCs were tentatively identified in the analyzed gas samples emitted from
135 the treated/untreated poultry manure. The compounds along with their matching
136 percentage of identity assignment in the MS spectral database, GC column retention times
137 and mean peak height are shown in the Table 1. Significant differences between
138 treatments were noted only for dimethyl disulfide on Day 7, where mineral adsorbent
139 (MA) alone was showing better deodorizing effect. Statistically significant differences
140 between control group and microbial-mineral litter additive (MMLA) treatment were
141 determined for methanethiol, dimethyl sulfide, 2-butanone, 2-pentanone, s-methyl
142 thioacetate and methyl ethyl disulfide on Day 4 of treatment. Statistically significant
143 differences between control group and MA treatment were noted for s-methyl thioacetate

144 on Day 4 of treatment. Relative reduction of target VOCs in comparison to the control
145 group on Days 4 and 7 are shown on Figures 2 and 3, respectively.

146 <Table 1>

147

148 <Figure 2>

149

150 <Figure 3>

151

152 In this study, obtained reduction levels of tentatively identified VOCs content determined
153 on Day 4 ranged between 31 and 83 % for the MA treatment and between 9 and 96 % for
154 MMLA treatment, depending on the analyzed compound. Reductions on Day 7 ranged
155 from -243 to +65% (MA) and -219 to +59% (MMLA) depending on the analyzed
156 compound. Negative values indicate increase in content of particular VOC. The increase
157 of VOCs content can be explained by decrease in adsorption ability over time (sorber
158 saturation effect) and also by re-emission of VOCs adsorbed within first days after
159 application of MMLA.

160

161 Results can be compared with prior research testing various methods of odor reduction
162 from livestock buildings, including deodorization of manure. Deodorization of poultry
163 manure with bacterial additives has been carried out by Matusiak et al. [18] and reduction
164 between 58% and 73% has been reported after day 4 of treatment. The 58% to 73%
165 reduction corresponds to the ~40% adjusted reduction, considering the drop of VOCs
166 content in the control group itself (as an effect of treatment time). Biofiltration conducted
167 at the reproductive hen farm reduced VOCs containing sulfur by 51% (max. 70%), while

168 for aldehydes and ketones the reduction ranged between 62 and 99% [22,23]. Cai et al.
169 [17] reported, that average reduction of the odor was between 51 and 67% after topical
170 application of zeolite on the poultry manure. Opaliński et al. [24] filtered the air polluted
171 by poultry manure through aluminosilicates adsorbents and the reduction of NH₃ and
172 VOCs emissions ranged between 58 and 84%. Considering the above, it can be assumed
173 that a mineral adsorbents could have sufficient deodorizing potential.

174 It is also worth noting that concentration of bacteria powder in the MMLA used in this
175 research was 20%, which is economically unjustified at this point of development of the
176 litter additive. There were no significant differences between MA and MMLA treatments
177 at the investigated concentration of bacteria. Thus, mineral adsorbent alone appears to be
178 responsible for major deodorizing effect in the investigated additive, at least during the
179 first week after its surficial application to manure.

180

181 3.2 Aroma profile of the manure

182 A total of 14 aromas have been detected and recorded in the analyzed gas samples. The
183 aromas represent a panelist's response to separated odorants eluting from GC column and
184 a sniff port. Aromas along with the compounds corresponding to them are shown in the
185 Table 2. An example aromagram is shown in Figure 4.

186 <Table 2>

187

188 <Figure 4>

189

190 By comparison of GC column retention times of tentatively identified VOCs with
191 retention times of aroma events it can be assumed that: *animal/fecal, hay/straw,*

192 *characteristic, fecal, mushroom, sauerkraut* aromas can be associated with *methanethiol,*
193 *dimethyl sulfide, s-methyl thioacetate, dimethyl disulfide, 3-octanone, dimethyl trisulfide,*
194 respectively. All aromas of the sulfur-containing compounds present during the analysis
195 are reported to be rotten- or fermented-like [25] and occur in manure matrixes [21, 26].

196

197 Parcsi and Stuetz [27] analyzed gas samples from different poultry houses and identified
198 6 odorants with the use of olfactory detection port, which two of them (dimethyl disulfide
199 and dimethyl trisulfide) were consistent with the odorants reported in this study. The
200 effectiveness in aroma reduction in comparison to the control group on Day 4 and Day 7
201 ranged between -250% and +100% and is shown in Figures 5 and 6, respectively.

202

203 <Figure5>

204

205 <Figure 6>

206

207 Influence of the investigated additives on the reduction of aroma intensities was not
208 statistically significant because the evaluation was limited to one panelist; however,
209 a general observation was made, that the MA treatment had better effect in reducing the
210 aroma intensity compared to MMLA which also was confirmed after smelling the
211 headspace of treated manure directly, at the end of a trial.

212

213 Economic analyses are ultimately needed for scale-up to farm applications. Material and
214 labor costs, feasibility of practical farm-scale application, biosecurity, toxicology, manure
215 quality and land application concerns have to be considered. To date, most published

216 literature involving economics of gaseous emissions from livestock operations are
217 focused on swine production [5,28]. It is recommended that economic analyses are
218 performed to estimate full scale application costs.

219

220 **4 Conclusion**

221 The microbial-mineral litter additive and mineral adsorbent (MMLA and MA,
222 respectively) were tested in lab-scale experiments for its potential to treat odorous VOCs
223 emissions from poultry manure within 7 days of its surficial application. Conditions under
224 which the study was carried were simulating scaled-down conditions occurring in a
225 typical poultry house in terms of ventilation rate and amount of manure per area.
226 Reduction level of tentatively identified VOCs content determined on Day 4 was between
227 31 and 83% for the MA treatment and in the range of 9 and 96% for MMLA treatment,
228 depending on the analyzed compound. MMLA and MA treatments efficacies were
229 considerably lower on Day 7 than on Day 4, and the increase in content of some VOCs
230 was observed likely due to saturation of the adsorbent and re-emission of VOCs. There
231 were no significant differences between treatments consisting of MMLA and MA. Thus,
232 based on these initial and short term (1 week) screening tests, there appears to be no
233 justification in enrichment of mineral adsorbents with investigated bacteria strains.
234 Additional research with either (a) longer treatment time, (b) optimization of bacteria
235 concentration, and/or (c) farm-scale research with poultry present during the experiment
236 is recommended. Economic analyses will also be needed to estimate full scale application
237 costs.

238

239 **Acknowledgments**

240 The research was financially supported by The National Centre for Research and
241 Development grant no. PBS2/B8/14/2014 "Innovative biopreparation for poultry
242 production premises". Authors would like to thank The Kościuszko Foundation for
243 funding the research scholarship "Research on Mitigation of Livestock Odour" (February
244 – April, 2016) at Iowa State University. Special thanks to the Fulbright Foundation for
245 supporting STEM Collaborations between Iowa State University and Wroclaw University
246 of Environmental and Life Sciences (September 2015 – June 2016).

247

248 **References**

- 249 1. European Commission. Poultry Meat - Agriculture and Rural Development.
250 Available online at http://www.ec.europa.eu/agriculture/poultry/index_en.htm (accessed:
251 March 08, 2016)
- 252 2. Hayes, E. T., Curran, T. P., Dodd, V. A. Odour and ammonia emissions from
253 intensive poultry units in. *Bioresource Technology*, 2006, 97(7):933–939
- 254 3. Donham K, Yeggy J, Dague R. Production rates of toxic gases from liquid swine
255 manure: Health implications for workers and animals in swine confinement buildings.
256 *Biological Waste*, 1988, 24(3):161-173
- 257 4. Ubeda Y, Lopez-Jimenez P A, Nicolas J, Calvet S. Strategies to control odours in
258 livestock facilities: a critical review. *Spanish Journal of Agricultural Research*, 2013,
259 11(4):1004-1015
- 260 5. Maurer D L, Koziel J A, Harmon J D, Hoff S J, Rieck-Hinz A M, Andersen D S.
261 Summary of performance data for technologies to control gaseous, odor, and particulate
262 emissions from livestock operations: Air management practices assessment tool
263 (AMPAT). *Data in Brief*, 2016, 7:1413-1429

-
- 264 6. Ye F X, Zhu R F, Yi L. Deodorization of swine manure slurry using horseradish
265 peroxidase and peroxides. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 2009, 167:148–153
- 266 7. Govere E M, Tonegawa M, Bruns M A, Wheeler E F, Heinemann P H , Kephart K
267 B, Dec J. Deodorization of swine manure using minced horseradish roots and peroxides.
268 *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 2005, 53(12):4880-4889
- 269 8. Yan Z, Liu X, Yuan Y, Liao Y, Li X. Deodorization Study of the Swine Manure with
270 Two Yeast Strains. *Biotechnology and Bioprocess Engineering*, 2013, 18:135-143
- 271 9. Buelna G, Dubé R, Turgeon N. Pig manure treatment by organic bed biofiltration.
272 *Desalination*, 2008, 213:297–304
- 273 10. Chen L, Hoff S, Cai L, Koziel J, Zelle B. Evaluation of wood chip-based biofilters
274 to reduce odor, hydrogen sulfide, and ammonia from swine barn ventilation air. *Journal*
275 *of the Air & Waste Management Association*, 2009, 59(5):520-530
- 276 11. Borowski S, Gutarowska B, Durka K, Korczyński M, Opaliński S, Kołacz R.
277 Biological deodorization of organic fertilizers. *Przemysł Chemiczny*, 2010, 89(4):318-
278 323 (in Polish)
- 279 12. Matusiak K, Borowski S, Opaliński S, Bakuła T, Kołacz R, Gutarowska B. Impact
280 of a microbial-mineral biopreparation on microbial community and deodorization of
281 manures. *Acta Biochimica Polonica*, 2015, 62(4):791-798
- 282 13. Maruthai Pillai S., Parsci G., Wang X., Stuetz R. Odour Abatement of Poultry Litter
283 Using Odour Control Products. *Chemical Engineering Transactions*, 2012, 30:247-252
- 284 14. Czyż K, Patkowska-Sokoła B, Dobrzański Z, Opaliński S. Application of nanosilver
285 based preparation in ammonia reduction in broiler house. *Archiv Fur Tierzucht-Archives*
286 *of Animal Breeding*, 2013, 82:823-832

-
- 287 15. Opaliński S, Korczyński M, Kołacz R, Dobrzański Z, Żmuda K. Application of
288 selected aluminosilicates for ammonia adsorption. *Przemysł Chemiczny*, 2009,
289 88(5):540-543 (in Polish)
- 290 16. Opaliński S, Korczyński M, Szoltysik M, Kołacz R, Dobrzański Z, Gbioreczyk W.
291 Application of mineral sorbents to filtration of air contaminated by odorous compounds.
292 *Chemical Engineering Transactions*, 2010, 23:369-374
- 293 17. Cai L, Koziel J A, Liang Y, Nguyen A T, Xin H. Evaluation of zeolite for control of
294 odorants emissions from simulated poultry manure storage. *Journal of Environmental*
295 *Quality*, 2007, 36:184–193
- 296 18. Matusiak K, Oleksy M, Borowski S, Nowak A, Korczynski M, Dobrzański Z,
297 Gutarowska B. The use of *Yucca schidigera* and microbial preparation for poultry manure
298 deodorization and hygienization. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 2016, 170:50-
299 59
- 300 19. Winkel A, Mosquera J, Koerkamp P, Ogink N, Aarnink A. Emissions of particulate
301 matter from animal houses in the Netherlands. *Atmospheric Environment*, 2015, 111:202-
302 212
- 303 20. Gutarowska B, Matusiak K, Borowski S, Rajkowska A, Brycki B. Removal of
304 odorous compounds from poultry manure by microorganisms on perlite bentonite carrier.
305 *Journal of Environmental Management*, 2014, 141:70-76
- 306 21. Cai L, Koziel J A, Lo Y, Hoff S. Characterization of volatile organic compounds and
307 odorants associated with swine barn particulate matter using solid-phase microextraction
308 and gas chromatography–mass spectrometry–olfactometry. *Journal of Chromatography*
309 *A*, 2006, 1102:60-72

-
- 310 22. Tymczyna L, Chmielowiec-Korzeniowska A, Saba L. Biological treatment of laying
311 house air with open biofilter use. *Polish Journal of Environmental Studies*, 2004,
312 13(4):425-428
- 313 23. Chmielowiec-Korzeniowska A, Tymczyna L, Drabik A. Use of organic and mineral
314 materials for biofiltration of air in hatcheries. *Annals of Animal Science*, 2007, 7(1): 153-
315 162
- 316 24. Opaliński S, Korczyński M, Szoltysik M, Dobrzański Z, Kołacz R. Application of
317 aluminosilicates for mitigation of ammonia and volatile organic compound emissions
318 from poultry manure. *Open Chemistry*, 2015, 13:967–973
- 319 25. Frank D, Owen C, Patterson J. Solid phase microextraction (SPME) combined with
320 gas-chromatography and olfactometry-mass spectrometry for characterization of cheese
321 aroma compounds. *Lebensmittel-Wissenschaft & Technologie*, 2004, 37:139-154
- 322 26. Trabue S, Scoggin K., Li H, Burns R, Xin H, Hatfield J. Odour emissions from
323 poultry litter - A review litter properties, odour formation and odorant emissions from
324 porous materials. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 2016, 177:306-319
- 325 27. Parsci G, Stuetz R M, *Biotechniques for Air Pollution Control II 2007*: 15-28. ISBN:
326 978-84-9749-258-4
- 327 28. Maurer D, Koziel J A, Bruning K, Parker D B. Pilot scale testing of renewable
328 biocatalyst for swine manure treatment and mitigation of odorous VOCs, ammonia, and
329 hydrogen sulfide gas emissions. *Atmospheric Environment*, 2017, 150: 313-321. doi:
330 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2016.11.021.
- 331

332 **Figure Captions**

333 **Figure 1.** Laboratory-scale system for controlled studies of surficial treatments of
334 poultry manure and mitigation of odour and gaseous emissions at Iowa State University.

335 **Figure 2.** Comparison of % reduction in target gas emissions, Day 4.

336 **Figure 3.** Comparison of % reduction in target gas emissions, Day 7.

337 **Figure 4.** Gas sample comparison of aromagram (bold line) and chromatogram (thin
338 line) resulting from a simultaneous chemical and sensory analyses. An image generated
339 from AromaTrax software by a panelist assessing separated compounds eluting from the
340 sniff port.

341 **Figure 5.** Odour intensity reduction associated with target compounds determined
342 by panelist at the sniff port of GC-MS-O, Day 4.

343 **Figure 6.** Odour intensity reduction associated with target compounds determined
344 by panelist at the sniff port of GC-MS-O, Day 7.

346 **Table 1.** Effect of investigated treatments on selected tentatively identified VOCs (mean, n=6).

compound	R _T /min	spectral match with MS database	day 4								day 7							
			C		MA		MMLA		SEM	P-Value	C		MA		MMLA		SEM	P-Value
			H	SD	H	SD	H	SD			H	SD	H	SD	H	SD		
1. methanethiol	2.80	86 %	12723	9125	7244	4430	3516	1104	1698	0.0294	4126	1225	5339	1916	6444	3176	468	0.2269
2. dimethyl sulfide	3.17	93 %	100273	71083	18316	17684	3555	971	16984	0.0463	15884	16852	11845	11439	16268	11947	2917	0.6387
3. 2-butanone	4.15	74 %	72537	53920	12340	11897	2879	311	12589	0.0151	16463	17514	14830	16224	13967	9853	3074	0.8671
4. 2-butanol	5.22	79 %	16139	6138	3502	2444	14640	19361	3503	0.0961	13108	15861	10728	9628	7567	4230	2294	0.9828
5. 2-pentanone	5.60	59 %	15271	9187	4170	3129	2298	1098	2154	0.022	2655	1695	4304	3228	6456	3864	706	0.1572
6. s-methyl thioacetate	6.37	93 %	8170	3478	1690	774	1413	442	1002	0.0066	3516	3716	2636	1980	1436	946	551	0.4263
7. dimethyl disulfide	7.25	94 %	800227	790731	513895	513207	129163	126608	148947	0.2443	19666	20920	6995	1875	62689	46311	8056	0.0225
8. methyl ethyl disulfide	9.55	88 %	15019	16269	9489	10108	1304	227	3160	0.0423	1001	249	3438	4942	1634	396	736	0.1389
9. 2-heptanone	10.87	81 %	9830	7951	6797	6849	1991	948	1670	0.2963	2404	1820	1822	1028	3246	1817	337	0.2758
10. 3-octanone	13.32	93 %	18672	17429	8445	8031	1834	729	3327	0.0716	3036	1409	4208	3260	3150	1796	488	0.8176
11. dimethyl trisulfide	14.07	95 %	441651	484344	112144	100126	50238	19648	80870	0.1129	15804	14597	5569	4293	38127	29594	4846	0.0718
12. 2-acetylfuran	14.48	54 %	12110	10497	5762	5490	2650	1919	1933	0.1661	1676	853	3040	3049	1966	890	436	0.8043
13. phenol	21.87	94 %	287710	173152	136910	82087	209976	132015	34648	0.3295	143685	132660	109257	144833	156696	149677	28073	0.5458
14. 4-methylphenol	23.15	94 %	28404	22409	10343	5932	11713	7108	3753	0.3505	12585	11991	13431	13327	6345	2967	2312	0.7562
15. 4-ethylphenol	24.58	94 %	65738	63272	25621	19660	24479	17635	10164	0.5195	41488	35413	34562	26047	28151	18146	5646	0.8190

R_T, retention time; C, control group; MA, mineral adsorbent; MMLA, microbial-mineral litter additive; H, mean peak height; SD, standard deviation; SEM, standard error of the mean;

348
349

Table 2. Summary of sensory analyses on aromas and odors emitted from poultry manure.

A _T / min	odor	corresponding compound
2.89	animal/fecal	methanethiol
3.20	hay/straw	dimethyl sulfide
6.24	characteristic	s-methyl thioacetate
6.80	sweet	-
7.37	fecal	dimethyl disulfide
8.97	characteristic	-
9.24	sweet/berry	-
13.36	mushroom	3-octanone
14.12	sauerkraut	dimethyl trisulfide
16.07	burnt bacon	-
16.23	soil/dusty	-
18.97	sour/dusty	-
19.37	burnt bacon	-
19.92	rotten eggs	-

A_T, detection time ('time stamp') when panelist detected an odor while performing simultaneous chemical and sensory analyses using GC-MS-Olfactometry;

350