



Università degli Studi Mediterranea di Reggio Calabria
Archivio Istituzionale dei prodotti della ricerca

Preliminary evaluation of the anaerobic biodegradability of three biobased materials used for the production of disposable plastics

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Original

Preliminary evaluation of the anaerobic biodegradability of three biobased materials used for the production of disposable plastics / Calabro', P.S., Folino, A., Fazzino, F., Komilis, D.. - In: JOURNAL OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. - ISSN 0304-3894. - 390:(2020), p. 121653. [10.1016/j.jhazmat.2019.121653]

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12318/63266> since: 2020-11-13T18:29:15Z

Published

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2019.121653>

The final published version is available online at: <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12318/63266>

Terms of use:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website

Publisher copyright

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università Mediterranea di Reggio Calabria (<https://iris.unirc.it/>) When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

21 September 2026

PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF THE ANAEROBIC BIODEGRADABILITY OF THREE BIOBASED MATERIALS USED FOR THE PRODUCTION OF DISPOSABLE PLASTICS

P.S. CALABRO^{*}, A. FOLINO^{**}, F. FAZZINO^{*}, D. KOMILIS^{***}

^{*} *Department of Civil, Energy, Environmental and Materials Engineering, Università Mediterranea di Reggio Calabria, via Graziella – loc. Feo di Vito, 891 22 Reggio Calabria, Italy, paolo.calabro@unirc.it.*

^{**} *Department Agraria, Università Mediterranea di Reggio Calabria, loc. Feo di Vito, 89122 Reggio Calabria*

^{***} *Department of Environmental Engineering, Democritus University of Thrace, Vas. Sofias 12, 671 00, Xanthi, Greece*

Abstract

Biodegradable plastics have been introduced to the market to substitute “traditional”, non-biodegradable, petro-based plastics to alleviate plastic pollution. Biochemical methane potential tests were carried out on compostable bags made of MaterBi®, biodegradable bottle wine corks and cellulosic plates to examine the anaerobic biodegradability of those materials. The impact of four factors: type of pretreatment (predigestion, mechanical, alkaline, predigestion and alkaline), digestion duration, type of inoculum and temperature were statistically evaluated through regression modeling. Anaerobic tests on compostable and polyethylene bags (control) were carried out in mesophilic (35 °C) and thermophilic (55 °C) conditions, while tests on bottle wine corks and cellulosic plates were carried out in mesophilic conditions only. After 15 days of digestion, a dry mass reduction of $22.8 \pm 6.2\%$ and $27.6 \pm 14.0\%$ for mesophilic and thermophilic tests respectively was recorded for MaterBi®. Chemical pretreatment with NaOH led to a mass reduction of $78.2 \pm 7.2\%$ and was the only statistically significant factor to affect both methane yields and dry mass loss. A higher digestion temperature led to an increased mass loss without a concurrent increase in methane production. The cellulosic plates were completely degraded ($99.9 \pm 0.03\%$ mass reduction), while the wine bottle corks weight did not change.

Keywords

Anaerobic digestion, bioplastics, organic waste, biodegradable plastics, BMP

29 **1. INTRODUCTION**

30 Pollution of the marine environment by plastics is one of the most severe environmental threats
31 humanity has to cope with [1], since around 7.8–8.2 million tonnes of discarded plastics enter the
32 oceans every year [2]. Plastic fragments, varying in size from macrodebris (>20 mm) to microdebris
33 (<5 mm) are one of the main causes of pollution of the world's oceans [3]. Seabirds, seals, whales,
34 and turtles are just a few in the long list of affected wildlife species suffering from exposures to plastic
35 fragments [4,5]. Moreover, it has been recently outlined how microplastics originating from plastic
36 debris can enter the human food chain [1].

37 Ban/reduction of single use plastic items, separate collection and valorisation through material or
38 energy recovery are the main options for solving the problem [1]. In addition to these policies, a more
39 recent option is to substitute the “traditional” non-biodegradable polymers with biodegradable ones
40 that are less persistent in the environment. These polymers and plasticizers should be readily
41 degradable to prevent the continuous accumulation of plastic debris in terrestrial and aquatic
42 environments [6,7].

43 Biodegradable plastics can have similar applications to fossil fuel based plastics [7] but their
44 biodegradability renders them a sustainable solution [8,9] when discarded.

45 A plastic that can be biologically decomposed during a composting process at a similar rate to other
46 compostable organic materials, without leaving visible toxic remainders, is classified as
47 “compostable” [10]. Therefore, a compostable plastic is biodegradable whereas a biodegradable
48 plastic is not always compostable [11,12].

49 The main factors affecting the biodegradation of plastics in the natural environment are their chemical
50 structure, their polymer chain and the crystallinity and complexity of their polymeric formula.
51 Generally, biodegradation of polymers with a short chain, an amorphous part, and a simple formula
52 is relatively easy. Moreover, the environmental conditions in which the polymers are placed or
53 disposed of (in particular pH, temperature, moisture and the oxygen content) play an essential role in
54 their biodegradation [13].

55 Although biodegradable plastics, like Polylactic Acid (PLA) or Polyhydroxyalkanoate (PHA), require
56 few years for degradation, their manufacturing cost is still high compared to that for conventional
57 plastics. A feasible way to minimize cost is to blend them with natural bio-materials such as cellulose
58 [2].

59 In Italy, since 01.01.2018, non-biodegradable lightweight plastic carrier bags are banned and have
60 been substituted for compostable bags. Moreover, compostable bags are now required in Italy to
61 deliver kitchen waste to the separate collection systems. The bags' compostability was considered
62 sufficient to avoid any problem in the facilities treating organics and to ensure the quality of the
63 digestate and compost that would be applied to farmland.

64 These bags must comply with the EN 13432 norm according to which lightweight plastic carrier bags
65 need to possess the following characteristics:

- 66 • the material must be degraded (weight loss) by at least 90% in 6 months in an environment
67 rich in carbon dioxide;
- 68 • at least 90% of the mass of the selected material must be reduced in fragments of less than 2
69 mm if in contact with organic materials for a period of at least 3 months;
- 70 • the presence of the material does not imply negative effects on the composting process;
- 71 • the amount of heavy metals present in the composted material must not exceed specified
72 standards.

73 For anaerobic degradation, the rate of conversion of the substance to biogas has to be at least 50% of
74 the theoretical value over a maximum period of two months.

75 Despite the sufficient knowledge on the aerobic degradation of biopolymers [12,14,15], research on
76 their anaerobic degradability is still limited [16].

77 Therefore, we cannot be sure that the organic waste treatment facilities (composting and anaerobic
78 digestion plants) already in operation can effectively manage bioplastics labelled as compostable. In
79 addition, we do not know if the quality of compost/digestate is affected by the presence of bioplastic
80 items, and if it fulfils the farmers' expectations (e.g. lack of visible pieces of bioplastics in
81 compost/digestate). On the contrary, recently all these concerns have been raised by
82 composting/anaerobic digestion plant managers in Italy [17].

83 The efficiency of biodegradation can be analysed through a number of tests (e.g. weight loss, analysis
84 of the surface morphology of polymer after microbial degradation); these tests can be performed
85 under both anaerobic or aerobic conditions [10].

86 Mohee et al. (2008) [39] examined the anaerobic degradation of MaterBi: the authors measured the
87 cumulative methane production over 32 days of batch digestion assays and compared it to that of the
88 reference cellulose filter paper (CFP). The plastic and CFP samples were cut finely to film sizes of
89 0.5–1.0 mm. The results showed methane yields equal to 125 and 126 NmL/g_{VS} for MaterBi and
90 cellulose, respectively. In another study [40], a Y class (injection moulded rigid items made of
91 thermoplastic starch and cellulose derivatives) MaterBi product was degraded by 90% under
92 anaerobic conditions after 30 days.

93 Yagi et al. (2014) [41] evaluated the anaerobic biodegradability of four bioplastics powders (125-250
94 µm), polycaprolactone (PCL), poly(lactic acid) (PLA), polyhydroxybutyrate (PHB) and
95 poly(butylene succinate) (PBS) under mesophilic condition (37 °C). The biodegradability of PHB,
96 PLA, and PCL was 90% in 9 days, 29% and 49% in 277 days, respectively. PBS could not be
97 anaerobically biodegraded by the sludge used as inoculum in that study.

98 The objective of this paper was to study the anaerobic degradation of some items designed to
99 substitute petro-based (i.e. fossil fuel based) conventional plastics (i.e. carrier bags, wine corks and
100 single use plates) under anaerobic conditions found in typical full-scale anaerobic plants. Some
101 experiments were specifically designed in such a way as to verify several management possibilities
102 for bio-plastic bags, since they are very common in Italy and are used to collect food waste.

103

104 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

105 **2.1. Substrates, inocula and sampling**

106 The experiments were carried out in four series, using different substrates and inocula (Table 1). The
107 substrates used (Figure 1.SI) were conventional carrier bags made of polyethylene (PE), compostable
108 bags made of MaterBi® designed for delivering organics to household waste collection systems
109 (composed of at least 60% starch and starch derivatives and of approximately 40% synthetic resin
110 that is hydrophilic and biodegradable [16]) and are compliant with the EN 13432 norm. Additional
111 substrates were wine bottle corks, marked as produced with a biobased materials, and cellulosic
112 plates. Substrates were characterized in terms of total and volatile solids and COD [18], as shown in
113 Table 1.

114 To verify several management possibilities, the compostable bags were pre-treated either
115 mechanically (shredding) or chemically (alkali addition) or were subject to anaerobic digestion for
116 15 days and then dried and used over a second cycle of digestion. Mechanical pre-treatment
117 (Experiment 2) consisted of shredding so that to reach particles with a final dimension of 1x1 cm.
118 Chemical pre-treatment (Experiment 2) was performed using a solution of NaOH (50%, Sigma-
119 Aldrich) with a dosage of 5% of total solids and a duration of 24 hours. The tests carried out on pre-
120 digested bags (Experiment 3) were aimed to simulate a new cycle of anaerobic digestion of MaterBi
121 bags remainders that are recovered from digestate by physical means (e.g. screening). Finally,
122 chemical (alkaline) treatment was also applied to pre-digested bags (Experiment 3).

123 **Table 1.** Characterization of substrates and inocula

124

Experiment 0 – PE and compostable bags				
	TS ^a (%)	VS ^b (%)	pH ^c	COD ^d (mg/gTS)
Mesophilic Inoculum (MES_RAW_A)	5.3 ± 0.05	74.5 ± 0.01	7.9	n.a.
Thermophilic inoculum (TERM_A)	4.7 ± 0.01	72.2 ± 0.01	8.3	n.a.
LDPE carrier bags	99.9 ± 0.01	92.4 ± 0.01	n.a.	n.a.
Compostable bags (MaterBi)	97.7 ± 0.35	99.5 ± 0.02	n.a.	1421 ± 110.09
Experiment 1 - compostable bags				
Mesophilic Inoculum (MES_RAW B)	5.0 ± 0.001	61.8 ± 0.53	8.5	n.a.
Thermophilic inoculum (TERM_B)	2.3 ± 0.04	58.6 ± 0.36	8.8	n.a.
Compostable bags (MaterBi)	97.7 ± 0.35	99.5 ± 0.02	n.a.	1421 ± 110.09
Experiment 1 - bio-based wine corks and cellulosic plates				
Mesophilic Inoculum (MES_RAW C)	5.23 ± 0.01	72.9 ± 0.01	8.1	n.a.
Bio-based corks	99.9 ± 0.01	95.5 ± 0.14	n.a.	90.4 ± 6.36
Cellulosic plates	97.6 ± 0.10	99.6 ± 0.04	n.a.	1185 ^e
Experiment 2 - compostable bags				
Mesophilic Inoculum (MES_RAW D)	4.20 ± 0.002	69.7 ± 0.003	8.0	n.a.
NaOH pre-treated compostable bags	99.9 ± 0.04	98.7 ± 0.19	12.3	n.a.
Experiment 3 - compostable bags				
Mesophilic Inoculum (MES_RAW E)	4.98 ± 0.001	74.28 ± 0.003	7.7	n.a.
Acclimated inoculum from exp. 2 (ADAPT)	2.83 ± 0.001	67.28 ± 0.024	7.9	
Pre-digested compostable bags	97.42 ± 0.003	99.45 ± 0.003	n.a.	n.a.
NaOH pre-tr. pre-digest. comp. bags	100.0 ± 0.1	97.8 ± 0.04	12.5	n.a.

125 ^aTotal Solids; ^bVolatile Solids; ^cChemical Oxygen Demand; ^dCOD of pure cellulose

126

127 The mesophilic inoculum used in the experimental activity (MES_RAW_A/B/C/D/E; Table 1) was
128 mainly represented by liquid digestate taken at different times from a full-scale plant fed with manure
129 and other agro-waste or residues operating under mesophilic conditions. The digestate from this
130 source has been being used as inoculum for the anaerobic batch tests, since years and has proved to
131 be apt for digesting diverse substrates [19–23]. During the mesophilic tests, inoculum conditioning
132 was reduced to the minimum; after collection, it was sieved to remove the remainders of fibrous
133 materials (e.g. straw) and was then kept for 5-10 days under anaerobic conditions at 35°C to reduce
134 non-specific biogas production before the experiments.

135 During the thermophilic tests, the inoculum (TERM_A/B) that was obtained from a real scale plant
136 was subject to the same pre-treatment but was progressively acclimated to thermophilic conditions
137 by increasing temperature from 35 to 55 °C at a rate of 1 °C per day.

138 In addition, during experiment 3, another inoculum (ADAPT) was used to verify a possible adaptation
139 of the microbial consortium to the specific substrate. The digestate of experiment 2 was used as the
140 ADAPT inoculum..

141

142 **2.2. Biochemical methane potential (BMP) tests**

143 Biochemical methane potential (BMP) tests were performed under mesophilic (35±0.5°C) and
144 thermophilic conditions (55±0.5°C). They were carried out using a method based on Schievano et al.
145 [24] that has been extensively used in previous experiments [20,25] and is compliant with the UNI/TS
146 11703:2018 norm recently introduced in Italy. The norm requires the use of three different nutrient
147 solutions defined as Solution A, B and C respectively.

148 Solution A contains specified quantities of KH_2PO_4 , $\text{Na}_2\text{HPO}_4 \cdot 12\text{H}_2\text{O}$, NH_4Cl , distilled water while
149 the amount to be used is 5% of the final volume of the mixture subjected to BMP test. Solution B
150 contains $\text{CaCl}_2 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$, $\text{MgCl}_2 \cdot 6\text{H}_2\text{O}$, $\text{FeCl}_2 \cdot 4\text{H}_2\text{O}$, distilled water and the amount to be used is 5% of
151 the final volume. Solution C contains $\text{MnCl}_2 \cdot 4\text{H}_2\text{O}$, H_3BO_3 , ZnCl_2 , CuCl_2 , $\text{Na}_2\text{MoO}_4 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$,
152 $\text{CoCl}_2 \cdot 6\text{H}_2\text{O}$, $\text{NiCl}_2 \cdot 6\text{H}_2\text{O}$, Na_2SeO_3 , distilled water and the amount to be used is 1% of the final
153 volume of the blend. Each set of experiments included blanks (used to assess the methane/biogas
154 production of inoculum, $V_{\text{CH}_4, \text{blank}}$) and, as per UNI/TS 11703:2018 norm, a control comprised a
155 batch fed with pure cellulose only. The methane yield of the latter must be $325 \pm 25\%$ NmL/gvs,
156 otherwise the experimental results are considered unreliable. Experimental conditions are
157 summarized in Table 2.

158 Bottles with three necks (two side necks, equipped with septa and the central main neck, volume 1.1
159 L, WTW-Germany), filled with the appropriate amounts of substrate and inocula (see Table 2), were
160 placed in a thermostatic cabinet at the appropriate temperatures (either $35 \pm 0.5^\circ\text{C}$ or $55 \pm 0.5^\circ\text{C}$).
161 The contents (substrate and inoculum) were mixed by a magnetic stirrer throughout the test period.
162 Three times per week, biogas was slowly transferred with a 100 mL syringe into a second bottle (an
163 alkaline trap) containing 1 L of a 3M NaOH solution to capture the CO_2 present in the biogas. The
164 pressure increases in the alkaline trap provoked the displacement of an amount of the alkaline solution
165 that was transferred by a tube connected to another side opening in the bottle to a graduated
166 volumetric cylinder. The total volume of the alkaline solution displaced by the gas was considered
167 equal to the volume of methane present in the biogas. The volume of the carbon dioxide was
168 calculated by the difference of the methane volume from the total biogas volume.

169

170

171

172

Table 2. Experimental program (n=number of replicates)

		Inoculum Type	T ^a (°C)	F/M ratio ^b (V _{Ssub} /V _{Sin})	Working Volume (mL)	Expected duration (days)	TS ^c at the beginning of experiment(%)	Substrate added (gTS)	pH at the beginning of experiment
Experiment 0	PE bags (n=3)	MES_RAW A	35	0.5	400	15	4.7	13.3	8.0 ± 0.01
	Compostable bags (n=3)	MES_RAW A	35	0.5	400	15	4.6	13.3	8.0 ± 0.01
	PE bags (n=3)	TERM_A	55	0.5	400	15	4.0	11.6	8.3 ± 0.01
	Compostable bags (n=3)	TERM_A	55	0.5	400	15	4.0	11.6	8.3 ± 0.01
	PE bags (n=3)	MES_RAW A	35	0.5	400	30	4.7	13.3	8.0 ± 0.01
	Compostable bags (n=3)	MES_RAW A	35	0.5	400	30	4.6	13.3	8.0 ± 0.01
	PE bags (n=3)	TERM_A	55	0.5	400	30	4.0	11.6	8.3 ± 0.01
	Compostable bags (n=3)	TERM_A	55	0.5	400	30	4.0	11.6	8.3 ± 0.01
	Experiment 1	Compostable bags (n=3)	MES_RAW B	35	0.5	400	15	2.6	2.48
Compostable bags (n=3)		MES_RAW B	35	0.5	400	30	2.6	2.48	8.5 ± 0.01
Compostable bags (n=3)		TERM_B	55	0.5	400	15	2.6	2.37	8.7 ± 0.01
Compostable bags (n=3)		TERM_B	55	0.5	400	30	2.6	2.48	8.5 ± 0.01
Bio-based Corks (n=3)		MES_RAW C	35	0.3	800	44	3.5	4.27	8.1 ± 0.02
Cellulosic plates (n=2)		MES_RAW C	35	0.3	800	44	3.5	5.05	8.0 ± 0.01
Experiment 2		Raw comp. bags (n=3)	MES_RAW D	35	0.5	400	15	3.5	3.68
	NaOH pre-treated comp. bags (n=3)	MES_RAW D	35	0.5	400	15	3.5	3.68	8.7 ± 0.12
	Mechanically pre-treated comp. b. (n=3)	MES_RAW D	35	0.5	400	15	3.5	3.68	8.3 ± 0.08
Experiment 3	Raw comp. bags (n=3)	MES_RAW E	35	0.3	262	15	4.0	1.90	8.3 ± 0.02
	Pre-digested comp. bags (n=3)	MES_RAW E	35	0.3	262	15	4.0	1.91	8.2 ± 0.03
	NaOH pre-tr. pre-digest. comp. bags (n=3)	MES_RAW E	35	0.3	262	15	4.0	1.91	8.2 ± 0.04
	Raw comp. bags (n=3)	ADAPT	35	0.5	250	15*	2.0	1.90	8.4 ± 0.05
	Pre-digested comp. bags (n=3)	ADAPT	35	0.5	250	15*	2.0	1.91	8.4 ± 0.02
	NaOH pre-tr. pre-digest. comp. bags (n=3)	ADAPT	35	0.5	250	15*	2.0	1.91	8.5 ± 0.03

174

^aTemperature; ^bSubstrate to inoculum (Food to Microorganism) ratio; ^c Total Solids;

175

*The experiment was terminated on day 8, since no biogas was generated from day 3 to 8..

176

177

178 The following expression was used to obtain the net specific methane production after 30 days:

179

180
$$BMP_{30} \left[\frac{NmL CH_4}{g VS} \right] = \frac{(V_{CH_4,s} - V_{CH_4,blank}) [NmL CH_4]}{VS_s \left[\frac{g VS}{L} \right] \cdot V_s [L]}$$

181 where the difference represents the net methane production measured at the end of the test; VS_s is the
182 concentration of volatile solids of the substrate present in the bottle at the beginning of the test, and
183 V_s is the overall volume (L).

184 The duration of the batch tests was set either at 30 or 44 days, to quantify the final biomethane yield
185 of raw bags, plates and corks or to 15 days, since this latter is the most common hydraulic retention
186 time for anaerobic digestion plants accepting food waste in Italy.

187 The results of the experiments were the biogas and methane yields and the substrate dry mass losses.
188 That is, after 15 days, or at the end of the experiments (30 or 44 d), the substrates were removed,
189 sieved, rinsed, dried and weighed to quantify the amount of substrate biodegraded.

190 Only for Experiment 3 and for the batches carried out using MES_RAW_D volatile fatty acids (VFA)
191 at the end of experiment were evaluated [26]

192

193 **2.3 Experimental design and regression modelling**

194 The experimental design for the tests carried out on biodegradable MaterBi bags is included in Table
195 3.

196 Outliers were removed prior to statistical analysis. Outliers were considered the experimental
197 measurements that were outside the $Q1-3 \times IQ$ to $Q3+3 \times IQ$ range (with IQ being the interquartile
198 range, which is defined as the difference $Q3$ (75% percentile) - $Q1$ (25% percentile)).

199 As a result of that removal, from an initial number of n=48 experimental measurements for methane
200 yield, 40 data point were finally used in the statistical analysis (8 outliers were removed). In the case
201 of the dry mass loss measurements, there were no outliers, so all n=42 data points were used to
202 perform statistics. The following generic linear regressions model was used to estimate significant
203 parameters:

204

$$\text{Response} = a + b \cdot \text{Sub_Raw} + c \cdot \text{Sub_Chem} + d \cdot \text{Sub_Mech} + e \cdot \text{Sub_Pred} + f \cdot \text{Sub_Pred/Chem} +$$
$$g \cdot \text{Temp} + h \cdot \text{Duration} + i \cdot \text{Inoculum} \quad (1)$$

205

206

207

208 where:

209 Response is the dependent variable, which is either the methane yield (NmL/g_{VS}) or the bioplastic
210 dry mass loss (%); Sub_Raw: categorical variable which takes the value of 1 if the substrate is raw
211 without any pretreatment and 0 in any other case; Sub_Chem: categorical variable which takes the
212 value of 1 if the substrate was chemically pretreated (alkali) and 0 in any other case; Sub_Mech:
213 categorical variable which takes the value of 1 if the substrate was mechanically pretreated
214 (shredding) and 0 in any other case; Sub_Pred: categorical variable which takes the value of 1 if the
215 substrate was predigested and 0 in any other case; Sub_Pred/Chem: categorical variable which takes
216 the value of 1 if the substrate was predigested and chemically pretreated and 0 in any other case;
217 Temp: categorical variable to indicate digestion temperature (mesophilic, thermophilic); Duration:
218 categorical variable to indicate experiment duration (15 d, 30 d); Inoculum: takes values of 0, 1,2,3 ,
219 respectively, for the four types of inocula mentioned earlier. ; a-h: regression coefficients; a: constant;
220 b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i: term coefficients.

221 During regression modelling, the best reduced models were calculated by sequentially removing the
222 terms that were statistically insignificant (at p<0.05) from the initial most complex model.

223

224

Table 3. Experimental design used for biodegradable bags only

Substrate type	Inoculum type	Temperature	n*
Raw MaterBi bags	1 - (MES_RAW A)	Mesophilic	6
Raw MaterBi bags	2 – TERM_A	Thermophilic	6
Raw MaterBi bags	2 - (MES_RAW B)**	Mesophilic	6
Raw MaterBi bags	3 – TERM_B**	Thermophilic	6
Raw MaterBi bags	4 - (MES_RAW D)	Mesophilic	3
Raw MaterBi bags	5- (MES_RAW E)	Mesophilic	3
Chemically pretreated MaterBi bags	4 - (MES_RAW D)	Mesophilic	3
Mechanically pretreated MaterBi bags	4 - (MES_RAW D)	Mesophilic	3
Predigested MaterBi bags	5 - (MES_RAW E)	Mesophilic	3
Predigested chem. pretreated MaterBi bags	5 - (MES_RAW E)	Mesophilic	3

225
226
227

*: n=number of replicates per experiment
** For these batches methane productions after both 15 and 30 days were used for statistical analysis.

228 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

229 No degradation of the conventional LDPE bags was recorded under both mesophilic and thermophilic
230 conditions (Table 4) as was assessed by the negligible mass loss; the slight cumulative biogas
231 production that recorded, however, was most probably attributed to the inoculum.

232 Cellulose based plates (Experiment 1) presented the highest specific methane production (Table 4),
233 since their degradation was fast and complete. In fact, 75% of the total methane production occurred
234 over 10 days. The behaviour of the corks was completely different (Experiment 1), since their
235 methane production was negligible.

236 Methane production from the compostable bags indicates that probably microbial consortium
237 acclimation is an issue. In fact, in the tests (24 different batches) carried out using raw or mechanically
238 treated compostable bags as substrate, seven (7) batches had a zero methane production or well below
239 the average of the other replicates. This was evident after analysing the coefficient of variation
240 indicated in Table 4 (i.e. Exp. 0, raw bags; Exp. 1, raw bags; Exp.2 mechanically pretreated bags;
241 Exp. 3).


242

Table 4. Experimental results

	Regimen - Substrate	Inoculum	Cumulative CH ₄ prod. ^I [NmL/gvs]			Final pH	Mass loss [%]	
			15 days	30 days	44 days		15 days	30 days
Experiment 0	Mesophilic - LDPE bags	MES_RAW_A	-11±24.1 ^{II}	-17±26.3 ^{II}	n.a.	7.6±0.01	-0.3±0.6 ^{III}	-0.1±0.1
	Thermophilic - LDPE bags	TERM_A	19±4.6	54±13.0	n.a.	8.0±0.02	-0.2±0.1 ^{III}	-0.4±0.1
	Mesophilic - Raw comp. bags	MES_RAW_A	132±35.7	152±32.6	n.a.	7.5±0.03	24.4±0.1	28.7±0.4
	Thermophilic - Raw comp. bags	TERM_A	67±62.6	67±62.6	n.a.	7.9±0.03	36.5±9.2	44.7±11.3
Experiment 1	Mesophilic - Raw comp. bags	MES_RAW_B	111±51.0	95±93.7	n.a.	7.3±0.01	19.5±9.43	24.1±1.6
	Thermophilic - Raw comp. bags	TERM_B	60±39.3	186±11.8	n.a.	7.8±0.01	28.5±1.91	37.0±12.1
	Mesophilic – Corks	MES_RAW_C	32±9.5	51±14.7	52±20.8	7.3±0.04	-1.6±0.02 ^{III}	1.5 ±0.2 ^{IV}
	Mesophilic - Cellulosic Plates	MES_RAW_C	276±22.5	304±29.2	311±37.6	7.3±0.04	99.9±0.03	100±0.0 ^{IV}
Experiment 2	Mesophilic raw comp. bags	MES_RAW_D	144±18.4	n.a.	n.a.	7.6±0.02	27.5±1.3	n.a.
	Mesophilic - NaOH pre-treat. comp. bags	MES_RAW_D	203±7.3	n.a.	n.a.	7.6±0.03	78.2±5.9	n.a.
	Mesophilic - Mechanically pre-treat. comp. bags	MES_RAW_D	117±46.5	n.a.	n.a.	7.5±0.02	29.3±2.2	n.a.
Experiment 3	Mesophilic raw comp. bags	MES_RAW_E	-2±58.4	n.a.	n.a.	7.5±0.00	19.7±1.9	n.a.
	Mesophilic - Pre-digested comp. bags	MES_RAW_E	33±12.2	n.a.	n.a.	7.6±0.00	4.8±2.4	n.a.
	Mesophilic - NaOH pre-tr. pre-digest. comp. bags	MES_RAW_E	27±26.2	n.a.	n.a.	7.6±0.02	- 0.3±2.4	n.a.
Experiment 3 ^V	Mesophilic raw comp. bags	ADAPT	42±5.8	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	Mesophilic - Pre-digested comp. bags	ADAPT	66±18.7	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	Mesophilic - NaOH pre-tr. pre-digest. comp. bags	ADAPT	70±6.6	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

^I The cumulative production is net, inoculum production was subtracted
^{II} A negative value indicates a production lower of that of the control (inoculum)
^{III} A negative value indicates a weight increase probably due to imperfect rinsing after digestion
^{IV} 44 days
^V Experiments with adapted inoculum stopped at day 8 since no biogas production was registered in days 3-8. Only biogas production at day 3 is reported.

245 In Experiment 1 (Table 4, Figure 1) the methane production of the compostable bags under
246 mesophilic conditions was completed in about 20 days. Then, the production was kept lower than the
247 blank's (inoculum) and therefore the accumulated net methane production after 30 days ended up to
248 be lower than that at 15 days. The error bars clearly indicate the high variability of methane
249 production, which was due to the negligible amount measured in one of the batches.
250 The highest methane production was recorded for Experiment 2 (Table 4, Figure 1).
251 In Experiment 3, the CH₄ production from the batches inoculated with MES_RAW_E was low,
252 although the blank's production was quantitative; the negative net cumulated production reported in
253 Table 4 (-2 Nml/g_{VS}) was a result of the fact that two of the three replicates produced less methane
254 than that of the inoculum. This might be a result of an inhibition of the microbial consortia present in
255 the runs with the substrate.



256 **Figure 1.** Cumulative methane production for some of the batch tests
257

258 The behaviour of the batches inoculated with the digestate coming from Experiment 2 (ADAPT) was
259 peculiar. This can be explained by the fact that methane production occurred in the first three days,
260 while in days 3-8, none of the batches produced biogas. The equipment and the procedures were
261 reviewed and the only explanation was some toxic effect probably somewhat similar to that recently
262 found by [27]; this was likely attributed to compounds derived from the bioplastic bags, such as
263 plastic additives and non-intentionally added compounds possibly present in Mater-bi constituents or
264 due to other compounds derived from its degradation. The batches were terminated at day 8 and
265 digestate was not analysed.

266 The mass of substrate recovered after sieving was negligible for the cellulosic plates. On the contrary,
267 no mass loss was detected for the corks and for the conventional LDPE bags (the small mass increase
268 could be due to imperfect rinsing of the materials extracted from batches). The compostable bags in
269 thermophilic conditions had lost 28% of their mass after 15 days and 41% after 30 days. Under
270 mesophilic conditions, bags dry mass reduction was 23% (4 experiments) after 15 days. The mass
271 reduction of shredded bags was similar to that of raw bags. The chemical treatment was very effective
272 in reducing the dry mass by over 78%.

273 A new digestion cycle (15 days) on pre-digested bags was ineffective even when a chemical treatment
274 was applied. It is possible that the synthetic resin present in MaterBi, although an alleged
275 biodegradable compound, needs a long residence time for effective degradation.

276 Biogas and methane production from the raw bags was practically null in Experiment 3. In fact, the
277 VFA concentration at the end of the experiment was very low for all the batches (range: 203 – 421
278 mg/L, mean: 272 ± 61 mg/L) and comparable to that of the blank (234 mg/L) while mass reduction
279 was similar to the other two experiments; it is likely that an inhibition of the process occurred
280 preventing the conversion of the substrate to VFAs and then to biogas.

281 This confirms that the acclimation of the microbial consortia [28] and the potential
282 release/accumulation of inhibiting compounds [27] are crucial during the anaerobic digestion of
283 bioplastics in full scale anaerobic digestors.

284



285

286 **Figure 2.** Digested compostable bags visual inspection; a) raw - mesophilic conditions – 15 days, b)
287 raw - mesophilic conditions – 30 days, c) raw - thermophilic conditions – 15 days, d) raw -
288 thermophilic conditions – 30 days; e) NaOH pre-treated - mesophilic conditions – 15 days, f) pre-
289 digested - mesophilic conditions – 15 days.

290

291

292 Figure 2 shows the rinsed and dried compostable bags removed from the reactors run at mesophilic
293 conditions. The samples digested for 15 days show some holes as they begun to disintegrate but even
294 after 30 days in mesophilic conditions their appearance did not change significantly. After 30 days in
295 thermophilic conditions, the bags were completely disintegrated.

296 It is evident that in full scale digesters with typical hydraulic residence times of around 15 days, the
297 bags are expected to be fully recognizable in the digestate, which is unacceptable for farmers [17] .
298 This situation can be different at longer residence times and under thermophilic conditions, but
299 unfortunately these conditions are rarely found in real digesters. The aforementioned results
300 (influence of temperature on fragmentation) are fully in agreement with those reported by [37].
301 Better results, based on the visual inspection of disintegration, were obtained with NaOH pretreatment
302 while the second cycle of digestion (Figure 2f) confirmed its inefficacy (compare with Figure 2b).

303

304 **3.1 Regression modelling**

305 The statistical analysis carried out using the generic regression modelling of equation (1) indicated
306 that from the pretreatment techniques, only the chemical pretreatment (see Table 5), when applied
307 alone, significantly increased both methane yields and dry mass loss of the bioplastics. That is, the
308 sole chemical pretreatment appeared to render the biodegradable organic matter of the bioplastics
309 more accessible for hydrolyzation to microorganisms compared to the raw substrate thus leading to
310 higher degradation extents and methane generation. The predigested and predigested/chemically
311 pretreated bioplastics, on the other hand, resulted in a significant reduction of the methane yields and
312 mass losses; this is reasonable, as predigestion (even when combined with chemical pretreatment)
313 removes organic matter from the substrate so that less organic matter becomes eventually available
314 during the anaerobic stage that follows. The mechanical pretreatment alone did not affect methane
315 yields or mass losses at all. Conflicting temperature effects were noted. The mesophilic temperature
316 led to a significant increase of the methane yield, while, on the other hand, it did not lead to a
317 concurrent increase of the dry mass loss. That is, dry mass loss was higher at thermophilic
318 temperatures than the mesophilic ones; this could be a result of an increased solids hydrolysis rate at
319 the thermophilic temperature. This increased hydrolysis may lead to a dry mass reduction but not to
320 a concurrent conversion to methane which was higher at the mesophilic range. The higher

321 experimental duration (30 d) led to a significantly higher methane yield and dry mass loss compared
 322 to the 15 d duration, which is an expected finding. The different inocula types did not affect any of
 323 the two responses.

324

325 **Table 5.** Regression coefficients (only coefficients statistically significant at $p < 0.05$ are shown)

326

327	Variable	Regression Coefficient	CH ₄ Yields NmL/gvs	Dry Mass Loss (%)
328	Constant	a	110	0.36
	Sub_Raw	b	-	-
329	Sub_Chem	c	99	0.52
	Sub_Mech	d	-	-
330	Sub_Pred	e	-71	- 0.22
	Sub_Pred / Chem	f	-61	-0.26
331	Temp	g	+15 (Meso) -15 (Thermo)*	-0.059 (Meso) +0.059 (Thermo)*
	Duration		+22 (30 d)** -22 (15 d)	+0.03 (30 d) -0.03 (15 d)
	Inoculum	h	-	-

332

333

334

335

336

*: coefficients +15 or -0.059 apply to mesophilic conditions and coefficients -15 or +0.059 applies to thermophilic conditions;

** : coefficient +22 or +0.03 apply to a 30 d duration and coefficients -22 or -0.03 apply to a 15 d duration.

337

338

339 4. CONCLUSIONS

340 The experiments carried out here indicate that:

- 341 • After anaerobic digestion, cellulose based samples were completely dissolved while the others
 342 were partially degraded (compostable bags mass loss in 15 days was 23% and 28% in
 343 mesophilic and thermophilic conditions respectively) or completely untouched (corks).

344

- The highest mass loss was recorded for the chemically pretreated bags digested under mesophilic conditions; the mass loss was 344% and 283% higher than that recorded for the raw bags in mesophilic and thermophilic environments, respectively.
- Compostable bags, except of those that were digested for long treatment times (30 days) under thermophilic conditions, were fully recognizable in the digestate after the end of the digestion process.
- The statistical analysis indicated that the chemical and the predigestion pretreatments statistically increased and decreased, respectively, the methane production and the mass loss compared to those of raw bioplastics. On the other hand, the mechanical pretreatment and the inocula type had no significant effects on both responses.
- The statistical analysis provided conflicting results on the the temperature effects. That i, the mesophilic temperature led to a significant increase of the methane yield, but did not lead to a concurrent increase of the dry mass loss. This effect could be a result of an increased solids hydrolysis rate at the highest temperature range.

For waste management systems already in operation, the substitution of petrol-based plastic items with biodegradable ones would be a sustainable solution. It is, however, certain that compostable plastics cannot be simply fed to conventional anaerobic reactors unless there is a preliminary treatment (e.g. chemical treatment) or some type of a post treatment (e.g. sieving to remove partially degraded bioplastics to be thermally treated before re-digestion or composting, digestate composting under thermophilic conditions), so that to minimize their visual presence in the digestate.

REFERENCES

- [1] P.S. Calabrò, M. Grosso, Bioplastics and waste management, *Waste Manag.* 78 (2018) 800–801. doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2018.06.054.

- 369 [2] S. Thakur, J. Chaudhary, B. Sharma, A. Verma, S. Tamulevicius, V.K. Thakur, Sustainability
370 of bioplastics: Opportunities and challenges, *Curr. Opin. Green Sustain. Chem.* 13 (2018) 68–
371 75. doi:10.1016/j.cogsc.2018.04.013.
- 372 [3] H.M. Koch, A.M. Calafat, Human body burdens of chemicals used in plastic manufacture,
373 *Philosophical Trans. R. Soc. B.* 364 (2009) 2063–2078. doi:10.1098/rstb.2008.0208.
- 374 [4] D.W. Laist, Impacts of marine debris: entanglement of marine life in marine debris including
375 a comprehensive list of species with entanglement and ingestion records, in: J.M. Coe, D.B.
376 Rogers (Eds.), *Mar. Debris, Sources, Impacts, Solut.*, Springer-Verlag, New York, NY, USA,
377 1997: pp. 99–139. doi:10.1007/978-1-4613-8486-1.
- 378 [5] M.R. Gregory, Environmental implications of plastic debris in marine settings--entanglement,
379 ingestion, smothering, hangers-on, hitch-hiking and alien invasions., *Philos. Trans. R. Soc.*
380 *Lond. B. Biol. Sci.* 364 (2009) 2013–25. doi:10.1098/rstb.2008.0265.
- 381 [6] R.U. Halden, Plastics and Health Risks, *Annu. Rev. Public Health.* 31 (2010) 179–194.
382 doi:10.1146/annurev.publhealth.012809.103714.
- 383 [7] S. Pathak, C. Sneha, B.B. Mathew, Bioplastics: Its Timeline Based Scenario & Challenges, *J.*
384 *Polym. Biopolym. Phys. Chem.* 2 (2014) 84–90. doi:10.12691/jpbpc-2-4-5.
- 385 [8] R.Y. Tabasi, A. Ajji, Selective degradation of biodegradable blends in simulated laboratory
386 composting, *Polym. Degrad. Stab.* 120 (2015) 435–442.
387 doi:10.1016/j.polymdegradstab.2015.07.020.
- 388 [9] S. Thakur, O.A. Arotiba, Synthesis, swelling and adsorption studies of a pH-responsive sodium
389 alginate–poly(acrylic acid) superabsorbent hydrogel, *Polym. Bull.* 75 (2018) 4587–4606.
390 doi:10.1007/s00289-018-2287-0.
- 391 [10] J. Sarasa, J.M. Gracia, C. Javierre, Study of the biodisintegration of a bioplastic material waste,
392 *Bioresour. Technol.* 100 (2009) 3764–3768. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2008.11.049.

- 393 [11] G. Kale, R. Auras, S.P. Singh, R. Narayan, Biodegradability of polylactide bottles in real and
394 simulated composting conditions, *Polym. Test.* 26 (2007) 1049–1061.
395 doi:10.1016/j.polymertesting.2007.07.006.
- 396 [12] G. Kale, T. Kijchavengkul, R. Auras, M. Rubino, S.E. Selke, S.P. Singh, Compostability of
397 bioplastic packaging materials: An overview, *Macromol. Biosci.* 7 (2007) 255–277.
398 doi:10.1002/mabi.200600168.
- 399 [13] V. Massardier-Nageotte, C. Pestre, T. Cruard-Pradet, R. Bayard, Aerobic and anaerobic
400 biodegradability of polymer films and physico-chemical characterization, *Polym. Degrad.*
401 *Stab.* 91 (2005) 620–627. doi:10.1016/j.polymdegradstab.2005.02.029.
- 402 [14] D. Briassoulis, C. Dejean, P. Picuno, Critical Review of Norms and Standards for
403 Biodegradable Agricultural Plastics Part II: Composting, *J. Polym. Environ.* 18 (2010) 346–
404 383. doi:10.1007/s10924-010-0222-z.
- 405 [15] D. Meeks, T. Hottle, M.M. Bilec, A.E. Landis, Compostable biopolymer use in the real world:
406 Stakeholder interviews to better understand the motivations and realities of use and disposal in
407 the US, *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* 105 (2015) 134–142. doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2015.10.022.
- 408 [16] V. Bátori, D. Åkesson, A. Zamani, M.J. Taherzadeh, I. Sárvári Horváth, Anaerobic degradation
409 of bioplastics: A review, *Waste Manag.* 80 (2018) 406–413.
410 doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2018.09.040.
- 411 [17] A. De Girolamo, Le bioplastiche stanno mettendo in difficoltà il circuito di raccolta dei rifiuti
412 organici - Greenreport: economia ecologica e sviluppo sostenibile, *Greenreport.It* . (2019).
413 [http://www.greenreport.it/news/economia-ecologica/le-bioplastiche-stanno-mettendo-in-](http://www.greenreport.it/news/economia-ecologica/le-bioplastiche-stanno-mettendo-in-difficolta-il-circuito-di-raccolta-dei-rifiuti-organici/?fbclid=IwAR2KTU-D7GliPHVfk8Hwnk29oM897xNFHchkdEj-Lth9f5MuQt3aUQu9uVM)
414 [difficolta-il-circuito-di-raccolta-dei-rifiuti-organici/?fbclid=IwAR2KTU-](http://www.greenreport.it/news/economia-ecologica/le-bioplastiche-stanno-mettendo-in-difficolta-il-circuito-di-raccolta-dei-rifiuti-organici/?fbclid=IwAR2KTU-D7GliPHVfk8Hwnk29oM897xNFHchkdEj-Lth9f5MuQt3aUQu9uVM)
415 [D7GliPHVfk8Hwnk29oM897xNFHchkdEj-Lth9f5MuQt3aUQu9uVM](http://www.greenreport.it/news/economia-ecologica/le-bioplastiche-stanno-mettendo-in-difficolta-il-circuito-di-raccolta-dei-rifiuti-organici/?fbclid=IwAR2KTU-D7GliPHVfk8Hwnk29oM897xNFHchkdEj-Lth9f5MuQt3aUQu9uVM) (accessed August 30,
416 2019).

- 417 [18] APHA, AWWA, WEF, Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater, 22nd
418 Edition, American Public Health Association, American Water Works Association, Water
419 Environment Federation, 2012.
- 420 [19] A. Evangelou, P.S. Calabrò, R. Greco, A. Sánchez, D. Komilis, Biodegradation Activity of
421 Eight Organic Substrates: A Correlation Study of Different Test Methods, Waste and Biomass
422 Valorization. 7 (2016) 1067–1080. doi:10.1007/s12649-016-9532-2.
- 423 [20] P.S. Calabrò, E. Paone, D. Komilis, Strategies for the sustainable management of orange peel
424 waste through anaerobic digestion, J. Environ. Manage. 212 (2018) 462–468.
425 doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2018.02.039.
- 426 [21] P.S. Calabrò, M.F. Panzera, Biomethane production tests on ensiled orange peel waste, Int. J.
427 Heat Technol. 35 (2017) S130–S136. doi:10.18280/ijht.35Sp0118.
- 428 [22] P.S. Calabrò, E. Catalán, A. Folino, A. Sánchez, D. Komilis, Effect of three pretreatment
429 techniques on the chemical composition and on the methane yields of *Opuntia ficus-indica*
430 (prickly pear) biomass, Waste Manag. Res. 36 (2018) 17–29.
431 doi:10.1177/0734242X17741193.
- 432 [23] P.S. Calabrò, M.F. Panzera, Anaerobic digestion of ensiled orange peel waste: Preliminary
433 batch results, Therm. Sci. Eng. Prog. (2018). doi:10.1016/j.tsep.2017.12.011.
- 434 [24] A. Schievano, M. Pognani, G. D’Imporzano, F. Adani, Predicting anaerobic biogasification
435 potential of ingestates and digestates of a full-scale biogas plant using chemical and biological
436 parameters., Bioresour. Technol. 99 (2008) 8112–7. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2008.03.030.
- 437 [25] P.S.P.S. Calabrò, R. Greco, A. Evangelou, D. Komilis, Anaerobic digestion of tomato
438 processing waste: Effect of alkaline pretreatment, J. Environ. Manage. 163 (2015) 49–52.
439 doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2015.07.061.
- 440 [26] K. Buchauer, A comparison of two simple titration procedures to determine volatile fatty acids
441 in influents to waste-water and sludge treatment processes, Water SA. (1998).

- 442 [27] V. Menicagli, E. Balestri, C. Lardicci, Exposure of coastal dune vegetation to plastic bag
443 leachates: A neglected impact of plastic litter, *Sci. Total Environ.* 683 (2019) 737–748.
444 doi:10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2019.05.245.
- 445 [28] H. Yagi, F. Ninomiya, M. Funabashi, M. Kunioka, Mesophilic anaerobic biodegradation test
446 and analysis of eubacteria and archaea involved in anaerobic biodegradation of four specified
447 biodegradable polyesters, *Polym. Degrad. Stab.* 110 (2014) 278–283.
448 doi:10.1016/j.polymdegradstab.2014.08.031.

449