Two Ad Sorption Models to Sam O. Dennis¹*, Teferi escribe the N Tsegaye², ne Ro & N bert ate University, Ţ Harrison ntomopathogenic rison¹ and Sunnie A. Al Normal (ω) Clark Atlanta burime³ Nema Univ todes in Soils

l'ennessee Sta

Abstra

soils were used to pack the columns. The soils had history of nursery crop production for at least 1 nematodes in disturbed soil columns. Bromide concentration of 0.8 M, non-toxic to the nematodes nematodes and bromide concentrations. Bromide and nematode breakthrough curves (BTCs), as todes' fate and transport processes in the soils. The amount of ENs sorbed to soils was tested with with the Freundlich isotherm while the Langmuir isotherm exhibited a non-linear fit. Relatively, the field soils, suggesting that sorption might be a key factor in determining nematodes transport through the transport through the source of the s En lea into the ho 90 oil env iro em ment. (E) Th U. study ລ and enual bio-control a ks to examine the t s had history of nu agen e fate of for steif soil--borne 2 insec at like Th e white grubs of the scarab beetles. Knowledge of their fate in soils is important for their re N 18 strain, an entomopathogenic nematode, in nursery soil at the column scale. Two field ten years. A Darcian flux (0.8 cm hr⁻¹) was used to facilitate movement (leaching) of the s was added to the soil surface as a conservative tracer. Leachate samples were assayed for well as two adsorption models, were used to provide evidence of entomopathogenic nema-two adsorption isotherms (Freundlich and Langmuir). A good fit of the data was obtained the bromide and nematodes' BTCs indicate that the ENs movement was retarded in both ough soil. field

5 2n

search Statio Those soils w Paleudults). lected soil sa columns. Th The soil Station, samples ils were ide lts). Those il samples . The soils i les that were in, in McMinny ere identified i McMinnville, Tennessee. The soils were used to pack the soil columns. T lentified in the study as Alabama soils (AS). The soils collected from the soils were identified in the study as the Tennessee soils (TS). Various nu were sterilized with an Amsco model 3021 autoclave with temperature in the columns were packed to a bulk density of 1.20 gm cm⁻³. A total o used for the form the study le ere collected from the Alabama k the soil o &M [University's ins. The soils the nursery ci re set at 25 al of eight (Tennes \frown rops 54^{0F} Winfred Thomas Research Station in Normal, Alabama and from the Tennessee State University Nu collected from the Alabama A&M University's location were classified as Decatur silt loam (Rhodic see State University's location were classified as the Waynesboro sandy clay loam (Clayey, kaolinitic, rops have been grown on both sites for at least ten years. The soil samples were collected from 0-35 c 54^{0F} for 60 minutes to kill existing nematodes in the soils. The sterilized soil samples were then used (8) soil columns were used for the study. e University Nursery (loam (Rhodic Paleud tyey, kaolinitic, therm ted from 0-35 cm dept Aursery Cr c Paleudul c, thermic cm depth. l to pack t

II, eaching Exp

Each soil column (8 columns total: 4 for Tennessee soil and 4 for Alabama soil) received approxima nematodes were left to equilibrate with the soil for 24 hours. Bromide solution, 0.8M (0.095kgL⁻¹) r lators with water dripping from them were then placed on top of the soil columns to leach the soil Leachate samples were collected in 500-ml polyethylene bottles at specific time interval (pore volu ported through the soil columns by water. The breakthrough curve for bromide concentration was volumes of the leachate. At the conclusion of the leaching experiment, the soil columns were cut int tracted and quantified under a stereomicroscope connected to an image analyzer programmed for (x^{-1}) non-toxic to the nematodes, an amount equivalent to soil for bromide and nematodes. The leaching experi-volumes). The leachate samples were assayed for the was plotted using the relative concentration C/C₀ (co t into six-depth increments as described by Dennis er for nematode recognition. valent to a field application rate of about 1 billion nematodes per active applied to the surface of each column as a solute tracer. The raining experiment was performed in duplicate and was run for 48 hours. If for the presence of nematodes and bromide that may have been trace C/C_0 (concentration recovered divided by initial concentration) ver Dennis et al. (1999). The nematodes in each soil depth increment we

III. Ne sorption exp

In the kinetics experiment we found that equilibrium adsorption of the nematodes was reached experiment was conducted the same way the kinetics experiment was done except for the follow 50, 100 200, 500 and 1000) were used. Due to difficulty in counting the nematodes and in order hours. After shaking, the soils samples were allowed to settle for about 40 seconds and the supe tion of nematodes in solution. This value was then subtracted from the initial concentrations (5 analysis (isotherms) was developed using the linear form of both the Freundlich and Langmuir were diluted with 100 ml of deionized water and shaken vigorously for 10 minutes with a Vorter if any, were counted and recorded as the concentration of nematodes desorbed. eached af followin (50, to ec fter 4 hours, and that 24 hour was an appropriate equilibrium t ng deviations: (a) The concentrations of nematodes inoculated w minimize error for miscount nematodes, concentration over 10 atant was poured into a watch glass. The nematodes in the susp 100 200, 500 and 1000 nematodes) to obtain the amount of nem Juations. (c) The remaining soil samples in the flask were not di Genieä shaker. This was done in order to desorb the nematodes ilibrium time for the sorption experiment. T culated were varied; six (6) concentrations is on over 1000 was not used. (b) The flasks we n the suspension were counted and recorded nt of nematodes sorbed to the soil at each co ere not discarded as in the kinetics experim ematodes that were sorbed to the soil. Nema on experiment. T) concentrations i (b) The flasks we ics experiment; in e soil. Nematodes i corde were shaker ded as the co n concentra iment; inst . Thus, the sor is including bla vere shaken fo led as the conc tead tio



Fig re $\dot{\omega}$ Obs erv ed br Pore Volume reakthrough 0 urv es (BT $\overline{\mathbf{O}}$: S b 0 mide

The primary goal of this study was to un research of this nature. Nursery crop pr some of these nematodes could migrate shows that the majority of the infective goal of most nursery crop growers is to p an alternative to current pesticides used as to understand the fate of micro-organisms like ENs in m prop production needs to be sustainable and environmental igrate below the root zone and contaminate groundwater. I ective juveniles of the ENs were recovered in the 0-15 cm d 's is to maximize the effectiveness of these nematodes aroun es used in the control of white grubs, the root feeding larva is to r s used vater. Howev 5 cm depths. ; around the 1 g larvae of sc in tally media tally fri r. Howe n hat 0 rer, This hat are predominately used by nursery crop growers to grow ornamentals. ndly. Since ENs might be released into nursery soil as part of growers' pest er, this study suggests that will not be the case. These nematodes tend to ha This had practical implication on the efficacy of these nematodes in contro root zones because this is where recalcitrant pests do most damage. Thus, i arab beetle (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae). pest ntrolling : 18, if ENs ha . These growers are one o st management strategy, i lave an affinity for soil; ou rolling soil-borne pests. It if ENs are applied to nur These our It is it of f the was dat evi Ś \mathbf{v}

Wagenet, R. application. P 'owelson, R. D. Ann K , and W. n Arbor and W. \bigcirc . Chen.1998. Press Inc. p P. Gerba. 1995. . Coupling pg 1-36. Fate and SO 0 transport ate hete 0f microorga leity Inis ລ ph in th Φ equilibriu soils. In: Selim, H. M. 2 Ind Ma (eds). **Physical Non** equilibrium in Soils

gd

Dennis,

S

0;,

R.

Ŧ

Harrison

S

Abu

rim

e

ຊ

Ind

T.

Isegaye.

1999.

Distribution

0

5

Õ ra

pc

ioglu,

M.

K

an

D

 \triangleright

Ha

rid

198

 \mathbf{Tr}

00

odsu

22

d

fa

Ite

0f

mic

00

rga

in

od

rou

Literature

Cite

Õ.

te University, Nashville IZ labama

ict

Methodology

onclusion

m ledia theo retical inv estigatio J Hydrol. (Amste rdam) 72:149-169

ter ıcilita ited entomopathogenic Π ematodes in soil columns. Proc. Southern Nurse

ry ciatio 61.

N

58

N

ose zone. In Vados Zone Charact terization R Monitoring. Wilson et al. (Eds.). Pp. 23 35

Introduction sively soil organisms. They attack insects by releasing bacteria while inside the insects (Figure 1). The bacteria as potential bio-control agents for soil-borne insects pests. In field nursery production systems, white grubs, e growers because the pests destroy crops. Additionally, presence of grubs in nursery root balls may result in que The primary means of controlling these soil-inhabiting insects is chemical insecticides. With the use of chemic tion abounds; and the active ingredients of these chemicals are usually highly toxic and persistent. Entomopa products. Therefore, knowledge of their fate in Soils and implications on water resources is important. The ot *carpocapsae* TN 18 strain, an entomopathogenic nematode, in nursery soil at the column scale. Freundlich an of ENs to nursery soils. and animal bacteria uit in qua chemica imal parasites. Entomopathogenic nematodes (ENs) are exclu-eria will eventually decimate the insect(s). As a result they used s, e.g. Japanese beetle grubs, present an increasing threat to quarantine actions and/or revocation of nursery certification. nicals, the potential for surface and groundwater contamina-pathogenic nematodes offer many advantages over chemical objective of the study is to examine the fate of *Steinernema* and Langmuir isotherms were used to describe the sorption used

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	takeholders for
$Pris_{n}$ (1:2) $3:3$ $5:3$ $5:3$ $5:3$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:4$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ $5:5$ <th></th>	
prr_{w} (122) 3.3 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 3.6 <th>ion isotherm:</th>	ion isotherm:
$prin_{r}$ (122) 3.3 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.6 1.50 100 periating R_{su}^{-} (cm hr ⁴) 1.51 1.51 1.50 100 periating 100 periating R_{su}^{-} (cm hr ⁴) 0.76 3.16 see soll colu in Alabama $Sand$ (%) 2.2 5.7 the tracet in Alabama bromide wa $Silt$ (%) 2.2 5.7 the tracet in Alabama bromide wa $rectardes in both solts 2.2 5.7 the tracet in the file solts, nematodes were were used to quantify nematodes sorption behavior in the field solts. The sorption data fortion: M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M $	0 ml water 800 - 1000 -
practic 3.3 3.5 3.5 set pathog organic Matter (%) 1.20 1.76 set pathog Bulk Density (gm cm ³) 1.51 1.51 1.50 Inperating re Sand (%) 0.76 3.16 set solit on period Particle size analysis 22 57 the observer Sand (%) 22 57 the tracer, if n Atlabana Porosity 0.41 29 nin Atlabana Porosity 0.43 0.44 set solit on the solit in the in a both solit in the tracer, if the tra	
prime5.35.35.35.3Organic Matter (%)1.201.76seet pathogBulk Density (gm cm-3)1.511.50fcmperatureParticle size analysis0.763.16in AlabamaSand (%)2257the tracer, theSilt (%)1.213714Porosity0.430.44Porosity norder to describe the fate of the nematodes in the nursery field soils. The sorption data formatter (for example and or quantify nematodes adsorbed $M = amount of nematodes adsorbedM = amount of nematodes adsorbedM = are constantsHowever, the data analysis was fitted to the logarithmic form, which gives a straight line is roughly an indicator of sorption capacity and the slope, adsorption intensity (Corapcio)$	
PHw (122)S.3S.3S.3S.3Organic Matter (%)1.201.76set pathogBulk Density (gm cm-3)1.511.50fmperatureKsar. (cm hr ⁻¹)0.763.16set soil coluParticle size analysis0.763.16in both soilsSand (%)2257the observeSilt (%)4129in both soilsPorosity0.440.430.44were used to quantify nematodes sorption behavior in the field soils. The sorption data field solue of absorbents $M =$ amount of nematodes adsorbed $M =$ are constants	
prr.(1:2)5.35.35.3in width. ThOrganic Matter (%)1.201.76see t pathogBulk Density (gm cm-3)1.511.50long periodreRasi. (cm hr ⁻¹)0.763.16see soil coluParticle size analysis2257the observeSand (%)2257the tracer, the observeSilt (%)371429Porosity0.430.44In order to describe the fate of the nematodes in the nursery field soils. The sorption data forin: $\frac{q}{M} = \mathbf{k} \mathbf{C}^{1n}$ Eq.1.	1452
Prr.v (1:2) 5.3 5.3 5.3 in width. Th Organic Matter (%) 1.20 1.76 temperatur Bulk Density (gm cm ⁻³) 1.51 1.50 long period nu- K _{sat} . (cm hr ⁻¹) 0.76 3.16 long period Particle size analysis 0.76 3.16 see soil colu in Alabama Particle size analysis 22 57 the tracer, the observe Sand (%) 22 57 the tracer, the observe Silt (%) 22 57 the tracer, the observe Silt (%) 22 57 the tracer, the observe Porosity 0.41 29 minic the if op or Porosity 0.43 0.44 No in poro No rder to describe the fate of the nematodes in the nursery field soils, nematodes so protion behavior in the field soils. The sorption data for were used to quantify nematodes sorption behavior in the field soils. The sorption data for	suspension,
primeprime5.35.35.35.4Organic Matter (%)1.201.76sect pathogsBulk Density (gm cm-3)1.511.50long periodRuic(cm hr-1)0.763.16long periodParticle size analysis0.763.16see soil coluSand (%)2257the tracer, the the tracer, the the tracer, the tra	ead they
prr.prr.S.3S.3S.3in width. ThOrganic Matter (%)1.201.76sect pathogoBulk Density (gm cm-3)1.511.50long periodKsat. (cm hr-1)0.763.16in AlabamareParticle size analysis2257the tracer, the tra	g blank (0,
$prI_w (1:2)$ 5.3 5.3 5.3 5.3 in width. Then width. Then with the trace is a malysis $nu Organic Matter (\%)$ 1.20 1.20 1.76 sect pathoge temperature $nu K_{Sat}. (cm hr^{-1})$ 1.51 1.50 long periodlong period re Particle size analysis 0.76 3.16 see soil coluin Alabama re Sand (%) 22 57 the tracer, the tracer is the tracer.	sorption
prfw (1:2)5.35.7in width. ThOrganic Matter (%)1.201.76sect pathogBulk Density (gm cm ⁻³)1.511.50long periodnu-K _{Sat} . (cm hr ⁻¹)0.763.16see soil colureParticle size analysis2257the tracer, tSand (%)2257the tracer, t	
prfw (1:2)5.35.7in width. ThOrganic Matter (%)1.201.76sect pathogoBulk Density (gm cm ⁻³)1.511.50long periodnu-K _{Sat} . (cm hr ⁻¹)0.763.16see soil colureParticle size analysisin both soilsbromide wa	were ex-
priv (1:2)5.35.7in width. There is a sect pathogeOrganic Matter (%)1.201.76sect pathogenu-Bulk Density (gm cm ⁻³)1.511.50long periodNu-K _{Sat} . (cm hr ⁻¹)0.763.16sect pathoge	versus pore
priv (1:2)5.35.7in width. ThOrganic Matter (%)1.201.76sect pathoge temperatureBulk Density (gm cm ⁻³)1.511.50long period The observe	urs.
priv(1:2)5.35.35.7in width. ThOrganic Matter (%)1.201.76sect pathogo temperature	acre. The ainfall simu-
$p_{\Pi_W}(1:2)$ 3.3 3.7 3.7 in width. Th	
Soil Properties Alabama Soil Tennessee Soil The average	ck the soil
col- Table 1. Soil Characteristics: The Alabama and Tennessee soils	pth. The col-

98.28 AL- Soils 1.032 0.331 0.99 4.7- 98.50 TN-Soils 1.072 0.287 0.99 4.7- 98.13 98.40 TN-Soils 1.072 0.287 0.98 5.4- 98.30 ** Retardation factor of ENs in tested soils 96.81 96.50 ** Retardation factor of ENs in tested soils 5.4- 96.50 96.50 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81 96.81		
98.28 AL- Soils 1.032 0.331 0.99 4. 98.50 TN-Soils 1.072 0.287 0.98 5. 98.13 98.40 ** Retardation factor of ENs in tested soils 5. 5. 5. 98.30 ** Retardation factor of ENs in tested soils 1.022 0.287 0.98 5. 96.81 Note: Soil columns were packed to a bulk density of 1.2g/cm ³ 5. 5. 5.	3088	3
98.28 AL- Soils 1.032 0.331 0.99 4. 98.50 TN-Soils 1.072 0.287 0.98 5. 98.40 ** Retardation factor of ENs in tested soils 5. 5. 5.	3098	2
98.28 AL-Soils 1.032 0.331 0.99 4. 98.50 TN-Soils 1.072 0.287 0.99 4. 98.40 TN-Soils 1.072 0.287 0.98 5. 98.40 State State 5. 5. 5.	3147	1
98.28 98.50 98.13 98.40 AL- Soils 1.032 0.331 0.99 4. 0.99 4. 0.98 5.		Tennessee Soil
98.28 AL- Soils 1.032 0.331 0.99 4. 98.50 TN-Soils 1.072 0.287 0.98 5. 98.13 5. 5. 5. 5. 5.	3149	4
98.28 AL- Soils 1.032 0.331 0.99 4. 98.50 TN-Soils 1.072 0.287 0.98 5.	3140	S
98.28 AL-Soils 1.032 0.331 0.99 4	3153	2
	3145	1
		Alabama Soil
red (mg L ⁻¹) Percent Recovery Media K θv 1/n F	Bromide Recovered (mg L ⁻	Soil Columns
action of the second se	Tallee of promitic (applied 5200 m	Table 2. Mass bai

versity, Atlanta GA



Figure 1. Nematode infested Grub.

Results

ennessee soils (TS) are shown in Table 1. The percentage of clay and silt in the AS soils see soils. The saturated hydraulic conductivity (Ksat) for both soils was low; the data soth soils have diverse soil characteristics that are unique to nursery crop production. ls amounts to a shows that

average size of the ENs used in the study range from 500 to 700 microns in length and 18-30 microns pathogenicity. They were maintained in the laboratory in the refrigerator and were brought to room perature before use. The LJs are morphological and physiological dapted to remain in soil for a pro-g period of time without taking food while in search for an insect host. observed breakthrough curves (BTCs) for nematodes and bromide for both the Alabama and Tennes-soil columns are shown in (Figure 3). Bromide breakthrough was observed after 2 and 3 pore volumes labama and Tennessee soils respectively. The Alabama soils have more clay and silt content therefore mide was slow breaking through. However, a mass balance of the tracer was almost achieved (97-99%) oth soils (Table 2). The movement of the ENs through soil columns did not follow the same pattern as tracer, thus the ENs did not breakthrough the soils. The water application rate did not have any signifi-t effect on the distribution of irrigation intensity after ENs are applied to field soils. The fact that some natodes (< 1%) were recovered in the leachate of the TS soils suggests some incidence of transport of in porous media. It also shows that when ENs are applied to soils they tend to remain in the media to och they were applied. Most of the ENs (~ 85%) recovered from the soil columns in both the Alabama Tennessee soils were in the 0-15cm surface depth (Figure 4). to des sorption was tested with two adsorption isotherms. The Langmuir and the Freundlich equations they are for the nematodes fitted a linear isotherm (Figure 5) when plotted using the Freundlich equations

ne witl cioglu è with a slope equal to n and an intercept equal to the value of log k for glu and Haridas, 1984). Taking the log of equation (Eq 1) it became: N п \vdash \bigcirc II 1 The : intercept

ch isotherm can be used to describe the sorption of nematodes to soil. The drawback is that its e can not tell when the surface of an adsorbent is saturated or an adsorption has reached a maxi-o describe the sorption of micro-organisms (viruses) to soil, although the viruses were smaller in y, when our data was plotted with the Langmuir equation, the isotherm was non-linear and the l lation is a non-linear model and as such cannot be recommended for describing nematode XI-

the R²

Eq. in

 \mathbf{x} Ò ul and solid phase the *k* in equation (3) becomes zero therefore R reduces to 1. Generally, the re-1 (Wagenet and Chen, 1998). In our study the retardation factor is an indication of the slowing value was 4.7 for the AL soils and 5.5 for the TN soils (Table 3). Since our values are grater than ls could be an important factor in their transport processes. here, ρ is bulk density, θv is volumetric moisture content and k in the equation is the adsorption