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ABSTRACT

Lambda-Cyhalothrin is extensively used in agriculture, horticulture and public health management in Kenya. The pesticide is effective against many vegetable pests, rice and other related disease vectors. This study investigated adsorption of L-Cyhalothrin onto sediments of Athi River and degradation on Kwale and Athi River soils. Sample analysis was conducted using UV-Visible spectrophotometry and the results were analyzed by fitting data into isotherm models including Langmuir, Freundlich, Temkin, Dubinin-Radushvich and Scathard plot to understand the environmental impacts of this pesticide. The models presented different numerical values but the results demonstrated similar characteristics. It stands out that Dubinin-Radushvich (D-R) with average $R^2$: 93.48, 93.75 and 89.8 fitted best in this experiment followed by Freundlich $R^2$: 78.28, 89.95 and 81.18 and Quasi-Langmuir $R^2$: 81.6, 87.45 and 70.53 for all samples from the upstream, midstream, and downstream of Athi River, respectively. The spontaneity of the adsorption process was also realized in $\Delta G$ values as predicted by Langmuir and Freundlich. In both models, the $\Delta G$ values for the midstream were negatives -9.781 KJ/Kmol and -2.720 KJ/Kmol for Langmuir and Freundlich, respectively. This showed complete spontaneous characteristics, whereas the $\Delta G$ value for upstream was positive (9.286 KJ/Kmol) for Langmuir and negative (-4.462.12 KJ/Kmol) for Freundlich. The downstream recorded a positive $\Delta G$ value (3.0968 KJ/Kmol) for Freundlich while Langmuir was negative (-5.4415KJ/Kmol). Other important parameters in Freundlich, such as the number of adsorbed molecules, n and the apparent equilibrium constant K were determined. The average values were 1.04, 0.73, and 0.39 for n and 6.36, 2.89, and 0.54 for K, for upstream, midstream and downstream, respectively. Degradation of L-Cyhalothrin was faster in Kwale soil than Athi River soil with half-life between 4 to 5 weeks for Kwale soil was faster than Athi River soil. Adsorption modeling and degradation studies of pesticide residues are vital to environmentalist and policy makers in determining the application and disposal mechanisms for these pollutants.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The use of pesticides (insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, rodenticides and acaricides) can be dated before 16th century when chemicals such as arsenic sulphide, Paris green (Copper acetoarsenite) were used to control Malaria-transmissions, though the use of synthetic organic pesticides began around 1940 (De, 2010). Lambda-Cyhalothrin is a synthetic insecticide that has similar biochemical effects to that of natural pyrethrin pesticide (He et al., 2008). It is the active ingredient in locally used insecticides with trade names such as Karate, Warrior, and Icon that are commonly applied to control insects and/or pests in public health emergency, agricultural/horticultural farming, and in homes (CDPR, 2006). It is effective against many crop and disease vector insects including potatoes, cereals, cotton, vegetables, mosquitoes, cockroaches, flies and ticks (He et al., 2008). Lambda-Cyhalothrin also kills many insects in their earlier forms of life. The pesticide works better against the eggs and larvae of insects (Lawler et al, 2007). L-Cyhalothrin is synthesized from two stereoisomers of cyhalothrin combined in a 1:1 ratio; (S)-α-cyano-3-phenoxybenzyl-(z)-(1R,3R)-3-(2-chloro-3,3,3-trifluoroprop-1-enyl)-2,2-dimethylcyclopropanecarboxylate and (R)-α-cyano-3-phenoxybenzyl-(z)-(1S,3S)-3-(2-chloro-3,3,3-trifluoroprop-1-enyl)-2,2-dimethylcyclopropane carboxylate (BIS, 1997). Figure 1.1 shows the Structural formula of Lambda-Cyhalothrin:
Figure 1. 1: Structure of L-Cyhalothrin. (Rajendran & Phogat, 2013).

L-Cyhalothrin appears white-like solid substance at standard room temperature and yellow in solution with low volatility. It has molecular weight of 449.9g/mol and molecular formula of C_{23}H_{19}ClF_3NO_3 (BIS, 1997). Lambda-Cyhalothrin and other pyrethroid pesticides used in livestock and crop farming due to their effective ability to prevent and cure crop diseases as well as to control vector-pests which has led to improved food security and livelihood in many developing countries. However, uncontrolled excessive use of the pesticides is hazardous to human life as well as the environment (FAO/WHO, 2012). Acute (short-term) human exposure leads to skin contact: (moderately; irritation, burning or prolong skin contact can cause allergic reaction), Ingestion: (vomiting or pulmonary injury, even death), and inhalation causes: (irritation to respiratory tract, headache, anesthesia, unconsciousness, nervous system effects or death) (Sharda, 2013). It is very toxic particularly to various species of fish and other aquatic organisms (He et al., 2008).
1.2 Environmental Fates

Lambda-Cyhalothrin is applied against insects due to its effective chemical action to pests and the rapid disappearance upon application in the environment (Serono et al., 2016). Studies have proven that approximately 2-5% of applied pesticides go to targeted organisms and subsequently the rest end up contaminating the environment (Garcia et al., 2011). Pesticide substrates in the environment undergo several chemical processes including oxidation, absorption, degradation, halogenation, transfer and other microbial actions (De, 2010). The transfer of pesticide residues away from the targeted sites through volatilization, spray drift, agricultural runoff, leaching, or crop removal is a major determining factor in assessing the overall environmental impacts of pesticides (Serono et al., 2016) as shown in Figure 1.2:

Figure 1. 2: Schematic Diagram for dissipation of pesticide in the Environment.
Figure 1.2 shows some typical transfer mechanisms of a pesticide in the environment after its application. Many processes take place after pesticide application, for example, runoff move the herbicide away from target place leading to chemical wastage and pest control (Markle et al., 2014). There is also possibility of it causing damages to other non-target plants and insects, polluting soil, and wetlands, and consequently increasing biodiversity loss (Mbui, 2014).

In addition, the binding of pesticides onto soil and sediment particles vary with pesticide types, soil pH, soil moisture and organic carbon contents as well as soil textures (Jong and Byoung, 1997). The ability of pesticides to stay in the environment for a period of time allows them to affect aquatic ecosystems mostly non-target organisms such as crustaceans (McLaughlin, 2009); (Lewis et al., 2009). This effect is possibly manifested through the reduction in predator’s fish populations notably those feeding on crustaceans or through direct consumption or contact from the environment. It may also be evidence from fish consuming human health, because laboratory studies show that a number of pesticides have potentials to accumulate in many different fish species (WHO, 1991).

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Pesticides are essential in public health protection and agricultural food production through crops and livestock protection against pests and disease vectors eradication of diseases such malaria and typhoid (De, 2010). Consequently, this has led to increased food production as well as improved livelihood in many developing countries. However, poor handling and excessive use of pesticides is hazardous to the general environment due to contamination/pollution challenges of surface and underground water, aquatic organisms, plants (food) and animals intoxication, including human and other biodiversity species (Manigandan et al., 2013). L-Cyhalothrin has been detected in pomegranate fruit residues and some other vegetables (Hem et al., 2010).
Ingestion and/or Inhalation of Lambda-Cyhalothrin can cause severe pulmonary injury, anesthesia, drowsiness, or may aggravate existing chronic respiratory and skin diseases (Sharda, 2013). Gastrointestinal and neurological problems, as well as problems in the endocrine and hormonal systems have been linked to pesticides in general (CDPR, 2011). Therefore, there is need to study the presence of these pesticides in the environment, as well as their adsorption and degradation phenomenon, which control fate and transport of these compounds.

1.4 Hypothesis of the Study

Null hypothesis: Lambda-Cyhalothrin does not dissipate far from the point of application in Athi River and Kwale soils due to its high affinity on soil organic matter.

Alternative hypothesis: L-Cyhalothrin does not move far from the point of application in Athi River and kwale from soils since it is not strongly adsorbed to these soils.

1.5 General Objective

The overall objective is to investigate the adsorption and degradation of Lambda-Cyhalothrin onto Kwale soil and the Athi River soil and sediments.

1.6 Specific Objectives

i. To determine the adsorption capacity of Lambda-Cyhalothrin on sediments from the Upper, Middle and Down streams along the Athi River.

ii. To investigate the degradation of L-Cyhalothrin in Athi River and Kwale soils.

iii. To study the thermodynamic properties of L-Cyhalothrin in Athi River soils and sediments and Kwale soils using adsorption isotherm models such as Langmuir, freudlich, Temkin and Dubinin.
1.7 Justification and Significance

Athi River passes through the cement manufacturing industries and Athi River town as it flows downwards to the Indian Ocean. Occurrence of L-Cyhalothrin in sewage, industrial wastes and underground water has been acknowledged in several World Health Organization (WHO) reports (WHO, 2013). The exposure of farmers and consumption of foods contaminated with pesticide residues are among the key concerns to the general public. Therefore, there is need to study the contamination levels of the pesticide (L-Cyhalothrin) in soils and sediments. Athi River is a major source of water and irrigation for the human population and farmers along its bank. These farmers and other users are potentially exposed to the pesticide and other chemical wastes associated with the river.
CHAPTER TWO

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Previous studies have shown that the presence of pesticides including Lambda-Cyhalothrin in soils and sediments depend on the chemical compositions, absorption/adsorption properties and the concentrations of the pesticide (Espino, 2008). A research on pesticides in organic farms using similar procedure adsorption of chlorpyrifos and photo-degradation of pesticide residues was carried out in Limuru, Kenya by Mbui and co-workers (2014) alluded to the same argument.

2.2 The Philippines Case

A contemporary study carried out in the Philippines to determine environmental mode of transportation and fate of four pesticide residues including Lambda-Cyhalothrin in soil, water and air showed that 95%-98% of the applied pesticides migrated from treated areas to nearby soil, air and water (Arias et al., 2008). It was recorded that lambda-Cyhalothrin was found from 2 meters to 20 meters away from target fields in air in varying concentrations of potential hazards (Serono et al., 2016). In water, the model prediction showed that L-Cyhalothrin could travel 200 meters away in 12 years (Wauchope et al., 1992). This proves the strong affinity of L-Cyhalothrin to soil and sediments as compared to other pesticides used in the research (Serono et al., 2016). Degradation of pesticides can be enhanced by increasing temperature and sunlight (Babu et al., 2011).

The model calculation also showed that about half of the initial concentration of L-Cyhalothrin sample degraded in eight and half years, from 2007-2015 (NPIC, 2015). Under regular application of Lambda-cyhalothrin, the soil half-life was found to be about 30 days (NPIC,
This indicates that L-Cyhalothrin has a potential of accumulating in animals and other biodiversity species (Serono et al., 2016).

2.3 Nairobi Case Study

In Nairobi, about 4 million residents including foreign visitors eat vegetables on regular basis. The city population is projected to rise to about 2.5 million more in a decade (GoK, 2003). This exponential population increase poses huge demand for food under the constraining condition of land scarcity (UNICEF et al., 2005).

There are about 3,000 farmers within Nairobi and its suburbs practicing horticultural/agricultural activities (Hide et al., 2001). Fifty percent (50%) of these farmers use poor quality water, untreated manure and do not follow standard application procedures for pesticides and other agrochemicals (Kang’ ethe et al., 2007). According to a research by the University of Nairobi and Sweden, kales (vegetables) from Nairobi City contain full spectrum of disease causing organisms (Lagerkvist et al., 2013). Vegetables are often grown on small plots along the sewer lines and polluted rivers due to the increasing cost of lands for commercial and domestic purposes and accessibility to irrigation water (Kilelu, 2014). Farmers regularly use untreated industrial wastewater with bounty of effluents for vegetables farming. For example Nairobi River, Ngong River and Athi River water is used by city residents for urban farming, domestic and even industrial activities (Mbui, 2014). At the Dandora Wastewater Treatment Plant, more than 10 acres out of the 500 acres is used for vegetable farming and other agricultural activities, by the squatters, the water quality does not meet the standards (WHO, 2006). Water from this polluted plant is used for irrigation while sewage sludge is applied as manure (Westcot, 1997). These wastewater sources consist of thousands cubic liters of industrial and domestic effluents
from industries and residential facilities. A report published in the East Medical Journal stated that quite a considerable number of residents in Nairobi eat highly contaminated vegetables (Kutto et al., 2011). Research by Karanja and coworkers showed that vegetables grown along Athi River, Ngong and Wangige rivers and those sold in the market places such as Kawangware, Kangemi and Githurai, contained hazardous chemicals and fecal bacterial (Karanja, et al., 2010). Urban farming activities are commonly practiced in informal settlements and the city suburbs. However, although the dumpsite environments, the sewage treatment effluents, and the effluent from slaughtered houses may look ideal for soil fertility for poor farmers and gardeners they may contain hazardous chemicals and disease pathogens (Gislason & Craig, 2005).

A joint research by the University of Nairobi and Kenyatta University, on the quality of vegetables in neighboring community (Khadiha) of the Kibera slum in Nairobi City and Maili Saba alongside Ngong River found heavy contamination by heavy metals and germs. The contaminants were mainly found in stems and leave of gardened vegetables, and raised serious health concern since the leaves and stems are the most consumed parts of vegetables. Soil and plant samples collected in the study also contained high load bacteriological contaminants (Karanja et al., 2010). Microbial contamination was also observed in a study conducted to evaluate the extent of for kales (Vegetables) contamination based on the supply chain to Nairobi and its surroundings (Kutto et al., 2011). Water used for irrigation from Ngong River has been blamed for heavy metal and bacteriological contamination.

2.4 Adsorption Isotherms

When the adsorbent and adsorbate come in contact for a sufficient time, they form an equilibrium between the available amount of the pesticide adsorbed (adsorbate) on sediments and
the amount remaining in solution. The equilibrium formed is defined by adsorption isotherm which is a curve that links the equilibrium concentration of a pesticide onto the surface of the sediment/soil to the amount of the pesticide in the solution.

This relationship can be expressed by adsorption isotherm which relates the amount of pesticide adsorbed onto sediment/soil surface and the equilibrium amount of the pesticide remaining in solution at a known temperature. There are many isotherm models use to predict equilibrium characteristics (Foo & Hameed, 2010). However, the four (4) commonly used models are as follows:

(I). Linear model (ii), Irving Langmuir model (iii), Herbert Freundlich model (IV), and the Brunauer, Emmet, and Teller (BET). These common adsorption isotherm models have been used to study adsorption on activated carbon at water and wastewater treatment plants (Thompson et al., 2001). The Herbert Freundlich isotherm is an experimental equation, whereas the Irving Langmuir isotherm is established on rational fundamentals i.e., Langmuir Isotherm considers: a monolayer equilibrium isotherm, making all adsorption sites equally distributed and it obeys 2\textsuperscript{nd} order chemical kinetic parameters. The first and most widely used is the Freundlich Isotherm (Freundlich, 1906). Adsorption isotherm model plays a very important role in adsorption thermodynamic because it states the amount of solute (pesticide) that the sediment/soil surface is capable of adsorbing at equilibrium depending on how much is left in solution.

2.4.1 Freundlich Isotherm

The characteristic adsorption of a pesticide by soils or sediments can be described by the Freundlich empirical isotherm in equation 2.1 (Hutson and Yang, 2000) and it derivation follows from equation 2.2 to equation 2.5.
\[ C_{ads} = K_F C_e^{1/n} \] 

Where \( C_{ads} (q_e) \) is concentration (milligram/mL) of the amount of pesticide adsorbed and \( K_F \) is Freudlich constant. \( C_e \) depicts concentration (milligram/mL) of pesticide (solute) in solution as equilibrium is established. The adsorption process of pesticides on soils involves several factors which are considered in conducting adsorption analysis (Vodrais et al., 2002).

First, what is the kinetics involved, particularly the amount of adsorption and desorption rate constants and the energy involved. Does the relationship show weak or strong interaction between the solute and the adsorbents? Second, what are the conditions before and at equilibrium and what impacts do the chemical compositions and/or configurations of both (adsorbent and pesticide) affect the result (Bowman and Sans, 1977).

In order to obtain the adsorption, desorption, equilibrium, kinetic and thermodynamic data, it is essential to come up with a functional adsorption/desorption isotherm model which can be used to calculate the relative equilibrium constant and its kinetic information (Srivastava et al., 2006). It is assumed that the colloidal/sediment particles adsorb the pesticide (solute) during shaking period, which indicates that the sediment is held in suspension. In such case, the adsorption and/or desorption equilibrium is described by the following equations:

\[ nX + S \leftrightarrow SX_n \] 

\[ K = [SX_n]/[X]^n[S] \] 

\[ [SX_n] = K[X]^{n}[S] \]

Where \( X \) is the pesticide molecule of interest; \( S \) is the adsorbent/substrate or the point of adsorption onto the surface of the colloid and/or sediment particle in solution and \( K \) is
desorption/adsorption equilibrium constant. Whereas SXn is the particle-pesticide adsorption complex formed. Similarly, one can note that S is a solid whose mass is very large compared to the solute. Therefore, [S] can customarily be taken to be unity, hence reducing Equation (2.4) to:

\[ [SX_n] = K[X]^n \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots (2.5) \]

\[ C_{ads} = K_F C_e^n \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots 2.6 \]

Taking log of both the left hand side (LHS) and right hand side (RHS) we have:

\[ \log[SX_n] = \log K + n\log[X] \ldots \ldots \ldots (2.7a) \]

\[ \ln q_e = \ln K_F + 1/\ln C_e \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots (2.7b) \]

Since Equation (2.6) is linear, the K value of the equilibrium constant, and n (number of pesticide molecules) can be obtained from the slope and intercept of log [SXn] versus log[X] plot, respectively. In addition, the standard Gibbs free energy of activation, (ΔG) can be approximated by use of the conventional equation:

\[ K = e^{-\frac{\Delta G}{RT}} \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots (2.8) \]

Considering the assumption that colloid and/or sediment adsorb Lambda-Cyhalothrin at the time of shaking (suspended particles) and that these adsorbed pesticide substrates melt onto the surfaces of the sediment as it settles. This means, at that moment the amount of reagent substrates (Lambda-Cyhalothrin) adsorbed by suspended particles, i.e. [X]_{ads} is found from Equation (2.8):

\[ [X]_{ads} = [X]_i - [X]_e \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots (2.9) \]

Where [X]_i, represents the initial pesticide concentration before the addition of a known mass of sediments and [X]_e is the equilibrium pesticide concentration. Also agitation enables the settling of sediments hence the separation of both adsorbed and dissolved pesticide particles. Since n,
number of pesticide particles is related to a sole adsorption point, \([SX_n]\) is obtained by:

\[
[SX_n] = \frac{1}{n} ([X]_i - [X]_e) \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \quad (2.10)
\]

\[
[SX_n] = \frac{1}{n} [X]_{ads} \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \quad (2.11)
\]

This demonstrates the presence of a colloidal bound fraction amid the pesticide and the liquid holding the sediment when it is shaken.

Similarly, they showed that such suspended bound fraction after settling is significantly small relative to sediment bound fraction which justifies the early statement made concerning how to find \([SX_n]\) using \([X]_{ads}\) as stated above. It should be noted that \([SX_n]\) is the equilibrium amount of suspended colloidal bound fraction at settling since not all the pesticide were adsorbed.

Therefore, on modifying Equation (2.11) to show the total adsorbed pesticide, we have:

\[
[X]_{ads} = nK'([X]_e + [SX_n]_w)^n \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \quad (2.12)
\]

From above in Equation (2.11), \(K'\) represents the apparent adsorption constant while \([SX_n]_w\) represents amount of colloidal bound fraction as it slows down at equilibrium. When the natural logarithm is taken, Equation (2.12) yields a linear expression:

\[
\ln[X]_{ads} = \ln(nK') + n\ln([X]_e + [SX_n]_w) \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \quad (2.13)
\]

If equilibrium is formed between the sediment (colloidal bound fraction) and the one in suspension Equation (2.13) becomes:

\[
nX + S \leftrightarrow (SXn)w \leftrightarrow (SXn) \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \quad (2.14)
\]

It is seen from Equation (2.13) that a state of balance exists in line with \([SXn]\) at settling equilibrium. Additionally, a graph of \(\ln([X]_{ads})\) versus \(\ln([X]_e + [SX_n]_w)\) as indicated by Equation (2.12) does not impact the result of \(n\) in Equations (2.6 and 2.10) thus it impacts result of \(nK'\). Therefore, the result of \(K'\) is not the actual equilibrium constant, rather its relative
equilibrium constant.

2.4.2 Langmuir Isotherm

Langmuir Isotherm predicts that adsorption of the pesticide molecules takes place on uniform surface of monolayer in which there is no interaction between the adsorbate and the energies involved (Langmuir, 1916). It is expressed as shown in Equation 2.15:

\[ Q_e = \frac{q_m b C_e}{1 + b C_e} \] \hspace{1cm} (2.15)

From Equation 2.15, \( Q_e \) stands for the amount adsorbed, \( C_e \) is the adsorbate equilibrium concentration (mg/L) and \( q_m \) is the highest amount adsorbed relative to the mass and available adsorption sites. This expression can be linearized as follows:

\[ \frac{C_e}{q_e} = \frac{1}{bQ^0} + \frac{C_e}{Q^0} \] \hspace{1cm} (2.16)

2.4.3 Quasi Langmuir Isotherm

A different circumstance of Langmuir Isotherm termed Quasi-Langmuir is expressed below:

\[ q_e = \frac{Q^0 K_L C_e}{1 + K_L C_e} \] \hspace{1cm} (2.17)

The parameters in this equation remain as in the original Langmuir equation. Langmuir is predicated upon three premises: monolayer, site equivalent and site independent. These three conditions are hardly met in sorption at one moment due to physical and chemical characteristics. Modified Langmuir isotherm models come in to account for such missed out conditions. The linear form of the equation 4.4 is expressed as:

\[ \frac{1}{q_e} = \left( \frac{1}{K_L Q^0} \right) + \frac{1}{q_e} \] \hspace{1cm} (2.18)

In this linear (Equation 2.18), \( 1/q_e \) can be plotted against \( 1/C_e \) that gives a slope at \( 1/K_L Q^0 \) and intercept at \( 1/Q^0 \).
2.4.4 Temkin Isotherm Model

This isotherm model predicts that heat of adsorption of chemical species linearly decreases with respect to adsorbate-adsorbent interactions. This process is a typical even distribution of the bonding energy and it extends to the binding energy (Temkin & Pyhev, 1940). It does not consider the extremely low and large values of concentration though it is a gas phase equilibrium prediction. It emphasizes that adsorption is marked by uniform sharing of the bonding energy up to higher level binding energy (Temkin and Pyhev, 1940). This model is expressed as follows:

\[ q_e = \frac{RT}{b_T} \ln(K_T C_e) \]  

(2.19)

This equation (Equation 2.19) can be expressed linearly as:

\[ q_e = B_T \ln K_T + B_T \ln C_e \]  

(2.20)

From these Equations (2.19) and (2.20), note that \( K_T \) (g/L) is binding constant, \( R \) is universal gas constant (J/Kmol), \( T \) is absolute temperature (K), \( b \) is change in adsorption energy (KJ/mol), and \( B_T \) is Temkin equilibrium Constant representing \( RT/b_T \). In Table 4.9, the parameters such as \( B_T \), \( B_T \ln K_T \), and \( K_T \) were obtained from the absorbance extrapolation.

2.4.5 Dubinin-Radushkevich (D-R) Isotherm Model

The model was used to show the apparent adsorption energy heterogeneity at sites of adsorption. This model has fitted well with high solute activities including intermediate concentration range data. This approach was originally applied to differentiate between the physical and chemical adsorptions of metal ions with its main free energy (E) per molecule (Dubinin, 1960). The equation and its linear form are expressed below:

\[ \ln q_e = \ln q_D - B_D \varepsilon^2 \]  

(2.21)
\[ \varepsilon = RT \ln \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{C_e} \right] \] 

From the above expressions, \( q_D \) is adsorption strength of soil/sediment (mg/g), \( B_\varepsilon \) is Dubinin-Radushkevich constant, \( q_e \) is amount of adsorbate at equilibrium (mg/g), and \( E \) is the free energy per molecule of adsorbate. \( T \) is the absolute temperature (k), \( R \) is the universal gas constant (j/kmol) and \( C_e \) is the adsorbate equilibrium concentration (mg/L).

One unique characteristic of this model is that it is temperature dependent. This allows for all suitable data to lie in the same curve, characteristic curve when adsorption data at separate temperatures are plotted as function of the amount adsorbed (\( \ln q_e \)) against the energy (\( E \)).
CHAPTER THREE

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.1 Area of Study and Collection of Samples

The sediments used in this study were collected along Athi River at three (3) sampling sites representing the upstream (Site 1), midstream (Site 2), and downstream (Site 3), and randomly selected soil samples from Athi River (Site 4) and Kwale. The collected samples were placed in sample bags and transported to the laboratory, department of Chemistry, University of Nairobi for analysis. The samples were dried and crushed into fine particles.

Figure 3.1: Study Area.
3.2 Apparatus and Instrumentation

The following materials, instruments and reagents were used:

UV-Visible spectrophotometer (UV-1700 Schamadzu model), Mini Orbital Shaker, Analytical balance (Fischer scientific A-160), Lambda-Cyhalothrin (karate 25g/kg pure), Glass bottles, Distilled water, Stop watch, Acetone and River sediment from Athi River and kwale coastal soil, in Kenya.

3.3 Chemicals and Reagents

3.3.1 Determination of Available Soil/Sediments Nutrients (Ca, K, Mg, Mn, Na and P)

The oven-dried soil samples were extracted in a 1:5 (mass/volume) ratio and combined with dilute hydrochloride acid (0.1N) and Sulfuric acid (0.025 N), respectively, (Carter, 1993). The determinations of metallic elements including sodium (Na), calcium (Ca), and potassium (K) were carried out using flame photometry while others, phosphorous, magnesium and manganese were determined calorimetrically (Mehlich, 1953).

3.3.2 Determination of Organic Carbon

The available organic carbon content of the samples was oxidized in concentrated dichromate solution at 150 °C for half an hour to be oxidized completely. The digest was cooled and Barium chloride added. The digest were mixed thoroughly and placed in a controlled environment for a 12-hour period undisturbed. The concentration was analyzed using spectrophotometer at a range between 200-900 nm (Gislason & Craig, 2005).

3.3.3 Total Nitrogen

The soil samples were digested with Conc. Sulphuric acid which contained selenium, potassium sulphate and copper sulphate and hydrated at about 350 °C. Total elemental Nitrogen (N) content
was determined by Distillation followed by Titration with the sulfuric acid (H₂SO₄) solution (Persson et al., 2008).

### 3.3.4 Soil pH Determination

The pH of the soil was determined in a 1:1 ratio of soil to water (weight/volume) using pH meter.

### 3.3.5 Trace Elements Analysis

The soil sample was oven-dried and obtained in a ratio of 1:1 (weight/volume) using dilute Hydrochloride (0.1M) extract to determine trace elements such as Fe, Zn and Cu using an Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometry, (FAAS) (Yang and Chang, 2005).

### 3.3.6 Cation Exchange Capacity at Neutral pH (Ca, Mg, K, and Na)

The samples were extracted with a dilute ammonium acetate solution (1N) buffered at neutral pH. The filtrate cation exchanged capacity for exchangeable metallic elements including Calcium, Magnesium, Potassium and Sodium were analyzed. The samples were leached again this time, with 1N KCl, and the leachates were used for the determination of the Cation Exchange Capacity. The expected elements such as sodium and potassium were determined using a flame photometry while others like calcium and magnesium were determined using the Flame Atomic absorption spectrophotometry. This was followed by the determination of Cation Exchange Capacity through Distillation followed by Titration with 0.01M HCl (Carroll, 1959); (Tuner and Clark, 1966).
3.4 Preparation of Standards and Reagents

3.4.1 Preparation of Standard Reagents

A standard solution of L-Cyhalothrin (1000 mg/L) was prepared and through appropriate dilution, the following concentrations were made: 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 20, 40, 60, 80, and 100mg/L. Absorbance for these dilute solutions were obtained photometrically at a range between 200 to 900nm to obtain the lambda maximum. To investigate the existence of the adsorption/desorption equilibrium, 2.0g, 1.0g, 0.5g, 0.2g and 0.1g of the dried sediments were placed in glass bottles and shaken with 10 ml of 1mg L-Cyhalothrin solution for an hour. The pesticide containing solutions were given about seventy two (72) hours to settle down. The aqueous parts were poured and filtered with a Whitman filter paper to obtain a clear conc. L-Cyhalothrin solution. The absorbance of $C_e$ and $Q_e$ was obtained using a UV-Visible spectrophotometer at 218 nm. To find $\Delta G$, $n$ and $K$, a 0.5g of the samples were mixed and shaken with 10ml deionized water spiked at 50, 40, 30, 20, and 10ppm of L-Cyhalothrin. The samples, each in a set of three (3) were shaken for 15min, 30min, 45min and 60min using an orbital shaker. Similarly, the concentration of L-Cyhalothrin in the decanted solution was obtained as explained above.

3.5 Degradation Procedure

In the degradation, a set of 3 experimental samples of 5g each (Athi River and Coastal soils) were weighed. To each, a concentration of 50 mg/L of L-Cyhalothrin was added in 100-ml glass bottles. The samples were stored in the dark and monitored on weekly interval for a period of five weeks. At each monitoring interval, like in the adsorption, the solution was decanted, filtered and run at 218 nm using UV-spectrophotometry to determine the level of degradation.
CHAPTER FOUR

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Sediments and Soil Characterizations

Characterization of both Athi River soil and sediments including Kwale soil was done using standard methods of soil analysis. The results of the analysis are in Tables 4.1 and 4.2.

Table 4.1: Athi River Sediment Profile used in the Adsorption Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Upstream</th>
<th>Midstream</th>
<th>Downstream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sediment depth</td>
<td>2-5cm</td>
<td>2-5cm</td>
<td>2-5cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameters</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>7.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nitrogen (%)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Org. Carbon (%)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorus (µg/g)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium me %</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium me %</td>
<td>23.90</td>
<td>30.20</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium me %</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manganese me %</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper (µg/g)</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron (µg/g)</td>
<td>191.00</td>
<td>174.00</td>
<td>39.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc (µg/g)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium me %</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conductivity</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sediments/soils’ properties have significant impacts on its adsorption capacity as shown later. The profile of Athi River sediments are shown in Table 4.1. The sediments were sampled about 2-5cm below the surface and one kilometer (1-Km) apart. The pH of the sediments is
generally high above the optimum level for many soils (5.5-6.5). This could be due to a number of factors such as discharges from industries upstream of the river. The high pH could also be attributed to pollution from agricultural activities and waste water discharges into river from surrounding local communities.

From Table 4.1, the primary essential elements (N, P, and K) responsible for soil fertility were low whereas the secondary essential elements (Ca, Na, Mg, Mn, and Zn) responsible for adsorption were higher in the soil. This explains the significance of pH values, i.e., the higher the pH the more dissolved ions, hence the more the adsorption capacity of the sediments especially for halogenated contaminants like pesticides. Another important observation from Table 4.1 is the low amount of available Total Organic Carbon. This was because the samples were collected along the river and as such microorganisms responsible to build such nutrients could be few or completely absent as result of pollution or industrial discharge mentioned earlier. Like Nitrogen, Total Organic carbon plays an important role in adsorption. The Total organic carbon content for all the three sampling sites were 0.54, 0.91 and 0.75% (Table 4.1). This means that the adsorption capacity of these materials is generally low. Another factor that influences the adsorption is the physical dipole-dipole attraction (Van der Waals force) that improves the adsorption capacity for the soil. Similarly, the properties of Athi River and Kwale soils (Table 4.2) exhibited different characteristic values, though degradation of Lambda-Cyhalothrin in both soils behaved similarly.

pH value for Kwale soil was higher than Athi River soil. This high pH could be as a result of relatively low rainfall associated with the coastal region where there is no leaching of the salts in the soil. The total organic carbon content is low probably due to absence of microorganisms.
Table 4.2: Athi River and Kwale Soils used in degradation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>ATHI RIVER SOIL</th>
<th>KWALE SOIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil depth</td>
<td>5-10cm</td>
<td>5-10cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parameters</strong></td>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nitrogen (%)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Org. carbon (%)</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorus (µg/g)</td>
<td>33.44</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium me %</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium me %</td>
<td>22.61</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium me %</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manganese me %</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper(µg/g)</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron (µg/g)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc (µg/g)</td>
<td>40.46</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Absorption Profile of Lambda-Cyhalothrin

The prepared standard solution of Lambda-Cyhalothrin compared with the literature λ max 218 nm. Figures 4.1 and 4.2 show the UV-Visible spectra range between (0-10 mg/L) and (0-100 mg/L), respectively. The plots of absorbance against concentration at 218 nm gave linear relationship as seen in Figures 4.3 and 4.4.
Figure 4.1: UV-Visible Spectra for L-Cyhalothrin (0-10 mg/L).

Figure 4.2 shows UV-Visible spectra of L-Cyhalothrin range (0-100 mg/L).

Figure 4.2: UV-Visible Spectra of L-Cyhalothrin (0-100 mg/L).
This means that Beer’s Law was obeyed according to the equation:

\[ A = \varepsilon CL \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad (4.1) \]

Where \( A \) is the absorbance, \( L \) is the path length of the light (1 cm) and \( C \) is concentration. The symbol \( \varepsilon \), is the molar absorption coefficient for the chemical species of interest.

![Figure 4.3: Plot of Absorbance against Concentration (0-10 mg/L) of L-Cyhalothrin.](image1)

![Figure 4.4: Plot of Absorbance against Concentration (0-100 mg/L) of L-Cyhalothrin.](image2)
4.3 Effect of Sediment Mass

The adsorption level of varied amounts of sediment masses as function of the concentration of Lambda-Cyhalothrin are given in Figures 4.5 and 4.6. It was established that the larger the amount of sediment, the lower the amount of lambda-Cyhalothrin (Pesticide) in the solution. This showed that as the number of available adsorption sites (sediment) increased the more it removed the pesticides from the solution, obeying the predictions of the isotherm models (Freundlich, Langmuir and others). As the mass of the sediment increased more adsorption sites, the average amount of L-Cyhalothrin adsorbed increased for all samples. For example in sample C (Downstream sediment), the average amount of L-Cyhalothrin remaining in solution after adsorption were 3.90, 3.20, 2.20, 1.600 and 0.90 from the initial Conc. (10 mg/L) for sediment masses of 0.10 g, 0.20 g, 0.50 g, 1.00 g and 2.00 g, respectively.

This means the more absorption sites the more molecules of L-Cyhalothrin could be adsorbed. Figure 4.6 gives the adsorption graph of L-Cyhalothrin in the solution measured at same fixed Conc. and time against varied masses.

![Figure 4.5: Plot of amount L-Cyhalothrin adsorbed (q_e) vs. varied masses (g) of the sample.](image)

Figure 4.5: Plot of amount L-Cyhalothrin adsorbed (q_e) vs. varied masses (g) of the sample.
Figure 4.6 gives the desorption graph of L-Cyhalothrin in the solution measured at fixed Conc. and time against varied masses.

![Figure 4.6](image)

**Figure 4.6: Plot of amount in solution (C<sub>e</sub>) against varied masses (g) of the sediment.**

From Figures 4.5 and 4.6, samples A, B, and C mean Upstream (A), Midstream (B), and Downstream (C) of Athi River, respectively. Whereas q<sub>e</sub> is the equilibrium concentration of the solute and C<sub>e</sub> is the concentration of Lambda-cyhalothrin in the solution. The two graphs for adsorption (Figure 4.5) and desorption (Figure 4.6) revealed reverse behavior for the concentration adsorbed and the concentration remaining in solution, respectively.

### 4.4 Effect Contact Time

The statistics adsorption results for the three (3) sediments (Upper, Middle and Down streams) of Athi River are shown in Table 4.3. The results obtained from spiking of various concentrations, i.e, 10 ppm, 20 ppm, 30 ppm, 40 ppm, and 50 ppm of Lambda-Cyhalothrin in 0.5 g of soil at different shaking times and initial pesticide concentrations were calculated from their absorbance relative to the standard solution as shown in Table 4.3.
Table 4.3: Data Summary for Adsorption Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Shaking Time (Minute)</th>
<th>Initial Conc.</th>
<th>SAMPLE A</th>
<th>SAMPLE B</th>
<th>SAMPLE C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Qe</td>
<td>Ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.97 ± 0.02</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>2.07 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.63 ± 0.03</td>
<td>17.37</td>
<td>3.03 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.89 ± 0.01</td>
<td>27.11</td>
<td>3.21 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.50 ± 0.02</td>
<td>33.50</td>
<td>6.90 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.22 ± 0.31</td>
<td>41.78</td>
<td>8.10 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.77 ± 0.02</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>1.97 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.77 ± 0.06</td>
<td>17.23</td>
<td>3.50 ± 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.30 ± 0.09</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>4.10 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.60 ± 0.04</td>
<td>34.40</td>
<td>4.97 ± 0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.87 ± 0.04</td>
<td>41.13</td>
<td>5.83 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.07 ± 0.04</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>2.20 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.67 ± 0.03</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td>2.67 ± 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.03 ± 0.04</td>
<td>26.97</td>
<td>3.27 ± 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.23 ± 0.02</td>
<td>32.77</td>
<td>5.77 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.63 ± 0.11</td>
<td>41.37</td>
<td>7.20 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.23 ± 0.04</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>1.93 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.83 ± 0.05</td>
<td>17.17</td>
<td>2.47 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.17 ± 0.03</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>4.00 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.87 ± 0.06</td>
<td>34.13</td>
<td>5.20 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.50 ± 0.02</td>
<td>41.50</td>
<td>6.63 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 4.3, as the shaking times increased the amount of the pesticide adsorbed increased. Similarly, the amount of pesticide adsorbed (mg/L) also depends on its initial concentration in solution and the amount of adsorption sites (mass of sediment). Therefore, as the initial concentration increases, the amount of pesticide molecules adsorbed increase proportionately per unit mass of the sediment.

The data obtained were fitted to different adsorption isotherm models. It was observed that the data for each of the sites, the Upstream (sample A), Midstream (Sample B) and downstream (Sample C) fitted well for more than one models. The various adsorption isotherm models and characteristic reactions to the samples are as follows.

### 4.4.1 Langmuir Isotherm Result

Using Langmuir Isotherm (equations 2.16 and 2.16), for example, the values obtained from the adsorption, at 15 minute $C_e/q_e = 0.1636 + 0.0040C_e$. Therefore, from equation 2.16, $1/bQ^0$ was 0.1636 while $1/Q^0$ was 0.004. To find $b$ as in Table 4.4, $1/b * 1/Q^0 = 0.1636$ and $b = 0.0041/0.1636 = 0.02494$. Similarly, $\Delta G = -RT\ln K_c$, where $R$ is universal gas constant (J/mol*k), $T$ is the absolute temperature (K) and $K_c$ is the equilibrium constant, which, in this case is $b$. Therefore $\Delta G = -(8.314 * 298 * \ln0.02494) = 9.1454$ KJ/mol. The data in the table below was arrived at by making assumption that columbic species don’t further react with one another (Langmuir, 1916).
Table 4.4: Langmuir Isotherm Data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (minute)</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>1/Q₀</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>1/bQ₀</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.00408</td>
<td>0.02494</td>
<td>0.1636</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>9,145.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-0.00063</td>
<td>-0.00323</td>
<td>0.1950</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-14,209.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-0.06515</td>
<td>-0.11158</td>
<td>0.5861</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>-5,442.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.004740</td>
<td>0.03060</td>
<td>0.1549</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>8,638.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-0.03340</td>
<td>-0.10634</td>
<td>0.3141</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>-5,552.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-0.05350</td>
<td>-0.093662</td>
<td>0.5712</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>-5,867.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.00519</td>
<td>0.03136</td>
<td>0.1655</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>8,577.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-0.00770</td>
<td>-0.0369</td>
<td>0.2105</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>-8,174.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-0.1226</td>
<td>-0.129052</td>
<td>0.9500</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>-5,072.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-0.00257</td>
<td>-0.01288</td>
<td>0.1996</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-10,782.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-0.01167</td>
<td>-0.05474</td>
<td>0.2132</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>-7,197.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-0.1177</td>
<td>-0.113829</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>-5,383.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above data obtained in Table 4.4, ΔG was calculated for each of the samples. ΔG is positive (+) for sample A (Upstream) indicating a non-spontaneous desorption process, whereas samples B (Midstream) and C (Downstream) had negative (-) ΔG values indicating that the reaction was spontaneous adsorption process. A plot of Ce/qe against Ce gave a nearly straight line with an intercept of 1/bQ₀ as shown in Figures 4.7, 4.8, and 4.9.

Figure 4.7 shows fitting of Sample A (Upstream) adsorption data to Langmuir Isotherm at varied shaking times (15, 30, 45, and 60 minutes). The unparalleled linearity and crossing over of the curve indicate its unsuitability to the model.
Figure 4.7: Langmuir Isotherm model for Sample A.

Figure 4.8 also shows the fitting of Sample B (midstream) adsorption data to Langmuir Isotherm at varied shaking times. Similarly, the crossing over indicates unfitting of the data to this model.

Figure 4.8: Langmuir Isotherm Model for Sample B.

Similarly as in Figures 4.7 and 4.8, Figure 4.9 shows the fitting of Sample C (downstream) adsorption data to Langmuir Isotherm at varied shaking times. Although the crossing over of the curves looks better fairly but follows similar trends as Figures 4.7 and 4.8.
From the absorbance value obtained at the UV-Visible, $C_e$ was extrapolated using the calibration graph to determine the amount adsorbed from initial concentration added to the sediment. For example, 10 mg/L of Lambda-Cyhalothrin was initially added to sample A (upstream) and shaken for 15 minutes. It was allowed to settle for 72 hours and the clear solution decanted. The absorbance of the solution was measured as 0.915 at 218 nm. The corresponding value deduced from the graph equaling to 4.5 $\mu$g/mL ($C_e$). Plots of $C_e/q_e$ vs $C_e$ were generated as in Figures.4.7, 4.8, and 4.9. A maximum concentration of 10 $\mu$g/mL was maintained and the variation in masses (0.1g, 0.2g, 0.5g, 1.0g, and 2.0g) was studied.

4.4.2 Quasi Langmuir Isotherm

A modified Langmuir Isotherm (Equation 2.17 and Equation 2.18) was used to also analyze the adsorption of the sediments from Athi River. In this first modified version of Langmuir, the adsorbate tends to behave as expected as seen from the regression values in Table 4.5. The plots of $1/q_e$ versus $1/C_e$ that has slope at $1/K_Q^0$ and intercept at $1/Q^0$ of each sample are shown in

Figure 4. 9: Langmuir Isotherm Model for Sample C.
Figures 4.10, 4.11 and 4.12.

Figure 4.10 shows the fitting of Sample A (Upstream) adsorption data to Quasi Langmuir Isotherm at varied Conc. and time against fixed mass of the sediment. The data fitted well from the linearity of the Curves and the coefficient of regression ($r^2$) values in Table 4.5.

**Table 4.5: Quasi-Langmuir Isotherm Data.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (minute)</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$1/KLQ^0$</th>
<th>$1/Q^0$</th>
<th>KL</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.2165</td>
<td>0.01139</td>
<td>0.52609</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.2702</td>
<td>-0.01858</td>
<td>-0.0688</td>
<td>0.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.6719</td>
<td>-0.0851</td>
<td>-0.12666</td>
<td>0.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.2195</td>
<td>0.01273</td>
<td>0.05799</td>
<td>0.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.2937</td>
<td>-0.02881</td>
<td>-0.09809</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.6969</td>
<td>-0.08077</td>
<td>-0.115898</td>
<td>0.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.2488</td>
<td>0.01567</td>
<td>0.06298</td>
<td>0.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.2873</td>
<td>-0.02732</td>
<td>-0.09509</td>
<td>0.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.264</td>
<td>-0.1836</td>
<td>-0.145253</td>
<td>0.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.2852</td>
<td>0.02442</td>
<td>0.08562</td>
<td>0.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.2422</td>
<td>-0.01963</td>
<td>-0.081048</td>
<td>0.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td>-0.1653</td>
<td>-0.126086</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.10 shows the fitting of Sample A (Upstream) adsorption data to Quasi Langmuir Isotherm at varied Conc. and time against fixed mass of the sediment. The curves in this figure are partly linear showing that sediment of Sample A is slightly a better L-Cyhalothrin adsorbent.
Figure 4.10: Quasi-Langmuir Isotherm Model for Sample A.

Figure 4.11 shows the fitting of Sample B (Midstream) adsorption data to Quasi Langmuir Isotherm at varied Conc. and time against fixed mass of the sediment. The curves in this figure are more linear than those in Figure 4.10 showing that sediment Sample B is slightly a better L-Cyhlothrin adsorbent than sediment Sample A.

Figure 4.11: Quasi-Langmuir Isotherm Model for Sample B.
Figure 4.12 like Figure 4.10 and Figure 4.11, shows the fitting of Sample C (Downstream) adsorption data to Quasi Langmuir at fixed mass against Conc. and time. The leaning of the curves shows that the data fitted partly to this model.

![Quasi-Langmuir Isotherm C](image)

**Figure 4.12: Quasi-Langmuir Isotherm Model for Sample C.**

From Equation (4.5), \( y = \frac{1}{q_e} \), \( m = \frac{1}{K_L Q_0} \), \( x = \frac{1}{C_e} \) and \( C = \frac{1}{Q_m} \) was used to calculate the regression \( (r^2) \) for example at 15 minutes of shaking time: \( \frac{1}{q_e} = 0.01139 + 0.2165 \frac{1}{C_e} \), \( r^2 = 0.80 \) and to determine the parameters as in Table 4.7: \( \frac{1}{K_L Q_0} = 0.2165 \) and \( \frac{1}{Q_0} = 0.01139 \), therefore \( K_L = 0.01139/0.2165 = 0.52609 \) as indicated.

### 4.4.3 Freundlich Isotherm Model

The same data as in Table 4.6 were exposed to Freundlich isotherm (Equations 2.1 and 2.7b) which gave positive \( \Delta G \) values for samples C (downstream) and negative \( \Delta G \) for samples A and B (upstream and midstream, respectively). This means that samples A and B underwent spontaneous adsorption using Freundlich isotherm while sample C went the opposite, non-spontaneous adsorption. Thus the Freundlich Isotherm is characteristic of heterogeneous surface (Freundlich, 1906).
From Equations (2.1 and 2.7b), $q_e$ (mg/g) is the amount of pesticide adsorbed and $C_e$ (mg/L) is the equilibrium concentration. $n$ is a constant that measures the adsorption of non-linearity between the solute concentration in the solution and the adsorption. It ($n$) expresses parameter that is characteristic of the quasi-Gaussian heterogeneity related to the adsorption surface. $K_F$ (mg/L) is the Freudlich isotherm constant that shows the apparent adsorption capacity of the adsorbent.

Table 4.6: Freundlich Isotherm Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (minute)</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>I/n</th>
<th>LnK_F</th>
<th>K_F</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>ΔG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.8957</td>
<td>1.883</td>
<td>6.5732</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>-4,665.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>1.691</td>
<td>5.4249</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>-1,921.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.136</td>
<td>-0.322</td>
<td>0.7247</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>797.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.9518</td>
<td>1.834</td>
<td>6.2589</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>-4,543.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.841</td>
<td>0.5828</td>
<td>1.7915</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>-1,444.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.966</td>
<td>-0.2400</td>
<td>0.7867</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>594.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.8852</td>
<td>1.852</td>
<td>6.3726</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>-4,588.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.174</td>
<td>1.549</td>
<td>4.7066</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>-3,837.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.228</td>
<td>-2.2880</td>
<td>0.1015</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>5,668.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>1.635</td>
<td>5.1295</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>-4,050.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>1.484</td>
<td>4.41055</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>-3,676.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.930</td>
<td>-2.151</td>
<td>0.1164</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>5,329.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this equation, plots of ln$q_e$ versus ln $C_e$ as presented in this linear form of Freundlich Isotherm have slopes at $1/n$ and intercepts at ln$K_F$. Graphs (in Figures 4.13, 4.14, and 4.15) were generated using the data highlighted in Table 4.6 above. Adsorption of Lambda-
Cyhalothrin unto Athi River sediments of the three (3) sampling areas fitted strongly to the Freundlich Isotherm model as shown. The regression ($r^2$) values ranging from 0.7420 to 0.992 and the linearity of the plot in Figures 4.13, 4.14, and 4.15.

Figure 4.13 shows the fitting of Sample A (Upstream) adsorption data to Freundlich Isotherm at fixed mass against varied Conc. and time. The coefficient of regression ($r^2$) values and the linearity of the curves show that the data fitted well into Freudlich Isotherm.

![Figure 4.13: Freundlich Isotherm Model for Sample A.](image)

Figure 4.14 shows the fitting of Sample B (Midstream) adsorption data to Freundlich Isotherm at fixed mass of sediment against varied Conc. (10, 20, 30, 40, and 50 mg/L) and time. Even though there are some crossovers of curves but generally the data fitted well to this model.
Figure 4.14: Freundlich Isotherm Model for Sample B.

Similarly, Figure 4.15 shows the fitting of Sample C (Downstream) adsorption data to Freundlich Isotherm at fixed mass against varied Concentration and time. As in Figure 4.13, there is some crossing over of the curves but the data fitted well to the model.

Figure 4.15: Freundlich isotherm Model for Sample C.
4.4.4 Temkin Isotherm Model

From Temkin isotherm model (Equations 2.19 and 2.20), note that \( K_T \) (mg/L) is binding constant, \( B_T \) is Temkin equilibrium Constant as in Table 4.9. The parameters such as \( B_T \), \( B_T \ln K_T \), and \( K_T \) were obtained from the absorbance extrapolation. For example, at 30 minutes of shaking time of the Downstream sediment of Athi River, the regression \( (r^2) = 0.989 \) was obtained from the \( q_e = -1.1735 + 20.49 \ln C_e \) 30. From the linear form Temkin isotherm, \( (\text{equation 4.11}) \), \( q_e = B_T \ln K_T + B_T \ln C_e \). From this expression, \( B_T = 20.49 \), \( B_T \ln K_T = -1.1735 \), and \( \ln K_T = -1.1735/20.49 = -0.084675 \). Table 4.7 shows the Temkin Isotherm data.

**Table 4.7: Temkin Isotherm Data.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (minute)</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>( B_T )</th>
<th>( B_T \ln K_T )</th>
<th>( K_T )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>19.58</td>
<td>-0.830</td>
<td>0.9585</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td>27.0787</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>44.56</td>
<td>-44.97</td>
<td>0.3645</td>
<td>0.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
<td>0.9188</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-9.45</td>
<td>38.80</td>
<td>-4.1058</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>39.11</td>
<td>-40.36</td>
<td>0.3563</td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>0.9318</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>-8.23</td>
<td>-0.3195</td>
<td>0.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>66.35</td>
<td>-84.08</td>
<td>0.2816</td>
<td>0.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>22.95</td>
<td>-6.19</td>
<td>0.7635</td>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>26.59</td>
<td>-8.95</td>
<td>-0.3329</td>
<td>0.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>-75.64</td>
<td>0.2652</td>
<td>0.947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The graphs generated from the Table 4.7 using Temkin isotherm model are as follow:

Figure 4.16 shows the fitting of Sample A (Upstream) adsorption data to Temkin Isotherm. The data generally fitted very well to this model from the coefficient of regression ($r^2$) values to the linearity of the curves. The figure shows a fixed mass of sediment Sample A against varied Conc. and time.

Figure 4. 16: Temkin Isotherm Model for Sample A.

Figure 4.17 shows the fitting of Sample B (Midstream) adsorption data to Temkin Isotherm. As in Figure 4.16, the data fitted well to this model. The curves are well linearized except curves for 15 and 30 minutes of shaking time which could be due to lesser time of shaking.
Figure 4.17: Temkin Isotherm Model for Sample B.

Figure 4.18 also shows the fitting of sediment Sample C (Downstream) adsorption data to Temkin Isotherm. The data gives better coefficient of regression ($r^2$) in Table 4.7.

Figure 4.18: Temkin Isotherm Model for Sample C.

The plots of $q_e$ versus $\ln C_e$ from linear expression shown in Equation 4.9 are given in Figures 4.16, 4.17 and 4.18. Samples A and C tend to fit well at different shaking times (15 minutes, 30
minutes, 45 minutes, and 60 minutes) whereas sample B fitted well only at 45 minutes and 60 minutes (Figure 4.16); while 15 and 30 minutes of shaking resulted into disproportionate plots.

**4.4.5 Dubinin-Radushkevich (D-R) Isotherm Model**

The model was used to show the apparent adsorption energy heterogeneity at sites of adsorption (Equations 2.21 and 2.22). Table 4.8 gives the summarized parameters of D-R data and its graphs in Figures 4.19, 4.20 and 4.21.

**Table 4.8: Dubinin-Radushkevich Isotherm Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (minute)</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Ln qD</th>
<th>B_D</th>
<th>qD</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>E (KJ/mol)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.854</td>
<td>-0.000002</td>
<td>47.1814</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>-353,553.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.844</td>
<td>-0.000002</td>
<td>46.7120</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>-353,553.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.421</td>
<td>-0.000006</td>
<td>83.1794</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>-117,851.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.795</td>
<td>-0.000001</td>
<td>44.4782</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>-707,106.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.839</td>
<td>-0.000002</td>
<td>46.4790</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>-353,553.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.203</td>
<td>-0.000005</td>
<td>66.8867</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>-141,421.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.841</td>
<td>-0.000002</td>
<td>46.5720</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>-353,553.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.995</td>
<td>-0.000002</td>
<td>54.3258</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>-353,553.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5.139</td>
<td>-0.000010</td>
<td>170.5451</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>-70,710.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.952</td>
<td>-0.000002</td>
<td>52.0393</td>
<td>0.9260</td>
<td>-353,553.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.888</td>
<td>-0.000002</td>
<td>48.8132</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>-353,553.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.754</td>
<td>-0.000010</td>
<td>116.0475</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>-70,710.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.19 shows the fitting of sediment Sample A (upstream) adsorption to Dubinin-Radushvich Isotherm. The data fitted well to this model. The linear curves and the coefficient of
determination (r²) values, i.e., 0.918, 0.938, and 0.864 were generated from the plot fixed mass against varied Conc. and time.

Figure 4.19: D-R Isotherm Model for Sample A.

Figure 4.20 shows plot of Sample B (midstream) adsorption data to Dubinin-Radushkevich Isotherm. As in Figure 4.19, the data fitted well to this model. The graph faces downward showing amount of L-Cyhalothrin remaining in solution after adsorption.

Figure 4.20: D-R Isotherm Model for B.
Figure 4.21 shows the fitting of sediment Sample C (downstream) adsorption data to Dubinin-Radushkevich Isotherm. The data fitted well to this model though the curves tend to disperse wider as the Conc. of L-Cyhalothrin in solution reduces with increasing free energy.

![Dubinin-Radushvich Isotherm C](image)

**Figure 4.21: D-R Isotherm Model for Sample C.**

From Table 4.8, the free energy (E) was calculated from the value of BD using the formula: 
\[
\ln q_e = \ln q_D - B_D E^2.
\]
For example, in 5 minutes of shaking time, \(\ln q_e = 3.844 - 0.000002 E^2\), \(r^2 = 0.938\). \(\ln q_D = 3.844\), \(B_D = 0.000002\) \(q_D = e^{3.844}\).

Generally, when the adsorption energy value falls below 8 KJ/kmol, the adsorption process is said to be characterized by physiosorption, implying physical binding of the pesticide to the surface of the soil/sediment. If the value is higher than 8 KJ/mol but less than 20 KJ/mol, it is said to be characterized by ion exchange and similarly, values beginning from 20 KJ/kmol and above are said to be characterized by particle diffusion. From Table 4.8 E (KJ/mol) values were lesser than 8kj/kmol, which implied that the adsorption process of Lamda-Cyhalothrin was
predominantly a physisorption process. From Figure 4.8 to Figure 4.20, the data fitted well Dubinin-Radushkevich isotherm at the various shaking times for samples A and B whereas sample C has some deviations, yet the coefficient of determination ($r^2$) ranges from 0.857 to 0.98.

4.4.6 Scatchard Plot Analysis

This analysis provides clear understanding on the affinity of the pesticide to binding sites and to analyze its adsorption result using the following equation:

$$\frac{q_e}{C_e} = Qb - q_e b \ldots \ldots \ldots$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.2)

From Equation (4.12), Q and b become scatchard plot constants when $q_e/C_e$ is plotted against $q_e$ to give a straight line. This means there is one binding site available for adsorption (Homogeneous surface); but when the plots fail to give a straight line then there are more binding sites available for adsorption.

Table 4. 9: Scatchard Analysis Data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (minute)</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>bQ₀</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Q₀</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.696</td>
<td>0.01280</td>
<td>445.0000</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.787</td>
<td>0.03036</td>
<td>157.6745</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.944</td>
<td>0.1096</td>
<td>17.7372</td>
<td>0.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.526</td>
<td>0.00635</td>
<td>917.4863</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.280</td>
<td>0.1029</td>
<td>31.8756</td>
<td>0.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.006</td>
<td>0.08668</td>
<td>23.1423</td>
<td>0.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.405</td>
<td>0.01197</td>
<td>451.5455</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.641</td>
<td>0.0534</td>
<td>86.91012</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>0.1301</td>
<td>9.3390</td>
<td>0.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.751</td>
<td>0.03880</td>
<td>122.4485</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.898</td>
<td>0.0525</td>
<td>97.4726</td>
<td>0.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.178</td>
<td>0.1093</td>
<td>10.7777</td>
<td>0.905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the regression values obtained, only Sample C (Downstream) shows consistence for high adsorption to lambda-Cyhalothrin (0.801, 0.836, 0.889 and 0.905) as seen in Table 4.9.

Figure 4.22 shows the fitting of sediment Sample A (Upstream) adsorption data to Scatchard plot. The data poorly fitted to this plot, the coefficient of determination values ($r^2$), i.e., 0.006, 0.003, 0.006, and 0.081 are also consistent with these results. The curves are almost parallel in the plain as the ratios of adsorption/desorption are plotted against adsorption as varied Conc. and time in a fixed mass.

**Figure 4.22: Scatchplot for Sample A.**

Figure 4.23 shows the fitting of sediment Sample B (Midstream) adsorption data to Scatchard plot. The data as in Figure 4.22 poorly fitted to this plot. The coefficient of determination values ($r^2$), i.e., 0.967, 0.056, 0.196, and 0.366 are similar.
Figure 4.23: Scatchard Plot for Sample B.

Figure 4.24 shows the fitting of sediment Sample C (Downstream) adsorption data to Scatchard plot. The data fitted well to this plot, the coefficient of determination values ($r^2$), i.e., 0.801, 0.836, 0.889, and 0.905.

Figure 4.24: Scatchard Plot for Sample C.
4.5 Degradation Studies

The degradation of pesticides depends on physical, chemical, and biological factors. These include the soil profiles, its organic matter content, the microbial activity in the soil and the acidity of the soil and chemical properties of the pesticides. Chemical factors that influence degradation include hydrolysis, adsorption and desorption.

From the Athi River and Kwale soil profiles (Table 4.2), the soils generally had similar properties. The key ones included medium acidic, low organic matter contents and metallic elements ranging to high. In the overall process, Lambda-Cyhalothrin degraded uniformly in both soils, but the values of degradation were higher in Kwale soil than Athi River soil as seen in Table 4.12. This increased value could be attributed to soil parameters aforementioned.

Table 4.10: Degradation Data for Athi River and Kwale Soils (µg/mL).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLES</th>
<th>WK₁ (µg/mL)</th>
<th>WK₂ (µg/mL)</th>
<th>WK₃ (µg/mL)</th>
<th>WK₄ (µg/mL)</th>
<th>WK₅ (µg/mL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athi River Soil</td>
<td>4.40 ±0.42</td>
<td>3.60 ±0.49</td>
<td>3.30 ±0.43</td>
<td>3.00 ±0.22</td>
<td>2.30 ±0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwale Soil</td>
<td>8.40 ±0.25</td>
<td>7.20 ±1.11</td>
<td>6.50 ±0.65</td>
<td>6.10 ±0.75</td>
<td>4.50 ±0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A plot of the amount of L-Cyhalothrin degraded against the number of week gave a non-linear relationship line. This indicates that degradation of the pesticide (Lambda-Cyhalothrin) continued to reduce from week one to the week five.

Figure 4.25 shows the comparative degradation of Lambda Cyhalothrin in Athi River soil and Kwale soil. The trend indicated in the graph shows pattern of degradation in both soils from week one to week five during the experiment, though kwale soil degraded greater amount of L-Cyhalothrin than Athi River soil.
Figure 4.25: Degradation of L-Cyhalothrin in Athi River and Kwale Soils.

As shown in Figure 4.25, Figure 4.26 is the linearized curve following complete parallel pattern of degradation of L-Cyhalothrin in Athi River soil and Kwale soil.

Figure 4.26: Rate Degradation of L-Cyhalothrin in Athi River and Kwale Soils.
From Figures 4.25 and 4.26, L-Cyhalothrin degraded uniformly in both soil samples, from high to low but at different rates and concentrations. Degradation of Lambda-Cyhalothrin in soils increased with time and was also affected by the soil properties mentioned earlier.
CHAPTER FIVE

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

1. Adsorption of Lambda-Cyhalothrin decreases with increase in mass of sediment. The longer the contact time the higher the adsorption.

2. Increase in concentration results in decreased percentage (%) adsorption. This is because at high initial concentration the number of moles of Lambda-Cyhalothrin available to the surface area high, so functional adsorption becomes dependent on initial concentration.

3. Adsorption of lambda cyhalothrin followed Freundlich-peterson isotherm model with regression values ranging from 0.954 to 0.992. As shaking time increased from 15 minutes to 60 minutes, the value of n increased from 0.1998 to 0.2914.

4. The value of G was 11.7946 ± 0.3Kjol/mol which indicates that adsorption of Lambda-Cyhalothrin by Athi River sediments is spontaneous.

5.2 Recommendation

5.2.1 Recommendation from this Study

Based on the above findings, results and overall discussions of this research project, it is recommended that:

1. The government and agricultural experts should promote use of biological methods of crop pest and diseases control methods to reduce environmental contamination/burden.

2. Environmentalists and scientists should come up with more efficient and effective ways of disposing pesticide residues and residual packaging materials.

3. KEPHIS, KARLO and Pesticide board should come up with Kenyan database containing
pesticide residues in particular area with their mode of safe disposal.

5.2.2 Recommendations for Further Work

Further research work is highly recommended to:

1. Determine the mechanism of pesticide residues degradation in the environment.

2. Determine the amount of lambda cyhalothrin reaching the target area of application to develop more efficient methods of application of pesticides.

3. Further work on adsorption behavior of these residues with respect to change in temperature should be done. This is because of the different weather conditions under which different farmers use these residues.

4. A database should be put in place on how farmers are using different classes of pesticide residues, how they dispose them and more so how they dispose the containers housing these residues.
REFERENCE


