

JOSTMED 16 (1), MARCH, 2020

ISSN: 0748 – 4710



**JOURNAL OF  
SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY,  
MATHEMATICS AND EDUCATION  
(JOSTMED)**

website: [www.futminna.edu.ng](http://www.futminna.edu.ng)


E-mail: [jostmedscience@yahoo.com](mailto:jostmedscience@yahoo.com), [jostmed@futminna.edu.ng](mailto:jostmed@futminna.edu.ng)

Phone: +234-816-680-7534



**PUBLISHED BY:**  
**DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE EDUCATION**  
**FEDERAL UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, MINNA,**  
**NIGERIA, AFRICA**

**JOURNAL OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY,  
MATHEMATICS AND EDUCATION  
(JOSTMED)**



**ISSN: 0748 – 4710**

**VOLUME 16 (1), MARCH, 2020**

## WELCOME TO JOSTMED

Welcome to the Journal of Science, Technology, Mathematics and Education (JOSTMED). The JOSTMED is a scholarly based journal published four times in a year by the Department of Science Education, School of Science and Science Education, Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria, since September 1998. The scope of the Journal includes the research, development, and practice in all areas of Science, Technology, Mathematics and Education.

### INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS

#### 1. General Guidelines

(i) **Types of Manuscripts:** The Editorial Board of the Journal of Science, Technology, Mathematics and Education accepts only scholarly and original articles that meet its aim and scope. Contributions must be original therefore, authors is/are to guarantee that their article is original and not currently being considered for publication elsewhere.

(ii) **Language:** The JOSTMED is published in English Language.

(iii) **Length:** Usually full-length article, survey or report should be between 3,000 - 5,000 words (12 – 15 pages).

(iv) **Abstract and Keywords:** Each article should be summarized in about 150 -200 words, serving as a brief description of the content of the article. In addition, following the abstract, supply 4 - 5 keywords/phrases that characterize the content of the paper and which can be used for indexing purposes.

(v) **Manuscript:** Manuscripts, including the abstract and references, should be typed double-spaced on A4 paper set-up using Times New Roman, 12 font size.

(vi) **Review:** Each submission will be subjected to blind peer-review by at least two experts in the fields of the articles. Before the publication of accepted article, corresponding authors will receive a PDF version of their manuscript for final proofing. It should, however, be emphasized that changes in content (new or additional results, corrected values, changes in article title, etc) are not permitted without the approval of the Managing Editor.

#### 2. Copyright

Only original papers will be accepted and processed. Paper accepted will be subjected to viper anti-plagiarize detector software. In addition, no compensation will be given in respect of published papers. However, authors reserve the right to use their own materials for purely educational and research purposes.

#### 3. Format of Submitted Manuscripts

All manuscripts, written in good English, should be submitted electronically as an e-mail attachment (in Microsoft Word format not scanned copy) to the journal e-mail: [jostmed@futminna.edu.ng](mailto:jostmed@futminna.edu.ng), [jostmedscience@yahoo.com](mailto:jostmedscience@yahoo.com) or managing editor's e-mail: [gambarii@yahoo.com](mailto:gambarii@yahoo.com), [gambari@futminna.edu.ng](mailto:gambari@futminna.edu.ng).

When submitting manuscript in a paper version three copies should be submitted in double line spacing with wide margins, and not more than 12 pages with illustrations inserted. Extra page will attract additional amount of N1,000.00/\$7.00 per page. Each article submitted must be accompanied with an assessment fee of three thousand naira (N3,000) only in cash or bank draft in favour of the Managing Editor (JOSTMED). Submission of manuscript is accepted throughout the year.

The beginning of the manuscript must bear the title of the paper and the full names of authors and their affiliations for correspondence (including e-mail and telephone number). Where there are two or more authors include the addresses for correspondence (e-mail and postal addresses) for the contact author.

Once the article is accepted for publication, the final version should be submitted online. Where that is not possible, the manuscript must be provided, accompanied by a Recordable CD of the same version labelled with: author name(s); titles of article and file name. The author must ensure that the final submission is complete, grammatically correct and without spelling or typographical errors. In preparing the disk, please use Microsoft Word. The sum of Fifteen Thousand (N15,000) naira only (£50.00 or \$100 US Dollar) should be paid to journal account. The online version of the published articles are available at [www.futminna.edu.ng](http://www.futminna.edu.ng) and can be accessed through the Internet free of charge.

#### 4. Organization

The background and purpose of the manuscript should be given first, followed by details of methods, materials, procedures and equipment used (where applicable). Findings, discussion, conclusions and recommendations should follow in that order. Appendices are not encouraged but may be countenanced if considered necessary for the manuscript content to be understood. Specifically, author is/are advised to consult the current APA Manual for the details they may need.

#### 5. Figures and Tables

Figures, charts and diagrams should be kept to a minimum, they must be numbered consecutively with roman numerals and a brief title. When submitting electronically, figures should be prepared separately, numbered consecutively and submitted in one of JPEG File interchange (jpg), CompuServe GIF (gif), and PC Paintbrush (pcx). Images should not exceed width of 450 pixels.

#### 6. References

The author should ensure that the references given are complete. References to personal letters, papers presented at meetings and other unpublished material may be included. Where such materials may help in the evaluation of the paper, copies should be made available to the Managing - Editor. Papers that are part of a series should include a citation of the previous papers, and explanatory materials may be appended to the manuscript to avoid footnotes. Citation of an author's work in the text should follow the author / date method of citation; the surname of the author (s) and year of publication should appear in text. Generally, the format for citations in the Manuscript for references is that of the latest edition of the American Psychological Association (APA) format. At the end of the article, a reference list in alphabetical order must be given.

#### 7. Disclaimer

The views and styles expressed in the articles in this publication are those of the individual authors and are not necessarily shared by the reviewers, the editors, the editorial consulting board, the Department of Science Education, or the Federal University of Technology, Minna.

**Prof. Gambari, A. I.**

The Managing Editor, (JOSTMED),

Department of Educational Technology, Federal University of Technology,

PMB. 65, Minna, Nigeria

**E-mail:** [gambarii@yahoo.com](mailto:gambarii@yahoo.com); [gambari@futminna.edu.ng](mailto:gambari@futminna.edu.ng)

**Website:** [www.gambariamosaisiaka.com.ng](http://www.gambariamosaisiaka.com.ng)

**Mobile Phone:** +234-816-680-7534; +234-803-689-7955

## EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief	-	Prof. (Mrs.) V. I. Ezenwa
Managing Editor	-	Prof. A. I. Gambari
Assistant Managing Editor	-	Dr. A. A. Yaki
Senior Associate Editor	-	Dr. O. C. Falode
Associate Editor	-	Dr. T. O. Alabi
Account Editor	-	Dr. (Mrs.) R. G. Wodu
Associate Editor	-	Mr. U. S. B. Idris

## EDITORIAL ADVISERS

NAME	SPECIALIZATION	ADDRESS
Prof. Afolabi Ayo Samuel	Civil & Chemical Engineering,	University of South Africa
Prof. M. O. Yusuf	Educational Technology	University of Ilorin
Prof. (Mrs.) R. Uyanga	Science Education	University of Uyo
Prof. P. A. O. Okebukola	Biology	L. A. S. U., Lagos
Prof. I. O. Inekwe	Mathematics Education	Michael Opara University of Agriculture, Umudike
Prof. Sanjay Mistra	Computer Cyber Security,	Covenant University, Canaanland, Ota
Prof. C. Ugodulunwa	Test and Measurement	UniJos
Prof. (Mrs.) U.N.V. Agwagah	Science Education	University of Nigeria Nsukka

## SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Nigeria Rate (Personal)	N1,000.00
Rate (Institutions)	N2,000.00
Other Countries Rate (Personal)	\$25.00 / £15.00
Rate (Institutions)	\$35.00 / £22.00

All Cheques should be made payable to:

**The Managing Editor**, JOSTMED, Department of Educational Technology,  
Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria.

Subscription must be pre-paid and must include 10% handling charges

## Contact

**Phone No:** +234-816-680-7534, +234-803-689-7955, +234-706-707-4366, +234-806-962-6979

**E-mail:** [jostmed@futminna.edu.ng](mailto:jostmed@futminna.edu.ng), [jostmedscience@yahoo.com](mailto:jostmedscience@yahoo.com)

**Website:** [jostmed.futminna.edu.ng](http://jostmed.futminna.edu.ng)

## Copyright ©

**Journal of Science, Technology, Mathematics and Education**

All Rights Reserved

**ISSN 0748-4710**

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THE ISSUE

- BUGGU, L. T.<sup>1</sup>, ABENU, A.<sup>2</sup>, YUSUFU, F.A.<sup>3</sup>, YAHAYA, T.I.<sup>4</sup>, & AUDU, E.B.<sup>5</sup>**  
<sup>1</sup>Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation, Abuja  
<sup>2</sup>Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering,  
Air Force Institute of Technology, Kaduna, Nigeria  
<sup>3</sup>Department of Geography, College of Education, Akwanga, Nasarawa State, Nigeria  
<sup>4</sup>Department of Geography, Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria  
<sup>5</sup>Government Secondary School, Abuja@30, Peki, Federal Capital Territory, Nigeria  
**Email:** [ltbuggu@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:ltbuggu@yahoo.co.uk)  
**Phone No:** +234-803-308-4433
- AUDU, E. B.<sup>1</sup>, USMAN, M. T.<sup>2</sup>, JIMOH, A. S.<sup>3</sup>, MUHAMMED, A. Y.<sup>4</sup>,  
& YAHAYA, T.I.<sup>2</sup>**  
<sup>1</sup>Government Secondary School, Abuja@30, Peki, Federal Capital Territory, Nigeria  
<sup>2</sup>Department of Geography, Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria  
<sup>3</sup>Universal Basic Education Board, Area 2, Garki, Abuja Federal Capital Territory,  
Nigeria  
<sup>4</sup>Government Science Secondary School, Abaji, Federal Capital Territory, Nigeria  
**Email:** [audu\\_ebamaiyi@yahoo.com](mailto:audu_ebamaiyi@yahoo.com)  
**Phone No:** +234-803-585-6619.
- <sup>1</sup>SALAMI, K.O., \*<sup>2</sup>BADMOS, A. A., <sup>2</sup>LAWAL, M. O., <sup>1</sup>KAYODE, R. M. O.,  
<sup>1</sup>BALOGUN, M. A., & <sup>3</sup>LAWAL A. O.**  
<sup>1</sup>Department of Home Economics and Food Science,  
University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.  
<sup>2</sup>Department of Animal Production, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.  
<sup>3</sup>ITAD Ltd, Hove, U.K.  
**Email:** [badmos111@yahoo.com](mailto:badmos111@yahoo.com)
- YUSUF TANKO USMAN**  
Department of Pre-ND Sciences, Niger State College of Agriculture, Mokwa, Nigeria  
**E-mail:** [tklokogoma@gmail.com](mailto:tklokogoma@gmail.com)  
**Phone No:** +234-806-872-4999
- AREKEMASE, M. O., \*<sup>1</sup> OYEDIJI, K.E., <sup>1</sup> OYEKAN, T. O., <sup>1</sup> AJAYI, C. F., <sup>1</sup>  
TIAMIYU, A. O., & <sup>1</sup> THAABIT, A. L**  
<sup>1</sup>Department of Microbiology, University of Ilorin  
**Email:** [arekemase.om@gmail.com](mailto:arekemase.om@gmail.com)  
**Phone No:** +234-706-324-1403
- <sup>1</sup>IDOWU, F. C., <sup>1</sup>IJAH, U. J. J., <sup>1</sup>BALA, J. D. & <sup>2</sup>TSADO, P. A.**  
<sup>1</sup>Department of Microbiology, School of Life Sciences,  
Federal University of Technology, Minna, Niger State, Nigeria  
<sup>2</sup>Department of Soil Science,  
School of Agriculture and Agricultural Technology,  
Federal University of Technology, Minna, Niger State, Nigeria.  
**E-mail:** [arabambicaroline@gmail.com](mailto:arabambicaroline@gmail.com)  
**Phone No:** +234-703-706-3073

- 7. G. G. BAKE<sup>A</sup>, M. H. ALIYU<sup>B</sup>, A. KPOTUN<sup>A</sup>, M. B. BABA<sup>A</sup>, A. ADAM<sup>C</sup> & Y. JAAFAR<sup>A</sup>**  
<sup>A</sup>Water Resources, Aquaculture and Fisheries Technology Department,  
Federal University of Technology Minna, Nigeria  
<sup>B</sup>Department of Agricultural Science Education,  
Niger State College of Education, Minna, Niger State, Nigeria  
<sup>C</sup>Department of Aquaculture and Fisheries,  
University of Ilorin, Kwara state, Nigeria  
**E-mail:** [gabbygana@futminna.edu.ng](mailto:gabbygana@futminna.edu.ng)  
**Phone No:** +234-80-6285-0992
- 8. SANI, Y.M.<sup>1</sup>, ETUK, S.O.<sup>2</sup>, ADAMU, M<sup>3</sup>, & ADEOSUN, V.O.<sup>4</sup>**  
<sup>1,2,4</sup> Department of Information and Media Technology,  
<sup>3</sup>Department of Computer science,  
Federal University of Technology, Minna, Niger State, Nigeria  
**E-mail:** [yahayasani@futminna.edu.ng](mailto:yahayasani@futminna.edu.ng)<sup>1</sup>, [abiolastella@futminna.edu.ng](mailto:abiolastella@futminna.edu.ng)<sup>2</sup>  
[bejian2004@yahoo.com](mailto:bejian2004@yahoo.com)<sup>3</sup> [vicsunited@gmail.com](mailto:vicsunited@gmail.com)<sup>4</sup>  
**Phone no:** +234-806-591-8550, +234-703-567-4352, +234-807-977-5565
- 9. MA'ALI, A. I.<sup>1</sup>, MOHAMMED, U.<sup>2</sup>, AUDU, K. J.<sup>3</sup>, YUSUF, A.<sup>4</sup>, & ABUBAKAR, A. D<sup>5</sup>.**  
<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics, Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University Lapai, Nigeria  
<sup>2,3,4</sup>Department of Mathematics, Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria  
<sup>5</sup>Department of Mathematics, Federal University Gashua, Yobe State, Nigeria  
**E-mail:** [aaimaali@yahoo.com](mailto:aaimaali@yahoo.com); [umaru.mohd@futminna.edu.ng](mailto:umaru.mohd@futminna.edu.ng)  
**Phone No:** +234-703-215-9609, +234-810-411-6780
- 10. OLADEJI, S. O., JIYA, M., & OLAYIWOLA, R. O.**  
Department of Mathematics, Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria  
**E-mail:** [olatundesolomon486@gmail.com](mailto:olatundesolomon486@gmail.com) & [olayiwola.rasaq@futminna.edu.ng](mailto:olayiwola.rasaq@futminna.edu.ng)  
**Phone No:** +234-806-774-3443
- 11. NKWOCHA, NGOZI CELESTINA<sup>1</sup>, PROF. V.I. EZENWA<sup>1</sup>, PROF. D. I. WUSHISHI<sup>1</sup>, & DR. M. M. NDAMITSO<sup>2</sup>**  
<sup>1</sup>Science Education Department,  
<sup>2</sup>Chemistry Department,  
Federal University of Technology Minna, Nigeria  
**Email:** [celestinachilotam@gmail.com](mailto:celestinachilotam@gmail.com)  
**Phone No:** +234-803-583-9992
- 12. SALAKO, E. ADEKUNLE**  
Department of Computer Science,  
FCT College of Education, Zuba, Nigeria  
**Email:** [kunlesky2@gmail.com](mailto:kunlesky2@gmail.com),  
**Phone No:** +234-803-657-2801
- 13. THADDEUS, H., ALABI, T.O. PhD, FALODE, O.C. PhD., & ANIAH, A, PhD**  
Department of Educational Technology,  
Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria  
**E-mail:** [hellenthaddeus@gmail.com](mailto:hellenthaddeus@gmail.com)  
**Phone No:** +234-803-518-2108

14. **HARUNA, B., & BALA, B., PhD**  
Department of Mathematics, School of Science,  
Niger State College of Education, Minna, Niger State.  
**Email:**[alajji4real@gmail.com](mailto:alajji4real@gmail.com)  
**Phone No:** +234-816-458-6330, +234-806-612-2405
15. **AMADI, MATHEW MARIANA, BASHIR, A. U. PhD., & MRS. R. W. GIMBA**  
PhD. Department of Science Education,  
School of Science and Technology Education,  
Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria  
**E-mail:**[amadimariana@gmail.com](mailto:amadimariana@gmail.com)  
**Phone No:** +234-806-214-2586
16. **<sup>1</sup>MUHAMMED, HADIZA. A., PhD, <sup>2</sup>NSOFOR, C. C., PhD; <sup>3</sup>FALODE, O. C. (PhD) & <sup>1</sup>USMAN, HUSSAINI**  
<sup>1</sup>Department of Educational Technology, College of Education, Minna,  
<sup>2</sup>Department of Educational Technology,  
Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria  
**Email:**[babankhadija73@gmail.com](mailto:babankhadija73@gmail.com)  
**Phone No:** +234-703-713-2138
17. **JAMILU, U., CHADO, A., PhD. & PROF. SHITTU, K. O.**  
Science Education Department,  
Federal University of Technology Minna, Nigeria  
**Email:**[jamilusman262@gmail.com](mailto:jamilusman262@gmail.com).  
**Phone No:** +234-805-527-3202
18. **OGALA, THEOPHILUS., C. S. GANA, PhD, & BASHIR, A. U., PhD**  
Department of Science Education,  
Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria  
**E-mail:**[ogalat@yahoo.com](mailto:ogalat@yahoo.com)  
**Phone No:** +234-803-690-5104
19. **<sup>1</sup>IGWE CHRISTOPHER OBETA, PhD, <sup>1</sup>OGUNSHOLA, FEMI, PhD,**  
**<sup>2</sup>ABUSOMWAN, SUNDAY BELLO, & <sup>3</sup>ALAEZI, JOHN OKWE**  
<sup>1</sup>Department of Industrial and Technology Education,  
Federal University of Technology Minna, Niger State, Nigeria  
<sup>2</sup>Vocational and Technical Education Department,  
University of Benin, Edo State, Nigeria  
<sup>3</sup>Department of Building, Baze University, Abuja  
**E-mail:**[christoigwe@gmail.com](mailto:christoigwe@gmail.com)  
**Phone No:** +234-803-404-0840
20. **<sup>1</sup>ABDU YUNUSA, & <sup>2</sup>YAKUBU, A.**  
<sup>1</sup>Department of Physics, Bayero University, Kano. Nigeria  
<sup>2</sup>Kano State Secondary Schools Management Board, Kano. Nigeria.  
**Email:** [yunusa\\_abdu@yahoo.com](mailto:yunusa_abdu@yahoo.com), [ayunusa.phy@buk.edu.ng](mailto:ayunusa.phy@buk.edu.ng)  
**Phone No:** +234-806-119-2954, +234-802-917-4511



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Appraisal of the Suitability of River Rido for Irrigation in Kaduna State, Nigeria. **Buggu, L. T., Abenu, A., Yusufu, F. A., Yahaya, T. I. & Audu, E. B.....1**
2. Trend of Rainfall Cycle and Its Implication for Agricultural and Hydrological Planning in the Guinea Ecological Zone, Nigeria. **Audu, E. B., Usman, M. T., Jimoh., A. S., Muhammed, A. Y. & Yahaya, T. I. ....12**
3. The Effect of Cinnamon Powder on the Shelf Life and Quality Attributes of Zobo Drinks. **Salami, K. O., Badmos, A. A., Lawal, M. O., Kayode, R. M. O., Balogun, M. A., & Lawal A. O.....24**
4. Subterranean Exploration Using Integrated Geophysical Techniques to Discover an Acceptable Place for Siting Viable Groundwater Well at Takowangwa Area, Niger State, Nigeria. **Yusuf Tanko Usman ..... 31**
5. Assessment of Ginger and Garlic in the Improvement of the Shelf-Life and Sensory Quality of Nunu (Fermented Milk). **Arekemase, M. O., Oyediji, K. E., Oyekan, T. O., Ajayi, C. F., Tiamiyu, A. O., & Thaabit, A. L .....45**
6. Screening of Organic Wastes and Microorganisms for Bioremediation of Spent Lubricating Oil Polluted Soil. **Idowu, F. C., Ijah, U. J. J., Bala, J. D., & Tsado, P. A.....59**
7. Relationship between Basic Morphometric Measurement, Growth Pattern and Proximate Composition of Silver Catfish (*Bagrus Filamentosus*) From Agaie-Lapai Dam. **G. G. Bake, M. H. Aliyu, A. Kpotun, M. B. Baba, A. Adam & Y. Jaafar ...75**
8. A Web-Based Location Identification Directory for Small and Medium Business Enterprises. **Sani, Y. M., Etuk, S. O., Adamu, M. & Adeosun, V. O. ....89**
9. Extended Block Hybrid Backward Differentiation Formula for Second Order Fuzzy Differential Equations Using Legendre Polynomial as Basis Function. **Ma'ali, A. I., Mohammed, U., Audu, K. J., Yusuf, A. & Abubakar, A. D. ....100**
10. Modeling and Analytical Simulation of Transient Free Convection Magnetohydrodynamics Flow between Two Heated Vertical Plates. **Oladeji, S. O., M. Jiya, & Olayiwola, R. O. ....112**
11. Effects of Context-Based and Problem-Solving Strategies on Achievement and Gender in Chemistry among Secondary School Students in North-Central, Nigeria. **Nkwocha, Ngozi Celestina., Prof. V. I. Ezenwa, Prof. D. I. Wushishi, & Dr. M. M. Ndamitso..... 121**
12. Effectiveness of Webquest-Based Learning Approach on Junior Secondary School Students' Performance in Computer Science. **Salako, E. Adekunle .....131**
13. Effects of Gamification Online Learning Platform on Students' Motivation and Achievement in Educational Technology among Universities in Nigeria. **Thaddeus, H., Alabi, T. O. PhD, Falode, O. C. PhD. & Aniah, A, PhD. .... 143**

14. Effects of Mathematics Laboratory on Senior Secondary School Students' Achievement in Mathematics in Minna Metropolis, Niger State. **Haruna, B., & Bala, B. PhD.....153**
15. Awareness, Perceived Usefulness and Utilization of Task-Based Teaching Strategy among Secondary School Mathematics Teachers in Minna Educational Zone, Niger State. **Amadi, Mathew Mariana; Bashir, A. U. PhD. & R. W. Gimba PhD..... 161**
16. Effects of Computer Simulation Instructional Package on Pupils' Interest in Physical Education in Niger State, Nigeria. **Muhammed, Hadiza. A. PhD., Nsofor C. C., PhD., Falode, O. C. PhD, & Usman, Hussaini.....172**
17. Study Habit and Gender as Determinants of Chemistry Performance among Senior Secondary School Chemistry Students in Minna Metropolis, Niger State. **Jamilu, U., Chado, A., PhD, & Prof. Shittu, K. O ..... 183**
18. Perception and Satisfaction in Lesson Study among Secondary School Physics Students Based on Learning Pattern in Federal Capital Territory Abuja. **Ogala, Theophilus; C. S. Gana PhD., & Bashir, A. U. PhD. .... 192**
19. Techniques for Improving Quality Management and Safety Culture on Building Construction Sites in Abuja **Igwe Christopher Obeta, PhD., Ogunshola, Femi, Ph.D., Abusomwan, Sunday Bello, & Alaezi, John Okwe ..... 201**
20. Simulation of Electrical Parameters and Thickness Optimization of ALSB/GASB Tandem Solar Cell. **Abdu Yunusa & A. Yakubu.....208**

## SCREENING OF ORGANIC WASTES AND MICROORGANISMS FOR BIOREMEDIATION OF SPENT LUBRICATING OIL POLLUTED SOIL

<sup>1</sup>IDOWU, F. C., <sup>1</sup>IJAH, U. J. J., <sup>1</sup>BALA, J. D., & <sup>2</sup>TSADO, P. A.

<sup>1</sup>Department of Microbiology,  
School of Life Sciences,  
Federal University of Technology, Minna, Niger State, Nigeria.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Soil Science,  
School of Agriculture and Agricultural Technology,  
Federal University of Technology, Minna, Niger State, Nigeria.

**Email:** arabambicaroline@gmail.com

**Phone No:** +234-703-706-3073

### Abstract

Microbes were isolated from spent lubricating oil polluted soil and organic wastes; cow dung (CowD), corn cob (CorC), chicken droppings (ChiD), rice husk (RicH) and sorghum husk (SorH) and were identified as species of *Aspergillus*, *Penicillium*, *Mucor*, *Trichophyton*, and *Fusarium* (fungi) and *Pseudomonas*, *Bacillus*, *Salmonella*, *Staphylococcus* and *Escherichia* (bacteria). The organisms and the organic wastes were screened for ability to utilize spent lubricating oil as a source of carbon and energy. The isolates utilized the oil at varying rates. However, five isolates (22.8%) utilized the oil maximally while eight isolates (31.8%) utilized it moderately and nine isolates (40.9%) utilized the spent lubricating oil minimally. The potential of the organic wastes to remediate spent lubricating oil polluted soil was monitored for 12 weeks by measuring the pH, microbial counts and total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH). The pH of unremediated soil ranged from 6.14 - 6.31 while that of remediated soil ranged from 6.18 - 7.25, 6.22 - 6.42, 6.38 - 7.51, 6.20 - 6.56 and 6.22 - 6.45 respectively after 12 weeks. The results showed that reduction in pH of the treatments were higher compared to the control and there were no significant differences ( $P > 0.05$ ) in the pH of the five biostimulation treatments. Also there was an increase in microbial count of the treatments while there was reduction in that of the control. The percentage degradation of oil in spent lubricating oil polluted soil remediated with organic wastes; CowD, CorC, ChiD, RicH and SorH were 68.52%, 61.11%, 74.07%, 57.40% and 66.67% respectively while that of the control was 11.73%. This revealed that organic wastes had the potential to remediate spent lubricating oil polluted soil considerably.

**Keywords:** Bioremediation, Organic wastes, Microorganisms, Spent lubricating oil, Soil

### Introduction

The contamination of land and water by improper disposal of spent lubricating oil (SLO) is on the increase, leading to ecological imbalance and soil infertility. Spent lubricating oil can also be released into the environment via engine leaks, automobiles and application into rural roads for dust control (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, ATSDR, 1997; (Stephen, Obaka, & Ekeji, 2016). The presence of different types of automobile and machinery has also resulted in increase in the use of lubricating oil. Onuoha, Olugbe, Uraka, and Uchendu (2011) reported that oil spills from industries, fuel serving stations, activities in petroleum depots during loading, transportation and auto-mechanic workshops, all combine to contribute to soil contamination. Spent lubricating oil contains heavy metals and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) that could be mutagenic and carcinogenic in nature (Abioye, Agamathu, & AbdulAzez, 2012). No matter how small, pollution influences the natural microbial community and affects both physical and chemical properties of the polluted environment (Ijah & Antai, 2003; Idowu & Ijah, 2018).

Spent engine oil is the brown-to-black, oily liquid removed from the engine of a motor vehicle, it is typically referred to as used motor oil that has been collected from motor vehicle servicing workshops, garages, and industry sources such as hydraulics oil, turbine oils, process oil and metal working fluids (Hamawand, Yusaf, & Ibrahim, 2013). Used engine oil is similar to unused oil except that it contains additional chemicals that are produced or that build up in the oil when it is used as an engine lubricant (Aucelio, de Souza, de Campos, Miekeley, & Da Silva, 2007). Used engine oil has many of the characteristics of unused oil. It smells like unused oil and contains the chemicals found in unused oil. It contains a mixture of different chemicals including low to high molecular weight (C15-C21) compounds, lubricants, additives, decomposition products and heavy metals which have been found to be harmful to the soil and human health (Duffus, 2002). These include straight chain (aliphatic) hydrocarbons and aromatic or polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), which are distilled from crude oil, and various additives that improve the performance of the oil in the engine (Aucelio *et al.*, 2007; Hamawand *et al.*, 2013). Aliphatic hydrocarbons are molecules with carbon atoms in simple or branched chains while aromatic hydrocarbons are compounds with unsaturated carbons in six-membered rings and with properties similar to benzene. PAHs are complex organic compounds containing three or more aromatic rings (Aucelio *et al.*, 2007; Hamawand *et al.*, 2013).

In addition to the chemicals found in unused oil, used oil contains chemicals that are formed when the oil is exposed to the high temperature and pressure inside an engine as it runs. It also contains metals such as aluminum, chromium, copper, iron, lead, manganese, nickel, silicon, and tin that comes from engine parts as they wear down. Also, used oil contains small amounts of water, gasoline, antifreeze, and chemicals that come from gasoline when it burns inside the engine (Singhabhandhu & Tezuka, 2010; Udonne, 2011). The chemicals found in used oil vary depending on the brand(s) and type of engine oil used, whether gasoline or diesel fuel was used, the mechanical condition of the engine that the oil came from, the various sources of used oil (e.g., automobiles, airplanes, trains, ships, tractors, lawn mowers), and the number of miles driven between oil changes (Singhabhandhu & Tezuka, 2010; Udonne, 2011). Due to its chemical composition, worldwide dispersion and effects on the environment, used motor oil is considered a serious environmental problem (Aucelio *et al.*, 2007; Abioye *et al.*, 2012; Abdulyekeen *et al.*, 2016).

Most current motor oil lubricants contain petroleum base stocks, which are toxic to the environment and difficult to dispose after use (Marai, 2015). Over 40% of the pollution in America's waterways is from used motor oil (Fox, 2007). Used oil is considered the largest source of oil pollution in the United States of America. By far, the greatest cause of motor oil pollution in Nigeria comes from drains and urban street runoff, much of which is from improper disposal of engine oil (Aucelio *et al.*, 2007).

The problems of pollution have led to the search for many remedial methods to bring about the cleanup of the polluted soils. Bioremediation, which involves the use of microorganisms to remediate and detoxify polluted site, appears to be favoured. It is eco-friendly, cost-effective, and efficient for the abatement and decontamination of hydrocarbon pollution and many other pollutants, but might take more duration than the conventional technique because of its natural process (Adekunle 2011; Ijah *et al.*, 2013; Effenyi *et al.*, 2017). The process relies on microbial enzymatic activities to transform or degrade the contaminants from the environment (Philip & Atlas, 2005). Biostimulation involves the addition of substrates, vitamins, oxygen and other compounds that can stimulate microorganism activity and increase their population so that they can degrade petroleum hydrocarbon faster. Stimulation of microorganisms by the addition of nutrients brings large quantities of carbon sources which tend to result in a rapid depletion of the available pools of major inorganic nutrients such as nitrogen and Phosphorous

(Kumar *et al.*, 2011). When fertilizer (nutrient) is added to the oil polluted soil, the organisms can rapidly degrade the oil, utilizing it as the carbon source and the fertilizer as the nitrogen and phosphorous source (Onuoha, 2011). Combinations of inorganic nutrients often are more effective than single nutrients where a low level of macronutrients and a high level of micronutrients are required to stimulate the activities of indigenous microbes (Onuoha, 2011). Addition of nutrients also promotes the growth of heterotrophic microorganisms which are not innate degraders of total petroleum hydrocarbon thereby creating a competition between the resident micro flora (Adams *et al.*, 2014).

Biostimulation which involves the addition of organic and inorganic nitrogen rich nutrients is an effective approach to enhance the bioremediation process. Addition of oil-degrading microbial consortia to supplement the indigenous populations (bioaugmentation) is another strategy for the bioremediation of oil contaminated environments (Rahman *et al.*, 2002; Idowu & Ijah, 2017).

## Materials and methods

### Collection and Processing of Samples

Spent lubricating oil polluted soil (SLOPS) was collected from abandoned mechanic workshop located at Old Airport Road, Minna, Niger State, Nigeria. It was collected at a depth of 5cm (Stephen *et al.*, 2016) into clean polythene bags and transported to the laboratory for analyses. Spent lubricating oil (SLO) used for this research was collected in a sterile jerry can from mechanic workshop at Keteren Gwari mechanic village, Niger State, Nigeria. Organic wastes used in this study were; corn cobs (CorC), sorghum husk (SorH), rice husk (RicH), cow dung (CowD) and chicken droppings (ChiD). Corn cobs, rice husk and sorghum husk were collected into clean polythene bags from a farm in Wushishi, Niger State, Nigeria. Cow dung was collected into clean polythene bags from a private cow ranch at Barkin sale, Minna, Niger State, Nigeria while chicken droppings were collected into clean polythene bags from a poultry farm in Nykamgbe, Minna, Niger State, Nigeria and transported to the laboratory. The organic wastes were air dried outside the laboratory and ground into fine powder using grinding mill and stored until required.

### Determination of Physical and Chemical Properties of Organic Wastes

The pH of organic wastes was determined using pH meter (Testronic digital pH meter, Model 3505, Jenway, United Kingdom) (Obire, 2012; Olalemi & Arotupin, 2012). The moisture content was determined using the dry weight method (Li & Mira, 2010). Macro-Kjeldahl method described by Black (1965) & Agbenin (1995) was used to determine total nitrogen. The Bray No. 1 method of Bray and Kurtz (1945) was used for the determination of available phosphorus. Organic matter, Sodium and potassium were determined according to the method of IITA (1979) and Agbenin (1995). The method described by Obi *et al.*, 2016 was used for the determination of heavy metals.

### Microbiological Analysis of Organic Wastes

One gramme (1 g) each of the organic waste were added to 10 mL of sterile deionized water respectively and shaken properly to give the first ( $10^{-1}$ ) dilution. Tenfold serial dilution was made by adding 1 mL of the  $10^{-1}$  suspension to 9 mL of sterile deionized water to make the subsequent dilutions up to  $10^{-10}$  dilution. The serially diluted organic waste samples were inoculated on nutrient agar (NA), sabouraud dextrose agar (SDA) and oil agar (OA) for the enumeration of aerobic heterotrophic bacteria, fungi, spent lubricating oil utilizing bacteria (OA-B) and spent lubricating oil utilizing fungi (OA-F) respectively (Ijah & Antai, 2003; Idowu & Ijah, 2017). The NA plates were incubated at 30°C for 48 hours, the SDA plates were incubated at room temperature ( $28^{\circ}\text{C} \pm 2^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) for 5 days, while oil agar (OA; B) plates were incubated at

30°C for 5 days (for oil degrading bacteria) and oil agar (OA; F) plates at room temperature (28°C ± 2°C) for 5 days (for oil degrading fungi). Nystatin (0.6 g/L) was added to OA used for isolation of SLO utilizing bacteria to suppress the growth of fungi while chloramphenicol (0.6 g/L) was added to OA used for isolation of SLO utilizing fungi to suppress the growth of bacteria (Abioye *et al.*, 2010; Idowu & Ijah, 2017). After incubation, distinct colonies were counted with the aid of colony counter (Mac-Anderson Instruments, UK). The counts were expressed as colony forming units per gram (cfu/g) of sample. The isolates were obtained in pure cultures by repeated subculturing on media used for the primary isolation. The pure isolates were maintained on agar slants at 4°C for further characterization and identification. All experiments were carried out in duplicates.

## **Utilization of Spent Lubricating Oil by Microbial Isolates**

### **Bacterial Isolates**

Five millilitres (5 mL) of mineral salt medium was dispensed into bottles containing 0.05 mL of spent lubricating oil (Ijah *et al.*, 2013). The bottles were sterilized at 121°C for 15 minutes, the medium was allowed to cool and 0.1 mL of nutrient broth grown culture ( $1.2 \times 10^3$  spores) of spent lubricating oil degrading bacterial isolates were inoculated and incubated at room temperature (28 ± 2°C) for 14 days. The turbidity, which developed as a result of bacterial growth was monitored visually and spectrophotometrically at the end of the incubation period and assigned +, ++ to +++, and determined the optical density (OD) respectively depending on the degree of turbidity (Abioye *et al.*, 2012). All experiments were carried out in duplicates.

### **Fungal isolates**

The ability of the fungal isolates to grow on, and utilize spent lubricating oil, as a source of carbon and energy was determined using the dry weight method of Li and Mira (2010). This was done by inoculating 0.1 mL of fungal spores ( $1.2 \times 10^3$  spores) into 10 ml of Bushnell and Haas (1941) medium (BHM) and 1% (v/v) of spent lubricating oil contained in test tubes. Control experiments were set up in test tubes containing 10ml of BHM plus 1% (v/v) of spent lubricating oil, but without added fungi. The tubes were incubated at room temperature (28± 2°C) for 21 days under a stationary condition. At the end of the incubation period, the growth of the inocula was determined by removing the growth, which was then rinsed with diethylether to remove the residual oil. It was put in crucible that has been weighed and then weighed again to note the weight of the crucible and the organism before drying. It was dried in an oven at 150°C for 1hour after which the weight of the dried cells and the crucible was determined. The weight of the cells was obtained by subtracting the weight of the crucible from the weight of the crucible plus dried cells. The extent of degradation of the incorporated spent lubricating oil by the fungal isolates was determined by the gravimetric analysis method of Odu (1972), Ijah and Antai (2003) and Idowu and Ijah (2017).

## **Screening of Organic Wastes for Potential to Remediate Spent Lubricating Oil Polluted Soil**

Completely randomized block design (CRBD) was used in this study. The bioremediation study was conducted according to the method of Baldrian *et al.* (2000) and Idowu and Ijah (2017). Two kilograms (2 kg) of spent lubricating oil polluted soil moistened with distilled water was weighed into bowls labeled A-E. Zero point two kilogram (0.2 kg) each of the organic wastes cow dung (CowD), corn cob (CorC), chicken droppings (ChiD), rice husk (Rich) and sorghum husk (SorH) was mixed thoroughly with the polluted soil in the bowls and were exposed in the laboratory. Control experiment was set up in a bowl containing only spent lubricating oil polluted soil. All experiments were in duplicates and sampling was done every two weeks for a total duration of 12 weeks. pH, microbial counts and total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) were monitored.

### **Determination of pH of remediated soil**

The pH of soil samples was determined using pH meter (Testronic digital pH meter, Model 3505, Jenway, United Kingdom). Five grammes (5g) of the soil sample was suspended in 25ml of distilled water and mixed well. The pH meter was standardized at pH 7.0 and pH 4.0 using phosphate buffer solution after which the pH of the samples was determined in duplicates by inserting the electrode into the soil suspension and noting the reading on the screen (Obire, 2012; Olalemi & Arotupin, 2012).

### **Microbiological analysis of remediated soil**

Serially diluted soil samples were inoculated on Nutrient agar (NA), Sabouraud dextrose agar (SDA) and Oil agar (OA) for the enumeration of aerobic heterotrophic bacteria, fungi, SLO utilizing bacteria (OA-B) and SLO utilizing fungi (OA-F) respectively (Ijah & Antai, 2003; Idowu & Ijah, 2017). The NA plates were incubated at 30°C for 24 - 48 hours, SDA plates were incubated at room temperature (28°C ± 2°C) for 3-5 days, while oil agar (OA; B) plates were incubated at 30°C for 3-5 days (for oil degrading bacteria) & oil agar (OA; F) plates at room temperature (28°C ± 2°C) for 5-7 days (for oil degrading fungi). Nystatin (0.6 g/L) was added to OA used for isolation of SLO utilizing bacteria to suppress the growth of fungi while chloramphenicol (0.6 g/L) was added to OA used for isolation of SLO utilizing fungi to suppress the growth of bacteria (Abioye *et al.*, 2010; Idowu & Ijah, 2017). After incubation, district colonies were counted with the aid of colony counter (Mac-Anderson Instruments, UK). The counts were expressed as colony forming units per gram (cfu/g) of sample. The isolates were obtained in pure cultures by repeated subculturing on media used for the primary isolation. The pure isolates were maintained on agar slants at 4°C for further characterization and identification.

### **Characterization and Identification of Isolates**

#### **Bacterial isolates**

Bacterial isolates were characterized based on their cultural and morphological characteristics, Gram staining as well as biochemical tests such as, production of catalase, indole, oxidase, urease, citrate test and methyl red-Voges Proskauer test (Fawole & Oso, 1988). The identities of the isolates were known by comparing their characteristics with those of known taxa using Bergey's Manual of Determinative Bacteriology (George *et al.*, 2009).

#### **Fungal isolates**

Two drops of seventy per cent (70%) alcohol was placed on a clean microscope slide, cultures of filamentous fungi isolates were transferred into the drops of alcohol using sterilized inoculating needle, two drops of lactophenol cotton blue dye was added and covered with a coverslip. It was initially examined using a low power objective lens (x10) and then a higher power objective lens (x40) for more detailed examination of spores and other structures. Results obtained were characterized based on the colour of aerial and substrate mycelium, nature of hyphae, shape and kind of asexual spore, appearance and characteristics of spore head while the identification was carried out using the scheme of Domsch and Gams (1970) and Nagamani *et al.* (2006).

### **Determination of Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon (TPH) in remediated soil**

Total petroleum hydrocarbon content of the remediated soil was determined gravimetrically by diethyl ether cold extraction. Ten grammes (10 g) of soil sample were weighed into 250 mL capacity conical flask and 50 mL of diethyl ether was added, and shaken for 30 minutes in an orbital shaker. The optical density of the extract was measured at 420 nm wavelength using spectrophotometer. The TPH in soil was estimated with reference to the standard curve derived from fresh spent lubricating oil diluted with diethyl ether. TPH data was fitted to first- order kinetics model of (Yeung *et al.* 1997 & Abioye *et al.* 2010).

## Data Analysis

Data generated from this study were analyzed using the computer package SPSS (Version 20), (Pallant, 2005). One way analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to establish significant differences at  $p < 0.05$  in the treatments and oil biodegradation by formulated bioremediation agents.

## Results And Discussion

### Microbiological and physicochemical properties of organic wastes

The physical, chemical and microbial properties of organic wastes used for bioremediation studies were presented in Table 1. The pHs of organic wastes (CowD, ChiD, RicH, SorH and CorC) were 8.40, 9.30, 6.00, 6.80 and 5.80 respectively. The moisture content were 8.15%, 7.35%, 6.25%, 6.10% and 7.26% respectively, organic matter were 347.00 g/kg, 462.00 g/kg, 129.00 g/kg, 55.00 g/kg and 2.00 g/kg respectively, nitrogen were 11.48 g/kg, 10.92 g/kg, 9.66 g/kg, 12.04 g/kg and 9.80 g/kg respectively, phosphorus were 0.64 g/kg, 11.49 g/kg, 1.19 g/kg, 1.02 g/kg and 0.46 g/kg respectively, sodium were 2.72 g/kg, 4.54 g/kg, 0.57 g/kg, 0.43 g/kg and 0.33 g/kg respectively, potassium were 11.70 g/kg, 22.43 g/kg, 3.96 g/kg, 19.70 g/kg and 3.43 g/kg respectively, calcium were 18.40 g/kg, 68.80 g/kg, 4.40 g/kg, 3.20 g/kg and 0.80 g/kg respectively and magnesium were 10.20 g/kg, 15.60 g/kg, 0.70 g/kg, 1.20 g/kg and 1.90 g/kg respectively. The heavy metals in the organic wastes were, Lead; 9.08 mg/L, 0.24 mg/L, 0.33 mg/L, 0.06 mg/L, 0.00 mg/L, and 0.03 mg/L respectively, Manganese; 1.80 mg/L, 4.63 mg/L, 2.60 mg/L, 0.96 mg/L, 0.67 mg/L and 0.22 mg/L respectively, Copper; 0.17 mg/L, 0.21 mg/L, 0.23 mg/L, 0.26 mg/L, 0.24 mg/L and 0.17 mg/L respectively. The pH level of the organic wastes is generally within the range as established by Federal Environmental Protection Agency, (1991). The moisture content of organic wastes were within the range that helps microorganisms to proliferate well. The acidic pH of the organic wastes (RicH, SorH and CorC) had also been reported by Abioye et al (2010), and Stephen & Abioye (2013), to favor most crude oil degrading microorganisms. The counts of aerobic heterotrophic bacteria and diesel oil utilizing bacteria of the organic wastes were  $4.5 \times 10^5$  cfu/g,  $3.2 \times 10^5$  cfu/g,  $3.0 \times 10^5$  cfu/g,  $4.2 \times 10^5$  cfu/g,  $3.5 \times 10^5$  cfu/g,  $3.6 \times 10^5$  cfu/g, and  $2.6 \times 10^5$  cfu/g,  $2.2 \times 10^5$  cfu/g,  $2.4 \times 10^5$  cfu/g,  $3.5 \times 10^5$  cfu/g,  $3.0 \times 10^5$  cfu/g,  $3.2 \times 10^5$  cfu/g respectively while those of the fungi and diesel oil utilizing fungi were  $5.2 \times 10^2$  cfu/g,  $2.5 \times 10^2$  cfu/g,  $2.6 \times 10^2$  cfu/g,  $3.8 \times 10^2$  cfu/g,  $3.4 \times 10^2$  cfu/g,  $4.0 \times 10^2$  cfu/g and  $3.5 \times 10^2$  cfu/g,  $2.3 \times 10^2$  cfu/g,  $2.2 \times 10^2$  cfu/g,  $3.5 \times 10^2$  cfu/g,  $3.0 \times 10^2$  cfu/g,  $3.8 \times 10^2$  cfu/g respectively. Ekundayo and Obuekwe, 2000; Abioye et al., 2010; and Debojit et al., have recorded similar microbial counts in organic wastes and attributed it to favourable physicochemical properties of the organic wastes.

**Table 1: Physical, Chemical and Microbial Properties of Organic Wastes**

Parameter	CowD	ChiD	RicH	SorH	CorC
pH	8.40	9.30	6.00	6.80	5.80
Moisture content (%)	8.15	7.35	6.25	6.10	7.26
Organic Matter (g/kg)	347.00	462.00	129.00	55.00	2.00
Total Nitrogen (g/kg)	11.48	10.92	9.66	12.04	9.80
Available Phosphorus (g/kg)	0.64	11.49	1.19	1.02	0.46
Sodium (g/kg)	2.72	4.54	0.57	0.43	0.33
Potassium (g/kg)	11.70	22.43	3.96	19.70	3.43
Calcium (g/kg)	18.40	68.80	4.40	3.20	0.80
Magnesium (g/kg)	10.20	15.60	0.70	1.20	1.90
THBC (cfu/g)	$3.2 \times 10^5$	$3.0 \times 10^5$	$4.2 \times 10^5$	$3.5 \times 10^5$	$3.6 \times 10^5$



SLOUBC (cfu/g)	$2.2 \times 10^5$	$2.4 \times 10^5$	$3.5 \times 10^5$	$3.0 \times 10^5$	$3.2 \times 10^4$
TFC (cfu/g)	$2.5 \times 10^2$	$2.6 \times 10^2$	$3.8 \times 10^2$	$3.4 \times 10^2$	$4.0 \times 10^2$
SLOUFC (cfu/g)	$2.3 \times 10^2$	$2.2 \times 10^2$	$3.5 \times 10^2$	$3.0 \times 10^2$	$3.8 \times 10^2$
Lead (mg/L)	0.24	0.33	0.06	0.00	0.03
Manganase (mg/L)	4.63	2.60	0.96	0.67	0.22
Copper (mg/L)	0.21	0.23	0.26	0.24	0.17

KEY g/kg = gramme per kilogramme, % = percentage, cfu/g = colony forming units per gramme, mg/L = milligramme per litre.

## Isolates from Organic Wastes

### Identification of bacteria

Species of the following bacteria genera were identified in the organic wastes: *Pseudomonas*, *Bacillus*, *Salmonella*, *Staphylococcus* and *Escherichia*. The bacteria were mainly members of *Bacillus* (31.58%), followed by *Escherichia* (26.32%), *Salmonella* (21.05%), *Pseudomonas* (10.53%), and *Staphylococcus* (10.53%). Species of *Bacillus* were more abundant than other species; this may be due to its ability to compete well with the other organisms present in the wastes. This agrees with the findings of Ekundayo et al., (2012). *Pseudomonas*, *Salmonella*, *Staphylococcus* and *Escherichia* were also found in organic wastes due to their ability to utilize the wastes as source of energy. (Obire, 2012; Alaa Eldin et al., 2017).

### Identification of fungi

Species of the following fungal genera were identified in the organic wastes: *Aspergillus*, *Penicillium*, *Mucor*, *Trichophyton*, and *Fusarium*. The fungi were mainly members of *Aspergillus* (36.4%), followed by *Mucor* (22.7%), *Penicillium* (13.6%), *Fusarium* (13.6%) and *Trichophyton* (9.09%), in that order. Species of *Aspergillus* were more abundant than other species because they were able to grow well in organic wastes. This agrees with the findings of Nadia (2011), Alaa Eldin et al., 2017. Ekundayo, Olukunle and Ekundayo (2012) also reported that species of *Aspergillus* are ubiquitous in nature. *Penicillium*, *Mucor*, *Trichophyton*, and *Fusarium* were also found in the organic wastes, this may be as a result of their ability to utilize the organic wastes as source of nitrogen and phosphorous to proliferate (Obire, 2012; Idowu & Ijah, 2017).

## Growth of microbial isolates on spent lubricating oil

### Bacterial isolates

The utilization of spent lubricating oil (SLO) as source of carbon and energy by bacterial isolates is presented in Table 2. The nineteen microbes isolated utilized oil at varying rates. It was observed that six isolates (31.6%) utilized the SLO maximally while thirteen isolates (68.4%) utilized it moderately (Table 2). Some members of the genera *Staphylococcus*, *Bacillus*, *Escherichia*, *Pseudomonas* and *Salmonella* utilized the SLO at maximum rate, while other strains of the organisms utilized the SLO at moderate rate as source of carbon and energy (Table 2). This result revealed that these bacteria have the ability to utilize SLO as source of carbon and energy to grow well. Kristin et al. (2003); Mai, Schormann et al. (2004) and Al-Nasrawi, (2012), have also reported the potential of microorganisms in utilization of hydrocarbons.

**Table 2: Utilization of spent lubricating oil by bacterial isolates**

Coded bacterial isolates	Extent of growth in SLO medium after 14 days	Optical density (OD at 420nm)
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> SA1	++	1.025
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> SA2	+++	1.350
<i>Bacillus subtilis</i> BS1	+++	1.044
<i>Bacillus subtilis</i> BS2	++	0.470
<i>Bacillus subtilis</i> BS3	++	0.362
<i>Bacillus subtilis</i> BS4	++	0.296
<i>Bacillus subtilis</i> BS5	++	0.251
<i>Bacillus subtilis</i> BS6	++	0.196
<i>Escherichia coli</i> EC1	++	0.419
<i>Escherichia coli</i> EC2	+++	1.250
<i>Escherichia coli</i> EC3	++	0.312
<i>Escherichia coli</i> EC4	++	0.268
<i>Escherichia coli</i> EC5	++	0.224
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> PA1	+++	1.448
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> PA2	+++	1.321
<i>Salmonella</i> spp.SS1	+++	1.270
<i>Salmonella</i> spp.SS2	++	0.986
<i>Salmonella</i> spp.SS3	++	0.724
<i>Salmonella</i> spp.SS4	++	0.526

**KEY:** ++ = Moderate growth, +++ =Maximum growth,

### Fungal isolates

The utilization of SLO as carbon source by fungal isolates is presented in Table 3. Twenty-two microbes isolated utilized the oil at varying rates. It was observed that five isolates (22.8%) utilized the SLO maximally, eight isolates (31.8%) utilized it moderately while nine isolates (40.9%) utilized the SLO minimally as a source of carbon and energy. Members of the genera *Aspergillus niger*, *Aspergillus flavus*, *Penicillium chrysogenum* and *Fusarium venenatum* utilized the SLO at maximum rate, while *Mucor mucedo* and *Trichophyton venenatum* utilized the SLO at moderate rate (Table 3). This result support the findings of Idowu and Ijah, (2017), which reported that *Aspergillus* spp. and *Penicillium* spp. are able to utilized diesel oil as source of carbon and energy maximally. Al-Nasrawi, (2012) and Idowu and Ijah (2018), have also reported that species of *Aspergillus* and *Penicillium* were abundant in hydrocarbon polluted soil.

**Table 3: Utilization of spent lubricating oil by fungal isolates**

Coded fungal isolates	Extent of growth in SLO medium after 21 days
<i>Aspergillus niger</i> A01	+++
<i>Aspergillus niger</i> A02	+++
<i>Aspergillus niger</i> A03	++
<i>Aspergillus niger</i> A04	++

Aspergillus niger A05	+
Aspergillus flavus B06	++
Aspergillus flavus B07	+++
Aspergillus flavus B08	+
Penicillium verrucosum C09	+++
Penicillium verrucosum C10	++
Penicillium verrucosum C11	+
Penicillium verrucosum C12	+
Fusarium spp.D13	+++
Fusarium spp.D14	++
Fusarium spp.D15	+
Mucor mucedo E16	+
Mucor mucedo E17	+
Mucor mucedo E18	++
Mucor mucedo E19	+
Mucor mucedo E20	++
Trichophyton soudanense F21	++
Trichophyton soudanense F22	+

**KEY:** + = Minimal growth, ++ = Moderate growth, +++ = Maximum growth.

The pH of unremediated soil ranged from 6.14 - 6.31 while that of remediated soil ranged from 6.18 - 7.25, 6.22 - 6.42, 6.38 - 7.51, 6.20 - 6.56 and 6.22 - 6.45 respectively after 12 weeks (Table 4). The pH of the treatments were higher compared to that of control experiments, this may be as a result of the addition of organic wastes which is capable of increasing the pH of the polluted soil (Atiku *et al.*, 2018). There were no significant differences ( $P > 0.05$ ) among the five biostimulation treatments. The reduction in pH might be as a result of acidic metabolites produced by the microorganisms (Hidayat *et al.*, 2012). The pH of treatments were within the range that support the growth of microorganisms (Ijah *et al.*, 2013).

#### Table 4: pH of Remediated Soil

**KEY:** SLOPS; spent lubricating oil polluted soil, CowD; cow dung, CorC; corn cob, ChiD; chicken droppings, Rich; rice husk, SorH; sorghum husk.


#### Microbial Counts in Remediated Soil

##### Aerobic heterotrophic bacterial (AHB) counts

The AHB counts in spent lubricating oil polluted soil (control) decreased from  $5.4 \times 10^5$  cfu/g -  $3.5 \times 10^5$  cfu/g while the counts in spent lubricating oil polluted soil remediated with organic wastes (CowD, CorC, ChiD, Rich and SorH) increased from  $6.9 \times 10^5$  cfu/g -  $7.2 \times 10^5$  cfu/g,  $7.2 \times 10^5$  -  $7.5 \times 10^5$  cfu/g,  $6.6 \times 10^5$  cfu/g -  $8.1 \times 10^5$  cfu/g,  $6.1 \times 10^5$  cfu/g -  $6.2 \times 10^5$  cfu/g

Time (Weeks)	SLOPS+CowD	SLOPS+CorC	SLOPS+ChiD	SLOPS+RicH	SLOPS+SorH	SLOPS Only
0	7.25 ± 0.40 <sup>a</sup>	6.42 ± 0.06 <sup>a</sup>	7.51 ± 0.10 <sup>a</sup>	6.52 ± 0.29 <sup>a</sup>	6.45 ± 0.03 <sup>d</sup>	6.31 ± 0.01 <sup>d</sup>
2	7.15 ± 0.40 <sup>a</sup>	6.38 ± 0.04 <sup>a</sup>	7.24 ± 0.04 <sup>c</sup>	6.49 ± 0.03 <sup>a</sup>	6.42 ± 0.02 <sup>cd</sup>	6.28 ± 0.03 <sup>cd</sup>
4	6.51 ± 0.38 <sup>a</sup>	6.32 ± 0.06 <sup>cd</sup>	7.16 ± 0.03 <sup>c</sup>	6.46 ± 0.04 <sup>a</sup>	6.37 ± 0.01 <sup>bcd</sup>	6.24 ± 0.03 <sup>bcd</sup>
6	6.56 ± 0.13 <sup>a</sup>	6.28 ± 0.04 <sup>bc</sup>	6.89 ± 0.04 <sup>b</sup>	6.42 ± 0.08 <sup>a</sup>	6.32 ± 0.06 <sup>abcd</sup>	6.20 ± 0.02 <sup>abc</sup>
8	6.32 ± 0.40 <sup>a</sup>	6.22 ± 0.04 <sup>bc</sup>	6.45 ± 0.03 <sup>a</sup>	6.36 ± 0.09 <sup>a</sup>	6.29 ± 0.03 <sup>abc</sup>	6.18 ± 0.03 <sup>ab</sup>
10	6.28 ± 0.03 <sup>a</sup>	6.17 ± 0.01 <sup>bc</sup>	6.40 ± 0.04 <sup>a</sup>	6.28 ± 0.04 <sup>a</sup>	6.26 ± 0.00 <sup>ab</sup>	6.16 ± 0.02 <sup>ab</sup>
12	6.18 ± 0.03 <sup>a</sup>	6.12 ± 0.02 <sup>a</sup>	6.38 ± 0.03 <sup>a</sup>	6.20 ± 0.05 <sup>a</sup>	6.22 ± 0.06 <sup>a</sup>	6.14 ± 0.02 <sup>a</sup>


and  $6.4 \times 10^5$  cfu/g -  $6.8 \times 10^5$  cfu/g respectively (Fig. 1). The reduction in the counts of AHB in spent lubricating oil polluted soil (control), could be as result of insufficient nitrogen and potassium in the polluted soil which could have served as nutrient for the proliferation of the organisms to grow well (Agbor *et al.*, 2012). However, there were significant increases in the counts of AHB in the polluted soil treated with CowD, ChiD and SorH compared to the CorC and RicH treatment. This could be as a result of high content of nitrogen and potassium in CowD, ChiD and SorH, which has been reported. (Abioye *et al.*, 2010; Atiku *et al.*, 2018) to enhance the growth of microorganisms. Low level of nitrogen and potassium in CorC & RicH may be responsible for the slight increase in the count of AHB in the amended soils.



**Fig. 1: Aerobic heterotrophic bacterial (AHB) counts of spent lubricating oil polluted soil remediated with organic wastes: SLOPS; spent lubricating oil polluted soil, CowD; cow dung, CorC; corn cob, ChiD; chicken droppings, RicH; rice husk, SorH; sorghum husk.**

**Spent lubricating oil utilizing bacterial (SLOUB) counts**


The SLOUB counts in spent lubricating oil polluted soil (control) ranged from  $4.4 \times 10^5$  cfu/g -  $2.5 \times 10^5$ cfu/g while the counts in spent lubricating oil polluted soil remediated with organic wastes (CowD, CorC, ChiD, RicH and SorH) ranged from  $4.3 \times 10^5$ cfu/g -  $5.2 \times 10^5$ cfu/g,  $3.7 \times 10^5$  cfu/g -  $4.8 \times 10^5$  cfu/g,  $4.7 \times 10^5$ cfu/g -  $5.7 \times 10^5$ cfu/g,  $3.8 \times 10^5$ cfu/g -  $4.7 \times 10^5$ cfu/g and  $4.4 \times 10^5$ cfu/g -  $5.3 \times 10^5$ cfu/g respectively (Fig. 2). These results indicated decrease in the counts of SLOUB in the control soil compared to the treatments which showed increase in the counts of SLOUB. This may be as a result of inadequate nutrient such as nitrogen and potassium which can stimulate the growth of microorganism in the polluted soil (Atiku *et al.*, 2018). The increase in the counts of SLOUB in CowD, ChiD and SorH were higher compared to CorC and RicH treatments. This may be as a result of high content of nitrogen and potassium in CowD, ChiD and SorH compared to CorC and RicH (Anhyr *et al.* 2017).



**Fig. 2: Spent lubricating oil utilizing bacteria (SLOUB) counts of spent lubricating oil polluted soil remediated with organic wastes:** SLOPS; spent lubricating oil polluted soil, CowD; cow dung, CorC; corn cob, ChiD; chicken droppings, RicH; rice husk, SorH; sorghum husk.

**Total fungal (TF) counts**


The TF counts in the control soil showed a decrease from  $5.3 \times 10^2$  cfu/g -  $3.5 \times 10^2$  cfu/g while that of polluted soil treated with CowD, CorC, ChiD, RicH and SorH increased from  $6.7 \times 10^2$  cfu/g to  $7.8 \times 10^2$  cfu/g,  $5.8 \times 10^2$  cfu/g to  $6.7 \times 10^2$  cfu/g,  $6.5 \times 10^2$  cfu/g to  $8.5 \times 10^2$  cfu/g,  $6.2 \times 10^2$  cfu/g to  $7.1 \times 10^2$  cfu/g and  $5.6 \times 10^2$  cfu/g to  $6.6 \times 10^2$  cfu/g respectively (Fig. 3). The decrease in TF counts in the control experiment might be as a result of acidic nature of the polluted soil and insufficient nutrients, such as nitrogen and phosphorous which can stimulate the growth of the organisms while the increase in the TF counts in the treatments may be attributed to the presence of organic wastes which increases the pH of the soil and serves as sources of nitrogen and potassium that stimulate the growth of microbes (Agboun *et al.*, 2016; Alaa El-Din *et al.*, 2017).



**Fig. 3: Total fungi counts (TFC) of spent lubricating oil polluted soil remediated with organic wastes:** SLOPS; spent lubricating oil polluted soil, CowD; cow dung, CorC; corn cob, ChiD; chicken droppings, RicH; rice husk, SorH; sorghum husk.

**Spent lubricating oil utilizing fungal (SLOUF) counts**

The SLOUF counts of control soil ranged from  $3.9 \times 10^2$  cfu/g -  $2.7 \times 10^2$  cfu/g while that of the treatments ranged from  $4.9 \times 10^2$  cfu/g -  $6.2 \times 10^2$  cfu/g,  $4.4 \times 10^2$  cfu/g -  $5.3 \times 10^2$  cfu/g,  $5.8 \times 10^2$  cfu/g -  $8.3 \times 10^2$  cfu/g,  $5.4 \times 10^2$  cfu/g -  $6.5 \times 10^2$  cfu/g and  $4.9 \times 10$  cfu/g -  $5.9 \times 10$  cfu/g respectively (Fig 4). The decrease in SLOUF counts in the control soil may be as result of limited ability of the microbes to utilize the carbon and energy source present in the polluted soil, due to the competition for the inadequate nutrient, while the significant increase in CowD, ChiD and SorH compared to CorC and RicH may be attributed to adequate nutrient which amount to high level of nitrogen and potassium in them compared to CorC and RicH (Agboun *et al.*, 2016).



**Fig. 4: Total fungi counts (TFC) of spent lubricating oil polluted soil remediated with organic wastes:** SLOPS; spent lubricating oil polluted soil, CowD; cow dung, CorC; corn cob, ChiD; chicken droppings, RicH; rice husk, SorH; sorghum husk.

## Identification and frequency of occurrence of microbial isolates in remediated soil

### Fungi

Species of the following fungal genera were identified in the soil: *Aspergillus*, *Penicillium*, *Mucor*, *Trichophyton*, and *Fusarium*. Their frequencies of occurrence were *Aspergillus* (36.4%), *Mucor* (22.7%), *Penicillium* (13.6%) and *Trichophyton* (9.09%), in that order (Table 5). Species of *Aspergillus* were more abundant than other species probably because of its wide spread distribution in the environment and also, for its ability to grow well in spent lubricating oil polluted soil. This agrees with the findings of Ekundayo *et al.*, (2012). Similarly, Idowu and Ijah (2018) reported that species of *Aspergillus* had highest degradative capacity. *Penicillium*, *Mucor*, *Trichophyton*, and *Fusarium* were also found in spent lubricating oil polluted soil due to their ability to utilize the oil to proliferate (Obire, 2012; Idowu & Ijah, 2017).

**Table 5: Frequency of occurrence of fungal isolates in bioremediated soil**

Organisms	Number of Isolates	% Frequency of occurrence
<i>Aspergillus flavus</i>	3	13.64
<i>Apergillus niger</i>	5	22.73
<i>Penicillium verrucosum</i>	4	18.18
<i>Trichophyton soudanense</i>	2	9.09
<i>Mucor mucedo</i>	5	22.73
<i>Fussarium venenatum</i>	3	13.64
Total	22	100

### Bacteria

Species of the following bacterial genera were identified in the soil: *Pseudomonas*, *Bacillus*, *Salmonella*, *Staphylococcus* and *Escherichia*. Their frequencies of occurrence (Table 6) were *Pseudomonas* (10.53%), *Bacillus* (31.58%), *Salmonella* (21.05%), *Staphylococcus* (10.53%) and *Escherichia* (26.32%). Species of *Bacillus* were more abundant than other species; this might be as a result of its ability to form a tough protective endospore, allowing it to tolerate extreme environmental conditions. Also, because of its ability to utilized hydrocarbon as source of carbon and energy. This agrees with the findings of Ekundayo *et al.* (2012) and Atiku *et al.* (2018). *Pseudomonas*, *Salmonella*, *Staphylococcus* and *Escherichia* were also found in spent lubricating oil polluted soil due to their ability to utilize the oil to proliferate (Obire, 2012; Idowu & Ijah, 2017).


**Table 6: Frequency of occurrence of bacterial isolates in bioremediated soil**

Organisms	Number of Isolates	% Frequency of occurrence
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	2	10.53
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	2	10.53
<i>Bacillus licheniformis</i>	6	31.58
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	5	26.32
<i>Salmonella enterica</i>	4	21.05
Total	19	100

### Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon (TPH) in Remediated Soil

The residual TPH in remediated soil with organic wastes (CowD, CorC, ChiD, RicH and SorH) decreased from 0.152g - 0.051g, 0.152g - 0.063g, 0.158g - 0.042g, 0.159g - 0.069g and 0.153g - 0.054g respectively after 12 weeks (Fig. 5). The residual TPH was high in the control soil compared to the treatments, meaning that the organic wastes added to the polluted soil

enhanced the remediation soil. The residual TPH in polluted soil, remediated with CowD, ChiD and SorH was lower than that of CorC and Rich, indicating that CowD, ChiD and SorH enhanced the spent lubricating oil degradation better than CorC and Rich. This may be due to high contents of nitrogen and potassium in CowD, ChiD and SorH compared to CorC and Rich. Abioye et al. (2010), Alaa El-Din et al., (2017) and Atiku et al., (2018) recorded similar results.



**Fig. 5: Residual TPH of spent lubricating oil polluted soil remediated with organic wastes: SLOPS; spent lubricating oil polluted soil, CowD; cow dung, CorC; corn cob, ChiD; chicken droppings, Rich; rice husk, SorH; sorghum husk.**

### Conclusion

This study screened organic wastes and microorganisms for potential to remediate spent lubricating oil polluted soil. The organic wastes harboured bacteria and fungi of various genera, particularly *Bacillus* and *Aspergillus*. These organisms utilized spent lubricating oil at varying rates. Microbial counts in the amended oil polluted soil were higher compared to the control soil. The study also revealed that CowD, ChiD and SorH enhanced the spent lubricating oil degradation better than CorC and Rich. The residual total petroleum hydrocarbon in remediated soil showed that these organic wastes have the potential to remediate spent lubricating oil polluted soil.

### References

- Abioye, P. O., AbdulAziz, A., & Agamuthu, P. (2010). Enhanced Biodegradation of used engine oil in soil amended with organic wastes. *Water, Air and Soil Pollution*, 209, 173-179.
- Abioye, O. P. Agamathu, P., & AbdulAzeze, A. R. (2012). Biodegradation of used motor oil in soil using organic waste amendments. *Biotechnology Research International*, 8(10), 1-8.
- Abdulyekeen, K. A., Muhammed, I. M., Giwa, S. O., & Abdulsalam, S. (2016). Bioremediation of used motor oil using elephant and horse dung as stimulants. *IOSR Journal of Environmental Science, Toxicology and Food Technology (IOSR. JESTFT)*, 10(12), 73-78.
- Adekunle, I. M. (2011). Bioremediation of soils contaminated with Nigerian Petroleum products using composted municipal wastes. *Bioremediation Journal*, 15 (4), 230-241.
- Alaa El-Din, G., Amar, A. A., Malsh, G., & Hussain, M. (2017). Study on the use of banana peels for oil spill removal. *Alexandria Engineering Journal*, 1, 3-5.
- Agboun, T. D. T., Apugo-Nwosu, T. U., Mohammed, J. A., Ameh, A. O., Abubakar, G., Mustapha, M., & Okoro, P. (2016). Potential of using *Moringa Oleifera* seeds in the Bioremediation of soil contaminated with crude oil. *British Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, 15(1), 1-8.

- Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). (1997). *Public Health Statements: Used Mineral Based Crankcase Oil*. Atlanta, ATSDR.
- Aucelio, R. Q., de Souza, R. M., de Campos, R. C, Miekeley, N., & Da Silva, C. L. P. (2007). The Determination of trace metals in lubricating oils by atomic spectrometry. *Spectrochim.*, 62, 952–961.
- Agbor, R. B., Ekpo, I. A., Osuagwu, A. N., Udofia, U. U., Okpako, E. C., & Antai, S. P. (2012). Biostimulation of Microbial Degradation of crude oil polluted soil using Cocoa Pod Husk and Plantain Peels. *Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology Research*, 2(3), 464-4699.
- AI-Nasrawi, H. (2012). Biodegradation of crude oil by fungi isolated from Gulf of México. *Journal of Bioremediation and Biodegradation*, 3 (4): 1-6.
- Atiku, Y. M., Abdulsalam, S., & Muhammed, I. M. (2018). Biostimulation of soil contaminated with spent motor oil using Cow dung and poultry litter in land framing Microcosm. *IOSR Journal of Environmental Science, Toxicology and Food Technology*, 12(3), 1-10.
- Baldrian, P., Inderwiesche, C., Gabriel, J., Nerud, F., & Zadrazil, F. (2000). Influence of cadmium and mercury on activities of Ligninolytic Enzymes and Degradation of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbon by *Pleurotus ostreatus* in soil. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 66(6), 2471-2474.
- Bushnell, L. D., & Hass, H. F. (1941). The utilization of certain hydrocarbons by *Microorganisms* *Journal of Bacteriology*, 41, 653-673.
- Duffus, J. H. (2002). Heavy Metals “a Meaningless Term” *International Union of Pure and Applied Chemists (IUPAC) Technical Report*. Pure. Applied. Chemistry, 74,793-807.
- Effendi, H., Munawaroh, A., & Ayu, I. P. (2017). Crude oil spilled water treatment with *Vetiveria zizanioides* in floating wetland. *The Egyptian Journal of Aquatic Research*, 43(3), 185-193.
- Ekundayo, F. O., Olukunle, O. F., & Ekundayo, E. A. (2012). Biodegradation of bonnylight crude oil by locally isolated fungi from oil contaminated soil in Akure, Ondo State. *Malaysian Journal of Microbiology*, 89(1): 42-46.
- Fox, M. F. (2007). Sustainability and environmental aspects of lubricants. In *Handbook of Lubrication and Tribology*, George, E. D., Totten, E., Eds.; Taylor and Francis: New York, NY, USA. pp. 13.
- Hamawand, I., Yusaf, T. F., & Ibrahim, S. (2013). Coal seam gas and associated water. *A Review Paper. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 22, 2-13.
- Hidayat, A., Sanro, T., & Itoh, K. (2012). Determination of chrysene degradation under saline conditions by *Fusarium sp.* F092, a fungus screened from nature. *Journal of Fungal Biology*, 116(6), 706-714.
- Idowu, F. C., & Ijah, U. J. J. (2017). Bioremediation of diesel oil polluted soil following amendment with fungal consortium. *Journal of Science Technology, Mathematics and Education (JOSTMED)*, 13(3), 16-26.
- Idowu, F. C., & Ijah, U. J. J. (2018). Changes in Microbial population during Mycoremediation of diesel oil contaminated soil. *Ife Journal of Science*, 20(2).



- Ijah, U. J. J., & Antai, S. P. (2003). The potential use of Chicken-drop Microorganisms for oil spill remediation. *The Environmentalist*, 23, 89-95.
- Ijah, U. J. J., Auta, S. H., & Olanrewaju, R. K. (2013). Biostimulation of crude oil contaminated soil using Soybean waste. *African Scientific Publisher*, 1, 285-291.
- Kumar, A., Bisht, B. S., Joshi, V. D., & Dhewa, T. (2011). Review on Bioremediation of polluted environment: A management tool. *International Journal of Environmental Science*, 1, 1079-1093.
- Marai, Y. P. (2015). Re-refining of used lubricating oil. *International Journal of Scientific and Engineering Research*, 6, 329-332.
- Obire, O. (2012). Studies on the Biodegradation potentials of some Microorganisms isolated from water systems of two petroleum producing area in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Botany*, 1, 81-90.
- Odu, C. T. (1972). Microbiology of soils contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons. Extent of Contamination and Some Soil and Microbial Properties after Contamination. *Journal of Institute of Petroleum*, 5, 201-208.
- Olalemi, S., & Arotupin, D. J. (2012). Effect of refined petroleum products contamination on bacterial population and Physicochemical characteristics of cultivated Agricultural Soil. *Journal of Microbiology, Biotechnology and Food Sciences*, 2(2), 684-700.
- Onuoha, S. C., Olugbe, V. U., Uraka, J. A., & Uchendu, D. O. (2011). Biodegradation potentials of Hydrocarbon degraders from waste-lubricating oil spilled soils in Ebonyi State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Agriculture and Biotechnology*, 13, 586-590.
- Philip. J. C., & Atlas, R. M. (2005). Bioremediation of contaminated soil and aquifers. *Encyclopedia Life Science*, 42, 138-139.
- Rahman, K. S. M., Banat, I. M., Thahira, J., Thayumana, V. T., & Lakshmanaperumalsamy, P. (2002). Bioremediation of Gasoline contaminated soil by a bacterial consortium amended with poultry litter, and Rhamnolipid Biosurfactant. *Bioresource Technology*, 81, 25-32.
- Singhabhandhu, A., & Tezuka, T. (2010). *The waste-to-energy framework for integrated multi-waste utilization: Waste cooking oil, waste lubricating oil, and waste plastics*. *Energy*, 35, 2544-2551.
- Stephen, E., Obaka, S. L., & Ekeji, D. (2016). Bioremediation of spent lubricating oil contaminated soil by amendment with lime fertilizer. *FUW Trend in Science and Technology Journal*, 1(2), 567-569.
- Udonne, J. D. (2011). A Comparative study of recycling of used lubrication oils using distillation, acid and activated charcoal with clay methods. *Journal of Petroleum and Gas Engineering*, 2, 12-19.
- Yeung, P. Y., Johnson, R. L., & Xu, J. G. (1997). Biodegradation of petroleum hydrocarbons in soil as affected by heating and forced aeration. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 26, 1511-1576.