

Validation of thermophysical properties for biodiesel production using waste vegetable oil

Bahman Najafi, Javad Jannatkah, Hassan Malek Ajhdar

Received: 04 March 2017 / Received in revised form: 25 April 2017, Accepted: 03 May 2017, Published online: 25 May 2017
© Biochemical Technology Society 2014-2017

Abstract

In this present study, we applied validation techniques like specificity, accuracy, precision and robustness to find the thermophysical properties of biodiesel produced using waste vegetable oil and waste cooking oil collected from local restaurants in Ardabil City, Iran. The validation techniques helped in improving the accuracy of the estimation of thermo-physical properties. The properties investigated in this study includes, density, viscosity, flash point, cloud point and heating value. We believe that this validation technique will have wide applications in biodiesel production.

Keywords: Validation, vegetable oils, biodiesel fuel, thermo-physical properties

Introduction

Method validation is an important requirement in pharmaceutical industries for any information submitted to international regulatory agencies in support of new product marketing or clinical trials applications. These validation techniques include, specificity, accuracy, precision and robustness (Shabir 2005; Marfil et al. 2016). One of the most important factors in evaluating the quality of biodiesel is to find the basic thermophysical properties and compare them with US ASTM standards (Chhetri et al. 2008). Researchers usually perform experiments directly and compare the results with ASTM standards. For improving the accuracy of the results and for reproducibility, for the first time, we are applied these validation techniques in biodiesel research for accurate estimation of thermophysical properties.

Materials and Methods

Used sunflower, corn, soybean and canole oils and waste cooking oil were collected from various restaurants present in Ardabil, Iran and pure oils were purchased from local market, Ardabil, Iran. The following thermophysical properties including, viscosity, density,

flash point, cloud point and heat value were found for used cooking oil and pure oil samples and compared with US ASTM standards.

The validation parameters of the proposed estimation of thermophysical properties were selected based on the recommendations of the current legislation of Resolution RE 899, of May 25, 2003 and of the document DOQ-CGCRE-008, according to Category I - quantitative tests for determination of active ingredient in pharmaceutical products or raw materials. Thus, specificity, precision, accuracy, and robustness were evaluated (Marfil et al. 2016). The first step in method validation is to prepare a protocol, preferably written, with the instructions in a clear step by step format, and approved prior to their initiation (Shabir 2005).

Specificity: Specificity is the ability to measure accurately and specifically the compound of interest in the presence of other components that may be expected to be present in the sample matrix. In this currently study the thermophysical properties were measured from five different restaurants from Ardabil, Iran. The analysis of the results were done using ANOVA and Statistica 6.0, Statsoft, USA was used for this study (Green 1996).

Precision: Precision is the degree of agreement among individual test results when an analytical method is used repeatedly to multiple samplings of a homogeneous sample. The thermophysical property of the oil was measured five times for checking the precision (Green 1996).

Accuracy: Accuracy is the closeness of test results to the true value. The thermophysical properties of each oil measured in specificity component were compared with the pure oil data and ANOVA was applied to check the level of deviation (Green 1996).

Robustness: Robustness is the capacity of a method to remain unaffected by small, deliberate variations in method parameters; a measure of the reliability of a method. The thermophysical properties of these oils were measured by adulterating all these oils with 2% of palm oil to validate the

Bahman Najafi, Javad Jannatkah, Hassan Malek Ajhdar

Department of Biosystem Engineering, Mohaghegh Ardabili University, Ardabil, Iran

Table 2: Validation of the thermophysical properties of waste oil collected from local market in Ardabil, Iran .

| Validation Parameter | Conditions | Thermophysical Property | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| | | Flash point (°C) | Kinematic viscosity (mm ² /s) | Cloud point (°C) | Density (kg/l) | Heating value (MJ/Kg) |
| Corn Oil | | | | | | |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 1 | 0.912 | 5.6 | -7 | 38.00 | 144 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 2 | 0.911 | 5.7 | -7 | 38.12 | 145 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 3 | 0.912 | 5.4 | -7 | 38.10 | 144 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 4 | 0.913 | 5.6 | -6 | 38.2 | 144 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 5 | 0.911 | 5.6 | -7 | 38.13 | 148 |
| Precision | Replicate - 1 | 0.913 | 5.7 | -6 | 38.14 | 144 |
| Precision | Replicate - 2 | 0.912 | 5.4 | -8 | 38.00 | 146 |
| Precision | Replicate - 3 | 0.912 | 5.5 | -7 | 38.11 | 147 |
| Precision | Replicate - 4 | 0.912 | 5.5 | -7 | 38.41 | 144 |
| Precision | Replicate - 5 | 0.911 | 5.6 | -7 | 38.11 | 148 |
| Accuracy | Pure Oils | 0.861 | 34.9 | -6 | 39.48 | 320 |
| Robustness | Adulterated* | 0.901 | 6.2 | -8 | 38.14 | 152 |
| Sunflower Oil | | | | | | |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 1 | 0.873 | 5.87 | -8 | 39.34 | 137 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 2 | 0.863 | 5.82 | -8 | 39.32 | 137 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 3 | 0.888 | 5.83 | -8 | 39.31 | 136 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 4 | 0.875 | 5.87 | -8 | 39.38 | 137 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 5 | 0.875 | 5.87 | -7 | 39.41 | 135 |
| Precision | Replicate - 1 | 0.873 | 5.88 | -8 | 39.40 | 134 |
| Precision | Replicate - 2 | 0.876 | 5.85 | -7 | 39.34 | 137 |
| Precision | Replicate - 3 | 0.845 | 5.86 | -8 | 39.51 | 137 |
| Precision | Replicate - 4 | 0.888 | 5.88 | -8 | 39.34 | 136 |
| Precision | Replicate - 5 | 0.862 | 5.87 | -8 | 39.34 | 136 |
| Accuracy | Pure Oils | 0.692 | 32.6 | -5 | 38.81 | 322 |
| Robustness | Adulterated* | 0.801 | 5.62 | -8 | 39.33 | 138 |
| Soybean oil | | | | | | |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 1 | 0.882 | 4.09 | -5.5 | 38.09 | 137 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 2 | 0.882 | 4.01 | -5.5 | 38.12 | 136 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 3 | 0.881 | 4.09 | -5 | 38.11 | 137 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 4 | 0.881 | 4.09 | -5 | 38.09 | 135 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 5 | 0.871 | 4.08 | -5 | 38.09 | 134 |
| Precision | Replicate - 1 | 0.861 | 4.08 | -5.5 | 38.11 | 133 |
| Precision | Replicate - 2 | 0.881 | 4.09 | -5.4 | 38.12 | 137 |
| Precision | Replicate - 3 | 0.861 | 4.09 | -5.5 | 38.09 | 137 |
| Precision | Replicate - 4 | 0.884 | 4.11 | -5 | 38.09 | 137 |
| Precision | Replicate - 5 | 0.881 | 4.12 | -5.5 | 38.10 | 135 |
| Accuracy | Pure Oils | 0.852 | 32.9 | -4 | 44.06 | 318 |
| Robustness | Adulterated* | 0.841 | 4.15 | -5.5 | 37.78 | 138 |
| Canola oil | | | | | | |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 1 | 0.875 | 4.58 | -11 | 35.49 | 142 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 2 | 0.877 | 4.51 | -11 | 35.49 | 147 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 3 | 0.875 | 4.52 | -11 | 35.48 | 147 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 4 | 0.877 | 4.57 | -10 | 35.41 | 142 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 5 | 0.876 | 4.57 | -11 | 35.42 | 142 |
| Precision | Replicate - 1 | 0.875 | 4.58 | -10 | 35.55 | 142 |
| Precision | Replicate - 2 | 0.877 | 4.51 | -10.5 | 35.49 | 148 |
| Precision | Replicate - 3 | 0.876 | 4.52 | -11 | 35.49 | 148 |
| Precision | Replicate - 4 | 0.875 | 4.58 | -11 | 35.49 | 147 |
| Precision | Replicate - 5 | 0.888 | 4.55 | -10.5 | 35.41 | 149 |
| Accuracy | Pure Oils | 0.912 | 35.1 | -8 | 38.85 | 328 |
| Robustness | Adulterated* | 0.845 | 4.58 | -11 | 34.25 | 148 |
| Restaurant waste cooking oil | | | | | | |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 1 | 0.861 | 5.51 | -5 | 38.73 | 168 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 2 | 0.862 | 5.5 | -5 | 38.73 | 167 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 3 | 0.863 | 5.51 | -5.5 | 38.77 | 168 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 4 | 0.861 | 5.51 | -5.5 | 38.12 | 166 |
| Specificity | Restaurant - 5 | 0.864 | 5.41 | -5 | 38.14 | 167 |
| Precision | Replicate - 1 | 0.854 | 5.42 | -5 | 38.7 | 165 |
| Precision | Replicate - 2 | 0.861 | 5.44 | -5 | 38.41 | 164 |
| Precision | Replicate - 3 | 0.861 | 5.51 | -5.5 | 38.1 | 163 |
| Precision | Replicate - 4 | 0.865 | 5.51 | -5.8 | 38.45 | 168 |
| Precision | Replicate - 5 | 0.865 | 5.61 | -5 | 38.41 | 169 |
| Accuracy | Pure Oils | 0.883 | 36.3 | -4 | 39.05 | 315 |
| Robustness | Adulterated* | 0.863 | 5.6 | -5 | 38.5 | 168 |

*Adulterated with 2% palm oil

Table 3: One way ANOVA

| Corn Oil | | | | | | Canola oil | | | | |
|------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|--------|----------|----------|------------|----------|--------|----------|----------|
| | Value | F | Effect | Error | p | Value | F | Effect | Error | p |
| Intercept | 0.000000 | 18093610 | 4 | 5.00000 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 3931498 | 5 | 4.00000 | 0.000000 |
| Flash Point ($^{\circ}$ C) | 0.000001 | 184 | 12 | 13.52026 | 0.040000 | 0.000154 | 18 | 15 | 11.44364 | 0.000010 |
| Intercept | 0.000023 | 34891.59 | 5 | 4.00000 | 0.005000 | 0.000001 | 1134587 | 5 | 4.00000 | 0.000154 |
| Kinematic viscosity (mm ² /s) | 0.000004 | 69.17 | 15 | 11.44364 | 0.03240 | 0.000000 | 184 | 15 | 11.44364 | 0.003200 |
| Intercept | 0.000294 | 6802.000 | 3 | 6.00000 | 0.000522 | 0.000031 | 25511.78 | 5 | 4.00000 | 0.000000 |
| Cloud point ($^{\circ}$ C) | 0.001389 | 22.834 | 9 | 14.75303 | 0.004110 | 0.000987 | 8.60 | 15 | 11.44364 | 0.000387 |
| Intercept | 0.000000 | 256224773 | 5 | 4.00000 | 0.007410 | 0.000000 | 7177394 | 5 | 4.00000 | 0.000000 |
| Density (kg/l) | 0.000006 | 58 | 15 | 11.44364 | 0.000000 | 0.000001 | 100 | 15 | 11.44364 | 0.000441 |
| Intercept | 0.000002 | 381876.2 | 5 | 4.00000 | 0.000000 | 0.000002 | 486502.1 | 5 | 4.00000 | 0.000000 |
| Heating value (MJ/Kg) | 0.000007 | 56.2 | 15 | 11.44364 | 0.000000 | 0.000000 | 165.1 | 15 | 11.44364 | 0.000410 |
| Sunflower Oil | | | | | | Waste oil | | | | |
| Intercept | 0.000000 | 8517166 | 5 | 4.00000 | 0.005000 | 0.000000 | 9660210 | 5 | 4.00000 | 0.000000 |
| Flash Point ($^{\circ}$ C) | 0.000000 | 185 | 15 | 11.44364 | 0.003500 | 0.000103 | 20 | 15 | 11.44364 | 0.000005 |
| Intercept | 0.000001 | 1130966 | 5 | 4.00000 | 0.000000 | 0.000006 | 208272.2 | 4 | 5.00000 | 0.000000 |
| Kinematic viscosity (mm ² /s) | 0.000001 | 135 | 15 | 11.44364 | 0.000000 | 0.000003 | 136.2 | 12 | 13.52026 | 0.000000 |
| Intercept | 0.000099 | 8105.477 | 5 | 4.00000 | 0.002600 | 0.000015 | 53560.10 | 5 | 4.00000 | 0.000000 |
| Cloud point ($^{\circ}$ C) | 0.001201 | 7.955 | 15 | 11.44364 | 0.000560 | 0.000837 | 9.17 | 15 | 11.44364 | 0.000282 |
| Intercept | 0.000007 | 276696.8 | 3 | 6.00000 | 0.004000 | 0.000004 | 346804.8 | 4 | 5.00000 | 0.000000 |
| Density (kg/l) | 0.001426 | 22.6 | 9 | 14.75303 | 0.041000 | 0.004960 | 7.2 | 12 | 13.52026 | 0.000487 |
| Intercept | 0.000001 | 1103866 | 5 | 4.00000 | 0.005000 | 0.000002 | 391510.5 | 5 | 4.00000 | 0.000000 |
| Heating value (MJ/Kg) | 0.000001 | 135 | 15 | 11.44364 | 0.000400 | 0.000000 | 238.2 | 15 | 11.44364 | 0.000000 |
| Soybean oil | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intercept | 0.000000 | 263382284 | 5 | 4.00000 | 0.000000 | | | | | |
| Flash Point ($^{\circ}$ C) | 0.000000 | 696 | 15 | 11.44364 | 0.000000 | | | | | |
| Intercept | 0.000007 | 487340.1 | 2 | 7 | 0.00045 | | | | | |
| Kinematic viscosity (mm ² /s) | 0.000005 | 1043.0 | 6 | 14 | 0.00052 | | | | | |
| Intercept | 0.002786 | 1252.945 | 2 | 7 | 0.000000 | | | | | |
| Cloud point ($^{\circ}$ C) | 0.323702 | 1.768 | 6 | 14 | 0.177925 | | | | | |
| Intercept | 0.000002 | 1648390 | 2 | 7 | 0.000000 | | | | | |
| Density (kg/l) | 0.000364 | 120 | 6 | 14 | 0.004141 | | | | | |
| Intercept | 0.000001 | 540595.1 | 5 | 4.00000 | 0.000000 | | | | | |
| Heating value (MJ/Kg) | 0.000001 | 135.0 | 15 | 11.44364 | 0.003200 | | | | | |

robustness of the process (Green 1996). All experiments were done in triplicates and the average value was reported.

The following thermophysical parameters were included in this current study.

Table 1: US ASTM standards (Volli and Purkait 2014)

| Characteristics | Standard Test Method | Allowable limit | Unit | Conditions or Methods |
|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Flash point | ASTM D-92 | Minimum 130 | $^{\circ}$ C | Open-cup method |
| Kinematic viscosity | ASTM D-445 | 1.9 - 6 | mm ² /s | At 40 $^{\circ}$ C |
| Cloud point | ASTM D-2500 | - | $^{\circ}$ C | - |
| Density | ASTM D1298 | 0.86-0.90 | kg/l | At 15 $^{\circ}$ C |
| Heating value | ASTM D-240 | - | MJ/Kg | Bomb calorimeter |

Results and Discussion

Validation results

The list of validation studies were shown in Table 2. The analysis of variance was done to the validation data for better understanding of the variations within the groups and for checking the statistical validity of the data.

Based on statistical analysis using one-way ANOVA, the models were highly significant with very low probability values of <0.01. It was noted that the model terms of independent variables were significant at 95% confidence level. Table 2, it is evident that the flash point of pure oil is higher than biodiesel due to high viscosity and long molecular chains of lipids. It is observed that the density and cloud point of biodiesel is higher than the density and cloud point of pure oil. The values were compared with US ASTM standards and were found to be satisfying.

Conclusion

The validation techniques were successfully applied for evaluating the thermophysical properties of biodiesel. We believe that the validation will help in confirming the accuracy of the data and the diversity of the results can be expanded still further for other thermophysical properties of biodiesel.

References

- Chhetri Arjun K, Chris Watts, M Rafiqul Islam (2008) Waste cooking oil as an alternate feedstock for biodiesel production. *Energies* 1(1): 3-18.
- Green JM (1996) A Guide to Analytical Method Validation. *J Amer Chem* 68:305A-9A. 27.
- Marfil PH, Vasconcelos FH, Pontieri MH, Telis V (2016) Development and validation of analytical method for palm oil determination in microcapsules produced by complex coacervation. *Química Nova* 39(1):94-99
- Shabir GA (2005) Step-by-step analytical methods validation and protocol in the quality system compliance industry. *J Validation Technology* 10:314-325.
- Volli V, Purkait MK (2014) Physico-chemical properties and thermal degradation studies of commercial oils in nitrogen atmosphere. *Fuel* 117:1010-1019.