

INTEGRATED MICROCONTROLLER MQ SENSORS FOR MONITORING BIOGAS: ADVANCEMENTS IN METHANE AND HYDROGEN SULFIDE DETECTION

by Jurnal Teknosains

Submission date: 12-Mar-2024 11:59AM (UTC+0800)

Submission ID: 2318316652

File name: 91936-332129-3-RV.docx (1.32M)

Word count: 4987

Character count: 28844

INTEGRATED MICROCONTROLLER MQ SENSORS FOR MONITORING BIOGAS: ADVANCEMENTS IN METHANE AND HYDROGEN SULFIDE DETECTION

SENSOR MQ MIKROKONTROLER TERINTEGRASI UNTUK MEMANTAU BIOGAS: KEMAJUAN DALAM DETEKSI METANA DAN HIDROGEN SULFIDA

ABSTRAK

Terobosan teknologi mikrokontroler mampu memberikan keuntungan dalam sistem monitoring biogas. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk memonitoring konsentrasi gas metana dan hidrogen sulfida pada biogas berbasis mikrokontroler. Bahan baku biogas yang digunakan di penelitian ini adalah 100% kotoran sapi dan 50:50 antara campuran kotoran sapi dengan limbah padat kota atau municipal solid waste (MSW). Instrumen penelitian terdiri dari: sensor MQ-4 diaplikasikan untuk mendeteksi konsentrasi metana dan sensor MQ-136 untuk mendeteksi hidrogen sulfida serta dilengkapi dengan termokopel tipe k untuk memonitoring temperatur anaerobik digester dan temperatur lingkungan. Semua sensor terintegrasi dengan mikrokontroler tipe ATmega 2560 yang diaplikasikan dalam penelitian ini. Teramati konsentrasi metana tertinggi pada biogas 100% kotoran sapi sebesar 3488 ppm pada waktu ke 21 hari. Hasil ini membuktikan biogas dari 100% kotoran sapi menghasilkan metana lebih baik dibandingkan biogas dari 50:50 campuran kotoran sapi dengan MSW. Konsentrasi hidrogen sulfida teramati mencapai 195 ppm pada 100% kotoran sapi dan 192 ppm untuk 50:50 campuran kotoran sapi dengan MSW. Temperatur teramati dalam kondisi mesophilik selama investigasi. Sistem monitoring biogas berbasis mikrokontroler merupakan teknologi yang menjanjikan karena mampu memberikan hasil secara real-time.

Kata kunci: Biogas; Microcontroller; Monitoring; Sensor MQ; Metana; Hidrogen sulfida;

ABSTRACT

Recent technological advances in microcontroller systems enable novel biogas monitoring capabilities. This study investigates microcontroller-based quantification of methane and hydrogen sulfide concentrations in biogas derived from anaerobic digestion. Anaerobic digesters were fed with either 100% cow dung substrates and a 50:50 mixture of cow dung with municipal solid waste (MSW). Methane levels were monitored using an MQ-4 sensor, hydrogen sulfide via an MQ-136 sensor, and temperature with a K-type thermocouple, all integrated with an ATmega 2560 microcontroller system. The 100% cow dung digester produced biogas with maximum methane concentrations of 3488 ppm at 21 days, indicating improved methane production compared to the 50:50 mixture of cow dung with MSW. Hydrogen sulfide reached 195 ppm and 192 ppm for the 100% cow dung and mixed digesters, respectively. Mesophilic temperature conditions were maintained throughout the digestion process. Real-time quantification of biogas composition demonstrates the capabilities of microcontroller-based anaerobic digester monitoring to provide precise methane and hydrogen sulfide measurements.

Keywords: Biogas; Microcontroller; Monitoring; MQ sensors; Methane; Hydrogen sulfide;

INTRODUCTION

Fossil fuels including oil, natural gas, and coal currently provide the majority of the

world's energy needs. However, increasing concerns about energy security and the environmental impacts associated with

greenhouse gas emissions have prompted interest in renewable energy sources [1], [2]. Biogas, which is comprised primarily of methane (CH₄) 45-75% and carbon dioxide (CO₂) 25-45% [3], is one such renewable fuel that can be sustainably produced through the biological conversion of organic materials in the absence of oxygen, known as anaerobic digestion (AD) [4], [5]. Compared to other renewables like solar, wind, or hydropower, biogas offers unique advantages as an energy source that is continuously available, storable, and flexible to use for electricity, heating, or vehicle fuel [6], [7]. In addition, biogas production through anaerobic digestion provides an efficient waste management solution that helps mitigate potent greenhouse gas emissions from organic waste streams including manure, crop residues, and food waste [8].

Cow dung is particularly suitable for biogas production because of its high methane content of 55–65%. The high cellulose and hemicellulose content in cow dung can be efficiently converted to methane by anaerobic digestion [9], [10]. The biogas production process involves mixing cow dung with water and feeding it into a sealed underground anaerobic digester tank [11], [12]. Municipal solid waste (MSW) refers to household trash and rubbish collected by

local authorities from residential and commercial areas. MSW mostly contains biodegradable organic components such as food waste, garden waste, paper products which have great potential for conversion to biogas through anaerobic digestion [13]. With rapid urbanization worldwide, volumes of MSW being generated are rising sharply posing a challenge for environmentally-sustainable disposal. Landfilling and incineration also have limitations. Anaerobic digestion provides an alternative waste treatment method that produces clean energy as an end product along with digestate that can be used as fertilizer [14].

The anaerobic digestion process involves four phases: hydrolysis, acidogenesis, acetogenesis, and methanogenesis. In the hydrolysis phase, extracellular enzymes released by hydrolytic bacteria convert complex insoluble organic polymers such as carbohydrates, proteins, and lipids into soluble monomeric units like sugars, amino acids, and fatty acids [15], [16]. Subsequently in the acidogenesis phase, acidogenic bacteria ferment these monomers into intermediate products including volatile fatty acids (VFAs), alcohols, hydrogen, and carbon dioxide. These intermediates are then converted into acetic acid, carbon dioxide, and hydrogen by acetogenic bacteria during

acetogenesis [17]. The last phase is methanogenesis phase, methanogens utilize the acetic acid, carbon dioxide, and hydrogen to generate methane gas [18].

Measurement of methane is imperative given its dual significance as a potent greenhouse gas and combustible biofuel. The methane concentration determines the calorific value of gases generated from renewable feedstocks, including biogas and landfill gas [19]. Conventional methane gas measurement has many disadvantages, such as relatively expensive costs and low measurement efficiency. Additionally, the measurement results cannot be delivered in real-time. The measurement of hydrogen sulfide (H_2S) present in biogas is imperative, as hydrogen sulfide is considered an impurity. Additionally, hydrogen sulfide is highly corrosive and can induce rapid corrosion in metallic materials. This occurs because hydrogen sulfide gas dissociates into hydrogen (H^+) and bisulfide (HS^-) ions when dissolved in water [20], [21]. Therefore, measuring both of gases CH_4 and H_2S is important to determine the characteristics of biogas.

Laboratory analysis of methane composition usually employs gas chromatography with thermal conductivity detection. Alternative methane measurement

instrumentation such as infrared Draeger 6811960 and GEM2000/5000 (Geotech Environmental Equipment Inc, Denver, CO, USA) sensors have been applied for in situ biogas and sewer line gas monitoring [22]. However, limitations exist with these analytical techniques, including high capital costs and the requirement for substantial sample volumes. The MQ-4 is an affordable semiconductor-based methane detector capable of measuring CH_4 concentrations ranging from 200 to 10,000 ppm. The sensor shows optimal functionality within an ambient temperature range of 10 to $50^\circ C$ and relative humidity below 95% [23], [24]. The MQ-4's sensitivity to methane combined with adjustments for temperature/humidity enables real-time monitoring of biogas methane content under typical anaerobic digester operating conditions. This sensor can be integrated with microcontroller devices such as Arduino, Raspberry and other microcontrollers [6].

This research investigates the concentrations of methane (CH_4) and hydrogen sulfide (H_2S) gases produced in small-scale anaerobic digestion biogas systems utilizing 100% cow dung and a 50:50 mixture of cow dung with municipal solid waste (MSW) as substrates. The biogas systems were integrated with microcontroller

technology utilizing an ATmega 2560 microcontroller for real-time monitoring and data acquisition. In addition to gas concentrations, the ambient and digester temperatures were observed throughout the anaerobic digestion process. The acquired real-time data on temperature profiles and biogas composition from the integrated monitoring systems may facilitate identification of optimal temperature ranges and organic loading rates to maximize methane yields in these small-scale biogas digesters.

METHOD

Material

The material tested in this paper is biogas generated from 100% cow dung and a 50:50 mixture of cow dung with MSW (Municipal Solid Waste). The use of 100% cow dung is

considered due to its abundant availability and specific characteristics. On a dry weight basis, cow dung contains approximately 18–20% volatile solids including carbohydrates, proteins, fats, cellulose, hemicellulose, and lignin [25], [26]. The carbon to nitrogen ratio in fresh cow dung averages around 20:1, which is optimal for methanogenic bacteria to carry out anaerobic digestion. Cow dung also possesses a natural population of hydrolytic, fermentative, acetogenic, and methanogenic microbes required to catalyze the four stages of anaerobic digestion. Globally, biogas derived from cow dung is composed of around 55–70% methane, 30–50% carbon dioxide and trace amounts of other gases [27]. In addition, biogas can also be produced through landfills as shown in Table 1.

2
Table 1.

Anaerobic digestion and landfill biogas composition [27]

Component	AD biogas	Landfill biogas	Units
CH ₄	53–70	30–65	vol%
CO ₂	30–50	25–47	vol%
N ₂	2–6	<1–17	vol%
O ₂	0–5	<1–3	vol%
H ₂	NA	0–3	vol%
C _x H _y	NA	NA	vol%
H ₂ S	0–2000	30–500	ppm
NH ₃	<100	0–5	ppm

Chlorines

<0.25

0.3–225

mg
Nm³

Source: N. de Nooijer et.al (2018)

The MSW used in this research included banana peels, tomato peels, and carrot peels. Banana peels are a good feedstock for biogas digesters due to their high carbohydrate and nutrient content. The main components are cellulose, hemicellulose, lignin, starch, and sugars. The biogas yield from banana peels with a cow manure content of 10% at 18 and 22 g of volatile solids (gvs) per liter were 50.20 and 40.49 gvs per day, respectively [28]. The actual yield can vary based on digester conditions and retention time. Tomato peels are rich in sugars and nutrients like nitrogen. The high moisture content and soft texture also make them easily degradable [29]. Carrot peels also have high carbohydrate and nitrogen content. Their lignin content is lower compared to other vegetable wastes, making them more readily degraded by anaerobic bacteria [30].

Experimental

The anaerobic digestion process was conducted in a plastic drum digester under batch conditions, with 100% cow dung and a

50:50 mixture of cow dung with MSW as the feedstock. The biogas plant operated at mesophilic temperature, and a highly active methanogenic community was present to facilitate the AD process. The experimental schematic is shown in Fig. 1. Anaerobic digestion experiments were performed using an instrumented lab-scale digester continuously monitored by methane (CH₄), hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), and temperature sensors interfaced to an ATmega 2560 microcontroller system. Methane and hydrogen sulfide gas detection were achieved using MQ-4 and MQ-136 metal oxide semiconductor sensors positioned in the digester headspace. The sensors operate on a resistance change principle when target gases are absorbed onto the heated sensor surface. Analog voltage signals proportional to gas concentrations are produced based on sensor resistances calculated through a wheatstone bridge circuit with an output range of 0–5V corresponding to 0–10,000 ppm [31].




Figure 1.
Experimental schematic of a microcontroller-integrated biogas system
Source: Author's analysis (2023)

Temperature profiling utilized a type K thermocouple probe with chromel and alumel conductors to generate a temperature-dependent voltage via the thermoelectric effect. The millivolt-level output spans -270°C to 1300°C measurement range [32]. The sensors were connected via jumper cables to analog inputs of the ATmega 2560, an 8-bit AVR RISC microcontroller clocked at 16MHz with 256KB flash and 8KB SRAM memory. ATmega 2560 specification can be seen in Table 2. Analog voltages from the sensors were digitized by the 10-bit analog-to-digital converter at a sampling rate of 1

kHz for high resolution real-time data. Serial I2C communication enabled interfacing a liquid crystal display to visualize the measured parameters. An Arduino IDE programming environment facilitated custom firmware development for sensor data acquisition, processing, logging, and control. Real-time sensor measurements were transmitted over USB to a PC for 21 days. All measurement results are stored on the microSD which is integrated with the microcontroller.

Table 2.

ATmega 2560 microcontroller specification [33]

Type	Description
Microcontroller	ATmega 2560
Operating voltage	5V
Input voltage	6-20V
Digital I/O pins	54 (of which provide PWM output)
Analog input pins	16
DC current per I/O pins	20 mA
Flash memory	256 kB of which 8 kB used by bootloader
SRAM	8 kB
EEPROM	4 kB
Clock speed	16 MHz

Source: A. S. Ismailov (2022) and Author's analysis

Configuration

The analog input pin A0 on the ATmega 2560 microcontroller is connected to the analog output pin A0 on the MQ-4 gas sensor. The analog input pin A1 on the ATmega 2560 is connected to the analog output pin A0 on the MQ-136 gas sensor. The VCC (power) pins on both gas sensors are connected to the 5V power rail on the ATmega 2560, while the GND (ground) pins on the sensors are wired to the ground rail on the ATmega 2560. The positive and negative thermocouple wires from the K-type thermocouple are connected to the input terminals on the MAX6675 thermocouple amplifier, whose SCK (serial clock) pin is connected to digital I/O pin 12, CS (chip select) pin to digital I/O pin 11, and SO (serial data out) pin to digital I/O pin 10 on the ATmega 2560.

The I2C interface pins SCL (serial clock) and SDA (serial data) on the 16x2 LCD display are connected to the SCL and SDA pins on the ATmega 2560 at digital I/O pins 21 and 20 respectively. Power and ground for the LCD come from the 5V and GND rails on the ATmega 2560. The SPI interface pins on the microSD card - MISO (master in, slave out), MOSI (master out, slave in), SCK (serial clock) and CS (chip select) - are connected to digital I/O pins 50, 51, 52 and 53 respectively on the ATmega 2560. Finally, the ATmega 2560 interfaces with the PC via a USB connection as shown in Fig. 2. The actual implementation of the microcontroller system with integrated sensors can be observed in Fig. 3. The programming code is shown in Fig. 4.




Figure 2.
Wiring and Interfacing Sensors to an ATmega 2560 Microcontroller
Source: Author's analysis (2023)



Figure 3.
Actual implementation of the microcontroller system with integrated sensors
Source: Author's analysis (2023)

The screenshot displays the Arduino IDE interface with two windows showing C++ code for sensor interfacing and data processing. The code includes comments and function calls for reading sensor data and displaying it on the LCD.


Figure 4.
Programmed code utilizing the Arduino IDE software
Source: Author's analysis (2023)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Response of MQ-4 of samples of biogas

Fig. 5 shows the response of the MQ-4 gas sensor to biogas over three trial repetitions each spanning 2 minutes, with measurements recorded every second. The MQ-4 sensor being utilized in this experiment is designed for the specific purpose of detecting and measuring methane concentration levels in biogas mixtures. The biogas sample analyzed contains an approximate methane concentration of 3000 ppm. As evident in the Fig. 5, the sensor measurements demonstrate the presence of small-scale random fluctuations and variability throughout the sampling duration. This measured response exhibits a mean

methane concentration of 3578 ppm based on the three trials. To quantify the variability, the standard deviation was calculated to be 55.1 ppm, which corresponds to 1.540% of the mean value. This relatively low standard deviation expresses little dispersion around the mean. In other words, the replicated trials aligned well, without substantial deviations between them under consistent test conditions.




1 Figure 5.
Response of the MQ-4 sensor to biogas
Source: Author's analysis (2023)

Response of MQ-136 of samples of biogas

Fig. 6 shows the response of the MQ-136 sensor to biogas over three repeated trials. The MQ-136 sensor was used to monitor hydrogen sulfide concentration levels every second for a total duration of two minutes during each trial repetition. Throughout the three trials, the hydrogen sulfide concentration exhibited fluctuations, ranging from a minimum of 171.04 ppm to a maximum of 191.36 ppm. The observed fluctuations in biogas levels during the

repeated trials highlights the importance of conducting multiple measurements to adequately characterize sensor response and account for inherent variability. The mean and standard deviation (expressed as % of mean) from the three repeats were $189.297 \pm 0.057\%$.



1 Figure 6.
Response of the MQ-136 sensor to biogas

Source: Author's analysis (2023)

Gas concentrations

Fig. 7 shows the variation in methane concentration between 100% cow dung and a 50:50 mixture of cow dung with MSW. There was no significant difference seen in both samples around 6 days of investigation. Methane concentration increased sharply in 100% cow dung, reaching 1224 ppm at approximately 12 days of incubation under mesophilic conditions 35°C. This correlates to the exponential CH₄ production phase as methanogenic archaea generate biogas from intermediates like volatile fatty acids formed during initial hydrolysis and acetogenesis

steps [23]. In contrast, the 50:50 mixture of cow dung with MSW co-digestion feedstock showed lower CH₄, reaching just 562 ppm by day 12. The delayed and reduced CH₄ production is likely due to the increased proportion of complex particulate organics in MSW, requiring longer hydrolysis times compared to readily biodegradable cow dung [3]. Moreover, at 18 days, the methane concentration in 100% cow dung increased to 3046 ppm, while it reached 1284 ppm for the 50:50 mixture of cow dung with MSW.

The significantly higher CH₄ levels in mono-digestion of cow dung can be attributed to the fiber-rich composition which provides ideal substrates for acetoclastic methanogenesis [34]. Cow dung contains a

significant amount of methane, which is produced during the normal digestive process. Fig. 7 also shows that as the investigation time increases, the methane concentration in both samples also increases. In addition, the highest methane concentration was observed in 100% cow dung at 3488 ppm, while it was 1624 ppm for the 50:50 mixture of cow dung with MSW. As expected, the high cellulosic and hemicellulosic content of cow dung promotes maximal methane generation by the endogenous gut archaea. In contrast, the presence of slowly biodegradable and inert fractions in MSW diluted the CH₄ producing potential in the co-digestion.




Figure 7. Varied methane concentrations between 100% cow dung and a 50:50 mixture of cow dung with MSW
 Source: Author's analysis (2023)

Variations in hydrogen sulfide concentration between 100% cow dung and a 50:50 mixture of cow dung with MSW are shown in Fig. 8. From the figure, it can be seen that the hydrogen sulfide concentration increased significantly in both samples. At 5 days, the hydrogen sulfide concentration was observed to be 117 ppm in 100% cow dung, while it was 102 ppm for the 50:50 mixture of cow dung with MSW. Cow dung contains sulfur-bearing organic compounds which serve as precursors for H₂S production. These include proteins like keratin and enzymes, amino acids such as methionine and cysteine, and other sulfur organics excreted in the manure [35]. The sulfur compounds get converted to H₂S gas during the anaerobic digestion process. Moreover, at around 15 days, both samples showed an increase of 171 ppm in 100% cow dung and 157 ppm in the 50:50 mixture of cow dung with MSW.

The concentration of hydrogen sulfide in the 50:50 mixture of cow dung with MSW

tends to be lower compared to 100% cow dung. This is due to MSW contains lower sulfur content than cow dung [36]. MSW provides more balanced nutrition for methane-forming archaea, reducing H₂S formation. The maximum hydrogen sulfide observed in 100% cow dung was 195 ppm at 21 days of investigation. Inside a digester, anaerobic bacteria convert and ferment the organic matter in cow dung into biogas. Sulfur compounds are metabolized into hydrogen sulfide and other sulfur byproducts like carbonyl sulfide. Factors include pH, temperature and organic loading rate impact H₂S production. At a neutral pH level, more free hydrogen ions are available to react with sulfur species to form H₂S. Higher temperatures speed up reaction kinetics. Overloading digesters can inhibit methane-forming archaea, leading to increased H₂S formation. Longer retention times also allow more sulfate reduction to H₂S [37].




Figure 8.
 Varied hydrogen sulfide concentrations between 100% cow dung and a 50:50 mixture of cow dung with MSW
 Source: Author's analysis (2023)

Temperature result

Fig. 9 shows variations in surrounding environment and anaerobic digester (AD) temperatures. From the observation, the digester temperature is relatively higher compared to the surrounding environment temperature throughout the study period. This phenomenon can be attributed to the closed, insulated nature of anaerobic digesters, which retains the heat produced during bacterial breakdown of organic matter. In contrast, the surrounding environment temperature is lower as it is

influenced by external weather conditions. At 3 days, the digester temperature was observed to be 43°C, while the surrounding environment temperature was 35°C. On the other hand, at 9 days, the temperature of both samples decreased by 35°C in the digester and 28°C in the surrounding environment temperature. This temperature decline may have been caused by lower microbial activity or feedstock input rates during this period. The highest temperature observed was 44°C in the digester around 3 days of investigation.




Figure 9.

Temperature variance between the anaerobic digester (AD) and the surrounding environment

Source: Author's analysis (2023)

Microcontroller role for anaerobic digestion monitoring system

The ATmega 2560 microcontroller has significant potential for real-time monitoring and control applications in biogas systems due to its technical specifications and connectivity. The 8-bit AVR RISC-based processor operating at 16MHz provides sufficient computational performance for anaerobic digestion process control algorithms. With 256KB of program memory and 8KB RAM, substantial compiled code and sensor data can be stored. Sixteen 10-bit ADC channels allow interfacing with analog biogas sensors to quantitatively measure methane, hydrogen sulfide and temperature. Digital I/O enables control of valves, pumps, and heating elements for automation. UART,

I2C, and SPI buses support addition of wireless modules for remote monitoring. The ATmega 2560's proven reliability in industrial environments, cost-effectiveness, and availability of programming libraries like Arduino make it highly adaptable for continuous sensing, logging, and real-time control in biogas plants. With proper integration of modern sensors and prudent firmware design, the ATmega 2560 has considerable scientific merit for increasing biogas yields through fine-grained monitoring of anaerobic digestion and automated system optimization.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates the effectiveness of microcontroller-implemented sensors for monitoring quantification of critical process

parameters in small-scale anaerobic digesters. Experimental data were collected on methane (CH₄), hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), and temperature levels during 21-day mesophilic digestion investigation utilizing substrate formulations of 100% cow dung and a 50:50 mixture of cow dung with municipal solid waste (MSW). Results indicate higher CH₄ production for the mono-digestion of cow dung compared to co-digestion, with maximum concentrations reaching 3488 ppm at day 21. Negligible differences in H₂S evolution were observed

between the two feedstock conditions, approaching 195 ppm and 192 ppm for the cow dung and co-digestate, respectively. Operating temperatures were maintained below the mesophilic threshold throughout the investigation. The microcontroller-enabled monitoring system provided continuous, high-accuracy measurements of biogas composition, facilitating data analysis. Overall, this research validates the promise of automated on-site sensors for evaluating and optimizing small-scale biogas digesters.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] X. Zeng, G. Chen, S. Luo, Y. Teng, Z. Zhang, and T. Zhu, "Renewable transition in the power and transport sectors under the goal of carbon-neutral in Sichuan, China," *Energy Reports*, vol. 8, pp. 738–748, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.egy.2022.02.213.
- [2] I. Utami, M. A. Riski, and D. R. Hartanto, "Nuclear Power Plants Technology to Realize Net Zero Emission 2060," *Int. J. Bus. Manag. Technol.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 158–162, 2022, [Online]. Available: www.theijbmt.com
- [3] I. G. A. Negara, A. A. N. B. Mulawarman, I. G. Santosa, and L. P. I. Midiani, "STUDI EKSPERIMENTAL GENERATOR ELEKTRIK BERBAHAN BAKAR BIOGAS GUNA MENDUKUNG NET ZERO EMISSION," vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 689–700, 2023, doi: 10.21776/jrm.v14i2.1431.
- [4] M. J. B. Kabeyi and O. A. Olanrewaju, "Technologies for biogas to electricity conversion," *Energy Reports*, vol. 8, pp. 774–786, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.egy.2022.11.007.

- [5] T. G. T. Nindhia, M. McDonald, and D. Styles, "Greenhouse gas mitigation and rural electricity generation by a novel two-stroke biogas engine," *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 280, p. 124473, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.124473.
- [6] H. M. Zabed, S. Akter, J. Yun, G. Zhang, Y. Zhang, and X. Qi, "Biogas from microalgae: Technologies, challenges and opportunities," *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 117, no. January, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2019.109503.
- [7] R. Feiz, M. Johansson, E. Lindkvist, J. Moestedt, S. N. Pålledal, and F. Ometto, "The biogas yield, climate impact, energy balance, nutrient recovery, and resource cost of biogas production from household food waste—A comparison of multiple cases from Sweden," *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 378, no. September, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.134536.
- [8] A. Lindfors, L. Hagman, and M. Eklund, "The Nordic biogas model: Conceptualization, societal effects, and policy recommendations," *City Environ. Interact.*, vol. 15, no. June, p. 100083, 2022,

- doi: 10.1016/j.cacint.2022.100083.
- [9] A. Haryanto, S. Triyono, and N. H. Wicaksono, "Effect of hydraulic retention time on biogas production from cow dung in a semi continuous anaerobic digester," *Int. J. Renew. Energy Dev.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 93–100, 2018, doi: 10.14710/ijred.7.2.93-100.
- [10] K. Oibileke, S. Mamphweli, E. L. Meyer, G. Makaka, and N. Nwokolo, "Design and Fabrication of a Plastic Biogas Digester for the Production of Biogas from Cow Dung," *J. Eng.*, vol. 2020, pp. 1–11, 2020, doi: 10.1155/2020/1848714.
- [11] S. Singh, N. Hariteja, S. Sharma, N. J. Raju, and T. J. R. Prasad, "Production of biogas from human faeces mixed with the co-substrate poultry litter & cow dung," *Environ. Technol. Innov.*, vol. 23, no. April, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.eti.2021.101551.
- [12] I. G. A. Negara *et al.*, "Experimental Study of Cooling Performance and Electrical Parameters in a Microcontroller-Driven Inverter AC System," vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 81–90, 2023.
- [13] T. Llano, C. Arce, and D. C. Finger, "Optimization of biogas production through anaerobic digestion of municipal solid waste: a case study in the capital area of Reykjavik, Iceland," *J. Chem. Technol. Biotechnol.*, vol. 96, no. 5, pp. 1333–1344, 2021, doi: 10.1002/jctb.6654.
- [14] O. Norouzi and A. Dutta, "The Current Status and Future Potential of Biogas Production from Canada's Organic Fraction Municipal Solid Waste," *Energies*, vol. 15, no. 2, 2022, doi: 10.3390/en15020475.
- [15] A. Anukam, A. Mohammadi, M. Naqvi, and K. Granström, "A review of the chemistry of anaerobic digestion: Methods of accelerating and optimizing process efficiency," *Processes*, vol. 7, no. 8, pp. 1–19, 2019, doi: 10.3390/PR7080504.
- [16] J. N. Meegoda, B. Li, K. Patel, and L. B. Wang, "A review of the processes, parameters, and optimization of anaerobic digestion," *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 15, no. 10, 2018, doi: 10.3390/ijerph15102224.
- [17] G. Náthia-Neves, M. Berni, G. Dragone, S. I. Mussatto, and T. Forster-Carneiro, "Anaerobic digestion process: technological aspects and recent developments," *Int. J. Environ. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 15, no. 9, pp. 2033–2046, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s13762-018-1682-2.
- [18] C. Morales-Polo, M. del Mar Cledera-Castro, and B. Yolanda Moratilla Soria, "Reviewing the anaerobic digestion of food waste: From waste generation and anaerobic process to its perspectives," *Appl. Sci.*, vol. 8, no. 10, 2018, doi: 10.3390/app8101804.
- [19] B. Bharathiraja, T. Sudharsana, J. Jayamuthunagai, R. Praveenkumar, S. Chozhavendhan, and J. Iyyappan, "Biogas production – A review on composition, fuel properties, feed stock and principles of anaerobic digestion," *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 90, no. April, pp. 570–582, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2018.03.093.
- [20] H. M. Zwain, B. K. Nile, A. M. Faris, M. Vakili, and I. Dahlan, "Modelling of hydrogen sulfide fate and emissions in extended aeration sewage treatment plant using TOXCHEM simulations," *Sci. Rep.*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1–11, 2020, doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-79395-8.
- [21] T. G. Tirta Nindhia, I. W. Surata, and A. Wardana, "The effect of biogas desulfurization to acidity of lubricant oil of the biogas fuelled engine," *IOP Conf. Ser. Mater. Sci. Eng.*, vol. 201, no. 1, 2017, doi: 10.1088/1757-899X/201/1/012021.
- [22] S. Yang, Y. Liu, N. Wu, Y. Zhang, S. Svoronos, and P. Pullammanappallil, "Low-cost, Arduino-based, portable device for measurement of methane composition in biogas," *Renew. Energy*, vol. 138, pp. 224–229, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.renene.2019.01.083.
- [23] I. S. P. Nagahage, E. A. A. D. Nagahage, and T. Fujino, "Assessment of the

- applicability of a low-cost sensor-based methane monitoring system for continuous multi-channel sampling,” *Environ. Monit. Assess.*, vol. 193, no. 8, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s10661-021-09290-w.
- [24] Iswanto, A. Ma’arif, B. Kebenaran, and P. Megantoro, “Design of gas concentration measurement and monitoring system for biogas power plant,” *Indones. J. Electr. Eng. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 726–732, 2021, doi: 10.11591/ijeecs.v22.i2.pp726-732.
- [25] V. Fasake and K. Dashora, “Characterization and morphology of natural dung polymer for potential industrial application as bio-based fillers,” *Polymers (Basel)*, vol. 12, no. 12, pp. 1–16, 2020, doi: 10.3390/polym12123030.
- [26] C. Font-Palma, “Methods for the Treatment of Cattle Manure—A Review,” *C*, vol. 5, no. 2, p. 27, 2019, doi: 10.3390/c5020027.
- [27] N. de Nooijer *et al.*, “On concentration polarisation in a fluidized bed membrane reactor for biogas steam reforming: Modelling and experimental validation,” *Chem. Eng. J.*, vol. 348, no. March, pp. 232–243, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.cej.2018.04.205.
- [28] S. Achinas, J. Krooneman, and G. J. W. Euverink, “Enhanced Biogas Production from the Anaerobic Batch Treatment of Banana Peels,” *Engineering*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 970–978, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.eng.2018.11.036.
- [29] G. Pataro, D. Carullo, M. A. Bakar Siddique, M. Falcone, F. Donsi, and G. Ferrari, “Improved extractability of carotenoids from tomato peels as side benefits of PEF treatment of tomato fruit for more energy-efficient steam-assisted peeling,” *J. Food Eng.*, vol. 233, pp. 65–73, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2018.03.029.
- [30] M. de Andrade Lima, D. Charalampopoulos, and A. Chatzifragkou, “Optimisation and modelling of supercritical CO₂ extraction process of carotenoids from carrot peels,” *J. Supercrit. Fluids*, vol. 133, pp. 94–102, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.supflu.2017.09.028.
- [31] N. M. Sakayo, J. N. Mutuku, and J. M. Ngaruiya, “Design and Calibration of a Microcontroller Based MQ-4 Gas Sensor for Domestic Cooking Gas System,” *Int. J. Appl. Phys.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 31–40, 2019, doi: 10.14445/23500301/ijap-v6i2p106.
- [32] A. Kadir and S. Kako, “Comparative Investigation on the Quality of Sensitivity of Six Different Types of Thermocouples,” *Al-Rafidain Eng. J.*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 117–126, 2022, doi: 10.33899/rengj.2022.132862.1157.
- [33] A. S. Ismailov, “Study of arduino microcontroller board,” *Sci. J.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 172–179, 2022.
- [34] A. J. M. Stams, B. Teusink, and D. Z. Sousa, “Ecophysiology of Acetoclastic Methanogens,” *Biog. Hydrocarb.*, pp. 1–14, 2019, doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-53114-4_21-1.
- [35] I. G. A. Negara, T. G. T. Nindhia, I. W. Surata, T. S. Nindhia, and S. K. Shukla, “Method on utilization of low quality biogas as a fuel for 4 stroke spark ignition engine of electric generator,” *Key Eng. Mater.*, vol. 877 KEM, pp. 147–152, 2021, doi: 10.4028/www.scientific.net/KEM.877.147.
- [36] A. Calbry-Muzyka, H. Madi, F. Rüsç-Pfund, M. Gandiglio, and S. Biollaz, “Biogas composition from agricultural sources and organic fraction of municipal solid waste,” *Renew. Energy*, vol. 181, pp. 1000–1007, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.renene.2021.09.100.
- [37] T. B. Pirzadah, B. Malik, R. A. Bhat, and K. R. Hakeem, “Early-stage response in anaerobic bioreactors due to high sulfate loads: Hydrogen sulfide yield and other organic volatile sulfur compounds as a sign of microbial community modifications,” *Bioresour. Technol.*, no. xxxx, 2022, doi: 10.1002/9781119789444.

INTEGRATED MICROCONTROLLER MQ SENSORS FOR MONITORING BIOGAS: ADVANCEMENTS IN METHANE AND HYDROGEN SULFIDE DETECTION

ORIGINALITY REPORT

11%

SIMILARITY INDEX

7%

INTERNET SOURCES

8%

PUBLICATIONS

2%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

- 1** Shunchang Yang, Yikan Liu, Na Wu, Yingxiu Zhang, Spyros Svoronos, Pratap Pullammanappallil. "Low-cost, Arduino-based, portable device for measurement of methane composition in biogas", Renewable Energy, 2019
Publication 2%

- 2** Niek de Nooijer, Fausto Gallucci, Emma Pellizzari, Jon Melendez et al. "On concentration polarisation in a fluidized bed membrane reactor for biogas steam reforming: modelling and experimental validation", Chemical Engineering Journal, 2018
Publication 1%

- 3** www.researchgate.net
Internet Source 1%

- 4** pdffox.com
Internet Source 1%

5	Submitted to University of Wollongong Student Paper	1 %
6	www.mdpi.com Internet Source	1 %
7	Jonathan Oxe, Hugh Blemings. "Chapter 5 PS/2 Keyboard or Mouse Input", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2009 Publication	1 %
8	Ali Erdogan Karaca, Ibrahim Dincer, Michael Nitefor. "A unique biomass based integrated energy system for cleaner production of multiple energy outputs for sustainable communities", Sustainable Cities and Society, 2023 Publication	<1 %
9	Chevonne Reynolds, Robert J. Fletcher, Celine M. Carneiro, Nicole Jennings et al. "Inconsistent effects of landscape heterogeneity and land-use on animal diversity in an agricultural mosaic: a multi-scale and multi-taxon investigation", Landscape Ecology, 2017 Publication	<1 %
10	Aditi Wagle, Michael J. Angove, Asmita Mahara, Amrita Wagle et al. "Multi-stage pre-treatment of lignocellulosic biomass for multi-	<1 %

product biorefinery: A review", Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments, 2022

Publication

11

Muyiwa Ajoke Akindolire, Haripriya Rama, Ashira Roopnarain. "Psychrophilic anaerobic digestion: A critical evaluation of microorganisms and enzymes to drive the process", Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 2022

Publication

<1 %

12

Wenju Tao, Jiaxin Yang, Liyu Chen, Yifan Zhang, Shaohua Wu, Jiaming Li, Zhaoshun Liu, Jingui He, Zhaowen Wang. "Environmentally friendly and efficient green recovery of fluoride from waste aluminum electrolytic sediment using Al₂O₃", Separation and Purification Technology, 2023

Publication

<1 %

13

pire.soe.ucsc.edu

Internet Source

<1 %

14

scholar.sun.ac.za

Internet Source

<1 %

15

A.Y. Sweet. "The Effect of Bradykinin on the Course of Respiratory Distress Syndrome", Neonatology, 1969

Publication

<1 %

16

manualzz.com

Internet Source

<1 %

17

[mdpi-res.com](https://www.mdpi-res.com)

Internet Source

<1 %

18

www.slideshare.net

Internet Source

<1 %

19

Minxuan Kuang, Shiyi Zhou, Jingxin Lei, Qiman Li. "Low environmental sensitive antistatic material based on poly(vinyl chloride)/quaternary ammonium salt by blending with poly(ethylene oxide)", Journal of Applied Polymer Science, 2008

Publication

<1 %

20

Vilis Dubrovskis, Imants Plume. "Anaerobic fermentation of kitchen waste", Latvia University of Life Sciences and Technologies, 2022

Publication

<1 %

21

Imane Adnane, Hamza Taoumi, Abdelkarim Elouahabi, Khadija Lahrech, Abdellah Oulmekki. "Valorization of crop residues and animal wastes: Anaerobic co-digestion technology", Heliyon, 2024

Publication

<1 %

22

Qigen Deng, Shuai Li, Mengmeng Yao, Chaosi Liu, Zhecheng Zhang, Sisi Xiang. "Study on the factors of hydrogen sulfide production

<1 %

from lignite bacterial sulfate reduction based on response surface method", Scientific Reports, 2023

Publication

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On