Validation and Development of Gravimetric Method for Humic Acid Determination

Sobia Noor[1], Rehmat Ullah[2](Corresponding Author), Muhammad Akram Qazi[3], Zafar Abbas[4], Fareeha Habib[5], Farhat Bashir[6], Muhammad Adeel Kamran[7], Atteq-ur-Rehman Memon[8], Allah Nawaz[9], Abdul Ghafar Khan[10]

[1, 6,] Scientific Officer, Soil and Water Testing Laboratory, Dera Ghazi Khan, Punjab, Pakistan
[2,] Principal Scientist, Soil and Water Testing Laboratory, Dera Ghazi Khan, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: rehmat1169@gmail.com
[3,] Chief Scientist, Soil Fertility Research Institute, Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan
[4, 5] Senior Scientist, Soil and Water Testing Laboratory, Dera Ghazi Khan, Punjab, Pakistan
[7,] Institute of Food Sciences & Nutrition, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Punjab, Pakistan
[8,] Director General, Pakistan National Accreditation Council, Islamabad, Pakistan
[9,] Soil Chemistry Section, Ayub Agricultural Research Institute, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan
[10,] Senior Scientist, Soil Fertility Research Institute, Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

Abstract

Samples of fertilizer undergo testing to ascertain the levels of nutrients they contain, but the results differ depending on the method used. Thus, the primary aim of this research was to create and verify a method for determining humic acid using gravimetric analysis. The gravimetric method for quantifying humic acid contents was validated at the Soil & Water Testing Laboratories (SWTL), Accredited for ISO: 17025 in D.G.Khan. The validation process encompassed repeatability, reproducibility, limit of detection, limit of quantification, recovery, and bias. Descriptive stat were used in the study (i.e Average, Standard Deviation, relative standard deviation, etc.), and for Reproducibility T-test was employed. The detection as well as quantification limits were 0.145% and 0.484% Humic acid, respectively. With a repeatability RSD of 0.4725%, the reproducibility showed T-calculated values of 0.05, which were below the T-tabulated threshold of 2.262. The alpha value for T used in this study was 0.05 (5% level of significance or 95% confidence interval, i.e K2. The recovery of Humic acid was 102.34%. The Z-scores for the results (QUATEST3 www.quatest3.com.vn) in Vietnam fell within the satisfactory range. The coefficient of correlation (0.999%) indicates a strong connection between the true value of Humic acid and the calculated values. This result indicates that the performance of the method was best. As all the parameters performed well and gave accurate results as per standard criteria. Therefore, the approach could be effectively applied for determining humic acid in fertilizers.

Keywords: Validation, Gravimetric, Development, Fertilizers, Method

DOI:	https://zenodo.org/records/15385388
Journal Link:	https://jai.bwo-researches.com/index.php/jwr/index
Paper Link:	https://jai.bwo-researches.com/index.php/jwr/article/view/119
Publication Process	Received: 14 Apr 2025/ Revised: 05 May 2025/ Accepted: 07 May 2025/ Published: 11 May 2025
ISSN:	Online [3007-0929], Print [3007-0910]

| *Indexing:* | |
| *Publisher:* | BWO Research International (15162394 Canada Inc.) https://www.bwo-researches.com |

Introduction

Lignin, tannins, cellulose, cutins, and other degraded plant and animal components are examples of humic compounds (Tan et al., 2000; Billingham, 2012; Hayes and Swift, 2020). After adding harvested leftovers, the soil has high levels of HS (Wiesler et al., 2016). Most arable land now has less harvested residues due to increased livestock and biogas production, which lowers the amount of HS in the soil. Researchers have tried to use external applications to make up for the lost HS over the past few decades (Rose et al., 2014; Gerke, 2018). Soil, coals, lignites, as well as organic contents, are the primary commercial sources of HS (Gollenbeek and Van Der Weide, 2020; Yang et al., 2021). According to their ability to be soluble in different solutions (i.e acidic, alkaline solutions), they are classified as fulvic acid and humic acid (De Melo et al., 2016). Because the humin percentage in HS does not decompose, scientists have concentrated on the humic acid fraction, as well as on fulvic acid fractions, as they can quickly increase soil fertility and health. According to Among et al., humic substances on crop productivity play an advantageous part in soils as well as plants because the humic acid fractions and Fulvic Acid fractions of humic materials are more reactive chemically and resistant to microbial responses (Billingham, 2012). Because of their amphiphilic characteristics and long-term degradation resistance, HA can form very complex cations (Wood, 1996).

Around 60% of the HA fraction is organic carbon (C), which is crucial for soil microbial growth (Sible et al., 2021). It also contains sulphur (S), hydrogen (H), oxygen (O), and nitrogen (N) in addition to C. For example, humic acids can improve the texture of soil, soil structure as well as water holding capacity and enhance microbial growth of soil, increasing its physic ochemical properties (Fuentes et al., 2018; Shah et al., 2018); enhance the availabilty of different nutrient elements in soil, particularly differentmicronutrient through chelating andtransportationof micronutrientsin theplant (Yang et al., 2021); and causesprecipitationofpoisonous heavy metal contents and decrease their transport to plants in turn lowers the amount of toxic substances that plant consume (Wu et al., 2017). By boosting plant growth-promoting hormones like auxin as well as cytokinin that support photosynthesis, nutrient breakdown, and develop stress resistance, humic acids also stimulate the growth of crops (Billingham, 2012; Rose et al., 2014; Canellas et al., 2020; Laskosky et al., 2020; Nardi et al., 2021; van Tol de Castro et al., 2021). Following HA treatment, earlier work has also found no impacts on soil health and the growth crop (Bybordi and Ebrahimian, 2013; Bassiouny et al., 2014; Mukherjee et al., 2014; Kelapa and Banyuasin, 2016). Higher Humic acid dosages are linked to improved physical properties of soil (Gollenbeek and Van Der Weide, 2020), but it is still unclear how they will affect crops and soil chemical properties (Rose et al., 2014).

By standard, the objective of validation of the analysis protocol is to guarantee that it accomplishes the appropriate criteria. Present research aimed to develop and validate a gravimetric technique for determining humic acid in various fertilizers.

Materials and methods

The humic acid Extrapure (Analytical grade) was used

Method validation

The development of method as well as its validation was achieved by the valuation of various analytical techniques of excellence according to International Conference on Harmonization, comprising of precision, repeatabilty, reproduciblity, limit of detection and quantification limits, percent recovery as well as for bias (Guideline, 2007; Sahoo et al., 2018). The present study regarding the validation of the method was conducted at the Soil & Water Testing Lab. Dera Ghazi Khan District of Punjab, Pakistan (Pakistan).

Accuracy

By definition, accuracy is referred to as ''closeness of results to the actual result''. For determining the accuracy of any method/protocol, the resulting data regarding of repeatability of two dissimilar scientists was used. According to Collaborative International Pesticides Analytical Council (CIPAC 1999), the better developed/validated protocol has a percent accuracy greater than 85.0 %. The accuracy was calculated using the method of (Desta and Amare (2017) and Sinshaw et al. (2019)).

Accuracy (%) = 100 - error

Precision

Precision is the ''agreement between a set of replicated measurements without having any information of actual values''. For the determination of the precision, the obtained results from the repeatability as well as the reproducibility were applied. For the repeatability of the first analyst (analyst-1), ten samples of humic acid were arranged with the same concentration of humic acid and their active ingredients were measured. Nevertheless, for the reproducibility of the second analyst (analyst-2), the humic acid samples of similar concentrations were prepared and analysed by taking 10 repeated readings (Barnawal et al., 2016).

Limit of detection and limit of quantification

Detection limits (LOD) are defined as the lowest quantity of a material which can be certainly detected as well as distinguished from zero (0). Nonetheless, it cannot certainly be quantified (González et al., 2018; McDowall, 2005). Whereas, the quantifying limits (LOQ) are the lowest quantity of the material which could be determined quantitatively with a satisfactory range concerning precision and accuracy (González et al., 2018; González & Herrador, 2007; Markley et al., 1998).

Measurement of uncertainty

For uncertainty determination, the Eurachem Guide was consulted. The uncertainty in the outcome may be due to several reasons (i.e person, methods, environmental conditions, different CRM and chemicals and instruments used). Whereas, the combined uncertainty is the combination of all other factors. The budget of uncertainty comprises total uncertainties because of the earlier-mentioned elements (Cortez, 1995; Örnemark, 2004). Uncertainty is measured at about a 68 percent confidence interval. As far as ISO: 17025 is concerned, the testing laboratories essentially signify their uncertainties with distinct levels of confidence, which is known as the expanded uncertainty. Uncertainty (Nazir et al., 2020; Aslam et al., 2021; Van der Veen & Cox, 2021).

Combined uncertainty= $\sqrt{\ } (U_{(x1)})^2 + (U_{(x2)})^2 + (U_{(x3)})^2 + (U_{(x4)})^2$

Expanded uncertainty = Combined uncertainty x level of confidence.

Robustness

The capability of any analysis method to remain unaffected by small changes in experimental conditions.

Method

The first humic acid sample was filtered, and then 5 5ml the filtrate in volumetric flask (100 ml volumetric flask). Added 50 ml of the extraction solution and shook for one hour through a mechanical shaker at 270 rpm. Made the volume of the extraction solution up to the mark. Centrifuged at 4000 RPM for 20 minutes to remove inert matter. Then added Nitric

Acid (concentrated) in the filtrate till the ph drops to 1. Kept the sample for 2.0 hours to complete the reaction. Humic acid gets precipitated. Oven dried the filter paper (Whatman No. 42) till constant weight and recorded its weight. Collected the precipitates by filtration through Whatman No. 42. Dried the precipitates in the oven at 105 oC till constant weight. Finally recorded dry precipitates weight.

Calculations

$$\textbf{Humic Acid (\%)} = \frac{\text{Weight of oven-dry precipitates}}{\text{Sample(volume taken)}} \times 100$$

Where:

Weight of dry precipitates = weight of oven-dried precipitates along with filter paper - weight of oven-dried filter paper

Table 1: Details of the Sample used in the study

Product Name	Company	Company Guaranteed Contents
Factor Plus	Suncrop Pesticides	Humic Acid: 10%

Repeatability

The nearness of the agreement amongst the independent outcomes was got using the same protocol on same test matrix, under similar environments (similar analyst, similar equipment, and similar lab and within short interval of time) the measurement of repeatability is considered as relative standrd deviation qualified with the term: 'repeatability' as repeatability RSD.

Factor Plus Humic Acid (HA=10%) of Suncrop Pesticides was employed for repeatability, reproducibility, as well as earlier studies. The data of ten (10) replications (Table 2) predicts that the Humic Acid protocol is quite repeatable with the relative standard deviation (%RSD) of 0.4725 % as it is <10% representing homogeneousness of the obtained data. Henceforth the said parameter is considered as qualifies. Therefore, this method is suitable for achieving good quality and reliable results.

Table 2: Repeatability findings of Humic Acid Fertilizer

Analyst-1		
Sr. No.	**Repeat**	**HA=10%**
1	1	10.2
2	2	10.25
3	3	10.15
4	4	10.27
5	5	10.29
6	6	10.22
7	7	10.26
8	8	10.29
9	9	10.24
10	10	10.17
	Average%	10.234
	Stdev	0.0484
	RSD%	0.4725

ReproducibTable 3he data (Table 3) explain the nearness of agreement among Humic Acid results achieved independently with the same protocol over the same testing matrix, however, under dissimilar conditions (dissimilar scientist, dissimilar environment and afterward dissimilar interval of time). The T-test was used during this validation experiment.

Table 3: Humic Acid Reproducibility Results

S.No.	Analyst 1	Analyst 2
1	10.2	10.26
2	10.25	10.28
3	10.15	10.24
4	10.27	10.19
5	10.29	10.17
6	10.22	10.25
7	10.26	10.26
8	10.29	10.23
9	10.24	10.16
10	10.17	10.23
Average (X)	10.234	10.227
SD	0.0484	0.0406

Precision (%RSD)	0.473	0.397

t- test= =((10.234-10.227)/SQRT ((0.0484)×2/10)+(0.0406)×2 / 10) = 0.05

Tabulated -t =2.262 at 95% level of confidence

By the t-test, the calculated t -t-value (i.e 0.05) is less than the t-tabulated (i.e., 2.262); therefore, the results are statistically non-significant with each other, Therefore, the protocol is capable of delivering reproducible results, though duplicating analysis with the standard deviations, i.e

± 0.0484 and ± 0.0406%, respectively, achieved by the two dissimilar scientists performing individually at dissimilar intervals of time. Reproducibility is supposed to be effective; henceforth, the parameter is qualified.

The %RSD of reproducible results was compared to the predicted relative standard deviation = PRSD(r). The PRSD(r) was calculated from the Horwitz formula: PRSD(R) = 2C -0.15

Where C is expressed as a mass fraction. The RSD(r) was found to be lower than the PRSDr, and hence the method was acceptable.

The Horwitz ratio or HorRat value

Horwitz ratio or HorRat value is a very simple performance parameter which reveals the acceptability of any analytical method regarding precision.

It is defined as the ratio of the Relative Standard Deviation of Reproducibility (RSDR), in percentage and is calculated from the reproducibility data, to the Predicted Relative Standard Deviation of Reproducibility (PRSDR) from the equation given by Horwitz, thus:

HorRat = RSDR/ PRSDR

The empirical acceptance range of HorRat is 0.5 to 2.

Table 4: Reproducibility of results of analysis of Humic acid by 2 analysts

Parameters	Analyst I	Analyst II
Relative Standard Deviation (Reproducibility) RSD_R	0.471	0.397
Predicted Relative Standard Deviation (Reproducibility) $PRSD_R$	2.83	
HorRat value	0.167	0.141

The Horwitz equation describes the relationship between the concentration of an analyte and the expected variability of the analytical method. The equation shows that:

The Horwitz equation is widely used in analytical chemistry to:

- Predict the expected variability of analytical methods
- Evaluate the performance of analytical methods
- Compare the performance of different analytical methods

Method Detection Limit (LOD)

By definition, the method limit of detection (LOD) is the lowest quantity of any ingredient which could be assessed as well as reported with 95% confidence level that the analyte concentration is > 0 and was calculated from the analysis of any material containing the particular analyte. The LOD of this study was 0.145 % Humic Acid in a given sample after multiplication by the method factor. 10 spiked samples of data were employed for determining the Limit of Detection.

LOD = blank value + k.s

Wherever:

k it is the factor that is multiplied with the standard deviations to calculate the uncertainty. Under prevailing situation, a factor (3) was used.

s= standard deviation for natural specimens without content, but for specimen having very low content or for the blank specimens. In this study, no any blank value was used as machine is already adjust to 0 (zero) for each reading. Subsequently, the standard deviation is for calculating the reproducibility of the laboratory.

LOD = value of blank + $k.s_r$ = $0 + 3 \times 0.0484$= 0.145%

Quantitation Limit of Method (LOQ)

The LOQ is the lowest concentration of any substance which could be determined with an acceptable range. In practice, the LOQ is calculated by the best conventions to be the analyte concentration. Conforming to the obtained standard deviation at a very low level multiplied by the factor, kq, which is normally used as ten (10). The quantification limit obtained in this study was 0.484 % Humic Acid (in a given fertilizer) after multiplication by a factor. The LOQ in this situation is determined as being the value of blank plus 10 times the SD of the repeatability, as explained under:

LOQ = Blank + k.sr = 0 + 10 × 0.0484= 0.484%

Recovery

The recorded recovery of the Humic acid sample (i.e 10.234 %) is within the suggested limit of the standard criterion (i.e. ± 5%) of the recovery (Table 4), Therefore, the protocol under study is confirmed in this regard and is qualified.

Table 4: Evaluation of Humic Acid Recovery

S. No.	Standard Matrix	Detail of Sample	HA % Expected	HA% Observed	Recovery (%) (Obs/exp) ×100	Verification range (± 5 % of 100% Recovery)	Comments
1	Humic Acid sample	10% HA	10	10.234	102.34	95– 105 %	Verified

Bias

QUATEST3 (www.quatest3.com.vn)

Lab Name	Lab No.	Sample code	Lab Results	Expanded Uncertainty	Z-Score	Remarks
SWTL, D.G.Khan	Lab-05	QUATEST3 QPT 029/24	9.95	0.024	0.76	Satisfactory

Uncertainty

Case # Ref:	Estimation of Humic Acid Content in Fertilizer (H.A=10%)

S/N	Analyst 1	Analyst 2
1	10.2	10.26
2	10.25	10.28
3	10.15	10.24
4	10.27	10.19
5	10.29	10.17
6	10.22	10.25
7	10.26	10.26
8	10.29	10.23
9	10.24	10.16
10	10.17	10.23
Average	10.234	10.227
SU	0.0484	0.0406
Max SU:	0.0484	

UNCERTAINTY BUDGET								
S/N	Sources of Uncertainty	Uncertainty	Type A/B	K Factor (Where Applicable)	Uncertainty Contribution	Average or Value	Relative Uncertainty	Combining Uncertainty
1	Analyst	0.0484	A	1	0.0484	17.921	0.002700742	7.29401E-06
2	Vol. Flask 100 ml	0.01	B	2	0.005102041	99.77	5.1138E-05	2.6151E-09
3	Volumetric Flask 1000 ml	0.11	B	2	0.056122449	999.4	5.61561E-05	3.15351E-09
4	Pipett 05 ml	0.002	B	2	0.001020408	4.98	0.000204901	4.19845E-08
5	Equipment (Oven)	0.7	B	2	0.357142857	106	0.003369272	1.1352E-05
6	Analytical Balance	0.00006	B	2	3.06122E-05	2	1.53061E-05	2.34277E-10
7	Environment	0.05	A	1	0.05	25.66	0.001948558	3.79688E-06
	Combined	0.0047	@	**95 % CL**				

	Uncertainty (Uc)			
	CL (K)	2	2	2
	Expanded Uncertainty (Ue)	0.0095	@	2
	Expanded Uncertainty per unit	0.0001	%	

Summary

S. No.	Parameter of Validation	Limit/ Range	Results	Comments
1	Reference Material	Humic Acid (10 %)	10.234	Qualifies
2	Repeatability	$RSD_{Repeatibility}$ <10 %	RSD=0.4725%	Qualifies
3	Reproducibility	T-Calculated < 2.262	T_{cal} = 0.05	Qualifies
4	Reproducibility	$RSD_{Reproducibility}$ <10 %	RSD=0.4725%	Qualifies
5	**Horwitz** ratio or HorRat value:	0.5-2.0	Within the admissible range	
6	Limit of Detection	< 5.0 Excellent <10 Acceptable	0.145%	Qualifies
7	Limit of Quantification	< 10 Excellent <15 Acceptable	0.484%	Qualifies
8	Recovery	95- 105 %	102.34%	Qualifies

Conclusion

The results of the validation study indicated that the Soil and Water Testing laboratory, Dera Ghazi Khan, is qualified to conduct Humic acid analysis using the proposed method by standards.

Recommendations

This method will perform well in all the laboratories with all requisite machinery, NIST Traceable CRM and calibrated equipment with similar environmental conditions.

References

Albiach R, Canet R, Pomares F, and Ingelmo F. Organic matter components and aggregate stability after the application of different amendments to a horticultural soil. Bioresour. Technol. 2001. 76, 125–129. doi: 10.1016/S0960-8524(00)00090-0

AOAC. Official Method of Analysis of AOAC International, 20th Edition, 2016 AOAC Official Method 2.7.05 Method No. 973.04 chapter 2; 53.

BybOrdin A, and Ebrahimian, E. Growth, yield and quality components of canola fertilized with urea and zeolite. Commun. Soil Sci. Plant Anal. 2013; 44, 2896–2915. doi: 10.1080/00103624.2013.823986

Billingham, KL. Humic products-potential or presumption for agriculture? Can humic products improve my soil? 2012 in the 27th Annual Conference (Orange, NSW: Grassland Society of NSW Inc.).

Canellas LP, Canellas NOA, Luiz Eduardo LES, Olivares FL, Piccolo A. Plant chemical priming by humic acids. Chem. Biol. Technol. Agric. 2020 (7): 12. doi: 10.1186/s40538-020-00178-4

Codex Alimentarius Commission. Requirements for the use of single-laboratory verification for Codex purposes. Codex Alimentarius Committee. Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling. 24th Session, November 2002; 1-12.

De Melo BAG, Motta FL, Santana MHA.. Humic acids: Structural properties and multiple functionalities for novel technological developments. Mater. Sci. Eng. C. 2016: 62, 967–974. doi: 10.1016/j.msec.2015.12.001

Estefan G, Sommer R, Ryan J. Methods of Soil, Plant and Water Analysis: A Manual For the West Asia and North Africa region. ICARDA. 2013.

El-Bassiouny H SM, Bakry, BA, El-Monem Attia AA, Abd Allah MM.. Physiological role of humic acid and nicotinamide on improving plant growth, yield, and mineral nutrients of wheat (Triticum durum L.) grown under newly reclaimed sandy soil. Agric. Sci. 2014. 05, 687–700. Doi: 10.4236/as.2014.58072

Fuentes M, Baigorri R, González-Gaitano G, García-Mina JM. New methodology to assess the quantity and quality of humic substances in organic materials and commercial products for agriculture. J. Soils Sediments. 2018; (18): 1389–1399. doi: 10.1007/s11368-016-1514-2

Gollenbeek L, Van Der Weide R. Prospects for Humic Acid Products From Digestate in the Netherlands. Report WPR-867. 2020; 40 (5). doi: 10.18174/541280

Hayes MHB, Swift RS. Vindication of humic substances as a key component of organic matter in soil and water. Adv. Agron. 2020;. (163): 1–37. doi: 10.1016/bs.agron.2020.05.001

ISO. Guide 34 General Requirements for the Competence of Reference Material Producers. 2nd, International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, Switzerland. 2009. 1-34

ISO. Fertilizers and soil conditioners- Determination of humic acid and hydrophobic Fulvic acid concentrations in fertilizer materials. Geneva, Switzerland. ISO 19822:2018(E).2018(8); 1-16

Kelapa T, Banyuasin K.. Effects of humic substances on plant growth and mineral nutrients uptake of wheat under conditions of salinity. Asian J. Crop Sci. 2016; (1): 87–95. doi: 10.3923/ajcs.2009.87.95.

Magnusson, B. Eurachem Guide: The Fitness for Purpose of analytical methods, Laboratory guide to method Verification and related topics, (2nd edition). 2014. ISBN 978-91-87461-59-0.

Mukherjee A, Lal R, Zimmerman AR. Impacts of 1.5-year field aging on biochar, humic acid, and water treatment residual amended soil. Soil Sci. 2014; (179): 333–339. doi: 10.1097/SS.0000000000000076.

NATA. Guidelines for the Verification and verification of chemical test methods, NATA technical note 17, 2009.

PSQCA. Pakistan Standard Specification for Potassium Sulphate. ICS: 65.080 PSQCA Karachi PS:5610: 2023 (Rev). 1-12.

Rose MT, Patti AF, Little KR, Brown AL, Jackson WR, Cavagnaro TR.. A meta-analysis and review of plant-growth response to humic substances: Practical implications for agriculture. Adv. Agron. 2014; (124): 37–89. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-800138-7.00002-4

Sible CN, Seebauer JR, Below FE. Plant biostimulants: a categorical review, their implications for row crop production, and relation to soil health indicators. Agronomy 11, 1297. doi: 10.3390/agronomy. 2021. 110 71297.

Validation of Analytical Methods for Food Control, Report of a Joint FAO/IAEA Expert Consultation, December 1997, FAO Food and Nutrition Paper No. 68, FAO, Rome 1998; 17-19. ISBN: 9251041318.

Wiesler F, Hund-Rinke K, Gäth S, George E, Greef JM, Hölzle LE.. Anwendng von organischen Düngern und organischen Reststoffen in der Landwirtschaft. Berichte uber Landwirtschaft 94, 1. doi: 10.12767/buel. 2016 v94i1.124

Wu S, Li R, Peng S, Liu Q, Zhu X.. Effect of humic acid on the transformation of soil heavy metals. IOP Conf. Ser.. Mater. Sci. Eng. 2017: 207, 012089. doi: 10.1088/1757-899X/207/1/012089

Yang F, Antonietti M.. The sleeping giant: A polymer view on humic matter in synthesis and applications. Prog. Polym. Sci. 2020. 100, 101182. doi: 10.1016/j.progpolymsci.2019.101182.