

## Biochar Characterization and Measurement Techniques

Characterizing biochar is critical to understanding its properties and ensuring its suitability for applications like soil amendment, pollutant removal, carbon sequestration, or material synthesis. Biochar's complex nature—shaped by feedstock, pyrolysis conditions, and post-processing—requires a suite of analytical techniques to assess its physical, chemical, and structural attributes. Methods such as Raman spectroscopy, X-ray diffraction (XRD), Fourier-transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR), energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDS), Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) analysis, scanning electron microscopy (SEM), and transmission electron microscopy (TEM) provide complementary insights, revealing how biochar's properties interact to determine its performance. These techniques are interconnected, as surface area, functional groups, crystallinity, and morphology collectively influence biochar's behavior in environmental systems [1, 2].

Raman spectroscopy probes biochar's carbon structure by analyzing vibrational modes, distinguishing between disordered (amorphous) and ordered (graphitic) phases. The D-band ( $\sim 1350\text{ cm}^{-1}$ ) reflects defects, while the G-band ( $\sim 1580\text{ cm}^{-1}$ ) indicates graphitic carbon. A higher D/G ratio, common in low-temperature biochar ( $300\text{--}400^\circ\text{C}$ ), suggests disordered structures with greater reactivity, suitable for adsorption but less stable. High-temperature biochar ( $600\text{--}700^\circ\text{C}$ ) shows a lower D/G ratio, indicating graphitic stability ideal for sequestration [3,4]. Raman helps predict biochar's longevity in soil, as stable carbon resists microbial breakdown, potentially storing carbon for millennia.

XRD examines biochar's crystalline phases, identifying minerals (e.g., quartz, calcite, sylvite) in ash-rich samples and assessing carbon crystallinity. Amorphous carbon, typical in biochar, produces broad XRD peaks, while graphitic structures, formed at high temperatures, yield sharper peaks. Mineral content influences biochar's pH and nutrient availability—calcium carbonate, for instance, raises pH, benefiting acidic soils. XRD also informs adsorption potential, as crystalline phases may alter surface interactions [5, 6]. For example, biochar with high sylvite content may release potassium, enhancing soil fertility but affecting cation exchange capacity.

FTIR spectroscopy detects surface functional groups, such as hydroxyl ( $-\text{OH}$ ), carboxyl ( $-\text{COOH}$ ), carbonyl ( $\text{C}=\text{O}$ ), and aromatic  $\text{C}=\text{C}$  bonds, by measuring infrared absorption. These groups drive biochar's chemical reactivity, enabling nutrient retention (e.g., ammonium binding) and pollutant adsorption (e.g., heavy metals). Low-temperature biochar is rich in oxygen-containing groups, enhancing ion exchange, while high-temperature biochar has more aromatic structures, improving stability. FTIR is vital for tailoring biochar to specific uses, such as immobilizing cadmium, where carboxyl groups play a key role. It also tracks changes post-application, as functional groups may oxidize in soil over time [7, 8].

EDS, often paired with SEM, provides elemental composition by detecting X-rays emitted from biochar's surface. It quantifies carbon, oxygen, nitrogen, and minerals (e.g., calcium, silicon), revealing ash

content and potential contaminants. For instance, biochar from sewage sludge may show elevated heavy metals, requiring screening for safe use. EDS maps elemental distribution, complementing FTIR's chemical insights and SEM's morphological data. Its limitation is shallow penetration, making it less suited for bulk analysis, where techniques like X-ray fluorescence (XRF) may supplement.

BET analysis measures surface area and porosity via nitrogen adsorption-desorption isotherms. Biochar's surface area ranges from 10 to over 500 m<sup>2</sup>/g, with high-temperature samples exhibiting greater values due to pore development. Porosity—micro- (<2 nm), meso- (2–50 nm), or macro- (>50 nm)—affects water retention, nutrient storage, and pollutant adsorption. For example, biochar with high microporosity excels in wastewater treatment, capturing small molecules like dyes. BET data guide application design, but results depend on biochar's pretreatment (e.g., degassing), requiring standardized protocols for consistency [10].

SEM visualizes biochar's surface morphology at the microscale, revealing pores, cracks, and particle shapes. Low-temperature biochar retains biomass structure (e.g., plant cell walls), while high-temperature biochar develops interconnected pores, enhancing adsorption. SEM images correlate morphology with function—porous biochar improves soil water retention, while rough surfaces aid microbial colonization. When coupled with EDS, SEM maps elemental hotspots, linking structure to composition. Its resolution, however, is limited compared to TEM, making it ideal for surface rather than internal analysis.

TEM provides nanoscale resolution, imaging biochar's internal structure, such as nanopores, carbon layers, or embedded nanoparticles. It is critical for studying modified biochars, where additives like iron oxides enhance catalytic or magnetic properties. TEM reveals pore connectivity and structural defects, which influence adsorption or stability. For instance, biochar with uniform nanopores may outperform heterogeneous samples in gas capture. TEM's high cost and sample preparation complexity limit routine use, but it complements SEM for comprehensive structural insights.

These techniques are interdependent, as biochar's properties are synergistic. High BET surface area is less effective without FTIR-detected functional groups to bind pollutants. SEM's morphological data gain context from XRD's mineral analysis, explaining ash-related features like crystal deposits. Raman's carbon structure insights inform TEM's nanoscale observations, linking macro- and microscale stability. Using multiple methods ensures robust characterization, addressing biochar's variability and guiding its optimization. For example, a soil biochar might require high surface area (BET), nutrient-rich minerals (EDS/XRD), and reactive groups (FTIR), while a remediation biochar prioritizes porosity (SEM/TEM) and adsorption sites (Raman/FTIR).

Challenges include equipment costs, technical expertise, and standardization. Biochar's heterogeneity complicates comparisons, necessitating large datasets to correlate measurements with performance. Accessibility is another barrier—advanced tools like TEM are not widely available, particularly in

developing regions. Collaborative networks and open-access databases could address this, as could portable, low-cost alternatives like handheld FTIR. Despite these hurdles, thorough characterization unlocks biochar's potential, enabling tailored solutions for agriculture, remediation, and beyond.

## References:

1. Varkolu, M.; Gundekari, S.; Omvesh; Palla, V.C.S.; Kumar, P.; Bhattacharjee, S.; Vinodkumar, T. Recent Advances in Biochar Production, Characterization, and Environmental Applications. *Catalysts* **2025**, *15*, 243. <https://doi.org/10.3390/catal15030243>
2. Mujtaba, G.; Hayat, R.; Hussain, Q.; Ahmed, M. Physio-Chemical Characterization of Biochar, Compost and Co-Composted Biochar Derived from Green Waste. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 4628. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13094628>
3. Matthew W. Smith, Ian Dallmeyer, Timothy J. Johnson, Carolyn S. Brauer, Jean-Sabin McEwen, Juan F. Espinal, Manuel Garcia-Perez, Structural analysis of char by Raman spectroscopy: Improving band assignments through computational calculations from first principles, *Carbon*, Volume 100, 2016, Pages 678-692, ISSN 0008-6223, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.carbon.2016.01.031>.
4. Orlando, A.; Franceschini, F.; Muscas, C.; Pidkova, S.; Bartoli, M.; Rovere, M.; Tagliaferro, A. A Comprehensive Review on Raman Spectroscopy Applications. *Chemosensors* **2021**, *9*, 262. <https://doi.org/10.3390/chemosensors9090262>
5. Zhang, J.; Huang, B.; Chen, L.; Du, J.; Li, W.; Luo, Z. Pyrolysis kinetics of hullless barley straw using the distributed activation energy model (DAEM) by the TG/DTA technique and SEM/XRD characterizations for hullless barley straw derived biochar. *Kinetics and Catalysis, Reaction Engineering and Materials Science, Braz.J.Chem.Eng.* **2018**, *35* (3), <https://doi.org/10.1590/0104-6632.20180353s20170382>
6. Stefaniuk, M.; Oleszczuk, P. Characterization of biochars produced from residues from biogas production. *Journal of Analytical and Applied Pyrolysis* **2015**, *115*, 157-165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaap.2015.07.011>.
7. Kassem, A., Abbas, L., Coutinho, O., Opara, S., Najaf, H., Kasperek, D., Pokhrel, K., Li, X., & Tiquia-Arashiro, S. Applications of Fourier Transform-Infrared spectroscopy in microbial cell biology and environmental microbiology: advances, challenges, and future perspectives. *Frontiers in microbiology* **2023**, *14*, 1304081. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2023.1304081>
8. Zhu, Z.; Duan, W.; Chang, Z.; Du, W.; Chen, F.; Li, F.; Oleszczuk, P. Stability of Functionally Modified Biochar: The Role of Surface Charges and Surface Homogeneity. *Sustainability* **2023**, *15*, 7745. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15107745>
9. Fan, J., Li, Y., Yu, H., Li, Y., Yuan, Q., Xiao, H., Li, F., & Pan, B. (2020). Using sewage sludge with high ash content for biochar production and Cu(II) sorption. *The Science of the Total Environment*, *713*, 136663. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.136663>
10. Mane, P.V.; Rego, R.M.; Yap, P.L.; Losic, D.; Kurkuri, M.D. Unveiling cutting-edge advances in high surface area porous materials for the efficient removal of toxic metal ions from water. *Progress in Materials Science* **2024**, *146*, 101314. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmatsci.2024.101314>.