

## Loughborough University Institutional Repository

---

# *The development of an onsite sanitation system based on vermifiltration: the 'tiger toilet'*

This item was submitted to Loughborough University's Institutional Repository by the/an author.

**Citation:** FURLONG, C. ... et al, 2015. The development of an onsite sanitation system based on vermifiltration: the 'tiger toilet'. *Journal of Water Sanitation and Hygiene for Development*, 5(4), pp.608-613.

### **Additional Information:**

- This paper was accepted for publication in the journal *Journal of Water Sanitation and Hygiene for Development* and the definitive published version is available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.2166/washdev.2015.167>

**Metadata Record:** <https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/2134/19851>

**Version:** Accepted for publication

**Publisher:** © IWA Publishing

**Rights:** This work is made available according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) licence. Full details of this licence are available at: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Please cite the published version.

# Journal of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development

## The development of an onsite sanitation system based on vermifiltration: the "Tiger Toilet"

--Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	WASHDev-D-15-00067R2
<b>Full Title:</b>	The development of an onsite sanitation system based on vermifiltration: the "Tiger Toilet"
<b>Short Title:</b>	An onsite sanitation system based on vermifiltration: the "Tiger Toilet"
<b>Article Type:</b>	Practical Paper
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	claire furlong, Ph. D WEDC London, UNITED KINGDOM
<b>Corresponding Author's Institution:</b>	WEDC
<b>First Author:</b>	Claire Furlong
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Claire Furlong Walter Gibson Michael Templeton
<b>Abstract:</b>	This paper describes the development of a novel onsite sanitation system based on vermifiltration, the Tiger Toilet. Initial laboratory experiments demonstrated that feed distribution was not required, a worm density of 2 kg/m <sup>2</sup> could be used, worms preferred wetter environments, and system configuration did not affect effluent quality. Installing the first prototype in the UK proved that the process functioned when scaled, i.e. COD and thermotolerant coliform reduction were found to be comparable with the laboratory results. Ten prototypes were then tested by households in rural India; all were working well after six months. The vermifilters were processing the amount of faeces entering the system on a daily basis, so faeces was not accumulating. It was estimated that they would require emptying after approximately five years, based on the depth of the vermicompost generated. With further development it is believed that the Tiger Toilet has the potential to become a superior form of onsite sanitation, when compared with traditional onsite sanitation technologies.
<b>Additional Information:</b>	
<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
Please enter the word count of your paper, including the space taken up by Abstract, References, Tables and Figures. Allow 350 words for <i>each</i> table and figure. Word limits can be found in the journal's <a href="#">Instructions for Authors</a> .	3409
Does the submission report research involving human subjects? Please refer to <a href="#">instructions for authors</a> for more details about the journal's requirements.	No - Human subjects are not involved
If the submission reports on research undertaken in a country please confirm that at least one author is from that country. Please refer to <a href="#">Instructions for authors</a> for further information.	Confirmed - This submission has an author from the country where the research was under taken

# The development of an onsite sanitation system based on vermifiltration: the “Tiger Toilet”

C. Furlong<sup>1,2</sup>, W. T. Gibson<sup>1</sup>, M. R. Templeton<sup>2</sup>, M. Taillade<sup>3</sup>, F. Kassam<sup>2</sup>, G. Crabb<sup>3</sup>, R. Goodsell<sup>3</sup>, J. McQuilkin<sup>3</sup>, A. Oak<sup>4</sup>, G. Thakar<sup>4</sup>, M. Kodgire<sup>4</sup>, R. Patankar<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Bear Valley Ventures Limited, Braeside, Utkinton Lane, Cotebrook, Tarporley, Cheshire, UK

<sup>2</sup>Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Imperial College London, UK

<sup>3</sup>Centre for Alternative Technology, Powys, UK

<sup>4</sup>PriMove Pvt Ltd, Bhusari Colony, Saudamini Complex, Paud Rd, Kothrud, Pune, India

**Keywords:** *Eisenia fetida*, faecal sludge, India, Sewage, Worms

## Abstract

This paper describes the development of a novel onsite sanitation system based on vermifiltration, the Tiger Toilet. Initial laboratory experiments demonstrated that feed distribution was not required, a worm density of 2 kg/m<sup>2</sup> could be used, worms preferred wetter environments, and system configuration did not affect effluent quality. Installing the first prototype in the UK proved that the process functioned when scaled, i.e. COD and thermotolerant coliform reduction were found to be comparable with the laboratory results. Ten prototypes were then tested by households in rural India; all were working well after six months. The vermifilters were processing the amount of faeces entering the system on a daily basis, so faeces was not accumulating. It was estimated that they would require emptying after approximately five years, based on the depth of the vermicompost generated. With further development it is believed that the Tiger Toilet has the potential to become a superior form of onsite sanitation, when compared with traditional onsite sanitation technologies.

## Introduction

1  
2 The majority of the world's population has little choice in terms of onsite sanitation  
3  
4 technology. Most rely on pit latrines, cesspits and septic tanks. A major problem  
5  
6 associated with these systems is that they require emptying, which can be costly,  
7  
8 inconvenient and hazardous. Approximately 200 million latrines and septic tanks  
9  
10 worldwide must be manually emptied each year, by workers descending into the pit  
11  
12 equipped with buckets and spades (Thye et al., 2011). Furthermore, the final disposal  
13  
14 of faecal sludge by any of these methods is often simply by dumping into the  
15  
16 immediate environment, thereby reintroducing pathogens which were previously  
17  
18 safely contained in the pit or tank. New onsite sanitation technologies need to be  
19  
20 developed which reduce the frequency of emptying and which not only contain, but  
21  
22 also treat the waste, so that handling and disposal are safer activities.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 Worm-based sanitation may provide a solution, since solids are further reduced by the  
32  
33 net loss of biomass and energy when the food chain is extended with worms (Xing et  
34  
35 al., 2014). This approach has the potential to reduce both the frequency of emptying  
36  
37 and the size of the sanitation system. Furthermore, worms have the ability to reduce  
38  
39 pathogens to the level where the by-product (vermicompost) can be safely applied to  
40  
41 land (Eastman et al., 2001). Vermicompost is dry and soil-like, making it easier to  
42  
43 handle and transport.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 This paper builds on the findings in Furlong et al. (2014), which is believed to be the  
53  
54 first paper to show that worms are able to efficiently digest and thrive on fresh human  
55  
56 faeces in a wet (flushing) vermifilter (a filter containing worms). Two laboratory  
57  
58 studies are described which explore critical design parameters. These studies led to  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 the development and testing of the first full-scale prototype. Finally, the results of the  
2 first six months of a field trial of the “Tiger Toilet” (a vermifilter paired with a pour-  
3 flush pan and superstructure) in rural India are presented.  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

## 9 **Methodology**

10 The species of worms used in the laboratory experiments and the first prototype were  
11  
12 *Eisenia fetida*, but the close relative *Eisenia andrei* were used in the field trials in  
13  
14 India, due to availability. A worm density of 2 kg/m<sup>2</sup> was used in all systems  
15  
16 described in this paper.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

### 24 ***Laboratory experiments***

25 A detailed description of the laboratory scale vermifilter components can be found in  
26  
27 Furlong et al. (2014). Experiment 1 explored the effect of vermifilter configuration on  
28  
29 the processing of waste and effluent quality, the effect of lower worm density and  
30  
31 feed distribution. The vermifilter configuration varied from Furlong et al. (2014):  
32  
33 Vermifilter 1 (V1) consisted of a bedding layer and sump only. Vermifilter 2 (V2)  
34  
35 consisted of a bedding layer, two drainage layers and a sump. Vermifilter 3 (V3)  
36  
37 consisted of a bedding layer, a drainage layer, another bedding layer and a sump.  
38  
39 Vermifilter 4 (V4) consisted of a bedding layer, drainage layer and a sump (Figure 1).  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

### 48 **Figure 1: Experiment 1 vermifilter configuration**

49  
50  
51  
52 The bedding material used in all vermifilters was a volumetric mixture of 33.3% coir,  
53  
54 33.3% woodchip and 33.3% vermicompost, and the drainage layer material was as  
55  
56 used previously (Furlong et al., 2014). Human faeces were harvested and the  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 vermifilters were fed as in Furlong et al. (2014) with the amount specified in Table 1.  
2 The exception was V4 where it was spread across the surface to assess feed  
3 dispersion. This experiment was split into four phases with different feeding regimes  
4 (Table 1). A resting phase was incorporated due to a lack of feed and staff over a  
5 holiday period.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

11  
12  
13  
14 Experiment 2 was a continuation of Experiment 1, the modular boxes being  
15 rearranged to the configuration in Furlong et al.(2014), and the effect of hydraulic  
16 loading was assessed (Table 1). Each vermifilter was fed the same amount, but this  
17 amount varied daily.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 **Table 1: Details of Experiment 1 and 2**

### 27 *CAT Prototype*

28  
29  
30  
31  
32 A full-scale prototype was based at the Centre for Alternative Technology (CAT) in  
33 Wales. It was a cylindrical tank with a diameter of 1.2 m and a height of 1.2 meters.  
34 Internally there was a 65 cm deep drainage layer (material as in Furlong et al., 2014),  
35 and on top of this was a 10 cm bedding layer (as in the laboratory experiments),  
36 which was contained by metal mesh. At the bottom there was a tap, so effluent  
37 samples could be taken. The prototype vermifilter had an insulated lid and was  
38 temperature controlled at 20°C by a heating blanket (to simulate a warmer climate).  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 ***Indian field trials***  
6

7 The field trials in India were located in a rural village approximately 60 km from  
8  
9 Pune, in Maharashtra State. Ten households (56 people) were recruited for this trial.  
10

11  
12  
13 Ten vermifilters were constructed in brick, diameter 1.2 m by 1.25 m deep with an  
14 open base. The bedding layer consisted of 10 cm of local compost and the drainage  
15 layer (60 cm deep) was graded aggregate, the top layer being sand. The design  
16 incorporated an inspection chamber for influent collection and a vertical perforated  
17 pipe for effluent collection. The vermifilters were set in the ground and the effluent  
18 infiltrated into the soil.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 All vermifilters were monitored weekly using structured observations, then five  
32 representative vermifilters were monitored monthly. Influent samples were taken  
33 monthly by blocking the outlet of the inspection chamber for 24 hours. The sample  
34 was then homogenised. Monthly effluent samples were collected via the perforated  
35 sample pipe (1.10 m x 10 cm diameter), open at both ends. A collection vessel was  
36 placed at the bottom of the pipe to block infiltration into the ground for one week. The  
37 effluent sample was allowed to settle before the supernatant was decanted for analysis  
38 due to vermicompost being washed into the sample pipe. This ensured the samples  
39 collected were representative of the effluent which was being infiltrated into the soil.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## 2.2 Methods of analysis

In the laboratory experiments wet mass measurements and calculations were performed as previously (Furlong et al., 2014). Influent and effluent samples were taken approximately weekly from the laboratory experiments and the CAT prototype. These were analysed for COD and thermotolerant coliforms (TTC) as in Furlong et al. (2014). The samples from the Indian prototypes were analysed in a commercial laboratory for COD (5220D, APHA, 1981) and TTC (9222B, APHA, 1981).

Statistical analysis of results was carried out using SPSS 12.0.1. One-way ANOVA was used to compare multiple data sets using the post-hoc Tukey test. The null hypothesis of these tests was accepted if  $p \geq 0.05$ .

## Results and Discussion

The process from laboratory to field took approximately three years.

### *Laboratory Experiment 1*

The total reduction in wet mass of faeces achieved over the course of Experiment 1 (cumulative faecal reduction) was 84-88% (Table 2). No significant difference was found in faecal reduction across the vermifilters. No effect of distributing the waste across the surface of the vermifilter was found, so a dispersal system is not required.

The weekly faecal mass reduction in V4 (worm density of 2 kg/m<sup>2</sup>) was compared to that from a vermifilter containing the same bedding material from Furlong et al. (2014), which had a higher worm density (4 kg/m<sup>2</sup>). A difference was found until week five, then the impact of using a lower worm density decreased. Suggesting a



1 worm density of 2 kg/m<sup>2</sup> could be used as long as the lag phase (4-5 weeks) was  
2 engineered into the system. No significant difference was found in the COD or TTC  
3 reduction across all the vermifilters. This suggests that treatment of effluent was  
4 through the separation of faecal matter by the bedding layer, rather than through  
5 treatment in the subsequent layers.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

### 11 ***Laboratory Experiment 2***

12 No significant difference in effluent quality or the processing of faeces was found  
13 across the vermifilters. This suggests that the worms are able to process faeces under  
14 both wet and dry conditions. Mass reduction under drier conditions may include the  
15 effects of, drying of faecal material as well as processing by the worms. When the  
16 vermifilters were decommissioned the vermicompost produced ranged from 1.9 to 3.9  
17 kg (Table 1). The lowest production was in V4 which supports this interpretation. V4  
18 contained more flies, the surface of the faeces was covered in fungus and it smelt  
19 anaerobic. The worm densities at the end of this experiment can be seen in Table 1.  
20 Higher final worm densities were associated with higher hydraulic loading,  
21 supporting the theory that *E. fetida* prefer wetter environments (Furlong et al., 2014).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

### 44 **Table 2: Results from different vermifilter studies including; COD and** 45 **thermotolerant coliform reduction, cumulative faecal reduction and** 46 **bioconversion ratios**

#### 47 ***CAT Prototype***

48 From Table 2 it can be seen that the reduction in COD and TTC was comparable with  
49 the laboratory experiments. During the 210 days of monitoring the system was found  
50 to work well, with no visible faecal overloading of the vermifilter. The system was  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 designed for 10 users, which was found to equate to two visits for urination only and  
2 three for urination and defecation per day, so it could be said that the system was  
3  
4 under used.  
5  
6  
7  
8

### 9 *Indian field trials*

10 It was estimated that during six months 216 kg of faecal matter had entered each  
11  
12 vermifilter (based on six people producing 200g of faecal matter per day, over six  
13  
14 months). If undigested this would cover the system to a depth of 21.6 cm. The actual  
15  
16 faecal accumulation over six months was estimated (by observations of coverage and  
17  
18 depth of faeces) to be between 0.2 and 4.5 kg (mean 1.5 kg). In four of the toilets it  
19  
20 was  $\leq$  1kg, which shows that the worms were processing daily the amount of faeces  
21  
22 entering the vermifilters.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 Vermicompost started to accumulate within two weeks of use, which was quicker  
32  
33 than in the laboratory experiments and the CAT prototype. This was thought to be  
34  
35 because of the higher temperatures in the India prototypes (20 to 41°C), which  
36  
37 hastens the worms' metabolism. The vermicompost accumulated around the edge of  
38  
39 the faeces and was then pushed to the sides of the vermifilters. This means that the  
40  
41 users will be able to empty the system relatively easily. Over the six month period a  
42  
43 depth of between <1 and 3 cm of vermicompost accumulated, which means the  
44  
45 vermifilters will only require emptying after five years. The worms themselves were  
46  
47 found to be elusive and were only seen in two of the vermifilters. This is quite normal  
48  
49 as worms feed from beneath. A lack of accumulation of faeces together with the  
50  
51 build-up of vermicompost indicates that the worms are present and processing faeces.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 The reduction of COD and TTC was lower in the Indian prototypes compared to the  
2 CAT prototype (Table 2). This was due to lower levels in the influent of the  
3  
4 vermifilters in India (Table 2). When this was explored it was found that up to 15  
5  
6 litres of water was being used per person per day to flush the systems in India  
7  
8 compared to only five litres used per person per day at CAT. A comparison of the  
9  
10 effluent COD and TTC reveals in absolute terms the effluent quality from the Indian  
11  
12 vermifilters is higher than for the CAT prototype (Table 2).  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

## 19 **Conclusions**

20  
21 This paper describes the journey of developing a vermifilter as a form of onsite  
22  
23 sanitation from laboratory experiment through to field trials. The laboratory  
24  
25 experiments honed critical design criteria which were then incorporated into the first  
26  
27 full-scale prototype. As this functioned as expected the process advanced to field  
28  
29 trials in rural Indian households. This study shows that the Tiger Toilets (vermifilter  
30  
31 paired with a pour-flush toilet pan and superstructure) have been operating  
32  
33 successfully in *real-life* situations for six months. The Tiger Toilet has the potential to  
34  
35 be superior to conventional technology as it provides users with the aspirational  
36  
37 benefits of a septic tank, a smaller footprint and better treatment of waste. Due to the  
38  
39 characteristics of the by-product (vermicompost) and where it is deposited in the  
40  
41 system, many of the problems associated with emptying traditional onsite sanitation  
42  
43 systems are also overcome.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

## 50 **Acknowledgements**

51  
52 The authors acknowledge the support of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation  
53  
54 through a grant to the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine and USAID  
55  
56 DIV grant number AID-OAA-F-13-00049 awarded to Bear Valley Ventures Ltd.  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3 **References**

4 APHA (American Public Health Association), 1981. Standard Methods for the  
5 Examination of Water and Wastewater. American Public Health Association,  
6  
7 Washington, D.C.


8  
9  
10  
11 Eastman B. R., Kane P. N., Edwards C. A., Trytek L., Gunadi B., Stermer A. L.,

12  
13  
14 Mobley J. R. 2001. The effectiveness of vermiculture in human pathogen reduction  
15 for USEPA biosolids stabilization. *Compost Science & Utilization*, 9 (1), 38-49.

16  
17  
18 Furlong C., Templeton M. R., Gibson W. T. 2014. Processing of human faeces by wet  
19 vermifiltration for improved on-site sanitation. *Journal of Water, Sanitation and*  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 Hygiene for Development, 4, 231-239.

25  
26  
27 Thye Y. P., Templeton M. R., Ali M. 2011. A critical review of technologies for pit  
28 latrine emptying in developing countries. *Critical Reviews in Environmental Science*  
29  
30  
31  
32 and Technology, 41 (20),1893-1819.

33  
34 Xing M., Zhao C., Yang J., Lv, B. 2014. Feeding behaviour and trophic relationship of  
35 earthworm and other predators in vermifiltration systems for liquid-state sludge  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000



Experiment 1 (186 days)					Experiment 2 (123 days)				
Phase	Phase description	Period (days)	Hydraulic loading (l/day)	Mean faeces addition (g/day)	Vermifilter	Hydraulic loading (l/day)	Mean faeces addition (g/day)	Final vermicompost weight (kg)	Final worm density (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )
1	50 g feed	1-30	12	45 ±15	1	30	157 ±45	3.2	11.8
2	100 g feed	31-47	12	97 ±1	2	12	157 ±46	3.9	11.3
3	Resting phase	48-71	1	0	3	1	155 ±46	3.9	8.3
4	Variable phase	72-186	12	99 ±66	4	0	158 ±46	1.9	8.0

Note: all masses are expressed as wet weights

Experiment	Mean across all vermifilters and phases						Cumulative faecal reduction <sup>1</sup> (%)	Conversion ratio <sup>2</sup>
	COD			TCC				
	Influent (mg/L)	Effluent (mg/L)	Reduction (%)	Influent (CFU/100ml)	Effluent (CFU/100ml)	Reduction (%)		
Furlong et al.,(2014) (360 days)	4,666 <sup>3</sup> ±2,848 (n=35)	602 ±326 (n=144)	87	1.03 x 10 <sup>9</sup> ±1.01 x 10 <sup>9</sup> (n=18)	2.13 x 10 <sup>6</sup> ±6.12 x 10 <sup>6</sup> (n=72)	2-log <sub>10</sub>	97-100	1:0.10-0.18
Experiment 1 (186 days)	6,000 <sup>3</sup> ±8,032 (n=17)	456 ±283 (n=68)	88	1.02 x 10 <sup>9</sup> ±1.08 x 10 <sup>9</sup> (n=9)	1.23 x 10 <sup>6</sup> ±1.71 x 10 <sup>6</sup> (n=36)	3-log <sub>10</sub>	84-88	-
Experiment 2 (123 days)	5,492 <sup>3,4</sup> ±5,358 (n=13)	719 ±363 (n=49)	90	9.02 x 10 <sup>8</sup> ±1.31 x 10 <sup>9</sup> (n=10)	1.48 x 10 <sup>6</sup> ±1.48 x 10 <sup>6</sup> (n=38)	3-log <sub>10</sub>	80-83	1:0.09-0.19
CAT Prototype (210 days)	14,985 <sup>3</sup> ±2,315 (n=9)	830 ±325 (n=20)	94	8.12 x 10 <sup>8</sup> ±9.90 x 10 <sup>8</sup> (n=5)	1.84 x 10 <sup>6</sup> ±1.98 x 10 <sup>6</sup> (n=17)	3-log <sub>10</sub>	-	-
Field systems (180 days)	309 ±87 (n=23)	167 ±63 (n=9)	44	5.97 x 10 <sup>5</sup> ±2.22 x 10 <sup>5</sup> (n=9)	1.70 x 10 <sup>3</sup> ±6.02x 10 <sup>2</sup> (n=9)	2-log <sub>10</sub>	98-100	-

<sup>1</sup> Reduction in the total wet mass of faeces that was added over the course of the experiment (Furlong et al., 2014)

<sup>2</sup> Total kg of faeces added: kg vermicompost harvested at the end of the experiment (Furlong et al., 2014)

<sup>3</sup> Influent was a suspension of the average daily mass of faeces over a week suspended in 12L of water

<sup>4</sup> Only one concentration of influent was analysed