

Supplementary material

Table S1: Summary of the main features of each technique/device

Technique	Average efficiency*	Main characteristics	Main disadvantages
Stacks, soil pits, earth mounds	8–12%	– Cheap and readily available – Cultural significance	– High emissions – Slow production (days) – Low efficiency
Beehive kilns	30–60%	– Large production* – Cultural significance	– Slow production (days) – Need for thick logs
Stoves and TLUDs	10–20%	– Rapid production (hours) – Syngas production – Small feedstock	Low efficiency: small batch production
Retort kilns	25–35%	Gas recovery: low emissions	– External feedstock to start-up – High investment cost – Slow production (days)
Kon-Tiki kilns	20–30%	– Low emissions – Rapid production (hours) – No external fuel to start-up	Incomplete pyrolysis of thick logs
Microwave-assisted pyrolysis	50%	– Easily controllable process – High yields	– Requires inert gas – Difficulty in scaling – Availability of microwave technologies
Solar-assisted pyrolysis	30–40%	Sun starts pyrolysis (no external energy supply needed)	– High investment cost – Solar intermittence and optical efficiency – Heterogeneity of the material produced

*Depends on size.

Table S2: Summary of physicochemical properties reported for biochars produced using non-conventional devices. References: SC: soil conditioning, WT: water treatment, ES: energy storage, N/A: non-applicable

Feedstock	Device	Peak temp (°C)	Yield (%)	C (%)	H (%)	N (%)	A _{BET} (m ² g ⁻¹)	Application	Reference
<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i> wood	Open-air stack	238–523	—	67.5–41.3	2.43	1.19	43–156	WT: Cadmium (12 mg/g) and oxytetracycline (14 mg/g) removal	[1]
<i>Eupatorium</i>	Earth-mound kiln	400–500	21	—	—	—	—	SC	[2]
<i>adenophorum</i> wood									
Wood mixture	Soil pit	—	—	88.2	1.9	0.36	404	WT: 2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4-D) removal	[3]
<i>Shorea robusta</i> wood	Soil pit	—	—	86.1	2.3	0.43	197	WT: 2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4-D) removal	[3]
Elephant grass	Soil pit	650	18 ± 1	68.5 ± 2.6	2.1 ± 0.2	—	64 ± 4	SC	[4]
Corn residues	Soil pit	650	14 ± 1	53.9 ± 1.5	3.4 ± 0.2	1.4 ± 0.7	52 ± 4	SC	[4]
Wood and rice husks	Soil pit	600–700	18–27	85.3–71.5	1.4–2.1	0.59–0.66	75–111	N/A	[5]
Wood and rice husks	Steel shielded soil pit	600–700	25–32	88.8–71.2	2.7	0.54	35	N/A	[5]
Coconut shells	Mud beehive kilns	—	—	87.4	3.2	0.58	91	WT: 2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4-D) removal	[3]
<i>Dimocarpus longan</i> wood	Mud beehive kilns	—	—	76.1	3.7	0.84	4	WT: 2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4-D) removal	[3]
Eucalyptus wood	Beehive kilns	300–700	23–25	82–93	0.1–0.6	1.0–2.5	190–370	WT: 2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4-D) removal	[6]
<i>Eupatorium</i>	Brick kiln	400–500	19	—	—	—	—	SC	[2]
<i>adenophorum</i> wood									
Corn cobs	Brick kilns	200	34.5	73.2	—	—	—	N/A	[7]
<i>Eupatorium</i>	TLUD	400–500	18	—	—	—	—	SC	[2]
<i>adenophorum</i> wood									
Elephant grass	TLUD	300	14	—	—	—	475	N/A	[8]
Pine wood and sawdust pellets	TLUD	1,000	—	—	—	—	429–470	ES	[9]
<i>Dimocarpus longan</i> wood	TLUD	—	—	86.2	1.4	0.35	333	WT: 2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4-D) removal	[3]
Woods	TLUD	720–755	18.9–25.3	69.9–76.5	1.2–3.1	0.6–1.3	190–473	SC	[10]
Eucalyptus branches.	Clay stove	350	—	71.8	—	3.3	—	SC	[11]
Pine wood	Retort kiln (ICPS)	200–300	30.4	—	—	—	—	N/A	[12]
Pine wood	Retort kiln (ICPS)	200–300	30	74.8	—	—	—	N/A	[7]
Wood	Retort kiln (drum)	200	25.3	71.4	—	—	—	N/A	[7]

(Continued)

Table S2: Continued

Feedstock	Device	Peak temp (°C)	Yield (%)	C (%)	H (%)	N (%)	A _{BET} (m ² g ⁻¹)	Application	Reference
Rice husks	Drum kiln	300–450	28.9	54.9	—	—	—	N/A	[7]
Corn cobs	Retort kiln	250–300	33	68.8	3.83	0.9	—	N/A	[13]
Eucalyptus bark	Retort kiln	250–300	68	56.2	3.26	0.5	—	N/A	[13]
Wood and rice husks	All-steel kilns	600–700	13–27	54.7–81.7	1.3–2.2	0.54–1.04	11–215	N/A	[5]
	45°–55°								
<i>Eupatorium</i>	Kon-Tiki kiln	680–700	—	72	1.33	0.54	215	SC	[14]
<i>adenophorum</i> wood									
Wood	Kon-Tiki kiln	650–800	15–20	80.8	1.07	0.39	289	N/A	[15]
Eucalyptus wood	Kon-Tiki kiln	700–800	26 ± 9	78 ± 3	2.2 ± 0.5	0.7 ± 0.2	239 ± 80	WT: Paracetamol (98 mg/g) removal	[16]
Eucalyptus wood	Kon-Tiki kiln	700–800	26 ± 9	78 ± 3	2.2 ± 0.5	0.7 ± 0.2	239 ± 80	SC WT: Arsenic (7%) removal	[17]
Guava (<i>Psidium guajava</i>) wood chips	Solar-assisted reactor	489.3	41.35 ± 3.23	58.6	3.2	0.4	24.6	WT: Nitrate (35.5 mg/g) removal	[18]

References

- [1] Xiao, L., L. Feng, and G. Yuan. Low-cost field production of biochars and their properties. *Environmental Geochemistry and Health*, Vol. 42, 2020, pp. 1569–1578.
- [2] Pandit, N. R., J. Mulder, S. E. Hale, H. P. Schmidt, and G. Cornelissen. Biochar from “Kon Tiki” flame curtain and other kilns: Effects of nutrient enrichment and kiln type on crop yield and soil chemistry. *PLoS One*, Vol. 12, 2017, pp. 1–12.
- [3] Kearns, J. P., L. S. Wellborn, R. S. Summers, and D. R. U. Knappe. 2,4-D adsorption to biochars: Effect of preparation conditions on equilibrium adsorption capacity and comparison with commercial activated carbon literature data. *Water Research*, Vol. 62, 2014, pp. 20–28.
- [4] Zhou, Q., B. A. Houge, Z. Tong, B. Gao, and G. Liu. An in-situ technique for producing low-cost agricultural biochar. *Pedosphere*, Vol. 28, 2018, pp. 690–695.
- [5] Cornelissen, G., N. R. Pandit, P. Taylor, B. H. Pandit, M. Sparrevik, and H. P. Schmidt. Emissions and char quality of flame-curtain “Kon Tiki” kilns for farmer-scale charcoal/biochar production. *PLoS One*, Vol. 11, 2016, pp. 1–11.
- [6] Kearns, J. P., D. R. U. Knappe, and R. S. Summers. Feasibility of using traditional kiln charcoals in low-cost water treatment: role of pyrolysis conditions on 2,4-D herbicide adsorption. *Environmental Engineering Science*, Vol. 32, 2015, pp. 912–922.
- [7] Sparrevik, M., C. Adam, V. Martinsen, and G. Cornelissen. Emissions of gases and particles from charcoal/biochar production in rural areas using medium-sized traditional and improved “retort” kilns. *Biomass & Bioenergy*, Vol. 72, 2015, pp. 65–73.
- [8] Adeniyi, A. G., J. O. Ighalo, D. V. Onifade, and A. George. Production of biochar from elephant grass (*Pennisetum purpureum*) using an updraft biomass gasifier with retort heating. *Biofuels*, 2019, pp. 1–8.
- [9] Huggins, T., H. Wang, J. Kearns, P. Jenkins, and Z. Jason. Biochar as a sustainable electrode material for electricity production in microbial fuel cells. *Bioresource Technology*, Vol. 157, 2014, pp. 114–119.
- [10] Vaughn, S. F., J. A. Kenar, F. J. Eller, B. R. Moser, M. A. Jackson, and S. C. Peterson. Physical and chemical characterization of biochars produced from coppiced wood of thirteen tree species for use in horticultural substrates. *Industrial Crops and Products*, Vol. 66, 2015, pp. 44–51.
- [11] Butphu, S., F. Rasche, G. Cadisch, and W. Kaewpradit. Eucalyptus biochar application enhances Ca uptake of upland rice, soil available P, exchangeable K, yield, and N use efficiency of sugarcane in a crop rotation system. *J Plant Nutr Soil Sci*, Vol. 183, 2020, pp. 58–68.
- [12] Adam, J. C. Improved and more environmentally friendly charcoal production system using a low-cost retort-kiln (Eco-charcoal). *Renewable Energy*, Vol. 34, 2009, pp. 1923–1925.
- [13] Djousse Kanouo, B. M., E. S. Allaire, and A. D. Munson. Quality of biochars made from eucalyptus tree bark and corncob using a pilot-scale retort Kiln. *Waste and Biomass Valorization*, Vol. 9, 2018, pp. 899–909.
- [14] Schmidt, H., B. Pandit, V. Martinsen, G. Cornelissen, P. Conte, and C. Kammann. Fourfold increase in pumpkin yield in response to low-dosage root zone application of urine-enhanced biochar to a fertile tropical soil. *Agriculture (London)*, Vol. 5, 2015, pp. 723–741.

- [15] Schmidt, H. P. and P. Taylor. Kon-Tiki flame cap pyrolysis for the democratization of biochar production. *Ithaka-Journal for Biochar Materials, Ecosystems and Agriculture*, 2014, pp. 338–348.
- [16] Bursztyn Fuentes, A. L., R. L. S. Canevesi, P. Gadonneix, S. Mathieu, A. Celzard, and V. Fierro. Paracetamol removal by Kon-Tiki kiln-derived biochar and activated carbons. *Industrial Crops and Products*, Vol. 155, 2020, id. 112740.
- [17] Bursztyn Fuentes, A. L., F. Barraqué, R. C. Mercader, A. N. Scian, and M. L. Montes. Efficient low-cost magnetic composite based on eucalyptus wood biochar for arsenic removal from groundwater. *Groundwater for Sustainable Development*, Vol. 14, 2021, id. 100585.
- [18] Li, S., T. Galoustian, and H. Trejo. Biochar pyrolyzed with concentrated solar radiation for enhanced nitrate adsorption. *Journal of Analytical and Applied Pyrolysis*, Vol. 174, 2023, id. 106131.