5th African International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management, Johannesburg/Pretoria, South Africa, April 23 - 25, 2024
Publisher: IEOM Society International, USA
Published: April 23, 2024
DOI: 10.46254/AF05.20240259

A Comparative Study Between an Alternative Whiteboard Marker Ink Made of Pulverized Chicken Bones and an Industrial Whiteboard Marker Ink

Lander Cabuay, Nikko Carlo Caneda, Rcrizthian Lao, and Jerard Angelo Pilipiña Faculty, Industrial Engineering Department

University of Santo Tomas España Boulevard, Sampaloc, Manila, 1008, Philippines <u>lander.cabuay.eng@ust.edu.ph</u>, <u>nikkocarlo.caneda.eng@ust.edu.ph</u> <u>rcrizthian.lao.eng@ust.edu.ph</u>, jerardangelo.pilipina.eng@ust.edu.ph

Engr. Jesselyn B. Alcain, MS Faculty, Industrial Engineering Department University of Santo Tomas España Boulevard, Sampaloc, Manila, 1008, Philippines <u>ibalcain@ust.edu.ph</u>

Abstract

This study investigates the potential of repurposing chicken bones as a sustainable alternative for whiteboard marker ink production. Pulverized chicken bones were compared to traditional industrial ink in terms of absorption, surface tension, and viscosity. Laboratory tests revealed no significant difference in surface tension between the two inks. However, viscosity results differed between observation and laboratory tests, potentially due to the chicken bone ink's absorbency affecting the drip test. The study found significant differences in absorbency between the inks, suggesting the chicken bone ink may require multiple applications. Cost analysis indicates that chicken bone ink is cheaper due to readily available ingredients. The research explores the potential of chicken bone components like proteins (acting as binders) and calcium carbonate (acting as a filler) in ink production. This research contributes to waste reduction and offers a potentially eco-friendly and cost-effective whiteboard marker ink alternative.

Keywords

Pulverized Chicken Bones, Chicken bone ink, Industrial Whiteboard Marker Ink, Whiteboard marker, Absorbance, Viscosity, and Surface Tension.

1. Introduction

Creative solutions are required in response to the growing global concern of waste reduction. Bux and Amicarelli (2022) brought attention to the difficulties in minimizing waste, especially given the lack of a standardized process for separating biowaste, which makes it difficult to value chicken bones, skin, and food waste. This study explores the possibility of using chicken bones for sustainable purposes that promote economic development, environmental health, and waste reduction. While manufacturers prioritize high-quality whiteboard marker ink that delivers exceptional writing performance, durability, and overall efficacy, consumer demands for eco-friendly alternatives are gaining traction (Boz et al. 2020). This study addresses this growing concern by evaluating an alternative whiteboard

marker ink derived from pulverized chicken bones. We compare the ink qualities of both options, focusing on absorption, surface tension, and viscosity on non-absorbent surfaces.

This research has the potential to offer a more practical and sustainable approach to ink production. The findings can benefit various stakeholders:

- Students: Reduced educational costs and potentially minimized exposure to harmful chemicals present in conventional inks.
- Professors: A valuable tool for introducing concepts of sustainability, circular economy, and material innovation in classrooms, fostering critical thinking about materials used.
- Environment: Potential replacement of chemical ingredients with eco-friendly alternatives, promoting environmental safety during production and waste disposal.
- Future Researchers: New insights for expanding the scope of the study and further development using advanced technology.

1.1 Objectives

The study aims to evaluate the efficacy of whiteboard marker ink derived from pulverized chicken bones compared to commercially available industrial counterparts. It seeks to determine whether the chicken bone-derived ink exhibits notable differences in critical characteristics like absorbance, surface tension, and viscosity compared to conventional whiteboard marker inks. Additionally, the research aims to offer insights into the specific contributions of pulverized chicken bone components to the formulation of marker ink. The specific objectives of the study include:

- 1. To identify if there is a significant difference between the surface tension of pulverized chicken bone marker ink and industrial whiteboard marker ink.
- 2. To identify if there is a significant difference between the absorbency of the pulverized chicken bone marker ink and the industrial whiteboard marker ink.
- 3. To identify if there is a significant difference between the viscosity of pulverized chicken bone marker ink and industrial whiteboard marker ink.

To determine how the components of pulverized chicken bones contribute to the production of whiteboard marker ink.

2. Literature Review

The literature review encompasses various studies highlighting the effects of whiteboard marker ink on users and the environment. Studies by Suaidi et al. (2022), Muchemi (2018), and Zhang et al. (2020) emphasize the harmful consequences of exposure to Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) present in whiteboard marker ink, such as xylene and formaldehyde, on both health and the environment. VOCs, commonly found in industrial settings, have been associated with adverse health effects ranging from respiratory issues to reproductive harm. Moreover, VOC emissions contribute to environmental pollution, underscoring the importance of exploring eco-friendly alternatives to conventional ink production methods (Suaidi et al. 2022; Muchemi, 2018; Zhang et al. 2020).

Furthermore, the review discusses the occupational hazards faced by workers in the printing industry, particularly regarding exposure to solvents like xylene. Studies by Hormozi et al. (2019) and Geraldino et al. (2021) reveal the correlation between occupational xylene exposure and adverse health effects, emphasizing the need for stringent workplace safety measures. Understanding exposure thresholds and health implications, as outlined by regulatory standards such as OSHA and NIOSH, is crucial for safeguarding worker well-being (Hormozi et al. 2019; Geraldino et al. 2021).

Additionally, the review highlights industry trends toward sustainability and explores strategies for mitigating environmental impact. Research by Rinkesh (2022), Andretta et al. (2021), and Jiang and Qu (2020) underscores the importance of addressing VOC emissions in various sectors, including printing and manufacturing, through innovative approaches and technological advancements. Initiatives such as utilizing biomass waste for ink production and implementing sustainable practices in the manufacturing industry offer promising solutions for reducing environmental footprint (Rinkesh 2022; Andretta et al. 2021; Jiang and Qu, 2020).

Furthermore, valorization studies on chicken bone waste by Pramualkijja et al. (2021) and Hussain et al. (2021) shed light on the potential for utilizing byproducts from the poultry industry in sustainable applications, such as collagen extraction and biodiesel production. These studies underscore the importance of exploring alternative uses for waste materials to minimize environmental impact and promote circular economy principles (Pramualkijja et al. 2021; Hussain et al. 2021).

Overall, the literature review underscores the urgent need for eco-friendly alternatives to conventional whiteboard marker ink production methods, considering the detrimental effects of VOC exposure on human health and the environment. It highlights the importance of adopting sustainable practices in various industries and exploring innovative approaches to waste valorization to mitigate environmental impact and promote a greener future (Suaidi et al.2022; Muchemi 2019; Zhang et al.2020; Hormozi et al. 2019; Geraldino et al. 2021; Rinkesh, 2022; Andretta et al. 2021; Jiang and Qu, 2020; Pramualkijja et al.2021; Hussain et al. 2021).



Figure 1. Conceptual Framework

3. Methods

The research explores using pulverized chicken bone as a sustainable alternative for whiteboard marker ink. Various tests and evaluations discovered that this unique substance could effectively produce ink suitable for writing and drawing, presenting a potential eco-friendly solution for ink manufacturing. The conceptual framework outlines the necessary research stages, including input, process, and output. Input involves identifying the components of the product, mainly focusing on the independent variable, while the process entails conducting tests to assess ink quality. The output phase presents the results of hypothesis testing and establishes a relationship between the independent variable (chicken bones) and the dependent variable (ink).

Overall, the research aims to demonstrate the feasibility of using pulverized chicken bone as whiteboard marker ink, highlighting its potential for waste material recycling and reducing environmental impact. By systematically evaluating the components and conducting tests, the study provides insights into the viability and effectiveness of this innovative approach. The conceptual framework guides the research process, ensuring clarity in methodology and facilitating the interpretation of results to determine whether the hypothesis regarding the relationship between chicken bones and ink holds.

4. Data Collection

In collecting data, the researchers will utilize self-observation and laboratory tests. The self-observation tests encompass spectrophotometry and drying time assessments to check the ink absorbance, drip, and Engler tests to

evaluate ink viscosity, and coin and capillary tests to analyze ink surface tension. Spectrophotometry measures light absorbance, aiding in understanding ink color intensity and formulation, while drying time tests provide insights into ink drying rates. Drip tests observe ink flow patterns, while Engler tests standardize viscosity measurement. Coin tests assess ink droplet behavior when interacting with a coin, and capillary tests evaluate ink movement through small spaces, reflecting surface tension properties. These tests collectively yield comprehensive data on ink characteristics crucial for optimizing formulations for specific applications.

5. Results and Discussion

The comparative analysis reveals that Ink Trial 1 demonstrates higher absorbency than Industrial Ink, as evidenced by superior results in the Spectrophotometry Test and quicker mean drying time. This heightened absorbency prompts considerations regarding its potential advantages or disadvantages in practical applications. Similarly, Ink Trial 2 exhibits greater absorbency compared to Industrial Ink, which is indicated by superior spectrophotometry results and faster drying time. This leads to inquiries into its efficacy in real-world scenarios. Regarding viscosity, Industrial Ink demonstrates more consistent viscosity, ensuring reliable performance, whereas Ink Trial 2 shows inconsistencies compared to Industrial Ink, despite both displaying inferior performance to the industrial ink in self-observation tests. In terms of surface tension, comparisons between Ink Trial 1 and Industrial Whiteboard Marker Ink, as well as Ink Trial 2 and Industrial Whiteboard Marker Ink, underscore the need for further research to elucidate their effects on ink performance in tasks such as writing or printing on various surfaces.

5.1 Numerical Results

Utilizing IBM SPSS Statistics and Excel, the researchers were able to extensively analyze the correlation between the industrial ink and ink trials 1 and 2, showing the mean, variance, t-stat, p-value, and other relative information. A T-test was utilized during this research.

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Un	equal Variances			
	Ink Trial 1	Industrial Ink		
Mean	11.45	27.7266	66667	
Variance	0.9597	13.2484	3333	
Observations	3		3	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0			
df	2			
t Stat	-7.479241989			
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.008705543			
t Critical one-tail	2.91998558			
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.017411086			
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273			
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273	est: Two-Sample Assuming Un	equal Variances	Industrial Ink
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273	est: Two-Sample Assuming Un an	equal Variances	Industrial Ink 27.72666667
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273	est: Two-Sample Assuming Un an iance	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 16.36666667 0.145833333	Industrial Ink 27.72666667 13.24843333
: Critical two-tail	4.30265273	est: Two-Sample Assuming Un an iance servations	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 16.36666667 0.145833333 3	Industrial Ink 27.72666667 13.24843333 3
: Critical two-tail	4.30265273	est: Two-Sample Assuming Un an iance servations oothesized Mean Difference	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 16.36666667 0.14583333 3 0	Industrial Ink 27.72666667 13.24843333 3
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273 t-Ti Me Var Ob: Hyp df	est: Two-Sample Assuming Un an iance servations pothesized Mean Difference	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 16.36666667 0.145833333 3 0 2	Industrial Ink 27.72666667 13.24843333 3
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273 t-Ti Me Var Ob: Hyp df t 5t	est: Two-Sample Assuming Un an iance servations pothesized Mean Difference at	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 16.36666667 0.145833333 3 0 2 -5.376250404	Industrial Ink 27.72666667 13.24843333 3
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273 t-Tr Me Var Ob: Hyy df t St Y	est: Two-Sample Assuming Un an iance servations pothesized Mean Difference at <=t) one-tail	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 16.36666667 0.14583333 3 0 2 -5.376250404 0.016449692	Industrial Ink 27.72666667 13.24843333 3
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273 t-Tri Mee Var Ob: Hyp df t St P(T t Cr	est: Two-Sample Assuming Un an iance servations pothesized Mean Difference iat <=t) one-tail itical one-tail	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 16.36666667 0.14583333 3 0 2 -5.376250404 0.016449692 2,91998558	Industrial Ink 27.72666667 13.24843333 3
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273 t-Ti Me Var Ob: Hyp df t \$1 P(T t Cr t Cr t Cr	est: Two-Sample Assuming Un an lance servations pothesized Mean Difference at <=t) one-tail <itical one-tail<br=""><=t) two-tail</itical>	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 16.36666667 0.145833333 0 2 -5.376250404 0.016449652 2.91998558 0.032899384	Industrial Ink 27.726666667 13.24843333 3

Figure 2. Sample results from the conducted T-test are shown above for comparison with industrial ink and ink trials 1 and 2 in terms of absorbency.

The outputs showcase the degree of association between the two inks based on the resulting p-values. The figure shows that there is a significant difference in absorbency between both ink trials 1 & 2 and the industrial ink.

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Un	equal Variances			
	Ink Trial 1	Industrial Ink		
Mean	23.95	11.26666667		
Variance	4.8837	3.866433333		
Observations	3	3		
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0			
df	4			
t Stat	7.426542972			
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.000877448			
t Critical one-tail	2.131846786			
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.001754896			
t Critical two-tail	2.776445105			
t Critical two-tail	2.776445105	t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Uni	equal Variances	Industrial Ink
t Critical two-tail	2.776445105	t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Un	Ink Trial 2	Industrial Ink 11.2666667
t Critical two-tail	2.776445105	t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Un Mean Variance	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 16.26666667 0.731033333	Industrial Ink 11.26666667 3.86643333
t Critical two-tail	2.776445105	t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Uni Mean Variance Observations	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 16.2666667 0.731033333 3	Industrial Ink 11.26666667 3.866433333 3
t Critical two-tail	2.776445105	t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Uni Mean Variance Observations Hypothesized Mean Difference	equal Variances ink Trial 2 16.26666667 0.731033333 3 0	Industrial Ink 11.2666667 3.866433333 3
t Critical two-tail	2.776445105	t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Un Mean Variance Observations Hypothesized Mean Difference df	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 16.26666667 0.731033333 3 0 3	Industrial Ink 11.2666667 3.866433333 3
t Critical two-tail	2.776445105	t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Uni Mean Variance Observations Hypothesized Mean Difference df t Stat	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 16.26666667 0.731033333 0 3 0 3 4.038976601	Industrial Ink 11.26666667 3.86643333 3
t Critical two-tail	2.776445105	t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Uni Mean Variance Observations Hypothesized Mean Difference df t Stat PIT<=t) one-tail	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 16.26666667 0.731033333 3 0 3 4.038976601 0.033652856	Industrial Ink 11.26666667 3.866433333 3
t Critical two-tail	2.776445105	t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Uni Mean Variance Observations Hypothesized Mean Difference df t Stat P(T<=t) one-tail t Critical one-tail	Ink Trial 2 Ink Trial 2 16.2666667 0.731033333 3 0 3 4.038976601 0.013652856 2.353363435	Industrial Ink 11.26666667 3.866433333 3
t Critical two-tail	2.776445105	t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Un Mean Variance Observations Hypothesized Mean Difference df t Stat P(T<=t) one-tail t Critical one-tail P(T<=t) two-tail	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 16.26666667 0.73103333 0 3 0 4.038976601 0.013652856 2.353363435 0.027305713	Industrial Ink 11.26666667 3.86643333 3

Figure 3. Sample results from the conducted T-test are shown above for the comparison of the industrial ink and ink trials 1 and 2 in terms of viscosity.

The outputs showcase the degree of association between the two inks based on the resulting p-values. The figure shows that there is a significant difference in viscosity between both ink trials 1 & 2 and the industrial ink.

a second s	equal Variances			
	Ink Trial 1	Industrial Whiteboard Marker	Ink	
Mean	70.37666667	47.5133	3333	
Variance	362.3717333	19.8082	23333	
Observations	3		3	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0			
df	2			
t Stat	2.025658433			
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.09002805			
t Critical one-tail	2.91998558			
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.1800561			
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273	Testi Ture Consele Assumine He		
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273	Test: Two-Sample Assuming Un	equal Variances	Industrial Whitehoused Markov Ink
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273	Test: Two-Sample Assuming Un	equal Variances	Industrial Whiteboard Marker Ink
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273	Test: Two-Sample Assuming Un Tean	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 74.41333333 62 10662222	Industrial Whiteboard Marker Ink 47.5133333 10.90972323
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273 t-	Test: Two-Sample Assuming Un lean ariance becarations	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 74.4133333 63.10263333	Industrial Whiteboard Marker Ink 47.51333333 19.80823333
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273	Test: Two-Sample Assuming Un lean ariance bservations vootbesiges Maan Difference	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 74.4133333 63.10263333 3 0	Industrial Whiteboard Marker Ink 47.5133333 19.80823333 3
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273 t- N V O H	Test: Two-Sample Assuming Un Tean ariance bservations ypothesized Mean Difference	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 74.41333333 63.10263333 3 0 3	Industrial Whiteboard Marker Ink 47.5133333 19.80823333 3
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273	Test: Two-Sample Assuming Un lean ariance bservations ypothesized Mean Difference f Stat	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 74.4133333 63.10263333 0 3 5.116902949	Industrial Whiteboard Marker Ink 47 5133333 19.80823333 3
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273 t- W V O H d t t	Test: Two-Sample Assuming Uni lean ariance bservations ypothesized Mean Difference f Stat	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 74.4133333 63.10263333 0 3 5.11690294 0.007222879	Industrial Whiteboard Marker Ink 47.5133333 19.80823333 3
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273	Test: Two-Sample Assuming Un lean ariance bservations ypothesized Mean Difference f Stat (T<=t) one-tail Critical one-tail	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 74.41333333 63.10263333 0 3 5.116902949 0.007222879 2.353364355	Industrial Whiteboard Marker Ink 47.5133333 19.80823333 3
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273	Test: Two-Sample Assuming Un ariance bservations ypothesized Mean Difference fat Tract Jone-tail Critical one-tail Critical one-tail	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 74.4133333 63.10263333 0 0 3 5.116902949 0.007222879 2.353363435 0.014445758	Industrial Whiteboard Marker Ink 47.51333333 19.80823333 3
t Critical two-tail	4.30265273 T- M V V O O H H d t t F P P	Test: Two-Sample Assuming Un ariance bservations ypothesized Mean Difference f Stat (T<=t) one-tail Critical one-tail (T<=t) wo-tail	equal Variances Ink Trial 2 74.4133333 63.10263333 0 3 5.116902949 0.007222879 2.353363435 0.014445758	Industrial Whiteboard Marker Ink 47 5133333 19.80823333 3

Figure 4. Sample results from the conducted T-test are shown above for the comparison of the industrial ink and ink trials 1 and 2 in terms of surface tension.

The outputs showcase the degree of association between the two inks based on the resulting p-values. The figure shows that there is a significant difference in surface tension between both ink trials 1 & 2 and the industrial ink.



5.2 Graphical Results

Figure 5. The graph displayed shows the mean outcomes of the 3 inks, Trials 1 and 2, and Industrial Ink from the absorbency test. The ink's absorbency was assessed through an Observation Test (Drying Time).

In the Drying Time test, the mean time for each of the three inks is indicated above, ink trial 1 has a mean time of 11.45 seconds, 16.37 seconds for ink trial 2, and 27.73 seconds for the industrial ink, respectively, dry on a whiteboard surface. These results show that industrial ink is the most effective in terms of absorbency since it does not dry out too quickly, while ink trial 1 was the least absorbent ink from the absorbency test.



Figure 6. The graph displayed shows the outcomes of the 3 inks, Trials 1 and 2, and Industrial Ink from the viscosity test.

An Observation Test (Drip Test) assessed the ink's viscosity. In the Drip test, the mean time for each of the three inks is indicated above, the ink trial 1 took 23.95 seconds, ink trial 2 took 16.27 seconds, and 31.85 seconds for the industrial ink, respectively, to assess the fluidity of the ink. These results show that industrial ink is the most effective in terms of viscosity, while ink trial 1 was the least effective ink from the viscosity test.





An Observation Test (Coin Test) assessed the ink's surface tension. In the Coin test, the mean time for each of the three inks is indicated above, the ink trial 1 has a mean time of 70.38 seconds, 74.41 seconds for ink trial 2, and 47.51 seconds for the industrial ink, respectively, to spread on a whiteboard surface. These results show that industrial ink is the most effective in terms of surface tension since it spreads evenly, while ink trial 2 was the least effective ink from the surface tension test.

5.3 Proposed Improvements

Several areas warrant further investigation regarding chicken bone-based ink. Its long-term durability requires examination, particularly its resistance to fading, erasing, and overall longevity for practical use in various settings. Additionally, a comprehensive environmental impact assessment of the production process is necessary, comparing it to traditional inks to highlight benefits and drawbacks. Chemical composition analysis should identify any potentially harmful substances while emphasizing environmental friendliness. User preferences and market viability, including cost-benefit analysis, need exploration, and alternative chicken bone applications. Comparative studies with other sustainable inks are essential, as is research into utilizing dehydrated chicken bones and identifying components to lower ink absorbance without compromising performance.

5.4 Validation

A Kruskal-Wallis test was performed to validate the T-tests previously performed. the Kruskal-Wallis test does not assume normal distribution or equal variance across groups, making it suitable for situations where these assumptions are violated (Schmidt 2022).

		Absobency				
	Ink Trial 1	Ink Trial 2	Industrial Whiteboard Marker Ink			
	12.48	16.45	31.85			
	10.53	16.7	26.37			
	11.34	15.95	24.96			
	3	5	9			
	1	6	8			
	2	4	7			
	6	15	24			
	3	3	3			
	12	75	192	279		
	The mean Absorbency from the Ink Trial 1					
H0	,	Ink Trial 2, an	d Industrial W	hiteboard		
	The mean Absobency from the Ink Trial 1,					
H1	Ink Trial 2, and Industrial Whiteboard					
	Marker Ink are not equal.					
Alpha=	0.05					
K=	7.2					
Critical Value	5.99146455					
P-value	0.02732372					
Conclusion	Reject H0					

Figure 8. In this case, after conducting the Kruskal-Wallis test to validate the results of the absorbency of the inks, it is revealed that the null hypothesis (H0), which states that the medians of the groups are all equal, is rejected.

There is evidence to suggest that the medians are different between at least two of the groups.

	Ink Trial 1	Ink Trial 2	Industrial Whiteboard Marker Ink			
	25.74	17.12	9.19			
	24.63	16.27	11.51			
	21.48	15.41	13.1			
	9	6	1			
	8	5	2			
	7	4	3			
	24	15	6			
	3	3	3			
	192	75	12	279		
	T	he mean Visco	osity from the I	nk Trial 1		
H0	,	Ink Trial 2, an	d Industrial W	hiteboard		
		Marke	r Ink are equa	l.		
	The mean Viscosity from the Ink Trial 1,					
H1	Ink Trial 2, and Industrial Whiteboard					
	Marker Ink are not equal.					
Alpha=	0.05					
K=	7.2					
Critical Value	5.99146455					
P-value	0.02732372					
Conclusion	Reject H0					

Figure 9. In this case, after conducting the Kruskal-Wallis test to validate the results of the viscosity of the inks.

It is revealed that the null hypothesis (H0), which states that the medians of the groups are not equal, is rejected There is evidence to suggest that the medians are different between at least two of the groups.

	Surface Tension					
	Ink Trial 1	Ink Trial 2	Industrial Whiteboard Marker Ink			
	85.59	80.65	46.51			
	49.03	65.47	52.38			
	76.51	77.12	43.65			
	9	8	2			
	3	5	4			
	6	7	1			
	18	20	7			
	3	3	3			
	108	133.3333333	16.33333333	257.6667		
	The r	The mean Surface Tension from the In				
H0		Ink Trial 2, an	d Industrial W	hiteboard		
		Marke	L			
	The mean Surface Tension from the Ink Trial 1,					
H1	Ink Trial 2, and Industrial Whiteboard					
	Marker Ink are not equal.					
Alpha=	0.05					
K=	4.35555556					
Critical Value	5.99146455					
P-value	0.11329301					
Conclusion	Accept H0					

Figure 10. In this case, after conducting the Kruskal-Wallis test to validate the results, it failed to reject the null hypothesis (H0) at a significance level of 0.05.

This means there is insufficient evidence to conclude that the mean surface tension differs between the three ink samples. therefore, the data suggests the mean surface tension of all three inks might be similar.

6. Conclusion

The researchers conducted a study to explore the feasibility of using pulverized chicken bones as an alternative to industrial whiteboard marker ink. Laboratory tests were performed to analyze absorbency, viscosity, and surface tension, with results indicating significant differences between the chicken bone ink and industrial ink in absorbency and viscosity. However, surface tension was found to be comparable between the two. Additionally, the cost-effectiveness of the chicken bone ink was highlighted due to its cheaper ingredients. The study also delved into the components of chicken bones, noting the presence of proteins, calcium carbonate, and carbon, which contribute to ink production by acting as binding agents, fillers, and pigments, respectively. This research suggests that while pulverized chicken bone ink may not match industrial ink in all aspects, it presents a potentially cost-effective alternative for specific applications.

References

- Andretta, I., Hickmann, F., Remus, A., Franceschi, C. H., Mariani, A., Orso, C., Kipper, M., Létourneau-Montminy, M., & Pomar, C., Environmental Impacts of pig and poultry Production: Insights from a Systematic review. Frontiers in Veterinary Science, 8, 2021. https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2021.750733
- Boz, Z., Korhonen, V., & Koelsch Sand, C., Consumer Considerations for the Implementation of Sustainable Packaging: A Review. Sustainability, 12(6), 2192, 2020. MDPI AG. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su12062192
- Bux, C., & Amicarelli, V. Separate collection and bio-waste valorization in the Italian poultry sector by material flow analysis. J Mater Cycles Waste Manag 24, 811–823,2022. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/s10163-022-01366-0
- ENGLER Viscosity Normalab. (2021, June 4). Normalab. https://www.normalab.com/en/produit/engler-2/#:~:text=ENGLER%20VISCOMETER%20FOR%20BITUMEN,-ENGLER%20Viscometer&text=This%20test%20method%20covers%20the,method%20are%20reproducib le%20results%20obtained.
- Forensic analysis of black ballpoint pen inks using capillary electrophoresis | Office of Justice Programs. (n.d.). https://www.ojp.gov/ncjrs/virtual-library/abstracts/forensic-analysis-black-ballpoint-pen-inks-usingcapillary
- Geraldino, B. R., Nunes, R. F. N., Gomes, J. B., da Poça, K. S., Giardini, I., Silva, P. V. B., Souza, H. P., Otero, U. B., & Sarpa, M. (2021). Evaluation of Exposure to Toluene and Xylene in Gasoline Station Workers. Advances in preventive medicine, 2021, 5553633. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/5553633
- Hormozi, M., Mirzaei, R., Nakhaee, A., Payandeh, A., Izadi, S., Haghighi, J.D., & Rahimpoor, R. (2019). Quantification of Urinary Metabolites of Toluene and Xylene Isomers as Biological Indices of Occupational Exposure in Printing Industry Workers. Health Scope. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8159630/
- Hussain, F., Alshahrani, S., Abbas, M. M., Khan, H. M., Jamil, A., Yaqoob, H., Soudagar, M. E. M., et al., Waste Animal Bones as Catalysts for Biodiesel Production; A Mini Review. Catalysts, 11(5), 630, 2021. MDPI AG. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/catal11050630
- Jiang, J., & Qu, L., Evolution and Emerging Trends of Sustainability in Manufacturing Based on Literature Visualization Analysis. IEEE Access, 8, 121074-121088, 2020.
- Muchemi, S.M., Moturi, W.N., & Ogendi, G.M., Influence of dry erase ink solvent mixtures on eye irritation. Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health Sciences, 10, 44-55, 2018.
- Peipei, C., Owanlu, J., Jingrun, C., & Mengbin, L. (2021). Cangnan printing & packaging industry renovation and VOCs governance experience. IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 657(1), 012027, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/657/1/012027
- Schmidt, S.K. (2022). Kruskal-Wallis Test. The SAGE Encyclopedia of Research Design.

- Suaidi, N. A., Alshawsh, M. A., Hoe, S. Z., Mokhtar, M. H., & Zin, S. R. M., Toxicological Effects of Technical Xylene Mixtures on the Female Reproductive System: A Systematic Review. Toxics, 10(5), 235, 2022. https://doi.org/10.3390/toxics10050235
- Zhang, Z. F., Zhang, X., Zhang, X. M., Liu, L. Y., Li, Y. F., & Sun, W. (2020). Indoor occurrence and health risk of formaldehyde, toluene, xylene and total volatile organic compounds derived from an extensive monitoring campaign in Harbin, a megacity of China. Chemosphere, 250, 126324. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2020.126324</u>

Bibliography

Lander I. Cabuay is a dedicated and results-oriented fourth-year industrial engineering student at the University of Santo Tomas. His passion for optimizing processes extends beyond the classroom, as evidenced by his internship at My Story Inc. There, Lander not only authored engaging marketing content but also made a standard operating procedure (SOP) to streamline content creation. This initiative demonstrates his commitment to efficiency and continuous improvement. Lander is a learner at heart, constantly seeking new skills, and prioritizes delivering high-quality work. As a team player, he values collaboration and understands his colleagues' strengths. Lander's adaptability and openness to new tools and processes make him a valuable asset in any environment focused on operational excellence.

Nikko Carlo C. Caneda, a fourth-year industrial engineering student with a genuine interest in the production field, particularly within manufacturing, has delved into comprehensive study materials and practical experiences to deepen his understanding. His internship at Universal Robina Corporation, a primary food manufacturing company, provided invaluable insights into the intricacies of manufacturing processes, quality control mechanisms, and supply chain management within the food industry. Through this experience, he sharpened his skills in optimizing production workflows, implementing lean methodologies, and enhancing operational efficiency, concentrating his commitment to pursuing a career dedicated to innovation and excellence in manufacturing engineering.

Rcrizthian C. Lao is a dedicated and driven student with a keen interest in operations research and operations management. Their enthusiasm for these subjects extends beyond the confines of the classroom, evident in his internship at "Pacific Paint (Boysen) Philippines" reflects their strong work ethic and pursuit of excellence, allowing them to refine their operational skills and gain valuable insights into logistics and factory management. With a combination of academic perseverance, leadership skills, and a compassionate drive to support others, Rcrizthian is well-equipped for success in the field of operations management.

Jerard Angelo O. Pilipiña, a fourth-year industrial engineering student with a passion for systems engineering processes, my internship at FCU Solutions, Inc. has provided hands-on experience in system procedures. Throughout my academic journey, I've explored various resources to deepen my understanding of the field. My learning journey includes online courses, workshops, and seminars on systems engineering principles and practices. Additionally, I actively engage in online forums and communities focused on industrial engineering and systems optimization. These experiences have not only broadened my knowledge but have also fueled my ambition to contribute to the improvement of industrial systems and processes.

Jesselyn B. Alcain earned a Bachelor of Science Degree in Industrial Engineering from the University of the Philippines Diliman-Quezon City, complementing her academic achievements with a Master's Degree in Management Engineering from the University of Santo Tomas (UST). Presently, she is pursuing a Doctorate Degree majoring in Commerce at UST. With a rich background and extensive experience in industrial engineering, she has contributed significantly to the field, notably through her tenure at a multinational semiconductor company, where she managed various manufacturing process functions. Currently, she leads process improvement initiatives at a non-life insurance company and holds the position of Internal Quality Audit Lead, playing a crucial role in upholding ISO 9001:2015 standards. Additionally, she serves as a part-time lecturer at the University of Santo Tomas' Faculty of Engineering.