

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

# DEVELOPMENT OF A NOVEL CAT LITTER FROM OLIVE OIL WASTE PRODUCTS

---

A thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTERS OF ANIMAL SCIENCE

at Massey University, Palmerston North  
New Zealand

**TIFFANY ANNE WENDLAND**  
**2011**

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisors, Dr. David Thomas and Dr. Ngaio Beausoleil. They helped me through every aspect of this thesis and gave me support when needed. They complemented each other in guiding me through this difficult and emotional process, and therefore I am extremely grateful to have had the privilege of working with the both of them.

I would also like to thank a large number of people for their assistance in the completion of my masters: Don Thomas for assisting me and letting me use the pelleter; Debbie Chesterfield for the use of the drying machines and storage of my product; everyone at the Centre for Feline Nutrition for helping me with research and use of the cats; Alasdair Noble for aiding in the statistical analysis; Mike Hedley, Ian Furkert, and Bob Toes for use of the research lab and assistance when it was needed.

While working on my masters, I had financial support through TechNZ. TechNZ is the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology's business investment programme and is designed to support companies and people undertaking research and development projects that result in new products, processes, or services. I also had support from Wayne Startup, CEO of The Village Press.

I would like to thank my friends for aiding in reviewing thesis chapters, assisting in experiments, and providing insight; and for providing encouragement and understanding, especially Kathleen Ward, Amanda McIhorne, and Jessica Raney. I would especially like to thank my partner Nick Rogers for helping me with ideas, the writing process, and mostly for putting up with me through the stressful times. This thesis would not have been completed without his help.

## Abstract

The aim of this study was to develop and test a novel cat litter (O-Litter) from the waste products of olive oil production. In order to do this, the waste products had to be tested to see if they had the characteristics of marketable cat litters. This was accomplished through three main experiments: cat preference for the litter, litter absorption capacity, and litter odour control.

To date, there is very little published research on cat litter and cat preferences. Therefore, much of the background information for the experiments described in this thesis came from patents, websites, or cat owners unsatisfied with litters and providing suggestions. Before starting any experiments on the development of a new cat litter from a waste product, determining which characteristics of a cat litter were of most importance was needed. A review of the available information did identify the main characteristics required, and subsequent experiments were performed to test them.

A pilot study was performed to determine an appropriate amount of time to leave the litter boxes in the cage with the cats in order to determine a preference between litters. Ten cats were given two types of litter in two litter boxes, with the positions interchanged daily for ten days. From this pilot study, we were able to determine that cats only needed exposure to the litter for two days to properly determine which litter they preferred.

The preference experiment was conducted with ten cats from the Centre for Feline Nutrition at Massey University. The cats were tested using a pair-wise preference test. Ten combinations of five different cat litter types (Vitapet Cat Litter, Natural O-Litter, Pellet A O-Litter, Pellet B O-Litter, and a control (empty litter box)) were used for a total of twenty days. Records of litter weight change and amount of excrement produced were used to determine which litter type the cats preferred. The results determined that based on the measurement criteria, the cats preferred the commercial brand, followed by Natural O-Litter.

For the absorption and odour control experiments, eight litter types were compared (VitaPet Purrfection, Breeder Celest, Excellence Ultra-Hygienic, VitaPet Cat Litter, Pellet A O-Litter, Pellet B O-Litter, and two versions of Natural O-Litter: old and new). In the absorption experiment a specified volume of water was added to the eight litter types (above). After 30 minutes the litter was strained, and it was determined that VitaPet Purrfection (which is a clumping variety of litter) was the best litter at absorbing water, followed by the two pelleted varieties of O-Litter.

For the odour control experiment, an ammonia-based cleaner was added to the litter which was contained in a preserving jar to prevent the ammonia from escaping. A filter paper soaked with hydrogen sulphate was used to absorb the ammonia that was not absorbed by the cat litter. An auto analyser was then used to determine the amount of ammonia absorbed by the filter paper, thus not absorbed by the cat litter. The results from this study showed that the two pellet varieties of O-Litter were the best at odour control for each time interval tested. In fact, all four O-Litters tested performed better than the commercial brands at absorbing the ammonia.

From these experiments, we are able to show that O-litter has the potential to make a marketable cat litter. When the O-litter products were compared to commercial brands, they either had qualities that were equal to or better than the commercial products they were compared with. Due to time constraints, not all of the characteristics of the litter were fully tested and some of these characteristics (e.g. dust control, clumping, and tracking) should be tested before the product goes on to the market. However, even without these additional tests, O-litter shows great potential as a cat litter.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
List of Tables .....	ix
List of Figures .....	xi
Chapter 1: General Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review and Research Question.....	3
2.1 Introduction .....	3
2.2 Cat ownership and the kitty litter market .....	4
2.3 Characteristics of marketable kitty litter .....	5
2.3.1 Animal preference .....	5
2.3.2 Odour Control .....	6
2.3.3 Absorbency .....	8
2.3.4 Clumping .....	8
2.3.5 Tracking and Dust.....	9
2.4 Existing cat litters .....	9
2.5 Development of a biodegradable cat litter from olive oil .....	14
2.5.1 Why develop a new cat litter? .....	14
2.5.2 Marketing O-litter .....	15
2.5.3 The Olive Oil Industry.....	15
2.6 Assessing suitability of olive oil waste products as a cat litter .....	16
2.7 Research questions .....	16
Chapter 3: Pilot Study for Litter Preference Experiment.....	17
3.1 Introduction .....	17
3.2 Materials and Methods.....	18
3.2.1 Animals.....	18
3.2.2 Cage and Litter Box Design .....	18
3.2.3 Litter Types and Processing .....	20
3.2.4 Litter Combinations.....	21
3.2.5 Measurement of Cat Preferences.....	21
3.2.5.1 Measurements.....	21

3.2.5.2 Data Analysis.....	22
3.3 Results.....	22
3.3.1 Proximate analysis .....	22
3.3.2 Litter Box Measurements.....	23
3.4 Discussion.....	28
3.5 Conclusion.....	30
Chapter 4: Cat Preferences for Litter Type .....	31
4.1 Introduction .....	31
4.2 Materials and Methods.....	32
4.2.1 Animals.....	32
4.2.2 Cage and Litter Box Design .....	32
4.2.3 Litter Combinations.....	33
4.2.4 Measuring Techniques .....	33
4.2.5 Determination of Preference .....	34
4.2.5.1 Individual Level Preferences.....	34
4.2.5.2 Population Level Preferences.....	35
4.2.6 Comparison of methods for determining preference .....	36
4.3 Results.....	36
4.3.1 Individual Level Preferences .....	36
4.3.2 Population Level Preferences .....	38
4.3.3 Comparison of rankings from various analytical methods .....	46
4.4 Discussion.....	47
4.4.1 Criteria for Determining Litter Preference.....	47
4.4.1.1 Individual Level.....	47
4.4.1.2 Population Level.....	48
4.4.2 Methods Used to Determine Preference.....	49
4.4.3 Comparison of the three O-litters.....	50
4.4.4 Limitations of Study .....	50
4.4.5 Future Study Directions .....	50
4.5 Conclusion.....	51

Chapter 5: Absorption.....	52
5.1 Introduction .....	52
5.2 Materials and Methods.....	52
5.2.1 Experimental Design .....	52
5.2.2 Experimental Procedure .....	53
5.2.3 Statistical Analysis.....	54
5.3 Results.....	54
5.4 Discussion.....	55
5.4.1 Experiment.....	55
5.4.2 Limitations and Future Direction .....	56
5.5 Conclusion.....	57
Chapter 6: Odour Control .....	58
6.1 Introduction .....	58
6.2 Materials and Methods.....	58
6.2.1 Experimental Design .....	58
6.2.1.1 Calibration Process.....	59
6.2.1.2 Experiment.....	60
6.2.2 Experimental Procedure .....	60
6.2.2.1 Calibration Process.....	60
6.2.2.2 Main Experiment.....	61
6.2.2.3 Analysis.....	62
6.2.3 Statistical Analysis.....	62
6.3 Results.....	62
6.3.1 Calibration.....	62
6.3.2 Main Experiment.....	63
6.3.3 Ranked Results .....	68
6.4 Discussion.....	68
6.4.1 Experiment.....	68
6.4.2 Ranked Results .....	71
6.4.3 Future Recommendations.....	71

6.5 Conclusion .....	72
Chapter 7: General Discussion .....	73
Conclusions .....	77
References .....	78
Appendix 3.1 .....	83
Appendix 4.1 .....	89
Appendix 6.1 .....	104

## List of Tables

Chapter	Table #	Title	Page
2	2.1	Components of normal cats urine	7
2	2.2	A comparison of the commercial cat litters currently available in New Zealand based on claims and price	12-14
3	3.1	The name; sex; birth date; age; and relatedness of the cats used for the pilot experiment	18
3	3.2	Litter combinations offered to each cat for the ten day test period	21
3	3.3	Weight change of single excrement and average weight due to tracking measured over all litter combinations and including data from all 10 cats	22
3	3.4	Results from proximate analysis	23
3	3.5	Summary of litter preferences for each cat and litter combination tested over 10 day period	27
4	4.1	Litter combinations used for preference experiment in the order in which they were presented to each cat	33
4	4.2	Average weight change of single excrement and average weight of tracking measured over all litter combinations for all 10 cats	35
4	4.3	Each litter combination showing the number of cats with a preference between litters, cats with no preferences, the binomial statistics, and the preferred litter for each combination based on the results from the binomial test from average weight change over 2 days	37
4	4.4	Each litter combination showing the number of cats with a preference between litters, cats with no preferences, the binomial statistics, and the preferred litter for each combination based on the results from the binomial test from average number of excrements over 2 days	38
4	4.5	Results of paired t-tests on average weight change for each litter combination based on data from all 10 cats	40
4	4.6	Results of sign tests on preference ratios based on weight change for each litter combination	42
4	4.7	Results of paired t-test based on average number of excrements for each litter combination	44
4	4.8	Results of sign tests on preference ratios based on average number of excrements for each litter combination	46
4	4.9	Approximate rankings of litters based on six analytical methods	46
5	5.1	Results from proximate analysis of new olive oil waste products	53

5	5.2	Absorption capacity for each litter and percentage of the water added that was absorbed by each litter	54
6	6.1	Results from the calibration process	63
6	6.2	Results from the 10 minute odour absorption experiment	64
6	6.3	Results from the 20 minute odour absorption experiment	65
6	6.4	Results from the 40 minute odour absorption experiment	66
6	6.5	Results from the 80 minute odour absorption experiment	67
6	6.6	Ammonia concentration for each litter at each time interval with an overall rank of litters based on ammonia absorption.	68

## List of Figures

Chapter	Figure	Title	Page
2	2.1	The evolution of the cat and its relationship to other animals in the order Carnivora	3
2	2.2	The cats voeronasal organs	6
3	3.1	Design and dimensions of the single cages used to house the cats during the pilot study	19
3	3.2	Plan of the single cage used for the pilot study	19
3	3.3	Orbit pelleter	20
3	3.4	Weight change of litters and number of excrements each day for Raven who was offered O-litters A and B over the ten day period.	24
3	3.5	Weight change of litters and number of excrements each day for Tui who was offered O-litters A and Natural over the ten day period.	24
3	3.6	Weight change of litters and number of excrements each day for Ra who was offered O-litter A and commercial over the ten day period.	25
3	3.7	Weight change of litters and number of excrements each day for Aura who was offered O-litter A and empty over the ten day period.	25
3	3.8	Weight change of litters and number of excrements each day for Rach who was offered O-litters B and Natural over the ten day period.	25
3	3.9	Weight change of litters and number of excrements each day for Lea who was offered O-litter B and commercial over the ten day period.	26
3	3.10	Weight change of litters and number of excrements each day for Beeva who was offered O-litter B and empty over the ten day period.	26
3	3.11	Weight change of litters and number of excrements each day for Jade who was offered O-litter natural and commercial over the ten day period.	26
3	3.12	Weight change of litters and number of excrements each day for Esta who was offered O-litter natural and empty over the ten day period.	27

3	3.13	Weight change of litters and number of excrements each day for Billi who was offered litters commercial and empty over the ten day period.	27
4	4.1	Average weight change for each litter in each combination using data from all 10 cats	39
4	4.2	Distribution of preference ratios based on weight change criterion	40-41
4	4.3	Average number of excrements for each litter in each combination using data from all 10 cats	43
4	4.4	Distribution of preference ratios based on the number of excrements criterion	44-45
5	5.1	Absorption capacity for each litter	55
6	6.1	Filter paper prepared for the study	59
6	6.2	Experimental apparatus used for the calibration process	60
6	6.3	Experiment apparatus to show how ammonia was dispensed onto each cat litter.	62
6	6.4	Amount of ammonia remaining unabsorbed by the litters and captured by filter paper soaked with KCl in 10 minutes after the cleaner was added	64
6	6.5	Amount of ammonia remaining unabsorbed by the litters and captured by filter paper soaked with KCl in 20 minutes after the cleaner was added	65
6	6.6	Amount of ammonia remaining unabsorbed by the litters and captured by filter paper soaked with KCl in 40 minutes after the cleaner was added	66
6	6.7	Amount of ammonia remaining unabsorbed by the litters and captured by filter paper soaked with KCl in 80 minutes after the cleaner was added	67