

1 **SUSTAINABLE POWER PRODUCTION IN A MEMBRANE-LESS AND**
2 **MEDIATOR-LESS WASTEWATER MICROBIAL FUEL CELL**

3

4 A. Aldrovandi ^a, Enrico Marsili ^b, Loredana Stante ^a, Patrizia Paganin ^c, Silvia
5 Tabacchioni ^c, Andrea Giordano ^{a,*}

6

7 ^a ENEA C.R. Bologna, ACS PROTIDR Section, Via Martiri di Montesole 4, 40129
8 Bologna – Italy

9 ^b BioTechnology Institute, University of Minnesota, 1479 Gortner Ave, St. Paul,
10 Minnesota 55108 - USA

11 ^c ENEA C.R. Casaccia, BAS-BIOTEC-GEN Section, Via Anguillarese 301, S. Maria di
12 Galeria 00123 Roma - Italy

13

14 * Corresponding author. Tel.: +39-051-6098580; Fax: +39-051-6098309

15 Email address: andrea.giordano@bologna.enea.it (A. Giordano)

1 **Abstract**

2 Microbial fuel cells (MFCs) fed with wastewater are currently considered a
3 feasible strategy for production of renewable electricity at low cost.

4 A membrane-less MFC with biological cathode was built from a compact
5 wastewater treatment reactor. When operated with an external resistance of 250 Ohm,
6 the MFC produced a long-term power of approximately 70 mW/m² for ten months.
7 Denaturing Gradient Gel Electrophoresis (DGGE) analysis of the cathode biomass
8 when the MFC was closed on a 2100 Ohm external resistance showed that the
9 sequenced bands were affiliated with *Firmicutes*, *α-Proteobacteria*, *β-Proteobacteria*,
10 *γ-Proteobacteria*, and *Bacteroidetes* groups.

11 When the external resistance was varied between 250 and 2100 Ohm,
12 sustainable resistance decreased from 900 to 750 Ohm, while sustainable power output
13 decreased from 32 to 28 mW/m². It is likely that these effects were caused by changes
14 in the microbial ecology of anodic and cathodic biomass attached to the electrodes.
15 Results suggest that cathodic biomass enrichment in “electroactive” bacteria may
16 improve MFCs power output in a similar fashion to what has been already observed for
17 anodic biomass.

18

19 **Keywords:** microbial fuel cell, sustainable power, biocathode, PCR-DGGE.

20

21 **1. Introduction**

22 In a Microbial Fuel Cell (MFC), microorganisms convert chemical energy to
23 electrical energy, via microbial-catalyzed redox reactions. A typical MFC consists of
24 anode and cathode compartments separated by a cationic membrane. Microbes in the

1 anode compartment oxidize a soluble electron donor (e.g., glucose, acetate) generating
2 electrons and protons. Electrons are then transferred to the anode surface and from there
3 to the cathodic compartment through the electrical circuit, while the protons migrate
4 through the electrolyte and then through the cationic membrane. Electrons and protons
5 are consumed in the cathode compartment reducing a soluble electron acceptor, such as
6 oxygen or ferricyanide. Electrical power is harnessed by inserting a load between the
7 two electrode compartments (Allen and Bennetto, 1993).

8 In early studies, exogenous electrochemicals mediators have been added into the
9 MFCs to allow electron transfer from the microbial cells to the electrode, due to the
10 non-conductive nature of the cell surface structures (Roller et al., 1984; Park and
11 Zeikus, 2003; Logan and Regan, 2006). However, recent evidence (Kim et al., 2004;
12 Jang et al., 2004; Gil et al., 2003) showed that complex microbial communities in
13 wastewater-fed MFCs produce soluble redox mediators (e.g., pyocyanin; Rabaey et al.,
14 2004). Furthermore, *Geobacter sulfurreducens* is known to transfer electrons beyond
15 cell surfaces to electrodes through membrane proteins (Bond and Lovley, 2003;
16 Chaudhury and Lovley, 2003) or nanowires (Reguera et al., 2005), *Shewanella*
17 *oneidensis* MR1 was shown to produce both soluble redox mediators (Marsili et al.,
18 2008) and nanowires (Gorby et al., 2006).

19 It has been shown that wastewaters of different origin can be fed to MFCs, thus
20 allowing energy production from an abundant and inexpensive source. Most of the
21 energy available from the oxidation of the organic load was converted to electricity
22 (50÷90 % in term of Coulombic efficiency) while the remaining energy was used for
23 microbial growth (Liu et al., 2007; Rabaey et al., 2005a). Integration of MFCs in
24 wastewater treatment plants allowed energy recovery and reduction of excess sludge

1 production with little effect on the mineralization of organic load and the rest of the
2 process (Rabaey and Verstraete, 2005). Wastewater MFCs are currently being assessed
3 as a renewable energy strategy (Logan and Regan, 2006).

4 However, in order to make the process economically feasible, it is necessary to:
5 a) eliminate the cationic membrane to reduce operating costs due to membrane
6 maintenance; b) implement MFCs in existing wastewater treatment plants, to reduce
7 capital investment; c) avoid an expensive cathodic catalyst in favour of aerobic biomass
8 (He and Angenent, 2006).

9 Recently, membrane-less wastewater MFCs have been designed and tested (Jang
10 et al., 2004; Moon et al., 2006; Ghangrekar and Shinde, 2007). While many studies
11 have dealt with anodic compartment (Min and Logan, 2004; You et al., 2006; Liu et al.,
12 2004), a few studies have been performed both to develop a biocathode capable of
13 directly reducing oxygen and to characterize the microbial community responsible for
14 the cathode catalysis (Bergel et al., 2005; Chen et al., 2008; Clauwaert et al., 2007;
15 Kang et al., 2003, Rabaey et al., 2008).

16 In this study, a membrane-less, mediator-less MFC was implemented on a
17 compact lab-scale wastewater treatment plant (WWTP), with a simple and economic
18 design, to couple wastewater treatment (removal of organic compounds and ammonia
19 oxidation) with sustainable electrical power production to avoid the use of expensive
20 catalysts for the cathode. The effect of the external load on sustainable power
21 production was investigated. Furthermore, the microbial composition of cathodic
22 biomass was characterized in order to determine whether the long-term operation of the
23 MFC cause an enrichment in electroactive bacteria at the cathode. The results indicate

1 that the electroactivity of cathodic biomass affect the power production in completely
2 biological MFCs.

3 **2. Material and Methods**

4 *2.1 Process and reactor design*

5 The two-stage process shown in Fig. 1 was adopted for organic substrate
6 removal and ammonia nitrification of high strength wastewaters (Malina and Pohland,
7 1992; Tchobanoglous et al., 2003). Sedimentation and fermentation of easily degradable
8 organic substrate took place in the first anaerobic stage of the process, and the following
9 aerobic stage nitrified ammonia and further oxidized organic compounds.

10 The bench-scale WWTP was built in PVC, composed of two anaerobic
11 compartments arranged in series (ABR, Anaerobic Baffled Reactor), and an aerobic
12 chamber and a sludge settler (implementing an activated sludge process), as shown in
13 Fig. 1. The volumes of the four compartments were 18 L, 18 L, 22 L, and 5 L,
14 respectively. The anaerobic compartments #1 and #2 were connected through an
15 overfall. A recycle pump (Watson Marlow 503 S, Wilmington MA, USA) was placed
16 between the two anaerobic compartments to evenly distribute the liquid below the
17 sludge blanket. Constant temperature in the ABR (35°C) was maintained with a heating
18 element (Rena, France) located in compartment #1 and controlled by a temperature
19 probe (Tersid, Milano, Italy) in compartment #2. The return activated sludge was
20 recycled from the settler #4 to the oxidation chamber #3 (Recycle ratio $R_r=2$). The
21 aerobic compartment #3 was aerated and stirred with an aquarium air pump (Schego,
22 Germany), with an air flow rate of approximately 6 L/min.

23 *2.2 Inoculation and medium*

1 Anaerobic compartments #1 and #2 were inoculated with 15.2 L of granular
2 sludge from a full-scale Up-flow Anaerobic Sludge Blanket (UASB) reactor treating
3 paper factory wastewater (Castelfranco Emilia, Italy). The aerobic compartment #3 was
4 inoculated with 6 L of activated sludge from a full-scale domestic wastewater treatment
5 plant (Trebbo di Reno, Italy).

6 The plant was fed with synthetic wastewater with the following composition (per
7 liter of tap water): 168 mg $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{SO}_4$, 60 mg $\text{MgSO}_4 \cdot 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$, 6 mg $\text{MnSO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$,
8 126 mg NaHCO_3 , 0.3 mg $\text{FeCl}_3 \cdot 6\text{H}_2\text{O}$, and 6 mg $\text{CaCl}_2 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$. Anhydrous glucose was
9 used as the organic substrate, at different concentrations as shown in Table 1. The
10 synthetic wastewater was buffered at pH 7.3 with 0.7 M K_2HPO_4 and 0.3 M KH_2PO_4 .
11 All chemicals were of reagent grade. Synthetic wastewater was stored and fed to the
12 reactor at 4°C and replaced every 3-4 days.

13 *2.3 Chemical analyses*

14 A pH electrode (Mettler Toledo, OH, USA) was placed in the anaerobic
15 compartment #2. Biogas production rate from the two anaerobic compartments was
16 monitored through a custom prepared wet tip gas flow meter. Methane content in biogas
17 was analyzed with an Ultramat 23 infrared spectrophotometer (Siemens, NY, USA).
18 Oxidation-reduction potential (ORP) was measured in both anaerobic (#2) and aerobic
19 compartments (#3) with metallic electrodes (Crison model 52-61, Alella, Spain).
20 Dissolved oxygen (DO) concentration in compartment #3 was measured with a Cell OX
21 325 oxymetric sensor (WTW OXI 340, Weilheim, Germany). Chemical Oxygen
22 Demand (COD) and ammonia nitrogen were determined in samples collected from
23 compartment #2 and #4, according to the Standard Methods (APHA, 1999).

24 *2.4 Microbial fuel cell*

1 Untreated glassy carbon anode and cathode, with geometrical surface of 160 cm²
2 each, were cleaned overnight in 1 M HCl and rinsed with deionized water prior to use,
3 then placed in compartment #2 and #3, respectively (Fig. 1). Electrodes were connected
4 via an external electric circuit on a load variable between 150 and 2000 Ohm. A
5 saturated calomel electrode (SCE, Hanna Instruments, RI, USA), was placed in
6 compartment #3 and used as reference to measure anodic and cathodic electrochemical
7 potentials.

8 Cell and half cell potentials were measured every hour with a milli-voltmeter
9 (Datataker, UK). Current was calculated from the potential through a shunt resistance of
10 100 Ohm. Temperature, pH, redox potentials, biogas production and electric measures
11 were stored in a Datataker 605 (Datataker, UK). The total applied resistance is referred
12 as the sum of external variable load and shunt resistance (100 Ohm), since the shunt
13 was in series with the load on the external circuit.

14 Sustainable power measure was performed daily with an in-house built
15 programmable variable resistance, as described by Menicucci et al., (2006). In a typical
16 experiment, total applied resistance varied between 1800 and 110 Ohm, with a rate of
17 400 Ohm/min. This procedure returned the maximum sustainable power (MSP), which
18 is the highest electrical power produced at steady state conditions. In addition to
19 maximum sustainable power, the minimum sustainable external resistance and the
20 maximum sustainable cell potential were determined.

21 *2.5 MFC Operating conditions*

22 Following inoculation, the reactor was continuously fed for 14 months. Changes
23 in operating conditions during this time period are shown in Table 1. The synthetic
24 wastewater was fed to the anaerobic compartment #1 of the MFC, with an organic load

1 (OL) variable between 0 and 16 g_{COD}/day, maintaining an anaerobic hydraulic residence
2 time of 12 days. The anode was never changed during the experiment, while a clean
3 cathode was inserted on day 238.

4 *2.6 Microbiological analyses*

5 2.6.1 Sample collection and DNA extraction

6 During step #8 suspended activated sludge (about 50 ml) was collected from the
7 aerobic chamber and sludge attached on the cathode was removed using a sterile razor
8 blade and re-suspended in a sterile phosphate buffer saline solution. Samples were
9 stored at - 80°C until use.

10 Sludge samples (5 ml) were dispersed overnight with a cation-exchange resin
11 (Chelex 100, Biorad, CA, USA) as described by Frølund et al. (1996). Lysis of the cells
12 was performed by the lysozyme + SDS technique described by Bourrain et al., (1999).
13 Total DNA from microbial cells was obtained by phenol/chloroform extraction and
14 isopropanol precipitation methods as previously described (Zhou et al., 1996).
15 Purification of crude DNA extracts was performed by the Wizard DNA clean-up system
16 (Promega, WI, USA). DNA concentration was determined spectrophotometrically with
17 NanoDrop instrument ND-1000 (NanoDrop Technologies Inc., Wilmington, DE, USA).

18 2.6.2 DGGE analysis of the V3 region of the 16S rRNA gene

19 Two µl (10 to 30ng of DNA) of each sample were subjected to PCR
20 amplification of the 16S rRNA gene using Bacteria-specific primers 27F (5'-
21 GAGAGTTTGATCCTGGCTCAG-3') and 1495R (5'-CTACGGCTACCTTGTTACG
22 A-3') as described by Di Cello et al., (1997) to produce a 1.450-bp fragment, which was
23 then used as a template for nested PCR with two different sets of primers. The first set,
24 composed of primers 357F-GC-clamp (5'-

1 CGCCCGCCGCGCCCCGCGCCCGGCCCGCCGCCCCCGCCCCCTACGGGAGG
2 CAGCAG-3') and 518R (5'-ATTACCGCGGCTGCTGG-3'), amplified a fragment of
3 161 bp (small fragment). The second set, consisted of primer 63F-GC-clamp (5'-
4 CGCCCGCCGCGCGCGGGCGGGGCGGGGGCACGGGGGGCAGGCCTAAC
5 ACATGCAAGTC-3') and the reverse primer 518R described above, was used to
6 produce a 495 bp fragment (large fragment). Nested PCRs to obtain the small and the
7 large fragments were carried out according to the procedures described by Van der
8 Gucht et al., (2005) and by El Fantroussi et al., (1999), respectively, with Taq DNA
9 polymerase (Quiagen, Milano, Italy). Fragments were resolved by double gradient
10 denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis (DG-DGGE) as described by Cremonesi et al.,
11 (1997), in a DCode universal mutation detection system (Bio-Rad, CA, USA). A 6 %-
12 12 % polyacrylamide (acrylamide: N,N-methylenebisacrylamide, 37.5:1) gel with
13 denaturing gradient ranging from 30 % to 60 % was used to resolve small fragments,
14 whereas a 6 %-12 % polyacrylamide (acrylamide: N,N-methylenebisacrylamide, 37.5:1)
15 gel with denaturing gradient ranging from 40 % to 70 % was used to resolve large
16 fragments. A 100 % denaturing solution contained 7 M urea and 40 % deionized
17 formamide. Approximately 700 ng of purified PCR products were loaded in each well.
18 The gels were run for 16 h at 75 mV in 1X TAE buffer at 60°C, stained with 50 µg/ml
19 ethidium bromide for 30 min, destained in water and photographed with the UVIpro
20 Platinum Gel Documentation System (GAS7500/7510).

21 2.6.3 Sequencing of DGGE fragments and phylogenetic analysis

22 DGGE-separated fragments were excised with a razor blade and allowed to passively
23 diffuse into the water at 4°C overnight. The eluted DNA was reamplified with the same
24 primers and PCR conditions described for DGGE analysis. The PCR products were

1 tested by DGGE for purity and identity with the original bands in the community
2 profiles and then sequenced. Sequencing reactions were prepared using Applied
3 Biosystem Big Dye® Terminator sequencing kit version 3.1, according to the
4 manufacturer's instructions and analyzed using a 3730 DNA Analyzer Applied
5 Biosystem apparatus. Each sequence was submitted to the CHECK_CHIMERA
6 program of the Ribosomal Database Project (RDP)
7 (<http://rdp.cme.msu.edu/cgis/chimera.cgi?su=SSU>) to detect the presence of possible
8 chimeric artifacts. Sequence similarity searches were performed using the BLAST
9 network service of the NCBI database and Seqmatch tool of the RDP
10 (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/BLAST/> and <http://rdp.cme.msu.edu/>, respectively). For
11 phylogenetic analysis, identification of 16S rRNA gene sequences was performed with
12 RDP Classification Algorithm (<http://rdp.cme.msu.edu/classifier/classifier.jsp>).

13 Partial 16S rRNA gene sequences obtained in this study have been deposited in
14 the NCBI nucleotide database under accession numbers EU492873-76 (small fragment
15 bands A-D) and EU597325-31 (large fragment bands F-N).

16 **3. Results**

17 *3.1 COD and ammonia removal*

18 The influent and effluent organic load during phase I to III (see Table 1) are
19 shown in Fig. 2, while Table 2 shows the COD removal in anaerobic and aerobic stages
20 of the process, as well as methane production in anaerobic stage. During phase I, the
21 influent glucose concentration was increased from 1.5 to 5 g/L (steps #1 to #4),
22 corresponding to a measured feeding OL of 3.4 to 16.0 g_{COD}/day. The average COD
23 removal in the anaerobic compartment varied between 66 and 91 % (Table 2). The

1 lowest value of COD removal was observed during the initial adaptation of anaerobic
2 biomass.

3 During phase II (step #5, see Table 2), glucose was removed from the influent
4 and the reactor was operated in absence of carbon and energy source. During this phase,
5 the COD values in the outlet were lower than 70 mg_{COD}/L.

6 During phase III (step #6 and #7), glucose was added again to the influent, at a
7 concentration of 3 g/L, corresponding to a measured OL of approximately 9.1 g_{COD}/day.
8 COD removal in anaerobic compartment rapidly stabilized at 94 % (Table 2). The
9 anaerobic COD removal measured in step #3, step #6 and #7 increased, although the
10 feeding OL was the same. This was due to the anaerobic biomass growth, consequent to
11 the absence of sludge withdrawal during the experimental period.

12 Daily methane production (Table 2) increased with OL and the organic substrate
13 removed in the ABR chamber (#1 and #2) was almost completely converted into
14 methane. The average pH value in the second ABR chamber was 6.9.

15 Dissolved oxygen in the aerobic compartment was 6.5±0.3 mgO₂/L through all
16 the experiment, while ammonia nitrogen in the effluent was always below than
17 1 mg NH₄-N/L, corresponding to 98 % nitrogen removal.

18 *3.2 Electrical power production*

19 Immediately after inoculation, the cell was closed on a total applied resistance of
20 250 Ohm for a period of 270 days. The cell potential grew from 50±3 mV at the end of
21 the starting phase (step #1), to 411±10 mV at the end of step #3 (Table 3),
22 corresponding to an OL of 9.6 g_{COD}/day (and a substrate concentration in the second
23 anaerobic chamber of 420 g_{COD}/m³, Table 2). Further OL increase from 9.6 to
24 16 g_{COD}/day (815 g_{COD}/m³ in the second anaerobic chamber, Table 2 step #4) did not

1 change the cell potential. Current and power output showed a similar pattern, reaching a
2 plateau of $163 \pm 5 \text{ mA/m}^2$ and $65.1 \pm 3.5 \text{ mW/m}^2$ of geometric electrode surface at
3 substrate concentration higher than $420 \text{ g}_{\text{COD}}/\text{m}^3$, indicating that organic substrate
4 concentration was not limiting power output.

5 When glucose was removed from medium for two weeks (step #5), power
6 production dropped rapidly reaching $1.2 \pm 0.3 \text{ mW/m}^2$, indicating that electricity was
7 produced mainly by the catalytic oxidation of organic substrate. During step #6, the
8 reactor was operated with an OL of $9.5 \text{ g}_{\text{COD}}/\text{day}$ and the electrical power production
9 reached in 14 days a plateau value of $72.7 \pm 1.6 \text{ mW/m}^2$. Specific current, cell potential
10 specific power, anodic and cathodic potential throughout the experiment are shown in
11 Fig. 3 a, Fig. 3 b, Fig. 3 c and Table 3.

12 *3.3 Anodic and cathodic potential*

13 At OL higher than $6.4 \text{ g}_{\text{COD}}/\text{day}$ (step #2), anode and cathode potential reached a
14 plateau of -176 ± 5 and $+234 \pm 5 \text{ mV vs. SCE}$, respectively (Fig. 3 c and Table 3). In the
15 absence of organic substrate (step #5), anodic potential increased to $+237 \pm 28 \text{ mV vs.}$
16 SCE , while cathode potential was less affected, indicating that the cathode was not the
17 current-limiting electrode in the cell (i.e. the one of the two electrodes that exhibits the
18 slower charge-transfer kinetics). Both specific power output and anode potential were
19 restored at nearly 100 % of their maximum values upon reintroduction of substrate in
20 the medium (step #6, Fig. 3 b and Fig. 3 c), suggesting that the anodic attached biomass
21 maintained its substrate oxidation capability.

22 *3.4 Role of cathodic biomass*

23 Cathodic potential dropped rapidly to $-214 \pm 1.4 \text{ mV vs. SCE}$ when a clean
24 glassy carbon cathode was inserted in the aerobic compartment (step #7). However,

1 residual electrical power was $10.5 \pm 0.1 \text{ mW/m}^2$, suggesting that suspended biomass and
2 soluble redox mediators had a role in the cathodic process (Fig. 3 c and Fig. 3 b).
3 Although thermodynamically feasible, direct oxygen reduction at the glassy carbon
4 electrode is not possible at the measured potential, as it was also shown during the
5 acclimation of cathodic biomass (step #1) The clean cathode was quickly colonized by
6 aerobic biomass, and after 5 days cell potential and power production resumed to 100
7 $\pm 10\%$ and $100 \pm 3.3\%$ of their values measured at the end of step #4, respectively
8 (Table 3 and Fig. 3 b).
9 To investigate the composition of the microbial community suspended in the aerobic
10 chamber and attached on the cathode, a partial domains profile of eubacterial 16S rRNA
11 gene was performed by DGGE. This was done after PCR amplification of the 16S
12 rDNA genes from total DNA of the two samples with the two sets of primers described
13 in Materials and Methods. Fig. 4 a and Fig. 4 b shows the DGGE patterns of the small
14 and large 16S rDNA fragments. There are fewer bands in the DGGE profiles of the
15 small fragment than in the DGGE patterns of the large fragment. However, suspended
16 aerobic biomass and the cathode attached biomass showed high fingerprint similarity as
17 most of the bands obtained were present in both samples (Fig. 4 a and Fig. 4 b).
18 Separated DGGE bands were excised from the gels, purified to determine the sequence,
19 and assigned to a specific group on the basis of a combination of Blast searches and
20 phylogenetic analysis. Table 4 shows the percentage of similarity between sequences of
21 excised bands and the closest relatives (NCBI Database). The nucleotide sequences of
22 the small fragment bands were referred to uncultured bacteria or DGGE clones of the
23 *Firmicutes*, *β -Proteobacteria*, and *Bacteroidetes* groups (Table 5), whereas most of the
24 sequences of the large fragment bands were affiliated with *α -Proteobacteria* and *γ -*

1 *Proteobacteria* groups. A band (E) was identified as a putative chimeric artefact based
2 on result from CHECK_CHIMERA analyses. Moreover, two large fragment bands (G
3 and H) were distantly affiliated with unclassified bacterial sequences retrieved from a
4 river sediment sample (EF667579), from a commercial nitrifying inoculum
5 (AJ786605.1) and from a biocathode chamber in a microbial fuel cell (EU 426928.1),
6 (Table 4).

7 *3.5 Sustainable resistance measure*

8 Sustainable resistance was measured at four different values of total applied
9 resistance, 250, 430, 1100, and 2100 Ohm, for at least 30 days. When the total applied
10 resistance was changed, the average value of sustainable resistance changed as shown in
11 Fig. 5 a. Specifically, at low total applied resistance (250 Ohm), the sustainable
12 resistance decrease rapidly with time, while at high total applied resistance (2100 Ohm),
13 the sustainable resistance value did not change appreciably with time (data not shown).
14 Sustainable power slightly increased when total resistance decreased (Fig. 5 a).

15 *3.6 Factor limiting power production*

16 *3.6.1 Current-limiting electrode*

17 The sustainable resistance was determined through an external resistance scan.
18 Anode and cathode potentials were measured at each external resistance value. The
19 electrode whose potential changes more during the scan is the current-limiting electrode
20 (Menicucci et al., 2006; Fuel cells handbook, 2004). Fig. 5 b and Fig. 5 c show a typical
21 external resistance scan between 110 and 1800 Ohm. The cathodic potential was nearly
22 constant at each external resistance value, showing that the current production was
23 limited by the anode.

24 *3.6.2 Limiting step in electron transfer*

1 Current did not show a maximum during the resistance scan, while power
2 reached a maximum at low value of external resistance (Fig. 5 c). A recent model
3 proved that these trends are typical of a MFC in which diffusion processes limits power
4 output (Shimotori et al., 2007). Because of these limitations, the sustainable power is
5 less than half the maximum power (Fig. 5 a). Diffusion limitations to electron transfer
6 are predominant in the range of total applied resistance explored in this study, which is
7 between 250 and 2100 Ohms.

8 **4. Discussion**

9 *4.1 Power production*

10 The cell was initially operated with a total applied resistance of 250 Ohm. After
11 58 days of biomass growth and with non-limiting OL, cathode and anode potential
12 reached a stable plateau of 234 ± 5 mV and -176 ± 5 mV vs. SCE, respectively (Fig. 3 c).

13 Both anodic and cathodic biomass established slowly and a plateau in current
14 and power production was reached only after 70 days (i.e. after about 3.3 times the total
15 Hydraulic Retention Time, HRT). Anodic attached biomass maintained its catalytic
16 activity over two weeks of feeding without glucose (step #5). When a new cathode was
17 inserted in the cell (step #7) suspended biomass adhered to the electrode in 5 days fully
18 restoring the catalytic reducing activity and the half cell potentials.

19 The potential of the biocathode, about 230 mV vs. SCE (474 mV vs. SHE), was
20 closed to that (~ 463 mV vs. SHE) observed for oxygen abiotic reduction at
21 conventional Pt-coated electrodes in cathode chamber (Oh et al., 2004). Therefore,
22 biocathode proved to be an efficient catalyst for oxygen reduction, and a feasible
23 alternative to abiotic systems in wastewater-fed MFCs.

1 Concerns arose in the past over non-catalytic power production in wastewater
2 fed MFC. Several media used for bacterial growth contained significant amount of
3 redox mediators, such as cysteine, and high strength wastewater contained reduced
4 sulfur species, which can work as abiotic electron donor and increase power production
5 in short term experiments. In this study, minimal salt media was used, therefore electron
6 donors other than glucose or redox mediators could be only by products of glucose
7 anaerobic degradation or microbially produced electron shuttles (Rabaey et al., 2004,
8 pyocyanine). In fact, when glucose was removed from the artificial wastewater fed to
9 the MFC (step#5), the power dropped, indicating a discharge to the anode of the
10 electrons stored in the attached biomass (e.g., in the protein membranes) and the
11 reoxidation of most of the reduced species in solution.

12 The MFC was initially run under demanding conditions for current production
13 (low external resistance). During this phase, glucose concentration in the wastewater
14 and OL were increased until non-limiting conditions were achieved. Since further
15 experiments were run using higher external resistance, it is assumed that non-limiting
16 conditions with respect to glucose concentration were maintained. With a non limiting
17 organic substrate concentration of $434 \pm 77 \text{ g}_{\text{COD}}/\text{m}^3$ in the second ABR chamber, the
18 specific current increased in an exponential fashion and then stabilized at
19 $159 \pm 1 \text{ mA}/\text{m}^2$, while power reached a plateau at $60.6 \pm 1 \text{ mW}/\text{m}^2$ (Fig. 3 a and Fig.
20 3 b).

21 Organic substrate removed in the ABR was converted almost completely into
22 methane, as shown in Table 2. This results was expected due to the low ratio of
23 electrode surface to the volume of anodic compartment
24 ($S_{\text{electrode}}/V_{\text{anode compartment}} = 0.4 \text{ m}^2/\text{m}^3$). In other studies, different electrode material

1 configurations were adopted in order to maximize power output such as, granular
2 graphite (Rabaey et al., 2005b), or high specific surface electrodes (Logan et al., 2006;
3 Gil et al., 2003; Chaudhury and Lovley, 2003). In such systems (Rabaey et al., 2005c),
4 an average COD to current efficiency of 59 ± 4 % was obtained and no methane
5 production was observed.

6 *4.2 Electron transfer mechanism*

7 When attached cathodic biomass was removed (step #7), power production
8 dropped to 13 % of the maximum power formerly measured. As discussed above, this
9 observation suggested that microbially produced redox mediators facilitated electron
10 transfer from the suspended and attached biomass to the anode. Microbially produced
11 redox mediators were identified in at least two cases (Rabaey et al., 2004; Marsili et al.,
12 2008). It is not clear from our results whether the increase in cathodic potential and
13 power production following electrode colonization is due to the concentration of such
14 microbial redox mediators in the attached biomass, or if direct electron transfer modes
15 are possible, as shown for dissimilatory metal-reducing bacteria (Reguera et al., 2005;
16 Gorby et al., 2006). However, the residual power measured seems to indicate the co-
17 presence of mediated and direct electron transfer mechanisms.

18 *4.3 Factors limiting power production*

19 The current-limiting electrode was determined through the sustainable power
20 measures. In a typical external resistance scan, between 1800 and 110 Ohm, cathodic
21 potential decrease by 20 % while the anodic potential increase by 70 % (Fig. 5 b). Once
22 the cathodic biomass had developed, the anode was the current-limiting electrode.
23 Sustainable power determination also provided insight over the processes which limit
24 long-term power. When an MFC is limited by diffusion, the current measured during a

1 sustainable resistance scan always increases as external resistance decreases, although
2 with a rate lower than that calculated from Ohm's law, since the cell potential is not
3 constant (Menicucci et al., 2006). However, in MFCs with membrane electrode
4 assembly (MEA) (Liang et al., 2007), power production is less affected by diffusion,
5 and is rather limited by the amount of the immobilized biomass and its catalytic activity
6 (Marsili et al., 2008; Shimotori et al., 2007). Sustainable power increases as long-term
7 external resistance decreases, and sustainable resistance decreases as long-term external
8 resistance decreases. Since decreased external resistance corresponds to higher electron
9 flow at the attached biomass/electrode interfaces, it is likely that such conditions favor
10 species with faster electron transfer rate. At higher external resistance, electroactive
11 bacteria are no longer favored and biomass nor efficient in substrate utilization is likely
12 selected.

13 DGGE of cathodic biomass using two different set of primers provided an
14 analytical tool to study the diversity of the microbial community suspended and
15 attached on the cathode. Use of the primers set P357F-GC clamp and 518R revealed a
16 high fingerprint similarity between the two samples. However, it is often not easy to
17 assign short partial sequences accurately, especially if the sequences lack close relatives
18 in the database (Kuske et al., 1997). Because of this reason and to overcome PCR bias
19 that often has been reported in DGGE experiments, (Hansen et al., 1998), we used the
20 second set of primer (p63F-GC clamp-518R). The DGGE profiles obtained by this
21 different set, that generated a larger 495-bp fragment, again revealed that the genomic
22 fingerprintings of the two samples are very similar. Moreover, the use of both primer
23 sets allowed a more accurate discrimination of different taxonomic groups inside the
24 samples. In related studies that examined the microbial community present at the

1 biocathode, a similar breadth of phylogenetic diversity was detected (α , β , γ
2 *Proteobacteria*, *Bacteroidetes*) (Clauwert et al., 2007; Chen et al., 2008; Rabaey et al.,
3 2008), whereas members of the *Firmicutes* group were detected for the first time. The
4 presence of this bacterial taxon in the cathodic compartment could be related to the fact
5 that the system was fed with glucose.

6 **Conclusions**

7 Further studies are needed to better understand the effect of external resistance
8 on microbial composition. It is possible that increased power production corresponds to
9 increased organization in electron transfer network in attached biomass. Also shift in
10 electron transfer strategies (e.g., from mediated to direct electron transfer) may play a
11 role in the change of sustainable resistance and sustainable power with time.

12 Based on the results from this study, we can conclude that with simple
13 modifications, a common wastewater treatment plant can produce electrical power,
14 without changes in COD removal and ammonia nitrification. The power produced was
15 limited by diffusion phenomena, rather than from catalytic activity of electrode
16 biomass. Sustainable power measures indicated that at lower external resistance
17 electroactive bacteria are favored.

18 Biocathode is proved to be an efficient catalyst for oxygen reduction, and a
19 feasible alternative to expensive Pt-based catalysts in wastewater-fed MFCs. A
20 taxonomic characterization performed on both suspended and attached cathodic
21 biomass showed that the sequenced DGGE bands were affiliated with *Firmicutes*, α -
22 *Proteobacteria*, β -*Proteobacteria*, γ -*Proteobacteria*, and *Bacteroidetes* groups.

1 **References**

- 2 Allen, R.M., Bennetto, H.P. (1993). Microbial fuel-cells: electricity production from
3 carbohydrates. *Appl. Biochem. Biotech.*, 39, 27–40.
- 4 APHA (1999). *Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater*, 19th
5 ed. Amer. Public Health Assoc., Washington, D.C. (1995).
- 6 Bergel, A., Fèron, D., Mollica, A (2005). Catalysis of oxygen reduction in PEM fuel cell
7 by seawater biofilm. *Elettrochemistry. Communications* 7, 900-904.
- 8 Bond, D. R., Lovley, D. R. (2003). Electricity Production by *Geobacter Sulfurreducens*
9 Attached to Electrodes. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, 69 (3), 1548-1555.
- 10 Bourrain, M., Achouak, W., Urbain, V., Heulin, T. (1999). DNA Extraction from
11 Activated Sludges. *Current Microbiol.* 38 (6), 315-319.
- 12 Chaudhuri, S. K., Lovley, D. R. (2003). Electricity Generation by Direct Oxidation of
13 Glucose in Mediatorless Microbial Fuel Cells. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, 21 (10), 1229-1232.
- 14 Chen, G.W., Choi, S.J., Lee, T.H., Lee, G.Y., Cha, J.H., Kim, C.W. (2008). Application
15 of biocathode in microbial fuel cells: cell performance and microbial community.
16 *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 79, 379-388.
- 17 Clauwaert, P., Van Der Ha, D., Boon, N., Verbeken, K., Verhaege, M., Rabaey, K.,
18 Verstraete, W. (2007). Open air biocathode enables effective electricity generation
19 with microbial fuel cells. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 41, 7564-7569.
- 20 Cremonesi, L., Firpo, S., Ferrari, M., Righetti, PG., Gelfi, C. (1997). Double-gradient
21 DGGE for optimized detection of DNA point mutations. *BioTechniques*, 22 (2), 326-
22 330.
- 23 Di Cello, F., Bevivino, A., Chiarini, L., Fani, R., Paffetti, D., Tabacchioni, S.,
24 Dalmastrì, C. (1997). Biodiversity of a *Burkholderia Cepacia* population isolated

1 from the maize rhizosphere at different plant growth stages. Appl. Environ.
2 Microbiol. 63 (11), 4485-4493.

3 El Fantroussi, S., Verschuere, L., Verstraete, W., Top, E. M. (1999). Effect of
4 Phenylurea Herbicides on soil microbial communities estimated by analysis of 16S
5 rRNA gene fingerprints and community-level physiological profiles. Appl. Environ.
6 Microbiol. 65 (3), 982-988.

7 Frølund B., Palmgren R., Keiding K., Nielsen PH. (1996). Extraction of extracellular
8 polymers from activated sludge using a cation exchange resin. Water Res. 30 (8),
9 1749–1758.

10 Fuel Cell Handbook (Seventh Edition) by EG&G Technical Services, Inc. for the
11 National Energy Technology Lab (NETL). 2004.

12 Ghangrekar, M.M., Shinde, V.B. (2007). Performance of membrane-less microbial fuel
13 cell treating wastewater and effect of electrode distance and area on electricity
14 production. Bioresour. Technol., 98 (15), 2879-2885.

15 Gil, G.C., Chang, I.S., Kim, B.H., Kim, M., Jang, J.K., Park, H.S., Kim, H.J. (2003).
16 Operational parameters affecting the performance of a mediator-less microbial fuel
17 cell. Biosens. Bioelectron. 18 (4), 327–334.

18 Gorby, Y. A., Yanina, S., Mclean, J. S., Rosso, K. M., Moyles, D., Dohnalkova, A.,
19 Beveridge, T. J., Chang, I. S., Kim, B. H., Kim, K. S., Culley, D. E., Reed, S. B.,
20 Romine, M. F., Saffarini, D. A., Hill, E. A., Shi, L., Elias, D. A., Kennedy, D. W.,
21 Pinchuk, G., Watanabe, K., Ishii, S., Logan, B., Nealson, K. H., Fredrickson, J. K.
22 (2006). Electrically Conductive Bacterial Nanowires Produced by *Shewanella*
23 *Oneidensis* Strain Mr-1 and Other Microorganisms. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.
24 103 (30), 11358-11363.

1 Jang, J. K., Pham, T. H., Chang, I. S., Kang, K. H., Moon, H., Cho, K. S., Kim, B. H.
2 (2004). Construction and Operation of a Novel Mediator-and Membrane-Less
3 Microbial Fuel Cell. *Process Biochem.* 39 (8), 1007-1012.

4 Hansen, M. C., Nielsen T. T., Givskov, M., Molin, S. (1998). Biased 16S rDNA PCR
5 amplification caused by interference from DNA flanking the template region. *FEMS*
6 *Microbiol. Ecol.* 26 (2), 141-149.

7 He, Z., Angenent, L. T. (2006). Application of Bacterial Biocathodes in Microbial Fuel
8 Cells. *Electroanal.* 18 (19-20), 2009-2015.

9 Kang, K. H., Jang, J. K., Pham, T. H., Moon, H., Chang, I. S., Kim, B. H. (2003). A
10 Microbial Fuel Cell With Improved Cathode Reaction as a Low Biochemical Oxygen
11 Demand Sensor. *Biotechnol. Lett.* 25 (16), 1357-1361.

12 Kim, B.H., Park, H.S., Kim, H.J., Kim, G.T., Chang, I.S., Lee, J., Phung, N.T. (2004).
13 Enrichment of Microbial Community Generating Electricity Using a Fuel-Cell-Type
14 Electrochemical Cell. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 63 (6), 672-681.

15 Kuske, C. R., Barns, S. M., Busch, J. D. (1997). Diverse uncultivated bacterial groups
16 from soils of the arid southwestern United States that are present in many geographic
17 regions. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 63 (9), 3614-3621.

18 Liang, P., Huang, X., Fan, M. Z., Cao, X. X., Wang, C. (2007). Composition and
19 Distribution of Internal Resistance in Three Types of Microbial Fuel Cells. *Appl.*
20 *Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 77 (3), 551-558.

21 Liu, H., Ramnarayanan, R., Logan, B. E. (2004). Production of Electricity During
22 Wastewater Treatment Using a Single Chamber Microbial Fuel Cell. *Environ. Sci.*
23 *Technol.*, 38 (7), 2281-2285.

1 Liu, Z.D., Du, Z.W., Lian, J., Zhu, X.Y., Li, S.H., Li, H.R. (2007). Improving energy
2 accumulation of microbial fuel cells by metabolism regulation using *Rhodospirillum rubrum*
3 *ferrireducens* as biocatalyst. Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol., 44 (4), 393–398.

4 Logan, B.E., Hamelers, B., Rozendal, R., Schroder, U., Keller, J., Freguia, S.,
5 Aelterman, P., Verstraete, W., Rabaey, K. (2006). Microbial Fuel Cells:
6 Methodology and Technology. Environ. Sci. Technol. 40 (17), 5181-5192.

7 Logan, B.E., Regan, J.M. (2006). Electricity-producing Bacterial Communities in
8 Microbial Fuel Cells. Trends in Biotechnol. 14 (12), 512-518.

9 Malina, F.J., Pohland, F.G. (1992). Design of Anaerobic Process for the Treatment of
10 Industrial and Municipal Wastes. Water Quality Management Library, Vol. 7, 169.

11 Marsili, E., Baron, D.B., Shikhare, I.D., Coursolle, D., Gralnick, J.A., Bond, D.R.
12 (2008). *Shewanella* Secretes Flavins That Mediate Extracellular Electron Transfer.
13 Proceeding National Academy of Sciences. 105 (10), 3968–3973.

14 Menicucci, J., Beyenal, H., Marsili, E., Veluchamy, R.A., Demir, G., Lewandowski, Z.
15 (2006). Procedure for Determining Maximum Sustainable Power Generated by
16 Microbial Fuel Cells. Environ. Sci. Technol. 40 (3), 1062-1068.

17 Min, B., Logan, B. E. (2004). Continuous Electricity Generation From Domestic
18 Wastewater and Organic Substrates in a Flat Plate Microbial Fuel Cell. Environ. Sci.
19 Technol., 38 (21), 5809-5814.

20 Moon, H., Chang, I. S., Kim, B. H. (2006). Continuous Electricity Production From
21 Artificial Wastewater Using a Mediator-Less Microbial Fuel Cell. Bioresour.
22 Technol., 97 (4), 621-627.

23 Oh S., Min B., Logan B. (2004). Cathode performance as a factor in electricity
24 generation in microbial fuel cell. Environ. Sci. Technol., 38 (18), 4900-4904.

1 Park, D. H. Zeikus, J. G. (2003). Improved Fuel Cell and Electrode Designs for
2 Producing Electricity From Microbial Degradation. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 81 (3), 348-
3 355.

4 Rabaey, K., Boon, N., Siciliano, S.D., Verhaege, M., Verstraete, W. (2004). Biofuel
5 Cells Select for Microbial Consortia that Self-Mediate Electron Transfer. *Appl.*
6 *Environ. Microbiol.*, 70 (9), 5373–5382.

7 Rabaey, K., Verstraete, W. (2005). Microbial Fuel Cells: Novel Biotechnology for
8 Energy Generation. *Trends Biotechnol.* 23 (6), 291-298.

9 Rabaey, K., Ossieur, W., Verhaege, M., Verstraete, W. (2005a). Continuous Microbial
10 Fuel Cells Convert Carbohydrates to Electricity. *Water Sci. Technol.* 52 (1-2), 515-
11 523.

12 Rabaey, K., Boon, N., Hofte, M., Verstraete, W. (2005b). Microbial Phenazine
13 Production Enhances Electron Transfer in Biofuel Cells. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 39
14 (9), 3401-3408.

15 Rabaey, K., Clauwaert, P., Aelterman, P., Verstraete, W. (2005c). Tubular Microbial
16 Fuel Cells for Efficient Electricity Generation. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 39 (20), 8077-
17 8082.

18 Rabaey, K., Read, S. T , Clauwaert, P., Freguia, S., Bond, P. L., Blackall, L. L., Keller,
19 J. (2008). Cathodic oxygen reduction catalyzed by bacteria in microbial fuel cells.
20 *ISME J.* 2, 519-527.

21 Reguera, G., Mccarthy, K. D., Mehta, T., Nicoll, J. S., Tuominen, M. T., Lovley, D. R.
22 (2005). Extracellular Electron Transfer Via Microbial Nanowires. *Nature*, 435
23 (7045), 1098-1101.

- 1 Roller, S. D., Bennetto, H. P., Delaney, G. M., Mason, J. R., Stirling, J. L., Thurston,
2 C.F. (1984). Electron-Transfer Coupling in Microbial Fuel-Cells .1. Comparison of
3 Redox-Mediator Reduction Rates and Respiratory Rates of Bacteria. *J. Chem.*
4 *Technol. Biotechnol. B-Biotechnology*, 34 (1), 3-12.
- 5 Shimotori, T., Bond, D.R., Lapara, T.M., Hozalski, R.M. (2007). Model of microbial
6 fuel cells in which bacteria employ a direct electron transfer strategy. 234th ACS
7 Natl. Meet. Book Abstr., 19 August 2007 - 23 August 2007.
- 8 Tchobanoglous, G., Burton, F.L., Stensel, H.D. (2003). *Wastewater Engineering:*
9 *Treatment and Reuse*. 4th ed. Metcalf & Eddy Inc., New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- 10 Van der Gucht, K., Vandekerckhove, T., Vloemans, N., Cousin, S., Muylaert, K.,
11 Sabbe, K., Gillis, M., Declerk, S., De Meester, L., Vyverman W. (2005).
12 Characterization of bacterial communities in four freshwater lakes differing in
13 nutrient load and food web structure. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.* 53 (2), 205-220.
- 14 You, S. J., Zhao, Q. L., Jiang, J. Q., Zhang, J. N. (2006). Treatment of Domestic
15 Wastewater With Simultaneous Electricity Generation in Microbial Fuel Cell Under
16 Continuous Operation. *Chem. Biochem. Eng. Q.* 20 (4), 407-412.
- 17 Zhou, J., Bruns, M.A., Tiedgje, J.M. (1996). DNA recovery from soils of diverse
18 composition. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 62 (2), 316-322.

19

20 **Acknowledgment**

21 The Authors would like to thank Prof. Natuschka M. Lee at the Technical University of
22 Munich, Germany, for her discussion on microbial characterization.