Optimal influent N-to-P ratio for stable microalgal cultivation in water treatment and nutrient recovery
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Abstract

Species specific nitrogen-to-phosphorus molar ratio (NPR) has been suggested for green microalgae. Algae can store nitrogen and phosphorus, suggesting that the optimum feed concentration dynamically changes as function of the nutrient storage. We assessed the effect of varying influent NPR on microalgal cultivation in terms of microbial community stability, effluent quality and biokinetics. Mixed green microalgae (Chlorella sorokiniana and Scenedesmus sp.) and a monoculture of Chlorella sp. were cultivated in continuous laboratory-scale reactors treating used water. An innovative image analysis tool, developed in this study, was used to track microbial community changes. Diatoms proliferated as influent NPR decreased, and were outcompeted once cultivation conditions were restored to the optimal NPR range. Low NPR operation resulted in decrease in phosphorus removal, biomass concentration and effluent nitrogen concentration. ASM-A kinetic model simulation results agreed well with operational data in the absence of diatoms. The failure to predict operational data in the presence of diatoms suggest differences in microbial activity that can significantly influence nutrient recovery in photobioreactors (PBR). No contamination occurred
during *Chlorella sp.* monoculture cultivation with varying NPRs. Low NPR operation resulted in
decrease in biomass concentration, effluent nitrogen concentration and nitrogen quota. The ASM-A
model was calibrated for the monoculture and the simulations could predict the experimental data in
continuous operation using a single parameter subset, suggesting stable biokinetics under the different
NPR conditions. Results show that controlling the influent NPR is effective to maintain the algal
community composition in PBR, thereby ensuring effective nutrients conversion.
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### 1. Introduction

Microalgal cultivation on used water resources has high potential for resource recovery. Cultivation
is mostly done in open systems, where the potential of contamination is high. Used water is a potential
source of energy, nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus) and fresh water. However, conventional used
water treatment focuses on the destruction of organic and inorganic constituents (Batstone et al.,
2015) through energy-intensive processes. Current research aims to develop new technologies to
reduce energy requirements (Gao et al., 2014) and facilitate resource recovery (Verstraete and
Vlaeminck, 2011). Microalgae cultivation has been proposed as a means to recover resources from
used water (Cai et al., 2013; Gardner-Dale et al., 2017; Matassa et al., 2015; Mehta et al., 2015).
Combining microalgal cultivation with used water resource recovery can result in production of
biomass suitable for biofuel production (Geiss et al., 2015; Mata et al., 2010; Wágner et al., 2016a).
Moreover, microalgal biomass can be used as natural slow-leaching fertiliser, thereby recycling
nutrients present in the used water (Coppens et al., 2016; Solovchenko et al., 2016), or as an
alternative source of protein (Matassa et al., 2015; Rasouli et al., 2018).
Many reactor configurations and cultivation methods have been proposed to grow microalgae on used water resources. Most of these systems consider open cultivation e.g., (Alcántara et al., 2015; Béchet et al., 2016; Sforza et al., 2014; Sutherland et al., 2014; Van Den Hende et al., 2014). Variation in the nutrient composition of influent water is reported to affect nutrient removal and thus effluent quality (Arbib et al., 2013). Therefore, using different wastewater streams for microalgae cultivation might compromise nutrient removal (Wang et al., 2010). Furthermore, nutrient loads and balances affect algal composition (De Francisci et al., 2018). When nitrogen or phosphorus are limiting, algae store inorganic carbon as starch and lipids, thus promoting algal biomass into an appealing feedstock for biofuel production (Ikaran et al., 2015; Mayers et al., 2014). Under nutrient limiting conditions, algae also shift pigmentation, usually producing more carotenoids, such as lutein, which are valuable antioxidants for food and feed industries (Safafar et al., 2015; Wágner et al., 2018). On the contrary, if nutrients are fed in excess, algae can store large quantities of phosphorus, e.g., as polyphosphates (Powell et al., 2011), and nitrogen, e.g., as protein (Gardner-Dale et al., 2017). Therefore, for the particular goal of water resource recovery, the effect of dynamic nitrogen-to-phosphorus molar ratio (NPR) on algal cultivation needs to be better understood.

A two-stage bacterial-algal cultivation for nutrient removal from used water was proposed by Valverde-Pérez et al. (2015), whereby an enhanced biological phosphorus recovery and removal (EBP2R) process provides optimal cultivation media for green microalgal growth. The combined EBP2R and algal photobioreactor (PBR) is referred to as TRENS system (Fang et al., 2016). The system produces an algal suspension where nutrients are stored in the algal biomass rather than present in the bulk liquid, which can be used for fertigation. The TRENS system offers the flexibility of cultivating different microalgal species under optimal conditions from a given used water source. In order to keep a stable NPR for algal cultivation, Valverde-Pérez et al. (2016a) proposed a control design structure for EBP2R systems. The study found that, under highly dynamic conditions, the
effluent NPR presented some variability around the optimal ratio. Therefore, understanding the
nutrients requirements and the optimal NPR of microalgal cultivation in dynamic used water systems
is essential.

As used water contains diverse microorganisms, such as algae and protozoa (Henze et al., 2008),
there is high risk of contamination, especially in open reactors, which may compromise algal
cultivation (Montemezzani et al., 2015). Thus, robust microalgal species or mixed microalgal
consortia are preferred for long term reactor operation (Novoveská et al., 2016). Lynch et al. (2015)
suggest the use of native species, which would outperform other microorganisms. Moreover, species
that can be cultivated in selective environments, such as high salinity or alkalinity, would reduce the
risk of contamination in such systems. Furthermore, promoting microalgal growth by optimized
cultivation (e.g. sufficient light availability, mixing, NPR and inorganic carbon source) can help
maintain the species composition (Borowitzka and Moheimani, 2013).

The optimal NPR of algae has been an interest since the 1950s, when Redfield (1958) found that the
optimal NPR in marine phytoplankton was 16 mol-N/mol-P. Since then, many researchers have
suggested that the optimal NPR in microalgae is species specific (Anbalagan et al., 2016; Beuckels
et al., 2015; Rhee and Gotham, 1980; Whitton et al., 2016) and may vary depending on cultivation
conditions, indicating microalgae adaptability to the culture conditions (Arbib et al., 2013; Beuckels
et al., 2015; Boelee et al., 2011; Dickinson et al., 2013; Gardner-Dale et al., 2017; Geider and La
Roche, 2002; Liu and Vyverman, 2015; Marcialhac et al., 2015; Rhee, 1978).

Therefore, the objectives of this study are: (i) to assess the effect of influent NPR on culture
composition in a mixed consortium and a monoculture during continuous cultivation; (ii) to assess
the effect of algal culture composition on nutrient recovery; (iii) propose PBR operational strategies
to maintain high nutrient recovery efficiency in open PBR processes.
2. Materials and methods

2.1. Microalgae and culture media

2.1.1. Continuous microalgal cultivation using a mixed green microalgal consortium

A mixed green microalgal consortium, isolated from a natural pond in contact with wastewater, mainly consisting of *Chlorella sorokiniana* and *Scenedesmus sp.* (Supporting Information (SI), Fig. S1) was used in this study (for further information on the culture characterization, the reader is referred to Wágner et al. (2016b)). The consortium was cultivated for 21 days on used water treated by a laboratory scale low-SRT enhanced biological phosphorus removal system (EBPR) operated as a sequencing batch reactor (SBR) at 3 days SRT. The treated used water was not sterilized prior to feeding the mixed algal consortium. The EBPR was fed with used water collected at Mølleåværket WWTP (Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark). Details on the operation of the EBPR system can be found elsewhere (Valverde-Pérez et al., 2016b).

2.1.2. Continuous microalgal cultivation using *Chlorella sp.*

Two reactors in continuous operation were run for 85 days with *Chlorella sp.* (identified based on microscopy, Fig. S1a, SI). The culture originated from the mixed consortium described in the previous section. However, *Scenedesmus sp.* was outcompeted before the start of this experiment. The culture was fed with treated used water collected from a laboratory scale continuous EBPR system operated at 16 days solids retention time, SRT (Fig. S2, SI). More details on the operation of the continuous EBPR can be found in the Supporting Information (page 9, SI, (Valverde-Pérez, 2015)). The influent used water fed to the EBPR was taken from Mølleåværket WWTP (Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark).

2.2. Microalgal cultivation in 1.4 L continuous PBR
2.2.1 Continuous reactor operation using the mixed green microalgal consortium

A cylindrical glass PBR with a working volume of 1.4 L was operated in the laboratory. The SRT was the same as the hydraulic residence time (HRT) in the system and it was kept at 2 days. Constant aeration at a flow rate of 30 L/h was used to mix and keep the microalgae in suspension. CO$_2$ was mixed to the air in a ratio 8-12% to maintain the pH in the 6.5-7.2 range. The reactor was kept at ambient temperature (23-26 °C). Based on previous experience with the mixed culture (Wágner et al., 2016b), light in the visible spectrum was continuously supplied from the top of the reactor at an average intensity of 800 ± 200 µmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ with a custom-built lamp, with a metal-halide bulb (OSRAM©, Germany). The reactors were covered with a black cloth around the wall, to avoid light entering from the side and to mitigate the daily light intensity changes that would occur in a laboratory. The treated used water, serving as the influent to the PBR, was kept at approximately 5 °C. The pH was adjusted to 6.5-7 (with HCl addition) to avoid phosphorus precipitation in the feed. The NPR of the influent to the PBR was varied during the cultivation. The NPR in this study is expressed as nitrogen-to-phosphorus molar ratio. During the first 6.5 days the influent NPR was kept at 17.6±1.6, selected based on previous experience with the mixed culture (Wágner et al., 2016b). Then, the NPR was lowered to 5.2 until day 10.5 and finally back to 16.5±0.1 until the end of the operation. The influent phosphorus concentration was kept constant at 6±0.7 mg-P/L by adding KH$_2$PO$_4$ (Sigma Aldrich), whilst the ammonium concentration was adjusted to reach the required NPR by adding NH$_4$HCO$_3$ (Sigma Aldrich) as nitrogen source.

2.2.2 Continuous reactor operation using Chlorella sp.

Two 1.4 L glass cylindrical PBRs were used as described in the previous section. The SRT and HRT in the system were kept at 3.5 days. Constant aeration mixed with CO$_2$ in 30-40 % ratio was used at a flow rate of 20 L/h to adjust the pH in the range of 6.5-7.5 and mix the suspension. Light was
supplied from the top of the reactors continuously with a custom-built lamp, providing in average 138 1262 ± 314 µmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, with a metal-halide light bulb (OSRAM©, Germany). The reactors were covered with a black cloth around the wall, to avoid light entering from the side of the reactor (Fig. S3a, SI) and to mitigate the daily light intensity changes that would occur in a laboratory. The cultivation was done at room temperature (approximately 21 ºC) until a sudden increase in ambient temperature due to the summer weather conditions (this period, from day 45 to day 58 is not discussed in this study). The reactor temperature was then controlled with a cooling system, whereby cold tap water was circulated around the PBR surface to lower the temperature inside the reactor to approximately to 21 ºC (Fig. S3b, SI). The treated used water, which served as the influent to the PBR, was kept at approximately 5 ºC. The pH was adjusted to 6.5-7 (with HCl addition) to avoid phosphorus precipitation in the feed. Two identical reactors were operated in parallel. One reactor was chosen as a reference (Reactor 1 (R1)) and was operated at constant influent NPR of 17.3±2. In a second reactor (Reactor 2 (R2)) the influent to the PBR was varied. During the first 21 days the influent NPR was kept at 16.8±2, then lowered to 10.3±0.33 until day 37, and finally back to 17.9±0.5 until day 45. The NPR in the second reactor was kept at 17.3±3 until day 71, when it was increased to 25.8±1.7 until day 85, the end of the reactor operation. The nitrogen and ortho-phosphate concentrations were adjusted to reach the required NPR by adding NaNO$_3$ (Sigma Aldrich) as nitrogen and KH$_2$PO$_4$ (Sigma Aldrich) as phosphorus source. The phosphorus concentration was kept constant at 3.9±0.33 mg-P/L and nitrogen was varied to reach the required NPR.

2.3. Image analysis for community composition description

The culture in each experiment was monitored using an innovative image analysis method developed during this study. One drop of suspension was taken with a disposable plastic pipette and the droplet was covered with a cover slip. Bright field imaging was done using a Motic AE31 microscope (Hong Kong) with a magnification of 20x. For image analysis, the software Image pro plus 7 3D suite (Media
Cybernetics, MD, USA) was used to automate the identification and quantification of the different types of algae based on their morphology. The different types of green microalgae were distinguished according to their morphology: i.e. *Chlorella sp.* (round and small individual cells, Fig. S1a, SI) and *Scenedesmus sp.* (elongated cells forming two-to-four-cell colonies, Fig. S1b, SI). The diatoms that appeared during cultivation could also be identified based on their morphology (elongated cells, larger than the other two species, Fig. S5a, SI). To distinguish between the genera, morphological descriptors (area, diameter, the aspect ratio, which is the ratio between the longest and shortest diameter and axis, which describes the long narrow algae) of each type were automatically acquired using the image analysis software. The morphological parameters (Table S2, SI) were observed to be culture condition specific. Therefore, it is suggested to calibrate the morphological parameters every time a new consortium is studied. The required number of images for the analysis of estimating the distribution of different species was tested on both the mixed culture (containing *Chlorella sp.* and *Scenedesmus sp.*) and the monoculture (containing *Chlorella sp.*) by taking up to 50 images and assessing the cell count and the cell area based on the number of images. The required number of images for the mixed culture was found to be 20, whilst for the monoculture it was 10 (Fig. S4, SI).

### 2.4. Batch experiments for model calibration

Three batch experiments were set up using a glass cylinder with a working volume of 1.2 L. Continuous lighting was provided by one custom-built lamp with a metal-halide light bulb (OSRAM©, Germany) from the top of the reactor with an average light intensity of 1000 ± 121 µmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹. CO₂ enriched airflow was supplied from the bottom of the reactor at 20 L/h and at 30-40 % CO₂ to guarantee full mixing and to keep pH between 6.5 and 7.5. The batch was prepared using 1 L of effluent from the laboratory scale EBPR system and 200 ml of effluent from the second continuous PBR containing *Chlorella sp.* The inoculum for the first batch was taken on day 21, when the culture was adjusted to an NPR of 16.8±2. The second batch was inoculated with algae taken on
day 37, when the culture was adjusted to an NPR of 10.3±0.3. Finally, the inoculum for batch 3 was taken on day 79, when the culture was cultivated at 25.8±1.7 NPR. The experiments were run with an initial NPR of 17. The required nitrogen and phosphorus concentrations were obtained by spiking NaNO₃ and KH₂PO₄ solutions. The initial conditions of the three experiments can be found in Table S1, SI.

2.5. Model based assessment, model calibration and statistical analysis

The ASM-A process model, developed in a previous study (Wágner et al., 2016b), was used for the simulations and parameter estimation. ASM-A, implemented in Matlab (The MathWorks, Natick, Massachusetts, USA) can predict the uptake and storage of nitrogen and phosphorus as well as microalgal growth and decay under photoautotrophic and heterotrophic conditions. Default parameters were used for the mixed culture and model was recalibrated when assessing the monoculture performance. Parameter estimation was carried out based on the global optimisation method for parameter estimation, Latin Hypercube Sampled priors for Simplex (LHSS) (Wágner et al., 2016b). 500 simulations were found sufficient to reach convergence for parameter estimation. Values for parameters not estimated in this study were taken from the original ASM-A calibration. The average light intensity in the reactor was calculated based on integration of the Lambert-Beer law. However, in this study we used a time variable average light intensity, by calculating it for each time step and updating it during the model simulations. The incident light intensity varied during the batch experiments, due to the decrease of the height of the suspension in the reactor resulting from the daily sampling. Thus, the incident light intensity was updated during the simulations (see level of complexity 2 for light modelling in (Wágner et al., 2018)). The Janus coefficient was calculated for model evaluation (Sin et al., 2008). The model parameter estimates are validated when the Janus coefficient approaches 1.
2.6. Analytical methods and calculations

Biomass in the continuous and batch reactors was analysed by measuring the total suspended solids (TSS) using glass fibre filter (Advantec©, USA) with a pore size of 0.6 µm (APHA et al., 1999). Total COD, total nitrogen and phosphorus measurements in the suspension were done using commercial test kits (Hach-Lange©, CO, USA). Following sample filtration (0.2 µm filter), ammonium, nitrate, nitrite and phosphate concentrations were measured using test kits supplied by Merck© (NJ, USA) and soluble COD was measured using Hach-Lange© test kits (CO, USA). The COD of the microalgal biomass was calculated by the difference of the total and soluble COD. The TSS to COD conversion factor was estimated to be in average 0.9 (calculated as described in SI). The internal cell quota of nitrogen was calculated based on the difference of total nitrogen in the algal suspension (algae+medium) and total soluble nitrogen in the filtrate (soluble organic N, NH$_4^+$, NO$_2^-$ and NO$_3^-$). The internal cell quota of phosphorus was obtained by the difference of total phosphorus in the algal suspension and soluble phosphate in the filtrate. Incoming light intensity and pH were monitored using LI-1400 Data Logger with LI-193 Spherical Underwater Quantum Sensor (LI-COR, USA) and Multi 3430 Digital pH meter for pH-Electrode Sentix 940 sensor (WTW, Germany), respectively. The pigment content of the biomass was measured as described in Wágner et al. (Wágner et al., 2018). Chlorophyll a and b as well as some carotenoids (lutein, β-carotene, violaxanthin) were targeted during the analysis. Protein content was calculated by multiplying the nitrogen quota by a nitrogen-to-protein factor as suggested by Gardner-Dale et al. (Gardner-Dale et al., 2017). Nitrogen-to-protein conversion factor value was taken from Templeton and Laurens (Templeton and Laurens, 2015). For *Chlorella sp.* it is reported to be 5.04 g protein/g N.
3. Results and discussion

3.1. Impact of varying nutrient availability on microalgal diversity

3.1.1. Mixed culture dynamics

The image analysis tool was used to monitor the culture composition in the mixed microalgal consortium. At the beginning of the cultivation the mixed microalgal consortium contained mostly *Scenedesmus sp.*, about 83% of the total cell count (Fig. 1). *Chlorella sp.* were present at 9% along with some other species belonging mainly to phylum *Chlorophyta* and some smaller ciliates at 8%.

The composition did not change in the first period of the cultivation, when the NPR was 17.6±1.6. When the influent NPR was lowered to 5.2, there was a sudden appearance of diatoms identified as *Nitzschia sp.* based on microscopic observation (Fig. S5a, SI). These diatoms were seeded from the influent water to the PBR (based on microscopic observations) that probably originated from the WWTP and proliferated under the altered cultivation conditions. Indeed, diatoms have been reported as indigenous algae species in sewage streams in Scandinavia (Krustok et al., 2015). Many diatoms have lower NPR compared to the mixed culture used in this study (Dang et al., 2018), so lower NPR may have selected for their growth. Furthermore, diatoms are able to grow in waters with very limited nitrogen availability. Indeed, the affinity coefficients reported for these microalgae are considerably lower compared to those reported for the mixed culture used in this study (ammonia affinity coefficients for diatoms are in the order of 1-10⁻³ mg-N/L, Fan et al., 2003, compared to 4-10 mg-N/L for our mixed culture, Wágner et al., 2016b), which make them efficient k-strategists.

Alternatively, diatoms build synergies with cyanobacteria in low nutrient environments, whereby cyanobacteria fix atmospheric nitrogen and make it bioavailable for diatoms (Foster et al., 2011).

Considering these aspects, when decreasing the ammonium in the influent to decrease the NPR, diatoms were still able to grow in the PBR, while the mixed culture’s growth was limited. When NPR
was above 16, nitrogen was not a limiting growth factor, thus promoting fast growing green microalgae (e.g., *Chlorella sp.*, which are r-strategists; Galès et al., 2019). The amount of diatoms increased to up to 8% of total cell count by day 10. Their relative abundance was much larger when accounting for the cell area (up to 34%), due to their 3-5 times higher cell size relative to *Chlorella sp.* and *Scenedesmus sp.* The cell area is relevant as it can be related to the TSS of the biomass (Fig. S6, SI), and thus it can allow the approximation of the mass fraction of the different species. Thus, although the cell count of diatoms was low compared to the other species, diatoms constituted a significant fraction of the biomass concentration. Moreover, the number and the size of ciliates increased in the reactor (Fig. S5b, SI), yielding a significant increase of the relative cell area of other non-classified species (66%, Fig. 1). However, ciliates were quickly washed out at day 10 (Fig. 1). Diatoms contain on several metabolites that can have a detrimental effect on the reproduction of ciliates (Miralto et al., 1999). Thus, the proliferation of diatoms in the PBR served to control ciliates population, which fed on them, and eventually led to lower numbers of these predators once the NPR was restored. The presence of ciliates and other grazers act as selective factor promoting the co-existence of *Chlorella sp.* and *Scenedesmus sp.*, as the second is more resilient to predators despite its comparably lower growth rates (Galès et al., 2019). On day 8, the fraction of *Chlorella sp.* started to increase while *Scenedesmus sp.* decreased. Nevertheless, by day 10, their cell count was reduced, possibly due to the presence of grazers that prefer *Chlorella* over *Scenedesmus sp.* due to their smaller size (Borowitzka and Moheimani, n.d.). After the NPR was set back to 16.5±0.1, the diatoms were outcompeted from the system, suggesting that the cultivation conditions were more optimal for *Chlorella* and *Scenedesmus sp.* Interestingly, the relative ratio of *Chlorella* and *Scenedesmus sp.* had shifted from day 11 to 21, reaching 77% of *Chlorella sp.* of the total cell count at day 21 (Fig. 1). Alcántara et al. (Alcántara et al., 2015) similarly observed that *Scenedesmus sp.* were initially more abundant, whilst by the end of the cultivation period *Chlorella sp.* proliferated. Thus, it is
hypothesised that the cultivation conditions are more optimal for *Chlorella sp.* than *Scenedesmus sp.* in our case, also supported by Beuckels et al. (Beuckels et al., 2015), who found that *Chlorella sp.* is capable of accumulating more nitrogen than *Scenedesmus sp.* This contradicts with other studies which showed that *Scenedesmus sp.* prefer larger NPR than *Chlorella sp.* when phosphorus concentration is varied (Marcilhac et al., 2015).

3.1.2. Monoculture dynamics

A monoculture of *Chlorella sp.* was cultivated in continuous reactor operation using effluent water from the upstream EBPR process. The culture composition did not change throughout the 85 days of cultivation and *Chlorella sp.* remained as a single microalgal species even though we used treated used water from the EBPR system without disinfection. There was some variation in the cell number and cell area during the cultivation (Fig. 2) that could be related to the variation in biomass concentration. However, the correlation with the TSS concentration is scattered and does not show strong relation (Fig. S7, SI). No major differences were observed in the cell counts from both PBR, suggesting the microalgae grew at similar rates in both of them. This is likely a consequence of excessive volumetric nutrient loading, which allowed *Chlorella sp.* to grow under non-limiting conditions. Indeed, only at the end of the operational period where the NPR was set to 10.3±0.3 nitrate reached levels close to 0 mg-N/L, suggesting that nitrate was not limiting during most of the operational period and *Chlorella sp.* grew at maximum capacity during most of the operational period.

We note that only *Chlorella sp.* were detected during this operational period. Grazers were not present in the influent and therefore there was not competitive advantage for *Scenedesmus sp.*, which were outcompeted by *Chlorella sp.* due to their comparably higher growth rates (Galès et al., 2019). The main difference between the two operational periods is the influent. When growing the mixed culture,
the effluents were collected from a lab-scale short SRT EBPR system suffering extreme filamentous bulking (Valverde-Pérez et al., 2016b), while in the second case effluents were collected from a lab-scale EBPR system exhibiting good performance (Valverde-Pérez 2015). Poor settleability promotes the proliferation of swimming protozoa (Liu et al., 2008), which explains why predators were only present in the study when the mixed culture was grown. In this experiment, the lowest NPR was higher than in case of the mixed culture experiment. NPR for *Chlorella sp.* biomass composition (Beuckels et al., 2015) are typically higher than for diatoms (Garcia et al., 2018) and therefore, a proper control of the NPR could effectively keep *Chlorella sp.* culture stable in the PBR. Thus controlling the NPR is a powerful tool to regulate and stabilize PBR used for resource recovery in combination with bacterial systems designed for carbon capture at low SRTs, as it is the case for the TRENS system (Valverde-Pérez et al., 2016a).

These results also demonstrate image analysis as a powerful tool to monitor algal system performance. This is especially relevant for open pond systems, which are usually subject to contamination by algae and other microbes (Montemezzani et al., 2015). Similar tools have been designed for activated sludge systems to, e.g., monitor filamentous bulking, and successfully implemented in full-scale systems (Mesquita et al., 2013). However, the application of these tools for microalgal cultures is limited to cell counting and morphology characterization, without distinguishing among species in mixed cultures (Havlik et al., 2013). More complex monitoring tools working at different wavelengths can perform similar measurements to those presented in our work (Winckelmann et al., 2016). However, to the best of our knowledge, no studies have used field microscopy combined with image analysis tools to characterize microalgal composition in mixed cultures. The method developed in this study has the potential to be implemented in full-scale algal
systems, offering new controlled variables, e.g. algal diversity, thereby leading to the development of innovative control strategies beyond conventional pH or cell density control (Olivieri et al., 2014).

3.2. Impact of influent NPR on treatment efficiency and nutrient recovery

The nutrients removal and effluent quality of the PBRs were assessed during the cultivation of mixed microalgal consortium (Fig. 3, Fig. S8, SI) and through the cultivation of the *Chlorella sp.* monoculture. As for the cultivation of the mixed microalgal consortium, the phosphate removal decreased significantly, from 95% to 40%, as a result of decreasing influent NPR, likely due to nitrogen limitation. Once the cultivation conditions were restored, the removal for both nitrogen and phosphorus reached up to 95%. The effluent quality was significantly affected by the changes in microalgal composition as a result of changes in influent NPR (Fig. S8, SI). The biomass concentration and the soluble effluent nitrogen concentration decreased during the NPR=5.2 period, while the effluent soluble phosphate concentration increased (Fig. S8, SI). Phosphorus quota reached a maximum of 0.15 g-P/g-TSS and was kept stable during the operational period, suggesting nitrogen was the limiting factor for biomass growth. Similar to our previous observations with the mixed culture, the nitrogen quota shows high variability (Wágner et al., 2016b). Interestingly, the pigments concentrations were not considerably affected by the change of NPR (Fig. S9, SI). Nevertheless, chlorophyll concentration showed high variability until day 10, which made it difficult to demonstrate that reduced NPR yielded low chlorophyll content. It should be noted that once the NPR was restored in day 10.5, chlorophyll content was more stable and always above 2.5 mg-chlorophyll/g-TSS. Previous studies demonstrated that under low nitrogen feeding conditions, such as those when the PBR was operated with NPR=5.2, can yield to lower chlorophyll content (Wágner et al., 2018).

*<Figure 3>*
In the cultivation of the *Chlorella sp.* monoculture, no significant difference was observed in the TSS concentration (Fig. 4a) in R1 and R2, except for the NPR=10.3±0.3 for R2, where biomass concentration was slightly lower in R2 (0.09 g/L) by the end of the period. Compared to the reference reactor with constant nutrient supply (R1), in R2, during the period of decreased nutrient availability (NPR=10.3±0.3), the nitrate concentration decreased until a steady-state at 1 mg N/L (Fig. 4d), lower than R1, whilst the internal nitrogen cell quota decreased to 0.01 gN/gCOD below that of R1 in the beginning of the low NPR period (Fig. 4b). During the phase of excess nutrient supply (NPR=25.8±1.7), there was an increase of the nitrate concentration in R2 until a steady state at 23 mg N/L, higher than R1, and an increase of the internal cell quota (0.12 gN/gCOD), higher than R1. This is reflected in the removal of nitrate (Fig. 4f). On average there was 75% nitrogen removal that increased to 95% under 10.3±.3 NPR and decreased to 60% under 25.8±1.7 NPR. The phosphate and the internal phosphorus quota (Fig. 4 e and c) showed no difference between the two reactor operations, resulting in a 60% average removal (Fig. 4f). Since phosphorus was not fully removed during the experiment, probably, the phosphorus load was too high and SRT and HRT too low during this experiment, thus limiting P removal. Nitrate accumulated in the last period, suggesting that feeding load was above the optimal range of NPR. The pigment content was not significantly affected by the change of NPR as no difference was observed between R1 and R2 (Fig. S10, SI), possibly because algae were not nutrient starved long enough.

*Figure 4*

In the beginning of the operating period with influent NPR=10.3±0.3, a decrease of nitrogen quota in R2 was observed, whilst TSS concentration remained unchanged. This result suggests that algae were able to grow under nitrogen limiting conditions at the expense of their internal nitrogen quota. In the second half of the NPR =10.3±0.3 period, the biomass concentration decreased in R2 while the nitrogen quota replenished. Hence, we conclude that the growth rate may not be affected by changes
in the influent NPR lasting for only a few days. Thus, the control by Valverde-Pérez et al. (2016a) will allow stable and optimal algal cultivation. Furthermore, sub-optimal NPR ratios may not result in growth rate limitation as long as both nitrogen and phosphorus are fed in-excess concentrations at a given SRT, as suggested by Arbib et al. (Arbib et al., 2013). However, if one of the nutrients becomes limiting for the given operational conditions, algal biomass productivity is considerably reduced. The NPR inside the algae was calculated (Fig. 5a) and it was found to be varying between 2.7 – 21.4 mol N/mol P. This range of NPR was obtained when nitrogen was varied and might expand when phosphorus is varied as well. The calculated protein content of the algae (calculated by direct conversion from the nitrogen quota) is between 0.06 – 0.8 g protein/g DW (Fig. 5b) and it is around 0.4 g protein/g DW under optimal NPR operation. This is in agreement with literature where Rasouli et al. (2018) reported 45% protein content for *Chlorella sorokiniana* and Molazadeh et al. (2019) reported between 43-61% protein content for *Chlorella vulgaris*. The high protein is, indeed, comparable to other microbial protein sources, such as methanotrophic bacteria (Valverde-Pérez et al., 2020).

3.3. Effect of influent NPR on microalgal growth kinetics

3.3.1. Changes in microalgal culture composition

To assess the impact of alteration in the influent nutrient supply to PBRs, the average parameter set reported in Wágner et al. (2016b) was used to simulate the results obtained in the continuous reactor operation with the mixed consortium. When only *Chlorella* and *Scenedesmus sp.* were present in the culture, accurate prediction of the biomass concentration, the nitrogen and phosphorus internal cell quota and the soluble nitrogen and phosphorus species were obtained (Fig. 6). When the influent NPR was lowered to 5.2 and diatoms and other microbes proliferated in the culture, the simulations failed
to predict the measured data. This discrepancy between measured and predicted results indicates altered process kinetics as a result of the diatom invasion, and the consequent deterioration of nutrient recovery in the PBR. Some discrepancies exist for the internal nitrogen quota, which can be consequence of a potential change in the nitrogen storage kinetics after the nitrogen limitation. The latter phenomenon was also observed by Wágner et al. (2016b).

3.3.2 Model calibration and evaluation of the operation with *Chlorella* sp.

The batch reactors were used to estimate kinetic parameters of the ASM-A model (Fig. S11 - S13, SI). The half-saturation coefficient and maximum uptake rate of nitrogen and phosphorus ($K_{NO,Alg}$, $K_{PO,Alg}$, $k_{NO,Alg}$ and $k_{PO,Alg}$), the maximum specific growth rate ($\mu_{A,max}$) and the biomass decay rate ($b_{Alg}$) were estimated using the LHSS method. Since the ammonium concentration in the PBR was low (below 0.1 mg/L) during the reactor operation as nitrate was the nitrogen source, $K_{NH,Alg}$ and $k_{NH,Alg}$ were not estimated in this experiment and literature value from Wágner et al. (2016b) was used. The estimated parameter subsets do not show significant differences obtained for the three batch experiments (Table 1).

Using the estimated parameter set obtained in the batch that was conducted after the first period with NPR=16.8±2 (17-17 batch, Table 1) we assessed the model prediction accuracy of the other two batches using the Janus coefficient (Table S3, SI). We found J~1, suggesting that the parameter set was fit to predict the PBR performance in the full operation period. Indeed, comparably good fit is obtained with the simulation results throughout the 85 days of experiments (Fig. 7) in terms of microalgal biomass concentration, soluble nitrate and phosphate concentration and internal phosphorus quota. The decrease of internal nitrogen quota in the beginning of the NPR= 10.3±0.3
period was not captured by the model prediction. In the same period, biomass concentration is slightly
over-predicted, possibly due to error propagation from the internal nitrogen quota predictions. This
was the only period where algae suffered nitrogen limitation. When dynamics expose algae to
nitrogen limitation conditions the maximum nitrate uptake rate ($k_{\text{NO,Alg}}$) shows variability (Wágner
et al., 2016b) and therefore a recalibration of that parameter would have been needed for proper
prediction of that period. When the algae was not under stress condition, no change in the kinetics for
the monoculture is observed. Taken together, the ASM-A simulation model can predict PBR
performance under dynamic conditions as long as there is no extreme nutrient limitation, which
heavily affects nitrate uptake rates or no changes the microbial composition of the consortium which
affects the biokinetics.

4. Conclusions

Effects of varying NPR on microalgal cultivation in terms of microbial composition and process
performance was assessed when cultivated on used water resources. During the cultivation of the
mixed microalgal species, diatoms, an indigenous alga, proliferated in the reactor when the NPR was
lowered below the optimal NPR range, and they were outcompeted once the NPR was restored.
Changes in microbial community could be effectively tracked by an image analysis method, which
has the potential of being a monitoring tool for full-scale algal systems. The phosphate removal
decreased significantly, after the NPR was lowered in the influent but once the cultivation conditions
were restored for the seeded green microalgal species, the removal for both nitrogen and phosphorus
recovered. Biomass and nitrogen concentration decreased while phosphorus concentration increased
in the effluent by decreasing the NPR. The ASM-A model could capture the measured data under
optimal NPR operation, but it failed to predict the measured results when diatoms proliferated under low NPR.

A monoculture of *Chlorella sp.* cultivated on used water resources with varying NPR remained stable and contamination-free. Low NPR condition decreased the biomass concentration, effluent nitrogen concentration and the internal nitrogen quota. The ASM-A model was calibrated for this monoculture and model simulations could predict the measurement data in continuous operation using a single parameter subset. Under nutrient limitation conditions, which affects the nitrate uptake rates, the model could not predict the nitrogen quota.

This study demonstrates that NPR is a powerful control parameter of the PBR performance. Moreover, process configurations or control schemes reported in literature (see, e.g. Valverde-Pérez et al. (2016a)) could effectively optimize the PBR performance.
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Figure 1: Variation in the culture composition during the 21 days cultivation period as affected by the NPR (indicated on the top of the graphs). (a) The cell counts are presented as the fraction of the total cell count. (b) The cell area is presented as the fraction of the total cell area (unit in pixels). The total cell count (number of cells) and the total cell area (total number of pixels per field of view) is presented on the figures, suggesting how the culture density changed.
Figure 2: Total cell counts (number of cells) (a) and cell area (unit in pixels) (b) of the *Chlorella sp.* during continuous reactor operation as affected by the NPR (indicated on the top of the graphs). The gap in the x-axis refers to the period where temperature control was not applied and thus it is not considered. Reactor 1 refers to the reference reactor operated at 17.3±2 NPR whilst Reactor 2 refers to the reactor with varying NPRs.

Figure 3: Removal of ammonium and phosphorus in the mixed microalgal consortium during the 21 days of cultivation (expressed as fraction of influent nutrients present in the effluent). The NPR
present in the system is indicated above the figure. The NPR (17.6±1.6, 5.2 and 16.5±0.1) is shown for each period.

**Figure 4:** Biomass concentration (a), internal nitrogen quota (b), internal phosphorus quota (c), bulk nitrate concentration (d), bulk phosphate concentration (e), and removal of nitrogen and phosphorus (f) during the cultivation of *Chlorella sp.* in used water resources in Reactor 1 and 2. Reactor 1 refers to the reference reactor operated at 17.3±2 NPR whilst Reactor 2 refers to the reactor with varying NPRs.
Figure 5: Nitrogen – to – phosphorus ratio (NPR) calculated inside the algae (a) and protein content of the algae calculated (b) during the cultivation of Chlorella sp. in used water resources in Reactor 1 and 2.
Figure 6: Simulation results of the mixed microalgal species cultivation. The red vertical dashed lines represent the time when the NPR was changed. Simulation 1 (blue line) represents the simulation of the whole cultivation period. Discrepancies following the decrease of NPR are due to the change in culture composition. Simulation 2 (orange line) represents the simulation of the second 16.5±0.1 NPR period. Discrepancies between blue and red lines are due to initial conditions after the second NPR shift, which are given by the simulation model for the full cultivation period simulation and set to the experimental values in simulation 2.
Figure 7: Simulation of Reactor 2 with varying NPR. The blue line indicates the model prediction of the measured data.
Tables

Table 1: Estimated parameter values obtained for the three batch experiments. The values are presented as mean ± standard deviation. The 17-17 batch denotes the cultivation where the inoculum was taken after the 16.8±2 NPR cultivation. The 10-17 batch denotes the cultivation where the inoculum was taken after the 10.3±0.33 NPR cultivation. The 25-17 batch denotes the cultivation where the inoculum was taken after the 25.8±1.7 NPR cultivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>17-17 batch</th>
<th>10-17 batch</th>
<th>25-17 batch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_A,_{\text{max}} \ (\text{d}^{-1})$</td>
<td>2.66±0.1</td>
<td>3.4±0.8</td>
<td>2.27±0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{N_{O},_{\text{Alg}}} \ (\text{gN m}^{-3})$</td>
<td>14.55±1</td>
<td>13±1.4</td>
<td>13.7±1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{P_{O},_{\text{Alg}}} \ (\text{gP m}^{-3})$</td>
<td>4.48±0.7</td>
<td>4±0.58</td>
<td>3.7±0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{N_{O},_{\text{Alg}}} \ (\text{gN g}^{-1} \text{COD d}^{-1})$</td>
<td>0.14±0.02</td>
<td>0.1±0.02</td>
<td>0.14±0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{P_{O},_{\text{Alg}}} \ (\text{gP g}^{-1} \text{COD d}^{-1})$</td>
<td>0.043±0.007</td>
<td>0.023±0.003</td>
<td>0.045±0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b_{\text{Alg}} \ (\text{d}^{-1})$</td>
<td>0.45±0.04</td>
<td>0.31±0.12</td>
<td>0.38±0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Table S1:** Initial conditions of the three batch experiments used for model calibration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batch</th>
<th>Initial Conditions</th>
<th>S\textsubscript{NH} (gN/m\textsuperscript{3})</th>
<th>S\textsubscript{NO2} (gN/m\textsuperscript{3})</th>
<th>S\textsubscript{NO3} (gN/m\textsuperscript{3})</th>
<th>S\textsubscript{PO} (gN/m\textsuperscript{3})</th>
<th>X\textsubscript{Nalg} (gN/m\textsuperscript{3})</th>
<th>X\textsubscript{Palg} (gP/m\textsuperscript{3})</th>
<th>X\textsubscript{Alg} (gCOD/m\textsuperscript{3})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Batch 1 (17-17)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>31.45036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch 2 (17-10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch 3 (17-25)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table S2:** Settings used for automatic detection of different species during image analysis. Units are in pixels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>microorganism</th>
<th>area</th>
<th>aspect ratio</th>
<th>diameter</th>
<th>axis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>min</td>
<td>max</td>
<td>min</td>
<td>max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorella sp.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenedesmus sp.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diatoms</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>∞</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table S3:** The RMSNE and the Janus coefficient of the calibration and evaluation to assess the accuracy of the model prediction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10-17 batch</th>
<th></th>
<th>10-25 batch</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSNE</td>
<td>Janus coefficient</td>
<td>RMSNE</td>
<td>Janus coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate in bulk liquid (S\textsubscript{NO3})</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphate in bulk liquid (S\textsubscript{PO4})</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algal biomass (X\textsubscript{Alg})</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen quota (X\textsubscript{AlgN})</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorous quota (X\textsubscript{AlgPP})</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RMSNE</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure S1: Micrographs of *Chlorella* sp. (a) and *Scenedesmus* sp. (b) used for the cultivation in this study.

Figure S2: The laboratory scale EBPR system consisting of anaerobic reactors (1) an aerobic reactor (2) and a solid liquid separation (3).
Figure S3: The 1.4 L continuous PBRs run in parallel for the experiments conducted with *Chlorella sp*. The reactors were covered with black cloth during the operation (a). The reactor set-up without the black cloth (b).

Figure S4: Cumulative average cells count for mixed culture of *Chlorella sp.* and *Scenedesmus sp.* (a). Cumulative average cells count for monoculture of *Chlorella sp*. Set_1 and set_2 refer to duplicate characterization of the optimal number of images, respectively. (b)
**Figure S5:** Diatoms, *Nitzschia sp.* (identified based on microscopy) that appeared during cultivation of the mixed consortium in the 5.2 NPR period (a). Ciliate that proliferated the 5.2 NPR period (b).

**Figure S6:** Correlation between the cell count and cell area during mixed microalgal cultivation.

**Figure S7:** Correlation between the cell count and cell area during cultivation of *Chlorella sp.*
Figure S8: Biomass concentration (a), internal nitrogen quota and internal phosphorus quota (b), bulk ammonium and nitrate concentration and bulk phosphate concentration (c) during the cultivation of mixed consortium in used water resources with varying NPRs.

Figure S9: Change in pigment concentration during the mixed green microalgal culture cultivation. Total chlorophyll = chlorophyll a + chlorophyll b. Total carotenoid = violaxanthin + lutein + β-carotein.
Figure S10: Change in pigment concentration during the *Chlorella sp.* culture cultivation in the reference reactor (Reactor 1) and the reactor where NPR was varied (Reactor 2). Total chlorophyll = chlorophyll a + chlorophyll b. Total carotenoid = violaxanthin + lutein + β-carotein.

Figure S11: Calibration of the batch where the inoculum was taken after the 10 NPR cultivation and the initial NPR was 17.
**Figure S12:** Calibration of the batch where the inoculum was taken after the 25 NPR cultivation and the initial NPR was 17.
The operation of the laboratory-scale continuous EBPR system

A laboratory scale EBPR system was used to treat domestic wastewater (Fig. S2). It consisted of a sequence of two anaerobic reactors, one aerobic reactor and one clarifier. On Fig. S2 there is a clarifier placed between the anaerobic and aerobic reactors (which can be used for EBP2R operation), however the retention time in this clarifier during the experiments was close to 0. The layout of the plant is shown in Fig. S13.

Figure S13: The layout of the continuous EBPR system.

The anaerobic phase was divided into two identical reactors, connected in series, with a working volume of 1.25 L of each reactor. A rotational stirrer working at 60 rpm provided mixing. The aerobic phase consisted of a 5.8 L glass cylinder. Air was provided from the bottom of the reactor by an air diffuser and a rotational stirrer working at 85 rpm provided mixing. A 2 L glass reactor served as the secondary clarifier including a cylinder part and a hopper in the bottom. The system was fed with primary treated domestic wastewater from Mølleåværket WWTP (Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark). The wastewater was stored twice per week in a cooled storage tank, working at 4°C with 180L of working volume, equipped by mixing and internal recirculation. The influent to the EBPR system was obtained by mixing the wastewater with a synthetic solution (rich in sodium propionate), in order to keep the quality of the influent stable in terms of COD and nutrients (N and P). The average values of the final mixture of influent water to the EBPR system were: 36 mg NH₄-N/L, 9.5 mg PO₄-P/L and 430 mg COD/L. The HRT in the system was kept at 13.8 h with an inflow of 11.1 L/day. Recirculation of
sludge from the clarifier to the first anaerobic reactor was provided. Moreover, part of the sludge was
daily discharged from the aerobic reactor, thus keeping total SRT at 16 days.

**Calculation of conversion factor between TSS and COD**

Total COD and soluble COD were determined on unfiltered and filtered (0.2 µm membrane filter)
samples respectively, using COD test kit (Hach Lange) with a range of 15 – 150 mgO₂/L for filtered
samples and with a range of 100-2000 mgO₂/L for unfiltered samples. The COD of the biomass was
calculated as the difference between the unfiltered and filtered sample and conversion factor based
on the measured TSS was calculated.