Effect of different ammonia sources on aceticlastic and hydrogenotrophic methanogens

Tian, Hailin; Fotidis, Ioannis; Kissas , Konstantinos ; Angelidaki, Irini

Published in:
Bioresource Technology

Link to article, DOI:
[10.1016/j.biortech.2017.11.081](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2017.11.081)

Publication date:
2018

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):

Tian, H., Fotidis, I., Kissas , K., & Angelidaki, I. (2018). Effect of different ammonia sources on aceticlastic and hydrogenotrophic methanogens. *Bioresource Technology*, 250, 390-397.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2017.11.081>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Accepted Manuscript

Effect of different ammonia sources on aceticlastic and hydrogenotrophic methanogens

Hailin Tian, Ioannis A. Fotidis, Konstantinos Kissas, Irini Angelidaki

PII: S0960-8524(17)32085-0
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2017.11.081>
Reference: BITE 19231

To appear in: *Bioresource Technology*

Received Date: 6 November 2017
Revised Date: 22 November 2017
Accepted Date: 23 November 2017

Please cite this article as: Tian, H., Fotidis, I.A., Kissas, K., Angelidaki, I., Effect of different ammonia sources on aceticlastic and hydrogenotrophic methanogens, *Bioresource Technology* (2017), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2017.11.081>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

**Effect of different ammonia sources on acetoclastic and
hydrogenotrophic methanogens**

Hailin Tian, Ioannis A. Fotidis*, Konstantinos Kissas, Irini Angelidaki

Department of Environmental Engineering, Technical University of Denmark, Bygningstorvet
Bygning 115, DK-2800 Kgs. Lyngby, DK

*Corresponding Author: Ioannis A. Fotidis, Department of Environmental Engineering,
Technical University of Denmark, Bygningstorvet Bygning 115, DK-2800 Kgs. Lyngby,
Denmark, Phone: (+45) 45251418; Fax: (+45) 45933850; e-mail: ioanf@env.dtu.dk

Abstract

Ammonium chloride (NH_4Cl) was usually used as a model ammonia source to simulate ammonia inhibition during anaerobic digestion (AD) of nitrogen-rich feedstocks. However, ammonia in AD originates mainly from degradation of proteins, urea and nucleic acids, which is distinct from NH_4Cl . Thus, in this study, the inhibitory effect of a “natural” ammonia source (urea) and NH_4Cl , on four pure methanogenic strains (aceticlastic: *Methanosarcina thermophila*, *Methanosarcina barkeri*; hydrogenotrophic: *Methanoculleus bourgensis*, *Methanoculleus thermophilus*), was assessed under mesophilic (37°C) and thermophilic (55°C) conditions. The results showed that urea hydrolysis increased pH significantly to unsuitable levels for methanogenic growth, while NH_4Cl had a negligible effect on pH. After adjusting initial pH to 7 and 8, urea was significantly stronger inhibitor with longer lag phases to methanogenesis compared to NH_4Cl . Overall, urea seems to be more toxic on both aceticlastic and hydrogenotrophic methanogens compared to NH_4Cl under the same total and free ammonia levels.

Keywords

Ammonia inhibition; Ammonium chloride; Anaerobic digestion; Pure strain; Urea.

1 Introduction

Biogas (a mixture of CH_4 and CO_2) is an attractive renewable energy (Holm-Nielsen et al., 2009), which is formed during anaerobic digestion (AD) of different biomasses. As one of the most promising and widely used green technologies, AD is a complex biological process with different microorganisms involved, which can reduce the waste pollution and offset part of the energy usage (Chynoweth et al., 2001). However, it is reported that some potential substrates are toxic to AD process by inhibiting the microorganisms' activity (Chen et al., 2008). Among these substrates, nitrogen-rich substrates stand out, due to the ammonia formation during their degradation. A low ammonia concentration ($< 200 \text{ mg NH}_4^+\text{-N L}^{-1}$) is beneficial to AD process; nevertheless, relatively high ammonia levels ($> 2000 \text{ mg NH}_4^+\text{-N L}^{-1}$) would inhibit AD, causing instability and even process failure (Liu and Sung, 2002). Total ammonia (TAN) in aqueous solutions is the sum of ammonium ions (NH_4^+) and free ammonia (FAN, NH_3). The NH_4^+ and NH_3 exist in an equilibrium (Eq. (1)), which is affected by the temperature and the pH (Emerson et al., 1975). Specifically, FAN, which was suggested to be the most toxic form of ammonia (Massé et al., 2014), increases along with temperature and pH. Methanogenesis, the last step of AD process, is more sensitive to ammonia than hydrolysis, acidogenesis and acetogenesis steps (Yenigün and Demirel, 2013). Furthermore, in most of the studies, hydrogenotrophic methanogens were reported to be more robust to ammonia toxicity than acetoclastic methanogens (Schnürer et al., 1999; Werner et al., 2014; Dai et al., 2017). However, controversial results can also be found (Calli et al., 2005; Karakashev et al., 2005).

Considering ammonia inhibition is such a serious and highly debated topic, a great number of studies focusing on the impact of ammonia levels and on inhibition mechanism have been conducted in different reactor types (Angelidaki and Ahring, 1993; Sung and Liu, 2003; Cuetos et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2015; Chen et al., 2016). As a result, it is reviewed that

50% inhibition was caused by TAN concentrations ranging from 1700 to 14000 mg $\text{NH}_4^+\text{-N}$ L^{-1} depending on different experimental conditions (Chen et al., 2008). However, in most of the aforementioned studies, ammonium chloride (NH_4Cl) was used as the inhibitor (ammonia source), and only few experiments can be found using other ammonia sources (Sterling et al., 2001; Westerholm et al., 2012; Dai et al., 2017). As a salt, NH_4Cl can dissociate immediately after addition into aqueous solutions and release chloride anions and ammonium cations, as shown in Eq. (2). However, since chloride anions could also be a potential inhibitor to AD process (Riffat and Krongthamchat, 2006; Viana et al., 2012), it is difficult to differentiate if the inhibitory effect only comes from ammonia. Moreover, in the real AD applications, when nitrogen-rich substrates are used as feedstocks, ammonia is usually formed by the degradation of proteins, urea and nucleic acids (Rajagopal et al., 2013). Furthermore, urea is the main part of animal urine besides water; thus abounds in animal slurry (e.g. poultry, mink pig, cattle) and slaughterhouse wastewater (Møller et al., 2004). Without urease, which is the enzyme that catalyses urea hydrolysis, urea in aqueous solutions has a negligible reaction rate constant of $6.3 \times 10^{-9} \text{ s}^{-1}$ and a half-life of 3.5 years (Krajewska, 2009). However, urease can be synthesized by different microorganisms, including some bacteria involved in AD process, which can accelerate the hydrolysis of urea by nearly 10^{14} times faster than the uncatalysed decomposition (Ciurli et al., 1999). As shown in Eq. (3), the direct hydrolysed product of urea is the most toxic ammonia form (i.e. FAN) (Zimmer, 2000). In addition, hydrolysis of urea causes sudden pH increase, which could negatively affect the AD process (Mobley et al., 1995; Ciurli et al., 1999).

Thus, in order to separate the inhibition only caused by ammonia and simulate this process closer to realistic conditions, urea was used as ammonia source in reactors fed with cattle manure (Sterling et al., 2001). However, among the limited studies using urea as ammonia source, nothing can be found about its effect on methanogens. Considering methanogenesis is the most sensitive step of AD process (Chen et al., 2008), it is important to understand the urea effect on different methanogens. In addition, to date, there are no studies assessing simultaneously the effect of NH_4Cl and urea on methanogenic archaea.

Therefore, the main aim of the present study was to investigate the effect of two different ammonia sources on four pure methanogenic strains (i.e. two aceticlastic and two hydrogenotrophic), under mesophilic (37°C) and thermophilic (55°C) conditions. To fulfil this aim, firstly, the effect on pH caused by the NH_4Cl dissociation and urea hydrolysis in AD batch reactors was investigated. Secondly, under controlled pH conditions (i.e. 7 and 8), five different TAN levels (i.e. ten different FAN levels) were applied on each pure methanogenic strain to evaluate the effect of the two ammonia sources on the cultures, independently of the pH.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Pure strains, ammonia sources and enzyme

Four pure methanogenic strains (aceticlastic: *Methanosarcina thermophila* TM-1 DSM No.1825 and *Methanosarcina barkeri* MS DSM No. 800; hydrogenotrophic: *Methanoculleus thermophilus* CR-1 DSM No. 2373 and *Methanoculleus bourgensis* MS2^T DSM No. 3045) were purchased from DSMZ GmbH Company and used throughout the study. *M. thermophila* and *M. thermophilus* are thermophilic, while *M. barkeri* and *M. bourgensis* are mesophilic methanogens. All the pure strains were cultivated in the specific growth media suggested by

DSMZ GmbH Company. Specifically, the growth media used were medium 120 (DSMZ, 2014a) for *M. thermophila*, medium 120a (DSMZ, 2014b) for *M. barkeri*, medium 141 (DSMZ, 2017) for *M. thermophilus*, and medium 332 (DSMZ, 2014c) for *M. bourgensis*. The carbon sources that were used for each strain were: acetate and methanol for *M. thermophila*; CO₂ for *M. thermophilus*; methanol for *M. barkeri*; and formate and CO₂ for *M. bourgensis*.

Ammonium chloride (Sigma-Aldrich, CAS no. 12125-02-9) and urea (Sigma-Aldrich, CAS no. 57-13-6) were used as ammonia sources for the main experiment. Urease (Type IX, Sigma-Aldrich, CAS no. 9002-13-5) from *Canavalia ensiformis* (jack bean) seeds was used as enzyme to hydrolyse urea. A buffer solution consisted of 0.2 M sodium phosphate with pH 7.3 was prepared for the dissolution of the enzyme before use.

2.2 Experimental setup

Two batch experimental assays were performed in this study to investigate the effect of different ammonia sources on pH fluctuation of the reactors (Assay I) and on the methanogenic process efficiency (Assay II). Before the experiments started, the pure strains, bought from DSMZ (DSMZ GmbH Company, Germany), were cultivated according to its corresponding cultivation protocols (DSMZ, 2014c; DSMZ, 2014b; DSMZ, 2014a; DSMZ, 2017). After several (4-6) generations, the cultures were used as inocula in the two experimental assays of the current study with a 20/80 (v/v) inoculum to medium ratio throughout the experiment. Meanwhile, urease was added to all batch reactors regardless of the ammonia source. Furthermore, all the experiments were conducted in triplicates.

2.2.1 Assay I: Effect on pH

All the pure strains were tested under different ammonia levels as depicted in Table 1. Serum vials were used with 40 and 118 mL working and total volume, respectively. After adding the corresponding medium, each vial was closed with butyl rubber stopper and sealed with aluminium caps, then flushed with a mixture gas of N₂/CO₂ (80/20, v/v) to create anoxic

conditions and autoclaved to provide sterile conditions. Other solutions that could not be autoclaved according to the instructions (NaHCO_3 , Na_2CO_3 , Vitamin, Methanol, L-cysteine- $\text{HCl}\cdot\text{H}_2\text{O}$ and $\text{Na}_2\text{S}\cdot 9\text{H}_2\text{O}$) were introduced by using sterilized, 0.2 μm pore size, Minisart[®] NML Syringe Filters (Sartorius Stedim Biotech GmbH, Germany) to avoid any contamination. $\text{Na}_2\text{S}\cdot 9\text{H}_2\text{O}$ solution was added as a reducing agent after inoculation. In addition, pure H_2 (62.4 mL) and CO_2 (15.6 mL) were added in the headspace of the batch reactors of the hydrogenotrophic strains. Afterwards, all the batch reactors were incubated at their corresponding temperatures ($37\pm 1^\circ\text{C}$ for mesophilic and $55\pm 1^\circ\text{C}$ for thermophilic). The pH was measured after the urea hydrolysis finished (approximately 20 hours after the incubation stated based on preliminary hydrolysis test, and the details were provided in the E-supplement file).

2.2.2 Assay II: Effect on methanogenesis

In this assay, two different ammonia sources with five different TAN and ten different FAN levels (as shown in Table 2) were tested on all the methanogens. For all the strains, serum vials with 40 mL working volume was used, while total volume of 245 mL was used for *M. thermophila* and *M. thermophilus* cultivation, and total volume of 118 mL was used for *M. barkeri* and *M. bourgensis*. The reactors were closed with rubber stoppers, sealed with aluminium caps, and flushed with a mixture N_2/CO_2 gas (80/20, v/v) after the addition of medium. All the reactors containing medium were autoclaved before inoculation. Chemical solutions, which could not be autoclaved, were added through sterilized filters afterwards. In addition, for hydrogenotrophic *M. thermophilus* and *M. barkeri*, H_2/CO_2 (80/20, v/v) mixture gas was injected into the headspace of the reactor to form 1 bar overpressure. Furthermore, a pH adjustment strategy (the details were provided in the E-supplement file) was performed to ensure the same pH levels (7 and 8) for each individual experiment using 4 M HCl and/ or NaOH solutions. Specifically, for reactors with NH_4Cl , where the dissociation happened

immediately, pH adjustment was performed before the incubation started. However, for reactors containing urea and the hydrolysis happened slowly, the pH was adjusted several times until the hydrolysis finished (the details were provided in the E-supplement file). Finally, all the batch reactors were incubated in their corresponding temperatures ($37\pm1^{\circ}\text{C}$ for mesophilic and $55\pm1^{\circ}\text{C}$ for thermophilic).

2.3 Analytical methods

Methane accumulation in the headspace of the batch reactors was determined by a gas chromatographer (Trace 1310 GC-TCD, Thermo Fisher, Denmark) equipped with a TracePLOT TG-BOND Q 26004–6030 column (30 m x 0.32 mm I.D., film thickness 10 μm) (Thermo Fisher), and helium was used as carrier gas (Tian et al., 2017). The pH of each reactor was measured with PHM99 LAB pH meter (Radiometer TM).

2.4 Calculations and statistics

2.4.1 Free ammonia

The free ammonia concentration was calculated based on the following equation (Siles et al., 2010):

$$\text{FAN} = \frac{\text{TAN}}{1 + \frac{10^{-\text{pH}}}{K_a}} \quad \text{Eq. (1)}$$

where K_a is the dissociation constant affected by temperature, which equals to 1.29×10^{-9} and 3.91×10^{-9} in this study for mesophilic and thermophilic condition, respectively.

2.4.2 Methane production inhibition

The methane production inhibition was defined as the ratio of the difference between theoretical and practical methane production divided by the maximum theoretical methane production. Maximum theoretical production, for the different carbon sources in the medium, was calculated according to Angelidaki et al. (2011) and it was 122, 373 and 525 $\text{mL CH}_4 \cdot \text{g}^{-1}$

VS for formate, acetate and methanol. Meanwhile, for the H₂/CO₂ mixture gas, it was calculated based on that 1 mL CH₄ forms from 4 mL H₂ and 1 mL CO₂.

2.4.3 Maximum specific growth rate

Maximum specific growth rate ($\mu_{\max}$) was calculated through the OriginLab program (OriginLab Corporation, Northampton, Massachusetts) by calculating the slope of the linear part of the semi-logarithmic graph of the methane production of the reactors versus time (Gray et al., 2009).

2.4.4 Statistical analysis

The OriginLab program was used for statistical analyses and data plotting. One-way and two-way ANOVA were used to evaluate the statistically differences ($p < 0.05$) of ammonia inhibition under different parameters (e.g. different ammonia sources, ammonia levels and pH levels). Single outliers test was applied to the triplicate measurements if needed.

3 Results and discussion

Impact on pH from two different ammonia sources

The impact of urea hydrolysis and NH₄Cl dissociation on pH was significantly different ($p < 0.05$, Fig. 1). Specifically, after urea hydrolysis completed, except for the basic TAN levels, the pH increased to around 9 for *M. thermophila*, *M. barkeri*, and *M. bourgensis*, which was outside of the pH limits (6.5-8.5) for AD process (Lay et al., 1998). This increase in pH after urea hydrolysis, was in agreement with a previous study (Udert et al., 2003) where elevated pH was observed alongside the extent of urea hydrolysis. The pH of *M. thermophilus* increased alongside the urea concentration, and it was about 8.5 at the highest TAN level (5000 mg NH₄⁺-N·L⁻¹). This different performance of *M. thermophilus* from the other strains could be explained by the stronger buffer capacity in *M. thermophilus* medium compared to the other media due to the higher NaHCO₃ concentration. In contrast, NH₄Cl dissociation did

not have any significant effect on the pH of batch reactors, with a maximum pH drop of approximately 0.3 units at the highest TAN levels ($10000 \text{ mg NH}_4^+-\text{N}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$). Therefore, it seems that NH_4Cl is not a representative ammonia source to simulate ammonia inhibition in AD reactors because, contrary to urea, it does not have an analogous pH effect.

Meanwhile, it also can be seen that a medium with strong buffer capacity could mitigate the effect of urea hydrolysis on pH (e.g. *M. thermophilus* case); thus, it is reasonable to suspect that the pH of manure-based AD reactors (high buffer capacity) would not increase in such a great extent. At the same time, without pH adjustment, the pure strains are not expected to grow with urea (except in the basic TAN concentrations), due to the unfavourable pH levels (> 8.5). Therefore, all the following methanogenesis batch experiments in assay II, were designed with a pH adjustment strategy (adjust the initial pH level to 7 and 8, respectively) to compare the effect of the two different ammonia sources on the pure methanogenic strains, independently of the pH.

3.2 Methanogenesis performance of different methanogens

3.2.1 Aceticlastic *M. thermophile* and *M. barkeri*

Urea had similar or significantly higher ($p<0.05$) inhibitory effect on both aceticlastic strains compared to NH_4Cl in the majority of the tested TAN levels. For example, NH_4Cl inhibited the methane production of *M. thermophila* by 58% at $5000 \text{ mg NH}_4^+-\text{N}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$ (pH=8); at the same time, urea inhibited the same strain more than 90% at $5000 \text{ mg NH}_4^+-\text{N}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$ for pH=7 and at all TAN levels above $3000 \text{ mg NH}_4^+-\text{N}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$ for pH=8 (Fig. 2a). The different inhibition effects were also reflected on the longer lag phases at the same ammonia levels for urea compared to NH_4Cl . To be specific, up to threefold longer lag phase periods were in urea reactors compared to NH_4Cl reactors (Table 3). Furthermore, at lower FAN levels ($< 151 \text{ mg NH}_3\text{-N}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$), μ_{max} of *M. thermophila* was between $0.04\text{-}0.06 \text{ h}^{-1}$ for both urea and NH_4Cl reactors coinciding with μ_{max} values reported before (Sowers et al., 1984; Mladenovska and

Ahring, 2000). However, NH_4Cl reactors had significantly higher μ_{max} compared to urea reactor for FAN levels above $151 \text{ mg NH}_3\text{-N}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$, which indicates a stronger inhibitory effect of urea (Fig. 2c).

M. barkeri was the most sensitive methanogenic strain to ammonia compared to all the other tested strains. Almost 100% inhibition was observed at $64 (5000 \text{ mg NH}_4^+\text{-N}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}, \text{pH}=7)$ and $89 \text{ mg NH}_3\text{-N}\cdot\text{L}^{-1} (7000 \text{ mg NH}_4^+\text{-N}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}, \text{pH}=7)$ for reactors with urea and with NH_4Cl , respectively (Fig.2b). These results were in accordance to previous studies reporting 50% inhibition of *M. barkeri* growth at $42 \text{ mg NH}_3\text{-N}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$ and more than 95% inhibition at $88 \text{ mg NH}_3\text{-N}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$ (Sprott and Patel, 1986; Hajarnis and Ranade, 1993). However, although complete inhibition occurred in most ammonia levels, for FAN levels lower than $64 \text{ mg NH}_3\text{-N}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$, where methanogenesis was observed, urea was clearly stronger inhibitor than NH_4Cl . Furthermore, urea prolonged the lag phase up to fourfold compared to NH_4Cl (Table 3). Even though *M. barkeri* was the most sensitive methanogenic strain tested in the present study, it had the highest μ_{max} of $0.11\text{-}0.12 \text{ h}^{-1}$ (optimal conditions), which decreased alongside with the increase of ammonia levels (Fig. 2d). Similar specific growth rates ($0.10\text{-}0.14 \text{ h}^{-1}$) of *M. barkeri* were reported by Jarrell et al. (1987) when TAN was below $1.4 \text{ NH}_4^+\text{-N}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$, and more than 50% reduction was detected around $4 \text{ NH}_4^+\text{-N}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$. However, no significant difference ($p>0.05$) of the μ_{max} can be found between urea and NH_4Cl reactors.

3.2.2 Hydrogenotrophic *M. thermophilus* and *M. bourgensis*

Overall, hydrogenotrophic methanogens were, as expected (Werner et al., 2014), more tolerant to NH_4Cl than the acetoclastic methanogens tested in the current study. Interestingly, it was also found that hydrogenotrophic methanogens were more tolerant to urea than acetoclastic methanogens. Nevertheless, similar to acetoclastic strains, urea also had a higher inhibitory effect on the hydrogenotrophic methanogens compared to NH_4Cl . However, there was an exception for *M. thermophilus* at low TAN levels ($< 3000 \text{ mg NH}_4^+\text{-N}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$), where

NH₄Cl seemed to be more toxic than urea (Fig. 3a). The reasons might be firstly, the pH of the urea reactors did not increase due to the strong buffer capacity of *M. thermophilus* medium as discussed previously; Secondly, NH₄Cl reactors suffered higher toxicity than urea reactors at the beginning because of the higher ammonia concentration from instant NH₄Cl dissociation compared to from the gradual urea hydrolysis process. However, at higher TAN levels (> 3000 mg NH₄⁺-N·L⁻¹), urea inhibited *M. thermophilus* significantly stronger ($p<0.05$) than NH₄Cl. All the *M. thermophilus* reactors had a lag phase smaller than 1.2 days (Table 4) maintaining a $\mu_{\max}$ between 0.03-0.04 h⁻¹ indicating that *M. thermophilus* was able to cope with the strong ammonia toxicity. This was in agreement with Wang et al. (2015) reporting no significant drop ($p>0.05$) on methane production at ammonia levels up to 7000 mg NH₄⁺-N·L⁻¹ for *M. thermophilus* with a $\mu_{\max}$ around 0.03 h⁻¹.

M. bourgensis was the most ammonia tolerant methanogenic strain tested in the current study, in which no more than 15% inhibition was observed, and independently of the ammonia sources, ammonia levels and pH levels (Fig.3b). This high tolerance was expected because *M. bourgensis* was reported (Fotidis et al., 2014) to thrive under high ammonia levels (5000 mg NH₄⁺-N L⁻¹). Moreover, Westerholm et al. (2015) observed that *M. bourgensis* was the dominant archaeon in AD reactors operated under high FAN levels (900 mg NH₃-N·L⁻¹), and Wang et al. (2015) also demonstrated that *M. bourgensis* can work properly at TAN levels up to 7000 mg NH₄⁺-N·L⁻¹. However, even with this tolerant methanogen, urea was proven more toxic than NH₄Cl, resulting in lag phases up to ten days for TAN levels above 5000 mg NH₄⁺-N·L⁻¹ (pH 8), compared to only two days lag phase for the NH₄Cl at the highest TAN levels. The same trend was observed among the specific growth rates, with significantly lower $\mu_{\max}$ for the urea reactors compared to NH₄Cl reactors in majority of the tested ammonia levels.

2353 The ammonia sources and the inhibition mechanism

276 In general, urea was a significantly stronger inhibitor than NH_4Cl (Table 5). This could be
 277 explained by the different manners that urea and NH_4Cl introduce TAN and FAN into the
 278 reactors. Specifically, NH_4Cl , as an easily soluble salt, can fully dissociate in aqueous phase
 279 immediately after its addition and the direct dissociative products are ammonium ions (Eq. 2),
 280 instead of the more toxic FAN form (Massé et al., 2014). On the contrary, urea, which is an
 281 organic compound, can only be hydrolysed slowly with the presence of urease, and produce
 282 directly FAN (Eq. (3)), which is the most toxic ammonia form (Zimmer, 2000). Therefore,
 283 relatively high FAN levels develop instantly after urea hydrolysis, before the final
 284 $\text{NH}_4^+ \rightleftharpoons \text{NH}_3$ equilibrium (Eq. 1) is established, driven by the pH and the temperature
 285 (Emerson et al., 1975). Compared to low FAN levels after NH_4Cl dissociation, this
 286 momentary exposure of the methanogenic cells to such high FAN concentrations after urea
 287 hydrolysis, could have a greater impact in their metabolic activity. Furthermore, NH_4Cl
 288 dissociation does not have a significant effect on the pH of the reactor and thus does not create
 289 unfavourable pH conditions for the methanogens. On contrary, urea hydrolysis without pH
 290 control could increase the pH of the reactor into unfavourable levels. Even though pH was
 291 adjusted constantly in the current experiment, until the hydrolysis of urea was completed, it
 292 was impossible to avoid a temporal pH increase during the urea hydrolysis period (details are
 293 provided in the E-supplement file). Thus the combined effect of momentary high FAN
 294 concentrations and pH increase, even for short time periods during the hydrolysis phase, is
 295 proposed as the main mechanism for the stronger inhibitory effect of urea compared to NH_4Cl
 296 on the pure methanogenic strains tested in this study.

297 4 Conclusions

298 The current study demonstrated that urea was significantly more toxic compared to NH_4Cl
 299 during AD process. Furthermore, urea hydrolysis resulted in a great pH increase to

unfavourable levels for methanogenic growth. However, a high buffer capacity can mitigate the pH increase and lower the ammonia toxicity from urea. Additionally, hydrogenotrophic methanogens were more tolerant, not only to NH_4Cl but also to urea, compared to acetoclastic methanogens. Finally, considering only pure strains were tested in this study, further studies in a more complex environment of real AD digesters are still needed to analyse the inhibition effect of urea.

Appendix A. Supplementary material

E-supplementary data for this work can be found in e-version of this paper online: Fig. S1. Preliminary urea hydrolysis test at different ammonia and pH levels with/ without urease under two different incubation temperatures, a) for thermophilic *M. thermophila* and b) for mesophilic *M. bourgensis*. Fig. S2. pH adjustment strategies to 7 and 8 at different urea concentrations for a) *M. thermophila*, b) *M. barkeri*, c) *M. thermophilus*, d) *M. bourgensis*

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by Energinet.dk under the project framework ForskEL “MicrobStop NH_3 -Innovative bioaugmentation strategies to tackle ammonia inhibition in anaerobic digestion process” (program no. 2015-12327). Hailin Tian would like to thank for the financial support from China Scholarship Council, and Konstantinos Kissas thanks Alexander S. Onassis Public Benefit Foundation for granting a scholarship. The authors thank Hector Garcia for his technical support during the experiments.

References

- [1] Angelidaki, I., Ahring, B., 1993. Thermophilic anaerobic digestion of livestock waste: the effect of ammonia. Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 38, 560-564.
- [2] Angelidaki, I., Karakashev, D., Batstone, D.J., Plugge, C.M., Stams, A.J., 2011. Biomethanation and its potential. Methods Enzymol. 494, 327-51.

- [3] Calli, B., Mertoglu, B., Inanc, B., Yenigun, O., 2005. Methanogenic diversity in anaerobic bioreactors under extremely high ammonia levels. *Enzyme Microb. Technol.* 37, 448-455.
- [4] Chen, H., Wang, W., Xue, L., Chen, C., Liu, G., Zhang, R., 2016. Effects of Ammonia on Anaerobic Digestion of Food Waste: Process Performance and Microbial Community. *Energy Fuels* 30, 5749-5757.
- [5] Chen, Y., Cheng, J.J., Creamer, K.S., 2008. Inhibition of anaerobic digestion process: a review. *Bioresour. Technol.* 99, 4044-64.
- [6] Chynoweth, D.P., Owens, J.M., Legrand, R., 2001. Renewable methane from anaerobic digestion of biomass. *Renewable Energy* 22, 1-8.
- [7] Ciurli, S., Benini, S., Rypniewski, W.R., Wilson, K.S., Miletto, S., Mangani, S., 1999. Structural properties of the nickel ions in urease: novel insights into the catalytic and inhibition mechanisms. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* 190, 331-355.
- [8] Cuetos, M.J., Gómez, X., Otero, M., Morán, A., 2008. Anaerobic digestion of solid slaughterhouse waste (SHW) at laboratory scale: Influence of co-digestion with the organic fraction of municipal solid waste (OFMSW). *Biochem. Eng. J.* 40, 99-106.
- [9] Dai, X., Hu, C., Zhang, D., Dai, L., Duan, N., 2017. Impact of a high ammonia-ammonium-pH system on methane-producing archaea and sulfate-reducing bacteria in mesophilic anaerobic digestion. *Bioresour. Technol.* 245, 598-605.
- [10] DSMZ. 2014a. 120. *Methanosarcina* medium, Leibniz-Institut DSMZ- Deutsche Sammlung von Mikroorganismen und Zellkulturen GmbH. German.
- [11] DSMZ. 2014b. 120a. *Methanosarcina barkeri* medium, Leibniz-Institut DSMZ - Deutsche Sammlung von Mikroorganismen und Zellkulturen GmbH.
- [12] DSMZ. 2017. 141. *Methanogenium* medium (H₂/CO₂), Leibniz-Institut DSMZ - Deutsche Sammlung von Mikroorganismen und Zellkulturen GmbH.

- [13] DSMZ. 2014c. 332. *Methanogenium bourgense* medium, Leibniz-Institut DSMZ - Deutsche Sammlung von Mikroorganismen und Zellkulturen GmbH.
- [14] Emerson, K., Russo, R.C., Lund, R.E., Thurston, R.V., 1975. Aqueous Ammonia Equilibrium Calculations: Effect of pH and Temperature. *J. Fish. Res. Board Can.* 32, 2379-2383.
- [15] Fotidis, I.A., Wang, H., Fiedel, N.R., Luo, G., Karakashev, D.B., Angelidaki, I., 2014. Bioaugmentation as a solution to increase methane production from an ammonia-rich substrate. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 48, 7669-76.
- [16] Gray, N.D., Sherry, A., Larter, S.R., Erdmann, M., Leyris, J., Liengen, T., Beeder, J., Head, I.M., 2009. Biogenic methane production in formation waters from a large gas field in the North Sea. *Extremophiles* 13, 511-9.
- [17] Hajarnis, S.R., Ranade, D.R., 1993. Revival of ammonia inhibited cultures of *Methanobacterium bryantii* and *Methanosarcina barkeri*. *J. Ferment. Bioeng.* 76, 70-72.
- [18] Holm-Nielsen, J.B., Al Seadi, T., Oleskowicz-Popiel, P., 2009. The future of anaerobic digestion and biogas utilization. *Bioresour. Technol.* 100, 5478-84.
- [19] Jarrell, K.F., Saulnier, M., Ley, A., 1987. Inhibition of methanogenesis in pure cultures by ammonia, fatty acids, and heavy metals, and protection against heavy metal toxicity by sewage sludge. *Can. J. Microbiol.* 33, 551-554.
- [20] Karakashev, D., Batstone, D.J., Angelidaki, I., 2005. Influence of environmental conditions on methanogenic compositions in anaerobic biogas reactors. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 71, 331-8.
- [21] Krajewska, B., 2009. Ureases I. Functional, catalytic and kinetic properties: A review. *J. Mol. Catal. B: Enzym.* 59, 9-21.

- [22] Lay, J.J., Li, Y.Y., Noike, T., 1998. The influence of pH and ammonia concentration on the methane production in high-solids digestion processes. *Water Environ. Res.* 70, 1075-1082.
- [23] Liu, T., Sung, S., 2002. Ammonia inhibition on thermophilic aceticlastic methanogens. *Water Sci. Technol.* 45, 113-120.
- [24] Massé, D.I., Rajagopal, R., Singh, G., 2014. Technical and operational feasibility of psychrophilic anaerobic digestion biotechnology for processing ammonia-rich waste. *Appl. Energy* 120, 49-55.
- [25] Mladenovska, Z., Ahring, B.K., 2000. Growth kinetics of thermophilic *Methanosarcina* spp. isolated from full-scale biogas plants treating animal manures. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.* 31, 225-229.
- [26] Mobley, H., Island, M.D., Hausinger, R.P., 1995. Molecular biology of microbial ureases. *Microbiol. Rev.* 59, 451-480.
- [27] Møller, H.B., Sommer, S.G., Ahring, B.K., 2004. Biological Degradation and Greenhouse Gas Emissions during Pre-Storage of Liquid Animal Manure. *J. Environ. Qual.* 33, 27-36.
- [28] Rajagopal, R., Massé, D.I., Singh, G., 2013. A critical review on inhibition of anaerobic digestion process by excess ammonia. *Bioresour. Technol.* 143, 632-641.
- [29] Riffat, R., Krongthamchat, K., 2006. Specific methanogenic activity of halophilic and mixed cultures in saline wastewater. *Int. J. Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2, 291-299.
- [30] Schnürer, A., Zellner, G., Svensson, B.H., 1999. Mesophilic syntrophic acetate oxidation during methane formation in biogas reactors. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.* 29, 249-261.

- [31] Siles, J., Brekelmans, J., Martin, M., Chica, A., Martin, A., 2010. Impact of ammonia and sulphate concentration on thermophilic anaerobic digestion. *Bioresour. Technol.* 101, 9040-9048.
- [32] Sowers, K.R., Nelson, M.J., Ferry, J.G., 1984. Growth of acetotrophic, methane-producing bacteria in a pH auxostat. *Curr. Microbiol.* 11, 227-229.
- [33] Sprott, G.D., Patel, G.B., 1986. Ammonia toxicity in pure cultures of methanogenic bacteria. *Syst. Appl. Microbiol.* 7, 358-363.
- [34] Sterling, M., Lacey, R., Engler, C., Riche, S., 2001. Effects of ammonia nitrogen on H₂ and CH₄ production during anaerobic digestion of dairy cattle manure. *Bioresour. Technol.* 77, 9-18.
- [35] Sung, S., Liu, T., 2003. Ammonia inhibition on thermophilic anaerobic digestion. *Chemosphere* 53, 43-52.
- [36] Tian, H., Fotidis, I.A., Mancini, E., Angelidaki, I., 2017. Different cultivation methods to acclimatise ammonia-tolerant methanogenic consortia. *Bioresour. Technol.* 232, 1-9.
- [37] Udert, K.M., Larsen, T.A., Biebow, M., Gujer, W., 2003. Urea hydrolysis and precipitation dynamics in a urine-collecting system. *Water Res.* 37, 2571-2582.
- [38] Viana, M.B., Freitas, A.V., Leitão, R.C., Pinto, G.A.S., Santaella, S.T., 2012. Anaerobic digestion of crude glycerol: a review. *Environ. Technol. Rev.* 1, 81-92.
- [39] Wang, H., Fotidis, I.A., Angelidaki, I., 2015. Ammonia effect on hydrogenotrophic methanogens and syntrophic acetate-oxidizing bacteria. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.* 91.
- [40] Werner, J.J., Garcia, M.L., Perkins, S.D., Yarasheski, K.E., Smith, S.R., Muegge, B.D., Stadermann, F.J., DeRito, C.M., Floss, C., Madsen, E.L., 2014. Microbial community dynamics and stability during an ammonia-induced shift to syntrophic acetate oxidation. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 80, 3375-3383.

- [41] Westerholm, M., Leven, L., Schnurer, A., 2012. Bioaugmentation of syntrophic acetate-oxidizing culture in biogas reactors exposed to increasing levels of ammonia. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 78, 7619-25.
- [42] Westerholm, M., Müller, B., Isaksson, S., Schnürer, A., 2015. Trace element and temperature effects on microbial communities and links to biogas digester performance at high ammonia levels. *Biotechnol. Biofuels* 8, 154.
- [43] Yenigün, O., Demirel, B., 2013. Ammonia inhibition in anaerobic digestion: A review. *Process Biochem.* 48, 901-911.
- [44] Zimmer, M., 2000. Molecular Mechanics Evaluation of the Proposed Mechanisms for the Degradation of Urea by Urease. *J. Biomol. Struct. Dyn.* 17, 787-797.

Figure legends

Fig. 1. pH value after the hydrolysis of the urea and the dissolution of the NH_4Cl at different ammonia levels, a) *M. thermophila*, b) *M. barkeri*, c) *M. thermophilus*, d) *M. bourgensis*

Fig. 2. Final methane production inhibition and μ_{max} of *M. thermophila* and *M. barkeri* under different ammonia sources, ammonia levels and pH levels, a) inhibition of *M. thermophila*, b) inhibition of *M. barkeri*, c) μ_{max} of *M. thermophila*, d) μ_{max} of *M. barkeri*.

Fig. 3. Final methane production inhibition and μ_{max} of *M. thermophilus* and *M. bourgensis* under different ammonia sources, ammonia levels and pH levels, a) inhibition of *M. thermophilus*, b) inhibition of *M. bourgensis*, c) μ_{max} of *M. thermophilus*, d) μ_{max} of *M. bourgensis*.

445 **Table 1.** Different ammonia levels for the two ammonia sources in Assay I.

Strains	Ammonia sources	TAN (mg $\text{NH}_4^+\text{-N}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$) *
<i>M. thermophila</i>	$\text{CO}(\text{NH}_2)_2$	130, 2000, 3000, 4000 and 5000
	NH_4Cl	130, 3000 and 5000
<i>M. barkeri</i>	$\text{CO}(\text{NH}_2)_2$	130, 3000, 5000, 7000 and 10000
	NH_4Cl	130, 5000 and 10000
<i>M. thermophilus</i>	$\text{CO}(\text{NH}_2)_2$	70, 2000, 3000, 4000 and 5000
	NH_4Cl	70, 3000 and 5000
<i>M. bourgensis</i>	$\text{CO}(\text{NH}_2)_2$	260, 3000, 5000, 7000 and 10000
	NH_4Cl	260, 5000 and 10000

446 * The lowest TAN level is the basic ammonia levels of the medium.

447

Table 2. Different ammonia and pH levels under the two different ammonia sources of Assay

II.

Strains	TAN (mg $\text{NH}_4^+\text{-N}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$) *	Ammonia sources	pH levels
<i>M. thermophila</i>	130, 2000, 3000, 4000 and 5000	NH_4Cl , $\text{CO}(\text{NH}_2)_2$	7, 8
<i>M. barkeri</i>	130, 3000, 5000, 7000 and 10000	NH_4Cl , $\text{CO}(\text{NH}_2)_2$	7, 8
<i>M. thermophilus</i>	70, 2000, 3000, 4000 and 5000	NH_4Cl , $\text{CO}(\text{NH}_2)_2$	7, 8
<i>M. bourgensis</i>	260, 3000, 5000, 7000 and 10000	NH_4Cl , $\text{CO}(\text{NH}_2)_2$	7, 8

* The lowest TAN level is the basic ammonia levels of the medium.

Table 3. Lag phase (days) of *M. thermophila* and *M. barkeri* under different experimental conditions.

Strains	Ammonia sources	pH	TAN levels (mg NH ₄ ⁺ -N·L ⁻¹)				
			130 (130) *	2000 (3000)	3000 (5000)	4000 (7000)	5000 (10000)
<i>M. thermophila</i>	NH ₄ Cl	7	0	0	0	0	0
		8	7.0 ± 3.0	11.0 ± 6.2	17.5 ± 7.5	32.6 ± 7.6	ND **
	CO(NH ₂) ₂	7	0	0	3.6 ± 0.5	4.4 ± 0.5	ND
		8	3.6 ± 1.9	33.0 ± 6.2	ND	ND	ND
<i>M. barkeri</i>	NH ₄ Cl	7	1.0	6.9	32.8 ± 5.9	ND	ND
		8	0.9	ND	ND	ND	ND
	CO(NH ₂) ₂	7	1.1	24.8 ± 8.0	ND	ND	ND
		8	1.2	ND	ND	ND	ND

*Numbers outside parentheses were ammonia concentrations for *M. thermophila*, and the ones inside for *M. barkeri*.

** ND: Not defined.

Table 4. Lag phase (days) of *M. thermophilus* and *M. bourgensis* under different experimental situation.

Strains	Ammonia sources	pH	TAN levels (mg NH ₄ ⁺ -N·L ⁻¹)				
			70	2000	3000	4000	5000
			(260)*	(3000)	(5000)	(7000)	(10000)
<i>M. thermophilus</i>	NH ₄ Cl	7	0	0	0	0	0
		8	0	1.2 ± 0.5	1.2 ± 0.5	1.2 ± 0.8	0.9 ± 0.7
	CO(NH ₂) ₂	7	0	0	0	0	0
		8	0	0	0	0	0
<i>M. bourgensis</i>	NH ₄ Cl	7	0	0	0	0	0
		8	0	0	0	0	2.0
	CO(NH ₂) ₂	7	0	0	0	0	0
		8	0	1.0	2.7 ± 0.5	4.3	10.1

*Numbers outside parentheses were the ammonia concentrations for *M. thermophilus*, and the ones inside for *M. bourgensis*.

Table 5. Overall comparison of highest methane production inhibition of all strains.

Strains	pH	NH ₄ Cl	CO(NH ₂) ₂
<i>M. thermophila</i> *	7	22.9 ± 0.9 %	91.0 ± 0.8 %
	8	57.9 ± 0.5 %	98.5 ± 0.2 %
<i>M. barkeri</i> **	7	99.4 ± 0 %	99.4 ± 0.1 %
	8	99.5 ± 0 %	99.6 ± 0.1 %
<i>M. thermophilus</i> *	7	3.8 ± 2.7 %	0%
	8	28.7 ± 1.2 %	42.2 ± 6.6 %
<i>M. bourgensis</i> *	7	3.1 ± 0.8 %	28.7 ± 1.2 %
	8	6.8 ± 0.7 %	15.2 ± 1.0 %

* Detected under the highest ammonia levels, specifically, for both pH levels, 5000 mg NH₄⁺-N·L⁻¹ for *M. thermophila* and *M. thermophilus*, and 10000 mg NH₄⁺-N·L⁻¹ for *M. bourgensis*.

** Detected under a relatively low ammonia levels, specifically, 7000 and 5000 mg NH₄⁺-N·L⁻¹ at pH 7 for NH₄Cl and urea, respectively, and 3000 mg NH₄⁺-N·L⁻¹ at pH 8 for both.

Highlights

- Urea hydrolysis increases reactor pH significantly more than ammonium chloride
- Urea is more toxic to methanogenic archaea than ammonium chloride
- Combined high free ammonia and pH levels is the toxicity mechanism of urea
- Hydrogenotrophic methanogens are more robust than acetoclastic methanogens to urea