Intermittent Aeration Suppresses Nitrite-Oxidizing Bacteria in Membrane-Aerated Biofilms: A Model-Based Explanation

Ma, Yunjie; Domingo Felez, Carlos; Plósz, Benedek G.; Smets, Barth F.

Published in:
Environmental Science and Technology

Link to article, DOI:
[10.1021/acs.est.7b00463](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b00463)

Publication date:
2017

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):
Ma, Y., Domingo Felez, C., Plósz, B. G., & Smets, B. F. (2017). Intermittent Aeration Suppresses Nitrite-Oxidizing Bacteria in Membrane-Aerated Biofilms: A Model-Based Explanation. *Environmental Science and Technology*, 51(11), 6146-6155. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b00463>

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.

1 Suppression of Nitrite-Oxidizing Bacteria in Intermittently 2 Membrane-Aerated Biofilms: A Model-Based Explanation

3 Yunjie Ma, Carlos Domingo-Félez, Benedek Gy. Plósz,[†] and Barth F. Smets^{*†}

4 Department of Environmental Engineering, Technical University of Denmark, Miljøvej Building 113, 2800 Kongens Lyngby,
5 Denmark

6 Supporting Information

7 **ABSTRACT:** Autotrophic ammonium oxidation in membrane-aerated biofilm reactors (MABRs) can make treatment of
8 ammonium-rich wastewaters more energy-efficient, especially within the context of short-cut ammonium removal. The challenge
9 is to exclusively enrich ammonium-oxidizing bacteria (AOB). To achieve nitrification, strategies to suppress nitrite-oxidizing
10 bacteria (NOB) are needed, which are ideally grounded on an understanding of underlying mechanisms. In this study, a counter-
11 diffusion nitrifying biofilm reactor was operated under intermittent aeration. During eight months of operation, AOB dominated,
12 while NOB were suppressed. On the basis of dissolved oxygen (DO), ammonium, nitrite, and nitrate profiles within the biofilm
13 and in the bulk, a 1-dimensional nitrifying biofilm model was developed and calibrated. The model was utilized to explore the
14 potential mechanisms of NOB suppression associated with intermittent aeration, considering DO limitation, direct pH effects on
15 enzymatic activities, and indirect pH effects on activity via substrate speciation. The model predicted strong periodic shifts in the
16 spatial gradients of DO, pH, free ammonia, and free nitrous acid, associated with aerated and nonaerated phases. NOB
17 suppression during intermittent aeration was mostly explained by periodic inhibition caused by free ammonia due to transient
18 periodic pH upshifts. Dissolved oxygen limitation did not govern NOB suppression. Different intermittent aeration strategies
19 were then evaluated for nitrification success in intermittently aerated MABRs: both aeration intermittency and duration were
20 effective control parameters.

1. INTRODUCTION

21 Short-cut ammonium (NH_4^+) removal via nitrite (NO_2^-) is
22 more energy- and cost-efficient than traditional NH_4^+ removal
23 via nitrate (NO_3^-) due to reduced aeration and external
24 electron donor requirements.^{1–3} This process requires full
25 nitrification (oxidation of all NH_4^+ to NO_2^-) and zero nitrification
26 (oxidation of none of the NO_2^- to NO_3^-): in other words,
27 minimal activity of nitrite-oxidizing bacteria (NOB) and
28 maximal activity of ammonium-oxidizing bacteria (AOB).
29 Similar conditions, with only partial nitrification, can also be
30 exploited to convert NH_4^+ to a 50:50 mixture of NO_2^- and
31 NH_4^+ , which can then be coupled to anoxic NH_4^+ oxidation to
32 attain even more resource efficient ammonium removal.^{4,5}

33 Various conditions have been successfully tested to suppress
34 NOB over AOB activity or wash-out NOB over AOB biomass
35 to attain nitrification in suspended growth systems. They include
36 the operation of bioreactors at limited dissolved oxygen (DO)
37 concentrations,⁶ at high temperature combined with low solids

retention times,¹ and at elevated free ammonia (FA) and/or
38 free nitrous acid (FNA) concentrations.⁷ In all cases, NOB
39 suppression or outcompetition versus AOB is based on
40 differential growth kinetics. Sometimes, the proper choice of
41 system inoculum also accelerates AOB over NOB selection.⁸ In
42 contrast, maintaining long-term nitrification in biofilm-based
43 reactors can be more challenging⁹ due to long solids retention
44 times in biofilms that interfere with outcompetition based on
45 kinetic principles. Finding operational conditions and confirm-
46 ing mechanisms that suppress NOB in biofilms remain a
47 challenge. On the one hand, the existence of strong spatial
48 chemical gradients (e.g., of DO, pH, and nitrogenous species)
49 in nitrifying biofilms¹⁰ makes it difficult to prescribe environ-
50

Received: January 24, 2017

Revised: April 26, 2017

Accepted: April 27, 2017

Published: April 27, 2017

mental conditions that favor AOB over NOB in the system. On the other hand, the existence of multiple simultaneous chemical gradients complicates identification of the underlying mechanism(s) that suppresses NOB. For example, pH and DO gradients occur simultaneously in active nitrifying biofilms;¹¹ it is difficult to unravel to what extent nitrification failure or success is associated with the differential effect of oxygen (AOB and NOB having different oxygen affinities)¹² or the differential effects of pH (AOB and NOB responding differently to pH, as a consequence of the pH-dependent maximum growth rates^{13,14} and the pH-dependent speciation of FA and FNA which act as both substrates and inhibitors).

Mathematical models are one way to describe multiple processes that occur simultaneously in time and space in nitrifying biofilms.^{15,16} A multispecies nitrifying biofilm model (MSNBM) was explicitly developed to study the competition between AOB and NOB; effects of DO, pH, FA, and FNA on growth kinetics were incorporated in a spatially explicit way to evaluate operational conditions for NOB suppression in codiffusion biofilms.^{3,17} Park et al.¹⁷ showed that FA inhibition of NOB was more efficient in nascent biofilms (when residual NH_4^+ was still high), but that DO limitation was the dominant mechanism of NOB suppression in established biofilms. Besides bulk DO and influent NH_4^+ concentration, the model suggested that bulk buffer capacity was another means to manipulate NOB suppression by affecting pH gradients within biofilms.

While AOB/NOB competition in conventional codiffusion biofilms has been studied in some detail,^{3,17,18} there are less studies on AOB/NOB competition in the context of nitrification in counter-diffusion biofilms. Counter-diffusion biofilms develop in membrane-aerated biofilm reactors (MABRs), where air delivery is via the biofilm base.¹⁹ MABRs have been broadly explored for autotrophic N removal.^{11,20,21} In counter-diffusion nitrifying MABRs, active bacteria thrive at the base of the biofilm, where they utilize oxygen supplied from the membrane lumen. Growth of bacteria, including NOB, at the biofilm base would limit the chance for outcompetition, once established, due to spatial protection by the overlying biofilm layers. Efficient operation of MABRs to attain long-term nitrification has, to our knowledge, not been documented, with the exception of one, highly loaded (33 g-N/m²/day), fully NH_4^+ penetrated MABR where controlling DO concentrations at the membrane-biofilm interface sufficed to maintain nitrification.²²

Recently, Pellicer-Nàcher et al.²¹ observed that fully nitrified MABRs accumulated NO_2^- immediately after switching from continuous to intermittent aeration, even at elevated oxygen loadings. The causal link between nitrification onset and aeration regime change was not explored. Here, we report additional experimental evidence of NOB suppression in intermittently aerated MABRs and we develop and calibrate an improved MSNBM incorporating explicit pH calculation. Using the calibrated model, we systematically evaluate potential causes for NOB suppression associated with intermittent aeration. From this analysis, we identify the periodic FA inhibition, caused by transient pH upshifts and decreases at the biofilm base, as the likely key cause for NOB suppression. A suitable operational window for an effective nitrification control in counter-diffusion systems is finally proposed.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Reactor Operation and Measurement Methods.

2.1.1. Reactor Configuration and Operation. The counter-diffusion MABRs consisted of two tubular gas filled PDMS membranes (3100506, Labmarket, Germany), both fixed in parallel to their longer dimension (Figure S1). The system had a liquid volume of 0.83 L (reactors: 31.5 × 5 × 3.5 cm) and was inoculated with enriched nitrifying biomass.²¹ To start up the system, the reactor was first run in a batch mode with an initial NH_4^+ concentration at 300 mg-N/L and continuous aeration. The onset of NH_4^+ consumption without oxygen accumulation in the bulk suggested biomass attachment around the membranes. Subsequently, the MABR was operated in continuous flow mode under intermittent aeration. Synthetic wastewater was fed continuously with an NH_4^+ concentration at 75 mg-N/L and without external organic carbon. Hydraulic retention time was 12 h. The intermittent aeration strategy consisted of a 6 h aeration period (100% air) followed by a 6 h nonaeration period (100% N_2). The aeration cycles were controlled by a set of solenoid valves, and the pressure in the lumen was 35 kPa. The bulk phase was completely mixed by recirculating at 1.5 L/min. DO and pH were measured with electrodes in the recirculation line (CelloX 325 and Sentix 41, WTW, Germany). Bulk pH was not controlled and remained at 7.2 ± 0.2 due to adequate buffer capacity (molar ratio in the influent: $\text{HCO}_3^-/\text{NH}_4^+ = 2.1$). Reactor temperature was at 32.5 ± 0.7 °C, which was above ambient temperature due to the unintentional heat added by the recirculation pump. The working temperature was not controlled to a lower value, as temperature effect on nitrification success in MABRs is minor.^{23,24} N concentrations (NH_4^+ , NO_2^- , and NO_3^-) were measured with colorimetric test kits (Spectroquant 14776, 00683, 09713; Merck, Germany).

2.1.2. Microelectrode Measurements. Commercially available DO microelectrode (OX-10, Unisense, Denmark) and lab-made potentiometric microelectrodes for NH_4^+ , NO_2^- , and NO_3^- ²⁵ were used for in situ profiling measurements within the biofilm. Profiling measurements were performed after biofilms reached steady state. Microelectrodes were controlled by a motorized micromanipulator to a precision up to 10 μm and began from the top of the biofilm. During measurements, the influent and recirculation were kept unchanged. For each profile, replicates ($n > 3$) were made and the average was considered in model fitting. Besides calibration following the protocols, the signal drift of N-species sensors over time was corrected by measuring N concentrations from effluent before and after profiling.

2.2. Model Development. The MSNBM is a one-dimensional model based on Terada et al.,²⁶ incorporating additional explicit pH calculation (Table S1). It was implemented in AQUASIM V2.1 with two compartments: a completely mixed gas compartment and a biofilm compartment containing biofilm and bulk liquid.²⁷ In the counter-diffusion regime, a physical diffusion link connects the gas compartment to the base of the biofilm, defined as

$$A \times k_{M,i} \left(\frac{1}{H_i} C_{i,\text{air}} - C_{i,\text{base}} \right) \quad (1)$$

where $C_{i,\text{air}}$ and $C_{i,\text{base}}$ are concentrations of carbon dioxide (CO_2) or oxygen (O_2) in the gas compartment and at the biofilm base (mg/L), H is the nondimensional Henry's Law coefficient (1.32 for CO_2 , 34.55 for O_2 , 33 °C), and $k_{M,i}$ is the

silicone membrane gas mass transfer coefficient ($k_{M,O_2} = 6$ m/d, $k_{M,CO_2} = 0.8$ m/d, Table S3). Gas transfer of N_2 and NH_3 is not modeled. Other major modeling assumptions, regarding biofilm structure, diffusion mass transfer, and boundary layer thickness, are as in Terada et al.²⁶ Process rate expressions are shown in Table S2. The calibrated nitrification model incorporating pH is available from the corresponding author.

2.2.1. Biological Processes. The MSNBM includes 3 active microbial groups, AOB, NOB, and heterotrophs (HB), and inerts accumulated during decay processes. For the two-step nitrification process, FA and FNA are considered as true substrates for growth and inhibition in nitrification and nitrification.²⁸ The growth rate expressions are described as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{AOB: } \mu_{\text{AOB}} \times X_{\text{AOB}} \times \frac{S_{O_2}}{K_{O_2}^{\text{AOB}} + S_{O_2}} \\ \times \frac{S_{\text{FA}}}{K_{\text{FA}}^{\text{AOB}} + S_{\text{FA}} + S_{\text{FA}} \times S_{\text{FA}}/K_{\text{I,FA}}^{\text{AOB}}} \times \frac{K_{\text{I,FNA}}^{\text{AOB}}}{K_{\text{I,FNA}}^{\text{AOB}} + S_{\text{FNA}}} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{NOB: } \mu_{\text{NOB}} \times X_{\text{NOB}} \times \frac{S_{O_2}}{K_{O_2}^{\text{NOB}} + S_{O_2}} \\ \times \frac{S_{\text{FNA}}}{K_{\text{FNA}}^{\text{NOB}} + S_{\text{FNA}} + S_{\text{FNA}} \times S_{\text{FNA}}/K_{\text{I,FNA}}^{\text{NOB}}} \times \frac{K_{\text{I,FA}}^{\text{NOB}}}{K_{\text{I,FA}}^{\text{NOB}} + S_{\text{FA}}} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where μ is the specific growth rate coefficient (1/day), dependent on local pH and μ_{max} ; S_{O_2} , S_{FA} , and S_{FNA} are O_2 , FA, and FNA concentrations (mg/L), respectively; K_{O_2} , K_{FA} , and K_{FNA} are half-saturation coefficients (mg/L); $K_{\text{I,FA}}$ and $K_{\text{I,FNA}}$ are inhibition coefficients (mg/L). Growth substrate inhibition (FA for AOB, FNA for NOB) is incorporated with the Andrews equation. Other types of inhibition (FA for NOB, FNA for AOB) are described with a noncompetitive inhibition term, as routinely done in similar studies.^{28,29}

For the denitrification process, NO_2^- and NO_3^- are modeled as separate electron acceptors. To avoid unnecessary complexity and focus on AOB/NOB competition, no intermediates (NO or N_2O) are considered. Bacteria have different decay rates in aeration and nonaeration periods: to simplify the model, AOB/NOB are assumed not to decay under anoxic or anaerobic conditions;³⁰ meanwhile, HB decay is modified by an anoxic reduction factor during nonaeration periods.

2.2.2. Chemical Process: pH Calculation. The one-dimensional model can keep track of local pH changes perpendicular to the membrane substratum. pH along biofilm depth is calculated on the basis of the proton production via nitrification and consumption via denitrification, the equilibrium reaction with bicarbonate buffer, and CO_2 stripping to the membrane lumen. The consumption of inorganic carbon for autotrophic growth is neglected as it has insignificant influence on pH changes under conditions when inorganic carbon is not limiting.

Protons produced and consumed in bioprocesses are listed in the stoichiometry matrix. The acid–base balance reaction with bicarbonate buffer is assumed to occur much faster than biological processes.³¹

$$H^+ + HCO_3^- \leftrightarrow H_2CO_3(CO_2) \quad \text{rate: } \left(\frac{S_{HCO_3^-} \times S_H}{K_{a,HCO_3}} - S_{CO_2} \right) \times 10^7 \quad (4)$$

where S_H , $S_{HCO_3^-}$, and $S_{H_2CO_3(CO_2)}$ are concentrations of proton, bicarbonate, and the sum of carbonic acid and dissolved carbon dioxide, respectively ($\mu\text{mol/L}$); K_{a,HCO_3} is the dissociation equilibrium constant of carbonic acid ($0.574 \mu\text{mol/L}$, 33°C , 1 atm). Protons produced in the nitrification process titrate HCO_3^- to H_2CO_3 , and oversaturated CO_2 diffuses from the biofilm base to the membrane lumen (eq 1). Acid–base reactions with phosphate ions were minor and neglected, as the molar ratio of $H_2PO_4^-/HCO_3^-$ in influent was lower than 3%.

2.2.3. Limitations/Inhibitions of AOB/NOB Activity. The growth rate expressions of AOB and NOB consider DO and pH effects. DO limitation is assessed by oxygen affinity constants. Two pH effects are included. (1) pH–enzyme effect: pH can affect nitrifying activity directly by changing the enzyme reaction mechanism or increasing the demand for maintenance energy.^{31,32} A Gaussian bell-shaped curve is chosen to model the pH–enzyme dependency of specific growth rates.¹³

$$\mu = \frac{\mu_{\text{max}}}{2} \left\{ 1 + \cos \left[\frac{\pi}{\omega} \times (pH - pH_{\text{opt}}) \right] \right\} \quad |pH - pH_{\text{opt}}| < \omega \quad (5)$$

where μ_{max} is the maximum specific growth rate at the optimal pH, pH_{opt} and ω is the pH range within which μ is larger than a half of μ_{max} ; (2) pH substrate-speciation effect: local pH values determine FA/FNA speciation from total NH_4^+/NO_2^- . The speciation between ionized/un-ionized species is assumed at instantaneous equilibrium.³³

$$S_{\text{FA}} = \frac{K_{a,NH_3} \times S_{NH_4}}{S_H} \quad S_{\text{FNA}} = \frac{S_{NO_2} \times S_H}{K_{a,NO_2}} \quad (6)$$

where K_{a,NH_3} and K_{a,NO_2} are dissociation equilibrium constants of ammonium and nitrous acid, respectively (0.000794 and $628.96 \mu\text{mol/L}$ (33°C , 1 atm)). Substrate speciation will result in differential degrees of FA/FNA inhibition.

2.3. Sensitivity Analysis and Parameter Estimation. To investigate the most determinant parameters on reactor performance, a sensitivity analysis was performed. Initial values of kinetic parameters were taken from the ASM model.²⁸ The optimal pH ranges for AOB and NOB growth kinetics (pH_{opt} and ω) were from Park et al.¹³ The temperature correction for μ_{max} and b_{max} are from Hao et al.³⁴ The MSNBM was first run in continuous aeration with default values for 300 days to achieve a stable nitrifying biofilm. Then, a local sensitivity analysis was performed after switching to intermittent aeration, giving the individual parameter a 100% value change while all others remained constant.²⁷ Reactor performances were evaluated in terms of ammonium removal efficiency (ARE, $\frac{S_{NH_4,\text{in}} - S_{NH_4,\text{eff}}}{S_{NH_4,\text{in}}} \%$), nitrate production efficiency (NaE, $\frac{S_{NO_3,\text{eff}}}{S_{NH_4,\text{in}} - S_{NH_4,\text{eff}}} \%$), nitrification efficiency (NE, $\frac{S_{NO_2,\text{eff}}}{S_{NH_4,\text{in}} - S_{NH_4,\text{eff}}} \%$) and NOB fraction (fNOB, $\frac{NOB}{NOB + AOB} \%$). The normalized sensitivity function is defined as,

$$\delta_j = \sqrt{\text{average}(\text{Sens}_{i,j}^2)} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Sens}_{i,j} = p_{i,j} \frac{\Delta y_j}{\Delta p_{i,j}} \quad (7)$$

where δ_j , y_j , and $p_{i,j}$ are the sensitivity function, the output reactor performances (ARE, NaE, NE, or fNOB), and the input parameters, respectively. $Sens_{i,j}$ was evaluated at different times during the aeration cycles (time interval of 0.01 day) and at 20 equidistant points within the biofilm or 1 point in the bulk phase. The averaged value was considered in the sensitivity analysis, and parameter sensitivity was ranked for each targeted performance metric. We focused on biokinetic and stoichiometric parameters related to AOB and NOB, as HB parameters are of secondary importance in nitrifying biofilms.³⁵

The most sensitive parameters were calibrated with steady state experimental data. The model calibration was carried out by trial and error through adjusting the parameter values one by one to minimize the fitting error. Root mean squared error was used to assess the quality of model-data fit as the objective function,

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\text{average} \left(\sum_j \sum_i \left(\frac{y_{\text{model},i,j} - y_{\text{meas},i,j}}{y_{\text{meas},j,\text{average}}} \right)^2 \right)} \quad (8)$$

where j is the targeted variable measured or estimated (NH_4^+ , NO_2^- , NO_3^- , and DO) and i is a sample point along biofilm depth ($i = 20$). The model was validated with additional experimental data from this MABR and experimental data from a separate membrane-aerated biofilm reactor (MABR2) operated under 4 different ammonium surface loadings (Table S5, detailed description of the experimental data used in model calibration and validation).³⁶ The calibrated parameters were checked by comparing RMSE in the calibration with RMSE in the validation and the Janus coefficient (J) was calculated,³⁷

$$J^2 = \frac{RMSE_{\text{val}}^2}{RMSE_{\text{cal}}^2} \quad (9)$$

2.4. Model Simulations. The calibrated MSNBM was run in 3 scenarios (Table S6, detailed description of each simulation scenario):

- (1) To validate the model with extra experimental data, the calibrated MSNBM was ran in intermittent aeration (6 h aeration period and 6 h nonaeration period) under different NH_4^+ surface loadings or in continuous aeration in a batch test. Then, the determinant factor(s) that govern NOB suppression in this MABR was explored with the validated model.
- (2) To clarify why NOB suppression occurred after switching to intermittent aeration from continuous aeration, the model was run in continuous aeration to achieve a nitrifying biofilm; then, aeration was switched to the same intermittent aeration as scenario 1.
- (3) To optimize the operational window for nitrification in intermittently aerated MABRs, different intermittent aeration strategies and influent concentrations were simulated in MSNBM after achieving a nitrifying biofilm in continuous aeration. The effects of aeration intermittency and residual NH_4^+ (FA) concentrations on NOB suppression were evaluated.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Model Calibration and Evaluation. A sensitivity analysis, considering the sum of reactor performances (ARE,

NaE, NE, and fNOB), was calculated to rank parameters (Figure S2). The most sensitive parameter is $\mu_{\text{max}}^{\text{AOB}}$, followed by $K_{\text{I,FA}}^{\text{AOB}}$, $\mu_{\text{max}}^{\text{NOB}}$, $K_{\text{I,FA}}^{\text{NOB}}$, $K_{\text{O}_2}^{\text{AOB}}$, and $K_{\text{O}_2}^{\text{NOB}}$. The ranking shows that μ_{max} is the most determinant among all kinetic parameters in nitrogen conversion simulations. It is consistent with the sensitivity analysis of Wang et al.³⁵ who ranked kinetic parameters in terms of nitrification performance and biofilm development in nitrifying biofilm reactors. The higher sensitivity regarding performance within the biofilm (Figure S2B) versus the bulk (Figure S2A) suggests that in situ microprofiling data is more informative in model calibration than bulk measurements, which were typically used.^{22,38} Therefore, microprofiling measurements (NH_4^+ , NO_2^- , NO_3^- , and DO) in the first aeration hour at steady state were used to calibrate sensitive parameter(s). Microprofiles in the last aeration hour (NH_4^+ , NO_2^- , NO_3^- , and DO) and bulk profiles during an intermittent aeration cycle (NH_4^+ , NO_2^- , NO_3^- , DO, and pH) representing the reactor performance at steady state were used for validation. Additional validation of the model and its parameter estimates was obtained by fitting the initial reactor performance (NH_4^+ , NO_2^- , and NO_3^-) when operated in batch start-up mode and by fitting the biofilm performance (NH_4^+ , NO_2^- , NO_3^- , and pH) of a separately operated MABR under different NH_4^+ surface loadings.

By fitting the most sensitive parameter, $\mu_{\text{max}}^{\text{AOB}}$, in the reported range,¹² the RMSE decreased to 0.5 and the deviation in NO_3^- fitting contributed the most to the error. Thus, the next most sensitive parameter, $\mu_{\text{max}}^{\text{NOB}}$, in NO_3^- sensitivity ranking (Figure S3) was added to the calibration and RMSE decreased to 0.1. Values of $\mu_{\text{max}}^{\text{AOB}}$ and $\mu_{\text{max}}^{\text{NOB}}$ were within a reasonable range: the estimated maximum growth rates at the optimal pH were 2.35 d^{-1} for AOB and 2.15 d^{-1} for NOB (Table 1). In the data

Table 1. Kinetic Parameter Values of AOB and NOB in the Calibrated Model

kinetic parameters	AOB	NOB	references
μ_{max} : the maximum specific growth rate, 1/d	2.35 (2.72 ^a)	2.15 (1.75 ^a)	this study
K_{O_2} : half-saturation coefficient for O_2 , mg/L	0.6	1.2	Hiatt and Grady ²⁸
Y : autotrophic yield, mgCOD/mgN	0.18	0.06	Hiatt and Grady ²⁸
$K_{\text{FA}}^{\text{AOB}}$, $K_{\text{FA}}^{\text{NOB}}$: half-saturation coefficient, mg/L	0.0075	0.0001	Hiatt and Grady ²⁸
$K_{\text{I,FA}}$: free ammonia inhibition coefficient, mg/L	1	0.2	Hiatt and Grady ²⁸
$K_{\text{I,FNA}}$: free nitrous acid inhibition coefficient, mg/L	0.1	0.04	Hiatt and Grady ²⁸
b_{max} : decay coefficient, 1/d	0.17	0.073	Hao et al. ³⁴
pH_{opt} (ω): optimal pH	8.4(3.2)	7.7(2.4)	Park et al. ¹³

^aDefault growth rates in ASM1N with temperature correction (33 °C).

fitting, the error function was bounded, but $\mu_{\text{max}}^{\text{AOB}}$ and $\mu_{\text{max}}^{\text{NOB}}$ were highly correlated indicating a poorly identifiable parameter set. Model evaluations were, however, not affected by changes in the $\mu_{\text{max}}^{\text{AOB}}$ (2.35–2.85) and $\mu_{\text{max}}^{\text{NOB}}$ (2.15–2.55) best-fit parameter value region (Figure S3D, approximate >99% confidence region: $\mu_{\text{max}}^{\text{AOB}}$, 2.25–2.95; $\mu_{\text{max}}^{\text{NOB}}$, 2.06–2.66). Predicted microprofiles agree with measurements in the first aeration hour at steady state (Figure 1A): NH_4^+ is consumed along biofilm depth and NO_2^- is produced; NO_3^- remains at lower concentrations than NO_2^- within the biofilm; DO penetrates 60 μm into the biofilm base. The greatest divergence

Figure 1. Experimental (discrete symbols) and predicted (line) concentrations in MABR at steady state (A) microprofiles in the first aeration hour, (B) microprofiles in the last aeration hour, and (C) bulk profiles during a 12 h intermittent aeration cycle. For each microprofile, replicates ($n > 3$) were made and the average was shown.

the biofilm in the last aeration hour (Figure 1B) and uniform dynamic variations of bulk concentrations during a 12 h intermittent aeration cycle. For example, it captured the pH decreases in the 6 h aeration phase and increases in the 6 h nonaeration phase (Figure 1C). It also predicted simultaneous production of NO_2^- and NO_3^- in the batch mode data validation (Figure S4A) and predicted NH_4^+ consumption and NO_2^- production following the tendencies observed in MABR2 (Figure S4B). Janus coefficients were around 1.9 (± 0.5), showing that the RMSEs were within the same order of magnitude in calibration and validations.

3.2. Model-Based Exploration of NOB Suppression in Intermittently Aerated MABRs. NOB suppression is the result of indirect and direct (competitive) interactions between AOB and NOB in the local environment. Net microbial activities are captured in the specific growth rates: biomass types with the higher specific growth rate will win the local competition. In the studied system, oxygen was provided intermittently from membrane lumen. The biomass type with the higher specific growth rate (AOB or NOB) thus dominated the oxygen utilization.

Consistent with experimental reactor operations, simulations were initiated with fully nitrifying biomass and subject to intermittent aeration. Both simulation and experimental data showed that after 2 weeks in intermittent aeration bulk N concentrations became stable, especially NO_3^- was below 1 mg-N/L indicating efficient suppression of NOB activity (Figure S9). To illustrate the competition in the first nitrifying stage, profiles of specific growth rates of AOB and NOB during an aeration cycle (6 h) are plotted at day 15 (Figure 2A). The averaged μ at time intervals shows kinetic variations over time: (1) 0–15 min, with the onset of aeration microbial activities recover from the previous nonaeration period and increase dramatically; (2) 15–180 min, AOB activity becomes stable, while NOB activity still recovers; (3) 180–360 min, both AOB and NOB activity reach pseudosteady state. The model shows the ratio of μ_{AOB} to μ_{NOB} increases in the intermittent aeration, compared to the ratio of $\mu_{\text{max}}^{\text{AOB}}$ to $\mu_{\text{max}}^{\text{NOB}}$ in continuous aeration (1.5 ± 0.15 versus 1.1). AOB preferentially utilize oxygen to support growth while NOB are outcompeted or their activity is suppressed.

To assess the relative contribution of DO/pH effects on NOB suppression, individual factors influencing growth rates were calculated spatially (at different biofilm depths) and temporally (at different times during the cycle). Considering the effective DO penetration depth, only results in the first 100 μm at the biofilm base are shown (Figure 2B).

3.2.1. DO Limitation in NOB Suppression. O_2 is a growth substrate for both AOB and NOB. In counter-diffusion biofilms, O_2 is provided via the lumen and NH_4^+ via the bulk. In the biofilm, DO penetrates only 60 μm during aeration periods with the highest concentration at the membrane–biofilm interface (biofilm depth = 0 μm), presenting spatial variations (Figure S5A). Besides, DO varies over time during aeration cycles. DO at the membrane–biofilm interface is 0 mg/L at the onset of aeration and quickly increases to the maximum concentration within 15 min. Afterward, DO concentrations within the biofilm remain stable until the end of aeration.

The DO limitation effect was evaluated on the basis of oxygen concentrations within the biofilm (Figure 2B, 1, DO limitation). In aeration periods, during the first 15 min, DO strongly limits both AOB and NOB activities. During the

in the overall fitting corresponds to NO_2^- at the biofilm base (6 mg-N/L) but only overestimates FNA concentrations by 0.002 mg-N/L. Errors in DO fitting at the membrane–biofilm interface (6.6 mg/L predicted versus 1.7 mg/L measured) have a minor influence on the oxygen competition between AOB and NOB (Table S4), consistent with Lackner and Smets³⁹ who reported that oxygen concentrations at interfaces were not decisive in nitrification performance in MABRs. Additionally, uncertainty in measuring the interface DO could be caused by microbial activities on the membrane and an efficiency factor E (1.3–4.3) was suggested to correct measured values.³⁶ MSNBM predicts consistent profiles in the different model validations. It predicted lower NH_4^+ and higher NO_2^- within

Figure 2. (A) Specific growth rates of AOB and NOB within the biofilm in a 6 h aeration period at day 15 (AOB, black; NOB, red). (B) Individual effect on AOB and NOB within the 100 μm -aerated biofilm base in a 6 h aeration period at day 15 (0, strong limitation/inhibition effect; 1, no limitation/inhibition effect).

following period, the limitation is alleviated as DO increases and stabilizes but still remains strong above 30 μm . With a lower DO affinity, NOB are more oxygen-limited than AOB. However, the relatively stronger limitation to NOB is insignificant in its suppression. Model results show that oxygen transfer and its diffusion mostly affects NH_4^+ oxidation efficiency rather than nitrification efficiency (Table S7).

3.2.2. pH–Enzyme Effect on NOB Suppression. Because pH affects AOB/NOB kinetics directly and indirectly, it is necessary to incorporate pH effects in models.^{14,40} Here, MSNBM predicts local pH values within the biofilm and the response to transient aeration phases (Figure S5B). While measurements showed that bulk pH remained relatively stable (± 0.2), pH within the biofilm, especially in the DO-penetrated zone, showed considerable variations (± 0.6). At the onset of aeration, the model indicates a transient pH upshift at the biofilm base (0–15 min). The accumulated alkalinity is attributed to continuous CO_2 diffusion from the biofilm base to the membrane lumen where N_2 gas flows through in the previous nonaeration period and slight denitrification activities. As aeration continues, pH decreases due to proton production associated with NH_4^+ oxidation. Simulations predict that pH within the biofilm becomes lower than in the bulk after 1 h of aeration and decreases slowly afterward. At the end of aeration, pH at the biofilm base is 0.4 units lower than the average bulk pH, which will increase again in the following nonaerated phase. Thus, pH varies periodically in the intermittently aerated biofilms, a pattern similar but slower than DO variations.

The pH–enzyme effect was assessed on the basis of local pH values (Figure 2B, 2, pH–enzyme effect). It favors NOB growth over AOB as NOB have a lower pH_{opt} (NOB: 7.7 versus AOB: 8.4) and pH varies in the optimal range for its growth. Moreover, the pH–enzyme effect is also insignificant in the overall AOB/NOB competition due to their robust growth in broad pH ranges and the relatively small pH variations in the system.

3.2.3. pH Substrate-Speciation Effects on NOB Suppression. FA/FNA concentrations rely on pH values as well as total $\text{NH}_4^+/\text{NO}_2^-$ concentrations. In counter-diffusion biofilms, NH_4^+ , provided via the bulk, is oxidized at the biofilm base producing NO_2^- which diffuses backward into the bulk.¹⁰ On the basis of ionic N concentrations, FA and FNA speciation synchronizes with pH variations (Figure S5C,D). For instance, at the onset of aeration, FA concentration is high due to NH_4^+ and alkalinity accumulation from the previous nonaeration period. During the following aeration period, FA concentration decreases, as pH drops and NH_4^+ consumption continues. On the other hand, FNA shows reversed variations: increasing as aeration progresses and with biofilm depth as a result of the proton and NO_2^- production.

The pH substrate-speciation effect was assessed on the basis of FA/FNA concentrations within the biofilm (Figure 2B, 3, FA/FNA inhibition). During the first 15 min, FA strongly inhibits AOB/NOB microbial activities ($\text{FA} > K_{\text{I,FA}}$). Afterward, the inhibition is alleviated as FA decreases. Noticeably, FA inhibits AOB and NOB in different ways: the inhibition effect

Table 2. Predicted Nitrification Efficiencies (NE, %) in Various Intermittent Aeration Strategies

simulation case	influent ^b		effluent (bulk)			
	NH ₄ ⁺ (mg-N/L)	buffer capacity ^b	NH ₄ ⁺ (mg-N/L)	pH	FA ^c (mg-N/L)	NE _{normalized} ^d
continuous	75	2.1	39	6.96	0.27	0.01
A: 6 + 6 ^a	75	2.1	53.0 ± 5	7.23 ± 0.15	0.71	1.00 ^d
B: 1 + 1	75	2.1	52.5 ± 1	7.22 ± 0.02	0.69	0.73
C: 12 + 12	75	2.1	53.1 ± 10	7.25 ± 0.25	0.78	0.79
D: 8 + 4	75	2.1	47.8 ± 4	7.14 ± 0.15	0.52	0.41
E: 6 + 6	100	2.1	72.0 ± 7	7.25 ± 0.15	1.02	1.74
F: 6 + 6	50	2.1	35.0 ± 3	7.20 ± 0.15	0.45	0.21
G: 6 + 6	50	5	31.2 ± 5	7.41 ± 0.10	0.64	0.83

^aAeration strategy 6 + 6 meant a 12 h intermittent aeration cycle consisting of a 6 h aeration phase and a 6 h nonaeration phase. ^bBuffer capacity in the influent was recorded as the molar ratio of bicarbonate (HCO₃⁻) to ammonium (NH₄⁺-N). ^cFA was calculated with the averaged NH₄⁺ concentrations and bulk pH during a full aeration cycle (eq 6). ^dFor a clear comparison, NE was normalized to the nitrification efficiency in the default simulation case A (NE = 48.5%). MSNBM was run in continuous aeration (200 days) to achieve a mature nitrifying biofilm, followed by various intermittent aeration strategies: (A–D) different intermittent aeration but the same influent; (A, E–G) the same aeration intermittency but different influent concentrations. NEs in the NOB suppression process in intermittent aeration were recorded (e.g., at day 215) (Table S6). In simulations E–G, oxygen loadings proportionally varied with NH₄⁺ influent concentrations (more simulations in Table S8).

remains strong for NOB throughout the aeration period (from 0.26 to 0.62), while it obviously weakens for AOB (from 0.54 to 0.89). FA inhibition rapidly becomes the most determinant factor in suppressing NOB over AOB. As FNA concentrations are always an order of magnitude lower than $K_{I,FNA}$, its inhibition effect on microbial activities is always minor thereby contributing little to NOB suppression.

Besides the inhibitor effect ($K_i/(K_i + S)$), FA/FNA exhibit the substrate limitation effect ($S/(K_s + S)$) in biological processes (eq 2). However, FA and FNA concentrations are far above the substrate affinities (K_{FA}^{AOB} and K_{FNA}^{NOB}) in the system, making the substrate limitation effects negligible.

3.2.4. Implication of Model-Based NOB Suppression.

Overall, FA inhibition caused by pH substrate speciation is the crucial factor in suppressing NOB in the intermittently aerated biofilm reactors. Nitrification success is insensitive to oxygen affinity constants or DO concentrations at the membrane–biofilm interface, a conclusion different from previous studies.^{41,42} Downing and Nerenberg²² suggested manipulating interface DO as an effective method to control shortcut nitrification in MABRs: with a lower interface DO, more NO₂⁻ accumulated. However, their biofilms performed at low nitrification rates with a low influent NH₄⁺ concentration, 3 mg-N/L, suggesting little FA inhibition and no NO₂⁻ accumulation or significant pH gradients. The single DO gradient within the biofilm presents the interface DO as having a key role in nitrification success. This method might not apply for N-rich wastewater treatment. For example, Lackner and Smets³⁹ concluded that nitrification success based only on interface DO was not possible in a counter-diffusion biofilm with high influent NH₄⁺ concentrations (20–800 mg-N/L), and nitrification efficiency was not predicted from oxygen affinity constants.

Counter- and codiffusion biofilms have different mechanisms of NOB suppression due to different spatial structures and population distributions.^{35,38,39} In counter-diffusion biofilms, the theoretically optimal habitat for NOB is the biofilm base, where both S_{O_2}/K_{O_2} and S_{FNA}/K_{FNA} have the highest values. In contrast, the base is not the optimal for AOB growth, as S_{O_2}/K_{O_2} and S_{FA}/K_{FA} cannot have the maximum at the same spatial position. Outcompeting NOB can be more difficult in counter-diffusion over codiffusion biofilms, where microbes (AOB and NOB) share the optimal habitats at the biofilm top near the

biofilm/liquid interphase. Others have similarly observed that NOB could survive better in counter- versus codiffusion biofilms, even when operated under constant oxygen limited (DO < 0.1 mg/L) and high pH (8.0–8.3) conditions in the bulk.³⁵ The inherent system geometry of membrane-aerated biofilms complicates NOB inhibition/washout. Besides, when applying intermittent aeration, periodic pH variations at the biofilm base exert a significant effect on NOB dynamics in counter-diffusion biofilms because of continuous CO₂ diffusion to the gas lumen. However, such pH variations are not expected in codiffusion biofilms. Many studies have highlighted the benefits of low DO with high FA to maintain shortcut NH₄⁺ removal in codiffusion biofilms.^{17,43} Park et al.³ explored simultaneous effects of DO and FA/FNA in lab-scale codiffusion nitrifying biofilms and found that NO₂⁻ accumulated due to DO limitation or FA inhibition and long-term NOB suppression could not be maintained without DO limitation involved. The results were consistent with Brockmann and Morgenroth⁴⁴ who suggested that oxygen limitation was the main mechanism for NOB suppression and FA inhibition was not necessarily required in codiffusion biofilms. However, DO limitation in nitrification counter-diffusion biofilms appears not as significant as reported for codiffusion biofilms, consistent with the observation that nitrification could not be achieved by solely manipulating air pressure in the membrane lumen in MABRs.²¹

3.3. Potential Explanation of NOB Suppression in the Study of Pellicer-Nàcher et al.²¹

To answer why NO₂⁻ accumulated after switching from continuous to intermittent aeration in MABRs, simulations were carried out with the calibrated MSNBM in continuous aeration for 200 days followed by intermittent aeration (6 h aeration and 6 h nonaeration cycles). The simulation shows a nitrifying biofilm during continuous aeration (NE = 0%) indicating no NOB suppression (Table 2, continuous aeration). After switching to intermittent aeration, the model predicts NOB suppression: NO₃⁻ decrease and NE increase (Table 2- strategy A, Figure S6). To find the critical factor for NOB suppression, variations of the individual pH/DO effect on AOB/NOB competition were assessed: each effect $\frac{\text{effect}_{AOB}}{\text{effect}_{NOB}}$ in intermittent aeration (for instance at day 215) was normalized by its value during continuous aeration. A value higher than 1 means the effect

576 favors NOB suppression in intermittent aeration, and a value
577 lower than 1 indicates it favors NOB growth.

578 Only FA inhibition is identified to favor NO_2^- accumulation
579 after switching the aeration strategy, while DO limitation, pH–
580 enzyme effect, and FNA inhibition remain unchanged (Figure
581 S7). FA inhibition shows certain varying patterns in
582 intermittent aeration: (1) overall, it is enhanced due to an
583 increased residual NH_4^+ ; (2) it is particularly strong during the
584 first 15 min of aeration. The simulated increase of residual
585 NH_4^+ after changing to intermittent aeration was also observed
586 in the study of Pellicer-Nàcher et al.²¹ in reactor B, bulk NH_4^+
587 increased by 100 mg/L at stages 1 and 2 (intermittent aeration)
588 compared to stage 0 (continuous aeration). Compared to
589 continuous aeration, MABRs in intermittent aeration display a
590 trade-off between NH_4^+ removal efficiency and nitrification
591 efficiency (Table 2). Nitrification is assisted by the evaluated
592 residual NH_4^+ , which underlines the importance of a minimum
593 NH_4^+ concentration in the bulk. Pérez et al.¹⁸ also highlighted
594 the need for minimum residual NH_4^+ for NOB suppression in
595 codiffusion biofilms but attributed the nitrification success to
596 differential oxygen limitation rather than FA inhibition, as NOB
597 were outcompeted due to the strong oxygen limiting conditions
598 imposed by a high residual NH_4^+ . The strong FA inhibition at
599 the onset of aeration is due to pH upshifts at the biofilm base in
600 the previous anoxic phases. It causes a longer lag phase of NOB
601 activity over AOB, which could be another reason for the
602 nitrification success. Theoretically, NOB locate at the biofilm
603 base, if enriched in MABRs; thus, pH upshift at the base is
604 more efficient to prompt FA inhibition than increasing bulk pH.
605 This lag phase has also been observed in other intermittently
606 aerated systems.^{45,46} Kornaros et al.⁴⁷ and Gilbert et al.⁴⁸
607 attributed the lag phase to a long (enzyme) reactivation time in
608 NOB nitrogen metabolism after anoxic exposure in batch
609 continuous stirred-tank reactors. However, the possibility for
610 pH variations was not considered in those studies, even though
611 CO_2 stripping could slowly increase bulk pH.⁴⁹

612 3.4. Nitrification in Various Intermittent Aeration

613 **Strategies.** For an intermittent aeration system with certain
614 NH_4^+/O_2 surface loadings, the aeration duration determines
615 residual NH_4^+ concentrations: a longer aeration lowers residual
616 NH_4^+ . The aeration intermittency determines pH upshift times
617 and the variation range of bulk concentrations: a higher
618 frequency causes more pH upshifts and a narrow variation
619 range. This information can be utilized to optimize intermittent
620 aeration strategies for efficient nitrification in MABRs (Table 2).
621 MSNBM simulation shows that a higher aeration intermittency
622 can accelerate NOB suppression (A and C) due to more times
623 of pH upshift in nonaeration phases to retard NOB activity
624 while slightly affecting AOB activity or decelerate NOB
625 suppression (B and A) due to the relatively high bulk NH_4^+
626 (pH) at the onset of aeration phases even though the averaged
627 bulk concentrations are the same. Longer aeration duration (D)
628 leads to a slower nitrification process but a higher NH_4^+ removal
629 efficiency, while keeping the same aeration intermittency. It is
630 consistent with the observation in Mota et al.⁵⁰ that
631 intermittently aerated reactors with longer anoxic phase had
632 the lower NOB abundance and relatively higher NH_4^+ effluent
633 concentrations. Both studies suggest that the maximum
634 aeration duration should be set to ensure nitrification success
635 in intermittent aeration, and a specific to the treated wastewater
636 ratio of aeration to nonaeration phase is needed to balance
637 NOB suppression against NH_4^+ removal.⁵¹ Simulation with
638 high NH_4^+ concentrations predicts fast nitrification in the

intermittent aeration (E) and vice versa slow nitrification with
low influent NH_4^+ (F). Further simulation with low NH_4^+
concentrations but high bulk pH (G) shows efficient nitrification,
confirming a key factor in NOB suppression was bulk FA rather
than residual NH_4^+ (more simulations in Table S8). In
intermittent aeration regime, the bulk FA can provide a rapid
indicator of the nitrification potential of MABRs (Figure S10).
MSNBM simulations reveal that aeration duration and
intermittency control the performance of intermittently aerated
nitrifying biofilms: longer aeration duration ensures a higher
 NH_4^+ removal efficiency yet impedes NOB suppression; higher
aeration intermittency presents unchanged NH_4^+ removal
performance, while its effect on NOB suppression should be
evaluated under specific conditions. Following this model-based
analysis, experimental validation of model predictions is
warranted.

In conclusion, we provide experimental evidence that
intermittent aeration supports efficient nitrification in membrane
aerated biofilm reactors (MABRs). A pH-explicit 1-D multi-
species nitrifying biofilm model (MSNBM) is developed and
calibrated: model analysis reveals that NOB suppression,
associated with intermittent aeration, is primarily governed by
periodic FA inhibition as the consequence of transient pH
upshifts during nonaeration. These pH upshifts are mainly
caused by alkalinity increases due to CO_2 stripping to the
membrane lumen (which also occurs during aeration) plus the
cessation of proton production (which only occurs during
aeration). In counter diffusion biofilms, pH effect is more
important than DO (limitation) effect on NOB suppression.
Both aeration intermittency and duration are effective control
factors to obtain nitrification success in intermittently mem-
brane-aerated biofilms, and maintaining nitrification and NH_4^+
removal efficiency is more easily ensured if operated with high
buffer capacities.

613 ■ ASSOCIATED CONTENT

614 ⓘ Supporting Information

The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the
ACS Publications website at DOI: 10.1021/acs.est.7b00463.

More detailed information on model description, model
simulations, and data analysis (PDF)

615 ■ AUTHOR INFORMATION

616 Corresponding Author

*E-mail: bfm@env.dtu.dk; tel: +45 4525 1600; fax: +45 4593
2850.

617 ORCID

Barth F. Smets: 0000-0003-4119-6292

618 Present Address

[†]B.G.P.: Department of Chemical Engineering, University of
Bath, Claverton Down, BA2 7AY Bath, United Kingdom.

619 Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

620 ■ ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank the China Scholarship Council
(CSC) for financial support to Y.M. and the Innovation Fund
Denmark (IFD) (Project LaGAS, File No. 0603-00523B) for
additional financial support.

695 ■ REFERENCES

- 696 (1) Hellinga, C.; Schellen, A.; Mulder, J.; Vanloosdrecht, M.;
697 Heijnen, J. The sharon process: An innovative method for nitrogen
698 removal from ammonium-rich waste water. *Water Sci. Technol.* **1998**,
699 37 (9), 135–142.
- 700 (2) Jenicek, P.; Svehla, P.; Zabranska, J.; Dohanyos, M. Factors
701 affecting nitrogen removal by nitrification/denitrification. *Water Sci.*
702 *Technol.* **2004**, 49 (5–6), 73–79.
- 703 (3) Park, S.; Chung, J.; Rittmann, B. E.; Bae, W. Nitrite accumulation
704 from simultaneous free-ammonia and free-nitrous-acid inhibition and
705 oxygen limitation in a continuous-flow biofilm reactor. *Biotechnol.*
706 *Bioeng.* **2015**, 112 (1), 43–52.
- 707 (4) van Dongen, U.; Jetten, M. S.; van Loosdrecht, M. C. The
708 SHARON-Anammox process for treatment of ammonium rich
709 wastewater. *Water Sci. Technol.* **2001**, 44 (1), 153–160.
- 710 (5) Kuenen, J. G. Anammox bacteria: from discovery to application.
711 *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **2008**, 6 (4), 320–326.
- 712 (6) Sliekers, A. O.; Haaijer, S. C. M.; Stafsnes, M. H.; Kuenen, J. G.;
713 Jetten, M. S. M. Competition and coexistence of aerobic ammonium-
714 and nitrite-oxidizing bacteria at low oxygen concentrations. *Appl.*
715 *Microbiol. Biotechnol.* **2005**, 68 (6), 808–817.
- 716 (7) Vadivelu, V. M.; Yuan, Z.; Fux, C.; Keller, J. The inhibitory effects
717 of free nitrous acid on the energy generation and growth processes of
718 an enriched *Nitrobacter* culture. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2006**, 40 (14),
719 4442–4448.
- 720 (8) Terada, A.; Lackner, S.; Kristensen, K.; Smets, B. F. Inoculum
721 effects on community composition and nitrification performance of
722 autotrophic nitrifying biofilm reactors with counter-diffusion geome-
723 try. *Environ. Microbiol.* **2010**, 12 (10), 2858–2872.
- 724 (9) Fux, C.; Huang, D.; Monti, A.; Siegrist, H. Difficulties in
725 maintaining long-term partial nitrification of ammonium-rich sludge
726 digester liquids in a moving-bed biofilm reactor (MBBR). *Water Sci.*
727 *Technol.* **2004**, 49 (11–12), 53–60.
- 728 (10) Schramm, A.; De Beer, D.; Gieseke, A.; Amann, R.
729 Microenvironments and distribution of nitrifying bacteria in a
730 membrane-bound biofilm. *Environ. Microbiol.* **2000**, 2 (6), 680–686.
- 731 (11) Shanahan, J. W.; Semmens, M. J. Alkalinity and pH effects on
732 nitrification in a membrane aerated bioreactor: An experimental and
733 model analysis. *Water Res.* **2015**, 74, 10–22.
- 734 (12) Vanneste, T. P. W.; Volcke, E. I. P. Modelling microbial
735 competition in nitrifying biofilm reactors. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* **2015**, 112
736 (12), 2550–2561.
- 737 (13) Park, S.; Bae, W.; Chung, J.; Baek, S.-C. Empirical model of the
738 pH dependence of the maximum specific nitrification rate. *Process*
739 *Biochem.* **2007**, 42 (12), 1671–1676.
- 740 (14) Fumasoli, A.; Morgenroth, E.; Udert, K. M. Modeling the low
741 pH limit of *Nitrosomonas* eutropha in high-strength nitrogen
742 wastewaters. *Water Res.* **2015**, 83, 161–170.
- 743 (15) Carrera, J.; Jubany, I.; Carvallo, L.; Chamy, R.; Lafuente, J.
744 Kinetic models for nitrification inhibition by ammonium and nitrite in
745 a suspended and an immobilised biomass systems. *Process Biochem.*
746 **2004**, 39 (9), 1159–1165.
- 747 (16) Martin, K. J.; Picioreanu, C.; Nerenberg, R. Assessing microbial
748 competition in a hydrogen-based membrane biofilm reactor (MBfR)
749 using multidimensional modeling. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* **2015**, 112 (9),
750 1843–1853.
- 751 (17) Park, S.; Bae, W.; Rittmann, B. E. Multi-Species Nitrifying
752 Biofilm Model (MSNBm) including free ammonia and free nitrous
753 acid inhibition and oxygen limitation. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* **2010**, 105 (6),
754 1115–1130.
- 755 (18) Pérez, J.; Lotti, T.; Kleerebezem, R.; Picioreanu, C.; van
756 Loosdrecht, M. C. M. Outcompeting nitrite-oxidizing bacteria in
757 single-stage nitrogen removal in sewage treatment plants: A model-
758 based study. *Water Res.* **2014**, 66, 208–218.
- 759 (19) Casey, E.; Glennon, B.; Hamer, G. Review of membrane aerated
760 biofilm reactors. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* **1999**, 27 (1–2), 203–215.
- 761 (20) Terada, A.; Yamamoto, T.; Igarashi, R.; Tsuneda, S.; Hirata, A.
762 Feasibility of a membrane-aerated biofilm reactor to achieve
763 controllable nitrification. *Biochem. Eng. J.* **2006**, 28 (2), 123–130.
- (21) Pellicer-Nàcher, C.; Sun, S.; Lackner, S.; Terada, A.; Schreiber, 764
F.; Zhou, Q.; Smets, B. F. Sequential aeration of membrane-aerated 765
biofilm reactors for high-rate autotrophic nitrogen removal: exper- 766
imental demonstration. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2010**, 44 (19), 7628– 767
7634. 768
- (22) Downing, L. S.; Nerenberg, R. Effect of oxygen gradients on the 769
activity and microbial community structure of a nitrifying, membrane- 770
aerated biofilm. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* **2008**, 101 (6), 1193–1204. 771
- (23) Pellicer-Nàcher, C.; Sun, S.; Lackner, S.; Terada, A.; Schreiber, 772
F.; Zhou, Q.; Smets, B. F. Sequential aeration of membrane-aerated 773
biofilm reactors for high-rate autotrophic nitrogen removal: exper- 774
imental demonstration. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2010**, 44 (19), 7628– 775
7634. 776
- (24) Zhu, S.; Chen, S. The impact of temperature on nitrification rate 777
in fixed film biofilters. *Aquac. Eng.* **2002**, 26 (4), 221–237. 778
- (25) Gieseke, A.; de Beer, D. Use of microelectrodes to measure in 779
situ microbial activities in biofilms, sediments, and microbial mats. *Mol.* 780
Microb. Ecol. Man. **2008**, 2, 3483–3514. 781
- (26) Terada, A.; Lackner, S.; Tsuneda, S.; Smets, B. F. Redox- 782
stratification controlled biofilm (ReSCoBi) for completely autotrophic 783
nitrogen removal: the effect of co- versus counter-diffusion on reactor 784
performance. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* **2007**, 97 (1), 40–51. 785
- (27) Reichert, P. AQUASIM 2.0—Computer program for the 786
identification and simulation of aquatic systems; EAWAG: Dubendorf, 787
Switzerland, 1998. 788
- (28) Hiatt, W. C.; Grady, C. P. L. An updated process model for 789
carbon oxidation, nitrification, and denitrification. *Water Environ. Res.* 790
2008, 80, 2145–2156. 791
- (29) Hellinga, C.; Van Loosdrecht, M. C. M.; Heijnen, J. J. Model 792
Based Design of a Novel Process for Nitrogen Removal from 793
Concentrated Flows. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling of* 794
Dynamical Systems **1999**, 5, 351–371. 795
- (30) Blackburne, R.; Yuan, Z.; Keller, J. Demonstration of nitrogen 796
removal via nitrite in a sequencing batch reactor treating domestic 797
wastewater. *Water Res.* **2008**, 42, 2166–2176. 798
- (31) Sötemann, S.; Musvoto, E.; Wentzel, M.; Ekama, G. Integrated 799
biological, chemical and physical processes kinetic modelling Part 1 – 800
Anoxic-aerobic C and N removal in the activated sludge system. *Water* 801
SA **2006**, 31 (4), 1044–1062. 802
- (32) Van Hulle, S. W. H.; Volcke, E. I. P.; Teruel, J. L.; Donckels, B.; 803
van Loosdrecht, M. C. M.; Vanrolleghem, P. A. Influence of 804
temperature and pH on the kinetics of the Sharon nitrification process. 805
J. Chem. Technol. Biotechnol. **2007**, 82 (5), 471–480. 806
- (33) Musvoto, E. V.; Wentzel, M. C.; Loewenthal, R. E.; Ekama, G. 807
A. Integrated chemical-physical processes modelling - I. Development 808
of a kinetic-based model for mixed weak acid/base systems. *Water Res.* 809
2000, 34 (6), 1857–1867. 810
- (34) Hao, X.; Heijnen, J. J.; Van Loosdrecht, M. C. Model-based 811
evaluation of temperature and inflow variations on a partial 812
nitrification–ANAMMOX biofilm process. *Water Res.* **2002**, 36 (19), 813
4839–4849. 814
- (35) Wang, R.; Terada, A.; Lackner, S.; Smets, B. F.; Henze, M.; Xia, 815
S.; Zhao, J. Nitrification performance and biofilm development of co- 816
and counter-diffusion biofilm reactors: modeling and experimental 817
comparison. *Water Res.* **2009**, 43 (10), 2699–2709. 818
- (36) Pellicer-Nàcher, C.; Domingo-Félez, C.; Lackner, S.; Smets, B. 819
F. Microbial activity catalyzes oxygen transfer in membrane-aerated 820
nitrifying biofilm reactors. *J. Membr. Sci.* **2013**, 446, 465–471. 821
- (37) Power, M. The predictive validation of ecological and 822
environmental models. *Ecol. Modell.* **1993**, 68 (1–2), 33–50. 823
- (38) Brockmann, D.; Rosenwinkel, K.-H.; Morgenroth, E. Practical 824
identifiability of biokinetic parameters of a model describing two-step 825
nitrification in biofilms. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* **2008**, 101 (3), 497–514. 826
- (39) Lackner, S.; Smets, B. F. Effect of the kinetics of ammonium and 827
nitrite oxidation on nitrification success or failure for different biofilm 828
reactor geometries. *Biochem. Eng. J.* **2012**, 69, 123–129. 829
- (40) Vangsgaard, A. K.; Mauricio-Iglesias, M.; Valverde-Pérez, B.; 830
Gernaey, K. V.; Sin, G. pH variation and influence in an autotrophic 831

- nitrogen removing biofilm system using an efficient numerical solution strategy. *Water Sci. Technol.* **2013**, 67 (11), 2608.
- (41) Wyffels, S.; Van Hulle, S. W. H.; Boeckx, P.; Volcke, E. I. P.; Van Cleemput, O.; Vanrolleghem, P. A.; Verstraete, W. Modeling and simulation of oxygen-limited partial nitrification in a membrane-assisted bioreactor (MBR). *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* **2004**, 86 (5), 531–542.
- (42) Volcke, E. I. P.; Sanchez, O.; Steyer, J.-P.; Dabert, P.; Bernet, N. Microbial population dynamics in nitrifying reactors: Experimental evidence explained by a simple model including interspecies competition. *Process Biochem.* **2008**, 43 (12), 1398–1406.
- (43) Chung, J.; Bae, W.; Lee, Y.-W.; Rittmann, B. E. Shortcut biological nitrogen removal in hybrid biofilm/suspended growth reactors. *Process Biochem.* **2007**, 42 (3), 320–328.
- (44) Brockmann, D.; Morgenroth, E. Evaluating operating conditions for outcompeting nitrite oxidizers and maintaining partial nitrification in biofilm systems using biofilm modeling and Monte Carlo filtering. *Water Res.* **2010**, 44 (6), 1995–2009.
- (45) Yoo, H.; Ahn, K.-H.; Lee, H.-J.; Lee, K.-H.; Kwak, Y.-J.; Song, K.-G. Nitrogen removal from synthetic wastewater by simultaneous nitrification and denitrification (SND) via nitrite in an intermittently-aerated reactor. *Water Res.* **1999**, 33 (1), 145–154.
- (46) Gilbert, E. M.; Agrawal, S.; Brunner, F.; Schwartz, T.; Horn, H.; Lackner, S. Response of Different Nitrospira Species To Anoxic Periods Depends on Operational DO. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2014**, 48 (5), 2934–2941.
- (47) Kornaros, M.; Dokianakis, S. N.; Lyberatos, G. Partial Nitrification/Denitrification Can Be Attributed to the Slow Response of Nitrite Oxidizing Bacteria to Periodic Anoxic Disturbances. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2010**, 44 (19), 7245–7253.
- (48) Gilbert, E. M.; Agrawal, S.; Brunner, F.; Schwartz, T.; Horn, H.; Lackner, S. Response of Different Nitrospira Species To Anoxic Periods Depends on Operational DO. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2014**, 48 (5), 2934–2941.
- (49) Li, J.; Elliott, D.; Nielsen, M.; Healy, M. G.; Zhan, X. Long-term partial nitrification in an intermittently aerated sequencing batch reactor (SBR) treating ammonium-rich wastewater under controlled oxygen-limited conditions. *Biochem. Eng. J.* **2011**, 55 (3), 215–222.
- (50) Mota, C.; Head, M. A.; Ridenoure, J. A.; Cheng, J. J.; de los Reyes, F. L. Effects of Aeration Cycles on Nitrifying Bacterial Populations and Nitrogen Removal in Intermittently Aerated Reactors. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2005**, 71 (12), 8565–8572.
- (51) Kornaros, M.; Marazioti, C.; Lyberatos, G. A pilot scale study of a sequencing batch reactor treating municipal wastewater operated via the UP-PND process. *Water Sci. Technol.* **2008**, 58 (2), 435–438.