



## Calibration and validation of model describing complete autotrophic nitrogen removal in granular sludge

Vangsgaard, Anna Katrine; Mutlu, A. Gizem; Gernaey, Krist; Smets, Barth F.; Sin, Gürkan

*Publication date:*  
2012

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

*Citation (APA):*  
Vangsgaard, A. K. (Author), Mutlu, A. G. (Author), Gernaey, K. (Author), Smets, B. F. (Author), & Sin, G. (Author). (2012). Calibration and validation of model describing complete autotrophic nitrogen removal in granular sludge. Sound/Visual production (digital)

---

### 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.

# Calibration and validation of model describing complete autotrophic nitrogen removal in granular sludge

Anna Katrine Vangsgaard<sup>a</sup>, A. Gizem Mutlu<sup>b</sup>, Krist V. Gernaey<sup>c</sup>,  
Barth F. Smets<sup>b</sup> and Gürkan Sin<sup>a</sup>


<sup>a</sup>CAPEC - Chemical and Biochemical Engineering – DTU

<sup>b</sup>Environmental Engineering – DTU

<sup>c</sup>PROCESS - Chemical and Biochemical Engineering - DTU

IWA Nutrient Removal and Recovery 2012: Trends in NRR

September 23-25, 2012. Harbin, China





# The case

A granular sludge SBR performing N removal through nitrification/anammox

- Calibration methodology developed
- Fast model initialization
- Stoichiometric ratio evaluation

Purpose:

- Experiment planning
- Performance prediction for control applications



# Methods

## Physical system




### Reactor characteristics:

Volume:	4L
Temperature:	30°C
pH:	7.5 ± 0.3
Mixing:	6-bladed Rushton impeller at 80 rpm + bubble aeration
Solids concentration:	4.2 g VSS/L
Ave. gran. size:	50 µm
Operating time:	11 months

### Sequencing batch operation:

Fill:	10 min.
Reaction:	444 min. consisting of three aerated phases and three non-aerated phases
Settling:	6 min.
Draw:	10 min.
Idle:	10 min.




# Methods

## Model description

Biofilm mass balance equations – Transport and microbial metabolism

Accumulation = Inflow - Outflow + Generation - Consumption

$$\frac{\partial(C_i V)}{\partial t} = -\partial(j_i A) + r_i \partial V \Leftrightarrow \frac{\partial C_i}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{z^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (z^2 j_{ci}) + r_i$$



1. Transport of **soluble** compounds is governed by **diffusion** and of **particulate** compounds by **advection**:

$$j_{si} = D_{bio,i} \frac{\partial S_i}{\partial x} \quad j_{xi} = -X_i u_F$$

2. The **granule radius** is a function of the growth and decay of bacteria and a detachment process:

$$\frac{dL}{dt} = u_{F,L} - u_D$$

Where the advective velocity is a function of the growth of particulates on the "inside" of a given point k:


$$u_{F,k} = \frac{1}{A_k} \int_0^k A_k \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_{part}} \frac{r_i}{\rho} \right)_k dz$$

# Methods

## Model description

Bulk liquid mass balance equations – Transport and microbial metabolism

$$\text{Accumulation} = \text{Inflow} - \text{Outflow} + \text{Generation} - \text{Consumption}$$



$$\frac{dC_i}{dt} = \frac{Q_{in} C_{i,in} - Q_{out} C_{i,bulk} - j_{Ci} A}{V} + r_{Ci}$$

Flux in and out of the biofilm:

Soluble species

$$j_{Si} = k_i (S_{i,bulk} - S_{i,L})$$

where

$$k_i = \frac{D_i}{L_B}$$


Particulate species

$$j_{Xi} = -u_D X_{i,L}$$

The mass transfer coefficient is estimated from a semi-empirical correlation considering mixing caused by bubble aeration


# Methods

## Methodology development



# Methods

## Methodology development





# Results

## Steady state calibration

- Step 1:  
Determine bulk liquid soluble N species concentrations

- Step 2:  
Capturing overall reactor performance through five evaluation criteria:  
Three ratios and two efficiencies:


$$R1 = \frac{\Delta NO_2^-}{\Delta NH_4^+} \longrightarrow \text{AOB vs. AnAOB + NOB} \rightarrow \text{relative activity}$$

$$R2 = \frac{\Delta NH_4^+}{\Delta TN} \longrightarrow \text{AnAOB vs. AOB} \rightarrow \text{relative activity}$$

$$R3 = \frac{\Delta NO_3^-}{\Delta NH_4^+} \longrightarrow \text{AnAOB vs. NOB} \rightarrow \text{relative activity}$$

$$E1 = \frac{\Delta NH_4^+}{NH_{4,in}^+} \longrightarrow \text{Absolute microbial activity}$$

$$E2 = \frac{\Delta TN}{TN_{in}} \longrightarrow \text{Absolute microbial activity}$$



# Results

## Steady state calibration



- Step 3:

Since oxygen  $k_L a$  could not be experimentally estimated, this was calibrated based on the five evaluation criteria:

	$k_L a$ d <sup>-1</sup>	R1 $\Delta NO_2^- / \Delta NH_4^+$	R2 $\Delta NH_4^+ / \Delta TN$	R3 $\Delta NO_3^- / \Delta TN$	NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> removal %	TN removal %
Simulation	524.4	0.000	1.052	0.049	79.25	74.32
Experimental	-	0.001	1.072	0.071	80.80	71.52

Experimental values were obtained as an average of one week of "steady state" operation.

Model was initialized by simulating continuous operation for 1000 days, which was then followed by 10 days of SBR operation of which the results from the last cycle were used for the steady state model evaluation.



# Results


## Dynamic calibration

- Step 4: Parameter subset identification  
Based on global sensitivity analysis:

	$\mu_{\max, \text{AOB}}$ $\text{d}^{-1}$	$K_{\text{O}_2, \text{AOB}}$ $\text{gCOD}/\text{m}^3$	$b_{\text{AOB}}$ $\text{d}^{-1}$	$\mu_{\max, \text{AnAOB}}$ $\text{d}^{-1}$	$K_{\text{O}_2, \text{AnAOB}}$ $\text{gCOD}/\text{m}^3$	$Y_{\text{AnAOB}}$ $\text{gCOD}/\text{gN}$
Default value	2.050	0.300	0.130	0.073	0.010	0.160
Lower bound	1.538	0.150	0.098	0.055	0.005	0.152
Upper bound	2.563	0.450	0.163	0.091	0.015	0.168

- Step 5: In-cycle data collection

Samples from bulk liquid were manually collected every 15 min. and analyzed for soluble N species.  
Analysis results from three cycles were used for calibration.



# Results

## Dynamic calibration




- Step 6: Calibration

Based on pragmatic Monte Carlo method, which was evaluated by WSSE:


$$WSSE = \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \frac{y_{meas,k}(t) - y_{model,k}(t, \theta)}{\sigma_k} \right)^2$$

	$\mu_{max,AOB}$ d <sup>-1</sup>	$K_{O2,AOB}$ gCOD/m <sup>3</sup>	$b_{AOB}$ d <sup>-1</sup>	$\mu_{max,AnAOB}$ d <sup>-1</sup>	$K_{O2,AnAOB}$ gCOD/m <sup>3</sup>	$Y_{AnAOB}$ gCOD/gN
Default value	2.050	0.300	0.130	0.073	0.010	0.160
Lower bound	1.538	0.150	0.098	0.055	0.005	0.152
Upper bound	2.563	0.450	0.163	0.091	0.015	0.168
Calibrated value	2.450	0.165	0.136	0.068	0.011	0.166



However, all MC sims have an offset compared to the collected data

→ Iteration of step 4-6, in accordance with the methodology




# Results

## Dynamic calibration





- Step 4-6 - iterated: Parameter subset and sampling space were expanded

	Unit	Default value	Lower bound	Upper bound	Calibrated value
$\mu_{max, AOB}$	$d^{-1}$	2.050	1.025	3.075	2.064
$K_{O_2, AOB}$	$gCOD/m^3$	0.300	0.150	0.450	0.332
$b_{AOB}$	$d^{-1}$	0.130	0.065	0.195	0.150
$\mu_{max, NOB}$	$d^{-1}$	1.454	0.727	2.181	0.974
$K_{O_2, NOB}$	$gCOD/m^3$	1.100	0.550	1.650	0.752
$b_{NOB}$	$d^{-1}$	0.061	0.030	0.091	0.069
$\mu_{max, AnAOB}$	$d^{-1}$	0.073	0.037	0.110	0.088
$K_{O_2, AnAOB}$	$gCOD/m^3$	0.010	0.005	0.015	0.013
$K_{HNO_2, AnAOB}$	$gN/m^3$	$2.81e-6$	$1.41e-6$	$4.22e-6$	$2.92e-6$
$Y_{AOB}$	$gCOD/gN$	0.210	0.105	0.315	0.292
$Y_{AnAOB}$	$gCOD/gN$	0.160	0.080	0.240	0.124
$D_{NO_2}$	$m^2/d$	$2.60e-4$	$1.30e-4$	$3.90e-4$	$1.70e-4$
$L_B$	$m$	$1.76e-5$	$8.80e-6$	$2.64e-5$	$2.26e-5$



Among the new MC sims, the subset sample giving the smallest error fitted much better to the data than the previous.



# Results Validation



- Step 7: Data collection for validation

Samples were collected during one cycle under slightly different conditions compared to the calibration cycles. The solids concentration was 4.4 g VSS/L and average granule size was 35  $\mu\text{m}$ .


- Step 8: Validation

The validation was evaluated by the Janus coefficient:

$$J^2 = \frac{\frac{1}{n_{\text{val}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{val}}} (y_{\text{meas},i} - y_{\text{model}}(t_i, \theta))^2}{\frac{1}{n_{\text{cal}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{cal}}} (y_{\text{meas},i} - y_{\text{model}}(t_i, \theta))^2}$$

Model output	MAE		RMSE		Janus coefficient
	Calibration	Validation	Calibration	Validation	
$\text{NH}_4^+$	0.030	0.053	0.039	0.057	1.478
$\text{NO}_2^-$	0.265	0.116	0.366	0.173	0.473
$\text{NO}_3^-$	0.131	0.080	0.171	0.093	0.544


J is relatively close to 1 for all model outputs, which implies a good model fit.





# Perspectives

- The validated model will be used for two purposes:
  - design of future lab-scale experiments in the form of perturbations in the operation
  - for predicting the process performance, which is important in future optimization and process control applications and in up-scaling of the system

Process optimization (based on results from Vangsgaard et al., 2012)



Analysis on calibrated model




# Perspectives

2) for predicting the process performance, which is important in future optimization and process control applications and in up-scaling of the system


Control implementation:

Three different control strategies have been developed and analyzed on the calibrated model.


1. Feedforward based on oxygen/nitrogen loading ratio (Vangsgaard et al., 2012)




2. Feedforward + feedback based on stoichiometric rules (Mutlu et al., 2012):



3. Cascade control as a combination of 1. and 2.





As future extension of the current work, the developed control strategy will be experimentally tested in the lab-scale reactors.





# Conclusions/wrap-up

- The model was successfully calibrated and validated by following a developed methodology:
  - First,  $k_L a$  was calibrated to long term "steady state" data by using novel evaluation criteria of **stoichiometric ratios** indicating the relative activity of the microbial groups.
  - Second, a subset of parameters were calibrated through dynamic calibration to in-cycle data.
  - An iteration of the second step was performed before a satisfactory result was obtained.
  
- A fast and efficient novel **initialization process** was developed
  - Simulating 1000 days of continuous operation before SBR operation.
  
- The model is now being used for optimization and control structure analyses.



## Thanks for your attention!

Acknowledgements to:

All the supervisors and the Danish Agency for Science, Technology and Innovation through the Research Centre for Design of Microbial Communities in Membrane Bioreactors (09-067230) for funding of the project

Contact info:

E-mail: [akv@kt.dtu.dk](mailto:akv@kt.dtu.dk)

Phone: +45 45252910

