Performance of industrial scale hollow-fibre membranes in a submerged anaerobic MBR (HF-SAnMBR) system at mesophilic and psychrophilic conditions
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Abstract

The aim of this work was to evaluate the effect of temperature on the performance of industrial hollow-fibre (HF) membranes treating urban wastewater in a submerged anaerobic MBR system (SAnMBR). To this end, a demonstration plant with two commercial HF ultrafiltration membrane modules (PURON®, Koch Membrane Systems, PUR-PSH31) was operated at 20, 25 and 33 °C. The mixed liquor total solid (MLTS) level was a key factor affecting membrane permeability (K). K was higher under psychrophilic than mesophilic conditions when operating at similar transmembrane fluxes and MLTS, because the biomass activity of the psychrophilic mixed liquor was lower than the mesophilic mixed liquor. Thus, lower extracellular polymeric substances (EPS) and soluble microbial products (SMP) levels were observed at psychrophilic conditions, which affected not only the three-dimensional floc matrix, but also the fouling propensity. However, no chemical cleaning was needed during the experimental period (almost one year) because no irreversible fouling problems were detected.
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1. Introduction

Aerobic membrane bioreactors (MBR) have recently become not only a legitimate alternative to conventional activated sludge processes, but also the preferred choice for urban wastewater treatment because of their reliability and efficiency [1]. The quality of the effluent is very good but the operating costs of aeration and sludge handling remain the biggest drawbacks of aerobic MBR technology [2]. High energy demand and high waste generation are both at odds with sustainability principles.

In this respect, in recent years there has been increasing interest in the study of anaerobic urban wastewater treatment at ambient temperatures, mainly focused on the sustainability benefits of anaerobic processes as opposed to aerobic processes (lower sludge production, lower energy demands, and energy recovery from methane production). The main challenge of anaerobic biotechnology is to develop treatment systems, such as anaerobic membrane bioreactors (AnMBR) that prevent biomass loss and enable high sludge retention times (SRTs) in order to compensate for the low growth rates of anaerobic microorganisms at ambient temperatures [3]. However, operating membrane bioreactors at high SRTs may imply operating at high MLTS levels. This is considered to be one of the main constraints on membrane operating [4] because it can result in a higher membrane fouling propensity.
Besides MLTS levels, several sludge properties have been identified elsewhere as key factors that affect membrane performance (because they can lead to the onset of either irreversible or irrecoverable fouling), i.e. particle size distribution, extracellular polymeric substances (EPS), soluble microbiological products (SMP), and biomass concentration [5]. Moreover, the limitations of anaerobic metabolism at ambient temperatures can cause non-complete organic matter degradation, leading to an increase in colloidal and soluble components that increase the fouling propensity of membranes [6]. Threshold EPS have been reported not only as the major sludge component keeping the floc in a three-dimensional matrix, but also as a key membrane foulant in MBR systems [7, 8, 9]. On the other hand, it is widely accepted that EPSs and SMPs are identical concepts [1], and that SMPs easily accumulate in MBRs because they are absorbed on the membrane surface where they block membrane pores and reduce membrane permeability [10]. Moreover, SMPs influence the structure and porosity of the cake layer formed on membrane surface [11]. Both EPSs and SMPs have been directly related to the biomass concentration of the mixed liquor [12], as well as to operating SRT [13]: a key factor in anaerobic biomass growth at ambient temperatures.

Several published studies have evaluated the effect of different sludge properties on membrane fouling in SAnMBR technology on a laboratory scale [3, 4, 14, 15]. However, there is still a lack of knowledge about the assessment of the different fouling mechanisms in SAnMBR technology treating low-strength wastewaters on an industrial scale. Moreover, the effect of the main operating conditions on membrane fouling has not been adequately evaluated on a laboratory scale because it depends considerably on the membrane size, especially in the case of hollow-fibre (HF) membranes. Therefore, further research is needed on HF-SAnMBR technology with industrial scale membranes in order to facilitate the design and implementation of this technology in full-scale
The main objective of this paper was to study the effect of temperature on the performance of industrial hollow-fibre membranes. This study is innovative because it studies membrane performance under specific conditions similar to those expected in full-scale plants located in warm climate regions (e.g. Mediterranean ones). In this respect, this study shows the long-term performance of industrial HF membranes at mesophilic and psychrophilic conditions in an SAnMBR demonstration plant treating effluent from a pre-treatment WWTP. The SAnMBR plant is located in Valencia (Spain), where the average daily ambient temperature ranges from 15 and 35 ºC approx. during the year. The assessment of the impact of temperature upon membrane performance will shed more light on the possible applications of this technology in the treatment of urban wastewater at ambient temperatures.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Demonstration plant description

Figure 1 shows the flow diagram of the HF-SAnMBR demonstration plant used in this study. It consists of an anaerobic reactor with a total volume of 1.3 m³ (0.4 m³ head space) connected to two membrane tanks each with a total volume of 0.8 m³ (0.2 m³ head space). Each membrane tank has one industrial HF ultrafiltration membrane unit (PURON®, Koch Membrane Systems (PUR-PSH31) with 0.05 µm pores). Each module has 9 HF bundles, 1.8 m long, giving a total membrane surface of 30 m². In order to improve the stirring conditions of the anaerobic reactor and to favour the stripping of the produced gases from the liquid phase, a fraction of the produced biogas is
continuously recycled to this reactor. In order to minimise the cake layer formation,
another fraction of the produced biogas is also continuously recycled to the membrane
 tanks through the bottom of each fibre bundle. To recover the bubbles of biogas in the
permeate leaving the membrane tank, two degasification vessels (DV) were installed:
each one between the respective MT and the vacuum pump. The funnel-shaped section
of conduit makes the biogas accumulate at the top of the DV. The resulting permeate is
stored in the clean-in-place (CIP) tank. In order to control the temperature when
necessary, the anaerobic reactor is jacketed and connected to a water heating/cooling
system.

Normally membranes are operated according to a specific schedule involving a
combination of different individual stages taken from a basic filtration-relaxation (F-R)
cycle. In addition to the classical membrane operating stages (filtration, relaxation, and
back-flush), two additional stages of membrane operation were also considered
degasification and ventilation). Degasification stage consists of a period of high flow-rate filtration that is carried out to enhance the filtration process efficiency by removing
the accumulated biogas from the top of the dead-end fibres. In the ventilation stage,
permeate is pumped into the membrane tank through the degasification vessel instead of
through the membrane. The aim of ventilation stage is to recover the biogas
accumulated in the degasification vessel. Thus, in terms of membrane cleaning,
ventilation performs as a relaxation stage since no transmembrane flux is applied whilst
maintaining a given gas sparging intensity.

By using two membrane tanks in parallel, the plant was designed with high
operating flexibility, which allows working with either one membrane tank or both
tanks. Moreover, each tank allows recycling continuously the obtained permeate to the
anaerobic reactor. Specifically in this study, the obtained permeate from MT1 (see Figure 1) was continuously recycled to the system in order to test different $J_{20}$ without affecting the hydraulic retention time (HRT) of the process. On the other hand, the obtained permeate from MT2 was fed to the CIP tank and corresponds to the effluent wastewater of the system (see Figure 1). Hence, different operating filtration modes were set in MT2 to achieve the different HRTs that were programmed to assess the biological process performance.

Numerous on-line sensors and automatic devices were installed in order to automate and control the plant operation and provide on-line information about the state of the process. In particular a group of on-line sensors was assigned to each membrane tank consisting of: 1 pH-temperature transmitter; 1 level indicator transmitter; 1 flow indicator transmitter for the mixed liquor feed pump; 1 flow indicator transmitter for the permeate pump; and 1 liquid pressure indicator transmitter in order to control the TMP. The group of actuators assigned to each membrane tank consisted of a group of on/off control valves that determine the direction of the flow in order to control the different membrane operating stages (filtration, back-flush, relaxation…) plus 3 frequency converters. Each frequency converter controls the rotating speed of the permeate pump, the mixed liquor feed pump, and the membrane tank blower. Further details about this SAnMBR demonstration plant can be found in Giménez et al. [16].

2.2. Demonstration plant operation

The SAnMBR demonstration plant was operated at a constant SRT of 70 days and three different temperatures (20, 25 and 33 ºC). The pH of the mixed liquor remained relatively stable at around 6.75 (the pH ranged from 6.5 to 7), and the alkalinity of the
mixed liquor remained at values of approximately 600 mgCaCO₃ L⁻¹. During the experimental period, the usual membrane operating mode was as follows: a 300-second basic F-R cycle (250 s filtration and 50 s relaxation), 30 seconds of back-flush every 10 F-R cycles, 40 seconds of ventilation every 10 F-R cycles, and 30 seconds of degasification every 50 F-R cycles. The up-flow sludge velocity in the membrane surface was set to 2.7 mm s⁻¹; and the average specific gas demand per square metre of membrane (SGDₘ) was 0.23 Nm³ m⁻² h⁻¹ (corresponding to a gas sparging velocity of around 7 mm s⁻¹). The operating period shown in this work was divided into four experimental periods taking into account both the 20 ºC-normalised transmembrane flux (J₂₀) and the controlled temperature values studied. Table 1 summarises the average values for J₂₀, 20 ºC-normalised critical flux (Jₐ,C,₂₀), temperature and HRT in each experimental period. As mentioned before, the J₂₀ values were set by using MT1, whilst the HRT values were set by using MT2.

Table 2 shows the average wastewater characteristics of the influent entering the anaerobic reactor. This table highlights the significant influent sulphate levels, and also the wide variation in the influent loads, reflected by the high standard deviation of each parameter. The uncertainty associated with each value includes both the standard deviation of the different samples analysed throughout the experiment and the variation coefficient associated with the analytical methods.

2.3. Analytical methods

2.3.1. Water quality analysis

In addition to monitoring the process on-line, the performance of the biological
process was assessed by taking 24-hour composite samples from influent and effluent streams, and taking grab samples of biogas and anaerobic sludge once a day. The following parameters were analysed in influent, effluent and anaerobic sludge: total solids (TS); volatile solids (VS); total suspended solids (TSS); volatile suspended solids (VSS); volatile fatty acids (VFA); carbonate alkalinity (Alk); sulphate (SO$_4$-S); total sulphide (measured as HS$^-$); nutrients (ammonium (NH$_4$-N) and orthophosphate (PO$_4$-P)); and total and soluble chemical oxygen demand (COD$_T$ and COD$_S$, respectively).

Particle size distribution, and EPS and SMP levels were measured twice a month. Furthermore, a sludge sample was fixed for microbiological analysis once a week.

Solids, COD, sulphate, sulphide and nutrients were determined according to Standard Methods [17]. Alk and VFA levels were determined by titration according to the method proposed by WRC [18].

2.3.2. Floc structure and particle size distribution

Particle size distribution was measured twice a month using a MASTERSIZER2000 coupled to Hydro 2000SM (A) with a detection range of 0.02 to 2000 µm. The sludge floc was examined by light microscopy and the images were captured with a microscope Leica DM2500 and a Leica DFC420c digital camera.

2.3.3. Microbiological analysis

Microbiological analysis was performed once a week by using the FISH (fluorescent in situ hybridization) technique [19] to identify the different species of sulphate reducing bacteria (SRB) and methanogenic archaea (MA). Hybridized cells
were enumerated by capturing images with a Leica DM2500 epifluorescence microscope and a Leica DFC420c digital camera and using automated bacteria quantification software [20] programmed in Matlab®. Further details about the microbiological analysis approach can be found in Giménez et al. [21].

2.3.4. EPS and SMP extraction and measurement

EPS and SMP extraction and measurement were carried out twice a month. Mixed liquor was collected from the membrane tank and a sample of 150 mL was centrifuged at 2000xG for 15 min at 4 °C (Eppendorf Centrifuge 5804R). The supernatant was filtered with a 1.2 µm filter and the SMP levels (SMP$_C$ and SMP$_P$, related to carbohydrates and proteins, respectively) were measured. The EPS extraction was based on the Cation Exchange Resin (CER) method proposed by Frølund et al. [22]. The sludge pellets were resuspended to their original volume using a buffer consisting of 2 mM Na$_3$PO$_4$, 4 mM NaH$_2$PO$_4$, 9 mM NaCl and 1 mM KCl at pH 7. The EPS extraction was performed as follows: 100 mL of the suspension was transferred to an extraction container and 70 g/g MLVS of CER were added; the suspension was stirred at the selected intensity (900 rpm) and extraction time (20 hours) at 4 °C. The extracted EPS was harvested by centrifuging the CER/sludge suspension for 15 min at 12000xG and 4 °C to remove the CER and MLTS. The supernatant was taken and filtered with a 1.2 µm filter and the extracted EPS levels (eEPS$_C$ and eEPS$_P$, related to carbohydrates and proteins, respectively) were measured. The carbohydrates and proteins of both SMP and eEPS were determined by colorimetry according to the methodology proposed by Dubois et al. [23] and Lowry et al. [24], respectively. Bovine serum albumin (BSA) and glucose were used as protein and carbohydrate standards, respectively.
2.3.5. **Membrane performance indices**

The 20 °C-normalised membrane permeability ($K_{20}$) was calculated using a simple filtration model (Eq. 1) that takes into account the TMP and J values monitored on line. This simple filtration model includes a temperature correction (Eq. 2) to take into account the dependence of permeate viscosity on temperature. The same temperature correction was used for J (Eq. 3). The total membrane resistance ($R_T$) was represented theoretically by the following partial resistances (Eq. 4): membrane resistance ($R_M$); cake layer resistance ($R_C$); and irreversible layer resistance ($R_I$).

$$K_{20} = \frac{J_T f_T}{TMP} \quad \text{(Eq. 1)}$$

$$f_T = e^{-0.0239 (T-20)} \quad \text{(Eq. 2)}$$

$$J_{20} = J_T \cdot e^{-0.0239 (T-20)} \quad \text{(Eq. 3)}$$

$$R_T = R_M + R_C + R_I \quad \text{(Eq. 4)}$$

Moreover, a modified flux-step method [25] was carried out in order to determinate the $J_{C,20}$ of each operating interval. Each $J_{C,20}$ was calculated according to the weak definition of this concept, i.e. the flux above which the relationship between $J_{20}$ and TMP becomes non-linear. Table 1 shows the obtained results for $J_{C,20}$ in each experimental period. These values were obtained at 23 g L$^{-1}$ of MLTS and SGD$_m$ of 0.23 Nm$^3$ h$^{-1}$ m$^{-2}$.

### 3. Results and discussion
3.1. Long-term membrane performance at mesophilic and psychrophilic conditions

Table 1 shows the obtained results for $J_{C,20}$ in each experimental period (determined at 23 g L$^{-1}$ of MLTS and SGD$_m$ of 0.23 Nm$^3$ h$^{-1}$ m$^{-2}$). For instance, on day 125 and day 240, $J_{C,20}$ resulted in 14 LMH in both trials. Therefore, the critical flux remained generally at values over 14 LMH during the operating period since SGD$_m$ was maintained at 0.23 Nm$^3$ h$^{-1}$ m$^{-2}$ and MLTS remained generally below 23 g L$^{-1}$ (see days 1-125 and 240-310). Hence, the long-term operating shown in this study was mainly carried out at sub-critical filtration conditions since $J_{20}$ was varied from 10 to 13.3 LMH [26].

Figure 2 shows the average daily $K_{20}$ (calculated with Eq. 1 and Eq. 2) obtained during the operating period, and the average daily MLTS level in the anaerobic sludge entering the membrane tank. Notice that the MLTS level in the membrane tank increases in proportion to the ratio between the net permeate flow rate and the sludge flow rate entering the membrane tank. Therefore, the operating MLTS in the membrane tank was actually higher (up to 5 g L$^{-1}$) than the ones shown in this work, since the data presented correspond to the MLTS level entering the membrane tank.

Figure 2 shows the considerable extent to which the MLTS level affects $K_{20}$ in the four experimental periods in this study (the MLTS decrease observed on day 170 was caused by a problem in the sludge wasting system). Every variation of the MLTS level was inversely reflected on $K_{20}$. It is important to note that even at high MLTS levels (up to 25 g L$^{-1}$), $K_{20}$ remained at sustainable values. As can be seen in period ii, $K_{20}$ remained at values above 100 LMH bar$^{-1}$ until a MLTS level of around 25 g L$^{-1}$ was reached. Similar behaviour was observed in period iii. This figure also shows that at
relatively stable MLTS levels (see days 90 - 110 or days 120 - 135), $K_{20}$ remained quite stable. This $K_{20}$ stability could be due to the low TMP achieved during this period (below 0.1 bars), which minimises membrane compression and causes a stable $R_M$.

Moreover, as can be observed in period iv, $K_{20}$ improved when MLTS decreased, which indicates the absence of irreversible fouling components on $R_T$. Hence, the higher $K_{20}$ obtained during the first months of operation was related to a lower cake layer formation rate due to lower MLTS levels. It is important to highlight the two different effects that determine $R_C$: the cake layer formation rate (due to the filtration process) and the cake layer removal rate (due mainly to biogas sparging). It is well known that at a given $SGD_m$ the cake layer removal efficiency decreases when the MLTS level increases. Therefore, in our study, which was carried out at a constant $SGD_m$, the decrease in $K_{20}$ caused by a higher MLTS level was mainly due to an increase in the cake layer formation rate. However, no irreversible fouling was detected, mainly as a result of both working at sub-critical filtration conditions and establishing an adequate membrane operating mode.

Figure 2 shows the different membrane performances in period i (mesophilic conditions) and period iv (psychrophilic conditions), which were conducted at identical $J_{20}$. Similar $K_{20}$ values were achieved even though membranes operated at higher MLTS levels in period iv than in period i. This behaviour can be observed better in Figure 3.

### 3.2. Sludge properties affecting membrane performance at mesophilic and psychrophilic conditions

#### 3.2.1. Effect of MLTS on membrane performance
Figure 3 shows how the MLTS level affects $K_{20}$ in three of the four series carried out during different operating periods. As can be observed in this figure, under the selected operating conditions (0.23 Nm$^3$ h$^{-1}$ m$^{-2}$ of SGD$_m$), a linear dependency of $K_{20}$ on MLTS was observed for each $J_{20}$. Any increase in the MLTS level caused a proportional decrease in $K_{20}$. As this figure illustrates, the behaviour in the two experimental series carried out at 33 °C (13.3 and 10 LMH of $J_{20}$) is similar since both series were carried out at the same mesophilic operating conditions. Despite observing no clear differences between the two series conducted at mesophilic conditions, it can be concluded that at similar MLTS levels the higher the $J_{20}$ applied the lower the $K_{20}$ obtained. This difference can also be observed in the slope of the linear regression between the MLTS level and $K_{20}$. This slope was slightly higher with a $J_{20}$ of 13.3 LMH than of 10 LMH, which indicated a higher reversible fouling propensity at higher fluxes. Moreover, both mathematical equations seem to indicate that the dependency of $K_{20}$ on MLTS starts becoming independent of $J_{20}$ when the MLTS level tends to zero since both intercept terms present similar values. On the contrary, the impact of $J_{20}$ on $K_{20}$ gets higher as MLTS increases. This behaviour tallies well with the classical definition of membrane permeability treating pure water. On the other hand, Figure 3 shows clear differences in the resulting $K_{20}$ between both mesophilic and psychrophilic conditions. In this respect, $K_{20}$ is considerably higher when the system is operated at psychrophilic than at mesophilic conditions. For instance, as can be deduced from the slope of the linear regressions resulting from the experimental series conducted at 13.3 LMH, $K_{20}$ is more sensitive to changes in MLTS when operating at 20 °C than at 33 °C. Figure 3 illustrates that the differences in $K_{20}$ observed between mesophilic and psychrophilic conditions are higher when the MLTS level decreases. In contrast, when the MLTS level increases, this parameter becomes a key factor affecting membrane performance in the operating conditions studied. Hence, it is possible to state that the influence of
MLTS on $K_{20}$ under mesophilic and psychrophilic operating conditions is also conditioned by other operating factors.

3.2.2. Effect of particle size distribution on membrane performance

Figure 4 shows the distribution of the average particle size in the mixed liquor corresponding to the three temperatures studied. For each temperature period, only one distribution is shown since the mean particle size throughout each temperature period depicted the same distribution shape. As can be seen in this figure, a unimodal floc size distribution was observed in every experimental period, which indicates that only one population of aggregates was present in the sludge. As ascertained by other authors [4], the single-peak distribution was demonstrated by microscopic observations of the flocs in the mixed liquor (see Figure 5). In these microscopic observations, a large amount of fine flocs in the mixed liquor was not observed. Thus, a low membrane fouling propensity, i.e. a low probability of permeability decrease, was expected [4, 27]. However, a slight decrease in the average value of these unimodal floc size distributions was detected when the temperature was reduced. These results were corroborated by examining the flocs in the mixed liquor by light microscopy. The mean floc sizes observed under psychrophilic conditions were smaller than those observed at mesophilic ones. Therefore, at psychrophilic conditions lower cake layer porosities may be reached as a result of the small average particle sizes. Moreover, as a result of the operating pressure, lower cake layer porosities may lead to higher cake layer tortuosity, which implies a higher specific cake layer resistance [28]. Nevertheless, Figure 4 shows that no particles lower than 0.3 $\mu$m were detected. Hence, considering that the mean pore size of the membranes is 0.05 $\mu$m, these results predict that, for our case study, this decrease of the particle sizes due to the decrease of temperature could only affect the
cake layer formation and/or consolidation over the membrane surface, but no other membrane filtration resistances related to MLTS, such as the one related to the internal fouling due to the blockage of pore channels.

3.2.3. Effect of biomass population, and EPS and SMP compounds on membrane performance

Figure 5 shows a sample of the microscopic observations of floc size and structure in the mixed liquor under mesophilic (Figure 5a) and psychrophilic (Figure 5b) conditions. This figure illustrates that the mean floc size in the mixed liquor was lower under psychrophilic conditions (approx. from 25 to 100 µm) than under mesophilic conditions (approx. from 50 to 200 µm). This reduction in floc size can be attributed to the impact of temperature upon the anaerobic biomass growth rate. Since the SRT was set constant to 70 days throughout the operating period, biomass activity declined sharply when the temperature was decreased (see Table 3). Thus, lower biomass concentrations were detected under psychrophilic conditions, which resulted in a lower enzymatic activity that could affect the sludge conglomeration.

Table 3 shows the average values derived from the anaerobic biomass activity in both mesophilic and psychrophilic operating periods. The uncertainty associated with each value includes both the standard deviation of the different samples analysed throughout the experimental period and the coefficient of variation associated with the analytical methods. This table shows a lower biomass concentration (referred to SRB and MA) at psychrophilic conditions than at mesophilic ones. This lower biomass concentration resulted in a considerably lower concentration of EPS in the mixed liquor, and also a lower SMP production. It is important to note that the EPS level is considered
to be one of the main sludge components that keeps the floc in a three-dimensional matrix. This fact was also observed in Figure 5, i.e. the average sizes of the psychrophilic flocs were lower than the mesophilic flocs, probably as a result of the lower EPS levels shown in Table 3.

Table 3 shows a considerably higher fraction of proteins than carbohydrates in both eEPS and SMP. The protein (P)/carbohydrate (C) ratio of SMP was 16.4 and 7.0 for mesophilic and psychophilic sludge, respectively. The P/C ratio of eEPS was 3.6 and 3.1 for mesophilic and the psychrophilic sludge, respectively. Liao et al. [29] observed that an increase in the P/C ratio resulted in an increase of the hydrophobicity of the floc, thus increasing the cake layer formation propensity. Since no clear differences were observed in the eEPS-P/C ratios, it was assumed that this parameter made no critical contribution to the differences observed in this study concerning the consolidation of the cake layer upon the membrane surface under mesophilic and psychrophilic conditions. A considerable difference was, however, observed between both SMP-P/C ratios under mesophilic and psychrophilic conditions (more than double). Therefore, the SMP level (and SMP particularly) was identified as one key factor affecting K_{20} in this work.

Pollice et al. [12] established that there is proportionality between biomass concentration and SMP production due to the increased release of organic material from cell lysis. In this sense, results from Table 3 show both higher biomass concentrations and higher SMP and eEPS levels under mesophilic conditions than under psychrophilic conditions. It is well known that the amount of SMP and EPS in mixed liquor directly affects membrane permeability. This effect was also observed in our study because lower values of K_{20} were reached when the SMP and eEP_{C} levels in the mixed liquor were higher, i.e. at higher temperatures. Moreover, Huang et al. [10] observed that the SMP could induce inter-particle pore blocking when they pass through the cake layer,
resulting in a higher cake layer formation rate. In this respect, a given gas sparging intensity could be less effective in detaching the cake layer from the membrane surface when there is a higher SMP level in the system, as a result of a higher propensity of cake layer formation and consolidation upon the membrane surface [7]. In addition, some studies have shown that when membranes are operated at sub-critical filtration conditions (as in our study), SMP and EPS are the main factors affecting membrane fouling since these compounds are accumulated in the system [12].

Hence, the differences observed in this study between $K_{20}$ under mesophilic and psychrophilic operating conditions can be explained by a higher fouling propensity at mesophilic than psychrophilic conditions due to a higher biomass concentration resulting in higher SMP and eEPS levels in the mixed liquor. In either case, since the level of EPS and SMP in the mixed liquor influences the structure and porosity of the cake layer created over the membrane surface [11], this higher fouling propensity was related to the reversible cake layer resistance. This hypothesis was strengthened because the $K_{20}$ returned to its previous values when the MLTS level decreased.

3.2.4. Other factors minimising the onset of irreversible fouling problems

As it has been mentioned before $K_{20}$ returned to initial values when the MLTS concentration decreased (see Figure 2). The recovery of $K_{20}$ was achieved without any chemical cleaning of the membrane. Hence, after almost one year of operation, no irreversible fouling problems were detected, even with high MLTS and temperature shocks affecting biomass population and its derived compounds. Moreover, it is important to highlight that the total filtering resistance remained at similar values throughout the whole operating period, when operating at similar MLTS levels. The
total filtering resistance was $1.5 \cdot 10^{12} \text{ m}^{-1}$ in average. Further details on the absence of irreversible fouling in this system can be found in Robles et al. [26].

Apart from operating at sub-critical filtration conditions and establishing an adequate membrane operating mode, no chemical cleaning was necessary probably because of the pH of the mixed liquor, which was always kept at values below 7 by recycling the biogas produced for in-situ sparging purposes (i.e. the CO$_2$ remained in the mixed liquor, resulting in alkalinity values of approx. 600 mgCaCO$_3$ L$^{-1}$). pH values below 7 may result in a negligible formation of chemical precipitates (e.g. struvite), which favours the absence of chemical fouling problems [26]. Low pH indirectly means low fouling propensity due to low dispersion of sludge flocs resulting in sub-products generation directly related to biofouling, i.e. colloids and solutes or biopolymers [30]. Moreover, it has been observed that low pH levels result in a low adherence and fouling propensity of EPS [31]. Nevertheless, further research is needed in order to assess the actual effect of pH on membrane fouling in anaerobic systems.

3.3. Overall biological process performance

The SAnMBR plant was operated at a SRT of 70 days and the HRT was ranged from approx. 5 to 24 hours. As regards the COD removal efficiency no significant differences were observed under both mesophilic and psychrophilic operating conditions, taking also into account the considerable dynamics in the influent load. COD removal efficiencies of around 85 % and low effluent COD concentrations (< 100 mg L$^{-1}$) were achieved. No significant differences were observed throughout the period, mainly due to the high retention of solids achieved by the physical process and the significant operating SRT. On the other hand, the decrease in the temperature resulted in
an increase in the average sludge production (approx. 30%): from about 0.16 to 0.23 kg VS kg\(^{-1}\) COD\(_{\text{REMOVED}}\). This increase was attributed to the decline of the biomass activity observed when the temperature was reduced, particularly due to a decrease in the hydrolysis rate. This decrease in the hydrolysis rate resulted in an accumulation of solids in the system. Nevertheless, the sludge production at psychrophilic temperature conditions was still lower than the common values observed in aerobic treatment of urban wastewaters (≈ 0.5 kg VS kg\(^{-1}\) COD\(_{\text{REMOVED}}\)). Concerning the biogas production, the decrease in the temperature resulted in a decrease in the methane production (approx. 20%), which was also related to the decrease in the hydrolysis rate. Nevertheless, a significant average biogas production (around 100 L d\(^{-1}\)) was observed throughout the whole experimental period, which evidenced a suitable biological process performance under both mesophilic and psychrophilic operating conditions. Regarding the sulphate reducing activity, influent sulphate was almost completely reduced to sulphide for the whole operating period (around 95%). It resulted in a composition of hydrogen sulphide in the biogas of 1.3% in average.

4. Conclusions

MLTS was identified as one of the key factors that affects K\(_{20}\). Nevertheless, K\(_{20}\) remained at sustainable values even at high MLTS (up to 25 g L\(^{-1}\)). The floc analysis showed a smaller mean floc size under psychrophilic than under mesophilic conditions, mainly due to a lower biomass activity, and thus lower EPS levels. Higher membrane fouling propensities were observed under mesophilic than under psychrophilic conditions due to higher SMP production. Nevertheless, after almost one year of operating, no irreversible fouling problems were detected. The long-term membrane performance demonstrated that HF-SAnMBR is a promising technology for urban
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Table and figure captions

Table 1. Average values for the 20 °C-normalised transmembrane flux (J_{20}), 20 °C-normalised critical flux (J_{C,20}), controlled temperature (T), and hydraulic retention time (HRT) in each operating period. J_{20} was studied in MT1 and HRT in the system was controlled with MT2. J_{C,20} determined in MT1 at MLTS of 23 g L^{-1} and SGD_m of 0.23 Nm^{-1} m^{-2}. N.D.: not determined.

Table 2. Average influent wastewater characteristics.

Table 3. Average sludge characteristics. Nomenclature: SRB: sulphate reducing bacteria; MA: methanogenic archaea; SMP: soluble microbial products; EPS: extracellular polymeric substances; C: carbohydrates; and P: proteins.

Figure 1. Flow diagram of the demonstration plant. Nomenclature: RF: rotofilter; ET: equalization tank; AnR: anaerobic reactor; MT: membrane tanks; DV: degasification vessel; CIP: clean-in-place; P: pump; and B: blower.

Figure 2. Evolution of membrane permeability and MLTS during the operating period. Experimental period: (i) J_{20} at 13.3 LMH and 33 °C; (ii) J_{20} at 10 LMH and 33 °C; (iii) J_{20} at 12 LMH and 25 °C; and (iv) J_{20} at 13.3 LMH and 20 °C.

Figure 3. Linear dependence of K_{20} upon MLTS and mathematical equation for three of the four experimental series: J_{20} at 13.3 LMH and 33 °C; J_{20} at 10 LMH and 33 °C; and J_{20} at 13.3 LMH and 20°C.

Figure 4. Distribution of mean particle size during the experimental period: (i) J_{20} at 13.3 LMH and 33 °C; (ii) J_{20} at 10 LMH and 33 °C; (iii) J_{20} at 12 LMH and 25 °C; and (iv) J_{20} at 13.3 LMH and 20 °C.

Figure 5. Microscopic observation of mixed liquor at (a) mesophilic and (b) psychrophilic conditions (bar = 100µm).
Figure 1. Long-term model validation using heavily-fouled membranes. Daily average values of: (a) $J_{20\text{net}}$ and SGD<sub>m</sub>; and (b) TMP<sub>EXP</sub> and TMP<sub>SIM</sub>. * $r$ represents the Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient between TMP<sub>EXP</sub> and TMP<sub>SIM</sub>. 
Figure 2. Long-term model validation using heavily-fouled membranes. Daily average values of: (a) MLTS, \( \omega_C \) and \( \omega_I \) and (b) \( \alpha_C \).
Figure 3. Long-term model validation using heavily-fouled membranes. Daily average values of $R_M$, $R_I$, $R_C$ and $R_T$ in: (a) absolute terms ($\text{m}^{-1}$); and (b) weighted average distribution (%).
Figure 4. Long-term model validation using lightly-fouled membranes. Daily average values of: (a) $J_{20}$ and SGD$_{in}$; and (b) TMP$_{EXP}$ and TMP$_{SIM}$. *$r$ represents the Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient between TMP$_{EXP}$ and TMP$_{SIM}$. 
Figure 5. Long-term model validation using lightly-fouled membranes. Daily average values of: (a) MLTS, $\omega_C$ and $\omega_I$; and (b) $R_M$, $R_I$, $R_C$ and $R_T$. 
Table 1. Average values for the 20 °C-normalised transmembrane flux ($J_{20}$), 20 °C-normalised critical flux ($J_{C,20}$), controlled temperature ($T$), and hydraulic retention time ($HRT$) in each operating period. $J_{20}$ was studied in MT1 and HRT in the system was controlled with MT2. $J_{C,20}$ determined in MT1 at MLTS of 23 g L$^{-1}$ and SGD$_{m}$ of 0.23 Nm$^{-3}$ h$^{-1}$ m$^{-2}$. N.D.: not determined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Period i (days 1 to 58)</th>
<th>Period ii (days 59 to 170)</th>
<th>Period iii (days 171 to 206)</th>
<th>Period iv (days 207 to 310)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$J_{20}$ in MT1 (LMH)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J_{C,20}$ in MT1 (LMH)</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled $T$ (°C)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRT (h)</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>5.5, 9.5, 12</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Average influent wastewater characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Mean ± SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TSS</td>
<td>mgTSS L⁻¹</td>
<td>242 ± 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSS</td>
<td>mgVSS L⁻¹</td>
<td>199 ± 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total COD</td>
<td>mgCOD L⁻¹</td>
<td>459 ± 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soluble COD</td>
<td>mgCOD L⁻¹</td>
<td>81 ± 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFA</td>
<td>mgCOD L⁻¹</td>
<td>7 ± 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₄-S</td>
<td>mgS L⁻¹</td>
<td>107 ± 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH₄-N</td>
<td>mgN L⁻¹</td>
<td>28.6 ± 9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO₄-P</td>
<td>mgP L⁻¹</td>
<td>3.1 ± 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alk</td>
<td>mgCaCO₃ L⁻¹</td>
<td>309.7 ± 44.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Average sludge characteristics. Nomenclature: SRB: sulphate reducing bacteria; MA: methanogenic archaea; SMP: soluble microbial products; EPS: extracellular polymeric substances; C: carbohydrates; and P: proteins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Mean ± SD</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesophilic (33 °C)</td>
<td>Psychrophilic (20 °C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRB</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>6 ± 2</td>
<td>3 ± 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>4 ± 2</td>
<td>2 ± 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRB + MA</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>10 ± 4</td>
<td>5 ± 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific SMP&lt;sub&gt;C&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>mg g&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;MLVS</td>
<td>5 ± 1</td>
<td>2 ± 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific SMP&lt;sub&gt;P&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>mg g&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;MLVS</td>
<td>82 ± 3</td>
<td>14 ± 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMP-P/C ratio</td>
<td>mgSMP&lt;sub&gt;P&lt;/sub&gt; mg&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;SMP&lt;sub&gt;C&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eEPS&lt;sub&gt;C&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>mg g&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;MLVS</td>
<td>34 ± 4</td>
<td>24 ± 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eEPS&lt;sub&gt;P&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>mg g&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;MLVS</td>
<td>121 ± 9</td>
<td>74 ± 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eEPS-P/C ratio</td>
<td>mgEPS&lt;sub&gt;P&lt;/sub&gt; mg&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;EPS&lt;sub&gt;C&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>