



Cairo University

SIMULTANEOUS ELECTRICITY GENERATION AND WASTEWATER TREATMENT USING MICROBIAL FUEL CELLS

By

Safwat Mahmoud Safwat Abd ElAzim Ahmed

A Thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in
CIVIL ENGINEERING - PUBLIC WORKS

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2016

SIMULTANEOUS ELECTRICITY GENERATION AND WASTEWATER TREATMENT USING MICROBIAL FUEL CELLS

By

Safwat Mahmoud Safwat Abd ElAzim Ahmed

A Thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in
CIVIL ENGINEERING - PUBLIC WORKS

Under the Supervision of

Prof. Dr. Hisham Sayed Abdel-Halim

Dr. Ehab Helmy Rozaik

Professor of Sanitary &
Environmental Engineering
Faculty of Engineering
Cairo University

Assistant Professor of Sanitary &
Environmental Engineering
Faculty of Engineering
Cairo University

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2016

SIMULTANEOUS ELECTRICITY GENERATION AND WASTEWATER TREATMENT USING MICROBIAL FUEL CELLS

By

Safwat Mahmoud Safwat Abd ElAzim Ahmed

A Thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in
CIVIL ENGINEERING - PUBLIC WORKS

**Approved by the
Examining Committee**

Prof. Dr. Hisham Sayed Abdel-Halim, Thesis Main Advisor

Prof. Dr. Ehab Mohamed Rashed, Internal Examiner

Prof. Dr. Maha Mostafa Elshafai, External Examiner
- Housing and Building National Research Center, Egypt

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2016

Acknowledgements

First, the deep thank to Allah by the grace of whom the progress and success of this work was possible.

I am deeply grateful to **Prof. Dr. Hisham Sayed Abdel-Halim**, Prof. of Sanitary and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University for patient guidance, helpful suggestions, great support and cooperation during this research progress.

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my supervisor **Dr.Ehab Helmy Rozaik**, Associate Professor of Sanitary and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University for his diligent effort, endless help, motivation and enthusiasm he transmitted to me during the research progress.

I owe gratitude and thanks to **Prof. Dr. Maha Elshafai, Prof. Dr. Osama Hodhod, Dr. Khaled Zaher, Dr. Minerva Edward, Dr. Abdel-Salam El-Awwad, Eng. Rana Ehab, and Eng. Mostafa Samir** for all the support they gave me.

I greatly appreciate the support and encouragement provided by my family, I couldn't have done this work without their help.

Finally, I owe my thanks and gratitude to every one who participated directly or indirectly in this work.

TABLE OF CONTENT

ACKNOWLEDGES	I
TABLE OF CONTENTS	II
LIST OF TABLES	IV
LIST OF FIGURES	V
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	VI
ABSTRACT	VII
1-INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES	1
1.1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.2. OBJECTIVES OF DISSERTATION	3
2-LITERATURE REVIEW	4
2.1. Biochemistry	4
2.1.1. The Generation of Biochemical energy	4
2.1.2. Energy and Biochemical Reactions	5
2.1.3. Electrochemistry	6
2.2. Wastewater	7
2.2.1. Introduction:.....	7
2.2.2. Carbohydrates:.....	8
2.2.1. a. Glucose:	9
2.2.1.b. Sucrose:	9

2.2.1.c. Starch:	9
2.2.3. Industrial Wastewater	9
2.2.3.a. Benzene:	9
2.2.3.b. Phenols:	10
2.2.4. Domestic Wastewater	10
2.2.5. Bioremediation	13
2.2.6. Biological Wastewater Treatment	14
2.2.6.a. Suspended Growth Processes:	14
2.2.6.b. Attached Growth Processes:	14
2.3. Microbial Fuel cells	14
2.3.1. Introduction	14
2.3.2. History of Microbial Fuel Cells	15
2.3.3. Bioelectricity Generation Using Microbial Fuel Cell	15
2.3.4. Mechanisms of Electron Transfer	17
2.3.5. Mediators	18
2.3.6. Community Analysis.....	19
2.3.7. Materials.....	19
2.3.7.a. Anode Material	20
2.3.7.b. Membranes and Separators	20
2.3.7.c. Cathode Materials	21
2.3.8. Various Configurations for MFC	22
2.3.8.a. Single Chamber Air-Cathode System	22
2.3.8.b. Two-Chamber Air-Cathode System	23
2.3.8.c. Tubular Single Chamber Air-Cathode System	24

2.3.8.d. Flat Plate System	24
2.3.8.e. Aqueous Cathode System Using Dissolved Oxygen	25
2.3.8.f. Tubular Packed Bed System	29
2.3.9. MFCs For Wastewater Treatment	32
2.3.9.a. Process Trains for wastewater treatment plants	32
2.3.9.b. Replacement of the Biological Treatment Reactor with MFCs ...	35
2.3.9.c. Overview on Recent Researches About Using MFCs	36
2.3.10. Reactor Scale Up	38
3-EXPERIMENTAL WORK	39
3.1. MFC setup and operating procedures	39
3.2. Analysis	51
4-RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	52
4.1. Effect of the three different configurations on the performance of the MFC used to treat synthetic wastewater	52
4.2. Effect of bacterial adhesion to the anode electrode on the performance of the MFC used to treat synthetic wastewater	57
4.3. Effect of increasing the surface area of the anode electrode in an MFC using activated alumina, extruded activated carbon, and granular activated carbon	62
4.4. Morphology of the electrodes	68
4.5. Performance of single chamber MFC used to treat glucose-based	70
4.6. Performance of single chamber MFC used to treat sucrose-based synthetic wastewater	74

4.7. Performance of single chamber MFC used to treat soluble starch-based synthetic wastewater	78
4.8. Performance of single-chamber MFC used to treat primary settled domestic wastewater at various pH values	82
4.9. Performance of single-chamber MFC used to treat phenol-based synthetic wastewater	86
4.10. Performance of single chamber MFC used to treat Benzene-based synthetic wastewater	90
4.11. Coulombic efficiencies obtained from the experiments	94
5-CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK RECOMMENDATIONS	96
5.1. CONCLUSIONS	96
5.2. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER WORK	97
REFERENCES	98

List of Tables

Table 3.1 - Specifications of the MFCs used in this study	43
Table 3.2 - Properties of the Activated Alumina	44
Table 3.3 - Properties of the Extruded Activated Carbon	44
Table 3.4 - Properties of the Granular Activated Carbon	44
Table 4.1 - Comparison between costs in case of anode electrode without immersion and in case of anode electrode pre-immersed in microbial solution	61
Table 4.2 - Power densities reported in literature versus those obtained in this study.....	67

List of Figures

Fig.2.1: Schematic of the basic components of a microbial fuel cell	17
Fig.2.2 : Operating principles of a MFC	18
Fig.2.3: Single chamber air-cathode	22
Fig.2.4: Two-chamber, air-cathode cube type MFC	23
Fig.2.5: Single-chamber air-cathode MFC with a cathode tube concentric with eight graphite anodes in an acrylic tube casing	24
Fig.2.6: Flat-plate MFC that has a CEM clamped between the two electrodes, with the plates drilled to contain a serpentine channel to allow flow of wastewater (WW) and air on opposite sides of the electrodes	25
Fig.2.7: Different H-type reactor MFCs	26
Fig.2.8: Two-chamber MFC used to produce up to 4.1 W/m ² (normalized to anode surface area) with ferricyanide as a catholyte.	27
Fig.2.9: H-type MFC using permanganate as the electron acceptor in the cathode chamber. (A) Schematic, (B) Photograph	28
Fig.2.10: Two-chamber “brushing” reactor developed by You et al. (2006) that used permanganate as the catholyte. (A) Schematic, (B) Photograph	29
Fig.2.11: Continuous-flow tubular reactors developed by (A) Jang et al. (2004), and (B) Moon et al. (2005) for electricity generation	30
Fig.2.12: Two different tubular upflow reactor designs using ferricyanide cathodes. (A) Schematic and (B) photograph of an upflow system with the reactor packed with reticulated vitreous carbon (RVC), with the CEM separating the two chambers. (C) Schematic of a reactor packed with granular activated carbon (GAC) with a tube made of a CEM and packed with GAC, that contains a ferricyanide solution	31
Fig.2.13: Process flow train for a typical domestic wastewater treatment plant	33
Fig.2.14: Biological treatment process consisting of a bioreactor and secondary clarifier. (A) Activated sludge process with aeration basin, sludge recycle, and	

waste sludge lines; (B) Trickling filter process consisting of biotower, solids contact tank, biotower effluent recycle and sludge recycle lines	34
Fig.2.15: Flow diagrams for using an MFC reactor as the biological treatment process. (A) A conventional treatment train with a downstream solids contact tank, sludge recycle line, and clarifier. (B) Combined with a MBR using the MFC as a pretreatment method to provide power for the MBR reactor	36
Fig. 3.1 - Dual chamber microbial fuel cell (DC+): a) scheme, b) photo	40
Fig. 3.2 - Single chamber air cathode microbial fuel cell with a PEM (SC+): a) scheme, b) photo	41
Fig. 3.3 - Single chamber air cathode microbial fuel cell without a PEM: a) Scheme of SC-, b) photo of SC-, c) Scheme of AASC-, d) Scheme of ACSC-, and e) Scheme of GCSC-	42
Fig. 3.4: Electrode	45
Fig. 3.5: Magnetic stirrer	46
Fig. 3.6: Magnetic stirrer bar	46
Fig. 3.7: Data acquisition system	47
Fig. 3.8: Proton exchange membrane (Nafion 117)	47
Fig. 3.9: Resistors	48
Fig. 3.10: Balance	48
Fig. 3.11: Aerator	49
Fig. 3.12: Titanium wire	49
Fig. 3.13: Hanna instrument multimeter	50
Fig. 4.1 - a) Voltage generation over time for a) DC+, b) SC+, and c) SC-	53
Fig. 4.2 - Power Density over time for DC+, SC+, and SC-	54
Fig. 4.3 - COD removal efficiency for DC+, SC+, and SC-	55
Fig. 4.4 - a) Anode electrode at the beginning of the experiment under a SEM (X8000), b) Anode electrode at the end of the experiment in DC+ under SEM(X8000), c) Anode electrode at the end of the experiment in SC+ under a SEM (X8000), d) Anode electrode at the end of the experiment in SC- under SEM (X8000)	56
Fig. 4.5 - Voltage over time for SC- with/without the immersion of the anode	

electrode	58
Fig. 4.6 - Power density over time for SC- with/without the immersion of the anode electrode	59
Fig. 4.7 - COD removal efficiency over time for SC- with/out the immersion of the anode electrode	60
Fig. 4.8 - AFM images a) anode electrode before immersion in the microbial solution, b) anode electrode after immersion in the microbial solution for one week	61
Fig. 4.9 - Voltage generation over time for the SC- with only the anode electrode, with the anode electrode and activated alumina, with the anode electrode and extruded activated carbon, and with the anode electrode and granular activated carbon	63
Fig. 4.10 - Power density over time for the SC- with only the anode electrode, with the anode electrode and activated alumina, with the anode electrode and extruded activated carbon, and with the anode electrode and granular activated carbon	64
Fig. 4.11 - COD removal efficiency over time for the SC- with only the anode electrode, with the anode electrode and activated alumina, a with the anode electrode and extruded activated carbon, and with the anode electrode and granular activated carbon	65
Fig.4.12 - Anode electrode under AFM before immersion process	68
Fig.4.13 - Anode electrode under AFM after immersion in microbial solution	69
Fig.4.14 - Anode electrode under AFM after immersion in anaerobic sludge	69
Fig.4.15 - Voltage over time with microbial solution and anaerobic sludge for glucose-based wastewater	71
Fig.4.16 - Power density over time with microbial solution and anaerobic sludge for glucose-based wastewater	72
Fig.4.17 - COD removal efficiency over time with microbial solution and anaerobic sludge for glucose-based wastewater	73
Fig.4.18 - Voltage over time with microbial solution and anaerobic sludge for sucrose-based wastewater	75
Fig.4.19 - Power density over time with microbial solution and anaerobic sludge for sucrose-based wastewater	
Fig.4.20 - COD removal efficiency over time with	

microbial solution and anaerobic sludge for sucrose-based wastewater	76
Fig.4.20 - COD removal efficiency over time with microbial solution and anaerobic sludge for sucrose-based wastewater	77
Fig.4.21 - Voltage over time with microbial solution and anaerobic sludge for soluble starch-based wastewater	79
Fig.4.22 - Power density over time with microbial solution and anaerobic sludge for soluble starch-based wastewater	80
Fig.4.23 - COD removal efficiency over time with microbial solution and anaerobic sludge for soluble starch-based wastewater	81
Fig. 4.24 -Voltage over time for primary settled domestic wastewaters at different pH values	83
Fig. 4.25 -Power density over time for primary settled domestic wastewaters at different pH values	84
Fig. 4.26 -COD removal efficiency over time for primary settled domestic wastewaters at different pH values	85
Fig. 4.27 -Voltage over time for phenol-based wastewater	87
Fig. 4.28 -Power density over time for phenol-based wastewater	88
Fig. 4.29 -COD removal efficiency over time for phenol-based wastewater	89
Fig. 4.30 -Voltage over time for benzene-based wastewater	91
Fig. 4.31 -Power density over time for benzene-based wastewater	92
Fig. 4.32 -COD removal efficiency over time for benzene-based wastewater	93
Fig.4.33 -Coulombic efficiencies for primary settled domestic wastewater, phenol-based wastewater, and benzene-based wastewater	95

ABSTRACT

This study shows the effects of various conditions on performance of microbial fuel cells (MFCs) used to treat wastewater. The conditions included the following: three different configurations (dual chamber MFC with proton exchange membrane (PEM), single chamber MFC with PEM, and single chamber MFC without PEM); bacterial adhesion; and increasing the anode surface area by using activated alumina, extruded activated carbon and granular activated carbon. The maximum voltage production, power density, and COD removal values were 28mV, 0.46 mW/m², and 68.8% respectively in case of dual chamber MFC with PEM; 3 mV, 0.0053 mW/m², and 54.5% respectively in case of single chamber MFC with PEM; and 78 mV, 10.77 mW/m², and 83%, respectively in case of single chamber MFC without PEM. The voltage generation, power density, and COD removal increased to 351 mV, 218 mW/m², and 98.7 %, respectively, when using an anode electrode that was immersed in the microbial solution for one week beforehand in the single chamber MFC without PEM. The voltage generation and power density improved to 420 mV, and 312 mW/m², respectively, after increasing the anode area through with 170 gm activated alumina, but no improvement was observed when using extruded activated carbon or granular activated carbon under the same conditions. Then the performance of single chamber membrane less microbial fuel cells used to treat three different carbohydrate synthetic wastewaters was investigated. The three synthetic wastewaters contained glucose, sucrose, and soluble starch respectively. Two different inocula were used: microbial solution containing different species of microorganisms, and anaerobic sludge. Results showed that the highest values of voltage, power densities and COD removal efficiencies were obtained in case of microbial fuel cells fed with glucose-based synthetic wastewater, and were found to be 351 mV, 218 mW/m², and 98.8 % respectively in case of microbial solution, and were found to be 508 mV, 456.8 mW/m², and 94.3 % respectively in case of anaerobic sludge. In all experiments, the values of voltage and power densities obtained in case of anaerobic sludge were higher than those obtained in case of microbial solution, while the values of COD removal efficiencies obtained in case of anaerobic sludge were less than those obtained in case of microbial solution. The study proved that the voltage generation, power densities, and COD removal efficiencies were inversely proportional to the complexity of carbohydrate used in single chamber microbial fuel cells. After that, the performance of a single-chamber microbial fuel cell (MFC) with various substrates was investigated. These substrates were primary settled domestic wastewater at pH = 6, primary settled domestic wastewater at pH = 7.2, primary settled domestic wastewater at pH = 8, phenol-based wastewater, and benzene-based wastewater. Electricity was successfully generated when these substrates were used as fuel in single-chamber MFCs inoculated with anaerobic sludge. The maximum voltages and power densities were 74 mV and 9.7 mW/m² for primary settled domestic wastewater at pH = 6, respectively; 135 mV and 32.3 mW/m² for primary settled domestic wastewater at pH = 7.2, respectively; 150 mV and 39.8 mW/m² for primary settled domestic wastewater at pH = 8, respectively; 58 mV and 5.95 mW/m² for phenol-based wastewater, respectively; and 106 mV and 19.9 mW/m² for benzene-based wastewater, respectively. The removal efficiencies for chemical oxygen demand (COD) and coulombic efficiencies were 78.2

% and 35.3 % for primary settled domestic wastewater at pH = 6, respectively; 85.1 % and 55.4 % for primary settled domestic wastewater at pH = 7.2, respectively; 80.8% and 72.9 % for primary settled domestic wastewater at pH = 8, respectively; 58.9 % and 15.1 % for phenol-based wastewater, respectively; and 73 % and 25.7 %for benzene-based wastewater, respectively. The highest voltage production, power density and COD removal were obtained using primary settled domestic wastewater, whereas the lowest values were obtained using phenol-based wastewater. The performance of the MFC was enhanced by increasing the influent pH of the primary settled domestic wastewater. The lowest coulombic efficiencies were obtained from phenol-based wastewater and benzene-based wastewater, which indicated that electrogenic bacteria were not the primary microorganisms responsible for the biodegradation of phenol and benzene.

Key words: Microbial Fuel Cells; Configurations; Bacterial Adhesion; Anaerobic Sludge; Carbohydrates; Benzene; Domestic Wastewater; Phenol