This is an Accepted Manuscript of the article: Santos-Clotas, E., Cabrera-Codony, A., Comas, J., Martín, M.J. (2020). Biogas purification through membrane bioreactors: Experimental study on siloxane separation and biodegradation. *Separation and Purification Technology*, vol. 238, art. Núm. 116440. Available online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2019.116440

@ 2020. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license http:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/



2

Biogas purification through membrane bioreactors: experimental study on siloxane separation and biodegradation

- 3 Eric Santos-Clotas^a, Alba Cabrera-Codony^a, Joaquim Comas^{a,b}, Maria J. Martín^{a*}
- 4 ^aLEQUIA, Institute of the Environment. University of Girona, Campus Montilivi, Girona
- 5 17003, Catalonia, Spain
- ⁶ ^b ICRA, Catalan Institute for Water Research, Girona, Spain.
- 7 *Corresponding author e-mail: maria.martin@udg.edu

8 ABSTRACT

9 Sewage biogas valorization to different energy applications is hampered by the presence of 10 volatile methyl siloxanes. Despite the high operating costs, adsorption onto activated carbon is 11 the most implemented technology for siloxane removal from biogas. In order to purify biogas 12 sustainably, the current work explores the diffusion of siloxanes (octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane 13 and decamethylcyclopentasiloxane) together with other biogas impurities (limonene, toluene and 14 hexane) through polydimethylsiloxane membranes. Abiotic tests revealed transport efficiencies 15 above 75% towards a clean air stream for most compounds, although the transport of the most 16 hydrophobic pollutants was challenged when water was circulated through the shell side of the 17 membrane. Moreover, the performance of a hollow-fiber membrane bioreactor, inoculated with 18 anerobic active sludge, was evaluated towards biogas purification in anoxic conditions. Toluene 19 and limonene were successfully degraded, hexane's removal efficiency was positively correlated 20 with the residence time, and siloxanes removal was achieved up to 21%. CO₂ was detected in the 21 outlet gas as the mineralization product as well as some byproducts from the degradation of 22 limonene and siloxanes. The presence of 1% of O_2 in the gas, as a strategy to substitute the NO_3^- 23 , efficiently supported high removal for volatile organic compounds and moderate for siloxanes, 24 which would ultimately reduce the operating costs of the technology.

26 KEYWORDS

27 Biogas purification; Membrane bioreactor; Siloxanes; Volatile Organic Compounds

28 1. INTRODUCTION

29 Biogas production arises from the anaerobic digestion of the enormous quantities of sludge 30 generated in wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) and also in landfills. Biogas exploitation is 31 currently increasing owing to its energy applications given by the high methane content, while 32 restricting the release of greenhouse gases (GHG) into the atmosphere. Besides the major 33 compounds constituting biogas mixtures (i.e. CH₄ and CO₂), there is a large variability of 34 impurities, including alkanes, aromatic hydrocarbons and halogens (Bak et al., 2019; Papadias et 35 al., 2011). Hydrogen sulfide (H₂S) is one of the impurities found at higher concentrations, ranging 36 from 1000 to 20000 ppm_v and has damaging corrosive properties to the combustion engines 37 (Montebello et al., 2014). Thus, it must be removed or reduced to different levels depending on 38 the use of biogas (Papurello et al., 2019; Santos-Clotas et al., 2019b).

39 On the other hand, volatile organic silicon compounds (i.e. siloxanes) have been found to be the 40 most harmful pollutants in energy recovery systems (ERS) during biogas valorization due to the 41 abrasive character of SiO₂, which is the conversion product of siloxanes after biogas combustion 42 (Soreanu et al., 2011). Their occurrence in sewage biogas arises from their presence in cosmetics, 43 personal care products, shampoos, detergents and many more everyday products that eventually 44 reach the WWTPs (Zhang et al., 2011). Given their low solubility in water and their liposoluble 45 nature, siloxanes are adsorbed onto the sludge flocs that reach the anaerobic digester where they 46 are volatilized with biogas due to the elevated temperatures (Dewil et al., 2006).

To meet the energy demand in the treatment facility, biogas can be converted into heat and energy by microturbines and internal combustion engines (ICE). Depending on the final biogas conversion system, upgrading steps will be imperative according to the manufacturer's requirements. In this sense, siloxane concentration in biogas prior to its valorization in microturbines or fuel cells must be decreased to levels below 0.03 or 0.1 mg m⁻³, respectively (de Arespacochaga et al., 2015; Santos-Clotas et al., 2019b). Biogas can also be injected into the domestic gas grids or it can be used as a car fuel after undergoing upgrading measures to fulfill the legislative demands which is regulated by the country-dependent national laws. For instance, siloxane concentration in biogas must be below 10 mg m⁻³ in Spain and Austria, or below 6 mg m⁻³ in Czech Republic prior to its injection into the national gas grids (Muñoz *et al.*, 2015).

57 Conventional technologies used for siloxane abatement are based on non-regenerative adsorption 58 onto fixed beds of activated carbon (AC) (Cabrera-Codony et al., 2015). Steam ACs are 59 frequently used in such application even though scientific reports highlight a superior siloxane 60 adsorption capacity by chemically activated carbons (Cabrera-Codony et al., 2018, 2014). Other 61 physical/chemical technologies for siloxane abatement include absorption into strong acids and 62 bases such as H₂SO₄, HNO₃ and NaOH (Schweigkofler and Niessner, 2001), and deep chilling in 63 which siloxanes are condensed by reducing the temperature of biogas to 5°C or even below -20°C 64 (Wheless and Pierce, 2004). Biological technologies for siloxane removal from biogas are under 65 investigation at lab-scale including biotrickling filtration (BTF) and membrane bioreactors 66 (MBR) among others.

67 Biotrickling filtration has resulted as an efficient technique in handling odor-laden gases as well 68 as biogas desulfurization (Lebrero et al., 2012; Montebello et al., 2014). Some scientific papers 69 are found in the literature reporting on the biological elimination of siloxanes in biotrickling filters 70 identifying mass transfer as the main limitation for siloxane elimination (Accettola et al., 2008; 71 Popat and Deshusses, 2008). Most of the studies in the literature assessing siloxane removal from 72 biogas with biotechnologies are conducted in aerobic conditions (i.e. O₂ as the final electron 73 acceptor) by providing air as the synthetic gas matrix. Since oxygen composition in biogas is 74 generally found below 1%, and more importantly due to explosion risks it is crucial to investigate 75 siloxane removal using other electron acceptors. In this sense, Santos-Clotas et al., (2019a) 76 studied the removal of octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane (D4) and decamethylcyclopentasiloxane 77 (D5) in an anoxic BTF by supplying NO_3^- in the trickling solution. D5 (37%) removal was higher 78 than D4 (13%), especially when the packing bed of the BTF was supplemented with activated 79 carbon which boosted D5's removal efficiency up to 45%. In this regard, siloxane degradation studies with different isolates from anaerobic batch enrichment cultures proved that D5 was more
biodegradable than D4 (Boada *et al.*, 2020).

82 On the other hand, membrane bioreactors (MBR) are based on the transference of gas pollutants 83 from one side of the membrane to the other, where a biofilm is developed over the surface of the 84 membrane and is in contact with a nutrient-containing mineral medium. Several types of 85 membranes are found commercially. Dense membranes are more selective, but their ability to 86 diffuse the pollutants through the fibers depends on the contaminant's solubility and diffusivity 87 (Kumar et al., 2008b). The driving force for the pollutants to permeate through the membrane 88 relies on the concentration gradient between both sides, thus depending on the ability of the 89 microbial population to degrade the contaminants (Reij et al., 1998). Membranes are capable of 90 selectively permeate pollutants that are hardly transferred using other reactor configurations 91 (Barbusinski et al., 2017). Few scientific reports assess the treatment of gas streams containing 92 volatile organic compounds (VOC), such as toluene, benzene and hexane among others, in lab or 93 pilot scale MBRs (Kumar et al., 2008a; Lebrero et al., 2014) as well as H₂S in biogas (Pokorna-Krayzelova et al., 2017). Considering biogas treatment, siloxane permeation through 94 95 polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS) membranes was only evaluated with clean air flowing in the other 96 side of the membrane, who reported high removal efficiencies for both cyclic and linear siloxanes 97 (Ajhar et al., 2012). However, no reports are found on biogas purification by means of MBRs.

98 The aim of this study is to investigate the performance of a hollow-fiber membrane bioreactor 99 inoculated with anaerobic digester sludge on the removal of siloxanes and other occurrent volatile 100 organic compounds in biogas. The abiotic transference through a PDMS membrane towards clean 101 air and water will be assessed as well as different strategies related to the final electron acceptor 102 will be evaluated in order to optimize the bioreactor.

104 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

105 **2.1 Synthetic biogas**

106 The synthetic biogas used for conducting this research consisted in nitrogen as the gas matrix 107 three VOC (hexane, toluene and limonene) and spiked with two siloxanes 108 (octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane D4, and decamethylcyclopentasiloxane D5) based on their 109 common occurrence in anerobic digester biogas (Papadias et al., 2011).

- 110 Liquid reagents of D4 (98%), D5 (97%), toluene (99.8%), D-limonene (97%) and n-hexane (99%) 111 (Sigma Aldrich) were used for the present work. The liquid reagent of each target compound was 112 added to a septum-sealed vial and weighted in an analytical balance (XSR105 Mettler Toledo, 113 USA). The vial was shacked at 200 rpm in an orbital shaker (3005, GFL) for 30 minutes to 114 guarantee homogeneity. The resulting mixture was accurately injected at 18 μ L h⁻¹ by a syringe 115 pump (11 Elite, Harvard Apparatus) through a septum in a tee union (Swagelok, USA) to a N_2 116 stream (99.999%, Abelló Linde, Spain) regulated by a mass flow controller (MC Series, Alicat 117 Scientific). The synthetic gas generated was homogenized in four static mixers (Koflo, Cole 118 Parmer, USA) connected in series followed by a mixing chamber. The target concentrations (C_0) 119 as well as main physical and chemical properties of the target pollutants are detailed in Table 1. 120 The inlet and outlet gas composition were analyzed by a flow-through gas sampling valve in a 121 gas chromatograph equipped with a flame ionization detector (GC-FID, 7890B Agilent 122 Technologies). Separation of the target pollutants was carried out by a HP-5ms Ultra Inert 123 capillary column (Agilent Technologies). Standards for calibration purposes were obtained by 124 injecting the target mixture (Table 1) to different N₂ flows. Detection limit for siloxanes was 1 125 mg m⁻³ while for VOCs was 0.5 mg m⁻³. Analysis of the inlet and outlet gas streams was performed
- 126 in triplicate (coefficient of variation < 5%).

Table 1. Main properties and reed gas concentration of the target compounds							
Compound	Formula	MW	Water solubility	\mathbf{C}_0	Henry's constant		
		[g mol ⁻¹]	[mg L ⁻¹]	[mg m ⁻³]	[atm m ³ mol ⁻¹]		
Hexane	H ₄ C	86.2	9.5	375 ± 18	1.80		

Table 1. Main properties and feed gas concentration of the target compounds

Toluene	Ĕ	92.1	526	24 ± 2	6.64 x 10 ⁻³
Limonene	Č.	136.2	13.8	220 ± 11	2.81 x 10 ⁻²
D4	\Si →Si 0Si ↓ ↓Si	296.6	0.056	54 ± 3	12.00
D5		370.7	0.017	102 ± 4	33.00

*in water at 25 °C according to PubChem library

127

128 **2.2 Gas abiotic experiments**

129 The PDMS membrane module employed for the first set of gas abiotic experiments was the PermSelect PDMSXA-10 (MedArray Inc, USA), consisting of 30 parallel dense hollow fibers of 130 190 μ m inner diameter and 300 μ m outer diameter. The membrane area was estimated at 10 cm² 131 132 and a lumen-side priming volume of 0.67 cm³. The test gas was flown through the lumen side 133 (inside fibers) at 50 mL min⁻¹ leading to a gas residence time (GRT) of 0.72 s. On the other side 134 of the fibers, i.e. the shell side, a clean N₂ stream was provided as displayed in Fig. 1 at rates 135 ranging from 25 to 400 mL min⁻¹, leading to different shell-to-lumen flow ratios (0.5, 1, 2, 4 and 136 8).

- 137 For each experiment, the test gas run overnight to reach steady state, due to the certain adsorption
- 138 of the compounds in the membrane fibers taking place during the first operation hours.



Fig. 1. Membrane setup for gas abiotic experiments: (1) N_2 cylinder; (2) Syringe pump; (3) 250-mL syringe with mixture; (4, 5) Mass flow controllers; (6) Hollow-fiber membrane (PDMSXA-10); (7, 8) Pressure transducers and (9, 10, 11) sampling ports for GC analysis.

140 **2.3 Hollow-fiber membrane bioreactor (HF-MBR)**

The reactor used was a commercial hollow-fiber module (PDMSXA-2500, PermSelect®, MedArrays Inc, USA) that consisted of 3200 hollow fibers of 190 and 300 µm inner and outer diameter, respectively. The total membrane area accounted for 2500 cm² and a lumen-side priming volume of 21 cm³. The synthetic test gas with the compounds in Table 1 was generated as described previously (section 2.1) and humidified through a gas wash bottle. The inlet gas was regulated by a mass flow controller and fed through the lumen side of the membrane module. Fig. 2 shows a schematic representation of the lab-scale hollow-fiber membrane bioreactor setup.

Through the shell side, the synthetic mineral medium with nutrients was recycled at 50 rpm (100 mL min⁻¹) by a peristaltic pump (323S Watson Marlow, USA) from an external reservoir
continuously agitated.

Fig. 2. Schematic representation of the HF-MBR. 1 N₂ bottle; 2 Syringe pump; 3 and 8 Mass flow controllers; 4 Water column; 5 Static mixers; 6 Mixing chamber; 7 and 9 Sampling points; 10 HF-MBR; 11 Nutrients reservoir; 12 Peristaltic pump

151

152 2.3.1 Abiotic operation

In a close-loop system where water is continuously recirculated, the pollutants' mass transfer depends on their solubility besides the transport efficiency of the membrane. So once the water had absorbed the maximum concentration possible for each compound, their mass transfer tends to zero. In order to approach a bioreactor configuration, in which a liquid media is found in one side of the membrane, the capacity of the contaminants to permeate from the lumen side towards water in the shell side was investigated. An open-loop configuration with clean water 159 continuously circulating through the membrane (water/gas) was set-up before inoculating the HF-160 MBR. The abiotic mass transfer characterization of the target VOCs and siloxanes was conducted 161 according to Lebrero *et al.*, (2014) at different GRTs. The test gas was supplied through the lumen 162 side whereas a clean water flow was circulated at a constant flow of 100 mL min⁻¹ through the 163 shell side of the module. The abiotic transfer of the target pollutants vas evaluated at 9.6, 16, 24, 164 40 and 60 s of GRT by monitoring their concentration in the inlet and outlet of the lumen and 165 calculating the transport efficiency (in %) as in Eq. 1.

166 2.3.2 Inoculum and synthetic mineral medium

Anaerobic sludge from the anaerobic digester of the urban wastewater treatment plant of Girona (Spain) was used as inoculum in the membrane bioreactor. In order to remove the dissolved organic matter from the sludge, the following procedure was carried out 3 times: centrifugation at 10000 rpm for 10 min (EBA 21, Hettich), pouring the remaining water and re-suspension with fresh mineral medium. The sludge was diluted to a final concentration of 4.2 g TSS L⁻¹, and 250 mL of the cleaned and diluted sludge were used as MBR inoculum.

173 The synthetic mineral medium was composed of (in g L⁻¹): 1 NaCl; 0.2 MgSO₄·7H₂O; 0.02 174 CaCl₂·2H₂O; 0.04 NH₄Cl; 1.16 KH₂PO₄·H₂O; 4.76 of HEPES buffering agent. The pH was 175 adjusted to 6.9 using NaOH 1 M. The resulting mineral medium was used for both the sludge 176 resuspension previously described and the recycling solution in the MBR operation. Anoxic 177 conditions were provided with 2 g L⁻¹ of NaNO₃⁻ in the mineral medium.

178 2.3.3 Operating conditions

The membrane module was inoculated with 250 mL of the cleaned sludge corresponding to a concentration of 4.2 g TSS L⁻¹ and operated at different conditions as summarized in Table 2. During stage I, 1-36 days, the GRT was 18 s, corresponding to a gas flow of 70 mL min⁻¹. The recirculating solution was renewed every 72 hours corresponding to a dilution rate of 0.3 d⁻¹. The influence of the GRT on the removal of the target pollutants was evaluated by increasing it to

184 31.5 s (period II days 37-64) and 63 s (days 65-73).

Automatic NO_3^- supply system started at day 73 by injecting a solution of 200 g NO_3^- L⁻¹ (provided by NaNO₃ of 99% purity) to the recirculation solution by means of a syringe pump (11 Elite, Harvard Apparatus) adjusted to maintain a stable concentration over 2.5 g L⁻¹, and the dilution rate of the recirculation solution was decreased to 0.1 d⁻¹.

189 In the stage IV-a (days 101-133), the GRT was decreased back to 18 s for comparison reasons. A

190 membrane cleaning was carried out at day 107 following the procedure described by Lebrero *et*

- 191 al., (2014), which consisted in increasing the liquid recycling rate in order to slough off the
- 192 biomass clogging.

In stage IV-b the carrier gas was supplemented with 1% of O_2 at day 134, based on the common O₂ content in biogas (Rasi et al., 2007), and was operated with NO₃⁻ and O₂ as final electron acceptors until day 152. Finally, from day 153 to 164 (stage IV-c), the reactor was operated with only O₂ and the automatic infusion of NO₃⁻ was stopped.

Table 2. Operating conditions of the HF-MBR.

Stage		Period	GRT	Final e ⁻	NO ₃ -
		[days]	[s]	acceptor	supply
Ι		1-36	18	NO ₃ -	Manual
II		37-64	31.5	NO_3^-	Manual
III	-a	65-73	63	NO_3^-	Manual
	-b	74-100	63	NO_3^-	Automatic
IV	-a	101-133	18	NO_3^-	Automatic
	-b	134-152	18	$NO_3^-+O_2$	Automatic
	-с	153-164	18	O_2	Automatic

197 2.3.4 Analytical procedures

198 NO₃⁻ concentration in the recycling solution of the HF-MBR was analyzed by a 199 Spectrophotometer (Cary3500, Agilent Technologies) following the Standard Methods 4500-200 NO₃⁻ (APHA, 1998). Identification of biodegradation by-products in the trickling solution was 201 conducted by means of a Gas Chromatography coupled to a Mass Spectrometry detector (GC-202 MS, 7890B-5977B, Agilent Technologies) as described in (Santos-Clotas *et al.*, 2019a) and α-ω-203 silanediols determination was carried out following the procedure reported by Cabrera-Codony 204 *et al.*, (2017). Pure commercial reagents were injected in the GC-MS for further confirmation. 205 CO_2 in the effluent of the HF-MBR (lumen side) was analyzed by means of a gas sampling valve 206 in the GC-MS described above, by monitoring the ion with m/z 44. Calibration standards were 207 prepared by diluting CO_2 (99.99%, Abelló Linde, Spain) to different N₂ streams.

The performance of the HF-MBR was evaluated by the removal efficiency (RE) and the elimination capacity (EC) following Eq. 1 and Eq. 2, respectively, considering the analysis of the inlet and outlet streams flowing through the lumen side of the membrane. In order to evaluate the biological degradation, the carbon mineralization efficiency (CME) was defined as in Eq. 3.

$$RE(\%) = \left(\frac{C_0 - C_F}{C_0}\right) \times 100$$
 Eq. 1

$$EC (g m^{-3}h^{-1}) = \left(\frac{(C_0 - C_F) \times Q}{V}\right)$$
Eq. 2

$$CME (\%) = \left(\frac{P_{CO2}}{\sum_i EC_i}\right) x 100$$
 Eq. 3

Where C_0 and C_F are the target compound concentrations (g m⁻³) in the inlet and outlet of the HF-MBR, Q is the gas flow (m³ h⁻¹) and V the reactor volume (m³). In Eq. 3 P_{CO2} refers to the C produced as CO₂ detected in the lumen outlet (g C m⁻³ h⁻¹), *i* refers to each target pollutant (i.e. hexane, toluene, etc.) and EC the elimination capacity expressed as g C m⁻³ h⁻¹ of each pollutant.

216 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

217 **3.1 Abiotic diffusion of the pollutants**

218 *3.1.1 Towards clean air*

The capacity of the PDMS membrane module to separate the target pollutants was investigated in gas abiotic experiments. Each target compound concentration was monitored in the feed gas and in both the lumen and the shell outlet streams. Experiments were done by triplicate with a relative error below 5%.

The transport efficiency of most compounds, reported in Fig.3, displayed a clear steep increase with the shell/lumen flow ratio. Incrementing the flow of clean gas in the shell side distinctly boosted the transference of the target pollutants through the membrane. In the case of limonene and D5, their transport increased from 66.5 and 74.5% at the lowest ratio, respectively, up to 94.8
and 99.2 at the highest ratio 8. The transport of toluene and D4 went respectively from 55.2 and
51.4% up to 82.7 and 76.8% by increasing the shell/lumen ratio from 0.5 to 8. Contrarily, hexane
was the compound with the lowest transport efficiencies, demonstrating a moderate increase from
36.8 to 48% from 0.5 to 8 ratios.

231 The transport efficiency of all pollutants, excluding hexane, through the membrane was above 232 50% even at the lowest shell/lumen ratio tested, demonstrating that operating at such a short 233 residence time (i.e. 0.72 s), and with a low gas flow through the shell side, the target pollutants 234 were successfully permeated through the membrane. These results point out that the PDMS 235 membrane had a high selectivity towards the target compounds, except for hexane. Moreover, as 236 a result of incrementing the shell flow, the transport efficiencies increased, which indicated that 237 the driving force for the compounds to permeate through the membrane was incremented as well. 238 Moreover, the diffusion of all compounds levelled off at a flow ratio of 2, where high transport 239 efficiencies were already recorded, being 97.1, 87.9, 77.8 and 72.1% for limonene, D5, toluene 240 and D4, respectively. Therefore, incrementing the shell flow from 100 up to 400 mL min⁻¹ (i.e. 241 shell/lumen flow ratio from 2 to 8) did not significantly improve the pollutants transport.

Similar experiments were carried out by Ajhar *et al.*, (2012) using the same membrane module with gas spiked with cyclic and linear siloxanes, and high permeabilities for the siloxane D4 and D5 were reported. Their siloxane removal, for both D4 and D5, appeared above 70% when the flow ratio was higher than 2, and also D5 removal was slightly higher than D4. Siloxane transport in the present study were obtained slightly higher despite the presence of VOCs.



Fig. 3. Transport efficiency through the membrane in gas/gas experiments at different shell/lumen flow ratios.

248 3.1.2 Towards clean water

The transport efficiency of each compound was evaluated at different GRTs as function of the test gas flow through the lumen side: 9.6, 16, 24, 40 and 60 s. Results for each compound are shown in Fig. 4.

252 A noticeable linear increase in the transport efficiency with the residence time was observed for 253 toluene, which was the compound with the highest water solubility. At 9.6 s its transport across 254 the membrane was of 40% and it raised up to 84 and 93% when the GRT was increased to 40 and 255 60 s, respectively. The transport efficiency of limonene increased from 28% at 9.6 s up to 53% at 256 60 s, although the improvement from 16 (39%) to 40 s (44%) was not significant, which might 257 be explained by the relatively low solubility of limonene in water. For the same reason, D4, D5 258 and hexane, that are low water-soluble compounds, were less transported through the membrane 259 than toluene and limonene. Maximum transport efficiencies for D4, D5 and hexane were 28, 37 260 and 21%, respectively, obtained at 60 s of residence time.

The PDMS membrane was capable of permeating both siloxanes in the abiotic gas experiments, but when water was present in the other side of the membrane, their diffusion was hampered due to their low solubility. In the case of hexane, a lower affinity with the membrane material than for the rest of pollutants was observed in the abiotic gas experiments, and the presence of a liquid 265 media did not improve its permeation through the membrane, which is in good agreement with

266 Lebrero et al., (2014). In this sense, even with much higher residence time in comparison with

the gas experiments, the transfer of the compounds was limited to their Henry's law coefficients.



Fig. 4. Transport efficiency through the membrai water/gas tests at different GRTs.

268

- 269 **3.2 HF-MBR performance**
- 270 3.2.1 Start-up of the HF-MBR

The HF-MBR was inoculated with anaerobic sludge from an urban WWTP and fed with the synthetic gas stream as in the abiotic experiments, detailed in Table 1. The outlet of the membrane was continuously monitored for evaluating the RE and EC of each target compound and the whole set of data obtained is plotted in Fig. 5 for each operation period as described in Table 2.

The reactor was initially run at a GRT of 18 s (stage I, days 0-36), corresponding to the first period of operation where the NO_3^- provided by the synthetic mineral media in the shell side of the HF-MBR was used by the biofilm as final electron acceptor. In this acclimation period the removal of both siloxanes was highly fluctuant, around 1 g m⁻³ h⁻¹ of D4 and 3 g m⁻³ h⁻¹ of D5. These elimination capacities correspond to removal efficiencies from 4 to 14% for D4 (Fig. 5D) and from 2 to 23% in the case of D5 (Fig. 5E).

On the other hand, steady state for toluene and limonene (Fig. 5B and C) biodegradation was achieved within 7-8 days reaching average REs of 52 ± 2 and $85 \pm 3\%$, respectively, which corresponded to ECs of 2.4 ± 0.1 and 33.5 ± 1.2 g m⁻³ h⁻¹. In the abiotic experiments with a clean water stream circulating continuously, the transport efficiency of these target VOCs at 16 s of GRT was 39.2% and 57.9% for limonene and toluene respectively. Therefore, the presence of a biofilm in the shell side of the membrane clearly promoted a higher elimination of these target VOCs. The degradation of these compounds favored their diffusion through the membrane, which led to higher REs.

289 Regarding hexane removal, steady state was achieved after 15 days with an average EC of 2.1 g 290 m⁻³ h⁻¹ (corresponding to a RE of 4%, Fig. 5A). Indeed, hexane abatement was expected to be 291 lower than the other VOCs due to the low diffusion through the membrane previously observed 292 in the abiotic experiments. Hexane's transference through the PDMS membrane was also 293 hampered by a low mass transfer to the aqueous media, which would be in agreement with 294 Lebrero et al., (2014). However, Zhao et al., (2011) reported that hexane biodegradation was 295 inhibited by the presence of toluene during the co-treatment of hexane and toluene mixtures in a 296 HF-MBR. In this sense, an inhibition effect could not be ruled out although the inlet 297 concentrations in the present study were much lower than in the aforementioned study.



Fig. 5. Time-course of the removal efficiency (RE, •) and elimination capacity (EC, \Box) of hexane (A), toluene (B), limonene (C), D4 (D) and D5 (E). Dashed lines indicate changes in the GRT (31.5, 63 and 18 s). Solid lines represent the strategies set for the electron acceptor (Automatic NO₃⁻ injection, 1% O₂ supply and NO₃⁻ injection stoppage).

300 *3.2.2 Influence of the gas residence time*

301 In order to improve the abatement of the target compounds, the GRT was increased to 31.5 s in

302 the second stage (stage II, days 37-64). In this scenario, the removal of siloxanes increased up to

303 REs 17 ± 6 and $21 \pm 6\%$ for D4 and D5, respectively, where the ECs accounted for average values 304 of 1.0 ± 0.2 and 2.5 ± 0.7 g m⁻³ h⁻¹. The stability of the siloxanes' removal continued displaying 305 ups and downs along the time-course of the reactor operation in spite of the higher GRT provided. 306 The lack of significant correlation between siloxane removal efficiency and the GRT, indicates 307 that their diffusion through the membrane towards the liquid side was limited due to their 308 hydrophobicity regardless the residence time. Even though an increased RE was obtained for both 309 siloxanes from 18 to 31.5 s, no further improvement was achieved at 60 s of GRT. To the authors' 310 knowledge, this is the first study operating an MBR towards the removal of siloxanes from biogas. 311 However, some reports in the literature investigated the biodegradation of cyclic siloxanes in 312 BTFs and agreed that mass transfer limitations hamper siloxane biodegradation (Accettola et al., 2008; Popat and Deshusses, 2008). More recently, the performance of an anoxic BTF towards a 313 314 VOC-siloxane mixture was investigated and REs of 20 and 37% for D4 and D5, respectively, 315 were reported (Santos-Clotas et al., 2019a).

316 It is important to stress that the use of MBR ultimately entails lower reactor sizes than those 317 necessary in BTF performing similarly, since the gas residence time in the BTF was 14 min, well 318 above the GRT studied in the present HF-MBR (18-60 s).

319 Contrarily, the longer residence time led to a rapid increase in the RE of all the VOCs (Fig. 5A, 320 B and C). Hexane reached a steady state RE of $30 \pm 6\%$ corresponding to an EC of 12.5 ± 1.2 g m⁻³ h⁻¹. Toluene gradually increased until its absence in the outlet gas stream (i.e. below the 321 322 detection limit of the analytical method) at day 52, which indicated that it was completely transferred through the membrane achieving an EC up to 2.6 ± 0.3 g m⁻³ h⁻¹. Several scientific 323 324 papers agree on the efficiency of MBRs for the removal of this aromatic hydrocarbon reporting elimination capacities up to 1500 g m⁻³ h⁻¹ at GRTs in the range 0.9-60 s (Mudliar et al., 2010). 325 326 Most toluene ECs reported are much higher than in the present work given the low flows treated 327 as well as the low concentration in biogas. Limonene displayed a similar but even faster trend 328 since, just right the day after increasing the residence time, its removal was already complete reaching an EC of 22.4 g m⁻³ h⁻¹. REs as high as 98% for limonene were obtained in a flat-sheet
MBR treating a mixture of VOCs at a GRT of 30 s (Lebrero *et al.*, 2013).

The GRT was further increased to 63 s in the third period (stage III, days 65-100). Toluene and limonene REs remained at 100%, as expected. while the RE of hexane increased up to $43 \pm 7\%$, much higher than the diffusion recorded in the water abiotic tests. Average ECs within this were 1.3, 11.2 and 8.2 g m⁻³ h⁻¹ for toluene, limonene and hexane, respectively. The abatement of siloxanes slightly decreased to $14 \pm 4\%$ for D4 and $17 \pm 2\%$ for D5.

Overall, toluene and limonene were completely removed when the HF-MBR was operated at GRTs longer than 18 s, although even at such short contact time removals were found above 80% for both pollutants. As regarded in Fig. 6 the RE of these VOCs was positively influenced by increasing the gas residence time. The removal of hexane also appeared to be boosted with higher residence times from 17% at 18 s up to an average RE of 42% at 63 s.



Fig. 6. Influence of the gas residence time on the RE of the target compounds at steady state of the HF-MBR (Stages I,II,III-a).

- 341
- 342 *3.2.3 Fate of biodegradation products*

In order to study the fate of the biodegradation products, the outlet gas was analyzed by GC-MS. Carbon mineralization efficiency was determined by the CO₂ formation, as final product of target compounds mineralization. Thus, Fig. 7A depicts the carbon removed as the sum of target compounds and the carbon formed in CO₂ form in the lumen side of the membrane. It is important to highlight that an irregular gas emission was detected through the shell side from the nutrient reservoir. GC-MS analysis revealed the presence of CO_2 in such emission, indicating that a minor contribution of the CO_2 released from the pollutants' biodegradation did not permeate through the membrane. Due to the scarce flow (below 4 mL min⁻¹) and its intermittence, this shell-side emission was not monitored neither accounted for in the CME calculations. Thus, most of the formed CO_2 was found in the lumen emission, given its capacity to permeate through the membrane, as reported by Ajhar *et al.*, P (2012), and the gas driving force in the lumen side.

The CME within Stage II was roughly 60%, suggesting a partial oxidation of the target compounds and the subsequent accumulation of biodegradation byproducts. In this context, the presence of a byproduct was recorded in the outlet emission of the reactor, which was later identified as α -terpinene by means of GC-MS analysis and a match higher than 90% with NIST library. The occurrence of such byproduct was related to an incomplete oxidation of limonene, as suggested by Santos-Clotas *et al.*, (2019a) in an anoxic BTF when the input of NO₃⁻ in the trickling solution was limited due to interruptions on the irrigation system.

Furthermore, GC-MS analysis of the recirculation solution revealed the presence of dimethylsilanediol, which could not be quantified due to the lack of pure commercial standards, but has been described as one of the main metabolites of cyclic siloxanes biodegradation (Wang *et al.*, 2014).

In Stage III, the beneficial role of a higher GRT (i.e. 63 s) was noticed with a complete removal of both toluene and limonene (Fig. 5B and 5C, respectively). Moreover, the presence of α terpinene was no longer recorded, suggesting that limonene was completely degraded. This was confirmed with a CME as high as 91 ± 6 %, where the carbon produced in CO₂ form detected in the lumen emission almost matched the carbon removed from the target compounds degradation (Fig. 7A).



Fig. 7. Time-course of (A) carbon removed from target compounds degradation (\Box) and carbon produced in CO₂ form (\bullet); and (B) the NO₃⁻ concentration in the recirculation mineral medium (\circ) and NO₃⁻ consume (\blacktriangle). Dashed lines indicate changes in the GRT (31.5, 63 and 18 s). Solid lines represent the strategies set for the electron acceptor (Automatic NO₃⁻ injection, 1% O₂ supply and NO₃⁻ injection stoppage).

373 *3.2.4 Strategies related to the final electron acceptor*

374 After the assessment of the GRT in Stages I, II and III-a, the operation of the HF-MBR in the next 375 stages were devoted to evaluate different strategies to enhance the performance and the stability 376 of the system. Up until day 73, the nitrate input was only provided by the periodic replacement of 377 the mineral medium solution. Thus, the NO_3^- concentration available for the biomass was highly 378 fluctuant, as depicted in Fig. 7B. In order to avoid such fluctuation, at day 74, an automatic 379 injection of a NO₃⁻ solution was started by means of a syringe pump. The concentration of NO₃⁻ 380 was then maintained between 1.7 and 2.2 g L⁻¹, based on literature (Muñoz et al., 2013). 381 Moreover, the recycling solution replacement was decreased to a dilution rate of 0.1 d⁻¹ to avoid 382 so frequent washings of the biomass suspended in the recycling solution. Resulting from this strategy, a NO₃⁻ consume of roughly 50 mg (L d)⁻¹ (Fig. 7B) supported an efficient removal of the 383 384 VOCs and a less oscillating removal of siloxanes.

385 In stage IV (days 101-152) the GRT was decreased back to 18 s in order to evaluate the influence 386 of the strategies over the removal of all the target pollutants, given the fact that toluene and 387 limonene were already removed due to higher GRTs. A sudden decrease in the performance of 388 the HF-MBR occurred at day 104 due to membrane clogging. This clogging was attributed to the 389 long operation time rather than the change in the EBRT. Its effect was most remarkably observed 390 for both toluene and limonene, whose REs dropped to 24 and 30%, respectively. The membrane 391 cleaning at day 108 allowed for the recovery of both target pollutants removal, which increased 392 to average REs of 83 ± 12 and $94 \pm 5\%$, clearly higher than those recorded in the first period that 393 operated at the same GRT. Hexane removal was also achieved higher than in the first period, its 394 RE increased from 5 to 21%. The performance of the HF-MBR towards siloxanes was more stable 395 within this period with ECs of 1.7 ± 0.2 and 3.9 ± 0.7 g m⁻³ h⁻¹. The concentration of electron 396 acceptor decreased after reducing the GRT to 18 s, so the NO₃⁻ injection had to be adjusted due 397 to an incremented consume of ca. 80 mg $(L d)^{-1}$.

398 3.2.5 Oxygen contribution

399 Considering that the common content of oxygen in biogas (Rasi et al., 2007) is ca. 1%, the 400 following strategy adopted regarding the final electron acceptor was implemented at day 133 401 (days 134-152) and consisted in supplementing the gas matrix with a 1% of O_2 . The RE of hexane 402 stabilized at $14 \pm 5\%$, slightly higher compared to the operation with NO₃⁻ alone. An enhanced 403 RE was also observed for toluene, whose RE stabilized at $94 \pm 3\%$ and EC at 4.3 ± 0.2 g m⁻³ h⁻¹. 404 For the rest of pollutants, no significant difference was distinguished when O₂ was incorporated. 405 79 ± 4 , 15 ± 2 and $14 \pm 2\%$ steady state REs were recorded for limonene, D4 and D5 respectively, 406 corresponding to ECs of 30.5 ± 1.5 , 1.4 ± 0.2 and 2.6 ± 0.7 g m⁻³ h⁻¹.

407 The highest CO₂ production was recorded in this stage corresponding to an average $28 \pm 6 \text{ g C} \text{ m}^{-1}$ 408 ³ h⁻¹ (Fig. 7A). However, the pollutants removal accounted for $45 \pm 12 \text{ g C} \text{ m}^{-3} \text{ h}^{-1}$, giving a rough 409 CME of 65 %, which was lower than in the previous stage. In this sense, a shorter residence time 410 implied lower RE and therefore an incomplete oxidation of limonene towards CO₂, which was 411 also observed in stage I. The change in the residence time affected specially the removal of 412 limonene (Fig. 5C), and simultaneously the presence of α -terpinene was recorded, which 413 eventually decreased the CME (Fig. 7A).

414 At the light of the results, the automatic infusion of nitrate was stopped at day 152 for investigating 415 the capacity of the O₂ to act as sole electron acceptor. Limonene and toluene REs stabilized at 92 416 ± 1 and 98 ± 2 , respectively, which was higher than the REs obtained with NO₃⁻ alone. The RE 417 of hexane, D4 and D5 were maintained at similar values than those accomplished with nitrate. In 418 this sense, the input of a 1% of O₂ in the gas matrix supported an efficient performance of the HF-419 MBR. These results suggest that the supplementation of NO_3^{-1} to provide the microbial consortium 420 with electron acceptor would not be necessary, which would eventually reduce the operating costs 421 of the technology, because 1% is the common concentration of O_2 in typical biogas streams.

422

423 4. CONCLUSIONS

424 The present work confirmed the potential of PDMS membranes to separate siloxanes as well as 425 other biogas impurities such as toluene and limonene from synthetic biogas gas towards a clean 426 air stream. The presence of water in the other side of the membrane hindered the permeability of 427 hexane, D4 and D5 due to their hydrophobic nature. The biofilm grown in the shell side of a HF-428 MBR enabled a complete transference of toluene and limonene when the gas residence time was 429 above 31.5 s, and also a higher diffusion of hexane. The quantification of the CO_2 in the outlet of 430 the HF-MBR confirmed the degradation of the pollutants and high carbon mineralization 431 efficiencies were obtained reaching values above 90%.

432 Several strategies regarding the final electron acceptor were performed. Supplementing the gas 433 with a 1% of O_2 supported an efficient performance of the bioreactor, which eventually would 434 reduce the costs of the technology since it is the common oxygen content in biogas.

435

Funding: This work was funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities
(CTQ2014-53718-R) co-funded by FEDER and University of Girona. Eric Santos-Clotas thanks

- 438 Universitat de Girona for his predoctoral grant (IFUdG-2015/51). Alba Cabrera-Codony
- 439 acknowledges support from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation
- 440 programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement N° 712949 (TECNIOspring
- 441 PLUS) and from the Agency for Business Competitiveness of the Government of Catalonia
- 442 (TECSPR16-1-0045). LEQUIA has been recognized as consolidated research groups by the
- 443 Catalan Government (2017-SGR-1552 and 2017SGR-548, respectively).
- 444 **Declaration of interests:** The authors declare no conflict of interests.
- 445

446 **5. REFERENCES**

- 447 1. (APHA), A.P.H.A., 1998. Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater,
 448 20th ed. Washington, USA.
- Accettola, F., Guebitz, G.M., Schoeftner, R., 2008. Siloxane removal from biogas by
 biofiltration: Biodegradation studies. Clean Technol. Environ. Policy 10, 211–218.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10098-007-0141-4
- Ajhar, M., Bannwarth, S., Stollenwerk, K.H., Spalding, G., Yüce, S., Wessling, M., Melin, T.,
 2012. Siloxane removal using silicone-rubber membranes. Sep. Purif. Technol. 89, 234–
 244. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2012.01.003
- Bak, C. u., Lim, C.J., Lee, J.G., Kim, Y.D., Kim, W.S., 2019. Removal of sulfur compounds
 and siloxanes by physical and chemical sorption. Sep. Purif. Technol. 209, 542–549.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2018.07.080
- Barbusinski, K., Kalemba, K., Kasperczyk, D., Urbaniec, K., Kozik, V., 2017. Biological
 methods for odor treatment e A review costs Thermal oxidation Catalytic oxidation
 Chemical scrubbing Adsorption Bioscrubbing Chemical neutralisation Biofiltration. J.
 Clean. Prod. 152, 223–241. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.03.093
- Boada, E., Santos-Clotas, E., Bertran, S., Cabrera-Codony, A., Gich, F., Martín, M.J., Ba, L.,
 2020. Potential use of Methylibium sp. as a biodegradation tool in organosilicon and
 volatile compounds removal for biogas upgrading 240.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2019.124908
- 466 Cabrera-Codony, A., Georgi, A., Gonzalez-Olmos, R., Valdés, H., Martín, M.J., 2017. Zeolites
 467 as recyclable adsorbents/catalysts for biogas upgrading: Removal of
 468 octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane. Chem. Eng. J. 307.
 469 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2016.09.017
- 470 Cabrera-Codony, A., Gonzalez-Olmos, R., Martín, M.J., 2015. Regeneration of siloxane471 exhausted activated carbon by advanced oxidation processes. J. Hazard. Mater. 285, 501–
 472 8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2014.11.053
- 473 Cabrera-Codony, A., Montes-Morán, M.A., Sánchez-Polo, M., Martín, M.J., Gonzalez-Olmos,
 474 R., 2014. Biogas upgrading: Optimal activated carbon properties for siloxane removal.
 475 Environ. Sci. Technol. 48. https://doi.org/10.1021/es501274a
- 476 Cabrera-Codony, A., Santos-Clotas, E., Ania, C.O., Martín, M.J., 2018. Competitive siloxane
 477 adsorption in multicomponent gas streams for biogas upgrading. Chem. Eng. J. 344.

- 478 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2018.03.131
- de Arespacochaga, N., Valderrama, C., Raich-Montiu, J., Crest, M., Mehta, S., Cortina, J.L.,
 2015. Understanding the effects of the origin, occurrence, monitoring, control, fate and
 removal of siloxanes on the energetic valorization of sewage biogas—A review. Renew.
 Sustain. Energy Rev. 52, 366–381. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.07.106
- 483 Dewil, R., Appels, L., Baeyens, J., 2006. Energy use of biogas hampered by the presence of
 484 siloxanes. Energy Convers. Manag. 47, 1711–1722.
 485 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2005.10.016
- 486 Kumar, A., Dewulf, J., Luvsanjamba, M., Van Langenhove, H., 2008a. Continuous operation of
 487 membrane bioreactor treating toluene vapors by Burkholderia vietnamiensis G4. Chem.
 488 Eng. J. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2007.09.039
- Kumar, A., Dewulf, J., Van Langenhove, H., 2008b. Membrane-based biological waste gas
 treatment. Chem. Eng. J. 136, 82–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2007.06.006
- Lebrero, R., Gondim, A.C., Pérez, R., García-Encina, P.A., Muñoz, R., 2014. Comparative
 assessment of a biofilter, a biotrickling filter and a hollow fiber membrane bioreactor for
 odor treatment in wastewater treatment plants. Water Res. 49, 339–350.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2013.09.055
- Lebrero, R., Rodríguez, E., Estrada, J.M., García-Encina, P.A., Muñoz, R., 2012. Odor
 abatement in biotrickling filters: Effect of the EBRT on methyl mercaptan and
 hydrophobic VOCs removal. Bioresour. Technol. 109, 38–45.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2012.01.052
- Lebrero, R., Volckaert, D., Pérez, R., Muñoz, R., Van Langenhove, H., 2013. A membrane
 bioreactor for the simultaneous treatment of acetone, toluene, limonene and hexane at
 trace level concentrations. Water Res. 47, 2199–2212.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2013.01.041
- Montebello, A.M., Mora, M., López, L.R., Bezerra, T., Gamisans, X., Lafuente, J., Baeza, M.,
 Gabriel, D., 2014. Aerobic desulfurization of biogas by acidic biotrickling filtration in a
 randomly packed reactor. J. Hazard. Mater. 280, 200–208.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2014.07.075
- Mudliar, S., Giri, B., Padoley, K., Satpute, D., Dixit, R., Bhatt, P., Pandey, R., Juwarkar, A.,
 Vaidya, A., 2010. Bioreactors for treatment of VOCs and odours A review. J. Environ.
 Manage. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2010.01.006
- Muñoz, R., Meier, L., Diaz, I., Jeison, D., 2015. A review on the state-of-the-art of
 physical/chemical and biological technologies for biogas upgrading. Rev. Environ. Sci.
 Biotechnol. 14, 727–759. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11157-015-9379-1
- Muñoz, R., Souza, T.S.O., Glittmann, L., Pérez, R., Quijano, G., 2013. Biological anoxic
 treatment of O2-free VOC emissions from the petrochemical industry: A proof of concept
 study. J. Hazard. Mater. 260, 442–450. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2013.05.051
- 516 Papadias, D., Ahmed, S., Kumar, R., 2011. Fuel Quality Issues in Stationary Fuel Cell Systems.
- 517 Papurello, D., Silvestri, S., Lanzini, A., 2019. Biogas cleaning: Trace compounds removal with
 518 model validation. Sep. Purif. Technol. 210, 80–92.
 519 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2018.07.081
- Pokorna-Krayzelova, L., Bartacek, J., Vejmelkova, D., Alvarez, A.A., Slukova, P., Prochazka,
 J., Volcke, E.I.P., Jenicek, P., 2017. The use of a silicone-based biomembrane for
 microaerobic H2S removal from biogas. Sep. Purif. Technol. 189, 145–152.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2017.07.077
- Popat, S.C., Deshusses, M. a., 2008. Biological removal of siloxanes from landfill and digester
 gases: Opportunities and challenges. Environ. Sci. Technol. 42, 8510–8515.

- 526 https://doi.org/10.1021/es801320w
- Rasi, S., Veijanen, A., Rintala, J., 2007. Trace compounds of biogas from different biogas
 production plants. Energy 32, 1375–1380. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2006.10.018
- Reij, M.W., Keurentjes, J.T.F., Hartmans, S., 1998. Membrane bioreactors for waste gas
 treatment. J. Biotechnol. 59, 155–167.
- Santos-Clotas, E., Cabrera-Codony, A., Boada, E., Gich, F., Muñoz, R., Martín, M.J., 2019a.
 Efficient removal of siloxanes and volatile organic compounds from sewage biogas by an anoxic biotrickling filter supplemented with activated carbon. Bioresour. Technol. 294, 122136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2019.122136
- Santos-Clotas, E., Cabrera-Codony, A., Castillo, A., Martín, M.J., Poch, M., Monclús, H.,
 2019b. Environmental Decision Support System for Biogas Upgrading to Feasible Fuel.
 Energies 12, 1546. https://doi.org/10.3390/en12081546
- 538 Schweigkofler, M., Niessner, R., 2001. Removal of siloxanes in biogases 83, 183–196.
- Soreanu, G., Béland, M., Falletta, P., Edmonson, K., Svoboda, L., Al-Jamal, M., Seto, P., 2011.
 Approaches concerning siloxane removal from biogas A review. Can. Biosyst. Eng. / Le
 Genie des Biosyst. au Canada 53.
- Wang, J., Zhang, W., Xu, J., Li, Y., Xu, X., 2014. Octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane removal using
 an isolated bacterial strain in the biotrickling filter. Biochem. Eng. J. 91, 46–52.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bej.2014.07.003
- 545 Wheless, E., Pierce, J., 2004. Siloxanes in landfill and digester gas update. SCS Eng. Environ.
 546 Consult. Contract. 1–10.
- 547 Zhang, Z., Qi, H., Ren, N., Li, Y., Gao, D., Kannan, K., 2011. Survey of cyclic and linear
 548 siloxanes in sediment from the Songhua River and in sewage sludge from wastewater
 549 treatment plants, Northeastern China. Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 60, 204–211.
 550 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00244-010-9619-x
- Zhao, K., Xiu, G., Xu, L., Zhang, D., Zhang, X., Deshusses, M.A., 2011. Biological treatment
 of mixtures of toluene and n-hexane vapours in a hollow fibre membrane bioreactor
 Biological treatment of mixtures of toluene and n-hexane vapours in a hollow fibre
 membrane bioreactor. Environ. Technol. 32, 617–623.
- 555 https://doi.org/10.1080/09593330.2010.507634
- 556
- 557
- 558
- 559