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/
 $\overline{ \mathbf{c} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{0} \mathbf{\mathbf{\odot}} \mathbf{e} }$

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*}
- ^a LEQUIA, Institute of the Environment. University of Girona, Campus Montilivi, Girona
- 17003, Catalonia, Spain
- ^b ICRA, Catalan Institute for Water Research, Girona, Spain.
- *Corresponding author e-mail: maria.martin@udg.edu

ABSTRACT

 Sewage biogas valorization to different energy applications is hampered by the presence of volatile methyl siloxanes. Despite the high operating costs, adsorption onto activated carbon is the most implemented technology for siloxane removal from biogas. In order to purify biogas sustainably, the current work explores the diffusion of siloxanes (octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane and decamethylcyclopentasiloxane) together with other biogas impurities (limonene, toluene and hexane) through polydimethylsiloxane membranes. Abiotic tests revealed transport efficiencies above 75% towards a clean air stream for most compounds, although the transport of the most hydrophobic pollutants was challenged when water was circulated through the shell side of the membrane. Moreover, the performance of a hollow-fiber membrane bioreactor, inoculated with anerobic active sludge, was evaluated towards biogas purification in anoxic conditions. Toluene 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 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 NO₃⁻ , efficiently supported high removal for volatile organic compounds and moderate for siloxanes, which would ultimately reduce the operating costs of the technology.

KEYWORDS

Biogas purification; Membrane bioreactor; Siloxanes; Volatile Organic Compounds

1. INTRODUCTION

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

 On the other hand, volatile organic silicon compounds (i.e. siloxanes) have been found to be the 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 (Soreanu *et al*., 2011). Their occurrence in sewage biogas arises from their presence in cosmetics, personal care products, shampoos, detergents and many more everyday products that eventually reach the WWTPs (Zhang *et al.*, 2011). Given their low solubility in water and their liposoluble nature, siloxanes are adsorbed onto the sludge flocs that reach the anaerobic digester where they 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 51 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, 55 iloxane 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).

 Conventional technologies used for siloxane abatement are based on non-regenerative adsorption onto fixed beds of activated carbon (AC) (Cabrera-Codony *et al*., 2015). Steam ACs are frequently used in such application even though scientific reports highlight a superior siloxane adsorption capacity by chemically activated carbons (Cabrera-Codony *et al*., 2018, 2014). Other physical/chemical technologies for siloxane abatement include absorption into strong acids and 62 bases such as H_2SO_4 , HNO_3 and NaOH (Schweigkofler and Niessner, 2001), and deep chilling in which siloxanes are condensed by reducing the temperature of biogas to 5ºC or even below -20ºC (Wheless and Pierce, 2004). Biological technologies for siloxane removal from biogas are under investigation at lab-scale including biotrickling filtration (BTF) and membrane bioreactors (MBR) among others.

 Biotrickling filtration has resulted as an efficient technique in handling odor-laden gases as well as biogas desulfurization (Lebrero *et al.*, 2012; Montebello *et al.*, 2014). Some scientific papers are found in the literature reporting on the biological elimination of siloxanes in biotrickling filters identifying mass transfer as the main limitation for siloxane elimination (Accettola *et al.*, 2008; 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. O_2 as the final electron acceptor) by providing air as the synthetic gas matrix. Since oxygen composition in biogas is generally found below 1%, and more importantly due to explosion risks it is crucial to investigate siloxane removal using other electron acceptors. In this sense, Santos-Clotas *et al.*, (2019a) 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 than D4 (13%), especially when the packing bed of the BTF was supplemented with activated 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).

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

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

104 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

105 **2.1 Synthetic biogas**

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

 Liquid reagents of D4 (98%), D5 (97%), toluene (99.8%), D-limonene (97%) and n-hexane (99%) (Sigma Aldrich) were used for the present work. The liquid reagent of each target compound was added to a septum-sealed vial and weighted in an analytical balance (XSR105 Mettler Toledo, 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 stream (99.999%, Abelló Linde, Spain) regulated by a mass flow controller (MC Series, Alicat 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 (C₀) as well as main physical and chemical properties of the target pollutants are detailed in Table 1. The inlet and outlet gas composition were analyzed by a flow-through gas sampling valve in a gas chromatograph equipped with a flame ionization detector (GC-FID, 7890B Agilent Technologies). Separation of the target pollutants was carried out by a HP-5ms Ultra Inert capillary column (Agilent Technologies). Standards for calibration purposes were obtained by 124 injecting the target mixture (Table 1) to different N_2 flows. Detection limit for siloxanes was 1 μ 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%).

*in water at 25 ºC according to PubChem library

128 **2.2 Gas abiotic experiments**

129 The PDMS membrane module employed for the first set of gas abiotic experiments was the 130 PermSelect PDMSXA-10 (MedArray Inc, USA), consisting of 30 parallel dense hollow fibers of 131 190 µm inner diameter and 300 µm outer diameter. The membrane area was estimated at 10 cm² 132 and a lumen-side priming volume of 0.67 cm^3 . 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 N_2 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 $(0.5, 1, 2, 4, 4, 4)$ 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.

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 143 diameter, respectively. The total membrane area accounted for 2500 cm^2 and a lumen-side 144 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 (100 149 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

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 continuously circulating through the membrane (water/gas) was set-up before inoculating the HF- MBR. The abiotic mass transfer characterization of the target VOCs and siloxanes was conducted 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 shell side of the module. The abiotic transfer of the target pollutants vas evaluated at 9.6, 16, 24, 40 and 60 s of GRT by monitoring their concentration in the inlet and outlet of the lumen and calculating the transport efficiency (in %) as in Eq. 1.

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 171 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 adjusted to 6.9 using NaOH 1 M. The resulting mineral medium was used for both the sludge 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.

2.3.3 Operating conditions

 The membrane module was inoculated with 250 mL of the cleaned sludge corresponding to a 180 concentration of 4.2 g TSS L^{-1} and operated at different conditions as summarized in Table 2. 181 During stage I, 1-36 days, the GRT was 18 s, corresponding to a gas flow of 70 mL min⁻¹. The 182 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 31.5 s (period II days 37-64) and 63 s (days 65-73).

185 Automatic NO₃ supply system started at day 73 by injecting a solution of 200 g NO₃ L⁻¹ 186 (provided by NaNO₃ of 99% purity) to the recirculation solution by means of a syringe pump (11) 187 Elite, Harvard Apparatus) adjusted to maintain a stable concentration over 2.5 g L^{-1} , and the 188 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.

193 In stage IV-b the carrier gas was supplemented with 1% of O_2 at day 134, based on the common 194 O_2 content in biogas (Rasi et al., 2007), and was operated with NO₃⁻ and O₂ as final electron 195 acceptors until day 152. Finally, from day 153 to 164 (stage IV-c), the reactor was operated with 196 - only O_2 and the automatic infusion of NO_3 ⁻ was stopped.

Table 2. Operating conditions of the HF-MBR.

| Stage | | Period | GRT | Final e | NO ₃ |
|-------|------|---------|------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | [days] | [s] | acceptor | supply |
| | | $1-36$ | 18 | NO ₃ | Manual |
| П | | 37-64 | 31.5 | NO ₃ | Manual |
| Ш | -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 | $NO3+O2$ | Automatic |
| | $-c$ | 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 Spectrophotometer (Cary3500, Agilent Technologies) following the Standard Methods 4500- 200 NO₃ (APHA, 1998). Identification of biodegradation by-products in the trickling solution was conducted by means of a Gas Chromatography coupled to a Mass Spectrometry detector (GC- MS, 7890B-5977B, Agilent Technologies) as described in (Santos-Clotas *et al.*, 2019a) and α-ω- silanediols determination was carried out following the procedure reported by Cabrera-Codony *et al.*, (2017). Pure commercial reagents were injected in the GC-MS for further confirmation.

 205 $CO₂$ 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 $CO₂$ (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.

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

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

$$
CME (%) = \left(\frac{P_{CO2}}{\sum_{i} EC_{i}}\right) x100
$$
 Eq. 3

212 Where C_0 and C_F are the target compound concentrations (g m⁻³) in the inlet and outlet of the HF-213 MBR, Q is the gas flow $(m^3 h^{-1})$ and V the reactor volume (m^3) . In Eq. 3 P_{CO2} refers to the C 214 produced as CO_2 detected in the lumen outlet (g C m⁻³ h⁻¹), *i* refers to each target pollutant (i.e. 215 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 221 and in both the lumen and the shell outlet streams. Experiments were done by triplicate with a relative error below 5%.

223 The transport efficiency of most compounds, reported in Fig.3, displayed a clear steep increase 224 with the shell/lumen flow ratio. Incrementing the flow of clean gas in the shell side distinctly 225 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 94.8 227 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.

 The transport efficiency of all pollutants, excluding hexane, through the membrane was above 50% even at the lowest shell/lumen ratio tested, demonstrating that operating at such a short residence time (i.e. 0.72 s), and with a low gas flow through the shell side, the target pollutants were successfully permeated through the membrane. These results point out that the PDMS membrane had a high selectivity towards the target compounds, except for hexane. Moreover, as a result of incrementing the shell flow, the transport efficiencies increased, which indicated that the driving force for the compounds to permeate through the membrane was incremented as well. Moreover, the diffusion of all compounds levelled off at a flow ratio of 2, where high transport 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. 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.

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.

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

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.

water/gas tests at different GRTs.

- **3.2 HF-MBR performance**
- *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 276 of operation where the $NO₃$ 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 278 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 280 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 282 achieved within 7-8 days reaching average REs of 52 ± 2 and $85 \pm 3\%$, respectively, which

283 corresponded to ECs of 2.4 \pm 0.1 and 33.5 \pm 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.

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

Fig. 5. Time-course of the removal efficiency (RE, \bullet) 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).

3.2.2 Influence of the gas residence time

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

303 REs 17 ± 6 and 21 ± 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 ups and downs along the time-course of the reactor operation in spite of the higher GRT provided. The lack of significant correlation between siloxane removal efficiency and the GRT, indicates that their diffusion through the membrane towards the liquid side was limited due to their hydrophobicity regardless the residence time. Even though an increased RE was obtained for both siloxanes from 18 to 31.5 s, no further improvement was achieved at 60 s of GRT. To the authors' knowledge, this is the first study operating an MBR towards the removal of siloxanes from biogas. However, some reports in the literature investigated the biodegradation of cyclic siloxanes in 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 VOC-siloxane mixture was investigated and REs of 20 and 37% for D4 and D5, respectively, were reported (Santos-Clotas *et al*., 2019a).

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

 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 detection limit of the analytical method) at day 52, which indicated that it was completely 323 transferred through the membrane achieving an EC up to 2.6 ± 0.3 g m⁻³ h⁻¹. Several scientific papers agree on the efficiency of MBRs for the removal of this aromatic hydrocarbon reporting 325 elimination capacities up to 1500 g m⁻³ h⁻¹ at GRTs in the range 0.9-60 s (Mudliar *et al.*, 2010). Most toluene ECs reported are much higher than in the present work given the low flows treated as well as the low concentration in biogas. Limonene displayed a similar but even faster trend since, just right the day after increasing the residence time, its removal was already complete

329 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 332 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 334 1.3, 11.2 and 8.2 g m⁻³ h⁻¹ for toluene, limonene and hexane, respectively. The abatement of 335 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).

-
- *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. 344 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 346 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 348 reservoir. GC-MS analysis revealed the presence of $CO₂$ in such emission, indicating that a minor contribution of the CO₂ 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 CO² 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 357 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 359 suggested by Santos-Clotas *et al.*, (2019a) in an anoxic BTF when the input of NO_3^- 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 368 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 NO_3 ⁻ 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).

372

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 $NO₃$ 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 383 strategy, a NO_3^- consume of roughly 50 mg $(L d)^{-1}$ (Fig. 7B) supported an efficient removal of the 384 VOCs and a less oscillating removal of siloxanes.

 In stage IV (days 101-152) the GRT was decreased back to 18 s in order to evaluate the influence of the strategies over the removal of all the target pollutants, given the fact that toluene and limonene were already removed due to higher GRTs. A sudden decrease in the performance of the HF-MBR occurred at day 104 due to membrane clogging. This clogging was attributed to the long operation time rather than the change in the EBRT. Its effect was most remarkably observed for both toluene and limonene, whose REs dropped to 24 and 30%, respectively. The membrane cleaning at day 108 allowed for the recovery of both target pollutants removal, which increased 392 to average REs of 83 ± 12 and 94 ± 5 %, clearly higher than those recorded in the first period that operated at the same GRT. Hexane removal was also achieved higher than in the first period, its 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 ± 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 O_2 was incorporated. 405 79 ± 4 , 15 ± 2 and 14 ± 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.

The highest CO_2 production was recorded in this stage corresponding to an average 28 ± 6 g C m⁻ $3^3 h^{-1}$ (Fig. 7A). However, the pollutants removal accounted for 45 ± 12 g C m⁻³ 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 limonene (Fig. 5C), and simultaneously the presence of α-terpinene was recorded, which eventually decreased the CME (Fig. 7A).

 At the light of the results, the automatic infusion of nitrate was stopped at day 152 for investigating 415 the capacity of the O_2 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 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 O_2 in the gas matrix supported an efficient performance of the HF-419 MBR. These results suggest that the supplementation of $NO₃$ to provide the microbial consortium 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.

4. CONCLUSIONS

 The present work confirmed the potential of PDMS membranes to separate siloxanes as well as other biogas impurities such as toluene and limonene from synthetic biogas gas towards a clean air stream. The presence of water in the other side of the membrane hindered the permeability of hexane, D4 and D5 due to their hydrophobic nature. The biofilm grown in the shell side of a HF- 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 $CO₂$ in the outlet of the HF-MBR confirmed the degradation of the pollutants and high carbon mineralization efficiencies were obtained reaching values above 90%.

 Several strategies regarding the final electron acceptor were performed. Supplementing the gas with a 1% of O² supported an efficient performance of the bioreactor, which eventually would reduce the costs of the technology since it is the common oxygen content in biogas.

 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

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

5. REFERENCES

- 1. (APHA), A.P.H.A., 1998. Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater, 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
- Cabrera-Codony, A., Georgi, A., Gonzalez-Olmos, R., Valdés, H., Martín, M.J., 2017. Zeolites as recyclable adsorbents/catalysts for biogas upgrading: Removal of octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane. Chem. Eng. J. 307. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2016.09.017
- Cabrera-Codony, A., Gonzalez-Olmos, R., Martín, M.J., 2015. Regeneration of siloxane- exhausted activated carbon by advanced oxidation processes. J. Hazard. Mater. 285, 501– 8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2014.11.053
- Cabrera-Codony, A., Montes-Morán, M.A., Sánchez-Polo, M., Martín, M.J., Gonzalez-Olmos, R., 2014. Biogas upgrading: Optimal activated carbon properties for siloxane removal. Environ. Sci. Technol. 48. https://doi.org/10.1021/es501274a
- Cabrera-Codony, A., Santos-Clotas, E., Ania, C.O., Martín, M.J., 2018. Competitive siloxane adsorption in multicomponent gas streams for biogas upgrading. Chem. Eng. J. 344.
- 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
- Dewil, R., Appels, L., Baeyens, J., 2006. Energy use of biogas hampered by the presence of siloxanes. Energy Convers. Manag. 47, 1711–1722. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2005.10.016
- Kumar, A., Dewulf, J., Luvsanjamba, M., Van Langenhove, H., 2008a. Continuous operation of membrane bioreactor treating toluene vapors by Burkholderia vietnamiensis G4. Chem. 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 514 treatment of O2-free VOC emissions from the petrochemical industry: A proof of concept
515 study. J. Hazard. Mater. 260. 442–450. https://doi.org/10.1016/i.ihazmat.2013.05.051 study. J. Hazard. Mater. 260, 442–450. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2013.05.051
- Papadias, D., Ahmed, S., Kumar, R., 2011. Fuel Quality Issues in Stationary Fuel Cell Systems.
- Papurello, D., Silvestri, S., Lanzini, A., 2019. Biogas cleaning: Trace compounds removal with model validation. Sep. Purif. Technol. 210, 80–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2018.07.081
- Pokorna-Krayzelova, L., Bartacek, J., Vejmelkova, D., Alvarez, A.A., Slukova, P., Prochazka, 521 J., Volcke, E.I.P., Jenicek, P., 2017. The use of a silicone-based biomembrane for
522 microaerobic H2S removal from biogas. Sep. Purif. Technol. 189, 145–152. 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.
- 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
- Schweigkofler, M., Niessner, R., 2001. Removal of siloxanes in biogases 83, 183–196.
- 539 Soreanu, G., Béland, M., Falletta, P., Edmonson, K., Svoboda, L., Al-Jamal, M., Seto, P., 2011.
540 Approaches concerning siloxane removal from biogas A review. Can. Biosyst. Eng. / Le 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. Consult. Contract. 1–10.
- Zhang, Z., Qi, H., Ren, N., Li, Y., Gao, D., Kannan, K., 2011. Survey of cyclic and linear siloxanes in sediment from the Songhua River and in sewage sludge from wastewater treatment plants, Northeastern China. Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 60, 204–211. 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.
- https://doi.org/10.1080/09593330.2010.507634
-
-
-
-