

## Manuscript Details

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| <b>Manuscript number</b> | BIOELECTHEM_2017_227_R3  |
| <b>Title</b>             | A study of microbial communities on terracotta separator and on biocathode of air breathing microbial fuel cells |
| <b>Article type</b>      | Research Paper   |

### Abstract

Recently, terracotta has attracted interest as low-cost and biocompatible material, to build separators in microbial fuel cells (MFCs). However, the influence of a non-conductive material like terracotta, on electroactive microbiological communities remains substantially unexplored. This study aims to study the microbial pools developed from two different seed inocula (bovine and swine sewage) in terracotta-based air-breathing MFC. A statistical approach on microbiological data confirmed different community enrichment in the MFCs, depending mainly on the inoculum. The results confirmed that terracotta separator impedes the growth of a biocathode. The biocathode-MFCs showed from 4 to 6-fold higher power densities than terracotta-MFCs. Both the thick biofilm formed on the surface (anolyte-side) of the terracotta separator and the biocathodes were analyzed by high-throughput Illumina sequencing applied to bacterial 16S rRNA gene. The results showed more abundant (3- to 5-fold) electroactive genera (mainly *Geobacter*, *Pseudomonas*, *Desulfuromonas* and *Clostridia* MBA03) in terracotta-free biocathodes than in terracotta biofilms. Nevertheless, terracotta separator induced only slight changes in anodic biofilms.

|                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <b>Keywords</b>             | Electroactive biofilms, biocathode, microbial fuel cell, terracotta, Illumina 16S rRNA gene sequencing              |
| <b>Manuscript category</b>  | Biofuel Cells and Signal Transduction   |
| <b>Corresponding Author</b> | Laura Rago  |
| <b>Order of Authors</b>     | Laura Rago, Sarah Zecchin, Stefania Marzorati, Andrea Goglio, Lucia Cavalca, Pierangela Cristiani, Andrea Schievano |
| <b>Suggested reviewers</b>  | Abraham Esteve-Núñez, Cesar Torres, Prathap Parameswaran  |

## Submission Files Included in this PDF

### File Name [File Type]

BIOELECTHEM\_2017\_227 - cover letter\_R3.docx [Cover Letter]

Comments from the editors and reviewers\_R3.docx [Response to Reviewers]

BIOELECTHEM\_2017\_227 - Highlights\_R3.doc [Highlights]

BIOELECTHEM\_2017\_227 - GraphAbstract\_R3.pptx [Graphical Abstract]

BIOELECTHEM\_2017\_227-manuscript\_R3.docx [Manuscript File]

BIOELECTHEM\_2017\_227 - Figures and captions\_R3.docx [Figure]

BIOELECTHEM\_2017\_227 - tables\_R3.docx [Table]

To view all the submission files, including those not included in the PDF, click on the manuscript title on your EVISE Homepage, then click 'Download zip file'.

Dear Scientific Committee of Bioelectrochemistry,

We gently submit you the revision of the manuscript BIOELECTROCHEM\_2017\_227 for the publication in the special issue of the journal Bioelectrochemistry on “*Electroactive microorganisms and microbial consortia*”, as original research.

The English was improved with the help of a native speaker, according to the editors' suggestion.

Authors: Laura Rago, Sarah Zecchin, Stefania Marzorati, Andrea Goglio, Lucia Cavalca, Pierangela Cristiani, Andrea Schievano

The results included in the manuscript have not been published/submitted or are being submitted to another journal. This manuscript investigates the microbiological communities of four air cathode MFCs, which were enriched using two different inocula: bovine and swine sewages. Two of these MFCs, BM and SM, were built using terracotta between the anode and the cathode. The presence of terracotta avoided the formation of biocathode in BM and SM. In parallel, two MFCs (BC and SC) were built as control without the terracotta separator between the electrodes. The main difference was induced by the different inoculum enrichment. Moreover, the electroactive microorganisms are more present on conductive material, the cathode, than on non-conductive material, the terracotta. The OTUs of well-known or suspected electroactive microorganisms in BC and SC cathodic biofilms were respectively 3 and 5 times more than in BM and SM terracotta biofilms. Moreover, the changes in the cathodic part of the reactors induces only slight changes in the bioanodic communities. Statistical approach (through UPGMA and PCoA) confirmed different enrichment in microbiological biofilms according to the inoculum and to the different part of the reactor.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first paper that deepens the microbiology of terracotta based MFCs.

The work done required relevant and different skills, for the tests and for the analyses, so a team of authors substantially contributed to reach the results, as detailed below, and all of them approved the version to be submitted:

- Laura Rago for acquisition and analyses of microbiological samples, coordinating the analyses and the results, and drafting the article
- Sarah Zecchin for bioinformatics and statistics of data, drafting relative parts of the article results

- Stefania Marzorati for acquisition and analyses of electrochemical data and drafting relative parts of the article;
- Andrea Goglio for building and maintain the reactors, for acquisition and analyses of electrochemical data;
- Lucia Cavalca for critical revision of the microbiological data and discussions
- Pierangela Cristiani for the revision of the article and for important intellectual content supervising bioelectrochemical results
- Andrea Schievano for the critical revision of the manuscript and the English.

I can confirm with the other authors that there are no conflict of interest, including any financial, personal or other relationships with other people or organizations within three years of beginning the submitted work that could inappropriately influence, or be perceived to influence, our work. The authors believe in the high reputation of Bioelectrochemistry journal and approved the version submitted.

Hoping in a positive response, We look forward to the challenge of publishing with the journal.

Truly,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Laura Rago". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Dr. Laura Rago (corresponding author)

PhD in Biotechnology

e-Bio Center - Department of Agricultural and Environmental Science (DISAA)

Università degli Studi di Milano

Via Celoria 2, 20133 Milan (Italy)

Tel. +39 02 50316446

[laura.rago@unimi.it](mailto:laura.rago@unimi.it)

Ref: BIOELECTHEM\_2017\_227\_R2

Title: A study of microbial communities on terracotta separator and on biocathode of air breathing microbial fuel cells

Journal: Bioelectrochemistry

Dear Dr. Rago,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Bioelectrochemistry. We have completed the review of your manuscript. A summary is appended below. I emphasise the need for improved English. Also for the tables, please use black only and remove any shading. While revising the paper please consider the reviewers' comments carefully. We look forward to receiving your detailed response and your revised manuscript.

**Comments from the editors and reviewers:**


**-Editor**

- This version of the manuscript is a substantial improvement over previous versions and it is nearly ready for publication. There are however still English issues (grammar and syntax errors, plus awkward sentences) in the newly added text. I encourage the authors to review the text with the help of a native speaker.


Dear editors, thank you a lot for your help and suggestions. We improved the English of the manuscript and we corrected the tables.

## Highlights

- Bovine and swine sewages were used as inoculum for microbial fuel cells (MFCs)
- Microbiology of terracotta-based MFCs was explored for the first time
- Illumina and statistics were used to characterize anodic and cathodic communities
- Terracotta-MFCs were compared with biocathode-MFCs
- Conductive material favored the presence of electroactive microorganisms



VS



## **A study of microbial communities on terracotta separator and on biocathode of air breathing microbial fuel cells**

Laura Rago<sup>a,\*</sup>, Sarah Zecchin<sup>b,c</sup>, Stefania Marzorati<sup>a</sup>, Andrea Goglio<sup>a</sup>, Lucia Cavalca<sup>c</sup>, Pierangela Cristiani<sup>d</sup>, Andrea Schievano<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *e*-Bio Center – Department of Environmental Science and Policies - Università degli Studi di Milano, via Celoria 2, 20133 Milan (Italy)

<sup>b</sup> Department of Biology, University of Konstanz, Konstanz, Germany

<sup>c</sup> *e*-Bio Center – Department of Food, Environmental and Nutritional Sciences (DeFENS), Università degli Studi di Milano, Via Celoria 2, 20133 Milan, Italy

<sup>d</sup> RSE - Ricerca sul Sistema Elettrico S.p.A., Sustainable Development and Energy Sources Department, Via Rubattino 54, 20134 Milan, Italy

\* Corresponding author: [laura.rago@unimi.it](mailto:laura.rago@unimi.it)

### **Abstract**

Recently, terracotta has attracted interest as low-cost and biocompatible material, to build separators in microbial fuel cells (MFCs). However, the influence of a non-conductive material like terracotta, on electroactive microbiological communities remains substantially unexplored. This study aims to study the microbial pools developed from two different seed inocula (bovine and swine sewage) in terracotta-based air-breathing MFC. A statistical approach on microbiological data confirmed different community enrichment in the MFCs, depending mainly on the inoculum. The results confirmed that terracotta separator impedes the growth of a biocathode. The biocathode-MFCs showed from 4 to 6-fold higher power densities than terracotta-MFCs. Both the thick biofilm formed on the surface (anolyte-side) of the terracotta separator and the biocathodes were analyzed by high-throughput Illumina sequencing applied to bacterial 16S rRNA gene. The results showed more abundant (3- to 5-fold) electroactive genera (mainly *Geobacter*, *Pseudomonas*, *Desulfuromonas* and *Clostridia MBA03*) in terracotta-free biocathodes than in terracotta biofilms. Nevertheless, terracotta separator induced only slight changes in anodic biofilms.

### **Keywords**

Electroactive biofilms, biocathode, microbial fuel cell, terracotta, Illumina 16S rRNA gene sequencing

## 1. Introduction

In microbial fuel cells (MFC), electroactive microorganisms may colonize both electrodes and be responsible of most redox reactions. In recent years, anodic biofilms (bioanodes) and cathodic biofilm (biocathode) communities, colonized by electrogenic microorganisms, are increasingly studied in different MFC configurations [1]. In air-breathing MFC, the biocathode may consist of mixed consortia of anaerobic, microaerophilic and aerobic microorganisms in direct contact with the conductive surface [2–4]. In this case, the success of MFC relies not only on the exoelectrogenic activity of bioanodic community, but also on the development of a complex microbial community on cathodes [2,5,6]. The presence of a thick cathodic biofilm has a double function: a) impeding oxygen diffusion through the anodic chamber, thereby preventing the inhibition of the anodic anaerobic biofilm [7,8]; b) catalyzing oxygen reduction reaction (ORR), i.e. improving electron transfer chains from the conductor to intermediate electron acceptors and finally to O<sub>2</sub> [2]. The bio-catalytic mechanisms were previously associated to cyclic red-ox reactions with sulfur, iron and manganese compounds, which facilitate the dispatch of electrons to oxygen [2–4,8,9]. Specific microaerophilic, strong halophilic and alkalophilic conditions (high pH and salt concentration) at cathodic interface [10,11] are responsible for the selection of peculiar microbial populations [2,4]. These types of biocathodes can be considered as low-cost catalysts towards ORR in air-cathode MFC. Also, biocathodes may influence the selection of anodic biofilm communities [2].

One important constraint has been impeding the application of air-cathode MFCs to treat organic-rich wastewater at a large scale [12]: cathodes easily get clogged by both organic and inorganic deposits and, over relatively short periods (30-60 days), their catalytic activity gets deactivated and their internal resistance increased [13,14]. For this reason, structural parts of electrodes and separators should be fabricated using low-cost and easily recycled materials.

In recent studies, terracotta (earthenware) was introduced as low-cost structure material for MFC building [15–17]. Terracotta cylinders were used to build air-cathode MFC and to separate anode (external wastewater side) and cathode (internal air side) [18,19]. Due to the porosity of terracotta (60-500 nm [20]) that allows electrolytes mobility, terracotta cylinders were proposed for aims other than energy harvesting, such as nutrients [11] or precious [21] and heavy metals [22] recovery from wastewaters by electro-osmosis [23]. This configuration in MFCs gives the opportunity to exploit the electro-osmotic flow, created by the electric field, to extract cations from the anolyte, depositing as salts on the separator and the cathode [11,18,22,24]. Terracotta has the advantage to be environmentally compatible and at end-of-life can be re-used directly as agricultural soil conditioner. Unlike the materials normally used in air-cathode MFC (e.g. gas diffusion layers on carbon cloth), terracotta is a non-conductive material. This condition can deeply affect the electroactive biofilms that colonize the electrodes. However, the influence of terracotta separators on microbial communities remains substantially unexplored.

Due to the small size of terracotta pores (typically terracotta pores diameter is lower than 100 nm), terracotta separators tend to microbiologically separate the cathode (air-side) from the anolyte. Especially when the cathode is exposed to the air, the absence of cathodic inoculation and the typical alkaline (pH >12) conditions established by the accumulation of hydroxyl ions at the cathode, can impede the formation of a proper cathodic biofilm, according to what observed in previous studies [11]. Under these conditions, the ORR tends to be prevalently abiotic [18]. On the anolyte-side, the biofilm is in contact with the non-conductive terracotta surface. Thus, the function of this biofilm for the MFC is different as compared to biocathodes (biofilm growing in direct contact with the cathode). The microbial community might vary substantially, especially for what concerns electroactive microorganisms.

The present study aims at exploring how the presence of a terracotta separator can influence the microbial communities of air-cathode MFC. Lab-scale MFC reactors with terracotta separators were compared to identical terracotta-free reactors, using two different wastewaters as inocula. Particular attention was focused on microbial community diversity. The comparison also allows better identification of the electroactive microorganisms that colonize the MFC cathodes. In addition,



52 anodic samples were analyzed and compared, to explore the influence of cathodic microbial  
53 community changes on anodic biofilm.

54

## 55 2. Materials and Methods

56 Two **biocathode-MFCs** (BC and SC) and two **terracotta-MFCs** (BM and SM) were operated for  
57 around **three** months. BC and BM were inoculated and fed using bovine sewage. Instead, swine  
58 sewage was used for SC and SM. **Sewages were collected in a farm near Milan (Italy).**

59 **DNA was extracted at the end of the experimental period, and it was processed by MiSeq 16S rRNA**  
60 **gene Illumina sequencing tools.**

### 61 2.1. MFCs configuration

62 Four reactors were built using Simple Pyrex<sup>®</sup> bottles (125 mL volume). Two of them as traditional  
63 air-cathode single chamber MFCs were built as previously described [25] and called BC and SC.  
64 Electrodes were made of carbon cloth (SAATI C1, Appiano Gentile, Italy). Plain carbon cloth (3×10  
65 cm) was rolled and placed at the bottom of the cell to serve as anode. Carbon cloth modified by a  
66 microporous layer made of activated carbon/PTFE mixture was used for cathodes [26]. Geometric  
67 surface area of the cathode exposed to the anolyte was **3.14 cm<sup>2</sup>**. Anode and cathode were electrically  
68 connected through an external copper circuit under a load of 100 Ω. Connections were insulated with  
69 non-conductive epoxy resin.

70 Other two MFCs (BM and SM) were built in similar way, but with a terracotta (non-  
71 conductive material) performing as membrane, between anode and cathode. The terracotta (25 cm<sup>2</sup>  
72 of area and 4 mm of thickness) was attached to the cathode **using silicone. The other side of the**  
73 **terracotta was exposed to the anolyte (due to the reactor geometry, only 3.14 cm<sup>2</sup> of terracotta were**  
74 **directly exposed to the solution). Anode and cathode were positioned at a relative distance of around**  
75 **4 cm.**

76

## 77 FIGURE 1

78

### 79 2.2. Inoculation and experimental set-up

80 All MFCs anodic chambers were inoculated **and fed in parallel with two different types of sewage as**  
81 **sole carbon source (except for the third cycle, named “Cycle 3 (acetate)” in Fig.2): bovine (BC and**  
82 **BM) and swine (SC and SM). Both sewages were filtered (0.5 mm mesh) and characterized before**  
83 **use (Table 1).**

84

## 85 TABLE 1

86

87 MFCs were monitored during four batch cycles (90 days). The first acclimation cycle (“Cycle 1” in  
88 Fig. 2) lasted from day 1 to day 34. The second cycle (“Cycle 2” in Fig. 2) lasted from day 34 to day  
89 56. After this period, 3 g L<sup>-1</sup> of sodium acetate (2.4 gCOD L<sup>-1</sup>) were added to all MFCs. This cycle  
90 (“Cycle 3 (acetate)” in Fig.2), from day 56 to 71, permitted to perform the electrochemical analysis  
91 reported in table 2. At day 72, all MFCs were refilled with sewage (20 mL), to replace the liquid  
92 phase evaporated during Cycle 3. This last cycle has been labelled as “Cycle 4” in Fig. 2.

93

### 94 2.3. Chemical analyses

95 Soluble fractions of Chemical Oxygen Demand (sCOD) were measured after filtration (0.2 μm nylon  
96 filters) using HACH COD vials and HACH DR220 Vis-spectrophotometer following the standard  
97 procedure. sCOD removal was calculated according to:  $(1 - \text{sCOD}_{\text{final}} / \text{sCOD}_{\text{initial}}) \cdot 100$ . Total  
98 Chemical Oxygen Demand (tCOD) was obtain by the same procedure, but without filtration.

99 pH of the anodic compartment and the electrical conductivity were periodically monitored with  
100 an Amel Instruments pH-meter (combined glass electrode, daily calibrated with two buffers at pH=7  
101 and pH=9) and an Amel Instruments conductivity meter (conductivity cell with a cell constant of 1  
cm<sup>-1</sup>), respectively.

102 Total Kjeldhal Nitrogen (TKN) was determined on fresh material, according to the analytical method  
103 for wastewater sludge, as previously reported [27].

#### 104 2.4. *Electrochemical analysis*

105 For each MFC, the potential difference across a load of 100  $\Omega$  ( $R_{ext}$ ) was recorded every 20 minutes  
106 using a multichannel Data Logger (Graphtech midi Logger GL820). The generated current density  
107 ( $j$ ) was then calculated by the equation  $j=IA^{-1}$ , where  $A$  is the cathode's surface area and  $I=V R_{ext}^{-1}$  is  
108 the current flowing through the external resistance;  $V$  is the potential.

109 Anodic open-circuit potentials (vs Ag/AgCl in KCl sat.) were periodically measured for each MFC  
110 system, after 30 min equilibration time. Power curves were recorded during Cycle 3 (Acetate) after 1  
111 h equilibration time in open circuit condition to calculate the internal resistance of all MFCs.

#### 112 2.5. *Brunauer–Emmett–Teller (BET) surface area and porosity*

113 The Brunauer–Emmett–Teller (BET) specific surface area was obtained from the  $N_2$   
114 adsorption/desorption isotherms at 77 K using a Micromeritics Tristar II apparatus. Specific surface  
115 area and porosity distribution were evaluated by BET and BJH theories using the instrumental  
116 software (Version 1.03). Before measurements, sample powders were heat-treated at 150  $^{\circ}C$  for 2 h  
117 under a  $N_2$  flow to remove adsorbed and undesired species from the sample surface.

#### 118 2.6. *DNA extraction*

119 DNA samples were obtained from each MFC at the end of the experiment. The anodic samples were  
120 obtained from all reactors. Small pieces of anodic carbon cloth were cut and combined for DNA  
121 extraction. The BC and SC cathodic samples were obtained scraping the cathodic biofilm from the  
122 carbon cloth with a sterile spatula. The same procedure was used to obtain terracotta biofilm samples  
123 for BM and SM reactors. Total DNA was extracted from approximately 0.25 g of samples using a  
124 PowerBiofilm DNA Isolation Kit (MoBio Laboratories, Inc., Carlsbad, CA) according to the  
125 manufacturer's instructions. Quantity and quality of the DNA were measured spectrophotometrically  
126 (BioPhotometer, Eppendorf). DNA was visualized under UV light in a 1% gel electrophoresis with  
127 TBE 0.5 $\times$  (Tris-Borate 50 mM; EDTA 0.1 mM; pH 7.5–8).

128 No samples were extracted from BM and SM cathodes, because the presence of terracotta separator  
129 with average pores size of 10 nm (maximum pores size of 100 nm) impeded the formation of a  
130 consistent cathodic biofilm in those reactors.

#### 131 2.7. *Illumina MiSeq sequencing*

132 Genomic DNA was PCR amplified using a two-stage “targeted amplicon sequencing (TAS)” protocol  
133 [28,29]. The sequencing was performed as described previously [2]. The primers contained 5'  
134 common sequence tags (known as common sequence 1 and 2, CS1 and CS2) as described previously  
135 [30]. Two primer sets were used for this study, including CS1\_341F/CS2\_806R (*Bacteria*),  
136 CS1\_ARC344F/CS2\_ARC806R (*Archaea*) [2].

137 Library preparation and pooling was performed at the DNA Services (DNAS) facility, Research  
138 Resources Center (RRC), University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC). Sequencing was performed at the  
139 W.M. Keck Center for Comparative and Functional Genomics at the University of Illinois at Urbana-  
140 Champaign (UIUC).

141 Forward and reverse reads were merged using PEAR [31]. Ambiguous nucleotides and primer  
142 sequences were trimmed (quality threshold  $p = 0.01$ ). After trimming, reads containing internal  
143 ambiguous nucleotides, lacking either primer and/or shorter than 300 bp were discarded. Chimeric  
144 sequences were identified with the USEARCH algorithm [32] and removed. Further analyses were  
145 performed with the QIIME tools [33]. Sequences with a similarity higher than 97% were grouped in  
146 Operational Taxonomic Units (OTUs) and representative sequences for each OTU were aligned to  
147 the SILVA SSU Ref dataset [34] using the PyNASt method [35]. The information concerning the  
148 taxonomic affiliations at phylum and genus level and the respective relative abundance, included in  
149 the OTU tables, is represented in Fig. 5 and 6. To compare the microbial diversity between samples,  
150 principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) and Unweighted Pair Group Method with Arithmetic mean  
151 (UPGMA) clustering were performed calculating weighted UniFrac analysis [36,37]. The  
152 significance between different clusters was tested with non-parametric multivariate analysis of

153 variance (PERMANOVA) [38].

154

### 155 3. Results and discussion

#### 156 3.1. Current generation of MFCs

157 Trends of the current density generated during **Cycle 1, Cycle 2, Cycle 3 (acetate), and Cycle 4** are  
158 plotted in **Fig. 2**. For both BM and SM, current production was about 4-5 times lower than for  
159 **biocathode-MFCs (respectively BC and SC)**, throughout the operation period of each system.

160 Focusing on BC module during **Cycle 1**, after 8 days of low current yield, the system started  
161 producing up to 200  $\mu\text{A cm}^{-2}$ , until the soluble organics were consumed and the current production  
162 decreased. During **Cycle 2**, the current density reached slightly higher **values and** after 15 days started  
163 decreasing. During **Cycle 3 (acetate)**, the current production reached again almost 200  $\mu\text{A cm}^{-2}$  and  
164 the cycle lasted for less time than previous cycles. This is coherent with the lower amount of **COD**  
165 **available** (2.4  $\text{g}_{\text{COD}} \text{L}^{-1}$  compared to the previous 13  $\text{g}_{\text{COD}} \text{L}^{-1}$ ). **The last cycle (Cycle 4)** yielded a  
166 prolonged current production, decreasing after 15 days.

167 The corresponding BM system (i.e. fed with the same bovine sewage but with the terracotta  
168 **separator**), produced almost a continuous but low current signal along 90 days of operation, around  
169 50  $\mu\text{A cm}^{-2}$ .

170 SC system (fed with swine sewage) started promptly producing current (at day 1 during **Cycle 1**),  
171 differently from the longer period needed by the corresponding system fed with bovine sewage. **The**  
172 **swine sewage had a lower soluble COD, as compared to the bovine sewage (See Table 1) but the**  
173 **suspended organic matrix was likely less complex and more degradable. The presence of more readily**  
174 **available carbon might have helped during acclimation, hence yielding higher currents. Also, swine**  
175 **sewage is less viscous and diffusion processes are easier, which could facilitate mass transfer**  
176 **processes**. An evident peak with a maximum of 350  $\mu\text{A cm}^{-2}$  was recorded already at day 5. Then, a  
177 decreasing current trend lasted till the end of the cycle. **Cycle 2** showed a similar behavior with a  
178 slightly lower current peak. **Cycle 3 (acetate)** showed a consistent drop in the peak maximum (200  
179  $\mu\text{A cm}^{-2}$ ) compared to previous batch cycles. **The last cycle (Cycle 4)** yielded again a high and  
180 prolonged current production.

181 The corresponding SM system (fed with the same swine **sewage, in presence of the** terracotta  
182 **separator**) produced an oscillating and low current signal along 90 days of operation, around 50  $\mu\text{A}$   
183  $\text{cm}^{-2}$  with some peaks of around 100  $\mu\text{A cm}^{-2}$ .

184

#### 185 **FIGURE 2**

186

#### 187 3.2. High-throughput sequencing and microbial community analysis

188 The DNA was extracted from the biofilms sampled from all anodes, **BC and SC** biocathodes **and BM**  
189 **and SM** terracotta surfaces (**anolyte-side**). **Fig. 3** shows hierarchical clustering analysis via the  
190 unweighted pair group method with arithmetic mean (UPGMA). As expected, UPGMA demonstrated  
191 that the use of different sewages induced different enrichment in microbiological biofilms. The results  
192 are clustered mainly into two different **clusters**, highlighting that different communities were selected  
193 according to the different inoculum. However, the cathodic sample of BC **diverged from BM**. This  
194 **aspect highlights strong differences in chemical and electrochemical conditions, between the two**  
195 **conditions. The same result was not confirmed** for the MFCs inoculated with swine sewage, probably  
196 due to the lower and less constant current density obtained from SC reactor during the experiment  
197 (Fig. 2), that surely led to less extreme conditions.

198 As statistically confirmed by beta significance analyses, the anode samples of bovine sewage MFCs  
199 were grouped together **and differed significantly from the swine sewage MFCs samples** ( $p \leq 0.01$ ).

200

#### 201 **FIGURE 3**

202

203 Principal Coordinates Analysis (PCoA) confirmed the clustering identified between samples derived  
204 from the same inocula (Fig. 4). Furthermore, a separation from anodic samples to the cathodic and  
205 terracotta ones emerged.

#### 206 207 **FIGURE 4**

208  
209 The phylum distribution is presented in **Fig. 5**. *Bacteroidetes* phylum was the most abundant in all  
210 samples and it was present at higher percentages **in both biocathode and terracotta** samples (30-37%)  
211 than in all anodic samples (around 25-28%). The presence of *Bacteroidetes* was previously reported  
212 in fermentative bioelectrochemical biofilms [2,39] due to their ability to biodegrade polymeric  
213 proteins and carbohydrates.

214 *Firmicutes* phylum **was** often retrieved in bioelectrochemical systems, associated to electrogenic  
215 activity [40,41]. Also in this study, it was found in all samples: 18-20% for all anodes and BM  
216 terracotta biofilm; 14% for SC cathode and SM terracotta; and >37% for BC cathode.

217 *Proteobacteria* OTUs accounted for around 19-26% for almost all samples, but their presence was  
218 higher for SC cathode (31%) and very low for BC cathode (5%). Well-known electroactive genera of  
219 this phylum, (such as *Geobacter*, *Pseudomonas*, *Desulfuromonas* etc.) often play important roles in  
220 bioelectroactive biofilms [42,43].

221 *Euryarchaeota* (phylum of *Archaea* domain) presence was different in all samples. Anodic samples  
222 of the MFCs treating bovine sewage, BC and BM anodes, showed 11-12% of OTUs, due to the  
223 inoculum and the anaerobic condition of this part of the MFCs. *Archaea* were less presents in SC and  
224 BC cathodes, **as well as in SM** terracotta (1-2%), given the more aerobic conditions. **A slightly higher**  
225 **number of OTUs was found in BM terracotta sample (5%), since this biofilm was thick enough to**  
226 **guarantee anaerobic conditions in inner layers.**

#### 227 228 **FIGURE 5**

229  
230 The genus representation, according to the OTUs distribution is presented in **Fig. 6**. As commented  
231 before, the OTUs collected for genera of *Archaea* domain were more abundant in BC and BM anodes  
232 with respect to the other samples. The genera *Methanosaeta* (5% for SC anode, around 3% for BC  
233 and SC anodes and less than 2% for all other samples) and *Methanosarcina* (7% only in BC and BM  
234 anodes) are both acetoclastic methanogens. They are often found in the anodes of BES, when  
235 methanogenesis is not inhibited, competing with exoelectrogens for the same electron donor [44].

236 The abundance of uncultured *VC2.1 Bac22* ranged between 6 and 11% in all the samples of SC and  
237 SM MFCs. The uncultured *Bacteroidetes vadinHA17* was found in all samples (<2%).

238 *vadinBC27 wastewater-sludge group* is a genus belonging to the *Bacteroidetes* that was 8-9% for all  
239 the bovine sewage-MFCs samples. The distribution of this genus was higher for SC cathode (6%)  
240 than for other swine sewage MFCs samples (<3% for SC and SM anodes, <2% for SM terracotta).  
241 This genus was previously found in bioelectrochemical biofilms of similar MFCs [2].

242 *Petrimonas*, with higher presence in BC cathode than BM terracotta (respectively >6% and 3%), can  
243 be considered interesting since it is often found in bioelectroactive biofilms of MFCs [39,45]. Its  
244 abundance was less than 2% in all other samples.

245 Strictly anaerobic and nitrate-reducing species of *Vulcanibacillus* genus were previously reported in  
246 electroactive biofilm [46]. In this study, its presence was higher in SC cathodic biofilm (3.4%) than  
247 in SM terracotta biofilm (1.9%).

248 *Desulfuromonas* genus was one of the most important exoelectrogenic bacteria in all anodic samples.  
249 It was more abundant in bovine sewage-MFC anodes (>8% for BC and <6% for BM anodic samples)  
250 than in swine sewage-MFC anodes (<6% for SC and <4% for SM anodes). *Desulfuromonas* was also  
251 present in SC cathode sample with more than 3% of the total OTUs (less than 0.2% for SM terracotta  
252 sample).



253 *Thiopseudomonas* genus was found only in the anode of the terracotta-MFCs, BM (1.6%) and SM  
254 (4.2%). Facultative anaerobic *Thiopseudomonas* species were found oxidizing sulfide anaerobically  
255 with nitrate as electron acceptor in the sludge of an anaerobic, denitrifying, sulfide-removal bioreactor  
256 [47].

257 Several species of *Clostridia* were previously identified as electrogenic microorganisms [2,48].  
258 *Clostridium sensu stricto 1* was found only in swine sewage-MFC anodes (6% for SC and 4% for  
259 SM). The same result was recorded in a recent study, in similar air-cathode MFC inoculated with  
260 swine sewage [2].

261 An important presence of *Clostridia MBA03* genera was reported in BC cathodic sample (2% MBA03  
262 uncultured and 9% of other MBA03), but not in terracotta BM sample, which suggests an important  
263 electrogenic activity of these genera.

264 The well-known electroactive bacteria *Geobacter* and *Pseudomonas* were found with an abundance  
265 close to the 2% only in SC cathode (less than 0.3% for SM terracotta sample).

266 *Halomonas* and *Tissierella* genera were reported only in BC cathode (respectively 1.7% and 1.5%).  
267 Although, both genera have not been clearly reported as electroactive, they were previously found in  
268 electroactive biofilms of fermentative bioelectrochemical systems [2,49]. Similar conclusions can be  
269 drawn for *Erysipelotrichaceae UCG-004* (3.5% in BC cathode) since several genera of  
270 *Erysipelotrichaceae* family were previously reported in bioelectrochemical biofilms [2,49].

271 The results presented in this study were partially corresponding to the few previous reports that went  
272 into deep studying microbiological communities in MFCs fed with animal-manures. For example, in  
273 swine wastewater treating MFC was reported the presence of *Bacillus*, *Corynebacterium*,  
274 *Citrobacter*, *Staphylococcus*, *Micrococcus* and *Pseudomonas*, *Lactobacillus*, *Escherichia coli*,  
275 *Aspergillus*, and *Rhizopus* genera [50]. In another study [51], in MFC treating swine manure, the  
276 relative abundance of *Turicibacter*, *Alkaliphilus* sp. and *Bacteroidetes* were significantly higher in  
277 the two MFC compared to the raw swine manure samples, suggested an implication of these bacteria  
278 in electrogenesis.

279 Regarding MFC treating bovine wastewater, in Zhao et al. [52] the DGGE analysis showed the  
280 presence of genera *Trichococcus* sp., *Pseudomonas* sp., *Bacillus* sp., *Clostridium* sp. and *Alcaligenes*  
281 sp..

282

## 283 FIGURE 6

284

### 285 3.3 Comparison between the biofilms of biocathodes-MFCs versus terracotta-MFCs

286 In all reactors, both anodic and cathodic communities were more influenced by the inoculum than  
287 from the presence of terracotta. In particular, statistical analysis (UPGMA and PCoA in Fig. 3 and 4)  
288 confirmed that similar communities were obtained for anodes inoculated with the same sewage.

289 Better electrochemical performances (Fig. 2) were achieved by both biocathode-MFCs (BC and SC),  
290 as compared to the corresponding terracotta-MFCs (BM and SM). This can be due to the absence of  
291 a consistent biocathode, able to improve the sole abiotic catalytic activity for oxygen reduction. The  
292 consequent lower current generated in terracotta-MFCs, induced only slight changes in anodic  
293 microbial communities (Fig. 6). In fact, the full-blown or suspected electroactive genera of anodic  
294 communities were around 30% for both BC and BM MFCs and around 20% for both SC and SM  
295 MFC (Fig. 6).

296 On the contrary, the biofilm developed on BM and SM terracotta presented important differences  
297 towards the electroactive communities of BC and SC biocathodic samples. The total amounts of  
298 OTUs reported for well-known or suspected electroactive microorganisms in BC cathode was around  
299 25% versus around 5% for BM terracotta. Over 15% of the total OTUs obtained for SC cathodic  
300 sample was attributable to either full-blown electroactive microorganisms (such as *Geobacter*,  
301 *Pseudomonas* and *Desulfuromonas*) or suspected electroactive genera (such as *Vulcanibacillus*,  
302 *vadinBC27* wastewater-sludge group and *Petrimonas*). The amounts of all these genera in SM  
303 terracotta biofilm was <5%.

304 In bioanodes of all MFCs, *Desulfuromonas* mainly directed the exoelectrogenic activity, supported  
305 by an important presence of acetoclastic methanogens. In previous studies, Direct Interspecies  
306 Electron Transfer (DIET) between *Archaea* and exoelectrogenic bacteria was associated to the  
307 increasing of exoelectrogenic activity [53]. Here, in SC MFC, exoelectrogenic activity was performed  
308 also by *Clostridium sensu stricto I*, as recently reported for a similar MFC inoculated with swine  
309 sewage [2].

310 *Thiopseudomonas* genus was reported in the bioanode of both terracotta-MFCs (BM and SM).  
311 *Thiopseudomonas*, a genus of well-known electroactive *Pseudomonadaceae* family, was often  
312 associated to the anaerobic oxidation of reduced sulfide compounds. Thus, its higher presence  
313 suggests a higher amount of reduced sulfur compounds in the terracotta-MFCs, also due to the  
314 presence of sulfur reducing bacteria (such as *Desulfuromonas*). In previous studies, it was  
315 hypothesized that the cathodic biofilm catalyzes ORR by promoting cyclic red-ox mechanisms, such  
316 as with sulfur compounds, facilitating the dispatch of electrons to oxygen [2,3,8,9]. The presence of  
317 terracotta separator with such small pores (10-100 nm), as detected by a BET and BJH analyses,  
318 impeded the formation of a consistent cathodic biofilm in BM and SM reactors. Thus, the absence of  
319 the cathodic biofilm was likely hindering the oxidation of sulfur compounds at cathode. This led to  
320 increase the amount of reduced sulfide and consequently enriching the microbial community in  
321 *Thiopseudomonas*. This result confirms that cathodic biofilms were not only consuming oxygen with  
322 traditional aerobic/microaerophilic metabolic pathways, but they also contributed to the  
323 electrochemical catalysis of cathodic ORR, according to more recent studies [2].

324 Deeply different were the microbial communities that colonized terracotta and cathodic biofilms.  
325 Several well-known electroactive bacteria as *Geobacter*, *Pseudomonas*, *Clostridia* and  
326 *Desulfuromonas* were found in biocathodic communities but not in terracotta biofilms. On the  
327 contrary, terracotta biofilms were colonized only by fermentative bacteria. That suggests that the  
328 possibility to interact with a conductive material, as cathodic carbon cloth, was ensuring better  
329 conditions for electroactive bacteria growth.

330 In the case of bovine sewage MFCs, the main difference between BC cathode and BM terracotta was  
331 represented by the high presence of genera of *Clostridia MBA03* only in BC cathode. In BC cathode,  
332 *Clostridia MBA03* represented >11% of the total OTUs, but it was not present at all in BM terracotta  
333 sample and it was <1% in the other samples. *Clostridia* are well known to be electroactive bacteria  
334 and their presence only in cathodic BC sample was definitely due to their capability to interact with  
335 conductive materials. In BC cathode, there were exclusively present other genera that were previously  
336 found in bioelectroactive biofilms and suspected to be electroactive (e.g. *Tissierella* and *Halomonas*)  
337 [2,49].

338

### 339 Conclusions

340 Different microbial communities were enriched in MFCs using bovine (for BC and BM) and swine  
341 (for SC and SM) sewages. The cathodic and terracotta biofilms in BC and SC MFCs were  
342 microbiologically different as confirmed by statistical analysis (unweight pair group method with  
343 arithmetic mean (UPGMA) and beta diversity calculated as principal coordinates analysis (PCoA)).  
344 In BM and SM MFCs, the presence of terracotta (pores size 10-100 nm) between the anode and the  
345 cathode impeded the biocathode development, undermining current production. The electroactive  
346 microorganisms were more enriched on conductive material, the cathode, than on non-conductive  
347 material, the terracotta. Indeed, the OTUs of well-known or suspected electroactive microorganisms  
348 in BC and SC cathodic samples (mainly *Geobacter*, *Pseudomonas*, *Desulfuromonas* and *Clostridia*  
349 *MBA03*) were respectively 3 and 5 times more than in BM and SM terracotta biofilms. The  
350 electroactive anodic communities were slightly influenced by the presence of terracotta, the  
351 increasing of internal resistance and the consequent lower current production than the cathodes.

352 In the next future, the use of terracotta as low cost and biocompatible material for MFC might be  
353 improved. We propose, for example, to investigate new composite porous materials with electro-  
354 conductive and electro-catalytic properties.

355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405

## Acknowledgments

The authors thank Dr. Mariangela Longhi for the BET measurement. This work was entirely financed by the Italian Ministry of University and Research (MIUR) (SIR2014 Grant, project RBSI14JKU3, BioFuelCellApp) and by the Research Fund for the Italian Electrical System (July 29, 2009 - Decree of March 19, 2009).

## Vitae

**Dr. Laura Rago** obtained her PhD in Biotechnology at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (Spain) in 2015. She earned her Biotechnology and Master's degree in Pharmaceutical, Veterinary and Medical Biotechnologies (respectively in 2008 and 2011) at Università Magna Græcia di Catanzaro (Italy). In 2013, she participated in a research stay at the Swette Center for Environmental Biotechnology in the Arizona State University (Tempe, USA). Now, she is a postdoctoral researcher at the *e*-Bio Center, Università degli Studi di Milano. From 2014, she has authored more than 10 peer-reviewed publications on microbiology of the bioelectrochemical systems. [orcid.org/0000-0003-0698-9289](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0698-9289)

**Dr. Sarah Zecchin** graduated in Biology as a bachelor and as a master student in 2010 and 2013 respectively. She started working on rice rhizospheric sulfate-reducing bacteria during her master traineeship at the Division of Microbial Ecology at the University of Vienna (Austria). During her PhD (obtained in 2017) in Food Systems at the University of Milano (Italy), she studied the rice rhizospheric microbial communities involved in arsenic contamination. She is currently working as a postdoctoral researcher at the Department of Biology of the University of Konstanz (Germany), dealing with novel species of sulfate-reducing bacteria living in rice rhizosphere. [orcid.org/0000-0003-2851-1702](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2851-1702)

**Dr. Stefania Marzorati** received her PhD in Chemical Sciences at the University of Milan in 2015. Her PhD thesis was related to the electrochemical oxygen reduction reaction on Pt-free nanostructures. She worked for six months in CRANN Institute at the Trinity College Dublin (Ireland) where she studied the electrochemical behavior of carbon-based thin films. At present she works as Post-Doc researcher at the *e*-Bio Center, University of Milan. Her research interests are devoted to electrocatalysis and preparation/characterization of carbon-based materials for microbial fuel cells application. She has co-authored 10 peer-reviewed papers, one book chapter and 30 conference proceedings.

**Dr. Andrea Goglio** graduated in 2016 in Agricultural Science at the University of Milan (Italy) with a research project at the China Agricultural University of Beijing (China) on the renewable energy and nutrients from organic waste by anaerobic digestion process. In the same year, he received the professional license of Agronomist and in 2013 he took the bachelor degree in Agricultural Science and Technology at the University of Milan. Presently, he is a research fellow at the Department of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences of the University of Milan. He has co-authored 1 peer-reviewed papers and 4 conference proceedings.

**Dr. Lucia Cavalca** is associate professor of General and Environmental Microbiology at the University of Milano. Her research is focused on microbial processes in the rhizosphere and in aquatic environments and on the exploitation of bacteria involved in metal removal from industrial effluents and ground water. She has been investigator in 14 national research programs and in 4 international programs. She has been coordinator of four national programs and of one international program. She authored 41 peer-reviewed papers on international journals and two book chapters, and she is inventor of one Italian patent application. [orcid.org/0000-0002-3512-1705](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3512-1705)

406 **Dr. Pierangela Cristiani**, Biologist at RSE SpA (Italian public-controlled Research Company for  
407 Energy fields), has a consolidated experience of research, cooperative projects and teaching on  
408 materials/microbes interactions. She is involved in the organization of several international  
409 conferences and she is chairing the WP “Microbial Corrosion” of the European Federation of  
410 Corrosion. Her current relevant activity includes the development of microbial fuel cells technology  
411 in collaboration with several university’s Departments and wastewater plants. She is author of more  
412 than 100 publications, more than 50 peer-reviewed journal papers and 8 book chapters.  
413 [orcid.org/0000-0001-6315-9690](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6315-9690).

414  
415 **Dr. Andrea Schievano** graduated in 2006 in Environmental Engineering at University of Padua  
416 (Italy) with a research project at Technical University of Denmark (DTU), Copenhagen DK. In 2010,  
417 he got his PhD degree in Agricultural Ecology and Engineering at University of Milan (Italy) and he  
418 won 2 Post-doc research fellowships (2010-2014) at the same institution. From 2015 he is Senior  
419 researcher, after being selected in the SIR (Scientific independence of young researchers) program of  
420 the Italian Ministry of University and Research (MIUR). He is author of around 40 scientific  
421 publications on international peer reviewed journals on waste bio-refineries and bio-electrochemical  
422 systems. [orcid.org/0000-0003-3458-2654](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3458-2654)

423  
424

## 425 **References**

- 426 [1] M. Dopson, G. Ni, T.H.J.A. Sleutels, Possibilities for extremophilic microorganisms in  
427 microbial electrochemical systems, *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.* 40 (2016) 164–181.  
428 [doi:10.1093/femsre/fuv044](https://doi.org/10.1093/femsre/fuv044).
- 429 [2] L. Rago, P. Cristiani, F. Villa, S. Zecchin, A. Colombo, L. Cavalca, A. Schievano, Influences  
430 of dissolved oxygen concentration on biocathodic microbial communities in microbial fuel  
431 cells, *Bioelectrochemistry.* 116 (2017) 39–51. [doi:10.1016/j.bioelechem.2017.04.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bioelechem.2017.04.001).
- 432 [3] P. Cristiani, A. Franzetti, I. Gandolfi, E. Guerrini, G. Bestetti, Bacterial DGGE fingerprints of  
433 biofilms on electrodes of membraneless microbial fuel cells, *Int. Biodeterior. Biodegrad.* 84  
434 (2013) 211–219. [doi:10.1016/j.ibiod.2012.05.040](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibiod.2012.05.040).
- 435 [4] Z. He, L.T. Angenent, Application of bacterial biocathodes in microbial fuel cells,  
436 *Electroanalysis.* 18 (2006) 2009–2015. [doi:10.1002/elan.200603628](https://doi.org/10.1002/elan.200603628).
- 437 [5] C.I. Torres, A.K. Marcus, H.-S. Lee, P. Parameswaran, R. Krajmalnik-Brown, B.E. Rittmann,  
438 A kinetic perspective on extracellular electron transfer by anode-respiring bacteria, *FEMS*  
439 *Microbiol. Rev.* 34 (2010) 3–17. [doi:10.1111/j.1574-6976.2009.00191.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6976.2009.00191.x).
- 440 [6] L. Huang, J.M. Regan, X. Quan, Electron transfer mechanisms, new applications, and  
441 performance of biocathode microbial fuel cells, *Bioresour. Technol.* 102 (2011) 316–323.  
442 [doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2010.06.096](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2010.06.096).
- 443 [7] E. Guerrini, M. Grattieri, S.P. Trasatti, M. Bestetti, P. Cristiani, Performance explorations of  
444 single chamber microbial fuel cells by using various microelectrodes applied to biocathodes,  
445 *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy.* 39 (2014) 21837–21846. [doi:10.1016/j.ijhydene.2014.06.132](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2014.06.132).
- 446 [8] P. Cristiani, M.L. Carvalho, E. Guerrini, M. Daglio, C. Santoro, B. Li, Cathodic and anodic  
447 biofilms in Single Chamber Microbial Fuel Cells, *Bioelectrochemistry.* 92 (2013) 6–13.  
448 [doi:10.1016/j.bioelechem.2013.01.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bioelechem.2013.01.005).
- 449 [9] Y. Sun, J. Wei, P. Liang, X. Huang, Electricity generation and microbial community changes  
450 in microbial fuel cells packed with different anodic materials, *Bioresour. Technol.* 102 (2011)  
451 10886–10891. [doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2011.09.038](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2011.09.038).
- 452 [10] A. Colombo, S. Marzorati, G. Lucchini, P. Cristiani, D. Pant, A. Schievano, Assisting  
453 cultivation of photosynthetic microorganisms by microbial fuel cells to enhance nutrients  
454 recovery from wastewater, *Bioresour. Technol.* (2017). [doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.03.038](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2017.03.038).
- 455 [11] I. Gajda, J. Greenman, C. Melhuish, C. Santoro, B. Li, P. Cristiani, I. Ieropoulos, Water  
456 formation at the cathode and sodium recovery using Microbial Fuel Cells (MFCs), *Sustain.*



- 457 Energy Technol. Assessments. 7 (2014) 187–194. doi:10.1016/j.seta.2014.05.001.
- 458 [12] H. Lin, X. Wu, B. Hu, J. Zhu, Microbial Electrochemical Systems for Agro-industrial  
459 Wastewater Remediation and Renewable Products Generation: A Review, *Elyns J. Microbes*.  
460 1 (2016) 1–20. doi:10.19104/amb.2014.101.
- 461 [13] M. Santini, S. Marzorati, S. Fest-Santini, S. Trasatti, P. Cristiani, Carbonate scale deactivating  
462 the biocathode in a microbial fuel cell, *J. Power Sources*. 356 (2017) 400–407.  
463 doi:10.1016/j.jpowsour.2017.02.088.
- 464 [14] M. Santini, M. Guilizzoni, M. Lorenzi, P. Atanassov, E. Marsili, S. Fest-Santini, P. Cristiani,  
465 C. Santoro, Three-dimensional X-ray microcomputed tomography of carbonates and biofilm  
466 on operated cathode in single chamber microbial fuel cell, *Biointerphases*. 10 (2015) 31009.  
467 doi:10.1116/1.4930239.
- 468 [15] G. Pasternak, J. Greenman, I. Ieropoulos, Comprehensive Study on Ceramic Membranes for  
469 Low-Cost Microbial Fuel Cells, *ChemSusChem*. (2015) 88–96. doi:10.1002/cssc.201501320.
- 470 [16] M. Behera, P.S. Jana, M.M. Ghangrekar, Performance evaluation of low cost microbial fuel  
471 cell fabricated using earthen pot with biotic and abiotic cathode, *Bioresour. Technol.* 101  
472 (2010) 1183–1189. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2009.07.089.
- 473 [17] J. Winfield, I. Gajda, J. Greenman, I. Ieropoulos, A review into the use of ceramics in microbial  
474 fuel cells, *Bioresour. Technol.* 215 (2016) 296–303. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2016.03.135.
- 475 [18] I. Gajda, J. Greenman, C. Melhuish, I. Ieropoulos, Simultaneous electricity generation and  
476 microbially-assisted electrosynthesis in ceramic MFCs, *Bioelectrochemistry*. 104 (2015) 58–  
477 64. doi:10.1016/j.bioelechem.2015.03.001.
- 478 [19] I. Gajda, A. Stinchcombe, J. Greenman, C. Melhuish, I. Ieropoulos, Ceramic MFCs with  
479 internal cathode producing sufficient power for practical applications, *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*.  
480 40 (2015) 14627–14631. doi:10.1016/j.ijhydene.2015.06.039.
- 481 [20] C. Santoro, K. Artyushkova, I. Gajda, S. Babanova, A. Serov, P. Atanassov, J. Greenman, A.  
482 Colombo, S. Trasatti, I. Ieropoulos, P. Cristiani, Cathode materials for ceramic based microbial  
483 fuel cells (MFCs), *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*. 40 (2015) 14706–14715.  
484 doi:10.1016/j.ijhydene.2015.07.054.
- 485 [21] H. Wang, Z.J. Ren, Bioelectrochemical metal recovery from wastewater: A review, *Water Res*.  
486 66 (2014) 219–232. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2014.08.013.
- 487 [22] I. Gajda, A. Stinchcombe, J. Greenman, C. Melhuish, I. Ieropoulos, Microbial fuel cell e A  
488 novel self-powered wastewater electrolyser for electrocoagulation of heavy metals, (2016).  
489 doi:10.1016/j.ijhydene.2016.06.161.
- 490 [23] I. Merino Jimenez, J. Greenman, I. Ieropoulos, Electricity and catholyte production from  
491 ceramic MFCs treating urine, *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*. 42 (2017) 1791–1799.  
492 doi:10.1016/j.ijhydene.2016.09.163.
- 493 [24] J.R. Kim, G.C. Premier, F.R. Hawkes, R.M. Dinsdale, A.J. Guwy, Development of a tubular  
494 microbial fuel cell (MFC) employing a membrane electrode assembly cathode, *J. Power  
495 Sources*. 187 (2009) 393–399. doi:10.1016/j.jpowsour.2008.11.020.
- 496 [25] E. Guerrini, P. Cristiani, S.P.M. Trasatti, Relation of anodic and cathodic performance to pH  
497 variations in membraneless microbial fuel cells, *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*. 38 (2013) 345–353.  
498 doi:10.1016/j.ijhydene.2012.10.001.
- 499 [26] C. Santoro, K. Artyushkova, S. Babanova, P. Atanassov, I. Ieropoulos, M. Grattieri, P.  
500 Cristiani, S. Trasatti, B. Li, A.J. Schuler, Parameters characterization and optimization of  
501 activated carbon (AC) cathodes for microbial fuel cell application, *Bioresour. Technol.* 163  
502 (2014) 54–63. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2014.03.091.
- 503 [27] A. Schievano, B. Scaglia, G. D’Imporzano, L. Malagutti, A. Gozzi, F. Adani, Prediction of  
504 biogas potentials using quick laboratory analyses: Upgrading previous models for application  
505 to heterogeneous organic matrices, *Bioresour. Technol.* 100 (2009) 5777–5782.  
506 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2009.05.075.
- 507 [28] S.J. Green, R. Venkatramanan, A. Naqib, Deconstructing the Polymerase Chain Reaction:

- 508 Understanding and Correcting Bias Associated with Primer Degeneracies and Primer-  
509 Template Mismatches, *PLoS One*. 10 (2015) e0128122. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0128122.
- 510 [29] S.M. Bybee, H. Bracken-Grissom, B.D. Haynes, R.A. Hermansen, R.L. Byers, M.J. Clement,  
511 J.A. Udall, E.R. Wilcox, K.A. Crandall, Targeted Amplicon Sequencing (TAS): A Scalable  
512 Next-Gen Approach to Multilocus, Multitaxa Phylogenetics, *Genome Biol. Evol.* 3 (2011)  
513 1312–1323. doi:10.1093/gbe/evr106.
- 514 [30] P. V. Moonsamy, T. Williams, P. Bonella, C.L. Holcomb, B.N. Höglund, G. Hillman, D.  
515 Goodridge, G.S. Turenchalk, L.A. Blake, D.A. Daigle, B.B. Simen, A. Hamilton, A.P. May,  
516 H.A. Erlich, High throughput HLA genotyping using 454 sequencing and the Fluidigm Access  
517 Array™ system for simplified amplicon library preparation, *Tissue Antigens*. 81 (2013) 141–  
518 149. doi:10.1111/tan.12071.
- 519 [31] J. Zhang, K. Kobert, T. Flouri, A. Stamatakis, PEAR: a fast and accurate Illumina Paired-End  
520 reAd mergeR, *Bioinformatics*. 30 (2014) 614–620. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btt593.
- 521 [32] R.C. Edgar, Search and clustering orders of magnitude faster than BLAST, *Bioinformatics*. 26  
522 (2010) 2460–2461. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btq461.
- 523 [33] J.G. Caporaso, J. Kuczynski, J. Stombaugh, K. Bittinger, F.D. Bushman, E.K. Costello, N.  
524 Fierer, A.G. Peña, J.K. Goodrich, J.I. Gordon, G.A. Huttley, S.T. Kelley, D. Knights, J.E.  
525 Koenig, R.E. Ley, C.A. Lozupone, D. McDonald, B.D. Muegge, M. Pirrung, J. Reeder, J.R.  
526 Sevinsky, P.J. Turnbaugh, W.A. Walters, J. Widmann, T. Yatsunenko, J. Zaneveld, R. Knight,  
527 QIIME allows analysis of high-throughput community sequencing data, *Nat. Methods*. 7  
528 (2010) 335–336. doi:10.1038/nmeth.f.303.
- 529 [34] C. Quast, E. Pruesse, P. Yilmaz, J. Gerken, T. Schweer, P. Yarza, J. Peplies, F.O. Glockner,  
530 The SILVA ribosomal RNA gene database project: improved data processing and web-based  
531 tools, *Nucleic Acids Res.* 41 (2013) D590–D596. doi:10.1093/nar/gks1219.
- 532 [35] J.G. Caporaso, K. Bittinger, F.D. Bushman, T.Z. DeSantis, G.L. Andersen, R. Knight,  
533 PyNAST: a flexible tool for aligning sequences to a template alignment, *Bioinformatics*. 26  
534 (2010) 266–267. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btp636.
- 535 [36] M. Hamady, R. Knight, Microbial community profiling for human microbiome projects: Tools,  
536 techniques, and challenges, *Genome Res.* 19 (2009) 1141–1152. doi:10.1101/gr.085464.108.
- 537 [37] P.H.A. Sneath, R.R. Sokal, Numerical taxonomy. The principles and practice of numerical  
538 classification., San Francisco, W.H. Freeman and Company., USA, 1973.
- 539 [38] M.J. Anderson, A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance, *Austral*  
540 *Ecol.* 26 (2001) 32–46. doi:10.1111/j.1442-9993.2001.01070.pp.x.
- 541 [39] N. Montpart, L. Rago, J.A. Baeza, A. Guisasola, Hydrogen production in single chamber  
542 microbial electrolysis cells with different complex substrates, *Water Res.* 68 (2015) 601–615.  
543 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2014.10.026.
- 544 [40] P. Parameswaran, H. Zhang, C.I. Torres, B.E. Rittmann, R. Krajmalnik-Brown, Microbial  
545 community structure in a biofilm anode fed with a fermentable substrate: The significance of  
546 hydrogen scavengers, *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 105 (2010) 69–78. doi:10.1002/bit.22508.
- 547 [41] B.E. Logan, Exoelectrogenic bacteria that power microbial fuel cells, *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 7  
548 (2009) 375–381. doi:10.1038/nrmicro2113.
- 549 [42] S.A. Patil, V.P. Surakasi, S. Koul, S. Ijmulwar, A. Vivek, Y.S. Shouche, B.P. Kapadnis,  
550 Electricity generation using chocolate industry wastewater and its treatment in activated sludge  
551 based microbial fuel cell and analysis of developed microbial community in the anode  
552 chamber, *Bioresour. Technol.* 100 (2009) 5132–5139. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2009.05.041.
- 553 [43] A.P. Borole, J.R. Mielenz, T.A. Vishnivetskaya, C.Y. Hamilton, Controlling accumulation of  
554 fermentation inhibitors in biorefinery recycle water using microbial fuel cells, *Biotechnol.*  
555 *Biofuels*. 2 (2009) 7. doi:10.1186/1754-6834-2-7.
- 556 [44] L. Rago, J. Guerrero, J.A. Baeza, A. Guisasola, 2-Bromoethanesulfonate degradation in  
557 bioelectrochemical systems, *Bioelectrochemistry*. 105 (2015) 44–49.  
558 doi:10.1016/j.bioelechem.2015.05.001.

- 559 [45] L. Lu, D. Xing, N. Ren, B.E. Logan, Syntrophic interactions drive the hydrogen production  
560 from glucose at low temperature in microbial electrolysis cells, *Bioresour. Technol.* 124 (2012)  
561 68–76. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2012.08.040.
- 562 [46] J. Cai, P. Zheng, Y. Xing, M. Qaisar, Effect of electricity on microbial community of microbial  
563 fuel cell simultaneously treating sulfide and nitrate, *J. Power Sources.* 281 (2015) 27–33.  
564 doi:10.1016/j.jpowsour.2015.01.165.
- 565 [47] W.-B. Tan, Z. Jiang, C. Chen, Y. Yuan, L.-F. Gao, H.-F. Wang, J. Cheng, W.-J. Li, A.-J. Wang,  
566 *Thiopseudomonas denitrificans* gen. nov., sp. nov., isolated from anaerobic activated sludge,  
567 *Int. J. Syst. Evol. Microbiol.* 65 (2015) 225–229. doi:10.1099/ijms.0.064634-0.
- 568 [48] K. Rabaey, N. Boon, S.D. Siciliano, M. Verhaege, W. Verstraete, Biofuel Cells Select for  
569 Microbial Consortia That Self-Mediate Electron Transfer, *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 70 (2004)  
570 5373–5382. doi:10.1128/AEM.70.9.5373-5382.2004.
- 571 [49] X. Zhou, Y. Qu, B.H. Kim, Y. Du, H. Wang, H. Li, Y. Dong, W. He, J. Liu, Y. Feng,  
572 Simultaneous current generation and ammonia recovery from real urine using nitrogen-purged  
573 bioelectrochemical systems, *RSC Adv.* 5 (2015) 70371–70378. doi:10.1039/C5RA11556F.
- 574 [50] C. Ogugbue, E. Ebode, S. Leera, Electricity generation from swine wastewater using microbial  
575 fuel cell, *J. Ecol. Eng.* 16 (2015) 26–33. doi:10.12911/22998993/60450.
- 576 [51] A. Vilajeliu-Pons, L. Bañeras, S. Puig, D. Molognoni, A. Vilà-Rovira, E. Hernández-del Amo,  
577 M.D. Balaguer, J. Colprim, External Resistances Applied to MFC Affect Core Microbiome  
578 and Swine Manure Treatment Efficiencies, *PLoS One.* 11 (2016) e0164044.  
579 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0164044.
- 580 [52] G. Zhao, F. Ma, L. Wei, H. Chua, C.-C. Chang, X.-J. Zhang, Electricity generation from cattle  
581 dung using microbial fuel cell technology during anaerobic acidogenesis and the development  
582 of microbial populations, *Waste Manag.* 32 (2012) 1651–1658.  
583 doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2012.04.013.
- 584 [53] M. Morita, N.S. Malvankar, A.E. Franks, Z.M. Summers, L. Giloteaux, A.E. Rotaru, C. Rotaru,  
585 D.R. Lovley, Potential for Direct Interspecies Electron Transfer in Methanogenic Wastewater  
586 Digester Aggregates, *MBio.* 2 (2011) e00159-11-e00159-11. doi:10.1128/mBio.00159-11.  
587

## Figure captures and figures

**Fig. 1a.** Schematic of the four reactors used in this study; and **1b.** Pictures of the biofilm growth on cathodes (BC-cat and SC-cat) or terracotta (BM-ter and SM-ter). In the pictures is possible to observe the white silicone circle used to attach the cathodes and the terracotta to the Simple Pyrex® bottles.

**Fig. 2.** Current density trends of MFCs during the operational period of 90 days.


**Fig. 3.** UPGMA clustering analysis showing swine and bovine sewage samples belonging to significantly different groups ( $p \leq 0.01$ ).

**Fig. 4.** Beta diversity calculated as principal coordinates analysis (PCoA) performed calculates weighted UniFrac distance between all samples. Grey dashed circles indicate groups of samples significantly correlated, according to Permutational Multivariate Analysis of Variance (PERMANOVA,  $p \leq 0.01$ ).


**Fig. 5.** Relative abundance at phylum level obtained with high throughput Illumina amplicon sequencing.

**Fig. 6.** Genus representation of Illumina 16S rRNA gene amplicon sequencing results of anodic and cathodic biofilms. Red dashed squares indicate full-blown or suspected electroactive genera according to the literature.


**FIGURE 1**




**FIGURE 2**



**FIGURE 3**




**FIGURE 4**







**FIGURE 6**



## AUTHORS' PHOTOS

**Dr. Laura Rago**



**Dr. Sarah Zecchin**



**Dr. Stefania Marzorati**



**Dr. Andrea Goglio**



**Dr. Lucia Cavalca**



**Dr. Pierangela Cristiani**



**Dr. Andrea Schievano**



## TABLES

*Table 1. Characterization of raw wastewaters*

|                      | <i>pH</i>   | <i>Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen / mg L<sup>-1</sup></i> | <i>Specific conductivity / mS cm<sup>-1</sup></i> | <i>Total COD / g L<sup>-1</sup></i> | <i>Soluble COD / g L<sup>-1</sup></i> |
|----------------------|-------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>Bovine sewage</i> | <i>7.41</i> | <i>2.35</i>  | <i>9.70</i>                                       | <i>29.15</i>                        | <i>12.66</i>                          |
| <i>Swine sewage</i>  | <i>7.59</i> | <i>2.52</i>  | <i>10.38</i>                                      | <i>8.50</i>                         | <i>5.62</i>                           |

*Table 2. Performance of all MFCs during a representative batch cycle (Cycle 2).*

|           | <i>% COD removal</i> | <i>Internal resistance/<math>\Omega</math></i> | <i>Max power density / mW m<sup>-2</sup></i> | <i>Anodic open circuit potential / mV vs Ag/AgCl</i> |
|-----------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| <i>BC</i> | <i>55</i>            | <i>155</i>                                     | <i>283</i>                                   | <i>-468</i>  |
| <i>BM</i> | <i>35</i>            | <i>4876</i>                                    | <i>33</i>                                    | <i>-492</i>  |
| <i>SC</i> | <i>65</i>            | <i>261</i>                                     | <i>333</i>                                   | <i>-503</i>  |
| <i>SM</i> | <i>57</i>            | <i>2606</i>                                    | <i>67</i>                                    | <i>-498</i>  |