

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Elevating phosphorus accumulation in waste stabilisation pond algae

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Environmental Engineering

at Massey University, Palmerston North,

New Zealand.

Matthew Sells

2019



**MASSEY
UNIVERSITY**

Abstract

Facultative waste stabilisation ponds (WSP) are used globally for wastewater treatment due to their low cost and simple operation. While WSPs can be effective at removing organic pollutants and pathogens, phosphorus removal is typically poor. Algae that are common in WSPs are known to accumulate phosphorus and increase their phosphorus content in the biomass from 1% up to 3.8% (gP/gSS), which is believed to be from the production of intracellular polyphosphate granules. This phenomenon, known as luxury uptake, may be possible to manipulate to improve phosphorus removal in WSPs; however, its occurrence is sporadic and poorly understood. This PhD thesis was undertaken to investigate the conditions that influence phosphorus accumulation in WSP algae. Phosphorus accumulation was quantified using two methods: (1) the traditional phosphorus content in the biomass (gP/gSS), and (2) a new image analysis method developed in this thesis that quantifies stained polyphosphate granules within individual algal cells (μm^2 granule/ μm^2 cell).

Following a literature review and screening experiments that sought to identify variables that could affect the phosphorus content in the biomass (gP/gSS), six variables: temperature, phosphorus concentration, light intensity, mixing intensity, organic load, and pH were comprehensively examined using 40 batch factorial experiments (2^{6-1}) and a mixed genus culture from a full-scale WSP. Nine variables and interactions had a significant effect on the phosphorus content in the biomass and were incorporated into a regression equation. This 'mixed genus' regression equation was tested against literature data, where seven out of the eight batch experiments from the literature were successfully predicted.

In order to identify if the batch findings could be applied to a continuous process, which is more typical of full-scale WSPs, a bench-scale novel 'luxury uptake' process was designed, built, and operated under five different scenarios. The regression equation successfully predicted the experimental results for three of the five conditions examined. It was theorised that differences in behaviour at the genus level might explain why all five conditions were not successfully predicted.

In an attempt to improve the prediction capability, the 'black-box' of mixed genus analysis was 'opened' to allow the effects of variables on phosphorus accumulation at the genus level to be directly examined. To achieve this, a new image analysis method was developed that quantified stained polyphosphate granules in individual algal cells. To ensure the granules

being measured were indeed polyphosphate, algal cells were analysed using transmission electron microscopy coupled with energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy, which confirmed the granules contained higher levels of phosphorus compared to the remaining cell. The image analysis method was then used to quantify stained polyphosphate granules in individual cells from the 40 batch factorial experiments mentioned previously.

The results using the image analysis method showed that, for the five most abundant algal genera, *Micractinium/Microcystis* had the highest average accumulation of polyphosphate granules (17% μm^2 granule/ μm^2 cell), followed by *Scenedesmus* (12%), *Pediastrum* (11%), *Monoraphidium* (8%), and *Actinastrum* (4%). Although none of the genera studied had the same combination of significant variables, all five genera preferred a high phosphorus concentration to elevate polyphosphate granule accumulation. Furthermore, a high light intensity, high organic load, or high temperature was preferred by the algae if the variable was significant for that genus.

The culture used in the bench-scale continuous flow 'luxury uptake' process originated from a mixed genus WSP culture; however, it had become dominated by the *Scenedesmus* genus. Therefore, the regression equation was refined to use the batch data for this genus alone. This new *Scenedesmus* regression equation was compared against the experimental data from the 'luxury uptake' process previously mentioned. Polyphosphate granule accumulation was now successfully predicted in all five experimental conditions at the 95% confidence level. This improved prediction capability indicates that an understanding of the algal genus present in a WSP system is required for accurate predictions of the phosphorus accumulation to be obtained, and the batch data can indeed be applied to a continuous process.

An unexpected result of the research was that, contrary to what was believed in the literature, an increase in the phosphorus content in the biomass did not necessarily increase the polyphosphate granule accumulation. Further examination identified that individual cells from the same algal species had varying polyphosphate granule contents from 0% to over 20% (μm^2 granule/ μm^2 cell) when exposed to the same conditions. This variation was hypothesised to be from cellular functions influencing the granules differently depending on the individual alga's cell cycle. In addition, when the phosphorus content in the biomass was increased above 2.1% (gP/gSS), no significant effect on the average quantity of polyphosphate granules was observed. This finding indicates that other forms of phosphorus storage must be responsible for attaining a highly elevated phosphorus content in the biomass.

The findings in this thesis have demonstrated that manipulation of phosphorus accumulation in WSP algae is possible, and predictable, albeit at a genus level. These findings pave the way forward for the development of a new algal-based biotechnology capable of harvesting phosphorus from wastewater.

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisors Prof. Andrew Shilton and Dr. Nicola Brown. Their support and guidance throughout my PhD motivated me to produce the highest level of work I possibly could. Their feedback on the many drafts of the research papers was invaluable and greatly appreciated.

Thank you to the Manawatu District Council, Horowhenua District Council, Tararua District Council, and the Palmerston North City Council for their assistance and access to the WSPs that allowed me to undergo my research.

Many thanks to all the staff from the School of Engineering and Advanced Technology at Massey University Palmerston North for their assistance during my PhD. In particular, I would like to thank Ann-Marie Jackson, John Sykes, and John Edwards for their assistance in the laboratory, and Glenda Rosoman and Michele Wagner for their assistance with the administrative aspects of this PhD. Thank you to the team at the Manawatu Microscopy and Imaging Centre, Dr Matthew Savoian, Ms Jordan Taylor, and Mrs Niki Minards, for the training and assistance with the many hours of microscopy work undertaken. I would also like to thank Nihal Jayamaha for his valuable guidance on the statistical analysis conducted in this PhD.

Thanks to all my postgraduate colleagues, Aidan Crimp, Ramsay Huang, Roland Schaap, and Zane Norvill, for their assistance and encouragement during my PhD. In particular, I would like to thank Maxence Plouviez for his assistance with the *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii* culture, and Paul Chambonniere for access to the pilot scale Palmerston North WSP that he used for his research.

I would also like to thank the Royal Society of New Zealand for financially supporting this research through the Marsden Fund (MAU1103). Thank you also to the Massey University scholarship office for their financial support through the Doctoral Scholarship.

Finally, thank you to all my friends and family for their support and encouragement throughout the PhD journey.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
Table of Figures.....	x
Table of Tables.....	xvi
Table of Equations.....	xix
Structure of the thesis.....	xx
List of papers and contribution.....	xxi
Introduction.....	22
Chapter 1 Literature Review.....	25
1.1 Waste stabilisation pond (WSP) overview.....	26
1.2 Phosphorus removal pathways in WSPs.....	29
1.3 Algal phosphorus uptake dynamics.....	30
1.4 The role of polyphosphate in the algal cell.....	31
1.5 Methods to quantify phosphorus accumulation in algae.....	33
1.5.1 Raman microscopy.....	34
1.5.2 Electron microscopy coupled with energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EM-EDS).....	35
1.5.3 Polyphosphate granule staining coupled with image analysis.....	36
1.5.4 Summary of the methods to quantify phosphorus accumulation in algae.....	37
1.6 Phosphorus accumulation mechanisms.....	38
1.6.1 Variables influencing over-compensation.....	38
1.6.2 Variables influencing luxury uptake of phosphorus.....	39
1.7 Summary.....	51
Chapter 2 Screening of variables.....	53
Abstract.....	54
2.1 Introduction.....	54

2.2 Methodology	56
2.2.1 Variable selection	57
2.2.2 Data analysis	59
2.3 Results and discussion	60
2.3.1 Organic loading.....	61
2.3.2 Concentration of calcium, magnesium and potassium cations.....	62
2.3.3 Prior phosphorus content of the biomass.....	64
2.3.4 Biomass concentration	65
2.3.5 Wastewater pH.....	66
2.3.6 Mixing intensity	67
2.4 Conclusions.....	68
Chapter 3 Variables affecting phosphorus accumulation in a mixed genus WSP biomass.....	69
Abstract	70
3.1 Introduction.....	70
3.2 Methodology	71
3.2.1 Batch factorial experiment	71
3.2.2 Semi-continuous flow 'luxury uptake' process.....	75
3.3 Results and discussion	81
3.3.1 Identification of significant variables and interactions	81
3.3.2 Implications on WSP system design and operation	86
3.3.3 Operation of a laboratory scale 'luxury uptake' process	88
3.4 Conclusions.....	91
Chapter 4 The effect of individual algal genera on phosphorus accumulation	93
Abstract	94
4.1 Introduction.....	94
4.2 Methodology	95
4.2.1 Developing the polyphosphate granule quantification method	96

4.2.2 Procedure for identifying variables that influence polyphosphate granule accumulation in individual algal genera	106
4.3 Results and discussion	108
4.3.1 Variables responsible for polyphosphate granule accumulation in individual WSP algal genera.....	108
4.3.2 Bench-scale semi-continuous flow 'luxury uptake' process	112
4.3.3 Comparing the polyphosphate granule content to the phosphorus content in the biomass	113
4.4 Conclusions	115
Chapter 5 Relating polyphosphate granules in algal cells to the phosphorus content of the biomass	117
Abstract.....	118
5.1 Introduction	118
5.2 Methodology.....	119
5.2.1 <i>Scenedesmus</i> experimental reactors	119
5.2.2 <i>Chlamydomonas reinhardtii</i> experimental reactors	120
5.2.3 Analytical methods	121
5.3 Results and Discussion	122
5.3.1 Does the staining and image analysis technique identify the polyphosphate granules correctly?	123
5.3.2 Do the species within a genus accumulate different amounts of polyphosphate granules?.....	124
5.3.3 What cellular processes are responsible for the variation in polyphosphate granule content?.....	126
5.3.4 Are there compounds other than polyphosphate granules responsible for phosphorus storage?	127
5.4 Conclusions	131
Chapter 6 Conclusions and recommendations	132

6.1 Conclusions.....	132
6.2 Recommendations for future research	134
6.3 Recommendations for the design and operation of a ‘luxury uptake’ process	136
6.3.1 Luxury uptake stage.....	136
6.3.2 Growth stage	139
6.3.3 Final design	140
References.....	144
Chapter 8 Appendices	157
8.2 Appendix for Chapter 2: Screening of variables.....	158
8.2.1 Synthetic wastewater recipe	158
8.2.2 Growth and phosphorus removal data used to calculate the phosphorus content of the biomass	159
8.3 Appendix for Chapter 3: Variables affecting phosphorus accumulation in a mixed genus WSP.....	165
8.3.1 Analysis of local waste stabilisation ponds.....	165
8.3.2 Statistical analysis of inoculum sources	167
8.3.3 Confounding of interactions using the 2 ⁶⁻¹ experimental design	168
8.3.4 Laboratory scale semi-continuous flow ‘luxury uptake’ process	169
8.3.5 Identifying the HRT required for the luxury uptake stage of the ‘luxury uptake’ process.....	171
8.3.6 Residual analysis of the linear regression fitted to produce Equation 3.2 that is used to predict the phosphorus content in the biomass.....	172
8.3.7 Regression equation for biomass growth under batch conditions	174
8.3.8 Additional experimental data from luxury uptake process.....	176
8.4 Appendix for Chapter 4: The effect of individual algal genera on phosphorus accumulation	177
8.4.1 Matlab code used for image analysis quantification of polyphosphate granules....	177
8.4.2 Is the Matlab methodology robust?.....	192

8.4.3 Regression equation used to incorporate the effects of variables on polyphosphate granule formation in the genera studied.....	197
8.5 Appendix for Chapter 5: Relating polyphosphate granules in algal cells to the phosphorus content of the biomass	203
8.5.1 Minimal medium.....	203
8.5.2 Mass balance on phosphorus in polyphosphate granules.....	204
Statement of contribution to doctoral thesis containing publications – Chapter 2.....	207

Table of Figures

Figure 0.1: Phosphorus concentration in the biomass at luxury uptake levels of 1.0% or 3.8% (gP/gSS). Adapted from Powell <i>et al.</i> (2008).....	23
Figure 1.1: Phosphate transfer into an algal cell according to Cembella <i>et al.</i> (1982).	30
Figure 1.2: Relationships between the polyphosphate groups and other cellular phosphorus fractions. RNA-P, DNA-P, Lipid-P, and Protein-P refer to the phosphorus associated with the respective compounds. Poly-P refers to polyphosphate with A, B, C, and D referring to the different fractions. Adapted from Miyachi <i>et al.</i> (1964).....	32
Figure 2.1: Example of the experimental reactors used during the screening experiments.	56
Figure 2.2: Effect of organic load on the average phosphorus content of the biomass. Error bars are 90% confidence intervals. The black dashed horizontal line represents the average of the three levels.....	62
Figure 2.3: Effect of cations calcium (A), magnesium (B), and potassium (C) on the average phosphorus content of the biomass. Error bars are 90% confidence intervals. The black dashed horizontal lines represent the average of the three levels.....	63
Figure 2.4: Effect of the prior phosphorus content of the biomass (i.e. different levels in the inoculum) on the average phosphorus content of the biomass. Error bars are 90% confidence intervals. The black dashed horizontal line represents the average of the three levels.....	64
Figure 2.5: Effect of the inoculum biomass concentration on the average phosphorus content of the biomass. Error bars are 90% confidence intervals. The black dashed horizontal line represents the average of the three levels.	65
Figure 2.6: Effect of using CO ₂ (A) or HCl (B) pH control on the average phosphorus content of the biomass. Error bars are 90% confidence intervals. The black dashed horizontal lines represent the average of the three levels.....	66
Figure 2.7: Effect of mixing intensity on the average phosphorus content of the biomass. Error bars are 90% confidence intervals. The black dashed horizontal line represents the average of the three levels.....	67
Figure 3.1: Schematic of the bench-scale 'luxury uptake' process design. Black lines represent the flow of the 'liquid' wastewater, and red lines represent the flow of 'solids'. Green rectangles represent reactors. The first three reactors are the luxury uptake stage, and the final three reactors are the growth stage. Solids harvesting occurs in the blue central	

clarifier. Solids recycle occurs in the final blue clarifier before the treated wastewater is discharged.....	76
Figure 3.2: The bench-scale 'luxury uptake' process used in experimentation. Two separate experiments are shown, with one set of conditions tested in the front setup, and the second set of conditions tested in the back setup.	77
Figure 3.3: Range of phosphorus contents of the biomass achieved in the 40 factorial experiments from day 2 to 7 inclusive. Run order refers to the reactors and conditions described in Table 3.2. The eight centre point reactors have been grouped at the bottom of the figure. The error bar on the right represents the maximum value, the right of the diagonal line box represents the 3 rd quartile, the line between the diagonal line box and red box is the median, the left of the solid red box represents the 2 nd quartile, and the error bar on the left represents the minimum value.....	80
Figure 3.4: Comparison between the phosphorus content of the biomass observed by Schmidt <i>et al.</i> (2016) and that predicted by Equation 3.2. Error bars are 95% confidence intervals.	83
Figure 3.5: Diagram of potential 'luxury uptake' process using the information obtained from this chapter. The pond sizes are not to scale. Arrows show the direction of flow.....	87
Figure 3.6: Experimental and predicted phosphorus contents of the biomass when operating the 'luxury uptake' process. Calculation of the predicted values is based on Equation 3.2. Predicted error bars are a 95% confidence interval calculated from Minitab analysis of the factorial experiment. Experimental error bars are 95% confidence intervals from repeated sampling (n = 2 to 6). The numbers in the brackets refer to the experiment number in Table 3.5.....	89
Figure 4.1: Example of <i>Scenedesmus</i> cells that have been stained using Ebel's cytochemical stain. A: Low phosphorus culture without polyphosphate granules. B: High phosphorus culture with polyphosphate granules shown as black areas within the cells.....	98
Figure 4.2: STEM image of a <i>Scenedesmus</i> cell. Note: STEM images are contrast inverted therefore electron dense areas appear as white.....	99
Figure 4.3: Typical STEM-EDS output from a <i>Scenedesmus</i> algal cell with polyphosphate granules. Top: STEM image of <i>Scenedesmus</i> cell (contrast inverted) showing electron-dense areas as white. Bottom: Phosphorus (P), oxygen (O), carbon (C), and calcium (Ca) spectrometric output as EDS laser goes from left to right along the orange line in the STEM image shown at the top. Black-dashed and solid red circles highlight areas of two	

separate polyphosphate granules in the STEM image and the corresponding position in the P, O, C, and Ca spectrometric outputs.	100
Figure 4.4: (A): Electron microscope image of a <i>Scenedesmus</i> alga. (B): SEM backscatter detection image of <i>Scenedesmus</i> alga with overlaid phosphorus (P) in red/top and lead (Pb) in green/bottom EDS outputs. The white dotted line in all images shows the EDS laser path.....	101
Figure 4.5: Raw image obtained from microscopic observation of stained <i>Scenedesmus</i> cells	103
Figure 4.6: A: original image, B: initial background removed, C: small non-cell objects removed, and D: edge corrected	104
Figure 4.7: Empirical relationship between mean cell colour and polyphosphate granule detection threshold (Note: a higher cell colour results in a lighter cell).....	105
Figure 4.8: Using the threshold to isolate the polyphosphate granules (B) from the algal cell (A)	105
Figure 4.9: Experimental and predicted polyphosphate granule accumulation in <i>Scenedesmus</i> cells when operating the 'luxury uptake' process. Calculation of the predicted values is based on the <i>Scenedesmus</i> regression equation shown in Appendix 8.4.3. Predicted error bars are a 95% confidence interval calculated from Minitab analysis of the factorial experiment. Experimental error bars are 95% confidence intervals from samples of multiple <i>Scenedesmus</i> cells (n>5). The numbers in brackets refer to the experiment number in Table 4.3.....	113
Figure 4.10: Relationship between polyphosphate granule accumulation in <i>Scenedesmus</i> cells and the phosphorus content of the culture observed in the bench-scale 'luxury uptake' process. Experimental error bars are 95% confidence intervals from repeated sampling (n ≥ 3 for all error bars except for the phosphorus content of the biomass at 2.5% where n = 2 which corresponds to the standard deviation).	114
Figure 5.1: Relationship between the phosphorus content of the biomass (gP/gSS) and the polyphosphate granule content of individual cells (μm^2 granules/ μm^2 cell) for the <i>Scenedesmus</i> genus. Purple diamonds represent the average polyphosphate granule content at the given phosphorus content of the biomass. Other markers represent the polyphosphate granule content from individual cells at the different phosphorus contents of the biomass. n refers to the number of individual <i>Scenedesmus</i> colonies.....	122
Figure 5.2: Electron microscope image of a <i>Scenedesmus</i> alga. (B): SEM backscatter detection image of <i>Scenedesmus</i> alga with overlaid phosphorus (P) in red/top and lead (Pb) in	

green/bottom EDS outputs. The white dotted line in all images shows the EDS laser path. Reproduced from Chapter 4)	124
Figure 5.3: Relationship between the phosphorus content of the biomass (gP/gSS) and the polyphosphate granule content of individual <i>C. reinhardtii</i> cells (μm^2 granules/ μm^2 cell). n refers to the number of individual cells. n>95 refers to the smallest number of individual cells analysed at that grouping of phosphorus contents of the biomass.	125
Figure 5.4: Example of the variation in the number of cells per colony seen in the <i>Scenedesmus</i> reactors.	127
Figure 5.5: An example STEM-EDS output from a <i>Scenedesmus</i> algal cell with polyphosphate granules. A: STEM image of <i>Scenedesmus</i> cell (contrast inverted) showing electron-dense areas as white. B: Oxygen EDS output. C: Phosphorus EDS output. D: Phosphorus EDS output overlaid on top of the STEM image. Note: A brighter intensity shows an increased elemental abundance in the EDS outputs.	128
Figure 5.6: Phosphorus associated with the polyphosphate granules for <i>Scenedesmus</i> and <i>C. reinhardtii</i> cells shown in Figure 5.1 and Figure 5.3 respectively. Error bars are the standard deviation produced from the variation in polyphosphate granule area of individual cells.	130
Figure 6.1: Possible changes in flow pattern for summer and winter flow. The 'X' represents valves, the green colour represents open valves and pipe flows, and the red colour represents closed valves and pipes with no flow.	137
Figure 6.2: Scale diagram of the proposed 'luxury uptake' system. Note: Luxury uptake stage flow pattern has been described previously in Figure 6.1.	140
Figure 6.3: Satellite image of the current WSP system for Rongotea, New Zealand	141
Figure 6.4: Proposed 'Luxury uptake' system based on the laboratory scale experiment using the current WSP setup at Rongotea. Top is the current setup, middle is the proposed setup using a primary facultative pond, and bottom is the proposed setup using a primary anaerobic pond. Note: maturation ponds are included in the bottom setup to utilise the remaining space leftover from the existing WSP at Rongotea. The flow patterns in the luxury uptake pond are shown earlier in Figure 6.1.	142
Figure 8.1: Effect of organic loading on biomass concentration (A) and phosphorus removal (B).	159
Figure 8.2: Effect of calcium, magnesium, and potassium concentration on the biomass concentration (A, C, E respectively) and phosphorus removal (B, D, F respectively).	160

Figure 8.3: Effect of the prior phosphorus content of the biomass on the biomass concentration (A), phosphorus removal (B) and adjusted phosphorus removal (C). (Note: percentages in the legend are the phosphorus content (gP/gSS) of the initial inoculum cultures).....	161
Figure 8.4: Effect of the initial biomass concentration on the biomass concentration (A), phosphorus removal (B), and adjusted biomass concentration (C) (Note: Legend shows starting biomass concentrations).....	162
Figure 8.5: (Top) Effect of CO ₂ pH control on biomass concentration (A) and phosphorus removal (B). (Bottom) Effect of HCl pH control on biomass concentration (C) and phosphorus removal (D).....	163
Figure 8.6: Effect of mixing intensity on biomass concentration (A) and phosphorus concentration (B).....	164
Figure 8.7: Comparison of centre point runs from Foxtton Beach, PNCC, and Rongotea. Error bars are the 95% confidence intervals based on the average of 4 centre point runs using Rongotea algae.....	167
Figure 8.8: Phosphorus content in the biomass for the eight centre point control reactors. Reactors 1 to 4 (cross pattern) were inoculated from Rongotea WSP, and reactors 5 to 8 (solid red) were inoculated from Palmerston North WSP. The black dotted line is an average of all centre point reactors. Error bars are 95% confidence intervals.....	168
Figure 8.9: Day that the maximum phosphorus content of the biomass (gP/gSS) was achieved. Reactor number refers to the run order given in Table 3.2.	171
Figure 8.10: Residual plots for Equation 3.2 that is used to predict the phosphorus content of the biomass	172
Figure 8.11: Actual experimental value vs predicted value using Equation 3.2.....	173
Figure 8.12: Residual plots produced in Minitab when producing the growth regression equation.....	175
Figure 8.13: Algal section user interface	180
Figure 8.14: The graphical user interface for background removal	191
Figure 8.15: The empirical relationship between mean cell colour and polyphosphate granule detection threshold (Note: a higher cell colour result in a lighter cell. 0 is black, and 255 is white).....	193
Figure 8.16: Example of the empirical detection threshold to identify polyphosphate granules. Top images show the separation of the cell from the background, while the bottom	

images show the granule detection at different thresholds. The typical threshold value is 0.41 as calculated using Equation 8.3 with a mean cell colour of 141, the low threshold value is 0.36 (typical value – 0.05), and the high threshold value is 0.46 (typical value + 0.05). Red circles show a spherical assumption based on the granule length and width. Blue arrows show the two separate granules that are combined into one granule when using the high detection threshold..... 194

Figure 8.17: Example of a typical *C. reinhardtii* cell used for the volume calculations. From top left to right: original image, background removed image, and background removed image with the red dotted outline showing the circumference used for the spherical estimation. From bottom left to right: low granule threshold, typical granule threshold as predicted by the empirical threshold relationship for *C. reinhardtii*, and high granule threshold. Red circles show the detected granules and the circumference used in the spherical estimation. 195

Figure 8.18: Comparison between area and volume calculations of polyphosphate granules in *C. reinhardtii* cells..... 196

Figure 8.19: Residual plots for the *Scenedesmus* regression equation 198

Figure 8.20: Residual plots for the *Micractinium/Microcystis* regression equation..... 199

Figure 8.21: Residual plots for the *Pediastrum* regression equation 200

Figure 8.22: Residual plots for the *Monoraphidium* regression equation..... 201

Figure 8.23: Residual plots for the *Actinastrum* regression equation 202

Figure 8.24: Phosphorus associated with the polyphosphate granules for *Scenedesmus* and *C. reinhardtii* cells shown in Figure 5.1 and Figure 5.3 respectively. Error bars are the standard deviation produced from the variation in polyphosphate granule area of individual cells..... 206

Table of Tables

Table 1.1: Key algal genera present in facultative ponds (7 studies), maturation ponds (5 studies), and HRAPs (7 studies) (Shelef 1982; Banat <i>et al.</i> 1990; Cromar <i>et al.</i> 1996; Pearson 2005; Godos <i>et al.</i> 2009; Shanthala <i>et al.</i> 2009; Park & Craggs 2010; Pham <i>et al.</i> 2014; Ariesyady <i>et al.</i> 2016; Mehrabadi <i>et al.</i> 2016; Crimp <i>et al.</i> 2018). Classification of class and order is based on Guiry and Guiry (2017). ✓ = present, ✖ = no mention of presence, F-WSP = facultative WSP, and M-WSP = Maturation WSP.	28
Table 1.2: Experimental methods used in the key literature on luxury uptake under WSP conditions	41
Table 1.3: The effect of increasing the phosphorus concentration on luxury uptake in WSP algae. “N/A” refers to unavailable data, and “not significant” is the result of a p-value greater than 0.1 suggesting less than 90% confidence.	42
Table 1.4: Effect on luxury uptake of interactions involving the phosphorus concentration	42
Table 1.5: The effect of increasing the temperature on luxury uptake in WSP algae. “N/A” refers to unavailable data, “not significant” is the result of a p-value greater than 0.1 suggesting less than 90% confidence, ^a inferred from effects on both ASP and AISP.....	45
Table 1.6: Effect of interactions of temperature with other variables for luxury uptake of phosphorus.....	45
Table 1.7: The effect of increasing the light intensity on luxury uptake in WSP algae. “N/A” refers to unavailable data, “not significant” is the result of a p-value greater than 0.1 suggesting less than 90% confidence, *Effect is only initially positive, ^a inferred from effects on both ASP and AISP, ^b measured above the water surface.....	47
Table 1.8: The ability of algal genera typically found in New Zealand WSPs to accumulate polyphosphate granules. *Microcystis is a cyanobacterium. <i>Chlamydomonas/Cryptomonas</i> and <i>Micractinium/Microcystis</i> * could not be differentiated and were therefore grouped. Adapted from Crimp <i>et al.</i> (2018).	51
Table 1.9: The effect of key variables on luxury uptake in algae. ¹ Effect is putative as it has not been studied under WSP conditions, ² Effect on luxury uptake was estimated based on growth and phosphorus removal data	52
Table 2.1: Identification of variables that could potentially influence the phosphorus content of the biomass	55
Table 2.2: Variable levels examined	57

Table 2.3: Effect of increasing the studied variable level on the phosphorus content of the biomass, growth, and phosphorus removal. Effects (negative or positive) are significant at 90% confidence. N/A is no significant effect at 90% confidence.....	61
Table 3.1: Summary of the variable levels examined. The full matrix of experiments is shown in Table 3.2.....	73
Table 3.2: The randomised fractional factorial matrix of experiments. Blocking was conducted on the temperature due to only one temperature control room being available at any one time. 'c' in the run order denotes a centre point control experiment.	79
Table 3.3: Coded effects of the significant variables and interactions on the maximum phosphorus content of the biomass observed over days 2 to 7. * Denotes an interaction between variables, and N/A is not applicable as the variable is not significant.....	82
Table 3.4: The combination of variable levels proposed in this study to increase the phosphorus content of WSP biomass. Error in the predicted value is a 95% confidence interval produced in Minitab from analysis of the factorial experiment.	84
Table 3.5: Experimental conditions used to operate the 'luxury uptake' process. Winter and summer refer to the conditions in Table 3.4.	88
Table 4.1: Effect of variables and interactions with a significant effect on polyphosphate granule accumulation for the algal genera <i>Scenedesmus</i> , <i>Micractinium/Microcystis</i> , <i>Pediastrum</i> , <i>Monoraphidium</i> , and <i>Actinastrum</i> . N/A = not applicable as the P-value is greater than 0.10 and no interaction involving the variable is significant, * represents an interaction, '+' is a positive effect, '-' is a negative effect. Significant effects have been highlighted yellow.....	109
Table 4.2: Combination of variable levels predicted to increase polyphosphate granule accumulation in the individual algal genera based on the levels tested in this study. N/A is due to no significant effect of the variable on polyphosphate granule accumulation.....	110
Table 4.3: Experimental conditions used to operate the 'luxury uptake' process. 'Winter' and 'Summer' refer to the conditions proposed in Chapter 3 to increase the phosphorus content of a mixed genus culture. 'Granule' refers to the conditions that are proposed to increase polyphosphate granule accumulation in the <i>Scenedesmus</i> genus.....	112
Table 5.1: Phosphorus concentration and light intensity used in experimental reactors.....	120
Table 6.1: Recommended conditions to operate the luxury uptake stage	137
Table 8.1: Synthetic wastewater composition according to Davis and Wilcomb (1967)	158
Table 8.2: Hutners trace elements composition according to Davis and Wilcomb (1967)	158

Table 8.3: Description of the sites sampled from the wider Manawatu region.	165
Table 8.4: Presence of algal genera in WSPs from the Manawatu region	166
Table 8.5: Pump times and flow rates.....	170
Table 8.6: HRT and average SRT of the entire luxury uptake process under the different operating conditions. Experiment number refers to the numbers given in Table 3.5.....	170
Table 8.7: The standardised effects of significant variables and interactions on the biomass growth. *Denotes an interaction between variables, ^a not applicable due to the variable not having a significant effect.	174
Table 8.8: Operating conditions for the luxury uptake process.....	176
Table 8.9: Additional experimental data obtained when operating the luxury uptake process under the different experimental conditions shown in Table 8.8.....	176
Table 8.10: Minimal medium used for the <i>Chlamydomonas reinhardtii</i> species work.....	203

Table of Equations

Equation 1.1: Calculating the phosphorus content of the biomass, %P (gP/gSS), multiplied by 100 to change into a percentage. Where: TP = total phosphorus concentration (gP/L), DP = dissolved phosphorus concentration (gP/L), and SS = biomass suspended solids concentration (gSS/L).....	33
Equation 2.1: Calculating the phosphorus content of the inoculum reactors.....	58
Equation 2.2: Calculating the phosphorus content of the biomass (gP/gSS)	59
Equation 3.1: Phosphorus content of the biomass (%P) using total dissolved phosphorus	74
Equation 3.2: Regression equation produced to predict the maximum phosphorus content in the biomass over days 2 to 7, %P (gP/gSS), as a percentage. T = temperature (°C), P = phosphorus concentration (mgP/L), L = light intensity ($\mu\text{E}/\text{m}^2\cdot\text{s}$), M = mixing intensity (RPM), C = organic load (mgCOD/L), and pH = pH. 'x' refers to an interaction effect between the variables. Note: the input value of the variables should be their initial value from day 0.	82
Equation 4.1: Calculating the polyphosphate granule content (μm^2 granule/ μm^2 cell) of a single algal cell.....	105
Equation 8.1: SRT calculation for luxury uptake process. Where: SS = suspended solids (mgSS/L), LU = luxury uptake stage, V = volume (L), Growth = growth stage, and Q = flow rate (L/d).	170
Equation 8.2: Regression equation to predict the biomass growth over seven days under batch conditions.....	174
Equation 8.3: The empirical relationship between the detection threshold and cell colour ...	193

Structure of the thesis

The chapters in this thesis are adapted from a series of scientific papers that have been published or are ready for submission to international peer-reviewed journals. While the presented content of the chapters is the same as the papers they are based on, the following changes have been made to improve the clarity of the thesis:

- Formatting changes have been conducted to ensure a consistent style throughout the thesis,
- The introductions of each chapter have been shortened to reduce repetition,
- If a method is repeated in later chapters, a reference back to the first mention of the method has been used, and
- Changing the references of papers produced in this PhD to their corresponding chapter number (i.e. a reference to the paper Sells *et al.* (2018) has been changed to Chapter 2).

A preface has been included at the beginning of each chapter to help link the individual chapters together and illustrate their contribution towards the research objectives of this thesis. The content presented in Chapters 1 through 5 has been used to produce the thesis conclusions that are discussed after Chapter 5.

The structure of this thesis complies with the Massey University “Guidelines for Doctoral Thesis by Publications”, 2015 issued by the graduate research school (GRS).

List of papers and contribution

A list of the chapters and relevant publications are given below. Along with these publications, an overview of the initial findings of this thesis was presented at the “11th IWA Specialist Group Conference on Wastewater Pond Technologies, 2016” in Leeds, UK.

Chapter 2

Sells, M. D., Brown, N., & Shilton, A. N. (2018). Determining variables that influence the phosphorus content of waste stabilization pond algae. *Water Research*, 132, 301-308. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2018.01.013

Chapter 3

Sells, M.D., Brown, N. and Shilton, A.N. Interactions between environmental and process variables influence phosphorus accumulation in waste stabilisation pond algae. *In preparation for submission to Water Research*.

Chapter 4

Sells, M.D., Brown, N. and Shilton, A.N. The conditions for phosphorus accumulation in algae are genus dependent. *In preparation for submission to Ecological Engineering*.

Chapter 5

Sells, M.D., Brown, N. and Shilton, A.N. Relating polyphosphate granule accumulation to the algal phosphorus content. *In preparation for submission to Environmental Science and Technology*.

Matthew Sells was the main contributor and lead author on all the papers mentioned above, with advice and editing assistance being obtained from his supervisors Prof. Andrew Shilton and Dr. Nicola Brown. Matthew Sells designed, conducted, and analysed the experimental work. The “statement of contribution to doctoral thesis containing publications” for the published paper can be found at the end of the appendices.