

1 **INFLUENCE OF SLUDGE AGE ON THE PERFORMANCE OF MFC**
2 **TREATING WINERY WASTERWATER**

3 Eduardo D. Penteado¹, Carmen Maria Fernandez-Marchante², Marcelo Zaiat¹, Pablo
4 Cañizares², Ernesto Rafael Gonzalez³, Manuel Andrés Rodrigo Rodrigo²

5

6 ¹ Laboratório de Processos Biológicos (LPB), Centro de Pesquisa, Desenvolvimento e
7 Inovação em Engenharia Ambiental, Escola de Engenharia de São Carlos (EESC),
8 Universidade de São Paulo (USP), Engenharia Ambiental - Bloco 4-F, Av. João Dagnone,
9 1100, Santa Angelina, 13563-120 São Carlos, SP, Brazil

10

11 ² Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Enrique Costa
12 Building, Av. Camilo José Cela, N°. 12, 13071 Ciudad Real, Spain

13

14 ³ Departamento de Físico Química, Instituto de Química de São Carlos (IQSC),
15 Universidade de São Paulo (USP), Avenida Trabalhador São-carlense, 400 - CEP 13566-
16 590 São Carlos, SP, Brazil

17

18 *Corresponding author: E-mail address: ernesto@iqsc.usp.br (E. R. Gonzalez)

19

20 **ABSTRACT**

21

22 The objective of this paper was to determine the influence of sludge age on microbial fuel
23 cell (MFC) performance for generating electricity and removing organic matter from
24 winery wastewater. Six Solid Retention Times (SRT) were used: 1.2, 1.4, 1.8, 2.3, 3.5
25 and 7.0 d. Results demonstrate that the electricity generation increases by decreasing the
26 SRT, selecting electrogenic microorganisms, once the specific organic loading rate
27 (SOLR) increased and the competition for substrate was reduced. Decreasing the SRT,
28 coulombic efficiency can be increased from 3.4% to almost 42.2% and maximum power
29 density from 58 to 890 mW m⁻². However the SRT did not influence on organic matter
30 removal in biological treatment, because only a small part of COD was removed
31 oscillating around 600 mg L⁻¹ d⁻¹ and it was very similar at all SRT studied.

32

33 **Keywords:** ► wastewater treatment ► energy recovery ► winery wastewater
34 ► microbial fuel cell ► sludge retention time

35

36

37 **HIGHLIGHTS**

38 - Power generation increases by decreasing the SRT selecting electrogenic
39 microorganisms

40 - SRT did not influence on organic matter removal in biological treatment

41 - Decreasing the SRT, Coulombic efficiency can be increased from 3.4% to
42 almost 42.2%

43 - maximum power density of 890 mW m^{-2} can be achieved with MFC with SRT
44 1.2 d

45

46

47 INTRODUCTION

48 Microbial fuel cells (MFC) have become an emerging and promising technology
49 that converts the chemical energy stored in organic and inorganic molecules directly into
50 electricity, using microorganisms as biocatalysts (Rodrigo et al., 2007). Microorganisms
51 oxidize organic matter on the anode producing electrons, which move through an external
52 electrical circuit towards the cathode reducing an electron acceptor. Transport of ions
53 through the bulk liquid or through an ion selective membrane keep the charge balance in
54 the cell (Logan et al., 2006; Rabaey & Verstraete, 2005; You et al., 2006). MFC permits
55 dual benefits like the wastewater treatment and power generation, seeming to be a
56 promising approach to mitigate the environmental impact caused by wastewater.
57 Nevertheless, the low power generation is one of the main bottlenecks for MFC
58 technology, which greatly limits its development and industrial application (Rabaey &
59 Verstraete, 2005).

60 Several parameters, such as operating conditions, reactor configuration, electrode
61 material, membrane type, electrode surface area and external resistance, are known to
62 affect MFC performance and are typically studied in works found in the literature (Akman
63 et al., 2013; Gonzalez del Campo et al., 2013; Larrosa et al., 2009; Li et al., 2013; Patil
64 & Gogate, 2012; Rahimnejad et al., 2011; Wei et al., 2012; You et al., 2006). However,
65 to best of our knowledge, there are no studies on the effects of Solid Retention Time
66 (SRT) on MFC performance.

67 The SRT or sludge age is an outstanding parameter for the design and operation
68 of biological wastewater treatment processes (Rodrigo et al., 1996) and, consequently, it
69 is expected to have a critical influence on the MFC performance, as well. SRT represents
70 the average time spent by microorganisms in the biological reactor; and it is directly
71 related to the population of microorganisms and the distribution of species, being a very

72 effective method for the selection of populations. The lower the SRT, the faster should
73 be the growth rate of microorganisms remaining in the biological reactor to avoid their
74 wash out.

75 Although the choice of an SRT can lead to many consequences related to the
76 biological wastewater process performance, its influence on the performance of the MFC
77 were not yet well studied. Opposite, what it has been studied in the literature related to
78 SRT is the influence on performance of the MFC of the Hydraulic Retention Time (HRT),
79 although the literature is also scarce at this point (Kim et al., 2015b) and it is focused on
80 the results obtained by changing HRT in a very limited range by feeding the MFC with
81 different fuels such as domestic wastewater (Min & Logan, 2004) (Puig et al., 2011), milk
82 processing wastewater (Kim et al., 2015a), synthetic wastewater (Wang et al., 2014) and
83 urban wastewater enriched with glycerol (Guimaraes & Linares, 2014).

84 In previous papers of this group, the application of MFC technology to treat
85 wineries wastewater was exhaustively studied and hence a deep understanding of the
86 performance of this system was obtained. Taking into account this background, this paper
87 focus on the effect of different SRT in the performance of a dual chamber MFC fed with
88 winery wastewater, paying special attention to the study of COD removal of winery
89 wastewater and the energy recovery.

90

91 **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

92

93 **MFC configurations and operation**

94 Two MFC were used in this work (Figure 1). They were made of acrylic tubes
95 (inner diameter 40 mm; length 180 mm). Sterion[®] membrane (preconditioned using a 3%
96 (v:v) hydrogen peroxide solution, 0.5 mol L⁻¹ sulfuric acid and ultrapure water) was used

97 to separate the MFC into two chambers with 70 mL (anode) and 100 mL (cathode),
98 respectively. Carbon felts (KFA10, SGL Carbon Group[®]) were used as electrodes in both
99 chambers. A stainless steel wire and an external resistance of 120 Ω connected the anode
100 and the cathode. The electrodes in both chambers were not replaced when the SRT was
101 changed.

102 The MFC was operated in parallel in semi-continuous mode with cycle time of 1
103 day or 24 hours and at room temperature (25 ± 3 °C). The anode compartment was
104 inoculated only at the beginning of experiment. To regulate the SRT, every day, a volume
105 of anolyte was taken from the anode chamber and replaced by fresh winery wastewater.
106 It is important to point out that using this technique (the purge of mixed liquor
107 microorganisms) only the microorganisms contained in the bulk of the MFC are directly
108 affected and this procedure does not affect to microorganism fixed on surfaces (biofilm).
109 It is also important to point out that at the same time, the Hydraulic Residence Time was
110 simultaneously modified in the system. The amounts removed in the tests were 10, 20,
111 30, 40, 50 and 60 mL, which resulted in SRT of 7.0, 3.5, 2.3, 1.8, 1.4 and 1.2 d,
112 respectively.

113 An important observation that should be taken into account in the discussion of
114 results is that the SRT influence on performance was studied by changing this parameter
115 in two different cells sequentially. MFC1 was operated at 7.0 d during 45 d and then the
116 SRT was changed to 2.3 for 35 d and finally to 1.4 d for 10 days. Complementary, MFC2
117 was operated at 3.5 d during the firsts 41 d and then the SRT was changed to 1.8 for 35 d
118 and finally to 1.2 d for 10 days. Overlapping of results obtained in both MFCs will be a
119 clear indication of the reproducibility of the performance of this type of MFC and will
120 support the conclusions drained from this work.

121 The cathode compartment of the MFC was connected to a water reservoir with
122 250 mL. A peristaltic pump was used to recirculate the solution of HCl (pH 3.5) from the
123 reservoir through the cathodic chamber of the MFC at 1.66 mL s^{-1} . An aquarium aerator
124 and porous stones diffusers were used in the reservoirs tank for supplying the oxygen to
125 the cathode chamber.

126

127 **Inoculum and wastewater**

128 The anode compartment was inoculated with 90% (V:V) of activated sludge
129 concentrated by sedimentation and collected from the activated sludge reactor at the
130 municipal Wastewater Treatment Plant of Ciudad Real (Spain) and 10% winery
131 wastewater. Hence, a mixed culture was used to startup the MFC. The concentration of
132 total solids and total volatile solids were 15.8 and 11.1 g L^{-1} respectively.

133 The winery wastewater was collected from the regulating reservoir of the
134 industrial wastewater treatment plant of the winery Bodegas Crisve (Socuéllamos, Spain),
135 and stored at 4°C before being used. Table 1 shows the composition of this winery
136 wastewater. NaHCO_3 (6000 mg L^{-1}) was used to adjust the pH to 6.5 and as buffer.
137 Dibasic sodium phosphate ($\text{Na}_2\text{HPO}_4 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$) and ammonium sulfate ($(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{SO}_4$) were
138 added to increase the phosphorous and nitrogen concentrations to $10 \text{ mg P-PO}_4^{3-} \text{ L}^{-1}$ and
139 $100 \text{ mg N-NT L}^{-1}$ according to a previous study about the availability of nutrients for this
140 type of wastewater.

141

142 **Analytical methods**

143 The pH, conductivity and dissolved oxygen were measured using a GLP22
144 Crison[®] pH-meter, a GLP 31 Crison[®] conductivity meter and an Oxi538 WTW[®] oxy-
145 meter, respectively. The total suspended (TSS) and volatile suspended (VSS) solids were

146 measured gravimetrically (Rodrigo et al., 2009). The COD and concentration of
147 phosphorous were measured using a spectrophotometer (DR2000, HACH®). The total
148 nitrogen was monitored using a Multi N/C 3100 Analytik Jena analyzer.

149

150 **Electrochemical measurements**

151 A digital multimeter (Keithley® 2000) was connected to the system to
152 continuously record the value of the cell potential and the data were recorded in a personal
153 computer. The polarization curves from the MFC were obtained by varying the resistance
154 in the circuit and measuring the voltage. Power densities (mW m^{-2}) and current densities
155 (mA m^{-2}) were based on the surface area of anode (7.0 cm^{-2}). The current (I) was
156 calculated using Ohm's Law ($I = E/R$), and the output power of the cell using $P = I E$,
157 where I (A) is the current, E (V) is the voltage, R (Ω) is the external resistance and P (W)
158 is the power. Coulombic efficiency (CE) was based on total current generation and the
159 maximum current that can be produced from COD oxidation and was calculated
160 according a previous research (Rodrigo et al., 2009).

161

162 **Results & Discussion**

163 Figure 2 depicts the average values of COD, total nitrogen (TN) and total
164 phosphorous (TP) before and after the daily feeding cycle for each SRT studied. The
165 MFCs were operated in semi-continuous mode and every day a fixed volume of the
166 anolyte (well homogenized) was replaced by fresh wastewater. Values shown in the
167 Figure 2 were calculated once stabilized the COD, after 7 days of operation and the
168 average value was calculated in order to avoid effects of fluctuations. It is important to
169 take into account that the higher values observed for the COD, TN and TP concentrations
170 for the lower SRT tested should not be considered as a direct consequence of the SRT but

171 of the operating procedure planned, as can be seen in Figure 3. The lower the SRT, the
172 higher is the amount of fresh winery wastewater added to the system and, hence, the lower
173 is the dilution of the carbon and nutrient sources in the anolyte caused by the replacement
174 with fresh wastewater. Another important observation that should be taken into account
175 in the discussion of results is that the SRT influence on performance was studied by
176 changing this parameter in two different cells sequentially. MFC1 was operated at 7.0 d
177 during 45 d and then the SRT was changed to 2.3 for 35 d and finally to 1.4 d for 10 days.
178 Complementary, MFC2 was operated at 3.5 d during the firsts 41 d and then the SRT was
179 changed to 1.8 for 35 d and finally to 1.2 d for 10 days. A good reproducibility of results
180 and the drawn of sound conclusions in spite of having used two independent cells is an
181 additional proof of the robustness of the MFC technology and it will strengthen the
182 conclusions obtained in this work.

183 Once clarified these important points, in comparing the daily COD removal, it can
184 be observed that just a very small fraction of the organic matter contained in the feeding
185 winery wastewater was removed during the operation of the MFC. In addition, this
186 fraction did not seem to depend on the SRT: it is around $600 \text{ mg L}^{-1} \text{ d}^{-1}$ regardless the
187 SRT (Figure 2). This observation should be explained in terms of the high fraction of
188 recalcitrant substances contained in winery wastewater (Pepe Sciarria et al., 2015). The
189 daily COD removal efficiency was only around 10%, being this value-much lower than
190 those observed by other authors (Cusick et al., 2010; Pepe Sciarria et al., 2015) who
191 reported efficiencies of about 67 % and 27 %, respectively, for the same type of
192 wastewater. Anyhow, the great variability of this type of wastewater, caused by the very
193 different processes involved in the manufacture of wine and by the seasonality in the
194 quality of this wastewater, can help to explain this divergence. Even with this low COD
195 removal, the organic matter seems not to be a limiting factor for the MFC performance.

196 In comparing the TN and TP consumptions rates for the different SRT tested (Figure 2b
197 and 2c), it can be noticed that the lower is the SRT, the higher is the resulting consumption
198 of nutrients, suggesting a more active population of microorganisms. Moreover, even for
199 the lower SRT, another important observation is that concentrations of nitrogen and
200 phosphorous were not limiting the MFC operation because the concentration at the end
201 of each daily feeding cycle is not negligible.

202 Figure 4 shows the microorganisms concentration, quantified as VSS and the
203 resulting specific organic loading rate (SOLR). As expected, the VSS increased with the
204 increase in the SRT. Longer SRT allowed more types of microorganisms to reproduce
205 efficiently, increasing the VSS concentration. At this point, it is important to bear in mind
206 that microorganisms with a low growth rate are washed out from the system if the removal
207 rate (by purging) is higher than the growth rate and this washing-out may happen at low
208 SRT. SRT control is an important method for the selection of populations because SRT
209 does not only affect the concentration of VSS but most importantly the distribution of the
210 different types of microorganisms. When the MFC was operated with a SRT of 7.0 d, the
211 VSS was 0.643 g L^{-1} . From that value, the decrease of the concentration is almost linear
212 and for the lowest SRT tested (1.2 d) the VSS was up to 72% lower (0.18 g L^{-1}). It is
213 interesting to observe that SOLR increased reducing the SRT, indicating that more
214 organic matter was available per microorganism, as direct consequence of the VSS
215 decline. As explained before this higher availability does not reflect on the COD
216 consumption rate, although it does in the TP and TN consumptions.

217 Once clarified the role of the SRT on the degradation of the winery wastewater, it
218 is important to focus on the energy aspects of the MFC performance. To assess if the SRT
219 influence the electrical generation the cell voltage and the polarization curves were
220 monitored.

221 The temporal variation of voltage at different SRT in semi continuous MFC is
222 shown in Figure 5. There is a clear influence of the SRT on the production of electricity
223 and a one-fold difference is observed in comparing the two extreme values tested in this
224 work. The highest average cell voltage was observed in MFC operated with 1.2 d SRT
225 (178 mV) and the lowest was reached in reactor operated in 7.0 d SRT (18 mV). The cell
226 voltage increased as the SRT decreased from 7 to 1.2 d (Figure 5A), which indicates that
227 lower SRT enhanced the MFC power generation because non exoeletrogens
228 microorganism were washed out and more organic matter could be used by exoeletrogens
229 bacteria. The daily voltage profile, as can be seen in Figure 5B, showed an unstable
230 profile, the voltage instantaneously increased but late it dropped. One possible reason for
231 this increase was the addition of hydrochloric acid to cathode to control the pH in 3.5,
232 which raise the concentration of protons reacting with oxygen and electrons and it
233 generates more energy. As the time passed by, the concentration of protons in cathode
234 decreased, and consequently the voltage reduced and pH raised.

235 For each SRT, polarization curves were recorded and showed the same behavior
236 than that observed in cell voltage, as can be seen in Figure 6 with better performance for
237 lower SRT. Thus, when the cell was operated with the longest SRT (7.0 d), the MFC
238 showed a maximum of power density of 58 mW m^{-2} (95 mV). Decreasing the SRT to 1.2
239 d lead to a significant increase in the power densities: the maximum power densities were
240 fifteen times higher than that reached with 7.0 d SRT (891 mW m^{-2} and 275 mV). It is
241 interesting to observed that the slope of polarization curve (Figure 6) decreased when the
242 SRT decreased from 7.0 to 1.2 d, because the ohmic loss was reduced due to the increment
243 of conductivity of solution (Table 2) as consequence of the MFC operation mode (the
244 lower the sludge age the higher the fresh winery wastewater amount added) and the
245 microbial community selection in lower SRT.

246 The increase in cell voltage and in power densities observed in polarization curves
247 varied linearly with the SRT, as shown in Figure 7. These relationships suggest that
248 electrogenic microorganisms have a higher growth rate than non-electrogenic
249 microorganisms and they prevail in the biological culture when sludge age is decreased.
250 In fact, under low SRT those microorganisms with a slow growth rate are washed out
251 because they required a larger time to reproduce. This may help to eliminate
252 microorganisms such as acidogenic and methanogenic when the system was operated in
253 low SRT decreasing the competition for substrate, as can be seen by the increment of
254 SOLR in low SRT (Figure 4).

255 It is worth pointing out that although no significant changes in the COD depletion
256 rate were observed for the different SRT, the activity of electrogenic microorganisms
257 improved greatly when the SRT were reduced and a higher ratio of the COD was
258 processed by electrogenic microorganisms, improving their prevalence with respect to
259 non bioelectrogenic microorganisms. This prevalence can be clearly seen in Figure 8,
260 where it is shown the changes in the Coulombic Efficiency calculated using the power
261 generated and the COD consumed. When the SRT was 1.2 d, the Coulombic Efficiency
262 increased twelve times from 3.4% when operated at SRT of 7.0 d to 42.2%, showing that
263 the reduction of SRT favored the electrogenic microorganisms. These values of the
264 Coulombic Efficiency can be considered as high, in particular if it is taken into account
265 that maximum expected efficiency (for a pure culture of bioelectrogenic microorganisms)
266 cannot exceed 40%, because this is the typical ratio of catabolic consumption of COD
267 (the remaining 60% is used in biological assimilation reactions). At this point, it is
268 interesting to observe that the reported Coulombic Efficiencies were higher than in other
269 studies carried out by (*Cusick et al., 2010; Pepe Sciarria et al., 2015*) who used a single
270 chamber air-cathode MFC (18 % and 15 %, respectively) for which ohmic losses are lower.

271

272 **Conclusions**

273 This paper demonstrates the relevant role of sludge retention time (SRT) on
274 electrical power generation and winery wastewater treatment in a dual-chamber MFC.
275 Power generation increases by decreasing the SRT, selecting electrogenic
276 microorganisms, once the SOLR increased and the competition for substrate was reduced.
277 However the SRT did not influence on organic matter removal, because only a small part
278 of COD was removed and it was very similar at all SRT studied.

279

280 **Acknowledgments**

281

282 The authors are grateful to FAPESP (Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado
283 de São Paulo) for supporting this research (Process 2014/07904-5, 2011/23026-0 and
284 2009/15984-0) and to Spanish government through contract CTQ2013-49748-EXP.

285

286 **References**

- 287 Akman, D., Cirik, K., Ozdemir, S., Ozkaya, B., Cinar, O. 2013. Bioelectricity generation
288 in continuously-fed microbial fuel cell: Effects of anode electrode material and
289 hydraulic retention time. *Bioresource Technology*, **149**, 459-464.
- 290 Cusick, R.D., Kiely, P.D., Logan, B.E. 2010. A monetary comparison of energy recovered
291 from microbial fuel cells and microbial electrolysis cells fed winery or domestic
292 wastewaters. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, **35**(17), 8855-8861.
- 293 Gonzalez del Campo, A., Lobato, J., Canizares, P., Rodrigo, M.A., Fernandez Morales,
294 F.J. 2013. Short-term effects of temperature and COD in a microbial fuel cell.
295 *Applied Energy*, **101**, 213-217.
- 296 Guimaraes, A.Q., Linares, J.J. 2014. Glycerol Utilization in Microbial Fuel Cells:
297 Conditioning, Stage and Influence of the Glycerol Concentration. *Journal of the*
298 *Electrochemical Society*, **161**(1), F125-F132.
- 299 Kim, H., Kim, B., Kim, J., Yu, J. 2015a. Effect of organic loading rates and influent
300 sources on energy production in multi-baffled single chamber microbial fuel cell.
301 *Desalination and Water Treatment*, **56**(5), 1217-1222.
- 302 Kim, K.-Y., Yang, W., Logan, B.E. 2015b. Impact of electrode configurations on
303 retention time and domestic wastewater treatment efficiency using microbial fuel
304 cells. *Water Research*, **80**, 41-46.

- 305 Larrosa, A., Lozano, L.J., Katuri, K.P., Head, I., Scott, K., Godinez, C. 2009. On the
306 repeatability and reproducibility of experimental two-chambered microbial fuel
307 cells. *Fuel*, **88**(10), 1852-1857.
- 308 Li, X., Zhu, N., Wang, Y., Li, P., Wu, P., Wu, J. 2013. Animal carcass wastewater
309 treatment and bioelectricity generation in up-flow tubular microbial fuel cells:
310 Effects of HRT and non-precious metallic catalyst. *Bioresource Technology*, **128**,
311 454-460.
- 312 Logan, B.E., Hamelers, B., Rozendal, R.A., Schrorder, U., Keller, J., Freguia, S.,
313 Aelterman, P., Verstraete, W., Rabaey, K. 2006. Microbial fuel cells:
314 Methodology and technology. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **40**(17),
315 5181-5192.
- 316 Min, B., Logan, B.E. 2004. Continuous electricity generation from domestic wastewater
317 and organic substrates in a flat plate microbial fuel cell. *Environmental Science &*
318 *Technology*, **38**(21), 5809-5814.
- 319 Patil, P.N., Gogate, P.R. 2012. Degradation of methyl parathion using hydrodynamic
320 cavitation: Effect of operating parameters and intensification using additives.
321 *Separation and Purification Technology*, **95**, 172-179.
- 322 Pepe Sciarria, T., Merlino, G., Scaglia, B., D'Epifanio, A., Mecheri, B., Borin, S.,
323 Licoccia, S., Adani, F. 2015. Electricity generation using white and red wine lees
324 in air cathode microbial fuel cells. *Journal of Power Sources*, **274**, 393-399.
- 325 Puig, S., Serra, M., Coma, M., Balaguer, M.D., Colprim, J. 2011. Simultaneous domestic
326 wastewater treatment and renewable energy production using microbial fuel cells
327 (MFCs). *Water Science and Technology*, **64**(4), 904-909.
- 328 Rabaey, K., Verstraete, W. 2005. Microbial fuel cells: novel biotechnology for energy
329 generation. *Trends in Biotechnology*, **23**(6), 291-298.
- 330 Rahimnejad, M., Ghoreyshi, A.A., Najafpour, G., Jafary, T. 2011. Power generation from
331 organic substrate in batch and continuous flow microbial fuel cell operations.
332 *Applied Energy*, **88**(11), 3999-4004.
- 333 Rodrigo, M.A., Canizares, P., Garcia, H., Linares, J.J., Lobato, J. 2009. Study of the
334 acclimation stage and of the effect of the biodegradability on the performance of
335 a microbial fuel cell. *Bioresource Technology*, **100**(20), 4704-4710.
- 336 Rodrigo, M.A., Canizares, P., Lobato, J., Paz, R., Saez, C., Linares, J.J. 2007. Production
337 of electricity from the treatment of urban waste water using a microbial fuel cell.
338 *Journal of Power Sources*, **169**(1), 198-204.
- 339 Rodrigo, M.A., Seco, A., PenyaRoja, J.M., Ferrer, J. 1996. Influence of sludge age on
340 enhanced phosphorus removal in biological systems. *Water Science and*
341 *Technology*, **34**(1-2), 41-48.
- 342 Wang, Y.-P., Zhang, H.-L., Li, W.-W., Liu, X.-W., Sheng, G.-P., Yu, H.-Q. 2014.
343 Improving electricity generation and substrate removal of a MFC-SBR system
344 through optimization of COD loading distribution. *Biochemical Engineering*
345 *Journal*, **85**, 15-20.
- 346 Wei, L., Yuan, Z., Cui, M., Han, H., Shen, J. 2012. Study on electricity-generation
347 characteristic of two-chambered microbial fuel cell in continuous flow mode.
348 *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, **37**(1), 1067-1073.
- 349 You, S.J., Zhao, Q.L., Jiang, J.Q., Zhang, J.N. 2006. Treatment of domestic wastewater
350 with simultaneous electricity generation in microbial fuel cell under continuous
351 operation. *Chemical and Biochemical Engineering Quarterly*, **20**(4), 407-412.

353

354 Figure captions

355 **Figure 1.** Experimental setup

356 **Figure 2:** Average values of COD (A), total nitrogen (TN, B) and total phosphorus (TP,
357 C) before (□) and after (■) feeding cycle and consuming rate in different sludge retention
358 time (△).

359 **Figure 3:** COD temporal profile before (×) and after the feeding cycle in MFC1 (A) and
360 MFC2 (B) in all conditions studied: in MFC1 with SRT 1.4 d (●), with SRT 2.3 d (△)
361 and with SRT 7.0 d (○) and in MFC2 with SRT 1.2 d (□), with SRT 1.8 d (▲) and with
362 SRT 3.5 d (■).

363 **Figure 4:** Relationship between: the VSS (■) and SOLR (○) in different SRT studied.

364 **Figure 5:** Voltage produced during the lifetest of the MFC fed with winery wastewater
365 in different SRTs: 1.2 (□), 1.4(●), 1.8(×), 2.3 (-), 3.5(■), 7 (○) d and the tendency (—)
366 in each case studied (A). Daily voltage profile in different days and conditions: with SRT
367 1.2 d in 83rd (□), with SRT 1.4 d in 86th (●), with SRT 1.8 d in 63rd (×), with SRT 2.3 d
368 in 68th (-), with SRT 3.5 d in 30th 3.5(■) and with SRT 7.0 d in 31st (○) day of operation.

369 **Figure 6:** Polarization curves (A and B) obtained in the MFC fed with winery wastewater
370 in different SRT: 1.2 (●), 1.4 (*), 1.8 (×), 2.33 (▲), 3.5 (■) and 7 (◆) d.

371 **Figure 7:** Relationship between the average cell voltage (□, tendency — —) and power
372 densities (■ and tendency ———) in different SRT studied.

373 **Figure 8:** Coloumbic Efficiencies during the life test of the MFC fed with winery
374 wastewater in different SRTs: 1.2 (□), 1.4(●), 1.8(×), 2.3 (-), 3.5(■), 7.0 (○) d and the
375 tendency (—) in each case studied.

376

378

Table 1: Characteristics of winery wastewater used.

Parameter	Value
pH	4.11
Conductivity (mS cm ⁻²)	2030
COD (mg L ⁻¹)	6850
TOC (mg L ⁻¹)	1030
Total Nitrogen (mg L ⁻¹)	18.3
Total Phosphorous (mg L ⁻¹)	0.95

379

380

Table 2: Average conductivities after feeding cycle for all SRT studied.

SRT (d ⁻¹)	1.2	1.4	1.8	2.3	3.5	7.0
Conductivity (mS cm ⁻¹)	10.2	9.9	8.1	7.5	6.0	5.7

381

382

383