

Co-digestion of multiple substrates

Mixing two or more different types of substrates together may improve nutrient balance and lead to a more stable AD process. This is favourable for maximising the gas production and resource utilisation and represents an integral part in the optimisation of a biogas plant. However, not all

substrate mixtures have positive effect on the process. The AMPTS II is an excellent batch fermentation test platform for fast evaluation of co-digestion strategy with minimal labour demand.

Example 1


Screening of single or multiple substrate combinations

AMPTS II may be used to simultaneously screen combinations of co-substrates to find the substrate mixture that leads to the highest gas production and fastest degradation (Cabbai et al., 2013; Sahito et al., 2013; Kuusik et al., 2013). For example, anaerobic co-digestion of sewage sludge with food waste or co-digestion of animal manure with energy crops may be one of the most viable solutions to optimise the digesters stability & efficiency in wastewater treatment or biogas plants.


Example 2

Optimisation of substrate mix for co-digestion

Besides the selection of co-substrates it is important to determine how the co-substrates should be mixed to maximise the gas production and resource utilisation. AMPTS II is an excellent tool in this regard as it allows for parallel evaluation of different co-substrate ratios and concentrations (Koch et al., 2015; Wall et al., 2013; Nartker et al., 2014).



Specific methane production of sewage sludge (SwS), OFMSW and two co-digestion mixtures (CO-DIG 1, CO-DIG 2) (Cabbai et al., 2013).



Ultimate methane yields vs. volatile solids (VS) content of food waste in sewage sludge mixture (Koch et al., 2015).

Example 3

Investigation of microbial communities change in co-digestion

In order to improve the overall co-digestion process AMPTS II could also be used for optimising the microbial community structure. An example is the evaluation of the hydrolysis/acidification reaction in a two-phase system that can separate the two groups of microbial communities (Rajagopal et al. 2014).

Another example is the investigation of how the methane potential and methanogenic communities change in a co-digestion process at different temperatures (i.e. mesophilic (37 °C) and thermophilic (55 °C) conditions) (Walter et al., 2015).

References

- Cabbai, V., Ballico, M., Aneggi, E., Goi, D., 2013. BMP tests of source selected OFMSW to evaluate anaerobic codigestion with sewage sludge. *Waste Manag.* 33, 1626-1632.
- Kuusik, A., Kuusik, A., Loigu, E.N.N., Sökk, O., 2013. Predicting preferable substrate blends for the production of biogas 192-197.
- Koch, K., Helmreich, B., Drewes, J.E., 2015. Co-digestion of food waste in municipal wastewater treatment plants: Effect of different mixtures on methane yield and hydrolysis rate constant. *Appl. Energy* 137, 250–255.
- Nartker, S., Ammerman, M., Aurandt, J., Stogsdil, M., Hayden, O., Antle, C., 2014. Increasing biogas production from sewage sludge anaerobic co-digestion process by adding crude glycerol from biodiesel industry. *Waste Manag.* 34, 2567–2571.
- Rajagopal, R., Ahamed, A., Wang, J.Y., 2014. Hydrolytic and acidogenic fermentation potential of food waste with source segregated feces-without-urine as co-substrate. *Bioresour. Technol.* 167, 564–568.
- Sahito, A.R., Mahar, R.B.U.X., Brohi, K.M., 2013. Anaerobic biodegradability and methane potential of crop residue co-digested with Buffalo Dung. *Mehran University Research Journal of Engineering and Technology.* 32, 509–518.
- Wall, D.M., O’Kiely, P., Murphy, J.D., 2013. The potential for biomethane from grass and slurry to satisfy renewable energy targets. *Bioresour. Technol.* 149, 425–431.
- Walter, A., Franke-Whittle, I.H., Wagner, A.O., Insam, H., 2015. Methane yields and methanogenic community changes during co-fermentation of cattle slurry with empty fruit bunches of oil palm. *Bioresour. Technol.* 175, 619–623.