



Studies into design and operation of microbial fuel cells using oxygen gas diffusion electrodes

A.-L. Schneider^a, H. Schell^a, S. Hild^b, K.-M. Mangold^b, A. Tiehm^{a,*}

^aDepartment of Environmental Biotechnology, DVGW-Technologiezentrum Wasser, Karlsruher Straße 84, 76139 Karlsruhe, Germany, Tel. +49 721 9678 137; emails: andreas.tiehm@tzw.de (A. Tiehm), anna-lena.schneider@tzw.de (A.-L. Schneider), heico.schell@tzw.de (H. Schell)

^bDECHEMA-Forschungsinstitut, Theodor-Heuss-Allee 25, 60486 Frankfurt am Main, Germany, Tel. +49 69 7564 327; emails: hild@dechema.de (S. Hild), mangold@dechema.de (K.-M. Mangold)

Received 29 November 2016; Accepted 3 February 2017

ABSTRACT

The use of microbial fuel cells (MFCs) represents a new concept to generate energy by anaerobic biological wastewater treatment. Using oxygen gas diffusion electrodes (GDEs) can facilitate the cell design since proton exchange membranes and a cathode chamber are not required. In this laboratory scale study, different GDEs were investigated. GDE type 1 with silver as electrocatalyst and type 2 with carbon nanotubes as electrocatalyst showed the best performance under the chosen conditions. Power density was affected by the electrode material and the availability of organic compounds (acetate, raw wastewater). MFC operation resulted in *Geobacteraceae* spp. enrichment at the anode. In a long-term operation with GDE type 1 over 10 weeks, biofilm formation also was observed at the GDE cathode, without negative impact on MFC performance. Our results emphasise the consideration of GDEs in up-scaling approaches.

Keywords: Microbial fuel cells; Electricity generation; Oxygen gas diffusion electrode; Cathode

1. Introduction

Conventional wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) have a high energy demand [1]. Especially small plants often do not operate a denitrification or an anaerobic digester. In particular for this scenario, the use of microbial fuel cells (MFCs) might represent a promising approach to generate electricity directly from wastewater [2]. Electrochemical processes in combination with biodegradation have already been reported for different applications, e.g., a combined bio-electroprocess in which water electrolysis stimulates microbial chloroethene degradation [3,4]. In MFCs, bacteria produce electricity from the oxidation of organic matter. One of the advantages of MFCs is the direct conversion of substrate

energy into electricity; further, compared with sludge digestion, gas treatment is not necessary because the exhaust gases are enriched with carbon dioxide. Furthermore, MFCs would generate lower amounts of sludge, thus reducing sludge dehydration costs [5,6].

MFCs are typically designed as two-chamber systems with a proton exchange membrane to separate the bacteria-containing anode chamber from the cathode chamber (Fig. 1(a)). In the anode compartment, an active biocatalyst oxidises the organic substrates and produces electrons and protons [7]. Through the proton exchange membrane, the protons are conducted to the cathode chamber and the electrons are conveyed through the external circuit [8]. In the cathode chamber, protons, electrons and oxygen react to

* Corresponding author.

water [9]. Two-chamber systems have the disadvantage that they use membranes. However, membranes can be a limiting factor, especially if fouling occurs due to suspended solid and soluble contaminants. Therefore, membranes are an essential cost factor for the construction of an MFC [10].

To overcome high internal resistance from membranes, new designs of one-chamber systems with gas diffusion electrodes (GDEs) have been developed and are described in several studies [11,12] (Fig. 1(b)). GDEs are mounted to face one side of the electrode towards the electrolyte and the other side towards the gas phase. Usually, GDEs are used in non-biological alkaline and proton exchange membrane fuel cells [13]. Up to now, GDEs have predominantly been applied in processes such as fuel cell and chloralkali electrolysis [14]. GDEs have advantages especially if a component from the gas phase is involved in the electrochemical reaction or when a desired gaseous component is developed at the electrode. GDEs are porous electrodes; the electrolyte can float from one side and the desired gas can diffuse into the electrode from the other side [13]. The structure of the GDE represents a large three-phase boundary surface between solid catalysts, electrolyte and gas phase [13]. A solid catalyst at this interface supports the electrochemical reaction between gaseous and liquid phase [13]. Important parameters for GDE performance are porosity, hydrophobicity of the electrode material and used catalyst.

As molecular oxygen shows very low solubility in electrolytes, the resulting low oxygen availability can be a limiting factor for the cathodic reaction in MFCs. By using a GDE in MFCs, the mass transfer of oxygen is optimised, because GDEs can use oxygen directly from the air, thereby reducing energy consumption for aeration of the electrolyte. Another advantage of these electrodes is that an extra cathode chamber is not required.

In this study, we investigated electricity generation using different GDEs in a single-chamber MFC without a membrane. Apart from GDEs with carbon as electrocatalyst, we also tested a GDE with precious metal as electrocatalyst. Operation of GDEs was studied with synthetic media and wastewater samples from a municipal treatment plant. Additionally, we conducted a long-term operation with the best-performing GDE over several weeks.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Chemicals and field samples

Sodium acetate was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich Co., St. Louis, USA (analytical grade $\geq 99\%$). The mineral medium contained the following mineral salts (analytical grade, Merck, Darmstadt, Germany) per litre of demineralised water: 3.17 g KH_2PO_4 , 5.68 g Na_2HPO_4 , 0.12 g $\text{MgHPO}_4 \times 3\text{H}_2\text{O}$, 0.45 g $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{HPO}_4$, 5 mL of trace element solution 1 (400 mg $\text{FeSO}_4 \times 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$, 40 mg $\text{MnSO}_4 \times 5\text{H}_2\text{O}$, 8 mg CoCl_2 , 40 mg $\text{ZnSO}_4 \times 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$, 40 mg $\text{CuSO}_4 \times 5\text{H}_2\text{O}$, 1.06 mg CaCl_2 , 6 mg H_3BO_3 , 8 mg $\text{Na}_2\text{MoO}_4 \times 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$ and 2 mL of concentrated H_3PO_4 per litre) and 0.1 mL of trace element solution 2 (50 mg $\text{Na}_2\text{WO}_4 \times 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$, 50 mg $\text{Na}_2\text{SeO}_3 \times 5\text{H}_2\text{O}$ and 250 mg of NiCl_2 per litre). The medium was adjusted to $\text{pH } 7.2 \pm 0.2$, autoclaved at 121°C for 20 min and inoculated with activated sludge from a municipal WWTP.

For wastewater experiments, we used sludge liquor from the primary sludge of a WWTP.

2.2. Experimental setup

The experiments were conducted in batch cells made of glass under anaerobic conditions (Fig. 2). As anode material,




Fig. 1. Scheme of a two-chamber MFC system separated by a membrane (a) compared with a one-chamber MFC system equipped with a gas diffusion electrode (GDE) (b).

we used carbon felt (SIGRACELL® KFD2.5EA, SGL Group, Germany). The geometric area of the anode was 19 cm². Different GDEs with different catalyst materials based on precious metal or carbon were obtained from Covestro AG (Leverkusen, Germany) and tested as cathode material. The geometric area of GDE cathodes was 7 cm² and the distance between the anode and cathode was 6 cm. The electrodes were connected with platinum wire through a resistance decade (10 Ω–1 kΩ) and two multimeters. For tests with synthetic media, the electrolyte consisted of 1 L mineral medium containing 2 g/L sodium acetate inoculated with activated sludge from a WWTP (300 mL). Six different GDEs were used as cathodes and placed with direct contact to the anode chamber. GDE type 1 contained silver, GDE type 2 carbon nanotubes, GDE type 3 graphite, GDE type 4 carbon black, GDE type 5 carbon fibre and GDE type 6 glassy carbon as electrocatalyst. All experiments were conducted at room temperature (20°C) and atmospheric pressure. The initial concentration of dissolved organic carbon (DOC) and total organic carbon (TOC) were analysed using an Elementar vario TOC cube (LOQ: 0.2 mg/L).

2.3. Calculations

Voltage (V) across the external resistor (R) and current (I) in the circuit of the MFC were recorded at 1 h intervals using a multimeter (34411A, KEYSIGHT, Agilent Technologies) connected to a personal computer. Power density (P) was calculated according to the formula: $P = I \times V$, and normalised by cathode projected area ($A = 7 \text{ cm}^2$).




Fig. 2. Experimental setup of the single-chamber MFC system used in this study and list of the tested GDE materials.

Table 1
Target genes, primer sequences and amplicon sizes for quantitative real-time PCR analysis

Target	Primer sequence (5'–3')	Amplicon size (bp)	Reference	Annealing temperature (°C)	Elongation time (s)
16S rRNA gene of bacteria	F-CCT ACG GGA GGC AGC AG R-ATT ACC GCG GCT GCT GGC	160	[15]	58	20
16S rRNA gene of <i>Geobacteraceae</i> spp.	F-AGG AAG CAC CGG CTA ACT CC R-GGC ACT GCA GGG GTC AAT A	330	[16] (forward), [17]	50	20
16S rRNA gene of <i>Shewanella</i>	F-CGC GAT TGG ATG AAC CTA G R-GGC TTT GCA ACC CTC TGT A	1,084	[18]	55	50

2.4. DNA extraction and PCR analysis

For polymerase chain reaction (PCR) analysis, 30 mL of process liquid were filtered through a 0.2 μm Supor-200 membrane filter (47 mm diameter) (Pall Life Science, New York, USA) at the beginning and the end of the experiment. Additionally, the anode material of the carbon felt was cut into small pieces (~0.3 g) and the wet weight was determined (dry mass ~12%) at the end of the experiment. The membranes and pieces of carbon felt were stored at –20°C until DNA extraction and analysis. Total DNA was extracted directly from the membranes and the carbon felt by using the FastDNA® Spin Kit for soil (MP Biomedicals, Illkirch-Graffenstaden, France) according to the manufacturer's instructions.

Geobacteraceae spp. and *Shewanella* specific DNA sequences as well as bacterial 16S rDNA were enumerated using quantitative real-time PCR (qPCR). We performed qPCR using RotorGene (Corbett, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Massachusetts, USA) and 9 μL reaction mixture [1× SYBR SensiMix™ (Bioline, London, UK), 0.5 μM of each primer and 1 μL of template] with a temperature program of 10 min at 95°C (initial denaturing and Hot Start Taq activation), followed by 40 cycles of 25 s, 95°C/30 s at the annealing temperature/20–50 s, 72°C (optical window on), followed by a final dissociation stage. Primers and annealing temperatures are listed in Table 1. All samples and standards were analysed in duplicate. Calibration was performed with serial dilutions of a known quantity of linearised plasmids containing according gene fragments. Amplification products were verified via QIAxcel Advanced system.

3. Results and discussion

We tested GDEs with different catalysts as cathode material in synthetic media and without separate proton exchange membranes. After an adaption time of 5 d, the measured cell voltage increased and settled to a constant value for all tested GDEs (Fig. 3). All investigated electrodes were able to generate electricity. Cell voltage was depending on the cathode material; GDE type 1 with silver as electrocatalyst and type 2 with carbon nanotubes as electrocatalyst showed the best performance under the chosen conditions.

In previous studies, using an air-cathode single chamber MFC with acetate or glucose, output voltages in the same order of magnitude were observed [12,19–23]. In most studies, platinum (Pt) was the most used and efficient cathodic catalyst for oxygen reduction [24]. The results of our study show that power generation in air-cathode MFC systems

is also possible with different cathodic catalysts based on carbon or silver. Silver is much cheaper than platinum metal catalysts. Therefore, it is used in the large scale electrochemical production of chlorine. Meanwhile automatic production facilities for silver-based GDEs are established. The new facilities and a growing demand will lead to a price reduction. Cost will also be reduced by silver recycling in an industrial scale by the manufacturer of the GDEs. Of course, carbon-based catalysts are still cheaper. However, carbon catalysts in contrast to silver catalyst might produce hydrogen peroxide as an unwanted by-product.

Additionally, PCR analyses were conducted for all experiments with different GDEs. DNA sequences for bacteria species which are able to transfer electrons to electrodes [25] were enumerated as well as the bacterial 16S rDNA. To compare the microbial communities, we determined the ratios of specific DNA sequences of *Geobacteraceae* spp. and *Shewanella* to the total bacterial 16S rDNA (Fig. 4). *Geobacteraceae* spp. accumulated at the anode surface over the test duration, regardless of the GDE material (Fig. 4(a)). The increasing proportion of *Geobacteraceae* spp. correlated with greater cell voltage, indicating that *Geobacteraceae* spp. influence electricity generation. However, DNA sequences of *Shewanella* were $\leq 1\%$ compared with the bacterial 16S rDNA at the anode surface over the test duration (Fig. 4(b)), indicating that this bacteria group grows poorly under the chosen conditions. Similarly, Chae et al. [26]

and Jung and Regan [27] reported the dominance of various *Geobacter*-like species, but no detection of *Shewanella* sp. in their MFCs fed with acetate, glucose and lactate as substrates.

Because of the highest voltage output with GDE type 1, corresponding to Fig. 3, we performed polarisation and power density curves as well as a long-term test. By changing the circuit resistance from 10 Ω to 10 k Ω , the polarisation curve of the MFC and a maximum power density of 353 mW/m² at 2,245 mA/m² (100 Ω), normalised to the cathode area, were obtained (Fig. 5).

In this study, power generation was lower than in previous studies with novel cathode structures (501 mW/m² [11] and 766 mW/m² [28]). It is difficult to compare power output directly with other MFC performances in the literature due to different microorganisms involved. The main goal of this study was to investigate the effects of different cathodic catalysts (six different materials) on power generation and microbial communities in an air-cathode MFC system. For optimisation of MFC configuration, future studies should consider additional factors such as the distance between the electrodes [29], anode/cathode chamber configurations, MFC volume, pre-colonised anodes [30], substrate types and solution conductivity [9,31].

In the long-term test, we observed constant power density over 10 weeks (Fig. 6). To avoid substrate limitations, a regular dose of sodium acetate (1 g/L) was added three times




Fig. 3. Cell voltage of six different gas diffusion electrodes (GDEs) with acetate (1,000 Ω resistance) inoculated with activated sludge (30%).




Fig. 5. Polarisation and power density curves of MFC with GDE type 1 after 27 d.





Fig. 4. Ratio of *Geobacteraceae* spp. and 16S gene copies (a) and ratio of *Shewanella* and 16S gene copies (b) in process liquid at the beginning (start) and end (end) of the experiment as well as at the anode material at the end of the experiment. The microbial fuel cell (MFC) was operated with six different gas diffusion electrodes (GDEs); asterisk indicates longer test duration (1.5-fold) compared with the other experiments.

(arrows). Power density rapidly decreased after ceasing the feeding with sodium acetate. This experiment demonstrated that feeding has an important influence on the MFC output. The results are in accordance with previous studies [23,26]. Most of the studies with air-cathode MFC systems were conducted in short operational periods (e.g., several hours or days). In this study, we monitored the performance of an air-cathode MFC system with GDE type 1 over several weeks. The increased biofilm at the inner cathode surface had no influence on MFC performance. The tested GDE material seemed very stable during MFC operation without a separation membrane. For practical application, e.g., in WWTPs, using low-maintenance material represents an economic advantage.

Additionally, an experiment with sludge liquor from primary sludge was conducted. Fig. 7 demonstrates the power densities referred to the projected cathode area for the synthetic medium with sodium acetate and with sludge liquor (initial concentration of TOC: 6.6 g/L and DOC: 1.2 g/L). Compared with the use of synthetic medium (initial concentration of TOC: 1.1 g/L and DOC: 0.6 g/L), the elapsed

time before power density increases was longer with sludge liquor. The generated power was ~50% lower than that with sodium acetate. This difference was probably caused by lower amounts of easily biodegradable organic substrates in the sludge liquor. The results revealed a direct correlation between power and substrate concentration and are in agreement with data from previous studies using raw wastewater and wastewater with added sodium acetate for MFC operations [24]. However, operation of an MFC with a complex substrate medium (sludge liquor) and GDE type 1 was possible.

Additionally, PCR analyses of the wastewater matrices were conducted to compare microbial communities. Fig. 8 demonstrates the ratio of specific DNA sequences of *Geobacteraceae* spp. and *Shewanella* to the bacterial 16S rDNA as described above. *Geobacteraceae* spp. accumulated at the anode surface over the duration of the test with sludge liquor, similar to experiments with synthetic media with acetate. *Shewanella* constituted <1% compared with 16S rDNA.




Fig. 6. Power density in mW/m^2 refers to cathode area for GDE type 1 ($1,000 \Omega$ resistor); arrows indicate feeding with sodium acetate.




Fig. 7. Power densities in mW/m^2 referred to the cathode area for MFC operation with the synthetic acetate medium in comparison with the sludge liquor as real-water matrices.





Fig. 8. Ratio of *Geobacteraceae* spp. and 16S gene copies (a) and ratio of *Shewanella* and 16S gene copies (b) in process liquid at the beginning (start) and end (end) of the experiment as well as at the anode material at the end of the experiment. MFC was operated with sludge liquor and GDE type 1.

4. Conclusion

In this study, we compared six GDEs with different cathodic catalysts in an air-cathode MFC system. Our results demonstrate that electricity generation with all examined GDEs is possible. GDE type 1, with silver as electrocatalyst, showed the best performance in comparison of GDEs with carbon-based catalysts. During the test duration, a typical bacteria group for electron transfer, *Geobacteraceae* spp., accumulated at the anode, and gene copy numbers correlated to power generation of the different GDE materials. Bacteria belonging to the *Shewanella* group were also detected, but constituted <1% compared with the bacterial 16S rDNA. The availability of organic compounds affected electricity generation. In a long-term test over several weeks, biofilm formation was observed at the GDE with a cathodic catalyst of silver, without negative impact on MFC performance.

Based on these promising results, further studies are encouraged. In particular, tests in continuously operated flow cells and with optimised parameters, e.g., electrode distance, should be considered in future studies.

Acknowledgements

Financial support of the German Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF, grant no 02WER1315B) is gratefully acknowledged. We thank the Covestro AG (Leverkusen, Germany) for providing GDE material. The authors thank Carmen Kraffert and Claudia Stange for PCR analysis.

References

- [1] S.T. Oh, J.R. Kim, G.C. Premier, T.H. Lee, C. Kim, W.T. Sloan, Sustainable wastewater treatment: how might microbial fuel cells contribute, *Biotechnol. Adv.*, 28 (2010) 871–881.
- [2] P. Aeltermann, K. Rabaey, P. Clauwaert, W. Verstraete, Microbial fuel cells for wastewater treatment, *Water Sci. Technol.*, 54 (2006) 9–15.
- [3] S. Lohner, A. Tiehm, Application of electrolysis to stimulate microbial reductive PCE dechlorination and oxidative VC biodegradation, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 43 (2009) 7098–7104.
- [4] S. Lohner, D. Becker, K.-M. Mangold, A. Tiehm, Sequential reductive and oxidative biodegradation of chloroethenes stimulated in a coupled bioelectro-process, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 45 (2011) 6491–6497.
- [5] K. Rabaey, W. Verstraete, Microbial fuel cells: novel biotechnology for energy generation, *Trends Biotechnol.*, 23 (2005) 291–298.
- [6] F.J. Hernández-Fernández, A. Pérez de los Ríos, M.J. Salar-García, V.M. Ortiz-Martínez, L.J. Lozano-Blanco, C. Godínez, F. Tomás-Alonso, J. Quesada-Medina, Recent progress and perspectives in microbial fuel cells for bioenergy generation and wastewater treatment, *Fuel Process. Technol.*, 138 (2015) 284–297.
- [7] G. Antonopoulou, K. Stamatelatu, S. Bebelis, G. Lyberatos, Electricity generation from synthetic substrates and cheese whey using a two chamber microbial fuel cell, *Biochem. Eng. J.*, 50 (2010) 10–15.
- [8] M. Rahimnejad, G. Najafpour, A.A. Ghoreyshi, Effect of Mass Transfer on Performance of Microbial Fuel Cell, *Mass Transfer in Chemical Engineering Processes*, Iran, Vol. 5, InTech, 2011, pp. 233–250.
- [9] Y. Sharma, B. Li, The variation of power generation with organic substrates in single-chamber microbial fuel cells (SCMFCs), *Bioresour. Technol.*, 101 (2010) 1844–1850.
- [10] Z. Hu, Electricity generation by a baffle-chamber membraneless microbial fuel cell, *J. Power Sources*, 179 (2008) 27–33.
- [11] C. Santoro, A. Agrios, U. Pasogullari, B. Li, Effects of gas diffusion layer (GDL) and micro porous layer (MPL) on cathode performance in microbial fuel cells (MFCs), *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, 36 (2011) 13096–13104.
- [12] S.-J. You, X.-H. Wang, J.-N. Zhang, J.-Y. Wang, N.-Q. Ren, X.-B. Gong, Fabrication of stainless steel mesh gas diffusion electrode for power generation in microbial fuel cell, *Biosens. Bioelectron.*, 26 (2011) 2142–2146.
- [13] A.E.W. Horst, K.-M. Mangold, D. Holtmann, Application of gas diffusion electrodes in bioelectrochemical syntheses and energy conversion, *Biotechnol. Bioeng.*, 113 (2016) 260–267.
- [14] A. Bulan, J. Kintrup, R. Weber, Gas Diffusion Electrode and Process for Production Thereof, US 20110311903 A1, Bayer Material Science AG, USA, 2011.
- [15] T.H.M. Smits, C. Devenoges, K. Szynalski, J. Maillard, C. Holliger, Development of a real-time PCR method for quantification of the three genera *Dehalobacter*, *Dehalococcoides*, and *Desulfitobacterium* in microbial communities, *J. Microbiol. Methods*, 57 (2004) 369–378.
- [16] D.E. Holmes, K.T. Finneran, R.A. O'Neil, D.R. Lovley, Enrichment of members of the family *Geobacteraceae* associated with stimulation of dissimilatory metal reduction in uranium-contaminated aquifer sediments, *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, 68 (2002) 2300–2306.
- [17] D.E. Cummings, O.L. Snoeyenbos-West, D.T. Newby, A.M. Niggemyer, D.R. Lovley, L.A. Achenbach, R.F. Rosenzweig, R.F., Diversity of *Geobacteraceae* species inhabiting metal-polluted freshwater lake sediments ascertained by 16S rDNA analyses, *Microb. Ecol.*, 46 (2003) 257–269.
- [18] S.G. Todorova, A.M. Costello, Design of *Shewanella*-specific 16S rRNA primers and application to analysis of *Shewanella* in a minerotrophic wetland, *Environ. Microbiol.*, 8 (2006) 426–432.
- [19] H. Liu, B.E. Logan, Electricity generation using an air-cathode single chamber microbial fuel cell in the presence and absence of a proton exchange membrane, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 38 (2004) 4040–4046.
- [20] H. Liu, S. Cheng, B.E. Logan, Production of electricity from acetate or butyrate using a single-chamber microbial fuel cell, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 39 (2005) 658–662.
- [21] B.E. Logan, S. Cheng, V. Watson, G. Estadt, Graphite fiber brush anodes for increased power production in air-cathode microbial fuel cells, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 41 (2007) 3341–3346.
- [22] A.P. Borole, C.Y. Hamilton, T. Vishnivetskaya, D. Leak, C. Andras, Improving power production in acetate-fed microbial fuel cells via enrichment of exoelectrogenic organisms in flow-through systems, *Biochem. Eng. J.*, 48 (2009) 71–80.
- [23] H. Wang, S.C. Jiang, Y. Wang, B. Xiao, Substrate removal and electricity generation in a membrane-less microbial fuel cell for biological treatment of wastewater, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 138 (2013) 109–116.
- [24] C. Santoro, B. Li, P. Christiani, G. Squadrito, Power generation of microbial fuel cells (MFCs) with low cathodic platinum loading, *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, 38 (2013) 692–700.
- [25] G. Reguera, K.D. McCarthy, T. Mehta, J.S. Nicoll, M.T. Tuominen, D.R. Lovley, Extracellular electron transfer via microbial nanowires, *Nature*, 435 (2005) 1098–1101.
- [26] K.-J. Chae, M.-J. Choi, J.-W. Lee, K.-Y. Kim, I.S. Kim, Effect of different substrates on the performance, bacterial diversity and bacterial viability in microbial fuel cells, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 100 (2009) 3518–3525.
- [27] S. Jung, J.M. Regan, Comparison of anode bacterial communities and performance in microbial fuel cells with different electron donors, *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.*, 77 (2007) 393–402.
- [28] S. Cheng, H. Liu, B.E. Logan, Increased performance of single-chamber microbial fuel cells an improved cathode structures, *Electrochem. Commun.*, 8 (2006) 489–494.
- [29] S. Cheng, H. Liu, B.E. Logan, Increased power generation in a continuous flow MFC with advective flow through the porous anode and reduced electrode spacing, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 40 (2006) 2426–2432.
- [30] C. Santoro, Y. Lei, B. Li, P. Cristiani, Power generation from wastewater using single chamber microbial fuel cells (MFCs) with platinum-free cathodes and pre-colonized anodes, *Biochem. Eng. J.*, 62 (2012) 8–16.
- [31] H. Liu, S. Cheng, B.E. Logan, Power Generation in fed-batch microbial fuel cells as a function of ionic strength, temperature, and reactor configuration, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 39 (2005) 5488–5493.