

Microalgae biomass concentration and reuse of water as new cultivation medium using ceramic membrane filtration

*Original*

Microalgae biomass concentration and reuse of water as new cultivation medium using ceramic membrane filtration / Ricceri, Francesco; Malaguti, Marco; Derossi, Clara; Zanetti, Mariachiara; Riggio, Vincenzo; Tiraferri, Alberto. - In: CHEMOSPHERE. - ISSN 0045-6535. - 307:(2022), p. 135724. [10.1016/j.chemosphere.2022.135724]

*Availability:*

This version is available at: 11583/2970386 since: 2022-07-31T04:45:21Z

*Publisher:*

Elsevier

*Published*

DOI:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2022.135724

*Terms of use:*

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

*Publisher copyright*

Elsevier preprint/submitted version

Preprint (submitted version) of an article published in CHEMOSPHERE © 2022,  
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2022.135724>

(Article begins on next page)

1 **Microalgae Biomass Concentration and Reuse of Water as**  
2 **New Cultivation Medium using Ceramic Membrane**  
3 **Filtration**

4 *Francesco Ricceri<sup>1,2†</sup>, Marco Malaguti<sup>1†</sup>, Clara Derossi<sup>1</sup>, Mariachiara Zanetti<sup>1</sup>, Vincenzo*  
5 *Riggio<sup>1</sup>, Alberto Tiraferrri<sup>1,2\*</sup>*

6  
7  
8  
9 1: Department of Environment, Land and Infrastructure Engineering, Politecnico di  
10 Torino, Corso Duca degli Abruzzi, 24 – 10129 Torino (Italy)

11 2: CleanWaterCenter@PoliTo, Corso Duca degli Abruzzi, 24 – 10129 Torino (Italy),  
12 web: <http://cleanwater.polito.it/>

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 *† These authors contributed equally*

20 *\*Corresponding Author.*

21 Email: [alberto.tiraferrri@polito.it](mailto:alberto.tiraferrri@polito.it); Tel: +390110907628, Fax: +390110907611.

22

23 **Abstract**

24 The aim of this study is to advance means for microalgae concentration with the simultaneous  
25 reuse of water as new cultivation medium, specifically, through ceramic membrane filtration.  
26 Three algae, namely, *Spirulina platensis*, *Scenedesmus obliquus*, and *Chlorella sorokiniana*  
27 were tested by filtering suspensions with four ceramic membranes having nominal pore sizes  
28 of 0.8  $\mu\text{m}$ , 0.14  $\mu\text{m}$ , 300 kDa, 15 kDa. The observed flux values and organic matter removal  
29 rates were directly related to the membrane pore size, with some differences in productivity  
30 between algae types, likely due to cell size and shape. Interestingly, similar near steady-state  
31 fluxes (70-120  $\text{L m}^{-2}\text{h}^{-1}$ ) were measured using membranes with nominal pore size above 15  
32 kDa, suggesting the dominance of cake layer filtration independently from the initial flux.  
33 Virtually complete algae cells rejections and high nitrate passage (>75%) were observed in  
34 all combinations. When the permeate streams were used as media for new growth cycles of  
35 the various algae, no or little growth was observed with *Spirulina p.*, while *Chlorella s.*  
36 (permeate from 300 kDa membrane) and especially *Scenedesmus o.* (permeate from 0.14  $\mu\text{m}$   
37 membrane) showed the fastest growth rates, not too dissimilar to those observed with ideal  
38 fresh media.

39

40

41 **Keywords:** Microfiltration; microalgae harvesting; water reuse; zero-liquid discharge; algae  
42 cultivation.

43

## 44 1 Introduction

45 Microalgae market is experiencing a significant growth in a plethora of commercial  
46 applications. Among the possible uses of microalgae, water and wastewater treatment,  
47 cosmetics, food and biotechnology already represent mature sectors (Kusmayadi et al., 2021;  
48 Miguel et al., 2021). More recently, important achievements have been achieved also in the  
49 use of algae for CO<sub>2</sub> fixation and biofuel production (Goh et al., 2019; Mathimani and  
50 Mallick, 2018). Indeed, biofuel production from microalgae is currently considerably more  
51 efficient if compared to traditional feedstocks, such as corn and other crops (Goh et al.,  
52 2019). Microalgae represent also a valuable asset for the treatment of concentrated industrial  
53 flue gases, since promising CO<sub>2</sub> fixation rates of roughly 5 gCO<sub>2</sub> L<sup>-1</sup>day<sup>-1</sup> were observed in  
54 ambient air, highlighting higher efficiencies than terrestrial plants (Lim et al., 2021)..  
55 Nevertheless, the harvesting process of microalgae consumes large water volumes and it is  
56 associated with high energy absorption and relevant cost investments, which combined are  
57 estimated to account for over the 30% of the total production costs (Wu et al., 2018). In fact,  
58 large-scale cultivations of microalgae are rarely feasible as of today.

59 Technology advances are mandatory to allow the recycling of the harvesting water, thus  
60 reducing water and nutrients usage up to percentage values of 84% and 55%, respectively,  
61 according to literature reports (Yang et al., 2011). From this perspective, an optimization of  
62 the harvesting techniques that also includes water reuse is important for achieving sustainable  
63 solutions in terms of both energy and water consumption (Bamba et al., 2021; Fret et al.,  
64 2020; Li et al., 2020). A recent review on water recycling in microalgae cultivation has  
65 highlighted limitations and potential benefits of this strategy, strongly suggesting that the  
66 success of further cultivation in reused water is varied and may depend on various factors,  
67 mainly, the algae strain and the quality of the recycled stream (Farooq et al., 2015). Another  
68 review work indicated that accumulated ions, dissolved organic matter, residual flocculants,

69 and cell debris can negatively affect the water reusability (Lu et al., 2020). Clearly, the  
70 characteristics of the reused water strongly depend on the separation process deployed for  
71 algae harvesting and concentration.

72 The most applied harvesting methods to concentrate algae biomass are: (i)  
73 coagulation/flocculation, (ii) dissolved air flotation, (iii) electrically run processes, (iv)  
74 centrifugation, and (v) membrane filtration (Ferreira et al., 2020; Singh and Patidar, 2018).  
75 Membrane-driven separation processes have advantages in terms of footprint and  
76 effectiveness, allowing also the concentration of high quality biomass (Singh and Patidar,  
77 2018; Zhang and Fu, 2018). In fact, it has been observed that algal cells are less prone to  
78 damage during the filtration and thus their reproduction capacity should not be affected  
79 (Petruševski et al., 1995). Specifically, microfiltration (MF) and ultrafiltration (UF) are the  
80 most promising pressure-driven membrane separation techniques for this specific application:  
81 these can harvest algal biomass achieving high concentration factors while using low  
82 operating pressures (Ahmad et al., 2012).

83 When it comes to the reuse of permeate streams upon algae concentration achieved with  
84 membrane-based processes, sparse and dissimilar results have been reported. For example,  
85 *Scenedesmus acuminatus* growth in a water stream obtained upon filtration of the algae  
86 suspension with a 50 kDa cut-off PVDF membrane was found to be strongly inhibited by  
87 organic matter, with a 13.4% rate of growth observed with respect to fresh media (Lu et al.,  
88 2019). On the other hand, Nędzarek et al. evaluated the composition of the permeate obtained  
89 by filtering *Monoraphidium contortum* through a 300 kDa UF membrane, specifically  
90 focusing on the presence of macronutrients necessary for new cultivation cycles, and  
91 indicated that high concentrations phosphorus and nitrogen imply high potential for reuse  
92 (Nędzarek et al., 2015). The varied reports available in the literature underline the current  
93 incomplete knowledge in this field and imply that further efforts are required to identify the

94 combinations of algae, membranes, and conditions that would result in successful water reuse  
95 (Discart et al., 2014; Farooq et al., 2015; Fret et al., 2020; Hwang and Rittmann, 2017; Loftus  
96 and Johnson, 2019; Lu et al., 2020; Lu et al., 2019; Neđzarek et al., 2015; Sha et al., 2019;  
97 Wang et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2010; Zhang et al., 2016).

98 Another factor that greatly influences both the performance of membrane-based microalgae  
99 concentration and permeate stream reusability is fouling (Discart et al., 2014). It has been  
100 highlighted how fouling phenomena are particularly detrimental when membranes are used  
101 for algae concentrations (Bamba et al., 2021; Novoa et al., 2021). In this respect, ceramic  
102 membranes have been suggested as effective solutions for algae dewatering due to their  
103 chemical resistance under a wide range of cleaning conditions. This characteristic allows  
104 substantial values of flux recovery during the cleaning processes, as well as to allow  
105 sterilization of the systems when they need to be deployed with different strains or after  
106 intense biological contamination (Ahmad et al., 2013; Wu et al., 2018). Reports indicate that  
107 membrane pore size greatly influences both fouling behavior and system performance, and  
108 that the selection of the appropriate porosity and operating conditions can successfully reduce  
109 the detrimental effects of fouling and promote water reuse (Zhang and Fu, 2018; Zhao et al.,  
110 2017).

111 In this research, we discuss how MF/UF may be applied to concentrate algae biomass and  
112 simultaneously reuse the water as new medium for other cycles of microalgae cultivation.  
113 Specifically, suspensions of three algae strains (*Spirulina platensis*, *Scenedesmus obliquus*,  
114 *Chlorella sorokiniana*) are filtered through ceramic membranes with different pore sizes to  
115 find the best combinations that would maximize productivity and permeate reuse potential .  
116 Flux behavior is presented as a function of time and recovery rate, together with removal  
117 rates of nutrients, algal cells, and algal organic matter. The algal cells are re-inoculated in the  
118 permeate solutions and the growth rates are compared to those obtained with ideal fresh

119 media. Finally, the most suitable algae-membrane combinations are proposed, while issues  
120 limiting the reuse of water are underlined.

## 121 2 **Materials and Methods**

### 122 2.1 **Microalgae cultivation in photobioreactor**

123 The concentration and the reuse of water from the cultivation of three microalgae strains were  
124 investigated, namely, *Spirulina platensis* (NIVA-CYA 428), *Scenedesmus obliquus* (SAG  
125 276-3b), and *Chlorella sorokiniana* (NIVA CHL-176) (Franchino et al., 2013). *Spirulina* has  
126 a diameter of about 8  $\mu\text{m}$  with an elongated shape, while *Scenedesmus* and *Chlorella* are  
127 characterized by a more spherical shape with a diameter of roughly 10  $\mu\text{m}$  and 2  $\mu\text{m}$ ,  
128 respectively. The biomass was obtained from a medium-size non-commercial  
129 photobioreactor, which provided a suspension with microalgae concentration of roughly 1  
130 g/L. The biomass concentration was estimated from dry weight measurements, conducted by  
131 first filtering the suspension through glass microfiber filters with pore size equal to 1.5  $\mu\text{m}$   
132 and then using a thermal scale operating at 120  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 10 min to eliminate the remaining  
133 moisture. The optimal growth medium used for algae cultivation was the BG-11 medium (pH  
134 7) for *Scenedesmus o.* and *Chlorella s.*, and the AO medium (pH 9.5) for *Spirulina p.*; see  
135 Supplementary Data file for the composition of the two media. The growth rates in the BG-11  
136 and AO media were used as benchmark to compare the growth rates obtained using the  
137 reused water collected from the membrane filtration system (permeate water).

### 138 2.2 **Microfiltration concentration process and materials**

139 The microfiltration tests were performed in a cross-flow lab-scale system. The unit comprises  
140 an inverter-controlled volumetric pump (Nuert, Pordenone, Italy), a thermally insulated feed  
141 tank, and a tubular membrane housing cell (TAMI Industries, Montreal, Canada) consisting

142 of a stainless-steel cylinder of 250 mm length and 10 mm inner diameter. A volume of 3 L of  
143 initial feed suspension was used for filtration tests, each with duration of three hours. For  
144 each algae species, the initial feed concentration was 1 g/L. The cross-flow velocity (CFV)  
145 and the trans-membrane pressure (TMP) were set equal to 2 m/s and 1 bar, respectively,  
146 adjusted using the pump inverter and a back-pressure valve. The temperature of the system  
147 was kept at  $20 \pm 2$  °C during the entire filtration. The permeate flux was calculated  
148 continuously by monitoring the change in volume over time of the increasing permeate  
149 stream collected in a small tank placed on a computer-interfaced balance, with weight  
150 measurements taken every 3 min. Four TiO<sub>2</sub>-based ceramic membranes purchased from  
151 TAMI Industries (Montreal, Canada) were selected to evaluate the membrane filtration. Their  
152 pore sizes were 0.8 µm, 0.14 µm, 300 kDa, and 15 kDa. Each tubular membrane had an inner  
153 diameter of 6 mm, 250 mm length, and an active filtration area of 47.1 cm<sup>2</sup>. Each of the three  
154 algae strain was cultivated in the photobioreactor and then the suspension filtered through  
155 each of the four membranes, for a total of 12 combinations. Filtration tests were conducted in  
156 duplicates.

157 Two fouling indices were applied to quantitatively evaluate the membranes performance in  
158 terms of flux loss over time and flux recovery after cleaning. Specifically, the flux recovery  
159 ratio, defined as  $FRR = J_{w2}/J_{w1}$ , and the total flux decline ratio, defined as  $DR_t = 1 - (J_p/J_{w1})$   
160 (Riccieri et al., 2021).  $J_{w1}$  and  $J_p$  represent the pure water flux measured with the pristine  
161 membrane and the stabilized flux at the end of the 3-hour filtration process, respectively,  
162 while  $J_{w2}$  is the flux measured with pure water after the cleaning procedure described in the  
163 following. After filtration of the biomass, chemical and physical cleaning was applied to  
164 recover the membrane flux. The cleaning was performed in three steps: (i) three quick tap  
165 water flushing steps of the feed loop to replace the algae culture in the filtration unit; (ii) two  
166 physical cleaning steps with demineralized water flowed in the feed loop for at least 10 min



167 each; (iii) backwash at 2 bar of pressure using a cleaning solution composed by 6 mL/L of  
168 NaClO and 1.5 g/L of citric acid and a temperature of ~65-70 °C. These conditions were  
169 chosen to remove and inactivate all the microalgae in the system and allow for the utilization  
170 of the filtration unit in a new filtration test with the same or with different algae strains.

### 171 2.3 Rejection measurements

172 The removals of algae organic matter (AOM) and nutrients by the membranes were evaluated  
173 for each filtration test. The overall observed rejection,  $R(\%)$ , is calculated as  $1 - (c_{\text{permeate}}/c_{\text{feed}})$ ,  
174 where  $c_{\text{permeate}}$  and  $c_{\text{feed}}$  indicate the concentration of a component in the total permeate  
175 volume collected at the end of each test and in the concentrated feed obtained at the end of  
176 each test, respectively.  $\text{NO}_3$  was used as representative molecule for the behavior of nutrients,  
177 since nitrogen is the most abundant one in the cultivation medium, while dissolved organic  
178 carbon (DOC) was set as a proxy for AOM concentration. DOC measurements were  
179 performed with 40 mL samples with a Shimadzu (Milan, Italian branch) TOC-LCSH FA,  
180 E200 (catalytic oxidation on Pt at 680 °C), after filtration through 0.45  $\mu\text{m}$  filters. DOC  
181 analyses were performed in non-purgeable organic carbon mode, following appropriate  
182 calibration (Haberkorn et al., 2019). Algae cells rejection was also evaluated through cell  
183 counting using a fluorescence microscope (Axioscope 5, Zeiss), which allowed a direct  
184 quantification of algae cells in the feed, concentrate, and permeate samples.

### 185 2.4 Assessment of water reuse potential

186 Before algae re-inoculation into the permeate solution, nitrate and phosphate were  
187 reintegrated to reach the standard conditions of the relative optimum medium. Ionic  
188 concentrations were measured with an Eco IC ion chromatography system purchased from  
189 Metrohm. The growth in these solutions was conducted in 250 mL laboratory flasks and the  
190 algae concentration was monitored by means of optical density (OD) measurements


191 conducted with a UV-31 spectrophotometer (Onda) at 680 nm wavelength. The initial  
192 concentration of microalgae was set to achieve an approximate OD value of 0.5 (~0.2 g/L), to  
193 have a reference common starting point. The growth of biomass was thus assessed for the  
194 following 10 days. Flask illumination was provided h 24/24 with a neon light (Extrastar T5-  
195 13W) and the suspensions were continuously agitated at 100 rpm. Each day, the OD was  
196 measured on duplicate samples. The resulting OD increase was fitted with a line, and the  
197 fitting was considered reliable only when associated with an  $R^2$  higher than 95%. The slopes  
198 of the OD fitting lines (dOD/dt) observed with the reused waters collected in the filtration  
199 tests performed with the various membranes were compared with that observed when each  
200 microalgae strain was grown in its respective ideal medium.

## 201 3 Results and discussion

### 202 3.1 Productivity observed for different membrane-algae combinations

203 The first set of tests had the goal to investigate the productivity of the various membranes in  
204 the filtration of microalgae, which would inform the most appropriate pore size to concentrate  
205 each of the three strains (Hung and Liu, 2006; Zhu et al., 2022). The average fluxes measured  
206 in the filtration tests for all membrane-algae combinations are displayed in Figure 1a-c. The  
207 values of final achieved recovery are also reported next to each curve and indicate the amount  
208 of extracted permeate with respect to the initial feed volume. As expected, the pure water  
209 flux,  $J_{w1}$ , reported before time 0, was proportional with membrane pore sizes, with values  
210 higher than  $200 \text{ L m}^{-2}\text{h}^{-1}$  for membranes with pore size  $\geq 300 \text{ kDa}$  and roughly  $30 \text{ L m}^{-2}\text{h}^{-1}$   
211 for the smaller pore dimensions of 15 kDa. When pure water was replaced by the algae feed  
212 (time zero), the permeate flux ( $J_p$ ) showed a very rapid reduction, typically in the first 20 min  
213 of filtration. This sudden flux decline was likely due to the development of a microalgae-rich  
214 cake layer. This trend is coherent with what observed in other literature studies (Hung and

215 Liu, 2006; Zhang et al., 2010). Following this phase, the flux reached a near-stable value or  
216 slowly declined as the feed suspension became increasingly concentrated with time.  
217 Differently from  $J_{w1}$ , the value of  $J_p$  did not correlate with the nominal pore size. The  
218 elongated filamentous shape of *Spirulina p.* might be responsible for the more rapid flux  
219 decline and lowest long-term flux value. On the other hand, spherical shaped *Scenedesmus o.*  
220 and *Chlorella s.* showed a smoother flux decline. *Chlorella s.* cells have smaller average  
221 diameter than *Scenedesmus o.* cells, possibly penetrating inside the membrane pores causing  
222 more severe fouling (Liao et al., 2018; Novoa et al., 2021). Overall, the three more porous  
223 membranes displayed similar productivity in the long-term, with fluxes in the range 70-100 L  
224  $m^{-2}h^{-1}$  when using different algae. Above 15 kDa, the resistance to flux appeared to be  
225 dominated by the algae cake layer: note that nominal pore size of the 300 kDa membrane is  
226 roughly 10 times smaller than the size of the most porous membrane (0.8  $\mu m$ ). On the other  
227 hand, the final flux measured with the membranes characterized by the narrowest pores  
228 tended to always reach a much lower value of approximately 10 L  $m^{-2}h^{-1}$ , regardless of the  
229 algae strain. These results are in good agreement with previous research reporting that similar  
230 fluxes, once stabilized, were achieved with both MF and UF membranes (Sun et al., 2013).  
231 This effect is also due to the fact that permeate flux in MF membranes is initially higher  
232 compared to UF, with a consequent higher fouling tendency.  
233 The comparable values of final water flux for the three more porous membranes suggest that  
234 a dynamic cake layer, called dynamic membrane, represented the dominant resistance and  
235 governed the process above a certain nominal membrane porosity (Bilad et al., 2014; Ersahin  
236 et al., 2012; Nguyen et al., 2012). These observations are coherent with previous ones that  
237 suggested that pure water flux has little correlation with the value of possible critical flux in  
238 MF or UF of colloidal suspensions (Bacchin et al., 2006; Gésan-Guiziou et al., 2002).



239 **Fig. 1.** Productivity measured for different algae-membrane combinations. Water flux  
 240 observed with different membranes as a function of time with: a) *Spirulina p.*;  
 241 *Scenedesmus o.*, and c) *Chlorella s.* The final value of recovery (collected permeate volume  
 242 divided by initial feed volume) is reported next to each profile. d) Fouling indices evaluated  
 243 for each algae-membrane combination.

244


245 As previously mentioned, according to our results, different cells shapes and physical  
 246 properties may affect the development and the characteristics of the cake layer, such as its  
 247 porosity and compactness, which in turn yield different resistances to filtration. Such  
 248 behavior was observed in previous research, whereby different cake layer resistance build-up  
 249 was observed during the filtration of various microalgae. Specifically, the cake layer formed

250 by *Chlorella vulgaris* had lower resistance than that associated with *Chlamydomonas*  
251 *reinhardtii*, with this result attributed to the different flexibility of the cells walls of the two  
252 algae strains (Marbelia et al., 2016; Shekhar et al., 2017)

253 Figure 1d summarizes the productivity results by means of two indices, the total flux decline  
254 ratio (DRt) and flux recovery ratio (FRR). The values reported in the graph are calculated by  
255 averaging the behavior obtained with all algae species for each membrane pore size. DRt  
256 slightly increased with smaller pore size, mirroring the lower flux loss upon dynamic  
257 membrane formation relative to pure water flux, but was low for the membrane with pore size  
258 15 kDa. A value of 0.5 for the latter membrane means that half of the productivity was lost  
259 when pure water was substituted with algae suspensions in the feed. FRR values ranged from  
260 60 to 100%, indicating high efficiency of the cleaning protocol to recover nominal  
261 productivity. This result is in good agreement with the study by Wu *et al.* (Wu et al., 2018),  
262 who reported a promising and steady filtration performance with low amount of irreversible  
263 fouling under conditions similar to those investigated in this study. Specifically, in this study  
264 the cleaning performance generally increased as the pore size decreased, indirectly suggesting  
265 that fouling mechanisms were progressively more detrimental for smaller pores. This result is  
266 consistent with previous reports (Silalahi and Leiknes, 2009). For example, pore blocking  
267 phenomena are usually more pronounced in MF/UF applications as the foulant size to pore  
268 size ratio is close to 1: in this case, AOM and in general extracellular components may have  
269 blocked smaller pores more effectively. This rationalization may also partly explain the large  
270 standard deviation calculated for the two membranes with larger pore size, for which instead  
271 algae cell themselves may function as pore blocking agents.

272 Finally, further implications of the filtration results may be highlighted by assessing the data  
273 summarized in Figure 2, which reports the values of the measured water fluxes at selected  
274 recovery values. This representation helps performing a more robust and rigorous comparison

275 of the productivity in the various tests: as also observed by other researchers (Zhang et al.,  
 276 2010), the flux is also affected by feed suspension concentration, which in our tests changed  
 277 in time and did not reach the same final value for all membrane-algae combinations. The  
 278 results indicate that, when considering productivity as the target parameter for maximization,  
 279 *Spirulina p.* may be concentrated with membranes with any pore size equal or above 300  
 280 kDa, *Scenedesmus o.* with membranes of large (0.8  $\mu\text{m}$ ) pore size, while *Chlorella s.* with  
 281 medium-sized pores. Algae shape and size may be the main characteristics affecting this  
 282 result. However, when it comes to coupling effective biomass concentration with potential  
 283 permeate water reuse, the quality of the permeate stream plays a role at least as important as  
 284 productivity. The selectivity of the different membranes is discussed below and provides  
 285 additional complexity to the system and to analyses aimed at the selection of the most  
 286 appropriate membrane for each algae strain with the goal of water reuse.



287  
 288 **Fig. 2.** Comparison of the measured fluxes obtained with algae-membrane combinations at  
 289 various values of recovery rate values.


### 290 3.2 Separation of algae cells, organic matter, nutrients

291 To be able to reuse the permeate stream effectively as a medium for subsequent cycles of  
 292 algae growth, the filtration process should ideally retain all unwanted matter in the

293 concentrate (beside the biomass that needs to be concentrated), namely, accumulated ions,  
294 cell debris, and dissolved organic matter, while allowing the passage of all the beneficial  
295 components (Discart et al., 2014; Lu et al., 2019). In this case, algal cells and AOM should be  
296 retained, while macro and micro-nutrients should be found in the permeate stream for their  
297 reuse. Algae cells removal was semi-quantitatively evaluated observing samples of the initial  
298 feed, the concentrate, and the permeate samples under a microscope. Fig. 3 shows that the  
299 algal cells removal efficiency was virtually complete (~100%): the concentrate suspensions  
300 (column b) showed a considerable higher density of algae if compared to the respective initial  
301 feed (column a), while the permeate solutions (column c) did not contain appreciable  
302 amounts of algal biomass. Microscope images of initial feed, concentrate, and permeate,  
303 taken in both normal and fluorescence mode for each strain, are reported in the  
304 Supplementary Data.

305

306



307


308 **Fig. 3.** Representative fluorescence microscope images of samples obtained filtering with 300  
 309 kDa membrane the feed streams of: (first row) *Spirulina p.*; (second row) *Scenedesmus o.*;  
 310 (third row) *Chlorella s.* The columns display images for: (a, first column) the initial feed  
 311 algae suspension; (b, second column) the final concentrate suspension obtained at the end of  
 312 the filtration process; (c, third column) the final collected permeate. Red and green cells in  
 313 the photos refer to alive and dead algae, respectively.

314

315 Fig. 4 summarizes the results obtained in terms of AOM and nitrate rejections. Results were  
 316 not reported for *Spirulina p.*, as both nutrients and DOC levels were below instrument's  
 317 detection limits in the permeate stream. For both *Scenedesmus o.* and *Chlorella s.*, a strong  
 318 correlation can be observed between the DOC rejection and membrane nominal selectivity:  
 319 higher rejection values were measured when the pore size was smaller. This trend is



320 consistent with the study by Luo *et al.* (Luo *et al.*, 2019), who analyzed the relation between  
 321 molecular weight (MW) of organics and their rejection in microfiltration, finding that  
 322 rejection increased when the organic to membrane pore size ratio increased. The same trend  
 323 was also reported by Villacorte *et al.*, who observed that the rejection of both AOM and  
 324 biopolymers increased when lowering the membranes pore size in MF/UF processes  
 325 (Villacorte *et al.*, 2015). In our study, ultrafiltration membranes ranging from 300 to 15 kDa  
 326 were likely able to remove medium to low molecular weight compounds (Zhang *et al.*, 2013).  
 327 Note that the DOC rejection values for *Scenedesmus o.* suspensions were significantly lower  
 328 than those observed with *Chlorella s.* This result may be due to diverse types and size of  
 329 AOM and other algal debris produced by the two strains.



330 **Fig. 4.** Separation performance of different membranes in terms of a) DOC rejection; b) NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>  
 331 passage with suspensions containing (patterned pink) *Scenedesmus o.* and (solid green)  
 332 *Chlorella s.* microalgae. In a), the DOC rejection is used as a proxy for AOM removal. The  
 333 behavior of *Spirulina p.* is not reported since nitrate and AOM amounts were always under  
 334 the detection levels in the permeate stream.


335

336 On the other hand, Fig. 4b shows that the passage of  $\text{NO}_3^-$  into the permeate stream was  
337 generally relevant and similar (~88-93%) when the membrane pore size was above 15 kDa.  
338 High passage implies lesser need of salts reintegration before the subsequent cultivation  
339 process, with a resultant positive effect in term of both economics and sustainability of the  
340 process. Indeed, nitrates and other ions are significantly smaller than the pore size of the  
341 investigated membranes and high passage was expected. That being said, the data suggests  
342 that a fraction of nitrate was rejected, probably due to interactions with the cake layer. Note  
343 that high nutrients passage is not necessarily desired and balance between nutrients should be  
344 the target, instead. Accumulation of non-limiting nutrients or a change in medium salinity  
345 may limit new growth cycles (Alyabyev et al., 2007; Rodolfi et al., 2003).

### 346 **3.3 Potential of water reuse for new cultivation cycles**

347 The permeate solutions collected during each filtration experiment were used as a new  
348 cultivation media to grow the respective algae species. The performance was always  
349 compared with that obtained with the ideal fresh growth medium (Sha et al., 2019; Zhang et  
350 al., 2016). Fig. 5 shows optical density values measured during cultivation as a function of  
351 time, to assess the evolution of algae biomass concentration. A trend line is shown only when  
352 the fitting of the dataset is characterized by an  $R^2$  value higher than 95%. Each data point is  
353 the result of duplicate experiments, while the  $R^2$  is retrieved by the fitting of the entire data  
354 population of OD values (2 per day for 10 days). Inconsistent results were obtained with  
355 *Spirulina p.*, as no growth was observed with two of the reused permeate solutions, while a  
356 trend of growth in the initial 4-5 days was followed by a decline in optical density for the rest  
357 of the test in permeates obtained with membrane characterized by pore sizes of 0.8  $\mu\text{m}$  and  
358 300 kDa, the latter being the only case in which a reasonable  $R^2$  was obtained. Even so, the  
359 results indicate considerable discrepancy in the growth of *Spirulina p.* between this permeate  
360 solution (0.049 1/day) and the ideal fresh medium (AO medium). Previous literature studies

361 and preliminary results (not shown) suggest that the limited growth may be due to imbalance  
 362 in the concentration of macro- and micro-nutrients in the reused permeate solution and/or to  
 363 the presence of toxic low molecular weight trace compounds and cell debris (Rodolfi et al.,  
 364 2003; Zhang et al., 2016). For this reason, knowledge of the performance of a system and of  
 365 the composition of a permeate stream is crucial to manage the replenishment of macro- and  
 366 micro-nutrients in the stream, or its partial dilution with freshwater, a topic that merits  
 367 sustained additional research efforts also from a biological standpoint.



368 **Fig. 5.** Growth rates in reused water and comparison with fresh ad hoc media for: a) *Spirulina*  
 369 *p.*; b) *Scenedesmus o.*; c) *Chlorella s.* Growth rate were estimated trough optical density  
 370 measurements. Tests were performed in duplicates: data points represent the average value.

371 The dashed lines are the best linear fits of data points and are shown only if the  $R^2$  value is  
372 higher than 95%. d) Growth rate of the three algae strains in (white bar) each respective fresh  
373 ad hoc medium and (colored bars) the reused water showing the best performance among  
374 those obtained from filtration tests using membranes of different pore sizes.

375

376 More consistent results were obtained with *Scenedesmus o.* and *Chlorella s.* For *Scenedesmus*  
377 *o.*, modest growths were recorded, but quite similar in the reused permeate and in the ideal  
378 fresh medium (BG-11 medium). Specifically, 70-75 % of growth rate was estimated in the  
379 “15 kDa permeate” and in the “0.14  $\mu\text{m}$  permeate” with respect to the ideal medium (0.108  
380 1/day); see Fig. 5b. Given the significant difference in productivity between the two  
381 membranes, the membrane with pore size equal to 0.14  $\mu\text{m}$  should be preferred in a potential  
382 scale-up. *Chlorella s.* showed the most promising results (Figure 5c). This strain presented  
383 the most rapid absolute growth rates. The highest rate (0.156 1/day) was observed in the  
384 permeate solution obtained with the 300 kDa membranes, having a value of 69% with respect  
385 to the ideal medium (0.224 1/day). Finally, for each algae a summary picture is provided in  
386 Fig. 5d, which displays slope values obtained in the ideal medium and with the most suitable  
387 reused permeate, selected by taking into consideration both productivity and reuse potential  
388 performance. Overall, the growth results obtained in the reused water in this study suggests  
389 an intermediate situation between reports that initially discouraged the reuse of algae growth  
390 media (Rodolfi et al., 2003) and more recent research suggesting that recycled culture media  
391 may be used without any decline in biomass productivity (Fon Sing et al., 2014). Careful  
392 control of the cake layer role and of the composition of the reuse streams may be the key for  
393 successful reuse of a high percentage of cultivation water.

394 Overall, the results of this research imply that permeate solutions can effectively be reused as  
395 new growth media to create a semi-closed harvesting and cultivation cycles. If the permeate

396 is reused without blending and if no further optimization is achieved, the results suggest a  
397 maximum retention time of the algae in the photobioreactor equal to 2-3 days during growth  
398 cycles. Therefore, it seems appropriate to limit the percentage of reused water by blending,  
399 which would imply taking into account discharging a fraction of wastewater and the need for  
400 makeup freshwater. However, a large room for improvements exists: for example, the  
401 balance of both macronutrients and micronutrients should be carefully assessed, monitored,  
402 and managed in the reused water, especially if a substantial portion of water is reused in  
403 every cycle, which would be associated with risks of deterioration of the quality of the  
404 growth medium after various cycles. Moreover, the presence and toxicity of potential organic  
405 by-products in the cultivation step should also be investigated because these compounds may  
406 also accumulate in the recycled water.

#### 407 4 **Conclusions**

408 Ceramic MF and UF membranes were evaluated in the harvesting of algal biomass and the  
409 permeate stream was reused as new cultivation medium. Ceramic membranes successfully  
410 concentrated biomass with productivity of  $60\text{-}120\text{ L m}^{-2}\text{h}^{-1}$  when feed algal concentrations  
411 were between 1.6 and 2 g/L. Algae cells were rejected nearly at 100% rate. Instead,  
412 membranes retained between 40 and 90% of the small-size or dissolved organic content.  
413 Lastly, nitrate passage was almost complete (80 to 95%). Satisfying growth of algae in the  
414 reuse permeates were registered with the combinations: (i) *Scenedesmus o.*-0.14  $\mu\text{m}$   
415 membrane; (ii) *Chlorella s.*-300 kDa membrane.

#### 416 **CRedit authorship contribution statement**

417 **Francesco Ricceri:** Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology,  
418 Validation, Writing – Original draft. **Marco Malaguti:** Data curation, Formal analysis,

419 Investigation, Methodology, Visualization, Writing – Original draft. **Clara Derossi:** Data  
420 curation, Investigation, Methodology. **Mariachiara Zanetti:** Funding acquisition, Project  
421 administration, Resources. **Vincenzo Riggio:** Funding acquisition, Project administration,  
422 Resources. **Alberto Tiraferri:** Funding acquisition, Project administration, Resources,  
423 Supervision, Visualization, Writing – review & editing.

#### 424 **Acknowledgments**

425 This work was supported by Politecnico di Torino and the CleanWaterCenter@PoliTo  
426 (58\_DIM20TIRALB; 01\_TRIN\_CI\_CWC).

#### 427 **Conflicts of interest**

428 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal  
429 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

#### 430 **Appendix A. Supplementary data**

431 Supplementary data to this article can be found online.

432

433 **References**

- 434 Ahmad, A.L., Mat Yasin, N.H., Derek, C.J.C., Lim, J.K., 2012. Crossflow microfiltration of  
435 microalgae biomass for biofuel production. *Desalination* 302, 65-70.  
436 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.desal.2012.06.026>.
- 437 Ahmad, A.L., Mat Yasin, N.H., Derek, C.J.C., Lim, J.K., 2013. Harvesting of microalgal biomass  
438 using MF membrane: Kinetic model, CDE model and extended DLVO theory. *J. Membr. Sci.*  
439 446, 341-349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.memsci.2013.07.012>.
- 440 Alyabyev, A.J., Loseva, N.L., Gordon, L.K., Andreyeva, I.N., Rachimova, G.G., Tribunskih, V.I.,  
441 Ponomareva, A.A., Kemp, R.B., 2007. The effect of changes in salinity on the energy  
442 yielding processes of *Chlorella vulgaris* and *Dunaliella maritima* cells. *Thermochim. Acta*  
443 458, 65-70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tca.2007.03.003>.
- 444 Bacchin, P., Aimar, P., Field, R.W., 2006. Critical and sustainable fluxes: Theory, experiments  
445 and applications. *J. Membr. Sci.* 281, 42-69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.memsci.2006.04.014>.
- 446 Bamba, B.S., Lozano, P., Ouattara, A., Elcik, H., 2021. Pilot-scale microalgae harvesting with  
447 ceramic microfiltration modules: evaluating the effect of operational parameters and  
448 membrane configuration on filtration performance and membrane fouling. *J. Chem. Technol.*  
449 *Biotechnol.* 96, 603-612. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jctb.6573>.
- 450 Bilad, M.R., Arafat, H.A., Vankelecom, I.F.J., 2014. Membrane technology in microalgae  
451 cultivation and harvesting: A review. *Biotechnol. Adv.* 32, 1283-1300.  
452 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotechadv.2014.07.008>.
- 453 Discart, V., Bilad, M.R., Marbelia, L., Vankelecom, I.F.J., 2014. Impact of changes in broth  
454 composition on *Chlorella vulgaris* cultivation in a membrane photobioreactor (MPBR) with  
455 permeate recycle. *Bioresour. Technol.* 152, 321-328.  
456 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2013.11.019>.
- 457 Ersahin, M.E., Ozgun, H., Dereli, R.K., Ozturk, I., Roest, K., van Lier, J.B., 2012. A review on  
458 dynamic membrane filtration: Materials, applications and future perspectives. *Bioresour.*  
459 *Technol.* 122, 196-206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2012.03.086>.
- 460 Farooq, W., Suh, W.I., Park, M.S., Yang, J.-W., 2015. Water use and its recycling in microalgae  
461 cultivation for biofuel application. *Bioresour. Technol.* 184, 73-81.  
462 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2014.10.140>.
- 463 Ferreira, J., de Assis, L.R., Oliveira, A.P.d.S., Castro, J.d.S., Calijuri, M.L., 2020. Innovative  
464 microalgae biomass harvesting methods: Technical feasibility and life cycle analysis. *Sci.*  
465 *Total Environ.* 746, 140939. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140939>.
- 466 Fon Sing, S., Isdepsky, A., Borowitzka, M.A., Lewis, D.M., 2014. Pilot-scale continuous recycling  
467 of growth medium for the mass culture of a halotolerant *Tetraselmis* sp. in raceway ponds  
468 under increasing salinity: A novel protocol for commercial microalgal biomass production.  
469 *Bioresour. Technol.* 161, 47-54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2014.03.010>.
- 470 Franchino, M., Comino, E., Bona, F., Riggio, V.A., 2013. Growth of three microalgae strains and  
471 nutrient removal from an agro-zootechnical digestate. *Chemosphere* 92, 738-44.  
472 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2013.04.023>.
- 473 Fret, J., Roef, L., Diels, L., Tavernier, S., Vyverman, W., Michiels, M., 2020. Combining medium  
474 recirculation with alternating the microalga production strain: a laboratory and pilot scale  
475 cultivation test. *Algal Res.* 46, 101763. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.algal.2019.101763>.
- 476 Gésan-Guiziu, G., Wakeman, R.J., Daufin, G., 2002. Stability of latex crossflow filtration: cake  
477 properties and critical conditions of deposition. *Chem. Eng. J.* 85, 27-34.  
478 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1385-8947\(01\)00149-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1385-8947(01)00149-8).
- 479 Goh, B.H.H., Ong, H.C., Cheah, M.Y., Chen, W.-H., Yu, K.L., Mahlia, T.M.I., 2019.  
480 Sustainability of direct biodiesel synthesis from microalgae biomass: A critical review.  
481 *Renew. Sust. Energ. Rev.* 107, 59-74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2019.02.012>.
- 482 Haberkorn, I., Buchmann, L., Hiestand, M., Mathys, A., 2019. Continuous nanosecond pulsed  
483 electric field treatments foster the upstream performance of *Chlorella vulgaris*-based

484 biorefinery concepts. *Bioresour. Technol.* 293, 122029.  
485 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2019.122029>.

486 Hung, M.T., Liu, J.C., 2006. Microfiltration for separation of green algae from water. *Colloids*  
487 *Surf. B* 51, 157-164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colsurfb.2006.07.003>.

488 Hwang, J.-H., Rittmann, B.E., 2017. Effect of permeate recycling and light intensity on growth  
489 kinetics of *Synechocystis* sp. PCC 6803. *Algal Res.* 27, 170-176.  
490 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.algal.2017.09.008>.

491 Kusmayadi, A., Leong, Y.K., Yen, H.-W., Huang, C.-Y., Chang, J.-S., 2021. Microalgae as  
492 sustainable food and feed sources for animals and humans – Biotechnological and  
493 environmental aspects. *Chemosphere* 271, 129800.  
494 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2021.129800>.

495 Li, S., Hu, T., Xu, Y., Wang, J., Chu, R., Yin, Z., Mo, F., Zhu, L., 2020. A review on flocculation  
496 as an efficient method to harvest energy microalgae: Mechanisms, performances, influencing  
497 factors and perspectives. *Renew. Sust. Energ. Rev.* 131, 110005.  
498 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.110005>.

499 Liao, Y., Bokhary, A., Maleki, E., Liao, B., 2018. A review of membrane fouling and its control in  
500 algal-related membrane processes. *Bioresour. Technol.* 264, 343-358.  
501 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2018.06.102>.

502 Lim, Y.A., Chong, M.N., Foo, S.C., Ilankoon, I.M.S.K., 2021. Analysis of direct and indirect  
503 quantification methods of CO<sub>2</sub> fixation via microalgae cultivation in photobioreactors: A  
504 critical review. *Renew. Sust. Energ. Rev.* 137, 110579.  
505 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.110579>.

506 Loftus, S.E., Johnson, Z.I., 2019. Reused Cultivation Water Accumulates Dissolved Organic  
507 Carbon and Uniquely Influences Different Marine Microalgae. *Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol.* 7.  
508 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2019.00101>.

509 Lu, Z., Loftus, S., Sha, J., Wang, W., Park, M.S., Zhang, X., Johnson, Z.I., Hu, Q., 2020. Water  
510 reuse for sustainable microalgae cultivation: current knowledge and future directions. *Resour.*  
511 *Conserv. Recycl.* 161, 104975. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.104975>.

512 Lu, Z., Sha, J., Wang, W., Li, Y., Wang, G., Chen, Y., Hu, Q., Zhang, X., 2019. Identification of  
513 auto-inhibitors in the reused culture media of the Chlorophyta *Scenedesmus acuminatus*.  
514 *Algal Res.* 44, 101665. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.algal.2019.101665>.

515 Luo, Y., Henderson, R.K., Le-Clech, P., 2019. Characterisation of organic matter in membrane  
516 photobioreactors (MPBRs) and its impact on membrane performance. *Algal Res.* 44, 101682.  
517 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.algal.2019.101682>.

518 Marbelia, L., Mulier, M., Vandamme, D., Muylaert, K., Szymczyk, A., Vankelecom, I.F.J., 2016.  
519 Polyacrylonitrile membranes for microalgae filtration: Influence of porosity, surface charge  
520 and microalgae species on membrane fouling. *Algal Res.* 19, 128-137.  
521 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.algal.2016.08.004>.

522 Mathimani, T., Mallick, N., 2018. A comprehensive review on harvesting of microalgae for  
523 biodiesel – Key challenges and future directions. *Renew. Sust. Energ. Rev.* 91, 1103-1120.  
524 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2018.04.083>.

525 Miguel, S.P., Ribeiro, M.P., Otero, A., Coutinho, P., 2021. Application of microalgae and  
526 microalgal bioactive compounds in skin regeneration. *Algal Res.* 58, 102395.  
527 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.algal.2021.102395>.

528 Nędzarek, A., Drost, A., Harasimiuk, F., Tórz, A., Bonisławska, M., 2015. Application of ceramic  
529 membranes for microalgal biomass accumulation and recovery of the permeate to be reused in  
530 algae cultivation. *J. Photochem. Photobiol. B: Biol.* 153, 367-372.  
531 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jphotobiol.2015.09.009>.

532 Nguyen, T., Roddick, F.A., Fan, L., 2012. Biofouling of Water Treatment Membranes: A Review  
533 of the Underlying Causes, Monitoring Techniques and Control Measures. *Membranes* 2, 804-  
534 840. <https://doi.org/10.3390/membranes2040804>.

535 Novoa, A.F., Vrouwenvelder, J.S., Fortunato, L., 2021. Membrane Fouling in Algal Separation  
536 Processes: A Review of Influencing Factors and Mechanisms. *Front. Chem. Eng.* 3.  
537 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fceng.2021.687422>.



538 Petruševski, B., Bolier, G., Van Breemen, A.N., Alaerts, G.J., 1995. Tangential flow filtration: A  
539 method to concentrate freshwater algae. *Water Res.* 29, 1419-1424.  
540 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0043-1354\(94\)00269-D](https://doi.org/10.1016/0043-1354(94)00269-D).

541 Ricceri, F., Giagnorio, M., Zodrow, K.R., Tiraferri, A., 2021. Organic fouling in forward osmosis:  
542 Governing factors and a direct comparison with membrane filtration driven by hydraulic  
543 pressure. *J. Membr. Sci.* 619, 118759. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.memsci.2020.118759>.

544 Rodolfi, L., Zittelli, G.C., Barsanti, L., Rosati, G., Tredici, M.R., 2003. Growth medium recycling  
545 in *Nannochloropsis* sp. mass cultivation. *Biomol. Eng.* 20, 243-248.  
546 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1389-0344\(03\)00063-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1389-0344(03)00063-7).

547 Sha, J., Lu, Z., Ye, J., Wang, G., Hu, Q., Chen, Y., Zhang, X., 2019. The inhibition effect of  
548 recycled *Scenedesmus acuminatus* culture media: Influence of growth phase, inhibitor  
549 identification and removal. *Algal Res.* 42, 101612.  
550 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.algal.2019.101612>.

551 Shekhar, M., Shriwastav, A., Bose, P., Hameed, S., 2017. Microfiltration of algae: Impact of algal  
552 species, backwashing mode and duration of filtration cycle. *Algal Res.* 23, 104-112.  
553 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.algal.2017.01.013>.

554 Silalahi, S.H.D., Leiknes, T., 2009. Cleaning strategies in ceramic microfiltration membranes  
555 fouled by oil and particulate matter in produced water. *Desalination* 236, 160-169.  
556 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.desal.2007.10.063>.

557 Singh, G., Patidar, S.K., 2018. Microalgae harvesting techniques: A review. *J Environ. Manage.*  
558 217, 499-508. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2018.04.010>.

559 Sun, X., Wang, C., Tong, Y., Wang, W., Wei, J., 2013. A comparative study of microfiltration and  
560 ultrafiltration for algae harvesting. *Algal Res.* 2, 437-444.  
561 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.algal.2013.08.004>.

562 Villacorte, L.O., Ekowati, Y., Winters, H., Amy, G., Schippers, J.C., Kennedy, M.D., 2015.  
563 MF/UF rejection and fouling potential of algal organic matter from bloom-forming marine  
564 and freshwater algae. *Desalination* 367, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.desal.2015.03.027>.

565 Wang, W., Sha, J., Lu, Z., Shao, S., Sun, P., Hu, Q., Zhang, X., 2018. Implementation of UV-  
566 based advanced oxidation processes in algal medium recycling. *Sci. Total Environ.* 634, 243-  
567 250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.03.342>.

568 Wu, X., Zhou, C., Li, K., Zhang, W., Tao, Y., 2018. Probing the fouling process and mechanisms  
569 of submerged ceramic membrane ultrafiltration during algal harvesting under sub- and super-  
570 critical fluxes. *Sep. Purif. Technol.* 195, 199-207.  
571 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2017.12.001>.

572 Yang, J., Xu, M., Zhang, X., Hu, Q., Sommerfeld, M., Chen, Y., 2011. Life-cycle analysis on  
573 biodiesel production from microalgae: Water footprint and nutrients balance. *Bioresour.*  
574 *Technol.* 102, 159-165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2010.07.017>.

575 Zhang, W., Zhang, W., Zhang, X., Amendola, P., Hu, Q., Chen, Y., 2013. Characterization of  
576 dissolved organic matters responsible for ultrafiltration membrane fouling in algal harvesting.  
577 *Algal Res.* 2, 223-229. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.algal.2013.05.002>.

578 Zhang, X., Hu, Q., Sommerfeld, M., Puruhito, E., Chen, Y., 2010. Harvesting algal biomass for  
579 biofuels using ultrafiltration membranes. *Bioresour. Technol.* 101, 5297-5304.  
580 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2010.02.007>.

581 Zhang, X., Lu, Z., Wang, Y., Wensel, P., Sommerfeld, M., Hu, Q., 2016. Recycling  
582 *Nannochloropsis oceanica* culture media and growth inhibitors characterization. *Algal Res.*  
583 20, 282-290. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.algal.2016.09.001>.

584 Zhang, Y., Fu, Q., 2018. Algal fouling of microfiltration and ultrafiltration membranes and control  
585 strategies: A review. *Sep. Purif. Technol.* 203, 193-208.  
586 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2018.04.040>.

587 Zhao, F., Chu, H., Yu, Z., Jiang, S., Zhao, X., Zhou, X., Zhang, Y., 2017. The filtration and  
588 fouling performance of membranes with different pore sizes in algae harvesting. *Sci. Total*  
589 *Environ.* 587-588, 87-93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.02.035>.

590 Zhu, T., Zhou, Z., Qu, F., Liu, B., Van der Bruggen, B., 2022. Separation performance of  
591 ultrafiltration during the treatment of algae-laden water in the presence of an anionic  
592 surfactant. *Sep. Purif. Technol.* 281, 119894. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2021.119894>.