Incorporation of the sulfur cycle in sustainable nitrogen removal systems - a review

Dominika Grubba^a*, Zhixuan Yin^b, Joanna Majtacz^a, Hussein Ezzi Al-Hazmi^a, Jacek Makinia^a

^aDepartment of Sanitary Engineering, Faculty of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Gdańsk University of Technology, ul. Narutowicza 11/12, 80-233 Gdańsk, Poland; dominika.grubba@pg.edu.pl; zhixuanyin@outlook.com; joamajta@pg.edu.pl; hussein.hazmi@pg.edu.pl; jmakinia@pg.edu.pl

^bSchool of Environmental and Municipal Engineering, Qingdao University of Technology, 11 Fushun Road, Qingdao 266033, PR China

*corresponding author; dominika.grubba@pg.edu.pl; +48 791 100 084

Abstract

In wastewater treatment systems, sulfur (S) removal processes are generally based on heterotrophic sulfate (SO₄²⁻) reduction by sulfate reducing bacteria and S-dependent autotrophic denitrification by sulfur oxidizing bacteria. A combination of either two cycles (N and S) or three cycles (N, S and C) appears to be a viable approach to sustainable wastewater treatment, resulting in energy savings and reduction of sludge production. This review shows how the S cycle can be coupled with the other cycles in single systems for efficient N and S removal. Operating conditions, advantages, limitations and challenges of such systems are described. S removal processes are generally based on heterotrophic sulfate $(SO_4^{2^-})$ reduction by sulfate reducing bacteria and S-dependent autotrophic denitrification by sulfur oxidizing bacteria. In terms of pH and temperature, the optimum conditions are determined by the narrowest ranges for heterotrophic SO_4^{2-} reduction (pH of 7-7.6, T = 28-30°C). The combined processes allow for almost complete N removal, while the efficiency of SO_4^{2-} removal can reach up to 75%. Among all the processes linking the N, S and C cycles, SANI (sulfate reduction, autotrophic denitrification and nitrification integrated) has been best recognized. Recently, the growing attention has been paid to the novel sulfammox process, which involves SO_4^{2-} dependent, anaerobic ammonia oxidizing bacteria. Numerous systems have been developed to combine SO₄²⁻ reduction, S-dependent autotrophic denitrification and partial nitritation/anammox processes. The coexistence of several bacterial groups and their competition for the substrates is thus a key issue to be considered. Specific inhibitors for each bacterial group also need to be recognized before full-scale implementations. Moreover, modeling the transformations of S

compounds has been incorporated with respect to all the processes responsible for those transformations.

Keywords: sulfur-dependent autotrophic denitrification; heterotrophic sulfate reduction; sulfammox; sulfur cycle; microbial community; mechanistic model

1. Introduction

2 High concentrations of ammonium (NH₄-N) lead to eutrophication of surface waters 3 and pose a threat to the aquatic life and human health (Qin et al., 2021). NH₄-N can effectively 4 be converted to nitrogen gas by combined nitrification-denitrification, but this method has a few important disadvantages, including a high demand of energy and carbon, and high sludge 5 production. On the other hand, sulfate (SO_4^{2-}) is a type of the secondary pollutant because 6 7 reduction of sulfide (S²⁻) under anaerobic conditions is harmful for the aquatic environment 8 (Hao et al. 2014). S compounds have not been widely used as substrates in wastewater treatment 9 processes. Simultaneous removal of these two compounds (N and S) from wastewater, with or 10 without involving the carbon (C) cycle, can be a viable approach to the sustainable wastewater 11 management. In particular, this approach may be an effective alternative in the case of many 12 types of industrial wastewater, which are characterized by high concentrations of pollutants, such as NH₄-N, SO_4^{2-} (>1000 mg/L of both N and S) and chemical oxygen demand (COD) (> 13 14 60,000 mg COD/L) (Rikmann et al., 2016, Jarvis and Younger 2000, Chapman, 1992).

A viable sustainable approach to biological wastewater treatment comprises a combination of nitrogen (N), sulfur (S) and carbon (C) removal. Lower operating costs result from the use of some products in one process as the substrates in other processes and the use of shared reactors. Moreover, no carbon is needed for S-dependent autotrophic denitrification, less sludge is generated, and the environmentally neutral compounds, such as nitrogen gas (N₂) and elementar sulfur (S⁰), are the final products of biochemical reactions (Lin et al., 2018).

22 Conventional nitrification/denitrification for N removal is now being replaced by more 23 sustainable N-shortcut processes, such as "nitrite shunt" or deammonification. In the case of S 24 compounds, biological removal is based on heterotrophic SO_4^{2-} reduction by sulfate reducing bacteria (SRB) and S-dependent autotrophic denitrification by sulfur oxidizing bacteria
(SOB). Recently, the growing attention has been paid to the novel sulfate reducing ammonia
oxidizing (sulfammox) process, which involves anaerobic ammonium oxidizing bacteria
(AAOB). These bacteria use SO₄²⁻, instead of nitrite nitrogen (NO₂⁻-N), as an electron
acceptor to oxidize NH₄⁺-N under anaerobic conditions.

30 The growing importance of using the combined N, S and C cycles in biological 31 wastewater treatment processes has been confirmed by the increasing number of review 32 papers on various aspects of S transformations. According to Web of Science database, 15, 12 33 and 3 review papers have been published specifically on S-dependent autotrophic denitrification, heterotrophic reduction of SO_4^{2-} and sulfammox (-see Figure S1 in the 34 Supporting Information (SI)). Several papers focused on particular issues, including a detailed 35 description of mechanisms of the individual processes, responsible microorganisms, reactors 36 37 used, optimal operational conditions or inhibiting factors in S-dependent autotrophic 38 denitrification (Wu et al., 2021, Cui et al., 2019, Lin et al., 2018), heterotrophic sulfate 39 reduction (Sinharoy et al., 2020b) and sulfammox (Liu et al., 2021, Grubba et al., 2021). 40 However, only a combination of either two cycles – (N and S) or three cycles (N, S 41 and C) would be the rational approach to wastewater treatment in order to save energy and the amount of sludge generated, especially for NH_4^+ -N and SO_4^{2-} rich industrial wastewater. Due 42 43 to the variety of N, S and C removal processes, the research interests have been shifting to the 44 use of single- and multi-stage systems based on the combination of several processes, such as 45 heterotrophic sulfate reduction, S-dependent autotrophic denitrification, nitrification, denitrification, anaerobic ammonia oxidation (anammox) and sulfammox (Wu et al., 2020, 46 47 Yuan et al., 2020, Sun et al., 2018, Liu et al., 2017, Qian et al., 2015a, b, c, Jiang et al., 2013, 48 Wang et al., 2009b).

49 Only two review papers (Hao et al., 2014, Show et al., 2013) described simultaneously 50 S-dependent autotrophic denitrification and heterotrophic sulfate reduction. Hao et al. (2014) 51 described a relationship between the N, S, C and P cycles in biological wastewater treatment 52 systems. These authors focused on the acceptors and electrons used in the transformations of S compounds, key microorganisms, developed technologies, factors influencing the process 53 performance, and achieved SO_4^{2-} reduction efficiencies. In the review of Show et al. (2013), 54 55 existing models of the transformations of S compounds were additionally described (see -56 Table S1 in SI).

57 The present review provides updated results of research on S transformations, which 58 have been revised and extended with new understanding and discoveries. A novel aspect is 59 the inclusion of sulfammox in these transformations as no paper has synthesized autotrophic S-dependent denitrification, heterotrophic sulfate reduction and the sulfammox process in one 60 61 review. In addition, the present study describes how sulfammox can increase the efficiency of 62 N and S removal. Various process configurations and technologies, which are based on the 63 three (N-S-C) cycles, are described and compared in terms of their efficiency. Moreover, 64 modeling the transformations of N, S and C compounds has been incorporated with respect to all processes responsible for those transformations. Such a review provides a deeper insight 65 66 into the conversions of S in biochemical processes, including sulfammox.

2. Single S-dependent biochemical processes integrating N, S and C conversions

69 There are three known processes combining sulfur and nitrogen conversions: S-dependent 70 autotrophic denitrification, heterotrophic sulfate reduction and autotrophic sulfammox. The 71 detailed description of those processes, including the metabolic mechanisms, biochemical 72 reactions, influencing environmental factors can be found in the SI (S1-S3).

67

68

73 including S^{2-} , S^{0} , thiosulfate ($S_2O_3^{2-}$) and sulfite (SO_3^{2-}), coupled with reduction of $NO_3^{-}-N$ 74 and/or NO₂⁻-N. T. denitrificans, Thiomicrospira denitrificans, Thiobacillus versutus, 75 76 Thiosphaera pantotropha and P. denitrificans are the known microorganisms responsible for that process. P. denitrificans is the chemotrophic α -proteobacteria which can grow on organic 77 78 monocarbon compounds (methanol, methylamine) while using reduced forms of S and 79 hydrogen as electron donors in denitrification (Baker et al., 1998). T. denitrificans belongs to β -proteobacteria that can use S₂O₃²⁻ and thiocyanates under aerobic conditions, and 80 additionally S^{2-} and S^{0} under anaerobic conditions. *Sulfurimonas denitrificans* belongs to the 81 ε -proteobacteria and is capable of oxidizing SO₃²⁻, S₂O₃²⁻ and S⁰, while both NO₃⁻-N and 82 oxygen are used as electron acceptors. T. thioparus is one of the representatives of autotrophic 83 denitrifiers that reduce NO₃⁻-N to NO₂⁻-N by oxidation of S^{2-} (Tang et al., 2009). Although 84 85 autotrophic denitrifying bacteria are chemolithotrophic, there are many denitrifying bacteria 86 capable of adapting to autotrophic, heterotrophic and even mixotrophic growth (*P. versatus*, 87 P. denitrificans, Beggiatoa sp.) (Pokorna and Zabranska, 2015).

Heterotrophic sulfate reduction is SO_4^{2-} reduction which takes place in two 88 independent different paths. The first is the use of organic electron donors, which are also the 89 90 carbon source for the SRB. The second is the use of inorganic electron donors, which must be 91 supplemented with a carbon source, such as CO₂ (Sinharoy et al., 2020a). The SRB can be 92 divided into 7 phylogenetic lines, including five for bacteria and two for archaea. Most of the 93 SRB found in sulfate reduction reactors belong to 23 genera within Deltaproteobacteria 94 (Desulfovibrio, Desulfobacteraceae, Desulfobulbaceae, Syntrophobacteraceae, 95 Desulfomicrobium, Desulfohalobium). Another SRB belong to the gram-positive genera 96 Clostridia (Desulfotomaculum, Desulfosporosinus and Desulfosporomusa). Three lineages, 97 Nitrospirae (Thermodesulfovibrio), Thermodesulfobacteria (Thermodesulfobacterium) and

S-dependent autotrophic denitrification consists of oxidation of S compounds,

98	<i>Thermodesulfobiaceae (Thermodesulfobium)</i> , contain only thermophilic SO ₄ ^{2–} reducing
99	agents. Archaeal SRB are Euryarchaeota and Crenarchaeota (Muyzer and Stams, 2008).
100	In a novel sulfammox process, NH_4^+ -N is oxidized to N ₂ , whereas SO_4^{2-} plays the role
101	of an electron acceptor which is reduced to S^0 under anaerobic conditions. <i>Brocadia</i>
102	Anammoxoglobus Sulfate (Liu et al., 2008) is a functional microorganism responsible for
103	simultaneous removal of NH_4^+ -N and SO_4^{2-} and ended the conversion of NH_4^+ -N and SO_4^{2-}
104	by producing NO ₂ ⁻ -N as an intermediate. The second isolated species, <i>Bacillus Benzoevorans</i> ,
105	is responsible for carrying out the entire sulfammox reaction (Cai et al., 2010).
106	Verrucomicrobia has also been reported to be involved in the sulfammox process (Rikmann et
107	al., 2016). Some Proteobacteria, which may potentially perform sulfammox, include the
108	following species: Sulfurimonas, Desulfuromonadales, Desulfovibrio, Desulfuromonas,
109	Desulfobulbus, norank Rhodobacteraceae and Thiobacillus (Rios-Del Toro et al., 2018, Wang
110	et al. 2017).
111	The key issues and challenges of S-dependent autotrophic denitrification,
112	heterotrophic sulfate reduction and sulfammox are presented in Table 1. Figure 1 below

113 shows the interactions between S-dependent autotrophic denitrification, heterotrophic sulfate

114 reduction and sulfammox process.





Figure 1. Interactions between S-dependent autotrophic denitrification, heterotrophic sulfate
reduction, anammox and sulfammox process

3. Operational conditions and performances of single S-dependent processes

Each of the discussed processes (S-dependent autotrophic denitrification, heterotrophic sulfate
reduction and sulfammox) can be carried out independently, as evidenced by numerous
studies (Tables 2 and 3). However, the challenge is to combine these processes, in either
single- or multi-stage systems, in order to make biological wastewater treatment systems
more efficient.

125 3.1. S-dependent autotrophic denitrification

In S-dependent autotrophic denitrification, the most frequently used electron donors are S^0 and S^{2-} (Table 2). The experiments were mainly carried out in packed bed reactors, but several other types of reactors were also used. The reported rates of denitrification varied in a wide range - from 0.03 to 8.13 kg N/m³/d, depending mainly on the temperature and influent NO₃⁻- N concentrations. The effects of pH in the investigated range (6.0-9.0) and S concentrations were less significant. For a detailed description of previous research related to S-dependent autotrophic denitrification, see the SI (S1). This process allowed for the efficient (>90%) removal of N and S²⁻ (Yang et al., 2016, Jing et al., 2010) with the NO₃⁻-N concentration in the range of 20-1230 mg N/L (Zhu et al., 2019, Zou et al., 2016, Kim et al., 2004).

During S-dependent autotrophic denitrification, SO_4^{2-} can be produced from different electron donors. Frequently, the S balance in the process is not 1/1 for the removed electron donor to SO_4^{2-} produced (Zou et al., 2016). In Table 2, the initial donor concentrations and the amount of SO_4^{2-} produced are similar. The observed imbalances result from the production of other S intermediates. The most common electron acceptor is NO_3^{-} -N, but several studies comparing NO_3^{-} -N and NO_2^{-} -N have been reported (Sun and Nemati, 2012, Moraes et al., 2012, Jing et al 2010).

142 Different aspects of S-dependent autotrophic denitrification have been addressed in 143 several reviews (Wu et al. 2021, Cui et al. 2019, Lin et al. 2018, Sabba et al. 2016). Wu et al. 144 (2021) summarized all types of biofilm denitrification in terms of the reactor configuration, 145 microbial transformations, factors influencing the process, and especially focused on N_2O 146 emissions. The coexistence of S-dependent denitrification with anammox was also reported 147 and S-driven denitrifiers were identified, including *Thiobacillus denitrificans* and 148 *Thiobacillus thioparus*.

149 Cui et al. (2019) described S-dependent autotrophic denitrification in terms of the 150 functional enzymes, electron donors, types of reactors, and operational factors. They also 151 emphasized a significant advantage regarding S-dependent autotrophic denitrification 152 compared to heterotrophic denitrification with respect to N₂O emissions. It was shown that 153 autotrophic denitrification mediated by S compounds (S^0 , S^{2-}) emitted significantly less N₂O 154 than heterotrophic denitrification with methanol, ethanol or acetate.

Sabba et al. (2016) focused mainly on SO_3^{2-} and its occurrence in the environment, 155 chemistry, microbiology, and the role in denitrification. It was emphasized that SO_3^{2-} is an 156 intermediate in the S oxidation pathway and should be chosen as the most economical 157 158 electron donor. Lin et al. (2018) focused primarily on S oxidation, including biological gas desulfurization, phototrophic S^{2-} oxidation, S-dependent autotrophic denitrification, biological 159 160 sulfur oxidation associated phosphorous removal, dye treatment. They also indicated viable applications of the products, such as Li batteries, production of S concrete by mixing S⁰ with 161 aggregates, biologically produced S fertilizer, oxidation of S^{2-} in microbiological fuel cells, 162 163 and reclamation of metals from sewage sludge.

164 3.2. Heterotrophic sulfate reduction

Table 3 presents the diversity of research carried out so far on heterotrophic SO₄²⁻ reduction 165 166 in terms of the electron donor, type of reactor and operating conditions. Most studies have 167 been carried out in the gas lift reactor and fluidized-bed reactor. Both organic and inorganic donors were used, including carbon monoxide, methane, methanol, ethanol, hydrogen, crab 168 shell, compost and many others. The use of different donors resulted in a different SO_4^{2-} 169 reduction efficiency. A detailed description of the research can be found in SI (S2). The use of 170 different electron donors and SO42- content resulted in a wide range of SO42- removal 171 efficiencies (51-98%) and rates (0-3400 mg $SO_4^{2-}/L/d$). Nielsen et al. (2019) used methanol 172 and ethylene glycol which resulted in reduction of SO_4^{2-} by 71.2% and 36.9%, respectively. 173 The decrease of SO_4^{2-} concentration was limited to 13.8 and 5.3%, respectively, with the use 174 of peat and straw. Low temperatures (below 10°C) significantly affected the SO₄²⁻ removal 175 176 rates. For example, Virpiranta et al. (2019) carried out studies at various temperatures (22°C,

177 16°C, 6°C) and found gradually decreasing SO_4^{2-} removal rates, i.e. 169, 98 and 13-42 mg 178 $SO_4^{2-}/L/d$, respectively.

179 Sulfate reduction is less popular compared to S-dependent autotrophic denitrification, 180 but that process has also been addressed in several reviews (Kumar et al. 2021, Costa et al., 181 2020, Sinharoy et al., 2020b, Serrano et al., 2019, Van den Brand et al., 2015). Kumar et al. 182 (2021) and Costa et al. (2020) focused on the use of SO_4^{2-} reduction for treatment of metal-183 rich wastewater and recovery of these metals, showing a high degree of SO_4^{2-} reduction (> 184 90%) along with the efficient (> 99%) recovery of metals (Fe, Zn, Cd, Cu).

Similarly, Sinharoy et al. (2020b) described treatment of acid mine drainage (AMD) with biological reduction of SO_4^{2-} . Heavy metals present in AMD can be removed by S^{2-} precipitation. The review discussed various gaseous substrates, such as H₂, CO, CH₄, as electron donors that could be used in this process. It was emphasized that only the microorganisms capable of using gaseous substrates are appropriate for the AMD treatment systems.

191 Serrano et al. (2019) focused on the optimum conditions for SRB. They presented the 192 recommended conditions for biomass, electron donor and acceptor and an experimental setup 193 of three SRB tests: (1) to assess the activity of SRB culture, (2) to determine the reduction 194 potential of an electron donor, and (3) to determine the possibility of using various sources of SO_4^{2-} as an electron acceptor. They collected methodologies and results from many 195 publications and recommended setup and monitoring conditions to increase the comparability 196 197 and reproducibility of the SRB tests. Sodium sulfate and lactate were used as an electron 198 acceptor and electron donor, respectively.

199 Van den Brand et al. (2015) analyzed important parameters, such as pH, organic
 200 substrates, COD/SO₄²⁻ ratio, substrate composition, SO₄²⁻, salt, temperature and DO. They

201found that the presence of SRB reduced pathogens, heavy metals and sludge produced.202Sulfate reduction, autotrophic denitrification and nitrification integrated (SANI) was203identified as a process combining the advantages of SRB and S-dependent autotrophic204denitrification. However, they indicated that in order to ensure the benefits of using SRB, a205sufficient SO_4^{2-} concentration in the influent wastewater would be required to maintain the206COD/ SO_4^{2-} ratio below 0.67.

207 **3.3.** Sulfammox

208 Sulfammox is a new process that has been addressed in the literature, especially review 209 papers, only very recently. Sulfammox has mainly been carried out in an upflow anaerobic sludge bed reactor and circulating flow reactor (Table 3). The obtained SO_4^{2-} removal 210 211 efficiencies are normally much lower compared to heterotrophic sulfate reduction. However, 212 sulfammox is an important process linking the N and S cycles, therefore the effect of sulfammox on the overall reduction of SO_4^{2-} and NH_4^+ -N should not be neglected. In the 213 studied systems, the typical influent concentrations of SO_4^{2-} ranged from 80 to 360 mg/L (Qin 214 et al., 2021, Zhang et al., 2019b) and the highest obtained SO_4^{2-} removal efficiency was 45% 215 216 (Zhang et al., 2019a). A detailed description of the research can be found in the SI (S3).

217 Liu et al. (2021) summarized the current understanding of sulfammox, including the 218 mechanisms, responsible microorganisms and factors influencing the process. It was 219 emphasized that the understanding of sulfammox has improved significantly in recent years, 220 but more attention should be paid to recognizing the microbial community and its metabolic 221 pathways. In addition, a variety of sulfammox end products were described that could be 222 substrates for various N and S (anammox, S-dependent autotrophic denitrification) processes 223 and coexist together in wastewater treatment systems. However, a challenge for the process is 224 to ensure optimal environmental factors, such as temperature, pH, DO, for its practical

225	applications. It was also emphasized that residual organic carbon could have a significant
226	positive effect on sulfammox, but this requires further research. A significant limitation of
227	sulfammox is that the process was mostly investigated under laboratory scale. Practical
228	applications should focus on implementations at low temperatures in full-size reactors.
229	In order to increase the efficiency of S removal in the sulfammox process, it is important to
230	maintain the optimal pH of 8.5 and temperature of 30°C (Cai et al., 2010). The N/S ratio is
231	also an important factor affecting that efficiency. When increasing the influent NH_4^+ -N
232	concentration from 166-666 mg N/L to 1000-2000 mg N/L, then the SO_4^{2-} removal efficiency
233	increased from 64% to 71%. However, after increasing the influent NH_4^+ -N concentration
234	further to >3000 mg/L, the SO_4^{2-} reduction efficiency decreased to 28% (Wang et al., 2017).
235	Also, reducing the concentration of SO_4^{2-} from 223 to 154 mg/L had a positive effect on the
236	removal of SO_4^{2-} in the sulfammox process (Zhang et al., 2020). The N/S ratio also influenced
237	the SO_4^{2-} removal efficiency, as the SO_4^{2-} removal efficiency at N/S = 2:1 and 4:1 was 38.8%
238	and 30.5%, respectively (Zhang et al., 2019a).

3.4. Optimal conditions for S-dependent autotrophic denitrification, heterotrophic sulfate reduction and the sulfammox process

Figure 2 shows a summary of the reported pH and temperature ranges and their optimal values for the three S-dependent processes. The overall optimum conditions are explicitly determined by the narrowest ranges for heterotrophic sulfate reduction, which are 7-7.6 and 28-30°C for pH and temperature, respectively. The processes of S-dependent autotrophic denitrification, heterotrophic sulfate reduction and sulfammox can occur simultaneously with deammonification or its component processes, i.e. partial nitritation and anammox.



248

249 Figure 2. Ranges of pH and temperatures and their optimal values ("[∅]" – optimum

250 conditions) reported in literature for the S-dependent processes

251

252 For comparison, for partial nitritation, the optimal ranges were 25-35°C for 253 temperature (Zhu et al. 2008, Kanders et al., 2014) and 7-8.6 for pH, with the optimal value of 254 8 (Jaroszyński et al., 2011). On the contrary, too low temperatures (10 - 15°C) cause the 255 excessive activity of NOB (Kouba et al. 2017), which can grow faster than AOB under such 256 conditions (Hellinga et al. 1998). The optimal pH range for NOB is 6 - 7.5, with the 257 maximum at 7 (Yin et al., 2016). For the anammox process, the optimal temperature and pH 258 is respectively 35-40°C (Dosta et al., 2008) and 6.7-8.3 (Jetten et al., 2001). The recommended ranges for efficient deammonification are as follows: T = 20 - 35°C (Kanders 259 260 et al. 2014) and pH of 7.5-8 (Oshiki et al., 2011).

When coupling sulfammox with S-dependent autotrophic denitrification and heterotrophic SO $_4^{2-}$ reduction to increase the efficiency of S removal, it is important to keep the optimal temperature of 28-30°C and pH of 7-7.6. The N/S ratio should be adjusted based on the stoichiometry of all the processes involved, so that products of one process can be the substrates for another process. Deviations from the optimal ratio can cause either production

266	of unwanted residues or bacterial competition for the substrates. SRB can compete with
267	sulfammox bacteria for SO_4^{2-} . Moreover, heterotrophic SO_4^{2-} reduction and sulfammox
268	contribute to formation of S^{2-} and/or S^{0} , which is the substrate for S-dependent autotrophic
269	denitrification. Too intensive production of S^{2-} may lead to the persistence of this toxic
270	compound in the effluent. The presence of carbon in heterotrophic SO_4^{2-} reduction may also
271	contribute to the development of heterotrophic bacteria responsible for heterotrophic
272	denitrification. Then NO ₃ ⁻ -N and/or NO ₂ ⁻ -N may become limited due to their use in both
273	autotrophic and heterotrophic denitrification. In such a case, it is recommended to use full or
274	partial nitrification to produce NO ₃ ⁻ -N and/or NO ₂ ⁻ -N. The competition and interactions of
275	microorganisms participating in the aforementioned processes are shown in Figure 1.

4. Wastewater treatment systems integrating the N-S-C cycles

4.1. Systems integrating the sulfur cycle with nitrification-denitrification - Sulfate reduction, Autotrophic denitrification and Nitrification Integrated (SANI) and its modifications

Biological $SO_4^{2^-}$ reduction along with biological oxidation of S in the form of $SO_3^{2^-}$, S⁰ or S₂O₃²⁻ are two main pathways responsible for S conversions in wastewater treatment systems (Cardoso et al., 2006). An integrated process for $SO_4^{2^-}$ reduction, autotrophic denitrification and nitrification (SANI) was aimed to primarily remove organic compounds and N (Wang et al., 2009b). This process was originally developed for saline wastewater in Hong Kong and demonstrated there in full-scale (Wu et al., 2016, Wang et al., 2009b).

With that innovative approach, the conventional wastewater treatment, incorporating C and N cycles, can be extended with the S cycle, as shown in Figure 3. In the first anaerobic zone, COD is removed by SRB, which results in SO_4^{2-} reduction to S^{2-} . In the second anoxic zone, autotrophic reduction of NO_3^{-} -N occurs with dissolved S^{2-} formed in the first zone. In the third aerobic zone, NH_4^+ -N is oxidized to NO_3^{-} -N, which is then recirculated to the second anoxic zone (Wang et al., 2009b). The SANI process and its modifications combine the advantages of energy saving, reduced sludge production and smaller footprint. Wang et al. (2009b) noted that the total cost reduction for SANI would be >50% for a WWTP with an influent flow rate of 10,000 m³/d.

The SANI process can be used for treatment of $SO_4^{2^2}$ -poor wastewater provided that 294 low-cost and S-rich sources are available. For example, wet flue gas desulfurisation (FGD) 295 systems used in boilers, coal-fired furnaces and power plants, can be reduced to alkaline flue 296 gas sorption for production of liquid waste containing SO_4^{2-} and SO_3^{2-} (Srivastava and 297 298 Jozewicz, 2001). Such a waste stream can be co-treated in the main wastewater stream in wet 299 FGD-SANI after removing suspended solids and heavy metals (Qian et al., 2013). 300 The Mixed Denitrification (MD) - SANI process has also been proposed (Qian 2015a,b,c). MD-SANI generates $S_2O_3^{2-}$, S^{2-} , and some volatile fatty acids (VFA), which are 301 302 subsequently converted in both heterotrophic denitrification (VFA) and autotrophic denitrification (S^{2-} and $S_2O_3^{2-}$) (Qian et al., 2015a). It should be noted that the latter process is 303 induced faster by $S_2O_3^{2-}$ than S^{2-} (Cardoso et al., 2006). Figure 3b-d shows the SANI, FGD-304 305 SANI and MD-SANI processes depending on the available substrates.



Figure 3. Biological wastewater treatment systems using a) conventional heterotrophic
denitrification with autotrophic nitrification b) SANI c) FGD-SANI d) MD-SANI

309

4.2. Systems integrating the S cycle with anammox-based nitrogen removal processes
In recent years, the growing attention has been paid to N removal using the anammox process.
The anammox process completely eliminates the need for organic C source, reduces the
amount of sludge produced by 80% and related energy costs for aeration by 60% compared to
conventional nitrification/denitrification. The anammox process also has economic
advantages in the context of co-treatment of wastewater containing S compounds, especially
S²⁻ (Kosugi et al., 2019).

- The anammox-based systems for combined N and S removal comprise (1) Sulfate
 Reduction, Denitrification/Anammox and Partial Nitrification (SRDAPN), (2) Partial
 Nitrification/Anammox and S-dependent autotrophic Denitrification (PNASD), (3) Anammox
 and S-dependent autotrophic Denitrification (ASD), and (4) S-dependent autotrophic Partial
 Denitrification/Anammox (SPDA).
 The SRDAPN process is similar to the SANI process, but enhanced with anammox
- 323 (Figure 4a). As a consequence, instead of full nitrification, only PN is needed to produce NO_2^{-1}
- 324 -N (Kosugi et al., 2019).



Figure 4. Wastewater treatment systems using the anammox process a) SRDAPN b) PNASDc) ASD d) SPDA

The PNASD process uses PN/A to remove NH_4^+ -N under aerobic (PN) – anoxic (anammox) conditions. With S-dependent autotrophic denitrification, the produced NO_3^- -N can further be reduced to N₂, as shown in Figure 4b. The PNASD process has been implemented as both two-stage (Dasgupta et al., 2017) and one-stage system (Yuan et al., 2020).

334 The PNASD system can also be limited to an ASD system that ignores the share of 335 PN, as shown in Figure 4c. Then the NO₂⁻-N acceptor for anammox is not obtained from the 336 conversion of NH₄⁺-N, but supplied from external sources. Accordingly, the costs of energy used to produce NO₂⁻-N by AOB in PN are neglected, but the costs of process substrates 337 increase. The residual NO_3 -N from anammox can be removed along with S compounds (S²⁻, 338 S^0 , $S_2O_3^{2-}$) by S-dependent autotrophic denitrification. The ASD process has been 339 340 implemented in both one-stage (Guo et al., 2016) and two-stage (Sun et al., 2018) systems. 341 If $NO_2^{-}N$ can be obtained by partial autotrophic denitrification of $NO_3^{-}N$ with oxidation of S compounds (S^{2-} , S^{0} , $S_2O_3^{2-}$), then it can be used as a substrate in the anammox 342 343 process. Liu et al. (2017) and Wu et al. (2019) used a UASB reactor to perform S-dependent denitrification with S^{2-} (Liu et al. 2017) and $S_2O_3^{2-}$ (Wu et al., 2019) for NH₄⁺-N removal 344 345 from wastewater, as shown in Figure 4d.

346 4.3. Systems including the sulfammox process

Both sulfammox and anammox incorporate "anaerobic" oxidation of NH_4^+ -N. The coexistence of both processes was found in marine sediments (Rios-Del Toro et al., 2018) and anaerobic sludge (Rikmann et al., 2016). In conventional sulfammox, $SO_4^{2^-}$ is an electron acceptor, which is reduced to S⁰ or S²⁻, while NH_4^+ -N is oxidized to N₂, NO_2^- -N and/or NO_3^- -N. Sulfammox may occur on its own, as shown in Figure 5a. Alternatively, the formed NO_2^- -

- 352 N may be used as an electron acceptor for anammox in the combined Sulfammox/Anammox
- 353 (SA) system (Figure 5b).





Figure 5. Wastewater treatment systems incorporating the sulfammox process a) Sulfammoxb) SA c) SSD d) SASD

As $NO_2^{-}-N$ and $NO_3^{-}-N$ are generated in sulfammox, the process can be combined with autotrophic S-dependent denitrification in an Sulfammox - S-dependent autotrophic Denitrification (SSD) system, as shown in Figure 5c (Liu et al., 2021, Grubba et al., 2021). The formed S⁰ and S²⁻ in sulfammox can be oxidized again to SO_4^{2-} , while NO_X-N are reduced to N₂. The SSD system can be expanded with anammox in SASD (Sulfammox – Anammox - S-dependent autotrophic denitrification), as shown in Figure 5d. In this case, NO₂⁻-N can be reduced by both AAOB and autotrophic denitrifiers (Liu et al., 2021, Grubba
et al., 2021).

5. Operational conditions and performances of the systems integrating the N-S-C

367 cycles

368 The biochemical processes associated with the C, N and S conversions and the

369 microorganisms responsible for those conversions can be found in the SI (Figure S2).

370 5.1. SANI, FGD-SANI, MD-SANI

The S cycle, which is part of the SANI process, ensures a more efficient use of electrons (Wu 371 372 et al., 2020) and eliminates the production of toxic S^{2-} (Qian et al., 2015c). In addition, it 373 reduces sludge production by 90% compared to the conventional biological N removal 374 processes. This is possible due to very low yield coefficients of the microorganisms responsible for SO₄²⁻ reduction, autotrophic denitrification and nitrification, i.e., 0.02 kg 375 376 VSS/kg COD, 0.01 kg VSS/kg NO₃⁻-N and 0.07 kg VSS/kg NH₄⁺-N, respectively (Lu et al., 377 2011, Wang et al., 2009b). In addition, there are other significant reductions, including energy 378 consumption by 35% (Lu et al., 2011), greenhouse gas emission (GHG) by 36% (Lu et al., 379 2011), and the space required for the process of wastewater treatment and sludge handling by 380 30%–40% (Liu et al., 2016).

MOST WIEDZY Downloaded from mostwiedzy.pl

As shown in Table 4, SANI shows a relatively high level of performance compared to the conventional systems. The efficiencies of SO_4^{2-} , total nitrogen (TN) and COD removal vary in the ranges of 72-98%, 55-74% and 82-97%, respectively (Hao et al., 2015, Lu et al., 2009). The SANI modifications (FGD-SANI and MD-SANI), which use wastewater streams from wet flue gas desulphurization, reveal even a greater performance potential (Qian et al., 2015a, b, Jiang et al., 2013). The biological reduction of SO_3^{2-} in FGD-SANI and MD-SANI provides more energy for bacterial growth, which is associated with a higher sludge efficiency 388 compared to the biological reduction of SO_4^{2-} (Jiang et al., 2013). Moreover, SO_3^{2-} is an 389 intermediate in SO_4^{2-} reduction, which may result in faster reduction by SRB.

Jiang et al. (2013) found that the removal rates of specific organics in the SO_3^{2-} and SO₄²⁻ reducing reactors were similar. At the extremely low temperatures (<10°C), incomplete reduction of SO_3^{2-} in an anaerobic reactor (Figure 3c) resulted in accumulation of $S_2O_3^{2-}$ and reduction in the removal rate of organics. However, the anoxic and aerobic reactors (Figure 3c) still provided a high removal efficiency of organics (>94%), while NH₄⁺-N and NO₃⁻-N were almost completely removed.

The MD reaction can lead to a much higher reduction of NO_3^--N and NO_2^--N compared to the S²⁻ based SANI process (Qian et al., 2015a). Qian et al. (2015b) reported that the denitrification rate increased sevenfold in MD-SANI compared to SANI. Furthermore, in comparison with SANI, FGD-SANI shows higher TN and COD removal efficiencies (98% and 94%). The complete removal of SO₃²⁻ and TN was achieved in MD-SANI, while the COD removal efficiency in that process was 81% (Table 4).

402 5.2. SRDAPN and PNASD - challenges resulting from the combination of aerobic and 403 anaerobic conditions

The presence of S^{2-} in the influent wastewater imposes a significant risk of inhibition of the 404 AAOB responsible for anammox. Threshold levels of S^{2-} inhibiting AAOB were found in the 405 range of <1 to 64 mg S/l (Jin et al., 2013, Carvajal-Arroyo et al., 2013, Dapena-Mora et al., 406 2007). The study by Wiśniewski et al. (2019) determined the half maximal inhibitory 407 concentration (IC₅₀) under two different S²⁻ conditions. The IC₅₀ was 4.25 mg H₂S-S/L at a 408 409 constant S²⁻ concentration of 11 mg TS-S/L and pH in the range 7-7.9 vs. 4.67 mg H₂S-S/L at a varying concentration of S²⁻ ranging from 1 to 15 mg TS-S/L and a constant pH of 7. The 410 411 decrease in AAOB activity was due to the pH-dependent non-ionized form of H₂S. In

412 addition, heterotrophic bacteria may coexistence with AAOB but also outcompete AAOB at
413 high influent C/N ratios (Chamchoi et al., 2008).

The PNASD process has been implemented in both one- and two-stage systems. The 414 two stage-systems are easier to maintain and allow to avoid the negative impact of S^{2-} on 415 416 AAOB and the competition between AOB and SOB for DO (Sahinkaya and Kilic, 2014a). Zhang et al. (2020) used S^0 for denitrification and observed only a small effect, when 417 DO was kept at the level of 0.4-0.8 mg/L. When the DO concentration increased to 1.2 mg 418 419 O_2/L , the concentrations of NO_3^--N and SO_4^{2-} also increased. This indicates excessive oxidation of S^{2-} or its reduced compounds in aerobic systems. Under non-limited DO 420 conditions, autotrophic SOB can readily utilize oxygen, which leads to accumulation of SO_4^{2-} . 421 On the other hand, too low DO concentrations in the PNASD process can reduce the NO₂⁻-N 422 423 production rate in PN.

424 5.3. ASD, SPDA and sulfammox systems - coexistence of AAOB and denitrifiers

Under anaerobic conditions, the combination of anammox process and S-dependent autotrophic denitrification can work with high removal efficiencies of TN (88-96%) and S (90-100%) (Table 4). AAOB and T. *denitrificans* can assist in the combined N and S removal without inhibition by S²⁻ (Guo et al., 2016). In that study, most of S²⁻ was oxidized to S⁰ at the influent ratios of NH₄⁺-N/S²⁻ and NO₂⁻-N/S²⁻ at 1.74 and 2.2-2.27, respectively. Two S forms can accumulate depending on the S/N ratio in the reactor, i.e., SO₄²⁻ (at S/N ratio <1) or S⁰ (at S/N ratio >1) (Cardoso et al., 2006).

When NO_2^-N is fed to the anammox process, S-dependent autotrophic denitrification may occur. When both NO_2^-N (anammox substrate) and NO_3^-N (anammox product) are simultaneously present in the influent, the latter form is the preferred electron acceptor for 435 denitrification (Guo et al., 2016). However, a small portion of NO₂⁻-N can also be used by T.
436 *denitrificans* and increase the overall efficiency of N and S removal.

Instead of complete denitrification, partial reduction to NO₂-N can be achieved. This 437 438 approach is advantageous for the Partial Denitrification/Anammox (PD/A) systems by continuously producing NO₂⁻-N for anammox (Wu et al., 2019). In addition, the consumption 439 440 of electron donors can be reduced in comparison with the conventional biological nitrogen 441 removal processes. The reported TN removal efficiencies exceeded 90% in SPDA (Table 4). 442 The novel sulfammox process has been applied in SO_4^{2-} and NH_4^+ -N-rich wastewater treatment systems. One of the intermediates in the sulfammox reaction is NO₂⁻N, which can 443 444 be used by either AAOB or S-dependent autotrophic denitrification along with the residual 445 NO_3 -N from anammox. Wu et al. (2020) combined sulfammox and anammox and obtained high removal efficiencies of NH_4^+ -N (98.5%) and SO_4^{2-} (53%). Furthermore, the sulfammox 446 447 and anammox processes can also be combined with S-dependent autotrophic denitrification 448 (Rios-Del Toro et al., 2018).

449 6. Modeling N, S and C conversions in wastewater treatment systems

Modeling has been proven to be an effective tool to understand complex, interrelated N, S and
C transformations (Show et al., 2013). In principle, two modeling approaches are possible,
including empirical models, such as artificial neural networks (ANNs), and mechanistic
models based on the Activated Sludge Model (ASM) family.

454 6.1. Artificial neural networks (ANNs)

The ANN model does not require a detailed process description, and it can be established by simple input and output parameters. Therefore, the ANN has been known for a long time as a tool in setting control mechanisms and performance models of biological wastewater treatment processes (Choi and Park, 2001). Wang et al (2009a) developed an ANN model to

459 monitor a denitrifying S²⁻ removal (DSR) process. The proposed model revealed that the 460 comparative influences of four input factors on DSR performance were as follows: hydraulic 461 retention time (HRT) > S²⁻ concentration > C/S ratio > N/S ratio. Even though the ANN 462 model is capable of predicting an intricate function between input and output parameters, it 463 cannot help in understanding mechanisms of the complex biochemical processes.

464 6.2. Mechanistic models

The International Water Association Activated Sludge Models (ASMs) No. 1, 2, 2d and 3 (Henze et al., 2000) describe conversions of organic C and N compounds (ASM1 and ASM3), and additionally P compounds (ASM2 and ASM2d). However, to simplify the model structure, all the ASMs only considered NO_3^--N reduction as a one-step heterotrophic process using readily biodegradable organic compounds as electron donors. Moreover, one-step NH_4^+-N oxidation to NO_3^--N was the only autotrophic N transformation.

471 S-dependent autotrophic denitrification and the synergistic and competitive 472 relationships among microorganisms were subsequently integrated with the ASMs. On one 473 hand, developing realistic models is essential for practical applications in simultaneous N, C and S removal systems. On the other hand, due to the complex interactions between 474 475 autotrophic and heterotrophic denitrifiers, developing an exhaustive model and appropriate 476 control strategy becomes challenging. The existing models (Table 5) have been used in 477 bench-scale reactors to predict the process involving intricate metabolic pathways with 478 synthetic substrates. However, further work is still necessary to confirm the models in 479 practical applications with real wastewater.

A detailed description of the mechanistic models can be found in SI (S4).

481 7. Implications of combining the N, S and C cycles in wastewater treatment

482 systems

483 **7.1.** Processes application opportunities

 S^0 and S^{2-} are considered good alternatives to organic matter in the denitrification process due 484 485 to the absence of organic residues in the treated wastewater. It is thus strongly recommended 486 to use S-dependent autotrophic denitrification instead of heterotrophic denitrification, 487 especially for wastewater with a low organic content. Attention should also be paid to the water-insoluble S⁰, which can physically be removed from wastewater and reused for 488 489 production of sulfuric acid, pesticides, fertilizers, in construction (Lin et al., 2018). It is economic, effective and readily available source of electrons. On the other hand, $S_2O_3^{2-}$ is 490 readily bioavailable and may mediate a higher rate of denitrification compared to S^0 and H_2S . 491 S^{2-} is often used in municipal and industrial areas requiring desulphurization. Depending on 492 493 the local conditions, S-dependent autotrophic denitrification can occur with a wide spectrum of S compounds. Moreover, it can get them from the initial SO_4^{2-} reduction stage in the 494 495 integrated systems combining N-S-C cycles.

Biological SRB-based methods are a sustainable way of treating AMD compared to physico-chemical methods (Sinharoy et al., 2020b). SRB are capable of using toxic metals in their metabolism, thus reducing environmental and human health problems. SRB can grow in a wide range of environmental conditions, which provides many opportunities for the development of technologies based on their metabolism, with SO_4^{2-} reduction being recognized as a key step in all S- dependent processes (Hao et al., 2014).

502 Among the various gaseous substrates for SO_4^{2-} reduction, H_2 is most energetic for 503 SRB. The resources that can be recovered from this process are metal sulfides and S⁰, which 504 has also been identified by Kumar and Pakshirajan (2020) as a potential substrate for S-505 dependent autotrophic denitrification. 506 The combination of the N, S and C cycles could lead to the development of 507 economically feasible and sustainable wastewater treatment systems that produce less sludge 508 and reduce carbon footprint compared to the existing systems. The SANI process has already 509 been used in several full-scale wastewater treatment installations in Hong Kong due to the 510 practice of flushing toilets with seawater (Jiang et al., 2013). The process can also be applied to freshwater wastewater, even in cold inland areas that do not contain enough SO_4^{2-} or SO_3^{2-} 511 512 rich wet flue gas desulphurization (Qian et al., 2015a, b, Jiang et al., 2013). It can also be 513 adapted to treat industrial wastewater by adding SO_4^{2-} , seawater or some SO_4^{2-} -rich 514 wastewater. Lu et al. (2009, 2012) suggested that the SANI process could be a good solution 515 in densely populated cities to treat saline wastewater as an economic source in terms of water 516 scarcity and wastewater treatment in water-poor coastal areas. 517 Other technologies that include anammox and SANI processes have discovered the

advantages of AAOB coexisting with SRB, SOB, and AOB. In addition, compared to the SANI process, the combination of SO_4^{2-} reduction, denitrification/anammox and partial nitrification will further reduce aeration energy consumption due to the lack of full nitrification required for NO₃-N production. The presence of anammox in the SRDAPN process resulted in an increased NO₂⁻-N removal efficiency by over 30% (Kosugi et al., 2019).

524 For wastewater with a low organic content, PNASD can be considered a viable option. 525 The two-step PNASD system was more efficient for N and S removal, and easier to maintain 526 than the one-step system (where bacteria competed for DO) (Dasgupta et al., 2017). 527 Moreover, it has also been proven that the process can be applied in a single reactor under

528 mainstream conditions (Yuan et al., 2020).

529 Instead of combining the heterotrophic SO_4^{2-} reduction with anammox, sulfammox 530 can replace or accompany both processes by using a SO_4^{2-} dependent AAOB. Recent studies

532 If SO_4^{2-} was reduced to S^{2-} or S^0 with organic compounds, this process would be replaced

533 with sulfammox, while eliminating the addition of external carbon. Another suggested

solution is to combine the sulfammox process with heterotrophic SO_4^{2-} reduction in order to

535 increase the reduction rate of SO_4^{2-} . Moreover, if sulfammox is used upstream of an S-

- 536 dependent autotrophic denitrification reactor, it contributes to oxidation of NH_4^+ -N to N_2
- 537 (which increases the overall efficiency of NH_4^+ -N removal) or NO_2^- -N and NO_3^- -N (which
- 538 can be used in S- dependent autotrophic denitrification). By combining sulfammox and
- anammox, the efficiency of NH_4^+ -N removal and SO_4^{2-} reduction to S^0 can be simultaneously
- 540 increased (Liu et al., 2021, Grubba et al., 2021).

541 7.2. Advantages and disadvantages of two cycles or three cycles in wastewater treatment

542 The advantages and disadvantages of the systems based on the N-S-C cycles and their 543 coupling are summarized below.

544 Advantages:

545 1. Approximately 35% reduction in energy consumption and up to 90% reduction in sludge546 production compared to full nitrification-denitrification.

547 2. Reduction or even no external carbon dosing for S-dependent autotrophic denitrification.

548 3. For the combined processes, almost complete N and S²⁻ removal and up to 75% efficiency 549 of SO_4^{2-} removal.

550 4. Products of one process used as the substrates for another process.

551 5. When replacing heterotrophic denitrification with S-dependent autotrophic denitrification, 552 carbon consumption is reduced by 100%. If heterotrophic SO_4^{2-} reduction is replaced by 553 sulfammox, carbon consumption is also reduced by 100%.

554 6. Removal of a few harmful compounds (NH_4^+ , NO_2^- , SO_4^{2-} , S^{2-}) in one system.

7. Approximately 30–40% reduction of volumes required for wastewater and sludge treatmentprocesses.

8. Reduction of GHG emissions by 36% compared to conventional nitrification-denitrification.

560 **Disadvantages:**

561 1. Limited use in cold regions due to the high optimal temperature range (28-30°C).

562 2. Complex interactions and competition for substrates between the functional563 microorganisms.

564 3. Greater complexity of the systems potentially resulting in higher investment costs.

565 4. The operating conditions must be compatible with all the N-S-C processes.

566 5. Some substrates/products involved in one process may be inhibitors for other processes,
567 e.g. S²⁻.

568 7.3. Processes application limitations

569 One of the most important limitations of technologies combining N, S and C cycle processes 570 is the narrow optimal range of temperature (28-30°C) and pH (7-7.6). Thus, cold weather in 571 inland areas also restricts the use of coupled systems.

572 An important factor that should be considered when implementing technologies 573 containing the S-dependent autotrophic denitrification process is the inhibition of this process caused by S²⁻ (Cardoso et al., 2006) as well as NO₂⁻-N, NO₃⁻-N and free nitric acid (FNA) 574 (Cui et al., 2019). Even though S^0 is an inexpensive and non-toxic electron donor, but it 575 provides a low denitrification rate due to its low solubility. The use of smaller S granules with 576 577 a larger surface area improves the reaction efficiency, however it can cause low porosity and 578 clogging and fouling of the reactors due to small S grain size or cracking (Wu et al., 2021). Moreover, as S^0 and H_2S reveal a much lower rate of NO_3^--N reduction, mainly the use of 579 $S_2O_3^{2-}$ is recommended in the process. However, its natural content of wastewater is rather 580 limited due to its instability (Cui et al., 2019). 581

In the case of heterotrophic SO_4^{2-} reduction, the presence of DO, NO_3^{-} -N and NO_2^{-} -N inhibits reduction of SO_4^{2-} and enhances oxidation of S^{2-} to S^0 or SO_4^{2-} (Mohanakrishnan et al., 2009). Moreover, the activity of SRB is inhibited by heavy metals, including Pb and Cd

(Sinharoy and Pakshirajan, 2019b). The toxicity of heavy metals depends mainly on the type of metal, responsible microorganisms, presence of other pollutants, and process conditions (Mal et al., 2016). Therefore, the systems based on heterotrophic SO_4^{2-} reduction cannot be used for wastewater rich in heavy metals. Moreover, a significant limitation is the limited number of microorganisms that are able to carry out SO_4^{2-} reduction with the use of gaseous substrates. Moreover, the low gas-liquid mass transfer also makes it difficult to scale-up the process.

592 A significant limitation in the implementation of integrated systems connecting N-S-C cycles is also the insufficient knowledge about the mechanism of sulfammox and responsible 593 594 microorganisms. Until now, there has been no genomic evidence to support the ability of AAOB to use SO_4^{2-} as an electron acceptor. The growth rate of potential functional bacteria is 595 596 also low, which limits their unambiguous identification (Liu et al., 2021). Moreover, the 597 organic matter present in the wastewater stimulates the survival of heterotrophic bacteria, 598 including denitrifiers. This leads to a competition between these bacteria and the sulfammox 599 bacteria, thus destroying the sulfammox process.

MOST WIEDZY Downloaded from mostwiedzy.pl

600 7.4. Processes application challenges

601 Using specific N, S and C removal processes independently of each other is much easier to 602 maintain than the processes combining these cycles. To link those processes in the combined technologies as presented in this review, it is important to recognize the effects of S^{2-} on N 603 604 removal processes, such as autotrophic/heterotrophic denitrification and anammox, as well as the competition between AOB and SOB for DO. S^{2-} and organic matter, which are fed to an 605 606 anaerobic compartment, can inhibit AAOB in anammox-coupled systems (Kosugi et al., 607 2019). Chen et al. (2018) showed that DO can react with S^{2-} while reducing the NO₃⁻-N removal rate. In addition, S^{2-} was reduced to S^{0} and then converted to SO_4^{2-g} due to the 608

presence of DO. These findings highlight the challenges faced by single-stage integratedsystems.

In order to avoid the inhibition of SO_4^{2-} reduction by heavy metals, it is recommended 611 to use an upstream reactor in order to remove metals from AMD using S^{2-} . In order to use 612 SO₄²⁻ reduction coupling systems, it is also necessary to consider selection of the appropriate 613 614 type of reactor, use of resistant microorganisms, and presence of other pollutants. Designing 615 novel reactor configurations with high gas-liquid mass transfer can also help in applying the 616 process in full scale. Moreover, instead of obtaining pure gases, a cost-effective solution 617 would be production of gaseous substrates by thermochemical or biochemical methods from 618 various compounds (e.g. waste) (Sinharoy et al., 2020b).

619 In the case of sulfammox, more research is needed to identify potential applications and integration with other systems. The key enzymes involved in the metabolism of NH4⁺-N 620 and SO_4^{2-} should also be investigated. For this purpose, it is important to develop appropriate 621 622 reactor configurations and create operational conditions that can enrich functional bacteria and allow for simultaneous removal of NH4⁺-N and SO4²⁻. Under non-limited NO3⁻-N 623 conditions, the SO₄²⁻ concentration may increase due to S-dependent autotrophic 624 denitrification. The role of organic matter also requires further investigation with regard to the 625 626 existence of the sulfammox process.

The combination of anammox, S-dependent autotrophic denitrification and sulfammox processes is challenging due to the different requirements of the microorganisms responsible for each process. The S-dependent autotrophic denitrification process may result in the production of SO_4^{2-} from S^{2-} or S^0 , which negatively affects sulfammox, where SO_4^{2-} must be reduced to S^0 (Liu et al., 2021). More focused research on the coexistence of sulfammox with other bacteria and the development of a mechanistic model are needed to better understand and predict N and S dynamics. Moreover, the S/N ratio also plays an important role in

determining the S-dependent autotrophic denitrification end products, requiring a closer look at the N and S dynamics. On the other hand, in order to avoid fouling and clogging of the reactors due to the presence of S^0 , it is important to search for the appropriate sulfur grain size.

Wang et al. (2009b) identified three main challenges for the SANI process. First of all, it is the low efficiency of both SO_4^{2-} reduction during heterotrophic and S-dependent autotrophic denitrification reduction. Secondly, high concentrations of SO_4^{2-} are required, which may increase residual S^{2-} in the treated wastewater. Thirdly, transfer of NO_3^{-} -N from the nitrification reactor to the S-dependent autotrophic denitrification reactor can also be difficult.

644 8. Conclusions

In terms of sustainability, the combination of N-S-C cycles processes has a few important benefits, including energy savings and lower sludge production. The combined processes allow for almost complete N and S²⁻ removal, while the efficiency of SO_4^{2-} removal can reach up to 75%.

Among all the processes linking the N-S-C cycles, SANI has been best recognized, but is rather not applicable in the case of wastewater with low organic content. Instead, it is worth of considering the sulfammox process that can reduce SO_4^{2-} and increase NH_4^+ -N removal rate under anoxic conditions without the addition of external carbon.

Practical applications of the reviewed systems still face many challenges, especially in the single-stage configurations. In particular, the coexistence of several bacterial groups (AOB, AAOB, sulfammox bacteria, SOB, SRB) and their competition for the substrates is a key issue to be considered. Moreover, practical applications of the coupled S and N/C cycles require realistic models. However, due to the complex interactions between autotrophic and

- 658 heterotrophic denitrifiers, development of a mechanistic model and appropriate control
- 659 strategy becomes challenging.
- 660 **Declaration of Competing Interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing
- 661 financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work
- reported in this paper.
- 663 Funding: This work was supported by the Narodowe Centrum Nauki (National Science
- 664 Center) under Grant [2020/37/N/ST8/02455].

665 **References:**

Azhar, M. A., Canfield, D. E., Fennel, K., Thamdrup, B., & Bjerrum, C. J. (2014). A model-based insight
into the coupling of nitrogen and sulfur cycles in a coastal upwelling system. Journal of Geophysical Research: *Biogeosciences*, 119(3), 264-285. doi.org/10.1002/2012JG002271

Baker, S. C., Ferguson, S. J., Ludwig, B., Page, M. D., Richter, O. -. H., & Van Spanning, R. J. M. (1998).
Molecular genetics of the genus paracoccus: Metabolically versatile bacteria with bioenergetic flexibility. *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews*, 62(4), 1046-1078. doi:10.1128/mmbr.62.4.1046-1078.1998

Bertolino, S. M., Melgaço, L. A., Sá, R. G., & Leão, V. A. (2014). Comparing lactate and glycerol as a single-electron donor for sulfate reduction in fluidized bed reactors. *Biodegradation*, 25(5), 719-733.
doi:10.1007/s10532-014-9694-1

Cai, J., Jiang, J. X., & Zheng, P. (2010). Isolation and identification of bacteria responsible for simultaneous
anaerobic ammonium and sulfate removal. *Science China Chemistry*, *53*(3), 645-650. doi:10.1007/s11426-0100053-8

678 Cardoso, R. B., Sierra-Alvarez, R., Rowlette, P., Flores, E. R., Gómez, J., & Field, J. A. (2006). Sulfide
679 oxidation under chemolithoautotrophic denitrifying conditions. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, 95(6), 1148680 1157. doi:10.1002/bit.21084

681 Carvajal-Arroyo, J. M., Sun, W., Sierra-Alvarez, R., & Field, J. A. (2013). Inhibition of anaerobic
682 ammonium oxidizing (anammox) enrichment cultures by substrates, metabolites and common wastewater
683 constituents. *Chemosphere*, 91(1), 22-27. doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2012.11.025

Chamchoi, N., Nitisoravut, S., & Schmidt, J. E. (2008). Inactivation of ANAMMOX communities under concurrent operation of anaerobic ammonium oxidation (ANAMMOX) and denitrification. *Bioresource Technology*, 99(9), 3331-3336. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2007.08.029

Chapman, D. (Editor) (1992). Water Quality Assessments. Published E & FN Spon on behalf of UNESCO, WHO and UNEP. London.

Chen, C., Shao, B., Zhang, R. -., Xu, X. -., Zhou, X., Yuan, Y., . . ., & Lee, D. -. (2018). Mitigating adverse impacts of varying sulfide/nitrate ratios on denitrifying sulfide removal process performance. *Bioresource Technology*, 267, 782-788. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2018.07.096

Chen, X., Liu, Y., Peng, L., Yuan, Z., & Ni, B. J. (2016). Model-based feasibility assessment of membrane biofilm reactor to achieve simultaneous ammonium, dissolved methane, and sulfide removal from anaerobic digestion liquor. *Scientific reports*, 6(1), 1-13. doi.org/10.1038/srep25114

Choi, D. -., & Park, H. (2001). A hybrid artificial neural network as a software sensor for optimal control of a wastewater treatment process. *Water Research*, 35(16), 3959-3967. doi:10.1016/S0043-1354(01)00134-8

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

Costa, J. M., Castro, K. C. D., Rodriguez, R. P., & Sancinetti, G. P. (2020). Anaerobic reactors for the treat ment of sulphate and metal-rich wastewater: A review. *International Journal of Environmental Analytical Chemistry*, doi:10.1080/03067319.2020.1728261

Cui, Y. -., Biswal, B. K., Guo, G., Deng, Y. -., Huang, H., Chen, G. -., & Wu, D. (2019). Biological nitrogen
removal from wastewater using sulphur-driven autotrophic denitrification. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, *103*(15), 6023-6039. doi:10.1007/s00253-019-09935-4

Dapena-Mora, A., Fernández, I., Campos, J. L., Mosquera-Corral, A., Méndez, R., & Jetten, M. S. M.
(2007). Evaluation of activity and inhibition effects on anammox process by batch tests based on the nitrogen
gas production. *Enzyme and Microbial Technology*, 40(4), 859-865. doi:10.1016/j.enzmictec.2006.06.018

Dasgupta, S., Wu, S., & Goel, R. (2017). Coupling autotrophic denitrification with partial nitritation anammox (PNA) for efficient total inorganic nitrogen removal. *Bioresource Technology*, 243, 700-707.
 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.06.130

Dosta, J., Fernández, I., Vázquez-Padín, J. R., Mosquera-Corral, A., Campos, J. L., Mata-Álvarez, J., &
Méndez, R. (2008). Short- and long-term effects of temperature on the anammox process. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 154(1-3), 688-693. doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2007.10.082

Grubba, D., Majtacz, J., & Mąkinia, J. (2021). Sulfate reducing ammonium oxidation (SULFAMMOX) pro cess under anaerobic conditions. *Environmental Technology and Innovation*, 22 doi:10.1016/j.eti.2021.101416

Guo, Q., Hu, H. -., Shi, Z. -., Yang, C. -., Li, P., Huang, M., . . ., & Jin, R. -. (2016). Towards
simultaneously removing nitrogen and sulfur by a novel process: Anammox and autotrophic desulfurizationdenitrification (AADD). *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 297, 207-216. doi:10.1016/j.cej.2016.03.138

Hao, T. -., Xiang, P. -., Mackey, H. R., Chi, K., Lu, H., Chui, H. -., ..., & Chen, G. -. (2014). A review of
biological sulfate conversions in wastewater treatment. *Water Research*, 65, 1-21.
doi:10.1016/j.watres.2014.06.043

Hao, T., Luo, J., Wei, L., Mackey, H. R., Liu, R., Rey Morito, G., & Chen, G. -. (2015). Physicochemical
and biological characterization of long-term operated sulfate reducing granular sludge in the SANIreg
process. *Water Research*, 71, 74-84. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2014.12.051

Hao, T., Wei, L., Lu, H., Chui, H., Mackey, H. R., van Loosdrecht, M. C. M., & Chen, G. (2013).
Characterization of sulfate-reducing granular sludge in the SANI® process. *Water Research*, 47(19), 7042-7052.
doi:10.1016/j.watres.2013.07.052

Hellinga, C., Schellen, A. A. J. C., Mulder, J. W., Van Loosdrecht, M. C. M., & Heijnen, J. J. (1998). The SHARON process: An innovative method for nitrogen removal from ammonium-rich waste water. *Water Science and Technology*, *37*(9), 135-142. doi:10.1016/S0273-1223(98)00281-9

Henze, M., Gujer, W., Mino, T., Van Loosdrecht, M.C.M. (2000). Activated sludge models ASM1, ASM2, ASM2d and ASM3. *IWA Scientific and Technical Report 9*, IWA publishing, London.

Jaroszynski, L. W., Cicek, N., Sparling, R., & Oleszkiewicz, J. A. (2011). Importance of the operating pH in maintaining the stability of anoxic ammonium oxidation (anammox) activity in moving bed biofilm reactors. *Bioresource Technology*, *102*(14), 7051-7056. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2011.04.069

Jarvis, A. P., & Younger, P. L. (2000). Broadening the scope of mine water environmental impact assessment: A UK perspective. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 20(1), 85-96. doi:10.1016/S0195-9255(99)00032-3

Jetten, M. S. M., Wagner, M., Fuerst, J., Van Loosdrecht, M., Kuenen, G., & Strous, M. (2001). Microbiology and application of the anaerobic ammonium oxidation ('anammox') process. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, *12*(3), 283-288. doi:10.1016/S0958-1669(00)00211-1

726

727

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

- Jiang, F., Zhang, L., Peng, G. -., Liang, S. -., Qian, J., Wei, L., & Chen, G. -. (2013). A novel approach to
 realize SANI process in freshwater sewage treatment use of wet flue gas desulfurization waste streams as sulfur
 source. *Water Research*, 47(15), 5773-5782. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2013.06.051
- 743 Jin, R. -., Yang, G. -., Zhang, Q. -., Ma, C., Yu, J. -., & Xing, B. -. (2013). The effect of sulfide inhibition on 744 the ANAMMOX process. *Water Research*, 47(3), 1459-1469. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2012.12.018
- Jing, C., Ping, Z., & Mahmood, Q. (2010). Influence of various nitrogenous electron acceptors on the anaerobic sulfide oxidation. *Bioresource Technology*, *101*(9), 2931-2937. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2009.11.047
- Kanders, L., Areskoug, T., Schneider, Y., Ling, D., Punzi, M., & Beier, M. (2014). Impact of seeding on the
 start-up of one-stage deammonification MBBRs. *Environmental Technology (United Kingdom)*, 35(22), 27672773. doi:10.1080/09593330.2014.920421
- Kim, H. -., Lee, I. -., & Bae, J. -. (2004). Performance of a sulphur-utilizing fluidized bed reactor for post denitrification. *Process Biochemistry*, *39*(11), 1591-1597. doi:10.1016/j.procbio.2003.07.004
- Kimura, K., Nakamura, M., & Watanabe, Y. (2002). Nitrate removal by a combination of elemental sulfurbased denitrification and membrane filtration. *Water Research*, *36*(7), 1758-1766. doi:10.1016/S00431354(01)00376-1
- Koenig, A., & Liu, L. H. (2001). Kinetic model of autotrophic denitrification in sulphur packed-bed reactors. *Water Research*, *35*(8), 1969-1978. doi:10.1016/S0043-1354(00)00483-8
- Koenig, A., & Liu, L. H. (2002). Use of limestone for pH control in autotrophic denitrification: Continuous
 flow experiments in pilot-scale packed bed reactors. *Journal of Biotechnology*, *99*(2), 161-171.
 doi:10.1016/S0168-1656(02)00183-9
- Kosugi, Y., Matsuura, N., Liang, Q., & Yamamoto-Ikemoto, R. (2019). Nitrogen flow and microbial
 community in the anoxic reactor of "Sulfate reduction, Denitrification/Anammox and partial nitrification"
 process. *Biochemical Engineering Journal*, 151 doi:10.1016/j.bej.2019.107304
- Kouba, V., Vejmelkova, D., Proksova, E., Wiesinger, H., Concha, M., Dolejs, P., . . ., & Bartacek, J. (2017).
 High-rate partial nitritation of municipal wastewater after psychrophilic anaerobic pretreatment. *Environmental Science and Technology*, *51*(19), 11029-11038. doi:10.1021/acs.est.7b02078
- Kumar, M., & Pakshirajan, K. (2020). Novel insights into mechanism of biometal recovery from wastewater
 by sulfate reduction and its application in pollutant removal. *Environmental Technology and Innovation*, 17 doi:10.1016/j.eti.2019.100542
 - Kumar, M., Nandi, M., & Pakshirajan, K. (2021). Recent advances in heavy metal recovery from wastewater by biogenic sulfide precipitation. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 278 doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.111555
 - Kumar, M., Sinharoy, A., & Pakshirajan, K. (2018). Process integration for biological sulfate reduction in a carbon monoxide fed packed bed reactor. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 219, 294-303. doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2018.04.033
 - Lin, S., Mackey, H. R., Hao, T., Guo, G., van Loosdrecht, M. C. M., & Chen, G. (2018). Biological sulfur oxidation in wastewater treatment: A review of emerging opportunities. *Water Research*, 143, 399-415. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2018.06.051
 - Liu, C., Li, W., Li, X., Zhao, D., Ma, B., Wang, Y., Lee, D. (2017). Nitrite accumulation in continuous-flow partial autotrophic denitrification reactor using sulfide as electron donor. *Bioresource Technology*, 243, 1237-1240. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.07.030
 - Liu, L. -., Xie, G. -., Xing, D. -., Liu, B. -., Ding, J., Cao, G. -., & Ren, N. -. (2021). Sulfate dependent ammonium oxidation: A microbial process linked nitrogen with sulfur cycle and potential application. *Environmental Research*, 192 doi:10.1016/j.envres.2020.110282

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

- Liu, S., Yang, F., Gong, Z., Meng, F., Chen, H., Xue, Y., & Furukawa, K. (2008). Application of anaerobic
 ammonium-oxidizing consortium to achieve completely autotrophic ammonium and sulfate removal. *Biore- source Technology*, 99(15), 6817-6825. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2008.01.054
- Liu, X., Dai, J., Wu, D., Jiang, F., Chen, G., Chui, H. -., & van Loosdrecht, M. C. M. (2016). Sustainable
 application of a novel water cycle using seawater for toilet flushing. *Engineering*, 2(4), 460-469.
 doi:10.1016/J.ENG.2016.04.013
- Lu, H., Ekama, G. A., Wu, D., Feng, J., van Loosdrecht, M. C. M., & Chen, G. -. (2012). SANI® process
 realizes sustainable saline sewage treatment: Steady state model-based evaluation of the pilot-scale trial of the
 process. *Water Research*, 46(2), 475-490. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2011.11.031
- Lu, H., Wang, J., Li, S., Chen, G. -., van Loosdrecht, M. C. M., & Ekama, G. A. (2009). Steady-state modelbased evaluation of sulfate reduction, autotrophic denitrification and nitrification integrated (SANI)
 process. *Water Research*, 43(14), 3613-3621. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2009.05.013
- Lu, H., Wu, D., Tang, D. T. W., Chen, G. H., Van Loosdrecht, M. C. M., & Ekama, G. (2011). Pilot scale
 evaluation of SANI® process for sludge minimization and greenhouse gas reduction in saline sewage
 treatment. *Water Science and Technology*, 63(10), 2149-2154. doi:10.2166/wst.2011.342
- Mal, J., Nancharaiah, Y. V., van Hullebusch, E. D., & Lens, P. N. L. (2016). Effect of heavy metal co-contaminants on selenite bioreduction by anaerobic granular sludge. *Bioresource Technology*, 206, 1-8.
 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2016.01.064
- Mohanakrishnan, J., Gutierrez, O., Sharma, K. R., Guisasola, A., Werner, U., Meyer, R. L., . . ., & Yuan, Z.
 (2009). Impact of nitrate addition on biofilm properties and activities in rising main sewers. *Water Research, 43*(17), 4225-4237. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2009.06.021
- Moraes, B. S., Souza, T. S. O., & Foresti, E. (2012). Effect of sulfide concentration on autotrophic denitrification from nitrate and nitrite in vertical fixed-bed reactors. *Process Biochemistry*, 47(9), 1395-1401.
 doi:10.1016/j.procbio.2012.05.008
- Muyzer, G., & Stams, A. J. M. (2008). The ecology and biotechnology of sulphate-reducing bacteria. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 6(6), 441-454. doi:10.1038/nrmicro1892
- Nevatalo, L. M., Mäkinen, A. E., Kaksonen, A. H., & Puhakka, J. A. (2010). Biological hydrogen sulfide
 production in an ethanol-lactate fed fluidized-bed bioreactor. *Bioresource Technology*, 101(1), 276-284.
 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2009.07.042
 - Nielsen, G., Coudert, L., Janin, A., Blais, J. F., & Mercier, G. (2019). Influence of organic carbon sources on metal removal from mine impacted water using sulfate-reducing bacteria bioreactors in cold climates. *Mine Water and the Environment*, 38(1), 104-118. doi:10.1007/s10230-018-00580-3
 - Nielsen, G., Hatam, I., Abuan, K. A., Janin, A., Coudert, L., Blais, J. F., . . ., & Baldwin, S. A. (2018). Semi-passive in-situ pilot scale bioreactor successfully removed sulfate and metals from mine impacted water under subarctic climatic conditions. *Water Research*, 140, 268-279. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2018.04.035
 - Oshiki, M., Shimokawa, M., Fujii, N., Satoh, H., & Okabe, S. (2011). Physiological characteristics of the anaerobic ammonium-oxidizing bacterium 'candidatus brocadia sinica'. *Microbiology*, 157(6), 1706-1713. doi:10.1099/mic.0.048595-0
 - Pokorna, D., & Zabranska, J. (2015). Sulfur-oxidizing bacteria in environmental technology. *Biotechnology Advances*, 33(6), 1246-1259. doi:10.1016/j.biotechadv.2015.02.007
 - Prachakittikul, P., Wantawin, C., Noophan, P., & Boonapatcharoen, N. (2016). ANAMMOX-like performances for nitrogen removal from ammonium-sulfate-rich wastewater in an anaerobic sequencing batch reactor. *Journal of Environmental Science and Health - Part A Toxic/Hazardous Substances and Environmental Engineering*, 51(3), 220-228. doi:10.1080/10934529.2015.1094336

814

815

816

817

818

819

820

821

822

823

824

825

826
- Qian, J., Jiang, F., Chui, H. K., Van Loosdrecht, M. C. M., & Chen, G. H. (2013). Industrial flue gas
 desulfurization waste may offer an opportunity to facilitate SANI® application for significant sludge
 minimization in freshwater wastewater treatment. *Water Science and Technology*, 67(12), 2822-2826.
 doi:10.2166/wst.2013.187
- Qian, J., Liu, R., Wei, L., Lu, H., & Chen, G. -. (2015a). System evaluation and microbial analysis of a
 sulfur cycle-based wastewater treatment process for co-treatment of simple wet flue gas desulfurization wastes
 with freshwater sewage. *Water Research*, 80, 189-199. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2015.05.005
- Qian, J., Lu, H., Cui, Y., Wei, L., Liu, R., & Chen, G. -. (2015c). Investigation on thiosulfate-involved
 organics and nitrogen removal by a sulfur cycle-based biological wastewater treatment process. *Water Research*, 69, 295-306. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2014.11.038
- Qian, J., Lu, H., Jiang, F., Ekama, G. A., & Chen, G. -. (2015b). Beneficial co-treatment of simple wet flue
 gas desulphurization wastes with freshwater sewage through development of mixed denitrification-SANI
 process. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 262, 109-118. doi:10.1016/j.cej.2014.09.066
- Qin, Y., Wei, Q., Zhang, Y., Li, H., Jiang, Y., & Zheng, J. (2021). Nitrogen removal from ammonium- and
 sulfate-rich wastewater in an upflow anaerobic sludge bed reactor: Performance and microbial community
 structure. *Ecotoxicology*, doi:10.1007/s10646-020-02333-x
- Qin, Y., Wei, Q., Zhang, Y., Li, H., Jiang, Y., & Zheng, J. (2021). Nitrogen removal from ammonium- and
 sulfate-rich wastewater in an upflow anaerobic sludge bed reactor: Performance and microbial community
 structure. *Ecotoxicology*, 30(8), 1719-1730. doi:10.1007/s10646-020-02333-x
- Rasol, R. M., Noor, N. M., & Din, M. M. (2015). Effect of temperature in SRB growth for oil and gas
 pipeline. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, 8(13) doi:10.17485/ijst/2015/v8i13/70635
- Reyes-Alvarado, L. C., Camarillo-Gamboa, Á., Rustrian, E., Rene, E. R., Esposito, G., Lens, P. N. L., &
 Houbron, E. (2018). Lignocellulosic biowastes as carrier material and slow release electron donor for sulphidogenesis of wastewater in an inverse fluidized bed bioreactor. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 25(6), 5115-5128. doi:10.1007/s11356-017-9334-5
- Reyes-Alvarado, L. C., Okpalanze, N. N., Rene, E. R., Rustrian, E., Houbron, E., Esposito, G., & Lens, P.
 N. L. (2017). Carbohydrate based polymeric materials as slow release electron donors for sulphate removal from
 wastewater. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 200, 407-415. doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2017.05.074
- Rikmann, E., Zekker, I., Tomingas, M., Tenno, T., Loorits, L., Vabamäe, P., . . ., & Tenno, T. (2016).
 Sulfate-reducing anammox for sulfate and nitrogen containing wastewaters. *Desalination and Water Treatment*, 57(7), 3132-3141. doi:10.1080/19443994.2014.984339
 - Rios-Del Toro, E. E., & Cervantes, F. J. (2016). Coupling between anammox and autotrophic denitrification for simultaneous removal of ammonium and sulfide by enriched marine sediments. *Biodegradation*, 27(2-3), 107-118. doi:10.1007/s10532-016-9759-4
 - Rios-Del Toro, E. E., Valenzuela, E. I., López-Lozano, N. E., Cortés-Martínez, M. G., Sánchez-Rodríguez,
 M. A., Calvario-Martínez, O., . . ., & Cervantes, F. J. (2018). Anaerobic ammonium oxidation linked to sulfate and ferric iron reduction fuels nitrogen loss in marine sediments. *Biodegradation*, 29(5), 429-442. doi:10.1007/s10532-018-9839-8
 - Sabba, F., DeVries, A., Vera, M., Druschel, G., Bott, C., & Nerenberg, R. (2016). Potential use of sulfite as a supplemental electron donor for wastewater denitrification. *Reviews in Environmental Science and Biotechnology*, *15*(4), 563-572. doi:10.1007/s11157-016-9413-y
 - Sáez-Navarrete, C., Rodríguez-Córdova, L., Baraza, X., Gelmi, C., & Herrera, L. (2012). Hydrogen kinetics limitation of an autotrophic sulphate reduction reactor. [Limitación cinética de hidrógeno de un reactor auto-trófico de reducción de sulfato] *DYNA* (Colombia), 79(172), 126-132.

860

861

862

863

864

865

866

867

868

869

870

- Sahinkaya, E., & Dursun, N. (2015). Use of elemental sulfur and thiosulfate as electron sources for water
 denitrification. *Bioprocess and Biosystems Engineering*, 38(3), 531-541. doi:10.1007/s00449-014-1293-3
- Sahinkaya, E., & Kilic, A. (2014a). Heterotrophic and elemental-sulfur-based autotrophic denitrification
 processes for simultaneous nitrate and cr(VI) reduction. *Water Research*, 50, 278-286.
- 876 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2013.12.005
- Sahinkaya, E., Kilic, A., & Duygulu, B. (2014b). Pilot and full scale applications of sulfur-based autotrophic
 denitrification process for nitrate removal from activated sludge process effluent. Water Research, 60, 210-217.
 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2014.04.052
- Serrano, A., Peces, M., Astals, S., & Villa-Gómez, D. K. (2019). Batch assays for biological sulfate-reduction:
 A review towards a standardized protocol. *Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology*, 50(12),
 1195-1223. doi:10.1080/10643389.2019.1644103
- Show, K. -., Lee, D. -., & Pan, X. (2013). Simultaneous biological removal of nitrogen-sulfur-carbon:
 Recent advances and challenges. *Biotechnology Advances*, 31(4), 409-420.
- 885 doi:10.1016/j.biotechadv.2012.12.006
- Sinharoy, A., & Pakshirajan, K. (2019b). Heavy metal sequestration by sulfate reduction using carbon
 monoxide as the sole carbon and energy source. *Process Biochemistry*, 82, 135-143.
 doi:10.1016/j.procbio.2019.04.002
- 889 Sinharoy, A., Baskaran, D., & Pakshirajan, K. (2019a). A novel carbon monoxide fed moving bed biofilm
- 890 reactor for sulfate rich wastewater treatment. Journal of Environmental
- 891 Management, 249 doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.109402
- Sinharoy, A., Baskaran, D., & Pakshirajan, K. (2020a). Process integration and artificial neural network
 modeling of biological sulfate reduction using a carbon monoxide fed gas lift bioreactor. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 391 doi:10.1016/j.cej.2019.123518
- Sinharoy, A., Pakshirajan, K., & Lens, P. N. L. (2020b). Biological sulfate reduction using gaseous
 substrates to treat acid mine drainage. *Current Pollution Reports*, 6(4), 328-344. doi:10.1007/s40726-020-001606
- Srivastava, R. K., & Jozewicz, W. (2001). Flue gas desulfurization: The state of the art. *Journal of the Air and Waste Management Association*, 51(12), 1676-1688. doi:10.1080/10473289.2001.10464387
 - Sun, X., Du, L., Hou, Y., Cheng, S., Zhang, X., & Liu, B. (2018). Endogenous influences on anammox and sulfocompound-oxidizing autotrophic denitrification coupling system (A/SAD) and dynamic operating strategy. *Bioresource Technology*, 264, 253-260. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2018.02.081
 - Sun, Y., & Nemati, M. (2012). Evaluation of sulfur-based autotrophic denitrification and denitritation for biological removal of nitrate and nitrite from contaminated waters. *Bioresource Technology*, *114*, 207-216. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2012.03.061
 - Tang, K., Baskaran, V., & Nemati, M. (2009). Bacteria of the sulphur cycle: An overview of microbiology, biokinetics and their role in petroleum and mining industries. *Biochemical Engineering Journal*, 44(1), 73-94. doi:10.1016/j.bej.2008.12.011
 - Tsukamoto, T. K., Killion, H. A., & Miller, G. C. (2004). Column experiments for microbiological treatment of acid mine drainage: Low-temperature, low-pH and matrix investigations. *Water Research*, 38(6), 1405-1418. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2003.12.012
 - Van den Brand, T. P. H., Roest, K., Chen, G. H., Brdjanovic, D., & van Loosdrecht, M. C. M. (2015). Potential for beneficial application of sulfate reducing bacteria in sulfate containing domestic wastewater treatment. *World Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology*, *31*(11), 1675-1681. doi:10.1007/s11274-015-1935-x

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909

910

911

912

913

- Van Houten, B. H. G. W., Van Doesburg, W., Dijkman, H., Copini, C., Smidt, H., & Stams, A. J. M. (2009).
 Long-term performance and microbial community analysis of a full-scale synthesis gas fed reactor treating sulfate- and zinc-rich wastewater. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 84(3), 555-563. doi:10.1007/s00253009-2075-8
- Virpiranta, H., Taskila, S., Leiviskä, T., Rämö, J., & Tanskanen, J. (2019). Development of a process for
 microbial sulfate reduction in cold mining waters cold acclimation of bacterial consortia from an arctic mining
 district. *Environmental Pollution*, 252, 281-288. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2019.05.087
- Wang, A., Liu, C., Han, H., Ren, N., & LEE, D. -. (2009a). Modeling denitrifying sulfide removal process
 using artificial neural networks. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 168(2-3), 1274-1279.
 doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2009.03.006
- Wang, A., Liu, C., Ren, N., Han, H., & Lee, D. (2010). Simultaneous removal of sulfide, nitrate and acetate:
 Kinetic modeling. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 178(1-3), 35-41. doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2010.01.039
- Wang, D., Liu, B., Ding, X., Sun, X., Liang, Z., Sheng, S., & Du, L. (2017). Performance evaluation and
 microbial community analysis of the function and fate of ammonia in a sulfate-reducing EGSB reactor. *Applied*Microbiology and Biotechnology, 101(20), 7729-7739. doi:10.1007/s00253-017-8514-z
- Wang, J., Lu, H., Chen, G. -., Lau, G. N., Tsang, W. L., & van Loosdrecht, M. C. M. (2009b). A novel
 sulfate reduction, autotrophic denitrification, nitrification integrated (SANI) process for saline wastewater
 treatment. *Water Research*, 43(9), 2363-2372. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2009.02.037
- Wisniewski, K., di Biase, A., Munz, G., Oleszkiewicz, J. A., & Makinia, J. (2019). Kinetic characterization
 of hydrogen sulfide inhibition of suspended anammox biomass from a membrane bioreactor. *Biochemical Engineering Journal*, 143, 48-57. doi:10.1016/j.bej.2018.12.015
- Wu, D., Deng, Y., Chen, G. (2019) Developing a new thiosulfate-driven sulfur-cycle anammox process.
 Conference Paper, The 16th International Water Association (IWA) World Conference on Anaerobic Digestion,
 Delft, The Netherlands, 23-27 June 2019
- Wu, D., Ekama, G. A., Chui, H. -., Wang, B., Cui, Y. -., Hao, T. -..., & Chen, G. -. (2016). Large-scale
 demonstration of the sulfate reduction autotrophic denitrification nitrification integrated (SANI®) process in
 saline sewage treatment. *Water Research*, *100*, 496-507. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2016.05.052
- Wu, L., Wei, W., Xu, J., Chen, X., Liu, Y., Peng, L., & Ni, B. -. (2021). Denitrifying biofilm processes for
 wastewater treatment: Developments and perspectives. *Environmental Science: Water Research and Technology*, 7(1), 40-67. doi:10.1039/d0ew00576b
- Wu, L., Yan, Z., Li, J., Huang, S., Li, Z., Shen, M., & Peng, Y. (2020). Low temperature advanced nitrogen
 and sulfate removal from landfill leachate by nitrite-anammox and sulfate-anammox. *Environmental Pollution, 259* doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2019.113763
 - Xu, G., Yin, F., Chen, S., Xu, Y., & Yu, H. -. (2016). Mathematical modeling of autotrophic denitrification (AD) process with sulphide as electron donor. *Water Research*, *91*, 225-234. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2016.01.011
 - Xu, X. -., Chen, C., Wang, A. -., Ni, B. -., Guo, W. -., Yuan, Y., . . ., & Ren, N. -. (2017). Mathematical modeling of simultaneous carbon-nitrogen-sulfur removal from industrial wastewater. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 321, 371-381. doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2016.08.074
 - Xu, X., Chen, C., Wang, A., Guo, W., Zhou, X., Lee, D. -., ..., & Chang, J. -. (2014). Simultaneous removal of sulfide, nitrate and acetate under denitrifying sulfide removal condition: Modeling and experimental validation. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 264, 16-24. doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2013.10.056
 - Yang, W., Lu, H., Khanal, S. K., Zhao, Q., Meng, L., & Chen, G. -. (2016). Granulation of sulfur-oxidizing bacteria for autotrophic denitrification. *Water Research*, 104, 507-519. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2016.08.049

949

950

951

952

953

954

955

956

- Yang, Z., Zhou, S., & Sun, Y. (2009). Start-up of simultaneous removal of ammonium and sulfate from an
 anaerobic ammonium oxidation (anammox) process in an anaerobic up-flow bioreactor. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 169(1-3), 113-118. doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2009.03.067
- Yin, Z., Santos, C. E. D. D., Vilaplana, J. G., Sobotka, D., Czerwionka, K., Damianovic, M. H. R. Z., ..., &
 Makinia, J. (2016). Importance of the combined effects of dissolved oxygen and pH on optimization of nitrogen
 removal in anammox-enriched granular sludge. *Process Biochemistry*, 51(9), 1274-1282.
- 964 doi:10.1016/j.procbio.2016.05.025
- Yuan, Y., Li, X., & Li, B. -. (2020). Autotrophic nitrogen removal characteristics of PN-anammox process
 enhanced by sulfur autotrophic denitrification under mainstream conditions. *Bioresource Technology*, 316 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2020.123926
- 268 Zhang, D., Cui, L., Madani, R. M. A., Wang, H., Zhu, H., & Liang, J. (2019a). Effect of nitrite and nitrate
 269 on sulfate reducing ammonium oxidation. *Water Science and Technology*, 80(4), 634-643.
 270 doi:10.2166/wst.2019.277j
- P71 Zhang, D., Cui, L., Wang, H., & Liang, J. (2019b). Study of sulfate-reducing ammonium oxidation process
 P72 and its microbial community composition. *Water Science and Technology*, 79(1), 137-144.
 P73 doi:10.2166/wst.2019.027
- 274 Zhang, K., Kang, T., Yao, S., Liang, B., Chang, M., Wang, Y., . . ., & Zhu, T. (2020). A novel coupling
 process with partial nitritation-anammox and short-cut sulfur autotrophic denitrification in a single reactor for
 the treatment of high ammonium-containing wastewater. *Water*
- 977 Research, 180 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2020.115813
- 278 Zhu, G., Peng, Y., Li, B., Guo, J., Yang, Q., & Wang, S. (2008). Biological removal of nitrogen from
 279 wastewater. *Reviews of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology*, 192, 159-195. doi:10.1007/978-0-387280 71724-1_5
- Zhu, T. -., Cheng, H. -., Yang, L. -., Su, S. -., Wang, H. -., Wang, S. -., & Wang, A. -. (2019). Coupled sulfur and iron(II) carbonate-driven autotrophic denitrification for significantly enhanced nitrate removal. *Environ- mental Science and Technology*, 53(3), 1545-1554. doi:10.1021/acs.est.8b06865
- Zou, G., Papirio, S., Lakaniemi, A. -., Ahoranta, S. H., & Puhakka, J. A. (2016). High rate autotrophic denitrification in fluidized-bed biofilm reactors. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 284, 1287-1294.
 doi:10.1016/j.cej.2015.09.074

Table 1. Key issues and challenges of S-dependent autotrophic denitrification, heterotrophic sulfate reduction and sulfammox

Торіс	Process											
	S-dependent autotrophic denitrification	Heterotrophic sulfate reduction	Sulfammox									
Key issues	consists of oxidation of S compounds, including S^{2-} , S^{0} , thiosulfate ($S_2O_3^{2-}$) and sulfite (SO_3^{2-}), coupled with reduction of NO_3^{-} -N and/or NO_2^{-} -N	SO ₄ ²⁻ reduction, which involves the use of organic electron donors or inorganic electron donors, which must be supplemented with a carbon source	NH_4^+ -N is oxidized to N_2 , whereas $SO_4^{2^-}$ plays the role of an electron acceptor and is reduced to S^0 under anaerobic conditions									
Challenges and opportunities	 a) a good alternative to heterotrophic denitrification due to the lack of carbon dosing; b) reduction of toxic S²⁻; c) the possibility of treating wastewater poor in organic content; d) residual SO₄²⁻ in wastewater; e) a long incubation time is needed before a fully adapted culture is obtained; f) precise control strategy (from S²⁻ to S⁰) and novel S⁰ recovery technology at the source; g) acclimation and adjustment of microorganisms: the concentration of S²⁻ should be controlled; maintaining the denitrification efficiency of autotrophic denitrification systems at low temperatures; alkalinity and pH control is necessary to prevent the formation of NO₂⁻-N; influence of the N/S ratio on the reactions and bioproducts, the optimal N/S ratio = 0.5-0.9 for S oxidation and NO₃-N reduction (see Eqs. 1-8 in the SI); h) when the dissolved oxygen (DO) concentration is > 1.6 mg O₂/L, denitrification is completely inhibited 	 a) SO₄²⁻ reduction, especially in SO₄²⁻ rich industrial wastewater; b) use of wastewater rich in organic compounds; c) high concentrations of SO₄²⁻ inhibit SRB activity; d) elevated levels of heavy metals may reduce or terminate SRB activity 	 a) anaerobic oxidation of NH₄-N without carbon addition; b) SO₄²⁻ reduction in wastewater; c) knowledge of microorganisms, mechanisms and their metabolic pathway is still limited; d) temperature, DO and pH would influence its practical applications; e) inhibition of sulfammox activity due to S²⁻ accumulation; f) with a high concentration of NO₃-N, SO₄²⁻ concentration may increase due to autotrophic denitrification 									

Reactor type	Electron donor	Temperature	рН	S-compound	Initial NO ₃ [—] N concentration	SO4 ²⁻ production	Denitrification rate	References
		(°C)	(-)	(mg S/L)	(mg N/L)	(mg S/L)	(kg N/m3/d)	-
Fluidized-bed reactor	$S_2O_3^{2-}$	20-30	7	184-2260	100-1230	150-320	1.24-3.25	Zou et al, 2016
Fluidized-bed reactor	S^0	28-30	7.2-9	na	25-75	100-600	0.07-0.2	Sahinkaya and Dursun 2015
Fluidized-bed reactor	${ m S}^{0/}{ m S}_{2}{ m O}_{3}^{2-}$	20	6.8- 8.2	na	20-700	na	2.53-3.37	Kim et al, 2004
Packed-bed reactor	\mathbf{S}^0	28-30	6-8	na	50-75	200-600	0.07-0.1	Sahinkaya and Kilic, 2014a
Packed-bed reactor	\mathbf{S}^0	10-26	6-8	na	30-60	191-483	0.03-0.24	Sahinkaya et al, 2014b
Packed-bed reactor	S^0	15.2-29	6.7- 8.4	592.42-5924.17	20-25	640	0.2	Kimura et al. 2002
Packed-bed reactor	S^0	20-25	8.3- 8.7	na	60-251	na	0.27-0.87	Koenig and Liu 2002
Packed-bed reactor	S^0	20-25	na	na	60-400	na	0.48-0.77	Koenig and Liu 2001
Up-flow continuous reactor	S ²⁻	29-31	7	160-1000	30.4-169.6	na	0.15-0.61	Jing et al. 2010
Up-flow anaerobic sludge blan- ket	dge blan- S ²⁻ 30 7.5 0.62 ^a		0.62ª	0.33ª	na	0.09-0.31	Yang et al. 2016	
Up-flow column reactor	S^0	30	7.3	na	20	6.15 - 7.92 ^b	0.22	Zhu et al, 2019
Vertical fixed-bed reactors	tors S^{2-} 30 7-7.5 49.3		20	20	na	Moraes et al. 2012		

Table 2. Process conditions and observed NO₃⁻ utilization rates during S-dependent autotrophic denitrification in different types of reactors

^akg/m³/d ^b g/g N_{removal}

Table. 3. Reactor types, operational (environmental) conditions, influent S concentrations and efficiency of heterotrophic SO_4^{2-} reduction and sulfammox

_		Temperature		SO 4 ²⁻	SO₄ ^{2−} removal efficiency	
Reactor type	Electron donor	(0.0)	_ рН _	concentration	– or rate	References
				(mg/L)		
	~	HETEROTROPH	IIC SULFATI	E REDUCTION		
Gas lift reactor	Carbon monoxide	30	7	250-1000	62.5-97.5%	Sinharoy et al, 2020a
Moving bed biofilm reactor	Carbon monoxide	30	7	250-1000	67.1–95.2%	Sinharoy et al, 2019a
	Succinic acid yeast ex-	22	_		$169 \text{ mg SO}_4^2 / L/d$	-
Batch	tract	16	-	1700	98 mg SO ₄ ²⁻ /L/d	Virpiranta et al., 2019
	uact	6			13-42 mg SO ₄ ²⁻ /L/d	
Batch	Methanol	5	7	-	26.7 mg SO ₄ ²⁻ /L/d	Nielsen et al., 2019
Packed bed reactor	Ethylene glycol	30	7	250-1000	$4.1 \text{ mg SO}_4^2 / L/d$	Kumar et al., 2018
Inverse fluidized bed reactor	Scourer	20	7	700	$34 \text{ mg SO}_4^2/\text{gVSS/d}$	Reyes-Alvarado et al,
	Cork	- 30	1	/00	$6.1 \text{ mg SO}_4^{2-}/\text{gVSS/d}$	2018
Packed bed reactor	Molasses	4-8	6.5-7.1	287-548.2	$0-22 \text{ mg SO}_4^2/L/d$	Nielsen et al., 2018
	Crab shell			721-738	6-9 mg SO ₄ ²⁻ /gVSS/d	
Batch	Potato	30	7	764-766	22-34 mg SO ₄ ²⁻ /gVSS/d	- Reyes-Alvarado et al,
	Filter paper	_		752-823	50-65 mg SO ₄ ²⁻ /gVSS/d	- 2017
Fluidized-bed reactor	Glycerol	23	5.5-8.5	2000-3000	167 mg SO ₄ ²⁻ /gVSS/d	Bertolino et al., 2014
	Hydrogen + carbon di-	20	605 705			Sáez-Navarrete et al
Stirred tank reactor	oxide	30	6.95-7.05	-	$3400 \text{ mg SO}_4^2/L/d$	2012
	Ethanol	25			$211 \text{ mg SO}_4^2/\text{gVSS/d}$	N I I. 2010
Fluidized-bed reactor	Ethanol + lactate	- 35	7.5	-	$2016 \text{ mg } \text{SO}_4^{2-}/\text{gVSS/d}$	Nevatalo et al., 2010
Gas lift reactor	Hydrogen	30-35	7-7.5	5000-30000	$7080 \text{ kg } \text{SO}_4^2 \text{/d}$	Van Houten et al., 2009
	Ethanol, spent manure				961-1345 mg SO ₄ ²⁻ /L/d	
Anaerobic filter	Methanol. spent ma-	6	2.5-4.3	900		Tsukamoto et al., 2004
	nure				$1057-1441 \text{ mg } SO_4^{22}/L/d$,
		SU	ULFAMMOX			
Upflow anaerobic sludge bed re-	A	25	7082	90	9.19 m - C/L / I	0:
actor	Ammonium nitrogen	33	7.9-8.3	80	8.18 mg S/L/d	Qin et al., 2021
				88	2-27%	
Circulating flow completely	Ammonium nitrogen	30	8.1-8.6	223	2-27%	Zhang et al., 2020
anaerodic reactor	U U			154	18-64%	
Self-designed circulating flow re-	· · ·	25	0100	183	approx. 40%	71 1 2010
actor	Ammonium nitrogen	35	8.1-8.3 -	216	approx. 0%	Zhang et al., 2019a

				116	approx. 30%	
			_	100	approx. 45%	
Calf designed since lating flow up			_	90	approx. 30%	
Self-designed circulating now re-	Ammonium nitrogen	30	8.1-8.6	170	approx. 30%	Zhang et al., 2019b
				360	approx. 5%	
Sequencing batch reactor	Ammonium nitrogen	-	-	261	19%	Prachakittikul et al., 2016
Batch	Ammonium nitrogen	30	8.5	163	40%	Cai et al., 2010
Upflow anaerobic sludge blanket reactor	Ammonium nitrogen	35	7.5–8.5	240	30%	Yang et al., 2009
Non-woven rotating biological contactor	Ammonium nitrogen	35	8-8.2	-	-	Liu et al., 2008

Process	Reactor type	S removal efficiency	N removal efficiency (N form)	COD removal efficiency	References
Sulfate reduction, Autotrophic de- nitrification and Nitrification Inte- grated (SANI)	Up-flow anaerobic sludge bed, an anoxic filter, an aerobic filter	16-68 mg S ²⁻ /L	74% (TN)	95%	Wang et al, 2009b
SANI	Up-flow sludge bed reac- tor, an anoxic reactor and an aerobic reactor	98 % S ²⁻	55% (TN)	87%	Lu et al, 2012
SANI	Up-flow anaerobic sludge bed, an anoxic filterand an aerobic filter	97 % S ²⁻	74% (TN)	97%	Lu et al., 2009
SANI	Sulfate-reducing up-flow sludge bed	75% SO ₄ ²⁻	-	90%	Hao et al., 2013
SANI	Sulfate-reducing up-flow sludge bed	72% SO ₄ ^{2–}	-	82%	Hao et al., 2015
Flue gas desulfurization - Sulfate reduction, Autotrophic denitrifica- tion and Nitrification Integrated (FGD-SANI)	Sulfite-reducing upflow anaerobic sludge bed	~54 % S ²⁻	~98% (TN)	94%	Jiang et al, 2013
Mixed Denitrification - Sulfate re- duction, Autotrophic denitrifica- tion and Nitrification Integrated (MD-SANI)	Sulfate/sulfite reducing up- flow sludge bed and an- oxic up-flow sludge bed	-	100% (NO ₃ ⁻ -N)	80%	Qian et al, 2015a
MD-SANI	Sulfur-reducing upflow sludge bed and the anoxic upflow sludge bed	~100% SO ₃ ²⁻	100% (TN)	81%	Qian et al, 2015b
Sulfate reduction, denitrifica- tion/anammox and partial nitrifica- tion (SRDAPN)	Laboratory scale up-flow anaerobic-anoxic biologi- cal filter reactor	400-500 mg S ²⁻ /d	79% (TN)	500-2300 mg/d	Kosugi et al., 2019
Partial Nitrification/Anammox and S-dependent autotrophic Denitrifi- cation (PNASD)	PN/A reactor and an ele- mental sulfur-supported packed bed autotrophic de- nitrification	-	97% (TN)	_	Dasgupta et al., 2017
PNASD		~100% S ²⁻	84% (TN)	-	Yuan et al., 2020

Table 4. Technologies for integrated S, N, COD removal and the observed removal efficiencies for S, N and COD

	Single reactor under main- stream conditions				
Anammox and S-dependent auto- trophic Denitrification (ASD)	Expanded granular sludge bed	90-100% S ₂ O ₃ ²⁻	98% (TN)	-	Sun et al., 2018
ASD	Up-flow anaerobic sludge blanket reactor	99.6% S ²⁻ , 330 mg S ²⁻ /L	88% (TN), 252 mg NH ₄ ⁺ -N/L	-	Guo et al, 2016
S-dependent autotrophic Partial Denitrification and Anammox (SPDA)	Up-flow anaerobic sludge blanket reactor	~100% S ₂ O ₃ ²⁻	>90% (TN)	-	Wu et al., 2019
SPDA	Up-flow anaerobic sludge blanket reactor	$70\% S^0$	90% (NO ₂ ⁻ -N)	-	Liu et al, 2017
Sulfammox/Anammox (SA) with COD	Moving Bed Biofilm Re- actor	10% SO4 ²⁻	30% (NH4 ⁺ -N)	-	Rikmann et al., 2016

		Influent concentrations Model structure								
No.	Reactor type	Substrate	$\begin{array}{ccc} Organic & S^{2-} & NO^3 \\ (mg \ COD/L) & (mg \ S^{2-}\text{-}S/L) & (mg \ - S^{2-}\text{-}S/L) \end{array}$		NO ³⁻ -N (mg -N/L)	No. of processes	No. of components	No. of parameters	S and N involved processes	References
1	Bench- scale EGSB re- actor	Synthetic wastewater	200-800	200-800	75-275	7	10	18	Hydrolysis: Particulate N \rightarrow Organic N Ammonification: Organic N \rightarrow NH ₄ ⁺ -N Heterotrophic: NO ₃ ⁻ -N \rightarrow N ₂ Autotrophic: NO ₃ ⁻ -N \rightarrow N ₂	Wang et al., 2010
2	Bench- scale EGSB re- actor	Synthetic wastewater	275-2300 mg C/L	156-1490	100-800	6	8	31	Autotrophic: $S^{2-} \rightarrow S_{0} \rightarrow SO_{4}^{2-}$ Autotrophic: $NO_{3}^{-}N \rightarrow NO_{2}^{-}N \rightarrow N_{2}$ Heterotrophic: $NO_{3}^{-}N \rightarrow NO_{2}^{-}N \rightarrow N_{2}$	Xu et al., 2014
3	Bench- scale SBR	Synthetic wastewater	-	<u> 194</u> 145	321 202	4	5	9	Autotrophic: $S^{2-} \rightarrow S_0 \rightarrow SO_4^{2-}$ Autotrophic: $NO_3^{-}N \rightarrow NO_2^{-}N \rightarrow N_2$	Xu et al., 2016
4	Bench- scale EGSB re- actor	Synthetic wastewater	2700	1000 mg SO ₄ ²⁻ - S/L	200-700	14	15	38	Autotrophic: $S^{2-} \rightarrow S_0$ Autotrophic: $NO_3^- \cdot N \rightarrow NO_2^- \cdot N$ Heterotrophic: $NO_3^- \cdot N \rightarrow NO_2^- \cdot N \rightarrow N_2$ Heterotrophic: $SO_4^{2-} \rightarrow S^{2-}$	Xu et al., 2017
5	MBfR	Anaerobic digestion liq- uor	50-100	30	50-1000	18	17	60	Autotrophic: $NH_4^+-N \rightarrow NO_2^N \rightarrow NO_3^N$ Autotrophic: NH_4^+-N , $NO_2^N \rightarrow N_2$, NO_3^N Heterotrophic: $NO_3^N \rightarrow N_2$ Autotrophic: $S^{2-} \rightarrow S^0 \rightarrow SO_4^{2-}$ Autotrophic: $CH_4 \rightarrow CO_2$	Chen et al., 2016
6	Coastal upwelling system	Sea water	-	0.1 mmol S/m ³	0.1 mmol N/m ³	9	14	4 46 $\frac{\text{Autotrophic: NH}_4^+\text{-}N \rightarrow NO_2^-\text{-}N \rightarrow NO_3^-\text{-}N}{\text{Heterotrophic: NO}_3^-\text{-}N \rightarrow NO_2^-\text{-}N \rightarrow N_2}}{\text{Heterotrophic: SO}_4^{2^-} \rightarrow SO_4^{2^-}}$		Azhar et al., 2014

Table 5. Overview of the reported mechanistic models linking C, S and N transformations

SBR: sequencing batch reactor, EGSB: expanded granular sludge bed, MBfR: membrane biofilm reactor.

1 Supporting information (SI)

2 Sulfur-dependent autotrophic denitrification (S1)

3 Mechanism of the process

The process of autotrophic sulfur (S)-dependent denitrification is used for the treatment of
domestic and industrial wastewater (Shao et al., 2010), landfill leachate (Koenig and Liu,
1996), groundwater (Wan et al., 2009) and salt water (Wang et al., 2009). Process reactions
are illustrated by the equations 1-8 (Huang et al., 2019, Cui et al., 2019, Lin et al., 2018,
Pokorna and Zabranska, 2015, Sun and Nemati 2012):

9

10
$$5S^{2-} + 2NO_3^{-} + 12H^+ \rightarrow 5S^0 + N_2 + 6H_2O$$
 (1)

11
$$5S^{2-} + 8NO_3^{-} + 8H^+ \rightarrow 5SO_4^{2-} + 4N_2 + 4H_2O$$
 (2)

12
$$3S^{2-} + 2NO_2^{-} + 8H^+ \rightarrow 3S^0 + N_2 + 4H_2O$$
 (3)

13
$$3S^{2-} + 8NO_2^{-} + 8H^+ \rightarrow 3SO_4^{2-} + 4N_2 + 4H_2O$$
 (4)

14
$$5S^0 + 6NO_3^- + 2H_2O \rightarrow 5SO_4^{2-} + 3N_2 + 4H^+$$
 (5)

15
$$3S^0 + 6NO_2^- \rightarrow 3SO_4^{2-} + 3N_2$$
 (6)

$$5S_2O_3^{2-} + 8NO_3^{-} + H_2O \rightarrow 10SO_4^{2-} + 4N_2 + 2H^+$$
(7)

$$3S_{2}O_{3}^{2-} + 7NO_{2}^{-} + H_{2}O \rightarrow 6SO_{4}^{2-} + 3,5N_{2} + 2H^{+}$$
(8)

Compared to heterotrophic denitrification, this process has many advantages, such as no addition of organic substrate, reduction of biomass (the biomass yield coefficient is 0,15-0,57 g for autotrophic biomass production, and 0,71-1,2 g for heterotrophic biomass production per 1 g of denitrified NO₃⁻-N and NO₂⁻-N) and a decrease in N₂O emissions (Huang et al., 2019, Sun and Nemati, 2012, Yang et al., 2016).

16

Thus, the process of autotrophic S-dependent denitrification can be used successfully in major carbon-deficient wastewater treatment systems (Cui et al., 2019). This also explains the use of this process for biogas desulfurization, cleaning of crude oil tanks before acidification, and anti-corrosion treatment of sewage systems (Qian et al., 2015, Park et al., 2014). To date, most of the research done on the S-dependent autotrophic denitrification process has been carried out with flocculent sludge (Cui et al., 2019).

29 Zhou et al. (2016) indicated that $S_2O_3^{2-}$ is more efficient in S-dependent autotrophic 30 denitrification than S⁰ or S²⁻. Similarly, Park et al. (2015) obtained NO₃⁻-N removal 31 efficiencies of 96.5% for $S_2O_3^{2-}$, 64.1% for S²⁻, 58.1% for persulfide (pyrite) and 38.8% for 32 S⁰. Thus, it has frequently been shown that $S_2O_3^{2-}$ is a suitable S source for the described 33 process. Cardoso et al. (2006) found that the specific rate of nitrate reduction for $S_2O_3^{2-}$ was 34 4.6 and 9.5 times higher than for H₂S and S⁰, respectively.

When S compounds are transformed, intermediate compounds can also be involved in the process. An example is participation of S⁰, resulting from oxidation of S²⁻, in S-dependent autotrophic denitrification (Xu et al., 2016). Fan et al. (2021) described the effect of intermediates, such as S²⁻, acid volatile sulfide (AVS), and S⁰, in autotrophic denitrification with S₂O₃²⁻ as an electron acceptor. When S²⁻, S₂O₃²⁻, AVS, and S⁰ coexisted in the autotrophic process of denitrification, their preferences were as follows: S²> S₂O₃²⁻ AVS \approx S⁰.

42 Environmental factors influencing the process performance

43 Temperature

The optimal temperature for most SOB remains under mesophilic conditions, i.e. in the range
of 25-35°C (Fajardo et al., 2014, Shao et al., 2010). When the temperature dropped from 2025°C to 5-10°C, the efficiency of N removal decreased from about 99% to 50% (Zhou et al.,
2011). However, there were also studies showing the denitrification rate of approximately 3.3

48 kg N/m³·d at 3°C in a fluidized-bed reactor with the HRT of 1h during 98 days (Di Capua et
49 al., 2017).

50 *pH*

The optimal pH for this process has been shown to be in the range of 6.8-8.2 and a decrease in the activity has been reported at pH <6.5 and >9 (Chen et al., 2016a, Vidal et al., 2002). The optimal pH values for reduction of NO₂-N and NO₃-N were 7.0 and 8.5, respectively, using S⁰ as an electron donor (Chen et al., 2018).

55 Previous research

Jing et al. (2010) performed the S-dependent autotrophic denitrification process with S^{2-} as an 56 57 electron donor in a 1.3 L up-flow continuous reactor fed with synthetic wastewater. When the 58 NO₃⁻N concentration increased from 30.4 mg N/L to 169.6 mg N/L, the volumetric NO₃⁻-N 59 removal rate increased from 0.15 kg N/m³/d to 0.61 kg N/m³/d. However, when the NO₃⁻-N concentration increased again to 189.7 mg N/L, the volumetric NO₃⁻-N removal rate 60 decreased to 0.59 kg N/m³/d. On the contrary, when the influent concentration of S^{2-} 61 increased from 160 mg/L to 1000 mg/L, the volumetric S²⁻ removal rate increased from 0.78 62 $kg/m^{3}/d$ to 4.57 kg/m³/d and the efficiency of S²⁻ removal was >90%. 63

Similarly, in the experiments of Kim et al. (2004) with two FBRs, the effect of NO₃⁻-N
concentration on the process was explicitly observed. The feed of FBR-1 was prepared from
treated domestic wastewater, while pre-treated leachate from a municipal landfill was used in
FBR-2. FBR-1 was operated for 358 days with NO₃⁻-N of 20 mg N/L, and FBR-2 for 342
days with NO₃⁻-N of 700 mg N/L. The maximum denitrification rates in FBR-1 and FBR-2
were respectively 2.53 kg N/m³/d (denitrification efficiency 91.7%) and 3.37 kg N/m³/d
(denitrification efficiency 83%).

71 Zou et al. (2016) investigated the S-dependent autotrophic denitrification process in two FBRs operated at different temperatures, i.e. 20 and 30°C, for 200 days. Oxidation of 72 $S_2O_3^{2-}$ was particularly unstable until day 54, and then $S_2O_3^{2-}$ remained below the detection 73 limit in both FBRs, and SO_4^{2-} concentration increased sharply to approximately 3700 and 74 3200 mg/L on days 38 and 33 in FBR-1 and FBR-2, respectively. The temperature had no 75 significant effect in the course of the process and the denitrification rate remained at the level 76 of 1.24-3.25 kg N/m³/d. Autotrophic denitrification and denitritation with $S_2O_3^{2-}$ as electron 77 78 donors were thus effectively maintained in the two FBRs.

In the study by Sahinkaya and Dursun (2015), the influent NO_3^--N concentration increased from 25 to 75 mg N/L in a FBR with S⁰ as an electron donor. The start-up period was relatively short as almost complete NO_3^--N and NO_2^--N reduction was achieved within one week. However, the process efficiency decreased during the long-term operation, which resulted in an increase in NO_3^--N and NO_2^--N concentrations. The denitrification rate ranged from 0.07 to 0.2 kg N/m³/d. SO_4^{2-} was produced and reached the level of 100-600 mg S/L in accordance with the process stoichiometry.

86 Moraes et al. (2012) investigated S-dependent autotrophic denitrification involving two electron acceptors $-NO_3$ -N and NO_2 -N in the absence of S², in excess of S² and 87 88 according to the stoichiometric equation of the S-dependent autotrophic denitrification process in vertical FBRs. The results showed that sulfur intermediate compounds (S⁰) were 89 mainly formed when excess of S^{2-} was used, especially for NO₃⁻-N. Moreover, NO₂⁻-N was 90 more readily consumed than $NO_3^{-}N$, and higher concentrations of S^{2-} led to greater formation 91 92 of S intermediates. The observed NO₃⁻-N removal efficiencies were 60-15%, 25.5-98.5% and 84%, respectively, in the absence of S^{2-} , in excess of S^{2-} and in concentration according to the 93 94 stoichiometric equation of the S-dependent autotrophic denitrification process.

95 In the study by Sahinkaya and Kilic (2014a), two parallel column bioreactors were 96 operated under autotrophic and heterotrophic conditions. For S-dependent autotrophic denitrification, a packed bed reactor was used. The simultaneous removal of NO3⁻-N and 97 98 chromate (VI) was achieved under both autotrophic and heterotrophic conditions. Cr (VI) 99 concentrations up to 0.5 mg/L did not adversely affect the autotrophic denitrification 100 efficiency and higher concentrations reduced the denitrification potential of the column. During the entire period, production of SO_4^{2-} ranged from 200 to 600 mg S/L and the 101 102 denitrification rate was $0.07-0.1 \text{ kg N/m}^3/\text{d.}$

103 Sahinkaya et al. (2014b) performed S-dependent autotrophic denitrification under the 104 temperature falling from 26 to 10°C. Three identical pilot-scale column bioreactors were 105 installed, different S to limestone ratios (1/1-3/1) were used and the results were compared 106 under different loading conditions during the long-term operation. Complete denitrification 107 was achieved until the NO_3 -N loading was 10 mg N/L/h. When the temperature dropped to 108 10°C in winter at the load of 18 mg N/L/h, the denitrification efficiency decreased to 60-70% 109 and the bioreactor with the S/L ratio of 1/1 showed slightly better performance. Throughout the study, the denitrification rate was $0.03-0.24 \text{ kg N/m}^3/\text{d}$. 110

111 Yang et al. (2016) conducted S-dependent autotrophic denitrification in an up-flow 112 anaerobic sludge blanket reactor operated continuously for 600 days. The nitrogen removal 113 efficiency of 94% and complete removal of S^{2-} were achieved. The denitrification rate was 114 0.09-0.31 kg N/m³/d with the HRT of 5 h, and the influent NO₃⁻-N and S²⁻ loads were 0.33 115 kg-N/m³/d and 0.62 kg S/m³/d, respectively.

116 Sulfate reduction (S2)

117 Mechanism of the process

Due to the formation of wastewater streams rich in SO₄^{2–}resulting from various anthropogenic 118 activities, there is a growing interest in the SO_4^{2-} reduction process using SRB. Although high 119 concentrations of SO_4^{2-} do not pose a direct threat to the environment and health, they disrupt 120 121 the natural S cycle. This imbalance can lead to H₂S formation, metal corrosion, and SO_x emissions (Abel et al., 2015). H₂S is often undesirable in wastewater treatment, but SO_4^{2-} 122 reduction may be beneficial due to the use of S^{2-} for heavy metal removal by precipitation, 123 124 autotrophic denitrification or autotrophic phosphorus removal (Rubio -Rincón et al., 2017). 125 Although SO_4^{2-} is the main electron acceptor for SRB, they can also use S compounds such as $S_2O_3^{2-}$, SO_3^{2-} , S^0 . When SO_4^{2-} is the electron acceptor, the process takes place in two 126 stages - first SO_4^{2-} is reduced to SO_3^{2-} and then to S^{2-} (Muyzer and Stams, 2008). When SO_4^{2-} 127 decomposes into S^{2-} , some of the decomposed S^{2-} leaves the reactor along with the biogas as 128 129 H₂S gas and the remaining H₂S present in the reactor as total dissolved sulfide (TDS). The components of TDS in the aquatic environment are S²⁻, HS- and H₂S (aq) (Samarathunga and 130 131 Rathnasiri, 2019).

Organic electron donors are used for the biological reduction of SO_4^{2-} , which at the 132 133 same time provide a carbon source for the SRB, as well as inorganic ones that require 134 supplementation with a carbon source, e.g. CO_2 (Sinharoy et al., 2020a). Some SO_4^{2-} rich 135 wastewater also contains high concentrations of organic compounds that can be used by SRB to reduce SO_4^{2-} . When they contain no organic compounds, compounds such as sugars 136 137 (glucose and sucrose) (Barber and Stuckey, 2000), alcohols (methanol and ethanol) 138 (Kaksonen et al., 2003), short-chain fatty acids (acetate, propionate, butyrate, lactate, 139 pyruvate, malate) (Kiran et al., 2017) and aromatics (benzoate, phenol) can support the biological reduction of SO_4^{2-} (Liamleam and Annachhatre, 2007). 140

- 141 Lactate, and especially sodium lactate, is the most common electron donor in the 142 biological reduction of SO_4^{2-} with SRB. It can be degraded by a wider range of SRB 143 compared to methanol. However, lactate is more expensive compared to methanol, ethanol or 144 acetate, making this solution on an industrial scale not economical.
- 145 Reduction of SO_4^{2-} with lactate (9) (Virpiranta et al., 2019):

146
$$2CH_3CHOHCOO^- + SO_4^2 \rightarrow 2CH_3COO^- + 2HCO_3^- + H_2S$$
(9)

147 Alternative methanol is the cheapest carbon source and is therefore widely used as an electron donor in biological processes. Compared to other carbon sources, its complete 148 149 oxidation to CO₂ is ensured, while e.g. lactate or ethanol are oxidized only to acetate (Rubio-150 Rincón et al., 2017), which reduces treatment costs due to the smaller amount of carbon source needed to reduce all SO_4^{2-} . However, it has been reported that methanogens compete 151 152 with SRB for methanol under mesophilic and thermophilic conditions (Kaksonen and Puhakka, 2007). However, adjusting factors such as pH, temperature, S^{2-} concentration and 153 154 metal concentration can limit the growth of methanogens in the presence of methanol 155 (Tsukamoto et al., 2004).

Also, ethanol and succinate are widely used as a carbon and electron source as it is arelatively economical option (Virpiranta et al., 2019).



160 Reduction of
$$SO_4^{2-}$$
 with ethanol (Virpiranta et al., 2019):

$$2CH_3CH_2OH + SO_4^{2-} \rightarrow 2CH_3COO^- + H_2S + 2H_2O$$
(10)

$$CH_{3}COO^{-} + SO_{4}^{2-} + H^{+} \rightarrow 2HCO_{3}^{-} + H_{2}S$$
(11)

Reduction of SO_4^{2-} with succinate (12) (Virpiranta et al., 2019):

161

162

$$164 \qquad 4(CH_2)_2(COO^{-})_2 + 3SO_4^{2^-} + 6H^+ \rightarrow 4CH_3COO^{-} + 4HCO_3^{-} + 3H_2S + 4CO_2 \tag{12}$$

165 H_2 , CO and CH₄ can also be used as electron donors, as well as their mixtures, which 166 reduce the cost of the process. Van Houten et al. (1996) have indicated that H_2 is the best 167 electron donor for SO_4^{2-} reduction when working on a large scale. Often, however, CO₂ is 168 required to achieve high process efficiency.

169 Reduction of
$$SO_4^{2-}$$
 with H_2 (13) (Sinharoy et al., 2020b):

170
$$4H_2 + SO_4^{2-} + H^+ \rightarrow HS^- + H_2O$$
 (13)

171 There are SRBs that use CO as a carbon and energy source, however, for most of 172 them, CO is toxic. However, this toxicity can be mitigated by the use of mixed culture 173 systems or the use of a layered structure of biomass (Sipma et al., 2006).

174 Reduction of
$$SO_4^{2-}$$
 with CO (14) (Sinharoy et al., 2020b):

175
$$4CO + SO_4^{2-} + 4H_2O \rightarrow 4HCO_3^{-} + HS^{-} + 3H^+$$
 (14)

The biological reduction of $SO_4^{2^-}$ can also be combined with the anaerobic oxidation of CH₄. CH₄ can provide 4 electrons, which is twice as much as H₂, so less gas volume is required to achieve the same $SO_4^{2^-}$ reduction efficiency. However, CH₄ can only be used by a limited number of microorganisms, which is a major disadvantage of this substrate.

180 Reduction of
$$SO_4^{2-}$$
 with CH₄ (15) (Sinharoy et al., 2020b):

$$CH_4 + SO_4^{2-} + 4H_2O \rightarrow HCO_3^{-} + HS^{-} + H_2O$$
(15)

182 Electron donors were also investigated as manure, sawdust, wood shavings,
183 lignocellulosic materials (Reyes-Alvadro et al., 2018), agricultural residues (Chang et al.,
184 2000), sewage sludge, whey or dairy sewage (Wolicka, 2008) and organic sewage (Das et al.,
185 2013), which unfortunately cause secondary environmental pollution.

186	Sun et al. (2018) proposed a conceptual model for the reduction of SO_4^{2-} and S^0 in the
187	presence or absence of HS ⁻ . When there is no HS ⁻ in the system, the production of HS ⁻ is
188	mainly through the reduction of SO_4^{2-} , while when HS ⁻ is present, polysulfide is formed by
189	the reaction of SO with HS ⁻ . As the concentration of HS ⁻ increases, more polysulfide is
190	formed which stimulates indirect S^0 reduction. When HS ⁻ exceeds a certain level, the indirect
191	reduction of S^0 with polysulfide plays a major role in the production of HS ⁻ , and the reduction
192	of SO_4^{2-} is almost completely stopped. This is important from the point of view of the process
193	economy, as the reduction of S^0 requires ¹ / ₄ of the organic matter needed to reduce $SO_4^{2^-}$,
194	according to the (16) and (17) reactions (Sun et al., 2018):

195
$$CH_3COO^- + 4S^0 + 2H_2O \rightarrow 2CO_2 + 4HS^- + 3H^+$$

$$CH_3COO^- + SO_4^{2-} \rightarrow 2HCO_3^- + HS^-$$
(17)

(16)

197 In a study by Sun et al. (2018), an effective S^0 reduction was observed in the 198 sulfidogenic bioreactor even at 1300 mg S/L of SO_4^{2-} in the inlet. 98.5% of HS⁻ was obtained 199 as a result of S^0 reduction, and SO_4^{2-} was barely consumed in the bioreactor.

200

201 Environmental factors influencing the proces performance

202 *Temperature*

SRBs are able to tolerate temperatures ranging from -5°C to 75°C and readily adapt to
temperature changes (Cocos et al., 2002). However, the optimal temperature for most SRBs is
in the narrow range of 28-30°C (Virpiranta et al., 2019), although there are strains for which
the optimum temperature is below 20°C (Knoblauch et al., 1999). Most of the bacteria that
tolerate cold temperatures are mesophilic (rather than psychrophilic) strains that can grow
under such conditions, termed psychrotolerant bacteria or psychotrophs. For example, some *Desulfobulbus* strains can grow at 6-10°C (Kharrat et al., 2017, Virpiranta et al., 2019).

210 Studies have also been conducted in the range of even lower 4-8°C (Nielsen et al., 2018),

211 which, however, has extended the adaptation time to such extreme conditions. The presence

212 of SRB was revealed by the presence of the *Deltaproteobacteria* and *Clostridia*. The study

showed a change in the composition of SRB taxa over time - an increase in the relative

- abundance of *Deltaproteobacteria* and a decrease in the relative abundance of members of the
- 215 Clostridia.
- 216 *pH*

Most of the studies on $SO_4^{2^-}$ reduction were carried out at pH in the range of 7-7.6, which is close to the optimal value for SRB. Pagnanelli et al. (2012) found the optimal pH value of 7.6 for the SRB, while Bratkova et al. (2013) observed the maximum $SO_4^{2^-}$ reduction rate at pH 7.25.

221 Previous research

Sinharov et al. (2019, 2020a) desulphurized wastewater containing SO_4^{2-} using carbon 222 223 monoxide in a moving bed biofilm reactor (2019) and in a gas lift reactor (2020a). The effect of HRT on the process was investigated and it was found that at the HRT of 72, 48 and 24 h, 224 SO₄²⁻ removal was 93.5%, 91.9% and 80.1%, respectively, and CO use was 85% throughout 225 226 the study (Sinharoy et al., 2019). These results were improved in a subsequent study (Sinharoy et al., 2020a). At the HRT of 72 h, the reduction of SO_4^{2-} and the use of CO were 227 97% and 89%, respectively (2020a). The best results in terms of SO_4^{2-} reduction (> 80%) 228 were obtained for low SO₄²⁻ loading and high CO loading conditions. The results for both 229 types of reactors were slightly better for the gas lift reactor. 230

Batch studies of Virpiranta et al. (2019) were performed in sealed vials and incubated at 3 different temperatures of 6°C, 16°C and 22°C for cold acclimatization and characterization of SRB consortia enriched from a sample of arctic sediments. Postgate medium was supplemented with lactate, ethanol or succinic acid and the resulting consortia grew with lactate and succinic acid, but not ethanol. The SO_4^{2-} reduction rates at 22°C were 169 mg/L/d, at 16°C - 98 mg/L/d, and for 6°C the rates ranged from 13 to 42 mg/L/d. Temperature had a significant effect on the activity of SRB. However, it is useful to be able to

acclimatize SRB to low temperatures due to the versatile applicability of the process.

Nielsen et al. (2019) conducted batch tests to check various carbon sources for SO₄²⁻ 239 240 reduction. Simple organic carbon sources (methanol and ethylene glycol) and complex 241 organic carbon sources (potato oil, brewing residues, peat and straw) were used to support 242 SRB growth. After 162 days, all bioreactors showed a decrease in both total organic carbon and SO₄²⁻ concentration at 5°C. However, a long acclimation period (98–112 days) was 243 required. The use of methanol and ethylene glycol resulted in SO_4^{2-} reduction by 71.2% and 244 36.9%, respectively. The decrease in SO_4^{2-} concentrations was limited to 13.8 and 5.3%, 245 246 respectively, when using peat and straw.

Reyes-Alvarado et al. (2017, 2018) used electron donors, such as potato, filter paper, crab shell (2017) and natural scourer and cork (2018), in their research. Maintaining SO_4^{2-} concentration close to 700-800 mg/L in both studies, the following SO_4^{2-} removal rates were obtained: 6-9, 22-34, 50-65, 34, 6.1 mg $SO_4^{2-}/gVSS/d$ for crab shell, potato, filter paper, scourer, cork, respectively. It was shown that the natural properties of the carbohydrate-based polymers limit the hydrolysis-fermentation step and thus the SO_4^{2-} reduction rate.

253 Sulfammox process (S3)

254 Mechanism of the process

A novel sulfammox biological process has recently been described in which NH_4^+ -N is oxidized to N_2 and SO_4^{2-} plays the role of an electron acceptor and is reduced to S^0 under anaerobic conditions. Sulfammox was first reported by Fdz-Polanco et al. (2001b) in a 258 granular activated carbon anaerobic fluidized bed reactor treating vinasse from an ethanol 259 distillery of sugar beet molasses. The sulfammox process can be most generally represented 260 by the following equation (18):

$$SO_4^{2-} + 2NH_4^+ \rightarrow S^0 + N_2 + 4H_2O$$
 (18)

In the follow-up studies, Liu et al. (2008) and Yang et al. (2009) identified SO_4^{2-} as a 262 263 potential electron acceptor as it was the feed component. The mechanism of the sulfammox 264 process is not fully understood yet - it turns out that there are exceptions to the described 265 process. In addition to N₂ and S⁰, sulfammox can lead to the formation of NO₂⁻-N and NO₃⁻-N as well as S^{2-} . Moreover, there are two different assumptions about the actual course of the 266 sulfammox process. The first assumes that NH4⁺-N is partially oxidized to NO2⁻-N with SO4²⁻ 267 and some of the NO₂⁻-N produced is reduced to N₂ by S²⁻ and then NO₂⁻-N and NH₄⁺-N are 268 converted to N₂. The second is that NH_4^+ -N is partially oxidized to NO_2^- -N by SO_4^{2-} and then 269 270 NH₄⁺-N is oxidized to N Liu et al., 2008).

271 nox process (Zhang et al., 2009), the Even though CO 272 experiments were performed either without COD addition (Bi et al., 2020, Zhang et al. 273 2019a,b, Prachakittikul et al., 2016, Cai et al., 2010) or with COD addition (Wang et al., 2017, Rikmann et al., 2016, Fdz-Polanco et al., 2001a,b). When COD is present in 274 275 wastewater, the sulfammox process can be coupled with subsequent heterotrophic

276 denitrification (Zhang et al. 2019b).

The differences in the NH_4^+ -N/SO₄²⁻ ratio in the conducted studies with respect to the stoichiometric ratio may result from the activity of ammonia oxidizing bacteria (AOB), which oxidizes NH_4^+ -N, and the reduction of SO_4^{2-} by organic compounds, as described by Bi et al. (2020). In this way, they questioned the presence of the sulfammox process, so it is important to conduct more detailed research.

$$N_2$$
 by NO₂⁻-N (Yang et al., 2009,
D is not required for the sulfamm

- 282 Environmental factors influencing the process performance
- 283 *Temperature*
- 284 The sulfammox process has been carried out at the temperatures in the range of 15-55°C
- (Zhang et al., 2019a,b, Cai et al., 2010, Yang et al., 2009, Zhao et al., 2006) with the optimal
- value in the range of 25-35°C (Cai et al., 2010). However, the sulfammox process could also
- 287 be maintained at lower temperatures, e.g. 20°C (Rikmann et al. 2016) and 14-15°C (Wu et al.
- 288 2020). In the latter case, the NH_4^+ -N and overall SO_4^{2-} removal efficiencies still remained
- 289 high, i.e. 98.5% and 52.8%, respectively.
- 290 *pH*
- 291 Sulfammox studies have mainly been carried out in the pH range of 7.5-8.6, specifically 7.5-
- 292 8.5 (Yang et al., 2009), 8-8.2 (Liu et al., 2008) 8.1-8.3 (Zhang et al., 2019a), 8.1-8.6 (Zhang et
- al., 2019b) with the best value of 8.5 (Cai et al., 2010). The efficiency of NH_4^+ -N and SO_4^{2-}
- removal decreased when the pH was < 7.5 and > 9.5 (Cai et al., 2010).

295 Previous research

296 Qin et al. (2021) conducted a sulfammox process in an upflow anaerobic sludge bed reactor for more than one year. The influent NH₄⁺-N concentration was 70 mg N/L and the NO₂⁻: 297 NO_3^{-1} : SO_4^{2-} molar ratio were 1:0.2:0.2, 0.5: 0.1: 0.3 and 0: 0:0.5, respectively, in stages I, II 298 299 and III. The NH₄⁺-N and SO₄²⁻ removal rates were 31 mg N/L/d and 8.18 mg S/L/d. 300 respectively. The excessive conversion of NH₄⁺-N in stage III was mainly attributed to the sulfammox reaction due to the high removal rate ratio of NH_4^+ -N: SO_4^{2-} (8.67: 1), 301 accumulation of S^{2-} and decreased pH, as well as a changed structure of the microbial 302 303 communities.

304 The results of Zhang et al. (2019a) in a circulating flow reactor showed that the 305 efficiency of NH_4^+ -N oxidation and SO_4^{2-} reduction increased in the presence of NO_2^- -N and 306 NO_3^--N . Nitrogen has been converted by nitrification, denitrification and conventional 307 anammox, simultaneously with the sulfammox process. The SO_4^{2-} removal efficiency reached 308 the maximum of 45%.

In the batch tests of Cai et al. (2010), reduction of SO_4^{2-} (40%) and NH_4^+ -N (44%) was considered exclusively due to sulfammox. Similarly, Yang et al. (2009) successfully performed sulfammox in an upflow anaerobic sludge blanket reactor. Only sulfammox was assumed to be responsible for the reduction of NH_4^+ -N and SO_4^{2-} with the SO_4^{2-} removal efficiency of 30%.

314 Modeling N, S and C transformations in wastewater treatment systems (S4)

Koenig and Liu (2001) established a half-order kinetic model for biofilms to describe
autotrophic denitrification by *Thiobacillus denitrificans* in an upflow S packed-bed reactor
fed with synthetic wastewater. The half-order reaction rate constants for autotrophic
denitrification using S⁰ were approximately one order of magnitude lower than those of
heterotrophic denitrification. However, the model was validated with pure substrate and pure
bacteria in a biofilm under autotrophic conditions, which largely limited its application to
other complex systems.

An et al. (2011) investigated the kinetics of two-step heterotrophic denitrification (reduction of NO_3^--N to NO_2^--N , and subsequently to N oxides and N_2 gas) using an oil reservoir culture, which was capable of functioning under both autotrophic and heterotrophic conditions. The developed kinetic model predicted the experimental results of batch and continuous systems in terms of simultaneous removal of S^{2-} , NO_3^--N , NO_2^--N and organic compounds.

Wang et al (2010) proposed a kinetic model to monitor a denitrifying S²⁻ removal (DSR) process with the ASM1 as a core model. By establishing inhibition and switch functions, the competition between autotrophic and heterotrophic denitrifiers was described, including the effect of S²⁻ inhibition on heterotrophic denitrification. The calibrated model was used to quantify the impact of the influent C/S ratio and S²⁻ levels on the performance of a bench-scale EGSB reactor. Model predictions indicated that the DSR reactor would operate efficiently when the influent C/S ratio was kept in the range of 0.5-3.0, and the S²⁻

concentration remained below 1000 mg S/L.

Xu et al (2014) developed a model to describe simultaneous removal of S^{2-} , NO₃⁻-N 336 and acetate (sole organic substrate) under denitrifying S^{2-} removal conditions in a continuous 337 338 flow reactor. The kinetic parameters were estimated via data fitting while considering the effects of initial S²⁻ concentration, S²⁻/ NO₃⁻-N ratio and acetate/ NO₃⁻-N ratio. The proposed 339 340 model accurately described the performance of DSR over wide ranges of the parameters. 341 Model predictions suggested that the adjustment of HRT would be an efficient way to mitigate high S^{2-} loadings. Despite accurate predictions for a pure substrate (acetate), the 342 343 model might not be applicable for actual industrial wastewater with complex characteristics.

344 Xu et al (2016) developed an autotrophic denitrification kinetic model to describe S^{2-} 345 oxidation and NO₂⁻-N removal in a bench-scale sequencing batch reactor (SBR). The model 346 parameters were estimated by data fitting from two studies with different combinations of S^{2-} , 347 S^0 , SO_4^{2-} , NO_3^{-} -N and NO_2^{-} -N. The final products of S^{2-} oxidation (S^0 and SO_4^{2-}) and their 348 concentrations could be accurately predicted, providing a strategy to control the effluent 349 SO_4^{2-} concentration or recover S^0 as the main end product from S^{2-} oxidation.

350 Xu et al (2017) further developed a complex model for C-N-S removal by combining 351 the ASMs and ADM1 (Anaerobic Digestion Model No.1), extended with oxygen/NO₃⁻-N 352 driven S²⁻ oxidation processes. The proposed model was also capable of simulating S relevant 353 processes, such as SO_4^{2-} reduction, S²⁻ oxidation and denitrifying S²⁻ removal process. Due to 354 some simplifications in the model structure and parameter uncertainty, that model would not 355 yet serve as a precise and quantitative tool in various full-scale applications.

356	Mechanistic models may also be useful in understanding the mechanisms of
357	sulfammox and its interactions with co-existing biochemical processes. However, due to the
358	complexity of the interactions, it still lacks research reports about the model development for
359	the sulfammox process. Chen et al (2016b) established a S-involved anammox model to
360	simulate the coexistence of AOB, nitrate oxidizing bacteria (NOB), anaerobic ammonia
361	oxidizing bacteria (AAOB), denitrification anaerobic methane oxidation (DAMO) bacteria,
362	and SOB in a membrane biofilm reactor (MBfR). The model described removal of NH_4^+ -N,
363	dissolved CH ₄ , and S^{2-} from sidestream anaerobic sludge digestion liquors. However, other
364	potential processes, such as endogenous heterotrophic denitrification, S-dependent
365	autotrophic denitrification and SO_4^{2-}/S reduction, were not incorporated in that model, and S^{2-}
366	inhibition was also neglected.
367	Azhar et al (2014) modeled the coupled N and S cycles in a coastal upwelling system.
368	In the S cycle, S ²⁻ -driven denitrification, SO_4^{2-} reduction, and S ²⁻ oxidation by $NO_3^{-}-N$
369	(chemolithoautotrophic NO ₃ ⁻ -N reduction) were considered. However, as the experimental
370	study was conducted in a natural costal water column and sediment, the reaction formulations,

process rates and kinetic parameters might not be directly applicable in wastewater treatment
systems. Moreover, some reactions, such as nitrogen fixation and remineralization, might be
neglected in those systems.



382



Figure S2. Simplified representation of the biochemical process associated with C, N and S
conversions (Xu et al., 2017).

Process/System	Issue	Cui et al., 2019	Tian and Yu, 2020	Hu et al., 2020	Ma et al., 2020	Wang et al., 2020	Park and Yoo, 2009	Lin et al., 2018	Wu et al., 2021	Show et al., 2013	Costa et al., 2020	Serrano et al, 2019	Lens et al, 1998	Xu and Chen, 2020	Kumar et al., 2021	Hao et al, 2014	van den Brand et al., 2015	Rios-Del Toro and Cervantes,	Liu et al., 2021	Grubba et al, 2020	This study
	recent advances in S-dependent auotrophic denitrification	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~											updated
NC	potential use of S-dependent auto- rophic denitrification	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~						~	~				updated
ICATIO	microbiological reactions and mi- croorganisms involved	~		~	~	~	~	✓	~	✓											~
NITRIF	factors influencing the operation of S-dependent auotrophic denitrifica- tion	~		~	~	~			~	~							~				~
HIC DE	comparison of greenhouse gas emissions from autotrophic and heterotrophic denitrification	✓				✓			~							~					
SOP	reactor configurations									✓											✓
AUTOTI	comparison of different electron donors (S compounds) for auto- trophic denitrification	~	~	~	~	✓	✓	~	~	✓											~
NDENT /	cost comparison of reduced-S spe- cies and organic substrate as an electron donor	~				~	~														
S - DEPEI	recent works on the hydrogen and/or iron- and/or methane- and/or carbon- S-dependent autotrophic denitrification	✓	✓		✓	~	~		~												
	mixotrophic denitrification		✓				~		✓	✓											✓
	natural occurrence of S-dependent autorophic denitrification			✓																	

387 Table S1. Issues incorporated in the review articles on the N-S-C cycles in wastewater treatment

	autotrophic denitrification in con- structed wetlands		~													
	S ⁰ reclamation and energy harvest			✓		✓	✓									
	S cycle combined with C and/or N and/or P cycles			~		~	~	~						~		
	environmental effects			~			~									
	comparison of biofilm reactors						✓									
	modeling description							✓								
	prospects, limitations and future re- search needs	~	~	~	~	~	~	~								updated
	recent reports on SO4 ²⁻ removal ef- ficiency												~	~		updated
	application of Sulfate Reducing Bacteria (SRB)								~	✓	~	~	~	~	~	✓
IION	SRB characteristics and metabo- lism								✓	✓	✓	✓		~		✓
UC.	competition of SRB for substrates										✓					✓
RED	SRB biomass source									✓		✓				
FATE	strategies to improve SRB toler- ance to heavy metals											~				
SULI	factors influencing the SRB metab- olism									~	~	~	~	~		~
ЭЩС	sulfate and sulfide removal tech-										✓			~		✓
ROF	bioreactors configurations								~				~			~
ROT	electron donors characteristics								✓	✓		✓		✓		✓
TEI	electron acceptors characteristics									✓				✓		
HI	SRB biomass disposal methods											✓				
	SRB-test monitoring									✓						
	reporting data in SRB-test									✓						
	emissions of SO4 ²⁻ -contaminated waters										~					

	characteristics and effects of water pollution by $S\Omega^{2^{-}}$			~							
	treatment of acid mine drainage (AMD)	~					~				
	heavy metal removal	✓			✓	✓	✓				
	methods for enhancement of SRB activity				✓						✓
	sulphide forms in aqueous medium at different pH values	~		~							
	prospects, limitations and future re- search needs	~	~	~	~	~	~				updated
	recent advances in sulfammox pro- cess							~	✓	~	updated
	characteristics of sulfammox							~	~	~	✓
	potential use of sulfammox process							~	~	✓	updated
	characteristics of NH ₄ -N anaerobic oxidation processes with different electron acceptors							~			
	spontaneity and oxidation-reduc-									~	
X	functional bacteria								~	~	✓
MMC	possible interactions with other bacteria								~	✓	✓
SULFA	bacteria responsible for the specific N and S transformations								~	~	~
	factors influencing the sulfammox								~	✓	✓
	the occurrence of sulfammox in the environment							~			~
	source of SO4 ²⁻									✓	
	reactors types							~	✓	✓	~
	co-existence of anammox, S-de- pendent autotrophic denitrification and sulfammox								~	~	~

	prospects, limitations and future re- search needs			~	~	~	~
SANI PROCESS	SANI process characteristics	✓	✓				✓
	diagram of the SANI reactor sys-	✓	✓				✓
	SANI key-parameters		✓				✓
	recent advances in SANI process						✓
	FGD-SANI and MD-SANI charac- teristics						✓
	diagram of the FGD-SANI and MD-SANI reactors system						✓
	FGD-SANI and MD-SANI key-pa- rameters						~
S CYCE WITH ANAMMOX	Sulfate Reduction, Denitrifica- tion/Anammox and Partial Nitrifi- cation (SRDAPN) characteristics						✓
	Partial Nitrification/Anammox and S-dependent autotrophic Denitrifi- cation (PNASD) characteristics						✓
	Anammox and S-dependent auto- trophic Denitrification (ASD) char- acteristics						~
	S-dependent autotrophic Partial Denitrification/Anammox (SPDA) characteristics						✓
	diagram of SRDAPN, PNASD, ASD nad SPDA						✓
	recent advances in SRDAPN, PNASD, ASD nad SPDA						~
	SRDAPN, PNASD, ASD nad SPDA key-parameters						✓

-		
	Sulfammox/Anammox (SA) char-	✓
	acteristics	
X	Sulfammox - S-dependent auto-	✓
Q	trophic Denitrification (SSD) char-	·
N	acteristics	
A.	Sulfammox – Anammox - S-de-	✓
Ę	pendent autotrophic denitrification	·
D.	(SASD) characteristics	
Η		
Ξ	diagram of the SA, SSD and SASD	✓
M		
IS	recent advances in SA, SSD and	\checkmark
E	SASD	
ELS	SA, SSD and SASD key parame-	J
X	ters	•

389 References

Abel, S., Nehls, T., Mekiffer, B., Mathes, M., Thieme, J., & Wessolek, G. (2015). Pools of sulfur in urban
rubble soils. *Journal of Soils and Sediments*, *15*(3), 532-540. doi:10.1007/s11368-014-1014-1

An, S., Stone, H., & Nemati, M. (2011). Biological removal of nitrate by an oil reservoir culture capable of
 autotrophic and heterotrophic activities: Kinetic evaluation and modeling of heterotrophic process. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 190(1-3), 686-693. doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2011.03.102

Azhar, M. A., Canfield, D. E., Fennel, K., Thamdrup, B., & Bjerrum, C. J. (2014). A model-based insight
 into the coupling of nitrogen and sulfur cycles in a coastal upwelling system. Journal of Geophysical Research:
 Biogeosciences, 119(3), 264-285. doi.org/10.1002/2012JG002271

Barber, W. P., & Stuckey, D. C. (2000). Effect of sulfate reduction on chemical oxygen demand removal in an anaerobic baffled reactor. *Water Environment Research*, *72*(5), 593-601. doi:10.2175/106143000X138175

Bi, Z., Wanyan, D., Li, X., & Huang, Y. (2020). Biological conversion pathways of sulfate reduction
ammonium oxidation in anammox consortia. *Frontiers of Environmental Science and Engineering*, 14(3)
doi:10.1007/s11783-019-1217-1

403 Bratkova, S., Koumanova, B., & Beschkov, V. (2013). Biological treatment of mining wastewaters by fixed-404 bed bioreactors at high organic loading. *Bioresource Technology*, *137*, 409-413.

405 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2013.03.177

Cai, J., Jiang, J. X., & Zheng, P. (2010). Isolation and identification of bacteria responsible for simultaneous
anaerobic ammonium and sulfate removal. *Science China Chemistry*, *53*(3), 645-650. doi:10.1007/s11426-0100053-8

Cardoso, R. B., Sierra-Alvarez, R., Rowlette, P., Flores, E. R., Gómez, J., & Field, J. A. (2006). Sulfide
oxidation under chemolithoautotrophic denitrifying conditions. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, 95(6), 11481157. doi:10.1002/bit.21084

Chang, I. S., Shin, P. K., & Kim, B. H. (2000). Biological treatment of acid mine drainage under sulphatereducing conditions with solid waste materials as substrate. *Water Research*, *34*(4), 1269-1277.
doi:10.1016/S0043-1354(99)00268-7

Chen, D., Yang, K., & Wang, H. (2016a). Effects of important factors on hydrogen-based autotrophic
denitrification in a bioreactor. *Desalination and Water Treatment*, 57(8), 3482-3488.
doi:10.1080/19443994.2014.986533

Chen, F., Li, X., Gu, C., Huang, Y., & Yuan, Y. (2018). Selectivity control of nitrite and nitrate with the reaction of S0 and achieved nitrite accumulation in the sulfur autotrophic denitrification process. *Bioresource Technology*, *266*, 211-219. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2018.06.062

Chen, X., Liu, Y., Peng, L., Yuan, Z., & Ni, B. J. (2016b). Model-based feasibility assessment of membrane biofilm reactor to achieve simultaneous ammonium, dissolved methane, and sulfide removal from anaerobic digestion liquor. *Scientific reports*, 6(1), 1-13. doi.org/10.1038/srep25114

Cocos, I. A., Zagury, G. J., Clément, B., & Samson, R. (2002). Multiple factor design for reactive mixture selection for use in reactive walls in mine drainage treatment. *Water Research*, 36(1), 167-177. doi:10.1016/S0043-1354(01)00238-X

Costa, J. M., Castro, K. C. D., Rodriguez, R. P., & Sancinetti, G. P. (2020). Anaerobic reactors for the treatment of sulphate and metal-rich wastewater: A review. *International Journal of Environmental Analytical Chemistry*, doi:10.1080/03067319.2020.1728261

Cui, Y. -., Biswal, B. K., Guo, G., Deng, Y. -., Huang, H., Chen, G. -., & Wu, D. (2019). Biological nitrogen removal from wastewater using sulphur-driven autotrophic denitrification. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, *103*(15), 6023-6039. doi:10.1007/s00253-019-09935-4

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

- Das, B. K., Gauri, S. S., & Bhattacharya, J. (2013). Sweetmeat waste fractions as suitable organic carbon
 source for biological sulfate reduction. *International Biodeterioration and Biodegradation*, 82, 215-223.
 doi:10.1016/j.ibiod.2013.03.027
- Di Capua, F., Milone, I., Lakaniemi, A. -., Lens, P. N. L., & Esposito, G. (2017). High-rate autotrophic
 denitrification in a fluidized-bed reactor at psychrophilic temperatures. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, *313*, 591598. doi:10.1016/j.cej.2016.12.106
- Fajardo, C., Mora, M., Fernández, I., Mosquera-Corral, A., Campos, J. L., & Méndez, R. (2014). Cross
 effect of temperature, pH and free ammonia on autotrophic denitrification process with sulphide as electron
 donor. *Chemosphere*, 97, 10-15. doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2013.10.028
- Fan, C., Zhou, W., He, S., & Huang, J. (2021). Sulfur transformation in sulfur autotrophic denitrification using
 thiosulfate as electron donor. *Environmental Pollution*, 268 doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2020.115708
- Fdz-Polanco, F., Fdz-Polanco, M., Fernandez, N., Urueña, M. A., Garcia, P. A., & Villaverde, S. (2001b).
 New process for simultaneous removal of nitrogen and sulphur under anaerobic conditions. *Water Research*, 35(4), 1111-1114. doi:10.1016/S0043-1354(00)00474-7
- Fdz-Polanco, F., Fdz-Polanco, M., Fernández, N., Urueña, M. A., García, P. A., & Villaverde, S. (2001a).
 Combining the biological nitrogen and sulfur cycles in anaerobic conditions. *Water Science and Technology*, 44(8), 77-84. doi:10.2166/wst.2001.0469
- Grubba, D., Majtacz, J., & Mąkinia, J. (2021). Sulfate reducing ammonium oxidation
 (SULFAMMOX) process under anaerobic conditions. *Environmental Technology and Innovation*, 22 doi:10.1016/j.eti.2021.101416
- Hao, T. -., Xiang, P. -., Mackey, H. R., Chi, K., Lu, H., Chui, H. -., ... Chen, G. -. (2014). A review of
 biological sulfate conversions in wastewater treatment. *Water Research*, 65, 1-21.
 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2014.06.043
- Hu, Y., Wu, G., Li, R., Xiao, L., & Zhan, X. (2020). Iron sulphides mediated autotrophic denitrification: An
 emerging bioprocess for nitrate pollution mitigation and sustainable wastewater treatment. *Water Research*, 179 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2020.115914
- Huang, S., Zheng, Z., Wei, Q., Han, I., & Jaffé, P. R. (2019). Performance of sulfur-based autotrophic
 denitrification and denitrifiers for wastewater treatment under acidic conditions. *Bioresource Technology*, 294 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2019.122176
 - Jing, C., Ping, Z., & Mahmood, Q. (2010). Influence of various nitrogenous electron acceptors on the anaerobic sulfide oxidation. *Bioresource Technology*, *101*(9), 2931-2937. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2009.11.047
 - Kaksonen, A. H., & Puhakka, J. A. (2007). Sulfate reduction based bioprocesses for the treatment of acid mine drainage and the recovery of metals. *Engineering in Life Sciences*, 7(6), 541-564. doi:10.1002/elsc.200720216
 - Kaksonen, A. H., Franzmann, P. D., & Puhakka, J. A. (2003). Performance and ethanol oxidation kinetics of a sulfate-reducing fluidized-bed reactor treating acidic metal-containing wastewater. *Biodegradation*, *14*(3), 207-217. doi:10.1023/A:1024262607099
 - Kharrat, H., Karray, F., Bartoli, M., Ben Hnia, W., Mhiri, N., Fardeau, M. -., ..., & Sayadi, S. (2017). Desulfobulbus aggregans sp. nov., a novel sulfate reducing bacterium isolated from marine sediment from the gulf of gabes. *Current Microbiology*, *74*(4), 449-454. doi:10.1007/s00284-017-1211-4
 - Kim, H. -., Lee, I. -., & Bae, J. -. (2004). Performance of a sulphur-utilizing fluidized bed reactor for postdenitrification. *Process Biochemistry*, *39*(11), 1591-1597. doi:10.1016/j.procbio.2003.07.004
 - Kiran, M. G., Pakshirajan, K., & Das, G. (2017). Heavy metal removal from multicomponent system by sulfate reducing bacteria: Mechanism and cell surface characterization. *Journal of Hazardous Materials, 324*, 62-70. doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2015.12.042

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

- Knoblauch, C., Jørgensen, B. B., & Harder, J. (1999). Community size and metabolic rates of psychrophilic
 sulfate-reducing bacteria in arctic marine sediments. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 65(9), 4230-
- 480 4233. doi:10.1128/aem.65.9.4230-4233.1999
- 481 Koenig, A., & Liu, L. H. (1996). Autotrophic denitrification of landfill leachate using elemental 482 sulphur. *Water Science and Technology*, *34*(5-6-6 pt 3), 469-476. doi:10.1016/0273-1223(96)00680-4
- 483 Koenig, A., & Liu, L. H. (2001). Kinetic model of autotrophic denitrification in sulphur packed-bed reac-484 tors. *Water Research*, *35*(8), 1969-1978. doi:10.1016/S0043-1354(00)00483-8
- 485 Kumar, M., Nandi, M., & Pakshirajan, K. (2021). Recent advances in heavy metal recovery from wastewater 486 by biogenic sulfide precipitation. *Journal of Environmental*
- 487 *Management*, 278 doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.111555
- Lens, P. N. L., Visser, A., Janssen, A. J. H., Hulshoff Pol, L. W., & Lettinga, G. (1998). Biotechnological
 treatment of sulfate-rich wastewaters. *Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology*, 28(1), 41-88.
 doi:10.1080/10643389891254160
- Liamleam, W., & Annachhatre, A. P. (2007). Electron donors for biological sulfate reduction. *Biotechnology Advances*, 25(5), 452-463. doi:10.1016/j.biotechadv.2007.05.002
- Lin, S., Mackey, H. R., Hao, T., Guo, G., van Loosdrecht, M. C. M., & Chen, G. (2018). Biological sulfur
 oxidation in wastewater treatment: A review of emerging opportunities. *Water Research*, 143, 399-415.
 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2018.06.051
- Liu, L. -., Xie, G. -., Xing, D. -., Liu, B. -., Ding, J., Cao, G. -., & Ren, N. -. (2021). Sulfate dependent
 ammonium oxidation: A microbial process linked nitrogen with sulfur cycle and potential
 application. *Environmental Research*, 192 doi:10.1016/j.envres.2020.110282
- Liu, S., Yang, F., Gong, Z., Meng, F., Chen, H., Xue, Y., & Furukawa, K. (2008). Application of anaerobic
 ammonium-oxidizing consortium to achieve completely autotrophic ammonium and sulfate removal. *Biore- source Technology*, 99(15), 6817-6825. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2008.01.054
- Ma, Y., Zheng, X., Fang, Y., Xu, K., He, S., & Zhao, M. (2020). Autotrophic denitrification in constructed
 wetlands: Achievements and challenges. *Bioresource Technology*, 318 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2020.123778
- Moraes, B. S., Souza, T. S. O., & Foresti, E. (2012). Effect of sulfide concentration on autotrophic denitrification from nitrate and nitrite in vertical fixed-bed reactors. *Process Biochemistry*, 47(9), 1395-1401.
 doi:10.1016/j.procbio.2012.05.008
 - Muyzer, G., & Stams, A. J. M. (2008). The ecology and biotechnology of sulphate-reducing bacteria. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, *6*(6), 441-454. doi:10.1038/nrmicro1892
 - Nielsen, G., Hatam, I., Abuan, K. A., Janin, A., Coudert, L., Blais, J. F., . . ., & Baldwin, S. A. (2018). Semi-passive in-situ pilot scale bioreactor successfully removed sulfate and metals from mine impacted water under subarctic climatic conditions. *Water Research*, 140, 268-279. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2018.04.035
 - Pagnanelli, F., Cruz Viggi, C., Cibati, A., Uccelletti, D., Toro, L., & Palleschi, C. (2012). Biotreatment of cr(VI) contaminated waters by sulphate reducing bacteria fed with ethanol. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 199-200, 186-192. doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2011.10.082
 - Park, J. -., Kim, S. -., Delaune, R. D., Cho, J. -., Heo, J. -., Ok, Y. S., & Seo, D. -. (2015). Enhancement of nitrate removal in constructed wetlands utilizing a combined autotrophic and heterotrophic denitrification technology for treating hydroponic wastewater containing high nitrate and low organic carbon concentrations. *Agricultural Water Management*, 162, 1-14. doi:10.1016/j.agwat.2015.08.001
 - Park, J. Y., & Yoo, Y. J. (2009). Biological nitrate removal in industrial wastewater treatment: Which electron donor we can choose. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 82(3), 415-429. doi:10.1007/s00253-008-1799-1

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520
- Park, K., Lee, H., Phelan, S., Liyanaarachchi, S., Marleni, N., Navaratna, D., ..., & Shu, L. (2014). Mitigation
 strategies of hydrogen sulphide emission in sewer networks A review. *International Biodeterioration and Biodegradation*, 95(PA), 251-261. doi:10.1016/j.ibiod.2014.02.013
- Pokorna, D., & Zabranska, J. (2015). Sulfur-oxidizing bacteria in environmental technology. *Biotechnology Advances*, 33(6), 1246-1259. doi:10.1016/j.biotechadv.2015.02.007

Prachakittikul, P., Wantawin, C., Noophan, P., & Boonapatcharoen, N. (2016). ANAMMOX-like perfor mances for nitrogen removal from ammonium-sulfate-rich wastewater in an anaerobic sequencing batch reac tor. *Journal of Environmental Science and Health - Part A Toxic/Hazardous Substances and Environmental En-* gineering, 51(3), 220-228. doi:10.1080/10934529.2015.1094336

- Qian, J., Lu, H., Jiang, F., Ekama, G. A., & Chen, G. -. (2015). Beneficial co-treatment of simple wet flue
 gas desulphurization wastes with freshwater sewage through development of mixed denitrification-SANI
 process. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 262, 109-118. doi:10.1016/j.cej.2014.09.066
- Qin, Y., Wei, Q., Zhang, Y., Li, H., Jiang, Y., & Zheng, J. (2021). Nitrogen removal from ammonium- and
 sulfate-rich wastewater in an upflow anaerobic sludge bed reactor: Performance and microbial community
 structure. *Ecotoxicology*, doi:10.1007/s10646-020-02333-x
- 537 Reyes-Alvarado, L. C., Camarillo-Gamboa, Á., Rustrian, E., Rene, E. R., Esposito, G., Lens, P. N. L., &
- 538 Houbron, E. (2018). Lignocellulosic biowastes as carrier material and slow release electron donor for sul-
- 539 philogenesis of wastewater in an inverse fluidized bed bioreactor. *Environmental Science and Pollution*
- 540 Research, 25(6), 5115-5128. doi:10.1007/s11356-017-9334-5
- Reyes-Alvarado, L. C., Okpalanze, N. N., Rene, E. R., Rustrian, E., Houbron, E., Esposito, G., & Lens, P.
 N. L. (2017). Carbohydrate based polymeric materials as slow release electron donors for sulphate removal from
 wastewater. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 200, 407-415. doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2017.05.074
- Rikmann, E., Zekker, I., Tomingas, M., Tenno, T., Loorits, L., Vabamäe, P., . . ., & Tenno, T. (2016).
 Sulfate-reducing anammox for sulfate and nitrogen containing wastewaters. *Desalination and Water Treatment*, 57(7), 3132-3141. doi:10.1080/19443994.2014.984339
- Rios-Del Toro, E. E., & Cervantes, F. J. (2019). Anaerobic ammonium oxidation in marine environments:
 Contribution to biogeochemical cycles and biotechnological developments for wastewater treatment. *Reviews in Environmental Science and Biotechnology*, 18(1), 11-27. doi:10.1007/s11157-018-09489-3
- Rubio-Rincón, F., Lopez-Vazquez, C., Welles, L., van den Brand, T., Abbas, B., van Loosdrecht, M., &
 Brdjanovic, D. (2017). Effects of electron acceptors on sulphate reduction activity in activated sludge
 processes. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, *101*(15), 6229-6240. doi:10.1007/s00253-017-8340-3
 - Sahinkaya, E., & Dursun, N. (2015). Use of elemental sulfur and thiosulfate as electron sources for water denitrification. *Bioprocess and Biosystems Engineering*, 38(3), 531-541. doi:10.1007/s00449-014-1293-3
 - Sahinkaya, E., & Kilic, A. (2014a). Heterotrophic and elemental-sulfur-based autotrophic denitrification processes for simultaneous nitrate and cr(VI) reduction. *Water Research*, 50, 278-286. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2013.12.005
 - Sahinkaya, E., Kilic, A., & Duygulu, B. (2014b). Pilot and full scale applications of sulfur-based autotrophic denitrification process for nitrate removal from activated sludge process effluent. Water Research, 60, 210-217. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2014.04.052
 - Samarathunga, I. R., & Rathnasiri, P. G. (2019). Effect of pH and external electron donor on mesophilic sulfate reduction during start-up of anaerobic digesters treating skim latex wastewater. Paper presented at the *MERCon 2019 Proceedings, 5th International Multidisciplinary Moratuwa Engineering Research Conference,* 325-330. doi:10.1109/MERCon.2019.8818784
 - Serrano, A., Peces, M., Astals, S., & Villa-Gómez, D. K. (2020). Batch assays for biological sulfatereduction: A review towards a standardized protocol. *Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology*, 50(12), 1195-1223. doi:10.1080/10643389.2019.1644103

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

- Shao, M. -., Zhang, T., & Fang, H. H. -. (2010). Sulfur-driven autotrophic denitrification: Diversity,
 biochemistry, and engineering applications. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 88(5), 1027-1042.
 doi:10.1007/s00253-010-2847-1
- Show, K. -., Lee, D. -., & Pan, X. (2013). Simultaneous biological removal of nitrogen-sulfur-carbon:
 Recent advances and challenges. *Biotechnology Advances*, 31(4), 409-420.
- 573 doi:10.1016/j.biotechadv.2012.12.006
- 574 Sinharoy, A., Baskaran, D., & Pakshirajan, K. (2019). A novel carbon monoxide fed moving bed biofilm
- 575 reactor for sulfate rich wastewater treatment. *Journal of Environmental*
- 576 *Management*, 249 doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.109402
- Sinharoy, A., Baskaran, D., & Pakshirajan, K. (2020a). Process integration and artificial neural network
 modeling of biological sulfate reduction using a carbon monoxide fed gas lift bioreactor. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 391 doi:10.1016/j.cej.2019.123518
- Sinharoy, A., Pakshirajan, K., & Lens, P. N. L. (2020b). Biological sulfate reduction using gaseous
 substrates to treat acid mine drainage. *Current Pollution Reports*, 6(4), 328-344. doi:10.1007/s40726-020-001606
- Sipma, J., Lettinga, G., Stams, A. J. M., & Lens, P. N. L. (2006). Hydrogenogenic CO conversion in a
 moderately thermophilic (55 °C) sulfate-fed gas lift reactor: Competition for CO-derived H2. *Biotechnology Progress*, 22(5), 1327-1334. doi:10.1021/bp0601084
- Sun, R., Zhang, L., Zhang, Z., Chen, G. -., & Jiang, F. (2018). Realizing high-rate sulfur reduction under
 sulfate-rich conditions in a biological sulfide production system to treat metal-laden wastewater deficient in
 organic matter. *Water Research*, 131, 239-245. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2017.12.039
- Sun, Y., & Nemati, M. (2012). Evaluation of sulfur-based autotrophic denitrification and denitritation for
 biological removal of nitrate and nitrite from contaminated waters. *Bioresource Technology*, 114, 207-216.
 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2012.03.061
- Tian, T., & Yu, H. -. (2020). Denitrification with non-organic electron donor for treating low C/N ratio
 wastewaters. *Bioresource Technology*, 299 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2019.1226
- Tsukamoto, T. K., Killion, H. A., & Miller, G. C. (2004). Column experiments for microbiological treatment
 of acid mine drainage: Low-temperature, low-pH and matrix investigations. *Water Research*, 38(6), 1405-1418.
 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2003.12.012
 - van den Brand, T. P. H., Roest, K., Chen, G. H., Brdjanovic, D., & van Loosdrecht, M. C. M. (2015). Potential for beneficial application of sulfate reducing bacteria in sulfate containing domestic wastewater treatment. *World Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 31(11), 1675-1681. doi:10.1007/s11274-015-1935-x
 - Van Houten, R. T., Van Der Spoel, H., Van Aelst, A. C., Hulshoff Pol, L. W., & Lettinga, G. (1996). Biological sulfate reduction using synthesis gas as energy and carbon source. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, 50(2), 136-144. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1097-0290(19960420)50:2<136::AID-BIT3>3.0.CO;2-N
 - Vidal, S., Rocha, C., & Galvão, H. (2002). A comparison of organic and inorganic carbon controls over biological denitrification in aquaria. *Chemosphere*, 48(4), 445-451. doi:10.1016/S0045-6535(02)00073-5
 - Virpiranta, H., Taskila, S., Leiviskä, T., Rämö, J., & Tanskanen, J. (2019). Development of a process for microbial sulfate reduction in cold mining waters cold acclimation of bacterial consortia from an arctic mining district. *Environmental Pollution*, 252, 281-288. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2019.05.087
 - Wan, D., Liu, H., Qu, J., Lei, P., Xiao, S., & Hou, Y. (2009). Using the combined bioelectrochemical and sulfur autotrophic denitrification system for groundwater denitrification. *Bioresource Technology*, 100(1), 142-148. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2008.05.042
 - Wang, A., Liu, C., Ren, N., Han, H., & Lee, D. (2010). Simultaneous removal of sulfide, nitrate and acetate: Kinetic modeling. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 178(1-3), 35-41. doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2010.01.039

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

- Wang, D., Liu, B., Ding, X., Sun, X., Liang, Z., Sheng, S., & Du, L. (2017). Performance evaluation and
 microbial community analysis of the function and fate of ammonia in a sulfate-reducing EGSB reactor. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 101(20), 7729-7739. doi:10.1007/s00253-017-8514-z
- Wang, J. -., Huang, B. -., Li, J., & Jin, R. -. (2020). Advances and challenges of sulfur-driven autotrophic
 denitrification (SDAD) for nitrogen removal. *Chinese Chemical Letters*, 31(10), 2567-2574.
- 619 doi:10.1016/j.cclet.2020.07.036
- Wang, J., Lu, H., Chen, G. -., Lau, G. N., Tsang, W. L., & van Loosdrecht, M. C. M. (2009). A novel sulfate
 reduction, autotrophic denitrification, nitrification integrated (SANI) process for saline wastewater
 treatment. *Water Research*, 43(9), 2363-2372. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2009.02.037
- 623 Wolicka, D. (2008). Biotransformation of phosphogypsum in wastewaters from the dairy 624 industry. *Bioresource Technology*, 99(13), 5666-5672. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2007.10.029
- Wu, L., Wei, W., Xu, J., Chen, X., Liu, Y., Peng, L., ... Ni, B. -. (2021). Denitrifying biofilm processes for
 wastewater treatment: Developments and perspectives. *Environmental Science: Water Research and Technology*, 7(1), 40-67. doi:10.1039/d0ew00576b
- Wu, L., Yan, Z., Li, J., Huang, S., Li, Z., Shen, M., & Peng, Y. (2020). Low temperature advanced nitrogen
 and sulfate removal from landfill leachate by nitrite-anammox and sulfate-anammox. *Environmental Pollution, 259* doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2019.113763
- Ku, G., Yin, F., Chen, S., Xu, Y., & Yu, H. -. (2016). Mathematical modeling of autotrophic denitrification
 (AD) process with sulphide as electron donor. *Water Research*, *91*, 225-234. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2016.01.011
- Ku, X. -., Chen, C., Wang, A. -., Ni, B. -., Guo, W. -., Yuan, Y., . . ., & Ren, N. -. (2017). Mathematical
 modeling of simultaneous carbon-nitrogen-sulfur removal from industrial wastewater. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 321, 371-381. doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2016.08.074
- Ku, X., Chen, C., Wang, A., Guo, W., Zhou, X., Lee, D. -., ..., & Chang, J. -. (2014). Simultaneous removal
 of sulfide, nitrate and acetate under denitrifying sulfide removal condition: Modeling and experimental
 validation. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 264, 16-24. doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2013.10.056
- Ku, Y. -., & Chen, Y. (2020). Advances in heavy metal removal by sulfate-reducing bacteria. *Water Science and Technology*, 81(9), 1797-1827. doi:10.2166/wst.2020.227
- Yang, W., Lu, H., Khanal, S. K., Zhao, Q., Meng, L., & Chen, G. -. (2016). Granulation of sulfur-oxidizing
 bacteria for autotrophic denitrification. *Water Research*, 104, 507-519. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2016.08.049
 - Yang, Z., Zhou, S., & Sun, Y. (2009). Start-up of simultaneous removal of ammonium and sulfate from an anaerobic ammonium oxidation (anammox) process in an anaerobic up-flow bioreactor. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 169(1-3), 113-118. doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2009.03.067
 - Zhang, D., Cui, L., Madani, R. M. A., Wang, H., Zhu, H., & Liang, J. (2019a). Effect of nitrite and nitrate on sulfate reducing ammonium oxidation. *Water Science and Technology*, 80(4), 634-643. doi:10.2166/wst.2019.277j
 - Zhang, D., Cui, L., Wang, H., & Liang, J. (2019b). Study of sulfate-reducing ammonium oxidation process and its microbial community composition. *Water Science and Technology*, 79(1), 137-144. doi:10.2166/wst.2019.027
 - Zhang, L., Zheng, P., He, Y., & Jin, R. (2009). Performance of sulfate-dependent anaerobic ammonium oxidation. *Science in China, Series B: Chemistry*, 52(1), 86-92. doi:10.1007/s11426-008-0161-x
 - Zhao, Q. -., Li, W., & You, S. -. (2006). Simultaneous removal of ammonium-nitrogen and sulphate from wastewaters with an anaerobic attached-growth bioreactor. *Water Sci Technol*, 54(8), 27–35. doi:10.2166/wst.2006.762

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

653

654

655

- Zhou, W., Liu, X., Dong, X., Wang, Z., Yuan, Y., Wang, H., & He, S. (2016). Sulfur-based autotrophic
 denitrification from the micro-polluted water. *Journal of Environmental Sciences (China*), 44, 180-188.
 doi:10.1016/j.jes.2016.01.002
- Chou, W., Sun, Y., Wu, B., Zhang, Y., Huang, M., Miyanaga, T., & Zhang, Z. (2011). Autotrophic
- denitrification for nitrate and nitrite removal using sulfur-limestone. *Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 23(11),
 1761-1769. doi:10.1016/S1001-0742(10)60635-3
- Zou, G., Papirio, S., Lakaniemi, A. -., Ahoranta, S. H., & Puhakka, J. A. (2016). High rate autotrophic deni-
- trification in fluidized-bed biofilm reactors. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 284, 1287-1294.
- 665 doi:10.1016/j.cej.2015.09.074