Citation	Vandamme D, Foubert I, Muylaert K (2013) Flocculation as a low-cost method for harvesting microalgae for bulk biomass production Trends in Biotechnology, vol 31(4), 233-239.
Archived version	Author manuscript: the content is identical to the content of the published paper, but without the final typesetting by the publisher
Published version	http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167779912002247
Journal homepage	http://www.elsevier.com/journals/trends-in-biotechnology/0167-7799
Author contact	your email dries.vandamme@kuleuven-kulak.be your phone number + 32 (0)56 24 6041
IR	https://lirias.kuleuven.be/handle/123456789/370736

(article begins on next page)

1 **Flocculation as a low-cost method for harvesting microalgae for bulk biomass**
2 **production**

3

4

5

6 Vandamme, Dries; Foubert, Imogen; Muylaert, Koenraad

7

8

9

10 KU Leuven Kulak, Laboratory Aquatic Biology, E. Sabbelaan 53, 8500 Kortrijk,
11 Belgium

12

13

14 *Corresponding author: koenraad.muylaert@kuleuven-kulak.be

15 Tel: +32 56 24 62 83 Fax: +32 56 24 69 99

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 **Abstract**

28

29 Global demand for biomass for food, feed, biofuels and chemical production is
30 expected to increase in the coming decades. Microalgae are a promising new source
31 of biomass that may complement agricultural crops. Production of microalgae has so
32 far been limited to high-value applications. In order to realize large-scale production
33 of microalgae biomass for low-value applications, new low-cost technologies are
34 needed to produce and process microalgae. A major challenge lies in the harvesting of
35 the microalgae, which requires the separation of a low amount of biomass consisting
36 of small individual cells from a large volume of culture medium. Flocculation is seen
37 as a promising low-cost harvesting method. Here, we give an overview of the
38 challenges and possible solutions for flocculating microalgae.

39

40

41

42 *Keywords:* microalgae; biomass; biofuels; flocculation; coagulation; separation;
43 harvesting

44

45

46

Microalgae: a promising new source of biomass

Due to a growing world population and an increase in living standards in developing economies, demand for biomass for food and animal feed is expected to increase with more than 50% in the next two decades (1). At the same time, initiatives are being taken to move from a fossil fuel based economy to a biobased economy in which biomass replaces petroleum as a source of transport fuel and as a feedstock for the chemical industry (2). As it is unlikely that agricultural biomass production can meet the growing demand for biomass, there is an urgent need for new sources of biomass that don't compete with agriculture. Microalgae are today considered to be the most promising new source of biomass (3,4,5) (Box 1). Using technology available today, the energy demand is too high for bulk microalgal biomass production for food, feed, bulk chemicals or biofuels (6,7,8). For microalgal biomass to become a commodity like most agricultural crops, the yield has to be increased and the cost of production reduced. The past years have seen an explosion in research and development in increasing the yield of microalgal biomass production through photobioreactor design (9), selection of strains (10) and genetic engineering of metabolic pathways (11). Much less progress has been made on research and innovation in downstream processing, although this is essential to reduce the cost of the production process (12, 13). Today, microalgal production is rapidly moving from lab- and pilot scale to commercial-scale demo installations (11), prompting the need for cost- and energy efficient downstream processing technologies.

The challenge of harvesting microalgae

73 A major challenge in downstream processing of microalgae lies in separating the
74 microalgae from their growth medium, i.e. the harvesting process. Because a high
75 biomass concentration leads to mutual shading of the microalgal cells and thus a
76 reduction in productivity, biomass concentrations in microalgal cultures are usually
77 low: from 0.5 g L⁻¹ in open pond reactors to about 5 g L⁻¹ in photobioreactors. This
78 means that a large volume of water has to be removed to harvest the biomass. Due to
79 the small size of the microalgal cells (2 – 20 µm) and their colloidal stability in
80 suspension (see Box 2), harvesting by means of sedimentation or simple screening is
81 not feasible, except perhaps for larger species such as *Arthrospira*. When microalgae
82 are produced for high-value products, harvesting is done by centrifugation.
83 Centrifugation is however too expensive and energy-intensive if biomass is to be used
84 for low-value products such as biofuels due to the large volumes of culture medium
85 that need to be processed. Finding an alternative technology that is capable of
86 processing large volumes of culture medium at a minimal cost is essential to reduce
87 the cost and increase the scale of microalgal biomass production (14, 15, 16, 17).
88
89 The cost and energy demand for harvesting microalgae could be significantly reduced
90 if the cells could be pre-concentrated by flocculation (18, 19). During flocculation,
91 single cells form larger aggregates that can be separated from the medium by simple
92 gravity sedimentation. When flocculation is used for harvesting microalgae, it is part
93 of a two-step harvesting process. Flocculation is used during the first step to
94 concentrate a dilute suspension of 0.5 g dry matter L⁻¹ 20 to 100 times to a slurry of
95 10 – 50 g L⁻¹. Further dewatering using a mechanical method like centrifugation is
96 then required to obtain an algal paste with a 25 % dry matter content (20). The energy

requirements for this final mechanical dewatering step are acceptable because the particles are relatively large and the volumes of water to be processed small (17).

Flocculation is a widely used technology in different industries ranging from brewing to water treatment and mining. In these industries, flocculation is generally used to separate a small amount of impurities from a large volume of liquid and the liquid is the end product. On the contrary, when flocculation is used for harvesting microalgae the harvested biomass is the end product. As a result, the economics are very different when flocculation is used for harvesting microalgal biomass than when it is used for removing impurities from a liquid. Also, contamination is a major issue as any chemicals added to induce flocculation end up in the harvested biomass. These chemicals can interfere with the final applications of the biomass (e.g. food or feed) or with further processing of the biomass (e.g. lipid extraction) (15).

Approaches for microalgae flocculation

Flocculation can be achieved in several ways (Box 3) and wide range of approaches for flocculating microalgae have been explored in the past years. These approaches range from traditional flocculation methods that are widely used in other fields of industry (e.g. chemical flocculation) to novel ideas based on the biology of microalgae (e.g. bioflocculation) and the use of emerging technologies (e.g. use of magnetic nanoparticles). Here we give a concise overview of these technologies with their advantages and disadvantages.

Chemical flocculation

Metal salts such as alum and ferric chloride are widely used for flocculation in industries like water treatment and mining. Although metal salts are being applied for harvesting microalgae (e.g. *Dunaliella*, 21), their use results in high concentrations of metals in the harvested biomass. These metals remain in the biomass residue after extraction of lipids or carotenoids (22). The metals in the biomass residue may however interfere with the use of the protein fraction in this residue as animal feed. The valorisation of the protein fraction as animal feed is said to be important for making microalgal biofuels economically viable (23). Despite this shortcoming, metal coagulants provide a good model system to study the interaction between flocculants and microalgal cells because their properties are well understood (24, 25).

Other commonly used chemical flocculants in other industries are synthetic polyacrylamide polymers. These may however contain traces of toxic acrylamide and thus also contaminate the microalgal biomass (26). Flocculants based on natural biopolymers are therefore a safer alternative. To be able to interact with the negative surface charge of microalgal cells, these biopolymers should be positively charged, which is rare in nature. A well known positively charged biopolymer is chitosan, which is derived from chitin, a waste product from shellfish production. Chitosan is a very efficient flocculant but it works only at low pH, while pH in microalgal cultures is relatively high (27). An alternative to chitosan is cationic starch, which is prepared from starch by addition of quaternary ammonium groups. The charge of these quaternary ammonium is independent of pH and therefore cationic starch works over a broader pH range than chitosan (28). Other examples of biopolymers than can be

used to flocculate microalgae are poly-gamma glutamic acid (an extracellular polymer produced by *Bacillus subtilis*) (29) or polymers present in flour from *Moringa oleifera* seeds (30). A general problem of polymer flocculants is that they undergo coiling at high ionic strengths and become ineffective (15). Therefore, they are less suitable for harvesting microalgae cultivated in seawater.

Autoflocculation

Flocculation often occurs spontaneously in microalgal cultures when pH increases above pH 9 (31). This of flocculation is often referred to as autoflocculation because it often occurs spontaneously in microalgal cultures as a result of a pH increases due to photosynthetic CO₂ depletion. Autoflocculation is associated with the formation of calcium or magnesium precipitates. Depending on the conditions, these precipitates carry positive surface charges and can induce flocculation through charge neutralization and/or sweeping flocculation.

Calcium phosphate precipitates are positively charged when calcium ions are in excess of phosphate ions and interact with the negative surface charge of microalgal cells (8, 17). High phosphate concentrations are required to for this type of flocculation to occur. Due to the declining phosphate reserves and increasing prices of phosphate, flocculation by calcium phosphate precipitation is unsustainable, except perhaps in applications where microalgae are used for wastewater treatment and excess phosphate needs to be removed (32). Magnesium hydroxide or brucite also precipitates at high pH. These precipitates are positively charged up to pH of 12 and can therefore also interact with the microalgal cell surface to cause flocculation (33,

34). Most waters contain sufficiently high background concentrations of magnesium for this process to occur. Calcium carbonate or calcite also precipitates at high pH but whether it can induce flocculation of microalgae remains to be demonstrated. Because flocculation at high pH is caused by formation of inorganic precipitates and not by pH as such, the harvested biomass contains high concentrations of minerals (35). Although these have a low toxicity, it is nevertheless preferable to remove them from the biomass.

Physical flocculation methods

Contamination of the biomass might be avoided when only applying physical forces can induce flocculation. For instance, flocculation of microalgae can be accomplished by applying a field of standing ultrasound waves. Although this method works well in the lab, it is difficult to apply at larger scales (36). In electro-coagulation-flocculation, flocculation is induced through electrolytic release of metal ions from a sacrificial anode (37). The efficiency of this method might be improved by changing the polarity of the electrodes (38). Similar to flocculation by metal salts, electro-coagulation-flocculation results in contamination of the biomass with metals, albeit to a lesser extent than when metal coagulants are directly used. Originoil claims to have developed a solution for this problem. Their method uses only electromagnetic pulses to neutralize the surface charge of microalgal cells and induce flocculation (39).

Recently, several studies have explored the use of magnetic nanoparticles to harvest microalgae. Magnetite (Fe_2O_3) nanoparticles may adsorb directly on the microalgal cells upon which the cells can be separated from the medium by applying a magnetic

field. This method thus combines flocculation and separation in a single process step (40). Magnetite nanoparticles seem to adsorb more easily on some microalgal species than on others (41). Adsorption can be improved by coating the nanoparticles with cationic polymers (42, 43). An advantage of using magnetite nanoparticles for harvesting microalgae is that the nanoparticles can be recovered after harvesting and subsequently re-used (40).

Bioflocculation

In natural blooms of microalgae occurring in lakes or rivers, flocculation sometimes occurs spontaneously. This spontaneous flocculation is assumed to be caused by extracellular polymers substances in the medium and is called bioflocculation (10). Bioflocculation is often successfully used for harvesting microalgae in facilities where microalgae are used in wastewater treatment (44). The underlying mechanism, however, is poorly understood and deserves further research as it may lead to a chemical-free method for flocculating microalgae. Some microalgal species flocculate more readily than others and such naturally bioflocculating microalgae can be mixed with other species to induce flocculation (45, 46). There are indications that bioflocculation may be initiated by infochemicals (47). Recently, an infochemical isolated from a senescent and flocculating culture of a *Skeletonema* species was found to be capable of inducing flocculation in a culture of another species of microalgae (48).

Bacteria or fungi can also induce bioflocculation of microalgae. Some fungi, for instance, have positively charged hyphae that can interact with the negatively charged

microalgal cell surface and cause flocculation (49, 50). Specific consortia of bacteria can also induce flocculation of microalgae (51, 52). These flocculating fungi or bacteria can be cultivated separately or in combination with the microalgae. Cultivating bacteria or fungi in combination with microalgae requires a carbon source in the medium. In wastewater, a carbon source is usually present and this allows co-cultivation of microalgae and bacteria. This results in a culture of mixed algal-bacterial flocs that can be easily harvested (53, 54). The use of bacteria or fungi as a flocculating agent avoids chemical contamination of the biomass but results in microbiological contamination, which may also interfere with food or feed applications of the microalgal biomass.

Genetic modification

Many research efforts are currently directed towards genetic modification of microalgae. Most recently published studies and granted patents in this field are aimed at increasing biomass productivity or increasing production of specific metabolites, most often lipids (10, 11). However, genetic modification may also be a promising way to harvest microalgae (8, 11). Here, achievements in genetic modification of yeast may be used as an example. In yeast, genetically modified strains have been developed that express flocculin proteins in their cell walls causing the cells to aggregate (55). The expression of these proteins can be induced by an environmental trigger or during a specific growth stage. Sapphire Energy described a method for flocculating microalgae in which ligand receptor pairs can be expressed in different strains that are mixed to induce flocculation, or that are expressed sequentially in the same strain (56). Genetic modification or selection may also be

aimed at facilitating flocculation by other methods. For instance, a cell wall-deficient mutant of *Chlamydomonas* was found to flocculate much more easily under alkaline conditions than the wild-type strain (57). This indicates that minor genetic modifications may greatly facilitate alkaline flocculation.

Properties of microalgae that influence flocculation

Most studies on flocculation of microalgae carried out so far focused on a single species cultured under one particular condition. But flocculation depends on the properties of microalgal cell surfaces and these properties differ between species and vary within a species depending on culture conditions. Because the cell surface to biomass ratio increases with decreasing cell size, smaller species will require a higher flocculant dose to harvest the same amount of biomass than larger species (45). The biochemical composition of the cell surface differs between species and these differences influence flocculation (58). Cell surface properties may even vary between different strains of the same species and cause differences in flocculation behavior between different strains (59). These properties are also variable within a species, resulting in a different flocculation behavior in e.g. exponential versus stationary phase cultures (60, 58).

The composition of the culture medium will also affect flocculation of microalgae. The pH influences the charge of not only the microalgal cell surface but often also of chemical flocculants and is therefore an important parameter to consider. Furthermore, microalgae often excrete significant quantities of organic matter into the growth medium (61). This algal organic matter consists of polysaccharides and

proteins that can compete with the algal cell surface for flocculants and thus interfere with flocculation (62, 63). It appears that the flocculant demand is determined to a larger degree by the quantity and composition of the algal organic matter than by the properties of the microalgal cells themselves (64, 65). Excretion of this algal organic matter is generally higher under nutrient stress (45), which is actually important to induce lipid accumulation in microalgae (e.g. 47). Higher lipid productivity in microalgae may thus be associated with a higher chemical demand for flocculation.

Flocculation as part of a two-step harvesting process

As production of microalgae today is still very expensive compared to agricultural biomass production, cost is an important factor to consider when evaluating flocculation technologies for harvesting microalgae. Harvesting microalgae using metal salts or chitosan is only marginally less expensive than centrifugation, currently the most commonly used method for harvesting microalgae (8). Flocculation using standing ultrasound waves costs even more than centrifugation. Magnetic nanoparticles are prohibitively expensive today but their cost may go down in the future if new methods for producing such nanoparticles become available (66). Cationic starch or other biopolymers are slightly cheaper than for instance chitosan but probably still too expensive for applications such as biofuel production.

Electro-coagulation-flocculation has a low electricity demand when the method is used in seawater and may be promising low-cost method for harvesting marine microalgae (37, 38). Other promising low-cost flocculation methods that are available today are autoflocculation at high pH and bioflocculation. The cost of

autoflocculation is very low even if a base is required to increase pH (17, 33). Bioflocculation by addition of flocculating microalgae, fungi or bacteria requires cultivating these microorganisms, but the cost for doing this is substantially lower than the cost of centrifugation (46). This cost can be avoided altogether if flocculating microalgae are co-cultivated with flocculating bacteria, which is possible if the medium contains a carbon source for the bacteria, as is often the case in wastewater. Controlled flocculation of microalgae through infochemicals or through genetic modification are promising technologies but require further basic research before they can be applied. The use of both infochemicals and genetic modification is likely to be highly species-specific. So far, virtually no information is available on the identity of infochemicals inducing bioflocculation. For most species of microalgae, a toolbox for genetic modification is not yet available. Therefore, upfront research and development costs for these flocculation methods are likely to be high.

The use of flocculation not only incurs direct costs for flocculation itself, but also indirect costs through its impact on other operations in the production process. For instance, many flocculation technologies cause contamination of the biomass with chemicals, minerals or microorganisms. This is the case for chemical flocculation, flocculation at high pH or bioflocculation by bacteria or fungi. These contaminants may limit the use of the biomass (e.g. for food or feed), or interfere with processing of the biomass. Some flocculation technologies also result in chemical contamination of the culture medium (e.g. metal salts or electro-coagulation-flocculation) or cause large changes in pH (e.g. autoflocculation). This may limit recycling of the culture medium and thus result in significant indirect costs that should be accounted for.

Flocculation is part of a two-step harvesting process in which flocculation is used to pre-concentrate the biomass before a physical method is used for the final dewatering. The more water can be removed during the first flocculation step, the lower the cost will be for the second mechanical dewatering step (67). To minimize the cost for mechanical dewatering, it is important that flocculation results in a low algal sludge volume (68). Not only the volume of water that can be removed during flocculation is important, also the rate at which this can be done is important. Therefore, microalgal flocs should have a high sedimentation rate. A flocculation technology that results in rapidly settling flocs requires a smaller harvesting unit and thus incurs lower investment costs. So far, few studies on flocculation of microalgae have taken parameters such as the sludge volume or the sedimentation rate into account (69).

Conclusion

Development of an efficient flocculation technology for microalgae may yield major cost and energy savings in large-scale production of microalgal biomass. Because of this, numerous studies have started to explore various approaches for flocculating microalgae. Chemical flocculation has the disadvantage that it results in contamination of the biomass, although the use of natural polymers may minimize this problem. Alkaline flocculation promises to be a low-cost flocculation method but also results in contamination of the biomass, albeit with mineral precipitates with low toxicity. Biological flocculation using fungi or bacteria holds a lot of potential when microalgae production is combined with wastewater treatment, as wastewater can provide the necessary carbon source for the flocculating microorganisms. Physical flocculation methods have the advantage that they may avoid contamination of the

biomass with chemicals or microorganisms. Fundamental research into infochemicals that induce flocculation in microalgae is urgently needed, as this may lead to a highly controllable method for inducing flocculation that avoids contamination. The same holds true for approaches to induce flocculation through genetic modification. Future studies should not only look at the efficiency of flocculation under specific conditions, but should also investigate how flocculation is influenced by properties of the microalgal cells or by culture conditions, particularly interference by organic matter in the culture medium. Cost is an important factor to consider when evaluating new flocculation methods for microalgae. Cost evaluation should not only take the cost of flocculation step itself into account, but also the influence on the entire production process.

Box 1. Production of microalgae

Microalgae and cyanobacteria are unicellular micro-organisms that live in water and produce biomass through photosynthesis. They evolved billions of years ago in the oceans, long before plants colonized the land. Many microalgae belong to different evolutionary lineages than terrestrial plants and are therefore capable of producing unique products such as poly-unsaturated fatty acids (EPA or DHA) or natural pigments (phycocyanin, astaxanthin) that cannot be found in terrestrial plants.

Microalgae occur in lakes, rivers and oceans but biomass concentrations in natural ecosystems are generally too low to be harvested commercially (except for certain lakes dominated by *Arthrospira*). Microalgae are produced commercially in special reactors designed to maximize photosynthesis: open ‘raceway ponds’ or closed photobioreactors. Raceway ponds consist of shallow basins while photobioreactors are transparent tubular or flat panel reactors. As productivity of microalgae is generally limited by self-shading of the cells in the culture, photobioreactors have a higher productivity than raceway ponds because light supply to the cells is more efficient. The main disadvantage of photobioreactors is their cost, although several potentially low-cost designs have been developed by the microalgae industry in the past years (e.g. Proviron, Solix).

Microalgae have been produced commercially for several decades but total production is still low (1000 tonnes year⁻¹) and aimed mainly at high-value products such as nutritional supplements, natural pigments or aquaculture feed. Only a few

389 species are being produced on a scale of hundreds to thousands of tonnes
390 (*Arthrospira*, *Chlorella*, *Dunaliella*, *Haematococcus*), while about 10 additional
391 species are produced at a smaller scale (70). The majority of the commercial
392 production today is done in open raceway ponds, but closed photobioreactors appear
393 to be favored by most new companies.

394

395

396

397 **Box 2. Stabilization of microalgal suspensions**

398

399 Particles suspended in water usually carry a positive or negative surface charge. To
400 maintain electrical neutrality, such charged particles will attract ions with an opposite
401 charge from the solution (counter ions). The system of the particle surface charge and
402 associated counter ions in the surrounding solution is called the electrical double
403 layer. Close to the particle surface, the counter ions form a dense layer of ions that is
404 inaccessible to other counter ions, the Stern layer. Further away from the particle
405 surface, the counter ions form a diffuse layer as a result of a balance between
406 electrostatic attraction and thermal diffusion. As a result, the potential difference
407 between the particle surface and the bulk solution decreases more or less
408 exponentially with distance from the particle surface.

409

410 The cloud of counter ions surrounding charged particles in a suspension results in an
411 electrical repulsion between the particles. The zeta potential is the potential difference
412 between the bulk fluid and the layer of counter ions that remains associated with the
413 charged particle when the particle is moving through the solution (the slipping plane).
414 Because the zeta potential can relatively easily be estimated from the mobility of the
415 charged particles in an electric field, it is a useful indicator of the degree of repulsion
416 between charged particles in a suspension. When the zeta potential is high (> 25 mV,
417 positive or negative), electrical repulsion between particles is strong and the
418 suspension is said to be stable. When the zeta potential is close to zero, particles can
419 approach each other to a point where they will be attracted by Van der Waals forces.

420 When that happens, particles will aggregate and flocculation or coagulation will
421 occur.

422

423 Just like in other stable suspensions of particles, microalgal cell suspensions are
424 stabilized by the surface charge of the cells. This surface charge originates
425 predominantly from the presence of carboxylic (-COOH) and amine (-NH₂) groups on
426 the cell surface. The carboxylic groups dissociate and are negatively charged above
427 pH 4-5 while the amine groups are uncharged at this pH. This results in a net negative
428 surface charge at pH above 4-5.

429

Box 3. Approaches to induce flocculation

Flocculation or coagulation is commonly used in wastewater treatment, drinking water production, mining and brewing to remove impurities from water. Flocculation of suspensions of particles can often be attributed to three common mechanisms, which can act alone or in combination.

- *Charge neutralization*: the phenomenon when positively charged ions, polymers or colloids strongly absorb on the negative surface charge of a particle, ultimately canceling the negative surface charge. As a result, the electrostatic repulsion between the particles disappears and particles will coagulate or flocculate.
- *Electrostatic patch mechanism*: the phenomenon when a highly charged polymer binds to part of the surface of a particle and thus results in a patch on the particle surface with opposite charge. Thus, the net residual charge of this patch can connect to a particle with opposite charge.
- *Bridging*: polymers or charged colloids simultaneously bind to the surface of two different particles to form a bridge between these particles. This bridge brings the particles together and causes flocculation. The division between patching and bridging is based on the size of the polymer in comparison with the size of the particle.
- *Sweeping flocculation*: particles are entrapped in a massive precipitation of a mineral. This causes flocculation of these particles.

455 Flocculation can be induced by several approaches. Metal salts such as alum and
456 ferric chloride are commonly used flocculants or coagulants. These metal salts
457 dissociate in water and the metal ions can cause flocculation through charge
458 neutralization. Metal ions readily hydrolyze in water to form metal hydroxides. Metal
459 hydroxides can precipitate even at low metal concentrations. These metal hydroxide
460 precipitates are often positively charged and can cause flocculation through charge
461 neutralization, bridging or sweeping flocculation. Other precipitates such as calcium
462 phosphates or magnesium hydroxides that can be formed at high pH can cause
463 flocculation through the same mechanisms as metal hydroxide precipitates. Another
464 important class of flocculants are polymers. Charged polymers can bind to the surface
465 of different particles and can cause flocculation through bridging. Charged polymers
466 can also neutralize or even reverse the surface charge of particles to cause flocculation
467 through charge neutralization or electrostatic patch aggregation.
468

Figures

Figure 1: Macroscopic and microscopic view of flocculation of a culture of *Chlorella vulgaris* using pH induced flocculation. The macroscopic view (left) shows a culture of *Chlorella vulgaris* in an Imhoff cone before and after flocculation. The microscopic view shows *Chlorella vulgaris* cells before (middle) and after (right) flocculation.

Figure I Box 1: Example of open ‘raceway pond’ reactors (Ingrepo, The Netherlands) and a novel design of a low-cost photobioreactor (Proviron, Belgium).

Figure I Box 2: Structure of the electrical double layer of charged ions in solution surrounding a negatively charged microalgal cell and the potential difference between the particle and the bulk fluid as a function of the distance from the particle surface.

References

1. Foley, J. *et al.* (2011) Solutions for a cultivated planet. *Nature*, 478, 337–342
2. Haveren, J. van *et al.* (2008) Bulk chemicals from biomass. *Biofuel. Bioprod. Bior.* 2, 41–57
3. Chisti, Y. (2008) Biodiesel from microalgae beats bioethanol. *Trends Biotechnol.* 26, 126–31
4. Posten, C. and Schaub, G. (2009) Microalgae and terrestrial biomass as source for fuels - a process view. *J. Biotechnol.* 142, 64–9
5. Wijffels, R. H. and Barbosa, M. J. (2010) An outlook on microalgal biofuels. *Science.* 329, 796–799
6. Beilen, J. B. van (2010) Why microalgal biofuels won ' t save the internal combustion engine. *Biofuel. Bioprod. Bior.* 4, 41–52
7. Walker, D. A. (2009) Biofuels, facts, fantasy, and feasibility. *J. Appl. Phycol.* 21, 509–517
8. Christenson, L. and Sims, R. (2011) Production and harvesting of microalgae for wastewater treatment, biofuels, and bioproducts. *Biotechnol. Adv.* 29, 686–702
9. Morweiser, M. *et al.* (2010) Developments and perspectives of photobioreactors for biofuel production. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 87, 1291–301

- 517 10. Larkum, A. W. D. *et al.* (2012) Selection, breeding and engineering of
 518 microalgae for bioenergy and biofuel production. *Trends Biotechnol.* 30, 198–
 519 205
- 520 11. Georgianna, D. R. and Mayfield, S. P. (2012) Exploiting diversity and synthetic
 521 biology for the production of algal biofuels. *Nature.* 488, 329–335
- 522 12. Chen, C.-Y. *et al.* (2010) Cultivation, photobioreactor design and harvesting of
 523 microalgae for biodiesel production: A critical review. *Bioresour. Technol.*
 524 102, 71–81
- 525 13. Greenwell, H. C. *et al.* (2010) Placing microalgae on the biofuels priority list: a
 526 review of the technological challenges. *J. Roy. Soc. Interface* 7, 703–26
- 527 14. Molina Grima, E. *et al.* (2003) Recovery of microalgal biomass and
 528 metabolites: process options and economics. *Biotechnol. Adv.* 20, 491–515
- 529 15. Uduman, N. *et al.* (2010) Dewatering of microalgal cultures: A major
 530 bottleneck to algae-based fuels. *J. Renewable Sustainable Energy.* 2, 012701
- 531 16. Brennan, L. and Owende, P. (2010) Biofuels from microalgae—A review of
 532 technologies for production, processing, and extractions of biofuels and co-
 533 products. *Renewable Sustainable Energy Rev.* 14, 557–577
- 534 17. Schlesinger, A. *et al.* (2012) Inexpensive non-toxic flocculation of microalgae
 535 contradicts theories; overcoming a major hurdle to bulk algal production.
 536 *Biotechnol. Adv.* 30, 1023-1030
- 537 18. Brentner, L. B. *et al.* (2011) Combinatorial life cycle assessment to inform
 538 process design of industrial production of algal biodiesel. *Environ. Sci.*
 539 *Technol.* 45, 7060–7067
- 540 19. Pienkos, P. T. and Darzins, A. (2009) The promise and challenges of
 541 microalgal-derived biofuels. *Biofuel. Bioprod. Bior.* 3, 431–440

- 542 20. Wileman, A. *et al.* (2011). Rheological properties of algae slurries for
- 543 minimizing harvesting energy requirements in biofuel production. *Biores.*
- 544 *Technol.* 104, 432-439
- 545 21. Ben-Amotz, A. and Avron M. (1990) The biotechnology of cultivating the
- 546 halotolerant alga *Dunaliella*. *Trends Biotechnol* 8,121–125
- 547 22. Rwehumbiza, V. M. *et al.* (2012) Alum-induced flocculation of
- 548 preconcentrated *Nannochloropsis salina*: Residual aluminium in the biomass,
- 549 FAMES and its effects on microalgae growth upon media recycling. *Chem. Eng.*
- 550 *J.* 200-202, 168-175
- 551 23. Wijffels, R. *et al.* (2010) Microalgae for production of bulk chemicals and
- 552 biofuels. *Biofuel. Bioprod. Bior.* 4, 287–295
- 553 24. Wyatt, N. *et al.* (2011) Critical conditions for ferric chloride-induced
- 554 flocculation of freshwater algae. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 109, 493-501
- 555 25. Zhang, X. *et al.* (2012) Influence of growth phase on harvesting of *Chlorella*
- 556 *zofingiensis* by dissolved air flotation. *Bioresour. Technol.* 37, 166-176
- 557 26. Bratby, J. (2006) *Coagulation and flocculation in water and wastewater*
- 558 *treatment*, IWA Publishing.
- 559 27. Chang, Y.-R., & Lee, D.-J. (2012) Coagulation–membrane filtration of *Chlorella*
- 560 *vulgaris* at different growth phases. *Drying Tech.* 30, 1317–1322
- 561 28. Vandamme, D. *et al.* (2010) Flocculation of microalgae using cationic starch. *J.*
- 562 *Appl. Phycol.* 22, 525–530
- 563 29. Zheng, H. *et al.* (2012) Harvesting of microalgae by flocculation with poly (γ -
- 564 glutamic acid). *Bioresour. Technol.* 112, 212–20

- 565 30. Teixeira, C. M. L. L. *et al.* (2012) Evaluation of *Moringa oleifera* seed flour as a
566 flocculating agent for potential biodiesel producer microalgae. *J. Appl. Phycol.*
567 DOI: 10.1007/s10811-011-9773-1
- 568 31. Spilling, K. *et al.* (2011) Inducing autoflocculation in the diatom
569 *Phaeodactylum tricornutum* through CO₂ regulation. *J. Appl. Phycol.* 23, 959–
570 966
- 571 32. Lundquist, T. *et al.* (2010) A realistic technology and engineering assessment
572 of algae biofuel production. Energy Biosciences Institute, University of
573 California Berkeley
- 574 33. Vandamme, D. *et al.* (2012) Flocculation of *Chlorella vulgaris* induced by high
575 pH: role of magnesium and calcium and practical implications. *Bioresour.*
576 *Technol.* 105, 114–119
- 577 34. Wu, Z. *et al.* (2012) Evaluation of flocculation induced by pH increase for
578 harvesting microalgae and reuse of flocculated medium. *Bioresour. Technol.*
579 110, 496–502
- 580 35. Show, K.-Y. *et al.* (2012) Algal Biomass Dehydration. *Bioresour. Technol.* DOI:
581 10.1016/j.biortech.2012.08.021
- 582 36. Bosma, R. *et al.* (2003) Ultrasound, a new separation technique to harvest
583 microalgae. *J. Appl. Phycol.* 15, 143–153
- 584 37. Vandamme, D. *et al.* (2011) Evaluation of electro-coagulation-flocculation for
585 harvesting marine and freshwater microalgae. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 108, 2320–
586 2329
- 587 38. Kim, J. *et al.* (2012) Continuous microalgae recovery using electrolysis with
588 polarity exchange. *Bioresour. Technol.* 124, 164–170

- 589 39. Gouveia, L. (2011) Microalgae as feedstock for Biofuels. *Springer Berlin*
590 *Heidelberg*
- 591 40. Cerff, M., Morweiser, M., Dillschneider, R., Michel, A., Menzel, K., & Posten, C.
592 (2012) Harvesting fresh water and marine algae by magnetic separation:
593 screening of separation parameters and high gradient magnetic filtration.
594 *Biores. Technol.*, 118, 289-295.
- 595 41. Xu, L., Guo, C., Wang, F., Zheng, Sen, & Liu, C.-Z. (2011) A simple and rapid
596 harvesting method for microalgae by in situ magnetic separation. *Biores.*
597 *Tech.*, 102, 10047-10051
- 598 42. Lim, J.K. *et al.* (2012) Rapid magnetophoretic separation of microalgae.
599 *Small*, 8, 1683-1692
- 600 43. Liu, D., Li, F., & Zhang, B. (2009) Removal of algal blooms in freshwater using
601 magnetic polymer. *Water Sci. & Tech.*, 59, 1085-1092
- 602 44. Craggs, R. *et al.* (2012) Hectare-scale demonstration of high rate algal ponds
603 for enhanced wastewater treatment and biofuel production. *J. Appl. Phycol.*
604 24, 329–337
- 605 45. Schenk, P. M. *et al.* (2008) Second generation biofuels: high-efficiency
606 microalgae for biodiesel production. *BioEnergy Res.* 1, 20–43
- 607 46. Taylor, R. L. *et al.* (2012) Treatment with algae extracts promotes
608 flocculation, and enhances growth and neutral lipid content in
609 *Nannochloropsis oculata*—a candidate for biofuel production. *Mar.*
610 *Biotechnol.* DOI: 10.1007/s10126-012-9441-8
- 611 47. Eldridge, R. J. *et al.* (2012) A comparative study of the coagulation behaviour
612 of marine microalgae. *J. Appl. Phycol.* DOI: 10.1007/s10811-012-9830-4

- 613 48. Salim, S. *et al.* (2012) Ratio between autoflocculating and target microalgae
614 affects the energy-efficient harvesting by bio-flocculation. *Bioresour. Technol.*
615 118, 49-55
- 616 49. Zhou, W. *et al.* (2012) Novel fungal pelletization-assisted technology for algae
617 harvesting and wastewater treatment. *Appl. Biochem. Biotechnol.* 167, 214–
618 28
- 619 50. Zhang, J. and Hu, B. (2012) A novel method to harvest microalgae via co-
620 culture of filamentous fungi to form cell pellets. *Bioresour. Technol.* 114, 529–
621 35
- 622 51. Gutzeit, G. *et al.* (2005) Bioflocculent algal-bacterial biomass improves low-
623 cost wastewater treatment. *Water Sci. Technol.* 52, 9–18
- 624 52. Lee, A. K. *et al.* (2008) Microbial flocculation, a potentially low-cost
625 harvesting technique for marine microalgae for the production of biodiesel. *J.*
626 *Appl. Phycol.* 21, 559–567
- 627 53. Van Den Hende, S. *et al.* (2011) Microalgal bacterial floc properties are
628 improved by a balanced inorganic/organic carbon ratio. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.*
629 108, 549–58
- 630 54. Su, Y. *et al.* (2011) Municipal wastewater treatment and biomass
631 accumulation with a wastewater-born and settleable algal-bacterial culture.
632 *Water Res.* 45, 3351–8
- 633 55. Govender, P. *et al.* (2008) Controlled expression of the dominant flocculation
634 genes FLO1, FLO5, and FLO11 in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Appl. Env.*
635 *Microbiol.*, 74, 6041–6052

- 636 56. Mendez M, Behnke C, Poon Y, Lee P. Induction of flocculation in
 637 photosynthetic organisms. Patent cooperation treaty application WO
 638 2009158658. 2009a
- 639 57. Scholz, M. *et al.* (2011) Flocculation of wall-deficient cells of *Chlamydomonas*
 640 *reinhardtii* mutant cw15 by calcium and methanol. *Biomass Bioenergy*. 35,
 641 4835–4840
- 642 58. Henderson, R. K. *et al.* (2008) Characterisation of algogenic organic matter
 643 extracted from cyanobacteria, green algae and diatoms. *Water Res.* 42, 3435–
 644 45
- 645 59. Cheng, Y.-S. *et al.* (2011) The impact of cell wall carbohydrate composition on
 646 the chitosan flocculation of *Chlorella*. *Process Biochem.* 46, 1927-1933
- 647 60. Danquah, M. K. *et al.* (2009) Microalgal growth characteristics and
 648 subsequent influence on dewatering efficiency. *Chem. Eng. J.* 151, 73–78
- 649 61. Hulatt, C. J. and Thomas, D. N. (2010) Dissolved organic matter (DOM) in
 650 microalgal photobioreactors: a potential loss in solar energy conversion?
 651 *Bioresour. Technol.* 101, 8690–7
- 652 62. Zhang, X. *et al.* (2012) Influence of growth phase on harvesting of *Chlorella*
 653 *zofingiensis* by dissolved air flotation. *Bioresour. Technol.* 116, 477-484
- 654 63. Chen, L. *et al.* (2008) The released polysaccharide of the cyanobacterium
 655 *Aphanothece halophytica* inhibits flocculation of the alga with ferric chloride. *J.*
 656 *Appl. Phycol.* 21, 327-331.
- 657 64. Henderson, R. K. *et al.* (2010). The impact of differing cell and algogenic
 658 organic matter (AOM) characteristics on the coagulation and flotation of
 659 algae. *Water Research*, 44, 3617–3624

- 660 65. Vandamme, D. *et al.* (2012) Influence of organic matter generated by
661 *Chlorella vulgaris* on five different methods of flocculation. *Bioresour. Technol.*
662 DOI: 10.1016/j.biortech.2012.08.121
- 663 66. Moon, J.W, *et al.* (2010) Large-scale production of magnetic nanoparticles
664 using bacterial fermentation. *J. Ind. Microbiol. Biotechnol.*, 37, 1023-31
- 665 67. Jorquera, O. *et al.* (2010) Comparative energy life-cycle analyses of microalgal
666 biomass production in open ponds and photobioreactors. *Bioresour. Technol.*
667 101, 1406–13
- 668 68. Danquah, M. K. *et al.* (2009). Dewatering of microalgal culture for biodiesel
669 production: exploring polymer flocculation and tangential flow filtration. *J.*
670 *Chem. Technol. & Biotechnol.*, 84, 1078–1083
- 671 69. Granados, M. R. *et al.* (2012) Evaluation of flocculants for the recovery of
672 freshwater microalgae. *Bioresour. Technol.* 118, 102-110
- 673 70. Milledge, J. J. (2010) Commercial application of microalgae other than as
674 biofuels: a brief review. *Rev. Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 1, 31–41

Figure 1

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

Figure 1 box 1

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

Figure 1 box 2
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

Figure I box 1 permission 1

[Click here to download Author Supplementary Material: 20121116 copyright permission request ProviAPT picture.pdf](#)

Figure I box 1 permission 2

[Click here to download Author Supplementary Material: DOC221112-22112012105122.pdf](#)