# Flocculation Harvesting Techniques for Microalgae

#### Subjects: Energy & Fuels

Contributor: Ibrahim A. Matter , Vu Khac Hoang Bui , Mikyoung Jung , Jung Yoon Seo , Young-Eun Kim , Young-Chul Lee , You-Kwan Oh

Microalgae have been considered as one of the most promising biomass feedstocks for various industrial applications such as biofuels, animal/aquaculture feeds, food supplements, nutraceuticals, and pharmaceuticals. Several biotechnological challenges associated with algae cultivation, including the small size and negative surface charge of algal cells as well as the dilution of its cultures, need to be circumvented, which increases the cost and labor. Therefore, efficient biomass recovery or harvesting of diverse algal species represents a critical bottleneck for large-scale algal biorefinery process. Among different algae harvesting techniques (e.g., centrifugation, gravity sedimentation, screening, filtration, and air flotation), the flocculation-based processes have acquired much attention due to their promising efficiency and scalability.

MicroalgaeharvestingflocculationbiomassbiofuelbiorefienryMagnetic particleElectroflotationElectroflotationElectroflotationElectroflotation

## 1. Introduction

Microalgal biomass has attracted much attention in the academic and industrial fields due to its various industrial applications such as animal/aquaculture feeds, food supplements, nutraceuticals, and pharmaceuticals [1][2]. Recently, petroleum-fuel scarcity as well as global warming associated with greenhouse gas emissions (e.g., CO<sub>2</sub>) are obliging scientists and engineers to actively look for new and renewable sources of transportation fuels [3]. Various liquid and gaseous biofuels, such as diesel, aviation fuel, ethanol, butanol, hydrogen, and methane, can be produced from algal biomass through biological and thermochemical transformation technologies [4][5].

Microalgae can utilize  $CO_2$  as an inorganic carbon substrate using light energy and can be grown using diverse water resources, including freshwater, seawater, and even industrial/domestic wastewater. They can be also cultivated at a large-scale using different bioreactor systems such as open ponds and photobioreactors <sup>[6][7]</sup>. However, due to the low concentration (~5 g/L) in culture, small size (~5 µm) and negative surface charge (~-20 mV) of algal cells, external energy and/or chemicals are generally required to accelerate their recovery from base water <sup>[8][9]</sup>. Furthermore, other morphological and physiological characteristics of algal cells such as shape, cell wall structure, and extracellular organic matter (EOM) change significantly depending on the nutritional and environmental conditions including medium composition, light, temperature, pH, culture duration, and bioreactor type <sup>[10]</sup>. The algae harvesting costs are generally estimated at 20–30%, with the occasional rise to 60%, of the

total biomass production cost, depending on the algal species and culture process used [11][12]. Therefore, the development of a high-efficiency and cost-effective harvesting process is key to achieving commercial scale algae-based process.

Algal biomass harvesting has been extensively studied with particular focus on centrifugation, gravity sedimentation, screening, filtration, air flotation, and flocculation techniques. However, there is no single universal harvesting method for all algal species and/or applications, which is both technically and economically viable <sup>[13][14]</sup>. For instance, centrifugation is based on a mechanical gravitational force that allows for efficient harvesting of suspended cells in a short time. However, due to the intensive energy requirement, it is recommended only for high-value algal products such as in foods and pharmaceuticals <sup>[14][15]</sup>. In the filtration process, micro-sized algal cells can be passed through a suitable membrane under high pressure to obtain a thick paste of algal biomass <sup>[16]</sup>. This size-exclusion method may be useful and scalable for algae harvesting only if problems in membrane blocking can be minimized or prevented <sup>[17][18]</sup>. The air flotation (or inverted sedimentation) harvesting process is based on the generation of up-rising gas bubbles that bind to algal cells and induce their flotation to the liquid surface <sup>[19]</sup>. However, due to differences in the surface hydrophobicity of algal cells, harvesting efficiency varies greatly depending on the species of algae <sup>[20]</sup>. It should also be noted that the high operation cost for producing small air bubbles can limit large-scale commercialization.

Flocculation refers to the aggregation of unstable and small particles through surface charge neutralization, electrostatic patching and/or bridging after addition of flocculants. Flocs formation allows for separation (or recovery) by simple gravity-induced settling or any other conventional separation method <sup>[21][22]</sup>. The flocculation process is simple and efficient, and has been extensively investigated as a promising strategy for harvesting various algal species <sup>[9][23]</sup>. Figure 1 shows the flocculation harvesting process of algal cells for algal biorefinery.



Figure 1. Schematic diagram of the flocculation harvesting process of algal cells with a recyclable flocculant.

As the flocculant plays a major role in the flocculation harvesting process, the discovery of a highly efficient and cost-effective flocculant has forever remained a challenge in most studies. Nowadays, the use of conventional inorganic metal salts such as aluminum sulfate and ferric sulfate has been reduced due to high dosage and biomass contamination <sup>[9]</sup>. Various natural and synthetic organic flocculants have been designed and developed to

improve flocculation efficiency. However, the former have high production cost and a short shelf-life while the latter have adverse effects on harvested biomass and non-biodegradability, due to their petroleum origins <sup>[24]</sup>. Metal cations released from the electrode under direct electric current condition are able to electrostatically attract almost all types of algal cells, resulting in efficient flocculation. Significant efforts are being directed to prevent electrode/biomass fouling and to reduce systemic/electric cost for large-scale algae harvesting. Nanoparticles in either single or hybrid forms decorated with various cationic chemicals have been employed for rapid algae separation and/or multi-functionalities such as cell disruption and lipid extraction <sup>[25]</sup>. This approach although highly efficient, is expensive and is mostly limited to laboratory-scale studies. Spontaneous aggregation of algal cells under specific conditions and the use of a self-flocculating microorganism can be considered as sustainable and environment-friendly <sup>[22][26]</sup>. However, species-specific reactivity, availability of low-cost bio-flocculant-microorganisms, and process scale-up should be properly considered for practical applications. Ideally, in addition to excellent harvesting efficiency and promising scalability, the industrial flocculant should satisfy the demands for recyclability, low toxicity, low-cost material, and massive production process.

### 2. Auto-Flocculation

In auto-flocculation, suspended algal cells spontaneously aggregate, forming large flocs, which induce their simple gravitational sedimentation (Figure 2). This phenomenon has been observed in various algal species particularly under non-ideal culture conditions such as change in pH and cultural aging, as summarized in <u>Table 1</u>. Both alkaline and acidic conditions have been reported to reduce the intensities of the negative surface charge of algal cells, thereby promoting their self-aggregation <sup>[27]</sup>. Under alkaline conditions above pH 9, the changes in the surface charge of algal cells are mainly attributable to significant secretion of protective extracellular polymers <sup>[28]</sup>. Under acidic conditions, fluctuating dissociations of carboxyl and amine groups in the algal cell wall can cause changes in surface charge.



Figure 2. Auto-flocculation harvesting of algal biomass. Three vials contain algal samples cultured in different nitrate concentrations: (left) 0.5×; (middle) 1× (original); and (right) 2×. Reprinted from Reference <sup>[29]</sup>, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License.

Table 1. Comparison of auto-flocculation techniques for algae harvesting.

Condition Alga (Cell Density) Optimal Harvesting Ref.

	pH 4.0	C. ellipsoideum (4.38 g/L)	95% @ 15 min	[ <u>27]</u>
Acidic pH	pH 4.0	C. nivale (4.17 g/L)	94% @ 15 min	[ <u>27]</u>
	рН 4.0	Scenedesmus sp. (6.94 g/L)	98% @ 15 min	[ <u>27]</u>
	рН 11.5	C. muelleri #862 (0.42 g/L)	100% @ 30 min	[ <u>30]</u>
	рН 11.0	C. vulgaris (0.5 g/L)	95% @ 60 min	[ <u>31</u> ]
Alkaline pH	рН 12.0	Chlorococcum sp. R-AP13	94% @ 10 min	[ <u>32]</u>
	рН 12.5	Ettlia sp. YC001 (1.2 g/L)	94% @ 30 min	[ <u>33</u> ]
	рН 10.4	N. oculate (2.27 $\times$ 10 <sup>5</sup> cells/mL)	90% @ 10 min	[ <u>34]</u>
	рН 11.6	S. quadricauda #507 (0.54 g/L)	95% @ 30 min	[ <u>30]</u>
Culture aging	16 days	S. obliquus AS-6-1 (2.25 g/L)	80% @ 30 min	[ <u>35]</u>

## 3. Bio-Flocculation

Bio-flocculation is performed by adding a self-flocculating microorganism (or its extracellular biopolymer) to the culture broth to harvest non-flocculating, target algae (Figure 3). Bio-flocculants include bacteria, fungi, yeasts, or self-flocculating algae as well as their exudate-rich culture supernatants, as shown in <u>Table 2</u>. Since no chemical is required in this process similar to the case of auto-flocculation, the bio-flocculation method can also be considered as a sustainable and environmentally friendly technique for algal biomass harvesting <sup>[36][37]</sup>. A bio-flocculant-microorganism can be prepared by co-culturing with target algae or culturing separately in a different bioreactor, before performing the intended use <sup>[22][38]</sup>. Although the mechanism of bio-flocculation has not been clearly elucidated, it is believed that it is mainly a function of the reactivity of the extracellular biopolymer and/or the direct adsorption of the self-flocculating microorganisms on the target algae <sup>[23][39]</sup>.



Figure 3. A schematic diagram of bio-flocculation harvesting of algal biomass using bacteria. EPS, extracellular polymeric substances. Reprinted from Reference <sup>[39]</sup> with permission from Springer Nature.

Table 2. Comparison of bio-flocculation techniques for algae harvesting.

Flocculant (Dosage)		Alga (Cell Density, Volume or Amount)	Optimal Harvesting	Ref.
Fungus	A. fumigatus	C. protothecoides	~90% @ 24 h	[ <u>40]</u>
	A. fumigatus (1.5–2.0 × 10 <sup>7</sup> spores/L)	S. quadricauda (5–8 × 10 <sup>8</sup> cell/mL)	~97% @ 48 h	[ <u>41]</u>
	A. fumigatus	T. suecica	~90% @ 24 h	[ <u>40</u> ]

	A. lentulus (1.0 $\times$ 10 <sup>6</sup> spores/mL)	Chroococcus sp. (1.58 g/L)	~100% @ 24 h	[ <u>42</u> ]
	Penicillium cells (1.92 g)	Chlorella sp. (3.84 g)	~98% @ 2.5 h	[ <u>43</u> ]
	Penicillium spores (1.1 × 10 <sup>4</sup> cells/mL)	Chlorella sp. (3.84 g)	~99% @ 28 h	[ <u>43]</u>
	Extracellular protein of S. bayanus (0.1 g/L)	C. reinhardtii (10 mL)	95% @ 3 h	[ <u>44]</u>
Yeast	Extracellular protein of S. bayanus (0.1 g/L)	Picochlorum sp. (10 mL)	75% @ 3 h	[44]
	S. bayanus (1:1, v/v)	C. reinhardtii (10 mL)	80% @ 6 h	[ <u>44</u> ]
	S. bayanus (1:1, v/v)	Picochlorum sp. (10 mL)	60% @ 6 h	[ <u>44</u> ]
	S. pastorianus (0.4 mg/g cell)	C. vulgaris (5 g/L)	90% @ 70 min	[ <u>36</u> ]
Bacterium	Flavobacterium, Terrimonas, and Sphingobacterium	C. vulgaris (6 × 10 <sup>6</sup> cells/mL)	94% @ 24 h	[45]
	Bio-flocculant secreted from S. silvestris W01 (3:1, w/w)	N. oceanica DUT01	90% @ 10 min	[ <u>46]</u>
	S. obliquus AS-6–1 (1%, v/v)	S. obliquus FSP-3 (10 mL)	83% @ 30 min	[ <u>35</u> ]
Alga	Exudates-rich spent media of C. cf. pseudomicroporum (1:1, v/v)	S. ellipsoideus (15 mL)	97% @ 4 h	[47]
	Phormidium sp.	Chlorella sp.	100% @ 5 min	[ <u>14</u> ]

#### References

#### L. Chemi, M.F., Zhang, Y.Y., Orhe, M., Li, C.Y.; Zhou, C.X.; Hong, P.Z.; Qian, Z.J. Antioxidant peptide purified from enzymatic hydrolysates of Isochrysis Zhanjiangensis and its protective effect against chemical floculation of algae occurs due to charge neutralization and electrostatic bridging between the ethanol induced oxidative stress of HepG2 cells. Biotechnol. Bioprocess Eng. 2019, 24, 308–317. suspended algal cells and the applied flocculant(s), resulting in floc formation and subsequent sedimentation (£ictide AM. MuMattert, Ir/argbac/estimicate/). Biotechnol. Bioprocess Eng. 2019, 24, 308–317. suspended algal cells and the applied flocculant(s), resulting in floc formation and subsequent sedimentation (£ictide AM. MuMattert, Ir/argbac/estimicate/). Biotechnol. Bioprocess Eng. 2019, 24, 308–317. suspended algal cells and the applied flocculant(s), resulting in floc formation and subsequent sedimentation (£ictide AM. MuMattert, Ir/argbac/estimicate/). Biotechnol. Bioprocess Eng. 2019, 24, 308–317. suspended algal cells and the applied flocculant(s), resulting in floc formation and subsequent sedimentation (£ictide AM. MuMattert, Ir/argbac/estimicate/). Bioprocess Eng. 2019, 24, 308–317. Support Biogcu2018, fd/9, wastefice clarification and algal biomass recovery <sup>[48]</sup>. Chitosan, cationic starches, modified tannins, and polyacrylamides are examples of organic polymers that are widely, used <sup>[28][49]</sup>. The 3. Oh, Y.-K.; Hwang, K.-R.; Kim, C.; Kim, J.R.; Lee, J.-S. Recent developments and key barriers to harvesting efficiency of both organic and inorganic flocculants depends largely and head algal solution chafterensides (4.5.; celnetinalis, Si-i, Shekkik, Merght) estimation, 257, 350–353. such as solubility and electronegativity, as well as the operating conditions, such as dosage and algal solution chafterensides (4.5.; celnetinalis, Si-i, Shekkik, Merght) estimation (5.2.9.7.9.7.5.), and algae investive flock-floce-algoe information solution shead algae investinatio invite cells of the thead information

- 6. Choi, Y.Y.; Hong, M.E.; Chang, W.S.; Sim, S.J. Autotrophic biodiesel production from the thermotolerant microalga Chlorella sorokiniana by enhancing the carbon availability with temperature adjustment. Biotechnol pipprocess Eng. 2023 24, 22-231.
- 7. Kim, B.; Praveenkumarok.; Chor E. Lee, K.; Jeon, S.G.; Ch. Specting for oleaginous and robust Chlorella spp. for obal-5 ed flue-gas-media biodiesel production. Energies 2018, 11, 2026.
- 8. Branyikova, I.; Filipenska, M.; Urbanova, K.; Ruzicka, M.C.; Pivokonsky, M.; Branyik, T. Physicochemical approach to alkaline flocculation of Chlorella vulgaris induced by calcium phosphate precipitates. Colloids Surf. B Biointerfaces 2018, 166, 54–60.
- 9. Lee, Y.-C.; Lee, K.; Oh, Y.-K. Recent nanoparticle equeering advances in microalgal cultivation and harvesting processes of biodiese production: A review. Dicresour. Technol. 2015, 184, 63–72.
- 10. Darwesh, O.M.; Matter, I.A.; Eida, M.F.; Moawad, H.; Oh, Y.K. Influence of nitrogen source and growth phase on extracellular biosynthesis of silver nanoparticles using cultural filtrates of Scenedesmus obliquus Apple Control 19, 9, 1465.
- 11. Udom, I.; Zaribaf, B.H.; Halfhide, T.; Gillie, B.; Dalrymple O.; P. O.; Ergas, S.J. Harvesting microalgae grown on wastewater Bioresour. Technol. 20(3):33101–106.
- 12. Matter, I.A.; Darwesh, O.M.; El-baz, F.K. Using the nature olymochnitosan in harvesting Scenedesmus species under externations and culture pH values. Int. J. Pharm. Biol. Sci. 2016, 7, 254–260.

13gRashid, she Park, WalkarSelvaremean floc Blatany bultueseing priorioad glace as any integrated papereachyte. Reprinted hanced biomas and inbeted of the productivity have stative text means and blockers and all of the second station.

Chemosphere 2018, 194, 67–75.

Table 3. Comparison of inorganic and organic chemical flocculants for algae harvesting. 14. Tiron, O.; Bumbac, C.; Manea, E.; Stefanescu, M.; Lazar, M.N. Overcoming microalgae

1	1 Flocculant (Dosage)		Alga (Cell Density or Volume)	Optimal Harvesting	Ref.	:er , 139–		
1	Inorganic flocculant	Al <sub>2</sub> (SO <sub>4</sub> ) <sub>3</sub> (1.2 g/L)	Tetraselmis sp. KCTC12236BP (3 g/L)	86% @ 30 min	[ <u>53]</u>	osmosis		
1		Al <sub>2</sub> (SO <sub>4</sub> ) <sub>3</sub> (152 mg/L)	Chlorella sp. (0.12 g/L)	100% @ 60 min	[ <u>54]</u>	ng a		
1		Al <sub>2</sub> (SO <sub>4</sub> ) <sub>3</sub> (180 mg/L)	Scenedesmus sp. (0.20 g/L)	90% @ 20 min	[ <u>55]</u>	cta and		
1		Al <sub>2</sub> (SO <sub>4</sub> ) <sub>3</sub> (20 mg/L)	C. reinhardtii (0.31 g/L)	90% @ 20 min	[ <u>55]</u>	stain.		
2		Al <sub>2</sub> (SO <sub>4</sub> ) <sub>3</sub> (438.1 μM)	N. oculata (1.7 g/L)	92% @ 320 min	[ <u>28]</u>			
2		Al <sub>2</sub> (SO <sub>4</sub> ) <sub>3</sub> (50 mg/L)	S. limacinum (0.93 g/L)	90% @ 20 min	[ <u>55]</u>	aiyae		
2		CaO (60 mg/L)	C. vulgaris (1.5 g/L)	85% @ 5min	[ <u>56]</u>	, .85,		
2		CaCO <sub>3</sub> -rich eggshell (80 mg/L)	C. vulgaris (2.3 g/L)	99% @ 20 min	[ <u>57]</u>			
2		FeCl <sub>3</sub> (0.4 g/L)	N. oculata (50 mL)	94% @ 180 min	[ <u>58]</u>	Current		
2		FeCl <sub>3</sub> (143 mg/L)	Chlorella sp. (0.12 g/L)	100% @ 40 min	[54]			
2	2	FeCl <sub>3</sub> (438.1 µM)	N. oculata (2.2 g/L)	78% @ 320 min	[ <u>28]</u>	sof		
		vrials in microalgae biorofineny Algal Ros 2010 41 101522						

rials in microalgae biorefinery. Algal Res. 2019, 41, 101522.

26. Gultom, S.O.; Hu, B. Review of microalgae harvesting via co-pelletization with filamentous fungus. Energies 2013, 6, 5921–5939.

2		Fe <sub>2</sub> (SO <sub>4</sub> ) <sub>3</sub> (0.6 g/L)	N. oculata (50 mL)	87% @ 180 min	[ <u>58]</u>	Ś
2	Biocnem.	Fe <sub>2</sub> (SO <sub>4</sub> ) <sub>3</sub> (1.0 g/L)	Chlorella sp. KR-1 (1.52 g/L)	98% @ 30 min	[ <u>59]</u>	ı. Appl.
2		Mg(OH) <sub>2</sub> (1 mM)	Chlorella sp. (0.1 g/L)	90% @ 30 min	[ <u>60]</u>	ən
3	Organic flocculant	Cationic inulin (60 mg/L)	Botryococcus sp.	89% @ 15 min	[ <u>61</u> ]	kaline
		Cationic starches (0.01 g/L)	S. dimorphus (0.12 g/L)	95% @ 90 min	[ <u>62]</u>	‡862.
(r)		Cationic starches (1.4:1, w/w)	S. obliquus	90% @ 60 min	[ <u>63]</u>	ella
(1) (1)		Cationic starches (119 mg/g cell)	B. braunii (0.62 g/L)	94% @ 20 min	[ <u>64]</u>	omass: .6–221. of Ettlia
3		Cationic starches (50 mg/L)	S. limacinum (0.93 g/L)	90% @ 20 min	[ <u>55]</u>	on
		Cationic starches (7.1 mg/L)	C. vulgaris (0.75 g/L)	90% @ 120 min	[ <u>65]</u>	es.
3		Cationic starches (89 mg/g cell)	C. pyrenoidosa (1.02 g/L)	96% @ 20 min	[ <u>64]</u>	Chang, ius
3		Chitosan (10 mg/g cell)	C. sorokiniana	99% @ 45 min	[ <u>66]</u>	occulant
3		Chitosan (120 mg/L))	C. vulgaris (1 g/L)	99% @ 3 min	[ <u>67]</u>	4–38.
3		Chitosan (40 mg/L)	Scenedesmus sp. A1	82% @ 60 min	[ <u>12]</u>	)ur.
З		Chitosan (30 mg/L)	Chlorella sp. (3 × 10 <sup>7</sup> cells/mL)	97% @ 60 min	[ <u>49</u> ]	Ζ.

Dionoccuration as an innovative harvesting strategy for microalgae. Rev. Environ. Sci. Biotechnol. 2016, 15, 573–583.

4       Epichlorohydrin-n,n-diisopropylamine-dimethylamine (8 mg/L)       Scenedesmus sp. (100 mL)       >90% @ 30 min       99       Plls, lipi         4       Modified tannin (10 mg/L)       M. aeruginosa (1 × 10 <sup>9</sup> cells/L)       97% @ 120 min       70       1440.         4       Modified tannin (210 mg/L)       Scenedesmus sp.       97% @ 40 min       71       A         4       Modified tannin (10 mg/L)       Scenedesmus sp.       97% @ 40 min       71       A         4       Modified tannin (10 mg/L)       N. oculate (400 mg/L)       98% @ 30 min       72       ced by Res.         7       Poly-L-lysine (70–150 kDa, 0.5 mg/L)       C. ellipsoidea (1 g/L)       98% @ 75 min       73       acteria -201.	4	Chitosan (30 mg/L) + sodium alginate (40 mg/L)	S. obliquus	86% @ 60 min	[ <u>68]</u>	A.S.; biofuel
AModified tannin (10 mg/L)M. aeruginosa (1 × 10° cells/L)97% @ 120 minI20AModified tannin (210 mg/L)Scenedesmus sp.97% @ 40 minI21AModified tannin (10 mg/L)N. oculate (400 mg/L)98% @ 30 minI22APoly-L-lysine (70–150 kDa, 0.5 mg/L)C. ellipsoidea (1 g/L)98% @ 75 minI23ADisperimentationC. ellipsoidea (1 g/L)98% @ 75 minI23ADisperimentationC. ellipsoidea (1 g/L)98% @ 75 minI23ADisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationBDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationBDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationBDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationBDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationBDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationBDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationBDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationBDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationBDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationBDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentationDisperimentation <td>4</td> <td>Epichlorohydrin-n,n- diisopropylamine- dimethylamine (8 mg/L)</td> <td>Scenedesmus sp. (100 mL)</td> <td>&gt;90% @ 30 min</td> <td>[<u>69</u>]</td> <td>ells, lipid</td>	4	Epichlorohydrin-n,n- diisopropylamine- dimethylamine (8 mg/L)	Scenedesmus sp. (100 mL)	>90% @ 30 min	[ <u>69</u> ]	ells, lipid
Modified tannin (210 mg/L)Scenedesmus sp.97% @ 40 min[71]ds forModified tannin (10 mg/L)N. oculate (400 mg/L)98% @ 30 min[72]ced by Res.Poly-L-lysine (70–150 kDa, 0.5 mg/L)C. ellipsoidea (1 g/L)98% @ 75 min[73]acteria -201.	4	Modified tannin (10 mg/L)	M. aeruginosa (1 × 10 <sup>9</sup> cells/L)	97% @ 120 min	[ <u>70</u> ]	1440. . A
A       Modified tannin (10 mg/L)       N. oculate (400 mg/L)       98% @ 30 min       [72]       ced by Res.         A       Poly-L-lysine (70–150 kDa, 0.5 mg/L)       C. ellipsoidea (1 g/L)       98% @ 75 min       [73]       acteria -201.		Modified tannin (210 mg/L)	Scenedesmus sp.	97% @ 40 min	[ <u>71</u> ]	ds for
A Poly-L-lysine (70–150 kDa, 0.5 mg/L) C. ellipsoidea (1 g/L) 98% @ 75 min play a Key –201.	4	Modified tannin (10 mg/L)	N. oculate (400 mg/L)	98% @ 30 min	[ <u>72</u> ]	ced by Res.
	4 play a ke	Poly-L-lysine (70–150 kDa, 0.5 mg/L)	C. ellipsoidea (1 g/L)	98% @ 75 min	[ <u>73</u> ]	acteria –201.

46. Wan, C.; Zhao, X.Q.; Guo, S.L.; Alam, M.A.; Bai, F.W. Bioflocculant production from Solibacillus silvestris W01 and its application in cost-effective harvest of marine microalga Nannochloropsis

# 5. Particle-Based Flocculation

47. Úbeda, B.; Gálvez, J.Á.; Michel, M.; Bartual, A. Microalgae cultivation in urban wastewater: Particle based floc: Lesen composition protoptially circumventer care dravbacks of conventional chemical floculation such Coefficient of the second and potential floculation such as hig-toxicity and difficulties related to chemical, recovery For these purposes, particle-based flocculants should be designed to be more efficient, recoverable, and/or have multi-functionalities other than algae recovery, such as 48. Yaser A.Z.: Cassey, T.L.: Hairel, M.A.: Shazwan, A.S. Current review on the cell distribution of light containing, wastewater. Int. J. Waste Res. 2014, 4, 153–159. development of new and optimal hano/micro-particle-based flocculants. This section summarizes the recent

499.00045,5 Pir. Alzenbar, verim, gwoing, the Ng, 9/19i.crC-hargicle. Wasenflor.cuthan, www. Aninover. Aninover particlagulason avecanticles (Table 4), and anore and anore cutation-addeedsed in evolution and thesh water

```
microalgae. Arab. J. Sci. Eng. 2017, 43, 1–9.
```

Table 4. Comparison of particle-based flocculants for algae harvesting.

50. Kim, D.G.; Oh, H.M.; Park, Y.H.; Kim, H.S.; Lee, H.G.; Ahn, C.Y. Optimization of flocculation

5	Kind	Flocculant	Dosage	Alga (Cell Density)	Optimal Harvesting	Ref.	2013, )18,
5	Aminoclay- based nanoparticle	AI-AC	0.6 g/L	Chlorella sp. KR-1 (1.7 g/L)	100% @ 30 min	[74]	n e00302.

5		AC-conjugated TiO <sub>2</sub>	3.0 g/L	Chlorella sp. KR-1 (1.5 g/L)	~85% @ 10 min	[ <u>75]</u>	with
5		AC-induced humic acid	5.0 g/L	Chlorella sp. (1.3 g/L)	~100% @ 30 min	[ <u>76]</u>	it type,
5		AC-templated nZVI	19.1 g/L	Chlorella sp. KR-1 (1.5 g/L)	~100% @ 3 min	[77]	vulgaris
5		APTES-coated BaFe <sub>12</sub> O <sub>19</sub>	2.3 g/g cell	Chlorella sp. KR-1	99% @ 3 min	[ <u>78]</u>	ınol. oculata
5		MgAC-Fe <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> hybrid composites	4.7 g/L	Chlorella sp. KR-1 (1.75 g/L)	99% @ 10 min	[ <u>79]</u>	rocess
6		MgAC-Fe <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> hybrid composites	4.3 g/L	S. obliquus (2.0 g/L)	99% @ 10 min	[ <u>79]</u>	of
6		Mg-APTES	0.6 g/L	Chlorella sp. KR-1 (1.7 g/L)	100% @ 30 min	[ <u>74]</u>	r algal
6		Mg-APTES	1.0 g/L	C. vulgaris (1.0 g/L)	97% @ 125 min	[ <u>80]</u>	duction
6		Mg-AC and Ce-AC	0.2 g/L	Cyanobacteria	~100% @ 60 min	[ <u>81</u> ]	of
6	Magnetic particle	Fe <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> nanoparticle	55.9 mg cell/mg particles	B. braunii	98% @ 1 min	[ <u>82]</u>	jaris sour.
6		$Fe_3O_4$ nanoparticle	5.8 mg cell/mg	C. ellipsoidea	98% @ 1 min	[ <u>82]</u>	Chlorella Usan.
	Process Biod	chem. 2013, 48, 110	7–1110.				

6		particles				ising
6	Fe <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> nanoparticle	0.12 g/L	N. maritima	95% @ 4 min	[ <u>83]</u>	r t
7	Fe <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> magnetic particle	10 g/g cell	Chlorella sp. KR-1	99% @ 1 min	[ <u>84]</u>	ginosa
7	Fe <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> -embedded carbon microparticle	~25 g/L	Chlorella sp. KR-1 (~2 g/L)	99% @ 1 min	[ <u>85]</u>	ira, R.B.
7	Fe <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> –PEI nanocomposite	0.02 g/L	C. ellipsoidea (0.75 g/L)	97% @ 2 min	[ <u>86</u> ]	-based , 87,
7	PEI-coated Fe <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub>	0.2 g/L	S. dimorphus (1.8 g/L)	82.7% @ 3 min	[87]	f ur.
7	Fe <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> -carbon- microparticle	10 g/L	Chlorella sp. KR-1 (2.0 g/L)	99% @ 1 min	[ <u>85]</u>	ə, J.S.; , 132,
7	Chitosan–Fe <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> composite	1.4 g/L	Chlorella sp. KR-1 (1.0 g/L)	~99% @ 5 min	[88]	J.Y.; sting
7 	Chitosan-coated $Fe_3O_4$ -Ti $O_2$	0.07 g/g cell	C. minutissima (3.0 g/L)	98% @ 2 min	[ <u>89]</u>	-K.; efficient

77. Lee, Y.C.; Lee, K.; Hwang, Y.; Andersen, H.R.; Kim, B.; Lee, S.Y.; Choi, M.H.; Park, J.Y.; Han, Y.K.; Oh, Y.-K.; Huh, Y.S. Aminoclay-templated nanoscale zero-valent iron (nZVI) synthesis for efficient harvesting of oleaginous microalga, Chlorella sp. KR-1. RSC Adv. 2014, 4, 4122–4127.
6. Electrochemical Flocculation

78. Seo, J.Y.; Lee, K.; Lee, S.Y.; Jeon, S.G.; Na, J.G.; Oh, Y.-K.; Park, S.B. Effect of barium ferrite Eleptentible state and clear and the state of the state o

electrodes, "sacrificial electrodes", whose metal ions are released into the aquatic environment, and "non-sacrificial 79. Kim, B.; Bui, V.K.H.; Farooq, W.; Jeon, S.G.; Oh, Y.-K.; Lee, Y.C. Magnesium aminoclay-Fe3O4 electrodes" with non-reactive anodes and cathodes (<u>Table 5</u>). The electrical current in aqueous solution can cause (MgAC-Fe3O4) hybrid composites for harvesting of mixed microalgae. Energies 2018, 11, 1359. a water-electrolysis reaction through either the sacrificial or non-sacrificial electrodes, which would release hydrogen and oxygen gases from the cathode and anode electrodes, respectively <sup>[90][91]</sup>. In this review, the 80 efter crompil/s/1;flbeeulation;(Ekan), plot celear spitis c as the folding following the standadig a clock of nanoclays. Green Chem. 2013, 15, 749-755.



84. Lee, K.; Lee, S.Y.; Praveenkumar, R.<sup>A,</sup> Kin, B., Seo, J.Y.; Jeon, S.G.; Na, J.C., Park, J.Y.; Kim,

D.M.; Oh, Y.-K. Repeated use of stable magnetic flocculant for efficient harvest of oleaginous Figure 5. Electrochemical flocculation harvesting of microalgae using aluminum electrodes (AI), graphite electrodes Chlorella sp. Bioresour. Technol. 2014, 167, 284–290. (C), aluminum sulfate (Al<sub>2</sub>(SO<sub>4</sub>)<sub>3</sub>), and graphite electrodes with aluminum sulfate (Al<sub>2</sub>(SO4)<sub>3</sub> + C): (a) microalgae SamSva, efficience, and Righter of the intermeter of processes. Reference of the effective of the process of the effective of th

Table 5. Comparison of sacrificial and non-sacrificial electrodes for algae harvesting 86. Hu, Y.R.; Guo, C.; Wang, F.; Wang, S.K.; Pan, F.; Liu, C.Z. Improvement of microalgae harvesting

8	Electrode		Alga (Cell Density)	Optimal Harvesting (Energy Requirement)	Ref.	g, UV 1. Sci.
8	Sacrificial	AI	C. pyrenoidosa	95.8% @ 1 min (0.3 kWh/kg cell)	[ <u>93</u> ]	<i>г</i> К.
		AI	C. vulgaris	98% @ 4 min (0.3 kWh/kg cell)	[ <u>94</u> ]	nagnetic
8		Al	M. aeruginosa (1.3 × 10 <sup>9</sup> cells/mL)	100% @ 45 min (0.4 kWh/m <sup>3</sup> )	[ <u>95</u> ]	ı: . 2016,
g		Al	Nannochloropsis sp. (2.5 g/L)	97% @ 10 min (0.06 kWh/kg cell)	[ <u>96</u> ]	
ç		Al	Scenedesmus sp.	~98.5% @ 20 min (2.3 kWh/kg cell)	[ <u>92</u> ]	lturoc: A
		Al	P. tricornutum	80% @ 30 min (0.2 kWh/kg cell)	[ <u>97</u> ]	ilures. A

r, н.А.А.; кнепег, с.; Stuart, в.J. investigation of electrolytic поссиlation for microalga Scenedesmus sp. using aluminum and graphite electrodes. RSC Adv. 2018, 8, 38808–38817.

9

g		Fe	C. vulgaris	80% @ 30 min (2.1 kWh/kg cell)	[ <u>97</u> ]	I.
g		Fe	Chlorococcum sp.	96% @ 15 min (9.2 kWh/kg cell)	[ <u>98</u> ]	on for
9		Fe	Green algae mixture (Scenedesmus, Kirchneriella, and Microcystis)	~95.6% @ 24 h (4.4 kWh/kg cell)	[ <u>99</u> ]	algae
5	<i>∠∠</i> ۵.	Fe	Tetraselmis sp.	94% @ 15 min (4.4 kWh/kg cell)	[ <u>98</u> ]	.19—
g	Non-sacrificial	С	C. sorokiniana	~95% @ 15 min (1.6 kWh/kg cell)	[ <u>90]</u>	ylaert, <sup>.</sup> oalgae.
C		С	C. pyrenoidosa	79.2% @ 1 min (0.3 kWh/kg cell)	[ <u>93</u> ]	

electrocoagulation as a recovery process of marine microalgae for biodiesel production. Chem. Eng. J. 2011, 174, 249–257.

99. Alexo, E.: Álvarez, X.; Cancela, Á.; Sánchez, Á. Harvesting green algae from eutrophic reservoir by electroflocculation and post-use for biodiesel production. Bioresour. Technol. 2015, 187, 255–

The monotonic of microalgae research is increasing in parallel with increasing demands for food, animal feeds, previously that debic the provider of the prov