

RESPONSE OF HYBRID ANAEROBIC REACTOR TO WASTE WATER TOXICITY

PRAGYA



DEPARTMENT OF BIOCHEMICAL ENGINEERING AND BIOTECHNOLOGY

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

February 2017

©Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2017

RESPONSE OF HYBRID ANAEROBIC REACTOR TO WASTE WATER TOXICITY

by

PRAGYA

DEPARTMENT OF BIOCHEMICAL ENGINEERING AND BIOTECHNOLOGY

Submitted

in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

to the



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

February 2017

DEDICATION

I WOULD LIKE
TO DEDICATE
MY THESIS
TO MY
BELOVED PARENTS

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled, “*Response of Hybrid Anaerobic Reactor to Waste Water Toxicity*”, being submitted by *Ms. Pragya*, to the **Indian Institute of Technology Delhi**, for the award of the degree of *Doctor of Philosophy*, is worth consideration. The thesis is a record of original bonafide research work carried out by her under my supervision and has been prepared in conformity with the rules and regulations of the institute. The results contained in this have not been submitted in part or full to any other University or Institute for the award of any degree or diploma.

Dr. T. R. Sreekrishnan

Professor

Department of Biochemical Engineering and Biotechnology

Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am extremely grateful to my esteemed supervisor, Prof. T. R. Sreekrishnan for his unconditional support, encouragement and guidance all the time. Without his enormous patience, time and motivation, it would not have been possible to complete my thesis successfully. I feel really blessed to have him as my supervisor, who taught me another aspect of life, that, "There is no limit to the amount of good a person can do, if they don't care who gets the credit".

I really wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Ziauddin Shaikh Ahammad, without whom the completion of this project and my thesis won't have been possible. His teachings and expertise in the field of molecular biology helped me a lot. He was a constant source of inspiration to me during my difficult phase.

Sincere acknowledgments are extended to Prof. G. P. Aggarwal, Prof. Atul Narang, Prof. Saroj Mishra, Dr. Malini Balakrishnan and Dr. Shilpi Sharma for their valuable guidance and support. I am indebted to my lab mates especially Bhuvanesh, Maneesh, Akanksha, Satyendra, Ashish, Maneesha for providing me with an encouraging environment. I would like to extend my thanks to all my friends here Pankaj, Swati, Richa, Sharddha, Shayoni for their constant encouragement and generous care throughout the research tenure.

I would also like to thank all the staff members and students in the Department of Biochemical Engineering and Biotechnology, for their kind support and necessary help. I am grateful to Mr. Kishan Chand, Mr. D. B. Sharma, Mrs. Neera, Mr. Mukesh Anand, Mrs Renu and Sitaram ji for their technical support and cooperation.

I am obliged to the authorities of Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi for the facilities received, to the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, New Delhi for financial assistance to carry out the research work.

My achievement is dedicated to My Mother and Father, who have encouraged me throughout my life and provided me with unconditional support and endless love. I would like to thank them for allowing me to realize my own potential. I would also like to extend my heartfelt thanks to My Brother, for his encouragement and helping me choose my career goals. I would like to thank My Grandfather who has always instilled me with confidence in life and help me focus towards my goals.

My heartfelt appreciation to My Husband, Ankur for his unconditional support and motivation without whom this journey towards completion of my work won't have been possible. I greatly value his contribution towards my goals. I would with love like to thank My daughter, Aahana for the patience she showed and the love showered by her.

I thank the Almighty for everything!

(PRAGYA)

ABSTRACT

Increased generation of hazardous / toxic waste from various anthropogenic activities and their discharge into water bodies has resulted in severe water pollution. This is quite common with industries that generate wastewaters with high concentrations of toxic compounds, which need specialized treatment systems. As toxicity is one of the major reason for reactor failure, this work was taken up to study the response of a Hybrid Anaerobic Reactor to various toxic compounds present in wastewaters. Three different toxic compounds were studied viz: Cyanide, 4- Chlorophenol and Cr (VI).

In anaerobic wastewater treatment processes, anaerobes are quite sensitive to the toxicity conditions resulting in treatment limitations. In this study focus was on understanding their responses to toxicities and managing the treatment efficiently. Hybrid Anaerobic Reactor requires granulated sludge for the start-up which is a time consuming process. The present study tries to understand the effect of these toxic compounds on the sludge characteristics and granulation process.

The effect of wastewater toxicities were studied in both suspended cell and attached cell systems. The performance of Hybrid Anaerobic Reactor was much better than the suspended cell system in the toxic conditions, based on the inhibitory concentrations estimated. The IC₅₀ values in case of suspended cell system were 40, 200 and 150 ppm for Cyanide, 4-CP and Cr (VI) treating batch reactors, respectively. However, in case of attached cell system these values were 60, 225 and 225 ppm, respectively. Both the chemical as well as microbial analyses were performed for these reactor systems. As such reactor systems treating various effluents have been in operation as “black-box” without any knowledge for the microbial

communities present in them. In this study, chemical performance of the reactors were correlated to their microbial community structures, which helped in tracking changes in the microbial populations, aiding efficient reactor operation. The results indicated hydrogenotrophs to be more tolerant to the toxic conditions. The analysis also suggested order *Methanobacteriales* to be the most tolerant methanogenic guild and bacterial genus *Clostridium*, *Lactobacillus*, *Pseudomonas*, *Gordonia*, *Methylobacterium*, *Cellulomonas*, *Rhodococcus* etc. to be more tolerant to toxic conditions.

Based on the findings, wastewater from a coke oven plant was treated and communities were enriched with the tolerant groups. This resulted in improved reactor performances. Thus, the study established that toxicity affects microbial guilds and there is a strong link between reactor performance and microbial communities. The findings of the study can be used to predict reactor behavior in such conditions.

सारांश

विभिन्न मानवीय गतिविधियों से उत्पन्न हुए खतरनाक/जहरीले कचरे को जल निकायों में छोड़ देने के कारण गंभीर जल प्रदूषण की स्थिति उत्पन्न हो गई है। उपरोक्त स्थिति उन उद्योगों के संबंध में काफी आम है जिनके द्वारा विषाक्त योगिकों की उच्च सांद्रता के साथ अपशिष्ट जल उत्पन्न किया जाता है तथा जिनको विशेष उपचार प्रणालियों की जरूरत है। चूंकि विषाक्तता रिएक्टर की विफलता का मुख्य कारण है, अतः इस काम को हाईब्रिड अवायवीय रिएक्टर की अपशिष्ट जल में मौजूद विभिन्न विषाक्त योगिकों के संबंध में प्रतिक्रिया का अध्ययन करने हेतु ग्रहण किया गया था। निम्न तीन विषाक्त योगिकों का अध्ययन किया गया: साइनाइड, 4 क्लोरोफिनोल तथा सी.आर. (VI)।

अवायवीय अपशिष्ट जल उपचार प्रक्रियाओं में, अनारोक्स विषाक्तता के लिए काफी संवेदनशील होते हैं जिसके परिणाम स्वरूप उपचार में अनेकों रुकावटें उत्पन्न होती हैं। इस अध्ययन में उनकी विषाक्तता के लिए प्रतिक्रियाओं तथा उनके कुशलता से इलाज के प्रबंध को समझने पर ध्यान केंद्रित किया गया है। हाईब्रिड अवायवीय रिएक्टर को शुरू करने के लिए दानेदार कीचड़ की आवश्यकता होती है जो कि समय लेने वाली प्रक्रिया है। वर्तमान अध्ययन उपरोक्त जहरीले योगिकों का कीचड़ की विशेषताओं तथा कणिकायन प्रक्रिया पर प्रभाव को समझने की कोशिश करता है।

अपशिष्ट जल विषाक्तता के प्रभाव का अध्ययन दोनों सस्पेंडिड सैल तथा अटैच्ड सैल प्रणाली द्वारा किया गया। अनुमानित निरोधात्मक सांद्रता के अनुसार, हाईब्रिड अवायवीय रिएक्टर का प्रदर्शन विषाक्त परिस्थितियों में सस्पेंडिड सैल प्रणाली की तुलना में बेहतर था। सस्पेंडिड सैल प्रणाली में साइनाइड, 4 सी.पी. तथा सी.आर. अपद्ध का शोधन करने वाले बैच रिएक्टर में आई.सी. 50 मूल्य क्रमशः 40, 200 एवं 150 पी.पी.एम. थे। जबकि अटैच्ड सैल प्रणाली में यह मूल्य क्रमशः 60, 225 एवं 225 पी.पी.एम. थे। इन सभी रिएक्टर प्रणालियों के सम्बन्ध में दोनों रसायनिक एवं माइक्रोबियल विश्लेषण किये गये थे। क्योंकि विभिन्न अपशिष्टों के शोधन में प्रयोग: हुई रिएक्टर प्रणालियों को उनमें मौजूद माइक्रोबियल समुदायों की बिना किसी जानकारी के ही "ब्लैक बॉक्स" के रूप में चलाया जा रहा है। इस अध्ययन में, रिएक्टरों के रसायनिक प्रदर्शन को उनकी माइक्रोबियल समुदाय संरचनाओं से सहसंबद्ध किया गया जिससे माइक्रोबियल आबादी में हुए परिवर्तनों को समझने में मदद मिली तथा कुशल रिएक्टर ऑपरेशन में सहायता मिली। परिणामों से यह संकेत मिला की

हाईड्रोजनोट्रोफस विषाक्त स्थिति को अधिक सहन कर सकते हैं। विश्लेषण से यह भी संकेत मिला की ऑर्डर मैथानोबैक्टेरियल्स सबसे अधिक सहनशील मैथानोजेनिक गिल्ड है तथा बैक्टेरियल जिनस, क्लोस्ट्रीडियम, लैक्टोबेसीलियस, सीयोडोमोनास, गोरडोनिया, मिथाईलओबैक्टीरियम, सैल्यूलोलूमोनास, रहोडोकोकस इत्यादि विषाक्ता की स्थिति में अधिक सहनशील हैं।

जांच- परिणामों के आधार पर कोक ओवन संयंत्र से प्राप्त अपशिष्ट जल का शोधन किया गया तथा समुदायों को सहनशील समूहों से समृद्ध किया गया। इसके परिणामस्वरूप रिएक्टर के प्रदर्शन में सुधार हुआ। इस प्रकार अध्ययन से यह स्थापित हुआ कि विषाक्ता माईक्रोबियल मंडली को प्रभावित करती है तथा रिएक्टर प्रदर्शन एवं माईक्रोबियल समुदायों के बीच एवं मजबूत कड़ी है। इस अध्ययन के जांच-परिणामों का प्रयोग रिएक्टर के व्यवहार को प्रीडिक्ट करने में किया जा सकता है।

CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xii
NOMENCLATURE	xiv
1. INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES	1-4
1.1 OBJECTIVES:	4
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5-35
2.1 BACKGROUND:.....	5
2.2 ANAEROBIC DIGESTION PROCESS:	5
2.3 PROPERTIES OF BIOGAS PRODUCED:	7
2.4 VARIOUS TROPHIC GROUPS:	7
2.5 APPLICATION AS A TREATMENT TECHNOLOGY:.....	10
2.6 FACTORS AFFECTING ANAEROBIC PROCESS TECHNOLOGY:	11
2.6.1 OPERATIONAL PARAMETERS:	11
2.6.1.1 SLUDGE/ SOLIDS RETENTION TIME (SRT):.....	12
2.6.1.2 HYDRAULIC RETENTION TIME (HRT):	12
2.6.1.3 ORGANIC LOADING RATE (OLR):	13
2.6.2 ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETERS:	13
2.6.2.1 pH:	13
2.6.2.2 TEMPERATURE:.....	14
2.6.2.3 SUBSTRATES CONTAINED IN THE WASTEWATERS:.....	15
2.6.2.4 TOXICITY:.....	16
2.7 TOXIC COMPOUNDS IN FOCUS:	17
2.8 TYPES OF ANAEROBIC SYSTEMS EMPLOYED FOR THE TREATMENT:	23
2.8.1 SUSPENDED CELL SYSTEMS:.....	23
2.8.2 ATTACHED CELL SYSTEMS:.....	24
2.8.2.1 GRANULATION IN HIGH-RATE SYSTEMS:	26
2.9 MICROBIAL CHARACTERIZATION:.....	27
2.9.1 PCR BASED METHODS:	28
2.9.1.1 DENATURING GRADIENT GEL ELECTROPHORESIS (DGGE) AND TEMPERATURE GRADIENT GEL ELECTROPHORESIS (TGGE):.....	29
2.9.1.2 RESTRICTION FRAGMENT LENGTH POLYMORPHISM (RFLP) AND TERMINAL RESTRICTION FRAGMENT LENGTH POLYMORPHISM (T-RFLP):	31
2.9.1.3 AUTOMATED RIBOSOMAL INTERGENIC SPACER ANALYSIS (ARISA), LENGTH-HETEROGENEITY PCR (LH-PCR) AND AMPLIFIED RIBOSOMAL DNA RESTRICTION ANALYSIS (ARDRA):	32
2.9.1.4 SINGLE STRAND CONFORMTAION POLYMORPHISM (SSCP):.....	33
2.9.1.5 RANDOM AMPLIFIED POLYMORPHIC DNA (RAPD):.....	33

2.9.1.6 QUANTITATIVE PCR (Q-PCR):.....	33
2.9.2 NON-PCR BASED METHODS:	34
2.9.2.1 MOLE PERCENTAGE GUANINE + CYTOSINE (MOL% G+C) BASED FRACTIONATION:	34
2.9.2.2 DNA-REASSOCIATION AND NUCLEIC ACID HYBRIDIZATION:	34
2.9.2.3 DNA MIROARRAY:.....	35
3. MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	36-53
3.1 MATERIALS:.....	36
3.1.1 INOCULUM:.....	36
3.1.2 SIMULATED WASTEWATER COMPOSITION:.....	36
3.1.3 POLLUTANT/TOXIC COMPOUNDS STOCK PREPARATION:.....	37
3.2 METHODS:.....	37
3.2.1 PREPARATION OF ACTIVE SEED INOCULA AND ENRICHMENT:	37
3.2.2 EXPERIMENTAL SET-UPS:	38
3.2.2.1 SUSPENDED CELL SYSTEMS SET-UPS:.....	38
3.2.2.2 ATTACHED CELL SYSTEMS SET-UPS:	39
3.2.3 EXPERIMENTAL METHODS:	40
3.2.3.1 EXPERIMENTS FOR SUSPENDED CELL SYSTEMS:	40
3.2.3.1.1 ESTIMATION OF EFFECT OF SULPHATE REDUCING BACTERIA IN Cr (VI) REMOVAL:	40
3.2.3.2 EXPERIMENTS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF SELF-IMMOBILIZED GRANULES IN HYBRID ANAEROBIC REACTORS:.....	41
3.2.3.3 EXPERIMENTS FOR ATTACHED CELL SYSTEMS:	42
3.3 ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES:.....	45
3.3.1 CHEMICAL OXYGEN DEMAND (COD):	45
3.3.2 MEASUREMENT OF VFA CONCENTRATION:	46
3.3.3 BIOGAS ANALYSIS:.....	46
3.3.4 MEASUREMENT OF OTHER CHEMICAL PARAMETERS:.....	46
3.3.5 MEASUREMENT OF 4-CHLOROPHENOL AND PHENOL:.....	46
3.3.6 MEASUREMENT OF CYANIDE:	47
3.3.7 MEASUREMENT OF Cr (VI):	47
3.3.8 SURFACE MORPHOLOGY (SEM):.....	47
3.3.9 DEOXYRIBONUCLEIC ACID EXTRACTION:	48
3.3.10 16S rRNA GENE AMPLIFICATION:	48
3.3.11 DENATURING GRADIENT GEL ELECTROPHORESIS (DGGE) AND ANALYSIS: ...	49
3.3.12 DIVERSITY INDICES:	50
3.3.13 SEQUENCING OF BANDS:.....	50
3.3.14 PHYLOGENETIC TREE CONSTRUCTION:	51
3.3.15 CLUSTER ANALYSIS OF DGGE PATTERN:	51
3.3.16 QUANTITATIVE-PCR:.....	51
3.3.17 DATA ANALYSIS:	52
3.3.17.1 TWO SAMPLE STATISTICAL TEST:.....	53
3.3.17.2 BIVARIATE ANALYSIS:.....	53
3.3.17.3 PRINCIPAL COMPONENT ANALYSIS (PCA):.....	53
3.3.17.4 NON- METRIC DIMENSIONAL ANALYSIS (NMDS):	53

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	54-201
4.1 ENRICHMENT OF MOTHER INOCULA:	54
4.2 RESPONSE OF BATCH REACTOR TO DIFFERENT POLLUTANTS CONTAINED IN THE WASTEWATERS:	54
4.2.1 CHEMICAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT:.....	55
4.2.1.1 METHANE PRODUCTION:	55
4.2.1.2 VOLATILE FATTY ACIDS PRODUCTION:	59
4.2.1.3 REMOVAL OF TOXIC COMPOUNDS:	62
4.2.1.4 ANAEROBIC TOXICITY ASSAY FOR HEXAVALENT CHROMIUM IN PRESENCE AND ABSENCE OF INHIBITOR FOR SULFATE REDUCING BACTERIA (SRBS) IN UNACCLIMATIZED SLUDGE:	65
4.2.2 MICROBIAL CHARACTERIZATION:	67
4.2.2.1 QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS:	67
4.2.2.1.1 EFFECT OF TOXINS ON ARCHAEAL COMMUNITIES:	67
4.2.2.1.2 EFFECT OF TOXINS ON BACTERIAL COMMUNITIES:.....	73
4.2.2.2 QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS:	80
4.2.2.3 SURFACE MORPHOLOGY OF REACTOR BIOMASS (SEM):	82
4.2.3 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:.....	84
4.3 START-UP AND GRANULATION IN HAR:.....	87
4.3.1 CHEMICAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT:.....	87
4.3.2 MICROBIAL CHARACTERIZATION:	92
4.3.2.1 QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS:	92
4.3.2.1.1 EFFECT OF SVI ON ARCHAEAL COMMUNITIES:	92
4.3.2.1.2 EFFECT OF SVI ON BACTERIAL COMMUNITIES:	97
4.3.2.2 QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS:	101
4.3.2.3 SURFACE MORPHOLOGY OF GRANULAR BIOMASS (SEM):	104
4.3.3 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:.....	106
4.4 RESPONSE OF ATTACHED CELL SYSTEM TO DIFFERENT POLLUTANTS CONTAINED IN THE WASTEWATERS:	109
4.4.1 CHEMICAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT:.....	109
4.4.1.1 METHANE PRODUCTION:	110
4.4.1.2 VOLATILE FATTY ACIDS PRODUCTION:	114
4.4.1.3 REMOVAL OF CHEMICAL OXYGEN DEMAND:	117
4.4.1.4 REMOVAL OF TOXIC COMPOUNDS:	119
4.4.2 MICROBIAL CHARACTERIZATION:	122
4.4.2.1 QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS:	122
4.4.2.1.1 EFFECTS OF CYANIDE ON MICROBIAL COMMUNITIES:	126
4.4.2.1.2 EFFECTS OF 4-CP ON MICROBIAL COMMUNITIES:.....	132
4.4.2.1.3 EFFECTS OF CR (VI) ON MICROBIAL COMMUNITIES:	137
4.4.2.1.4 EFFECT OF TOXINS ON ATTACHED CELL SYSTEMS:	144
4.4.2.2 QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS:	148
4.4.2.3 SURFACE MORPHOLOGY OF GRANULAR BIOMASS (SEM):	155
4.4.3 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:.....	159
4.4.3.1 BIVARIATE ANALYSIS:.....	159
4.4.3.2 PRINCIPAL COMPONENT ANALYSIS:	162
4.4.3.3 NMDS ANALYSIS:.....	170

4.5 MANAGEMENT OF TOXIC INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT:	178
4.5.1 CHEMICAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT:	180
4.5.2 MICROBIAL CHARACTERIZATION:	185
4.5.2.1 QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS:	185
4.5.2.2 QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS:	194
4.5.2.3 SURFACE MORPHOLOGY OF GRANULAR BIOMASS (SEM):	196
4.5.3 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:	197
4.5.3.1 BIVARIATE ANALYSIS:	197
4.5.3.2 PRINCIPAL COMPONENT ANALYSIS:	198
4.5.3.3 NMDS ANALYSIS:	200
5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	202-207
REFERENCES	208-220
APPENDICES	221-272
APPENDIX-I	221
APPENDIX-II.....	222
APPENDIX III.....	224
APPENDIX-IV	251
RESUME.....	273

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: Schematic representation of steps involved in Anaerobic Digestion.	7
Figure 3.1: A schematic diagram of the suspended cell system.....	38
Figure 3.2: A photograph of the HAR setup.	39
Figure 3.3: A schematic diagram of HAR setup.	39
Figure 4.1: Methane production and pH profile for the inoculum batch reactor.	54
Figure 4.2: Methane production and pH profile for the batch set-up 1.....	57
Figure 4.3: Methane production and pH profile for the batch set-up 2.....	57
Figure 4.4: Volatile fatty acids profile for the batch set-up 1	61
Figure 4.5: Volatile fatty acids profile for the batch set-up 2.	61
Figure 4.6: Concentration profiles for toxic compounds in suspended cell (batch) systems...	64
Figure 4.7: Reduction profiles for toxic compounds in suspended cell (batch) systems.	65
Figure 4.8: Methane production inhibition experiment with Cr (VI) (150 ppm) addition in presence and absence of SRB inhibitors.	66
Figure 4.9: A.) PCR-DGGE archaeal profiles; B.) Cluster analysis for B1, B2 and B3 reactors (set up 1).	69
Figure 4.10: A.) PCR-DGGE archaeal profiles; B.) Cluster analysis for B4 and B5 reactors (set up 2).	72
Figure 4.11: A.) PCR-DGGE bacterial profiles; B.) Cluster analysis for B1, B2 and B3 reactors.....	75
Figure 4.12: A.) PCR-DGGE bacterial profiles; B.) Cluster analysis for B4 and B5 reactors.	77
Figure 4.13: Quantitative analysis of 16s rRNA gene for five different methanogenic guilds and bacteria.	81
Figure 4.14: SEM Micrograph of biomass present in various suspended cell system. a&b.) Micrograph of B1; c&d.) Micrograph of B2; e&f.) Micrograph of B3 and g&h.) Micrograph of B4.....	83
Figure 4.15: Representing the characteristics of sludge developed in different reactors. a.) Inocula volume added at the start-up and SLR developed, b.) SRT and Wash out values of sludge and, c.)VSS/SS ratio and MLSS values of sludge at different SVI values..	90
Figure 4.16: Methane production and pH profiles of three HARs (R2, R4 and R7) for 180 days.	91

Figure 4.17: (a) DGGE fingerprinting of archaea present in different reactor systems set up for granule formation, based on 16SrRNA genes. (b) Cluster analysis of archaeal DGGE, using UPMA based on DICE coefficient.....	93
Figure 4.18: (a) DGGE fingerprinting of bacteria present in different reactor systems set up for granule formation, based on 16SrRNA genes. (b) Cluster analysis of bacterial DGGE, using UPMA based on DICE coefficient.....	98
Figure 4.19: Q-PCR methanogen profiles of HARs .	102
Figure 4.20: Bacteria Q-PCR profiles of HARs.....	102
Figure 4.21: Picture depicts granules shape.	104
Figure 4.22: SEM images for the reactor granules.....	104
Figure 4.23: SEM images for the seeding inocula used.	105
Figure 4.24: NMDS plot showing shifts in the quantitative structure of methanogenic community between different reactors.....	108
Figure 4.25: Methane production and pH profile of reactors fed with different pollutants (H1-H4).	110
Figure 4.26: VFAs profile in reactors fed with different pollutants (H1-H4).....	114
Figure 4.27: COD Removed in reactors fed with different pollutants (H1-H4).	117
Figure 4.28: Pollutant removal profiles and pollutant removal efficiencies.	120
Figure 4.29: a.) Archaeal DGGE profile, b.) Bacterial DGGE profile c.) UPGMA based cluster analysis for archaeal profile and d.) UPGMA based cluster analysis for bacterial profile for H4 reactor system.	124
Figure 4.30 a.) Archaeal DGGE profile, b.) Bacterial DGGE profile c.) UPGMA based cluster analysis for archaeal profile and d.) UPGMA based cluster analysis for bacterial profile for H1 reactor system.	130
Figure 4.31: a.) Archaeal DGGE profile, b.) Bacterial DGGE profile c.) UPGMA based cluster analysis for archaeal profile and d.) UPGMA based cluster analysis for bacterial profile for H2 reactor system.	136
Figure 4.32: a.) Archaeal DGGE profile, b.) Bacterial DGGE profile c.) UPGMA based cluster analysis for archaeal profile and d.) UPGMA based cluster analysis for bacterial profile for H3 reactor system.	141
Figure 4.33: Ranking of sample points obtained from different HARs on the basis of Simpson's Index (1/D) and Shannon Index ($\exp H'$). Initial point is of 180 th day and final point is of 355 th day.	147

Figure 4.34: Absolute quantification of methanogenic communities in H1, H2, H3 and H4 bioreactors.....	150
Figure 4.35: Absolute quantification of bacterial abundance in H1, H2, H3 and H4 bioreactors.....	154
Figure 4.36: SEM photograph of the biomass obtained from H1.	156
Figure 4.37: SEM photograph of the biomass obtained from H2.	156
Figure 4.38: SEM photograph of the biomass obtained from H3.	157
Figure 4.39: SEM photograph of the biomass obtained from H4.	158
Figure 4.40: PCA Loading plots for all the HAR reactor systems.....	164
Figure 4.41: PCA Loading plots for all the HAR reactor systems describing effects of different variables studied on each other.	168
Figure 4.42: NMDS plots for H1 reactor system.	172
Figure 4.43: NMDS plots for H2 reactor system.	174
Figure 4.44: NMDS plots for H3 reactor system.	175
Figure 4.45: NMDS plots for H4 reactor system.	176
Figure 4.46: Methane production and pH profiles of coke oven effluents treating reactor systems.....	181
Figure 4.47: a.) VFAs and b.) COD removal profiles of coke oven effluents treating reactor systems.....	184
Figure 4.48: a.) Nitrate concentration profiles in the effluents b.) Pollutant removal efficiencies of coke oven effluents treating reactor systems.	184
Figure 4.49: Pollutant concentration profiles for cyanide and phenol in the coke oven effluents treating reactor systems.....	184
Figure 4.50: a.) Archaeal DGGE profile, b.) Bacterial DGGE profile c.) UPGMA based cluster analysis for archaeal profile and d.) UPGMA based cluster analysis for bacterial profile for coke oven effluent treating reactor systems.	190
Figure 4.51: Quantitative analysis of Methanogenic guilds and Bacterial genes of HARs treating coke oven effluents.....	194
Figure 4.52: SEM photograph of the biomass obtained from coke oven effluent treating reactor systems.....	196
Figure 4.53: PCA loading plots for coke oven effluent treating reactor systems.	199
Figure 4.54: NMDS plots for coke oven effluent treating reactor systems.....	200

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Advantages and disadvantages of PCR-based molecular methods for microbial community characterization.....	28
Table 3.1: 1% Simulated wastewater composition.	36
Table 3.2: Details of HARs set up for understanding of SVI role in granulation.....	42
Table 3.3: Detailed understanding of pollutant addition in the HARs and naming of the samples obtained on respective days.	43
Table 3.4: Experimental set-up for coke oven wastewater treatment.	44
Table 3.5: Composition of coke oven wastewater.	45
Table 3.6: List of qPCR primers set used with complete sequence.	52
Table 4.1: Bacterial genus listed in the order of their decreasing tolerance to various toxic compounds.	78
Table 4.2: Archaeal groups listed in the order of their decreasing tolerance to various toxic compounds.	78
Table 4.3: Variables included in the dataset, summarizing the changes occurred during toxicity studies.	84
Table 4.4: Characteristics of sludge developed under each experimental run started up with different percentage of inocula.	88
Table 4.5: Archaeal groups and Bacterial order listed in the order of their decreasing significance in bio-granulation.	100
Table 4.6: Variables included in the bivariate dataset for bio-granulation studies.....	106
Table 4.7: Archaeal groups listed in the order of their decreasing tolerance to various toxic compounds in the attached cell system.	144
Table 4.8: Bacterial genus listed in the order of their decreasing tolerance to various toxic compounds in the attached cell systems.	146
Table 4.9: Representation of the nomenclature used in NMDS analysis.....	171
Table 4.10: Values of various chemical parameters obtained from HAR studies.	179
Table 4.11: Average Concentrations of VFAs, COD removed and Methane content (%). ...	183
Table 4.12: Average Concentrations for different pollutants removed and pollutant removal efficiency.....	185

Table 4.13: Archaeal groups listed in the order of their decreasing tolerance to various pollutants present in the coke oven effluents.192

Table 4.14: Bacterial genus dominating in the Control and Coke oven effluents treating reactor systems.192

NOMENCLATURE

AFBR	ANAEROBIC FLUIDIZED BED REACTOR
COD	CHEMICAL OXYGEN DEMAND
CP	CHLOROPHENOL
Cr (VI)	HEXAVALENT CHROMIUM
DGGE	DENATURING GRADIENT GEL ELECTROPHORESIS
HAR	HYBRID ANAEROBIC REACTOR
HRT	HYDRAULIC RETENTION TIME
MBT	<i>METHANOBACTERIALES</i>
MCC	<i>METHANOCOCCALES</i>
MMB	<i>METHANOMICROBIALES</i>
MSC	<i>METHANOSARCINACEAE</i>
MST	<i>METHANOSAETACEAE</i>
NMDS	NON- METRIC MULTIDIMENSIONAL SCALING
OLR	ORGANIC LOADING RATE
PCA	PRINCIPAL COMPONENT ANALYSIS
PCR	POLYMERASE CHAIN REACTION
PLR	POLLUTANT LOADING RATE
PRE	POLLUTANT REMOVAL EFFICIENCY
PRR	POLLUTANT REMOVAL RATE
Q-PCR	QUANTITATIVE POLYMERASE CHAIN REACTION
SEM	SCANNING ELECTRON MICROSCOPY
SLR	SLUDGE LOADING RATE
SRB	SULFATE REDUCING BACTERIA
SRT	SLUDGE/ SOLIDS RETENTION TIME
TSS	TOTAL SUSPENDED SOLIDS
UASB	UPFLOW ANAEROBIC SLUDGE BLANKET
VFA	VOLATILE FATTY ACID
VSS	VOLATILE SUSPENDED SOLIDS