

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**Understanding methanotroph ecology in a
biofilter for efficiently mitigating methane
emissions**

**A thesis presented in fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of**

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Soil Science (Biotechnology)

at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.



Massey University

Rashad Ahmed Syed

2016

Abstract

In New Zealand, the majority of the greenhouse gas (GHG), methane (CH₄) emissions are from the agriculture sector (enteric fermentation, manure management) and the remainder from solid waste disposal, coal mining and natural gas leaks. A soil-based biofilter made from volcanic pumice soil (isolated from a landfill in Taupo, New Zealand) and perlite has been tested and promoted to mitigate high concentrations (3 300 ppm – 100 000 ppm) of CH₄ emissions from a dairy effluent storage pond. This soil-perlite mixture exhibited excellent physical (porosity, water holding capacity and bulk density) characteristics to support the growth and activity of an active methanotroph community. Methanotrophs comprise a diverse group of aerobic alpha and gamma proteobacteria (type I and type II methanotrophs, respectively) that are present naturally in soils where CH₄ is produced. However, there is little information on the methanotrophs community structure, population diversity and abundance in this soil-based biofilter. Understanding the activity of these diverse genera under varying soil conditions is essential for optimum use of biofiltration technology, and is the main aim of this thesis.

This thesis describes a study to use molecular techniques (PCR, quantitative PCR, T-RFLP and molecular cloning) (Chapter 3) to reveal the population dynamics of methanotrophs (type I, type II and various genera – *Methylobacter*/*Methylomonas*/*Methylosarcina*, *Methylococcus* and *Methylocapsa*), in order to build a more efficient CH₄ biofiltration system. Methanotroph population dynamics in two fundamentally different prototypes of volcanic pumice soil biofilters – a column and a floating/cover biofilter studied are presented in Chapters 4 and 5.

The column biofilter study (Chapter 4) examined the performance of a previously used acidic soil-biofilter medium that was further acidified from pH 5.20 ± 0.20 to 3.72 ± 0.02 by H₂S present in the biogas (from the dairy effluent pond).. The more acidic soil biofilter medium (volcanic pumice soil and perlite, 50:50 v/v) was reconstituted with optimal moisture content (110% gravimetric dry wt or ~ 60 % WHC) and achieved a maximum CH₄ removal rate of 30.3 g m⁻³ h⁻¹. In addition, the population of *Methylocapsa*-like methanotroph increased by 400 %, demonstrating

the ability of these soil microorganisms to adapt and grow under acidic pH conditions in the biofilter. The results from this study indicated that (i) when primed with CH₄, a soil biofilter can effectively regain efficiency if sufficient moisture levels are maintained, regardless of the soil acidity; (ii) changes in the methanotroph population did not compromise the overall capacity of the volcanic pumice soil to oxidise CH₄; and (iii) the more acidic environment (pH 3.72) tends to favour the growth and activity of acid-loving *Methylocapsa*-like methanotroph while being detrimental to the growth of the *Methylobacter* / *Methylococcus* / *Methylocystis* group of methanotroph.

In the floating biofilter (Chapter 5), original acidic soil biofilter medium (pH 5.20) as used in column study was assessed to remove CH₄ from the effluent pond surface for a period of one year (December 2013 to November 2014). Field evaluation was supported with a concurrent laboratory study to assess their CH₄-oxidising capacity, in addition to identifying and comparing the methanotroph community changes in the soil when exposed to field conditions. Results indicated that (i) irrespective of the season, the floating biofilters in the field were removing $67 \pm 6\%$ CH₄ throughout the study period with a yearly average rate of $48 \pm 23 \text{ g CH}_4 \text{ m}^{-3} \text{ h}^{-1}$; however, the highest CH₄ removal rate achieved was $101.5 \text{ g m}^{-3} \text{ h}^{-1} \text{ CH}_4$, about 300 % higher than the highest CH₄ removal rate by the acidified column biofilter (Chapter 4); (ii) the acidity of the field floating biofilters increased from a pH value of 5.20 to 4.72, but didn't suppress the genera of methanotrophs (particularly *Methylobacter*/*Methylosinus*/*Methylocystis*); (iii) the laboratory-based floating biofilters experienced biological disturbances with low and high CH₄ removal phases during the study period, with an yearly average CH₄ oxidation removal of 58%; and (iv) both type I and type II methanotrophs in the field floating biofilters were more abundant, diverse and even compared with the methanotroph community in the laboratory biofilters. This study has demonstrated the ability of the floating biofilters to efficiently mitigate dairy effluent ponds emissions in the field, without requiring any addition of nutrients or water; however, during very dry conditions, occasional addition of water might be needed to keep the biofilter bed moist ($\geq 23 \pm 4 \%$ dry wt).

Earlier New Zealand studies and the current studies (Chapters 4 and 5) were based on the use of a particular volcanic pumice soil as biofilter medium. However, the limited availability of volcanic pumice soil and associated transportation costs limited the wider application of this technology within New Zealand and internationally. This necessitated the assessment of other farm soils and potentially suitable, economical, and locally available biofilter materials that could potentially be used by the farmers to mitigate CH₄ emissions (Chapter 6). The potential biofilter materials, viz. farm soil (isolated from a dairy farm effluent pond bank area), pine biochar, garden waste compost, and weathered pine bark mulch were assessed with and without inoculation with a small amount of volcanic pumice soil. All materials supported the growth and activity of methanotrophs. However, the CH₄ removal was high (> 80%) and consistent in the inoculated - farm soil and biochar, and was supported by the observed changes in the methanotroph community. The CH₄ removal was further enhanced (up to 99%) by the addition of nutrient solution. Field evaluations of these potential materials are now needed to confirm the viability of these materials for recommending them for use on farms.

Chapter 7 summarises the molecular results from all the above studies, and describes the future studies. Molecular techniques indicated that a very diverse (Shannon's diversity, $H' = 3.9$ to 4.4) group of type I and type II methanotrophs were present in the volcanic pumice soil, which assisted the biofilter materials to perform under varying abiotic conditions. Many novel species and strains of type I and type II methanotrophs were also identified in these soils. For long-term, low cost and efficient and stable CH₄ removal, the presence of an even and abundant population (of type I and type II methanotrophs) is however essential. Nevertheless, biofilters offer much promise for mitigating CH₄ emissions from dairy ponds, piggeries, and landfills, thereby contributing to the lowering of emissions of this potent greenhouse gas to mitigate the effects of climate change.

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my parents (Farzana, Mazheruddin), siblings (Imad, Fuad, Hafsa and Dr Iqra), wife (Abeer) and my mentors (Drs Surinder, Kevin and Bernd) for their encouragement and unending support throughout my PhD.

I also dedicate this work to Late Dr D J Ross for Des Ross Memorial Scholarship awarded by Landcare Research

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I thank almighty Allah for all the blessings I have in my life.

I would like to express my greatest appreciation to my supervisors – Drs Surinder Sagar, Kevin Tate and Bernd Rehm for their tireless support, inspiration, encouragement and constructive advice in making this Thesis happen.

Besides my supervisory panel, I would like to thank Thilak Palmada, Peter Berben, Adrian Walcroft, Chris Pratt, Kelly Simpson, Neha Jha and Ted Pinkney for all the technical help; Anne Austin for editing the manuscripts; Donna Giltrap for advice on statistical analysis; Nicolette Faville for help with poster design; Miko Kirschbaum for career advice; John Dando for fun quizzes; Kay Eastwood, Tegan Kinniburgh and Jacoba Kerr for the morning teas at Landcare Research; fellow mates at Bernd's lab (Massey University) and Landcare Research. I also thank Landcare Research for the Des Ross memorial Scholarship; Bernd's lab (Science Tower C3.15c) for allowing me to carry out molecular biology activities; Anja Scheimann for the Light Cycler training at Institute of Fundamental Sciences; Liza Haarhoff and Denise Stewart for the administrative work at Institute of Agriculture and Environment, Massey University; and Lance Currie for the FLRC workshops.

Special thanks to Ramadas Dhanushkodi for continuous encouragement, care and support during high and low phases of my PhD and life. Also many thanks to Stalin Fernandez, Neha Jha, Khadija Malik, Pranoy Pal, Hazim Arafah, Rajesh Gangalam, Ahmed Elwan, Abdul Jabbar, Mohammed Owais, Abdul Fayyaz, Asad Razzaq, Saleh Umair, Zia ur Rehman, Zulfiqar Butt, Ibrahim Bahadly, Mohammed Al Aqqad, Kamal Adhikari, Aiyaz Mahmood, Santhi Priya, Rajasekhar Reddy for their love, support and advice during the 3.5 years of my PhD.

Very special thanks to my Family (Farzana Mazher, Syed Khaja Mazheruddin, Imad Syed, Farheen Imad, Fuad Syed, Atifa Shaheen, Late Hafsa Mazher, Azhad Ahmed

and Iqra Syeda). Words cannot express how grateful I am to their love, inspiration, sacrifices, prayers and support in my life. At the end I would like express appreciation to my beloved wife Abeer Ahmed who has spent sleepless nights with me and was always my support during the last stages of thesis writing.

Publications and Presentations

Peer reviewed International scientific journals

1. **Syed R**, Sagggar S, Tate KR and Rehm BHA (2016). *Does acidification of soils compromise its methane-oxidizing capacity?* *Biology & Fertility of Soils* 52:573-583.
2. **Syed R**, Sagggar S, Tate KR and Rehm BHA (2016). *Assessing farm soil, biochar, compost and weathered mulch to mitigate methane emissions.* *Applied Microbiology & Biotechnology* 100:9365-9379.
3. **Syed R**, Sagggar S, Tate KR, Rehm BHA and Berben P (2017): *Assessing the performance of floating biofilters for oxidation of methane from dairy effluent ponds.* *Journal of Environmental Quality* 46:272-280.

Conference/Workshops/meetings

4. **Syed R**, Sagggar S, Tate K and Rehm B (2014). *Characterizing a field methane oxidation biofilter – treating farm CH₄ emissions from Massey No. 4 dairy pond.* (Poster presentation) In: *Nutrient Management for the Farm, Catchment and Community*, (Eds LD Currie & CL Christensen). <http://firc.massey.as.nz/publications.html> Occasional Report No. 27, Fertilizer and Lime Research Centre, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand, 11p.
5. **Syed R**, Sagggar S, Tate K and Rehm B (2014). *Improving the performance of a biofilter to reduce methane emissions from dairy effluent ponds.* Poster presentation. New Zealand Soil Science Society (NZSSS) conference, Hamilton, 1–4 December 2014.
6. **Syed R**, Sagggar S, Tate K and Rehm B (2015). *Assessment of Potential Biofilter Materials to Mitigate Methane Emissions.* (Poster presentation) In: *Moving Farm Systems to Improved Attenuation*, (Eds LD Currie and LL Burkitt). <http://firc.massey.ac.nz/publications.html> Occasional Report No.

- 28, Fertilizer and Lime Research Centre, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand, 10p.
7. **Syed R**, Saggar S, Tate K and Rehm B (2015). *Assessment of potential biofilter materials to oxidise methane emissions*. Oral Presentation. Methanet/NzOnet meeting, Ministry of Primary Industries, Wellington, 7–8 May 2015.
 8. **Syed R**, Saggar S, Tate K and Rehm B (2016). *Using molecular tools to understand the methane oxidation potential of biofilter material*. Oral Presentation. Methanet/NzOnet meeting, Ministry of Primary Industries, Wellington, 26–27 May 2016.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Publications and Presentations.....	viii
Table of Contents.....	x
List of Tables.....	xiv
List of Figures.....	xvi
List of Abbreviations.....	xx
Chapter 1.....	27
Introduction and Objectives.....	27
1.1 Background.....	27
1.2 Thesis objectives.....	29
1.3 Thesis structure.....	30
Chapter 2.....	32
Review of Literature.....	32
2.1 Methane emissions.....	32
2.1.1 Waste Management.....	33
2.1.2 Manure management.....	33
2.2 Methane production process.....	35
2.3 Methane mitigation options.....	36
2.3.1 Gas capture for flaring and power generation.....	36
2.3.2 Biotechnology using methanotrophs.....	38
2.4 Methanotrophs.....	39
2.4.1 Characteristics.....	39
2.4.2 Methane oxidation process.....	42
2.4.3 Factors effecting methanotroph activity.....	43
2.5 Molecular methods to study methanotrophs ecology.....	48
2.6 Biofilters.....	53
2.6.1 Biofilter material.....	53
2.6.2 Landfill methane gas mitigation.....	55

2.6.3 Biofilters for waste treatment.....	56
2.6.4 Anaerobic dairy effluent methane mitigation	57
2.7 Conclusions.....	59
Chapter 3.....	60
Materials and Methods.....	60
3.1 Gas chromatography	60
3.2 Moisture content	60
3.3 pH.....	61
3.4 Microbial biomass carbon and nitrogen.....	61
3.5 Total Carbon (C) and Total Nitrogen (N).....	62
3.6 Nitrate and Ammonium N	62
3.7 DNA extraction and PCR.....	62
3.8 Quantitative PCR	64
3.9 Terminal-RFLP	68
3.10 Cloning, sequencing and phylogenetic analysis	69
Chapter 4.....	71
Does acidification of a soil biofilter compromises its methane oxidising capacity?	71
4.1 Introduction.....	71
4.2 Materials and Methods.....	72
4.2.1 Preparation of the biofilter.....	72
4.2.2 Biofilter setup and experiment.....	73
4.2.3 Gas samples	74
4.2.4 Soil samples	75
4.2.5 Molecular analysis	75
4.3 Results.....	75
4.3.1 Methane removal by the soil-biofilter.....	75
4.3.2 Factors affecting soil methane oxidation	76
4.3.3 Microbial biomass C and N	83
4.3.4 Abundance and diversity of Methanotroph.....	84
4.4 Discussion.....	86
4.5 Conclusions.....	89
Chapter 5.....	92

Assessing the performance of floating biofilters for oxidation of methane from dairy effluent ponds	92
5.1 Introduction.....	92
5.2 Materials and Methods.....	93
5.2.1 Preparation of the floating biofilter.....	93
5.2.2 Gas samples	94
5.2.3 Physical and chemical analysis of soil.....	95
5.2.4 DNA extraction, PCR and T-RFLP	95
5.2.5 Quantitative PCR	95
5.2.6 Cloning, sequencing, and phylogenetic analysis	96
5.2.7 Bio statistical analysis.....	96
5.3 Results.....	96
5.3.1 Physical and chemical changes in the floating biofilters	96
5.3.2 Pond biofilter	98
5.3.3 Laboratory-based biofilter	100
5.3.4 Methanotroph population dynamics in the biofilter.....	102
5.4 Discussion.....	106
5.4.1 Performance of the floating biofilters	106
5.4.2 Methanotroph population dynamics	109
5.4.3 Effect of H ₂ S on methanotroph population dynamics	110
5.4.4 Practical considerations	111
5.5 Conclusions.....	111
Chapter 6.....	113
Assessment of potential biofilter materials to mitigate methane emissions	113
6.1 Introduction.....	113
6.2 Materials and Methods.....	114
6.2.1 Laboratory fed-batch experiments	114
6.2.2 Addition of nutrients to soil and biochar	116
6.2.3 Physico-chemical analysis	116
6.2.4 Molecular analysis	117
6.2.5 Phylogenetic tree construction.....	117
6.2.6 Statistical analysis	117
6.3 Results.....	120
6.3.1 Methane removal of materials (with and without inoculum).....	120

6.3.2 Methanotroph abundance.....	124
6.3.3 Methanotroph diversity.....	127
6.3.4 Factors affecting CH ₄ removal.....	129
6.3.5 Phylogenetic analysis.....	136
6.4 Discussion.....	136
6.4.1 Performance of the materials.....	136
6.4.2 Aerobic methanotroph community – abundance and diversity	138
6.5 Conclusions.....	141
Chapter 7.....	143
General discussions and future perspective.....	143
7.1 Effect of CH ₄ flux on methanotroph abundance and activity.....	143
7.2 Methanotrophs during unfavourable conditions.....	145
7.3 Effect of pH on methanotroph community structure and biofilters performance.....	148
7.4 Ratio between type I and type II methanotrophs as an indicator of stable CH ₄ removal.....	149
7.5 Effect of nutrients on stable CH ₄ removal.....	149
7.6 Design considerations.....	151
7.7 Limitations and challenges of molecular tools.....	151
7.8 Future directions.....	152
7.8.1 Mitigating high concentrated CH ₄ emissions.....	152
7.8.2 Mitigating low concentrated CH ₄ emissions.....	153
References.....	155
Appendices.....	164
Appendix I.....	164
Appendix II.....	170
Appendix III.....	172
Appendix IV.....	174

List of Tables

Table 2.1 Functional probes (<i>pmoA</i>) targeting methanotrophs	51
Table 2.2 Phylogenetic probes (16S rRNA) targeting methanotrophs	52
Table 3.1 Primers used in this study to target different groups and genera of methanotrophs	63
Table 3.2 Thermal reaction conditions of qPCR assays used in this study.....	64
Table 4.1 Average gene copy number with standard deviations ($\times 10^8$) per gm of dry soil over the study period (90 days); n=8.	79
Table 4.2 Diversity and abundance based on T-RFLP analysis of <i>pmoA</i> genes of methanotroph. Phylotypes is indicative of the number of species present. Higher the H' value, more the diversity. Evenness assumes a value between 0 and 1, with 1 being complete evenness, n=2.....	80
Table 5.1 Physico-chemical properties of the laboratory and pond biofilters during the 11-month study period. ^a indicates significant difference ($P < 0.05$) between the initial and final day of biofilter samples.....	97
Table 5.2 Quantitative PCR results showing the abundance of gene copy number ($\times 10^8$ per gm of dry soil) belonging to type I and type II methanotrophs and different genera within. ^a indicates significant difference ($P < 0.05$) between the initial and final day of biofilter samples. Data= avg \pm SD (n=2).....	103
Table 5.3 Methanotrophs diversity in the pond and lab – floating biofilters as indicated by T-RFLP. Data = avg \pm SD (n=2).	104
Table 6.1 Physico-chemical properties of the materials tested. ^a indicates significantly ($P < 0.05$) different value than the volcanic pumice soil.	115
Table 6.2 Initial and final moisture content and pH measurements of the materials tested. n=3.	123
Table 6.3 Gene copy number ($\times 10^8$) per gram of dry material. Table includes the data of initial and final days of the study period. Values are reported as Avg \pm SD. Volcanic pumice soil (the positive control) had 5x inoculum compared to other materials tested (farm soil, compost, biochar and sterile weathered mulch); # = indicates inoculated farm soil/biochar amended with nutrients supplied at a CH ₄ concentration of 3 300 ppm (qPCR numbers are after 52 days of incubation) and * = indicates inoculated farm soil/biochar amended with nutrients supplied at CH ₄ concentration of 20 000 ppm during the 24-hr fed-batch period	

(qPCR numbers are after 52 days of incubation). ^a indicates the materials are statistically significant ($P < 0.05$) from volcanic pumice soil, whereas ^b indicates the significant difference ($P < 0.05$) between respective inoculated and non-inoculated material. 125

Table 6.4 Richness, shannon’s diversity and evenness of the biofilter materials analysed on initial and final days of the study period. The higher the shannon’s diversity, the higher the diversity of the methanotrophs; evenness is measured between a value of 0 and 1 (1 indicates the even distribution of the population). Volcanic pumice soil (the positive control) had 5X inoculum compared to other materials tested (farm soil, compost, biochar and sterile weathered mulch); # = indicates inoculated farm soil/biochar amended with nutrients supplied at a CH₄ feeding concentration of 3 300 ppm and * = indicates inoculated farm soil/biochar amended with nutrients supplied at CH₄ concentration of 20 000 ppm during the 24-hr fed-batch period. ^a indicates statistically significant increase during the study period. 128

Table 7.1 Physico-chemical properties (moisture, pH, total C and N) and methanotroph abundance (qPCR) of the volcanic pumice soil + perlite biofilter medium in different experimental systems, and associated maximum CH₄ removal rates. Abundance is represented as gene copy number $\times 10^8$ per gm of dry material. 144

Table 7.2. Methanotroph (Type I and II) abundance ($\times 10^8$ gene copy numbers per gm of dry material), richness (number of phylotypes based on T-RFLP), maximum CH₄ removed and time the materials took to remove >80% of CH₄ over the study period (stability) of volcanic pumice soil, farm soil, compost, biochar and sterile weathered mulch. * materials never removed >80% CH₄ during the study period. 150

List of Figures

Figure 1.1 Thesis structure.....	31
Figure 2.1 Organic matter decomposition and methanogenesis involving non-methanogenic and methanogenic microorganisms. Methanogens convert partially reduced carbon compounds to CH ₄ and CO ₂	36
Figure 2.2 Methane oxidation process involving RuMP and serine pathway of carbon assimilation in methanotrophs. (Hanson and Hanson, 1996)	42
Figure 2.3 Methane production from the pond, and methane mitigation from the above (using biofilters)	58
Figure 3.1 Example showing the crossing point values and the amplification curves for Type I 16S rRNA standards (ranging from 10 ⁻² to 10 ⁻⁶ dilutions).....	66
Figure 3.2 Post-qPCR run analysis: (a) Melting curves and (b) 2% TBE gel. This was done to confirm specific amplification of target genes during the qPCR run.....	67
Figure 3.3 Generating standard curves by plotting log gene copy numbers and crossing point values.	68
Figure 4.1 Schematic diagram showing biogas capture from the Massey Dairy No.4 effluent pond, and feeding it through a column biofilter filled with soil seeded with methanotrophs. Methane gets converted to CO ₂ during the process.....	73
Figure 4.2 (a) Methane (%) removed by the biofilter on day-0, day-10, day-29 and day-90. (b) Methane flux across various depths of the biofilter – 0 cm and 54 cm indicating the top/outlet and bottom/inlet of the biofilter, respectively. (c) CO ₂ concentration in g day ⁻¹ across various depths of the biofilter – 0 cm and 54 cm indicating the top/outlet and bottom/inlet of the biofilter, respectively.	78
Figure 4.3 Scatterplot showing the moisture along the length of the Biofilter on day-0, day-10, day-29 and day-90. Values are represented based on % dry weight (oven drying). Fig.4.2b Scatterplot showing the pH change in the Biofilter across the various depths and study period. At the end of the study, base of the biofilter becomes more acidic due to the oxidation of H ₂ S to H ₂ SO ₄ . Fig.4.2c Microbial Biomass C and N in the Biofilter on day-0, day-29 and day-90 of the study period. Variability within the box plot indicates the variability along the length of the biofilter. Fig.4.2d Box plot showing methanotroph population on day-90. Variability within the box plot indicates the variability along the length of the biofilter. <i>Methylocapsa</i> like methanotroph is significantly different with $P < 0.005$ than other populations.	82

Figure 4.4 Methanotroph community change in refilled or backfilled soil: Day-0 represents the first day of spare soil (pH-5.2) filled into the day-10 sample slot; Day-19 data represents, the spare soil analysed for a change in the community on day-29 sampling day. Except for type I and *Methylocapsa*, all other groups show a decreasing trend. Data = avg±SD (n=8).

..... 83

Figure 4.5 The phylogenetic tree was inferred using the Neighbour-Joining method based on the multiple alignment (clustal W) of nucleotides coding for pmoA gene. The percentage of replicate trees in which the associated taxa clustered together in the bootstrap test (1000 replicates) is shown next to the branches. The tree is drawn to scale, with branch lengths in the same units as those of the evolutionary distances used to infer the phylogenetic tree. The evolutionary distances were computed using the number of differences method and are in the units of the number of base differences per sequence. Evolutionary analyses were conducted in MEGA7 software package. 84

Figure 5.1 Floating biofilters used in this experimental study (11 months). Chambers (both control (without medium) and biofilter (with medium)) were placed on a floating structure to allow buoyancy and avoid penetration of effluent into the chambers. The holes present in the control and biofilter chambers allowed the methane to diffuse passively into the chambers from the pond. Biofilter and control chambers were kept open during the study period and were not covered during changing weathered conditions. 94

Figure 5.2 Methane flux ($\text{m}^3 \text{day}^{-1}$) from the outlet of pond biofilters (n=4) and control chambers (n=4) during the study period (January–November). Standard deviations indicate the deviation from the mean of the replicates. Dashed line indicates mean temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) during the study period. Year 2014 particularly had highest temperature records in February. 99

Figure 5.3 Methane removed ($\text{g m}^{-3} \text{h}^{-1}$) and fraction oxidised (%) by the pond biofilters during the study period. Error bars represent the standard deviation from the mean of replicates (n=4). 100

Figure 5.4 Net nitrous oxide (N_2O) emissions ($\times 10^{-9} \text{m}^3 \text{day}^{-1}$) from the outlets of control (n= 4) and pond biofilters (n= 4). Error bars represents the standard deviation from the mean of the replicates. Higher the difference between the two series, higher the N_2O removed by the pond biofilters..... 101

Figure 5.5 Methane influx ($\text{g m}^{-3} \text{h}^{-1}$), removal rate ($\text{g m}^{-3} \text{h}^{-1}$) and % CH_4 oxidised by the laboratory-based biofilters (n = 2) over the study period. Methane influx was increased after

a month and then was decreased over the rest of the study period. Error bars represent the standard deviation of the mean from the triplicate gas measurements.	102
Figure 5.6 Comparing CH ₄ oxidised (%) of laboratory and pond – floating biofilters. Outliers represent the minimum and maximum CH ₄ oxidised, and the median represents the average CH ₄ oxidised during the study period (n=4 and 2 for pond and laboratory biofilters, respectively).	104
Figure 5.7 Principal component analysis of biofilter materials on initial and final day of study period based on terminal-restriction fragments (T-RFs). Dendogram was produced by considering the similarities between samples using Euclidean distance with single linkage method.	107
Figure 5.8 Heat map analysis of terminal-restriction fragments (T-RFs) profile of the biofilter materials. Data segregated based on the relative abundance of more than 1%.	107
Figure 5.9 Unrooted phylogenetic tree constructed using Neighbour Joining method by considering the differences in nucleotides using a bootstrap value of 1000. All the cloned <i>pmoA</i> sequences (500 bp) showed similarities to different genera within type I methanotrophs (<i>Methylovulum</i> , <i>Methylosoma</i> , <i>Methylobacter</i> and <i>Methylomicrobium</i>), indicating presence of novel species or strains.	108
Figure 6.1 CH ₄ removal of the inoculated and non-inoculated materials – (a) farm soil, (b) compost, (c) biochar and (d) sterile weathered mulch. Volcanic pumice soil (the positive control) had 5X inoculum compared to other materials tested (farm soil, compost, biochar and sterile weathered mulch). Error bars represent the standard deviation from the mean of triplicates. Each data point represents the % CH ₄ calculated at the end of a 24 hour fed-batch period. Varying CH ₄ feeding phases (3 300 ppm, 10 000 ppm and 20 000 ppm) are indicated using the dashed lines.	119
Figure 6.2 Average CH ₄ removal (%) by all the biofilter materials tested over the study period. Error bars represents the maximum and minimum CH ₄ removed during the study period (n=3). Volcanic pumice soil (the positive control) had 5x inoculum compared to other materials tested (farm soil, compost, biochar and sterile weathered mulch). Low feed-CH ₄ concentration supplied at 3 300 ppm, and high feed-CH ₄ concentration supplied at 20 000 ppm.	121
Figure 6.3 Comparing inoculated soil and biochar – with and without amended nutrients. Stabilisation time indicates the number of days required for a material to reach a stable CH ₄ removal efficiency of more than 80% (n=3).	122

-
- Figure 6.4** Principal component analysis (PCA) based upon the T-RFs profile at the initial and final study period of the materials tested. Dendograms were revealed by grouping the materials based on single linkage Euclidean distance method. 133
- Figure 6.5** Heat map prepared using Genesis™ software Version 1.7.7. It is based on T-RF profile of all the materials on day final of the study period. Only the data with a relative abundance of >0.05 is included in this analysis. *Gamma-proteobacterial* (Type I) methanotrophs (*Methylobacter*, *Methylochromium*, *Methylosoma* and *Methylovulum*) were indicated by 440 and 504 bp, whereas 244 bp represents *α-proteobacterial* (type II) methanotrophs (*Methylocystis* and *Methylosinus* like) 134
- Figure 6.6** Factorial analysis indicating the correlation between CH₄ removal and various physical, chemical and biological factors studied. 134
- Figure 6.7** Unrooted phylogenetic neighbour-joining tree based upon nucleotides coding for partial methane monooxygenase gene subunit A (pmoA) of the cloned sequences (500 bp). Cloned sequences are compared to type strains or species of methanotrophs (accession numbers in the brackets). In silico digestion of the sequences (bp length) are presented. The percentage of replicate trees in which the associated taxa clustered together in the bootstrap test (1000 replicates) are shown next to the branches. The tree is drawn to scale, with branch lengths in the same units as those of the evolutionary distances used to infer the phylogenetic tree. The evolutionary distances were computed using the number of differences method and are in the units of the number of base differences per sequence. Evolutionary analyses were conducted in MEGA7 (Kumar *et al.*, 2016). 135
- Figure 7.1** Principal component analysis of terminal-restriction fragment (T-RFs) of the volcanic pumice soil in the acidic biofilter (Chapter 4), floating biofilters (Chapter 5) and laboratory jar experiments (Chapter 6). Samples from the initial and final period of study are shown here for a comparison. 146
- Figure 7.2** Heatmap analysis (based on T-RF's >1% relative abundance) of the volcanic pumice soil in the acidic reconstituted biofilter (Chapter 4), floating biofilters (chapter 5) and laboratory Jar experiments (Chapter 6). 147

List of Abbreviations

μ	Micro
AN	Avogadro's number
ANOVA	Analysis of variance
B	Boron
bp	base pair
C	Carbon
CaCl ₂	Calcium chloride
CaCl ₂ .2H ₂ O	Calcium chloride dihydrate
CH ₃ OH	Methanol
CH ₄	Methane
CMM	Coal mine methane
CO ₂ -e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
CoCl ₂ .6H ₂ O	Cobalt chloride hexahydrate
COD	Chemical oxygen demand
Cp	Crossing point
CuCl ₂ .2H ₂ O	Copper Chloride dihydrate
DGGE	Denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis
EBRT	Empty bed residence time
EC	Elimination Capacity
EDTA	Ethylene diamine tetra acetic acid
EEA	European Environment Agency
E _H	Evenness
EPA	Environmental protection agency
EPS	Exopolymeric Substances
FADH	Formaldehyde dehydrogenase
FAM	6-carboxy fluorescein
FDH	Formate dehydrogenase
FeSO ₄ .7H ₂ O	Iron sulphate heptahydrate
FID	Flame ionisation detector
FR	Francop
GC	Gas Chromatography
Gg	Giga gram
GHG	Greenhouse gas
GWP	Global warming potential
H'	Shannon's diversity
H ₂ S	Hydrogen sulphide
H ₂ SO ₄	Sulphuric acid
H ₃ BO ₃	Boric acid
HCHO	Formaldehyde
HDPE	High density poly ethylene
IPCC	Intergovernmental panel for climate change
K ₂ SO ₄	Potassium sulphate
KCl	Potassium chloride
KH ₂ PO ₄	Potassium mono phosphate
KJ	Kilo Joule
KNO ₃	Potassium nitrate
Kt	Kilo tonne
LFG	Landfill gas

MBC	Microbial biomass C
MBN	Microbial biomass N
MDH	Methanol dehydrogenase
MfE	Ministry for Environment
MgSO ₄ .7H ₂ O	Magnesium sulphate heptahydrate
MMO	Methane monooxygenase
MMT	Million metric tonne
MnCl ₂ .4H ₂ O	Manganese chloride tetrahydrate
MOB	Methane oxidising bacteria
MSW	Municipal sewage waste
MVA	Mine ventilation air
Na ₂ HPO ₄	Disodium phosphate
Na ₂ MoO ₄ .2H ₂ O	Sodium molybdate dihydrate
NCBI	National Centre for Biotechnology Information
NiCl ₂ .6H ₂ O	Nickel chloride hexahydrate
NMVOC	Non-methane volatile organic compounds
NPK	Nitrogen phosphorous potassium
PADS	Passive air diffusion system
PBS	Phosphate buffer saline
PCA	Principal Component Analysis
PCR	Polymerase Chain reaction
PHA	Polyhydroxy alkanooates
PLFA	Phospholipid-derived fatty acids
<i>pmoA</i>	Particulate methane monooxygenase subunit A
PMOB	Passive methane oxidation biocover
PVC	Poly vinyl chloride
qPCR	Quantitative Polymerase Chain reaction
Rpm	Revolutions per minute
RSKB	Rashad Surinder Kevin Bernd
RuMP	Ribulose monophosphate
Taq	<i>Thermus aquaticus</i>
TBE	Tris Borate EDTA
TCD	Thermal conductivity detector
TCE	Trichloro ethylene
T-RFLP	Terminal-restriction fragment length polymorphism
T-RFs	Terminal-restriction fragments
UV	Ultra violet
VOC	Volatile organic compounds
VS	Volatile solids
WHC	Water holding capacity
ZnSO ₄ .7H ₂ O	Zinc sulphate heptahydrate

