

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 **Reducing the Anaerobic Digestion Model N°1 for its**  
6  
7  
8 **application to an industrial wastewater treatment plant**  
9  
10  
11 **treating winery effluent wastewater**  
12  
13  
14

15  
16  
17 **Carlos García-Diéguez<sup>1</sup>, Olivier Bernard<sup>2</sup>, Enrique Roca<sup>1,\*</sup>**  
18

19  
20 <sup>1</sup> USC – PRODES. University of Santiago de Compostela, Department of Chemical  
21  
22 Engineering/School of Engineering, Sustainable Processes and Products Engineering and  
23  
24 Management Research Group. Rua Lope Gomez de Marzoa s/n, 15705 Santiago de  
25  
26 Compostela, Spain.  
27

28  
29 <sup>2</sup> INRIA. Sophia-Antipolis Cedex, 06902 France (e-mail: [olivier.bernard@inria.fr](mailto:olivier.bernard@inria.fr)).  
30  
31

32  
33  
34  
35 \* Corresponding author. Tel +34 881816774. Fax +34 881816702. E-mail: [enrique.roca@usc.es](mailto:enrique.roca@usc.es)  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 **Abstract**  
8  
9

10  
11 The Anaerobic Digestion Model N°1 (ADM1) is a complex model which is widely accepted  
12 as a common platform for anaerobic process modeling and simulation. However, it has a  
13 large number of parameters and states that hinders its calibration and its use in control  
14 applications. A principal component analysis technique was extended and applied to  
15 simplify the ADM1. The method shows that the main model features could be obtained  
16 with a minimum of two reactions for winery effluent wastewater. A new reduced  
17 stoichiometric matrix was identified and the kinetic parameters were estimated on the  
18 basis of representative known biochemical kinetics (Monod and Haldane). The obtained  
19 reduced model takes into account the measured states in the anaerobic wastewater  
20 treatment (AWT) plant and reproduces the dynamics of the process fairly accurately. The  
21 reduction methodology presented here can be used to develop on-line control,  
22 optimization and supervision strategies for AWT plants.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 **Keywords**  
42

43 ADM1; anaerobic wastewater treatment; modeling; model reduction; PCA.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

# 1. Introduction

Towards a sustainable society, the production of chemicals from renewable resources and particularly from waste streams is emerging as an important biotechnological application. Efforts are now being made to remove organic contaminants as far as possible without external sources of energy. For these reasons and as consequence of the application of Directive 96/61/EC, the BREF in Common Waste Water and Waste Gas Treatment recommend the use of Anaerobic Wastewater Treatment (AWT) as a best available technique (BAT) for the pre-treatment of wastewater such as those from agro-food industries with high biodegradable soluble substances (European Commission, 2003). Consequently, in the last decades, AWT has evolved into a consolidated technology for the treatment of medium to high load wastewater from agro-food industries (Gomez *et al.*, 2010, van Lier *et al.*, 2001). However, the suitable operation of an AWT plant requires constant surveillance and the targeted adjustment of different process parameters (Garcia *et al.*, 2007, Olsson *et al.*, 2005).

Anaerobic digestion process involves many interactions between species that may not all have been accurately identified. AWT has classically been regarded as a difficult process to be controlled and managed. For these reasons, modeling of AWT process has been a very active area through the last decades (Angelidaki *et al.*, 1993, Bernard *et al.*, 2001, Costello *et al.*, 1991, Dalmau *et al.*, 2010, Gavala *et al.*, 2003, Lee *et al.*, 2009, Mairet *et al.*, 2011, Mosey, 1983, Mu *et al.*, 2008, Muha *et al.*, 2012, Siegrist *et al.*, 2002, Tartakovsky *et al.*, 2008). All this knowledge about the process and its modeling has tried to be condensed into a model that is known as IWA Anaerobic Digestion Model n°1 (ADM1) (Batstone *et al.*, 2002). It is a standard benchmark for developing operational strategies and evaluating the performance of controllers (Batstone and Steyer, 2007).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 However, its large number of parameters (86 parameters) and not measurable states  
6  
7 (especially a large number of types of biomass) hinders its use in the development of  
8  
9 control applications. The ADM1 tries to be as widely applicable as possible and therefore  
10  
11 the price to be paid is that the mathematical analysis is very difficult, this influencing further  
12  
13 developments in state and parameter estimation, dynamic optimization and control. Thus,  
14  
15 a reduction of the model is considered as a reasonable alternative to simplify its  
16  
17 complexity and facilitate the development of controllers to specific applications.  
18  
19

20  
21 There are different methodologies that can be applied for the reduction of models. These  
22  
23 are mainly divided in projection (such as the methods based on singular value  
24  
25 decomposition or proper orthogonal decomposition) and non-projection based methods  
26  
27 (such as singular perturbation). Some research works on model reduction have been  
28  
29 focused on extending or applying these methodologies to the reduction of wastewater  
30  
31 treatment models (Barrou et al., 2008, Chachuat et al., 2003, Steffens et al., 1997). In  
32  
33 general, the majority of these methodologies give as result reduced models that do not  
34  
35 take into account the variables that are measured in AWT facilities. Besides, they lead to a  
36  
37 reduced model that reproduces properly the behavior but that does not maintain the  
38  
39 biochemical sense of variables and parameters.  
40  
41

42  
43 Bernard *et al.* (Bernard and Bastin, 2005a, Bernard and Bastin, 2005b) have developed a  
44  
45 methodology, based on the projection of data through a principal component analysis  
46  
47 (PCA). This method allows to reducing the complexity of biochemical models taking into  
48  
49 account the measurable variables and maintaining the highest possible biochemical  
50  
51 sense. Furthermore, this technique has proven to be effective for reducing the Benchmark  
52  
53 Simulation Model N° 1 (BSM1) (Barrou *et al.*, 2008), and the identification of the minimal  
54  
55 reaction network for several biochemical systems (Bernard et al., 2006, Bernard and  
56  
57 Bastin, 2005a, Bernard and Bastin, 2005b, Bernard and Queinnec, 2008, Helias et al.,  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 2011).

6  
7 The present paper aims to extend, to structure and to evaluate the ability of a model  
8 reduction technique as basis for the development of a simplified model with control and  
9 monitoring purposes. In this sense, a new reduced model was developed from ADM1  
10 using a PCA based technique (Bernard and Bastin, 2005a, Bernard and Bastin, 2005b).  
11 The first step consisted of evaluating the number of reactions to be taken into account for  
12 preserving the greatest possible variability. In a second step, the new reduced *pseudo-*  
13 stoichiometric matrix was computed from the principal axis. Then, the process kinetic was  
14 determined and adjusted using already known biochemical kinetic expressions. Finally, the  
15 resulting model was validated, where the results of the different states were compared with  
16 the results of ADM1. Additionally, an alternative procedure was used to compute and to  
17 validate the *pseudo*-stoichiometric matrix derived from PCA.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

## 35 **2. Materials and methods**

### 36 **2.1 Experimental data**

37  
38  
39 The input data set used in this study corresponds to experiments carried out in an  
40 anaerobic USBF reactor treating winery effluents. The main characteristics of the input,  
41 organic loading rate (OLR) and the influent concentration of chemical oxygen demand  
42 ( $COD_{in}$ ), are shown in Fig. 1. The used data set corresponds to an experiment where a  
43 series of increasing influent OLRs up to destabilizing the process had been applied to an  
44 anaerobic digester (Ruiz-Filippi, 2005). These data were used as input of an ADM1  
45 simulator and the results of the simulation were used to derive a reduced model.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 **Fig. 1.**  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 11 **2.2 IWA Anaerobic Digestion Model no. 1 (ADM1)**

12 ADM1 (Batstone *et al.*, 2002) is a complex model of multistep anaerobic process  
13 transformations. ADM1 incorporates processes such as hydrolysis of particulates,  
14 acidogenesis, acetogenesis and methanogenesis, and it includes 26 dynamic state  
15 concentration variables, 19 biochemical kinetic processes, 3 liquid-gas mass transfer  
16 kinetic processes, 8 implicit algebraic variables per liquid vessel, and 86 parameters. A  
17 detailed description on ADM1 can be seen in the IWA Scientific and Technical Report N°  
18 13 (Batstone *et al.*, 2002).  
19  
20

21 A virtual plant of ADM1 in a DAE (differential and algebraic equation) implementation and  
22 checked for consistency with the benchmark version from Lund University (Rosen *et al.*,  
23 2006, Rosen and Jeppsson, 2006) was used to the simulations. Additionally, the virtual  
24 plant incorporates ethanol degradation pathways (Ruiz-Filippi *et al.*, 2004) and it was  
25 calibrated for the anaerobic USBF (Upflow Sludge Bed Filter) reactor which was used to  
26 obtain the experimental data.  
27  
28

29 The dynamic behavior of the anaerobic digestion process in the USBF reactor was  
30 described by the following macroscopic mass balance applied to the liquid phase:  
31  
32

$$33 \frac{d\xi}{dt} = D\xi_{in} - \alpha D\xi - Q_G(\xi) + K \cdot r(\xi) \quad (1)$$

34 where,  $\xi_{in}$  and  $\xi$  represent the inlet concentration vector and the state vector respectively,  
35  $D$  is the dilution rate,  $Q_G(\xi)$  quantifies the loss of mass of each specie by transfer to the  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 gas phase. The parameter  $\alpha$  ( $0 \leq \alpha_i \leq 1$ ) describes the solid behavior inside of reactor  
6  
7 measuring the deviation from the ideal mixing behavior. The term  $K \cdot r(\xi)$  represents the  
8  
9 transformation phenomena in the bioreactor where  $r(\xi)$  is the ( $p \times 1$ ) vector of reaction  
10  
11 rates and  $K$  is the *pseudo*-stoichiometric matrix with dimension  $n \times p$  being  $n$  the number of  
12  
13 species and  $p$  the number of reactions or processes considered in the model. Thus, each  
14  
15  $k_{ij}$  element of the matrix  $K$  corresponds to the yield coefficient that relates the  $j^{\text{th}}$  reaction  
16  
17 with the concentration of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  specie. In consequence, a specie  $i^{\text{th}}$  with a positive value of  
18  
19  $k_{ij}$  is related to the products of the reaction  $j^{\text{th}}$  while a negative  $k_{ij}$  value refers to substrate  
20  
21 consumption; and if  $k_{ij} = 0$  the  $i^{\text{th}}$  specie is not involved in the  $j^{\text{th}}$  reaction.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

### 28 29 **2.3 Model reduction method**

30  
31 A complete structured procedure to reduce ADM1 consisting of 4 steps was extended and  
32  
33 applied:

- 34  
35 1. The first step in the model reduction procedure consists of determining the number  
36  
37 of reactions  $p$  (i.e., number of columns of the reduced stoichiometric matrix  $K$ )  
38  
39 applying the methodology based on PCA developed by Bernard *et al.* (Bernard and  
40  
41 Bastin, 2005a, Bernard and Bastin, 2005b). PCA was applied in combination with  
42  
43 the appropriate mass balances, where the number of measured species  $n$  is  
44  
45 assumed to be greater than the number of reactions  $p$ . It is described in the section  
46  
47 2.3.1.  
48  
49
- 50  
51 2. The second step was the determination of a new *pseudo*-stoichiometric matrix ( $K$ )  
52  
53 from the principal components (i.e., eigenvectors from PCA). It is described in  
54  
55 detail in the section 2.3.2.  
56  
57
- 58  
59 3. In the third step a state transformation was applied in order to obtain a set of new  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 kinetic functions and their parameters. These were modeled using well-known  
6  
7 kinetic functions used for reproducing the reactions rates of biochemical reactions  
8  
9 (i.e., Monod, Haldane, Contois, etc.). It is described in the section 2.3.4.

- 10  
11  
12 4. Finally, the accuracy of the reduced model was assessed along with its ability for  
13  
14 fitting quantitatively the data.  
15

16 A scheme that summarizes the model reduction methodology is shown in the Fig. 2.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 **Fig. 2.**  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 The method was applied to obtain a reduced model for an AWT plant treating winery  
29  
30 effluent wastewater. Nonetheless, the methodology described below could be applied to  
31  
32 any other type of wastewater (e.g., effluents of agro-food industries) and to other  
33  
34 biochemical models based on mass balances.  
35

36 The following section explains how a new reaction network with a lower dimension than  
37  
38 ADM1 can be obtained by means of the PCA method.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

#### 44 *2.3.1 Dimension of the reaction network* 45

46 In the reduction of biochemical models the number of reactions to be considered, is crucial  
47  
48 for avoiding an unmanageable boost in complexity. The aim is to define the smallest  
49  
50 number of reactions or processes ( $p$ ) that can represent the process dynamic. For this  
51  
52 task, the general mass balance (Eq. (1)) was rewritten such that the transport terms were  
53  
54 grouped on the left side or first member in the Eq. (2) while the biochemical  
55  
56 transformations  $K \cdot r(\xi)$  were located on the right side.  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



$$\frac{d\xi}{dt} - v(\xi(t)) = K \cdot r(\xi(t)) \quad (2)$$

where  $v(\xi)$  represents all fluxes of material in the bioreactor. Then, from Eq. (2) the following equation can be obtained, where  $u(t)$  can be computed because of all transport terms are known:

$$u(t) = K \cdot r(t) \quad (3)$$

The determination of the number of *pseudo*-reactions ( $p$ ) implies the identification of the dimension of the space where  $u(t)$  lives. It corresponds to the principal component analysis (PCA). PCA is a statistical technique for the reduction of dimensionality in a multivariable process. PCA provides a roadmap for how to reduce a complex data set to a lower dimension to reveal the sometimes hidden, simplified structure that often underlay it. To address this question,  $u(t)$  is considered at  $N$  time instants, with  $N > n$ , and these vectors are gathered in a matrix  $U = [u(t_1) \ u(t_2) \ \dots \ u(t_N)]$ . The number of *pseudo*-reactions ( $p$ ) is then determined by counting the number of non-zero eigenvalues of  $UU^T$  (Bernard and Bastin, 2005a, Bernard and Bastin, 2005b). Nonetheless, in practice there are not zero eigenvalues for the matrix  $UU^T$ . Let us remark that the eigenvalues of  $UU^T$  correspond to the variance associated with the corresponding eigenvector (i.e., principal component) (Johnson and Wichern, 1992). Thus, the method consists of selecting the  $p$  first eigenvectors which represents a total variance larger than a fixed confidence threshold (e.g., 90%).

In order to give the same weighting to all the variables in the PCA, the data vectors  $u(t_i)$

were normalized as follows:

$$\bar{u}_i(t_k) = \frac{u_i(t_k) - \bar{u}_i}{\sqrt{N} \cdot stdv(u_i)} \quad (4)$$

where  $\bar{u}_i$  is the mean value of  $u_i(t_k)$  and  $stdv(u_i)$  is the corresponding standard deviation.

### 2.3.2 Pseudo-stoichiometric matrix identification

The second step in the model reduction technique consists of determining a new *pseudo*-stoichiometric matrix  $K$ . In this sense, the family of possible *pseudo*-stoichiometric matrices  $K$  is parameterized by a matrix  $G$  according to Eq. (5). Therefore, a number of  $p^2$  constraints must be introduced to identify  $K$ .

$$K = \rho \cdot G \quad (5)$$

From a mathematical point of view, the identification of each *pseudo*-reaction (i.e.,  $k_j$  – column of  $K$ ) is independent of the identification of the other *pseudo*-reactions. Hence, let us assume that  $p$  constraints are available for each  $j^{\text{th}}$  *pseudo*-reaction and then these can be identified using Eq. (6).

$$k_j = \rho \cdot G_j = g_{1,j}\rho_1 + g_{2,j}\rho_2 + \dots + g_{p,j}\rho_p \quad (6)$$

Constraints can be chosen, as follows: *i*) normalizing the  $j^{\text{th}}$  reaction with respect to one specie, imposing a +1 or a -1 in some element of  $k_j$ ; *ii*) assuming that a specific component

is not involved in the reaction and therefore imposing a zero in the corresponding stoichiometric coefficient; *iii*) imposing the conservation of elementary mass balances; and *iv*) many other valuable assumptions based on *a priori* knowledge of anaerobic digestion process can be set up. However, let us remark that, constraints without biochemical meaning could be also applied to identify  $K$  but it should not be the preferred option.

### 2.3.3 Pseudo-stoichiometric matrix validation

To validate the *pseudo*-stoichiometric matrix an alternative calculation procedure was applied (Bernard and Bastin, 2005b). The idea consists in identifying a group of  $n-p$  vectors gathered in  $\beta$ , such that:

$$\beta^T K = 0 \quad \text{with } \beta \in \mathfrak{R}^n \quad (7)$$

Once the  $n-p$  vectors were identified, it was necessary to solve the multiple linear regressions associated to each vector  $\beta_i$  (refers to Eq. (8)) from where the stoichiometric coefficients were reidentified. Then, the sign of the stoichiometric coefficients and the significance of regressions were checked.

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i u_i(t) = 0 \quad (8)$$

### 2.3.4 Kinetics and parameter estimation

The third step in the model reduction methodology consists in estimating the reaction rates with respect to the biochemical species in the system. To simplify the parameter

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 identification procedure and to limit the correlation between the kinetic parameters, each  
6  
7 reaction was treated separately.  
8

9  
10 In order to isolate each  $j^{th}$  reaction a state transformation was applied. It was assumed that  
11  
12 there exists a  $\lambda_j$  vector (with dimension  $n \times 1$ ) according to the following approach (Chen *et*  
13  
14 *al.*, 2000):  
15

$$16 \lambda_j^T \text{ s.t. } \lambda_j^T K = (0 \dots 0 1 0 \dots 0) \quad (9)$$

$$17 r_j(\xi(t)) = \lambda_j^T K r(\xi(t)) \quad (10)$$

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 Then combining Eq. (3) and Eq. (10), each reaction rate can be expressed as:  
28  
29

$$30 r_j(\xi(t)) = \lambda_j^T u(t) \quad (11)$$

31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 Now the objective is to identify the reaction rates ( $r_j$ 's) as a function of some components  
37  
38 of the state  $\xi$ . In this sense, the reactions rates are determined by many factors but they  
39  
40 often mainly depend on substrate and biomass concentration. However, this step is far  
41  
42 from being trivial and different kinetics can be proposed. Here we suggest to investigate  
43  
44 the possibility that  $r_j/X_j$  (*reaction rate / biomass for the  $j^{th}$  reaction*) would be a function of  
45  
46 some of the substrate concentrations identified in the previous step. The substrates  
47  
48 correspond to negative elements in  $k_j$  and the biomass species correspond to some  
49  
50 positive elements in  $k_j$ . Thus, the procedure consists of determining whether the  $S_k$  leads  
51  
52 to a functional relationship in the space  $(r_j/X_j, S_k)$ . Then, known kinetic models can be  
53  
54 chosen in order to assess the adjustment of the reduced model with regard to the data. In  
55  
56 general, for the appropriate pair  $X_j$  and  $S_k$ , the function can be chosen from the set defined  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

by Eq. (12).

$$\frac{r_j(X_j, S_k)}{X_j} = \mu_j(X_j, S_k) = \begin{cases} Monod \\ Haldane \\ Contois \\ Other \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Once the mappings  $r_j(\xi)$  have been selected, a procedure of parameter identification is necessary. As a first step, the parameters of each reaction  $j^{th}$  can be estimated by minimizing the following objective function:

$$J_j(\theta_j) = \min \sum_{k=1}^N (\mu_{model}(\theta_j, X, S)_k - \mu_{data}(X, S)_k)^2 \quad (13)$$

where,  $\theta_j$  represents the set of parameters associated with the kinetic model selected for the  $j^{th}$  reaction. This provides a first estimate of kinetic parameters ( $\theta_j$ ) which will then be used as an initial estimate for a further multi-objective optimization. The aim is to reduce the error between the data generated by the original model and the data reproduced by the reduced model. Thus, the latter optimization consists in minimizing the following objective function along the considered time instants  $t_k$ :

$$J(\theta) = \min \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^N \omega_i (\xi_{model_i}(\theta, t_k) - \xi_{data_i}(t_k))^2 \quad (14)$$

Here,  $\omega_i$  is a selected weight for each state variable;  $\xi_{data}$  and  $\xi_{model}$  are the states of the original and reduced model respectively.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 **3. Results and discussion**

10  
11  
12 **3.1 Number of *pseudo*-reactions**

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
PCA was applied to experimental data from an USBF reactor treating winery effluent wastewater and simulated ADM1 data with the aim of determining the number of *pseudo*-reactions that must be taken into account to simplify the ADM1. Depending on data availability (i.e., measured process variables), different numbers of mass balances were considered for computing the number of *pseudo*-reactions. Table 1 shows the species considered for the application of mass balances (9, 8 or 7 balances) and summarizes the number of reactions obtained in each case for a preservation of data variability of 90%. As it can be observed in the table, when 7 mass balances were considered the resulting number of *pseudo*- reactions was lesser than the other two cases. This apparent discrepancy occurred as result of the methodology used. As a general rule, a lesser number of mass balances implied a lower number of *pseudo*-reactions to be considered in the reduced model structure. In fact, according to the adopted methodology, several combinations are often possible among reaction networks of different complexity (Bernard and Bastin, 2005b) and therefore the choice of a reaction network and its associated stoichiometry matrix is usually the result of modeling assumptions, data availability and modeling objectives. Hence, modeler expertise is crucial for determining the interest of increasing the accuracy of the model by increasing its complexity.

56 **Table 1**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 In the case of anaerobic digesters, only a small set of measured variables are available  
9 on-line (Spanjers and van Lier, 2006). Thus, the reduction method was applied considering  
10 only those variables that can be measured or easily estimated in AWT plants. These  
11 variables were: chemical oxygen demand ( $S_1$ ), concentration of volatile fatty acids ( $S_2$ )  
12 (note that the volatile fatty acids-VFA are also a source of chemical oxygen demand-COD,  
13 however we decided to represent the VFA in a separate way from main COD source),  
14 methane ( $CH_4$ ), inorganic carbon concentration ( $IC$ ), inorganic nitrogen concentration ( $IN$ ),  
15 acidogenic biomass concentration ( $X_1$ ) and methanogenic biomass concentration ( $X_2$ ).  
16 Considering this set of variables, the results obtained by application of PCA suggest that a  
17 model with  $p$  equal to 2 reactions (i.e., a new  $7 \times 2$  pseudo-stoichiometric matrix  $K$ ) would  
18 be adequate to describe the behavior of an AWT plant treating winery effluent wastewater.  
19 This can be observed in Fig. 3, where the accumulated explained variance is higher than a  
20 90% by considering only 2 reactions.. This result agrees with other scientific works, where  
21 two reactions were used to represent the experimental data issued from an anaerobic  
22 plant processing ethanol containing wastewater (Bernard et al., 2006, Bernard and  
23 Queinnec, 2008).  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 **Fig. 3.**  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

### 53 **3.2 Pseudo-stoichiometric matrix** 54

55 Once the number of compounds to be modeled was established (i.e.,  $n$  equal to 7) and the  
56 number of reactions was determined (i.e.,  $p$  equal to 2), the next step consisted in the  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62

identification of the *pseudo*-stoichiometric matrix  $K$  for the reduced model. As it was explained previously in the section 2.3.2, a number of  $p^2$  constraints ( $2^2 = 4$ ) were required to identify a new *pseudo*-stoichiometric matrix  $K$ . The structure of  $K$  is shown in the Eq.

(15):

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} k_{11} & k_{12} & S_1 \\ k_{21} & k_{22} & S_2 \\ k_{31} & k_{32} & CH_4 \\ k_{41} & k_{42} & IC \\ k_{51} & k_{52} & X_1 \\ k_{61} & k_{62} & X_2 \\ k_{71} & k_{72} & IN \end{pmatrix} \quad (15)$$

Two constraints by reaction were proposed based on *a priori* knowledge of anaerobic digestion process. Constraints that preserve as much as possible the biochemical meaning were preferred over any other possibilities. Thus, the first column or first reaction was identified assuming that it corresponds to the acidogenic step and therefore the following constraints were considered:

- The reaction was normalized with regard to the acidogenic biomass ( $X_1$ ) and then a value of +1 was assigned to the stoichiometric coefficient  $k_{51}$  (refers to Eq. (15)).
- It was assumed that the solubility of methane is negligible and also that it is only produced in the methanogenic step (i.e.,  $k_{31} = 0$ ).

In a similar way, two constraints were used to identify the second column (see Eq. (15)) or 2<sup>th</sup> *pseudo*-reaction, considering it equivalent to the methanogenic step of the anaerobic digestion process:

- The second reaction was normalized with regard to the methanogenic biomass ( $X_2$ ); this implies that a value of +1 was imposed for the stoichiometric coefficient



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

$k_{62}$ .

- It was considered that original source of COD cannot be directly consumed by the methanogenic biomass (i.e.,  $k_{12} = 0$ ).

Each pair of constraints associated to a column of  $K$  permitted to solve the linear system that corresponds with each *pseudo*-reaction (refers to Eq. (6)). Then, the unknown stoichiometric coefficients  $k_{ij}$  were calculated by means of Eq. (5). The obtained *pseudo*-stoichiometric matrix that results of this procedure is the following:

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} -25.50 & 0 \\ 24.10 & -19.03 \\ 0 & 0.278 \\ -0.259 & 0.277 \\ 1 & 0.281 \\ -0.533 & 1 \\ -0.006 & -0.007 \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} S_1 \\ S_2 \\ CH_4 \\ IC \\ X_1 \\ X_2 \\ IN \end{matrix} \quad (16)$$

This new *pseudo*-stoichiometric matrix reduces considerably the 28 x 21 ADM1 stoichiometric matrix.

### 3.3 Kinetics of the Reduced Model

The functions that describe the kinetics were chosen in order to assess whether the model fits well the data. Fig. 4 shows the projected data and the kinetic fitted data according with Eq. (12).

**Fig. 4.**

As it is shown in Fig. 4, the reaction rate was expressed with regard to the biomasses (i.e., acidogenic biomass  $X_1$  and methanogenic biomass  $X_2$  concentrations), and plotted against the corresponding substrate concentration (i.e.,  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ ) for each *pseudo*-reaction. A Monod kinetic function (Eq. (17)) was chosen for acidogenesis – 1<sup>st</sup> *pseudo*-reaction (see Fig. 4a) while a Haldane kinetic function (Eq. (18)) was chosen for methanogenesis – 2<sup>nd</sup> *pseudo*-reaction (see Fig. 4b).

$$r_1(X_1, S_1) / X_1 = \frac{\mu_{\max,1} \cdot S_1}{K_{s,1} + S_1} \quad (17)$$

$$r_2(X_2, S_2) / X_2 = \frac{\mu_{\max,2} \cdot S_2}{K_{s,2} + S_2 + S_2^2 / K_{I,2}} \quad (18)$$

Initially, the parameters were identified using Eq. (13), and then these were optimized to improve the response of the reduced model (refers to Eq. (14)). The results of the parameter identification procedure are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2**

### 3.4 *pH* - electroneutrality

Electroneutrality is a principle that must be respected in biochemical processes; so the concentration of anions weighted by the number of electrical charges must be equal to the concentration of cations with the same weighting. In ADM1, electroneutrality principle is used to evaluate the *pH* in the medium (an important variable to be monitored). The *pH* is

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 calculated using a charge balance which implies the use of an algebraic equation. This  
6 algebraic equation cannot be reduced by the PCA method and therefore it was adapted  
7 considering the state variables of the reduced model.  $pH$  was computed using the charge  
8 balance in Eq. (19) which is an adaptation of ADM1 charge balance.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

$$HO^- + HCO_3^- + An^- + s_2^- - Cat^+ - NH_4^+ - H^+ = 0 \quad (19)$$

18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 Affinity constants were used for computing the dissociated chemical species involved in  
24 (19). The affinity constant for the dissociated volatile fatty acid ( $s_2^-$ ) was assumed equal to  
25 acetic acid affinity constant considering that it is the major volatile fatty acid compound in  
26 anaerobic digestion process under not overloaded conditions.  $Cat^+$  and  $An^-$  represent  
27 additional positive and negative ions respectively (e.g.  $Na^+$ ,  $Cl^-$ ). Fig. 5 compares the  
28 values of  $pH$  obtained by ADM1 and the results obtained with the charge balance given by  
29 Eq. (19). According with the results shown in this figure, the approximation used for the  
30 affinity constant seems to be reasonable.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 **Fig. 5.**  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

### 51 **3.5 Gas flow**

52 Methane and carbon dioxide flows are other two important operating parameters used to  
53 monitor anaerobic processes. As the solubility of methane is very low (with a Henry  
54 constant of 0.00116 M/bar in water at 310 K - (Batstone et al., 2002)), it is possible to  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 simplify the differential equation corresponding to the methane in the reduced model  
6  
7 structure applying a singular perturbing simplification (Kokotovic et al., 1986; Bastin and  
8  
9 Dochain, 1990; Dochain and Vanrolleghem, 2001). Hence, the methane concentration in  
10  
11 the liquid phase and its time derivate were set to zero and it was assumed that there not  
12  
13 exists mass transfer resistance between the liquid and the gas phase. Thus, the methane  
14  
15 gas flow ( $Q_M$ ) was computed using the Eq. (20).  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

$$22 \quad Q_M = k_{32} \cdot r_2 \quad (20)$$

23  
24  
25  
26  
27 where  $r_2$  is the kinetic rate associated to methanogenesis and  $k_{32}$  is the yield coefficient of  
28  
29 methane.  
30  
31

32 Besides, the carbon dioxide has relatively high solubility and therefore its flow rate ( $Q_C$ )  
33  
34 was estimated using Henry's law and the following mass transfer equation:  
35  
36  
37  
38

$$39 \quad Q_C = k_L a \cdot (S_{CO_2} - KH_{CO_2} \cdot P_c) \quad (21)$$

40  
41  
42  
43 where,  $k_L a$  is the overall mass transfer coefficient for carbon dioxide,  $S_{CO_2}$  is the  $CO_2$   
44  
45 concentration in the liquid phase,  $KH_{CO_2}$  is the Henry constant for  $CO_2$  in water at 310 K  
46  
47 (0.0246 kg mol/m<sup>3</sup>·bar - (Batstone et al., 2002)) and  $P_c$  is the  $CO_2$  partial pressure in the  
48  
49 biogas.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## 3.6 Model validation

### 3.6.1 Validation of the macroscopic reaction network

The macroscopic reaction network estimated by means of PCA was validated finding the *pseudo*-stoichiometric matrix ( $K_{val}$ ) by the alternative method described in the section 2.3.3. In consequence, a multiple linear regression was derived for each vector  $\beta_i$ , according to Eq. (8). The numerical results obtained from each regression are shown in Table 3. It resulted that all the regressions were significant. Furthermore, the identified *pseudo*-stoichiometric matrix after validation (Eq. (22)) was compared with that obtained previously by PCA (see Eq. (16)). These matrices and its elements (comparing the order of magnitude and signs) are closer, which validates the estimated reaction scheme.

Table 3

$$K_{val} = \begin{pmatrix} -23.01 & 0 \\ +21.07 & -16.63 \\ 0 & 0.253 \\ -0.214 & 0.239 \\ 1 & 0.169 \\ -0.801 & 1 \\ -0.002 & -0.008 \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} S_1 \\ S_2 \\ CH_4 \\ IC \\ X_1 \\ X_2 \\ IN \end{matrix} \quad (22)$$

### 3.6.2 Validation of the reduced model

For nonlinear models (e.g., ADM1), it is not possible to check analytically the accuracy of a model, and therefore the quality of a model is assessed by means of simulations. Thus, the main objective of model validation was to verify that the reduced model fits the data

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 properly. Consequently, simulations with the reduced model were carried out, and the  
6  
7 different states were compared then with the results obtained by the original model  
8  
9 (ADM1). It is important to note that the validation phase was performed with a data set  
10  
11 which was not used to establish or to identify the reduced model.  
12  
13

14 Fig. 6 shows the results of the simulations provided by the reduced model against ADM1  
15  
16 simulation data (i.e., *COD* concentration in the effluent, *VFA* concentration in the effluent  
17  
18 and methane flow rate). The dynamic of the system is well explained by the reduced  
19  
20 model which is based on a  $7 \times 2$  *pseudo*-stoichiometric matrix in comparison with  $28 \times 21$   
21  
22 ADM1 matrix. Thus, it is demonstrated that this very simple model is able to properly  
23  
24 describe the behavior of the principal monitoring and control variables for an AWT plant  
25  
26 treating winery effluents. A limitation of the reduced model is that will not be able to  
27  
28 differentiate among the different volatile fatty acids and different microorganism  
29  
30 populations. For instance, it cannot forecast a propionate accumulation, as this feature has  
31  
32 not been taken into account in its development. However, the model is able to reproduce  
33  
34 the *pH* properly (Fig. 5). Furthermore, the used reduction methodology is flexible enough  
35  
36 for allowing the inclusion of new variables depending on modeling objectives.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 **Fig. 6.**  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 These results show how ADM1 can be reduced to a much simpler one describing well  
51  
52 enough the behavior of the modeled system for a specific type of wastewater.  
53

54 Table 4 shows the number of parameters, state variables, types of biomass, *pseudo*-  
55  
56 reactions and outputs in ADM1 against those used in the reduced model for winery  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 effluents. From these data, it can be observed the degree of reduction or simplification with  
6  
7 regard to ADM1. In this sense, the reduced model has a higher complexity ratio (i.e., ratio  
8  
9 between the number of available measurements and the number of parameters) than  
10  
11 ADM1. As a consequence, the development of controllers and estimators from the  
12  
13 reduced model would be easier. On another hand, the reduced model could be  
14  
15 recalibrated automatically due to the most of its state variables are measured on-line.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 **Table 4**

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29 **4. Conclusions**

30  
31  
32  
33 In this paper, a reduction methodology was extended and applied to evaluate its ability to  
34  
35 obtain a reduced model from ADM1 for control and supervision purposes. This  
36  
37 methodology appeared to be a powerful tool to simplify ADM1 and models with similar  
38  
39 structure for AWT. A reduced model with only two biochemical reactions was derived using  
40  
41 this methodology. It was able to represent the dynamics of anaerobic digestion considering  
42  
43 the instrumentation available at an AWT plant treating winery effluent wastewater. Future  
44  
45 work will focus on the proposal and development of observers, software sensors and  
46  
47 controllers based on the methodology presented here.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 **Nomenclature**

<b>Acronyms</b>	<b>Variable</b>	<b>Units</b>
$\alpha$	solid behavior model parameter ( $0 \leq \alpha_i \leq 1$ )	[-]
$\beta$	sound left kernel vectors matrix ( $n-p \times p$ )	

1			
2			
3			
4			
5	$\theta_j$	set of kinetic parameters	
6	$\lambda_j$	transformation vectors ( $n \times 1$ ) (see Eq. (9))	
7	$\mu_j$	specific growth rate	1/d
8	$\mu_{data}$	specific growth rate vector related to the data ( $1 \times N$ )	1/d
9	$\mu_{max,1}$	maximum acidogenic bacteria growth rate	1/d
10	$\mu_{max,2}$	maximum methanogenic bacteria growth rate	1/d
11	$\mu_{model}$	specific growth rate vector related to the reduced model ( $1 \times N$ )	1/d
12	$v$	fluxes of material in the bioreactor ( $n \times 1$ ) (see Eq. (2))	
13	$\xi$	state vector ( $n \times 1$ )	
14	$\xi_{data}$	state vector related to the data ( $n \times 1$ )	
15	$\xi_{model}$	state vector related to the reduced model ( $n \times 1$ )	
16	$\xi_{in}$	inlet concentration vector ( $n \times 1$ )	
17	$\rho$	matrix of eigenvectors ( $n \times p$ )	
18	$\rho_j$	eigenvector (column $j$ of $\rho$ )	
19	$\omega_j$	weights during parameter optimization	
20	$An^-$	anions concentration	kg mol/m <sup>3</sup>
21	$Cat^+$	cations concentration	kg mol/m <sup>3</sup>
22	$COD$	chemical oxygen demand	
23	$COD_{in}$	influent concentration of chemical oxygen demand	kg COD/m <sup>3</sup>
24	$D$	dilution rate	1/d
25	$G$	$G$ matrix ( $p \times p$ ) (see Eq. (5))	
26	$H^+$	hydron concentration	kg mol/m <sup>3</sup>
27	$HCO_3^-$	bicarbonate concentrations	kg mol/m <sup>3</sup>
28	$HO^-$	hydroxide concentration	kg mol/m <sup>3</sup>
29	$J$	objective function	
30	$K$	<i>pseudo</i> -stoichiometric matrix ( $n \times p$ )	
31	$k_{32}$	yield coefficient for methane	kg mol-CH <sub>4</sub> /kg COD
32	$k_{71}$	yield for inorganic nitrogen (acidogenesis)	kg mol-IN/kg COD
33	$k_{72}$	yield for inorganic nitrogen (methanogenesis)	kg mol-IN/kg COD
34	$KH_{CO_2}$	*Henry's constant for CO <sub>2</sub> in water at 310K (0.0246 kg mol/m <sup>3</sup> ·bar)	kg mol/m <sup>3</sup> ·bar
35	$K_I$	Inhibition constant	kg COD/m <sup>3</sup>
36	$k_i$	rows of matrix $K$	
37	$k_{ij}$	element $i,j$ of the <i>pseudo</i> -stoichiometric matrix $K$	
38	$k_{La}$	liquid-to-gas mass transfer coefficient	1/d
39	$K_s$	half-saturation constant	kg COD/m <sup>3</sup>
40	$K_{val}$	<i>pseudo</i> -stoichiometric matrix for validation ( $n \times p$ )	
41	$N$	number of data set records	
42	$n$	number of states	
43	$NH_4^+$	ammonium concentration	kg mol/m <sup>3</sup>
44	$OLR$	organic loading rate	kg COD/m <sup>3</sup> ·d
45	$p$	number of processes or reactions	
46	$P_c$	CO <sub>2</sub> partial pressure in biogas	bar
47	$Q_G$	mass transferred to the gas phase	kg mol/m <sup>3</sup> ·d
48	$Q_C$	carbon dioxide transferred to the gas phase	kg mol/m <sup>3</sup> ·d
49	$Q_M$	methane transferred to the gas phase	kg mol/m <sup>3</sup> ·d
50	$q_m$	methane gas flow	m <sup>3</sup> /d



$r$	reaction rates vector ( $p \times 1$ )	
$r_1$	acidogenesis reaction rate	kg COD/m <sup>3</sup> ·d
$r_2$	methanogenesis reaction rate	kg COD/m <sup>3</sup> ·d
$S_1$	organic substrate concentration (COD source)	kg COD/m <sup>3</sup>
$S_2$	volatile fatty acids concentration	kg COD/m <sup>3</sup>
$s_2^-$	ionized volatile fatty acids concentration	kg mol/m <sup>3</sup>
$S_{CO_2}$	CO <sub>2</sub> concentration in the liquid phase	kg mol/m <sup>3</sup>
$t_k$	considered time instants	
$U$	set of data records $U = [u(t_1) \ u(t_2) \ \dots \ u(t_N)]$ at $N$ time instants ( $n \times N$ )	
$u$	transport vector for each time instant ( $n \times 1$ )	
$\tilde{u}$	transport vector normalized ( $n \times 1$ )	
VFA	volatile fatty acids	
$X_1$	acidogenic biomass concentration	kg COD/m <sup>3</sup>
$X_2$	methanogenic biomass concentration	kg COD/m <sup>3</sup>

\* Taken from (Perry and Green, 1999).

## References

- Angelidaki, I., Ellegaard, L., Ahring, B.K., 1993. A Mathematical-Model for Dynamic Simulation of Anaerobic-Digestion of Complex Substrates - Focusing on Ammonia Inhibition. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 42 (2), 159-166.
- Barrou, O., Karama, A., Lakhali, E.K., Bernard, O., Pons, M.N., Corriou, J.P., 2008. Estimation of a reduced model of the BSM1 activated sludge wastewater treatment plant. *Int. J. Chem. React. Eng.* 6 (A63).
- Batstone, D.J., Keller, J., Angelidaki, I., Kalyuzhny, S., Pavlostathis, S.G., Rozzi, A., Sanders, W., Siegrist, H., Vavilin, V.A., 2002. *Anaerobic Digestion Model No. 1 (ADM1)*, IWA Publishing, London.
- Batstone, D.J., Steyer, J.P., 2007. Use of modelling to evaluate best control practice for winery-type wastewaters. *Water Sci. Technol.* 56 (2), 147-152.
- Bernard, O., Bastin, G., 2005a. Identification of reaction networks for bioprocesses: determination of a partially unknown pseudo-stoichiometric matrix. *Bioprocess. Biosyst. Eng.* 27 (5), 293-294.
- Bernard, O., Bastin, G., 2005b. On the estimation of the pseudo-stoichiometric matrix for macroscopic mass balance modelling of biotechnological processes. *Math. Biosci.* 193 (1), 51-77.
- Bernard, O., Chachuat, B., Helias, A., Rodriguez, J., 2006. Can we assess the model complexity for a bioprocess: theory and example of the anaerobic digestion process? *Water Sci. Technol.* 53 (1), 85-92.
- Bernard, O., Hadj-Sadok, Z., Dochain, D., Genovesi, A., Steyer, J.P., 2001. Dynamical

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5 model development and parameter identification for an anaerobic wastewater treatment  
6 process. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 75 (4), 424-438.  
7  
8  
9 Bernard, O., Queinnec, I., 2008. *Dynamic models of biochemical processes: properties of*  
10 *the models*, Hermes Science, Paris.  
11  
12 Chachuat, B., Roche, N., Latifi, M.A., 2003. Reduction of the ASM 1 model for optimal  
13 control of small-size activated sludge treatment plants - Réduction du modèle ASM 1  
14 pour la commande optimale des petites stations d'épuration à boues activées. *Revue*  
15 *des Sciences de l'Eau.* 16 (1), 5-26.  
16  
17  
18 Chen, L., Bernard, O., Bastin, G., Angelov, P., 2000. Hybrid modelling of biotechnological  
19 processes using neural networks. *Control Eng. Practice.* 8 (7), 821-827.  
20  
21 Costello, D.J., Greenfield, P.F., Lee, P.L., 1991. Dynamic Modeling of A Single-Stage  
22 High-Rate Anaerobic Reactor .1. Model Derivation. *Water Res.* 25 (7), 847-858.  
23  
24 Dalmau, J., Comas, J., Rodriguez-Roda, I., Pagilla, K., Steyer, J.P., 2010. Model  
25 development and simulation for predicting risk of foaming in anaerobic digestion  
26 systems. *Bioresour. Technol.* 101 (12), 4306-4314.  
27  
28  
29 European Commission, 2003. Reference document on Best Available Techniques in  
30 Common Waste Water and Waste Gas Treatment / Management System in the  
31 Chemical Sector, European IPPC Bureau (EIPPCB), Seville.  
32  
33 Garcia, C., Molina, F., Roca, E., Lema, J.M., 2007. Fuzzy-based control of an anaerobic  
34 reactor treating wastewaters containing ethanol and carbohydrates. *Ind. Eng. Chem.*  
35 *Res.* 46, 6707-6715.  
36  
37  
38 Gavala, H.N., Angelidaki, I., Ahring, B.K., 2003. Kinetics and modeling of anaerobic  
39 digestion process. *Adv. Biochem. Eng. Biotechnol.* 81, 57-93.  
40  
41  
42 Gomez, A., Zubizarreta, J., Rodrigues, M., Dopazo, C., Fueyo, N., 2010. An estimation of  
43 the energy potential of agro-industrial residues in Spain. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*  
44 [Gomez, Antonio; Zubizarreta, Javier; Rodrigues, Marcos; Dopazo, Cesar; Fueyo,  
45 Norberto] *Univ Zaragoza, Fluid Mech Grp, Zaragoza 50018, Spain.* 54 (11), 972-984.  
46  
47  
48 Helias, A., Leclercq-Perlat, M.N., Bernard, O., 2011. Identification of the biological reaction  
49 network in solid fermentations: applications to cheese ripening. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* To  
50 be published.  
51  
52  
53 Johnson, R., Wichern, D., 1992. *Applied multivariable statistical analysis*, Prentice - Hall,  
54 New Jersey.  
55  
56  
57 Lee, M.Y., Suh, C.W., Ahn, Y.T., Shin, H.S., 2009. Variation of ADM1 by using  
58 temperature-phased anaerobic digestion (TPAD) operation. *Bioresour. Technol.* 100  
59 (11), 2816-2822.  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5 digestion of microalgae using ADM1. *Bioresour. Technol.* 102 (13), 6823-6829.  
6  
7 Mosey, F.E., 1983. Mathematical modeling of the anaerobic digestion process: regulatory  
8 mechanisms for the formation of short-chain volatile acids from glucose. *Water Sci.*  
9 *Technol.* 15 (8/9), 209-232.  
10  
11 Mu, S.J., Zeng, Y., Wu, P., Lou, S.J., Tartakovsky, B., 2008. Anaerobic digestion model  
12 no. 1-based distributed parameter model of an anaerobic reactor: I. Model  
13 development. *Bioresour. Technol.* 99 (9), 3665-3675.  
14  
15 Muha, I., Grillo, A., Heisig, M., Schonberg, M., Linke, B., Wittum, G., 2012. Mathematical  
16 modeling of process liquid flow and acetoclastic methanogenesis under mesophilic  
17 conditions in a two-phase biogas reactor. *Bioresour. Technol.* 106, 1-9.  
18  
19 Olsson, G., Martinus, K., Zhiguo, Y., Jensen, A.L., Steyer, J.P., 2005. *Instrumentation,*  
20 *Control and Automation in Wastewater Systems*, IWA Publishing, London.  
21  
22 Perry, R., Green, D., 1999. *Perry's Chemical Engineering Handbook*, 7th. Edition ed.,  
23 McGraw - Hill, USA.  
24  
25 Rosen, C., Jeppsson, U., 2006. Aspects on ADM1 implementation within the BSM2  
26 framework IWABSM TG Technical Report, LUTEDX/(TEIE-7224), Lund University,  
27 Lund, Sweden.  
28  
29 Rosen, C., Vrecko, D., Gernaey, K.V., Pons, M.N., Jeppsson, U., 2006. Implementing  
30 ADM1 for plant-wide benchmark simulations in Matlab/Simulink. *Water Sci. Technol.* 54  
31 (4), 11-19.  
32  
33 Ruiz-Filippi, G. (2005) *Monitorización y control avanzado de reactores anaerobios*. PhD.  
34 Thesis , University of Santiago de Compostela.  
35  
36 Ruiz-Filippi, G., Rodriguez, J., Roca, E., Lema, J.M. Modification of the IWA-ADM1 for  
37 application to anaerobic treatment of ethanolic wastewater from wine factories. 1341-  
38 1344. 2004. *Anaerobic Digestion 10th World Congress Anaerobic Bioconversion for*  
39 *Sustainability*. 29-8-2004.  
40  
41 Siegrist, H., Vogt, D., Garcia-Heras, J.L., Gujer, W., 2002. Mathematical model for meso-  
42 and thermophilic anaerobic sewage sludge digestion. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 36 (5),  
43 1113-1123.  
44  
45 Spanjers, H., van Lier, J., 2006. *Instrumentation in anaerobic treatment-research and*  
46 *practice*. *Water Sci. Technol.* 53 (4-5), 63-76.  
47  
48 Steffens, M.A., Lant, P.A., Newell, R.B., 1997. A systematic approach for reducing  
49 complex biological wastewater treatment models. *Water Res.* 31 (3), 590-606.  
50  
51 Tartakovsky, B., Mu, S.J., Zeng, Y., Lou, S.T., Guiot, S.R., Wu, P., 2008. Anaerobic  
52 digestion model No. 1-based distributed parameter model of an anaerobic reactor: II.  
53 Model validation. *Bioresour. Technol.* 99 (9), 3676-3684.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 van Lier, J., Tilche, A., Ahring, B., Macarie, H., Moletta, R., Dohanyos, M., Hulshoff Pol, L.,  
6 Lens, P., Verstraete, W., 2001. New perspectives in anaerobic digestion. Water Sci.  
7 Technol. 43 (1), 1-18.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Tables

**Table 1** Mass balances considered depending on the key chemical species involved in the anaerobic process and number of *pseudo*-reactions determined by PCA with a data variability threshold of 90%. (COD: Chemical Oxygen Demand, VFA: Volatile Fatty Acids expressed as acetic).

**Table 2** Kinetic parameters obtained for the reduced model.

**Table 3** Significance of the regressions (threshold 5%) derived from Eq. (8) and parameter values.

**Table 4** Comparison of the complexity between the ADM1 and the reduced model.

**Table 1**

Mass balances considered depending on the key chemical species involved in the anaerobic process and number of *pseudo*-reactions determined by PCA with a data variability threshold of 90%. (COD: Chemical Oxygen Demand, VFA: Volatile Fatty Acids expressed as acetic).

	9 mass balances	8 mass balances	7 mass balances
Soluble compounds	COD	COD	COD
	VFA	VFA	VFA
	Inorganic carbon	Inorganic carbon	Inorganic carbon
	Inorganic nitrogen	Inorganic nitrogen	Inorganic nitrogen
	Methane	Methane	Methane
	Hydrogen	Hydrogen	
Biomass	Acidogenic biomass	Acidogenic biomass	Acidogenic biomass
	Acetoclastic biomass	Methanogenic biomass	Methanogenic biomass
	Hydrogenotrophic biomass		
Number of pseudo-reactions	3 (3)	3(3)	2(2)

\* Inside of parenthesis the number of reactions computed from experimental data.

**Table 2**

Kinetic parameters obtained for the reduced model.

<b>Parameter</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Acidogenesis 1<sup>st</sup> <i>pseudo</i>-reaction</b>	<b>Methanogenesis 2<sup>nd</sup> <i>pseudo</i>-reaction</b>
$\mu_{\max}$	1/d	0.065 (0.085)	2.016 (2.029)
$K_s$	kg COD/m <sup>3</sup>	0.279 (0.193)	1.668 (1.450)
$K_i$	kg COD/m <sup>3</sup>	- (-)	0.024 (0.034)

<sup>0</sup> In brackets the initial values for the optimization by equation (12).

**Table 3**

Significance of the regressions (threshold 5%) derived from Eq. (8) and parameter values.

Vector	Unknown	Significance	Value	Interval
$\beta_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{k_{21} + k_{22} \cdot k_{61}}{k_{11}} \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ k_{22} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\frac{k_{21} + k_{22} \cdot k_{61}}{k_{11}}$ $k_{22}$	Yes	0.337 16.63	[0.327 0.346] [16.24 17.03]
$\beta_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{k_{21}}{k_{11}} \\ 1 \\ \frac{k_{22}}{k_{32}} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\frac{k_{21}}{k_{11}}$ $\frac{k_{22}}{k_{32}}$	Yes	0.916 65.72	[0.915 0.917] [65.66 65.78]
$\beta_3 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{k_{41} - k_{42} \cdot k_{61}}{k_{11}} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ -k_{42} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\frac{k_{41} - k_{42} \cdot k_{61}}{k_{11}}$ $-k_{42}$	Yes	-0.001 0.239	[-0.001 -0.0008] [0.232 0.245]
$\beta_4 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{k_{42} - k_{52} \cdot k_{41}}{k_{11} \cdot k_{42}} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -\frac{k_{52}}{k_{42}} \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\frac{k_{42} - k_{52} \cdot k_{41}}{k_{11} \cdot k_{42}}$ $-\frac{k_{52}}{k_{42}}$	Yes	0.050 -0.708	[0.0499 0.0502] [-0.675 -0.741]



$$\beta_s = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{k_{71} - k_{61} \cdot k_{72}}{k_{11}} \\ k_{11} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -k_{72} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \frac{k_{71} - k_{61} \cdot k_{72}}{k_{11}} \quad \text{Yes} \quad \begin{matrix} -0.0004 \\ -0.0076 \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} [-0.0004 \ -0.0004] \\ [-0.0076 \ -0.0077] \end{matrix}$$


---

**Table 4**

Comparison of the complexity between the ADM1 and the reduced model.

	ADM1	Reduced Model
Parameters	89	13
State variables	28	7
Types of biomass	8	2
Number of reactions	21	2
Outputs	32	8
Complexity ratio*	$7/89 = 0.08$	$7/13 = 0.54$

\* Complexity ratio is defined as the ratio between the number of available measurements and the number of parameters. A higher ratio complexity indicates greater model simplicity.

## Figures

**Fig. 1.** Input conditions for the anaerobic USBF reactor treating winery effluents. The organic loading rate  $OLR$  (-) ( $\text{kg COD/m}^3\cdot\text{d}$ ) and the influent concentration of chemical oxygen demand  $COD_{in}$  (-) ( $\text{kg COD/m}^3$ ).

**Fig. 2.** Scheme of the procedure used for model reduction.


**Fig. 3.** Explained variance (bar) and cumulated explained variance for 7 mass balances ( $\blacktriangle$ ) with respect to the number of reactions for winery effluents treated in a USBF.

**Fig. 4.** Simulated reaction rate and kinetics of the reduced model. a) Acidogenesis – Monod function.  $r_1$ : acidogenic reaction rate;  $X_1$ : acidogenic biomass;  $S_1$ : primary organic substrate expressed as chemical oxygen demand (COD). b) Methanogenesis – Haldane function.  $r_2$ : methanogenic reaction rate;  $X_2$ : methanogenic biomass;  $S_2$ : volatile fatty acids.


**Fig. 5.**  $pH$  simulation comparing the behavior of the reduced model (-) against the ADM1 (-).

**Fig. 6.** Time evolution of methane flow rate  $q_m$  ( $\text{m}^3/\text{d}$ ), chemical oxygen demand  $S_1$  ( $\text{kg COD/m}^3$ ) and volatile fatty acids concentration  $S_2$  ( $\text{kg COD/m}^3$ ) at the outlet of the USBF reactor for the reduced model (-) and ADM1 (-).


Figure(1)





Figure(2)




Figure(3)



Figure(4)



Figure(5)





Figure(6)

