



HAL
open science

Bidirectional microbial electron transfer: switching an acetate oxidizing biofilm to nitrate reducing conditions

Narcís Pous, Alessandro Carmona Martinez, Anna Vilajeliu-Pons, Erika Fiset, Lluís Bañeras, Eric Trably, M. Dolors Balaguer, Jesus Colprim, Nicolas Bernet, Sebastià Puig

► To cite this version:

Narcís Pous, Alessandro Carmona Martinez, Anna Vilajeliu-Pons, Erika Fiset, Lluís Bañeras, et al.. Bidirectional microbial electron transfer: switching an acetate oxidizing biofilm to nitrate reducing conditions. *Biosensors and Bioelectronics*, 2016, 75, pp.352-358. 10.1016/j.bios.2015.08.035 . hal-02640915

HAL Id: hal-02640915

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02640915v1>

Submitted on 4 Aug 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **Bidirectional microbial electron transfer: switching an acetate**
2 **oxidizing biofilm to nitrate reducing conditions**

3 Narcís Pous^a, Alessandro A. Carmona-Martínez^b, Anna Vilajeliu-Pons^a, Erika Fiset^a,
4 Lluís Bañeras^c, Eric Trably^b, M. Dolors Balaguer^a, Jesús Colprim^a, Nicolas Bernet^b and
5 Sebastià Puig^{a,*}

6 ^aLEQUIA, Institute of the Environment, University of Girona, C/ Maria Aurèlia Capmany, 69, Facultat de Ciències, E-17071
7 Girona, Spain. *Correspondence to: S. Puig, E-mail: sebastia@lequia.udg.cat

8 ^bINRA, UR0050, Laboratoire de Biotechnologie de l'Environnement, Avenue des Etangs, Narbonne, F-11100, France

9 ^cMolecular Microbial Ecology Group, Institute of Aquatic Ecology, University of Girona, Spain.

10

11 **ABSTRACT**

12 Up to date a few electroactive bacteria embedded in biofilms are described to catalyze
13 both anodic and cathodic reactions in bioelectrochemical systems (i.e. bidirectional
14 electron transfer). How these bacteria transfer electrons to or from the electrode is still
15 uncertain. In this study the extracellular electron transfer mechanism of bacteria within
16 an electroactive biofilm was investigated by using cyclic voltammetry (CV) and
17 differential pulse voltammetry (DPV). First, a mature anodic electroactive biofilm was
18 developed from an activated sludge sample (inoculum), acetate as electron donor and a
19 poised electrode (+397 mV vs. SHE). Later, this biofilm was “switched” to biocathodic
20 conditions by feeding it with a medium containing nitrates and poisoning the electrode at –
21 303 mV vs. SHE. The electrochemical characterization indicated that both, acetate
22 oxidation and nitrate reduction took place at a similar formal potential of -175 ± 05 and -
23 175 ± 34 mV vs. SHE, respectively. The biofilm was predominantly composed by
24 *Geobacter* sp. at both experimental conditions. Taken together, the results indicated that
25 both processes could be catalyzed by using the same electron conduit, and most likely
26 by the same bacterial consortium. Hence, this study suggests that electroactive bacteria

1 within biofilms could use the same electron transfer conduit for catalyzing anodic and
2 cathodic reactions.

3 **Keywords**

4 Bidirectional extracellular electron transfer, bioanode, biocathode, bioelectrochemical
5 systems, electroactive biofilms.

6

7 **1. INTRODUCTION**

8 The interaction of microorganisms with metals, such as dissimilatory Fe(III) reduction
9 (Lovley, 1991) has found a substantial utility for microbial bioelectrochemical systems
10 (BES) (Pant et al., 2012). In BES, strains within the well-known dissimilatory metal
11 reducing *Geobacteraceae* (Bond and Lovley, 2003) and *Shewanellaceae* (Baron et al.,
12 2009) bacterial families, are capable of oxidizing and reducing a solid electrode
13 material. In bioanodes, bacteria use the electrode as an electron sink for the oxidation of
14 organic matter. Thus, electrical energy can be harvested (Logan and Rabaey, 2012).
15 Contrarily, in biocathodes, bacteria obtain electrons from the electrode to reduce
16 oxidized compounds. Such electrode oxidizing process can be used for treating
17 inorganic contaminants, such as nitrate (Clauwaert et al., 2007), or to produce added-
18 value chemicals like hydrogen (Batlle-Vilanova et al., 2014) or C2-C4 organic acids and
19 alcohols (Ganigue et al., 2015), among others.

20 Metal-reducing bacteria use external cytochromes or soluble mediators to interact
21 with metals via a process termed direct and mediated electron transfer (DET and MET,
22 respectively) (Schröder, 2007). In BES, the electron transfer between microorganisms
23 and bioanodes has been well elucidated for a handful of anode-respiring bacteria (ARB)
24 such as *Geobacter sulfurreducens* (Fricke et al., 2008), *Rhodopseudomonas palustris*
25 (Xing et al., 2008), *Thermincola ferriacetica* (Parameswaran et al., 2013),

1 *Geoalkalibacter subterraneus* (Carmona-Martínez et al., 2013), and *Shewanella*
2 *oneidensis* (Marsili et al., 2008). While bacteria within the *Geobacteraceae* are
3 examples of ARB using DET to transport electrons from an available electron donor
4 (organic matter) to the solid electrode (Carmona-Martínez et al., 2013; Fricke et al.,
5 2008), members of the *Shewanellaceae* have been characterized for using both DET and
6 MET (Carmona-Martinez et al., 2011; Marsili et al., 2008). However, the
7 *Shewanellaceae* produce significantly less current densities. In contrast, the
8 fundamental principles of the mechanism for electron uptake from cathodes by
9 microorganisms have been scarcely reported (Rosenbaum et al., 2011). Few examples
10 of biocathode electron transfer characterization are available in literature.
11 *Mariprofundus ferrooxydans* was electrochemically characterized for its ability of
12 reducing oxygen using an electrode as electron donor (Summers et al., 2013). Recently,
13 two independent works have reported the electrochemical characterization of nitrate
14 reducing biocathodes, one being predominantly colonized by *Thiobacillus* sp. (Pous et
15 al., 2014), and the second one being dominated by *Rhodocyclales* and *Burkholderiales*,
16 also within the *betaproteobacteria* (Gregoire et al., 2014). These articles described
17 Nernstian current-potential dependency for biocathode, as it is usually observed in
18 bacterial bioanodes.

19 For metal-reducing bacteria able to both reduce Fe(III) and oxidize Fe(II) it has been
20 hypothesized that the same protein of the Mtr respiratory pathway could be used for a
21 bidirectional transport of electrons, i.e. obtaining and delivering electrons from/to the
22 electrode (Shi et al., 2012).

23 In BES, the bidirectional activity of a few electroactive bacteria embedded in
24 biofilms has been demonstrated. Dumas et al. (2008) and Strycharz et al. (2011) showed
25 that *Geobacter sulfurreducens* could perform anodic acetate oxidation and cathodic

1 fumarate reduction, but their results suggested that a different electron conduit was
2 used. Ross et al. (2011) demonstrated that *Shewanella oneidensis* Mtr pathway could be
3 reversed for fumarate reduction. Geelhoed and Stams (2011) showed the ability of pure
4 *Geobacter sulfurreducens* to use the electrode for both the oxidation of acetate and the
5 reduction of protons to hydrogen. Jeremiasse et al. (2012) showed that a mixed culture
6 biofilm could be firstly grown as an acetate-oxidizing bioanode and afterwards switched
7 to a hydrogen-producing biocathode, which certainly decreased the start-up time (>2
8 times faster). Mixed culture biofilms able to both catalyze organic matter oxidation and
9 oxygen or nitrate reduction have been also described (Blanchet et al., 2014; Cheng et
10 al., 2012, 2010). However, to the best of the authors' knowledge, the main electron
11 transfer mechanism governing such "switchable" electroactive biofilms has not been
12 elucidated yet. For this reason, this study presents the electrochemical characterization
13 of a "switchable" electroactive biofilm able to oxidize acetate and later able to
14 successfully reduce nitrate.

15 Two anodic electroactive biofilms were developed from an activated sludge sample,
16 using acetate as sole electron donor and a polarized electrode at +397 mV vs standard
17 hydrogen electrode (SHE) as sole electron acceptor. Once the biofilm was visible in the
18 anode (after three fed-batch cycles), its operation was switched to a biocathode able to
19 reduce nitrates using the electrode as electron donor at -303 mV vs. SHE. The electron
20 transfer mechanism of both oxidizing- and reducing-activities was elucidated using
21 voltammetric techniques.

22

23

24

25

1 **2. MATERIAL AND METHODS**

2 **2.1. Experimental set-up**

3 A three-neck 1L round-bottom flask (one-chamber BES) was used as a reactor and
4 assembled following a three-electrode arrangement. Two graphite rods (diameter: 4.5
5 mm and length: 250 mm) were used as working- and counter- electrodes, respectively
6 (Mersen Iberica, Spain). All bioelectrochemical experiments were conducted under
7 potentiostatic control using Ag/AgCl as a reference electrode (+197 mV vs SHE, model
8 RE-5B BASi, United States). The working electrode was placed at the central neck,
9 while the reference- and the counter- electrodes were placed at lateral necks.

10 Two biological replicates were performed using the same set-up (labeled as R-1 and
11 R-2, respectively), as well as an abiotic control test.

12 All media were prepared with distilled water and vigorously flushed with N₂ gas
13 (purity ≥ 99.9%; Praxair, Spain) to remove traces of dissolved oxygen. Basal (substrate
14 free solution) mineral media were composed of: 2.640g·L⁻¹ KH₂PO₄, 4.320g·L⁻¹
15 Na₂HPO₄; 0.130g·L⁻¹ KCl; 0.020g·L⁻¹ NH₄Cl and 0.1mL micronutrients (Carmona-
16 Martínez et al., 2013). Basal media was amended with acetate (CH₃COO⁻, 0.840g·L⁻¹
17 CH₃COONa) or nitrate plus bicarbonate (NO₃⁻, 0.182g·L⁻¹ NaNO₃ and 1.398g·L⁻¹
18 NaHCO₃) for bioanode or biocathode conditions, respectively. The round-bottom flask
19 was filled with 1L of medium, which resulted in a working electrode wet surface area of
20 31±1 cm² for R-1 and R-2. All experiments were carried out at pH 7.0 and room
21 temperature (22°C).

22 **2.2. Reactor operation: Bioanodic and biocathodic conditions**

23 The round-bottom flask was inoculated with 0.050 L of activated sludge from an urban
24 wastewater treatment plant (Girona, Spain) per 1 L of synthetic medium. Figure 1
25 shows the workflow followed in this study.

1 An electroactive bioanode was grown by feeding the reactor with the acetate-
2 containing medium. The reactor was operated in fed-batch mode for three different fed-
3 batch cycles in which the acetate-exhausted medium was replaced for fresh medium
4 containing the initial amount of acetate. At all times during anodic conditions, the
5 working electrode (WE) was polarized at +200 mV vs Ag/AgCl (+397 mV vs SHE at
6 25°C) (model SP-50, Bio-logic, France) following the procedure described elsewhere
7 (Gimkiewicz and Harnisch, 2013). Henceforth, all potentials will be referred vs SHE.

8 Once the electrochemical characterization of mature anodic biofilms concluded (see
9 below) the medium was changed to a nitrate-solution to start biocathodic conditions and
10 two feeding cycles were performed. During biocathodic conditions, the WE was
11 polarized at -303 mV.

12 The procedure was performed in duplicate (R-1 and R-2). Abiotic nitrate reduction
13 was tested using new graphite electrodes polarized at -303 mV during 16 h.

14 **2.3. Characterization of biofilm performance: Bioelectrochemical measurements**

15 The biofilm was electrochemically characterized by cyclic voltammetry (CV) under
16 turnover, acetate (CH_3COO^-) or nitrate (NO_3^-), and non-turnover (substrate-free)
17 conditions. The CV was performed from -401 to +798 mV at scan rate of $1\text{mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$
18 (Harnisch and Freguia, 2012). Additionally, differential pulse voltammetry (DPV) was
19 recorded from -401 to +798 mV by setting the following parameters: pulse height of 50
20 mV, pulse width of 300 ms, step height of 1 mV and step time of 1000 ms (scan rate of
21 $1\text{mV}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$). Data extracted from CVs and DPVs as peak detection and first derivative
22 analyses were performed using the free-software SOAS (Fourmond et al., 2009). The
23 mid-point potential (E_f) of redox couples was calculated as the mean value of the
24 oxidative and reductive potential. All data are based on experiments of at least two
25 independent biofilm replicates and standard deviations are presented throughout the

1 manuscript. The use of two biologic replicates have been stated as enough to prove
2 bioelectrochemical performance (Logan, 2012).

3 **2.3. Analytical methods and calculations**

4 At the start and at the end of each feeding period, samples were taken for
5 physicochemical analyses. The biofilm activity under bioanodic conditions was checked
6 by the analysis of acetate and any other short chain volatile fatty acid: propionic,
7 butyric, isobutyric, valeric, isovaleric, hexanoic, ethanol) in the liquid phase through a
8 gas-chromatograph equipped with a DB-FFAP column and a flame ionization detector
9 (7890A, Agilent, USA). The biofilm activity under biocathodic conditions was checked
10 by the analysis of nitrates (electron acceptor) and nitrites, ammonium and nitrous oxide
11 (possible end-products). Nitrates, nitrites and ammonium were analysed following the
12 recommendations of the American Public Health Association (APHA) (APHA, 2005).
13 Nitrous oxide was analysed using a N₂O microsensor (Unisense, Denmark). pH was
14 measured with a pH-meter (pH-meter basic 20⁺, Crison, Spain). Coulombic efficiency
15 (*CE*) for nitrate reduction was calculated following the methodology described by
16 Virdis et al. (2009).

17 **2.4. Molecular analyses**

18 Once both bioanodic and biocathodic conditions were electrochemically characterized, a
19 representative sample of the biofilm attached to the electrode was gently scratched,
20 collected and stored at -20°C. Bacterial 16S rRNA gene was amplified by PCR using
21 universal primers 357F-GC (Turner et al., 1999) and 907R (Lane, 1991). PCR products
22 were analyzed by Denaturing Gradient Gel Electrophoresis (DGGE) according to the
23 method described by Prat et al. (2009). A 35–70% urea-formamide denaturing gradient
24 was used (Supplementary material S1). The DGGE gels were stained with SybrGold
25 during 45 minutes and visualized under UV excitation. Digital images of acrylamide

1 gels were used to determine the relative intensity of each band (a proxy for its relative
2 abundance) by using ImageJ software (National Institutes of Health (NIH), USA).
3 Nucleotide sequences obtained from selected DGGE bands were aligned with available
4 16S rRNA genes of known *Geobacter* species available in the Silva data base
5 (www.arb-silva.de, downloading date February 2015). Phylogenetic trees were
6 reconstructed with distance (neighbor-joining, NJ) and maximum-parsimony (MP)
7 methods using MEGA v6.06 software with 1000 bootstrap replicates (Tamura et al.,
8 2013). Pairwise deletion and Jukes Cantor methods were used. NCBI accession
9 numbers of *Geobacteraceae* used can be found in supplementary material S2.

10

1 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

2 **3.1. Growth of an electroactive anodic biofilm**

3 Reactor inoculation and anodic biofilm growth were carried out following the standard
4 procedure described elsewhere (Gimkiewicz and Harnisch, 2013). Such protocol is as
5 an effective methodology to grow an electroactive biofilm dominated by *Geobacter* sp.
6 when using activated sludge as inoculum (Harnisch et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2008). The
7 growth of a *Geobacter* sp. enriched biofilm on the two replicates was inferred due to the
8 appearance of its characteristic visible reddish colour on the working-electrode surface
9 (later confirmed by sequencing). It is worth noticing that no biofilm was observed on
10 the counter-electrode surface, which supports that the reddish biofilm observed on the
11 working-electrode was related to its behaviour. However, electroactivity was slightly
12 higher for R-1 in terms of maximum current density (j_{max}) probably due to the higher
13 biomass in this electrode compared to R-2 (Image of R-1 showed in supplementary
14 material S3).

15 Nonetheless, three fed-batch cycles were conducted at +397 mV to ensure that a
16 mature anodic biofilm able to oxidize acetate was grown on the electrodes.
17 Representative fed-batch cycles for R-2 can be observed in Figure 2. Representative
18 cyclic voltammeteries are shown in Figure 2 for R-1 and in supplementary material S4
19 for R-2. Once the development of the electroactive biofilm was corroborated by
20 reproducible values of j_{max} and a stable shape in cyclic voltammetry, the activity of the
21 biofilm was “switched” from anodic to cathodic conditions by poisoning the working
22 electrode at -303 mV.

23 **3.1.1. Turnover CV analyses of mature anodic acetate-oxidizing biofilms**

24 The anodic activity in the presence of acetate (*i.e.*, “turnover conditions”) was
25 characterized through cyclic voltammetry (CV). Representative CVs of mature

1 electroactive biofilms are shown in Figure 3 compared to the bare electrode CV.
2 Electrochemical data extracted from CVs for both replicates are summarized in Table 1.

3 It is worth noticing that the CV performed under turnover conditions was clearly
4 different from the one of the bare electrode abiotic voltammogram (flat black CV in Fig.
5 2). Thus, such turnover CV indicated the establishment of a mature biofilm.
6 Furthermore, the CV under turnover conditions presented a positive sigmoidal shape
7 typically observed in biofilms colonized by anode-respiring bacteria (ARB) able to
8 produce repetitive high currents (*i.e.*, j around $1 \text{ A}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$) and thick biofilms (Fricke et
9 al., 2008). It additionally suggests a DET mechanism (Carmona-Martínez et al., 2013).
10 The sigmoidal shape was further characterized by calculating the first derivative of the
11 current with respect to the applied electrode potential during CV (Inset in Fig. 3A). The
12 biofilm in both replicates was characterized by the detection of a dominant redox couple
13 with a formal potential $E_{f,1}$ around $-175\pm 5 \text{ mV}$ (Table 1).

14 **3.1.2. Non-turnover CV and DPV analyses of mature anodic biofilms**

15 A typical CV of non-turnover conditions could be observed when substrate-free
16 medium was used (Fig. 3B). DPV was used as an additional voltamperometric
17 technique to clarify the catalytic activity under non-turnover conditions (Harnisch and
18 Rabaey, 2012). Experimentally, DPV is considered to possess a higher degree of
19 selectivity/sensitivity to study electroactive biofilms (Marsili et al., 2008). non-turnover
20 DPVs showed a clear peak at around $-159\pm 22 \text{ mV}$. Interestingly, this DPV peak
21 matched to the formal potential $E_{f,1}$ previously observed in CV recorded under acetate-
22 containing medium (turnover conditions). This finding suggests that the biofilm could
23 be employing a similar electron transfer mechanism under both turnover and non-
24 turnover conditions.

1 A further comparison of $E_{f,1}$ showed its proximity to the value previously reported by
2 Liu et al., (2008) (-124 mV vs. SHE) (Liu et al., 2008) where the authors developed an
3 electroactive biofilm highly enriched in *Geobacter* sp. from a primary wastewater as
4 inoculum and using acetate as the electron donor. Such experimental procedure was
5 very similar to the one used in this study. Additionally, $E_{f,1}$ was similar to values
6 reported in pure cultures of *Geobacter sulfurreducens* with E_f between -106 and -206
7 mV vs. SHE. This evidences a possible shared direct electron transfer mechanism
8 (Carmona-Martínez et al., 2013).

9 The comparison of CV shapes (considered as equivalent to an electrochemical
10 fingerprint of certain microorganisms), the formal potentials using acetate as electron
11 donor, and the reddish biofilm observed at the end of the three feeding cycles
12 (supplementary material S3) suggest that the biofilm grown on the electrode was mainly
13 composed by an anode-respiring bacterium belonging to the *Geobacteraceae* family
14 (Harnisch et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2008).

15 Under non-turnover CV conditions an oxidation peak at around +91 mV was also
16 found which could indicate the presence of a masked redox couple (Fig. 2B). The use of
17 DPV revealed a “shoulder” on the voltammogram that somehow resembles a minor
18 redox peak at about $+183 \pm 2$ mV vs. SHE. Nevertheless, it is not completely clear how
19 this non prominent additional peak ($E_{f,2}$) is involved in the overall ET mechanism.

20 **3.2. Switching the anodic electroactive biofilm to denitrifying cathodic activity**

21 After three fed-batch cycles operated with acetate as sole electron donor were
22 completed, the denitrifying activity of the electroactive biofilm was tested (Fig. 2). The
23 acetate exhausted medium was removed and the reactor was fed with a nitrate-
24 containing medium (32.1 ± 0.9 mgN- $\text{NO}_3^- \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$). To promote denitrification, the electrode
25 potential was switched from +397 to a more reductive value, -303 mV, since at this

1 potential the denitrifying cathodic catalytic activity is clearly enhanced (Pous et al.,
2 2015, 2014).

3 After the exchange of medium and the decrease of the WE potential, it took about
4 two days for a constant negative current density to occur as an indication of electron
5 uptake (Fig. 1 on day 65th). Concomitantly, the concentrations of nitrate, nitrite and
6 nitrous oxide were analyzed at the beginning and at the end of each fed cathodic cycle
7 to corroborate nitrate reducing activity. According to the chemical analyses conducted,
8 nitrate reduction occurred without accumulation of intermediates (nitrite or nitrous
9 oxide), with an average nitrate removal rate of $345 \pm 166 \text{ mgN} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{d}^{-1}$ considering the
10 whole batch (supplementary material S5). The maximum nitrate removal rate was
11 observed in R-1 with $532 \text{ mgN} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{d}^{-1}$ ($218 \text{ mgN} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{d}^{-1}$ for R-2). Abiotic experiments
12 were carried out during 16 hours in which a stable but very low current density of -
13 $0.003 \pm 0.000 \text{ A} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$ was observed and no nitrate reduction could be detected as an
14 experimental evidence of the biofilm mediated electrochemical activity observed in R-1
15 and R-2. No conversion of nitrite neither nitrous oxide were observed in abiotic
16 experiments.

17 According to our results, the microbial community within the electroactive biofilm
18 was able to reduce nitrates. Considering that the current demand observed was used for
19 the whole denitrification pathway (from NO_3^- to N_2 , which counts as 5 mol of electrons
20 per mol of NO_3^-), the mean *CE* was $14 \pm 1\%$. If only the reduction of nitrate to nitrite was
21 taken into account (which accounts for $2e^-$ per mol of NO_3^-), the *CE* was $35 \pm 4\%$.

22 **3.2.1. Turnover CV analyses of cathodic denitrifying biofilms**

23 Besides the current uptake during the chronoamperometry (Fig. 2) and the conversion of
24 nitrate into dinitrogen gas, the biofilm activity in the presence of nitrate was also

1 electrochemically characterized by CV (Fig. 3C). The CVs in the presence of nitrate
2 revealed that the anodic biofilm originally developed with acetate was able to switch to
3 nitrate-reducing conditions, presenting a negative sigmoidal shape. When calculating
4 the first derivative of such cathodic turnover CVs, a clear redox couple was observed
5 with a formal potential at -175 ± 34 mV (pH 7.0 and 22°C). The mid-point potential for
6 nitrate reduction is similar to previous values reported for denitrifying biocathodes. For
7 example, Pous et al. (2014) reported nitrate reduction at -0.30 V vs Ag/AgCl (-103 mV
8 vs SHE) at pH 8 and 22°C in a cathode predominantly covered by the
9 *betaproteobacteria Thiobacillus* sp. Additionally, Gregoire et al. (Gregoire et al., 2014)
10 exhibited a biocathode predominantly covered by the *betaproteobacteria Rhodocyclales*
11 and *Burkholderiales* presenting nitrate reduction at -0.125 V vs Ag/AgCl ($+72$ mV vs
12 SHE) at pH 7.2 and 30°C.

13 From the results obtained, it can be suggested that the electroactive biofilm
14 developed on the working electrodes was capable of switching from an anodic to a
15 cathodic state. Interestingly, when comparing the similarity of formal potential values of
16 i) acetate-oxidizing and ii) nitrate-reducing conditions in this study, it can be suggested
17 that, from an electrochemical perspective, a similar electron transfer mechanism should
18 be used for both purposes (anodic and cathodic behaviour) (Rosenbaum et al., 2011).

19 **3.2.2. Non-turnover CV and DPV analyses of cathodic biofilms**

20 After complete conversion of nitrate into dinitrogen, the biofilm was again tested under
21 non-turnover conditions (Fig. 3B, blue CV and Fig. 2C, blue DPV). In this case, the CV
22 depicted a clearer redox couple around -158 ± 33 mV. The application of DPVs
23 confirmed the predominance of the redox couple found in CV with a formal potential
24 ($E_{f,1}$) at -158 ± 33 mV. Additionally, a “shoulder” in DPV that resembled somehow a

1 peak around $+183\pm 2$ mV was found. However, it remains unclear how the peak with
2 formal potential $E_{f,2}$ could participate in the overall ET mechanism.

3 Additionally, the shape observed in cathodic non-turnover CVs presented a lower
4 capacitance. An increase of capacitance in CV has been associated with the growth of
5 an electroactive biofilm on the electrode surface (Schrott et al., 2011). Therefore, the
6 decrease of capacitance in CVs under non-turnover cathodic vs. anodic conditions could
7 indicate that only a certain percentage of the biofilm was able to catalyze the reduction
8 of nitrate. The loss of capacitance in cathodic non-turnover CV also illustrates that some
9 microorganisms within the biofilm were not active in such conditions.

10 When considering all the formal potentials calculated under both anodic and cathodic
11 conditions, it is evident that no significant shift of the formal potentials for acetate
12 oxidation and nitrate reduction exists. Therefore, from the electrochemical perspective,
13 we suggest that the redox systems detected at a formal potential around -175 mV ($E_{f,1}$)
14 were responsible for both delivering and taking electrons to and from the electrode,
15 respectively. Nevertheless, from the microbiological perspective, whether the same
16 electron transfer conduit is used for both acetate-oxidation and nitrate-reduction
17 processes remains unclear and it would require more in-depth molecular studies
18 evaluating the different cytochromes/proteins involved in both processes.

19 In a biosensor application, the developed biofilm would allow the detection of both
20 acetate and nitrate. Although both catalytic processes presented a similar formal
21 potential, acetate oxidation occurred at potentials higher than -175 mV, while nitrate
22 reduction occurred at potentials below -175 mV. Therefore, the analysis of both
23 compounds could be discerned by poisoning the working electrode at +397 mV for acetate
24 and -303 mV for nitrate analyses, respectively.

25

1 **3.3. Microbial biofilm analysis**

2 **3.3.1 Enrichment of *Geobacter* species**

3 Similar bands were observed in both R1 and R2 replicates through PCR-DGGE
4 analyses. Only the bands from R-1 were sequenced (Fig. 4) and subsequently
5 quantified. In order to quantify the DGGE bands, these were stained and analyzed
6 through ImageJ software (Supplementary material S6).

7 In samples taken after bioanodic conditions, bands A2→C2 presented the highest
8 intensity (16.8% of abundance, supplementary material S6). Sequences retrieved from
9 bands A2→C2 confirmed the presence of a *Geobacter* species with (> 99% similarity
10 with *Geobacter* sp. CLFeRB, Genbank accession number DQ086800). On the one side,
11 several bacteria within the *Geobacteraceae* family are known to use an electrode as
12 electron acceptor (anodic role) (Lovley et al., 2011). On the other side, nitrate reduction
13 using the electrode as electron donor (cathode role) has only been confirmed for
14 *Geobacter metallireducens* as a pure culture (Gregory et al., 2004), and a mixed
15 bacterial community enriched in *Geobacter grbiciae* (Gregory et al., 2004).

16 Despite *Geobacter* sp. str. CLFeRB (99%) has been recently described to develop on
17 BES anodes (Jung and Regan, 2007; Zhang et al., 2014), its capability for nitrate
18 reduction is still unknown. According to phylogenetic inferences with known and
19 physiologically characterized *Geobacter* species (Fig. 4), A2→C2 sequences had high
20 similarities to the 16S rRNA gene sequence of *Geobacter pelophilus* Dfr2 (95%) and
21 *Geobacter argillaceus* G12 (73%). Both species are able to use acetate as electron donor
22 (Lovley et al., 2011; Straub and Buchholz-Cleven, 2001) and nitrate as electron
23 acceptor (Lovley et al., 2011; Ohtsuka et al., 2013) and have been detected in anode
24 biofilms but not in denitrifying cathodes (de Cárcer et al., 2011; Kouzuma et al., 2013).
25 Hence we show, for the first time, the presence of this bacterium in anodes and cathodes

1 at relevant cells densities. The enrichment of *Geobacter* sp. on the working electrode
2 surface was very likely due to the constant experimental conditions imposed throughout
3 the experiments, such as: (i) the use of a fixed anodic applied potential (+397 mV vs.
4 SHE), (ii) constant temperature (22°C), (iii) neutral pH (7.0), (iv) homogeneous mass
5 transfer in the bulk medium due to continuous stirring, (iv) use of a synthetic medium
6 containing a non fermentable substrate, such as acetate and (v) strict anoxic conditions
7 (Harnisch et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2008; Yates et al., 2012).

8 After the switching to cathodic conditions, the most intense band was still the band
9 belonging to *Geobacter* sp. (band A2→C2; 27.4% band relative abundance), suggesting
10 that the cathodic activity was very likely due to this microorganism and thus the main
11 responsible of the bidirectional microbial electron transfer using redox systems with
12 formal potential at around -175 mV ($E_{f,1}$). No voltammetric analyses of bidirectional
13 electron transfer behaviour for anodic acetate-oxidation coupled with cathodic nitrate-
14 reduction had been reported previously, and reduction reactions are restricted to the use
15 of fumarate as an electron acceptor. Dumas et al. (2008) and Strycharz et al. (2011)
16 evaluated the bidirectional activity of *Geobacter sulfurreducens* for anodic acetate-
17 oxidation and cathodic fumarate-reduction. Their results suggested that electrons for
18 anodic acetate oxidation and cathodic fumarate reduction in pure cultures were
19 transferred using different electron conduits. The differences observed for bidirectional
20 activity of acetate-oxidation/nitrate-reduction (this study) compared to acetate-
21 oxidation/fumarate-reduction (Dumas et al., 2008; Strycharz et al., 2011) could be
22 explained by the nature of the electron acceptor as well as the different experimental
23 set-up used. It is worth noticing that nitrate and fumarate formal potentials are
24 significantly different. At pH 7, fumarate/succinate formal potential is +33 mV vs SHE,
25 while nitrate/nitrite formal potential is +424 mV vs SHE. Moreover, in the present

1 study, a mixed culture biofilm was characterized and thus the observed formal potential
2 indicates a mean value for the whole mixed culture biofilm, not only for a single
3 bacterial specie.

4 **3.3.2 Less abundant members of the electrode microbial community**

5 Other less intense bands showed relevant changes in their relative intensity when
6 electrode was switched from anodic to cathodic conditions, thus revealing some
7 specificity on prevailing bacterial metabolisms.

8 DGGE bands A1→C1 and A3→C3 decreased during cathodic conditions compared
9 to anodic conditions (Supplementary material S6). Interestingly, sequence from band
10 A3→C3 that clustered within the *Rhodocyclaceae* (*betaproteobacteria*), a family
11 containing several denitrifying species, disappeared when switching from anodic (A3)
12 to cathodic (C3) conditions (from 16.7 to 0.0%). These results suggest that, although
13 present in anodic conditions, this bacterial phylotype is not likely to participate in
14 electrocatalytic nitrate reduction since it is wiped out from the electrode due to the less
15 favorable conditions.

16 The *deltaproteobacteria* *Desulfobrivio* sp. (bands A5→C5) presented a similar
17 intensity in both conditions (2.7 and 3.0% in terms of band relative abundance), which
18 could indicate that was capable of living in both environments.

19 Sequence from band A4→C4 showed relevant similarities to members of the
20 *Synergistetes* group. They increased on intensity as conditions were switched from
21 anodic to cathodic (from 2.0 to 26.0%), suggesting that cathodic conditions were more
22 favorable for this microorganism, allowing them to grow. Members of *Synergistetes*
23 group has been found in nitrifying and denitrifying reactors (Wang et al., 2014) and
24 some are known to perform sulfide dependent nitrate reduction (Cytryn et al., 2005). It
25 supports the growth of *Synergistetes* under nitrate reducing conditions.

1 Besides different contribution of the less abundant members was detected in anodic
2 acetate-oxidizing (*Geobacter* dominance shared with *Rhodocyclaceae*) and cathodic
3 nitrate-reducing conditions (*Geobacter* dominance shared with *Synergistetes*), a similar
4 redox system at -175 mV ($E_{f,1}$) was detected in CVs and DPVs, suggesting that the main
5 contributor to the catalytic signal was similarly present in both conditions. Therefore, a
6 mixed culture biofilm predominantly composed by *Geobacter* sp. was responsible of the
7 bidirectional microbial electron transfer using redox systems with formal potential at
8 around -175 mV ($E_{f,1}$).

9 The results obtained in this study also have an impact on the study of autonomous
10 microbial fuel cells (i.e., electricity can be obtained from spontaneous redox processes)
11 that couple acetate oxidation and nitrate reduction (Clauwaert et al., 2009). The results
12 presented here suggest that an acetate-oxidizing anode and a nitrate-reducing cathode
13 composed of *Geobacter* sp. dominated biofilms would not produce a thermodynamic
14 spontaneous process. In fact, the enrichment of *Geobacter* sp. in denitrifying
15 biocathodes have been reported when operating the cathode at a poised potential
16 (Gregory et al., 2004), but not under microbial fuel cell mode.

17 **4. CONCLUSIONS**

18 In this study we report (based) on the electrochemical characterization of a “switchable”
19 electroactive biofilm. A microbial community predominantly composed by *Geobacter*
20 sp. was able to both oxidize acetate at a poised electrode potential of +397 mV and
21 reduce nitrate at -303 mV. Voltammetric analyses revealed that electron transfer for
22 both acetate oxidation and nitrate reduction took place at a similar formal potential, thus
23 carried out by the same consortia. Biocatalysis of acetate occurred at a formal potential
24 of -175 ± 5 mV while nitrate reduction occurred at a formal potential of -175 ± 34 mV (vs.
25 SHE). With non-turnover cyclic voltammetry formal potentials of -159 ± 22 and -158 ± 33

1 mV were calculated in bioanodic and biocathodic conditions, respectively. These results
2 suggest that the electroactive biofilm was capable of switching its activity from an
3 anodic acetate-oxidizing state to a cathodic nitrate-reducing state by using an electron
4 channel located at around a redox potential of -175 mV in both cases.

5 The results presented here pave the way on the investigation of switchable
6 electroactive biofilms. Not only the same biofilm can be operated as anode or as a
7 cathode, but also the same electron transport conduit can be used for both purposes.

8

9 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

10 This work was supported by the Spanish Government (CTQ2014SGR-1168, CTQ2014-
11 53718-R). A.A.C.M. was supported by the French National Research Agency (Project:
12 ANR-10-BTBR-02). N.P. was supported by the Catalan Government (2012FI-B00941).
13 The authors acknowledge the scientific contribution of Pau Batlle-Vilanova (LEQUIA-
14 UdG).

15

16 **5. REFERENCES**

17 APHA, 2005. Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater, 19th
18 ed. Washington DC, USA.

19 Baron, D., LaBelle, E., Coursolle, D., Gralnick, J.A., Bond, D.R., 2009. *J. Biol. Chem.*
20 284 (42), 28865–28873. doi:10.1074/jbc.M109.043455.

21 Batlle-Vilanova, P., Puig, S., Gonzalez-Olmos, R., Vilajeliu-Pons, A., Bañeras, L.,
22 Balaguer, M.D., Colprim, J., 2014. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy* 39 (3), 1297–1305.
23 doi:10.1016/j.ijhydene.2013.11.017.

- 1 Blanchet, E., Pécastaings, S., Erable, B., Roques, C., Bergel, A., 2014. *Bioresour.*
2 *Technol.* 173, 224–30. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2014.09.076.
- 3 Bond, D.R., Lovley, D.R., 2003. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 69 (3), 1548–1555.
4 doi:10.1128/AEM.69.3.1548-1555.2003.
- 5 Carmona-Martinez, A.A., Harnisch, F., Fitzgerald, L.A., Biffinger, J.C., Ringeisen,
6 B.R., Schröder, U., 2011. *Bioelectrochemistry* 81 (2), 74–80.
7 doi:10.1016/j.bioelechem.2011.02.006.
- 8 Carmona-Martínez, A.A., Pierra, M., Trably, E., Bernet, N., 2013. *Phys. Chem. Chem.*
9 *Phys.* 15 (45), 19699–19707. doi:10.1039/c3cp54045f.
- 10 Cheng, K.Y., Ginige, M.P., Kaksonen, A.H., 2012. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 46 (18),
11 10372–10378. doi:10.1021/es3025066
- 12 Cheng, K.Y., Ho, G., Cord-Ruwisch, R., 2010. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 44 (1), 518–525.
13 doi:10.1021/es9023833
- 14 Clauwaert, P., Rabaey, K., Aelterman, P., De Schampelaire, L., Pham, T.H., Boeckx,
15 P., Boon, N., Verstraete, W., 2007. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 41 (9), 3354–3360.
16 doi:10.1021/es062580r.
- 17 Cytryn, E., Van Rijn, J., Schramm, A., Gieseke, A., De Beer, D., Minz, D., 2005. *Appl.*
18 *Environ. Microbiol.* 71 (10), 6134–6141. doi:10.1128/AEM.71.10.6134-6141.2005.
- 19 De Cárcer, D.A., Ha, P.T., Jang, J.K., Chang, I.S., 2011. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.*
20 89 (3), 605–12. doi:10.1007/s00253-010-2903-x.
- 21 Dumas, C., Basseguy, R., Bergel, A., 2008. *Electrochim. Acta* 53 (5), 2494–2500.
22 doi:10.1016/j.electacta.2007.10.018.

- 1 Fourmond, V., Hoke, K., Heering, H.A., Baffert, C., Leroux, F., Bertrand, P., Léger, C.,
2 2009. *Bioelectrochemistry* 76 (1-2), 141–147.
3 doi:10.1016/j.bioelechem.2009.02.010.
- 4 Fricke, K., Harnisch, F., Schröder, U., 2008. *Energy Environ. Sci.* 1 (1), 144–147.
5 doi:10.1039/b802363h.
- 6 Ganigué, R., Puig, S., Batlle-Vilanova, P., Balaguer, M.D., Colprim, J., 2015. *Chem.*
7 *Commun.* 51, 3235–3238. doi:10.1039/C4CC10121A.
- 8 Geelhoed, J.S., Stams, A.J.M., 2011. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 45 (2), 815–820.
9 doi:10.1021/es102842p.
- 10 Gimkiewicz, C., Harnisch, F., 2013. *J. Vis. Exp.* (82), 50800.
- 11 Gregoire, K.P., Glaven, S.M., Hervey, J., Lin, B., Tender, L.M., 2014. *J. Electrochem.*
12 *Soc.* 161 (13), H3049–H3057. doi:10.1149/2.0101413jes
- 13 Gregory, K.B., Bond, D.R., Lovley, D.R., 2004. *Environ. Microbiol.* 6 (6), 596–604.
14 doi:10.1111/j.1462-2920.2004.00593.x.
- 15 Harnisch, F., Freguia, S., 2012. *Chem. Asian J.* 7 (3), 466–475.
16 doi:10.1002/asia.201100740.
- 17 Harnisch, F., Koch, C., Patil, S.A., Hübschmann, T., Müller, S., Schröder, U., 2011.
18 *Energy Environ. Sci.* 4 (4), 1265–1267. doi:10.1039/c0ee00605j.
- 19 Harnisch, F., Rabaey, K., 2012. *ChemSusChem* 5 (6), 1027–1038.
20 doi:10.1002/cssc.201100817.
- 21 Jeremiasse, A.W., Hamelers, H.V., Croese, E., Buisman, C.J., 2012. *Biotechnol.*
22 *Bioeng.* 109 (3), 657–664. doi:10.1002/bit.24338.

- 1 Jung, S., Regan, J.M., 2007. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 77 (2), 393–402.
2 doi:10.1007/s00253-007-1162-y.
- 3 Kouzuma, A., Kasai, T., Nakagawa, G., Yamamuro, A., Abe, T., Watanabe, K., 2013.
4 *PLoS One* 8 (11), e77443. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0077443.
- 5 Lane, D.J., 1991. 16S/23S rRNA sequencing, in: Sons, J.W. and (Ed.), *Nucleic acid*
6 *techniques in bacterial systematic*. New York, USA, pp. 115-175.
- 7 Liu, Y., Harnisch, F., Fricke, K., Sietmann, R., Schröder, U., 2008. *Biosens.*
8 *Bioelectron.* 24 (4), 1012–1017. doi:10.1016/j.bios.2008.08.001.
- 9 Logan, B.E., 2012. *ChemSusChem* 5 (6), 988–994. doi:10.1002/cssc.201100604.
- 10 Logan, B.E., Rabaey, K., 2012. *Science* 337 (6095), 686–690.
11 doi:10.1126/science.1217412.
- 12 Lovley, D.R., 1991. *Microbiol. Rev.* 55 (2), 259-287.
- 13 Lovley, D.R., Ueki, T., Zhang, T., Malvankar, N.S., Shrestha, P.M., Flanagan, K.A.,
14 Akhujkar, M., Butler, J.E., Giloteaux, L., Rotaru, A.-E., Holmes, D.E., Franks, A.E.,
15 Orellana, R., Risso, C., Nevin, K.P., 2011. *Geobacter: the microbe electric's*
16 *physiology, ecology, and practical applications.*, 1st ed, *Advances in microbial*
17 *physiology*. Elsevier Ltd. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-387661-4.00004-5.
- 18 Marsili, E., Baron, D.B., Shikhare, I.D., Coursolle, D., Gralnick, J.A., Bond, D.R.,
19 2008. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 105 (10), 3968–3973.
20 doi:10.1073/pnas.0710525105.

1 Ohtsuka, T., Yamaguchi, N., Makino, T., Sakurai, K., Kimura, K., Kudo, K., Homma,
2 E., Dong, D.T., 2013. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 47 (12), 6263-6271. doi:
3 10.1021/es400231x.

4 Pant, D., Singh, A., Van Bogaert, G., Irving Olsen, S., Singh Nigam, P., Diels, L.,
5 Vanbroekhoven, K., 2012. *RSC Adv.* 2 (4), 1248–1263. doi:10.1039/c1ra00839k.

6 Parameswaran, P., Bry, T., Popat, S.C., Lusk, B.G., Rittmann, B.E., Torres, C.I., 2013.
7 *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 47 (9), 4934–4940. doi:10.1021/es400321c.

8 Pous, N., Koch, C., Colprim, J., Puig, S., Harnisch, F., 2014. *Electrochem. commun.* 49,
9 93–97. doi:10.1016/j.elecom.2014.10.011.

10 Pous, N., Puig, S., Dolores Balaguer, M., Colprim, J., 2015. *Chem. Eng. J.* 263, 151–159.
11 doi:10.1016/j.cej.2014.11.002.

12 Prat, C., Ruiz-Rueda, O., Trias, R., Anticó, E., Capone, D., Sefton, M., Bañeras, L.,
13 2009. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 75 (7), 1922-1931. doi: 10.1128/AEM.02758-08.

14 Rosenbaum, M., Aulenta, F., Villano, M., Angenent, L.T., 2011. *Bioresour. Technol.*
15 102 (1), 324–333. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2010.07.008.

16 Ross, D.E., Flynn, J.M., Baron, D.B., Gralnick, J.A., Bond, D.R., 2011. *PLoS One* 6
17 (2), e16649. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0016649.

18 Schröder, U., 2007. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* 9 (21), 2619–2629.
19 doi:10.1039/b703627m.

20 Schrott, G.D., Bonanni, P.S., Robuschi, L., Esteve-Nuñez, A., Busalmen, J.P., 2011.
21 *Electrochim. Acta* 56 (28), 10791–10795. doi:10.1016/j.electacta.2011.07.001.

- 1 Shi, L., Rosso, K.M., Zachara, J.M., Fredrickson, J.K., 2012. *Biochem. Soc. Trans.* 40
2 (6), 1261–1267. doi:10.1042/BST20120098.
- 3 Straub, K.L., Buchholz-Cleven, B.E.E., 2001. *Int. J. Syst. Evol. Microbiol.* 51 (5),
4 1805–1808.
- 5 Strycharz, S.M., Glaven, R.H., Coppi, M.V, Gannon, S.M., Perpetua, L.A, Liu, A.,
6 Nevin, K.P., Lovley, D.R., 2011. *Bioelectrochemistry* 80 (2), 142–150.
7 doi:10.1016/j.bioelechem.2010.07.005.
- 8 Summers, Z.M., Gralnick, J.A., Bond, D.R., 2013. *mBio* 4 (1), e00420-00412.
- 9 Tamura, K., Stecher, G., Peterson, D., Filipinski, A., Kumar, S., 2013. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 30
10 (12), 2725–2729. doi:10.1093/molbev/mst197.
- 11 Turner, S., Pryer, K.M., Miao, V.P.W., Palmer, J.D., 1999. *J. Eukaryot. Microbiol.* 46
12 (4), 327-338.
- 13 Virdis, B., Rabaey, K., Yuan, Z., Rozendal, R.A., Keller, J., 2009. *Environ. Sci.*
14 *Technol.* 43 (13), 5144–5149. doi:10.1021/es8036302.
- 15 Wang, Z., Zhang, X.-X., Lu, X., Liu, B., Li, Y., Long, C., Li, A., 2014. *PLoS One* 9
16 (11), e113603. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0113603.
- 17 Xing, D., Zuo, Y., Cheng, S., Regan, J.M., Logan, B.E., 2008. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 42
18 (11), 4146–4151. doi:10.1021/es800312v.
- 19 Yates, M.D., Kiely, P.D., Call, D.F., Rismani-Yazdi, H., Bibby, K., Peccia, J., Regan,
20 J.M., Logan, B.E., 2012. *ISME J.* 6 (11), 2002–2013. doi:10.1038/ismej.2012.42.
- 21 Zhang, H., Chen, X., Braithwaite, D., He, Z., 2014. *PLoS One* 9 (9), e107460.
22 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0107460.

Highlights

- Growth of electroactive biofilm able to oxidize acetate and reduce nitrate.
- Electrochemical characterization of the switchable electroactive biofilm.
- Bidirectional catalysis using a redox system located around -175 mV vs. SHE.
- Biofilm predominantly composed of *Geobacter* sp.

Table 1. Summary of electrochemical data extracted from CVs and DPVs.

WE role	E_{app} (mV vs. SHE)	Conditions	E_f (mV vs. SHE)
Anode	+397	Turnover	-175±05
		Non-turnover	-159±22
Cathode	-303	Turnover	-175±34
		Non-turnover	-158±33

WE: working electrode; E_{app} : applied potential during chronoamperometry; E_f : formal potential. Note: Turnover and Non-turnover conditions indicate the presence (turnover) or absence (non-turnover) of substrate while performing voltammetric analyses in anodic (acetate) and cathodic (nitrate) conditions.




Figure 1. Scheme of the reactor's configuration used to perform the studies as well as the workflow followed: i) Reactor's set-up; ii) bioanodic conditions and iii) biocathodic conditions.




Figure 2. Overall strategy of biofilm formation and electrochemical characterization points. Exemplary chronoamperometry for R-2 is shown. Sampling for microbial analyses after anodic (*) and cathodic (**) conditions are indicated. Vertical arrows indicate addition of acetate (206 ppmC- CH_3COO^- ; anodic conditions) or nitrate (32 ppmN- NO_3^- ; cathodic conditions).




Figure 3. Representative voltammograms of a mature electroactive biofilm during anodic (red) and cathodic (blue) conditions. A) Anodic turnover CV (inset: first derivative); B) Non-turnover CVs (inset: DPVs) and C) Cathodic Turnover CV (inset: first derivative). Note: bare electrode CV in A, B and C shows the CV before biofilm growth (black).




Figure 4. DGGE profiles of the microbial community within the biofilm after anodic and cathodic conditions in R-1 sample. Taxonomic information according to BLAST searches of analyzed sequences is summarized in the table at the right side.




Figure 5. Phylogenetic analysis based on 16S rRNA gene sequence obtained in this study (DGGE Bands A2→C2) is marked in red. Sequences and accession numbers of selected organisms were retrieved from GenBank. Phylogenetic distances were determined by neighbor-joining method.