



HAL
open science

Effect of coupling alkaline pretreatment and sewage sludge co-digestion on methane production and fertilizer potential of digestate

Doha Elalami, Florian Monlau, H el ene Carr ere, Karima Abdelouahdi,
Abdallah Oukarroum, Youssef Zeroual, Abdellatif Barakat

► To cite this version:

Doha Elalami, Florian Monlau, H el ene Carr ere, Karima Abdelouahdi, Abdallah Oukarroum, et al.. Effect of coupling alkaline pretreatment and sewage sludge co-digestion on methane production and fertilizer potential of digestate. *Science of the Total Environment*, 2020, 743, pp.140670. 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140670 . hal-02911715

HAL Id: hal-02911715

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02911715v1>

Submitted on 22 Aug 2022

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 destin ee au d ep ot et  a la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publi es ou non,  emanant des  tablissements d'enseignement et de recherche fran ais ou  trangers, des laboratoires publics ou priv es.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 **Effect of coupling alkaline pretreatment and sewage sludge co-** 2 **digestion on methane production and fertilizer potential of digestate**

3 Doha Elalami ^{a,b,c}, Florian Monlau^d, Helene Carrere^{a,*}, Karima Abdelouahdi^c, Abdallah
4 Oukarroum^b, Youssef Zeroual^f and Abdellatif Barakat^{b,e}

5 ^aINRAE, Montpellier University, LBE, 102 Avenue des Etangs, 111000 Narbonne, France

6 ^bMohammed VI Polytechnic University, 43150, Benguerir, Morocco.

7 ^cLaboratory of materials chemistry and environment, Cadi Ayyad University, Marrakech, Morocco

8 ^dAPESA, Pôle Valorisation, Cap Ecologia, 64230, Lescar, France.

9 ^eIATE, Montpellier University, INRAE, Agro Institut, 34060 Montpellier, France.

10 ^fOCP Group, Complexe industriel Jorf Lasfar. BP 118 El Jadida, Morocco

11 *corresponding author: helene.carrere@inrae.fr

12 **Abstract**

13 This study aims at investigating how organic waste co-digestion coupled with alkaline
14 pretreatment can impact the methane production and fertilizer value of produced digestates. For
15 this purpose, sludge alone and mixed with olive pomace or macroalgal residues were subjected to
16 anaerobic digestion with and without alkaline pretreatment. In addition, co-digestion of pretreated
17 sludge with raw substrates was also carried out and compared to the whole mixture pretreatment.
18 KOH pretreatment enhanced methane production by 39%, 15% and 49% from sludge, sludge
19 mixed with olive pomace and sludge mixed with macroalgal residues, respectively. The
20 digestates were characterized according to their physico-chemical and agronomic properties.
21 They were then applied as biofertilizers for tomato growth during the first vegetative stage (28 d
22 of culture). Concentrations in chlorophyll *a* and carotenoids in tomato plants, following sludge

23 digestate addition, rose by 46% and 41% respectively. Sludge digestate enhanced tomato plant
24 dry weight by 87%, while its nitrogen content rose by 90%. The impact of nitrogen and
25 phosphorus contents in the digestate was strongest on tomato plant dry weight, thus explaining
26 the efficiency of sludge digestate relative to other types of digestate. However, when methane
27 production is considered, the combination of pre-treatment with co-digestion of macroalgal
28 residues and sludge appears most beneficial for maximizing energy recovery and for biofertilizer
29 generation.

30 **Keywords:** anaerobic digestion, waste activated sludge, pretreatment, codigestion, biofertilizer,
31 chlorophyll.

32 **Abbreviations**

33 **AcoD** Anaerobic co-digestion

34 **AD** Anaerobic digestion

35 **BMP** biomethane potential test

36 **CEL** Cellulose

37 **FOS** Volatile organic acids

38 **HEM** Hemicelluloses

39 **HRT** hydraulic retention time

40 **LIGN** Lignin

41 **MAR** Macroalgal residues

42 **MonoD** mono-digestion

43 **NDS** Neutral detergent soluble

44 **OP** Olive pomace

45 **PLS** Partial least square

- 46 **TAC** Total alkalinity
- 47 **TKN** Total Kjeldahl nitrogen
- 48 **TWAS** Thickened waste activated sludge
- 49 **TS** Total solids
- 50 **VFAs** Volatile fatty acids
- 51 **VS** Volatile solids

52 **1. Introduction**

53 As the world population grows, the consumption of food and water is increasing exponentially.
54 Wastewater treatment plants, along with the food industry, generate enormous amounts of
55 organic waste such as sludge, which are, in many developing countries, landfilled or burned
56 (Babayemi and Dauda, 2010). As a country with fairly significant natural resources, Morocco is
57 presently experiencing an increasing generation of biomass waste which needs to be dealt with
58 (Mohamed et al., 2018). Examples of these wastes include olive pomace from oil extraction (OP),
59 red seaweed or macroalgae residues (MAR). Wet olive pomace is generated at 400 000 tons per
60 year (Bouknana et al., 2014), MAR at 870 tons per year (Aboulkas et al., 2017) and dry weight
61 sludge at 255 500 tons per year (Belhadj et al., 2013). The lack in sustainable management of
62 these wastes would eventually lead to long-term harmful effects on the environment, which might
63 even be taking place already (Dahhou et al., 2017). Nowadays, effective waste management
64 strategies are required to ensure the sustainability of the processes and to minimize their impact
65 on the environment. Indeed, currently applied sludge management techniques include
66 incineration, composting, anaerobic digestion (AD) and agronomic valorisation (land application)
67 (Cieřlik et al., 2015).

68 Anaerobic digestion, one of the most widespread solutions for processing organic waste, is a
69 biological process that transforms organic matter into biogas and into a residue called digestate.
70 Digestate can have fertilizing or amending properties. The quantity of methane produced and the
71 quality of the digestate necessarily depend upon the properties of the substrates used. They also
72 rely on the AD conditions or the application of biomass pretreatments. Among these properties,
73 substrate composition and its biodegradability are crucial parameters.

74 Parameters such as the C to N ratio, moisture content and pH can be adjusted by adding a co-
75 substrate prior to AD, known as co-digestion. Other benefits of co-digestion are the dilution of
76 inhibitory compounds such as fatty acids or phenols but also the improvement of the buffering
77 capacity (Iacovidou et al., 2012). In addition, co-digestion contributes to the balance, in the
78 digesters, between macro and micronutrients that are necessary for anaerobic microorganisms.
79 From a technical point of view, co-digestion allows to take advantage of already existing
80 digesters to manage additional wastes; furthermore, by increasing their energy production the site
81 consumption can be covered (Mu et al., 2020). However, although co-digestion can be applied to
82 improve AD performances, it should be done with caution as there is a risk of modifying the
83 rheology of the mixture and increasing its total solid content (TS) which in turn may reduce the
84 digester performance (Miryahyaei et al., 2020).

85 The co-digestion of sludge with other substrates has been investigated intensely during the past
86 decades. The organic fraction of municipal solid waste and food waste can represent two
87 potential co-substrates of the AD process of wastewater sludge. Co-substrates such as fatty
88 wastes and glycerol were also studied, but with sludge/co-substrate ratios generally above 50%
89 (Volatile solids (VS) basis) (Jensen et al., 2014). On the contrary, food wastes or agricultural

90 residues (manure, fruit and vegetable wastes) can be added at a higher ratio but it generally
91 remains around 50% (Algapani et al., 2017). For instance, a 19% improvement in methane
92 production was obtained after co-digestion of sludge with 40% (VS basis) olive pomace (Alagöz
93 et al., 2015). Biomasses such as macro- and microalgae have also been studied as sludge co-
94 substrates but not as often as the other aforementioned wastes (Elalami et al., 2019). For instance,
95 macroalgae (*Ulva spp.*) have been co-digested with mixed sludge at a ratio of 11% (VS basis) but
96 no synergy was observed (Costa et al., 2012). In parallel, Mahdy et al. (2014) observed a synergy
97 for methane production during the co-digestion of the microalgae strain *Chlorella vulgaris*, with
98 primary sludge (+26%), but not with waste activated sludge (Mahdy et al., 2014).

99 Nonetheless, besides the co-digestion benefit, most of these biomasses are relatively difficult to
100 degrade by AD, as their hydrolysis is the rate limiting step. To overcome this bottleneck, various
101 pretreatment techniques have been applied, with extensive research in the case of sewage sludge
102 (Kor-Bicakci and Eskicioglu, 2019). Hydrothermal pretreatment and steam explosion are among
103 the most effective pretreatments on sludge and lignocellulosic biomasses (Cheah et al., 2020).
104 However, the costs of these pre-treatments raise questions concerning their efficiency (Cheah et
105 al., 2020). More recently, researchers have given more attention to low temperature pre-
106 treatments using a minimum amount of chemicals or by replacing these with organic reagents
107 that are less harmful for the environment (Kamusoko et al., 2019).

108 Previous works by the authors highlight the potential of alkaline pretreatments for increasing
109 methane production from both olive pomace (Elalami et al., 2020a) and macroalgal residues
110 (Elalami et al., 2020b). Although alkaline pretreatments are not yet used at full scale AD, they
111 favour the enhancement of the sludge methane potential (Heo et al., 2003; Li et al., 2012).

112 Alkaline pretreatments result in the solubilisation of sugars, polyphenols and lipids while the
113 lignin content in the pretreated OP is reduced (Pellera et al., 2016). In addition, NaOH
114 pretreatment (pH=12, 90°C for 2 h) has resulted in the solubilisation of 67% of crude proteins in
115 sludge (Liu et al., 2008). Alkaline pre-treatment also improves the buffering capacity by adjusting
116 the pH value of the substrate (Kamusoko et al., 2019).

117 Pretreatment can also enhance the effectiveness of co-digestion. It can be applied to a single
118 substrate as well as to a mixture. However, this approach can generate additional costs, which is
119 why it has been investigated more seldom than co-digestion alone. Examples of pretreatments
120 combined with sludge co-digestion include thermo-alkaline techniques for lignocellulosic
121 residues (Abudi et al., 2016b) and mechanical or thermal treatment for macroalgal and microalgal
122 biomasses (Mahdy et al., 2014; Tedesco et al., 2013). In fact, Abudi et al. (2017) reported that
123 thermal pretreatment of sludge synergistically increased the batch methane production of the
124 mixture containing the organic fraction of municipal wastes, sludge and rice straw at a ratio of
125 1:1.5:1.5 (Abudi et al., 2016a). In addition, Solé-Bundo et al. (2019) found that thermal
126 pretreatment of microalgae increased the methane production of its mixture with primary sludge
127 (Solé-Bundó et al., 2020).

128 Pretreatments can further affect the quality of the digestate (Tampio et al., 2016). For example,
129 the KOH pretreatment of wheat straw at a dose of 6% (TS basis) resulted in a 138% higher
130 potassium and 68% higher ammonia content compared to untreated wheat straw digestate (Jaffar
131 et al., 2016). NaOH pretreatment has been the most widely used alkaline pre-treatment in
132 literature (Carrère et al., 2010). However, the substitution of NaOH by KOH can reduce the

133 impact of pre-treatment for the agronomic use of the digestate, since sodium can increase the
134 salinity of the soil (Bolzonella et al., 2018).

135 Very few studies have yet investigated the impact of pretreatment on plant properties after
136 digestate application. Solé-Bundó et al. (2017) reported that although digestate from thermally
137 pretreated microalgae improved digestate hygienisation , it did not increase the cress growth
138 index (Solé-Bundó et al., 2017).

139 In a previous study, a comparison was made between digestates originating from untreated and
140 KOH-pretreated macroalgal residues. Both types of digestate led to similar results for tomato and
141 wheat germination and for plant growth. Nevertheless, tomato plant weight increased with the use
142 of digestate issued from the co-digestion of macroalgal residues and sewage sludge, thus
143 implying the advantage of sludge addition to the digestion feedstock (Elalami et al., 2020b). Note
144 that the combination between pretreatment and co-digestion had not yet been investigated.

145 Sludge pre-treatment and co-digestion have been studied extensively in the field of AD processes
146 and their performances. However, as a novelty, the present study proposes to examine the effect
147 of pre-treatment, either alone or combined with co-digestion, on the quality of digestate. The
148 further use of digestate as fertilizer for plant growth is also explored. Here, various pretreatment
149 and co-digestion strategies were applied to organic wastes in order to achieve both bioenergy
150 (methane) and biofertilizer (digestate) production. Semi-continuous reactors were thus used both
151 to confirm the efficiency of alkaline pretreatment on biogas production and to produce the
152 digestates destined as fertilizers. The various digestates were characterised from a physico-
153 chemical point of view and then tested for their efficiency on tomato growth during the first

154 vegetative stage. Finally, the correlation between dry weight of tomato plants and digestate
155 properties was assessed through partial least square regression.

156 2. Materials and methods

157 2.1. Substrates and soil

158 Macroalgal residues (MAR) from agar extraction (*Gelidium sesquipedale*) were provided by a
159 company located in Morocco. The MAR had a TS of 89% and a VS content of 79% (TS basis).

160 The olive pomace (OP) originated from a traditional olive oil extraction mill in the region of Beni
161 Mellal in Morocco. It contained 97% of TS and 88% (TS basis) of VS.

162 The dried substrates were dried and grinded with a knife mill (SM 100, Retsch, Germany) using a
163 4 mm screen size. The thickened waste activated sludge (TWAS) was collected from a
164 wastewater treatment plant located in Narbonne-France. This sludge contained 19% TS and 78%
165 VS (TS basis). A paper mill anaerobic sludge was used as inoculum for running the semi-
166 continuous assay. It was characterised by a TS and VS content of 64 g/l and 45 g/l respectively.

167 Clay-rich soil used for the experiment was sampled between 10 and 30 cm depth from a farm
168 located in the South of France. This soil was prepared as described in (Elalami et al., 2020b). It
169 contained 1.9% organic matter, a C/N ratio of 8.9, a pH of 8.4, 0.13% total nitrogen, 0.04 g/kg
170 total P₂O₅, 0.18 g/kg K₂O and 0.15 g/kg MgO. The cation exchange capacity (7.8 g/kg) was
171 measured using the Metson method (NF X 31-130).

172 2.2. Alkali pretreatment

173 A potassium hydroxide solution (Merck, 35% w/w) was added at a dose of 5 g KOH/100 g TS at
174 25°C. Mixture of sludge (6.7 g wet weight) and MAR (1.42 g wet weight) or OP (1.17 g wet
175 weight) was pretreated by adding 0.36 ml or 0.35 ml of KOH respectively. Water was then added
176 to achieve a solid to liquid ratio of 2 g VS/100 ml and the mixture was kept under agitation at 100
177 rpm for 2 d. Similarly, TWAS was pretreated alone to be mono-digested and to be co-digested

178 with untreated MAR or OP. For sludge mono-digestion, 13.4 g of wet sludge was pre-treated
179 with 0.36 ml KOH at 25°C for 2 d, whereas for the co-digestion, 6.7 g of sludge was pretreated
180 with 0.18 ml of KOH using 50 ml of water for 2 d. Finally, 1.17 g of OP or 1.42 g of MAR and
181 50 ml of water were added. For all chemical pretreatments, the temperature, stirring conditions
182 and the substrate/water ratio were maintained at 25°C, 100 rpm and 2 g of VS/100 ml of water
183 respectively.

184 2.3. Anaerobic digestion assays

185 Continuous stirred tank reactors (CSTR) with a working volume of 2.5 l were used for the semi-
186 continuous anaerobic digestion of untreated and alkali pretreated mixtures of MAR and OP with
187 TWAS. The reactors were fed manually once a day, and functioned under mesophilic conditions
188 (37°C) with a hydraulic retention time (HRT) of 20 d and an organic loading rate of 1 gVS/l.d.
189 The homogenisation of reactors was ensured by a continuous magnetic stirring system. The
190 anaerobic digestion lasted for about 4 HRTs (80 d), which is in agreement with the scientific
191 consensus that requires at least 2-3 HRTs ensure the stability of the system. The various
192 conditions investigated at CSTR reactor scales are presented in **Table 1**. The monitoring of
193 reactor performances was carried out according to (Elalami et al., 2020b). Biogas production was
194 measured online using Ritter milligas counters, and biogas composition was analysed by gas
195 chromatography (GC CLARUS 480-Perkin Elmer) as described in (Sambusiti et al., 2012).

196 **Table 1** Various feeding conditions applied in CSTR reactors

197 2.4. Analysis

198 The APHA method (American Public Health Association) (APHA, 1998) was applied for
199 measuring total and volatile solids . After KOH pretreatment, the solid and liquid phases of the
200 mixtures were separated with a centrifuge (5430, Eppendorf, Germany) at 7830 rpm for 15 min.
201 The solid fraction was then dried overnight at 105°C. The dried solid phase of the mixtures was
202 subjected to the Van-Soest method in order to determine the contents in Neutral detergent soluble
203 (NDS), hemicellulose (HEM), cellulose (CEL) and lignin (LIGN) (Van Soest, 1963). The term
204 "like" was used here to refer to fractions extracted from the Van-Soest method steps, bearing in
205 mind that sludge and MAR are not lignocellulosic. The C, H, N and S content was measured by
206 elemental analysis using Thermo Scientific FlashSmart analyser, via flash combustion at 950°C.
207 Digestate conductivity was measured according to the NF EN 13038. The digestate content in
208 nutrients and in raw substrates (P, K) was determined with the same experimental protocol as
209 described in (Elalami et al., 2020b).

210 2.5. Tomato growth test

211 A plant growth test was performed to validate the agronomic quality of the digestates. After trial
212 preparations, the small pots (500 ml) were placed in a growth chamber (Fitotron, Weiss
213 Gallenkamp, UK), according to the OECD 208 guidelines (2006) under controlled light
214 conditions (16 hours of light (4670 LUX) and 8 hours of darkness), temperature (25°C in light
215 period and 18°C in dark period), humidity (60% under light and 80% in the dark).

216 The application of the digestates was not only compared with unfertilized soil but also with
217 industrial fertilizer. Thus, a dose of 150 kg N/ha was applied for both the digestate and industrial
218 fertilizer (commercially available ammonium nitrate), while the P concentration in industrial
219 fertilizer was 50 kg P / ha (by addition of triple superphosphate).

220 Each set of conditions contained 4 pots in which six tomato seeds were sowed. The pots were
221 placed in the growth chamber. Every 24-48 h, the pots were watered by weighing and adding
222 distilled water to reach the initial weight. After 70% of the control seeds germinated, three tomato
223 seeds were left in each pot in order to allow enough space for plant growth for dry weight
224 measurement. After 28 d, the tomato plants were harvested by cutting the stems at ground level.
225 A certain amount of fresh plants was kept aside for chlorophyll content determination. The
226 remaining plants were dried for 48 h at 70°C in a forced-air oven, weighed and analysed. The
227 germination index and dry weight of the tomato plants are given in (Eq.1 and 2) (Elalami et al.,
228 2020b).

$$229 \text{ Dry weight (gTS/100 plants)} = \frac{\text{Dry weight of harvested plants (70}^\circ\text{ C)}}{\text{Number of plants}} * 100 \text{ (Eq. 1)}$$

$$230 \text{ Germination index (\%)} = \frac{\text{Final number of seeds that sprouted}}{\text{Number of initial seeds}} * 100 \text{ (Eq. 2)}$$

231 Chlorophyll refers to the green pigments present in plant chloroplasts. They have a major role in
232 photosynthesis, which consists in the absorption of light energy in order to convert carbon
233 dioxide and water into carbohydrates and oxygen. Chlorophyll *a* has a blue/green colour, while
234 chlorophyll *b* is a yellow/green pigment. In addition, plants also contain orange/red-coloured
235 carotenoids that contribute to the photosynthetic system as accessory light energy absorbers and
236 as photo protectants of the photosynthetic apparatus.

237 The extraction of chlorophyll *a*, chlorophyll *b* and carotenoids was carried out by soaking 0.5 g
238 of fresh biomass in 10 ml methanol (98%) for 5 min. The solution was then centrifuged at 10000
239 rpm for 15 min (Hettich Zentrifugen Rotanta 460). 0.5 ml of the clarified solution was sampled
240 and diluted in 4.5 ml methanol (98%). The solution was then analysed with a UV–VIS

241 spectrophotometer (Jenway 7315) to determine the absorbance at 470, 652 and 665 nm. These
242 pigments (chlorophyll *a*, chlorophyll *b* and carotenoids) were quantified using the following
243 equations (**Eq.3, 4 and 5**) (Lichtenthaler, 1987):

$$244 \quad \text{Chlorophyll a } (\mu\text{g/gTS}) = \frac{16.7A_{665} - 9.16A_{652}}{m_{\text{biomass}}} \times 10 \quad (\text{Eq. 3})$$

$$245 \quad \text{Chlorophyll b} (\mu\text{g/gTS}) = \frac{30.09A_{652} - 15.3A_{665}}{m_{\text{biomass}}} \times 10 \quad (\text{Eq. 4})$$

$$246 \quad \text{Carotenoids } (\mu\text{g/gTS}) = \frac{(1000A_{470} - 1.63Ca - 104.9Cb)}{221m_{\text{biomass}}} \times 10 \quad (\text{Eq. 5})$$

247 2.6. Statistical analysis

248 A t-test was applied to evaluate the significance of the results obtained ($p < 0.05$). Partial least
249 squares (PLS) regression is a statistical method for determining the linear relationship between
250 two matrices X (digestate properties) and Y (dry weight of tomato plants). The PLS of
251 experimental data was performed using SIMCA from UMETRICS. A correlation coefficient R^2
252 was computed to assess the statistical relationship between the two variables. In addition, the root
253 mean square error of estimation (RMSEE) represents the distance between the observed Y
254 variable and the predicted Y variable. The cross-validated coefficient (Q^2) and root mean square
255 error of cross validation ($RMSE_{CV}$) generated from an internal method used by SIMCA to define
256 the accuracy of the prediction were used for validating the model.

257 **3. Results and discussion**

258 3.1. Elemental analysis of feedstocks

259 First, the composition of the substrates was assessed in order to estimate the benefits in their pre-
260 treatment and anaerobic digestion. The composition of the substrates used in this study is shown

261 in **Table 2**. The phosphorous content was highest in sludge relative to the other substrates, while
262 more potassium was found in olive pomace. The C to N ratio was highest in olive pomace,
263 mainly due to its high lipid and lignin content (Elalami et al., 2018). Conversely, sludge
264 presented the lowest C/N ratio which explains why its co-digestion with other substrates that
265 have a better C/N is more favourable. The optimal C to N ratio for anaerobic digestion is within
266 the 25-30 range (Appels et al., 2008). However, in this study, all mixtures had lower C to N
267 ratios. Anaerobic digestion also depends on the biodegradability of the substrates. Therefore, pre-
268 treatment was applied to increase the biodegradability of the mixtures.

269 **Table 2** Composition of the substrates (sludge, olive pomace and macroalgal residues).

270 3.2. Impact of pretreatment on Van-Soest fractions

271 Van-Soest fibres in the raw and pretreated substrates as well as in their mixtures are presented in
272 **Fig.1**. The KOH pretreatment (5% TS basis, at 25°C for 2 d) significantly reduced the
273 hemicellulose-like and cellulose-like fractions contained in TWAS by 70% and 86% respectively,
274 while increasing the easily accessible fractions such as NDS (+163%). This observation concurs
275 with previous studies (Chen et al., 2020; Heo et al., 2003). For example, NaOH pretreatment (10
276 M added to reach a pH of 12) was found to significantly increase soluble COD, soluble proteins,
277 sugars and volatile fatty acids in waste activated sludge (Chen et al., 2020).

278 Moreover, the NDS, lignin-, cellulose- and hemicellulose-like composition of the mixtures did
279 not significantly differ from the calculated composition which was based on the sum of the
280 different fractions from the two separate substrates forming each mixture. In the mixture of
281 pretreated sludge and OP, the hemicellulose content fell by 32%, while lignin-like fractions
282 dropped by 28% and NDS rose by 45%. Similarly, a pretreatment of the whole mixture obviously

283 seemed to be more efficient in degrading the most recalcitrant materials contained in both TWAS
284 and OP. The lignin-like content decreased by 53% relative to the untreated TWAS and OP
285 mixture, while the hemicellulose-like fraction fell by 63% and zero effect was observed on the
286 cellulose-like fraction. Conversely, the NDS increased strongly after KOH pretreatments (+91%).
287 The pretreatment of sludge alone before MAR addition did not have any significant effect on
288 lignin-like and cellulose-like fractions relative to an untreated mixture. However, the strongest
289 effect of alkaline pretreatment could be observed on the whole sludge and MAR mixture, where
290 lignin- and hemicellulose-like fractions dropped by 73% and 64% respectively, while the NDS
291 increased by 71%.

292 **Fig.1** Van-Soest fractions in the substrates, their mixtures, pretreated substrates and mixtures. OP (Olive
293 pomace), MAR (Macroalgae residues), TWAS (Thickened waste activated sludge).

294 The alkaline pretreatment effect on lignocellulosic biomass such as olive pomace has already
295 been reported in literature. Alkaline pretreatment aims at reducing the lignin content through the
296 cleavage of ester bonds in lignin/phenolic-carbohydrate complexes (Taylor et al., 2011), thus
297 explaining the significant impact of pretreatment of a whole sludge and olive pomace mixture on
298 the solubilisation and lignocellulosic matrix degradation.

299 It is also noteworthy that neither sludge nor MAR are lignocellulosic matrices. These analysed
300 fractions are only lignocellulose-like fractions that acted as indicators to quantify the impact of
301 pretreatment on organic matter. However, it was obvious that the pre-treatment of sludge alone
302 reduced the hemicellulose-like fraction and enhanced NDS, while the pretreatment of whole
303 mixtures also affected lignin- and cellulose-like fractions. This may be related to the amount of
304 KOH added.

3.3. Anaerobic digesters performance

3.3.1. Methane production

The reactor performances for the different scenarios are presented in **Table 3**. Over a total operating time of 80 d, all reactors were stable by the 50th d (data not shown). According to reactor performance, co-digestion of sludge with OP (R1) and MAR (R4) resulted in increased methane specific production by 75% and 72% respectively relative to R1S, while for co-substrates, co-digestion improved ammonium concentrations and FOS/TAC (Volatile organic acids to total alkalinity ratio). Furthermore, the TS and VS removal increased due to co-digestion of sludge with OP and MAR. This was related to a higher methane production in the co-digesters.

The KOH pretreated sludge (R2S) produced 39% more methane compared to untreated sludge (R1S). The pretreatment of sludge alone and of a whole sludge and OP mixture both showed a similar methane production. Indeed, R2 and R3 produced 13 % and 15 % higher methane volumes compared to R1. This finding might result from an inhibition effect occurring within the R3, probably due to the release of phenolic compounds after delignification of OP by KOH pretreatment, while the R2 functioned normally. For this reason, in similar studies, it is recommended to dose polyphenols in digesters fed with a chemically pre-treated substrate, such as OP, that is rich in lignin. Pellerá et al. (2016) observed that the application of a NaOH pretreatment to OP, led to a linear increase in total polyphenol concentrations along with the dose of NaOH, regardless of temperature. they reached 5 mg gallic acid equivalent/gVS at a dose of 1 mmole NaOH/gVS at 25°C for 16 h (Pellerá et al., 2016). Note that a phenol concentration of 1.5 g/l should not be exceeded in order to maintain a proper methanogen activity (Monlau et al., 2014).

327 Hence, alkali pretreatment, applied to sludge only seems to be a more effective and
328 environmentally friendly strategy rather than pretreating a whole mixture of TWAS and OP
329 which requires more KOH addition to the system. Previously, Alagöz et al. (2015) reported that
330 ultrasonic pretreatment applied to waste activated sludge increased the methane potential by 24%
331 during co-digestion with olive pomace, although this was not compared with ultrasonic
332 pretreatment of the whole mixture (TWAS and OP) (Alagöz et al., 2015). The highest methane
333 production was achieved in R6 (fed with alkali pretreated mixture of TWAS and MAR). With a
334 methane yield of 281 Nml CH₄/gVS, the KOH pretreatment enhanced the methane production by
335 49% relative to the raw mixture (R4). On the contrary, the R5 (fed with the mixture of pretreated
336 sludge and macroalgal residues) did not result in any significant enhancement when compared
337 with the raw mixture.

338 **Table 3** Semi-continuous reactors performance; R1S (untreated sludge), R2S (pretreated sludge), R1
339 (sludge+olive pomace), R2 (pretreated sludge and olive pomace), R3 (pretreated mixture of sludge and
340 olive pomace), R4 (sludge+macroalgal residues), R5 (pretreated sludge and macroalgal residue), R6
341 (pretreated mixture of sludge and macroalgal residue).

342 Some previous studies on sludge, OP and macroalgal residue pretreatments, are presented in
343 **Table 4**. In general, alkali pre-treatments are more effective on lignocellulosic residues (Pellera
344 et al., 2016; Peng et al., 2019; Thomas et al., 2019), since they alter the lignin structure (Cheah et
345 al., 2020).

346 As reported in (Ruiz-Hernando et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2018), alkaline reagent can increase
347 methane production from sludge up to 34%. Results from the present study agree with this
348 observation. In addition, coupling alkaline pre-treatment with heat has further improved sludge
349 biodegradability and consequently the amount of methane produced. Thermal pre-treatment for 6

350 hours at 80°C prior to NaOH addition resulted in a 172% improvement in methane production
351 (Zou et al., 2020). For OP, thermal pre-treatment with steam explosion led to a 49% reduction in
352 hemicelluloses, resulting in higher solubilisation and, in turn, increased methane production in
353 the liquid fraction of the pre-treated OP. Nevertheless, alkaline or thermo-alkaline pre-treatment
354 effectively reduce the lignin content of the OP, thus leading to a 17 % and 23% increase in
355 produced methane, as observed by (Elalami et al., 2020a) and (Pellera et al., 2016), respectively.
356 Alagöz et al. (2015) also reported that microwave or US pre-treatment of sludge prior to co-
357 digestion with OP increased methane production by 38% and 44%, respectively (Alagöz et al.,
358 2015). Results from the present study do not achieve this same level of improvement, therefore
359 implying that sludge solubilisation can be enhanced with heating.

360 As for macro-algae, studies have been carried out on different species of seaweed but never on
361 residues of already industrially exploited macroalgae. In the present study, 49% more methane
362 resulted from KOH pre-treatment of the sludge and MAR mixture. However, to the authors'
363 knowledge, no studies yet discuss pre-treatment of sludge mixtures and macroalgal residues.
364 Generally, thermal or chemical pre-treatments of macroalgae biomass have previously been
365 reported with varying improvement rates ranging between 4 and 26% (Ding et al., 2020; Elalami
366 et al., 2020b; Jard et al., 2013; Vanegas et al., 2015).

367 The impact of pre-treatment on methane production thus essentially depends on the nature of the
368 substrate used and on its composition in addition to pre-treatment and AD conditions. For this
369 reason, the concept of exergy, has been proposed for comparing different pretreatments
370 (Soltanian et al., 2020). However, future works on exergy and the economic aspects of alkaline
371 pre-treatment still need to be considered.

372 **Table 4** Comparison between the results from the present study and other sludge, olive pomace and
373 macroalgal biomass pretreatment assessments.

374

375 **3.3.2. Other parameters**

376 The buffer capacity of reactors containing KOH-pretreated substrate was found to be
377 significantly higher than the buffer capacity of reactors containing untreated substrate. Sambusiti
378 et al. (2013) reported that the FOS/TAC ratio should ideally remain lower than 0.3 to avoid
379 inhibition and further acidification of the system (Sambusiti et al., 2013). Here, no inhibition was
380 observed and the reactors exhibited FOS/TAC ratio values ranging between 0.19 and 0.39. The
381 maximum FOS/TAC value (0.39) was achieved in R2. The FOS/TAC ratio fell during the AD
382 experiment, reaching values between 0.13 and 0.24 at steady state. The highest VFA
383 concentrations were found in R2S (0.37 g eq acetic acid/l which is equivalent to 6.2 mol/m³).
384 This is lower than the inhibitory concentration of 9 mole/m³ reported in the literature (Appels et
385 al., 2008).

386 Furthermore, ammonium concentrations ranged between 217 mg/l and 600 mg/l, which lies
387 within the recommended range for anaerobic microorganisms (200-1500 mg/l) (Rajagopal et al.,
388 2013). Maximal ammonium concentrations were obtained in KOH pretreated reactors. These
389 were at 600, 510 and 568 mg/l in R2S, R3 and R6 respectively. Although such increases in NH₄⁺
390 concentrations may result from the degradation of proteins during KOH pretreatment, ammonium
391 concentrations decreased towards the end of the AD process, tending to stabilize at 411, 237 and
392 278 mg/l for R2S, R3 and R6 respectively. High ammonium concentrations contributed to an
393 increase in alkalinity, which in turn ensures an optimal level of pH between 6.5 and 7.8. Despite
394 the fact that the pH at the inlet was high (up to 12.8) for pretreated substrates which had not been

395 neutralized, the reactors still worked correctly and digestate pH fell within 6.9 and 7.4 at steady
396 state. In addition, KOH pretreatment resulted in the enhancement of VS removal, ranging
397 between 4% and 39%. This result concurs with the study by Monlau et al. (2015) who achieved a
398 VS removal enhancement of 20% following NaOH pretreatment of sunflowers (1 mmole/gTS,
399 55°C for 24 h).

400 Although pretreatment conditions were not identical, the KOH concentration (0.9 mmol/gTS)
401 was similar to that of NaOH used in (Monlau et al., 2015). However, for a weaker lime
402 concentration (2.8 g/100 gTS of organic fraction of municipal solid waste, room temperature and
403 6 h), the VS removal increased by 21% (Torres and Lloréns, 2008). The effectiveness of a
404 pretreatment therefore also depends on the reagent used, on the liquid-solid ratio and on the
405 studied substrate.

406 To conclude, co-digestion of sludge with OP and MAR led to in an improvement in methane
407 production relative to sludge alone. This is related to the methane potential of the co-substrates
408 which is higher than that of sludge. In addition, alkaline pretreatment had the strongest impact on
409 reactor performance. In particular, co-digestion coupled with pretreatment clearly improved
410 methane production, digestate ammonium concentrations and VS removal. On the whole, an
411 economical assessment and optimisation remains necessary, involving both costs and benefits of
412 biogas production and use of digestate. As examples, (Aghbashlo et al., 2019; Tabatabaei et al.,
413 2020) have reported exergy based economic analyses.

414 3.4. Digestates properties

415 Digestate properties are summarized in **Table 5**. Comparison between digestates produced from
416 sludge mono and co-digestion pointed out that co-digestion residues are richer in organic matter
417 (and carbon) which, in turn, should improve the amending value of sludge digestate.

418 KOH pretreatment reduced the TS and VS content in digestates. This is mainly due to methane
419 improvement and to the consequent decrease in C and H concentrations in digestates.
420 Nonetheless, regarding the fibre content, lignin, hemicelluloses and cellulose-like fractions
421 seemed to decrease after AD. Fibre removal efficiency was strongly related to the nature of the
422 co-substrate as well as its initial fibre composition. Indeed, the lignin-like fraction decreased in
423 the R2S digestate, while the hemicellulose-like fraction dropped in the R3. The cellulose-like
424 fraction in the R6 digestate decreased in comparison with the R4 digestate.

425 Regarding the nutrient profile, KOH pretreatment increased the conductivity level in R2S, R2,
426 R3, R5 and R6 up to 1370 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$, probably because of the high potassium content in all the
427 digestates following KOH pretreatment. This result agrees with (Elalami et al., 2020b), who
428 observed how the KOH pre-treatment of MAR (5% at 25°C for 2 d) also improved conductivity
429 and reduced the digestate organic matter content. Jaffar et al. (2015) reported that a KOH
430 pretreatment (6% TS, room temperature for 3 d) enhanced the total nitrogen, phosphorus and
431 potassium contents of digestate by 9% ,7% and 138% respectively, in comparison with untreated
432 wheat straw digestate (Jaffar et al., 2016). Nevertheless, in the current study, the total
433 phosphorous concentration did not appear to be significantly affected by KOH pretreatment, with
434 values ranging between 61.6 and 80.8 mg $\text{P}_2\text{O}_5/\text{kg TS}$ for sludge mono-digestion, 43.5-60 mg
435 $\text{P}_2\text{O}_5/\text{kg TS}$ and 42.1-54 mg $\text{P}_2\text{O}_5/\text{kg TS}$ for sludge co-digestion with OP and MAR respectively.
436 While the potassium content in digestate from untreated substrates varied between 9.4 and 24.6 g

437 K₂O/kg TS, potassium concentrations varied between 65.2 and 194 g K₂O /kg in digestate issued
438 from sludge or pretreated mixtures.

439 The ammonium content increased due to higher protein degradation following KOH
440 pretreatment. This finding agrees with the study by Zou et al. (2020) in which a thermoalkaline
441 pretreatment (80°C for 6 h then mixture of NaOH and Ca(OH)₂ at pH= 12 and 25°C for 24 h)
442 increased ammonia levels by 140% at the end of the AD process, when compared with sludge
443 alone (Zou et al., 2020). Similarly, thermoalkaline pretreatment (140°C, 60 meq NaOH/l for 1 h)
444 tripled the ammonium concentrations in a sludge and food-waste mixture (Lee et al., 2019).

445 In addition, total nitrogen and sulfur concentrations slightly fell in digestates issued from KOH
446 pretreated substrates. However, as a CHNS analysis was performed on dried digestate, the
447 volatile forms of sulfur did not contribute to the measured value. This was also the case for
448 nitrogen; indeed, the N and total Kjeldahl nitrogen (TKN) differences could be essentially
449 attributed to the volatilization of NH₃ due to digestate drying prior to elemental analysis.

450 To conclude, when compared to mono-digestion of sludge, co-digestion significantly improved
451 methane production and increased the organic matter content of the digestate. Concurrently,
452 when compared to untreated substrate digestate, alkaline pretreatment also improved methane
453 production and enriched the digestate with ammonium.

454 **Table 5** Properties of tomato plants grown on unfertilized soil (control) and with industrial fertilizer or
455 different digestates. R1S (untreated sludge), R2S (pretreated sludge), R1 (sludge+olive pomace), R2
456 (pretreated sludge and olive pomace), R3 (pretreated mixture of sludge and olive pomace), R4
457 (sludge+macroalgal residues), R5 (pretreated sludge and macroalgal residue), R6 (pretreated mixture of
458 sludge and macroalgal residue).

459 3.5. Efficiency of the various digestates on tomato plant growth

460 **3.5.1. Effect on germination and dry weight of tomato plants**

461 The results of tomato growth tests on soil alone, with industrial fertilizer and after digestate
462 application are summarized in **Fig.2**. Note that the germination index was not significantly
463 impacted by digestate quality.

464 This finding concurs with Solé-Bundo et al. (2017) who reported that diluted digestates from
465 untreated, pretreated microalgae and microalgae co-digested with sludge did not present any
466 significant effect on the germination index of cress seeds. However, at high digestate
467 concentrations (10%), co-digestion proved to be more effective in maintaining a maximal
468 germination index while mono-digestion residues reduced germination by 40% (Solé-Bundó et
469 al., 2017). Similarly, Albuquerque et al. (2012) observed that the germination index of both
470 cress and lettuce improved when pig slurry digestate was applied at a concentration of 1%
471 (Albuquerque et al., 2012). Such a dilution avoids phytotoxicity issues. However, in the present
472 study, digestate dilution was not required, probably due to their low TS, which could be related to
473 the low OLR applied to the digester. This implies that the content in phytotoxic compounds was
474 low.

475 **Fig.2** Germination index (a) and dry weight (b) of tomato plants grown on unfertilized soil (control) and
476 soil fertilized with industrial fertilizer and different digestates. R1S (untreated sludge), R2S (pretreated
477 sludge), R1 (sludge+olive pomace), R2 (pretreated sludge and olive pomace), R3 (pretreated mixture of
478 sludge and olive pomace), R4 (sludge+macroalgal residues), R5 (pretreated sludge and macroalgal
479 residues), R6 (pretreated mixture of sludge and macroalgal residues).

480 On the contrary, the dry weight of tomato plants, after digestate addition, increased under all
481 conditions. Regarding R1S, it rose by 87% compared to unfertilized soil, quite similarly to the
482 effect of industrial fertilizer addition. However, the addition of R2S did not result in a higher dry

483 weight result compared to R1S. Similarly, R2, R3 and R5, R6 digestates did not show a
484 significant difference in dry weight compared to R1 and R3 digestates, suggesting that KOH
485 pretreatment effect was not significant. By comparing co-digestion with sludge mono-digestion
486 residues, sludge digestate was found to be more beneficial for plant growth, probably thanks to
487 its high phosphorous content, especially in the case of co-digestion with OP. Previously, Solé-
488 Bundo et al. (2017) reported that sludge and microalgae co-digestion residues were less
489 phytotoxic than microalgae digestate, thus suggesting that the addition of sludge enhanced the
490 agronomic value of the digestate (Solé-Bundó et al., 2017). In addition, thermally pretreated
491 microalgae (75°C for 10 h) digestate did not show any impact on cress growth. However, in the
492 case of OP digestates, the presence of phenolic compounds may explain the decrease in dry
493 weight of tomato plants, in comparison with MAR co-digestion residues. Besides, orange waste
494 digestate was previously found to strongly reduce the germination rate of ryegrass (-92%) as well
495 as its dry weight (-50%) (Kaparaju et al., 2012). Similarly, the addition of digestate from the co-
496 digestion of olive waste and citrus pulp resulted in a significant decrease in the germination (-
497 90%) of cucumber growth (Panuccio et al., 2019).

498 **3.5.2. Effect on tomato plant properties**

499 The properties of tomato plants, cultivated on the various digestates produced, are provided in
500 **Table 6.** Co-digestion of sludge and OP residues enhanced the C, H, N and pigment contents in
501 comparison with unfertilized soil. Nevertheless, chlorophyll *b* was unaffected neither by digestate
502 nor by industrial fertilizer addition, while the carotenoid content increased following the addition
503 of industrial fertilizer or of each type of digestate (up to +72%). In addition, the R1 digestate
504 increased the chlorophyll *a* concentration by 8% compared to industrial fertilizer, while the other

505 digestates presented similar or even lower pigment contents, as was the case for the R5 and R6
506 digestates. This is probably related to a decrease in the absorption of nutrients required for
507 chlorophyll *a* production within the plant. This effect can occur if metal concentrations in the
508 digestate are too high. It is therefore recommended to carry out metal analysis of the digestate
509 before its application, especially for digestate containing macroalgae. Indeed, macroalgae are
510 known to absorb and concentrate metals from a contaminated environment (Wang and Dei,
511 1999). Furthermore, raw sludge digestate proved to be more profitable for enhancing tomato
512 plant properties in comparison with pretreated sludge digestate. Indeed, the pretreated sludge
513 digestate contained less organic matter than untreated sludge digestate.

514 Reports on the impact of digestate properties on plant composition are scarce in the literature
515 (Albuquerque et al., 2012; Ronga et al., 2018; Y. Wang et al., 2018). Cow manure digestate is
516 known to enrich soil with nutrients, mainly N, P and K, which in turn improves the nutrient
517 content in watermelon fruit (Albuquerque et al., 2012). Similarly, liquid digestate from pig
518 manure can enhance the sugar and protein content in maize plants by 10 % and 12% respectively
519 (Y. Wang et al., 2018) while another digestate from agricultural wastes has been observed to
520 enhance the nitrogen, potassium and phosphorous content in alfalfa leaves by 18%, 17% and 7%
521 relative to industrial fertilizer (Koszel and Lorencowicz, 2015). In contrast, Sortino et al. (2014)
522 did not observe any effect of urban bio-waste digestate on the C and N levels of harvested tomato
523 plants (Sortino et al., 2014). Moreover, Ronga et al. (2018) found that co-digestion residues from
524 maize silage, triticale silage, cow slurry and grape stalks led to a decrease in the aromatic
525 compounds of peppermint and basil plants (Ronga et al., 2018). The effect of a digestate
526 therefore depends on the substrate composition, on AD conditions and on the type of pre-
527 treatment or co-digestion, in addition to plant and soil properties.

552 on the dry mass of the plants. These results agree with previous studies where the nitrogen and
553 phosphorus contents were found to be growth-limiting elements, especially for the very early
554 stages of growth (Cooke et al., 2005; Malhotra et al., 2018).

555 In addition, Razaq et al. (2017) reported that both nitrogen and phosphorus affected plant height,
556 root morphology and chlorophyll content (Razaq et al., 2017). In contrast, Iocoli et al. (2019)
557 found that lettuce dry weight was highly related to ammonium nitrogen. They also reported that
558 organic nitrogen is associated with recalcitrant organic structures which are not readily available
559 for plants (Iocoli et al., 2019). However, these results still need to be confirmed on long term
560 assays in field conditions, since results can be strongly affected by the availability of elements,
561 the soil texture, the climate conditions and the type of plant tested.

562 **Fig.3** PLS results linking dry weight of tomato plants to digestate characteristics, a) centred and scaled
563 coefficients, b) predicted versus observed dry weight of tomato plants.

564 **4. Conclusions and future prospects**

565 Co-digestion improves methane production relative to sludge mono-digestion and both types of
566 digestate virtually share the same degree of impact on plant dry weight. This suggests that co-
567 digestion can improve methane production and ensure a P and N supply, since these nutrients
568 correlate strongly with plant dry weight. Alkaline pre-treatment has shown to improve methane
569 production, although it does not seem to affect the growth of tomato plants. Digestate application
570 increased chlorophyll *a* and carotenoid concentrations in tomato plants. However, the alkaline
571 pretreatment of MAR mixtures led to a fall in concentrations of these pigments in tomato plants.
572 In future studies, the impact of digestate application on heavy metals in soil and plants should be
573 investigated over long-term field trials. In addition, the sustainability of integrating pretreatment

574 and co-digestion strategies will have to be addressed for pilot scales including the analysis of
575 economic, environmental and societal aspects.

576 **Acknowledgments**

577 Special thanks to Blandine Schraauwers (technician at the APESA platform) for her technical
578 assistance during tomato growth and for conducting chlorophyll and carotenoid analysis. We
579 would like to thank the OCP Group, INRAE, APESA, and University Mohamed VI Polytechnic
580 (UM6P) for providing financial support for this work (Atlass Project; <https://umr-iate.cirad.fr/projets/atlass-ocp>).

582 **References**

- 583 Aboulkas, A., Hammani, H., El Achaby, M., Bilal, E., Barakat, A., El harfi, K., 2017.
584 Valorization of algal waste via pyrolysis in a fixed-bed reactor: Production and
585 characterization of bio-oil and bio-char. *Bioresource Technology* 243, 400–408.
586 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2017.06.098>
- 587 Abudi, Z.N., Hu, Z., Sun, N., Xiao, B., Rajaa, N., Liu, C., Guo, D., 2016a. Batch anaerobic co-
588 digestion of OFMSW (organic fraction of municipal solid waste), TWAS (thickened
589 waste activated sludge) and RS (rice straw): Influence of TWAS and RS pretreatment and
590 mixing ratio. *Energy* 107, 131–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2016.03.141>
- 591 Abudi, Z.N., Hu, Z., Xiao, B., Abood, A.R., Rajaa, N., Laghari, M., 2016b. Effects of
592 pretreatments on thickened waste activated sludge and rice straw co-digestion:
593 Experimental and modeling study. *Journal of Environmental Management* 177, 213–222.
594 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2016.04.028>
- 595 Aghbashlo, M., Tabatabaei, M., Soltanian, S., Ghanavati, H., Dadak, A., 2019. Comprehensive
596 exergoeconomic analysis of a municipal solid waste digestion plant equipped with a
597 biogas genset. *Waste Management* 87, 485–498.
598 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2019.02.029>
- 599 Alagöz, A., Yenigün, O., Erdiñçler, A., 2015. Enhancement of anaerobic digestion efficiency of
600 wastewater sludge and olive waste: Synergistic effect of co-digestion and
601 ultrasonic/microwave sludge pre-treatment. *Waste Management* 46, 182–188.
602 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2015.08.020>
- 603 Alburquerque, J.A., de la Fuente, C., Campoy, M., Carrasco, L., Nájera, I., Baixauli, C.,
604 Caravaca, F., Roldán, A., Cegarra, J., Bernal, M.P., 2012. Agricultural use of digestate for
605 horticultural crop production and improvement of soil properties. *European Journal of*
606 *Agronomy* 43, 119–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2012.06.001>
- 607 Algapani, D.E., Wang, J., Qiao, W., Su, M., Goglio, A., Wandera, S.M., Jiang, M., Pan, X.,
608 Adani, F., Dong, R., 2017. Improving methane production and anaerobic digestion

609 stability of food waste by extracting lipids and mixing it with sewage sludge. *Bioresource*
610 *Technology* 244, 996–1005. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2017.08.087>

611 APHA, 1998. *Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater*. American Public
612 Health Association, American Water Works Association and Water Environmental
613 Federation.

614 Appels, L., Baeyens, J., Degreève, J., Dewil, R., 2008. Principles and potential of the anaerobic
615 digestion of waste-activated sludge. *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science* 34, 755–
616 781. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecs.2008.06.002>

617 Babayemi, J., Dauda, K., 2010. Evaluation of Solid Waste Generation, Categories and Disposal
618 Options in Developing Countries: A Case Study of Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Sciences*
619 *and Environmental Management* 13. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jasem.v13i3.55370>

620 Belhadj, S., El Bari, H., Karouach, F., Joute, Y., Chica, A., Martín, M., 2013. Production of
621 Methane from Mesophilic Anaerobic Digestion of Sewage Sludge in Morocco.
622 *AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH (AJASR)* 2, 81–
623 91.

624 Bolzonella, D., Fatone, F., Gottardo, M., Frison, N., 2018. Nutrients recovery from anaerobic
625 digestate of agro-waste: Techno-economic assessment of full scale applications. *Journal*
626 *of Environmental Management* 216, 111–119.
627 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2017.08.026>

628 Bouknaana, D., Hammouti, R., Salghi, S., Jodeh, S., Zarrouk, A., Warade, I., Aouniti, A., Sbaa,
629 M., 2014. Physicochemical Characterization of Olive Oil Mill Wastewaters in the eastern
630 region of Morocco. *J. Mater. Environ. scie* 5, 1039–1058.

631 Carrère, H., Dumas, C., Battimelli, A., Batstone, D.J., Delgenès, J.P., Steyer, J.P., Ferrer, I.,
632 2010. Pretreatment methods to improve sludge anaerobic degradability: A review. *Journal*
633 *of Hazardous Materials* 183, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2010.06.129>

634 Cheah, W.Y., Sankaran, R., Show, P.L., Tg. Ibrahim, Tg.N.B., Chew, K.W., Culaba, A., Chang,
635 J.-S., 2020. Pretreatment methods for lignocellulosic biofuels production: current
636 advances, challenges and future prospects. *Biofuel Res. J.* 7, 1115–1127.
637 <https://doi.org/10.18331/BRJ2020.7.1.4>

638 Chen, H., Yi, H., Li, H., Guo, X., Xiao, B., 2020. Effects of thermal and thermal-alkaline
639 pretreatments on continuous anaerobic sludge digestion: Performance, energy balance
640 and, enhancement mechanism. *Renewable Energy* 147, 2409–2416.
641 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2019.10.051>

642 Cieślík, B.M., Namieśnik, J., Konieczka, P., 2015. Review of sewage sludge management:
643 standards, regulations and analytical methods. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 90, 1–15.
644 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.11.031>

645 Cooke, J.E.K., Martin, T.A., Davis, J.M., 2005. Short-term physiological and developmental
646 responses to nitrogen availability in hybrid poplar. *New Phytologist* 167, 41–52.
647 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2005.01435.x>

648 Costa, J.C., Gonçalves, P.R., Nobre, A., Alves, M.M., 2012. Biomethanation potential of
649 macroalgae *Ulva* spp. and *Gracilaria* spp. and in co-digestion with waste activated sludge.
650 *Bioresource Technology* 114, 320–326. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2012.03.011>

651 Dahhou, M., El Moussaouiti, M., El Morhit, M., Gamouh, S., Moustahsine, S., 2017. Drinking
652 water sludge of the Moroccan capital: Statistical analysis of its environmental aspects.
653 *Journal of Taibah University for Science* 11, 749–758.
654 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtusci.2016.09.003>

- 655 Ding, L., Cheng, J., Lin, R., Deng, C., Zhou, J., Murphy, J.D., 2020. Improving biohydrogen and
656 biomethane co-production via two-stage dark fermentation and anaerobic digestion of the
657 pretreated seaweed *Laminaria digitata*. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 251, 119666.
658 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119666>
- 659 Elalami, D., Carrere, H., Abdelouahdi, K., Garcia-Bernet, D., Peydecastaing, J., Vaca-Medina,
660 G., Oukarroum, A., Zeroual, Y., Barakat, A., 2020a. Mild microwaves, ultrasonic and
661 alkaline pretreatments for improving methane production: Impact on biochemical and
662 structural properties of olive pomace. *Bioresource Technology* 299, 122591.
663 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2019.122591>
- 664 Elalami, D., Carrere, H., Abdelouahdi, K., Oukarroum, A., Dhiba, D., Arji, M., Barakat, A.,
665 2018. Combination of Dry Milling and Separation Processes with Anaerobic Digestion of
666 Olive Mill Solid Waste: Methane Production and Energy Efficiency. *Molecules* 23.
667 <https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules23123295>
- 668 Elalami, D., Carrere, H., Monlau, F., Abdelouahdi, K., Oukarroum, A., Barakat, A., 2019.
669 Pretreatment and co-digestion of wastewater sludge for biogas production: Recent
670 research advances and trends. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 114, 109287.
671 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2019.109287>
- 672 Elalami, D., Monlau, F., Carrere, H., Abdelouahdi, K., Charbonnel, C., Oukarroum, A., Zeroual,
673 Y., Barakat, A., 2020b. Evaluation of agronomic properties of digestate from macroalgal
674 residues anaerobic digestion: impact of pretreatment and co-digestion with waste
675 activated sludge. *Waste Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2020.04.019>
- 676 Heo, N.-H., Park, S.-C., Lee, J.-S., Kang, H., 2003. Solubilization of waste activated sludge by
677 alkaline pretreatment and biochemical methane potential (BMP) tests for anaerobic co-
678 digestion of municipal organic waste. *Water Science and Technology* 48, 211–219.
679 <https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2003.0471>
- 680 Iacovidou, E., Ohandja, D.-G., Voulvoulis, N., 2012. Food waste co-digestion with sewage
681 sludge – Realising its potential in the UK. *Journal of Environmental Management* 112,
682 267–274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2012.07.029>
- 683 Iocoli, G.A., Zabaloy, M.C., Pasdevicelli, G., Gómez, M.A., 2019. Use of biogas digestates
684 obtained by anaerobic digestion and co-digestion as fertilizers: Characterization, soil
685 biological activity and growth dynamic of *Lactuca sativa* L. *Science of The Total*
686 *Environment* 647, 11–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.07.444>
- 687 Jaffar, M., Pang, Y., Yuan, H., Zou, D., Liu, Y., Zhu, B., Korai, R.M., Li, X., 2016. Wheat straw
688 pretreatment with KOH for enhancing biomethane production and fertilizer value in
689 anaerobic digestion. *Chinese Journal of Chemical Engineering* 24, 404–409.
690 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cjche.2015.11.005>
- 691 Jard, G., Dumas, C., Delgenes, J.P., Marfaing, H., Sialve, B., Steyer, J.P., Carrère, H., 2013.
692 Effect of thermochemical pretreatment on the solubilization and anaerobic
693 biodegradability of the red macroalga *Palmaria palmata*. *Biochemical Engineering Journal*
694 79, 253–258. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bej.2013.08.011>
- 695 Jensen, P.D., Astals, S., Lu, Y., Devadas, M., Batstone, D.J., 2014. Anaerobic codigestion of
696 sewage sludge and glycerol, focusing on process kinetics, microbial dynamics and sludge
697 dewaterability. *Water Research* 67, 355–366. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2014.09.024>
- 698 Kamusoko, R., Jingura, R.M., Parawira, W., Sanyika, W.T., 2019. Comparison of pretreatment
699 methods that enhance biomethane production from crop residues - a systematic review.
700 *Biofuel Res. J.* 6, 1080–1089. <https://doi.org/10.18331/BRJ2019.6.4.4>

701 Kaparaju, P., Rintala, J., Oikari, A., 2012. Agricultural potential of anaerobically digested
702 industrial orange waste with and without aerobic post-treatment. *Environmental*
703 *Technology* 33, 85–94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09593330.2011.551839>

704 Kor-Bicakci, G., Eskicioglu, C., 2019. Recent developments on thermal municipal sludge
705 pretreatment technologies for enhanced anaerobic digestion. *Renewable and Sustainable*
706 *Energy Reviews* 110, 423–443. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2019.05.002>

707 Koszel, M., Lorencowicz, E., 2015. Agricultural Use of Biogas Digestate as a Replacement
708 Fertilizers. *Agriculture and Agricultural Science Procedia* 7, 119–124.
709 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aaspro.2015.12.004>

710 Lee, W., Park, S., Cui, F., Kim, M., 2019. Optimizing pre-treatment conditions for anaerobic co-
711 digestion of food waste and sewage sludge. *Journal of Environmental Management* 249,
712 109397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.109397>

713 Li, H., Li, C., Liu, W., Zou, S., 2012. Optimized alkaline pretreatment of sludge before anaerobic
714 digestion. *Bioresource Technology* 123, 189–194.
715 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2012.08.017>

716 Lichtenthaler, H.K., 1987. Chlorophylls and carotenoids: Pigments of photosynthetic
717 biomembranes, in: *Methods in Enzymology*. Elsevier, pp. 350–382.
718 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0076-6879\(87\)48036-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0076-6879(87)48036-1)

719 Liu, X., Liu, H., Chen, Jinhuan, Du, G., Chen, Jian, 2008. Enhancement of solubilization and
720 acidification of waste activated sludge by pretreatment. *Waste Management* 28, 2614–
721 2622. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2008.02.001>

722 Mahdy, A., Mendez, L., Ballesteros, M., González-Fernández, C., 2014. Algal culture integration
723 in conventional wastewater treatment plants: Anaerobic digestion comparison of primary
724 and secondary sludge with microalgae biomass. *Bioresource Technology* 184, 236–244.
725 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2014.09.145>

726 Malhotra, H., Vandana, Sharma, S., Pandey, R., 2018. Phosphorus Nutrition: Plant Growth in
727 Response to Deficiency and Excess, in: *Plant Nutrients and Abiotic Stress Tolerance*. pp.
728 171–190. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-9044-8_7

729 Miryahyaei, S., Das, T., Othman, M., Batstone, D., Eshtiaghi, N., 2020. Anaerobic co-digestion
730 of sewage sludge with cellulose, protein, and lipids: Role of rheology and digestibility.
731 *Science of The Total Environment* 731, 139214.
732 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139214>

733 Mohamed, B., Mounia, K., Aziz, A., Ahmed, H., Rachid, B., Lotfi, A., 2018. Sewage sludge used
734 as organic manure in Moroccan sunflower culture: Effects on certain soil properties,
735 growth and yield components. *Science of The Total Environment* 627, 681–688.
736 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.01.258>

737 Monlau, F., Kaparaju, P., Trably, E., Steyer, J.P., Carrere, H., 2015. Alkaline pretreatment to
738 enhance one-stage CH₄ and two-stage H₂/CH₄ production from sunflower stalks: Mass,
739 energy and economical balances. *Chemical Engineering Journal* 260, 377–385.
740 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2014.08.108>

741 Monlau, F., Sambusiti, C., Barakat, A., Quéméneur, M., Trably, E., Steyer, J.-P., Carrère, H.,
742 2014. Do furanic and phenolic compounds of lignocellulosic and algae biomass
743 hydrolyzate inhibit anaerobic mixed cultures? A comprehensive review. *Biotechnology*
744 *Advances* 32, 934–951. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotechadv.2014.04.007>

745 Mu, L., Zhang, L., Zhu, K., Ma, J., Ifran, M., Li, A., 2020. Anaerobic co-digestion of sewage
746 sludge, food waste and yard waste: Synergistic enhancement on process stability and

747 biogas production. *Science of The Total Environment* 704, 135429.
748 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.135429>

749 Panuccio, M.R., Papalia, T., Attinà, E., Giuffrè, A., Muscolo, A., 2019. Use of digestate as an
750 alternative to mineral fertilizer: effects on growth and crop quality. *Archives of*
751 *Agronomy and Soil Science* 65, 700–711.
752 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03650340.2018.1520980>

753 Pellerà, Santori, S., Pomi, R., Poletti, A., Gidarakos, E., 2016. Effect of alkaline pretreatment
754 on anaerobic digestion of olive mill solid waste. *Waste Management* 58, 160–168.
755 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2016.08.008>

756 Peng, J., Abomohra, A.E.-F., Elsayed, M., Zhang, X., Fan, Q., Ai, P., 2019. Compositional
757 changes of rice straw fibers after pretreatment with diluted acetic acid: Towards enhanced
758 biomethane production. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 230, 775–782.
759 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.05.155>

760 Rajagopal, R., Massé, D.I., Singh, G., 2013. A critical review on inhibition of anaerobic digestion
761 process by excess ammonia. *Bioresource Technology* 143, 632–641.
762 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2013.06.030>

763 Razaq, M., Zhang, P., Shen, H., Salahuddin, 2017. Influence of nitrogen and phosphorous on the
764 growth and root morphology of *Acer mono*. *PLoS ONE* 12, e0171321.
765 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0171321>

766 Ronga, D., Pellati, F., Brighenti, V., Laudicella, K., Laviano, L., Fedailaine, M., Benvenuti, S.,
767 Pecchioni, N., Francia, E., 2018. Testing the influence of digestate from biogas on growth
768 and volatile compounds of basil (*Ocimum basilicum* L.) and peppermint (*Mentha x*
769 *piperita* L.) in hydroponics. *Journal of Applied Research on Medicinal and Aromatic*
770 *Plants* 11, 18–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmap.2018.08.001>

771 Ruiz-Hernando, M., Martín-Díaz, J., Labanda, J., Mata-Alvarez, J., Llorens, J., Lucena, F.,
772 Astals, S., 2014. Effect of ultrasound, low-temperature thermal and alkali pre-treatments
773 on waste activated sludge rheology, hygienization and methane potential. *Water Research*
774 61, 119–129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2014.05.012>

775 Sambusiti, C., Ficara, E., Malpei, F., Steyer, J.P., Carrère, H., 2013. Benefit of sodium hydroxide
776 pretreatment of ensiled sorghum forage on the anaerobic reactor stability and methane
777 production. *Bioresource Technology* 144, 149–155.
778 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2013.06.095>

779 Sambusiti, C., Ficara, E., Malpei, F., Steyer, J.P., Carrère, H., 2012. Influence of alkaline pre-
780 treatment conditions on structural features and methane production from ensiled sorghum
781 forage. *Chemical Engineering Journal* 211–212, 488–492.
782 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2012.09.103>

783 Solé-Bundó, M., Cucina, M., Folch, M., Tàpias, J., Gigliotti, G., Garfi, M., Ferrer, I., 2017.
784 Assessing the agricultural reuse of the digestate from microalgae anaerobic digestion and
785 co-digestion with sewage sludge. *Science of The Total Environment* 586, 1–9.
786 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.02.006>

787 Solé-Bundó, M., Garfi, M., Ferrer, I., 2020. Pretreatment and co-digestion of microalgae, sludge
788 and fat oil and grease (FOG) from microalgae-based wastewater treatment plants.
789 *Bioresource Technology* 298, 122563. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2019.122563>

790 Soltanian, S., Aghbashlo, M., Almasi, F., Hosseinzadeh-Bandbafha, H., Nizami, A.-S., Ok, Y.S.,
791 Lam, S.S., Tabatabaei, M., 2020. A critical review of the effects of pretreatment methods

792 on the exergetic aspects of lignocellulosic biofuels. *Energy Conversion and Management*
793 212, 112792. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2020.112792>

794 Sortino, O., Montoneri, E., Patanè, C., Rosato, R., Tabasso, S., Ginepro, M., 2014. Benefits for
795 agriculture and the environment from urban waste. *Science of The Total Environment*
796 487, 443–451. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.04.027>

797 Tabatabaei, M., Aghbashlo, M., Valijanlian, E., Kazemi Shariat Panahi, H., Nizami, A.-S.,
798 Ghanavati, H., Sulaiman, A., Mirmohamadsadeghi, S., Karimi, K., 2020. A
799 comprehensive review on recent biological innovations to improve biogas production,
800 Part 1: Upstream strategies. *Renewable Energy* 146, 1204–1220.
801 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2019.07.037>

802 Tampio, E., Salo, T., Rintala, J., 2016. Agronomic characteristics of five different urban waste
803 digestates. *Journal of Environmental Management* 169, 293–302.
804 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2016.01.001>

805 Taylor, P., Monlau, F., Barakat, A., Trably, E., Dumas, C., Steyer, J., Carrère, H., 2011. Critical
806 Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology Lignocellulosic Materials Into
807 Biohydrogen and Biomethane : Impact of Structural Features and Pretreatment and
808 Biomethane : Impact of Structural Features 37–41.
809 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10643389.2011.604258>

810 Tedesco, S., Benyounis, K.Y., Olabi, A.G., 2013. Mechanical pretreatment effects on
811 macroalgae-derived biogas production in co-digestion with sludge in Ireland. *Energy* 61,
812 27–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2013.01.071>

813 Thomas, H.L., Arnoult, S., Brancourt-Hulmel, M., Carrère, H., 2019. Methane Production
814 Variability According to Miscanthus Genotype and Alkaline Pretreatments at High Solid
815 Content. *Bioenerg. Res.* 12, 325–337. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12155-018-9957-5>

816 Torres, M.L., Lloréns, Ma. del C.E., 2008. Effect of alkaline pretreatment on anaerobic digestion
817 of solid wastes. *Waste Management* 28, 2229–2234.
818 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2007.10.006>

819 Van Soest, P.J., 1963. The Use of Detergents in the Analysis of Fibrous Feeds: II. A Rapid
820 Method for the Determination of Fiber and Lignin. *Official Agriculture Chemistry*.

821 Vanegas, C.H., Hernon, A., Bartlett, J., 2015. Enzymatic and organic acid pretreatment of
822 seaweed: effect on reducing sugars production and on biogas inhibition. *International*
823 *Journal of Ambient Energy* 36, 2–7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01430750.2013.820143>

824 Wang, W.-X., Dei, R.C.H., 1999. Kinetic measurements of metal accumulation in two marine
825 macroalgae. *Marine Biology* 135, 11–23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002270050596>

826 Wang, Xu, Bingqing, Zhang, X., Yang, Q., Xu, Bingjie, Yang, P., 2018. Enhanced Biogas
827 Production and Dewaterability from Sewage Sludge with Alkaline Pretreatment at
828 Mesophilic and Thermophilic Temperatures. *Water Air Soil Pollut* 229, 57.
829 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11270-018-3726-0>

830 Wang, Y., Li, W., Wang, F., Liu, S., Wang, W., 2018. Performance of maize plant reconstruction
831 and storage nutrient mobilization induced by liquid phase of anaerobically digested pig
832 manure. *J Mater Cycles Waste Manag* 20, 274–282. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10163-016-0576-y>

833 Zou, X., Yang, R., Zhou, X., Cao, G., Zhu, R., Ouyang, F., 2020. Effects of mixed alkali-thermal
834 pretreatment on anaerobic digestion performance of waste activated sludge. *Journal of*
835 *Cleaner Production* 259, 120940. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120940>

836
837

838
839
840
841
842
843
844

845
846

847
848
849
850
851

852
853
854
855

856

857

858

859

860

861

862

863

864

865

List of Tables

- Table 1** Various feeding conditions applied in CSTR reactors.
- Table 2** Composition of the substrates (sludge, olive pomace and macroalgal residues).
- Table 3** Semi-continuous reactors performance; R1S (untreated sludge), R2S (pretreated sludge), R1 (sludge+olive pomace), R2 (pretreated sludge and olive pomace), R3 (pretreated mixture of sludge and olive pomace), R4 (sludge+macroalgal residues), R5 (pretreated sludge and macroalgal residue), R6 (pretreated mixture of sludge and macroalgal residue).
- Table 4** Comparison between the results from the present study and other sludge, olive pomace and macroalgal biomass pretreatment assessments.
- Table 5** Properties of tomato plants grown on unfertilized soil (control) and with industrial fertilizer or different digestates. R1S (untreated sludge), R2S (pretreated sludge), R1 (sludge+olive pomace), R2 (pretreated sludge and olive pomace), R3 (pretreated mixture of sludge and olive pomace), R4 (sludge+macroalgal residues), R5 (pretreated sludge and macroalgal residue), R6 (pretreated mixture of sludge and macroalgal residue).
- Table 6** Properties of tomato plants from different seeding conditions. R1S (untreated sludge), R2S (pretreated sludge), R1 (sludge+olive pomace), R2 (pretreated sludge and olive pomace), R3 (pretreated mixture of sludge and olive pomace), R4 (sludge+macroalgal residues), R5 (pretreated sludge and macroalgal residue), R6 (pretreated mixture of sludge and macroalgal residue).

866

List of Figures


867 **Fig.1** Van-Soest fractions in the substrates, their mixtures, pretreated substrates and mixtures. OP (Olive
868 pomace), MAR (Macroalgae residues), TWAS (Thickened waste activated sludge).

869 **Fig.2** Germination index (a) and dry weight (b) of tomato plants grown on unfertilized soil (control) and
870 soil fertilized with industrial fertilizer and different digestates. R1S (untreated sludge), R2S (pretreated
871 sludge), R1 (sludge+olive pomace), R2 (pretreated sludge and olive pomace), R3 (pretreated mixture of
872 sludge and olive pomace), R4 (sludge+macroalgal residues), R5 (pretreated sludge and macroalgal
873 residues), R6 (pretreated mixture of sludge and macroalgal residues).

874 **Fig.3** PLS results linking dry weight of tomato plants to digestate characteristics, a) centred and scaled
875 coefficients, b) predicted versus observed dry weight of tomato plants.

876

877



*After burning the "lignin-like" fraction.

Fig.1 Van-Soest fractions in the substrates, their mixtures, pretreated substrates and mixtures. OP (Olive pomace), MAR (Macroalgae residues), TWAS (Thickened waste activated sludge).




Fig.2 Germination index (a) and dry weight (b) of tomato plants grown on unfertilized soil (control) and soil fertilized with industrial fertilizer and different digestates. R1S (untreated sludge), R2S (pretreated sludge), R1 (sludge+olive pomace), R2 (pretreated sludge and olive pomace), R3 (pretreated mixture of sludge and olive pomace), R4 (sludge+macroalgal residues), R5 (pretreated sludge and macroalgal residues), R6 (pretreated mixture of sludge and macroalgal residues).




Fig.3 PLS results linking dry weight of tomato plants to digestate characteristics, a) centred and scaled coefficients, b) predicted versus observed dry weight of tomato plants.

Table 1 Various feeding conditions applied in CSTR reactors.

	Reactors	Feedstock		
		OP (% VS)	TWAS (% VS)	MAR (% VS)
Sludge mono-digestion	R1S-TWAS	0	100	0
	R2S-TWASKOH	0	100 + KOH*	0
Co-digestion	R1-TWAS:OP	50	50	0
	R2-TWASKOH:OP	50	50 + KOH*	0
	R3-(TWAS:OP)KOH	50+ KOH*	50+ KOH*	0
	R4- TWAS:MAR	0	50	50
	R5-TWASKOH:MAR	0	50 + KOH*	50
	R6-(TWAS:MAR)KOH	0	50+ KOH*	50+ KOH*

*Pretreatment conditions: 5% TS, 25°C for 2 d. OP (Olive pomace), MAR (Macroalgae residues), TWAS (thickened waste activated sludge).

Table 2 Composition of the substrates (sludge, olive pomace and macroalgal residues).

Substrates	OP	TWAS:OP	TWAS	TWAS:MAR	MAR
C (% TS)	52±0.2	-	38.3±0.6	-	38.8±0.2
H (% TS)	7.2±0.3	-	5.68±0.05	-	6.1±0.3
N (% TS)	1.0±0.2	-	6.13±0.06	-	4.0±0.2
S (% TS)	0.10±0.01	-	1.12±0.03	-	0.65±0.01
C/N	52.0	12.0	6.7	7.6	9.7
P (g /kg TS)	10.1±0.4	-	39.2±0.4	-	11.5±0.3
K (g /kg TS)	65±4	-	37.3±0.1	-	3.6±0.4
Lipids (%)	16.4±0.8	-	-	-	-

OP (Olive pomace), MAR (macroalgal residues), TWAS (thickened waste activated sludge).

Table 3 Semi-continuous reactors performance; R1S (untreated sludge), R2S (pretreated sludge), R1 (sludge+olive pomace), R2 (pretreated sludge and olive pomace), R3 (pretreated mixture of sludge and olive pomace), R4 (sludge+macroalgal residues), R5 (pretreated sludge and macroalgal residue), R6 (pretreated mixture of sludge and macroalgal residue).

Reactors	pH _{in}	pH at steady state	Methane (Nml /gVS _{in})	Methane enhancement (% untreated)	TS removal (%TS _{in})	VS removal (%VS _{in})	Max VFA (g eq acetic acid/l)	FOS/TAC		NH ₄ ⁺ (mg/l)		
								Max	Steady state	Max	Steady state	
MonoD	R1S	7	6.9	109±5	-	20	28	0.02	0.19	0.13	254	254
	R2S	9	7.5	152±14	39	29	39	0.37	0.29	0.21	600	411
AcoD	R1	6.4	7.2	191±10	-	30	37	0.05	0.23	0.21	217	178
	R2	7.2	7.1	215±24	13	32	42	0.18	0.39	0.24	428	217
	R3	12.6	7.2	220±16	15	34	43	0.31	0.31	0.16	510	237
	R4	7.1	7.2	188±19	-	40	46	0.15	0.19	0.14	239	201
	R5	7.3	7.3	194±28	3	38	48	0.3	0.33	0.22	468	257
	R6	12.8	7.4	281±25	49	45	58	0.04	0.32	0.16	568	278

MonoD (mono-digestion), AcoD (anaerobic co-digestion), TS (total solids), VS (volatile solids), VFA (volatile fatty acids), FOS (volatile organic acids), TAC (total alkalinity).

Table 4 Comparison between the results from the present study and other sludge, olive pomace and macroalgal biomass pretreatment assessments.

Substrates	Pretreatment	Conditions	Methane enhancement	Ref
Waste activated sludge	Thermoalkaline	80°C for 6h, then a mixture of NaOH and Ca(OH) ₂ was added (at a ratio of NaOH: Ca(OH) ₂ =4:1)	+172%	(Zou et al., 2020)
Waste activated sludge	Alkaline	157 g NaOH/kg TS at 25°C for 24 h. Biomethane potential test (BMP) at 37°C for 35 d.	+34%	(Ruiz-Hernando et al., 2014)
Waste activated sludge	Alkaline	NaOH (pH=8) for 6 d at 35°C. BMP at 35°C for 56 d.	+30%	(Wang et al., 2018)
Olive pomace	Steam explosion	200°C for 5 min and 1.57 MPa. BMP at 35°C for 23 d.	<p>Untreated OP: 366 ml/g VS.</p> <p>Liquid fraction of OP: 589 ml/g VS.</p> <p>Solid fraction of OP: 263 ml/g VS.</p>	(Rincón et al., 2016)
Olive pomace	Thermoalkaline	NaOH (1 mmol/gVS) for 4h at 90°C Biomethane potential test (BMP) at 35°C for 50 d.	+23%	(Pellera et al., 2016)
Olive pomace	Alkaline	NaOH (4%) for 2 d and 25°C BMP at 35°C for 30 d.	+17%	(Elalami et al., 2020a)
Waste activated sludge and olive pomace (1:1 (g/g))	Ultrasonic	200W for 30 min on sludge alone. batch-fed anaerobic reactors at 37 °C for 30 days.	+23%	(Alagöz et al., 2015)
Brown macroalga “ <i>Laminaria digitate</i> ”	Microwaves	For 30 min at 175 °C and 2000 kPa on sludge alone. batch-fed anaerobic reactors at 37 °C for 30 days.	+44%	
Red macroalga “ <i>Palmaria palmata</i> ”	Thermal	140 °C for 20 min Two-stage anaerobic digestion (batch dark fermentation at 35°C for 3 d, then batch AD at 35°C for 21 d).	+26%	(Ding et al., 2020)
Brown macroalga “ <i>Laminaria digitate</i> ”	Alkaline	NaOH (4% TS) at 20°C for 24 h. BMP for 35°C.	+18%	(Jard et al., 2013)
Red macroalgal residues	Acid	2.5% citric acid 120 °C; 1 h; 1 atm BMP at 35°C for 32 d.	+4%	(Vanegas et al., 2015)
Sewage sludge	Alkaline	KOH (5%) for 2 d and 25°C AD CSTR: HRT of 20 d at 37°C.	+20%	(Elalami et al., 2020b)
Waste activated sludge and olive pomace	Alkaline	5% of KOH for 2 d and 25°C AD CSTR: HRT of 20 d at 37°C. 5% of KOH for 2 d and 25°C on sludge alone. Codigestion ratio 1:1 (VS) AD CSTR: HRT of 20 d at 37°C.	+39%	
Waste activated sludge and olive pomace			+13%	In this study
Waste activated sludge and red macroalgal residues		5% of KOH for 2 d and 25°C Codigestion ratio 1:1 (VS) AD CSTR : HRT of 20 d at 37°C.	+15%	
			+49%	

Table 5 Properties of tomato plants grown on unfertilized soil (control) and with industrial fertilizer or different digestates. R1S (untreated sludge), R2S (pretreated sludge), R1 (sludge+olive pomace), R2 (pretreated sludge and olive pomace), R3 (pretreated mixture of sludge and olive pomace), R4 (sludge+macroalgal residues), R5 (pretreated sludge and macroalgal residue), R6 (pretreated mixture of sludge and macroalgal residue).

	R1S untreated TWAS	R2S TWASKOH	R1 TWAS:OP	R2 TWASKOH:OP	R3 (TWAS:OP)KOH	R4 TWAS:MAR	R5 TWASKOH:MAR	R6 (TWAS:MAR)KOH
Conductivity ($\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$)	645 \pm 1	1370 \pm 30	412 \pm 3	870 \pm 22	1070 \pm 35	482 \pm 26	684 \pm 26	921 \pm 28
pH	7.8 \pm 0.1	8.3 \pm 0.5	7.5 \pm 0.1	8.1 \pm 0.3	8.2 \pm 0.4	7.6 \pm 0.0	8.3 \pm 0.2	8.3 \pm 0.2
TS (%)	1.2 \pm 0.0	1.1 \pm 0.02	1.2 \pm 0.4	1.3 \pm 0.03	0.6 \pm 0.01	1.0 \pm 0.0	0.9 \pm 0.01	1.1 \pm 0.02
VS (%TS)	70.7 \pm 0.1	51 \pm 1.2	73.2 \pm 0.4	62 \pm 1.4	44.5 \pm 1.1	74.8 \pm 0.1	56.8 \pm 0.8	53.8 \pm 0.9
Ash (%TS)	29.3	49	26.8	38	55.5	25.2	43.2	46.2
Elemental analysis* (% TS)								
C	34.7 \pm 0.1	29.06 \pm 0.03	38.7 \pm 0.2	34.2 \pm 0.1	35.7 \pm 0.1	37.2 \pm 0.2	33.63 \pm 0.03	34.5 \pm 0.2
H	6.0 \pm 0.2	4.17 \pm 0.03	5.7 \pm 0.3	4.58 \pm 0.01	5.3 \pm 0.2	5.2 \pm 0.1	4.75 \pm 0.08	4.5 \pm 0.1
N	4.7 \pm 0.1	3.0 \pm 0.1	3.9 \pm 0.3	3.19 \pm 0.01	3.4 \pm 0.1	5.6 \pm 0.2	4.79 \pm 0.04	6.6 \pm 0.2
S	1.27 \pm 0.01	1.06 \pm 0.03	0.98 \pm 0.01	0.89 \pm 0.02	0.96 \pm 0.01	1.50 \pm 0.01	1.26 \pm 0.02	1.01 \pm 0.06
Van-Soest fractions (%TS)								
NDS	31 \pm 1	40 \pm 5	19 \pm 4	31 \pm 5	37 \pm 3	38 \pm 11	32 \pm 3	41 \pm 2
HEM	33 \pm 1	36 \pm 4	29 \pm 2	38 \pm 2	16 \pm 2	20 \pm 3	32 \pm 11	26 \pm 5
CEL	2 \pm 1	2 \pm 1	2 \pm 1	4 \pm 1	8 \pm 3	7 \pm 4	3.9 \pm 0.1	0.3 \pm 0.1
LIGN	26 \pm 1	15 \pm 3	41 \pm 2	21 \pm 4	35 \pm 4	29 \pm 3	25 \pm 3	28 \pm 3
Nutrients profile								
NH ₄ ⁺ (g N/kg TS)	21.2 \pm 0.1	37.4 \pm 1.5	10.8 \pm 2.8	16.7 \pm 0.9	39.5 \pm 2.3	15.6 \pm 0.6	28.6 \pm 2.1	25.3 \pm 1.7
TKN (gN/kg TS)	50.9 \pm 1.2	69.1 \pm 0.9	34.7 \pm 7.6	38.5 \pm 0.9	71.7 \pm 1.2	46.5 \pm 4.9	57.8 \pm 0.3	58.2 \pm 0.7
K (g K ₂ O/kg TS)	18.0 \pm 0.1	97.8 \pm 1.3	24.6 \pm 2.3	48.4 \pm 2.3	194.0 \pm 4.2	9.4 \pm 0.6	65.2 \pm 0.9	98.2 \pm 1.8
P (g P ₂ O ₅ /kg TS)	80.8 \pm 1.2	61.6 \pm 0.6	60.0 \pm 5.1	43.4 \pm 2.5	45.4 \pm 1.3	54.0 \pm 0.7	50.3 \pm 3.2	42.1 \pm 2.6

*Elemental analysis on the solid fraction of the digestate only. TS (total solids), VS (volatile solids), NDS (neutral detergent soluble), CEL (cellulose), HEM (hemicelluloses), LIGN (lignin), TKN (total Kjeldahl nitrogen).

Table 6 Properties of tomato plants from different seeding conditions. R1S (untreated sludge), R2S (pretreated sludge), R1 (sludge+olive pomace), R2 (pretreated sludge and olive pomace), R3 (pretreated mixture of sludge and olive pomace), R4 (sludge+macroalgal residues), R5 (pretreated sludge and macroalgal residue), R6 (pretreated mixture of sludge and macroalgal residue).

	C (%TS)	H (%TS)	N (%TS)	S (%TS)	Chlorophyll a ($\mu\text{g/gTS}$)	Chlorophyll b ($\mu\text{g/gTS}$)	Carotenoid ($\mu\text{g/gTS}$)
Control (soil)	35.8 \pm 0.2 ^a	5.19 \pm 0.01 ^a	1.14 \pm 0.02 ^a	0.77 \pm 0.02 ^a	48.8 \pm 9.9 ^b	22.2 \pm 13.2 ^a	13.9 \pm 2.1 ^a
Industrial fertilizer (100%)							
R1S	37.4 \pm 0.1 ^c	5.3 \pm 0.1 ^{ab}	2.17 \pm 0.05 ^c	0.74 \pm 0.05 ^a	90.4 \pm 2.2 ^d	27.8 \pm 2.0 ^a	23.6 \pm 3.5 ^{bc}
R2S	36.9 \pm 0.1 ^b	5.2 \pm 0.1 ^b	1.48 \pm 0.03 ^c	0.81 \pm 0.07 ^c	61.5 \pm 3.0 ^b	18.6 \pm 1.2 ^a	19.6 \pm 0.6 ^b
R1	35.2 \pm 0.1 ^b	5.04 \pm 0.03 ^{ab}	2.2 \pm 0.1 ^{ab}	1.12 \pm 0.02 ^a	78.7 \pm 3.2 ^d	21.7 \pm 1.5 ^a	23.9 \pm 1.8 ^c
R2	36.5 \pm 0.1 ^c	5.3 \pm 0.1 ^c	2.0 \pm 0.2 ^c	1 \pm 0.1 ^a	65.1 \pm 1.4 ^c	20.0 \pm 1.2 ^a	22.1 \pm 0.5 ^c
R3	37.7 \pm 0.1 ^b	5.4 \pm 0.1 ^c	2.0 \pm 0.1 ^b	0.8 \pm 0.04 ^b	67.0 \pm 3.0 ^c	20.0 \pm 0.9 ^a	22.3 \pm 0.4 ^c
R4	36.75 \pm 0.04 ^b	5.31 \pm 0.01 ^c	1.6 \pm 0.1 ^c	0.67 \pm 0.07 ^c	69.6 \pm 1.5 ^c	27.8 \pm 2.0 ^a	23.6 \pm 3.5 ^c
R5	35.9 \pm 0.03 ^a	5.03 \pm 0.02 ^c	2.1 \pm 0.2 ^a	0.81 \pm 0.08 ^a	21.1 \pm 0.5 ^a	21.4 \pm 0.7 ^a	23.1 \pm 1.1 ^c
R6	37.2 \pm 0.02 ^c	5.27 \pm 0.02 ^b	1.68 \pm 0.1 ^{ab}	0.713 \pm 0.03 ^{ab}	21.5 \pm 0.5 ^a	18.3 \pm 0.7 ^a	18.5 \pm 0.0 ^b

KOH pretreatment:
↗ CH₄ production

Plant growth after digestate application

