

# *Methylophilaceae* and *Hyphomicrobium* as target taxonomic groups in monitoring the function of methanol-fed denitrification biofilters in municipal wastewater treatment plants

Antti J. Rissanen<sup>1,2</sup> · Anne Ojala<sup>3,4</sup> · Tommi Fred<sup>5</sup> · Jyrki Toivonen<sup>6</sup> · Marja Tirola<sup>2</sup>

Received: 18 May 2016 / Accepted: 30 October 2016 / Published online: 8 November 2016  
© Society for Industrial Microbiology and Biotechnology 2016

**Abstract** Molecular monitoring of bacterial communities can explain and predict the stability of bioprocesses in varying physicochemical conditions. To study methanol-fed denitrification biofilters of municipal wastewater treatment plants, bacterial communities of two full-scale biofilters were compared through fingerprinting and sequencing of the 16S rRNA genes. Additionally, 16S rRNA gene fingerprinting was used for 10-week temporal monitoring of the bacterial community in one of the biofilters. Combining the data with previous study results, the family *Methylophilaceae* and genus *Hyphomicrobium* were determined as suitable target groups for monitoring. An increase in the relative abundance of *Hyphomicrobium*-related biomarkers occurred simultaneously with increases in water flow,  $\text{NO}_x^-$  load, and methanol addition, as well as a higher

denitrification rate, although the dominating biomarkers linked to *Methylophilaceae* showed an opposite pattern. The results indicate that during increased loading, stability of the bioprocess is maintained by selection of more efficient denitrifier populations, and this progress can be analyzed using simple molecular fingerprinting.

**Keywords** Methanol · Denitrification · Biofilter · *Hyphomicrobium* · *Methylophilaceae*

## Introduction

Denitrification is an essential biotechnological process in municipal wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) for reducing the nitrogen (N) load to recipient waters. This step-wise reduction of water-soluble nitrate ( $\text{NO}_3^-$ ) via nitrite ( $\text{NO}_2^-$ ) to gaseous nitric oxide (NO), nitrous oxide ( $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ ), and di-nitrogen ( $\text{N}_2$ ) is catalyzed by facultative anaerobic heterotrophic bacteria. Denitrification is a community process, as many denitrifiers perform only a portion of the reduction steps, reducing  $\text{NO}_3^-$  to  $\text{NO}_2^-$  or to  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ , and only some bacterial species are capable of the whole denitrification chain from  $\text{NO}_3^-$  to  $\text{N}_2$  gas [8]. Due to the unfavorably low carbon-to-nitrogen (C:N) ratio of the water in many N removal systems, an additional organic C and energy source, usually methanol, is used in the process. In WWTPs, methanol-fed denitrification is often accomplished by filtration of the wastewater through a support material in biofilters [17].

The physicochemical and technical aspects of the methanol-utilizing denitrification processes have been comprehensively characterized [17, 20]. However, the optimal control and operation of the processes would also benefit greatly from microbiological data [22, 39], such as the

**Electronic supplementary material** The online version of this article (doi:10.1007/s10295-016-1860-5) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

✉ Antti J. Rissanen  
antti.rissanen@tut.fi

<sup>1</sup> Department of Chemistry and Bioengineering, Tampere University of Technology, P.O. Box 541, 33101 Tampere, Finland

<sup>2</sup> Department of Biological and Environmental Science, University of Jyväskylä, P.O. Box 35, 40014 Jyväskylä, Finland

<sup>3</sup> Department of Environmental Sciences, University of Helsinki, P.O. Box 65, 00014 Helsinki, Finland

<sup>4</sup> Department of Forest Sciences, University of Helsinki, P.O. Box 27, 00014 Helsinki, Finland

<sup>5</sup> Helsinki Region Environmental Services Authority HSY, P.O. Box 100, 00066 Helsinki, Finland

<sup>6</sup> Salon Vesi, P.O. Box 77, 24101 Salo, Finland

**Table 1** Characteristics of the municipal wastewater treatment plants (WWTPA and WWTPB) and the studied methanol-fed denitrification biofilters

	WWTPA	WWTPB
Type/N removal	Biol.chem./pre- and postdenitr.	Biol.chem/postdenitr.
Population equivalent	740,000	31,000
Aver. flow rate (m <sup>3</sup> /day)	280,000	14,000
Annual aver. N-reduction (%) <sup>a</sup>	90	75
Annual <i>T</i> range (°C)	9–18	2–20
Number of denitr. filter cells	10	6
Bed volume (m <sup>3</sup> /filter cell)	432	56
Carrier material in filter cells	Polystyrene beads	Polystyrene beads
Aver. NO <sub>x</sub> <sup>-</sup> red. (mol/m <sup>3</sup> /d) <sup>b</sup>	44	63
Aver. NO <sub>x</sub> <sup>-</sup> red. (%) <sup>b</sup>	89	81
Aver. surface load (m/h) <sup>b</sup>	8.1	3.4
Aver. hydraulic retent. time (h) <sup>b</sup>	0.4	0.6

<sup>a</sup> Annual average relative N-reduction for the whole treatment process in WWTPs

<sup>b</sup> Average NO<sub>x</sub><sup>-</sup> reduction expressed per carrier material volume, average relative NO<sub>x</sub><sup>-</sup> reduction, average surface load, and average hydraulic retention time in the studied filter cell in WWTPA (study period 20 August 2008–31 October 2008) and in the whole biofilter system in WWTPB (study period 1 September 2008–31 October 2008)

identity and potential controlling factors of the taxonomic groups crucial for the system function, which could be used in process monitoring [22]. Methylo-trophs play a key role in methanol-fed denitrification systems, both by directly utilizing methanol as an electron donor in denitrification as well as by transforming methanol into various organic extracellular compounds, which are utilized by co-occurring non-methylo-trophic denitrifiers [22]. Of the known methylo-trophic denitrifiers, the genus *Hyphomicrobium* (*Alphaproteobacteria*) is frequently detected in methanol-fed denitrification systems [2, 6, 21, 27–29, 35, 38] and is thus considered a suitable target for monitoring methanol-fed denitrification [22]. In addition, bacteria within family *Methylophilaceae* (*Betaproteobacteria*) [10, 29, 33, 36] as well as within genera *Methyloversatilis* (*Betaproteobacteria*) [2] and *Paracoccus* (*Alphaproteobacteria*) [6, 21, 27] can also play a significant role in the process. However, most studies have been done at laboratory scale. Other than the studies of Neef et al. [27] and Lemmer et al. [21], which found *Paracoccus* and *Hyphomicrobium* to be important methylo-trophs in a methanol-fed denitrifying sand filter of a WWTP, very little is known about the overall bacterial dynamics or about the identity and community dynamics of methylo-trophic denitrifiers in full-scale biofilters. There are ecological differences between methylo-trophs and non-methylo-trophs [21]. In addition, the ecology of *Hyphomicrobium* differs from that of *Methyloversatilis* [2], *Paracoccus* [21], and *Methylophilaceae* [10]. This indicates that methylo-trophs and non-methylo-trophs as well as different taxonomic groups of methylo-trophs respond differently to the temporal and inter-system variations in the physico-chemical conditions confronted by the full-scale biofilters.

This study investigated the bacterial communities of two full-scale methanol-fed denitrifying WWTP biofilters by length heterogeneity PCR (LH-PCR) [37] and clone library and 454-pyrosequencing analysis of the 16S rRNA gene sequences. We specifically focused on the taxonomic groups of the methylo-trophic bacteria that inhabited both of the biofilters as well as previously studied systems. In addition to comparing the bacterial communities of the two biofilters, we analyzed the temporal variation in the structure of the bacterial communities and linked it with the physico-chemical and functional data during a 10-week follow-up period in one of the biofilters. We aimed to determine the following: (1) which methylo-trophic taxonomic groups are typical for methanol-fed denitrification systems and could thus be used as target taxonomic groups for monitoring the process function in full-scale WWTP biofilters; (2) whether variations in physico-chemical conditions affect the bacterial community structure; and (3) whether methylo-trophs and non-methylo-trophs as well as (4) different taxonomic groups of methylo-trophs respond differently to these variations.

## Materials and methods

### Microbiological sampling

Samples were collected from the methanol-fed denitrification filters of two municipal wastewater treatment plants: the Viikinmäki wastewater treatment plant in Helsinki, Finland (WWTPA), and the Salo wastewater treatment plant in Salo, Finland (WWTPB) (Table 1). WWTPA is a

large plant with one of the largest denitrification filter systems in the world, whereas WWTPB is a small-sized plant (Table 1). Methanol-fed denitrification filters have been functioning since 2004 and 2007 in WWTPA and WWTPB, respectively. In both sites, the denitrification is preceded by an aerobic stage (activated sludge) where nitrification occurs. The samples from the denitrification filter of WWTPA were collected from the same denitrification cell at 5- to 9-day intervals during a 10-week follow-up period (27 August 2008–28 October 2008). The samples from the denitrification filter of WWTPB were collected once (2 October 2008). In addition, samples from the inflow of the denitrification systems were collected once (from WWTPA 10 November 2008 and from WWTPB 2 October 2008).

The biofilter samples were taken from the backwash water channel. Backwashing consists of air-sparging and washing, which detaches biomass from the carrier material. Samples of the backwash water (1 sample per sampling date in WWTPA, 2 replicate samples in WWTPB) and polystyrene carrier material beads escaping from the WWTPB biofilter were collected into sterile 50 ml plastic containers. Bacteria in the inflow of the systems were collected by filtering 100–200 ml water using Sarstedt Filtropur S 0.2 polyethersulfone filters. The samples were stored at  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$  before further processing within 1–2 months.

### Background data and $\text{NO}_x^-$ reduction

Online monitoring data of the WWTPs were used as background data in this study. For WWTPA, water flow ( $W_f$ ), methanol addition rate ( $\text{Met}_f$ ), inflow and outflow concentrations of  $\text{NO}_3^- + \text{NO}_2^-$  (henceforth  $\text{NO}_x^-$  in and  $\text{NO}_x^-$  out, respectively) in the studied denitrification cell, as well as inflow temperature (T) and inflow concentrations of  $\text{O}_2$  ( $\text{O}_{2\text{in}}$ ), suspended solids ( $\text{SS}_{\text{in}}$ ),  $\text{PO}_4^{3-}$  ( $\text{PO}_4^{3-}$  in), total phosphorous ( $\text{TP}_{\text{in}}$ ), and outflow concentrations of SS ( $\text{SS}_{\text{out}}$ ),  $\text{PO}_4^{3-}$  ( $\text{PO}_4^{3-}$  out), and TP ( $\text{TP}_{\text{out}}$ ) in the whole denitrification system were measured hourly. Daily averages (for the time period 20 August 2008–31 October 2008) were then calculated. For WWTPB, daily averages (for the time period 1 September 2008–31 October 2008) for  $W_f$  and  $\text{Met}_f$  along with T,  $\text{NO}_x^-$  in,  $\text{PO}_4^{3-}$  in,  $\text{SS}_{\text{in}}$ , and  $\text{O}_{2\text{in}}$  and  $\text{NO}_x^-$  out,  $\text{PO}_4^{3-}$  out, and  $\text{SS}_{\text{out}}$  were calculated for the whole denitrification system. The  $\text{NO}_x^-$  load ( $\mu\text{mol s}^{-1}$ ) in the inflow ( ${}_L\text{NO}_x^-$  in) and outflow ( ${}_L\text{NO}_x^-$  out) water was calculated from  $W_f$  and  $\text{NO}_x^-$  in or  $\text{NO}_x^-$  out. Denitrification in the filters was calculated either as relative (%) or actual ( $\mu\text{mol s}^{-1}$ )  $\text{NO}_x^-$  reduction as follows:

$$\text{NO}_x^- \text{ reduction} = \frac{(\text{NO}_x^- \text{ in} - \text{NO}_x^- \text{ out})}{\text{NO}_x^- \text{ in}} \times 100$$

$$\text{Actual NO}_x^- \text{ reduction} = {}_L\text{NO}_x^- \text{ in} - {}_L\text{NO}_x^- \text{ out}$$

Denitrification in this study refers to the conversion of water-soluble  $\text{NO}_x^-$  into gaseous forms, but the proportions of NO,  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ , and  $\text{N}_2$  in the end product are not separated.

### Molecular microbiological analyses

DNA extraction of each sample—from 10 mg of freeze-dried backwash sample material from WWTPA and WWTPB, from five frozen carrier beads from WWTPB (sample WWTPB\_Car), and from the Filtropur filters containing the inflow water samples—was carried out as previously described [32].

For the LH-PCR analysis, PCR was performed using the universal bacterial primers F8 (5'-AGA GTT TGA TCM TGG CTC AG-3') (1:4 ird700-labelled) [41] and PRUN518r (5'-ATT ACC GCG GCT GCT GG-3') [26], with a GeneAmp PCR system 9600 (Perkin Elmer), in previously described reaction mixtures [31]. For the PCR reaction, the following program was used: an initial denaturation step at  $95^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 5 min, 30 cycles of amplification ( $94^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 30 s,  $53^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 1 min,  $72^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 3 min), and final elongation at  $72^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 15 min. The LH-PCR analysis was done as previously described [31]. The relative area (%), that is, the relative abundance of each LH-PCR peak was defined as a ratio of the total peak area (sum of the areas of all peaks) of the sample.

PCR for the clone library analyses of 16S rRNA was performed using the universal bacterial primers 27F (5'-AGAGTTTGATCMTGGCTCAG-3') [19] and 907R (5'-CCGTCAATTCMTTGGAGTTT-3') [13], and cloning and sequencing (Sanger sequencing) of the PCR amplicons was done as in Rissanen et al. [32]. For the clone libraries, PCR products of the samples from WWTPA on all sampling dates (WWTPA—library), PCR products of the replicate samples of backwash water (WWTPB—library), and the carrier materials of WWTPB (WWTPB\_Car—library) were pooled separately.

The bacterial communities of WWTPA were also studied via 454-pyrosequencing. Equal amounts of nucleic acid extracts from each sampling date were pooled before PCR reactions, and the PCR and sequencing was performed as previously described [32].

### Sequence analysis

The analysis of the clone library and 454-pyrosequencing library sequences was done as previously described [32]. Putative methylotrophic operational taxonomic units (OTUs) (97% identity threshold) were determined based on the previous literature [1, 2, 5, 10, 18, 27, 34, 35]. Clone library OTUs assigned to the methylotrophic families found from both biofilters (*Methylophilaceae* and *Hyphomicrobiaceae*) were subjected to phylogenetic tree analyses, as

described previously [32]. In addition, phylogenetic classification was linked to the LH-PCR peaks in silico using the length and taxonomical data obtained in the clone library analysis.

16S rRNA gene sequences of the clone libraries were deposited into the EMBL database (accession numbers KP098594—KP098735, KP098971—KP098975, and KP098985—KP098988). The 454-pyrosequencing data were deposited into the NCBI SRA database (SRX646346).

### Statistical analyses

Bray–Curtis dissimilarities among the samples were calculated from the relative abundances of the LH-PCR peaks. Temporal variations in the structure of the bacterial communities of WWTPA were then analyzed by non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMS) of the LH-PCR peak data. Changes in the WWTPA community structures were correlated with variations in the background parameters using Mantel's test. In addition, temporal variations in the relative abundances of the LH-PCR peaks affiliated with methylotrophs and non-methylotrophs were correlated with variations in the background parameters using either Pearson correlation analysis (for normally distributed variables, normality tested using the Shapiro–Wilk test) or Spearman's correlation analysis (for non-normally distributed variables). For background parameters, the average daily values for the time period between the two samplings were used in the correlation analyses. Temporal and inter-system variations in the community structures were also analyzed by hierarchical clustering (UPGMA linkage) using the LH-PCR data. The NMS analysis and Mantel's test were performed in PC-ORD 6.0 [24], and cluster analysis was done using PAST version 3.09 [11]. The correlation analyses were performed in PASW 18.0 (PASW Statistics 18, Release Version 18.0.0, SPSS, Inc., 2009, Chicago).

## Results

### Performance of the denitrification biofilters


As is typical for WWTPs in Northern countries in autumn,  $W_f$  increased and  $T$  decreased during the study period in both filter systems (Fig. 1, Online Resource 1).  $NO_{x\text{ in}}^-$  and  $O_{2\text{ in}}$  were generally higher and more variable in WWTPB ( $NO_{x\text{ in}}^-$ : 700–2900  $\mu\text{mol/L}$ ;  $O_{2\text{ in}}$ : 1–215  $\mu\text{mol/L}$ ) than in WWTPA ( $NO_{x\text{ in}}^-$ : 500–1000  $\mu\text{mol/L}$ ;  $O_{2\text{ in}}$ : 40–110  $\mu\text{mol/L}$ ). In addition,  $NO_{x\text{ in}}^-$  decreased in WWTPB and  $O_{2\text{ in}}$  in WWTPA during the study period (Fig. 1, Online Resource 1). The higher  $NO_{x\text{ in}}^-$  in WWTPB compared to WWTPA could be due to possible differences in the total N concentrations feeding the WWTPs, the nitrification

efficiency between WWTPA and WWTPB, or the lack of a pre-denitrification system in WWTPB (Table 1). In the filters,  $Met_f$  is controlled by a feedback loop that controls the  $NO_3\text{-N}$  concentration inside the filter cells [7]. As a result,  $Met_f$  followed  ${}_LNO_{x\text{ in}}^-$  tightly, and they both controlled the actual  $NO_{x\text{ in}}^-$  reduction rate ( $\mu\text{mol/s}$ ) in the systems (Fig. 1, Online Resource 1). This kept the C:N ratio in the inflow ( $Met_f:{}_LNO_{x\text{ in}}^-$  ratio), as well as the relative  $NO_{x\text{ in}}^-$  reduction and the  $NO_{x\text{ out}}^-$  concentration, relatively stable in both systems. However, the relative  $NO_{x\text{ in}}^-$  reduction and  $NO_{x\text{ out}}^-$  concentration were higher and lower, respectively, and temporally more stable, and  $Met_f:{}_LNO_{x\text{ in}}^-$  was lower in WWTPA ( $Met_f:{}_LNO_{x\text{ in}}^-$  ratio: 0.90–1.13; relative  $NO_{x\text{ in}}^-$  reduction: 82–93%;  $NO_{x\text{ out}}^-$ : 66–99  $\mu\text{mol/L}$ ) than in WWTPB ( $Met_f:{}_LNO_{x\text{ in}}^-$  ratio: 0.98–1.18; relative  $NO_{x\text{ in}}^-$  reduction: 64–90%;  $NO_{x\text{ out}}^-$ : 128–870  $\mu\text{mol/L}$ , when the exceptional values of 25 October were excluded) (Fig. 1, Online Resource 1). When estimated per carrier volume, the load of  $NO_{x\text{ in}}^-$ ,  $O_2$  and methanol feeding as well as the actual  $NO_{x\text{ in}}^-$  reduction rate were on average lower in WWTPA ( $NO_{x\text{ in}}^-$ : 570  $\mu\text{mol/m}^3/\text{s}$ ;  $O_2$ : 50  $\mu\text{mol/m}^3/\text{s}$ ; methanol: 590  $\mu\text{mol/m}^3/\text{s}$ ; actual  $NO_{x\text{ in}}^-$  reduction: 510  $\mu\text{mol/m}^3/\text{s}$ ) than in WWTPB ( $NO_{x\text{ in}}^-$ : 890  $\mu\text{mol/m}^3/\text{s}$ ;  $O_2$ : 60  $\mu\text{mol/m}^3/\text{s}$ ; methanol: 930  $\mu\text{mol/m}^3/\text{s}$ ; actual  $NO_{x\text{ in}}^-$  reduction: 730  $\mu\text{mol/m}^3/\text{s}$ ). The higher  $O_2$  load increases the requirement for electron donors for  $O_2$  reduction (to allow anaerobic conditions for denitrification), which explains the higher  $Met_f:{}_LNO_{x\text{ in}}^-$  ratio in WWTPB than in WWTPA. Furthermore, the average surface load was higher and the average hydraulic retention time (HRT) lower in the biofilter of WWTPA (Table 1).

### Differences in the bacterial community structures between the biofilters

Based on the UPGMA clustering of the LH-PCR data, conditions within the biofilters shaped the original bacterial communities (communities of the inflow water) in both WWTPA and WWTPB (Online Resource 2, 3). The bacterial communities of the WWTPA and WWTPB samples clustered separately (Table 2; Online Resource 2, 3), except for the carrier material of WWTPB, which more resembled the backwash water of WWTPA than that of WWTPB (Table 2, Online Resource 2).

Samples of the sheared biomass in the backwash water were used in comparing the methylotrophic communities between WWTPA and WWTPB. The relative abundance of putative methylotrophs was much higher in WWTPB than in WWTPA (Table 2). *Methylophilaceae* and *Hyphomicrobiaceae* were the dominant methylotrophic families that were found in both biofilters, whereas *Paracoccus* (*Rhodobacteraceae*) and *Methyloversatilis* (*Rhodocyclaceae*) were found only in WWTPB (Table 2; Figs. 2, 3). According to



**Fig. 1** NO<sub>x</sub><sup>-</sup> reduction, operating conditions, and microbial community dynamics in the denitrification filter of WWTPA (the 10-week follow-up period of microbial communities [27 August 2008–28 October 2008] is framed). **a** Temperature and the concentration of NO<sub>x</sub><sup>-</sup> and O<sub>2</sub> in the inflow, concentration of NO<sub>x</sub><sup>-</sup> in the outflow, and the relative NO<sub>x</sub><sup>-</sup> reduction. **b** NO<sub>x</sub><sup>-</sup> load in the inflow and outflow, actual NO<sub>x</sub><sup>-</sup> reduction rate, water flow, methanol addition rate, and methanol:NO<sub>x</sub><sup>-</sup> ratio in the inflow. **c** Results of non-metric multi-

dimensional scaling analysis of LH-PCR peak abundance data (1. axis shown, explaining 90% of the variability in community structure) and relative abundance of methylotrophs, *Hyphomicrobium* (peak 466 bp) and *Methylophilaceae* (peak 521 bp), as well as their sum as a biomarker of methylotrophs and the relative abundance of non-methylotrophs (sum of all peaks except 466, 521 and 524 bp) based on the LH-PCR peak data



**Table 2** Bacterial community composition (% of the 16S rRNA gene sequences) in the denitrifying biofilters of municipal wastewater treatment plants (WWTPA and WWTPB) based on clone library and 454-pyrosequencing analyses of the sheared biomass in backwash water and the biomass on carrier material (only in WWTPB)

		WWTPA	WWTPA (454) <sup>a</sup>	WWTPB	WWTPB_Car (carrier mat.)
Number of sequences:		45	3643	58	48
Frequency (%) <sup>b</sup>					
Total methylotrophs		33	28	74	38
<i>Alphaproteobacteria</i>		7	3	5	15
<i>Hyphomicrobiaceae</i>		7	2	2	10
<i>Hyphomicrobium</i> II <sup>c</sup>	Meth	7	2	2	10
<i>Methylocystaceae</i>	Meth	–	<0.1	–	–
<i>Rhodobacteraceae</i>		–	<0.2	3	–
<i>Paracoccus</i>	Meth	–	–	3	–
<i>Bradyrhizobiaceae</i>		–	<0.1	–	2
<i>Bradyrhizobium</i>	Meth	–	–	–	2
<i>Betaproteobacteria</i>		47	41	74	33
<i>Methylophilaceae</i>	Meth	26	25	66	26
Cluster Met I <sup>d</sup>	Meth	–	–	66	10
<i>Methylotenera</i> I <sup>d</sup>	Meth	22	25	–	6
<i>Methylotenera</i> II <sup>d</sup>	Meth	2	–	–	8
Unclassified <sup>d</sup>	Meth	2	–	–	2
<i>Rhodocyclaceae</i>		9	4	3	2
<i>Methyloversatilis</i>	Meth	–	–	3	–
<i>Comamonadaceae</i>		9	4	2	2
<i>Deltaproteobacteria</i>		9	10	3	–
<i>Epsilonproteobacteria</i>		–	<0.5	–	–
<i>Gammaproteobacteria</i>		–	3	2	2
<i>Moraxellaceae</i>		–	1	–	–
<i>Acinetobacter</i>	Meth	–	<0.1	–	–
<i>Methylococcaceae</i>	Meth	–	<0.2	–	–
<i>Acidobacteria</i>		–	1	–	15
<i>Actinobacteria</i>		–	1	2	8
<i>Bacteroidetes</i>		9	8	7	6
<i>Flavobacteriaceae</i>		–	1	–	–
<i>Flavobacterium</i>	Meth	–	1	–	–
<i>Chloroflexi</i>		11	2	2	–
<i>Deinococcus-Thermus</i>		2	<0.1	–	4
<i>Nitrospirae</i>		–	–	–	4
<i>Planctomycetes</i>		–	<0.5	–	8
Unclassified bacteria + others		15	30	5	5

Putative methylotrophic taxa are marked with Meth

<sup>a</sup> Library generated using 454—pyrosequencing


<sup>b</sup> Classification was made using RDP database in Mothur and by phylogenetic tree analysis (Figs. 2, 3). Assignment to methylotrophic function was based on previous literature. Frequencies are given as percentages (%) of total number of sequences in a sample

<sup>c</sup> Clustering (clusters I and II) of *Hyphomicrobium* according to Rainey et al. [30]. See also Fig. 2

<sup>d</sup> Clustering based on Fig. 3


the clone library analyses, *Hyphomicrobiaceae* had a much higher relative abundance in WWTPA than in WWTPB, whereas the opposite was observed for *Methylophilaceae*

(Table 2). In contrast to the backwash sample, the carrier material of WWTPB did not harbor *Paracoccus* or *Methyloversatilis*, but rather *Bradyrhizobium*. The carrier material



**Fig. 2** Phylogenetic tree (neighbor joining method) of the 16S rRNA gene clone libraries of the *Hyphomicrobiaceae* assigned operational taxonomic units (OTUs) (at 97% sequence similarity) in the studied denitrification filters. *Hyphomicrobium* clusters were previously

defined by Rainey et al. [30]. The numbers in brackets after the OTU number indicate the number of sequences within that OTU. The numbers at the nodes indicate the percentages of occurrence in 1000 bootstrapped trees (bootstrap values >50% are shown)



**Fig. 3** Phylogenetic tree (neighbor joining method) of the 16S rRNA gene clone libraries of the *Methylophilaceae* assigned OTUs. *Methylophilaceae* clusters were defined in this study (see tree details in the legend of Fig. 2)

of WWTPB also had a higher and lower relative abundance of *Hyphomicrobiaceae* and *Methylophilaceae*, respectively, than the backwash material of WWTPB (Table 2).

*Hyphomicrobiaceae* was represented by only 2 OTUs in the clone libraries. These OTUs belonged to *Hyphomicrobium* cluster II [30] (Table 2; Fig. 2). OTU 16 was shared between WWTPA and WWTPB. The other OTU, OTU 22, likely representing a different *Hyphomicrobium* species, was only found in the carrier material of WWTPB (Fig. 2), where it was more abundant than OTU 16. 454-pyrosequencing had a lower resolution for detecting *Hyphomicrobiaceae* than the clone library analysis (Table 2), but it showed 7 *Hyphomicrobiaceae* OTUs in WWTPA, of which the dominant one, harboring almost all (91%) of the *Hyphomicrobiaceae* sequences in the 454-pyrosequencing library, was identical to OTU 16 in the clone library (Fig. 2).

Bacteria within *Methylophilaceae*, consisting of ten OTUs, were divided into four groups (Table 2; Fig. 3). Three of the groups, that is, clusters Met I, *Methylotenera* I, and *Methylotenera* II (clustering according to this study), included eight OTUs covering the majority of the observed *Methylophilaceae* sequences (Table 2; Fig. 3). *Methylotenera* I and *Methylotenera* II were closely related to the cultured members of the genus *Methylotenera* (Fig. 3), while the Met I cluster probably represented a novel species of *Methylotenera* with no cultured representatives so far. The fourth group included two rare OTUs that were not closely affiliated to known *Methylophilaceae* genera (Table 2; Fig. 3). Strikingly, despite the high relative abundance of *Methylophilaceae*, the backwash material of WWTPB had only one *Methylophilaceae* OTU, and it belonged to cluster Met I (Fig. 3). Cluster Met I was also the most abundant group of *Methylophilaceae* in the carrier material of WWTPB, whereas it was absent in WWTPA (Table 2; Fig. 3). In contrast, clusters *Methylotenera* I and II were found in the backwash material of WWTPA and also in the carrier material of WWTPB (Table 2; Fig. 3). *Methylotenera* I was much more abundant than *Methylotenera* II in WWTPA, but it was only slightly less abundant than *Methylotenera* II in the carrier material of WWTPB (Table 2). 454-pyrosequencing found 6 *Methylophilaceae* OTUs in WWTPA, of which the dominant OTU, harboring almost all (99%) of the *Methylophilaceae* sequences in the 454-pyrosequencing library, was identical to *Methylotenera* OTU 6 (within cluster *Methylotenera* I) in the clone library analyses (Fig. 3). Furthermore, 454-pyrosequencing of 16S rRNA gene amplicons revealed a marginal abundance ( $\leq 1\%$  of 16S rRNA sequences) of the following putative methylotrophs: *Methylocystaceae*, *Methylococcaceae*, *Acinetobacter*, and *Flavobacterium* in WWTPA (Table 2). 454-pyrosequencing also resulted in a higher proportion of unclassified bacterial sequences than the clone library analysis (Table 2).

The abundant non-methylotrophic bacterial groups ( $\geq 5\%$  of 16S rRNA sequences in any of the libraries) included *Acidobacteria*, *Actinobacteria*, *Bacteroidetes* (other than *Flavobacterium*), *Chloroflexi*, *Comamonadaceae*, *Deltaproteobacteria*, *Planctomycetes*, and *Rhodocyclaceae* (other than *Methyloversatilis*) (Table 2).


### Temporal variation in the bacterial community in the WWTPA biofilter

The bacterial community structure changed over time (non-metric multidimensional scaling analysis, Fig. 1), along with a temporal change in several operational parameters (Fig. 1). The fluctuations in the community structure were correlated with variations in  $W_f$  (Mantel's test,  $r = 0.36$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $n = 10$ ),  ${}_{\text{L}}\text{NO}_x^-$  ( $r = 0.61$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $n = 10$ ),  $\text{Met}_f$  ( $r = 0.55$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $n = 10$ ), and T ( $r = 0.59$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $n = 10$ ). In addition, the community structure correlated with the actual  $\text{NO}_x^-$  reduction rate ( $r = 0.62$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ).

To study the variation of the methylotrophic taxa in WWTPA, the phylogenetic classification was linked to the LH-PCR peaks in silico using the length and taxonomic data obtained from the clone library analyses (Online Resource 3). All the clone library sequences with a size of 466 bp in the area amplifiable by LH-PCR primers belonged to OTU 16 within the *Hyphomicrobium* II cluster, and all the sequences of genus *Hyphomicrobium* had the size of this peak (see Fig. 2). The sequences assigned to *Methylophilaceae* were found only within peaks 521 bp and 524 bp, and they dominated only within peak 521 bp (73%), which was also the largest peak in the LH-PCR profiles of WWTPA (Online Resource 3). Peak 521 bp consisted mostly of OTU 6 within the *Methylotenera* I cluster (67%) and for the smaller part of the unclassified *Methylophilaceae* OTU 137 (6%) (see Fig. 3), *Burkholderiales* (13%), *Rhodocyclales* (7%, not *Methyloversatilis*), and *Bacteroidetes* (7%, not *Flavobacterium*). Thus, LH-PCR peaks 466 and 521 bp were chosen as biomarkers of *Hyphomicrobium* and *Methylophilaceae*, respectively. Furthermore, the sum of LH-PCR peaks 466 and 521 bp was used as a general biomarker for methylotrophs, whereas the sum of all peaks excluding methylotrophic peaks 466, 521, and 524 bp (see above) was used as a biomarker for non-methylotrophs.

During the study period, there was a negative correlation between the relative abundances of *Hyphomicrobium* and *Methylophilaceae* ( $r = -0.91$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) (Fig. 4). The relative abundance of *Hyphomicrobium* increased as  $\text{Met}_f$ ,  $W_f$ , and  ${}_{\text{L}}\text{NO}_x^-$  increased ( $\text{Met}_f$ :  $r = 0.74$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ;  $W_f$ :  $\rho = 0.67$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ;  ${}_{\text{L}}\text{NO}_x^-$ :  $r = 0.80$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $n = 10$ ) (Figs. 1, 4), while the opposite took place with *Methylophilaceae* ( $\text{Met}_f$ :  $r = -0.74$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ;  $W_f$ :  $\rho = -0.66$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ;  ${}_{\text{L}}\text{NO}_x^-$ :  $r = -0.77$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $n = 10$ ). The





**Fig. 4** Correlation between the relative abundance of the peaks assigned to **a** *Hyphomicrobium* (peak 466 bp) and *Methylophilaceae* (peak 521 bp) and **b** methylotrophs (sum of 466 and 521 bp) and non-methylotrophs (sum of all peaks except 466, 521, and 524 bp) in the length heterogeneity-PCR (LH-PCR) analysis of WWTPA samples during the 10-week monitoring period. Physicochemical and process

relative abundance of *Methylophilaceae* also increased as T increased ( $r = 0.67, p < 0.05, n = 10$ ), while there was no correlation between T and *Hyphomicrobium* ( $r = -0.62, p = 0.06, n = 10$ ) (Fig. 4). The relative abundance of total methylotrophs decreased as  $\text{Met}_f$  and  $\text{LNO}_{x\text{ in}}$  increased ( $\text{Met}_f: r = -0.73, p < 0.05; \text{LNO}_{x\text{ in}}: r = -0.77, p < 0.05, n = 10$ ) and T decreased ( $r = 0.67, p < 0.05$ ), while the opposite took place with non-methylotrophs ( $\text{Met}_f: r = 0.79, p < 0.05; \text{LNO}_{x\text{ in}}: r = 0.80, p < 0.05; T: r = -0.72, p < 0.05, n = 10$ ) (Fig. 4). An increase in the relative abundance of *Hyphomicrobium* ( $r = 0.77, p < 0.05, n = 10$ ) and non-methylotrophs ( $r = 0.80, p < 0.05, n = 10$ ) and a decrease in *Methylophilaceae* ( $r = -0.77, p < 0.05, n = 10$ ) and total methylotrophs ( $r = -0.76, p < 0.05, n = 10$ ) also occurred with the increase in the actual  $\text{NO}_x^-$  reduction rate (Figs. 1, 4).

### Discussion

Bacteria belonging to genus *Hyphomicrobium* inhabited both WWTP biofilters. This agrees with the results from many previous studies (e.g. [2, 27, 29]) indicating that bacteria in *Hyphomicrobium* are crucial for the function of methanol-utilizing denitrification processes. Moreover, this further confirms that *Hyphomicrobium* is a suitable target genus for monitoring denitrification in full-scale methanol-fed WWTP biofilters [23].

*Methylophilaceae* were also important components of the bacterial communities in both biofilters, which is in accordance with results from laboratory-scale methanol-fed denitrification systems [10, 29, 36]. In addition,

variables correlating ( $p < 0.05$ ) with the relative abundance of both groups in either **a** or **b**; the sign of the correlations are shown with *black-colored text* and *dashed-line arrow*, whereas those correlating only with one of the groups are shown as *gray-colored text* and *dashed-line arrow*

*Methylophilaceae* were abundant in pilot-scale activated sludge reactors during a period of high nitrate and methanol concentration [12] and in a full-scale, methanol-fed, activated sludge plant [33]. Since the first indication of the methylotrophic denitrification capability of *Methylophilaceae* was shown in 2004 [10], *Methylophilaceae* were not even targeted [*Methylophilaceae*-specific fluorescence in situ hybridized (FISH) probes were not used] in a previous study of a full-scale WWTP biofilter (a sand filter) [21, 27]. However, the addition of methanol led to enrichment of *Betaproteobacteria* in the biofilter [27], and it can be suggested that this was at least partially due to the growth of *Methylophilaceae*. Together, these results suggest that, besides *Hyphomicrobium*, bacteria belonging to *Methylophilaceae* are crucial for the function of methanol-utilizing denitrification processes. Furthermore, the results from the WWTPA and WWTPB biofilters and methanol-affected activated sludge systems [12, 33] indicate that, of the family *Methylophilaceae*, the bacteria belonging to genus *Methylotenera*, which includes species that couple methylotrophy to denitrification [16], can be important components of methanol-fed denitrification systems. In addition, many yet uncultivated species of *Methylotenera* probably also exist, as exemplified by the abundant Cluster Met I detected in WWTPB. However, *Methylobacillus* [29, 36] and *Methylophilus* [29] as well as another, thus far uncultivated *Methylophilaceae* genus [10] (Fig. 3) were determined to be the primary methanol-consuming *Methylophilaceae* in previous laboratory-scale studies of methanol-utilizing denitrification. Thus, *Methylophilaceae* can be used as a target family for monitoring denitrification in full-scale methanol-fed WWTP biofilters, although

there can be variation in the genera and species mediating the process between different systems.

The considerable differences between the bacterial communities within the biofilters and in the water feeding the biofilters indicate that prevailing physicochemical conditions are very strong determinants of the bacterial community structure inside the biofilters. A change in the primary C source from multicarbon sources (present in the feed water) to methanol can exert an especially strong structuring force on the bacterial communities [36]. We suggest that differences in the biofilter communities between WWTPA and WWTPB are mostly due to variations in physicochemical conditions, but the effect of variations in the original inocula (bacteria from preceding activated sludge stage) cannot be completely ruled out.

Many possible physicochemical factors might have affected the differences between the filters. The higher abundance of methylotrophs in WWTPB than in WWTPA could be explained by the higher availability of methanol (higher  $\text{Met}_{f:L}\text{NO}_x^-$  inflow and higher  $\text{Met}_f$  estimated per carrier volume). As a higher  $\text{O}_2$  load caused the higher  $\text{Met}_{f:L}\text{NO}_x^-$  inflow in WWTPB, the higher abundance of methylotrophs could be due to a higher contribution of aerobic methylotrophs and methylotrophs performing aerobic denitrification in WWTPB. Analogous to aerobic methane oxidation coupled with denitrification (AME-D) [43], these methylotrophs could have contributed to the overall denitrification performance by consuming  $\text{O}_2$  and by converting methanol to substrates utilizable by non-methylotrophic denitrifiers. However, higher HRT and lower surface load, which act through decreasing the input of bacteria (mostly non-methylotrophic) from the preceding activated sludge stage and through lowering the physical force exerted on the carrier material, might have also favored the growth and development of methylotrophs over non-methylotrophs in WWTPB.

Capable of aerobic denitrification, *Paracoccus* tolerates  $\text{O}_2$  better than *Hyphomicrobium*, which thrive in anoxic conditions, and thus *Paracoccus* were favored in the surface zones of the biofilm in a previously studied full-scale biofilter (a sand filter) [21]. This is in accordance with our results on the higher and lower relative abundance of *Paracoccus* and *Hyphomicrobium*, respectively, in the sheared biomass of the backwash water (representing more aerobic surface biofilm) than in the carrier material (representing deeper anoxic biofilm) in WWTPB. Similarly, the lower  $\text{O}_2$  load (as expressed per carrier volume) could explain the higher abundance of *Hyphomicrobium* and the absence of *Paracoccus* in WWTPA. Since some *Methylothera* strains are aerobic [3, 14] or perform aerobic denitrification [25], the higher abundance of *Methylophilaceae* in the sheared biomass than in the carrier material could also be due to differences in  $\text{O}_2$  availability. However, it could

also be due to differences in  $\text{NO}_x^-$  and methanol availability, which is expected to be higher in the biofilm surface. The results indicate that Cluster Met I, which was the sole *Methylophilaceae* group in the sheared biomass of WWTPB, was especially favored by the higher availability of  $\text{O}_2$ ,  $\text{NO}_x^-$ , and/or methanol. Therefore, the lower  $\text{O}_2$ ,  $\text{NO}_x^-$ , and methanol load (as expressed per carrier volume) could both explain the lower abundance of *Methylophilaceae* and the absence of Cluster Met I in WWTPA. However, as discussed below for the temporal variation in the bacterial community in WWTPA, the lower abundance of *Methylophilaceae* and higher abundance of *Hyphomicrobium* in WWTPA could also be due to a lower HRT and higher surface load, which could favor *Hyphomicrobium* over *Methylophilaceae*. In addition, as there are variations in the response of different *Hyphomicrobium* species to varying  $\text{NO}_3^-$  [23], the differential distribution of the two *Hyphomicrobium* species (OTUs) between the sheared biomass and carrier material in WWTPB was probably due to the decreased availability of  $\text{NO}_3^-$  deeper in the biofilm. Finally, *Methyloversatilis* and *Paracoccus* gain an ecological advantage by shifting between using C1-carbon and multicarbon substrates [2, 4, 34]. Their presence in WWTPB, but not in WWTPA, might also reflect higher temporal variation in the availability of methanol or higher and temporally more variable availability of other C sources (present in feed water or produced from methanol) in WWTPB.

In accordance with the results from the comparison of the biofilters, many possible physicochemical factors might have affected the temporal variation in the bacterial community structure within the WWTPA biofilter. The overall bacterial community structure changed due to variations in the availability of electron acceptors ( $\text{NO}_x^-$ ) and donors (methanol) as well as in temperature, which have also previously been shown to affect denitrifying communities [9, 40]. In addition, changes in the water flow, which act through changing the HRT and surface load, possibly affected the community structure. However, due to the covariation among these factors (Fig. 1) and the relatively small sample size, it is impossible to specify the effects of each variable. In contrast to explaining differences between the biofilters, the availability of  $\text{O}_2$  [the  $\text{O}_2$  concentration and the  $\text{O}_2$  flow ( $\mu\text{mol s}^{-1}$ ) (data not shown)] did not affect the temporal variation in the community structure in WWTPA.

Assigning taxonomies to the LH-PCR peaks allowed for analysis of the relationship between the physicochemical factors and bacterial communities at the level of major functional and methylotrophic groups. Methylotrophs and non-methylotrophs as well as the key methylotrophic groups, *Methylophilaceae* and *Hyphomicrobium*, responded differently to variations in the physicochemical

factors. Since the bulk of methylotrophs consisted of *Methylophilaceae* in every sampling occasion, the variation in the relative abundance of methylotrophs tightly followed that of *Methylophilaceae*.

The decrease in *Methylophilaceae* (and total methylotrophs) and increase in *Hyphomicrobium* and non-methylotrophs with increasing  $\text{NO}_x^-$  and methanol loads contrast with the above comparison between WWTPA and WWTPB. This discrepancy could be due to the dominant *Methylophilaceae* group in WWTPA, *Methylotenera* I, having a slower growth rate and a lesser response to increases in  $\text{NO}_x^-$  and methanol than the dominant group in WWTPB, Cluster Met I. However, differences in the water flow acting through changes in the HRT and surface load provide a more unifying explanation for the community variations both between the biofilters and within WWTPA. With an increased water flow (lowered HRT and increased surface load), the input of non-methylotrophic bacteria from the preceding activated sludge stage was increased, which could have lowered the relative abundance of *Methylophilaceae* (and total methylotrophs). Furthermore, increased physical disturbance due to increased water flow could have caused the selective removal of *Methylophilaceae*, which would further contribute to the decrease in methylotrophs as well as to the increase in *Hyphomicrobium*. *Prosthecae* and buds of *Hyphomicrobium* [42] might have provided firmer attachment to the carrier material than the flagellum and ‘prostheca-like’ structures of *Methylotenera* [15]. In addition, decreased temperature could have decreased the growth rate of *Methylophilaceae* (and total methylotrophs), which could have also contributed to the observed community variations.

Physicochemical factors can control microbial process rates both directly by affecting the short-term cell function and indirectly by affecting the microbial community structure in the longer term [40]. The correlation between the community structure and function (actual  $\text{NO}_x^-$  reduction rate) in the WWTPA biofilter suggests that physicochemical factors controlled the denitrification rate of the biofilter indirectly by modifying the community composition. However, this study cannot rule out the importance of direct control of physicochemical factors on cell function. The decrease in *Methylophilaceae* and total methylotrophs and increase in *Hyphomicrobium* and non-methylotrophs with an increasing actual  $\text{NO}_x^-$  reduction rate are surprising and contrast with the results from a laboratory reactor in which the relative abundance of *Methylophilaceae* increased and that of *Hyphomicrobium* did not change with increasing denitrification rate [10]. However, this discrepancy is probably due to differing expressions of the process rate, expressed as per biofilter or per volume of carrier material in our study and as per mass of biomass (mixed liquor volatile suspended solids [MLVSS]) in Ginje et al.

[10]. Unfortunately, MLVSS was not analyzed in this study. However, the higher actual  $\text{NO}_x^-$  reduction rate with an increasing relative abundance of non-methylotrophs suggests that non-methylotrophs can efficiently support the N removal of methanol-fed denitrification systems, especially during periods of high N load. In those conditions, methylotrophs might have increasingly allocated more of the methanol C into extracellular substances than into biomass and thus supported the activity of non-methylotrophs.

## Conclusions

Combining the results of the two WWTP biofilters with those of previous studies confirms that bacteria in genus *Hyphomicrobium* and family *Methylophilaceae* are crucial components of methanol-utilizing denitrification. Thus, *Hyphomicrobium* and *Methylophilaceae* can be used as target taxonomic groups to monitor the function of full-scale methanol-fed denitrification biofilters of WWTPs. Although *Methylotenera* was the major *Methylophilaceae* genus in the studied WWTP biofilters, other genera (*Methylophilus* and *Methylobacillus*) may be more important in other systems. There were differences in the bacterial communities between the biofilters. In addition, 10-week monitoring of one of the biofilters showed temporal variation in the bacterial community. Variation in the loads of  $\text{NO}_x^-$  and  $\text{O}_2$  as well as in the methanol addition rate, water flow rate (acting through changing HRT and surface load), and temperature were all potential candidates affecting the structure of the bacterial communities. Methylotrophs and non-methylotrophs as well as *Hyphomicrobium* and *Methylophilaceae* responded differently to these variations. Furthermore, the correlation of the bacterial community structure with the process function (actual  $\text{NO}_x^-$  reduction rate) in the temporally monitored biofilter indicates that fluctuating physicochemical conditions affected the denitrification rate indirectly by affecting the community composition. Further temporal monitoring and/or experimental studies combined with modern sophisticated culture-independent (stable isotope probing of DNA/RNA, metatranscriptomics, metagenomics) as well as culture-dependent (high-throughput culturing) techniques are needed to resolve the exact mechanisms underlying the observed relationship among the physicochemical factors, bacterial communities (methylotrophs, non-methylotrophs, *Hyphomicrobium*, and *Methylophilaceae*), and process function.

**Acknowledgements** We thank P. Lindholm, P. Lindell, L. Sundell, K. Murtonen, and M. Heinonen for technical assistance. We thank R. Kettunen for valuable comments on this manuscript. We also thank H. Devlin, B. Thamdrup, and S. Hallin for comments on the earlier version of this manuscript. This study was funded by Maa-ja Vesiteknii-kan Tuki ry for A.J.R and Academy of Finland (Projects 286642 and

140964 to A.J.R and 260797 to M.T.) as well as European Research Council (ERC) Consolidator Project 615146 to M.T.

### Compliance with ethical standards

**Conflict of interest** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

### References

- Bamforth CW, Quayle JR (1978) Aerobic and anaerobic growth of *Paracoccus denitrificans* on methanol. Arch Microbiol 119:91–97
- Baytshtok V, Lu H, Park H, Kim S, Yu R, Khandran K (2009) Impact of varying electron donors on the molecular microbial ecology and biokinetics of methylotrophic denitrifying bacteria. Biotechnol Bioeng 102:1527–1536
- Beck DAC, McTaggart TL, Setboonsarng U, Vorobev A, Kalyuzhnaya MG, Ivanova N, Goodwin L, Woyke T, Lidstrom ME, Chistoserdova L (2014) The expanded diversity of *Methylophilaceae* from Lake Washington through cultivation and genomic sequencing of novel ecotypes. PLoS One 9:e102458
- Błaszczak M (1993) Effect of medium composition on the denitrification of nitrate by *Paracoccus denitrificans*. Appl Environ Microbiol 59:3951–3953
- Chistoserdova L, Kalyuzhnaya MG, Lidstrom ME (2009) The expanding world of methylotrophic organisms. Annu Rev Microbiol 63:477–499
- Claus G, Kutzner HJ (1985) Denitrification of nitrate and nitric acid with methanol as carbon source. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol 22:378–381
- Corona F, Mulas M, Haimi H, Sundell L, Heinonen M, Vahala R (2013) Monitoring nitrate concentrations in the denitrifying post-filtration unit of a municipal wastewater treatment plant. J Process Contr 23:158–170
- Gentile ME, Nyman JL, Criddle CS (2007) Correlation of patterns of denitrification instability in replicated bioreactor communities with shifts in the relative abundance and the denitrification patterns of specific populations. ISME J 1:714–728
- Gentile M, Yan T, Tiquia SM, Fields MW, Nyman J, Zhou J, Criddle CS (2006) Stability in a denitrifying fluidized bed reactor. Microb Ecol 52:311–321
- Ginige MP, Hugenholtz P, Daims H, Wagner M, Keller J, Blackall LL (2004) Use of stable isotope-probing, full-cycle rRNA analysis, and fluorescence in situ hybridization-microautoradiography to study a methanol-fed denitrifying microbial community. Appl Environ Microbiol 70:588–596
- Hammer Ø, Harper DAT, Ryan PD (2001) PAST: paleontological statistics software package for education and data analysis. Palaeontol Electron 4(1):9
- Isazadeh S, Ozcer PO, Frigon D (2014) Microbial community structure of wastewater treatment subjected to high mortality rate due to ozonation of return activated sludge. J Appl Microbiol 117:587–596
- Johnson JL (1994) Similarity analysis of DNAs. In: Gerhardt P, Murray RGE, Wood WA, Krieg NR (eds) Methods for general and molecular bacteriology. American Society for Microbiology, Washington, DC, pp 655–682
- Kalyuzhnaya MG, Beck DA, Vorobev A, Smalley N, Kunkel DD, Lidstrom ME, Chistoserdova L (2012) Novel methylotrophic isolates from lake sediment, description of *Methylotenera versatilis* sp. nov. and emended description of the genus *Methylotenera*. Int J Syst Evol Micr 62:106–111
- Kalyuzhnaya MG, Boverman S, Lara JC, Lidstrom ME, Chistoserdova L (2006) *Methylotenera mobilis* gen. nov., sp. nov., an obligately methylamine-utilizing bacterium within the family *Methylophilaceae*. Int J Syst Evol Micr 56:2819–2823
- Kalyuzhnaya MG, Martens-Habbena W, Wang T, Hackett M, Stolyar SM, Stahl DA, Lidstrom ME, Chistoserdova L (2009) *Methylophilaceae* link methanol oxidation to denitrification in freshwater lake sediment as suggested by stable isotope probing and pure culture analysis. Environ Microbiol Reports 1:385–392
- Koch G, Siegrist H (1997) Denitrification with methanol in tertiary filtration. Water Res 31:3029–3038
- Kolb S (2009) Aerobic methanol-oxidizing *Bacteria* in soil. FEMS Microbiol Lett 300:1–10
- Lane DJ (1991) 16S/23S rRNA sequencing. In: Stackebrandt E, Goodfellow M (eds) Nucleic acid techniques in bacterial systematics. Wiley, New York, pp 115–175
- Lemmer H, Zaglauer A, Metzner G (1997) Denitrification in a methanol-fed fixed-bed reactor. Part 1: Physico-chemical and biological characterization. Water Res 31:1897–1902
- Lemmer H, Zaglauer A, Neef A, Meier H, Amann R (1997) Denitrification in a methanol-fed fixed-bed reactor. Part 2: Composition and ecology of the bacterial community in the biofilms. Water Res 31:1903–1908
- Lu H, Chandran K, Stensel D (2014) Microbial ecology of denitrification in biological wastewater treatment. Water Res 64:237–254
- Martineau C, Mauffrey F, Villemur R (2015) Comparative analysis of denitrifying activities of *Hyphomicrobium nitratorans*, *Hyphomicrobium denitrificans* and *Hyphomicrobium zavarzinii*. Appl Environ Microbiol 81:5003–5014
- McCune B, Mefford MJ (2011) PC-ORD. Multivariate analysis of ecological data. Version 6. MjM Software, Gleneden Beach, Oregon, USA
- Mustakhimov I, Kalyuzhnaya MG, Lidstrom ME, Chistoserdova L (2013) Insights into denitrification in *Methylotenera mobilis* from denitrification pathway and methanol metabolism mutants. J Bacteriol 195:2207–2211
- Muyzer G, Dewaal EC, Uitterlinden AG (1993) Profiling of complex microbial populations by denaturing gel electrophoresis of polymerase chain reaction amplified genes coding for 16S ribosomal RNA. Appl Environ Microbiol 59:695–700
- Neef A, Zaglauer A, Meier H, Amann R, Lemmer H, Schleifer K-H (1996) Population analysis in a denitrifying sand filter: Conventional and in situ identification of *Paracoccus* spp. in methanol-fed biofilms. Appl Environ Microbiol 62:4329–4339
- Nurse GR (1980) Denitrification with methanol: microbiology and biochemistry. Water Res 14:531–537
- Osaka T, Yoshie S, Tsuneda S, Hirata A, Iwami N, Inamori Y (2006) Identification of acetate- or methanol-assimilating bacteria under nitrate-reducing conditions by stable-isotope probing. Microb Ecol 52:253–266
- Rainey FA, Ward-Rainey N, Gliesche CG, Stackebrandt E (1998) Phylogenetic analysis and intragenetic structure of the genus and the related genus *Filomicrobium*. Int J Syst Bacteriol 48:635–639
- Rissanen AJ, Kurhela E, Aho T, Oittinen T, Tirola M (2010) Storage of environmental samples for guaranteeing nucleic acid yields for molecular microbiological studies. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol 88:977–984
- Rissanen AJ, Ojala A, Dernjatin M, Jaakkola J, Tirola M (2016) *Methylophaga* and *Hyphomicrobium* can be used as target genera in monitoring saline water methanol-utilizing denitrification. J Ind Microbiol Biot. doi:10.1007/s10295-016-1839-2
- Saunders AM, Albertsen M, Vollertsen J, Nielsen PH (2016) The activated sludge ecosystem contains a core community of abundant organisms. ISME J 10:11–20

34. Smalley NE, Taipale S, De Marco P, Doronina NV, Kyrpides N, Shapiro N, Woyke T, Kalyuzhnaya MG (2015) Functional and genomic diversity of methylotrophic *Rhodocyclaceae*: description of *Methyloversatilis discipulorum* sp. nov. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol* 65:2227–2233
35. Sperl GT, Hoare DS (1971) Denitrification with methanol: a selective enrichment for *Hyphomicrobium* species. *J Bacteriol* 108:733–736
36. Srinandan CS, D'souza G, Srivastava N, Nayak BB, Nerurkar AS (2012) Carbon sources influence the nitrate removal activity, community structure and biofilm architecture. *Bioresour Technol* 117:292–299
37. Suzuki M, Rappe MS, Giovannoni SJ (1998) Kinetic bias in estimates of coastal picoplankton community structure obtained by measurements of small-subunit rRNA gene PCR amplicon length heterogeneity. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 64:4522–4529
38. Timmermans P, Van Heute A (1983) Denitrification with methanol: Fundamental study of the growth and denitrification capacity of *Hyphomicrobium* sp. *Water Res* 17:1249–1255
39. Wagner M, Loy A, Nogueira R, Purkhold U, Lee N, Daims H (2002) Microbial community composition and function in wastewater treatment plants. *Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek* 81:665–680
40. Wallenstein MD, Myrold DD, Firestone M, Voytek M (2006) Environmental controls on denitrifying communities and denitrification rates: insights from molecular methods. *Ecol Appl* 16:2143–2152
41. Weisburg WG, Barns SM, Pelletier DA, Lane DJ (1991) 16S ribosomal DNA amplification for phylogenetic study. *J Bacteriol* 173:697–703
42. Wu X-L, Yu S-L, Gu J, Zhao G-F, Chi C-Q (2009) *Filomicrobium insigne* sp. nov., isolated from an oil-polluted saline soil. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol* 59:300–305
43. Zhu J, Wang Q, Yuan M, Tan GYA, Sun F, Wang C, Wu W, Lee PH (2016) Microbiology and potential applications of aerobic methane oxidation coupled to denitrification (AME-D) process: a review. *Water Res* 90:203–215