

**BIOLOGICAL SULPHATE REDUCTION USING  
LIGNOCELLULOSE HYDROLYSIS BY-PRODUCTS PRODUCED  
BY FUNGAL HYDROLYSIS OF *CENCHRUS CILIARIS* CV.  
MOLOPO (BUFFELSGRASS)**

by

**Stephanus Malherbe**

Submitted in the partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree

**Master of Science**

In the Faculty of Biological, Agricultural and Information Sciences  
Department of Microbiology and Plant Pathology  
University of Pretoria  
Pretoria  
South Africa

October 2000

*"Try not to become a man of success  
but rather a man of value."*

Albert Einstein

I certify that the thesis hereby submitted, and the work presented therein, to the University of Pretoria for the degree of M.Sc. has not been previously submitted by myself in respect of a degree at any other University.

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**BIOLOGICAL SULPHATE REDUCTION USING LIGNOCELLULOSE  
HYDROLYSIS BY-PRODUCTS PRODUCED BY FUNGAL HYDROLYSIS OF  
*CENCHRUS CILIARIS* CV. MOLOPO (BUFFELSGRASS)**

by

**STEPHANUS MALHERBE**

**Promoter** : Prof. T. E. Cloete  
**Department** : Microbiology and Plant Pathology  
**Degree** : M.Sc. (Microbiology)

**SUMMARY**

The biological treatment of acid mine drainage using sulphate reducing bacteria (SRB) is an alternative to chemical treatment. However, substrate availability normally becomes the limiting factor for sustaining sulphate reduction. Biological pretreatment of *Cenchrus ciliaris* cv. Molopo (Buffelsgrass) by white rot fungi was investigated to enhance the biodegradability of this lignocellulose substrate. *In vitro* dry matter digestibility was used to measure the effectiveness of fungal delignification. None of the treatments increased the digestibility of the natural substrate. Only *Pleurotus ostreatus* was capable of improving the initial digestibility of steam pasteurized grass by 7% over 6 weeks. A brown leachate was produced in all treatments over the experimental period. Literature indicated that such a leachate could contain inhibitors or stimulants of bacterial growth. An antimicrobial activity assay indicated that the leachate did not inhibit aerobic Gram negative or Gram positive bacteria. The effect of the leachate on sulphate reduction by SRB was investigated at 3% and 6% concentrations, using 3% preconditioned inoculum. Overall sulphate reduction varied from 27.7% to 44.9% and long-term sulphate reduction rates of 9.4 mg/l/d to 15 mg/l/d were observed. Sulphate removal efficiencies (in terms of mg SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup> reduced / mg COD consumed) of 27% to 52% were obtained. No biological sulphate reduction was observed in the control reactors. Reactors amended with 3% *P. ostreatus*, *S. commune* and *P. chrysosporium* leachate

performed better compared to other leachate treatments. Sulphate removal was comparable to literature values, but sulphate reduction rates were considerably lower in this study. Near-neutral pH was maintained in all leachate amended reactors, unlike the controls. Therefore, leachate buffering capacity could enhance SRB survival and consequently expedite biological sulphate reduction.

**BIOLOGIESE SULFAATREDUKSIE DEUR GEBRUIK TE MAAK VAN  
LIGNOSELLULOSE AFBRAAK PRODUKTE GEPRODUSEER VANAF DIE  
AFBRAAK VAN *CENCHRUS CILIARIS* CV. MOLOPO (BUFFELSGRAS)  
DEUR SWAMME**

deur

**STEPHANUS MALHERBE**

**Promotor** : Prof. T. E. Cloete  
**Departement** : Mikrobiologie en Plantpatologie  
**Graad** : M.Sc. (Mikrobiologie)

**OPSOMMING**

Die gebruik van sulfaatreducerende bakterieë vir die behandeling van suurmyn dreinerings is 'n alternatief tot chemiese behandeling. Volgehoute sulfaatreduksie word normaalweg beperk deur die beskikbaarheid van die substraat. Wit-vrot swamme is gebruik om die bioafbreekbaarheid van *Cenchrus ciliaris* cv. Molopo (Buffelsgras) te verbeter. Die effektiwiteit van lignien afbraak deur die wit-vrot swamme is gemeet in terme van *in vitro* droë materiaal verteerbaarheid. Geeneen van die behandelings kon die verteerbaarheid van natuurlike Buffelsgras verbeter nie. Die verteerbaarheid van stoom-gepasteuriseerde Buffelsgras is deur *Pleurotus ostreatus* met 7% oor 6 weke verbeter. Tydens die eksperimentele tydperk is 'n bruin vloeistof in al die reaktors geproduseer. Volgens die literatuur kon hierdie uitloogmateriaal chemiese verbindings bevat wat bakteriële groei inhibeer of stimuleer. 'n Filtreerpapierskyfie tegniek het getoon dat beide Gram negatiewe en Gram positiewe aerobe bakterieë nie deur die uitloogmateriaal geïnhibeer word nie. Die uitwerking van die uitloogmateriaal op biologiese sulfaatreduksie is ondersoek deur gebruik te maak van 3% of 6% van die uitloogmateriaal en 3% van 'n voorafbehandelde inokulum. Die totale sulfaatreduksie het gewissel tussen 27.7% en 44.9%, terwyl langtermyn sulfaatreduksie tempo's van 9.4 mg/l/d tot 15 mg/l/d aangeteken is. Die effektiwiteit van sulfaatverwydering (in terme van mg SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup> gereduseer / mg chemiese suurstofbehoefte verbruik) het gewissel

tussen 27% en 52%. Geen biologiese sulfaatreduksie het in die kontrole reaktors plaasgevind nie. In vergelyking met die kontrole reaktors, was die sulfaatreduksie beter in die reaktors met 3% uitloogmateriaal van *P. ostreatus*, *S. commune* en *P. chrysosporium*. Alhoewel die sulfaatreduksietempo's baie laag was, vergelyk die totale sulfaatreduksie goed met dié wat in die literatuur beskryf is. 'n Neutrale pH is nie in die kontrole reaktors gehandhaaf nie, maar wel in al die reaktors wat uitloogmateriaal bevat het. Dus kan die bufferkapasiteit van die lignosellulose uitloogmateriaal sulfaatreduserende bakterieë se oorlewingsvermoë verbeter en gevolglik biologiese sulfaatreduksie voorthelp.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

**I express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to the following persons:**

**Prof. T. E. Cloete**, Department of Microbiology and Plant Pathology, University of Pretoria, for giving me the opportunity to join this Innovation Fund project, and also for his guidance, insight and support. Thank you for being an example in many aspects of research and life.

**Mr. W. Pulles**, Managing Director of Pulles, Howard and De Lange (PHD), for funding this project and granting me the privilege to incorporate the research into my thesis.

The **Foundation for Research and Development, University of Pretoria** and **PHD** for financial support.

**Marcel Hattingh, René van Zyl, Celia Snyman** and **Jacques Maree** for technical assistance.

My **parents, grandparents and other family members** for their curiosity, support and prayers.

**Gerrit Huymans** and the **Doxa Deo home cell group** for their support, encouragement and praying. Regarding this project, more words were uttered in prayer than in conversation.

**Mariaan**, for all your help and encouragement. Thank you for always being optimistic when I was not. You are the light in my life.

At times it felt as if I was walking this road alone, but that was really the time when **You** were carrying me. Take my hand, and show me the future! May my dreams, inspired by **Your** grace and kindness, lead me to discovery...



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Summary</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Opsomming</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>Table of contents</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>List of abbreviations</b>	<b>xiv</b>
<b>List of figures and tables</b>	<b>xvii</b>
<b>Chapter 1</b>	
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter 2</b>	
<b>Literature review</b>	<b>9</b>
1. Lignocellulose composition	9
1.1 Chemical composition	9
1.2 Tertiary architecture of the lignocellulose matrix	12
1.3 Physical structure of grass cell walls	13
2. Degradation of plant organic matter in soil	14
2.1 Role of soil microfauna	15
2.2 Role of soil microflora	16
2.3 Humification processes	16
2.4 Kinetics of plant organic matter decomposition	18
2.4.1 First-order reaction kinetics	18
2.4.2 Decomposition kinetics	20
2.4.3 Modeling plant decomposition data	22
3. Cellulose and hemicellulose degradation	27
4. Microbiological degradation of lignin	29
4.1 Ecology of lignocellulose degradation	29
4.2 Fungal biodegradation of lignin	32

4.2.1	Patterns of wood decay	32
4.2.2	Lignin degrading enzymes	33
4.2.3	Biological pretreatment agents to be evaluated	34
4.3	Lignin biodegradation by actinomycetes	38
4.4	Bacterial lignin biodegradation	38
5.	Biodegradation of other plant components	39
5.1	Protein degradation	39
5.2	Lipid degradation	40
5.3	Nucleic acid degradation	41
6.	Inhibition of lignocellulose degradation	41
6.1	Physical barriers	41
6.2	Chemical recalcitrance	43
6.3	Interaction of lignocellulose degradation products with humic substances	44
7.	Toxic effect of lignocellulose degradation	45
7.1	Intrinsic substrate toxicity	45
7.2	Lignin-carbohydrate complexes	45
7.3	Lignin monomers and phenolic degradation intermediates	46
7.4	Other degradation products	48
8.	Role of natural consortia in lignocellulose degradation	48
8.1	Rumen	48
8.2	Termite hindgut	50
8.3	Anaerobic aquatic sediments	54
9.	Analysis of lignocellulose degradation	57
9.1	Acid-insoluble lignin	57
9.2	Detergent method for forage fiber analysis	58
9.3	Carbohydrate analysis	59
9.4	Spectroscopy	59
9.5	Chromatography	60
9.6	Microscopy	60
9.7	Digestibility	61
9.8	Fungal biomass estimations on decomposing lignocellulose	62
9.9	Monitoring lignin degradation using radioisotope-labeled lignins	63

9.10 Enzyme activities and the release of enzyme end-products	63
10. Industrial exploitation of lignocellulose biodegradation	64
10.1 Solid-state fermentation technology	64
10.1.1 Unique features of SSF	64
10.1.2 Advantages and disadvantages of SSF	66
10.1.3 Ecophysical requirements for biological delignification	67
10.1.4 Kinetics of SSF	72
10.1.5 SSF bioreactor configurations	73
10.1.6 SSF bioreactor design considerations	85
10.2 Silage manufacturing	86
10.2.1 Role of plant enzymes	87
10.2.2 Role of microorganisms	87
10.2.3 Loss of nutrients during silage manufacture	88
10.3 Biopulping	89
11. References	90

### Chapter 3

#### **Biological pretreatment of *Cenchrus ciliaris* cv. Molopo for use in the passive treatment of mine water**

1. Introduction	107
2. Materials and Methods	110
2.1 Fungal strains	110
2.2 Substrate preparation	110
2.3 Preparation of fungal inocula and experimental setup	110
2.3.1 Preparation of pre-inoculum	110
2.3.2 Preparation of large-scale inoculum	111
2.4 Substrate inoculation	111
2.5 Sampling	112
2.6 Physical and chemical analyses	114
2.6.1 Dry mass loss	114
2.6.2 pH	114

2.6.3 <i>In vitro</i> dry matter digestibility	114
2.7 Microbiological analysis	115
3. Results	116
3.1 Physical and chemical analyses	116
3.2 Microbiological analysis	126
4. Discussion	133
4.1 Influence of biological pretreatment on digestibility of Buffelsgrass	133
4.2 The effect of substrate particle size on Buffelsgrass degradation	133
4.3 The influence of pH on the Buffelsgrass digestibility	134
4.4 Microbiology of Buffelsgrass degradation	135
4.5 Leachate origin and significance	137
5. Conclusions	138
6. References	140

## Chapter 4

### **Sulphate reduction using fungal hydrolysis by-products (leachate) of *Cenchrus ciliaris* cv. Molopo (Buffelsgrass)**

1. Introduction	146
1.1 The carbon source dilemma	146
1.2 Lignocellulose leachate: characteristics and significance	147
1.3 Objectives	149
2. Materials and Methods	151
2.1 Leachate antimicrobial activity assay	151
2.2 Preparation of inoculum	152
2.3 Leachate origin and application strategy	153
2.4 Leachate amended experiments	153
2.5 Physical and chemical analyses	154
2.6 Microbiological analyses	154
3. Results	155
3.1 Leachate antimicrobial activity	155
3.2 Vitality of inoculum	155

3.3 Leachate amended experiments	156
4. Discussion	179
4.1 Process performance	179
4.2 Characteristics of organic COD	180
4.3 Implications of leachate buffering capacity	183
5. Conclusions	183
6. References	185
<b>Chapter 5</b>	
<b>General conclusions</b>	<b>191</b>

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

$\alpha$	alpha
$\beta$	beta
ADF	acid detergent fiber
AMD	acid mine drainage
APHA	American Public Health Association
APPL	acid-precipitable polymeric lignin
ATP	adenosine triphosphate
AWWA	American Water Works Association
BOD <sub>5</sub>	5 day biochemical oxygen demand
cfu	colony forming units
cfu/ml	colony forming units per milliliter
cm	centimeter
COD	chemical oxygen demand
CoA	coenzyme A
CSL	corn steep liquor
cv.	cultivar
d	days
°C	degrees Celsius
dH <sub>2</sub> O	distilled water
EMP	Embden-Meyerhof-Parnas
FNC	fine natural control
FNPc	fine natural <i>Phanerochaete chrysosporium</i>
FNPo	fine natural <i>Pleurotus ostreatus</i>
FNSc	fine natural <i>Schizophyllum commune</i>
g	gram
g/l	gram per liter
h	hour
HPLC	high performance liquid chromatography
INRA	Institut de la Recherche Agronomique
IR	infrared

IVD	<i>in vitro</i> digestibility
IVDMD	<i>in vitro</i> dry matter digestibility
IVRD	<i>in vitro</i> rumen digestibility
<i>k</i>	specific rate constant
LCCs	lignin-carbohydrate complexes
LiP	lignin peroxidase
l	liter
ME	malt extract
Mn	manganese
MnP	manganese-dependent peroxidase
$\mu\text{g}\cdot\text{g}^{-1}$	microgram per gram
$\mu\text{m}$	micrometer
mg/l	milligram per liter
mg/l/d	milligram per liter per day
ml	milliliter
ml/l	milliliter per liter
mm	millimeter
min	minutes
M	molar
NDF	neutral detergent fiber
NMR	nuclear magnetic resonance
<i>o</i>	ortho
<i>p</i>	para
<i>P. chryso</i>	<i>Phanerochaete chrysosporium</i>
PCP	pentachlorophenol
%	percent
rpm	revolutions per minute
s	seconds
SEM	scanning electron microscopy
SF	submerged fermentation
spp.	species
SRB	sulphate reducing bacteria

SSF	solid-state fermentation
TAPC	total anaerobic plate count
TCA	tricarboxylic acid cycle
TEM	transmission electron microscopy
UV	ultraviolet
V	volt
WPCF	Water Pollution Control Federation



## LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

### List of Figures

<b>Figure 1.1</b>	Effects of acidity originating from AMD in river systems.	4
<b>Figure 1.2</b>	Effects of heavy metals originating from AMD in river systems.	5
<b>Figure 1.3</b>	The major effects of AMD on a river system.	6
<b>Figure 2.1</b>	Structure of cellulose showing $\alpha$ -1,4-linkages.	10
<b>Figure 2.2</b>	Schematic representation of xylan hemicellulose.	10
<b>Figure 2.3</b>	Hydroxycinnamyl alcohol subunits of lignin.	10
<b>Figure 2.4</b>	General structural formula of a softwood lignin.	12
<b>Figure 2.5</b>	Incorporation of ferulic acid into cell wall matrices via attachment to structural polysaccharides.	13
<b>Figure 2.6</b>	Distribution of <i>Cenchrus ciliaris</i> (Buffelsgras) in Southern Africa.	14
<b>Figure 2.7</b>	Comparative biomass and CO <sub>2</sub> flux for the microflora and fauna decomposers in forest litter.	15
<b>Figure 2.8</b>	First-order function $A = 10e^{-0.5t}$ , plotted on linear, log <sub>10</sub> and ln scales.	20
<b>Figure 2.9</b>	Decomposition of uniformly labeled ryegrass incubated in soil in the field.	21
<b>Figure 2.10</b>	Model describing decomposition of carbon in plant residues and the turnover of soil organic matter constituents.	23
<b>Figure 2.11</b>	Decomposition of straw carbon ( C ) in the laboratory, plotted as a series of first-order reactions after correction for microbial production.	24
<b>Figure 2.12</b>	Principle component analysis (PCA) of wheat straw solid state fermentation.	26
<b>Figure 2.13</b>	Schematic representation of the degradation of a cellulose chain.	28

<b>Figure 2.14</b>	The Embden-Meyerhof-Parnas (EMP) catabolic pathway of glycolysis .	30
<b>Figure 2.15</b>	The tricarboxylic acid (TCA) cycle (also known as the Krebs cycle) and the abbreviated terminal respiration system.	31
<b>Figure 2.16</b>	General catabolic pathway for the degradation of fatty acids by microorganisms.	40
<b>Figure 2.17</b>	Enlargement of sclerenchyma fiber at the broken end showing progressive digestion fronts adjacent to bacteria.	42
<b>Figure 2.18</b>	A simplified scheme depicting the degradation of glucose in the rumen to organic acids and methane gas.	49
<b>Figure 2.19</b>	Proposed working model for symbiotic wood polysaccharide dissimilation in <i>R. flavipes</i> .	52
<b>Figure 2.20</b>	Suggested roles of sulphate reducing bacteria in the termite gut.	53
<b>Figure 2.21</b>	Radial profiles of oxygen and hydrogen partial pressure in the agarose-embedded hindgut of the woodfeeding termite <i>R. flavipes</i> .	54
<b>Figure 2.22</b>	Degradation and cycling of organic matter in sediments.	56
<b>Figure 2.23</b>	Effect of sterilization and inoculation with <i>P. tremelosa</i> on CO <sub>2</sub> evolution from early stages of solid state fermentation of aspen wood.	71
<b>Figure 2.24</b>	Schematic representation of a koji-making apparatus.	74
<b>Figure 2.25</b>	Rotary drum-type koji-making apparatus.	74
<b>Figure 2.26</b>	Chip pile-based system process flow sheet.	76
<b>Figure 2.27</b>	Packed bed reactor process flow sheet.	77
<b>Figure 2.28</b>	Schematic diagram of the multi-layer packed-bed reactor system.	78
<b>Figure 2.29</b>	Schematic diagram of the spouted-bed bioreactor.	79
<b>Figure 2.30</b>	Schematic diagram of the prepilot reactors.	80
<b>Figure 2.31</b>	Schematic diagram of the pilot plant.	81
<b>Figure 2.32</b>	Agitated vessels used for lignin and manganese peroxidases production by <i>Phanerochaete chrysosporium</i> .	82

<b>Figure 2.33</b>	Fermentation equipment used for comparing SSF with submerged fermentation.	84
<b>Figure 3.1</b>	Completed plastic tubing reactor constructed for the biological pretreatment of Buffelsgrass.	112
<b>Figure 3.2</b>	Allocation of analyses to individual reactors per reactor set.	113
<b>Figure 3.3</b>	Influence of different treatments on solid state fermentation of fine natural grass as described by dry mass loss, corrected digestibility, digestibility of the remaining residue, and pH.	118
<b>Figure 3.4</b>	Influence of different treatments on solid state fermentation of medium natural grass as described by dry mass loss, corrected digestibility, digestibility of the remaining residue, and pH.	120
<b>Figure 3.5</b>	Influence of different treatments on solid state fermentation of uncut natural grass as described by dry mass loss, corrected digestibility, digestibility of the remaining residue, and pH.	123
<b>Figure 3.6</b>	Influence of different treatments on solid state fermentation of steamed grass as described by dry mass loss, corrected digestibility, digestibility of the remaining residue, and pH.	125
<b>Figure 3.7</b>	Schematic representation of the fungal community structure showing dominant fungi present on decaying grass.	127
<b>Figure 3.8</b>	Light microscope images of some of the dominant fungi isolated from the decaying plant material.	129
<b>Figure 3.9</b>	<i>Coprinus</i> spp. mushrooms on uncut natural grass inoculated with <i>P. ostreatus</i> (week 5).	130
<b>Figure 3.10</b>	Scanning electron microscope images of control (autoclaved) and uncut natural grass treatments.	131
<b>Figure 3.11</b>	Scanning electron micrographs of fine steamed grass inoculated with <i>S. commune</i> .	132
<b>Figure 4.1</b>	Summary of the experimental layout for evaluating sulphate reduction using the leachate as carbon source.	150

<b>Figure 4.2</b>	Antimicrobial activity assay for leachates derived from different weeks of fine natural grass treatments.	156
<b>Figure 4.3</b>	Change in chemical parameters monitored during inoculum preparation.	158
<b>Figure 4.4</b>	Development of microbial population structure during inoculum preparation.	159
<b>Figure 4.5</b>	Comparison of the reactor that received 3% leachate (left) with the control reactor (right).	160
<b>Figure 4.6</b>	Comparison of pH values and specific sulphate reduction rates between sampling events for leachate-free controls, natural and <i>P. ostreatus</i> leachate treatments.	162
<b>Figure 4.7</b>	Comparison of pH values and specific sulphate reduction rates between sampling events for <i>S. commune</i> leachate treatments.	163
<b>Figure 4.8</b>	Comparison of pH values and specific sulphate reduction rates between sampling events for <i>P. chrysosporium</i> leachate treatments.	164
<b>Figure 4.9</b>	Diauxic growth of <i>E. coli</i> .	166
<b>Figure 4.10</b>	Comparison of BOD <sub>5</sub> results from the control, and natural and <i>P. ostreatus</i> leachate treatments.	167
<b>Figure 4.11</b>	Comparison of BOD <sub>5</sub> results from the <i>S. commune</i> leachate treatments.	168
<b>Figure 4.12</b>	Comparison of BOD <sub>5</sub> results from the <i>P. chrysosporium</i> leachate treatments.	169
<b>Figure 4.13</b>	Relationship between observed sulphate reduction and theoretical FeS/H <sub>2</sub> S accumulation for the controls, and natural and <i>P. ostreatus</i> leachates.	171
<b>Figure 4.14</b>	Relationship between observed sulphate reduction and theoretical FeS/H <sub>2</sub> S accumulation for the <i>S. commune</i> leachates.	172
<b>Figure 4.15</b>	Relationship between observed sulphate reduction and theoretical FeS/H <sub>2</sub> S accumulation for the <i>P. chrysosporium</i> leachates.	173

<b>Figure 4.16</b>	Change in microbiological parameters of leachate-free controls, natural and <i>P. ostreatus</i> leachate treatments.	175
<b>Figure 4.17</b>	Change in microbiological parameters of <i>S. commune</i> leachate treatments.	176
<b>Figure 4.18</b>	Change in microbiological parameters of <i>P. chrysosporium</i> leachate treatments.	177

### List of Tables

<b>Table 2.1</b>	Typical chemical composition of various lignocellulosic materials.	10
<b>Table 2.2</b>	Role of soil microfauna in mineralization of plant material.	16
<b>Table 2.3</b>	Pool sizes, decomposition rates, and efficiency of microbial production.	24
<b>Table 2.4</b>	Organic compounds present in wet sediments.	55
<b>Table 2.5</b>	Major advantages and disadvantages of the 72% H <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> or Klason procedure.	58
<b>Table 2.6</b>	Significance of enzymatic activities monitored to characterize lignocellulose degradation.	64
<b>Table 4.1</b>	Defined and undefined carbon sources evaluated for use in AMD treatment systems.	147
<b>Table 4.2</b>	Pretreatment methods evaluated to determine the best leachate sterilization procedure.	151
<b>Table 4.3</b>	Chemical composition of artificial acid mine drainage.	152
<b>Table 4.4</b>	Leachate application strategy.	153
<b>Table 4.5</b>	Composition and preparation of modified Postgate's medium B for the enumeration of sulphate reducing bacteria (SRB).	155
<b>Table 4.6</b>	Chemical and microbiological results from preliminary drip bag experiment evaluating effectiveness of inoculum in the presence and absence of leachate.	160

<b>Table 4.7</b>	Overall sulphate removal efficiencies for leachate amended treatments after 70 d.	165
<b>Table 4.8</b>	Efficiency of biological sulphate removal process based on lignocelluloseleachate carbon source.	178
<b>Table 4.9</b>	Examples of defined and undefined carbon sources evaluated for use in active or passive AMD treatment systems.	181
<b>Table 4.10</b>	Summary of results obtained from AMD treatment experiments using undefined carbon sources.	182