APPENDIX

Manuscript Title: Estimating Microbial Hydrogen Consumption in Hydrogen Storage in Porous Media as a Basis for Site Selection

Authors: Eike Marie Thaysen, Sean McMahon, Gion Strobel, Ian Butler, Bryne Ngwenya, Niklas Heinemann, Mark Wilkinson, Ali Hassanpouryouzband, Chris McDermott, Katriona Edlmann

Number of pages: 13

Number of figures: 1

Number of tables: 4

Number of texts: 3



Figure. A.1. H₂ solubility as a function of temperature at 0.1 MPa (a) and of temperature and pressure (b) and (c).

Table A.1. Laboratory studies investigating homoacetogenesis. Studies in bold were used for the calculation of H2 consumption in the depletedoil and gas fields. State constant for H2 turnover; $^{\diamond}$ Km = Michaelis Menten kinetics, Ks = Monod kinetics, V_{max}= maximum reaction rate.

				H ₂ -cons	suming proc	ess: homoaceto	genesis				
Species of bacteria/ archaea (growth stage)	Time	рН	Temp. (°C)	Exposure [H ₂] in air (%) (pressure; Mpa)	Exposure [H ₂] in water (µg L ⁻¹)	H2 consumption (nm H2 h ⁻¹)	Biomass growth)	k \$ (h-1)	Km or Ks [◊] (μM)	Vmax (h ⁻¹)	Ref.
NA (steady state)	242 d	inlet: 8.7 outlet: 9.6- 11.8	20 ± 2	200-1500 (0.2- 1.5 MPa, with H ₂ replenishment)	~2000- 10000	~1.7-1.9*10 ⁵	0	0.03±.006	0.01 Ks	0.5±0.2	[1]
Butyribacterium methylotrophicum (growing)	2 d	7.2- 7.4	37	64 (0.1 MPa, without H2 replenishment)	NA	2.03- 5.01*10 ⁵	1.55- 1.85 g mol ⁻¹ H2	0.02- 0.037	NA	NA	[2]
Sporomusa termida (growing)	2.4 d (1 day lag phase)	7.2	30	80 (0.1 MPa, without H ₂ replenishment)	NA	0.2-2.7*10 ⁵	0.0039- 0.0138 g protein L ⁻¹ day ⁻¹	0.09	6 Km	NA	[3]
Acetobacterium psammolithicum (growing)	15 d	6.8- 7.9	30	80 (0.2 MPa, no H ₂ replenishment)	NA	0.7-2.1*10 ⁵	NA	NA	NA	NA	[4]
Acetobacterium woodi (steady state)	119 d	7	30	80 (0.1 MPa, with H ₂ replenishment)	1100	NA	1.7 g mol ⁻¹ H ₂	0.024	NA	NA	[5]

Table A.2. Laboratory studies investigating methanogenesis. Studies in bold were used for the calculation of H₂ consumption in the depleted oil and gas fields. ⁽⁶⁾ Rate constant for H₂ turnover; ⁽⁶⁾ Km= Michaelis Menten kinetics, Ks= Monod kinetics, V_{max}= maximum reaction rate; ^{χ} calculated based on reaction 3, the composition of methanogenic cells, their production of biomass and their assimilation of C [6]. Resting cells are cells that do not divide nor respire or respire and divide at reduced rate.

				H2-consu	ming process	: methanogenesis	5				
Species of bacteria/ archaea (growth stage)	Time	рН	Temp. (°C)	Exposure [H2] in air (%) (pressure; MPa)	Exposure [H2] in water (μg L ⁻¹)	H ₂ consumption	Biomass growth	k ∜ (h⁻ ¹)	Km or Ks [◊] (μM)	V _{max}	Ref
<i>Methanospirillum hungatei JF-1</i> (resting)	7-10 h	6.7	37	80 (0.25 MPa, no H2 replenishment)	24-42	2001-2382 nM h ⁻¹	0.16-0.24 g protein mole ⁻¹ H ₂	NA	NA	NA	[7]
<i>Methanospirillum hungatei JF-1</i> (growing)	47-48 h	6.7	37	80 (0.25 MPa, no H2 replenishment)	85-93	852-874 nM h ⁻¹	NA	0.052- 0.054	5.8-7.3 Ks	140 nmol H ₂ mg protein ⁻¹ min ⁻¹	[7]
Methanobacterium bryantii (growing)	8 d	7.3	37	80 (0.1 MPa, with H2 replenishment)	33-105	1.9-7.7*10 ⁴ nM h ⁻¹	5.2-6.4 mg protein day ⁻¹	0.03	18 Ks	2- 3.2 mol H ₂ g ⁻¹ cells day ⁻¹	[8]
NA	12-29 d	NA	15	9-10 (0.1 MPa, without H ₂ replenishment)	NA	9.9*10 ⁴ nM h ⁻¹	NA	NA	NA	NA	[9]
<i>mixed culture</i> (growing)	6 h	7	35	NA	61	21-58*10 ⁴ nM h ⁻¹	NA	NA	1.0±0.18 Ks	NA	[10]
Methanocaldococcus jannaschii (growing)	NA	6	82	~87 (0.1 MPa, no H ₂ replenishment)	80-83	$\begin{array}{l} \text{4.446 mol } \text{H}_2 \\ \text{mole}^{\text{-1}} \ \text{CH}_4 ^{\chi} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.5\pm0.1^{*}10^{12}\\ \text{cells mole}^{\text{-1}}\\ \text{CH}_4 \end{array}$	NA	NA	$496\pm 21 \text{ fmol}$ CH ₄ cell ⁻¹ h ⁻¹	[11]
Methanocaldococcus jannaschii (growing)	NA	6	82	~2 (0.1 MPa, no H ₂ replenishment)	15-27	$\begin{array}{l} \text{4.446 mol } \text{H}_2 \\ \text{mole}^{\text{-1}} \ \text{CH}_4 ^{\chi} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.1\pm0.2^{*}10^{12}\\ \text{cells mole}^{\text{-1}}\\ \text{CH}_4 \end{array}$	NA	NA	$\begin{array}{c} 139 \pm 8 \\ fmol \ CH_4 \\ cell^{-1} \ h^{-1} \end{array}$	[11]
Methanocaldococcus strain JH146 (growing)	6 to 14 h	4-9	82	80 (0.2 MPa, no H ₂ replenishment)	2369	$\begin{array}{l} \text{4.446 mol } H_2 \\ \text{mole}^{\text{-1}} \ \text{CH}_4{}^{\chi} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 5.85 \pm \\ 0.31^{*}10^{12} cells \\ mole^{-1} CH_4 \end{array}$	NA	NA	NA	[12]

Table A.3. Laboratory studies investigating SSR. Studies in bold were used for the calculation of H₂ consumption in the depleted oil and gas fields. Studies investigating SSR. Studies in bold were used for the calculation of H₂ consumption in the depleted oil and gas fields. Studies investigating SSR. Studies in bold were used for the calculation of H₂ consumption in the depleted oil and gas fields. Studies investigating SSR. Studies in bold were used for the calculation of H₂ consumption in the depleted oil and gas fields. Studies investigating SSR. Studies in bold were used for the calculation of H₂ consumption in the depleted oil and gas fields. Studies investigating SSR. Studies in bold were used for the calculation of H₂ consumption in the depleted oil and gas fields. Studies investigating SSR. Studies in bold were used for the calculation of H₂ consumption in the depleted oil and gas fields. Studies investigating SSR. Studies in bold were used for the calculation of H₂ consumption in the depleted oil and gas fields. Studies investigating SSR. Studies in bold were used for the calculation of H₂ consumption in the depleted oil and gas fields. Studies investigating SSR. Studies in bold were used for the calculation of H₂ consumption in the depleted oil and gas fields. Studies investigating SSR. Studies in bold were used for the calculation of H₂ consumption in the depleted oil and gas fields.

				H ₂ -co	nsuming pro	cess: sulfate red	luction					
Species of bacteria/ archaea (growth stage)	Time	рН	Temp. (°C)	Exposure [H ₂] in air (%) (pressure; MPa)	Exposure [H2] in water (μg L ⁻¹)	H ₂ consumption (nM h ⁻¹)	SO4 ²⁻ or S (mM)	Biomass growth	k ℅ (h- 1)	Km or Ks [◊] (μM)	Vmax	Ref
NA (steady state)	242 d	inlet: 8.7 outlet: 9.6- 11.8	20 ± 2	200-1500 (0.2- 1.5 MPa, with H ₂ replenishment)	~2000- 10000	0.9-2.6*10 ⁴	0.3	0	NA	(H ₂): 0.001 Ks (SO4 ²⁻): 1000 Ks	0.07± 0.04 h ⁻¹	[1]
Desulfovibrio G11 (resting)	11.5- 15 h	6.7	37	80 (0.25 MPa, no H ₂ replenishment)	14.1-16.1	507-578	23.8	0.71-0.99 g protein mole ⁻¹ H ₂	NA	NA	NA	[7]
Desulfovibrio G11 (growing)	13.3 h	6.7	37	80 (0.25 MPa, no H2 replenishment)	NA	6.7*10 ⁴	23.8	NA	4.9- 6.5*10 ⁻ ² *5.7	2.4-4.2 Ks	110 nmol mg protein ⁻¹ min ⁻¹	[7]
Desulfomicrobium hypogeium (growing)	15 d	6.8- 7.9	30	50-80 (0.1-0.2 MPa, no H ₂ replenishment)	NA	0.5-2.5*10 ⁵	10.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	[4]
Desulfotomaculum sp (growing)	60 d	6.5- 7.0	55	80 (0.1 MPa, no H ₂ replenishment)	NA	0.7-1.3*10 ⁷	25.9	NA	NA	NA	NA	[13]
				Н2-со	nsuming pro	cess: sulfur red	uction					
Pyrobaculum islandicum (growing)	45 h	6	100	80 (0.1 MPa, no replenishment)	NA	2.5-11.1*105	6.3	$\begin{array}{c} 0.3 - \\ 10^* 10^6 \\ \text{cells ml}^{-1} \\ \text{h}^{-1} \end{array}$	NA	NA	NA	[14]

Table A.4. Reservoir conditions for 42 DOGF and five H₂ storage test sites. Except where indicated otherwise, data are from [15]. ω = reference [16]. \bigstar = data from reference [17] where the salinity was calculated from the major ions in solution or from the [Cl⁻]. \clubsuit = reference [18]. NA= not available. Values in red and green show unfavorable and tolerable conditions, respectively, for the growth of the major of H₂-utilizing microorganisms.

Field name	Field area (Km ²)	P (MPa)	Temp (°C)	рН	Salinity (M)
Frigg	100	19.5	61	6.5-7.4	1.08 [∞] ;0.07-0.53 [♠]
Boa	NA	20.4	73	NA	NA
Rhum	25	83.5	150	NA	NA
Fulmar	11	38.8	140	NA	2.36
Brent	78	39.4	96	NA	0.43
Britania	246	38.0	129-145	NA	0.29-1.71
Miller	45	49.3	121	7.2	1.61*
Beryl	49	36.0	101	6.1	1.11-1.54
Judy (Andrew 1)	NA	46.9	137	7.4	0.14-0.15*
Judy/Joanne	NA	48.2	146	NA	NA
Ravenspurn North	24	30.9	103	NA	NA
Ravenspurn South	36	30.5	93	NA	NA
Amethyst	97	27.9	88	5.6	4.45*
Murdoch	NA	41.8	112	4.3	4.45*
Boulton B	NA	44.1	116	NA	3.42
Schooner	55	44.0	110	NA	1.61
Clipper	49	26.2	79	NA	3.42
Leman	253	20.5	52	8.5	5.9*
North Sean	5	27.0	94	NA	3.85
South Sean	10	27.0	89	NA	3.85
East Sean	4	26.4	97	NA	3.85
Barque	36	26.0	79	4.7	3.42
Hamilton	15	9.6	30	5.8	1.59-4.18*
Hamilton North	8	10.5	30	7.9	2.93*
Lennox	9	11.1	30	NA	4.62
North Morecambe	24	12.3	33	NA	5.13
South Morecambe	84	12.7	33	NA	5.13
Rhyl	NA	14.9	36	5.5	5.80*
Dalton	NA	28.8	91	5	0.26
Beaufort	1.7	27.6	91	NA	3.35
Bessemer	NA	18.2	91	NA	3.35
Brown	1.5	27.4	89	NA	3.87
Camelot	8.9	19.3	60	NA	3.08
Corvette	3.2	28.6	79	NA	3.42
Davy	6	28.2	88	6.8	1.25*
Gawain	11.1	28.4	80	NA	3.42
Indefatigable	155	28.4	91	NA	3.35
Viking	NA	28.6-37.2	65-80	NA	3.76
The V fields gas complex	127	23.9-26.4	61-81	NA	3.25-4.96
Agat	NA	35.1%	101%	NA	NA
Veslefrikk	NA	29.8-35.0 ^{\$\$}	<mark>67-</mark> 114 [℅]	6.5%	0.27-0.72\$
Heidrun North	NA	23.4%	76 ^纷	NA	0.86%
Emsland	NA	NA	120-130	NA	5.46
Altmark	NA	20	80	NA	7.18
Ketzin	NA	6	35	6	4.02
Lehen	NA	4.7	40	8.2	0.24-0.31
Lobodice	NA	4	20-45	6.7	0.03

Text A.1. Elemental Cell Composition for Major Hydrogen Oxidizing Microorganisms (A) and Calculation of the Number SSRM Cells that could grow based on the Nitrogen Content in the Frigg Reservoir (B)

A. For hydrogenothrophic methanogens grown under optimal conditions the cell composition is: C (37.1-42.6 %), H (5.5-6.4 %), N (9.5-10.1 %), Na (0.4-1.6 %), K (1.1-5.5 %), S (0.6-1.0 %), P (1.9-2.8 %), Ca (0.009-0.06 %), Mg (0.09-0.4 %), Fe (0.07-0.28 %) [19]. From these figures, an oxygen content of 29-44 % can be estimated by difference. A similar complete dataset could not be retrieved for the composition of other H₂-consuming bacteria. The homoacetogen *Acetobacterium sp. strain 69* has the cell composition C (45 %), H (6 %), N (10 %); O (29 %) and 7% other, not specified elements [20]. Cells of the model SSRM *Desulfovibrio desulfuricans* have the elemental formula $CH_{1.4}O_{0.4}N_{0.2}$ [21]. Assuming an average C content of 46 % for bacteria residing in 6 different aquatic ecosystems [22] the remaining elemental composition of *D. desulfuricans* is H (5 %), N (11 %); O (25 %) and 13 % other. Contents of P, Na, S, K, Ca, Mg and Fe in homoacetogens and SSRM were assumed to be as for methanogens.

B. The N content per cell,
$$N_{cell}$$
, was calculated to 8.6*10⁻¹¹ mg N cell⁻¹ according to Eq. A.1

$$N_{cell} = \frac{P.N_{cell}}{100} \times m_{cell}$$
(A.1)

where $P.N_{cell}$ is the percentage of N in the SSRM cells, 11 %, and m_{cell} is the mass of the SSRM cells, 8.6*10⁻¹⁰ mg cell⁻¹.

The calculation of the dissolved N₂ concentration, C_{N2} , was based on the partial pressure of N₂ in the aquifer, pN_2 , of 0.99 atm, and used Eq. A.2.

$$C_{N2} = pN_2 \times M \times K_{HN2} \tag{A.2}$$

where *M* is the molar mass of N of 14 g mol⁻¹ and K_{HN2} is the Henrys law's constant for N₂ at the 334.15 K of the Frigg reservoir. The latter was calculated to $3.8*10^{-4}$ mol L⁻¹ atm⁻¹using Eq. A.3

$$K_{HN2} = K_{H}^{0} \times e^{\left(F * \left(\frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{T^{0}}\right)\right)}$$
(A.3)

where K_{H^0} is Henry's laws constant for N₂ at 298.15 K, 0.00061 mol L⁻¹ atm⁻¹, *F* is the Van't Hoff coefficient for N₂, 1300, T is the actual temperature in K and T⁰ is the reference temperature, 298.15 K. Inserting the K_{HN2} into Eq. A.2 yielded a C_{N2} of 5.3 mg L⁻¹.

Finally, the potential growth of SSRM, *G*, in the Frigg aquifer was calculated to $6.2*10^{10}$ cells L⁻¹ by dividing the C_{N2} with *N_{cell}* (Eq. A.4).

$$G = \frac{C_{N2}}{N_{cell}} \tag{A.4}$$

Text A.2. Example Calculation of the H₂ Consumption per Synthesized Cell for Methanogens, Exemplified by *Methanobacterium bryantii*.

The mass of protein, m_{prot} , for a living, i.e. wet, *Methanobacterium bryantii* cell was calculated to be $1.4*10^{-13}$ g according to Eq. A.5

$$m_{prot} = \frac{prot_{cell}}{100} \times m_{cell} \times \chi \tag{A.5}$$

where $prot_{cell}$ is the cell protein content of 50 % for dry cells of *Methanobacterium bryantii* [8], m_{cell} is wet cell mass, of $1.77*10^{-12}$ g for methanogens [6], and χ is the dry weight to wet weight ratio of 0.4 for bacteria in general [23].

The daily growth rate, GR_{cell} , was 9.9-52*10⁹ cells L⁻¹ day⁻¹, according to Eq. A.6

$$GR_{cell} = \frac{GR_{prot}}{m_{prot}} \tag{A.6}$$

where GR_{prot} is the daily growth rate of 0.0014-0.0074 g protein L⁻¹ day⁻¹ [8]. Finally, Eq. A.7 allowed the calculation of the H₂ consumption per synthesized cell, $H_{2}usage_{cell}$ to 3.5-4.6*10⁻⁵ nM cell⁻¹ using a microbial H₂ consumption, ΔH_2 , of 4.5-18*10⁻⁴ [8].

$$H_2 usage_{cell} = \frac{\Delta H_2}{GR_{cell}}$$
(A.7)

The time, t, for when the cell count is reached was calculated from the daily growth rate, GR_{cell} and the estimated microbial counts, G, according to Eq. A.8

$$t = \frac{G}{GR_{cell}}$$
(A.8)

Text A.3. Calculation of the Hydrogen Consumption in a Hydrogen Storage System We calculated the potential H₂ consumption, ΔH_{2pot} , to 7.8 -3117*10⁴ nM L⁻¹ for methanogens in the Frigg reservoir by dividing $H_{2usage_{cell}}$ (SI Text 3) with G (SI Text 2) (A.9).

$$\Delta H_{2pot} = \frac{H_2 usage_{cell}}{G} \tag{A.9}$$

The Frigg field holds an aquifer volume, V_{field} , of 4.8 km³. The moles of H₂ the in aquifer, n_{H2} , were calculated anticipating equal volumes of H₂ and water and using the ideal gas law (Eq. A.10).

$$n_{H2} = \frac{P \times V}{R \times T} \tag{A.10}$$

where *P* is the aquifer pressure of 19.5 MPa, *V* is the volume of H₂ (or brine) of $2.4*10^{15}$ cm³ resulting from $V_{field} \ge 0.5$, *R* is the gas constant of 8.314 cm³ MPa mol⁻¹ K⁻¹ and *T* is the aquifer temperature. The Frigg aquifer holds $1.7*10^{13}$ moles H₂.

Finally, the percentage of H₂ consumed as a function of growing and resting methanogen cells, $H_{2}usage$, was calculated to <0.01-1.3 % according to Eq. A.11

$$H_2 usage = 100 * \frac{\Delta H_{2pot}}{C_{H2}}$$
(A.11)

where c_{H2} is the concentration of H_2 in the aquifer of $7.13*10^9$ nM L⁻¹ resulting from dividing n_{H2} with V.

REFERENCES

1. Berta M, Dethlefsen F, Ebert M, Schafer D, Dahmke A. Geochemical effects of millimolar hydrogen concentrations in groundwater: An experimental study in the context of subsurface hydrogen storage. Environ Sci Technol 2018;52(8):4937-49.

2. Lynd LH, Zeikus JG. Metabolism of H₂-CO₂, methanol, and glucose by *Butyribacterium methylotrophicum*. J Bacteriol 1983;153(3):1415-23.

3. Breznak JA, Switzer JM, Seitz HJ. Sporomusa termitida sp. nov., an H₂/CO₂-utilizing acetogen isolated from termites*. Arch Microbiol 1988;150:282-8.

4. Krumholz LR, Harris SH, Tay ST, Suflita JM. Characterization of two subsurface H₂utilizing bacteria, *Desulfomicrobium hypogeium* sp. nov. and *Acetobacterium psammolithicum* sp. nov., and their ecological role. Appl Environ Microbiol 1999;65(6):2300-6.

5. Peters V, Janssen PH, Conrad R. Effciency of hydrogen utilization during unitrophic and mixotrophic growth of *Acetobacterium woodii* on hydrogen and lactate in the chemostat. Fems Microbiol Ecol 1998;26:317-24.

6. Amid A, Mignard D, Wilkinson M. Seasonal storage of hydrogen in a depleted natural gas reservoir. Int J Hydrogen Energy 2016;41(12):5549-58.

7. Robinson JA, Tiedje JM. Competition between sulfate-reducing and methanogenic bacteria for H₂ under resting and growing conditions. Arch Microbiol 1984;137:26-32.

 Karadagli F, Rittmann BE. Kinetic characterization of *Methanobacterium bryantii M.o.H.* Environ Sci Technol 2005;39:4900-5.

9. Mitteregger M, Bauer S, Loibner AP, Schritter J, Gubik A, Backes D, et al., inventorsMethod for the hydrogenotrophic methanogenesis of H₂ and CO₂ into CH₄ patent no. EP3280807A1. 2016. 10. Smatlak CR, Gossett JM, Zinder SH. Comparative kinetics of hydrogen utilization for reductive dechlorination of tetrachloroethene and methanogenesis in an anaerobic enrichment culture. Environ Sci Technol 1996;30:2850-8.

Topcuoglu BD, Meydan C, Nguyen TB, Lang SQ, Holden JF. Growth kinetics,
 carbon isotope fractionation, and gene expression in the hyperthermophile
 Methanocaldococcus jannaschii during hydrogen-limited growth and interspecies hydrogen
 transfer. Appl Environ Microbiol 2019;85(9):1-14.

12. Eecke HCV, Akerman NH, Huber JA, Butterfield DA, Holden JF. Growth kinetics and energetics of a deep-sea hyperthermophilic methanogen under varying environmental conditions. Environ Microbiol Rep 2013;5(5):665-71.

 van Houten RT, Yun SY, Lettinga G. Thermophilic sulphate and sulphite reduction in lab-scale gas-lift reactors using H₂ and CO₂ as energy and carbon source. Biotechnol Bioeng 1997;55:807-14.

14. Huber R, Kristjansson JK, Stetter KO. *Pyrobaculum* gen. nov., a new genus of neutrophilic, rod-shaped archaebacteria from continental solfataras growing optimally at 100°C. Arch Microbiol 1987;149:95-101.

15. Gluyas JG, Hichens HM. The United Kingdom oil and gas fields commemorative millennium volume Gluyas JG, Hichens HM, editors: Memoirs of the Geological Society of London; 2003.

Brewster J. The Frigg Field, Block 10/1 UK North Sea and 25/1, Norwegian North
 Sea. Memoirs of the geological Society of London. 141991. p. 117-26.

17. Oil and gas field data from the North Sea [Internet]. Oil and Gas Authority 2020[cited 19.5.2020]. Available from: <u>https://www.ogauthority.co.uk/data-centre/</u>.

18. Barth T, Riis M. Interactions between organic acid anions in formation waters and reservoir mineral phases. Org Geochem 1992;19(4-6):455-82.

12

19. Scherer P, Lippert H, Wolff G. Composition of the major elements and trace-elements of 10 methanogenic bacteria determined by inductively coupled plasma emission-spectrometry. Biol Trace Elem Res 1983;5(3):149-63.

20. Lynd L, Kerby R, Zeikus JG. Carbon monoxide metabolism of the methylotrophic acidogen *Butyribacterium methylotrophicum*. J Bacteriol 1982;149(1):255-63.

21. Okabe S. Rate and stoichiometry of sulfate reducing bacteria in suspended and biolfilm cultures. Montana, USA: Montana State University; 1992.

22. Fagerbakke KM, Heldal M, Norland S. Content of carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, sulfur and phosphorus in native aquatic and cultured bacteria. Aquat Microb Ecol 1996;10 15-27.

23. Bratbak G, Dundas I. Bacterial dry matter content and biomass estimations. Appl Environ Microbiol 1984;48(4):755-7.