Acetate: A New Feedstock for Biomanufacturing

A Critical Review of Metabolic Engineering Strategies, Production Platforms, and Future Perspectives

---

Abstract

The transition toward sustainable bioeconomies necessitates the exploration of alternative carbon feedstocks beyond conventional sugars. Acetate, a simple C2 compound, has emerged as a promising next-generation substrate for biomanufacturing, offering unique advantages including derivation from waste streams, CO_2 fixation, and compatibility with circular economy principles. This review critically examines the current state of acetate-based biomanufacturing, encompassing upstream production routes (syngas fermentation, electrochemical synthesis, and waste valorization), metabolic engineering strategies to overcome inherent challenges (toxicity, energy limitations, and redox imbalances), and downstream product portfolios ranging from bulk chemicals to high-value biopolymers. We analyze the thermodynamic and bioenergetic constraints that differentiate acetate metabolism from sugar-based systems, highlighting both successful implementations and persistent bottlenecks. Controversies regarding acetate assimilation pathway optimization, ATP availability, and host organism selection are discussed in depth. Finally, we provide a forward-looking perspective on how emerging technologies—including synthetic biology, adaptive laboratory evolution, and integrated bioprocessing—will shape acetate-based biomanufacturing over the next decade. This review aims to guide researchers and industrial practitioners toward realizing the full potential of acetate as a sustainable building block for the bio-based economy.

Keywords: Acetate metabolism, biomanufacturing, C2 feedstock, metabolic engineering, syngas fermentation, circular bioeconomy

---

1. Introduction: The Imperative for Alternative Carbon Sources

The chemical industry's reliance on fossil-derived feedstocks poses severe environmental and economic challenges, driving the urgent need for renewable alternatives[1][2]. First-generation biorefineries based on glucose and sucrose have demonstrated technical feasibility but face criticism for competing with food systems and requiring arable land[3]. Second-generation approaches utilizing lignocellulosic biomass partially address these concerns but introduce processing complexities related to recalcitrance and inhibitor formation[4]. Consequently, attention has shifted toward next-generation feedstocks—particularly C1 compounds (CO_2, CO, methane, formate, methanol) and C2 substrates (acetate and ethanol)—that can be derived from industrial waste gases, electrochemical processes, or anaerobic digestion[5][6].

Among these alternatives, acetate occupies a unique position as both a direct fermentation product from C1 gases and an abundant component of numerous waste streams[7]. Acetate concentrations ranging from 2–20 g/L are routinely generated during anaerobic digestion of organic waste, lignocellulosic hydrolysate fermentation, and syngas conversion by acetogenic bacteria[8][9]. Furthermore, emerging electrochemical CO_2 reduction technologies can produce acetate with high selectivity, potentially coupling renewable electricity with carbon capture and utilization (CCU)[10][11]. Unlike highly reduced C1 compounds such as methane, acetate can be metabolized aerobically by a broad phylogenetic range of microorganisms, offering greater flexibility in host selection and product diversification[12].

Despite these advantages, acetate utilization for biomanufacturing faces substantial challenges that have historically limited industrial implementation. The weak acid (pKa 4.76) readily crosses cell membranes in its protonated form, causing intracellular acidification and growth inhibition at concentrations above 5–10 g/L in most organisms[13][14]. Energetically, acetate assimilation requires ATP investment yet yields lower carbon-to-ATP conversion efficiency compared to glycolysis, creating bioenergetic bottlenecks for biosynthetic processes[15][16]. Redox imbalances further complicate matters, as acetate metabolism through the glyoxylate shunt or tricarboxylic acid (TCA) cycle generates insufficient reducing equivalents for many biosynthetic pathways[17]. These interconnected challenges demand sophisticated metabolic engineering strategies that simultaneously address toxicity, energy availability, and cofactor balancing.

This review synthesizes recent advances in acetate-based biomanufacturing, organizing the discussion around three critical dimensions: (1) upstream acetate production technologies; (2) metabolic engineering strategies to optimize acetate assimilation and product formation; and (3) downstream product portfolios with techno-economic considerations. We emphasize unresolved controversies, comparative analysis of competing approaches, and identification of knowledge gaps that warrant future investigation. Our perspective section projects how convergence of synthetic biology, systems metabolic engineering, and bioprocess intensification will enable economically competitive acetate biorefinery operations within the next decade.

---

2. Upstream Acetate Production: From Waste to Value

2.1 Syngas Fermentation via Acetogenic Bacteria

Syngas (synthesis gas)—primarily composed of CO, CO_2, and H_2—represents one of the most abundant sources of acetate production potential[18]. Syngas can be generated through gasification of diverse carbonaceous materials including coal, natural gas, biomass, or municipal solid waste, making it a versatile bridge between waste streams and chemical production[19]. Acetogenic bacteria, particularly species from the genera *Clostridium*, *Acetobacterium*, *Moorella*, and *Sporomusa*, utilize the Wood-Ljungdahl pathway (WLP) to fix CO_2 and reduce CO into acetyl-CoA, which is subsequently converted to acetate[20][21].

The WLP operates as a highly efficient carbon fixation mechanism, theoretically allowing production of 1 mole acetate from 4 moles H_2 and 2 moles CO_2, or 2 moles acetate directly from 4 moles CO[22]. Energy conservation in acetogens occurs through chemiosmotic ion gradient formation (typically Na^+ or H^+) coupled to ATP synthesis, with the Rnf complex playing a central role in electron bifurcation[23]. Recent studies with *Moorella*

thermoacetica achieved acetate titers of 45 g/L at pilot scale using biomass-derived syngas, demonstrating technical scalability[24]. Similarly, *Clostridium ljungdahlii* and *Clostridium autoethanogenum* have been engineered not only for acetate production but also for direct conversion to ethanol and 2,3-butanediol[25][26].

However, several challenges constrain industrial implementation. Gas-liquid mass transfer limitations, particularly for CO with its low aqueous solubility (~1 mM at 1 atm), necessitate specialized bioreactor designs with high mass transfer coefficients (kLa)[27]. Oxygen contamination in industrial waste gases severely inhibits acetogen metabolism, requiring costly purification or development of oxygen-tolerant strains[28]. Product titers remain modest compared to sugar fermentations, with most acetate concentrations below 20 g/L creating high downstream separation costs[29]. Furthermore, the thermodynamics of acetogenesis limit energy yields, constraining biomass formation and overall volumetric productivities[30].

2.2 Electrochemical CO_2 Reduction to Acetate

Microbial electrosynthesis (MES) has emerged as a promising alternative that couples electrochemical CO_2 reduction with biological upgrading[31]. In MES systems, cathodic reactions reduce CO_2 to intermediates such as formate or H_2, which acetogens subsequently convert to acetate[32]. Direct electron transfer from cathodes to microorganisms remains controversial, with most evidence suggesting H_2-mediated indirect mechanisms dominate[33]. Recent innovations using Bi_2O_3-modified electrodes achieved acetate titers of 16 g/L through formate-intermediate pathways, demonstrating improved selectivity over purely electrochemical approaches[34].

A key advantage of MES lies in its modularity—electrical input can be derived from renewable sources (solar, wind), enabling diurnal CO_2 conversion without continuous feedstock availability[35]. However, current density limitations (typically <10 A/m^2) result in low space-time yields compared to conventional fermentation[36]. Faradaic efficiency for acetate formation varies widely (20–80%) depending on system configuration, with competing H_2 evolution reactions often dominating[37]. Energy efficiency remains a critical bottleneck, with most MES systems requiring >20 kWh per kg acetate produced—substantially higher than thermochemical routes[38].

2.3 Waste Stream Valorization and Anaerobic Digestion

Organic waste streams represent abundant, low-cost acetate sources with negative or zero feedstock costs[39]. Anaerobic digestion of agricultural residues, food waste, and wastewater generates volatile fatty acids (VFAs) dominated by acetate, typically at 2–15 g/L concentrations[40]. Lignocellulosic hydrolysates from second-generation ethanol production contain 3–8 g/L acetate released from hemicellulose acetylation[41]. Industrial wastewater from paper mills, chemical manufacturing, and food processing similarly provides dilute acetate streams[42].

The primary challenge with waste-derived acetate is its dilute nature, creating high downstream processing costs that can exceed feedstock value[43]. Mixed contaminants (phenolics, furfurals, heavy metals) in lignocellulosic hydrolysates impose additional stress on production hosts, necessitating robust tolerance mechanisms[44]. Seasonal and compositional variability of waste streams complicates process control and reproducibility[45]. Nevertheless, techno-economic analyses suggest that even low-titer

acetate streams (>5 g/L) can achieve favorable economics when coupled with high-value product formation and when considering avoided disposal costs[46].

Production Route	Acetate Titer (g/L)	Productivity (g/L/h)	Key Challenges
Syngas fermentation	10-45	0.5-4.0	Mass transfer, low titer [24][27]
Microbial electrosynthesis	5-16	0.1-0.8	Energy efficiency, current density [34] [37]
Anaerobic digestion	2-15	0.3-2.0	Dilution, contaminants [40] [43]
Lignocellulose hydrolysate	3-8	N/A	Inhibitors, variability [41][44]

Table 1: Comparison of upstream acetate production technologies and their performance metrics

---

3. Metabolic Engineering for Enhanced Acetate Utilization

3.1 Acetate Assimilation Pathways and Their Optimization

Microorganisms employ two primary routes for acetate activation to acetyl-CoA: (1) the phosphotransacetylase-acetate kinase (Pta-AckA) pathway, which reversibly converts acetate to acetyl-CoA via acetyl-phosphate with ATP generation, and (2) acetyl-CoA synthetase (Acs), which directly ligates acetate to CoA with ATP consumption[47][48]. These pathways exhibit distinct kinetic properties and regulatory behaviors that profoundly influence acetate utilization efficiency.

The Pta-AckA pathway, while ATP-yielding during acetate formation, operates reversibly and achieves lower acetate affinity (Km ~10 mM) compared to Acs (Km ~0.2 mM)[49]. In *Escherichia coli*, Acs undergoes post-translational acetylation by Pat (protein acetyltransferase), which inactivates the enzyme, creating a regulatory circuit that limits acetate uptake capacity[50]. Deletion of *patZ* (encoding Pat) or overexpression of CobB deacetylase enhances Acs activity, improving acetate consumption rates by 30–50%[51] [52]. Conversely, simultaneous overexpression of both pathways generates synergistic effects, with engineered *E. coli* strains achieving acetate consumption rates exceeding 5 mmol/g CDW/h—among the highest reported values[53].

The glyoxylate shunt, comprising isocitrate lyase (AceA) and malate synthase (AceB), enables net carbon assimilation from acetate by bypassing CO_2-releasing steps of the TCA cycle[54]. However, this pathway faces dual challenges: it generates minimal reducing equivalents (NADH, NADPH) and provides no direct ATP beyond oxidative phosphorylation[55]. For biosynthetic processes requiring substantial reducing power—such as fatty acid, isoprenoid, or amino acid production—the glyoxylate shunt alone proves insufficient. Recent strategies employ targeted TCA cycle engineering, fine-tuning

flux distribution between the glyoxylate shunt and oxidative TCA pathways to balance energy generation with precursor supply[56][57].

A landmark study by Huang et al. demonstrated modular pathway optimization in *E. coli* for homoserine production from acetate, achieving 44.1 g/L titer at 53% theoretical yield[58]. This required coordinated overexpression of both Pta-AckA and Acs pathways, enhancement of glyoxylate shunt flux, and crucially, increased pantothenate kinase activity to alleviate CoA limitation[59]. The work highlights how acetate metabolism imposes unique cofactor demands—particularly for CoA, NADPH, and ATP—that must be systematically addressed through multi-target engineering.

3.2 Overcoming Energetic Limitations: ATP and NADPH Balancing

Acetate assimilation imposes severe bioenergetic constraints compared to glucose metabolism. Glycolysis generates 2 net ATP per glucose via substrate-level phosphorylation (SLP), whereas acetate activation by Acs consumes 1 ATP per acetate molecule without direct SLP compensation[60]. This negative ATP balance forces greater reliance on oxidative phosphorylation, reducing the theoretical yield of ATP-demanding products[61]. Recent intracellular ATP measurements using genetically encoded biosensors revealed that acetate-grown *E. coli* maintains 30–40% lower ATP concentrations than glucose-grown cells under comparable conditions[62].

Paradoxically, strategic acetate supplementation (2–4 mM) to sugar-based fermentations can boost ATP levels and enhance production of energy-intensive compounds[63]. This counterintuitive phenomenon reflects acetate's rapid oxidation through the TCA cycle, generating reducing equivalents that drive electron transport chain activity[64]. Zhang and colleagues demonstrated that acetate co-feeding increased intracellular ATP by 80% in *E. coli*, leading to 60% higher titers of terpenoid products[65]. Similar benefits were observed with *Pseudomonas putida*, where oleate supplementation (another CoA-activating substrate) preferentially elevated ATP pools[66].

NADPH availability constitutes an equally critical constraint for anabolic processes. The oxidative pentose phosphate pathway (oxPPP) represents the primary NADPH source in most organisms, yet acetate entry through the glyoxylate shunt largely bypasses this pathway[67]. Engineering NADPH regeneration systems through heterologous transhydrogenase expression (UdhA, PntAB) or $NADP^+$-dependent glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase (GapN) partially alleviates this limitation[68][69]. In *Yarrowia lipolytica*, microbial electrosynthesis directly supplied reducing power, enabling a 35% increase in fatty alcohol production from acetate when coupled with enhanced Pta-AckA expression[70].

Recent work has explored ATP-neutral glycolytic engineering by replacing NAD^+-dependent GAPDH with $NADP^+$-dependent GapN, simultaneously generating NADPH while maintaining ATP yields[71]. However, such strategies often trigger growth defects due to perturbed redox balancing, requiring suppressor mutations in NADPH-oxidizing enzymes to restore fitness[72]. These findings underscore the delicate homeostasis between energy currency and redox cofactors that must be preserved when engineering acetate-based production strains.

3.3 Addressing Acetate Toxicity: Mechanisms and Engineering Solutions

Acetate toxicity represents perhaps the most pervasive challenge in acetate-based biomanufacturing. Undissociated acetic acid (pKa 4.76) freely diffuses across cell membranes, dissociating in the cytoplasm and acidifying the intracellular environment[73]. This process increases proton burden on the cell, disrupts pH homeostasis, and causes pleiotropic effects including membrane destabilization, protein denaturation, and DNA damage[74]. Most microorganisms exhibit growth inhibition at acetate concentrations exceeding 5–10 g/L, severely constraining achievable product titers[75].

Naturally acetate-resistant organisms like *Acetobacter aceti* tolerate >40 g/L acetate through specialized adaptations including modified membrane lipid composition, enhanced efflux systems, and unique metabolic circuits[76][77]. Proteomic analysis revealed that acetate-adapted *A. aceti* upregulates a specialized citric acid cycle variant employing succinyl-CoA:acetate CoA-transferase (SCACT), which bypasses acetyl-CoA synthetase and its ATP requirement while generating additional ATP via succinate-CoA ligase[78]. This pathway has recently been identified in over 30 fermentative bacteria, suggesting broader evolutionary significance than previously recognized[79].

Metabolic engineering approaches to enhance acetate tolerance have focused on several strategies: (1) adaptive laboratory evolution (ALE) to select for resistant mutants; (2) rational engineering of global regulators; and (3) introduction of stress-protective pathways[80]. ALE of *Halomonas bluephagenesis* over 71 transfers yielded strain B71 with enhanced acetate tolerance and 65% higher PHB production from acetate[81]. Mechanistic studies attributed improved tolerance to altered membrane fatty acid composition—specifically increased cyclopropane fatty acids (CFAs) at the expense of unsaturated fatty acids (UFAs)[82].

Rational engineering of the global regulator cAMP receptor protein (CRP) in *E. coli* generated mutants with >5-fold improved growth rates in 15 g/L acetate[83]. A single amino acid substitution (D138Y) in CRP altered expression of over 400 genes involved in TCA cycle metabolism, phosphotransferase systems, and stress response pathways[84]. Conversely, deletion of transcriptional repressor IclR, which derepresses the glyoxylate shunt, improved acetate assimilation but without direct tolerance enhancement[85].

An emerging strategy involves introducing polyhydroxybutyrate (PHB) mobilization pathways, which surprisingly confer broad-spectrum acetate tolerance[86]. Expression of PHB synthesis (PhaCAB) and degradation (PhaZ) genes under stress-responsive promoters enabled *E. coli* to maintain 53% cell viability under acetate stress, compared to 25% in control strains[87]. Mechanistic investigations revealed that PHB mobilization releases 3-hydroxybutyrate, which modulates membrane lipid composition by increasing CFA ratios and enhancing membrane integrity[88]. This pathway enabled production of 7.21 g/L succinate and 1.24 g/L PHB from acetate in fed-batch cultures[89].

Strategy	Approach	Tolerance Improvement	Reference
Adaptive evolution	ALE of *H. bluephagenesis* (71 transfers)	2-fold growth rate	[81]
Global regulator	CRP mutation (D138Y) in *E. coli*	5-fold growth rate	[83]
PHB mobilization	PhaCABZ expression in *E. coli*	2-fold cell viability	[87]
Cofactor engineering	CoA availability enhancement	1.5-fold titer	[58]
Membrane engineering	Altered fatty acid composition	35% CFA increase	[82]

Table 2: Engineering strategies for enhancing acetate tolerance in production hosts

---

4. Product Portfolios: From Bulk Chemicals to Specialty Compounds

4.1 Biofuels and Platform Chemicals

Acetate has been successfully converted into various bulk chemicals and biofuels, demonstrating its versatility as a carbon source. Ethanol production from acetate proceeds naturally in many acetogens, with *Clostridium autoethanogenum* achieving ethanol:acetate ratios of 93:7 under optimized conditions[90]. However, thermodynamic constraints limit ethanol titers, as acetate reduction to ethanol requires substantial reducing equivalents[91]. Co-feeding strategies supplementing acetate with H_2 or formate improve ethanol selectivity by providing additional electrons[92].

2,3-Butanediol (2,3-BDO) and acetoin represent higher-value C4 products with applications as chemical intermediates and potential biofuels[93]. Engineered *E. coli* strains expressing the complete acetate utilization pathway achieved 1.56 g/L diols from acetate in fed-batch operations—a 30% improvement over previous reports[94]. The relatively modest titers reflect fundamental challenges in driving biosynthesis from acetate, including ATP limitations and redox imbalances[95]. Nevertheless, 2,3-BDO's industrial value ($2,000–3,000/ton) provides economic incentive for continued optimization.

Organic acids including succinate, lactate, and malate have been produced from acetate with varying success[96]. Succinate production reached 7.21 g/L in *E. coli* strains harboring PHB mobilization pathways, benefiting from both enhanced acetate tolerance and improved carbon flux through the TCA cycle[97]. Malic acid production was demonstrated through sequential fermentation, where *Clostridium ljungdahlii* first converts syngas to acetate, which *Aspergillus oryzae* subsequently transforms into malate[98]. Such modular bioprocessing strategies offer flexibility to optimize each conversion step independently.

4.2 Biopolymers: PHAs and Lipids

Polyhydroxyalkanoates (PHAs), particularly poly(3-hydroxybutyrate) (PHB), represent one of the most commercially promising applications for acetate bioconversion[99]. PHAs are biodegradable thermoplastics synthesized naturally by many bacteria as carbon and energy storage compounds[100]. Acetate serves as an excellent precursor because it directly enters the PHB biosynthetic pathway via acetyl-CoA condensation[101].

Halomonas species have emerged as preferred hosts due to their ability to accumulate PHB under non-sterile, high-salinity conditions that inhibit contaminants[102]. Engineered *Halomonas* sp. strains overexpressing acetyl-CoA transferase (AtoAD) achieved 46 g/L PHB from acetate with 0.62 g/g yields in fed-batch fermentation[103]. The AtoAD enzyme enhances acetate activation while bypassing ATP-consuming Acs, improving carbon and energy efficiency[104]. PHB titers and yields from acetate now approach those achieved with glucose, suggesting technical maturity approaching commercialization[105].

Yarrowia lipolytica, *Cryptococcus curvatus*, and other oleaginous yeasts efficiently convert acetate into lipids (triacylglycerols) suitable for biodiesel production[106][107]. Under nitrogen limitation, these organisms channel acetyl-CoA into fatty acid synthesis rather than growth, achieving lipid contents exceeding 60% of cell dry weight[108]. Lipid production from dilute acetate (5–10 g/L) via semicontinuous cultivation reached 12 g/L in *Y. lipolytica*, with volumetric productivity of 0.5 g/L/h[109]. Integration with upstream acetate production from waste streams creates attractive circular economy scenarios where organic waste becomes biodiesel feedstock[110].

4.3 Amino Acids and Specialty Chemicals

Amino acid production from acetate demonstrates the feasibility of synthesizing complex biochemicals from this simple C2 substrate. Threonine and homoserine biosynthesis from acetate in *E. coli* achieved titers of 45.8 g/L and 44.1 g/L, respectively—representing the highest reported amino acid concentrations from acetate[111]. These impressive results required systematic engineering of acetate assimilation, CoA availability, glyoxylate shunt flux, and TCA cycle activity[112]. The 53–65% theoretical yields indicate substantial remaining inefficiencies, likely stemming from ATP and NADPH limitations inherent to acetate metabolism.

Histidine production from acetate was reported in *Corynebacterium glutamicum* auxotrophs, though requiring glucose co-feeding for optimal productivity[113]. This limitation reflects the challenge of deriving sufficient biosynthetic precursors from acetate alone, as amino acid synthesis demands diverse carbon skeletons and substantial NADPH supply. Future work integrating formate co-feeding or electrosynthesis-derived reducing equivalents may overcome these constraints[114].

Isoprenoid production, specifically isoprenol, has been demonstrated in acetate-tolerant *Pseudomonas putida* strains[115]. Acetogens such as *Clostridium ljungdahlii* naturally produce small amounts of hexanol and butanol from syngas via acetate intermediates when co-cultured with chain-elongating bacteria like *Clostridium kluyveri*[116]. These synthetic consortia achieve product diversification beyond what single strains accomplish, producing C4–C6 fatty acids and alcohols at combined rates of 14 mmol/L/day[117].

Product	Host Organism	Titer (g/L)	Yield (%)	Reference
Ethanol	*C. autoethanogenum*	5-15	60-70	[90]
2,3-Butanediol	*E. coli*	1.56	35	[94]
Succinate	*E. coli*	7.21	48	[97]
PHB	*Halomonas* sp.	46	62	[103]
Lipids	*Y. lipolytica*	12	55	[109]
Homoserine	*E. coli*	44.1	53	[111]
Threonine	*E. coli*	45.8	65	[111]

Table 3: Representative products synthesized from acetate via metabolic engineering

---

5. Emerging Technologies and System-Level Integration

5.1 Synthetic Consortia and Division of Labor

Microbial consortia employing metabolic division of labor offer potential advantages over monocultures for acetate bioconversion[118]. In such systems, specialized strains perform distinct tasks—one optimized for acetate generation from C1 gases, another for product synthesis—avoiding the metabolic burden of engineering all functions into a single host[119]. The *Clostridium autoethanogenum-Clostridium kluyveri* co-culture exemplifies this strategy, converting CO directly to medium-chain fatty acids (MCFAs) with acetate serving as the intermediate[120].

Recent work demonstrated that acetate supplementation significantly stimulates chain elongation, with 20 mM acetate enhancing butyrate and caproate production rates by 2–3 fold[121]. Mechanistic analysis using ^{13}C-isotope tracing revealed that MCFA-producing strains recycle acetate to maximize lactate utilization under acetate limitation, whereas butyrate producers favor faster growth through direct acetate assimilation[122]. These physiological trade-offs, encoded in CoA-transferase substrate specificity, represent fundamental constraints shaping product selectivity[123].

Spatial organization of consortia through compartmentalization or biofilm engineering can improve stability and productivity[124]. However, challenges remain regarding population dynamics, cross-feeding efficiency, and maintaining stable ratios between strains during continuous operation[125]. Dynamic metabolic flux analysis and computational modeling will be essential for rational consortium design and optimization[126].

5.2 Electro-Agriculture and Plant Cell Culture

An intriguing emerging application involves using electrochemically generated acetate for plant growth—termed "electro-agriculture"[127]. Recent demonstrations showed that genetically modified tobacco cells can incorporate acetate alongside photosynthesis, enabling indoor cultivation with reduced light requirements[128]. While current systems require 2–4 mM acetate concentrations that partially support growth, the long-term vision involves engineering plants to fully utilize acetate as the primary carbon source[129].

If realized, electro-agriculture could theoretically reduce agricultural land use by 90% by enabling high-density vertical farming independent of sunlight[130]. Acetate production via electrochemical CO_2 reduction would couple renewable electricity with food production, creating closed-loop systems particularly valuable for space exploration or desert agriculture[131]. However, substantial challenges remain including plant acetate tolerance, metabolic engineering of heterotrophic growth pathways, and energy efficiency optimization[132].

5.3 Process Intensification and Downstream Integration

Techno-economic analyses consistently identify downstream separation costs as limiting factors for acetate-based processes, particularly when operating from dilute waste streams[133]. Process intensification strategies combining in situ product recovery (ISPR) with fermentation can substantially improve economics[134]. Membrane-based electrodialysis, extractive fermentation using organic solvents, and adsorption-based techniques have been investigated for acetate and product recovery[135].

For volatile products like ethanol and 2,3-BDO, gas stripping enables continuous removal during fermentation, alleviating product inhibition and reducing separation energy[136]. PHB production benefits from *Halomonas*'s salt tolerance, as hypersaline conditions enable open fermentation while high intracellular PHB content simplifies cell lysis and polymer extraction[137]. Lipid products can be directly transesterified in biomass to produce biodiesel, minimizing purification requirements[138].

Integration of acetate production with utilization in unified biorefinery concepts represents the ultimate process intensification strategy[139]. Mobile pilot plants coupling biomass gasification with syngas fermentation have demonstrated proof-of-concept for on-site acetate generation and subsequent conversion to single-cell protein[140]. Such distributed biorefinery models may prove economically superior to centralized facilities, particularly for waste valorization applications[141].

---

6. Controversies, Knowledge Gaps, and Critical Perspectives

6.1 The Pathway Debate: Pta-AckA versus Acs

A persistent controversy concerns which acetate assimilation pathway—Pta-AckA or Acs—should be prioritized for engineering enhanced utilization. The Pta-AckA pathway offers higher flux capacity and ATP neutrality (ATP-generating during acetate formation, ATP-consuming during assimilation)[142]. However, its reversibility creates metabolic futility cycles and lower affinity limits effectiveness at low acetate concentrations[143]. Acs

provides irreversible, high-affinity activation but consumes ATP and undergoes complex post-translational regulation[144].

Emerging evidence suggests the answer depends critically on application context. For low-titer acetate streams (<5 g/L), Acs's high affinity proves advantageous despite ATP cost[145]. For concentrated acetate fermentations (>10 g/L), simultaneous overexpression of both pathways generates synergistic benefits exceeding either alone[146]. The optimal strategy likely varies with product pathway energetics—ATP-generating products may tolerate Acs consumption, whereas ATP-demanding biosynthesis benefits from Pta-AckA[147].

Resolution of this debate requires systems-level modeling incorporating kinetic parameters, regulatory networks, and product pathway demands. Dynamic flux balance analysis coupled with experimental validation across diverse production scenarios could provide quantitative design rules for pathway selection and expression level optimization[148].

6.2 Host Selection: Specialists versus Generalists

Whether to employ acetate specialists (natural acetogens) or engineer acetate utilization into model organisms represents another strategic choice with profound implications[149]. Specialists like *Clostridium autoethanogenum* naturally tolerate high acetate concentrations and efficiently assimilate C1 gases, but offer limited genetic tools and product portfolios[150]. Model organisms (*E. coli*, *Corynebacterium glutamicum*, *P. putida*, *Y. lipolytica*) provide extensive toolboxes and established production platforms but require substantial engineering to achieve comparable acetate tolerance and utilization efficiency[151].

Halophilic organisms like *Halomonas bluephagenesis* may represent a middle ground, combining reasonable genetic tractability with intrinsic stress tolerance enabling open, non-sterile fermentation[152]. However, their obligate salt requirement increases medium costs and complicates downstream processing[153]. Cell-free systems bypassing cellular constraints altogether have been proposed but remain far from industrial viability due to cofactor regeneration challenges and enzyme stability[154].

Comparative techno-economic analyses across host platforms for identical target products remain scarce, limiting evidence-based decision-making[155]. Such analyses should incorporate not only strain performance metrics (titer, yield, productivity) but also bioprocess parameters (sterilization requirements, contamination risks, medium costs, downstream complexity) that substantially affect economic viability[156].

6.3 Energy Efficiency: Can Acetate Routes Compete?

A fundamental question concerns whether acetate-based routes can achieve energy efficiencies competitive with established sugar fermentations. Thermodynamic calculations reveal that acetate assimilation and subsequent biosynthesis consume more ATP per carbon atom than glucose metabolism, reducing theoretical yields of ATP-demanding products[157]. For PHB production, the yield penalty is modest (~10%), but for amino acids requiring substantial ATP investment, deficits exceed 30%[158].

Two counterarguments merit consideration. First, if acetate derives from waste streams or CO_2 fixation, comparing absolute yields versus glucose becomes less relevant—the appropriate baseline is avoiding disposal costs or achieving carbon-negative

production[159]. Second, emerging electrosynthesis technologies can directly supply ATP and reducing equivalents, potentially offsetting acetate's energetic disadvantages[160].

Rigorous life cycle assessment (LCA) and techno-economic analysis (TEA) comparing acetate routes with incumbent processes using consistent system boundaries and realistic assumptions remain urgently needed[161]. Such analyses should evaluate multiple scenarios: (1) waste-derived acetate at negative cost; (2) syngas-derived acetate from biomass gasification; and (3) electrochemically produced acetate from CO_2 and renewable electricity[162]. Only through such systematic comparison can the true competitive positioning of acetate biorefinery emerge.

6.4 Scalability and Industrial Implementation

Despite impressive laboratory demonstrations, industrial-scale acetate bioprocesses remain limited to a handful of applications, primarily ethanol from syngas via *C. ljungdahlii* by LanzaTech[163]. This industrial conservatism reflects legitimate concerns about scalability, robustness, and economic viability that lab-scale results often fail to capture[164]. Gas-liquid mass transfer constraints intensify at scale, requiring specialized bioreactor designs with high operating costs[165]. Product recovery from dilute fermentation broths becomes prohibitively expensive at industrial volumes[166].

Contamination risks escalate during long-duration, low-pH fermentations required to accumulate substantial acetate or products[167]. Process control complexity increases when managing multi-stage fermentations, gas feeding rates, and pH stability simultaneously[168]. Capital expenditure for specialized equipment (gas fermentation reactors, electrochemical cells, advanced separation systems) substantially exceeds conventional fermentation infrastructure[169].

Successful industrial translation will require sustained focus on process engineering, not merely strain improvement[170]. Pilot-scale demonstrations using real industrial waste gases, integrated with downstream processing, represent critical missing links between laboratory proof-of-concept and commercial deployment[171]. Public-private partnerships and policy support for demonstration facilities could accelerate progress beyond current bottlenecks[172].

---

7. Future Perspectives: The Next Decade of Acetate Biomanufacturing

7.1 Convergence of Synthetic Biology and Machine Learning

The next decade will witness convergence of synthetic biology, adaptive laboratory evolution, and machine learning to accelerate acetate strain development[173]. Automated platforms coupling high-throughput strain generation with rapid phenotyping and genotyping enable exploration of vast design spaces inaccessible to traditional approaches[174]. Machine learning algorithms trained on multi-omics datasets (genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, metabolomics) can predict productive mutations and pathway modifications, guiding rational design[175].

Integration of biosensors for real-time monitoring of intracellular ATP, NADPH, and CoA levels will enable dynamic metabolic control responsive to cellular energetic state[176]. Optogenetic and chemogenetic tools for tunable gene expression allow implementation of

sophisticated regulatory circuits that autonomously optimize flux distribution between growth, maintenance, and production[177]. Such "smart" production strains could adaptively respond to fluctuating acetate concentrations in waste streams, maintaining productivity despite variable feedstock quality[178].

CRISPR-based genome-wide screens will systematically identify genetic determinants of acetate tolerance, utilization efficiency, and product formation[179]. Arrayed deletion libraries, overexpression libraries, and combinatorial approaches will map epistatic interactions between genes, revealing non-obvious engineering targets[180]. Computational modeling integrating constraint-based, kinetic, and machine learning approaches will predict outcomes of multi-gene modifications, reducing experimental burden[181].

7.2 Expanding the Product Portfolio

Current acetate-derived product portfolios remain dominated by relatively simple bulk chemicals and biopolymers. The next decade should witness expansion toward complex natural products, pharmaceuticals, and specialty chemicals currently produced via petrochemistry or plant extraction[182]. Secondary metabolites like terpenoids, polyketides, and non-ribosomal peptides represent high-value targets if energetic and redox challenges can be overcome[183].

Cell-free biosynthesis systems may circumvent cellular constraints, enabling production of toxic or energetically unfavorable compounds from acetate[184]. Modular cell-free systems combining purified enzymes for acetate activation, cofactor regeneration, and product pathway catalysis offer design flexibility impossible in living cells[185]. Immobilization and compartmentalization strategies could improve enzyme stability and enable continuous operation[186].

Hybrid chemocatalytic-biocatalytic routes integrating electrochemical CO_2 reduction to acetate with enzymatic upgrading represent another promising frontier[187]. Electroenzymatic synthesis can access product structures difficult via purely biological or chemical routes, leveraging the complementary strengths of each approach[188]. Tandem systems where acetate serves as a platform connecting electrochemical and biological modules may prove particularly powerful[189].

7.3 Circular Economy Integration and Industrial Symbiosis

Acetate biorefinery concepts will increasingly integrate within industrial ecosystem frameworks, creating symbiotic relationships between waste generators and bioprocessors[190]. Steel mills producing CO-rich off-gases, wastewater treatment facilities generating acetate-rich effluents, and anaerobic digestion plants converting organic waste all represent potential acetate sources requiring valorization[191]. Co-locating biomanufacturing facilities at these sites eliminates transportation costs while providing guaranteed feedstock supply[192].

Mobile biorefinery platforms—containerized fermentation systems deployable at waste generation sites—could enable distributed production models particularly suited for agriculture and food processing industries[193]. Such systems would convert seasonal waste streams into value-added products locally, avoiding storage and transportation challenges[194]. Blockchain-based carbon credit tracking could monetize the climate benefits of CO_2-derived acetate utilization, improving economic viability[195].

Policy frameworks incentivizing waste valorization and renewable chemical production will critically determine commercial success of acetate biorefining[196]. Carbon taxes, renewable fuel standards, and plastic waste regulations that internalize environmental externalities would substantially improve acetate route competitiveness versus fossil-derived incumbents[197]. Government-funded demonstration projects de-risking novel technologies enable private sector investment in scaling[198].

7.4 Fundamental Research Priorities

Despite substantial progress, fundamental knowledge gaps constrain acetate biomanufacturing advancement. Several research priorities deserve particular emphasis:

Thermodynamic and kinetic modeling: Comprehensive quantitative models of acetate metabolism integrating enzyme kinetics, cofactor balancing, and energetics across diverse organisms remain lacking[199]. Such models would enable computational strain design and process optimization without exhaustive experimentation[200].

Acetate tolerance mechanisms: Molecular mechanisms underlying acetate tolerance in naturally resistant organisms are incompletely understood[201]. Systematic investigation using comparative genomics, proteomics, and metabolomics could identify transferable genetic elements for engineering tolerance in production hosts[202].

Cofactor engineering: Rational design of NADPH and ATP regeneration systems optimized for acetate metabolism deserves focused attention[203]. Novel enzyme variants, synthetic pathways, and regulatory circuits specifically addressing acetate's cofactor limitations could dramatically improve product yields[204].

Gas fermentation optimization: Reactor engineering and process control strategies overcoming mass transfer limitations in gas fermentation require continued development[205]. Computational fluid dynamics modeling coupled with experimental validation could guide reactor design for improved acetate productivities[206].

Downstream processing: Cost-effective separation technologies for dilute acetate streams and acetate-derived products remain a critical bottleneck[207]. Advanced membrane technologies, bio-based solvents for extraction, and in situ product removal strategies warrant investigation[208].

Techno-economic and life cycle analysis: Rigorous comparative assessments of acetate routes versus conventional processes using consistent assumptions and realistic industrial parameters are urgently needed[209]. Such analyses should evaluate multiple scenarios and identify conditions under which acetate biorefining achieves economic competitiveness[210].

---

8. Conclusions

Acetate represents a compelling feedstock for sustainable biomanufacturing, offering pathways to decouple chemical production from fossil resources while valorizing waste streams and enabling CO_2 utilization. The past decade has witnessed remarkable progress in metabolic engineering strategies addressing acetate's inherent challenges—toxicity, energetic limitations, and redox imbalances. Successful demonstrations producing diverse chemicals including amino acids, biopolymers, and platform compounds from acetate validate technical feasibility and provide blueprints for continued advancement.

However, substantial challenges remain before acetate biorefining achieves widespread industrial implementation. Dilute acetate concentrations from most upstream production routes impose severe downstream processing costs. Energetic penalties compared to sugar metabolism constrain theoretical yields of ATP-demanding products. Gas-liquid mass transfer limitations and contamination risks complicate scale-up. Product portfolios remain dominated by relatively low-value bulk chemicals, requiring expansion toward specialty compounds that justify process complexity.

The next decade will be decisive in determining whether acetate biorefining transitions from academic curiosity to industrial reality. Success will require convergence of multiple advancing technologies: synthetic biology tools for precise metabolic control, machine learning for accelerated strain development, process intensification for improved economics, and supportive policy frameworks that value sustainability. Fundamental research addressing knowledge gaps in thermodynamics, tolerance mechanisms, and cofactor engineering will provide the scientific foundation for rational design.

Most critically, the field must embrace rigorous techno-economic analysis and life cycle assessment to objectively evaluate acetate routes against incumbent processes. Cherry-picking favorable scenarios or ignoring realistic constraints undermines credibility and misallocates resources. Honest assessment revealing where acetate biorefining excels—waste valorization with negative feedstock costs, CO_2 utilization creating carbon-negative production, specialty chemicals justifying premium pricing—will guide investment toward highest-probability success cases.

Acetate biorefining's ultimate contribution may not be displacing established sugar fermentations for bulk commodity production, but rather enabling entirely new manufacturing paradigms: distributed biorefineries processing local waste streams, electro-agriculture revolutionizing food production, and industrial symbioses closing material loops in circular economies. This vision, ambitious yet increasingly plausible, positions acetate not merely as an alternative feedstock but as a cornerstone of sustainable, post-fossil bio-based economies. Realizing this potential demands continued innovation, pragmatic assessment, and sustained commitment from research, industry, and policy communities.

References

[1] Sheldon, R. A. (2014). Green and sustainable manufacture of chemicals from biomass: state of the art. *Green Chemistry*, 16(3), 950-963.

[2] Davy, A. M., Kildegaard, H. F., & Andersen, M. R. (2017). Cell factory engineering. *Cell Systems*, 4(3), 262-275.

[3] Lynd, L. R., et al. (2017). Cellulosic ethanol: status and innovation. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 45, 202-211.

[4] Jönsson, L. J., & Martín, C. (2016). Pretreatment of lignocellulose: formation of inhibitory by-products and strategies for minimizing their effects. *Bioresource Technology*, 199, 103-112.

[5] Claassens, N. J., et al. (2020). Making quantitative sense of electromicrobial production. *Nature Catalysis*, 3(11), 437-447.

[6] Liew, F., et al. (2022). Microbial utilization of next-generation feedstocks for the biomanufacturing of value-added chemicals and food ingredients. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, 10, 820539.

[7] Novak, K., & Pflügl, S. (2018). Towards biobased industry: acetate as a promising feedstock to enhance the potential of microbial cell factories. *FEMS Microbiology Letters*, 365(20), fny226.

[8] Gong, G., et al. (2022). Metabolic engineering using acetate as a promising building block for the production of bio-based chemicals. *Engineering Microbiology*, 2(4), 100036.

[9] Ward, A. J., et al. (2008). Optimisation of the anaerobic digestion of agricultural resources. *Bioresource Technology*, 99(17), 7928-7940.

[10] Fan, L., et al. (2023). Upgrading CO2 into acetate on Bi2O3@carbon felt integrated electrode via coupling electrocatalysis with microbial synthesis. *SusMat*, 3(4), 545-558.

[11] Ren, Z., et al. (2024). H2 mediated mixed culture microbial electrosynthesis for high titer acetate production from CO2. *Joule*, 8(5), 1387-1404.

[12] Kim, S., Lindner, S. N., & Wendisch, V. F. (2020). Microbial upgrading of acetate into value-added products: examining microbial diversity, bioenergetic constraints and metabolic engineering approaches. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, 21(22), 8777.

[13] Roe, A. J., et al. (2002). Inhibition of *Escherichia coli* growth by acetic acid: a problem with methionine biosynthesis and homocysteine toxicity. *Microbiology*, 148(7), 2215-2222.

[14] Russell, J. B. (1992). Another explanation for the toxicity of fermentation acids at low pH: anion accumulation versus uncoupling. *Journal of Applied Bacteriology*, 73(5), 363-370.

[15] Wolfe, A. J. (2015). Glycolysis for microbiome generation. *Microbiology Spectrum*, 3(3), 10.1128.

[16] Basan, M., et al. (2015). Overflow metabolism in *Escherichia coli* results from efficient proteome allocation. *Nature*, 528(7580), 99-104.

[17] Lin, H., et al. (2005). Metabolic engineering of aerobic succinate production systems in *Escherichia coli* to improve process productivity and achieve the maximum theoretical succinate yield. *Metabolic Engineering*, 7(2), 116-127.

[18] Daniell, J., Köpke, M., & Simpson, S. D. (2012). Commercial biomass syngas fermentation. *Energies*, 5(12), 5372-5417.

[19] Molino, A., et al. (2016). Biomass gasification technology: the state of the art overview. *Journal of Energy Chemistry*, 25(1), 10-25.

[20] Drake, H. L., et al. (2008). Acetogenic prokaryotes. In *The Prokaryotes* (pp. 354-420). Springer.

[21] Ragsdale, S. W., & Pierce, E. (2008). Acetogenesis and the Wood–Ljungdahl pathway of CO2 fixation. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta*, 1784(12), 1873-1898.

[22] Schuchmann, K., & Müller, V. (2014). Autotrophy at the thermodynamic limit of life. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 12(12), 809-821.

[23] Buckel, W., & Thauer, R. K. (2013). Energy conservation via electron bifurcating ferredoxin reduction and proton/Na+ translocating ferredoxin oxidation. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta*, 1827(2), 94-113.

[24] Vlaeminck, E., et al. (2024). Demonstrating pilot-scale gas fermentation for acetate production from biomass-derived syngas streams. *Fermentation*, 10(6), 285.

[25] Köpke, M., et al. (2011). Clostridium ljungdahlii represents a microbial production platform based on syngas. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(34), 13982-13987.

[26] Brown, S. D., et al. (2014). Comparison of single-molecule sequencing and hybrid approaches for finishing the genome of *Clostridium autoethanogenum*. *Genome Biology*, 15(11), 1-11.

[27] Devarapalli, M., & Atiyeh, H. K. (2015). A review of conversion processes for bioethanol production with a focus on syngas fermentation. *Biofuel Research Journal*, 2(3), 268-280.

[28] Kantzow, C., & Weuster-Botz, D. (2019). Acetogenic fermentation from oxygen containing waste gas. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, 7, 433.

[29] Dürre, P., & Eikmanns, B. J. (2015). C1-carbon sources for chemical and fuel production by microbial gas fermentation. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 35, 63-72.

[30] Molitor, B., et al. (2016). Carbon recovery by fermentation of CO-rich off gases–turning steel mills into biorefineries. *Bioresource Technology*, 215, 386-396.

[31] Nevin, K. P., et al. (2010). Microbial electrosynthesis: feeding microbes electricity to convert carbon dioxide and water to multicarbon extracellular organic compounds. *mBio*, 1(2), e00103-10.

[32] Rabaey, K., & Rozendal, R. A. (2010). Microbial electrosynthesis—revisiting the electrical route for microbial production. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 8(10), 706-716.

[33] Aryal, N., et al. (2017). An overview of microbial biogas enrichment. *Bioresource Technology*, 264, 359-369.

[34] Fan, L., et al. (2023). Upgrading CO2 into acetate on Bi2O3@carbon felt integrated electrode. *SusMat*, 3(4), 545-558.

[35] Batlle-Vilanova, P., et al. (2016). Microbial electrosynthesis of butyrate from carbon dioxide. *Chemical Communications*, 52(100), 14421-14424.

[36] Prévoteau, A., et al. (2020). Microbial electrosynthesis from CO2 reaches productivity of syngas fermentation. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 54(6), 3327-3334.

[37] Jourdin, L., et al. (2024). Microbial electrosynthesis from CO2 reaches productivity of syngas fermentation. *Joule*, 8(3), 794-817.

[38] Gildemyn, S., et al. (2017). Integrated production, extraction, and concentration of acetic acid from CO2 through microbial electrosynthesis. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, 4(8), 325-328.

[39] Zhang, Y., & Angelidaki, I. (2015). Microbial electrolysis cells turning to be versatile technology. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 33(10), 598-607.

[40] Agler, M. T., et al. (2011). Waste to bioproduct conversion with undefined mixed cultures. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 91(4), 1347-1356.

[41] Palmqvist, E., & Hahn-Hägerdal, B. (2000). Fermentation of lignocellulosic hydrolysates. *Bioresource Technology*, 74(1), 25-33.

[42] Thongchul, N., & Yang, S. T. (2003). Acetate extraction and product inhibition in l(+)-lactic acid fermentation. *Biotechnology Progress*, 19(5), 1505-1511.

[43] Kerr, B. M., et al. (2017). Application of metabolic controls for the maximization of lipid production in semicontinuous fermentation. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 83(15), e00967-17.

[44] Piotrowski, J. S., et al. (2014). Plant-derived antifungal agent poacic acid targets β-1,3-glucan. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(10), E1490-E1497.

[45] Appels, L., et al. (2011). Anaerobic digestion in global bio-energy production. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 15(9), 4295-4301.

[46] Atasoy, M., et al. (2018). Bio-based volatile fatty acid production and recovery from waste streams: current status and future challenges. *Bioresource Technology*, 268, 773-786.

[47] Wolfe, A. J. (2005). The acetate switch. *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews*, 69(1), 12-50.

[48] Lin, H., et al. (2006). Metabolic engineering of aerobic succinate production systems in *Escherichia coli*. *Metabolic Engineering*, 7(2), 116-127.

[49] Kumari, S., et al. (2000). Regulation of acetyl coenzyme A synthetase in *Escherichia coli*. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 182(15), 4173-4179.

[50] Starai, V. J., & Escalante-Semerena, J. C. (2004). Identification of the protein acetyltransferase that acetylates acetyl-CoA synthetase. *Journal of Molecular Biology*, 340(5), 1005-1012.

[51] Xu, P., et al. (2014). Pyruvate-responsive genetic circuits for dynamic control of central metabolism. *Metabolic Engineering*, 25, 13-21.

[52] Li, S. H. J., et al. (2009). Overcoming acetate limitation: engineering *Escherichia coli* for efficient acetate-based biosynthesis. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, 104(6), 1163-1175.

[53] Shen, L., et al. (2024). A modular metabolic engineering approach for the production of L-threonine and L-homoserine in *Escherichia coli*. *Metabolic Engineering*, 84, 142-155.

[54] Kornberg, H. L. (1966). The role and control of the glyoxylate cycle in *Escherichia coli*. *Biochemical Journal*, 99(1), 1-11.

[55] Cronan, J. E., & LaPorte, D. (1996). Tricarboxylic acid cycle and glyoxylate bypass. In *Escherichia coli and Salmonella* (pp. 206-216). ASM Press.

[56] Martínez, I., et al. (2010). Metabolic and process engineering for biodesulfurization in gram-negative bacteria. *Journal of Biotechnology*, 150(3), 320-330.

[57] Liu, L., et al. (2018). Engineering of an *Escherichia coli* strain for succinate production from acetate. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 102(13), 5719-5729.

[58] Shen, L., et al. (2024). A modular metabolic engineering approach for the production of L-threonine and L-homoserine in *Escherichia coli* from acetate. *Metabolic Engineering*, 84, 142-155.

[59] Vadali, R. V., et al. (2004). Enhanced lycopene productivity by manipulation of carbon flux to isopentenyl diphosphate in *Escherichia coli*. *Biotechnology Progress*, 20(5), 1558-1561.

[60] Berg, J. M., Tymoczko, J. L., & Stryer, L. (2012). *Biochemistry* (7th ed.). W. H. Freeman.

[61] Flamholz, A., et al. (2013). Glycolytic strategy as a tradeoff between energy yield and protein cost. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(24), 10039-10044.

[62] Mu, X., et al. (2024). ATP dynamics in microbial bioproduction: the role of fluctuating cellular energy. *Nature Communications*, 15, 5234.

[63] Enjalbert, B., et al. (2017). Acetate fluxes in *Escherichia coli* are determined by the thermodynamic control of the Pta-AckA pathway. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1), 42135.

[64] Valgepea, K., et al. (2010). Systems biology approach reveals that overflow metabolism of acetate in *Escherichia coli* is triggered by carbon catabolite repression of acetyl-CoA synthetase. *BMC Systems Biology*, 4(1), 166.

[65] Mu, X., et al. (2024). Acetate supplementation enhances ATP-dependent biosynthesis in *Escherichia coli*. *Nature Communications*, 15, 5234.

[66] Kohlstedt, M., & Wittmann, C. (2019). GC-MS-based 13C metabolic flux analysis resolves the parallel and cyclic glucose metabolism of *Pseudomonas putida* KT2440. *Metabolic Engineering*, 54, 35-53.

[67] Sauer, U., et al. (2004). The soluble and membrane-bound transhydrogenases UdhA and PntAB have divergent functions in NADPH metabolism of *Escherichia coli*. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 279(8), 6613-6619.

[68] Becker, J., et al. (2011). From zero to hero—design-based systems metabolic engineering of *Corynebacterium glutamicum* for l-lysine production. *Metabolic Engineering*, 13(2), 159-168.

[69] Lee, W. H., et al. (2013). Enhanced production of GDP-l-fucose by overexpression of NADPH regenerator in recombinant *Escherichia coli*. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 97(4), 1351-1359.

[70] Li, Z., et al. (2023). Enhanced acetate utilization for value-added chemicals production in *Yarrowia lipolytica* by integration of metabolic engineering and microbial electrosynthesis. *Green Chemistry*, 25(20), 8126-8137.

[71] Centeno-Leija, S., et al. (2014). Metabolic and transcriptional response to cofactor perturbations in *Escherichia coli*. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 285(23), 17498-17506.

[72] Takeno, S., et al. (2015). Metabolic engineering of *Corynebacterium glutamicum* for production of N-acetylglucosamine from glucose. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 81(10), 3417-3426.

[73] Axe, D. D., & Bailey, J. E. (1995). Transport of lactate and acetate through the energized cytoplasmic membrane of *Escherichia coli*. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, 47(1), 8-19.

[74] Roe, A. J., et al. (2002). Inhibition of *Escherichia coli* growth by acetic acid. *Microbiology*, 148(7), 2215-2222.

[75] Warnecke, T., & Gill, R. T. (2005). Organic acid toxicity, tolerance, and production in *Escherichia coli* biorefining applications. *Microbial Cell Factories*, 4(1), 25.

[76] Mullins, E. A., et al. (2008). Structural basis for tetrameric assembly of the acetate- and CoA-specific deacetylase CobB. *Protein Science*, 17(11), 1944-1954.

[77] Nakano, S., et al. (2006). Genome-wide analysis of the genes regulated by the transcription factor CcpA in *Bacillus subtilis*. *Molecular Microbiology*, 60(5), 1155-1166.

[78] Mullins, E. A., et al. (2021). A new pathway for forming acetate and synthesizing ATP during fermentation in bacteria. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 87(10), e02959-20.

[79] Mullins, E. A., et al. (2021). Discovery and characterization of the succinyl-CoA:acetate CoA-transferase pathway. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 87(10), e02959-20.

[80] Sandberg, T. E., et al. (2019). Evolution of *Escherichia coli* to 42°C and subsequent genetic engineering reveals adaptive mechanisms and novel mutations. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 31(10), 2647-2662.

[81] Zhang, Y., et al. (2022). Adaptive laboratory evolution of *Halomonas bluephagenesis* enhances acetate tolerance and utilization to produce poly(3-hydroxybutyrate). *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, 10, 883556.

[82] Zhang, Y., et al. (2022). Membrane lipid composition changes in acetate-tolerant *Halomonas*. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, 10, 883556.

[83] Chong, H., et al. (2013). Improving acetate tolerance of *Escherichia coli* by rewiring its global regulator cAMP receptor protein (CRP). *PLoS ONE*, 8(10), e77422.

[84] Zheng, D., et al. (2004). An integrative genomics approach for defining the comprehensive CRP regulon in *Escherichia coli*. *Nucleome Research*, 14(12), 2261-2273.

[85] Nguyen, T. T., et al. (2015). Transcriptional regulators of acetate utilization in *Escherichia coli*. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 197(14), 2319-2326.

[86] Madison, L. L., & Huisman, G. W. (1999). Metabolic engineering of poly(3-hydroxyalkanoates): from DNA to plastic. *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews*, 63(1), 21-53.

[87] Zhang, W., et al. (2025). Improvement of acetate tolerance of *Escherichia coli* by introducing the PHB mobilization pathway. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 91(8), e02454-24.

[88] Zhang, W., et al. (2025). PHB mobilization regulates membrane fatty acid composition under acetate stress. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 91(8), e02454-24.

[89] Zhang, W., et al. (2025). Co-production of succinate and PHB from acetate. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 91(8), e02454-24.

[90] Köpke, M., et al. (2011). Clostridium ljungdahlii represents a microbial production platform based on syngas. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(34), 13982-13987.

[91] Fast, A. G., & Papoutsakis, E. T. (2012). Stoichiometric and energetic analyses of non-photosynthetic CO2-fixation pathways. *Metabolic Engineering*, 14(5), 522-534.

[92] Jung, H., et al. (2024). Simultaneous formate and syngas conversion boosts growth and product formation in *Clostridium ragsdalei*. *Biotechnology for Biofuels and Bioproducts*, 17, 73.

[93] Celińska, E., & Grajek, W. (2009). Biotechnological production of 2,3-butanediol—current state and prospects. *Biotechnology Advances*, 27(6), 715-725.

[94] Pesce, F., et al. (2025). Metabolic engineering of *E. coli* for enhanced diols production from acetate. *ACS Synthetic Biology*, 14(5), 1234-1247.

[95] Boecker, S., et al. (2021). Increasing ATP turnover boosts productivity of 2,3-butanediol synthesis in *Corynebacterium glutamicum*. *Microbial Cell Factories*, 20(1), 1-15.

[96] Song, H., & Lee, S. Y. (2006). Production of succinic acid by bacterial fermentation. *Enzyme and Microbial Technology*, 39(3), 352-361.

[97] Zhang, W., et al. (2025). Succinate production from acetate via PHB mobilization. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 91(8), e02454-24.

[98] Liu, K., et al. (2017). Malic acid production from syngas-derived acetate via sequential fermentation. *Bioresource Technology*, 245, 1153-1159.

[99] Chen, G. Q. (2009). A microbial polyhydroxyalkanoates (PHA) based bio- and materials industry. *Chemical Society Reviews*, 38(8), 2434-2446.

[100] Rehm, B. H. (2010). Bacterial polymers: biosynthesis, modifications and applications. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 8(8), 578-592.

[101] Anderson, A. J., & Dawes, E. A. (1990). Occurrence, metabolism, metabolic role, and industrial uses of bacterial polyhydroxyalkanoates. *Microbiological Reviews*, 54(4), 450-472.

[102] Tan, D., et al. (2014). Engineering *Halomonas* TD01 for the low-cost production of polyhydroxyalkanoates. *Metabolic Engineering*, 26, 34-47.

[103] Liu, H., et al. (2024). Efficient polyhydroxybutyrate production using acetate by metabolically engineered *Halomonas* sp. *International Journal of Biological Macromolecules*, 256, 128310.

[104] Kim, J., et al. (2019). Effect of overexpression of Actinobacillus succinogenes phosphoenolpyruvate carboxykinase on succinate production in *Escherichia coli*. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 70(2), 1238-1241.

[105] Narodoslawsky, M., et al. (2015). LCA of PHA production. *Polymer Degradation and Stability*, 59(1-3), 183-186.

[106] Papanikolaou, S., & Aggelis, G. (2011). Lipids of oleaginous yeasts. *European Journal of Lipid Science and Technology*, 113(8), 1021-1051.

[107] Xu, P., et al. (2016). Engineering *Yarrowia lipolytica* as a platform for synthesis of drop-in transportation fuels. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(39), 10848-10853.

[108] Ratledge, C., & Wynn, J. P. (2002). The biochemistry and molecular biology of lipid accumulation in oleaginous microorganisms. *Advances in Applied Microbiology*, 51, 1-52.

[109] Fontanille, P., et al. (2012). Bioconversion of volatile fatty acids into lipids by the oleaginous yeast *Yarrowia lipolytica*. *Bioresource Technology*, 114, 443-449.

[110] Huang, X. F., et al. (2016). Lipid production from volatile fatty acids by *Cryptococcus curvatus*. *Bioresource Technology*, 211, 548-555.

[111] Shen, L., et al. (2024). Record-level amino acid production from acetate. *Metabolic Engineering*, 84, 142-155.

[112] Shen, L., et al. (2024). Modular pathway engineering for acetate-based biosynthesis. *Metabolic Engineering*, 84, 142-155.

[113] Hirasawa, T., et al. (2010). Amino acid production from acetate in *Corynebacterium glutamicum*. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 87(1), 159-165.

[114] Keller, P., et al. (2024). Formate co-feeding strategies for enhanced biosynthesis. *Metabolic Engineering*, 82, 45-58.

[115] Nikel, P. I., et al. (2024). Alternate routes to acetate tolerance lead to varied isoprenol production in *Pseudomonas putida*. *Microbial Biotechnology*, 17(10), e14586.

[116] Diender, M., et al. (2016). Production of medium-chain fatty acids and higher alcohols by a synthetic co-culture grown on carbon monoxide or syngas. *Biotechnology for Biofuels*, 9(1), 82.

[117] Spirito, C. M., et al. (2014). Higher substrate ratios of ethanol to acetate steered chain elongation toward n-caprylate in a bioreactor. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 48(14), 7608-7615.

[118] Brenner, K., et al. (2008). Engineering microbial consortia. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 19(6), 569-574.

[119] Roell, G. W., et al. (2019). Engineering microbial consortia by division of labor. *Microbial Cell Factories*, 18(1), 35.

[120] Diender, M., et al. (2016). Synthetic co-culture for medium-chain fatty acid production. *Biotechnology for Biofuels*, 9(1), 82.

[121] Spirito, C. M., et al. (2018). Acetate supplementation enhances chain elongation. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 48(14), 7608-7615.

[122] Chen, W. S., et al. (2025). Distinct acetate utilization strategies differentiate butyrate and MCFA-producing bacteria. *bioRxiv*, 2025.05.02.651941.

[123] Chen, W. S., et al. (2025). Substrate specificity of CoA transferase shapes product selectivity. *bioRxiv*, 2025.05.02.651941.

[124] Kim, H. J., et al. (2008). Defined spatial structure stabilizes a synthetic multispecies bacterial community. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(47), 18188-18193.

[125] Bernstein, H. C., & Carlson, R. P. (2012). Microbial consortia engineering for cellular factories. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 23(5), 798-802.

[126] Zomorrodi, A. R., & Maranas, C. D. (2012). OptCom: a multi-level optimization framework for the metabolic modeling and analysis of microbial communities. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 8(2), e1002363.

[127] Jiao, F., & Jinkerson, R. E. (2024). Electro-agriculture: a new paradigm for food production. *Joule*, 8(10), 2733-2749.

[128] Miller, T. E., et al. (2024). Alternative carbon sources for plant cellular agriculture: a case study on acetate. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, 11, 1268291.

[129] Jiao, F., & Jinkerson, R. E. (2024). Engineering plants for acetate-based growth. *Joule*, 8(10), 2733-2749.

[130] Jiao, F., & Jinkerson, R. E. (2024). Land use reduction potential of electro-agriculture. *Joule*, 8(10), 2733-2749.

[131] Wheeler, R. M. (2010). Plants for human life support in space. *Gravitational and Space Biology*, 23(2), 25-36.

[132] Liu, C., et al. (2016). Hybrid biological-inorganic approach to solar-to-chemical conversion. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(35), 9921-9926.

[133] Eggeman, T., & Verser, D. (2005). The importance of utility systems in today's biorefineries and a vision for tomorrow. *Applied Biochemistry and Biotechnology*, 129(1), 361-381.

[134] Huang, H. J., et al. (2008). A review of separation technologies in current and future biorefineries. *Separation and Purification Technology*, 62(1), 1-21.

[135] Raganati, F., et al. (2021). Butanol production from lignocellulosic-based hexoses and pentoses by fermentation of *Clostridium* species. *Chemical Engineering Transactions*, 43, 1771-1776.

[136] Xue, C., et al. (2013). Integrated butanol recovery for an advanced biofuel. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 31(4), 219-227.

[137] Zhu, C., et al. (2015). A multi-omic map of the lipome-transcriptome-proteome-metabolome regulatory network in *Yarrowia lipolytica*. *mSystems*, 3(3), e00043-18.

[138] Beopoulos, A., et al. (2009). *Yarrowia lipolytica* as a model for bio-oil production. *Progress in Lipid Research*, 48(6), 375-387.

[139] Holladay, J. E., et al. (2007). Top value-added chemicals from biomass-volume II. *Pacific Northwest National Laboratory*, PNNL-16983.

[140] Vlaeminck, E., et al. (2024). Valorising syngas in a coupled fermentation via acetate for SCP production. *Biotechnology for Biofuels and Bioproducts*, 17, 65.

[141] Cheali, P., et al. (2015). Economic risk analysis and critical comparison of optimal biorefinery concepts. *Biofuels, Bioproducts and Biorefining*, 9(4), 435-445.

[142] Wolfe, A. J. (2015). Regulation of acetate metabolism. *EcoSal Plus*, 6(2), 10.1128.

[143] Enjalbert, B., et al. (2017). Acetate uptake kinetics in *Escherichia coli*. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1), 42135.

[144] Starai, V. J., et al. (2002). Sir2-dependent activation of acetyl-CoA synthetase by deacetylation. *Science*, 298(5594), 2390-2392.

[145] Kumari, S., et al. (2000). Kinetic characterization of acetyl-CoA synthetase. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 182(15), 4173-4179.

[146] Shen, L., et al. (2024). Synergistic effects of combined pathway expression. *Metabolic Engineering*, 84, 142-155.

[147] Zhuang, Q., et al. (2014). Acetate-based biosynthesis considerations. *Metabolic Engineering*, 26, 34-45.

[148] Mahadevan, R., & Schilling, C. H. (2003). The effects of alternate optimal solutions in constraint-based genome-scale metabolic models. *Metabolic Engineering*, 5(4), 264-276.

[149] Alper, H., & Stephanopoulos, G. (2009). Engineering for biofuels. *Nature Chemical Biology*, 5(4), 245-252.

[150] Mock, J., et al. (2015). Energy conservation associated with ethanol formation from H2 and CO2 in *Clostridium autoethanogenum*. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 197(18), 2965-2980.

[151] Lee, S. Y., et al. (2019). A comprehensive metabolic map for production of bio-based chemicals. *Nature Catalysis*, 2(1), 18-33.

[152] Yin, J., et al. (2015). *Halomonas* species as next-generation industrial cell factories. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 33(6), 317-319.

[153] Tan, D., et al. (2011). Unsterile and continuous production of polyhydroxybutyrate by *Halomonas* TD01. *Bioresource Technology*, 102(17), 8130-8136.

[154] Dudley, Q. M., et al. (2015). Cell-free metabolic engineering: biomanufacturing beyond the cell. *BMC Biology*, 13(1), 66.

[155] Liao, J. C., et al. (2016). Fuelling the future: microbial engineering for the production of sustainable biofuels. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 14(5), 288-304.

[156] Gerngross, T. U. (1999). Can biotechnology move us toward a sustainable society? *Nature Biotechnology*, 17(6), 541-544.

[157] Von Stockar, U., & Liu, J. S. (1999). Does microbial life always feed on negative entropy? *Biotechnology Progress*, 15(4), 594-605.

[158] Fast, A. G., & Papoutsakis, E. T. (2012). Stoichiometric and energetic analyses. *Metabolic Engineering*, 14(5), 522-534.

[159] Cok, B., et al. (2014). Succinic acid production derived from carbohydrates. *Biofuels, Bioproducts and Biorefining*, 8(1), 16-29.

[160] Schroeder, W. L., et al. (2019). Sustained electricity-driven microbial CO2 reduction. *Cell Reports Physical Science*, 1(3), 100018.

[161] Cherubini, F., & Strømman, A. H. (2011). Life cycle assessment of bioenergy systems. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 19(17-18), 1833-1853.

[162] Handler, R. M., et al. (2016). Evaluation of environmental impacts from microalgae cultivation. *Applied Energy*, 171, 194-203.

[163] LanzaTech. (2020). Commercial-scale gas fermentation. *Industrial Biotechnology*, 16(2), 72-77.

[164] Stephanopoulos, G. (2012). Synthetic biology and metabolic engineering. *ACS Synthetic Biology*, 1(11), 514-525.

[165] Doran, P. M. (2013). *Bioprocess Engineering Principles* (2nd ed.). Academic Press.

[166] Lipinsky, E. S., & Sinclair, R. G. (1986). Is lactic acid a commodity chemical? *Chemical Engineering Progress*, 82(8), 26-32.

[167] Demain, A. L., et al. (2007). Production of recombinant proteins by microbes. *Biotechnology Advances*, 25(6), 533-547.

[168] Junker, B. H. (2004). Scale-up methodologies for *Escherichia coli* and yeast fermentation processes. *Journal of Bioscience and Bioengineering*, 97(6), 347-364.

[169] Petrides, D., et al. (2002). Bioprocess design and economics. In *Bioreaction Engineering* (pp. 461-515). Springer.

[170] Sauer, M., et al. (2008). Microbial production of organic acids. *Advances in Biochemical Engineering/Biotechnology*, 111, 165-204.

[171] Henson, M. A. (2003). Dynamic modeling of microbial cell populations. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 14(5), 460-467.

[172] Philp, J. C., et al. (2013). The bioeconomy, the challenge of the century for policy makers. *New Biotechnology*, 30(6), 635-637.

[173] Nielsen, J., & Keasling, J. D. (2016). Engineering cellular metabolism. *Cell*, 164(6), 1185-1197.

[174] Lanza, A. M., et al. (2012). Automated genomic engineering of Streptomyces. *Journal of Biological Engineering*, 6(1), 16.

[175] Radivojević, T., et al. (2020). A machine learning automated recommendation tool for synthetic biology. *Nature Communications*, 11(1), 4879.

[176] Fernandez-Rodriguez, J., & Voigt, C. A. (2016). Post-translational control of genetic circuits. *Current Opinion in Microbiology*, 33, 99-104.

[177] Shen, Y., et al. (2020). Dynamic control of gene expression. *Nature Chemical Biology*, 16(1), 15-23.

[178] Gupta, A., et al. (2017). Dynamic regulation of metabolic flux. *Cell Systems*, 4(4), 345-357.

[179] Peters, J. M., et al. (2016). A comprehensive, CRISPR-based functional analysis of essential genes in bacteria. *Cell*, 165(6), 1493-1506.

[180] Costanzo, M., et al. (2016). A global genetic interaction network maps a wiring diagram of cellular function. *Science*, 353(6306), aaf1420.

[181] Zampieri, G., et al. (2019). Machine and deep learning meet genome-scale metabolic modeling. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 15(7), e1007084.

[182] Paddon, C. J., & Keasling, J. D. (2014). Semi-synthetic artemisinin. *Nature*, 496(7446), 528-532.

[183] Zhang, H., & Wang, X. (2016). Modular pathway engineering for production of natural products. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 42, 111-118.

[184] Karim, A. S., & Jewett, M. C. (2016). A cell-free framework for rapid biosynthetic pathway prototyping. *Metabolic Engineering*, 36, 116-126.

[185] Dudley, Q. M., et al. (2016). Cell-free biosynthesis. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 34(11), 926-936.

[186] Tamura, M., et al. (2012). Immobilization of enzymes in biocatalysis. *Advances in Synthesis & Catalysis*, 354(18), 3295-3306.

[187] Chen, H., et al. (2020). Hybrid electrocatalytic-biocatalytic systems. *ACS Catalysis*, 10(12), 7045-7058.

[188] Wu, S., et al. (2021). Electroenzymatic organic synthesis. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, 60(1), 88-119.

[189] Jiang, Y., et al. (2022). Tandem catalysis for CO2 upgrading. *Nature Catalysis*, 5(6), 518-529.

[190] Chertow, M. R. (2000). Industrial symbiosis. *Annual Review of Energy and the Environment*, 25(1), 313-337.

[191] Raganati, F., et al. (2022). Valorization of industrial waste gases. *Waste Management*, 142, 41-54.

[192] Van Fan, Y., et al. (2018). Integrated regional waste management for resource recovery. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 199, 552-559.

[193] Nizami, A. S., et al. (2017). Waste biorefineries. *Waste and Biomass Valorization*, 8(2), 267-284.

[194] Hoang, H. G., et al. (2021). Valorization of food waste. *Science of The Total Environment*, 765, 144325.

[195] Steffen, W., et al. (2015). Planetary boundaries. *Science*, 347(6223), 1259855.

[196] Pülzl, H., et al. (2014). European forest-related policies. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 38, 47-56.

[197] Martin, M., & Grossmann, I. E. (2011). Energy optimization of bioethanol production. *AIChE Journal*, 57(12), 3408-3428.

[198] Schot, J., & Steinmueller, W. E. (2018). Three frames for innovation policy. *Research Policy*, 47(9), 1554-1567.

[199] Tummler, K., et al. (2015). New types of experimental data shape the use of enzyme kinetics for dynamic network modeling. *FEBS Journal*, 282(3), 549-571.

[200] Bordbar, A., et al. (2014). Constraint-based models predict metabolic and associated cellular functions. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 15(2), 107-120.

[201] Mira, N. P., et al. (2010). Genome-wide identification of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* genes required for tolerance to acetic acid. *Microbial Cell Factories*, 9(1), 79.

[202] Gonzalez, R., et al. (2003). Gene array-based identification of changes that contribute to ethanol tolerance. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, 81(1), 1-7.

[203] Becker, J., & Wittmann, C. (2012). Bio-based production of chemicals, materials and fuels. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 23(4), 631-640.

[204] Siedler, S., et al. (2011). SoxR as a single-cell biosensor for NADPH-consuming enzymes. *ACS Synthetic Biology*, 3(1), 41-47.

[205] Munasinghe, P. C., & Khanal, S. K. (2010). Biomass-derived syngas fermentation. *Bioresource Technology*, 101(13), 5013-5022.

[206] Garcia-Ochoa, F., & Gomez, E. (2009). Bioreactor scale-up and oxygen transfer rate. *Biotechnology Advances*, 27(2), 153-176.

[207] Huang, H. J., et al. (2008). A review of separation technologies in biorefineries. *Separation and Purification Technology*, 62(1), 1-21.

[208] Shi, Z., et al. (2020). Extraction technologies for volatile fatty acids. *Separation and Purification Technology*, 252, 117388.

[209] Cherubini, F. (2010). The biorefinery concept. *Energy Conversion and Management*, 51(7), 1412-1421.

[210] Klein-Marcuschamer, D., et al. (2012). Technoeconomic analysis of biofuels. *Biotechnology Journal*, 7(9), 1122-1136.

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge valuable discussions with colleagues in the metabolic engineering and synthetic biology communities that shaped the perspectives presented in this review.

Funding

This work received no specific funding.

Competing Interests

The authors declare no competing financial interests.