Acetate: A New Feedstock for Biomanufacturing

Abstract

The transition toward sustainable biomanufacturing requires diversification beyond conventional sugar-based feedstocks. Acetate has emerged as a promising alternative carbon source that can be derived from abundant, low-cost resources including waste streams, lignocellulosic biomass, and C1 gases (CO, CO_2, CH_4). This review critically examines the state-of-the-art in acetate-based biomanufacturing, encompassing acetate production routes, metabolic pathways and engineering strategies for acetate utilization, tolerance mechanisms, and the diverse portfolio of value-added products achievable from this C2 platform molecule. We analyze the biochemical and bioenergetic constraints that have historically limited acetate bioconversion, evaluate recent advances in overcoming these barriers through synthetic biology and metabolic engineering, and highlight remaining challenges in scalability and economic viability. Acetate's direct connection to acetyl-CoA—a central metabolic hub—positions it as an ideal precursor for numerous acetyl-CoA-derived chemicals, biopolymers, fuels, and food ingredients. As biorefineries increasingly integrate with circular economy principles, acetate represents a critical bridge between waste valorization and sustainable chemical production. We conclude with a forward-looking perspective on technological innovations and research priorities that will determine whether acetate can fulfill its potential as a next-generation feedstock for industrial biotechnology over the coming decade.

1. Introduction

The chemical industry's historical dependence on petroleum-derived feedstocks faces mounting pressure from resource depletion, price volatility, and climate imperatives[1][2]. Consequently, biomanufacturing has positioned itself as a cornerstone of the emerging bioeconomy, offering routes to produce fuels, chemicals, materials, and food ingredients from renewable resources through microbial fermentation. While first-generation bioprocesses predominantly relied on food-derived sugars (glucose, sucrose), subsequent efforts have focused on lignocellulosic sugars from non-food biomass[3]. However, even these second-generation feedstocks present economic and technical barriers: pretreatment complexity, inhibitor formation, seasonal availability, and competition with other biomass utilization pathways[4].

Against this backdrop, acetate (CH_3COO^-) has garnered increasing attention as an alternative C2 feedstock with distinct advantages[5][6]. Acetate is notable for its: (i) derivability from diverse, abundant sources including industrial waste gases, agricultural residues, municipal waste streams, and electrochemical CO_2 reduction; (ii) relatively low toxicity compared to other platform chemicals; (iii) high water solubility facilitating bioprocess compatibility; and (iv) direct metabolic conversion to acetyl-coenzyme A (acetyl-CoA), the universal biosynthetic precursor for a vast array of value-added compounds[7][8].

The metabolic simplicity of acetate activation—requiring only one or two enzymatic steps to reach acetyl-CoA—theoretically provides shorter pathways and potentially higher carbon efficiencies than sugar catabolism through glycolysis[9]. Furthermore, acetate utilization bypasses the overflow metabolism issues that plague high-density glucose fermentations, where acetate accumulates as an inhibitory byproduct[10]. Paradoxically, transforming this "fermentation waste" into a primary feedstock represents both an elegant solution to acetate toxicity and an opportunity for waste valorization.

Despite these conceptual advantages, acetate-based biomanufacturing faces substantial challenges. Acetate is not the preferred carbon source for most industrial microorganisms; its assimilation is energetically demanding, growth rates are typically slower than on sugars, and product titers often remain suboptimal[11][12]. Moreover, at concentrations necessary for economical fermentation (>10 g/L), acetate exhibits growth inhibition through multiple mechanisms including intracellular acidification, membrane disruption, and metabolic burden[13][14].

This review provides a comprehensive analysis of acetate as a biomanufacturing feedstock, structured as follows: Section 2 examines production pathways for acetate from various renewable sources; Section 3 dissects the biochemistry of microbial acetate metabolism, uptake, and tolerance mechanisms; Section 4 surveys metabolic engineering strategies that have enhanced acetate utilization; Section 5 catalogs the expanding portfolio of products derived from acetate; Section 6 analyzes remaining technical and economic barriers; and Section 7 offers perspectives on future research directions and the technology's commercialization trajectory.

2. Acetate Production: From Waste to Valuable Feedstock

2.1 Syngas Fermentation and C1 Gas Conversion

One of the most compelling routes to acetate leverages autotrophic acetogenic bacteria capable of fixing C1 gases—CO, CO_2, and H_2—through the Wood-Ljungdahl pathway (WLP), also termed the reductive acetyl-CoA pathway[15][16]. This ancient metabolic route enables acetogens to use CO as both carbon source and electron donor, or to reduce CO_2 with electrons from H_2 or CO oxidation, ultimately synthesizing acetyl-CoA and subsequently acetate while conserving energy via substrate-level phosphorylation[17][18].

Syngas, a mixture primarily comprising CO, CO_2, and H_2, can be generated from gasification of diverse carbonaceous materials including municipal solid waste, agricultural residues, coal, or industrial off-gases (steel mill flue gas, refinery waste streams)[19][20]. The stoichiometry of syngas fermentation to acetate follows:

- From CO alone: $4CO + 2H_2O \rightarrow CH_3COOH + 2CO_2$
- From CO_2 and H_2: $2CO_2 + 4H_2 \rightarrow CH_3COOH + 2H_2O$
- From syngas mixtures: combinations depending on gas composition[21]

Prominent acetogenic species include *Clostridium ljungdahlii*, *Clostridium autoethanogenum*, *Moorella thermoacetica*, *Acetobacterium woodii*, and *Clostridium aceticum*[22][23]. These organisms demonstrate remarkable metabolic flexibility, tolerating variable gas compositions and impurities (H_2S, NO_x, NH_3) present in industrial waste gases, though inhibitory thresholds vary by species and adaptation history[24][25].

Pilot-scale and commercial demonstrations of syngas fermentation have focused predominantly on ethanol production (LanzaTech, INEOS Bio), but acetate accumulation represents the thermodynamically favorable and kinetically faster product under most conditions[26]. Recent work with *M. thermoacetica* achieved acetate titers exceeding 50 g/L from syngas in pilot-scale continuous reactors, demonstrating technical feasibility[27]. The subsequent conversion of this microbially-produced acetate to higher-value products via heterotrophic organisms—termed sequential fermentation—has emerged as a promising biorefinery architecture[28][29].

2.2 Electrochemical CO_2 Reduction

Microbial electrosynthesis (MES) represents an innovative hybrid technology coupling electrochemical CO_2 reduction with microbial metabolism[30]. In MES systems, CO_2 is reduced at a biocathode to intermediates (H_2, formate, or directly to acetate) using electrical current derived from renewable sources. Acetogens colonizing the cathode then utilize these intermediates or electrical electrons directly to produce acetate and other products[31][32].

MES offers potential advantages over conventional syngas fermentation: (i) avoidance of gasification's high temperatures and energy requirements; (ii) direct coupling with intermittent renewable electricity for energy storage; (iii) higher selectivity and purity of CO_2 feed compared to syngas; and (iv) operation at ambient temperatures and pressures[33]. Recent advances have achieved acetate production rates approaching 10 g/L/day with coulombic efficiencies exceeding 80%[34].

A particularly elegant two-stage architecture has been demonstrated where Stage 1 electrochemically converts CO_2 to acetate, and Stage 2 feeds this acetate to heterotrophs producing proteins, lipids, or specialty chemicals[35]. This approach decouples the slow autotrophic growth phase from the faster heterotrophic production phase, potentially overcoming kinetic limitations inherent to single-stage systems.

2.3 Lignocellulosic Biomass and Waste Stream Valorization

Lignocellulosic biomass processing generates acetate through multiple routes. During dilute acid or hydrothermal pretreatment, acetyl groups on hemicellulose are liberated as acetic acid, typically at 5-15 g/L concentrations in pretreatment liquors[36][37]. While conventionally viewed as an inhibitor requiring removal before sugar fermentation, this acetate represents a substantial carbon stream—estimates suggest that utilizing acetate from US lignocellulosic biorefining could supply feedstock for millions of tons of chemicals annually[38].

Anaerobic digestion of organic waste inherently produces volatile fatty acids (VFAs) including acetate as intermediates before methanogenesis. By interrupting the process before the methanogenic stage (termed "arrested anaerobic digestion"), acetate-rich effluents can be harvested[39][40]. Food waste, agricultural residues, wastewater treatment sludge, and industrial organic waste streams have all been demonstrated as viable sources, with acetate concentrations ranging from 2-20 g/L depending on feedstock and operational parameters[41].

Dark fermentation for hydrogen production from carbohydrate-rich waste generates acetate as a major co-product. The coupling of dark fermentation's acetate-rich effluent

with polyhydroxyalkanoate (PHA) production has emerged as an attractive biorefinery integration strategy[42][43].

2.4 Chemical Synthesis Routes

While this review focuses on biological production, it is worth noting that acetate can be synthesized through methanol carbonylation (the dominant industrial route producing >10 million tons annually), ethylene oxidation, or alkane oxidation[44]. These chemical routes currently produce acetate primarily for use as acetic acid in chemical synthesis, solvents, and preservatives. However, the potential to couple renewable electricity-driven CO_2 hydrogenation to methanol followed by carbonylation to acetate represents a hybrid chemo-bio route worthy of consideration in future biorefinery designs[45].

3. Biochemistry of Acetate Metabolism

3.1 Acetate Uptake and Activation

Microorganisms have evolved multiple pathways for acetate internalization and activation to acetyl-CoA, the choice of which significantly impacts growth rate, ATP balance, and carbon flux distribution[46][47].

Passive Diffusion of Acetic Acid: At pH values below the pKa of acetic acid (4.76), undissociated acetic acid can diffuse across the cell membrane. Inside the neutral-pH cytoplasm, it dissociates releasing protons, which leads to intracellular acidification—a primary mechanism of acetate toxicity[48][49].

Active Transport: At physiological pH (6-8), acetate exists predominantly in its dissociated form and requires active transport. In *Escherichia coli*, the ActP acetate/proton symporter facilitates acetate uptake at low external concentrations, while at high concentrations other mechanisms may dominate[50].

Activation Pathways: Once intracellular, acetate must be activated to acetyl-CoA through one of two primary routes:

1. **Acetyl-CoA Synthetase (Acs) Pathway:** Direct ATP-dependent ligation
$$Acetate + CoA + ATP \rightarrow Acetyl\text{-}CoA + AMP + PP_i$$
This pathway consumes 2 ATP equivalents (ATP → AMP requires subsequent AMP + ATP → 2 ADP, consuming another ATP equivalent)[51].
2. **Acetate Kinase-Phosphotransacetylase (AckA-Pta) Pathway:** Two-step activation via acetyl-phosphate
$$Acetate + ATP \xrightarrow{AckA} Acetyl\text{-}P + ADP$$
$$Acetyl\text{-}P + CoA \xrightarrow{Pta} Acetyl\text{-}CoA + P_i$$
This pathway consumes 1 ATP and is reversible, functioning in both acetate synthesis and utilization[52].

The regulatory control of these pathways is complex. In *E. coli*, Acs is preferentially expressed at low acetate concentrations (<5 mM) where its higher affinity (Km ≈ 0.2 mM) provides a kinetic advantage[53]. At higher acetate concentrations (>20 mM), the AckA-Pta

pathway dominates despite its lower affinity (Km ≈ 7 mM) due to its lower ATP cost and higher catalytic efficiency[54]. Post-translational acetylation of Acs by the Pat acetyltransferase inactivates the enzyme, while the CobB deacetylase reverses this modification—creating a sophisticated acetylation-based control system that senses cellular acetyl-CoA/CoA ratios[55].

3.2 Central Metabolism from Acetyl-CoA

Acetyl-CoA occupies a central position in metabolism, serving as the entry point to multiple pathways:

Glyoxylate Shunt (Bypass): When acetate is the sole carbon source, the glyoxylate shunt circumvents the CO_2-releasing steps of the tricarboxylic acid (TCA) cycle, enabling net synthesis of biosynthetic precursors[56]. The isocitrate lyase (AceA) and malate synthase (AceB) reactions characteristic of this pathway convert two molecules of acetyl-CoA into one molecule of malate, which can then be converted to oxaloacetate and subsequently to phosphoenolpyruvate (PEP) for gluconeogenesis[57].

$$2\ Acetyl\text{-}CoA + NAD^+ \rightarrow Malate + 2\ CoA + NADH + H^+$$

The glyoxylate shunt is essential for growth on acetate as it provides C4 compounds for anabolism; deletion of *aceA* or *aceB* typically renders organisms unable to grow on acetate as sole carbon source[58].

Energy Conservation: Acetate catabolism via the TCA cycle and oxidative phosphorylation generates ATP. However, the ATP yield per carbon is lower for acetate than glucose: complete oxidation of one acetate theoretically yields ~10 ATP, whereas one glucose (C6) yields ~32 ATP, translating to ~5.3 ATP per carbon—nearly twice as efficient as acetate on a per-carbon basis[59]. This energetic deficit partially explains the slower growth rates observed on acetate.

Biosynthetic Demands: Conversion of acetyl-CoA to biosynthetic precursors requires malate-to-pyruvate conversion, catalyzed by malic enzyme (Mae) or phosphoenolpyruvate carboxykinase (PckA). These reactions are energetically costly, with malic enzyme requiring NADPH and releasing CO_2, resulting in carbon loss:

$$Malate + NADP^+ \rightarrow Pyruvate + CO_2 + NADPH$$

This CO_2 loss represents a fundamental carbon efficiency challenge for acetate-based production, particularly for biomass formation[60].

3.3 Acetate Toxicity and Tolerance Mechanisms

Acetate inhibition manifests through multiple mechanisms, creating a complex challenge for bioprocess development[61][62].

Intracellular Acidification: Acetic acid influx and intracellular dissociation releases protons, lowering cytoplasmic pH. This disrupts the proton-motive force, inhibits glycolysis and other pH-sensitive enzymes, and triggers stress responses[63]. Studies using intracellular pH sensors have documented pH drops of 0.5-1.0 units at inhibitory acetate concentrations[64].

Membrane Perturbation: Acetate alters membrane fluidity and integrity, potentially through direct interactions with phospholipids or indirect effects on membrane protein function. Transcriptomic studies reveal upregulation of membrane repair and lipid biosynthesis pathways under acetate stress[65].

Metabolic Burden: High-flux acetate utilization creates metabolic imbalances. Accumulation of acetyl-CoA, acetyl-phosphate, or TCA cycle intermediates can inhibit key enzymes through product inhibition or allosteric regulation[66]. The cellular acetyl-CoA/CoA ratio increases dramatically during acetate growth, potentially sequestering free CoA and limiting other CoA-dependent reactions[67].

Tolerance Mechanisms: Organisms employ diverse strategies to cope with acetate stress:

- **Proton Export:** Enhanced activity of H^+-ATPases and other proton pumps maintains cytoplasmic pH at the expense of ATP[68]
- **Stress Response Activation:** The RpoS (σ^s) sigma factor in *E. coli* coordinates general stress responses including catalase, DNA repair enzymes, and chaperones[69]
- **Membrane Composition Changes:** Increased cyclopropane fatty acid content and altered phospholipid headgroup distribution enhance membrane stability[70]
- **Metabolic Rerouting:** Upregulation of pathways that consume excess acetyl-CoA or generate reducing power to balance redox stress[71]

4. Metabolic Engineering Strategies for Enhanced Acetate Utilization

4.1 Overexpression of Acetate Utilization Pathways

The most direct approach to enhance acetate consumption involves overexpression of rate-limiting steps in uptake and activation. Multiple studies have demonstrated that coordinated overexpression of acetate activation (Acs or AckA-Pta), glyoxylate shunt enzymes (AceA, AceB), and malate-to-pyruvate conversion (MaeA or MaeB) synergistically increases acetate flux[72][73].

In *E. coli*, a landmark study comparing Acs versus AckA-Pta overexpression for 2,3-butanediol production from acetate revealed that the AckA-Pta route achieved 35% higher product titers (1.56 g/L) and 15% faster acetate consumption rates[74]. The authors attributed this to the lower ATP expenditure and favorable thermodynamics of the reversible AckA-Pta pathway. Importantly, singular overexpression of acetate uptake alone proved insufficient; coordinated amplification of downstream pathways (glyoxylate shunt, malic enzyme) was essential for realizing improvements[75].

Similar strategies in *Pseudomonas putida* KT2440 for medium-chain-length polyhydroxyalkanoate (mcl-PHA) production from acetate achieved 92% higher titers and 50% improved yields through Acs overexpression coupled with *phaC* (PHA synthase) amplification[76].

4.2 Adaptive Laboratory Evolution

Adaptive laboratory evolution (ALE) has proven remarkably effective for improving acetate utilization and tolerance. Serial passaging under acetate-selective pressure allows accumulation of beneficial mutations without requiring prior knowledge of specific targets[77][78].

A recent ALE study with *E. coli* in acetate-limited chemostats identified mutations in *rpoD* (σ^{70}), *cspC* (cold shock protein), *dnaJ* (chaperone), and *ydcI* (transcription factor) that collectively conferred faster growth (doubling times reduced from 6 h to 3 h) and higher acetate tolerance (up to 100 mM)[79]. Mechanistic analysis revealed that:

- *rpoD* mutations increased *acs* transcription through altered sigma factor promoter recognition
- *dnaJ* mutations shifted acetate activation from AckA-Pta to Acs by disrupting DnaK-mediated regulation
- *ydcI* mutations derepressed *gltA* (citrate synthase), increasing TCA cycle flux

Intriguingly, 45% of evolved clones exhibited growth trade-offs when returned to glucose medium—demonstrating antagonistic pleiotropy where acetate-adaptive mutations proved maladaptive in glucose[80]. This highlights a critical consideration for industrial strains: adaptation to acetate may compromise performance on mixed substrates.

Contrasting results emerged from ALE of the acetogen *Clostridium* sp. AWRP under increasing acetate concentrations. While the evolved strain gained tolerance to 10 g/L acetate and increased ethanol production, it paradoxically showed downregulation of autotrophic $CO_2 + H_2$ metabolism and reduced gas consumption rates[81]. This "metabolic degeneration" suggests that acetate-adapted acetogens may shift preference toward heterotrophic growth—an important consideration for sequential fermentation designs.

4.3 Transcriptional and Regulatory Engineering

Rational manipulation of regulatory networks controlling acetate metabolism has yielded substantial improvements. Key strategies include:

Derepression of Glyoxylate Shunt: The glyoxylate shunt repressor IclR inhibits *aceBAK* operon expression when preferred carbon sources are available. Deletion of *iclR* constitutively activates the glyoxylate shunt, accelerating acetate consumption[82]. However, constitutive activation may create metabolic imbalance if not coordinated with downstream pathway demand.

Rewiring RpoS Regulation: Since RpoS positively regulates stress resistance but can reduce growth rate, fine-tuning its expression through promoter engineering or post-translational modification (via *rssB* modulation) can optimize the growth-stress resistance trade-off[83].

Small RNA (sRNA) Engineering: The sRNA GcvB regulates multiple genes involved in amino acid metabolism. Engineering GcvB and other regulatory sRNAs has shown promise for coordinating complex metabolic changes without requiring modification of multiple individual genes[84].

4.4 Pathway Redirection and Product Formation

Beyond improving acetate consumption, redirecting carbon flux toward desired products requires product-specific engineering:

Blocking Competing Pathways: Deletion of pathways that consume acetyl-CoA or key intermediates can increase product yield. For example, deletion of *pta* (phosphotransacetylase) prevents acetate re-formation, while *adhE* deletion eliminates ethanol formation, channeling flux toward alternative products[85].

Balancing Cofactors: Acetate metabolism generates reducing equivalents (NADH, NADPH) whose balance critically affects product formation. For production of reduced compounds (e.g., butanol, isopropanol), additional reducing power is required, necessitating overexpression of transhydrogenases (PntAB, UdhA) or NADPH-generating pathways[86].

Eliminating Carbon Loss: The malate-to-pyruvate conversion via malic enzyme releases CO_2, reducing carbon efficiency. Alternative pyruvate generation routes that avoid CO_2 loss—such as direct conversion of oxaloacetate to pyruvate via PckA (which consumes ATP)—can improve carbon yield but at energetic cost[87].

4.5 Systems-Level and Multi-Omics Approaches

Genome-scale metabolic models (GEMs) have become invaluable tools for rationally designing acetate-utilizing strains[88]. Flux balance analysis (FBA) of *E. coli* growing on acetate identified malate synthase (AceB) and isocitrate dehydrogenase (Icd) as high-control-coefficient reactions, predictions subsequently validated experimentally[89].

Transcriptomic, proteomic, and metabolomic profiling of acetate-grown cells has revealed:

- Significant upregulation of glyoxylate shunt, acetate activation, and gluconeogenesis genes—as expected
- Unexpected downregulation of certain amino acid biosynthesis pathways, suggesting metabolic bottlenecks
- Accumulation of TCA cycle intermediates (succinate, fumarate, malate), indicating potential product inhibition points
- Depletion of free CoA pools, highlighting CoA availability as a potential limiting factor[90][91]

Integration of these multi-omics datasets through constraint-based modeling and machine learning is beginning to enable predictive engineering, though the complexity of acetate metabolism continues to yield surprises.

5. Product Portfolio from Acetate

5.1 Biofuels

Ethanol and Higher Alcohols: Acetogenic bacteria naturally produce ethanol from syngas, with *C. ljungdahlii* and *C. autoethanogenum* achieving ethanol titers of 30-50 g/L in optimized fed-batch cultures[92]. Interestingly, acetate supplementation at 10-20 mM has been shown to enhance ethanol productivity in acetogens by 2-3 fold, possibly by providing additional reducing equivalents or triggering metabolic shifts toward solventogenesis[93].

Engineered heterotrophs have also been developed for acetate-to-ethanol conversion. While less efficient than sugar-to-ethanol, this provides a valorization route for acetate from waste streams[94].

Butanol, a superior biofuel with higher energy density and lower hygroscopicity, has been produced from acetate by engineering acetate utilization into solventogenic clostridia. However, titers remain low (<5 g/L) due to severe butanol toxicity compounding acetate inhibition[95].

Isopropanol: Metabolic engineering of *E. coli* with the secondary alcohol pathway from *Clostridium beijerinckii* achieved isopropanol production from acetate, though titers (0.8 g/L) remain far below industrial requirements[96].

5.2 Organic Acids and Dicarboxylic Acids

Succinate and Fumarate: These C4 dicarboxylic acids are building blocks for biodegradable polymers (polybutylene succinate) and precursors for industrial chemicals. Acetate's entry via the glyoxylate shunt naturally generates C4 acids, making it a theoretically attractive feedstock. However, engineering efficient succinate production from acetate has proven challenging due to the reductive TCA branch requiring substantial NADH input and competing with energy generation[97].

Lactate: Lactic acid, used in biodegradable polylactic acid (PLA) production and as a food preservative, has been produced from acetate by expressing heterologous lactate dehydrogenase in acetate-utilizing hosts. Titers of 15-20 g/L have been reported, though productivity remains lower than glucose-based processes[98].

3-Hydroxypropionic Acid (3-HP): This platform chemical can be produced via malonyl-CoA, which is synthesized from acetyl-CoA by acetyl-CoA carboxylase. Engineering this pathway in *E. coli* growing on acetate achieved 3-HP titers of 4.2 g/L[99].

5.3 Polyhydroxyalkanoates (PHAs)

PHAs are biodegradable polyesters with mechanical properties similar to conventional plastics, making them attractive petroleum alternatives[100]. Acetate is an excellent PHA feedstock because:

- Acetyl-CoA is the direct precursor for PHB (poly-3-hydroxybutyrate) via the thiolase-reductase-synthase pathway
- Many PHA-accumulating organisms (e.g., *Cupriavidus necator*, *Pseudomonas* spp.) naturally utilize acetate efficiently
- Waste-derived acetate provides low-cost feedstock for commodity polymer applications[101]

P. putida KT2440 engineered for enhanced acetate utilization produced medium-chain-length PHA (mcl-PHA) at 2.8 g/L with 43% cellular PHA content from acetate[102]. Mixed microbial cultures enriched on VFA-containing waste streams have achieved PHA contents exceeding 60% dry cell weight, with acetate as a major carbon source[103].

A particularly promising integrated process couples dark fermentation's acetate-rich effluent directly to PHA production by photosynthetic purple bacteria (*Rhodovulum* spp.), achieving PHA titers of 3-5 g/L with the potential for low-cost, sunlight-driven production[104][105].

5.4 Amino Acids and Proteins

Single-Cell Protein (SCP): The conversion of CO_2 to acetate (via MES or gas fermentation) followed by aerobic fermentation to microbial biomass represents a closed carbon cycle for sustainable protein production[106]. A recent pilot-scale demonstration converted syngas-derived acetate to SCP using *Cupriavidus necator*, achieving protein contents of 70-75% with amino acid profiles comparable to fishmeal[107].

This two-stage CO_2-to-protein route addresses both climate mitigation (CO_2 capture) and food security. Economic analyses suggest production costs of $2-3/kg protein are achievable at scale—competitive with soy protein isolate[108].

L-Lysine and L-Glutamate: These high-value amino acids are produced at multi-million-ton scales for animal feed and food applications. Engineering acetate utilization into *Corynebacterium glutamicum*, the industrial workhorse for amino acid production, has been explored. While proof-of-concept has been established, titers and yields remain below those achieved on glucose, primarily due to lower growth rates and ATP limitations[109].

5.5 Terpenoids and Polyketides

The mevalonate and methylerythritol phosphate (MEP) pathways that produce terpenoid precursors (isopentenyl pyrophosphate, IPP) both utilize acetyl-CoA as starting material. This makes acetate an ideal feedstock for terpenes, including:

- **Isoprene:** A platform chemical for synthetic rubber, produced in engineered *E. coli* from acetate at titers of 0.4 g/L[110]
- **Farnesene:** A diesel precursor and specialty chemical, produced at 0.8 g/L from acetate[111]
- **Taxadiene:** A precursor to the anticancer drug Taxol, synthesized in acetate-grown *E. coli* expressing heterologous taxadiene synthase[112]

Polyketides, a diverse class including antibiotics, anticancer agents, and industrial chemicals, are synthesized from malonyl-CoA building blocks derived from acetyl-CoA. Engineering polyketide production from acetate remains largely unexplored but represents a high-value opportunity.

5.6 Fatty Acids and Lipids

Microbial lipids (single-cell oils, SCOs) are increasingly attractive for biodiesel, oleochemicals, and omega-3 fatty acid supplements. Oleaginous yeasts (*Yarrowia lipolytica*, *Rhodotorula* spp.) and bacteria (*Rhodococcus opacus*) naturally accumulate lipids to >50% dry cell weight[113].

Y. lipolytica engineered for enhanced acetate assimilation achieved lipid contents of 45% with lipid titers of 15 g/L from acetate—approaching industrial relevance[114]. The fatty acid profile (predominantly C16-C18) was suitable for biodiesel without further modification.

Engineered *E. coli* producing free fatty acids (FFAs) from acetate has also been reported, though titers remain low (<2 g/L) due to toxicity and membrane disruption caused by FFAs[115].

5.7 Esters and Fragrance Compounds

Short-chain esters like ethyl acetate and butyl acetate are important solvents and flavor compounds. Autotrophic production of ethyl acetate from CO via engineered *C. autoethanogenum* expressing yeast alcohol acetyltransferase (ATF1) achieved 4.5 mM butyl acetate when supplemented with butanol[116]. This demonstrates proof-of-principle for direct C1-to-ester conversion, bypassing acetate isolation.

Acetate can also serve as substrate for engineered pathways producing longer-chain esters, lactones, and other fragrance molecules, though this area remains in early research stages.

6. Technical and Economic Challenges

6.1 Bioenergetic Constraints

The fundamental energetic disadvantage of acetate relative to sugars creates an inherent productivity ceiling. The ATP yield per carbon is approximately half that of glucose, translating directly to slower growth rates and lower biomass yields[117]. For products requiring substantial reducing equivalents (NADH, NADPH), the situation is even more challenging as acetate catabolism generates less reducing power per carbon than glucose catabolism.

Potential solutions include:

- **Product Selection:** Focusing on acetyl-CoA-derived products that minimize biomass requirements and avoid highly reduced products
- **Co-feeding strategies:** Supplementing acetate with small amounts of glucose or glycerol to support energy generation while using acetate for biosynthesis
- **Metabolic decoupling:** Using energy-efficient organisms for biomass generation (from glucose) followed by non-growing biotransformation using acetate[118]

6.2 Toxicity and Concentration Limitations

Economic viability typically requires substrate concentrations >50 g/L to minimize downstream processing costs. However, acetate toxicity becomes severe above 10-20 g/L for most organisms[119]. While fed-batch feeding can maintain acetate below inhibitory levels, this compromises volumetric productivity.

Tolerance engineering via ALE, rational design, or screening naturally acetate-tolerant extremophiles remains an active research area. *Candida tropicalis* and certain *Acetobacter* species demonstrate growth at >30 g/L acetate, suggesting that higher tolerance is biologically achievable[120].

6.3 Contamination and Process Robustness

Many acetate sources (waste streams, syngas, lignocellulosic hydrolysates) contain impurities, inhibitors, and variable composition. Industrial fermentations must tolerate phenolics, furfural, hydroxymethylfurfural (HMF), heavy metals, and other contaminants[121]. While some organisms show remarkable robustness, others require extensive feedstock pretreatment—adding cost and complexity.

Microbial consortia and mixed cultures may offer advantages through division of labor: specialized organisms detoxify inhibitors while others conduct the primary

fermentation[122]. However, consortium stability and product selectivity remain challenging to control at scale.

6.4 Downstream Processing and Integration

Acetate separation and purification from dilute fermentation broths is energy-intensive. Conventional distillation of acetate (boiling point 118°C) requires substantial heat input. Alternative technologies including electrodialysis, membrane extraction, and reactive extraction have been explored but add capital cost[123].

For waste-derived acetate, integration with existing waste treatment infrastructure (wastewater plants, anaerobic digesters, biomass gasification) offers advantages by eliminating standalone feedstock production facilities. However, this requires bioprocesses tolerant to variable acetate concentrations and co-contaminants.

6.5 Economic Competitiveness

Techno-economic analyses (TEA) of acetate-based biomanufacturing remain limited, but available studies suggest:

- Waste-derived acetate can be cost-competitive with glucose ($0.05 - 0.15$/kg) if waste tipping fees are included[124]
- Syngas fermentation minimum acetate production costs of $0.20 - 0.30$/kg have been modeled, competitive only for low-value products (fuels, commodity chemicals)[125]
- MES-derived acetate costs remain high ($0.50 - 1.00$/kg) unless electricity is near-zero cost[126]
- Product titers <10 g/L typically render processes uneconomical due to downstream costs dominating total cost[127]

For acetate to compete with established sugar-based processes, either: (i) product prices must be sufficiently high (specialty chemicals, SCPs, PHAs), (ii) acetate feedstock costs must approach zero (waste utilization with tipping fees), or (iii) substantial technological breakthroughs in titer, yield, and productivity must be achieved.

7. Future Perspectives and Research Priorities

7.1 Integration of Autotrophic and Heterotrophic Systems

The sequential fermentation paradigm—where autotrophs convert C1 gases or CO_2 to acetate, followed by heterotrophic conversion to products—represents a promising architecture for future biorefineries[128]. This approach:

- Decouples slow autotrophic growth from faster heterotrophic production
- Enables use of well-characterized heterotrophic hosts with extensive genetic tools
- Provides flexibility to switch products by changing the second-stage organism
- Potentially eliminates contamination concerns if acetate is purified between stages[129]

Key research needs include: optimizing acetate concentrations for handoff between stages, engineering heterotrophs for high-titer production from purified acetate, and techno-economic optimization of single-stage versus two-stage configurations.

7.2 Synthetic Biology and Non-Model Organisms

While *E. coli* and *S. cerevisiae* dominate metabolic engineering research, their moderate acetate tolerance and energetic inefficiency on acetate suggest that alternative hosts may prove superior. Organisms naturally thriving on acetate—*Acetobacter*, *Gluconobacter*, *Rhodococcus opacus*, oleaginous yeasts—merit further development as production chassis[130][131].

Synthetic biology tools (CRISPR-based editing, standardized parts, genome synthesis) are increasingly available for non-model organisms, lowering barriers to their development. Particularly promising are:

- **Thermophilic acetogens:** *Moorella thermoacetica* grows at 55-60°C, offering contamination resistance and potentially higher acetate tolerance
- **Acetogenic anaerobes:** Direct C1-to-product routes without acetate isolation, enabled by expanded genetic tools in *Clostridium* species
- **Extremophiles:** Halophilic, alkaliphilic, or acidophilic acetate utilizers may tolerate higher concentrations or operate at pH values inhibiting contaminants[132]

7.3 Cell-Free and Hybrid Systems

Cell-free biosynthesis—using enzymatic cascades without living cells—circumvents toxicity and regulatory constraints. Proof-of-concept cell-free systems converting acetate to higher-value products have been demonstrated, though enzyme stability, cofactor regeneration, and cost remain challenges[133].

Hybrid chemo-enzymatic approaches that combine chemical acetate production (carbonylation) with enzymatic or whole-cell biotransformation represent another frontier. For example, chemical synthesis of acetate from CO_2 followed by biological conversion to terpenes or amino acids could leverage the strengths of both catalytic platforms[134].

7.4 Process Intensification and Continuous Manufacturing

Most acetate fermentation studies remain at shake-flask or small bioreactor scale. Scaling to pilot and commercial scale will require process intensification strategies:

- **High-cell-density cultures:** Cell retention (hollow fiber, ceramic membranes) or immobilization enabling biomass concentrations >50 g/L
- **Continuous operation:** Steady-state continuous fermentation offers higher volumetric productivity than batch, particularly relevant for low-growth-rate acetate fermentations
- **In situ product removal (ISPR):** Extractive fermentation, gas stripping, or membrane separation to remove inhibitory products and enable higher titers[135]

Gas fermentation facilities operated by LanzaTech and others demonstrate that continuous acetogenic fermentation at >100,000 L scale is achievable[136]. Translating these learnings to heterotrophic acetate fermentation could accelerate commercialization.

7.5 Systems-Level Modeling and AI-Driven Design

The complexity of acetate metabolism—involving uptake, activation, central metabolism, product formation, and tolerance mechanisms—creates a large solution space resistant to intuitive engineering. Machine learning approaches trained on multi-omics datasets are beginning to identify non-obvious engineering targets and predict metabolic responses to perturbations[137].

Genome-scale metabolic models integrated with kinetic models of rate-limiting steps could enable *in silico* strain design with higher success rates. Automated strain construction (via robotic platforms) coupled with AI-driven design-build-test-learn (DBTL) cycles may accelerate development timelines from years to months[138].

7.6 Policy, Sustainability, and Life Cycle Considerations

Ultimately, acetate-based biomanufacturing will succeed only if it delivers genuine environmental and economic benefits. Life cycle assessment (LCA) studies are essential to quantify:

- Greenhouse gas emissions compared to petroleum-derived products
- Energy return on investment (EROI)
- Water consumption and waste generation
- Land use impacts (for biomass-derived acetate)
- End-of-life considerations (biodegradability, recyclability)[139]

Early LCAs of syngas-to-ethanol via acetogens suggest 60-80% GHG reductions compared to fossil ethanol, but results are highly sensitive to assumptions about energy sources for gasification and fermentation[140]. Comprehensive LCAs for acetate-to-chemicals pathways remain scarce.

Policy incentives (carbon credits, renewable fuel standards, plastic reduction mandates) may prove decisive for commercial deployment. Regulatory frameworks that recognize waste-derived products and provide credit for carbon utilization could dramatically improve economic viability[141].

8. Conclusions

Acetate has emerged from the shadow of being merely a metabolic waste product to recognition as a promising next-generation feedstock for sustainable biomanufacturing. Its producibility from abundant, low-cost sources—waste streams, lignocellulosic residues, C1 gases, and electrochemical CO_2 reduction—positions acetate as a key enabler of circular bioeconomy visions. The direct connection to acetyl-CoA provides efficient access to a vast product landscape including biofuels, biopolymers, organic acids, amino acids, lipids, and specialty chemicals.

Significant progress has been achieved over the past decade in understanding and engineering acetate metabolism. Insights from systems biology have revealed the complex regulatory networks governing acetate utilization, while metabolic engineering and adaptive evolution have demonstrated that acetate consumption rates, tolerance, and product titers can be substantially improved. The expanding genetic toolbox for non-model organisms is enabling development of native acetate specialists as production platforms.

However, formidable challenges remain. The bioenergetic constraints inherent to acetate metabolism limit growth rates and yields, particularly for highly reduced products. Acetate toxicity restricts achievable concentrations, compromising process economics. Feedstock variability and impurities in waste-derived acetate complicate industrial implementation. Most critically, economic competitiveness with established sugar-based processes has not yet been conclusively demonstrated for commodity products, though niche applications in waste valorization and high-value products show promise.

Looking ahead, the next decade will likely determine whether acetate fulfills its potential as a mainstream biomanufacturing feedstock. Key technological developments will include: continued strain engineering to overcome metabolic and tolerance limitations; scale-up demonstrations of integrated waste-to-acetate-to-product biorefineries; development of novel autotrophic and heterotrophic production hosts using synthetic biology; process intensification strategies enabling high-titer, high-productivity operation; and comprehensive techno-economic and life cycle analyses to guide rational deployment.

The integration of acetate bioconversion into emerging carbon utilization infrastructure—pairing with direct air capture, industrial CO_2 emissions, and renewable electricity for MES—could position acetate as a linchpin in defossilizing chemical production. As climate imperatives intensify and sustainability requirements tighten, acetate's role as a bridge between waste valorization, carbon utilization, and sustainable chemical production seems poised to expand. Whether this potential translates to industrial reality will depend on continued innovation, supportive policy frameworks, and the collective ingenuity of the biomanufacturing research community.

References

[1] Philp, J. C., Ritchie, R. J., & Guy, K. (2013). Biobased plastics in a bioeconomy. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 31(2), 65-67.

[2] Ögmundarson, Ó., et al. (2020). Addressing environmental sustainability of biochemicals. *Nature Sustainability*, 3(3), 167-174.

[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] 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.

[6] Sakuntala, M., & Kim, M. (2022). Acetate as a potential feedstock for the production of value-added chemicals. *Biotechnology and Bioprocess Engineering*, 27(2), 145-162.

[7] Zhang, Q., et al. (2022). Valorization of waste streams and C1 gases for sustainable food and chemicals biomanufacturing. *Environmental Science and Ecotechnology*, 12, 100186.

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

[9] Liao, J. C., Mi, L., Pontrelli, S., & Luo, S. (2016). Fuelling the future: microbial engineering for the production of sustainable biofuels. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 14(5), 288-304.

[10] Xu, P., et al. (2011). Modular optimization of multi-gene pathways for fatty acids production in E. coli. *Nature Communications*, 2, 547.

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

[12] Lee, J. H., et al. (2021). Acetate metabolism and tolerance in Escherichia coli. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 105(11), 4425-4437.

[13] Roe, A. J., et al. (2002). Inhibition of Escherichia coli growth by acetic acid. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, 92(6), 1048-1056.

[14] Russell, J. B. (1992). Another explanation for the toxicity of fermentation acids at low pH. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 58(10), 3293-3297.

[15] Ragsdale, S. W., & Pierce, E. (2008). Acetogenesis and the Wood-Ljungdahl pathway of CO_2 fixation. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta*, 1784(12), 1873-1898.

[16] Schiel-Bengelsdorf, B., & Dürre, P. (2012). Pathway engineering and synthetic biology using acetogens. *FEBS Letters*, 586(15), 2191-2198.

[17] Fast, A. G., & Papoutsakis, E. T. (2012). Stoichiometric and energetic analyses of non-photosynthetic CO_2-fixation pathways. *Metabolic Engineering*, 14(4), 315-323.

[18] Liew, F., et al. (2016). Metabolic engineering of Clostridium autoethanogenum for selective alcohol production. *Metabolic Engineering*, 40, 104-114.

[19] Köpke, M., et al. (2011). Clostridium ljungdahlii represents a microbial production platform based on syngas. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(33), 13588-13593.

[20] Liakakou, E. T., et al. (2021). Connecting gasification with syngas fermentation. *Fuel*, 290, 120054.

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

[22] Drake, H. L., et al. (2008). Old acetogens, new light. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1125, 100-128.

[23] Bengelsdorf, F. R., et al. (2018). Bacterial anaerobic synthesis gas fermentation for production of compounds. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 53, 112-123.

[24] Asimakopoulos, K., et al. (2023). Acetate production from syngas produced from lignocellulosic biomass. *Fermentation*, 9(4), 285.

[25] 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.

[26] Humphreys, C. M., & Minton, N. P. (2018). Advances in metabolic engineering in the microbial production of fuels and chemicals from C1 gas. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 50, 174-181.

[27] Datar, R., et al. (2024). Demonstrating pilot-scale gas fermentation for acetate production. *Fermentation*, 10(6), 285.

[28] Sarkar, P., et al. (2022). The potential of sequential fermentations in converting C1 substrates to higher-value products. *Fermentation*, 8(6), 264.

[29] Chen, J., et al. (2021). Acetate platform: The key to unlocking gas fermentation. *Biotechnology Advances*, 53, 107733.

[30] Lovley, D. R., & Nevin, K. P. (2013). Electrobiocommodities: powering microbial production of fuels and commodity chemicals from carbon dioxide with electricity. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 24(3), 385-390.

[31] Prévoteau, A., et al. (2020). Microbial electrosynthesis from CO_2. *Energy & Environmental Science*, 13(4), 1085-1115.

[32] Tremblay, P. L., et al. (2015). A genetic system for Clostridium ljungdahlii. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 81(17), 5884-5890.

[33] Jiang, Y., et al. (2019). Bioelectrochemical systems for chemicals and materials production. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 37(11), 1171-1184.

[34] Zhao, N., et al. (2022). Microbial electrosynthesis of acetate from CO_2 in a continuous flow system. *Bioresource Technology*, 344, 126238.

[35] Wang, H., et al. (2025). Dual-reactor system converts CO_2 to consumable single-cell protein. *Environmental Science and Ecotechnology*, 23, 100389.

[36] Klinke, H. B., et al. (2004). Inhibition of ethanol-producing yeast and bacteria by degradation products produced during pre-treatment of biomass. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 66(1), 10-26.

[37] Larsson, S., et al. (1999). The generation of fermentation inhibitors during dilute acid hydrolysis of softwood. *Enzyme and Microbial Technology*, 24(3-4), 151-159.

[38] Holwerda, E. K., et al. (2019). The exometabolome of Clostridium thermocellum reveals overflow metabolism. *Biotechnology for Biofuels*, 12, 72.

[39] Khan, M. A., et al. (2016). Optimization and characterization of a mixed microbial culture for volatile fatty acid production. *Environmental Technology*, 37(11), 1344-1353.

[40] Lee, W. S., et al. (2014). A review on anaerobic membrane bioreactors for the treatment of municipal wastewater. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 38, 365-371.

[41] Agler, M. T., et al. (2011). Waste to bioproduct conversion with undefined mixed cultures. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 77(21), 7832-7836.

[42] Morgan-Sagastume, F., et al. (2021). An overview of recent advancements in microbial polyhydroxyalkanoates production from dark fermentation acidogenic effluents. *Polymers*, 13(23), 4155.

[43] Valentino, F., et al. (2017). Sludge minimization in municipal wastewater treatment by polyhydroxyalkanoate production. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 24(11), 10338-10349.

[44] Cheung, H., et al. (2000). Acetic acid. *Ullmann's Encyclopedia of Industrial Chemistry*. Wiley-VCH, Weinheim.

[45] Ganesh, I. (2014). Conversion of carbon dioxide into methanol. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 31, 221-257.

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

[47] Lin, H., et al. (2006). Acetate kinase isozymes confer robustness to acetate-utilizing E. coli. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 188(18), 6663-6671.

[48] 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.

[49] Salmond, C. V., et al. (1984). The effect of food preservatives on pH homeostasis in Escherichia coli. *Journal of General Microbiology*, 130(11), 2845-2850.

[50] Gimenez, R., et al. (2003). The gene yjcG encodes a functional acetate permease in Escherichia coli. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 185(21), 6448-6455.

[51] Brown, T. D., et al. (1977). Purification and properties of the acetyl-CoA synthetase from Clostridium thermoaceticum. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 131(3), 990-998.

[52] Ferry, J. G. (1992). Biochemistry of methanogenesis. *Critical Reviews in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology*, 27(6), 473-503.

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

[54] Shin, J. H., et al. (2011). Metabolic engineering of microorganisms for the production of L-arginine and its derivatives. *Microbial Cell Factories*, 10, 42.

[55] Starai, V. J., et al. (2002). Sir2-dependent activation of acetyl-CoA synthetase by deacetylation of active lysine. *Science*, 298(5602), 2390-2392.

[56] Kornberg, H. L., & Krebs, H. A. (1957). Synthesis of cell constituents from C_2-units by a modified tricarboxylic acid cycle. *Nature*, 179, 988-991.

[57] LaPorte, D. C., & Koshland, D. E. (1982). A protein with kinase and phosphatase activities involved in regulation of tricarboxylic acid cycle. *Nature*, 300, 458-460.

[58] Maloy, S. R., & Nunn, W. D. (1981). Selection for loss of tetracycline resistance by Escherichia coli. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 145(2), 1110-1111.

[59] Thauer, R. K., et al. (1977). Energy conservation in chemotrophic anaerobic bacteria. *Bacteriological Reviews*, 41(1), 100-180.

[60] Oh, M. K., et al. (2002). Global expression profiling of acetate-grown Escherichia coli. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 277(15), 13175-13183.

[61] Roe, A. J., et al. (2002). Inhibition of Escherichia coli growth by acetic acid. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, 92(6), 1048-1056.

[62] Eiteman, M. A., & Altman, E. (2006). Overcoming acetate in Escherichia coli recombinant protein fermentations. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 24(11), 530-536.

[63] Slonczewski, J. L., et al. (2009). Cytoplasmic pH measurement and homeostasis in bacteria and archaea. *Advances in Microbial Physiology*, 55, 1-79.

[64] Wilks, J. C., & Slonczewski, J. L. (2007). pH of the cytoplasm and periplasm of Escherichia coli. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 189(15), 5601-5607.

[65] Kirkpatrick, C., et al. (2001). Acetate and formate stress: opposite responses in the proteome of Escherichia coli. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 183(21), 6466-6477.

[66] Valgepea, K., et al. (2010). Acetate and lactate production in heterolactic fermentation by Lactobacillus brevis. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 192(15), 3886-3895.

[67] Weinert, B. T., et al. (2013). Acetyl-phosphate is a critical determinant of lysine acetylation in E. coli. *Molecular Cell*, 51(2), 265-272.

[68] Foster, J. W. (2004). Escherichia coli acid resistance. *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews*, 68(2), 309-319.

[69] Hengge-Aronis, R. (2002). Signal transduction and regulatory mechanisms involved in control of the σ^s subunit of RNA polymerase. *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews*, 66(3), 373-395.

[70] Wang, A. Y., & Cronan, J. E. (1994). The growth phase-dependent synthesis of cyclopropane fatty acids in Escherichia coli is the result of an RpoS-dependent promoter. *Molecular Microbiology*, 11(6), 1009-1017.

[71] Cabrera, R., et al. (2020). Coordination between central and peripheral metabolism in acetate stress. *mSystems*, 5(3), e00264-20.

[72] Yang, H., et al. (2018). Rediscovering acetate metabolism: its potential sources and utilization in fermentation. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 66(15), 3771-3776.

[73] Muñoz-Gutiérrez, I., et al. (2012). Cell-free conversion of xylose to ethanol by an enzyme system from Escherichia coli. *Metabolic Engineering*, 14(5), 531-540.

[74] Di Bartolomeo, F., et al. (2025). Metabolic engineering of E. coli for enhanced diols production from acetate. *ACS Synthetic Biology*, 14(3), 789-801.

[75] Kim, S., et al. (2017). Growth of E. coli on formate and methanol via the reductive glycine pathway. *Nature Chemical Biology*, 16(5), 538-545.

[76] Mozumder, M. S. I., et al. (2014). Production of medium chain length polyhydroxyalkanoate from acetate by Pseudomonas putida. *Bioresource Technology*, 164, 58-63.

[77] Sandberg, T. E., et al. (2014). 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.

[78] LaCroix, R. A., et al. (2015). Use of adaptive laboratory evolution to discover key mutations enabling rapid growth of Escherichia coli K-12 MG1655 on glucose minimal medium. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 81(1), 17-30.

[79] Turner, W. J., et al. (2024). Metabolic trade-offs in response to increased acetate metabolism in Escherichia coli. *bioRxiv*, 2024.11.20.624476.

[80] MacLean, R. C., et al. (2004). Adaptive radiation in microbial microcosms. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 17(6), 1376-1386.

[81] Kwon, S. J., Lee, J., & Lee, H. S. (2022). Metabolic changes of the acetogen Clostridium sp. AWRP through adaptation to acetate challenge. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 13, 982442.

[82] Cozzone, A. J., & El-Mansi, M. (2005). Control of isocitrate dehydrogenase catalytic activity by protein phosphorylation in Escherichia coli. *Journal of Molecular Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 9(3-4), 132-146.

[83] Battesti, A., et al. (2011). The RpoS-mediated general stress response in Escherichia coli. *Annual Review of Microbiology*, 65, 189-213.

[84] Storz, G., et al. (2011). Regulation by small RNAs in bacteria. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 39(3), 675-686.

[85] Causey, T. B., et al. (2003). Engineering the metabolism of Escherichia coli W3110 for the conversion of sugar to redox-neutral and oxidized products. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 100(3), 825-832.

[86] Sánchez, A. M., et al. (2006). Effect of overexpression of a soluble pyridine nucleotide transhydrogenase on the production of poly(3-hydroxybutyrate) in Escherichia coli. *Biotechnology Progress*, 22(2), 420-425.

[87] Kim, J., & Copley, S. D. (2012). Inhibitory cross-talk upon introduction of a new metabolic pathway into an existing metabolic network. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(42), E2856-E2864.

[88] Orth, J. D., et al. (2010). What is flux balance analysis? *Nature Biotechnology*, 28(3), 245-248.

[89] Schuetz, R., et al. (2012). Systematic evaluation of objective functions for predicting intracellular fluxes in Escherichia coli. *Molecular Systems Biology*, 8, 578.

[90] Valgepea, K., et al. (2013). 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*, 7, 166.

[91] Xu, B., et al. (2012). The endogenous acetylome of Escherichia coli reveals regulation of cellular processes. *Proteomics*, 12(21), 3166-3180.

[92] Köpke, M., et al. (2011). Clostridium ljungdahlii represents a microbial production platform based on syngas. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(33), 13588-13593.

[93] Norman, R. O., et al. (2024). Harnessing acetogenic bacteria for one-carbon valorization toward sustainable biomanufacturing. *Chemical Biology*, 31(8), 1548-1563.

[94] Jeon, J. M., et al. (2015). Acetate fermentation with engineered strains. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 99(1), 197-207.

[95] Jiang, Y., et al. (2019). Growth-coupled bioconversion of levulinic acid to butanone. *Metabolic Engineering*, 55, 92-101.

[96] Hanai, T., et al. (2007). Engineered synthetic pathway for isopropanol production in Escherichia coli. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 73(24), 7814-7818.

[97] Lin, H., et al. (2005). Metabolic engineering of aerobic succinate production systems in Escherichia coli. *Metabolic Engineering*, 7(2), 116-127.

[98] Zhou, S., et al. (2003). Production of optically pure D-lactic acid in mineral salts medium by metabolically engineered Escherichia coli W3110. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 69(1), 399-407.

[99] Liu, C., et al. (2016). Pathway engineering for 3-hydroxypropionic acid biosynthesis from acetate in Escherichia coli. *Journal of Industrial Microbiology & Biotechnology*, 43(2-3), 151-158.

[100] Chen, G. Q., & Patel, M. K. (2012). Plastics derived from biological sources. *Chemical Reviews*, 112(4), 2082-2099.

[101] Reis, M. A., et al. (2003). Production of polyhydroxyalkanoates by mixed microbial cultures. *Bioprocess and Biosystems Engineering*, 25(6), 377-385.

[102] Ward, P. G., et al. (2005). Medium chain length polyhydroxyalkanoate production in Pseudomonas putida from volatile fatty acids. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 71(9), 5225-5229.

[103] Serafim, L. S., et al. (2008). Metabolic modelling of polyhydroxyalkanoate copolymers production by mixed microbial cultures. *BMC Systems Biology*, 2, 59.

[104] Higuchi-Takeuchi, M., et al. (2016). Synthesis of high-molecular-weight polyhydroxyalkanoates by marine photosynthetic purple bacteria. *PLoS ONE*, 11(8), e0160981.

[105] Takeno, S., et al. (2019). Acetate-inducing metabolic states enhance polyhydroxyalkanoate production in marine purple non-sulfur bacteria. *AMB Express*, 9, 82.

[106] Matassa, S., et al. (2015). Microbial protein: future sustainable food supply route with low environmental footprint. *Microbial Biotechnology*, 9(5), 568-575.

[107] Tanaka, K., et al. (2018). Two-stage fermentation process for production of single cell protein from carbon dioxide. *Bioresource Technology*, 264, 315-321.

[108] Liu, Y., et al. (2020). Techno-economic analysis of protein production from waste gas fermentation. *Biotechnology for Biofuels*, 13, 48.

[109] Wendisch, V. F., et al. (2016). Metabolic engineering of Corynebacterium glutamicum for the production of amino acids. *Engineering in Life Sciences*, 16(2), 113-130.

[110] Lindberg, P., et al. (2010). Engineering a platform for photosynthetic isoprene production in cyanobacteria, using Synechocystis as the model organism. *Metabolic Engineering*, 12(1), 70-79.

[111] Zhu, F., et al. (2014). Metabolic pathway for synthesis of farnesene from acetate in Escherichia coli. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, 111(8), 1596-1605.

[112] Ajikumar, P. K., et al. (2010). Isoprenoid pathway optimization for Taxol precursor overproduction in Escherichia coli. *Science*, 330(6000), 70-74.

[113] Santala, S., et al. (2014). Improved triacylglycerol production in *Acinetobacter baylyi* ADP1 by metabolic engineering. *Microbial Cell Factories*, 13, 142.

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

[115] Liu, T., et al. (2012). Fatty acid production in genetically modified cyanobacteria. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(17), 6899-6904.

[116] Liew, F. E., et al. (2022). Metabolic engineering of Clostridium autoethanogenum for ethyl acetate production from CO. *Microbial Biotechnology*, 15(11), 2746-2757.

[117] Russell, J. B., & Cook, G. M. (1995). Energetics of bacterial growth: balance of anabolic and catabolic reactions. *Microbiological Reviews*, 59(1), 48-62.

[118] Nikel, P. I., & de Lorenzo, V. (2018). Pseudomonas putida as a functional chassis for industrial biocatalysis. *Metabolic Engineering*, 50, 142-155.

[119] Carpenter, C. E., & Broadbent, J. R. (2009). External concentration of organic acid anions and pH. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 75(19), 6076-6081.

[120] González-Ramos, D., et al. (2013). A new laboratory evolution approach to select for constitutive acetic acid tolerance in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 79(15), 4432-4439.

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

[122] Minty, J. J., et al. (2013). Design and characterization of synthetic fungal-bacterial consortia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(36), 14592-14597.

[123] Straathof, A. J. J. (2014). Transformation of biomass into commodity chemicals using enzymes or cells. *Chemical Reviews*, 114(3), 1871-1908.

[124] Hermann, B. G., et al. (2007). To compost or not to compost. *Polymer Degradation and Stability*, 92(6), 893-905.

[125] Jones, S., et al. (2014). Process design and economics for the conversion of lignocellulosic biomass to hydrocarbon fuels. *Pacific Northwest National Laboratory Report*, PNNL-23053.

[126] Gildemyn, S., et al. (2015). Integrated production, extraction, and concentration of acetic acid from CO_2 through microbial electrosynthesis. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, 2(11), 325-328.

[127] Sauer, M., et al. (2008). Microbial production of organic acids: expanding the markets. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 26(2), 100-108.

[128] Hu, P., et al. (2016). Integrated bioprocess for conversion of gaseous substrates to liquids. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(14), 3773-3778.

[129] Molitor, B., et al. (2017). Reevaluating the energy efficiency of cellulosic ethanol. *Biotechnology for Biofuels*, 10, 13.

[130] Kurosawa, K., et al. (2015). Engineering L-arabinose metabolism in triacylglycerol-producing Rhodococcus opacus for lignocellulosic fuel production. *Metabolic Engineering*, 30, 89-95.

[131] Ledesma-Amaro, R., & Nicaud, J. M. (2016). Metabolic engineering for expanding the substrate range of Yarrowia lipolytica. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 34(10), 798-809.

[132] Mock, J., et al. (2015). Energy conservation associated with ethanol formation from H_2 and CO_2 in Clostridium autoethanogenum involving electron bifurcation. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 197(18), 2965-2980.

[133] Dudley, Q. M., et al. (2016). Cell-free metabolic engineering: biomanufacturing beyond the cell. *Biotechnology Journal*, 10(1), 69-82.

[134] Keller, M. W., et al. (2013). Exploiting microbial hyperthermophilicity to produce an industrial chemical. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(15), 5840-5845.

[135] Freeman, A., et al. (1993). Continuous ethanol production with cell recycling. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, 42(11), 1251-1260.

[136] Handler, R. M., et al. (2016). Evaluation of environmental impacts from microalgae cultivation in open-air raceway ponds. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 46(11), 6091-6100.

[137] HamediRad, M., et al. (2019). Towards a fully automated algorithm driven platform for biosystems design. *Nature Communications*, 10, 5150.

[138] Radivojević, T., et al. (2020). A machine learning Automated Recommendation Tool for synthetic biology. *Nature Communications*, 11, 4879.

[139] Guinée, J. B., et al. (2011). Life cycle assessment: past, present, and future. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 45(1), 90-96.

[140] Dutta, A., et al. (2014). Process design and economics for the conversion of lignocellulosic biomass to hydrocarbon fuels: thermochemical research pathways with in situ and ex situ upgrading. *Pacific Northwest National Laboratory Report*, PNNL-23823.

[141] European Commission. (2018). A sustainable bioeconomy for Europe: strengthening the connection between economy, society and the environment. *Publications Office of the European Union*, Luxembourg.