Acetate: A New Feedstock for Biomanufacturing

A Comprehensive Review

Abstract

The transition from petrochemical-based to sustainable biomanufacturing systems represents one of the most pressing challenges in industrial biotechnology. Acetate, a two-carbon (C2) organic acid, has emerged as a promising alternative feedstock that addresses critical limitations inherent in conventional sugar-based bioprocesses. Unlike glucose and other carbohydrates that compete with food production and require arable land, acetate can be derived from diverse renewable sources including industrial waste streams, lignocellulosic biomass, synthesis gas (syngas), and electrochemical CO_2 reduction. This review critically examines the metabolic engineering strategies, process optimization approaches, and economic considerations that underpin acetate-based biomanufacturing. We analyze the conversion of acetate to high-value products including biopolymers, organic acids, alcohols, and specialty chemicals across multiple microbial platforms. Key challenges such as acetate toxicity, energetic constraints, and redox balancing are discussed alongside innovative solutions including adaptive laboratory evolution, synthetic pathway design, and hybrid bioelectrochemical systems. Current production titers, yields, and productivities are compared to establish performance benchmarks and identify knowledge gaps. Finally, we provide a forward-looking perspective on how acetate-based bioprocesses may contribute to circular carbon economies and achieve industrial-scale implementation within the next 5-10 years.

Keywords: Acetate metabolism, biomanufacturing, metabolic engineering, C1/C2 feedstocks, circular bioeconomy, synthetic biology

1. Introduction

1.1 The Imperative for Alternative Feedstocks

Contemporary biomanufacturing relies predominantly on first-generation feedstocks—primarily glucose derived from corn, sugarcane, and other food crops[1] [2]. While these processes have achieved commercial success in producing biofuels and biochemicals, they face fundamental limitations that constrain scalability and sustainability. The competition between industrial fermentation and food production raises ethical concerns and price volatility, while the carbon efficiency of glucose-based processes is inherently limited by obligate CO_2 loss during pyruvate decarboxylation[3] [4]. Approximately 33-50% of carbon from glucose is lost as CO_2 during conversion to acetyl-CoA, the central metabolic hub for biosynthesis of most value-added chemicals[4] [5].

These constraints have catalyzed intensive research into next-generation feedstocks, particularly C1 (CO, CO_2, methane, methanol, formate) and C2 (acetate, ethanol) compounds[1] [2]. Among these alternatives, acetate occupies a unique position due to its ubiquity in biological systems, relatively low toxicity compared to other C1 substrates, and direct convertibility to acetyl-CoA without carbon loss[4] [5].

1.2 Acetate as a Platform Molecule

Acetate (CH_3COO^-) serves multiple roles in industrial biotechnology: it is simultaneously a fermentation byproduct, a metabolic intermediate, and an increasingly recognized feedstock for bioproduction[4] [5] [6]. The compound's significance extends beyond its chemical simplicity. Acetate represents the smallest organic acid capable of supporting heterotrophic growth, possesses moderate energy content ($\Delta G^{\circ\prime}$ = -845 kJ/mol for complete oxidation), and can be metabolized by diverse microorganisms spanning bacteria, archaea, yeasts, and filamentous fungi[6] [7].

The metabolic centrality of acetyl-CoA—derived directly from acetate—positions this feedstock as an ideal precursor for a vast array of industrial products. Over 30% of cellular carbon in growing microorganisms flows through acetyl-CoA, making it a branch point for fatty acid biosynthesis, the tricarboxylic acid (TCA) cycle, amino acid metabolism, and numerous secondary metabolites[5] [7]. Products accessible from acetate-derived acetyl-CoA include biopolymers (polyhydroxyalkanoates), platform chemicals (succinate, itaconic acid), advanced biofuels (isobutanol, isopropanol), and pharmaceutical intermediates (mevalonate)[4] [5] [8].

1.3 Scope and Organization

This review synthesizes recent advances in acetate-based biomanufacturing, with particular emphasis on developments reported since 2020. We begin by examining acetate production methods and sources, followed by detailed analysis of metabolic pathways for acetate assimilation. Subsequent sections address key engineering strategies for product formation, challenges related to acetate toxicity and energetics, and comparative analysis of microbial host platforms. Process engineering considerations including fermentation strategies and downstream processing are evaluated. The review concludes with critical perspectives on remaining bottlenecks and strategic directions for the field over the next decade.

2. Sources and Production of Acetate

2.1 Biological Production Routes

2.1.1 Syngas Fermentation via Acetogenesis

The most industrially promising route to acetate involves the fermentation of synthesis gas (syngas)—a mixture of CO, CO_2, and H_2 derived from gasification of carbonaceous materials [9] [10] [11]. Acetogenic bacteria, particularly species within the genera *Clostridium*, *Moorella*, and *Acetobacterium*, utilize the Wood-Ljungdahl pathway to fix C1 gases into acetate with remarkable efficiency [9] [11] [12].

The Wood-Ljungdahl pathway represents one of nature's most elegant carbon fixation mechanisms, coupling CO or CO_2 reduction directly to acetyl-CoA formation [9] [12]. The pathway proceeds via two branches: the methyl branch generates a methyl group from CO_2 through sequential reduction, while the carbonyl branch reduces CO_2 to CO or utilizes exogenous CO. These components converge at the bifunctional carbon monoxide dehydrogenase/acetyl-CoA synthase (CODH/ACS) complex, which condenses CO, a methyl group, and coenzyme A to form acetyl-CoA [9] [12].

Recent pilot-scale demonstrations have validated the technical feasibility of syngas-to-acetate conversion. *Moorella thermoacetica*, a thermophilic acetogen, achieved acetate concentrations of 22.3 g/L from lignocellulosic biomass-derived syngas with growth of 1.3 g/L biomass [10] [13]. The process exhibited comparable performance to synthetic gas controls, demonstrating robustness to real-world feedstock complexity [10]. Acetogens tolerate substantial concentrations of syngas impurities including tars, sulfur compounds, and nitrogen oxides, though H_2S and HCN remain significant inhibitors requiring gas cleaning steps [14] [10].

Critical challenges in syngas fermentation include mass transfer limitations—gas-to-liquid CO transfer rates often limit productivity—and relatively narrow product spectra from native acetogens [9] [14]. Contemporary research addresses these limitations through reactor engineering (e.g., hollow fiber membranes, microbubble generation) and metabolic engineering to expand product diversity beyond acetate and ethanol [14] [12].

2.1.2 Lignocellulosic Biomass Degradation

Acetate is a natural constituent of lignocellulosic biomass hydrolysates, arising primarily from deacetylation of hemicellulose during pretreatment [15] [16]. Xylan and other hemicelluloses contain acetyl side groups that are released as acetic acid under acidic or thermal conditions, typically yielding 2-10% acetate by weight of biomass [15] [16].

While often viewed as an inhibitory byproduct in second-generation ethanol production, this acetate represents a potentially valuable co-product stream [15] [16]. The acetate concentration in hydrolysates ranges from 5-20 g/L depending on biomass source and pretreatment severity [15] [16]. Combined with dedicated acetate fermentation from pretreated solids using mixed microbial consortia, total acetate recovery can reach 20-30 g/L [17] [15].

Recent strategies have demonstrated anaerobic acetate production from lignocellulosic feedstocks via thermophilic mixed cultures, achieving >85% selectivity for acetate among volatile fatty acids at 60°C and pH 6 [17]. This approach offers dual benefits: detoxification of inhibitory acetate from hydrolysates and generation of a concentrated acetate stream for downstream biomanufacturing [17] [15].

2.2 Electrochemical and Hybrid Systems

2.2.1 Direct Electrochemical CO_2 Reduction

Electrochemical reduction of CO_2 to acetate represents an emerging technology that integrates renewable electricity with CO_2 capture and utilization[74-79][18] [19]. Copper-based electrocatalysts have demonstrated selective C-C coupling to form C2+ products including acetate, with faradaic efficiencies reaching 32-47% under optimized conditions[20] [18] [19].

Amine-functionalized Cu catalysts (G3-NH_2/Cu) achieved one of the highest reported performances: 47.0% faradaic efficiency for acetate with a partial current density of 202 mA cm^{-2} at -0.97 V versus the reversible hydrogen electrode[18] [19]. The mechanism involves stabilization of *CCO intermediates through the basic amine network, favoring ethenone pathways toward acetate over ethylene/ethanol formation[18] [19].

Alternative catalyst systems including Cu-Se nanoparticles, Bi-based materials (for formate), and metal-organic frameworks have expanded the toolbox for electrochemical C1/C2 production[21] [22][88-90]. However, commercial implementation faces significant hurdles: high energy requirements (>3 kWh/kg acetate), membrane crossover of liquid products (~30% loss), and catalyst stability under prolonged operation[21] [18].

2.2.2 Hybrid Bioelectrochemical Systems

An innovative strategy combines electrochemical CO_2-to-formate conversion with microbial formate-to-acetate upgrading[23] [24]. Bismuth-based cathodes achieve near-complete faradaic efficiency (>95%) for formate production, which then serves as feedstock for acetogenic bacteria[23] [24]. This two-step approach achieved 3.77 g/L acetate over 14 days (0.269 g/L/day) in continuous operation[24].

Hybrid systems exploit the complementary strengths of abiotic and biotic catalysis: electrochemistry provides high selectivity and tunability for CO_2 reduction to formate, while microorganisms enable formate condensation to acetate via the Wood-Ljungdahl pathway without additional energy input[23] [24]. Scale-up challenges include electrode surface area limitations and maintaining stable biofilm-electrode interfaces[24].

2.3 Industrial Waste Streams and Circular Economy

Acetate-rich waste streams represent low- or negative-cost feedstocks that support circular bioeconomy principles[5] [25]. Sources include:

- **Fermentation off-gases and spent media:** E. coli fermentations for recombinant protein or biofuel production typically accumulate 10-50 g/L acetate as an overflow metabolite[26] [27]. Rather than disposal, this acetate can feed secondary fermentations for value-added chemicals[5] [28].
- **Anaerobic digestion effluents:** Municipal wastewater treatment and agricultural waste processing via anaerobic digestion generate acetate-rich digestates (10-30 g/L)[25] [17]. Microbial electrosynthesis or aerobic upgrading can convert this acetate to higher-value products[25] [17].
- **Chemical industry byproducts:** Cellulose acetate production, acetic acid synthesis overflows, and pharmaceutical manufacturing generate concentrated acetate streams that currently require disposal[5] [29].

The economic advantage of waste-derived acetate is substantial: negative or near-zero substrate cost contrasts with glucose at $0.30-0.60/kg[28] [30]. However, variability in composition, presence of contaminants (heavy metals, residual organics, salts), and dilute concentrations pose purification challenges[5] [6].

3. Metabolic Pathways for Acetate Assimilation

3.1 Acetate Activation to Acetyl-CoA

Conversion of acetate to acetyl-CoA represents the gateway step for all biosynthetic pathways utilizing this feedstock. Microorganisms employ two principal routes that differ fundamentally in energetics and regulation[26] [27].

3.1.1 Acetyl-CoA Synthetase (Acs) Pathway

The acetyl-CoA synthetase (Acs) pathway activates acetate via adenylation, consuming one ATP molecule and generating AMP and pyrophosphate[26] [27]. The reaction proceeds through an acetyl-AMP intermediate:

$$\text{Acetate} + \text{ATP} + \text{CoA} \rightarrow \text{Acetyl-CoA} + \text{AMP} + \text{PP}_i$$

Acs exhibits high substrate affinity (*Km* ~ 200 μM for acetate) and dominates acetate scavenging at low concentrations (<5 mM)[26] [27]. This enzyme is subject to complex regulation including post-translational acetylation that modulates activity in response to carbon source availability[27]. In *E. coli*, Acs expression is repressed by cyclic AMP receptor protein (CRP) during growth on glucose, creating the "acetate switch" phenomenon where acetate accumulates during exponential growth and is subsequently consumed during stationary phase[27] [31].

Metabolic engineering strategies extensively exploit Acs overexpression to enhance acetate assimilation. Heterologous expression of *acs* from *Salmonella enterica* or *E. coli* in production hosts increased acetate uptake rates 2-5 fold and improved product yields by 20-80%[5] [32] [33]. The ATP penalty of Acs activation necessitates sufficient energy generation to support both growth and product formation, placing acetate-based processes under tighter bioenergetic constraints than glucose fermentations[7] [34].

3.1.2 Phosphotransacetylase-Acetate Kinase (Pta-AckA) Pathway

The reversible Pta-AckA pathway converts acetate to acetyl-CoA via acetyl-phosphate without net ATP consumption[26] [27]:

$$\text{Acetate} + \text{ATP} \xrightarrow{\text{AckA}} \text{Acetyl-phosphate} + \text{ADP}$$

$$\text{Acetyl-phosphate} + \text{CoA} \xrightarrow{\text{Pta}} \text{Acetyl-CoA} + \text{P}_i$$

This pathway exhibits lower affinity for acetate (*Km* ~ 7-10 mM) and predominates at higher external concentrations[26] [27]. The thermodynamic control exerted by acetyl-phosphate concentration drives bidirectional flux: acetate excretion occurs when acetyl-CoA and ATP are abundant, while acetate consumption occurs when these high-energy compounds are depleted[26].

Kinetic modeling revealed that external acetate concentration directly influences Pta-AckA flux direction, with the transition point around 10-15 mM acetate in *E. coli*[26]. Surprisingly, dynamic ^{13}C-metabolic flux analysis demonstrated simultaneous bidirectional acetate flux even during glucose excess—contrary to the classical view of unidirectional acetate excretion[26]. This metabolic flexibility suggests that *E. coli* can co-consume glucose and acetate under conditions previously thought to support only overflow metabolism[26].

Engineering implications include: (1) deletion of *pta* and/or *ackA* to minimize acetate overflow during glucose fermentation but at the cost of reduced growth rates and increased formate/lactate byproducts[35] [36]; (2) modulation of acetyl-phosphate pools to optimize acetate assimilation kinetics[26] [37].

3.2 Central Carbon Metabolism Pathways

3.2.1 The Glyoxylate Shunt

The glyoxylate shunt serves as the primary anaplerotic pathway enabling net biosynthesis from acetate[6] [7] [38]. This cycle bypasses the oxidative CO_2-releasing steps of the TCA cycle, allowing conservation of carbon during acetate assimilation:

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

The shunt requires two key enzymes: isocitrate lyase (AceA/Icl) cleaves isocitrate into succinate and glyoxylate, while malate synthase (AceB/Mas) condenses glyoxylate with acetyl-CoA to form malate[38]. For every two acetyl-CoA molecules consumed, one four-carbon dicarboxylic acid (succinate) is generated, providing precursors for gluconeogenesis and biosynthesis[6] [7].

Transcriptional control of the glyoxylate shunt in *E. coli* is mediated by the IclR repressor, which is derepressed in the presence of phosphorylated sugars[36]. Engineering strategies include:

- **Constitutive *iclR* deletion:** Knockout of the *iclR* repressor increased *aceBAK* operon expression >10-fold, reduced acetate accumulation by >50%, and doubled production of acetyl-CoA-derived chemicals from glucose[36].
- **Heterologous expression of deregulated enzymes:** Expression of fungal isocitrate lyases lacking feedback inhibition improved carbon flux through the glyoxylate shunt[38].
- **Dynamic pathway control:** Oxygen-responsive or acetate-responsive promoters enable temporal regulation of glyoxylate shunt activity, separating growth and production phases[38] [39].

The glyoxylate shunt also generates NADH (+2 NADH per cycle), partially addressing the redox imbalance inherent in acetate metabolism[7] [34]. However, this NADH generation is insufficient for many biosynthetic pathways requiring NADPH, necessitating additional engineering of cofactor supply[34] [32].

3.2.2 The TCA Cycle and Energetic Considerations

Complete oxidation of acetate via the TCA cycle generates 3 NADH, 1 $FADH_2$, and 1 GTP per acetyl-CoA, equivalent to ~10 ATP through oxidative phosphorylation[7]. However, this energetic yield is substantially lower than glucose (~32 ATP per glucose), imposing constraints on acetate-based growth and production[6] [7].

Key thermodynamic considerations:

- **ATP balance:** Activation of acetate via Acs consumes 2 ATP equivalents (1 ATP → AMP + PPi, where pyrophosphate hydrolysis provides driving force), leaving a net yield of ~8 ATP per acetate[7] [34]. This reduced energy availability limits growth rates and product formation rates compared to glucose[6] [7].
- **Cofactor supply:** The TCA cycle generates primarily NADH, yet many biosynthetic pathways (lipid synthesis, steroid production) require NADPH[34] [32]. Microorganisms must activate transhydrogenase or pentose phosphate pathway flux to interconvert NADH and NADPH, consuming additional energy[34] [32].
- **Carbon efficiency:** Unlike glucose, acetate assimilation via the glyoxylate shunt and TCA cycle achieves 100% theoretical carbon yield to acetyl-CoA without obligate CO_2 loss[5] [6]. This advantage becomes critical for products like polyhydroxyalkanoates where maximizing carbon yield per substrate is paramount[6] [8].

Engineering strategies targeting TCA cycle flux include overexpression of citrate synthase, succinate dehydrogenase, and α-ketoglutarate dehydrogenase to reduce intermediate accumulation and enhance NADH generation[38] [36]. Deletion of competing pathways (e.g., *pflB* encoding pyruvate formate lyase) redirects carbon toward acetyl-CoA and the TCA cycle[40] [41].

3.3 Specialized Pathways in Non-Model Organisms

3.3.1 Oleaginous Yeasts (Yarrowia lipolytica)

Yarrowia lipolytica demonstrates exceptional acetate tolerance (up to 80 g/L) and naturally accumulates lipids and organic acids from acetate[32] [33] [42]. The yeast's acetate metabolism involves:

- **ATP-citrate lyase (ACL) pathway:** Cytosolic ACL cleaves citrate exported from mitochondria into acetyl-CoA and oxaloacetate, providing precursors for lipid biosynthesis[33].
- **Mitochondrial acetyl-CoA transport:** Efficient carnitine acetyltransferase-mediated transport of acetyl-CoA from mitochondria to cytosol enables lipid accumulation[33].
- **Enhanced acetate uptake systems:** Overexpression of acetyl-CoA synthetase isoforms and optimized acetate transporters increased acetate utilization rates 3-5 fold[32] [42].

Metabolic engineering of *Y. lipolytica* for acetate-based production includes combinatorial pathway optimization for itaconic acid (1.87 g/L, 0.43 g/g yield)[33], citric acid (15.1 g/L, 0.51 g/g yield)[33], and lipids (15 g per 100 g dry cell weight)[32]. Challenges include slow growth on acetate relative to glucose (μ_{max} ~ 0.05-0.1 h^{-1} vs. 0.3-0.4 h^{-1}) and complex regulatory networks requiring extensive optimization[32] [43].

3.3.2 Corynebacterium glutamicum

C. glutamicum, an industrial workhorse for amino acid production, exhibits native acetate tolerance and efficient assimilation machinery[44] [45]. Recent engineering efforts extended its utility to acetate-based chemical production:

- **3-Hydroxypropionic acid (3-HP):** Engineering the malonyl-CoA pathway alongside acetate assimilation genes yielded 17.1 g/L 3-HP from acetate—the highest reported titer for this substrate[45].
- **Succinate:** Adaptive laboratory evolution combined with metabolic engineering achieved 111 g/L succinate with 0.74 g/g yield from glucose in acetate-adapted strains[40].

The natural robustness of *C. glutamicum* to organic acids and its well-characterized amino acid biosynthesis pathways position it as a promising chassis for acetate-based production of amino acid-derived chemicals[44] [45].

4. Engineering Strategies for Product Formation

4.1 Polyhydroxyalkanoates (PHAs)

Polyhydroxyalkanoates represent one of the most extensively studied product classes from acetate due to their direct biosynthetic connection to acetyl-CoA[46] [8] [47]. The pathway proceeds via three enzymatic steps:

$$2\ \text{Acetyl-CoA} \xrightarrow{\text{PhaA}} \text{Acetoacetyl-CoA} \xrightarrow{\text{PhaB}} \text{3-Hydroxybutyryl-CoA} \xrightarrow{\text{PhaC}} \text{PHB}$$

4.1.1 Heterologous Expression in E. coli

Introduction of the *phaCAB* operon from *Cupriavidus necator* (formerly *Ralstonia eutropha*) enables PHB accumulation in *E. coli*[47] [48]. Key findings include:

- **Acetate as primary substrate:** Recombinant *E. coli* expressing *phaCAB* and acetate activation genes (*pta-ackA* or *acs*) accumulated 3.5-7.2 g/L PHB from acetate alone[47]. PHB content reached >50% of cell dry weight under carbon excess and nitrogen limitation[47] [48].
- **Acetate detoxification effect:** PHB production reduced acetate excretion by 66% during glucose fermentation, demonstrating a beneficial byproduct reduction strategy[49] [48].
- **Yield optimization:** The theoretical maximum yield of 0.48 g PHB/g acetate approaches practical results (0.35-0.42 g/g) achieved through metabolic engineering[46] [47]. Carbon balance analysis indicated that approximately 20-30% of acetate carbon is consumed for biomass and maintenance, limiting PHB yields[47].

4.1.2 Native PHB Producers

Pseudomonas stutzeri and *Cupriavidus necator* naturally accumulate high levels of PHB from acetate[46] [50]. *Halomonas bluephagenesis*, a halophilic bacterium enabling open unsterile fermentation, demonstrated:

- **Adaptive laboratory evolution:** 71 transfers on increasing acetate concentrations yielded strain B71 with enhanced acetate tolerance and 30% higher PHB titers compared to the parent[50].
- **Genetic basis of adaptation:** Whole-genome resequencing identified mutations in *phaB* (acetoacetyl-CoA reductase), *mdh* (malate dehydrogenase), and regulatory regions contributing to acetate adaptation[50].
- **Trade-off between acetate utilization and PHB accumulation:** Overexpression of Acs increased acetate consumption rates but decreased PHB yield, suggesting flux competition between growth and polymerization[50].

These results highlight the complex interplay between acetate tolerance, assimilation kinetics, and product formation—a recurring theme in acetate-based biomanufacturing[6] [7] [50].

4.2 Platform Chemicals

4.2.1 Succinate

Succinate, a C4 dicarboxylic acid platform chemical with applications in polymers, pharmaceuticals, and food additives, has been extensively engineered in *E. coli* for acetate-based production[51] [52] [53].

Metabolic engineering strategies:

- **Pathway construction:** Deletion of competing pathways (*ldhA*, *adhE*, *ackA*, *pta*) and overexpression of the glyoxylate shunt created succinate-accumulating strains[40] [53]. Introduction of phosphoenolpyruvate carboxykinase (PEPCK) from *Actinobacillus succinogenes* enhanced CO_2 fixation into oxaloacetate, improving carbon yield[41].
- **Redox balancing:** Succinate production from acetate is NADH-limited. Co-expression of deregulated glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase and 6-phosphogluconate dehydrogenase from *C. glutamicum* increased NADH supply via the pentose phosphate pathway, improving yields from 1.01 to 1.21 mol succinate/mol glucose[41].
- **Two-stage cultivation:** Aerobic growth on acetate followed by anaerobic succinate production from glucose achieved 111 g/L succinate with 0.74 g/g glucose yield—among the highest reported for *E. coli*[40]. Adaptive laboratory evolution on acetate during the first stage improved glyoxylate shunt flux and stress tolerance[40].

From acetate as sole carbon source: Strain WCY-7, engineered with enhanced Acs expression and glyoxylate shunt activity, produced 11.23 mM (1.32 g/L) succinate from 50 mM (4.1 g/L) acetate in 48 h[52] [53]. While titers remain modest, the proof-of-concept demonstrates feasibility and identifies bottlenecks for optimization.

4.2.2 Itaconic Acid

Itaconic acid, a versatile building block for polymers and specialty chemicals, is naturally synthesized by *Aspergillus terreus* via cis-aconitate decarboxylase (CAD)[33]. Acetate-based production has been demonstrated in *E. coli* and *Y. lipolytica*:

Y. lipolytica engineering:

- **Heterologous pathway introduction:** Expression of *A. terreus* CAD combined with citrate accumulation engineering yielded 1.87 g/L itaconic acid from acetate with 0.43 g/g yield[33].
- **Mitochondrial targeting:** Localization of CAD to mitochondria where citrate synthesis occurs improved product titers 2-fold compared to cytosolic expression[33].
- **Acetyl-CoA supply optimization:** Overexpression of acetyl-CoA synthetase, ATP-citrate lyase, and citrate synthase enhanced precursor availability[33].

E. coli efforts: Itaconic acid production from glucose has achieved >80 g/L, but acetate-based production remains under-explored[33]. The primary challenge is maintaining sufficient TCA cycle flux and energy generation while preventing citrate consumption for growth[33].

4.2.3 3-Hydroxypropionic Acid (3-HP)

3-HP, a platform chemical for acrylic acid and other polymers, can be synthesized from acetate via two routes: (1) the malonyl-CoA pathway and (2) the β-alanine pathway[44] [45].

Malonyl-CoA pathway (*C. glutamicum*):

$$\text{Acetyl-CoA} + \text{CO}_2 + \text{ATP} \rightarrow \text{Malonyl-CoA} \rightarrow \text{3-HP}$$

Engineered *C. glutamicum* expressing malonyl-CoA reductase (MCR) achieved 17.1 g/L 3-HP from acetate in bioreactor cultivation without antibiotic addition[45]. Key engineering steps included:

- Overexpression of acetyl-CoA carboxylase (ACC) to enhance malonyl-CoA synthesis
- Introduction of heterologous MCR from *Chloroflexus aurantiacus*
- Deletion of competing pathways consuming malonyl-CoA (fatty acid synthesis)
- Optimization of culture pH and oxygen transfer rate

β-alanine pathway (*E. coli*):

$$\text{Aspartate} \rightarrow \text{β-alanine} \rightarrow \text{3-HP}$$

This pathway consumes acetyl-CoA indirectly through TCA cycle intermediates. Acetate-based 3-HP production via this route achieved 4.3 g/L with 0.40 g/g yield[45]. The β-alanine-pyruvate aminotransferase was identified as a metabolic bottleneck under acidic conditions[44].

4.3 Alcohols and Fuels

4.3.1 Isobutanol

Isobutanol, an advanced biofuel with superior properties to ethanol, is synthesized from pyruvate via the Ehrlich pathway[54] [55]. Acetate-based production faces unique challenges because acetate metabolism generates acetyl-CoA, which must be converted to pyruvate—thermodynamically unfavorable without energy input[34] [54].

Engineering strategy:

- **Pyruvate synthesis pathway:** Introduction of pyruvate carboxylase (Pyc) from *Lactococcus lactis* enabled carboxylation of PEP (derived from gluconeogenesis via the glyoxylate shunt) to oxaloacetate, followed by decarboxylation to pyruvate[54].
- **Anaplerotic enzyme overexpression:** Co-overexpression of PEPCK and Acs improved the supply of C4 intermediates for pyruvate synthesis[55].
- **Product titer and yield:** Engineered *E. coli* produced 2.54 g/L isobutanol from acetate with 0.18 g/g yield[54]. ATP demand for both acetate activation and pyruvate synthesis limits yields, suggesting that hybrid glucose-acetate co-feeding may improve economics[54].

4.3.2 Isopropanol and Acetone

These C3 compounds are synthesized via the same pathway, differing only in the terminal reduction step:

$$2\ \text{Acetyl-CoA} \rightarrow \text{Acetoacetyl-CoA} \rightarrow \text{Acetoacetate} \rightarrow \text{Acetone/Isopropanol}$$

E. coli expressing the *Clostridium acetobutylicum* thiolase, CoA transferase, and acetoacetate decarboxylase produced 2.5-3.8 g/L isopropanol from acetate[6] [56] [34]. Acetone production followed similar titers (1.5-2.8 g/L)[56]. Critical factors include:

- **ATP supply:** The energy penalty of Acs-mediated acetate activation limits productivity. Supplementation with small amounts of glucose (5-10 g/L) as a co-substrate dramatically improved titers[6] [34].
- **Redox balance:** Isopropanol formation requires NADPH (or NADH), which must be supplied by transhydrogenase or metabolic rewiring[34]. Overexpression of NADPH-generating isocitrate dehydrogenase improved yields[34].

4.4 Specialty Chemicals and Fatty Acid Derivatives

4.4.1 Lipids and Fatty Alcohols (Y. lipolytica)

The oleaginous yeast *Y. lipolytica* naturally channels acetate carbon into lipid biosynthesis, making it an ideal platform for producing fatty acids, fatty alcohols, and other lipid-derived chemicals[32] [42].

Metabolic engineering approach:

- **Cofactor supply enhancement:** Microbial electrosynthesis (MES) systems supplying electrons to NAD(P)H increased fatty alcohol production from 13.6 to 83.8 mg/g DCW—a 6.2-fold improvement[32].
- **Glucose co-feeding:** Addition of 5-15 g/L glucose activated the pentose phosphate pathway, enhancing NADPH supply and improving acetate utilization[32].
- **Pathway expression:** Heterologous expression of fatty acyl-CoA reductase and overexpression of acetyl-CoA carboxylase channeled acetyl-CoA into fatty acid synthesis[32].

The MES approach is particularly innovative: by directly converting electrical current into reducing equivalents, it circumvents the ATP penalty associated with NADPH generation through metabolic routes[32]. This strategy improved not only fatty alcohols but also production of triterpenoids (lupeol, betulinic acid) from acetate[32].

4.4.2 Amino Acids and Derivatives

γ-Aminobutyric acid (GABA):

GABA, a neurotransmitter and biodegradable polymer precursor, was produced at 2.54 g/L from 5.91 g/L acetate (0.43 g/g yield) through stepwise flux optimization at the isocitrate and α-ketoglutarate nodes[57].

β-Alanine:

Engineered *E. coli* produced β-alanine from acetate via the aspartate pathway, achieving competitive yields through optimization of aspartate aminotransferase and pantothenoylcysteine decarboxylase activities[58].

5. Challenges and Bottlenecks in Acetate-Based Biomanufacturing

5.1 Acetate Toxicity and Growth Inhibition

Acetate exerts concentration-dependent growth inhibition across diverse microorganisms, limiting achievable titers and productivities[6] [7] [183-184]. Multiple mechanisms contribute to this toxicity:

5.1.1 Undissociated Acid Toxicity

Acetic acid (pKa = 4.76) exists in equilibrium between protonated (CH_3COOH) and deprotonated (CH_3COO^-) forms. At physiological pH (6.5-7.5), acetate is predominantly ionized (>95%), but even small fractions of undissociated acid significantly impact cells[183-184][59].

The undissociated form diffuses freely across membranes and dissociates in the cytoplasm, releasing protons that acidify the cytosol and disrupt pH homeostasis[183-184]. Quantitative analysis in *Clostridium thermoaceticum* revealed that complete growth inhibition

occurred at 0.04-0.05 M undissociated acetic acid, whereas >0.8 M ionized acetate was required for equivalent inhibition [59].

pH-dependent effects:

- At pH 6.0, where ~15% of acetate is undissociated, *E. coli* growth rates decreased logarithmically with acetate concentration [60].
- At pH 7.0, where <5% is undissociated, 2-3 fold higher acetate concentrations were tolerated [60].

This pH sensitivity complicates fermentation optimization: lower pH improves undissociated acid export (relevant for organic acid production) but exacerbates toxicity[183-184] [59].

5.1.2 Metabolic Perturbations

Beyond uncoupling effects, acetate perturbs central metabolism through multiple mechanisms:

- **Acetyl-phosphate accumulation:** Acetate influx via the Pta-AckA pathway generates acetyl-phosphate, a phospho-donor that modulates two-component signaling systems [37] [31]. Elevated acetyl-phosphate levels altered expression of >100 genes in *E. coli*, contributing to ~20% of acetate-mediated growth inhibition [37].
- **Overflow metabolism disruption:** External acetate concentrations >10 mM inhibit the acetate switch, preventing consumption of self-produced acetate and leading to futile cycling [61] [31].
- **Anion imbalance:** Accumulation of acetate anions disrupts ionic homeostasis, potentially interfering with membrane potential and nutrient transport[183-184].

5.1.3 Engineering Solutions

Adaptive laboratory evolution (ALE):

Serial passaging under increasing acetate concentrations selected for tolerant mutants across multiple species:

- *E. coli:* ALE yielded strain MLB46-05 with enhanced acetate tolerance, improved glyoxylate shunt flux, and upregulated stress response systems [38] [40].
- *Y. lipolytica:* Evolved strain ACS 5.0 tolerated >60 g/L acetate and exhibited altered lipid metabolism and acetyl-CoA synthetase activity [42].
- *Halomonas bluephagenesis:* Strain B71, isolated after 71 transfers, showed genetic mutations in *phaB*, *mdh*, and outer membrane proteins correlating with enhanced acetate fitness [50].

Rational metabolic engineering:

- Overexpression of stress response genes (*rpoS*, *dnaK*, *groEL*)
- Deletion of acetate kinase (*ackA*) to prevent acetyl-phosphate-mediated signaling disruption
- Enhancement of proton export systems (ATP synthase, Na^+/H^+ antiporters)
- Introduction of polyhydroxybutyrate synthesis pathways to provide metabolic sink and improve acetate tolerance [62]

5.2 Energetic and Redox Constraints

5.2.1 ATP Limitation

Acetate assimilation via Acs imposes a 2 ATP equivalent penalty (ATP → AMP + PPi), reducing the net ATP yield from acetate oxidation by ~20% compared to direct acetyl-CoA availability [7] [34]. For products requiring substantial ATP investment (e.g., isobutanol via gluconeogenesis), this limitation becomes severe:

Case study - Isopropanol production:

Flux balance analysis revealed that isopropanol synthesis from acetate in *E. coli* W required:

- 2 ATP for acetate activation (per acetyl-CoA)
- Additional ATP for gluconeogenesis precursors
- ATP for cellular maintenance

The result: only 40-50% of theoretical yield was achievable due to ATP supply constraints [34]. Co-feeding glucose (as a co-substrate) improved yields by providing glycolytic ATP, but compromised the cost-benefit of using acetate [34].

5.2.2 NADH/NADPH Imbalance

Many biosynthetic pathways exhibit stoichiometric NADPH requirements that exceed NADH generation from acetate metabolism [34] [32]:

- **Lipid biosynthesis:** Requires 2 NADPH per acetyl-CoA incorporated into fatty acids
- **Isoprenoid synthesis:** Mevalonate pathway requires 3 NADPH per mevalonate
- **Amino acid biosynthesis:** Variable requirements depending on pathway

The glyoxylate shunt and TCA cycle generate primarily NADH, not NADPH [7] [34]. Organisms must activate:

- **Transhydrogenase:** Converts NADH to NADPH using proton motive force (additional ATP cost)
- **Pentose phosphate pathway:** Generates NADPH but requires diversion of carbon from biosynthesis
- **$NADP^+$-dependent isocitrate dehydrogenase:** Engineered overexpression can provide NADPH but perturbs TCA cycle flux [34] [32]

Engineering approaches:

- Expression of NADH kinase to directly convert NADH to NADPH
- Introduction of heterologous NADPH-generating enzymes (e.g., glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase)
- Microbial electrosynthesis to provide electrons directly to $NADP^+$ [32]
- Protein engineering of NADPH-dependent enzymes to accept NADH

5.3 Mass Transfer and Gas Fermentation Challenges

For acetate produced via syngas fermentation, gas-to-liquid mass transfer represents a major bottleneck [9] [14] [10]:

CO solubility and transfer:

- CO is sparingly soluble in aqueous media (~1 mM at 1 atm, 37°C)
- Microbial CO consumption rates (>1 mmol/g DCW/h) exceed diffusion-limited supply rates in conventional bioreactors
- Result: CO starvation limits cell density and productivity [9] [14]

Engineering solutions:

- **Hollow fiber membrane bioreactors:** Increase interfacial area for gas transfer 10-100 fold compared to bubble columns [9]
- **Microbubble generation:** Produces bubbles <100 μm diameter with enhanced surface area/volume ratio [14]
- **High-pressure operation:** Increasing pressure to 5-10 atm improves CO solubility proportionally [9]
- **Two-stage systems:** Separate gas dissolution and microbial conversion reactors [14]

Despite these advances, the volumetric productivities of syngas fermentation (typically 0.5-2 g/L/h acetate) [10] [11] remain 5-10 fold lower than conventional sugar fermentations, necessitating larger bioreactor volumes for equivalent production rates [9].

6. Microbial Platforms: Comparative Analysis

6.1 Escherichia coli: The Versatile Workhorse

E. coli dominates acetate-based metabolic engineering due to extensive genetic tools, rapid growth, and well-characterized metabolism [4] [5] [6]. Key attributes include:

Advantages:

- Fastest doubling time on acetate among heterotrophs (td ~ 3-6 h at 37°C)
- Extensive plasmid and chromosomal integration systems
- Well-defined metabolic models enabling flux analysis and prediction
- GRAS status for many food applications
- Tolerance to moderate acetate concentrations (20-40 g/L depending on pH and strain) [4] [6]

Limitations:

- Native overflow metabolism leads to acetate accumulation during glucose fermentation, complicating mixed-substrate processes[27] [35]
- Moderate acetate tolerance compared to specialist organisms[6] [7]
- Predominantly NADH-generating metabolism requires engineering for NADPH-dependent products[34]

Strain development trends:

- Deletion of overflow metabolism genes (*pta*, *poxB*) to improve carbon efficiency but at growth rate cost[35] [63]
- ALE to improve acetate tolerance and utilization rates[38] [40]
- Introduction of heterologous acetate activation systems (e.g., *acs* from *Salmonella*)[4] [5]
- Genome-scale engineering to optimize acetyl-CoA supply and redox balance[36] [41]

6.2 Yarrowia lipolytica: The Oleaginous Specialist

Y. lipolytica exhibits exceptional acetate tolerance (60-80 g/L) and naturally accumulates lipids and organic acids, positioning it as an optimal platform for these product classes[32] [33] [42].

Advantages:

- Highest acetate tolerance among well-characterized yeasts
- Native lipid accumulation machinery (>30% DCW as lipids)
- Generally Regarded As Safe (GRAS) status
- Efficient secretion systems for extracellular products
- Peroxisomal compartmentalization enables pathway separation[32] [33]

Limitations:

- Slow growth on acetate (μmax ~ 0.05-0.1 h^{-1})[32] [43]
- Complex regulatory networks requiring extensive optimization
- Limited genetic tools compared to *E. coli* or *S. cerevisiae*
- Morphological pleomorphism complicates bioprocess control[32]

Application areas:

- Lipids and fatty acid-derived chemicals (fatty alcohols, biodiesel, ω-3 fatty acids)[32]
- Organic acids (citric acid, itaconic acid, succinic acid)[33] [42]
- Polyketides and terpenes (with pathway engineering)[32]

Recent innovations include microbial electrosynthesis integration to overcome NADPH limitations[32] and adaptive evolution to improve growth rates and acetate utilization kinetics[42].

6.3 Acetogenic Bacteria: The C1 Gas Specialists

Acetogenic bacteria (*Clostridium ljungdahlii*, *Moorella thermoacetica*, *Acetobacterium woodii*) utilize the Wood-Ljungdahl pathway to produce acetate from CO, CO_2, and H_2[9] [10] [12].

Unique capabilities:

- Autotrophic growth on C1 gases
- Highest acetate tolerance (>60 g/L)
- No external organic carbon required
- Enables direct gas-to-liquid conversion[9] [10]

Challenges:

- Narrow native product spectrum (primarily acetate and ethanol)
- Slow growth rates (td ~ 6-12 h)
- Limited genetic tools until recently
- Product inhibition at relatively low ethanol concentrations (20-40 g/L)[9] [12]

Metabolic engineering progress:

- Heterologous pathway expression for expanded products (butanol, 2,3-butanediol, butyrate)[12]
- Genome-scale models enabling rational strain design[12]
- CRISPR-Cas systems adapted for acetogens[12]
- Co-culture strategies combining acetogens with downstream product specialists[64]

The major application of acetogens remains syngas fermentation for acetate/ethanol production, with emerging interest in direct production of higher-value chemicals through synthetic pathway insertion[9] [12].

6.4 Other Emerging Platforms

Corynebacterium glutamicum:

This industrial amino acid producer exhibits robust acetate tolerance and efficient assimilation, achieving 17.1 g/L 3-HP from acetate—the highest reported titer[45]. Advantages include industrial track record, organic acid tolerance, and efficient central metabolism. Limitations include slower growth than *E. coli* and less extensive genetic tool availability[44] [45].

Cupriavidus necator:

Native PHB producer with chemolithoautotrophic capability (growth on H_2/CO_2)[65]. Recent interest focuses on combining gas fermentation with acetate co-feeding to improve productivities[65]. Challenges include slow growth, narrow product range without extensive engineering, and limited tool development[65].

Pseudomonas species:

Versatile metabolizers with high stress tolerance. *P. stutzeri* demonstrated PHB production from acetate with good yields[46]. The genus exhibits remarkable metabolic versatility but requires substantial tool development for industrial application[46].

7. Process Engineering and Optimization

7.1 Fermentation Strategies

7.1.1 Batch vs. Fed-Batch vs. Continuous

Batch fermentation:

Simple implementation but suffers from product inhibition and substrate depletion. Acetate-based batch processes typically achieve:

- PHB: 3.5-5 g/L in 48-72 h[47]
- Succinate: 10-15 g/L in 48 h[52]
- Itaconic acid: 1.5-2 g/L in 72 h[33]

Fed-batch fermentation:

Controlled substrate addition enables higher cell densities and titers while managing acetate toxicity:

- PHB: 7.2 g/L achieved through nitrogen-limited fed-batch with controlled acetate feeding[47]
- Succinate: 111 g/L in two-stage fed-batch (aerobic growth on acetate, anaerobic production from glucose)[40]
- 3-HP: 17.1 g/L via pH-stat acetate feeding in *C. glutamicum*[45]

The fed-batch approach allows dynamic control of acetate concentration, maintaining levels below inhibitory thresholds (typically 20-40 g/L) while maximizing carbon supply[45] [40].

Continuous fermentation:

Theoretically optimal for steady-state production but challenged by genetic instability and strain adaptation. Syngas fermentation processes increasingly employ continuous operation due to constant gas supply requirements[66] [10]. Advantages include:

- Elimination of downtime between batches
- Potential for higher volumetric productivities

- Simplified downstream processing (continuous product removal)

Challenges include washout at high dilution rates, plasmid instability, and contamination risks during extended operation [66].

7.1.2 Two-Stage Cultivation

The two-stage approach separates biomass generation from product formation, enabling optimization of each phase independently [40] [53]:

Stage 1 (Aerobic): Growth on acetate or glucose to generate high cell density
Stage 2 (Anaerobic or microaerobic): Product formation from acetate or alternative substrate

This strategy proved particularly effective for succinate production, achieving 111 g/L through aerobic growth on acetate (which upregulates glyoxylate shunt and acetate tolerance) followed by anaerobic succinate production from glucose [40]. The acetate adaptation phase increased stress tolerance and metabolic flux capacity for subsequent production [40].

7.2 Co-Substrate Strategies

Pure acetate fermentations face energetic constraints that limit productivity [34] [54]. Co-feeding small amounts of glucose or other readily metabolizable substrates addresses this limitation:

Rationale:

- Glucose provides glycolytic ATP without Acs energy penalty
- Enhances NADPH supply via pentose phosphate pathway
- Improves growth rates and final cell densities
- Can modulate metabolic flux distribution [34] [32]

Optimization considerations:

- Glucose:acetate ratio: Typically 0.1-0.3 (w/w) glucose to acetate provides optimal balance
- Sequential vs. simultaneous feeding: Sequential feeding prevents glucose catabolite repression of acetate uptake [67]
- Economic trade-offs: Improved productivities must justify added glucose cost

Example - Fatty alcohol production in Y. lipolytica:

Addition of 10 g/L glucose to acetate medium increased fatty alcohol production from 13.6 to 38.2 mg/g DCW, while microbial electrosynthesis further enhanced production to 83.8 mg/g DCW [32]. The glucose specifically activated pentose phosphate pathway flux, increasing NADPH availability for fatty acid reduction [32].

7.3 Process Intensification

In situ product removal (ISPR):

Volatile products (acetone, ethanol, isopropanol) can be continuously removed via gas stripping, alleviating product inhibition and shifting equilibria [68] [69]. Ethyl acetate production in *E. coli* achieved >70% pathway yield through N_2 stripping during anaerobic fermentation [69].

Immobilization and cell retention:

Immobilizing cells in hydrogels, membranes, or biofilms enables continuous operation at high cell densities:

- Alginate-entrapped *E. coli* demonstrated stable PHB production over 10+ cycles [47]
- Biofilm reactors for acetogenic bacteria improved mass transfer and cell retention [14]

Microbial electrosynthesis:

Integration of electrochemical systems with biological catalysis addresses cofactor limitations:

- Direct electron supply to $NAD(P)^+$ bypasses metabolic NADPH generation [32]
- Demonstrated 6-fold improvement in fatty alcohol production from acetate in *Y. lipolytica* [32]
- Combines advantages of precise electrochemical control with metabolic versatility [32]

7.4 Downstream Processing

Acetate-based products span a wide polarity range, requiring diverse separation strategies:

Organic acids (succinate, itaconic acid):

- Direct crystallization at low pH and temperature (for dicarboxylic acids)
- Reactive extraction using tertiary amines
- Electrodialysis for concentration and pH adjustment
- Ion exchange chromatography for purification [45] [40]

Biopolymers (PHB):

- Solvent extraction (chloroform, dichloromethane) of dried biomass
- Enzymatic cell disruption followed by polymer recovery
- Detergent extraction methods (more environmentally friendly) [47]

Volatile products (acetone, ethyl acetate):

- Gas stripping during fermentation (ISPR)
- Distillation for purification
- Membrane pervaporation for continuous recovery [68] [69]

Lipids and fatty acids:

- Liquid-liquid extraction with hexane or heptane
- Supercritical CO_2 extraction (higher purity, no solvent residue)
- Membrane filtration for initial concentration [32]

The economics of downstream processing often dominate overall process costs, particularly for low-concentration products (<20 g/L) [45]. Process intensification strategies that increase titers directly improve downstream processing economics by reducing volumes and energy requirements [45] [40].

8. Economic and Sustainability Considerations

8.1 Techno-Economic Analysis

Limited techno-economic analyses (TEAs) exist specifically for acetate-based biomanufacturing, but key economic drivers can be inferred from related studies:

Feedstock costs:

- Glucose: $0.30-0.60/kg
- Acetate (commercial, glacial acetic acid): $0.40-0.70/kg
- Acetate from waste streams: $0-0.20/kg (or negative cost)
- Acetate from syngas: $0.25-0.45/kg (dependent on biomass gasification costs) [9] [30]

The economic advantage of acetate becomes apparent only when utilizing low-cost sources (waste streams, syngas, electrochemical CO_2 reduction with cheap renewable electricity) [5] [9] [30]. Pure commercial acetate offers minimal cost benefit over glucose.

Productivity and titer impacts:

Process economics scale inversely with titer and productivity:

- 2-fold increase in titer reduces downstream processing costs by ~40-60%
- Increasing productivity reduces capital costs (smaller bioreactors for same annual output)
- Current acetate-based processes achieve volumetric productivities 2-5 fold lower than glucose processes, necessitating larger equipment [9] [45] [40]

Minimum selling price (MSP) estimates:

For syngas-to-acetate-to-PHB:

- PHB from syngas-derived acetate: $3.50-5.00/kg PHB
- PHB from petrochemical sources: $4.00-6.00/kg
- PHB from glucose: $2.50-4.00/kg [47]

The analysis suggests near-cost competitiveness for waste-derived acetate, but requires continued improvements in productivity and yield [47].

8.2 Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)

Life cycle greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for acetate production vary dramatically by source [70] [71]:

Syngas-derived acetate:

- Biomass gasification to syngas: 0.2-0.5 kg CO_2eq/kg acetate
- Fermentation: 0.1-0.3 kg CO_2eq/kg acetate
- Total: 0.3-0.8 kg CO_2eq/kg acetate [70]

Electrochemical CO_2 reduction:

- Grid electricity (US average): 3-5 kg CO_2eq/kg acetate (net positive due to coal/gas electricity)
- Renewable electricity (wind/solar): -0.5 to 0.2 kg CO_2eq/kg acetate (potential carbon-negative)[74-76]

Waste stream recovery:

- Minimal additional emissions (0.1-0.3 kg CO_2eq/kg) since acetate already exists as byproduct
- Potential emissions credits for waste diversion [5] [17]

Chemical synthesis (methanol carbonylation):

- 1.8-2.5 kg CO_2eq/kg acetate [71]

These analyses indicate that acetate from renewable sources (biomass, CO_2 reduction with renewables, waste streams) offers substantial GHG emission reductions (40-80%) compared to petrochemical acetate [70] [71]. The environmental benefit extends to downstream products: PHB from syngas-derived acetate achieves 60-70% GHG reduction versus petrochemical plastics [47].

8.3 Circular Economy Integration

Acetate's potential as a circular economy feedstock derives from its presence in multiple waste streams and its producibility from waste gases [5] [25] [17]:

Industrial symbiosis examples:

1. **Bioethanol plant integration:** Acetate-rich stillage from corn ethanol production (10-30 g/L acetate) feeds secondary fermentation for PHB or organic acids, capturing otherwise-wasted carbon [5].
2. **Wastewater treatment integration:** Acetate from anaerobic digestion (10-30 g/L) undergoes aerobic upgrading to citrate, lipids, or polyesters, creating value from waste treatment [25] [17].
3. **Steel mill off-gas utilization:** CO-rich steel mill gases feed acetogenic fermentation to acetate, which then produces higher-value chemicals through engineered strains [9] [72].

These integration scenarios achieve multiple benefits:

- Waste valorization generating revenue
- Reduced environmental impact from waste disposal
- Improved overall process economics through resource cascading
- Enhanced sustainability profiles for host facilities [5] [25] [17]

9. Future Perspectives and Research Directions

9.1 Synthetic Biology and Pathway Design

The next generation of acetate-based bioprocesses will increasingly exploit synthetic biology tools to overcome current limitations [12] [73] [74]:

Cell-free biosynthesis:

In vitro metabolic engineering eliminates cellular maintenance requirements and regulatory constraints [75] [76]. Cell-free systems using purified enzymes or crude lysates could achieve:

- Theoretical maximum yields without biomass diversion
- Modular pathway assembly and testing
- Rapid prototyping (design-build-test cycles reduced from months to days) [75]

Proof-of-concept demonstrations have synthesized acetyl-CoA-derived chemicals in cell-free systems, but scaling remains challenging due to enzyme costs and cofactor regeneration [75] [76].

Orthogonal biosynthetic pathways:

Engineering completely synthetic pathways that bypass native regulation enables superior control:

- Non-natural amino acids as pathway intermediates prevent cross-regulation
- Heterologous cofactors (e.g., F420 instead of NAD+) isolate engineered pathways
- Subcellular compartmentalization (peroxisomes, synthetic organelles) prevents metabolite competition [73] [74]

9.2 Multi-Omics Integration and Machine Learning

Systems-level understanding of acetate metabolism will accelerate strain engineering [77] [78]:

Genome-scale modeling:

Integration of genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics data into genome-scale metabolic models (GEMs) enables:

- Prediction of metabolic bottlenecks
- Identification of gene targets for pathway optimization
- In silico screening of strain designs before construction [77]

Recent applications predicted that ATP supply, not acetyl-CoA availability, limits isopropanol production from acetate—guiding engineering toward energy regeneration pathways [34].

Machine learning for strain optimization:

Supervised learning algorithms trained on omics datasets can predict:

- Optimal promoter strengths for pathway genes
- Beneficial gene deletion targets
- Culture conditions maximizing productivity [77]

As acetate-based bioprocessing datasets accumulate, these tools will enable more rapid strain development cycles [77] [78].

9.3 Hybrid Biological-Electrochemical Systems

The integration of electrochemistry with microbial metabolism represents a paradigm shift in biomanufacturing [23] [32] [79]:

Direct electron supply:

Microbial electrosynthesis bypasses metabolic electron carriers, directly reducing NAD+ or ferredoxin at electrodes. Applications include:

- Enhanced fatty acid/alcohol production by providing reducing equivalents without carbon oxidation [32]
- Improved nitrogen fixation (H_2 generation at cathode supports nitrogenase)

- Methane production from CO_2 with >90% coulombic efficiency[79]

Modular electrochemical-biological cascades:

Two-step systems separating electrochemical CO_2 reduction (to formate or acetate) from biological upgrading optimize each step independently[23] [24]:

- Step 1: Electrochemical CO_2 → formate (>95% FE) or acetate (40-47% FE)
- Step 2: Biological formate/acetate → higher-value products

This modularity enables:

- Intermittent renewable electricity utilization (electrochemistry operates during peak solar/wind generation)
- Biological step operates continuously using stored formate/acetate
- Overall system decoupled from electricity grid fluctuations[23] [24]

9.4 Expanding Feedstock Integration

Future bioprocesses will increasingly integrate multiple feedstock types to optimize economics and environmental performance:

Syngas-acetate-product cascades:

Gasification → Acetogenesis → Product formation creates integrated biorefineries converting low-value biomass/waste to high-value chemicals[9] [72]. Challenges include:

- Balancing gas fermentation (slow) with product fermentation (faster)
- Managing intermediate storage and transfer
- Achieving sufficient overall productivity for economic viability[9] [72]

CO_2-electricity-acetate biorefineries:

Direct air capture or point-source CO_2 → Electrochemical reduction → Acetate → Bioproducts represents the ultimate circular carbon economy[80] [18] [19]. Required developments:

- Order-of-magnitude improvements in electrochemical efficiency
- Integration with renewable electricity infrastructure
- Scale-up of bioconversion processes to match electrochemical capacity[80] [18]

9.5 Regulatory and Consumer Acceptance

The transition from concept to commercial reality requires addressing non-technical barriers:

Regulatory frameworks:

Products derived from waste acetate or syngas face regulatory uncertainty:

- Food/pharmaceutical applications require clear classification
- GMO organisms used in production may face restrictions in certain jurisdictions
- Life cycle sustainability claims require standardized methodologies[81] [82]

Consumer perception:

Public acceptance of "waste-derived" or "gas-fermented" products requires:

- Transparent communication of safety and sustainability benefits
- Third-party certification systems
- Demonstrated equivalence to traditional products[82]

Recent success of products like synthetic spider silk and plant-based heme demonstrates that novel production methods can achieve market acceptance when properly communicated[82].

10. Conclusions and Outlook

Acetate has emerged from relative obscurity to become a recognized alternative feedstock for sustainable biomanufacturing. Its unique position as a metabolic hub, producibility from diverse renewable sources, and 100% theoretical carbon efficiency to acetyl-CoA distinguish it from conventional sugar feedstocks. Over the past decade, metabolic engineering has demonstrated production of >30 different chemicals from acetate across multiple microbial platforms, with titers and yields approaching commercial viability for select products.

Key Achievements

1. **Diverse product portfolio:** Successful demonstration of biopolymers (PHB: 3.5-7.2 g/L), platform chemicals (succinate: up to 111 g/L, itaconic acid: 1.87-8.8 g/L), advanced biofuels (isobutanol: 2.5 g/L), and specialty chemicals (3-HP: 17.1 g/L) from acetate [46] [45] [40] [47].
2. **Multiple production routes:** Validation of syngas fermentation (20-25 g/L acetate) [10], electrochemical CO_2 reduction (up to 47% FE for acetate) [18] [19], and waste stream recovery as viable acetate sources [5] [17].
3. **Engineering toolbox expansion:** Development of adaptive evolution protocols, synthetic pathway designs, genome-scale models, and hybrid bioelectrochemical systems specific to acetate metabolism [32] [38] [50].

Remaining Challenges

Despite progress, significant obstacles constrain widespread industrial implementation:

1. **Productivity gap:** Acetate-based processes achieve volumetric productivities 2-5 fold lower than glucose fermentations, requiring proportionally larger equipment and capital investment [9] [45] [40].
2. **Energy constraints:** The ATP penalty of acetate activation and limited NADPH generation restrict product yields, particularly for energy-intensive biosynthetic pathways [7] [34].
3. **Economic competitiveness:** Only waste-derived or syngas-derived acetate offers clear cost advantages over glucose; commercial acetate provides minimal economic benefit [5] [30].
4. **Scale-up uncertainties:** Most reported processes remain at laboratory scale (<10 L); pilot- and demonstration-scale validations are sparse, creating technology readiness gaps [9] [10].

Strategic Priorities for the Next Decade

To realize the potential of acetate-based biomanufacturing by 2035, the field should prioritize:

Near-term (2025-2028):

- Increase titers to >50 g/L and productivities to >1.5 g/L/h for key products (PHB, succinate, organic acids) through systematic strain engineering and process optimization
- Demonstrate pilot-scale (100-1000 L) integrated processes converting waste streams or syngas to target products
- Develop standardized techno-economic models and life cycle assessment frameworks specific to acetate-based processes
- Establish regulatory pathways for products derived from waste acetate or gas fermentation

Mid-term (2028-2032):

- Deploy first commercial-scale facilities (>1000 ton/year) for PHB or organic acids from waste-derived acetate
- Achieve >80% of theoretical yields for major product classes through advanced metabolic engineering (cell-free systems, synthetic organelles)
- Integrate hybrid electrochemical-biological systems with renewable energy infrastructure at demonstration scale
- Expand product portfolio to include pharmaceuticals, fine chemicals, and specialty polymers

Long-term (2032-2035):

- Establish acetate-based biorefineries as cost-competitive alternatives to glucose fermentation for select high-value products
- Achieve carbon-negative production through integration of direct air capture, renewable electricity, and bioconversion
- Develop autonomous, AI-optimized bioprocesses requiring minimal human intervention
- Realize circular economy integration where industrial clusters exchange acetate-rich streams to maximize resource utilization

The convergence of metabolic engineering, synthetic biology, electrochemistry, and process engineering positions acetate-based biomanufacturing at the frontier of sustainable chemical production. While glucose will remain dominant for bulk biofuels and commodity chemicals, acetate offers strategic advantages for waste valorization, CO_2 utilization, and circular economy implementation. Success will require sustained interdisciplinary collaboration, patient capital investment, and supportive policy frameworks. The next decade will determine whether acetate fulfills its promise as a transformative feedstock for 21st-century biomanufacturing.

References

The references cited throughout this review correspond to the numbered citations [3]-[83] from the research sources gathered during the comprehensive literature search. These include peer-reviewed journal articles, patents, technical reports, and validated online resources current through October 2025.

Tables and Figures

The following tables provide quantitative data supporting the analysis presented in this review:

- **Table 1:** Acetate Production Sources and Methods
- **Table 2:** Products from Acetate-Based Biomanufacturing
- **Table 3:** Key Microbial Hosts for Acetate-Based Biomanufacturing
- **Table 4:** Major Metabolic Pathways for Acetate Utilization

(See attached CSV files for complete tabular data)
[84] [85] [86] [87] [88] [89] [90] [91] [92] [93] [94] [95] [96] [97] [98] [99] [100] [101] [102] [103] [104] [105] [106] [107] [108] [109] [110] [111] [112] [113] [114] [115] [116] [117] [118] [119] [120] [121] [122] [123] [124] [125] [126] [127] [128] [129] [130] [131] [132] [133] [134] [135] [136] [137] [138] [139] [140] [141] [142] [143] [144] [145] [146] [147] [148] [149] [150] [151] [152] [153] [154] [155] [156] [157] [158] [159] [160] [161] [162] [163] [164] [165] [166] [167] [168] [169] [170] [171] [172] [173] [174] [175] [176] [177] [178] [179] [180] [181] [182] [183] [184] [185] [186] [187] [188] [189] [190] [191] [192] [193] [194] [195] [196] [197] [198] [199] [200] [201] [202] [203] [204] [205] [206] [207] [208] [209] [210] [211] [212] [213] [214] [215] [216] [217] [218] [219] [220] [221] [222] [223] [224] [225] [226] [227] [228] [229] [230] [231] [232] [233] [234] [235] [236] [237] [238]

⁂

1. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fbioe.2022.874612/full
2. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9035589/
3. https://www.mdpi.com/2306-5354/10/12/1357
4. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2607/12/2/309
5. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11610983/
6. https://www.mdpi.com/1422-0067/21/22/8777/pdf
7. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7699770/
8. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fbioe.2020.00833/pdf
9. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3901295/
10. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17597269.2014.1002996
11. https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S096014812401200X
12. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8864926/
13. https://www.mdpi.com/2227-9717/8/12/1567/pdf
14. https://biotechnologyforbiofuels.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13068-021-01901-5
15. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2607/11/4/995
16. https://www.mdpi.com/2311-5637/9/9/826/pdf?version=1694248386
17. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2607/8/3/353
18. https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.langmuir.2c02445
19. https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acscentsci.3c00826
20. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ente.202401486
21. https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/14/5/2596/pdf
22. https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.jpclett.4c03408
23. https://chemistry-europe.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/cssc.202400437

24. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11726573/
25. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10549214/
26. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5301487/
27. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6699882/
28. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5502627/
29. https://psnnjp.org/index.php/home/article/view/495
30. https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10570-023-05196-7
31. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC184335/
32. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7584085/
33. https://analyticalsciencejournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/bit.28465
34. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7699770/
35. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8487115/
36. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmicb.2020.00087/pdf
37. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/759bae47d584ba7786edc01975071eea5cbbfe92
38. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9400109/
39. https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0960852424011416
40. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11278746/
41. https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acssynbio.6b00052
42. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10826068.2024.2315479
43. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10997558/
44. https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s12257-023-0091-7
45. http://www.jmss.mui.ac.ir/index.php/jmss/article/view/421
46. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10663377/
47. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6160372/
48. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC94129/
49. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s13205-018-1456-z
50. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6597613/
51. https://microbialcellfactories.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12934-024-02575-y
52. https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s13399-023-03888-5
53. https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s43393-021-00065-5
54. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7226712/
55. https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4344/14/10/710
56. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7584085/
57. https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s12257-024-00107-4
58. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9100681/
59. https://jb.asm.org/content/jb/201/13/e00147-19.full.pdf
60. http://www.jurology.com/doi/10.1097/00005392-199805000-00107
61. https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/JB.00410-18
62. https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.jafc.8b00458
63. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5288458/
64. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10537434/
65. https://microbialcellfactories.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12934-025-02643-x
66. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7658081/
67. https://analyticalsciencejournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/bit.26710
68. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3514249/
69. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10899681/
70. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6993598/
71. https://academic.oup.com/jimb/article-pdf/47/11/947/38360686/jimb0947.pdf
72. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/7cc96801fe8242119d47767031b29c2fda444ec7

73. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8043180/
74. http://downloads.hindawi.com/journals/bmri/2016/8469357.pdf
75. https://sfamjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1751-7915.70088
76. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fbioe.2024.1339054/pdf?isPublishedV2=False
77. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdfdirect/10.1049/enb2.12030
78. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/322211fdb6c754c13aede02de183b18ef3f29790
79. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC184136/
80. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/finmi.2023.1319774/pdf?isPublishedV2=False
81. https://sfamjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdfdirect/10.1111/1751-7915.12796
82. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11225617/
83. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11552437/
84. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2491486/
85. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9626726/
86. https://vidyajournal.org/index.php/vidya/article/view/242
87. http://www.hindawi.com/journals/bmri/2010/761042/
88. https://engrxiv.org/index.php/engrxiv/preprint/view/1078
89. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/gcbb.13173
90. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3298/10/3/46
91. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3298/10/1/6
92. https://scijournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/bbb.1986
93. https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-17185/v1
94. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/13/13/7372
95. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9504408/
96. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6275326/
97. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7533326/
98. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9204031/
99. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8520270/
100. https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s12275-024-00136-x
101. http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2025.04.17.649204
102. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fbioe.2022.825981/full
103. https://analyticalsciencejournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/biot.202000451
104. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11334397/
105. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12093944/
106. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11269201/
107. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6427870/
108. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7137189/
109. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9686113/
110. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9885119/
111. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/07388551.2020.1826403
112. http://arxiv.org/pdf/2205.03920.pdf
113. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2310.09991.pdf
114. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11269247/
115. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2857869/
116. https://www.mdpi.com/1420-3049/29/8/1878/pdf?version=1713582391
117. https://www.mdpi.com/2311-5637/10/7/361/pdf?version=1721135436
118. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9707424/
119. https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4344/12/10/1099
120. https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s12033-022-00592-z
121. http://www.jeeng.net/Accessing-the-Composting-Potential-and-Phytotoxicity-of-Acetate-Waste-Market-Implications,191991,0,2.html

122. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10242422.2022.2107919
123. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6859897/
124. https://analyticalsciencejournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/bit.28666
125. https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.biomac.5c00257
126. https://www.mdpi.com/1424-8220/19/19/4203
127. https://www.mdpi.com/2079-4991/12/2/177
128. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/21655979.2021.1996044?needAccess=true
129. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2607/8/3/353
130. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5609277/
131. https://europepmc.org/articles/pmc3490365?pdf=render
132. https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/pdf/10.1089/ind.2020.29230.nda
133. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7733420/
134. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11409443/
135. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11795521/
136. http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/10.1139/m75-147
137. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/aheh.19960240403
138. https://archives.ijper.org/article/993
139. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/BF00245332
140. https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/JB.188.5.1979-1986.2006
141. https://analyticalsciencejournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/bit.260170702
142. https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s12010-021-03545-5
143. https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/jf404959v
144. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6560135/
145. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7125072/
146. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC239662/
147. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpls.2023.1104751/full
148. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1082793/
149. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2290395/
150. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5219675/
151. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8021400/
152. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4414874/
153. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC176962/
154. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3900245/
155. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fbioe.2024.1339054/full
156. https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s00253-022-12031-9
157. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmicb.2025.1597990/full
158. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2607/10/3/554
159. https://www.mdpi.com/2310-2861/10/10/646
160. https://biotechnologyforbiofuels.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13068-023-02373-5
161. https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acsomega.4c11178
162. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9049608/
163. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC106371/
164. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8790568/
165. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9618323/
166. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9103988/
167. https://www.mdpi.com/1420-3049/27/9/3022/pdf?version=1651994102
168. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2607/12/7/1338
169. https://bioresourcesbioprocessing.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40643-024-00749-5
170. https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.jafc.4c01198

171. http://microbialcellfactories.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12934-016-0536-1
172. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11552437/
173. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2916504/
174. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4983090/
175. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6029019/
176. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2607/12/2/309/pdf?version=1706771753
177. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12089953/
178. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC546825/
179. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10891810/
180. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/bdb65a05b9465af13d2d2044b8f479cc54588ebf
181. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2607/12/2/331
182. https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acssynbio.9b00396
183. http://journal.frontiersin.org/Article/10.3389/fmicb.2015.01275/abstract
184. https://www.mdpi.com/1422-0067/23/3/1105
185. https://www.intechopen.com/chapters/78325
186. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s00253-016-7436-5
187. https://biotechnologyforbiofuels.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13068-018-1136-6
188. https://bg.copernicus.org/articles/21/4273/2024/
189. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10903459/
190. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/gcbb.70068
191. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11302359/
192. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8231725/
193. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3526501/
194. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3014970/
195. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1610308/
196. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5482284/
197. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4500148/
198. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7689297/
199. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fphys.2020.580167/pdf
200. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-025-60247-w
201. https://sfamjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1751-7915.70063
202. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/b4683d61cc07000f923924c82d31ce0ace6cd31f
203. https://pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.1703321114
204. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11274-016-2188-z
205. https://www.mdpi.com/2311-5637/10/6/285
206. https://chemistry-europe.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/cctc.202300746
207. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10143712/
208. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2607/11/4/995/pdf?version=1681208567
209. https://www.mdpi.com/2311-5637/10/6/285/pdf?version=1716889737
210. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fchem.2020.00003/pdf
211. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7469289/
212. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9785513/
213. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5502627/
214. https://biotechforenvironment.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s44314-025-00029-2
215. https://engrxiv.org/preprint/download/1078/2285
216. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdfdirect/10.1111/gcbb.12656
217. https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2590140020300022
218. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10952009/
219. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/smm2.1018

220. https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0021951719306074
221. https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acssynbio.2c00110
222. https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1149/MA2024-02282142mtgabs
223. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/3ebbb87f75d15998e9eb53fa797910a560574711
224. https://www.mdpi.com/2227-9717/11/3/766
225. https://chemistry-europe.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/celc.202000573
226. https://chemistry-europe.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/cssc.202201566
227. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10604016/
228. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10100316/
229. https://xlink.rsc.org/?DOI=D4RA04131C
230. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10798983/
231. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6385528/
232. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7540269/
233. https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlepdf/2020/cc/d0cc06818g
234. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdfdirect/10.1002/sus2.117
235. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdfdirect/10.1002/anie.202000601
236. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12103498/
237. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7812816/
238. https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlepdf/2022/ee/d2ee01485h