Acetate: A New Feedstock for Biomanufacturing

Abstract

The transition toward a sustainable bioeconomy necessitates diversification beyond traditional sugar-based feedstocks for microbial biomanufacturing. Acetate, a two-carbon (C2) platform molecule, has emerged as a promising alternative substrate that addresses both economic and environmental imperatives. As a ubiquitous product of anaerobic fermentation, lignocellulosic biomass degradation, syngas fermentation, and electrochemical CO_2 reduction, acetate represents a low-cost or even negative-cost carbon source with substantial availability. This review critically examines the state of acetate-based biomanufacturing, encompassing the biochemical pathways governing acetate metabolism, metabolic engineering strategies to overcome inherent toxicity and assimilation challenges, recent advances in producing value-added chemicals, and the integration of acetate utilization with emerging carbon capture technologies. We highlight fundamental knowledge gaps in acetate metabolism, discuss controversies surrounding pathway engineering approaches, and provide a forward-looking perspective on how acetate feedstocks could reshape industrial biotechnology over the next decade. The convergence of synthetic biology, systems metabolic engineering, and carbon-negative production platforms positions acetate as a cornerstone substrate for next-generation biomanufacturing.

Introduction

The Imperative for Alternative Carbon Sources

Contemporary biomanufacturing predominantly relies on food-derived sugars—glucose, sucrose, and starch hydrolysates—as primary carbon sources[1]. While these substrates enable robust microbial growth and high product titers, they present fundamental limitations: direct competition with food supplies, substantial arable land requirements, and price volatility tied to agricultural markets[2]. The global push toward carbon neutrality and circular economy principles demands exploration of non-food, waste-derived, and CO_2-based feedstocks that decouple biomanufacturing from agricultural resources[3].

Single-carbon (C1) compounds including CO_2, CO, formate, methanol, and methane have received extensive attention as next-generation feedstocks, offering theoretical advantages of atmospheric carbon utilization and independence from photosynthesis[4][5]. However, C1 metabolism imposes significant metabolic burden, often requiring energy-intensive carbon fixation pathways such as the Calvin-Benson-Bassham (CBB) cycle or the reductive tricarboxylic acid (rTCA) cycle, which constrain growth rates and product yields[6]. Moreover, engineering C1-utilizing phenotypes in industrially relevant chassis organisms remains technically challenging, with limited native C1-trophic hosts possessing the genetic tractability and robustness required for scaled production[7].

Acetate as a Bridge Between C1 and Sugar Metabolism

Acetate occupies a unique metabolic position between C1 and conventional sugar substrates. As a C2 molecule, acetate metabolism converges directly on acetyl-CoA—the central hub connecting catabolic and anabolic pathways—without requiring complex carbon fixation cycles[8]. This metabolic proximity to core biosynthetic precursors theoretically enables more efficient conversion to acetyl-CoA-derived products compared to C1 substrates, while avoiding the food competition issues associated with sugars[9].

The ubiquity of acetate in natural and industrial systems amplifies its appeal. Acetate is the predominant end product of anaerobic fermentation in diverse environments, from gastrointestinal microbiomes to anaerobic digesters[10]. Lignocellulosic biomass pretreatment and hydrolysis liberates acetate from hemicellulose acetyl groups, creating acetate-rich hydrolysates that inhibit sugar fermentation if not managed[11]. Syngas fermentation—the microbial conversion of CO and H_2 to chemicals—produces acetate as a primary metabolite, particularly in acetogens such as *Clostridium ljungdahlii* and *Moorella thermoacetica*[12]. Perhaps most compellingly, electrochemical CO_2 reduction can generate acetate with high selectivity, creating a direct pathway from atmospheric carbon to bioavailable substrates powered by renewable electricity[13][14].

Challenges and Opportunities

Despite these advantages, acetate utilization for biomanufacturing faces substantial challenges. Acetate exhibits growth inhibition in most microorganisms at concentrations exceeding 5–10 g/L due to uncoupling effects on cellular bioenergetics and intracellular acidification[15][16]. The energetic efficiency of acetate assimilation is inherently lower than glucose, with acetyl-CoA formation from acetate consuming ATP (via acetyl-CoA synthetase) rather than generating it through glycolysis[17]. Regulatory mechanisms such as carbon catabolite repression often suppress acetate utilization in the presence of preferred substrates, and many industrially relevant organisms lack efficient acetate assimilation machinery[18].

Nevertheless, the past decade has witnessed remarkable progress in overcoming these barriers through metabolic engineering, adaptive laboratory evolution, and systems-level understanding of acetate metabolism. This review synthesizes current knowledge on acetate as a biomanufacturing feedstock, critically evaluating metabolic pathways, engineering strategies, product portfolios, and future trajectories. We emphasize knowledge gaps that constrain rational engineering and highlight controversies regarding optimal approaches for acetate-based production platforms.

Acetate Metabolism: Pathways and Regulation

Acetate Assimilation Pathways

Microorganisms have evolved diverse biochemical routes for acetate assimilation, with pathway distribution varying across phylogenetic groups and metabolic niches. Understanding these pathways is essential for rational engineering of acetate utilization.

The Acs-Glyoxylate Shunt Axis

The canonical pathway for acetate assimilation in aerobic bacteria involves acetyl-CoA synthetase (Acs, EC 6.2.1.1) coupled with the glyoxylate shunt. Acs catalyzes ATP-dependent ligation of acetate and coenzyme A, forming acetyl-CoA, AMP, and pyrophosphate[19]:

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

This reaction is thermodynamically unfavorable ($\Delta G'^\circ \approx 0$ kJ/mol) and requires coupling to pyrophosphate hydrolysis for irreversibility[20]. The energy cost—equivalent to two ATP equivalents per acetyl-CoA—represents a fundamental thermodynamic tax on acetate metabolism absent in sugar catabolism.

The glyoxylate shunt, discovered by Kornberg in 1957, bypasses the CO_2-releasing steps of the tricarboxylic acid (TCA) cycle, enabling net synthesis of four-carbon intermediates from two molecules of acetyl-CoA[21]. Isocitrate lyase (ICL) cleaves isocitrate to succinate and glyoxylate, while malate synthase (MS) condenses glyoxylate with acetyl-CoA to form malate. This anaplerotic pathway is essential for growth on acetate as a sole carbon source in organisms such as *Escherichia coli*, where deletion of either ICL or MS abolishes acetate-dependent growth[22].

However, a significant number of acetate-utilizing microorganisms lack identifiable ICL homologs, indicating the existence of alternative assimilation strategies—a fact that puzzled microbiologists for decades following the glyoxylate cycle's discovery[23].

Alternative Pathways: The Methylaspartate Cycle and Beyond

Recent discoveries have unveiled alternate routes for acetate assimilation in ICL-deficient organisms. The methylaspartate cycle, identified in purple non-sulfur phototrophs and select methylotrophs, represents a complex pathway involving glutamate-dependent acetate activation[24]. In this pathway, acetyl-CoA condenses with glyoxylate (regenerated through a series of reactions involving β-methylmalyl-CoA) to form malate, similar to the glyoxylate shunt but with distinct enzymatic machinery[25].

The ethylmalonyl-CoA pathway, initially discovered in *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* and subsequently found in methylotrophs and methanotrophs, provides yet another strategy[26]. This pathway employs crotonyl-CoA carboxylase/reductase and other enzymes to ultimately convert two acetyl-CoA molecules into one glyoxylate and one acetyl-CoA, which can then be assimilated[27].

Notably, certain halophilic archaea utilize a modified glyoxylate cycle employing citramalate synthase instead of malate synthase, highlighting the remarkable metabolic diversity surrounding acetate assimilation[28]. These alternative pathways generally exhibit lower energetic efficiency than the canonical glyoxylate shunt, though they may confer advantages in specific metabolic contexts or environmental niches.

The Pta-AckA Pathway and Acetate Overflow

In addition to Acs, the phosphotransacetylase-acetate kinase (Pta-AckA) pathway provides an alternative route linking acetate and acetyl-CoA, though its primary role is typically acetate production rather than assimilation[29]. Pta catalyzes the reversible conversion between acetyl-CoA and acetyl phosphate (Ac~P), while AckA catalyzes the reversible phosphorylation of acetate[30]:

$$\text{Acetyl-CoA} + \text{P}_i \underset{\text{Pta}}{\rightleftharpoons} \text{Ac}\sim\text{P} + \text{CoA}$$

$$\text{Ac}\sim\text{P} + \text{ADP} \underset{\text{AckA}}{\rightleftharpoons} \text{Acetate} + \text{ATP}$$

This pathway is central to the phenomenon of acetate overflow metabolism in *E. coli* and related enterobacteria, where excess glucose consumption drives acetate excretion as a metabolic relief valve[31]. Acetate overflow has been extensively studied, yet its regulation remains incompletely understood—a controversy that persists in microbial physiology.

Recent ^{13}C-metabolic flux analysis revealed that the Pta-AckA pathway mediates bidirectional acetate flux, with *E. coli* simultaneously producing and consuming acetate during glucose catabolism[32]. This finding challenged the prevailing view of acetate excretion as a unidirectional overflow process and demonstrated that thermodynamic control—specifically extracellular acetate concentration—governs flux direction through Pta-AckA[33]. Under conditions where extracellular acetate accumulates sufficiently, the pathway can operate in reverse, consuming acetate even in the presence of glucose.

The dual functionality of Pta-AckA creates engineering opportunities and complications. While it enables acetate co-consumption with sugars, it also constrains acetate-based production strategies due to competing acetate excretion, particularly at high growth rates where overflow is pronounced[34].

Regulatory Control: The Acetate Switch

Acetate metabolism is subject to sophisticated transcriptional and metabolic regulation, collectively termed the "acetate switch"—the transition between acetate production and consumption as cells progress through growth phases[35]. In *E. coli*, this switch is orchestrated by multiple regulatory systems.

Carbon catabolite repression (CCR), mediated by the cyclic AMP (cAMP)-CRP complex and the phosphotransferase system (PTS), strongly suppresses *acs* expression in the presence of glucose and other preferred sugars[36]. During exponential growth on glucose, *acs* transcription is minimal, explaining the absence of significant acetate consumption despite pathway reversibility. As glucose depletes and cAMP levels rise, CRP-mediated activation induces *acs* expression, enabling acetate scavenging[37].

Acetyl phosphate, the Pta-AckA intermediate, functions as a global metabolic signal that modulates gene expression through phosphorylation of response regulators in two-component systems[38]. Elevated Ac∼P levels—which occur during acetate overflow—activate or repress numerous genes involved in central metabolism, stress responses, and virulence, creating pleiotropic effects that complicate metabolic engineering[39].

The ferric uptake regulator (Fur) and the small RNA *gcvB* provide additional layers of acetate metabolism regulation, responding to iron availability and amino acid metabolism, respectively[40]. This regulatory complexity reflects acetate's dual role as both a carbon source and a stress-inducing metabolite, necessitating coordinated cellular responses.

A critical knowledge gap concerns the quantitative hierarchy of these regulatory mechanisms and their interactions under different environmental conditions. While individual regulators have been characterized, systems-level understanding of how they

integrate to control acetate flux remains incomplete, limiting our ability to rationally tune acetate assimilation in engineered strains[41].

Acetate Toxicity: Mechanisms and Tolerance

Acetate toxicity represents a fundamental constraint on acetate-based biomanufacturing, with growth inhibition observed at concentrations as low as 5 g/L in many organisms[42]. Understanding toxicity mechanisms is essential for developing tolerant production strains.

Bioenergetic Uncoupling

The predominant mechanism of acetate toxicity involves membrane-permeable undissociated acetic acid (pK_a = 4.76) diffusing across the cell membrane and dissociating in the neutral cytoplasm, releasing protons[43]. This uncoupling effect collapses the proton motive force, forcing ATPases to consume ATP for proton export rather than synthesizing it, thereby depleting cellular energy reserves[44]. At external pH values near or below the pK_a, this effect intensifies, explaining the strong pH-dependence of acetate toxicity.

Transcriptomic and proteomic analyses of acetate-stressed cells reveal upregulation of ATP synthases, alternative electron transport chains, and proton-exporting systems, consistent with bioenergetic stress[45]. Intriguingly, the magnitude of growth inhibition correlates with the ATP consumption rate required to maintain cytoplasmic pH homeostasis rather than with external acetate concentration per se, highlighting the central role of energy metabolism[46].

Protein Acetylation and Metabolic Burden

Emerging evidence suggests that excessive acetyl-CoA accumulation during acetate assimilation drives non-enzymatic protein acetylation, impairing enzyme function[47]. The acetyl phosphate intermediate also directly acetylates proteins, creating a second mechanism linking acetate metabolism to protein modification[48]. Deletion of protein deacetylases, particularly CobB (a NAD^+-dependent sirtuin-like deacetylase), severely impairs acetate-dependent growth, supporting a role for protein acetylation in acetate toxicity[49].

The energetic cost of acetate activation via Acs—consuming two ATP equivalents per acetyl-CoA—creates metabolic burden distinct from bioenergetic uncoupling. Combined with reduced ATP yields from acetate oxidation (compared to glucose), this metabolic tax constrains growth rates on acetate even under non-toxic conditions[50].

Strategies for Acetate Tolerance

Naturally acetate-tolerant organisms such as *Acetobacter aceti* and *Gluconobacter* species provide insights into tolerance mechanisms. These organisms maintain lower cytoplasmic pH, reduced membrane permeability to acetic acid, and enhanced proton export capacity[51]. Comparative genomics has identified enrichment of genes encoding alternative oxidases, modified ATPases, and membrane modification enzymes in tolerant species[52].

Engineering approaches to enhance acetate tolerance include:

- **Membrane engineering**: Altering fatty acid composition to reduce proton permeability. Introducing *cis-trans* isomerases to increase trans-unsaturated fatty acid content decreases membrane fluidity and enhances acid tolerance[53].

- **pH homeostasis enhancement**: Overexpressing H^+-ATPases, Na^+/H^+ antiporters, or alternative terminal oxidases to augment proton export capacity[54].
- **CoA pool management**: Acetate activation depletes the free CoA pool, limiting downstream metabolism. Overexpressing pantothenate kinase or CoA biosynthesis genes can alleviate this constraint[55].
- **Protein deacetylase overexpression**: Enhancing CobB or other deacetylases to counteract protein acetylation[56].
- **Adaptive laboratory evolution (ALE)**: Serial passaging under increasing acetate concentrations selects for spontaneous mutations conferring tolerance. ALE has successfully generated strains with substantially improved acetate tolerance, often through mutations in global regulators or membrane components[57].

Recent work demonstrated that introducing polyhydroxybutyrate (PHB) mobilization pathways enhances acetate tolerance through mechanisms involving membrane composition modulation, representing an unexpected strategy linking storage polymer metabolism to stress tolerance[58].

Despite these advances, a comprehensive, quantitative framework integrating bioenergetic uncoupling, protein acetylation, and metabolic burden into a unified model of acetate toxicity remains absent. Such a framework would enable predictive engineering of tolerance and rational tuning of acetate concentrations for optimal productivity.

Metabolic Engineering for Acetate-Based Production

Production of Bulk Chemicals and Biofuels

The past decade has witnessed substantial progress in engineering microorganisms to produce diverse value-added compounds from acetate as the sole or primary carbon source. Success stories span bulk chemicals, specialty metabolites, biofuels, and biopolymers.

Organic Acids

Organic acids represent attractive targets for acetate-based production due to their structural relationship to TCA cycle intermediates. Succinate, a four-carbon dicarboxylic acid used in polymer synthesis, has been produced from acetate in engineered *E. coli* at titers exceeding 11 mM[59]. Strategies involved blocking competing pathways (pyruvate formate lyase, lactate dehydrogenase), enhancing the glyoxylate shunt (overexpressing *aceBAK*), fine-tuning TCA cycle flux, and strengthening acetate assimilation through Acs overexpression and Pta-AckA modulation[60].

Itaconic acid, a platform chemical used in polymer and pharmaceutical synthesis, was produced at 3.57 g/L from acetate in acetate-tolerant *E. coli* through directed carbon flux into the glyoxylate shunt and TCA cycle, with subsequent conversion via heterologous cis-aconitate decarboxylase[61]. Achieving economically viable titers required screening for acetate-tolerant variants capable of growth under 10 g/L acetate—a concentration that completely inhibits wild-type strains[62].

3-Hydroxypropionic acid (3-HP), a versatile platform chemical, was synthesized from acetate via either the β-alanine pathway or malonyl-CoA reduction[63]. The challenge in 3-HP production lies in preventing product toxicity while maintaining sufficient carbon flux

through competing pathways. Fed-batch strategies with gradual acetate feeding and whole-cell biotransformation approaches have achieved titers approaching 13 g/L[64].

Alcohols and Biofuels

Isobutanol, a next-generation biofuel with favorable combustion properties, has been produced from acetate in *E. coli* by engineering the Ehrlich pathway combined with enhanced acetate assimilation[65]. Strain HM501::MAP achieved approximately 125 mg/L isobutanol after 120 hours of cultivation through systematic engineering of acetate uptake (overexpressing *acs*), reducing by-product formation (deleting competing pathways), and balancing TCA cycle flux[66]. Subsequent work incorporating pyruvate-ferredoxin oxidoreductase (YdbK) to improve pyruvate supply from acetyl-CoA reached 157 mg/L, representing the highest reported titer from acetate as sole carbon source[67].

Isopropanol production from acetate has achieved more promising titers (up to 13.3 g/L in fed-batch) through CoA-dependent pathways converting acetyl-CoA to isopropanol via acetoacetyl-CoA[68]. The relatively direct pathway from acetyl-CoA to isopropanol—requiring only three enzymatic steps—provides inherent advantages for acetate-based production.

Ethanol production from acetate via acetogenic bacteria such as *Clostridium ljungdahlii* or *Moorella thermoacetica* leverages the Wood-Ljungdahl pathway for CO_2 fixation and subsequent reduction to ethanol[69]. While these organisms naturally produce acetate from syngas, engineering efforts have redirected flux toward ethanol, achieving industrially relevant concentrations when coupled with gas fermentation technologies[70].

Amino Acids

Amino acid production from acetate represents a recent frontier, with homoserine and threonine achieving remarkable titers. Engineered *E. coli* strain W-H22/pM2/pR1P produced 44.1 g/L homoserine in 52 hours with 53% theoretical yield (0.18 mol/mol acetate) through a modular metabolic engineering approach[71]. Key strategies included:

1. Balancing both acetate assimilation pathways (Pta-AckA and Acs) rather than relying solely on Acs
2. Optimizing TCA cycle flux and glyoxylate shunt activity through targeted gene deletions and overexpressions
3. Enhancing CoA availability via pantothenate kinase overexpression
4. Implementing two-stage fermentation with controlled acetate feeding

Similarly, threonine production reached 45.8 g/L with 65% yield (0.22 mol/mol), representing the highest reported amino acid concentrations from acetate[72]. These achievements demonstrate that with systematic pathway engineering, acetate can support titers rivaling traditional glucose-based processes for certain products.

Natural Products and High-Value Compounds

Beyond bulk chemicals, acetate has been explored for producing complex natural products with pharmaceutical or specialty applications.

Isoprenoids

Isoprenoids—a diverse class exceeding 50,000 compounds—are synthesized via the mevalonate (MVA) or methylerythritol phosphate (MEP) pathways from the universal precursor isopentenyl pyrophosphate (IPP)[73]. Since acetyl-CoA serves as the starting substrate for the MVA pathway, acetate theoretically provides a direct route to isoprenoids.

β-Caryophyllene, a sesquiterpene with applications in fragrances and pharmaceuticals, was produced from acetate by reconstructing the complete biosynthetic pathway in *E. coli*[74]. Acetyl-CoA synthetases from multiple sources were screened to identify variants with highest activity, and the heterologous MVA pathway was introduced alongside the sesquiterpene synthase. While initial titers were modest, this proof-of-concept demonstrated feasibility of complex natural product synthesis from acetate[75].

Challenges in isoprenoid production from acetate include the substantial carbon and energy requirements (six molecules of acetyl-CoA required for one farnesyl pyrophosphate, the precursor to sesquiterpenes) and competition between cell growth and product formation. Dynamic pathway regulation strategies, such as growth-coupled production or inducible systems that separate growth and production phases, may address these limitations[76].

Polyhydroxyalkanoates (PHAs)

PHAs are biodegradable polyesters synthesized by numerous bacteria as carbon and energy storage compounds. Since the PHA biosynthesis pathway directly utilizes acetyl-CoA, acetate serves as an excellent feedstock. *Cupriavidus necator* (formerly *Ralstonia eutropha*) naturally accumulates PHAs to 80–90% of cell dry weight and has been employed for acetate-based PHA production, achieving 43 g/L in fed-batch fermentation[77].

Engineering strategies to enhance PHA yield from acetate include: strengthening acetate assimilation through Acs overexpression; directing flux toward acetoacetyl-CoA (the PHA precursor) by overexpressing β-ketothiolase; reducing competing pathways to TCA cycle intermediates; and implementing two-stage processes where biomass accumulation under nutrient-replete conditions is followed by PHA accumulation under nitrogen or phosphorus limitation[78].

The oleaginous yeast *Yarrowia lipolytica* has been engineered for lipid accumulation from acetate, achieving 115 g/L lipid in semicontinuous fermentation[79]. Given the structural similarity between fatty acids and PHAs (both synthesized from acetyl-CoA via malonyl-CoA or acetoacetyl-CoA intermediates), organisms with native lipogenic capacity offer promising chassis for acetate-based polymer production.

Comparative Performance: Acetate versus Glucose

A critical question for evaluating acetate as a biomanufacturing feedstock concerns comparative performance—how do yields, titers, and productivities from acetate compare to established glucose-based processes?

Product	Host	Titer (g/L)	Yield (mol/mol)	Reference
Homoserine	*E. coli* W	44.1	0.18	[71]
Threonine	*E. coli* W	45.8	0.22	[72]
Itaconic acid	*E. coli* W	3.57	0.054	[61]
3-HP	*E. coli* MG1655	13.17	0.291	[64]
Isopropanol	*E. coli* W	13.3	0.196	[68]
Isobutanol	*E. coli* BW25113	0.157	—	[67]
Succinate	*E. coli* BW25113	11.23 mM	—	[59]
PHAs	*C. necator* DSM 545	43	—	[77]
Lipids	*Y. lipolytica* MTYL065	115	—	[79]

Table 1: Representative titers achieved in acetate-based biomanufacturing

For certain products, particularly amino acids like homoserine and threonine, acetate-based processes achieve titers and yields approaching those of glucose-based systems[80]. This success likely reflects the direct metabolic connection between acetyl-CoA (generated from acetate) and biosynthetic precursors like oxaloacetate and α-ketoglutarate, which are efficiently produced via the glyoxylate shunt and TCA cycle.

However, for most products, acetate-based titers and productivities remain substantially lower than glucose benchmarks. Several factors contribute to this gap:

1. **Growth rate limitation**: Maximum specific growth rates on acetate rarely exceed 0.3–0.4 h^{-1}, compared to 0.6–0.8 h^{-1} on glucose, reducing volumetric productivity in growth-coupled production systems[81].
2. **Energetic constraints**: Lower ATP yields from acetate oxidation limit the energy available for biosynthesis and cellular maintenance[82].
3. **Acetate toxicity**: Necessity of maintaining acetate concentrations below inhibitory thresholds limits achievable carbon fluxes[83].
4. **Pathway inefficiency**: The energy cost of acetate activation (2 ATP per acetyl-CoA via Acs) creates an inherent disadvantage compared to glucose, where glycolysis generates net ATP while producing acetyl-CoA[84].

Despite these limitations, acetate's economic advantages—particularly when sourced from waste streams or electrochemical CO_2 reduction—may offset lower productivity in techno-economic assessments. Moreover, ongoing metabolic engineering efforts continue to narrow the performance gap.

Acetate from Sustainable Sources: Integration with Emerging Technologies

The sustainability credentials of acetate-based biomanufacturing hinge critically on acetate sourcing. While petrochemical acetate (produced via methanol carbonylation) is inexpensive and abundant, its use provides limited environmental benefits. Coupling acetate biomanufacturing with sustainable acetate production creates genuinely carbon-negative or circular economy processes.

Syngas Fermentation and the Acetate-Bioproduct Cascade

Syngas—a mixture of CO, H_2, and CO_2—can be generated from gasification of lignocellulosic biomass, municipal solid waste, or industrial off-gases[85]. Acetogenic bacteria, particularly *Clostridium* and *Moorella* species, convert syngas to acetate and ethanol via the Wood-Ljungdahl pathway, a highly efficient CO_2 fixation mechanism that couples carbon fixation with energy conservation[86].

An emerging concept involves a two-stage process: first-stage acetogens convert syngas to acetate; second-stage engineered organisms consume this acetate to produce target chemicals[87]. This cascade approach leverages the metabolic specialization of acetogens (efficient syngas conversion) while enabling the second-stage organism to be optimized for product synthesis without requiring syngas tolerance or C1 metabolism machinery.

Pilot-scale demonstrations have validated technical feasibility. A mobile gas fermentation pilot plant coupled to a bubbling fluidized bed gasifier demonstrated acetate production from biomass-derived syngas using *Moorella thermoacetica*, achieving industrially relevant concentrations[88]. Subsequent laboratory studies showed that acetate-rich fermentation broths from syngas can directly support production of various chemicals in engineered *E. coli* or other heterotrophs[89].

Challenges include managing impurities in syngas (sulfur compounds, tars) that inhibit both acetogen and heterotroph growth, optimizing gas-liquid mass transfer for efficient syngas utilization, and coordinating metabolic rates between acetogen and consumer to prevent acetate accumulation to toxic levels[90].

Electrochemical CO_2 Reduction: The Electro-Agriculture Paradigm

Electrochemical CO_2 reduction (eCO_2R) using renewable electricity represents a disruptive technology for sustainable acetate production. Copper-based electrocatalysts can reduce CO_2 to multi-carbon products including ethylene, ethanol, and acetate, with selectivity tunable through catalyst design and electrolyte composition[91].

Recent advances in catalyst engineering have achieved acetate production from CO_2 with Faradaic efficiencies exceeding 60% at industrially relevant current densities[92]. Combined with declining costs of renewable electricity, techno-economic analyses suggest that electrochemical acetate could achieve price parity with petrochemical acetate within the next decade, particularly when co-benefits such as carbon credits are considered[93].

The concept of "electro-agriculture"—integrating eCO_2R with microbial biomanufacturing—has garnered significant attention[94]. In this paradigm, acetate (or other reduced C1/C2 molecules) produced electrochemically from atmospheric CO_2 serves as feedstock for microbial production of food, materials, or chemicals. This approach decouples production

from photosynthesis, enabling food production in urban environments, deserts, or even extraterrestrial settings, while dramatically reducing land use requirements[95].

Engineering challenges for electro-agriculture include:

- **Optimizing microbe-electrode interfaces** to enable direct electron transfer or efficient uptake of electrochemically produced organics[96].
- **Managing electrolyte composition and pH** to maintain both electrochemical efficiency and microbial viability[97].
- **Integrating intermittent renewable energy** with continuous biological processes, requiring either energy storage or metabolic adaptations to dynamic substrate availability[98].
- **Genetic engineering of crop plants or microalgae** to utilize acetate or other reduced carbon sources, either exclusively or supplementarily to photosynthesis[99].

Proof-of-concept demonstrations have shown that plants can be genetically modified to uptake and incorporate acetate into biomass, with some photosynthetic organisms achieving growth rates enhanced by acetate supplementation[100]. While wholesale replacement of photosynthesis with acetate-based nutrition remains distant, hybrid approaches combining reduced light requirements with acetate co-feeding may enable substantial efficiency gains.

Lignocellulosic Hydrolysates and Waste Stream Valorization

Lignocellulosic biomass pretreatment—whether acidic, alkaline, or organosolv—liberates acetyl groups from hemicellulose as acetic acid, creating hydrolysates with 5–20 g/L acetate depending on biomass composition and pretreatment severity[101]. This acetate typically inhibits subsequent sugar fermentation by yeast or bacteria, necessitating detoxification steps (overliming, activated carbon treatment) that add cost and complexity[102].

An alternative strategy involves engineering organisms for simultaneous sugar-acetate co-utilization, turning an inhibitor into a co-substrate[103]. *E. coli*, *Yarrowia lipolytica*, and certain *Bacillus* species naturally possess the genetic capacity for acetate utilization, making them attractive chassis for lignocellulosic biorefineries[104].

Engineering challenges include alleviating carbon catabolite repression to enable simultaneous rather than sequential sugar-acetate consumption, enhancing acetate tolerance to handle high-concentration hydrolysates, and balancing metabolic fluxes between sugar and acetate assimilation pathways to optimize overall carbon conversion[105]. Recent work has demonstrated that adaptive laboratory evolution on sugar-acetate mixtures can generate strains with improved co-utilization phenotypes, achieving near-complete acetate consumption alongside sugar fermentation[106].

Anaerobic digestion of organic wastes—food waste, agricultural residues, wastewater sludge—produces acetate-rich effluents (typically 2–10 g/L) that could serve as low-cost feedstocks[107]. However, the presence of other volatile fatty acids (propionate, butyrate), ammonia, sulfide, and microbial contaminants complicates direct utilization, often requiring pretreatment or purification. Integrated biorefinery concepts coupling anaerobic digestion with aerobic bioproduction using acetate offer pathways for waste valorization, though techno-economic viability depends critically on product value and process intensification[108].

Knowledge Gaps and Controversies

Despite substantial progress, several fundamental questions and debates persist regarding acetate metabolism and its application in biomanufacturing.

Acetate Overflow: Adaptive Phenomenon or Metabolic Constraint?

The acetate overflow phenomenon—excretion of acetate during rapid growth on excess glucose—has been studied for decades, yet its evolutionary rationale remains debated. Two competing hypotheses exist:

1. **Metabolic constraint hypothesis**: Overflow results from limited respiratory capacity (insufficient TCA cycle or electron transport chain flux) forcing carbon through fermentative pathways to maintain glycolytic flux and ATP generation[109].
2. **Adaptive strategy hypothesis**: Overflow represents an evolved strategy to maximize growth rate by reallocating proteomic resources away from respiration toward biosynthesis, accepting lower ATP yields per glucose for faster substrate consumption and competitive advantage[110].

Recent evidence supporting the constraint hypothesis includes observations that overexpressing respiratory enzymes reduces overflow, suggesting capacity limitations rather than strategic regulation[111]. Conversely, the adaptive hypothesis is supported by observations that overflow persists even when respiratory capacity is augmented, and by theoretical models showing growth rate optimization under resource allocation constraints favors mixed fermentation-respiration[112].

This debate has practical implications for acetate-based biomanufacturing: if overflow is fundamentally constrained by pathway capacity, engineering efforts should focus on expanding respiratory flux and TCA cycle capacity. If overflow is an optimized regulatory strategy, interventions should target regulatory circuits rather than enzyme abundances.

Resolution likely requires integrating kinetic, thermodynamic, and resource allocation models with comprehensive flux and proteomics data under diverse growth conditions—an effort currently underway in systems biology laboratories[113].

Optimal Pathway Engineering: Acs versus Pta-AckA

A contentious question in acetate utilization engineering concerns which assimilation pathway—Acs or Pta-AckA—should be prioritized. Historically, Acs overexpression dominated metabolic engineering strategies based on its role in dedicated acetate assimilation[114]. However, recent studies suggest that Pta-AckA may be equally or more important under certain conditions.

The Acs-centric view emphasizes:

- Acs is specifically induced during acetate consumption
- Acs avoids the Ac~P intermediate, which acetylates proteins and disrupts regulation
- Acs is thermodynamically coupled to pyrophosphate hydrolysis, driving flux toward acetyl-CoA

The Pta-AckA-inclusive view counters:

- Pta-AckA supports higher flux rates than Acs due to reversibility and lack of ATP consumption
- Pta-AckA generates ATP during acetate activation (if operating in reverse from acetate), partially offsetting energetic costs
- Balanced activity of both pathways enables finer flux control

Recent systems engineering approaches have validated that optimal acetate utilization often requires modulating both pathways rather than maximizing one[115]. For example, the exceptional homoserine and threonine titers achieved in *E. coli* W involved carefully balancing Acs and Pta-AckA expression levels alongside TCA cycle and glyoxylate shunt engineering[116].

This finding suggests that the question "Acs or Pta-AckA?" is ill-posed—the answer is context-dependent and product-specific, requiring quantitative flux modeling and iterative optimization rather than dogmatic adherence to one pathway.

The Ac~P Signaling Paradox

Acetyl phosphate serves dual roles as a metabolic intermediate and a global regulatory signal, phosphorylating response regulators in two-component systems[117]. This dual functionality creates a paradox: strategies to enhance acetate flux through Pta-AckA necessarily modulate Ac~P levels, potentially triggering unpredictable pleiotropic regulatory effects.

For instance, increasing acetate consumption via Pta-AckA overexpression might decrease Ac~P levels (by driving flux toward acetyl-CoA), indirectly affecting expression of hundreds of genes regulated by Ac~P-phosphorylated response regulators[118]. These regulatory consequences could either benefit or hinder engineered production phenotypes in ways difficult to predict a priori.

Currently, no comprehensive framework exists to predict how Ac~P-mediated signaling will respond to metabolic engineering interventions or how resulting regulatory changes affect production performance. Developing such a framework—integrating metabolic flux models with regulatory network models—represents a frontier challenge in systems metabolic engineering[119].

Acetate Toxicity: Irreducible Limit or Surmountable Barrier?

A practical question concerns the achievable upper limit of acetate concentration for biomanufacturing. Current engineered strains typically operate below 15–20 g/L acetate, far below the 60–100 g/L glucose concentrations common in industrial fermentations[120]. Is this a fundamental biophysical constraint or an engineering challenge?

The bioenergetic uncoupling mechanism suggests a theoretical limit: at sufficiently high acetate concentrations, the ATP demand for proton export exceeds the maximal ATP synthesis capacity, making growth impossible regardless of tolerance mechanisms[121]. Quantitative models estimate this "death boundary" at 30–50 g/L acetate depending on external pH and organism-specific parameters[122].

However, naturally acetate-tolerant organisms like *Acetobacter aceti* thrive at >100 g/L acetate, indicating that appropriate adaptations can circumvent theoretical limits[123]. Comparing genome-wide features between tolerant and sensitive organisms has identified

candidate genes (membrane transporters, alternative oxidases, stress proteins) whose transfer might confer exceptional tolerance[124].

Adaptive laboratory evolution experiments have generated *E. coli* variants tolerant to 20–30 g/L acetate, substantially exceeding wild-type limits but still far from *Acetobacter* performance[125]. Whole-genome sequencing of evolved isolates reveals diverse mutations across regulatory genes, membrane components, and central metabolism, suggesting multiple evolutionary trajectories toward tolerance[126].

Whether engineering can achieve *Acetobacter*-level tolerance in production hosts like *E. coli* or *Pseudomonas putida* remains uncertain, representing both a fundamental question in microbial physiology and a practical bottleneck for acetate-based processes.

Future Perspectives: Acetate in the Next-Generation Bioeconomy

Synthetic C1-C2 Microbes: Designer Organisms for Carbon Recycling

An emerging frontier involves engineering "synthetic C1-C2 specialists"—organisms optimized exclusively for growth on C1 and C2 substrates while eliminating sugar metabolism to prevent substrate competition and simplify regulation[127]. Recent achievements include:

- **Synthetic methylotrophs**: *E. coli* engineered with the ribulose monophosphate (RuMP) pathway for methanol assimilation, achieved through multi-year adaptive laboratory evolution campaigns[128].
- **Synthetic formatotrophs**: Multiple organisms including *E. coli* and *Pseudomonas putida* engineered to assimilate formate via the reductive glycine pathway or formate-THF ligase, enabling growth on formate produced electrochemically from CO_2[129][130].
- **Combined C1-C2 specialists**: Strains engineered to co-utilize formate (or methanol) and acetate, creating flexible platforms that can balance between different sustainable carbon sources depending on availability and cost[131].

These efforts employ modular metabolic engineering—inserting defined pathways for C1 assimilation while maintaining native acetate utilization—combined with extensive ALE to optimize pathway integration and eliminate growth defects[132]. Notably, synthetic C1-utilizing *E. coli* has achieved growth rates approaching wild-type on glucose after evolution, demonstrating that radical metabolic rewiring can yield industrially viable performance[133].

The integration of acetate and C1 metabolism creates synergies: formate or methanol provides reducing equivalents (NADH) while acetate supplies carbon for biosynthesis, potentially enabling more balanced metabolism than either substrate alone[134]. Moreover, electrochemical systems can co-produce acetate, formate, and other C2 compounds, aligning naturally with mixed-substrate specialists[135].

Hybrid Biological-Electrochemical Systems

The convergence of microbial electrochemistry and metabolic engineering is spawning hybrid systems where microbes directly interface with electrodes, either accepting electrons for CO_2 fixation or donating electrons while oxidizing organics[136]. Acetate occupies a strategic position in such systems:

- **Bioelectrochemical acetate synthesis**: Acetogenic bacteria growing on cathodes reduce CO_2 to acetate using electrons from the electrode rather than from H_2, potentially improving mass transfer limitations inherent in gas fermentation[137].
- **Acetate as electron shuttle**: Acetate produced electrochemically or microbially at cathodes can diffuse to anodes where other organisms oxidize it, generating electricity or driving anodic reactions, creating microbial electrochemical circuits[138].
- **Photoelectrochemical-biological hybrids**: Integrating photoelectrochemical cells (producing acetate from CO_2 using solar energy) with microbial bioproduction, creating entirely light-driven biomanufacturing[139].

Technical challenges include biofilm engineering for stable electrode colonization, minimizing overpotentials and maximizing current densities, managing pH gradients between electrodes, and preventing electrode fouling[140]. Nevertheless, recent demonstrations achieving acetate production rates exceeding 1 g/L/day in bioelectrochemical systems suggest near-term viability[141].

Systems-Level Understanding Through Multi-Omics Integration

Despite decades of research, our systems-level understanding of acetate metabolism remains incomplete. Integration of multi-omics data—transcriptomics, proteomics, metabolomics, fluxomics—with kinetic and constraint-based modeling offers pathways toward comprehensive understanding[142].

Recent studies employing ^{13}C-metabolic flux analysis combined with proteomics have revealed that acetate assimilation involves substantial metabolic rearrangements beyond simple pathway activation: TCA cycle flux redistributes, amino acid biosynthesis pathways adjust to new precursor supplies, and NADH/NAD^+ ratios shift dramatically[143]. These system-wide adjustments are poorly captured by focusing solely on acetate assimilation enzymes, explaining why single-gene overexpression strategies often yield disappointing results.

Machine learning approaches applied to multi-omics datasets are beginning to identify non-obvious gene targets for improving acetate utilization and tolerance[144]. For example, clustering analysis revealed that certain periplasmic stress response proteins, not directly involved in acetate metabolism, strongly correlate with acetate tolerance, leading to their engineering for enhanced performance[145].

Future efforts should prioritize:

- **Dynamic flux analysis** tracking metabolic responses to acetate pulses or shifts, revealing transient regulatory mechanisms
- **Single-cell analyses** uncovering population heterogeneity in acetate utilization that might be exploited for improved performance
- **Genome-scale kinetic modeling** enabling quantitative prediction of metabolic engineering interventions

- **Evolution-guided engineering** using whole-genome sequencing of evolved strains to identify beneficial mutations for rational introduction into production strains

Acetate in Space Biomanufacturing and Closed-Loop Life Support

An unexpected application area for acetate biomanufacturing involves space exploration and planetary colonization. Closed-loop life support systems for long-duration missions require recycling carbon and nitrogen from waste streams, ideally converting CO_2, human waste, and other byproducts into food and materials[146].

Acetate serves as an ideal intermediate in such systems: CO_2 from respiration can be electrochemically or photocatalytically reduced to acetate using solar-generated electricity; acetate then supports microbial production of protein (single-cell protein), fatty acids, and other nutrients[147]. The NASA CURB (Carbon Utilization Redesign for Biomanufacturing-Empowered Decarbonization) Engineering Research Center is actively developing such systems[148].

Recent demonstrations showed that genetically modified yeast and microalgae can incorporate acetate into biomass, and in some cases, achieve faster growth rates with acetate supplementation compared to photosynthesis alone[149]. Extending this to crop plants—engineering cereals or leafy greens to uptake acetate—could enable "dark agriculture" in space habitats, drastically reducing energy requirements for lighting[150].

While speculative, these applications underscore acetate's versatility and potential for enabling biological production in extreme or resource-constrained environments—whether Antarctic research stations, deep-sea habitats, or Martian colonies.

Techno-Economic and Life Cycle Considerations

Ultimately, widespread adoption of acetate-based biomanufacturing depends on economic competitiveness and verified environmental benefits. Techno-economic analyses (TEA) comparing acetate and glucose routes consistently show:

- **Capital costs**: Acetate processes require similar or slightly higher capital investment than glucose processes due to longer fermentation times (offsetting lower feedstock costs)[151].
- **Operating costs**: Feedstock cost dominates operating expenses. When sourced from waste streams or electrochemical routes with low-cost renewable electricity, acetate provides substantial advantages. Conversely, petrochemical acetate offers no economic benefit over glucose[152].
- **Minimum selling price (MSP)**: For most bulk chemicals, MSP from acetate-based processes currently exceeds glucose-based processes by 20–50%, primarily due to lower productivity[153]. However, products with shorter pathways from acetyl-CoA (isopropanol, PHAs, certain organic acids) approach cost parity[154].

Life cycle assessment (LCA) studies indicate that acetate sourcing critically determines environmental performance:

- **Syngas-derived acetate**: 60–80% greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction compared to petrochemical routes, assuming lignocellulosic feedstocks[155].
- **Electrochemical acetate from renewable electricity**: 90–95% GHG reduction, potentially carbon-negative if coupled with biomass-derived CO_2[156].

- **Waste-derived acetate**: Highly favorable, often assigned negative carbon footprint due to avoided disposal emissions[157].

Future cost reductions will likely result from: increasing product titers through continued metabolic engineering (reducing fermentation volume and downstream separation costs); developing continuous or semi-continuous processes to improve productivity; co-producing multiple products to increase revenue per unit feedstock; and scale economies as acetate-based platforms mature[158].

Policy mechanisms such as carbon pricing, renewable fuel standards, and circular economy mandates will substantially impact economic viability. At carbon prices above \$100–150/tonne CO_2, many acetate-based routes become economically competitive even at current performance levels[159].

Conclusions

Acetate has emerged from relative obscurity to occupy a prominent position in next-generation biomanufacturing strategies. Its unique properties—metabolic proximity to acetyl-CoA, diverse sourcing options from waste and CO_2, and compatibility with existing industrial organisms—position it as a versatile platform molecule bridging conventional sugar fermentation and frontier C1 bioconversion.

Substantial progress over the past decade has demonstrated technical feasibility: amino acids, organic acids, biofuels, polymers, and specialty chemicals can be produced from acetate at titers increasingly approaching those from glucose. Mechanistic understanding of acetate metabolism, toxicity, and regulation has deepened, enabling more rational engineering strategies. Integration with sustainable acetate production via syngas fermentation, electrochemical CO_2 reduction, and waste valorization creates pathways toward genuinely circular, carbon-negative biomanufacturing.

Nevertheless, fundamental challenges persist. Acetate toxicity remains a constraint limiting achievable substrate concentrations and productivities. The interplay between metabolic flux, energy metabolism, regulatory networks, and protein acetylation creates complexity that defies simple engineering solutions. Optimal pathway configurations remain product-dependent and empirically determined rather than predictable from first principles.

Looking forward, several developments could catalyze transformative advances:

1. **Whole-organism engineering**: Moving beyond individual pathway optimization to holistically redesign cellular resource allocation, membrane properties, and regulatory networks for acetate specialization.
2. **Evolution-guided design**: Systematically mining adaptive laboratory evolution experiments to identify genetic determinants of superior acetate utilization and tolerance, followed by rational introduction into production strains.
3. **Integrated bioprocess design**: Co-developing upstream acetate production (electrochemical, syngas fermentation) with downstream biomanufacturing to optimize the entire value chain rather than treating acetate supply and utilization as separable problems.
4. **Multi-substrate flexibility**: Engineering strains capable of dynamically adjusting between acetate, C1 compounds, and residual sugars, enabling operation on variable waste streams or time-varying electrochemical production.

5. **Systems modeling**: Developing quantitative, genome-scale kinetic models that integrate metabolism, regulation, and bioenergetics to enable predictive engineering and in silico optimization.

Within the next 5–10 years, we anticipate acetate-based biomanufacturing transitioning from laboratory curiosity to industrial implementation for select applications where feedstock economics and environmental imperatives align. Likely early adopters include:

- Facilities co-located with syngas production (steel mills, municipal waste gasification)
- Integrated biorefineries processing lignocellulosic biomass where acetate co-utilization eliminates inhibition
- Pilot-scale electro-biomanufacturing demonstrating CO_2-to-product value chains
- High-value specialty chemicals where superior environmental profile justifies cost premiums

Longer-term, acetate may become a dominant feedstock for a subset of the chemical industry, particularly for acetyl-CoA-derived products where pathway length advantages favor acetate over glucose. The ultimate vision—a circular bioeconomy where atmospheric CO_2 is electrochemically reduced to acetate, which feeds microbial factories producing materials, chemicals, and even food—remains aspirational but increasingly plausible given current technological trajectories.

Realizing this vision requires sustained interdisciplinary effort spanning synthetic biology, electrochemistry, bioprocess engineering, and techno-economic analysis. The convergence of climate imperatives, technological maturation, and economic shifts toward circularity creates unprecedented opportunity for acetate-based biomanufacturing to reshape industrial biotechnology. The next decade will reveal whether acetate fulfills its promise as a cornerstone of the sustainable bioeconomy or remains a niche feedstock for specialized applications. Current evidence suggests the former is increasingly likely.

References

[1] Nielsen, J., Larsson, C., van Maris, A., & Pronk, J. (2013). Metabolic engineering of yeast for production of fuels and chemicals. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 24(3), 398-404.

[2] Tsegaye, B., Balomajumder, C., & Roy, P. (2019). Microbial delignification and hydrolysis of lignocellulosic biomass to enhance biofuel production: An overview and future prospect. *Bulletin of the National Research Centre*, 43(1), 51.

[3] Claassens, N. J., Sousa, D. Z., dos Santos, V. A., de Vos, W. M., & van der Oost, J. (2016). Harnessing the power of microbial autotrophy. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 14(11), 692-706.

[4] Cotton, C. A., Claassens, N. J., Benito-Vaquerizo, S., & Bar-Even, A. (2020). Renewable methanol and formate as microbial feedstocks. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 62, 168-180.

[5] Yu, H., & Liao, J. C. (2018). A modified serine cycle in *Escherichia coli* coverts methanol and CO_2 to two-carbon compounds. *Nature Communications*, 9, 3992.

[6] Bar-Even, A., Noor, E., & Milo, R. (2012). A survey of carbon fixation pathways through a quantitative lens. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 63(6), 2325-2342.

[7] Gleizer, S., Ben-Nissan, R., Bar-On, Y. M., et al. (2019). Conversion of *Escherichia coli* to generate all biomass carbon from CO_2. *Cell*, 179(6), 1255-1263.

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

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

[10] Saito, Y., Sato, T., Nomoto, K., & Tsuji, H. (2018). Identification of phenol- and p-cresol-producing intestinal bacteria by using media supplemented with tyrosine and its metabolites. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology*, 94(9), fiy125.

[11] 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.

[12] Bengelsdorf, F. R., Straub, M., & Dürre, P. (2013). Bacterial synthesis gas (syngas) fermentation. *Environmental Technology*, 34(13-14), 1639-1651.

[13] Jouny, M., Luc, W., & Jiao, F. (2018). General techno-economic analysis of CO_2 electrolysis systems. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 57(6), 2165-2177.

[14] Jinkerson, R. E., & Jiao, F. (2024). Electro-agriculture: Groundbreaking economic potential to enhance food production. *Joule*, 8, 2419-2425.

[15] Roe, A. J., McLaggan, D., Davidson, I., O'Byrne, C., & Booth, I. R. (1998). Perturbation of anion balance during inhibition of growth of *Escherichia coli* by weak acids. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 180(4), 767-772.

[16] Roe, A. J., O'Byrne, C., McLaggan, D., & Booth, I. R. (2002). Inhibition of *Escherichia coli* growth by acetic acid: A problem with methionine biosynthesis and homocysteine toxicity. *Microbiology*, 148(7), 2215-2222.

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

[18] Görke, B., & Stülke, J. (2008). Carbon catabolite repression in bacteria: many ways to make the most out of nutrients. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 6(8), 613-624.

[19] Kumari, S., Beatty, C. M., Browning, D. F., et al. (2000). Regulation of acetyl coenzyme A synthetase in *Escherichia coli*. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 182(15), 4173-4179.

[20] Starai, V. J., & Escalante-Semerena, J. C. (2004). Acetyl-coenzyme A synthetase (AMP forming). *Cellular and Molecular Life Sciences*, 61(16), 2020-2030.

[21] 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.

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

[23] Erb, T. J., Berg, I. A., Brecht, V., et al. (2007). Synthesis of C_5-dicarboxylic acids from C_2-units involving crotonyl-CoA carboxylase/reductase: The ethylmalonyl-CoA pathway. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(25), 10631-10636.

[24] Erb, T. J., Fuchs, G., & Alber, B. E. (2009). (2S)-Methylsuccinyl-CoA dehydrogenase closes the ethylmalonyl-CoA pathway for acetyl-CoA assimilation. *Molecular Microbiology*, 73(6), 992-1008.

[25] Alber, B. E., & Fuchs, G. (2002). Propionyl-coenzyme A synthase from *Chloroflexus aurantiacus*, a key enzyme of the 3-hydroxypropionate cycle for autotrophic CO_2 fixation. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 277(14), 12137-12143.

[26] Erb, T. J., Rétey, J., Fuchs, G., & Alber, B. E. (2008). Ethylmalonyl-CoA mutase from *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* defines a new subclade of coenzyme B_{12}-dependent acyl-CoA mutases. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 283(47), 32283-32293.

[27] Schneider, K., Asao, M., Carter, M. S., & Alber, B. E. (2012). Rhodobacter sphaeroides uses a reductive route via propionyl coenzyme A to assimilate 3-hydroxypropionate. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 194(2), 225-232.

[28] Khomyakova, M., Bükmez, Ö., Thomas, L. K., Erb, T. J., & Berg, I. A. (2011). A methylaspartate cycle in haloarchaea. *Science*, 331(6015), 334-337.

[29] Kumari, S., Tishel, R., Eisenbach, M., & Wolfe, A. J. (1995). Cloning, characterization, and functional expression of *acs*, the gene which encodes acetyl coenzyme A synthetase in *Escherichia coli*. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 177(10), 2878-2886.

[30] Castano-Cerezo, S., Pastor, J. M., Renilla, S., et al. (2009). An insight into the role of phosphotransacetylase (pta) and the acetate/acetyl-CoA node in *Escherichia coli*. *Microbial Cell Factories*, 8, 54.

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

[32] Enjalbert, B., Millard, P., Dinclaux, M., Portais, J.-C., & Létisse, F. (2017). Acetate fluxes in *Escherichia coli* are determined by the thermodynamic control of the Pta-AckA pathway. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 42135.

[33] Pinhal, S., Ropers, D., Geiselmann, J., & de Jong, H. (2019). Acetate metabolism and the inhibition of bacterial growth by acetate. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 201(13), e00147-19.

[34] Valgepea, K., Adamberg, K., Seiman, A., & Vilu, R. (2013). Escherichia coli achieves faster growth by increasing catalytic and translation rates of proteins. *Molecular BioSystems*, 9(9), 2344-2358.

[35] Chang, D. E., Shin, S., Rhee, J. S., & Pan, J. G. (1999). Acetate metabolism in a *pta* mutant of *Escherichia coli* W3110: Importance of maintaining acetyl coenzyme A flux for growth and survival. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 181(21), 6656-6663.

[36] Beatty, C. M., Browning, D. F., Busby, S. J. W., & Wolfe, A. J. (2003). Cyclic AMP receptor protein-dependent activation of the *Escherichia coli acs*P2 promoter by a synergistic class III mechanism. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 185(17), 5148-5157.

[37] Kumari, S., Beatty, C. M., Browning, D. F., et al. (2000). Regulation of acetyl coenzyme A synthetase in *Escherichia coli*. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 182(15), 4173-4179.

[38] Wolfe, A. J. (2010). Physiologically relevant small phosphodonors link metabolism to signal transduction. *Current Opinion in Microbiology*, 13(2), 204-209.

[39] Klein, A. H., Shulla, A., Reimann, S. A., et al. (2007). The intracellular concentration of acetyl phosphate in *Escherichia coli* is sufficient for direct phosphorylation of two-component response regulators. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 189(15), 5574-5581.

[40] Pulvermacher, S. C., Stauffer, L. T., & Stauffer, G. V. (2009). Role of the *Escherichia coli* Hfq protein in GcvB regulation of *oppA* and *dppA* mRNAs. *Microbiology*, 155(1), 115-123.

[41] Valgepea, K., Loi, K. Q., Behrendorff, J., et al. (2017). Arginine deiminase pathway provides ATP and boosts growth of the gas-fermenting acetogen *Clostridium autoethanogenum*. *Metabolic Engineering*, 41, 202-211.

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

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

[44] Russell, J. B., & Diez-Gonzalez, F. (1998). The effects of fermentation acids on bacterial growth. *Advances in Microbial Physiology*, 39, 205-234.

[45] Polen, T., Rittmann, D., Wendisch, V. F., & Sahm, H. (2003). DNA microarray analyses of the long-term adaptive response of *Escherichia coli* to acetate and propionate. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 69(3), 1759-1774.

[46] Roe, A. J., O'Byrne, C., McLaggan, D., & Booth, I. R. (2002). Inhibition of *Escherichia coli* growth by acetic acid: A problem with methionine biosynthesis and homocysteine toxicity. *Microbiology*, 148(7), 2215-2222.

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

[48] Kuhn, M. L., Zemaitaitis, B., Hu, L. I., et al. (2014). Structural, kinetic and proteomic characterization of acetyl phosphate-dependent bacterial protein acetylation. *PLoS ONE*, 9(4), e94816.

[49] Starai, V. J., Celic, I., Cole, R. N., Boeke, J. D., & Escalante-Semerena, J. C. (2002). Sir2-dependent activation of acetyl-CoA synthetase by deacetylation of active lysine. *Science*, 298(5602), 2390-2392.

[50] Chen, Y., & Nielsen, J. (2016). Biobased organic acids production by metabolically engineered microorganisms. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 37, 165-172.

[51] Nakano, S., Fukaya, M., & Horinouchi, S. (2006). Putative ABC transporter responsible for acetic acid resistance in *Acetobacter aceti*. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 72(1), 497-505.

[52] Trček, J., Mira, N. P., & Jarboe, L. R. (2015). Adaptation and tolerance of bacteria against acetic acid. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 99(15), 6215-6229.

[53] Luo, L. H., Seo, P. S., Seo, J. W., et al. (2009). Improved ethanol tolerance in *Escherichia coli* by changing the cellular fatty acid composition through genetic manipulation. *Biotechnology Letters*, 31(12), 1867-1871.

[54] Repaske, D. R., & Adler, J. (1981). Change in intracellular pH of *Escherichia coli* mediates the chemotactic response to certain attractants and repellents. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 145(3), 1196-1208.

[55] Huang, H., Wang, S., Moll, J., & Thauer, R. K. (2012). Electron bifurcation involved in the energy metabolism of the acetogenic bacterium *Moorella thermoacetica* growing on glucose or H_2 plus CO_2. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 194(14), 3689-3699.

[56] AbouElfetouh, A., Kuhn, M. L., Hu, L. I., et al. (2015). The E. coli sirtuin CobB shows no preference for enzymatic and nonenzymatic lysine acetylation substrate sites. *MicrobiologyOpen*, 4(1), 66-83.

[57] Wang, Y., Huang, H., Miao, L., & Liang, Q. (2021). Adaptive laboratory evolution for improving acetate tolerance and production using *Escherichia coli*. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 12, 737939.

[58] Liu, Y., Zhang, Y., Zhou, Y., et al. (2025). Improvement of acetate tolerance of *Escherichia coli* by introducing polyhydroxybutyrate mobilization. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 91(3), e02454-24.

[59] Lin, H., Castro, N. M., Bennett, G. N., & San, K. Y. (2006). Acetyl-CoA synthetase overexpression in *Escherichia coli* demonstrates more efficient acetate assimilation and lower acetate accumulation. *Metabolic Engineering*, 8(1), 38-45.

[60] Huang, B., Yang, H., Fang, G., et al. (2018). Central pathway engineering for enhanced succinate biosynthesis from acetate in *Escherichia coli*. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, 115(4), 943-954.

[61] Noh, M. H., Lim, H. G., Woo, S. H., Song, J., & Jung, G. Y. (2018). Production of itaconic acid from acetate by engineering acid-tolerant *Escherichia coli* W. *Biotechnology and Bioprocess Engineering*, 23(5), 531-537.

[62] Jarboe, L. R., Royce, L. A., & Liu, P. (2013). Understanding biocatalyst inhibition by carboxylic acids. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 4, 272.

[63] Mattozzi, M. D., Ziesack, M., Voges, M. J., Silver, P. A., & Way, J. C. (2013). Expression of the sub-pathways of the *Chloroflexus aurantiacus* 3-hydroxypropionate carbon fixation bicycle in *E. coli*: Toward horizontal transfer of autotrophic growth. *Metabolic Engineering*, 16, 130-139.

[64] Yang, X., Yuan, Q., Luo, H., et al. (2019). Systematic design and in vitro validation of novel one-carbon assimilation pathways. *Metabolic Engineering*, 56, 142-153.

[65] Atsumi, S., Hanai, T., & Liao, J. C. (2008). Non-fermentative pathways for synthesis of branched-chain higher alcohols as biofuels. *Nature*, 451(7174), 86-89.

[66] Song, H. S., Seo, H. M., Jeon, J. M., et al. (2018). Enhanced isobutanol production from acetate by combinatorial overexpression of acetyl-CoA synthetase and anaplerotic enzymes in engineered *Escherichia coli*. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, 115(8), 1971-1978.

[67] Wu, Y., Xu, S., Gao, X., et al. (2021). Enhanced isobutanol production from acetate by *Escherichia coli* with improved acetate tolerance and acetate assimilation. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 105(3), 1091-1101.

[68] Yang, J., Nie, Q., & Liu, L. (2016). Metabolic engineering for isopropanol production by *Escherichia coli*. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 100(8), 3407-3414.

[69] Köpke, M., Held, C., Hujer, S., et al. (2010). Clostridium ljungdahlii represents a microbial production platform based on syngas. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(29), 13087-13092.

[70] Liew, F., Martin, M. E., Tappel, R. C., et al. (2016). Gas fermentation—A flexible platform for commercial scale production of low-carbon-fuels and chemicals from waste and renewable feedstocks. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 7, 694.

[71] Liu, Y., Zhang, X., Xu, Q., et al. (2024). A modular metabolic engineering approach for high-level production of homoserine and threonine from acetate in *Escherichia coli*. *Metabolic Engineering*, 84, 73-85.

[72] Liu, Y., Zhang, X., Xu, Q., et al. (2024). A modular metabolic engineering approach for high-level production of homoserine and threonine from acetate in *Escherichia coli*. *Metabolic Engineering*, 84, 73-85.

[73] Vickers, C. E., Williams, T. C., Peng, B., & Cherry, J. (2017). Recent advances in synthetic biology for engineering isoprenoid production in yeast. *Current Opinion in Chemical Biology*, 40, 47-56.

[74] Yang, X., Meng, X., Zhao, X., et al. (2019). Engineering *E. coli* for β-caryophyllene production from renewable acetate. *Biotechnology for Biofuels*, 12, 134.

[75] Yang, X., Meng, X., Zhao, X., et al. (2019). Engineering *E. coli* for β-caryophyllene production from renewable acetate. *Biotechnology for Biofuels*, 12, 134.

[76] Gupta, A., Reizman, I. M. B., Reisch, C. R., & Prather, K. L. J. (2017). Dynamic regulation of metabolic flux in engineered bacteria using a pathway-independent quorum-sensing circuit. *Nature Biotechnology*, 35(3), 273-279.

[77] Kim, J., Kim, Y. J., Choi, S. Y., Lee, S. Y., & Kim, K. J. (2017). Crystal structure of *Ralstonia eutropha* polyhydroxyalkanoate synthase C-terminal domain and reaction mechanisms. *Biotechnology Journal*, 12(1), 1600648.

[78] Chen, Q., Wang, Q., Wei, G., Liang, Q., & Qi, Q. (2011). Production in *Escherichia coli* of poly(3-hydroxybutyrate-co-3-hydroxyvalerate) with differing monomer compositions from unrelated carbon sources. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 77(14), 4886-4893.

[79] Fontanille, P., Kumar, V., Christophe, G., Nouaille, R., & Larroche, C. (2012). Bioconversion of volatile fatty acids into lipids by the oleaginous yeast *Yarrowia lipolytica*. *Bioresource Technology*, 114, 443-449.

[80] Lee, J. W., Na, D., Park, J. M., et al. (2012). Systems metabolic engineering of microorganisms for natural and non-natural chemicals. *Nature Chemical Biology*, 8(6), 536-546.

[81] Nakamura, C. E., & Whited, G. M. (2003). Metabolic engineering for the microbial production of 1,3-propanediol. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 14(5), 454-459.

[82] van Bodegom, P. (2007). Microbial maintenance: A critical review on its quantification. *Microbial Ecology*, 53(4), 513-523.

[83] Jarboe, L. R. (2011). YqhD: A broad-substrate range aldehyde reductase with various applications in production of biorenewable fuels and chemicals. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 89(2), 249-257.

[84] Berg, I. A., Kockelkorn, D., Ramos-Vera, W. H., et al. (2010). Autotrophic carbon fixation in archaea. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 8(6), 447-460.

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

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

[87] Liew, F. E., Nogle, R., Abdalla, T., et al. (2022). Carbon-negative production of acetone and isopropanol by gas fermentation at industrial pilot scale. *Nature Biotechnology*, 40(3), 335-344.

[88] Richter, H., Molitor, B., Diender, M., Sousa, D. Z., & Angenent, L. T. (2016). A narrow pH range supports butanol, hexanol, and octanol production from syngas in a continuous co-culture of *Clostridium ljungdahlii* and *Clostridium kluyveri* with in-line product extraction. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 7, 1773.

[89] Bengelsdorf, F. R., Poehlein, A., Linder, S., et al. (2016). Industrial acetogenic biocatalysts: A comparative metabolic and genomic analysis. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 7, 1036.

[90] Molitor, B., Richter, H., Martin, M. E., Jensen, R. O., & Angenent, L. T. (2016). Carbon recovery by fermentation of CO-rich off gases—Turning steel mills into biorefineries. *Bioresource Technology*, 215, 386-396.

[91] Nitopi, S., Bertheussen, E., Scott, S. B., et al. (2019). Progress and perspectives of electrochemical CO_2 reduction on copper in aqueous electrolyte. *Chemical Reviews*, 119(12), 7610-7672.

[92] Li, F., Thevenon, A., Rosas-Hernández, A., et al. (2020). Molecular tuning of CO_2-to-ethylene conversion. *Nature*, 577(7791), 509-513.

[93] De Luna, P., Hahn, C., Higgins, D., et al. (2019). What would it take for renewably powered electrosynthesis to displace petrochemical processes? *Science*, 364(6438), eaav3506.

[94] Jinkerson, R. E., & Jiao, F. (2024). Electro-agriculture: Groundbreaking economic potential to enhance food production. *Joule*, 8, 2419-2425.

[95] Jiao, F., & Jinkerson, R. E. (2024). Rethinking food production: A sustainable alternative to photosynthesis. *Nature Sustainability*, 7, 1023-1028.

[96] Nevin, K. P., Woodard, T. L., Franks, A. E., Summers, Z. M., & Lovley, D. R. (2010). Microbial electrosynthesis: Feeding microbes electricity to convert carbon dioxide and water to multicarbon extracellular organic compounds. *mBio*, 1(2), e00103-10.

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

[98] Rosenbaum, M., Aulenta, F., Villano, M., & Angenent, L. T. (2011). Cathodes as electron donors for microbial metabolism: Which extracellular electron transfer mechanisms are involved? *Bioresource Technology*, 102(1), 324-333.

[99] Wijffels, R. H., Kruse, O., & Hellingwerf, K. J. (2013). Potential of industrial biotechnology with cyanobacteria and eukaryotic microalgae. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 24(3), 405-413.

[100] Gassler, T., Sauer, M., Gasser, B., et al. (2020). The industrial yeast *Pichia pastoris* is converted from a heterotroph into an autotroph capable of growth on CO_2. *Nature Biotechnology*, 38(2), 210-216.

[101] Palmqvist, E., & Hahn-Hägerdal, B. (2000). Fermentation of lignocellulosic hydrolysates. II: Inhibitors and mechanisms of inhibition. *Bioresource Technology*, 74(1), 25-33.

[102] Jönsson, L. J., Alriksson, B., & Nilvebrant, N. O. (2013). Bioconversion of lignocellulose: Inhibitors and detoxification. *Biotechnology for Biofuels*, 6(1), 16.

[103] Huang, H., Chai, C., Li, N., et al. (2016). Phthiocerol dimycocerosate of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* is a virulence lipid that inhibits macrophage autophagy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(15), E2238-E2247.

[104] Sonderegger, M., & Sauer, U. (2003). Evolutionary engineering of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* for anaerobic growth on xylose. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 69(4), 1990-1998.

[105] Kim, S. R., Skerker, J. M., Kang, W., et al. (2013). Rational and evolutionary engineering approaches uncover a small set of genetic changes efficient for rapid xylose fermentation in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *PLoS ONE*, 8(2), e57048.

[106] Sandberg, T. E., Salazar, M. J., Weng, L. L., Palsson, B. O., & Feist, A. M. (2019). The emergence of adaptive laboratory evolution as an efficient tool for biological discovery and industrial biotechnology. *Metabolic Engineering*, 56, 1-16.

[107] Angelidaki, I., Karakashev, D., Batstone, D. J., Plugge, C. M., & Stams, A. J. (2011). Biomethanation and its potential. *Methods in Enzymology*, 494, 327-351.

[108] Agler, M. T., Wrenn, B. A., Zinder, S. H., & Angenent, L. T. (2011). Waste to bioproduct conversion with undefined mixed cultures: The carboxylate platform. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 29(2), 70-78.

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

[110] Molenaar, D., van Berlo, R., de Ridder, D., & Teusink, B. (2009). Shifts in growth strategies reflect tradeoffs in cellular economics. *Molecular Systems Biology*, 5(1), 323.

[111] De Mey, M., De Maeseneire, S., Soetaert, W., & Vandamme, E. (2007). Minimizing acetate formation in *E. coli* fermentations. *Journal of Industrial Microbiology & Biotechnology*, 34(11), 689-700.

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

[113] Basan, M., Zhu, M., Dai, X., et al. (2020). A universal trade-off between growth and lag in fluctuating environments. *Nature*, 584(7821), 470-474.

[114] Farmer, W. R., & Liao, J. C. (1997). Reduction of aerobic acetate production by *Escherichia coli*. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 63(8), 3205-3210.

[115] Liu, Y., Zhang, X., Xu, Q., et al. (2024). A modular metabolic engineering approach for high-level production of homoserine and threonine from acetate in *Escherichia coli*. *Metabolic Engineering*, 84, 73-85.

[116] Liu, Y., Zhang, X., Xu, Q., et al. (2024). A modular metabolic engineering approach for high-level production of homoserine and threonine from acetate in *Escherichia coli*. *Metabolic Engineering*, 84, 73-85.

[117] Wolfe, A. J. (2016). Bacterial protein acetylation: New discoveries unanswered questions. *Current Genetics*, 62(2), 335-341.

[118] McCleary, W. R., Stock, J. B., & Ninfa, A. J. (1993). Is acetyl phosphate a global signal in *Escherichia coli*? *Journal of Bacteriology*, 175(10), 2793-2798.

[119] O'Brien, E. J., Monk, J. M., & Palsson, B. O. (2015). Using genome-scale models to predict biological capabilities. *Cell*, 161(5), 971-987.

[120] Luli, G. W., & Strohl, W. R. (1990). Comparison of growth, acetate production, and acetate inhibition of *Escherichia coli* strains in batch and fed-batch fermentations. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 56(4), 1004-1011.

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

[122] Sieuwerts, S., Molenaar, D., van Hijum, S. A., et al. (2010). Mixed-culture transcriptome analysis reveals the molecular basis of mixed-culture growth in *Streptococcus thermophilus* and *Lactobacillus bulgaricus*. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 76(23), 7775-7784.

[123] Matsushita, K., Toyama, H., & Adachi, O. (1994). Respiratory chains and bioenergetics of acetic acid bacteria. *Advances in Microbial Physiology*, 36, 247-301.

[124] Nakano, S., Fukaya, M., & Horinouchi, S. (2006). Putative ABC transporter responsible for acetic acid resistance in *Acetobacter aceti*. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 72(1), 497-505.

[125] Rudolph, B., Gebendorfer, K. M., Buchner, J., & Winter, J. (2010). Evolution of *Escherichia coli* for growth at high temperatures. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 285(25), 19029-19034.

[126] Sandberg, T. E., Salazar, M. J., Weng, L. L., Palsson, B. O., & Feist, A. M. (2019). The emergence of adaptive laboratory evolution as an efficient tool for biological discovery and industrial biotechnology. *Metabolic Engineering*, 56, 1-16.

[127] Bar-Even, A. (2016). Formate assimilation: The metabolic architecture of natural and synthetic pathways. *Biochemistry*, 55(28), 3851-3863.

[128] Chen, C. T., Chen, F. Y. H., & Bogorad, I. W. (2021). Synthetic methylotrophy: Engineering the production of chemicals from methanol in yeast. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 65, 102-109.

[129] Yishai, O., Lindner, S. N., Gonzalez de la Cruz, J., et al. (2016). The formate bio-economy. *Current Opinion in Chemical Biology*, 35, 1-9.

[130] Claassens, N. J., Cotton, C. A., Kopljar, D., & Bar-Even, A. (2019). Making quantitative sense of electromicrobial production. *Nature Catalysis*, 2(5), 437-447.

[131] Gassler, T., Heggeset, T. M. B., Kosa, G., et al. (2020). The industrial yeast *Pichia pastoris* is converted from a heterotroph into an autotroph capable of growth on CO_2. *Nature Biotechnology*, 38(2), 210-216.

[132] Kim, S., Lindner, S. N., Aslan, S., et al. (2020). Growth of *E. coli* on formate and methanol via the reductive glycine pathway. *Nature Chemical Biology*, 16(5), 538-545.

[133] Gleizer, S., Ben-Nissan, R., Bar-On, Y. M., et al. (2019). Conversion of *Escherichia coli* to generate all biomass carbon from CO_2. *Cell*, 179(6), 1255-1263.

[134] Bang, J., & Lee, S. Y. (2018). Assimilation of formic acid and CO_2 by engineered *Escherichia coli* equipped with reconstructed one-carbon assimilation pathways. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(40), E9271-E9279.

[135] Zhu, X., Tan, X., Choi, K. H., et al. (2021). Metabolic evolution of two reducing equivalent-conserving pathways for high-yield succinate production in *Escherichia coli*. *Metabolic Engineering*, 24, 87-96.

[136] 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.

[137] Nevin, K. P., Hensley, S. A., Franks, A. E., et al. (2011). Electrosynthesis of organic compounds from carbon dioxide is catalyzed by a diversity of acetogenic microorganisms. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 77(9), 2882-2886.

[138] Logan, B. E., & Rabaey, K. (2012). Conversion of wastes into bioelectricity and chemicals by using microbial electrochemical technologies. *Science*, 337(6095), 686-690.

[139] Schippers, A., Neretin, L. N., Kallmeyer, J., et al. (2005). Prokaryotic cells of the deep sub-seafloor biosphere identified as living bacteria. *Nature*, 433(7028), 861-864.

[140] Prévoteau, A., Carvajal-Arroyo, J. M., Ganigué, R., & Rabaey, K. (2020). Microbial electrosynthesis from CO_2: Forever a promise? *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 62, 48-57.

[141] Batlle-Vilanova, P., Puig, S., Gonzalez-Olmos, R., et al. (2016). Continuous acetate production through microbial electrosynthesis from CO_2 with microbial mixed culture. *Journal of Chemical Technology & Biotechnology*, 91(4), 921-927.

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

[143] Haverkorn van Rijsewijk, B. R., Nanchen, A., Nallet, S., et al. (2011). Large-scale ^{13}C-flux analysis reveals distinct transcriptional control of respiratory and fermentative

metabolism in *Escherichia coli*. *Molecular Systems Biology*, 7(1), 477.

[144] Zampieri, G., Vijayakumar, S., Yaneske, E., & Angione, C. (2019). Machine and deep learning meet genome-scale metabolic modeling. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 15(7), e1007084.

[145] Sastry, A. V., Hu, A., Heckmann, D., et al. (2021). The *Escherichia coli* transcriptome mostly consists of independently regulated modules. *Nature Communications*, 12(1), 1-14.

[146] Hendrickx, L., De Wever, H., Hermans, V., et al. (2006). Microbial ecology of the closed artificial ecosystem MELiSSA (Micro-Ecological Life Support System Alternative): Reinventing the wheel? *Research in Microbiology*, 157(1), 77-86.

[147] Clauwaert, P., Muys, M., Alloul, A., et al. (2017). Nitrogen cycling in bioregenerative life support systems: Challenges for waste refinery and food production processes. *Progress in Aerospace Sciences*, 91, 87-98.

[148] National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). (2024). CURB Engineering Research Center: Carbon Utilization Redesign for Biomanufacturing-Empowered Decarbonization. Retrieved from https://www.nasa.gov

[149] Gassler, T., Heggeset, T. M. B., Kosa, G., et al. (2020). The industrial yeast *Pichia pastoris* is converted from a heterotroph into an autotroph capable of growth on CO_2. *Nature Biotechnology*, 38(2), 210-216.

[150] Jinkerson, R. E., & Jiao, F. (2024). Electro-agriculture: Groundbreaking economic potential to enhance food production. *Joule*, 8, 2419-2425.

[151] Davis, R., Tao, L., Tan, E. C. D., et al. (2013). Process design and economics for the conversion of lignocellulosic biomass to hydrocarbons: Dilute-acid and enzymatic deconstruction of biomass to sugars and biological conversion of sugars to hydrocarbons. *National Renewable Energy Laboratory* (NREL), Golden, CO, Report NREL/TP-5100-60223.

[152] Humbird, D., Davis, R., Tao, L., et al. (2011). Process design and economics for biochemical conversion of lignocellulosic biomass to ethanol. *National Renewable Energy Laboratory* (NREL), Golden, CO, Report NREL/TP-5100-47764.

[153] Hong, S. H., & Lee, S. Y. (2004). Importance of redox balance on the production of succinic acid by metabolically engineered *Escherichia coli*. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 64(2), 248-254.

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

[155] Eisentraut, A. (2010). Sustainable production of second-generation biofuels: Potential and perspectives in major economies and developing countries. *International Energy Agency* (IEA), Paris, Report IEA/OECD.

[156] Jouny, M., Luc, W., & Jiao, F. (2018). General techno-economic analysis of CO_2 electrolysis systems. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 57(6), 2165-2177.

[157] Agler, M. T., Spirito, C. M., Usack, J. G., Werner, J. J., & Angenent, L. T. (2012). Chain elongation with reactor microbiomes: Upgrading dilute ethanol to medium-chain carboxylates. *Energy & Environmental Science*, 5(8), 8189-8192.

[158] 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.

[159] Correa, D. F., Beyer, H. L., Fargione, J. E., et al. (2019). Towards the implementation of sustainable biofuel production systems. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 107, 250-263.