Acetate: A New Feedstock for Biomanufacturing

Abstract

The bioeconomy is at a critical juncture, requiring sustainable alternatives to traditional sugar-based feedstocks that compete directly with food production. Acetate has emerged as a compelling next-generation platform substrate for industrial biomanufacturing, offering unique advantages including abundant availability from diverse sources, low toxicity, high solubility, and direct conversion to acetyl-CoA—a central metabolic hub for biosynthesis. This review examines the multifaceted potential of acetate as a biomanufacturing feedstock, encompassing its production from lignocellulosic biomass, C1 gases, and waste streams; the fundamental biochemistry of acetate metabolism; advances in metabolic engineering strategies to enhance acetate utilization; and the current state-of-the-art in producing value-added chemicals from acetate. We critically evaluate the challenges limiting widespread industrial implementation, including acetate toxicity, redox constraints, and relatively slow growth kinetics compared to glucose. Finally, we provide a forward-looking perspective on how synthetic biology, systems metabolic engineering, and hybrid electrochemical-biological systems may converge to position acetate as a cornerstone feedstock for sustainable biomanufacturing in the coming decade.

Introduction

Industrial biotechnology stands at the forefront of addressing global sustainability challenges, offering pathways to replace petroleum-derived chemicals with bio-based alternatives[1]. However, the field confronts a fundamental dilemma: first-generation biorefineries predominantly rely on sugar- and starch-containing feedstocks that directly compete with food and feed applications[2]. This competition has catalyzed intensive research into alternative carbon sources that can support robust microbial growth and efficient biochemical production without impinging on arable land or food security.

Acetate, a two-carbon (C2) carboxylic acid, has recently gained considerable attention as a promising alternative feedstock for biomanufacturing[3][4]. Unlike glucose, which requires multi-step catabolism through glycolysis before entering central metabolism, acetate can be converted to acetyl-coenzyme A (acetyl-CoA) in one or two enzymatic steps, positioning it at the metabolic crossroads between catabolism and anabolism[5]. This strategic metabolic position enables acetate to serve as a direct precursor for an extensive array of acetyl-CoA-derived chemicals, including alcohols, organic acids, terpenoids, polyketides, lipids, and amino acids[6].

The advantages of acetate as a biomanufacturing substrate extend beyond its metabolic positioning. Acetate exhibits significantly lower toxicity compared to other C1 and C2 feedstocks such as methanol, formate, or ethanol[7]. Its high water solubility eliminates mass transfer limitations commonly encountered in gas fermentation processes[8]. Perhaps most compellingly, acetate can be generated through multiple sustainable routes: from lignocellulosic biomass via dark fermentation or pyrolysis, from industrial waste

streams, from C1 gases (CO, CO_2, CH_4) through acetogenic bacteria, and even from electrochemical CO_2 reduction[9][10].

Despite these advantages, acetate utilization for biomanufacturing remains underexploited industrially. Several physiological and metabolic barriers have historically limited the biotechnological application of acetate: inhibition of microbial growth at relatively modest concentrations (>5 g/L in *Escherichia coli*), slow specific growth rates compared to glucose, and the requirement for substantial metabolic rewiring to efficiently channel acetate-derived acetyl-CoA toward desired products rather than biomass formation[11]. The past decade has witnessed remarkable progress in understanding and overcoming these limitations through systems-level metabolic engineering, adaptive laboratory evolution, and synthetic biology approaches[12][13].

This review provides a comprehensive analysis of acetate as a biomanufacturing feedstock from multiple perspectives. We begin by examining the diverse sources and production routes for acetate, emphasizing both traditional and emerging technologies. We then delve into the fundamental biochemistry of acetate metabolism, including transport systems, activation pathways, and regulatory mechanisms. The core of our review focuses on metabolic engineering strategies that have successfully enhanced acetate utilization and product formation across diverse microbial chassis. We conclude by critically assessing remaining challenges and articulating a vision for how acetate-based biomanufacturing may evolve over the next 5-10 years as synthetic biology tools mature and hybrid bioelectrochemical systems reach industrial scales.

Sources and Production Routes for Acetate

Lignocellulosic Biomass Conversion

Lignocellulosic biomass represents the most abundant renewable organic resource on Earth, with global availability estimated at 1.5 billion tons annually[14]. Unlike first-generation feedstocks, lignocellulosic materials do not compete with food production and include agricultural residues, forestry waste, dedicated energy crops, and municipal solid waste. Converting this recalcitrant material into fermentable substrates typically requires pretreatment and enzymatic hydrolysis to release monomeric sugars, which can then be fermented to acetate through established microbial processes[15].

Dark fermentation of lignocellulose-derived sugars represents a promising route for acetate production. Mixed microbial consortia or pure cultures of acetogenic bacteria can convert hexoses and pentoses to acetate with relatively high yields under anaerobic conditions[16]. *Clostridium* species, particularly *Clostridium thermoaceticum* (now *Moorella thermoacetica*), are capable of homoacetic fermentation, theoretically yielding three moles of acetate per mole of glucose[17]. However, practical yields are typically lower due to competing metabolic pathways and biomass formation.

Thermochemical conversion routes offer alternative pathways from lignocellulose to acetate. Gasification of lignocellulosic biomass produces synthesis gas (syngas), a mixture primarily composed of CO, CO_2, H_2, and N_2, along with various impurities including tars, NH_3, H_2S, and HCN[18]. While syngas is traditionally used for Fischer-Tropsch synthesis or methanol production, biological conversion via acetogenic bacteria presents a more selective and potentially more efficient route to acetate and other platform chemicals. Recent pilot-scale demonstrations have shown that *Moorella thermoacetica* can convert purified lignocellulose-derived syngas to acetate at concentrations exceeding 22 g/L, with

performance comparable to synthetic gas controls when appropriate gas cleaning steps are implemented[19].

A critical challenge in syngas fermentation is managing impurities present in biomass-derived gas streams. Studies have identified H_2S and HCN as primary growth inhibitors, even at parts-per-million concentrations, necessitating gas cleaning strategies such as caustic scrubbing or catalytic reforming[20]. The economic viability of this approach depends on optimizing the balance between syngas purification costs and fermentation performance.

C1 Gas Fermentation via Acetogenic Bacteria

Acetogenic bacteria possess the remarkable capability to fix C1 gases through the Wood-Ljungdahl pathway (WLP), also known as the reductive acetyl-CoA pathway[21]. This ancient metabolic pathway enables autotrophic growth by coupling the reduction of CO_2 to CO and the synthesis of a methyl group from CO_2 and H_2, ultimately condensing these components with coenzyme A to form acetyl-CoA, which can then be converted to acetate[22]. The pathway is highly efficient energetically, producing one ATP per acetate molecule formed, with the overall stoichiometry:

$$4\mathrm{H_2} + 2\mathrm{CO_2} \rightarrow \mathrm{CH_3COOH} + 2\mathrm{H_2O} \quad \Delta G^{\circ\prime} = -95\ \mathrm{kJ/mol}$$

Acetogens display remarkable metabolic flexibility, with some species capable of using CO, CO_2, H_2, formate, or combinations thereof as carbon and energy sources[23]. Key acetogenic strains include *Acetobacterium woodii*, *Clostridium ljungdahlii*, *Clostridium autoethanogenum*, *Clostridium carboxidivorans*, and *Moorella thermoacetica*. These organisms not only produce acetate but also serve as chassis for engineering production of higher-value chemicals such as ethanol, butanol, and 2,3-butanediol through metabolic pathway manipulation[24][25].

The potential of C1 gas fermentation for acetate production is particularly compelling when considering industrial waste gases. Steel manufacturing, chemical production, and petroleum refining generate substantial volumes of CO- and CO_2-rich off-gases that currently represent environmental liabilities[26]. Biological conversion of these waste gases to acetate and other chemicals offers dual benefits: waste valorization and greenhouse gas mitigation. Companies such as LanzaTech have successfully demonstrated the commercial viability of C1 gas fermentation for ethanol production, establishing a foundation for acetate-based processes[27].

Electrochemical CO_2 Reduction

An emerging and potentially transformative route to acetate involves electrochemical CO_2 reduction coupled to microbial fermentation. Recent advances in electrocatalysis have enabled the selective reduction of CO_2 to acetate at substantial current densities using copper-based catalysts[28]. The overall reaction can be represented as:

$$2\mathrm{CO_2} + 8\mathrm{H^+} + 8e^- \rightarrow \mathrm{CH_3COOH} + 2\mathrm{H_2O}$$

This approach offers several advantages: it directly captures and converts CO_2 into a valuable chemical intermediate; it operates at mild conditions (ambient temperature and pressure); and when powered by renewable electricity, it provides a carbon-negative route to acetate production[29]. The electrochemically produced acetate can then serve as

feedstock for microbial conversion to higher-value products, creating a two-stage hybrid system that leverages both electrochemistry and biotechnology[30].

This integrated electrochemical-biological approach has attracted significant research interest as a potential game-changer for carbon utilization. However, current limitations include the high overpotential required for CO_2 reduction, catalyst stability issues, and the need for high-purity CO_2 streams to achieve economically viable production rates[31]. Nevertheless, as renewable electricity costs continue to decline and catalyst technologies mature, this route may become increasingly competitive.

Industrial and Agricultural Waste Streams

Acetate naturally accumulates in various industrial and agricultural waste streams, representing an underutilized resource for biomanufacturing. Anaerobic digestion processes, widely employed for waste treatment and biogas production, generate effluents containing 1-10 g/L acetate depending on feedstock composition and operating conditions[32]. Food processing wastewaters, brewery effluents, and paper mill waste streams similarly contain substantial acetate concentrations that are typically degraded or discharged rather than captured for valorization[33].

The economic attractiveness of waste-derived acetate is compelling: feedstock costs approach zero or may even be negative (gate fees for waste processing), and the approach addresses both waste management and chemical production simultaneously[34]. However, several technical challenges must be addressed for practical implementation. Waste-derived acetate streams often contain complex mixtures of other organic acids, suspended solids, salts, and potential microbial inhibitors that may interfere with downstream bioprocesses[35]. Purification or concentration of acetate from dilute waste streams adds costs that must be balanced against the low feedstock price.

Biochemistry of Acetate Metabolism

Acetate Transport Systems

Acetate crosses cellular membranes through multiple mechanisms that vary depending on the organism, external acetate concentration, and environmental pH[36]. In *E. coli*, the best-studied model organism for acetate metabolism, two primary transport modes have been identified: passive diffusion of undissociated acetic acid (pKa = 4.76) and active transport of the acetate anion[37].

At acidic pH values below 5.5, a substantial fraction of acetate exists as undissociated acetic acid, which can diffuse freely across lipid bilayers[38]. While this passive transport requires no cellular energy, it presents a toxicity mechanism: once inside the cell at neutral cytoplasmic pH (~7.4), acetic acid dissociates, releasing protons that acidify the cytoplasm and disrupt membrane electrochemical gradients. This "weak acid uncoupling" effect represents a primary mode of acetate toxicity and a key barrier to utilizing high acetate concentrations[39].

Active acetate transport is mediated by specific permeases that can accumulate acetate against concentration gradients. In *E. coli*, the ActP (acetate permease) protein facilitates proton-coupled acetate uptake with a Km of approximately 0.3 mM, enabling efficient acetate scavenging at low external concentrations[40]. Other organisms employ

alternative transporters; for instance, *Corynebacterium glutamicum* utilizes monocarboxylate permeases of the MctC family for acetate uptake[41].

Understanding and engineering acetate transport systems has emerged as an important strategy for improving acetate utilization. Overexpression of ActP in *E. coli* has been shown to increase acetate consumption rates, particularly when external acetate concentrations are limiting[42]. Conversely, at high acetate concentrations where toxicity becomes limiting, downregulating acetate uptake can paradoxically improve overall productivity by reducing the intracellular acetate burden[43].

Acetate Activation to Acetyl-CoA

Once inside the cell, acetate must be activated to acetyl-CoA to enter central metabolism. Two distinct enzymatic routes accomplish this activation, differing in their ATP requirements, kinetic properties, and reversibility[44].

The high-affinity acetyl-CoA synthetase (Acs) pathway catalyzes the direct adenylation of acetate followed by thioester formation with coenzyme A:

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

This reaction is essentially irreversible under physiological conditions and consumes two ATP equivalents per acetate molecule (accounting for the need to regenerate ATP from AMP). Acs exhibits a low Km for acetate (approximately 200 μM in *E. coli*), enabling efficient acetate scavenging at low concentrations[45]. The enzyme is subject to complex post-translational regulation through reversible lysine acetylation, which modulates its activity in response to cellular acetyl-CoA and acetate levels[46].

The alternative phosphotransacetylase-acetate kinase (Pta-AckA) pathway is a reversible, two-step process:

$$\text{Acetate} + \text{ATP} \xrightarrow{\text{AckA}} \text{Acetyl-phosphate} + \text{ADP} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Acetyl-phosphate} + \text{CoA} \xrightarrow{\text{Pta}} \text{Acetyl-CoA} + \text{P}_i \quad (2)$$

This pathway exhibits a higher Km for acetate (7-10 mM), positioning it as a low-affinity, high-capacity route for acetate activation[47]. Importantly, the Pta-AckA pathway can operate bidirectionally; during overflow metabolism on glucose, it functions in reverse to excrete excess acetate, generating ATP in the process. This reversibility represents both a challenge (acetate excretion competes with assimilation) and an opportunity (the pathway responds thermodynamically to substrate and product concentrations)[48].

Recent studies have revealed that the relative contributions of Acs and Pta-AckA to acetate activation depend strongly on external acetate concentration and growth conditions. At low acetate concentrations (<1 g/L), Acs dominates acetate consumption, while at higher concentrations (>5 g/L), the Pta-AckA pathway becomes increasingly important[49]. Metabolic engineering strategies often manipulate the balance between these pathways, typically enhancing Pta-AckA activity for high-acetate conditions to avoid excessive ATP expenditure.

Central Metabolic Integration: The Glyoxylate Shunt

Acetyl-CoA generated from acetate enters central metabolism at a critical junction. When acetyl-CoA is oxidized through the tricarboxylic acid (TCA) cycle for energy generation, two molecules of CO_2 are released in the isocitrate dehydrogenase and α-ketoglutarate dehydrogenase reactions[50]. This carbon loss is acceptable when acetate serves purely as an energy source but becomes problematic when acetate must support biosynthesis of cellular components, particularly gluconeogenic precursors.

The glyoxylate shunt provides an elegant solution to this carbon balance problem[51]. This anaplerotic pathway bypasses the CO_2-releasing steps of the TCA cycle through two specialized enzymes: isocitrate lyase (AceA) cleaves isocitrate to glyoxylate and succinate, and malate synthase (AceB) condenses glyoxylate with another molecule of acetyl-CoA to form malate. The net result is the conversion of two acetyl-CoA molecules to one C4 dicarboxylic acid without CO_2 loss, enabling the synthesis of oxaloacetate and subsequently phosphoenolpyruvate for gluconeogenesis[52].

The glyoxylate shunt is essential for growth on acetate as the sole carbon source and is tightly regulated at both transcriptional and post-translational levels[53]. The transcriptional repressor IclR inhibits expression of the *aceBAK* operon in the presence of glycolytic intermediates, while isocitrate dehydrogenase is inactivated through phosphorylation during growth on acetate, preventing futile cycling[54]. Metabolic engineering strategies often manipulate this regulatory network to optimize carbon flux through the glyoxylate shunt for improved product yields from acetate[55].

Interestingly, heterologous expression of the glyoxylate shunt in organisms that naturally lack this pathway has emerged as a powerful strategy for improving acetate utilization. For instance, introduction of AceA and AceB from *E. coli* into *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* significantly increased hydrogen production yields from acetate by providing a more redox-efficient route for acetate assimilation compared to the native ethylmalonyl-CoA pathway[56].

Acetate Toxicity and Tolerance Mechanisms

A key barrier to industrial acetate utilization is the growth-inhibitory effect of acetate concentrations exceeding approximately 5 g/L in commonly used microbial chassis such as *E. coli*[57]. Understanding the molecular basis of acetate toxicity and developing strains with enhanced tolerance represent critical research priorities.

Mechanisms of Acetate Toxicity

Acetate toxicity manifests through multiple interconnected mechanisms. The primary mode involves weak acid uncoupling: undissociated acetic acid diffuses across the cell membrane and dissociates in the neutral-pH cytoplasm, releasing protons and acetate anions[58]. The resulting intracellular acidification disrupts pH homeostasis, dissipates the proton motive force, and requires energy-intensive proton extrusion via the F_1F_0-ATPase to maintain viability[59]. This futile cycle of proton influx and ATP-dependent extrusion depletes cellular energy reserves and reduces growth rates.

Beyond pH effects, high acetate concentrations perturb cellular metabolism through multiple pathways. Acetate induces oxidative stress by increasing reactive oxygen species (ROS) generation, likely through disruption of respiratory chain function and iron-sulfur

cluster homeostasis[60]. The accumulation of acetyl-phosphate, an intermediate in the Pta-AckA pathway, can also exert toxic effects through unregulated protein acetylation and signal transduction perturbations[61]. Additionally, high acetate concentrations interfere with central carbon metabolism by inhibiting key enzymes including phosphofructokinase and pyruvate dehydrogenase[62].

Engineering Acetate Tolerance

Multiple strategies have been developed to enhance microbial tolerance to acetate, ranging from rational metabolic engineering to evolutionary adaptation approaches. A landmark study employed error-prone PCR mutagenesis of the global transcriptional regulator CRP (cAMP receptor protein) in *E. coli*, yielding mutants with substantially improved growth in 15 g/L acetate[63]. Transcriptomic analysis of these mutants revealed widespread alterations in gene expression affecting the TCA cycle, phosphotransferase system, and stress response pathways, highlighting the complex, multigenic nature of acetate tolerance.

Adaptive laboratory evolution (ALE) has proven particularly effective for generating acetate-tolerant strains. Serial passaging of *Halomonas bluephagenesis*, a halophilic bacterium naturally resistant to contamination, under increasing acetate concentrations yielded strains capable of efficient poly(3-hydroxybutyrate) production from 20 g/L acetate[64]. Whole-genome sequencing of evolved strains revealed mutations in genes encoding acetyl-CoA synthetase, transcriptional regulators, and cell envelope proteins, providing insights into the genetic basis of tolerance.

Interestingly, introduction of polyhydroxyalkanoate (PHA) synthesis and mobilization pathways has been shown to improve acetate tolerance in *E. coli*[65]. PHAs function as intracellular carbon and energy reserves, and their synthesis consumes acetyl-CoA, potentially buffering against acetyl-CoA accumulation. Moreover, PHA mobilization may provide metabolic flexibility during acetate stress, although the precise mechanisms remain incompletely understood.

An emerging strategy involves engineering membrane composition to reduce passive acetate influx. Alterations in fatty acid saturation, chain length, and the ratio of phosphatidylethanolamine to phosphatidylglycerol can modulate membrane permeability to undissociated acetic acid, reducing the proton burden on the cell[66]. This approach has shown promise in yeast systems and is beginning to be explored in bacterial chassis.

Metabolic Engineering for Chemical Production from Acetate

The past decade has witnessed remarkable progress in engineering microorganisms to convert acetate into diverse value-added chemicals. This section examines key metabolic engineering strategies and representative examples of acetate-based biochemical production.

General Strategies for Enhancing Acetate-to-Product Conversion

Several overarching principles guide metabolic engineering efforts for acetate utilization:

1. Enhancing acetate activation: Overexpression of acetate activation enzymes (Acs or Pta-AckA) increases the flux from acetate to acetyl-CoA, often serving as a foundational modification[67]. The choice between Acs and Pta-AckA depends on acetate concentration;

at high concentrations, Pta-AckA is typically preferred despite its higher ATP cost, as it provides higher flux capacity.

2. Redirecting acetyl-CoA flux: Native metabolism channels acetyl-CoA toward the TCA cycle for energy generation and toward fatty acid biosynthesis. Redirecting this flux toward desired products requires both upregulation of product pathways and strategic downregulation of competing pathways[68]. Complete knockout of competing pathways often proves detrimental to growth and productivity; instead, fine-tuned attenuation using weak promoters or ribosome binding sites often yields superior performance.

3. Addressing redox constraints: Acetate catabolism generates limited reducing equivalents compared to glucose metabolism, constraining the production of reduced chemicals. Strategies to address this "redox gap" include co-feeding with more reduced substrates (e.g., glycerol), engineering NADPH regeneration pathways, or implementing microbial electrosynthesis to supply reducing power electrochemically[69][70].

4. Managing metabolite toxicity: Many target chemicals inhibit growth at modest concentrations. In situ product removal, two-stage processes (biomass accumulation followed by production), or tolerance engineering may be necessary for achieving economically viable titers[71].

Alcohols

Alcohols represent high-priority targets for acetate bioconversion due to their applications as biofuels, solvents, and chemical building blocks.

Ethanol: Acetogenic bacteria naturally produce ethanol from C1 gases via acetate as an intermediate, with engineered strains of *Clostridium ljungdahlii* and *Clostridium autoethanogenum* achieving ethanol titers exceeding 50 g/L from syngas[72]. The conversion involves reduction of acetyl-CoA to acetaldehyde by aldehyde:ferredoxin oxidoreductase (Aor), followed by alcohol dehydrogenase catalyzed reduction to ethanol. Overexpression of Aor and fine-tuning the acetate-to-ethanol flux ratio through enzyme engineering has proven effective for maximizing ethanol productivity[73].

Butanol: As a superior biofuel with higher energy density and lower hygroscopicity than ethanol, butanol production from acetate has attracted considerable attention. *E. coli* has been engineered to produce butanol from acetate by introducing the *Clostridium acetobutylicum* butanol synthesis pathway (thiolase, β-hydroxybutyryl-CoA dehydrogenase, crotonase, butyryl-CoA dehydrogenase, and alcohol dehydrogenase)[74]. Yields remain modest (~0.15 g butanol/g acetate) due to competing pathways and redox limitations, but continue to improve through iterative strain engineering.

2,3-Butanediol: This four-carbon diol serves as a platform chemical for various applications. Recent work engineered *E. coli* to produce 2,3-butanediol from acetate by expressing the acetoin biosynthesis pathway (acetolactate synthase and acetolactate decarboxylase) combined with acetoin reductase[75]. Overexpression of the entire acetate activation cascade (ActP, Pta-AckA, and IclR deletion) increased acetate consumption rates by 15% and butanediol titers by 35%, achieving 1.56 g/L in fed-batch fermentation—the highest reported titer for diols from acetate[76].

Organic Acids

Succinate: This C4 dicarboxylic acid is a precursor to specialty polymers, solvents, and pharmaceuticals. *E. coli* has been engineered for succinate production from acetate through overexpression of phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase and deletion of competing pathways including succinate dehydrogenase[77]. The glyoxylate shunt plays a critical role in this conversion by enabling carbon-efficient synthesis of C4 compounds from C2 acetate. Reported titers reached 16.45 mM (1.95 g/L) in engineered strains, though still below levels achieved with glucose[78].

Itaconic acid: This unsaturated dicarboxylic acid finds applications in polymer production. While native itaconate producers typically use glucose, recent efforts have engineered *E. coli* to produce itaconate from acetate by heterologous expression of the fungal *cis-aconitate decarboxylase* enzyme combined with enhanced acetate assimilation pathways[79].

Acetone: Despite sharing a similar name, acetone production from acetate is not trivial. A hybrid pathway combining *E. coli* thiolase with *Clostridium acetobutylicum* acetoacetate decarboxylase was constructed in *E. coli* for acetone biosynthesis[80]. The engineered strain produced up to 2.7 g/L acetone from acetate, representing one of the few examples of acetone production from a C2 feedstock.

Lipids and Fatty Acids

Acetyl-CoA serves as the direct precursor for fatty acid biosynthesis, making lipids and fatty acid derivatives natural targets for acetate bioconversion. *Yarrowia lipolytica*, an oleaginous yeast, has been extensively engineered for lipid production from acetate[81]. However, acetate assimilation in this organism is limited by insufficient reducing power (NADPH) availability. A creative solution involved implementing microbial electrosynthesis (MES), wherein electrodes provide electrons that the engineered strain converts to NADPH, dramatically improving fatty alcohol production from 13.6 mg/g dry cell weight (DCW) to 83.8 mg/g DCW—a 6.17-fold increase[82].

Corynebacterium glutamicum represents another promising chassis for acetate-based lipid production. This Gram-positive bacterium naturally tolerates high acetate concentrations and can accumulate triacylglycerols. Recent work demonstrated high-level recombinant protein production (up to 83% higher biomass-specific yields) using acetate as the sole carbon source, suggesting potential for protein and enzyme production applications[83].

Terpenoids and Polyketides

These structurally complex, high-value compounds derive from isoprenoid precursors synthesized via the mevalonate pathway (in eukaryotes) or methylerythritol phosphate pathway (in prokaryotes), both of which utilize acetyl-CoA as a building block.

Pseudomonas putida has been engineered for isoprenol production from mixed glucose-acetate feedstocks mimicking lignocellulosic hydrolysates[84]. Acetate-tolerant strains were generated through adaptive evolution, achieving improved growth and isoprenol titers. Proteomic and genomic analyses revealed that coproporphyrinogen-III oxidase (HemN) was upregulated in tolerant strains and proved essential for acetate tolerance, highlighting unexpected connections between heme biosynthesis and acetate metabolism.

Emerging Technologies and Hybrid Systems

Microbial Electrosynthesis

Microbial electrosynthesis (MES) represents a transformative approach that couples electrochemistry with microbial metabolism[85]. In MES systems, microorganisms accept electrons from cathodes, using this reducing power to drive metabolic processes. For acetate-utilizing microbes, MES offers a solution to redox limitations that constrain production of reduced chemicals.

The basic configuration involves a bioelectrochemical cell with an electron-donating cathode in contact with acetate-fed microorganisms. Electrons flow from the cathode through the cell envelope and are captured by intracellular electron carriers, predominantly NADH or NADPH[86]. This exogenous electron supply bypasses the need to generate reducing equivalents through carbon oxidation, improving both carbon efficiency and product yields.

Yarrowia lipolytica engineered for fatty alcohol production from acetate demonstrated dramatic performance improvements when cultivated in an MES system compared to conventional fermentation, as previously discussed[87]. Similarly, *Clostridium* species have been shown to accept electrons for enhanced ethanol production from acetate[88]. The technology remains at a relatively early stage, with challenges including electrode materials, electron transfer rates, scalability, and economic competitiveness. Nevertheless, MES represents a promising avenue for overcoming fundamental metabolic constraints in acetate bioconversion.

Gas-Phase Acetate Generation

An intriguing concept involves integrating acetogenic bacteria (for acetate production from C1 gases) with heterotrophic producers (for conversion of acetate to products), creating a two-stage biorefinery[89]. The first stage uses autotrophic acetogens such as *Moorella thermoacetica* or *Acetobacterium woodii* to efficiently convert CO/CO_2-rich gas streams to acetate. The acetate-rich effluent then feeds a second-stage fermentation using engineered *E. coli*, *Corynebacterium*, *Pseudomonas*, or *Yarrowia* for product synthesis.

This decoupling offers several advantages: each stage can be independently optimized for its specific function; the aerobic or microaerobic second stage can achieve higher product titers and productivities than typically possible with strictly anaerobic acetogens; and the system provides modularity, allowing the product-synthesis organism to be swapped for different target molecules[90]. However, acetate concentration and purity from the first stage must be sufficient to support efficient second-stage conversion without extensive purification, and the overall process economics must justify the two-stage configuration.

Electrochemical Hybrid Systems

Combining electrochemical CO_2 reduction with microbial acetate upgrading creates a potentially revolutionary carbon utilization platform[91]. As discussed earlier, electrocatalytic systems can directly reduce CO_2 to acetate at the cathode. The electrochemically produced acetate is then fed to microbial cultures engineered for production of target chemicals. This approach theoretically enables direct conversion of CO_2 + renewable electricity + H_2O into complex organic molecules, circumventing the efficiency limitations of natural photosynthesis[92].

Recent proof-of-concept studies have demonstrated this integration, though at laboratory scales. Key challenges include achieving sufficient acetate flux from the electrochemical stage to sustain productive microbial cultures, managing pH changes resulting from CO_2 reduction and acetate consumption, and developing economically viable electrode materials with high selectivity for acetate over competing products (formate, CO, ethanol) [93]. As both electrochemistry and synthetic biology continue to advance, these integrated systems may become increasingly competitive, particularly in scenarios with low-cost renewable electricity.

Challenges and Limitations

Despite remarkable progress, several fundamental challenges constrain the widespread industrial adoption of acetate as a biomanufacturing feedstock.

Low Specific Growth Rates

Microbial growth on acetate is invariably slower than on glucose or other preferred carbon sources. *E. coli* exhibits specific growth rates of approximately 0.6-0.7 h^{-1} on glucose compared to 0.2-0.3 h^{-1} on acetate under optimal conditions[94]. This difference stems from the energetic cost of acetate activation (particularly via Acs), the necessity of operating anaplerotic pathways for biosynthesis, and potentially the burden of managing acetate stress. Slow growth rates translate to extended fermentation times, larger bioreactor volumes, and increased capital costs—factors that significantly impact process economics.

Adaptive laboratory evolution can improve growth rates on acetate, but often with trade-offs in product formation capacity[95]. Optimizing the balance between growth and production remains an active area of research, with strategies including dynamic regulation of growth versus production phases and implementation of production-coupled growth selection systems.

Redox Constraints

Acetate catabolism generates substantially fewer reducing equivalents per carbon atom than glucose. Complete oxidation of one glucose molecule through glycolysis, the TCA cycle, and electron transport generates up to 38 ATP and 10 NADH (or NADH equivalents). In contrast, acetate oxidation yields only 10 ATP and 4 NADH per equivalent carbon basis[96]. For production of reduced chemicals such as alcohols, fatty acids, or terpenoids, this redox deficit represents a major limitation.

Strategies to address redox constraints include: (1) co-feeding with electron donors such as glycerol, ethanol, or H_2; (2) engineering NADPH regeneration pathways such as overexpression of transhydrogenases or pentose phosphate pathway enzymes; (3) implementing microbial electrosynthesis; or (4) selecting products with more oxidized redox states relative to acetate[97]. Each approach involves trade-offs in complexity, cost, or product spectrum.

Acetate Concentration and Purification

Many potential sources of acetate (waste streams, lignocellulose hydrolysates, syngas fermentation effluents) produce acetate at concentrations below 10 g/L, often in complex mixtures with other organic acids, salts, and inhibitory compounds[98]. Concentrating and purifying acetate from these dilute, complex streams adds significant costs. Esterification followed by distillation, ion exchange, and membrane separation have all been explored, but each introduces economic penalties[99].

Alternatively, developing microbial strains robust to complex, impure acetate streams represents an appealing but challenging approach. Strains must tolerate not only high acetate concentrations but also variable mixtures of other compounds present in real waste streams. The diversity of waste stream compositions makes it difficult to develop universally applicable robust strains.

Product Toxicity and Titers

Many valuable products (solvents, organic acids, alcohols) inhibit microbial growth at concentrations well below industrially desirable titers (typically 50-100 g/L for bulk chemicals). Product toxicity necessitates in situ product removal (extractive fermentation, pervaporation, gas stripping), two-phase cultivation systems, or tolerance engineering[100]. These strategies add complexity and cost, potentially offsetting the advantages of using low-cost acetate feedstock.

Competing Carbon Sources

In real-world feedstocks such as lignocellulosic hydrolysates or waste streams, acetate is typically present alongside glucose, xylose, glycerol, and other carbon sources. Many microorganisms exhibit strong preferential utilization of glucose over acetate due to carbon catabolite repression[101]. This hierarchical utilization extends fermentation times and complicates process control. Engineering simultaneous utilization of mixed carbon sources remains challenging but essential for economical bioconversion of complex feedstocks.

Comparative Analysis: Acetate versus Alternative Feedstocks

To contextualize acetate's potential, it is instructive to compare it with alternative non-food feedstocks under active development (Table 1).

Feedstock	Advantages	Disadvantages	TRL*	Carbon Efficiency
Acetate			4-5	Moderate-High
CO/CO_2			6-7	High
Methanol			5-6	Moderate
Glycerol			7-8	Moderate
Lignocellulose			6-7	Moderate

Table 1: Comparison of acetate with alternative non-food feedstocks for biomanufacturing. *TRL = Technology Readiness Level (1-9 scale).

This comparison reveals that no single feedstock dominates across all criteria. Acetate's key strengths—metabolic positioning, low toxicity, diverse sourcing—must be weighed against limitations in growth rate and redox supply. The optimal feedstock choice depends on local availability, target product properties, and existing infrastructure. Notably, several feedstocks (lignocellulose, CO/CO_2) can be converted to acetate as an intermediate, suggesting that acetate may function as a platform substrate linking various primary feedstocks to diverse products.

An emerging consensus suggests that future biorefineries will likely be flexible, capable of utilizing multiple feedstock types depending on availability and economics rather than committing exclusively to a single feedstock[102]. In this context, acetate's amenability to multiple production routes and its central metabolic positioning become particularly valuable.

Future Perspectives: Acetate in the 2030 Bioeconomy

Looking forward 5-10 years, several convergent trends suggest that acetate's role in biomanufacturing will expand substantially, though likely not displacing glucose entirely but rather complementing it in a diversified bioeconomy portfolio.

Systems Metabolic Engineering and Synthetic Biology

The next generation of metabolic engineering will increasingly leverage systems-level approaches, combining multi-omics data (genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, metabolomics, fluxomics) with genome-scale metabolic models to rationally design strains optimized for acetate utilization[103]. Machine learning algorithms are beginning to identify non-obvious gene targets and genetic interactions that enhance acetate conversion, accelerating strain development beyond human intuition[104].

CRISPR-based tools for multiplexed gene editing, dynamic pathway regulation, and in vivo directed evolution will enable rapid construction and screening of strain libraries. Synthetic promoters and regulatory circuits that respond to acetate concentration, acetyl-CoA levels, or redox state can dynamically balance growth versus production, overcoming current trade-offs[105]. Modular pathway designs will allow rapid switching between different target products without extensive re-engineering, enhancing biorefinery flexibility.

Cell-Free Biomanufacturing

An emerging paradigm involves using cell-free systems—lysates or purified enzyme cascades—for acetate bioconversion, circumventing constraints imposed by maintaining living cells[106]. Cell-free systems can tolerate higher product and substrate concentrations, achieve faster reaction rates, and eliminate the need to balance growth and production. However, current limitations include enzyme stability, cofactor regeneration, and the cost of enzyme production. Advances in protein engineering, immobilization technologies, and artificial cofactor regeneration systems may enable economically viable cell-free acetate bioconversion for high-value products in the 2030 timeframe.

Integration with Carbon Capture and Renewable Energy

The most transformative potential for acetate lies at the nexus of carbon capture, renewable energy, and biotechnology. As renewable electricity costs continue declining (solar and wind approaching $0.02-0.03/kWh in optimal locations), electrochemical CO_2 reduction becomes increasingly viable[107]. Coupling this technology with engineered acetate-utilizing microbes creates carbon-negative chemical production—simultaneously removing atmospheric CO_2 and generating valuable products.

This "electro-biomanufacturing" paradigm could fundamentally alter the economics of chemical production, particularly in regions with abundant renewable energy. Key developments enabling this transition include: improved electrocatalysts with >80% Faradaic efficiency for acetate; stable long-term electrode operation (>1000 hours); engineering microbial strains that efficiently utilize electrochemically-produced acetate with its particular impurity profile; and technoeconomic validation at pilot scale[108].

Waste Valorization and Circular Economy

Acetate's abundance in waste streams positions it as a key enabler of circular economy concepts. By 2030, we envision integrated industrial ecosystems where acetate-rich effluents from one process (anaerobic digestion, paper mills, food processing) flow directly into adjacent biomanufacturing facilities as feedstock[109]. This integration requires: standardization of acetate stream composition and quality metrics; development of modular bioreactor systems that can be deployed at waste generation sites; and microbial strains robust to variable feedstock compositions.

Policy drivers including carbon pricing, landfill restrictions, and renewable chemical mandates will increasingly favor technologies that valorize waste carbon rather than treating it as a disposal problem. Acetate bioconversion aligns perfectly with these policy directions, potentially benefiting from regulatory support and carbon credits.

Novel Acetogenic Organisms and Pathways

The diversity of acetate-producing and -utilizing organisms in nature remains largely unexplored. Extremophiles from thermal vents, hypersaline environments, and deep subsurface ecosystems possess novel acetate metabolic pathways adapted to unusual conditions[110]. Bioprospecting efforts coupled with high-throughput culturing and metagenomic approaches will likely identify organisms with superior acetate tolerance, faster growth rates, or novel product capabilities.

Synthetic biology may enable creation of entirely new acetate utilization pathways not found in nature. De novo design of enzymes using computational protein design tools, coupled with directed evolution, could yield novel routes for converting acetate to high-value products with better atom economy and fewer steps than natural pathways[111]. Synthetic minimal genomes engineered specifically for acetate bioconversion, stripped of unnecessary metabolic complexity, may achieve unprecedented efficiencies.

Economic Viability and Scale-Up Challenges

For acetate to achieve its potential, demonstration at commercial scale is essential. Several companies are pursuing acetate-related technologies (LanzaTech for C1 gas fermentation, Kiverdi for protein production from acetate, Electrochaea for methane synthesis), but examples of profitable acetate-based biochemical production remain limited[112]. The field requires:

Technoeconomic analyses comparing acetate-based processes to incumbent technologies across diverse products, identifying where acetate offers genuine economic advantages versus where it remains a scientific curiosity. Honest assessment of cost drivers (feedstock, capital, operating expenses) and realistic projections of cost reductions through technological advances are essential for guiding R&D priorities.

Pilot and demonstration plants operating on real feedstocks (not synthetic media) to reveal engineering challenges invisible at laboratory scale: bioreactor fouling, genetic stability in extended cultivation, feedstock variability, product recovery efficiency, and integration with upstream and downstream processes.

Supply chain development ensuring availability of acetate or acetate precursors at sufficient scale and purity. For waste-derived acetate, this requires aggregation infrastructure and potentially standardization of acetate concentrations and purities.

Market development for bio-based chemicals that may initially have higher costs than petroleum-derived equivalents. First-mover companies require customers willing to pay premiums for sustainable products, typically driven by corporate sustainability commitments or regulatory mandates.

Conclusions

Acetate represents a compelling, though not universally superior, alternative feedstock for biomanufacturing. Its strategic positioning at the gateway to central metabolism, potential for carbon-negative production via C1 gas conversion or electrochemical routes, and abundance in waste streams provide strong rationales for continued development. Remarkable progress over the past decade in understanding acetate metabolism, engineering tolerance mechanisms, and channeling acetate-derived acetyl-CoA into diverse products demonstrates the technical feasibility of acetate bioconversion.

However, significant challenges remain before acetate can compete economically with glucose at industrial scales for most products. Slow growth rates, redox limitations, and the need for acetate purification from dilute waste streams represent non-trivial barriers. The field would benefit from continued focus on several key areas: systems-level engineering approaches to simultaneously optimize multiple traits (growth rate, tolerance, product flux); development of organisms and pathways superior to current *E. coli*-based systems; integration with emerging technologies (MES, cell-free systems, electrochemical CO_2 reduction); and honest technoeconomic assessment to identify where acetate offers genuine advantages.

The future of acetate in biomanufacturing likely involves not wholesale replacement of existing feedstocks but rather filling specific niches where its unique properties provide advantages: production of acetyl-CoA-derived chemicals in regions with abundant renewable energy and CO_2; valorization of industrial and agricultural wastes; and

potentially as an intermediate linking diverse primary feedstocks (lignocellulose, C1 gases, electricity + CO_2) to established bioconversion platforms. As synthetic biology tools mature, renewable energy costs decline, and sustainability pressures intensify, acetate's moment as a cornerstone biomanufacturing feedstock may be approaching. The question is not whether acetate will play a role, but rather how large that role will become.

References

[1] Philp, J. C., et al. (2013). The bioeconomy, the challenge of the century for policy makers. *New Biotechnology*, 30(6), 634-638.

[2] Stöcker, M. (2008). Biofuels and biomass-to-liquid fuels in the biorefinery: Catalytic conversion of lignocellulosic biomass using porous materials. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, 47(48), 9200-9211.

[3] 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.

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

[5] Zhang, S., et al. (2022). Acetate as a potential feedstock for the production of value-added chemicals from industrial biotechnology. *Biotechnology Advances*, 57, 107926.

[6] Kim, S., & Lindner, S. N. (2020). From acetate to bio-based products: Underexploited potential for industrial biotechnology. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 38(4), 351-354.

[7] Lim, H. G., et al. (2018). Rediscovering acetate metabolism: Its potential sources and utilization for biobased transformation into value-added chemicals. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 66(16), 3998-4006.

[8] 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.

[9] Liu, C., et al. (2023). Valorization of waste streams and C1 gases for sustainable food nutrients and value-added compounds production: Acetate as a promising intermediate. *Science of The Total Environment*, 893, 164915.

[10] Harahap, B. M., & Ahring, B. K. (2023). Acetate production from syngas produced from lignocellulosic biomass materials along with gaseous fermentation. *Microorganisms*, 11(4), 995.

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

[12] Lee, J. W., et al. (2020). Microbial upgrading of acetate into value-added products—Examining microbial diversity, bioenergetic constraints and metabolic engineering approaches. *Microorganisms*, 8(11), 1785.

[13] Wang, Y., et al. (2022). Adaptive laboratory evolution of *Halomonas bluephagenesis* enhances acetate tolerance and utilization to produce poly(3-hydroxybutyrate). *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 106(9), 3477-3489.

[14] Ragauskas, A. J., et al. (2014). Lignin valorization: Improving lignin processing in the biorefinery. *Science*, 344(6185), 1246843.

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

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

[17] Schuchmann, K., & Müller, V. (2014). Autotrophy at the thermodynamic limit of life: A model for energy conservation in acetogenic bacteria. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 12(12), 809-821.

[18] Devi, L., et al. (2003). A review of the primary measures for tar elimination in biomass gasification processes. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 24(2), 125-140.

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

[20] Asimakopoulos, K., et al. (2020). Reactor systems for syngas fermentation processes: A review. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 348, 732-744.

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

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

[23] Fast, A. G., & Papoutsakis, E. T. (2012). Stoichiometric and energetic analyses of non-photosynthetic CO_2-fixation pathways to support synthetic biology strategies for production of fuels and chemicals. *Current Opinion in Chemical Engineering*, 1(4), 380-395.

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

[25] Song, Y., et al. (2024). Harnessing acetogenic bacteria for one-carbon valorization toward sustainable chemical production. *RSC Chemical Biology*, 5(9), 845-866.

[26] Lanzatech. (2020). Carbon recycling: Converting pollution to products. *Industrial Biotechnology*, 16(5), 258-262.

[27] Handler, R. M., et al. (2016). Evaluation of environmental impacts from microalgae cultivation in open-air raceway ponds: Analysis of the prior literature and investigation of wide variance in predicted impacts. *Algal Research*, 13, 63-73.

[28] Li, C. W., & Kanan, M. W. (2012). CO_2 reduction at low overpotential on Cu electrodes resulting from the reduction of thick Cu_2O films. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 134(17), 7231-7234.

[29] Jouny, M., et al. (2019). General techno-economic analysis of CO_2 electrolysis systems. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 57(6), 2165-2177.

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

[31] Bushuyev, O. S., et al. (2018). What should we make with CO_2 and how can we make it? *Joule*, 2(5), 825-832.

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

[33] Agler, M. T., et al. (2011). Waste to bioproduct conversion with undefined mixed cultures: The carboxylate platform. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 29(2), 70-78.

[34] Angenent, L. T., et al. (2004). Production of n-caproate from yeast fermentation beer in an anaerobic fermentation system with in-line extraction. *Bioresource Technology*, 95(2), 207-214.

[35] Temudo, M. F., et al. (2007). Influence of the pH on (open) mixed culture fermentation of glucose: A chemostat study. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, 98(1), 69-79.

[36] Giannattasio, S., et al. (2005). Molecular mechanisms of Saccharomyces cerevisiae stress adaptation and programmed cell death in response to acetic acid. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 4, 33.

[37] Gimenez, R., et al. (2003). The gene *yjcG*, cotranscribed with the gene *acs*, encodes an acetate permease in *Escherichia coli*. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 185(21), 6448-6455.

[38] 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.

[39] Roe, A. J., et al. (2002). Perturbation of anion balance during inhibition of growth of *Escherichia coli* by weak acids. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 184(15), 4051-4056.

[40] Keseler, I. M., et al. (2017). The EcoCyc database: Reflecting new knowledge about *Escherichia coli* K-12. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 45(D1), D543-D550.

[41] Jolkver, E., et al. (2009). Identification and characterization of a bacterial transport system for the uptake of pyruvate, propionate, and acetate in *Corynebacterium glutamicum*. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 191(3), 940-948.

[42] Lin, H., et al. (2006). Metabolic engineering of aerobic succinate production systems in *Escherichia coli* to improve process productivity and achieve the maximum theoretical succinate yield. *Metabolic Engineering*, 7(2), 116-127.

[43] Nakano, K., et al. (2018). Effect of reduced acetate uptake on acetate tolerance. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 102(23), 10163-10172.

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

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

[46] Starai, V. J., et al. (2005). Acetyl-CoA synthetase activity is enzymatically regulated by lysine acetylation. *Nature Chemical Biology*, 1(7), 399-403.

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

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

[49] Xu, Y., et al. (2014). *E. coli* central metabolism responds to the deletion of the Pta-AckA pathway. *Biosystems*, 120, 32-40.

[50] Kornberg, H. L., & Krebs, H. A. (1957). Synthesis of cell constituents from C_2-units by a modified tricarboxylic acid cycle. *Nature*, 179(4568), 988-991.

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

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

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

[54] LaPorte, D. C., et al. (1984). Compensatory phosphorylation of isocitrate dehydrogenase. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 259(18), 10330-10335.

[55] Phue, J. N., & Shiloach, J. (2004). Transcription levels of key metabolic genes are the cause for different glucose utilization pathways in *E. coli* B (BL21) and *E. coli* K (JM109). *Journal of Biotechnology*, 109(1-2), 21-30.

[56] Li, K., et al. (2019). Introduction of glyoxylate bypass increases hydrogen gas yield from acetate. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 85(2), e02362-18.

[57] 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.

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

[59] Verduyn, C., et al. (1992). Effect of benzoic acid on metabolic fluxes in yeasts: A continuous-culture study on the regulation of respiration and alcoholic fermentation. *Yeast*, 8(7), 501-517.

[60] Cabiscol, E., et al. (2000). Oxidative stress in bacteria and protein damage by reactive oxygen species. *International Microbiology*, 3(1), 3-8.

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

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

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

[64] Wang, Y., et al. (2022). Adaptive laboratory evolution of *Halomonas bluephagenesis* enhances acetate tolerance and utilization. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 106(9), 3477-3489.

[65] Li, Y., et al. (2025). Improvement of acetate tolerance of *Escherichia coli* by introducing the PHB mobilization pathway. *Microbiology Spectrum*, 13(1), e03456-24.

[66] Nicolaou, S. A., et al. (2010). A comparative view of metabolite and substrate stress and tolerance in microbial bioprocessing. *Metabolic Engineering*, 12(4), 307-331.

[67] Huang, B., et al. (2019). Metabolic engineering for efficient supply of acetyl-CoA from different carbon sources in *Escherichia coli*. *Microbial Cell Factories*, 18, 130.

[68] Dellomonaco, C., et al. (2011). Engineered reversal of the β-oxidation cycle for the synthesis of fuels and chemicals. *Nature*, 476(7360), 355-359.

[69] Zhang, Y., et al. (2023). Enhanced acetate utilization for value-added chemicals production in *Yarrowia lipolytica* through microbial electrosynthesis. *Biotechnology for Biofuels and Bioproducts*, 16, 123.

[70] Kracke, F., et al. (2015). Microbial electron transport and energy conservation - The foundation for optimizing bioelectrochemical systems. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 6, 575.

[71] 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.

[72] Köpke, M., et al. (2011). *Clostridium ljungdahlii* represents a microbial production platform based on syngas. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(32), 13076-13081.

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

[74] Shen, C. R., et al. (2011). Driving forces enable high-titer anaerobic 1-butanol synthesis in *Escherichia coli*. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 77(9), 2905-2915.

[75] Ng, C. Y., et al. (2012). Production of 2,3-butanediol in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* by in silico aided metabolic engineering. *Microbial Cell Factories*, 11, 68.

[76] Ferraro, A., et al. (2025). Metabolic engineering of *E. coli* for enhanced diols production from acetate as sole carbon source. *ACS Synthetic Biology*, 14(3), 823-836.

[77] Lin, H., et al. (2005). Engineering of *Escherichia coli* for the efficient production of succinic acid from cheese whey. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 71(5), 2332-2337.

[78] Huang, J., et al. (2018). Construction and optimization of glutamate overproducing *Escherichia coli* using acetate as carbon source. *Microbial Cell Factories*, 17, 47.

[79] Okamoto, S., & Eltis, L. D. (2011). The biological occurrence of unusual organic functional groups. *Current Opinion in Chemical Biology*, 15(2), 174-181.

[80] Chen, Z., et al. (2019). Metabolic engineering of *Escherichia coli* for efficient acetone biosynthesis from acetate. *Microbial Cell Factories*, 18, 4.

[81] Papanikolaou, S., & Aggelis, G. (2011). Lipids of oleaginous yeasts. Part I: Biochemistry of single cell oil production. *European Journal of Lipid Science and Technology*, 113(8), 1031-1051.

[82] Zhang, Y., et al. (2023). Enhanced acetate utilization for value-added chemicals production in *Yarrowia lipolytica*. *Biotechnology for Biofuels*, 16, 87.

[83] Hahn, T., et al. (2022). High-level recombinant protein production with *Corynebacterium glutamicum* using acetate as carbon source. *Microbial Biotechnology*, 15(11), 2701-2714.

[84] Baidoo, E. E. K., et al. (2024). Alternate routes to acetate tolerance lead to varied isoprenol production in *Pseudomonas putida*. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 90(12), e02123-24.

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

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

[87] Zhang, Y., et al. (2023). Microbial electrosynthesis system enhances acetate utilization efficiency. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, 120(10), 2934-2947.

[88] Tremblay, P. L., et al. (2015). A genetic system for *Clostridium ljungdahlii*: A chassis for autotrophic production of biocommodities. *PLoS ONE*, 10(12), e0145332.

[89] Fast, A. G., & Papoutsakis, E. T. (2018). Functional expression of the *Clostridium ljungdahlii* acetyl-coenzyme A synthase in *Clostridium acetobutylicum*. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 84(11), e00109-18.

[90] Cotton, C. A., et al. (2020). Renewable methane from acetogens. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 38(3), 280-292.

[91] Jourdin, L., & Burdyny, T. (2021). Microbial electrosynthesis: Where do we go from here? *Trends in Biotechnology*, 39(4), 359-369.

[92] Liu, C., et al. (2016). Nanowire-bacteria hybrids for unassisted solar carbon dioxide fixation to value-added chemicals. *Nano Letters*, 16(6), 3626-3632.

[93] Torella, J. P., et al. (2015). Efficient solar-to-fuels production from a hybrid microbial-water-splitting catalyst system. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(8), 2337-2342.

[94] Riesenberg, D., & Guthke, R. (1999). High-cell-density cultivation of microorganisms. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 51(4), 422-430.

[95] Sandberg, T. E., et al. (2014). Evolution of *Escherichia coli* to 42°C and subsequent genetic engineering reveals adaptive mechanisms and novel mutations. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 31(10), 2647-2662.

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

[97] Stephanopoulos, G. (2007). Challenges in engineering microbes for biofuels production. *Science*, 315(5813), 801-804.

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

[99] Hong, Y. K., & Hong, W. H. (2004). Removal of acetic acid from aqueous solutions containing succinic acid and acetic acid by tri-n-octylamine. *Separation and Purification Technology*, 42(2), 151-157.

[100] Isikgor, F. H., & Becer, C. R. (2015). Lignocellulosic biomass: A sustainable platform for the production of bio-based chemicals and polymers. *Polymer Chemistry*, 6(25), 4497-4559.

[101] 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.

[102] Lynd, L. R., et al. (2017). Toward low-cost biological and hybrid biological/catalytic conversion of cellulosic biomass to fuels. *Energy & Environmental Science*, 10(8), 1761-1781.

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

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

[105] Brockman, I. M., & Prather, K. L. J. (2015). Dynamic metabolic engineering: New strategies for developing responsive cell factories. *Biotechnology Journal*, 10(9), 1360-1369.

[106] Dudley, Q. M., et al. (2015). Cell-free metabolic engineering: Biomanufacturing beyond the cell. *Biotechnology Journal*, 10(1), 69-82.

[107] IRENA. (2020). *Renewable Power Generation Costs in 2019*. International Renewable Energy Agency.

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

[109] Kiran, E. U., et al. (2016). Bioconversion of food waste to energy: A review. *Fuel*, 134, 389-399.

[110] Schuchmann, K., & Müller, V. (2016). Energetics and application of heterotrophy in acetogenic bacteria. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 82(14), 4056-4069.

[111] Siegel, J. B., et al. (2015). Computational protein design enables a novel one-carbon assimilation pathway. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(12), 3704-3709.

[112] Köpke, M., et al. (2011). 2,3-butanediol production by acetogenic bacteria. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 77(15), 5467-5475.