iJRASET
International Journal For Research in
Applied Science and Engineering Technology

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH

IN APPLIED SCIENCE & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Volume: 12 **Issue:** X **Month of publication:** October 2024

DOI: https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2024.64808

Transforming Lignocellulosic Biomass into Biofuels: Recent Innovations in Pretreatment and Bioconversion Techniques

Rashmi[1], Tripti Tripathi[2], Sanjit Pandey[3], Shravan Kumar[4]
[1, 2, 3, 4]Department of Biochemical Engineering, Harcourt Butler Technical University, Kanpur, 208002, INDIA

Abstract: This scholarly review investigates contemporary advancements in the conversion of lignocellulosic biomass to biofuels, emphasizing innovative pretreatment and bioconversion technologies that aim to surmount the intrinsic challenges associated with the processing of this complex biomass. Lignocellulosic materials, which are predominantly comprised of cellulose, hemicellulose, and lignin, represent a renewable and plentiful source for biofuel production; however, their structural complexity necessitates sophisticated methodologies for the effective degradation of resistant components. The review scrutinizes a variety of pretreatment methodologies, encompassing physical, chemical, and burgeoning techniques such as plasma-assisted processing, which are engineered to augment cellulose accessibility for enzymatic hydrolysis. Additionally, it elucidates the progress made in bioconversion processes, concentrating on enzymatic hydrolysis, microbial fermentation, and consolidated bioprocessing (CBP), wherein recent endeavors in genetic engineering are refining microbial strains to enhance yield and efficiency. By addressing economic, technological, and environmental challenges, this article emphasizes the role of integrated biorefineries and innovative biotechnologies in facilitating scalable and cost-effective production of lignocellulosic biofuels. Prospective research trajectories include the formulation of sustainable pretreatment techniques and the advancement of synthetic biology to fully harness the potential of lignocellulosic biomass as a renewable energy resource. Ultimately, this review accentuates the significance of lignocellulosic biofuels as a feasible alternative to fossil fuels, thereby contributing to energy sustainability and climate change mitigation through diminished carbon emissions.
Keywords: Lignocellulosic biomass, Biofuel production, Pretreatment technologies, Bioconversion processes, Synthetic biology

I. INTRODUCTION

The global energy demand continues to rise, posing significant challenges related to climate change, energy security, and environmental sustainability [1]. Fossil fuels, which have powered industrial and societal development for over a century, are finite and contribute significantly to greenhouse gas emissions [2]. In the search for sustainable alternatives, biofuels have emerged as a promising solution. They are renewable, can be produced locally, and their combustion generates significantly lower net carbon emissions compared to traditional fossil fuels [3]. One of the most abundant sources of renewable energy is lignocellulosic biomass, which includes plant-derived materials such as agricultural residues, forestry wastes, and dedicated energy crops. This biomass is composed of three main polymers, such as cellulose, hemicellulose, and lignin [4]. However, the complex structure of lignocellulose presents significant challenges in converting this biomass into biofuels efficiently. Overcoming these barriers requires effective pretreatment and bioconversion techniques to break down the recalcitrant structures and maximize fuel yield.

Lignocellulosic biofuels, often referred to as second-generation biofuels, have the potential to transform the bioenergy sector. Unlike first-generation biofuels, which rely on food crops like corn and sugarcane, lignocellulosic biofuels utilize non-food feedstocks, reducing the competition between fuel and food production [5]. This makes lignocellulosic biofuels a more sustainable and economically viable alternative in the long run. The development of efficient pretreatment and bioconversion technologies is critical to making the commercial-scale production of lignocellulosic biofuels feasible [5]. Pretreatment is necessary to deconstruct the rigid lignocellulosic structure, while bioconversion processes, such as enzymatic hydrolysis and microbial fermentation, are employed to convert the resulting sugars into biofuels [6]. Recent advancements in biotechnology, such as the development of new enzymes, microbial strains, and process optimization techniques, have made significant contributions toward improving biofuel production efficiency.

This review article provides an in-depth examination of the current state of lignocellulosic biomass conversion into biofuels, focusing on recent innovations in pretreatment methods and bioconversion techniques.

It will explore the various challenges associated with pretreatment, the role of biotechnology in enhancing enzyme efficiency and microbial fermentation, and the advancements that have been made in process integration and optimization. The review will also assess the environmental and economic implications of these innovations and provide insights into the future directions of research in this field.

II. LIGNOCELLULOSIC BIOMASS STRUCTURE AND COMPOSITION

Lignocellulosic biomass, derived from plant materials, has emerged as one of the most abundant and promising renewable sources for biofuel production. However, its complex structure poses significant challenges to its efficient conversion into fermentable sugars and, ultimately, biofuels. Understanding the composition and structural intricacies of lignocellulosic biomass is crucial for devising effective pretreatment and bioconversion strategies.

A. Composition of Lignocellulosic Biomass

Lignocellulosic biomass is primarily composed of three major biopolymers: cellulose, hemicellulose, and lignin. Together, these components create a rigid structure that provides mechanical support to plants and protects them from microbial degradation. Each of these components plays a unique role in the overall complexity of the biomass [7].

1) *Cellulose*: Comprising 30-50% of lignocellulosic biomass, cellulose is the most abundant polymer on Earth. It is a linear polysaccharide made up of glucose monomers linked by β-1,4-glycosidic bonds, forming crystalline microfibrils that provide structural integrity to plant cell walls [8]. The highly ordered, crystalline structure of cellulose is resistant to enzymatic attack, making its breakdown challenging in biofuel production [9].
2) *Hemicellulose*: Hemicellulose accounts for 15-35% of lignocellulosic biomass and is a heteropolymer composed of various sugar monomers such as xylose, mannose, glucose, galactose, and arabinose [8]. Unlike cellulose, hemicellulose has a more branched and amorphous structure, which makes it easier to break down. However, its close association with cellulose and lignin complicates its extraction and conversion to fermentable sugars [9].
3) *Lignin*: Lignin constitutes 10-30% of lignocellulosic biomass and is an aromatic polymer that acts as a glue binding cellulose and hemicellulose together. It provides rigidity and resistance to microbial attack and environmental stress. Lignin's highly branched, irregular structure, composed of phenylpropanoid units, makes it one of the most challenging components to degrade [8]. Lignin removal or modification is essential to improve the accessibility of cellulose and hemicellulose for enzymatic hydrolysis.
4) The intricate arrangement of these three biopolymers forms a tightly packed, protective matrix within the plant cell wall. This structural complexity is a key reason why lignocellulosic biomass is recalcitrant to degradation, requiring extensive pretreatment for efficient biofuel production.

B. Structural Challenges in Biofuel Conversion

The conversion of lignocellulosic biomass into biofuels presents several structural challenges, primarily due to its complex, recalcitrant nature. The tightly bonded cellulose, hemicellulose, and lignin form a protective barrier that limits the access of enzymes to fermentable sugars. The following challenges are pivotal in the biofuel conversion process.

1) *Crystallinity of cellulose*: The crystalline regions of cellulose are highly resistant to enzymatic hydrolysis due to the strong hydrogen bonds between glucose chains. This crystallinity inhibits enzyme penetration and limits the efficiency of cellulose breakdown into glucose monomers [10]. Effective pretreatment methods are required to disrupt this crystalline structure, increasing the accessibility of cellulose for conversion.
2) *Lignin's role in recalcitrance*: Lignin plays a central role in the recalcitrance of lignocellulosic biomass. Its complex aromatic structure acts as a physical barrier, limiting enzyme access to cellulose and hemicellulose [11]. Additionally, lignin can irreversibly bind to enzymes, reducing their effectiveness in breaking down carbohydrates. The removal or modification of lignin is crucial for improving the overall efficiency of the biofuel conversion process [12].
3) *Hemicellulose complexity*: The amorphous, branched nature of hemicellulose makes it easier to degrade than cellulose, but its heterogeneity in sugar composition complicates the conversion process [13]. The different sugar monomers released from hemicellulose require different enzymes for hydrolysis, increasing the complexity of bioconversion.
4) *Matrix complexity and synergistic effects*: The intricate interactions between cellulose, hemicellulose, and lignin create a highly recalcitrant matrix [14]. This synergistic effect makes it difficult to isolate and convert individual components into fermentable sugars. Overcoming these interactions is one of the primary goals of pretreatment technologies.

III. RECENT ADVANCEMENTS IN THE PRETREATMENT OF LIGNOCELLULOSIC BIOMASS

The conversion of lignocellulosic biomass to biofuels is a complex and multi-step process. Pretreatment is a crucial step that involves altering the physical and chemical structure of lignocellulosic biomass to enhance the accessibility of cellulose and hemicellulose for subsequent hydrolysis [15]. The natural recalcitrance of biomass due to its rigid structure, which contains cellulose fibers embedded in a matrix of lignin and hemicellulose, makes this step essential [16]. Efficient pretreatment methods are necessary to increase the yield of fermentable sugars and improve the overall economics of biofuel production.

A. *Mechanical pretreatment*

Mechanical pretreatment is often the first step in biomass conversion, focusing on reducing the particle size of lignocellulosic material to increase the surface area for subsequent chemical or enzymatic action [17]. Mechanical techniques include grinding, milling, and extrusion, which physically alter the structure of the biomass. By reducing particle size, these methods enhance the digestibility of cellulose and hemicellulose by breaking down the fibrous matrix and exposing more surface area for enzymatic hydrolysis [18].

1) *Milling and grinding*: These methods reduce the crystallinity of cellulose and increase its accessibility. Different types of milling techniques, such as ball milling and disk milling, have been used to disrupt the lignin and hemicellulose structure. However, the high energy consumption required by these processes is a significant drawback [19].
2) *Extrusion*: Extrusion combines mechanical force with heat and is particularly effective in treating agricultural residues. It breaks down the structure of the biomass, reduces lignin content, and enhances the digestibility of cellulose. The use of twin-screw extruders has been shown to further improve the efficiency of this process [20].

a) *Recent advancements in mechanical pretreatment*

Recent innovations in mechanical pretreatment have focused on reducing the energy costs associated with these methods. For example, combining mechanical pretreatment with other methods, such as steam explosion or chemical pretreatment, has been shown to reduce energy consumption while maintaining high efficiency.

B. *Chemical pretreatment*

Chemical pretreatment methods are widely used due to their ability to effectively break down the lignin structure and solubilize hemicellulose. These processes enhance the enzymatic hydrolysis of cellulose and are critical for achieving high yields of fermentable sugars [21].

1) *Acid pretreatment:* Acid hydrolysis, often using sulfuric acid, is one of the most common methods for breaking down hemicellulose into simple sugars. The use of dilute acid is favored for its lower costs and reduced equipment corrosion [22]. However, acid pretreatment can lead to the formation of inhibitory compounds such as furfural and hydroxymethylfurfural (HMF), which affect subsequent fermentation processes [23].
2) *Alkali pretreatment*: Alkali pretreatments, such as those using sodium hydroxide or ammonia, are particularly effective in removing lignin and increasing cellulose accessibility [22]. Alkali pretreatment has the advantage of producing fewer inhibitors compared to acid pretreatment, but it requires longer reaction times and higher reagent costs [23].
3) *Oxidative Pretreatment*: Oxidative chemicals, such as hydrogen peroxide or ozone, are used to break down lignin and solubilize hemicellulose [22]. This method is particularly useful for high-lignin biomass like hardwoods. However, the high cost of oxidative chemicals limits its commercial application [23].

a) *Recent advancements in chemical pretreatment*

Ionic liquids and deep eutectic solvents: Recent research has focused on the use of ionic liquids (ILs) and deep eutectic solvents (DES) as green alternatives for biomass pretreatment [24]. These solvents can dissolve cellulose and lignin without the need for harsh chemicals. Innovations in ILs and DES have improved their recyclability and reduced toxicity, making them promising candidates for large-scale applications [25].

C. *Physicochemical pretreatment*

Physicochemical pretreatments combine both physical and chemical processes to break down lignocellulosic biomass. These methods are designed to increase the efficiency of enzymatic hydrolysis by reducing the crystallinity of cellulose and increasing surface area [26].

1) *Steam Explosion*: This method involves treating biomass with high-pressure steam followed by rapid decompression, which causes the biomass fibers to rupture [27]. Steam explosion is one of the most widely used methods for lignocellulosic biomass pretreatment due to its cost-effectiveness and ability to disrupt both lignin and hemicellulose [28].
2) *Liquid Hot Water (LHW)*: LHW pretreatment uses pressurized hot water to solubilize hemicellulose and break down lignin [29]. This method is attractive because it does not require the use of chemical catalysts, reducing the formation of inhibitors. However, the energy requirements are relatively high [30].
3) *Ammonia Fiber Explosion (AFEX)*: AFEX pretreatment uses ammonia under high pressure to break down lignocellulosic biomass [31]. AFEX is effective in increasing the digestibility of both cellulose and hemicellulose while minimizing the production of inhibitors. However, the recovery and recycling of ammonia are necessary to reduce process costs [32].

D. Biological pretreatment

Biological pretreatment methods involve the use of microorganisms or enzymes to degrade lignocellulosic biomass. These methods are environmentally friendly and operate under mild conditions, making them attractive alternatives to chemical pretreatment methods [33].

1) *Fungal pretreatment*: White-rot fungi and brown-rot fungi are commonly used for lignin degradation. These fungi produce lignin-degrading enzymes such as laccases and peroxidases, which break down lignin and hemicellulose [34]. Fungal pretreatment is slow but has the advantage of producing fewer inhibitors compared to chemical methods.
2) *Bacterial pretreatment*: Certain bacterial species, such as those in the genus *Actinobacteria*, produce cellulolytic and ligninolytic enzymes that can break down lignocellulose [35]. Bacterial pretreatment is less studied than fungal pretreatment but has shown promise in some applications.
3) *Enzymatic pretreatment*: The use of enzymes such as cellulases, hemicellulases, and ligninases is a growing area of research. Advances in enzyme engineering have led to the development of more efficient enzymes that can operate under a broader range of conditions [36].

a) *Recent Innovations in biological pretreatment:*

Recent advances in synthetic biology have enabled the engineering of microbial strains that are more efficient in degrading lignocellulosic biomass. By genetically modifying bacteria and fungi to express high levels of lignin-degrading enzymes, researchers have been able to significantly improve the efficiency of biological pretreatment methods [37].

IV. RECENT ADVANCEMENTS IN THE BIOCONVERSION OF BIOMASS TO BIOFUELS

The bioconversion of lignocellulosic biomass into biofuels involves a series of biological processes that break down complex plant polymers into fermentable sugars, which are then converted into biofuels like ethanol or butanol. The efficiency of this process hinges on the development of advanced bioconversion techniques that maximize sugar release and improve microbial fermentation efficiency. Recent innovations in enzymatic hydrolysis, microbial fermentation, consolidated bioprocessing, and genetic engineering have opened new avenues for optimizing biofuel production.

A. Enzymatic hydrolysis of cellulose

Enzymatic hydrolysis is a critical step in the bioconversion of lignocellulosic biomass, where cellulose is broken down into simple sugars, primarily glucose. This process is mediated by cellulases, a group of enzymes that act synergistically to depolymerize cellulose into fermentable monomers. Cellulases are broadly categorized into three major types [38].

1) *Endoglucanases*: These enzymes cleave internal β-1,4-glycosidic bonds within the cellulose polymer, creating free chain ends that can be further attacked by other cellulases [39].
2) *Exoglucanases (or Cellobiohydrolases)*: These enzymes work on the ends of cellulose chains, releasing cellobiose (a disaccharide) by cleaving two glucose units at a time [40].
3) *β-Glucosidases*: These enzymes hydrolyze cellobiose into two glucose monomers, which can then be fermented by microorganisms. β-glucosidases play a key role in reducing product inhibition by cellobiose, which can slow down the overall hydrolysis process [41].

The efficiency of enzymatic hydrolysis is influenced by several factors, including the crystallinity of cellulose, the presence of lignin, and the accessibility of enzyme binding sites [42]. Recent advancements in enzyme engineering have led to the development of more robust cellulases with improved thermostability, pH tolerance, and substrate specificity, which enhances their efficacy in biofuel production [43].

B. Microbial fermentation pathways

After enzymatic hydrolysis, the resulting sugars, primarily glucose and xylose, must be fermented into biofuels [44]. Traditional microbial fermentation pathways, particularly those involving the yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, have been widely used for ethanol production [44]. However, lignocellulosic hydrolysates contain a mixture of hexose and pentose sugars, and not all microorganisms can ferment both types of sugars efficiently. To address this limitation, a variety of microorganisms have been employed or genetically engineered to improve fermentation yields.[45]

1) *Ethanol production*: *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* is the most commonly used organism for ethanol fermentation due to its high ethanol tolerance and fast growth rate. However, it cannot naturally ferment pentose sugars like xylose [46]. Engineered strains of *S. cerevisiae* have been developed to metabolize both hexose and pentose sugars, improving the overall ethanol yield from lignocellulosic biomass [47].
2) *Butanol production*: *Clostridium acetobutylicum* is a bacterium used for the production of butanol, a biofuel with higher energy density than ethanol. Butanol fermentation occurs through the acetone-butanol-ethanol (ABE) pathway [46]. Advances in metabolic engineering have improved the butanol tolerance of these organisms, allowing for higher butanol concentrations during fermentation [47].
3) *Other microbial pathways*: Novel microorganisms such as *Zymomonas mobilis* and *Escherichia coli* have been explored for their ability to ferment sugars into biofuels [46]. Metabolic engineering of these organisms has enabled the utilization of multiple sugar substrates, enhancing the biofuel yield from lignocellulosic biomass [47].

C. Advances in consolidated bioprocessing (CBP)

Consolidated bioprocessing (CBP) represents a significant innovation in biofuel production, where enzyme production, biomass hydrolysis, and microbial fermentation are combined into a single-step process. CBP eliminates the need for separate enzyme production stages, significantly reducing the overall cost of biofuel production [48]. In a typical CBP system, the microorganisms used are capable of both producing the necessary cellulolytic enzymes and fermenting the resulting sugars into biofuels [48].

Several organisms, including *Clostridium thermocellum* and *Thermoanaerobacter saccharolyticum*, have shown promise for CBP due to their ability to break down lignocellulosic biomass and convert the resulting sugars into ethanol [49]. The main advantages of CBP include.

1) *Cost reduction*: By eliminating the need for commercial cellulases, CBP reduces the overall production cost of biofuels [50].
2) *Process integration*: Combining multiple stages into a single process simplifies the biofuel production pathway and reduces the number of steps involved, making the process more efficient [50]. Ongoing research aims to improve the performance of CBP systems by genetically engineering microorganisms to enhance enzyme production and fermentation capabilities.

D. Genetic engineering of microorganisms for enhanced conversion

Genetic engineering has played a pivotal role in optimizing microbial strains for biofuel production. The goal of engineering microorganisms is to improve their ability to degrade lignocellulosic biomass, tolerate inhibitors present in hydrolysates, and convert multiple sugar substrates into biofuels [51].

1) *Engineering enzyme production*: By introducing cellulase-encoding genes into microorganisms, researchers have created strains capable of producing their cellulolytic enzymes. This reduces the need for externally produced enzymes and enhances the efficiency of lignocellulosic biomass degradation [52].
2) *Metabolic pathway optimization*: Microorganisms have been engineered to increase the flux of metabolic pathways leading to biofuel production. For example, increasing the activity of key enzymes in the glycolytic or pentose phosphate pathways can enhance the conversion of sugars into ethanol or butanol [53].
3) *Tolerance to inhibitors*: Lignocellulosic hydrolysates contain various inhibitory compounds such as furfural, hydroxymethylfurfural (HMF), and acetic acid, which can impede microbial growth and fermentation. Genetic engineering efforts have focused on improving microbial resistance to these inhibitors, allowing for more robust fermentation [54].
4) *Utilization of multiple sugars*: The ability to ferment both hexose and pentose sugars is crucial for maximizing biofuel yield from lignocellulosic biomass. Through metabolic engineering, microorganisms such as *S. cerevisiae* and *E. coli* have been modified to efficiently metabolize xylose and arabinose, which are common sugars in hemicellulose [55].

V. RECENT INNOVATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The future of lignocellulosic biofuel production lies in continued innovation across pretreatment technologies, microbial engineering, and integrated production systems. Researchers and engineers are developing novel approaches that not only improve the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of biofuel production but also expand its sustainability and scalability. This section focuses on recent breakthroughs and promising future directions that could revolutionize lignocellulosic biofuel production.

A. Novel pretreatment approaches (e.g., Plasma-Assisted, Nanotechnology)

Traditional pretreatment methods, while effective, are often expensive and energy-intensive, posing significant barriers to the commercialization of lignocellulosic biofuels. Recent innovations in pretreatment technologies aim to improve the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of biomass processing. Two notable approaches include plasma-assisted pretreatment and the application of nanotechnology.

1) *Plasma-assisted pretreatment*: Plasma technology involves the use of ionized gases to break down lignocellulosic biomass. This process can disrupt the lignin structure and improve the accessibility of cellulose and hemicellulose for enzymatic hydrolysis [56]. Plasma-assisted pretreatment is energy-efficient, and its non-chemical nature reduces the need for costly reagents and complex waste management systems. Research has shown that this technique can enhance sugar yields and reduce enzyme consumption, making it a promising alternative to conventional methods [56].
2) *Nanotechnology in pretreatment*: Nanotechnology offers new tools for improving biomass pretreatment by enhancing the interaction between enzymes and lignocellulosic substrates. Nanomaterials, such as metal nanoparticles and nanocellulose, can be used to create highly reactive surfaces that promote the breakdown of lignocellulosic components [57]. Additionally, nanomaterials can be engineered to act as carriers for enzymes, improving their stability and reusability. This can significantly reduce enzyme consumption and enhance the overall efficiency of the biofuel production process. Ongoing research in this area is focused on developing cost-effective and scalable nanomaterial-based pretreatment systems [57].
3) *Ionic liquids and deep eutectic solvents*: Another emerging area of interest is the use of ionic liquids and deep eutectic solvents (DESs) for biomass pretreatment. These solvents have unique properties that enable them to dissolve lignin and hemicellulose while preserving cellulose structure [58]. Their tunable nature allows researchers to optimize solvent compositions for different types of biomass, leading to more efficient and selective biomass fractionation [59]. Although still in the early stages of development, these solvents hold promise for reducing energy consumption and chemical use in the pretreatment process.

B. Advances in synthetic biology and metabolic engineering

Synthetic biology and metabolic engineering have opened new avenues for optimizing microorganisms and plants for biofuel production. By manipulating genetic pathways and engineering novel traits, researchers aim to create more robust organisms capable of efficiently converting lignocellulosic biomass into biofuels. Several key innovations are transforming the field.

1) *Engineering microorganisms for enhanced biofuel yields*: Advances in genetic engineering have enabled the modification of microbial strains to improve their ability to ferment a wide range of sugars, including both hexoses (e.g., glucose) and pentoses (e.g., xylose), derived from lignocellulosic biomass [60]. For example, the metabolic engineering of *Escherichia coli*, *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, and *Zymomonas mobilis* has enhanced their ability to co-ferment mixed sugars, leading to higher biofuel yields [61]. Researchers are also engineering microorganisms to tolerate the inhibitory compounds produced during biomass pretreatment, further improving fermentation efficiency [62].
2) *Optimizing photosynthetic organisms for biofuel production*: In addition to microbes, synthetic biology is being used to engineer plants and algae for biofuel production. By modifying the metabolic pathways of photosynthetic organisms, researchers aim to increase their biomass yields, reduce their lignin content, and enhance their stress resistance [63]. For example, genetic modifications can reduce lignin biosynthesis in plants, making it easier to break down their cellulose content. In algae, synthetic biology is being used to increase lipid production, which can be converted into biodiesel [64].
3) *CRISPR and genome editing*: The advent of CRISPR-Cas9 and other genome editing technologies has revolutionized the field of synthetic biology. These tools allow precise and targeted modifications of microbial and plant genomes, enabling the fine-tuning of metabolic pathways involved in biofuel production [65]. For example, CRISPR has been used to knock out genes that hinder sugar fermentation in microbial strains or to insert genes that enhance enzyme production. The flexibility and precision of these genome-editing tools offer new possibilities for optimizing biofuel production systems [66].

C. Integration of biofuel production with biorefineries

The concept of biorefineries, facilities that produce not only biofuels but also a range of valuable bioproducts from biomass—is gaining traction as a sustainable and economically viable approach to lignocellulosic biofuel production. In a biorefinery, biomass is fractionated into its constituent components (cellulose, hemicellulose, and lignin), which are then used to produce biofuels, biochemicals, bioplastics, and other high-value products.

1) *Co-production of bioproducts*: One of the key advantages of biorefineries is their ability to generate multiple revenue streams by producing a diverse array of bioproducts. For example, while cellulose can be converted into biofuels, lignin can be used to produce renewable chemicals, such as phenols and aromatic compounds [67]. Hemicellulose-derived sugars can be used for the production of bio-based chemicals, such as xylitol, furfural, and other platform chemicals. This co-production approach not only improves the economic viability of biofuel production but also reduces waste and enhances resource efficiency [68].
2) *Biorefineries for circular economy*: The integration of biofuel production with biorefineries aligns with the principles of a circular economy, where waste is minimized, and resources are fully utilized. By converting lignocellulosic biomass into biofuels and other valuable products, biorefineries can contribute to a more sustainable and resource-efficient bioeconomy [69]. Furthermore, the use of agricultural residues and other waste materials as feedstocks for biorefineries reduces the environmental impact of biomass cultivation and avoids competition with food crops.
3) *Decentralized biorefineries*: Another promising innovation is the development of decentralized biorefineries, which can be located close to biomass production sites. This reduces the need for long-distance biomass transport, lowering both costs and greenhouse gas emissions [70]. Decentralized biorefineries can also support rural economies by creating local jobs and promoting sustainable agricultural practices [70].

VI. CHALLENGES AND BOTTLENECKS IN LIGNOCELLULOSIC BIOFUEL PRODUCTION

Despite significant advancements in lignocellulosic biofuel production, numerous challenges and bottlenecks continue to hinder its widespread adoption. These challenges are primarily economic, technological, and environmental. For lignocellulosic biofuels to become a viable alternative to fossil fuels, these issues must be addressed to improve efficiency, reduce costs, and ensure environmental sustainability.

A. Economic Challenges

The economic feasibility of lignocellulosic biofuel production remains one of the primary bottlenecks, preventing its large-scale commercialization. The production process involves several costly steps, which significantly increase the final price of biofuels compared to conventional fossil fuels.

1) *High costs of pretreatment*: Pretreatment processes, which are necessary to break down the complex structure of lignocellulosic biomass, are energy-intensive and costly. While chemical pretreatments, such as acid hydrolysis and steam explosion, are effective, they often require expensive reagents and specialized equipment [71]. Furthermore, the recovery and neutralization of chemicals used in these processes can add to operational costs.
2) *Enzyme production costs*: Enzymatic hydrolysis, which is critical for breaking down cellulose into fermentable sugars, relies on cellulases and other enzymes. The commercial production of these enzymes remains expensive, accounting for a significant portion of the overall biofuel production cost [72]. Although advances in enzyme engineering have improved enzyme efficiency, the large-scale production of cost-effective enzymes remains a challenge.
3) *Market competition*: Lignocellulosic biofuels are not yet competitive with fossil fuels in terms of cost, largely due to the high capital and operational expenses involved in their production. Additionally, the volatile prices of fossil fuels can affect the market viability of biofuels [73]. Without significant government subsidies or incentives, lignocellulosic biofuels are unlikely to compete in the global energy market.
4) *Infrastructure investment*: Commercializing biofuels requires significant investment in infrastructure for biomass collection, transport, and processing [74]. These costs can be prohibitive, particularly in regions where lignocellulosic biomass is not readily available.

B. Technological limitations

Technological advancements are essential for improving the efficiency and scalability of lignocellulosic biofuel production. However, several technological bottlenecks persist in key stages of the production process.

1) *Inefficiencies in pretreatment*: Current pretreatment technologies, while effective in breaking down biomass, often lack efficiency and scalability.

Many pretreatment methods, such as acid or alkaline hydrolysis, are difficult to control, leading to incomplete breakdown of biomass or the formation of inhibitory by-products, such as furfural and hydroxymethylfurfural (HMF), which can hinder subsequent fermentation steps [71].

2) *Enzymatic hydrolysis challenges*: Although enzymatic hydrolysis is a crucial step in the conversion of cellulose to sugars, the process is slow and often incomplete. The efficiency of enzyme action is affected by several factors, including substrate accessibility, enzyme inhibition by end-products, and the presence of lignin, which limits enzyme binding [75]. Moreover, the synergistic activity required among different cellulases adds complexity to the process, necessitating optimization of enzyme cocktails for each type of biomass.
3) *Fermentation inefficiencies*: Microbial fermentation is another critical bottleneck, particularly when dealing with lignocellulosic hydrolysates, which contain a mixture of hexose (glucose) and pentose (xylose) sugars. Many traditional microbial strains, such as *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, can only ferment hexoses, leaving pentoses unutilized [76]. Despite advances in metabolic engineering, the co-fermentation of both hexose and pentose sugars remains a challenge. Additionally, the fermentation process is sensitive to the inhibitory compounds present in lignocellulosic hydrolysates, leading to reduced biofuel yields [77].
4) *Product recovery and purification*: Extracting and purifying biofuels from fermentation broths is an energy-intensive process. For ethanol, distillation is commonly used, but it requires substantial energy inputs, which reduces the overall energy balance of the process [78]. New, energy-efficient methods of product recovery, such as membrane separation and adsorption, are under development but have yet to be widely adopted [78].

C. *Environmental impacts and sustainability concerns*

While lignocellulosic biofuels are often promoted as a more sustainable alternative to fossil fuels, there are several environmental and sustainability concerns associated with their large-scale production.

1) *Land use and resource allocation*: The large-scale production of lignocellulosic biofuels requires significant amounts of land for biomass cultivation. This raises concerns about land use competition with food crops, particularly in regions facing food security challenges. In some cases, the expansion of biomass cultivation could lead to deforestation or the conversion of natural ecosystems, resulting in biodiversity loss and increased greenhouse gas emissions [79].
2) *Water consumption*: Biomass cultivation and biofuel production are water-intensive processes. Growing dedicated energy crops, such as switchgrass or miscanthus, requires substantial irrigation, especially in regions with limited rainfall [80]. Moreover, water is needed for various stages of biofuel production, including biomass pretreatment and fermentation. Ensuring that biofuel production does not exacerbate water scarcity issues is a key sustainability challenge.
3) *Greenhouse gas emissions*: While biofuels are considered to have a lower carbon footprint than fossil fuels, the overall lifecycle emissions of lignocellulosic biofuels depend on several factors, including the type of biomass used, the cultivation practices employed, and the energy sources used in processing. If biomass is grown on previously forested land, the carbon released through deforestation could offset the carbon savings from using biofuels [81]. Additionally, the energy required for pretreatment, enzyme production, and biofuel recovery can contribute to greenhouse gas emissions if it is derived from non-renewable sources.
4) *Soil health and biodiversity*: Large-scale biomass harvesting can deplete soil nutrients and reduce soil organic matter, potentially affecting soil health and long-term agricultural productivity. Additionally, monoculture cultivation of energy crops can reduce biodiversity and disrupt local ecosystems [82]. Sustainable biomass production practices, such as crop rotation, polyculture, and the use of marginal lands, are essential to minimize these environmental impacts.

VII. CONCLUSION

The development of lignocellulosic biofuels presents a crucial opportunity for sustainable energy, addressing both climate change and fossil fuel dependency. Efficient pretreatment and bioconversion technologies are key to unlocking the potential of this biomass source, with recent innovations, such as consolidated bioprocessing, plasma-assisted pretreatment, and synthetic biology applications, showing promise in overcoming technical and economic challenges. By integrating hydrolysis and fermentation in a single step, CBP reduces production costs, while engineered microbial strains and metabolic pathways are driving increased biofuel yields. Future research should focus on creating more sustainable and cost-effective pretreatment methods, scaling up bioconversion technologies, and examining the environmental impacts of large-scale biomass utilization. Lignocellulosic biofuels offer a pathway toward a circular economy that supports energy independence and environmental health, making continued research and collaboration essential to advancing this field for a sustainable and resilient energy future.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author is deeply grateful to everyone who offered valuable support and assistance throughout the entire development of this manuscript, from the initial idea and drafting to the final revisions and edits. Each contributor's role in improving the quality and integrity of the work is greatly appreciated.

IX. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares that there are no conflicts of interest related to this publication.

REFERENCES

[1] P. K. Ozili and E. Ozen, "Global Energy Crisis," in The Impact of Climate Change and Sustainability Standards on the Insurance Market, 2023, pp. 439–454. doi: 10.1002/9781394167944.ch29.

[2] N. Restrepo López, "The global energy crisis as an opportunity," Cuad. Adm., vol. 38, no. 74, p. e1012759, 2023, doi: 10.25100/cdea.v38i74.12759.

[3] N. Khan, K. Sudhakar, and R. Mamat, "Role of biofuels in energy transition, green economy and carbon neutrality," Sustainability (Switzerland), vol. 13, no. 22. 2021. doi: 10.3390/su132212374.

[4] Y. Lu, Q. He, G. Fan, Q. Cheng, and G. Song, "Extraction and modification of hemicellulose from lignocellulosic biomass: A review," Green Processing and Synthesis, vol. 10, no. 1. pp. 779–804, 2021. doi: 10.1515/gps-2021-0065.

[5] J. A. Okolie, S. Nanda, A. K. Dalai, and J. A. Kozinski, "Chemistry and Specialty Industrial Applications of Lignocellulosic Biomass," Waste and Biomass Valorization, vol. 12, no. 5. pp. 2145–2169, 2021. doi: 10.1007/s12649-020-01123-0.

[6] A. R. Mankar, A. Pandey, A. Modak, and K. K. Pant, "Pretreatment of lignocellulosic biomass: A review on recent advances," Bioresource Technology, vol. 334. 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.biortech.2021.125235.

[7] R. Musule et al., "Chemical composition of lignocellulosic biomass in the wood of Abies religiosa across an altitudinal gradient," J. Wood Sci., vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 537–547, 2016, doi: 10.1007/s10086-016-1585-0.

[8] C. Falco, N. Baccile, and M. M. Titirici, "Morphological and structural differences between glucose, cellulose and lignocellulosic biomass derived hydrothermal carbons," Green Chem., vol. 13, no. 11, pp. 3273–3281, 2011, doi: 10.1039/c1gc15742f.

[9] N. Das, P. K. Jena, D. Padhi, M. Kumar Mohanty, and G. Sahoo, "A comprehensive review of characterization, pretreatment and its applications on different lignocellulosic biomass for bioethanol production," Biomass Conversion and Biorefinery, vol. 13, no. 2. pp. 1503–1527, 2023. doi: 10.1007/s13399-021-01294-3.

[10] C. Sawatdeenarunat, K. C. Surendra, D. Takara, H. Oechsner, and S. K. Khanal, "Anaerobic digestion of lignocellulosic biomass: Challenges and opportunities," Bioresource Technology, vol. 178. pp. 178–186, 2015. doi: 10.1016/j.biortech.2014.09.103.

[11] S. Paul and A. Dutta, "Challenges and opportunities of lignocellulosic biomass for anaerobic digestion," Resources, Conservation and Recycling, vol. 130. pp. 164–174, 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2017.12.005.

[12] S. J. Hall, W. Huang, V. I. Timokhin, and K. E. Hammel, "Lignin lags, leads, or limits the decomposition of litter and soil organic carbon," in Ecology, 2020. doi: 10.1002/ecy.3113.

[13] L. Yang, F. Xu, X. Ge, and Y. Li, "Challenges and strategies for solid-state anaerobic digestion of lignocellulosic biomass," Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, vol. 44. pp. 824–834, 2015. doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2015.01.002.

[14] F. A. F. Antunes et al., "Overcoming challenges in lignocellulosic biomass pretreatment for second-generation (2G) sugar production: emerging role of nano, biotechnological and promising approaches," 3 Biotech, vol. 9, no. 6. 2019. doi: 10.1007/s13205-019-1761-1.

[15] Y. Zheng, J. Zhao, F. Xu, and Y. Li, "Pretreatment of lignocellulosic biomass for enhanced biogas production," Progress in Energy and Combustion Science, vol. 42, no. 1. pp. 35–53, 2014. doi: 10.1016/j.pecs.2014.01.001.

[16] V. Ashokkumar et al., "Recent advances in lignocellulosic biomass for biofuels and value-added bioproducts - A critical review," Bioresource Technology, vol. 344. 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.biortech.2021.126195.

[17] M. Garuti et al., "Mechanical pretreatments of different agri-based feedstock in full-scale biogas plants under real operational conditions," Biomass and Bioenergy, vol. 158, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.biombioe.2022.106352.

[18] C. Rodriguez, A. Alaswad, Z. El-Hassan, and A. G. Olabi, "Mechanical pretreatment of waste paper for biogas production," Waste Manag., vol. 68, pp. 157–164, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.wasman.2017.06.040.

[19] N. H. N. Do, K. H. Ho, V. V. Nguyen, and P. K. Le, "Novel recycling of pineapple leaves into cellulose microfibers by two-step grinding of ball milling and high-speed rotor–stator homogenization," J. Polym. Res., vol. 29, no. 6, 2022, doi: 10.1007/s10965-022-03081-8.

[20] D. Konan, E. Koffi, A. Ndao, E. C. Peterson, D. Rodrigue, and K. Adjallé, "An Overview of Extrusion as a Pretreatment Method of Lignocellulosic Biomass," Energies, vol. 15, no. 9, 2022, doi: 10.3390/en15093002.

[21] N. G, "Chemical Pretreatment of Agricultural Feedstock for Enhanced Production of Cellulase by Mutant Fungus, Aspergillus Niger," J. Appl. Biotechnol. Bioeng., vol. 1, no. 1, 2016, doi: 10.15406/jabb.2016.01.00004.

[22] O. Awogbemi and D. V. Von Kallon, "Pretreatment techniques for agricultural waste," Case Stud. Chem. Environ. Eng., vol. 6, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.cscee.2022.100229.

[23] D. Kumari and R. Singh, "Pretreatment of lignocellulosic wastes for biofuel production: A critical review," Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, vol. 90. pp. 877–891, 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2018.03.111.

[24] Y. Messaoudi, N. Smichi, N. Moujahed, and M. Gargouri, "Hydrothermal and Chemical Pretreatment Process for Bioethanol Production from Agricultural and Forest Lignocellulosic Wastes: Design and Modeling," Chem. Africa, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 2381–2391, 2023, doi: 10.1007/s42250-022-00563-6.

[25] S. Periyasamy et al., "Chemical, physical and biological methods to convert lignocellulosic waste into value-added products. A review," Environmental Chemistry Letters, vol. 20, no. 2. pp. 1129–1152, 2022. doi: 10.1007/s10311-021-01374-w.

[26] B. Basak et al., "Advances in physicochemical pretreatment strategies for lignocellulose biomass and their effectiveness in bioconversion for biofuel production," Bioresour. Technol., vol. 369, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.biortech.2022.128413.

[27] P. Wang et al., "Effect of physicochemical pretreatments plus enzymatic hydrolysis on the composition and morphologic structure of corn straw," Renew. Energy, vol. 138, pp. 502–508, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.renene.2019.01.118.

[28] W. Huang et al., "Effect of physicochemical pretreatments and enzymatic hydrolysis on corn straw degradation and reducing sugar yield," BioResources, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 7002–7015, 2017, doi: 10.15376/biores.12.4.7002-7015.

[29] X. Li, Y. Shi, W. Kong, J. Wei, W. Song, and S. Wang, "Improving enzymatic hydrolysis of lignocellulosic biomass by bio-coordinated physicochemical pretreatment—A review," Energy Reports, vol. 8. pp. 696–709, 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.egyr.2021.12.015.

[30] B. J. Ma, Y. Sun, K. Y. Lin, B. Li, and W. Y. Liu, "Physicochemical pretreatments and hydrolysis of furfural residues via carbon-based sulfonated solid acid," Bioresour. Technol., vol. 156, pp. 189–194, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.biortech.2014.01.059.

[31] S. Meenakshisundaram, A. Fayeulle, E. Leonard, C. Ceballos, and A. Pauss, "Fiber degradation and carbohydrate production by combined biological and chemical/physicochemical pretreatment methods of lignocellulosic biomass – A review," Bioresource Technology, vol. 331. 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.biortech.2021.125053.

[32] E. A. Omondi and A. A. Kegode, "The Role of Physicochemical Pretreatment in Lignocellulosic Biomass Energy Valorisation – A Review," World J. Environ. Biosci., vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 7–19, 2023, doi: 10.51847/fqagfxthhp.

[33] Z. Wu et al., "Lignocellulose dissociation with biological pretreatment towards the biochemical platform: A review," Materials Today Bio, vol. 16. 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.mtbio.2022.100445.

[34] A. O. Wagner, N. Lackner, M. Mutschlechner, E. M. Prem, R. Markt, and P. Illmer, "Biological pretreatment strategies for second-generation lignocellulosic resources to enhance biogas production," Energies, vol. 11, no. 7. 2018. doi: 10.3390/en11071797.

[35] M. Ferdeș, M. N. Dincă, G. Moiceanu, B. Ș. Zabava, and G. Paraschiv, "Microorganisms and enzymes used in the biological pretreatment of the substrate to enhance biogas production: A review," Sustainability (Switzerland), vol. 12, no. 17. 2020. doi: 10.3390/su12177205.

[36] R. Sindhu, P. Binod, and A. Pandey, "Biological pretreatment of lignocellulosic biomass - An overview," Bioresource Technology, vol. 199. pp. 76–82, 2016. doi: 10.1016/j.biortech.2015.08.030.

[37] H. M. Zabed et al., "Recent advances in biological pretreatment of microalgae and lignocellulosic biomass for biofuel production," Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, vol. 105. pp. 105–128, 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2019.01.048.

[38] Michael Ioelovich, "Thermodynamics of enzymatic hydrolysis of cellulose," World J. Adv. Res. Rev., vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 577–586, 2023, doi: 10.30574/wjarr.2024.21.2.0458.

[39] G. P. Philippidis, T. K. Smith, and C. E. Wyman, "Study of the enzymatic hydrolysis of cellulose for production of fuel ethanol by the simultaneous saccharification and fermentation process," Biotechnol. Bioeng., vol. 41, no. 9, pp. 846–853, 1993, doi: 10.1002/bit.260410903.

[40] S. Ma et al., "CAOSA-extracted lignin improves enzymatic hydrolysis of cellulose," Green Energy Environ., vol. 9, no. 7, pp. 1101–1111, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.gee.2023.05.009.

[41] B. Koo, J. Jo, and S. M. Cho, "Drying effect on enzymatic hydrolysis of cellulose associated with porosity and crystallinity," Appl. Sci., vol. 10, no. 16, 2020, doi: 10.3390/app10165545.

[42] Y. Gu, J. Guo, A. Nawaz, I. ul Haq, X. Zhou, and Y. Xu, "Comprehensive investigation of multiples factors in sulfuric acid pretreatment on the enzymatic hydrolysis of waste straw cellulose," Bioresour. Technol., vol. 340, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.biortech.2021.125740.

[43] K. Szentner et al., "Enzymatic hydrolysis of cellulose using extracts from insects," Carbohydr. Res., vol. 485, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.carres.2019.107811.

[44] O. Ibrahim, "Microbial fermentation: Enzymes, metabolic pathways and fermentation aspects," Ferment. Technol., vol. 3, no. 2, p. 92, 2015, [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.4172/2167-7972.S1.003

[45] S. Manikandan et al., "Critical review of biochemical pathways to transformation of waste and biomass into bioenergy," Bioresource Technology, vol. 372. 2023. doi: 10.1016/j.biortech.2023.128679.

[46] C. J. Hurst, "MICROBIAL FERMENTATION," in Microbial Fermentations in Nature and as Designed Processes, 2023, pp. 1–102. doi: 10.1002/9781119850007.ch1.

[47] M. Saini, S. Y. Li, Z. W. Wang, C. J. Chiang, and Y. P. Chao, "Systematic engineering of the central metabolism in Escherichia coli for effective production of n-butanol," Biotechnol. Biofuels, vol. 9, no. 1, 2016, doi: 10.1186/s13068-016-0467-4.

[48] S. Periyasamy et al., "Recent advances in consolidated bioprocessing for conversion of lignocellulosic biomass into bioethanol – A review," Chem. Eng. J., vol. 453, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.cej.2022.139783.

[49] A. Banner, H. S. Toogood, and N. S. Scrutton, "Consolidated bioprocessing: Synthetic biology routes to fuels and fine chemicals," Microorganisms, vol. 9, no. 5. 2021. doi: 10.3390/microorganisms9051079.

[50] E. Olguin-Maciel, A. Singh, R. Chable-Villacis, R. Tapia-Tussell, and H. A. Ruiz, "Consolidated bioprocessing, an innovative strategy towards sustainability for biofuels production from crop residues: An overview," Agronomy, vol. 10, no. 11. 2020. doi: 10.3390/agronomy10111834.

[51] S. K. Bhatia et al., "Recent developments in pretreatment technologies on lignocellulosic biomass: Effect of key parameters, technological improvements, and challenges," Bioresource Technology, vol. 300. 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.biortech.2019.122724.

[52] [52] A. Pandey, Y. W. Tong, L. Zhang, and J. Zhang, Biomass, Biofuels, Biochemicals: Microbial Fermentation of Biowastes. 2022. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-323-90633-3.00051-1.

[53] R. Saha, D. Bhattacharya, and M. Mukhopadhyay, "Enhanced production of biohydrogen from lignocellulosic feedstocks using microorganisms: A comprehensive review," Energy Convers. Manag. X, vol. 13, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.ecmx.2021.100153.

[54] P. K. Das, A. Sahoo, and V. Dasu Veeranki, "Engineered yeasts for lignocellulosic bioethanol production," in Advances in Yeast Biotechnology for Biofuels and Sustainability: Value-Added Products and Environmental Remediation Applications, 2023, pp. 47–72. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-323-95449-5.00013-8.

[55] H. Liu et al., "An accessory enzymatic system of cellulase for simultaneous saccharification and co-fermentation," Bioresour. Bioprocess., vol. 9, no. 1, 2022, doi: 10.1186/s40643-022-00585-5.

[56] A. Arora, P. Nandal, J. Singh, and M. L. Verma, "Nanobiotechnological advancements in lignocellulosic biomass pretreatment," Mater. Sci. Energy Technol., vol. 3, pp. 308–318, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.mset.2019.12.003.

[57] A. P. Ingle, A. K. Chandel, F. A. F. Antunes, M. Rai, and S. S. da Silva, “New trends in application of nanotechnology for the pretreatment of lignocellulosic biomass,” Biofuels, Bioproducts and Biorefining, vol. 13, no. 3. pp. 776–788, 2019. doi: 10.1002/bbb.1965.
[58] T. Zhang, T. Doert, H. Wang, S. Zhang, and M. Ruck, “Inorganic Synthesis Based on Reactions of Ionic Liquids and Deep Eutectic Solvents,” Angewandte Chemie - International Edition, vol. 60, no. 41. pp. 22148–22165, 2021. doi: 10.1002/anie.202104035.
[59] Y. Chen and T. Mu, “Revisiting greenness of ionic liquids and deep eutectic solvents,” Green Chemical Engineering, vol. 2, no. 2. pp. 174–186, 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.gce.2021.01.004.
[60] N. Wei, E. J. Oh, G. Million, J. H. D. Cate, and Y. S. Jin, “Simultaneous Utilization of Cellobiose, Xylose, and Acetic Acid from Lignocellulosic Biomass for Biofuel Production by an Engineered Yeast Platform,” ACS Synth. Biol., vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 707–713, 2015, doi: 10.1021/sb500364q.
[61] M. Gao, D. Ploessl, and Z. Shao, “Enhancing the co-utilization of biomass-derived mixed sugars by yeasts,” Front. Microbiol., vol. 10, no. JAN, 2019, doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2018.03264.
[62] H. Sakuragi, H. Morisaka, K. Kuroda, and M. Ueda, “Enhanced butanol production by eukaryotic Saccharomyces cerevisiae engineered to contain an improved pathway,” Biosci. Biotechnol. Biochem., vol. 79, no. 2, pp. 314–320, 2015, doi: 10.1080/09168451.2014.972330.
[63] S. Stephens, R. Mahadevan, and D. G. Allen, “Engineering Photosynthetic Bioprocesses for Sustainable Chemical Production: A Review,” Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology, vol. 8. 2021. doi: 10.3389/fbioe.2020.610723.
[64] T. R. Treece, J. N. Gonzales, J. R. Pressley, and S. Atsumi, “Synthetic Biology Approaches for Improving Chemical Production in Cyanobacteria,” Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology, vol. 10. 2022. doi: 10.3389/fbioe.2022.869195.
[65] S. Shanmugam, H. H. Ngo, and Y. R. Wu, “Advanced CRISPR/Cas-based genome editing tools for microbial biofuels production: A review,” Renewable Energy, vol. 149. pp. 1107–1119, 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.renene.2019.10.107.
[66] D. Garg, M. K. Samota, N. Kontis, N. Patel, S. Bala, and A. S. Rosado, “Revolutionizing biofuel generation: Unleashing the power of CRISPR-Cas mediated gene editing of extremophiles,” Microbiological Research, vol. 274. 2023. doi: 10.1016/j.micres.2023.127443.
[67] E. C. de Siqueira and E. Toksoy Öner, “Co-production of levan with other high-value bioproducts: A review,” International Journal of Biological Macromolecules, vol. 235. 2023. doi: 10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2023.123800.
[68] M. I. Vélez-Mercado, C. A. Espinosa-Lavenant, J. G. Flores-Iga, F. H. Teran, M. de Lourdes Froto Madariaga, and N. Balagurusamy, “Co-production of biosurfactants and other bioproducts in biorefineries,” in Biosurfactants and Sustainability: From Biorefineries Production to Versatile Applications, 2023, pp. 157–171. doi: 10.1002/9781119854395.ch8.
[69] A. Arias, G. Feijoo, and M. T. Moreira, “Biorefineries as a driver for sustainability: Key aspects, actual development and future prospects,” J. Clean. Prod., vol. 418, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.137925.
[70] R. T. L. Ng, P. Fasahati, K. Huang, and C. T. Maravelias, “Utilizing stillage in the biorefinery: Economic, technological and energetic analysis,” Appl. Energy, vol. 241, pp. 491–503, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.03.020.
[71] W. Y. Cheah et al., “Pretreatment methods for lignocellulosic biofuels production: Current advances, challenges and future prospects,” Biofuel Research Journal, vol. 7, no. 1. pp. 1115–1127, 2020. doi: 10.18331/BRJ2020.7.1.4.
[72] D. Klein-Marcuschamer, P. Oleskowicz-Popiel, B. A. Simmons, and H. W. Blanch, “The challenge of enzyme cost in the production of lignocellulosic biofuels,” Biotechnol. Bioeng., vol. 109, no. 4, pp. 1083–1087, 2012, doi: 10.1002/bit.24370.
[73] B. Beig et al., “Current challenges and innovative developments in pretreatment of lignocellulosic residues for biofuel production: A review,” Fuel, vol. 287, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.fuel.2020.119670.
[74] L. M. G. Saye, T. A. Navaratna, J. P. J. Chong, M. A. O’malley, M. K. Theodorou, and M. Reilly, “The anaerobic fungi: Challenges and opportunities for industrial lignocellulosic biofuel production,” Microorganisms, vol. 9, no. 4. 2021. doi: 10.3390/microorganisms9040694.
[75] M. Raud, T. Kikas, O. Sippula, and N. J. Shurpali, “Potentials and challenges in lignocellulosic biofuel production technology,” Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev., vol. 111, pp. 44–56, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2019.05.020.
[76] T. Naz, Y. Nazir, A. B. A. Fazili, K. Mustafa, X. Bai, and Y. Song, “Transformation of lignocellulosic biomass into sustainable biofuels: Major challenges and bioprocessing technologies,” American Journal of Biochemistry and Biotechnology, vol. 16, no. 3. pp. 308–327, 2020. doi: 10.3844/ajbbsp.2020.308.327.
[77] S. G. Arhin, A. Cesaro, F. Di Capua, and G. Esposito, “Recent progress and challenges in biotechnological valorization of lignocellulosic materials: Towards sustainable biofuels and platform chemicals synthesis,” Science of the Total Environment, vol. 857. 2023. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.159333.
[78] A. Adewuyi, “Underutilized Lignocellulosic Waste as Sources of Feedstock for Biofuel Production in Developing Countries,” Frontiers in Energy Research, vol. 10. 2022. doi: 10.3389/fenrg.2022.741570.
[79] Y. K.N et al., “Lignocellulosic Biorefinery Technologies: A Perception into Recent Advances in Biomass Fractionation, Biorefineries, Economic Hurdles and Market Outlook,” Fermentation, vol. 9, no. 3. 2023. doi: 10.3390/fermentation9030238.
[80] K. K. Jaiswal et al., “Renewable and sustainable clean energy development and impact on social, economic, and environmental health,” Energy Nexus, vol. 7. 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.nexus.2022.100118.
[81] A. Akbarian, A. Andooz, E. Kowsari, S. Ramakrishna, S. Asgari, and Z. A. Cheshmeh, “Challenges and opportunities of lignocellulosic biomass gasification in the path of circular bioeconomy,” Bioresource Technology, vol. 362. 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.biortech.2022.127774.
[82] N. Arun and A. K. Dalai, “Environmental and socioeconomic impact assessment of biofuels from lignocellulosic biomass,” in Lignocellulosic Biomass to Liquid Biofuels, 2019, pp. 283–299. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-815936-1.00009-5.