



**Simultaneous Saccharification and Co-Fermentation  
Using Co-Culture for Conversion of Mango Leaves  
into Bioethanol**

by

**Tarrsini.M A/P Mahadevan  
(1741112528)**

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

**Faculty of Chemical Engineering Technology  
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PERLIS**

2022

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere indebtedness and utmost gratitude to my appa, Mr. Mahadevan Sivasubramaniam and my amma, Mrs. Rajeswarie Reno. I am unable to find the appropriate words to describe my appreciation for their motivation, financial supports and the faith they had in me. In other words, it is my pleasure to declare that without them and both my siblings, Deshan and Thaanushah, I will not be where I am now.

Furthermore, I am sincerely thankful to my supervisor Dr. Ng Qi Hwa for his supervisions, ideas, invaluable guidance, continuous encouragement, caring and friendly nature. Without his inexhaustible support and patience, this thesis would not have been possible. My co-supervisor, Associate Professor Dr. Sam Sung Ting is another person whom I am grateful too. His willingness to help out during the needs of financial aid and his contributions in my study have been very much appreciated. Next, I would like to extend my heartfelt thanks to my co-supervisor from Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, Dr. Teoh Yi Peng for her suggestions throughout my research work.

In addition, my deepest appreciation goes to Dr. Kunasundari Balakrishnan, Dr. Shuit Hoong Siew, Dr. Khadijah Hanim Abdul Rahman, Dr. Noorunnajwa Diyana Yaacob, and Madam Rozaini Abdullah for their constructive recommendations that allowed me to improve the content of my research work. Apart from that, I am pleased to take this opportunity to extend my special thanks to Madam Assyafinar Asri, Miss Fauziah Zainuddin, Madam Siti Aminah Mohd Hassan as well as Madam Nurul Ain Harmiza Abdullah for their enthusiastic advices and useful critiques throughout my study.

Besides, it is a must for me to acknowledge the financial support granted by Fundamental Research Grant Scheme (FRGS) under a grant number of FRGS/1/2017/TK02/UNIMAP/02/7 from the Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia. Moreover, my sincere thanks to Universiti Malaysia Perlis (UniMAP) for providing facilities and fund to support my study. Besides, this would be a great platform to appreciate all the lecturers, teaching engineers and technical unit of UniMAP. They also deserve to be recognized for their guidance especially in the completion of my study.

Last but not least, I would like to thank each and every friend of mine who has lend a hand in completing my study such as, Siti Nur Arina Md Yusuf, Naresh Sandrasekaran, Siti Norsaffirah Zailan, Nurdalilah Othman, Tai Shen Koon, Mohana Sundari Ganesa, Rosmahidayu Rosnan, Natasha Yasmin Hasnol Azahari, and all those whom I might unintentionally left out in expressing my gratitude.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>DECLARATION OF THESIS</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	<b>xii</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>xv</b>
<b>LIST OF SYMBOLS</b>	<b>xvi</b>
<b>ABSTRAK</b>	<b>xvii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>xviii</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background Study	1
1.2 Problem Statement	4
1.3 Research Objectives	6
1.3.1 General Objective	6
1.3.2 Specific Objectives	6
1.4 Research Scope	7
<b>CHAPTER 2 : LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Bioethanol	8
2.1.1 Limitation of First-Generation (1G) Bioethanol Production	9
2.1.2 Prospective of Second-Generation (2G) Bioethanol Production	10

2.2	LC Biomass	14
2.2.1	Mango	14
2.2.2	Competence of Mango Leaves as LC Biomass	16
2.2.3	Mango Varieties	19
2.3	Pretreatment	20
2.3.1	Single-Stage Chemical Pretreatment	24
2.3.2	Two-Stage Chemical Pretreatment	25
2.4	Enzymatic Saccharification	27
2.4.1	On-site Saccharification Enzymes Production	30
2.5	Integrated Fermentation Configuration	32
2.5.1	SHF	33
2.5.2	SSF	34
2.5.3	SSCF	36
2.6	Ethanologenic Microorganisms	40
2.7	Process Parameters Affecting Bioethanol Production	43
2.7.1	Temperature	44
2.7.2	pH	46
2.7.3	Substrate Concentration	48
2.7.4	Incubation Time	51
2.8	Unstructured Models for Fermentation Kinetics	53
2.8.1	Microbial Growth	55
2.8.2	Substrate Utilization	57
2.8.3	Product Formation	58
2.9	Concluding Remarks	60
<b>CHAPTER 3 :            METHODODOLOGY</b>		<b>62</b>
3.1	Methodology Flowchart	62
3.2	Chemicals	65

3.3	LC Biomass Preparation	68
3.4	Feasibility Analysis of LC Substrate for Bioethanol Production	68
3.4.1	Moisture Content Determination	68
3.4.2	Biochemical Composition Analysis	69
3.4.2.1	Extractives Content	69
3.4.2.2	Hemicellulose Content	70
3.4.2.3	Lignin Content	70
3.4.2.4	Ash Content	71
3.4.2.5	Cellulose Content	71
3.4.3	Preliminary Enzymatic Saccharification	72
3.4.4	Total Reducing Sugar Analysis	73
3.4.5	Preliminary Bioethanol Production	73
3.5	Chemical Pretreatment	74
3.5.1	Single-Stage Acid/Alkaline Pretreatment	74
3.5.2	Two-Stage Acid-Alkaline/Alkaline-Acid Pretreatment	75
3.5.3	Evaluation on Modifications in LC Biomass after Chemical Pretreatment for Bioethanol Production	75
3.5.3.1	Total Solid Recovery	76
3.5.3.2	Morphological Study	76
3.5.3.3	Crystallinity Index Determination	77
3.5.3.4	Spectroscopic Characterization	77
3.6	Saccharification Enzymes Production	78
3.6.1	Microorganism Maintenance	78
3.6.2	Inoculum Development of <i>A. niger</i>	78
3.6.3	Construction of Growth Profile	79

3.6.4	Saccharification Enzymes Production	79
3.6.5	Saccharification Enzymes Extraction	80
3.6.6	Saccharification Enzyme Activity Evaluation	81
3.6.6.1	Filter Paper Assay (FPA)	81
3.6.6.2	Xylanase Assay	82
3.6.7	Stability Study of Saccharification Enzymes	83
3.7	Statistical Analysis	83
3.8	Compatibility of Co-Culture System	84
3.8.1	Fermentation Microorganisms Maintenance	84
3.8.2	Inoculum Preparation of Fermentation Microorganisms	85
3.8.3	Growth Profile in Enrichment Media	85
3.8.4	Microbial Growth, Reducing Sugar and Bioethanol Profile in Production Media	86
3.9	Study on Process Parameters of Bioethanol Production using SSCF	86
3.9.1	SSCF	86
3.9.2	Screening Process	87
3.9.3	Optimization Process	88
3.10	Selected Unstructured Models for Fermentation Kinetics	89
3.10.1	Microbial Growth Kinetics	89
3.10.2	Substrate Consumption Kinetics	92
3.10.3	Product Formation Kinetics	94
3.10.4	Model Validation	96
3.11	Analytical Methods	96
3.11.1	Dry Cell Mass Determination	96
3.11.2	Reducing Sugar and Bioethanol Concentration Determination	97
<b>CHAPTER 4 : RESULTS &amp; DISCUSSION</b>		<b>98</b>
4.1	Establishment of An Efficient Chemical Pretreatment for LC Substrate	98

4.1.1	Feasibility of Mango Leaves Varieties as LC Biomass for Bioethanol Production	99
4.1.1.1	Preliminary Enzymatic Saccharification	104
4.1.1.2	Preliminary Bioethanol Production	106
4.1.2	Biochemical Composition Analysis of Untreated and Pretreated Harum Manis Mango Leaves	107
4.1.3	Morphological Study	116
4.1.4	Crystallinity Index Determination	120
4.1.5	Spectroscopic Characterization	122
4.1.6	Preliminary Enzymatic Saccharification	125
4.1.7	Preliminary Bioethanol Production	128
4.2	Hydrolytic Potential of On-Site Produced Saccharification Enzymes	130
4.2.1	Cellulase Production	131
4.2.2	Xylanase Production	134
4.2.3	Stability Study of Saccharification Enzymes	136
4.2.3.1	Effect of Temperature on Saccharification Enzyme Activity	136
4.2.3.2	Effect of pH on Saccharification Enzyme Activity	138
4.3	Compatibility of The Proposed Co-Culture System	140
4.3.1	Growth Profile	141
4.3.2	Fermentation Profile	143
4.4	Study on Process Parameters of Bioethanol Production using SSCF	147
4.4.1	Screening Process via Two Full Factorial Design	147
4.4.1.1	Model Significance	150
4.4.1.2	Normal Probability Plot	154
4.4.1.3	Pareto Chart	155
4.4.1.4	Selection of Parameters and Range for Optimization	156

4.4.2	Optimization Process via CCD	158
4.4.2.1	Model Significance	162
4.4.2.2	Confirmation of Experiments and Adequacy of Model	165
4.4.2.3	Effect of pH on Bioethanol Production	167
4.4.2.4	Effect of Temperature on Bioethanol Production	169
4.4.2.5	Effect of Incubation Time on Bioethanol Production	171
4.4.2.6	Interaction between Parameters	172
4.4.2.7	Optimal Design (Validation)	176
4.5	Kinetic Studies of Optimized Bioethanol Production	178
4.5.1	Microbial Growth Kinetic	179
4.5.2	Substrate Consumption Kinetic	182
4.5.3	Product Formation Kinetic	185
<b>CHAPTER 5 :</b>	<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>189</b>
5.1	Conclusions	189
5.2	Recommendations	191
<b>REFERENCES</b>		<b>193</b>
<b>APPENDIX A</b>	<b>GLUCOSE CALIBRATION CURVE</b>	<b>222</b>
<b>APPENDIX B</b>	<b>XYLOSE CALIBRATION CURVE</b>	<b>223</b>
<b>APPENDIX C</b>	<b>ETHANOL CALIBRATION CURVE</b>	<b>224</b>
<b>LIST OF PUBLICATIONS</b>		<b>225</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

	<b>PAGE</b>
Table 2.1: Energy profile of gasoline, corn and cellulosic ethanol	12
Table 2.2: Comparison between 1G and 2G bioethanol production	13
Table 2.3: Composition of various types of LC biomass	18
Table 2.4: Glucan content and glucose yield of corn stover recovered from various pretreatments	26
Table 2.5: Fermentable sugar concentration from enzymatic saccharification of rice straw	30
Table 2.6: Comparative data of integrated fermentation configurations applied in 2G bioethanol production	38
Table 2.7: Optimal temperature for 2G bioethanol production	44
Table 2.8: Optimal pH for 2G bioethanol production	47
Table 2.9: Optimal substrate concentration for 2G bioethanol production	49
Table 2.10: Optimal incubation time for 2G bioethanol production	51
Table 3.1: List of chemicals used in the experimental procedure	65
Table 3.2: Composition of basal media	80
Table 3.3: Details on the variables used in two full factorial design for screening process	87
Table 3.4: Details on the variables used in CCD for optimization process	89
Table 4.1: Reducing sugar concentration and enzymatic hydrolysis efficiency of mango leaves varieties	105

Table 4.2: Bioethanol concentration of mango leaves varieties	106
Table 4.3: Biomass composition of Harum Manis mango leaves after selected pretreatments	108
Table 4.4: CrI of Harum Manis mango leaves before and after various pretreatment methods	121
Table 4.5: Concentration of reducing sugar along with enzymatic hydrolysis efficiency of Harum Manis mango leaves in the raw and chemically pretreated state	126
Table 4.6: Bioethanol concentration of untreated and chemically pretreated Harum Manis mango leaves	129
Table 4.7: Two full factorial design used in the screening process with respect to bioethanol yield	147
Table 4.8: ANOVA of two full factorial design for SSCF based screening process	150
Table 4.9: Multiple correlation coefficients obtained from ANOVA for SSCF based screening process	152
Table 4.10: CCD used in the optimization process with respect to bioethanol yield	159
Table 4.11: ANOVA of CCD for SSCF based optimization process	162
Table 4.12: Statistical parameters obtained from ANOVA for SSCF based optimization process	164
Table 4.13: Predicted and experimental outcome based on the optimized bioethanol production process	177
Table 4.14: Kinetic parameters of microbial growth models	181
Table 4.15: Kinetic parameters of substrate consumption models	184

©This item is protected by original copyright

## LIST OF FIGURES

	<b>PAGE</b>
Figure 2.1: Mango tree located in Institute of Sustainable Agrotechnology (INSAT), UniMAP	15
Figure 2.2: Production of mango in Malaysia	17
Figure 2.3: Effect of pretreatment on LC biomass	22
Figure 2.4: Action site of cellulase on cellulose structure	28
Figure 2.5: Action site of hemicellulose (xylan) hydrolysing enzymes	29
Figure 3.1: Process flow diagram of this study	64
Figure 4.1: Biomass composition of mango leaves varieties	100
Figure 4.2: Effect of selected pretreatment on Harum Manis mango leaves	111
Figure 4.3: SEM Images of Harum Manis mango leaves (a). Without pretreatment, (b). Acid pretreatment, (c). Alkaline pretreatment (d). Acid-alkaline pretreatment and (e). Alkaline-acid pretreatment	117
Figure 4.4: XRD diffractogram of raw and pretreated Harum Manis mango leaves	121
Figure 4.5: FTIR spectra of raw and pretreated Harum Manis mango leaves	123
Figure 4.6: Cellulase activity along with growth profiles of <i>A. niger</i> in enrichment and production media	132
Figure 4.7: Xylanase activity along with growth profiles of <i>A. niger</i> in enrichment and production media	134
Figure 4.8: Effect of temperature on saccharification enzyme activity	137

Figure 4.9: Effect of pH on saccharification enzyme activity	139
Figure 4.10: Growth profile of monoculture along with co-culture in enrichment and production media	141
Figure 4.11: Fermentation profile of <i>S. cerevisiae</i> monoculture in acid-alkaline pretreated Harum Manis mango leaves	144
Figure 4.12: Fermentation profile of <i>T. versicolor</i> monoculture in acid-alkaline pretreated Harum Manis mango leaves	145
Figure 4.13: Fermentation profile of <i>S. cerevisiae</i> and <i>T. versicolor</i> co-culture in acid-alkaline pretreated Harum Manis mango leaves	146
Figure 4.14: Plot of predicted versus actual results of SSCF based screening process	153
Figure 4.15: Normal probability of screening process focused on SSCF based bioethanol production	154
Figure 4.16: Pareto chart of screening process focused on SSCF based bioethanol production	156
Figure 4.17: Normal probability of internally studentized residuals of parameters for SSCF based bioethanol production	165
Figure 4.18: Plot of internally studentized residuals versus predicted response for parameters for SSCF based bioethanol production	166
Figure 4.19: One factor plot of pH for optimization of SSCF based bioethanol production	167
Figure 4.20: One factor plot of temperature for optimization of SSCF based bioethanol production	169
Figure 4.21: One factor plot of incubation time for optimization of SSCF based bioethanol production	171

Figure 4.22: 3D response surface and 2D contour plots showing interaction between pH and temperature on the response of SSCF based bioethanol production, bioethanol yield	173
Figure 4.23: 3D response surface and 2D contour plots showing interaction between pH and incubation time on the response of SSCF based bioethanol production, bioethanol yield	174
Figure 4.24: 3D response surface and 2D contour plots showing interaction between temperature and incubation time on the response of SSCF based bioethanol production, bioethanol yield	175
Figure 4.25: Ramps of pH, temperature, incubation time and bioethanol yield	176
Figure 4.26: Microbial growth kinetic of <i>S. cerevisiae</i> and <i>T. versicolor</i> co-culture with experimental and predicted data	180
Figure 4.27: Substrate utilization kinetic of <i>S. cerevisiae</i> and <i>T. versicolor</i> co-culture with experimental and predicted data	183
Figure 4.28: Product formation kinetic of <i>S. cerevisiae</i> and <i>T. versicolor</i> co-culture with experimental and predicted data	186

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
ATP	Adenosine Triphosphate
CCD	Central Composite Design
DNS	Dinitrosalicylic Acid
FPA	Filter Paper Assay
FPU	Filter Paper Unit
FRIM	Forest Research Institute Malaysia
FTIR	Fourier Transform Infrared
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
HPLC	High Performance Liquid Chromatography
INSAT	Institute of Sustainable Agrotechnology
IU	International Unit
IUPAC	International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry
LAP	Laboratory Analytical Procedure
LC	Lignocellulosic
MYGP	Malt Yeast Glucose Peptone
NREL	National Renewable Energy Laboratory
PDA	Potato Dextrose Agar
PDB	Potato Dextrose Broth
RED	Renewable Energy Directive
RMSD	Root Mean Square Deviation
RSM	Response Surface Methodology
SEM	Scanning Electron Microscope
SHF	Separate Hydrolysis and Fermentation
SSCF	Simultaneous Saccharification and Co-Fermentation
SSF	Simultaneous Saccharification and Fermentation
TSS	Total Soluble Solids
XRD	X-Ray Diffraction
1G	First-Generation
2G	Second-Generation

## LIST OF SYMBOLS

cm	Centimeter
°	Degree
°C	Degree Celsius
g	Gram
h	Hour
kV	Kilovolt
$\lambda$	Lambda (Wavelength)
L	Liter
$\mu$ L	Microliter
mL	Milliliter
mg	Milligram
mm	Millimeter
mM	Millimolar
min	Minute
M	Molar
nm	Nanometer
%	Percentage
rpm	Revolutions per minute
w/v	Weight to volume ratio
w/w	Weight to weight ratio

©This item is protected by original copyright

## Pensakaridaan Serentak dan Ko-Fermentasi Menggunakan Ko-Kultur untuk Pertukaran Daun Mangga kepada Bioetanol

### ABSTRAK

Persaingan makanan berbanding bahan api telah mendorong minat negara terhadap bioetanol sekunder, yang dihasilkan dari biojisim lignoselulosa (LC). Daun mangga (*Mangifera indica*) telah diakui sebagai sisa pertanian yang tidak boleh dimakan berpotensi dijadikan substrat untuk bioetanol berasaskan LC kerana kandungan polisakarida yang tinggi. Selain itu, pensakaridaan serentak dan ko-fermentasi (SSCF) dikenali sebagai keadah effective untuk meningkatkan produksi bioetanol sekunder ini. Namun demikian, ko-kultur untuk menukar kedua-dua gula heksosa dan pentosa dalam daun mangga secara serentak kepada bioetanol masih belum ditemui. Oleh itu, kajian ini menekankan pada pertukaran daun mangga kepada bioetanol menggunakan *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* dan *Trametes versicolor* melalui SSCF. Pada mulanya, perbandingan komposisi biojisim antara varieti daun mangga menunjukkan Harum Manis merupakan sumber bioetanol yang paling wajar kerana mengandungi holoselulosa (78.73 %), kepekatan gula fermentasi ( $163.83 \pm 5.48$  mg/g biojisim) dan bioetanol ( $0.21 \pm 0.02$  g/L) yang lebih tinggi berbanding Chokanan dan Sunshine. Seterusnya, kajian ini bertujuan untuk menjelaskan perubahan struktur daun manga Harum Manis selepas pra-rawatan kimia tunggal (asid atau alkali) dan berperingkat (asid-alkali atau alkali-asid). Pra-rawatan berperingkat asid-alkali dengan kesan pendeligninan paling ketara ( $86.97 \pm 1.26$  %) membolehkan biojisim menghasilkan komposisi holoselulosa, kandungan gula fermentasi dan kepekatan bioethanol yang tertinggi iaitu masing-masing pada 95.26 %,  $415.02 \pm 7.01$  mg/g biojisim dan  $1.57 \pm 0.06$  mg/mL. Di samping itu, pencirian struktur mengesahkan bahawa biojisim selepas pra-rawatan asid-alkali merupakan substrat yang paling sesuai untuk pengeluaran bioetanol dalam kajian ini. Seterusnya, selulase dan xilanase telah disintesis daripada *Aspergillus niger* dengan aktiviti enzimatik masing-masing pada  $0.413 \pm 0.014$  FPU/mL dan  $0.514 \pm 0.009$  IU/mL dalam kajian ini. Kedua-kedua enzim ini telah terbukti sesuai untuk sakarifikasi enzimatik semasa penghasilan bioethanol. Selepas itu, kajian ini juga menunjukkan bahawa *S. cerevisiae* dan *T. versicolor* serasi sebagai ko-kultur untuk meningkatkan ko-fermentasi glukosa dan xilosa dalam daun mangga kepada bioetanol dengan ketara. Dengan ini, penghasilan bioetanol berdasarkan SSCF yang ditentukan telah disaring dan dioptimumkan. Hasilnya, keadaan optimum pada suhu: 30.68 °C, pH: 5 dan masa inkubasi: 5.08 hari telah menyumbang kepada produksi bioetanol maksimum sebanyak  $79.59 \pm 0.32$  %. Akhirnya, kinetik pengeluaran bioetanol ini dikaji. Model Logistik dan model Modifikasi Gompertz ditemui untuk memahami sintesis sel ko-kultur, penggunaan substrat, dan pembentukan produk yang berlaku semasa pengeluaran bioetanol ini. Secara keseluruhannya, potensi penambahbaikan untuk proses SSCF ini dapat diterokai menggunakan pandangan kinetik yang diperolehi untuk pertukaran daun mangga kepada bioetanol secara berkesan.

## Simultaneous Saccharification and Co-Fermentation Using Co-Culture for Conversion of Mango Leaves into Bioethanol

### ABSTRACT

The food versus fuel competition has spurred nation's interest on secondary bioethanol, which is produced from lignocellulosic (LC) biomass. Mango leaves (*Mangifera indica*) have been recognized as abundantly available non-edible agricultural waste that could be a LC based bioethanol substrate for their high polysaccharide content. Besides, simultaneous saccharification and co-fermentation (SSCF) is identified as an effective method to maximize this secondary bioethanol production. However, a feasible co-culture to simultaneously convert both hexose and pentose sugar in the mango leaves into bioethanol is yet to be discovered. Therefore, the present work emphasizes on conversion of mango leaves into bioethanol through co-culture of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and *Trametes versicolor* via SSCF. Initially, a comparison of biomass composition among mango leaves varieties indicated that Harum Manis mango leaves are the most desirable bioethanol crop for its highest holocellulose content of 78.73 %, maximum concentration of fermentable sugar ( $163.83 \pm 5.48$  mg/g of biomass) and bioethanol ( $0.21 \pm 0.02$  mg/mL) compared to Chokanan and Sunshine. Subsequently, this study aimed to elucidate the structural changes of Harum Manis mango leaves after single-stage (acid and alkaline) and two-stage (acid-alkaline and alkaline-acid) chemical pretreatments. Acid-alkaline pretreatment with the maximum delignification effect ( $86.97 \pm 1.26$ ) facilitated the biomass to yield the highest holocellulose composition, fermentable sugar content and bioethanol concentration of 95.26%,  $415.02 \pm 7.01$  mg/g and  $1.57 \pm 0.06$  mg/mL, respectively. Additionally, the structural characterizations also validated the acid-alkaline pretreated biomass to be the most feasible substrate for bioethanol production in this study. Next, cellulase and xylanase with enzymatic activity of  $0.413 \pm 0.014$  FPU/mL and  $0.514 \pm 0.009$  IU/mL, respectively, were synthesized from *Aspergillus niger* in this study. These enzymes were proven to be viable for enzymatic saccharification during the bioethanol production. Thereafter, this study also demonstrated that *S. cerevisiae* and *T. versicolor* were compatible as a co-culture to significantly enhanced the co-fermentation of glucose and xylose in the mango leaves into bioethanol. With this, the designated SSCF based bioethanol production was screened and optimized. Consequently, the optimum condition at temperature: 30.68°C, pH: 5 and incubation time: 5.08 days yielded a maximum bioethanol production of  $79.59 \pm 0.32$  %. Lastly, kinetic study of this bioethanol production was evaluated. The Logistic model and Modified Gompertz model were discovered to proficiently understand the co-culture cell synthesis, substrate consumption, and product formation that occurred during the bioethanol production. Overall, the scale up potential of this SSCF process could be explored using the obtained kinetic insights for an efficient conversion of mango leaves into bioethanol.

## CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION

Chapter one presents background study, problem statement, research objectives, and scope of research. Background study is a brief overview on the evolution of bioethanol production. Problem statement reflects on existing problems in the field of bioethanol production to which this research work, studies on mango leaves as lignocellulosic (LC) substrate for the production of bioethanol via simultaneous saccharification and co-fermentation (SSCF) configuration could be a solution. This section validated the significance of the research work. The final part of this chapter is on research objectives and scope that specifies the depth of the research work.

### 1.1 Background Study

In the current waves of globalization, fossil fuels including petroleum, coal, and natural gas are known to be the most dependent non-renewable sources. Owing to the needs of transportation and industrialization that rose tremendously, natural gas and petroleum source have been losing their sustainability gradually (Sathendra et al., 2019; Tan et al., 2020). This awareness has led to the search for an alternative energy resource (Jugwanth et al., 2020; Qu et al., 2020). Through this quest, researchers have devoted their attention to the production of ethanol fuel (Bhardwaj et al., 2020).

Ethanol can be manufactured either through the chemical or microbiological method. The chemical pathway to produce ethanol can be described through the reaction mechanism of ethylene hydration (Maćzyńska et al., 2019). The transformation of reducing sugar by selective microorganism into ethanol during fermentation defines the microbiological process (Cao et al., 2020). In fact, the monomeric sugar in the

microbiological process usually originates from renewable sources such as agricultural feedstock and plant residuals (de Barros Ranke et al., 2020). Ethanol produced via this microbial fermentation process is known as bioethanol or green petroleum (Mohapatra et al., 2020).

Currently, the bioethanol production process has been gaining intense interest worldwide in the transportation sector (Astolfi et al., 2020; Rabbani et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020). In fact, bioethanol is the most suitable alternative for fossil fuel. Unlike petroleum, bioethanol is a form of renewable energy, non-toxic and biodegradable (Arpia et al., 2021). In conjunction with its establishment as clean and safe for petroleum replacement, bioethanol is widely used as a biofuel additive to decrease environmental issues especially greenhouse gas (GHG) emission (Balali & Stegen, 2021; Granjo et al., 2020). Renewable Energy Directive (RED) has published a legislative proposal, RED II, which obliges the countries of European Union to have an energy production of at least 27 % from renewable source, whereby 6.8 % should be represented by the biofuel industry by 2030. This requirement is in line with the need of the Fuel Quality Directive to reduce 6 % of GHG emission caused by fossil fuel combustion in vehicles within year 2020 (Garofalo et al., 2020).

At earlier stages, bioethanol manufactured at industrial scale utilized starch and sucrose-based sources such as corn, sugarcane, maize and potato as a substrate. However, as for the present scenario, this first-generation (1G) bioethanol production was not optioned in term of long-term reliability (Adetoyese et al., 2020). This is because the substrates are edible biomass. A continuous usage of these feedstocks could cause incompetence to meet the human food demand (Ben-Iwo et al., 2016; Mishra &

Ghosh, 2020). Subsequently, second-generation (2G) bioethanol production has been introduced in both academic society and biofuel industry. LC biomass such as agricultural residue is aided as substrate for 2G bioethanol production (Bonenkamp et al., 2020).

In this study, the leaves of Mango (*Mangifera indica*) removed during the pruning session were chosen for the secondary bioethanol production. This LC based agricultural left-over is widely accessible with polymeric constituents similar to the conventional starchy or sugary biomass used in bioethanol production. Specifically, the cumulative of cellulose and hemicellulose composition in the mango leaves could be converted into fermentable sugar for bioethanol production (Das et al., 2013; Paul et al., 2020). In addition, these leaves were acclaimed as agricultural waste and discarded through burning (Shi et al., 2020; Singh et al., 2020). Indeed, this make the LC biomass a non-competitive food supply. As a consequence, food versus fuel crisis was resolved (Alayoubi et al., 2020; Lyu et al., 2020; Pachón et al., 2020; Rabbani et al., 2020). Furthermore, this method is a wise practise of waste materials management and could be a great environmental solution to demolish the intolerable condition caused by dumping of waste into landfills (Stoumpou et al., 2020). Besides, this waste to wealth initiative would be a strategy to minimize the expenditures of the raw material and, thus, developing a cost-effective bioethanol production process (Song et al., 2020).

Since mango leaves are used during the bioethanol production, a combination of enzymatic saccharification and fermentation is commonly suggested to overcome the complexity of the LC biomass. Among various integrated fermentation technologies, SSCF approach has emerged to be the most effective method for the 2G bioethanol

production (Chen et al., 2017; Liu & Chen, 2016). In SSCF, saccharification enzymes added into the media convert the LC carbohydrates converts into fermentable sugars such as hexose and pentose sugar. Simultaneously, the inoculated hexose and pentose sugar fermenting mono or co-culture microbial system yields the bioethanol. The overall process of SSCF takes place in one vessel (Panahi et al., 2020). This process is an advanced version of the initially discovered method of separate hydrolysis and fermentation (SHF) and simultaneous saccharification and fermentation (SSF). In precise, the SSCF process has been experimentally proven to record a higher bioethanol yield in comparison to SHF and SSF. This is because, unlike, SHF and SSF, in SSCF, both the pentose and hexose sugar available in LC biomass could be utilized without an end-product inhibition during the process (Amoah et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2017; Qin et al., 2017).

To date, there has been certainly insufficient discussion of the research works conducted on SSCF based bioethanol production from mango leaves. Although previous studies have been reported on mango waste residues as a substrate for bioethanol production, the focus was only on implementation of SHF and SSF methods (Das et al., 2013; Jahid et al., 2018). Hence, this study is an investigation on the feasibility to maximize the utilization of the fermentable sugar in mango leaves for production of bioethanol via SSCF configuration.

## **1.2 Problem Statement**

Mango leaves is an agricultural lignocellulosic left-over with limitless accessibility for secondary bioethanol production. The conversion of mango leaves into bioethanol requires inclusion enzymatic saccharification and fermentation processes

after the delignification process to overcome the structural recalcitrance. At first, SHF process was implemented whereby the enzymatic hydrolysis conducted prior to fermentation led to end-product inhibition which resulted a low bioethanol yield. These obstacles contribute to the initiation of SSF method in which enzymatic hydrolysis is carried out in parallel with the fermentation process to convert only glucose into bioethanol. Conversely, xylose in LC biomass cannot be utilized for bioethanol production using SSF configuration. Hence, SSCF was introduced for its strategical approach which combined enzymatic hydrolysis and co-fermentation of glucose and xylose to boost the bioethanol yield.

However, previous studies on SSCF process have reported selective utilization of glucose over xylose which triggered decrease in bioethanol yield. Despite a number of attempts through metabolic as well as evolutionary engineering to facilitate the SSCF process, the xylose fermentation capacity of the microbial strain is inhibited by the presence of glucose. Based on these constraints, a viable microbial co-culture system to execute the bioethanol production via SSCF process is still in search. Although *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* is widely incorporated into LC bioethanol production, this yeast strain can only metabolize glucose into bioethanol. Hence, it would be worthy to co-culture *S. cerevisiae* with a xylose-utilizing microorganism that could maximize conversion efficiency of fermentable sugar derived from mango leaves into bioethanol. Nevertheless, concerns on the growth conditions adaptability and fermentation compatibility of the microbial strains should be addressed prior to attempting this SSCF approach for bioethanol production from mango leaves.

### **1.3 Research Objectives**

The research objective is divided into two which are the general objective and the specific objectives.

#### **1.3.1 General Objective**

In general, this study is structured to analyse the prospective of *M. indica* leaves as a LC substrate for the bioethanol production via SSCF co-cultured with *S. cerevisiae* and *Trametes versicolor*.

#### **1.3.2 Specific Objectives**

- 1) To investigate the biochemical composition and structural modifications after chemical pretreatment on the selected variety of mango leaves for bioethanol production.
- 2) To examine the hydrolytic potential of on-site synthesized saccharification enzymes along with the compatibility of *S. cerevisiae* and *T. versicolor* for bioethanol production.
- 3) To screen and optimize the process parameters of bioethanol production using SSCF configuration.
- 4) To evaluate the kinetic of the proposed bioethanol production process using unstructured kinetic models.