



HAL
open science

Fermentation of cellulose pyrolysis oil by a Clostridial bacterium

Felipe Buendia, Charles Greenhalf, Chiara Barbiero, Emmanuel Guedon, Cedric Briens, Franco Berruti, Anthony Dufour

► **To cite this version:**

Felipe Buendia, Charles Greenhalf, Chiara Barbiero, Emmanuel Guedon, Cedric Briens, et al.. Fermentation of cellulose pyrolysis oil by a Clostridial bacterium. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 2020, 143, pp.105884. 10.1016/j.biombioe.2020.105884 . hal-04518916

HAL Id: hal-04518916

<https://hal.science/hal-04518916>

Submitted on 24 Mar 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

Fermentation of cellulose pyrolysis oil by a *Clostridial* bacterium

2 F. Buendia-Kandia^a, C. Greenhalf^b, C. Barbiero^b, E. Guedon^a, C. Briens^b, F. Berruti^{b*}, A. Dufour^{a*}

4 ^a Reactions and Process Engineering Laboratory (LRGP), CNRS, Lorraine University, ENSIC, 54000 Nancy, France.

^b Institute for Chemicals and Fuels from Alternative Resources (ICFAR), Western University, Ilderton ON N0M 2A0, Canada.

6 * anthony.dufour@univ-lorraine.fr

* fberruti@uwo.ca

8

Abstract

10 The coupling of thermochemical and biological conversion of biomass is a promising strategy to
produce chemicals in future integrated biorefineries. Indeed, thermochemical conversion such as
12 pyrolysis is a fast process without any solvent or enzyme for the depolymerization of biomass. In
this work, cellulose was pyrolyzed to produce sugars which have been then fermented by bacteria
14 (*Clostridium acetobutylicum*) to produce acetone and butanol. This type of bacteria presents an
interesting biological platform: it is resilient, easily up-scalable and *Clostridium* can be genetically
16 engineered to target various other chemicals. Pyrolysis of cellulose was performed in a continuous
fluidized bed reactor equipped with a staged condensation system, including a warm electrostatic
18 precipitator. Different bio-oil fractions rich in levoglucosan (LVG) and with different
concentrations in inhibitors for the fermentation stage were produced. LVG was found to be non-
20 fermentable by *C. acetobutylicum*. Therefore, the bio-oil fractions were hydrolysed to obtain
fermentable glucose. The mechanisms of acid hydrolysis (with diluted H₂SO₄) of LVG and
22 cellobiosan have been revealed by high resolution mass spectrometry. The microorganisms were
not able to grow with all hydrolysed bio-oil fractions depending on the concentration in inhibitors
24 (aldehydes and organic acids). The fractions rich in LVG (and then glucose) lead to normal bacterial
growth and normal fermentation products pattern without the need of detoxification. These results
26 show the importance of a pyrolysis process with a staged condensation as a preliminary step for
fermentation. It opens the road to production of various cellulose-derived chemicals by bacteria.

28 **Keywords:** cellulose, pyrolysis, hydrolysis, ABE fermentation

Table of content (only for reviews)

30		
	1	Introduction.....3
32	2	Materials and methods6
	2.1	Reactants.....6
34	2.2	Pyrolysis6
	2.3	Hydrolysis of the pyrolytic oil7
36	2.4	Microorganism and media7
	2.5	Fermentation.....8
38	2.6	Analysis of liquids8
	2.6.1	Total sugars quantification by the phenol/sulphuric acid method8
40	2.6.2	Analysis of pyrolysis products by GC-FID/MS9
	2.6.3	Analysis of levoglucosan and cellobiosan by HILIC-LTQ-Orbitrap MS.....9
42	2.6.4	Analysis of sugars by HPAEC-PAD9
	2.6.5	Analysis of the fermentation products by HPLC-UV10
44	3	Results 10
	3.1	Pyrolysis of cellulose.....10
46	3.2	Hydrolysis of cellulose pyrolysis oils.....14
	3.3	Fermentation of glucose, levoglucosan and bio-oil fractions17
48	3.4	Integration of thermochemical and biological conversion20
	4	Conclusion.....22
50		
52		
54		

1 Introduction

56 Valorisation of lignocellulosic materials in biorefineries offers a renewable and sustainable
alternative to crude oil refineries [1]. Cellulose can be extracted from the lignocellulosic matrix
58 through different fractionation processes [2–5]. Besides its use in the paper industry [6], cellulose
can be converted by catalytic or biological processes into fuels and chemicals [7,8]. Its direct
60 fermentation undergoes long reaction times taking several days (due to its recalcitrance), ending in
a relatively low yield of the final product [9,10]. For this reason, the depolymerisation of cellulose
62 is required prior to its fermentation. Cellulose depolymerisation through direct acid hydrolysis
produces a maximum glucose yield of about 70 wt.% with reaction times of about 2 hours, but this
64 process requires expensive corrosion-resistant reactor operated at high pressures and temperatures
and it leads to high operating cost related with acid recovery and high sugars dilution in water
66 [11,12]. Enzymatic hydrolysis is commonly used for the depolymerisation of cellulose [13].
However, in the bioethanol industry, enzyme cost represents more than 45 % of the minimum
68 ethanol selling price, making this stage the most expensive one of the global process [14].

Fast pyrolysis allows a direct thermochemical depolymerisation of cellulose without solvents or
70 enzymes. This process produces bio-oil (as the main fraction), char and permanent gas [15]. In
comparison with enzymatic hydrolysis, fast pyrolysis is not sensitive to inhibitors and can reach
72 higher sugar yields in only seconds, compared to days in the case of biochemical conversions using
enzymes [13]. In addition, the depolymerisation process must reduce the production of inhibiting
74 compounds that hinder microbial growth during the fermentation process [16]. To overcome this
problem, pyrolysis plants can be equipped with fractional condensation systems that separate
76 pyrolytic vapours according to their boiling point [17]. Therefore, the condensation system allows
recovering a heavy oil rich in sugars (for further conversion with microorganisms) separated from
78 the light oil with the microorganism inhibitory compounds (light oxygenated: aldehydes, alcohols,
carboxylic acids) [17,18]. The light fractions can be valorised for other purposes, such as the pre-

80 treatment of biomass for its demineralization in order to increase the sugars yield after fast pyrolysis
[19].

82 Some molecules (glutamic acid, 3-hydroxypropionic acid, isoprene, farnesene, itaconic acid, lactic
acid, etc.) [20] can only be synthesized through biological conversion involving enzymes or
84 microorganisms. For instance, fermentation can convert the saccharides into various chemicals of
industrial interest such as: butanol, ethanol, xylitol, sorbitol, 1,3-propanediol, biodiesel, lactic acid,
86 succinic acid, isoprene, hydrogen, among others [21,22].

Therefore, it is of tremendous interest to combine pyrolysis of cellulose for a fast depolymerisation
88 without solvents or enzymes and further biological conversion of the as-produced depolymerized
products recovered in the bio-oil. Table 1 presents an overview of work dealing with the biological
90 conversion of cellulose pyrolysis oils.

92 **Insert Table 1 here.**

94 While fermentation of biomass-derived saccharides into biofuels and chemicals has been widely
investigated [23,24], published studies on the biological conversion of the anhydro-saccharides
96 found in pyrolytic bio-oil are rather rare (see Table 1) [25,26]. Indeed, levoglucosan (LVG) is not a
common molecule in nature (unless as a stable marker of wood fires), therefore the microorganisms
98 capable of its direct metabolism are very rare [27]. Some strains have been genetically engineered
for this purpose [28]. Otherwise, using mild acidic media, levoglucosan can be easily hydrolysed
100 into glucose that is one of the most common fermentable sugars [29].

Several microorganisms allow the conversion of sugars into fuels and chemicals but not all of them
102 are suitable for industrial production for two main reasons: 1) its adaptability to different
environments (pH, temperature, etc.) without adjusting carbon and nitrogen inputs (flow rate and
104 hydrodynamic), 2) its simplicity of homogenization in the multiphase bioreactor, and 3) the
capability of monitoring cell density in a relatively short time [30].

106 The acetone-butanol-ethanol (ABE) fermentation using *Clostridial* species is one of the most
promising biological conversion processes because it has already been developed at industrial scale
108 since World War I [31]. Second, metabolic engineered strains of *C. acetobutylicum* are able to produce
a wide variety of interesting platform molecules [32–34]. Third, *Clostridium* bacteria present an
110 important microbial adaptation and a good resistance to various inhibitors [35,36].

Another promising way is the fermentation of syngas produced by biomass gasification using
112 specific *Clostridial* strains that are able to convert carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide into
alcohols. This approach allows the valorisation of biomass wastes [37,38]. However, the
114 fermentation using carbohydrates presents faster cell growth, more efficient mass transfer
(carbohydrates are already present as a soluble molecule in the aqueous phase) and several
116 microorganisms are able to ferment carbohydrates to produce a wide variety of chemicals and
biofuels [39]. Therefore, syngas fermentation is of potential interest for valorising wastes syngas
118 but it seems more favourable to convert cellulosic biomass into soluble sugars (than into a syngas)
for a further fermentation process.

120 For all these reasons, *Clostridium* bacteria were chosen in the present work to ferment cellulose
pyrolysis oils. The process developed in this work is presented in Figure 1.

122

Insert Figure 1. here.

124

Cellulose was pyrolyzed in a fluidized bed reactor using a fractional condensation train to produce
126 a bio-oil with a high sugar content. This oil was hydrolysed to obtain fermentable sugars. The
hydrolysed oil was, then, fermented using *C. acetobutylicum*. To the best of our knowledge, this work
128 reports for the first time the combination of fast pyrolysis with staged-condensation, hydrolysis
and ABE fermentation for the valorisation of cellulosic materials into building blocks (Figure 1).

130 This process arrangement could be further used to produce various other targeted chemicals from
cellulose by means of metabolic engineering of diverse *Clostridium* strains.

134 **2 Materials and methods**

2.1 Reactants

136 Microcrystalline cellulose Avicel PH-101 (particle size < 50 μm), glucose (99.5 %), sulphuric acid
(99.99 %), acetone (99.9 %), ethanol (99.8 %), butanol (>99 %), acetic acid (>99.5 %), lactic acid
138 (>98 %), butyric acid (99 %) were purchased from Sigma Aldrich, San Luis, USA. Levoglucosan
(98 %), cellobiose (98 %) and cellobiosan (95 %) standards were purchased from Carbosynth
140 (Compton, United Kingdom).

142 **2.2 Pyrolysis**

Fast pyrolysis of cellulose was performed at ICFAR (Canada) in a gas fluidized bed pilot plant
144 equipped with a feeding system allowing an efficient distribution of cellulose in the fluidized zone
of the reactor (Figure 2).

146

Insert Figure 2. here.

148

The bed was fluidized using 1033 g of quartz sand. The fluidization gas was nitrogen at 25 standard
150 litres per minute (SLPM) and compressed air was used to activate the valve of the pulsating feeding
system [40]. The average temperature inside the reactor was 475 $^{\circ}\text{C}$, with a vapour residence time
152 of 2.2 s. 0.5 kg of cellulose was pyrolyzed during 30 min. Temperature was monitored at five
different locations along the reactor, as shown in Figure S1. A staged condensation system of
154 successive condensers with bath temperatures of 70, 45, and 5 $^{\circ}\text{C}$, recovered five different bio-oil
fractions, as shown in Figure 2. The second condenser was a temperature controlled electrostatic

156 precipitator (ESP) [41]. The permanent gas was vented and not analysed. All the bio-oil fractions
were recovered and stored at -20°C for further experiments and analysis.

158

2.3 Hydrolysis of the pyrolytic oil

160 An autoclave stirred reactor (stainless steel 316, Parr Instrument Company) of 300 mL was used
for the hydrolysis of pyrolytic oil (presented in supplementary material, Figure S2). 10 g of oil were
162 hydrolysed in 200 mL of an acidic water solution (1.5 wt.% of H₂SO₄) at 120 °C for 44 min under
10 bar of nitrogen atmosphere (used to maintain the water in liquid phase) following the method
164 proposed by Bennett et al. [29]. Samples were taken (by a sampling system, see Figure S2b) before
heating the reactor, when the target temperature was reached (t=0min, beginning of isothermal
166 conversion at 120°C), after 20 min of reaction at 120°C and at the end, after 44 min of reaction at
120°C. The final solution was then recovered and stored for further analysis and fermentation.

168

2.4 Microorganism and media

170 Spores of *Clostridium acetobutylicum* ATCC 824 were maintained in Difco™ Reinforced *Clostridial*
Medium (RCM) at ambient temperature [42]. All precultures were rigorously conducted in a similar
172 way. Each experiment was started with the spores of *C. acetobutylicum*. The spore culture was diluted
to a concentration of 10 % in 10 mL of RCM fresh media (Hungate tubes) and then heat shocked
174 at 80 °C for 20 min to induce germination. Reactivated cultures were incubated in fresh RCM
medium at 37 °C for 12 h and then used to inoculate the corresponding cultures containing the
176 bio-oil within the synthetic medium. The synthetic medium was composed of 0.5 g/L KH₂PO₄,
1.5 g/L (NH₄)₂SO₄, 1 g/L MgCl₂, 0.15 g/L CaCl₂, 1.5 g/L yeast extract, 0.01 g/L FeSO₄·7H₂O,
178 0.01 g/L MnSO₄·H₂O, 4x10⁻⁵ g/L biotin. All the chemicals, yeast extract and biotin were provided
by Sigma Aldrich.

180

2.5 Fermentation

182 Batch fermentations were carried out in 50 mL fermentation vials. 40 mL of the synthetic media
and 5 mL of each hydrolysed pyrolytic oil were transferred to the fermentation vials and then
184 sterilized in an autoclave. The vials were initially purged with nitrogen to ensure an anaerobic
atmosphere and then inoculated with 5 mL of pre-culture. The medium pH was set to 5 before
186 inoculation.

Throughout all fermentation experiments, temperature was maintained at 37 °C. The starting sugar
188 concentrations resulted from the pyrolysis-hydrolysis are provided in the results section. Cell
growth was impossible to monitor by spectrophotometry due to the dark colour of the mixture
190 after mixing with the bio-oil sample, but the formation of products is a clear indicator of cell
growth. Samples were taken every 12 h. Each experiment was carried out until there was no more
192 substrate consumption for a maximum of 72 h. All the experiments were performed at least in
duplicate. Other fermentability tests with pure glucose and levoglucosan were performed in the
194 same conditions.

196 2.6 Analysis of liquids

2.6.1 Total sugars quantification by the phenol/sulphuric acid method

198 Total sugars present in pyrolysis oil, hydrolysed oil and after fermentation were quantified using
the phenol/sulphuric acid assay [43]. The absorbance was measured in a spectrophotometer
200 Multiskan™ GO (Thermo Scientific™) at 490 nm. Glucose was used to determine the calibration
curves and the total carbohydrates were calculated as glucose-equivalent. Total non-sugar
202 compounds were calculated as the difference between the total water-soluble compounds
(weighted after lyophilisation) and the total carbohydrates.

204

2.6.2 Analysis of pyrolysis products by GC-FID/MS

206 Analysis of the bio-oil fractions was performed using gas chromatography coupled with a flame
ionization detector and mass spectrometry (GC-FID/MS). 2 g of each bio-oil fractions from the
208 staged condensation system were dissolved in 20 mL methanol. 1 μ L of tetradecene was added to
the 20 mL as an internal standard. Then, 1 μ L of the solution was injected in an Agilent 7890 gas
210 chromatograph with an Agilent HP-5MS column (diphenyl -5% - dimethylpolysiloxane -95%), FID
and MS [44]. A split ratio of 10 was used. The temperature program was: 40°C (hold 10 min), then
212 increased 5°C/min until 200°C (hold 21 min). The relative response factor were calculated
according to the predictive method of Saint-Laumer et al. [45].

214

2.6.3 Analysis of levoglucosan and cellobiosan by HILIC-LTQ-Orbitrap MS

216 Levoglucosan and cellobiosan present in the real pyrolysis oil was monitored during the hydrolysis
step by using hydrophilic interaction liquid chromatography coupled to a linear trap quadrupole
218 Orbitrap mass spectrometer analyser (HILIC-LTQ-Orbitrap MS) using a YMC-Pack Polyamine II
(250 mm x 4.6 mm) column guarded by a 7.5 mm x 4.6 mm pre-column cartridge, both from YMC
220 Europe GmbH (Dinslaken, DE). The method was presented in a previous article [46].

2.6.4 Analysis of sugars by HPAEC-PAD

Glucose and cellobiose were analysed by high performance anion exchange chromatography with
224 pulsed amperometric detection (HPAEC-PAD) [46]. The column used was a CarboPac PA100.
The HPLC system was equipped with a quaternary solvent delivery pump. Two solvents were used
226 in this analysis: de-ionized water (A) and a 100 mM sodium hydroxide solution (B). The method
uses a gradient program as follow: 5 min of stabilization at 25 % B, then from 0 to 5 min 25 % B,
228 from 5 to 10 min a gradient from 25 to 100 % of B and from 10 to 25 min 100 % B.

230 **2.6.5 Analysis of the fermentation products by HPLC-UV**

Acetone, ethanol, butanol, acetic acid, lactic acid and butyric acid concentrations were measured
232 with a HPLC equipped with a refractive index detector and an ultraviolet-visible spectroscopy
(HPLC-RID-UV), using an Aminex HPX 87h column. The samples were filtered with a 0.2 µm
234 filter and the injection volume was 10 µL. The oven of the column was kept at 45 °C. The mobile
phase was a 25 mM sulphuric acid (H₂SO₄) solution. The analysis time was 35 min in isocratic
236 mode.

238 **3 Results**

First, the results on the fast pyrolysis of cellulose are presented in section 3.1. Then the hydrolysis
240 of bio-oil (section 3.2.) and their fermentation (section 3.3.) are displayed. Finally, the integration
of the 3 process steps is discussed in section 3.4.

242

3.1 Pyrolysis of cellulose

244 Cellulose pyrolysis in the fluidized bed reactor has produced 73, 22 and 5 wt.% of bio-oil,
permanent gas and char respectively, as shown in Figure 3.

246

Insert Figure 3 here.

248

The objective of this work was to produce the highest possible yield of bio-oil that can be converted
250 into value-added chemicals by fermentation. The concentration in inhibitory compounds
(aldehydes and carboxylic acids) in the bio-oil should be low for the microorganisms used in the
252 fermentation process. Three important features of this pyrolysis set-up enable achieving this goal.
The first one is the pulsed intermittent feeder which promotes a good contact between cellulose
254 particles and the hot sand bed leading to a fast heating rate and a high yield in bio-oil [47]. The

second feature is the staged condensation system for product recovery. Moreover, the vapour
256 residence time in the hot zone of the fluidized bed reactor is short (2.2 s) in order to reduce
secondary conversion of levoglucosan [48,49]. The bio-oil was collected with the 5-stage
258 condensation system allowing the separation of the anhydro-saccharides from the lighter
compounds (e.g. acetic acid, furans, ketones, etc.). The bio-oils collected from condensers 1, 2 and
260 3 are called fractions C1, C2 and C3, respectively. The bio-oil collected from condensers 4 and 5
was mixed in one single fraction called C4, since these two condensers are in parallel and at the
262 same temperature. These staged condensers resulted in bio-oil fractional yields (calculated relative
to the initial mass of cellulose) of 45, 19, 5 and 4 wt.% for the fractions C1, C2, C3 and C4
264 respectively.

Fractions C1 and C2 consisted of a viscous sugar-rich oil that solidified at ambient temperature.
266 These two condensers represented 87.8 wt.% of the whole bio-oil and they were submitted to
subsequent fermentation.

268 Fractions C3 and C4 were significantly clearer and less viscous than fractions C1 and C2. These
two fractions represented, when combined, only 12.2 wt.% of the whole bio-oil and their main
270 purpose was to collect compounds that would inhibit further biological conversion.

The temperature of the gas leaving the reactor was 333 °C. The temperature of the first condenser
272 was set to 70 °C. In this way, most of the levoglucosan and other anhydro-saccharides with higher
dew point was trapped in this first condenser. The temperature of the second condenser was set
274 to 45 °C, in order to recover the remaining anhydro-saccharides. The second condenser was a
warm electrostatic precipitator (ESP) in order to recover aerosols formed after the first condenser
276 [41]. This warm ESP presents an interesting feature in order to control the recovery of anhydro-
sugars while limiting the condensation of lighter compounds rich in inhibitors for the fermentation.
278 The bath temperatures of the downstream condensers were set at 5°C so that the lighter
compounds were collected in the last condensers.

280 The composition and chemical nature of the compounds in these fractions is of crucial importance
for a successful fermentation. For this reason, GC/MS-FID characterization was conducted on
282 each fraction. The yield in total sugars was analysed by the phenol/sulphuric acid method. The
mass yields of the individual and total saccharides quantified in the bio-oil fractions are presented
284 in Table 2.

286 **Insert Table 2 here.**

288 Figures S3a, S3b and S3c, in the supplementary material, show the chromatograms corresponding
to the bio-oil fractions C1, C2 and C3 respectively. Fraction C4 did not contained any sugar
290 (according to the total sugars analysis) and was not suitable for this GC analysis due to its high
content of water.

292 Fractions C1 and C2, presented a successful separation of levoglucosan with almost no light
compounds (e.g. carboxylic acids, aldehydes, ketones), as presented in Figure S3a and b.

294 Levoglucosan was mainly recovered in the first condenser (19.8wt% based on cellulose, see Table
2) and in the second one (C2: 6.8 wt.%). It is selectively recovered in the first 2 condensers
296 representing 99% of produced LVG. This LVG yield is similar than that reported by Piskorz et al.
[48] on a continuous fluidized bed reactor. However, it is lower than that reported by Patwardhan
298 et al. [49]. This is probably because their vapour residence time is lower (~ 1.3 s), so the secondary
reactions are less important in their reactor. Westerhof et al. also shown a yield of 40 wt.% with a
300 residence time of 1.6 s [50]. Small quantities of levoglucosan were also condensed in fraction C3
but no other saccharide was found in this fraction with the analysis performed in this work. The
302 presence of levoglucosan in fraction C3 may be explained by interactions with lighter compounds
which may reduce its dew point. Levoglucosan may also come from fine mist droplets escaped
304 from the electrostatic precipitator C2. C3 is mainly composed of glycolaldehyde, 1-hydroxy-2-

propanone, 3-hydroxy-3-butanone, furfural (etc.) which are known products from cellulose
306 pyrolysis [17,51].

Other products of cellulose dehydration reactions identified and quantified by GC-FID-MS were
308 1,6-anhydro- β -D-glucofuranose, levoglucosenone and 1,4:3,6-dianhydro- α -D-glucofuranose.

1,6-anhydro- β -glucofuranose was the second major product found in fractions C1 and C2. This
310 compound has been previously reported as an important pyrolysis product in the literature [52–
54]. This compound is an isomer of levoglucosan, with a subsequent rearrangement of the
312 glucofuranose unit at the non-reducing end of the molecule, finishing in the characteristic
heterocycle of furanoses. Any anhydrous end among the oligomeric compounds are potential
314 precursors of furanolic ends [55].

1,4:3,6-Dianhydro- α -D-glucofuranose and levoglucosenone were only detected in fraction C2
316 (Table 2). These results show that the conditions of C2 (ESP) are well targeted to collect efficiently
these compounds, as it was previously shown in the work done by Pollard et al. [17].

318 Overall, total sugars represented 80.4 and 59.7 wt.% of the bio-oil fractions C1 and C2 respectively,
making them potential substrates for subsequent fermentation.

320 In all the cases, the sum of the saccharides quantified by GC is less than the total sugars' yields.
Other saccharides are not identified by GC analysis. Indeed, the main anhydro-saccharides detected
322 by GC-FID-MS are only monomeric due to the limitation of this analytical method to quantify
only relatively volatile compounds. Besides, it has been proven that around 35 % of cellobiosan is
324 converted into levoglucosan inside the GC injector, generating erroneous yields and
misunderstandings of the pyrolysis phenomena [56].

326 For this reason, the two first fractions, C1 and C2, were analysed by HILIC-LTQ-OrbitrapMS
looking for any heavy compounds. Nonetheless, cellobiosan was identified only in the C1 fraction.

328 Cellotriosan in the bio-oils was also looked for by HILIC-Orbitrap MS. However, none of bio-oil
fractions contained any trimers around this m/z . This compound has higher dew points than the

330 reaction temperature. It is most probably not devolatilized and further converted to char or
volatiles [57,58]. If it was ejected and transferred in aerosol, it may undergo secondary reactions.

332

These data show that pyrolysis with staged condensation provided a bio-oil fraction with a high
334 concentration of sugars. The sugar-rich fractions (C1 and C2) and the combination of all bio-oil
fractions (F) have been used as substrate in a fermentation process using *C. acetobutylicum* in order
336 to produce building blocks. This will be discussed in section 3.3. Fractions C3 and C4 contained
too high concentrations of acids and too low concentration in sugars for fermentation. These
338 fractions can be used for other purposes in an integrated biorefinery for instance for biomass
leaching prior to pyrolysis [59].

340 Fermentation tests were performed with these bio-oil fractions and with pure levoglucosan
showing no bacterial growth. Cellobiosan was also present in fraction C1. The fermentation test of
342 C1 fraction was also negative. To the best of our knowledge, this work reports for the first time
the non-fermentable nature of cellobiosan when used as substrate to cultivate *C. acetobutylicum*.
344 These results show that bio-oils fraction, levoglucosan and cellobiosan are not directly fermentable
by *C. acetobutylicum*. These will be discussed further in section 3.3. For this reason, a hydrolysis stage
346 was implemented in order to obtain fermentable saccharides from anhydro-saccharides.

348 **3.2 Hydrolysis of cellulose pyrolysis oils**

The anhydro-saccharides produced by pyrolysis, collected in fractions C1 and C2, were hydrolysed
350 in diluted acidic media in order to produce sugars fermentable by *C. acetobutylicum*. Mass yields
before and after hydrolysis of the fractionated and complete bio-oil (all fractions) are presented in
352 Figure 4.

354 **Insert Figure 4 here.**

356 This mild hydrolysis enables the fast hydration of levoglucosan and other anhydro-saccharides
producing (mostly) glucose.

358 Total sugars yields (based on cellulose mass) were 49.2, 36.4, 11.4 and 1.3 wt.% for the bio-oils
total fractions (F), C1, C2 and C3 respectively. Levoglucosan yields were 27 wt.% for the total
360 fraction F, 19.8 and 6.8 wt.% for the fractions C1 and C2. After hydrolysis, the total sugars yield
slightly decreased in all fractions obtaining values of 42.9, 33.6, 8.9 and 0.5 wt.% for the bio-oils F,
362 C1, C2 and C3 respectively. In all the cases, there was no levoglucosan present in the samples after
the hydrolysis stage. The loss of total sugars during hydrolysis is probably due to the overreaction
364 (degradation) of sugars into aldehydes and carboxylic acids by dehydration and decarboxylation
reactions [60]. One advantage of performing this hydrolysis stage is the conversion of anhydro-
366 sugars with DP>2 into sugars (such as cellobiose). The fermentable behaviour of these sugars has
been previously studied [61,62]. HILIC-LTQ-Orbitrap MS has been used to study more in depth
368 the conversion of levoglucosan and cellobiosan present in the C1 fraction during their hydrolysis.
Figure S4 displays the SIM mode spectra of levoglucosan, glucose, cellobiosan and cellobiose
370 during the hydrolysis of fraction C1. An isomer of cellobiosan was identified in the initial pyrolysis
C1 fraction. Small quantities of levoglucosan were hydrolysed into glucose when the sample was
372 dissolved for analysis, whereas no significant quantities of cellobiose were detected at this time
(Figure S4a). Formation of glucose and cellobiose was important when the acid was added and the
374 reactor heated from ambient temperature to 120°C, as displayed in Figure S4b. Then, during the
44 min of reaction, cellobiose decreases probably hydrolysed into glucose. A simplified scheme
376 presenting the hydrolysis of LVG and cellobiosan in real bio-oils based on this HILIC-Orbitrap
MS analysis is presented in Figure 5.

378

Insert Figure 5 here.

380

Mild acid hydrolysis enables the successful recovery of 92.3 and 78.1 % of the sugars in fractions
382 C1 and C2. Glucose yields of the hydrolysed samples are higher than the theoretical yield for the
conversion of only levoglucosan. Therefore, these data show that this hydrolysis stage allowed not
384 only to convert practically all the levoglucosan, but also other pyrolysis-derived saccharides as
glucose (most probably cellobiosan). Table 3 presents a comparison between the main processes
386 for cellulose depolymerisation.

388 **Insert Table 3 here.**

390 It is known that enzymatic hydrolysis allows cellulose depolymerisation with high selectivity.
However, this process presents relatively high reaction times and operational cost due to the price
392 of enzymes and their complex recycling [13]. The hydrothermal depolymerisation in both batch
and continuous reactor presented similar and higher yield to pyrolysis respectively. However, these
394 processes are highly energy demanding due to the high quantity of solvent (water in this case). This
also dilutes the sugars of interest and entrained various by-products in the water flow [63,64]. Fast
396 pyrolysis offers an interesting alternative to produce sugars from cellulose with high selectivity for
dimers and monomers (thanks to the staged condensation), lower operational cost and faster
398 reaction times. The subsequent mild acid hydrolysis stage of the bio-oil is easily operated with a
high selectivity as demonstrated in this present work and in agreement with Bennett et al. [29]. Our
400 HILIC high resolution mass spectrometry analysis reveals that glucose and cellobiose are the major
sugar compounds after hydrolysis of the bio-oils and that no other sugars were present in high
402 yields. Therefore, fast pyrolysis combined with mild hydrolysis leads to a good selectivity into
glucose and cellobiose and lower dilution in water than direct hydrothermal conversion of cellulose
404 (without the pyrolysis stage) [65–67].

406 3.3 Fermentation of glucose, levoglucosan and bio-oil fractions

408 At this point, fermentable bio-oils with few inhibiting compounds have been produced. In order
to study any cross effects of potential inhibitory compounds present in the bio-oil, fermentation
by *C. acetobutylicum* ATCC 824 of pure levoglucosan, glucose, alone or in mixture, were first
410 evaluated on both synthetic and reinforced clostridial medium (RCM). Results are reported in Table
4. These two culture medias offer the best conditions for the growth of *C. acetobutylicum*.

412

Insert Table 4 here.

414

In all cases, glucose was almost completely converted with a conversion degree of around 90 wt.%.
416 However, levoglucosan utilisation by *C. acetobutylicum* is lower than ~ 5 wt.% (table 4), whatever
the culture medium used. In the synthetic medium, pH values do not decrease with levoglucosan
418 (LVG). This point highlights that a low metabolism activity occurs with LVG. Indeed, the drop in
pH results usually from organic acids accumulation such as acetic or butyric acids, which are one
420 of the main products produced during the growth phase. In this study, such products are produced
in very low amount when levoglucosan was the only source of carbon. The low conversion of
422 levoglucosan could be explained by levoglucosan hydrolysis at very low rate due to the relatively
weak acidic environment of the fermentation media.

424 Besides, fermentation of levoglucosan by *C. acetobutylicum* was never reported in the literature as
well as with other clostridium species [68].

426 This work demonstrates that *C. acetobutylicum* is unable to use levoglucosan probably because this
molecule is not present naturally in raw biomasses. Microorganisms are not commonly exposed to
428 levoglucosan and they have not developed tools for its metabolism. Indeed, levoglucosan is a stable
marker of forest fires in the environment.

430 Consequently, the hydrolysis stage to convert levoglucosan into a fermentable substrate is required.
The fermentation of hydrolysed bio-oils by *C. acetobutylicum*, using glucose pregrown inocula, were

432 carried out in the same experimental conditions as the ones studied for pure levoglucosan, glucose
and levoglucosan/glucose mixtures. When the hydrolysed whole bio-oil (from fraction “F”) is used
434 in a fermentation process, *C. acetobutylicum* did not exhibit any cell growth, suggesting that inhibitors
present in important concentrations in fraction F may have a detrimental effect on the cellular
436 activity [68]. On the contrary, when hydrolysed fractions C1 and C2 are used as the carbon source,
a normal cell growth with typical fermentation product pattern is observed. These results confirm
438 that staged condensation efficiently ensure the fermentability of ~88 wt.% of the bio-oil (fractions
C1 and C2, see table 2) produced by cellulose pyrolysis.

440 However, the fermentation of hydrolysed bio-oil fractions by *C. acetobutylicum* required a specific
care in the initial pH. Indeed, if the pH value is not adjusted upon addition of bio-oil (initial pH
442 between 2 and 3), *C. acetobutylicum* was unable to grow. Therefore, setting the pH value of the culture
media to a value at least superior than the pKa of the main fermentation acidic products (4.7 – 4.8)
444 is of crucial importance. In this work, setting a pH value of 5 before inoculation was shown to be
relevant for the cellular activity. In these conditions, fermentation processes of bio-oil fractions C1
446 and C2 by *C. acetobutylicum* were carried out during 72 h. Kinetics of sugar utilization and
metabolites production are shown on Figure 6. Fermentation of the bio-oil fractions was done
448 separately to study the effects of each composition on the fermentation products.

At the beginning of the fermentation process, the total sugar concentrations were 44.5 and 27.8
450 g/L for the cultures containing fractions C1 and C2 respectively. Fermentation of fraction C1
exhibited a continuous sugar utilization all along the 72 h of culture, with a final sugar residue of
452 2.8 g/L. In the case of fraction C2, total sugar consumption was consumed during the first 48 h of
fermentation, then stopped and its concentration remained stable at a concentration of 4 g/L until
454 the end of the fermentation at 72 h. Both cultures exhibit a normal ABE fermentation pattern, so
they could be combined into one sole fermentable fraction during the process. Final pH was
456 analysed at the end of the fermentation (pH 3.5 with hydrolysed C1 and 3.9 with C2).

Under our experimental conditions, the fermentation of the fraction C1 leads to a butyric acid
458 maximum concentration of 3.1 g/L after 24 h of culture, whereas the maximum butyric acid
concentration (2.3 g/L) was obtained only after 36 h of fermentation with the fraction C2, probably
460 because of the differences in composition and in concentration of fermentable sugars. As a result,
the production of the solvents (ABE) triggered by acids occurs much later with C2 than with C1,
462 leading to a decrease of the overall fermentation productivity for the C2 fraction (figure S6).
Contrary to butyric acid, acetic acid production was similar for both fractions. Indeed, final
464 concentrations were 1 and 1.1 g/L for the fractions C1 and C2 respectively and the slightly lower
acetic acid production with C1 may be explained by its conversion into acetone [69]. Maximum
466 concentration of acetic acid was found after 48 and 36 h of fermentation for fractions C1 and C2
respectively. In agreement with fermentation pattern of *C. acetobutylicum* usually observed with
468 glucose and related substrates [70], lactic acid production was relatively low in both fractions
compared to other fermentation products. Total solvent concentration obtained after 72 h of
470 fermentation were 11 and 5 g/L for fractions C1 and C2 respectively. More specifically, after 72 h
of fermentation with fraction C1, *C. acetobutylicum* was able to produce up to 8 and 2.9 g/L of
472 butanol and acetone respectively, whereas only 3.3 g/L of butanol and 1.6 g/L were measured with
fraction C2 after the same fermentation time. Acetone production started after 24 h of
474 fermentation for fraction C1 and after 12 h for fraction C2. Ethanol was produced in relatively low
concentration after the fermentation process of both fractions (see supplementary material, Figure
476 S5). As a general rule, the ratios between the produced butanol, acetone and ethanol agreed with
those of a typical fermentation by *C. acetobutylicum* when glucose is the carbon and energy source
478 [42]. Accordingly, the bio-oil fractions C1 and C2 did not contain any strong inhibitors that altered
the fermentation product pattern of *C. acetobutylicum*. Concerning the productivities (mg/L/h) of
480 the solvents produced during the fermentation (presented in figure S6), the highest productivities
were mainly achieved after 48 h of fermentation, whereas the highest yields (wt.) were obtained
482 after 72 h fermentation (see Figure S6). During the last 24 h of the process, i.e. from 48 to 72 h of

fermentation, the productivities of butanol, acetone and ethanol decreased significantly for the 2
484 hydrolysed fractions C1 and C2.

486 **3.4 Integration of thermochemical and biological conversion**

488 Figure 7 shows the yields in products obtained by pyrolysis of cellulose, then the hydrolysis of the
bio-oil and finally the fermentation of the sugars obtained by *C. acetobutylicum*.

490

Insert Figure 7 here.

492

First, 73 wt.% of the initial cellulose was converted into bio-oil by fast pyrolysis. The rest of the
494 cellulose becomes gas and char that can be used to recover energy. The overall cellulose to sugars
yield was 49.2 wt.% (see table 2, fraction F). The sugar-rich bio-oil fraction (trapped in the first
496 two condensers) represented 64.4 wt.% of the initial cellulose (88 wt.% of the whole bio-oil) and
accounted for 97 wt.% of total sugars produced. LVG yield is 27wt.% (based on initial cellulose
498 weight). Even if the light oil fraction yield of 9 wt.% was significantly lower than that of the sugar-
rich fraction, the fermentation test with the total bio-oil (fraction F) proved that the inhibiting
500 nature of these compounds will stop any cell growth. The hydrolysis stage under mild acidic
conditions allowed recovering 92 and 78 wt.% of the sugars contained in fractions C1 and C2
502 respectively, so 33.6 wt.% and 8.9 wt.% on cellulose basis (figure 4). Glucose represents 89 and 70
wt.% of the sugars recovered after hydrolysis of the bio-oils C1 and C2 respectively. The high
504 content of glucose, that is a known fermentable sugar and frequently the preferred substrate of
several microorganisms, increases substantially the cellular performance during the fermentation
506 process. The fermentation of the fractionated-hydrolysed bio-oil converts 33 wt.% of the sugars
(43%wt. cellulose base) into building blocks, corresponding to a yield of 14 wt.% relative to the

508 initial cellulose. Table 5 presents a comparison between the main process for the production of
butanol from different resources.

510

Insert Table 5 here.

512

Butanol mass yield from propylene is considerably higher than those of the processes that use
514 biomass as feedstock. But propylene is not a primary sustainable resource and the global efficiency
of butanol production from crude oil is not easily accounted. Several research work attempts
516 developing thermochemical and biochemical processes to produce butanol and other chemicals
from renewable resources. In the case of butanol chemical synthesis from ethanol, this pathway
518 still requires the production of the ethanol, since it is not a primary resource. The production of
butanol from first generation biomass is in competition with alimentary feedstock, which might
520 provoke socio-political issues. Second generation biomass is commonly depolymerized using
enzymes that add compelling production costs to the global process [13].

522 Therefore, our approach presents potential benefits compared to other production routes of
butanol. Indeed, cellulose is the most available bio-macromolecule on Earth. Its depolymerisation
524 by pyrolysis does not consume costly enzymes or toxic solvents. Moreover, the hydrolysed sugar-
rich bio-oil does not require any detoxification to ensure its fermentability. Nevertheless, our
526 butanol yield could be further improved. The batch fermentation process using *C. acetobutylicum*
converts approximately one third of the carbon source (sugars) in gas and another third in other
528 cells. The yields and selectivity to ABE products could be improved by a continuous fermentation
process, avoiding the consumption of sugars for cell growth and a better control of fermentation
530 conditions [71,72]. Gas produced by *C. acetobutylicum* is a mixture of hydrogen (H₂) and carbon
dioxide (CO₂) that can be further valorised. The hydrolysed bio-oils fractions rich in glucose could
532 be converted following this same approach by other bacteria or yeast such as glutamic acid, 3-

hydroxypropionic acid, 1,3-propanediol, succinic acid, isoprene, farnesene, itaconic acid and lactic
534 acid [73–75].

536 **4 Conclusion**

This work reports for the first time the combination of pyrolysis and fermentation using *Clostridium*
538 *acetobutylicum*. Cellulose pyrolysis with a staged condensation system recovers 88 % of the bio-oil as
a sugar-rich fraction separated from the undesired inhibitory compounds.

540 Anhydro-saccharides produced by fast pyrolysis were not fermentable by *C. acetobutylicum*.
However, a mild and fast acid hydrolysis allowed converting 70 % of these anhydro-saccharides
542 into sugars that were successfully fermentable. The conversion of the hydrolysed oil presented a
normal fermentation pattern producing 14 %wt. of building blocks. The fermentation productivity
544 could be further improved notably by designing a continuous reactor.

546

Bibliography


- 548 [1] A.J. Ragauskas, C.K. Williams, B.H. Davison, G. Britovsek, J. Cairney, C.A. Eckert, W.J. Frederick,
550 J.P. Hallett, D.J. Leak, C.L. Liotta, J.R. Mielenz, R. Murphy, R. Templer, T. Tschaplinski, The Path
Forward for Biofuels and Biomaterials, *Science*. 311 (2006) 484–489.
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1114736>.
- 552 [2] S.H. Lee, T.V. Doherty, R.J. Linhardt, J.S. Dordick, Ionic liquid-mediated selective extraction of lignin
554 from wood leading to enhanced enzymatic cellulose hydrolysis, *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 102 (2009) 1368–
1376. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.22179>.
- 556 [3] J.J. Bozell, S.K. Black, M. Myers, D. Cahill, W.P. Miller, S. Park, Solvent fractionation of renewable
woody feedstocks: Organosolv generation of biorefinery process streams for the production of
558 biobased chemicals, *Biomass Bioenergy*. 35 (2011) 4197–4208.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2011.07.006>.
- 560 [4] R. Katahira, A. Mittal, K. McKinney, P.N. Ciesielski, B.S. Donohoe, S.K. Black, D.K. Johnson, M.J.
Biddy, G.T. Beckham, Evaluation of Clean Fractionation Pretreatment for the Production of
562 Renewable Fuels and Chemicals from Corn Stover, *ACS Sustain. Chem. Eng.* 2 (2014) 1364–1376.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/sc5001258>.
- 564 [5] M.-F. Li, S. Yang, R.-C. Sun, Recent advances in alcohol and organic acid fractionation of
lignocellulosic biomass, *Bioresour. Technol.* 200 (2016) 971–980.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2015.10.004>.
- 566 [6] P. Stenius, *Papermaking Science and Technology: Forest products chemistry*. Book 3, Fapet, 2000.
- 568 [7] F. Cherubini, G. Jungmeier, M. Wellisch, T. Willke, I. Skiadas, R. Van Ree, E. de Jong, Toward a
common classification approach for biorefinery systems, *Biofuels Bioprod. Biorefining*. 3 (2009) 534–
546. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bbb.172>.
- 570 [8] N. Savage, Fuel options: The ideal biofuel, *Nature*. 474 (2011) S9–S11.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/474S09a>.
- 572 [9] M. Desvaux, E. Guedon, H. Petitdemange, Kinetics and metabolism of cellulose degradation at high
574 substrate concentrations in steady-state continuous cultures of *Clostridium cellulolyticum* on a
chemically defined medium, *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 67 (2001) 3837–3845.
- 576 [10] P.T. Reed, J.A. Izquierdo, L.R. Lynd, Cellulose fermentation by *Clostridium thermocellum* and a
mixed consortium in an automated repetitive batch reactor, *Bioresour. Technol.* 155 (2014) 50–56.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2013.12.051>.
- 578 [11] R. Rinaldi, F. Schüth, Acid Hydrolysis of Cellulose as the Entry Point into Biorefinery Schemes,
ChemSusChem. 2 (2009) 1096–1107. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cssc.200900188>.
- 580 [12] W.S. Mok, M.J. Antal, G. Varhegyi, Productive and parasitic pathways in dilute acid-catalyzed
582 hydrolysis of cellulose, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 31 (1992) 94–100.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/ie00001a014>.
- 584 [13] L. Jiang, A. Zheng, Z. Zhao, F. He, H. Li, N. Wu, The comparison of obtaining fermentable sugars
from cellulose by enzymatic hydrolysis and fast pyrolysis, *Bioresour. Technol.* 200 (2016) 8–13.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2015.09.096>.
- 586 [14] G. Liu, J. Zhang, J. Bao, Cost evaluation of cellulase enzyme for industrial-scale cellulosic ethanol
588 production based on rigorous Aspen Plus modeling, *Bioprocess Biosyst. Eng.* 39 (2016) 133–140.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00449-015-1497-1>.
- 590 [15] J. Lédé, Cellulose pyrolysis kinetics: An historical review on the existence and role of intermediate
active cellulose, *J. Anal. Appl. Pyrolysis*. 94 (2012) 17–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaap.2011.12.019>.
- 592 [16] L.J. Jönsson, C. Martín, Pretreatment of lignocellulose: Formation of inhibitory by-products and
strategies for minimizing their effects, *Bioresour. Technol.* 199 (2016) 103–112.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2015.10.009>.
- 594 [17] A.S. Pollard, M.R. Rover, R.C. Brown, Characterization of bio-oil recovered as stage fractions with
unique chemical and physical properties, *J. Anal. Appl. Pyrolysis*. 93 (2012) 129–138.
596 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaap.2011.10.007>.
- 598 [18] M.R. Rover, P.A. Johnston, T. Jin, R.G. Smith, R.C. Brown, L. Jarboe, Production of Clean Pyrolytic
Sugars for Fermentation, *ChemSusChem*. 7 (2014) 1662–1668.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/cssc.201301259>.

- 600 [19] B. Pecha, P. Arauzo, M. Garcia-Perez, Impact of combined acid washing and acid impregnation on
the pyrolysis of Douglas fir wood, *J. Anal. Appl. Pyrolysis*. 114 (2015) 127–137.
602 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaap.2015.05.014>.
- [20] S. Choi, C.W. Song, J.H. Shin, S.Y. Lee, Biorefineries for the production of top building block
604 chemicals and their derivatives, *Metab. Eng.* 28 (2015) 223–239.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2014.12.007>.
- [21] R. Parajuli, T. Dalgaard, U. Jørgensen, A.P.S. Adamsen, M.T. Knudsen, M. Birkved, M. Gylling, J.K.
606 Schjørring, Biorefining in the prevailing energy and materials crisis: a review of sustainable pathways
608 for biorefinery value chains and sustainability assessment methodologies, *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*
43 (2015) 244–263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.11.041>.
- [22] J.J. Bozell, G.R. Petersen, Technology development for the production of biobased products from
610 biorefinery carbohydrates—the US Department of Energy’s “Top 10” revisited, *Green Chem.* 12
612 (2010) 539–554.
- [23] F. Cherubini, The biorefinery concept: Using biomass instead of oil for producing energy and
614 chemicals, *Energy Convers. Manag.* 51 (2010) 1412–1421.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2010.01.015>.
- [24] F. Bauer, L. Coenen, T. Hansen, K. McCormick, Y.V. Palgan, Technological innovation systems for
616 biorefineries: a review of the literature, *Biofuels Bioprod. Biorefining*. 11 (2017) 534–548.
618 <https://doi.org/10.1002/bbb.1767>.
- [25] L.R. Jarboe, Z. Wen, D. Choi, R.C. Brown, Hybrid thermochemical processing: fermentation of
620 pyrolysis-derived bio-oil, *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 91 (2011) 1519–1523.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-011-3495-9>.
- [26] A. Zheng, T. Chen, J. Sun, L. Jiang, J. Wu, Z. Zhao, Z. Huang, K. Zhao, G. Wei, F. He, H. Li, Toward
622 Fast Pyrolysis-Based Biorefinery: Selective Production of Platform Chemicals from Biomass by
624 Organosolv Fractionation Coupled with Fast Pyrolysis, *ACS Sustain. Chem. Eng.* 5 (2017) 6507–6516.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/acssuschemeng.7b00622>.
- [27] Y. Kitamura, Y. Abe, T. Yasui, Metabolism of Levoglucosan (1, 6-Anhydro- α -d-glucopyranose) in
626 Microorganisms, *Agric. Biol. Chem.* 55 (1991) 515–521.
- [28] J.G. Linger, S.E. Hobdey, M.A. Franden, E.M. Fulk, G.T. Beckham, Conversion of levoglucosan and
628 cellobiosan by *Pseudomonas putida* KT2440, *Metab. Eng. Commun.* 3 (2016) 24–29.
630 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meteno.2016.01.005>.
- [29] N.M. Bennett, S.S. Helle, S.J.B. Duff, Extraction and hydrolysis of levoglucosan from pyrolysis oil,
632 *Bioresour. Technol.* 100 (2009) 6059–6063. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2009.06.067>.
- [30] A.L. Demain, J.L. Adrio, Contributions of Microorganisms to Industrial Biology, *Mol. Biotechnol.* 38
634 (2007) 41. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12033-007-0035-z>.
- [31] D.T. Jones, D.R. Woods, Acetone-butanol fermentation revisited., *Microbiol. Rev.* 50 (1986) 484–
636 524.
- [32] C. Zhu, T. Shen, D. Liu, J. Wu, Y. Chen, L. Wang, K. Guo, H. Ying, P. Ouyang, Production of liquid
638 hydrocarbon fuels with acetoin and platform molecules derived from lignocellulose, *Green Chem.* 18
(2016) 2165–2174. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C5GC02414E>.
- [33] D. Cai, Z. Dong, J. Han, H. Yu, Y. Wang, P. Qin, Z. Wang, T. Tan, Co-generation of bio-butanol and
640 bio-lipids under a hybrid process, *Green Chem.* 18 (2016) 1377–1386.
642 <https://doi.org/10.1039/C5GC02285A>.
- [34] C. Xue, M. Liu, X. Guo, E. P. Hudson, L. Chen, F. Bai, F. Liu, S.-T. Yang, Bridging chemical- and
644 bio-catalysis: high-value liquid transportation fuel production from renewable agricultural residues,
Green Chem. 19 (2017) 660–669. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C6GC02546C>.
- [35] N. Qureshi, M.J. Bowman, B.C. Saha, R. Hector, M.A. Berhow, M.A. Cotta, Effect of cellulosic sugar
646 degradation products (furfural and hydroxymethyl furfural) on acetone–butanol–ethanol (ABE)
648 fermentation using *Clostridium beijerinckii* P260, *Food Bioprod. Process.* 90 (2012) 533–540.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fbp.2011.09.002>.
- [36] T. Cerisy, T. Souterre, I. Torres-Romero, M. Boutard, I. Dubois, J. Patrouix, K. Labadie, W. Berrabah,
650 M. Salanoubat, V. Doring, Evolution of a biomass-fermenting bacterium to resist lignin phenolics,
652 *Appl Env. Microbiol.* 83 (2017) e00289–17.
- [37] Á. Fernández-Naveira, M.C. Veiga, C. Kennes, Selective anaerobic fermentation of syngas into either
654 C2-C6 organic acids or ethanol and higher alcohols, *Bioresour. Technol.* 280 (2019) 387–395.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2019.02.018>.

- 656 [38] C. Benevenuti, A. Botelho, R. Ribeiro, M. Branco, A. Pereira, A.C. Vieira, T. Ferreira, P. Amaral,
Experimental Design to Improve Cell Growth and Ethanol Production in Syngas Fermentation by
658 *Clostridium carboxidivorans*, *Catalysts*. 10 (2020) 59.
- [39] D. Kennes, H.N. Abubackar, M. Diaz, M.C. Veiga, C. Kennes, Bioethanol production from biomass:
660 carbohydrate vs syngas fermentation, *J. Chem. Technol. Biotechnol.* 91 (2016) 304–317.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/jctb.4842>.
- [40] F.M. Berruti, L. Ferrante, F. Berruti, C. Briens, Optimization of an Intermittent Slug Injection System
662 for Sawdust Biomass Pyrolysis, *Int. J. Chem. React. Eng.* 7 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.2202/1542-6580.2077>.
- [41] R.J. Bedmutha, L. Ferrante, C. Briens, F. Berruti, I. Inculet, Single and two-stage electrostatic
664 demisters for biomass pyrolysis application, *Chem. Eng. Process. Process Intensif.* 48 (2009) 1112–
1120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cep.2009.02.007>.
- [42] F. Monot, J.-R. Martin, H. Petitdemange, R. Gay, Acetone and Butanol Production by *Clostridium*
666 *acetobutylicum* in a Synthetic Medium, *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 44 (1982) 1318–1324.
- [43] Michel DuBois, K.A. Gilles, J.K. Hamilton, P.A. Rebers, Fred. Smith, Colorimetric Method for
670 Determination of Sugars and Related Substances, *Anal. Chem.* 28 (1956) 350–356.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/ac60111a017>.
- [44] R.N. Olcese, J. François, M.M. Bettahar, D. Petitjean, A. Dufour, Hydrodeoxygenation of guaiacol, a
672 surrogate of lignin pyrolysis vapors, over iron based catalysts: kinetics and modeling of the lignin to
674 aromatics integrated process, *Energy Fuels*. 27 (2013) 975–984.
- [45] J.-Y. de Saint Laumer, E. Cicchetti, P. Merle, J. Egger, A. Chaintreau, Quantification in Gas
676 Chromatography: Prediction of Flame Ionization Detector Response Factors from Combustion
678 Enthalpies and Molecular Structures, *Anal. Chem.* 82 (2010) 6457–6462.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/ac1006574>.
- [46] F. Buendia-Kandia, G. Mauviel, E. Guedon, E. Rondags, D. Petitjean, A. Dufour, Decomposition of
680 cellulose in hot-compressed water: detailed analysis of the products and effect of operating conditions,
682 *Energy Fuels*. (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.energyfuels.7b02994>.
- [47] F.M. Berruti, C.L. Briens, Novel intermittent solid slug feeder for fast pyrolysis reactors:
684 Fundamentals and modeling, *Powder Technol.* 247 (2013) 95–105.
- [48] J. Piskorz, D. Radlein, D.S. Scott, On the mechanism of the rapid pyrolysis of cellulose, *J. Anal. Appl.*
686 *Pyrolysis*. 9 (1986) 121–137. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-2370\(86\)85003-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-2370(86)85003-3).
- [49] P.R. Patwardhan, D.L. Dalluge, B.H. Shanks, R.C. Brown, Distinguishing primary and secondary
688 reactions of cellulose pyrolysis, *Bioresour. Technol.* 102 (2011) 5265–5269.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2011.02.018>.
- [50] R.J. M. Westerhof, S.R. G. Oudenhoven, P. S. Marathe, M. Engelen, M. Garcia-Perez, Z. Wang, S.R.
690 A. Kersten, The interplay between chemistry and heat/mass transfer during the fast pyrolysis of
692 cellulose, *React. Chem. Eng.* 1 (2016) 555–566. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C6RE00100A>.
- [51] M. Garcia-Perez, A. Chaala, H. Pakdel, D. Kretschmer, C. Roy, Characterization of bio-oils in
694 chemical families, *Biomass Bioenergy*. 31 (2007) 222–242.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2006.02.006>.
- [52] D. Gardiner, The pyrolysis of some hexoses and derived di-, tri-, and poly-saccharides, *J. Chem. Soc.*
696 *C Org.* 0 (1966) 1473–1476. <https://doi.org/10.1039/J39660001473>.
- [53] I.S. Fagerson, Thermal degradation of carbohydrates; a review, *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 17 (1969) 747–
698 750. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf60164a019>.
- [54] F. Shafizadeh, R.H. Furneaux, T.G. Cochran, J.P. Scholl, Y. Sakai, Production of levoglucosan and
700 glucose from pyrolysis of cellulosic materials, *J. Appl. Polym. Sci.* 23 (1979) 3525–3539.
702 <https://doi.org/10.1002/app.1979.070231209>.
- [55] M.J. Antal Jr., W.S.L. Mok, G.N. Richards, Mechanism of formation of 5-(hydroxymethyl)-2-
704 furfuraldehyde from d-fructose and sucrose, *Carbohydr. Res.* 199 (1990) 91–109.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0008-6215\(90\)84096-D](https://doi.org/10.1016/0008-6215(90)84096-D).
- [56] P.S. Marathe, A. Juan, X. Hu, R.J.M. Westerhof, S.R.A. Kersten, Evaluating quantitative determination
706 of levoglucosan and hydroxyacetaldehyde in bio-oils by gas and liquid chromatography, *J. Anal. Appl.*
708 *Pyrolysis*. 139 (2019) 233–238. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaap.2019.02.010>.
- [57] I. Milosavljevic, V. Oja, E.M. Suuberg, Thermal effects in cellulose pyrolysis: relationship to char
710 formation processes, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 35 (1996) 653–662.

- 712 [58] A. Dufour, B. Ouartassi, R. Bounaceur, A. Zoulalian, Modelling intra-particle phenomena of biomass
pyrolysis, *Chem. Eng. Res. Des.* 89 (2011) 2136–2146.
- 714 [59] D.L. Dalluge, T. Daugaard, P. Johnston, N. Kuzhiyil, M.M. Wright, R.C. Brown, Continuous
production of sugars from pyrolysis of acid-infused lignocellulosic biomass, *Green Chem.* 16 (2014)
4144. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C4GC00602J>.
- 716 [60] B.M. Kabyemela, T. Adschiri, R.M. Malaluan, K. Arai, Glucose and Fructose Decomposition in
Subcritical and Supercritical Water: Detailed Reaction Pathway, Mechanisms, and Kinetics, *Ind. Eng.
718 Chem. Res.* 38 (1999) 2888–2895. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ie9806390>.
- 720 [61] F. Raganati, G. Olivieri, P. Götz, A. Marzocchella, P. Salatino, Butanol production from hexoses and
pentoses by fermentation of *Clostridium acetobutylicum*, *Anaerobe.* 34 (2015) 146–155.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anaerobe.2015.05.008>.
- 722 [62] F. Buendia-Kandia, E. Rondags, X. Framboisier, G. Mauviel, A. Dufour, E. Guedon, Diauxic growth
of *Clostridium acetobutylicum* ATCC 824 when grown on mixtures of glucose and cellobiose, *AMB
724 Express.* 8 (2018) 85. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13568-018-0615-2>.
- 726 [63] E. Chornet, R.P. Overend, Biomass Liquefaction: An Overview, in: R.P. Overend, T.A. Milne, L.K.
Mudge (Eds.), *Fundam. Thermochem. Biomass Convers.*, Springer Netherlands, 1985: pp. 967–1002.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-4932-4_54.
- 728 [64] A.A. Peterson, F. Vogel, R.P. Lachance, M. Fröling, J. Michael J. Antal, J.W. Tester, Thermochemical
biofuel production in hydrothermal media: A review of sub- and supercritical water technologies,
730 *Energy Environ. Sci.* 1 (2008) 32–65. <https://doi.org/10.1039/B810100K>.
- 732 [65] A.H. Conner, B.F. Wood, C.G.H. Jr, J.F. Harris, Kinetic Model for the Dilute Sulfuric Acid
Saccharification of Lignocellulose, *J. Wood Chem. Technol.* 5 (1985) 461–489.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02773818508085207>.
- 734 [66] N. Abatzoglov, J. Bouchard, E. Chornet, R.P. Overend, Dilute acid depolymerization of cellulose in
aqueous phase: Experimental evidence of the significant presence of soluble oligomeric intermediates,
736 *Can. J. Chem. Eng.* 64 (1986) 781–786. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cjce.5450640510>.
- 738 [67] F. Buendia-Kandia, G. Mauviel, E. Guedon, E. Rondags, D. Petitjean, A. Dufour, Decomposition of
Cellulose in Hot-Compressed Water: Detailed Analysis of the Products and Effect of Operating
Conditions, *Energy Fuels.* 32 (2018) 4127–4138. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.energyfuels.7b02994>.
- 740 [68] H. Rabemanolontsoa, G. Kawasaki, S. Saka, Effects of decomposed products from Japanese cedar
hydrolyzates on acetic acid fermentation by *Clostridium thermocellum* and *Moorella thermoacetica*
742 (*C. thermoaceticum*), *Process Biochem.* 57 (2017) 26–34.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procbio.2017.03.020>.
- 744 [69] F. Buendia-Kandia, E. Rondags, X. Framboisier, G. Mauviel, A. Dufour, E. Guedon, Diauxic growth
of *Clostridium acetobutylicum* ATCC 824 when grown on mixtures of glucose and cellobiose,
746 representative of cellulose hydrolysis products, Submitted. (2018).
- 748 [70] L. Girbal, C. Croux, I. Vasconcelos, P. Soucaille, Regulation of metabolic shifts in *Clostridium*
acetobutylicum ATCC 824, *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.* 17 (1995) 287–297.
[https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/0168-6445\(95\)00017-7](https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/0168-6445(95)00017-7).
- 750 [71] S.-Y. Li, R. Srivastava, S.L. Suib, Y. Li, R.S. Parnas, Performance of batch, fed-batch, and continuous
A–B–E fermentation with pH-control, *Bioresour. Technol.* 102 (2011) 4241–4250.
752 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2010.12.078>.
- 754 [72] A.P. Mariano, T.C. Ezeji, N. Qureshi, Butanol production by fermentation: efficient bioreactors, in:
Commer. Biobased Prod., 2015: pp. 48–70.
- 756 [73] R. A. Sheldon, Green and sustainable manufacture of chemicals from biomass: state of the art, *Green*
Chem. 16 (2014) 950–963. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C3GC41935E>.
- 758 [74] B. Tabah, A. Varvak, I. Neel Pulidindi, E. Foran, E. Banin, A. Gedanken, Production of 1,3-
propanediol from glycerol via fermentation by *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, *Green Chem.* 18 (2016)
4657–4666. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C6GC00125D>.
- 760 [75] C. Pateraki, S. J. Andersen, D. Ladakis, A. Koutinas, K. Rabaey, Direct electrochemical extraction
increases microbial succinic acid production from spent sulphite liquor, *Green Chem.* 21 (2019) 2401–
762 2411. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C9GC00361D>.
- 764 [76] E.M. Prosen, D. Radlein, J. Piskorz, D.S. Scott, R.L. Legge, Microbial utilization of levoglucosan in
wood pyrolysate as a carbon and energy source, *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 42 (1993) 538–541.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.260420419>.

- 766 [77] C. Wen, C.M. Moreira, L. Rehmann, F. Berruti, Feasibility of anaerobic digestion as a treatment for
768 the aqueous pyrolysis condensate (APC) of birch bark, *Bioresour. Technol.* 307 (2020) 123199.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2020.123199>.
- [78] J. Lian, M. Garcia-Perez, R. Coates, H. Wu, S. Chen, Yeast fermentation of carboxylic acids obtained
770 from pyrolytic aqueous phases for lipid production, *Bioresour. Technol.* 118 (2012) 177–186.
- [79] J. Lian, S. Chen, S. Zhou, Z. Wang, J. O’Fallon, C.-Z. Li, M. Garcia-Perez, Separation, hydrolysis and
772 fermentation of pyrolytic sugars to produce ethanol and lipids, *Bioresour. Technol.* 101 (2010) 9688–
9699. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2010.07.071>.
- [80] C. Torri, D. Fabbri, Biochar enables anaerobic digestion of aqueous phase from intermediate pyrolysis
774 of biomass, *Bioresour. Technol.* 172 (2014) 335–341.
- [81] L. Luque, R. Westerhof, G. Van Rossum, S. Oudenhoven, S. Kersten, F. Berruti, L. Rehmann,
776 Pyrolysis based bio-refinery for the production of bioethanol from demineralized ligno-cellulosic
778 biomass, *Bioresour. Technol.* 161 (2014) 20–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2014.03.009>.
- [82] D.S. Layton, A. Ajarapu, D.W. Choi, L.R. Jarboe, Engineering ethanologenic *Escherichia coli* for
780 levoglucosan utilization, *Bioresour. Technol.* 102 (2011) 8318–8322.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2011.06.011>.
- [83] X. Zhao, Z. Chi, M. Rover, R. Brown, L. Jarboe, Z. Wen, Microalgae fermentation of acetic acid-rich
782 pyrolytic bio-oil: Reducing bio-oil toxicity by alkali treatment, *Environ. Prog. Sustain. Energy.* 32
784 (2013) 955–961.
- [84] X. Zhao, L. Jarboe, Z. Wen, Utilization of pyrolytic substrate by microalga *Chlamydomonas*
786 *reinhardtii*: cell membrane property change as a response of the substrate toxicity, *Appl. Microbiol.*
Biotechnol. 100 (2016) 4241–4251. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-016-7439-2>.
- [85] B. Song, F. Buendia-Kandia, Y. Yu, A. Dufour, H. Wu, Importance of lignin removal in enhancing
788 biomass hydrolysis in hot-compressed water, *Bioresour. Technol.* (2019) 121522.
790 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2019.121522>.
- [86] R.W. Torget, J.S. Kim, Y.Y. Lee, Fundamental Aspects of Dilute Acid Hydrolysis/Fractionation
792 Kinetics of Hardwood Carbohydrates. 1. Cellulose Hydrolysis, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 39 (2000) 2817–
2825. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ie990915q>.
- [87] Y.-H.P. Zhang, L.R. Lynd, Cellodextrin preparation by mixed-acid hydrolysis and chromatographic
794 separation, *Anal. Biochem.* 322 (2003) 225–232. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ab.2003.07.021>.
- [88] M. Brito, F. Martins, Life cycle assessment of butanol production, *Fuel.* 208 (2017) 476–482.
796 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2017.07.050>.
- [89] A.S. Ndou, N. Plint, N.J. Coville, Dimerisation of ethanol to butanol over solid-base catalysts, *Appl.*
798 *Catal. Gen.* 251 (2003) 337–345. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926-860X\(03\)00363-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0926-860X(03)00363-6).
- [90] B. Ndaba, I. Chiyanzu, S. Marx, n-Butanol derived from biochemical and chemical routes: A review,
800 *Biotechnol. Rep.* 8 (2015) 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.btre.2015.08.001>.
- [91] Á. Fernández-Naveira, M.C. Veiga, C. Kennes, H-B-E (hexanol-butanol-ethanol) fermentation for
802 the production of higher alcohols from syngas/waste gas, *J. Chem. Technol. Biotechnol.* 92 (2017)
804 712–731. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jctb.5194>.
- [92] V. Liberato, C. Benevenuti, F. Coelho, A. Botelho, P. Amaral, N. Pereira, T. Ferreira, *Clostridium* sp.
806 as Bio-Catalyst for Fuels and Chemicals Production in a Biorefinery Context, *Catalysts.* 9 (2019) 962.
- [93] I. Komonkiat, B. Cheirsilp, Felled oil palm trunk as a renewable source for biobutanol production by
808 *Clostridium* spp., *Bioresour. Technol.* 146 (2013) 200–207.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2013.07.067>.
- [94] L. Li, H. Ai, S. Zhang, S. Li, Z. Liang, Z.-Q. Wu, S.-T. Yang, J.-F. Wang, Enhanced butanol production
810 by coculture of *Clostridium beijerinckii* and *Clostridium tyrobutyricum*, *Bioresour. Technol.* 143
812 (2013) 397–404. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2013.06.023>.
- [95] L. Devi Gottumukkala, R. Kumar Sukumaran, S.V. Mohan, S.K. Valappil, O. Sarkar, A. Pandey, Rice
814 straw hydrolysate to fuel and volatile fatty acid conversion by *Clostridium sporogenes* BE01: bio-
electrochemical analysis of the electron transport mediators involved, *Green Chem.* 17 (2015) 3047–
816 3058. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C5GC00310E>.
- [96] K. Liu, H.K. Atiyeh, O. Pardo-Planas, T.C. Ezeji, V. Ujor, J.C. Overton, K. Berning, M.R. Wilkins,
818 R.S. Tanner, Butanol production from hydrothermolysis-pretreated switchgrass: Quantification of
inhibitors and detoxification of hydrolyzate, *Bioresour. Technol.* 189 (2015) 292–301.
820 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2015.04.018>.




822

Figure 1. Scheme of the proposed cellulose biorefinery using fast pyrolysis, hydrolysis and ABE fermentation.

824


826




828

Figure 2. Schematic of the fluidized bed with staged condensation system.


830



832 **Figure 3.** Mass yield of pyrolysis products and bio-oil fractions in the condensers (C1 to C5). All
 834 the yields were calculated in reference to the initial cellulose weight.




836 **Figure 4.** Total sugars, levoglucosan and glucose mass yields in the corresponding bio-oil
 838 fractions. (F=combination of all bio-oil fractions): a) after pyrolysis; b) after pyrolysis followed by
 hydrolysis



840


Figure 5. Simplified mechanism of levoglucosan and cellobiosan hydrolysis in mild acidic media.

842



844 **Figure 6.** Kinetic of sugar consumption and products formation during the fermentation of
 846 cellulosic bio-oil obtained after hydrolysis from a) first condenser (C1) and b) second condenser
 (C2) by *C. acetobutylicum*. Products: acetic acid (dark blue, ●), butyric acid (yellow, ■), butanol
 (light blue, □), acetone (orange, Δ), total ABE (brown, ◇) and total sugars (grey, x).

848



850

852

Figure 7. Mass yields in main products along the conversion chain: pyrolysis, hydrolysis and fermentation. Sugar-rich fraction=C1+C2 condensers

854

856 **Table 1.** Overview of different works dealing with the biological conversion of cellulose-derived liquid products with a focus on a pretreatment of lignocellulosic material by pyrolysis.

858

Type of pretreatments	Biological process	Target products (yield)	Advantages	Drawbacks	Refs.
Organosolv (organic acids, 3h, 108°C) cellulose pyrolysis (Pyroprobe, 20 s, 550°C at 10°C/ms)	Not tested (just proposed)	Levogluconan: (relative yield by GC/MS 42.1-59.8 wt.%)	Fast depolymerization of cellulose producing high bio-oil yields	Pyrolysis technology (Pyroprobe) might not be representative of those used at industrial scale (like fluidized beds).	[26]
Biomass fast pyrolysis, detoxification by activated carbon and hydrolysis	Fermentation of the sugar-rich fraction by yeast	Ethanol (yeast: 0.02 – 0.43 g/ g of substrate)	Fast and low-cost production of sugars. Good detoxification.	Probable carbon sources not accounted. The method was not tested for bacteria.	[76]
Biomass pyrolysis (Fluidized bed reactor, 500°C)	Anaerobic digestion of aqueous pyrolytic condensate	Methane: (262 mL from 1 g/L of acetic acid condensate equivalent)	Valorisation of a pyrolysis aqueous phase by-product	Requires a long period (days) for the inoculum to adapt	[77]
Biomass pyrolysis (Rotatory reactor, 450°C) Detoxification for the recovery of organic acids in the aqueous phase (evaporation, activated carbon)	Fermentation of acetic and formic acids by oleaginous yeast (<i>C. curvatus</i> , <i>R. glutinis</i> and <i>L. starkeyi</i>)	Lipids (11 wt%) Yeast cells (40 wt%)	Valorisation of the pyrolytic aqueous phase to added-value products (lipids)	Requires a detoxification process with drawbacks at industrial level	[78]
Fast pyrolysis of acid washed poplar, acid hydrolysis and activated carbon detoxification	Fermentation producing ethanol by: <i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i> , and lipids by: <i>Cryptococcus curvatus</i> and <i>Rhodotorula glutinis</i>	Ethanol (50 wt.% of initial glucose) Lipids (9 - 16 wt.% of initial glucose)	Flexibility of the detoxification method working in both ethanol and lipid fermentation	Require better extraction and detoxification procedures	[79]
Biomass intermediate pyrolysis (fixed bed reactor, 400°C for 10 min at 100°C/min)	Anaerobic digestion of the aqueous pyrolysis liquid with biochar addition	Methane (0.2 mL CH ₄ /mL _{reactor} /day or 65 % of the theoretical yield)	Utilisation of biochar for the conversion of pyrolytic liquid with acceptable rate	Inhibitors slow down the conversion and thus, the methane yield. Methane is a low value product.	[80]
Biomass fast pyrolysis with fractional condensation, hydrolysis	Fermentation of the sugar rich pyrolytic fraction by <i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i>	Ethanol (41 % of theoretical yield based on the cellulose fraction)	Advanced fast pyrolysis combined with fractional condensation. Detoxification procedure by liquid extraction.	The fermentation substrate was blended with pure glucose	[81]
Biomass fast pyrolysis with staged condensation	Fermentation by <i>E. Coli</i> genetically modified	Ethanol (0.35 g per g of levoglucosan consumed)	Advanced pyrolysis process. Strain capable of metabolizing	Sensitive to inhibitors present in the raw aqueous pyrolytic liquid	[82]

			levoglucosan directly		
Biomass fast pyrolysis with staged condensation, alkali treatment with sodium hydroxide	Fermentation of acetic-acid rich fraction by microalgae <i>Chlamydomonas reinhardtii</i>	Lipids (only positive cell growth reported)	Effective detoxification of the aqueous bio-oil fraction	Requires a metabolically evolved strain to metabolise the bio-oil fraction	[83,84]
Cellulose fast pyrolysis with staged condensation and hydrolysis	Fermentation of the sugar-rich fraction by <i>Clostridium acetobutylicum</i>	Building blocks (23.7wt.% of the substrate). Butanol (15 wt.% of the sugars)	Simple separation of the sugar-rich fraction without further detoxification. Tolerant and robust strain.	Fermentation stage needs to be up-scaled in a continuous process	This work

862 **Table 2.** Saccharides quantified by GC-FID-MS and Total Carbohydrates Analysis of the bio-oil
 fractions produced by cellulose pyrolysis with staged condensation system (C1 to C4: condensers
 1 to 4+5, F: combination of all bio-oil fractions).

864

Fraction	Compound	Retention Time (min)	Mass yield (wt.% of the oil fraction)	Mass yield (wt.% of cellulose)
C1	Levoglucofan	33.6	43.7	19.8
	1,6-Anhydro- β -D-glucofuranose	35.8	3.1	1.4
	<i>Total sugars</i>	-	80.4	36.4
C2	Levoglucofanone	21.1	0.17	0.03
	1,4:3,6-Dianhydro- α -d-glucofuranose	24.3	0.41	0.08
	Levoglucofan	33.6	35.5	6.8
	1,6-Anhydro- β -D-glucofuranose	35.9	2.49	0.48
	<i>Total sugars</i>	-	59.7	11.4
C3	Levoglucofan	33.6	9.6	0.4
	<i>Total sugars</i>	-	29.0	1.3
C4	<i>Total sugars</i>	-	0	0
F	Levoglucofanone	21.1	0.04	0.03
	1,4:3,6-Dianhydro- α -d-glucofuranose	24.3	0.1	0.08
	Levoglucofan	33.6	36.9	27.0
	1,6-Anhydro- β -D-glucofuranose	35.9	2.6	1.9
	<i>Total sugars</i>	-	71.3	49.2

866

868 **Table 3.** Comparison of the main methods of cellulose depolymerization into fermentable sugars,
 for the same cellulose substrate (Avicel cellulose)

870

Cellulose conversion method	Reaction Time	Reaction agent	Yield (wt.%)	Comments	Ref.
Enzymatic hydrolysis 50°C and 1 bar	18 h	Enzyme cocktail of cellulase and β -glucosidase	~56	Glucose yield obtained after ball milling. Long cellulose pre-treatment and high cost of enzyme.	[13]
Hydrothermal liquefaction in batch reactor 220°C and 24 bar	120 min	Water	~50	Important secondary reactions occur in batch reactors. Batch process not well intensified for up-scaling. Various by-products diluted in the same water stream as glucose.	[46]
Hydrothermal liquefaction in continuous flow reactor 250°C and 100 bar	80 min	Water	80	Primary sugars obtained in a highly diluted solution under these conditions of flow reactor. Various by-products diluted in the same water stream as glucose.	[60,85]
Direct mild acid hydrolysis of cellulose (Whatman no. 1 paper, not Avicel in this case) 215 °C and 345 bar	120 min	Percolating flow of weak (5 mM) acid (H_2SO_4)	71	Glucose yield depends on complex diffusion resistances for released glucose to the bulk medium, which is a function of the reactor configuration.[65] Various oligomers and by-products produced.[12,66]	[12,65,86,87]
Fast pyrolysis in fluidised bed reactor followed by hydrolysis Pyrolysis: 475°C and 1 bar Hydrolysis: 120°C and 10 bar	Pyrolysis: few seconds Hydrolysis: 44 min	Heat then mild-acid (H_2SO_4)	43	Yield of total fermentable sugars. Requires strain capable of fermenting multiple sugars.	This work

872

874 **Table 4.** Levoglucosan, glucose and glucose/levoglucosan mixtures consumption by *C. acetobutylicum* ATCC 824 grown on two different culture media. (Initial pH was 5 in all cases)

Type of culture media	Initial Glucose (g/L)	Initial Lvg* (g/L)	% Glucose used	% Lvg used	Final pH
Synthetic media	0	5.1	0	1.1	5.8
	4.9	0.0	90.2	0	4.9
	4.7	5.2	100.0	3.6	4.7
	9.6	4.6	89.9	5.2	4.3
Reinforced clostridial medium (RCM)	5.7	0.0	89.3	0.0	4.8
	5.0	5.5	89.4	3.8	4.8

876

Table 5. Comparison of this approach with other butanol production process

Type of resource	Process	Butanol mass yield	Advantages	Drawbacks	Ref.
Crude oil (propylene)	Chemical synthesis Oxo process	75 - 95 wt.% based on propylene and not crude oil	High yield in a two-step process based on propylene after refining	Fossil feedstock. Requires low pressures and modified Rh-catalyst Mass yield integrated in multiproduct oil refinery	[88]
Ethanol	Chemical synthesis	50 – 80 wt.%	High yields. Possibility of renewable feedstock.	High production cost involving three reaction steps. Ethanol is not a primary biomass resource (production efficiency).	[89,90]
Syngas (CO and CO ₂)	Hexanol-butanol-ethanol (HBE) fermentation	~ 50 % of CO conversion. 1.6 – 2.3 g/L of butanol (in a 1.2 L reactor medium).	Industrial waste syngas as feedstock	Tar present in syngas must be managed. Mass transfer between gas and liquid (low solubility of syngas) is a major bottleneck for up-scaling syngas fermentation.	[91,92]
Alimentary biomass (as corn, starch, glucose)	Acid hydrolysis and ABE fermentation	18 – 35 wt.%*	Renewable feedstock	Feedstock in competition with alimentary feedstocks	[93,94]
Lignocellulosic biomass (switchgrass)	Enzymatic hydrolysis and ABE fermentation	23 – 24 wt.%*	Renewable and non-alimentary feedstock	High cost of enzymes. Complex detoxification procedures required.	[95,96]
Cellulose	Pyrolysis and ABE fermentation	15 wt.%*	Renewable and non-alimentary feedstock. No enzyme or solvent for the depolymerisation	Further up-scaling in continuous fermentation reactor should be tested.	This work

880 *Yield expressed per gram of sugar