





Impact of Wheat Straw Pretreatment Technologies on Sugar Yield and **Succinic Acid Fermentation**

Federico Liuzzi¹, Maria Antonietta Rao², Raffaele Loffredo^{2,3}, Patrizia Casella³, Isabella De Bari¹, Antonio Molino³

¹Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and Sustainable Economic Development (ENEA) - Bioenergy, Biorefinery and Green Chemistry division (ENEA-TERIN-BBC), Strada Statale Jonica km 419 + 500, 75026 Rotondella (MT), Italy ² Department of Agricultural Sciences, University of Naples, Federico II, Via Università 100, 8055 Portici (NA), Italy

³Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and Sustainable Economic Development – sustainability, biotechnology and agroindustry division, Bio (ENEA-SSPT-BIOAG), Piazz.le Enrico Fermi 1, 80055 Portici (NA), Italy

Am

The study examined the effects of inhibitors, such as acetic acid and furfural, released with fermentative sugars from hemicellulose-lignin matrix after an acid catalyzed steam explosion (SE), on the production of succinic acid by Actinobacillus succinogenes through batch fermentation. Moreover, a comparative investigation was carried out on the effectiveness of pretreatment technologies (diluted acid (DA), organosolv (OS), and green solvent (GS) - specifically γ -valerolactone) on wheat straw biomass, focusing on cellulose recovery, hydrolysis efficiency, lignin removal, and preliminary lignin characterization. By comparing these methods, the study assessed the selective extraction efficiency and quantified monomeric, oligomeric, and degradation by-products. Additionally, this research is part of the Agritech, a project aimed to valorizing green wastes, and it provides insights into optimizing pretreatment strategies for improved biomass conversion and valorization of wheat straw.

Process set-up

PRELIMINARY FERMENTATION SET-UP

- > These tests were conducted on a hydrolysate of wheat straw treated by catalyzed steam explosion
- Inoculum 25% (v/v)
- Temperature 37°C
- 180 rpm (in the dark)

FNF

TSB growth medium (CTL and IN tests)



• Sugars concentration (uHPLC-ELSD)(Agilent *p/n 685775-924*) **Organic acids** concentration (uHPLC-DAD) (Agilent p/n *PL1170-6830*)

Tab. 1. Concentration of strain, sugars, acetic acid and furfural for fermentation tests

Concentration (mg/l)										
	CTL-G-L	CTL- G/X-L	IN-AA-L	IN-AA/F-L	WS-L	CTL-G-H	CTL-G/X-H	IN-AA-H	IN-AA/F-H	WS-H
A. succinogenes	370	370	370	370	370	1100	1100	1100	1100	1100
D- (+)-Glucose	367	367	367	367	367	1130	1130	1130	1130	1130
D-(+)-Xylose	0	171	171	171	171	0	428	428	428	428
Acetic acid	0	0	21	21	21	0	0	52.5	52.5	52.5
Furfural	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	15	15

PRETREATMENT SET-UP

> Further there were done optimization of pretreatment steps by comparing several pre-treatments:

 \blacktriangleright Diluted acid pretreatment H₂SO₄ concentration: 0.2% 0.6% **1**% > Organosolv (H_2SO_4 1%/EtOH) 1:1- time: 🗖 1h **D** 2h 3h \blacktriangleright Green solvent (GVL/H₂O) - ratio: 0.2 0.5 0.8





Results

Tab. 2. Performance of fermentation process: inbihition rate of the strain growth, sugars consumption, concentration of succinic acid (SA), yield and productivity

Growth	Glucose	Xylose	SA	SA	Viold	Due de stietter et 24h	
Innibition	consumption	consumption	concentration	concentration	riela	Productivity at 24n	
rate				Reduction	$(\mathbf{gr}_{SA}/\mathbf{gr}_{glucose})$	(mg /(l * h))	

The effect of the inhibitory compounds both individually for acetic acid and together with furfural was evident at all concentrations tested;

	(%)	(70)	(70)	(g/1)	(%)	0	
CTL-G-L		31.9		0.20		55.6%	4.5
CTL/X-L		30.5	9.3	0.20		53.5%	4.3
IN-AA-L	29.5	23.7	-	0.10	53	25.7%	3.1
IN-AA/F-L	32.4	21.0	-	0.07	67	17.8%	2.1
WS-L	61.6	11.4	-	0.01	95	2.7%	0.3
CTL-G-H		51.3	-	0.52		47,3%	16.0
CTL-G/X-L		51.1	6.1	0.51		46,4%	16.3
IN-AA-H	33.5	25.2	4.2	0.36	30	32,9%	11.5
IN-AA/F-H	41.2	23.9	5.4	0.20	62	17,8%	6.7
WS-H	58.7	19.5	3.7	0.09	83	8,2%	3.4

Tab. 3 Analysis of hemicellulose liquid fraction and determination of internal lignocellulosic composition of pretreated wheat straw

		Liquid fract	ion	Solid residue			
Wheat straw	Xylose	xylooligomer ^b	acetic/	Furans/	Cellulose	Xylan	Acid
treatment	recovery ^a %	%	xylose %	xylose %	content (%)	content (%)	insoluble lignin
							content (%)
Raw Material	/	/	/	/	34.2	18.9	23.5
ACSE	87.5	5.7	13.6	6.2	53.2	2.1	32.5
DA 0.2%	51.1	20.1	19.0	4.5	40.8	11.1	28.5
DA 0.6%	62.7	0.8	19.6	3.5	39.2	9.3	34.0
DA 1%	42.8	0	41.6	7.2	45.7	1.6	33.4
OS EtOH 1h	44.7	61.0	27.3	5.2	53.3	6.3	21.2
OS EtOH 2h	53.8	65.1	23.3	4.2	53.7	6.8	19.9
OS EtOH 3h	44.1	71.2	25.6	5.3	57.8	6.2	22.3
GVL 20%	nd	nd	nd	nd	35.2	16.1	22.9
GVL 50%	nd	nd	nd	nd	40.9	18.8	21.3
GVL 80%	nd	nd	nd	nd	39.1	18.9	20.5

(a) with respect to xylose in the raw material; (b) with respect to the total xylose recovery

- Better results in terms of succinic acid concentration were obtained from a higher initial strain and sugar concentration;
- The higher initial strain concentration seemed to have better counteracted the presence of inhibitor when straw hydrolysate was used as the sole source of sugars

ENZYMATIC HYDROLYSIS PROCESS



Fig. 1. Determination of saccharification yields at the end of processes



Ctec2 15FPU/g; 150rpm; 72h

- \checkmark The synergistic effect of acetic acid and furfural has been shown to inhibit bacterial growth and succinic acid production. Despite the poor fermentability of wheat straw hydrolysate, succinic acid was obtained at $9*10^{-2} \pm 7*10^{-3}$ g/L from glucose and xylose in hydrolysate at concentrations of 1.1 g/L and 0.4 g/L.
- \checkmark The highest xylose recovery in the liquid fraction was observed with the ACSE treatment (87.5%), followed by DA treatments, with the highest recovery at 0.6% DA (62.7%). OS-EtOH treatments achieved moderate xylose recovery, primarily in oligometric form. GVL eluted with sugars, and residual xylan analysis indicated poor recovery, with increased degradation byproducts observed due to the DA 1% treatment. In terms of solid residue, the highest cellulose content was found after the OS-2h treatment (57.8%). SE steam explosion achieved nearly quantitative enzymatic hydrolysis yield, whereas the DA treatment demonstrated poorer performance.

This work was supported by The National Recovery and Resilience Plan (NRRP) – Next Generation EU – Mission 4, Component 2, Investment 1.4, under the "National Research Centre for Agricultural Technologies", Agritech, [grant number CN0000022].