

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: Different lignocellulosic feedstock used worldwide for bioethanol production. (a- Sugarcane bagasse, b-Wheat Straw, c-Rice Straw, d-Cotton stalk, e-*Prosopis juliflora*, f-*Lantana camara*, g-Willow, h-*Gracillaria verrucosa*)

Figure 2.2: Availability of lignocellulosic biomass (kilo ton per year) in India

Figure 2.3: Schematic illustration of process of conversion of lignocellulosic biomass to bioethanol

Figure 2.4: Schematic diagram showing mechanism of enzymatic hydrolysis

Figure 2.5: Overview of various fermentation strategies

Figure 2.6: Various inhibitors generated during pretreatment of lignocellulosic biomass

Figure 4.1: Screening of various thermotolerant yeasts for inhibitor(s) tolerance on agar medium. *I- inhibitor cocktail plates (acetic acid, furfural, vanillin); C-Control plate (without inhibitors)

Figure 4.2: Colony characteristics and cell morphology (40× magnification) of yeast isolates JKH1 (a & b), JKH4 (c & d), JKH5 (e & f) and JKH7 (g & h).

Figure 4.3: Biochemical characterization of selected yeast isolates JKH1 (a), JKH4 (b), JKH5 (c), and JKH7 (d) (1- Urease, 2- Melibiose, 3- Lactose, 4- Maltose, 5- Sucrose, 6- Galactose, 7- Cellobiose, 8- Inositol, 9- Xylose, 10- Dulcitol, 11- Raffinose, 12- Trehalose).

Figure 4.4: Agarose gel electrophoresis representing ITS-5.8S rDNA amplicons of selected yeast isolates. Lane 1: PCR amplicon of JKH1, Lane 2: PCR amplicon of JKH4, Lane 3: PCR amplicon of JKH5, Lane 4: PCR amplicon of JKH7 and Lane M: 1000 b.p. DNA ladder

Figure 4.5: The phylogenetic trees showing genetic relatedness of *Pichia kudriavzevii* JKH1 (a), *Kluyveromyces marxianus* JKH4 (b), *Kluyveromyces marxianus* JKH5 (c) and *Kluyveromyces marxianus* JKH7 (d) with other yeasts based on their ITS-5.8S rDNA region

Figure 4.6: Effect of different glucose concentrations on ethanol production by *Pichia kudriavzevii* JKH1 (a), *Kluyveromyces marxianus* JKH4 (b), *Kluyveromyces marxianus* JKH5 (c) and *Kluyveromyces marxianus* JKH7 (d) and standard thermotolerant yeast strains *Kluyveromyces marxianus* NCIM 3565 (e) and *Kluyveromyces marxianus* MTCC 4136 (f).

Figure 4.7: Effect of different glucose concentrations on residual reducing sugars during fermentation by *Pichia kudriavzevii* JKH1 (a), *Kluyveromyces marxianus* JKH4 (b), *Kluyveromyces marxianus* JKH5 (c) and *Kluyveromyces marxianus* JKH7 (d) and standard thermotolerant yeast strains *Kluyveromyces marxianus* NCIM 3565 (e) and *Kluyveromyces marxianus* MTCC 4136 (f).

Figure 4.8: Growth curve of *Pichia kudriavzevii* JKH 1 (a) and *Kluyveromyces marxianus* JKH 5 (b)

Figure 4.9: Effect of acetic acid (a), furfural (b), vanillin (c) individually and in combination (d) on the growth of *Pichia kudriavzevii* JKH1 at 42°C for 24 h.

Longer lag phase than the control was considered as inhibition

Figure 4.10 : Effect of different concentrations of various inhibitors on the growth of *P. kudriavzevii* JKH1 on YP agar plates. AA:F:V (1+1+1[Cocktail I]; 2+2+2 [Cocktail II]; 3+3+3[Cocktail III]; 4+4+4 [Cocktail IV]; 1+0.1+0.1 [Cocktail V], 2+0.2+0.2 [Cocktail VI]; 3+0.3+0.3 [Cocktail VII]; 4+0.4+0.4 [Cocktail VIII]; 5+0.5+0.5 [Cocktail IX])

Figure 4.11: Effect of acetic acid (a), furfural (b), vanillin (c) individually and in combination (d) on the growth of *Kluyveromyces marxianus* JKH5 at 42°C. Longer lag phase than the control was considered as inhibition.

Figure 4.12: Effect of different concentrations of various inhibitors on the growth of *K. marxianus* JKH5 in YPD agar plates. AA:F:V (1+1+1[Cocktail I]; 2+2+2 [Cocktail II]; 3+3+3[Cocktail III]; 4+4+4 [Cocktail IV]; 1+0.1+0.1 [Cocktail V], 2+0.2+0.2 [Cocktail VI]; 3+0.3+0.3 [Cocktail VII]; 4+0.4+0.4 [Cocktail VIII]; 5+0.5+0.5 [Cocktail IX])

Figure 4.13: Comparison of growth profile of parent and adapted yeast strain *Pichia kudriavzevii* strain on medium supplemented with inhibitors, AA: acetic acid (6 g/L) (a), F: furfural (3.2 g/L) (b), V: vanillin (2.8 g/L) (c), and cocktail: (acetic acid+furfural+vanillin) (3+1+1 g/L) (d)

Figure 4.14 Comparison of growth profile of parent and adapted yeast strains of *Kluyveromyces marxianus* on medium supplemented with inhibitors, AA: acetic acid (6 g/L) (a), F: furfural (3.2 g/L) (b), V: vanillin (3 g/L) (c), and cocktail: (acetic acid+furfural+vanillin) (3+1+1 g/L) (d)

Figure 4.15: Effect of different glucose concentrations on growth of the adapted yeast *K. marxianus* JKH5 C60

Figure 4.16: Effect of different temperatures on growth of the adapted yeast *K. marxianus* JKH5 C60

Figure 4.17 Effect of ethanol supplementation on growth of *K. marxianus* JKH5 C60

Figure 4.18: Response surface plots of Box-Behnken design for optimization of sequential pretreatment of SCB showing influence of sulphuric acid and temperature (a); temperature and solid loading (b); sulphuric acid and solid loading (c); sulphuric acid and time (d); temperature and time (e); time and solid loading (f) on the response sugar yield

Figure 4.19 Response surface plots of Box-Behnken design for optimization of sequential pretreatment of SCB showing influence of sulphuric acid and temperature (a); temperature and solid loading (b); sulphuric acid and solid loading (c); sulphuric acid and time (d); temperature and time (e); time and solid loading (f) for the response cellulose content

Figure 4.20: Three dimensional response surface plot showing influence of alkali concentration and solid loading on the response cellulose content for optimization of sequential pretreatment of sugarcane bagasse through D-optimal design

Figure 4.21: FTIR spectra of untreated and pretreated sugarcane bagasse

Figure 4.22: Scanning electron micrographs of (i) untreated, (ii) dilute acid pretreated and (iii) sequential dilute acid-alkali pretreated sugarcane bagasse

Figure 4.23: EDX spectrum of (a) untreated, (b) dilute acid pretreated and (c) dilute acid-alkali pretreated sugarcane bagasse.

Figure 4.24: Thermal degradation curves of untreated, dilute acid pretreated and sequential dilute acid-alkali pretreated sugarcane bagasse

Figure 4.25: X-ray diffraction analysis of untreated and pretreated sugarcane bagasse

Figure 4.26: SANS analysis of untreated and pretreated sugarcane bagasse

Figure 4.27: Effect of enzyme dosage on enzymatic saccharification of sequentially pretreated sugarcane bagasse

Figure 4.28: Effect of temperature on enzymatic saccharification of sequentially pretreated sugarcane bagasse

Figure 4.29 Effect of initial pH on enzymatic saccharification of sequentially pretreated sugarcane bagasse

Figure 4.30: Effect of Tween 80 concentration on enzymatic saccharification of sequentially pretreated sugarcane bagasse

Figure 4.31: Separate hydrolysis and fermentation of sequential pretreated sugarcane bagasse by adapted yeast *K. marxianus* JKH5 C60 (a) enzymatic hydrolysis at different enzyme doses and (b) ethanol fermentation

Figure 4.32: Batch simultaneous saccharification and fermentation of sequentially pretreated sugarcane bagasse in the presence of fermentation inhibitors by *K. marxianus* JKH5 C60 under shake flask. The solid loading of 15% (dry wt.), enzyme dosage of 20 FPU/g and inhibitor concentrations: acetic acid+furfural+vanillin (3+1+1) g/L were used

Figure 4.33: Batch simultaneous saccharification and fermentation of sequentially pretreated sugarcane bagasse by the adapted yeast *K. marxianus* JKH5 C60 at lab-scale fermenter in presence and absence of inhibitors. The solid loading was 15% (dry wt.) and 20 FPU/g enzyme dosage

Figure 4.34: Batch simultaneous saccharification and fermentation of sequentially pretreated sugarcane bagasse at high solid loadings by adapted yeast *K. marxianus* JKH5 C60 under shake-flask.

Figure 4.35: Fed-batch simultaneous saccharification and fermentation of sequential pretreated sugarcane bagasse by *K. marxianus* JKH5 C60 under shake flask employing biomass feeding strategy. Trial A, B and C were conducted at different solid loadings 18, 20 and 30 %, respectively

Figure 4.36: Fed-batch simultaneous saccharification and fermentation of sequential pretreated sugarcane bagasse by *K. marxianus* JKH5 C60 under shake flask employing biomass and enzyme

feeding strategy. Trial D, E and F were conducted at different solid loadings 18, 20 and 30 %, respectively

Figure 4.37: Fed-batch simultaneous saccharification and fermentation of sequentially pretreated sugarcane bagasse by adapted yeast *K. marxianus* JKH5 C60 under shake flask in presence and absence of inhibitory compounds. The solid loading was 20% (dry wt.) and 20 FPU/g enzyme dosage were employed

Figure 4.38: Fed-batch simultaneous saccharification and fermentation of pretreated sugarcane bagasse in the presence of inhibitors by *K. marxianus* JKH5 C60 at bench-top fermenter. The solid loading was 20% (dry wt.) and 20 FPU/g enzyme dosage were employed

Figure 4.39: Fermentation of acid hydrolysate by *Pichia stipitis* NCIM 3499 for ethanol production under shake flask

Figure 4.40: Mass Balance for bioconversion of sequential dilute acid-pretreated sugarcane bagasse to ethanol