



## STUDY OF FERMENTATION INHIBITORS TOLERANCE OF YEASTS ISOLATED FROM MEXICAN ECOSYSTEMS

López-Moreno A.<sup>a</sup>, Baquerizo G.<sup>c</sup>, Lappe P.<sup>b</sup> and <u>Le Borgne S.<sup>a</sup></u> a) Departamento de Procesos y Tecnología, UAM-Cuajimalpa, 01120 México D.F. b) Instituto de Biología, UNAM, 04510 México D.F. c) Departamento de Bioingeniería, Unidad Profesional Interdisciplinaria de Biotecnología, IPN, 07738 México D.F. <u>sylvie.le.borgne@gmail.com</u>

Key words: yeasts, bioethanol, fermentation inhibitors

Introduction. Second-generation bioethanol production requires fermenting organisms able to convert lignocellulose-derived sugars to ethanol in the presence of inhibitory released during biomass compounds pretreatment and hydrolysis. Fermentation inhibitors mainly include weak acids, furans and phenolic compounds. Saccharomyces cerevisiae has traditionally been used in the production of ethanol industrial from sugarcane and starch. S. cerevisiae is unable to ferment pentose; however, both laboratory and industrial strains of S. cerevisiae have been successfully genetically engineered to ferment pentoses. In this study, the tolerance of autochthonous yeasts, isolated from henequen and mezcal musts (Table 1) to lignocellulose-derived fermentation inhibitors was investigated.

Methods. 96 wells microplates were used to perform yeasts anaerobic growth in YNB medium containing 10 g/L of glucose (1). Initial pH was adjusted to 5.5 and growth was monitored by OD<sub>595 nm</sub> measurements. The inhibitor cocktail was added to achieve initial concentrations of 100, 75, 50 and 25% (v/v). A 100% concentration consisted of 3.5 g/L formic acid, 4.5 g/L acetic acid, 2.9 g/L furfural, 3.8 g/L 5-hydroxymethylfurfural, 0.15 g/L cinnamic acid and 0.18 q/L coniferylaldehyde (2).

Table 1. Yeasts isolates tested in this work.

Isolate	Procedency
S. cerevisiae C110	Henequen
S. cerevisiae D135A5	Mezcal
S. cerevisiae D145A13	Mezcal
Zygosaccharomyces bisporus D14FA	Mezcal
S. cerevisiae M13SA2	Mezcal

**Results.** *S. cerevisiae* C110 and D135A5 showed the highest tolerance and presented the same final OD<sub>595 nm</sub> in the presence of 0 to 100% of the cocktail. *S. cerevisiae* D145A13 growth was affected from a 75% cocktail concentration. *Z. bisporus* D14FA growth decreased with cocktail concentration above 50%. *S. cerevisiae* M13SA2 seemed to be

less tolerant and presented a decreased growth from a 50% concentration. In the presence of only furans, the isolates generally reached the same final  $OD_{595 nm}$  at all concentrations tested. However longer lag phase and decreased growth rate were detected. For only phenolic compounds, the isolates reached lower  $OD_{595 nm}$  at all concentrations tested (Table 2) and also showed a longer lag phase and decreased growth rate. The isolates were practically unaffected by acids.

 Table 2. OD<sub>595 nm</sub>after 10 h of growth in the presence of phenolic compounds.

Isolate	Concentration of phenolic compounds (%)				
	0	25	50	75	100
C110	0.9	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.35
D135A5	0.95	0.7	0.5	0.35	0.3
D145A13	1.2	0.7	0.55	0.55	0.3
D14FA	1.3	1.2	0.8	0.5	0.35
M13SA2	0.9	0.6	0.4	0.33	0.3

**Conclusions.** The isolates showed significant differences in inhibitor tolerance and growth inhibition by classes of inhibitors. Phenolic compounds were the most toxic, followed by furans. Isolates probably adapted or detoxified furans during growth. The acids presented almost no effect in the tested concentrations. The most tolerant isolates could be used as starting material to develop genetically engineered strains for the production of second-generation bioethanol.

**Acknowledgements.** Proyecto interdisciplinario UAM-Cuajimalpa: Retos y oportunidades del aprovechamiento de la biomasa lignocelulósica para la obtención de biocombustibles y otros productos de valor agregado en México - Un enfoque social y tecnológico. Proyecto CONACYT CB-2010/156451: Estudios básicos sobre tolerancia y adaptación de levaduras a inhibidores de fermentación encontrados en hidrolizados de biomasa lignocelulósica.

## References.

1. Almeida JR, Karhumaa K, Bengtsson O, Gorwa-Grauslund MF. (2009). Bioresour Technol. 100(14):3674-3677.

2. Martín C, Jönsson LJ. (2003) Enzyme Microb Tech(32):386–395.