

Integrating dark and light biohydrogen production strategies: towards the hydrogen economy

Redwood, Mark; Paterson-Beedle, Marion; Macaskie, Lynne

DOI:

[10.1007/s11157-008-9144-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11157-008-9144-9)

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Redwood, M, Paterson-Beedle, M & Macaskie, L 2008, 'Integrating dark and light biohydrogen production strategies: towards the hydrogen economy', *Rev. Environ. Sci. Bio/Technol*, vol. 8, pp. 149-185.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11157-008-9144-9>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Integrating dark and light bio-hydrogen production strategies: towards the hydrogen economy

Mark D. Redwood, Marion Paterson-Beedle and Lynne E. Macaskie

School of Biosciences, University of Birmingham

Correspondence should be addressed to Dr Mark D. Redwood, School of Biosciences, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK.

Tel: +44 1214145889

Fax: +44 1214145925

e-mail: m.d.redwood@bham.ac.uk

Keywords:

bio-hydrogen, bioenergy, renewable energy, hydrogen economy, dark fermentation, dual systems, photosynthesis.

Abstract

Biological methods of hydrogen production are preferable to chemical methods because of the possibility to use sunlight, CO₂ and organic wastes as substrates for environmentally benign conversions, under moderate conditions. By combining different microorganisms with different capabilities, the individual strengths of each may be exploited and their weaknesses overcome. Mechanisms of bio-hydrogen production are described and strategies for their integration are discussed. Dual systems can be divided broadly into wholly light-driven systems (with microalgae/cyanobacteria as the 1st stage) and partially light-driven systems (with a dark, fermentative initial reaction). Review and evaluation of published data suggests that the latter type of system holds greater promise for industrial application. This is because the calculated land area required for a wholly light-driven dual system would be too large for either centralised (macro-) or decentralised (micro-)energy generation. The potential contribution to the hydrogen economy of partially light-driven dual systems is overviewed alongside that of other bio-fuels such as bio-methane and bio-ethanol.

Contents

- 1: Bio-fuels for sustainable energy production
- 2: The use of microorganisms for H₂ production.
 - 2.1: Photobiological H₂ production
 - 2.1.1: Photoautotrophs
 - 2.1.2: Photoheterotrophs
 - 2.2: Dark fermentation
 - 2.2.1: Axenic cultures
 - 2.2.2: Mixed fermentation
- 3: Hybrid hydrogen
 - 3.1: Techniques for connecting the components of a dual system
 - 3.2: Comparing diverse strategies
 - 3.3: Selection of organisms for the 2nd stage
 - 3.4: Selection of organisms for the 1st stage
 - 3.4.1: Dual systems with photoautotrophic 1st stage
 - 3.4.1.1: Energy generation potential with a photoautotrophic 1st stage
 - 3.4.2: Dual systems with dark fermentative 1st stage
 - 3.4.2.1: Selection of organisms for a dark fermentative 1st stage
 - 3.4.2.2: Distribution of H₂ between 1st and 2nd stages
 - 3.4.2.3: Energy generation potential with a dark fermentative 1st stage.
 - 3.4.2.4: Bio-H₂, bio-methane or bio-ethanol?
- 4: Conclusions and future perspectives
- 5: Acknowledgements
- 6: Bibliography

Glossary & Abbreviations

ADP: Adenosine diphosphate

Akinete: Vegetative cyanobacterial cell accumulating carbohydrate. The main component of filaments, including heterocysts

APB: Anoxygenic photosynthetic bacteria

ATP: Adenosine triphosphate

Autotrophy: Metabolism with the synthesis of carbohydrate using light and/or inorganic substrates

Av. : Average

Axenic: Pure culture containing only one type of microorganism

BOD: Biological oxygen demand; the mass of oxygen consumed by microorganisms during the oxidation of organic compounds from a sample of water

COD: Chemical oxygen demand; the mass of oxygen consumed during the chemical oxidation of organic compounds from a sample of water

CSTR: Continuously stirred tank reactor

Direct bio-photolysis: H₂ production from water; electrons liberated from H₂O by photosystem II recombine with H⁺ to form H₂, catalysed by hydrogenase or nitrogenase

DF: Dark fermentation

DF-PF: dual system combining dark fermentation and photofermentation

DMFC: Direct methanol fuel cell, a type of PEM-FC using methanol fuel directly without reforming as in the indirect methanol fuel cell

dw: Dry cell weight

FHL: Formate:hydrogen lyase

Fermentation: Microbial growth mode in which ATP is generated only by substrate level phosphorylation in the absence of exogenous electron acceptors (e.g. O₂, NO₃⁻, NO₂²⁻, SO₄²⁻)

HRT: Hydraulic retention time. The total flow rate through a diluted system over its volume

Indirect bio-photolysis: H₂ production from water *via* the photosynthesis and fermentation of carbohydrates

Heterocyst: A cyanobacterial cell specialised for N₂ fixation

Heterotrophy: Microbial metabolism utilising organic carbon sources

HHV: higher heating value

Hyperthermophilic: refers to extreme thermophiles most active in the temperature range 80 – 110 °C

LDH: Fermentative lactate dehydrogenase

Light conversion efficiency: The percentage of available light energy converted to H₂, distinct from photosynthetic efficiency (PE)

Mesophilic: Most active in the temperature range 20 – 40 °C

NADH: Nicotinamide-adenine dinucleotide

Net energy ratio: The dimensionless ratio of the energy outputs to primary inputs for the entire operational lifetime of a system

Nitrogenase: Nitrogenase complex (reductase and nitrogenase)

PE: Photosynthetic efficiency. The percentage of photosynthetically active light energy converted to H₂. (includes only those wavelengths which interact with photopigments)

PEM-FC: Proton exchange membrane fuel cell; a type of low-temperature fuel cell considered most suitable for transport applications

PF: Photofermentation

PHB: Poly-β-hydroxybutyrate, a storage polymer

Photoheterotrophy: light-driven mode of anaerobic metabolism using organic substrates as electron donors.

Pi : Inorganic phosphate

PFL: Pyruvate:formate lyase

PFOR: Pyruvate:ferredoxin oxidoreductase

Photopigments: Light harvesting proteins

PEM-FC: Proton-exchange membrane fuel cell

Phototrophy: Microbial metabolism using light energy

Photoautotrophy: Microbial metabolism using light energy for the synthesis of carbon sources

PNS bacteria: Purple non-sulfur bacteria

PSI: Photosystem I

PSII: Photosystem II

Reserve: The amount of a resource in place (e.g. oil in the ground) that is economically recoverable

SOFC: Solid oxide fuel cell, a high temperature alkaline fuel cell

SOT medium: Growth medium for cyanobacteria containing salts and trace elements but no carbon source

Thermophilic: Most active in the temperature range 40 – 60 °C

UASB: Upstream anaerobic sludge blanket reactor.

1: Bio-fuels for sustainable energy production

An estimated 45 % of the identified world oil reserves has been combusted and atmospheric CO₂ has increased by 20 % since 1900 (Holmes & Jones 2003; Keeling & Whorf 2005). Conservative estimates suggest that demand for oil will outstrip supply by 2050 (Holmes & Jones 2003), while the Stern Review (Stern 2006) highlights the urgent need for reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. A sustainable energy economy is needed and this will require a different fuel; one that is not limited in supply and whose use is environmentally benign. Hydrogen is now recognised as a key energy vector in the future energy economy. H₂ storage technology and fuel cell efficiency continue to receive urgent attention and have advanced sufficiently for transport applications to approach commercial viability. For example, BMW's fleet of 100 "Hydrogen 7" cars, each having a material value of \$500,000, is now available for promotional purposes (carsguide.com.au, Nov 2006). A prototype H₂-powered boat is also opening the way to economic transport *via* inland waterways (Bevan *et al.* 2007). Whereas the use of H₂ in transport applications is dependent upon such emerging technologies, its use in stationary applications, for electricity supply, is limited primarily by H₂ availability.

Biological approaches could contribute to large-scale H₂ production as various microorganisms can produce H₂ under moderate conditions from readily available, renewable substrates, making biological strategies potentially competitive with chemical process such as reforming and gasification. Bio-hydrogen processes are 'CO₂-neutral', being fuelled by carbohydrates originating from photosynthetic fixation of CO₂. Furthermore, bio-H₂ is free of CO and H₂S (both catalyst poisons) and requires no treatment before use in fuel cells for electricity generation (Macaskie *et al.* 2005).

Suitable feeds for bio-hydrogen generation processes can be found in agricultural residues (Nath & Das 2003; Hawkes *et al.* 2008), food wastes (Franchi *et al.* 2004; Karlsson *et al.* 2008) and effluents from industrial processes such as refining sugar (Yetis *et al.* 2000; Ren *et al.* 2006), distilling alcohol (Sasikala *et al.* 1992), olive processing (Eroğlu *et al.* 2004), producing cheese (Davila-Vazquez *et al.* 2008b) and producing tofu (Zhu *et al.* 1995; 2002). Hence, microbial processes could be employed to remediate wastes while simultaneously producing H₂ with the dual economic benefit of energy production and savings in the cost of waste disposal. In the UK the majority of waste is disposed by land-filling and the related environmental damage is being recognised in financial terms *via* landfill tax; which is paid additionally to normal landfill fees. In 2008, UK landfill fees were in the range GBP 11-40/tonne, to which landfill tax added GBP 24/tonne increasing by £8/year (WRAP Gate Fees Report, 2008, www.wrap.org.uk/marketknowledge). The avoidance of waste disposal costs is, therefore, anticipated to be an important economic driver in the start-up of bioenergy processes.

The capability for H₂ formation is widespread among microorganisms, but only a few have been investigated with a focus on bio-hydrogen production. In particular, photosynthetic microorganisms such as microalgae, cyanobacteria and purple bacteria are of interest, along with various dark fermentations. Each of these candidates represents a potential method in its own right, but it has long been recognised that multi-organism systems, combining the capabilities of different species would be required to realise the maximum potential for bio-hydrogen production (Rocha *et al.* 2001; Wakayama & Miyake 2001; de Vrije & Claassen 2003; Nath *et al.* 2005; Basak & Das 2007). Several examples of dual systems are illustrated in Table 1. The purpose of this review is to advance the state of knowledge by comparing the successes of diverse strategies, relating them to the methods employed, evaluating the potential for energy generation and by highlighting potential problems.

2: The use of microorganisms for H₂ production

This work does not attempt to review microbial hydrogen production (for reviews see Vignais *et al.* 1985; Blankenship *et al.* 1995; Sasikala *et al.* 1995; Nandi & Sengupta 1998; Claassen *et al.* 1999; Das & Veziroglu 2001; Hallenbeck & Benemann 2002; Nath & Das 2004a, 2004b; Bae *et al.* 2005; Dutta *et al.*

2005; Hawkes *et al.* 2007; Tsygankov 2007), but provides a summary of those organisms which have been studied expressly for the purpose of H₂ production. Combining different organisms in multi-organism strategies creates the possibility to exploit the most useful facets of different metabolisms. In order to evaluate multi-organism strategies, the broad metabolic mechanisms are first considered individually.

2.1: Photobiological hydrogen production

Many microorganisms have evolved the capacity to harness solar energy for growth and several types of photosynthetic microorganism are potentially useful for bio-hydrogen production. Artificial light sources are often used as models for future applications with sunlight, but solar bio-hydrogen projects have been successful (see below) despite the diurnal and seasonal variations in light intensity.

2.1.1: Photoautotrophic microorganisms

Photoautotrophs produce H₂ by two distinct mechanisms: “direct photolysis” and “indirect photolysis” which can both occur in the same organism (Figure 1). Like higher plants, microalgae (green unicellular algae) and cyanobacteria (previously called blue-green algae) have two photosystems (Photosystems I and II: PSI and PSII), which produce H₂ by “direct photolysis” in which water is decomposed to H₂ and O₂ (oxygenic photosynthesis). The dual photosystems split water, reducing electron carriers and exporting protons to generate a proton gradient for ATP generation (Miyake *et al.* 1999).

Hydrogenase and nitrogenase enzymes are found in cyanobacteria, but (as in purple bacteria, see later) self-sustained H₂ formation in the light results from the activity of nitrogenase, which consumes ATP and re-oxidises electron carriers. In microalgae a hydrogenase performs the reduction of 2H⁺ to H₂ without any ATP requirement. In “indirect photolysis”, CO₂ is fixed *via* the Calvin cycle to synthesise simple sugars which are then accumulated as polycarbohydrates (starch in microalgae and glycogen in cyanobacteria). Stored carbohydrates can be metabolised fermentatively (section 2.2) to generate H₂ indirectly.

In direct photolysis H₂ production is limited due to the inhibition of hydrogenase and nitrogenase by oxygen generated from water. In contrast indirect photolysis separates the production of O₂ and H₂ spatially (into compartments) or temporally (into aerobic and anaerobic phases) as described below (Levin *et al.* 2004a) and is therefore sustainable. For example, continuous H₂ production was achieved for up to 1 month using *Anabaena cylindrica*, when O₂ was artificially removed from the culture by purging with argon gas (Madamwar *et al.* 2000).

Cyanobacteria are divided into non nitrogen-fixing varieties (e.g. *Synechococcus* spp.) which form only one kind of cell (akinetes) and nitrogen-fixing varieties (e.g. *Nostoc*, *Anabaena* spp.), which form akinetes and also heterocysts arranged into filaments - chains of cells connected by channels for the exchange of nutrients (Tsygankov 2007). Heterocysts differ from akinetes due to the absence of O₂ generation by PSII, the increased rate of O₂ consumption by respiration, the presence of a thick envelope to limit the ingress of environmental O₂ and the expression of nitrogenase to fix N₂ as NH₄⁺, supporting the growth of the adjacent akinetes (Madamwar *et al.* 2000; Tamagnini *et al.* 2002). Heterocystous cyanobacteria separate H₂ production and O₂ production spatially (by compartmentalisation) accumulating glycogen in the vegetative akinetes and fermenting it to produce H₂ in the anaerobic heterocysts. Non N₂-fixing cyanobacteria and microalgae separate H₂ production and O₂ production temporally, producing H₂ by the dark anaerobic fermentation of photosynthesised carbohydrates (Carrieri *et al.* 2008). Upon transition to darkness, the generation of O₂ by the photosystem ceases and residual O₂ is consumed by respiration enabling H₂ production (Tsygankov 2007).

The capacity for self-sustained aerobic H₂ production in the light (i.e. without the artificial removal of O₂), is an advantageous property of heterocystous cyanobacteria (e.g. *Anabaena* spp.) achieving maximum H₂ production rates of *ca.* 100 μmol H₂/mg chlorophyll *a*/h, with light conversion efficiencies of

up to 3.9 % (proportion of absorbed light energy converted to H₂) (Dutta *et al.* 2005; Yoon *et al.* 2006; Sakurai & Masukawa 2007). Rates were increased 3-7 fold in *Anabaena* mutants deficient in uptake hydrogenase activity (Borodin *et al.* 2000; Happe *et al.* 2000; Masukawa *et al.* 2002; Yoshino *et al.* 2007) and this strategy was applied in outdoor culture. However, the maximum light conversion efficiency was only 0.1 %, which has implications for the large scale application of this approach (Lindblad *et al.* 2002; Tsygankov *et al.* 2002).

Unicellular cyanobacteria have also been studied with a view to dark fermentative H₂ production, being unsuitable for photoproduction of H₂ due to their high (competing) uptake hydrogenase activity in the light (Troshina *et al.* 2002). However, a mutant of *Synechocystis* deficient in uptake hydrogenase activity photoproduced H₂ at a rate of 6 μmol H₂/mg chlorophyll *a*/h (2 mL/L/h) (Cournac *et al.* 2004).

Like unicellular cyanobacteria, microalgae were originally studied for dark H₂ production by indirect photolysis (Miyamoto *et al.* 1987). The isolation of *Chlamydomonas* spp. MGA161 having a high rate of H₂ photoproduction (6 mmol H₂/g chlorophyll *a*/h), high starch accumulation (18 % w/w) and unusually rapid and efficient dark fermentation (2 mol H₂/mol starch-glucose) prompted the study of a dual system (Miura *et al.* 1986) (Table 1).

The extent of metabolic engineering success in microalgae lags behind that of cyanobacteria due to the greater difficulty of eukaryotic genetic engineering. Work is ongoing to improve light conversion efficiency through the truncation of light-harvesting antenna complexes, an approach already proven using PNS bacteria (see below, section 2.1.2) (Akkerman *et al.* 2002; Polle *et al.* 2002). Other approaches are to study and develop O₂-tolerant hydrogenases (Ghirardi *et al.* 2005; Tosatto *et al.* 2008) and to express clostridial hydrogenase in non-heterocystous cyanobacteria, the aim being to engineer the rapid and ATP-independent (hydrogenase-mediated) H₂ production by direct photolysis in a fast-growing host organism, possibly overcoming O₂-inhibition through strong expression (Miyake *et al.* 1999).


A relatively new method to increase rates of H₂ production by direct photolysis is nutrient deprivation. Under conditions of sulfate-limitation the iron-sulfur clusters of PSII subunits cannot be maintained and PSII activity is inhibited (Wykoff *et al.* 1998). The rate of O₂ production decreases, while the respiration rate remains high and establishes anoxia, which permits hydrogenase and/or nitrogenase expression. The result is sustained H₂ production *via* direct photolysis. The technique was pioneered using microalgae (Benemann 1996; Jo *et al.* 2006; Laurinavichene *et al.* 2006) and has been recently extended to cyanobacteria (Antal & Lindblad 2005).

2.1.2: Photoheterotrophs

Purple non-sulfur (PNS) bacteria are anoxygenic photosynthetic bacteria which, unlike the purple and green sulfur bacteria, do not produce H₂S (a powerful catalyst poison) and the off-gas is typically > 90 % H₂, hence it is suitable for use in PEM-fuel cells without purification (Nakada *et al.* 1995).

PNS bacteria produce H₂ under photoheterotrophic conditions (light, anaerobiosis, organic electron donor) although they are metabolic generalists capable of autotrophic and heterotrophic growth. The best-studied species belong to the genera *Rhodobacter*, *Rhodospseudomonas* and *Rhodospirillum*.

H₂ is produced by the nitrogenase enzyme, which is active anaerobically under nitrogen limitation (Vignais *et al.* 1985). In the absence of N₂ the production of H₂ occurs according to equation 1.



In this respect the reaction serves to dissipate excess ATP and reducing power where growth is nitrogen-limited. The nitrogenase complex must be saturated with ATP and also NADH for optimal


activity, hence H₂ photoproduction occurs most rapidly under saturating light intensity at the expense of organic electron donors.

Nitrogenase activity is strictly a facet of anaerobic metabolism since O₂ damages the photopigments needed to maintain ATP flux for nitrogenase activity and nitrogenase expression is strongly inhibited by oxygen (Koku *et al.* 2002). Sustained H₂ photoproduction is possible as the single photosystem (PSI) of these organisms does not generate O₂ (this is termed anoxygenic photosynthesis) and continuous H₂-producing cultures have been operated for up to several months (Liessens & Verstraete 1986; Weetall *et al.* 1989; Eroğlu *et al.* 1997; Hassan *et al.* 1997; Fascetti *et al.* 1998; Tsygankov *et al.* 1998; Yokoi *et al.* 2001; Franchi *et al.* 2004; Shi & Yu 2006).

Rocha *et al.* (2001) analysed a large number of reports, indicating that the efficiency of light conversion to H₂ is variable for PNS bacteria, the average value being *ca.* 4 %. The theoretical maximum photosynthetic efficiency is considered to exceed 10 % (Akkerman *et al.* 2002) but the photosystems of PNS bacteria saturate at low light intensity, leading to low light conversion efficiency under high light intensity, e.g. in solar photobioreactors (Wakayama & Miyake 2002). PNS bacteria are adapted to photosynthesis at low light intensities, requiring large light harvesting complexes to capture diffuse light energy and conduct it into the reaction centre. Light conversion efficiency may be improved beyond 10 % by genetic manipulation to reduce the size of light-harvesting antennae, thereby increasing the saturating light intensity (Table 2). This would allow efficient H₂ production at higher light intensities, by deeper or denser cultures (Miyake *et al.* 1999; Vasilyeva *et al.* 1999; Kondo *et al.* 2002; Kim *et al.* 2004; Kondo *et al.* 2006; Kim *et al.* 2006a) (Table 2).

Nitrogenase-mediated H₂ formation is irreversible (Hillmer & Gest 1977b), which is an advantageous property in relation to reversible hydrogenase-mediated H₂ production, which is inhibited under high partial pressure of H₂ (Valdez-Vazquez *et al.* 2006). However, in PNS bacteria, uptake hydrogenase activity can detract from H₂ yields (Sasikala *et al.* 1990), prompting the development of uptake hydrogenase deficient mutants with up to 70 % increased H₂ production efficiency (Willison *et al.* 1984; Jahn *et al.* 1994; Worin *et al.* 1996; Öztürk *et al.* 2006) (Table 2).

Nitrogenase re-oxidises electron carriers to reduce 2H⁺ to H₂ and any other reductive processes ('electron sinks') can compete with and detract from H₂ production. The formation of the carbon storage polymer poly-β-hydroxybutyrate (PHB) from acetate is such a competing reductive reaction (equation 2) (Vincenzini *et al.* 1997; Khatipov *et al.* 1998).



Mutagenesis of the PHB synthase gene yielded PHB deficient mutants, which were capable of H₂ production under conditions that would normally favour PHB synthesis (Husted *et al.* 1993) (Table 2). In recent studies, double mutants lacking uptake hydrogenase and also PHB synthase produced H₂ at up to 2.5-fold higher rates compared to the parent strain (Lee *et al.* 2002; Kim *et al.* 2006b), while in a separate study a similar double mutant sustained H₂ production for over 45 days, while the wild-type ceased H₂ production after 10 days (Franchi *et al.* 2004).

Numerous simple organic molecules serve as suitable electron donors for PNS bacteria, including common fermentation products such lactate, acetate, butyrate, propionate and succinate (Hillmer & Gest 1977a, 1977b), alcohols such as ethanol and propanol (Fuji *et al.* 1987) and other substrates such as aromatic acids (e.g. cinnamate, benzoate) (Sasikala *et al.* 1994b; Fissler *et al.* 1995). Substrate range is strain-specific (Tao *et al.* 2008) and the biochemical pathways of assimilation are uncertain for many of these substrates, with the exception of acetate (a common fermentation product). In most bacteria acetate is assimilated using the glyoxylate cycle, but a diverse group of microorganisms (including *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* and *Rhodospirillum rubrum*) lacks the key glyoxylate cycle enzyme, isocitrate lyase, while rapidly assimilating acetate. An alternative citramalate cycle is now thought to operate in these species (Ivanovskii *et al.* 1997; Filatova *et al.* 2005a; 2005b). The distinction is important in the context of H₂ production as species lacking

the glyoxylate shunt generally require the availability (not the addition) of CO₂ during H₂ production from acetate, with the exception of *R. sphaeroides* which has a high capacity for acetate consumption (and hence CO₂ production) compared to other PNS bacteria and also has a thick capsule obstructing the diffusion of produced CO₂ (Table 2). Some uncertainty remains over the suitability of ethanol, a common fermentation product, as an electron donor for photoproduction of H₂. A *Rhodospseudomonas* species produced H₂ at the expense of various alcohols (Fuji *et al.* 1987) and ethanol was consumed simultaneously with acetate by *Rhodobium marinum* at *ca.* 50 % the rate of acetate, although the initial concentration of ethanol was *ca.* 25 % that of acetate (Ike *et al.* 2001). Ethanol was rapidly removed from an *Escherichia coli* fermentation effluent by *R. sphaeroides* O.U.001 after a delay of 96 h, although the induction of ethanol-utilising enzymes was not monitored (Redwood & Macaskie 2006). Hence, it is plausible that other PNS bacteria would be capable of ethanol utilisation after an adaptation period.

PNS bacteria have significant potential for industrial application as mixed cultures can be maintained for extended periods (Liessens & Verstraete 1986; Ko & Noike 2002; Fang *et al.* 2005; Ying Li *et al.* 2008), industrial waste streams can make suitable feeds for the photoproduction of H₂ (Thangaraj & Kulandaivelu 1994; Fascetti *et al.* 1998; Yiğit *et al.* 1999; Zhu *et al.* 1999a; Yetis *et al.* 2000), larger scale photobioreactors are under development (Hoekema *et al.* 2002; Hoekema *et al.* 2006; Claassen & de Vrije 2007) and outdoor projects using sunlight have been successful (Wakayama *et al.* 2000; Wakayama & Miyake 2002; Eroğlu *et al.* 2008).

The foremost limitation with PNS bacteria is the incompatibility of nitrogenase activity and the presence of NH₄⁺. Waste streams can only be used for H₂ production if they are of high C/N ratio and many reports of this application are available (Sasikala *et al.* 1992; Turkarslan *et al.* 1997; Tsygankov *et al.* 1998; Yiğit *et al.* 1999; Yetis *et al.* 2000; Eroğlu *et al.* 2004; Fang *et al.* 2005). Low C/N waste streams have been applied successfully for the purposes of biomass production and effluent remediation (Ensign 1977; Hassan *et al.* 1997; Cornet *et al.* 2003; Yun & Ohta 2005). H₂ production using low C/N feeds has been accomplished by the use of immobilisation matrices which exclude cations such as NH₄⁺ (Zhu *et al.* 1999b; Zhu *et al.* 2001) and the development of nitrogenase-derepressed strains (Wall & Gest 1979; Zinchenko *et al.* 1991; Yagi *et al.* 1994; Zinchenko *et al.* 1997) (Table 2). These approaches were not, however, tested at pilot-scale or in continuous culture and issues such as the economic viability of immobilisation and the long-term stability of nitrogenase-derepressed strains remain to be addressed.

PNS bacteria are capable, therefore, of efficient conversion of organic acids to H₂, providing a potentially applicable method for the remediation of wastes rich in organic acids, alcohols or aromatics. With the exception of unusual strains (Macler *et al.* 1979; Macler & Bassham 1988; Oh *et al.* 2004), PNS bacteria lack the capacity for the efficient conversion of sugars to H₂ and for this application a dark fermentation is the method of choice.

2.2 Dark Hydrogen fermentation

Large quantities of simple and complex carbohydrates are available as agricultural and food processing residues (Easterly & Burnham 1996; Filho & Badr 2004; Haq & Easterly 2006; Mabee *et al.* 2006; Levin *et al.* 2007). Fermentative bacteria represent a promising means not only to reclaim energy from these wastes in the form of hydrogen but also to utilise the wastes as resources, a particularly valuable attribute given the escalating cost of landfill (Bartelings *et al.* 2005). Indeed, it was calculated that the savings in landfill tax would be the main economic driver, outweighing the value of the energy produced *via* dark-fermentative production of H₂ from confectionery waste (Macaskie 2004).

The anaerobic degradation of organic matter by heterotrophic microorganisms can liberate H₂ at high rates, depending on the particular organisms and conditions. Fermentation generates energy solely through substrate level phosphorylation. Substrates are converted to reduced compounds, which are excreted as waste products and the ATP yield is low, in comparison to respiration. The formation of relatively reduced organic molecules is an integral part of all dark fermentations and some of these molecules (e.g. acetate) can

inhibit H₂ production if allowed to accumulate (Roe *et al.* 1998; Kirkpatrick *et al.* 2001; Van Ginkel & Logan 2005).

In a minority of fermentative microorganisms (e.g. *Klebsiella* spp.) H₂ production is primarily mediated by nitrogenase (Vignais *et al.* 2001) but due to the high ATP requirement and low turnover rate of nitrogenase, the theoretical H₂ yield is only 0.5 mol H₂/mol hexose (Wakayama & Miyake 2001). Without the contribution of light energy through photosynthesis, hydrogenase is preferred for H₂ production due to its higher rate of turnover and lower metabolic cost. The highest fermentative H₂ yields have been achieved using clostridia, other enteric bacteria and hyperthermophiles (see reviews: Hallenbeck 2005; Davila-Vazquez *et al.* 2008a).

H₂ fermentations are restricted by the Thauer limit. Thermodynamically, no more than 4 mol H₂ can be produced from 1 mol hexose because substrate level phosphorylation must produce whole numbers of ATP and the yield of ATP from glucose must be at least 1 mol/mol for the cell to survive (Thauer 1977). However, microbial fermentation typically generates more than 1 mol ATP and less than 4 mol H₂/mol hexose, quantities that vary according to the metabolic system and conditions, as described below.

2.2.1 Axenic dark fermentations

Axenic cultures (pure cultures containing clonal microbial populations) have been used in the majority of fermentation research, creating a wealth of information regarding model organisms and the understanding of their fermentative metabolism has facilitated and rationalised the optimisation of conditions for H₂ production.

Dark fermentations are united by the initial glycolytic generation of ATP, NADH and pyruvate. Three enzymes compete for pyruvate: pyruvate:ferredoxin oxidoreductase (PFOR), pyruvate:formate lyase (PFL) and the fermentative lactate dehydrogenase (LDH). The realised H₂ yield is dependent upon the fate of pyruvate, which differs among species due to varying activities of PFL, PFOR and LDH, of which one or more may be present (Figure 2).

Mixed-acid fermentation, in which the key enzymes are PFL and the formate:hydrogen lyase (FHL) complex (comprising a specific formate dehydrogenase and hydrogenase) (Figure 2B), is performed by facultative anaerobes such as *E. coli*. PFL converts pyruvate to acetyl-CoA and formate, which is cleaved to H₂ and CO₂ by FHL, while acetyl-CoA is divided between the formation of acetate (which generates ATP) and the formation of ethanol (which oxidises NADH to regenerate NAD). PFOR is expressed constitutively to a low level (Knappe 1987), but since H₂ is entirely formate-derived (Ordal & Halvorson 1939) PFOR is not thought to be involved in H₂ production in *E. coli*.

Ideally, mixed-acid fermentation yields 2 mol H₂/mol glucose (Figure 2B), but in batch mode a yield of *ca.* 50 % of this is usually obtained due to diversion of pyruvate into lactate formation. The latter can be suppressed by control of culture conditions or through metabolic engineering (Sode *et al.* 1999; 2001). While the cleavage of formate is irreversible, H₂ recycling is an issue, as suggested by the observation of 37 % increased H₂ yield in Hyd-2 mutants of *E. coli* (Redwood *et al.* 2007c). The rate of H₂ formation was also increased through the increased expression of FHL (Penfold *et al.* 2003; Yoshida *et al.* 2005).

Facultative anaerobes of the related genus *Enterobacter* also produce H₂ from formate but analysis of the fermentation balance implicated the simultaneous activity of the NADH pathway (Tanisho & Ishiwata 1995; Tanisho *et al.* 1998; Kurokawa & Shigeharu 2005), in which the regeneration of NAD⁺ is coupled to the reduction of ferredoxin by NADH:ferredoxin oxidoreductase (NFOR). Reduced ferredoxin subsequently transfers electrons onto H⁺ to produce additional H₂. The NADH pathway (operating simultaneously with PFL/FHL) could theoretically achieve the Thauer limit (4 mol H₂/mol glucose). However both electron transfer reactions (from NADH onto oxidised ferredoxin and from reduced ferredoxin onto H⁺) are reversible and neither would be considered electrochemically feasible under standard conditions: i.e. the standard electrode potentials of the NAD and ferredoxin half-cells (-320 mV and -400 mV, respectively) are more positive than that of the H⁺ half-cell (-414 mV) (McCormick 1998). A very low H₂ partial pressure

(pH₂) (theoretically <60 Pa or <0.0006 bar) is required to drive this reaction forwards and H₂ yields exceeding 2 mol H₂/mol glucose were obtained only under vacuum or with continuous gas purging to strip away H₂ (Park et al. 2005). Indeed, a maximum yield of 3.9 mol H₂/mol glucose was reported using *E. cloacae* under a vacuum of 330 torr (equivalent to 0.44 bar or 44 kPa) (Mandal et al. 2006).

Clostridia also use the NADH pathway. In this case PFOR cleaves pyruvate to acetyl-CoA and CO₂, transferring electrons to ferredoxin, which is coupled to a reversible hydrogenase to produce H₂. In this situation, all H₂ is produced by a single reversible reaction and it is even more important to maintain a low pH₂ (Kataoka et al. 1997; Mizuno et al. 2000). Advances in gas separation technology may permit a purge-gas recycle system to remove the need for large quantities of inert, anaerobic purge gas for H₂ removal (Nielsen et al. 2001; Liang et al. 2002; Teplyakov et al. 2002).

A positive pressure (ca. 1-1.5 bar at 25 °C) is needed for H₂ uptake by metal hydride H₂-stores (Züttel 2004). Therefore, to charge a H₂ store directly from a fermentation culture (without intermediary gas-pressurisation) would require an organism capable of sustaining H₂ production under high pH₂. This would require the absence of biological H₂ recycling and would preclude a reversible H₂-producing system, such as the NADH pathway occurring in enteric bacteria and clostridia, but may be possible using an uptake hydrogenase mutant of *E. coli* in which the FHL complex (involving hydrogenase-3) performs the irreversible oxidation of formate to form H₂ (and CO₂). However, a degree of reversibility is a common property of hydrogenases (Van Haaster et al. 2005) and although hydrogenase-3 has no uptake role during fermentation (Redwood et al. 2007c), it is known to operate reversibly when coupled to redox dyes (e.g. Sauter et al. 1992). Therefore, the latter strategy may tolerate a higher pH₂, but regardless of the organism employed, a pressurisation step would be advantageous between the fermentation and the H₂-store.

Various *Clostridium* spp. have been investigated for bio-hydrogen production (Collet et al. 2004), of which *C. butyricum* is perhaps the best known. Like *E. coli* and *E. aerogenes*, this organism is mesophilic but unlike them, it is a strict anaerobe. Hence, clostridial growth media are usually supplemented with a reducing agent to ensure anaerobiosis. Alternatively, a facultative aerobe, added to the H₂-production culture, was effective as an O₂-scavenger (Yokoi et al. 2001).

The H₂ yield from *C. butyricum* could in theory reach 4 mol H₂/mol hexose (Figure 2C) although a detailed metabolic analysis of *C. butyricum* calculated a maximum of 3.26 mol H₂/mol hexose (Chen et al. 2006) and practical yields obtained using clostridia rarely exceed 2 mol H₂/mol hexose (Collet et al. 2004; Ferchichi et al. 2005).

The clostridial species selected for H₂ production produce acetate and butyrate rather than propionate but they sporulate in response to environmental stresses such as heat or nutrient depletion, hence, the feeding regimes used in continuous culture are designed to maintain excessive nutrient concentrations to minimise sporulation (Hawkes et al. 2002). Asporogenic mutants have proved advantageous in ethanol production from cellulose, but have not yet been applied to H₂ production (Taillez et al. 1983). Whereas mesophilic clostridia sporulate as temperature increases, certain clostridial species are moderately thermophilic. For example, *C. thermolacticum* prefers to grow at 54 °C (Collet et al. 2004). Recently hyperthermophiles, which live and produce H₂ at temperatures above 60 °C have been studied. Little biochemical information is yet available (e.g. de Vrije et al. 2007) but it seems that hyperthermophiles are capable of H₂ production with higher yields than mesophiles (Hallenbeck 2005). For example, a yield of 2.8 mol H₂/mol glucose was reported for *Thermotoga elfii* and 3.2-3.7 mol/mol for *Caldicellulosiruptor saccharolyticus* (Van Niel et al. 2002; Kadar et al. 2004; de Vrije et al. 2007). Observations support the connection of H₂ production with the hydrogenase-linked oxidation of electron carriers (as in clostridia), rather than the decomposition of formate (as in enteric bacteria). A pH₂ of 10-20 kPa (0.1-0.2 bar) induced a metabolic shift to inhibit H₂ production in *C. saccharolyticus* (Van Niel et al. 2003) and a limiting H₂ pressure of 20 kPa (0.2 bar) was reported for a mixed hyperthermophilic culture (Van Groenestijn et al. 2002), while formate was not decomposed by *Thermotoga neapolitana* (Van Ooteghem et al. 2004).

The necessity of growth on solid media for molecular work (i.e. at temperatures lower than the melting point of agar), makes hyperthermophiles less readily amenable to genetic engineering, although alternative solid media such as gelrite are available (Van Ooteghem et al. 2004). Thermophilic cultures are

resistant to overgrowth by mesophilic contaminants but although an economic analysis is not available, the energetic costs associated with maintaining 70 °C may mitigate against large-scale application.

Several mesophilic and thermophilic clostridia and hyperthermophiles have the capacity to utilise complex carbohydrates such as cellulose and starch, a valuable property widening the potential for the use of industrial waste streams and agricultural residues as feeds. For example, *T. neopolitana* can utilise dextrans (Van Ooteghem *et al.* 2004) and *C. thermocellum* produced 1.6 mol H₂/mol hexose from delignified wood (Levin *et al.* 2006). Enteric bacteria generally lack the ability to metabolise complex carbohydrates although the necessary genes can be introduced in the case of *E. coli* (Dien *et al.* 2000).

2.2.2 Mixed dark fermentations

The use of mixed cultures offers practical advantages over the use of pure cultures, such as the use of feedstocks without pre-treatment or sterilisation and is already a proven, commercially available technology (Kyazze *et al.* 2007). Inocula for H₂ production can be obtained from soil, compost or anaerobic digestion sludge (Hawkes *et al.* 2002; 2007). H₂ was produced from sucrose using sewage sludge microflora with a yield of 1.7 mol H₂/mol hexose (Lin & Lay 2005) and from food processing effluent using a heat-treated (2 h, 104 °C) sludge inoculum with typical yields of 0.2-0.87 mol H₂/mol hexose (Oh & Logan 2005). Rice slurry was fermented by a heat-treated (30 min, 100 °C) clostridial community to produce up to 2.5 mol H₂/mol hexose (Fang *et al.* 2006). Paper sludge and cellulose powder were rapidly degraded by mesophilic anaerobic consortia, producing mixtures of CH₄ and H₂ (Ueno *et al.* 1995; Valdez-Vazquez *et al.* 2005).

For mixed cultures there is a tendency towards lower rates and yields of H₂ production because non H₂-producing organisms (e.g. methanogens and sulfate-reducers) consume a proportion of the substrate and perform H₂ uptake using H₂ as an electron donor. Furthermore, H₂S (the product of dissimilatory sulfate reduction) is a potent catalyst poison requiring removal if the bio-hydrogen is intended for use in a fuel cell. Hence, for the efficient production of clean H₂, the microbial population must be controlled to some degree in order to select for H₂-producers. Methanogens can be suppressed by the addition of chemical inhibitors or by operating continuous cultures at low pH or HRT (Hawkes *et al.* 2007). The microbial population is often manipulated by applying pre-selection on the inoculum (Valdez-Vazquez *et al.* 2005). A widely adopted strategy is to select for spore-forming clostridia using a heat-treated inoculum and where this can be achieved the properties of clostridial fermentation (above) are predominantly applicable (Kim *et al.* 2004; Van Ginkel & Logan 2005). However, heat treatment also eliminates non-sporulating H₂-producers (e.g. *Enterobacter* spp.) and selects for spore-forming H₂-consumers (e.g. some acetogens) (Kraemer & Bagley 2007). The metabolic switch from H₂ production to solventogenesis can be avoided by the intermittent release of headspace pressure and N₂ purging (Valdez-Vazquez *et al.* 2006).

3: Hybrid hydrogen

As reviewed above, no single-stage system has been shown to produce H₂ beyond 4 mol H₂/mol hexose. Current research focuses on the possible use of two-component systems *via* a variety of strategies (Table 1). These dual systems are united by the conversion of carbohydrates into organic acids in the 1st stage (which may be mesophilic or thermophilic and may not necessarily produce H₂), followed by the conversion of fermentation products into H₂ in the 2nd stage (Figure 3). In some examples, algae or cyanobacteria initially photosynthesise carbohydrates, which are then fermented by the same organisms, while other systems use carbohydrates as the primary feed, either as artificial solutions or in the form of wastes or algal biomass.

3.1 Techniques for connecting the components of a dual system

Alongside the choice of organisms, dual systems have been implemented through a variety of strategies. The nature of the bridge connecting these two stages is a key part of the operational strategy affecting the overall productivity of the system. The simplest approach constitutes a co-culture in which different organisms are in direct contact and act simultaneously, under the same conditions (Figure 3A). However, a compromise needs to be sought between the optimal requirements of each microbial component. While increasing the complexity and cost, sequential reactors permit the operator to maintain different conditions in separate parts of the dual system, allowing a combination of organisms, which may not be compatible in co-culture (Figure 3B). For example, (wild-type) microalgae/cyanobacteria and PNS bacteria were not compatible in co-culture since the photosynthetic generation of oxygen inhibited nitrogenase-mediated H₂ production by the PNS bacteria (Miyamoto *et al.* 1987; Weetall *et al.* 1989). Further, sequential reactor systems can be potentially more effective as either component can be optimised without compromise to the other and may be preferred even for 'compatible' combinations of organisms.

Sequential reactors require some method to transport fermentation products from the 1st reactor to the 2nd (while retaining biomass), which presents an engineering challenge for future scale-up operations. The simplest and most common method is 'batch-transfer' in which spent medium is transferred between reactors in batches. Centrifugation followed by filtration or autoclaving is usually performed to generate a clear, sterile feed for the 2nd stage (e.g. Yokoi *et al.* 2002; Redwood & Macaskie 2006). For large-scale application, continuous processes are generally preferred over batch systems. Fermentation products could potentially be transferred continuously through the use of bi-phasic solvent extraction, by continuous centrifugation or by membrane systems (Banik *et al.* 2003; Emanuelsson *et al.* 2003; Splendiani *et al.* 2003), but these techniques have yet to be applied in a H₂-producing system.

3.2 Comparing diverse strategies

As explained above, the two components of a dual system may be bridged in several ways. To add to the difficulty of comparison, either part of the dual system may use free or immobilised cells and may operate in batch, fed-batch, repeated fed-batch, or continuous mode and the two components may be linked continuously or discontinuously in an open (exit flow to waste) or recycling system.

In order to reach some conclusions about the efficacy of different strategies, a common comparator is needed. Rates of H₂ production are not always meaningful in this kind of comparison due to number of contributory factors and variables. A common parameter taking into account many factors can be useful, (e.g. H₂ volume produced / reactor volume / dry cell weight / mol substrate consumed / time) but the accurate interpretation of so many factors from published accounts is rarely possible. The molar yield of H₂ from hexose (or monosaccharide) is the most appropriate measure for the comparison of dual systems, as it can be applied regardless of organisms, scale, means of integration and the chemical natures of substrates (Table 1). This factor can be misleading, however, in the case of complex feeds (e.g. algal biomass, tofu wastewater) containing organic acids or non-hexose substrates such as fats and proteins from the outset, which contribute to the fermentative yield of organic intermediates (Ike *et al.* 1997; Ike *et al.* 2001).

Additionally, the strategies under evaluation involve an input of solar energy, implying a positive relationship between the system's production capacity and its associated area for absorbing solar energy. Due to the cost and technical challenge of constructing expansive photobioreactors of gas-tight, transparent materials, the energy yield per area of reactor footprint is considered as a second key parameter for comparison.

3.3 Selection of organisms for the 2nd stage

In a dual H₂ producing system, the 2nd stage functions to clean up the effluent from the 1st stage (i.e. to decrease its BOD) and to produce a secondary H₂ stream at the expense of stage 1 products (e.g. reduced organic molecules). An algal-PNS bacterial symbiosis was proposed but no experimental data is yet available (Melis & Melnicki 2006). Fermentation products (e.g. acetate) could be used as C-source for the growth of microalgae, cyanobacteria or PNS bacteria. While acetate is regularly used in algal growth media (Kim *et al.* 2006c), the authors are not aware of any published attempts to cultivate algae or cyanobacteria using fermentation products as carbon sources. PNS bacteria, conversely, have been cultivated to produce biomass, single-cell protein, or PHB (poly-β-hydroxybutyrate), using primary fermentation waste streams (Ensign 1977; Hassan *et al.* 1997). Reduced organic molecules are the preferred carbon source for PNS bacteria (Biebl & Pfennig 1981), suggesting that these species may be ecologically associated with fermentative, organic acid-producing organisms. There are many examples of the use of PNS bacteria for H₂ production from wastes (e.g. Thangaraj & Kulandaivelu 1994), many of which have similar characteristics to fermentation effluents.

Using PNS bacteria in the 2nd stage, organic fermentation products can be converted to H₂ with high efficiency (50-100 % of stoichiometric yield) (Rocha *et al.* 2001) and light conversion efficiencies could approach a hypothetical maximum of 10 % (Akkerman *et al.* 2002). Using both dairy and sugarcane wastewaters the PNS bacterium *Rhodospseudomonas capsulata* produced H₂ at a 10-fold higher rate than the cyanobacterium *Anacystis nidulans* (Thangaraj & Kulandaivelu 1994).

PNS bacteria are the popular choice for the conversion of organic fermentation products to H₂ in the 2nd stage of a dual system. Of the 37 reports summarised in Table 1, only one employed a purple sulfur bacterium for this purpose (Akano *et al.* 1996; Ikuta *et al.* 1997) and none employed microalgae or cyanobacteria, which employ a more energetically demanding mechanism of H₂ production than do APB (Claassen *et al.* 1999).

3.4: Selection of organisms for the 1st stage

In this overview, dual systems are grouped broadly according to whether both 1st and 2nd stages or only the 2nd stage are light-driven.

3.4.1: Dual systems with photoautotrophic 1st stage

In this approach, photoautotrophs produce H₂ and accumulate carbohydrate during an initial light phase. The photoautotroph switches to fermentative metabolism during a subsequent dark phase, converting starch or glycogen to organic fermentation products, which are utilised by PNS bacteria to generate H₂ in the next light phase. Alternatively, the phototroph cell mass may be harvested to supply the feed for a dual system with dark fermentative 1st stage (section 3.4.2).

1st and 2nd stages may be joined in co-culture or sequentially with transfer of spent broth between stages. Co-culture was until recently unsuitable for this combination because the O₂ produced by microalgae/cyanobacteria would prevent photoproduction of H₂ by PNS bacteria. Microalgal strains exhibiting a decreased rate of photolysis relative to respiration (i.e. decreased rate of O₂ production) have recently become available and work is ongoing to characterise H₂ production in co-cultures of attenuated microalgae and PNS bacteria (Melis & Happe 2004).

In this type of system, there is the possibility for H₂ production in 3 stages because microalgae/cyanobacteria can produce H₂ both at night and by day. While the production of H₂ through photolysis (or nitrogenase) is widely reported (above), there are no accounts of 3-stage systems in which H₂

production occurred in all 3 stages. In all cases, the accumulated biomass was the sole substrate from which H₂ was generated, by dark algal/cyanobacterial fermentation followed by photofermentation.

In most cases, algal fermentation produced no H₂. In the most successful example (Miura *et al.* 1992), the yield of microalgal fermentation from accumulated starch was *ca.* 1.3 mol H₂/mol hexose and the overall yield was maintained at a steady 10.5 mol H₂/mol hexose for 5 days under continuous illumination (8 mol/mol under diurnal illumination). *Chlamydomonas* spp. were found to accumulate higher levels of starch than other microalgae (Ike *et al.* 2001) and strain MGA161 with a high fermentative H₂ yield was highlighted (Miura *et al.* 1986). Although the microalgal-based dual system achieved excellent H₂ yields based on the accumulated carbohydrate, the rate of carbohydrate accumulation limits the application of this strategy as discussed below.

3.4.1.1: Energy generation potential with a photoautotrophic 1st stage

In the case of a dark-fermentative 1st stage fed by wastes or synthetic solutions, the feeding rate can easily be adjusted to control the overall rate of H₂ production, whereas an algal/cyanobacterial-driven system (dependent on light) is limited by the yield of photoautotrophic carbohydrate production (e.g. mol hexose/m² light capture area/day). Combined with the molar yield of H₂ *per* hexose in the dual system, this can indicate the potential rate of H₂ production from a given light capture area (Table 3). Using an 800 L pond-type pilot plant with CO₂ as the carbon source for cultivation of *Chlamydomonas* spp., Ikuta *et al.* (1997) achieved a maximum productivity of 92.6 mmol hexose/m²/d and an average productivity of 24.4 mmol hexose/m²/d over 23 days. Using a closed photobioreactor, *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii* was grown under outdoor light conditions using CO₂ in addition to acetate as carbon sources, yielding 158 mmol starch-hexose/m²/d (Kim *et al.* 2006c). Assuming cultivation conditions can be optimised to maintain the highest rate of starch accumulation this value was used to calculate the potential productivities of algal/cyanobacterial-driven dual systems (Table 3).

Using the data provided by Levin *et al.* (2004a) (see legend to Table 3), it can be calculated that at least 436 m² of light capture area would be needed to generate sufficient H₂ to power one home with modest energy requirements (1 kW), discounting the energy costs of the process (e.g. mixing, pumping, medium supplements, pH control and maintenance). Thus, significant improvements in the rate and efficiency of light conversion to carbohydrate would be required to permit biological energy generation by a dual system reliant upon microalgal or cyanobacterial starch accumulation, which is rather overshadowed by the availability of significant quantities of starch and cellulose wastes (Yokoi *et al.* 2002; Haq & Easterly 2006).

As a best-case scenario, metabolic engineering (see above) would lead to significant improvements in the efficacy of direct photolysis, allowing significant H₂ production coupled to carbohydrate accumulation. For decentralised domestic energy generation the available light capture area is estimated to be of the order of 20 m². This is challenging since it would require a 20-fold increase in productivity (along with parallel developments in process automation and assuming negligible operational energy costs). Large centralised hydrogen farms might be more efficiently run, but such an industry would be in direct competition with conventional agriculture, which currently accounts for 77 % of land in the UK (Anon 2005). However, H₂ farms would not require fertile soil and might be operated in inhospitable environments such as deserts or on contaminated land where remediation might not be economically attractive (Aldhous 2006). The cultivation of 'energy crops' is currently receiving widespread attention (e.g. de Vrije & Claassen 2003; Aldhous 2006; Schnoor 2006). For example, *Jatropha* spp. are proposed as energy crops suitable for cultivation on sparse, non-arable land for the production of seed oil, which can be esterified to produce bio-diesel fuel with the co-production of 'press-cake' residues which are suitable substrates for bioconversion, e.g. to H₂ (Staubmann *et al.* 1997; Gübitz *et al.* 1999; Martínez-Herrera *et al.* 2006; Tiwari *et al.* 2007). A comparison of the potential energy yields *per* hectare for crop farms and photo-energy farms would repay study.

As the planet's most plentiful energy source, solar energy must be part of any vision of future energy generation. This is the case either in a wholly light-driven system (e.g. microalgae + PNS bacteria) or in a

partially light driven system (fermentation + PNS bacteria) where the fermentation is fed on biomass residues. As world population and food-demand grow, the limited availability of non-agricultural land may discourage algal or cyanobacterial cultivation. While 'green roofs' are established as a means of improved insulation and storm water retention, the potential of rooftop agriculture remains to be widely exploited (Nowak 2004). At the same time, the availability of residues is set to increase from both food and energy crops. Therefore, with the current state of knowledge and technology development, a dual system with dark fermentative 1st stage has a greater potential for near-term application.

On a broader scale, the use of microbial photosynthesis will have to compete with photovoltaic (PV) technology which, although as yet economically unattractive in most applications, is also under parallel development (Avi 2007). Data are, as yet, unavailable to compare the energy yields from optimised PV and bio-systems as industrial-scale photobioreactors for H₂ production are still under development. The estimated net energy ratio (NER) was *ca.* 2 for a photobioreactor lasting 20 years, constructed using tubes of flexible polyethylene film (thickness 0.18 mm), under the assumptions of film replacement every 3 years, 80 % time on-line, 20 % loss of H₂ and discounting the costs of nutrients, temperature control and water (Burgess & Fernandez-Velasco 2007).

3.4.2: Dual systems with a dark fermentative 1st stage

Dark fermentation represents a rapid and relatively simple method for the conversion of carbohydrates into hydrogen, but the accumulation of organic fermentation products can exert stress upon the fermenting microorganisms and generates a secondary waste, requiring disposal (Eiteman & Altman 2006). Concurrently, fermentation products are preferred substrates for PNS bacteria, which oxidise reduced organic molecules and dispose of the reducing power as H₂. It has long been recognised that dark fermentation and photo-fermentation should be coupled to create an efficient scheme for waste-free hydrogen production (Odom & Wall 1983; Miyake *et al.* 1984). In practice, the maximum yield reported was 8.3 mol H₂/mol hexose (Kim *et al.* 2006c) and indeed several independent results of *ca.* 7 mol H₂/mol hexose were generated by different methods (Table 1).

The dark fermentation-photofermentation (DF-PF) dual system can be operated in continuous mode over extended periods. The longest experiment reported sustained H₂ evolution for 45 days by coupling lactic acid fermentation and a continuous photofermentation, but the yield of H₂/mol hexose cannot be calculated from the available data (Franchi *et al.* 2004). Yokoi *et al.* (2001 and 2002) reported sustainable operation of a dual system for 30 days, maintaining a steady overall yield of 7 mol H₂/mol hexose, using sweet potato starch residue. This system was used in repeated-batch culture, the fermenter being partially drained daily and the photobioreactor every 5 days. A fully continuous system is currently under development (Redwood & Macaskie 2007a, 2007b). A continuous *E. coli* CSTR and a continuous *R. sphaeroides* photobioreactor were integrated by anion-selective electro dialysis, simultaneously transferring anionic fermentation products, while retaining repressive ammonium ion, *E. coli* cells and suspended solids. This approach resulted in sustained H₂ production by *E. coli* with a yield of 1.6 mol H₂/mol hexose and sustained H₂ photoproduction by *R. sphaeroides* despite the presence of 15 mM ammonium ion in the initial feed. The overall yield was 2.4 mol H₂/mol glucose, attributable to a low efficiency in the PBR (38 %) and a proportion of *E. coli* products being uncharged species (ethanol), not transported by electro dialysis. An overall yield of 10.1 mol H₂/mol glucose could be predicted based on a substrate conversion efficiency of 75 % in the photobioreactor and optimisation of the latter is in progress.

Therefore, with present approaches, a dual system can be sustained continuously and achieves on average *ca.* 60 % of the hypothetical maximum, 12 mol H₂/mol hexose (Figure 2D). As a priority, research is needed to investigate techniques for the integration and rate-balancing of inter-dependent bioreactors, alongside further study of the conditions needed to sustain high H₂ production continuously in either component of DF-PF dual systems.

3.4.2.1 Selection of organism for dual systems with dark fermentative 1st stage

An ideal fermentation, coupled to an ideal photo-fermentation could approach the maximum stoichiometry of 12 mol H₂/mol hexose (Figure 2D). As different fermentations can theoretically be coupled to a photofermentation to achieve the same maximum yield (Figure 2), differences in practicality and experimental yields must be addressed.

The distinction is made between the use of obligate anaerobes in stage 1 and facultative aerobes/anaerobes because there are distinct differences between the biochemical mechanisms of H₂ production of these classes (section 2.2, Figure 2).

In the case described by Yokoi *et al.* (2001 and 2002), the facultative anaerobe *Enterobacter aerogenes* was included in the 1st stage in co-fermentation with the strict anaerobe *C. butyricum* (Table 1). This example is classed among the strict anaerobic dual systems because *Enterobacter*, being unable to utilise starch, did not contribute to the fermentation but provided a cheaper alternative to reducing agents to ensure anaerobiosis by scavenging O₂ (Yokoi *et al.* 2001; Yokoi *et al.* 2002).

Facultative anaerobes (e.g. *E. coli*) can be pre-cultured rapidly, are readily amenable to metabolic engineering and do not require the addition of a reducing agent to 'poise' the redox potential, while the biochemistry of mixed-acid fermentation has been well-studied (Stephenson & Stickland 1932; Knappe 1987; Alam & Clark 1989; Clark 1989; Bock & Sawers 1992; Vardar-Schara *et al.* 2008). Nevertheless, obligate anaerobes have been preferred in the study of dual systems, perhaps due to the potentially higher H₂ yield. Table 1 shows 14 examples of strict anaerobe-driven dual systems, with an average overall yield (where given) of 5.73 mol H₂/mol hexose (or 47.8 %). Conversely only eight examples of dual systems could be found using other types of fermentation in the 1st stage, of which systems based on lactic acid fermentation were the most effective, producing (overall) up to 7.3 mol H₂/mol hexose entirely from the 2nd stage (Kawaguchi *et al.* 2001). High overall yield is, therefore, possible without H₂ production in the 1st stage. This can be explained by the fact that lactic acid fermentation has been optimised for the industrial production of lactic acid (Li *et al.* 2004) and because lactate is theoretically converted to 6 H₂ in the 2nd stage, which typically operates with high efficiency (section 2.1.2).

It is possible that researchers have frequently disregarded mixed-acid fermentation for use in the 1st stage because of its theoretically lower H₂ yield (Figure 2). The fermentative yield of H₂ from hexose by living organisms is thermodynamically limited to 4 mol H₂/mol hexose (Thauer 1977). The metabolic pathways of strict anaerobes (e.g. *C. butyricum*) allow this to be achieved only under very low H₂ partial pressure, otherwise the reaction is stoichiometrically similar to mixed-acid fermentation, producing a maximum of 2 mol H₂/mol hexose (Figure 2). The yield from strict anaerobic fermentation in a dual system has not exceeded 2.6 mol/mol (Table 1) and the use of a non-sporulating facultative anaerobe would represent an insignificant sacrifice of yield for a significant reward in practicality (Figure 2D, section 3.4.2.1).

Hyperthermophilic fermentations may yield up to 3.8 mol H₂/mol hexose in practice (section 2.2.1), but no accounts describe dual systems using hyperthermophiles. Furthermore, they would not be compatible with PNS bacteria in co-culture, which produce H₂ optimally at *ca.* 30 °C and live at temperatures below 47 °C (Castenholz 1995). A hypothetical industrial-scale facility based on the sequential combination of a thermobioreactor and a photobioreactor was estimated to produce H₂ at a cost of €2.74 /kg H₂ (de Vrije & Claassen 2003). If the bio-H₂ were used to generate electricity in a fuel cell operating at 50 % efficiency and 95 % utilisation, the cost of the energy production would be €0.145 /kWh. The price of domestic electricity is *ca.* €0.25-0.30 /kWh (2008, www.britishgas.co.uk). However a more extensive economic analysis of the bioprocess, suggested a cost of €4/kg H₂ (Davila-Vazquez *et al.* 2008a). Continued research and development of bio-hydrogen systems is required preceding a reliable economic assessment.

Some information is available regarding the use of non-axenic fermentations in the 1st stage of a dual system (Table 1). This strategy takes advantage of the presence of suitable microorganisms in the feedstock, thus eliminating the need to sterilise inputs and to pre-culture specific organisms. However, in undefined mixtures of microorganisms it is more difficult to repress unwanted reactions (section 2.2.2), H₂ yields are

generally lower than in axenic dual systems (Table 1) and it would be difficult to ensure reproducibility between feedstock sources and locations.

3.4.2.2: Distribution of H₂ production among stages of a dual system

Ike *et al.* (1997) compared 3 different methods of H₂ generation from algal biomass rich in starch, of which the most effective (in terms of H₂ yield) involved a lactic acid fermentation (producing no H₂) followed by photo-fermentation with PNS bacteria, showing that it is not essential to produce H₂ in both phases of the dual system.

Figure 2 illustrates that various different stage 1 fermentations (e.g. lactic acid, mixed-acid and clostridial-type fermentations) can be applied with different H₂ yields but with equal potential for H₂ production overall (12 mol H₂/mol hexose). The type of fermentation employed affects the theoretical distribution of H₂ between the 1st and 2nd stages. If lactic acid fermentation were used, all 12 moles of H₂ would arise from the 2nd stage; 10 for mixed-acid fermentation and 8-10 for *C. butyricum*.

It is possible that *C. butyricum*-based dual systems have been favoured by researchers in order to skew the distribution of H₂ production towards the 1st stage and thus to minimise the required transfer of organic fermentation products and the light capture area. Conversely, H₂ is generally produced by fermentations at *ca.* 50 % of the theoretical maximum, while the photo-fermentation typically operates at *ca.* 70 % efficiency, so a higher overall yield could be expected using lactic acid or mixed-acid fermentation in which more H₂ is produced in the more efficient 2nd stage. The gain in productivity should be offset against the increased costs of light capture area and transfer of fermentation products.

3.4.2.3 Energy generation potential with a dark fermentative 1st stage.

The increased productivity of a dual system over a single-stage system is significant. For example, a molasses-fed pilot fermentation plant generated 8240 L H₂ (342.5 mol H₂) and 3000 L effluent *per day* (Ren *et al.* 2006). The effluent contained primarily acetate and ethanol with a hydrogen production potential of 246.35 mmol H₂/L (authors' calculations). Therefore the addition of a photoheterotrophic 2nd stage could maximally increase productivity by 317 %.

As a best-case scenario, a dual system capable of generating 12 mol H₂/mol hexose might be developed. Work is underway to meet a target of 10 mol H₂/mol hexose, which would make bio-H₂ economically viable, given low feedstock costs (Davila-Vazquez *et al.* 2008a). Using reported values for the productivity of dual systems, the potential for energy generation can be estimated.

With the same assumptions as used in Table 3, a household might consume H₂ at a minimum rate of 573.6 mol/d (Levin *et al.* 2004a; Levin 2004b). The feasibility of the decentralised application of a sequential dual system was evaluated (in this study) by calculating the necessary reactor sizes and the feed requirements to meet this demand. The energy requirements of the process were not taken into account.

If the potential H₂ yield (12 mol H₂/mol hexose) were to be distributed 4:8 between the 1st and 2nd stages, respectively, then the dark fermentation would be required to produce 191.2 mol H₂/d and the photobioreactor 382.4 mol H₂/day (of which only *ca.* 12 h is light). Using published volumetric productivities (Levin *et al.* 2004a; Levin 2004b), it was calculated that a 79.6 L fermenter (containing an undefined mesophilic culture, *ca.* 0.1 mol H₂/L/h) would be needed. The productivity of the photobioreactor (PBR) would be constrained by several parameters: the limited efficiency of light conversion to H₂ (10 % maximum; Akkerman *et al.* 2002), light availability (1 kW/m² for 12 h/d; Miyake *et al.* 1999), specific rate of H₂ production (*ca.* 0.1 L H₂/g dw/h; Rocha *et al.* 2001), culture depth (*ca.* 5 cm), culture density (*ca.* 1 g dw/L : OD *ca.* 2.5). To operate within these constraints a PBR volume of 7648 L would be required. The corresponding square panel PBR could be 12.4 m wide with a light capture area of 153.0 m² and a depth of 5

cm; sufficiently shallow to maintain the entire culture under saturating light intensity (Nakada *et al.* 1995; Katsuda *et al.* 2000). This area could potentially harvest 6.6 GJ *per* 12 h light period, indicating a comfortable light conversion efficiency of 1.65 % to meet the H₂ demand (Figure 4).

It is noteworthy that the limiting factor is the specific rate of H₂ production (necessitating a dense culture and limiting the PBR depth) rather than the light conversion efficiency even at the reasonable light intensity of 1 kW/m². Were specific rates to be increased (e.g. through improved strains or bioreactors) the light intensity and conversion efficiency would then limit the productivity of the photobioreactor. At a light intensity of 1 kW/m² for 12 h *per* day, with 65.8 % of useful solar energy and a light conversion efficiency of 10 % the corresponding light capture area to produce 382.4 mol H₂ in 12 h would be of 38.44 m² (6.2 m x 6.2 m). A house might barely accommodate an 80 L fermenter and a 40 m² photobioreactor, along with H₂ storage, regulatory equipment and fuel cell (Figure 4), but even with a conversion efficiency of 12 mol H₂/mol hexose, the feed-demand would be 7.74 kg cellulose/d or 8.17 kg sucrose/d, which could be supplemented with organic household wastes for disposal, although the additional sugar from this source would be negligible. Sugar production is an agricultural industry, so this option could not be applied in the long-term due to competition for farmland (as 3.4.1.1) but wastes from sugar production and processing could be exploited as feed substrates.

Whereas the cultivation of energy-dedicated crops to generate sugars for conversion to H₂ would incur costs, it could be economically realistic to co-locate H₂ production with feed sources such as food processing plants. The UK food industry produces *ca.* 5.3 million tonnes of biodegradable waste annually, a large fraction of which is disposed of by land-filling, incurring both economic and environmental costs (Anon 2004; Bartelings *et al.* 2005). Co-locating food-waste generation and conversion to H₂ would remove transport and disposal costs, while minimising spoilage of the residues to maintain their value. Bio-H₂ production could be optimised for the use of residues having relatively consistent composition and little H₂ storage or distribution would be required as produced energy could be used on-site to meet predictable energy demands and any excess production could be sold to alleviate the demand for fossil fuel.

There are many accounts of bio-hydrogen production from non-synthetic substrates (i.e. wastes) and dual systems have been applied in several cases (Table 1) (Zhu *et al.* 1995; Fascetti *et al.* 1998; Kim *et al.* 2001; Zhu *et al.* 2002; Franchi *et al.* 2004). De Vrije and Claassen (2003) described a hypothetical process fed by lignocellulosic biomass and calculated that 9 % of the domestic energy demand could be met using available biomass residues in the Netherlands. However, the authors are not aware of any currently operating economically viable bioprocess based on lignocellulosic feedstocks.

3.4.2.4 Bio-H₂, bio-methane or bio-ethanol?

Biomass residues are available in significant quantities for use as feedstocks for bioenergy production (Easterly & Burnham 1996; Filho & Badr 2004; Haq & Easterly 2006; Mabee *et al.* 2006; Dawson & Boopathy 2007; Levin *et al.* 2007). Bioprocesses for the production of H₂, methane and ethanol can all utilise biomass residues as feeds, although currently, bio-ethanol and bio-methane processes are commercially more advanced than bio-H₂ processes.

Levin *et al.* (2007) calculated the energy potential of Canada's biomass residues for methane production by anaerobic digestion and H₂ production by anaerobic bacterial fermentation. The potential H₂ energy equated to only 41.4 % of the potential methane energy. However, this calculation was based on a H₂ yield of 1.3 mol H₂/mol hexose from a single-stage bacterial fermentation. Several authors report multi-organism systems for H₂ production producing in excess of 7 mol H₂/mol hexose (Weetall *et al.* 1989; Miura *et al.* 1992; Ike *et al.* 2001; Kawaguchi *et al.* 2001; Yokoi *et al.* 2001; Asada *et al.* 2006; Kim *et al.* 2006c). Hence, a bio-H₂ process could be more energetically productive than a bio-methane process if dual H₂-producing systems could be implemented. With H₂ as the final product, bio-methane could be converted by steam reforming, which is a well-established thermocatalytic process. However, this would introduce significant parasitic energy demand due to the required high temperature (*ca.* 700 °C). Furthermore reformed H₂ is contaminated with CO (a potent catalyst poison) and would require extensive purification in

order to be made comparable in quality to Bio-H₂. Therefore, a dual H₂-producing system would offer the comparative advantages of significantly greater energetic productivity and applicability to fuel cells.

Bio-ethanol is a major energy vector in Brazil, with a production of 16 billion L of ethanol annually, requiring *ca.* 3 million hectares of land. The total sugarcane crop area (for sugar and ethanol) is 5.6 million hectares (Goldemberg 2007). The average industrial yield from the crop of 2004/2005 was 144.35 kg sucrose/tonne sugarcane, equivalent to 79.39 L of anhydrous ethanol/tonne sugarcane or 82.86 L hydrous ethanol/tonne sugarcane (Nastari *et al.* 2005). Therefore, the process efficiency of bio-ethanol production is 80.5 % (of a biochemical maximum of 2 mol ethanol/mol hexose). Considering the higher heating value (HHV) of ethanol of 29.840 MJ/kg (<http://hydrogen.pnl.gov/cocoon/morf/hydrogen/article/401>), the bio-ethanol process produces 2,212 kJ energy/mol hexose (from sugar cane). To equal this energy yield a bio-hydrogen process must achieve *ca.* 7.8 mol H₂/mol hexose (HHV of H₂ = 141.88 MJ/kg, hydrogen.pnl.gov/cocoon/morf/hydrogen/article/401). This could not be achieved by a single-organism system and a dual system would be required.

4: Conclusions and future perspectives

Biological hydrogen production is a promising avenue that should be pursued urgently as the world energy demand increases, fossil fuel resources dwindle and the need for greenhouse gas minimisation becomes increasingly pressing. Hydrogen biotechnology is poised to become increasingly prominent alongside, and eventually emerging as competitive with other sustainable bio-fuel processes and/or as an adjunct to them.

This review shows that (unlike with bio-ethanol production) no single microorganism can produce competitive yields of H₂. Multiple-organism systems offer increased H₂ yields and would be mandatory for realistic future energy generation.

Examination of the properties of photosynthetic microorganisms revealed that purple non-sulfur (PNS) bacteria are the most suitable organisms for the 2nd stage of a dual system, while for the 1st stage dark fermentation, clostridia have been the most widely used, but facultative aerobes may increase the ease of operation while detracting little from the overall H₂ yield.

A dual system combining anaerobic fermentation and photoheterotrophy could potentially result in high energy yields from industrial wastes or biomass residues, although it is unlikely that a domestic household would produce sufficient fermentable waste to make a significant contribution to its energy budget. For example, the power output of a pilot fermentation plant neared the demand of 1 household, processing daily *ca.* 4.4 tonne of diluted feedstock (molasses, 3 g COD/L) to generate 343 mol H₂ (Ren *et al.* 2006), sufficient to produce a constant electrical power output of 0.6 kW using a realistic PEM-FC (operating at 50 % efficiency and 95 % utilisation; Levin *et al.* 2004a).

Even by increasing the output by several-fold by addition of the second stage PBR it is unlikely that a light-driven dual system would repay investment for single household domestic electricity generation. Furthermore, it can be calculated that for domestic self-sufficiency several tonnes of sugary waste would be required annually, therefore, substrate supply would be the limiting factor rather than spatial considerations. Hence, industrial, retail and agricultural waste producers would be the likely initial users of bio-H₂ systems.

In addition to food processing and retailing wastes, biomass residues are available in significant quantities for use as feedstocks for bioenergy production (Easterly & Burnham 1996; Filho & Badr 2004; Haq & Easterly 2006; Mabee *et al.* 2006; Levin *et al.* 2007). Bioprocesses for the production of H₂, methane and ethanol can all utilise biomass residues as feedstocks although, currently, bio-ethanol and bio-methane processes are commercially more advanced than bio-H₂ processes.

It was argued above (section 3.4.2.4) that a dual bio-H₂ system could be more productive than bio-methane and equally productive to bio-ethanol in terms of energy production, but these calculations were based on two noteworthy assumptions. Firstly, this calculation did not take into account parasitic energy losses, such as the distillation cost incurred by ethanol recovery (*ca.* 25-33 % of the product's combustion

value; Kvaalen *et al.* 2006) or the operating costs of relatively complex dual systems for H₂ production, which cannot be estimated due to the immaturity of this technology. Secondly the assumption was made that energy can be recovered from H₂ and CH₄ with equal efficiency, e.g. by coupling of the bio-gas-producing generation reactor to a fuel cell for electricity generation assuming a pure gas stream (e.g. see Macaskie *et al.* 2005). The most efficient type, proton exchange membrane (PEM; also called polymer electrolyte membrane) fuel cells, achieve the highest power densities when H₂ is used as a fuel, whereas solid oxide fuel cells (SOFCs) are more suitable for the use of hydrocarbons such as methane (Larminie & Dicks 2003). However SOFCs use an oxide ion-conducting ceramic material as the electrolyte and require an operating temperature of 600-1100 °C and hence the necessary heat input detracts from the overall energy balance. In addition, any contamination of bio-methane with H₂S, the end product of dissimilatory sulfate metabolism by the sulfate-reducing bacteria present in anaerobic mixed cultures, would necessitate gas filtration, since sulfur compounds are powerful catalyst poisons affecting all types of fuel cells. The direct methanol fuel cell (DMFC) is a type of PEM-FC in which methanol reacts (slowly) at the anode according to: $\text{CH}_3\text{OH} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow 6\text{H}^+ + 6\text{e}^- + \text{CO}_2$ (Larminie & Dicks 2003). For DMFC, the power density is relatively low compared to PEM-FC and SOFC, but this would not prevent application in portable devices such as laptop computers, where the power storage exceeds 0.025 kWh and the required DMFC unit would be significantly smaller in volume than the equivalent lithium-ion battery (see Larminie & Dicks, 2003).

The formation of methanol from methane *via* methane monooxygenase is very well established (Grosse *et al.* 1999; Dalton 2005) and a comparative study of the various bio-gas and fuel cell-coupling options would be worthwhile.

Fuels which are liquid at ambient temperature (e.g. methanol and ethanol) have higher volumetric energy densities than gaseous H₂. Apart from the consideration of land use the long-term economics of bio-ethanol production should be considered (Rogers *et al.* 2005). Ethanol cannot be used efficiently in fuel cells (Larminie & Dicks 2003) and a significant problem is considered to be the higher cost of bio-ethanol production (from cellulosic biomass) as compared to diesel or petrol. The price of bio-ethanol was projected to become comparable to that of petrol by 2015, based on a conservative forecasted price of \$35-\$40 *per* barrel crude oil (Chandel *et al.* 2007), but this may occur sooner due to spiralling oil prices (\$135 *per* barrel in May 2008 and climbing; www.bloomberg.com). The distillation cost of ethanol is significantly higher at low ethanol concentrations (Zacchi & Axelsson 1989) and a membrane distillation process can be used as an efficient and cost effective option (see Chandel *et al.* 2007); molecular sieve techniques are now widely used in the industry (Rogers *et al.* 2005). A net energy balance (NEB) calculated by Hill *et al.* (2006) suggested that corn grain ethanol provides *ca.* 25 % more energy than that consumed in its production; however, almost all of the NEB can be attributed to the 'energy credit' for the animal feed co-product.

Such calculations are moderated according to the geographic region. Hence, Brazil has certain comparative advantages in ethanol production. Unlike American or European processes based on crops (e.g. barley, corn or wheat) that must first be converted at significant expense into fermentable sugars, Brazilian (and also Australian) processes are based on sugarcane which the climate favours, obviating any need for conversion. Ethanol produced from sugarcane in Brazil has a net positive energy balance (renewable energy output *versus* fossil fuel input) of 10.2, whilst the equivalent value for ethanol from corn (US) is 1.4 (Goldemberg 2007). Also, the production cost of ethanol from sugarcane (Brazil) (\$0.81 *per* gallon, in 2006) is lower compared to ethanol from corn (US) (\$1.03 *per* gallon, in 2006) and is competitive with gasoline in the US, even considering the import duty of \$0.54 *per* gallon and energy-efficiency penalties (30 % or less with modern flexible fuel vehicle technologies) (Goldemberg 2007). Ethanol produced in Brazil has remained fully competitive with gasoline on the international markets, without government intervention, since 2004, i.e. subsidising ethanol production is a thing of the past. In addition to the production of ethanol, the industrial processing of sugarcane generates bagasse, a valuable product which adds to the industry's positive environmental differential because it has been used to replace fossil fuels in the production of industrial heat and electricity in the sugar mills and distilleries, thereby boosting the abatement potential of greenhouse gases emission (Macedo *et al.* 2004). Moreover, the competition for land use between food and fuel has not been substantial: sugarcane covers 10 % of total cultivated land but only 1 % of total land available for agriculture in Brazil (Goldemberg 2007).

A recent review (Hill *et al.* 2006) has evaluated critically the long-term potential for bio-ethanol against emerging bio-diesel technology. While ethanol is made by the fermentation of biomass substrates (cane sugar is ideal because no further processing is required), bio-diesel is made *via* processing of plant material from 'energy crops'. For example, soybean bio-diesel is sourced directly from long-chain triglycerides obtained from the seeds; in comparison corn-starch requires pre-enzymatic conversion into fermentable sugars for ethanol production. Critically, bio-diesel yields 93 % more energy than that invested in its production and, relative to the fossil fuels they displace, greenhouse gas emissions are reduced by 12 % and by 41 % by bio-ethanol and bio-diesel, respectively. However, Hill *et al.* (2006) point out that 'even dedicating all U.S. corn and soybean production to bio-fuels would meet only 12 % of gasoline demand and 6 % of diesel demand'. Lin & Tanaka (2006) suggest that any country with a significant agronomic-based economy could use technology for ethanol fuel production. However, this and many other critiques overlook the difficulty of achieving a positive energy balance for the production of bio-ethanol from crops such as corn and wheat rather than from sugarcane. Whereas the result of recent studies was a positive energy balance of 1.4 (Goldemberg 2007), the cultivation area needed to support a US fuel economy based on corn-ethanol would equate to most of the nation's land area (Pimentel 2001) and the same argument applies to all 'energy crops' that compete for agricultural land with food supply, a very major factor, which is acknowledged but understated by Hill *et al.* (2006). These authors suggest the use of agriculturally marginal land or the use of waste biomass for bio-ethanol production; both are potentially more sustainable than outright energy crop cultivation. Assuming that the cost of ethanol recovery can be lowered by effective recovery technology, the use of large global reserves of lignocellulosic waste biomass as potentially fermentable feedstock is receiving widespread attention with respect to bio-ethanol production and also with respect to bio-H₂ production (de Vrije & Claassen 2003; Aldhous 2006; Schnoor 2006). The main problem lies in converting the recalcitrant woody material into readily fermentable substrate. This requires pre-treatment, which may be physico-chemical, enzymatic or combinations of these. An overview of upstream treatments is outside the scope of this review and the reader is referred to recent example reviews in this area (Rogers *et al.* 2005; Lin & Tanaka 2006; Chandel *et al.* 2007). Once a fermentable feedstock is generated there are several options for the downstream energy production process and the hydrolysate could be equally well used for bio-hydrogen production as for bio-ethanol production, without the attendant processing costs.

The use of energy crops for bio-diesel production is particularly promising and the technological limitations have been reviewed by Abdullah *et al.* (2007). Chemically, 'bio-diesel' is fatty acid methyl esters, produced by the transesterification of oils and fats with methanol in the presence of suitable catalysts. Here bio-methanol could find a large-scale application as an alternative to the niche market for fuel cell use. The disadvantages of bio-diesel production are that large volumes of contaminated wastewater are produced and that homogeneous catalysis is employed for maximum processing efficiency; the catalyst is currently not retained and major research efforts are directed towards the development of solid phase catalysts (Abdullah *et al.* 2007). Glycerol is produced in tonnage quantities as a by-product, which could be a suitable substrate for microbial fermentation to produce ethanol or H₂ as additional energy products. However, the glycerol is obtained as an aqueous impure NaCl-solution which requires purification and its use as a fermentation substrate would compete with other potential uses in the pharmaceutical, cosmetic and food industries and as animal feeds, polymers, surfactants and lubricants (Ma & Hanna 1999). Assuming that microorganisms resistant to the contaminants are developed, bio-hydrogen production could be attractive in this context since a gaseous product is easily separated from the fermentation liquor and hence the purity or otherwise of the starting material is largely irrelevant, assuming the product gas stream is free of volatile agents.

Bio-diesel is made from waste oils or by pressing plant material (e.g. seeds) to extract the oils and hence plant residua could be a useful waste for fermentation to make a secondary ethanol or hydrogen fuel stream; however, the problems of upstream treatment of the wastes are similar to those of other fibrous materials (above), although in at least one example waste from oil production (in this case olive oil) has been used as the substrate for bio-hydrogen production (Eroğlu *et al.* 2004). Clearly the use of edible oils from food-crops such as *Olea* spp. (olive) for bio-fuel production would be impractical, however attention has recently focused on the use of inedible oil for bio-diesel production, obtained from the tropical oil seed

plant *Jatropha curcas*, which is drought-resistant and can grow on marginal, sub-arable or even waste land (Srivastava & Prasad 2000) in Central and South America, Mexico, South-East Asia, India and Africa. *J. curcas* is not suitable as animal feed without detoxification (Martínez-Herrera *et al.* 2006) but has many other applications and a transesterification process of the seed oil as a bio-fuel has been evaluated on an industrial scale (1500 tonnes per annum; Gübitz *et al.* 1999). Due to its high free fatty acid content (*ca.* 14 % w/w) *Jatropha* oil requires pre-esterification using methanol before conventional transesterification to produce bio-diesel, which was shown to give a high yield of bio-diesel with satisfactory fuel properties (Tiwari *et al.* 2007). Bio-methane production from anaerobic digestion is a potential source of bio-methanol, which could find use in the pre-esterification reaction. Crushing *Jatropha* seeds to release the oil results in an equal mass of press-cake, which can be used as a substrate for further bioprocessing, e.g. methane production by anaerobic digestion (Staubmann *et al.* 1997) or, indeed bio-H₂ production although this has not been attempted to date.

In conclusion, the production of bio-fuels (bio-diesel, bio-ethanol or bio-gases) from energy-dedicated crops appears to be unsustainable unless the plant occupies a niche other than agricultural land or provides a high yield of energy *per area* of cultivation. Agricultural residues (lignocellulosic biomass) are available as sources of fermentable substrate for bio-fuel production but the conversion of these wastes into fermentable substrate forms a common bottleneck. Bio-gases and bio-ethanol can both be made by the fermentation of sugars and sugary wastes but the processing costs of ethanol limit the energy output of this method.

The hydrogen economy *per se* is still some decades away but combination and hybrid technologies are appealing in the shorter term. Production of H₂ from food waste sources or from the wastes from bio-diesel production is potentially a clean and sustainable route to clean energy production.

Although the maximum yields of H₂ from sugar are being approached by fermentation this is only possible by the application of more than one microorganism. This review has attempted to identify the two-stage approaches by which maximum yields (and rates) of conversion can be obtained and it identifies that, as with energy crops, available land area for light capture is likely to be a major limiting factor in operation. Under-used, waste ground in sunny regions (as for *Jatropha*) could provide one solution but for most of the developed world arable land takes priority for food production. Process intensification is required to overcome the problem of light delivery to the second stage photofermentations, which would push bio-H₂ production to competitive levels. A review of photobioreactor designs to achieve effective light transfer into high-activity cultures is outside the scope of this overview; the reader is referred to recent reviews (Tsygankov 2001; Hoekema *et al.* 2002; Kondo *et al.* 2002; Hoekema *et al.* 2006; Claassen & de Vrije 2007).

5: Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the financial support of the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (Grant no. BB/C516128/1 and studentship no. 10703 to MDR), Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (Grant no. EP/E03488/1) and Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Contract no. NTFUN2). LEM was supported by a BBSRC/Royal Society Industrial Fellowship in partnership with C-Tech Innovation Ltd.

6: Bibliography

- Abdullah AZ, Razali N, Mootabadi H & Salamatinia B (2007). Critical technical areas for future improvements in biodiesel technologies. *Environ Res Lett* 2:034001 doi:10.1088/1748-9326/2/3/034001.
- Akano T, Miura Y, Fukatsu K, Miyasaka H, Ikuta Y, Matsumoto H, Hamasaki A, Shioji N, Mizoguchi T, Yagi K & Maeda I (1996). Hydrogen production by photosynthetic microorganisms. *Appl Biochem Biotechnol* 57-8:677-688.
- Akkerman I, Janssen M, Rocha J & Wijffels RH (2002). Photobiological hydrogen production: photochemical efficiency and bioreactor design. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 27(11-12):1195-1208.
- Alam KY & Clark DP (1989). Anaerobic fermentation balance of *Escherichia coli* as observed by *in vivo* nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy. *J Bacteriol* 171(11):6213-6217.
- Aldhous P (2006). Green gold. *New Sci* 25 Feb:37-40.
- Anon (2004). United Kingdom Food and Drink Processing Mass Balance: Biffaward Programme on Sustainable Resource Use. C-Tech Innovation, Capenhurst, UK.
- Anon (2005). Agriculture in the United Kingdom. Retrieved Aug 2007, 2007, from statistics.defra.gov.uk/esg/publications/auk/2005/default.asp.
- Antal TK & Lindblad P (2005). Production of H₂ by sulphur-deprived cells of the unicellular cyanobacteria *Gloeocapsa alpicola* and *Synechocystis* sp. PCC 6803 during dark incubation with methane or at various extracellular pH. *J Appl Microbiol* 98(1):114-20.
- Aoyama K, Uemura I, Miyake J & Asada Y (1997). Photosynthetic bacterial hydrogen production with fermentation products of cyanobacterium *Spirulina platensis*. International Conference on Biological Hydrogen Production, Waikoloa, Hawaii, Plenum Press, New York.
- Asada Y, Tokumoto M, Aihara Y, Oku M, Ishimi K, Wakayama T, Miyake J, Tomiyama M & Kohno H (2006). Hydrogen production by co-cultures of *Lactobacillus* and a photosynthetic bacterium, *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* RV. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 31(11):1509-1513.
- Avi S (2007). Photovoltaics literature survey (No. 51). *Progress in Photovoltaics: Research and Applications* 15(1):87-91.
- Bae J-H, Bardiya N & Reddy MRVP (2005). Bio-hydrogen: technology and future prospects. *Wealth from waste: trends and technologies*. Lal B & Reddy MRVP, (Eds). New Delhi, India, TERI Press: 87-132.
- Banik RM, Santhiagu A, Kanari B, Sabarinath C & Upadhyay SN (2003). Technological aspects of extractive fermentation using aqueous two-phase systems. *World J Microbiol Biotechnol* 19(4):337-348.
- Bartelings H, van Beukering P, Kuik O, Linderhof V, Oosterhuis F, Brander L & Wagtenonk A (2005). Effectiveness of landfill taxation, Report prepared for the Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment, Institute for Environmental Studies, Vrije Universiteit, R-05/05, Amsterdam. Available at www.ivm.falw.vu.nl/research_output/index.cfm/home_subsection.cfm/subsectionid/FF91BCBD-EAFE-426A-ABB8184073A39BBF.
- Basak N & Das D (2007). The prospect of purple non-sulfur (PNS) photosynthetic bacteria for hydrogen production: the present state of the art. *World J Microbiol Biotechnol* 23:31-42.
- Benemann JR (1996). Hydrogen biotechnology: Progress and prospects. *Nat Biotechnol* 14:1101-1103.
- Bevan A, Book D, Züttel A & Harris R (2007). The protium project: A hybrid electric canal boat using metal hydride store and a PEM fuel cell. The Oxford-Kobe Energy Seminar, 22th-24th April 2007. Hydrogen Storage: The International Grand Challenge, Kobe Institute, Japan.
- Biebl H & Pfennig N (1981). Isolation of members of the family *Rhodospirillaceae*. *The Prokaryotes*. Starr MP, Stolp H, Truper HG, Balows A & Schlegel HG, (Eds). Springer. 1: 267-273.
- Blankenship RE, Madigan MT & Bauer CE (1995). Anoxygenic photosynthetic bacteria. Dordrecht, The Netherlands, Kluwer Academic.
- Bock A & Sawers G (1992). Fermentation. *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella Typharium*. Niedhardt FC, (Ed.). Washington DC, ASM Press. 1: 262-282.
- Borodin VB, Tsygankov AA, Rao KK & Hall DO (2000). Hydrogen production by *Anabaena variabilis* PK84 under simulated outdoor conditions. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 69(5):478-485.
- Burgess G & Fernandez-Velasco JG (2007). Materials, operational energy inputs, and net energy ratio for photobiological hydrogen production. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 32:1255-1234.
- Carrieri D, Ananyev G, Garcia Costas AM, Bryant DA & Dismukes GC (2008). Renewable hydrogen production by cyanobacteria: Nickel requirements for optimal hydrogenase activity. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 33(8):2014-2022.
- Castenholz RW (1995). Ecology of thermophilic anoxygenic phototrophs. *Anoxygenic photosynthetic bacteria*. Blankenship RE, Madigan MT & Bauer CE, (Eds). Dordrecht, The Netherlands, Kluwer Academic: 87-103.
- Chandel AK, Chan ES, Rudravaram R, Narusu ML, Rao LV & Ravindra P (2007). Economics and environmental impact of bioethanol production technologies: an appraisal. *Biotechnol Mol Biol Rev* 2(1):14-32.

- Chen X, Sun Y, Xiu Z, Li X & Zhang D (2006). Stoichiometric analysis of biological hydrogen production by fermentative bacteria. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 31:539-549.
- Claassen PAM, van Lier JB, Lopez-Contreras AM, van Niel EWJ, Sijtsma L, Stams AJM, de Vries SS & Weusthuis RA (1999). Utilisation of biomass for the supply of energy carriers. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 52:741-755.
- Claassen PAM, Budde MAW, Van Noorden GE, Hoekema S, Hazewinkel JHO, Van Groenestijn JW & De Vrije GJ (2004). Biological hydrogen production from agro-food by-products. Total Food: Exploiting co-products - minimizing waste, Institute of Food Research, Norwich, UK.
- Claassen PAM & de Vrije GJ (2007). Hydrogen from biomass. Public report, BWP II project, Agrotechnology and Food Sciences Group, Wageningen. 2007.
- Clark DP (1989). The fermentation pathways of *Escherichia coli*. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 5(3):223-234.
- Collet C, Adler N, Schwitzguebel J-P & Peringer P (2004). Hydrogen production by *Clostridium thermolactum* during continuous fermentation of lactose. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 29:1479-1485.
- Cornet JF, Favier L & Dussap CG (2003). Modeling stability of photoheterotrophic continuous cultures in photobioreactors. *Biotechnol Prog* 19:1216-1227.
- Cournac L, Guedeney G, Peltier G & Vignais PM (2004). Sustained photoevolution of molecular hydrogen in a mutant of *Synechocystis* sp. strain PCC 6803 deficient in the type I NADPH-dehydrogenase complex. *J Bacteriol* 186:1737-1746.
- Dalton H (2005). The Leeuwenhoek Lecture 2000 The natural and unnatural history of methane-oxidizing bacteria. *Phil Trans R Soc B* 360(1458):1207-1222.
- Das D & Veziroglu TN (2001). Hydrogen production by biological processes: a survey of literature. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 26:13-28.
- Davila-Vazquez G, Arriaga S, Alatraste-Mondragón F, de León-Rodríguez A, Rosales-Colunga LM & Razo-Flores E (2008a). Fermentative biohydrogen production: trends and perspectives. *Rev Environ Sci Biotechnol* 7(1):27-45.
- Davila-Vazquez G, Alatraste-Mondragón F, de León Rodríguez A & Razo-Flores E (2008b). Fermentative hydrogen production in batch experiments using lactose, cheese whey and glucose: Influence of initial substrate concentration and pH. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 33(19):4989-4997.
- Dawson L & Boopathy R (2007). Use of post-harvest sugarcane residue for ethanol production. *Bioresour Technol* 98(9):1695-1699.
- de Vrije T & Claassen PAM (2003). Dark hydrogen fermentations. Bio-methane & Bio-hydrogen. Reith JH, Wijffels RH & Barten H, (Eds). Petten, Netherlands, Dutch Biological Hydrogen Foundation: 103-123.
- de Vrije T, Mars AE, Budde MAW, Lai MH, Dijkema C, de Waard P & Claassen PAM (2007). Glycolytic pathway and hydrogen yield studies of the extreme thermophile *Caldicellulosiruptor saccharolyticus*. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 74:1358-1367.
- Dien BS, Nichols NN, O'Bryan PJ & Bothast RJ (2000). Development of new ethanologenic *Escherichia coli* strains for fermentation of lignocellulosic biomass. *Appl Biochem Biotechnol* 84-6:181-196.
- Dutta D, De D, Chaudhuri S & Bhattacharya SK (2005). Hydrogen production by cyanobacteria. *Microb Cell Fact* 4:36.
- Easterly JL & Burnham M (1996). Overview of biomass and waste fuel resources for power production. *Biomass Bioenergy* 10(2-3):79-92.
- Eiteman MA & Altman E (2006). Overcoming acetate in *Escherichia coli* recombinant protein fermentations. *Trends Biotechnol* 24(11):530-536.
- Emanuelsson EAC, Arcangeli JP & Livingston AG (2003). The anoxic extractive membrane bioreactor. *Water Res* 37(6):1231-1238.
- Ensign JC (1977). Biomass production from animal wastes. *Microbial Energy Conversion*. Schlegel HG & Barnea J, (Eds). Oxford, Pergamon: 455-483.
- Eroğlu E, Gündüz U, Yücel M, Türker L & Eroğlu I (2004). Photobiological hydrogen production by using olive mill wastewater as a sole substrate source. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 29:163-171.
- Eroğlu E, Eroğlu I, Gündüz U, Türker L & Yücel M (2006). Biological hydrogen production from olive mill wastewater with two-stage processes. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 31(11):1527-1535.
- Eroğlu I, Aslan K, Gündüz U, Yücel M & Türker L (1997). Continuous hydrogen production by *R. sphaeroides* O.U. 001. International Conference on Biological Hydrogen Production, Waikoloa, Hawaii, Plenum Press, New York.
- Eroğlu I, Tabanoğlu A, Gündüz U, Eroğlu E & Yücel M (2008). Hydrogen production by *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* O.U.001 in a flat plate solar bioreactor. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 33:531-541.
- Fang HHP, Liu H & Zhang T (2005). Phototrophic hydrogen production from acetate and butyrate in wastewater. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 30:785-793.
- Fang HHP, Li C & Zhang T (2006). Acidophilic biohydrogen production from rice slurry. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 31:683-692.

- Fascetti E, D'Addario E, Todini O & Robertiello A (1998). Photosynthetic hydrogen evolution with volatile organic acids derived from the fermentation of source selected municipal solid wastes. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 23(9):753-760.
- Ferchichi M, Crabbe E, Hintz W, Gil GH & Almadidy A (2005). Influence of culture parameters on biological hydrogen production by *Clostridium saccharoperbutylacetonicum* ATCC 27021. *World J Microbiol Biotechnol* 21(6-7):855-862.
- Filatova LV, Berg IA, Krasil'nikova EN, Tsygankov AA, Laurinavichene TV & Ivanovskii RN (2005a). A study of the mechanism of acetate assimilation in purple nonsulfur bacteria lacking the glyoxylate shunt: Acetate assimilation in *Rhodobacter sphaeroides*. *Microbiol* 74(3):265-269.
- Filatova LV, Berg IA, Krasil'nikova EN & Ivanovskii RN (2005b). A study of the mechanism of acetate assimilation in purple nonsulfur bacteria lacking the glyoxylate shunt: Enzymes of the citramalate cycle in *Rhodobacter sphaeroides*. *Microbiol* 74(3):270-278.
- Filho PA & Badr O (2004). Biomass resources for energy in north-eastern Brazil. *Appl Energy* 77:51-67.
- Fissler J, Kohring GW & Giffhorn F (1995). Enhanced hydrogen production from aromatic acids by immobilized cells of *Rhodospseudomonas palustris*. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 44:43-46.
- Franchi E, Tosi C, Scolla G, Penna GD, Rodriguez F & Pedroni PM (2004). Metabolically engineered *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* RV strains for improved biohydrogen photoproduction combined with disposal of food wastes. *Mar Biotechnol* 6:552-565.
- Fuji T, Tarusawa M, Miyanaga M, Kiyota S, Watanabe T & Yabuki M (1987). Hydrogen production from alcohols, malate and mixed electron donors by *Rhodospseudomonas* sp. No. 7. *Agric Biol Chem* 51(1):1-7.
- Ghirardi ML, King PW, Posewitz MC, Maness PC, Fedorov A, Kim K, Cohen J, Schulten K & Seibert M (2005). Approaches to developing biological H₂-photoproducing organisms and processes. *Biochem Soc Trans* 33:70-72.
- Goldemberg J (2007). Ethanol for a sustainable energy future. *Science* 315:808-810.
- Gosse JL, Engel BJ, Rey FE, Harwood CS, Scriven LE & Flickinger MC (2007). Hydrogen production by photoreactive nanoporous latex coatings of nongrowing *Rhodospseudomonas palustris* CGA009. *Biotechnol Prog* 23(1):124-130.
- Grosse S, Laramee L, Wendlandt K-D, McDonald IR, Miguez CB & Kleber H-P (1999). Purification and characterization of the soluble methane monooxygenase of the type II methanotrophic bacterium *Methylocystis* sp. strain WI 14. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 65(9):3929-3935.
- Gübitz GM, Mittelbach M & Trabi M (1999). Exploitation of the tropical oil seed plant *Jatropha curcas* L. *Bioresour Technol* 67:73-82.
- Hallenbeck PC & Benemann JR (2002). Biological hydrogen production; fundamentals and limiting processes. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 27(11-12):1185-1193.
- Hallenbeck PC (2005). Fundamentals of the fermentative production of hydrogen. *Water Sci Technol* 52(1-2):21-29.
- Happe T, Schutz K & Bohme H (2000). Transcriptional and mutational analysis of the uptake hydrogenase of the filamentous cyanobacterium *Anabaena variabilis* ATCC 29413. *J Bacteriol* 182(6):1624-31.
- Haq Z & Easterly JL (2006). Agricultural residue availability in the United States. *Appl Biochem Biotechnol* 129-132:3-21.
- Hassan MA, Shirai Y, Kusubayashi N, Karim MIA, Nakanishi K & Hashimoto K (1997). The production of polyhydroxyalkanoate from anaerobically treated palm oil mill effluent by *Rhodobacter sphaeroides*. *J Ferment Bioeng* 83(5):485-488.
- Hawkes FR, Dinsdale R, Hawkes DL & Hussy I (2002). Sustainable fermentative hydrogen production: challenges for process optimisation. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 27:1339-1347.
- Hawkes FR, Hussy I, Kyazze G, Dinsdale R & Hawkes DL (2007). Continuous dark fermentative hydrogen production by mesophilic microflora: Principles and progress. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 32:172-184.
- Hawkes FR, Forsey H, Premier GC, Dinsdale RM, Hawkes DL, Guwy AJ, Maddy J, Cherryman S, Shine J & Auty D (2008). Fermentative production of hydrogen from a wheat flour industry co-product. *Bioresour Technol* 99:5020-5029.
- Hill J, Nelson E, Tilman D, Polasky S & Tiffany D (2006). Environmental, economic, and energetic costs and benefits of biodiesel and ethanol biofuels. *Proc Nat Acad Sci USA* 103:11206-11210.
- Hillmer P & Gest H (1977a). H₂ metabolism in the photosynthetic bacterium *Rhodospseudomonas capsulata*: H₂ production by growing cultures. *J Bacteriol* 129(2):724-731.
- Hillmer P & Gest H (1977b). H₂ metabolism in the photosynthetic bacterium *Rhodospseudomonas capsulata*: Production and utilisation of H₂ by resting cells. *J Bacteriol* 129(2):732-739.
- Hoekema S, Bijmans M, Janssen M, Tramper J & Wijffels RH (2002). A pneumatically agitated flat-panel photobioreactor with gas re-circulation: anaerobic photoheterotrophic cultivation of a purple non-sulfur bacterium. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 27(11-12):1331-1338.

- Hoekema S, Douma RD, Janssen M, Tramper J & Wijffels RH (2006). Controlling light-use by *Rhodobacter capsulatus* continuous cultures in a flat-panel photobioreactor. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 95(4):613-26.
- Holmes B & Jones N (2003). Brace yourself for the end of cheap oil. *New Sci* 179(2406):9.
- Hustede E, Steinbuechel A & Schlegel HG (1993). Relationship between the photoproduction of hydrogen and the accumulation of PHB in nonsulfur purple bacteria. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 39(1):87-93.
- Ike A, Toda N, Murakawa T, Hirata K & Miyamoto K (1997). Hydrogen photoproduction from starch in CO₂-fixing microalgal biomass by a halotolerant bacterial community. *Biohydrogen*, Hawaii, Plenum Press, New York and London.
- Ike A, Kawaguchi H, Hirata K & Miyamoto K (2001). Hydrogen photoproduction from starch in algal biomass. *Biohydrogen II : An Approach to Environmentally Acceptable Technology*. Miyake J, Matsunaga T & San Pietro A, (Eds). Pergamon: 53-61.
- Ikuta Y, Akano T, Shioji N & Maeda I (1997). Hydrogen production by photosynthetic microorganisms. *International Conference on Biological Hydrogen Production*, Waikoloa, Hawaii, Plenum Press, New York.
- Ivanovskii RN, Krasil'nikova EN & Berg IA (1997). The mechanism of acetate assimilation in the purple nonsulfur bacterium *Rhodospirillum rubrum* lacking isocitrate lyase. *Microbiol* 66(6):621-626.
- Jahn A, Keuntje B, Dorffler M, Klipp W & Oelze J (1994). Optimizing photoheterotrophic H₂ production by *Rhodobacter capsulatus* upon interposon mutagenesis in the *hupL* gene. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 40:687-690.
- Jo JH, Lee DS & Park JM (2006). Modeling and optimization of photosynthetic hydrogen gas production by green alga *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii* in sulfur-deprived circumstance. *Biotechnol Prog* 22(2):431-437.
- Kadar Z, de Vrije T, van Noorden GE, Budde MAW, Szengyel Z, Reczey K & Claassen PAM (2004). Yields from glucose, xylose, and paper sludge hydrolysate during hydrogen production by the extreme thermophile *Caldicellulosiruptor saccharolyticus*. *Appl Biochem Biotechnol* 113-116:497-508.
- Karlsson A, Vallin L & Ejlertsson J (2008). Effects of temperature, hydraulic retention time and hydrogen extraction rate on hydrogen production from the fermentation of food industry residues and manure. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 33(3):953-962.
- Kataoka N, Miya A & Kiriya K (1997). Studies on hydrogen production by continuous culture system of hydrogen-producing anaerobic bacteria. *Water Sci Technol* 36(6-7):41-47.
- Katsuda T, Arimoto T, Igarashi K, Azuma M, Kato J, Takakuwa S & Ooshima H (2000). Light intensity distribution in the externally illuminated cylindrical photo-bioreactor and its application to hydrogen production by *Rhodobacter capsulatus*. *Biochem Eng J* 5:157-164.
- Kawaguchi H, Hashimoto K, Hirata K & Miyamoto K (2001). H₂ production from algal biomass by a mixed culture of *Rhodobium marinum* A-501 and *Lactobacillus amylovorus*. *J Biosci Bioeng* 91(3):277-282.
- Keeling CD & Whorf TP (2005). Atmospheric CO₂ records from sites in the SIO air sampling network. *Trends: A Compendium of Data on Global Change*. Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, U.S. Department of Energy, Oak Ridge, Tenn., U.S.A.
- Kern M, Koch HG & Klemme JH (1992). EDTA activation of H₂ photoproduction by *Rhodospirillum rubrum*. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 37(4):496-500.
- Khatipov E, Miyake M, Miyake J & Asada Y (1998). Accumulation of poly-β-hydroxybutyrate by *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* on various carbon and nitrogen substrates. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 162:39-45.
- Kim E-J, Kim J-S, Kim M-S & Lee JK (2006a). Effect of changes in the level of light harvesting complexes of *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* on the photoheterotrophic production of hydrogen. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 31:531-538.
- Kim M-S, Lee TJ, Yoon YS, Lee IG & Moon KW (2001). Hydrogen production from food processing wastewater and sewage sludge by anaerobic dark fermentation combined with photo-fermentation. *Biohydrogen II : An Approach to Environmentally Acceptable Technology*. Miyake J, Matsunaga T & San Pietro A, (Eds). Pergamon: 263-272.
- Kim M-S, Baek J-S & Lee JK (2006b). Comparison of H₂ accumulation by *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* KD131 and its uptake hydrogenase and PHB synthase deficient mutant. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 31:121-127.
- Kim M-S, Baek J-S, Yun Y-S, Sim SJ, Park S & Kim S-C (2006c). Hydrogen production from *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii* biomass using a two-step conversion process: Anaerobic conversion and photosynthetic fermentation. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 31:812-816.
- Kim NJ, Lee JK & Lee CJ (2004). Pigment reduction to improve photosynthetic productivity of *Rhodobacter sphaeroides*. *J Gen Microbiol* 1692(28):607-16.
- Kim S-H, Han S-K & Shin H-S (2004). Feasibility of biohydrogen production by anaerobic co-digestion of food waste and sewage sludge. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 29:1607-1616.
- Kirkpatrick C, Maurer LM, Oyelakin NE, Yoncheva YN, Maurer R & Slonczewski JL (2001). Acetate and formate stress: Opposite responses in the proteome of *Escherichia coli*. *J Bacteriol* 183(21):6466-6477.
- Knappe J (1987). Anaerobic dissimilation of pyruvate. *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella Typharium*. Niedhardt FC, (Ed.). Washington DC, Am Soc Microbiol. 1: 151-155.

- Ko IB & Noike T (2002). Use of blue optical filters for suppression of growth of algae in hydrogen producing non-axenic cultures of *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* RV. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 27(11-12):1297-1302.
- Koku H, Eroğlu I, Gündüz U, Yücel M & Türker L (2002). Aspects of the metabolism of hydrogen production by *Rhodobacter sphaeroides*. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 27:1315-1329.
- Kondo T, Arakawa M, Wakayama T & Miyake J (2002). Hydrogen production by combining two types of photosynthetic bacteria with different characteristics. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 27(11-12):1303-1308.
- Kondo T, Wakayama T & Miyake J (2006). Efficient hydrogen production using a multi-layered photobioreactor and a photosynthetic bacterium mutant with reduced pigment. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 31(11):1522-1526.
- Kraemer JT & Bagley DM (2007). Improving the yield from fermentative hydrogen production. *Biotechnol Lett* 29:685-695.
- Kurokawa T & Shigeharu T (2005). Effects of formate on fermentative hydrogen production by *Enterobacter aerogenes*. *Mar Biotechnol* 7:112-118.
- Kvaalen E, Wankat PC & McKenzie BA (2006). Alcohol distillation: Basic principles, equipment, performance relationships, and safety. www.ces.purdue.edu/extmedia/AE/AE-117.html, accessed May 2008.
- Kyazze G, Dinsdale R, Guwy AJ, Hawkes FR, Premier GC & Hawkes DL (2007). Performance characteristics of a two-stage dark fermentative system producing hydrogen and methane continuously. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 97(4):759-770.
- Larminie J & Dicks A (2003). *Fuel cell systems explained*, 2nd ed., John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, Sussex, UK.
- Laurinavichene TV, Fedorov AS, Ghirardi ML, Siebert M & Tsygankov AA (2006). Demonstration of sustained hydrogen production by immobilised, sulfur-deprived *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii* cells. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 31:659-667.
- Lee CM, Chen PC, Wang CC & Tung YC (2002). Photohydrogen production using purple nonsulfur bacteria with hydrogen fermentation reactor effluent. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 27(11-12):1309-1313.
- Levin DB, Pitt L & Love M (2004a). Biohydrogen production: prospects and limitations to practical application. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 29:173-185.
- Levin DB (2004b). Re: Biohydrogen production: prospects and limitations to practical application-Erratum. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 29:1425-1426.
- Levin DB, Islam R, Cicek N & Sparling R (2006). Hydrogen production by *Clostridium thermocellum* 27405 from cellulosic biomass substrates. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 31(11):1496-1503.
- Levin DB, Zhu H, Beland M, Cicek N & Holbein BE (2007). Potential for hydrogen and methane production from biomass residues in Canada. *Bioresour Technol* 98:654-660.
- Li H, Mustacci R, Knowles CJ, Skibar W, Sunderland G, Dalrymple I & Jackman S, A. (2004). An electrokinetic bioreactor: using direct electric current for enhanced lactic acid fermentation and product recovery. *Tetrahedron* 60:655-661.
- Liang TM, Cheng SS & Wu KL (2002). Behavioral study on hydrogen fermentation reactor installed with silicone rubber membrane. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 27(11-12):1157-1165.
- Liessens J & Verstraete W (1986). Selective inhibitors for continuous non-axenic hydrogen production by *Rhodobacter capsulatus*. *J Appl Bacteriol* 61(6):547-557.
- Lin C-Y & Lay CH (2005). A nutrient formation for fermentative hydrogen production using anaerobic sewage sludge microflora. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 30:285-292.
- Lin Y & Tanaka S (2006). Ethanol fermentation from biomass resources: current state and prospects. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 69(6):627-642.
- Lindblad P, Christensson K, Lindberg P, Fedorov A, Pinto F & Tsygankov A (2002). Photoproduction of H₂ by wildtype *Anabaena* PCC 7120 and a hydrogen uptake deficient mutant: From laboratory experiments to outdoor culture. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 27(11-12):1271-1281.
- Ma F & Hanna MH (1999). Biodiesel production: a review. *Bioresour Technol* 70:1-15.
- Mabee WE, Fraser EDG, McFarlane PN & Saddler JN (2006). Canadian biomass reserves for biorefining. *Appl Biochem Biotechnol* 129-132:22-40.
- Macaskie LE (2004). Biological hydrogen production from crops & sugar wastes. Final Report, EPSRC Project GR/S62406/01.
- Macaskie LE, Baxter-Plant VS, Creamer NJ, Humphries AC, Mikheenko IP, Mikheenko PM, Penfold DW & Yong P (2005). Applications of bacterial hydrogenases in waste decontamination, manufacture of novel bionanocatalysts and in sustainable energy. *Biochem Soc Trans* 33(Pt 1):76-9.
- Macedo IC, Leal MRLV & Silva JEAR (2004). Assessment of greenhouse gas emissions in the production and use of fuel ethanol in Brazil, available at www.unica.com.br/i_pages/files/gee3.pdf.
- Macler BA, Pelroy RA & Bassham JA (1979). Hydrogen formation in nearly stoichiometric amounts from glucose by a *Rhodospseudomonas* mutant. *J Bacteriol* 138(2):446-452.

- Macler BA & Bassham JA (1988). Carbon allocation in wild-type and Glc⁺ *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* under photoheterotrophic conditions. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 54(11):2737-2741.
- Madamwar D, Garg N & Shah V (2000). Cyanobacterial hydrogen production. *World J Microbiol Biotechnol* 16:757-767.
- Mandal B, Nath K & Das D (2006). Improvement of biohydrogen production under decreased partial pressure of H₂ by *Enterobacter cloacae*. *Biotechnol Lett* 28:831-835.
- Martínez-Herrera J, Siddhuraju P, Francis G, Dávila-Ortíz G & Becker K (2006). Chemical composition, toxic/antimetabolic constituents, and effects of different treatments on their levels, in four provenances of *Jatropha curcas* L. from Mexico. *Food Chem* 96:80-89.
- Masukawa H, Mochimaru M & Sakurai H (2002). Disruption of the uptake hydrogenase gene, but not of the bidirectional hydrogenase gene, leads to enhanced photobiological hydrogen production by the nitrogen-fixing cyanobacterium *Anabaena* sp. PCC 7120. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 58(5):618-24.
- McCormick DB (1998). Oxidation–reduction reactions. *Encyclopedia of Life Sciences*. Chichester, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Melis A & Happe T (2004). Trails of green alga hydrogen research - from Hans Gaffron to new frontiers. *Photosynth Res* 80(1-3):401-409.
- Melis A & Melnicki MR (2006). Integrated biological hydrogen production. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 31(11):1563-1573.
- Miura Y, Ohta S, Mano M & Miyamoto K (1986). Isolation and characterisation of a unicellular green alga exhibiting high activity in dark hydrogen production. *Agric Biol Chem* 50(11):2837-2844.
- Miura Y, Saitoh C, Matsuoka S & Miyamoto K (1992). Stably sustained hydrogen production with high molar yield through a combination of a marine green alga and a photosynthetic bacterium. *Biosci Biotechnol Biochem* 56(5):751-754.
- Miyake J, Mao X-Y & Kawamura S (1984). Photoproduction of hydrogen from glucose by a co-culture of a photosynthetic bacterium and *Clostridium butyricum*. *J Ferment Technol* 62(6):531-535.
- Miyake J, Miyake M & Asada Y (1999). Biotechnological hydrogen production: research for efficient light conversion. *J Biotechnol* 70:89-101.
- Miyamoto K, Ohta S, Nawa Y, Mori Y & Miura Y (1987). Hydrogen production by a mixed culture of a green alga *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii* and a photosynthetic bacterium *Rhodospirillum rubrum*. *Agric Biol Chem* 51(5):1391-1324.
- Mizuno O, Dinsdale R, Hawkes FR, Hawkes DL & Noike T (2000). Enhancement of hydrogen production from glucose by nitrogen gas sparging. *Bioresour Technol* 73:59-65.
- Nakada E, Asada Y, Arai T & Miyake J (1995). Light penetration into cell suspensions of photosynthetic bacteria and relation to hydrogen production. *J Ferment Bioeng* 80(1):53-57.
- Nandi R & Sengupta S (1998). Microbial production of hydrogen: An overview. *Crit Rev Microbiol* 24(1):61-84.
- Nastari PM, Macedo IC & Szwarc A (2005). Observations on the draft document entitled "Potential for Biofuels for transport in developing countries". The World Bank, Air Quality Thematic Group, p. 8. http://www.unica.com.br/i_pages/files/ibm.pdf.
- Nath K & Das D (2003). Hydrogen from biomass. *Curr Sci* 85(3):265-271.
- Nath K & Das D (2004a). Biohydrogen production as a potential energy source - Present state-of-art. *J Sci Indust Res* 63(9):729-738.
- Nath K & Das D (2004b). Improvement of fermentative hydrogen production: various approaches. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 65(5):520-529.
- Nath K, Kumar A & Das D (2005). Hydrogen production by *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* strain O.U.001 using spent media of *Enterobacter cloacae* strain DM11. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 68:533-541.
- Nath K, Muthukumar M, Kumar A & Das D (2008). Kinetics of two-stage fermentation process for the production of hydrogen. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 33(4):1195-1203.
- Nielsen AM, Amandusson H, Bjorklund R, Dannerun H, Ejlertsson J, Ekedahl L-G, Lundstrom I & Svensson BH (2001). Hydrogen production from organic waste. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 26:547-550.
- Nowak M (2004). Urban Agriculture on the Rooftop, Cornell University, available at www3.telus.net/public/a6a47567/roofgarden_thesis.pdf.
- Odom JM & Wall JD (1983). Photoproduction of H₂ from cellulose by an anaerobic bacterial culture. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 45(4):1300-1305.
- Oh SE & Logan BE (2005). Hydrogen and electricity production from a food processing wastewater using fermentation and microbial fuel cell technologies. *Water Res* 39(19):4673-4682.
- Oh Y-K, Seol E-H, Kim M-S & Park S (2004). Photoproduction of hydrogen from acetate by a chemoheterotrophic bacterium *Rhodopseudomonas palustris* P4. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 29:1115-1121.

- Ordal EJ & Halvorson HO (1939). A comparison of hydrogen production from sugars and formic acid by normal and variant strains of *Escherichia coli*. *J Bacteriol* 38:199-220.
- Öztürk Y, Yücel M, Daldal F, Mandaci S, Gündüz U, Türker L & Eroğlu I (2006). Hydrogen production by using *Rhodobacter capsulatus* mutants with genetically modified electron transfer chains. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 31(11):1545-1552.
- Park W, Hyun SH, Oh SE, Logan BE & Kim IS (2005). Removal of headspace CO₂ increases biological hydrogen production. *Environ Sci Technol* 39(12):4416-4420.
- Penfold DW, Forster CF & Macaskie LE (2003). Increased hydrogen production by *Escherichia coli* strain HD701 in comparison with the wild-type parent strain MC4100. *Enz Microb Technol* 33(2-3):185-189.
- Pimentel D (2001). The limitations of biomass energy. in *Encyclopedia of Physical Science and Technology*, 3rd edition. Meyers R, (Ed.), Academic Press, San Diego, CA: p.159-171.
- Polle JEW, Kanakagiri S, Jin E, Masuda T & Melis A (2002). Truncated chlorophyll antenna size of the photosystems - a practical method to improve microalgal productivity and hydrogen production in mass culture. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 27(11-12):1257-1264.
- Redwood MD & Macaskie LE (2006). A two-stage, two-organism process for biohydrogen from glucose. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 31(11):1514-1521.
- Redwood MD & Macaskie LE (2007a). Method and apparatus for biohydrogen production. British Patent Application No. 0705583.3. UK
- Redwood MD & Macaskie LE (2007b). Efficient bio-H₂ and PEM-FC catalyst. Proceedings of the 7th Hydrogen - Power and Theoretical Engineering Solutions International Symposium (HyPoThESIS VII), Merida, Mexico. CICY ISBN:968-6114-21-1.
- Redwood MD, Mikheenko IP, Sargent F & Macaskie LE (2007c). Dissecting the roles of *E. coli* hydrogenases in biohydrogen production. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 278:48-55.
- Ren N, Li J, Wang Y & Liu S (2006). Biohydrogen production from molasses by anaerobic fermentation with a pilot-scale bioreactor system. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 31:2147-2157.
- Rocha JS, Barbosa MJ & Wijffels RH (2001). Hydrogen production by photoheterotrophic bacteria: Culture media, yields and efficiencies. *Biohydrogen II : An Approach to Environmentally Acceptable Technology*. Miyake J, Matsunaga T & San Pietro A, (Eds). Pergamon: 3-32.
- Roe AJ, McLaggan D, Davidson I, O'Byrne C & Booth IR (1998). Perturbation of anion balance during inhibition of growth of *Escherichia coli* by weak acids. *J Bacteriol* 180(4):767-772.
- Rogers PL, Jeon YJ & Svenson CJ (2005). Application of biotechnology to industrial sustainability. *Trans IChemE Part B* 83(B6):499-503.
- Sakurai H & Masukawa H (2007). Promoting R & D in photobiological hydrogen production utilizing mariculture-raised cyanobacteria. *Mar Biotechnol* 9:128-145.
- Sasikala C, Ramana CV & Prasad GS (1994a). H₂ production by mixed cultures. *World J Microbiol Biotechnol* 10(2):221-223.
- Sasikala C, Ramana CV & Rao PR (1994b). Nitrogen fixation by *Rhodospseudomonas palustris* OU 11 with aromatic compounds as carbon source / electron donors. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 122:75-78.
- Sasikala K, Ramana CV, Rao PR & Subrahmanyam M (1990). Effect of gas phase on the photoproduction of hydrogen and substrate conversion efficiency on the photosynthetic bacterium *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* O.U. 001. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 15(11):795-797.
- Sasikala K, Ramana CV & Subrahmanyam M (1991). Photoproduction of hydrogen from wastewater of a lactic acid fermentation plant by a purple non-sulfur photosynthetic bacterium *Rhodobacter sphaeroides*. *Indian J Exp Biol* 29(74-75).
- Sasikala K, Ramana CV & Rao PR (1992). Photoproduction of hydrogen from the waste water of a distillery by *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* O.U. 001. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 17(1):23-27.
- Sasikala K, Ramana CV, Rao PR & Kovacs KL (1995). Anoxygenic Phototrophic Bacteria : Physiology and Advances in Hydrogen Production Technology. *Adv Appl Microbiol* 38:211-295.
- Sauter M, Bohm R & Bock A (1992). Mutational analysis of the operon (*hyc*) determining hydrogenase-3 formation in *Escherichia coli*. *Mol Microbiol* 6(11):1523-1532.
- Schnoor JL (2006). Biofuels and the environment. *Environ Sci Technol* 40(13):4024.
- Shi X-Y & Yu Q-H (2006). Continuous production of hydrogen from mixed volatile fatty acids with *Rhodospseudomonas capsulata*. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 31:1641-1647.
- Sode K, Watanabe M, Makimoto H & Tomiyama M (1999). Construction and characterisation of fermentative lactate dehydrogenase *E. coli* mutant and its potential for bacterial hydrogen production. *Appl Biochem Biotechnol* 77-79:317-323.

- Sode K, Yamamoto S & Tomiyama M (2001). Metabolic engineering approaches for the improvement of bacterial hydrogen production based on *Escherichia coli* mixed acid fermentation. *Biohydrogen II : An Approach to Environmentally Acceptable Technology*. Miyake J, Matsunaga T & San Pietro A, (Eds). Pergamon: 195-204.
- Splendiani A, Nicoletta C & Livingston AG (2003). A novel biphasic extractive membrane bioreactor for minimization of membrane-attached biofilms. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 83(1):8-19.
- Srivastava A & Prasad R (2000). Triglycerides-based diesel fuels. *Renew Sustain Energy Rev* 4(2):111-133.
- Staubmann R, Foidl G, Foidl N, Guebitz GM, Lafferty R, Valencia-Arbizu VM & Walter S (1997). Biogas production from *Jatropha curcas* press-cake. *Appl Biochem Biotechnol* 63-65(0):457-467.
- Stephenson M & Stickland LH (1932). Hydrogenlyases: Bacterial enzymes liberating molecular hydrogen. *Bacteriol J* 26:712-724.
- Stern N (2006). Stern review executive summary. New Economics Foundation. Available at news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/30_10_06_exec_sum.pdf.
- Tabita FR (1995). The biochemistry and metabolic regulation of carbon metabolism and CO₂ fixation in purple bacteria. *Anoxygenic Photosynthetic Bacteria*. Blankenship RE, Madigan MT & Bauer CE, (Eds). 885-914.
- Taillez P, Girard H, Longin R, Beguin P & Millet J (1983). Cellulose fermentation by an asporogenic mutant and an ethanol-tolerant mutant of *Clostridium thermocellum*. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 55(1):203-206.
- Tamagnini P, Axelsson R, Lindberg P, Oxelfelt F, Wunschiers R & Lindblad P (2002). Hydrogenases and hydrogen metabolism in cyanobacteria. *Microb Mol Biol Rev* 66(1):1-20.
- Tanisho S & Ishiwata Y (1995). Continuous hydrogen production from molasses by fermentation using urethane foam as a support of flocks. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 20(7):541-545.
- Tanisho S, Kuromoto M & Kadokura N (1998). Effect of CO₂ removal on hydrogen evolution by fermentation. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 23(7):559-563.
- Tao Y, Chen Y, Wu Y, He Y & Zhou Z (2007). High hydrogen yield from a two-step process of dark and photo-fermentation of sucrose. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 32:200-206.
- Tao Y, He Y, Wu Y, Liu F, Li X, Zong W & Zhou Z (2008). Characteristics of a new photosynthetic bacterial strain for hydrogen production and its application in wastewater treatment. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 33(3):963-973.
- Teplyakov VV, Gassanova LG, Sostina EG, Slepova EV, Modigell M & Netrusov AI (2002). Lab-scale bioreactor integrated with active membrane system for hydrogen production: experience and prospects. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 27:1149-1155.
- Thangaraj A & Kulandaivelu G (1994). Biological hydrogen photoproduction using dairy and sugarcane wastewaters. *Bioresour Technol* 48:9-12.
- Thauer R (1977). Limitation of microbial H₂-formation via fermentation. *Microbial Energy Conversion*. Schlegel HG & Barnea J, (Eds). Oxford, Pergamon: 201-204.
- Tiwari AK, Kumar A & Raheman H (2007). Biodiesel production from jatropha oil (*Jatropha curcas*) with high free fatty acids: An optimized process. *Biomass Bioenergy* 31:569-575.
- Tosatto SCE, Toppo S, Donatella C, Giacometti GM & Costantini P (2008). Comparative analysis of [FeFe] hydrogenase from *Thermotogales* indicates the molecular basis of resistance to oxygen inactivation. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 33(2):570-578.
- Troshina O, Serebryakova L, Sheremetieva M & Lindblad P (2002). Production of H₂ by the unicellular cyanobacterium *Gloeocapsa alpicola* CALU 743 during fermentation. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 27(11-12):1283-1289.
- Tsygankov A (2007). Nitrogen-fixing cyanobacteria: A review. *Appl Biochem Microbiol* 43(3):250.
- Tsygankov AA, Fedorov AS, Laurinavichene TV, Gogotov IN, Rao KK & Hall DO (1998). Actual and potential rates of hydrogen photoproduction by continuous culture of the purple non-sulphur bacterium *Rhodobacter capsulatus*. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 49(1):102-107.
- Tsygankov AA (2001). Laboratory scale photobioreactors. *Appl Biochem Microbiol* 37(4):333-341.
- Tsygankov AA, Fedorov AS, Kosourov SN & Rao KK (2002). Hydrogen production by cyanobacteria in an automated outdoor photobioreactor under aerobic conditions. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 80(7):777-83.
- Tsygankov AA (2007). Biological generation of hydrogen. *Russ J Gen Chem* 77(4):685-693.
- Turkarlan S, Yiğit OD, Aslan K, Eroğlu I & Gündüz U (1997). Photobiological hydrogen production by *R. sphaeroides* O.U 001 by utilisation of waste water from milk industry. *International Conference on Biological Hydrogen Production*, Waikoloa, Hawaii, Plenum Press, New York.
- Ueno Y, Kawai T, Sato S, Otsuka S & Morimoto S (1995). Biological production of hydrogen from cellulose by natural anaerobic microflora. *J Ferment Bioeng* 97(4):395-397.
- Valdez-Vazquez I, Sparling R, Risbey D, Rinderknecht-Seijas N & Poggi-Varraldo HM (2005). Hydrogen generation via anaerobic fermentations of paper mill wastes. *Bioresour Technol* 96:1907-1913.

- Valdez-Vazquez I, Rios-Leal E, Carmona-Martinez A, Munoz-Paez KM & Poggi-Varaldo HM (2006). Improvement of biohydrogen production from solid wastes by intermittent venting and gas flushing of batch reactors headspace. *Environ Sci Technol* 40:3509-3415.
- Van Ginkel S & Logan BE (2005). Inhibition of biohydrogen production by undissociated acetic and butyric acids. *Environ Sci Technol* 39:9350-9356.
- Van Groenestijn JW, Hazewinkel JHO, Nienoord M & Bussmann PJT (2002). Energy aspects of biological hydrogen production in high rate bioreactors operated in the thermophilic temperature range. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 27(11-12):1141-1147.
- Van Haaster DJ, Hagedoorn PL, Jongejan JA & Hagen WR (2005). On the relationship between affinity for molecular hydrogen and the physiological directionality of hydrogenases. *Biochem Soc Trans* 33(1):12-14.
- Van Niel EWJ, Budde MAW, de Haas GG, van der Wal FJ, Claassen PAM & Stams AJM (2002). Distinctive properties of high hydrogen producing extreme thermophiles, *Caldicellulosiruptor saccharolyticus* and *Thermotoga elfii*. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 27(11-12):1390-1398.
- Van Niel EWJ, Claassen PAM & Stams AJM (2003). Substrate and product inhibition of hydrogen production by the extreme thermophile, *Caldicellulosiruptor saccharolyticus*. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 81(3):255-262.
- Van Ooteghem SA, Jones A, van der Lelie D, Dong B & Mahajan D (2004). H₂ production and carbon utilization by *Thermotoga neapolitana* under anaerobic and microaerobic growth conditions. *Biotechnol Lett* 26(15):1223-1232.
- Vardar-Schara G, Maeda T & Wood TK (2008). Metabolically engineered bacteria for producing hydrogen via fermentation. *Microb Technol* 1(2):107-125.
- Vasilyeva L, Miyake M, Khatipov E, Wakayama T, Sekine M, Hara M, Nakada E, Asada Y & Miyake J (1999). Enhanced hydrogen production by a mutant of *R. sphaeroides* having an altered light-harvesting system. *J Biosci Bioeng* 87(5):619-624.
- Vignais PM, Colbeau M, Willison JC & Jouanneau Y (1985). Hydrogenase, nitrogenase, and hydrogen metabolism in the photosynthetic bacteria. *Adv Microb Physiol* 26:155-234.
- Vignais PM, Billoud B & Meyer J (2001). Classification and phylogeny of hydrogenases. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 25(4):455-501.
- Vincenzini M, Marchini A, Ena A & DePhilippis R (1997). H₂ and poly-β-hydroxybutyrate, two alternative chemicals from purple non sulfur bacteria. *Biotechnol Lett* 19(8):759-762.
- Wakayama T, Nakada E, Asada Y & Miyake J (2000). Effect of light/dark cycle on bacterial hydrogen production by *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* RV - From hour to second range. *Appl Biochem Biotechnol* 84-6:431-440.
- Wakayama T & Miyake J (2001). Hydrogen from biomass. *Biohydrogen II : An Approach to Environmentally Acceptable Technology*. Miyake J, Matsunaga T & San Pietro A, (Eds). Pergamon: 3-32.
- Wakayama T & Miyake J (2002). Light shade bands for the improvement of solar hydrogen production efficiency by *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* RV. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 27:1495-1500.
- Wall JD & Gest H (1979). Derepression of Nitrogenase Activity in Glutamine Auxotrophs of *Rhodospseudomonas capsulata*. *J Bacteriol* 137(3):1459-1463.
- Weetall HH, Sharma BP & Detar CC (1989). Photometabolic production of hydrogen from organic substrates by free and immobilised mixed cultures of *Rhodospirillum rubrum* and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 23:605-614.
- Willison JC, Madern D & Vignais PM (1984). Increased photoproduction of hydrogen by non-autotrophic mutants of *Rhodospseudomonas capsulata*. *Biochem J* 219(2):593-600.
- Worin NA, Lissolo T, Colbeau A & Vignais PM (1996). Increased H₂ photoproduction by *Rhodobacter capsulatus* strains deficient in uptake hydrogenase. *J Mar Biotechnol* 4:28-33.
- Wykoff DD, Davies JP, Melis A & Grossman AR (1998). The regulation of photosynthetic electron-transport. *Plant Physiol* 117:129-139.
- Yagi K, Maeda I, Idehara K, Miura Y, Akano T, Fukatu K, Ikuta Y & Nakamura HK (1994). Removal of inhibition by ammonium ion in nitrogenase-dependent hydrogen evolution of a marine photosynthetic bacterium, *Rhodospseudomonas* sp strain W-1s. *Appl Biochem Biotechnol* 45-6:429-436.
- Yetis M, Gündüz U, Eroğlu I, Yücel M & Türker L (2000). Photoproduction of hydrogen from sugar refinery wastewater by *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* O.U. 001. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 25:1035-1041.
- Yiğit OD, Gündüz U, Türker L, Yücel M & Eroğlu I (1999). Identification of by-products in hydrogen producing bacteria; *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* O.U. 001 grown in the waste water of a sugar refinery. *J Biotechnol* 70:125-131.
- Ying Li R, Zhang T & Fang HHP (2008). Characteristics of a phototrophic sludge producing hydrogen from acetate and butyrate. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 33(9):2147-2155.
- Yokoi H, Mori S, Hirose J, Hayashi S & Takasaki Y (1998). H₂ production from starch by a mixed culture of *Clostridium butyricum* and *Rhodobacter* sp. M-19. *Biotechnol Lett* 20(9):895-899.

- Yokoi H, Saito A, Uchida H, Hirose J, Hayashi S & Takasaki Y (2001). Microbial hydrogen production from sweet potato starch residue. *J Biosci Bioeng* 91(1):58-63.
- Yokoi H, Maki R, Hirose J & Hayashi S (2002). Microbial production of hydrogen from starch-manufacturing wastes. *Biomass Bioenergy* 22:389-395.
- Yoon JH, Shin JH, Kim M-S, Sim SJ & Park TH (2006). Evaluation of conversion efficiency of light to hydrogen energy by *Anabaena variabilis*. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 31:721 – 727.
- Yoshida A, Nishimura T, Kawaguchi H, Inui M & Yukuwa H (2005). Enhanced hydrogen production from formic acid by formate hydrogen lyase-overexpressing *Escherichia coli* strains. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 71(11):6762-6768.
- Yoshino F, Ikeda H, Masukawa H & Sakurai H (2007). High photobiological hydrogen production activity of a *Nostoc* sp. PCC 7422 uptake hydrogenase-deficient mutant with high nitrogenase activity. *Mar Biotechnol* (NY) 9(1):101-112.
- Yun S-I & Ohta Y (2005). Removal of volatile fatty acids with immobilised *Rhodococcus* sp. B261. *Bioresour Technol* 96:41-46.
- Zacchi G & Axelsson A (1989). Economic evaluation of preconcentration in product and of ethanol from dilute sugar solutions. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 34:223-233.
- Zhu H, Miyake J, Tsygankov AA & Asada Y (1995). Hydrogen production from highly concentrated organic wastewater by photosynthetic bacteria & anaerobic bacteria. *Water Treatment* 10:61-68.
- Zhu H, Suzuki T, Tsygankov AA, Asada Y & Miyake J (1999a). Hydrogen production from tofu wastewater by *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* immobilised in agar gels. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 24:305-310.
- Zhu H, Wakayama T, Suzuki T, Asada Y & Miyake J (1999b). Entrapment of *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* in cationic polymer/agar gels for hydrogen production in the presence of NH₄⁺. *J Biosci Bioeng* 88(5):507-512.
- Zhu H, Wakayama T, Asada Y & Miyake J (2001). Hydrogen production by four cultures with participation by anoxygenic photosynthetic bacterium and anaerobic bacterium in the presence of NH₄⁺. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 26(11):1149-1154.
- Zhu HG, Ueda S, Asada Y & Miyake J (2002). Hydrogen production as a novel process of wastewater treatment - Studies on tofu wastewater with entrapped *R. sphaeroides* and mutagenesis. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 27(11-12):1349-1357.
- Zinchenko VV, Kopteva AV, Belavina NV, Mitronova TN, Frolova VD & Shestakov SV (1991). The study of *Rhodobacter sphaeroides* mutants of different type with derepressed nitrogenase. *Genetika* 27(6):991-999.
- Zinchenko VV, Babykin M, Glaser V, Mekhedov S & Shestakov SV (1997). Mutation in *ntrC* gene leading to the derepression of nitrogenase synthesis in *Rhodobacter sphaeroides*. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 147:57-61.
- Zurrer H & Bachofen R (1979). Hydrogen production by the photosynthetic bacterium *Rhodospirillum rubrum*. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 37(5):789-793.
- Züttel A (2004). Hydrogen storage methods. *Naturwissenschaften* 91(4):157-172.

Table 1 : Summary of dual systems employed for bio-hydrogen production

Feeds, substrates, supplements	1 st stage		Integration strategy	2 nd stage		Overall productivity	Notes, limitations, caveats	Source
	Inoculum and mode	Productivity		Organism and mode	Productivity			
Microalgae – Anoxygenic photosynthetic bacteria								
CO ₂ (sole C source)	<i>Chlamydomonas</i> MGA161 Batch	ca. 1.3 mol H ₂ / hexose + acetate and ethanol	Sequential batch-transfer	Photosynthetic bacterium W-1S Fed-batch	ca. 6.7 mol H ₂ /mol hexose	8 mol H ₂ /mol hexose for (7 d) ^a	12 h day/night cycle	(Miura et al. 1992)
					ca. 9.2 mol H ₂ /mol hexose	10.5 mol H ₂ /mol hexose (7 d) ^a	Continuous illumination	
CO ₂ , NG	<i>Chlamydomonas</i> sp. strain MGA161 Repeated batch, 30 °C	Av. 24.4 mmol hexose/d 80% conversion to glycerol, acetate, ethanol	Sequential batch-transfer	<i>Rhodovulum sulfidophilum</i> Purple sulfur bacteria Fed-batch	Average: 3.4 L H ₂ /d	5.8 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^b 23 d operation	Pilot scale. Difficulty with contamination of the 2 nd stage	(Akano et al. 1996; Ikuta et al. 1997)
NG	<i>C. reinhardtii</i> , batch	NG	Co-culture ratio NG	<i>Rhodospirillum rubrum</i> PNS bacteria batch	NG	NG	Qualitative success, data NG	(Melis & Melnicki 2006)
Cyanobacteria – Anoxygenic photosynthetic bacteria								
Glucose	<i>Synechococcus cedrorum</i> batch	mol H ₂ / mol hexose free: 0.013 immob. : 0.01	Co-culture 1:1 (vol)	<i>Rhodobacter sphaeroides</i> O.U.001 PNS bacteria batch	<u>mol H₂/mol hexose</u> free: 0.186 immob. : 3.82	<u>mol H₂/mol hexose</u> free: 0.702 ^a immob. : 0	Continuous illumination (2.4 klux)	(Sasikala et al. 1994a)
SOT medium lacking nitrate	<i>Spirulina platensis</i> Batch N-starvation	Light phase: 1.03 mmol hexose/L/d Dark phase: 1 hexose → 0.68 H ₂ + 0.4 acetate + 0.15 formate	Sequential batch-transfer	<i>R. sphaeroides</i> RV PNS bacteria batch	Nearly stoichiometric	ca. 2 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^b 2 mmol H ₂ /day/L	Light-dark cycle (72 h light, 24 h dark)	(Aoyama et al. 1997)

Obligate anaerobic fermenters – Anoxygenic photosynthetic bacteria

glucose	<i>Clostridium butyricum</i> batch	16 % of total H ₂ 1.1 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	Immobilised co-culture 1:5 (mass)	<i>R. sphaeroides</i> RV PNS bacteria batch	84 % of total H ₂ ^a <i>est.</i> 70.4 % efficiency ^b	7.0 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	Continuous illumination, > 300 h	(Miyake et al. 1984)
Tofu or alcohol wastewater	<i>C. paraputrificum</i> Batch, 30 °C	<u>mL/h/L</u> 10 % Tofu: 68 50 % Alcohol: 90	Sequential batch-transfer	<i>R. sphaeroides</i> RV PNS bacteria batch	<u>μmol/h</u> 10 % Tofu: 2 50 % Alcohol: 4	Pre-treatment by fermentation improved photosynthetic H ₂ production		(Zhu et al. 1995)
Glucose	<i>C. butyricum</i> SC-E1 continuous	2.0-2.3 mol H ₂ /mol hexose	Sequential continuous	<i>Rhodobacter</i>	-	1.4-5.6 mol H ₂ /mol hexose (predicted) ^a	Hypothetical study	(Kataoka et al. 1997);
Starch + yeast extract + glutamate	<i>C. butyricum</i> batch	1.9 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	Sequential batch-transfer	<i>Rhodobacter</i> sp. M-19 PNS bacteria	1.7 mol H ₂ /mol hexose 32.4 % efficiency ^b	<u>mol H₂/mol hexose</u> 3.6 ^a	Medium included glutamate	(Yokoi et al. 1998)
		-	Co-culture 1:10 (mass)		-	Batch: 4.5 ^a Repeated fed- batch: 6.4 ^a	Fed-batch performed for 30 days	
glucose	<i>C. butyricum</i> NCIB 9576 semi-continuous	1.29 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^b	Sequential batch-transfer	<i>R. sphaeroides</i> E151 Immobilised in hollow fibres Fed-batch	0.36 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^b	1.64 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^b	-	(Kim et al. 2001)
Rice-wine wastewater		1 L H ₂ /L wastewater in 18 h ^a			0.44 L H ₂ / L broth/ day for 10 days ^a	1.44 H ₂ /L broth/ day ^a	-	
Tofu wastewater		0.9 L H ₂ /L wastewater in 26 h ^a			0.2 L H ₂ / L broth/day for 30 days ^a	1.1 L H ₂ /L broth/day ^a	-	
Glucose	<i>C. butyricum</i> batch, immobilised	NG 62% of H ₂	Immobilised co-culture <i>ca.</i> 1:1 (mass)	<i>R. sphaeroides</i> RV batch, immobilised	NG 38% of H ₂	NG	H ₂ produced for <i>ca.</i> 24 h	(Zhu et al. 2001)
Tofu wastewater		-	-		-	2.2 L H ₂ /L wastewater	H ₂ produced for <i>ca.</i> 48 h	(Zhu et al. 2002)

Sweet potato starch residue + polypepton or corn steep liquor	<i>C. butyricum</i> & <i>Enterobacter aerogenes</i> co-culture initially ca. 2:1 (w:w) ^b Repeated-batch HRT: 2 d	2.7 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	Sequential batch-transfer	<i>Rhodobacter</i> sp. M-19 + 20µg/l Na ₂ MoO ₄ + 10 mg/l EDTA Repeated-batch HRT: 6.25 d	4.5 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	7.2 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	Performed for >30 days	(Yokoi et al. 2001; Yokoi et al. 2002)
Potato steam peel hydrolyzate	<i>Caldicellulosiruptor saccharolyticus</i> batch	2.9 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^b	Sequential batch-transfer	<i>R. capsulatus</i> + yeast extract 31 °C, Batch	45.6 % efficiency ^b	5.64 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	Glucose was not the sole substrate in hydrolyzate	(Claassen et al. 2004)
Algal biomass (starch) <i>C. reinhardtii</i>	<i>Clostridium butyricum</i> batch	2.6 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	Sequential batch-transfer	<i>R. sphaeroides</i> KD131 PNS bacteria + glutamate, batch	88 % efficiency ^b	8.3 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	Starch was not the sole substrate in algal biomass	(Kim et al. 2006c)
Glucose	Anaerobic bacteria Continuous, 37 °C	1.36 mol H ₂ /mol hexose, + acetate, propionate, butyrate ^a	Sequential batch-transfer	<i>Rhodopseudomonas capsulata</i> 35 °C, continuous	3.2 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a 40 % efficiency	4.56 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	Glutamate added to stage-1 effluent. 1 st stage maintained for over 6 months, 2 nd for over 10 days.	(Shi & Yu 2006)
Facultative aerobes/anaerobes – Anoxygenic photosynthetic bacteria								
Dextrose	<i>Streptococcus faecalis</i>	lactate (0.35 M) No H ₂	Sequential batch-transfer	<i>Rhodospirillum rubrum</i> S-1 Fed-batch, 30 °C	99 % efficiency 16-24 mL H ₂ /g/h	NG	1 st stage was industrial yoghurt production	(Zurrer & Bachofen 1979)
Cellulose	<i>Cellulomonas</i> sp. batch	Hexose → organic acids (no H ₂)	Co-culture 1:1 (vol)	<i>Rhodopseudomonas. capsulata</i> B100 (WT) batch <i>R. capsulata</i> ST410 batch	- -	1.2-4.3 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a 4.6-6.2 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	20 mL scale. All H ₂ from 2 nd stage. ST410 is a H ₂ uptake deficient mutant	(Odom & Wall 1983)
Glucose	<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i> Continuous 18-19 °C	NG	Immobilised co-culture (ratio NG)	<i>Rhodospirillum rubrum</i> Continuous 18-19 °C	NG	1.3-5.3 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^b 10 days	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> was a contaminant	(Weetall et al. 1989)
Sawdust hydrolysate						6.6-8.4 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^b 30 days		
Cellulose hydrolysate						NG 46 days		

Molasses	NG Industrial lactic acid production	No H ₂ 3.4 mM lactate in wastewater	Sequential batch-transfer	<i>Rhodobacter sphaeroides</i> O.U.001 Batch, 30 °C	> 100 % based on lactate content of wastewater	4480 mL H ₂ /L wastewater	Wastewater contained non-lactate substrates and was diluted 10-fold	(Sasikala et al. 1991)
algal biomass (starch)	Mixed bacterial community enriched on succinate	-	Co-culture	Consortium: <i>Rhodobium marinum</i> , <i>Vibrio fluvialis</i> and <i>Proteus vulgaris</i>	-	1.13 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	Algal biomass may contain substrates other than starch	(Ike et al. 1997)
<i>C. reinhardtii</i>	<i>Lactobacillus amylovorus</i> Batch	Hexose → lactic acid 70-80% (no H ₂)	Sequential batch-transfer	<i>Rhodobacter sphaeroides</i> RV batch + 10 mM glutamate	41.7 % efficiency ^b	4.6 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a		
Starch	<i>Vibrio fluvialis</i> Batch	Acetate & ethanol (no H ₂)	Sequential batch-transfer	<i>Rhodobium marinum</i> A-501 (halophile)	100 % of H ₂ 95 % efficiency	2.4 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^b	-	
algal biomass (starch)	<i>L. amylovorus</i> batch	Lactate (no H ₂)			100 % of H ₂	7.9 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	Starch was not the sole substrate in algal biomass	(Ike et al. 2001)
<i>C. reinhardtii</i>	<i>V. fluvialis</i>	No H ₂	Co-culture <i>ca.</i> 1:2 (mass)		100 % of H ₂	6.2 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a		
algal biomass (starch)			Co-culture <i>ca.</i> 5:6 (mass)		100 % of H ₂	7.3 mol H ₂ /mol hexose, 60.8 % ^a	stable pH, 13 days	
<i>C. reinhardtii</i> & <i>Dunaleilla tertiolecta</i>	<i>Lactobacillus amylovorus</i> batch, 30 °C	No H ₂ 1.6 mol lactate/mol starch-hexose	Sequential batch- transfer	<i>R. marinum</i> PNS bacteria batch, 30 °C + 1.5 g/L NaHCO ₃	3.4 mol H ₂ /mol lactose (57 %)	5.4 mol H ₂ /mol hexose, 45.3 % ^a	-	(Kawaguchi et al. 2001)
Glucose	<i>Rhodospseudomonas palustris</i> P4 Dark-adapted	0.041 mol H ₂ and 5.7 mol organic carbon/mol hexose ^b	Sequential batch- transfer	<i>Rhodospseudomonas palustris</i> P4 Light-adapted	10 % efficiency on fermentation broth	2-fold increase over dark fermentation alone ^a	Rate of H ₂ photoproduction too low to be economically practical	(Oh et al. 2004)
Glucose	<i>Enterobacter cloacae</i> DM11 Batch, 37 °C, static	1.86 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	Sequential batch- transfer	<i>Rhodobacter sphaeroides</i> O.U.001 Batch, 30 °C	37-43 % efficiency ^a	NG	-	(Nath et al. 2005)

	<i>E. cloacae</i> DM11 Batch, 37 °C, stirred	3.31 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a		<i>R. sphaeroides</i> O.U.001 Batch, 34 °C				(Nath et al. 2008)
Glucose	<i>Lactobacillus</i> <i>delbrueckii</i> Batch, 30 °C	Lactate, acetate No H ₂	Immobilised co-culture 4:11 (mass)	<i>R. sphaeroides</i> RV Batch, 30 °C	100 % of H ₂	7.1 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	-	(Asada et al. 2006)
Glucose	<i>E. coli</i> HD701 Batch, 30 °C	0.4 mol H ₂ /mol hexose	Sequential batch- transfer	<i>R. sphaeroides</i> O.U.001 Batch, 30 °C	Acetate and ethanol consumed No H ₂	0.4 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	Inhibitory N-source in primary substrate	(Redwood & Macaskie 2006)
Glucose (60 mmol/day)	<i>E. coli</i> HD701 Continuous, 30 °C HRT=30 days	1.6 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	Sequential continuous transfer by electro- dialysis	<i>R. sphaeroides</i> O.U.001 Continuous, 30 °C HRT=3 days	0.83 mol H ₂ /mol hexose 38 % efficiency	2.4 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	Predicted yield: 10.1 mol H ₂ /mol hexose 2 stages not balanced	(Redwood & Macaskie 2007a, 2007b)
Non-axenic dark fermentation – Anoxygenic photosynthetic bacteria								
Cow manure	Mixed bacterial culture from digester	H ₂ , CH ₄ , acetate, propionate, butyrate	Sequential batch- transfer	Mixed, predominantly <i>Rhodopseudomonas</i> spp.	10 g dw/L	Disposal of wastes & generation of biomass	Biomass produced rather than H ₂	(Ensign 1977)
Poultry manure	Extant feed microbes	acetate, propionate, butyrate			11 g dw/L			
Palm oil mill effluent	Palm oil sludge	Main products: Acetate and propionate, no H ₂ , no NH ₄ ⁺	Sequential batch- transfer	<i>Rhodobacter</i> <i>sphaeroides</i> + NH ₄ Cl to 0.25 g/l continuous	No H ₂ PHB	1 g PHB/l feed	Valuable alternative product	(Hassan et al. 1997)
Fruit & vegetable waste	Extant feed microorganisms, batch, ambient temperature	Main product: lactate, no H ₂	Sequential batch- transfer	<i>Rhodobacter</i> <i>sphaeroides</i> RV + Mo, 30 °C cont. chemostat	100 mL H ₂ /g dw/h for 10 days	NG	2 nd stage produced H ₂ for 10 days, then switched to PHB	(Fascetti et al. 1998)
				<i>R. sphaeroides</i> RV WT, 30 °C cont. chemostat	Max. 100 mL H ₂ g dw/h (1 st 24 h)	NG	10 days H ₂ , then PHB	(Franchi et al. 2004)

				Strain SMV087 PHB ⁻ , H ₂ uptake ⁻ cont. chemostat		NG	> 45 days H ₂	
Glucose UASB					<u>Headspace gas</u> 7 % H ₂ 4 % CH ₄	NG		
Glucose CSTR	NG anaerobic bacteria Batch, > 43 °C	Main product: butyrate, no H ₂	Sequential batch- transfer	Contents of 1 st stage + <i>Rhodopseudomonas</i> <i>palustris</i> Batch, 35 °C	<i>ca.</i> 14 % H ₂ <i>ca.</i> 2 % CH ₄	NG	toxic products from 1 st stage: H ₂ S and ethanol	(Lee et al. 2002)
Glucose & beef extract CSTR					<i>ca.</i> 55 % H ₂ 0 % CH ₄	NG		
Olive Mill Wastewater (Diluted 50 %)	Acclimated sludge Batch, 30 °C	No H ₂	Sequential batch- transfer	<i>Rhodobacter</i> <i>sphaeroides</i> O.U.001 Batch, 30 °C	100 % of H ₂	29 L H ₂ /L feed	Pre-treatment of the feed lessened the need for dilution	(Eroğlu et al. 2006)
Sucrose	Cattle dung Batch, 38 °C	1.29 mol H ₂ /mol hexose	Sequential batch- transfer	<i>R. sphaeroides</i> SH2C Batch, 30 °C	63-70 % efficiency ^a	3.32 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	-	(Tao et al. 2007)
Non-biological – Anoxygenic photosynthetic bacteria								
algal biomass (starch) <i>C.</i> <i>reinhardtii</i>	Heat-HCl treatment	Glucose, fatty acids and NH ₄ ⁺	Sequential batch- transfer	<i>R. sphaeroides</i> RV batch + 10 mM glutamate	0.02 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	0.02 mol H ₂ /mol hexose ^a	-	(Ike et al. 1997)

Cultures contained free cells (and not immobilised) unless otherwise stated. NG: not given in source and/or cannot be calculated from given data. ^a Value given in original cited source. ^b Authors calculations from source data. *Thermophiles are classed tentatively as strict anaerobes; *Thermotoga* spp. may in fact be microaerophiles (Van Ooteghem et al. 2004). Accounts are sorted according to the type of organism used in the 1st stage and then by date, grouping work by the same authors). Some accounts have been omitted due to insufficient data.

Table 2 : Bottlenecks to the application of anoxygenic photosynthetic bacteria in H₂ production.

Limitation	Effect	Solutions	Progress	Ref
Low light conversion efficiency due to unsuitable light intensity	Large land area needed due to low intensity of solar illumination and shallow cultures	Develop strains with truncated light harvesting antenna	Proven at lab-scale	(Miyake et al. 1999; Vasilyeva et al. 1999; Kondo et al. 2002; Kim et al. 2004; Kondo et al. 2006; Kim et al. 2006a)
		Improved photobioreactor design	Ongoing	(Tsygankov 2001; Hoekema et al. 2002; Wakayama & Miyake 2002; Hoekema et al. 2006; Claassen & de Vrije 2007)
		Immobilisation; adaptation to a more constant light intensity	Proven at lab-scale	(Zhu et al. 2002; Gosse et al. 2007)
Sub-optimal conversion of substrates to H ₂	Diversion of carbon, reductant and ATP into PHB synthesis detracts from H ₂ production	Develop PHB deficient strains	Proven at pilot-scale	(Husted et al. 1993; Lee et al. 2002; Franchi et al. 2004; Kim et al. 2006b)
Requirement for CO ₂ (species- and substrate-dependent, see text)	Limited substrate uptake; continuous gas purging prevents cycling of produced CO ₂	Recirculation of headspace gas	Proven at pilot-scale	(Hoekema et al. 2002)
		Use of species not requiring CO ₂ e.g. <i>R. sphaeroides</i> , <i>R. capsulatus</i>	Proven at lab-scale	(Ivanovskii et al. 1997; Filatova et al. 2005a; Filatova et al. 2005b)
H ₂ uptake detracts from net H ₂ production	Decreased net H ₂ production	Develop strains deficient in uptake Hydrogenases	Proven at pilot-scale	(Willison et al. 1984; Jahn et al. 1994; Worin et al. 1996; Lee et al. 2002; Öztürk et al. 2006; Kim et al. 2006b)
		Metal limitation (e.g. using EDTA) to prevent synthesis of active uptake hydrogenases	Proven at lab-scale	(Kern et al. 1992)
Culture contamination	Loss of PNS bacteria due to overgrowth of contaminants	Selective chemical inhibitors	Proven at lab-scale	(Liessens & Verstraete 1986)
		Blue light-filters prevent algal growth	Proven at lab-scale	(Ko & Noike 2002)
Nitrogenase 'switch-off' in response to fixed sources of N (esp. NH ₄ ⁺)	Limited to using substrates with high C/N ratio	Use of NH ₄ ⁺ -insensitive strains (derepression of nitrogenase)	Proven at lab-scale	(Wall & Gest 1979; Zinchenko et al. 1991; Yagi et al. 1994; Zinchenko et al. 1997)
		Anion-selective immobilisation matrices	Proven at lab-scale	(Zhu et al. 1999b; Zhu et al. 2001)
		Electroseparation of NH ₄ ⁺	Proven at lab-scale	(Redwood & Macaskie 2007a)

Table 3 : Potential productivities of algal/cyanobacterial-driven dual systems

Organism	1 st stage		Dual system yield (mol H ₂ /mol hexose)	Theoretical rate of H ₂ production (mol H ₂ /m ² /day) *	Light capture area needed to power 1 home (m ²) **	Source
	Photoautotrophic productivity (mol hexose/m ² /day)*	NG Assume 0.158				
<i>Chlamydomonas</i> sp.	NG Assume 0.158		8	1.27	451.7	(Miura et al. 1992)
<i>Chlamydomonas</i> sp.	Av. : 0.0244 Max. : 0.0926		5.8	Av. : 0.142 Max. : 0.537	Av. : 4039.4 min. : 1068.2	(Akano et al. 1996; Ikuta et al. 1997)
<i>Synechococcus cedrorum</i>	NG Assume 0.158		0.702 (free cells)	0.111	5167.6	(Sasikala et al. 1994a)
<i>Spirulina platensis</i>	NG Assume 0.158		2	0.317	1809.5	(Aoyama et al. 1997)
<i>Clostridium butyricum</i>	0.158 microalgal starch		8.3	1.315	436.2	(Kim et al. 2006c)
<i>Lactobacillus amylovorus</i>	NG Assume 0.158 cyanobacterial glycogen		4.6	0.729	786.8	(Shi & Yu 2006)
<i>Lactobacillus amylovorus</i>	NG Assume 0.158 microalgal starch		7.3 (co-culture)	1.157	495.8	(Ike et al. 2001)
			5.4 (sequential)	0.856	670.1	

NG: The productivity of carbohydrate accumulation was not given and could not be calculated from given data. The assumed value of 0.158 mol hexose/m²/day was calculated from published data (Kim et al. 2006c). Photoautotrophic productivity was assumed to be similar after scale-up and under dual system conditions but may be less e.g. due to light limitation in co-culture.

* by multiplying the photoautotrophic productivity with the dual system yield.

** Assuming a home can be powered by a 1 kW PEM fuel cell demanding 23.9 mol H₂/h and operating at 50 % efficiency and 95 % H₂ utilisation (Levin et al. 2004a).

Values are authors' calculations from data given in the published sources shown.






Figure 1: Direct and indirect photolysis. Through direct photolysis, the H₂ evolving enzyme is hydrogenase in microalgae and nitrogenase in cyanobacteria (see text). The dotted line represents the avoided inhibition of dark fermentation by O₂ via indirect photolysis.


A: Lactic acid fermentation e.g. *Lactobacillus amylovorus*



B: Mixed-acid fermentation e.g. *Escherichia coli*



C: Anaerobic fermentation e.g. *Clostridium butyricum*



D: Effect of fermentation-type on hypothetical dual systems

Ideal fermentations

A: *L. amylovorus*

1 glucose → 2 lactate

2 lactate → 12 H₂

0 H₂ + 12 H₂ = 12 H₂

B: *E. coli*

1 glucose → 2 H₂ + 1 ethanol + 1 acetate

1 ethanol + 1 acetate → 10 H₂

2 H₂ + 10 H₂ = 12 H₂

C: *C. butyricum* (a mixture of two reactions)

1 glucose → 4 H₂ + 2 acetate

2 acetate → 8 H₂

4 H₂ + 8 H₂ = 12 H₂

1 glucose → 2 H₂ + 1 butyrate

1 butyrate → 10 H₂

2 H₂ + 10 H₂ = 12 H₂

Figure 2: Suitable dark fermentations for dual systems. Pathways are abridged to highlight the overall balances. Dotted lines indicate alternative/competing pathways. Abbreviations: LDH lactate dehydrogenase, PFL pyruvate:formate lyase, ACK acetate kinase, FHL formate:hydrogen lyase, PTA phosphotransacetylase, ADH alcohol dehydrogenase, NFOR NADH:ferredoxin oxidoreductase, TL thiolase, BHBD hydroxybutyryl-CoA dehydrogenase, EH enoyl-CoA hydratase, BDH butyryl-CoA dehydrogenase. Compiled from Sode et al. (2001) and Chen et al. (2006).




Figure 3: Dual systems in co-culture (A) and in sequential reactors (B).




Figure 4: Spatial feasibility of de-centralized energy generation. The cartoon depicts one possible configuration of a sequential dual system combining dark fermentation and PNS bacteria. Detailed explanation is given in section 3.4.2.3.

