

Investigation of food waste valorization through sequential lactic acid fermentative production and anaerobic digestion of fermentation residues

Original

Investigation of food waste valorization through sequential lactic acid fermentative production and anaerobic digestion of fermentation residues / Demichelis, F., Pleissner, D., Fiore, S., Mariano, S., Navarro Guti rrez, I.M., Schneider, R., Venus, J.. - In: BIORESOURCE TECHNOLOGY. - ISSN 0960-8524. - STAMPA. - 241:(2017), pp. 508-516.
[10.1016/j.biortech.2017.05.174]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/2684885 since: 2017-10-23T11:07:31Z

Publisher:

Elsevier Ltd

Published

DOI:10.1016/j.biortech.2017.05.174

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

Elsevier postprint/Author's Accepted Manuscript

  2017. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. The final authenticated version is available online at:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2017.05.174>

(Article begins on next page)

1 **INVESTIGATION OF FOOD WASTE VALORIZATION THROUGH SEQUENTIAL**
2 **LACTIC ACID FERMENTATIVE PRODUCTION AND ANAEROBIC DIGESTION**
3 **OF FERMENTATION RESIDUES. ~~PART I: TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT~~**

4

5 Francesca Demichelis^a, Daniel Pleissner^b, Silvia Fiore^a, Silvia Mariano^a, Ivette Michelle
6 Navarro Gutiérrez^c, Roland Schneider^c, Joachim Venus^{c*}

7

8 ^aDIATI, Politecnico di Torino, corso Duca degli Abruzzi 24, 10129 Torino, Italy

9 ^bSustainable Chemistry (Resource Efficiency), Institute of Sustainable and Environmental
10 Chemistry, Leuphana University of Lüneburg, C13.203 , 21335 Lüneburg, Germany

11 ^cLeibniz Institute for Agricultural Engineering and Bioeconomy Potsdam, Max-Eyth-Allee
12 100, 14469 Potsdam, Germany

13

14

15 *Corresponding author: Joachim Venus, Leibniz Institute for Agricultural Engineering and
16 Bioeconomy Potsdam, Max-Eyth-Allee 100, 14469 Potsdam, Germany, E-mail: [jvenus@atb-](mailto:jvenus@atb-potsdam.de)
17 [potsdam.de](mailto:jvenus@atb-potsdam.de), Tel: +49 331 5699 112, Fax: +49 331 5699 849

18

19

20 **Abstract**

21 This work concerns the investigation of the sequential production of lactic acid (LA) and
22 biogas from food waste (FW). LA was produced from FW using a *Streptococcus sp.* strain via
23 simultaneous saccharification and fermentation (SSF) and separate enzymatic hydrolysis and
24 fermentation (SHF). Via SHF a yield of 0.33 g_{LA}/g_{FW} (productivity 3.38 g_{LA}/L·h) and via SSF
25 0.29 g_{LA}/g_{FW} (productivity 2.08 g_{LA}/L·h) was obtained. Fermentation residues and FW
26 underwent anaerobic digestion (3 wt% TS). Biogas yields were 0.71, 0.74 and 0.90 Nm³/kg_{VS}
27 for FW and residues from SSF and SHF respectively. The innovation of the approach is
28 considering the conversion of FW into two different products through a biorefinery concept,
29 therefore making economically feasible LA production and valorising its fermentative
30 residues. Finally, a mass balance of three different outlines with the aim to assess the amount
31 of LA and biogas that may be generated within different scenarios is presented.

32

33

34 **Keywords:** biorefinery, fermentation, lactic acid, enzymatic hydrolysis, biogas

35

36 **1. Introduction**

37 Biowaste generation in EU was estimated at 94 Mt for 2015 and current treatment options
38 include landfilling, incineration, mechanical-biological treatment (MBT), composting and
39 anaerobic digestion (EU, 2010). Food waste (FW) from households, restaurants, caterers and
40 retail premises represents an important fraction of biowaste. FW is globally one of the most
41 severe environmental, social and economic problems of developed and developing countries,
42 accounting for over one billion tonnes produced every year (Gustavsson, 2011).

43 Currently the main environmental threat from organic waste is methane production from such
44 waste decomposing in landfills. Before the adoption of the Landfill Directive 1999/31/EC
45 methane emissions from landfills accounted for 30% of the global anthropogenic emissions of
46 methane into the atmosphere (COM, 1996). Landfill Directive 1999/31/EC obliges member
47 states to reduce the amount of landfilled biodegradable municipal waste to 35% of 1995 levels
48 by 2016, however it doesn't prescribe specific treatment options for the diverted waste. The
49 response of EU member states since mid 1990s was the implementation of MBT, anaerobic
50 digestion and composting processes. However 20 years later, it is mandatory to improve the
51 management of biowaste by supporting technical solutions that are able to generate added
52 value products.

53 The composition of FW is heterogeneous, being made of (w/w) 30-60 % starch, 5-10 %
54 proteins and 10-40 % lipids (Pleissner et al., 2013). Hence, it represents an interesting
55 feedstock for biorefinery processes. FW biological valorisation is not only an environmentally
56 friendly waste treatment option, but it is also a benefit to the bio-based economy since
57 valuable waste material can be employed instead of expensive raw substrates.

58 Lactic acid (LA) has many applications in the food and beverage sector as well as in the
59 pharmaceutical and chemical industries, and its polymerisation gives origin to the
60 biodegradable polymer poly(lactic acid) (PLA) (Abdel-Rahman et al, 2016). The main paths

61 of fermentative production of LA from FW are separate enzymatic hydrolysis and
62 fermentation (SHF), and simultaneous saccharification and fermentation (SSF) (see Table 1).
63 While in SSF enzymatic hydrolysis and fermentation are performed in a single reactor (with
64 uniform temperature and pH conditions), SHF foresees two separate phases, and thus allows
65 the application of optimal temperature and pH conditions for each process and the use of an
66 acid or enzyme in the hydrolysis step, which may be highly effective for complex substrates.
67 SSF in comparison with SHF showed shorter processing time, reduced substrate/product
68 inhibition and lower energy and plant costs (Castillo Martinez et al., 2013; Abdel-Rahman et
69 al., 2013). SSF was either carried out by enzymes added with the inoculum (Wang et al.,
70 2016), using a single microbial strain (Pleissner et al., 2017) or an indigenous microbial
71 consortium (Kim et al., 2016; Tang et al., 2016).

72 The aim of this study is to investigate the technical, economic and environmental feasibility
73 of the sequential fermentative production of LA and biogas from FW using either SHF or
74 SSF. LA and biogas production can be carried out using mature technologies, however, the
75 two options are usually considered separately. Fermentative production of LA from FW was
76 already proven to be feasible (Pleissner et al., 2017; Pleissner et al., 2015a and 2015b; Kwan
77 et al., 2015; Li et al., 2015); however its main drawbacks are the high process costs, necessary
78 to achieve a marketable LA, and a relevant amount of fermentative residues to be managed.
79 LA production costs include: sterilization, fermentation and downstream processes. The most
80 expensive cost items are sterilization and downstream processes, which represent up to 41%
81 of the conventional fermentation process (Wang et al., 2015) and 1.57-1.62 €/kg_{LA} (Joglekar
82 et al, 2006). Sterilization and downstream processes are strictly recommended in order to
83 achieve a LA quality that is commercially competitive, since food grade purity and
84 pharmaceutical plastic grade purity are 80% and 90%, respectively (Vijayakumar, 2007). LA

85 fermentation costs vary in the range of 0.72-1.13 €/kg_{LA} (Wang et al, 2015), while market
86 value of LA is 1.36 €/ kg_{LA} (ICIS, 2016).

87 AD of FW has been widely explored (see Table 2), and it has been implemented on full scale
88 for the last decades, in agreement with waste management hierarchy and EU policy about
89 organic waste management. Biogas yields observed for FW were 0.26-0.63 m³/kg_{VS} (Fantozzi
90 et al., 2011; Pavi et al., 2017; Alibardi and Cossu, 2015; Kafle et al., 2013; Dinuccio et al.,
91 2010; Gunaseelan et al., 2009), while methane yields were 0.15-0.25 m³/kg_{VS} for fruit pulp
92 (Gali et al., 2009) and 0.26-1.4 m³_{methane}/kg_{VS} for mixed FW (Labatut et al., 2011; Elbeshbishy
93 et al., 2012; Maya-Altamira et al., 2008).

94 Plant size that makes AD profitable ranks at 50-100 kWe and investment costs vary between
95 3000-5000 € and 6000-7000 € for plant sizes of around 500-1000 kWe and 50-100 kWe,
96 respectively (Insabato, 2013). Electric energy has a current value of 0.10 €/kWh and thermal
97 energy of 0.105 €/kWh (Eurostat, 2016).

98 The novelty of the approach consists of taking into account the conversion of FW into two
99 different high value products through a biorefinery concept, therefore making at the same
100 time economically feasible LA production and solving the issue of fermentative residues
101 valorization. This approach is consistent with EU strategy about circular economy; moreover,
102 industrial biotechnology belongs to the Key Enabling Technologies (KET), whose
103 development, exploitation and implementation into the development of marketable goods and
104 services are among priority action lines of European industrial policy.

105 ~~The present research, concerning the overall investigation of the feasibility of the proposed~~
106 ~~biorefinery chain, is structured in three parts. Part I (this study) covers the technical issues,~~
107 ~~while the economic and environmental assessments will be respectively discussed in parts II~~
108 ~~and III. Considering LA fermentation, this study describes SHF while the details about SSF~~

109 process are given elsewhere (Pleissner et al., 2017). Nevertheless, AD tests performed on
110 SHF and SSF fermentation residues, as well as on FW, are here fully taken into account.
111 Finally, a mass balance was evaluated for three different process outlines, with the aim to
112 assess the amount of LA and biogas that may be generated considering different scenarios. In
113 detail, LA fermentation through SHF or SSF (Scenario 1), biogas production from FW
114 anaerobic digestion (scenario 2) and sequential LA fermentation and AD of fermentation
115 residues (scenario 3) were discussed and compared.

116

117 **2. Material and Methods**

118 **2.1 Food waste**

119 FW, made of noodles, potatoes, vegetables, rice, fruits, meat and sauce, was collected daily
120 from the canteen of Leibniz Institute for Agricultural Engineering and Bioeconomy Potsdam
121 for 15 days in July 2015 (141 kg in total). Immediately after collection, FW was blended
122 through a kitchen blender and stored at -20°C. At the end of the sampling period, all FW
123 blends were pooled and homogenised. FW amounts employed in all tests, as well as
124 glassware, were autoclaved at 121°C for 15 minutes before use to exclude the presence of
125 autochthon microorganisms competing with the ones specifically inoculated for the study.

126

127 **2.2 Microorganisms**

128 A mesophilic *Streptococcus* sp. strain A620 (internal label), isolated from tapioca starch, was
129 employed in LA fermentations. The strain was classified by the German Collection of
130 Microorganisms and Cell Cultures (DSMZ Braunschweig, Germany) and is available at the
131 Leibniz Institute for Agricultural Engineering and Bioeconomy Potsdam. The strain was
132 cultured in 300 mL flasks, containing 60 mL of MRS broth (Merck, Germany) and 0.67 g
133 Everzit Dol (Evers, Germany) dolomite as buffer. Incubation occurred at 35°C for 24 hours.

134 The initial pH in all flasks was equal to 6.0. Flasks were shaken at 100 rpm in an orbital
135 shaker.

136 ~~The microbial consortium used as inoculum for anaerobic digestion tests was supplied from a~~
137 ~~mesophilic anaerobic digester at Leibniz Institute for Agricultural Engineering and~~
138 ~~Bioeconomy Potsdam. It consisted of 3.2 % (w/w) total solids (TS) and 54.4 % (w/w) volatile~~
139 ~~solids (VS). The pH was 7.8.~~

140

141 **2.3 Enzymatic hydrolysis**

142 Enzymatic hydrolysis tests were carried out without repetitions in presence of 1 L FW in a 2
143 L BIOSTAT bioreactor (Sartorius AG, Germany). Stargen and Fermgen (Genencor
144 International, The Netherlands) were employed to hydrolyze starch and proteins at 59°C and
145 pH 4.5 for one hour, respectively. Hydrolytic performance was investigated regarding
146 different solid-to-liquid ratios (11, 12.5, 20 and 25%, w/w) and enzyme loading (see section
147 3.2.2). Enzyme loading investigations were carried out at a solid-to-liquid ratio of 20% (w/w).
148 Mixing was set between 400 and 800 rpm depending on viscosity of the FW. Samples were
149 withdrawn, then inactivated at 95°C for 20 minutes, centrifuged at 5000 RPM for 10 minutes
150 and supernatant was stored at -20°C until used in analyses.

151 Yields of glucose and FAN per gram of dry food waste (Y, g/g) was calculated as follows:

152 $Y = P / FW$, where P [g] is the release in glucose or FAN and FW the amount of food waste
153 applied [g].

154

155 **2.4 Lactic acid fermentation**

156 LA fermentation was carried out in duplicate using a 2 L BIOSTAT bioreactor (Sartorius AG,
157 Germany) containing 1 L of FW with a 20% (w/w) solid-to-liquid ratio. After enzymatic
158 hydrolysis (see section 2.3), the reaction conditions were changed to 35°C and pH 6.0. A 6%

159 (v/v) *Streptococcus* sp. strain A620 inoculum was used. Samples were analyzed for sugars
160 (glucose, fructose and sucrose) and lactic acid concentrations. Results are presented as mean
161 values of two replicates. After LA fermentation, solids and the oily phase were separated
162 through centrifugation, and the supernatant was afterwards inactivated at 95°C for 20 minutes
163 and stored at -20°C. The residual solids were mixed with the oily fraction floating on the
164 supernatant and employed as feedstock for anaerobic digestion (AD) tests.

165

166 **2.5 Anaerobic digestion**

167 Three substrates (homogenized FW and fermentation residues from SHF and SSF processes)
168 underwent AD. AD batch tests were carried out at 37°C using 3% (w/w) total solids (TS) in 2
169 L (1.5 L working volume) SCHOTT glass bottles. Substrate-to-inoculum ratio was 2:1.
170 Digesters were manually shaken once a day. Each bottle was connected by 4/6 mm Teflon
171 tubes (PTFE, Germany) to 3 L sampling tubes containing a saturated saline solution acidified
172 with some drops of concentrate sulphuric acid. Biogas volume and composition were daily
173 measured through water displacement and a gas analyzer (see section 2.6), respectively. Each
174 AD test was carried out in triplicate. Furthermore, controls using inoculum and cellulose, and
175 only inoculum (blanks) were carried out in triplicate. AD tests were finished when marginal
176 biogas production was below 1%.

177 Solubilization (made of disintegration and hydrolysis) is assumed as the rate-limiting step
178 during AD of complex substrates rich in suspended solids (Van Lier et al., 2008). The
179 disintegration constant (k_d) values were calculated as follows (Angelidaki et al., 2009).
180 Assuming a first order kinetic model, the disintegration rate may be achieved through the first
181 part of the cumulative biogas curve obtained from AD tests, according to:

$$B(t) = B)_{exp}(1 - e^{-k_{dis}t})$$

182 where:

183 B(t) represents the cumulative biogas/methane production at a given time

184 B_{exp} is the ultimate biogas/methane potential yield of the substrate

185 k_{dis} is the first order disintegration rate [1/d]

186 t is the time [day].

187

188 **2.6 Analytcs**

189 Samples characterization was carried out in duplicate according to EPA reference methods
190 (EPA, 2016) where not otherwise specified and mean values are presented. TS of FW and
191 fermentation residues were analyzed after drying at 105°C until constant weight. Then dried
192 FW and fermentative residues were weighted and combusted at 550°C for 5 hours in a muffle
193 furnace for volatile solids (VS) analysis.

194 Fibers (ADF, NDF and lignin) were analyzed using an ANKOM²⁰⁰⁰ fiber analyser on FW
195 pre-dried at 60°C for 48 hours.

196 Sugars determination was carried out by cold water extraction. 3-5 g of dried FW and 50 mL
197 of demineralized water were shaken for 30 minutes; afterwards 2 mL of a 30% (w/w) ZnSO₄
198 solution and 2 mL of a 15% (w/w) C₆N₆FeK₄ solution were added. After shaking, the mixture
199 was filtrated and the clear filtrate analyzed by HPLC.

200 LA and sugars concentrations in fermentation samples were analyzed by HPLC (DIONEX,
201 USA): 10 µL of sample was injected in a Eurokat H column (300 mm × 8 mm × 10 µm,
202 Knauer, Germany) and eluted isocratically with 0.8 mL/min of 5 mM H₂SO₄. Detection was
203 carried out by a refractive index detector (RI-71, SHODEX, Japan). Each analysis was carried
204 out in duplicate.

205 Cat- and anion concentrations in fermentation samples were analyzed by ion chromatography
206 (DIONEX, USA). For quantification of cations, 25 µL of sample was injected in an IonPac

207 CS 16 column (250 mm × 4 μm, DIONEX, USA) and eluted isocratically with 1.0 mL/min of
208 30 mM CH₃SO₃H at 40°C. For quantification of anions, 25 μL of sample was injected in on
209 an IonPac AS9-HC column (250 mm × 4 μm, DIONEX, USA) and eluted isocratically with
210 1.2 mL/min of 9 mM Na₂CO₃ at room temperature. Detection of cat- and anions was carried
211 out though a conductivity cell. Each analysis was carried in duplicate.

212 Lipids analysis was performed by means of ANKOM Technology (USA) according to the
213 ANKOM Technology Method 2, 01-30-09: Determination of Oil/Fat Utilizing High
214 Temperature Solvent Extraction (ANKOM, 2014). Kjeldahl-nitrogen content in FW was
215 determined according to DIN-EN-25663 standard method using a Kjeldahl System K-370/37.
216 Protein content was calculated by multiplying the Kjeldahl-N content by 5.7 (Leung et al.,
217 2012). Free amino nitrogen (FAN) concentration was measured using the ninhydrin reaction
218 method (Lie, 1973), employing glycine as standard.

219 Elemental analysis was performed with a VARIO EL III elemental analyzer according to the
220 manufacturers' protocol (Elementar Analysensysteme GmbH, Germany).

221 Quantification of methane, carbon dioxide, oxygen and hydrogen sulfide produced during AD
222 was carried out using a GA 2000 (Ansyco, Germany) gas analyzer.

223

224 **2.7 Statistical analysis**

225 One way analysis of variance was carried out in SigmaPlot and used to measure the statistical
226 difference of LA formation between repetitions. Statistically significant difference in median
227 values was accepted for $P < 0.05$.

228

229 **3. Results and discussion**

230 **3.1. Food Waste characterization**

231 FW consisted of (w/w): 18.1% TS, 93.2% VS/TS, 33.5% starch, 14.8% protein, 12.9% fat ,
232 8.5% free sugars, 8% NDF, 3.2% ADF and 0.1% lignin. Elemental analysis showed (values
233 referred to dry weight): 47.9% C, 7.67% H, 2.56% N and 0.09% S. FW composition is in
234 agreement with literature (Alibardi and Cossu, 2015; Campuzano and Gozalez-Martinez,
235 2016) and FW proved to be a suitable substrate for the proposed biorefinery concept.

236

237 **3.2. Enzymatic hydrolysis**

238 The efficient recovery of nutrients from FW strongly depends on the activity of enzymes
239 added. Rosgaard et al. (2007) reported that the efficiency of an enzyme based hydrolysis of
240 pretreated barley straw decreases when the viscosity of the slurry gets too high. To investigate
241 this effect on food waste and to reduce the amount of enzyme needed to effectively hydrolysis
242 food waste and to recover glucose and FAN different solid-to-liquid ratio and enzyme
243 loadings were investigated.

244

245 **3.2.1 Solid-to-liquid ratio**

246 Glucose recovery was strongly dependent on the solid-to-liquid ratio (see Figure 1A). After 5-
247 10 hours glucose concentration leveled off and 54.2 g/L was obtained when 11% (w/w) was
248 applied. Glucose concentration steadily increased to 80.9 g/L when 25% (w/w) was used. A
249 33.5% (w/w) starch content and a 25% (w/w) solid-to-liquid ratio accounts to a starch loading
250 of 83.8 g. The theoretical conversion of starch into glucose is 0.9 (Wymann et al., 2004), and
251 thus 94.4 g/L can be theoretically recovered. The obtained glucose concentration (80.9 g/L)
252 implies a recovery of 85%. Theoretically, 41.8 g/L of glucose can be obtained at a solid-to-
253 liquid ratio of 11% (w/w). The obtained glucose concentration of 54.2 g/L, however, indicates
254 the presence of a remarkable amount of free glucose. Table 1 3 shows that the yield of
255 glucose per gram of FW decreases with increasing solid-to-liquid ratio. It is assumed that

256 better mixing conditions achieved at 11% (w/w) contributed to a better hydrolytic
257 performance, and thus to a higher yield (0.49 g/g_{FW}), while at 25% (w/w) a yield equal to 0.33
258 g/g_{FW} was obtained.

259 Contrarily, even when the solid-to-liquid ratio was increased, the amount of recovered FAN
260 remained relatively constant (see Figure 1B). Even though the concentration increased from
261 0.23 g/L to 0.29 g/L within 24 hours with increasing solid-to-liquid ratio, this trend is not
262 comparable to the results shown in Figure 1A. The complete digestion of 14.3% (w/w)
263 proteins in FW would certainly have an effect on FAN concentration. However, it might be
264 concluded that proteases used are not appropriate for the digestion of proteins in FW. The
265 yield of FAN (see Table 1 3) decreased by increasing solid-to-liquid ratio. While 2.04 mg/g of
266 dry FW was obtained at 11% (w/w), only 1.15 mg/g was obtained at 25% (w/w).

267

268 **3.2.2 Enzyme concentration**

269 In order to determine the lowest specific enzyme loading for glucose and FAN recovery
270 different specific enzyme loadings as shown in Table 2 4 were tested. Contrarily to the solid-
271 to-liquid ratio, the specific enzyme loading had no remarkable effect on glucose and FAN
272 recovery (see Figures 1C and D). Yields were between 0.33 and 0.39 g glucose and between
273 1.82 and 1.92 g FAN per gram of dry FW (see Table 4).

274

275 **3.3 Lactic acid fermentation**

276 Due to the previously mentioned viscosity problems, 20% (w/w) solid-to-liquid ratio was
277 chosen for LA fermentation. FW hydrolysis with Stargen was kept short for only one hour as
278 it was found that the release of glucose occurs quickly (see Figure 1). After one hour 67.3 g/L
279 of glucose was obtained which is in agreement with Figure 1. The hydrolyzed substrate was
280 then inoculated with *Streptococcus* sp. strain A620 and the fermentation was carried out for

281 29 hours. Immediately after inoculation, LA concentration increased exponentially, reaching
282 39.2 g/L after 11 hours. Afterwards, it further increased linearly to 66.5 g/L until fermentation
283 was stopped (see Figure 2). Glucose was completely consumed, but traces of sucrose and
284 fructose, available as additional carbon sources, were still present. The first 11 hours was also
285 the period of time where most of the FAN was consumed (see Figure 2B). Fermentation was
286 carried out in duplicate and no statistical difference ($P=0.637$) was found for LA formation
287 between repetitions.

288 The overall yield obtained in this study using SHF, considering the LA concentration after 29
289 hours, was 0.33 g_{LA} per gram of dry FW with a productivity of 3.38 g_{LA}/L.h. SSF performed
290 on same FW resulted in a yield of 0.29 g_{LA}/g_{FW} and a productivity of 2.08 g_{LA}/L.h after 28
291 hours (Pleissner et al., 2017), thus SHF resulted in higher yield and productivity. Higher
292 Yields (g_{LA}/g_{dry FW}) were found in literature are 0.27 (Kwan et al., 2016) and 0.99
293 (Kitpreechavanich et al., 2016) for SHF processes; 0.85 (Kim et al., 2016) and 0.46 (Tang et
294 al., 2016) are accounted for SSF processes. (see Table 1); However the yield strongly depends
295 on substrate composition and on the strain. Productivity, defined as mass of LA generated per
296 volume of fermentation broth in a time unit, is therefore a more reliable criterion to assess the
297 performance of a fermentation process. During exponential phase 3.38 g_{LA}/L.h was produced
298 in the present study, which is remarkably higher than productivity values in literature (see
299 Table 1). It is known that *Streptococcus* sp. strain A620 (Pleissner et al., 2017) is able to
300 degrade food waste, and thus this capability may additionally contribute to the release of
301 glucose. Lowest productivity of 0.28 g_{LA}/L.h was found when FW was converted with an
302 indigenous microbial consortium (Tang et al., 2016). This is not surprising, as the microbial
303 consortium is not specialized to form only LA, but a mixture of different organic acids. The
304 study of Kim et al. (2016) is of particular relevance for FW utilization approaches as it
305 illustrates how FW can be utilized in repeated batch cultures over a long period of time. Even

306 though a higher productivity was obtained in the present study and by Kwan et al. (2016)
307 when FW was first enzymatically pretreated, the simplicity of processes presented by
308 Pleissner et al. (2017), Kim et al. (2016) and Tang et al. (2016) clearly shows that the process
309 steps can be reduced to a minimum.

310

311 **3.4 Anaerobic digestion**

312 AD tests lasted 20 days and resulted in following yields (see Figure 3): FW 0.710 ± 0.02
313 $\text{Nm}^3/\text{kg}_{\text{VS}}$ biogas, $0.398 \pm 0.035 \text{ Nm}^3/\text{kg}_{\text{VS}}$ methane (56.35% v/v); fermentative residues from
314 SSF: $0.743 \pm 0.01 \text{ Nm}^3/\text{kg}_{\text{VS}}$ biogas, $0.499 \pm 0.008 \text{ Nm}^3/\text{kg}_{\text{VS}}$ methane (67.19% v/v);
315 fermentative residues from SHF: $0.90 \pm 0.016 \text{ Nm}^3/\text{kg}_{\text{VS}}$ biogas, $0.62 \pm 0.013 \text{ Nm}^3/\text{kg}_{\text{VS}}$
316 methane (68.8% v/v). Biogas and methane yields obtained from fermentation residues are
317 higher than the ones achieved from FW, mostly likely because of the differences among the 3
318 substrates in relative abundance of carbohydrates, proteins and lipids. In detail, fermentative
319 residues were rich in proteins and lipids, since their carbohydrate fraction was mostly already
320 exploited in LA fermentation. Hence biogas and methane yields of fermentative residues were
321 similar to pure proteins ($0.7 \text{ Nm}^3/\text{kg}_{\text{VS}}$ biogas, with an average methane content equal to 70%,
322 v/v) and lipids ($1.2 \text{ Nm}^3/\text{kg}_{\text{VS}}$ biogas with an average methane content equal to 68%, v/v)
323 (Weiland, 2010). FW was made of carbohydrates, proteins and lipids, but carbohydrates are
324 the most abundant fractions, and thus biogas and methane trends were comparable to
325 carbohydrates typical values ($0.8 \text{ Nm}^3/\text{kg}_{\text{VS}}$ biogas, with an average methane content of 50%,
326 v/v) (Weiland, 2010).

327 Both SSF and SHF demonstrated two accomplishments: generation of a value added product
328 (LA) and enhancement of biogas and methane yields. In a certain way, SSF and SHF had on
329 AD the effect of a highly effective biological pre-treatment resulting in an improvement of
330 methane production. In fact, the main purpose of AD pre-treatments is breaking the structure

331 of substrate particles and transforming them in easily biodegradable liquefied products
332 (Bracchitta, 2012). Considering the results achieved in the present research, it is possible to
333 affirm that LA fermentation exploited carbohydrate (mainly) and protein (partly) fractions,
334 leaving the lipids almost unaltered for the consequently carried out AD process (see Table 3
335 5) and boosting the kinetics of methane production. This assumption was confirmed by the
336 values of the disintegration constant (k_d), calculated according to Angelidaki (Angelidaki,
337 2009), which were equal to 0.43 1/d for FW, 0.35 1/d for SSF residues and 0.33 1/d for SHF
338 residues. These values are of the same order of magnitude of the ones obtained in other
339 studies (Fiore et al, 2016; Ruffino et al., 2015) using rice bran and husk (0.38 1/d), coffee dust
340 and peel (0.31 1/d), mixed vegetable waste (0.38 1/d) and pesto sauce waste (0.25 1/d). Other
341 Authors obtained 0.15-0.29 1/d for fruit pulp (Gali et al., 2009), 0.34 1/d and 0.26 1/d for
342 onion and potato respectively (Giuliano et al., 2013), and 0.14-0.35 1/d for mixed food waste
343 (Alibardi and Cossu, 2015). Moreover, However, the trend of k_d values obtained in this study
344 (FW>SSF>SHF) was expected because, as before mentioned, both fermentative residues were
345 deprived from the readily digestible carbohydrate fraction, with a higher efficiency of
346 enzymatic hydrolysis.

347

348 **3.5. Mass balance**

349 A mass balance was evaluated (see Figures 4-6) for three different process outlines with the
350 aim to assess the amount of LA and biogas that may be generated considering different
351 scenarios. In detail, LA production by means of SHF or SSF (Scenario 1); biogas generation
352 through anaerobic digestion (Scenario 2); sequential production of LA from FW and of biogas
353 from fermentative residues (Scenario 3). The mass balance starts with a theoretical amount of
354 1000 kg dry FW made of 335 kg of starch, 148 kg proteins 129 kg fat and 85 kg free sugars.
355 About LA production, downstream processes are considered according to the process scheme

356 usually adopted at Leibniz Institute for Agricultural Engineering and Bioeconomy in
357 Potsdam. In detail, a sequence of micro- and nanofiltration, softening, mono- and bipolar
358 electro dialysis, decolorisation, anion and cation exchange and distillation was taken into
359 account.

360 Considering Scenario 1, 148.2 kg of LA and 851.8 kg of wastes (residual solids plus LA lost
361 in downstream process) and 149 kg of LA and 851.1 kg of wastes (residual solids plus LA
362 lost in downstream process) were produced respectively through SSF and SHF. Using
363 Scenario 2, 260.49 Nm³ of CH₄ and consequentially 2604.9 KWh of primary energy could be
364 produced. Taking into account Scenario 3, combined SSF and AD produced 148.2 kg LA and
365 236.5 Nm³ of CH₄ and therefore 2365 KWh of primary energy and 417 kg of digestate; while
366 coupling SHF and AD produced 149 kg LA and 269.64 Nm³ of CH₄ and therefore 2696.4
367 KWh of primary energy and 408.52 kg of digestate. Wastes generated within the three
368 scenarios, residual solids generated by Scenario 1, as well as digestate deriving from
369 Scenarios 2 and 3 could be valorized in a composting process.

370 The mass balance of Scenario 1 (see Figure 4) underlines that the main bottleneck of LA
371 fermentation is the huge amount of wastes produced after fermentation and downstream
372 processes. In Scenario 3, this drawback is partially solved by the consecutive AD. Anyway,
373 downstream processes are usually highly complex and expensive, and they require a careful
374 optimization (Komesu et al, 2017).

375

376 **4. Conclusions**

377 This work investigated the technical feasibility of a sequential biorefinery process for the
378 production of LA and biogas from FW via either SHF or SSF, which was proven. The main
379 findings of the research are that SHF achieved higher yield and productivity than SSF, lasting
380 one hour more than SSF. Sequential LA and biogas production moved forward from biomass

381 conventional management and showed two profits: first, AD reduced and valorised the
382 fermentative residues generated from LA fermentation; second, SSF and SHF determined an
383 effective enhancement of biogas and methane yields with respect of FW.

384

385 **5. References**

386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418

(1) Abdel-Rahman, M.A., Sonomoto, K., 2016. Opportunities to overcome the current limitations and challenges for efficient microbial production of optically pure lactic acid. *J. Biotechnol.*, 236, 176-192

(2) Alibardi, L., Cossu, R., 2015. Composition variability of the organic fraction of municipal solid waste and effects on hydrogen and methane production potentials. *Waste Manage.* 36, 147-155.

(3) Angelidaki, I., Alves, M., Bolzonella, D., Borzacconi, L., Campos, J.L., Guwy, A.J., kalyuzhnyi, S., Jenicek, P., van Lier, J.B.,2009. Defining the biomethane potential (BMP) of solid organic wastes and energy crops: a proposed protocol for batch assays. *Water Sci. Technol.* 927-934.

(4) ANKOM. 2014. Acid detergents fiber in feeds - filter bag technique. Available at: https://www.ankom.com/sites/default/files/document-files/Method_5_ADF_Method_A200_RevE_11_04_14.pdf (accessed 2/03/2017)

(5) Campuzano, R., González Martínez,S., 2016. Characteristics of the organic fraction of municipal solid waste and methane production: A review. *Waste Manage.* 54, 3-12

(6) Castillo Martínez, F.A., Balciunas, E.M., Salgado, J.M., Dominguez Gonzalez, J.M, Converti, A., Pinheiro de Souza Oliveira, R. 2013. Lactic acid properties, applications and production: A review. *Trends Food Sci. Technol.* 30 , 70-83.

(7) COM, 1996: Strategy paper for reducing methane emissions. Communication from the Commission to the Council and to the European Parliament. COM (96) 557 final, 15 November 1996, available at: <http://aei.pitt.edu/3919/> (accessed 2/03/2017)

(8) Dinuccio, E., Balsari, P., Gioelli, F., Menardo, S., 2010. Evaluation of the biogas productivity potential of some Italian agro-industrial biomasses. *Bioresour. Technol.* 101, 3780-3783.

(9) Elbeshbishy, E., Nakhla, G., Hafez, H., 2012. Biochemical methane potential (BMP) of food waste and primary sludge: influence of inoculum pre-incubation and inoculum source. *Bioresour. Technol.* 110, 18–25

(10) EPA (2016). Tests Method for Evaluating Solid Wastes, SW-846 2012, available at: <http://www.epa.gov/osw/hazard/testmethods/sw846/online/index.htm> (accessed 4/12/2016)

- 419 (11) EU, 2010. Assessment of the options to improve the management of biowaste in the
420 European Union, final report. Study contract nr. 07.0307/2008/517621/ETU/G4
421 EUROPEAN COMMISSION DG ENVIRONMENT, Arcadis project nr.
422 11/004759/version C/12-02-2010, available at:
423 [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/compost/pdf/ia_biowaste%20-](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/compost/pdf/ia_biowaste%20-20final%20report.pdf)
424 [20final%20report.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/compost/pdf/ia_biowaste%20-20final%20report.pdf) (accessed 2/03/2017)
- 425 (12) EUROSTAT, 2016. Key to European statistics, available at:
426 <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/conferences> (accessed 4/8/2016)
- 427 (13) Fantozzi, F., Buratti, C., 2011. Anaerobic digestion of mechanically treated OFMSW:
428 Experimental data on biogas/ methane production and residues characterization.
429 *Bioresour. Technol.* 102, 8885-8892
- 430 (14) Fiore, S., Ruffino, B., Campo, G., Roati, C., Zanetti, M.C., 2016. Scale-up evaluation
431 of the anaerobic digestion of food-processing industrial wastes. *Renew. Energy.* 96,
432 949-959
- 433 (15) Gali, A., Benabdallah, T., Astals, S., Mata-Alvarez, J., 2009. Modified version of
434 ADM1 model for agro-waste application. *Bioresour. Technol.* 100, 2783-2790
- 435 (16) Giuliano, A., Bolzonella, D., Pavan, P., Cavinato, C., Cecchi, F., 2013. Co-digestion
436 of livestock, energy crops and agro-waste: feeding and process optimization in
437 mesophilic and thermophilic conditions. *Bioresour. Technol.* 128, 612-618
- 438 (17) Gunaseelan, V.N., 2009. Predicting ultimate methane yields of *Jatropha curcus* and
439 *Morus indica* from their chemical composition. *Bioresour. Technol.* 13, 3426-3429
- 440 (18) Gustavsson, J., 2011. Save the food. Study conducted for the International Congress.
441 Dusseldorf: SIK –The Swedish Institute for Food and Biotechnology.
- 442 (19) ICIS, 2016. Pricing information about the chemical, energy and fertilizer market,
443 available at:
444 <http://www.icis.com/> (accessed 4/8/2016).
- 445 (20) Joglekar, H.G., Rahman, I., Babu, S., Kulkarni, B.D, Joshi, A., 2006. Comparative
446 assessment of downstream processing options for lactic acid. *Sep. Purif. Technol.* 52,
447 1-17
- 448 (21) Kafle, G.K., Kim, S.H., Sung, K.I., 2013. Ensiling of fish industry waste for biogas
449 production: a lab scale evaluation of biochemical methane potential (BMP) and
450 kinetics. *Bioresour. Technol.*, 127, 326–336

- 451 (22) Kim, M.S., Na, J.-G., Lee, M.K., Ryu, H., Chang, Y.-K., Triolo, J.M., Yun, Y.-M.,
452 Kim, D.H., 2016. More value from food waste: Lactic acid and biogas recovery.
453 Water Resour. 96, 208-216.
- 454 (23) Kiran, E.U., Trzcinski, A.P., Liu, Y., 2015. Enhancing the hydrolysis and methane
455 production potential of mixed food waste by an effective enzymatic pretreatment.
456 Bioresour.Technol. 183, 47-52.
- 457 (24) Kitpreechavanich, V., Hayami, A., Talek, A., Chin, C.F.S., Tashiro, Y., Sakai, K.,
458 2016. Simultaneous production of l-lactic acid with high optical activity and a soil
459 amendment with food waste that demonstrates plant growth promoting activity. J.
460 Biosci. Bioeng. 122, 105-110.
- 461 (25) Komesu,A.,Rocha de Oliveira, J.A.,Helena da Silva Martins,L., Wolf Maciel, M..R.,
462 Maciel Filho, R., 2017. Lactic Acid Production to Purification: A Review.
463 Bioresources.com: available at:
464 [http://ojs.cnr.ncsu.edu/index.php/BioRes/article/view/BioRes_12_2_Komesu_Review](http://ojs.cnr.ncsu.edu/index.php/BioRes/article/view/BioRes_12_2_Komesu_Review_Lactic_Acid_Production_Purification)
465 [Lactic Acid Production Purification \(accessed 23/02/2017\)](http://ojs.cnr.ncsu.edu/index.php/BioRes/article/view/BioRes_12_2_Komesu_Review_Lactic_Acid_Production_Purification)
- 466 (26) Kwan, T.H., Hu, Y., Lin, C.S.K., 2016. Valorisation of food waste via fungal
467 hydrolysis and lactic acid fermentation with *Lactobacillus casei* Shirota. Bioresour
468 Technol. 217, 129-136
- 469 (27) Labatut, R.A., Angenent, L.T., Scott, N.R., 2011. Biochemical methane potential and
470 biodegradability of complex organic substrates. Bioresour. Technol. 102, 2254–2264
- 471 (28) Leung, C.C.J., Cheung, A.S.Y., Zhang, A.Y.Z., Lam, K.F., Lin, C.S.K., 2012.
472 Utilisation of waste bread for fermentative succinic acid production. Biochem Eng J,
473 65, 10-15
- 474 (29) Li, X., Chen, Y., Zhao, S., Chen, H., Zheng,X., Luo,J.,Liu,Y., 2015. Efficient
475 production of optically pure L-lactic acid from food waste at ambient temperature by
476 regulating key enzyme activity. Water Rese. 70, 148-157
- 477 (30) Lie, S. 1973. The EBC-ninhydrin method for determination of free alpha amino
478 nitrogen. J Inst Brew, 37-41.
- 479 (31) Maya-Altamira, L. Baun, I., Angelidaki, A., Schmidt, J.E., 2008. Influence of
480 wastewater characteristics on methane potential in food-processing industry
481 wastewaters. Water Res. 42, 2195–2203

- 482 (32) Pavi,S., Kramer,L.E.,Gomes,L.P., Schiavo Miranda, L.A., 2017. biogas production
483 from co-digestion of organic fraction of municipal solid waste and fruit and vegetable
484 waste. *Bioresour. Technol.* 228, 362-367
- 485 (33) Pleissner, D., Demichelis, F., Mariano, S., Fiore, S., Navarro Gutiérrez, I.,
486 Schneider , R.,Venus, J., 2017. Direct production of lactic acid based on
487 simultaneous saccharification and fermentation of mixed restaurant food waste. *J.*
488 *Clean. Prod.*, 143, 615-623
- 489 (34) Pleissner, D., Lau, K.Y., Schneider, R., Venus, J., Lin, C.S.K., 2015a. Fatty acid
490 feedstock preparation and lactic acid production as integrated processes in mixed
491 restaurant food and bakery wastes treatment. *Food Res. Int.*, 73, 52-61.
- 492 (35) Pleissner, D., Lau, K.Y., Zhang, C., Lin, C.S.K., 2015b. Plasticizer and surfactant
493 formation from food-waste- and algal biomass-derived lipids. *Chem.Sus.Chem*, 8,
494 1686-1691.
- 495 (36) Pleissner, D., Lam, W.C., Sun, Z., Ki Lin, C.S., 2013. Food waste as nutrient source
496 in heterotrophic microalgae cultivation. *Bioresour. Technol.* 137, 139-146.
- 497 (37) Rosgaard, L. Andric, P., Dam-Johansen, K., Pedersen, S., Meyer, A.S., 2007. Effects
498 of substrate loading on enzymatic hydrolysis and viscosity of pretreated barley straw.
499 *Appl. Biochem. Biotechnol.*, 143. 27-40.
- 500 (38) Ruffino, B., Fiore, S., Roati, C., Campo, G., Novarino, D., Zanetti, M.C., 2015. Scale
501 effect of anaerobic digestion tests in fed-batch and semi-continuous mode for the
502 technical and economic feasibility of a full scale digester, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 182,
503 302-313
- 504 (39) Van Lier, J., Mahmoud, N., Zeemen, G., 2008. Anaerobic wastewater treatment.
505 *Biological wastewater Treatment:Principles, Modelling and design*, IWA Publishing,
506 London, 401-442.
- 507 (40) Vijayakumar, J.,Aravindan, R., Viruthagiri, T., 2007. Lactic acid is commercially
508 available at different grades (qualities). *Chem. Biochem. Eng. Q.* 22, 245-264.
- 509 (41) Tang, J., Wang, X., Hu, Y., Zhang, Y., Li, Y. 2016. Lactic acid fermentation from
510 food waste with indigenous microbiota: Effects of pH, temperature and high OLR.
511 *Waste Manage*, 52, 278-285.
- 512 (42) Wang, J., Chang, Q., Yu, M., Niu, R., Wu, C., Wang, Q., 2016. SSF Wang, J., Chang,
513 Q., Yu, M., Niu, R., Wu, C., Wang, Q., 2016. SSF Production of L-lactic Acid from
514 Food Waste and *Sophoraflavescens* Residues. *Procedia. Environ. Sci.* 31, 122-126.

- 515 (43) Weiland, P., 2010. Biogas production: current state and perspectives. *App. Microbio.*
516 *Biotechnol.* 85, 849-860.
- 517 (44) Wyman, C.E., Decker, S.R., Himmel, M.E., Brady, J.W., Skopec, C.E., Viikari, L.
518 2004. Hydrolysis of cellulose and hemicellulose. in: *Polysaccharides: Structural*
519 *Diversity and Functional Versatility*, (Ed.) S. Dumitriu, CRC Press. Boca Raton, FL,
520 USA, pp. 995-1033.
- 521
- 522

523 **Figure captions**

524 **Figure 1.** Solid-to-liquid ratio and enzyme loading. Recovery of glucose (A) and FAN (B)
525 when enzymatic hydrolysis of blended food waste was carried out in presence of 350 μ l
526 Stargen and 700 μ L Fermgen at different solid-to-liquid ratios (w/w): 11.1% (open circle),
527 12.5% (closed circle), 20% (open triangle) or 25% (closed triangle). Recovery of glucose (C)
528 and FAN (D) when enzymatic hydrolysis was carried out at a solid-to-liquid ratio of 20%
529 (w/w) at different specific enzyme loadings: 3.5 μ L/g Stargen and 5 μ L/g Fermgen (open
530 circle), 1.75 μ L/g Stargen and 2.5 μ L/g Fermgen (closed circle), 0.88 μ L/g Stargen and 1.25
531 μ L/g Fermgen (open triangle), 0.44 μ L/g Stargen and 0.63 μ L/g Fermgen (closed triangle) or
532 0.11 μ L/g Stargen and 0.32 μ L/g Fermgen (open square). Results are based on single
533 measurements.

534
535 **Figure 2.** Lactic acid fermentation. Change of glucose (closed circle), fructose (open
536 triangle), sucrose (open square), FAN (closed triangle) and lactic acid (open circle)
537 concentrations during enzymatic pretreatment of food waste with 700 μ L Stargen and
538 subsequently carried out lactic acid fermentation using *Streptococcus* sp. strain A620 (A and
539 B). Fermentations were carried out in duplicate and mean values are shown. No statistical
540 difference (P=0.637) was found between replicates.

541
542 **Figure 3.** Specific methane production from food waste (continuous line), SSF fermentative
543 residues (triangle-dot line) and SHF fermentative residues (dotted line) through anaerobic
544 digestion.

545
546 **Figure 4.** Mass balance from food waste to lactic acid: Scenario1 represents the L(+)-lactic
547 acid production through separate hydrolysis and fermentation (SHF) and simultaneous

548 saccharification and fermentation (SSF). Mass balance is based on dry weight. OFMSW:
549 organic fraction of municipal solids wastes

550 **Figure 5.** Mass balance from food waste to biogas: Scenario 2 represents biogas and methane
551 production through anaerobic digestion (AD). Mass balance is based on dry weight. OFMSW:
552 organic fraction of municipal solids wastes

553

554 **Figure 6:** Mass balance from food waste to lactic acid and biogas Scenario 3 represents
555 combined L(+)-lactic acid and biogas production. Mass balance is based on dry weight.
556 OFMSW: organic fraction of municipal solids wastes

557

558 **Table 1.** Lactic acid productivity (Pr) and yields of lactic acid per gram of dry food waste (Y_{FW}) when fermentation was carried out after
 559 enzymatic hydrolysis or by simultaneous saccharification and fermentation.

Mode	Strain	Pr [g/L·h]	Y_{FW} [g/g]	Reference
SHF	<i>Streptococcus</i> sp. strain A620	3.38	0.33	this study
SHF ¹	<i>L. casei</i> Shirota	2.61	0.27	(Kwan et al., 2016)
SHF ²	<i>Bacillus</i> sp. strain T27	0.44	0.99	(Kitpreechavanich et al., 2016)
SSF	<i>Streptococcus</i> sp. strain A620	2.08	0.29	(Pleissner et al. 2017)
SSF ³	Indigenous microbial consortium	1.58	~0.85	(Kim et al., 2016)
SSF ⁴	<i>L. casei</i>	0.70	-	(Wang et al., 2016)
SSF	Indigenous microbial consortium	0.28	0.46	(Tang et al., 2016)

560 ¹Food waste was pretreated with fungal enzymes

561 ²Studies were carried out with model kitchen refuse pretreated with glucoamylase

562 ³Fermentation was carried out as repeated batch culture

563 ⁴Co-fermentation with sophoraflavescens residues in presence of cellulase and amylase

564

565 **Table 2.** Biogas and methane yields and disintegration constants (k_{dis}) from food waste through AD in mesophilic conditions. nd= not defined

Substrate	Yield	k_{dis} (1/d)	Reference	
orange pulp	$0.25 \text{ m}^3_{\text{methane}}/\text{kg}_{VS}$	0.29		566
pear pulp	$0.15 \text{ m}^3_{\text{methane}}/\text{kg}_{VS}$	0.18	Gali et al., 2009	567
apple pulp	$0.18 \text{ m}^3_{\text{methane}}/\text{kg}_{VS}$	0.15		568
onion	$0.92 \text{ m}^3_{\text{biogas}}/\text{kg}_{VS}$	0.34	Giuliano et al., 2013	
potato	$0.83 \text{ m}^3_{\text{biogas}}/\text{kg}_{VS}$	0.26		569
tomato skins and seeds	$0.42 \text{ m}^3_{\text{biogas}}/\text{kg}_{VS}$		Dinuccio et al., 2010	
fruit and vegetable waste	$0.32-0.63 \text{ m}^3_{\text{biogas}}/\text{kg}_{VS}$	nd	Gunaseelan, 2009	570
bread waste	$0.58 \text{ m}^3_{\text{biogas}}/\text{kg}_{VS}$	nd	Kafle et al., 2013	571
vegetable waste	$0.36 \text{ m}^3_{\text{methane}}/\text{kg}_{COD}$	nd	Maya-Altamira et al., 2008	572
plain pasta	$0.33 \text{ m}^3_{\text{methane}}/\text{kg}_{VS}$	nd		573
cabbage	$0.26 \text{ m}^3_{\text{methane}}/\text{kg}_{VS}$	nd	Labatut et al., 2011	
potatoes	$0.33 \text{ m}^3_{\text{methane}}/\text{kg}_{VS}$	nd		574
FW (50% bread, 20% vegetables, 10% fruit, 5% meat, 15% nd)	$0.43 \text{ m}^3_{\text{biogas}}/\text{kg}_{VS}$	0.35		575
FW (50% meat, 20% vegetables, 10% fruit, 5% bread, 15% nd)	$0.59 \text{ m}^3_{\text{biogas}}/\text{kg}_{VS}$	0.14	Alibardi and Cossu, 2015	576
FW (36% bread, 20% vegetables, 10% fruit 19% meat, 15% nd)	$0.49 \text{ m}^3_{\text{biogas}}/\text{kg}_{VS}$	0.27		577
OFMSW	$0.26 \text{ m}^3_{\text{biogas}}/\text{kg}_{VS}$	nd	Fantozzi et al., 2011	578
	$0.49 \text{ m}^3_{\text{biogas}}/\text{kg}_{VS}$	nd	Pavi et al., 2017	
FW	$0.4-1.4 \text{ m}^3_{\text{methane}}/\text{kg}_{VS}$	nd	Elbeshbishy et al., 2012	579

580

581 **Table 1 3.** Yields of glucose ($Y_{Glc/FW}$) and FAN ($Y_{FAN/FW}$) per gram of dry food waste when enzymatic hydrolysis was carried out at different
582 solid-to-liquid ratios.

583

Solid-to-liquid ratio	$Y_{Glc/FW}$	$Y_{FAN/FW}$
[% w/w]	[g/g]	[mg/g]
11.1	0.49	2.04
12.5	0.48	2.20
20	0.34	1.27
25	0.33	1.15

584

585

586

587

588

589

590

591 **Table 2 4.** Yields of glucose ($Y_{\text{Glc}/\text{FW}}$) and FAN ($Y_{\text{FAN}/\text{FW}}$) per gram of dry food waste when enzymatic hydrolysis was carried out at a solid-to-
 592 liquid ratio of 20% (w/w) and different enzyme concentrations of Stargen and Fermgen per gram of dry food waste (n. a. = not analyzed).

593

Enzyme concentration		$Y_{\text{Glc}/\text{FW}}$	$Y_{\text{FAN}/\text{FW}}$
[$\mu\text{L}/\text{g}$]		[g/g]	[mg/g]
Stargen	Fermgen		
3.50	5.00	0.36	1.92
1.75	2.50	0.39	1.92
0.88	1.25	0.33	1.82
0.44	0.63	0.38	1.61
0.11	0.32	0.39	n. a.

594

595

596


597

598 **Table 3 5.** Evaluation of anaerobic digestion performances in terms of biogas and methane yields, of methane content and of disintegration

599 constant

Substrate	Biogas [Nm ³ /kg _{vs}]	CH ₄ [Nm ³ /kg _{vs}]	CH ₄ [%]	k _{dis} [1/d]
Food waste	0.71±0.020	0.39±0.035	56.35	0.43
Fermentative residues from SSF	0.74±0.01	0.499±0.008	67.19	0.35
Fermentative residues from SHF	0.90±0.016	0.62±0.013	68.80	0.33


600 **Figure 1.**



601

602


603 **Figure 2.**



604

605

606 **Figure 3.**



607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617 **Figure 4.**



618

619

620


621

622

623

624 **Figure 5.**

Scenario 2




625

626

627

628 **Figure 6.**



629