

## Production of raw starch degrading amylase by *Bacillus subtilis* TLO3 and its application in bioethanol production using starch-rich flours

## Abstract

Since the 20<sup>th</sup> century, oil became indispensable in fields of energy and chemical industry, leading to a global dependence and causing great damages to environment. Bioethanol is currently the most widely used liquid biofuel in the world. The starch pre-treatment for ethanol production requires the use of amylolytic microorganisms, or starch degrading enzymes, such as  $\alpha$ -amylases and glucoamylases, to convert it into fermentable sugars. In this study, an amylase hyperproducer strain *Bacillus subtilis* TLO3 newly isolated from natural soil, was used for amylase production. The crude enzyme was used thereafter for raw corn and wheat starches pre-treatment. After that, the yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* was inoculated into the saccharified starch solutions for fermentation. The total reducing sugars released during saccharification were measured, and the amount of ethanol produced, as well as, the reducing sugars were monitored all along the fermentation process. Thus, 70% and 91% reducing sugars were obtained after saccharification of wheat and corn starch, respectively, by *B. subtilis* TLO3 amylase. The fermentation process monitoring showed a continuous decrease in the total sugars, concurrently with an increase in ethanol production that reached 0.92 g/l (2%) for wheat flour and 1.1 g/l (2.4%) for corn flour after 24 h.

**Keywords:** amylase; *Bacillus subtilis* TLO3; bioethanol; pre-treatment; raw starch.

## Introduction

Throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century, oil and its derivatives became the main energy source, thus leading to a global economic dependence [1]. Besides this, fossil fuels are responsible for the emission of greenhouse gases, contributing to global climate change. Biomass can make a substantial contribution to supplying future energy demand in a sustainable way. It is presently the largest global contributor of renewable energy [2]. Bioethanol is currently the

26 most widely used liquid biofuel in the world. Global ethanol production was about 13000  
 27 million gallons in 2007, and production has almost doubled over the past years, with a  
 28 production approaching 26000 million gallons for 2015 [3]. At present, bioethanol is  
 29 produced exclusively via 1<sup>st</sup> generation technologies, utilizing sugar and starch-rich  
 30 feedstocks, as no commercial size 2<sup>nd</sup> generation cellulosic ethanol facilities are presently in  
 31 operation [4]. Starch is a natural, cheap, available, renewable, and biodegradable  
 32 carbohydrate polymer produced by many plants as a source of stored energy. Bioethanol  
 33 production using starch rich materials, represents a cost-effective means for the production of  
 34 bio-alcohol comparing to the use of lignocelluloses [5]. Corn is the dominant material in the starch to  
 35 ethanol transformation industry worldwide [6]. However , wheat is the first  
 36 available material for the production of bioethanol in some regions [4]. Traditional  
 37 conversion of starch into alcohol requires a two-stage process: hydrolysis of starch by acid or  
 38 amylolytic enzyme and fermentation by anaerobic bacterium or yeast. Simultaneous  
 39 saccharification and fermentation with mixed is an effective method for the direct  
 40 fermentation of starch offering the advantages of realization in one reactor and the glucose  
 41 produced is rapidly converted into ethanol (Beschkov et al.,1984). However, in this system  
 42 the ethanol yield decreases because starch is consumed by the growth of amylolytic  
 43 microorganisms. To increase the production of ethanol, it is necessary to breed a  
 44 microorganism by a genetic manipulation, which can directly ferment starch into ethanol [7,  
 45 8]. In the present study, two starch-rich products *ie:* wheat and corn flours; were used as  
 46 biomass for the production of ethanol. The raw starch contained in the flours was pre-treated  
 47 with crude amylase produced by the strain *B. subtilis* TLO3, which optimal production  
 48 conditions were previously investigated. Thereafter, the released sugars were fermented using  
 49 the yeast *S. cerevicea*. A comparison between the two substrates was done concerning the  
 50 reducing sugars obtained and the ethanol produced.

## 51 Methodology

### 52 1. Biological material

53 Wheat (*Triticum durum*) and corn (*Zea mays*) flours were used as starch-rich substrate for the  
54 production of bioethanol. The strain *Bacillus subtilis* TLO3 (accession number KR262718)  
55 was isolated from rhizosphere of olive tree in Tlemcen (Algeria) after a screening program  
56 from different sources based on amylase production and physiological features (data not  
57 shown). The yeast *S. cerevisiae* was obtained from a commercial source.

### 58 2. Amylase production optimization

59 Medium composition and production conditions were optimized to obtain the best  
60 combination for optimal amylase production by the strain *B. subtilis* TLO3. The optimization  
61 was done using the OVAT (One-Variable-at-Time) method and amylase activity was  
62 analysed by estimating the released reducing ends of sugar according to the dinitrosalicylic  
63 acid (DNS) method of [9]. The experiments were realized using basal media containing 0,5%  
64 starch and 0,2% yeast extract with pH 7 and shaking at 150 rpm. The production media were  
65 sterilized by autoclaving at 121° for 20min. The flasks were then cooled and inoculated with  
66 the 24h culture seed 4%. The following paramaters were tested: Secondary carbon sources  
67 (Glucose, cellobiose, saccharose, xylose, galactose, lactose, cellulose, tween 20, tween 80,  
68 glycerol (0,5%)) ; Nitrogen sources (peptone, casein, yeast extract, Urea, gelatine (0,25%),  
69 Sodium nitrate and sodium nitrite (0,5%)); NaCl concentration (2,5 , 5, 10, 15, 20%, 25%) ;  
70 pH (5, 6 ,7, 8, 9, 10) ; Temperature ( 28°C, 37°C, 50°C, 60°C and 80°C) ; Inoculum size (0,5,  
71 1, 2, 3, 4, 5%) and Incubation time (24, 48, 72 hours).

### 72 3. Amylase production

73 Two flasks containing 120 ml amylase production optimized medium were prepared. The  
74 strain *B. subtilis* TLO3 was cultivated on nutrient broth for 24h at 60°C. Five per cent of the  
75 culture was inoculated to the amylase production medium. After 24h of incubation at 37°C

76 under orbital shaking 150 rpm, the medium was centrifuged at 10000 rpm during 10 min at  
77 4°C and the supernatant was used as crude amylase for the saccharification of the flours.

#### 78 **4. Wheat and corn flours saccharification**

79 Ten grams of each flour was added to the crude supernatant then incubated under orbital  
80 shaking 150rpm at 45°C for 4h for wheat flour, and at 35°C for 24h for corn flour, in  
81 accordance with time and temperature of saccharification necessary for each starch [10, 11].  
82 Samples were taken every hour and centrifuged at 10000 rpm for 10min to determine the  
83 amount of reducing sugars released. Media were finally centrifuged at 10000 rpm for 10 min  
84 at 4°C ; then the supernatants autoclaved at 121°C for 20 min.

#### 85 **5. Reducing sugars fermentation using *Saccharomyces cerevisiae***

86 The strain *S. cerevisiae* was cultivated on a Peptone-yeast-glucose medium for 48h at 30°C.  
87 Each saccharification medium was inoculated with 5% yeast culture. The media were then  
88 incubated at 30°C for 24h and samples were taken each hour for the monitoring of reducing  
89 sugar and ethanol concentrations.

#### 90 **6. Determination of reducing sugars and ethanol production**

91 The amount of reducing sugars was measured before and after flours saccharification and  
92 throughout the fermentation process using the DNS method [9]. Concerning the ethanol  
93 production, it was determined by the colorimetric method described by [12]. A mixture  
94 containing 0.5ml sample to be assayed, mixed with 0.5ml sodium dichromate reagent; 0.5ml  
95 acetate buffer pH 4.3 and 2.5ml sulphuric acid 1N. The solution was then vortexed for 1min  
96 then incubated at room temperature for 120min. The absorbance was read at 578nm using a  
97 spectrophotometer and a standard curve was plotted using different ethanol concentrations.

### 98 **Results and discussion**

#### 99 **1. Amylase production optimization**

The highest amylase production was obtained using 0.5% starch as essential carbon source, 0.5% xylose as secondary carbon source, 0.25% urea as nitrogen source, 2.5% NaCl and 3% inoculum size. The production was optimum at initial pH: 7, temperature 50°C and 24 h incubation period at 150 rpm shaking. The high production yield noted at high temperature (50°C), pH range from 6 to 9 and in short time (24h), are promising results for application at large scale allowing high amylase production and consequently elevated concentrations of fermentable sugars for bioethanol production.

## 2. Wheat and corn flours amylase pre-treatment

Flours starch saccharification was performed using crude amylase produced by *B. subtilis* TLO3 (Figure 1, Figure 2). A good yield of released reducing sugars was noted for both flours. Thus, a percentage of 70% and 91% of reducing sugars was obtained during the saccharification of wheat and corn flours, respectively; proving the efficiency of starch saccharification of the crude amylase produced by *B. subtilis* TLO3. Several studies reported raw starch saccharification for bioethanol production using amylase produced by *Bacillus* spp. strains [13, 14].

## 3. Reducing sugars fermentation and ethanol production

The monitoring during 24h of reducing sugars fermented and ethanol produced is shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4. The choice of duration of 24h for the fermentation was motivated by the advantage of production of ethanol in a short time which allows doing considerable energy savings. The reducing sugars concentration at the beginning of the fermentation was 142 µg/ml and 214 µg/ml for wheat and corn flours, respectively. This difference could be due to the starch content of corn 79% [15], which is superior to that of wheat 62% [16]. The presence of resistant starch inaccessible to amylase enzymes up to 13% for wheat flour and 8.1% for corn flour [17], can also explain that difference. The monitoring of reducing sugars concentration during the fermentation showed a slight increase in the 3 first hours, which can

be explained by a secretion of amylase by the yeast *S. cerevisiae*. This was followed by a continuous decrease reaching 42% and 79% less for wheat flour and maize, respectively, comparing to initial concentrations. This decrease indicates clearly that the yeast transformed the reducing sugars, glucose in particular, obtained after the saccharification of the flours starch. Concerning ethanol production, the monitoring showed a production yield of 0.92 g/l (2%) for the wheat flour and 1.1 g/l (2.4%) for the corn flour after 24h. For the wheat flour the production was steady during the 4 first hours, then a continuous increase was noticed from the fifth hour. For the corn flour, after an increase during the 3 first hours, the amount of ethanol declined during 3 hours, then resumed the increase in a continuous manner until 24h. This decrease could be due to a contamination by an acetic acid bacteria, which could ferment ethanol and transform it to acetic acid by and oxydo-reduction reaction [18], which represents a limiting factor in bioethanol production process. The best ethanol yield was obtained using corn flour because of the higher starch content, and thus fermentable sugars. Evaluative studies concerning starch for ethanol yield optimization described five criteria that influences the functional properties of starch : amylose/ amylopectin content [19-23], the morphology of starch granule [24], the fine structure of amylopectin [25-27], thermal properties [20, 22] and pasting properties [22].

## Conclusion:

Bioethanol production using starch rich substrates, in particular corn, represents a cost-effective means for the production of bio-alcohol comparing to the use of lignocelluloses. Amylase pre-treatment of starchy materials gave encouraging results in ethanol production, especially for corn flour. The flours composition affects the fermentable sugars yields and thus the ethanol production. The prior optimization of amylase production conditions is an essential step for an optimal hydrolysis of starch. The bioethanol production conditions could be optimized to achieve a successful scale-up to industrial level production.

150 Disclaimer: - The title and abstract of this manuscript was presented in the conference  
 151 Conference Name: “The Energy and Materials Research Conference - EMR2017, At Lisbon  
 152 (Portugal)”  
 153 available link is  
 154 “[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316545287\\_Production\\_of\\_raw\\_starch\\_degrading](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316545287_Production_of_raw_starch_degrading_)  
 155 [\\_amylase\\_by\\_Bacillus\\_subtilis\\_TLO3\\_and\\_its\\_application\\_in\\_bioethanol\\_production\\_from\\_](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316545287_Production_of_raw_starch_degrading_)  
 156 [starch-rich\\_flours”](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316545287_Production_of_raw_starch_degrading_)  
 157 Date- April 2017

## 158 References

- 159 1. Cinelli, B.A., et al., *A brief review on the emerging technology of ethanol production*  
 160 *by cold hydrolysis of raw starch*. Fuel, 2015. **150**: p. 721-729.
- 161 2. IEA\_Bioenergy. *Bioenergy – a sustainable and reliable energy source. A review of*  
 162 *status and prospects*. 2009 [cited 2016 December 2016]; ExCo: 2009:06:[Available  
 163 from: [http://www.ieabioenergy.com/publications/main-report-bioenergy-a-](http://www.ieabioenergy.com/publications/main-report-bioenergy-a-sustainable-and-reliable-energy-source-a-review-of-status-and-prospects/)  
 164 [sustainable-and-reliable-energy-source-a-review-of-status-and-prospects/](http://www.ieabioenergy.com/publications/main-report-bioenergy-a-sustainable-and-reliable-energy-source-a-review-of-status-and-prospects/).
- 165 3. Renewable Fuel Association. *World Fuel Ethanol Production* 2015 [cited 2016  
 166 December 12]; Available from: <http://ethanolrfa.org/resources/industry/statistics/>.
- 167 4. Saunders, J., D.B. Levin, and M. Izydorczyk, *Limitations and challenges for wheat-*  
 168 *based bioethanol production*, in *Economic Effects of Biofuel Production*, M.A. Dos  
 169 Santos Bernardes, Editor. 2011, InTech: Rijeka. p. 430-452.
- 170 5. McAloon, A., et al., *Determining the cost of producing ethanol from corn starch and*  
 171 *lignocellulosic feedstocks*. National Renewable Energy Laboratory Report, 2000.
- 172 6. Gnansounou, E. and A. Dauriat, *Ethanol fuel from biomass: A review*. Journal of  
 173 Scientific and Industrial Research, 2005. **64**(11): p. 809.

- 174 7. Nakamura, Y., et al., *Alcohol fermentation of starch by a genetic recombinant yeast*  
175 *having glucoamylase activity*. Biotechnology and bioengineering, 1997. **53**(1): p. 21-  
176 25.
- 177 8. Shigechi, H., et al., *Direct production of ethanol from raw corn starch via*  
178 *fermentation by use of a novel surface-engineered yeast strain codisplaying*  
179 *glucoamylase and  $\alpha$ -amylase*. Applied and Environmental Microbiology, 2004. **70**(8):  
180 p. 5037-5040.
- 181 9. Miller, G.L., *Use of Dinitrosalicylic Acid Reagent for Determination of Reducing*  
182 *Sugar*. Analytical Chemistry, 1959. **31**(3): p. 426-428.
- 183 10. Textor, S.D., et al., *Cold enzyme hydrolysis of wheat starch granules*. The Canadian  
184 Journal of Chemical Engineering, 1998. **76**(1): p. 87-93.
- 185 11. Uthumporn, U., I.S.M. Zaidul, and A.A. Karim, *Hydrolysis of granular starch at sub-*  
186 *gelatinization temperature using a mixture of amylolytic enzymes*. Food and  
187 Bioproducts Processing, 2010. **88**(1): p. 47-54.
- 188 12. Sumbhate, S.V., et al., *Colorimetric Method for the Estimation of Ethanol in*  
189 *Alcoholic-Drinks*. 2012, 2012. **1**(1): p. 6.
- 190 13. Somda, M., et al., *Improvement of bioethanol production using amylasic properties*  
191 *from Bacillus licheniformis and yeasts strains fermentation for biomass valorization*.  
192 Asian J. Biotechnol, 2011. **3**: p. 254-261.
- 193 14. Tran, H.T.M., et al., *Potential use of Bacillus subtilis in a co-culture with Clostridium*  
194 *butylicum for acetone–butanol–ethanol production from cassava starch*. Biochemical  
195 Engineering Journal, 2010. **48**(2): p. 260-267.
- 196 15. Jaekel, L.Z., et al., *Influence of xylanase addition on the characteristics of loaf bread*  
197 *prepared with white flour or whole grain wheat flour*. Food Science and Technology  
198 (Campinas), 2012. **32**: p. 844-849.



- 199    16.    Neves, M.A.d., et al., *Production of alcohol by simultaneous saccharification and*  
200            *fermentation of low-grade wheat flour*. Brazilian Archives of Biology and  
201            Technology, 2006. **49**: p. 481-490.
- 202    17.    Murphy, M.M., J.S. Douglass, and A. Birkett, *Resistant starch intakes in the United*  
203            *States*. Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 2008. **108**(1): p. 67-78.
- 204    18.    Gómez-Manzo, S., et al., *The Oxidative Fermentation of Ethanol in*  
205            *Gluconacetobacter diazotrophicus Is a Two-Step Pathway Catalyzed by a Single*  
206            *Enzyme: Alcohol-Aldehyde Dehydrogenase (ADHa)*. International Journal of  
207            Molecular Sciences, 2015. **16**(1): p. 1293-1311.
- 208    19.    Lee, M.-R., B.G. Swanson, and B.-K. Baik, *Influence of amylose content on*  
209            *properties of wheat starch and breadmaking quality of starch and gluten blends*.  
210            Cereal chemistry, 2001. **78**(6): p. 701-706.
- 211    20.    Wu, X., et al., *Factors impacting ethanol production from grain sorghum in the dry-*  
212            *grind process 1*. Cereal Chemistry, 2007. **84**(2): p. 130-136.
- 213    21.    Wu, X., et al., *Effects of amylose, corn protein, and corn fiber contents on production*  
214            *of ethanol from starch-rich media 1*. Cereal chemistry, 2006. **83**(5): p. 569-575.
- 215    22.    Zhao, R., et al., *Comparison of waxy vs. nonwaxy wheats in fuel ethanol fermentation*.  
216            Cereal Chemistry, 2009. **86**(2): p. 145-156.
- 217    23.    Zhu, L.-J., et al., *Characterization of arsenic-resistant endophytic bacteria from*  
218            *hyperaccumulators Pteris vittata and Pteris multifida*. Chemosphere, 2014. **113**: p. 9-  
219            16.
- 220    24.    Liu, Q., et al., *Investigation of digestibility in vitro and physicochemical properties of*  
221            *A-and B-type starch from soft and hard wheat flour*. Cereal Chemistry, 2007. **84**(1): p.  
222            15-21.

- 223 25. Ao, Z. and J.-l. Jane, *Characterization and modeling of the A-and B-granule starches*  
224 *of wheat, triticale, and barley*. Carbohydrate Polymers, 2007. **67**(1): p. 46-55.
- 225 26. Sasaki, T., et al., *Comparison of physical properties of wheat starch gels with*  
226 *different amylose content*. Cereal chemistry, 2002. **79**(6): p. 861-866.
- 227 27. Zhang, G., M. Sofyan, and B.R. Hamaker, *Slowly digestible state of starch:*  
228 *mechanism of slow digestion property of gelatinized maize starch*. Journal of  
229 agricultural and food chemistry, 2008. **56**(12): p. 4695-4702.





Figure 1. Reducing sugars released during the saccharification of wheat flour.

240




241

242

**Figure 2. Reducing sugars released during the saccharification of corn flour.**

243



244


245

**Figure 3. Monitoring of ethanol production and reducing sugars during the fermentation of wheat flour using *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*.**

246

247

248



249

250

**Figure 4. Monitoring of ethanol production and reducing sugars during the fermentation of corn flour using *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*.**