

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**APPLICATION OF ALTERNATIVE FERMENTER DESIGN**

**IN**

$\frac{116}{6139}$

**WHEY-ETHANOL PRODUCTION**

**(A Preliminary study)**

A Thesis presented in fulfilment

of the requirements for the degree of Master of Technology in Biotechnology

at

Massey University

**CALVIN SIU FAN TIN**

~~1990~~ 1995

To

Mt. Egmont, Mt. Ngauruhoe, Mt. Tongariro and

Mt. Ruapehu

## ABSTRACT

The performance of a crossflow-microfiltration recycle reactor for whey-ethanol production was studied. Experiments using the yeast strain *Kluyveromyces marxianus* Y-113, an industrial whey-ethanol strain, and reconstituted acid whey permeate powder were carried out. Unsteady state experiments (i.e. with 100% cell recycle) were conducted at 46-137 g/l feed lactose concentration and dilution rates of 0.44-1.3 hr<sup>-1</sup>. These experiments were used to estimate the maximum specific growth rate ( $\mu_m$ ), biomass substrate yield coefficient ( $Y_{xs}$ ), product substrate yield coefficient ( $Y_{ps}$ ). A mathematical model for biomass, lactose and ethanol concentration prediction was also developed. The model was based on Monod kinetics incorporating the concepts of a significant biomass volume fraction and single product inhibition. Two unsteady state experiments were conducted at 53.4-55.7 g/l lactose and dilution rate of 0.88-0.95 hr<sup>-1</sup> to check fermentation model accuracy. Two steady state runs at 64-110 g/l lactose, dilution rates of 0.34-0.43 hr<sup>-1</sup> were established for comparison with the unsteady state runs and to observe the effect of operation under stable conditions with the cell concentration regulated at 10 g/l..

Productivity increases of up to 13 times over the commercial batch fermentation process using the same organism was obtained. The highest productivity obtained was 13.7 g/l.hr. when the biomass was allowed to accumulate to 29.6 g/l, but lactose utilization (46%) and ethanol concentration (10.5 g/l) were low. In general, lower values of substrate utilization and ethanol concentration were noted at high dilution rates. At high feed lactose concentrations, lower lactose utilization was obtained. It was also noted that the growth rate was not significantly affected by substrate concentration and dilution rate. The product substrate coefficient ( $Y_{ps}$ ) was affected by dilution rate but independent of lactose concentration. Increasing dilution rate also decreased the biomass yield coefficient ( $Y_{xs}$ ) and the product substrate yield coefficient ( $Y_{ps}$ ). Further experiments are needed to better understand the effects of these parameters on yield coefficients. Steady state runs showed close agreement to the corresponding unsteady state experiments.

Major problem of the fermenter operation was insufficient membrane flux which resulted in short fermentation runs at some condition. To solve this

problem, a dual membrane configuration coupled with a permeate back flushing mechanism should be introduced.

The mathematical model developed was adequate, but not optimal, an uncertainties of  $\pm 30\%$  and  $\pm 20\%$  in prediction of lactose and biomass concentrations were noted. While this was acceptable in the context of preliminary economic analysis and process optimization, to further improve the model accuracy, a relationship between the various yield coefficients and operating conditions has to be determined. Better estimation of the maximum specific growth rate ( $\mu_m$ ) and incorporating a function to describe the variation of specific growth rate ( $\mu$ ) with biomass and ethanol concentrations is needed. More accurate estimation of the biomass substrate yield coefficient ( $Y_{xs}$ ) is also necessary for further model refinement.

In conclusion, the crossflow-microfiltration recycle fermenter has demonstrated potential application in whey-ethanol production with much improved productivity over current commercial and batch systems. Further studies are needed to determine its performance as compared to other intensive fermenter designs. The mathematical model developed also provides sufficient accuracy for preliminary process economic analysis and for process optimization study.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to acknowledge and thank the following people :

Dr. A J Mawson for his guidance and supervision. His patience, encouragement and enthusiasm for this project was greatly appreciated.

Professor R L Earle for his help and financial assistance.

Dr. I S Maddox for his willingness to listen to the many problems I had.

Dr. A Cleland for assistance with the Minitab analysis.

Mr. J Alger and Mr. B Collins of the Department of Biotechnology for their assistance on laboratory equipment fabrication requirements that arose during this project. The dozens of "Double Brown" from John kept my momentum going.

Laboratory staff of the Department of Biotechnology for their assistance on numerous occasions.

A J Patrick for the steam puddings during those long nights.

And finally, thanks to the "Prime" computer for not breaking down when needed.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| ABSTRACT   | i    |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT  | iii  |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS  | iv   |
| LIST OF FIGURES  | xii  |
| LIST OF TABLES   | xvi  |
| CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION   | 1    |
| CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW  | 3    |
| 2.1 Introduction   | 3    |
| 2.2 Whey production and utilization                                    | 3    |
| 2.2.1 Origins of whey and deproteinated whey                           | 3    |
| 2.2.2 Composition of whey  | 6    |
| 2.2.3 Whey production  | 7    |
| 2.2.4 Whey utilization   | 8    |
| 2.2.5 Whey disposal  | 10   |
| 2.3 Ethanol fermentation by <i>Kluyveromyces</i> strains               | 10   |
| 2.3.1 Introduction   | 10   |
| 2.3.2 Morphology and metabolism of the<br><i>Kluyveromyces</i> species | 10   |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 2.3.3 Effect of lactose and ethanol concentration                              | 11 |
| 2.3.4 Media supplementation (yeast extract,<br>ergosterol, lipid)              | 13 |
| 2.3.5 Effect of inoculum size and temperature                                  | 13 |
| 2.4 Industrial and pilot scale plant operations for whey ethanol<br>production | 14 |
| 2.5 Overview of alternative whey-ethanol fermentation systems                  | 17 |
| 2.5.1 Suspended biomass  | 19 |
| 2.5.1.1 Biomass not retained   | 19 |
| 2.5.1.1.1 Continuous stirred tank  | 19 |
| 2.5.1.2 Biomass retained   | 22 |
| 2.5.1.2.1 Batch stirred tank   | 22 |
| 2.5.1.2.2 Gravity settling   | 23 |
| 2.5.1.2.3 Membrane separation  | 27 |
| 2.5.1.2.3.1 Brief description of<br>microfiltration membrane                   | 30 |
| 2.5.2 Attached biomass   | 31 |
| 2.5.3 Other configurations   | 33 |
| 2.6 Discussion   | 37 |
| CHAPTER 3 MATERIALS AND METHODS  | 42 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 3.1 Materials                                 | 42 |
| 3.1.1 Microbiological media                   | 42 |
| 3.1.2 Chemicals                               | 42 |
| 3.1.3 Gases and other materials               | 42 |
| 3.1.4 Organism                                | 43 |
| 3.1.5 Recycle fermenter                       | 44 |
| 3.2 Methods                                   | 48 |
| 3.2.1 Inoculum preparation                    | 48 |
| 3.2.2 Medium preparation                      | 48 |
| 3.2.3 Fermenter cleaning                      | 48 |
| 3.2.4 Fermenter sterilization                 | 49 |
| 3.2.5 Gas sterilization                       | 49 |
| 3.2.6 Continuous fermentation                 | 49 |
| 3.2.7 pH measurement                          | 50 |
| 3.2.8 Biomass dry weight measurement          | 50 |
| 3.2.9 Ethanol concentration determination     | 52 |
| 3.2.10 Determination of lactose concentration | 54 |
| 3.2.11 Experimental plan                      | 56 |
| 3.2.12 Statistical analysis                   | 58 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| CHAPTER 4 FERMENTATIONS : RESULTS AND DISCUSSION | 59 |
| 4.1 Continuous fermentation results              | 59 |
| 4.1.1 Introduction                               | 59 |
| 4.1.2 Unsteady state run (1-4)                   | 60 |
| 4.1.3 Steady state runs (5-6)                    | 67 |
| 4.2 Discussion                                   | 71 |
| 4.3 Conclusions and recommendations              | 75 |
| CHAPTER 5 PROCESS MODELLING                      | 76 |
| 5.1 Introduction                                 | 76 |
| 5.2 Model formulation                            | 78 |
| 5.2.1 Abbreviations and nomenclature             | 78 |
| 5.2.2 Assumptions                                | 79 |
| 5.2.3 Verbal-balance                             | 79 |
| 5.2.3.1 Biomass balance                          | 81 |
| 5.2.3.2 Substrate balance                        | 81 |
| 5.2.3.3 Product balance                          | 81 |
| 5.2.4 Mathematical formulation                   | 81 |
| 5.2.4.1 Biomass balance                          | 81 |
| 5.2.4.2 Substrate balance                        | 81 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 5.2.4.3 Product balance                              | 81  |
| 5.2.5 Model solutions                                | 82  |
| 5.2.5.1 Static (steady-state) analytical solutions   | 82  |
| 5.2.5.1.1 Solution for biomass concentration         | 82  |
| 5.2.5.1.2 Solution for substrate concentration       | 82  |
| 5.2.5.1.3 Solution for product concentration         | 82  |
| 5.2.5.2 Dynamic (unsteady-state) numerical solutions | 83  |
| 5.3 Experimental                                     | 83  |
| 5.4 Results  | 88  |
| 5.4.1 Simulation series one                          | 88  |
| 5.4.2 Simulation series two                          | 96  |
| 5.4.3 Sensitivity analysis simulations               | 103 |
| 5.5 Discussion                                       | 106 |
| 5.6 Conclusions and recommendations                  | 109 |
| CHAPTER 6 FINAL DISCUSSION                           | 110 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| REFERENCES  | 115 |
| APPENDIX 1 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE<br>STANDARD CURVE DATA                             | 115 |
| A1.1 Statistical analysis on the dry weight-absorbance standard<br>curve                  | 123 |
| A1.1.1 Minitab regression analysis printout   | 123 |
| A1.1.2 Statistical analysis of the regression results                                     | 125 |
| A1.2 Statistical analysis on the ethanol concentration-<br>nominal area standard curve    | 126 |
| A1.2.1 Minitab regression analysis printout   | 126 |
| A1.2.2 Statistical analysis of the regression results                                     | 129 |
| A1.3 Statistical analysis on the lactose concentration-HPLC<br>peak area standard curve   | 130 |
| A1.3.1 Minitab regression analysis printout   | 130 |
| A1.3.2 Statistical analysis of the regression results                                     | 133 |
| APPENDIX 2 FERMENTATION AND SIMULATION DATA   | 134 |
| APPENDIX 3 SIMULATION PARAMETERS ESTIMATION   | 162 |
| A3.1 Sample printout of the non-linear regression analysis on<br>the unsteady-state trial | 162 |
| A3.2 Fermentation parameters estimation   | 164 |
| A3.2.1 Unsteady-state parameters calculation (based on<br>the fitted logistic equations)  | 164 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| A3.2.1.1 Maximum specific growth rate estimation  | 164 |
| A3.2.1.2 Biomass yield coefficient estimation   | 164 |
| A3.2.1.3 Product yield coefficient estimation   | 165 |
| A3.3 Sample linear regression analysis on the estimated<br>unsteady-state fermentation parameters                         | 166 |
| A3.3.1 Minitab printout of the maximum specific<br>growth rate regression analysis  | 166 |
| A3.3.2 Statistical analysis of the regression results   | 168 |
| A3.4 Sample linear regression analysis on the sensitivity test<br>results of the biomass level on fermentation parameters | 169 |
| A3.4.1 Minitab regression analysis printout   | 169 |
| A3.4.2 Statistical analysis of the regression results   | 171 |
| APPENDIX 4 SIMULATION PROGRAM   | 172 |
| A4.1 Printout of the simulation program   | 172 |

## LIST OF FIGURES

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| 2.1 Milk utilisation (Webb & Whittier 1970)  | 4    |
| 2.2 Processing plant for whey protein concentrate production<br>from sweet whey (APV 1988)                 | 5    |
| 2.3 A schematic diagram of a lactalbumin and lactose production<br>process (Kessler 1981)                  | 6    |
| 2.4 Summary of processes for whey utilization (Irvine & Hill 1985)   | 9    |
| 2.5 Flow sheet of the whey ethanol plant by Dansk Daering<br>Industri (Fergusson 1980)                     | 16   |
| 2.6 A fermenter classification chart   | 18   |
| 2.7 Classification chart of suspended biomass fermenters   | 19   |
| 2.8 Schematic diagram of a single stage continuous stirred tank<br>fermenter (Maiorella <i>et al</i> 1981) | 20   |
| 2.9 Schematic diagram of a multistage continuous fermenter<br>(Maiorella <i>et al</i> 1981)                | 21   |
| 2.10 Schematic diagram of a partial recycle fermenter<br>(Maiorella <i>et al</i> 1981)                     | 24   |
| 2.11 Schematic diagram of a APV tower fermenter<br>(Maiorella <i>et al</i> 1981)                           | 25   |
| 2.12 Schematic drawing of a continuous stirred tank-centrifuge<br>fermenter (Reesen & Strube 1978)         | 26   |
| 2.13 Schematic diagram of hollow fibre fermenter<br>(Mehaia & Cheryan 1984)                                | 27   |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 2.14 Schematic diagram of a dialysis fermenter<br>(Maioresella <i>et al</i> 1981)                       | 28 |
| 2.15 Schematic diagram of a rotor fermenter (Maioresella <i>et al</i> 1981)                             | 29 |
| 2.16 A schematic diagram of continuous membrane extractive<br>fermenter (Maioresella <i>et al</i> 1981) | 34 |
| 2.17 Schematic drawing of continuous solvent extractive fermenter<br>(Maioresella <i>et al</i> 1981)    | 34 |
| 2.18 Schematic diagram of a vacuform fermenter<br>(Maioresella <i>et al</i> 1981)                       | 35 |
| 2.19 Schematic diagram of a plug fermenter (Maioresella <i>et al</i> 1981)                              | 36 |
| 3.1 Schematic diagram of the recycle fermentation system  | 46 |
| 3.2 A photograph of the recycle fermentation system   | 47 |
| 3.3 Photograph of the Ceraflo Asymmetric Ceramic Microfilter  | 47 |
| 3.4 Standard curve of biomass concentration (dry wt. g/l) vs<br>absorbance (620nm)                      | 51 |
| 3.5 Standard curve of relative area vs ethanol conc. (g/l)  | 53 |
| 3.6 Standard curve of $\log_{10}$ peak area vs $\log_{10}$ lactose conc. (g/l)                          | 55 |
| 4.1 Plot of biomass, lactose, ethanol concentration (g/l) vs<br>time (hr.) for run 1                    | 61 |
| 4.2 Plot of biomass, lactose, ethanol concentration (g/l) vs<br>time (hr.) for run 2                    | 62 |
| 4.3 Plot of biomass, lactose, ethanol concentration (g/l) vs<br>time (hr.) for run 3                    | 63 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 4.4 Plot of biomass, lactose, ethanol concentration (g/l) vs time (hr.) for run 4   | 64 |
| 4.5 Plot of biomass, lactose, ethanol concentration (g/l) vs time (hr.) for run 5   | 68 |
| 4.6 Plot of biomass, lactose, ethanol concentration (g/l) vs time (hr.) for run 6   | 69 |
| 5.1 A flow diagram of modelling procedure (Nicholson 1980)                          | 77 |
| 5.2 Schematic diagram of the fermenter system                                       | 80 |
| 5.3 Plot of experimental and predicted biomass conc. (g/l) vs time (hr.) (run 7)    | 89 |
| 5.4 Plot of experimental and predicted lactose conc. (g/l) vs time (hr.) (run 7)    | 90 |
| 5.5 Plot of experimental and predicted ethanol conc. (g/l) vs time (hr.) (run 7)    | 91 |
| 5.6 Plot of experimental and predicted biomass conc. (g/l) vs time (hr.) (run 8)    | 93 |
| 5.7 Plot of experimental and predicted lactose conc. (g/l) vs time (hr.) (run 8)    | 94 |
| 5.8 Plot of experimental and predicted ethanol conc. (g/l) vs time (hr.) (run 8)    | 95 |
| 5.9 Plot of experimental and simulation biomass concentration-time profile (run 5)  | 97 |
| 5.10 Plot of experimental and simulation lactose concentration-time profile (run 5) | 98 |

- 5.11 Plot of experimental and simulation ethanol concentration-time 99  
profile (run 5)
- 5.12 Plot of experimental and simulation biomass concentration-time 100  
profile (run 6)
- 5.13 Plot of experimental and simulation lactose concentration-time 101  
profile (run 6)
- 5.14 Plot of experimental and simulation ethanol concentration-time 102  
profile (run 6)

## LIST OF TABLES

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| 2.1 Typical composition of wheys produced in New Zealand (g/kg) (Short & Doughty 1977)                                    | 7    |
| 2.2 Summary of the cheese and casein production (tonne) of New Zealand from 1984-1989 (New Zealand Dairy Board 1989)      | 7    |
| 2.3 Summary of ethanol yield data   | 12   |
| 2.4 Summary of the threshold ethanol concentration  | 12   |
| 2.5 Summary on effect of ergosterol supplementation on biomass (data extracted from Chen & Zall 1982)                     | 13   |
| 2.6 Summary of the fermentation methods employed by nine commercial size distilleries and one pilot scale plant           | 14   |
| 2.7 Summary of batch fermentation data  | 23   |
| 2.8 Summary of fermentation data of various attached biomass fermenter  | 32   |
| 2.9 Summary of performance data of various fermenters   | 38   |
| 2.10 Fermentation data on batch, continuous hollow, CSTR-hollow fibre studies (K. fragilis NRRL Y-2415, synethtic medium) | 39   |
| 3.1 Composition of slant agar for culture maintenance   | 43   |
| 3.2 Composition of broth for inoculum preparation   | 43   |
| 3.3 Composition of the deproteinated whey permeate powder for recycle fermentation trials                                 | 43   |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 3.4 A standard 2x2 factorial experimental plan  | 57 |
| 3.5 A modified 2x2 factorial experimental plan  | 58 |
| 4.1 Summary of the operating conditions for run 1-6   | 59 |
| 4.2 Summary of fermentation performance parameters<br>(unsteady state run 1-4, at end of fermentation run)                                  | 65 |
| 4.3 Summary of fermentation parameters for unsteady state run<br>(runs 1-4) at 10 g/l biomass   | 66 |
| 4.4 Summary of fermentation performance parameters<br>(steady state run 5-6)  | 70 |
| 4.5 Summary of predicted and experimental fermentation<br>parameter (unsteady state, at 10 g/l biomass)                                     | 73 |
| 4.6 Summary of fermentation parameters (unsteady state run 2,<br>3 and steady state run 5, 6)   | 74 |
| 5.1 Summary of simulation conditions (simulation series one)  | 83 |
| 5.2 Summary of simulation conditions (simulation series two)  | 84 |
| 5.3 Summary of factorial experimental plan (2 level, 5 factors)<br>and simulation results on run 7 (t = 12 hr.) for sensitivity<br>analysis | 86 |
| 5.4 Summary of biomass, lactose, ethanol concentration<br>(run 7, t = 9 hr.)  | 88 |
| 5.5 Summary of biomass, lactose, ethanol concentration<br>(run 8, t = 9 hr.)  | 92 |
| 5.6 Summary of the steady-state performance data of run 5   | 96 |
| 5.7 Summary of the steady-state performance data of run 6   | 96 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 5.8 Summary of percentage error of biomass, lactose, ethanol concentration prediction (run 7, 8 at $t = 9$ hr. experimental)      | 106 |
| 5.9 Summary of percentage error of biomass, lactose, ethanol concentration prediction (run 7, 8 at 10 g/l biomass)                | 106 |
| 5.10 Summary of the steady-state lactose and ethanol concentration prediction (run 5, 6)  | 107 |
| 5.11 Summary of yield coefficients at various biomass (run 1-4)   | 107 |
| 5.12 Summary of sensitivity coefficients of various fermentation parameters on biomass, lactose and ethanol concentration (run 7) | 108 |
| A1.1 Raw data of the biomass dry weight-absorbance standard curve   | 125 |
| A1.2 Raw data of the nominal area-ethanol concentration standard curve  | 128 |
| A1.3 Raw data of the peak area-lactose concentration standard curve   | 132 |
| A2.1 Raw data of fermentation trial 1   | 134 |
| A2.2 Raw data of fermentation trial 2   | 136 |
| A2.3 Raw data of fermentation trial 3   | 138 |
| A2.4 Raw data of fermentation trial 4   | 140 |
| A2.5 Raw data of fermentation trial 5   | 142 |
| A2.6 Raw data of fermentation trial 6   | 144 |
| A2.7 Raw data of fermentation trial 7   | 146 |

|       |   |     |
|-------|---|-----|
| A2.8  | Raw data of fermentation trial 8  | 148 |
| A2.9  | Raw data of simulation trial run 5 (analytical solution as simulation parameters) | 150 |
| A2.10 | Raw data of simulation trial run 5 (regression solution as simulation parameters) | 152 |
| A2.11 | Raw data of simulation trial run 6 (analytical solution as simulation parameters) | 154 |
| A2.12 | Raw data of simulation trial run 6 (regression solution as simulation parameters) | 156 |
| A2.13 | Raw data of simulation trial run 7 (regression solution as simulation parameters) | 158 |
| A2.14 | Raw data of simulation trial run 8 (regression solution as simulation parameters) | 160 |