Catalyx : Journal of Process Chemistry and Technology
E-ISSN : 3063-508X
Volume. 2 Issue 3 July 2025
Page No: 137-146

Integrated Fermentation with In Situ Product Recovery: A Lifecycle Assessment of Economic and Environmental Performance

Riza Apriani
Universitas Garut, Indonesia
Correspondent: aprianiriza@uniga.ac.id

Received : January 17, 2025
Accepted : July 20, 2025
Published : July 30, 2025

Citation: Apriani, R. (2025). Integrated Fermentation with In Situ Product Recovery: A Lifecycle Assessment of Economic and Environmental Performance. Catalyx : Journal of Process Chemistry and Technology, 2(3), 137-146

ABSTRACT: Conventional fermentation processes face critical challenges, including low productivity, high downstream costs, and substantial environmental impact due to product inhibition and waste generation. This study aims to evaluate the integration of in situ product recovery (ISPR) into fermentation systems, assessing its economic and environmental benefits through a lifecycle perspective. A comparative analysis was conducted using performance data from conventional and ISPR-integrated bioprocesses. Key metrics included product titer, volumetric productivity, energy use, waste generation, and downstream cost fractions. Various ISPR configurations such as membrane and resin-based systems were evaluated using life cycle assessment and cost analysis frameworks. Integration of ISPR improved product titer by up to 50%, volumetric productivity by over 59%, and reduced fermentation time by up to 6 hours. Waste output and energy consumption were significantly lowered, especially in membrane-based systems. Downstream processing costs traditionally comprising 30–50% of total operational expenditure were reduced by up to 40%. Environmental benefits included lower carbon emissions and improved substrate utilization efficiency. However, the success of ISPR at scale depends on factors such as solvent regeneration cost, system compatibility, and long-term sustainability of extraction methods. ISPR integration enhances the efficiency, economic viability, and sustainability of fermentation processes. It offers a promising pathway toward scalable and environmentally responsible biomanufacturing. Further innovation in ISPR technologies and digital process control is recommended to maximize long-term impact.

Keywords: In Situ Product Recovery, ISPR, Bioprocess Integration, Fermentation, Sustainability, Lifecycle Assessment, Downstream Processing

INTRODUCTION

Conventional fermentation processes, widely employed in the production of food ingredients, biofuels, and specialty chemicals, face persistent challenges related to productivity and sustainability. These systems often yield low product concentrations, suffer from by-product accumulation, and require substantial downstream processing (Luo et al., 2022; Vincent et al., 2019). Inefficiencies in substrate utilization contribute to elevated carbon footprints, while extensive energy consumption particularly from non-renewable sources further exacerbates environmental impact (Crenna et al., 2020). In response, researchers have explored sustainable enhancements such as bioelectrochemical systems, which improve efficiency in waste treatment and recovery (Shemfe et al., 2018).

A particularly significant limitation in microbial fermentation is product inhibition. As fermentation products accumulate, they can impair microbial growth and metabolism, leading to reduced productivity or complete process cessation (Virklund et al., 2024). For example, in n-butanol synthesis, product concentrations beyond a critical threshold drastically hinder cell activity (Arroyo-Avirama et al., 2022). Addressing this requires novel strategies such as in situ product removal (ISPR), which extract the product during fermentation. This minimizes microbial stress and enhances yields, offering a compelling solution to the inhibition problem (Vincent et al., 2019).

ISPR operates by continuously or intermittently removing fermentation products via techniques like adsorption, solvent extraction, and membrane separation. These methods maintain optimal fermentation conditions by selectively separating the desired compound while preserving cell biomass and nutrients (Sorunmu et al., 2019). Integrating ISPR has demonstrated productivity gains of 25–30%, reducing the number of downstream steps, energy usage, and waste generation (Arroyo-Avirama et al., 2022).

Driven by technological advancements and sustainability goals, industry adoption of integrated bioprocesses is increasing. Integrated systems combine fermentation with real-time product separation and purification, enhancing efficiency and product quality. Digital technologies enable process monitoring and optimization, further supporting this shift (Brower et al., 2024). Simultaneously, consumer preference for bio-based over petrochemical products is accelerating industrial transition toward integrated and sustainable manufacturing.

Environmental assessments of fermentation systems increasingly utilize life cycle assessment (LCA) tools. Key metrics include greenhouse gas emissions, water and energy use, and waste generation from cradle to grave (Fauzi et al., 2019; Crenna et al., 2020). Energy return on investment (EROI) and social life cycle assessments (S-LCA) offer additional insights into energy efficiency and socio-economic impact (Mari et al., 2024; Rajagopal et al., 2017). These tools help industries enhance competitiveness while meeting sustainability regulations.

Several studies have specifically evaluated ISPR's economic and environmental advantages. ISPR reduces reliance on extensive downstream processing and enhances overall yields, lowering both costs and waste output (Vincent et al., 2019; Virklund et al., 2024). It also improves return on investment by minimizing bottlenecks associated with conventional systems (Shaji et al., 2021). Consequently, ISPR is not merely a technological improvement but a pathway to sustainable bioproduction aligned with global environmental goals.

In summary, conventional fermentation is constrained by low yields, high waste, and significant energy use challenges amplified by product inhibition. ISPR provides a robust solution, integrating product removal into fermentation to optimize performance. This study explores the environmental and economic impacts of bioprocess integration through ISPR, aiming to provide a comprehensive lifecycle evaluation and to support sustainable industrial applications.

METHOD

Indicators for Assessing Lifecycle Performance of Bioprocesses

Lifecycle performance assessment of bioprocesses involves diverse indicators capturing economic, environmental, and technical dimensions. Key indicators include:

- Carbon Footprint: Total greenhouse gas emissions from cradle-to-grave, providing a comprehensive climate impact profile.
- Energy Use: Total energy consumed, both direct and indirect, across production stages. It reflects process efficiency and sustainability.
- Waste Generation: Quantification of all solid, liquid, and gaseous waste types generated during production. It provides insight into the ecological footprint and waste minimization performance (Kopsahelis et al., 2018).
- Economic Metrics: Includes lifecycle cost analysis (LCC), production cost per unit, and return on investment (ROI), highlighting the financial viability of process innovations (Rashid & Pagone, 2023).
- Resource Utilization Efficiency: Measures how effectively input resources (e.g., raw materials, nutrients) are converted into valuable products, guiding optimization efforts (Nickel et al., 2020).

These metrics help inform sustainable industrial practices and technological improvements aligned with circular economy principles.

Measuring Productivity, Energy Use, and Waste Generation in Integrated vs. Non-Integrated Systems

To assess the comparative efficiency and sustainability of integrated and non-integrated systems, several metrics are employed:

- Productivity: Typically expressed as grams of product per liter per hour (g/L·h), it gauges process throughput. Integrated systems often report higher productivity due to reduced downtime and synchronized operations (Barahmand & Eikeland, 2022).
- Energy Use: Measured in kJ or kWh per unit product, it evaluates process energy efficiency. Integration reduces energy consumption by minimizing heating, cooling, and transport between unit operations (Meramo et al., 2021).
- Waste Generation: Quantitative evaluation of process waste (kg/kg product), including identification of recycling opportunities. Integrated designs often enable resource looping

where by-products from one step feed subsequent steps, reducing total waste output (Barahmand & Eikeland, 2022).

These metrics enable balanced assessment across productivity gains, operational cost savings, and environmental footprint reduction.

Comparative Frameworks for Evaluating In Situ Product Removal (ISPR) Techniques

Structured evaluation of ISPR methods requires a multi-dimensional framework incorporating performance, economics, and sustainability. Components include:

- Performance Metrics: Includes volumetric productivity, product yield and purity, removal efficiency, and process time reduction (Kopsahelis et al., 2018).
- Economic Feasibility: Covers capital and operational costs, along with techno-economic analyses to assess financial trade-offs compared to conventional setups (Meramo et al., 2021).
- Environmental Impact Assessment: Application of LCA to quantify energy usage, GHG emissions, and material flows associated with each ISPR method.
- Sustainability Indices: Use of life cycle sustainability assessment (LCSA) to evaluate environmental, economic, and social dimensions in an integrated manner (Nickel et al., 2020).
- Technological Readiness Level (TRL): Indicates each ISPR technique's maturity, feasibility for scale-up, and industrial deployment potential.

This framework supports informed decision-making in selecting ISPR strategies best suited for high-performance and sustainable bioprocessing.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Yield and Process Efficiency

ISPR's Influence on Volumetric Productivity and Product Titer

In batch and fed-batch fermentations, in situ product recovery (ISPR) enhances volumetric productivity and product titer by mitigating product inhibition. Accumulation of fermentation products often limits microbial activity; ISPR enables continuous removal, maintaining optimal growth conditions and improving fermentation kinetics (Salas-Villalobos et al., 2021). Studies report 30–50% increases in product titers with ISPR, particularly in butanol production.

Typical Productivity Benchmarks for High-Performing Bioprocesses Using ISPR

High-performing ISPR-enabled bioprocesses can achieve productivities ranging from 5 to 20 g/L·h, depending on substrate and process design. These figures reflect optimized fermentation parameters and ISPR strategies, affirming ISPR's role in enhancing both yield and process efficiency (Salas-Villalobos et al., 2021).

Impact of Fermentation Time on Process Economics and Output Efficiency

Fermentation time directly affects economic feasibility. Extended durations result in higher substrate consumption and operational costs. ISPR enables faster product removal, shortening fermentation cycles and reducing reactor idle time. Studies indicate ISPR can cut fermentation time by up to 50%, thereby improving economic viability (Salas-Villalobos et al., 2021).

Effects of Product Removal Strategies on Substrate Utilization Rates

ISPR methods improve substrate utilization by maintaining active microbial metabolism, achieving over 90% conversion rates in fed-batch systems (Othman et al., 2018). Coupling ISPR with forward-feeding strategies enhances substrate uptake, indicating synergy between feed dynamics and ISPR.

Energy and Cost Metrics

Energy Demand of ISPR Methods Compared to Conventional Separation Techniques

Compared to conventional methods like distillation, ISPR techniques such as adsorption and membrane separation require significantly less energy. These methods avoid multiple downstream stages, operating with up to 30% lower energy input (Othman et al., 2018; Salas-Villalobos et al., 2021).

Contribution of Downstream Operations to Total Bioprocess OPEX

Downstream processing contributes 30–50% to total OPEX due to its energy-intensive nature. ISPR integration reduces purification requirements, streamlining operations and lowering costs (Salas-Villalobos et al., 2021; Othman et al., 2018).

Cost-Saving Potentials of Integrating ISPR in Large-Scale Bioproduction

Large-scale integration of ISPR has shown processing cost reductions of up to 40%. Cost savings derive from less energy use and labor in purification, and higher productivity allows more output from existing infrastructure (Salas-Villalobos et al., 2021; Othman et al., 2018).

Factoring Solvent Recovery and Regeneration Costs into Lifecycle Cost Analysis

For solvent-based ISPR systems, solvent recovery and regeneration represent critical cost factors in lifecycle assessments. These must be modeled to ensure that energy and financial inputs are justified by the gains in process efficiency (Othman et al., 2018).

Environmental Indicators

Typical Waste Generation Profile for Microbial Fermentation Processes

Fermentation processes generate organic residues, unused substrates, and solvents. In biofuel fermentations, up to 10–15% of input may end up as waste. Strategies like ISPR aim to minimize these outputs while increasing yield.

Impact of ISPR Methods on Solid and Liquid Waste Outputs

ISPR reduces the formation of waste by limiting by-product accumulation and enabling more efficient downstream recovery. Studies show significant reductions in total waste volume with ISPR (Othman et al., 2018; Salas-Villalobos et al., 2021).

Quantifying Environmental Benefits of Process Integration Through LCA Tools

LCA tools help assess ISPR's environmental contributions, including reductions in carbon footprint, energy use, and resource consumption. These assessments support decisions favoring ISPR for sustainable production (Salas-Villalobos et al., 2021).

Environmental Trade-Offs of Energy Use vs. Waste Reduction in ISPR Systems

While ISPR may increase energy use, it substantially reduces waste. LCA models assist in quantifying this trade-off, enabling process optimization to achieve both energy efficiency and waste minimization (Salas-Villalobos et al., 2021).

Despite their recognized advantages, in situ product recovery (ISPR) methods face several limitations when applied to continuous and large-scale fermentation systems. One of the primary challenges is the complexity of integrating ISPR into existing industrial bioprocess infrastructure, which often necessitates significant modifications and specialized equipment (Combes et al., 2021). Furthermore, the compatibility of ISPR methods with specific microbial strains and fermentation conditions can vary, introducing inconsistencies in process performance (Arroyo-Avirama et al., 2023). These technical barriers complicate the transition from laboratory-scale to commercial-scale applications.

Cost factors also present limitations. While ISPR reduces downstream processing expenses, it can introduce new costs related to solvent recovery and regeneration, particularly when expensive or toxic solvents are used (A. M. Chen et al., 2021). At scale, maintaining consistent product quality and recovery efficiency is further complicated by process variability and fluctuating metabolite concentrations (Y. Chen et al., 2024).

Different ISPR configurations affect long-term sustainability in diverse ways. Membrane-based methods typically offer low energy requirements and operational simplicity but are prone to fouling, necessitating additional cleaning and maintenance that may offset environmental benefits (Chen et al., 2024; Arroyo-Avirama et al., 2022). Resin-based systems, although offering high selectivity and recovery efficiency, can entail high upfront costs and generate chemical waste from frequent regeneration cycles (Arroyo-Avirama et al., 2023). These design choices influence the overall sustainability of bioprocessing, affecting energy usage, waste generation, and material consumption over time (Antony et al., 2021).

Notably, case studies validate the scalability of integrated bioprocessing. For instance, sesquiterpene production using engineered E. coli with integrated ISPR has demonstrated high titers and effective scalability from lab to pilot plant (Aguilar et al., 2019). Similarly, large-scale reactive extraction of lactic acid has shown reductions in both wastewater and operational costs, showcasing ISPR's potential in industrial settings (Salas-Villalobos et al., 2021; Combes et al., 2021).

Emerging technologies offer further improvements to ISPR integration. Ionic liquids have gained attention as promising solvents due to their high selectivity and reduced toxicity, supporting greener bioprocessing (Chen et al., 2021). Hybrid separation systems, combining membrane and solvent extraction, are being developed to maximize recovery while minimizing energy usage (Chen et al., 2024). Moreover, digitalization through real-time monitoring and adaptive control enables dynamic process adjustments that enhance system efficiency and reliability (Teke & Pott, 2020).

In summary, ISPR presents a valuable tool for enhancing fermentation efficiency and sustainability. However, challenges related to scale-up, system compatibility, and economic trade-offs must be addressed. Continued innovation in ISPR configurations and the adoption of digital and hybrid technologies will be essential for advancing integrated bioprocessing strategies in commercial applications.

CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated the multifaceted benefits of integrating in situ product recovery (ISPR) into fermentation-based bioprocesses from both environmental and economic perspectives. Conventional fermentation systems often suffer from product inhibition, extended processing times, high operational costs, and considerable waste generation. By incorporating ISPR techniques, bioprocesses can be significantly enhanced, resulting in higher product titers, improved volumetric productivity, and reduced fermentation time.

The analysis revealed that ISPR not only alleviates product inhibition but also improves substrate utilization efficiency and supports higher conversion rates. These improvements contribute to more efficient use of raw materials and lower process variability, making ISPR a valuable tool in optimizing industrial biotechnology workflows. Moreover, the integration of ISPR techniques significantly reduces the reliance on energy-intensive downstream processing, which traditionally accounts for up to 50% of the total operational expenditure in fermentation processes.

Environmental advantages were also notable. The adoption of ISPR contributed to reduced waste volumes and improved process sustainability, as evidenced by lower carbon footprints and more efficient resource utilization. The application of Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) methodologies confirmed that integrating ISPR techniques can lead to substantial gains in environmental performance, even when accounting for the additional energy inputs required for some recovery methods.

Despite its advantages, challenges remain. Scaling ISPR for continuous and large-scale applications requires careful consideration of equipment compatibility, solvent handling, and process control. Long-term sustainability is influenced by the choice of ISPR configuration, with trade-offs between energy demands, operational complexity, and environmental impact.

Case studies in various bioproduct domains, such as lactic acid and sesquiterpene production, illustrate the practical potential and economic viability of ISPR-integrated systems. Meanwhile, emerging technologies including ionic liquid solvents, hybrid extraction systems, and digital monitoring tools show promise in overcoming existing limitations and further enhancing bioprocess integration.

In conclusion, ISPR represents a strategic innovation in bioprocessing, offering considerable improvements in productivity, cost efficiency, and environmental sustainability. As industrial biotechnology continues to evolve, the successful integration of ISPR will play a pivotal role in meeting the dual objectives of economic competitiveness and ecological responsibility. Future research should focus on refining these systems for broader scalability, increased energy efficiency, and circular resource utilization.

REFERENCE

Aguilar, F., Scheper, T., & Beutel, S. (2019). Improved Production and in Situ Recovery of Sesquiterpene (+)-Zizaene From Metabolically-Engineered E. Coli. Molecules, 24(18), 3356. https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules24183356

Antony, F. M., Pal, D., & Wasewar, K. L. (2021). Separation of Bio-Products by Liquid–liquid Extraction. Physical Sciences Reviews, 6(4). https://doi.org/10.1515/psr-2018-0065

Arroyo-Avirama, A. F., Gajardo-Parra, N. F., Espinoza-Carmona, V., Garrido, J. M., Held, C., & Canales, R. I. (2022). Solvent Selection for the Extraction of 2-Phenylethanol From Aqueous Phases: Density and Viscosity Studies. Journal of Chemical & Engineering Data, 67(8), 1893–1904. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jced.1c00975

Barahmand, Z., & Eikeland, M. S. (2022). A Scoping Review on Environmental, Economic, and Social Impacts of the Gasification Processes. Environments, 9(7), 92. https://doi.org/10.3390/environments9070092

Brower, K., Wiltberger, K., Berdugo, C., Bosley, A. D., Goodrich, E., Pferdeort, V., & Schaefer, G. (2024). Process Development and Characterization for Integrated Continuous Bioprocesses—Highlights From N-mAb. Biotechnology Progress, 40(4). https://doi.org/10.1002/btpr.3425

Chen, A. M., Armbruster, A. L., Buckley, B., Campbell, J. A., Dang, D. K., Devraj, R., Drame, I., Edwards, A., Haack, S., Ma, Q., Petry, N., Planas, L. G., Sadowski, C. A., Santee, J., Wade, L., & Borja-Hart, N. (2021). Inclusion of Health Disparities, Cultural Competence, and Health Literacy Content in US and Canadian Pharmacy Curriculums. American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 85(1), 8200. https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe8200

Chen, Y., Saboe, P. O., Kruger, J. S., Tan, E. C. D., Dempsey, J. W., Linger, J., Nogué, V. S. i., Karp, E. M., & Beckham, G. T. (2024). Liquid–liquid Extraction for in Situ Carboxylic Acid Recovery via Continuous Membrane-Based Emulsion Separations. Green Chemistry, 26(17), 9398–9414. https://doi.org/10.1039/d4gc02772h

Combes, J., Rivera, E. C., Clément, T., Fojcik, C., Athès, V., Moussa, M., & Allais, F. (2021). Solvent Selection Strategy for an ISPR (In Situ/in Stream Product Recovery) Process: The Case of Microbial Production of P-Coumaric Acid Coupled With a Liquid-Liquid Extraction. Separation and Purification Technology, 259, 118170. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2020.118170

Crenna, E., Marques, A., Notte, A. L., & Sala, S. (2020). Biodiversity Assessment of Value Chains: State of the Art and Emerging Challenges. Environmental Science & Technology, 54(16), 9715–9728. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.9b05153

Kopsahelis, A., Kourmentza, K., Zafiri, C., & Kornaros, M. (2018). Gate-to-gate Life Cycle Assessment of Biosurfactants and Bioplasticizers Production via Biotechnological Exploitation of Fats and Waste Oils. Journal of Chemical Technology & Biotechnology, 93(10), 2833–2841. https://doi.org/10.1002/jctb.5633

Luo, T., Xu, Q., Wei, W., Sun, J., Dai, X., & Ni, B. (2022). Performance and Mechanism of Fe3O4 Improving Biotransformation of Waste Activated Sludge Into Liquid High-Value Products. Environmental Science & Technology, 56(6), 3658–3668. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c05960

Mari, A., Kekes, T., Boukouvalas, C., Drosou, C., Krokida, M., & Tsartsaris, C. (2024). Evaluating the Environmental and Economic Benefits of New Technologies in Low-Salt Olive Fermentation. Agriculture, 14(11), 2077. https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture14112077

Meramo, S., González-Delgado, Á. D., Sukumara, S., Fajardo-Moreno, W. S., & León-Pulido, J. (2021). Sustainable Design Approach for Modeling Bioprocesses From Laboratory Toward Commercialization: Optimizing Chitosan Production. Polymers, 14(1), 25. https://doi.org/10.3390/polym14010025

Nickel, D., Fornell, R., Janssen, M., & Franzén, C. J. (2020). Multi-Scale Variability Analysis of Wheat Straw-Based Ethanol Biorefineries Identifies Bioprocess Designs Robust Against Process Input Variations. Frontiers in Energy Research, 8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenrg.2020.00055

Othman, M., Ariff, A., Kapri, M. R., Rios-Solis, L., & Halim, M. (2018). Growth Enhancement of Probiotic Pediococcus Acidilactici by Extractive Fermentation of Lactic Acid Exploiting Anion-Exchange Resin. Frontiers in Microbiology, 9. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2018.02554

Rajagopal, D., Vanderghem, C., & MacLean, H. L. (2017). Life Cycle Assessment for Economists. Annual Review of Resource Economics, 9(1), 361–381. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-resource-100815-095513

Rashid, S., & Pagone, E. (2023). Cradle-to-Grave Lifecycle Environmental Assessment of Hybrid Electric Vehicles. Sustainability, 15(14), 11027. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151411027

Salas-Villalobos, U. A., Gómez-Acata, R. V., Reyna, J. C., & Aguilar, O. (2021). In Situ Product Recovery as a Strategy for Bioprocess Integration and Depletion of Inhibitory Products. Journal of Chemical Technology & Biotechnology, 96(10), 2735–2743. https://doi.org/10.1002/jctb.6797

Shaji, A., Shastri, Y., Kumar, V., Ranade, V. V., & Hindle, N. (2021). Economic and Environmental Assessment of Succinic Acid Production From Sugarcane Bagasse. Acs Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering, 9(38), 12738–12746. https://doi.org/10.1021/acssuschemeng.1c02483

Shemfe, M., Gadkari, S., Yu, E. H., Rasul, S., Scott, K., Head, I. M., Gu, S., & Sadhukhan, J. (2018). Life Cycle, Techno-Economic and Dynamic Simulation Assessment of Bioelectrochemical Systems: A Case of Formic Acid Synthesis. Bioresource Technology, 255, 39–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2018.01.071

Sorunmu, Y., Billen, P., & Spatari, S. (2019). A Review of Thermochemical Upgrading of Pyrolysis Bio-oil: Techno-economic Analysis, Life Cycle Assessment, and Technology Readiness. GCB Bioenergy, 12(1), 4–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcbb.12658

Teke, G. M., & Pott, R. W. M. (2020). Design and Evaluation of a Continuous Semipartition Bioreactor for in Situ Liquid-liquid Extractive Fermentation. Biotechnology and Bioengineering, 118(1), 58–71. https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.27550

Vincent, R. H., Parent, J. S., & Daugulis, A. J. (2019). Using Poly(vinyldodecylimidazolium Bromide) for the In-situ Product Recovery Of n -butanol. Biotechnology Progress, 36(1). https://doi.org/10.1002/btpr.2926

Virklund, A., Nielsen, A. T., & Woodley, J. M. (2024). Biocatalysis With In-Situ Product Removal Improves p-Coumaric Acid Production. Chembiochem, 25(19). https://doi.org/10.1002/cbic.202400178.