

Escherichia coli and its application to biohydrogen production

Luis Manuel Rosales-Colunga ·
Antonio De León Rodríguez

Published online: 8 October 2014
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2014

Abstract Hydrogen is an attractive energy carrier because of its high energy density, and used as a raw material in various chemical processes. Nowadays, hydrogen demand is supplied from non-renewable sources, and alternative sources are becoming mandatory. Hydrogen production by biological methods uses renewable resources as substrate and its production occurs at ambient temperature and atmospheric pressure. Thus, it is less energy intensive than the chemical and thermochemical methods used to produce hydrogen. This review is focused on fermentative hydrogen production by *Escherichia coli*. The hydrogen production pathway, the genetic manipulations, and expression of non-native pathways into this microorganism are reviewed. The hydrogen production using alternative substrates is a critical point to develop sustainable process by this reason the principal substrates for hydrogen production using *E. coli* are revised. Other strategies like two stages processes and immobilized cells are also discussed.

Keywords Biofuels · Biohydrogen · Hydrogen yield · formate regulon · Mixed acid fermentation · Metabolic engineering

1 Introduction

Fossil fuels are the primary source of energy used to satisfy world's energy demand, and their intensive use has caused an accelerated consumption of non-renewable resources (Davila-Vazquez et al. 2008). It has been suggested that depletion of fossil resources will lead to an energy crisis in the near future (Kapdan and Kargi 2006). In addition, there is now a general scientific consensus that observed trends in global warming are being caused by fossil fuel combustion and anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases (Luque et al. 2008). These issues have lead to explore new energy sources that could substitute fossil fuels, and be environmentally friendly and renewable.

Hydrogen is a promising fuel as it has a higher energy content than oil (142 MJ/kg for hydrogen vs. 42 MJ/kg for oil) (Nurul Islam et al. 2005) and its combustion results only in water and energy. Hydrogen is not only used as a fuel carrier; it is widely used by the chemical industry for the production of ammonia and methanol as well for the hydrogenation of fats and oils in the food industry, production of electronic devices, steel processing and re-formulation of gasoline in refineries (Ramachandran and Menon 1998; Kapdan and Kargi 2006; Fonseca et al. 2008).

L. M. Rosales-Colunga
Facultad de Ingeniería, Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí, Av. M. Nava 8, Zona Universitaria, CP 78290 San Luis Potosí, SLP, Mexico

A. De León Rodríguez (✉)
División de Biología Molecular, Instituto Potosino de Investigación Científica y Tecnológica, Camino a la Presa San José 2055, Col. Lomas 4^a secc., CP 78216 San Luis Potosí, SLP, Mexico
e-mail: aleonr@ipicyt.edu.mx; aleonr@me.com

At present, 40 % hydrogen is produced from natural gases, 30 % from heavy oil and naphtha, 18 % from coal, 4 % from electrolysis and only about 1 % from biomass (Sinha and Pandey 2011). These processes require high temperatures or pressures or both. If hydrogen production is based on fossil products or the processes to obtain this gas require high energy, then hydrogen is not the solution to solve the growing energy requirements. In the present scenario, biological hydrogen production processes are becoming important.

2 Biological hydrogen production

The main advantages of biological production are the use of renewable resources as substrate and its operation at ambient temperature and atmospheric pressure. Besides, it is less energy intensive than chemical and thermochemical methods used to produce hydrogen. Biological hydrogen production processes can be classified into three major categories: biophotolysis of water using algae and cyanobacteria, photofermentation of organic compounds by photosynthetic bacteria and dark fermentative production (Hallenbeck 2005).

In biophotolysis, photosynthetic organisms use solar energy to split water, producing O₂ and reduced ferredoxin, the latter can reduce a hydrogenase or nitrogenase, producing hydrogen (Hallenbeck and Ghosh 2009). The main advantage of this process is the abundance of substrate and simple products, whereas the disadvantages are low conversion efficiencies, sensibility of hydrogenase to oxygen and light dependence (Hallenbeck and Ghosh 2009). The anaerobic photosynthesis carried out by non-sulfur purple bacteria is called photofermentation. In this process the solar energy is used to produce ATP and high-energy electrons that reduce ferredoxin. ATP and reduced ferredoxin drive proton reduction to hydrogen by nitrogenase enzyme. These organisms cannot obtain electrons from water and therefore use organic compounds. The main disadvantages are low conversion efficiencies and the expensive photo-bioreactors required. The advantage of this process is the use of organic acid wastes as substrate allowing the use of residues of dark fermentation as substrate (see below) and increasing the overall hydrogen yield.




Fig. 1 Alignment of hydrogenases from *Escherichia coli* and *Enterobacter cloacae*

3 The Dark fermentation pathway

A variety of different microorganisms can be used anaerobically to break down mainly carbohydrate-rich substrates into hydrogen and other products, principally organic acids (lactic, acetic, butyric, etc.) and alcohols (ethanol, butanol, etc.). Final products depend of type of microorganism, oxidation state of the substrate and environmental conditions (Hallenbeck and Ghosh 2009). For hydrogen production by dark fermentation both, axenic or non-axenic cultures could be used.

Hypothetically up to 12 mol of hydrogen can be obtained per mole of glucose, but there are no single metabolic pathways in nature that would allow this reaction. The theoretical yields of hydrogen from dark fermentations depend on the type of organisms that are used in fermentation (Mathews and Wang 2009). Facultative anaerobes such as *Escherichia coli* produce a maximum yield of 2 mol of hydrogen from each mole of glucose consumed, whereas other enterobacteria such as *Enterobacter cloacae* produce 4 mol (Redwood et al. 2009). Both of these microorganisms produce hydrogen from formate. Sequences analysis of hydrogenase 3 (Hyd 3) large subunit from *E. coli* and hydrogenases of *E. cloacae* (hydrogenase 3 large subunit and Fe-hydrogenase) is shown in Fig. 1. As noted, these large-subunit sequences of Hyd 3 of *E. coli* and *E. cloacae* show high identity. The presence of other hydrogenases in *E. cloacae* and the higher hydrogen yield of this microorganism implicate the simultaneous activity of NADH pathway in which the regeneration of NAD is coupled to the reduction of ferredoxin by NADH: ferredoxin oxidoreductase (NFOR), and the formate pathway to achieve this yield.

Dark fermentation seems to be the best promise for biohydrogen production due its low cost, rapid production rates, no direct solar input needed, and stable hydrogen-producing enzymes. Also, organic wastes from agriculture or sewage can be used into anaerobic bioreactors, achieving the dual goals of waste management and hydrogen production (Chittibabu et al. 2006). Dark fermentations also solve the problem of expensive photo-bioreactors, which are necessary for direct biophotolysis and photofermentations, whereas the weaknesses are the low hydrogen yields and the large quantities of side products formed (ethanol and organic acids such as acetate, lactate, succinate and butyrate).




Fig. 2 The fermentative pathways in *Escherichia coli*

4 Hydrogen production by *Escherichia coli*

E. coli can grow in the presence or absence of oxygen. In both conditions, glucose is transported and catabolized to pyruvate, but the further metabolism of pyruvate is different. In aerobic condition, the glycolysis and the Krebs cycle generate NADH, which it is reoxidized by the respiratory chain. Under anaerobic condition, NADH is still produced by glycolysis, but the respiratory chain is not working and NADH must be reoxidized to continue the glycolysis process. Thus, the key issue of fermentation is to recycle the NADH by the conversion of pyruvate to fermentation products (Clark 1989).

Figure 2 shows the fermentative pathway in *E. coli*. Carbohydrates are catabolized to phosphoenolpyruvate, which can be converted to oxaloacetate, by incorporation of CO₂ by phosphoenolpyruvate carboxylase (PPC). Oxaloacetate is further converted to malate, fumarate and finally to succinate. A pathway from decarboxylate succinate to propionate was proposed (Haller et al. 2000; Froese et al. 2009), and some works reported propionate in *E. coli* fermentations (Jian et al. 2010; Zhang et al. 2010; Rosales-Colunga et al. 2010a; Redwood et al. 2012). Nevertheless, the metabolic function of this pathway remains uncertain. Most of the phosphoenolpyruvate is transformed to pyruvate, which is broken down into formate and acetyl-CoA by the pyruvate formate lyase (PFL). The formate is converted to hydrogen and CO₂

by the formate-hydrogen-lyase complex (FHL), whereas acetyl-CoA yields acetate or ethanol. There is evidence for a pathway that uses acetyl-CoA to butyrate formation via crotonyl-CoA (Lugg et al. 2008), and butyrate production has been reported in *E. coli* fermentations under particular culture conditions (Blackwood et al. 1956; Redwood et al. 2012).

Under circumstances of high pyruvate accumulation, this may be converted to lactate by lactate dehydrogenase enzyme (LDH) (Clark 1989). As mentioned above the pathway to produce hydrogen involves formate production. Thus, formate metabolism is important for hydrogen production. There are three formate dehydrogenases (FDH) in *E. coli*, FDH-N, which is active when cells are growing anaerobically in the presence of nitrate, and it is encoded by the *fdnGHI* operon. FDH-O is induced under anaerobic growth and is encoded by the *fdoGHI* operon. The *fdhF* gene encodes FDH-H and it is only active under fermentative conditions. It forms part of the FHL complex and is responsible for the catabolism of formate in the hydrogen production pathway. Hydrogen is produced by the Hyd-3 enzyme, which also forms part of the FHL complex. Besides Hyd-3, *E. coli* has others 3 hydrogenases, Hyd-1, 2 and 4. Hyd-1 and Hyd-2 are considered as up-take hydrogenases; however, Kim et al. (2010) reported hydrogen production ability for Hyd-1 even under micro-aerobic conditions and Trchounian et al. (2012) found that Hyd-1, Hyd-2 and Hyd-3 can operate in reverse mode depending on pH and substrate type. Hyd-4 has not been biochemically characterized (Redwood et al. 2008).

FHL complex is shown in Fig. 3. This complex comprises seven proteins; six of them are encoded in the *hyc* operon. HycB, C, D, F and G are membrane electron transfer proteins, while HycE is the hydrogenase Hyd-3. FocA is not part of the complex, but is related to the formate metabolism because this is the formate channel and it exports the formate to prevent the acidification of the cytoplasm and then re-imports the formate when the pH is low in the culture medium. The formate regulon comprises genes that are involved in the formate metabolism. Besides the operon *hyc* and *fdhf*, the regulon also includes the *hypA-E* operon, *fhIA*, and *hydN-hypF* operon. The HypA-E, HypF, and HycI proteins are required for assembly of the Ni-Fe cofactor and the maturation of the three hydrogenases. FhIA is the transcriptional activator of the regulon, whereas HycA is the negative

regulator. A detailed description of the formate regulon has been published by Leonhartsberger et al. (2002) and Sawers (2005).

5 Improvement of hydrogen production and yield by genetic manipulations of *E. coli* metabolic pathways

Among the genetically modified microorganisms reported for biohydrogen production, *E. coli* is one of the most widely used because its genome sequence is known, and the metabolic pathways and metabolism are the best understood of all bacteria. Also, there are molecular tools for its manipulation. Some examples of mutant strains of *E. coli* used for biohydrogen production are presented in Table 1.

Since HycA is the negative regulator of the formate regulon, the activity of FHL complex is increased when *hycA* gene is mutated (Leonhartsberger et al. 2002), thus HycA defective strains are hydrogen overproducer (Penfold et al. 2003; Yoshida et al. 2005). Yoshida et al. (2005) overexpressed *fhIA* and performed the *hycA* inactivation. With these genetic modifications, the transcription of *fdhF* and *hycE* increased 6.5- and 7-fold, respectively, and hydrogen production increased 2.8-fold compared with the wild-type strain. Hydrogenases 1 and 2 and formate dehydrogenase N and O are located in the periplasmic space (Fig. 3), whereas hydrogenase 3 and FDH-H are located in cytoplasm. The transport of these proteins to the periplasmic is performed by the Twin arginine translocation (Tat) protein system. Therefore, Tat mutant strains do not take formate up needed for hydrogen production. Penfold et al. (2006) reported that defective mutant strains of Tat transport (*ΔtatC* and *ΔtatA-E*) showed a hydrogen production comparable to *E. coli* strain carrying a *ΔhycA*. However, double mutant strain *ΔtatC ΔhycA* did not increase hydrogen production. Thus, it is possible that discarding activities of the uptake hydrogenases that recycle a portion of hydrogen, and the formate hydrogenases N and O, which oxidize the formate without hydrogen production, could increase the hydrogen production by *E. coli*. Indeed, the effect of mutations in uptake hydrogenases, in lactate dehydrogenase gene (*ldhA*) and *fhIA* was studied by Bisailon et al. (2006). They reported that each mutation contributed to a slight increase in hydrogen production, and the effect was

Fig. 3 Schematic representation of the FHL complex




Table 1 Some *E. coli* mutants performed to improve hydrogen production

Strain	Mutation	Maximum yield (mol H ₂ /mol substrate)	Substrate	References
SR13	Inactivation of <i>hycA</i> and overexpression of <i>fhlA</i>	NR	Formic acid	Yoshida et al. (2005)
FTD701	Inactivation of <i>hycA</i> and <i>tatC</i>	NR	Glucose	Penfold et al. (2006)
DJT135	Deletion of uptake hydrogenases, mutation of <i>ldhA</i> and constitutive expression of <i>fhl</i>	2	Glucose	Bisaillon et al. (2006), Turcot et al. (2008)
		1.51	Glucose	Ghosh and Hallenbeck (2009a)
		1.69	Glucose	Ghosh and Hallenbeck (2009b)
BW25113 (modified)	Deletion of <i>hyaB</i> , <i>hybC</i> , <i>hycA</i> , <i>fdoG</i> , <i>frdC</i> , <i>ldhA</i> and <i>aceE</i>	1.35	Glucose	Maeda et al. (2007a)
BW25113 (modified)	Deletion of <i>hyaB</i> , <i>hybC</i> , <i>hycA</i> , <i>fdoG</i> , and over expression of <i>fhlA</i>	1	Formate	Maeda et al. (2008)
SR15	Deletion of <i>ldhA</i> and <i>frdBc</i>	1.82	Glucose	Yoshida et al. (2006)
WDHL	Deletion of <i>lacI</i> and <i>hycA</i>	0.30	Glucose	Rosales-Colunga et al. (2012)
GW16	Deletion of <i>hyaAB</i> , <i>hybABC</i> , <i>hycA</i> , <i>ldhA</i> and <i>frdBC</i>	1.82	Glucose	Mathews et al. (2010)
SH5	Deletion of <i>hyaAB</i> , <i>hybBC</i> , <i>hycA</i> , <i>ldhA</i> and <i>frdAB</i>	2.11	Glucose	Kim et al. (2009)
ZF3	Deletion of <i>narL</i>	0.96	Glucose	Fan et al. (2009)

NR not reported

synergistic. This same strain was used by Turcot et al. (2008) and gave the highest hydrogen production and yield in continuous cultures. The highest yields (at, or somewhat higher than 2 mol H₂/mol glucose) were obtained with cultures limited for glucose (22 mM glucose); in a posterior work (Ghosh and Hallenbeck 2009b), a yield of 1.69 mol H₂/mol glucose was achieved under 75 mM glucose.

Maeda et al. (2007a) performed multiple stable mutations to direct the metabolic flux toward hydrogen production. The best strain involves mutations on *hyaB*, *hybC*, *hycA*, *fdoG*, *frdC*, *ldhA* and *aceE* genes. The *hyaB* and *hybC* genes were deleted to abolish the

uptake activity of hydrogenases 1 and 2. The *fdoG* and *aceE* genes code for the α subunit of formate dehydrogenase O and the pyruvate dehydrogenase respectively. The inactivation of *frdC* gene abolishes the succinate synthesis pathway. The same group reached the theoretical yield from formate with a strain with deletions of *hyaB*, *hybC*, *hycA*, *fdoG*, and overexpression of *fhlA* (Maeda et al. 2008). Yoshida et al. (2006) enhanced the hydrogen yield from 1.08 with the wild type strain to 1.82 mol H₂/mol glucose using a *ΔldhA*, *ΔfrdBC* strain. The same yield was obtained by Mathews et al. (2010) using a strain with deletions on uptake hydrogenases (*hyaAB*, *hybABC*),

hycA, lactate dehydrogenase (*ldh*) and fumarate reductase (*frdBC*), whereas Kim et al. (2009) reached 2.11 mol H₂/mol glucose with a similar strain under low hydrogen partial pressure.

The synthesis of PFL, FHL, and FhlA is activated by the global transcriptional factor Fnr (Sawers 2005; Salmon et al. 2003; Perrenoud and Sauer 2005; Constantinidou et al. 2006), whereas the dual transcriptional regulator NarL repressed the synthesis of PFL and FHL (Overton et al. 2006). Fan et al. (2009) described increases in specific and molar yields of hydrogen achieved by the modification of *focA*, *ppc*, *narL*, and *fnr* genes. The strain ZF1 (Δ *focA*) and ZF3 (Δ *narL*) produced 14.9 and 14.4 μ mol H₂/mg dry cell weight, respectively, compared to 9.8 μ mol H₂/mg dry cell weight produced by the wild type strain. Strain ZF3 also displayed the best molar yield of 0.96 mol H₂/mol of glucose compared to 0.54 for the wild type strain.

6 Improvement of hydrogen production

by expression of heterologous pathways in *E. coli*

As discussed above, the low hydrogen yield of *E. coli* pathway is the main disadvantage. To overcome this drawback, some efforts have been made focused on the heterologous expression of hydrogenase genes to enhance hydrogen production (Table 2). The use of this strategy can be traced back more than 30 years ago to Karube et al. (1983). These authors cloned and expressed the hydrogenase from *Clostridium butyricum* into *E. coli* HK16. Since this first attempt, some other efforts have been made (Table 2). The overexpression of a Fe-hydrogenase from *E. cloacae* in a non-hydrogen-producing *E. coli* BL21 strain was made by Mishra et al. (2004) using degenerate primers designed from the conserved zone of *hydA* gene. The resultant recombinant strain showed the ability to produce hydrogen. King et al. (2006) reported the production in *E. coli* of active enzymes by the co-expression of proteins involved in maturation of hydrogenases from *Clostridium acetobutylicum* and Fe–Fe hydrogenases from *C. acetobutylicum*, *C. pasteurianum*, and *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii*. The purified enzymes showed similar specific activities to those purified from native sources. Akhtar and Jones (2008b) constructed a functional synthetic operon with the Fe–Fe

hydrogenase (*hydA*) and its maturation factors (*hydF*, *hydE* and *hydG*) from *C. acetobutylicum* and demonstrated that the deletion of *iscR* gene, which codes for the transcriptional negative regulator of the iron-sulfur cluster, stimulated the recombinant Fe–Fe hydrogenase activity (Akhtar and Jones 2008a). Finally, they developed a synthetic hydrogen pathway by co-expression of a putative pyruvate flavodoxin/ferrodoxin oxidoreductase YdbK from *E. coli*, [4Fe–4S]-ferredoxin from *C. pasteurianum* and *C. acetobutylicum* HydF, HydE, HydG, and HydA reached a maximum yield of 1.88 mol H₂/mol glucose consumed (Akhtar and Jones 2009). Kuchenreuther et al. (2010) described the production of active Fe–Fe hydrogenases from *C. reinhardtii* or *C. pasteurianum* using maturases from *Shewanella oneidensis*.

As discussed above, *E. coli* can perform the NADPH-dependent hydrogen production pathway if adequate hydrogenases from other microorganisms are expressed (King et al. 2006; Akhtar and Jones 2008b). Kim et al. (2011) introduced *hydAEFG* from *C. acetobutylicum*, *fdxA* and *yumC* from *C. pasteurianum*, and *B. subtilis*, respectively, in an *E. coli* BL21 (DE3) strain. Since NADPH is generated mainly by the pentose phosphate pathway, and the activation of this pathway is accompanied by activation of gluconeogenesis, FBpase II (a key enzyme in gluconeogenic pathway which is less sensitive to regulation, encoded by *glpX*), and glucose 6 phosphate 1 dehydrogenase (a key enzyme activating pentose phosphate pathway, encoded by *zwf*) were overexpressed in that *E. coli* strain. Overexpression of *glpX* increased the hydrogen yield 1.48-fold whereas the co-expression of the two genes increased the yield further 2.32-fold.

Agapakis et al. (2010) performed various hydrogen-producing electron circuits containing Fd-dependent hydrogenases from *C. acetobutylicum*, *C. saccharobutylicum*, *C. reinhardtii*, and *S. oneidensis*, ferredoxins from *C. acetobutylicum*, *Spinacia oleracea*, and *Zea mays* and PFORs from *C. acetobutylicum*, *Desulfovibrio africanus*, and *E. coli*. The *E. coli* BL21 (DE3) strain had multiple deletions in uptake hydrogenases and competing carbon pathways. The resulting hydrogen production yield was 0.4 mol H₂/mol glucose.

Ni–Fe hydrogenases were also expressed in *E. coli* due to low oxygen sensitivity. Maeda et al. (2007b) cloned the bidirectional Ni–Fe hydrogenase

Table 2 Heterologous expression of genes used to improve hydrogen production

Strain	Heterologous gene	Maximum yield (mol H ₂ /mol substrate)	References
BL-21(DE3)/ PGEX4T-1/ <i>hydA</i>	Fe-hydrogenase from <i>Enterobacter cloacae</i>	NR	Mishra et al. (2004)
BL-21(DE3) (Transformed with various plasmids)	Fe–Fe hydrogenases from <i>Clostridium acetobutylicum</i> , <i>C. pasteurianum</i> and <i>Chlamydomonas reinhardtii</i> and maturation proteins from <i>Clostridium acetobutylicum</i>	NR	King et al. (2006)
BL21(DE3) Δ <i>iscR</i> pAF pYdbK	Construction of a synthetic hydrogen pathway with genes from <i>C. pasteurianum</i> and <i>C. acetobutylicum</i>	1.88	Akhtar and Jones (2009)
BL21(DE3) Δ <i>iscR</i> pACYCDuet-1 <i>hydGX-hydEF</i> (maturases) pET21(b) (hydrogenases) HFdYzg	Fe–Fe hydrogenase from <i>C. reinhardtii</i> or <i>C. pasteurianum</i> and maturases from <i>Shewanella oneidensis</i> <i>hydAEFG</i> from <i>C. acetobutylicum</i> , <i>fdxA</i> from <i>C. pasteurianum</i> and <i>yumC</i> from <i>B. subtilis</i> . Homologous overexpression of <i>zwf</i> and <i>fdx</i>	NR	Kuchenreuther et al. (2010) Kim et al. (2011)
BL21(DE3) Δ <i>hycE</i> , Δ <i>hyaB</i> , Δ <i>hybC</i> , Δ <i>afpr</i> , Δ <i>ydbK</i> , Δ <i>hcr</i> , Δ <i>yeaX</i> , Δ <i>hcaD</i> , Δ <i>afdB</i> (Transformed with various plasmids)	Various hydrogen producing electron circuits containing Fd-dependent hydrogenases from <i>C. acetobutylicum</i> , <i>C. saccharobutylicum</i> , <i>C. reinhardtii</i> , and <i>S. oneidensis</i> . Ferredoxins from <i>C. acetobutylicum</i> , <i>Spinacia olearcea</i> , and <i>Zea mays</i> and PFORs from <i>C. acetobutylicum</i> , <i>Desulfovibrio africanus</i>	0.4	Agapakis et al. (2010)
TG1 pBS(Kan)Synhox	Hydrogenase (<i>hoxEFUYH</i>) from <i>Synechocystis</i> sp. PCC6803	NR	Maeda et al. (2007b)
MW4W	Ni–Fe hydrogenase and maturation factors from <i>Pyrococcus furiosus</i>	NR	Sun et al. (2010)
FTD147 pRC41	Ni–Fe hydrogenase (<i>hynSL</i>), maturases (<i>hynD</i> , <i>hupH</i> and <i>hypCABDFE</i>), and adjacent genes (<i>orf2</i> , <i>cyt</i> , <i>orf1</i>) from <i>Alteromonas macleodii</i>	NR	Weyman et al. (2011)
BL21(DE3) Δ <i>hyaB</i> , Δ <i>hybC</i> , Δ <i>hycE</i> , Δ <i>hyfG</i> , Δ <i>pflB</i> pSynHox and/or pETHox	Hydrogenase (<i>hoxEFUYH</i>) and maturation factors (<i>hypA1B1CDEF</i> and <i>hoxW</i>) from <i>Synechocystis</i> sp. PCC6803	NR	Wells et al. (2011)

NR not reported

(*hoxEFUYH*) from *Synechocystis* sp. in *E. coli*. This strain yielded 41-times more hydrogen than the strain with the empty vector after 18 h. This effect was due to the inhibition of the uptake activity. Sun et al. (2010) reported the co-expression of four structural genes for the NADP-dependent hydrogenase and nine genes for its maturation from *Pyrococcus furiosus*. The recombinant enzyme showed to be as functional as the native enzyme. They also observed that the maturation machinery of *E. coli* produces a functional hydrogenase when it only expressed the structural genes for the hydrogenase and a protease from *P. furiosus*. However, the hydrogenase activity was only

reported in vitro. Weyman et al. (2011) cloned and expressed the structural gene for Ni–Fe hydrogenase, maturases and adjacent genes from *Alteromonas macleodii* “deep ecotype” in *E. coli* lacking native hydrogenases. The hydrogenase showed to be active in vitro in both aerobic and anaerobic conditions. They also demonstrated the activity of a Ni–Fe hydrogenase from *Thiocapsa roseopersicina* when co-expressed with the accessory proteins from *A. macleodii*. Wells et al. (2011) expressed the *Synechocystis* sp. hydrogen production pathway and its maturation factors in an *E. coli* strain in which the hydrogenases and formate production pathway were abolished. They reported

in vivo production of 20 μmol of hydrogen per liter of culture.

7 Hydrogen production with *E. coli* using alternative carbon sources

Most of the research to improve hydrogen production has been conducted using glucose as substrate. However, to be competitive, biological hydrogen production must use carbohydrate rich wastes (Table 3). Penfold and Macaskie (2004) transformed to *E. coli* HD701, a hydrogenase-upregulated strain and FTD701 (a derivative of HD701 that has a deletion of the *tatC* gene), with the plasmid pUR400 carrying the *scr* regulon. This regulon contain the genes of *Salmonella thompson* to metabolize sucrose. The resulting *E. coli* strain produced hydrogen from sucrose. The parental strains did not produce hydrogen, whereas recombinant strains produced 1.27 and 1.38 ml H_2/mg dry weight/l. Rosales-Colunga et al. (2010b) obtained a yield of 2.74 mol H_2/mol lactose

consumed, using cheese whey as substrate, and an *E. coli* ΔhycA ΔlacI strain (WDHL). In a subsequent work, hydrogen production from lactose, glucose and galactose was reported; the maximum yield was attained with galactose (Rosales-Colunga et al. 2012). Ghosh and Hallenbeck (2009a) reported the hydrogen yields from arabinose, fructose, gluconate, glucose, lactose, maltose, manitol, sorbitol, sucrose, trehalose, and xylose. The highest hydrogen yield obtained was 1.47 mol H_2/mol substrate using sorbitol. Morsy (2011) used hydrolyzed molasses as substrate using the strain HD701. The highest hydrogen production of 570 ml of H_2/l and a rate of 19 ml/h were obtained using a concentration of 10 g/l of reducing sugars. However, the maximal yield (132 ml of hydrogen/g of reducing sugars) was obtained from 2.5 g/l of reducing sugars.

Perego et al. (1998) used a corn starch hydrolysate (85 % glucose, dry basis) to produce hydrogen with *E. coli* and *E. aerogenes*; with *E. coli* a maximum yield of 0.36 mol/mol glucose was reached. In this study, *E. aerogenes* showed a better production from this substrate. Orozco et al. (2012) performed the

Table 3 Hydrogen production using alternative carbon sources

Strain	Strategy	Maximum yield (mol H_2/mol substrate)	Substrate	References
FTD701/pUR400	Inactivation of <i>hycA</i> and <i>tatC</i> and expression of the genes necessary for sucrose transport and metabolism	NR	Sucrose	Penfold and Macaskie (2004)
WDHL	Inactivation of <i>hycA</i> and <i>lacI</i>	2.74 1.12	Cheese whey Galactose	Rosales-Colunga et al. (2010b) Rosales-Colunga et al. (2012)
DJ135	Deletion of uptake hydrogenases, mutation of <i>ldhA</i> and constitutive expression of <i>fhl</i>	1.47	Sorbitol	Ghosh and Hallenbeck (2009a)
HD701	Acid hydrolysis	132 ml/g reducing sugar	Molasses (hydrolyzed)	Morsy (2011)
NCIMB	Enzymatic hydrolysis	0.36	Corn starch	Perego et al. (1998)
HD701	Hydrothermal hydrolysis	0.38	Starch	Orozco et al. (2012)
BL21(DE3) ΔiscR pAF pYdbK	Expression of <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> AmyE	NR	Starch	Akhtar and Jones (2009)
SY03(pZSKLMgldA)	Inactivation of <i>frdA</i> , <i>pta</i> and overexpression of <i>gldA</i> and <i>dhaKLM</i>	≈ 1	Glycerol	Shams Yazdani and Gonzalez (2008)
BW25113	Low pH	NR	Glycerol	Trchounian et al. (2011)
HW2	Adaptive evolution and chemical mutagenesis	21 $\mu\text{mol}/\text{mg}$ protein	Glycerol	Hu and Wood (2010)

NR not reported

hydrothermal hydrolysis of starch with carbon dioxide and detoxification of hydrolysis with activated coal. Hydrogen production using this hydrolysis strategy was equal to glucose controls. Akhtar and Jones (2009) reported an *E. coli* that expresses an amylase and it was used for hydrogen production from starch without previous hydrolysis.

Glycerol has become an abundant and inexpensive carbon source due to its generation as by-product from biodiesel fuel production. For this reason some efforts have been focused on obtaining hydrogen from glycerol. Yazdani and Gonzalez (2008) created the strain SY03 (pZSKLMgldA) in which the acetate and succinate pathways were minimized by inactivation of phosphate acetyltransferase (*pta*) and fumarate reductase (*frdA*), respectively. The enzymes responsible for the conversion of glycerol to dihydroxyacetonephosphate, a glycolytic intermediate, were overexpressed. The yield of ethanol and hydrogen reached was 95 % of the theoretical maximum. Trchounian et al. (2011) studied the glycerol fermentation and hydrogen production, they found that at pH of 5.5 the hydrogen production was 1.5-fold higher than at a pH 6.5. Starting with *E. coli* BW25113 *frdC* that lacks fumarate-reductase and by using both adaptive evolution and chemical mutagenesis combined with a selection method based on increased growth in glycerol. Hu and Wood (2010) obtained the strain HW2, that produced 20-fold more hydrogen in glycerol medium.

8 Fermentative approaches used to improve hydrogen production using *E. coli*

The main disadvantage of fermentative hydrogen production is the low yield due to the production of other metabolites, mainly organic acids. To improve the net yield of hydrogen a two-stage system can be used. In the first stage, a dark fermentation is used to produce hydrogen, and in the second stage the organic acids produced in the first step are used as substrate for photofermentation, increasing the total hydrogen yield. For example, Salih (1989) used cheese whey pretreated with *E. coli* to produce hydrogen by a photosynthetic *Rhodospirillum rubrum*. *E. coli* was only used to pretreat of cheese whey and not for hydrogen production; however, hydrogen production increased when pretreated whey was used (Table 4). Redwood and Macaskie (2006) tried to produce

hydrogen in two stages, first, by fermentation of glucose by *E. coli* HD701 and then by photofermentation of the residual medium by *R. sphaeroides*. Nevertheless, hydrogen production did not occur during photofermentation of the residual liquor per se due to the presence of fixed nitrogen compounds. This issue was further solved by electroseparation of ammonium ion and the authors reported a continuous *E. coli* reactor and a continuous *R. sphaeroides* photobioreactor integrated by anion-selective electro-dialysis, simultaneously transferring anionic fermentation products, while retaining repressive ammonium ion, *E. coli* cells and suspended solids (Redwood et al. 2009). This approach resulted in sustained hydrogen production by *E. coli* with a yield of 1.6 mol H₂/mol hexose and sustained hydrogen photoproduction by *R. sphaeroides*. The overall yield was 2.4 mol H₂/mol glucose. This electro-extractive strategy was also used to enhance continuous hydrogen and organic acid production by *E. coli* FTD67 (Redwood et al. 2012). The pH was controlled by separation of organic acids, which can be used in a further hydrogen production step by photofermentation. The maximal rate was 4.7 l/d/l of culture and yield of 0.7 mol/mol glucose.

Waks and Silver (2009) combined the industrial advantages of yeast with *E. coli* hydrogen production. They proposed biomass conversion to formate by *S. cerevisiae* and the subsequent conversion of formate to hydrogen by *E. coli*. The endogenous formate dehydrogenases of *S. cerevisiae* were deleted and the pyruvate formate lyase and alcohol dehydrogenase from *E. coli* were expressed; galactose was used in this first stage to produce formate. The formate-enriched medium was further used to produce hydrogen by *E. coli*. Abd-Alla et al. (2011) proposed the use of rotten dates to produce hydrogen in a 3-stage process. In the first stage, *E. coli* EGY was used to consume oxygen and maintain the anaerobic condition. In the second, stage hydrogen was produced using *C. acetobutylicum* ATCC 824 and finally photofermentation by *R. capsulatus* was used. The maximal total yield of the process was 7.8 mol hydrogen/mol sucrose. Seppälä et al. (2011) examined hydrogen production in a co-culture of *E. coli* and *C. butyricum*. They found that the total hydrogen production of the co-culture was higher compared to the monoculture of each strain. However, the co-culture yield (1.65 mol H₂/mol glucose) was lower than that obtained by the pure culture of *C. butyricum* (2.09 mol H₂/mol glucose).

Table 4 Other strategies used to improve hydrogen production

Strategy	Maximum yield (mol H ₂ /mol substrate)	References
Pretreatment of cheese whey with <i>E. coli</i> and photoproduction by <i>Rhodospirillum rubrum</i>	NR	Salih (1989)
Two stages using <i>E. coli</i> and photoproduction by <i>R. sphaeroides</i>	0.376 (G)	Redwood and Macaskie (2006)
Two stages using <i>E. coli</i> and photoproduction by <i>R. sphaeroides</i> in continuous mode	2.4 (G)	Redwood et al. (2009)
Electro-extractive fermentation	0.7 (G)	Redwood et al. (2012)
Dual organism system using <i>S. cerevisiae</i> to produce formate and used to produce hydrogen by <i>E. coli</i>	NR	Waks and Silver (2009)
Three stages using <i>E. coli</i> to maintain the anaerobic condition and hydrogen production by <i>C. acetobutylicum</i> and <i>R. capsulatus</i>	7.8 (S)	Abd-Alla et al. (2011)
Co-culture of <i>E. coli</i> and <i>C. butyricum</i>	1.65 (G)	Seppälä et al. (2011)
Compact high density reactor.	NR	Ishikawa et al. (2006)
Compact stacked flatbed reactor (CSFR)	1.2 (G)	Ishikawa et al. (2008)
Strain SH5 immobilized in agar matrix	1 (F)	Seol et al. (2011)

G glucose, S sucrose, F formate, NR not reported

Another strategy widely used to produce a variety of products is the use of immobilized cells. Its main advantages are increase in the biomass concentration, low risk of contamination, operational stability, and high productivity (Seol et al. 2011). Therefore, this strategy has been used in hydrogen production. For example, Ishikawa et al. (2006) probed the encapsulation of *E. coli* MC13-4 in alginate gel beads, and hydrogen increased 3-fold compared to a free cell system; nonetheless, the gas remained as bubbles in the interspace of the gel. This system was connected to a fuel cell and can produce electricity. In a later work (Ishikawa et al. 2008), a compact stacked flatbed reactor (CSFR) was developed to extract the produced gas easily. This reactor comprises pieces of agar plates containing *E. coli* MC13-4 at high density and reached the yield of 1.2 mol H₂/mol glucose, and the production rate of 6.7 l of hydrogen/g dry cell/l of reactor/h. Seol et al. (2011) examined three different matrices (agar, agarose, and sodium alginate) to immobilize a hydrogen over-producer strain of *E. coli* (SH5). Using agar as matrix and optimal conditions a maximum production rate of 2.4 l of hydrogen/l/h and yield around 100 % of the theoretical from formate (1 mol/mol) were attained. They also probed a sustained production in a feed-batch operation mode.

Escherichia coli is a valuable microorganism in the study of hydrogen production as discussed above and is still a model that can provide useful information to know the hydrogen producer pathways and to improve them.

9 Conclusions

Genetic manipulations, the use of a diversity of carbohydrates, and redirection of the carbon flux to favor hydrogen production have been used to increase hydrogen yield. However, until now *E. coli* has been just an excellent microorganism to study processes to produce hydrogen in lab-scale. Additional efforts should be conducted to obtain suitable processes feasible to scaling-up to produce hydrogen for commercial purposes, for instance those where metabolites such as succinate or recombinant protein are the main products and hydrogen is a by-product. Novel and new approaches such as using synthetic biology to improve hydrogen production are still needed in a new generation of overproducing hydrogen strains.

Acknowledgments We thank CONACyT for partial funding of this work through SENER Grant 150001 and CONACyT-Básicas 178988. The authors thank Jennifer Eckerly Goss for English correction.

References

- Abd-Alla MH, Morsy FM, El-Enany A-WE (2011) Hydrogen production from rotten dates by sequential three stages fermentation. *Int J Hydrog Energy* 36:13518–13527
- Agapakis C, Ducat D, Boyle P, Wintermute E, Way J, Silver P (2010) Insulation of a synthetic hydrogen metabolism circuit in bacteria. *J Biol Eng* 4:3
- Akhtar M, Jones P (2008a) Deletion of *iscR* stimulates recombinant clostridial Fe–Fe hydrogenase activity and H₂-accumulation in *Escherichia coli* BL21(DE3). *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 78:853–862
- Akhtar MK, Jones PR (2008b) Engineering of a synthetic *hydF-hydE-hydG-hydA* operon for biohydrogen production. *Anal Biochem* 373:170–172
- Akhtar MK, Jones PR (2009) Construction of a synthetic YdbK-dependent pyruvate: H₂ pathway in *Escherichia coli* BL21(DE3). *Metab Eng* 11:139–147
- Bisaillon A, Turcot J, Hallenbeck PC (2006) The effect of nutrient limitation on hydrogen production by batch cultures of *Escherichia coli*. *Int J Hydrog Energy* 31:1504–1508
- Blackwood AC, Ledingham GA, Neish AC (1956) Dissimilation of glucose at controlled pH values by pigmented and non-pigmented strains of *Escherichia coli*. *J Bacteriol* 72:497–499
- Chittibabu G, Nath K, Das D (2006) Feasibility studies on the fermentative hydrogen production by recombinant *Escherichia coli* BL-21. *Process Biochem* 41:682–688
- Clark DP (1989) The fermentation pathways of *Escherichia coli*. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 63:223–234
- Constantinidou C, Hobman JL, Griffiths L, Patel MD, Penn CW, Cole JA, Overton TW (2006) A Reassessment of the fnr regulon and transcriptomic analysis of the effects of nitrate, nitrite, NarXL, and NarQP as *Escherichia coli* K12 adapts from aerobic to anaerobic growth. *J Biol Chem* 281:4802–4815
- Davila-Vazquez G, Arriaga S, Alatraste-Mondragón F, de León-Rodríguez A, Rosales-Colunga LM, Razo-Flores E (2008) Fermentative biohydrogen production: trends and perspectives. *Rev Environ Sci Biotechnol* 7:27–45
- Fan Z, Yuan L, Chatterjee R (2009) Increased hydrogen production by genetic engineering of *Escherichia coli*. *PLoS One* 4:e4432
- Fonseca A, Sá V, Bento H, Tavares MLC, Pinto G, Gomes LACN (2008) Hydrogen distribution network optimization: a refinery case study. *J Clean Prod* 16:1755–1763
- Froese DS, Dobson CM, White AP, Wu X, Padovani D, Banerjee R, Haller T, Gerlt JA, Surette MG, Gravel RA (2009) Sleeping beauty mutase (*sbm*) is expressed and interacts with *ygfd* in *Escherichia coli*. *Microbiol Res* 164:1–8
- Ghosh D, Hallenbeck PC (2009a) Fermentative hydrogen yields from different sugars by batch cultures of metabolically engineered *Escherichia coli* DJT135. *Int J Hydrog Energy* 34:7979–7982
- Ghosh D, Hallenbeck PC (2009b) Response surface methodology for process parameter optimization of hydrogen yield by the metabolically engineered strain *Escherichia coli* DJT135. *Bioresour Technol* 101:1820–1825
- Hallenbeck PC (2005) Fundamentals of the fermentative production of hydrogen. *Water Sci Technol* 52:21–29
- Hallenbeck PC, Ghosh D (2009) Advances in fermentative biohydrogen production: the way forward? *Trends Biotechnol* 27:287–297
- Haller T, Buckel T, Retey J, Gerlt JA (2000) Discovering new enzymes and metabolic pathways: conversion of succinate to propionate by *Escherichia coli*. *Biochemistry* 39:4622–4629
- Hu H, Wood TK (2010) An evolved *Escherichia coli* strain for producing hydrogen and ethanol from glycerol. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun* 391:1033–1038
- Ishikawa M, Yamamura S, Takamura Y, Sode K, Tamiya E, Tomiyama M (2006) Development of a compact high-density microbial hydrogen reactor for portable bio-fuel cell system. *Int J Hydrog Energy* 31:1484–1489
- Ishikawa M, Yamamura S, Ikeda R, Takamura Y, Sode K, Tamiya E, Tomiyama M (2008) Development of a compact stacked flatbed reactor with immobilized high-density bacteria for hydrogen production. *Int J Hydrog Energy* 33:1593–1597
- Jian J, Zhang S-Q, Shi Z-Y, Wang W, Chen G-Q, Wu Q (2010) Production of polyhydroxyalkanoates by *Escherichia coli* mutants with defected mixed acid fermentation pathways. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 87:2247–2256
- Kapdan IK, Kargi F (2006) Bio-hydrogen production from waste materials. *Enzyme Microb Technol* 38:569–582
- Karube I, Urano N, Yamada T, Hirochika H, Sakaguchi K (1983) Cloning and expression of the hydrogenase gene from *Clostridium butyricum* in *Escherichia coli*. *FEBS Lett* 158:119–122
- Kim S, Seol E, Oh Y-K, Wang GY, Park S (2009) Hydrogen production and metabolic flux analysis of metabolically engineered *Escherichia coli* strains. *Int J Hydrog Energy* 34:7417–7427
- Kim J, Jo B, Cha H (2010) Production of biohydrogen by recombinant expression of [NiFe]-hydrogenase 1 in *Escherichia coli*. *Microb Cell Fact* 9:54
- Kim YM, Cho H-S, Jung GY, Park JM (2011) Engineering the pentose phosphate pathway to improve hydrogen yield in recombinant *Escherichia coli*. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 108:2941–2946
- King PW, Posewitz MC, Ghirardi ML, Seibert M (2006) Functional studies of [FeFe] hydrogenase maturation in an *Escherichia coli* biosynthetic system. *J Bacteriol* 188:2163–2172
- Kuchenreuther JM, Grady-Smith CS, Bingham AS, George SJ, Cramer SP, Swartz JR (2010) High-yield expression of heterologous [FeFe] hydrogenases in *Escherichia coli*. *PLoS One* 5:e15491
- Leonhartsberger S, Korsia I, Bock A (2002) The molecular biology of formate metabolism in enterobacteria. *J Mol Microbiol Biotechnol* 4:269–276
- Lugg H, Sammons R, Marquis P, Hewitt C, Yong P, Paterson-Beedle M, Redwood M, Stamboulis A, Kashani M, Jenkins M, Macaskie L (2008) Polyhydroxybutyrate accumulation by a *Serratia* sp. *Biotechnol Lett* 30:481–491
- Luque R, Herrero-Davila L, Campelo JM, Clark JH, Hidalgo JM, Luna D, Marinas JM, Romero AA (2008) Biofuels: a technological perspective. *Energy Environ Sci* 1:542–564

- Maeda T, Sanchez-Torres V, Wood T (2007a) Enhanced hydrogen production from glucose by metabolically engineered *Escherichia coli*. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 77:879–890
- Maeda T, Vardar G, Self W, Wood T (2007b) Inhibition of hydrogen uptake in *Escherichia coli* by expressing the hydrogenase from the cyanobacterium *Synechocystis* sp. PCC 6803. *BMC Biotechnol* 7:25
- Maeda T, Sanchez-Torres V, Wood TK (2008) Metabolic engineering to enhance bacterial hydrogen production. *Microb Biotechnol* 1:30–39
- Mathews J, Wang GY (2009) Metabolic pathway engineering for enhanced biohydrogen production. *Int J Hydrog Energy* 34:7404–7416
- Mathews J, Li Q, Wang G (2010) Characterization of hydrogen production by engineered *Escherichia coli* strains using rich defined media. *Biotechnol Bioprocess Eng* 15:686–695
- Mishra J, Khurana S, Kumar N, Ghosh AK, Das D (2004) Molecular cloning, characterization, and overexpression of a novel [Fe]-hydrogenase from a high rate of hydrogen producing *Enterobacter cloacae* IIT-BT 08. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun* 324:679–685
- Morsy FM (2011) Hydrogen production from acid hydrolyzed molasses by the hydrogen overproducing *Escherichia coli* strain HD701 and subsequent use of the waste bacterial biomass for biosorption of Cd(II) and Zn(II). *Int J Hydrog Energy* 36:14381–14390
- Nurul Islam M, Rafiqul Alam Beg M, Rofiqul Islam M (2005) Pyrolytic oil from fixed bed pyrolysis of municipal solid waste and its characterization. *Renew Energy* 30:413–420
- Orozco RL, Redwood MD, Leeke GA, Bahari A, Santos RCD, Macaskie LE (2012) Hydrothermal hydrolysis of starch with CO₂ and detoxification of the hydrolysates with activated carbon for bio-hydrogen fermentation. *Int J Hydrog Energy* 37:6545–6553
- Overton TW, Griffiths L, Patel MD, Hobman JL, Penn CW, Cole JA, Constantinidou C (2006) Microarray analysis of gene regulation by oxygen, nitrate, nitrite, FNR, NarL and NarP during anaerobic growth of *Escherichia coli*: new insights into microbial physiology. *Biochem Soc Trans* 34:104–107
- Penfold DW, Macaskie LE (2004) Production of H₂ from sucrose by *Escherichia coli* strains carrying the pUR400 plasmid, which encodes invertase activity. *Biotechnol Lett* 26:1879–1883
- Penfold DW, Forster CF, Macaskie LE (2003) Increased hydrogen production by *Escherichia coli* strain HD701 in comparison with the wild-type parent strain MC4100. *Enzyme Microb Technol* 33:185–189
- Penfold DW, Sargent F, Macaskie LE (2006) Inactivation of the *Escherichia coli* K-12 twin-arginine translocation system promotes increased hydrogen production. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 262:135–137
- Perego P, Fabiano B, Ponzano GP, Palazzi E (1998) Experimental study of hydrogen kinetics from agroindustrial by-product: optimal conditions for production and fuel cell feeding. *Bioprocess Eng* 19:205–211
- Perrenoud A, Sauer U (2005) Impact of global transcriptional regulation by ArcA, ArcB, Cra, Crp, Cya, Fnr, and Mlc on glucose catabolism in *Escherichia coli*. *J Bacteriol* 187:3171–3179
- Ramachandran R, Menon RK (1998) An overview of industrial uses of hydrogen. *Int J Hydrog Energy* 23:593–598
- Redwood MD, Macaskie LE (2006) A two-stage, two-organism process for biohydrogen from glucose. *Int J Hydrog Energy* 31:1514–1521
- Redwood MD, Mikheenko IP, Sargent F, Macaskie LE (2008) Dissecting the roles of *Escherichia coli* hydrogenases in biohydrogen production. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* 278:48–55
- Redwood M, Paterson-Beedle M, Macaskie L (2009) Integrating dark and light bio-hydrogen production strategies: towards the hydrogen economy. *Rev Environ Sci Biotechnol* 8:149–185
- Redwood MD, Orozco RL, Majewski AJ, Macaskie LE (2012) Electro-extractive fermentation for efficient biohydrogen production. *Bioresour Technol* 107:166–174
- Rosales-Colunga LM, González García R, De León Rodríguez A (2010a) Estimation of hydrogen production in genetically modified *E. coli* fermentations using an artificial neural network. *Int J Hydrog Energy* 35:13186–13192
- Rosales-Colunga LM, Razo-Flores E, Ordoñez LG, Alatrísté-Mondragón F, De León-Rodríguez A (2010b) Hydrogen production by *Escherichia coli DhycA ΔlacI* using cheese whey as substrate. *Int J Hydrog Energy* 35:491–499
- Rosales-Colunga LM, Razo-Flores E, Rodríguez ADL (2012) Fermentation of lactose and its constituent sugars by *Escherichia coli* WDHL: impact on hydrogen production. *Bioresour Technol* 111:180–184
- Salih FM (1989) Improvement of hydrogen photoproduction from *E. coli* pre-treated cheese whey. *Int J Hydrog Energy* 14:661–663
- Salmon K, S-p Hung, Mekjian K, Baldi P, Hatfield GW, Gunsalus RP (2003) Global gene expression profiling in *Escherichia coli* K12. *J Biol Chem* 278:29837–29855
- Sawyer RG (2005) Formate and its role in hydrogen production in *Escherichia coli*. *Biochem Soc Trans* 33:42–46
- Seol E, Manimaran A, Jang Y, Kim S, Oh Y-K, Park S (2011) Sustained hydrogen production from formate using immobilized recombinant *Escherichia coli* SH5. *Int J Hydrog Energy* 36:8681–8686
- Seppälä JJ, Puhakka JA, Yli-Harja O, Karp MT, Santala V (2011) Fermentative hydrogen production by *Clostridium butyricum* and *Escherichia coli* in pure and cocultures. *Int J Hydrogen Energy* 36:10701–10708
- Sinha P, Pandey A (2011) An evaluative report and challenges for fermentative biohydrogen production. *Int J Hydrog Energy* 36:7460–7478
- Sun J, Hopkins RC, Jenney FE Jr, McTernan PM, Adams MWW (2010) Heterologous expression and maturation of an NADP-dependent [NiFe]-hydrogenase: a key enzyme in biofuel production. *PLoS One* 5:e10526
- Trchounian K, Sanchez-Torres V, Wood TK, Trchounian A (2011) *Escherichia coli* hydrogenase activity and H₂ production under glycerol fermentation at a low pH. *Int J Hydrog Energy* 36:4323–4331
- Trchounian K, Poladyan A, Vassilian A, Trchounian A (2012) Multiple and reversible hydrogenases for hydrogen production by *Escherichia coli*: dependence on fermentation substrate, pH and the F0F1-ATPase. *Crit Rev Biochem Mol Biol* 47:236–249
- Turcot J, Bisaillon A, Hallenbeck PC (2008) Hydrogen production by continuous cultures of *Escherichia coli* under different nutrient regimes. *Int J Hydrog Energy* 33:1465–1470

- Waks Z, Silver PA (2009) Engineering a synthetic dual-organism system for hydrogen production. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 75:1867–1875
- Wells MA, Mercer J, Mott RA, Pereira-Medrano AG, Burja AM, Radianingtyas H, Wright PC (2011) Engineering a non-native hydrogen production pathway into *Escherichia coli* via a cyanobacterial [NiFe] hydrogenase. *Metab Eng* 13:445–453
- Weyman PD, Vargas WA, Chuang RY, Chang Y, Smith HO, Xu Q (2011) Heterologous expression of *Alteromonas macleodii* and *Thiocapsa roseopersicina* [NiFe] hydrogenases in *Escherichia coli*. *Microbiology* 157:1363–1374
- Yazdani SS, Gonzalez R (2008) Engineering *Escherichia coli* for the efficient conversion of glycerol to ethanol and co-products. *Metab Eng* 10:340–351
- Yoshida A, Nishimura T, Kawaguchi H, Inui M, Yukawa H (2005) Enhanced hydrogen production from formic acid by formate hydrogen lyase-overexpressing *Escherichia coli* strains. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 71:6762–6768
- Yoshida A, Nishimura T, Kawaguchi H, Inui M, Yukawa H (2006) Enhanced hydrogen production from glucose using *ldh-* and *frd-*inactivated *Escherichia coli* strains. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 73:67–72
- Zhang H, Boghigian BA, Pfeifer BA (2010) Investigating the role of native propionyl-CoA and methylmalonyl-CoA metabolism on heterologous polyketide production in *Escherichia coli*. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 105:567–573