

# Widely used catalysts in biodiesel production: A review

*Bishwajit Changmai,<sup>1</sup> Chhangte Vanlalveni,<sup>2</sup> Avinash Prabhakar Ingle,<sup>3</sup> Rahul Bhagat,<sup>4</sup> Lalthazuala Rokhum<sup>1,5\*</sup>*

<sup>1</sup>Department of Chemistry, National Institute of Technology Silchar, Silchar, 788010

<sup>2</sup>Department of Botany, Mizoram University, Tanhril, Aizawl, Mizoram, 796001, India

<sup>3</sup>Department of Biotechnology, Engineering School of Lorena, University of Sao Paulo, Lorena, SP, Brazil

<sup>4</sup>Department of Biotechnology, Government Institute of Science, Aurangabad, Maharashtra, India

<sup>5</sup>Department of Chemistry, University of Cambridge, Lensfield Road, Cambridge CB2 1EW, UK.

\*Email: rokhum@che.nits.ac.in and/or lalthazualarokhum@gmail.com

## Contents

1. Introduction

2. (Trans)esterification

3. Biodiesel

4. Feedstock for biodiesel production

4.1.1 Edible plant oil

4.1.2 Non-edible plant oil

4.1.3 Waste cooking oil

4.1.4 Animal fats

4.1.5 Algae oil

5. Characterization of catalysts and biodiesel

6. Homogeneous catalyst

6.1. Base catalyst

6.2. Acid catalyst

7. Heterogeneous catalyst

7.1. Base catalyst

7.1.1. Alkaline earth metal oxides

7.1.2. Transition metal oxide

7.1.3. Zeolite

7.1.4. Supported catalysts

34	7.1.5. Hydrotalcite
35	7.1.6. Mixed metal oxides
36	7.1.7. Bio-waste based catalyst
37	7.1.7.1. Waste shells
38	7.1.7.1.1. Eggshell
39	7.1.7.1.2. Mollusk shell and other seashells
40	7.1.7.2. Ashes of biomass
41	7.2. Acid catalysts
42	7.2.1. Sulfated catalyst
43	7.2.2. Ion-exchange resin
44	7.2.3. Mixed metal oxides
45	7.2.4. Sulfonated carbon-based catalyst
46	7.3. Enzyme catalyst
47	7.4. Bifunctional solid catalyst
48	8. Biodiesel production processes
49	9. Catalyst comparison
50	10. Conclusions and outlook

Acknowledgement

References

## Abstract

An ever-increasing energy demand and environmental problems associated with exhaustible fossil fuels have led to the search for an alternative renewable source of energy. In this context, biodiesel has attracted attention worldwide as an alternative to fossil fuel for being renewable, non-toxic, biodegradable, carbon-neutral; hence eco-friendly. Despite homogeneous catalyst has its own merits, currently, much attention has been paid to chemically synthesize heterogeneous catalysts for biodiesel production as it can be tuned as per specific requirement, easily recovered, thus enhance reusability. Recently, biomass-derived heterogeneous catalysts have risen to the forefront of biodiesel productions because of their sustainable, economical and eco-friendly nature. Further, nano and bifunctional catalysts have emerged as a powerful catalyst largely due to their high surface area and potential to convert free fatty acids and triglycerides to biodiesel, respectively. This review highlighted the latest synthesis routes of various types of catalysts including acidic, basic, bifunctional and nanocatalysts derived from different chemicals as well as biomass. In addition, the impacts of


different methods of preparation of catalysts on the yield of biodiesel are also discussed in details.

## Highlights

- Biodiesel has attracted immense attention as a potential substitute for fossil fuels.
- Esterification and transesterification reactions to produce biodiesel are discussed.
- Effects of various reaction parameters in biodiesel production processes are highlighted.
- Review on the different characterization techniques employed in biodiesel production processes.
- Acid, basic and bifunctional catalysts employed in biodiesel productions are highlighted.
- Different sources, methods of preparation and activities of catalysts are reviewed.

**Keywords:** Biodiesel, Homogeneous catalyst, Heterogeneous catalyst, Characterization, Fatty acid methyl esters, Renewable energy


## Graphical abstract:



## 1. Introduction

The exponential growth of the world's population coupled with the high standard of living has resulted in a steep increase in energy consumption.<sup>1, 2</sup> The world's total primary energy consumed (TPEC), which is over 150,000,000 GW h in the year 2015, is estimated to rise by a triggering 57 % in 2050<sup>3</sup>. Currently, the transportation of goods and services, which is the major contributor to the global economy, primarily rely on non-renewable fossil fuels. In total primary energy consumption, 80 % of the energy consumed is associated with petroleum resources. Amongst these, 54 % is consumed in the transportation sector<sup>4</sup>. It has been predicted that energy consumption in the transportation section will increase with an average rate of 1.1 % per year. As a result, the high energy consumption of non-renewable petroleum-based fuel to fulfil increasing energy demand of human society has led to an ecological imbalance, excess greenhouse gas emission, acid rain, global warming and drastic decline in fossil fuel reserves. These negative factors associated with excessive consumption and exhaustible nature of fossil fuels compel scientific communities to look out for an alternative energy source.<sup>5, 6</sup>


Biofuels are an excellent source of energy and widely seen as a potential substitute for fossil fuels. They are prepared from renewable sources such as plants, municipal wastes, agricultural crops, agricultural and forestry by-product.<sup>7</sup> Over the last few decades, biofuel such as biodiesel has gained significant attention as an alternative fuel in the research field because of its sustainable and environment-friendly nature. Biodiesel has exhibited properties similar to conventional fossil fuels (petro-diesel) and has some properties better than petro-diesel such as high combustion efficiency, high flash point, high cetane number, lower CO<sub>2</sub> emission, lower sulfur content and better lubrication.<sup>8,9</sup> The high flash point of biodiesel (423 K), as compared to petrodiesel (337 K), makes it non-flammable and non-explosive resulting in easy and safe handling, storage, and transportation. Additionally, it can be directly used in the automotive engine without any additional alteration.<sup>10</sup> It is estimated that biodiesel demand will increase to double or triple by the year 2020.<sup>11</sup> In the light of this, in the last decades, much attention has been paid to research on biodiesel production with an intension make it more sustainable and economical. An increasing interest in biodiesel is validated by the number of research paper publications in this area as shown in Figure 1. Statistical data analysis in Figure 1 depicted the increasing trend of published research papers in the field of biodiesel. These data were collected in February 2020 from "SciFinder Database" using the keyword "biodiesel". From a meagre 157 publications in the year 1993, it has exponentially increased to 3725 publications during its peak in 2014.




**Figure 1:** Publications per year for biodiesel during the period 1993 to Feb 2020 (Data collected from SciFinder Database)

## 2. (Trans)esterification

Transesterification or alcoholysis is a process to produce biodiesel in which edible/non-edible oils or triglyceride (TG) and alcohol have undergone nucleophilic reaction to form fatty acid methyl ester (FAME) and glycerol as a byproduct.<sup>12</sup> The transesterification reaction is illustrated in Scheme 1. Three sequential reversible reactions occurred in the transesterification process; i) conversion of triglyceride to diglyceride, ii) diglyceride conversion to monoglyceride, and finally, iii) monoglyceride conversion to glycerol. An ester is formed in each conversion steps, thus one TG molecule produced three molecules of ester. Transesterification reaction can efficiently convert triglyceride of vegetable oil into FAME, also called biodiesel, as depicted in Scheme 1. However, esterification reaction, a reaction between carboxylic acids and alcohols to afford esters.<sup>13–15</sup> is essential to convert all free fatty acids (FFA) of vegetable oil into biodiesel as shown in Scheme 2. These transesterification and esterification reactions are usually carried out in the two-pots procedure. Usually, the high FFA content of vegetable oil is first converted to esters (FAME) via esterification reaction by employing acid catalyst followed by transesterification reaction using a basic catalyst to convert triglycerides to FAME. However, (trans)esterification reactions (or simultaneous transesterification and esterification) in one-pot is highly desirable to convert both triglycerides and FFA of vegetable oil (with high FFAs) to FAME to reduce time and cost of biodiesel production. The different routes to synthesized biodiesel are outlined in Figure 2.



**Figure. 2:** Catalyst classification for biodiesel synthesis



**Scheme 1:** Base-catalyzed reaction mechanism for transesterification of TGs of vegetable oil to biodiesel.



**Scheme 2:** Acid-catalyzed esterification of FFA content of vegetable oil to biodiesel

### 3. Biodiesel

American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) described biodiesel as a mono-alkyl ester produced from edible/non-edible oils or animal fats.<sup>16</sup> Vegetable oils or animal fats comprise of mainly triacylglycerol (TAG) which is an ester of fatty acids (FA) and glycerol. The physicochemical properties of vegetable oils and animal fats are greatly influenced by the compositions of the TAG which further often dictates the quality of biodiesel produced from these resources. FA are classified broadly into two groups: i) saturated FA which has carbon-carbon single bond, and ii) unsaturated FA which comprises of at least one carbon-carbon double bond. The FA most widely found in vegetable oils are oleic acid (18:1), palmitic acid (16:0), linoleic acid (18:2), and linolenic acid (18:3), stearic acid (18:0), palmitoleic acid (16:1), myristic acid (14:0), arachidic acid (20:0). Besides these FA, a trace amount of phospholipids, tocopherols, carotenes, sulphur compounds, and water are also found in vegetable oils.<sup>17,18</sup>

### 4. Feedstocks for biodiesel production

The feedstocks for production of biodiesel are mainly edible<sup>18–20</sup> and non-edible vegetable oils,<sup>21–23</sup> waste cooking oils<sup>24,25</sup> and animal fats including tallow,<sup>25</sup> yellow grease,<sup>26</sup> lard,<sup>27</sup> chicken fat<sup>28–30</sup> and by-products from the production of Omega-3 fatty acids from fish oil.<sup>31,32</sup> Algae are another promising feedstocks for biodiesel which have a high potential to replace edible oil due to their availability in a pond, sewage water or in shallow ocean water without dislodging land used for food production.<sup>32–34</sup> In worldwide, 31 % biodiesel is produced from palm oil, 27 % from soybean oil and 20 % from rapeseed oil.<sup>35</sup> Different countries used various feedstock based on their local availability. The major feedstocks used in various countries are listed in Table 1. The feedstocks cost alone contributed 75 % of biodiesel cost.<sup>36</sup> Thus, proper selection of feedstocks for biodiesel is necessary to reduce the overall cost of biodiesel production. Ironically, utilization of edible oils (sunflower, rape, soy, etc.) as feedstocks for biodiesel, called the first-generation biofuels, resulted in food versus fuel

problem and also disturbed the agricultural farmland allocation.<sup>27,37</sup> In Malaysia, the edible palm oil price has increased by 70 % due to its uses as feedstock in biodiesel industry.<sup>38</sup> In this regard, to mitigate the problem associated with food versus fuel nexus and high cost of first-generation biodiesel, currently, non-edible oil are largely targeted as a biodiesel feedstock. Another problem associated with first-generation biofuels is their remarkably higher cost than fossil fuels. Hence, to bring the cost of biodiesel, utilization of non-edible oil as biodiesel feedstocks is highly relevant. Non-edible oil of more than 300 species are available in South Asia. India has abundant amount (approximately 1 million tons per year) of such non-edible oils. *Pongamia Pinnata* (Karanja) and *Jatropha curcas* oils (JCO) were identified as the most promising feedstocks by the Government of India. However, in India's biodiesel program, *Jatropha* has got prominence over *Karanja* due to its less gestation period. If properly managed, non-edible crops planted in different parts of the world has the potential to reduce our dependence on fossil fuel for energy sources and edible oil as biodiesel feedstocks.

Biodiesel has been widely used biofuels in the European Union (EU) and 49 % of biodiesel were produced from rapeseed oil in 2015 in EU.<sup>39</sup> With the increasing uses of waste cooking oil (WCO), recycled vegetable oils and palm oils, the share of rapeseed oil in biodiesel production decreased from 72 % in 2008. To reduce our dependency on edible oil and reduce the price of biodiesel, EU has raised the share of WCO to 2<sup>nd</sup> position after rapeseed oil in 2015.<sup>40</sup> The top five biodiesel producer in EU are Germany, France, Spain, Netherlands, and Poland. Germany is the largest biodiesel producer in EU and its production capacity increased from 3.2 billion litres in 2010 to 3.8 billion litres in 2014.<sup>41</sup>

**Table 1: Countrywise feedstocks used for biodiesel production.**

Country	Feedstock
India	<i>Jatropha/ Pongamia Pinnata</i> (Karanja) / Soybean/ Rapeseed/ Sunflower
Argentina	Soybeans
Brazil	Soybeans/ Palm oil/ Castor/ Cotton oil
France	Rapeseed/ Sunflower
Peru	Palm/ <i>Jatropha</i>
Germany	Rapeseed
Spain	Linseed oil/ Sunflower
Italy	Rapeseed/ Sunflower



Turkey	Sunflower/ Rapeseed
Greece	Cottonseed
Sweden	Rapeseed
Norway	Animal fats
China	Jatropha/ Waste cooking oil/ Rapeseed oil
Indonesia	Palm oil/ Jatropha/ Coconut
Japan	Waste cooking oil
Malaysia	Palm oil
Philippines	Coconut/ Jatropha oil
Bangladesh	Rubber seed/ <i>Pongamia Pinnata</i> oil
Pakistan	Jatropha oil
Thailand	Palm/ Jatropha/ Coconut oil
Iran	Palm/ Jatropha/ Castor/ Algae oil
Singapore	Palm oil
Ghana	Palm oil
Zimbabwe	Jatropha oil
Kenya	Castor oil
Mali	Jatropha oil
UK	Rapeseed/waste cooking oil
Ireland	Frying oil/ Animal fat
Canada	Rapeseed/ Animal fat/ Soybean oil
Mexico	Animal fat/ Waste Oil
USA	Soybeans/ Waste oil/ Peanut
Cuba	Jatropha curcas/ Moringa/ Neem oil
Australia	Jatropha/ Pongamia/ Waste cooking oil/ Animal tallow
New Zealand	Waste cooking oil/ Tallow

---

Wide types of feedstocks such as edible plant oils, non-edible oils, waste cooking oils, animal fats, and algal oil have been considered for the synthesis of biodiesel, and are discussed below:

#### **4. 1 Edible plant oils**

Soybean oil,<sup>42</sup> sunflower oil,<sup>43</sup> rapeseed oil,<sup>44</sup> and palm oil<sup>45</sup> are widely utilized as a biodiesel feedstock in numerous nations, for example, Argentina, Brazil, Indonesia, Europe, US, Malaysia etc. At present, an estimated 95 % of the worlds' total biodiesel is produced from sunflower oil, rapeseed oil, and palm oil.<sup>46</sup> Various types of edible oils exploited as feedstocks for the production of biodiesel are recorded in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Different forms of edible oils utilized to produce biodiesel.

No.	Edible oil for biodiesel production	Plant source	The botanical name of the plant source
1	Sunflower oil	Sunflower	<i>Helianthus annuus</i>
2	Rapeseed oil	Rape	<i>Brassica napus</i>
3	Soybean oil	Soybean	<i>Glycine max</i>
4	Palm oil	Mesocarp of oil palm	<i>Elaeis guineensis</i>
5	Coconut oil	Coconut	<i>Cocos nucifera</i>

## 4. 2 Non-edible plant oils

Recently, non-edible plant oils have been increasingly considered as another promising potential feedstock for biodiesel attributable to their high oil content and low cost. In addition, unlike edible oils, it does not pose 'food versus fuel' problem as they can be grown in barren and arid regions which are not suitable for agriculture. Further, non-edible oil plants can grow under harsh conditions and hardly need any attention; thus, reducing the cost involved in cultivation and potentially reduced the cost of biodiesel.<sup>47,48</sup> Some of the commonly investigated non-edible plant oils for biodiesel production include *Jatropha curcas*, *Pongamia glabra* (Karanja), *Madhuca indica* (Mahua), *Azadirachta indica* (neem), *Moringa oleifera* (moringa seed), *Calophyllum inophyllum*, *Salvadora oleoides* (Pilu), *Nicotiana tabacum* (tobacco), cottonseed oil, Eruca Sativa Gars, terebinth, rubber seed oil, desert date, *Acrocomia aculeate* (macaúba), *Crambe abyssinica* (hochst), linseed oil, rubber seed oil, *Sapium sebiferum* (chinese tallow), *Sapindus mukorossi* (soapnut), *Euphorbia tirucalli* (milk bush), *Calophyllum inophyllum* (polangafish oil, Jojoba, leather pre-fleshings, apricot seed, *Pistacia chinensis* Bunge Seed, sal oil, *Moringa oleifera* and croton megalo-carpus. Amongst all these oil plants, *Jatropha curcas*, *Pongamia glabra* (karanja), *Madhuca indica* (Mahua), *Azadirachta indica* (neem) are commercially available and most largely used in biodiesel production.<sup>49</sup>

### **4. 3 Waste cooking oil**

Biodiesel production from WCO can partially substitute fossil fuels as well as can solve the energy crisis and environmental pollution. Moreover, WCO is cheaper than fresh vegetable oils, consequently, lessen the expense incurred for biodiesel synthesis. WCO can be grouped into two classifications based on their FFA content if the FFA content is >15 %, then it is called brown grease, otherwise, it is named 'yellow grease'. Annually billion tons of WCO is generated throughout the world. In EU, it is estimated that around 0.7-1 MT WCO were collected per year. Among 80,000 tons of WCO, around 65,000 tons were collected from UK only, basically originating from commercial restaurants and food processing industries. Therefore, disposal of WCO is a major concern which otherwise contaminates water and environment at large. Although some portions of WCO oil were used in the production of soap, major parts of WCO were usually dumped into the river and landfills. In the light of this, the production of biodiesel from WCO not only reduced the cost of biodiesel but also resolved the disposal problem of WCO and minimized environmental pollution.

### **4. 4 Animal fats**

Animal fats are another feedstock for biodiesel production that have the potential to reduce the cost of biodiesel. This type of feedstock includes lard, tallow and chicken fat. However, due to the presence of a high quantity of saturated fatty acids, it has some shortcomings both in chemical and physical properties such as poor cloud point, poor pour point and so forth. At the same time, its high saturation level has various advantages such as high cetane number, high oxidation stability etc. Moreover, animal fats are more favourable biodiesel feedstocks as compared to vegetable oils due to their low price.

### **4. 5 Algal oil**

Currently, microalgae are viewed as one of the most promising feedstocks for the industrial-scale synthesis of biodiesel. Biodiesel production from algal oil is highly sustainable as several strains of microalgae can double in size within hours; thereby have the capacity to create a large number of litres of biodiesel per hectare every year.<sup>50</sup> Additionally, as several microalgal strains can be grown on non-arable land in a saline water medium, their mass cultivating doesn't compete with food production.

## 5. Characterization of catalysts and biodiesel

Several analytical techniques are employed to characterize both catalysts and FAME produced. Each analytical techniques will be discussed in the upcoming sections as and when relevant. As a preliminary study, Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (FT-IR) is usually employed to detect the presence of various functional groups in the catalyst, while X-ray diffraction (XRD) can be employed to investigate the crystallinity and qualitative detection of elements present in the catalyst. The surface morphology, particle size and the structure of the catalysts can be investigated using Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and Transmission electron microscopy (TEM). The chemical compositions are investigated using Energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDX). X-ray fluorescence (XRF) is commonly used for quantitative detection of metal oxides and X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) analyses are routinely performed for the quantitative measurement of the elements present in the catalyst and also provide the chemical state information of the catalyst. Surface area, pore volume and pore diameter are usually measured by Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) analysis, whereas the thermal stability of the catalysts is analyzed using thermogravimetric analysis (TGA). The acidity, as well as basicity of the catalysts, are usually investigated using  $\text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{CO}_2$  temperature-programmed desorption (TPD) analyses. In addition, basicity and acidity of the catalyst can be visualized by Hammett indicators tests and acid-base titration methods. Valuable information about the degree of carbonization and/or aromatization of carbonaceous material used as a catalyst can be obtained using solid-state magic-angle spin-nuclear magnetic resonance (MAS NMR). Likewise, the successful conversion of biodiesel feedstocks to FAME is confirmed using different analytical techniques. Usually, NMR analysis is used as a confirmation tool to identify the formation of FAME. Despite not common, FT-IR analysis can also be used to identify the FAME formation. The chemical components of FAME along with their respective percentage are usually identified using gas chromatography-mass spectroscopy (GC-MS) technique. In addition,  $^1\text{H}$  NMR spectra can be used to give concrete information about the purity of FAME and percentage conversion of vegetable oil to FAME using Knothe and Kenar equation (1).

$$\% \text{ Conversion} = 100 \times \frac{2A_{Me}}{3A_{CH_2}} \quad (1)$$

Here,  $A_{Me}$  and  $A_{CH_2}$  are the integration values of methoxy protons and methylene protons of FAME respectively.

## 6. Homogeneous catalyst:

The homogeneous catalysts utilized for the transesterification reaction are classified into two groups such as i) base catalysts, for example, NaOH and KOH and ii) acid catalysts such as sulphuric, sulphonic, hydrofluoric, and hydrochloric acids.

### 6. 1 Base catalyst:

Homogeneous base catalysts are most widely investigated in the transesterification of vegetable oil to FAME as they are cheap and easily accessible. Till date, several homogenous base catalysts have been utilized for the synthesis of FAME e.g., KOH, NaOH, NaOCH<sub>3</sub> etc. as shown in Table 3. The uses of NaOH and KOH as catalyst showed excellent catalytic activities towards biodiesel production such as minimum reaction time, high biodiesel yield and occurred at ambient temperature and pressure. However, this process has some certain limitations like water is formed as a byproduct, which reduces biodiesel yield. Other than KOH and NaOH, sodium methoxide and potassium methoxide gives better biodiesel performance as water is not formed in these processes. An alkaline catalyst is not suitable for transesterification of vegetable oils with high FFA content (>2 wt. %). However, it is fit for refined vegetable oils with low FFA content (ranging from less than 0.5 wt. % to less than 2 wt. %).

Dmytryshyn *et al.*<sup>51</sup> examined the transesterification of various vegetable oil such as canola oil, green seed canola oil from heat-harmed seeds, handled waste fryer oil and natural waste fryer oil with methanol to afford FAME using KOH catalyst, and reported a biodiesel yield of 51-87 % under the optimum reaction conditions. In another study, KOH was exploited to convert crude rubber oil and palm oil mixture to biodiesel in 98 % yield under the optimum reaction conditions. The vegetable oil was esterified using acid catalyst prior to a base-catalyzed transesterification process, to get low FFA content vegetable oil.<sup>52</sup> Similarly, KOH was utilized as a catalyst for the transformation of soybean oil to FAME in 96 % yield.<sup>53</sup> Roselle oil<sup>34</sup> rapeseed oil,<sup>54</sup> frying oil,<sup>55,56</sup> used olive oil,<sup>57</sup> palm kernel<sup>58</sup> and duck tallow<sup>59</sup> were also successfully transesterified to FAME using KOH catalyst. Karmee *et al.*<sup>60</sup> reported the transesterification of *Pongamia pinnata* to FAME in 92 % conversion using base catalyst KOH. Interestingly, the utilization of tetrahydrofuran (THF) as a co-solvent increased the conversion to 95 %.

Meng *et al.*<sup>23</sup> detailed an exceptionally high activity of NaOH towards biodiesel production from WCO with high FFA in 89.8 % conversion under the optimized reaction settings. The high FFA substance of WCO was reduced by a pre-esterification process with sulphuric acid. Similarly, waste cooking/frying oil,<sup>61,62</sup> canola oil,<sup>63</sup> sunflower oil,<sup>64</sup> palm oil<sup>65</sup>

and cotton seed oil<sup>66</sup> were converted to biodiesel using NaOH as a homogeneous catalyst. Furthermore, NaOCH<sub>3</sub><sup>67, 68</sup> was evaluated as a catalyst for transesterification of rice bran oil to FAME by Rashid *et al.*<sup>67</sup> where 83.3 % biodiesel yield was observed in 60 min under the optimum reaction conditions.

**Table 3:** Distinctive homogeneous base catalysts utilized for biodiesel production.

No.	Catalyst	Feedstock	<sup>a</sup> Conditions	Yield (%)	Ref.
1.	KOH	Vegetable oil	6:1, 1, 25, 40	51-87	51
2.	KOH	Crude rubber/palm oil	8:1, 2, 55, 300	98	52
3.	KOH	Soybean oil	6:1, 1, 60, 60	96	53
4.	KOH	Roselle oil	8:1, 1.5, 60, 60	99.4	36
5.	KOH	Rapeseed	6:1, 1, 65, 120	95-96	54
6.	KOH	Frying oil	12:1, 1, 60, 120	72.5	55
7.	KOH	Waste Frying oil	6:1, 1, 65, 60	96.15	56
8.	KOH	Used olive oil	12:1, 1.26, 25, 90	94	57
9.	KOH	Palm kernel	6:1, 1, 60, 60	96	58
10.	KOH	Duck tallow	6:1, 1, 65, 180	83.6	59
11.	KOH	<i>Pongamia pinnata</i>	10:1, 1, 60, 90	92 <sup>b</sup>	60
12.	NaOH	Waste cooking oil	6:1, 1, 50, 90	89.8 <sup>b</sup>	23
13.	NaOH	Waste frying oil	4.8:1, 0.6, 65, 60	98	61
14.	NaOH	Waste frying oil	7.5:1, 0.5, 50, 30	96	62
15.	NaOH	Canola oil	6:1, 1, 45, 15	98	63
16.	NaOH	Sunflower	6:1, 1, 60, 120	97.1	64
17.	NaOH	Refined palm oil	6:1, 1, 60, 30	95	65
18.	NaOH	Cotton seed oil	6:1, 1, 60, 60	97	66
19.	NaOCH <sub>3</sub>	Soybean oil	6:1, 0.6, 60, 60	97	53
20.	NaOCH <sub>3</sub>	Rice bran	7.5:1, 0.88, 55, 60	83.3	67
21.	NaOCH <sub>3</sub>	Waste cooking oil	6:1, 0.75, 65, 90	96.6	68

<sup>a</sup>Methanol-to-oil (M/O) molar ratio, catalyst loading (wt. %), temperature (°C), reaction time (min).

<sup>b</sup>Conversion

## 6. 2 Acid catalyst:

Base catalysts are usually preferred over acid catalysts as they are more reactive and low cost. However, base catalysts may react with FFA present in the feedstock during transesterification, bringing about soap formation by saponification, which may consume the catalyst and diminish its reactivity. Meanwhile, acidic catalyst is neutral to the FFA and henceforth shows better outcomes for transesterification or esterification of vegetable oils or fats having a high amount of FFA ( $\geq 2$  wt. %). Generally, acid catalysts are utilized to bring down the FFA content in WCO and animal fats by means of esterification prior to transesterification using base catalyst<sup>5</sup>. Several acids such as H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>, HCl, H<sub>3</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> and sulfonated acids were mostly utilized for the (trans)esterification of vegetable oils.<sup>36</sup> However, acid-catalyzed biodiesel production has some major limitations such as slow reaction rate (4000 times slower than the rate of base-catalyzed transesterification) and require high alcohol to oil molar ratio.<sup>69-71</sup> Moreover, it has environmental and corrosive related problems.<sup>69</sup> Because of these demerits, acid-catalyzed biodiesel synthesis is not very popular and is less examined. Some reported literature of acid-catalyzed biodiesel production and their results are listed in Table 4.

Wang *et al.*<sup>70</sup> examined the biodiesel synthesis from WCO and reported a 90 % yield.. Moreover, Miao *et al.*<sup>72</sup> examined the conversion of soybean oil to biodiesel using trifluoroacetic acid catalyst and reported 98.4 % biodiesel yield at optimal reaction conditions . Similarly, various edible/non-edible oils such as WCO,<sup>73</sup> soybean oil,<sup>71</sup> zanthoxylum bungeanum<sup>74</sup> and tobacco seed oil<sup>75</sup> were used for biodiesel production using sulfuric acid. Moreover, trifluoroacetic acid was utilized as a homogeneous acid catalyst for the esterification/transesterification of soybean oil to biodiesel.<sup>72</sup> The catalyst brought about a high biodiesel yield of 98.4 % under the optimum reaction conditions. From the above discussion, it was observed that an acid-catalyzed esterification/transesterification reactions usually require drastic reaction conditions such as high M/O molar ratio, catalyst loading, temperature and long reaction time as compared to base-catalyzed transesterification reactions.

**Table 4:** Different acidic homogeneous catalysts utilized for biodiesel synthesis.

No.	Catalyst	Feedstock	<sup>a</sup> Conditions	Yield (%)	Ref.
1.	H <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub>	Chicken/mutton tallow	30:1, 1.25/2.5, 50/60, 1440	99.01±0.71/ 93.21±5.07	25
2.	H <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub>	WCO	20:1, 4, 95, 600	90	70
3.	H <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub>	Used frying oil	3.6:1, 0.1, 65, 40	79.3	73

4.	H <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub>	Soybean oil	6:1, 3, 60, 2880	98	71
5.	H <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub>	<i>Zanthoxylum bungeanum</i>	24:1, 2, 60, 80	98	74
6.	H <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub>	Tobacco seed oil	18:1, 1, 60, 25	91	75
7.	C <sub>2</sub> HF <sub>3</sub> O <sub>2</sub>	Soybean oil	20:1, 2 M, 120,	98.4	72
300					

<sup>a</sup>Methanol-to-oil molar ratio, catalyst loading (wt. %), temperature (°C), reaction time (min).

## 7. Heterogeneous catalysts

Although homogeneous catalyst has its own advantages such as high reactivity and low cost, its utilization in the production of biodiesel is accompanied by several shortfalls such as low quality of glycerol produced, the catalyst cannot be regenerated and the lengthy process involves in the purification of biodiesel; thereby makes the whole process labour-intensive and uneconomical. Hence, in recent years, the heterogeneous catalyst has attracted immense attention for biodiesel production as it can be tailored to match specific requirement, easily recovered and reused for several cycles of catalytic reaction, thereby potentially bring down the labour involved and cost of biodiesel.

Unlike homogeneous catalysts, heterogeneous catalysts mostly appear in a solid form, thus the reaction mixture and the catalyst are in a different phase. In heterogeneous catalyzed reactions, the catalyst surface is the main site for reaction to occurs.<sup>76</sup> The following advantages of utilizing a solid catalyst in transesterification make the process green: i) Catalyst can be reused, ii) very minimal amount of wastewater generated during the process, iii) glycerol separation from the final mixture (glycerol, biodiesel and catalyst) is much easier, iv) high purity glycerol is obtained.

Heterogeneous catalysts have several advantages over a homogeneous catalyst such as simple separation, recyclability and reusability. Moreover, solid catalysts are eco-friendly, less toxic, minimum corrosion and reduced energy intake. Thus, solid catalysts provide an efficient and economical pathway for biodiesel production.<sup>12,77,78</sup> Heterogeneous or solid catalysts can be grouped into two categories: i) basic and ii) acidic heterogeneous catalysts. Nowadays, researchers have developed several heterogeneous catalysts, which can promote esterification and transesterification reactions simultaneously in one reaction vessel (one-pot). These type of catalysts are mostly utilized for biodiesel synthesis from the vegetable oils or animal fats having a high amount of FFA without the requirement of additional pretreatment step to reduce the FFA content.<sup>12</sup>



## 7.1 Base catalysts:

In recent years, basic heterogeneous catalysts have been most widely investigated as it can overcome the constraints associated with homogeneous basic catalysts and shows excellent catalytic activity under mild reaction conditions. However, these catalysts are suitable only for biodiesel feedstock with low FFA content, otherwise, catalysts will react with the FFA to produce soap by means of saponification reaction, which make separation of biodiesel from glycerol tedious, thereby diminished biodiesel yield. Several solid base catalysts reported in the literature such as alkaline metal oxide, transition metal oxides, mixed metal oxides, hydrotalcites, zeolites, biomass-based catalyst are discussed comprehensively in this section.


### 7.1.1 Alkaline earth metal oxides:

Oxides of alkaline earth metal are one of the most widely studied catalysts for biodiesel synthesis due to their insolubility in methanol and low toxicities. The basicity of alkaline earth metal oxides follows the order:  $\text{MgO} < \text{CaO} < \text{SrO} < \text{BaO}$ .  $\text{MgO}$  is almost inactive towards the transesterification reaction.<sup>79,80</sup> Among all alkaline earth metal oxides,  $\text{CaO}$  is most widely utilized in FAME production as it is highly basic, insoluble in alcohol, non-toxic, cheap and easily available.<sup>81</sup> However, it is very sensitive to FFA content and forms undesirable byproducts via saponification and also lost its activity in the process.<sup>82</sup> Despite its high activity,  $\text{SrO}$  is less studied in transesterification reactions as it is very sensitive to the atmospheric moisture and reacts with  $\text{CO}_2$  and water to form  $\text{SrCO}_3$  and  $\text{Sr(OH)}_2$ . Table 5 shows the activity of various alkaline metal oxide towards biodiesel production.

Kouzu *et al.*<sup>82</sup> examined the transesterification of soybean oil using  $\text{CaO}$  catalyst and reported a high biodiesel yield of 95 % under the optimized reaction conditions. Granados *et al.*<sup>83</sup> found that  $\text{CaO}$  calcined at 700 °C showed very high activity towards biodiesel production from sunflower oil and attained 94 % biodiesel yield. Furthermore, the transesterification of rapeseed oil was reported by Kawashima *et al.*<sup>84</sup> where  $\text{CaO}$  was pretreated with methanol to form  $\text{Ca(OCH}_3\text{)}$ , which acted as an initiator for the transesterification reaction. A high biodiesel yield of 90 % was observed using the optimized reaction conditions. In another work,  $\text{SrO}$  catalyzed transesterification of soybean oil has been reported by Liu *et al.*<sup>85</sup> The catalyst showed excellent activity with a high yield of 95 % at 70 °C and 30 min time. The catalyst is highly stable and can be reused for 10 successive cycles.

Ultrasonic-assisted biodiesel synthesis from palm oil was reported using diverse metal oxides such as  $\text{CaO}$ ,  $\text{BaO}$  and  $\text{SrO}$ .<sup>86</sup> The activity of the catalyst in ultrasonic-assisted biodiesel synthesis was compared with the traditional magnetic stirring process and found that ultrasonic

process showed 95.2 % of yield using BaO within 60 min reaction time, which otherwise take 3-4 h in conventional stirring process. Similarly, ultrasonic-assisted transesterification using CaO and SrO resulted in an increase in biodiesel yield from 5.5 % to 77.3 % and 48.2 % to 95.2 % respectively. These findings show the advantages of using ultrasonication in the field of chemical synthesis particularly in the field of biodiesel synthesis. The authors also investigated the influence of ultrasonic amplitude on the biodiesel synthesis from palm oil and observed that 50 % ultrasonic amplitude displayed the best result in terms of biodiesel yield. Catalyst reusability test revealed that the catalytic activity of BaO decreased drastically, especially in the ultrasonic process during the reusability test, which was mainly due to catalyst leaching. The reaction set-up is depicted in Figure 3.



**Figure 3:** Schematic portrayal of experimental set up for ultrasonic-assisted transesterification reaction. Reproduced from ref. [86].

**Table 5:** Different alkaline earth metal oxide catalyzed biodiesel production under various reaction conditions.

No.	Catalyst	Feedstock	<sup>a</sup> Conditions	Yield (%)	Ref.
1	CaO	Soybean oil	12:1, 8, 65, 180	95	82
2	CaO	Sunflower oil	13:1, 3, 60, 120	94	83
3	CaO	Rapeseed oil	3.8:1, 0.7, 60, 160	90	84
4	SrO	Soybean oil	6:1, 3, 70, 30	95	85
5	BaO	Palm oil	9:1, 3, 65, 60	95.2	86


<sup>a</sup>Methanol-to-oil molar ratio, catalyst loading (wt. %), temperature (°C), reaction time (min).

### 7.1.2 Transition metal oxides:

Despite the high reactivity of alkaline earth metal oxides, they have some serious drawbacks such as low reusability and high sensitivity towards moisture that reduced their catalytic efficacy. To overcome these inherent drawbacks, metal oxides of Zn, Ti, Zr and Zn are widely investigated in transesterification reactions as they are easily available, highly stable and showed excellent catalytic activities.<sup>87-89</sup> To date, numerous transition metal oxide-based catalysts have been reported in the field of biodiesel synthesis from vegetable oil as depicted in Table 6. da Silva *et al.*<sup>90</sup> reported Cu(II) and Co(II) impregnated on chitosan catalyst for FAME synthesis from soybean oil. The adsorption process for Cu(II) on chitosan is better than Co(II). However, Co(II)@chitosan showed higher biodiesel yield (94.01 %) as compared to Cu(II)@chitosan (88.82 %) using the optimal reaction conditions. In another work, Jitputti *et al.*<sup>87</sup> investigated ZrO<sub>2</sub>, ZnO, SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>/SnO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>/ZrO<sub>2</sub>, KNO<sub>3</sub>/KL zeolite and KNO<sub>3</sub>/ZrO<sub>2</sub> for the FAME synthesis from the crude palm kernel oil and crude coconut oil, and found that SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>/ZrO<sub>2</sub> catalyst displays the highest reactivity for both the oils with biodiesel yield of 90.30 % and 86.30 % respectively. The decreasing order of the catalyst activity towards biodiesel synthesis from crude kernel oil is SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>/ZrO<sub>2</sub> > SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>/SnO<sub>2</sub> > ZnO > KNO<sub>3</sub>/ZrO<sub>2</sub> > KNO<sub>3</sub>/KL zeolite > ZrO<sub>2</sub> and for the crude coconut oil is SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>/ZrO<sub>2</sub> > SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>/SnO<sub>2</sub> > ZnO > KNO<sub>3</sub>/KL zeolite > KNO<sub>3</sub>/ZrO<sub>2</sub> > ZrO<sub>2</sub>.

Meanwhile, Baskar *et al.*<sup>91</sup> used Mn-doped ZnO nanomaterial for the conversion of Mahua oil to biodiesel and observed that catalyst calcined at 600 °C showed highest biodiesel yield of 97 % under the optimum reaction conditions. The kinetic investigation of the reaction revealed that 181.91 kJ/mol activation energy is necessary for biodiesel synthesis from Mahua oil utilizing Mn-doped ZnO catalyst. The prepared Mn-doped ZnO catalyst was seen as a cluster and spherical in shape as depicted in Figure 4 A. FI-TR analysis was performed to confirm the formation of biodiesel. Absorption bands at 1744 and 1703 cm<sup>-1</sup> demonstrated CO stretching of methyl esters in Mahua oil and biodiesel respectively. The main spectrum region that allows for chemical discrimination between Mahua oil and produced biodiesel is in the range 1500-900 cm<sup>-1</sup> also called known as fingerprint region. Figure 4B revealed the symmetric and asymmetric stretching of alkyl regions at 1376, 1463, 2852, 2922 cm<sup>-1</sup> and CO group of lactones and esters at 1735 cm<sup>-1</sup>. Moreover, the stretching band of CO group of typical esters at around 1703 cm<sup>-1</sup> was observed in Figure 4C. In light of this FT-IR bands, the product obtained after transesterification of Mahua oil using Mn-doped ZnO catalyst was confirmed as biodiesel.

Na<sub>2</sub>MoO<sub>4</sub> has been synthesized and investigated as a catalyst in transesterification of soybean oil by Nakagaki *et al.*<sup>92</sup> The catalyst displayed high activity towards the transesterification reaction and afforded biodiesel yield of 95.6 %. The high reactivity of the catalyst is due to the acid sites of Mo(VI), which can polarize O-H bond easily. Correspondingly, Serio *et al.*<sup>93</sup> also reported the high reactivity of vanadyl phosphate-based catalyst in the biodiesel synthesis from soybean oil. Regardless of the low surface area, the high reactivity of the catalyst is attributed to the structural/surface morphologies. Biodiesel yield of ≥88 % was recorded using the optimal reaction conditions. The dehydrated product of the catalyst VOPO<sub>4</sub>.2H<sub>2</sub>O can be converted to VOPO<sub>4</sub> simply by calcination at 400-500 °C.



**Figure 4:** SEM image (A) and FT-IR spectrum (B, C) of Mn-doped ZnO nanomaterial. Reproduced from ref. [92].

504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510

**Table 6:** Various transition metal oxide catalyzed biodiesel production under different reaction conditions.

No.	Catalyst	Feedstocks	<sup>a</sup> Conditions	Yield (%)	Ref.
1	Cu(II)@chitosan	Soybean oil	1:5 <sup>c</sup> , 2, 70, 180	88.82	90
2	Co(II)@chitosan	Soybean oil	1:5 <sup>c</sup> , 2, 70, 180	94.01	90
3	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> /ZrO <sub>2</sub>	Crude palm kernel oil	6:1, 3, 200, 60	90.30	87
4	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> /ZrO <sub>2</sub>	Crude coconut oil	6:1, 3, 200, 60	86.30	87
5	Mn doped ZnO	Mahua oil	7:1, 8, 50, 50	97	91
6	Na <sub>2</sub> MoO <sub>4</sub>	Soybean oil	54:1, 3, 120, 180	95.6	92
7	Vanadyl phosphate	Soybean oil	0.88:2, 0.5, 180, 60	≥88	93

<sup>a</sup>Methanol-to-oil molar ratio, catalyst loading (wt. %), temperature (°C), reaction time (min).

<sup>c</sup>w/w


### 7.1.3 Zeolites

Zeolites are crystalline aluminosilicates that possess microporous structure.<sup>94</sup> It can exist in different structural morphology depending on their synthesis process and reaction conditions such as Si/Al molar ratio, pore sizes and proton exchange levels. The wide opportunity for structural modification of zeolites makes them an excellent catalyst for various acid-base reactions. Recently, zeolites are intensively investigated in the field of biodiesel production due to their shape selectivity and acidic character. Normally, zeolites are moderately active for the esterification reaction, however, by increasing the pore size and varying the Si/Al ratio, the catalytic properties can be improved. Moreover, zeolites can incorporate various metal ions such as Na<sup>+</sup>, K<sup>+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup> etc., which are mainly responsible for its basic nature.<sup>95</sup> Table 7 shows various reported zeolite catalysts employed in biodiesel synthesis.

In 2007, NaX zeolite loaded with various concentration of KOH was synthesized and reported as a catalyst in FAME production from soybean oil.<sup>96</sup> Catalyst loaded with 10 % KOH followed by heating at 393 K for 3 h gave the best result with 85.6 % yield under the optimized reaction conditions. Shu *et al.*<sup>97</sup> prepared La/zeolite beta using La(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub> as a precursor *via* ion exchange technique and exploited in FAME production from soybean oil. They reported that La/zeolite beta has higher stability and catalytic activity towards FAME production compared to zeolite beta catalyst. A yield of 48.9 % was obtained using La/zeolite beta under the

534 optimized reaction conditions such as 14.5:1 M/O molar ratio, 0.011 wt. % catalyst loading,  
535 60°C and 4 h time. In the year 2008, Ramos *et al.*<sup>98</sup> studied three zeolites such as mordenite,  
536 beta and X for the conversion of sunflower oil biodiesel. They examined the effect of different  
537 loaded/stacked metals on such zeolites. Zeolite X showed the best catalytic activity as it has a  
538 higher number of super basic sites which is absent in other zeolites. Effect of binder, sodium  
539 bentonite, on the catalytic reactivity of such zeolites was tested, where X zeolite was  
540 agglomerated and thus catalytic activity reduced slightly. A high yield of 93.5 % and 95.1 %  
541 of FAME was obtained at 60 °C with and without binder, respectively. In another report, Wu  
542 *et al.*<sup>99</sup> synthesized a series of CaO supported on zeolites such as NaY, KL and NaZSM-5 *via*  
543 microwave irradiation and utilized in biodiesel synthesis from soybean oil. They reported that  
544 supported CaO showed better result compared to the naked CaO as supported catalyst have a  
545 high surface area, porosity and basic strength. Accordingly, the best result was exhibited by  
546 NaY supported CaO (30 % CaO loaded on NaY) under the optimized reaction conditions.

547 Strontium nanocatalyst supported on ZSM-5 by incipient wetness impregnation method  
548 was prepared and applied in biodiesel synthesis from sunflower oil.<sup>100</sup> The authors reported the  
549 effect of calcination temperature and Sr/ZSM-5, Ba-Sr/ZSM-5 mass ratios. Ba-Sr/ZSM-5 (Ba  
550 4 wt. % to the Sr weight and Sr 6 wt. % to the ZSM-5 weight exhibited the best performance  
551 with 87.7 % yield under optimal conditions. In the meantime, Narkhede *et al.*<sup>101</sup> synthesized a  
552 series of 12-tungstosilicic acid, SiW<sub>12</sub> (10-40 wt. %) impregnated on zeolite H $\beta$  and applied it  
553 in biodiesel synthesis from soybean oil. Interestingly, SEM image of the 30 % SiW<sub>12</sub>/H $\beta$   
554 (Figure 5b) is similar with the pure zeolite H $\beta$  (Figure 5a) and revealed that framework  
555 structure of H $\beta$  was retained even after the impregnation of SiW<sub>12</sub> and suggested that SiW<sub>12</sub>  
556 was homogeneously distributed in the framework structure of H $\beta$  zeolite. They reported a 95  
557 % yield of FAME under the optimized reaction conditions.




**Figure 5:** SEM micrographs of (a) H $\beta$  and (b) 30 % SiW<sub>12</sub>/H $\beta$ . Reproduced from ref 101.

In 2012, Babajide *et al.*<sup>102</sup> synthesized a zeolite derived from fly ash and then ion-exchanged with K to form FA/K-X zeolite, which was then applied in biodiesel synthesis from sunflower oil. They reported a high yield of 83.53 % under the optimized reaction conditions. Similarly, Manique *et al.*<sup>103</sup> prepared zeolite (sodalite) derived from coal fly ash *via* the hydrothermal process and utilized in biodiesel synthesis from soybean oil. The developed sodalite has a definite surface area of 10 m<sup>2</sup>/g. They also reported a maximum conversion of 95.5 % soybean oil using the optimized reaction conditions. Recently, Al-Jammal *et al.*<sup>104</sup> prepared zeolite derived from zeolite tuft followed by impregnation of a series of KOH (1-6 M) and heated at 80 °C for 4 h to form KOH/zeolite catalyst and finally utilized in biodiesel synthesis from waste sunflower oil. The catalyst (1-4 M) KOH/zeolite exhibited a biodiesel yield of 96.7 % under the reaction conditions: 11.5:1 M/O molar ratio, catalyst amount of 6 wt. % w.r.t. oil, 50 °C temperature and reaction time of 2 h.

In the same vein, Du *et al.*<sup>105</sup> developed La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> impregnated on NaY zeolite catalyst having a spherical shape with 3-5 mm size and utilized it in biodiesel synthesis from castor oil. In addition, they explored the impact of calcination temperature in the range of 600-1000 °C on biodiesel yield and observed that the catalyst calcined at 800 °C showed the best result. They also revealed that the incorporation of surfactant improved the dispersion of La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> and pore size of zeolite. The XRD pattern of the pure zeolite NaY and the catalyst La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>/NaY zeolite calcined in the temperature range of 600-1000 °C is displayed in Figure 6. The XRD pattern of the pure zeolite (Figure 6a) and the catalyst calcined at 600 °C (Figure 6b) and 800 °C (Figure 6c) are almost same and revealed that the crystallinity of the zeolite NaY does not change upon the incorporation of La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>. However, on increasing the temperature to 1000 °C,



the XRD pattern (Figure 11e) showed no characteristic peaks of zeolite, suggests that at high calcination temperature, the crystallinity of the zeolite is lost.



**Figure 6:** XRD pattern of pure zeolite (a),  $\text{La}_2\text{O}_3/\text{NaY}$ -600 (b),  $\text{La}_2\text{O}_3/\text{NaY}$ -800 (C),  $\text{S-La}_2\text{O}_3/\text{NaY}$ -800 (d),  $\text{La}_2\text{O}_3/\text{NaY}$ -1000 (e). Reproduced from ref. [105].

**Table 7:** Different zeolite catalyzed FAME production under various reaction conditions.


No.	Catalyst	Feedstocks	<sup>a</sup> Conditions	Yield (%)	Ref.
1	KOH@NaX zeolite	Soybean oil	10:1, 3, 65, 480	85.6	96
2	La/zeolite beta	Soybean oil	14.5:1, 0.011, 60, 240	48.9	97
3	Zeolite X	Sunflower oil	6:1, 10, 60, 420	95.1	98
4	CaO@NaY zeolite	Soybean oil	9:1, 3, 65, 180	95	99
5	Ba-Sr/ZSM-5	Sunflower oil	9:1, 3, 60, 180	87.7	100
6	$\text{H}_4[\text{W}_{12}\text{SiO}_{40}]@zeolite$	Soybean oil	4:1, 0.2, 65, 480	95	101
7	FA/K-X zeolite	Sunflower oil	6:1, 3, 60, 480	83.53.	102
8	Sodalite	Soybean oil	12:1, 4, 65, 120	95.5	103
9	KOH/zeolite	Waste sunflower oil	11.5:1, 6, 50, 120	96.7	104

10	La <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> /NaY zeolite	Castor oil	15:1, 10, 70, 50	84.6	105
----	---	------------	------------------	------	-----

<sup>a</sup>Methanol-to-oil molar ratio, catalyst loading (wt. %), temperature (°C), reaction time (min).

#### 7.1.4 Supported catalyst

To increase the stability and reusability of alkaline earth metal oxides, catalyst support plays an important role as they can reduce the mass transfer limitation and provide a high surface area with high porosity, where metals are anchored.<sup>106</sup> Till now several catalyst support such as alumina, silica, ZnO and ZrO<sub>2</sub> had been proposed for the production of FAME. Alumina is extensively employed as catalyst supports for various basic or acidic compounds exploited as a solid catalyst in esterification/transesterification reactions.<sup>107</sup> Several alumina supported catalysts employed in the transesterification reaction for biodiesel synthesis as shown in Table 8. In 2006, Xie *et al.*<sup>108</sup> investigated the potential of KI loaded on Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> support catalyst for biodiesel synthesis from soybean oil. They prepared a series of KI@Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> catalysts by changing the KI amount and investigated their catalytic activities. They observed that catalyst loaded with 35 % KI and calcined at 773 K showed highest FAME conversion of 96 % against all other catalysts under the optimal reaction conditions. In another study, potassium oxide loaded on alumina derived from various potassium salts such as KNO<sub>3</sub>, KOH, KF, KI and K<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> were compared and found that KF@Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> showed the best result compared to other catalysts, because of the generation of new phase K<sub>2</sub>O on the surface of alumina and as result basicity of the catalyst increases.<sup>109</sup> In addition, Ma *et al.*<sup>110</sup> reported the synthesis of FAME via transesterification of rapeseed oil using K@KOH@Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> catalyst. The formation of Al-O-K composite enhanced the basicity of the catalyst, thereby catalytic efficiency. They investigated catalytic activity by varying the amount of K and KOH and found that 7.5 and 20 wt. % (w.r.t. alumina) of K and KOH, respectively displayed the highest activity with 84.52 % biodiesel yield. Moreover, Chen *et al.*<sup>111</sup> reported biodiesel production from soybean oil using K@γ-Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> catalyst in a rotating packed bed (RPB) reactor. The schematic representation of RPB model is displayed in Figure 7. The main advantage of RPB reactor is that it provides efficient mixing of three immiscible reactants such as oil, methanol and the catalyst. A high yield of 96.4 % was reported using the optimal reaction conditions.



**Figure 7:** RPB experimental apparatus utilized for heterogeneously catalyzed transesterification reaction. Components: (1) CSTR reactor; (2) stirrer; (3) thermocouples; (4) sample port; (5) thermostat; (6) control valve; (7) pumps; (8) flow-meter; (9) RPB reactor; (10) stationary liquid distributor; (11) packed-bed rotator; (12) K/g-Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> catalyst; (13) housing case; (14) rotor shaft; (15) motor. Reproduced from ref. [111].

616

617 Zhang *et al.*<sup>112</sup> synthesized KOH impregnated modified alumina catalyst for biodiesel  
 618 synthesis from microalgae oil. Firstly, the alumina was modified with Lanthanum and barium  
 619 to increase its surface area, possess desired pore volume and pore distribution and finally  
 620 impregnation of KOH on the modified alumina to form the desired catalyst. They reported that  
 621 25 % KOH (w.r.t. modified alumina) impregnated on modified alumina and calcined at 550 °C  
 622 for 4 h showed the best activity towards the transesterification reaction with 97.7 % biodiesel  
 623 yield under the ideal reaction conditions. Umdu *et al.*<sup>113</sup> synthesized CaO@Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> via the sol-  
 624 gel method and conducted a transesterification reaction of microalgae (*Nannochloropsis*  
 625 *oculata*) oil to produce biodiesel. The catalyst has higher reactivity than the bare CaO, which  
 626 was almost inactive towards transesterification of the desired microalgae. The alumina was  
 627 loaded with 80 wt. % (w.r.t. Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>) Ca(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub> · 4H<sub>2</sub>O and calcined at 500 °C for 6 h to form 80  
 628 wt. % CaO@Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> that possessed the highest catalytic activity with 97.5 % biodiesel yield. In  
 629 addition, Zabeti *et al.*<sup>114</sup> synthesized a CaO@Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> catalyst using calcium acetate *via*  
 630 calcination at 718 °C for biodiesel synthesis from palm oil. They have used Response Surface

Methodology (RSM) in association with Central Composite Design (CCD) to determine the optimum reaction conditions such as M/O molar ratio, catalyst amount, reaction temperature and reaction time. Biodiesel yield of 98.64 % was obtained under the optimum reaction conditions.

**Table 8:** Different aluminium supported solid catalyst for biodiesel production.

No.	Catalyst	Feedstock	<sup>a</sup> Conditions	Yield (%)	Ref.
1	KI@Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	Soybean oil	15:1, 2, 65, 480	96	108
2	K@KOH@Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	Rapeseed oil	9:1, 4, 60, 60	84.52	110
3	K@ $\gamma$ -Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	Soybean oil	24:1, 10.6, 60, 60	96.4	111
4	KOH/La-Ba-Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	Microalgae	NR, 25, 60, 180	97.7 <sup>b</sup>	112
5	CaO@Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	<i>Nannochloropsis oculata</i>	30:1, 2, 50, 240	97.5	113
6	CaO@Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	Palm oil	12:1, 6, 65, 300	98.64	114

<sup>a</sup>Methanol-to-oil molar ratio, catalyst loading (wt. %), temperature (°C), reaction time (min).

<sup>b</sup>Conversion

NR: Not reported

Apart from alumina, there are several materials which are used as catalyst support such as SiO<sub>2</sub>, ZrO<sub>2</sub> and activated carbon (AC) (Table 9). In 2010, Samart *et al.*<sup>115</sup> conducted transesterification reaction using CaO impregnated on mesoporous SiO<sub>2</sub> catalyst for FAME production. They also investigated the influence of CaO amount and reported that 15 wt. % CaO (w.r.t. SiO<sub>2</sub>) loading showed the maximum yield of 95.2 %. In addition, the synthesis of FAME from palm oil using a CaO impregnated on bimodal meso-macroporous SiO<sub>2</sub> support catalyst was reported by Witoon *et al.*<sup>116</sup>. They investigated the influence of CaO loading and pellet size on biodiesel conversion and also compared with unimodal SiO<sub>2</sub> supported CaO catalyst. CaO in 40 wt. % CaO@SiO<sub>2</sub> were highly aggregated on the surface of the mesoporous SiO<sub>2</sub>, hence increases the surface basicity; while CaO in 30 wt. % CaO@SiO<sub>2</sub> were highly dispersed inside the mesopore of the silica support, accordingly 40 wt. % CaO@SiO<sub>2</sub> showed higher FAME yield compared to 30 wt. % CaO@SiO<sub>2</sub>. They also reported that the catalyst with pellet size 335  $\mu$ m showed a maximum yield of 92.45 %. Moreover, Wu *et al.*<sup>117</sup> reported catalysts consisting of three different potassium compounds (KAc, K<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> and K<sub>2</sub>SiO<sub>3</sub>) impregnated on mesoporous SiO<sub>2</sub> such as AlSBA-15 and SBA-15 for the production of FAME

from JCO. Three potassium salts with different concentration were impregnated on AlSBA-15 and SBA-15 and found that the basicity lies in the order of 35 wt. %  $\text{K}_2\text{SiO}_3@\text{AlSBA-15}$  > 35 wt. %  $\text{K}_2\text{CO}_3@\text{AlSBA-15}$  > 35 wt. %  $\text{KAc}@\text{AlSBA-15}$  and thus 30 wt. %  $\text{K}_2\text{SiO}_3$  showed highest yield of 95.7 % under the optimized reaction conditions.


The concept of AC-based catalyst is an attempt towards the development of a novel alternative to homogeneous alkaline in the form a heterogeneous catalyst. These kinds of catalysts have pulled in a lot of consideration from the scientific community because the uses of carbon as catalysts not only makes them reusable in the production process but also greatly reduce the formation of the soap and increases glycerol purity.<sup>118</sup> To date, different kinds of activated carbon-based catalysts have been developed and successfully exploited in biodiesel production, some of them are briefly discussed here (Table 18). Narowska *et al.*<sup>118</sup> proposed the development of a novel carbon-based catalyst to replace alkaline homogeneous catalyst as a solid catalyst which has the potential to be reused multiple times, eliminating various limitations associated with other traditional catalysts. In this context, the authors demonstrated the preparation of FAME from corn oil *via* transesterification utilizing KOH supported on activated carbon catalyst. The result showed that the highest yield (92 wt. %) of FAME was recorded using optimal reaction conditions. These finding indicated that activated carbon-supported catalysts can be promisingly employed in the transesterification of the waste corn oil using methanol.

Previously, Buasri *et al.*<sup>119</sup> reported calcium oxide impregnated on AC catalyst in the synthesis of highly pure FAME from waste cooking palm oil through continuous transesterification of FFA. After optimization of various reaction, a maximum FAME yield (94 %) was accomplished. In another study, Konwar *et al.*<sup>120</sup> also synthesized AC-supported calcium oxide from *Turbonilla striatula* shell and further, their applicability as a catalyst has been investigated in biodiesel synthesis from vegetable oil. It was reported that the catalyst displayed more than 90% oil conversion under the optimized reaction conditions. Moreover, this approached is economically viable due to easy recoverability of the catalyst. The catalyst was utilized for five progressive reactions cycles with minimum activity loss.

Hameed *et al.*<sup>121</sup> examined a solid catalyst KF supported on AC for biodiesel synthesis from WCO. They designed a composite rotatable reactor to optimize the reaction parameters and obtained 83 % methyl ester yield. In 2010, Baroutian *et al.*<sup>122</sup> studied FAME synthesis in a packed bed membrane reactor (PBMR) from palm oil using a solid catalyst of KOH supported on AC generated from palm shell (Figure 8). They also investigated the impact of reaction parameters using RSM. The highest biodiesel yield of 98.03 % was reported using the catalyst

with optimized reaction conditions. In addition, Li *et al.*<sup>123</sup> reported in situ synthesis of  $K_2CO_3@KFA$  via mixing of  $K_2CO_3$  and kraft lignin (KF) succeeded by calcination at 800 °C and utilized the catalyst in biodiesel synthesis from rapeseed oil. They also investigated the influence of reaction parameters on the FAME production and reported that a maximum yield of 99.6 % under the optimized reaction conditions.

Further, Buasri *et al.*<sup>124</sup> conducted a synthesis process where a solution of KOH was mixed with activated carbon (AC) originated from coconut shell to form KOH@AC and used this catalyst in biodiesel synthesis from WCO. The authors claimed that the synthesized catalyst has extraordinary catalytic reactivity and showed 86 % biodiesel yield under the optimized reaction conditions. Similarly, Wan *et al.*<sup>125</sup> examined a solid base catalyst CaO@AC for FAME synthesis from palm oil. RSM was utilized to investigate the impact of reaction parameters on biodiesel synthesis. A maximum yield of 80.98 % was reported under the optimal reaction conditions and also claimed that the catalyst can retain its activity even after two cycles. Recently, Fadhil *et al.*<sup>126</sup> conducted a transesterification reaction of bitter almond oil to produce biodiesel using KAc impregnated on activated carbon originated from the waste of polyethyleneterphthalate. A maximum yield of 93.21 % with high purity was reported. The authors claimed that the catalyst showed excellent reactivity towards biodiesel synthesis compared to other reported solid base catalyst as the catalyst showed a very high yield in very low optimal reaction conditions. Moreover, according to the authors, the catalyst has great stability as it can be reused for 6 cycles.



**Figure 8:** Schematic diagram of PBMR for FAME synthesis. Components: (1) palm oil; (2) methanol; (3) crude material siphon; (4) magnetic stirrer; (5) blending vessel; (6) flowing siphon; (7) boiling water flowing; (8) water chiller; (9) wound thermal exchanger; (10) ceramic membrane; (11) pressure check; (12) temperature indicator; (13) methanol recuperation unit; (14) siphon; (15) isolating funnel. Reproduced from ref. [122].

Liu *et al.*<sup>127</sup> examined a solid base catalyst KF/CaO/AC calcined at 500 °C for 5 h for the conversion of soybean oil to biodiesel. The authors claimed that the main catalytic role was played by K<sub>2</sub>O and KCaF<sub>3</sub> that are present in the catalyst. The catalyst demonstrated high yield of 99.9 % only in 20 min. Nonetheless, they reported that the catalyst is highly sensitive towards water contents in methanol and oleic acid. Therefore it is necessary to use anhydrous oil and methanol to overcome this problem. In conclusion, from all these above-mentioned studies a collective inference can be drawn that activated carbon-based catalysts will be the next generation novel alternative to traditionally available catalysts for efficient transesterification of different oils.

In the meantime, the application of zinc oxide supported silver nanoparticles (ZnO@Ag NPs) as a solid catalyst for the conversion of palm oil to FAME was reported by Laskar *et al.*<sup>128</sup> The transformation of palm oil to FAME was confirmed using NMR analysis and 10

components of FAME were identified using GC-MS technique, with methyl octadecanoate (C18:0) being the major component. Mixture with different ratio of Ag on ZnO were prepared, where 10 wt. % ZnO@Ag was found to be the most active catalyst producing 96 % FAME under optimum reaction conditions. In the recent past, Taslim *et al.*<sup>129</sup> also demonstrated the efficacy of low-cost AC-based catalyst developed from candlenut shell (an agricultural waste) through the impregnation of KOH for biodiesel production from WCO. The results obtained has shown that the yield of biodiesel up to 96.65 % using optimized reaction conditions.

**Table 9:** Different solid supported catalyst for biodiesel synthesis.

No.	Catalyst	Feedstocks	<sup>a</sup> Conditions	Yield (%)	Ref.
1.	CaO/SiO <sub>2</sub>	Soybean oil	16:1, 5, 60, 480	95.2	115
2.	CaO/SiO <sub>2</sub> (bimodal)	Palm oil	12:1, 5, 60, 240	94.15	116
3.	K <sub>2</sub> SiO <sub>3</sub> @AlSBA-	Jatropha oil	9:1, 15.30, 60, 180	95.7	117
4.	KOH/AC	Corn oil	3:1, 0.75, 62.5, 60	92	118
5.	CaO/AC	WCO	25:1, NR, 60, 480	94	119
6.	CaO/AC	Vegetable oil	40:111, 120, 420	>90	120
7.					
8.	KF/AC	WCO	8.85:1, 3, 175, 60	83	121
9.	KOH/AC	Palm oil	24:1, 30.3, 64.1, 60	98.03	122
10.	K <sub>2</sub> CO <sub>3</sub> @KFA	Rapeseed oil	15:1, 3, 65, 120	99.6	123
11.	KOH@AC	WCO	25:1, NR, 60, 120	86.3	124
12.	CaO@AC	Palm oil	15:1, 5.5, 190, 81	80.98	125
13.	KAc/AC	Bitter almond oil	9:1, 2.50, 65, 150	93.21	126
14.	KF/CaO/AC	Soybean oil	12:1, 2.1, 65, 20	99.9	127
15.	Ag@ZnO	Palm oil	10:1, 10, 60, 60	96	128
16.	KOH/AC	WCO	12:1, 3, 60, 120	96.65	129

<sup>a</sup>Methanol-to-oil molar ratio, catalyst loading (wt. %), temperature (°C), reaction time (min).




### 7.1.5 Hydrotalcite:

Recently, hydrotalcites have attracted interest as a solid catalyst in the transesterification reactions due to their tunable properties and excellent performance. They belong to the layered double hydroxide (LDH) family. The general formula of hydrotalcite is  $[M_n^{2+} M_m^{3+} (OH)_{2(n+m)}]^{m+} [A^{x-}]_{m/x} \cdot yH_2O$ , where  $M^{2+}$  is a divalent metal e.g.,  $Ca^{2+}$ ,  $Zn^{2+}$ ,  $Mg^{2+}$  etc.,  $M^{3+}$  is a trivalent metal, most frequently  $Al^{3+}$ , whereas  $A^{x-}$  is an anion with x in the range of 0.1-0.5<sup>130,131</sup>. Table 10 shows various reported hydrotalcite catalysts employed in the biodiesel synthesis from different feedstocks. Navajas *et al.*<sup>132</sup> prepared Mg/Al hydrotalcite with composition within the range of 1.5-5 by co-precipitation method and applied it in the conversion of sunflower oil to biodiesel. The basicity of the catalyst increased with the increase in Mg/Al molar ratio and degree of rehydration. They reported a 96 % conversion of oil to FAME (92 % yield) utilizing the rehydrated hydrotalcite under the optimal reaction conditions.

Zeng *et al.*<sup>133</sup> reported Mg-Al hydrotalcite with various Mg/Al molar ratio and used them as a heterogeneous catalyst for the transesterification of soybean oil. The hydrotalcite calcined at 773 K and 3:1 Mg to Al molar ratio exhibited the highest catalytic activity with 90.5 % conversion of oil. Recently, Ma *et al.*<sup>134</sup> investigated a heterogeneous catalyst Mg-Al hydrotalcite in the production of biodiesel from WCO. They mentioned that the catalyst with Mg/Al molar ratio 3:1 and calcined at 500 °C have a high surface area, excellent crystallinity and mesoporous structure, subsequently showed excellent activity. They also reported 95.2 % FAME yield under the optimized reaction condition. In the same manner, Zeng *et al.*<sup>135</sup> prepared Mg/Al-CO<sub>3</sub> with Mg/Al molar ratio of 4:1 *via* urea method and compared their structures and catalytic activities with those prepared by co-precipitation for the biodiesel synthesis from microalgae oil. They studied the crystal size and surface basicity of all the prepared hydrotalcites and reported that the crystal size of the hydrotalcites prepared using urea method is greater than as-synthesized ones. They also reported that the mixed oxide of the hydrotalcite prepared *via* urea method showed the highest catalytic reactivity with the maximum conversion of 90.30 %.

Further, Mg-Al hydrotalcite loaded with 1.5 % K was prepared and used as a catalyst for the synthesis of biodiesel from palm oil.<sup>136</sup> A maximum 86.6 % yield was reported using the optimized reaction conditions. They also studied the effect of the synthesized biodiesel on six types of elastomers such as NBR, HNBR, NBR/PVC, acrylic rubber, co-polymer FKM, and terpolymer FKM, which are commonly found in the fuel system. For testing, the elastomers were immersed in B10 (10 % biodiesel in diesel) and found that only terpolymer FKM and co-


polymer FKM showed a slight change in the properties. Thus, concluded that B10 is compatible with the diesel engines without any modification. In another work, Liu *et al.*<sup>137</sup> prepared Zn-Al hydrotalcite within the temperature range of 413-773 K to form dehydrated Zn-Al hydrotalcite and Zn-Al mixed oxides and used both the catalysts in the transesterification reaction in a fixed-bed reactor. The OH groups in the dehydrated Zn-Al is responsible for the high basicity of the catalyst. However,  $Mn^{+}-O^{2-}$  pairs and isolated  $O^{2-}$  anions are the main basic sites in Zn-Al metal oxides. Furthermore, they compared the catalytic activity of both dehydrated Zn-Al HT and Zn-Al oxides and found that the dehydrated HT calcined at 473 K showed highest catalytic activity and stability towards biodiesel synthesis with a maximum yield of 76 % at 140 °C for 1 h. Similarly, a heterogeneous base catalyst, KF/Ca-Al was developed for the biodiesel production from palm oil.<sup>138</sup> The catalyst was prepared from layered double hydroxides of Ca-Al, where the introduction of KF enhanced the catalytic activity. It was observed that 100 wt. % loading of KF decreased particle size of catalyst as shown by the SEM image of KF/Ca-Al (Figure 9). The authors also reported biodiesel yield of 97.14 % under the optimized reaction conditions. Besides, biodiesel production from poultry fats was reported by using a solid base catalyst, Mg-Al hydrotalcite.<sup>139</sup> The influence of calcination temperature for the preparation of catalyst was investigated and disclosed that the catalyst calcined at 550 °C showed the maximum catalytic activity. Moreover, the authors detailed that rehydration of the catalyst before the transesterification reaction and preferential adsorption of TAGs on the surface of the catalyst reduced the catalytic activity.



**Figure 9:** SEM image of KF/Ca-Al.  
Reproduced from ref. [138].

Helwani *et al.*<sup>140</sup> synthesized Mg-Al hydrotalcite *via* combustion method using saccharose for biodiesel synthesis from JCO. SEM image of the catalyst calcined at 850 °C displays a lamellar microstructure with closely packed flakes (Figure 10). The catalyst calcined

at 850 °C and recrystallized with 20 % saccharose fuel showed the best reactivity with 75.2 % biodiesel conversion under the optimized reaction conditions. A layered double hydroxide of zinc hydroxide nitrate was also reported for FAME synthesis from palm oil.<sup>141</sup> The catalyst showed excellent reactivity towards the transesterification reaction with 96.5 % biodiesel yield.



**Figure 10:** SEM image of Mg-Al HT calcined at 850 °C Reproduced from ref. [140].

**Table 10:** Different hydrotalcite catalyzed FAME production under various reaction conditions.

No.	Catalyst	Feedstocks	<sup>a</sup> Conditions	Yield (%)	Ref.
1	Mg-Al HT	Sunflower oil	48:1, 2, 60, 480	92	132
2	Mg-Al HT	Soybean oil	6:1, 1.5, 65, 240	90.5	133
3	Mg-Al HT	WCO	6:1, 1.5, 80, 150	95.2	134
4	Mg/Al-CO <sub>3</sub>	Microalgae oil	6.4:1, 1.7, 66, 240	90.3	135
5	K/Mg-Al HT	Palm oil	30:1, 7, 100, 360	86.6	136
6	Zn-Al HT	Soybean oil	26:1, NR, 140, 60	76	137
7	KF/Ca-Al	Palm oil	12:1, 5, 65, 300	97.98	138
8	Mg-Al HT	Poultry fat	30:1, 10, 120, 120	75	139
9	Mg-Al HT	Jatropha oil	30:1, 5, 160, 240	93.4	140
10	Zn <sub>5</sub> (OH) <sub>8</sub> (NO <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> .2H <sub>2</sub> O	Palm oil	6:1, 2, 140, 120	96.5	141

<sup>a</sup>Methanol-to-oil molar ratio, catalyst loading (wt. %), temperature (°C), reaction time (min).


NR= Not reported

### 7.1.6 Mixed metals oxides:

Mixed metal oxides provide exceptionally fascinating properties especially when each component differs from one another. The basic idea of synthesizing the mixed metal-oxide catalysts is to increase the basic or acid strength, surface area, and stability of these catalysts when compared with single metal oxides. Henceforth, a series of highly efficient, reusable, and stable solid catalysts were prepared. For example, a combination of two metal oxides can show acid-base properties or some unique properties irrespective of their individual properties.<sup>142</sup>

The basicity of metals increases as it becomes less electronegative down the group. In the meantime, the highly basic metal oxides those formed with alkaline and alkaline earth metals are usually carbonated in air, and hence are inert. Hence, strong basicity can be achieved only after a high temperature treatment to obtain a carbonate-free metal oxide surface, making the process highly energy demanding.<sup>143</sup> Interestingly, mixed metal oxides with high reactivity can be obtained at a much lower temperature making it highly demanded in catalysis. To date, several mixed metal oxides have been reported in transesterification reactions and are listed in Table 11.

Kawashima *et al.*<sup>144</sup> investigated various calcium-containing catalysts-CaTiO<sub>3</sub>, CaMnO<sub>3</sub>, Ca<sub>2</sub>Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, CaZrO<sub>3</sub>, and CaO-CeO<sub>2</sub> in the biodiesel production from rapeseed oil. Among these, CaO-CeO<sub>2</sub> showed excellent results (approximately 90 % yield) with high stability compared to other calcium-containing heterogeneous catalysts under the optimized reaction conditions. The catalyst can be reused for 7 times with a high yield of >80 % in each time. Sun *et al.*<sup>145</sup> also prepared La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> loaded ZrO<sub>2</sub> catalyst by varying La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> amount from 7-28 wt. % and investigated for the synthesis of biodiesel. 21 wt. % La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> loading on ZrO<sub>2</sub> and calcined at 600 °C demonstrated the highest catalytic activity towards biodiesel production from sunflower oil. The authors proposed a model for the preparation of the catalyst, where La(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub> was impregnated on the surface of ZrO<sub>2</sub> followed by drying to form a film of La(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>, which upon calcination forms the La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>/ZrO<sub>2</sub> composite, resulting in a decrease in particle size due to *t/m* phase transition (Figure 11). A high oil conversion of 96 % and 84.9 % FAME yield was observed under optimal reaction conditions. They reported an excellent activity of catalyst prepared by 21 wt. % loaded La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> and calcined at 600 °C.




**Figure 11:** Proposed model for the solid-state reaction on the catalyst surface. Reproduced from ref. [145].

Wen *et al.*<sup>146</sup> obtained TiO<sub>2</sub>-MgO catalyst *via* the sol-gel method and employed it in the FAME synthesis from WCO. Substitution of Ti to the Mg lattice led to defects in the surface of the catalyst, enhanced both the activity and stability of the catalyst. It was revealed that the catalyst with 1:1 Ti to Mg molar ratio and calcined at 923 K is the most active one in FAME synthesis. Biodiesel yield of 92.3 % was observed utilizing the catalyst MT-1-923 using the optimal reaction conditions. Similarly, SrO/SiO<sub>2</sub> and SrO/CaO has been synthesized and their catalytic activity was compared with naked SrO in transesterification of olive oil by Chen *et al.*<sup>147</sup> Although naked SrO showed very good catalytic activity and afforded 82 % yield in just 15 min, biodiesel yield shrunk to 68.9 % when the reaction was performed for 3 h. They reported that the reason for the unusual decreased in biodiesel yield was due to reverse reaction between FAME and glycerol, which showed that the catalyst not only catalyzed the forward reaction but also catalyzed the reverse reaction as well. On the contrary, modification of SrO with SiO<sub>2</sub> and CaO provided an excellent activity as well as high stability. They observed that around 95 % conversion was obtained at 65 °C using SrO/SiO<sub>2</sub> and SrO/CaO in 10 and 20 min respectively. However, they reported that on decreasing the reaction temperature to 45 °C, SrO/CaO showed only 20.20 % conversion as compared to SrO/SiO<sub>2</sub>, which showed 76.9 % conversion. Thus, SrO/SiO<sub>2</sub> displayed better reactivity towards transesterification of olive oil than SrO/CaO and possessed high tolerance to the water content and FFA of biodiesel feedstocks.

In the recent past, Madhuvilakku *et al.*<sup>148</sup> developed TiO<sub>2</sub>-ZnO nanocatalyst and utilized in FAME synthesis from palm oil. Arrangement of deformities on the catalyst surface as a result of the substitution of Ti on Zn grid improved the reactivity and stability of the prepared catalyst. They recorded 92 % biodiesel yield was acquired under the optimized reaction conditions. Similarly, a series of ZnO-La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> catalyst have been examined in the biodiesel synthesis from waste oil by Yan *et al.*<sup>149</sup> Incorporation of La promoted dispersion of ZnO and improved acidic-basic sites, thereby increased catalytic activity towards both

transesterification and esterification reactions. The molar ratio of 3:1 Zn to La showed the highest activity towards biodiesel production. A high 96 % yield was reported under the optimal reaction conditions. The authors also reported that the catalyst can endure FFA and water contents and thus allowed direct conversion of waste oil to FAME. In another work, transesterification of palm kernel oil to produce biodiesel has also been reported using a mixed metal oxide solid base catalyst CaO-ZnO.<sup>150</sup> Upon incorporation of Zn to the CaO phase, the particle size of the catalyst has decreased and has reduced the calcination temperature required for the decomposition of carbonates to its oxides. Lowering of calcination temperature for the decomposition of CaCO<sub>3</sub> upon the incorporation of Zn can be explained by particle size reduction coupled with a loss of H<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> from the zinc carbonate. The schematic representation for the decomposition of CaCO<sub>3</sub> and formation of CaO-ZnO mixed metal oxides is displayed in Scheme 3. It is well known that decarbonisation is a reversible process, which mostly depends on atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>, particle size and composition. The dissociation of CO<sub>2</sub> normally occurs in the outer surface (Scheme 3A). Moreover, upon calcination, the evolved CO<sub>2</sub> may form a layer on the surface of the material during the continuous disjunction of inner particles, generated a possibility for recarbonation of CaO to CaCO<sub>3</sub> (Scheme 3B). However, incorporation of ZnCO<sub>3</sub> resulted in the formation of voids due to its decomposition to zinc oxide. The resulting voids facilitated heat transfer to the interior particles and evaporation of the gaseous compounds. Moreover, due to the small particle size of the CaO-ZnO, the diffusion distance of CO<sub>2</sub> decreased, thus calcination temperature also decreased.



**Scheme 3:** Proposed models for  $\text{CaCO}_3$  decomposition to  $\text{CaO}$  (A) and mixed precipitate of  $\text{Ca-Zn}$  Reproduced from ref. [150].

Among solid base catalysts, solid  $\text{ZrO}_2$  catalysts become popular because of their environmentally benign nature and economic viability for biodiesel production. Till date, different types of  $\text{ZrO}_2$  catalysts have been developed for use in biodiesel production. In this line, Su *et al.*<sup>151</sup> synthesized microporous solid base  $\text{MgO-ZrO}_2$  composites and utilized them as effective heterogeneous catalysts in biodiesel synthesis. They claimed that such microporous catalysts are of great significance as the presence of porous materials in the preparation of these catalysts provided the ability to interact with atoms, ions, molecules.

Recently, Ibrahim *et al.*<sup>152</sup> examined the influence of different support materials like  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ ,  $\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3$ ,  $\text{TiO}_2$  and  $\text{SiO}_2$  on physicochemical properties and efficacy of  $\text{ZrO}_2$  solid catalysts commonly used in biodiesel synthesis. From the results obtained it was revealed that  $\text{ZrO}_2$  supported on  $\text{SiO}_2$  showed the highest conversion rate due to comparatively high surface area and a high number of Lewis acid sites. In another study, Faria *et al.*<sup>153</sup> developed nanosized catalyst mixed metal oxides  $\text{SiO}_2/\text{ZrO}_2$  catalyst prepared *via* sol-gel strategy and examined its reactivity in the synthesis of biodiesel from soybean oil. It was observed that this catalyst displayed promising reactivity and gave  $96.2 \pm 1.4$  % biodiesel yield after 3 h of reaction time. In addition, the catalyst can be reused for 6 progressive cycles with little drop in activity. In 2008, Albuquerque *et al.*<sup>154</sup> synthesized  $\text{MgO-CaO}$  mixed metal oxides with different  $\text{Mg/M}$  ( $\text{M} = \text{Al}$  or  $\text{Ca}$ ) molar ratios and used it as a highly active catalyst for the transformation of

sunflower oil to biodiesel in 92 % yield under the optimized reaction conditions. The highest activity towards the transesterification reaction was found for a bulk Mg:Ca molar ratio of 3.8, whereas bare CaO were found to afford a lower yield of biodiesel under the same reaction conditions. The authors attributed this interesting activity to the higher BET surface area of the MgO-CaO mixed metal oxide ( $12.8 \text{ m}^2 \text{ g}^{-1}$ ), in comparison to CaO ( $1.2 \text{ m}^2 \text{ g}^{-1}$ ).

**Table 11:** Various mixed metal oxide catalyzed transesterification of vegetable oil.

No.	Catalyst	Feedstocks	<sup>a</sup> Conditions	Yield (%)	Ref.
1.	CaO-CeO <sub>2</sub>	Rapeseed oil	6:1, 10, 60, 600	90	144
2.	La <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> /ZrO <sub>2</sub>	Sunflower oil	30:1, 21, 200, 300	84.9	145
3.	TiO <sub>2</sub> -MgO	WCO	50:1, 10, 160, 360	92.3	146
4.	SrO/SiO <sub>2</sub>	Olive oil	6:1, 5, 65, 10	95	147
5.	SrO/CaO	Olive oil	6:1, 5, 65, 20	95	147
6.	TiO <sub>2</sub> -ZnO	Palm oil	6:1, 14, 60, 300	92	148
7.	ZnO-La <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	Waste oil	6:1, 2.3, 200, 180	96	149
8.	CaO-ZnO	Palm kernel oil	30:1, 10, 60, 60	>94	150
9.	MgO-ZrO <sub>2</sub>	Soybean oil	20:1, 3, 150, 360	99	151
10.	ZrO <sub>2</sub> @SiO <sub>2</sub>	Stearic acid	120:1, 10, 120, 180	48.6	152
11.	SiO <sub>2</sub> /ZrO <sub>2</sub> NP	Soybean oil	6.6:1, 2.8 mmol, 50, 180	96.2±1.4	153
12.	MgO-CaO	Sunflower oil	12:1, 2.5, 60, 60	92	154

<sup>a</sup>Methanol-to-oil molar ratio, Catalyst loading (wt. %), Temperature (°C), Reaction time (min).

### 7.1.7 Biomass-based catalyst

In recent year, bio-waste derived heterogeneous catalyst gains significant attention both in the realm of catalysis and biofuel research, and are reviewed by several authors recently<sup>155-160</sup> The advantages of using waste materials as a catalyst are largely due to their cheap, abundant, non-toxic, ecofriendly, economic, renewable, sustainable and easily availability. Many researchers utilized waste biomass as a catalyst for low FFA oil (edible oil) as well as in high FFA oil (edible and non-edible oils). The biomass includes plant ashes, waste shells, bones, industrial wastes and so forth. Profitably, catalysts derived from waste biomass potentially make biodiesel production highly cost-effective and environmentally benign.




### 7.1.7.2 Waste shells

Despite several chemically synthesized heterogeneous catalysts mentioned earlier show promising and comparatively high biodiesel yield, their synthesis routes are sometimes complicated, expensive, chemically wasteful, time consuming and non-economical. Therefore, with the growing high demand for renewable energy, there is a need to search for an ideal heterogeneous catalyst which is easy to synthesize, non-toxic, low cost, widely available, biodegradable and eco-friendly in nature, yet exhibits high catalytic activity in biodiesel production. In the light of this, utilization of CaO (derived from high-temperature calcination of waste shells containing  $\text{CaCO}_3$ ) has been a front runner in recent times. The use of waste shells as a source of CaO not only make the whole production of biodiesel sustainable but also solved the problem associated with waste disposal of huge quantities of waste shell generated due to human consumption.

#### 7.1.7.2.1 Eggshell

Various eggshell derived heterogeneous catalysts are available for the transformation of edible/non-edible oils to FAME as listed in Table 12. For the first time, CaO originated from chicken eggshell calcined at 1000 °C was utilized for biodiesel synthesis by Wei *et al.*<sup>161</sup> Biodiesel yield greater than 95 % was obtained. They have calcined the eggshell at different temperatures from 200 °C to 1000 °C and then tested their efficacy for the transformation of soybean oil to FAME. They observed that those calcined above 800 °C were the most active catalysts, where the XRD spectra display a crystalline CaO (Figure 12). Samples calcined at 700 °C for 2 h contain  $\text{CaCO}_3$  as the principal constituent and CaO as a minor one, hence medium yield (90 %) were obtained. Calcinations below 600 °C did not result in the formation of CaO, hence, low catalytic activity was observed (<30 % biodiesel yield). Hence, CaO in the catalyst is the principal basic constituent, which led to the high reactivity of the catalyst. From this experiment, it is suggested that waste shells have to be calcined at a temperature of at least 800 °C for 2 h to fully convert  $\text{CaCO}_3$  to CaO, a highly basic catalyst.




**Figure 12:** XRD patterns of natural eggshell and the materials obtained by calcining natural eggshell in the range of 200 °C–1000 °C. Reproduced from ref. [161].

948


949 In recent years, CaO derived from eggshell has been widely investigated in transformation  
 950 of various edible/non-edible oils such as soybean oil,<sup>162–164</sup> karanja oil,<sup>165</sup> WCO,<sup>166–175</sup> palm  
 951 oil,<sup>176–179</sup> rapeseed oil,<sup>180,181</sup> sunflower oil,<sup>182–185</sup> JCO,<sup>186</sup> microalgae oil,<sup>187–189</sup> chicken fat,<sup>190</sup>  
 952 catfish oil,<sup>191</sup> *Helianthus annuus* L oil,<sup>192</sup> cotton oil<sup>193</sup> and sativa oil<sup>194</sup> for FAME production.  
 953 In 2014, Niju *et al.*<sup>172</sup> examined a highly active modified chicken eggshell derived CaO catalyst  
 954 for the synthesis of FAME from WFO. The authors reported that highly reactive CaO can be  
 955 obtained from eggshells *via* calcination-hydration-dehydration treatment. While the FAME  
 956 conversion was only 67.57 % for commercial CaO catalyst, CaO obtained from the eggshell  
 957 calcined at 900 °C followed by hydration and dehydration at 600 °C (Eggshell-CaO-900-600)  
 958 gave 94.52 % conversion under the optimized reaction conditions. Calcination followed by  
 959 hydration and dehydration greatly increased the surface area of the eggshell derived CaO as  
 960 compared to those obtained with the only calcination. The high activity of the modified CaO

(Eggshell-CaO-900-600) is attributed to the high surface area ( $8.6401 \text{ m}^2\text{g}^{-1}$ ) compared to both commercial CaO ( $3.0022 \text{ m}^2\text{g}^{-1}$ ) and eggshell derived-CaO calcined at  $900^\circ\text{C}$  (eggshell-CaO-900) ( $3.7262 \text{ m}^2\text{g}^{-1}$ ). The basicity of modified catalyst lies in the region  $12.2 < H_- < 15.0$ . Figure 13b depicted the SEM image of CaO generated from the calcination–hydration–dehydration treatment of eggshells (i.e. egg shell-CaO-900-600) which shows a honeycomb-like porous surface. However, in the case of the eggshell-CaO-900, rod-like structure with microporous particles (size ranging from  $1.29$  to  $2.0 \mu\text{m}$ ) was observed (Figure 13a).




**Figure 13:** SEM image of a) eggshell-CaO-900. b). Eggshell-CaO-900-600. Reproduced from ref. [172].

In another work, waste chicken fat obtained from slaughterhouse was converted to FAME using calcined chicken eggshell catalyst under microwave irradiation (Figure 14).<sup>190</sup> Esterification was carried out to lessen FFA content of the chicken oil below  $1 \text{ mg KOH/g}$  of oil, followed by transesterification to yield FAME. Flow diagram of biodiesel production using chicken eggshell as a catalyst is presented in Figure 15. Optimization of transesterification process parameters by response surface methodology was performed.




**Figure 14:** Microwave-assisted synthesis of FAME using an eggshell catalyst. Reproduced from ref. [190].



**Figure 15:** Flow diagram of biodiesel production utilizing chicken eggshell catalyst. Reproduced from ref. [190].

Similarly, *Helianthus annuus* L oil was converted to FAME using eggshell derived CaO.<sup>192</sup> The preparation route of CaO starting from the shell is presented in Figure 16. Under the optimized reaction conditions, 99.2 % of FAME yield was achieved. The catalyst is stable up to the fourth cycle where 87.8 % yield was observed.



**Figure 16:** Schematic layout for eggshell originated CaO synthesis.  
Reproduced from ref. [192].

Earlier, Ansori *et al.*<sup>195</sup> reported a chicken shell derived CaO catalyzed synthesis of FAME from *C. inophyllum* L oil under a microwave (MW) irradiation. Initially, oil FFA content was pre-esterified utilizing  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$ , which was then transesterified by utilizing the CaO catalyst (originated from chicken shell) and reported 98.90 % FAME yield in 12.47 min. In another work, Mansir *et al.*<sup>196</sup> examined the application of W/Mo/CaO catalyst, where tungsten and molybdenum were impregnated on CaO derived from waste eggshell, for the transformation of WCO *via* concerted esterification/transesterification to produce FAME in a one-pot process. Moreover, the authors investigated the influence of W and Mo loading on CaO in its catalytic activity and found that catalytic activity increased when wt. % of W is higher than wt. % of Mo over the range of 0.3-0.7 %. A maximum yield of 96.2 % was reported under the optimum reaction conditions using 0.6 W/0.4 Mo/CaO. In addition, several literatures are available for the transesterification of WCO having FFA content in the range of 4-7.1 % to produce methyl ester using various eggshell derived CaO catalyst impregnated with acidic and basic compounds. Examples of such catalysts are CaO/anthill,<sup>197</sup> CaO/Zn,<sup>198</sup> CaO/KF/ $\text{Fe}_3\text{O}_4$ ,<sup>199</sup> CaO/ $\text{SiO}_2$  based on palm empty fruit bunch (PEFB),<sup>200</sup> and Mo-Zr/CaO<sup>201</sup> etc.

In 2015, Joshi *et al.*<sup>164</sup> synthesized various metal oxides, for example, ZnO,  $\text{MnO}_2$ ,  $\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3$  and  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  impregnated on CaO derived from eggshell via calcination at 900 °C and exploited these catalysts in the conversion of non-edible JCO to FAME. Among all the mixed metal oxides, the surface area and pore volume of ZnO-CaO is highest and thus showed an excellent 95.2 % JCO conversion. The authors also reported that the catalyst is very stable towards the

transesterification of JCO and can be reused for 4 cycles. Similarly, Teo *et al.*<sup>202</sup> synthesized CaO NPs derived from *Gallus domesticus* eggshell via precipitation method and utilized it for the conversion of JCO to give FAME with 97 % yield under the optimal reaction conditions. TEM images and particle size distribution of waste eggshell of *Gallus domesticus* derived nano-CaO catalyst is displayed in Figure 17 (A, B, C) which revealed that the particles were regular spheroidal shape and the average particle diameter is 16-27 nm. Figure 17 D displays the basicity measurement of the catalyst and commercial CaO using CO<sub>2</sub>-TPD technique. All CaO catalysts showed a broad desorption peak owing to the existence of strong basic strength. The desorption peaks of both catalysts observed over the temperature ranging from 550 to 700 °C are attributed to the super-basic characteristics of the nanoparticles.

In 2011, Olutoye *et al.*<sup>203</sup> reported a mixed metal solid catalyst, where Mg(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub> and KNO<sub>3</sub> were impregnated on CaO originated from eggshell and exploited it in the transformation of palm oil to FAME. The authors made three sets of a catalyst by changing the loading amount of Mg(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub> and KNO<sub>3</sub> on CaO with wt. % ratio of 6:1:1, 2:1:1 and 1:1.5:1.5 and investigated their influence on the transesterification reaction and reported that the catalyst with wt. % ratio of 6:1:1 showed the maximum yield of 85.8 %. In addition, several works are reported in the literature regarding the transesterification of palm oil using chicken shell derived CaO modified solid catalyst such as CaO/SiO<sub>2</sub><sup>204,205</sup> CaO/rice husk<sup>206</sup> etc. Recently, Sulaiman *et al.*<sup>207</sup> successfully synthesized a mixture of calcined coconut waste and egg waste for the transformation of palm oil to biodiesel. The authors employed RSM based on CCD to study the ideal reaction conditions: coconut waste/eggshell waste ratio, M/O molar ratio, catalyst amount, reaction temperature and reaction time. After a successful investigation, they reported that 5:1 wt. % ratio of coconut waste/eggshell waste showed the maximum yield of 81 % under the optimal reaction conditions.




Figure 17: TEM images and particle size distributions of surfactant assistant CaO nanocatalysts: after 40 min (a); after 80 min (b) and after 120 min (c) and CO<sub>2</sub> desorption performance commercial of CaO (a) and nano CaO catalysts: after 40 min (b); after 80 min (c) and after 120 min (d). Reproduced from ref. [202].

1039

1040

1041 In another work, A Li doped CaO catalyst derived from eggshell was examined for the  
 1042 transformation of nahor oil to produce FAME by Boro *et al.*<sup>208</sup> They measured the FFA content  
 1043 in the nahor oil and found 15 mg KOH/g. Due to this high FFA contents, a two-step process  
 1044 was investigated; firstly, esterification was performed using sulfuric acid to bring down FFA  
 1045 amount up to <1 followed by transesterification reaction using Li/CaO catalyst. They also  
 examined the impact of Li doping on the conversion of oil to FAME and reported a maximum



94 % conversion when the Li doping was 2 wt. %. Recently, Rahman *et al.*<sup>209</sup> modified CaO derived from chicken eggshell with transition metals such as Zn and Cu and applied the catalyst in the transformation of eucalyptus oil to FAME. The authors reported that the surface area and basicity of Zn/CaO are higher than the Cu/CaO, therefore Zn/CaO showed better result with 93.2 % FAME yield. Moreover, the impregnation of Zn on CaO improved the stability of the catalyst and can be used for 7 consecutive cycles. In another report, a magnetically recoverable KF modified CaO derived from eggshell was prepared and employed in the transformation of neem oil to FAME.<sup>199</sup> The author reported that the primary advantage of the catalyst is that the catalyst circumvented saponification reaction and therefore transesterification of neem oil (FFA content 4.2 %) can proceed through the one-step process, and 94.5 % FAME can be achieved.

In 2010, a novel eggshell originated CaO impregnate on fly ash was reported for the transesterification of soybean oil to form FAME. The influence of CaO loading was studied by the authors and found that 30 wt. % CaO loading showed a maximum yield of 96.97 %. Moreover, CaO supported on fly ash enhanced catalyst reusability and reactivity compared to neat eggshell originated CaO.<sup>210</sup> In addition, a KF modified CaO originated from eggshell was examined for the transformation of soybean oil to FAME. The modified catalyst has higher basicity than the neat CaO due to the addition of KOH in the process.<sup>211</sup> Recently, Chowdhury *et al.*<sup>212</sup> synthesized a Na-doped CaO derived from chicken eggshell and exploited it in the transesterification of *Madhuca indica* oil. A two-step process was employed as the oil have 45 % of FFA content. They first esterified the oil using 5 wt. % sulfuric acid to lessen FFA content of the oil followed by transesterification using Na-doped CaO catalyst. To study the influence of reaction parameters on the transformation of oil to biodiesel, Taguchi approach was used, where they observed that M/O molar ratio and the reaction temperature have the highest impact and reaction time has the minimal impact on the transformation of oil to FAME. In 2014, Chen *et al.*<sup>213</sup> demonstrated the synthesis of FAME from palm oil using CaO catalyst derived from ostrich egg-shell *via* ultrasonication. They compared the production of biodiesel using both mechanical stirring and ultrasonication process and reported that the latter case showed higher yield (92.7 %). Moreover, the catalyst can be used for 8 consecutive cycles. A transesterification process for soybean oil deodorizer distillate (SODD) to produce FAME was reported using CaO derived from the duck eggshell. They measured the FFA content of SODD and found 53.2 %, therefore to overcome the saponification problem the oil was pre-esterified with sulfuric acid and then the transesterification was performed of the pre-esterified SODD oil using CaO catalyst to produce FAME with an overall yield of 94.6 %.<sup>2</sup> In addition, CaO



derived from quail eggshell were also utilized for the transformation of palm oil <sup>214</sup> and JCO <sup>215</sup> to biodiesel in high yield.

**Table 12:** Various eggshells derived solid base catalyst for FAME production.

No.	Catalyst source	Catalyst	Feedstock	<sup>a</sup> Conditions	Yield (%)	Ref.
1.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Soybean oil	9:1, 3, 65, 180	>95	161
2.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Soybean oil	10:1, 7, 57.5, 120	93	216
3.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Soybean oil	8:1, 10, 65, 180	90	163
4.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Soybean oil	14:1, 4, 60, 180	91	164
5.	Ostrich eggshell	CaO	Karanja oil	8:1, 2.5, 65, 150	95	165
6.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	WCO	22.5:1, 3.5, 65, 330	91	166
7.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	WCO	12:1, 1.5, 65, 120	94	167
8.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	WCO	4:1, 2, 65, 120	NR	168
9.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	WFO	9:1, 3, 65, 180	95.05	169
10.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	WCO	12:1, 1.5, 60, 60	96.23	191
11.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	WCO	24:1, 4, 60, 240	100	217
12.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	WCO	12:1, 5, 65, 60	94.52 <sup>b</sup>	172
13.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	WCO	10:1, 1.5, 60, 50	96.07	173
14.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	WCO	6:1, 3, 60, 30	97.50	174
15.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	WCO	9:1, 5, 65, 165	87.8	175
16.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	WCO	15:1, 6, 65, 420	75.92	218
17.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Palm oil	18:1, 10, 60, 90	>90	176
18.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Palm oil	18:1, 15, 900 W, 4	96.7	177
19.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Palm oil	12:1, 10, 60, 120	94.1	178
20.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Palm oil	6:1, 5, NR, 30	95	179
21.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Rape seed oil	9:1, 3, 60, 180	96	180
22.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Rapeseed oil	9:1, 4, 60, 60	95.12	181
23.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Sunflower oil	9:1, 3, 60, 180	96	182

24.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Sunflower oil	11:1, 5, 60, 3	83.2	183
25.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Sunflower oil	9:1, 3, 60, 240	97.75	219
26.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Sunflower oil	12:1, 2, 60, 180	100	185
27.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	JCO	81, 2, 65, 150	90	186
28.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Microalgae <i>Chlorella</i> <i>vulgaris</i>	10:1, 1.39, 70, 180	92.03	187
29.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Microalgae	10:1, 1.7, 70, 216	86.41	188
30.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Micro algae/ <i>S. armatus</i>	10:1, 1.61, 75, 240	90.44	189
31.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Chicken fat	13:1, 8.5, 57.5, 300	90.41	190
32.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Catfish oil	12:1, 1.5, 60, 60	87.77	191
33.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	<i>Helianthus</i> <i>annuus</i> L oil	8:1, 2.5, 65, 120	99.2	192
34.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	Cotton oil	9:1, 3, 60, 180	98.08	193
35.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	<i>C. sativa</i> oil	12:1, 1, 65, 120	97.2	194
36.	Chicken eggshell	CaO	<i>C.</i> <i>inophyllum</i> L oil	9:1, 3.88, MW, 12.47	98.90	195
37.	Chicken eggshell	CaO/W/Mo	WCO	15:1, 2, 70, 120	96.2	196
38.	Chicken eggshell	CaO/anthill	WCO	6:1, 5, 60, 120	70	197
39.	Chicken eggshell	CaO/Zn	WCO	20:1, 5, 65, 240	96.74	198
40.	Chicken eggshell	CaO/KF/Fe <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub>	WCO	15:1, 6, 65, 120	97	199
41.	Chicken eggshell	CaO/SiO <sub>2</sub> based on PEFB	WCO	14:1, 8, 60, 90	96	200
42.	Chicken eggshell	Mo-Zr/CaO	WCPO	15:1, 3, 80, 180	90.1	201
43.	Chicken eggshell	ZnO/CaO	JCO	12:1, 5, 65, 60	98.2	164
44.	Chicken eggshell	CaO NPs	JCO	6:1, 2, 90, 120	98	202

45.	Chicken eggshell	Ky(MgCa) <sub>2x</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	Palm oil	16:1, 5.53, 65, 273	88	203
46.	Chicken eggshell	CaO/SiO <sub>2</sub>	Palm oil	15:1, 9, 65, 480	80.21	204
47.	Chicken eggshell	CaO/SiO <sub>2</sub>	Palm oil	15:1, 3, 60, 120	87.5	205
48.	Chicken eggshell	CaO/Rice husk	Palm oil	9:1, 7, 65, 240	91.5	206
49.	Chicken eggshell	CaO/Cocon ut waste	Palm oil	24:1, 5, 65, 180	81	207
50.	Chicken eggshell	Li/CaO	Nahor oil	10:1, 5, 65, 240	94	208
51.	Chicken eggshell	CaO/Zn	Eucalyptus oil	6:1, 5, 65, 150	93.2	209
52.	Chicken eggshell	CaO/KF/Fe <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub>	Neem oil	15:1, 6, 65, 120	97	199
53.	Chicken eggshell	CaO/fly ash	Soybean oil	6.9:1, 1, 70, 300	96.97	210
54.	Chicken eggshell	CaO/KF	Soybean oil	12:1, 2, 65, 120	99.1	211
55.	Chicken eggshell	Na/CaO	<i>Madhuca</i> <i>indica</i> oil	9:1, 5, 60, 120	81.1	212
56.	Ostrich eggshell	CaO	Palm oil	9:1, 8, 60, 60	92.7	213
57.	Duck eggshell	CaO	SODD	10:1, 10, 60, 80	94.6	2
58.	Quail eggshell	CaO	Palm oil	12:1, 1.5, 65, 120	98	214
59.	Quail eggshell/ crab shell	CaO	Jatropha oil	18:1, 4, MW, 5	94	215

1084 <sup>a</sup>Methanol-to-oil molar ratio, catalyst loading (wt. %), temperature (°C), reaction time (min).

1085 <sup>b</sup>Conversion

1086 NR= Not reported

1087 WCPO= Waste cooking palm oil


1088

#### 1089 7.1.7.2.2. Mollusk shell and other seashells

1090 Mollusk shell and other seashells derived solid catalyst has been widely investigated in  
1091 the transformation of edible/non-edible oils to produce biodiesel, and are listed in Table 13.  
1092 Examples are a basic solid catalyst developed by impregnation of KI on the calcined oyster  
1093 shell which was utilized in the transformation of soybean oil to FAME.<sup>116-119</sup> The authors  
1094 reported that impregnation and calcination increase the surface area to an extent of 32 fold and

therefore increases the catalytic activity. The main disadvantages of the catalyst are the reusability factor and higher loading of KI.<sup>220</sup> In addition, there is various literature where neat CaO derived from oyster shell were utilized for transformation of soybean oil to FAME<sup>221</sup> and microwave-assisted (800 W) biodiesel synthesis from jatropha oil.<sup>222</sup> Recently, a basic heterogeneous catalyst was developed from the river snail shell by calcination at 800 °C for 4 h. The catalyst was employed for the transesterification of WCO for biodiesel production. They performed KOH titration and found that FFA content in the WCO is 0.3 %, therefore direct transesterification was carried out and 98.19 % yield was achieved under the optimal reaction conditions.<sup>223</sup> Elsewhere other reports are also available where CaO derived from calcined river snail were used for the transesterification of various edible/non-edible oils, for example, palm oil,<sup>224</sup> soybean oil<sup>225</sup> and WFO.<sup>226</sup>

In 2016, Liu *et al.*<sup>227</sup> developed a solid catalyst, where KBr was loaded on calcined snail shell and kaoline mixture followed by activation of the catalyst *via* calcination at 500 °C for 4 h and applied the catalyst in the transformation of soybean oil to FAME. They also investigated the effect of loading of KBr and wt. % ratio of snail shell/kaoline mixture on biodiesel yield and found that the catalyst showed a maximum yield of 98.5 % when the KBr loading and wt. % ratio of snail shell/kaoline were 40 wt. % and 4:1, respectively. Mixing of snail shell and kaoline together provides the catalyst extra stability compared to their pure form<sup>227</sup>. In addition, Laskar *et al.*<sup>228</sup> developed a solid basic catalyst CaO derived from a calcined snail shell for the conversion of soybean oil to biodiesel. Under the ideal reaction states, 98 % biodiesel yield was achieved. It is reported that at 400-600 °C calcination temperature, CaCO<sub>3</sub> of snail shell transformed to calcite. When calcination temperature was further increased to 700 and 800 °C, a minor and major component of CaO was achieved, which was later completely transformed into CaO at 900 °C calcination temperature. Figure 18 reveals that 100 % transformation of CaCO<sub>3</sub> into CaO can be achieved above 800 °C calcination temperature.



**Figure 18:** XRD spectra of normal and calcined (400-1000 °C) snail shells. Reproduced from ref. [228].

In another work, El-Gendy *et al.*<sup>229</sup> reported CaO catalyst originated from snail shell calcined at 800 °C and utilized it in the transesterification reaction. RSM was utilized to investigate the influence of reaction parameters on the biodiesel production and reported that 96.76 % yield was observed under the optimized reaction conditions. Similarly, various literature is available for the transesterification of WCO to FAME using CaO derived from snail shell collected from different sources.<sup>230,231</sup> Very recently, Krishnamurthy *et al.*<sup>232</sup> developed a solid catalyst, CaO nanoparticles derived from snail shell *via* the hydrothermal method and investigated its application in the transesterification of *H. wightiana* oil to produce FAME. However, a high FFA content (7.57 %) in the oil led the authors to follow a two-steps process: 1) pre-esterification and 2) transesterification for the production of FAME. RSM was utilized to examine the impact of reaction parameters on FAME synthesis, reported 96.92 % yield under the optimal reaction conditions. In a similar vein, CaO derived from snail shell was also investigated for the transformation of *A. africana* seed oil<sup>233</sup> and showed 85 % FAME yield.

A calcined mussel/cockle/scallop shell derived CaO was developed for the transformation of palm oil for FAME production. The authors reported high catalyst reactivity catalytic activity with great stability towards the transesterification of palm oil with 95 % conversion.<sup>234</sup> In the meantime, Hadiyanto *et al.*<sup>235</sup> developed a solid catalyst, modified CaO

(derived from green mussel shell) with activated carbon (C) followed by impregnation on NaOH and utilized the catalyst in the transformation of palm oil. The wt. % C/CaO ratio of 2:3 showed the maximum yield of 95.12 % under the optimal reaction conditions. Similarly, KOH impregnated mussel shell derived CaO was examined for castor oil transformation to biodiesel. The authors made a comparison between non-impregnated and KOH impregnated catalysts and revealed that the KOH impregnated catalyst displayed higher reactivity as well as basicity and reported 91.7 % FAME yield using KOH impregnated catalyst.<sup>236</sup> Moreover, calcined mussel shell derived catalyst were widely examined for the transformation of vegetable oils, for example, soybean oil,<sup>237,238</sup> Chinese tallow oil,<sup>239</sup> *Camelina sativa* oil<sup>240</sup> etc., for biodiesel production.

Syazwani *et al.*<sup>241</sup> examined CaO, originated from angel wing shell (AWS) calcined at 900 °C for 2 h, for the conversion of *N. oculata* micro-algae oil to FAME. The catalyst possessed high reactivity with great stability and can be reused for 3 consecutive cycles. Furthermore, a bifunctional catalyst was developed for conversion of palm fatty acid distillate (PFAD) to FAME. The angel wing shell was calcined to form CaO followed by sulfonation to afford the catalyst. The authors reported that the catalyst surface area increased to two-fold after the modification, as a result, the catalyst showed excellent activity towards the esterification of PFAD. Unfortunately, the catalyst was reusable only for two cycles as blocking of active sites occurred in each reaction cycles. Therefore to enhance the reusability of the catalyst, pretreatment of the catalyst such as washing and re-calcination are necessary before each reaction cycles.<sup>242</sup> In 2015, Asikin-Mijan *et al.*<sup>243</sup> developed a waste clam shell derived CaO using hydration-dehydration treatment and investigated its catalytic application in the conversion of palm oil to FAME. They also examined the effect of hydration-dehydration time on biodiesel conversion and found that higher is the hydration time higher is the catalytic activity as hydration for longer-term enhanced the formation of Ca(OH)<sub>2</sub> and thus increased the basicity, reduced the crystallinity and also enhanced the surface area. They reported that the rehydration for 12 h showed the maximum 98 % FAME yield under optimized reaction conditions. Similarly, investigation of naked CaO catalyst, derived from a calcined short-necked clamshell, recorded 93 % biodiesel yield under the optimal reaction conditions.<sup>244</sup> In addition, CaO derived from various calcined clamshell were utilized for the transformation of diverse edible/non-edible oils, for example, palm oil,<sup>245,246</sup> WFO<sup>247</sup> etc., to produce biodiesel.

A solid ethanol-treated catalyst CaO, derived from calcined abalone shell was examined for production of FAME from palm oil. The authors investigated the impact of ethanol treatment at different temperature (RT, 100 °C and 160 °C) and found that the catalyst treated

with ethanol at 100 °C showed the maximum yield of 96.2 % as ethanol treatment provides high basicity, high surface area and lowered the catalyst crystallinity. Moreover, comparison of modified CaO with naked CaO showed that modified CaO has higher reusability and provided higher biodiesel yield.<sup>248</sup> In addition, there are several reports available in literature regarding the transesterification of palm oil to FAME utilizing CaO based solid catalyst originated from various waste shells such as *T. jourdani* shell,<sup>249</sup> *A. cristatum* shell,<sup>250</sup> cockle shell<sup>251</sup> and obtuse horn shell<sup>252</sup> etc.

In 2009, Xie *et al.*<sup>253</sup> synthesized a solid catalyst via three-step: i) incomplete carbonization of a biont shell at 500 °C, ii) KF impregnation and iii) catalyst activation at 300 °C. The developed catalyst was utilized for conversion of rapeseed oil to FAME. They reported that the catalyst displayed excellent reactivity due to the formation of a higher amount of active sites during the reaction between incomplete carbonized shell and KF. The effect of KF loading was also examined and found that 25 % KF loading is optimal and showed 97 % FAME yield under the optimized reaction conditions. Correspondingly, Boro *et al.*<sup>254</sup> demonstrated the synthesis of CaO catalyst by calcination of *Turbonilla striatula* shell and utilized it for transformation of mustard oil to FAME. The effect of calcination temperature was examined and observed that the catalyst calcined at 900 °C displayed maximum 93.3 % FAME yield. In addition, CaO derived from calcined *Turbonilla striatula* was modified with Ba in the range of 0.5-1.5 wt. % and utilized it for the transformation of WCO to biodiesel. Due to the high acid value 22 mg KOH/g, the oil was pretreated with sulfuric acid to reduce the acid value <1. Then the pretreated oil was transesterified with Ba/CaO catalyst. The authors also examined the effect of Ba loading and found that 1 % of Ba doped showed >98 % biodiesel yield.<sup>255</sup> In addition, *Chicoreus brunneus* shell was calcined above 800 °C to convert CaCO<sub>3</sub> to CaO followed by hydration/dehydration to form a solid base catalyst and examined it for the transformation of rice bran oil. Calcination and hydration provide the catalyst high porosity, enhances the basicity, catalytic activity and reusability.<sup>256</sup> In addition, shrimp shell originated catalysts has also been utilized for transformation of various edible/non-edible oils to FAME. Yang *et al.*<sup>257</sup> synthesized a catalyst via a three steps processes; (i) inadequate carbonization of shrimp shell, (ii) reaction with KF and (iii) activation of the catalyst under the heating condition for the rapeseed oil transformation. The authors examined the impact of carbonization temperature, KF amount and activation temperature and found that 89.1 % biodiesel was achieved under the reaction states: carbonization temperature of 450 °C, KF amount of 25 wt. % and an activation temperature of 250 °C. The excellent catalyst reactivity is attributable to the formation of active sites during the reaction between incomplete

carbonized shrimp shell and KF. Moreover, a solid catalyst, CaO nanoparticles with a diameter of 66 nm derived from *Polymesoda erosa* shell via calcination-hydration-dehydration process was developed for the transformation of JCO to FAME in a two-step procedure: 1) pre-esterification and 2) transesterification. The influence of reaction parameters on the oil conversion was examined by RSM technique and displayed 98.54 % FAME yield.<sup>258</sup>

In the recent past, Sivakumar *et al.*<sup>259</sup> developed a solid catalyst derived from *Scylla Tranquebarica* crab shell calcined at 750 °C for sunflower oil transformation to FAME. The developed catalyst displayed similar reactivity to that of commercial CaO and reported a very high conversion of 94.2 % under the optimal reaction conditions. Similarly, Shankar *et al.*<sup>260</sup> prepared a solid catalyst where CaO (derived from crab shell calcined at 900 °C) impregnated on Na-ZSM-5 followed by activation at 550 °C for 10 h and utilized it for production of FAME from neem oil. The impact of CaO loading was examined and found that 15 wt. % CaO impregnation showed a maximum 95 % biodiesel formation. Moreover, various reports are available for the transesterification of edible/non-edible oils such as palm oil<sup>261</sup> and karanja oil<sup>262</sup> utilizing CaO originated from calcined crab shells.

**Table 13:** Various mollusk and seashells derived solid catalyst for biodiesel production.

No.	Catalyst source	Catalyst	Feedstock	<sup>a</sup> Conditions	Yield (%)	Ref.
1.	Oyster shell	CaO/KI	Soybean	10:1, 1mmol/g, 50, 240	79.5	220
2.	Oyster shell	CaO	Soybean oil	6:1, 25, 65, 300	73.8	221
3.	Oyster and <i>Pyramidella</i> shells	CaO	Jatropha oil	15:1, 4, MW, 6	93	222
4.	River snail shell	CaO	WCO	9:1, 3, 65, 60	92.5 <sup>b</sup>	223
5.	River snail shell	CaO	Palm oil	12:1, 5, 65, 90	98.5	224
6.	River snail shell	CaO	Soybean oil	9:1, 3 <sup>c</sup> , 65, 180	98	225
7.	River snail shell	CaO	WFO	6.03:1, 2, 60, 420	87.28	226
8.	Snail shell	CaO/KBr/k aolin	Soybean oil	6:1, 2, 65, 120	98.5	227
9.	Snail shell	CaO	Soybean oil	6:1, 3, RT, 420	98	228



10.	Snail shell	CaO	WFO	6:1, 3, 60, 60	96	229
11.	Snail shell	CaO	WCO	9:1, 9, 60, 180	84.14	230
12.	Snail shell ( <i>S. canarium</i> )	CaO	WCO	12:1, 3, 65, 240	83.5	231
13.	Snail shell	Nano-CaO	<i>H. wightiana</i> oil	12.4:1, 0.892, 61.6, 145.154	98.93	232
14.	Snail shell	CaO	<i>A. africana</i> seed oil	6:1, 1.5, 55, 65	85	233
15.	Mussel/cockle/scallops shell	CaO	Palm oil	9:1, 10, 65, 180	95	234
16.	Mussel shell ( <i>Perna varidis</i> )	C/CaO/NaOH	Palm oil	0.5:1, 7.5, 65, 180	95.12	235
17.	Mussel shell	CaO/KOH	Castor oil	6:1, 2, 60, 180	91.17	236
18.	Mussel shell	CaO	Soybean oil	24:1, 12, 60, 480	94.1	237
19.	Mussel shell	CaO	Soybean oil	9:1, 4, 65, 180	>98 <sup>b</sup>	238
20.	Fresh water mussel shell	CaO	Chinese tallow oil	12:1, 5, 70, 90	97.5	239
21.	Mussel/clamp/oysters	CaO	<i>Camelina sativa</i> oil	12:1, 1, 65, 120	95/93 /91	240
22.	Angel wing shell	CaO	<i>N. oculata</i> (Microalgae) oil	150:1, 9, 65, 60	84.11	241
23.	Angel wing shell	CaO-SO <sub>4</sub>	PFAD	15:1, 5, 80, 180	98 <sup>b</sup>	242
24.	Clamshell	CaO	Palm oil	9:1, 1, 65, 120	98	243
25.	Short necked clam ( <i>O. orbiculata</i> ) shell	CaO	JCO	20:1, 4, 65, 360	93	244
26.	Clamshell ( <i>M. meretrix</i> )	CaO	WFO	6.03:1, 3, 60, 180	> 89	245
27.	White bivalve clamshell	CaO	WFO	18:1, 8, 65, 180	95.84	246

28.	Venus clam ( <i>Tapes belcheri</i> S.)	CaO	Palm oil	15:1, 5, 65, 360	97	247
29.	Abalon shell	CaO	Palm oil	9:1, 7, 65, 150	96.2	248
30.	<i>T. jourdani</i> shell	CaO	Palm oil	3:1, 10, 80, 420	99.33 <sup>b</sup>	249
31.	<i>A. cristatum</i> shell	CaO	Palm oil	8:1, 3, 60, 360	93	250
32.	Cockleshell	CaO	Palm oil	0.54:1, 4.9, reflux, 180	99.4	251
33.	Obtuse horn shell	CaO	Palm oil	12:1, 5, reflux, 360	86.75	252
34.	Biont (turtle) shell	CaO/KF	Rape seed oil	9:1, 3, 70, 180	97.5	253
35.	<i>Turbonilla striatula</i> shell	CaO	Mustard oil	9:1, 3, 65 ±5, 360	93.3	254
36.	<i>Turbonilla striatula</i> shell	CaO/Ba	WCO	6:1, 1, 65, 120	> 98 <sup>b</sup>	255
37.	<i>Chicoreus brunneus</i> shell	CaO	Rice bran oil	30:1, 0.4, 65, 120	93	256
38.	Shrimp shell	CaO/KF	Rape seed oil	9:1, 2.5, 65, 180	89.1 <sup>b</sup>	257
39.	<i>P. erosa</i> seashells	Nano-CaO	Jatropha oil	5.15:1, 0.02, RT, 133.1	95.8	258
40.	Crab shell ( <i>S. tranquebarica</i> )	CaO	Sunflower oil	12:1, 8, 95, 75	94.2	259
41.	Crab shell	CaO/Na-ZSM-5	Neem oil	12:1, 15, 75, 360	95	260
42.	Crab shell ( <i>S. serrata</i> )	CaO	Palm oil	0.5:1, 5, 65, 150	98.8	261
43.	Crab shell	CaO	Karanja oil	8:1, 2.5, 65, 120	94	262

1224 <sup>a</sup>Methanol-to-oil molar ratio, catalyst loading (wt. %), temperature (°C), reaction time (min).

1225 <sup>b</sup>Conversion


1226 <sup>c</sup>w/w

1227 PFAD = palm fatty acid distillate

1228


### 7.1.7.2 Ashes of biomass

In recent years, the application of waste plant ashes as a highly active heterogeneous catalyst has drawn increasing attention in the realm of biodiesel production. A huge amount of alkali or alkaline earth elements mostly K, Ca and Mg present in the ashes of waste plant biomass acted as a highly basic catalyst in the transesterification reaction to produce biodiesel from vegetable oil with low FFA. In case of vegetable oil with high FFA, reduction of FFA to <1% (by acid-catalyzed esterification) before transesterification reaction is mandatory to elude catalyst consumption in soap formation, which otherwise leads to low biodiesel yield. Usually, biomass is collected, washed and dried either in oven or sunlight, burnt in the open air or burnt in the air followed by calcination to produce a highly basic ash catalyst as shown in Figure 19. Different basic ash catalysts utilized and their efficacy in the synthesis of biodiesel are presented in Table 14. In a pioneering work, Chouhan *et al.*<sup>263</sup> reported the use of amphibian plant *L. perpusilla* Torrey ash as a solid catalyst in biodiesel synthesis from JCO. The plant biomass was subjected to calcination at  $550 \pm 5$  °C for 2 h to obtain the ash catalyst. The crystallinity of the catalyst was affirmed by XRD patterns. Impact of catalyst loading revealed that 5 wt. % (w.r.t. oil) is enough to obtain a high 89.43% biodiesel yield under the optimal reaction conditions. Nevertheless, reusability study demonstrated that the catalyst lost its reactivity in each progressive reaction cycles owing to leaching of the reactive elements in the catalyst. Thereby, the catalyst was recycled up to 3 cycles only.



**Figure 19:** Flowchart for the synthesis of ash catalyst derived from plant biomass.

In another work, oil palm ash was seen as an active catalyst for biodiesel synthesis from WCO by Chin *et al.*<sup>264</sup> Figure 20 depicted the SEM micrograph of the palm ash, which displayed the porous nature of the ash catalyst, while Table 15 listed the elements exist in the palm ash determined from the EDX analysis. It was observed that the palm ash consisted of a large amount of potassium, while a relatively low quantity of aluminum, zinc, and magnesium was also found. Besides, it was seen that the K<sub>2</sub>O was the primary driver for the high basicity and catalytic activity of the catalyst towards biodiesel synthesis. CCD was utilized to investigate the impact of the optimized reaction conditions in biodiesel synthesis such as M/O ratio, reaction time and temperature and catalyst loading. Accordingly, the predicted and experimental biodiesel yields were found to be 60.07 % and 71.74 % respectively.




**Figure 20:** SEM micrograph of palm ash. Reproduced from ref <sup>264</sup>.

**Table 15.** EDX data for compositions of palm ash by. Ref. [264].

Elements	Atomic wt. %
Potassium (K)	40.59
Magnesium (Mg)	0.76
Silicone (Si)	2.63
Aluminum (Al)	0.50
Zinc (Zn)	0.33
Oxygen (O)	29.36
Carbon (C)	14.56

In the meantime, Boey *et al.*<sup>265</sup> reported a solid base, derived from boiler ash (BA) *via* calcination, catalyzed biodiesel synthesis from palm oil. BA effectively transformed palm oil to FAME at moderate reaction conditions and delivered 90% FAME yield. Ironically, the ash is intolerant to the presence of moisture and FFA at 1 wt. % in the feedstock. Betiku *et al.*<sup>266</sup> reported a process for biodiesel synthesis from *Thevetia peruviana* oil by utilizing calcined *Musa paradisiacal* (plantain) peel ash catalyst. The dried powdered plantain peels were calcined at 500 °C for 3.5 h to produce plantain peels ash. Biodiesel yield of 95.2% was acquired using the optimized reaction conditions. In addition, Etim *et al.*<sup>267</sup> utilized ripe plantain fruit peel as a solid catalyst in biodiesel synthesis from *Azadirachta indica* oil. At the onset, pre-esterification of the oil was performed to diminish the FFA contents from 5.81 wt. % to 0.90 wt. % utilizing M/O molar ratio of 2.19 v/v and 6 wt. % of  $\text{Fe}_2(\text{SO}_4)_3$ . Finally, the pre-esterified oil was transformed to FAME *via* transesterification reaction catalyzed by plantain fruit peel ash. Coconut husk ash catalyst was also reported for biodiesel synthesis from JCO.<sup>268</sup> The husks were subjected to calcination at various temperatures ranging from 250-500 °C and identified that catalyst produced at 350 °C calcination temperature was found to be the most reactive one for biodiesel synthesis giving 99.86 % yield within 30 min at the moderate reaction temperature. XRD patterns of the catalysts are presented in Figure 21 which revealed the presence of several components of ash such as KCl,  $\text{K}_2\text{Si}_2\text{O}_5$ ,  $\text{K}_2\text{SO}_4$ ,  $\text{K}_2\text{S}_3$ ,  $\text{KAlO}_2$ ,  $\text{K}_4\text{CaSi}_3\text{O}_9$ ,  $\text{FeCa}_2\text{Al}_2\text{BSi}_4\text{O}_{15}\text{OH}$ , etc.




**Figure 21:** XRD patterns of calcined coconut husk calcined at different temperatures. Reproduced from ref <sup>268</sup>.

Cocoa pod husks (CPHs) was used as a solid catalyst for biodiesel synthesis from soybean oil by Ofori-Boateng *et al.*<sup>269</sup> The authors examined the reactivity of MgO impregnated CPH (MgO@CPH) and bare CPH in biodiesel synthesis under the optimal reaction states and achieved 98.7% and 91.4% biodiesel yields respectively. Moreover, the synthesized fuel satisfies the European biodiesel quality norm (EN 14112). In another study, the production of biodiesel from yellow oleander (*Thevetia peruviana*) seed oil using banana (*Musa balbisiana* Colla) peel ash was reported.<sup>270</sup> K, Na, CO<sub>3</sub>, Cl present in the ash are responsible for the high basicity, thus the reactivity of the catalyst. Oil transformation of 96 % was demonstrated in just 3 h time under room temperature. The produced biodiesel conform to standards set for ASTM D6751, EN 14214 and so forth. BET surface area measurement of the catalyst revealed that the surface area is 1.487m<sup>2</sup>/g. The biodiesel was free from sulfur and has displayed a high cetane number. Meanwhile, *Musa balbisiana* Colla underground stem (MBCUS) ash was examined as a solid base catalyst for biodiesel synthesis from high FFA containing JCO by Sharma *et al.*<sup>271</sup> Characterization of the ash catalyst revealed that it is comprised of oxides and carbonates of various alkali and alkaline earth metals, which leads to the high basicity of the catalyst and surface area is 39 m<sup>2</sup>/g. It was reported that the catalyst is very effective during the biodiesel synthesis process at 275 °C and internal pressure (4.2 MPa) and resulted in 98.0 % biodiesel yield.

Betiku *et al.*<sup>272</sup> led an investigation on the application of banana (*Musa* ‘Gross Michel’) peel waste as a catalyst for biodiesel synthesis from *Bauhinia monandra* (Napoleon's plume) seed oil (BMSO), with a motive to develop a low-cost fuel. The burnt ash of the banana peel was further calcined at 700 °C for 4 h to produce a highly active catalyst. They have utilized RSM model to determine the optimal reaction conditions for biodiesel synthesis using the ash catalyst. The RSM plot of M/O molar ratio and catalyst loading on *Bauhinia monandra* (Napoleon's plume) methyl ester (BMME) yield is shown in Figure 22a. It is observed that BMME yield improved from 0 to >90 wt. % as the M/O molar ratio expanded from 7:1 to 14:1 and catalyst loading increased from 1.5 to 3.5 wt. %. This might be ascribed to the increase in active sites number as a result of increased in catalyst loading. Besides, BMME yield diminished marginally when the catalyst loading was above 3.5 wt. % (Figure 22a). In addition, the plot revealed a direct connection between the M/O molar ratio and catalyst loading on the

biodiesel yield. As the two parameters increases, biodiesel yield also increased (Figure 22a). The transformation of the pre-esterified oil to biodiesel was done inside the time span of 33.79-76.21 min. The extended reaction time, somewhere in the range of 33.79 and 55 min, favoured biodiesel yield; after 55 min, the yield diminished. Figure 22b displays the impact of reaction time and catalyst loading on biodiesel yield. It is observed from the surface plot that rise in catalyst loading and reaction time leads to an increase in biodiesel yield. Moreover, the plot displayed that 90 wt. % biodiesel yield is reached using 4.5 wt. % catalyst loading within 80 min reaction time. In addition, Figure 22c illustrates the surface plot to examine the impact of M/O molar ratio and reaction time on biodiesel yield. It is observed from the plot that increases in two parameters such as M/O molar ratio and reaction time leads to a rise in biodiesel yield. It is seen from the figure that increases in M/O molar ratio from 7:1-14:1 improved the biodiesel yield from 33% to 100 %. Therefore, the highest biodiesel yield was recorded at 14:1 M/O molar ratio and 80 min reaction time.




**Figure 22:** 3-D plots of biodiesel yield.  
Reproduced from ref. [272].

1328

1329           Meanwhile, Onoji *et al.*<sup>273</sup> built up a novel technique to utilize rubber seed shell (RSS)  
1330 ash calcined at 800 °C as a solid base catalyst for the transformation of rubber seed oil to  
1331 biodiesel. The high FFA content of the RSS ( $9.01 \pm 0.07\%$ ) was pre-esterified using  $H_2SO_4$  to  
1332  $>1\%$  FFA. Reusability study of the catalyst revealed that  $>80\%$  biodiesel yield was noticed  
1333 after 4 successive reaction cycles. The surface area and pore size of the calcined RSS was found  
1334 to be 2.29 nm and 352.51  $m^2/g$ , respectively. Similarly, Gohain *et al.*<sup>274</sup> studied the application  
1335 of *Musa balbisiana* Colla peel ash catalyst to produce biodiesel from WCO. It was observed




that the calcination procedure improved the mesoporous and microporous morphology of the catalyst and upgraded its surface area bringing about the higher catalytic activity. The external morphology of the catalyst examined by SEM analysis revealed aggregation of the particles and porosity in the range of micro and meso. Moreover, 100 % conversion of WCO to biodiesel was confirmed by  $^1\text{H}$  NMR spectra (Figure 23b) utilizing Knothe and Kenar equation (1). The  $^1\text{H}$  NMR spectrum of WCO (Figure 18a) displays two peaks at 4.1 and 5.3 ppm because of the glyceridic protons (Figure 23a). The presence of peak of methoxy protons at  $\sim 3.6$  ppm and vanishing of the signs of glyceridic peak close to 4-4.2 ppm (Figure 18b) confirmed the formation of biodiesel.



**Figure 23:**  $^1\text{H}$  NMR Spectrum of (a) WCO and (b) Biodiesel. Reproduced from ref. [274].


In the recent year, Pathak *et al.*<sup>275</sup> utilized *Musa acuminata* peel ash (MAPA) catalyst for biodiesel synthesis from soybean oil at room temperature. Catalyst characterization reported the existence of various alkali and alkaline earth metals that enhance the catalyst basicity and reactivity of the ash catalyst. K (14.27 %), C (47.51 %) and O (30.27 %) are the primary/main elements exist in MAPA as revealed by the XPS data (Figure 24). The authors reported 98.95 % biodiesel yield under the optimized reaction conditions.



**Figure 24:** XPS survey (a), C 1s (b), O 1s (c), and K 2p (d) spectra of MAPA. Reproduced from ref. [275].

Sharma *et al.*<sup>276</sup> investigated the reactivity of wood ash catalyst calcined at different temperature for biodiesel synthesis from JCO. Ester conversion in the range of 97-99% could be achieved with wood ash catalysts. Wood ash calcined at 800 °C afforded 98.7% oil conversion under the ideal reaction conditions. Uprety *et al.*<sup>277</sup> studied the application of wood ash derived from birch bark and fly ash blazed at 800 °C for 4 h synthesis of biodiesel from palm oil. Birch bark ash gave FAME yield of  $88.06 \pm 0.72$ , whereas, fly ash from wood pellet afforded  $99.92 \pm 0.01\%$  yield. Recently, the application of banana peduncle ash as an efficient solid base catalyst for the synthesis of biodiesel from *Ceiba pentandra* oil (CPO) was investigated.<sup>278</sup> Based on the response surface methodology (RSM) study, the ideal reaction conditions for the transformation of CPO into FAME was found to be 1.978 wt. % catalyst loading, 60 min response time, 9.20:1 M/O molar ratio with a maximum predicted FAME yield of 99.36 % which was assessed experimentally as  $98.69 \pm 0.18\%$ . The same research team also investigated the utilization of *Musa acuminata* peduncle for biodiesel preparation from CPO.<sup>279</sup> The authors calculated the surface area and pore diameter of the calcined ash catalyst from BET analysis data and reported  $45.99 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$  and 9.77 nm respectively. Moreover, the catalyst consists of diverse minerals along with potassium as primary components, which leads to the


higher reactivity of the catalyst (Figure 25). High conversion of  $98.73 \pm 0.50$  % FAME was observed under the optimum reaction conditions.



**Figure 25:** EDS images (a) uncalcined and b) calcined banana peduncle. Reproduced from ref. [279].

In 2019, Mendonça *et al.*<sup>280</sup> reported the utilization of calcined (800 °C for 4 h) waste cupuaçu seeds as a solid base catalyst in the synthesis of biodiesel from soybean oil and ethanol. Similarly, Nath *et al.*<sup>281</sup> utilized a solid base catalyst derived from waste *Brassica nigra* plant for the efficient preparation of biodiesel. The SEM-EDX analysis of the catalyst revealed the existence of potassium (56.13 %) and calcium (26.04 %) in huge amount, which may be considered as key ingredients for the high basicity of the catalyst. The authors also measured the surface area pore volume of the catalyst *via* BET analysis and came about 7.308 m<sup>2</sup>/g and 0.011 cm<sup>3</sup>/g respectively. The catalyst possessed excellent reactivity in transforming the soybean oil to FAME and displayed 98.79% FAME yield in a short time frame of 25 min under the optimum states. Betiku *et al.*<sup>156</sup> prepared ash catalyst from kola nut pod husk and used it to convert Kariya seed oil (KSO) to biodiesel, namely Kariya oil methyl esters (KOME), via transesterification process. A maximum of  $98.67 \pm 0.01$  wt. % of FAME yield was observed.

Moreover, the reusability examination of the catalyst suggests that it can be reused for 4 progressive cycles. Recently Changmai *et al.*<sup>282</sup> converted soybean oil to biodiesel using orange peel ash in 98 % yield. XRF analysis showed the presence of oxide of potassium (51.64 %) and calcium. Hammet indicator strategy was employed to examine the catalyst basicity and it was seen as  $9.8 < H_- < 12.2$ . The author's measured catalyst pore volume and surface area from BET analysis and found 0.428 cc/g and 605.60 m<sup>2</sup>/g, respectively. Moreover, GC-MS analysis (Figure 26) reveals the existence of six components in the synthesized FAME; methyl palmitate (11.63 %), methyl oleate (25.32 %) and methyl linoleate (54.34 %) are the major components.




**Figure 26:** GC-MS spectrum of biodiesel from soybean oil. Reproduced from ref. [282].

Waste *Sesamum indicum* plant ash catalyst was also successfully utilized for the transformation of sunflower oil to biodiesel.<sup>283</sup> The measured surface area of the catalyst is 3.66 m<sup>2</sup>/g as obtained from the BET analysis data. A high 98.9 % biodiesel yield was accomplished. They reused the catalyst up to the 3<sup>rd</sup> cycle which yields 94.2 % biodiesel. In addition, Mendonça *et al.*<sup>284</sup> utilized waste tucumã peels ash catalysts for biodiesel synthesis from soybean oil. The catalyst characterization by XRF showed it was mostly composed of oxides of potassium, calcium and magnesium.. Because of its heterogeneous and non-leachable nature, the catalyst derived from *tucumã* peels could be reused at least 5 times. In another study, *Tectona grandis* leaves ash catalyst was developed and utilized for the transformation of WCO to FAME by Gohain *et al.*<sup>285</sup> The measured surface area and pore size of the catalyst are 116.833 m<sup>2</sup>/g and 112.210 Å, respectively as calculated from BET data. 100 % oil transformation to FAME was accomplished at room temperature using the optimized reaction

conditions. Furthermore, cocoa pod husk derived solid base catalyst was employed in the transformation of neem seed oil to FAME.<sup>286</sup> A two-step process was employed for the conversion of neem seed oil to FAME, i) pretreatment of the oil was performed using  $\text{Fe}_2(\text{SO}_4)_3$  catalyst to reduce the FFA content from 28.76 % to 0.39 % and ii) transesterification of pretreated oil using the calcined bio waste-derived catalyst. The authors also studied the effect of reaction parameters using Box-Behnken design (BBD) and CCD of RSM was utilized to determine the optimized reaction conditions. Similarly, a walnut shell derived catalyst was developed for the transformation of sunflower oil to biodiesel.<sup>287</sup> The catalyst was prepared from walnut shells *via* air combustion, thereby bringing down the cost involved in the calcination process to afford ash. The authors reported a 98 % FAME yield within a brief time frame of 10 min. Recently, the transformation of sunflower oil to synthesize FAME using calcined sugar beet generated from agro-industry waste was reported.<sup>288</sup> The catalyst has a high amount of highly basic CaO and showed very high reactivity towards the transesterification process to afford about 93 % FAME yield. 98.39 % soybean oil transformation to FAME under room temperature was reported using *M. acuminata* trunk ash catalyst recently.<sup>289</sup>

Most biomass ash catalysts are usually applied for transesterification reactions of different biodiesel feedstocks and different reaction conditions. These make a comparison of the effectiveness of such catalysts under the same reaction condition impossible. Hence, to have a better insight into the activities of catalysts under the same reaction conditions and feedstock, Odude *et al.*<sup>290</sup> examined the transformation of pre-esterified palm kernel oil (PKO) to FAME utilizing two diverse catalysts viz. calcined banana peel ash (CBPA) and calcined cocoa pod husk ash (CCPHA) under same reaction conditions. RSM technique was utilized for the optimization of both CBPA and CCPHA catalyzed transformation process of PKO to FAME. CCD was utilized to acquire the best possible combination of M/O ratio, catalyst loading and reaction time for the highest conversion of oil to FAME as portrayed in Figure 27. The observed FAME yields under the optimized conditions utilizing catalysts CBPA and CCPHA were 99.5 and 99.3 wt. %, respectively. The created models when exposed to statistical assessment demonstrated that CBPA catalyzed transformation model was better than CCPHA-catalyzed transformation model. In the meantime, *Carica papaya* stem<sup>291</sup> and *Musa balbisiana* underground stem<sup>292</sup> was also reported as a solid catalyst to convert *Scenedesmus obliquus* and *Mesua ferrea* oil respectively, to FAME.





**Figure 27:** Contour and surface plots for PKOME synthesis. Reproduced from ref. [290].

1442

1443

**Table 14:** Different plant ash catalysts in biodiesel productions

No.	Catalyst source	Feedstock	Conditions	Yield (%)	Ref.
1.	<i>L. perpusilla</i> Torrey	JCO	9:1, 5, 65 ± 5, 300	89.43	263
2.	Oil palm ash	WCO	18:0, 5.35, 60, 30	71.74	264

3.	Oil palm ash/ boiler ash (BA)	Palm olein	15:1, 3, 60, 30	90	265
4.	<i>Musa paradisiacal</i> (plantain) peels	<i>Thevetia peruviana</i> oil	3.3:1, 3, 60, 60	95.2	266
5.	Ripe plantain fruit peel	<i>Azadirachta indica</i> oil	1:0.73, 0.65, 65, 57	99.2	267
6.	Coconut husk	JCO	12:1, 7, 45, 30 min,	99.86	268.
7.	Cocoa pod husks	Soybean oil	6:1, 1, 60, 60/120	98.7/ 91.4	269
8.	<i>Musa balbisiana</i> Colla peel	<i>Thevetia peruviana</i> seed oil	20:1 <sup>d</sup> , 20, RT, 180	96 <sup>b</sup>	270
9.	<i>Musa balbisiana</i> Colla underground stem	JCO	9:1, 5, 275, 60	98	271
10.	Musa ‘Gross Michel’ peel	Napoleon's plume seed oil	7.6:1, 2.75, 65, 69.02	98.5	272
11.	Rubber seed shell	Rubber seed oil	0.20:1 <sup>e</sup> , 2.2, 60, 60	83.06	273
12.	<i>Musa balbisiana</i> Colla peel	WCO	6:1, 2, 60, 180	100 <sup>b</sup>	274
13.	<i>M. acuminata</i> peel	Soybean	6:1, 7, RT, 240	98.95	275
14.	Wood ( <i>Acacia nilotica</i> ) stem	JCO	12:1, 5, 65, 180	98.7 <sup>b</sup>	276
15.	Birch bark/ fly ash	Palm oil	12:1, 3, 60, 180	88.06 ± 0.72/ 99.92 ± 0.01	277
16.	Musa spp “Pisang Awak” peduncle	<i>Ceiba pentandra</i> oil	9.20:1, 1.978, 65, 60	98.69 ± 0.18	278
17.	<i>Musa acuminata</i> peduncle	<i>Ceiba pentandra</i> oil	11.46:1, 2.68, 65, 106	98.73±0.50 <sup>b</sup>	279
18.	<i>Theobroma grandiflorum</i> seeds	Soybean oil	10:1, 10, 80, 480	98.36 <sup>b</sup>	280
19.	<i>Brassica nigra</i> plant	Soybean oil	12:1, 7, 65, 25	98.79	281

20.	Kola nut pod husk	Kariya seed oil (KSO)	6:1, 3, 65, 75	98.67±0.01	156
21.	Orange peel	Soybean oil	6:1, 7, RT, 420	98 <sup>b</sup>	282
22.	<i>Sesamum indicum</i> plant	Sunflower oil	12:1, 7, 65, 40	98.9	283
23.	Tucumã peels	Soybean oil	15:1, 1, 80, 240	97.3 <sup>b</sup>	284
24.	<i>Tectona grandis</i> leaves	WCO	6:1, 2.5, RT, 180	100 <sup>b</sup>	285
25.	Cocoa pod husk	<i>Azadirachta indica</i> oil	0.73:1 <sup>e</sup> , 0.65, 65, 57	99.3	286
26.	Walnut shell	Soybean oil	12:1, 5, 60, 10	98	287
27.	Sugar beet waste	Sunflower oil	4.5:1, 1, 75, 60	93 <sup>b</sup>	288
28.	<i>M. acuminata</i> trunk	Soybean oil	6:1, 14, RT, 360	98.39 <sup>b</sup>	289
29.	Banana peel/ cocoa pod husk	Palm kernel oil	0.80:1 <sup>e</sup> , 4, 65, 65	99.5/99.3	290
30.	<i>Carica papaya</i> stem	<i>Scenedesmus obliquus</i>	9:1, 2, 60, 180	93.33 <sup>b</sup>	291
31.	<i>Musa balbisiana</i> underground stem	<i>Mesua ferrea</i> oil	9:1, 5, 60, 275	95 <sup>b</sup>	292

<sup>a</sup>\*Methanol-to-oil molar ratio, catalyst loading (wt. %), temperature (°C), reaction time (min).

<sup>b</sup>Conversion

<sup>d</sup>mL/g

<sup>e</sup>v/v.

## 7.2 Acid catalysts

Acid can catalyze both transesterification and esterification reactions without soap formation.<sup>293</sup> Hence, unlike base catalysts, an acid catalyst has the potential to afford biodiesel from poor quality oil with high FFA and high water content. In the transesterification reaction, alkaline catalysts are superior in promoting methoxide anion formation from methanol. In contrary to it, acidic catalysts are less active in methoxide anion formation, but could activate the carbonyl bonds via H<sup>+</sup> addition (Brønsted acidic sites) or via coordination of the carbonyl oxygen with the coordinatively unsaturated metal ion sites (Lewis acidic sites), and thereby promote transesterification. Hence, an increase in the number of either Brønsted or Lewis acidic sites promotes faster FAME formation *via* transesterification. Delightfully,



heterogeneous acid catalysts are endorsed as a potential alternative to homogenous acids catalysts as it possesses certain advantages like it can be easily separated and reused, less corrosive and less toxic.<sup>294</sup> In recent years, several research groups have studied the feasibility of solid acid catalysts for esterification/transesterification processes and proposed economical and environment-friendly approaches for biodiesel production.<sup>295–297</sup>

### 7.2.2 Ion exchange resin

It is a well-known fact that several catalysts have been employed for FAME production from various feedstocks. But due to the certain disadvantages of conventional catalysts, researchers are always in search of an ideal catalyst which should overcome all associated limitations such as catalyst should be active at lower temperatures, exhibits high catalytic efficacy in terms of conversion of FAME, easy availability, low cost, easy downstream processing and reusability. Such an ideal catalyst can be considered as potential and economically viable candidates for biodiesel production.<sup>298</sup> In this context, one of them is ion exchange resin which meets most of the specifications of an ideal catalyst. Thus, many research groups have studied the role of ion exchange resins as solid catalysts in FAME product.<sup>299,300</sup> Resin is the insoluble solid material that can retain and discharge ions simultaneously.<sup>301</sup> Resins are broad categories into cationic and anionic resin based on functional groups and degree of cross-linkages. It possesses specific functional groups responsible for the permutation of ions.<sup>301</sup> Having one of the important properties, the resin-based catalyst undergoes easy recovery from liquid mixtures by simple methods and are active at low temperature.

Since last few years, the cationic resins have gained considerable attention due to the advantages like functioning at soft reaction conditions, non-corrosive nature, more numbers of active sites and lower residual waters production.<sup>302,303</sup> The cationic resin catalysts possess numerous active acid sites that play a crucial role in FAME production *via* esterification/transesterification reactions.<sup>304,305</sup> Various ion exchange resin catalyst utilized for FAME production together with ideal reaction conditions are listed in Table 16. In 2007, Shibasaki-Kitakawa *et al.*<sup>302</sup> in a comparative study reported that cation exchange resins showed less efficacy than anion exchange resins towards the conversion of triacylglycerols to biodiesel. Moreover, while evaluating the conversion rates of various commercial resins such as Diaion PA308, PA306, PA306S and Diaion HPA25, it was observed that highly porous resin-like Diaion HPA25 showed low conversion rate and it is believed this might be due to resistance of the resin towards the water. According to Ren *et al.*<sup>303</sup> transformation of soybean

oil to FAME reduced from 95.2 % to 87.7 % in the existence of D261 anion-exchange resin when the water content is enhanced from 0.0 % to 1.0 % by mass of oil. Similarly, in another study Deboni *et al.*<sup>304</sup> also reported lowering of reaction rate due to the presence of water inside the resins.

Generally, ion exchange resins are utilized for purification and softening of water at room temperature. Recently, Kansedo *et al.*<sup>305</sup> compared the catalytic efficiencies of different ion exchange resins like Amberlyst 15, Dowex DR-2030 and DR-G8 for the transformation of FFA into FAME *via* esterification of the sea mango oil (hydrolyzed) at RT. The results revealed that Amberlyst 15 showed maximum efficacy with the highest FAME production compared to Dowex DR-2030 and Dowex DR-G8. However, Jaya *et al.*<sup>306</sup> utilized ion exchange resins catalyst at a moderately lower temperature (50 °C to 80 °C) for biodiesel production which is analogous to those of homogenous catalytic process. Further, Umer and co-worker investigated the transformation of *Lagenaria Vulgaris* seed oil to biodiesel exploiting Amberlyst 15 resin and calcium oxide (egg cell) catalyst. The authors reported 93.2 % yield of biodiesel when Amberlyst 15 ion exchange resin was used as a catalyst with the loading of 5 % w/w and M/O ratio of 40 % w/w for 40 min of and reaction time at 60 °C.<sup>307</sup> Similarly, Kansedo and Lee<sup>308</sup> investigated the esterification of hydrolyzed sea mango oil utilizing different cationic ion exchange resins, and over 80 % yield of FAME was recorded using Amberlyst 15 catalyst at a comparatively lower temperature within 1 hr of reaction time and with catalyst loading less than 5 % w/w.

Recently, Deboni *et al.*<sup>304</sup> reported 99 % yield of methyl and ethyl esters from soybean oil with methanol and ethanol respectively using optimal reaction conditions. Whereas, Guzhan *et al.*<sup>309</sup> recorded 63 % yield of FAME from canola oil using Amberlyst-26 under the optimized reaction conditions.. Moreover, in another study, a yield of about 67 % was observed for canola oil and methanol with almost similar reaction conditions.<sup>301,309</sup> The conversion of tallow fat with methanol showed the yield of methyl and ethyl esters around 95 % using Amberlyst-A26 OH with reaction conditions like tallow fat with methanol molar ratio of 6:1, resin loading of 2 mol/L at 65 °C temperature for about 8.5 hours.<sup>310</sup>

Hartono *et al.*<sup>311</sup> investigated the catalytic efficacy of heterogeneous catalyst obtained from a different source like Lewatit macroporous resin, Amberlite gel resin and natural zeolite from Bayah to transform WCO to biodiesel. Authors reported the 85.94 % yield of biodiesel production by Lewatit macroporous anion exchanger with 6 M NaOH. Whereas, Amberlite gel with 6 M HCl displayed 65.22 % biodiesel generation. Previously, Shibasaki-Kitakawa *et al.*<sup>312</sup> reported the usefulness of the anion-exchange resin from their catalytic and adsorption

abilities for the transformation of WCO to FAME. In their another study, Shibasaki-Kitakawa *et al.*<sup>313</sup> also developed ion-exchange resin catalysts based continuous process for the production of biodiesel. FFA conversions rate was estimated for different catalysts with reactions conditions like mole ratio of M/O (6:1), temperature (63.83 °C), reaction time (2 h) and catalyst load (20 wt. %). The maximum FFA conversions of 79.7 % were recorded for NKC-9. Whereas, for 001 x 7 and D61 catalysts it was found to be only 32.2 % and 10.3 % respectively.<sup>314</sup> Jalilnejad-Falizi *et al.*<sup>315</sup> achieved the highest FFA conversions by ion exchange resins (PD206-Na<sup>+</sup> and PD206-H<sup>+</sup>) under the optimal reation conditions. All the above-mentioned reports are enough to summarize that ion exchange resins can be employed as one the potential heterogeneous catalysts in biodiesel production.

**Table 16:** Different ion exchange resin catalyst used for the production of biodiesel.

No.	Catalyst	Feedstocks	<sup>a</sup> Conditions	Yield (%)	Ref.
1	D261 anion-exchange resin	Soybean oil	9:1, 50.15, 56	95.2 <sup>b</sup>	303
2	Amberlyst A26 OH anion exchange resin	Acid soybean oil	9:1, 2, 50, NR	78	304
3	Amberlyst-15	Hydrolyzed sea mango oil	6:1, 30,30, NR	>90	305
4	Basic anion exchange resin.	Pongamia oil	9:1, 75, 60	85	306
5	Amberlyst 15 ion exchange resin	Lagenaria vulgaris seed oil	40:1, 5, 60, 40	93.2	307
6	Amberlyst	Hydrolyzed sea mango oil	3:12, 100, 60	>80	308
7	Amberlyst-26	Canola oil	6:1, 3, 45, 90	67	309
8	Amberlyst-A26 OH	Tallow fat	6:1, 2 mol/L, 65, 360	95	310
9	Amberlite gel resin	WCO	7:1, 60, 120	85.94	311
10	Cation-exchange resin	Rice bran oil	6:1, 20, 63.83, 120	79.7	313
11	Purolite-PD206	Corn oil	18:1, 65, 2880	79.45	315

<sup>a</sup>Methanol-to-oil molar ratio, catalyst loading (wt. %), temperature (°C), reaction time (min).

<sup>b</sup>Conversion

NR: Not reported

PFAD: palm fatty acid distillate

### 7.2.3 Sulfated catalyst

Among solid acid catalysts, sulfated catalysts have attracted considerable attention for transesterification due to their super-acid property. Sulfated inorganic metal oxides are reported to be chemically stable, and have super acidity comparable to 100 % sulfuric acid, remarkable acid-base and redox properties.<sup>316</sup> Different kinds of sulfated catalysts such as sulfated zirconia, tin oxide, zirconia-alumina, etc. have been successfully exploited in the production of biodiesel; but among these, sulfated zirconia is most widely studied catalyst (Table 17). Various reports are available on the transformation of oil to FAME utilizing sulfated zirconia catalyst, but there are some studies which presented certain drawbacks of these catalysts which include low catalytic activities, drastic reaction conditions, and reusability issues. Moreover, lack of uniform pore size and low surface area are the other factors which restrict their wide uses in catalyzing bulky oil molecules of biodiesel feedstocks. In this context, several attempts have been made to modify sulfated zirconia catalysts with an intention to increase their catalytic efficacy.

Xia *et al.*<sup>317</sup> demonstrated the synthesis of mesoporous materials which has the potential to improve the activity of sulfated zirconia catalyst owing to their promising and outstanding properties like high surface area, uniform and controllable pore size. According to Alexander *et al.*<sup>318</sup> the modification of sulfated zirconia catalyst enhanced the total acidity which basically increased catalyst active sites. In another study, Guoliang *et al.*<sup>319</sup> proposed that change in phase structure of sulfated zirconia can also increase its catalytic activity and therefore, they developed tetragonal sulfated zirconia which showed enhanced catalytic activity in the FAME synthesis procedure. Moreover, some of the studies proposed the modification of sulfated zirconia on MCM-41 (Mobil Composition of Matter No. 41) support for the generation of methyl tert-butyl ether to improve its catalytic performance, the results obtained revealed that the catalytic performance of the prepared supported sulfated zirconia catalyst was 2.5-3.0 times greater than neat sulfated zirconia.<sup>317,320</sup> Similarly, Muthu *et al.*<sup>321</sup> reported the preparation of FAME from neem (*Azadirochta indica*) oil using sulfated zirconia catalyst. It was revealed that catalyst is highly stable to oils with high FFA concentration. The strong acid sites of this catalyst showed a considerable impact on its reactivity in the transformation of neem oil.

Recently, Lam *et al.*<sup>322</sup> developed  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}/\text{SnO}_2$  catalyst by impregnation method and exploited it for the conversion of WCO to biodiesel. Further, the authors studied the bi-metallic impact of the catalyst, in which  $\text{SnO}_2$  was blended in with  $\text{SiO}_2$  and  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ , at various weight ratios to increase the activity of  $\text{SnO}_2$ . The finding confirmed that  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}/\text{SnO}_2\text{-SiO}_2$  weight ratio of 3 showed exceptionally high reactivity with 92.3 % biodiesel yield using optimal reaction conditions. Similarly, Pereira *et al.*<sup>323</sup> demonstrated the application of  $\text{SnSO}_4$  catalyst for the esterification of oleic acid (as model feedstock) and acid soybean oil having high contents of FFA. It was found that model feedstock containing 70 wt. % of FFA showed 92 % FAME yield using excess ethanol, 5 wt. %  $\text{SnSO}_4$  at 100 °C for 3 h. Moreover, it was also reported that the catalyst is stable up to ten cycles without any significant decrease in biodiesel yield. Moreover, one of the studies involved the application of sulfated tin oxide modified with  $\text{SiO}_2$  ( $\text{SO}_4^{2-}/\text{SnO}_2\text{-SiO}_2$ ) catalyst to produce FAME from JCO.<sup>324</sup> The sulfated titania-based solid superacid catalysts are another kind of sulfated catalysts. Li *et al.*<sup>325</sup> prepared three different titania-based solid superacid catalysts and these were exploited for the transformation of rape seed oil to FAME at 353 K with a 12:1 molar ratio of M/O under atmospheric pressure. It was found that all three prepared catalysts showed a significant yield of biodiesel due to their stronger surface acidities. Moreover, Alaba *et al.*<sup>316</sup> reviewed that apart from these there are various other sulfated metal oxides such as titania, silica and combination of both also showed remarkable performance. It was also proved thorough investigation led by several researchers who have applied sulfated silica as catalysts for esterification and transesterification.<sup>326,327</sup> In this context, Gardy and co-workers demonstrated a facile preparation of sulfated doped  $\text{TiO}_2$  catalyst that has been utilized efficiently in petroleum refinery. The authors reported that the synthesized catalyst has better reactivity than other sulfated metal oxides, primarily because of the acidic properties of  $\text{TiO}_2$  particles, which was subjected to sulfonation to enhance its acidity. The catalyst displayed great efficiency in the synthesis of FAME from WCO.<sup>328,329</sup>

**Table 17:** Different types of sulfated catalyst reported for biodiesel production.

No.	Catalyst	Feedstocks	Conditions	Yield (%)	Ref.
1	$\text{SO}_4^{2-}/\text{ZrO}_2$	Neem oil	9:1, 1, 65, 120	95	321
2	$\text{SO}_4^{2-}/\text{SnO}_2\text{-SiO}_2$	WCO	15:1, 3, 150, 180	92.3	322
3	$\text{SnSO}_4$	Soybean oil	3.5:1, 5, 100, 180	92	323
4	$\text{SO}_4^{2-}/\text{SnO}_2\text{-SiO}_2$	Jatropha oil	15:1, 3, 180, 120	97	324
5	$\text{SO}_4^{2-}/\text{TiO}_2$	Rapeseed oil	12:1, NR. 80, 720	51	325

6	Ti(SO <sub>4</sub> )O	WCO	9:1, 1.5, 75, 180	97.1	328
7	TiO <sub>2</sub> /PrSO <sub>3</sub> H	WCO	15:1, 4.5, 60, 540	98.3	329

<sup>a</sup>Methanol-to-oil molar ratio, catalyst loading (wt. %), temperature (°C), reaction time (min).

NR: Not reported

### 7.2.1 Mixed metal oxides

A wide range of acidic mixed metal oxide catalysts has been utilized to overcome the problem associated with high FFA content in low-cost biodiesel feedstock employed in FAME production (Table 18). Suzuta *et al.*<sup>330</sup> reported utilization of Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-SiO<sub>2</sub> catalyst in the conversion of JCO to FAME. The catalyzed reaction displayed 95.6 % FAME yield under the optimized reaction conditions. When Fe loading was raised from 0.07 to 2.1 wt. %, the acidity of the catalyst increased drastically. Fe-oxide species scattered over the SiO<sub>2</sub> surface were recognized as the active sites. In the meantime, ZnAl<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub>/ZnFe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> catalyst was also examined for the transformation of oil such as sunflower oil, WCO and JCO.<sup>331</sup> During the reaction, the Zn 3d electrons of ZnAl<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> and ZnFe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> spinels were likely to take part in the electronic excitation, thereby Zn 3d electrons are probably going to undertake a vital job to enhance the catalyst reactivity. In 2012, Xie *et al.*<sup>332</sup> synthesized SnO<sub>2</sub>-SiO<sub>2</sub> catalyst by loading 8 wt. % Sn onto SiO<sub>2</sub> followed by calcination (550 °C) and exploited it in the transformation of soybean to FAME yielding 81.7 % under the optimal reaction conditions.

Impregnation followed by calcination (600 °C) was used to synthesize Fe-Mn-MoO<sub>3</sub>/ZrO<sub>2</sub> catalyst, which could provide a high 95.6 ± 0.15 % yield of FAME.<sup>333</sup> It is interesting to observe that ZrO<sub>2</sub> and MoO<sub>3</sub>/ZrO<sub>2</sub> gave a lower FAME yield of 48.6 ± 1.14 and 73.0 ± 0.25 % respectively. The high activity of Fe-Mn-MoO<sub>3</sub>/ZrO<sub>2</sub> catalyst is attributed to high surface area (49.5 m<sup>2</sup>g<sup>-1</sup>) and availability of huge active sites (2411 μmolg<sup>-1</sup>) in the catalyst. Moreover, catalyst reusability examination revealed that it is stable up to 6 progressive reaction cycles of transesterification of WCO without loss in its efficiency. On the other hand, enhanced catalytic activity was observed in a mixed metal oxide of WO<sub>3</sub>/SnO<sub>2</sub> in the soybean oil transformation in comparison with the individual WO<sub>3</sub> and SnO<sub>2</sub> species.<sup>334</sup> The bonding of WO<sub>3</sub> with SnO<sub>2</sub> was believed to upgrade WO<sub>3</sub>/SnO<sub>2</sub> acidity. The catalyst is highly stable and was reused up to 4 times without much depreciation in the biodiesel yield.

Further, Xie *et al.*<sup>335</sup> studied 30 wt. % WO<sub>3</sub> loading on AlPO<sub>4</sub> catalyst and recorded a good 72.5 % conversion to biodiesel under the optimized reaction condition. The high catalyst reactivity was attributed to the existence of WO<sub>3</sub> that enhanced the surface acid sites. Similarly, Amani *et al.*<sup>336</sup> reported a series of Mn<sub>3.5x</sub>Zr<sub>0.5y</sub>Al<sub>x</sub>O<sub>3</sub> catalyst for the transformation of WCO

to FAME. The  $\text{Mn}_{1.4}\text{Zr}_{0.35}\text{Al}_{0.6}\text{O}_3$  catalyst demonstrates better catalyst reactivity as far as FAME yield (>93 %) than the  $\text{Mn}_{1.4}\text{Zr}_{0.35}\text{O}_3$  catalyst (52.8 %). The bonding between metals in the crystal structure efficiently influenced the catalyst reactivity. It was observed that the amphoteric component of the Al developed the surface region of the catalyst and framed a complex structure with other metal oxides, though Mn alternated the morphology and catalyst basic site density. In the meantime, Zhang *et al.*<sup>337</sup> reported Zr-Mo mixed metal oxide functionalized with various carboxylic acids, for example, lauric acid, stearic acid, palmitic acid and myristic acid for biodiesel production from oleic acid. The modification of Zr-Mo metal oxide using such monofunctional carboxylic acids enhances the catalyst acidity and surface area, thus upgraded the rate of the reaction. They also reported that among all, stearic acid-functionalized Zr-Mo metal oxide showed the best result with the maximum oleic acid conversion of 94.2 %. Catalyst reusability test revealed that the catalyst is stable up to 6 progressive cycles. Similarly, WCO was utilized for the FAME production using ferric-manganese doped tungstate molybdena nanoparticles (FMWMo).<sup>338</sup> The dopants Fe-Mn enhances the surface area, density of acidic sites and the stability towards the esterification of WCO. A maximum yield of  $92.3 \pm 1.12$  % methyl ester was achieved under the optimized reaction conditions.

**Table 18:** Different types of solid acid catalysts for FAME production.

No.	Catalyst	Feedstocks	<sup>a</sup> Conditions	Yield (%)	Ref.
1.	$\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3\text{-SiO}_2$	Jatropha oil	218:1, 15, 220, 180	95.6	330
2.	$\text{ZnAl}_2\text{O}_4/\text{ZnFe}_2\text{O}_4$	Sunflower oil, WCO, Jatropha oil	9:1, 5, 180, 600	>90	331
3.	$\text{SnO}_2\text{-SiO}_2$	Soybean oil	24:1, 5, 180, 300	81.7	332
4.	$\text{Fe-Mn-MoO}_3/\text{ZrO}_2$	WCO	25:1, 4, 200, 300	$95.6 \pm 0.15$	333
5.	$\text{WO}_3\text{-SnO}_2$	Soybean oil	30:1, 5, 110, 300	79.2	334
6.	$\text{WO}_3(30 \text{ wt. } \%) / \text{AlPO}_4$	Soybean oil	30:1, 5, 180, 300	72.5	335
7.	$\text{Mn}_{1.4}\text{Zr}_{0.35}\text{Al}_{0.6}\text{O}_3$	WCPO	14:1, 2.5, 150, 300	>93	336
8.	Zr-Mo	Oleic acid	10:1, 4, 180, 120	$94.2^b$	337
9.	FMWMo	WCO	25:1, 6, 200, 480	$92.3 \pm 1.12$	338

<sup>a</sup>Methanol-to-oil molar ratio, catalyst loading (wt. %), temperature (°C), reaction time (min).

#### 7.2.4 Sulfonated carbon-based catalyst

In the last few decades, various carbon materials with different shape, size, and structures have been developed by several research groups and utilized as low-cost catalysts for diverse industrial processes including transesterification.<sup>339</sup> Currently, sulfonated carbons i.e. SO<sub>3</sub>H-functionalized acidic carbon materials are considered as a new group of the metal-free solid acid catalyst described by their original carbon structure and Brønsted acidity equivalent to concentrated H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>. Sulfonated carbon acid catalysts can be easily prepared by processes like incomplete carbonization of aromatic compounds in concentrated H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub><sup>340</sup> or sulfonation of incompletely carbonized natural organic matter, such as sugar<sup>341–343</sup> and cellulosic materials.<sup>344,345</sup> Sulfonation can also be achieved by treating carbon material with a sulfonating reagent such as gaseous SO<sub>3</sub>, ClSO<sub>3</sub>H, p-toluenesulfonic acid, 4-benzenediazonium sulfonate or SO<sub>3</sub>H-containing aryl diazoniums etc.<sup>346–349</sup> These materials possess promising features such as biogenic, environment-friendly, lower production costs, distinctive surface chemistry, high chemical and thermal stability.

The acid-catalyzed chemical reactions such as saccharification, esterification, transesterification and acetylation are vital operations commonly used for the valorization of biomass or their components to useful products in various food, fuel and chemical industries.<sup>350</sup> The functionalized acidic carbons from inexpensive sources including natural organic carbon matter such as sugars, carbohydrates, cellulosic materials, lignin have been achieved by several researchers.<sup>351–353,341</sup> Besides this, agro waste such as husk, straw, seed cover, cow manure, corn cob<sup>342,343,354,355</sup>, carbonaceous waste from industries (char, oil pitch, coke, glycerol, etc.)<sup>356,357,346,348</sup> and polymer resins<sup>349,358,359</sup> were also used. Various carbon supports (e.g. zeolite-templated carbons, mesoporous carbons, active carbon, etc)<sup>352,353,360,361</sup> and more recently nanostructured carbons such as graphene, graphene oxide, carbon nanotubes, and carbon dots)<sup>362–367</sup> have been exploited for the same purpose.


Over the last few years, there is growing interest from researchers towards the application of sulfonated carbon-based catalysts due to their noteworthy efficacies mentioned earlier. Many reports are available which demonstrated the efficient nature of sulphonic acid-functionalized catalyst in biodiesel production using various feedstocks.<sup>362,356,367</sup> One of the reports presented the synthesis of organosulfonic acid (i.e. propylsulfonic and arenesulfonic groups) functionalized mesoporous silicas through a simple one-step process. The synthesized novel catalysts that possessed propylsulfonic groups and arenesulfonic groups were further evaluated for their catalytic efficacy in the esterification of fatty acid with methanol to produce methyl esters and the authors also compared the efficacy of these heterogeneous catalysts with



a variety of commercially available catalysts such as sulfuric acid, p-toluene sulfonic acid, Nafion NR50, Amberlyst-15, etc. The obtained results indicated that the organosulfonic acid-functionalized mesoporous silica catalysts showed the highest reactivity compared to all the above mentioned commercial solid acid catalysts in fatty acid esterification process. Moreover, it was also recorded that the efficiency of these catalysts was largely depended on important factors such as the median pore diameter of the catalyst and the acidic strength of the organosulfonic acid group present over this catalyst. Considering these findings, it can be proposed that there is a huge potential to developed catalysts using organic-inorganic mesoporous materials.<sup>363</sup> In general, the activity of carbon-based catalysts upon fatty acid (C16-C18) esterification to produce biodiesel primarily depends on three primary factors: (i) -SO<sub>3</sub>H group density, (ii) total acid density, and (iii) porosity. Different sulfonated carbon-based acid catalyst utilized for FAME production are listed in Table 19. Numerous reported catalysts demonstrated promising outcome in the (trans)esterification of biodiesel feedstocks with high FFA and afforded > 85% FAME yield. In the meantime, several investigations had been conducted using model acids (e.g. palmitic acid, oleic acid, etc. which are the major components of vegetable oil as reactant) that mainly focused on esterification reaction.


In a pioneering work towards the preparation of biomass-based sulfonated carbon catalyst, Toda *et al.*<sup>364</sup> synthesized sulfonated carbon catalyst by partial carbonization of sugar followed by sulfonation in fuming H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>. The prepared catalyst consists of sheets of indistinctive carbon having a high amount of sulfonic groups along with hydroxyl and carboxyl as a minor group (Figure 28). The highly active bio-based carbon catalyst was utilized for transformation of oleic and stearic acid to FAME *via* esterification. Apart from -SO<sub>3</sub>H group, presence of -OH and -COOH groups in the catalyst greatly enhance the catalytic activity and make it highly water tolerant. The successful incorporation of -SO<sub>3</sub>H group and formation of carbonized materials are can be easily confirmed by using FT-IR and <sup>13</sup>C MAS NMR analysis respectively, as depicted in Figure 33.<sup>368</sup> FT-IR spectra (Figure 29a) displayed two bands at 1040 and 1377 cm<sup>-1</sup> (in SO<sub>3</sub>H), ascribed to SO<sub>3</sub> and O=S=O stretching vibration, respectively, suggests the existence of -SO<sub>3</sub>H groups. <sup>13</sup>C MAS NMR (Figure 29b) depicted three major peaks at 130, 155, and 180 ppm, ascribed to polycyclic aromatic carbon atoms, phenolic OH, and COOH groups, respectively.

In another work, Hara *et al.*<sup>356</sup> examined sulfonated carbon catalyst in biodiesel synthesis. The findings showed that amorphous carbon material containing sulfonic acid groups enhances the catalytic performance, thus displayed extraordinary reactivity in esterification/transesterification reactions in comparison to the ordinary solid acid catalyst.




**Figure 28:** Synthesis of sulfonated carbon catalyst from sucrose and D-glucose.

Reproduced from ref. [364].



**Figure 29:** FT-IR (a) and  $^{13}\text{C}$  MAS NMR (b) spectrum for the sulfonated carbon catalyst originated from cellulose. Reproduced from ref. [368].

Likewise, Nakajima *et al.*<sup>365</sup> synthesized amorphous cellulose-originated carbon solid acid (CCSA) catalyst and exploited it in the transformation of oleic acid to FAME, and observed a 99.9 % yield under the optimized conditions. The carbon material displayed much higher catalytic activity in esterification reaction in comparison to ordinary solid acid catalysts examined, such as niobic acid, Amberlyst-15 and Nafion NR50. Interestingly, those CCSA catalyst prepared at a lower carbonization temperature before subjected to sulfonation gave a lot better biodiesel yield as compared to those prepared at higher carbonization temperature. This is attributed to the huge amount of  $-\text{OH}$  and  $-\text{COOH}$  groups in the former which enhanced its acidic nature, thereby its catalytic activities (Figure 30). The catalyst reactivity remains intact after 10 progressive cycles.




**Figure 30:** Schematic structures of SO<sub>3</sub>H-bearing CCSA materials carbonized at below 723 K (A) and (B) above 823 K. Reproduced from ref. [365].

1730

1731 Simultaneous carbonization and sulfonation in a one-pot synthesis of solid acid catalyst  
 1732 directly from biomass have also been explored by various experts as it is straight forward, cost  
 1733 and time-efficient. Malins *et al.*<sup>366</sup> synthesized C-SO<sub>3</sub>H via simultaneous carbonization-  
 1734 sulfonation and utilized it for FAME production. The C-SO<sub>3</sub>H catalysts with the highest density  
 1735 of SO<sub>3</sub>H groups (0.81 mmol Hp/g) were prepared using optimal reaction conditions. It was  
 1736 noted that under optimized reaction conditions 96.5 % of FAME was recorded. Interestingly,  
 1737 the catalyst has great stability and can be easily recovered and reused for subsequent reaction  
 1738 cycles. Moreover, in the comparative study of esterification reactions of rapeseed oil fatty  
 1739 acids, the prepared catalyst exhibited similar reactivity to Amberlyst-15.

1740 Another recent report proposed a synthesis of the heterogeneous sulfonated catalyst  
 1741 using activated carbon to overcome several problems like drastic reaction conditions such as  
 1742 very high temperature, pressure, longer reaction time and expensive overall process cost. The  
 1743 above-mentioned activated carbon catalyst was prepared from corncobs as a precursor and  
 1744 utilized in the microwave-assisted conversion of soybean oil with ethanol to FAME. In this

study, about 88.7 % yield of pure biodiesel was reported at 0-600 W of microwave power. Moreover, the catalyst was reused up to 5 cycles.<sup>355</sup> Figure 31 represents the schematic illustration of the application of activated carbon-based catalyst in the transesterification of various oils using methanol.




**Figure 31:** Schematic representation of transesterification of various oils using activated carbon-based catalysts.

In 2009, Yuan *et al.*<sup>369</sup> examined the application of solid acid catalyst originated from sulfonated activated carbon ( $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4/\text{C}$ ) for catalyzing transesterification of castor oil and methanol as feedstock. Melero *et al.*<sup>370</sup> synthesized sulfonic acid-modified mesostructured (SAM) catalyst and studied their efficacy in crude vegetable oils transformation to FAME. The results obtained noted that this catalyst has the ability to yield 95 wt. % pure FAME and oil transformation close to 100 %. Despite the presence of FFAs, this catalyst displayed significantly high activity toward simultaneous esterification and transesterification reactions. Similarly, Zuo *et al.*<sup>371</sup> developed various sulfonic acid functionalized mesoporous SBA-15 catalysts and tested their catalytic activity in the microwave-assisted conversion of soybean oil and 1-butanol to biodiesel. The authors observed that the catalytic efficacy of these catalysts mainly depends on the acid strength and not on the number of acid sites. Further, propyl- $\text{SO}_3\text{H}$  and arene- $\text{SO}_3\text{H}$  functionalized SBA-15 catalysts found to have comparatively better reactivity

in the transesterification process. However, perfluoro-SO<sub>3</sub>H functionalized SBA-15 catalyst displayed leaching of the active sites in each progressive cycles, thus reactivity decreased. Shah *et al.*<sup>372</sup> demonstrated esterification of FFAs in acid oil (which is a byproduct of oil refining) using sulfonic acid-functionalized silica (SiO<sub>2</sub>-Pr-SO<sub>3</sub>H) catalyst to prepare biodiesel. Further, the authors optimized various reaction conditions such as temperature, reaction time, catalyst concentration, and M/O molar ratio, etc. which usually affects the conversion to FAME. A high conversion (i.e. 96.78 % conversion after 8 h was reported at optimized conditions) can be achieved using these solid acid catalysts.

Moreover, in recent past Varyambath *et al.*<sup>373</sup> developed different sulfonic acid-functionalized organic knitted porous polyaromatic microspheres (OPPSO<sub>3</sub>H) utilizing pyrene, anthracene, and naphthalene as monomers *via* Friedel-Crafts alkylation, followed by crosslinking reactions. Further, these heterogeneous catalysts were utilized for the transformation of long-chain fatty acids and triglycerides to biodiesel. These solid acid catalysts were found to be very promising for biodiesel synthesis as they showed excellent surface acidity. In addition, several other sulphonic acid-functionalized catalysts were successfully developed and exploited in the production of biodiesel. In this context, Shagufta *et al.*<sup>374</sup> reviewed all such sulphonic acid-functionalized in catalysts esterification and transesterification reactions. This review can be consulted for more detail information.

Yu *et al.*<sup>375</sup> studied biodiesel production by exploiting coal-based acid catalysts and reported an oleic acid conversion of 97.6 % under the optimal reaction conditions. Similarly, Tang and Niu<sup>376</sup> investigated the synthesis of carbon-based solid acid catalysts from bamboo through partial carbonization and sulfonation approach. The microstructure of catalyst was activated by phosphoric acid impregnation. The catalyst afforded biodiesel yield 97.3 % at optimum conditions which decreased to 83.7 % in fourth reaction cycles. In addition, biodiesel production from oleic acid was reported using sulfonated activated carbon from bamboo.<sup>377</sup> A sulfonated carbonaceous material synthesized via single-step hydrothermal sulfonation of glucose has also been used as a catalyst for esterification of waste cooking oil to produce biodiesel.<sup>378</sup> FESEM images of the carbonaceous material (C) (Figure 32a) and the sulfonated carbonaceous material (C-SO<sub>3</sub>H) (Figure 32b) showed microsphere and microsphere with an attached sulfonic group on the surface respectively. The catalyst showed great stability with 93.4 % FAME yield under the optimized reaction conditions.



**Figure 32:** FESEM images of a) C and b) C-SO<sub>3</sub>H. Reproduced from ref. [378].

Guan *et al.*<sup>379</sup> synthesized sulfonated multi-walled carbon nanotube (S-MWCNT) for the conversion of triglyceride to FAME in 97.8 %. The high catalytic reactivity is because of high surface area (198.9 m<sup>2</sup> g<sup>-1</sup>), high porosity (10-15 nm) and high acid sites. Similarly, sulfonated carbonaceous material from starch was utilized as a solid catalyst for esterification of PFAD.<sup>380</sup> A novel, efficient, inexpensive and environment-friendly acid catalyst was synthesized from coconut meal residue (CMR). CMR-DS-SO<sub>3</sub>H catalyst was prepared by a one-step direct in-situ carbonization in concentrated H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> and reported for the transformation of waste palm oil (WPO) to biodiesel. The prepared sulfonated catalyst has acid density 3.8 mmol/g, surface area 1.33 m<sup>2</sup>/g and means pore volume 0.31 cm<sup>3</sup>/g. The results obtained recorded a high yield of 92.7 % biodiesel from WPO.<sup>381</sup> Moreover, Wang *et al.*<sup>382</sup> investigated the application of monodispersed hollow carbon/silica solid acid catalyst HS/C-SO<sub>3</sub>H, which was prepared by chemical activation approach, in the esterification of oleic acid with methanol to produce biodiesel.

Besides this, another kind of sulfonated functionalized carbon material i.e. sulfonated ordered mesoporous carbon (SOMC) catalyst showed promising biodiesel production (73.59 % yield).<sup>383</sup> Recently, sulfonated acid catalyst obtained from corncob (SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>/corncob), has been reported as an excellent catalyst for conversion of oleic acid to obtain methyl oleate in good yield (> 80 % after 8 h at 60 °C).<sup>384</sup> Mahdavi and Darabi<sup>385</sup> prepared sulfonated carbon catalyst by treatment of sucrose and concentrated H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> at high temperature (sulfonation and carbonization approach). The synthesized C-SO<sub>3</sub>H catalyst was further utilized for the conversion of oleic acid to FAME in 93.04 % yield. Moreover, a solid acid catalyst generated from sulfonation of microcrystalline cellulose powder was successfully applied for oleic acid esterification, showed 99.9 % biodiesel yield under the optimized reaction

conditions.<sup>386</sup> In another investigation, waste cooking oil was transformed to produce biodiesel utilizing an environmentally benign sulfonated carbon microsphere catalyst.<sup>387</sup> The catalyst with surface area 86 m<sup>2</sup>/g and acidity 1.38 mmol/g was developed by consecutive hydrothermal carbonization and sulfonation of xylose. Using this catalyst, biodiesel yield of 89.6 % was recorded at optimal reaction conditions. Catalyst reusability report revealed that in each cycle biodiesel yield was reduced by 9 %. Furthermore, sulfonated carbon-based solid acid catalyst was also utilized for the transformation of PFAD<sup>388</sup> and *Mesua Ferrea* Linn oil<sup>389</sup> to biodiesel.

To bring down the cost of biodiesel production, several sulfonated raw biomass has been prepared and investigated for their catalytic activities. In this line, a sulfonated solid-acid catalyst obtained from coconut shells (SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>/coconut shell) reported 88.03 % biodiesel yield.<sup>390</sup> In the same vein, oil palm trunk/ sugarcane bagasse,<sup>391</sup> corn straw,<sup>392</sup> bamboo,<sup>393</sup> *Jatropha curcas* seed,<sup>394</sup> bio-glycerol,<sup>395</sup> glycerol,<sup>396</sup> microalgae residue,<sup>397</sup> oil cake waste,<sup>398,399</sup> de-oiled waste cake,<sup>400</sup> de-oiled canola meal-SO<sub>3</sub>H,<sup>401</sup> pine chip char<sup>402</sup> and biochar<sup>403,404</sup> are reported as a catalysts for FAME production.

**Table 19:** Different sulfonated carbon-based acid catalyst used for biodiesel production.

No.	Catalyst	Feedstock	<sup>a</sup> Conditions	Yield (%)	Ref.
1.	Sulfonated sugar	Oleic acid	10:1 <sup>f</sup> , 7.4, 80, 240	NR	364
2.	Sulfonated carbon	Oleic acid	2.92:1 <sup>c</sup> , 17.2, 95, 240	99.9	365
3.	ACPhSO <sub>3</sub> H	Rapeseed oil	20:1, 10, 65, 420	95	366
4.	Sulfonated AC	Soybean oil	6:1, 20, 75, 20	88.7	355
5.	H <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> /C	Castor oil	12:1, 5, 65, 60	94	369
6.	SAM	Vegetable oil	10:1, 6, 180, 120	95	370
7.	SO <sub>3</sub> H/SBA-15	Soybean oil	6:1, 5, 190, 30	90	371
8.	SiO <sub>2</sub> -Pr-SO <sub>3</sub> H	Acid oil	15:1, 4, 100, 480	96.78 <sup>b</sup>	372
9.	OPPSO <sub>3</sub> H	Soybean oil	50:1 <sup>c</sup> , 10, 70, 600	93 <sup>b</sup>	373
10.	Coal based solid acid	Oleic acid	10:1, 8, 240, 67	97.6 <sup>b</sup>	375

11.	Sulfonated carbon-based solid acid	Oleic acid	10:1,10,65, 120	97.3	376
12.	Sulfonated activated carbon	Oleic acid	7:1 <sup>f</sup> , 12, 180, 85	96 <sup>b</sup>	377
13.	C-SO <sub>3</sub> H	Waste cooking oil	20:1, 10, 60, 180	93.6	378
14.	Sulfonated multiwalled carbon nanotube	Triglycerides	10:1 <sup>f</sup> , 3.7, 60, 150	97.8 <sup>b</sup>	379
15.	ICS-SO <sub>3</sub> H	Palm fatty acid distillate	10:1, 2, 180, 75	90.4	380
16.	CMR-DS- SO <sub>3</sub> H	Waste palm oil	12:1, 5, 65, 72	92.7	381
17.	HS/C-SO <sub>3</sub> H	Oleic acid	5:1, 3.5, 80, 300	96.9 <sup>b</sup>	382
18.	SOMC	Oleic acid	10:1, 3.5, 80, 600	73.59 <sup>b</sup>	383
19.	SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> /corncob	Oleic acid	15:1, 5, 60, 480	>80	384
20.	C-SO <sub>3</sub> H	Oleic acid	10:1, 1.5, 67, 120	93.04	385
21.	C-SO <sub>3</sub> H	Oleic acid	16:1, 17, 95, 240	99.9	386
22.	C-SO <sub>3</sub> H	WCO	10:1, 10, 110, 240	89.6	387
23.	C-SO <sub>3</sub> H	PFAD	15:1, 2.5, 80, 240	95.3 <sup>b</sup>	388
24.	C-SO <sub>3</sub> H	<i>Mesua Ferrea</i> Linn oil	40:1, 5, 120, 1440	97.79	389
25.	Coconut shell- SO <sub>3</sub> H	Palm oil	30:1, 6, 60, 360	88.03	390
26.	Oil palm trunk/ Sugarcane bagasse-SO <sub>3</sub> H	Waste Oil	1.17 mL/min, 12, 130, 240	80.6/83.2	391
27.	Corn straw- SO <sub>3</sub> H	Oleic acid	3:1, 3, 60, 240	92	392



28.	Bamboo-SO <sub>3</sub> H	Oleic acid	7:1 <sup>f</sup> , 2, 90, 360	98.4	393
29.	Jatropha curcas Seed-SO <sub>3</sub> H	JCO	12:1, 7.5, 60, 60 99.13	99.13 <sup>b</sup>	394
30.	Bio-glycerol	Karanja oil	45:1, 20, 160, 240	99.5	395
31.	Glycerol	Palmitic acid	9.7:1 <sup>c</sup> , 10, 65, 240	99 <sup>b</sup>	396
32.	Microalgae residue	Oleic acid	NR,5, 80, 720	98 <sup>b</sup>	397
33.	Oil cake waste-SO <sub>3</sub> H	JCO/ <i>M. ferrea</i> L. oil	43:1, 5, 80, 480	99	398
34.	Oil cake waste-SO <sub>3</sub> H	Oleic acid	12:1, 20, 60, 120	94 <sup>b</sup>	399
35.	De-oiled waste cake	Oleic acid	20:1, 3, 64, 600	97 <sup>b</sup>	400
36.	De-oiled canola Meal-SO <sub>3</sub> H	Oleic acid	60:1, 7.5, 65, 1440	93.8 <sup>b</sup>	401
37.	Pine chip char	Palmitic acid	6:1, 5,55-60, 300	97	402
38.	Biochar	Canola oil	15:1 <sup>f</sup> , 5, 65, 1440	92	403
39.	Biochar	Canola oil, oleic acid	30:1, 5, 315, 180	48	404

<sup>a</sup>Methanol-to-oil molar ratio, catalyst loading (wt. %), temperature (°C), reaction time (min).

<sup>b</sup>Conversion

<sup>f</sup>Ethanol to oil molar ratio

NR: Not reported.

### 7.3 Enzyme catalyst

In recent years, enzyme catalysts are widely examined for the production of biodiesel as they produce high-quality biodiesel, improve the product separation process, mild reaction conditions and most importantly their ecological benignness (Table 20).<sup>405,406</sup> Besides, they do not form soap with FFA contrary to the alkaline catalyst and hence can be utilized in the biodiesel production in industrial scale.

In biocatalyst mediated reactions, usually enzymes can be used in free form or can be immobilized on a matrix, i.e. immobilized lipase.<sup>407</sup> The free enzymes are more sensitive towards the pH, temperature and impurities of reactants which may create obstacle in bioprocesses. However, these problems can be overcome by immobilizing enzyme onto different types of support materials.<sup>408</sup> The commonly adopted immobilization methods for biological processes include entrapment, adsorption and covalent bonding. Among these techniques, entrapment found to be effective offering greater advantages such as ease of process scale up, higher stability of enzyme and longer enzymatic activity retention.<sup>409, 410</sup> Mostly lipase enzymes obtained from microbial sources have been used for biodiesel production<sup>411</sup> proposed the method for large scale production of bacterial or fungal lipases due to their extracellular nature. Moreover, lipases obtained from diverse plant sources are also considered as the potential substitute for catalysing the transesterification process.<sup>412</sup> The advantages associated with lipase catalyst over the other catalyst used in biodiesel production are superior quality and higher yield of biodiesel, free from soap formation, lower reaction temperature and can work on variety of feedstock.<sup>413</sup>

Compared to homogeneous and heterogeneous catalysts, enzymatic catalysts are less studied hence scanty of literature is available when compared with reports on above-mentioned two catalysts. However, the high cost of the free lipase catalyst along with the limited long-term use has led to the exploitation of immobilized lipase catalyst to reduce the cost of the catalyst and its reusability. Apart from that, immobilized lipase catalyst showed greater tolerance to pH variation, high thermal stability and high substrate selectivity.<sup>414,415</sup> To date, large number of literature are available in the field of biodiesel production using both free<sup>416–418</sup> and immobilized<sup>419–422</sup> enzyme catalyst.

Recently, Jayaraman *et al.*<sup>423</sup> demonstrated the lipase enzyme mediated transesterification of waste cooking oil (WCO) and reported 88% of biodiesel yield. Marín-Suárez *et al.*<sup>424</sup> demonstrated the lipase-catalyzed transesterification of low quality fish oil through the process optimization, moreover, the reusability of enzyme was also studied. Authors evaluated the efficacy of commercially available immobilized enzymes such as Liposome RM IM, Lipozyme TL IM and Novozym 435<sup>425</sup> for biodiesel production from waste fish oil. The results obtained revealed that Novozym 435 showed maximum catalytic activity resulting in highest yield of FAME i.e. 82.91 wt. % and enzyme can be reused for about ten successive cycles. In another study, it was reported that immobilized lipase (Epobond *P. cepacia*) employed in transesterification of waste vegetable oil reported to achieve ester yield of 46.32%.<sup>426</sup> Similarly, the *Candida cylindracea* lipase immobilised on the functionalised

activated carbon was tested as a catalyst in the transesterification of *Jatropha curcas* oil. It was found that free fatty acid yield of 78% was achieved at optimized reaction conditions and further biocatalyst was found stable up to four consecutive cycles of transesterification.<sup>427</sup> Beside, lipase obtained from plant source like rice bran lipase produced 83.4 wt.% FAME yield from rice bran oil under optimized conditions.<sup>428</sup>

Moreover, Muanruksa and Kaewkannetra<sup>429</sup> examined the biodiesel production from sludge palm oil (SPO) via two steps of extraction and enzymatic esterification. The immobilised *Rhizopus oryzae* lipase on alginate-polyvinyl alcohol (PVA) beads were used for conversion of FFAs from SPO to fatty acids methyl esters (biodiesel). It was found that at optimum condition, the maximum biodiesel yield of 91.30% was achieved and biocatalyst showed higher stability and catalytic efficiency up to 15 cycles. It is reported that enzymatic transesterification reaction to produce biodiesel is the slowest pathway among all the known transformations. Taking into account, application of ultrasonic in the enzyme-catalyzed transesterification improves the reaction rate and hence reduces the reaction time.<sup>414,422</sup> Thus, it can be a promising technique for the industrial-scale production of biodiesel in a very short time.

**Table 20:** Different enzyme catalysts reported for the production of biodiesel.

Sl. No	Catalyst	Feedstock	<sup>a</sup> Conditions	Yield	Ref.
1	Lipase immobilized on biosupport beads	Hybrid non edible oils	6:1 <sup>c</sup> , 10, 50, 1440	~78	407
2	Lipase	WCO	3:1, 1.5, 65, 240	88	423
3	Thermomysis Lanugonosus Lipase	Rubber seed oil	4:1, 5, NR, 65	92.83	416
4	CalleraTM Trans L lipase	Soybean oil	4.51:1, 1.45, 35, 1440	96.9	417
5	Lipase@AC	Sardine oil	9:1, 10, 30, 600	94.5	418
6	Lipase@APTES-Fe <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub>	<i>Aspergillus</i> lipid	4:1, 300 <sup>b</sup> , 45, 240	84	419
7	Lipase@ZIF-67	Soybean oil	6:1, 10, 45, 3600	78	420
8	Lipase@[bmim][PF <sub>6</sub> ]	Food compost	6:1, 40, 50, 840	72	421

9	Lipase@[bmim][NTf <sub>2</sub> ]	Food compost	6:1, 40, 50, 840	48	421
10	Lipase@Immobead	Blended non-edible oils	7.64:1, 3.55, 36, 120	94	422
11	Novozym 435 lipase	Waste fish oil	35.45:1 <sup>d</sup> , 50, 35, 480	82.91 wt %	424
12	Novozym 435 lipase	BSFL fat	14.64:1 <sup>e</sup> , 17.58, 39.5, 720	96.97	425
13	Immobilized lipase (Epobond- <i>Pseudomonas cepacia</i> )	Waste vegetable oil	3:1 <sup>d</sup> , 3, 37, 90	46.32	426
14	Immobilized <i>Candida cylindracea</i> lipase	<i>Jatropha curcas</i> oil	HR, 8, 40, 1440	78	427
15	Immobilised <i>Rhizopus oryzae</i> lipase	sludge palm oil (SPO)	3:1, 5, 40, 240	91.30	428
16	Lipase (from rice bran)	Rice Bran oil	6:1, NR, 40, 17280	83.4 wt %	429


<sup>a</sup>Methanol-to-oil molar ratio, catalyst loading (wt. %), temperature (°C), reaction time (min). NR: Not reported.

<sup>b</sup>miligram

#### 7.4 Bifunctional solid catalysts

Despite the high reactivity of the basic solid catalyst towards biodiesel production, they are not an effective catalyst for transesterification of oils having a high amount of FFA as such catalyst are highly sensitive to the FFA, which leads to soap generation and thus interfere in the separation process of glycerol from biodiesel. On the other hand, solid acid catalysts are insensitive to the FFA content and esterify waste oils or low-cost oils without any requirement of pretreatment. However, water formed during the course of the reaction may lead to the decomposition of triglycerides to diglycerides, resulting in the formation of more FFA and catalyst leaching.<sup>430</sup> Taking these difficulties into account, developing a new type of solid

catalysts that possess dual characteristics such as solid acidic character to tackle the FFA and solid basic character for easy transesterification of triglycerides to FAME has been a recent interest in the realm of biodiesel research. To date, numerous bifunctional catalysts are reported for the FAME production (Table 21), which will be discussed in this section. Farooq *et al.*<sup>78</sup> developed a bifunctional Mo-Mn/ $\gamma$ -Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-MgO catalyst and utilized it for the simultaneous esterification/transesterification of WCO having FFA content of 3.27 mg KOH/g. The authors investigated the effect of MgO loading (5-20 wt. %) on its catalytic activity and found that 15 wt. % MgO loading showed highest catalytic activity with 91.4 % biodiesel yield under the ideal reaction conditions. Moreover, the catalyst showed excellent stability towards the biodiesel production from WCO as it is stable up to 8 progressive reaction cycles without any major loss of its activity. In another study, Cu/Zn/ $\gamma$ -Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> catalyst was utilized for the simultaneous esterification/transesterification of WCO for production of FAME via RSM.<sup>431</sup> The effect of Cu/Zn wt. % ratio and calcination temperature on the catalytic reactivity was also examined and found that 10:90 Cu/Zn wt. % ratio and 800 °C calcination temperature showed 88.82 % FAME yield. The authors also studied the structure and particle size of the synthesized catalyst *via* TEM micrographs (Figure 33). Figure 33a displayed that the average diameter of the particles lies in between 4-6 nm. The lattice fringes measured from Figure 33b, c and d are 0.201, 0.282 and 0.242 nm, matched with the hkl planes (400), (220) and (311) of alumina respectively. The lattice fringes in Figure 33e is 0.240 nm fitted with the hkl plane (200) of CuO and lattice fringes 0.281 nm (Figure 33f) fitted with the ZnO plane (100). Similarly, biodiesel production from WCO was reported using diverse bifunctional solid catalysts such as Mg/MCM-41,<sup>432</sup>  $\gamma$ -Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-CeO<sub>2</sub>,<sup>433</sup> KAcZX<sup>434</sup> and Sr/ZrO<sub>2</sub><sup>435</sup> etc.




**Figure 33:** TEM micrograph for Cu/Zn(10:90)/ $\gamma$ -Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-800 °C (a) HRTEM displayed the lattice fringes of (b) Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (400), (c) Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (220), (d) Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (311), (e) CuO (200) and (f) ZnO (100). Reproduced from ref. [431].

1931

1932 Nizah *et al.*<sup>436</sup> synthesized a bifunctional catalyst Bi<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> *via* wet impregnation  
 1933 procedure and employed it for one-pot esterification/transesterification of JCO having FFA  
 1934 content of 6.1 mg KOH/g. The authors investigated the influence of Bi<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> impregnation on  
 1935 La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> support by varying the wt. % of Bi<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> in the range of 1-7 wt. % and found that 5 wt. %  
 1936 Bi<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> impregnated on La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> showed maximum biodiesel yield of 94 %. The high catalyst  
 1937 reactivity is attributed to the well dispersion of Bi<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> on La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> support, that directly enhanced  
 1938 the surface area and thus increases selectivity and rate of the reaction. Similarly, biodiesel  
 1939 production from JCO having a high amount of FFA was reported by using a bifunctional solid  
 1940 catalyst CaO-La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>.<sup>437</sup> The esterification/transesterification was performed in a high-  
 1941 temperature reactor (Figure 34). The effect of Ca/La atomic ratio on the catalytic activity was  
 1942 examined and observed that 0.8 atomic ratio of Ca/La showed maximum biodiesel yield of  
 1943 98.76 % under the optimized reaction conditions. The high catalytic reactivity is because of  
 1944 well dispersion of CaO on the surface of La<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, that led to an increase in catalyst surface area.

Moreover, the synthesized catalyst is chemically stable and can be used for 4 consecutive cycles.




**Figure 34:** Schematic diagram of a high-temperature reactor. Reproduced from ref. [437].

Another study revealed the synthesis of mixed metal oxide  $\text{Mn@MgO-ZrO}_2$  via co-precipitation and impregnation method and utilization of the catalyst in the FAME production from kernel oil.<sup>438</sup> The efficiency of the catalyst in FAME production was tested by changing the Mg/Zr ration from 0.2-05 and found that 0.4 Mg/Zr has the optimal active sites followed by impregnation of 4 wt. % Mn to  $\text{MgO-ZrO}_2$  composite to enhance its reactivity and displayed 96.4 % biodiesel yield. The high catalyst reactivity is due to a large number of active sites and the mesoporous nature of the catalyst. Jeon *et al.*<sup>439</sup> synthesized heteropolyacid (HPA) functionalized ZIF-8 (zeolite imidazole framework-8) to form a bifunctional catalyst for the production of biodiesel from rapeseed oil in a batch reactor. The catalyst possesses core-shell nanostructure as displayed by the TEM micrograph (Figure 35), where the rhombic dodecahedral ZIF-8 core was surrounded by thin-wrinkled HPA shell, thus enhances the surface area and catalyst reactivity. Moreover, the effect of concentration of HPA for the functionalization was also tested by varying the amount of HPA such as 0.05, 0.1, 0.3 and 0.5 and found that 0.1 g HPA functionalized ZIF-8 showed maximum FAME conversion of 98.02



% under the optimized reaction conditions. Similarly, another bifunctional catalyst organotriphosphonic acid-functionalized ferric alginate (ATMP-FA) was developed for the oleic acid esterification to produce biodiesel.<sup>440</sup> The reaction conditions are optimized by using Box–Behnken model of RSM. Moreover, the catalyst is very stable towards the esterification reaction and can be reused for 5 consecutive cycles.



**Figure 35:** TEM image of HPA-ZIF-8.  
Reproduced from ref. [439].

Recently, a solid bifunctional catalyst originated from bio-waste angel wing shell (AWS) via two-step processes-i) calcination of angel wing shell and ii) sulfonation of the calcined angel wing shell to produce sulfonated angel wing shell (AWS/SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>) was reported for esterification of PFAD to produce biodiesel.<sup>441</sup> The sulfonation procedure increases the surface area of bare AWS from 3.88 to 6.53 m<sup>2</sup>g<sup>-1</sup>, thus enhanced the catalytic reactivity. The authors tested the influence of sulfuric acid concentration by varying the sulfuric acid amount from 3-11 M and found that sulfonation with 7M sulfuric acid showed 98 % FAME yield. The authors also checked the reusability of the catalyst and observed blockage of the active sites of the catalyst after 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive cycles; which necessitate pretreatment of the spent catalyst to increase its reusability. In addition, a coordinated polymer of Zn, [Zn(4,4'-bipy)(OAc)<sub>2</sub>]<sub>n</sub> was tested for the soybean oil transformation to FAME.<sup>442</sup> The catalyst showed excellent reactivity and showed 98 % FAME yield under the optimized reaction conditions. The authors reported that the high reactivity of the catalyst is attributed to the bipyridine present in the catalyst. In another study, the conversion of canola oil to FAME was reported using potassium impregnated titania (K/TiO<sub>2</sub>).<sup>443</sup> The addition of K on the surface of titania increases the surface



energy from 86 to 102 m<sup>2</sup>/g, thus enhanced the catalytic activity. The authors investigated the effect of K loading on catalytic activity and found that 20 wt. % K loaded titania was optimum and showed 100 % conversion of canola oil to biodiesel.

**Table 21:** Different bifunctional solid catalyst reported for biodiesel production.

No	Catalyst	Feedstocks	<sup>a</sup> Conditions	Yield (%)	Ref.
1	Mo-Mn/ $\gamma$ -Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -15 % MgO	WCO	27:1, 3, 100, 240	91.4	78
2	Cu/Zn(10:90)/ $\gamma$ -Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -800 °C	WCO	18:1, 6, 65±5, 180	88.82	431
3	Mg/MCM-41	WCO	8:1, 10, 80, 180	94	432
4	$\gamma$ -Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -CeO <sub>2</sub>	WCO	30:1, 7, 110, 270	81.1	433
5	KAcZX	WCO	48:1, 6, 120, 180	80.8	434
6	Sr/ZrO <sub>2</sub>	WCO	29:1, 2.7, 115.5, 169	79.7	435
7	Bi <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -La <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	JCO	15:1, 2, 150, 240	94	436
8	CaO-La <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	JCO	25:1, 3, 160, 180	98.76	437
9	Mn@MgO-ZrO <sub>2</sub>	Kernel oil	15:1, 3, 90, 240	96.4	438
10	HPA@ZIF-8	Rapeseed oil	10:1, 4, 240, 300	98.02 <sup>b</sup>	439
11	AWS/SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	PFAD	15:1, 5, 80, 180	98	441
12	[Zn(4,4'-bipy)(OAc) <sub>2</sub> ] <sub>n</sub>	Soybean oil	3.2/5 (v/v), 2, 180, 120	98	442
13	K/TiO <sub>2</sub>	Canola oil	36:1, 6, 70, 180	100 <sup>b</sup>	443


<sup>a</sup>Methanol-to-oil molar ratio, catalyst loading (wt. %), temperature (°C), reaction time (min).

<sup>b</sup>Conversion

## 8. Biodiesel production process

Biodiesel can be produced by (trans)esterification, thermal cracking and pyrolysis.<sup>444–447</sup> Amongst all these methods, transesterification is generally utilized for the synthesis of biodiesel.<sup>447</sup> The generalized diagram for biodiesel production process is presented in Figure 36 which consists of synthesis and purification steps.<sup>448</sup> Alkali, acid and enzyme are routinely exploited as a catalyst for the transesterification reactions. These catalysts had their own merits and demerits as compiled in Table 22.<sup>449</sup> Till now, homogeneous base catalysts such as NaOH, KOH are normally utilized for biodiesel synthesis in industrial scale. In the meantime, owing

to their capacity to catalyze both esterification/transesterification reactions, a homogeneous acid catalyst such as  $H_2SO_4$  and  $HCl$  are generally picked for feedstock having high FFA such as non-edible vegetable oil, WCO and animal fats. Recently, the heterogeneous catalyst has attracted interest to a great extent for biodiesel synthesis because of their easy recyclability and reusability for successive reaction cycles.



**Figure 36:** Representative diagram for biodiesel production. Reproduced from ref. [447].

**Table 22:** Points of interest and detriments of different catalyst utilized for transesterification/esterification reaction (Reproduced from ref. [449]).

Catalyst types	Examples	Advantages	Disadvantages
<b>Homogeneous</b>			
Alkali	NaOH, KOH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High reactivity</li> <li>• Faster reaction rate</li> <li>• Minimum cost</li> <li>• Encouraging kinetics</li> <li>• Moderate working conditions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate for high FFA in feedstocks</li> <li>• Deactivates in presence of moisture and FFA.</li> <li>• Requirement of high amount of waste water</li> </ul>

Acid	H <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> , HCl, HF etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Non-reactive to moisture and FFA content in oil.</li> <li>▪ Catalyzed simultaneous esterification/transesterification reactions.</li> <li>▪ Avoid formation of soap.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Saponification occurs as a side reaction.</li> <li>• Non-recyclable</li> <li>• Corrosive in nature</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Slow reaction rate</li> <li>▪ Long reaction time</li> <li>▪ Equipment corrosion</li> <li>▪ Higher reaction temperature and pressure</li> <li>▪ High alcohol/oil requirement</li> <li>▪ Weak catalytic activity</li> <li>▪ Catalyst is difficult to recycle</li> </ul>

### Heterogeneous

Alkali	CaO, SrO, MgO, mixed oxide and hydrotalcite	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-corrosive</li> <li>• Environmentally benign</li> <li>• Recyclable</li> <li>• Fewer disposal problems</li> <li>• Easy separation</li> <li>• Higher selectivity</li> <li>• Longer catalyst life</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slow reaction rate compared to homogeneous one</li> <li>• Low FFA requirement in the feedstock (&lt; 1 wt. %)</li> <li>• Highly sensitive to water and FFA</li> <li>• Saponification as side reaction</li> <li>• Soap formation</li> <li>• High volume of wastewater</li> <li>• Leaching of active catalyst sites</li> <li>• Diffusion limitations,</li> <li>• Complex and expensive synthesis route</li> </ul>
--------	---	---	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High cost of catalyst synthesis</li> </ul>
Acid	ZrO, TiO, ZnO, ion-exchange resin, sulfonic modified mesostructure silica etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Insensitive to FFA and water content in the oil</li> <li>▪ Catalyzed simultaneous esterification and transesterification reactions</li> <li>▪ Recyclable, eco-friendly</li> <li>▪ Non-corrosive to reactor and reactor parts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Moderate reaction rate</li> <li>▪ Long reaction time</li> <li>▪ Higher reaction temperature and pressure</li> <li>▪ High alcohol/oil requirement</li> <li>▪ Weak catalytic activity</li> <li>▪ Low acidic site</li> <li>▪ Low micro porosity</li> <li>▪ Leaching of active catalyst sites</li> <li>▪ Diffusion limitations</li> <li>▪ Complex and expensive synthesis route</li> <li>▪ High cost of catalyst synthesis</li> </ul>

## 9. Catalyst comparison

It is seen from the literature that the reactivity of both homogeneous base and acid catalysts are very high compared to heterogeneous catalysts.<sup>61,70</sup> Despite the high reactivity, homogeneous catalysts have some serious shortfalls such as low quality of glycerol produced, the catalyst cannot be regenerated and the lengthy process involves in the purification of biodiesel; thereby makes the whole process labour-intensive and uneconomical.<sup>76</sup> To overcome these shortfalls, solid catalysts have been widely investigated. Alkaline earth, basic metal oxides and supported solid base catalyst shows excellent activity towards biodiesel production, however, their low stability, high sensitivity against the FFA limits its industrial application,<sup>143</sup> whereas, their acid counterparts are not efficient towards the transesterification reactions. Recently, mixed metal oxides are gaining immense attentions in the field of biodiesel production due to their generally high surface area, excellent thermal and chemical stability, tailored acid-base properties and hence can be used prominently utilized for (trans)esterification of vegetable oil having high FFA.<sup>145</sup>

Literatures revealed that enzyme-based catalyst have various advantages over other catalyst such as environmentally benign, operate at mild reaction conditions and display high specificity.<sup>432</sup> Unfortunately, due to their sensitivity towards heat, poor operational stability and narrow pH range, the use of such catalyst for industrial scale production of biodiesel is not a wise choice.<sup>433</sup> However, immobilized lipase has various advantages compared to free lipase such as cost-effective, high thermal stability and greater tolerance to pH change.<sup>435</sup> Thus, it has a scope for utilization in industrial scale biodiesel production. Besides, the present study suggests that bio-waste derived catalyst can be used potentially in the industrial scale production of biodiesel as they are easily available, cost-effective and most importantly environmentally benign.<sup>161</sup> The main limitation is their reusability due to the leaching of the active sites.<sup>165</sup> Apart from that, metal free carbon based solid acid catalyst is also a promising candidate for industrial scale production of biodiesel as these materials possess promising features such as biogenic, environment-friendly, lower production costs, distinctive surface chemistry, high chemical and thermal stability.<sup>383</sup> Bifunctional catalyst has been a recent interest in the realm of biodiesel research as it possess dual characteristics such as solid acidic character to tackle the FFA and solid basic character for easy transesterification of triglycerides to FAME and hence can be utilized for the (trans)esterification of diverse oil systems. Apart from that, bifunctional catalyst are highly reusable, thermostable and insensitive to the moisture.<sup>438</sup> Thus, bifunctional solid catalyst can be utilized in the successful production of industrial scale biodiesel.

## 10. Conclusion and outlook

The exponential growth in the human population around the globe and industrial globalization tremendously increases the demand for petroleum fuels like diesel for various purposes. However, considering the limited resources of fossil fuels, searching for a novel, renewable and sustainable alternative fuel was required. In this context, researchers focused on FAME production from different renewable sources as an effective way. A variety of methods have been proposed for biodiesel production however, among all the existing methods, transesterification is considered as the foremost choice.

Transesterification reaction involves the use of a basic catalysts such as homogeneous and heterogeneous catalysts. The use of homogeneous catalysts is found to be promising as far as rate of biodiesel production is concerned; but it is associated with certain limitations. The homogeneous catalysts based transesterification reaction involves the consumption of high energy, moreover, the treatment of wastewater generated is essential due to the presence of

unreacted chemicals. These limitations created the need for the development of efficient catalysts which was completed in terms of heterogeneous catalysts. These catalysts attracted a great of attention from the scientific community all over the world because of its several advantages over homogeneous catalysts such as the simple realization of continuous reactors, production of cleaner glycerol, and the absence of both the alkaline catalyst neutralization step and the necessity to replace the consumed catalyst. Due to these advantages, heterogeneous catalysts have opened up the chance for another powerful pathway for FAME production. However, the reactivity of the solid catalyst is dependent on several variables which mainly involve the oil type, alcohol to oil molar ratio, temperature, type of reactor, etc. therefore, selection of these variables at an optimum level is a crucial step. The heterogeneous catalysts are considered comparatively promising because only external-surface active species of porous solid support involved in the reaction and these catalysts can be recovered in some cases. However, in case of certain catalysts like CaO, leaching was reported which adversely influences the reaction and hence, researchers are looking at nanotechnology as new hope.

Nanotechnology is the most emerging branch of science having promising applications in catalysis. Moreover, it reported to have the ability to fabricate the catalyst surface in order to meet the prerequisites of explicit applications and beat the different issues related to both homogeneous and heterogeneous catalysts. Nanocatalysts can act as an interface between homogeneous and heterogeneous catalysts having the possibility to develop promising solid-acid or solid-base catalysts which can be easily recovered using conventional filtration and centrifugation techniques. The development and use of magnetic nanoparticle-supported catalysts is a path-breaking research because such catalysts can be easily recovered by using a simple magnetic field and reused for progressive reaction cycles which helps to reduce the overall process cost involved in biodiesel production which is the ultimate aim.

It is well proven that the application of biological catalyst (enzyme) is more effective over all kinds of chemical catalysts, but the involvement of expensive enzyme increases the overall cost of the FAME production process. In this context, immobilization of such enzymes on the surface of various magnetic nanoparticles was found to be a novel concept because of the easy recovery of the immobilized enzyme along with magnetic nanoparticles and its reusability. Moreover, it also solves the problem of leaching of the enzymes during the reaction due to immobilization. Although nanocatalysts reported to have promising applications, the toxicological concerns associated with nanoparticles is a topic of debate because there are mixed opinions from the scientific community.

The present study revealed that the properties of the catalyst such as basicity and acidity play a pivotal role in the biodiesel production. Several literatures suggest the basicity of the catalyst directly proportional to the transesterification activity.<sup>171, 195</sup> Similarly, acidity of the catalyst decides the esterification activity of the catalyst.<sup>383, 390</sup> Higher the acidity of the catalyst, higher is the esterification activity. Apart from basicity and acidity, catalytic activity of the solid catalyst depends on its surface area and porosity. Literatures revealed that high surface area of the catalyst enhances the rate of biodiesel production.<sup>184, 225</sup>

It is believed that several newly introduced catalysts will take a central position in the near future and help to produce biodiesel through eco-friendly and economically viable processes. The development of novel heterogeneous catalysis having both acid and basic sites on its surface will have promising future in biodiesel production technologies because they have ability to overcome the issues usually caused because of the utilization of homogeneous catalysts. The application of bifunctional solids can be a novel way in heterogeneous catalysts mediated biodiesel production, because they showed the capability to accomplish simultaneous esterification and transesterification reactions in one-pot. In addition, the development and application of nanocatalysts will be a milestone in biodiesel production. These nanocatalysts will be the next generation catalysts which will help to develop most effective, sensitive, sustainable and economically viable technology for the FAME production in the near future. Although recent advances in the developments various homogeneous, heterogeneous and nanocatalyst showed promising future for biodiesel industries or biorefineries, more efforts are required to develop even more effective and cheap catalysts which will help to overcome the present issues all the above-mentioned catalysts and increase the efficiency of biodiesel production sustainably.

### Acknowledgement

Science and Engineering Research Board (SERB), India is thankfully acknowledged for the research fund (Grant No. SB/FT/CS-103/2013 and SB/EMEQ-076/2014).

### References

- 1 G. Ciarrocchi, A. Montecucco, G. Pedrali-Noy and S. Spadari, *Biochem. Pharmacol.*, 1988, **37**, 1803–1804.
- 2 X. Yin, X. Duan, Q. You, C. Dai, Z. Tan and X. Zhu, *Energy Convers. Manag.*, 2016, **112**, 199–207.
- 3 International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA), *Global Energy Transformation: A*

2122        *Roadmap to 2050*, 2018.

2123    4    IEA, *Int. Energy Agency, Paris*, 2016, 1–77.

2124    5    M. G. Kulkarni and A. K. Dalai, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2006, **45**, 2901–2913.

2125    6    S. Chatterjee, Dhanurdhar and L. Rokhum, *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, 2017, **72**,  
2126        560–564.

2127    7    A. da Silva César, M. A. Conejero, E. C. Barros Ribeiro and M. O. Batalha, *Renew.*  
2128        *Energy*, 2019, **133**, 1147–1157.

2129    8    M. T. Lund, T. K. Berntsen and J. S. Fuglestedt, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2014, **48**,  
2130        14445–14454.

2131    9    F. C. De Oliveira and S. T. Coelho, *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, 2017, **75**, 168–179.

2132    10   J. Ling, S. Nip, W. L. Cheok, R. A. de Toledo and H. Shim, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2014,  
2133        **173**, 132–139.

2134    11   L. E. Singer and D. Peterson, *International energy outlook 2010*, **0484**.

2135    12   D. Y. C. Leung, X. Wu and M. K. H. Leung, *Appl. Energy*, 2010, **87**, 1083–1095.

2136    13   G. Pathak, D. Das and L. Rokhum, *RSC Adv.*, 2016, **6**, 93729–93740.

2137    14   G. Pathak and L. Rokhum, *ACS Comb. Sci.*, 2015, **17**, 483–487.

2138    15   B. Malleshham, P. Sudarsanam and B. M. Reddy, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2014, **53**,  
2139        18775–18785.

2140    16   B. H. Hameed, L. F. Lai and L. H. Chin, *Fuel Process. Technol.*, 2009, **90**, 606–610.

2141    17   D. R. Lathiya, D. V. Bhatt and K. C. Maheria, *Bioresour. Technol. Reports*, 2018, **2**,  
2142        69–76.

2143    18   J. M. Encinar, N. Sánchez, G. Martínez and L. García, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2011, **102**,  
2144        10907–10914.

2145    19   L. Li, W. Du, D. Liu, L. Wang and Z. Li, *J. Mol. Catal. B Enzym.*, 2006, **43**, 58–62.

2146    20   J. Kansedo, K. T. Lee and S. Bhatia, *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 2009, **33**, 271–276.

2147    21   M. N. Nabi, M. M. Rahman and M. S. Akhter, *Appl. Therm. Eng.*, 2009, **29**, 2265–  
2148        2270.

2149    22   S. V. Ghadge and H. Raheman, *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 2005, **28**, 601–605.

2150    23   X. Meng, G. Chen and Y. Wang, *Fuel Process. Technol.*, 2008, **89**, 851–857.

2151    24   S. A. Shaban, *Egypt. J. Chem.*, 2012, **55**, 437–452.

2152    25   H. N. Bhatti, M. A. Hanif, M. Qasim and Ata-ur-Rehman, *Fuel*, 2008, **87**, 2961–2966.

2153    26   P. Cao, M. A. Dubé and A. Y. Tremblay, *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 2008, **32**, 1028–  
2154        1036.

2155    27   H. Y. Shin, S. H. Lee, J. H. Ryu and S. Y. Bae, *J. Supercrit. Fluids*, 2012, **61**, 134–



2156 138.

2157 28 M. Gürü, A. Koca, Ö. Can, C. Çınar and F. Şahin, *Renew. Energy*, 2010, **35**, 637–643.

2158 29 E. Alptekin and M. Canakci, *Fuel*, 2010, **89**, 4035–4039.

2159 30 C. Y. Lin and R. J. Li, *Fuel Process. Technol.*, 2009, **90**, 130–136.

2160 31 J. F. Costa, M. F. Almeida, M. C. M. Alvim-Ferraz and J. M. Dias, *Energy Convers.*

2161 *Manag.*, 2013, **74**, 17–23.

2162 32 S. H. A.B.M and S. Aishah, *Am. J. Biochem. Biotechnol.*, 2008, **4**, 250–254.

2163 33 G. Najafi, B. Ghobadian and T. F. Yusaf, *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, 2011, **15**,

2164 3870–3876.

2165 34 L. Chen, T. Liu, W. Zhang, X. Chen and J. Wang, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2012, **111**,

2166 208–214.

2167 35 U. Zur and R. V. O. N. Oel-proteinpflanzen, *Union Zur Förderung Von Oel- Und*

2168 *Proteinpflanzen E.V.*, 2017, 51.

2169 36 I. M. Atadashi, M. K. Aroua, A. R. Abdul Aziz and N. M. N. Sulaiman, *J. Ind. Eng.*

2170 *Chem.*, 2013, **19**, 14–26.

2171 37 S. P. Singh and D. Singh, *Ren. Sus. Energ. Rev.*, 2010, **14**, 200–216.

2172 38 S. D. A. P. Apptanaidu, A. M. Ali and M. H. Alias, *J. Ekon. Malaysia*, 2014, **48**, 29–

2173 40.

2174 39 B. Flach, S. Lieberz, M. Rondon, B. Williams and C. Teiken, *GAIN Report: EU-28*

2175 *Biofuels Annual*, 2015, 14–21.

2176 40 R. Delzeit, T. Heimann, F. Schuenemann and M. Soeder. *GTAP*, 2019.

2177 41 U. Zur and R. V. O. N. Oel-proteinpflanzen, *Union Zur Förderung Von Oel- Und*

2178 *Proteinpflanzen E.V.* 2015.

2179 42 J. L. Shumaker, C. Crofcheck, S. A. Tackett, E. Santillan-Jimenez and M. Crocker,

2180 *Catal. Letters*, 2007, **115**, 56–61.

2181 43 K. Bélaŋi-Bakó, F. Kovács, L. Gubicza and J. Hancsóŋ, *Biocatal. Biotransformation*,

2182 2002, **20**, 437–439.

2183 44 S. Yan, H. Lu and B. Liang, *Energy and Fuels*, 2008, **22**, 646–651.

2184 45 D. A. G. Aranda, R. T. P. Santos, N. C. O. Tapanes, A. L. D. Ramos and O. A. C.

2185 Antunes, *Catal. Letters*, 2008, **122**, 20–25.

2186 46 M. R. Avhad and J. M. Marchetti, *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, 2015, **50**, 696–718.

2187 47 A. Karmakar, S. Karmakar and S. Mukherjee, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2010, **101**, 7201–

2188 7210.

2189 48 M. M. Gui, K. T. Lee and S. Bhatia, *Energy*, 2008, **33**, 1646–1653.

2190 49 K. Shikha and C. Y. Rita, *J. Chem. Pharm. Res.*, 2012, **4**, 4219–4230.

2191 50 A. L. Ahmad, N. H. M. Yasin, C. J. C. Derek and J. K. Lim, *Renew. Sustain. Energy*  
2192 *Rev.*, 2011, **15**, 584–593.

2193 51 S. L. Dmytryshyn, A. K. Dalai, S. T. Chaudhari, H. K. Mishra and M. J. Reaney,  
2194 *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2004, **92**, 55–64.

2195 52 S. Yusup and M. A. Khan, *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 2010, **34**, 1500–1504.

2196 53 J. M. Dias, M. C. M. Alvim-Ferraz and M. F. Almeida, *Fuel*, 2008, **87**, 3572–3578.

2197 54 U. Rashid and F. Anwar, *Fuel*, 2008, **87**, 265–273.

2198 55 J. M. Encinar, J. F. González and A. Rodríguez-Reinares, *Fuel Process. Technol.*,  
2199 2007, **88**, 513–522.

2200 56 A. A. Refaat, N. K. Attia, H. A. Sibak, S. T. El Sheltawy and G. I. ElDiwani, *Int. J.*  
2201 *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2008, **5**, 75–82.

2202 57 M. P. Dorado, E. Ballesteros, M. Mittelbach and F. J. López, *Energy and Fuels*, 2004,  
2203 **18**, 1457–1462.

2204 58 O. J. Alamu, S. O. Jekayinfa and T. a Akintola, *Agric. Eng.*, 2007, **9**, 1–11.

2205 59 K. H. Chung, J. Kim and K. Y. Lee, *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 2009, **33**, 155–158.

2206 60 S. K. Karmee and A. Chadha, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2005, **96**, 1425–1429.

2207 61 P. Felizardo, M. J. Neiva Correia, I. Raposo, J. F. Mendes, R. Berkemeier and J. M.  
2208 Bordado, *Waste Manag.*, 2006, **26**, 487–494.

2209 62 B. B. Uzun, M. Kiliç, N. Özbay, A. E. Pütün and E. Pütün, *Energy*, 2012, **44**, 347–351.

2210 63 D. Y. C. Leung and Y. Guo, *Fuel Process. Technol.*, 2006, **87**, 883–890.

2211 64 U. Rashid, F. Anwar, B. R. Moser and S. Ashraf, *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 2008, **32**,  
2212 1202–1205.

2213 65 Z. Ilham, *Malaysian J. Biochem. Mol. Biol.*, 2009, **17**, 5–9.

2214 66 S. T. Keera, S. M. El Sabagh and A. R. Taman, *Fuel*, 2011, **90**, 42–47.

2215 67 U. Rashid, F. Anwar, T. M. Ansari, M. Arif and M. Ahmad, *J. Chem. Technol.*  
2216 *Biotechnol.*, 2009, **84**, 1364–1370.

2217 68 K. S. Chen, Y. C. Lin, K. H. Hsu and H. K. Wang, *Energy*, 2012, **38**, 151–156.

2218 69 K. Jacobson, R. Gopinath, L. C. Meher and A. K. Dalai, *Appl. Catal. B Environ.*, 2008,  
2219 **85**, 86–91.

2220 70 Y. Wang, S. Ou, P. Liu, F. Xue and S. Tang, *J. Mol. Catal. A Chem.*, 2006, **252**, 107–  
2221 112.

2222 71 M. Canakci and J. Van Gerpen, 1999, **42**, 1203–1210.

2223 72 X. Miao, R. Li and H. Yao, *Energy Convers. Manag.*, 2009, **50**, 2680–2684.

- 2224 73 M. J. Nye, T. W. Williamson, W. Deshpande, J. H. Schrader, W. H. Snively, T. P.  
2225 Yurkewich and C. L. French, *J. Am. Oil Chem. Soc.*, 1983, **60**, 1598–1601.
- 2226 74 J. Zhang and L. Jiang, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2008, **99**, 8995–8998.
- 2227 75 V. B. Veljković, S. H. Lakićević, O. S. Stamenković, Z. B. Todorović and M. L. Lazić,  
2228 *Fuel*, 2006, **85**, 2671–2675.
- 2229 76 P. Dalvand and L. Mahdavian, *Biofuels*, 2018, **9**, 705–710.
- 2230 77 Y. Ma, Q. Wang, X. Sun, C. Wu and Z. Gao, *Renew. Energy*, 2017, **107**, 522–530.
- 2231 78 M. Farooq, A. Ramli and D. Subbarao, *J. Clean. Prod.*, 2013, **59**, 131–140.
- 2232 79 M. Zabeti, W. M. A. Wan Daud and M. K. Aroua, *Fuel Process. Technol.*, 2009, **90**,  
2233 770–777.
- 2234 80 T. F. Dossin, M. F. Reyniers, R. J. Berger and G. B. Marin, *Appl. Catal. B Environ.*,  
2235 2006, **67**, 136–148.
- 2236 81 M. C. Math, S. P. Kumar and S. V. Chetty, *Energy Sustain. Dev.*, 2010, **14**, 339–345.
- 2237 82 M. Kouzu, S. ya Yamanaka, J. suke Hidaka and M. Tsunomori, *Appl. Catal. A Gen.*,  
2238 2009, **355**, 94–99.
- 2239 83 M. L. Granados, M. D. Z. Poves, D. M. Alonso, R. Mariscal, F. C. Galisteo, R.  
2240 Moreno-Tost, J. Santamaría and J. L. G. Fierro, *Appl. Catal. B Environ.*, 2007, **73**,  
2241 317–326.
- 2242 84 A. Kawashima, K. Matsubara and K. Honda, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2009, **100**, 696–700.
- 2243 85 C. Y. Cao and Y. H. Zhao, *Int. J. Green Energy*, 2013, **10**, 219–229.
- 2244 86 H. Mootabadi, B. Salamatina, S. Bhatia and A. Z. Abdullah, *Fuel*, 2010, **89**, 1818–  
2245 1825.
- 2246 87 J. Jitputti, B. Kitiyanan, P. Rangsunvigit, K. Bunyakiat, L. Attanatho and P.  
2247 Jenvanitpanjakul, *Chem. Eng. J.*, 2006, **116**, 61–66.
- 2248 88 M. Stöcker, *J. Mol. Catal.*, 1985, **29**, 371–377.
- 2249 89 S. J. Yoo, H. shik Lee, B. Veriansyah, J. Kim, J. D. Kim and Y. W. Lee, *Bioresour.*  
2250 *Technol.*, 2010, **101**, 8686–8689.
- 2251 90 R. B. da Silva, A. F. Lima Neto, L. S. Soares dos Santos, J. R. de Oliveira Lima, M. H.  
2252 Chaves, J. R. dos Santos, G. M. de Lima, E. M. de Moura and C. V. R. de Moura,  
2253 *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2008, **99**, 6793–6798.
- 2254 91 G. Baskar, A. Gurugulladevi, T. Nishanthini, R. Aiswarya and K. Tamilarasan, *Renew.*  
2255 *Energy*, 2017, **103**, 641–646.
- 2256 92 S. Nakagaki, A. Bail, V. C. dos Santos, V. H. R. de Souza, H. Vrabel, F. S. Nunes and  
2257 L. P. Ramos, *Appl. Catal. A Gen.*, 2008, **351**, 267–274.

2258 93 M. Di Serio, M. Cozzolino, R. Tesser, P. Patrono, F. Pinzari, B. Bonelli and E.  
2259 Santacesaria, *Appl. Catal. A Gen.*, 2007, **320**, 1–7.

2260 94 B. Rongxian, T. Yisheng and H. Yizhuo, *Fuel Process. Technol.*, 2004, **86**, 293–301.

2261 95 A. P. S. Chouhan and A. K. Sarma, *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, 2011, **15**, 4378–  
2262 4399.

2263 96 W. Xie, X. Huang and H. Li, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2007, **98**, 936–939.

2264 97 Q. Shu, B. Yang, H. Yuan, S. Qing and G. Zhu, *Catal. Commun.*, 2007, **8**, 2159–2165.

2265 98 M. J. Ramos, A. Casas, L. Rodríguez, R. Romero and Á. Pérez, *Appl. Catal. A Gen.*,  
2266 2008, **346**, 79–85.

2267 99 H. Wu, J. Zhang, Q. Wei, J. Zheng and J. Zhang, *Fuel Process. Technol.*, 2013, **109**,  
2268 13–18.

2269 100 M. Feyzi and G. Khajavi, *Ind. Crops Prod.*, 2014, **58**, 298–304.

2270 101 N. Narkhede and A. Patel, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2013, **52**, 13637–13644.

2271 102 O. Babajide, N. Musyoka, L. Petrik and F. Ameer, *Catal. Today*, 2012, **190**, 54–60.

2272 103 M. C. Manique, L. V. Lacerda, A. K. Alves and C. P. Bergmann, *Fuel*, 2017, **190**,  
2273 268–273.

2274 104 N. Al-Jammal, Z. Al-Hamamre and M. Alnaief, *Renew. Energy*, 2016, **93**, 449–459.

2275 105 L. Du, S. Ding, Z. Li, E. Lv, J. Lu and J. Ding, *Energy Convers. Manag.*, 2018, **173**,  
2276 728–734.

2277 106 S. Semwal, A. K. Arora, R. P. Badoni and D. K. Tuli, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2011, **102**,  
2278 2151–2161.

2279 107 A. Bohlouli and L. Mahdavian, *Biofuels*, 2019, **0**, 1–14.

2280 108 W. Xie and H. Li, *J. of Mol. Cat. A: Chemical*, 2006, **255**, 1–9.

2281 109 J. Paulo, A. Duarte, L. Di and A. Souza, *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, 2016, **59**, 887–  
2282 894.

2283 110 H. Ma, S. Li, B. Wang, R. Wang and S. Tian, *JAOCs*, 2008, 263–270.

2284 111 Y. Chen, Y. Huang, R. Lin, N. Shang and C. Chang, *J. Taiwan Inst. Chem. Eng.*, 2011,  
2285 **42**, 937–944.

2286 112 X. Zhang, Q. Ma, B. Cheng, J. Wang, J. Li and F. Nie, *J. Nat. Gas Chem.*, 2012, **21**,  
2287 774–779.

2288 113 E. S. Umdu, M. Tuncer and E. Seker, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2009, **100**, 2828–2831.

2289 114 M. Zabeti, W. Mohd, A. Wan and M. K. Aroua, *Fuel Process. Technol.*, 2010, **91**,  
2290 243–248.

2291 115 C. Samart, C. Chaiya and P. Reubroycharoen, *Energy Convers. Manag.*, 2010, **51**,

2292 1428–1431.

2293 116 T. Wittoon, S. Bumrungsalee, P. Vathavanichkul and S. Palitsakun, *Bioresour.*  
2294 *Technol.*, 2014, **156**, 329–334.

2295 117 H. Wu, J. Zhang, Y. Liu, J. Zheng and Q. Wei, *Fuel Process. Technol.*, 2014, **119**,  
2296 114–120.

2297 118 B. Narowska, M. Kułazyński, M. Łukaszewicz and E. Burchacka, *Renew. Energy*,  
2298 2019, **135**, 176–185.

2299 119 A. Buasri, B. Ksapabutr, M. Panapoy and N. Chaiyut, *Korean J. Chem. Eng.*, 2012, **29**,  
2300 1708–1712.

2301 120 L. J. Konwar, J. Boro and D. Deka, *Energy Sources, Part A Recover. Util. Environ.*  
2302 *Eff.*, 2018, **40**, 601–607.

2303 121 B. H. Hameed, C. S. Goh and L. H. Chin, *Fuel Process. Technol.*, 2009, **90**, 1532–  
2304 1537.

2305 122 S. Baroutian, M. K. Aroua, A. Aziz, A. Raman, N. Meriam and N. Sulaiman, *Fuel*  
2306 *Process. Technol.*, 2010, **91**, 1378–1385.

2307 123 X. Li, Y. Zuo, Y. Zhang, Y. Fu and Q. Guo, *Fuel*, 2013, **113**, 435–442.

2308 124 A. Buasri, N. Chaiyut, V. Loryuenyong and C. Rodklum, *Sci. Asia*, 2012, **38**, 283–288.

2309 125 Z. Wan and B. H. Hameed, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2011, **102**, 2659–2664.

2310 126 A. B. Fadhil, A. M. Aziz and M. H. Altamer, *Fuel*, 2016, **170**, 130–140.

2311 127 H. Liu, L. Su, Y. Shao and L. Zou, *Fuel*, 2012, **97**, 651–657.

2312 128 I. B. Laskar, L. Rokhum, R. Gupta and S. Chatterjee, *Environ. Prog. Sustain. Energy*,  
2313 2019, **39**, 1–11.

2314 129 Taslim, O. Bani, Iriany, N. Aryani and G. S. Kaban, *Key Eng. Mater.*, 2018, **777**, 262–  
2315 267.

2316 130 S. Abelló, F. Medina, D. Tichit, J. Pérez-Ramírez, J. C. Groen, J. E. Sueiras, P. Salagre  
2317 and Y. Cesteros, *Chem. - A Eur. J.*, 2005, **11**, 728–739.

2318 131 D. P. Debecker, E. M. Gaigneaux and G. Busca, *Chem. - A Eur. J.*, 2009, **15**, 3920–  
2319 3935.

2320 132 A. Navajas, I. Campo, A. Moral, J. Echave, O. Sanz, M. Montes, J. A. Odriozola, G.  
2321 Arzamendi and L. M. Gandía, *Fuel*, 2018, **211**, 173–181.

2322 133 H. yan Zeng, Z. Feng, X. Deng and Y. qin Li, *Fuel*, 2008, **87**, 3071–3076.

2323 134 Y. Ma, Q. Wang, L. Zheng, Z. Gao, Q. Wang and Y. Ma, *Energy*, 2016, **107**, 523–531.

2324 135 H. Y. Zeng, S. Xu, M. C. Liao, Z. Q. Zhang and C. Zhao, *Appl. Clay Sci.*, 2014, **91**–  
2325 **92**, 16–24.

2326 136 W. Trakarnpruk and S. Porntangjitlikit, *Renew. Energy*, 2008, **33**, 1558–1563.

2327 137 Q. Liu, B. Wang, C. Wang, Z. Tian, W. Qu, H. Ma and R. Xu, *Green Chem.*, 2014, **16**,  
2328 2604–2613.

2329 138 L. Gao, G. Teng, G. Xiao and R. Wei, *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 2010, **34**, 1283–1288.

2330 139 Y. Liu, E. Lotero, J. G. Goodwin and X. Mo, *Appl. Catal. A Gen.*, 2007, **331**, 138–148.

2331 140 Z. Helwani, N. Aziz, M. Z. A. Bakar, H. Mukhtar, J. Kim and M. R. Othman, *Energy*  
2332 *Convers. Manag.*, 2013, **73**, 128–134.

2333 141 C. S. Cordeiro, G. G. C. Arizaga, L. P. Ramos and F. Wypych, *Catal. Commun.*, 2008,  
2334 **9**, 2140–2143.

2335 142 J. Tantirungrotechai, P. Chotmongkolsap and M. Pohmakotr, *Microporous*  
2336 *Mesoporous Mater.*, 2010, **128**, 41–47.

2337 143 H. Hattori, *Chem. Rev.*, 1995, **95**, 537–558.

2338 144 A. Kawashima, K. Matsubara and K. Honda, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2008, **99**, 3439–  
2339 3443.

2340 145 H. Sun, Y. Ding, J. Duan, Q. Zhang, Z. Wang, H. Lou and X. Zheng, *Bioresour.*  
2341 *Technol.*, 2010, **101**, 953–958.

2342 146 Z. Wen, X. Yu, S. T. Tu, J. Yan and E. Dahlquist, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2010, **101**,  
2343 9570–9576.

2344 147 C. L. Chen, C. C. Huang, D. T. Tran and J. S. Chang, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2012, **113**,  
2345 8–13.

2346 148 R. Madhuvilakku and S. Piraman, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2013, **150**, 55–59.

2347 149 S. Yan, S. O. Salley and K. Y. Simon Ng, *Appl. Catal. A Gen.*, 2009, **353**, 203–212.

2348 150 C. Ngamcharussrivichai, P. Totarat and K. Bunyakiat, *Appl. Catal. A Gen.*, 2008, **341**,  
2349 77–85.

2350 151 J. Su, Y. Li, H. Wang, X. Yan and D. Pan, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, 2016, **663**, 61–65.

2351 152 M. M. Ibrahim, H. R. Mahmoud and S. A. El-molla, *Catal. Commun.*, 2019, **122**, 10–  
2352 15.

2353 153 E. A. Faria, I. M. Dias, P. A. Z. Suarez and A. G. S. Prado, *J. Brazillian Chem. Soc.*,  
2354 2009, **20**, 1732–1737.

2355 154 M. C. G. Albuquerque, J. Santamaría-González, J. M. Mérida-Robles, R. Moreno-  
2356 Tost, E. Rodríguez-Castellón, A. Jiménez-López, D. C. S. Azevedo, C. L. Cavalcante  
2357 and P. Maireles-Torres, *Appl. Catal. A Gen.*, 2008, **347**, 162–168.

2358 155 K. Rajkumari, D. Das, G. Pathak and L. Rokhum, *New J. Chem.*, 2019, **43**, 2134–  
2359 2140.

- 2360 156 E. Betiku, A. A. Okeleye, N. B. Ishola, A. S. Osunleke and T. V. Ojumu, *Catal.*  
2361 *Letters*, 2019, **149**, 1772–1787.
- 2362 157 R. Shan, L. Lu, Y. Shi, H. Yuan and J. Shi, *Energy Convers. Manag.*, 2018, **178**, 277–  
2363 289.
- 2364 158 G. Pathak, K. Rajkumari and L. Rokhum, *Nanoscale adv.*, 2019, **1**, 1013-1020.
- 2365 159 B. Changmai, I. B. Laskar and L. Rokhum, *J. Taiwan Inst. Chem. Eng.*, 2019, **102**,  
2366 276-282.
- 2367 160 C. Xu, M. Nasrollahzadeh, M. Sajjadi, M. Maham, R. Luque and A. R. Puente-  
2368 Santiago, *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, 2019, **112**, 195–252.
- 2369 161 Z. Wei, C. Xu and B. Li, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2009, **100**, 2883–2885.
- 2370 162 J. Goli and O. Sahu, *Renew. Energy*, 2018, **128**, 142-154.
- 2371 163 A. A. Ayodeji, M. E. Ojewumi, B. Rasheed and J. M. Ayodele, *Data Br.*, 2018, **19**,  
2372 1466–1473.
- 2373 164 G. Joshi, D. S. Rawat, B. Y. Lamba, K. K. Bisht, P. Kumar, N. Kumar and S. Kumar,  
2374 *Energy Convers. Manag.*, 2015, **96**, 258–267.
- 2375 165 Y. C. Sharma, B. Singh and J. Korstad, *Energy and Fuels*, 2010, **24**, 3223-3231.
- 2376 166 N. Tshizanga, E. F. Aransiola and O. Oyekola, *South African J. Chem. Eng.*, 2017, **23**,  
2377 145-156.
- 2378 167 Y. H. Tan, M. O. Abdullah, C. Nolasco-Hipolito and N. S. Ahmad Zauzi, *Renew.*  
2379 *Energy*, 2017, **114**, 437-447.
- 2380 168 Y. C. Wong and R. X. Ang, *Open Chem.*, 2018, **16**, 1166–1175.
- 2381 169 P. Suwannasom, R. Sriraksa, P. Tansupo and C. Ruangviriyachai, *Energy Sources*,  
2382 *Part A Recover. Util. Environ. Eff.*, 2016, **38**, 3221–3228.
- 2383 170 G. Santya, T. Maheswaran and K. F. Yee, *SN Appl. Sci.*, 2019, **1**, 152-160.
- 2384 171 P. Parthasarathy and S. K. Narayanan, *Environ. Prog. Sustain. Energy*, 2014, **33**, 676–  
2385 680.
- 2386 172 S. Niju, M. M. M. S. Begum and N. Anantharaman, *J. Saudi Chem. Soc.*, 2014, **18**,  
2387 702–706.
- 2388 173 A. R. Gupta and V. K. Rathod, *Waste Manag.*, 2018, **79**, 169-178.
- 2389 174 N. S. El-Gendy, S. F. Deriase, A. Hamdy and R. I. Abdallah, *Egypt. J. Pet.*, 2015, **24**,  
2390 37-48.
- 2391 175 Y. P. Peng, K. T. T. Amesho, C. E. Chen, S. R. Jhang, F. C. Chou and Y. C. Lin,  
2392 *Catalysts*, 2018, **8**, 81-91.
- 2393 176 N. Viriya-Empikul, P. Krasae, W. Nualpaeng, B. Yoosuk and K. Faungnawakij, *Fuel*,

2394 2012, **92**, 239–244.

2395 177 P. Khemthong, C. Luadthong, W. Nualpaeng, P. Changsuwan, P. Tongprem, N.

2396 Viriya-Empikul and K. Faungnawakij, *Catal. Today*, 2012, **190**, 112-116.

2397 178 N. Viriya-empikul, P. Krasae, B. Puttasawat, B. Yoosuk, N. Chollacoop and K.

2398 Faungnawakij, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2010, **101**, 3765–3767.

2399 179 A. Annam Renita, P. P. Chowdhury, P. Sultana, P. Phukan and A. Hannan, *Int. J.*

2400 *Pharm. Pharm. Sci.* 2016, **8**, 143-146.

2401 180 A. a Jazie, H. Pramanik and a S. K. Sinha, *Spec. Issue Int. J. Sustain. Dev. Green*

2402 *Econ.*, 2013, **2**, 2315–4721.

2403 181 F. Yasar, *Fuel*, 2019, **255**, 115828.

2404 182 K. Kara, F. Ouanji, M. El Mahi, E. M. Lotfi, M. Kacimi and Z. Mahfoud, *Biofuels*,

2405 2019, **24**, 1-7.

2406 183 E. Fayyazi, B. Ghobadian, H. H. Van De Bovenkamp, G. Najafi, B.

2407 Hosseinzadehsamani, H. J. Heeres and J. Yue, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2018, **38**, 12742-

2408 12755.

2409 184 L. M. Correia, R. M. A. Saboya, N. de Sousa Campelo, J. A. Cecilia, E. Rodríguez-

2410 Castellón, C. L. Cavalcante and R. S. Vieira, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2014, **151**, 207–213.

2411 185 I. Reyero, F. Bimbela, A. Navajas, G. Arzamendi and L. M. Gandía, *Fuel*, 2015, 158,

2412 558-564.

2413 186 S. B. Chavan, R. R. Kumbhar, D. Madhu, B. Singh and Y. C. Sharma, *RSC Adv.*, 2015,

2414 **5**, 63596-63604.

2415 187 P. R. Pandit and M. H. Fulekar, *J. Environ. Manage.*, 2017, **198**, 319-329.

2416 188 P. R. Pandit and M. H. Fulekar, *Renew. Energy*, 2019, **136**, 837-845.

2417 189 P. R. Pandit and M. H. Fulekar, in *Materials Today: Proceedings*, 2019, **10**, 75-86.

2418 190 K. Kirubakaran and V. Arul Mozhi Selvan, *J. Environ. Chem. Eng.*, 2018, **6**, 4490–

2419 4503.

2420 191 G. Santya, T. Maheswaran and K. F. Yee, *SN Appl. Sci.*, 2019, **1**, 152-160.

2421 192 M. L. Savaliya, M. S. Bhakhar and B. Z. Dholakiya, *Catal. Letters*, 2016, **146**, 2313-

2422 2323.

2423 193 L. Da Silva Castro, A. G. Barañano, C. J. G. Pinheiro, L. Menini and P. F. Pinheiro,

2424 *Green Process. Synth.*, 2019, **8**, 235–244.

2425 194 Y. Hangun-Balkir, *J. Chem.*, 2016.

2426 195 A. Ansori, S. A. Wibowo, H. S. Kusuma, D. S. Bhuana and M. Mahfud, *Open Chem.*,

2427 2019, **17**, 1185-1197.



2428 196 N. Mansir, S. Hwa Teo, M. Lokman Ibrahim and T. Y. Yun Hin, *Energy Convers.*  
2429 *Manag.*, 2017, **151**, 216-226.

2430 197 A. S. Yusuff, O. D. Adeniyi, M. A. Olutoye and U. G. Akpan, *Int. J. Technol.*, 2018, **1**,  
2431 1-11.

2432 198 M. J. Borah, A. Das, V. Das, N. Bhuyan and D. Deka, *Fuel*, 2019, **242**, 345-354.

2433 199 A. S. Oladipo, O. A. Ajayi, A. A. Oladipo, S. L. Azarmi, Y. Nurudeen, A. Y. Atta and  
2434 S. S. Ogunyemi, *Comptes Rendus Chim.*, 2018, **21**, 684–695.

2435 200 M. D. Putra, Y. Ristianingsih, R. Jelita, C. Irawan and I. F. Nata, *RSC Adv.*, 2017, **7**,  
2436 55547–55554.

2437 201 N. Mansir, S. H. Teo, U. Rashid and Y. H. Taufiq-Yap, *Fuel*, 2018, **211**, 67–75.

2438 202 S. H. Teo, A. Islam, H. R. F. Masoumi, Y. H. Taufiq-Yap, J. Janaun, E. S. Chan and  
2439 M. A. khaleque, *Renew. Energy*, , DOI:10.1016/j.renene.2017.04.039.

2440 203 M. A. Olutoye, S. C. Lee and B. H. Hameed, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2011, **102**, 10777-  
2441 10783.

2442 204 G. Chen, R. Shan, S. Li and J. Shi, *Fuel*, 2016, **143**, 110-117.

2443 205 N. S. Lani, N. Ngadi, N. Y. Yahya and R. A. Rahman, *J. Clean. Prod.*, 2018, **164**, 210-  
2444 218.

2445 206 G. Y. Chen, R. Shan, J. F. Shi and B. B. Yan, *Fuel Process. Technol.*, 2015, **133**, 8–13.

2446 207 S. Sulaiman and N. I. F. Ruslan, *Energy Sources, Part A Recover. Util. Environ. Eff.*,  
2447 2017, **39**, 154–159.

2448 208 J. Boro, L. J. Konwar and D. Deka, *Fuel Process. Technol.*, 2014, **122**, 72–78.

2449 209 W. U. Rahman, A. Fatima, A. H. Anwer, M. Athar, M. Z. Khan, N. A. Khan and G.  
2450 Halder, *Process Saf. Environ. Prot.*, 2019, **122**, 313-319.

2451 210 R. Chakraborty, S. Bepari and A. Banerjee, *Chem. Eng. J.*, 2010, **165**, 798-805.

2452 211 D. Zeng, Q. Zhang, S. Chen, S. Liu, Y. Chen, Y. Tian and G. Wang, *J. Environ. Chem.*  
2453 *Eng.*, 2015, **3**, 560–564.

2454 212 S. Chowdhury, S. H. Dhawane, B. Jha, S. Pal, R. Sagar, A. Hossain and G. Halder,  
2455 *Biomass Convers. Biorefinery*, 2019, 1-11.

2456 213 G. Chen, R. Shan, J. Shi and B. Yan, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2014, **171**, 428-432.

2457 214 Y. B. Cho and G. Seo, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2010, **22**, 8515-8519.

2458 215 A. Buasri and V. Loryuenyong, in *Materials Today: Proceedings*, 2017, 4, 6051-6059.

2459 216 J. Goli and O. Sahu, *Renew. Energy*, 2018, **128**, 142-154.

2460 217 S. Niju, K. M. M. S. Begum and N. Anantharaman, *Environ. Prog. Sustain. Energy*,  
2461 2015, 34, 248-254.

- 2462 218 N. P. Asri, B. Podjojono, R. Fujiani and Nuraini, *IOP Conf. Ser. Earth Environ. Sci.*,  
2463 2017, **67**, 1-7.
- 2464 219 L. M. Correia, R. M. A. Saboya, N. de Sousa Campelo, J. A. Cecilia, E. Rodríguez-  
2465 Castellón, C. L. Cavalcante and R. S. Vieira, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2014, **151**, 207–213.
- 2466 220 S. Jairam, P. Kolar, R. Sharma-Shivappa Ratna, J. A. Osborne and J. P. Davis,  
2467 *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2012, **104**, 329-335.
- 2468 221 N. Nakatani, H. Takamori, K. Takeda and H. Sakugawa, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2009,  
2469 **100**, 1510-1513.
- 2470 222 A. Buasri, T. Rattanapan, C. Boonrin, C. Wechayan and V. Loryuenyong, *J. Chem.*,  
2471 2015.
- 2472 223 S. Kaewdaeng, P. Sintuya and R. Nirunsin, *Energy Procedia*, 2017, **138**, 937–942.
- 2473 224 W. Roschat, T. Siritanon, T. Kaewpuang, B. Yoosuk and V. Promarak, *Bioresour.*  
2474 *Technol.*, 2016, **209**, 343-350.
- 2475 225 X. Liu, H. Bai, D. Zhu and G. Cao, *Advanced Materials Research*, 2011, **148**, 794-  
2476 798.
- 2477 226 A. Birla, B. Singh, S. N. Upadhyay and Y. C. Sharma, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2012, **106**,  
2478 95–100.
- 2479 227 H. Liu, H. shuang Guo, X. jing Wang, J. zhong Jiang, H. Lin, S. Han and S. peng Pei,  
2480 *Renew. Energy*, 2016, 93, 648-657.
- 2481 228 I. B. Laskar, K. Rajkumari, R. Gupta, S. Chatterjee, B. Paul and L. Rokhum, *RSC*  
2482 *Adv.*, 2018, **8**, 20131–20142.
- 2483 229 N. S. El-Gendy, S. F. Deriase and A. Hamdy, *Energy Sources, Part A Recover. Util.*  
2484 *Environ. Eff.*, 2014, **36**, 623-637.
- 2485 230 Sani. J, Samir. S, Rikoto. II, Tambuwal. AD, Sanda. A, Maishanu. SM and Laden.  
2486 MM, *Innov. Energy Res.* 2017, 6, 1-4.
- 2487 231 V. A. Fabiani, R. O. Asriza, A. R. Fabian and M. Kafillah, in *IOP Conference Series:*  
2488 *Earth and Environmental Science*, 2019, **353**, 12012.
- 2489 232 K. N. Krishnamurthy, S. N. Sridhara and C. S. Ananda Kumar, *Renew. Energy*, 2020,  
2490 **146**, 280-296.
- 2491 233 A. A. Otori, A. Mann, M.A.T. Suleiman and E. C. Egwimvol. *Nigerian J. Chem. Res.*,  
2492 2011, **23**, 837–846.
- 2493 234 A. Buasri, N. Chaiyut, V. Loryuenyong, P. Worawanitchaphong and S. Trongyong,  
2494 *Sci. World J.*, 2013.
- 2495 235 H. Hadiyanto, A. H. Afianti, U. I. Navi'A, N. P. Adetya, W. Widayat and H. Sutanto,

2496 *J. Environ. Chem. Eng.*, 2017, **5**, 4559-4563.

2497 236 S. Nurdin, N. A. Rosnan, N. S. Ghazali, J. Gimbun, A. H. Nour and S. F. Haron, in  
2498 *Energy Procedia*, 2015, **79**, 576-583.

2499 237 R. Rezaei, M. Mohadesi and G. R. Moradi, *Fuel*, 2013, **109**, 534–541.

2500 238 Y. Zhang, X. Shen, H. Bai and S. Liu, *World Automation Congress Proceedings*, 2012,  
2501 1-4.

2502 239 S. Hu, Y. Wang and H. Han, *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 2011, **35**, 3627–3635.

2503 240 A. Perea, T. Kelly and Y. Hangun-Balkir, *Green Chem. Lett. Rev.*, 2016, **9**, 27–32.

2504 241 O. Nur Syazwani, U. Rashid and Y. H. Taufiq Yap, *Energy Convers. Manag.*, 2015,  
2505 **101**, 749–756.

2506 242 O. N. Syazwani, U. Rashid, M. S. Mastuli and Y. H. Taufiq-Yap, *Renew. Energy*,  
2507 2019, **131**, 187–196.

2508 243 N. Asikin-Mijan, H. V. Lee and Y. H. Taufiq-Yap, *Chem. Eng. Res. Des.*, 2015, **102**,  
2509 368–377.

2510 244 Y. Taufiq-Yap, H. Lee and P. Lau, *Energy Explor. Exploit.*, 2012, **30**, 853-866.

2511 245 P. Nair, B. Singh, S. N. Upadhyay and Y. C. Sharma, *J. Clean. Prod.*, 2012, **29**, 82-90.

2512 246 N. Girish, S. P. Niju, K. M. Meera Sheriffa Begum and N. Anantharaman, *Fuel*, 2013,  
2513 **111**, 653–658.

2514 247 O. N. Syazwani, S. H. Teo, A. Islam and Y. H. Taufiq-Yap, *Process Saf. Environ.*  
2515 *Prot.*, 2017, **105**, 303–315.

2516 248 G. Y. Chen, R. Shan, B. B. Yan, J. F. Shi, S. Y. Li and C. Y. Liu, *Fuel Process.*  
2517 *Technol.*, 2016, **143**, 110-117.

2518 249 S. Boonyuen, S. M. Smith, M. Malaithong, A. Prokaew, B. Cherdhirunkorn and A.  
2519 Luengnaruemitchai, *J. Clean. Prod.*, 2018, 177, 925-929.

2520 250 W. Suryaputra, I. Winata, N. Indraswati and S. Ismadji, *Renew. Energy*, 2013, 50, 795-  
2521 799.

2522 251 P. L. Boey, G. P. Maniam, S. A. Hamid and D. M. H. Ali, *Fuel*, 2011, **88**, 283-288.

2523 252 S. L. Lee, Y. C. Wong, Y. P. Tan and S. Y. Yew, *Energy Convers. Manag.*, 2015, **93**,  
2524 282–288.

2525 253 J. Xie, X. Zheng, A. Dong, Z. Xiao and J. Zhang, *Green Chem.*, 2009, **11**, 355–364.

2526 254 J. Boro, A. J. Thakur and D. Deka, *Fuel Process. Technol.*, 2011, **92**, 2061–2067.

2527 255 J. Boro, L. J. Konwar, A. J. Thakur and D. Deka, *Fuel*, 2014, 129, 182-187.

2528 256 H. Mazaheri, H. C. Ong, H. H. Masjuki, Z. Amini, M. D. Harrison, C. T. Wang, F.  
2529 Kusumo and A. Alwi, *Energy*, 2018, **144**, 10-19.

2530 257 L. Yang, A. Zhang and X. Zheng, *Energy and Fuels*, 2009, **23**, 3859-3865.

2531 258 R. Anr, A. A. Saleh, M. S. Islam, S. Hamdan and M. A. Maleque, *Energy and Fuels*,  
2532 2016, **30**, 334–343.

2533 259 P. Sivakumar, P. Sivakumar, K. Anbarasu, R. Mathiarasi and S. Renganathan, *Int. J.*  
2534 *Green Energy*, 2014, **11**, 886-897.

2535 260 V. Shankar and R. Jambulingam, *Sustain. Environ. Res.*, 2017, **27**, 273–278.

2536 261 P. L. Boey, G. P. Maniam and S. A. Hamid, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2011, **168**, 15-22.

2537 262 D. Madhu, S. B. Chavan, V. Singh, B. Singh and Y. C. Sharma, *Bioresour.*  
2538 *Technol.*, 2016, **214**, 210-217.

2539 263 A. P. S. Chouhan and A. K. Sarma, *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 2013, **55**, 386–389.

2540 264 L. H. Chin, B. H. Hameed and A. L. Ahmad, *Energy and Fuels*, 2009, **23**, 1040–1044.

2541 265 P. L. Boey, S. Ganesan, S. X. Lim, S. L. Lim, G. P. Maniam and M. Khairuddean,  
2542 *Energy*, 2011, **36**, 5791–5796.

2543 266 E. Betiku and S. O. Ajala, *Ind. Crops Prod.*, 2014, **53**, 314–322.

2544 267 A. O. Etim, E. Betiku, S. O. Ajala, P. J. Olaniyi and T. V. Ojumu, *Sustain.*, 2018, **10**,  
2545 707-715.

2546 268 V. Vadery, B. N. Narayanan, R. M. Ramakrishnan, S. K. Cherikkallinmel, S. Sugunan,  
2547 D. P. Narayanan and S. Sasidharan, *Energy*, 2014, **70**, 588–594.

2548 269 C. Ofori-Boateng and K. T. Lee, *Chem. Eng. J.*, 2013, **220**, 395–401.

2549 270 D. C. Deka and S. Basumatary, *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 2011, **35**, 1797–1803.

2550 271 A. K. Sarma, P. Kumar, M. Aslam and A. P. S. Chouhan, *Catal. Letters*, 2014, **144**,  
2551 1344–1353.

2552 272 E. Betiku, A. M. Akintunde and T. V. Ojumu, *Energy*, 2016, **103**, 797–806.

2553 273 S. E. Onoji, S. E. Iyuke, A. I. Igbafe and M. O. Daramola, *Energy and Fuels*, 2017, **31**,  
2554 6109–6119.

2555 274 M. Gohain, A. Devi and D. Deka, *Ind. Crops Prod.*, 2017, **109**, 8–18.

2556 275 G. Pathak, D. Das, K. Rajkumari and L. Rokhum, *Green Chem.*, 2018, **20**, 2365–2373.

2557 276 M. Sharma, A. A. Khan, S. K. Puri and D. K. Tuli, *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 2012, **41**,  
2558 94–106.

2559 277 B. K. Uprety, W. Chaiwong, C. Ewelike and S. K. Rakshit, *Energy Convers. Manag.*,  
2560 2016, **115**, 191–199.

2561 278 M. Balajii and S. Niju, *Renew. Energy*, 2020, **146**, 2255–2269.

2562 279 M. Balajii and S. Niju, *Energy Convers. Manag.*, 2019, **189**, 118–131.

2563 280 I. M. Mendonça, F. L. Machado, C. C. Silva, S. Duvoisin Junior, M. L. Takeno, P. J.

2564 de Sousa Maia, L. Manzato and F. A. de Freitas, *Energy Convers. Manag.*, 2019, **200**,  
2565 112095.

2566 281 B. Nath, B. Das, P. Kalita and S. Basumatary, *J. Clean. Prod.*, 2019, **239**, 118112.

2567 282 B. Changmai, P. Sudarsanam and L. Rokhum, *Ind. Crops Prod.*, 2019, **145**, 111911-  
2568 111919.

2569 283 B. Nath, P. Kalita, B. Das and S. Basumatary, *Renew. Energy*, 2020, **151**, 295-310.

2570 284 I. M. Mendonça, O. A. R. L. Paes, P. J. S. Maia, M. P. Souza, R. A. Almeida, C. C.  
2571 Silva, S. Duvoisin and F. A. de Freitas, *Renew. Energy*, 2019, **130**, 103–110.

2572 285 M. Gohain, K. Laskar, H. Phukon, U. Bora, D. Kalita and D. Deka, *Waste Manag.*,  
2573 2020, **102**, 212–221.

2574 286 E. Betiku, A. O. Etim, O. Perea and T. V. Ojumu, *Energy and Fuels*, 2017, **31**, 6182–  
2575 6193.

2576 287 M. R. Miladinović, M. V. Zdujić, D. N. Veljović, J. B. Krstić, I. B. Banković-Ilić, V.  
2577 B. Veljković and O. S. Stamenković, *Renew. Energy*, 2020, **147**, 1033–1043.

2578 288 H. H. Abdelhady, H. A. Elazab, E. M. Ewais, M. Saber and M. S. El-Deab, *Fuel*, 2020,  
2579 **261**, 116481.

2580 289 K. Rajkumari and L. Rokhum, *Biomass Conversion and Biorefinery*, 2020, 1-10.

2581 290 V. O. Odude, A. J. Adesina, O. O. Oyetunde, O. O. Adeyemi, N. B. Ishola, A. O. Etim  
2582 and E. Betiku, *Waste and Biomass Valorization*, 2019, **10**, 877–888.

2583 291 M. Gohain, K. Laskar, A. K. Paul, N. Daimary, M. Maharana, I. K. Goswami, A.  
2584 Hazarika, U. Bora and D. Deka, *Renew. Energy*, 2020, **147**, 541–555.

2585 292 M. Aslam, P. Saxena and A. K. Sarma, *Energy and Environment Research*. 2014, **4**,  
2586 1927-0569.

2587 293 M. Di Serio, R. Tesser, L. Pengmei and E. Santacesaria, *Energy and Fuels*, 2008, **22**,  
2588 207–217.

2589 294 N. S. Talha and S. Sulaiman, *ARPJ. Eng. Appl. Sci.*, 2016, **11**, 439–442.

2590 295 F. Allieux, B. J. Holland, L. Kong and L. F. Dumée, 2017, **4**, 1–10.

2591 296 K. L. T. Rodrigues, V. M. D. Pasa and É. C. Cren, *J. Environ. Chem. Eng.*, 2018, **6**,  
2592 4531–4537.

2593 297 L. Ma, Y. Han, K. Sun, J. Lu and J. Ding, *J. Energy Chem.*, 2015, **000**, 1–7.

2594 298 S. Xia, X. Guo, D. Mao, Z. Shi, G. Wu and G. Lu, *RSC Adv.*, 2014, **4**, 51688–51695.

2595 299 N. Shibasaki-kitakawa, K. Hiromori, T. Ihara, K. Nakashima and T. Yonemoto, *FUEL*,  
2596 2015, **139**, 11–17.

2597 300 M. Banchemo and G. Gojjelino, *Energies*, 2018, 11, 1843-1851.

- 2598 301 D. R. Radu and G. A. Kraus, *Heterogeneous Catalysis for Today's Challenges*. 2015.  
2599 117-130.
- 2600 302 N. Shibasaki-kitakawa, H. Honda, H. Kuribayashi and T. Toda, 2007, **98**, 416–421.
- 2601 303 Y. Ren, B. He, F. Yan, H. Wang, Y. Cheng, L. Lin, Y. Feng and J. Li, *Bioresour.*  
2602 *Technol.*, 2012, **113**, 19–22.
- 2603 304 M. Tubino, A. José and D. A. Meirelles, *Chem. Eng. J.*, 2018, **333**, 686-696.
- 2604 305 J. Kansedo, Y. X. Sim and K. T. Lee, *IOP Conf. Ser. Mater. Sci. Eng.*, 2019, 495,  
2605 012050-012060.
- 2606 306 N. Jaya, B. K. Selvan and S. J. Vennison, *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf.*, 2015, **121**, 3–9.
- 2607 307 A. Umar, A. Uba, M. L. Mohammed, M. N. Almustapha, C. Muhammad and J. Sani,  
2608 *Niger. J. Basic Appl. Sci.*, 2019, **26**, 88.
- 2609 308 J. Kansedo and K. T. Lee, *Energy Sci. Eng.*, 2014, **2**, 31–38.
- 2610 309 O. Ilgen, A. N. Akin and N. Boz, *Turkish J. Chem.*, 2009, **33**, 289–294.
- 2611 310 B. Vafakish and M. Barari, *Kem. u Ind. Chem. Chem. Eng.*, 2017, **66**, 47–52.
- 2612 311 R. Hartono, B. Mulia, M. Sahlan, T. S. Utami, A. Wijanarko and H. Hermansyah, *AIP*  
2613 *Conf. Proc.*, 2017, **1826**, 020020.
- 2614 312 N. Shibasaki-Kitakawa, T. Tsuji, M. Kubo and T. Yonemoto, *Bioenergy Res.*, 2011, **4**,  
2615 287–293.
- 2616 313 N. Shibasaki-Kitakawa, T. Tsuji, K. Chida, M. Kubo and T. Yonemoto, *Energy and*  
2617 *Fuels*, 2010, **24**, 3634–3638.
- 2618 314 Y. Feng, B. He, Y. Cao, J. Li, M. Liu, F. Yan and X. Liang, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2010,  
2619 **101**, 1518–1521.
- 2620 315 N. Jalilnejad Falizi, T. Güngören Madenoğlu, M. Yüksel and N. Kabay, *Int. J. Energy*  
2621 *Res.*, 2019, **43**, 2188–2199.
- 2622 316 P. A. Alaba, Y. M. Sani, W. Mohd and A. Wan, *RSC Adv.*, 2016, **6**, 78351–78368.
- 2623 317 Q. H. Xia, K. Hidajat and S. Kawi, *Chem. Commun.*, 2000, **22**, 2229–2230.
- 2624 318 A. V. Ivanov, S. V. Lysenko, S. V. Baranova, A. V. Sungurov, T. N. Zangelov and E.  
2625 A. Karakhanov, *Microporous Mesoporous Mater.*, 2006, **91**, 254–260.
- 2626 319 S. H. I. Guo-liang, Y. U. Feng, Y. A. N. Xiao-liang and L. I. Rui-feng, *J. Fuel Chem.*  
2627 *Technol.*, 2017, **45**, 311–316.
- 2628 320 Q. H. Xia, K. Hidajat and S. Kawi, *J. Catal.*, 2002, **205**, 318–331.
- 2629 321 H. Muthu, V. S. Selvabala, T. K. Varathachary, D. K. Selvaraj, J. Nandagopal and S.  
2630 Subramanian, *Brazilian J. Chem. Eng.*, 2010, **27**, 601–608.
- 2631 322 M. K. Lam, K. T. Lee and A. R. Mohamed, *Appl. Catal. B Environ.*, 2009, **93**, 134–

2632 139.

2633 323 C. O. Pereira, M. F. Portilho, C. A. Henriques and F. M. Z. Zotin, *J. Braz. Chem. Soc.*,  
 2634 2014, **25**, 2409–2416.

2635 324 G. Kafuku, K. T. Lee and M. Mbarawa, *Chem. Pap.*, 2010, **64**, 734–740.

2636 325 X. Li and W. Huang, *Energy Sources, Part A Recover. Util. Environ. Eff.*, 2009, **31**,  
 2637 1666–1672.

2638 326 M. L. Testa, V. La Parola, L. F. Liotta and A. M. Venezia, *J. Mol. Catal. A Chem.*,  
 2639 2013, **367**, 69–76.

2640 327 M. L. Testa, V. La Parola and A. M. Venezia, *Catal. Today*, 2010, **158**, 109–113.

2641 328 J. Gardy, A. Hassanpour, X. Lai and M. H. Ahmed, *Appl. Catal. A Gen.*, 2016, **527**,  
 2642 81–95.

2643 329 J. Gardy, A. Hassanpour, X. Lai, M. H. Ahmed and M. Rehan, *Appl. Catal. B*  
 2644 *Environ.*, 2017, **207**, 297–310.

2645 330 T. Suzuta, M. Toba, Y. Abe and Y. Yoshimura, *JAOCs, J. Am. Oil Chem. Soc.*, 2012,  
 2646 **89**, 1981–1989.

2647 331 K. Thirunavukkarasu, T. M. Sankaranarayanan, A. Pandurangan, R. Vijaya Shanthi  
 2648 and S. Sivasanker, *Catal. Sci. Technol.*, 2014, **4**, 851–860.

2649 332 W. Xie, H. Wang and H. Li, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2012, **51**, 225–231.

2650 333 F. H. Alhassan, U. Rashid and Y. H. Taufiq-Yap, *J. Oleo Sci.*, 2015, **64**, 505–514.

2651 334 W. Xie and T. Wang, *Fuel Process. Technol.*, 2013, **109**, 150–155.

2652 335 W. Xie and D. Yang, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2012, **119**, 60–65.

2653 336 H. Amani, Z. Ahmad, M. Asif and B. H. Hameed, *J. Ind. Eng. Chem.*, 2014, **20**, 4437–  
 2654 4442.

2655 337 Q. Zhang, H. Li, X. Liu, W. Qin, Y. Zhang, W. Xue and S. Yang, *Energy Technol.*,  
 2656 2013, **1**, 735–742.

2657 338 F. H. Alhassan, U. Rashid and Y. H. Taufiq-Yap, *J. Oleo Sci.*, 2015, **64**, 91–99.

2658 339 A. Mahajan and P. Gupta, *Environ. Chem. Lett.*, 2020, **18**, 299–314.

2659 340 M. Hara, T. Yoshida, A. Takagaki, T. Takata, J. N. Kondo, S. Hayashi and K. Domen,  
 2660 *Angew. Chemie - Int. Ed.*, 2004, **43**, 2955–2958.

2661 341 S. P. Adhikari, Z. D. Hood, S. Borchers and M. Wright, *Chemistry select*, 2020, **5**,  
 2662 1534–1538.

2663 342 R. A. Arancon, H. R. Barros, A. M. Balu, C. Vargas and R. Luque, *Green Chem.*,  
 2664 2011, **13**, 3162–3167.

2665 343 A. Sandouqa, Z. Al-Hamamre and J. Asfar, *Renew. Energy*, 2019, **132**, 667–682.

2666 344 K. Malins, J. Brinks, V. Kampars and I. Malina, *Appl. Catal. A Gen.*, 2016, **519**, 99–  
2667 106.

2668 345 M. Kacem, G. Plantard, N. Wery and V. Goetz, *Cuihua Xuebao/Chinese J. Catal.*,  
2669 2014, **35**, 1571–1577.

2670 346 Q. Shu, J. Gao, Z. Nawaz, Y. Liao, D. Wang and J. Wang, *Appl. Energy*, 2010, **87**,  
2671 2589–2596.

2672 347 M. Goncialves, V. C. Souza, T. S. Galhardo, M. Mantovani, F. C. A. Figueiredo, D.  
2673 Mandelli and W. A. Carvalho, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2013, **52**, 2832–2839.

2674 348 Y. Zhong, Q. Deng, P. Zhang, J. Wang, R. Wang, Z. Zeng and S. Deng, *Fuel*, 2019,  
2675 **240**, 270–277.

2676 349 V. Trombettoni, D. Lanari, P. Prinsen, R. Luque, A. Marrocchi and L. Vaccaro, *Prog.*  
2677 *Energy Combust. Sci.*, 2018, **65**, 136–162.

2678 350 M. Otadi, A. Shahraki, M. Goharrokhi and F. Bandarchian, *Procedia Eng.*, 2011, **18**,  
2679 168–174.

2680 351 K. Rajkumari, I. B. Laskar, A. Kumari, B. Kalita and L. Rokhum, *React. Funct.*  
2681 *Polym.*, 2020, **149**, 104519.

2682 352 P. P. Upare, J. M. Lee, D. W. Hwang, S. B. Halligudi, Y. K. Hwang and J. S. Chang, *J.*  
2683 *Ind. Eng. Chem.*, 2011, **17**, 287–292.

2684 353 K. Fukuhara, K. Nakajima, M. Kitano, S. Hayashic and M. Hara, *Phys. Chem. Chem.*  
2685 *Phys.*, 2013, **15**, 9343.

2686 354 T. S. Galhardo, N. Simone, M. Gonçalves, F. C. A. Figueiredo, D. Mandelli and W. A.  
2687 Carvalho, *ACS Sustain. Chem. Eng.*, 2013, **1**, 1381–1389.

2688 355 P. D. Rocha, L. S. Oliveira and A. S. Franca, *Renew. Energy*, 2019, **143**, 1710–1716.

2689 356 M. Hara, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2010, **3**, 601–607.

2690 357 L. J. Konwar, P. Mäki-Arvela and J. P. Mikkola, *Chem. Rev.*, 2019, **119**, 11576–  
2691 11630.

2692 358 I. B. Laskar, K. Rajkumari, R. Gupta and L. Rokhum, *Energy and Fuels*, 2018, **32**,  
2693 12567–12576.

2694 359 K. Rajkumari, I. B. Laskar, A. Kumari, B. Kalita and L. Rokhum, *React. Funct.*  
2695 *Polym.*, 2020, **149**, 104519.

2696 360 M. M. Alam, M. A. Hossain, M. D. Hossain, M. A. H. Johir, J. Hossen, M. S. Rahman,  
2697 J. L. Zhou, A. T. M. K. Hasan, A. K. Karmakar and M. B. Ahmed, *Processes*, 2020, **8**,  
2698 203.

2699 361 X. J. Zhang, Y. Y. Wang, Z. C. Jiang, P. T. Wu, Y. M. Jin and Y. Q. Hu, *Xinxing Tan*



2700 *Cailiao/New Carbon Mater.*, 2013, **28**, 484–488.

2701 362 Q. Zhang, Y. Zhang, T. Deng, F. Wei, J. Jin and P. Ma, *Sustainable production of*  
2702 *biodiesel over heterogeneous acid catalysts*, Elsevier B.V., 2020, 407–432.

2703 363 I. K. Mbaraka, D. R. Radu, V. S. Y. Lin and B. H. Shanks, *J. Catal.*, 2003, **219**, 329–  
2704 336.

2705 364 M. Toda, A. Takagaki, M. Okamura, J. N. Kondo, S. Hayashi, K. Domen and M. Hara,  
2706 *Nature*, 2005, **438**, 178.

2707 365 K. Nakajima, M. Hara, B. Hu, Q. Lu, Y. ting Wu, Z. xi Zhang, M. shu Cui, D. jia Liu,  
2708 C. qing Dong, Y. ping Yang, V. Aniya, A. Kumari, D. De, D. Vidya, V. Swapna, P. K.  
2709 Thella, B. Satyavathi, H. Zhang, X. Meng, C. Liu, Y. Wang and R. Xiao, *J. Anal.*  
2710 *Appl. Pyrolysis*, 2018, **2**, 1296–1304.

2711 366 K. Malins, V. Kampars, J. Brinks, I. Neibolte and R. Murnieks, *Applied Catalysis B:*  
2712 *Environmental*, 2015, **176**, 553–558.

2713 367 S. Pandian, A. Sakthi Saravanan, P. Sivanandi, M. Santra and V. K. Booramurthy,  
2714 *Refining Biomass Residues for Sustainable Energy and Bioproducts*. Academic Press,  
2715 2020. 87–109.

2716 368 M. Kitano, D. Yamaguchi, S. Suganuma, K. Nakajima, H. Kato, S. Hayashi and M.  
2717 Hara, *Langmuir*, 2009, **25**, 5068–5075.

2718 369 H. Yuan, B. L. Yang and G. L. Zhu, *Energy and Fuels*, 2009, **23**, 548–552.

2719 370 J. A. Melero, L. F. Bautista, G. Morales, J. Iglesias and D. Briones, *Energy and Fuels*,  
2720 2009, **23**, 539–547.

2721 371 D. Zuo, J. Lane, D. Culy, M. Schultz, A. Pullar and M. Waxman, *Appl. Catal. B*  
2722 *Environ.*, 2013, **129**, 342–350.

2723 372 K. A. Shah, J. K. Parikh and K. C. Maheria, *Res. Chem. Intermed.*, 2015, **41**, 1035–  
2724 1051.

2725 373 A. Varyambath, M. R. Kim and I. Kim, *New J. Chem.*, 2018, **42**, 12745–12753.

2726 374 Shagufta, I. Ahmad and R. Dhar, *Catal. Surv. from Asia*, 2017, **21**, 53–69.

2727 375 H. Yu, S. Niu, C. Lu, J. Li and Y. Yang, *Fuel*, 2017, **208**, 101–110.

2728 376 X. Tang and S. Niu, *J. Ind. Eng. Chem.*, 2019, **69**, 187–195.

2729 377 S. Niu, Y. Ning, C. Lu, K. Han, H. Yu and Y. Zhou, *Energy Convers. Manag.*, 2018,  
2730 **163**, 59–65.

2731 378 I. F. Nata, M. D. Putra, C. Irawan and C. K. Lee, *J. Env. Chem. Eng*, 2017, **5**, 2171–  
2732 2175.

2733 379 Q. Guan, Y. Li, Y. Chen, Y. Shi, J. Gu, B. Li and R. Miao, *RSC Adv.*, 2017, **7**, 7250–

2734 7258.

2735 380 I. M. Lokman, *Arab. J. Chem.*, 2016, **9**, 179-189.

2736 381 I. Thushari and S. Babel, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2018, **248**, 199–203.

2737 382 Y. Wang, D. Wang, M. Tan, B. Jiang, J. Zheng, N. Tsubaki and M. Wu, *ACS Appl.*  
2738 *Mater. Interfaces*, 2015, **7**, 26767–26775.

2739 383 R. Liu, X. Wang, X. Zhao and P. Feng, *Carbon N. Y.*, 2008, **46**, 1664 – 1669.

2740 384 S. Dechakhumwat, P. Hongmanorom, C. Thunyaratchatanon, S. M. Smith, S.  
2741 Boonyuen and A. Luengnaruemitchai, *Renew. Energy*, 2020, **148**, 897–906.

2742 385 M. Mahdavi, *Iranian Journal of Catalysis*, 2019, **9**, 27-35.

2743 386 M. Hara, *Top. Catal.*, 2010, **53**, 805–810.

2744 387 T. T. V. Tran, S. Kaiprommarat, S. Kongparakul, P. Reubroycharoen, G. Guan, M. H.  
2745 Nguyen and C. Samart, *Waste Manag.*, 2016, **52**, 367–374.

2746 388 S. Hosseini, J. Janaun and T. S. Y. Choong, *Process Saf. Environ. Prot.*, 2015, **98**,  
2747 285–295.

2748 389 L. J. Konwar, J. Wärnå, P. Mäki-Arvela, N. Kumar and J. P. Mikkola, *Fuel*, 2016, **166**,  
2749 1–11.

2750 390 A. Endut, S. Hanis, Y. Sayid, N. Hanis, M. Hanapi, S. Hajar, A. Hamid, F. Lananan,  
2751 M. Khairul, A. Kamarudin, R. Umar and H. Khatoon, *International Biodeterioration &*  
2752 *Biodegradation*, 2017, **124**, 250-257.

2753 391 F. Ezebor, M. Khairuddean, A. Z. Abdullah and P. L. Boey, *Energy Convers. Manag.*,  
2754 2014, **88**, 1143–1150.

2755 392 T. Liu, Z. Li, W. Li, C. Shi and Y. Wang, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2013, **133**, 618–621.

2756 393 Y. Zhou, S. Niu and J. Li, *Energy Convers. Manag.*, 2016, **114**, 188–196.

2757 394 H. H. Mardhiah, H. C. Ong, H. H. Masjuki, S. Lim and Y. L. Pang, *Energy Convers.*  
2758 *Manag.*, 2017, **144**, 10–17.

2759 395 B. L. A. Prabhavathi Devi, T. Vijai Kumar Reddy, K. Vijaya Lakshmi and R. B. N.  
2760 Prasad, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2014, **153**, 370–373.

2761 396 B. L. A. P. Devi, K. N. Gangadhar, P. S. S. Prasad, B. Jagannadh and R. B. N. Prasad,  
2762 *ChemSusChem*, 2009, **2**, 617–620.

2763 397 X. Fu, D. Li, J. Chen, Y. Zhang, W. Huang, Y. Zhu, J. Yang and C. Zhang, *Bioresour.*  
2764 *Technol.*, 2013, **146**, 767–770.

2765 398 L. J. Konwar, R. Das, A. J. Thakur, E. Salminen, P. Mäki-Arvela, N. Kumar, J. P.  
2766 Mikkola and D. Deka, *J. Mol. Catal. A Chem.*, 2014, **388–389**, 167–176.

2767 399 E. M. Santos, A. P. D. C. Teixeira, F. G. Da Silva, T. E. Cibaka, M. H. Araújo, W. X.

- 2768 C. Oliveira, F. Medeiros, A. N. Brasil, L. S. De Oliveira and R. M. Lago, *Fuel*, 2015,  
2769 **150**, 408–414.
- 2770 400 L. J. Konwar, P. Mäki-Arvela, E. Salminen, N. Kumar, A. J. Thakur, J. P. Mikkola and  
2771 D. Deka, *Appl. Catal. B Environ.*, 2015, **176–177**, 20–35.
- 2772 401 B. V. S. K. Rao, K. Chandra Mouli, N. Rambabu, A. K. Dalai and R. B. N. Prasad,  
2773 *Catal. Commun.*, 2011, **14**, 20–26.
- 2774 402 J. R. Kastner, J. Miller, D. P. Geller, J. Locklin, L. H. Keith and T. Johnson, *Catal.*  
2775 *Today*, 2012, **190**, 122–132.
- 2776 403 A. M. Dehkhoda, A. H. West and N. Ellis, *Appl. Catal. A Gen.*, 2010, **382**, 197–204.
- 2777 404 A. M. Dehkhoda and N. Ellis, *Catal. Today*, 2013, **207**, 86–92.
- 2778 405 L. Fjerbaek, K. V. Christensen and B. Norddahl, *Biotechnol. Bioeng.*, 2009, **102**,  
2779 1298–1315.
- 2780 406 F. Moazeni, Y. C. Chen and G. Zhang, *J. Clean. Prod.*, 2019, **216**, 117–128.
- 2781 407 D. Kumar, T. Das, B. S. Giri, E. R. Rene and B. Verma, *Fuel*, 2019, **255**, 115801.
- 2782 408 D. Kumar, T. Das, B. S. Giri and B. Verma, *New J. Chem.*, 2018, **42**, 15593–15602.
- 2783 409 K. C. Badgujar, K. P. Dhake and B. M. Bhanage, *Process Biochem.*, 2013, **48**, 1335–  
2784 1347.
- 2785 410 N. R. Mohamad, N. H. C. Marzuki, N. A. Buang, F. Huyop and R. A. Wahab,  
2786 *Biotechnol. Biotechnol. Equip.*, 2015, **29**, 205–220..
- 2787 411 Z. Amini, Z. Ilham, H. C. Ong, H. Mazaheri and W. H. Chen, *Energy Convers.*  
2788 *Manag.*, 2017, 141, 339–353.
- 2789 412 R. W. M. Mounquengui, C. Brunschwig, B. Baréa, P. Villeneuve and J. Blin, *Prog.*  
2790 *Energy Combust. Sci.*, 2013, **39**, 441–456.
- 2791 413 S. V. Ranganathan, S. L. Narasimhan and K. Muthukumar, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2008,  
2792 **99**, 3975–3981.
- 2793 414 A. Gusniah, H. Veny and F. Hamzah, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2019, **58**, 581–589.
- 2794 415 K. H. Kim, O. K. Lee and E. Y. Lee, *Catalysts*, 2018, **8**, 68.
- 2795 416 J. Sebastian, C. Muraleedharan and A. Santhiagu, *Int. J. Green Energy*, 2017, **14**, 687–  
2796 693.
- 2797 417 J. H. C. Wancura, D. V. Rosset, M. V. Tres, J. V. Oliveira, M. A. Mazutti and S. L.  
2798 Jahn, *Can. J. Chem. Eng.*, 2018, **96**, 2361–2368.
- 2799 418 A. Arumugam and V. Ponnusami, *Heliyon*, 2017, **3**, 486.
- 2800 419 R. Jambulingam, M. Shalma and V. Shankar, *J. Clean. Prod.*, 2019, **215**, 245–258.
- 2801 420 S. Rafiei, S. Tangestaninejad, P. Horcajada, M. Moghadam, V. Mirkhani, I.

2802 Mohammadpoor-Baltork, R. Kardanpour and F. Zadehahmadi, *Efficient biodiesel*  
 2803 *production using a lipase@ZIF-67 nanobioreactor*, 2018, vol. 334.  
 2804 421 H. Taher, E. Nashef, N. Anvar and S. Al-Zuhair, *Biofuels*, 2019, **10**, 463–472.  
 2805 422 R. S. Malani, S. B. Umriwad, K. Kumar, A. Goyal and V. S. Moholkar, *Energy*  
 2806 *Convers. Manag.*, 2019, **188**, 142–150.  
 2807 423 J. Jayaraman, K. Alagu, P. Appavu, N. Joy, P. Jayaram and A. Mariadoss, *Renew.*  
 2808 *Energy*, 2020, **145**, 399–407.  
 2809 424 M. Marín-Suárez, D. Méndez-Mateos, A. Guadix and E. M. Guadix, *Renew. Energy*,  
 2810 2019, **140**, 1-8.  
 2811 425 H. C. Nguyen, S. H. Liang, S. S. Chen, C. H. Su, J. H. Lin and C. C. Chien, *Energy*  
 2812 *Convers. Manag.*, 2018, **158**, 168-175.  
 2813 426 C. G. Lopresto, S. Naccarato, L. Albo, M. G. De Paola, S. Chakraborty, S. Curcio and  
 2814 V. Calabrò, *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf.*, 2015, **121**, 229-235.  
 2815 427 N. A. Kabbashi, N. I. Mohammed, M. Z. Alam and M. E. S. Mirghani, *J. Mol. Catal. B*  
 2816 *Enzym.*, 2015, **116**, 95-100.  
 2817 428 N. Choi, Y. Kim, J. S. Lee, J. Kwak, J. Lee and I. H. Kim, *J. Am. Oil Chem. Soc.*,  
 2818 2016, **93**, 311-318.  
 2819 429 P. Muanrukxa and P. Kaewkannetra, *Renew. Energy*, 2020, **146**, 901-906.  
 2820 430 N. Choi, D. S. No, H. Kim, B. H. Kim, J. Kwak, J. S. Lee and I. H. Kim, *Ind. Crops*  
 2821 *Prod.*, 2018, **120**, 140-146.  
 2822 431 N. F. Sulaiman, W. Azelee, W. Abu, S. Toemen, N. M. Kamal and R. Nadarajan,  
 2823 *Renew. Energy*, 2019, **135**, 408-416.  
 2824 432 M. Pirouzman, M. Mahdavi and Z. Ghasemi, *Fuel*, 2018, **216**, 296–300.  
 2825 433 A. Ramli and M. Farooq, *Malaysian Journal of Analytical Sciences*, 2015, **19**, 8-19.  
 2826 434 M. E. Borges and A. Brito, *International Journal of Chemical Reactor Engineering*,  
 2827 2011, **9**, 1-20.  
 2828 435 W. Nor, N. Wan, N. Aishah and S. Amin, *Fuel Process. Technol.*, 2011, **92**, 2397–  
 2829 2405.  
 2830 436 M. F. R. Nizah, Y. H. Taufiq-yap, U. Rashid, S. Hwa and Z. A. S. Nur, *Energy*  
 2831 *Convers. Manag.*, 2014, **88**, 3–8.  
 2832 437 H. V Lee, J. C. Juan and Y. H. Tau, 2015, **74**, 124–132.  
 2833 438 F. Jamil, A. H. Al-muhatseb, M. Tay, Z. Myint, M. Al-hinai, L. Al-haj, M. Baawain,  
 2834 M. Al-abri, G. Kumar and A. E. Atabani, *Energy Convers. Manag.*, 2018, **155**, 128–  
 2835 137.

2836 439 Y. Jeon, W. S. Chi, J. Hwang, D. H. Kim, J. H. Kim and Y. Shul, *"Applied Catal. B,*  
2837 *Environ.*, 2019, **242**, 51-59.

2838 440 W. Liu, P. Yin, X. Liu and R. Qu, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2014, **173**, 266–271.

2839 441 O. Nur, U. Rashid and M. Sufri, *Renew. Energ.*, 2019, **131**, 187-196.

2840 442 F. Farzaneh and F. Moghzi, *React. Kinet. Mech. Catal.*, 2016, **118**, 509–521.

2841 443 D. Salinas, S. Guerrero and P. Araya, *Catal. Commun.*, 2010, **11**, 773–777.

2842 444 K. Srilatha, N. Lingaiah, B. L. A. P. Devi, R. B. N. Prasad, S. Venkateswar and P. S.  
2843 S. Prasad, *Appl. Catal. A Gen.*, 2009, **365**, 28–33.

2844 445 C. M. R. Prado and N. R. Antoniosi Filho, *J. Anal. Appl. Pyrolysis*, 2009, **86**, 338–347.

2845 446 A. Wisniewski, V. R. Wiggers, E. L. Simionatto, H. F. Meier, A. A. C. Barros and L.  
2846 A. S. Madureira, *Fuel*, 2010, **89**, 563–568.

2847 447 J. Van Gerpen, *Fuel Process. Technol.*, 2005, **86**, 1097–1107.

2848 448 S. H. Y. S. Abdullah, N. H. M. Hanapi, A. Azid, R. Umar, H. Juahir, H. Khatoon and  
2849 A. Endut, *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, 2017, **70**, 1040–1051.

2850 449 S. Hanis, Y. Sayid, N. Hanis, M. Hanapi and A. Azid, 2017, **70**, 1040–1051.

2851