1	Sustainable biorefinery development for valorizing all wastes from date palm
2	agroindustry
3	
4	Simin Shokrollahi ¹ , Amin Shavandi ² , Oseweuba Valentine Okoro ² , Joeri F.M. Denayer ³ ,
5	Keikhosro Karimi ^{3*}
6	
7	¹ Department of Chemical Engineering, Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan 84156-83111,
8	Iran
9	² Université libre de Bruxelles (ULB), École polytechnique de Bruxelles, 3BIO-BioMatter,
10	Avenue F.D. Roosevelt, 50-CP 165/61, 1050 Brussels, Belgium
11	³ Department of Chemical Engineering, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, 1050 Brussels, Belgium
12	*Corresponding author:
13	Tel: +983133915623
14	Fax: +98-3133912677
15	E-mail address: keikhosro.karimi@vub.be
16	

17 Abstract

This study examined how various residues from date palm agroindustrial can be utilized in a 18 19 biorefinery platform to produce ethanol, methane, and lignin. Liquid hot water, ethanol 20 organosolv, and catalyzed ethanol organosolv (CEO) pretreatments were applied to trunk, leaves, 21 leaf sheath, pedicels, date cake, and seeds. The process included extracting lignin from the liquid 22 fraction, followed by converting the pretreated solid material into ethanol. The fermentation residues were also utilized to produce biomethane through anaerobic digestion. Two different 23 scenarios were employed for the biorefining, i.e., (I) maximum lignin production and (II) 24 25 maximum biofuel production. The best results for the first scenario were obtained when CEO 26 was employed in the pretreatment of date palm wastes, where 806.9 mL ethanol, 902.8 L 27 methane, and 528.0 g lignin were produced from each kg of each residue. In energetic terms, the biofuel products (i.e., ethanol and methane) were determined to have a combined energy content 28 29 equivalent to 1553.1 mL of gasoline. Likewise, the most favorable outcomes of the second 30 scenario were obtained by incorporating CEO pretreatment of trunk, leaf sheath, leaves, and pedicels in the valorization of untreated date cake and seeds. Furthermore, for the second 31 scenario, the resulting products were 967.5 mL ethanol, 1605.3 L methane, and 341.0 g lignin, 32 33 with the biofuel products having a combined energetic content equivalent to 2452.0 mL of gasoline. These findings indicate that the biorefining of date palm agroindustrial wastes has 34 significant potential for bioenergy production. 35

Keywords: Date palm residues, biofuel, lignin, catalyzed ethanol organosolv, biorefining,
sustainable valorization

38 1. Introduction

Phoenix dactylifera L., known as date palm, is one of the most abundant agricultural crops in 39 40 tropical and subtropical regions worldwide. Date palm holds significant socioeconomic importance, especially in the Middle East and North Africa [1]. With an annual production of 41 one million tons of dates, Iran ranks among the top three date-producing countries globally [2]. 42 43 According to the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) data from 2019, a total of over 9 million tons of dates were harvested worldwide from a land area of approximately 1.3 million 44 hectares [2]. Date palm trees are propagated via methods like offshoots, chance seedlings, or 45 tissue culture. Upon reaching maturity, the fruits undergo harvesting, which can be manual or 46 47 assisted by mechanical lifts to access the fruit-bearing crown. Besides harvesting, pruning is vital in date farming, removing aged and unhealthy leaves, as well as trimming spines and undesired 48 inflorescences. These practices maintain farm health and appearance, and optimize fruit 49 50 production [3]. During annual pruning and fruit harvesting, more than 3 million tons of 51 secondary biomass such as leaves, fronds, and stems are generated [4]. Furthermore, in the date processing industry, which encompasses the production of date syrup and date confectionery, the 52 53 extraction of date honey or syrup from the fruits is carried out using hot water. This extraction 54 process leads to the formation of two types of industrial waste, namely the seeds and the fibrous material of the fruit pulp, known as date fruit pomace or date cake [5]. Despite their abundance 55 and potential for bioenergy production [6], these lignocellulosic materials are commonly burnt in 56 57 fields or disposed of in landfills, leading to unfavorable environmental outcomes [7]. With the 58 ability to produce significant amounts of waste biomass, date palm trees offer a highly potential 59 and cost-effective resource that can be efficiently utilized through biorefinery processes.

The biorefinery concept is a promising alternative to conventional industrial processes, as it 60 enables the conversion of biomass feedstock into a range of renewable bioproducts and 61 62 bioenergy with minimal waste generation and chemical consumption. The implementation of multi-product biorefineries further increases the sustainability of the bioconversion process, as it 63 allows for the production of multiple value-added products from a single feedstock [8,9]. The 64 65 utilization of date palm wastes for biorefinery purposes not only provides a sustainable and ecofriendly alternative to traditional fossil fuels and petrochemicals but also supports the 66 67 development of a circular economy by promoting the use of renewable resources.

To efficiently valorize date palm wastes, like other lignocelluloses, an appropriate pretreatment strategy is needed to overcome the recalcitrant structure of cellulose, hemicellulose, and lignin composite [10,11]. Various pretreatment methods have been suggested to improve biorefinery efficiency, with organosolv and liquid hot water pretreatments being among the most effective [12,13].

Organosolv pretreatment is one of the most feasible approaches for fractionating recalcitrant lignocelluloses and facilitating their conversion since it enables the comprehensive utilization of all biomass components, particularly lignin [14,15]. Organosolv pretreatment has the capability to generate sulfur-free, highly pure, and low molecular weight lignin. High-grade lignin can be employed in the manufacturing of diverse polymeric materials, including phenolic powder resins, polyurethane and polyisocyanurate foams, and epoxy resins [16,17].

Organosolv pretreatment dissolves lignin in an organic solvent and hemicelluloses in the aqueous
phase, leaving behind a residue rich in cellulose that is available for enzymatic saccharification
[14,15]. In comparison to other pretreatments, organosolv offers different benefits such as
chemical reusability, multi-product synthesis, lower enzyme requirements, and less sugar

degradation [16,18,19]. Additionally, the organic solvent used can be easily recovered, and
various solvents like alcohols, ketones, phenols, and ethers can be used with or without catalysts
[19]. Ethanol is a commonly used solvent for organosolv pretreatment due to its affordability,
water-miscibility, and low toxicity [20].

Liquid hot water pretreatment is a cost-effective and eco-friendly hydrothermal method that
improves enzymatic hydrolysis by solubilizing hemicellulose and modifying biomass structure
[12]. It produces minimal inhibiting or corrosive byproducts and requires less capital investment
than other chemical pretreatments [10,21].

91 Previous studies have revealed valuable insights into the potential of date palm waste 92 valorization. However, their focus has been mostly on characterizing date palm fibers [22–24] 93 and utilizing them in single product processes such as lignin [14], bioethanol [25,26], and biogas production from date fruit [27]. Additionally, some of these studies lacked an appropriate 94 pretreatment strategy to effectively utilize the recalcitrant biomass [7,28]. Table S1 in the 95 supplementary material summarizes a number of most relevant works on date palm waste 96 valorization. Further research is needed to explore the full potential of this abundant biomass 97 98 resource.

In our previous work [29], the use of phosphoric acid pretreatment for date palm waste was explored. However, some limitations to this approach were identified, including the high cost of phosphoric acid and its high acid concentration, which may limit its practicality as a pretreatment method. Furthermore, lignin was not extracted, and the energy production was lower than expected. This highlights the necessity for alternative pretreatment methods that can more efficiently and cost-effectively convert date palm waste into energy, while also allowing for the recovery of valuable components such as lignin.

To address these limitations, a new study was conducted to investigate the potential of date palm
residues for a biorefinery development using ethanol organosolv and liquid hot water
pretreatments. To the best of our knowledge, the potential of date palm residues for a multiproduct biorefinery using ethanol organosolv pretreatment has not been investigated. Catalyst
addition to the organosolv pretreatment of different types of date palm waste has not been
evaluated in comparison to liquid hot water pretreatment. Additionally, secondary uses of date
cake after juice extraction is yet to be explored.

This study explored the potential of date palm waste for a multi-product biorefinery using 113 ethanol organosolv (EO), catalyzed ethanol organosolv (CEO), and liquid hot water (LHW) 114 115 pretreatments. Date palm biomasses, including trunk, leaf sheath, leaves, and pedicels, as well as date cake and date seeds, were evaluated for biofuel production, with lignin extraction and 116 biomethane production from fermentation residue. Two scenarios were compared to determine 117 118 the most favorable pretreatment conditions. The assessment relied on the overall energy 119 produced from ethanol and methane, measured in gasoline equivalents. Additionally, the study did not consider the potential of lignin as a fuel source; rather, the emphasis was on assessing its 120 121 monetary value.

122 **2.** Materials and Method

123 **2.1. Materials**

Date palm fruits and lignocellulosic residues (Mazafati cultivar) were gathered from a palm
plantation located in Kerman, Iran, at coordinates 29°06′22″N and 58°21′25″E. Each type of
waste was treated separately instead of in combination based on two reasons. Firstly, the various
date palm wastes are not produced simultaneously on an annual basis. For instance, leaf and

pedicel wastes occur periodically, while trunks endure for longer periods. Secondly, there is a 128 significant difference in the proportion of each waste type within the total amount. For example, 129 130 tree trunks weigh several orders of magnitude more compared to the seeds. The materials were washed with water to eliminate dust. The date seeds were manually removed and the fleshy part 131 of palm dates (200 g) was mixed with 1000 mL water and heated at 100 °C for 60 min to extract 132 133 sugars. The suspension was then filtered and date cakes were collected and dried at room temperature. Each feedstock, including date cake, seeds, tree trunk, leaves, leaf sheath, and 134 pedicels, was individually ground using a mill (VI-3307, Vidas, Tehran, Iran), sieved to obtain 135 particle sizes between 177 and 841 μ m (20-80 mesh), and stored at room temperature until 136 needed. 137

Cellic® CTec2 cellulase, provided by Novozymes in Denmark, with an activity level of 125
FPU/mL, was utilized for enzymatic hydrolysis. The enzyme activity was assessed using the
method outlined by Adney and Baker [30]. *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (CCUG53310) from the
Culture Collection University of Gothenburg in Sweden was employed for sugar fermentation to
produce ethanol.

143 **2.2. Pretreatments**

A high-pressure stainless steel batch reactor with a working volume of 500 mL was used to pretreat 50 g of feedstock with a 75% (V/V) aqueous ethanol solution in a solid-to-liquid ratio of 1:8 at 180 °C for 60 min [31]. In some runs, 1% (W/W) sulfuric acid was added as a catalyst. After cooling, the materials were filtered (Whatman No.1) and washed with 100 mL of ethanol (75%, V/V) and water (distilled water). The solid residue was air-dried at 25 °C for 24 h, while the liquor part was diluted with three volumes of water to promote the precipitation of dissolved lignin. The precipitated lignin was then recovered using a filterpaper (Whatman No.1) and air-

dried at about 25 °C for 24 h. Both the dried pretreated materials and the precipitated lignin were
kept in resealable bags at room temperature until use.

153 Liquid hot water pretreatment was conducted at similar conditions to ethanol organosolv

154 pretreatment, with the only difference being the replacement of the aqueous ethanol as a solvent

155 with distilled water in the reactor.

156 **2.3. Enzymatic hydrolysis**

157 Enzymatic hydrolysis of untreated and pretreated substrates was conducted using cellulase at a

158 concentration of 15 FPU/g dry matter. The experiment involved a solid loading of 5% (W/V), 50

mM sodium citrate buffer, and a temperature of 45 $^{\circ}$ C with stirring at 120 rpm for a duration of

160 72 hours. To prevent microbial growth, 0.5 g/L of sodium azide was added. Glucose

161 concentrations in liquid samples were measured and yields were calculated using Equation (1):

162 Glucose yield (%) =
$$\frac{Produced glucose concentration \left(\frac{g}{L}\right)}{Substrate concentration \left(\frac{g}{L}\right) \times Glucan percentage \times GDF} \times 100$$
Eq. (1)

where GDF is the dehydration factor of glucan, i.e., 1.111 [32].

164 **2.4. Ethanolic fermentation**

165 Ethanol was produced using the non-isothermal hydrolysis followed by simultaneous

saccharification and fermentation (NSSF) method, which involved 24 hours of hydrolysis in a 50

- mM sodium citrate buffer at a solid loading of 5% (W/V) and a temperature of 45 $^{\circ}$ C with 15
- 168 FPU/g. Next, the necessary nutrients were supplemented and fermented by the addition of 10 g/L
- 169 S. cerevisiae [33]. The medium was then incubated under anaerobic conditions at 32 °C and 120
- 170 rpm for 72 h. Yields of ethanol were calculated using Eq. (2):

171
$$E than ol yield (\%) = \frac{Produced ethanol concentration (\frac{g}{L})}{Substrate concentration (\frac{g}{L}) \times Glucan percentage \times GDF \times Y} \times 100 \qquad Eq. (2)$$

where GDF is the dehydration factor of glucan (1.111) and Y is the maximum yield of ethanolproduction from glucose (0.51) [32].

After the completion of the experiment, ethanol was evaporated and the fermentation residues
retained in the bottles were collected and freeze dried (Christ freeze dryer, Alpha 1-2 LDplus
Model, Germany) as the substrate for biomethane production.

177 **2.5. Anaerobic digestion**

178 Biomethane production was carried out under mesophilic conditions in 118 mL dark glass

bottles, which were tightly sealed with butyl rubbers and aluminum caps [34]. Each bottle

180 contained substrate (0.25 g), inoculum (20 mL), and distilled water (5 mL). The outflow of a

181 continuous anaerobic digester with a capacity of 7000 m³ operating at 37°C (Isfahan Municipal

182 Wastewater Treatment Plant, Isfahan, Iran) was used as an inoculum. The inoculum had a total

solids (TS) content of 4.8% and a volatile solids (VS) content of 2.2%. To measure the

184 biomethane production from the inoculum, a blank sample was prepared using the same amount

185 of inoculum and deionized water. Prior to incubation for 40 days, the samples were

186 deoxygenated by purging with pure nitrogen gas for approximately 2 minutes. Gas samples were

187 extracted from the bottles for subsequent analysis using gas chromatography (GC).

188 **2.6.** Analytical methods

189 The standard methods provided by Sluiter et al. [35] were followed for measuring the total solids 190 (TS) and volatile solids (VS) of the date palm wastes. The structural carbohydrates and lignin of 191 the date palm wastes were determined following the National Renewable Energy Laboratory

method [36]. The calculation of xylan and lignin removal was performed using the formulasprovided by Hashemi *et al.* [33].

194 To monitor the chemical structure of substrates before and after the pretreatments, Fourier

transform infrared (FTIR) spectrometry was conducted using the WQF-510A FTIR instrument

196 (BRAIC, China), employing the KBr pellet technique [37]. Analysis was done on the infrared

transmittance adsorption data from 4000 to 500 cm^{-1} wavenumbers.

198 The morphological alterations in the lignocelluloses structures were followed using scanning

electron microscopy (SEM) (EVO® LS, Zeiss, Germany). The substrates were coated with gold
before being examined using SEM at 15 kV.

201 The quantification of sugars and ethanol was carried out using HPLC equipped with UV/Vis and

202 RI detectors (Jasco International Co., Tokyo, Japan). For ethanol analysis, a Bio-Rad Aminex

203 HPX-87H column (Hercules, USA) was employed at a temperature of 60 °C with a mobile phase

consisting of 5 mM sulfuric acid flowing at a rate of 0.6 mL/min. The analysis of sugars was

205 performed using a Bio-Rad Aminex HPX-87P column (Hercules, USA) eluted with 0.6 mL/min

206 demineralized water at a temperature of 85 °C.

207 The composition of methane and carbon dioxide in biogas was determined using a gas

chromatograph (2550TG, Teif Gostar, Iran). The analysis was conducted using a Porapak Q GC

column (3 m long, 3 mm initial diameter, Taufkirchen, Germany). Analytical grade nitrogen gas

at a flow rate of 45 mL/min was used as a carrier gas. The column was maintained at a

temperature of 40 °C, while the detector and injector were both set to a temperature of 100 °C.

212 2.7. Gasoline equivalent

To compare the various pretreatment methods, the energy value of the products was determined by calculating the gasoline equivalent. This was done by considering the heating values of fuels, as well as the total solids (TS), volatile solids (VS), and solid recoveries of the substrates following the pretreatment process. The lower heating values of 32.0 MJ/L, 21.2 MJ/L, and 36.1 MJ/Nm³ were considered for gasoline, ethanol, and methane, respectively [33]. The gasoline

equivalents of ethanol and methane were calculated using Equations 3 and 4, respectively.

219 Gasoline equivalent of ethanol (L/g)
220
$$= \frac{Produced \ ethanol\left(\frac{g}{L}\right) \times Solid \ recovery\left(\%\right)}{Substrate \ concentration\left(\frac{g}{L}\right) \times \ Ethanol \ density\left(\frac{g}{L}\right)} \times \frac{21.2 \ MJ/L}{32 \ MJ/L}$$

Eq. (3)

Eq. (4)

221

222 Gasoline equivalent of methane
$$(L/g)$$

223 = Produced methane $\left(\frac{Nm^3}{g\,VS}\right) \times VS$ of substrate (g/g)
36.1 ML/Nm^3

224 × Solid recovery (%) ×
$$\frac{36.1 MJ/Nm^3}{32 MJ/L}$$

225

226 **2.8. Lignin value**

The value of the lignin generated from the biorefinery platform was evaluated using the Pound currency. The price range for lignin was found to be £158.21-£288.22, with an average price of £208.2 used in the calculations [38].

230 **2.9. Statistical analysis**

All experiments were duplicated, and the analysis of variance (ANOVA) was carried out using

- 232 SAS software (Version 9.4, NC, USA). The Tukey test was performed at 95% confidence level
- and means with identical letters were determined to not significantly differ from one another.
- 234 2.10. Scenarios of biorefinery development

Two scenarios for the biorefinery of date palm wastes were examined. The first scenario aimed to achieve maximum lignin and the second scenario sought to achieve maximum bioenergy production. To determine the superior pretreatment condition, the total gasoline equivalents for ethanol and methane, as well as the value of lignin, were calculated and compared for each scenario.

240 **3. Results and Discussion**

Ethanol organosolv, catalyzed ethanol organosolv, and liquid hot water pretreatments were performed on date palm wastes. The obtained liquor was utilized to precipitate lignin. The solids were analyzed through FTIR and SEM to evaluate the physicochemical effects of pretreatments before their use in ethanol production via the NSSF process. After which the NSSF residues were subjected to anaerobic digestion to produce biomethane. Then, the two biorefinery scenarios were analyzed and compared, considering the gasoline equivalents of ethanol and methane as well as the monetary value of lignin.

248 **3.1.** Compositional and structural modification by pretreatments

The chemical compositions of date palm wastes before and after the pretreatments are presented 249 250 in Table 1. The values of lignin, hemicellulose, and glucan for raw materials, were 12.3-36.1 wt.%, 21.4-78.4 wt.%, and 14.3-43.9 wt.%, respectively. The remaining components were 251 mainly ashes in the range of 1.2-15.0 wt.%. Date palm wastes have been found to contain more 252 ash than other types of biomass [22]. Table 1 shows that the seeds have high hemicellulose 253 content and low lignin and glucan contents compared to other samples. Likewise, lower contents 254 255 of glucan (20.63 wt.%) and lignin (5-10 wt.%) were reported for the date seeds relative to the glucan and lignin contents of other samples. However, the high hemicellulose content of date 256

seeds contradicts previous studies that reported lower percentages [39,40]. This may suggest thatthe seeds were not fully ripe, as arabinan and mannan amounts decrease as the fruit ripens [41].

259 Furthermore, differences in climate, soil, growth conditions, and age may affect lignocellulosic

260 composition [42,43]. However, comparable results were observed previously [44,45]. Due to the

high carbohydrate content and low lignin content, the date seeds could constitute a sufficient

feedstock for biofuel production. Similarly, the low carbohydrate content and high lignin contentof the date cake make it a suitable candidate as a feedstock for lignin production.

264 Table 1 also shows that pretreatments mostly affected the lignin and hemicellulose amount of the 265 date palm wastes. Considering the solid recoveries, CEO, EO, and LHW pretreatments facilitated 266 50-89 wt.%, 30-55 wt. %, and 7-35 wt. % lignin removal, respectively. The highest yield of 267 lignin release was attributed to CEO pretreatment of date cake, which facilitated the release of 21 g of lignin per 100 g of raw material into the liquor. This finding was similar to the result 268 obtained in a previous study [14] where 13% of lignin was removed from date palm fronds 269 270 through the organosolv pretreatment. Delignification of lignocelluloses occurs as a result of the 271 breaking of lignin-lignin and lignin-carbohydrate linkages as well as lignin solubilization in 272 organic solvents [42]. Various studies have confirmed that the presence of an acid catalyst can enhance delignification, as the catalyst speeds up bond breakdown [32,42,46]. For instance, CEO 273 achieved a 51% delignification rate for leaves, which was 1.7 and 7.4 fold higher than that of EO 274 275 and LHW pretreatments, respectively. Similarly, Amiri and Karimi [31] found that pretreating pine and elm with ethanol containing 1 % sulfuric acid resulted in a maximum delignification of 276 277 58% and 42%, respectively.

Table 1 also shows that the yields of the hemicellulosic sugars, i.e., xylan, mannan, arabinan, andgalactan, were dependent on the type of pretreatment strategy employed. LHW was the most

effective pretreatment for xylan removal, eliminating 55-88% of xylan from the trunk, leaf 280 sheath, leaves, and date cake. Whereas, in the case of date seeds, the highest hemicellulose 281 282 removal (39%) occurred through the EO pretreatment. Furthermore, the effectiveness of hemicellulose removal for pedicels, after CEO and LHW pretreatments, were comparable (77 283 and 78%). The high potential of hemicellulose removal in the LHW process has been attributed 284 285 to the hydronium ions created by high-temperature water and acetic acid produced by acetyl substituents of hemicelluloses which function as catalysts [10]. Previously, autohydrolysis of rice 286 287 straw, pinewood, and elmwood facilitated the removal of 53-61% of the hemicellulose, whereas organosolv pretreatment only removed ~23% [47]. 288

The solubilization of lignin and hemicellulose resulted in an elevation in the glucan content of the pretreated materials. After CEO, EO, and LHW pretreatments, solids with glucan content in the ranges of 16.3-64.6 wt.%, 15.1-56.5 wt.%, and 15.0-56.1 wt.%, remained. The highest glucan content of 64.6 wt.% was observed after CEO pretreatment of pedicels which was 1.5 fold higher than that of the raw substrate.

Solid recoveries of all pretreated samples are presented in Table 1. As expected recoveries had a
reverse relationship with the severity of the pretreatments [31] with averages of 68, 65, and 59%
solid recovery obtained from LHW, EO, and CEO, respectively. Furthermore, the introduction of
a catalyst was shown to lead to a reduction in the solid residue yield, primarily owing to xylan
and lignin solubilization [46].

Overall, chemical composition data showed that all pretreatments increased cellulose content in most of the substrates, with LHW removing more xylan and CEO removing more lignin. This matches findings for other biomasses [48].

	Substrate and pretreatment		Chem	ical composition (wt.%)		Solid recovery (wt.%)	Glucan recovery (wt.%)	Hemicellulose removal (wt.%)	Lignin removal (wt.%)
Track Track Untreated 43.92.0.8 18.72.1.3 4.22.0.4 22.12.0.1 9.32.0.7 -		Glucan	Xylan	Other carbohydrates ¹	Lignin	Ash		(,		(
Unreated 43.9+0.8 18.7±1.3 42:-0.4 22.1+0.1 9.3+0.7 .<	Trunk			-						
Ethanol organosolv 55.7±1.7 15.6±0.4 4.4±0. 20.8±1.4 6.0±0.1 70.0±0.3 88.9 26.2 28.2 Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 63.6±0.0 15.5±1.5 Not detected 16.5±2.5 67.00 67.2±1.5 97.3 22.1 24.5 Liquid hot water 53.4±0.5 11.7±0.0 Not detected 16.5±2.5 67.00 67.2±1.5 97.3 22.1 24.5 Liquid hot water 43.7±0.4 16.5±0.7 50.0±2 21.1±0.2 14.3±0.3 - <	Untreated	43.9±0.8	18.7±1.3	4.2±0.4	22.1±0.1	9.3±0.7	-	-	-	-
Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 63.6.00 15.5.1.5 Not detected 16.5.2.5 6.7.00 67.2.1.5 97.3 22.1 24.5.5 Liqui how water 55.4.0.5 11.7.00 Not detected 26.4.0.2 6.8.0.8 71.4.0.6 90.1 14.6 34.1 Lard sheath Untreated 43.7.2.0.4 16.5.0.7 50.0.0.2 21.1.1.0.2 14.3.2.0.3 -	Ethanol organosolv	55.7±1.7	15.6±0.4	4.4±1.0	20.8±1.4	6.0 ± 0.1	70.0±0.3	88.9	26.2	28.2
Liquid hot water 55.4+0.5 11.7=0.0 Not detected 26.4+0.2 6.8+0.8 71.4+0.6 90.1 14.6 34.1 Lead sheath Untreated 43.7+0.4 16.5=0.7 5.0+0.2 21.1+0.2 14.3=0.3 - - - . . Ethanol organosolv 53.9±2.6 13.8±0.1 Not detected 15.8±0.4 9.6±0.0 68.1±1.0 84.0 20.5 30.0 Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 61.8±0.4 10.2±0.8 Not detected 15.8±0.4 9.6±0.3 64.6±1.0 91.4 16.9 26.65 Liquid hot water 49.4±0.3 8.3±0.5 6.4±0.2 20.0±0.4 8.8±0.3 69.0±0.4 78.0 21.3 29.3 Leaves Untreated 35.3±0.6 19.8±0.2 3.7±0.2 24.6±0.6 15.0±1.1 - - . . . Untreated 35.3±0.6 19.8±0.2 3.7±0.2 26.6±0.2 16.7±0.1 16.2±0.3 72.0 18.2 38.8 Catalyzed ethanol organosolv	Catalyzed ethanol organosolv	63.6±0.0	15.5±1.5	Not detected	16.5±2.5	6.7±0.0	67.2±1.5	97.3	22.1	24.5
Ladisheath Lutreated 43.72.04 16.52.07 5.02.02 21.12.02 14.32.03 Ethanol organosolv 53.92.6 13.82.01 Not deccted 19.82.01 9.62.00 68.12.10 84.00 20.5 30.00 Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 61.82.06 10.2-0.8 Not deccted 15.82.04 9.62.03 64.61.0 91.4 16.9 26.60 Liqui hot water 49.42.03 8.30.5 6.42.02 20.02.04 8.82.03 69.02.0 7.00 18.2 3.83 Catoryzed ethanol organosolv 39.64.07 9.34.0.5 2.64.02 2.67.20.3 14.42.01 64.26.2 10.2 18.2 3.88 Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 50.30.0 11.71.10 Not deccted 17.92.1 60.80.6 86.6 19.6 31.8 Liqui hot water 37.02.2 47.90 7.12.01 1.62.00 5 10.2 56.6 Pathcols 1.172.10 23.92.03 7.82.03 7.71.10 1.62.00	Liquid hot water	55.4±0.5	11.7±0.0	Not detected	26.4±0.2	6.8±0.8	71.4±0.6	90.1	14.6	34.1
Unreated 43.7±0.4 16.5±0.7 5.0±0.2 21.1±0.2 14.3±0.3 -	Leaf sheath									
Ethanol organosolv 53.9±2.6 13.8±0.1 Not detected 19.8±0.1 9.6±0.0 68.1±1.0 84.0 20.5 30.0 Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 61.8±0.6 10.2±0.8 Not detected 15.8±0.4 9.6±0.3 64.6±1.0 91.4 16.9 26.6 Liquid hot water 49.4±0.3 8.3±0.5 6.4±0.2 20.0±0.4 8.8±0.3 69.0±0.4 78.0 21.3 29.3 Leaves Uthreated 55.3±0.6 19.8±0.2 3.7±0.2 24.6±0.6 15.0±1.1 - - . . Ethanol organosolv 50.3±0.0 11.7±1.6 Not detected 19.9±0.4 17.0±1.0 60.8±0.6 86.6 19.6 31.8 Liquid hot water 37.0±2.3 4.7±0.4 1.7±0.1 36.8±0.5 15.0±1.4 65.2±0.6 10.2 15.6±0 Pedicels Uthreated 41.7±1.0 2.9±0.5 Not detected 17.8±0.3 0.7±0.1 68.5±0.7 9.2 17.0 20.7 Catalyzed thanol organosolv 56.5±0.8 17.1±0	Untreated	43.7±0.4	16.5±0.7	5.0±0.2	21.1±0.2	14.3±0.3	-	-	-	-
Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 61.8±0.6 10.2±0.8 Not detected 15.8±0.4 9.6±0.3 64.6±1.0 91.4 16.9 26.6 Liquid hot water 49.4±0.3 8.3±0.5 6.4±0.2 20.0±0.4 8.8±0.3 69.0±0.4 78.0 21.3 29.3 Leaves Untreated 35.3±0.6 19.8±0.2 3.7±0.2 24.6±0.6 15.0±1.1 -	Ethanol organosolv	53.9±2.6	13.8±0.1	Not detected	19.8±0.1	9.6±0.0	68.1±1.0	84.0	20.5	30.0
Liquid hot water 49.4±0.3 8.3±0.5 6.4±0.2 20.0±0.4 8.8±0.3 69.0±0.4 78.0 21.3 29.3 Leaves	Catalyzed ethanol organosolv	61.8±0.6	10.2±0.8	Not detected	15.8±0.4	9.6±0.3	64.6±1.0	91.4	16.9	26.6
Leaves Name <	Liquid hot water	49.4±0.3	8.3±0.5	6.4±0.2	20.0±0.4	8.8±0.3	69.0±0.4	78.0	21.3	29.3
Untreated $35,3+0.6$ $19,8\pm0.2$ $3,7\pm0.2$ $24,6\pm0.6$ $15,0\pm1.1$ $ 1$ 1.2 $1.8.2$ 38.8 Catalyzed ethanol organosolv $50,3\pm0.0$ 11.7 ± 1.6 Not detected $19,9\pm0.4$ $17,0\pm1.0$ 60.8 ± 0.6 $8.6.6$ $19,6.6$ 31.8 Liquid hot water $37,0\pm2.3$ 4.7 ± 0.4 1.7 ± 0.1 36.8 ± 0.5 15.0 ± 1.4 62.2 ± 0.6 65.2 10.2 56.6 Pedicels $ -$ </td <td>Leaves</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Leaves									
Ethanol organosolv 39.5±0.7 9.3±0.5 2.6±0.2 26.7±0.3 14.4±0.1 64.2±0.3 72.0 18.2 38.8 Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 50.3±0.0 11.7±1.6 Not detected 19.9±0.4 17.0±1.0 60.8±0.6 86.6 19.6 31.8 Liquid hot water 37.0±2.3 4.7±0.4 1.7±0.1 36.8±0.5 15.0±1.4 62.2±0.6 65.2 10.2 56.6 Pedicels Untreated 41.7±1.0 23.9±0.3 7.8±0.3 27.1±0.1 1.6±0.0 - - . . Untreated 41.7±1.0 23.9±0.3 7.8±0.3 27.1±0.1 1.6±0.0 - - . . Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 56.5±0.8 17.1±0.2 Not detected 12.9±1.3 0.7±0.5 51.7±0.3 80.1 20.4 23.0 Liquid hot water 56.1±0.6 9±0.6 Not detected 26.3±0.3 0.7±0.1 72.0±0.6 96.9 8.8 27.1 Date cake Liquid hot water 32.0±0.2 21.5±0.	Untreated	35.3±0.6	19.8±0.2	3.7±0.2	24.6±0.6	15.0±1.1	-	-	_	_
Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 50.3±0.0 11.7±1.6 Not detected 19.9±0.4 17.0±1.0 60.8±0.6 86.6 19.6 31.8 Liquid hot water 37.0±2.3 47±0.4 1.7±0.1 36.8±0.5 15.0±1.4 62.2±0.6 65.2 10.2 56.66 Pedicels Untreated 41.7±1.0 23.9±0.3 7.8±0.3 27.1±0.1 1.6±0.0 - <td>Ethanol organosolv</td> <td>39.6±0.7</td> <td>9.3±0.5</td> <td>2.6±0.2</td> <td>26.7±0.3</td> <td>14.4±0.1</td> <td>64.2±0.3</td> <td>72.0</td> <td>18.2</td> <td>38.8</td>	Ethanol organosolv	39.6±0.7	9.3±0.5	2.6±0.2	26.7±0.3	14.4±0.1	64.2±0.3	72.0	18.2	38.8
Liquid hot water 37.0 ± 2.3 4.7 ± 0.4 1.7 ± 0.1 36.8 ± 0.5 15.0 ± 1.4 62.2 ± 0.6 65.2 10.2 56.6 PedicelsUntreated 41.7 ± 1.0 23.9 ± 0.3 7.8 ± 0.3 27.1 ± 0.1 1.6 ± 0.0 $ -$ Ethanol organosolv 56.5 ± 0.8 17.1 ± 0.2 Not detected 17.8 ± 0.7 0.4 ± 0.1 68.5 ± 0.7 92.8 17.0 20.7 Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 64.6 ± 0.2 13.4 ± 1.1 Not detected 12.9 ± 1.3 0.7 ± 0.5 51.7 ± 0.3 80.1 20.4 23.0 Liquid hot water 56.1 ± 0.6 9.9 ± 0.6 Not detected 26.3 ± 0.3 0.7 ± 0.1 72.0 ± 0.6 96.9 8.8 27.1 Date cakeUntreated 32.0 ± 0.2 21.5 ± 0.3 7.2 ± 0.9 36.1 ± 0.6 6.4 ± 0.4 $ -$ Ethanol organosolv 29.5 ± 0.4 22.6 ± 0.6 4.0 ± 0.6 45.2 ± 1.9 5.3 ± 1.2 46.4 ± 0.7 42.7 49.9 67.1 Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 29.5 ± 0.4 22.6 ± 0.6 4.0 ± 0.6 45.2 ± 1.9 5.1 ± 1.2 46.4 ± 0.7 42.7 49.9 67.1 Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 45.5 ± 0.1 14.8 ± 1.3 Not detected 38.9 ± 0.7 6.5 ± 0.3 40.1 ± 0.6 57.1 30.9 64.5 Liquid hot water 25.0 ± 1.4 5.1 ± 1.0 8.4 ± 0.3 64.2 ± 0.2 2.0 ± 0.0 51.0 ± 2.0 39.8 23.1 87.2 SeedsUntreated 14.3 ± 0.3 Not	Catalyzed ethanol organosolv	50.3±0.0	11.7±1.6	Not detected	19.9±0.4	17.0±1.0	60.8±0.6	86.6	19.6	31.8
Pedicels Pedicels <th< td=""><td>Liquid hot water</td><td>37.0±2.3</td><td>4.7±0.4</td><td>1.7±0.1</td><td>36.8±0.5</td><td>15.0±1.4</td><td>62.2±0.6</td><td>65.2</td><td>10.2</td><td>56.6</td></th<>	Liquid hot water	37.0±2.3	4.7±0.4	1.7±0.1	36.8±0.5	15.0±1.4	62.2±0.6	65.2	10.2	56.6
Untreated 41.7 ± 1.0 23.9 ± 0.3 7.8 ± 0.3 27.1 ± 0.1 1.6 ± 0.0 $ -$ <t< td=""><td>Pedicels</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Pedicels									
Ethanol organosolv56.5 \pm 0.817.1 \pm 0.2Not detected17.8 \pm 0.70.4 \pm 0.168.5 \pm 0.792.817.020.7Catalyzed ethanol organosolv64.6 \pm 0.213.4 \pm 1.1Not detected12.9 \pm 1.30.7 \pm 0.551.7 \pm 0.380.120.423.0Liquid hot water56.1 \pm 0.69.9 \pm 0.6Not detected26.3 \pm 0.30.7 \pm 0.172.0 \pm 0.696.98.827.1Date cakeTT <td>Untreated</td> <td>41.7±1.0</td> <td>23.9±0.3</td> <td>7.8±0.3</td> <td>27.1±0.1</td> <td>1.6±0.0</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>_</td> <td>_</td>	Untreated	41.7±1.0	23.9±0.3	7.8±0.3	27.1±0.1	1.6±0.0	-	-	_	_
Catalyzed ethanol organosolv Liquid hot water 64.6 ± 0.2 56.1 ± 0.6 13.4 ± 1.1 9.9 ± 0.6 Not detected 12.9 ± 1.3 26.3 ± 0.3 0.7 ± 0.5 0.7 ± 0.1 51.7 ± 0.3 72.0 ± 0.6 80.1 96.9 20.4 8.8 23.0 27.1 Date cakeImage: cake <th< td=""><td>Ethanol organosolv</td><td>56.5±0.8</td><td>17.1±0.2</td><td>Not detected</td><td>17.8±0.7</td><td>0.4±0.1</td><td>68.5±0.7</td><td>92.8</td><td>17.0</td><td>20.7</td></th<>	Ethanol organosolv	56.5±0.8	17.1±0.2	Not detected	17.8±0.7	0.4±0.1	68.5±0.7	92.8	17.0	20.7
Liquid hot water 56.1±0.6 9.9±0.6 Not detected 26.3±0.3 0.7±0.1 72.0±0.6 96.9 8.8 27.1 Date cake Untreated 32.0±0.2 21.5±0.3 7.2±0.9 36.1±0.6 6.4±0.4 -	Catalyzed ethanol organosolv	64.6±0.2	13.4±1.1	Not detected	12.9±1.3	0.7±0.5	51.7±0.3	80.1	20.4	23.0
Date cakeUntreated 32.0 ± 0.2 21.5 ± 0.3 7.2 ± 0.9 36.1 ± 0.6 6.4 ± 0.4 $ -$ <td>Liquid hot water</td> <td>56.1±0.6</td> <td>9.9±0.6</td> <td>Not detected</td> <td>26.3±0.3</td> <td>0.7±0.1</td> <td>72.0±0.6</td> <td>96.9</td> <td>8.8</td> <td>27.1</td>	Liquid hot water	56.1±0.6	9.9±0.6	Not detected	26.3±0.3	0.7±0.1	72.0±0.6	96.9	8.8	27.1
Untreated 32.0 ± 0.2 21.5 ± 0.3 7.2 ± 0.9 36.1 ± 0.6 6.4 ± 0.4 $ -$ <t< td=""><td>Date cake</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Date cake									
Ethanol organosolv 29.5 ± 0.4 22.6 ± 0.6 4.0 ± 0.6 45.2 ± 1.9 5.3 ± 1.2 46.4 ± 0.7 42.7 49.9 67.1 Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 45.5 ± 0.1 14.8 ± 1.3 Not detected 38.9 ± 0.7 6.5 ± 0.3 40.1 ± 0.6 57.1 30.9 64.5 Liquid hot water 25.0 ± 1.4 5.1 ± 1.0 8.4 ± 0.3 64.2 ± 0.2 2.0 ± 0.0 51.0 ± 2.0 39.8 23.1 87.2 SeedsVUntreated 14.3 ± 0.3 Not detected 78.4 ± 0.8 12.3 ± 0.4 1.5 ± 0.2 $ -$ Ethanol organosolv 15.1 ± 0.8 Not detected 67.7 ± 0.4 9.4 ± 1.0 0.7 ± 0.0 70.6 ± 0.8 74.5 25.4 22.5 Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 16.3 ± 0.2 Not detected 73.3 ± 0.0 1.9 ± 0.1 1.0 ± 0.0 69.0 ± 1.1 78.7 29.0 4.8 Liquid hot water 15.0 ± 0.7 Not detected 65.3 ± 0.4 10.4 ± 0.4 0.6 ± 0.2 80.2 ± 1.4 84.1 16.5 16.7	Untreated	32.0±0.2	21.5±0.3	7.2±0.9	36.1±0.6	6.4±0.4	-	-	_	_
Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 45.5 ± 0.1 14.8 ± 1.3 Not detected 38.9 ± 0.7 6.5 ± 0.3 40.1 ± 0.6 57.1 30.9 64.5 Liquid hot water 25.0 ± 1.4 5.1 ± 1.0 8.4 ± 0.3 64.2 ± 0.2 2.0 ± 0.0 51.0 ± 2.0 39.8 23.1 87.2 SeedsUntreated 14.3 ± 0.3 Not detected 78.4 ± 0.8 12.3 ± 0.4 1.5 ± 0.2 $ -$ Ethanol organosolv 15.1 ± 0.8 Not detected 67.7 ± 0.4 9.4 ± 1.0 0.7 ± 0.0 70.6 ± 0.8 74.5 25.4 22.5 Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 16.3 ± 0.2 Not detected 73.3 ± 0.0 1.9 ± 0.1 1.0 ± 0.0 69.0 ± 1.1 78.7 29.0 4.8 Liquid hot water 15.0 ± 0.7 Not detected 65.3 ± 0.4 10.4 ± 0.4 0.6 ± 0.2 80.2 ± 1.4 84.1 16.5 16.7	Ethanol organosolv	29.5±0.4	22.6±0.6	4.0±0.6	45.2±1.9	5.3±1.2	46.4±0.7	42.7	49.9	67.1
Liquid hot water 25.0 ± 1.4 5.1 ± 1.0 8.4 ± 0.3 64.2 ± 0.2 2.0 ± 0.0 51.0 ± 2.0 39.8 23.1 87.2 SeedsUntreated 14.3 ± 0.3 Not detected 78.4 ± 0.8 12.3 ± 0.4 1.5 ± 0.2 $ -$ Ethanol organosolv 15.1 ± 0.8 Not detected 67.7 ± 0.4 9.4 ± 1.0 0.7 ± 0.0 70.6 ± 0.8 74.5 25.4 22.5 Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 16.3 ± 0.2 Not detected 73.3 ± 0.0 1.9 ± 0.1 1.0 ± 0.0 69.0 ± 1.1 78.7 29.0 4.8 Liquid hot water 15.0 ± 0.7 Not detected 65.3 ± 0.4 10.4 ± 0.4 0.6 ± 0.2 80.2 ± 1.4 84.1 16.5 16.7	Catalyzed ethanol organosolv	45.5±0.1	14.8±1.3	Not detected	38.9±0.7	6.5±0.3	40.1±0.6	57.1	30.9	64 5
Seeds Untreated 14.3±0.3 Not detected 78.4±0.8 12.3±0.4 1.5±0.2 -	Liquid hot water	25.0±1.4	5.1±1.0	8.4±0.3	64.2±0.2	2.0±0.0	51.0±2.0	39.8	23.1	87.2
Untreated 14.3 ± 0.3 Not detected 78.4 ± 0.8 12.3 ± 0.4 1.5 ± 0.2 Ethanol organosolv 15.1 ± 0.8 Not detected 67.7 ± 0.4 9.4 ± 1.0 0.7 ± 0.0 70.6 ± 0.8 74.5 25.4 22.5 Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 16.3 ± 0.2 Not detected 73.3 ± 0.0 1.9 ± 0.1 1.0 ± 0.0 69.0 ± 1.1 78.7 29.0 4.8 Liquid hot water 15.0 ± 0.7 Not detected 65.3 ± 0.4 10.4 ± 0.4 0.6 ± 0.2 80.2 ± 1.4 84.1 16.5 16.7	Seeds									
detected detected 0.7±0.4 9.4±1.0 0.7±0.0 70.6±0.8 74.5 25.4 22.5 Ethanol organosolv 15.1±0.8 Not detected 67.7±0.4 9.4±1.0 0.7±0.0 70.6±0.8 74.5 25.4 22.5 Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 16.3±0.2 Not detected 73.3±0.0 1.9±0.1 1.0±0.0 69.0±1.1 78.7 29.0 4.8 Liquid hot water 15.0±0.7 Not detected 65.3±0.4 10.4±0.4 0.6±0.2 80.2±1.4 84.1 16.5 16.7	Untreated	14.3±0.3	Not	78.4±0.8	12.3±0.4	1.5±0.2	-	-		
Catalyzed ethanol organosolv 16.3 ± 0.2 Not 73.3 ± 0.0 1.9 ± 0.1 1.0 ± 0.0 69.0 ± 1.1 78.7 29.0 4.8 Liquid hot water 15.0 ± 0.7 Not 65.3 ± 0.4 10.4 ± 0.4 0.6 ± 0.2 80.2 ± 1.4 84.1 16.5 16.7	Ethanol organosolv	15.1±0.8	detected Not	67.7±0.4	9.4±1.0	0.7±0.0	70.6±0.8	74.5	25.4	22.5
Liquid hot water 15.0 ± 0.7 Not 65.3 ± 0.4 10.4 ± 0.4 0.6 ± 0.2 80.2 ± 1.4 84.1 16.5 16.7 detected	Catalyzed ethanol organosolv	16.3±0.2	detected Not detected	73.3±0.0	1.9±0.1	1.0±0.0	69.0±1.1	78.7	29.0	4.8
	Liquid hot water	15.0±0.7	Not detected	65.3±0.4	10.4±0.4	0.6±0.2	80.2±1.4	84.1	16.5	16.7

Table 1. Chemical compositions of pretreated and untreated date palm wastes.

305	SEM images were taken to explore how materials changed morphologically through the
306	pretreatments and the results are shown in Figure 1. Figure 1 shows that the pretreatments led to
307	enhanced porosity via the creation of sponge-like shapes for greater accessibility. These
308	modifications can be attributed to the removal of lignin and partial solubilization of
309	hemicellulose [16,49]. Figure 1 also depicts some small particles or larger agglomerates on the
310	surface of some pretreated materials, which might be redeposited lignin. According to previous
311	research, they are generated when the temperature and ethanol concentration drop during the
312	washing stages after the lignocellulose ethanol pulping process [50].
313	
314	
315	
316	
317	
318	
319	
320	
321	
322	
522	
323	





Figure 1. SEM images with 5000× magnification for (a) untreated trunk, (b) EO pretreated

- trunk, (c) untreated leaf sheath, (d) CEO pretreated leaf sheath, (e) untreated leaves, (f) EO
- 327 pretreated leaves, (g) untreated pedicels, (h) CEO pretreated pedicels (i) untreated date cake, (j)
- 328 LHW pretreated date cake, (k) untreated seeds, and (l) LHW pretreated seeds.

FTIR spectroscopy was utilized to analyze the crystallinity and structural changes of the wastematerials before and after undergoing pretreatments. Table 2 displays the results of calculating

332 the crystallinity index (CI) and total crystallinity index (TCI) using the absorbance ratios of 1420 to 894 cm⁻¹ and 1375 to 2900 cm⁻¹, respectively [51]. In most cases, the pretreatments led to a 333 decrease in both CI and TCI of the substrates, which indicates an increase in amorphous 334 cellulose content and a decrease in crystalline cellulose content. The highest CI reduction of 335 28.0% was achieved after LHW pretreatment of seeds, which was comparable to that of 24.48% 336 337 reduction of TCI in acid-catalyzed organosoly pretreatment of oil palm empty fruit bunch, a lignocellulosic residue of the same family as date palm [20]. On the other hand, in some cases 338 (i.e. pedicels, leaves, leaf sheath, and date cake), the CI and TCI increased as a result of some 339 340 pretreatments. The increase in CI and TCI may be attributed to the decrease in amorphous hemicellulose and lignin which can lead to an increase in crystallinity [8]. Such an increase in 341 crystallinity is however not desirable since hydrolytic enzymes are unable to access the high 342 crystalline regions of lignocelluloses and thus is one of the challenges encountered during 343 enzymatic hydrolysis [31]. As a result of decreasing crystallinity, organosolv pretreatment has 344 345 been found to speed up hydrolysis and decrease the amount of enzyme needed to achieve high digestibility [16]. 346 347

- 348
- 349
- 350
- 351
- 352

Substrate	CI	TCI
Trunk		
Untreated	1.68	1.64
Ethanol organosolv	1.37	1.57
Catalyzed ethanol organosolv	1.52	1.53
Liquid hot water	1.52	1.49
Leaf sheath	1.50	1.47
Untreated	1.59	1.47
Ethanol organosolv	1.94	1.64
Catalyzed ethanol organosolv	1.58	1.63
Liquid hot water	1.66	1.52
Loguog		
Leaves	1 46	1 4 4
Ethenol organosoly	1.40	1.44
Catalward athenal arganosaly	1.70	1.20
Liquid hat mater	1.55	1.44
Liquid not water	1.75	1.54
Pedicels		
Untreated	1 27	1 29
Ethanol organosoly	1.17	1.25
Catalyzed ethanol organosoly	1 40	1 49
Liquid hot water	1.10	1.19
Elquita not water	1.20	1.22
Date cake		
Untreated	1.79	1.28
Ethanol organosolv	1.42	1.34
Catalyzed ethanol organosolv	1.39	1.24
Liquid hot water	2.21	1.44
-		
Seeds		
Untreated	1.55	1.01
Ethanol organosolv	1.52	1.28
Catalyzed ethanol organosolv	1.48	1.21
Liquid hot water	1.12	1.46

355 **3.2. Enzymatic hydrolysis**

356 The glucose yields of untreated and pretreated solids, after enzymatic hydrolysis, are presented

in Figure 2. Figure 2 demonstrates low hydrolysis efficiency for all untreated samples, except for

date cake, with glucose yields ranging from 14.3 to 38.0 wt.%. All the pretreatment processes,

except those for date cake, increased the yields and resulted in solids with 1.2-4.3 fold higher

yields of glucose. LHW was the most proficient pretreatment approach to enhance glucose yields
(30.9-92.7%) from trunk, leaves, leaf sheath, and seeds, where the higher glucose yields were
attributed to improved hemicellulose removal after LHW pretreatment. Liquid hot water
pretreatment has been demonstrated to release acetyl groups from hemicellulose, creating acetic
acid, which accelerates the breakdown of hemicellulose and improves enzymatic access to the
cellulose fraction for a more efficient hydrolysis process [52].

Figure 2 also shows that LHW pretreatment of leaf sheath was the most efficient with 4 fold rise 366 in ethanol yield. This observation is expected since according to Table 1, the LHW pretreatment 367 facilitated the highest lignin reduction of 35% when applied to the leaf sheath sample. On the 368 369 other hand for the CEO pretreatment, the pedicel sample, with the delignification of 75%, was shown to have the highest ethanol yield. Indeed, a correlation between glucan digestibility and 370 lignin removal was observed in organosolv pretreatment of date palm fronds, although it must be 371 stated that the effectiveness of enzymatic hydrolysis is not solely limited by lignin content [14]. 372 Comparing CEO and EO pretreatments, the addition of sulfuric acid catalyst had a positive 373 impact on the glucose yields of all substrates except leaves and date cake. The introduction of 374 375 sulfuric acid increases the rate of lignin removal, with lignin reported to adsorb enzymes irreversibly, implying that enhanced lignin removal leads to an improvement in glucose yields 376 377 [46]. Due to the irreversible enzyme adsorption that lignin has been shown to have, lignin

378 removal increases glucose yields.

It has been shown that pretreatment at high temperatures and acidic conditions causes the
glycosidic bonds in hemicellulose and hemicellulose-lignin connections to break effectively.
However, the breakdown of some of the released carbohydrates during pretreatment under these

conditions may have a negative impact on the hydrolysis productivity [32] which could be the
cause of the glucose yield reduction of CEO pretreated leaves and date cake.



Figure 2. Glucose yields of untreated and different pretreated date palm wastes by
enzymatic hydrolysis (error bars show standard deviations and the same letters indicate
no statistical difference).

396 3.3. Ethanol production

Figure 3 displays the ethanol yields obtained from treated and untreated samples by the NSSF.

398 The ethanol yields of the untreated trunk, date cake, leaf sheath, leaves, pedicels, and seeds were

found to be 12.4%, 98.3% 39.0%, 44.4%, 29.9%, and 59.6%, respectively. For all samples,

400 except date cake, the pretreatments resulted in improved ethanol yields (i.e., 1.1-6.0 times higher

401 yields). Similar trends for ethanol and enzymatic hydrolysis were observed for trunk, seeds, and

leaf sheath after different pretreatments. On the other hand, for leaves, pedicels, and date cake, 402 the trend was different. In the case of the leaves, there was not a significant difference between 403 404 the ethanol yields of LHW and EO based on ANOVA analysis. Figure 3, however, shows that the CEO pretreated pedicels and LHW pretreated date cake did not produce as much as ethanol 405 that was expected according to their enzymatic hydrolysis potential. The low amounts of ethanol 406 407 yield could be a result of yeast-inhibitory chemical formation which restricts the growth of microorganisms during the fermentation process [53]. These observations are comparable to 408 409 similar investigations in the literature. For instance, in the study by Hashemi *et al.* [33], a 1 h 410 hydrothermal pretreatment of safflower at 180 °C was applied to improve the ethanol yield from 11.6 to 40.8%. This ethanol yield was further increased to 60.3% after prolonging the 411 pretreatment to 5 h. In another study, Ostovareh et al. [32] conducted organosolv pretreatment 412 with and without acid catalyst addition to produce ethanol from sweet sorghum stalks. The 413 414 highest ethanol yield of 72.5% was achieved from stalks that underwent acid-catalyzed 50% 415 ethanolic pretreatment at a temperature of 140 °C. While the yield of untreated straw was about 30%. However, the study also reported a decline in ethanol yields at a higher temperature of 160 416 °C when sulfuric acid was present. Fang et al. [25] also obtained an ethanol yield of 80% by 417 418 pretreating the date palm rachis hydrothermally at 200 °C. The corresponding values for the raw and pretreated materials at 180 °C were 33% and about 40%, respectively. These outcomes are 419 420 comparable to those attained in the present study using date leaves. The lower yields obtained for 421 rachis may be attributed to its more resistant structure compared to the leaves.

422

423

424



Figure 3. Ethanol yields of different pretreated and untreated wastes (error bars show standard deviations and the same letters indicate no statistical difference).

435

437 **3.4. Biomethane production**

To enhance waste utilization and energy recovery, the fermentation residues obtained in NSSF were used to produce biomethane. To evaluate the effect of the fermentation process on biomethane production, the untreated samples were also anaerobically digested. The biomethane potential (BMP) results are summarized in Figure 4. For the majority of samples, the BMPs of fermented residues were either lower than that of the unfermented substrate, or the difference was not statistically significant according to the ANOVA analysis. This occurred because most of the useful carbon sources of cellulose and hemicellulose in the substrates were

utilized/consumed during NSSF. As illustrated in Figures 4a to 4e, the BMPs from the fermented 445 trunk, leaf sheath, leaves, pedicels, and date cake ranged from 70.8 to 200.2 mL/g VS. Most of 446 447 the applied pretreatments increased the BMPs, with the CEO fermentation residues presenting the highest BMPs which ranged from 210.4 to 275.5 mL/g VS. The lower concentrations of 448 lignin achieved during CEO pretreatment, as discussed earlier in Table 1, may be responsible for 449 450 the higher methane generation from CEO fermentation residues. This is because lignin acts as a protective barrier against microbial degradation of biomass. Indeed, according to 451 452 Mirmohamadsadeghi et al. [8], the main obstacle to improved BMPs from biomass is the 453 presence of high lignin content since in general, anaerobic microorganisms degrade cellulose and hemicellulose more efficiently than lignin [8]. Similar results were also reported in the anaerobic 454 digestion of palm and petiole of the date palm with BMPs of 258.76 and 166.71 mL/g TS, 455 respectively [54]. The efficient removal of lignin by the CEO pretreatment approach may also 456 457 explain the ~ 4-fold increase in the BMP of untreated pedicels from 63.6 mL/g VS to 271.4 mL/g VS. 458

On the other hand, the BMPs of the seeds were determined to be diminished after pretreatment as 459 shown in Figure 4f. This observation may be due to the removal of the energy-dense lipids in the 460 461 seeds after the pretreatments. This observation is consistent with the literature since lipids have been reported to be the highest contributor to the biomethane generation potential compared to 462 463 other macromolecules such as proteins and carbohydrates [55]. For instance, in a previous study [29], the BMP of 670 mL/g VS was attained from fermentation residues of date seeds and 464 465 reduced to ~300 mL/g VS after phosphoric acid pretreatment, due to the lipid removal [29]. Overall, the biomethane results suggest that the NSSF process could act as a kind of pretreatment 466 for biomethane production from all date palm wastes except date cake. 467

Additionally, Figures S1 and S2, the Supplementary material, demonstrate that a portion of
hemicellulosic sugars is solubilized and remains unutilized during the pretreatments, indicating
the potential for increased energy recovery if these carbohydrates can be recovered and
incorporated into the anaerobic digestion process.

472 **3.5.Gasoline equivalent and value-added material production**

In examining the preferred pretreatment process, the bioenergy production potentials of 473 biomethane and ethanol were calculated based on various pretreatment methods. The results, 474 475 shown in Figure 5, highlighted the total gasoline equivalents of different date palm wastes. The untreated trunk, leaves, pedicels, and leaf sheath exhibited gasoline equivalent ranges of 125.4-476 477 263.8 mL/kg. In most cases, the applied pretreatments enhanced these gasoline equivalents, 478 particularly with the CEO pretreatment, which achieved the highest values of 255.8-344.7 mL/kg. Conversely, date cake and seeds saw reduced gasoline equivalents after pretreatment, 479 480 with the highest values observed in the raw substrates.

Figure 5 illustrated that relying solely on ethanol production was impractical, as it yielded

relatively low gasoline equivalents ranging from 22.3-149.5 mL/kg. Yet, the production of

biomethane from fermentation residues notably increased gasoline equivalents, ranging from

484 90.9-817.8 mL/kg. The CEO pretreatment particularly enhanced total gasoline equivalent values

by 2.3 to 4.3 times compared to scenarios considering ethanol as the sole product.

486

487

488



Figure 4. Yield of biomethane production via anaerobic digestion from unfermented and
different fermentation residues. Dark gray, light gray, and black columns indicate the
yield obtained after 9, 30, and 40 days (error bars show standard deviations, and the same
letters indicate no statistical difference).

After pretreatment and ethanol production, subjecting the fermentation residues of untreated
seeds to anaerobic digestion resulted in a significant 21.2-fold increase in gasoline equivalents
compared to scenarios that only recovered ethanol without generating methane from the residues.
A previous study on olive wastes revealed that side-stream methane production could triple the
total energy production of the process [48].

- Additionally, the economic potential of the extracted lignin was assessed. The CEO pretreatment
- showed lignin recoveries ranging from 26.0% to 48.8%, translating to potential monetary
- 517 benefits from £5,416.6 to £10,156.1. In contrast, the organosolv pretreatment yielded lignin
- recoveries ranging from 16.3% to 32.5%, corresponding to potential monetary benefits from
- 519 £3,385.4 to £6,770.7.



Figure 5. Gasoline equivalent values from ethanol (light gray bars) and methane (dark
gray bars) based on 1 kg of initial substrate for untreated and pretreated wastes through
different pretreatment conditions (error bars show standard deviations and the same
letters indicate no statistical difference).

541 **3.6. Biorefinery development**

Two scenarios for biorefinery development could be followed: (I) maximum lignin production 542 543 scenario and (II) maximum biofuel production scenario. Figure 6 depicts process diagrams of 544 these two scenarios. When the target is lignin production as the main output, CEO pretreatment is recommended for all the date palm residues to meet the first scenario. Considering 1 kg of 545 546 each sample, the first scenario yields 806.9 mL of ethanol and 902.8 L of methane, which can be equated to the energy produced by 1553.1 mL of gasoline. Additionally, this scenario also 547 generates 528.0 g of lignin, which holds the potential value of £47467.9. Whereas, untreated date 548 cake and seeds, as well as CEO pretreated of other substrates, are recommended as a feedstock 549 550 for implementation of the second scenario. The second scenario yields 967.5 mL of ethanol and 551 1605.3 L of methane, which can be considered equivalent to the energy produced by 2452.0 mL of gasoline. Furthermore, this scenario generates 341.0 g of lignin, which holds a monetary 552 potential of £29987.3. Detailed information on the mass balance of lignin, carbohydrates, and 553 554 key products for each waste in every scenario are presented in Figures S1 and S2, Supplementary material. 555

556 Asia and Africa are leading date-producing regions in the world with 1 million hectares of harvested area [56]. The typical density of palm trees in each hectare is around 125, while each 557 558 palm produces, on average, 400 kg of dates and 50 kg of leaf residues annually [3,57]. Moreover, 559 date seeds contributed to about 10% of date fruit weight [58]. Considering the reasons discussed earlier for using individual wastes instead of mixing them, the focus was placed on the main 560 residues that are practical and representative of the waste generated in the date palm industry. 561 562 This approach allows for a more reasonable estimation of the waste management potential. It 563 aligns with industry practices and reflects how date palm waste is realistically utilized in

different scenarios. Based on this approach, considering leaf waste as the main residue fraction
from the palm [14], as well as date, and seed wastes, employing the first scenario gives the
possibility to produce 4 million m³ ethanol and 7 billion m³ methane, which are equated to 10
million m³ gasoline, and 7 million ton lignin. Employing the second scenario could generate 12
million m³ ethanol and 15 billion m³ methane, which are equated to 25 million m³ gasoline, and
400 kiloton lignin in Asia and Africa annually.



Figure 6. Process diagram for ethanol, methane, and lignin production through (a) first
scenario, i.e. maximum lignin production, and (b) second scenario, i.e. maximum biofuel
production.

576 **4.** Conclusions

The wastes generated in the palm date agroindustry demonstrated significant potential for the 577 578 production of ethanol and lignin, with the added benefit of being able to utilize the fermentation 579 residues for methane production. The study explored different pretreatment requirements for various date palm waste components in order to maximize biofuel and lignin production. CEO 580 581 pretreatment of biomass resulted in maximum lignin production in the first scenario. In the second scenario, untreated date cake and seeds, along with CEO pretreatment of other residues, 582 resulted in maximum biofuel production. In the first scenario, the production of highly pure and 583 sulfur-free lignin was 35.4% higher than the second scenario, whereas the second scenario 584 585 resulted in 19.9% more ethanol and 77.8% more methane than the first scenario. These findings demonstrate the importance of tailoring the pretreatment strategy to the specific components of 586 date palm waste to maximize the production of targeted products. Moreover, a techno-economic 587 analysis is crucial to assess the commercial viability of the process on a large scale. With further 588 589 optimization, the conversion of date palm waste into biofuels and lignin can offer a sustainable and eco-friendly alternative to fossil fuels. 590

591 CRedit authorship contribution statement

Simin Shokrollahi: Investigation, Formal analysis, Data curation, Methodology, Resources,
Visualization, Writing - original draft, Amin Shavandi: Validation, Writing – review & editing.
Oseweuba Valentine Okoro: Validation, Writing – review & editing., Joeri F.M. Denayer:
Validation, Writing - review & editing, Keikhosro Karimi: Conceptualization, Funding
acquisition, Methodology, Project administration, Supervision, Validation, Writing - review &
editing.

598	Decla	aration of Competing Interest				
599	The a	authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal				
600	relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.					
601	Ackr	owledgment				
602	Novo	ozymes, Denmark, is highly appreciated for kindly providing the hydrolytic enzymes.				
603						
604	Refe	rences				
605	[1]	Ben Atitallah I, Ntaikou I, Antonopoulou G, Alexandropoulou M, Brysch-Herzberg M,				
606		Nasri M, et al. Evaluation of the non-conventional yeast strain Wickerhamomyces				
607		anomalus (Pichia anomala) X19 for enhanced bioethanol production using date palm sap				
608		as renewable feedstock. Renew Energy 2020;154:71-81.				
609		https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2020.03.010.				
610	[2]	FAOSTAT. On-line statistical database of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the				
611		United Nations. 2019, Available online at: http://apps.fao.org (Accessed on November 30,				
612		2021).				
613	[3]	Zaid A. Date palm cultivation. In: Arias-Jiménez EJ, editor., Rome: Food and Agriculture				
614		Organization of the United Nations; 2002. Retrieved from:				
615		https://www.fao.org/3/Y4360E/y4360e00.htm.				
616	[4]	Jaafar K a. Biogas production by anaerobic digestion of date palm pulp waste. Al-				
617		Khwarizmi Eng J 2010;6:14–20.				
C10	[5]	Haria S. Alam M. Calimanaa F. Mahamad MM. Kamal Eldin A. Al Marrayai All				

618 [5] Haris S, Alam M, Galiwango E, Mohamed MM, Kamal-Eldin A, Al-Marzouqi AH.

619		Characterization analysis of date fruit pomace: An underutilized waste bioresource rich in
620		dietary fiber and phenolic antioxidants. Waste Manag 2023;163:34-42.
621		https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2023.03.027.
622	[6]	Alsulami RA, El-Sayed SA, Eltaher MA, Mohammad A, Almitani KH, Mostafa ME.
623		Thermal decomposition characterization and kinetic parameters estimation for date palm
624		wastes and their blends using TGA. Fuel 2023;334.
625		https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2022.126600.
626	[7]	Chandrasekhar K, Cayetano RDA, Mehrez I, Kumar G, Kim SH. Evaluation of the
627		biochemical methane potential of different sorts of Algerian date biomass. Environ
628		Technol Innov 2020;20:101180. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eti.2020.101180.
629	[8]	Mirmohamadsadeghi S, Karimi K, Azarbaijani R, Dashora K, Kumar V, Aghbashlo M, et
630		al. Pretreatment of lignocelluloses for enhanced biogas production: a review on
631		influencing mechanisms and the importance of microbial diversity. Renew Sustain Energy
632		Rev 2021;135:110173. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.110173.
633	[9]	Duan Y, Tarafdar A, Kumar V, Ganeshan P, Rajendran K, Shekhar Giri B, et al.
634		Sustainable biorefinery approaches towards circular economy for conversion of biowaste
635		to value added materials and future perspectives. Fuel 2022;325.
636		https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2022.124846.
637	[10]	Chen W, Ni S. Liquid hot water as sustainable biomass pretreatment technique for
638		bioenergy production: A review. Bioresour Technol 2022;344.
639		https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2021.126207.
640	[11]	Beig B, Riaz M, Raza Naqvi S, Hassan M, Zheng Z, Karimi K, et al. Current challenges

641		and innovative developments in pretreatment of lignocellulosic residues for biofuel
642		production: a review. Fuel 2020;287:119670. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2020.119670.
643	[12]	Pérez JA, Ballesteros I, Ballesteros M, Sáez F, Negro MJ, Manzanares P. Optimizing
644		liquid hot water pretreatment conditions to enhance sugar recovery from wheat straw for
645		fuel-ethanol production. Fuel 2008;87:3640-7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2008.06.009.
646	[13]	Kumar G, Dharmaraja J, Arvindnarayan S, Shoban S, Bakonyi P, Saratale GD, et al. A
647		comprehensive review on thermochemical, biological, biochemical and hybrid conversion
648		methods of bio-derived lignocellulosic molecules into renewable fuels. Fuel
649		2019;251:352-67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2019.04.049.
650	[14]	Cybulska I, Brudecki GP, Zembrzuska J, Schmidt JE, Lopez CGB, Thomsen MH.
651		Organosolv delignification of agricultural residues (date palm fronds, Phoenix dactylifera
652		L.) of the United Arab Emirates. Appl Energy 2017;185:1040-50.
653		https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.01.094.
654	[15]	Michelin M, Liebentritt S, Vicente AA, Teixeira JA. Lignin from an integrated process
655		consisting of liquid hot water and ethanol organosolv: physicochemical and antioxidant
656		properties. Int J Biol Macromol 2018;120:159–69.
657		https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2018.08.046.
658	[16]	Zhao X, Cheng K, Liu D. Organosolv pretreatment of lignocellulosic biomass for
659		enzymatic hydrolysis. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol 2009;82:815-27.
660		https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-009-1883-1.
661	[17]	Cebreiros F, Clavijo L, Boix E, Ferrari MD, Lareo C. Integrated valorization of eucalyptus

sawdust within a biorefinery approach by autohydrolysis and organosolv pretreatments.

663		Renew Energy 2020;149:115–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2019.12.024.
664	[18]	Nurfahmi, Ong HC, Jan BM, Tong CW, Fauzi H, Chen WH. Effects of organosolv
665		pretreatment and acid hydrolysis on palm empty fruit bunch (PEFB) as bioethanol
666		feedstock. Biomass and Bioenergy 2016;95:78-83.
667		https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2016.09.008.
668	[19]	Salapa I, Katsimpouras C, Topakas E, Sidiras D. Organosolv pretreatment of wheat straw
669		for efficient ethanol production using various solvents. Biomass and Bioenergy
670		2017;100:10-6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2017.03.011.
671	[20]	Mondylaksita K, Ferreira JA, Millati R, Budhijanto W, Niklasson C, Taherzadeh MJ.
672		Recovery of high purity lignin and digestible cellulose from oil palm empty fruit bunch
673		using low acid-catalyzed organosolv pretreatment. Agronomy 2020;10.
674		https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy10050674.
675	[21]	Champadang O, Boonsombuti A, Luengnaruemitchai A. Enhanced enzymatic digestibility
676		of water lettuce by liquid hot water pretreatment. Bioresour Technol Reports 2022;18.
677		https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biteb.2022.101100.
678	[22]	Alotaibi MD, Alshammari BA, Saba N, Alothman OY, Sanjay MR, Almutairi Z, et al.
679		Characterization of natural fiber obtained from different parts of date palm tree (Phoenix
680		dactylifera L.) 2019;135:69–76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2019.05.102.
681	[23]	AlMaadeed MA, Kahraman R, Noorunnisa Khanam P, Al-Maadeed S. Characterization of
682		untreated and treated male and female date palm leaves. Mater Des 2013;43:526-31.
683		https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matdes.2012.07.028.

684	[24]	Elseify LA, Midani M, Hassanin AH, Hamouda T, Khiari R. Long textile fibres from the
685		midrib of date palm: Physiochemical, morphological, and mechanical properties. Ind
686		Crop Prod 2020;151:112466. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2020.112466.
687	[25]	Fang C, Schmidt JE, Cybulska I, Brudecki GP, Frankær CG, Thomsen MH. Hydrothermal
688		pretreatment of date palm (Phoenix dactylifera L.) leaflets and rachis to enhance
689		enzymatic digestibility and bioethanol potential. Biomed Res Int 2015;2015:1-13.
690		https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/216454.
691	[26]	Antit Y, Olivares I, Hamdi M. Biochemical conversion of lignocellulosic biomass from
692		date Palm of phoenix dactylifera L. into ethanol production. Energies 2021.
693		https://doi.org/10.3390/en14071887.
694	[27]	Lattieff FA. A study of biogas production from date palm fruit wastes. J Clean Prod
695		2016;139:1191-5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.08.139.
696	[28]	Djaafri M, Drissi A, Mehdaoui S, Kalloum S, Atelge MR, Khelafi M, et al. Anaerobic
697		digestion of dry palms from five cultivars of Algerian date palm (Phoenix dactylifera L .)
698		namely H ' mira , Teggaza , Tinacer , Aghamou and Takarbouchet : a new comparative
699		study TS. Energy 2023;269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2023.126774.
700	[29]	Shokrollahi S, Denayer JFM, Karimi K. Efficient bioenergy recovery from different date
701		palm industrial wastes. Energy 2023;272:127057.
702		https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2023.127057.
703	[30]	Adney B, Baker J. Measurement of cellulase activities: Laboratory Analytical Procedure
704		(LAP); Issue Date: 08/12/1996.

705	[31]	Amiri H, Karimi K. Improvement of acetone, butanol, and ethanol production from woody
706		biomass using organosolv pretreatment. Bioprocess Biosyst Eng 2015;38:1959-72.
707		https://doi.org/10.1007/s00449-015-1437-0.

- 708 [32] Ostovareh S, Karimi K, Zamani A. Efficient conversion of sweet sorghum stalks to biogas
- and ethanol using organosolv pretreatment. Ind Crops Prod 2015;66:170–7.
- 710 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2014.12.023.
- [33] Hashemi SS, Mirmohamadsadeghi S, Karimi K. Biorefinery development based on whole
 safflower plant. Renew Energy 2020;152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2020.01.049.
- 713 [34] Hansen TL, Schmidt JE, Angelidaki I, Marca E, Jansen JLC, Mosbæk H, et al. Method for
- determination of methane potentials of solid organic waste. Waste Manag 2004;24:393–
 400. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2003.09.009.
- [35] Sluiter A, Hames B, Hyman D, Payne C, Ruiz R, Scarlata C, et al. Determination of total
- solids in biomass and total dissolved solids in liquid process samples: Laboratory
- 718 Analytical Procedure (LAP). NREL/TP-510-42621 2008:3–5.
- 719 [36] Sluiter A, Hames B, Ruiz RO, Scarlata C, Sluiter J, Templeton D, et al. Determination of

structural carbohydrates and lignin in biomass: Laboratory Analytical Procedure (LAP).

- 721 NREL/TP-510-42618 2008:1–14.
- [37] Sravan Kumar S, Manoj P, Giridhar P. Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR)
- analysis, chlorophyll content and antioxidant properties of native and defatted foliage of

green leafy vegetables. J Food Sci Technol 2015;52:8131–9.

725 https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-015-1959-0.

- [38] Lignin price, Shandong Gaotang Kelin Environmental Protection Technology Co,
 http://www.alibaba.com. (Accessed on October 28, 2023).
- 728 [39] Hasan Ba Hamid HS, Ku Ismail KS. Optimization of enzymatic hydrolysis for acid
- pretreated date seeds into fermentable sugars. Biocatal Agric Biotechnol 2020;24:101530.
- 730 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bcab.2020.101530.
- [40] Bharath G, Hai A, Rambabu K, Banat F, Jayaraman R, Taher H, et al. Systematic

732 production and characterization of pyrolysis-oil from date tree wastes for bio-fuel

applications. Biomass and Bioenergy 2020;135:105523.

- 734 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2020.105523.
- [41] Canton M, Drincovich F, Walker RP, Famiani F, Bonghi C. Metabolism of stone fruits:
 reciprocal contribution between primary metabolism and cell wall. Front Plant Sci
 2020;11:1–10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2020.01054.
- 738 [42] Hesami SM, Zilouei H, Karimi K, Asadinezhad A. Enhanced biogas production from
- sunflower stalks using hydrothermal and organosolv pretreatment. Ind Crops Prod

740 2015;76:449–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2015.07.018.

- [43] Fadhil AB, Alhayali MA, Saeed LI. Date (Phoenix dactylifera L.) palm stones as a
- potential new feedstock for liquid bio-fuels production. Fuel 2017;210:165–76.
- 743 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2017.08.059.
- [44] Chaari R, Khlif M, Mallek H, Bradai C, Lacoste C, Belguith H, et al. Enzymatic
- treatments effect on the poly (butylene succinate)/ date palm fibers properties for bio-
- composite applications. Ind Crop Prod 2020;148:112270.
- 747 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2020.112270.

748	[45]	Bensidhom G, Ben Hassen Trabelsi A, mahmood MA, Ceylan S. Insights into pyrolytic
749		feedstock potential of date palm industry wastes: Kinetic study and product
750		characterization. Fuel 2021;285:119096. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2020.119096.
751	[46]	Nozari B, Mirmohamadsadeghi S. Bioenergy production from sweet sorghum stalks via a
752		biorefinery perspective. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol 2018.
753		https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-018-8833-8.
754	[47]	Amiri H, Karimi K. Integration of autohydrolysis and organosolv delignification for
755		efficient acetone, butanol, and ethanol production and lignin recovery. Ind Eng Chem Res
756		2016;55:4836–45. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.6b00110.
757	[48]	Najafi E, Castro E, Karimi K. Biorefining for olive wastes management and efficient
758		bioenergy production. Energy Convers Manag 2021;244:114467.
759		https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2021.114467.
760	[49]	Tsegaye B, Balomajumder C, Roy P. Organosolv pretreatments of rice straw followed by
761		microbial hydrolysis for efficient biofuel production. Renew Energy 2019.
762		https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2019.10.176.
763	[50]	Xu Y, Li K, Zhang M. Lignin precipitation on the pulp fibers in the ethanol-based
764		organosolv pulping. Colloids Surfaces A Physicochem Eng Asp 2007;301:255-63.
765		https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colsurfa.2006.12.078.
766	[51]	Fan M, Dai D, Huang B. Fourier Transform infrared spectroscopy for natural fibres-
767		materials analysis. InTech 2012. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.5772/35482.
768	[52]	Bukhari NA, Loh SK, Luthfi AAI, Nasrin AB, Abdul PM, Harun S, et al. Oil palm trunk

- biomass pretreatment with oxalic acid and its effect on enzymatic digestibility and
- fermentability. Mater Today Proc 2019;42:119–23.
- 771 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpr.2020.10.267.
- 772 [53] Wu Z, Lee YY. Nonisothermal simultaneous saccharification and fermentation for direct
- conversion of lignocellulosic biomass to ethanol. Appl Biochem Biotechnol Part A

Enzym Eng Biotechnol 1998;70–72:479–92. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02920161.

- [54] Mehrez I, Chandrasekhar K, Kim W, Kim S-H, Kumar G. Comparison of alkali and ionic
- liquid pretreatment methods on the biochemical methane potential of date palm waste
- biomass. Bioresour Technol 2022;360:127505.
- 778 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2022.127505.
- [55] Lesteur M, Bellon-Maurel V, Gonzalez C, Latrille E, Roger JM, Junqua G, et al.
- 780 Alternative methods for determining anaerobic biodegradability: A review. Process

781 Biochem 2010;45:431–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procbio.2009.11.018.

- [56] FAO. Proposal for an international year of date palm, COAG 2020, twenty-seventh
- session, 28 September 2 October 2020, Retrieved from:
- https://www.fao.org/about/meetings/coag/coag-27/list-of-documents/en/, (Accessed on
 May 14, 2022).
- 786 [57] Abd-Alla MH, Elsadek El-Enany AW. Production of acetone-butanol-ethanol from
- 787 spoilage date palm (Phoenix dactylifera L.) fruits by mixed culture of Clostridium
- acetobutylicum and Bacillus subtilis. Biomass and Bioenergy 2012;42:172–8.
- 789 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2012.03.006.
- [58] Elnajjar E, Al-Zuhair S, Hasan S, Almardeai S, Al Omari SAB, Hilal-Alnaqbi A.

- 791 Morphology characterization and chemical composition of United Arab Emirates date
- seeds and their potential for energy production. Energy 2020;213:118810.
- 793 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2020.118810.