International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Sustainable Energy Materials: A Review of Biomass-Derived Materials for Energy Storage and Conversion

A. M. Okafor[1], K. D. Moh[2], E. A. Ani.[1,3] & K. E. Madu[1]

[1]Department of Mechanical Engineering, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Uli – Nigeria.
[2]Department of Mechanical Engineering, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka – Nigeria
[3]Department of Mechanical Engineering, Caritas University, Amorji-Nike, Enugu- Nigeria
Email: ke.madu@coou.edu.ng; kingsleyblack2@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The growing emphasis on sustainable energy technologies worldwide has motivated investigations into bio-derived materials for energy storage and conversion. This review highlights recent developments in biomass processing methods like pyrolysis and hydrothermal carbonization, which produce high-performance materials, such as hard carbon anodes and porous carbon electrodes. These materials provide renewable, sustainable alternatives to standard resources and alleviate environmental and geopolitical concerns associated with fossil fuels and rare metals. However, challenges remain, such as varying feedstock, large-scale production, and lower performance in acidic conditions. Cost-effectiveness and life-cycle trade-offs cloud the prospects for widespread adoption. The research also demonstrates the potential of hybrid systems and policy measures in addressing these challenges and highlights the role of biomass as a key sustainable energy technology compatible with Circular Economy guidelines.

Keywords: *Biomass-Derived Materials; Sustainable Energy Storage; Energy Conversion; Carbon-Neutral Materials*

1. Introduction

The global energy sector is evolving fast with urgent compulsion from imperatives of fossil fuel depletion, climate change, and environmental pollution. Though contributing over 80 percent of the world's energy currently, fossil fuels are not only nonrenewable but also responsible for the majority of the greenhouse gases approximately 89% of global CO_2 emissions in 2022 [1-4]. The resultant climate crisis with global temperature increases, extreme weather conditions, and ecosystem degradation has hastened the search for sustainable alternatives. Renewable energy sources such as solar, wind, and hydropower have gained traction, but their intermittency demands high-level energy storage and conversion technologies for reliability and grid stability[2,5,6]. However, most conventional energy storage materials, including lithium, cobalt, and rare-earth metals, are faced with critical challenges such as geopolitical supply risks, high cost, and severe environmental toxicity from source mining and end-of-life disposal [7,8]. For instance, lithium-ion batteries, despite market leadership, rely on cobalt, a material linked to unethical mining practices and supply chain vulnerability [9][10]. These limitations underscore the imperative to develop sustainable, eco-friendly materials that can meet the growing demand for energy storage and conversion without exacerbating environmental or socio-economic burdens[11,12].Within this scheme, biomass-derived materials have established themselves as a viable alternative based on their renewability, abundant availability, and carbon-neutral lifecycle[13]. As compared to synthetic materials, which normally require high-energy-consuming material processing, biomass harnesses organic wastes like agricultural residues, forestry residues, and algal biomass to produce high-value functional materials[14]. For instance, lignocellulosic biomass that accounts for almost 60% of the entire agricultural residue can be converted to porous carbon electrodes for supercapacitors or hard carbon anodes for sodium-ion batteries with comparable performance to conventional materials at much less process costs[15,16]. Additionally, biomass-derived materials comply with the philosophies of a circular economy since they add value to waste, reduce landfill pressures, and allow for carbon sequestration[17,18]. One example is the utilization of chitosan, a biopolymer derived from the exoskeletons of crustaceans, in proton-exchange membranes for fuel cells, with superior ionic conductivities that are also biodegradable [19]. The scalability and cost-effectiveness of biomass are clearly superior to those of other sustainable materials, such as metal-organic frameworks (MOFs) or graphene. Despite MOFs' remarkable porosity and catalytic activity, certain sustainability benefits are negated by the high temperatures and hazardous solvents used in their synthesis [20].Similarly, graphene, while being highly conductive, encounters scalability issues due to the complexity involved in its production process [21]. Biomass, on the other hand, is well-compatible with low-energy processes like hydrothermal carbonization or enzymatic hydrolysis, making it an apt choice for large-scale use.

The main scope of this review is to provide a systematic evaluation of the progress that has been made in biomass-derived materials for energy storage and conversion, highlighting their structural properties, performance metrics, and feasibility for practical applications. Over the past decade, remarkable progress has been made in the tailoring of biomass-derived carbon materials for specific applications, the best example of which is nitrogen-doped porous carbon for oxygen reduction reactions (ORR) in fuel cells, whose efficiency is now comparable to that of platinum catalysts [16,22]. Similarly, lignin-based binders have shown promise as alternatives to polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF) in lithium-ion batteries, with the added benefit of avoiding toxic solvents [23,24]. Yet, the quest for consistency in material quality, as opposed to the inherent variability of biomass feedstocks continues, as does the challenge of scaling production to mass quantities without compromising cost competitiveness against the functional value provided by conventional materials [25]. Moreover, while promising results are generally achieved at the laboratory scale, industrial implementation requires overcoming limitations in terms of long-term stability, lifecycle analysis, and compatibility with current energy supply infrastructure [26]. Biomass-derived supercapacitor electrodes show high capacitance under controlled experimental conditions but are subject to premature degradation under more realistic operational conditions [27]. This review discusses emerging trends, which include the deployment of machine learning algorithms for the optimization of processing parameters for biomass, along with the development of hybrid systems combining biomass with innovative nanomaterials like MXenes to enhance both the conductivity and the lifespan [28]. Synthesizing these observations, this paper attempts to lay down a strategic framework for future research activities, highlighting the scope for interdisciplinarity in overcoming technical, as well as economic, hurdles. Finally, the transition to biomass-derived energy materials is more than just a scientific endeavor; it is a holistic program that has to align with policy frameworks, industry norms, and sustainability missions to achieve a secure future supply of energy.

2.Biomass Processing and Material Synthesis

The transformation of biomass into sophisticated functional materials for energy applications represents a critical nexus of sustainability and technological advancement. Unlike conventional synthetic materials, which often rely on energy-intensive processes and non-renewable feedstocks, biomass offers a carbon-neutral solution that leverages the natural structural complexity of nature to create high-performance materials [29]. However, the process of translating raw biomass into functional energy materials is replete with scientific and engineering hurdles, requiring careful optimization of feedstock choice, conversion methods, and downstream treatment modifications to achieve the desired electrochemical properties. [30,31]. The diversity of biomass sources ranging from plant residues rice husks and stalks of the maize plant to biowaste of municipalities illustrates both challenge and opportunity. Lignocellulosic biomass, the majority of this material being residues from residues of agriculture or forestry-sourced residues, is most prized for the high level of carbon content and rigidity both of which are of utility for pyrolysis to conductive carbon matrix materials [32-34]. But the inherent heterogeneity with respect to the ratio of the cellulose, hemicellulose, and lignin components may give rise to material property variation impossible to remove short of the implementation of strict control procedures [35]. Controversies have been generated about the scale-up of material from biomass, some holding the position that the standardization of preprocessing procedures may remove these inconsistencies [36][37], but others holding the opinion that the inherent unreliability of natural feedstocks places limitations on their suitability to industry scale-up[38]. The process of conversion is the core to determining the function of the resultant material, and within this the scientific community is also split about the most productive and sustainable approaches. Thermochemical pyrolysis processes of hydrothermal carbonization are most widely utilized for their potential in converting biomass to porosity-controllable carbon-rich material with tunable surface chemistry. Mid-temperatures of pyrolysis, for example, at 500–700°C give rise to biochar of highly graphitic structure for battery anode material, while 800–1000°C produces disordered carbons as the supercapacitor electrode material of preference[3940].However, opponents of pyrolysis advance that the input of energy offsets the environmental gains, specially where the process is done using fossil fuels [41]. Hydrothermal carbonization, based on the usage of high-temperature and high-pressure water as the solvent, is less energetically intensive but has the drawback of preserving the functional groups like the hydroxyl and the carboxyl group for electrochemical activity [42-44]. There is equipment for reaction under high pressure that is an issue of costs, besides the issue of affecting the aspect of safety for industries at a large scale[45,46]. Chemical activation with KOH or $ZnCl_2$ is also an issue. KOH activation makes the ultra-high surface area (>2000 m^2/g) of the carbon structures a feature of much value in supercapacitors but at the price of toxic wastes that are tiresome to wash thus making disposal of wastes cumbersome [47,48].

Biological conversion pathways, i.e., enzymatic hydrolysis or fermentation, are greener but with respective limitations. Enzymatic hydrolysis can selectively depolymerize biomass to release residues or sugars for downstream processing but is ruled out for large-scale processing due to costs associated with the enzyme along with sensitivity to operation conditions [49,50]. Fermentation, on the other hand, has the potential to convert biomass to biofuels or platform chemicals but is restricted in applicability to material for energy due to low yield and long processing time [51,52]. To overcome these limitations, the research is now shifting towards hybrid approaches that exploit a synergy of the thermochemical and the biological steps. For example, the hydrolysis of lignocellulosic biomass prior to enzymatic treatment with dilute acid can promote ensuing fermentation to carbon precursors [53]. Functionality strategies expand the possibilities of biomass-derived materials even more. Heteroatom doping, i.e., incorporation of nitrogen or sulfur, may radically alter electronic properties, transforming inert carbon to an active catalyst for oxygen reduction reactions (ORR) in fuel cells [54,55]. The origin of the dopant, however, whether the synthetic reagents or the biomass itself, is a sustainability issue. Assuredly, some research leans towards self-doping from nitrogen-rich biomass like chitin or algae that eliminates the use of chemicals from the exterior [56], other authors are convinced that controlled doping with purified reagents ensures reproducibility, high performance [57,58].

Characterization of biomass-derived materials is also critical and divisive, in that the choice of analysis techniques may influence performance interpretations. Morphological features like pore structure and graphitic domains are found through structural characterization using SEM and TEM, but these techniques persistently provide restricted statistical sampling, with the possibility of overgeneralization [59]; [60]. While crystallinity analysis is extremely useful using XRD, this does not identify the presence of the amorphous phases that are characteristic in carbons derived from biomass material [61]. Surface area and porosity, also most commonly measured through BET analysis, are widely provided as defining parameters for materials intended for energy storage, but the procedure assumes geometry of idealized pore shapes that can misrepresent behaviour[62,63]. Electrochemical methods such as cyclic voltammetry (CV) and electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) are essential for the assessment of performance but are prone to experimental conditions like electrolyte composition and scan rates, which can result in variations between studies [64]. A given biomass-derived carbon, for example, can exhibit excellent capacitance in a controlled lab test using a three-electrode setup but not perform in an actual device because of binder resistance or electrode thickness [65]. These methodological discrepancies highlight the need for standard test protocols to allow comparisons between biomass-derived and conventional materials to be made fairly. The technical challenge of developing biomass-derived material is also a philosophic challenge in that it requires the confrontation of sustainability vs. high-performance achievement trade-offs. Success stories are claimed for lignin-derived hard carbons for sodium-ion batteries with capacities comparable to graphite in lithium systems (300–350 mAh/g, [66,67]. Other critics mention the poor cycling stability and rate capability of most biomass-derived electrodes compared to synthetic analogs [68,69]. The introduction of metal nanoparticles, for instance, iron or cobalt, to biomass carbons may enhance catalysis but raises the issues of resource scarcity and toxicity [70,71].New processes such as microwave-assisted pyrolysis and plasma functionalization have the potential to minimize some of these challenges through minimized inputs of energy and precise control over material properties [56], but to date, their scalability has not been determined. Ultimately, long-term sustainability of biomass-derived energetic materials will depend on a strategy that balances both ecological and technological metrics of performance. Lifecycle analyses (LCAs) will be the tools for doing so because they translate the overall environmental benefit of biomass processing pathwaysfrom feedstock cultivation to end-of-life disposal. Only insofar as these complexities are engaged head-on can biomass realize the potential that is present for it to become a foundation for sustainable energy storage and transformation.

3. Applications in Energy Storage

The addition of biomass-derived materials to the energy storage systems has been a revolutionary step to bypass the sustainability limitations of conventional technology. However, this is also a sphere that is plagued with inconsistencies where inducing breakthroughs at the level of the laboratory have been at loggerheads with the reality of practical deployment. Biomass-derived hard carbon material has been at the center of research in the technology of batteries as an anode for the lithium-ion (Li-ion) and sodium-ion (Na-ion) batteries, with a strong case for sustainability without the sacrifice of quality. Hard carbon from lignocellulosic biomass feedstocks, for example, wood or plant residues, has a disordered but stable structure that facilitates efficient intercalation of Na+ or Li+ to achieve capacities that are comparable to that of graphite (300–350 mAh/g for Li-ion, 250–300 mAh/g for Na-ion) [72]. These are said to bypass the geopolitical and ethical issues of the mining of graphite, most specifically Na-ion batteries, being touted to drive the low-cost aspect of the storage in the grid [70]. Use of biomass-derived materials for energy storage Though skeptics outline varying performance of biomass-derived carbons due to feedstock diversity Rice husk-derived hard carbon, for instance, may surpass that derived from coconut shells in cycling stability but is restricted due to sacrificed initial coulombic efficiency [73,74]. These inconsistencies have had calls for preprocessing and standardization improvement, but critics are convinced that these would undermine the cost advantage of biomass[75,37].Apart from anodes, lignin, a paper industry waste, has been employed as a conductive binder to replace polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF) in battery electrodes, addressing the toxicity concerns as well as valorization of the wastes [76,77]. The inherent polyphenolic character of lignin leads to some amount of adhesion along with slight conductibility to enable electrode integrity without employing harmful chemicals like N-methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP) [78,79]. Studies have established that the lignin-based binders can provide the same level of mechanical stability like PVDF at decreased electrode fabrication costs.[80,81]. However, hydrophilicity of lignin is said to compromise long-term performance in humid conditions, necessitating hydrophobic modification that jeopardizes the "green" credentials [82-84]. Similarly, biomass-derived electrolytes in the form of ionic liquid doped cellulose membranes offer biodegradable substitutes for synthetic polymers in solid-state batteries. Such a membrane has comparable ionic conductivity (>1 mS/cm) and thermal stability but suffers from a narrow electrochemical stability window that restrains high-voltage operation [85]. The question is whether the environmental benefit is compensated for at the cost of compromised performance, in this case for electric vehicles where energy density is paramount[86,87].

Another area where biomass-derived materials are gaining ground is that of supercapacitors, and more narrowly the form of porous carbon electrodes. The high surface area (>2000 m^2/g) and hierarchical porosity of biomass-derived activated carbons produced from peanut shells or bamboo, for example, allow for rapid charge/discharge rates and high capacity (200–300 F/g in aqueous electrolytes [88,89]. Supporters mention that the materials are functionally equal to synthetic carbons but produced at a fraction of the cost, some of which maintain 90% capacity retention at 10,000 cycles [90]. However, the use of chemical activators like KOH that result in toxic waste undermines the sustainability argument, with efforts to seek out self-activating feedstocks like seaweed that require little post-processing [91]. The quest for graphene analogs derived from biomass proves this paradox. While thermally exfoliating lignin or chitosan has been shown to yield highly conducting graphene-like sheets, the former do not possess the perfect crystallinity typical of CVD-synthesized graphene and thus have been restricted to comparatively low-power devices [92]. Chitosan gel supercapacitors, for example, highlight the unique advantages of biomass in new fields. Chitosan, a polysaccharide derived from the exoskeletons of crustaceans, produces strong hydrogels that may act as both electrolyte and separator, enabling ultrathin, wearable devices [93]. These systems achieve areal capacitances between 50–100 mF/cm^2 with being fully biodegradable a stark contrast to polymers that come from petroleum. Nonetheless, there are nevertheless obstacles to cross in terms of achieving competitive energy densities and scalability, with a few scientists arguing that hybrid structures with synthetic additives are perhaps inevitable for commercial reasonableness [27,94].In thermal energy storage, phase-change materials (PCMs) from biomass like plant oil fatty acids or composite paraffins of lignin are the renewable possibilities for building temperature management [95,96]. These PCMs possess latent heats of 150–200 J/g, comparable to petroleum-based analogs, and are carbon-neutral and non-toxic [22,97].Critics point to their flammability and low thermal conductivity that necessitate additives that reduce their environmental appeal [98-100]. Hydrogen storage is another important niche that exploits the microporosity of activated carbons from coconut shells or walnut hulls to physisorb H_2 at modest pressures. While these materials achieve decent storage capacities (2–3 wt% at 77 K), their room-temperature performance remains not good enough for realistic applications, and controversies about their role in a hydrogen economy have ensued [101].

3.1 Applications in Energy Conversion

The quest for green energy conversion processes has brought materials derived from biomass into the focus, offering an alluring union of environmental benefits and electrochemistry. But here is a space where new-age concepts battle out with stubborn technological limitations. In fuel cell technology, the development of carbon catalysts from biomass for oxygen reduction (ORR) and oxygen evolution reactions (OER) has shattered the traditional monopoly of platinum-based catalysts [102,103]. Nitrogen-doped plant-derived biomass or porous carbons made from chitosan exhibited exceptional alkaline medium ORR performance, onset potentials within a window of 50 mV from that of Pt/C, and exceptional methanol tolerance, an extremely desirable aspect in the event of direct methanol fuel cells [104]. Proponents envision these materials could reduce the cost of fuel cells by as much as 40% while preventing platinum sensitivity to poisoning [105]. However, critics cite the performance gap in acidic environments where biomass-based catalysts typically possess 100–150 mV higher overpotentials than Pt, limiting their application in proton-exchange membrane fuel cells [103,106]. This has sparked intense debates on whether further heteroatom doping (e.g., with sulfur or phosphorus) can bridge this gap, or if inherent material limitations will always limit biomass catalysts to niche applications[107,108].

Microbial fuel cells (MFCs) are another horizon where biomass technology meets with pragmatic realities. Bioelectrode utilization based on algae takes advantage of the conductivity of algal carbon scaffolds as well as the regenerating capability of catalytic sites within living microorganisms. Recent systems based on Spirulina-derived porous carbon anodes have achieved power densities of2.1 W/m² comparable to synthetic carbon felt systems while simultaneously treating wastewater [109,110]. Advocates point to the clean circularity of such systems, where waste biomass enables both energy generation and environmental remediation. However, the Achilles' heel of MFCs is that they have extremely low energy conversion efficiencies (typically <5%) and scalability challenges [111]. The same algae electrodes that work fine in pilot-scale reactors typically fail under actual circumstances that fluctuate, including organic load or pH variations that destabilize microbial populations [112,113]. This has escalated the heat for debate regarding whether MFCs should be responding to energy recovery or focus exclusively on their well-established wastewater treatment application, with certain researchers pushing for hybrid approaches encompassing integration of MFCs with traditional technology[16].Technologies for hydrogen production have also been transformed by biomass advances, though controversially. Photocatalytic biomass reforming with photoenergy being used to decompose lignocellulosic waste to produce H_2 is a potentially transformative alternative to water splitting. 10.29–12.77 mmol/g/h H_2 evolution rates from lignin or glucose are achieved by TiO_2-based systems modified with biomass-derived carbon dots with the additional advantage of waste valorization [114,115]. These "waste-to-hydrogen" processes are lauded for their double environmental benefits, but critics allude to their employment of sacrificial reagents and the unresolved problem of scaling photoreactor designs up from bench-top demonstrations[116,117]. More contentious is the use of biochar-supported catalysts for conventional water splitting. Although the high surface area of biochar and its metal-chelating properties make it an ideal support for Ni or Co electrocatalysts reducing overpotentials to 280–320 mV at 10 mA/cm² [118,119], long-term stability is called into question. The same defects that enhance the catalytic performance of biochar (e.g., oxygen vacancies) can also favor metal nanoparticle agglomeration during long-term operation [120]. This has split the research community between those advocating for defect engineering for performance optimization, and those in favor of protective coatings that may cancel out biochar's cost advantages [121].

In solar energy conversion, biomass-derived carbon quantum dots (CQDs) have generated excitement and skepticism. Synthesized from food waste or agricultural waste through hydrothermal synthesis, these CQDs exhibit tunable photoluminescence and excellent photon conversion efficiencies (>15% in some DSSC designs) [122,123]. Their ability to upconvert low-energy photons could potentially increase photovoltaic efficiencies beyond the Shockley-Queiser limit, but practical devices still experience stability issues under UV exposure. More fundamentally, the quantum yield of biomass CQDs (typically 20–30%) lags behind synthetic counterparts (40–60%), raising questions about whether the sustainability trade-off is acceptable for high-performance uses [124]. Similarly polarized is the use of biotemplates such as cellulose nanocrystals or butterfly wing scales to pattern light-harvesting materials. These approaches take advantage of nature's evolved photonic structures to design photoelectrodes with record light-trapping properties, including 30% broader absorption bandwidths than planar architectures [125]. But the weakness of these organic templates to high-temperature processing is a severe hindrance, and some workers consider that biomimetic synthetic replication will ultimately prove more practical than direct utilization of biomass [126,124]. Behind these technical arguments lies a deeper philosophical split regarding the place of biomass in energy conversion systems. Optimists see a future where cascading biorefineries combine fuel cells, hydrogen production, and photovoltaics in a closed-loop systemfor example, utilizing lignin waste from biofuel manufacture to produce ORR catalysts, which in turn facilitate clean hydrogen production ([127,128]. Pessimists counter that such visions ignore the ruthless thermodynamics of converting energy; biomass processes will consume more energy in than they output, especially when lifecycle effects are completely accounted for [129]. Perhaps the truth lies somewhere in the middle. The recent innovation of hybrid systems like biochar-graphene composite catalysts that marry biomass' sustainability with synthetic materials' performance suggests compromise is the path ahead[130].

3.2 Challenges and Limitations of Biomass-Derived Energy Materials

The transition to biomass-derived materials for energy application is a compelling picture of sustainable development, yet the transition is faced with intricate challenges that need paramount examination. At the technical level, the inherent composition variability of biomass is a fundamental obstacle to standardization and reliability. Unlike synthetic precursors with well-controlled chemical structure, biomass feedstocks possess radical differences in their structural components depending on species, growth environment, and harvesting period [131,132]. For instance, the content of lignin in crop residues varies from 15% to 30% among different crops and even among crops of the same kind [133], leading to discrepancies in the performance of derived carbon materials. This variability is passed on to the entire value chain, creating uncertain outcomes in critical parameters such as pore structure distribution in activated carbons or crystallinity in hard carbon anodes [134]. While some scientists advocate for the use of advanced machine learning algorithms to predict and compensate for such variabilities [135], others argue that such technological solutions only mask the inherent limitations of biomass as a precision engineering material [136]

The performance gap between biomass-derived and conventional materials is another long-standing controversy of ongoing debate in the research community. In energy storage applications, biomass-derived carbons tend to exhibit much lower conductivity values (10-50 S/cm) compared to synthetic graphitic materials (100-200 S/cm), at the expense of undesirable trade-offs between sustainability and performance [137]. Similarly, biomass-based battery electrode cycle stability lags behind due to residual heteroatoms and structure defects that induce electrolyte decomposition - a problem particularly serious in sodium-ion battery anodes where biomass-based hard carbons suffer 10-15% greater capacity fade after 100 cycles ([138-140]. Proponents contend that creative material designs, such as hierarchically porous structures combining micro- and mesopores [141], can compensate for such intrinsic limitations, whereas critics point out that these engineering solutions are often at the expense of exactly those sustainability benefits that make biomass attractive in the first place [136].Economic viability is perhaps the most direct stumbling block to large-scale adoption of biomass-derived energy materials. The utopian premise of "waste-to-wealth" more often than not runs afoul of the stark reality of biomass supply chains, in which expenses related to collection, transportation, and preprocessing can consume more than 45% of the whole production budget [142,143]. A techno-economic study of rice husk-derived silicon for battery anodes found that despite the zero-cost feedstock assumption, overall production cost was greater than that of conventional silicon due to energy-intensive purification steps [144,145]. Scalability of the processing methods raises the same concerns; however promising laboratory-scale pyrolysis or hydrothermal carbonization may be, large-scale processes are beset by heat transfer problems and byproduct management that greatly affect both output quality and process economics[146,147]. These economic realities have provoked opposing opinions, with some authors advocating distributed small-scale biorefineries in order to save on transport costs [148,149], while others have argued for intense process intensification to achieve the economies of scale that would make substantial market penetration possible[150,151]. The cost-effectiveness of biomass-derived materials becomes all the more uncertain when considering perpetually declining fossil-based equivalent prices. Petroleum coke, the peerless raw material for graphitic synthetic materials, has had level prices for many years due to established extraction and processing facilities [152,153]. By comparison, even optimistic predictions place the cost of production for biomass-derived carbons at 2−5/kg, representing a significant market barrier despite environmental benefits [154,155]. This economic fact has led some analysts to question whether biomass materials are competitive in the absence of large policy interventions such as carbon pricing or renewable material requirements [156,157],while others think that continuous process innovation will bridge the gap sooner or later as technologies mature [158]. Environmental trade-offs are probably the most subtle and contentious limits in the biomass energy materials realm. The alluring tale of carbon neutrality has a tendency to disregard the substantial water, land, and nutrient requirements of intensive biomass cultivation. Microalgae, which are usually promoted as a viable feedstock for bioelectrodes, require approximately 3,000-5,000 liters of water per kilogram of biomass produced and high fertilizer inputs that cause eutrophication [159,160]. Life-cycle analyses (LCAs) have equally complex images; whereas activated carbons derived from wheat straw have 40-50% lower global warming potential than coal-derived options, they carry 20-30% higher impacts in other categories like freshwater ecotoxicity and arable land occupation [161,162]. Such incongruous results have been associated with vehement methodological debate around the manner of appropriately quantifying carbon sequestration with regard to biomass production, appropriate accounting of effects when applying it in multi-product scenarios, and selection of correct systemic boundaries on which to calculate [163,164].The carbon neutrality hypothesis itself comes under increasing questioning as more thorough investigations become available. A number of recent studies show that based on energy sources used in processing and including indirect land-use changes, certain biomass pathways may end up producing more CO_2-equivalent emissions than their fossil fuel-based counterparts especially where forest-derived feedstocks are concerned [165,166]. Even ostensibly green processing methods like hydrothermal carbonization have unseen environmental costs if the high-pressure vessels used to make them are produced with energy-intensive processes and have short lifetimes [167]. These findings have stimulated calls for sophisticated, spatially explicit LCA techniques capable of capturing the full richness of biomass systems [168,169], though these approaches necessarily increase the expense and volume of data to analyze, and thus impose new barriers to comprehensive sustainability analysis.

The overlap of these technological, economic, and environmental limitations creates a web of issues that are not easy to resolve. The efforts to improve the performance of materials through more advanced functionalization, for example, by heteroatom doping or metal nanoparticle addition, tend to introduce new economic and environmental costs [170]. Similarly. Attempts to normalize biomass feedstocks through intensive preprocessing reduce technical heterogeneity at the cost of inflating cost and energy inputs, potentially offsetting the very sustainability gains that motivate biomass in the first place [171,37].This hydra-headed landscape has led some authors to question whether biomass is being pushed into applications where it's effectively just misplaced, potentially rather than steered into niches where its advantages can be recognized to greatest effect [172-174], while others suggest that with sufficient innovation and systems redesign, biomass can overcome current limitations to play a significant role in transitioning to a sustainable energy economy [175].

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

The creation of biomass-derived materials for energy conversion and storage is indicative of both the promise and challenge in the transition to renewable energy systems. Throughout this review, it has been demonstrated that biomass offers a renewable, carbon-neutral, and abundant raw material for application in anything from battery anodes and supercapacitor electrodes to catalytic systems for fuel cells and hydrogen generation. They have shown functional equivalence in many lab environments with value addition of waste valorization, low energy process, and synergies with circular economy concepts. However, challenges in scaling up these successes to industrial scales still continue to exist. Inherent feedstock variability, poor reproducibility, and inconsistency in electrochemical performance under real-world conditions still hinder large-scale implementation. The economic costs of preprocessing, collection logistics, and scalability also threaten to undermine biomass's touted cost-effectiveness. Moreover, performance trade-offs such as reduced conductivity, instability in acidic conditions, and compromised energy densities still exist compared to synthetic or fossil-based alternatives.

These are augmented by the insidious results of life-cycle assessments, which sometimes reveal greater ecological costs than anticipated when biomass systems are viewed in their entirety at each stage. Despite these trade-offs, the path forward need not be a binary choice between technical performance and ecological integrity. Rather, the future of biomass energy materials may lie in hybrid solutions combining biomass with high-performance additives, machine learning-optimized feedstocks, and the combination of multiple conversion pathways in cascade systems. Emerging innovations such as self-doped carbon materials, enzymatic preprocessing combined with hydrothermal treatment, and multifunctional composite electrodes are already bridging the gap between utility and sustainability. Yet, these advances will only reach full maturity with policy support and standardization in testing and lifecycle accounting. Therefore, it is recommended that future efforts be concentrated in three strategic areas: first, the development of standardized protocols for biomass material characterization and electrochemical testing; secondly, the development of modular, small-scale biorefineries that reduce transportation and preprocessing costs; and finally, the implementation of policy instruments that internalize environmental and societal costs of synthetic materials, thus leveling the playing field. A biomass-based materials future is sustainable but achievable only through concerted interdisciplinary effort, technological innovation, and regulatory foresight.

REFERENCES

[1] G. Wood, "Fossil Fuels in a Carbon-Constrained World," in *The Palgrave Handbook of Managing Fossil Fuels and Energy Transitions*, G. Wood and K. Baker, Eds., Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020, pp. 3–23. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-28076-5_1.

[2] S. Gandomi, M. Barzegar, S. Zolghadri, and M. R. Rahimpour, "The future of fossil fuels supply and impacts on sustainability," *Encyclopedia of Renewable Energy, Sustainability and the Environment*, p. 121, 2024.

[3] K. E. Madu and C. H. Achebe, "ENERGY CONSUMPTION REQUIREMENT AND WIND ENERGY GENERATION POTENTIAL OF A RURAL COMMUNITY," 2018, Accessed: Jan. 28, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://phd-dissertations.unizik.edu.ng/onepaper.php?p=344

[4] K. E. Madu, U. Nosegbe, E. K. Orhorhoro, and J. E. Igbagbon, "Performance Evaluation of a Photovoltaic System for Household in Asaba, Nigeria," *African Journal of Environmental Sciences and Renewable Energy*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 42–60, 2025.

[5] A. Burak and D. Eldar, "Sustainable power solutions: Renewable energy & storage advancements," *Journal of Science & Technology*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 13–34, 2024.

[6] K. E. Madu, E. I. Nwankwo, G. O. Okoronkwo, and J. I. Onyewudiala, "Micro-Mechanics Mercerization Analysis on the Tensile Strength and Interphase Quality of Stipa Stem Fibre-Reinforced Polypropylene Composite Materials," *Iconic Research and Engineering Journals*, vol. 3, no. 5, p. 73, 2019.

[7] B. E. Lebrouhi, S. Baghi, B. Lamrani, E. Schall, and T. Kousksou, "Critical materials for electrical energy storage: Li-ion batteries," *Journal of Energy Storage*, vol. 55, p. 105471, 2022.

[8] I. S. Filutich, M. V. Dobrokhotova, I. S. Kuroshev, and Y. V. Ukhina, "Trends and prospects of the market of rare earth metals and materials for electric power storage systems," *Russian Journal of Industrial Economics*, vol. 15, no. 4, 2023, Accessed: May 07, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://ideas.repec.org/a/ach/journl/y2023id1111.html

[9] N. Muralidharan, E. C. Self, J. Nanda, and I. Belharouak, "Next-Generation Cobalt-Free Cathodes – A Prospective Solution to the Battery Industry's Cobalt Problem*," in *Transition Metal Oxides for Electrochemical Energy Storage*, 1st ed., J. Nanda and V. Augustyn, Eds., Wiley, 2022, pp. 33–53. doi: 10.1002/9783527817252.ch3.

[10] S. Van den Brink, R. Kleijn, B. Sprecher, and A. Tukker, "Identifying supply risks by mapping the cobalt supply chain," *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, vol. 156, p. 104743, 2020.

[11] M. Fichtner, "Materials for sustainable energy production, storage, and conversion," *Beilstein Journal of Nanotechnology*, vol. 6, no. 1. Beilstein-Institut, pp. 1601–1602, 2015. Accessed: May 08, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.beilstein-journals.org/bjnano/articles/2190-4286-6-163

[12] A. M. Okafor and K. E. Madu, "Thermal Properties of Composite Materials: A systematic review of experimental and theoretical models," *Int. J. Res. Publ. Rev.*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 11018–11018, Apr. 2025, doi: 10.55248/gengpi.6.0425.15121.

[13] K. Madu and G. O. Okoronkwo, "Areca fiber-reinforced polyester bio-composites pull-out analysis," *Equatorial Journal of Chemical Sciences*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2018, Accessed: May 26, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3212488

[14] S. Yu, J. Sun, Y. Shi, Q. Wang, J. Wu, and J. Liu, "Nanocellulose from various biomass wastes: Its preparation and potential usages towards the high value-added products," *Environmental Science and Ecotechnology*, vol. 5, p. 100077, 2021.

[15] Z. Huang, J. Huang, L. Zhong, W. Zhang, and X. Qiu, "Deconstruction Engineering of Lignocellulose Toward High-Plateau-Capacity Hard Carbon Anodes for Sodium-Ion Batteries," *Small*, vol. 20, no. 50, p. 2405632, Dec. 2024, doi: 10.1002/smll.202405632.

[16] Y. Huang *et al.*, "A glance of coupled water and wastewater treatment systems based on microbial fuel cells," *Science of the Total Environment*, vol. 892, p. 164599, 2023.

[17] K. Madu, G. O. Okoronkwo, and E. I. Nwankwo, “Effects of fiber volume fraction and curing time on impact–hardness strength properties of areca fibers reinforced polyester thermoset composites,” *An International Open Free Access, Peer Reviewed Research Journal ISSN*, pp. 0184–7937, 2019.

[18] K. Madu and G. O. Okoronkwo, “Synthetic glass fiber-reinforced polyester polymer composite hybrid life cycle energy analysis,” *Equatorial Journal of Chemical Sciences*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2018, Accessed: May 26, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3197875

[19] F. A. Doobi and F. Q. Mir, “Exploring the development of natural biopolymer (chitosan)-based proton exchange membranes for fuel cells: A review,” *Results in Surfaces and Interfaces*, p. 100218, 2024.

[20] Q. Zhang, S. Yan, X. Yan, and Y. Lv, “Recent advances in metal-organic frameworks: Synthesis, application and toxicity,” *Science of The Total Environment*, vol. 902, p. 165944, 2023.

[21] J. H. Cho, D. Cayll, D. Behera, and M. Cullinan, “Towards repeatable, scalable graphene integrated micro-nano electromechanical systems (MEMS/NEMS),” *Micromachines*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 27, 2021.

[22] L. Liu *et al.*, “Novel bio-based phase change materials with high enthalpy for thermal energy storage,” *Applied Energy*, vol. 268, p. 114979, 2020.

[23] S. C. Mun, Y. H. Jeon, and J. H. Won, “Progress and challenges for replacing n-methyl-2-pyrrolidone/polyvinylidene fluoride slurry formulations in lithium-ion battery cathodes,” *Progress in Natural Science: Materials International*, 2024, Accessed: May 08, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S100200712400056X

[24] T. C. Nirmale, B. B. Kale, and A. J. Varma, “A review on cellulose and lignin based binders and electrodes: Small steps towards a sustainable lithium ion battery,” *International journal of biological macromolecules*, vol. 103, pp. 1032–1043, 2017.

[25] A. Ghosh, R. Buser, F. Héroguel, and J. Luterbacher, “Sustainable Materials: Production Methods and End-of-life Strategies,” *Chimia*, vol. 77, no. 12, pp. 848–857, 2023.

[26] Z. Xu *et al.*, “Advancing perovskite solar cell commercialization: Bridging materials, vacuum deposition, and AI-assisted automation,” *Next Materials*, vol. 3, p. 100103, 2024.

[27] S. S. Shah, “Biomass-derived carbon materials for advanced metal-ion hybrid Supercapacitors: A step towards more sustainable energy,” *Batteries*, vol. 10, no. 5, p. 168, 2024.

[28] C. Qian, K. Sun, and W. Bao, “Recent advance on machine learning of MXenes for energy storage and conversion,” *Intl J of Energy Research*, vol. 46, no. 15, pp. 21511–21522, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.1002/er.7833.

[29] A. Bachs-Herrera, D. York, T. Stephens-Jones, I. Mabbett, J. Yeo, and F. J. Martin-Martinez, “Biomass carbon mining to develop nature-inspired materials for a circular economy,” *IScience*, vol. 26, no. 4, 2023, Accessed: May 08, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.cell.com/iscience/fulltext/S2589-0042(23)00626-0

[30] F. Yu, S. Li, W. Chen, T. Wu, and C. Peng, “Biomass-Derived Materials for Electrochemical Energy Storage and Conversion: Overview and Perspectives,” *Energy & Environ Materials*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 55–67, Mar. 2019, doi: 10.1002/eem2.12030.

[31] Y. Sun, J. Miao, X. Fan, K. Zhang, and T. Zhang, “Recent Progress in Electrochemical Conversion from Biomass Derivatives into High-Value-Added Chemicals,” *Small Structures*, vol. 5, no. 7, p. 2300576, Jul. 2024, doi: 10.1002/sstr.202300576.

[32] K. N. Yogalakshmi *et al.*, “Lignocellulosic biomass-based pyrolysis: A comprehensive review,” *Chemosphere*, vol. 286, p. 131824, 2022.

[33] S. Yu, L. Wang, Q. Li, Y. Zhang, and H. Zhou, “Sustainable carbon materials from the pyrolysis of lignocellulosic biomass,” *Materials Today Sustainability*, vol. 19, p. 100209, 2022.

[34] K. E. Madu, G. O. Okoronkwo, and M. E. K. Orji, “Analysis of Areca Plant Stem Fibre Reinforced Polyester Thermo-set Composite Mechanical Properties,” *International Journal of Engineering and Technical Research*, vol. 9, pp. 28–32, 2019.

[35] H. Zhu *et al.*, “Wood-derived materials for green electronics, biological devices, and energy applications,” *Chemical reviews*, vol. 116, no. 16, pp. 9305–9374, 2016.

[36] R. M. O’Dea, J. A. Willie, and T. H. Epps, “100th Anniversary of Macromolecular Science Viewpoint: Polymers from Lignocellulosic Biomass. Current Challenges and Future Opportunities,” *ACS Macro Lett.*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 476–493, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1021/acsmacrolett.0c00024.

[37] A. E. Ray *et al.*, “Multiscale Characterization of Lignocellulosic Biomass Variability and Its Implications to Preprocessing and Conversion: a Case Study for Corn Stover,” *ACS Sustainable Chem. Eng.*, vol. 8, no. 8, pp. 3218–3230, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1021/acssuschemeng.9b06763.

[38] C. L. Williams, T. L. Westover, R. M. Emerson, J. S. Tumuluru, and C. Li, “Sources of Biomass Feedstock Variability and the Potential Impact on Biofuels Production,” *Bioenerg. Res.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 1–14, Mar. 2016, doi: 10.1007/s12155-015-9694-y.

[39] D. Bao, Z. Li, X. Liu, C. Wan, R. Zhang, and D.-J. Lee, "Biochar derived from pyrolysis of oily sludge waste: structural characteristics and electrochemical properties," *Journal of Environmental Management*, vol. 268, p. 110734, 2020.

[40] V. V. Pavlenko *et al.*, "Temperature dependent characteristics of activated carbons from walnut shells for improved supercapacitor performance," *Eurasian Chemico-Technological Journal*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 99–105, 2018.

[41] D. Kim, M. Han, N. Kim, J. Kim, and S. P. Jung, "Waste Plastic Pyrolysis Industry: Current Status and Prospects," *J Korean Soc Environ Eng*, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 395–407, 2024.

[42] C. J. Durán-Valle, A. B. Botet-Jiménez, and D. Omenat-Morán, "Hydrothermal Carbonisation: An Eco-Friendly Method for the Production of Carbon Adsorbents," in *Adsorption Processes for Water Treatment and Purification*, A. Bonilla-Petriciolet, D. I. Mendoza-Castillo, and H. E. Reynel-Ávila, Eds., Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017, pp. 77–108. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-58136-1_4.

[43] M. T. Reza, "Hydrothermal Carbonization," *Energies*, vol. 15, no. 15, Art. no. 15, Jan. 2022, doi: 10.3390/en15155491.

[44] K. Madu and A. E. Uyaelumuo, "Parametric analysis of the effects of carburizing process on the mechanical properties of carburized mild steel," *Equatorial Journal of Engineering (2018)*, pp. 14–21, 2018.

[45] Y. Shen, "A review on hydrothermal carbonization of biomass and plastic wastes to energy products," *Biomass and Bioenergy*, vol. 134, p. 105479, 2020.

[46] A. L. Pauline and K. Joseph, "Hydrothermal carbonization of organic wastes to carbonaceous solid fuel–A review of mechanisms and process parameters," *Fuel*, vol. 279, p. 118472, 2020.

[47] J. Wang and S. Kaskel, "KOH activation of carbon-based materials for energy storage," *Journal of materials chemistry*, vol. 22, no. 45, pp. 23710–23725, 2012.

[48] Y. Li, J. Mei, L. Wu, Q. Xu, and Z. Li, "Ultrahigh surface area hierarchical porous carbon derived from biomass via a new KOH activation strategy for high-performance supercapacitor," *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, vol. 49, pp. 67–80, 2024.

[49] K. Vasić, Ž. Knez, and M. Leitgeb, "Bioethanol production by enzymatic hydrolysis from different lignocellulosic sources," *Molecules*, vol. 26, no. 3, p. 753, 2021.

[50] S. Malgas *et al.*, "Enzymatic path to bioconversion of lignocellulosic biomass," in *Recent Advances in Bioconversion of Lignocellulose to Biofuels and Value-Added Chemicals within the Biorefinery Concept*, Elsevier, 2020, pp. 5–32. Accessed: May 09, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780128182239000023

[51] L. Gnanasekaran, A. K. Priya, S. Thanigaivel, T. K. Hoang, and M. Soto-Moscoso, "The conversion of biomass to fuels via cutting-edge technologies: Explorations from natural utilization systems," *Fuel*, vol. 331, p. 125668, 2023.

[52] K. E. Madu and G. O. Okoronkwo, "Analysis of adsorptive treatment of Brewery Effluent with Activated Black Date Seed Carbon," *Equatorial Journal of Engineering*, vol. 78, 2018.

[53] A. Woźniak, K. Kuligowski, L. Świerczek, and A. Cenian, "Review of Lignocellulosic Biomass Pretreatment Using Physical, Thermal and Chemical Methods for Higher Yields in Bioethanol Production," *Sustainability*, vol. 17, no. 1, Art. no. 1, Jan. 2025, doi: 10.3390/su17010287.

[54] R. Gutru *et al.*, "Recent progress in heteroatom doped carbon based electrocatalysts for oxygen reduction reaction in anion exchange membrane fuel cells," *international journal of hydrogen energy*, vol. 48, no. 9, pp. 3593–3631, 2023.

[55] K. A. Jannath and H. A. Saputra, "A Review on Recent Developments in Transition Metal and Heteroatom-Doped Carbon Catalysts for Oxygen Reduction Reaction," *Electrochemical Science Adv*, vol. 5, no. 2, p. e202400033, Apr. 2025, doi: 10.1002/elsa.202400033.

[56] H. Li, Y. Li, S. Zhu, Y. Li, I. Zada, and Y. Li, "Recent advances in biopolymers-based carbon materials for supercapacitors," *RSC Advances*, vol. 13, no. 47, pp. 33318–33335, 2023, doi: 10.1039/D3RA06179E.

[57] S. Kim *et al.*, "Controlled Doping of Electrocatalysts through Engineering Impurities," *Advanced Materials*, vol. 34, no. 28, p. 2203030, Jul. 2022, doi: 10.1002/adma.202203030.

[58] H. Wu, B. Guan, Y. Sun, Y. Zhu, and Y. Dan, "Controlled doping by self-assembled dendrimer-like macromolecules," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 41299, 2017.

[59] H. Safari, B. J. Balcom, and A. Afrough, "Characterization of pore and grain size distributions in porous geological samples–An image processing workflow," *Computers & geosciences*, vol. 156, p. 104895, 2021.

[60] J. E. Zuliani, C. Q. Jia, and D. W. Kirk, "Elucidating the Importance of Pore Structure in Determining the Double-Layer Capacitance of Nanoporous Carbon Materials," *J. Phys. Chem. C*, vol. 121, no. 38, pp. 20555–20566, Sep. 2017, doi: 10.1021/acs.jpcc.7b02944.

[61] J. Chen *et al.*, "Robust Biomass-Derived Carbon Frameworks as High-Performance Anodes in Potassium-Ion Batteries," *Small*, vol. 19, no. 7, p. 2206588, Feb. 2023, doi: 10.1002/smll.202206588.

[62] K. Yang *et al.*, "Graphdiyne and its Composites for Lithium-Ion and Hydrogen Storage," *Chemistry A European J*, vol. 29, no. 53, p. e202301722, Sep. 2023, doi: 10.1002/chem.202301722.

[63] T. S. Mathis, N. Kurra, X. Wang, D. Pinto, P. Simon, and Y. Gogotsi, "Energy Storage Data Reporting in Perspective—Guidelines for Interpreting the Performance of Electrochemical Energy Storage Systems," *Advanced Energy Materials*, vol. 9, no. 39, p. 1902007, Oct. 2019, doi: 10.1002/aenm.201902007.

[64] X. Zhao, P. Wang, Y. Wang, P. Chao, and H. Dong, "Coprecipitation synthesis and impedance studies on electrode interface characteristics of 0.5 Li2MnO3· 0.5 Li (Ni0. 44Mn0. 44Co0. 12) O2 cathode material," *Energies*, vol. 16, no. 16, p. 5919, 2023.

[65] M. Gowtham, M. Balaji, and C. Sivakumar, "Enhancing Supercapacitor Performance with Biomass-Derived Carbon Materials: A Review of Dimensional Innovations," *NanoNEXT*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 16–26, 2024.

[66] M. Härmas, A. Olgo, A. Adamson, M. Koppel, and A. Jänes, "Optimizing synthesis temperature for lignin-derived hard carbon anode for high cycling capacity in sodium-ion batteries," *Journal of The Electrochemical Society*, vol. 171, no. 2, p. 020539, 2024.

[67] Y. Jin *et al.*, "From waste biomass to hard carbon anodes: predicting the relationship between biomass processing parameters and performance of hard carbons in sodium-ion batteries," *Processes*, vol. 11, no. 3, p. 764, 2023.

[68] H. Jin, J. Li, Y. Yuan, J. Wang, J. Lu, and S. Wang, "Recent Progress in Biomass-Derived Electrode Materials for High Volumetric Performance Supercapacitors," *Advanced Energy Materials*, vol. 8, no. 23, p. 1801007, Aug. 2018, doi: 10.1002/aenm.201801007.

[69] Y. Wang *et al.*, "Biomass-Derived Carbon With Large Interlayer Spacing for Anode of Potassium Ion Batteries," *Advanced Materials*, vol. 36, no. 52, p. 2410132, Dec. 2024, doi: 10.1002/adma.202410132.

[70] Y. Li *et al.*, "Functional carbon-supported nanocatalysts for biomass conversion," *Molecular Catalysis*, vol. 538, p. 113003, 2023.

[71] K. Akhtar *et al.*, "Lignocellulosic biomass supported metal nanoparticles for the catalytic reduction of organic pollutants," *Environ Sci Pollut Res*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 823–836, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1007/s11356-019-06908-y.

[72] W. Zhang *et al.*, "Machine learning for hydrothermal treatment of biomass: A review," *Bioresource Technology*, vol. 370, p. 128547, 2023.

[73] L. Tan *et al.*, "High-Coulombic-Efficiency Hard Carbon Anode Material for Practical Potassium-Ion Batteries," *Batteries & Supercaps*, vol. 7, no. 5, p. e202400010, May 2024, doi: 10.1002/batt.202400010.

[74] Y. Tang *et al.*, "Electrochemical Behavior of the Biomass Hard Carbon Derived from Waste Corncob as a Sodium-Ion Battery Anode," *Energy Fuels*, vol. 38, no. 8, pp. 7389–7398, Apr. 2024, doi: 10.1021/acs.energyfuels.4c00564.

[75] Q. A. Nguyen, W. A. Smith, B. D. Wahlen, and L. M. Wendt, "Total and sustainable utilization of biomass resources: a perspective," *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, vol. 8, p. 546, 2020.

[76] I. Dobryden, C. Montanari, D. Bhattacharjya, J. Aydin, and A. Ahniyaz, "Bio-based binder development for lithium-ion batteries," *Materials*, vol. 16, no. 16, p. 5553, 2023.

[77] M. Baloch and J. Labidi, "Lignin biopolymer: The material of choice for advanced lithium-based batteries," *RSC advances*, vol. 11, no. 38, pp. 23644–23653, 2021.

[78] S. N. Bryntesen, I. Tolstorebrov, A. M. Svensson, P. Shearing, J. J. Lamb, and O. S. Burheim, "Introducing lignin as a binder material for the aqueous production of NMC111 cathodes for Li-ion batteries," *Materials Advances*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 523–541, 2023.

[79] Y. Qian *et al.*, "Direct Construction of Catechol Lignin for Engineering Long-Acting Conductive, Adhesive, and UV-Blocking Hydrogel Bioelectronics," *Small Methods*, vol. 5, no. 5, p. 2001311, May 2021, doi: 10.1002/smtd.202001311.

[80] S. N. Bryntesen, O. S. Burheim, and J. Lamb, "Introducing a Bio-Degradable Binder for Aqueous Production of NMC111 Cathodes," in *Electrochemical Society Meeting Abstracts 241*, The Electrochemical Society, Inc., 2022, pp. 2425–2425. Accessed: May 09, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1149/MA2022-0162425mtgabs/meta

[81] J. Dominguez-Robles, R. Sanchez, P. Diaz-Carrasco, E. Espinosa, M. T. García-Domínguez, and A. Rodriguez, "Isolation and characterization of lignins from wheat straw: Application as binder in lithium batteries," *International journal of biological macromolecules*, vol. 104, pp. 909–918, 2017.

[82] E. Lizundia and D. Kundu, "Advances in Natural Biopolymer-Based Electrolytes and Separators for Battery Applications," *Adv Funct Materials*, vol. 31, no. 3, p. 2005646, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1002/adfm.202005646.

[83] A. Lisỳ, A. Ház, R. Nadányi, M. Jablonskỳ, and I. Šurina, "About Hydrophobicity of lignin: A review of selected chemical methods for lignin valorisation in biopolymer production," *Energies*, vol. 15, no. 17, p. 6213, 2022.

[84] R. Herrera, F. Poohphajai, A. Sandak, and O. Gordobil, "Simultaneous improvement of surface wettability and UV resistance of wood with lignin-based treatments," *Polymers*, vol. 15, no. 16, p. 3409, 2023.

[85] X. Gong *et al.*, "Recent advances on cellulose-based solid polymer electrolytes," *Industrial Chemistry & Materials*, 2024, Accessed: May 09, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2024/im/d4im00066h

[86] J. H. Luong, C. Tran, and D. Ton-That, "A paradox over electric vehicles, mining of lithium for car batteries," *Energies*, vol. 15, no. 21, p. 7997, 2022.

[87] M. Tournaviti, C. Vlachokostas, A. V. Michailidou, C. Savva, and C. Achillas, "Addressing the Scientific Gaps Between Life Cycle Thinking and Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis for the Sustainability Assessment of Electric Vehicles' Lithium-Ion Batteries," *World Electric Vehicle Journal*, vol. 16, no. 1, Art. no. 1, Jan. 2025, doi: 10.3390/wevj16010044.

[88] M.-F. Wu, C.-H. Hsiao, C.-Y. Lee, and N.-H. Tai, "Flexible Supercapacitors Prepared Using the Peanut-Shell-Based Carbon," *ACS Omega*, vol. 5, no. 24, pp. 14417–14426, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.1021/acsomega.0c00966.

[89] S. M. X. Goh *et al.*, "Harnessing bamboo waste for high-performance supercapacitors: A comprehensive review of activation methods and applications," *Journal of Energy Storage*, vol. 105, p. 114613, 2025.

[90] N. Kumar, S.-B. Kim, S.-Y. Lee, and S.-J. Park, "Recent advanced supercapacitor: a review of storage mechanisms, electrode materials, modification, and perspectives," *Nanomaterials*, vol. 12, no. 20, p. 3708, 2022.

[91] T. Kar *et al.*, "A comprehensive analysis of Sargassum natans-derived inorganic carbon composite for electrochemical charge storage," *Journal of Energy Storage*, vol. 82, p. 110600, 2024.

[92] E. Sheikhzadeh, N. Akhyar, and W. W. A. W. Salim, "Synthesis, properties, and application of biomass-derived graphene-like material," *Graphene, Nanotubes and Quantum Dots-Based Nanotechnology*, pp. 189–208, 2022.

[93] J. M. Calderón Moreno, M. Chelu, and M. Popa, "Eco-Friendly Conductive Hydrogels: Towards Green Wearable Electronics," *Gels*, vol. 11, no. 4, p. 220, 2025.

[94] X. Zhu, Y. Zeng, X. Zhao, D. Liu, W. Lei, and S. Lu, "Biomass-Derived Carbon and Their Composites for Supercapacitor Applications: Sources, Functions, and Mechanisms," *EcoEnergy*, p. e70000, Mar. 2025, doi: 10.1002/ece2.70000.

[95] C. Baylis and C. A. Cruickshank, "Review of bio-based phase change materials as passive thermal storage in buildings," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 186, p. 113690, 2023.

[96] D. Li *et al.*, "Incorporation technology of bio-based phase change materials for building envelope: A review," *Energy and Buildings*, vol. 260, p. 111920, 2022.

[97] R. Ravotti, O. Fellmann, L. J. Fischer, J. Worlitschek, and A. Stamatiou, "Assessment of the thermal properties of aromatic esters as novel phase change materials," *Crystals*, vol. 10, no. 10, p. 919, 2020.

[98] Y. Yang, L. Haurie, and D.-Y. Wang, "Bio-based materials for fire-retardant application in construction products: a review," *J Therm Anal Calorim*, vol. 147, no. 12, pp. 6563–6582, Jun. 2022, doi: 10.1007/s10973-021-11009-5.

[99] J. Zhou *et al.*, "Biomass-Derived Carbon Materials for High-Performance Supercapacitors: Current Status and Perspective," *Electrochem. Energ. Rev.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 219–248, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s41918-020-00090-3.

[100] S. Jiang *et al.*, "Cellulose-based composite thermal-insulating foams toward eco-friendly, flexible and flame-retardant," *Carbohydrate Polymers*, vol. 273, p. 118544, 2021.

[101] E. Rivard, M. Trudeau, and K. Zaghib, "Hydrogen storage for mobility: a review," *Materials*, vol. 12, no. 12, p. 1973, 2019.

[102] Y. Jiao, K. Xu, H. Xiao, C. Mei, and J. Li, "Biomass-derived carbon aerogels for ORR/OER bifunctional oxygen electrodes," *Nanomaterials*, vol. 13, no. 17, p. 2397, 2023.

[103] A. Dessalle, J. Quílez-Bermejo, V. Fierro, F. Xu, and A. Celzard, "Recent progress in the development of efficient biomass-based ORR electrocatalysts," *Carbon*, vol. 203, pp. 237–260, 2023.

[104] Z. Yao, J. Ma, T. K. Hoang, M. Shi, and A. Sun, "High performance biomass-derived catalysts for the oxygen reduction reaction with excellent methanol tolerance," *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, vol. 45, no. 51, pp. 27026–27035, 2020.

[105] A. S. Alabi, A. P. I. Popoola, O. M. Popoola, N. R. Mathe, and M. Abdulwahab, "Materials for electrocatalysts in proton exchange membrane fuel cell: A brief review," *Frontiers in Energy Research*, vol. 11, p. 1091105, 2023.

[106] S. Zago, L. C. Scarpetta-Pizo, J. H. Zagal, and S. Specchia, "PGM-Free Biomass-Derived Electrocatalysts for Oxygen Reduction in Energy Conversion Devices: Promising Materials," *Electrochem. Energy Rev.*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 1, Dec. 2024, doi: 10.1007/s41918-023-00197-3.

[107] X. Hu, M. Fan, Y. Zhu, Q. Zhu, Q. Song, and Z. Dong, "Biomass-derived phosphorus-doped carbon materials as efficient metal-free catalysts for selective aerobic oxidation of alcohols," *Green Chemistry*, vol. 21, no. 19, pp. 5274–5283, 2019.

[108] Y. Rangraz and M. M. Heravi, “Recent advances in metal-free heteroatom-doped carbon heterogonous catalysts,” *RSC advances*, vol. 11, no. 38, pp. 23725–23778, 2021.

[109] A. A. Yaqoob, M. N. Mohamad Ibrahim, M. Rafatullah, Y. S. Chua, A. Ahmad, and K. Umar, “Recent advances in anodes for microbial fuel cells: an overview,” *Materials*, vol. 13, no. 9, p. 2078, 2020.

[110] N. A. Barakat *et al.*, “Synergistic advancements in sewage-driven microbial fuel cells: novel carbon nanotube cathodes and biomass-derived anodes for efficient renewable energy generation and wastewater treatment,” *Frontiers in Chemistry*, vol. 11, p. 1286572, 2023.

[111] E. A. Hamedani, A. Abasalt, and S. Talebi, “Application of microbial fuel cells in wastewater treatment and green energy production: a comprehensive review of technology fundamentals and challenges,” *Fuel*, vol. 370, p. 131855, 2024.

[112] S. Maryjoseph and B. Ketheesan, “Microalgae based wastewater treatment for the removal of emerging contaminants: A review of challenges and opportunities,” *Case studies in chemical and environmental engineering*, vol. 2, p. 100046, 2020.

[113] S. Garcia-Segura *et al.*, “Disparities between experimental and environmental conditions: Research steps toward making electrochemical water treatment a reality,” *Current Opinion in Electrochemistry*, vol. 22, pp. 9–16, 2020.

[114] M. F. Kuehnel and E. Reisner, “Solar Hydrogen Generation from Lignocellulose,” *Angew Chem Int Ed*, vol. 57, no. 13, pp. 3290–3296, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.1002/anie.201710133.

[115] C. Shi *et al.*, “Insights into Selective Glucose Photoreforming for Coproduction of Hydrogen and Organic Acid over Biochar-Based Heterojunction Photocatalyst Cadmium Sulfide/Titania/Biochar,” *ACS Sustainable Chem. Eng.*, vol. 12, no. 7, pp. 2538–2549, Feb. 2024, doi: 10.1021/acssuschemeng.3c04835.

[116] M. Zhang and P. Roth, “Flow photochemistry—from microreactors to large-scale processing,” *Current Opinion in Chemical Engineering*, vol. 39, p. 100897, 2023.

[117] P. Mani *et al.*, “Scaling up of photocatalytic systems for large-scale hydrogen generation,” *Applied Physics Reviews*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2025, Accessed: May 10, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://pubs.aip.org/aip/apr/article/12/1/011303/3330351

[118] Z. Ying, L. Gao, X. Zheng, B. Dou, and G. Cui, “Enhanced oxygen evolution reaction kinetics through biochar-based nickel-iron phosphides nanocages in water electrolysis for hydrogen production,” *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, vol. 47, no. 67, pp. 28782–28793, 2022.

[119] P. I. Soriano, G. J. Almonte, C. I. Sungcang, J. N. Perez, A. E. S. Choi, and J. R. Ortenero, “Enhancing Stability and Activity of Transition Metal Chalcogenides: Development of Carbon-Based Hydrochar Supported Nickel-Cobalt Selenide Electrocatalyst for Oxygen Evolution Reaction,” *ECS Transactions*, vol. 113, no. 1, p. 3, 2024.

[120] S.-F. Jiang, L.-L. Ling, Z. Xu, W.-J. Liu, and H. Jiang, “Enhancing the Catalytic Activity and Stability of Noble Metal Nanoparticles by the Strong Interaction of Magnetic Biochar Support,” *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, vol. 57, no. 39, pp. 13055–13064, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1021/acs.iecr.8b02777.

[121] P. Conte *et al.*, “Recent developments in understanding biochar’s physical–chemistry,” *Agronomy*, vol. 11, no. 4, p. 615, 2021.

[122] Z. Dong *et al.*, “Biomass-based carbon quantum dots and their agricultural applications,” *Plant Stress*, p. 100411, 2024.

[123] E. Dhandapani, N. Duraisamy, and R. M. Raj, “Green synthesis of carbon quantum dots from food waste,” *Materials Today: Proceedings*, vol. 51, pp. 1696–1700, 2022.

[124] L. Wang, S. Weng, S. Su, and W. Wang, “Progress on the luminescence mechanism and application of carbon quantum dots based on biomass synthesis,” *RSC advances*, vol. 13, no. 28, pp. 19173–19194, 2023.

[125] S. Tang, W. Qiu, S. Xiao, Y. Tong, and S. Yang, “Harnessing hierarchical architectures to trap light for efficient photoelectrochemical cells,” *Energy & Environmental Science*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 660–684, 2020.

[126] A. Gumyusenge and J. Mei, “High Temperature Organic Electronics,” *MRS Advances*, vol. 5, no. 10, pp. 505–513, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1557/adv.2020.31.

[127] M. Muhyuddin *et al.*, “Lignin-derived bimetallic platinum group metal-free oxygen reduction reaction electrocatalysts for acid and alkaline fuel cells,” *Journal of Power Sources*, vol. 556, p. 232416, 2023.

[128] W. Liu and X. Wu, “Ligin-derived graphene-like ultrathin carbon materials for ORR catalysis,” in *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, IOP Publishing, 2024, p. 012003. Accessed: May 10, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1742-6596/2749/1/012003/meta

[129] N. J. Sliper, “Energy Utilization and Conversion in Modern Biomass Conversion Technologies,” *Journal of Computational Intelligence in Materials Science*, vol. 2, pp. 001–011, 2024.

[130] G. Hristea, M. Iordoc, E.-M. Lungulescu, I. Bejenari, and I. Volf, “A sustainable bio-based char as emerging electrode material for energy storage applications,” *Scientific Reports*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 1095, 2024.

[131] J. Yan *et al.*, “Characterizing Variability in Lignocellulosic Biomass: A Review,” *ACS Sustainable Chem. Eng.*, vol. 8, no. 22, pp. 8059–8085, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.1021/acssuschemeng.9b06263.

[132] C. L. Williams, R. M. Emerson, and J. S. Tumuluru, “Biomass compositional analysis for conversion to renewable fuels and chemicals,” *Biomass volume estimation and valorization for energy*, pp. 251–270, 2017.

[133] F. Tan, L. He, Q. Zhu, Y. Wang, G. Hu, and M. He, “Characterization of different types of agricultural biomass and assessment of their potential for energy production in China,” *BioResources*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 6447–6464, 2019.

[134] L. Xie *et al.*, “Hard Carbon Anodes for Next-Generation Li-Ion Batteries: Review and Perspective,” *Advanced Energy Materials*, vol. 11, no. 38, p. 2101650, Oct. 2021, doi: 10.1002/aenm.202101650.

[135] T. Ji *et al.*, “Machine learning-assisted thermomechanical coupling fabrication of hard carbon for sodium-ion batteries,” *Energy Storage Materials*, vol. 71, p. 103563, 2024.

[136] M. Boyer, F. Kusche, S. Hackfort, L. Prause, and F. Engelbrecht-Bock, “The making of sustainability: ideological strategies, the materiality of nature, and biomass use in the bioeconomy,” *Sustain Sci*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 675–688, Mar. 2023, doi: 10.1007/s11625-022-01254-4.

[137] W. Lin, S. Zhao, B. Lu, F. Jiang, Z. Lu, and Z. Xu, “Structures, performances and applications of green biomass derived carbon in lithium-ion batteries,” *Energy Materials*, vol. 4, no. 5, p. N-A, 2024.

[138] R. Li, Y. Zhou, W. Li, J. Zhu, and W. Huang, “Structure Engineering in Biomass-Derived Carbon Materials for Electrochemical Energy Storage,” *Research*, vol. 2020, p. 2020/8685436, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.34133/2020/8685436.

[139] A. V. Baskar *et al.*, “Recent Progress in Synthesis and Application of Biomass-Based Hybrid Electrodes for Rechargeable Batteries,” *Adv Funct Materials*, vol. 33, no. 3, p. 2208349, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.1002/adfm.202208349.

[140] B. Zhong *et al.*, “Biomass-Derived Hard Carbon for Sodium-Ion Batteries: Basic Research and Industrial Application,” *ACS Nano*, vol. 18, no. 26, pp. 16468–16488, Jul. 2024, doi: 10.1021/acsnano.4c03484.

[141] S. A. Hesse *et al.*, “Materials Combining Asymmetric Pore Structures with Well-Defined Mesoporosity for Energy Storage and Conversion,” *ACS Nano*, vol. 14, no. 12, pp. 16897–16906, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1021/acsnano.0c05903.

[142] M. Jazinaninejad, M. Nematollahi, A. S. Zamenjani, and A. Tajbakhsh, “Sustainable operations, managerial decisions, and quantitative analytics of biomass supply chains: A systematic literature review,” *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 374, p. 133889, 2022.

[143] O. Abbasi, M. Mokhtari, R. Askari, S. Jambarsang, and A. A. Ebrahimi, “Forecast Future Production and Estimation of Future Costs of Municipal Solid Waste Collection and Transportation System in Yazd Using WAGS Software,” *Journal of Environmental Health and Sustainable Development*, 2020, Accessed: May 11, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://publish.kne-publishing.com/index.php/JEHSD/article/view/4961

[144] A. V. Fafure *et al.*, “Advances in Silicon-Carbon Composites Anodes Derived from Agro wastes for Applications in Lithium-ion battery: a review,” *Heliyon*, 2024, Accessed: May 11, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.cell.com/heliyon/fulltext/S2405-8440(24)07513-3

[145] S. Kim and Y.-I. Lim, “Economic Comparison of Nano-Porous Silica Production Processes from Rice Husk and Sand,” in *2023 AIChE Annual Meeting*, AIChE, 2023. Accessed: May 11, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://aiche.confex.com/aiche/2023/meetingapp.cgi/Paper/670243

[146] T. T.-T. Ho, A. Nadeem, and K. Choe, “A review of upscaling hydrothermal carbonization,” *Energies*, vol. 17, no. 8, p. 1918, 2024.

[147] E. Jansson, M. Kjell, and K. Ålund, “The Important Role of Pyrolysis and Hydrothermal Carbonization in a Sustainable Circular Bioeconomy: A Brief Literature Review,” *Studia Ecologiae et Bioethicae*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 101–114, 2024.

[148] A. López-Molina, D. Sengupta, C. Shi, E. Aldamigh, M. Alandejani, and M. M. El-Halwagi, “An integrated approach to the design of centralized and decentralized biorefineries with environmental, safety, and economic objectives,” *Processes*, vol. 8, no. 12, p. 1682, 2020.

[149] E. Angouria-Tsorochidou, D. A. Teigiserova, and M. Thomsen, “Environmental and economic assessment of decentralized bioenergy and biorefinery networks treating urban biowaste,” *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, vol. 176, p. 105898, 2022.

[150] F. J. Keil, “Process intensification,” *Reviews in Chemical Engineering*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 135–200, Feb. 2018, doi: 10.1515/revce-2017-0085.

[151] Z. Wang, *Process Intensification for the Valorization of Lignocellulosic Biomass-Derived Feedstocks*. University of Delaware, 2023. Accessed: May 11, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://search.proquest.com/openview/1531bece58765eaf9708d030830b6cba/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

[152] R. L. B. Cabral, E. R. V. P. Galvão, P. B. A. Fechine, F. M. F. Galvão, and J. H. O. do Nascimento, “A minireview on the utilization of petroleum coke as a precursor for carbon-based nanomaterials (CNMs): perspectives and potential applications,” *RSC advances*, vol. 14, no. 28, pp. 19953–19968, 2024.

[153] T. Rong *et al.*, “Electrochemical graphitization transformation of deposited carbon for Li-ion storage: sustainable energy utilization from coke oven solid waste,” *Journal of Materials Chemistry A*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 84–94, 2023.

[154] M. Elias, D. L. Sanchez, P. Saksa, J. Hunt, and J. Remucal, "Market analysis of coupled biochar and carbon credit production from wildfire fuel reduction projects in the western USA," *Biofuels Bioprod Bioref*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 1226–1237, Sep. 2024, doi: 10.1002/bbb.2614.

[155] E. Torres-Morales, D. Khatiwada, M. Xylia, and F. X. Johnson, "Investigating biochar as a net-negative emissions strategy in Colombia: Potentials, costs, and barriers," *Current Research in Environmental Sustainability*, vol. 6, p. 100229, 2023.

[156] D. Taylor, K. Chong, and M. Röder, "Designing biomass policy: The political economy of renewable energy for net zero," *WIREs Energy & Environment*, vol. 13, no. 2, p. e512, Mar. 2024, doi: 10.1002/wene.512.

[157] OECD, *Carbon Management: Bioeconomy and Beyond*. OECD, 2023. doi: 10.1787/b5ace135-en.

[158] C. L. Chambon, P. Verdía, P. S. Fennell, and J. P. Hallett, "Process intensification of the ionoSolv pretreatment: effects of biomass loading, particle size and scale-up from 10 mL to 1 L," *Scientific reports*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 15383, 2021.

[159] H. Hassan, F. A. Ansari, I. Rawat, and F. Bux, "Unlocking the potential of microalgae: Cultivation in algae recycled effluent with domestic wastewater for enhancing biomass, bioenergy production and CO2 sequestration," *Journal of Water Process Engineering*, vol. 68, p. 106499, 2024.

[160] L. M. Laurens, M. Chen-Glasser, and J. D. McMillan, "A perspective on renewable bioenergy from photosynthetic algae as feedstock for biofuels and bioproducts," *Algal Research*, vol. 24, pp. 261–264, 2017.

[161] Y. Ma, D. Li Liu, G. Schwenke, and B. Yang, "The global warming potential of straw-return can be reduced by application of straw-decomposing microbial inoculants and biochar in rice-wheat production systems," *Environmental Pollution*, vol. 252, pp. 835–845, 2019.

[162] J. B. Yong, L. S. Tan, and J. Tan, "Comparative life cycle assessment of biomass-based and coal-based activated carbon production," *Progress in Energy and Environment*, pp. 1–15, 2022.

[163] E. Hoxha *et al.*, "Biogenic carbon in buildings: a critical overview of LCA methods," *Buildings & Cities*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 504–524, 2020.

[164] P. Kumar *et al.*, "Carbon Sequestration and Soil Carbon Build-Up under *Eucalyptus* Plantation in Semi-Arid Regions of North-West India," *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 319–331, May 2021, doi: 10.1080/10549811.2020.1749856.

[165] Y. Jafri *et al.*, "Double yields and negative emissions? Resource, climate and cost efficiencies in biofuels with carbon capture, storage and utilization," *Frontiers in Energy Research*, vol. 10, p. 797529, 2022.

[166] M. S. Booth, "Not carbon neutral: Assessing the net emissions impact of residues burned for bioenergy," *Environmental Research Letters*, vol. 13, no. 3, p. 035001, 2018.

[167] G. Ischia and L. Fiori, "Hydrothermal Carbonization of Organic Waste and Biomass: A Review on Process, Reactor, and Plant Modeling," *Waste Biomass Valor*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 2797–2824, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s12649-020-01255-3.

[168] C. Vance, J. Sweeney, and F. Murphy, "Space, time, and sustainability: The status and future of life cycle assessment frameworks for novel biorefinery systems," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 159, p. 112259, 2022.

[169] L. Lijó, S. González-García, D. Lovarelli, M. T. Moreira, G. Feijoo, and J. Bacenetti, "Life Cycle Assessment of Renewable Energy Production from Biomass," in *Life Cycle Assessment of Energy Systems and Sustainable Energy Technologies*, R. Basosi, M. Cellura, S. Longo, and M. L. Parisi, Eds., in Green Energy and Technology. , Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2019, pp. 81–98. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-93740-3_6.

[170] M. Z. Yameen, S. R. Naqvi, D. Juchelková, and M. N. A. Khan, "Harnessing the power of functionalized biochar: progress, challenges, and future perspectives in energy, water treatment, and environmental sustainability," *Biochar*, vol. 6, no. 1, p. 25, Mar. 2024, doi: 10.1007/s42773-024-00316-3.

[171] Q. A. Nguyen, W. A. Smith, B. D. Wahlen, and L. M. Wendt, "Total and sustainable utilization of biomass resources: a perspective," *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, vol. 8, p. 546, 2020.

[172] C. Gatete and M.-H. Dabat, "From the fuel versus food controversy to the institutional vacuum in biofuel policies: evidence from West African countries," *Energ Sustain Soc*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 12, Dec. 2017, doi: 10.1186/s13705-017-0114-3.

[173] D. Khatiwada and P. Purohit, "Special issue on assessing the modern bioenergy potential and strategies for sustainable development: transformations through nexus, policy, and innovations," *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 1. MDPI, p. 374, 2021. Accessed: May 11, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/13/1/374

[174] A. A. Adeleke *et al.*, "Sustainability of multifaceted usage of biomass: A review," *Heliyon*, vol. 7, no. 9, 2021, Accessed: May 11, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.cell.com/heliyon/fulltext/S2405-8440(21)02128-9

[175] D. Mignogna, M. Szabó, P. Ceci, and P. Avino, "Biomass energy and biofuels: Perspective, potentials, and challenges in the energy transition," *Sustainability*, vol. 16, no. 16, p. 7036, 2024.