

Comparing the effectiveness of three different biorefinery processes at recovering bioactive products from hemp (*Cannabis sativa* L.) byproduct

Leonardo Setti¹, Seyedeh Parya Samaei², Irene Maggiore¹, Lorenzo Nissen^{3*}, Andrea Gianotti^{2,3}, and Elena Babini²

¹CHIMIND (Department of Industrial Chemistry) *Alma Mater Studiorum* - University of Bologna, V.le Risorgimento 4, 40136, Bologna, Italy.

²DISTAL (Department of Agricultural and Food Sciences) *Alma Mater Studiorum* - University of Bologna, P.za G. Goidanich 60, 40122, Cesena (FC), Italy.

³CIRI (Interdepartmental Centre of Agri-Food Industrial Research), *Alma Mater Studiorum* - University of Bologna, Via Q. Bucci 336, 47521 Cesena (FC), Italy

ONLINE RESOURCE 3

Table S3. Total amount of HPB biorefinery products (% w/w, g lyophilized powder/100 g of HPB) obtained after chemical extraction, fermentation by *Lactobacillus* spp. (LB325, C1112, MR13 and their pool, at different incubation times), and SSF by *Pleurotus ostreatus* (samples PLH after 4, 9, 13 and 17 days of incubation). Means followed by the same letter did not differ significantly (Tukey test, *P* < 0.05)

Process and samples		Products yield (%)
<i>Enzymatic hydrolysis</i>		
HMBPI		7.00 ± 0.23
<i>Microbial fermentation</i>		
<i>Sample</i>	<i>Time (h)</i>	
Control	0	8.77 ± 0.38 ^{bcd}
Control	6	7.22 ± 0.59 ^{cd}
Control	24	6.58 ± 0.43 ^d
Control	72	6.52 ± 0.35 ^d
C1112	6	8.50 ± 0.44 ^{bcd}
C1112	24	9.40 ± 0.41 ^{bcd}
C1112	72	9.84 ± 0.21 ^{bc}
MR13	6	20.14 ± 0.39 ^a
MR13	24	20.39 ± 0.18 ^a
MR13	72	20.16 ± 0.36 ^a
LB325	6	10.65 ± 0.52 ^b
LB325	24	20.66 ± 0.43 ^a
LB325	72	20.78 ± 0.39 ^a
Pool	6	18.81 ± 0.19 ^a
Pool	24	21.58 ± 0.45 ^a
Pool	72	21.09 ± 0.27 ^a
<i>Solid state fermentation</i>		
<i>Sample</i>	<i>Time (days)</i>	
PLH	4	1.36 ± 0.11 ^a
PLH	9	2.27 ± 0.34 ^a
PLH	13	1.29 ± 0.30 ^a
PLH	17	1.84 ± 0.17 ^a