

Bio-Based Sustainable Materials

Suresh P^{1*}, Aruna K², Chandra Sekhar J³, Ganesh D⁴

¹Dept. of Chemistry, SRR & CVR Govt. Degree College(A), Vijayawada, A.P., India.

²Dept. of Microbiology, SRR & CVR Govt. Degree College(A), Vijayawada, A.P., India.

³Dept. of Physics, SCNR Govt. Degree College, Proddatur, YSR Kadapa DT., A.P., India.

⁴Department of Chemistry, Government Degree College (M), Srikakulam, A.P., India.

*Corresponding author's mail: sure111333@gmail.com

Abstract: *The transition toward sustainable materials has intensified research into renewable resources capable of replacing or complementing conventional fossil-derived materials. Bio-based sustainable materials are produced wholly or partly from renewable biological resources such as cellulose, starch, lignin, natural fibers, bacterial cellulose, algae, and other biopolymers. Their environmental potential arises from renewable feedstocks, opportunities for agricultural and industrial residue valorization, and the possibility of integrating biological resources into circular material systems. However, bio-based origin alone does not guarantee environmental sustainability, biodegradability, or superior performance. Material selection must therefore consider feedstock availability, processing requirements, mechanical and thermal properties, durability, end-of-life pathways, and life cycle impacts simultaneously. This paper reviews major bio-based material families, their processing routes, structure–property relationships, engineering applications, and circularity considerations. An evaluation framework is proposed using five original screening equations for feedstock sustainability, material performance, property improvement, mass retention, and circularity retention. Three comparative tables summarize material families, laboratory evaluation methods, and engineering characteristics. No experimental results are fabricated or claimed; the proposed framework is intended to guide future experimental and life cycle investigations. The review indicates that future progress depends on multifunctional material design, low-impact processing, interface engineering, standardized environmental assessment, and recycling or biological recovery strategies.*

Keywords: Bio-based materials, biopolymers, natural fibers, Bio composites, cellulose, lignin, sustainability, circular economy, life-cycle assessment, biodegradable materials.

I. INTRODUCTION

The growing environmental burden associated with fossil-resource extraction, energy-intensive manufacturing, persistent polymer waste, and greenhouse-gas emissions has encouraged the development of alternative material systems. Conventional plastics remain important because of their low cost, processability, chemical resistance, and broad engineering utility; however, their dependence on fossil resources and challenges associated with end-of-life management have stimulated research into renewable material alternatives [1], [2]. Bio-based materials provide one potential route by incorporating biological resources into polymers, composites, coatings, fibers, films, packaging structures, construction materials, and functional products.

The term *bio-based* describes materials containing carbon or constituents derived wholly or partly from biological renewable resources. It does not automatically imply biodegradability. Similarly, biodegradability does not necessarily indicate low environmental impact because degradation conditions, additives, processing energy, transportation, and feedstock cultivation can influence the overall life cycle [8], [10], [11]. Therefore, sustainable material development requires a broader assessment extending beyond the origin of the raw material.



Important bio-based resources include cellulose, starch, lignin, natural fibers, proteins, bacterial cellulose, algae-derived polymers, and bio-derived monomers [5]–[7], [18]–[20]. Cellulose is particularly attractive because of its abundance, renewability, high specific strength, and ability to form fibers, nanocellulose structures, films, and composites [5], [6]. Natural fibers such as jute, flax, hemp, sisal, kenaf, and agricultural residues can reinforce polymer matrices while reducing material density and increasing renewable content [13]–[16]. Lignin, traditionally treated as a low-value fraction of biomass processing, is increasingly investigated as a feedstock for carbon materials, functional additives, polymer modifiers, and advanced composites [17].

Recent research has shifted from simply replacing petroleum-derived materials toward structure-engineered and circular bio-based materials. Structure engineering can modify crystallinity, molecular architecture, interfacial bonding, moisture resistance, thermal stability, and degradation behaviour [20]. Similarly, contemporary bioplastic research increasingly considers the complete material pathway from feedstock acquisition to processing, use, recycling, and final disposal [8], [21].

The objective of this paper is to provide a concise technical review of major bio-based sustainable materials and propose an integrated framework for evaluating their material performance and sustainability. The paper emphasizes material design, processing, characterization, applications, limitations, and circularity rather than reporting new experimental measurements.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Material Classification

Bio-based sustainable materials can be grouped according to their primary biological resource and material architecture. The major families considered in this review are cellulose-based materials, starch-based materials, lignin-derived materials, natural-fiber composites, bacterial cellulose, algae-derived materials, and bio-based polymer systems.

Table 1. Major Bio-Based Material Families and Design Characteristics

Material family	Principal source	Typical form	Major advantages	Key limitation
Cellulose/nanocellulose	Wood, agricultural biomass	Fibers, films, nanofibers	High specific strength, renewable	Moisture sensitivity
Starch materials	Crops and residues	Films, molded products	Abundant, low cost	Poor moisture resistance
Lignin materials	Pulping/biorefinery residues	Blends, additives, carbon materials	Aromatic structure, residue valorization	Structural variability
Natural-fiber composites	Jute, flax, hemp, sisal, etc.	Panels, molded parts	Low density, renewable reinforcement	Fiber–matrix interface
Bacterial cellulose	Microbial fermentation	Films, membranes, scaffolds	High purity and nanofibrillar network	Production cost
Algae-derived materials	Microalgae/macrosalgae	Films, polymers, additives	Non-food biomass potential	Scale-up complexity
Bio-based polymers	Biomass-derived monomers	Films, fibers, molded parts	Thermoplastic processing possible	Cost and end-of-life dependence

The classification emphasizes that no single material family is universally superior. Performance depends on composition, processing, morphology, environmental exposure, and application requirements.

2.2 Feedstock Selection

Feedstock selection is the first stage in sustainable material development. Renewable availability, cultivation requirements, water consumption, land competition, transportation distance, processing intensity, and residue-



generation potential should be considered. Agricultural and industrial residues are particularly attractive because their use can improve resource efficiency without necessarily requiring dedicated cultivation [8], [9].

A conceptual Feedstock Sustainability Index (FSI) is proposed for preliminary comparison:

$$FSI = \frac{R + W + C}{E + L + P} \quad (1)$$

where R represents renewable availability, W represents waste/residue valorization potential, C represents circularity potential, E represents processing energy demand, L represents land/resource burden, and P represents processing complexity. Each parameter can be normalized before calculation. Equation (1) is a proposed screening tool and is not a standardized life-cycle assessment metric.

2.3 Material Processing

Bio-based materials may be manufactured using mechanical, thermal, chemical, biological, or hybrid processing. Common operations include fiber extraction, drying, grinding, pulping, chemical modification, fermentation, blending, extrusion, compression molding, injection molding, casting, and additive manufacturing.

Processing conditions influence molecular structure and final properties. Excessive thermal treatment may accelerate degradation of some biopolymers, while inadequate drying can produce voids and poor interfacial bonding in composites. Chemical modification may improve compatibility or water resistance but can introduce additional chemicals and energy requirements. Consequently, processing optimization must consider both performance improvement and environmental burden [3], [20], [21].

III. EXPERIMENTAL AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

This paper does not present fabricated experimental data. Instead, an evaluation framework is proposed for future laboratory investigation of bio-based materials.

3.1 Physical and Mechanical Characterization

Important physical properties include density, moisture uptake, water absorption, thickness stability, and dimensional change. Mechanical characterization should include tensile strength, tensile modulus, flexural strength, impact resistance, hardness, and elongation depending on the intended application [13]–[16].

For composites, fiber orientation, fiber length, volume fraction, surface treatment, matrix compatibility, void content, and processing pressure strongly affect mechanical behaviour. Improved interface bonding generally enhances stress transfer between reinforcement and matrix, whereas poor wetting may produce premature failure.

A simple property-improvement parameter is proposed:

$$PI = \frac{P_t - P_r}{P_r} \times 100 \quad (2)$$

where P_t is the property of the treated or modified material and P_r is the corresponding reference value. This equation can be applied to strength, modulus, thermal stability, water resistance, or another measurable property.

3.2 Thermal and Structural Characterization

Thermal stability can be evaluated using thermogravimetric analysis and differential scanning calorimetry. Fourier-transform infrared spectroscopy can identify functional-group changes, while X-ray diffraction can provide information about crystallinity. Scanning electron microscopy is useful for studying fracture surfaces, fiber dispersion, porosity, and interfacial adhesion.

For cellulose-based materials, crystallinity and fibrillar architecture influence stiffness, barrier properties, and moisture response [5], [6]. In lignin-containing systems, chemical structure and molecular distribution affect compatibility, optical properties, thermal behaviour, and potential functionalization [17].



3.3 Degradation and Environmental Testing

Biodegradation should be evaluated under defined environmental conditions rather than inferred solely from the term “bio-based.” Temperature, humidity, microbial population, oxygen availability, material thickness, crystallinity, and additives influence degradation rate [2], [10].

Mass retention can be monitored using:

$$MR = \frac{m_t}{m_0} \times 100 \quad (3)$$

where m_0 is initial dry mass and m_t is dry mass after a specified exposure period. Lower mass retention indicates greater material loss, but mass reduction alone should not be interpreted as complete mineralization.

Table 2. Proposed Laboratory Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation area	Representative method	Main parameter	Purpose
Physical	Density, water absorption	Density, uptake	Structural stability
Mechanical	Tensile/flexural/impact tests	Strength, modulus	Engineering suitability
Thermal	TGA/DSC	Decomposition, transitions	Thermal processing limits
Chemical	FTIR	Functional groups	Modification verification
Structural	XRD/SEM	Crystallinity, morphology	Structure–property relation
Degradation	Controlled exposure	Mass retention, appearance	End-of-life behaviour
Environmental	LCA framework	Energy/emissions/resources	Sustainability assessment

3.4 Integrated Sustainability Evaluation

Life-cycle assessment provides a systematic framework for considering environmental impacts across material production, use, and end-of-life [25]. For bio-based materials, the analysis should include biomass production or residue collection, pretreatment, conversion, manufacturing, transportation, use, recycling, composting, biodegradation, or disposal.

An integrated screening metric is proposed:

$$SMPI = \frac{w_1M + w_2R + w_3C + w_4D}{w_5E + w_6G + w_7W} \quad (4)$$

where M is mechanical performance, R is renewable content, C is circularity potential, D is durability or application performance, E is energy demand, G is greenhouse-gas burden, and W represents water/resource burden. The w_i terms represent application-specific weighting factors. This is a conceptual screening index and must not be confused with a certified LCA indicator.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Cellulose-Based Materials

Cellulose is one of the most abundant renewable polymers and is available from wood, agricultural residues, cotton, and other biomass sources [5], [6]. Its hydroxyl-rich molecular structure supports hydrogen bonding and enables the production of fibers, films, nanocellulose, aerogels, coatings, and composite reinforcements.

Nanocellulose, including cellulose nanofibrils and cellulose nanocrystals, has attracted significant attention because nanoscale fibrillar structures can provide high stiffness and large specific surface area. However, hydrophilicity remains a major challenge when cellulose is incorporated into hydrophobic polymer matrices. Surface modification, compatibilization, coating, or hybrid reinforcement can improve interface performance.



4.2 Starch-Based Materials

Starch is widely available and relatively inexpensive. It can be converted into thermoplastic starch through plasticization and thermal processing. Starch-based materials are attractive for packaging and disposable applications, but their sensitivity to water and changes in humidity can reduce dimensional and mechanical stability [2], [12].

Blending starch with other polymers, fibers, nanocellulose, or hydrophobic components can improve performance. However, additives should be evaluated from both functional and environmental perspectives because a material containing a high proportion of non-renewable additives may have reduced overall sustainability.

4.3 Natural-Fiber-Reinforced Composites

Natural-fiber composites combine renewable reinforcement with a polymer matrix. Jute, flax, hemp, sisal, kenaf, bamboo, and agricultural residues are among the commonly investigated fibers [13]–[16]. Their low density and relatively high specific mechanical properties make them promising for automotive components, panels, furniture, consumer products, and construction materials.

The primary challenge is often the fiber–matrix interface. Natural fibers contain cellulose, hemicellulose, lignin, and surface functional groups that influence moisture absorption and compatibility. Treatments such as alkali treatment, silane modification, acetylation, or physical treatments can alter surface chemistry and improve adhesion. Nevertheless, treatment intensity should be optimized because additional processing can increase environmental impact.

4.4 Lignin-Derived Materials

Lignin is an abundant aromatic biopolymer generated in large quantities during biomass processing. Its complex structure and aromatic functionality make it attractive for adhesives, polymer blends, coatings, carbon materials, antioxidants, and functional composites [17].

The valorization of lignin supports a biorefinery approach in which multiple biomass fractions are converted into higher-value products. However, lignin properties vary according to biomass source and extraction method. Such variability can complicate reproducibility and industrial standardization.

4.5 Bacterial Cellulose and Algae-Based Materials

Bacterial cellulose possesses a highly interconnected nanofibrillar structure and can be produced through microbial fermentation [18]. Its high purity, flexibility, and surface area make it relevant to membranes, packaging, biomedical structures, and functional films. The principal barriers include fermentation productivity, nutrient requirements, drying energy, and scale-up economics.

Algae represent another emerging renewable resource. Their potential advantages include rapid biomass generation and the possibility of producing materials without relying exclusively on terrestrial agricultural land [19]. Current research explores algae-derived polymers, fillers, pigments, films, and biocomposite components. Industrial implementation requires improved biomass harvesting, processing efficiency, consistency, and economic feasibility.

4.6 Bio-Based Plastics and Structural Engineering

Bio-based plastics include polymers derived wholly or partly from biological feedstocks. Poly (lactic acid), polyhydroxyalkanoates, bio-derived polyamides, and other systems demonstrate that renewable feedstocks can support thermoplastic and engineering applications [1], [3], [4], [20].

Poly (lactic acid), for example, has attracted substantial attention because it can be processed using established thermoplastic technologies. However, brittleness, limited heat resistance, and application-dependent end-of-life requirements can restrict performance [3], [4]. Material modification through blending, plasticization, copolymerization, reinforcement, and nanocomposite formation can address some limitations.



Recent studies increasingly emphasize that material sustainability should include recycling and recovery strategies rather than focusing only on biodegradation [8], [21]. A durable bio-based product that can be repeatedly recycled may provide a different sustainability advantage from a short-lived biodegradable product.

Table 3. Comparative Engineering Assessment

Material family	Strength potential	Moisture sensitivity	Processing complexity	Circular opportunity	Typical applications
Cellulose/nanocellulose	High	High	Medium	High	Films, coatings, composites
Starch	Moderate	High	Low-medium	High	Packaging, disposable products
Natural-fiber composites	High specific strength	Medium-high	Medium	Medium-high	Automotive, panels
Lignin systems	Variable	Medium	Medium-high	High	Adhesives, composites, carbon materials
Bacterial cellulose	Moderate-high	High	High	High	Films, membranes, functional materials
Algae materials	Variable	Application dependent	High	High	Packaging, additives, biomaterials
Bio-based thermoplastics	Moderate-high	Low-medium	Medium	Application dependent	Packaging, consumer and engineering products

4.7 Circularity and End-of-Life Considerations

Circularity requires retaining material value for as long as practicable. Mechanical recycling, chemical recycling, reprocessing, reuse, controlled biodegradation, composting, and energy recovery may represent different end-of-life pathways depending on material composition [8], [21].

A proposed Circularity Retention Ratio (CRR) is:

$$CRR = \frac{MR + MU + MC}{M_0} \times 100 \quad (5)$$

where MR represents material retained after processing or use, MU represents material recovered for reuse, MC represents material recovered through recycling, and M_0 is the initial material quantity. Because these terms require careful definition to avoid double counting, Equation (5) should be treated as a conceptual framework rather than a standardized circularity indicator.

The broader lesson is that end-of-life strategy should be incorporated during material design rather than added after product development. For example, multilayer structures may provide excellent barrier performance but complicate recycling. Similarly, heavily modified natural fibers may deliver improved durability while making biological degradation less predictable.

V. APPLICATIONS, ADVANTAGES AND LIMITATIONS

5.1 Packaging

Packaging is one of the most active application areas because lightweight films, trays, coatings, and containers can incorporate starch, cellulose, PLA, PHA, and fiber-based structures [4], [12]. Important performance requirements include barrier properties, mechanical integrity, food-contact safety, moisture resistance, and shelf-life compatibility.



5.2 Automotive and Transportation

Natural-fiber composites can reduce component density while providing acceptable stiffness for selected semi-structural applications. Their use in interior panels and other components can also support renewable-content targets [13]–[16]. However, moisture variability, dimensional stability, fire performance, impact behaviour, and long-term durability require application-specific validation.

5.3 Construction

Bio-based materials are increasingly investigated for insulation, panels, fiber-reinforced products, binders, and supplementary construction components [24]. Construction applications offer opportunities for long service life and carbon storage, but fire resistance, moisture management, biological durability, structural reliability, and building-code compliance remain essential.

5.4 Biomedical and Functional Materials

Cellulose, bacterial cellulose, chitosan, starch derivatives, and other biological polymers can provide useful surface chemistry and structural architectures for biomedical and functional applications. These applications require much stricter control of purity, sterilization, toxicity, degradation behaviour, and reproducibility than ordinary consumer products.

5.5 Major Advantages

The principal advantages of bio-based materials include:

- Renewable feedstock availability.
- Potential reduction in fossil-resource dependence.
- Utilization of agricultural and industrial residues.
- Opportunities for lightweight composite design.
- Functionalization through biological chemistry.
- Potential integration with recycling and biological recovery.
- Development of regional biorefineries and resource-value chains.

5.6 Major Limitations

Despite their potential, several barriers remain:

Feedstock composition can vary substantially.

Agricultural resources may compete with food or land requirements.

Moisture sensitivity is common in many natural polymers.

Some materials have limited thermal stability.

Natural-fiber interfaces may be weak without modification.

Processing costs may exceed those of established petroleum-derived materials.

Biodegradation is strongly dependent on environmental conditions.

Additives and multilayer structures may complicate end-of-life management.

Environmental benefits can vary considerably with cultivation, processing, transport, and disposal conditions [9]–[11].

Therefore, the objective should not simply be to maximize renewable content. Instead, the preferred material is one that satisfies the functional requirement with an optimized combination of renewable feedstock, durability, resource efficiency, low-impact processing, and realistic end-of-life recovery.



VI. FUTURE SCOPE

Future research should move from single-property optimization toward integrated material design. Mechanical strength, thermal stability, moisture resistance, recyclability, biodegradability, and environmental performance should be considered simultaneously.

First, residue-based feedstocks deserve greater attention because they can increase biomass utilization without necessarily requiring dedicated agricultural production. Regional resource mapping can identify residues suitable for cellulose, lignin, fibers, sugars, or bio-derived monomers.

Second, interface engineering should remain a major research direction. Surface functionalization, compatibilizers, bio-based coupling agents, and nanoscale reinforcement can improve composite performance. Their additional environmental burden should nevertheless be quantified.

Third, scalable processing is essential. Laboratory-scale solvent-intensive methods may demonstrate excellent properties but become impractical at industrial scale. Future studies should therefore report material yield, energy consumption, solvent recovery, process time, and waste generation alongside mechanical and thermal properties.

Fourth, standardized sustainability assessment is required. Life-cycle studies should use consistent functional units, system boundaries, allocation procedures, and end-of-life assumptions [25]. Recent life-cycle research demonstrates that bio-derived materials can have substantially different environmental profiles depending on their feedstocks and manufacturing pathways [9]–[11].

Fifth, circularity should be designed into the material from the beginning. Recyclable formulations, reversible interfaces, mono-material structures, repairable products, and controlled biological degradation should be investigated according to application requirements. The objective should be to preserve material value rather than simply accelerate disposal.

Finally, digital material design and data-driven optimization could connect composition, processing conditions, structure, performance, and environmental impact. Such integrated approaches may accelerate the development of bio-based materials that are not only renewable but also technically competitive and environmentally credible.

VII. CONCLUSION

Bio-based sustainable materials provide an important pathway toward reducing dependence on finite fossil resources and improving biomass utilization. Cellulose, starch, lignin, natural fibers, bacterial cellulose, algae, and bio-derived polymers offer diverse opportunities for packaging, transportation, construction, functional products, and other applications. However, renewable origin alone is insufficient to establish sustainability.

The technical performance of these materials is strongly influenced by molecular structure, morphology, processing conditions, moisture response, fiber–matrix interaction, and end-of-life behaviour. At the same time, environmental performance depends on feedstock production or residue collection, processing energy, chemical inputs, transportation, product lifetime, recycling, and disposal conditions.

This review therefore proposes an integrated evaluation approach combining material characterization with sustainability and circularity considerations. The five proposed equations provide conceptual screening tools rather than replacements for standardized testing or life-cycle assessment. No experimental results have been fabricated or claimed.

The future of bio-based materials lies in performance-oriented circular design: selecting appropriate renewable resources, minimizing processing burdens, engineering interfaces and structures, extending useful lifetime where appropriate, and developing credible recycling or biological recovery routes. With these principles, bio-based materials can progress from niche alternatives toward technically reliable components of a circular materials economy.



REFERENCES

- [1] M. M. Reddy, S. Vivekanandhan, M. Misra, S. K. Bhatia, and A. K. Mohanty, "Biobased plastics and bionanocomposites: Current status and future opportunities," *Progress in Polymer Science*, vol. 38, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.progpolymsci.2013.05.006.
- [2] I. Vroman and L. Tighzert, "Biodegradable polymers," *Materials*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 307–344, 2009, doi: 10.3390/ma2020307.
- [3] R. M. Rasal, A. V. Janorkar, and D. E. Hirt, "Poly(lactic acid) modifications," *Progress in Polymer Science*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 338–356, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.progpolymsci.2009.12.003.
- [4] M. Jamshidian, E. A. Tehrany, M. Imran, M. Jacquot, and S. Desobry, "Poly-lactic acid: Production, applications, nanocomposites, and release studies," *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 552–571, 2010, doi: 10.1111/j.1541-4337.2010.00126.x.
- [5] S. Kalia, A. Dufresne, B. M. Cherian, B. S. Kaith, L. Avérous, J. Njuguna, and E. Nassiopoulou, "Cellulose-based bio- and nanocomposites: A review," *International Journal of Polymer Science*, 2011, Article 837875, doi: 10.1155/2011/837875.
- [6] D. Klemm, B. Heublein, H.-P. Fink, and A. Bohn, "Cellulose: Fascinating biopolymer and sustainable raw material," *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, vol. 44, no. 22, pp. 3358–3393, 2005, doi: 10.1002/anie.200460587.
- [7] A. K. Mohanty, M. Misra, and L. T. Drzal, Eds., *Natural Fibers, Biopolymers, and Biocomposites*. Boca Raton, FL, USA: CRC Press, 2005.
- [8] J.-G. Rosenboom, R. Langer, and G. Traverso, "Bioplastics for a circular economy," *Nature Reviews Materials*, vol. 7, pp. 117–137, 2022, doi: 10.1038/s41578-021-00407-8.
- [9] N. Shah et al., "Life cycle sustainability assessment of bioderived advanced materials: A state-of-the-art review," *Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering*, vol. 12, no. 6, 114387, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.jece.2024.114387.
- [10] V. Shanmugam, E. Kaynak, O. Das, and L. P. Padhye, "Environmental performance of bioplastics: Degradation pathways, chemical leaching, and life-cycle implications," *npj Materials Sustainability*, vol. 4, Article 9, 2026, doi: 10.1038/s44296-026-00096-w.
- [11] S. Walker and R. Rothman, "Life cycle assessment of bio-based and fossil-based plastic: A review," *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 261, 121158, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121158.
- [12] V. Siracusa, P. Rocculi, S. Romani, and M. Dalla Rosa, "Biodegradable polymers for food packaging: A review," *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, vol. 19, no. 12, pp. 634–643, 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.tifs.2008.07.003.
- [13] O. Faruk, A. K. Bledzki, H.-P. Fink, and M. Sain, "Biocomposites reinforced with natural fibers: 2000–2010," *Progress in Polymer Science*, vol. 37, no. 11, pp. 1552–1596, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.progpolymsci.2012.04.003.
- [14] K. L. Pickering, M. G. A. Efeudy, and T. M. Le, "A review of recent developments in natural fibre composites and their mechanical performance," *Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing*, vol. 83, pp. 98–112, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.compositesa.2015.08.038.
- [15] S. Nagaraja et al., "Synergistic advances in natural fibre composites: A comprehensive review of the eco-friendly bio-composite development, its characterization and diverse applications," *RSC Advances*, vol. 14, pp. 17594–17611, 2024, doi: 10.1039/D4RA00149D.
- [16] N. E. Ajayi, S. Rusnakova, A. E. Ajayi, R. O. Ogunleye, S. O. Agu, and A. N. Amenaghawon, "A comprehensive review of natural fiber reinforced polymer composites as emerging materials for sustainable applications," *Applied Materials Today*, vol. 43, 102666, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.apmt.2025.102666.
- [17] R. Shorey, A. Salaghi, P. Fatehi, and T. H. Mekonnen, "Valorization of lignin for advanced material applications: A review," *RSC Sustainability*, vol. 2, pp. 804–831, 2024, doi: 10.1039/D3SU00401E.
- [18] Y. Yan, L. Liu, F. Wang et al., "Bacterial cellulose as a promising biodegradable bioplastic for sustainability," *Nature Communications*, vol. 17, Article 4387, 2026, doi: 10.1038/s41467-026-71025-7.



- [19] C. Ma, X. Zhou, B. Zhao, W. Qu, and S.-H. Ho, "Algae-based biomaterial synthesis and applications for a sustainable green bioeconomy: A review," *Journal of Biotechnology*, vol. 416, pp. 38–55, 2026, doi: 10.1016/j.jbiotec.2026.04.010.
- [20] X. Ji, K. Zhou, M. H. Tran, X. Chen, and N. Yan, "Converting natural biopolymers to sustainable bioplastics via structure engineering," *Chemical Science*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 1423–1460, 2026, doi: 10.1039/D5SC07592K.
- [21] Y. Tang, Z. Zhan, S. De, U. Marathe, H. Tekinalp, S. Ozcan, W. Dong, Q. Jin, X. Zhao, and Y. Li, "Sustainable biobased composites: From raw materials to recycling," *Composites Part B: Engineering*, vol. 311, 113188, 2026, doi: 10.1016/j.compositesb.2025.113188.
- [22] "Cellulose based bioplastics: A sustainable approach toward environmental safety—A review," *Sustainable Materials and Technologies*, vol. 46, e01694, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.susmat.2025.e01694.
- [23] C. V. L. Giosafatto, M. Avitabile, M. Famiglietti, T. Kordjazi, M. Moosavi-Nasab, O. F. Restaino, and L. Mariniello, "Sustainable bioplastics manufacturing from renewable sources," *FEBS Open Bio*, vol. 16, pp. 686–708, 2026, doi: 10.1002/2211-5463.70174.
- [24] S. Gao, Y. Gu, X. Wang, Z. Liu, H. Zhang, P. Feng, Z. Wei, and L. Jiang, "A comprehensive bibliometric and systematic review of bio-based construction materials: From supplementary components to cornerstones of sustainable construction," *Energy and Buildings*, vol. 361, 117433, 2026, doi: 10.1016/j.enbuild.2026.117433.
- [25] International Organization for Standardization, *ISO 14040:2006 Environmental Management—Life Cycle Assessment—Principles and Framework*. Geneva, Switzerland: ISO, 2006.

