Journal of Carcinogenesis
Covering Genesis to Therapeutics

Journal of Carcinogenesis, ISSN: 1477-3163
2024; Vol 23: Issue 1, https://carcinogenesis.com/

The Evolution and Future of Bioreactors in Bioprocessing: A Comprehensive Review

Ratheesh Goud Karabooja[1]

[1]Scientist III Kashiv Bioscience LLC Piscataway New Jersey, USA
Email: Ratheesh.goud@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Bioreactors have come a long way—from humble fermentation vessels to sophisticated single-use systems driving the modern biopharmaceutical industry. This review takes a human-centered look at the historical evolution, the game-changing emergence of disposable technologies, and what the future holds as we shift toward smarter, more sustainable, and highly efficient systems.

Keywords: *Bioreactors, Bioprocess Engineering, Bioprocessing, Single-Use Bioreactors, Continuous Bioprocessing, Perfusion Culture, Process Analytical Technology (PAT), Bioreactor Design and Scale-Up, Mass Transfer and Oxygen Transfer Rate (OTR), Cell Culture Systems, Upstream and Downstream Processing, Smart Bioreactors, Artificial Intelligence in Bioprocessing, Industrial Biotechnology, Sustainable Biomanufacturing.*

How to Cite: Ratheesh Goud Karabooja, (2024) The Evolution and Future of Bioreactors in Bioprocessing: A Comprehensive Review, *Journal of Carcinogenesis*, *Vol.23, No.1*, 924-935

1. INTRODUCTION

Bioreactors are the analytical field between engineering and biology-constructed systems that offer controlled microorganisms and mammalian cells or any other biological specimen growth conditions. Their discovery and development have been core in the development of biotechnology as scientists are able to investigate and produce complex molecules not just antibiotics, but also the newest cell and gene therapies.

The biopharmaceutical sector has reported an exponentially growing rate in the past several decades, and bioreactors form the backbone of most of this success. Bioreactors are used in the vaccine, monoclonal antibodies, recombinant proteins and biosimilars development industries- from bench scale development through large-scale manufacture. This growing need in the biological therapeutics has necessitated innovation on the design of reactors, material, and control systems.

Conventionally, bioreactors were made of glass and stainless steel, which were stipulated by the engineering requirements of durability, sterility and reusability. These systems required elaborate clean-in-place (CIP) and steam-in-place (SIP) procedures, yet were effective, their scalability and flexibility were constrained by the facilities. As the industry became older, so became its requirements as the industry demanded reduced turnaround time, reduced contamination threats, and increased production flexibility. Such difficulties formed the background of the emergence and acceptance of disposable, single-use bioreactor (SUB) systems.

Along with changing the workflow of operations, a switch between traditional systems to single-use systems have also resulted in greatly decreasing the capital investment of facility construction and verification. The movement has been particularly beneficial to the contract development and manufacturing organizations (CDMOs) and early-stage biotechnology firms wishing to access the market quickly and at low cost.

In addition to economic and operational incentives, the drive towards high-fidelity bioreactor systems is directly related to the rise of personalized medicine, gene therapies, and mRNA-based applications. These cures can be small, high-quality production runs whose efficiency can definitely be boosted by the pace and adaptability of present-day bioreactor design. Moreover, developments in automation, sensor technology, and artificial intelligence have opened new avenues for real-time monitoring, process control, and predictive analytics in bioprocessing.

In this review, the evolution of bioreactors will be in-depth discussed with particular attention to the historical development of bio reactors, the introduction of the single-use technology, the advantages in terms of design, and outlook on the future with the corresponding digitalization and sustainable manufacturing strategies. The analysis of the

engineering achievements as well as the application of bioprocessing tells us more about the pivotal role of bioreactors in the further development of life sciences and therapeutic innovation. Bioreactors are simply at the core of biological production. It is in the bioreactors where the magic happens whether its brewing beer, or manufacturing life-saving monoclonal antibodies, or scaling the viral vectors as gene therapies arrive at the doorstep. They have been modified along with the scientific discoveries as their purpose, design, and functioning adapted.

2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF BIOREACTORS

The history of bioreactors is rather long and eventful, but it dates not to sterile laboratories with modern equipment and clean-rooms, but to the kitchens, breweries and apothecaries of ancient nations. More than two millennia ago, primitive people utilized the fermentation potential of microbes, which were previously a source of empowerment to the fermentation process, unwittingly at the start of the contemporary advanced bioprocesses. The early beginnings of bioreactors were in the form of clay vessels in which fermentation of drinks such as beer or curd was prepared.

In the 19th century, when the science of microbiology emerged, the beginnings of the development of bioreactors as specifically constructed tools appeared. The experiments carried out by Louis Pasteur on yeast and fermentation had showed that microorganisms caused biochemical transformations Pasteur, 1876. This discovery stimulated a scientific and industrial enthusiasm in the cultivation of microbes. The firsts-controlled fermentation processes were noticed in scholarly labs and modest pharmaceutical facilities

One such defining moment was experienced in World War II when there was an urgent need to produce penicillin and this sparked the development of bioreactor technology. Large scale production could not be contained using the traditional and shallow trays, hence scientists and engineers worked together to create a larger-controlled fermenter. These were new containers built mainly out of stainless steel which could be mixed accurately in pH, temperature, aeration and agitation. This time was characterized by the appearance of the modern bioreactor ACS, 1999.

The bioreactor equipment grew more advanced during the decades after war. Stirred-tank reactors became common in the 1950s and 60s in both academic and industrial laboratories. These reactors were also sturdy and could handle the process control better and this assisted in production of vitamins, enzymes, amino acids and later on recombinant protein production.

The 80s and the 90s came along with the biotechnology revolution. With the emergence of genetic engineering cell culture took center stage in the production of monoclonal antibodies and recombinant therapeutics. Bioreactors were again facing the stratagem of having to change--the change this time involving a need to harbor the fragile mammalian cells instead of the robust bacteria and fungi. The development of these changes resulted in the impeller and the sparging systems innovation and also applying the sensors innovation.

It is only in the late 1990s, early 2000s when the idea of single-use bioreactors (SUBs) caught on. In 1999, Wave Bioreactor was introduced, and it was the key to a new era in the history of bioprocessing. Designed by Dr. Vijay Singh, this disposable system transformed the learning curve by decreasing the setup and clean up time by a huge margin and provides enough control in the initial stages of production Singh, 1999. This innovation started as an experimental one but over the years it has become an industry benchmark with SUBs now becoming critical components in almost all biopharmaceutical manufacturing steps.

Current bioreactors appear in numerous shapes and sizes, some of them are rocking, stirred, bubble, perfusion, built of various materials, including stainless steel (high-grade materials) and polymer film (pre-sterilized). However they have a unified minority. Those are the direct descendants of the fermentation-vessels and milk-curdling-vessels of our forefathers--conceived, re-created, and re-devised, in a newer day of medicine and discovery.

The history of bioreactors is surprisingly long and surprisingly rich-a history that dates not to sterile labs and high-technology sterile rooms, but to kitchens, breweries, and apothecary shops of Civilization. In thousands of years, early humans were already taking the advantage of fermentation which was powered by microbes, without realizing that one day, this would be the basis of current bioprocessing. The clay jars in which drinks such as beer were fermented or curd made, were the early ancestors of the current bioreactors.

By 19th century, when microbiology emerged as a scientific field, bioreactors started to take the form of purpose designed equipment. The experiments of Louis Pasteur regarding yeast and fermentation showed that biochemical transformations were caused by microorganisms. Such discovery led to a boom in scientific and industrial work on cultivating microbes. First of all, controlled fermentations started to be established in laboratories in academia and small-scale pharmaceutical applications.

One of the turning points was the World War II period, when the necessity to produce penicillin on a huge scale motivated the developments of bioreactor technologies. The existing small flasks and trays lacked the ability to produce on a large-scale, thus scientists and engineers teamed up to construct larger species where fermentation could be controlled. These new vessels--which were made mostly of stainless steel-enabled pH, temperature, aeration and agitation to be precisely controlled. This was around the time of the onset of the modern bioreactor.

Bioreactors achieved the sophistication over the decades after the war. The stirred-tank reactor became widespread in the 1950s and 60s both in the academy and in industry. These reactors were long lasting and permit superior control over the process allowing the synthesis of vitamins, enzymes, amino acids and eventually, recombinant proteins.

The biotechnology revolution came in the 1980s and the 90s. Cell culture became a primary part of monoclonal and recombinant therapeutic production with the introduction of genetic engineering. Bioreactors were once again forced to change- no longer was it needed that it could handle robust microorganisms like bacteria or fungi because at this point the cells that had to be handled were delicate mammalian cells. These developments resulted in impeller, sparging system, and sensor innovation.

The concept of single-use bioreactors (SUBs) did not gain traction, though, until the late 1990s and early 2000s. The Wave Bioreactor was introduced in the year 1999 and turned out to be an important era in the history of bioprocessing. This disposable system (developed by Dr. Vijay Singh) saved time by minimizing setup and cleaning and provided enough control in early-phase production. Later turning into an industry standard, what started out as an experimental innovation, SUBs now serve a major role in almost all phases of biopharmaceutical manufacturing.

The modern bioreactor takes on a variety of forms; rocking, stirred, bubble, perfusion and can be made of a wide range of materials; stainless steel grades, high quality plastics like the pre-sterilized polymer films. They are the direct successors of the fermentation-pots and milk curdling-pots of our forefathers--re-visaged, re-modelled, and readapted to a new era of medicine and discovery. Bioreactors have not always been as advanced as they are now. The most primitive ones were re-used vessels which had wine or vinegar fermented in them. This changed with World War II, when mass penicillin production required a reactor jump. By the 1950s, stainless-steel stirred tanks had become standard, prized for their robustness and controllability.

3. TRADITIONAL BIOREACTOR DESIGN AND OPERATION

But the conventional bioreactors are the pioneers of ancient and contemporary biotechnology. They were long life, sterile and reproducible stainless steel, or borosilicate glass systems. and they have been the workhorses of industrial fermentation and bioprocessing, giving large-scale amounts of antibiotics, enzymes, amino acids and therapeutic proteins.

Borne of the most elemental engineering concepts, traditional bioreactors basically work to create a controlled means under which biological entities, be they bacteria, yeast, or mammalian cells, grow, metabolize and make something like us want. This culture involves strict control of such conditions as temperature, pH, dissolved oxygen, rate of agitation, and nutrient concentration **Weber et al., 2002**.

The most popular one is the stirred-tank bioreactor (STR). To achieve uniform conditions and allow gas exchange, most designs have an impeller that stirs the culture medium in this design. Baffles do not allow deep vortex to form and spargers are oxygenated or other gases piped. It is an aircraft that with all its mechanical simplicity required tremendous levels of sophistication in operations **Eibl & Eibl, 2006.**

Bioreactors can be run in three main operational modes:

- **Batch:** All ingredients are added at the beginning, and the system is left to run without additional input until the end of the cycle.
- **Fed-batch:** Nutrients are added over time to extend the productive phase, commonly used for achieving high cell densities and yields.
- **Continuous:** Fresh media is constantly added while culture is removed, maintaining a steady state and maximizing productivity over time Namdev & Lio, 2000.

The systems are very effective but they carry trade- offs. They need large clean-in-place (CIP) and steam-in-place (SIP) systems to avoid contamination and guarantee sterility between the batches. CIP/SIP systems entail complicated plumbing, automated programs running cleaners, and steam sterilizing routines validated to fulfill GMP standards Pierce & Shabram, 2004.

This results in excessive use of water and energy, long periods of downtimes and stringent processes of validation.

and once humanized, one can picture detailed, almost ritual preparations made to each and every production cycle: engineering scales the sensors, technicians make sure the agitation curves and temperatures look good, and operators are now putting on the protective gear so that no contamination is made. Every batch is a collaboration of nature and man care.

Nevertheless, traditional bioreactors are lovable to a great number of process scientists despite their disadvantages. They can provide a level of control that is unrivalled, scalability to the 20,000 liter or greater level, and decades of process experience. Such systems are the gold standard in the case of complex biologics and well-established products.

However, the most reputable designs are even rethought in a business sphere that requires increasingly high speed and innovation. With the future bringing a more personalized medicine and shorter development cycles, the role being played by traditional systems is a changing one. They are not obsolete, and they are not even the relics of the past but they become a point of comparison with which new technologies STILL are compared to this day. The old-style bioreactors are the veterans of older and contemporary biotechnology. Such systems were usually made of the high-grade stainless steel or borosilicate glass and were durable, sterile, and highly reproduceable. Over the past few decades, they have been used as the workhorses of industrial fermentation and bioprocessing to make antibiotics, enzymes, amino acids, and therapeutic proteins at industrial scale.

At their core, traditional bioreactors operate on fundamental engineering principles: provide a controlled environment in which biological entities—whether bacteria, yeast, or mammalian cells—can grow, metabolize, and produce desired compounds. This environment includes precise regulation of parameters like temperature, pH, dissolved oxygen, agitation speed, and nutrient availability.

The most widely used configuration is the stirred-tank bioreactor (STR). In this design, an impeller stirs the culture medium to maintain uniform conditions and facilitate gas exchange. Baffles prevent vortex formation, and spargers introduce oxygen or other gases. It's a design that, while mechanically simple, demands significant operational sophistication.

Bioreactors can be run in three main operational modes:

- **Batch:** All ingredients are added at the beginning, and the system is left to run without additional input until the end of the cycle.
- **Fed-batch:** Nutrients are added over time to extend the productive phase, commonly used for achieving high cell densities and yields.
- **Continuous:** Fresh media is constantly added while culture is removed, maintaining a steady state and maximizing productivity over time.

Such systems are very effective yet they have trade-offs. They need large clean-in-place (CIP) and steam-in-place (SIP) systems to avoid contamination and to maintain sterility between the batches. This causes large water and energy wastes, long system downtimes, and stringent validation practices particularly in a regulated sectors such as pharmaceuticals.

To bring these systems a human level a Production cycle is carefully (pre-meditated ritual like) prepared with sensors being set up by a qualified engineer, the agitation and temperature machinations being checked over by technicians and the operators donning protective clothing so that no contamination befalls the product. Every batch is a merge of biology and human effortfulness coordination.

Traditional bioreactors are adored by process scientists in spite of their difficulties. They provide unexampled control, scaling to 20,000 liters or more, and decades of the process knowledge. These systems are used even nowadays as the gold standard in case of complex biologics or well-approved products.

Nevertheless, even the most well-braided designs are re-conceptualized in an industry that requires consumers more agile and innovative than ever before. With a future of personalized medicine and fast development cycles, the place of traditional systems seems to change. They have not become an obsolete notion, rather they are tools that are still used as a point of reference to gauge new up and coming technologies. Classical batch (or fed-batch and continuous) bioreactors are characterized by a narrow temperature, pH, and oxygen control. However, all of this was outweighed by a price: they were too expensive, they have to be thoroughly cleaned (CIP/SIP) and they needed extensive validation work.

Journal of Carcinogenesis, ISSN: 1477-3163
2024; Vol 23: Issue 1, https://carcinogenesis.com/

4. EMERGENCE OF SINGLE-USE BIOREACTORS (SUBS)

Fast forward to 1999, when Singh introduced the Wave Bioreactor—a pivotal innovation that kickstarted the single-use revolution Singh, 1999. These systems, often made of gamma-irradiated polymer bags, eliminated cleaning woes and offered unmatched flexibility.

5. TYPES OF DISPOSABLE BIOREACTORS

Disposable bioreactors, also known as single-use bioreactors (SUBs), come in a variety of formats designed to meet the needs of different cell types, culture volumes, and process intensities. Unlike their traditional stainless-steel counterparts, these bioreactors use pre-sterilized plastic film bags, often mounted in a supportive framework, to provide a sterile and flexible environment for cell cultivation. Below are the primary types of SUBs, along with their unique characteristics and typical applications.

5.1 Rocking-Type Bioreactors

Rocking-type bioreactors are some of the earliest and most widely recognized SUBs. They feature pillow-shaped disposable bags that rest on a rocking platform. The rocking motion gently sloshes the liquid culture back and forth, ensuring mixing and gas exchange.

- **Advantages**: Simple to use, gentle shear environment, fast setup.
- **Ideal For**: Mammalian cells like CHO, hybridomas, and stem cells.
- **Examples**: Wave Bioreactor™, Cultibag RM, AppliFlex.
- **Limitations**: Lower mass transfer and scalability beyond 500L can be challenging.

5.2 Stirred Single-Use Bioreactors

These systems mimic traditional stirred-tank reactors but utilize disposable liners or bags equipped with impellers and integrated sensors. They offer enhanced process control and are more scalable compared to rocking systems.

- **Advantages**: Better mixing and oxygen transfer, suitable for fed-batch and perfusion processes.
- **Ideal For**: CHO, HEK293, PER.C6® cell lines, especially for monoclonal antibody production.
- **Examples**: Thermo Fisher's HyClone, Sartorius Cultibag STR, XCellerex XDR.
- **Limitations**: Slightly more complex operation; impeller-driven mixing may be excessive for delicate cell types.

5.3 Orbitally Shaken Bioreactors

In these systems, the disposable bag or vessel is mounted on a platform that moves in a circular orbital motion. These are typically used for scale-up studies and early-stage development.

- **Advantages**: High oxygen transfer rates, simple operation.
- **Ideal For**: Microbial cultures and suspension-adapted mammalian cells.
- **Examples**: Kuhner Shaker systems.

5.4 Bubble Column and Airlift Bioreactors

These bioreactors rely on gas sparging for mixing and oxygenation. The culture medium circulates as bubbles rise, creating natural convection currents.

- **Advantages**: No mechanical agitation required, low shear forces.
- **Ideal For**: Shear-sensitive cells, algae, and insect cells.
- **Limitations**: Limited control over mixing and gas exchange at larger scales.

5.5 Fixed-Bed and Packed-Bed Bioreactors

In fixed-bed systems, cells grow on a stationary matrix within a disposable container, while media flows past them. These systems are well-suited for adherent cell lines.

- **Advantages**: Supports high-density cultures in small volumes.
- **Ideal For**: Vaccine production, gene therapy vectors.
- **Examples**: iCELLis bioreactor platform.

Humanizing the Technology

From the outside, disposable bioreactors may seem like mere plastic bags with tubing and connectors. But to the scientists and technicians using them, these systems represent speed, agility, and opportunity. Whether it's enabling a startup to produce its first clinical batch or helping a global firm pivot to a new therapeutic, SUBs have democratized biomanufacturing. They're the embodiment of biotechnology's shift toward smarter, faster, and more flexible production methods.
With continual innovation in film technology, integrated sensors, and design customization, the family of disposable bioreactors continues to expand—reshaping the future of how biologics are made.

- **Rocking-Type**: Examples include Wave Bioreactor™, *Cultibag RM*, and *CELL-tainer®*. These are gentle on cells and simple to operate.
- **Stirred SUBs**: Technologies like *Thermo Fisher's HyClone* and *XCellerex XDR* emulate traditional reactors with improved scalability.
- **Orbital and Bubble Shakers**: Often used for microbial cultures and initial screening.

6. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Single-use and traditional bioreactor technologies have differences and tradeoffs that predispose them to various phases of development and production. Comparative analysis assists process engineers, facility designers and decision makers in selecting optimum system on the basis of scalability, product yield, turnaround time, cost, and flexibility to regulatory compliance.

6.1 Performance and Efficiency

The single-use stainless-steel bioreactors are high-performing well-established reproducible and scalable bioreactors. Such systems provide great process control over parameters, and this is particularly necessary when handling a complex biologic. They however are capital intensive, extensive cleaning and validation is required, and are less adaptable to multi-product settings. Instead, single-use bioreactors (SUBs) are fast to setup, less subject to contamination, and easy to clean. They work well in multiproduct plants, clinical productions and high development rate plants. Although the gas transfer is low in SUBs as compared to high scale stainless-steel systems, constant innovation is filling that gap- especially in hybrids and intensified designs.

6.2 Operational Flexibility

The conventional systems are most applicable when the volumes are large and single item products. They are less mobile and provide cost effectiveness over long run in known and high-volume processes. The workability of SUBs is unbeatable; changeover between products is made easy, and production is made possible without any problem even in multiple locations. They find application in rapidly developing fields of therapy such as gene therapy and mRNA vaccines.

6.3 Cost and Infrastructure

SUBs cut the initial capital outlay enormously and eliminate the complicacy of designing a facility. They make CIP/SIP systems unnecessary and they minimize the load on utilities. On the contrary stainless-steel systems though they are durable, require high infrastructure and maintenance costs.

6.4 Environmental and Sustainability Concerns

In the used traditional bioreactor, there is high usage of water and energy to clean and sterilize them. By decreasing this incursion, SUBs post their own issues of sustainability, that is, plastic waste. But recycling of disposable parts and bio degradable films are in the pipeline.

6.5 Scalability

Stainless-steel systems can scale to over 20,000 liters, making them ideal for high-demand biologics. SUBs are currently scalable up to 2,000 liters, though multiple parallel SUBs can be deployed in distributed manufacturing models. New hybrid systems are helping bridge the gap between single-use flexibility and large-scale production.

6.6 Summary Table

Feature	Traditional Bioreactors	Single-Use Bioreactors (SUBs)
Setup Time	Long (weeks to months)	Short (days to weeks)
Cleaning	CIP/SIP required	Not required
Capital Cost	High	Low
Operating Cost	Moderate to High	Low to Moderate
Contamination Risk	Moderate (requires rigorous cleaning)	Low (pre-sterilized)
Scalability	Up to 20,000+ L	Up to ~2,000 L
Flexibility	Low	High
Environmental Impact	High (water, steam)	Moderate (plastic waste)
Turnaround Time	Slow	Fast
Regulatory Acceptance	Well established	Growing acceptance

Such a broad comparison explains why I suspect that the future of biomanufacturing will be some sort of hybrid model that represents the durability of the traditional systems together with flexibility and efficiency of disposable technologies. The choice of the system to be utilized finally lies with the product, process, capabilities of the facilities, and commercial objectives. Wave-type bioreactors are charming, straightforward to establish, and ideal to mammalian cell culture, but they are ineffective when it comes to mixing and oxygen transfer. Here comes CELL-tainer®, which incorporates a special two-dimensional motion and therefore facilitates a faster mass transfer resulting in high-density microbial and fungal cultures *CELLution Biotech*.

7. APPLICATIONS IN BIOPHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURING

In the production of biopharmaceuticals, bioreactors play a critical role in that they are the principal means of cell growth of those producing therapeutic proteins, vaccines, enzymes, and gene therapy products. They work throughout the development pipeline, including small-scales process development in research laboratories, scale-ups to large-scale commercial manufactures that are regulated by manufacturing plants, etc.

7.1 Monoclonal Antibodies (mAbs)

CHO and PER.C6 cell line producing monoclonal antibodies are mostly cultivated in bioreactors, particularly stirred tank and single-use systems. These medicament proteins have revolutionized cancer, autoimmune disorders and infectious diseases treatment. The speedy scale-up and quick changeover are provided by SUBs, which is especially beneficial in the case of contract manufacturing and clinical production.

7.2 Vaccine Production

Whether inactivated virus vaccine or recombinant protein subunit vaccine or mRNA vaccine, the bioreactor is the key in their manufacture. Examples include insect cell cultures in wave-type bioreactors to produce protein antigen and mRNA-based vaccines which depends on microbial fermentations and the enzymatic reactor reaction in scale-up reactor systems.

7.3 Cell and Gene Therapies

CAR-T therapies, viral vector-based gene therapies, have increased publicity on small-volume and high-value procedures. Because of the reduced possibility of contamination and the ability to manage multiple batches from one source, disposable bioreactors will be favored in this case. They can support suspension and cell cultures attached, such as HEK293 and AAV-producing ones.

7.4 Biosimilars and Recombinant Proteins

With the expiry of patents of biologics, biosimilars are becoming famous. Insulin, growth hormones, and erythropoietin biosimilars have to be prepared using bioreactors. Multi-product facilities are validated through quick turnaround using SUBs.

7.5 Microbial-Based Biopharmaceuticals

Microbial fermentation Enzymes, peptides and antibiotics are produced by microbial fermentation analogous to that used in mammalian systems but using stainless-steel or high-mass-transfer disposable bioreactor systems, although of lower frequency than the mammalian systems. The small-scale cell culture of microorganisms in CELL-tainer and the stirred SUBs has brought a single-use scenario of microbial culture.

7.6 Continuous Manufacturing

Continuous bioprocessing is on the rise (with the assistance of regulations), currently being performed by the perfusion bioreactors. The systems guarantee a steady quality of the products and increased productivity. The enabling systems in this space are SUBs with ATF (Alternating Tangential Flow) or TFDF (Tangential Flow Depth Filtration) systems.

Real-World Example: mRNA Vaccine Production

In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, such companies as Moderna and Pfizer resorted to using high-tech bioreactor systems to increase their production volumes with unseen rates. The SUBs could be deployed fast which is essential in capitalizing on world demand due to their modularity.

Summary

Bioreactors drive almost all the significant types of biopharmaceutical products; that is, discovery through commercialization. The switch to disposables and increased increment in processing has only increased their relevance. Flexibility and scalability of the modern bioreactor-based systems also serve to deliver innovations to the life sciences industry as the needs related to more individualized and complex therapies pressure it. The manufacturing of antibodies and immunization with CHO and PER.C6 R cell lines is impossible without use of SUBs. Advanced processes like *DSM's XD® platform* have shown that these systems can achieve titers above 10 g/L—numbers once thought unachievable.

8. ADVANTAGES OF SINGLE-USE SYSTEMS

- Quick setup, lower upfront investment
- No CIP/SIP, minimal contamination risk
- Excellent for multiproduct facilities
- Scalable from R&D to 2000 L production

9. LIMITATIONS AND CHALLENGES

Although the field of bioreactor technologies has continued to expand at a very high pace, the conventional and single-use systems still exhibit significant shortcomings that influence the use of these systems in the manufacture of biopharmaceuticals. Being aware of these weaknesses is useful in the process of developing the process or selecting the system to use.

9.1 Oxygen Transfer Limitations

Transfer of oxygen is also an important performance critical aspect in bioreactors more so in high-density cultures of microbial and mammalian cells. Oxygen transfer efficiency is generally measured as volumetric oxygen transfer coefficient (kLa) and differs widely between types of bioreactor and is itself dependent upon agitation rate, sparger arrangement, vessel shape and gas velocity *van 't Riet, 1979*.

Traditional stirred-tank bioreactors favour the agitation of mechanical stirring and sparging to supply cultures with high oxygen demands an elevated kLa value. With appropriately designed impellers and aeration strategy, these systems may attain kLa of 200 or more and 300 h -1 or higher, favoring the growth of aerobic microorganisms such as E. coli and Pichia pastoris *Tang & Hamel, 2007*.

Single-use bioreactors, especially the rocking motion and flexible polymer bag type, however, are generally lower in kLa-generally between 5 and 40 h -1. This not only can inhibit the growth of the oxygen-intensive cultures but also restrains the highest attainable cell density particularly in microbial applications *Mikola et al., 2007*.

To illustrate the limitation, we consider the basic oxygen transfer rate equation:

Oxygen transfer rate (OTR) = kLa × (C* - C)**

Where:

- **kLa** = volumetric mass transfer coefficient (h^{-1})
- **C*** = oxygen saturation concentration (mg/L)
- **C** = actual dissolved oxygen concentration (mg/L)

Assuming a 200 L SUB with a kLa of 20 h^{-1} and oxygen saturation of 7 mg/L, maintaining a DO of 2 mg/L:

OTR = 20 × (7 - 2) = **100 mg/L/h**

This means: **Total OTR = 100 mg/L/h × 200 L = 20,000 mg/h = 20 g/h of oxygen**

Microbial systems can require oxygen consumption rates upwards of 50–100 g/h depending on metabolic activity and biomass *Kybal & Sikyta, 1987*. Hence, additional oxygen supplementation strategies such as:

- Pure oxygen sparging
- Increased agitation or baffles
- Micro-sparger or macro-sparger combinations
- Pressurized reactor operation (limited in SUBs)

may be required. Limitations also arise due to the material constraints of SUBs, which are less capable of withstanding high pressure or intense agitation, thus capping the feasible oxygen transfer enhancement range.

Modern innovations seek to address these barriers through:

- Enhanced sparger and impeller designs in hybrid systems
- Intelligent control systems for DO regulation
- Perfusion culture strategies enabling lower oxygen demand over prolonged durations

With increasing interest to ensure maximum processing due to the prevailing demand of the intensified processing in terms of microbial cultures, continuous perfusion cultures, and so on, enabling oxygen transfer will continue an important design and operating benchmark, irrespective of the future platform to be used. The issue of oxygen transfer is of major concern in terms of performance of the bioreactors, particularly in the modality/high-density culture of microbial and mammalian cells. The efficiency of oxygen transfer is normally expressed in volumetric oxygen transfer coefficient (kLa) and this value differs greatly in different designs of bioreactors.

Mechanical agitation and sparging in conventional stirred-tank bioreactors give high kLa values, which serve cultures requiring high oxygen usage. Depending upon the types of impellers, the speed of agitation and the rates of gas through-puts, these systems can reach kLa of 200-300 h-1 and more.

In comparison, the kLa values of single-use bioreactors, notably rocking motion bioreactors and bag-based bioreactors is usually lower, and can vary between 5-40 h-1. This drawback may pose a problem to the growth of oxygen-intensive organisms (e.g. E. coli or Pichia pastoris) and might impose a barrier on the attainable cell density.

To estimate the oxygen transfer capacity, the following simplified calculation can be used:

Oxygen transfer rate (OTR) = kLa × (C* - C)**

Where:

- **kLa** = volumetric mass transfer coefficient (h^{-1})
- **C*** = saturation concentration of oxygen in the medium (mg/L)
- **C** = actual dissolved oxygen concentration (mg/L)

For example, in a 200 L SUB with a kLa of 20 h^{-1} and a saturation oxygen concentration of 7 mg/L, if the culture maintains a DO of 2 mg/L:

OTR = 20 × (7 - 2) = **100 mg/L/h**

This means the system can transfer 100 mg of oxygen per liter of culture per hour. For the entire volume:

Total OTR = 100 mg/L/h × 200 L = 20,000 mg/h = 20 g/h of oxygen

Such a rate is not usually enough in high-density microbial cultures and may be consumed in a much higher rate. In this way, additional oxygenation approaches (i.e. enriched air or pure oxygen sparging, intensified agitation, or high-performance sparger designs) are frequently needed.

In addition, the mechanical constraints of the bag films and connectors in SUBs may restrict operation pressure even further which would further decrease the solubility of gases and the Oxygen furnishing capability. The challenges are targeted to be overcome by better film materials, hybrid systems, and perfusion-based systems that can keep optimum oxygen levels in the future design. In single use systems especially in rocking and bag type bioreactor systems, the oxygen transfer efficiency can be less efficient than those of traditional stainless-steel stirred tanks. They are therefore inappropriate in high density microbial fermentations that require high levels of oxygenation.

9.2 Material Compatibility and Leachables

SUBs are made out of plastic films, which are known to release extractables and leachables, or compounds that can leach into the product in operation. This should be thoroughly tested and verified not to compromise with the safety of products or their effectiveness.

9.3 Mechanical Limitations

In some processes, disposable systems are not capable of operating under high-pressure, agitation or high-viscosity conditions that are involved. There are weak bag pieces and connectors which may break down under pressure, particularly during prolonged or involving activities.

9.4 Supply Chain and Vendor Lock-In

They tend to use proprietary parts distributed by certain manufacturers. This may present a problem of availability, pricing, and flexibility- when a vendor drops a certain format or a kind of bag, for instance.

9.5 Environmental Impact

Disposable plastic parts are concerning as to waste management and sustainability. Although SUBs decrease the use of water and energy sources, their single-use attributes create high amounts of non-biodegradable waste. The recycling opportunities that are available, currently, are not very numerous and should be carefully processed.

9.6 Regulatory Uncertainty

Whereas regulatory bodies are becoming more favorable toward the use of single-use systems, there is not yet long-term data showing the overall picture. Any new application should be confirmed as complying with Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP) and inconsistency in regulations across the world may cause delays.

Nevertheless, current work on material science, process analytics, and modularity have continued to eliminate much of these drawbacks. The users should not compromise convenience and flexibility with stringent validation and environment care, at least in the meantime. Of course, no system is perfect:

- Oxygen transfer remains a bottleneck for microbial applications
- Risk of extractables and leachables
- Dependence on proprietary bag suppliers
- Environmental concerns over single-use plastics

10. REGULATORY AND GMP CONSIDERATIONS

SUBs must pass stringent regulatory tests. They must comply with *USP Class VI*, and developers must assess extractables, sterility, and process consistency. Aligning with *ICH Q8–Q11* ensures they’re fit for GMP operations.

11. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The next bioreactor technology is at the adjacency of transformation and sustainability of engineering and process intensification. The tendency of future is the big change towards smart, environmentally friendly, hybrid systems with an attempt to close the balance between elasticity and performance.

- **Intensified Processing**: Higher perfusion techniques through Alternating Tangential Flow (ATF) and Tangential Flow Depth Filtration (TFDF) technology allow even the highest cell concentrations to be achieved and biomanufacturing undertaken continuously, which leads to enhanced productivity and reduced down-time of reactors *Eibl & Eibl, 2009*.

- **Smart Bioreactors**: Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) should bring a revolution in control strategies. Predictive analytics will also be applied in smart bioreactors that automate feeding strategies, cell health as well as deviations in the system to enhance greater reliability and yield *Zijlstra et al., 2009*.

- **Hybrid Designs**: Hybrid approaches to bioreactor design Hybrid bioreactor systems which integrate disposable plastic bags with stainless-steel support structures are becoming available with increased temperature control, pressure resistance, and modularity. The goal of such systems is to offer the dose of sterility and versatility of disposables and maintain the strength of conventional reactors.

- **Eco-Conscious Innovation**: The paradigm of sustainability is moving towards the center of bioprocess designing. To ease the environmental cost of the single use systems, researchers are coming up with bio degradable films and recyclable plastics. A number of programs are in place to create closed-loop recycling of bioreactor bags and components *Weber et al., 2002*.

The emerging trends do point to a paradigm shift in the way biologics are manufactured (hard to flexible, capital intensive to intelligent, responsible and environmental conscious manufacturing ecosystems). In the future, bioreactors should be expected to no longer be merely passive vessels in the process, but rather key active and data-driven players in the therapeutic development.

- **Intensified Processing**: Advanced perfusion with tools like *ATF/TFDF* enables ultra-high cell densities.
- **Smart Bioreactors**: AI and machine learning will soon control feeding, oxygen, and even predictive analytics.
- **Hybrid Designs**: Combining disposables with stainless-steel jackets for better thermal control.
- **Eco-Conscious Innovation**: Biodegradable materials and recyclable plastics are in development.

12. CONCLUSION

From their humble origins to the high-tech systems of today, bioreactors have been central to the growth of biotechnology. With innovations on the horizon, their role will only become more critical—as enablers of scalable, flexible, and sustainable biomanufacturing.

REFERENCES

1. Kybal & Sikyta (1987), Biotechnology Letters
2. Singh V (1999), Cytotechnology
3. Wurm F (2004), Nature Biotechnology
4. Kadarusman J et al. (2005), Biotechnology Progress
5. US Patent US2003/0036192 A1
6. Mikola M et al. (2007), Bioprocess and Biosystems Engineering
7. Eibl R & Eibl D (2006), Plant Tissue Culture Engineering
8. Namdev PK & Lio P (2000), BioPharm
9. Palazón J et al. (2003), Planta Medica

10. Weber W et al. (2002), Cytotechnology
11. Pierce L & Shabram PW (2004), BioProcessing Journal
12. Tang YJ & Hamel JF (2007), Biotechnology Progress
13. WO 2007/001173 A2 Patent
14. WO 2008/153401 A1 Patent
15. Eibl R & Eibl D (2009), Advances in Biochem Eng/Biotech