

1 **Shrimp (*Penaeus vannamei*) cooking wastewater as a source of astaxanthin**
2 **and bioactive peptides**

3
4 Isabel Rodríguez Amado^{*a}, M^a Pilar González, Miguel Anxo Murado & José Antonio
5 Vázquez

6
7 Grupo de Reciclado y Valorización de Residuos (REVAL). Instituto de Investigaciones
8 Mariñas (IIM-CSIC), R/ Eduardo Cabello 6, 36208, Vigo (SPAIN)

9
10 * Corresponding author. Tel: +34 986214469; fax: +34 986292762

11
12 E-mail address: sabelara@iim.csic.es

13
14 ^aPresent address: School of Pharmacy. University of Reading. PO Box 224.

15 Whiteknights. Reading. Berkshire RG6 6AD.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 **Short title:** Shrimp wastewater as a source of astaxanthin and bioactive peptides
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

1 **ABSTRACT**

2

3 BACKGROUND: Ultrafiltration has led to the recovery of valuable products from
4 seafood processing wastes. However, the use of crustacean process wastewaters as
5 a source of bioactive compounds with application in the chemical, pharmaceutical
6 and food industries has been scarcely studied to date.

7 RESULTS: This study reports the recovery of high concentrations of astaxanthin (10-
8 $13 \mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$) by 300 kDa ultrafiltration of shrimp cooking wastewater, indicating
9 astaxanthin is somehow associated to high MW retained proteins. Individual UF with
10 300, 100 and 30 kDa MWCO membranes and the sequential UF 100→30 kDa were
11 the most effective configurations for protein concentration. Besides, hydrolysates
12 from these three protein-concentrated fractions showed very potent ACE-inhibitory
13 ($1.98, 9.87$ and $23.10 \mu\text{g mL}^{-1} IC_{50}$ values) and β - carotene bleaching activities
14 compared to hydrolysates from other fish and seafood species.

15 CONCLUSIONS: According to these results, shrimp cooking wastewater is a good
16 source of astaxanthin and bioactive peptides. This approach based on the
17 ultrafiltration of shrimp cooking wastewaters contributes towards the depuration of
18 this by-product, while enabling the recovery and production of high value-added
19 products.

20

21 **Keywords:**

22 Ultrafiltration; enzymatic proteolysis; bioactive peptides; seafood wastewater; shrimp;
23 astaxanthin.

24 **Abbreviations:**

25

26 ACE: Angiotensin-converting enzyme; BHA: butyl hydroxyanisole; BHT: butyl
27 hydroxytoluene; DF: diafiltration; DPPH: 1,1-Diphenyl-2-picrylhydrazyl; FAPGG: N-[3-
28 (2-Furyl) acryloyl]-L-phenylalanyl-glycyl-glycine; IC_{50} : inhibitory concentration causing
29 a 50% ACE inhibition; MWCO: molecular weight cut-off; UF: ultrafiltration.

30

1 **1. Introduction**

2
3 The shrimp processing industry produces large amounts of industrial wastes. These
4 residues are mostly solid by-products consisting of body carapace and head ¹ that
5 are rich in proteins, chitin and carotenoids. Among these products, chitin has focused
6 scientific interest because its N-deacetylated derivative, chitosan, is soluble in acid
7 solutions and has many different applications. The recovery of carotenoids such as
8 astaxanthin from shrimp solid by-products has also been widely studied ^{1,2} due to its
9 application in the pharmaceutical, chemical, food and feed industries because,
10 among others, to its colouring and antioxidant properties. Astaxanthin is bound to
11 lipoproteins from the shell matrix of crustaceans ³. The removal of free astaxanthin
12 from these sources implies the using of thermal treatment ¹, enzymatic hydrolysis ^{3,4}
13 or fermentation with lactic acid bacteria ², followed by the extraction with organic
14 solvents ^{4,5} or edible oils ^{1,6,7}. Although the yield of carotenoids recovered from these
15 shrimp solid wastes depends on their treatment, in general, organic solvents are
16 more efficient than oil extraction ⁴. However the latter are preferred as an
17 environmentally-friendly alternative compatible with food applications. Recently,
18 alternative processes like solid-phase ⁸ and supercritical CO₂ ⁹ extraction have also
19 been proposed for astaxanthin recovery from shrimp by-products.

20 In addition to solid wastes, shellfish cooking plants produce highly pollutant
21 wastewaters ¹⁰. Although the effluent composition varies depending on the ratio
22 product/water, the animal species and the cooking duration, they usually show a high
23 chemical oxygen demand due to their high organic load ¹¹. At present, effluents are
24 either directly discarded in the environment or sent to a public wastewater treatment
25 plant according to their pollutant load ¹⁰. Conventional seafood wastewater
26 processing methods were traditionally activated sludge and aerated lagoon system,
27 but more recently new processes offering improved capability, lower cost

1 performance, and better care for the environment have been implemented ¹². Some
2 alternatives are the use of anaerobic treatment or hybrid systems combining
3 anaerobic and aerobic processes with anaerobic pre-treatment ¹². However, the
4 efficiency of biological treatment of wastewaters with high saline content by
5 conventional techniques is poor due to sodium toxicity to microorganisms ¹³. The low
6 depuration of cooking effluents containing a high saline content ¹¹ leads to poor
7 effluent quality and therefore alternative methods must be explored.

8 Besides, the costs of wastewater processing are generally high ¹¹ due to the need of
9 pre-treatment and the complexity of the different phases involved. It has been
10 claimed that the recovery of the residual organic material present in crustacean
11 cooking water could reduce the cost of depolluting treatments, and it would also lead
12 to their valorisation by searching for potentially bioactive molecules ¹⁴. In this context,
13 the use of membrane technology is a promising alternative allowing the achievement
14 of both objectives in a single stage or combined with the hydrolysis of the retained
15 protein. Actually, the application of ultrafiltration for the separation, concentration and
16 purification of valuable compounds from seafood by-products has been successfully
17 applied to different sources. Li et al. ¹⁵ reported the recovery of the enzymes trypsin
18 and chymotrypsin from yellowfin tuna spleen extract by microfiltration followed by
19 continuous-batch concentration using a 0.10 µm hollow fiber membrane. On the
20 other hand, Murado et al. ¹⁶ obtained highly pure chondroitin sulphate (99%) by
21 chemical hydrolysis, selective precipitation and ultrafiltration–diafiltration of
22 Thornback skate (*Raja clavata*). Also the use of ultra- and nanofiltration has proven
23 to be effective for the recovery of aroma ^{11,17}, proteins ^{18,19} and bioactive peptides ¹⁹
24 from seafood wastewaters. The latter, mainly antioxidant and ACE-inhibitory peptides,
25 have received special attention due to their economical interest as potential
26 alternatives to synthetic compounds. Recently, Pérez-Santín et al. ¹⁴ reported the

1 production of a functional concentrate with antioxidative and antihypertensive (ACE-
2 inhibitory) properties from shrimp (*Penaeus* spp.) cooking juice by centrifugation.
3 These activities were strongly related to the presence of small peptides and other
4 antioxidants, such as free astaxanthin (cis and trans isomers) and derived esters.
5 However, to the best of our knowledge, there are no reports on the use of
6 ultrafiltration (UF) for the recovery of astaxanthin neither for producing antioxidants
7 and ACE-inhibitory hydrolysates from shrimp cooking wastewaters.
8 In this paper we propose an integrated method for producing protein hydrolysates
9 with high ACE-inhibitory and/or antioxidant activity from shrimp cooking wastewaters,
10 by combining UF and enzymatic hydrolysis. Also a protein and astaxanthin-
11 concentrated fraction with potential application as additive for aquaculture feeding
12 can be recovered by membrane technology. This approach can be an interesting
13 alternative for reducing the costs of wastewater treatment and their pollutant effects.

14

15 **2. Materials and Methods**

16 *2.1. Shrimp cooking wastewater*

17 In this study we utilised cooking wastewater from the industrial manufacturing of
18 shrimp (*Penaeus vannamei*) that was kindly provided by Bajamar Séptima S.A.
19 (Arteixo, Galicia, Spain). The wastewater was received under refrigeration, decanted
20 to discard particulate matter such as small meat and shell pieces, sampled for
21 analytical determinations and stored at -18°C until further use.

22

23 *2.2. Analytical methods*

24 The content of ashes, protein, total nitrogen, total and reducing sugars was
25 determined. Solid residue and ashes were quantified by heating and calcination at
26 106 and 550°C, respectively. Total nitrogen was determined by the method of

1 Havilah et al. ²⁰. Soluble proteins were measured using the method of Lowry et al. ²¹,
2 total sugar content by the phenol-sulphuric acid method, according to Strickland and
3 Parsons ²², and reducing sugars were quantified by means of 3,5-dinitrosalicylic
4 reaction ²³. Further analysis of chemical oxygen demand (COD) and suspended
5 solids (SS) were carried out using the APHA Standard Methods 5220 C and 2540 B
6 respectively ²⁴, being the mean compositions given in Table 1.

7 To determine astaxanthin concentration, 1 volume of the 300 kDa retentate was
8 combined with 3 volumes of sunflower oil at 30°C and the mixture stirred for 18 h ²⁵.
9 Then the solution absorbance was measured at the λ_{\max} (487 nm: A487) and the
10 carotenoid yield as astaxanthin ($\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$) was calculated using the following equation
11 1:

$$Y = \frac{A_{487} \times V_{oil} \times 10^6}{100 \times V_w \times E} \quad (1)$$

12
13
14
15 where,

16 Y is the astaxanthin yield per volume of bulk liquid ($\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$); V_{oil} is the volume of
17 recovered pigmented oil; V_w the volume of retentate and E the specific extinction
18 coefficient.

19

20 2.3. Ultrafiltration-diafiltration process

21 The cooking wastewater was subjected to ultrafiltration-diafiltration (UF-DF) using a
22 single or sequential UF steps with membranes (Prep/Scale-TFF cartridges, Millipore
23 Corporation, Bedford, MA, USA) of 300, 100, 30, 10 and 1 kDa molecular weight cut-
24 off (MWCO). According to the manufacturer, cartridges were made of
25 polyethersulfone, except for 1 kDa, which was from regenerated cellulose.

1 The operation mode was the following: an initial phase of ultrafiltration (UF) at 40°C
2 with total recirculation of retentate was performed, immediately followed by a
3 diafiltration (DF) step. During UF, the inlet pressure remained constant to determine
4 the drops of flow rate due to the increased concentration of the retentate and to
5 possible adhesions to the membrane. The final retentate (after DF) was lyophilized
6 and stored at 4°C for further analysis. Permeate of the UF step was stored at -18 °C
7 until the following UF-DF was carried out and permeate from the DF phase was
8 discarded.

9 For modelling the membrane process, we assumed a DF with constant volume
10 (filtration flow = water intake flow), where the concentration (or the total amount) of a
11 permeable solute in the retentate followed first order kinetics ¹⁹:

12

$$13 \quad R = R_f + R_0 \exp[-(1-s)D] \quad (2)$$

14

15 where, R is the concentration of permeable protein in the retentate (% from the level
16 at initial DF), R_0 the initial concentration (%), R_f is the final and asymptotic
17 concentration (%), D is the relative diavolume (volume of added water/constant
18 retentate volume) and s is the specific retention of protein with variation between 0
19 (the solute is filtered as the solvent) and 1 (the solute is totally retained). Thus, using
20 normalized values (%): $R_0 + R_f = 100$, with $R_0 = 0$ if all protein is permeable. In addition,
21 the percentage of protein eliminated by three diavolumes (Q_{3D}) was calculated by
22 substituting in equation (2) the value of parameter D by 3.

23

24 *2.4. Preparation of enzymatic hydrolysates*

25 Each lyophilized protein concentrate was suspended in 5 mM Britton-Robinson buffer
26 pH 9.0 at a final concentration of 100 g L⁻¹ and hydrolysed using a 0.4 % (v/w) of

1 alcalase 2.4 L from Novo Co. (Novozyme Nordisk, Bagsvaerd, Denmark). These
2 suspensions were divided into individual experimental units of 2 mL, each
3 corresponding to a time of hydrolysis and the enzymatic hydrolysis carried out in a
4 water bath at 55°C under agitation. Just after adding the enzyme, a sample was
5 taken (t=0) and then after 15, 30, 60, 120, 240 and 480 min of hydrolysis. Samples
6 were boiled for 5 min to inactivate the protease and then cooled in an ice-water bath.
7 Hydrolysates were centrifuged at 5000 g for 15 min in an Allegra X-12R centrifuge
8 (Beckman Coulter, Inc., Miami, USA) and supernatants were stored at -18°C until
9 further analysis of their degree of hydrolysis, ACE inhibitory and antioxidant activities.

10

11 *2.5. Degree of hydrolysis determination*

12 The degree of hydrolysis (DH) at each sampling time was defined as the ratio of the
13 released tyrosine to the maximal tyrosine in the sample ^{19,26}, according to the
14 following expression:

15

$$16 \quad DH = \frac{C_t - C_0}{C_m} \times 100 \quad (3)$$

17

18 where, C_t is the tyrosine concentration (g L^{-1}) of the hydrolysate at time t , C_0 is the
19 tyrosine concentration (g L^{-1}) of the sample at time zero and C_m is the maximal
20 tyrosine concentration (g L^{-1}) of the sample. Tyrosine was measured by the method
21 described in Barker and Worgan ²⁷. The kinetic profiles of DH (%) were described
22 using the von Bertalanffy equation ¹⁹:

23

$$24 \quad DH = K [1 - \exp(-rt)] \quad (4)$$

25

1 where, K is the maximum DH (%) or the limit of the function when $t \rightarrow \infty$, r is the
2 specific maximum rate of hydrolysis (min^{-1}) and t the time of hydrolysis (min).
3 Furthermore, we have defined the maximum rate of hydrolysis (v_m in $\% \text{ min}^{-1}$) as
4 $v_m = Kr$.

6 2.6. Angiotensin I-converting enzyme (ACE) inhibition assay

7 The antihypertensive activity of the hydrolysates was determined using N-[3-(2-Furyl)
8 acryloyl]-L-phenylalanyl-glycyl-glycine (FAPGG) as substrate ²⁸ as adapted by
9 Estévez et al. ²⁹. Briefly, 10 μL of supernatant hydrolysate were mixed with 10 μL of
10 ACE solution (0.5 U mL^{-1}) in each well of a 96-well microtiter plate. The reaction was
11 started by adding 150 μL of substrate (0.88 mM FAPGG in 50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.5,
12 0.3 M NaCl) preheated at 37°C . The absorbance at 340 nm (A_{340}) was recorded at
13 time intervals of 30 seconds for 30 minutes. The control consisted of samples
14 containing 10 μL of buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.5, 0.3 M NaCl) instead of protein
15 hydrolysate.

16 Hydrolysates ACE-inhibitory capacity (I_{ACE}) was calculated as a function of the
17 average slope of decrease in absorbance with time and expressed as percent
18 inhibition of the enzyme, according to the following expression:

19

$$20 \quad I_{ACE} (\%) = \left[1 - \frac{\rho A_h}{\rho A_c} \right] \times 100 \quad (5)$$

21

22 where, I_{ACE} is the ACE-inhibitory capacity (%), ρA_h is the slope of decrease in A_{340}
23 in the presence of inhibitor (hydrolysate) and ρA_c is the slope of decrease in A_{340} in
24 the absence of inhibitor (control).

1 For the calculation of the protein concentration causing a 50% ACE inhibition (IC_{50}),
2 dose-response curves were obtained assaying different concentrations of
3 hydrolysates. IC_{50} values were calculated by fitting the dose-response curves of I_{ACE}
4 vs. protein concentration to a sigmoidal model defined by the Weibull equation ^{19,29}:

$$6 \quad I_{ACE} = K \left\{ 1 - \exp \left[-\ln 2 \left(\frac{C}{m} \right)^a \right] \right\} \quad (6)$$

7
8 where, K is the maximum I_{ACE} (%), C is the protein concentration ($\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$), m is the
9 concentration for semi-maximum I_{ACE} (IC_{50} in $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$) and a is the form parameter
10 related to the maximum slope of the function (*dimensionless*).

12 2.7. Antioxidant activity determination

13 2.7.1. β -carotene bleaching assay

14 The β -carotene bleaching assay adapted to use with microplate spectrophotometer ³⁰
15 was utilized. Reactions were performed combining in each well of a 96-well
16 microplate, 50 μL of antioxidant (BHT at 6-30 mg L^{-1} or hydrolysate sample) with 250
17 μL of β -carotene/linoleic emulsion. The absorbance at 470 nm was recorded during
18 180 min in a Multiskan Spectrum Microplate Spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific)
19 at 45°C.

20 All reaction mixtures were performed in triplicate. For each series, reversed curves
21 were obtained by subtracting the absorbance at time t from the absorbance value at
22 time 0 . The area under the curves (AUC) can be approximated by the following
23 function:

$$24 \quad AUC = \frac{\Delta t}{2} (y_0 + 2y_1 + 2y_2 + \dots + 2y_{n-2} + 2y_{n-1} + 2y_n) \quad (7)$$

1 where y_0 to y_n are the $n+1$ y-values defining the curve, and Δt is the sampling interval
2 (min).

3 Calculated areas were plotted against BHT concentrations and fitted by linear
4 regression. Then antioxidant activities were calculated as μM BHT equivalent mg^{-1} of
5 sample by interpolation of the calculated areas for each sample in the BHT curve
6 obtained for each assay.

7

8 *2.7.2. 1,1-Diphenyl-2-picrylhydrazyl (DPPH) radical-scavenging capacity*

9 The antioxidant activity as radical-scavenging capacity was determined with DPPH
10 as a free radical, using an adaptation to microplate of the method described by
11 Brand-Williams et al. ³¹. For the modified procedure, hydrolysate supernatants
12 containing the antioxidant activity (10 μl) were added to 200 μl of a 60 μM solution of
13 DPPH in 50% ethanol. The decrease in absorbance was followed at 515 nm every 5
14 min until the reaction reached a plateau. The activity was expressed as BHT
15 equivalents (μM BHT equivalent mg^{-1}), calculated as described above.

16

17 *2.8. Numerical and statistical methods*

18 Fitting procedures and parametric estimations calculated from the experimental data
19 were carried out by minimising the sum of quadratic differences between the
20 observed and model-predicted values, using the non-linear least-squares (quasi-
21 Newton) method provided by the macro *Solver* of the Microsoft Excel spreadsheet.
22 The confidence intervals for the parametric estimates (t-Student test; $\alpha = 0.05$),
23 consistency of the mathematical models (Fisher's F test; $\alpha = 0.05$) and covariance
24 and correlation matrices were calculated using the '*SolverAid*' macro, which is freely

1 available from Levie's Excellaneous website:
2 <http://www.bowdoin.edu/~rdelevie/exellaneous/>.

3

4 **3. Results and Discussion**

5 *3.1. Protein and astaxanthin concentration by UF-DF*

6 The shrimp cooking wastewater had rather low protein content and COD (Table 1)
7 compared to values previously reported for seafood cooking juices^{11,17}. The
8 composition of the effluents varies depending on the ratio product/water, species to
9 be treated and processing time³² and so the low protein concentration must be due
10 to a low ratio shrimp/water and/or to a short time of cooking.

11 The protein concentration kinetics of four examples from all the UF cut-offs and
12 sequences studied are shown in Figure 1 (additional UF-DF kinetics can be seen in
13 the Appendix, Figures 1-3). Since equation (2) accurately simulated the DF process
14 and parameter determinations were always significant (Student's t test, $\alpha = 0.05$), the
15 estimated protein rejection (Q_{3D}) was calculated using this equation.

16 Ultrafiltration with 300, 100 and 30 kDa MWCO membranes led to the best results of
17 protein recovery, reaching a maximum of $27.12 \pm 0.16 \text{ g L}^{-1}$ protein content after 30
18 kDa UF (Table 2). In general, the using of a single membrane produced better results
19 in terms of protein recovery (>80%) than following sequential UF. Nonetheless,
20 100→30 kDa and 300→100→30 kDa UF sequences resulted in a 90% and 75% of
21 protein retention while in all other cases, protein rejection varied from 33% to 66%
22 (Table 2) revealing a moderate to low efficiency of these UF sequences for protein
23 concentration. These results suggest the major shrimp proteins in cooking
24 wastewater are in a range of molecular weights within 100 and 30 kDa.

25 Comparing UF performances with reported values in the literature is not always
26 simple because experimental conditions are diverse in terms of wastewater source,

1 concentration methodology and parameter determination (usually chemical oxygen
2 demand or nitrogen content). But, taking into account that most of organic
3 compounds in the cooking wastewater are protein (Table 1), COD reductions above
4 80% were achieved leading to comparable depuration efficiencies than those
5 reported for the recovery of marine flavours from seafood cooking waters by
6 nanofiltration and reverse osmosis ¹⁰ and by nanofiltration of fish meal waters ¹⁸. Also
7 COD depurations were higher than those reported by Ferjani et al. ³³ for cuttlefish
8 wastes with greater organic load.

9 The UF-DF process at 300 kDa surprisingly showed a high retention of astaxanthin
10 despite the low molecular weight (597 Da) of the pigment. In fact, during the UF
11 phase, the initial permeates showed slight yellowish coloration, completely
12 disappearing after DF and leading to an intense colored (pink-orange) retentate. A
13 13-fold concentration factor was achieved after 300 kDa UF-DF, reaching
14 astaxanthin concentrations between 10 and 13 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$ in the retentate according to
15 spectrophotometric analysis (Equation 1). Astaxanthin is found naturally in the shell
16 matrix of crustaceans mainly esterified or complexed with proteins ³. So, this result
17 suggests astaxanthin is retained because it must be forming polymeric aggregates
18 and/or bound to macromolecules, mainly proteins, that are also retained during
19 ultrafiltration using a 300 kDa membrane.

20

21 *3.2. Enzymatic hydrolysis of protein concentrates*

22 The concentration of shrimp hydrolysable protein in the concentrates recovered by
23 UF-DF was found to be very different (Table 3). Surprisingly, the protein content
24 before hydrolysis was significantly lower for those fractions resulting from the UFs
25 with the highest performances (300, 100 and 30 kDa). Since all fractions were
26 normalized in dry matter content upon lyophilisation, the low protein concentration

1 indicated a relatively higher content in other compounds such as lipids, sugars and
2 salts. Hydrolysis of shrimp protein concentrates recovered by UF-DF were performed
3 with alcalase using experimental conditions (pH 9.0, 55°C) previously utilised for the
4 production of cuttlefish hydrolysates ¹⁹. As in that case, alcalase was chosen due to
5 the broad substrate specificity and low-cost compared to other proteases
6 commercially available.

7 Shrimp protein concentrates recovered by UF using different MWCO membranes
8 provided a wide variety of hydrolysis profiles (Figure 2). Proteolytic kinetics were
9 modelled using the von Bertalanffy equation (Equation 4) obtaining statistically
10 significant parameters ($p < 0.05$) for all of them (Table 3). As previously reported for
11 shrimp by-products ⁴ and other fish species ^{34,35}, alcalase efficiently hydrolysed
12 shrimp proteins recovered from cooking wastewaters. According to the parametric
13 estimations, the highest levels of hydrolysis (K) were achieved for protein
14 concentrates obtained from individual rather than sequential UF and decreased when
15 lower MWCO membranes were utilised (Table 3). Thereby, retentates of 300 and
16 100 kDa provided maximal K values (80 and 70%, respectively) whereas the DH
17 dropped to 35 and 43% when UF was performed using 30 and 1 kDa membranes.
18 Also maximal hydrolysis rates (v_m) for these samples were 10-80 times higher than
19 those of protein concentrates recovered from sequential UF, indicating retentates
20 from UF at 300, 100, 30 and 1 kDa were the fastest and highly hydrolysable (Table 3).
21 An identical trend was observed in the hydrolysis of cuttlefish proteins recovered by
22 UF from four industrial effluents ¹⁹ and support the preference of alcalase for high
23 molecular weight substrates.

24 The protein content might have an effect on the degree and rate of hydrolysis but, if
25 time enough is given to the hydrolysis mixture to react, a higher E/S ratio would
26 increase the rate of hydrolysis rather than the maximum degree of hydrolysis. Since

1 almost all hydrolysis carried out reached a steady-state phase (data not shown),
2 other factors might have a greater influence on the efficiency of the hydrolysis
3 process, including the presence of other compounds and the MW and composition of
4 the main proteins in the UF fractions.

5

6 *3.3. ACE inhibitory activity of shrimp hydrolysates*

7 ACE-inhibitory activity (I_{ACE}) varied from 24.5 to 92.4% (Table 3). Our results
8 revealed ACE-inhibitory activity increased ($p < 0.05$) up to a maximum after 1-2 h of
9 hydrolysis, remaining stable after 8 h (data not shown). Therefore and for
10 comparative purposes, only the activities before and after 8 h of hydrolysis are
11 summarised (Table 3). The higher ACE-inhibitory values after hydrolysis revealed the
12 efficacy of alcalase in releasing active peptides from shrimp protein concentrates.

13 Due to its broad specificity, alcalase extensively hydrolyses peptidic bonds and so it
14 is more likely to produce active peptides. For this reason it has been widely
15 employed to digest different marine organisms^{19,34,37} to produce ACE inhibitors.
16 Peptides containing hydrophobic amino acids in the C-terminal sequence are
17 particularly suitable for their binding to ACE and consequently better inhibitors of the
18 enzyme³⁶. On the contrary, the hydrolysis of the 300→1 kDa protein concentrate did
19 not significantly increase ACE-inhibitory activity, suggesting a further hydrolysis of
20 the active peptides or a formation of less inhibitory peptides²⁹. Nevertheless, further
21 analysis in terms of size characterization and amino acid composition of the different
22 fractions is needed to confirm this hypothesis.

23 However, the calculation of IC_{50} values is the best way to compare ACE-inhibitory
24 activity because this parameter only depends on intrinsic characteristics of the
25 sample. In our study, at least seven concentrations of each protein hydrolysate were
26 assayed to calculate their IC_{50} values. Dose-response curves were constructed

1 plotting ACE-inhibitory activity (%) as a function of protein concentration ($\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$).
2 Data of samples showing different dose-response profiles (Figure 3) were modelled
3 using equation (6) in order to compare their ACE-inhibitory potency. This model has
4 been used to fit dose-response curves in different research areas ^{38,39} and recently
5 has also been satisfactorily applied for IC_{50} calculation of protein hydrolysates ^{19,29}.
6 Equation 6 accurately fitted the experimental data (Figure 3) providing in all cases
7 high coefficients of determination ($R^2 > 0.98$). Moreover, this equation was consistent
8 (Fisher's F test; $p < 0.05$) and parameter estimations were always significant
9 (Student's t test, $\alpha = 0.05$) (data not shown).

10 Since the IC_{50} value is the protein concentration causing a 50% ACE inhibition, this
11 means that samples providing identical inhibitory level at lower protein concentration
12 are more active, *i.e.* have a lower IC_{50} value. But this does not imply samples with
13 different protein content would necessarily have different IC_{50} values. Actually, a
14 sample with higher protein content could have a lower IC_{50} value depending on the
15 composition, MW and the ratio of active/ total peptides. For instance, 8h hydrolysates
16 of the samples 300→100→30 and 100→30 kDa have higher protein content than
17 30→10→1 kDa and yet their IC_{50} value is lower (Table 3).

18 Our results indicated that UF-fractionation followed by proteolysis of shrimp protein
19 concentrates produced hydrolysates with very different IC_{50} values (Table 3). ACE
20 inhibitory potencies varied from 1.98 to 618 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$, suggesting that this
21 methodology can provide peptide mixtures with highly diverse compositions based on
22 the MWCO of the UF membranes utilized. The analysis of IC_{50} values clearly showed
23 that samples hydrolysed to a higher extent were the most active, *i. e.* with lower IC_{50}
24 values. Therefore, hydrolysates from protein concentrates recovered by UF at 300,
25 100, 30 and 1 kDa had the lowest IC_{50} values, although the activity of the latter was
26 from 9 to 100-fold lower than the others. Balti et al. ³⁴ also observed a direct

1 relationship between ACE inhibitory activity (%) and DH of cuttlefish muscle protein
2 hydrolysates prepared by treatment with various bacterial proteases.
3 The IC_{50} values of the 300, 100, 30 kDa hydrolysates were as low as 1.98, 9.87 and
4 23.10 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$, revealing a very potent ACE-inhibitory activity of these peptide
5 mixtures. These ACE-inhibitory capacities were higher than those recently reported
6 for a concentrate recovered from shrimp (*Penaeus* spp.) cooking juice by
7 centrifugation ¹⁴. These authors found IC_{50} values of 4004 and 1700 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$ for the
8 liquid supernatant (CJ-L) and the concentrate (CJ-S) separated after passing a
9 thawed cooking juice (CJ) through a centrifugal separator. Also higher IC_{50} values
10 than those of our four most active fractions were reported for *Acetes chinensis*
11 muscle hydrolysates at laboratory ⁴⁰ and pilot scale ⁴¹ production before (980 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$
12 ¹) and after (220 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$) of 3 kDa UF. However, closer ACE-inhibitory potencies to
13 those reported in our work were obtained for alcalase (100–200 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$) and
14 protamex (70 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$) hydrolysates produced from solid wastes of cooked shrimps
15 (*Pandalopsis dispar*) ⁴².

16

17 3.4. Antioxidant activity of shrimp hydrolysates

18 Results of *in vitro* antioxidant activity support the fact that the most bioactive
19 hydrolysates are those prepared from 300, 100 and 30 kDa protein concentrates
20 (Table 4). In contrast to ACE-inhibitory activity, although in general our results
21 showed increased antioxidant capacity along proteolysis progress, in some cases,
22 the effect was not significant or the activity decreased after 8h of alcalase hydrolysis.
23 In fact, the scavenging on DPPH of the most active fractions significantly ($p < 0.05$)
24 decreased (300 and 100 kDa) or was maintained (30 kDa) after proteolysis (Table 4).
25 Although several investigations have shown a positive correlation between high
26 degree of hydrolysis and antioxidant activity for different fish ^{43,44} hydrolysates, other

1 studies have also reported a decrease of scavenging activity after protein hydrolysis
2 ⁴⁵. Hence these results agree in suggesting that, in addition to peptide length, other
3 factors such as amino acid composition, presence of free amino acids and
4 differences in test conditions also determine antioxidant activity of protein
5 hydrolysates. A recent study dealing with the contribution of individual or groups of
6 amino acids to antioxidant activities of food protein hydrolysates ⁴⁶, concluded that
7 sulfur-containing, acidic and hydrophobic amino acids had strong positive effects on
8 scavenging on DPPH. In contrast, positively- charged amino acids negatively
9 contributed to scavenging of this stable radical. On the other hand, the presence of
10 these residues, such as arginine and lysine, in C-terminal peptide sequences
11 contribute towards improved ACE inhibitory activity ⁴². Then, if alcalase hydrolysis
12 was likely to produce a high proportion of peptides containing this residues in the C-
13 terminus position, this would explain the observed increase in ACE-inhibitory activity
14 and the loss of DPPH scavenging activity after extensive hydrolysis with this
15 protease. Many peptides containing at least one of these residues in the C-terminal
16 sequence were identified in most of the major ACE-inhibitory fractions isolated from a
17 cuttlefish hydrolysate ⁴⁷, prepared using the same conditions reported in this work.
18 Nevertheless, to confirm this hypothesis the composition of the most active fractions
19 must be analysed.

20 The highest antioxidant activity was observed in the 300 kDa retentate due to the
21 high astaxanthin concentration in this fraction (Table 4). This carotenoid is known to
22 have strong antioxidant activity because of its ability to quench singlet oxygen and to
23 scavenge free radicals as a consequence of the presence of conjugated double
24 bonds in this compound. According to Pérez-Santín et al. ¹⁴, other antioxidant
25 compounds in shrimp cooking juice might be principally peptides, reducing sugars,

1 citrates or phenolic compounds, being the latter also reported to occur in shrimp shell
2 wastes.

3 The 300 kDa UF process leading to the recovery of a protein and astaxanthin
4 concentrated fraction from shrimp cooking wastewater is schematically represented
5 in Figure 4. This flowchart also summarizes the protein concentration, ACE-inhibitory
6 and antioxidant activity of the 300, 100, 300→100→30→10 →1 and 100→30→10 →1
7 kDa, as two examples of sequential UFs using all the MWCO membranes utilised in
8 this work.

9

10 **4. Conclusions**

11 Ultrafiltration of shrimp cooking wastewater with 300, 100, 30 and 100→30 kDa
12 MWCO membranes is an effective resource to protein concentration, indicating the
13 main soluble proteins in this effluent are within 100 and 30 kDa. Hydrolysates
14 prepared from 300, 100 and 30 kDa protein-concentrated fractions have remarkable
15 antihypertensive (IC_{50} values of 1.98, 9.87 and 23.10 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$, respectively) and
16 antioxidant activities.

17 In addition, concentrations of 10-13 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$ astaxanthin can be recovered after UF at
18 300 kDa due to its aggregation to high MW proteins. For these reasons, shrimp
19 cooking wastewater is a promising source of valuable compounds for the formulation
20 of functional foods while allowing wastewater depuration.

21

22 **Acknowledgements**

23 We wish to thank to Ana Durán, Margarita Nogueira and Javier Fraguas for their
24 excellent technical assistance. We also thank to Dalva Martínez from Bajamar
25 Séptima, Pescanova Group (A Coruña, Galicia, Spain) for providing the shrimp
26 cooking wastewater. The company Bajamar Séptima S.A. funded this study (Contract

1 N° 20090910 co-financed by the Centre for Industrial Technological Development
2 (CDTI)). We are grateful to Ramiro Martinez (Novozymes A/S, Spain) for supplying
3 the Alcalase 2.4 L utilized in this work.
4

5 **References**

- 6 1 Sachindra NM and Mahendrakar NS, Process optimization for extraction of
7 carotenoids from shrimp waste with vegetable oils. *Biores Technol* **96**:1195-1200
8 (2005).
- 9 2 Armenta-López R, Guerrero IL and Huerta S, Astaxanthin extraction from shrimp
10 waste by lactic fermentation and enzymatic hydrolysis of the carotenoprotein
11 complex. *J Food Sci* **67**:1002-1006 (2002).
- 12 3 Matsuno T, Aquatic animal carotenoids. *Fisheries Sci* **67**:771-783 (2001).
- 13 4 De Holanda HD and Netto FM, Recovery of components from shrimp
14 (*Xiphopenaeus kroyeri*) processing waste by enzymatic hydrolysis. *J Food Sci*
15 **71**:C298-C303 (2006).
- 16 5 Sachindra NM, Bhaskar N and Mahendrakar NS, Recovery of carotenoids from
17 shrimp waste in organic solvents. *Waste Manage* **26**:1092-1098 (2006).
- 18 6 Chen H and Meyers SP, Extraction of astaxanthin pigment from crawfish waste
19 using a soy oil process. *J Food Sci* **47**:892-896 (1982).
- 20 7 Handayani AD, Sutrisno, Indraswati N and Ismadji S, Extraction of astaxanthin from
21 giant tiger (*Panaeus monodon*) shrimp waste using palm oil: studies of extraction
22 kinetics and thermodynamic. *Bioresource Technol* **99**:4414-4419 (2008).
- 23 8 Zhu T and Row KH, Extraction of astaxanthin from shrimp waste using response
24 surface methodology and a new hybrid organic-inorganic monolith. *Separ Sci Tech*
25 **48**:1510-1517 (2013).

1 9 Sánchez-Camargo AP, Martínez-Correa HA, Paviani LC and Cabral FA,
2 Supercritical CO₂ extraction of lipids and astaxanthin from Brazilian redspotted
3 shrimp waste (*Farfantepenaeus paulensis*). *J Supercrit Fluid* **56**: 164-173 (2011).

4 10 Vandajon L, Cros S, Jaouen P, Quéméneur F and Bourseau P, Recovery by
5 nanofiltration and reverse osmosis of marine flavours from seafood cooking waters.
6 *Desalination* **144**:379-385 (2002).

7 11 Cros S, Lignot B, Jaouen P and Bourseau P, Technical and economical
8 evaluation of an integrated membrane process capable both to produce an aroma
9 concentrate and to reject clean water from shrimp cooking juices. *J Food Eng*
10 **77**:379-471 (2006).

11 12 Tay J-H, Show K-Y and Hung Y-T, Seafood processing wastewater treatment, in
12 Handbook of industrial and hazardous wastes treatment, ed by Wang LK, Hung Y-T,
13 Lo HH and Yapijakis C. Marcel Dekker Inc. 2nd ed, pp 694-738 (2004).

14 13 Yang J, Spanjers H, Jeison D and Van Lier JB, Impact of Na⁺ on biological
15 wastewater treatment and the potential of anaerobic membrane bioreactors: A review.
16 *Crit Rev Environ Sci Technol* **43**:2722-2746 (2013).

17 14 Pérez-Santín E, Calvo MM, López-Caballero ME, Montero P and Gómez-Guillén
18 MC, Compositional properties and bioactive potential of waste material from shrimp
19 cooking juice. *LWT - Food Sci Technol* **54**:87-94 (2013).

20 15 Li Z, Kittikun AH and Youravong W, Removal of suspended solids from tuna
21 spleen extract by microfiltration: a batch process design and improvement. *Biochem.*
22 *Eng. J.* **38**:226–233 (2008).

23 16 Murado, MA, Fraguas J, Montemayor MI, Vázquez JA and González P,
24 Preparation of highly purified chondroitin sulphate from skate (*Raja clavata*) cartilage
25 by-products. Process optimization including a new procedure of alkaline
26 hydroalcoholic hydrolysis. *Biochem Eng J* **49**:126-132 (2010).

1 17 Bourseau P, Massé A, Cros S, Vandanjon L and Jaouen P, Recovery of aroma
2 compounds from seafood cooking juices by membrane processes. *J Food Eng*
3 **128**:157-166 (2014).

4 18 Afonso MD and Bórquez R, Nanofiltration of wastewaters from the fish meal
5 industry. *Desalination* **151**:131-138 (2002).

6 19 Amado IR, Vázquez JA, González MP and Murado MA, Production of
7 antihypertensive and antioxidant activities by enzymatic hydrolysis of protein
8 concentrates recovered by ultrafiltration from cuttlefish processing wastewaters.
9 *Biochem Eng J* **76**:43-54 (2013).

10 20 Havilah EJ, Wallis DM, Morris R and Woolnough JA, A micro-colorimetric method
11 for determination of ammonia in Kjeldahl digests with a manual spectrophotometer.
12 *Lab Pract* **26**:545-547 (1977).

13 21 Lowry OH, Rosebrough NJ, Farr AL and Randall RJ, Protein measurement with
14 the folin phenol reagent. *J Biol Chem* **193**:265-275 (1951).

15 22 Strickland JDH and Parsons TR, A practical handbook of seawater analysis. *J*
16 *Fish Res Board Can* **167**:57-62 (1968).

17 23 Bernfeld P, Enzymes of starch degradation and synthesis. *Adv Enzymol* **12**:379-
18 427(1951).

19 24 Clesceri LS, Greenberg AE and Eaton AD. Standard methods for the examination
20 of water and wastewater (twentieth ed.). New York: American Public Health
21 Association (APHA). Methods updated since 1998 are available online at [http://](http://www.standardmethods.org)
22 www.standardmethods.org.

23 25 Amado IR, Vázquez JA, Murado MA and González MP, Recovery of astaxanthin
24 from shrimp cooking wastewater: Optimization of astaxanthin extraction by response
25 surface methodology and kinetic studies. *Food Bioproc Technol*. In Press (2014).

1 26 Vázquez JA, González MP and Murado MA, Peptones from autohydrolysed fish
2 viscera for nisin and pediocin production. *J Biotechnol* **112**:299–311 (2004).

3 27 Barker TW and Worgan JT, The utilisation of palm oil processing effluents as
4 substrates for microbial protein production by the fungus *Aspergillus oryzae*. *Appl*
5 *Microbiol Biotechnol* **11**:234-240 (1981).

6 28 Shalaby SM, Zakora M and Otte J, Performance of two commonly used
7 angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibition assays using FA-PGG and HHL as
8 substrates. *J Dairy Res* **73**:178-186 (2006).

9 29 Estévez N, Fuciños P, Sobrosa AC, Pastrana L, Pérez N and Rúa ML, Modeling
10 the angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitory activity of peptide mixtures obtained
11 from cheese whey hydrolysates using concentration-response curves. *Biotechnol*
12 *Progr* **28**:1197-1206 (2012).

13 30 Prieto MA, Rodríguez-Amado I, Vázquez JA and Murado MA. β -Carotene assay
14 revisited. Application to characterize and quantify antioxidant and prooxidant
15 activities in a microplate. *J Agric Food Chem* **60**:8983-8993 (2012).

16 31 Brand-Williams W, Cuvelier ME and Berset C, Use of a free radical method to
17 evaluate antioxidant activity. *LWT - Food Sci Technol* **28**: 25-30 (1995).

18 32 Whala K, Ben Amar R, Bourseau P and Jaouen P, Nanofiltration of concentrated
19 and salted tuna cooking juices. *Process Saf Environ* **87**:331-335 (2009).

20 33 Ferjani E, Ellouze E and Ben Amar R, Treatment of seafood processing
21 wastewaters by ultrafiltration-nanofiltration cellulose acetate membranes.
22 *Desalination* **177**:43-49 (2005).

23 34 Balti R, Nedjar-Arroume N, Adjé EY, Guillochon D and Nasri M, Analysis of novel
24 angiotensin I-converting enzyme inhibitory peptides from enzymatic hydrolysates of
25 cuttlefish (*Sepia officinalis*) muscle proteins. *J Agric Food Chem* **58**:3840-3846
26 (2010).

1 35 Kristinsson HG and Rasco BA, Biochemical and functional properties of Atlantic
2 salmon (*Salmo salar*) muscle proteins hydrolyzed with various alkaline proteases. *J*
3 *Agric Food Chem* **48**:657-666 (2000).

4 36 Mullally MM, Meisel H and FitzGerald RJ, Identification of a novel angiotensin-I-
5 converting enzyme inhibitory peptide corresponding to a tryptic fragment of bovine β -
6 lactoglobulin. *FEBS Lett* **402**:99–101 (1997).

7 37 Ko S-C, Kang N, Kim E-A, Kang MC, Lee S-H, Kang S-M et al., A novel
8 angiotensin I-converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitory peptide from a marine *Chlorella*
9 *ellipsoidea* and its antihypertensive effect in spontaneously hypertensive rats.
10 *Process Biochem* **47**:2005-2011 (2012).

11 38 Rial D, Vázquez JA and Murado MA, Effects of three heavy metals on the bacteria
12 growth kinetics: a bivariate model for toxicological assessment. *Appl Microbiol*
13 *Biotechnol* **90**:1095-1109 (2011).

14 39 Vázquez JA, Modeling of chemical inhibition from amyloid protein aggregation
15 kinetics. *BMC Pharmacol Toxicol* **15**:1-9 (2014).

16 40 He H, Chen X, Sun C, Zhang Y and Gao P, Preparation and functional evaluation
17 of oligopeptide-enriched hydrolysate from shrimp (*Acetes chinensis*) treated with
18 crude protease from *Bacillus* sp. SM98011. *Biores Technol* **97**:385-390 (2006).

19 41 He H-L, Wu H, Chen X-L, Shi M, Zhang X-Y, Sun C-Y, Zhang YZ and Zhou BC,
20 Pilot and plant scaled production of ACE inhibitory hydrolysates from *Acetes*
21 *chinensis* and its in vivo antihypertensive effect. *Biores Technol* **99**:5956-5959 (2008).

22 42 Cheung IWY and Li-Chan ECY, Angiotensin-I-converting enzyme inhibitory
23 activity and bitterness of enzymatically-produced hydrolysates of shrimp
24 (*Pandalopsis dispar*) processing byproducts investigated by Taguchi design. *Food*
25 *Chem* **122**:1003-1012 (2010).

1 43 Balti R, Bougatef A, El Hadj Ali N, Ktari N, Jellouli K, Nedjar-Arroume N, Dhulster
2 P and Nasri M, Comparative study on biochemical properties and antioxidative
3 activity of cuttlefish (*Sepia officinalis*) protein hydrolysates produced by alcalase and
4 *Bacillus licheniformis* NH1 proteases. *J Amino Acids* **2011**: 1-11 (2011).

5 44 Je J-Y, Park P-J and Kim S-K, Antioxidant activity of a peptide isolated from
6 Alaska pollack (*Theragra chalcogramma*) frame protein hydrolysate. *Food Res Int* **38**:
7 45-50 (2005).

8 45 Theodore AE, Raghavan S and Kristinsson HG, Antioxidative activity of protein
9 hydrolysates prepared from alkaline-aided channel catfish protein isolates. *J Agric*
10 *Food Chem* **56**:7459-7466 (2008).

11 46 Udenigwe CC and Aluko RE, Chemometric analysis of the amino acid
12 requirements of antioxidant food protein hydrolysates. *Int J Molec Sci* **12**:3148-3161
13 (2011).

14 47 Amado IR, Vázquez JA, González P, Esteban-Fernández D, Carrera M and
15 Piñeiro C, Identification of the major ACE-Inhibitory peptides produced by enzymatic
16 hydrolysis of a protein concentrate from cuttlefish wastewater. *Mar Drugs* **12**:1390-
17 1405 (2014).

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

1 **TABLE CAPTIONS**

2

3 **Table 1.** Average composition of shrimp industrial wastewater. TS: total sugars, RS:
4 reducing sugars, DR: dry residue, TP: total soluble Lowry-protein, COD: chemical
5 oxygen demand, SS: suspended solids. Confidence intervals for $\alpha=0.05$.

6

7 **Table 2.** Initial (C_i), final (C_f) protein concentration and Q_{3D} parameter in the
8 retentates for each UF-DF process with different molecular weight cut-off (MWCO)
9 membranes are shown.

10

11 **Table 3.** Parameters of the hydrolysis kinetics (equation (4)) from shrimp protein
12 concentrates produced by UF with different MWCO membranes. Total protein (TP)
13 and ACE-inhibitory activity (%) of these hydrolysates before and after 8 h hydrolysis,
14 and IC_{50} values of 8 h hydrolysates or the final retentate, when hydrolysis was not
15 carried out, are also shown.

16

17 **Table 4.** β -carotene bleaching assay (β C) and DPPH radical scavenging activities
18 (μ M BHT equivalent mg^{-1} of sample) of shrimp hydrolysates determined before and
19 after 8h hydrolysis. ND: not activity detected.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Selection of four different UF-DF process from shrimp cooking wastewater using the following molecular weight cut-offs membranes: A) 300 kDa; B) 300→100 kDa; C) 300→100→30 kDa and D) 300→100→30→10 kDa. Left: concentration of retained protein in linear relation with the factor of volumetric concentration (f_c) showing experimental data (points) and theoretical profiles corresponding to a completely retained solute (discontinuous line). Right: progress of protein (○) and nitrogen (●) retention with the increase of diavolume from DF process (D). For clarity, confidence intervals (in all cases less than 5% of the experimental mean value; $\alpha = 0.05$; $n = 2$) were omitted. Equation (2) was used to fit the experimental data.

Figure 2. Proteolytic kinetics of shrimp protein concentrates obtained by ultrafiltration using different molecular weight cut-off membranes. Left: ●, 30 kDa; ○, 300→100→30 kDa; ▼, 100→30 kDa. Middle: ●, 300→100→30→10 kDa; ○, 30→10 kDa. Right: ●, 1 kDa; ○, 300→1 kDa; ▼, 100→30→10→1 kDa; △, 30→10→1 kDa. Experimental data (points) were fitted to equation (4) (continuous lines).

Figure 3. Experimental data (symbols) for ACE-inhibitory activity of hydrolysates prepared from different shrimp protein concentrated fractions recovered by ultrafiltration (UF). The dose-response curves (lines) were obtained according to equation (6). Keys in A: ●, 300 kDa; ○, 100 kDa; ▲, 30 kDa UF retentates. Keys in B: ○, 100→30→10→1 kDa; ●, 300→100→30→10→1 kDa and ▲ 30→10→1 kDa UF retentates.

- 1 **Figure 4.** Flowchart summarizing different alternatives for the recovery of astaxanthin
- 2 and the production of bioactive peptides from shrimp cooking wastewaters.