**Optimization of electrospraying conditions for the microencapsulation
of probiotics and evaluation of their resistance during storage and *in-
vitro* digestion**

Laura G. Gomez-Mascaraque¹, Russell Cruz Morfin², Rocío Perez-Masiá¹, Gloria
Sanchez^{3,4}, Amparo Lopez-Rubio^{1*}

¹Food Preservation and Food Quality Department, IATA-CSIC, Avda. Agustin
Escardino 7, 46980 Paterna, Valencia, Spain

² Universidad de las Americas Puebla, San Andrés Cholula, Puebla, México

³Department of Microbiology and Ecology, University of Valencia, Valencia, Spain

⁴ Molecular Taxonomy Group, IATA-CSIC, Avda. Agustin Escardino 7, 46980 Paterna,
Valencia, Spain

*Corresponding author: Tel.: +34 963900022; fax: +34 963636301

E-mail address: amparo.lopez@iata.csic.es (A. López-Rubio)

ABSTRACT

Electrospraying has recently emerged as a novel microencapsulation technique with potential for the protection of probiotics. However, research efforts are still needed to minimize the viability loss observed during the processing of sensitive strains, and to maximize productivity. The aim of the present work was the optimization of the electrospraying conditions for the microencapsulation of a model probiotic microorganism, *Lactobacillus plantarum*, within a whey protein concentrate matrix. In a pre-optimization step, the convenience of encapsulating fresh culture instead of freeze-dried bacteria was established. Additionally, a surface response methodology was used to study the effect of the applied voltage, surfactant concentration, and addition of a prebiotic to the formulation on cell viability and productivity. Viability losses lower than 1 log₁₀ CFU were achieved and the bacterial counts of the final products exceeded 8.5 log₁₀ CFU/g. The protection ability of the developed structures during storage and *in-vitro* digestion was also evaluated.

Keywords

Electrospraying, encapsulation, *L. plantarum*, probiotic, whey protein

1 INTRODUCTION

Microencapsulation technologies constitute a plausible approach for the preservation of biologically active ingredients in food systems including probiotic bacteria (Chandramouli, Kailasapathy, Peiris, & Jones, 2004; Kailasapathy & Champagne, 2011; Krasaekoopt, Bhandari, & Deeth, 2003), not only during processing or storage, but also during gastrointestinal transit, improving the delivery of probiotic strains to the large intestine (Shori, 2015). Several methods have been reported to microencapsulate probiotic microorganisms, including spray-coating (Champagne, Raymond, & Tompkins, 2010), emulsion and/or spray-drying (Picot & Lacroix, 2003), extrusion (Doherty et al., 2012), and gel-particle technologies (Chandramouli et al., 2004). Being a well-established process that can produce large amounts of material, spray-drying is the most commonly used microencapsulation technique in the food industry (Gharsallaoui, Roudaut, Chambin, Voilley, & Saurel, 2007). However, this technique involves the use of high temperatures, which results in significant cell mortality (Salar-Behzadi et al., 2013). On the other hand, spray-coating and entrapment in gel particles generate relatively big particles (90-250 μm and $>200 \mu\text{m}$, respectively) that may affect food sensory qualities (Augustin, 2003), and the latter is considerably expensive to be scaled up in the food industry (Champagne et al., 2010; Krasaekoopt et al., 2003). Recently, electrospraying has emerged as an alternative microencapsulation technique (Bock, Dargaville, & Woodruff, 2012) which can generate very fine particulate structures in a one-step process (Chakraborty, Liao, Adler, & Leong, 2009) under mild conditions (López-Rubio & Lagaron, 2012). It basically involves the application of a high voltage electrical field to a polymer solution, dispersion or melt which is sprayed towards a charged collector, where the dry nano- or microparticles are deposited (Bhardwaj & Kundu, 2010; Bhushani & Anandharamakrishnan, 2014; Chakraborty et

al., 2009) (cf. Supplementary material). Some of the advantages of electrospraying include the possibility of working under mild ambient conditions and using food-grade solvents, achieving high encapsulation efficiencies and obtaining smaller particle sizes than in conventional mechanical atomisers (Bock et al., 2012; Chakraborty et al., 2009; Jaworek & Sobczyk, 2008). Recently, electrohydrodynamic processes were proposed for the entrapment of living bifidobacteria within ultrathin polymeric fibers (López-Rubio, Sanchez, Sanz, & Lagaron, 2009), which significantly reduced their viability loss during storage at different temperatures. Furthermore, the electrospraying technique proved to be useful for the encapsulation of *Bifidobacterium animalis* subsp. *lactis* Bb12 within edible hydrocolloids for functional foods applications, effectively prolonging bacterial survival at different relative humidities (López-Rubio, Sanchez, Wilkanowicz, Sanz, & Lagaron, 2012). Although the viability of the aforementioned commercial strain was not significantly affected by the electrohydrodynamic process, it was found that a certain viability loss occurred when trying to microencapsulate non-commercial probiotic cultures during the electrospraying processing. In addition, the different process parameters and the properties of the probiotic feed suspension have an impact on the productivity of the electrospraying technique, as the formation of stable jets from aqueous media is complicated (R. Pérez-Masiá, J. M. Lagaron, & A. López-Rubio, 2014) and often leads to dripping of the polymeric solution if conditions are not optimized. Thus, a study of the impact of different electrospraying variables on the bacterial viability loss and the process yield is needed.

Lactobacillus plantarum, a prominent species among lactic acid bacteria which has been found to colonize healthy human gastrointestinal tracts (Gbassi, Vandamme, Ennahar, & Marchioni, 2009) and to whom a number of health benefits have been attributed, such as reduction of serum cholesterol levels (Yoon et al., 2013) or

downregulation of proinflammatory genes (Bäuerl et al., 2013), has been used as a model probiotic microorganism for the present study. Regarding the encapsulation matrix, a whey protein concentrate (WPC) was selected as the main wall component of the capsules, as its capability for preserving the viability of probiotic microorganisms had already been demonstrated in a previous work using *B. animalis* (López-Rubio et al., 2012). Moreover, whey proteins are cheap by-products from the cheese industry and possess functional characteristics (López-Rubio & Lagaron, 2012). The aim of the present work was to study the impact of the electrospraying conditions on the viability of *L. plantarum* within the obtained WPC microstructures, as well as on the productivity of the process. This mathematical modelling has been attempted following a Design of Experiments (DoE) methodology (Jovanović, Rakić, Ivanović, & Jančić-Stojanović, 2014), applying a second-order Box-Behnken design to maximize the bacterial viability and the process yield. The capability of the microencapsulation structures obtained by applying the optimal electrospraying conditions to prolong the survival of *L. plantarum* during storage at different relative humidities, as well as during static *in-vitro* digestion, was also evaluated.

2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Materials

Whey protein concentrate (WPC), under the commercial name of Lacprodan® DI-8090 and with a w/w composition of ~80% protein, ~9% lactose and ~8% lipids, was kindly donated by ARLA (ARLA Food Ingredients, Viby, Denmark), and was used without further purification. *Lactobacillus plantarum* strain CECT 748 T was obtained from the Spanish Cell Culture Collection (CECT) and routinely grown in Man, Rogosa and Sharpe (MRS) broth (Scharlau, Barcelona, Spain). Serial dilutions were made in 1 g/L

meat peptone solution and plate counting was performed on MRS agar, both provided by Conda Pronadisa (Spain). Surfactant Tween20®, maltodextrin (with dextrose equivalent 16.5-19.5), pepsin from porcine gastric mucosa, pancreatin from porcine pancreas, bile extract porcine and phosphate buffered saline (PBS) were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Spain). The commercial resistant starch Fibersol® was manufactured by ADM/Matsutani (Iowa, USA). The LIVE/DEAD BacLight Bacterial Viability Kit was purchased from Invitrogen (California, USA). All inorganic salts used for the *in-vitro* digestion tests were used as received.

2.2 Preparation of WPC dispersions

WPC dispersions were prepared by mixing the protein concentrate with distilled water or skimmed milk under magnetic stirring at room temperature to achieve a concentration of 0.3 g/mL. This concentration had been previously optimized based on previous works (López-Rubio & Lagaron, 2012; López-Rubio et al., 2012) in order to minimize dripping of the suspensions during electrospraying. Fibersol® and/or Tween20® were also added to some of the formulations in variable amounts.

2.3 Preparation of probiotic cells suspensions

Two different strategies were used to incorporate the probiotic cells within the WPC dispersions. The first one involved the use of a fresh culture of *L. plantarum*. Bacteria were grown in MRS broth for 24 h at 37°C, reaching the growth stationary state as observed from the growth curves (results not shown) constructed using a POLARstar Omega Microplate Reader from BMG LABTECH (Ortenberg, Germany) (final cell density of 9-10 log₁₀ CFU/mL). The lactobacilli were then collected by centrifugation in

50 mL tubes at 4000 rpm for 5 min using an Eppendorf Centrifuge 5804R equipped with an Eppendorf Rotor S-4-72, obtaining a pellet that was subsequently washed twice with PBS and re-suspended in the WPC dispersions. The second approach consisted in freeze-drying the cell culture after re-suspension of the twice-washed pellet in a PBS solution containing 0.1 g/mL of maltodextrin, and subsequent incorporation of the freeze-dried cells into the WPC dispersions.

2.4 Preparation of probiotic-containing capsules through electrospraying

The suspensions were processed using a Fluidnatek® LE-10 electrospinning/electrospraying apparatus, equipped with a variable high voltage 0–30 kV power supply, purchased from BioInicia S.L. (Valencia, Spain). Probiotic-containing WPC suspensions were introduced into a sterile 5 mL plastic syringe and pumped at a steady flow-rate of 0.15 mL/h through a stainless-steel needle (2.41 mm of inner diameter). The needle was connected through a PTFE wire to the syringe, which was placed on a digitally controlled syringe pump (KD Scientific Inc., Holliston, U.S.A.). The obtained encapsulation structures were collected on a stainless-steel plate connected to the ground electrode of the power supply and placed at a distance of 10 cm with respect to the tip of the needle. The suspensions were processed during a fixed time of 4h. Applied voltage varied within the range of 10-14 kV. A schematic representation of the setup used for microencapsulation can be found in the supplementary material.

2.5 Viability of encapsulated and non-encapsulated *L. plantarum*

The viability of *L. plantarum* was evaluated by plate counting. Samples were subjected to 10-fold serial dilutions in 1 g/L meat peptone solution and plated on MRS agar. After 24-48 h incubation at 37°C, the number of colony-forming units (CFU) was determined.

Cell viability was evaluated for the probiotics-containing WPC suspensions before processing (N_0) and in the dry electrosprayed products (N_{ES}) by resuspension of a precise amount of the powder in 1 mL of peptone solution. Tests were made in triplicate.

2.6 Morphological characterization of the capsules

Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) was conducted on a Hitachi microscope (Hitachi S-4800) at an accelerating voltage of 10 kV and a working distance of 10-12 mm. Samples were sputter-coated with a gold-palladium mixture under vacuum prior to examination.

In addition, optical microscopy images were taken using a digital microscopy system (Nikon Eclipse 90i) fitted with a 12 V, 100 W halogen lamp and equipped with a digital imaging head which integrates an epifluorescence illuminator. A digital camera head (Nikon DS-5Mc) was attached to the microscope. Nis Elements software was used for image capturing.

In order to confirm the presence of the probiotic bacteria within the WPC capsules, the cells were stained using a LIVE/DEAD kit (BacLight® viability kit, Invitrogen) prior to the electrospraying process. Because the dye used to observe live cells in green (SYTO 9®) was found to also stain WPC, it was not possible to discern live bacteria from the encapsulating matrix after the electrospraying process, and only sporadic death cells could be distinguished in red due to the propidium iodide dye. Consequently, bacteria were intentionally killed before staining by resuspension of the twice-washed bacterial pellet in 20 mL of 96% (v/v) ethanol and subsequent incubation at room temperature for 40 minutes. The ethanolic suspension was then washed and the dead pellet was resuspended in 10 mL of buffered peptone water. Propidium iodide was used as a red

dye according to the manufacturer protocol, before incorporating the dead bacteria to the feed WPC dispersions for electrospraying.

2.7 Optimization of electrospraying process parameters through Box-Behnken experimental design

Three key variables were selected for the optimization of the electrospraying process in terms of bacterial viability loss (y_1) and product yield (y_2): the applied voltage (x_1), the concentration of a prebiotic additive (Fibersol®) incorporated into the formulation (x_2), and the concentration of a surfactant (Tween20®) added to the feed suspensions (x_3). A Box-Behnken fractional-factorial experimental design was developed with these three variables at three levels (3^3) in order to reduce the number of experimental runs. This model was used to correlate the response variables, y_1 and y_2 , to the independent variables, x_1 , x_2 and x_3 , by fitting them to a polynomial second order model, whose general equation is Eq. 1, where y_i are each of the predicted responses, x_i and x_j are the input variables affecting the response variables, β_0 is the offset term, β_i are the linear coefficients, β_{ii} are the quadratic coefficients and β_{ij} are the interaction coefficients (Ismail & Nampoothiri, 2010). Table 1 summarizes the independent variables (factors) used and their assayed levels (coded as +1, 0 and -1).

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_i \sum x_i + \beta_{ii} \sum x_i^2 + \beta_{ij} \sum_i \sum_j x_i x_j \quad (\text{Eq. 1})$$

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

A small number of experimental runs (i.e. 15 runs, each made in triplicate) was necessary for the optimization process (cf. Table 3). The design included replicated central points. The bacterial viability loss (ΔN) was calculated as the difference in viability per unit mass of dry solids in the suspensions before processing and in the dry electrosprayed products, according to Eq. 2. The product yield was determined according to Eq. 3.

$$\Delta N = N_0 - N_{ES} \quad (\text{Eq. 2})$$

$$\text{Product yield (\%)} = \frac{\text{Mass of electrosprayed product recovered from collector}}{\text{Mass of solids in the processed suspension}} \times 100 \quad (\text{Eq. 3})$$

2.8 Survival of encapsulated *L. plantarum* under stress conditions

Selected electrosprayed capsules containing *L. plantarum* were stored at medium and high relative humidities (RH), i.e. 53 and 75%, as described in (López-Rubio et al., 2012), and their bacterial viability was tested after different time intervals. For this purpose, the powders were introduced in desiccators containing $\text{Mg}(\text{NO}_3)_2$ and NaCl saturated solutions, respectively. Similarly, freeze-dried samples of *L. plantarum* obtained from the same formulations used for the electrospraying process (by lyophilization of the feed WPC-based suspensions) were also stored at the same conditions, in order to compare the proposed microencapsulation technique with a well-established preservation method.

2.9 Survival of encapsulated *L. plantarum* during digestion

Suspensions (0.03 g/mL) of the electrosprayed capsules or their freeze-dried counterparts, respectively, in distilled water were subjected to *in-vitro* gastrointestinal digestion in order to evaluate the survival of protected *L. plantarum* during simulated consumption. Digestion was simulated according to the standardized static *in vitro* digestion protocol developed within the framework of the Infogest COST Action (Minekus et al., 2014). Simulated salivary fluid (SSF), simulated gastric fluid (SGF), and simulated intestinal fluid (SIF) were prepared according to the harmonized compositions (Minekus et al., 2014). In the oral phase, the suspensions were mixed with SSF (50:50 v/v) and incubated at 37°C for 2 min under agitation in a thermostatic bath. In the gastric phase, the oral digesta was mixed with SGF (50:50 v/v) and porcine pepsin (2000 U/mL), and incubated at 37°C for 2 h under agitation. In the duodenal phase, the gastric digesta was mixed with SIF (50:50 v/v), porcine bile extract (10 mM) and porcine pancreatin (100 U/mL of trypsin activity), and incubated at 37°C for 2 h under agitation. The pH was adjusted to 7, 3, and 7 in the oral, gastric and duodenal phases, respectively. Aliquots were collected after the gastric and the duodenal phases and the viability of *L. plantarum* in the digestas was assessed by plate counting.

2.10 Statistical analysis

The response surface modelling was conducted using the software Unscrambler X (version 10.1, CAMO software AS, Oslo, Norway, 2010). The statistical analysis of the Box-Behnken model was performed through analysis of variance (ANOVA). A $p < 0.05$ was considered significant. The determination coefficient (R^2), which measures the goodness of fit of the regression model, was used as an indicator of the quality of the model to predict the experimental data.

A statistical analysis of the rest of the experimental data was performed through analysis of variance (one-way ANOVA) using OriginPro 8 (OriginLab Corp., Northampton, USA). Homogeneous sample groups were obtained by using Fisher LSD test (95% significance level, $p < 0.05$).

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Pre-optimization of the electrospraying conditions

The first (preliminary) step in this process optimization was to determine whether the initial state of the cells had an effect on cell viability after encapsulation and, also, to determine the maximum cell load which could be incorporated within the protein matrix. For this purpose, freeze-dried bacteria were added to the WPC dispersions in different amounts, and compared with addition of bacterial pellets obtained from different volumes of fresh culture in 5 mL of WPC dispersion. The use of a non-ionic surfactant, Tween20® (a polysorbate), to improve the electrospraying process (R. Pérez-Masiá, J. Lagaron, & A. López-Rubio, 2014) and limit the dripping of the aqueous solutions was also considered, and its influence on the bacterial viability was thus studied. Table 2 summarizes the test conditions used in this first stage. The applied voltage was fixed at 10 kV in all cases, keeping the rest of the processing parameters as stated in Section 2.4.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

First, the initial viability (N_0) of *L. plantarum* in the WPC suspensions was compared using the different formulations. It was observed that adding higher amounts of freeze-dried bacteria (i.e. $5 \cdot 10^{-3}$, 10^{-2} and $1.5 \cdot 10^{-2}$ g/mL) did not yield significant differences (p

< 0.05) in the initial cell counts. All the formulations prepared using freeze-dried bacteria exhibited an initial bacterial viability in the range of $7.23 \pm 0.21 \log_{10}$ CFU/g. Similarly, no significant differences ($p < 0.05$) were found in the initial cell counts when using pellets obtained from 5 mL or 10 mL of fresh culture to prepare the suspensions. In these cases, the average initial viability was $9.38 \pm 0.42 \log_{10}$ CFU/g. Lastly, the suspension prepared using a pellet obtained from 100 mL of fresh culture had an average N_0 of $10.28 \pm 0.35 \log_{10}$ CFU/g. These results showed that significantly higher initial cell counts were achieved when using fresh culture for the preparation of the suspensions. It is worth mentioning that higher amounts of freeze-dried bacteria could not successfully be incorporated into the WPC dispersions because the resultant feed suspensions aggregated and precipitated in the syringe during the electrospraying process.

Figure 1 summarizes the results from viability loss (ΔN) and product yields of *L. plantarum* after the electrospraying process of the different formulations containing freeze-dried bacteria (a, c) and fresh culture (b, d). In general, greater viability losses and lower productivities were observed when using freeze-dried microorganisms than for fresh cultures, mainly explained by the poor bacterial dispersion within the WPC suspension when using the freeze-dried form of the probiotic strain. However, the suspension prepared using 100 mL of fresh culture also exhibited a high viability drop and lower productivities, which could be attributed to an excess of biomass in the formulation which apart from hindering proper microencapsulation of the bacteria, led to extensive dripping of the solution. In general, the product yield was considerably improved by the addition of Tween20® which, apart from favouring bacterial dispersion, led to lower surface tensions of the suspensions (Rocío Pérez-Masiá et al.,

2014) and it did not significantly affect the viability loss of *L. plantarum* at the low concentrations used (1-5% w/w).

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

In view of the results, the formulation containing a bacterial pellet obtained from 10 mL of fresh broth and 5 wt.% of Tween20® provided the greatest product recovery percentage ($16.1 \pm 2.1\%$) while experiencing one of the lowest viability losses ($0.6 \pm 0.1 \log_{10}$ CFU/g). This specific formulation resulted in capsules containing over 10^9 CFU/g (cf. Figure 2), a final bacterial count in the dry product which was similar to that obtained from a 100 mL-pellet, although with much higher productivity. Thus, this formulation was chosen as the starting point for further optimization of the electrospraying process through a Box-Behnken experimental design, in order to increase the product yield while maintaining high bacterial viabilities in the final product.

INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

3.2 Mathematical modelling of the electrospraying process

Three key factors potentially influencing the bacterial viability and product yield in the microencapsulation of probiotics through electrospraying processes were selected for the Box-Behnken modelling: the applied voltage (x_1), the concentration of Fibersol® in the formulations (x_2), and the ratio of Tween20® in the feed suspensions (x_3). The applied voltage is known to exert an effect on the properties of electrosprayed materials (Bock et al., 2012). On one hand it must be sufficiently high to overcome the surface

tension of the suspensions, in order to efficiently produce the microcapsules. On the other hand, it was hypothesized that too strong electric fields might impose a source of stress on the probiotic strain, having an impact on its viability. Fibersol® is a commercial resistant starch recognized as GRAS by the FDA, so it was used as a prebiotic additive (Topping & Clifton, 2001) to ascertain whether the addition of the carbohydrate, apart from giving rise to a symbiotic product, could enhance bacterial viability within the capsules. Other prebiotics have been previously reported to increase the viability of probiotic bacteria upon microencapsulation through spray-drying (Fritzen-Freire et al., 2012). Lastly, the positive effect of Tween20® on the product yield was evidenced in the previous section and a more exhaustive study of its impact on bacterial viability loss should be carried out in order to optimize the feed formulation.

Hence, a Box-Behnken design was developed with these three factors at three levels in order to assess their impact on the response variables and find the optimum combination of these parameters able to yield the best results. The lower and upper levels of each factor (cf. Table 1) were fixed based on preliminary experiments carried out to determine the limits which allowed a stable electrospraying process (results not shown). A total of 15 experimental runs, each made in triplicate, were necessary to construct the design models. Table 3 summarizes the full design and the experimental values obtained for the response variables in each run.

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

The results in Table 3 were used to construct two polynomial second order models (according to Eq. 1) with the aid of the software Unscrambler X, each corresponding to one of the response variables y_1 and y_2 . Both models were statistically analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) in order to check the significance of their linear, quadratic and interaction terms, as well as the significance of the models themselves. The quality of the models was also checked by comparing the experimental results in Table 3 with the values predicted by the models. As observed in Figure 3, the model obtained for y_1 did not accurately describe the experimental values. This was attributed to the intrinsic variability of the results and consequent high deviations that are obtained when studying microbiological systems. Due to its great lack of fit, the use of this model for the prediction and optimization of the viability loss during electrospraying was considered risky and thus the model was disregarded. Conversely, an acceptable value was obtained for the lack of fit of the model for y_2 and, thus, this model was considered adequate for the prediction and optimization of the product yield for the proposed electrospraying process.

INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE

The final model equation which correlates the product yield with the three factors, after disregarding non significant terms, is expressed in Eq. 4, where x_i are the coded values of the factors (from -1 to +1, cf. Table 1). Table 4 shows the results of the ANOVA analysis for this model, from where it could be concluded that the linear terms corresponding to the applied voltage and the ratio of Tween20®, as well as their interaction, are highly significant ($p < 0.01$). The linear and quadratic terms involving the ratio of Fibersol® in the formulation were also statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). The

offset term ($\beta_0 = 27.9$) corresponds to the predicted value of the product yield at the central point ($x_1=0$; $x_2=0$; $x_3=0$), and its value is not significantly different from the experimental result ($31.0 \pm 7.8 \%$). This further confirms the goodness of fitting of this model.

$$y_2(\%) = (27.9 + 12.4x_1 + 3.8x_2 + 23.8x_3 + 10.7x_3x_1 + 7.5x_2^2) \quad (\text{Eq. 4})$$

INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

In practice, the mathematical model in Eq. 4 can be interpreted by comparing the magnitude of its coefficients. Firstly, all of them are positive, which means that an increase in any of the three factors within the limits of the model had a favourable effect on product yield. The factors which had the greatest impact were the concentration of surfactant ($\beta_3 = 23.8$) and the applied voltage ($\beta_1 = 12.4$). Indeed, the addition of surfactants has been proposed as a useful strategy for the successful production of electrosprayed materials from biopolymeric aqueous solutions or dispersions, as they reduce their high surface tension and thus facilitate their spraying at acceptable voltages (Rocío Pérez-Masiá et al., 2014). On the other hand, increasing the applied voltage helps overcoming the surface tension of the fluid and facilitates the electrospraying process (Bock et al., 2012). In fact, both factors had a synergistic effect, as evidenced from their high interaction coefficient ($\beta_{13} = 10.7$). Figure 5 shows the interaction effect of varying these two factors on the product yield according to the model, for a constant level of x_2 . The addition of the prebiotic carbohydrate also improved the product yield, although to a lesser extent ($\beta_2 = 3.8$; $\beta_2^2 = 7.5$). It is worth noting that product yields

over 65% were achieved for the best combinations, that is, more than three times greater than the best result obtained from the pre-optimization stage, showing a considerable improvement.

INSERT FIGURE 4 ABOUT HERE

Regarding the viability loss during electrospraying, although a successful mathematical modelling was not achieved in terms of the three proposed factors, the results allowed the extraction of some qualitative conclusions about the effects of these variables on the process. While a clear tendency was not observed for variations in the applied voltage or the concentration of Fibersol® in the formulation, a slight increase in the viability loss during electrospraying was found in average for increasing Tween20® contents. In any case, the viability loss always remained below 1 log₁₀ CFU/g, thus yielding average bacterial counts in the final electrosprayed materials in the range of 8.7-9.3 log₁₀ CFU/g.

3.3 Morphology of selected encapsulation structures

Two of the electrosprayed materials obtained from section 3.2. were selected for further evaluation. The first one was the powder produced in Run 8, as the conditions used for these tests ($x_1=1$; $x_2=0$; $x_3=1$) resulted in one of the highest product yields. No significant differences were found between the product yields obtained for Run 8 and 12 (cf. Table 3), but the former showed a slightly lower viability loss and, thus, this sample was chosen. The second one was selected in order to obtain minimal viability losses. However, the runs which resulted in the minimum losses had too low product yields. Thus, a minimum product yield of 50% was fixed as an acceptable limit considering

that lower yields would not be industrially attractive for production. The conditions used in Run 4 ($x_1=1$; $x_2=1$; $x_3=0$) resulted in the electrosprayed capsules which, meeting this requirement, experienced the lowest viability loss, so the product obtained from this specific composition was chosen for further testing.

Figure 5 shows the morphology of the selected samples. The electrosprayed product obtained from Run 8 exhibits a more homogeneous structure, where individual and spherical particles could be distinguished. In contrast, the powder obtained in Run 4 presents a rather amorphous shape, with some individual capsules but also some fused structures. These differences might be attributed to the greater ratio of Tween20® used in Run 8, which facilitated the electrospraying process by reducing the surface tension of the suspensions. The location of the lactobacilli inside the electrosprayed capsules was confirmed by the optical and fluorescence microscopy images of the materials (cf. Figure 5 C and D). As stated in Section 2.6, bacteria had to be killed before staining to avoid the use of the dye SYTO 9®, which also stained the WPC matrix and precluded the identification of live cells. Although many of the particles did not contain microorganisms, the presence of dead bacteria within some of the WPC-based capsules was confirmed.

INSERT FIGURE 5 ABOUT HERE

3.4 Survival of encapsulated *L. plantarum* under stress conditions

The ability of the selected capsules to protect *L. plantarum* when subjected to stress conditions was assessed by measuring the viability of the probiotic within the materials after storage during certain time periods at different relative humidity conditions (i.e.

53% and 75%). The survival of the lactobacilli within the electrosprayed capsules was compared to that of freeze-dried samples containing the same formulations as in Runs 4 and 8, respectively. All materials exhibited similar initial cell counts regardless of the method used for their preservation, confirming that the viability losses observed upon electrospraying are similar to those produced during freeze-drying. Figure 6 shows that electrosprayed microcapsules provided enhanced protection to the bacteria compared to freeze-drying for the same formulations at both storage conditions. Indeed, for the freeze-dried materials, a reduction of 1 log₁₀ CFU/g was observed after 1 day of storage at 75% RH, and there were no cell counts after 1 week. In contrast, no viability losses were found for microencapsulated bacteria after 24h and their survival was prolonged for 10 days at the same conditions. Similarly, less than 1 log₁₀ CFU/g reduction was observed for microencapsulated bacteria after 3 weeks of storage at 53% RH while the viability of freeze-dried bacteria decreased almost 3 log₁₀ CFU/g in the same period. Furthermore, while no cell counts were found for the freeze-dried samples after 45 days, the microcapsules only experienced about 3 log₁₀ CFU/g viability loss in the same time period. These results are attributed to a better material organization in the compact, capsular assemblies than in the porous, random structure of the freeze-dried material, which resulted in the prolonged viability of the encapsulated bacteria.

INSERT FIGURE 6 ABOUT HERE

3.5 Survival of encapsulated *L. plantarum* during digestion

Viability of *L. plantarum* microcapsules and freeze-dried material was also evaluated after an *in-vitro* digestion process. Table 5 shows the cell counts obtained initially and after the gastric and duodenal phases of the digestion. Again, all the materials presented

similar cell counts prior to the digestion process. It was observed that the main viability loss occurred after the gastric phase, due to the acidic conditions of this stage (pH=3). However, the microencapsulation achieved a slightly better protection for the bacteria than freeze-drying, probably because the arrangement of the wall material into capsular structures delayed its dissolution, thus slightly delaying the exposure of the probiotic bacteria to the simulated gastric fluid and enhancing the protective effect of the matrix in comparison with the freeze-dried samples. However, very small differences were observed after the intestinal phase, probably because in this step the capsules were completely disrupted and could not protect the bacteria. Nevertheless, the slight differences observed between both processing techniques could also be ascribed to the high resistance of this specific strain to acidic conditions, as observed in preliminary trials which showed that *L. plantarum* viability was hardly affected by acid conditions (pH = 3.8) after 1h of exposure (data not shown).

INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

4 CONCLUSIONS

The present work shows the convenience of using fresh culture of *L. plantarum* over freeze-dried bacteria for the preparation of the feed suspensions, as this approach led to higher initial cell counts in the WPC suspensions, lower viability losses during electrospraying and greater process productivities. Also, the addition of a surfactant, Tween20®, to the feed suspensions considerably increased the product yield. Although the model obtained for the viability loss could not explain the experimental results with statistical significance, a model for the product yield was successfully developed through a Box-Behnken experimental design. According to this model, an increase in

any of the three selected factors selected (applied voltage, surfactant concentration and addition of a prebiotic) had a favourable effect on the product yield, being the concentration of surfactant and the applied voltage the factors which had the greatest impact on the product yield, exhibiting a synergistic effect. Regarding the bacterial viability loss during electrospraying, it remained below 1 log₁₀ CFU/g in all tests, so that the final electrosprayed materials had average bacterial counts in the range of 8.7-9.3 log₁₀ CFU/g. Finally, while the electrosprayed microcapsules conferred *L. plantarum* similar protection against digestion as compared to a more widely-used preservation method such as freeze-drying, they proved to offer enhanced protection during storage of the food ingredient at high relative humidity. Since the ingredients used to prepare the encapsulating matrices in this study are edible and/or recognized by the FDA as GRAS, incorporation of the proposed structures into food products would be a feasible approach for the development of enhanced functional food products containing probiotics.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Laura G. Gómez-Mascaraque is recipient of a predoctoral contract from the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (MINECO), Call 2013. Russell Cruz Morfin received a scholarship from the Mexican National Council for Science and Technology (CONACYT), Call 2014. Gloria Sánchez is supported by the “Ramón y Cajal” Young Investigator program of the MINECO. This work was financially supported by the Spanish MINECO project AGL2012-30647 and by the CSIC project 201470I002. José María Coll is gratefully acknowledged for technical support on bacterial staining and the use of the optical microscope.

531 REFERENCES

- 532 Augustin, M. (2003). The role of microencapsulation in the development of functional dairy
533 foods. *Australian Journal of Dairy Technology*, 58(2), 156-160.
- 534 Bäuerl, C., Llopis, M., Antolín, M., Monedero, V., Mata, M., Zúñiga, M., . . . Pérez-Martínez, G.
535 (2013). Lactobacillus paracasei and Lactobacillus plantarum strains downregulate
536 proinflammatory genes in an ex vivo system of cultured human colonic mucosa *Genes*
537 *& Nutrition*, 8, 165-180.
- 538 Bhardwaj, N., & Kundu, S. C. (2010). Electrospinning: A fascinating fiber fabrication technique.
539 *Biotechnology Advances*, 28(3), 325-347. doi:
540 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biotechadv.2010.01.004>
- 541 Bhushani, J. A., & Anandharamakrishnan, C. (2014). Electrospinning and electrospraying
542 techniques: Potential food based applications. *Trends in Food Science & Technology* 1-
543 13.
- 544 Bock, N., Dargaville, T. R., & Woodruff, M. A. (2012). Electrospaying of polymers with
545 therapeutic molecules: State of the art. *Progress in Polymer Science*, 37(11), 1510-
546 1551.
- 547 Chakraborty, S., Liao, I. C., Adler, A., & Leong, K. W. (2009). Electrohydrodynamics: A facile
548 technique to fabricate drug delivery systems. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*, 61(12),
549 1043-1054. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2009.07.013>
- 550 Champagne, C. P., Raymond, Y., & Tompkins, T. A. (2010). The determination of viable counts
551 in probiotic cultures microencapsulated by spray-coating. *Food microbiology*, 27(8),
552 1104-1111.
- 553 Chandramouli, V., Kailasapathy, K., Peiris, P., & Jones, M. (2004). An improved method of
554 microencapsulation and its evaluation to protect Lactobacillus spp. in simulated gastric
555 conditions. *Journal of microbiological methods*, 56(1), 27-35.
- 556 Doherty, S. B., Auty, M. A., Stanton, C., Ross, R. P., Fitzgerald, G. F., & Brodtkorb, A. (2012).
557 Survival of entrapped Lactobacillus rhamnosus GG in whey protein micro-beads during
558 simulated ex vivo gastro-intestinal transit. *International Dairy Journal*, 22(1), 31-43.
559 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2011.06.009>
- 560 Fritzen-Freire, C. B., Prudêncio, E. S., Amboni, R. D., Pinto, S. S., Negrão-Murakami, A. N., &
561 Murakami, F. S. (2012). Microencapsulation of bifidobacteria by spray drying in the
562 presence of prebiotics. *Food Research International*, 45(1), 306-312.
- 563 Gbassi, G. K., Vandamme, T., Ennahar, S., & Marchioni, E. (2009). Microencapsulation of
564 Lactobacillus plantarum spp in an alginate matrix coated with whey proteins.
565 *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 129(1), 103-105.
- 566 Gharsallaoui, A., Roudaut, G., Chambin, O., Voilley, A., & Saurel, R. (2007). Applications of
567 spray-drying in microencapsulation of food ingredients: An overview. *Food Research*
568 *International*, 40(9), 1107-1121. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2007.07.004>
- 569 Ismail, B., & Nampoothiri, K. (2010). Production, purification and structural characterization of
570 an exopolysaccharide produced by a probiotic Lactobacillus plantarum MTCC 9510.
571 *Archives of Microbiology*, 192(12), 1049-1057. doi: 10.1007/s00203-010-0636-y
- 572 Jaworek, A., & Sobczyk, A. T. (2008). Electrospinning route to nanotechnology: An overview.
573 *Journal of Electrostatics*, 66(3-4), 197-219. doi:
574 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.elstat.2007.10.001>
- 575 Jovanović, M., Rakić, T., Ivanović, D., & Jančić-Stojanović, B. (2014). Optimization of the
576 Separation of Ephedrine, Pseudoephedrine, Phenylephrine, and Synephrine by
577 Hydrophilic Interaction Liquid Chromatography Employing Experimental Design

- Methodology. *Instrumentation Science & Technology*, 43(2), 156-169. doi: 10.1080/10739149.2014.910670
- Kailasapathy, K., & Champagne, C. (2011). Trends in the microencapsulation of probiotics for application in dairy products. *Agro Food Industry Hi Tech*, 22(2), 25.
- Krasaekoopt, W., Bhandari, B., & Deeth, H. (2003). Evaluation of encapsulation techniques of probiotics for yoghurt. *International Dairy Journal*, 13(1), 3-13. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0958-6946\(02\)00155-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0958-6946(02)00155-3)
- López-Rubio, A., & Lagaron, J. M. (2012). Whey protein capsules obtained through electrospraying for the encapsulation of bioactives. *Innovative Food Science & Emerging Technologies*, 13(0), 200-206. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ifset.2011.10.012>
- López-Rubio, A., Sanchez, E., Sanz, Y., & Lagaron, J. M. (2009). Encapsulation of Living Bifidobacteria in Ultrathin PVOH Electrospun Fibers. *Biomacromolecules*, 10(10), 2823-2829. doi: 10.1021/bm900660b
- López-Rubio, A., Sanchez, E., Wilkanowicz, S., Sanz, Y., & Lagaron, J. M. (2012). Electrospinning as a useful technique for the encapsulation of living bifidobacteria in food hydrocolloids. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 28(1), 159-167. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2011.12.008>
- Minekus, M., Alming, M., Alvito, P., Ballance, S., Bohn, T., Bourlieu, C., . . . Brodkorb, A. (2014). A standardised static in vitro digestion method suitable for food - an international consensus. [10.1039/C3FO60702J]. *Food & Function*, 5(6), 1113-1124. doi: 10.1039/C3FO60702J
- Pérez-Masiá, R., Lagaron, J., & López-Rubio, A. (2014). Development and Optimization of Novel Encapsulation Structures of Interest in Functional Foods Through Electrospraying. *Food and Bioprocess Technology*, 7(11), 3236-3245. doi: 10.1007/s11947-014-1304-z
- Pérez-Masiá, R., Lagaron, J. M., & López-Rubio, A. (2014). Surfactant-aided electrospraying of low molecular weight carbohydrate polymers from aqueous solutions. *Carbohydrate polymers*, 101, 249-255.
- Picot, A., & Lacroix, C. (2003). Production of Multiphase Water-Insoluble Microcapsules for Cell Microencapsulation Using an Emulsification/Spray-drying Technology. *Journal of food science*, 68(9), 2693-2700.
- Salar-Behzadi, S., Wu, S., Toegel, S., Hofrichter, M., Altenburger, I., Unger, F. M., . . . Viernstein, H. (2013). Impact of heat treatment and spray drying on cellular properties and culturability of Bifidobacterium bifidum BB-12. *Food Research International*, 54(1), 93-101. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2013.05.024>
- Shori, A. B. (2015). The effect of encapsulating materials on the survival of probiotics during intestinal digestion: A review. *Ciencia e Tecnologia dos Materiais*, 27(1), 73-77. doi: 10.1016/j.ctmat.2015.07.002
- Topping, D. L., & Clifton, P. M. (2001). Short-chain fatty acids and human colonic function: roles of resistant starch and nonstarch polysaccharides. *Physiological reviews*, 81(3), 1031-1064.
- Yoon, H.-S., Ju, J.-H., Kim, H.-N., Park, H.-J., Ji, J., Lee, J.-E., . . . Holzapfel, W. (2013). Reduction in cholesterol absorption in Caco-2 cells through the down-regulation of Niemann-Pick C1-like 1 by the putative probiotic strains Lactobacillus rhamnosus BFE5264 and Lactobacillus plantarum NR74 from fermented foods. *International Journal of Food Sciences and Nutrition* 64(1), 44-52.

Table 1. Factors for the Box- Behnken design and their levels. Mass fractions are expressed with respect to the amount of WPC

Factors		Levels		
		-1	0	+1
x_1	Voltage (kV)	10	12	14
x_2	Fibersol ® (wt.%)	0	10	20
x_3	Tween20 ® (wt.%)	1	5	9

Table 2. Different conditions evaluated during the pre-optimization stage

State of bacteria	Amount of bacteria	Proportion of Tween20	639
Freeze-dried	5 mg/mL _{WPC susp.}	-	640
Freeze-dried	10 mg/mL _{WPC susp.}	-	
Freeze-dried	15 mg/mL _{WPC susp.}	-	641
Freeze-dried	5 mg/mL _{WPC susp.}	1 g/100g _{WPC}	
Freeze-dried	5 mg/mL _{WPC susp.}	5 g/100g _{WPC}	642
Fresh culture	Pellet from 5 mL broth	-	
Fresh culture	Pellet from 5 mL broth	5 g/100g _{WPC}	643
Fresh culture	Pellet from 10 mL broth	5 g/100g _{WPC}	
Fresh culture	Pellet from 100 mL broth	5 g/100g _{WPC}	644

649

650 **Table 3.** Complete full design and results for the response variables

651

Run	x_1 (kV)	x_2 (wt.%)	x_3 (wt.%)	y_1 ($\log_{10}$ CFU/g)	y_2 (%)
1 ^(*)	10	0	5	0.92 ± 0.16	16.8 ± 1.6
2	14	0	5	0.96 ± 0.13	54.5 ± 8.4
3	10	20	5	0.76 ± 0.15	24.6 ± 1.7
4	14	20	5	0.74 ± 0.03	56.4 ± 4.1
5	10	10	1	0.64 ± 0.09	9.3 ± 7.9
6	14	10	1	0.50 ± 0.12	3.2 ± 3.0
7	10	10	9	0.66 ± 0.12	29.6 ± 9.4
8	14	10	9	0.83 ± 0.05	65.7 ± 9.2
9	12	0	1	0.72 ± 0.15	5.0 ± 1.6
10	12	20	1	0.84 ± 0.20	7.2 ± 2.5
11	12	0	9	0.99 ± 0.09	50.6 ± 10.1
12	12	20	9	0.89 ± 0.18	68.5 ± 3.5
13-15	12	10	5	0.54 ± 0.04	31.0 ± 7.8

652 ^(*) From previous section

653

654

655

656 **Table 4.** ANOVA analysis for the response surface quadratic model in Eq. 4

657

	Sum of Squares	DF ^(*)	Mean Square	F ratio	p-value
Model	1.955	5	0.3909	55.54	4.1×10^{-15}
x ₁	0.373	1	0.3725	52.92	2.4×10^{-8}
x ₂	0.035	1	0.0353	5.01	3.2×10^{-2}
x ₃	1.359	1	1.3585	193.01	2.4×10^{-15}
x ₁ x ₃	0.137	1	0.1365	19.40	1.0×10^{-4}
x ₂ ²	0.052	1	0.0517	7.34	1.0×10^{-2}
Lack of Fit R ² = 0.894	0.129	7	0.0184	4.63	0.0018

658 ^(*) DF = Degrees of freedom

659

660

Table 5. Viability of *L. plantarum* before digestion and after the gastric and duodenal phases. Different letters (a-c) within the same column indicate significant differences among the samples

Sample	Initial (UFC/g)	After Gastric Phase (UFC/g)	After Intestinal Phase (UFC/g)
Freeze-Drying (Run 4)	$(2.3 \pm 1.4) \times 10^9$ ^a	$(1.5 \pm 0.1) \times 10^7$ ^a	$(4.7 \pm 1.1) \times 10^6$ ^a
Electrospraying (Run 4)	$(2.0 \pm 1.4) \times 10^9$ ^a	$(2.7 \pm 0.5) \times 10^7$ ^b	$(8.7 \pm 3.3) \times 10^6$ ^a
Freeze-Drying (Run 8)	$(1.7 \pm 0.8) \times 10^9$ ^a	$(1.4 \pm 0.4) \times 10^7$ ^a	$(6.7 \pm 1.6) \times 10^6$ ^a
Electrospraying (Run 8)	$(2.3 \pm 0.6) \times 10^9$ ^a	$(7.3 \pm 0.7) \times 10^7$ ^c	$(1.6 \pm 0.2) \times 10^7$ ^b

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Viability losses obtained using a) freeze-dried bacteria and b) fresh culture, and product yields using c) freeze-dried bacteria and d) fresh culture. Different letters in each pair of graphs denote statistically significant differences between results ($p < 0.05$).

Figure 2. Cell viability of the final electrosprayed products obtained from pellets of fresh culture of *L. plantarum*. Different letters denote statistically significant differences between results ($p < 0.05$).

Figure 3. Predicted versus experimental values for a) viability loss and b) product yield.

Figure 4. Response surface for the product yield, showing the interaction of the applied voltage and the ratio of Tween20® at a constant level of prebiotic concentration (level 0).

Figure 5. SEM images of WPC-based electrosprayed microcapsules containing *L. plantarum*, obtained under conditions in Run 4 (A) and Run 8 (B), and optical micrographs of the latter under normal light (C) and using a fluorescence source (D). Scale bars in all images correspond to 20 μm .

Figure 5. Survival of electrosprayed microcapsules (continuous lines) vs. freeze-dried materials (dotted lines) after storage at different relative humidities.

FIGURE 1.

FIGURE 2.

FIGURE 3.

FIGURE 4.

FIGURE 5.

FIGURE 6.

711 Highlights

- 712 • Surface response methodology was used to optimize a probiotic encapsulation process
- 713 • Electrospraying was used to encapsulate *L. plantarum* as a model probiotic
- 714 • Voltage, surfactant and prebiotic concentration were the three variables considered
- 715 • Low viability losses and great product yields were obtained after optimization
- 716 • Enhanced protection during storage at high relative humidity was also observed
- 717

718

Supplementary Material

Scheme 1. Simplified representation of the electrospraying setup used for the microencapsulation of *L. plantarum*