

Title	Membrane filtration and isoelectric precipitation technological approaches for the preparation of novel functional and sustainable protein isolate from lentils
Authors	Alonso-Miravalles, Loreto;Jeske, Stephanie;Bez, Jurgen;Detzel, Andreas;Busch, Mirjam;Krueger, Martina;Wriessnegger, Clara L.;O'Mahony, James A.;Zannini, Emanuele;Arendt, Elke K.
Publication date	2019
Original Citation	Alonso-Miravalles, L., Jeske, S., Bez, J., Detzel, A., Busch, M., Krueger, M., Wriessnegger, Clara L., O'Mahony, J. A.; Zannini, E. and Arendt, E. K. (2019) 'Membrane filtration and isoelectric precipitation technological approaches for the preparation of novel, functional and sustainable protein isolate from lentils', European Food Research and Technology, In Press
Type of publication	Article (preprint)
Link to publisher's version	https://link.springer.com/journal/217
Rights	© 2019. This is a pre-print of an article to be published in European Food Research and Technology
Download date	2024-07-13 15:02:54
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/7868



Draft Manuscript for Review

**Membrane filtration and isoelectric precipitation
technological approaches for the preparation of novel
functional and sustainable protein isolate from lentils**

Journal:	<i>European Food Research and Technology</i>
Manuscript ID	EFRT-19-0094.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Apr-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Alonso-Miravalles, Loreto ; University College Cork, Food and Nutritional Sciences Jeske, Stephanie; University College Cork School of Food and Nutritional Sciences Bez, Juergen; Fraunhofer-Institut fur Verfahrenstechnik und Verpackung Detzel, Andreas.; Institut fur Energie- und Umweltforschung Heidelberg GmbH Busch, Mirjam; Institut fur Energie- und Umweltforschung Heidelberg GmbH Krueger, Martina; Institut fur Energie- und Umweltforschung Heidelberg GmbH Wriessnegger, Clara Larissa.; Institut fur Energie- und Umweltforschung Heidelberg GmbH O'Mahony, James A. ; University College Cork, Food and Nutritional Sciences Zannini, Emanuele; University College Cork, Food and Nutritional Sciences Arendt, Elke; University College Cork, Food and Nutritional Sciences; University College Cork APC Microbiome Institute,
Keywords:	Lentil protein isolate, Ultrafiltration, Isoelectric precipitation, Physicochemical properties, Protein functionality, Life cycle assessment

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6 1 **Membrane filtration and isoelectric precipitation technological approaches for the preparation of novel,**
7 2 **functional and sustainable protein isolate from lentils**

8
9 3 Loreto Alonso-Miravalles¹ and Stephanie Jeske¹, Juergen Bez², Andreas Detzel³, Mirjam Busch³, Martina
10 4 Krueger³, Clara Larissa Wriessnegger³, James A. O'Mahony¹, Emanuele Zannini¹, Elke K. Arendt^{1,4}

11
12
13 5 ¹School of Food and Nutritional Sciences, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

14
15 6 ²Fraunhofer Institute for Process Engineering and Packaging, Giggenhauser Str. 35, D-85354 Freising, Germany

16
17 7 ³IFEU - Institut für Energie- und Umweltforschung Heidelberg GmbH, Im Weiher 10, 69121 Heidelberg

18
19 8 ⁴APC Microbiome Institute Ireland, University College Cork, Ireland

20
21 9 Corresponding author e-mail: e.arendt@ucc.ie; tel: +353 21 490 2064

22
23
24 10 **Abstract**

25
26 11 Isoelectric precipitation and ultrafiltration were investigated for their potential to produce protein products
27 12 from lentils. Higher protein concentrations were obtained when ultrafiltration was used (>90%), whereas
28 13 isoelectric precipitation resulted in higher contents of dietary fibre and some minerals (i.e., sodium and
29 14 phosphorus). Differences in the functional properties between the two ingredients were found as the isoelectric
30 15 precipitated ingredient showed lower protein solubilities over the investigated pH range (from 3 to 9) which can
31 16 be linked to the slightly higher hydrophobicity values (2688.7) and total sulfhydryl groups (23.9 µM/g) found in
32 17 this sample. In contrast, the protein ingredient obtained by ultrafiltration was superior with regard to its solubility
33 18 (48.3%; pH 7), fat-binding capacity (2.24 g/g), water holding capacity (3.96 g/g), gelling properties (11%; w/w),
34 19 and foam-forming capacity (69.6%). The assessment of the environmental performance showed that both LPIs
35 20 exhibited promising properties and low carbon footprints in comparison to traditional dairy proteins.

36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 21 **Keywords**

48 22 Lentil protein isolate, Ultrafiltration, Isoelectric precipitation Physicochemical properties, Protein
49 23 functionality, Life cycle assessment.

24 **1 Introduction**

25 The expected continued growth of the global population to 9.6 billion people by 2050 is creating a need to
26 identify and develop solutions for the provision of high-quality food [1, 2]. In addition, the high demand for
27 healthy, sustainable and cost-effective food protein ingredients by consumers is driving the investigation of new
28 and innovative protein sources [3, 4]. Agriculture is one of the main contributors to climate change, and cattle
29 farming faces particular sustainability challenges [5]. The conversion factor of feed protein to milk protein is
30 about 14%, while the remaining 86% is “lost” for human nutrition [6]. Plant-based protein ingredients can serve
31 as an alternative to animal-derived protein, due to their contribution to environmental sustainability, their role in
32 addressing food security challenges and their cost-effectiveness [7]. However, replacing animal-based protein
33 ingredients with those of plant origin is not easy, as significant differences exist between ingredients from both
34 sources in composition, taste, digestibility and techno-functional properties. Nevertheless, research is advancing
35 and several plant ingredients have been applied in a wide range of products [8, 9]. For instance, using extrusion,
36 soya protein was processed into a highly fibrous texture simulating that of meat [10]. In addition to soy, other
37 plant-based proteins have been studied as meat replacers such as canola, rapeseed, wheat gluten, peas and beans
38 [11]. bread quality and nutritional profile was improved with the addition of fermented faba bean [10], and sensory
39 evaluation of a strawberry flavoured lupin-based yogurt like product showed good acceptability sensory
40 properties [11].

41 In that respect, legumes are gaining increased attention, as they contain high amounts of protein, typically
42 ranging between 20 and 40%, and are rich sources of essential amino acids such as lysine [12, 13]. Traditionally,
43 they are consumed as whole, split or milled products [14] and approximately 5,481,120 ha are harvested and
44 6,315,858 tonnes of lentils are produced globally each year [15]. Lentil seeds are showing promising results for
45 the preparation of protein flours, concentrates and isolates due to the lack of allergens and anti-nutritional
46 compounds (e.g., isoflavones found in soya) and also as they are an affordable, sustainable and abundant raw
47 material [16]. Various techniques and approaches such as wet fractionation (e.g., ultrafiltration and isoelectric
48 precipitation) are used to separate and concentrate high levels of protein from other constituents [17, 18] in cereals
49 and legumes. The physicochemical properties and functionality of these isolated protein ingredients are essential
50 in the processing and formulation of food products, providing texture, taste and nutrition for a desirable and
51 pleasurable product. These properties depend not only on the nature of the protein but also on the processing and
52 isolation techniques used. Most studies focused on this subject have been conducted on dairy and soya [19, 20]

1
2
3 53 and increasingly also on legumes in recent years [21–25]. The results of these studies indicate that the methods
4
5 54 applied for isolation affect the composition and the physicochemical characteristics of [the](#) extracted protein
6
7 55 ingredients. Jarpa-Parra et al. [26] highlights the need to establish a deeper connection between the extraction
8
9 56 conditions of lentil protein and their influence on lentil protein functionality.

10
11 57 The aim of this work was to produce novel lentil protein isolates using two different technological approaches
12
13 58 and to study the techno-functional properties (e.g., solubility, emulsifying, gelling properties) and environmental
14
15 59 sustainability (life cycle assessment) of the ingredients based on the same raw material. The results obtained in
16
17 60 this study will provide much needed information about the sustainability of the two different approaches and
18
19 61 potential applications of the resultant ingredients in the development of novel, healthy and sustainable food
20
21 62 product formulations.

63 2 *Materials and Methods*

64 2.1 *Raw materials and chemicals*

65 For extraction of lentil proteins, brown lentils of commercial quality (*Lens culinaris cv. Itaca*), provided by
66 Agroservice Spa, San Severino Marche, Italy, were used as raw material. All chemicals used were purchased from
67 Sigma-Aldrich (St Louis, Missouri, USA), unless otherwise stated.

68 2.2 *Preparation of protein isolates*

69 Lentil seeds were dehulled in an underrunner disc sheller (Streckel & Schrader GmbH, Germany) and the
70 kernels and hulls were separated in an air classifier (Turboplex, Hosokawa Alpine AG, Augsburg, Germany).
71 Kernels were milled using an impact mill (UPZ, Hosokawa Alpine AG, Germany) to a mean particle size (D50)
72 of 21 µm. For extraction of protein, lentil flour was suspended in water at pH 7.5 to extract the high molecular
73 weight proteins. The insoluble dietary fibre and lentil starch were then separated from the soluble high molecular
74 weight proteins by decanting. Lentil protein isolate (LPI) was recovered from the resulting protein extract either
75 by isoelectric precipitation (IEP) or by ultrafiltration (UF), as shown in Figure 1. LPI-IEP was isolated from the
76 aqueous protein extract by acid precipitation at pH 4.5, which coincides with minimum solubility of lentil proteins
77 [27]. Subsequently, the precipitated proteins were separated in a disc separator and the sediment was neutralized
78 with 3 M NaOH, pasteurised (65°C, 30 min) and spray dried ($T_{in}: 180^{\circ}\text{C}$, $T_{out}: 75^{\circ}\text{C}$) to obtain the protein isolate
79 powder. LPI-UF was extracted at 50°C using a polysulfone membrane with a molecular weight cut-off of 10 kDa
80 followed by diafiltration with demineralized water (retentate:water; 1:1.7) to enrich the protein content of the
81 retentate. The resulting retentate was pasteurized (65°C, 30 min) and spray dried ($T_{in}: 180^{\circ}\text{C}$, $T_{out}: 75^{\circ}\text{C}$). The
82 protein isolates were stored at room temperature until further analysis.

83 2.3 *Compositional analysis*

84 Total nitrogen content of the LPIs was analysed according to the Kjeldahl method (MEBAK 1.5.2.1) [28]
85 using a nitrogen-to-protein conversion factor of 6.25. Fat content was measured following the Soxhlet method
86 (AACC Method 30-25.01) [29]. Ash content was determined by dry ashing in a muffle furnace at 500°C for 5 h
87 (AOAC 923.03).[30]. Moisture was determined by oven drying at 103°C for 5 h (AOAC 925.10) [31]. Total starch
88 (AOAC Methods 996.11 and AACC Method 76-13.01) [32, 33] content was determined using an enzymatic kit
89 (Megazyme, Bray, Co. Wicklow, Ireland). Minerals were analysed using inductively coupled plasma-optical
90 emission spectrophotometry [34]. The soluble and insoluble fibre content of the samples was analysed in
91 accordance with the AOAC method 991.43 [35].

92 **2.4 Protein profile analysis**

93 Protein profile was assessed using sodium dodecyl sulphate-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (SDS-PAGE)
94 using precast gels (Mini-PROTEAN TGX, Bio-Rad Laboratories, CA, USA) under non-reducing and reducing
95 conditions as described by Alonso-Miravalles & O'Mahony [36]. The sample loading buffer contained 65.8 mM
96 Tris-HCl (pH 6.8), 26.3% (w/v) glycerol, 2.1% SDS and 0.01% bromophenol blue. The running buffer (10x
97 Tris/Glycine/SDS, Bio-Rad Laboratories, CA, USA) had a composition of 25 mM Tris, 192 mM glycine and 0.1%
98 SDS (w/v), pH 8.3. The staining solution used was Coomassie Brilliant Blue R-250 (Bio-Rad Laboratories, CA,
99 USA). The target final protein concentration was 1 mg/mL and 8 μ L of sample solution was loaded into each
100 well of the gel and ~~the gels were~~ run at a constant voltage of 150 V.

101 **2.5 Protein secondary structure**

102 Information about secondary structure of the proteins was obtained using circular dichroism (CD)
103 spectrophotometry (Chirascan, Applied Photophysics, Leatherhead, UK). Protein solutions of 1 mg/mL were
104 prepared in 10 mM sodium phosphate buffer (pH 7) and solubilized overnight at 4°C using magnetic stirring at
105 250 rpm. Subsequently, samples were filtered (0.25 μ m) and the CD spectra was measured with a path length of
106 0.1 mm in the range 180-260 nm at a bandwidth of 1 nm and spectral resolution of 1 nm and data acquisition rate
107 of 1 point/s. The average of three spectra was obtained and a 5-point smoothing algorithm was applied.

108 **2.6 Scanning electron microscopy**

109 Protein powders were mounted on aluminium stubs using double-sided adhesive carbon tape, and sputter
110 coated with a 5 nm layer of gold/palladium (Au:Pd = 80:20) using a Quorum Q150R ES Sputter Coating Unit
111 (Quorum Technologies Ltd., Sussex, U.K.). The coated samples were loaded into a sample tube and examined
112 using a JSM-5510 scanning electron microscope (JEOL Ltd, Tokyo, Japan), operated at an accelerating voltage
113 of 5 kV.

114 **2.7 Particle size distribution**

115 Particle size distribution of protein dispersions was measured using static laser light diffraction (Mastersizer
116 3000, Malvern Instruments Ltd, Worcestershire, UK). For the preparation of samples, the protein isolate powders
117 were mixed with ultrapure water at a concentration of 1% protein (w/v), pH adjusted to 7, and stirred overnight at
118 4°C. The refractive index of protein was set at 1.45 [27] and the absorption and dispersant refractive indices used
119 were 0.1 and 1.33, respectively. LPI dispersions, equilibrated at 22°C, were introduced into the dispersing unit
120 using ultrapure water as dispersant until a laser obscuration of 12% was achieved.

121 2.8 *Hydrophobicity*

122 Surface hydrophobicity (S_0) of protein particles was measured according to Hayakawa and Nakai [37] using
123 1-anilino-8-naphthalenesulfonate (ANS) with slight modifications as described by Karaca et al. [16]. Protein
124 solutions were serially diluted with 10 mM phosphate buffer (pH 7) ranging from 0.0006–0.015% (w/v). ANS
125 (10 μM ; 8.0 mM in 0.1 M phosphate buffer, pH 7) were mixed with 2 mL of diluted sample and left in darkness
126 for 15 min. Fluorescence was measured ($\lambda_{\text{excitation}}$ 390 nm, $\lambda_{\text{emission}}$ 470 nm) and corrected by a blank measured
127 without ANS. The results are presented as the slopes ($R^2 \geq 0.98$) of the absorbance versus protein concentration.

128 2.9 *Sulfhydryl groups*

129 Sulfhydryl groups were determined using Ellman's reagent (5,5'-dithio-bis-(2-nitrobenzoic acid) according
130 to the method of Van der Plancken et al. [38]. The protein samples were diluted to 2 mg/mL with 10 mM phosphate
131 buffer (pH 7) for free sulfhydryl groups, while for total sulfhydryl groups a buffer containing 6 M urea and 0.5 M
132 SDS was used. Ellman's reagent (80 μL) was added to 2.5 mL of diluted sample and absorbance was measured
133 at 412 nm after 15 min. For the reagent blank, the protein samples were replaced by the sodium phosphate buffer
134 and mixed with 80 μL of Ellman's reagent. Sulfhydryl groups were quantified as follows:

$$135 \quad (1) \mu\text{m SH/g protein} = (A_{412} - A_{412B}) \cdot \frac{1,000,000}{\epsilon} \cdot C$$

136 where A_{412} is the absorbance at 412 nm, A_{412B} is the absorbance at 412 nm for the blank, ϵ is the extinction
137 coefficient, which was taken as $13,600 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-1}$, and C is the protein concentration in mg/mL of the diluted
138 sample.

139 2.10 *Protein solubility*

140 The solubility of proteins as influenced by pH, was determined by adjusting the pH of protein dispersions
141 from 3.0 to 8.0 at 0.5 units intervals using 0.1 and 1 M HCl or NaOH. Protein samples (1% w/v) were hydrated at
142 4°C. The pH was re-adjusted before measurements. Samples were centrifuged at 5,000 g for 30 min. The protein
143 contents of the supernatants were analysed using the Kjeldahl method as described in Section 2.3. The results
144 were expressed as % of the total protein content.

145 2.11 *Zeta potential*

146 The zeta potential of protein solutions at the same pH values as for protein solubility analysis were determined
147 using a Zetasizer nano-Z (Malvern Instruments Ltd; UK). Samples were prepared as described for the protein
148 solubility, excluding the centrifugation step, and diluted with ultrapure water to a concentration of 0.1% (w/v) and

1
2
3 149 pH was readjusted. The measurement was performed using an automatic voltage selection and zeta potential was
4
5 150 calculated using the Smoluchowski model. Refractive and absorption indices of 1.45 and 0.001 were used,
6
7 151 respectively.

10 152 **2.12 Water holding capacity**

11 153 Analysis of water holding capacity (WHC) of proteins was determined according to AACC method 56-30.01
12
13 [39] with some modifications. Samples (1.000 g ± 0.005 g) were mixed with 30 mL of distilled water using an
14
15 154 Ultra-Turrax equipped with a S10N-5G dispersing element (Ika-abortechnik, Janke and Kunkel GmbH, Staufen,
16
17 155 Germany) for 15 s and then shaken for 30 min at 1,000 rpm using a platform shaker (UNI MAX 1010, Heidolph,
18
19 156 Schwabach, Germany). Subsequently, the mixture was centrifuged at 2,000 g for 10 min. WHC was expressed as
20
21 157 grams of water retained per gram of protein isolate.
22
23

24 159 **2.13 Fat absorption capacity**

25 160 Fat absorption capacity (FAC) was determined following the method described by Boye et al. [13] with slight
26
27 161 modifications. Powder (1 g) and sunflower oil (6 g) were weighted into a 15 mL centrifuge tube (Sarstedt,
28
29 162 Nümbrecht, Germany), mixed with a vortex for 3 min and centrifuged at 4,000 g for 30 min. The oil was removed
30
31 163 from the tube carefully and weighed again. FAC was expressed as grams of fat water-retained per gram of protein
32
33 164 isolate.
34
35

36 165 **2.14 Foaming properties**

37 166 Protein dispersions (20 mL) with a protein concentration ranging from 0.1 to 3.3% (w/v) in ultrapure water
38
39 167 were frothed using an Ultra-Turrax equipped with a S10N-10G dispersing element (Ika-Labortechnik, Janke and
40
41 168 Kunkel GmbH, Staufen) at high speed for 30 s. The height of the sample (liquid and foam phase) was measured
42
43 169 over 60 min. The foaming capacity was taken as sample expansion at 0 min, while foam stability was expressed
44
45 170 as sample expansion after 60 min. Foam expansion was calculated according to the following equation:
46
47

$$49 \quad 171 \quad (2) \text{ Foam expansion} = \frac{\text{Sample height after foaming} - \text{Initial sample height}}{\text{Initial sample height}} \cdot 100$$

52 172 **2.15 Emulsifying properties**

53 173 Protein solutions (1%, w/v) were hydrated with ultrapure water using a magnetic stirrer at 250 rpm overnight
54
55 174 at 4°C and pH 7. The next day samples were adjusted to room temperature and the pH was re-adjusted if necessary
56
57 175 and pre-emulsions were prepared as follows: 20 mL of sunflower oil was added to 180 mL of 1% protein (w/v)
58
59 176 solution and homogenized for 3 min at 10,000 rpm using an ultraturrax (T 25 digital Ultra-Turrax, Staufen,

Germany). Emulsifying activity (EAI) and stability (ESI) indices were determined using the method described by Pearce and Kinsella [40], with slight modifications. In brief, 250 μL emulsion were taken from the bottom of the homogenized sample after 0 and 120 min and diluted (1:100, v/v) in 0.1% sodium dodecyl sulphate (SDS) solution. The absorbance at a wavelength of 500 nm was read using a spectrophotometer. EAI and ESI were calculated using the following equations:

$$(3) \text{EAI} \left(\frac{\text{m}^2}{\text{g}} \right) = \frac{2 \cdot 2.303 \cdot A_0 \cdot DF}{C \cdot \theta \cdot 10000}$$

$$(4) \text{ESI} (\text{min}) = \frac{A_0}{A_0 - A_{120}} \cdot 120$$

where DF is the dilution factor (100), C is the initial concentration of protein (0.01 g/mL), θ is the fraction of oil used to form the emulsion (0.1), and A_0 and A_{120} are the absorbance of the diluted emulsion at 0 and 120 min, respectively.

2.16 Gelation characteristics

2.16.1. Least gelling concentration

The least gelling concentration (LGC) is defined as the lowest concentration required to form a self-supporting gel. The LGC test was performed according to the method of Sathe et al. [41] with some modification. LPI dispersions ranging from 6 to 16% (w/v) were prepared in 0.01 M phosphate buffer at pH 7.0. These suspensions were heated in 15 mL test tubes (Sarstedt, Nümbrecht, Germany) in a water bath at 90°C for 30 min, after which they were cooled rapidly under running water and stored at 4°C overnight. LGC was determined visually as the minimum concentration of protein at which the contents of the tube did not flow.

2.16.2. Texture profile analysis

Texture profile analysis (TPA) of the LPI gels was performed using a TA.XT Plus™ texture analyser (Stable Microsystems Ltd., Crawley, UK) to determine their mechanical properties. Protein gels (25%; w/v) were prepared by heating LPI dispersions as described above. Gels were cut into small cylinders of 8.2 mm in diameter and 8.0 mm in height. The gel pieces were compressed twice to 30% of their original height at a constant speed of 0.3 mm/s using a cylindrical probe with 20 mm diameter. The TPA parameters of hardness, cohesiveness, adhesiveness, gumminess and springiness were calculated according to the definitions of Bourne [42].

2.17 Life cycle assessment

1
2
3 203 Environmental performance of LPIs was examined by means of life cycle assessment (LCA) using Umberto
4
5 204 5.5 software. LCA is carried out as an attributional cradle-to-gate LCA and includes the individual processes
6
7 205 associated with LPIs shown in Figure 1. Impact assessment methods are based on Umweltbundesamt Berlin [43].
8
9

10 206 **2.18 Statistical analysis**

11 207 All analyses were carried out in triplicate, with exception of analyses of fibre and minerals, which are
12
13 208 performed following a validated method and therefore analysed just once and reported without standard deviation.
14
15 209 The other data generated was subjected to student's T-test to determine statistically significant differences ($p <$
16
17 210 0.05) between mean values for the different samples, at a 95% confidence level. The statistical program used was
18
19 211 Excel (Microsoft Office 365 ProPlus, version 1809).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

212 3 **Results and Discussion**

213 3.1 **Compositional analysis**

214 The macro- and micro-nutrient composition of the LPIs is shown in Table 1. The protein content of LPI-UF
215 (93.7%) was significantly higher ($p < 0.05$) than that obtained for LPI-IEP (85.1%). The reason for this higher
216 protein content can be explained by the ultrafiltration process, where specific pore sized membranes are used
217 leading to higher protein levels in the final ingredient [25]. Additionally, by diafiltration more soluble substances
218 (e.g. sugars, minerals) permeate the membrane thereby further purifying the protein. (4.49%). Regarding the fat
219 content, no significant differences ($p < 0.05$) were found between LPI-UF (4.40%) and LPI-IEP (4.49%). The ash
220 content for LPI-IEP (5.46%) was significantly higher than for LPI-UF (3.51%) which was expected since, with
221 the former approach, NaOH and HCl are used to solubilize and precipitate the proteins [17]; this can be seen in
222 the determined sodium content of LPI-IEP. Interestingly, high values of magnesium and calcium were obtained
223 in LPI-UF. An explanation for these high values might be the retention of these minerals in the retentate along
224 with the protein during the UF process. These differences in the mineral profile can play an important role in the
225 functionality of these protein ingredients such as the solubility, emulsifying and gelling properties [44]. For
226 example, in dairy proteins, especially caseins, calcium plays an important role in determining their gelation
227 behaviour, facilitating linkages between proteins [45]. Also, other authors have studied the role of calcium on
228 gelation properties of a soya drink, finding coagulation of soya proteins when the ionic calcium concentration was
229 increased [46, 47]. The fibre content, mostly soluble dietary fibre, was higher in the LPI-IEP (1.8%) than in LPI-
230 UF (<0.1%). A reason for the higher fibre content in LPI-IEP could be that a part of the fibres were precipitated
231 together with the protein and/or were only partially removed by the centrifugation step; the lower protein content
232 of LPI-IEP is an indicator of this.

233 3.2 **Structural properties**

234 3.2.1 **SDS-PAGE**

235 SDS-PAGE analyses under non-reducing and reducing conditions of the two LPIs are shown in Figure 2.
236 Both samples showed similar protein profiles, with several common bands under non-reducing and reducing
237 conditions. Proteins with molecular weight (MW) of ~50, ~37 and ~20 kDa under non-reducing conditions were
238 observed. The bands at MW ~50 kDa may correspond to vicilin subunits, which composes a 7S trimeric protein,
239 one of the major globulins, together with legumin found in many pulses. Each trimer of vicilin has a MW of 150
240 kDa without disulphide bridging [48]. The bands at 37 and 25 kDa correspond to the acidic and basic subunits of

legumin, in accordance with previous studies [49, 50]. Legumin, an 11S globulin, is an hexameric protein formed by subunits with MW ~60 kDa, which consist of an acidic (~40 kDa) and a basic (~20 kDa) subunit linked by disulfide bonding [14, 24]. Under reducing conditions, similar profiles were observed, although bands at 37 and 25 kDa were slightly more intense, with the disappearance of some high MW bands at ~50 kDa. This can be correlated with the dissociation of legumin into its acidic (MW ~40 kDa) and basic (~20 kDa) subunits by the dissociation of the disulphide bond when a reducing agent (DTT) is applied.

3.2.2 Secondary structure

Furthermore, far-UV CD spectroscopic measurements were performed to gain information about the secondary structure of LPIs. Amide groups are optically active and absorb circular polarized far-UV light. Depending on their conformation, i.e., their secondary structure, characteristic CD spectra are obtained [51]. As shown in Figure 3, both LPIs exhibited a positive peak at 185 nm, and a broad negative peak with a minimum at 208 nm, indicating a defined secondary structure of α -helix [51]. Only slight differences can be observed in the spectra. Similar spectra for lentil flour and isolated proteins using IEP were found by Aryee and Boye [52], indicating that secondary structure conformational changes were limited during the extraction of the proteins.

3.2.3 Scanning electron microscopy

Representative micrographs of the LPI powders are given in Figure 4. In general, a heterogeneous mixture of rounded particles with smooth, shrivelled, hollow and wrinkled surfaces were observed in both LPIs. These features are typical for spray dried powders and have been attributed to rapid evaporation of water during the spray-drying process [53–55]. Joshi et al. [24] also observed similar folded and wrinkled surfaces in LPI powders obtained by spray drying. The sizes of the powder particles, as seen from the scale bars, were generally between 10 and 50 μm . LPI-IEP and LPI-UF showed similar powder characteristics, although the LPI-IEP primary particles are in a closer arrangement than the LPI-UF particles where the powder particles seem more dispersed.

3.2.4 Particle size distribution

The particle size observations obtained by SEM can be correlated with the particle size distribution (PSD) determined using laser diffraction (Figure 5). Both LPIs showed a monomodal size distribution with a size range of 10 to 100 μm . The volume-weighted mean particle diameter ($D_{4,3}$) values of LPI-UF and LPI-IEP were 32.8 μm and 29.4 μm , respectively. The LPI-IEP also had significantly lower values for surface-weighted mean particle diameter ($D_{3,2}$), $D(50)$ and $D(90)$ (Table 2). Similar profiles were observed by Crowley et al. [56]) in high-protein

269 (90%) milk protein concentrates after 24 h of rehydration, with particle sizes ranging from 10 to 100 μm ,
270 classifying them as large and poorly-dispersible particles.

271 3.2.5 *Surface hydrophobicity*

272 Hydrophobic groups exposed to the surface of the proteins enable hydrophobic interactions, and
273 adsorption to interfaces; hence having an influence on many properties, such as emulsification and foaming [57].
274 These values are shown in Table 2. The LPI-IEP had a significantly higher surface hydrophobicity with a value
275 of 2688 in comparison to LPI-UF with a value of 2411. However, the differences were not major, but significantly
276 different, indicating that the extraction method had no major impact on the surface hydrophobicity of the proteins.
277 Comparable studies found a value of 2200 for legumin-like proteins isolated from lentils [14], while Joshi et al.
278 [58] found a considerably higher value of 568 determined for mg/mL, which translates to 5680 using the same
279 protein concentration units as in this study.

280 3.2.6 *Sulphydryl groups*

281 Results of sulphydryl groups measured as free and total are shown in Table 2. The concentration of free
282 and total sulphydryl groups were found to be higher for LPI-IEP, with 6.04 and 23.9 $\mu\text{mol/g}$ protein, respectively,
283 compared to 5.88 and 22.5 $\mu\text{mol/g}$ protein, respectively for LPI-UF. Literature considering the sulphydryl groups
284 of lentil proteins is scarce and diverse; Li & Lee [59] reported disulphide contents of 0.31 $\mu\text{mol/g}$, and free
285 sulphydryl groups of 0.032 $\mu\text{mol/g}$, being considerably lower than the values found in this study. On the other
286 hand, Ladjal-Ettoumi et al. [49] found comparable values; they reported 16.1 $\mu\text{mol/g}$ and 31.0 $\mu\text{mol/g}$ for free and
287 total sulphydryl groups, respectively. In both cases, the relatively low amount of free sulphydryl groups indicated
288 the formation of aggregates, being characteristic for globular proteins, and can be linked also to the relatively
289 large particle size. In general, both LPIs showed similar values for hydrophobicity and also sulphydryl groups.
290 However, LPI-IEP showed a trend with significant difference ($p < 0.05$) to higher values, indicating a slightly
291 more open structure with higher surface active groups.

292 3.3 *Functional properties*

293 3.3.1 *Solubility and zeta potential*

294 Both isolates showed similar solubility and zeta potential values across the pH range, as shown in Figure 6,
295 achieving the highest solubility at acidic and alkaline pH values. Similarly, at the extreme low and high pH ranges,
296 the lentil protein particles showed the highest positive and negative charge, respectively. LPI-IEP showed lower
297 solubility values across the pH range compared with LPI-UF. This may be explained by the removal of soluble

1
2
3 298 proteins in the supernatant during the extraction process and, therefore, more insoluble protein fraction is present
4
5 299 in LPI-IEP (Figure 1). High solubility values and positive charge (+ 30 mV) were observed at pH 3, followed by
6
7 300 minimum solubility and a net charge of 0 mV for both isolates at pH 4.5, indicating that the isoelectric point was
8
9 301 reached. Solubility was higher again at pH 6 and pH 6.5 for LPI-UF and LPI-IEP, reaching a value of 43% for
10
11 302 both isolates at pH 7 and the surface charge decreased, reaching values between -20 and -30 mV. Karaca et al.
12
13 303 [16], found similar values for surface charge (-22.6 mV) for LPI-IEP at pH 7. The highest solubility was obtained
14
15 304 for the LPI-UF at pH 9, at 54.7%, while LPI-IEP reached 50.18%. LPI-UF showed also a higher solubility at
16
17 305 acidic conditions with a value of 39.4% at pH 3.5. The LPI-IEP had lower solubility at lower pH's, having a value
18
19 306 of 11.9% at pH 3.5. The general profiles of the observed solubility and zeta potential curves are characteristic for
20
21 307 lentil proteins, as previously reported by Boye et al. [13], [who studied the solubility of different plant-based](#)
22
23 308 [protein isolates finding high solubilities for lentil and pea proteins in comparison with chickpea](#). Lee et al. [60]
24
25 309 analysed the protein solubility of commercial soya products including flours, concentrates and isolates and found
26
27 310 generally lower solubility at low pH's. Solubility is one of the most important properties of proteins, influencing
28
29 311 for example the ability to form and stabilise foams, emulsions and gels. Although insoluble proteins can be used
30
31 312 in meat preparations, highly soluble proteins provide the most versatility for substitution and extension of animal
32
33 313 proteins [61].

314 3.3.2 *Foaming properties*

315 Foaming is, in many product applications, a desired property of proteins, providing structure and
316 stability. The foaming properties of LPIs, as a function of protein concentration, are shown in Table 3. The
317 foaming capacity was low for both isolates at 0.1% (w/v) at 9.42 and 6.52% for LPI-UF and LPI-IEP, respectively.
318 With increasing concentration, the foaming capacity increased, reaching 69.5 and 57.2% for 3.3 % (w/v) LPI-UF
319 and LPI-IEP, respectively. Likewise, the foam stability increased from 0% for both LPIs to 44.9% and 39.1% for
320 LPI-UF and LPI-IEP, respectively. The LPI-UF showed significantly better foaming properties at the high protein
321 concentrations compared to the LPI-IEP. In addition, other studies found that protein isolates of various sources
322 prepared by UF were superior to those obtained by precipitation, especially in terms of protein solubility and
323 foaming characteristics [13, 62]. The results obtained show a high ability of lentil proteins to create foam with
324 high stability, indicating its potential for application in food processing. Compared to other commercial proteins
325 from potato (36.9%), pea (10.6%), carob (17.2%), lupin (13.9%) and soya (36.4%) analysed by Horstmann et al.
326 [63] for their application in bread, both LPIs showed better foam capacities; even potato protein, known to have

1
2
3 327 good foaming ability, showed lower values. These results underline the great prospect of LPIs being used in
4
5 328 bakery products, ice cream or other dairy formulations, where foaming properties are desired.
6
7

8 329 **3.3.3 Emulsification properties**

9 330 Proteins can act as emulsifiers by forming a film/skin around oil droplets dispersed in an aqueous medium,
10
11 331 thereby stabilizing emulsions and preventing structural changes such as coalescence, creaming, flocculation or
12
13 332 sedimentation [13]. The emulsifying activity (EAI) and emulsifying stability index (ESI) of LPI-UF and LPI-IEP
14
15 333 are shown in Table 4. EAI and ESI are two indices often used to evaluate the emulsifying properties of proteins.
16
17 334 ESI values were found to be higher for LPI-UF (63.8 min), compared to LPI-IEP (51.0 min). The EAI values were
18
19 335 quite similar for both LPIs; however, higher values were found for LPI-IEP (16.5 m²/g) in comparison with LPI-
20
21 336 UF (14.3 m²/g). These higher values for LPI-IEP can be related to the higher surface hydrophobicity compared to
22
23 337 LPI-UF. The EAI values were lower in comparison to other studies where different protein-to-fat ratios or high-
24
25 338 pressure homogenization were applied [13, 64]. For example, M. Joshi et al. [58] found that the EAI increased 3-
26
27 339 fold when the concentration of protein increased from 10 mg/mL to 30 mg/mL, whereas in this study the protein
28
29 340 concentration was maintained at 10 mg/mL. In addition, high pressure homogenization, as applied to cow's milk,
30
31 341 can help to unfold globulins (which are known for having high MW and compact structures) and enable them to
32
33 342 migrate to the interface in order to form a stable emulsion [16]. These factors can be taken into consideration for
34
35 343 further studies in order to enhance the emulsification properties.
36
37

38 344 **3.3.4 Water holding and fat ~~absorption~~-holding capacity**

39 345 Water holding and fat ~~absorption~~-holding capacity (WHC and FHAC) of proteins is an important
40
41 346 functionality, since it influences structure, mouth feel and flavour retention of food formulations. The ability of
42
43 347 protein to retain oil or water can be important in food applications, such as ground meat formulations, doughnuts
44
45 348 and bakery products. Values are shown in Table 2. Significant differences were found for the WHC between the
46
47 349 two different LPIs, showing a higher value of 3.96 g/g for the LPI-UF, compared to 2.60 g/g for LPI-IEP.
48
49 350 Compared to other studies, both isolates showed a relatively high WHC; Boye et al. [13] reported values of 0.6
50
51 351 and 2.7 g/g for protein concentrates isolated from several legumes. However, the authors found no considerable
52
53 352 effect of the preparation method, possibly due to the comparatively low protein contents of their samples.
54
55 353 Horstmann et al. [63], found values ranging from 0.0 g/g for a potato and soya, and up to 2.66 g/g for a pea protein
56
57 354 ingredient. They associated the protein content to be negatively correlated with the WHC, i.e., other constituents
58
59 355 affect the values to a substantial degree. In contrast, in this study it was found that a higher protein content
60

356 correlateds with a higher WHC. Results for FHAC showed also significantly higher values for LPI-UF (2.24 g
357 oil/g protein) in comparison to LPI-IEP (2.09 g oil/g protein). The value obtained for LPI-UF is comparable to
358 that obtained by Boye et al. [13] for red lentil protein with a FAC of 2.26 g oil/g protein. In addition, this author
359 found the highest FAC value for LPI in comparison with yellow pea and kabuli chickpeas proteins.

360 3.3.5 Gelation characteristics

361 Heat induced gelation occurs when proteins aggregate to form a three-dimensional network. The ability to do
362 so depends on the state and surface conformation of the proteins, e.g., free sulfhydryl groups, hydrophobicity,
363 charge and correspondingly the electrostatic interaction between proteins, and their ability to associate to form a
364 continuous network throughout the matrix [65]. LGC was measured as an indicator of the gelation capacity. The
365 LPI-UF formed a gel, resisting flow when inverted, at a concentration of 11% (w/v), whereas for the LPI-IEP 16%
366 was needed (Table 4). The lower concentration needed for a firm gel to be formed by the LPI-UF may be
367 associated with the higher protein solubility, which is known to be an important factor in gel formation [24].
368 Likewise, Boye et al. [25] found that various legume proteins isolated by UF have lower LGC in comparison to
369 IEP methods. They found comparable values, with 10% for LPI prepared by UF and 12% for isolates prepared by
370 IEP. The LPI-UF also formed a much stronger gel, which is evident in the values obtained from the TPA test: the
371 hardness for LPI-UF was three-fold higher than that of LPI-IEP. Likewise, gumminess and chewiness were also
372 significantly higher for LPI-UF than for LPI-IEP gels. On the other hand, other parameters, such as adhesiveness,
373 springiness, resilience and cohesiveness were not significantly different. The higher gelling properties of LPI-UF
374 may be linked to the higher calcium levels, which has been shown to enhance hydrophobic coagulation of heat
375 treated milk and soya proteins [46]. The ability to form strong gels upon heating is a desirable
376 ~~property~~ functionality in bakery products; when heat is applied to the dough, its viscosity increases ~~, which gives~~
377 ~~stability to expanding gas cells,~~ resultsing in a higher gas retention during baking and a higher desirable specific
378 volume of the product is reached [66]. Furthermore, in non-traditional ways, ~~also~~ meat, yoghurt and cheese
379 alternatives may be produced from heat-set gels, providing ~~facilitating to~~ the product ~~with~~ a gel-like matrix.

380 3.4 Life cycle assessment

381 Environmental performance of LPI obtained by IEP and UF was examined by means of life cycle assessment
382 (Table 5). Indicators such as aquatic eutrophication, photochemical oxidant formation, stratospheric ozone
383 depletion, phosphorus use and land use showed lower potential environmental impacts for LPI-UF in comparison
384 to LPI-IEP. For the remaining indicators studied, the ranking was switched. Especially the contribution of the

1
2
3 385 lentil cultivation stage affects the outcome of these indicators. An overview on main contributors is exemplarily
4
5 386 given in Figure 7 for four indicators - the remaining indicators followed one out of those four illustrated result
6
7 387 contribution patterns. The higher the contribution of the lentil cultivation stage, the more important is the protein
8
9 388 yield advantage from LPI-UF, as less lentil seeds were required per kg protein isolated. On the other hand, lower
10
11 389 process energy was required for processing of LPI-IEP, which leads to lower potential environmental impacts for
12
13 390 the remaining indicators including climate change. The net nitrogen benefit due to air nitrogen fixation by lentil
14
15 391 plants (as they are legumes) in the growth phase is up to 20% of the total environmental impact depending on the
16
17 392 indicator for both LPIs.

18
19 393 Further, LPIs showed promising carbon footprints within the portfolio of soya-based and cow's milk-based
20
21 394 protein isolate food ingredients: The production of both LPIs potentially releases a quarter of carbon dioxide
22
23 395 equivalents (3.5 to 4.2 kg CO₂-e/kg) than caseinate or whey protein production (19 kg CO₂-e/kg and 20 kg CO₂-
24
25 396 e/kg, respectively) as examined in an attributional LCA by Thrane, Paulsen, Orcutt, & Krieger [67]. Compared to
26
27 397 soya protein isolate, depending on the literature source chosen, LPIs showed similar [67] or up to 4-fold lower
28
29 398 values [68] for their potential release of carbon dioxide equivalents.

30 399 The environmental impact profiles of LPIs were also compared with traditional cow's milk protein as
31
32 400 illustrated in Figure 8. Two different scenarios for the production of cow's milk protein were taken into
33
34 401 consideration: the environmental impact, high or low, of the milk protein was set up depending on the theoretical
35
36 402 amount of protein that is fed to the cow i.e. cow feed per kg milk and share of concentrate versus silage feed
37
38 403 components within the feed mix were the parameters set to low and high for those ranges. Indicator results of
39
40 404 LPIs are lower (and thus favourable) or equal for all of the examined indicators except the land use indicator. The
41
42 405 latter is related to comparatively high agricultural yields of feed crops in comparison with relatively low yields
43
44 406 for lentils. It should be noted that feed crops have undergone long-time optimisation of agricultural practices in
45
46 407 order to reach relatively high yields. Lentils on the other hand have not been cultivated in comparable amounts
47
48 408 on global scale than animal feed crops. Therefore, related optimization might take place along with increased
49
50 409 interest in lentils in the future.

51 410 Overall, the environmental impact of both LPIs was lower, contributing e.g. to a reduction of greenhouse
52
53 411 gases compared to cow's milk protein.

54
55
56
57 412 **4 Conclusion**

1
2
3 413 Various physical and functional properties of two LPI isolated by IEP and UF were investigated, indicating
4
5 414 that they could contribute different desirable attributes to a wide range of food products. The results suggest that,
6
7 415 in general, UF resulted in a product with better functional properties, such as higher protein solubility, WHC,
8
9 416 greater gelling and foaming properties and emulsion stability. Differences in functional properties between the
10
11 417 isolates under investigation were attributed to differences in the extraction methods, resulting in different
12
13 418 compositions. Both isolates contained high levels of protein; however, LPI prepared by UF contained significantly
14
15 419 higher values of protein, calcium and magnesium, whereas LPI prepared by IEP had higher levels of other minor
16
17 420 constituents such as fibre, sodium and phosphorous. The life cycle assessment showed that the two main drivers
18
19 421 for the environmental impact of LPIs were the cultivation stage and the protein isolation process. Overall, both
20
21 422 LPIs exhibited promising environmental performance, especially if compared to traditional cow's milk proteins.
22
23 423 These ~~favorable~~favourable functional, nutritional and environmental properties of LPIs could be exploited in the
24
25 424 preparation and development of diverse food products and may also be suitable for the substitution of soya or
26
27 425 animal derived proteins. Further studies are required to investigate protein functionality and applicability of these
28
29 426 in food systems as well as life cycle assessments of the food products thereof.

32 427 **5 *Declarations of interest***

33
34 428 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

38 429 **6 *Acknowledgement***

39
40 430 The work for this publication has been undertaken as part of the PROTEIN2FOOD project. This project has
41
42 431 received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant
43
44 432 agreement No 635727. We thank our colleagues Dave Waldron, Tom Hannon and Michael Cronin for technical
45
46 433 assistance and expertise that greatly assisted the work.

434 7 **References**

- 435 1. Henchion M, Hayes M, Mullen AM, Fenelon M, Tiwari B (2017) Future Protein Supply and Demand:
436 Strategies and Factors Influencing a Sustainable Equilibrium. *Foods* 6:53.
437 <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods6070053>
- 438 2. United Nations (2015) Revision of World Population Prospects. In: United Nations.
439 <https://population.un.org/wpp/Graphs/Probabilistic/POP/TOT/>. Accessed 1 Dec 2018
- 440 3. Day L (2013) Proteins from land plants - Potential resources for human nutrition and food security. *Trends*
441 *Food Sci Technol* 32:25–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2013.05.005>
- 442 4. Don C (2017) Future Proteins: Functionality , Processing , and Sourcing. *AACC Int* 62:144–148
- 443 5. Poore J, Nemecek T (2018) Reducing food’s environmental impacts through producers and consumers.
444 *Science* (80-) 360:987–992. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aag0216>
- 445 6. Shepon A, Eshel G, Noor E, Milo R (2016) Energy and protein feed-to-food conversion efficiencies in
446 the US and potential food security gains from dietary changes. *Environ Res Lett* 11:105002.
447 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/11/10/105002>
- 448 7. Aiking H (2011) Future protein supply. *Trends Food Sci Technol* 22:112–120.
449 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2010.04.005>
- 450 8. Coda R, Varis J, Verni M, Rizzello CG, Katina K (2017) Improvement of the protein quality of wheat
451 bread through faba bean sourdough addition. *LWT - Food Sci Technol* 82:296–302.
452 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LWT.2017.04.062>
- 453 9. Jiménez-Martínez C, Hernández-Sánchez H, Dávila-Ortiz G (2003) Production of a yogurt-like product
454 from *Lupinus campestris* seeds. *J Sci Food Agric* 83:515–522. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.1385>
- 455 10. Lin S, Huff HE, Hsieh F (2002) Extrusion Process Parameters, Sensory Characteristics, and Structural
456 Properties of a High Moisture Soy Protein Meat Analog. *J Food Sci* 67:1066–1072.
457 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2621.2002.tb09454.x>
- 458 11. Riaz MN (2011) Texturized vegetable proteins. In: Phillips GO, Williams PA (eds) *Handbook of food*

- 1
2
3 459 proteins, 1st ed. Woodhead Publishing Limited, pp 395–418
4
5
6 460 12. Duranti M (2006) Grain legume proteins and nutraceutical properties. *Fitoterapia* 77:67–82.
7
8 461 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fitote.2005.11.008>
9
10
11 462 13. Boye JI, Aksay S, Roufik S, Ribéreau S, Mondor M, Farnworth E, Rajamohamed SH (2010) Comparison
12
13 463 of the functional properties of pea, chickpea and lentil protein concentrates processed using ultrafiltration
14
15 464 and isoelectric precipitation techniques. *Food Res Int* 43:537–546.
16
17 465 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2009.07.021>
18
19
20 466 14. Jarpa-Parra M, Bamdad F, Tian Z, Zeng H, Temelli F, Chen L (2015) Impact of pH on molecular structure
21
22 467 and surface properties of lentil legumin-like protein and its application as foam stabilizer. *Colloids*
23
24 468 *Surfaces B Biointerfaces* 132:45–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COLSURFB.2015.04.065>
25
26 469 15. FAOSTAT Database (2016) Food and Agriculture Organization. <http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QC>.
27
28 470 Accessed 15 Nov 2018
29
30
31 471 16. Karaca AC, Low N, Nickerson M (2011) Emulsifying properties of chickpea, faba bean, lentil and pea
32
33 472 proteins produced by isoelectric precipitation and salt extraction. *Food Res Int* 44:2742–2750.
34
35 473 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2011.06.012>
36
37
38 474 17. Arntfield SD, Maskus HD (2011) Peas and other legume proteins. In: Phillips GO, Williams PA (eds)
39
40 475 *Handbook of Food Proteins*, 1st ed. Woodhead Publishing, Cambridge, UK, pp 233–266
41
42
43 476 18. Dijkstra D, Linnemann A, Van Boekel T (2003) Towards Sustainable Production of Protein-Rich Foods:
44
45 477 Appraisal of Eight Crops for Western Europe. Part II: Analysis of the Technological Aspects of the
46
47 478 Production Chain. *Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr* 43:481–506. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10408690390246332>
48
49
50 479 19. Nishinari K, Fang Y, Guo S, Phillips GO (2014) Soy proteins: A review on composition, aggregation and
51
52 480 emulsification. *Food Hydrocoll* 39:301–318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2014.01.013>
53
54
55 481 20. Fox PF, Uniacke T, McSweeney PLH, O'Mahony JA (2015) *Dairy Chemistry and Biochemistry*, 2nd ed.
56
57 482 Springer International Publishing, New York
58
59 483 21. Papalamprou EM, Doxastakis GI, Biliaderis CG, Kiosseoglou V (2009) Influence of preparation methods
60

- 1
2
3 484 on physicochemical and gelation properties of chickpea protein isolates. *Food Hydrocoll* 23:337–343.
4
5 485 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2008.03.006>
6
7
8 486 22. Peng W, Kong X, Chen Y, Zhang C, Yang Y, Hua Y (2016) Effects of heat treatment on the emulsifying
9
10 487 properties of pea proteins. *Food Hydrocoll* 52:301–310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2015.06.025>
11
12
13 488 23. Sánchez-Vioque R, Clemente A, Vioque J, Bautista J, Millán F (1999) Protein isolates from chickpea
14
15 489 (Cicer arietinum L.): Chemical composition, functional properties and protein characterization. *Food*
16
17 490 *Chem* 64:237–243. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0308-8146\(98\)00133-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0308-8146(98)00133-2)
18
19
20 491 24. Joshi M, Adhikari B, Aldred P, Panozzo JF, Kasapis S (2011) Physicochemical and functional properties
21
22 492 of lentil protein isolates prepared by different drying methods. *Food Chem* 129:1513–1522.
23
24 493 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2011.05.131>
25
26
27 494 25. Boye J, Zare F, Pletch A (2010) Pulse proteins: Processing, characterization, functional properties and
28
29 495 applications in food and feed. *Food Res Int* 43:414–431. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2009.09.003>
30
31
32 496 26. Jarpa-Parra M (2018) Lentil protein : a review of functional properties and food application . An overview
33
34 497 of lentil protein functionality. *Int J Food Sci Technol* 53:892–903. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijfs.13685>
35
36
37 498 27. Johnston SP, Nickerson MT, Low NH (2015) The physicochemical properties of legume protein isolates
38
39 499 and their ability to stabilize oil-in-water emulsions with and without genipin. *J Food Sci Technol* 52:4135–
40
41 500 4145. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-014-1523-3>
42
43
44 501 28. MEBAK (2011) MEBAK- Würze, Bier, Biermischgetränke, Methodensammlung der Mitteleuropäischen
45
46 502 Brautechnischen Analysenkommission, Selbstverlag der MEBAK. In: Wort, beer and beer-based
47
48 503 beverages.
49
50
51 504 29. AACC, Approved Methods of the American Association of Cereal Chemists, Method 30-25.01 - Crude
52
53 505 Fat in Wheat, Corn, Soy Flour and Feed Mixes (2001). In: International Approved Methods of Analysis,
54
55 506 11th ed. St. Paul, MN
56
57
58 507 30. AOAC, Official Methods of Analysis of AOAC International, AOAC Method 923.03 - Ash of Flour
59
60 508 (2005). In: Official Methods of Analysis, 18th ed. AOAC International Publisher, Gaithersburg, MD

- 1
2
3 509 31. AOAC, Official Methods of Analysis of AOAC International, AOAC Method 925.10, Solids (Total) and
4
5 510 Moisture in Flour (2005). In: Official Methods of Analysis, 18th ed. AOAC International Publisher,
6
7 511 Gaithersburg, MD
8
9
10 512 32. AOAC, Official Methods of Analysis of AOAC International, AOAC Method 996.11 - Total Starch in
11
12 513 Cereal Products (2005). In: Official Methods of Analysis, 18th ed. AOAC International Publisher,
13
14 514 Gaithersburg, MD
15
16 515 33. AACC, Approved Method of the American Association of Cereal Chemists, Method 76-13.01 - Total
17
18 516 Starch Assay Procedure (2001). In: International Approved Methods of Analysis, 11th ed. St. Paul, MN
19
20
21 517 34. US EPA Method 6020 Method 6020, Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry
22
23
24 518 35. AOAC, Official Methods of Analysis of AOAC International, AOAC Method 991.43 - Total, Soluble and
25
26 519 Insoluble Dietary Fibre in Foods (2005). In: Official Methods of Analysis, 18th ed. AOAC International
27
28 520 Publisher, Gaithersburg, MD
29
30
31 521 36. Alonso-Miravalles L, O'Mahony JA (2018) Composition, Protein Profile and Rheological Properties of
32
33 522 Pseudocereal-Based Protein-Rich Ingredients. *Foods* 7:1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods7050073>
34
35
36 523 37. Hayakawa SS, Nakai S (1985) Relationships of Hydrophobicity and Net Charge to the Solubility of Milk
37
38 524 and Soy Proteins. *J Food Eng* 50:486–491. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2621.1985.tb13433.x>
39
40
41 525 38. Van Der Plancken I, Van Loey A, Hendrickx MEG (2005) Changes in Sulfhydryl Content of Egg White
42
43 526 Proteins Due to Heat and Pressure Treatment. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf050289+>
44
45
46 527 39. AACC, Approved Methods of the American Association of Cereal Chemists, Method 56-30.01 - Water
47
48 528 Hydration Capacity of Protein Materials (2001). In: International Approved Methods of Analysis, 11th
49
50 529 ed. St. Paul, MN
51
52 530 40. Pearce KN, Kinsella JE (1978) Emulsifying properties of proteins: evaluation of a turbidimetric technique.
53
54 531 *J Agric Food Chem* 26:716–723. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf60217a041>
55
56
57 532 41. Sathe SK, Deshpande SS, Salunkhe DK (1982) Functional Properties of Lupin Seed (*Lupinus mutabilis*)
58
59 533 Proteins and Protein Concentrates. *J Food Sci* 47:491–497. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365->
60

- 1
2
3 534 2621.1982.tb10110.x
4
5
6 535 42. Bourne MC (2002) Food Texture and Viscosity - Concept and Measurements. In: Food Texture and
7
8 536 Viscosity, 2nd ed. Food Science and Technology, Elsevier, p 416
9
10
11 537 43. Umweltbundesamt Berlin (2016) Prüfung und Aktualisierung der Ökobilanzen für
12
13 538 Getränkeverpackungen. UBA-Texte 19/2016. Berlin
14
15
16 539 44. Foegeding EA, Davis JP (2011) Food protein functionality: A comprehensive approach. Food Hydrocoll
17
18 540 25:1853–1864. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2011.05.008>
19
20
21 541 45. Farrell HM, Bleck GT, Brown EM, Butler JE, Creamer LK, Hicks CL, Hollar CM, Swaisgood HE (2004)
22
23 542 Nomenclature of the Proteins of Cows ' Milk — Sixth Revision. J Dairy Sci 87:1641–1674
24
25
26 543 46. Pathomrungruangsriyounggul P, Lewis MJ, Grandison AS (2010) Effects of calcium-chelating agents and
27
28 544 pasteurisation on certain properties of calcium-fortified soy milk. Food Chem 118:808–814.
29
30 545 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2009.05.067>
31
32
33 546 47. Joshi M, Timilsena Y, Adhikari B (2017) Global production, processing and utilization of lentil: A review.
34
35 547 J Integr Agric 16:2898–2913. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119\(17\)61793-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119(17)61793-3)
36
37
38 548 48. Dagorn-Scaviner C, Gueguen J, Lefebvre J (1987) Emulsifying properties of pea globulins as related to
39
40 549 their adsorptions behaviours. J Food Sci 52:335–341
41
42
43 550 49. Ladjal-Ettoumi Y, Boudries H, Chibane M, Romero A (2016) Pea, Chickpea and Lentil Protein Isolates:
44
45 551 Physicochemical Characterization and Emulsifying Properties. Food Biophys 11:43–51.
46
47 552 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11483-015-9411-6>
48
49
50 553 50. Barbana C, Boye JI (2011) Angiotensin I-converting enzyme inhibitory properties of lentil protein
51
52 554 hydrolysates: Determination of the kinetics of inhibition. Food Chem 127:94–101.
53
54 555 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2010.12.093>
55
56
57 556 51. Greenfield N (2007) Using circular dichroism spectra to estimate protein secondary structure. Nat Protoc
58
59 557 1:2876–2890. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nprot.2006.202>.Using
60
558 52. Aryee AN., Boye JI (2015) Comparative study of the effects of processing on the nutritional,

- 1
2
3 559 physicochemical and functional properties of lentil. *J Food Process Preserv* 41:1–13.
4
5 560 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfpp.12824>
6
7
8 561 53. Kim EHJ, Chen XD, Pearce D (2009) Surface composition of industrial spray-dried milk powders. Effects
9
10 562 of spray drying conditions on the surface composition. *J Food Eng* 94:169–181.
11
12 563 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2008.10.020>
13
14
15 564 54. Kelly GM, O'Mahony JA, Kelly AL, Huppertz T, Kennedy D, O'Callaghan DJ (2015) Influence of
16
17 565 protein concentration on surface composition and physico-chemical properties of spray-dried milk protein
18
19 566 concentrate powders. *Int Dairy J* 51:34–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2015.07.001>
20
21
22 567 55. Amagliani L, O'Regan J, Kelly AL, O'Mahony JA (2016) Physical and flow properties of rice protein
23
24 568 powders. *J Food Eng* 190:1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2016.05.022>
25
26
27 569 56. Crowley S V., Desautel B, Gazi I, Kelly AL, Huppertz T, O'Mahony JA (2015) Rehydration
28
29 570 characteristics of milk protein concentrate powders. *J Food Eng* 149:105–113.
30
31 571 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2014.09.033>
32
33
34 572 57. Kato A, Nakai S (1980) Hydrophobicity determined by a fluorescence probe method and its correlation
35
36 573 with surface properties of proteins. *Biochim Biophys Acta - Protein Struct* 624:13–20.
37
38 574 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-2795\(80\)90220-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-2795(80)90220-2)
39
40
41 575 58. Joshi M, Adhikari B, Aldred P, Panozzo JF, Kasapis S, Barrow CJ (2012) Interfacial and emulsifying
42
43 576 properties of lentil protein isolate. *Food Chem* 134:1343–1353.
44
45 577 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2012.03.029>
46
47
48 578 59. Li M, Lee T-C (2000) Effect of Extrusion Temperature on the Solubility and Molecular Weight of Lentil
49
50 579 Bean Flour Proteins Containing Low Cysteine Residues. *J Agric Food Chem* 48:880–884.
51
52 580 <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf990328f>
53
54
55 581 60. Lee K, Ryu H, Rhee K (2003) Protein solubility characteristics of commercial soy protein products. *J Am*
56
57 582 *Oil Chem Soc* 80:85–90. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s11746-003-0656-6>
58
59
60 583 61. Boland MJ, Rae AN, Vereijken JM, Meuwissen MPM, Fischer ARH, van Boekel MAJS, Rutherford SM,
584
585 Gruppen H, Moughan PJ, Hendriks WH (2013) The future supply of animal-derived protein for human

- 1
2
3 585 consumption. *Trends Food Sci Technol* 29:62–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2012.07.002>
4
5
6 586 62. Fuhrmeister H, Meuser F (2003) Impact of processing on functional properties of protein products from
7
8 587 wrinkled peas. *J Food Eng* 56:119–129. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0260-8774\(02\)00241-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0260-8774(02)00241-8)
9
10
11 588 63. Horstmann SW, Foschia M, Arendt EK (2017) Correlation analysis of protein quality characteristics with
12
13 589 gluten-free bread properties. *Food Funct* 8:2465–2474. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C7FO00415J>
14
15
16 590 64. Avramenko NA, Low NH, Nickerson MT (2013) The effects of limited enzymatic hydrolysis on the
17
18 591 physicochemical and emulsifying properties of a lentil protein isolate. *Food Res Int* 51:162–169.
19
20 592 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2012.11.020>
21
22
23 593 65. Kinsella J (1983) Relationships between structure and functional properties of food proteins. In: Fox P,
24
25 594 Condon S (eds) *Food proteins*. Applied Science, London, p 51
26
27 595 66. Zhou J, Liu J, Tang X, Tang CX (2018) Effects of whey and soy protein addition on bread rheological
28
29 596 property of wheat flour. *J Texture Stud* 49:38–46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jtxs.12275>
30
31
32 597 67. Thrane M, Paulsen PV, Orcutt MW, Krieger TM (2017) Soy Protein: Impacts, Production, and
33
34 598 Applications. In: Nadathur SR, Wanasundra JPD, Scanlin L (eds) *Sustainable Protein Sources*, 1st ed.
35
36 599 Academic Press, London
37
38
39 600 68. Berardy A, Costello C, Seager T (2015) Life Cycle Assessment of Soy Protein Isolate. *Proc Int Symp*
40
41 601 *Sustain Syst Technol* 3:13. <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1517821>
42
43
44 602
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Macro- and micro-nutrient composition of lentil protein isolates obtained by ultrafiltration (LPI-UF) or isoelectric precipitation (LPI-IEP).

Composition [g/100 g]	LPI-UF	LPI-IEP
Protein	93.7 ± 0.34 ^a	85.13 ± 0.76 ^b
Fat	4.40 ± 0.13 ^a	4.49 ± 0.37 ^a
Starch	*N.D.	*N.D.
Moisture	5.63 ± 0.02 ^a	4.87 ± 0.08 ^b
Ash	3.51 ± 0.11 ^a	5.46 ± 0.04 ^b
Insoluble dietary fibre	<0.1	<0.1
Soluble dietary fibre	<0.1	1.8
Minerals [mg/kg]		
Chlorine	2.0	2.4
Sodium	1300	11000
Zinc	57	48
Calcium	2200	710
Magnesium	2300	750
Iron	150	170
Phosphorous	6100	9400

Values within a column that share a superscript are not significantly different from one another ($p < 0.05$).

*N.D. = Not Detected

Table 2. Particle size distribution parameters of 1% (w/v) protein solutions, surface hydrophobicity, sulfhydryl groups, water and oil holding capacity of lentil protein isolates obtained by ultrafiltration (LPI-UF) and isoelectric precipitation (LPI-IEP).

	LPI-UF	LPI-IEP
Particle size distribution [μm]		
D _{4,3}	32.8 \pm 3.21 ^a	29.4 \pm 0.64 ^a
D _{3,2}	23.3 \pm 0.91 ^a	18.1 \pm 1.37 ^b
D _v (10)	12.5 \pm 0.26 ^a	9.02 \pm 0.24 ^b
D _v (50)	26.9 \pm 1.31 ^a	19.0 \pm 1.41 ^b
D _v (90)	62.8 \pm 9.03 ^a	56.6 \pm 5.81 ^a
Surface Hydrophobicity	2411 \pm 49.5 ^a	2688 \pm 92.8 ^b
Free Sulfhydryl groups [$\mu\text{M/g}$ protein]	5.88 \pm 0.01 ^a	6.04 \pm 0.58 ^a
Total Sulfhydryl groups [$\mu\text{M/g}$ protein]	22.5 \pm 0.15 ^a	23.9 \pm 1.42 ^a
Water holding capacity [g water/g protein]	3.96 \pm 0.2 ^a	2.6 \pm 0.11 ^b
Fat <u>binding-holding</u> capacity [g oil/g protein]	2.24 \pm 0.16 ^a	2.09 \pm 0.23 ^a

Values within a column that share a superscript are not significantly different from one another ($p < 0.05$).

Table 3. Foaming properties of protein solutions of lentil protein isolates obtained by ultrafiltration (LPI-UF) and isoelectric precipitation (LPI-IEP)

Protein concentration (w/v)	Foam capacity (%)		Foaming stability after 60 min (%)	
	LPI-UF	LPI-IEP	LPI-UF	LPI-IEP
0.1	9.42 ± 1.26 ^a	6.52 ± 0.00 ^b	0.00 ± 0.00 ^a	0.00 ± 0.00 ^a
0.5	18.1 ± 1.26 ^a	18.8 ± 1.26 ^a	6.52 ± 5.75 ^a	5.80 ± 3.32 ^a
1.0	33.3 ± 2.51 ^a	33.3 ± 11.2 ^a	15.9 ± 4.53 ^a	12.3 ± 1.26 ^a
3.0	58.7 ± 9.48 ^a	51.4 ± 6.28 ^a	43.5 ± 5.75 ^a	31.8 ± 5.47 ^a
3.3	69.6 ± 3.77 ^a	57.2 ± 5.47 ^b	44.9 ± 1.26 ^a	39.1 ± 5.75 ^a

Values within a column that share a superscript are not significantly different from one another ($p < 0.05$).

For Peer Review


Table 4. Gelling and emulsifying properties of protein solutions of lentil protein isolates obtained by ultrafiltration (LPI-UF) and isoelectric precipitation (LPI-IEP).

	LPI-UF	LPI-IEP
Emulsifying properties		
Emulsifying activity [m^2/g]	14.3 ± 1.22^a	16.5 ± 0.03^b
Emulsifying stability [min]	63.8 ± 6.70^a	51.0 ± 0.96^b
Least gelation concentration % [w/v]	11.0 ± 0.00^a	16.0 ± 0.00^b
Texture profile analysis of LPI gels		
Hardness [mN]	2055 ± 114^a	669 ± 20.2^b
Adhesiveness [mN/s]	-98.7 ± 9.02^a	-83.7 ± 1.53^b
Springiness	0.47 ± 0.08^a	0.32 ± 0.04^a
Cohesiveness	0.30 ± 0.01^a	0.30 ± 0.02^a
Resilience	0.05 ± 0.01^a	0.03 ± 0.00^a
Gumminess	623 ± 53.7^a	210 ± 4.36^b
Chewiness	257 ± 83.1^a	76.3 ± 7.09^b

Values within a column that share a superscript are not significantly different from one another ($p < 0.05$).

Table 5. Environmental impact profile of lentil protein isolates per kg isolate (PI), prepared by ultrafiltration (LPI-UF) and isoelectric precipitation (LPI-IEP)

	LPI- IEP	LPI-UF
<i>Environmental impact potentials (LCA):</i>		
Climate Change [kg CO ₂ -e/kg PI]	3.53	4.17
Aquatic Eutrophication [g PO ₄ -e/kg PI]	111	103
Terrestrial Eutrophication [g PO ₄ -e/kg PI]	1.57	1.77
Acidification [g SO ₂ -e/kg PI]	14.5	18.2
Photochemical Oxidant Formation [g O ₃ -e/kg PI]	2.22	2.17
Fine Particulate Matter [g PM _{2.5} -e/kg PI]	11.9	14.9
Stratospheric Ozone Depletion [mg CFC11-e/ PI]	58.2	55.1
<i>Additional indicators at the inventory level (LCI):</i>		
Phosphorus Use [g/kg PI]	245	229
Cumulative Energy Demand, non-renewable [MJ/kg PI]	45	59
Blue Water (process) [kg/kg PI]	42	49
Land Use [m ² /kg PI]	57	53



1
2

Figure 1. Preparation of lentil protein isolates from *Lens culinaris* cv. *Itaca* in pilot-scale.




Figure 2. Representative sodium dodecyl sulphate-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (SDS-PAGE) pattern of lentil protein isolates obtained by ultrafiltration (LPI-UF) and isoelectric precipitation (LPI-IEP) under non-reducing (NR) and reducing (R) conditions. The first lane of the gel contains the molecular weight marker.





Figure 3. Far-UV circular dichroism (CD) spectra (smoothened curve) of lentil protein isolates obtained by ultrafiltration (—) or isoelectric precipitation (- - -).



39 **Figure 4.** Scanning electron micrographs of isoelectric precipitated (column 1) and ultrafiltrated (column
40 2) lentil protein isolate powder ingredients. Magnification of row (a) 250, (b) 500 and (c) 1000. Scale bars
41 10 μm .
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60






Figure 5. Particle size distribution of 1 % (w/v) ultrafiltrated (—) or isoelectric precipitated (---) lentil protein solutions obtained in deionised water at 25 °C.



42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 6. Protein solubility (a) and zeta potential (b) values at different pH ranges of lentil protein isolates obtained by ultrafiltration (—) and isoelectric precipitation (---).




Figure 7. Contributions of main life cycle steps to environmental impact profiles of lentil protein isolates prepared by ultrafiltration (LPI-UF) and isoelectric precipitation (LPI-IEP). CED = Cumulative primary energy demand




Figure 8. Comparison of environmental impact profiles of lentil protein isolates versus cow milk protein ranges, lentil protein isolates are prepared by ultrafiltration (LPI-UF) and isoelectric precipitation (LPI-IEP). Highest result is set to 100%. dLUC = direct land use change