<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Isolation and characterisation of antifungal compounds from lactic acid bacteria and their application in wheat and gluten-free bread</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author(s)</strong></td>
<td>Axel, Claudia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publication date</strong></td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of publication</strong></td>
<td>Doctoral thesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Rights** | © 2015, Claudia Axel.  
[http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/] |
| **Embargo information** | No embargo required |
| **Item downloaded from** | [http://hdl.handle.net/10468/2127] |

Downloaded on 2018-12-30T00:20:20Z
Isolation and characterisation of antifungal compounds from lactic acid bacteria and their application in wheat and gluten-free bread

Thesis presented by
Claudia Axel
State-approved Diplom Food Chemist

Under the supervision of
Prof. Dr. Elke K. Arendt
To obtain the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy – PhD in Food Science and Technology

Head of School
Prof. Yrjo Roos

April 2015
# Table of Contents

**Table of Contents** ........................................................................................................................................... i

**List of Figures** ........................................................................................................................................ vi

**List of Tables** ........................................................................................................................................... ix

**Declaration** ............................................................................................................................................. xi

**Abbreviations** .......................................................................................................................................... xii

**Abstract** .................................................................................................................................................. 1

**Acknowledgements** ................................................................................................................................. 2

**Chapter 1**  **Introduction** ...................................................................................................................... 3

1.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................................................. 4

1.2 References ............................................................................................................................................. 8

**Chapter 2**  **Literature Review – Mould spoilage of bread and its biopreservation: A review of current strategies for bread shelf life extension** ................................................................................................................................. 13

2.1 Abstract ................................................................................................................................................. 14

2.2 Introduction ........................................................................................................................................... 15

2.3 Cereals and their contamination with fungi and mycotoxins ................................................................. 17

2.4 Conventional food preservatives ........................................................................................................... 19

2.5 Alternative preservation techniques ......................................................................................................... 21

2.5.1 Fermentation ..................................................................................................................................... 21

2.5.1.1 Lactic acid bacteria ......................................................................................................................... 21

2.5.1.2 Yeast ............................................................................................................................................ 29

2.5.2 Plant derive compounds ..................................................................................................................... 31

2.5.3 Protective packaging .......................................................................................................................... 33

2.5.4 Further applications ............................................................................................................................ 36
### 2.6 Conclusion ................................................................. 38

### 2.7 Acknowledgements ...................................................... 39

### 2.8 References ........................................................................ 40

### Chapter 3  **Quantification of cyclic dipeptides from cultures of Lactobacillus brevis R2Δ by HRGC/MS using Stable Isotope Dilution Assay** .................................................. 54

#### 3.1 Abstract .............................................................. 55

#### 3.2 Introduction .......................................................... 56

#### 3.3 Material and Methods ...................................................... 59

##### 3.3.1 Chemicals ......................................................... 59

##### 3.3.2 Synthesis of isotopically labelled cyclo-dipeptides ......... 59

##### 3.3.3 Standard wort production ........................................... 61

##### 3.3.4 MRS-broth and wort fermentations and sample extractions ...... 61

##### 3.3.5 Quantification of cyclic dipeptides by HRGC/MS .............. 61

##### 3.3.6 Statistical analysis ................................................. 62

#### 3.4 Results and Discussion .................................................. 63

##### 3.4.1 Deuteration of cyclic dipeptides ..................................... 63

##### 3.4.2 HRGC/MS cyclic dipeptide analysis method performance........ 67

##### 3.4.3 Quantification of proline-based cyclic dipeptides in *Lb. brevis* R2Δ fermented MRS-broth and wort ..................................................... 70

#### 3.5 Conclusion ........................................................................ 77

#### 3.6 Acknowledgements ...................................................... 77

#### 3.7 References ........................................................................ 78

### Chapter 4  **Application of Lactobacillus amylovorus DSM19280 in gluten-free sourdough bread to improve the microbial shelf life** ............................................. 85

#### 4.1 Abstract ........................................................................ 86
5.3.2 Flour characterisation ................................................................. 119
5.3.3 Sourdough Type II preparation .................................................. 119
5.3.4 Sourdough analysis ................................................................. 120
5.3.5 In situ antifungal activity .......................................................... 121
5.3.6 Statistical analysis ................................................................. 121
5.4 Results and Discussion ............................................................... 122
5.4.1 Flour analysis ........................................................................... 122
5.4.2 Characterization of the antifungal LAB sourdough ................. 124
5.4.2.1 Carbohydrate metabolism ................................................. 124
5.4.2.2 Impact of flour substrate on LAB viability and acidification rate .................................................. 125
5.4.2.3 Influence of flour substrate on the quantity of antifungal compounds ................................................. 127
5.4.3 In situ application of sourdough biopreservative ................. 132
5.5 Conclusion .................................................................................. 135
5.6 Acknowledgements .................................................................. 135
5.7 References ............................................................................... 137

Chapter 6 Antifungal activity of three different Lactobacillus species and their production of antifungal carboxylic acid in wheat sourdough. ................................................................. 143
6.1 Abstract ....................................................................................... 144
6.2 Introduction ................................................................................ 145
6.3 Materials and Methods .............................................................. 147
6.3.1 Materials ................................................................................ 147
6.3.2 Cultures, media and growth conditions .................................. 147
6.3.3 Amylolytic and proteolytic activity test .................................. 148
List of Figures

Figure 2-1 Fumonisin B2 with marked free amino group.......................................................... 36

Figure 3-1 Mass spectra (MS-El) of cyclo(Leu-Pro) (A), [²H]-cyclo(Leu-Pro) (B),
cyclo(Pro-Pro) (C), [²H]-cyclo(Pro-Pro) (D), cyclo(Met-Pro) (E), [²H]-
cyclo(Met-Pro) (F), cyclo(Ph-Pro) (G), [²H]-cyclo(Ph-Pro) (H). .......... 65

Figure 3-2 Chromatogram obtained from the cyclic dipeptide standards: 1, cyclo(Leu-
Pro) at 17.80 min (RI 2301.2); 2, cyclo(Pro-Pro) at 17.86 min (RI 2302.4);
3, cyclo(Met-Pro) at 20.97 min (RI 2706.8); 4, and cyclo(Ph-Pro) at 21.83
min (RI 2823.6).............................................................................................. 68

Figure 3-3 Calibration curves obtained by mass chromatography of defined labelled
and unlabelled cyclic dipeptides; peak areas of the selected isotopomers of
cyclic dipeptides are always related to the peak area of the isotopic labelled
internal standard; R^2 values for each curve were above 0.998 (cf. Table
3-3). .................................................................................................................. 69

Figure 3-4 Amplified chromatogram of the _Lb. brevis_ R2Δ MRS-broth CFS extract:
Total ion chromatogram (A), chromatogram of m/z 154 with peak 1 for
cyclo(Leu-Pro) (B), chromatogram of m/z 194 with peak 2 for cyclo(Pro-
Pro) (C), chromatogram of m/z 228 with peak 3 for cyclo(Met-Pro) (D)
and chromatogram of m/z 244 with peak 4 for cyclo(Ph-Pro) (E). ..... 71

Figure 3-5 Mass spectra obtained from the extract of MRS-broth fermented with _Lb.
brevis_ R2Δ: mass spectrum at 17.84 min (RI 2302) resulted from peak 1 +
2 (A), mass spectrum at 20.97 min (RI 2706.8) resulted from peak 3 (B)
and mass spectrum at 21.83 min (RI 2823.6) resulted from peak 4 (C). 72

Figure 4-1 Evaluation of fungal outgrowth on quinoa bread slices......................... 95

Figure 4-2 In-vitro starch digestibility agar plate test, a) positive _Lb. amylavorus_ 19280;
b) negative _Lb. brevis_ R2Δ............................................................................ 98

Figure 4-3 Shelf life of quinoa bread against environmental moulds during a 14-day
storage period. Bread spoilage is indicated as percentage of the total
surface area of each of the 12 slices where fungal outgrowth occurred:
Mould free slices (white area), <10 % mouldy (grey diagonally striped
area), 10–24 % mouldy (grey area), 25-49 % mouldy (black horizontally
striped area) and >50% mouldy (black area). Mean values are shown (n = 2), error bars indicate standard deviations. ............................................... 101

Figure 4-4 Chromatographic profile of a 15 µg/mL standard mix (dashed line); freeze dried quinoa sourdough samples, fermented with *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 (black line) and chemical acidified control (grey line) extracted according to Brosnan et al. (2014). Compounds listed in Table 4-4...... 103

Figure 4-5 Crumb hardness for quinoa and wheat sourdough breads and their controls; mean values ± confidence interval (α = 0.05) ...................... 106

Figure 5-1 Cell growth after sourdough fermentation (48 h) with *Lb. reuteri* R29 using different substrates; mean values ± confidence interval (α = 0.05), different lower case letters indicate statistical difference (P < 0.01)..... 126

Figure 5-2 Chromatograms with identified compounds in samples of quinoa, rice and wheat sourdough doughs fermented with *Lb. reuteri* R29; A) 4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid, B) hydrocaffeic acid, C) 4-hydroxybenzoic acid, D) 2-hydroxisocaprylic acid, E) vanillic acid, F) caffeic acid, G) 3-phenyllactic acid, H) phloretic acid, I) hydroferulic acid, J) benzoic acid, K) p-coumaric acid, L) ferulic acid, M) salicylic acid, N) azelaic acid; chromatograms from quinoa sample mainly with B and C from rice and H from wheat sample. .......................................................... 131

Figure 5-3 Shelf life of quinoa, rice and wheat control breads and sourdough breads fermented with *Lb. reuteri* R29 after challenging against environmental moulds during a 14-day storage period. Bread spoilage is indicated as percentage of the total surface area of each of the 12 slices where fungal outgrowth occurred: Mould free slices (white area), < 10% mouldy (grey diagonally striped area), 10–24% mouldy (grey area), 25–49% mouldy (black horizontally striped area) and > 50% mouldy (black area). Mean values are shown (n = 2), error bars indicate standard deviations........ 134

Figure 6-1 Proteolytic activity on milk agar (left) and amylolytic activity on starch agar (right) of *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 (a), *Lb. brevis* R2∆ (b) and *Lb. reuteri* R29 (c). ........................................................................................................... 153
Figure 6-2 Inhibitory zones formed around *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280, *Lb. brevis* R2Δ and *Lb. reuteri* R29 against *F. culmorum* TMW4.2043 after 2 days of incubation in comparison with substrate control (only mMRS5-agar). 154

Figure 6-3 Growth of *F. culmorum* TMW4.2043 (10⁴ cfu/mL) in malt extract broth (pH 4) containing: 15 % (---●---), 7.5 % (—x—), 3.75 % (—○—) or 0 % (・・・▲・・・) of cell-free supernatant of (A) *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280; (B) *Lb. brevis* R2Δ and (C) *Lb. reuteri* R29. Data represents the average of a duplicate with standard deviations. .............................. 155

Figure 6-4 Chromatograms of 3-phenyllactic acid (I) and 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid (II) derived from extracts of wheat sourdough fermented with *Lb. reuteri* R29 (A), *Lb. brevis* R2Δ (B) and *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 (C). Mass spectra of 3-phenyllactic acid (ID) and 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid (IID)............. 159

Figure 6-5 Shelf life of wheat bread against environmental moulds during a 14-day storage period. Bread spoilage is indicated as percentage of the total surface area of each of the 12 slices where fungal outgrowth occurred: Mould-free slices (white area), <10 % mouldy (grey diagonally striped area), 10–24 % mouldy (grey area), 25–49 % mouldy (black horizontally striped area) and >50 % mouldy (black area). Mean values are shown (n = 2); error bars indicate standard deviations. .......................................................... 161
List of Tables

Table 2-1  Antifungal lactic acid bacteria used as starter for biopreservatives, their tested activity and related antifungal compounds, over the last 15 years. .................................................................................................................................................. 23

Table 2-2  Antifungal yeasts applied in bread baking, their tested activity and related antifungal compounds. .............................................................................................................................................. 30

Table 3-1  Isotopomeric distribution of unlabelled and deuterium labelled cyclic dipeptides (molecular m/z-ion of the unlabelled cyclic dipeptide in bold). ............................................................................................................................................... 66

Table 3-2  Determination of the concentration of the labelled compounds using methyl octanoate as internal standard (1 µg/mL)........................................................................................................... 67

Table 3-3  Selected m/z of unlabelled compounds and labelled standards and calibration functions used for the quantification of cyclic dipeptides. ... 69

Table 3-4  Concentration of cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro), cyclo(Met-Pro) and cyclo(Phe-Pro) in cultures of \textit{Lb. brevis} R2Δ, acid treated broth and in unfermented controls. ................................................................................................................................................ 73

Table 4-1  Quinoa and wheat flour composition (values based on fresh weight of samples)\textsuperscript{a}. ................................................................................................................................................................. 97

Table 4-2  Carbohydrate levels, lactate formation, TTA and pH in sourdoughs made from quinoa and wheat flour (DY 200) after 48 h fermentation\textsuperscript{a}. .......... 99

Table 4-3  pH and TTA values of quinoa sourdoughs breads\textsuperscript{a}. ................................. 102

Table 4-4  Concentration of antifungal compounds (ppm)\textsuperscript{a}. ................................. 105

Table 4-5  Bread and crumb characteristics of sourdough breads and control breads made from quinoa and wheat flour\textsuperscript{a}. .............................................................................................................. 108

Table 5-1  Quinoa, rice and wheat flour composition (values based on fresh weight of samples)\textsuperscript{a}. ................................................................................................................................................... 123

Table 5-2  Initial and residual sugars [mmol/kg flour] from flours and sourdoughs (SD) fermented with \textit{Lb. reuteri} R29\textsuperscript{a}. ................................................................. 125

Table 5-3  Values for pH, total titratable acid (TTA) and organic acids (lactate and acetate) of flours and sourdough (SD) after fermentation using \textit{Lb. reuteri} R29\textsuperscript{a}. .............................................................................................................. 127
Table 5-4 Antifungal compounds [ppm] analysed in freeze dried quinoa, rice and wheat sourdoughs fermented with *L.b. reuteri* R29a. ................................. 129

Table 6-1 Sourdough characterisation of the fermentation of wheat flour (DY 200) after 48 h fermentationa different species of LABa. ................................. 156

Table 6-2 Antifungal compounds [ppm] analysed in freeze dried sourdoughs^a^ and their single MIC. ................................................................. 157
**Declaration**

I hereby declare that this thesis is my own work and effort, and that it has not been submitted for another degree, neither at the National University Ireland, Cork nor elsewhere. Where other sources of information have been used, they have been acknowledged.

_____

Signature
Abbreviations

AP, Active packaging
aw, Water activity
CD, Coeliac disease
cfu, Colony forming unit
DON, Deoxynivalenol
DY, Dough yield
EFSA, European Food Safety Authority
GRAS, Generally regarded as safe
HRGC/MS, High resolution gas chromatography-low resolution mass spectrometry
LAB, Lactic acid bacteria
MAP, Modified atmosphere packaging
MIC, Minimal inhibition concentration
OTA, Ochratoxin A
PTV, Programmable Temperature Vaporizer
QPS, Qualified Presumption of Safety
RID, Refractive index detector
SD, Sourdough
SIDA, Stable isotope dilutions assay
TTA, Total titratable acidity
UV/DAD, Ultra violet-diode array detector
Abstract
As part of the “free-from” trend, biopreservation for bread products has increasingly become important to prevent spoilage since artificial preservatives are more and more rejected by consumers. A literature review conducted as part of this thesis revealed that the evaluation of more suitable antifungal strains of lactic acid bacteria (LAB) is important. Moreover, increasing the knowledge about the origin of the antifungal effect is fundamental for further enhancement of biopreservation. This thesis addresses the investigation of *Lactobacillus amylovorus* DSM19280, *Lb. brevis* R2Δ and *Lb. reuteri* R29 for biopreservation using *in vitro* trials and *in situ* sourdough fermentations of quinoa, rice and wheat flours as biopreservatives in breads. Their contribution to quality and shelf life extension on bread was compared and related to their metabolic activity and substrate features. Moreover, the quantity of antifungal carboxylic acids produced during sourdough fermentation was analysed. Overall a specific profile of antifungal compounds was found in the sourdough samples which were strain and substrate dependently different. The best preservative effect in quinoa sourdough and wheat sourdough bread was achieved when *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 fermented sourdough was used. However, the concentration of the antifungal compounds found in these biopreservatives were much lower when compared with *Lb. reuteri* R29 as the highest producer. Nevertheless, the artificial application of the highest concentration of these antifungal compounds in chemically acidified wheat sourdough bread succeeded in a longer shelf life than achieved only by acidifying the dough. This evidences their partial contribution to the antifungal activity and their synergy. Additionally, a HRGC/MS method for the identification and quantification of the antifungal active compounds cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro), cyclo(Met-Pro) and cyclo(Phe-Pro) was successfully developed by using stable isotope dilutions assays with the deuterated counterparts. It was observed that the concentrations of cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro), and cyclo(Phe-Pro) increased only moderately in MRS-broth and wort fermentation by the activity of the selected microorganism, whereas the concentration of cyclo(Met-Pro) stayed unchanged.
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Chapter 1  Introduction
1.1 Introduction

Bread belongs to one of the major staple foods and is consumed daily in all parts of the world (Hager et al., 2012). Additionally, the interest in the application of alternative gluten-free crops for the production of gluten-free bread is growing constantly, mainly due to the rising diagnosis of coeliac disease (CD) as well as other allergic reactions and non-coeliac gluten sensitivity have risen over the last years (Catassi et al., 2013; Fasano and Catassi, 2012). CD is an immune-mediated enteropathy caused by the ingestion of the prolamin fraction of gluten (present in wheat, rye and barley) in genetically sensitive individuals (Gallagher, 2009). The adherence to a gluten-free diet is still the only accepted treatment for CD (Arendt et al., 2011). Consequently, a growing market exists in gluten-free cereal products (Zannini et al., 2012).

Microbial spoilage of bread and the consequent waste problem still causes large economic losses for both the bakery industry and the consumer. Sourdough is the foremost fermentation method used for baking purposes and it has been proven to be ideal for improving the texture, aroma, flavour, and nutritional value; furthermore, it retards staling and extends the microbial shelf life of gluten-containing and gluten-free breads (Arendt et al., 2007; Gänzle et al., 2007; Moore et al., 2008; Moroni et al., 2009). Traditional sourdough, classified as Type I, is a mixture of flour and water, which is fermented spontaneously by lactic acid bacteria (LAB) and yeasts, refreshed and propagated in various fermentation steps (Corsetti, 2013). Whereas, Type II is obtained through a unique fermentation step using a portion of the mature sourdough from Type I or defined starter cultures (Corsetti, 2013). Sourdough fermented with specific antifungal strains of LAB serves as a high-potential biological ingredient to produce breads with an extended shelf life. Chapter 2 gives an overview of the current status of bread spoilage and reviews possible methods for bread biopreservation.

LAB represent a group of Gram-positive bacteria which are associated with a range of metabolic and physiological characteristics. Their use as starter cultures in the manufacture of fermented foods relies on a long tradition. However, in the last recent decades the research of LAB has gained great prominence. One part of this research is to study the antifungal activity of LAB. Driven by the increasing demand of
consumers for more natural and minimal-processed foods, the application of specific antifungal LAB strains is promising for biopreservation. As such, LAB fermented food products fit perfectly in the healthy lifestyle trend and offer a natural way to extend shelf life ensuring food safety.

Many species of the genus *Lactobacillus* but also some *Lactococcus*, *Pediococcus* and *Leuconostoc* species were assessed for safety from the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) without raising safety concerns. As a result, they have been included in the QPS (Qualified Presumption of Safety) list for authorised use in the food and feed chain within the European Union (EFSA, 2012). Conclusively, this promotes these starter cultures to be categorised as safe biological agents guaranteeing a clean label by the EU regulation on food additives (EEC, 2008). The same applies to the U.S., where they enjoy the generally regarded as safe (GRAS) status regulated by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

In the last decades, considerable effort has been directed to screen the antifungal activity of LAB in order to find suitable starter cultures for biopreservation. This content was recently reviewed by a number of studies (Crowley et al., 2013; Dalié et al., 2010; Oliveira et al., 2014; Pawlowska et al., 2012). However, *in situ* applications, where antifungal LAB starter cultures were used, are still scarce but include milk, meat, fruit, vegetable and cereal fermentations.

Lactic and acetic acid are the main fermentation products by LAB. In addition to these, further low-molecular weight compounds have been isolated from LAB fermentates which have been associated with antifungal activity. They include other organic acids (e.g., formic, propionic, and butyric acids), carbon dioxide, diacetyl, hydrogen peroxide, 3-hydroxy fatty acids, cyclic dipeptides, phenyl and substituted phenyl derivates (e.g., 3-phenyllactic, 4-hydroxyphenyllactic, benzoic acid), reuterin, fungicins and other proteinaceous compounds (Batish et al., 1997; Magnusson et al., 2003; Ryan et al., 2011; Schnürer and Magnusson, 2005; Sjögren et al., 2003; Ström et al., 2002; Yang and Chang, 2010). However, some studies showed that the concentrations of several of these metabolites in the culture broths are much lower than their minimal inhibition concentration (MIC), which is required for non-synergistic antifungal activity. Therefore, a complex synergistic mechanism between
the metabolites has been proposed to play the key role in antifungal action (Cortés-Zavaleta et al., 2014; Miescher Schwenninger et al., 2008; Ndagano et al., 2011; Niku-Paavola et al., 1999).

The obligate homofermentative strain *Lactobacillus amyllovorus* DSM19280 has previously been reported to be effective against a range of different food spoilage (Belz et al., 2012; Lynch et al., 2014; Oliveira et al., 2015; Ryan et al., 2011; Waters et al., 2012). *Lactobacillus reuteri* R29, as an obligate heterofermentative strain, revealed antifungal activity in malting trials (Oliveira et al., 2015). The aim of this thesis was to further investigate these strains for *in vitro* and *in situ* cereal fermentations along with another strain, *Lactobacillus brevis* R2Δ, selected for its antifungal traits.

Cyclic dipeptides provide a multitude of bioactive properties (e.g., anticancer, antiviral, antihyperglycemic, and antimicrobial) which make them to remarkable tools for industrial and clinical applications (Borthwick et al., 2012). Several proline-based and two leucine-based cyclic dipeptides have been isolated from culture broths of different LAB (Dal Bello et al., 2007; Li et al., 2011; Magnusson et al., 2003; Niku-Paavola et al., 1999; Ryan et al., 2011; Ström et al., 2002; Yang and Chang, 2010). The presence of these cyclic dipeptides in LAB fermentates was associated with antifungal activity although the quantity of these compounds were not assessed by these studies. To investigate the concentration level of cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro), cyclo(Met-Pro) and cyclo(Phe-Pro), deuterium-labelled (2H-labelled) counterparts of these four cyclic dipeptides were synthesized in order to develop stable isotope dilutions assays (SIDA) in combination with high resolution gas chromatography-low resolution mass spectrometry (Chapter 3). The developed method was then applied to analyse MRS-broth and wort fermentates using the selected strains.

Chapter 4, Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 evaluate the potential and suitability of the selected antifungal strains to improve the microbial shelf life of gluten-containing and gluten-free bread and consequently improve safety and quality. In order to fully exploit the antifungal efficacy of the starter cultures, Type II sourdough fermentations were applied. These are generally not suitable for achieving dough leavening but are used for dough acidification and as dough improvers (Corsetti, 2013). A further approach with these studies was to evaluate the metabolic activity, acidification
pattern and quantity of antifungal compounds associated with the LAB sourdough fermentation and their contribution to shelf life extension on bread.
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2.1 Abstract
Microbial spoilage of bread and the consequent waste problem causes large economic losses for both the bakery industry and the consumer. Furthermore the presence of mycotoxins due to fungal contamination in cereals and cereal products remains a significant issue. The use of conventional chemical preservatives has several drawbacks, necessitating the development of clean-label alternatives.

In this review, we aim to describe current research aiming to extend the shelf life of bread through the use of more consumer friendly and ecologically sustainable preservation techniques as opposed to chemical additives. Studies on the in situ-production/-expression of antifungal compounds are presented, with special attention given to recent developments over the past decade. Sourdough fermented with antifungal strains of lactic acid bacteria is an area of increasing focus and serves as a high-potential biological ingredient to produce gluten-containing and gluten-free breads with improved nutritional value, quality and safety due to shelf-life extension, and is in-line with consumers demands for more products containing less additives.

In addition, alternative biopreservation techniques are briefly addressed. This review outlines recent progress that has been made in the area of bread biopreservation and future perspectives in this important area.
2.2 Introduction

Baked goods are considered to be one of the most important products of the food industry. Bread is a staple food in many countries and consumed daily all over the world. Within the European Union (EU) the production of bread is relatively stable showing low growth in most western countries. The Germans and Austrians consume the most bread averaging at 80 kg bread per person per year, while the UK and Ireland have the lowest average annual consumption, less than 50 kg (The Federation of Bakers, 2012). In contrast to Europe, the consumption of bread products shows an increasing trend in most developing countries (Elsanhoty et al., 2013).

Over the last decade, consumer behaviour in the baked goods category has changed. In particular, consumers’ concerns about safety and additive contents in food have received much attention. Additionally, the number of health-conscious consumers has increased. Consequently, a high demand for "natural" and "wholesome" foods without chemical preservatives and additives exists on the market. Accordingly, bread manufacturers have increasingly moved to produce so called “clean label products” which fit this healthier lifestyle of customers. Food labels of such products have claims such as “no preservatives” or “natural”. In fact, marketing the absence of additives/preservatives (21 % of new products launched in Europe 2013/2014) and the inclusion of wholegrain continues to drive health-focused new product developments (Mintel, 2014). In turn, such minimally processed food without chemical preservatives or other artificial additives should still be of high-quality and have an extended shelf life.

Spoilage of bread can be caused by bacteria, yeast and moulds. However, contamination originates predominantly post baking by fungal spores being deposited from the bakery environment (Knight and Menlove, 1961). The most critical factors controlling the growth of undesirable fungi on foodstuffs are oxygen, temperature, pH, and water activity \((a_w)\). Generally, breads have a relatively high moisture content and \(a_w\) between 0.94–0.97 at a pH of about 6 with sliced, prepacked and wrapped breads belong to the most susceptible bakery products for mould spoilage (Magan et al., 2003a). This is because wrapping prevents moisture loss from the bread slices allowing suitable growth conditions for fungi in a humid atmosphere. When wrapped,
freshly baked breads without any added preservatives have a shelf-life of only a few days at room temperature.

Microbial deterioration of bread is of serious concern and the consequent waste problem still causes large economic losses for both the bakery industry and the consumer (Melikoglu and Webb, 2013). In 2011, Novozymes surveyed over 4000 bread consumers throughout Europe and found evidence that the main reason that bread was thrown away was because it had become mouldy (van Sint Fiet, 2015). Apart from the unpleasant sight of visible mould growth, fungi are also responsible for the production of mycotoxins and off-flavours, which might be produced even before fungal outgrowth is visible (Magan et al., 2003b). Thus, spoiled breads represent a hazard which can be of a high risk to consumer’s health.

Physical methods like ultraviolet light, infrared radiation, microwave heating or ultra-high pressure treatments can destroy post-baking contaminants in breads. However, few studies employing these methods have been done in the recent past. In light of the continuing consumer trend towards a healthier lifestyle, studies have increasingly set targets to replace traditionally used chemical preservatives with environmental friendly, “clean-label” alternatives. Thus the use of “biopreservation”, defined as the extension of “shelf life by the use of natural or controlled microbiota and/or their antimicrobial compounds” (Stiles, 1996) has become an increasingly important field of research. Furthermore, this term can also be applied to active plant ingredients or plant extracts. Additionally, recent investigations have dealt with improving protective packaging. This paper reviews the potential for biopreservation and smart packaging to insure bread safety with an emphasis on the in situ-production/-expression of antifungal compounds by lactic acid bacteria (LAB).
2.3 Cereals and their contamination with fungi and mycotoxins

Many species and varieties of cereals and pseudocereals are cultivated worldwide. Their products are an important source of nutrients for human consumption in both developed and developing countries. The major cereal crops produced worldwide are wheat, rice and maize (FAO, 2013). Most relevant for bread production in the western world is wheat followed by rye. Other relevant cereals include barley, oat, and the gluten-free crops, millet, sorghum, quinoa, amaranth and buckwheat. The latter three belong to the pseudocereals, which feature higher quality protein and the presence of abundant quantities of fibre, vitamins and minerals such as calcium and iron when compared to their cereal counterparts (Alvarez-Jubete et al., 2010).

Cereals and pseudocereal crops are susceptible to a wide spectrum of plant pathogens. During cultivation, cereal contamination by fungi can cause severe plant diseases which can cause enormous yield losses correlated with the reduction of grain quality. Common phytopathogenic pathogens include filamentous fungi such as *Alternaria*, *Aureobasidium*, *Cladosporium*, *Claviceps*, *Epicoccum*, *Fusarium* and *Helminthosporium*, with *Fusarium* infections seem to representing a major threat (Oliveira et al., 2014). Cereal grains and their products are exposed to contamination post-harvest, during storage and pre- and post-processing. The most common fungi related to losses in bakery products belong to the genera *Aspergillus*, *Cladosporium*, *Endomyces*, *Fusarium*, *Monilia*, *Mucor*, *Penicillium*, and *Rhizopus* (Dal Bello et al., 2007). Other bread ingredients, equipment or packaging material, when contaminated, could also represent a potential vehicle allowing spoilage-related and undesirable microorganisms into the baking environment (Reale et al., 2013). To guarantee food safety and quality along the food production chain, it is essential to follow guidelines like Codex Alimentarius including implementing such systems as good agricultural practices (GAP), good manufacturing practices (GMPs), good hygienic practices (GHPs) and Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) systems.

In normal bakery practice moulds do not survive the bread-baking process (Knight and Menlove, 1961). In contrast, mycotoxins produced by crop pathogens and food-spoilage fungi are relatively heat stable (Vidal et al., 2015; Wu and Wang, 2015) and therefore often represent a more serious problem (Osborne and Stein, 2007). The
effect of processing on the mycotoxin content in grains was recently summarized by Kaushik et al. (2015). The author concluded that the reduction in mycotoxins during baking is relatively low and varies with the toxin. An EU regulation (No. 1881/2006) defines maximum levels for the mycotoxins, aflatoxin (2 µg/kg) and ochratoxin A (OTA) (3 µg/kg) in all cereal products; for the *Fusarium* mycotoxins, deoxynivalenol (DON) (500 µg/kg) and zearalenone (50 µg/kg) specific maximum levels have been set for bread and other bakery products such as biscuits or pastries (EEC, 2006). However, for some *Fusarium* mycotoxins like T-2 and HT-2 toxins, fumonisins, enniatins and nivalenol no maximum level has yet been set. A great number of articles are available in the literature for further reading about mycotoxins. Pereira et al. (2014) give an up-to-date review about the occurrence of mycotoxins specifically in cereals and cereal-related foodstuff along with their recent methods of analysis. A review by Oliveira et al. (2014) addresses cereal fungal infections in relation with bioprotection. The authors provide an extensive overview of mycotoxins found in cereal crops, their fungal source and their possible health hazards for humans and animals. Mycotoxins may cause severe health problems with carcinogenic, nephrotoxic, neurotoxic and/or immunosuppressive effects. Wu et al. (2014) provide a more detailed description about the adverse human health impacts associated with the major groups of mycotoxins, aflatoxin, fumonisins, DON and OTA. Co-occurrence of different mycotoxins is of great concern due to possible synergic toxic effects. Of further concern are conjugated mycotoxins, which are masked by transformation, conjugation or compartmentalization. Food processing can result in conjugation. To date, no regulatory levels exist for these conjugated mycotoxins in cereals and cereal-based foods.

The presence of mycotoxins due to fungal contamination in cereals and cereal products remains a significant problem worldwide, and although monitoring occurs in most countries, they are detected frequently in processed cereal products (Aldana et al., 2014; Błajet-Kosicka et al., 2014; Demirel and Sarıozlu, 2014; Škrbić et al., 2012).
2.4 Conventional food preservatives

Weak organic acids such as propionic and sorbic acid are commonly added as chemical preservatives to suppress the growth of undesired microorganisms and to lengthen the shelf life of bakery products. Generally at lower pH values, these acids are in their undissociated form and can easily penetrate the plasma membrane. Once intracellular, the acid dissociates and due to the release of charged protons, the cell cytoplasm gets acidified. Consequently, the drop in pH decreases phosphofructokinase activity, a key enzyme of glycolysis, and hence reduces the ATP yield (Krebs et al., 1983). Recent investigations have suggested that sorbic acid may act additionally as a membrane-active antimicrobial compound through the inhibition of the plasma membrane H+-ATPase proton pump (Stratford et al., 2013a, 2009).

Within the EU, the use of chemical preservatives in bakery wares like bread and rolls is limited (EEC, 2008). Because of their higher water solubility and easier handling than their respective corrosive acids, potassium, sodium or calcium salts of propionic and sorbic acid are the forms generally used (Magan et al., 2003a). Sorbate is allowed up to 0.2 % (w/w) and propionate can be added to a maximum 0.3 % (EEC, 2008). To define it more precisely, these levels pertain only to prepacked sliced bread and rye bread. A maximum of only 0.1 % propionate is permitted for prepacked unsliced bread. This means that for unpacked bread and in particular wheat bread made only from wheat flour, water, yeast or sourdough and salt, neither the addition of sorbate nor propionate is allowed. The addition of benzoic acid to bakery products is, although sometimes examined in studies (Guynot et al., 2005; Suhr and Nielsen, 2004), not authorized.

Suhr et al. (2004) conducted an *in vitro* screening experiment over a wide pH and aw range using different concentrations of weak acid preservatives in rye agar and wheat agar, against 9 fungal isolates. On wheat agar, a high propionate concentration (0.3 %) generally had a strong inhibitory effect on all fungi tested at pH 4.5 and aw 0.95, but not at pH 6, which is generally the pH of standard wheat bread. However, on rye agar (high aw and low pH), the growth of *P. roqueforti* even occurred up to the addition of 0.3 % propionate. Thus, the authors concluded that the addition of propionate to rye sourdough bread is not recommended due to the resistance of *P. roqueforti*. 
Furthermore, in our opinion, those results also indicate that propionate has only slight effect in mould inhibition when included in breads at pH 6.

In another study, sorbate completely inhibited fungal growth at $a_w$ 0.90 and pH 4.5 when compared to calcium propionate assayed at the highest concentration in bread analogues at 0.3 % level (Guynot et al., 2005). The current legislated maximum level of 0.2 % was not tested. However, although sorbate seems to be more efficient at inhibiting spoilage, it is rarely used in bread due to its negative impact on bread volume (Lavermicocca et al., 2000). The use of 0.3 % calcium propionate in vitro only partially prevented germination of conidia, in 12 tested fungal species (Lavermicocca et al., 2000). Nevertheless, some in situ experiments on the use of propionate to control bread spoilage showed shelf life prolongation and some further examples are given throughout this review.

Overall, high concentrations of sorbate or propionate are desired for antifungal activity, but this can also alter the sensory properties of the product. Prolonged usage of the same preservatives against spoilage fungi may lead to the development of fungal resistance to those chemicals (Levinskaite, 2012; Stratford et al., 2013b; Suhr and Nielsen, 2004). Moreover, concentrations below the maximum level of preservative must be chosen carefully. Sub-optimal concentrations, lower than 0.03 % can result in an enhancement of fungal growth (Marin et al., 2002) and higher mycotoxin production (Arroyo et al., 2005).
2.5 Alternative preservation techniques

The disadvantages outlined regarding the use of chemical preservatives has encouraged researchers to finding alternative agents to control spoilage fungi in food products. Furthermore, strategies need to be developed to reduce mycotoxins levels ensuring food safety and consumer health.

2.5.1 Fermentation

2.5.1.1 Lactic acid bacteria

Microbial fermentation is one of the oldest and most economically and ecologically friendly methods of preserving foods (Zannini et al., 2012). Among bakery products the microorganisms most widely used as starter cultures, applied for example in sourdough production, are LAB. Since active compounds responsible for biopreservation are produced or released by LAB \textit{in situ}, use of sourdough technology can replace chemical preservatives, guaranteeing a clean label while imparting additional positive effects, such as improved flavour, texture and nutritional properties, coupled with higher consumer acceptance (Pawlowska et al., 2012). A further benefit of LAB is that many species from the genera \textit{Lactobacillus}, \textit{Lactococcus}, \textit{Pediococcus} and \textit{Leuconostoc} have been referred to the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) for safety assessment without raising safety concerns. As a result, they have been included in the QPS (Qualified Presumption of Safety) list for authorised use in the food and feed chain within the European Union (EFSA, 2012). The same applies to the US, where they enjoy the Generally Regarded as Safe (GRAS) status regulated by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

Recently there have been several comprehensive reviews examining LAB with respect to their antifungal activity spectrum, effective metabolites and their interactions with mycotoxins (Crowley et al., 2013; Dalié et al., 2010; Oliveira et al., 2014). This review however, describes how specific antifungal LAB strains have been applied to extend the shelf life of bread. In general, a low preservative effect can be achieved through the use of LAB-fermented sourdough due to the pH drop and acidification associated with the production of organic acids, mainly lactic and acetic acid. However, it has been reported that chemical acidification either has no influence on
mould inhibition or can only prolong shelf life to a limited extent (Axel et al., 2015; Ryan et al., 2011). Accordingly, this suggests that LAB, in addition to producing lactate and acetate, produce or release other active compounds during fermentation, which contribute to the antifungal activity when sourdough is included in bakery products. These metabolites are usually low molecular mass compounds such as phenyl and substituted phenyl derivates (3-phenyllactic, 4-hydroxyphenyllactic, and benzoic acid), cyclic dipeptides, hydroxy fatty acids or antifungal peptides. Coupled to their relatively high minimal inhibition concentration (MIC), they are produced at low levels in the fermentation substrate. Thus, the antifungal inhibitory mechanism is believed to originate from a complex synergy effect among these low molecular mass compounds. Moreover, the production of the antifungal compounds during fermentation is substrate specific (Axel et al., 2015; Vermeulen et al., 2006). Therefore, it is necessary to measure the levels of these compounds produced both in nutrient growth media and the sourdough environment.

In the last decades, considerable effort has been directed to screen the antifungal activity of LAB in order to find suitable starter cultures for sourdough fermentation. In terms of biopreservation, these studies first rely on in vitro assays which either include dual culture plate assays and or microtitre plate assays (Magnusson and Schnürer, 2001). If a strain shows broad activity against a range of bread spoilage organisms, it is further evaluated in sourdough fermentation and bread baking to assess both its potential to extend shelf life and its effects on bread quality. Such an approach was undertaken by several research groups and findings are presented in Table 2-1. This table summarizes which LAB have been applied as antifungal starter culture in sourdough and bread fermentation. It also presents the mould activity spectrum and the antifungal compounds analysed which were related to the biopreservative extension of shelf life Furthermore, it includes a few studies that assess whether the level of mycotoxins can be decreased by means of fermentation.
Table 2-1 Antifungal lactic acid bacteria used as starter for biopreservatives, their tested activity and related antifungal compounds, over the last 15 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starter culture used</th>
<th>Activity spectrum</th>
<th>Antifungal compounds in biopreservative</th>
<th>Substrate/Application</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lb. amylovorus DSM19280</td>
<td><em>A. niger,</em> <em>F. culmorum,</em> <em>P. expansum,</em> <em>P. roqueforti,</em> environmental moulds&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>PLA, OH-PLA, hydroferulic acid, phloretic acid</td>
<td>Wheat sourdough, Quinoa sourdough</td>
<td>(Axel et al., 2015; Belz et al., 2012; Ryan et al., 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lb. plantarum</td>
<td>Deoxynivalenol</td>
<td>n.d.&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Wheat sourdough</td>
<td>(Banu et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lb. brevis (DI-PROX MTTX, commercial starter mix)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lb. plantarum CRL 778</td>
<td><em>A. niger</em> (w= 0.971, 60% lower Ochrotaxin A production)</td>
<td>Organic acids, PLA, OH-PLA</td>
<td>Wheat slurry, Quinoa slurry and mixtures</td>
<td>(Gerez et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Deoxynivalenol, ochratoxin A</td>
<td>n.d.&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Traditional wheat sourdough type I</td>
<td>(Vidal et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lb. plantarum FST 1.7</td>
<td><em>A. niger,</em> <em>F. graminearum,</em> <em>F. culmorum,</em> <em>F. oxysporum,</em> (no activity against <em>P. roqueforti</em>), environmental moulds&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Cyclic dipeptides, PLA</td>
<td>Wheat sourdough, Gluten-free sourdough (mixture of brown rice, corn starch, buckwheat and soya flour), Gluten-free sourdough (quinoa, teff, buckwheat, oat, sorghum)</td>
<td>(Dal Bello et al., 2007; Moor et al., 2008; Ryan et al., 2009a, 2009b, 2008; Wolter et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lactococcus BSN</td>
<td><em>A. niger,</em> <em>F. oxysporum,</em> <em>F. moniliforme</em></td>
<td>n.d.&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Wheat sourdough</td>
<td>(Varsha et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lb. bannencii DSM16381</td>
<td><em>A. niger,</em> <em>P. roqueforti,</em> environmental moulds&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Monohydroxy octadecenoic acid</td>
<td>Wheat sourdough supplemented with linoleic acid</td>
<td>(Black et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lb. rhamnosus TISTR 541</td>
<td><em>A. flavus/</em> aflatoxin (B1, B2, G1, G2)</td>
<td>Aflatoxin binding cell wall</td>
<td>Baladi bread (whole wheat flour)</td>
<td>(Elsanhoty et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starter culture used</th>
<th>Activity spectrum</th>
<th>Antifungal compounds in biopreservative</th>
<th>Substrate/Application</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>P. acidilactici</em> KTU05-7, <em>P. pentosaceus</em> KTU05-8, <em>P. pentosaceus</em> KTU05-10</td>
<td><em>A. fumigatus</em>, <em>A. niger</em>, <em>A. versicolor</em>, <em>F. culmorum</em>, <em>P. chrysogenum</em>, <em>P. expansum</em>, environmental moulds</td>
<td>Bacteriocins like inhibitory substances, organic acids</td>
<td>Single LAB cell suspension 5x10⁴ cfu/cm² sprayed on the surface of the baked wheat bread</td>
<td>(Cizekiiene et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial sourdough starter</td>
<td>Beauvericin, enniatin, n.d.</td>
<td>Wheat and rye sourdough</td>
<td>(Hu et al., 2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Leuconostoc citreum</em> C5, <em>W. confusa</em> HO24</td>
<td><em>Cladosporium sp.</em>, <em>Neurospora sp.</em>, <em>P. crustosum</em></td>
<td>Organic acids</td>
<td>Rice sourdough for steamed rice cake</td>
<td>(Baek et al., 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>L. citreum</em> HO12, <em>W. koreensis</em> HO20</td>
<td><em>A. niger</em>, <em>P. roqueforti</em></td>
<td>Ethanol, organic acids</td>
<td>Whole wheat sourdough</td>
<td>(Choi et al., 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. paralimentarius</em> PB127, <em>Lb. rossiae</em> LD108</td>
<td><em>A. japonicus</em></td>
<td>Antifungal peptides, organic acids, PLA</td>
<td>Wheat sourdough, Panettone</td>
<td>(Garofalo et al., 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. plantarum</em> ATCC 20179, <em>Lb. acidophilus</em> ATCC 20079</td>
<td>Environmental moulds</td>
<td>Organic acids</td>
<td>Sourdough in traditional Iran flat bread (Sangak)</td>
<td>(Najafi et al., 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. fermentum</em> Te007, <em>Lb. paracasei</em> D5, <em>Lb. pentosus</em> G004, <em>P. pentosaceus</em> Te010 (Co-cultures)</td>
<td><em>A. niger</em>, <em>A. oryzae</em></td>
<td>protein-like compounds</td>
<td>LAB cells or supermatants added to bread dough</td>
<td>(Muhialdin et al., 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. acidophilus</em></td>
<td>Environmental moulds</td>
<td>Organic acids</td>
<td>Wheat sourdough</td>
<td>(Plessas et al., 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. sakei</em> (Co-culture)</td>
<td>Environmental moulds</td>
<td>Organic acids</td>
<td>Wheat sourdough</td>
<td>(Rizzello et al., 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. plantarum</em> LB1 + <em>Lb. rossiae</em> LB5 (Co-culture)</td>
<td><em>P. roqueforti</em>, environmental moulds</td>
<td>Antifungal peptides, organic acids; acetic acid, formic acid, lactic acid, PLA</td>
<td>Sourdough fermented wheat germ (freeze dried) in wheat bread</td>
<td>(continued on next page)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starter culture used</td>
<td>Activity spectrum</td>
<td>Antifungal compounds in biopreservative</td>
<td>Substrate/Application</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. buchneri</em> FUA 3252</td>
<td><em>A. clavatus</em>, <em>Cladosporium sp.</em>, <em>Mortierella sp.</em>, <em>P. roqueforti</em>, environmental moulds&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Acetic acid, ethanol, lactic acid, propionic acid</td>
<td>Wheat and whole wheat sourdough</td>
<td>(Zhang et al., 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. diolivorans</em> DSM14421 (Co-cultures)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. reuteri</em> CRL1100</td>
<td><em>A. niger</em>, <em>Penicillium sp.</em></td>
<td>Organic acids, PLA</td>
<td>Wheat sourdough</td>
<td>(Gerez et al., 2010, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. plantarum</em> CRL778</td>
<td><em>P. roqueforti</em>, environmental moulds&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Antifungal peptide and protein</td>
<td>Wheat sourdough + water-soluble extract (27%, vol/wt, 5 mg of protein/mL) from <em>Phaseolus vulgaris cv. Pinto</em></td>
<td>(Coda et al., 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. brevis</em> AM7</td>
<td><em>P. roqueforti</em>, environmental moulds&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>n.d.&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Wheat sourdough (Iranian Lavash bread)</td>
<td>(Fazeli et al., 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. casei</em></td>
<td>Environmental moulds&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>n.d.&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Wheat sourdough</td>
<td>(Fazeli et al., 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. fermentum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. plantarum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. plantarum</em> 21B</td>
<td><em>A. niger</em></td>
<td>n.d.&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Wheat sourdough</td>
<td>(Lavermicocca et al., 2000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>not determined; <sup>b</sup>Shelf life test without fungal spore inoculum/ or exposure to bakery air.

In an *in vitro* screening with 95 strains of different lactobacilli and pediococci against *A. niger* CH101, *Penicillium sp.* CH102 and *F. graminearum* CH103, *Lb. plantarum* CRL778 performed best (Gerez et al., 2009) and also *in situ* (Gerez et al., 2010). In a follow-up study by the same group, this same strain was applied *in situ* as a biopreservative culture inoculated into a slurry composed of water, wheat and quinoa flour (Gerez et al., 2014). The growth of *A. niger* 13D and levels of OTA on the resulting bread slices were decreased by 60% independent to *a*<sub>w</sub>. The antifungal effect was related to the production of lactic, acetic, 3-phenyllactic acid and 4-hydroxy-phenyllactic acids. In contrast, Vidal et al. (2014) found that OTA levels were confirmed to be quite stable during the bread making process, regardless of whether sourdough was added or not. Traditional wheat sourdough type I was used for the latter experiment, where the specific microbiota were not determined. Sourdough type I, is a mixture of flour and water, which is fermented spontaneously by LAB and
yeasts and continuously back-slopped in various fermentation steps (Corsetti, 2013). A Type II is obtained through a unique one-step fermentation using a portion of the mature sourdough from Type I or defined starter cultures (Corsetti, 2013). Elsanhoty et al. (2013) inoculated wheat grains with *A. flavus* to allow aflatoxin B and G production. Fermentation of the contaminated flour with *Lb. rhamnosus* TISTR541 and yeast resulted in the lowest level of aflatoxin in the bread. A sourdough fermentation using a commercial starter mix (*Lb. plantarum* and *Lb. brevis*) also gave a significant decrease (58.6-66.5 %) in DON content produced with *F. graminearum* MI113 artificially contaminated wheat flour (Banu et al., 2014). The detoxifying effect of LAB against mycotoxins is believed to be the result of binding to bacterial cell wall structures, with peptidoglycan being particularly important (Lahtinen et al., 2004). Other strategies for biological detoxification of mycotoxins using microorganisms have been recently reviewed by Hathout and Aly (2014).

*Lb. plantarum* FST1.7 represents another antifungal LAB strain which has been applied to extend the shelf life of wheat and gluten-free (composite recipe using a mix of brown rice flour, buckwheat flour, corn starch and soya flour) sourdough breads, after it was shown to be active against spoilage moulds and bacteria *in vitro* (Dal Bello et al., 2007; Moore et al., 2008; Ryan et al., 2008). The antifungal activity of *Lb. plantarum* FST1.7 was related to lactic acid, 3-phenyllactic acid and the two cyclic dipeptides cyclo (L-Leu-L-Pro) and cyclo (L-Phe-L-Pro) production which were detected in the cell free supernatant. Subsequent analyses revealed the presence of 3-phenyl lactic acid and cyclic dipeptides also in the wheat sourdough (Ryan et al., 2009a, 2009b). Unfermented LAB growth media already contains cyclic dipeptides but their concentrations can increase upon fermentation with LAB (Axel et al., 2014). The level of cyclic dipeptides found in sourdough and broth are 1,000-fold lower than the MICs indicating a minor significance in the antifungal action, but synergistic effects with other compounds are possible (Axel et al., 2014; Niku-Paavola et al., 1999; Ryan et al., 2009a). In the gluten-free system, it must be stated however, that *Fusarium* outgrowth on the infected gluten-free bread slices started for all breads after 2 days. In comparison with the other gluten-free breads, the *Lb. plantarum* FST1.7 sourdough bread had the lowest increase in mould spoilage per day (Moore et al., 2008). The
same strain failed to extend the shelf life when single types of gluten-free flour was fermented and incorporated in a gluten-free bread system (Wolter et al., 2014).

The biological preservation of wheat sourdough bread fermented with *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 inhibited the growth of *A. niger*, *F. culmorum*, *P. expansum* and *P. roqueforti* more effectively than calcium propionate (Ryan et al., 2011). The successful inhibitory activity in salt-reduced wheat sourdough bread and gluten-free quinoa sourdough bread reinforces the potential of this strain as an antifungal starter culture (Axel et al., 2015; Belz et al., 2012). HPLC-UV/DAD analysis of the *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 fermented quinoa sourdough extracts revealed the presence of the antifungal compounds hydroferulic acid, 4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid, phloretic acid and 3-phenyllactic acid ranging from 13 to 86 ppm (Axel et al., 2015).

In fact, few studies have reported the use of sourdough in gluten-free products for mould inhibition (Axel et al., 2015; Baek et al., 2012; Moore et al., 2008). In contrast to wheat bread, gluten-free breads usually have higher water contents and $a_w$ (Hager et al., 2012; Moore et al., 2004). This higher water availability makes gluten-free products more susceptible for fungal spoilage. In the absence of the gluten network, the movement of water from the gluten-free bread crumb to the crust is enhanced (Sciarini et al., 2010). Thus, combating fungal contaminations in gluten-free systems is more difficult. The same applies for salt-reduced bread. Salt acts as a preservative agent due to its ability to reduce $a_w$.

An interesting and so far unique approach was undertaken by Rizzello et al. (2011), exploiting the potential of sourdough fermented wheat germ to delay fungal outgrowth on wheat bread. Wheat germ is the embryo containing part of the grain and one of the main by-products of the milling process. It features high quality proteins, lipids and is rich in vitamins. Use of sourdough biotechnology stabilised and improved some nutritional characteristics of wheat germ making it suitable for food processing (Rizzello et al., 2010). The use of the freeze-dried wheat germ (4 %, w/w) fermented with a co-culture of *Lb. plantarum* LB1 and *Lb. rossiae* LB5 prevented fungal outgrowth on bread slices to at least 28 days of storage, behaving similar to calcium propionate (0.3 %, w/w) addition (Rizzello et al., 2011). A complex synergistic system between organic acids and peptides was suggested to be responsible for mould
prevention. The sequence of an antifungal peptide was found to be encrypted in the cereal protein expansin which belongs to the plant defensin-like proteins. It was hypothesised that defensins can induce membrane permeabilization of fungi during the defence response (Picart et al., 2012). Sourdough with propionate improves synergistic antifungal activity (Ryan et al., 2008; Zhang et al., 2010). As a result of the consumer’s aversion to chemical ingredients, some studies have examined the application of natural propionic acid fermentation. *In situ*-propionate production of LAB with propionic acid bacteria (PAB) in co-fermentation is possible, but rather impracticable due to the slow or even absent growth of PAB in the sourdough system (Javanainen and Linko, 1993; Suomalainen and Mäyrä-Mäkinen, 1999). Co-culture fermentation of specific LAB strains enables another option of producing propionate naturally. Lactate is first converted into 1,2-propanediol by *Lb. buchneri* (Oude Elferink et al., 2001) and 1,2-propanediol is further converted into propionate by *Lb. diolivorans* (Krooneman et al., 2002). Zhang et al. (2010) used this cooperative metabolism of *Lb. buchneri* FUA 3252 and *Lb. diolivorans* DSM14421 for bread preservation. Although the bread prepared with 20% sourdough achieved the longest shelf life, high amounts of propionate (10 mM/kg) and acetate (35 mM/kg) were unfavourable in terms of sensory properties (Zhang et al., 2010). Additionally, a long fermentation time of 14 days was required to ensure the formation of sufficient amounts of propionic acid. More studies have reported prolonged bread shelf life using combined starter cultures for sourdough fermentation (Muhialdin et al., 2011; Plessas et al., 2011). The better antifungal effect was explained by higher acidification rates. The conversion of linoic acid to an antifungal monohydroxy-octadecenoic acid was observed in sourdough fermentation by *Lb. hammesii* DSM16381 (Black et al., 2013). The sourdough has potential to be used as a biopreservative since the addition of 20% in bread making resulted in an extended shelf life when challenged with *P. roqueforti* and *A. niger*, and environmental contamination without inoculation. Most of the studies presented apply the starter culture in the traditional sourdough making process. However, a different approach was followed by Cizeikiene et al. (2013). After inoculation in MRS media, the single LAB cell suspension
(~5×10⁴ CFU/cm) was sprayed on the surface of the baked wheat bread. The experimental procedure did not clarify whether the LAB cell suspension was washed or remained suspended in MRS medium. We judge the latter treatment as unacceptable for food applications. Overall antifungal LAB-fermented sourdough serves as a great potential biopreservative ingredient to produce chemical preservative-free breads with an extended shelf life, coupled with other advantages like improved flavour and texture.

2.5.1.2 Yeast

The application of yeasts other than baker’s yeast (Saccharomyces cerevisiae) with or without the combination of LAB is also suggested as a promising alternative for bread preservation (Table 2-2). For instance, the yeast Wickerhamomyces anomalus LCF1695 (formerly known as Pichia anomala) was used as mixed starter, in combination with Lb. plantarum 1A7, for sourdough fermentation. This combination, when added to a standard bread recipe, allowed a microbial shelf life of at least 14 days during storage at room temperature after artificial inoculum (10² conidia/ml) with P. roqueforti DPPMAF1 (Coda et al., 2011). In subsequent work by the same group another yeast strain, Meyerozyma guilliermondii LCF1353 (previously Pichia guilliermondii), was found out of 146 yeast strains to harbour marked antifungal activity toward the indicator fungus P. roqueforti DPPMAF1. As shown under pilot plant conditions, the bread including the sourdough fermented with a combined starter culture consisting of M. guilliermondii LCF1353, W. anomalus LCF1695 and Lb. plantarum 1A7 strain showed the longest shelf-life (Coda et al., 2013). High ethanol and ethyl acetate concentrations were determined in the water/salt-soluble dough extract resulting, together with proteinaceous compounds, in fungal inhibition. Bread quality parameters like specific volume and crumb hardness were not significantly different to the control breads. The fungal outgrowth of Penicillium paneum KACC 44834 on white pan bread leavened with P. anomala SKM-T was significantly decreased in comparison to normal baker’s yeast (Mo and Sung, 2014). The sensory qualities of bread were also improved by the presence of the pleasing flavour compounds phenylethyl alcohol and 2-phenylethyl...
acetate, which were only produced by *P. anomala* SKM-T. These compounds also contributed to the shelf life extension.

The antifungal activity of *W. anomalus* and *M. guilliermondii* has previously been demonstrated under silage storage conditions (Petersson and Schnürer, 1995). Nevertheless, further research on the use of these yeasts is needed to confirm the *in situ*-antifungal activity for bread biopreservation. The use of *W. anomalus* seems to be safe, because this species is also included in the QPS list, although authorised only when it is used for enzyme production (EFSA, 2012). However, the safety of the yeast *M. guilliermondii* needs to be assessed for use as a biological control agent in food.

Table 2-2 Antifungal yeasts applied in bread baking, their tested activity and related antifungal compounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starter culture used</th>
<th>Activity spectrum</th>
<th>Antifungal compounds in biopreservative</th>
<th>Substrate/Application</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Pichia anomala</em> SKM-T</td>
<td><em>P. paneum</em></td>
<td>2-phenylethyl acetate, phenylethyl alcohol</td>
<td>Wheat dough for white pan bread</td>
<td>(Mo and Sung, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Meyerozyma guilliermondii</em> LCF1353 + <em>Wickerhamomyces anomalus</em> LCF1695 (Co-culture with <em>Lb. plantarum</em> 1A7)</td>
<td><em>P. roqueforti</em> environmental moulds(^1)</td>
<td>Antifungal peptides, ethanol, ethyl acetate</td>
<td>Wheat sourdough</td>
<td>(Coda et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>W. anomalus</em> LCF1695 (Co-culture with <em>Lb. plantarum</em> 1A7)</td>
<td><em>P. roqueforti</em> environmental moulds(^1)</td>
<td>Antifungal peptides, ethanol, ethyl acetate</td>
<td>Wheat sourdough</td>
<td>(Coda et al., 2011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Shelf life test without fungal spore inoculum/or exposure to bakery air.
2.5.2 Plant derive compounds

The growing interest in the application of natural ingredients with multifunctional properties in food has also led to extensive investigation of plant extracts as biopreservatives. Recently reviewed by da Cruz Cabral et al. (2013), a comprehensive summary is given on in vitro experiments regarding the use of plant extracts and essential oils for controlling common food spoilage fungi. Additionally the mode of action and the impact on mycotoxins is discussed. However, only a few in situ tests are presented, without any application on bread. It is noteworthy that few studies dealing with the direct addition of plant extract in bakery products. Recent developments also employ essential oils in edible coating films of active packaging and will be discussed in Section 2.5.3.

Using a simple storage test, without artificial inoculum, Wei et al. (2009) evaluated the antifungal activity of different raisin extracts and products in conventional bread. The breads made with the raisin paste and raisin water extract (7.5 %) showed the best mould-retarding properties when compared to the control containing no preservative. However, they were not significantly different to the positive control containing 0.24 % propionate. The authors related the antifungal activity to a synergistic effect between the formed Maillard products and phenolic compounds. Although bread quality parameters were not included in the study, the raisin extract seems to have potential to reduce chemical preservatives in food systems and should be further investigated.

The interest in applying antifungal proteins and peptides for bread biopreservation alone or in combination with sourdough (Coda et al., 2008; Rizzello et al., 2015, 2011, 2009), and as biocontrol agents against fungal pathogens in agriculture has increased in recent years (Yan et al., 2015). A large number of antifungal proteins have been reported from a multitude of organisms including leguminous flowering plants, non-leguminous flowering plants, gymnosperms, but also fungi, bacteria, insects and mammals (Ng, 2004). They are categorized by type and function, comprising thaumatin-like proteins, chitinases, glucanases, embryo-abundant proteins, miraculin-like proteins, cyclophilin-like proteins, allergen-like proteins, defensins, thionins, and nonspecific lipid transfer proteins (Ng, 2004). The various mechanisms of antifungal
action for a range of plant antifungal proteins were recently summarized by Yan et al. (2015). Antifungal chitinases act hydrolytically on fungal cell wall chitin leading to cell lysis (Graham and Sticklen, 1994). Defensins cause membrane permeabilization (Picart et al., 2012). A similar action was proposed for lipid transfer proteins (Selitrennikoff, 2001). It is possible to observe a combination of antifungal proteins in a single plant species (Ye et al., 2000).

Water/salt-soluble extracts of different legume flour hydrolysates (soy, lentil, pea, chick pea and faba bean) were obtained by the use of fungal proteases and tested in vitro against P. roqueforti DPPMAF1 (Rizzello et al., 2015). Pea (Pisum sativum) hydrolysate, the most active antifungal biopreservative, was freeze dried and used as ingredient for bread making at a level of 1.6 % (w/w). Bread made with the combination of sourdough fermented by the antifungal strain Lb. plantarum 1A7 and the pea flour hydrolysate had the longest shelf life. The antifungal activity was attributed to three native proteins (pea defensins 1 and 2, a nonspecific lipid transfer protein and a mixture of peptides released during hydrolysis).

Rizzello et al. (2009) also reported the use of water-soluble extract from Amaranthus spp. seeds during storage of gluten-free and wheat flour breads. Novel antifungal peptides (agglutinin sequences) were identified in the extract, which showed in vitro inhibition of a large number of spoilage fungal species isolated from bakeries (5 mg/mL). Three different types of bread were produced; control bread, bread with added amaranth water-soluble extract, and sourdough bread (Lb. sanfranciscensis E9) with added amaranth water-soluble extract. Bread slices were inoculated with P. roqueforti DPPMAF1 (10^2/mL). With the addition of the water-soluble extract to the breads the appearance of fungal mycelium was delayed by at least 7 days, being more pronounced for the sourdough breads. Furthermore, the addition of the water-soluble extract improved the quality of the gluten-free breads regarding taste and specific volume. Lb. sanfranciscensis is the most frequently used LAB as leavening agent for sourdough production (Gänzle, 2014). The antifungal activity of this strain was not specified by the authors. Thus, we speculate further improvement of the preservative effect when amaranth water-soluble extract would have been combined with sourdough fermented with a known antifungal LAB.
2.5.3 Protective packaging

Packaging is an important factor in extending the microbial shelf life of bakery products. Normal packed bread provides aerobic microorganisms like fungi adequate amounts of oxygen for growth. The principle of modified atmosphere packaging (MAP) revolves around reducing oxygen by replacing the headspace of the product either with carbon dioxide alone or mixtures of it and nitrogen. Generally for bakery products, the gas mixture consists of 60 % or more carbon dioxide with nitrogen acting as a filler gas. Thus, carbon dioxide is the fungistatic component slowing down the proliferation of moulds. Furthermore, it may alter the permeability of the cell membrane, reduce the internal pH of the cell and influencing certain enzyme systems and changing metabolic activities (Farber, 1991). Due to the highly porous texture of bakery products complete oxygen elimination is challenging (Hempel et al., 2013). Moreover, oxygen accumulation over time can occur even if packaging films of low oxygen permeability are used. The introduction of active packaging (AP) provided a significant improvement over MAP. AP techniques prevents bread spoilage through the use of oxygen absorbers, ethanol emitters and other antimicrobial agents which are either incorporated as a layer in the packaging or in edible films, or placed for example as sachets in the packaging. AP can be combined with the classical MAP approach. An extensive review of shelf life in packed bakery products was published by Galić et al. (2009). This review covers many studies dealing with MAP including active packaging and describes the types of material used for cereal based food packaging. Therefore, this section presents an update in research conducted within the last 5 years.

As previously mentioned, plant extract or essential oils can be used in antimicrobial films for AP of bread. Balaguer et al. (2013) found good in vitro antifungal activity against P. expansum and A. niger testing gliadin films containing cinnamon aldehyde. In an in situ test wheat bread slices were inoculated with P. expansum conidial suspension (10^6 spores/mL). After 30 days, fungal growth remained absent on bread slices which were packed into mono cast polypropylene bags with a piece (13 cm × 8 cm) of the antimicrobial gliadin film treated with 5 % cinnamon aldehyde at 23 °C. Cellulose-derived polymers also containing 5 % cinnamon aldehyde and
polypropylene with an organic solvent base (ethyl acetate) coated with nitrocellulose containing the cinnamon essential oil, present further materials which were used successfully for gluten-free and wheat bread shelf life extension (Gutiérrez et al., 2011; Lopes et al., 2014). The shelf life of wheat pan bread was not increased using biodegradable films based on cassava starch with cinnamon powder (Kechichian et al., 2010). The authors observed an increase in $a_w$ of the film due to product instability. Hence, the material which supports the antimicrobial-active substance seems to be of great importance. The commission regulation (EU) No. 10/2011, also known as plastic implementation measure (PIM), controls which materials can be used for food packaging and sets specific migration limits to ensure food safety (EEC, 2011).

Otoni et al. (2014) included nano-emulsions of oregano and clove bud essential oil in edible films from methylcellulose. Their antifungal efficacy was attributed to the phenolic compounds eugenol, carvacrol and thymol. Those compounds have shown antimicrobial activity against a range of bacteria due to reduction of the proton gradient through the cell membrane. The reduced proton gradient, along with the resulting depletion of the ATP pool, kills microbial cells (Ben Arfa et al., 2006; Lambert et al., 2001). *In vitro* tests with the essential oils inhibited spore germination of *A. niger* ATCC 16404 and *Penicillium sp.* ATCC 2147 at a concentration of 20 mg/mL (Otoni et al., 2014).

The overall sensory and physicochemical properties of the bread can be influenced by aromatic compounds like cinnamon aldehyde or thymol, although present at very low levels in the final product. Although the cinnamon aroma was noticeable to a panellist at the highest concentration level (0.374 g per self-adhesive active label of 13×10 cm), no significant differences were found in cinnamon taste between control (no cinnamon aldehyde) and positive samples (Gutiérrez et al., 2011). In contrast, although antimicrobial sachets containing more than 5 % oregano essential oil reduced the growth rate of moulds on sliced bread, the content of $\gamma$-terpinene and $\beta$-cymene on treated bread increased throughout storage and their acceptance was reduced (Passarinho et al., 2014). Marjoram and sage essentials oil vapour treatment also showed inhibition of mould on bread slices in a model AP system (Krisch et al., 2013). However, the taste and odour was rated from strange to unacceptable.
Isothiocyanates are another group of potential antimicrobial substances, these are hydrolysed products of sulphur containing compounds called glucosinolates, which occur naturally in cruciferous vegetables, such as broccoli, cabbage, cauliflower, kale, turnip, radish, canola, rapeseed and various mustards (Isshiki et al., 1992). Azaiez et al. (2013) demonstrated their ability in their gaseous state to inhibit the fungal growth of *Fusarium moniliforme* CECT 2987 and to reduce the levels of fumonisins produced by this strain in a bread AP model system. Allyl and phenyl isothiocyanates showed stronger activity than benzyl isothiocyanates. Allyl isothiocyanate at 500 µg/L vapor phase concentration presented the highest reduction of about 96 % fumonisin B₂ in comparison to the un-treated control. Indeed, chromatograms presented in the publication evidenced that the high peak of fumonisin B₂ present in the control sample almost disappeared in the isothiocyanate treated samples. The strongly electrophilic carbon in the isothiocyanate group (−N=C=S) easily binds to thiol and free amino groups of amino acids, peptides and proteins (Luciano and Holley, 2009). It was suggested that isothiocyanates bind the free amino group of the fumonisin, depicted in Figure 2-1. Further investigation will examine any toxicity of the products generated by the reaction of fumonisin B₂ and isothiocyanates (Azaiez et al., 2013).

To overcome problems arising from the strong aroma of highly volatile compounds, further experiments are needed to minimise the impact on product aroma, flavour and sensory attributes, while maintaining high efficacy when used in combination with other technologies. AP has a great potential in extending the shelf life of bread. Nevertheless, further improvements are needed using better biodegradable materials, to fulfil the green approach.
2.5.4 Further applications

The addition of ethanol is a traditional preservative method. Hence, from the consumer point of view, ethanol might be a more preferable preservative agent over some other chemical substances. A recently published review by Dao and Dantigny (2011) summarizes the control of food spoilage fungi by ethanol with a detailed explanation of its mode of action. In studies ethanol was used to control post-harvest fruit decay. According to an in vitro data based model against 12 common food spoilage moulds, the inhibition concentration of ethanol was estimated in a range between 3 to 5 % (Dantigny et al., 2005). All experiments were performed at high aw values of 0.99 at intermediate pH of 5.8. However, for increasing the shelf life of bread concentrations between 0.2 and 12 % are reported (Dao and Dantigny, 2011).

Katsinis et al. (2008) found an improved effect of sorbate and propionate on naturally contaminated products, when ethanol was added to the bread surface (0.5 % w/w). In a challenge test against Chrysonilia sitophila (“the red bread mould”) and Hypopichia burtonii (“the chalky mould”) on packed and sliced bread, growth was inhibited at very low (0.8 %) and medium (2.0 %) ethanol concentrations, respectively (Berni and Scaramuzza, 2013).

Due to its low toxicity, ethanol enjoys GRAS status in the USA. In the European Union, ethanol is not included in the regulation on food additives (EEC, 2008). Thus, there is no restriction about the use of ethanol as a preservative. If added to a product, it has to be listed as “ethyl alcohol” or “ethanol” on the ingredients. The results of studies presented above suggest that ethanol could act as an effective additional
barrier to inhibit fungal growth in bakery products. Thus it represents an interesting alternative to the use of chemical preservatives and merits further research. A further application showing promise includes the addition of ethanol emitter in active packaging (Hempel et al., 2013).

One study tested the influence of 1-monoglyceride of medium chain fatty acids (MAG), 1-monocaprylin and 1-monocaprin on spoilage inhibition (P. chrysogenum, P. jensenii, Monascus ruber, A. niger) on bread (Buňková et al., 2010). The microfilm of MAG (65 mg/L) spread on the bread surface showed fungal inhibition up to 14 days storage. MAG belong to food additives in accordance with the principle of “quantum satis” addition for good manufacturing practice and commonly acts as emulsifier in breads (EEC, 2008). A mode of action was hypothesized that 1-monocaprylin destabilizes membranes by increasing membrane fluidity and the number of phase boundary defects (Hyldgaard et al., 2012).

The use of biosurfactants, in particular lipopeptides produced by microorganisms has attracted the food industry due to their wide range of functionalities including their antimicrobial activity (Campos et al., 2013). Antibacterial and antifungal lipopeptides are mostly synthesized by strains of Bacillus subtilis and are classified into 3 main classes; surfactin, iturin, and fengycin (Muthusamy et al., 2008). B. subtilis belong to the QPS Bacillus species, with no safety concerns being reported from their usage in food products (EFSA, 2012). Mnif et al. (2012) evaluated the influence of biosurfactant produced by B. subtilis SPB1 on bread quality at concentrations of 0.025, 0.05, 0.075, and 0.1 % (flour weight basis). Bread prepared with 0.075 % SPB1 biosurfactant showed higher specific volume when compared to a control containing the same amount of soya lecithin. Texture profile analysis of bread prepared with and without biosurfactant showed also decreased firmness. Microbiological analysis of the 0.075 % SPB1 biosurfactant containing bread had fungal and bacterial counts of $2\times10^3$ and $4\times10^2$ cfu/g, respectively; these counts were 1 log less than the control after 8 days of storage which was attributed to the significantly lower aw values of bread with added SPB1 biosurfactant. However, the aw was in general low, with values below 0.8 for all the breads produced. Microbial counts do not provide sufficient data if not compared to a specific reference level. The reference values of microbial counts of
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$10^2$ and $10^5$ cfu/g for moulds and bacteria, respectively, were suggested for frozen, ready to eat, bakery wares (i.e., rolls or croissants) from the German Society for Hygiene and Microbiology (DGHM, 2006). These reference values are based on which micro-flora can be expected and are tolerated in terms of good hygiene practice. Furthermore, the sample size needs to be sufficient and appropriate representing at least a small sale unit of 50 g (DGHM, 2006). There are other antimicrobial agents derived from microorganisms showing antifungal activity. Natamycin produced by *Streptomyces natalensis* is listed as preservative E235 in the EU regulation on food additives (EEC, 2008). In Europe, it is permitted only for surface treatment for the protection of cheeses and sausages. The GRAS status in the USA allows its addition also to yoghurt (FDA, 2014).

Cherry laurel (*Prunus laurocerasus* L.) leaf extracts were suggested as novel biopreservatives after showing very low MIC (µg/mL) against a range of bread spoilage fungi (Sahan, 2011). The highest total antifungal effect was observed from ethanol and acetone extracts, but biologically active components were not analysed. Further studies would be needed in order to confirm the *in situ* antifungal activity of MAG, antimicrobial agents and cherry laurel leaf extracts on bakery products, including assessing product safety.

2.6 Conclusion

In order to meet the needs and to fulfil the high consumer demand for additive-free bakery products, current research has focused on biopreservation to extend the shelf life of bread. Furthermore, the ineffective usage of chemical preservatives due to the development of resistance by several fungi has increased the pressure to find alternative agents.

The application of biopreservatives derived from plants or biosurfactants seem interesting alternatives to chemical preservatives. More reports are expected about the use of antifungal proteins. Antimicrobial essential oils need to be further evaluated, where progress could also lead to a better sensory profile. Protective packaging material should focus on biodegradable materials ensuring customer satisfaction.
Obviously, all data presented in Section 2.5 were obtained from different baking technologies and methodologies defining the mould-free shelf life of the resulting product. Furthermore, varying contamination levels or inoculum sizes per slice of bread, and storage conditions make an overall comparison of shelf life-extension potential between different methodologies difficult. In our opinion, mouldiness should be assessed with the first visible appearance of fungal colonies on bread and bread slices. Nevertheless, in some studies, a bread slice was considered mouldy if more than 1% of the total surface area was covered with fungi (Ryan et al., 2011, 2008) or all the inoculated spots started to show fungal growth (Zhang et al., 2010). Thus, a standardised method for defining bread mouldiness is vital to allow meaningful comparisons to be made.

Sourdough fermented with antifungal strains serves as a high-potential biological ingredient to produce gluten-containing and gluten-free breads that meet presently consumer needs with improved nutritional value, bread quality and safety due to an extended shelf life. Despite the relatively high abundance of LAB, the antifungal potential and binding properties for mycotoxins is highly strain specific, which should be considered as a criterion for the selection of LAB for use as starter cultures in food and feed. The application of antifungal starter strains is still limited and more strains need to be investigated in situ. Further research is required to improve the shelf life of gluten-free bread. Research into the removal of mycotoxins in food matrices is still in its infancy. Many novel methods have been introduced with high potential for biopreservation of bakery products. The next step will be to up-scale the use of such biopreservatives in the marketplace, potentially in combination with other technologies such as intelligent packaging, which will necessitate production of such compounds at an industrial scale.
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3.1 Abstract

Lactic acid bacteria (LAB) play an important role as natural preservatives in fermented food and beverage systems reducing the application of chemical additives. Thus, investigating their antifungal compounds, such as cyclic dipeptides, has gained prominence. Previous research has primarily focused on isolation of these compounds. However, their precise quantification will provide further information regarding their antifungal performance in a complex system. To address this, deuterated labelled standards of the cyclic dipeptides cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro), cyclo(Met-Pro) and cyclo(Phe-Pro) were synthesised and stable isotope dilution assays were developed enabling an accurate quantification of cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro), cyclo(Met-Pro) and cyclo(Phe-Pro) in MRS-broth and wort. Quantitative results showed that in the Lactobacillus brevis R2Δ fermented MRS-broth, the concentrations of cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro) and cyclo(Phe-Pro) were significantly higher (P < 0.05), and in wort for cyclo (Leu-Pro) when compared to their controls. This indicates, that the formation of these three cyclic dipeptides is related with L.b. brevis R2Δ metabolism. Furthermore, this represents the first report of cyclic dipeptides quantification using stable isotope dilution assays in LAB cultures both in vitro and in a food system.
3.2 Introduction

Cyclic dipeptides (also known as 2,5-diketopiperazines) are low molecular weight compounds providing a multitude of bioactive properties. They are associated with activities such as anticancer, antiviral, antihyperglycemic, or act as glycosidase inhibitors, neuroprotective agents, and antifungal or antibacterial compounds, thus making them remarkable tools for industrial and clinical applications (Borthwick, 2012). As such, cyclic dipeptides have become increasingly researched, as is evident in recent literature (Borthwick, 2012; de Carvalho and Abrahaim, 2012; Cornacchia et al., 2012; Huang et al., 2010; Ressurreicao et al., 2011). Contrastingly, Prasad (1995) concluded that they were a relatively unexplored class of bioactive peptides at that time. Furthermore certain cyclic dipeptides have been classed as novel signal molecules in addition to acylated homoserine lactones enabling bacteria to communicate inter- and intra-species, which is known as quorum sensing (Martins and Carvalho, 2007; O'Neil et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2010). Within therapeutical practices, this offers a great opportunity in infection management through virulence attenuation by blocking cell-to-cell communication (Borthwick, 2012).

Cyclic dipeptides have also been identified in culture broths fermented with lactic acid bacteria (LAB), the class of bacteria most widely used in food fermentation (Dal Bello et al., 2007; Li et al., 2011; Magnusson et al., 2003; Niku-Paavola et al., 1999; Ryan et al., 2011; Strom et al., 2002; Yang and Chang, 2010). Many species, especially from the genus Lactobacillus, have been referred to the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) for safety assessment without raising safety concerns. As a result, they have been included in the QPS (Qualified Presumption of Safety) list for authorised use in the food and feed chain within the European Union (EFSA, 2007). Nowadays, consumers are more concerned about safety and additive content in food resulting in an increasing demand for natural and “free-from” foods. As a consequence, research interest has grown in the application of LAB due to their biopreservative capacities (Pawlowska et al., 2012). The use of these bacteria can greatly contribute to an environmentally friendly, safe and ecological approach to food and feed preservation (Axel et al., 2012).
In food and beverages proline-containing cyclic dipeptides are particularly abundant (Borthwick, 2012; Chen et al., 2009, 2007; Chen et al., 2004; Gautschi et al., 1997; Ginz and Engelhardt, 2000; Ryan et al., 2009). They can be formed during food processing due to the degradation of peptides caused by high temperature or pH-value changes. The mechanism of action transforms linear peptide precursors, thus involving them in intra-molecular cyclization (Rizzi, 1989). Biosynthesis of cyclic dipeptides involves dedicated non-ribosomal peptide synthases or cyclo-peptide synthases (Gondry et al., 2009; Gruenewald et al., 2004; Schultz et al., 2008). Proline-based cyclic dipeptides have been isolated from culture broths of different LAB (Lactobacillus amylovorus, Lb. coryniformis, Lb. plantarum, Lb. reuteri and Lb. sakei, as well as Pediococcus pentosaceus). These include cyclo(L-His-L-Pro), cyclo(L-Leu-L-Pro), cyclo(L-Met-L-Pro), cyclo(L-Phe–L-Pro), cyclo(L-Phe–trans-4-OH-L-Pro), cyclo(L-Pro-L-Pro) and cyclo(L-Tyr-L-Pro) and additionally, two leucine based cyclic dipeptides cyclo(Gly–Leu) and cyclo(Leu–Leu) were identified (Dal Bello et al., 2007; Li et al., 2011; Magnusson et al., 2003; Niku-Paavola et al., 1999; Ryan et al., 2011; Strom et al., 2002; Yang and Chang, 2010). The presence of these cyclic dipeptides in LAB cultures is associated with antifungal activity. LAB produce a range of secondary metabolites such as; organic acids, fatty acids, proteinaceous compounds, and a variety of other low-molecular weight compounds - providing antifungal activity (Broberg et al., 2007; Ndagano et al., 2011; Niku-Paavola et al., 1999; Ryan et al., 2011; Strom et al., 2002). However, some studies showed that the concentrations of several of these metabolites in the culture broths are much lower than their minimal inhibition concentration (MIC), which is required for non-synergistic antifungal activity. Therefore, the antifungal mode of action seems to originate from a synergistic effect of all these antifungal compounds that LAB secrete. The concentration of cyclic dipeptides in LAB fermented culture media has not been evaluated yet. Ryan et al. (2009) quantified the levels of cyclo(L-Leu-L-Pro) and cyclo(L-Phe-L-Pro) in LAB-fermented wheat dough and bread. However, the long extraction procedure is a considerable drawback of this method. Additionally it requires high volumes of solvent.
Our research presents an accurate and rapid quantification of cyclic dipeptides from LAB-fermented culture medium and an in situ liquid food system.

Herein, $^2$H-labelled counterparts of four cyclic dipeptides were synthesized for the first time in order to develop stable isotope dilution assays (SIDA) in combination with high resolution gas chromatography-low resolution mass spectrometry (HRGC/MS). SIDA has been proven as accurate quantification tools of several food ingredients, e.g., odorants, vitamins and mycotoxins (Grosch, 2001; Rychlik, 2003; Rychlik and Schieberle, 1999). Cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro), cyclo(Met-Pro) and cyclo(Phe-Pro) were identified and quantified in both MRS-broth and wort which had been fermented with the antifungal LAB strain *Lb. brevis* R2Δ as an example. Knowledge about the concentration of these compounds contributes to further understanding of the synergistic effects, which provide the antifungal activities associated with certain LAB strains.
3.3 Material and Methods

3.3.1 Chemicals

All chemicals were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich Chemie (Taufkirchen, Germany), unless otherwise stated. Cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro), cyclo(Met-Pro) and cyclo(Phe-Pro) were purchased from Bachem (Weil am Rhein, Germany). Anhydrous sodium sulphate was from Merck, Darmstadt, Germany.

3.3.2 Synthesis of isotopically labelled cyclo-dipeptides

Isotopically labelled cyclo-dipeptides were not commercially available and thus were synthesised using a protium-deuterium (\(^1\text{H} - ^2\text{H}\)) exchange reaction. Deuteration of the cyclic dipeptide standards was carried as described by Steinhaus and Schieberle (2005) for the deuteration of 3-methylindole. Briefly, in a self-made small autoclave (stainless steel, 80 mm, 10 mm i.d., 3 mm wall thickness) with screw cap and PTFE sealing, cyclic dipeptide (0.1 mmol) was dissolved in deuterium oxide (1.4 mL) and heated (160 °C; 168 h) in the presence of palladium on barium sulphate (5 %; 200 mg) by means of a block heater (model SBH200D, Stuart Bench Top Science Equipment, UK). After cooling, the mixture was filtered (G4 glass filter) into a vacuum flask and subsequently washed with distilled water (3 x 2 mL) and ethyl acetate (3 x 2 mL). The filtrate was then transferred into a separating funnel by rinsing the vacuum flask with distilled water (2 x 25 mL) and ethyl acetate (2 x 25 mL). After separating the organic phase, the aqueous layer was extracted with ethyl acetate (5 x 25 mL). Organic layers were combined and dried over anhydrous Na\(_2\)SO\(_4\) (stock solution). HRGC/MS-EI analysis of the unlabelled and synthesised compounds confirmed the exchange of \(^1\text{H}\)-by \(^2\text{H}\)-atoms. Mass spectral data of the labelled compounds are listed below.

\(^{[}{^2\text{H}_{10}]\text{-cyclo}(\text{Leu-Pro}); \text{yield: } 0.0121 \text{ mmol; } 12.1 \%; \text{EI-MS (m/z: intensity in %)}\}

156 (100), 71 (49), 157 (32), 72 (32), 88 (20), 158 (17), 73 (14), 127 (13), 56 (11), 70 (11), 155 (11), 42 (10), 126 (10), 74 (10), 75 (9), 44 (9), 69 (8), 43 (8).
[1H8.14]-cyclo(Pro-Pro); yield: 0.0111 mmol; 11.1 %; EI-MS (m/z: intensity in %) 78 (100), 208 (39), 106 (23), 77 (22), 76 (17), 44 (15), 207 (14), 152 (14), 46 (12), 74 (11), 122 (11), 58 (10), 180 (7), 48 (7), 108 (6), 134 (6), 42 (6), 124 (96), 105 (6), 120 (5).

[1H2.5]-cyclo(Met-Pro); yield: 0.0195 mmol; 19.5 %; EI-MS (m/z: intensity in %) 156 (100), 71 (57), 169 (24), 230 (23), 141 (18), 72 (11), 157 (10), 61 (9), 42 (8), 56 (6), 57 (6), 69 (5), 168 (5), 127 (5), 70 (4), 128 (4), 154 (4), 231 (4), 41 (3), 114 (3).

[1H7.15]-cyclo(Phe-Pro); yield: 0.0395 mmol; 39.7 %; EI-MS (m/z: intensity in %) 127 (100), 155 (55), 98 (42), 128 (36), 72 (27), 253 (27), 71 (20), 97 (20), 156 (20), 129 (15), 70 (12), 252 (11), 254 (10), 73 (9), 99 (9), 42 (9), 69 (7), 157 (7), 154 (6), 96 (5).
3.3.3 Standard wort production
A lab-scale (50 L) tank was used for wort production. Firstly, the malt (Sebastian, 2008 harvest, Cork Malting Company, Ireland) was milled with a two-roller mill (0.4 mm distance between rollers) and grist (7.2 kg) was mashed into 27 L of water at 62 °C. The following mashing regime was applied: 28.1 min at 62 °C, 25.0 min at 72 °C, and a mash off temperature of 78 °C, with a heating rate of 1 °C/min between the individual rests. Wort was boiled for 1 h and adjusted to a final extract content of 9 % (w/w) by adding hot water. Precipitates in hot wort were removed by filtration. Hot wort was transferred into a 50 L stainless steel container and cooled to 30 °C in a tempered water bath.

3.3.4 MRS-broth and wort fermentations and sample extractions
*L. brevis* R2Δ was grown in MRS-broth and separately in standard wort at 30 °C for 48 h. Subsequently, the MRS and wort cultures were centrifuged (7,500 g for 15 min at 4 °C) and the supernatants were sterile filtered (0.45 µm pore-size filter; Millipore) to prepare cell-free supernatant (CFS), which was frozen at -20 °C prior to analysis. Uninoculated MRS-broth and wort were used as controls and were processed using the same procedure as for the fermented samples. Aliquots of the CFS and wort (1 mL) were diluted with deionised water (10 mL) and known amounts of deuterium-labelled standards were added (CFS: 6 µg for cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Met-Pro), cyclo(Phe-Pro) and 2 µg for cyclo(Pro-Pro); wort: 3 µg for cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Met-Pro), cyclo(Phe-Pro) and 2 µg for cyclo(Pro-Pro)). The samples were equilibrated for 10 min and then extracted with ethyl acetate (3 x 10 mL). Organic layers were combined, dried over anhydrous sodium sulphate and the volume reduced to 1 mL in a rotary evaporator (40 °C, 240 mbar). The extract obtained was then stored at -20 °C prior to analysis. Blank MRS-broth and wort were treated in the same way as the supernatants from culture of the antifungal strain.

3.3.5 Quantification of cyclic dipeptides by HRGC/MS
HRGC/MS analyses were performed with a DSQ™ II single quadrupole GC/MS system (Thermo Fisher Scientific) running in electron ionization mode at 70 eV of
electron energy. The GC column, an Agilent J&W DB-1701 capillary column (50 m x 0.32 mm x 0.1 µm), coated with 14 %(-cyanopropyl-phenyl)-methyl-polysiloxane, was operated with helium as a carrier gas in the split mode (split ratio 10:1). Samples were injected into a PTV (Programmable Temperature Vaporizer) injector system, which was heated to 280 °C. The oven temperature was held at 80 °C for 2 min, then raised by 10 °C/min to 280 °C and held for 10 min. The flow rate was set to 2.3 mL/min. The HRGC/MS runs were recorded using Thermo Scientific Xcalibur 2.0 software (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Hemel Hempstead, UK). Calibration curves were generated additionally by analysis of solutions containing unlabelled and labelled compounds in different ratios (1:10 to 10:1) and concentrations (0.5 – 10 µg/mL) and used to calculate the concentrations of the compounds based on their area counts using the following equation:

\[ C_{\text{Compound}} = \left( \frac{A_{\text{Compound}}}{A_{iS}} \times a + b \right) \times \frac{m_{iS}}{V} \]

Where \( C_{\text{Compound}} \) = concentration of appropriate cyclic dipeptide, \( A_{\text{Compound}} \) = area counts for appropriate cyclic dipeptide, \( A_{iS} \) = area counts for deuterium labelled standard, \( a \) = slope from the calibration curve, \( b \) = intercept form the calibration curve, \( m_{iS} \) = amount of deuterium labelled standard, \( V \) = volume of the sample analysed.

### 3.3.6 Statistical analysis

The statistical analysis, using Minitab 16 software, of three independent replicates \((n = 3)\) was performed using one-way ANOVA. Where F-values were significant, pairwise comparisons were carried out with the help of Fisher's least significant difference (LSD) procedure to determine the statistical significance between the fermented sample and unfermented control. Differences were considered significant at \( P < 0.05 \).
3.4 Results and Discussion

3.4.1 Deuteration of cyclic dipeptides

A prerequisite for the quantification of food components is the application of assays with high accuracy in order to obtain precise data and valuable information. Losses of the target compound and the standard during extraction and isolation prior to instrumental analysis should be consequently compensated. Thus, the target compound itself would be the “perfect” standard but a differentiation of compound and standard during analysis is of course not possible. Isotopic labelled compounds however are almost identical to unlabelled target compounds. They differ from the target compound only by the presence of elements with higher molecular weight (e.g., \(^2\text{H}\)- instead of \(^1\text{H}\)-atoms), which are incorporated in the unlabelled compound by synthesis. The chemical and physical properties of both compounds are almost identical and the prerequisite of compensation of losses during isolation is achieved (Grosch, 2001). The isotopic labelled standards of cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro), cyclo(Met-Pro) and cyclo(Phe-Pro) were synthesized consequently in this study by \(^1\text{H}\rightarrow\text{^2\text{H}}\) exchange reactions in order to develop a quantification assay for the dipeptides.

Compound structures (L-isomers) are shown in Figure 3-1 (A, C, E, and G). Mass spectral data of the labelled cyclic dipeptides (MS-EI) showed the successful incorporation of 2 to 15 deuterium atoms depending on the compound, appearing as shifts of 2 to 15 mass units from the undeuterated analogues (Figure 3-1; B, D, F and H). The isotopomeric distributions were calculated on base of the area intensities of extracted ion chromatograms (Table 3-1). Thus, the \(^1\text{H}\rightarrow\text{^2\text{H}}\) exchange was not complete and multicomponent mixtures of labelled isotopomers were obtained. Efficient \(^1\text{H}\rightarrow\text{^2\text{H}}\) exchange reactions are challenging to develop (Modutlwa et al., 2010). Nonetheless, materials with narrow isotope clusters formed by \(^1\text{H}\rightarrow\text{^2\text{H}}\) exchange can be fit for use as an internal standard for MS investigations as long as the \(^2\text{H}\) incorporation exceeds 99.5 % (0.5 % unlabelled reactant remaining) and a representative mass peak is present in the mixture that can be used as the reference mass of the internal standard (Derdau et al., 2009). Furthermore, at least two \(^2\text{H}\)-atoms should be integrated in the standards because of the natural \(^1\text{3}\text{C}\)-content.
resulting in a \([M^+]^\text{+}\)-signal of the analyte (e.g., 7.9 % for cyclo(Leu-Pro) for m/z 155, Table 3-1). Both prerequisites were fulfilled by all synthesized compounds as shown in Table 3-1, which lists the distribution of the isotopomers \(^2\text{H}_0\) up to \(^2\text{H}_{18}\) of each unlabelled and synthesised cyclic compounds. Regarding \(^2\text{H}\)-cyclo(Pro-Pro) as an example, the mass spectrum of unlabelled compound consisted in particular of isotopomer 194 ([M]^+, \(^2\text{H}_0\), 89.0 %) besides isotopomers 195 ([M]^+, \(^2\text{H}_1\), 10.0 %), 196 ([M]^+, \(^2\text{H}_2\), 0.9 %) and 197 ([M]^+, \(^2\text{H}_3\), 0.1 %), which were not detectable in \(^2\text{H}\)-cyclo(Pro-Pro). A complete \(^1\text{H}-^2\text{H}\)-exchange of all 14 hydrogen atoms and a uniform deuteration was not achieved because all isotopomers in the range 198 ([M]^+, \(^2\text{H}_4\)) to 208 ([M]^+, \(^2\text{H}_{14}\)) were detected. However, isotopomers 208 (54.7 %) and 207 (20.9 %, [M]^+, \(^2\text{H}_{13}\)) were the most abundant ones and consequently chosen as target isotopomer of labelled cyclo (Pro-Pro). The \(^2\text{H}_0\)-isotopomer was also not determined in cyclo(Phe-Pro) but the distribution of the isotopomers was heterogeneous again (Table 3-1). The target isotopomers \(^2\text{H}_{8,11}\) were selected due to their high content in the labelled cyclo(Phe-Pro). In contrast to the aforementioned labelled compounds, the \(^2\text{H}_0\)-isotopmer was detected in \(^2\text{H}\)-cyclo(Met-Pro) (0.2 %) and \(^2\text{H}\)-cyclo(Leu-Pro) (0.6 %) but this low content was accepted (Table 3-1). The target isotopomers \(^2\text{H}_{2,3}\) was chosen for the same reason for both cyclo(Met-Pro) and cyclo(Leu-Pro).

Concentrations of these target labelled compounds in the stock solution were determined by HRGC/MS total ion current (TIC) quantification using a standard procedure with methyl octanoate as the internal standard (Kiefl et al., 2013; Steinhaus et al., 2003). Calibration curves were generated by analysis of mixtures containing unlabelled cyclic dipeptides (2-8 µg/mL) and methyl octanoate (1 µg/mL) in known amounts under the same experimental conditions and calibration functions were determined (Table 3-2).
The yields of the synthesised compounds were calculated based on the final and the initially used amounts of the compounds. These yields were low and ranged only between 11.1 % and 39.7 %. The losses (60 – 89 %) were caused most likely by component degradation during synthesis due to the thermal conditions and losses during liquid-liquid extraction after synthesis.

Figure 3-1 Mass spectra (MS-EI) of cyclo(Leu-Pro) (A), [²H]-cyclo(Leu-Pro) (B), cyclo(Pro-Pro) (C), [²H]-cyclo(Pro-Pro) (D), cyclo(Met-Pro) (E), [²H]-cyclo(Met-Pro) (F), cyclo(Phe-Pro) (G), [²H]-cyclo(Phe-Pro) (H).
Table 3-1 Isotopomeric distribution of unlabelled and deuterium labelled cyclic dipeptides (molecular m/z-ion of the unlabelled cyclic dipeptide in bold).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isotopic labelling</th>
<th>Cyclo(Leu-Pro)</th>
<th>Cyclo(Pro-Pro)</th>
<th>Cyclo(Met-Pro)</th>
<th>Cyclo(Phe-Pro)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m/z- ion</td>
<td>Unlabelled</td>
<td>Labelled</td>
<td>m/z- ion</td>
<td>Unlabelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2$H&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2$H&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2$H&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2$H&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2$H&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2$H&lt;sub&gt;5&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2$H&lt;sub&gt;6&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2$H&lt;sub&gt;7&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2$H&lt;sub&gt;8&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2$H&lt;sub&gt;9&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2$H&lt;sub&gt;10&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2$H&lt;sub&gt;11&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2$H&lt;sub&gt;12&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2$H&lt;sub&gt;13&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2$H&lt;sub&gt;14&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2$H&lt;sub&gt;15&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2$H&lt;sub&gt;16&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2$H&lt;sub&gt;17&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2$H&lt;sub&gt;18&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-2 Determination of the concentration of the labelled compounds using methyl octanoate as internal standard (1 µg/mL).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product of synthesis</th>
<th>Concentration in stock solution [µg/mL]</th>
<th>Calibration function&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Coefficient of determination (R&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;) value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[²H]-cyclo(Leu-Pro)</td>
<td>15.49±0.99</td>
<td>y = 1.6589x - 1.5397</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[²H]-cyclo(Pro-Pro)</td>
<td>12.85±1.53</td>
<td>y = 1.3916x - 1.2927</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[²H]-cyclo(Met-Pro)</td>
<td>25.97±1.35</td>
<td>y = 0.9064x - 2.5456</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[²H]-cyclo(Phe-Pro)</td>
<td>59.10±4.21</td>
<td>y = 1.2211x - 0.9722</td>
<td>0.985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values ± SD (n = 3); *The concentration ratio of unlabelled compound and methyl octanoate as internal standard was calculated using the function with y as ion intensity ratio of analyte and internal standard by HRGC/MS total ion current (TIC).

3.4.2 HRGC/MS cyclic dipeptide analysis method performance

A thoroughly validated high resolution HRGC/MS method was developed for the analysis of proline cyclic dipeptides. Cold injection with a PTV injector system offers many advantages compared to hot injection methods by showing greatly reduced discrimination of less volatile compounds (Poy et al., 1981). Figure 3-2 illustrates the chromatographic separation and peak shape achieved for the four target cyclic dipeptides. Peaks 1 and 2 belonging to cyclo(Leu-Pro) and cyclo(Pro-Pro) showed peak overlapping with retention indices of 2301.2 and 2302.4, respectively. However, this co-elution is offset, considering that only different and specific isotopomers of the unlabelled and labelled compounds were selected for quantification (see also Figure 3-1; A and C). Cyclo(Met-Pro) with a retention index (RI) of 2706.8 eluted separately from cyclo(Phe-Pro) which had a retention index of 2823.6. Calibration curves were generated by plotting the ratios of the area intensities of the labelled and unlabelled standards against the concentration ratios (Figure 3-3). The plots gave straight lines showing linearity in the observed range of area ratios. Coefficients of determination (R<sup>2</sup>) values above 0.998 were obtained for standards spiked into ethyl acetate. The sensitivity of the method was expressed using the limit of detection (LOD) and the limit of quantification (LOQ). The LOD of the proposed method was determined by successive analyses of chromatographic extracts of standard solution in ethyl acetate with decreasing amounts of the analytes until a signal-to-noise ratio of 3:1 was reached. The LOQ was determined considering a signal-to-noise ratio of 10:1.
The LOD achieved for the method ranged from 0.06 mg/L for cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro) as well as cyclo(Phe-Pro) and 0.10 mg/L for cyclo(Met-Pro) and the LOQ ranged from 0.18 to 0.3 mg/L, respectively, standard solution in ethyl acetate.

![Figure 3.2 Chromatogram obtained from the cyclic dipeptide standards](image)

Based on the results of the isotopomeric distribution (Table 3.1), the target isotopomers of unlabelled compound and labelled standard were selected (Table 3.3) and the area intensities of the extracted ion chromatograms were determined.
Table 3-3 Selected m/z of unlabelled compounds and labelled standards and calibration functions used for the quantification of cyclic dipeptides.

| Compound         | Selected m/z of unlabelled compound | Internal standard | Selected m/z of labelled standard | Calibration function  

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cyclo-(Leu-Pro)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>$^2$H$_{2.3}$</td>
<td>156-157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cyclo-(Pro-Pro)</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>$^3$H$_{13-14}$</td>
<td>207-208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cyclo-(Met-Pro)</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>$^2$H$_{2.3}$</td>
<td>230-231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cyclo-(Phe-Pro)</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>$^2$H$_{8,11}$</td>
<td>252-255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Isotopic labelling of the internal standard. $^b$The mass ratio of unlabelled compound and labelled standard was calculated using the function with x as ion intensity ratio of analyte and internal standard.

Figure 3-3 Calibration curves obtained by mass chromatography of defined labelled and unlabelled cyclic dipeptides; peak areas of the selected isotopomers of cyclic dipeptides are always related to the peak area of the isotopic labelled internal standard; $R^2$ values for each curve were above 0.998 (cf. Table 3-3).
3.4.3 Quantification of proline-based cyclic dipeptides in *Lb. brevis* R2Δ fermented MRS-broth and wort

Due to the biopreservation role attributed to LAB, it is useful to evaluate their production of antifungal metabolites, such as cyclic dipeptides. Previous research has primarily focussed on isolation of these compounds; however, their quantification will provide further information regarding their antifungal performance in a complex system.

The HRGC/MS method described was used to detect and quantify proline-based cyclic dipeptides present in the fermented MRS-broth and wort, which were pre-extracted with ethylacetate. Recovery tests were conducted by spiking the cyclic dipeptides standards into unfermented MRS-broth followed by the whole extraction procedure. Recovery rates were 87% for cyclo(Leu-Pro), 94% for cyclo(Pro-Pro) and 98% for cyclo(Phe-Pro). Further studies would be needed to carry out the low recovery for cyclo(Met-Pro) obtaining only 54%. To confirm the presence of the target cyclic dipeptides in the samples, their retention indices and fragmentation patterns were compared with their counterpart standards. Figure 3-4 shows the chromatogram derived from the *Lb. brevis* R2Δ fermented MRS-broth CFS extract. The retention indices of peaks 1-4, resulting from the mass traces of the target cyclic dipeptides, were in accordance with those obtained from the standards (Figure 3-2). Furthermore, the mass spectra of these peaks (Figure 3-5) also matched the fragmentation patterns of the standards (Figure 3-1; A, C, E and G), confirming again the presence of these four cyclic dipeptides analysed in these samples. Due to the cyclo(Leu-Pro) and cyclo(Pro-Pro) co-elution, no separate mass spectrum of these individual compounds could be generated.

MRS-medium contains peptone, yeast and meat extract, which provide a source of amino acids and nitrogen for LAB metabolism and growth, but also likely consisting of cyclic dipeptides formed during manufacturer media extraction or processing through heat treatment. The same is true for wort production. Additional analyses confirmed the hypotheses of thermal generation of the four cyclic dipeptides, because the compounds were identified unequivocally in the unfermented control samples.
Figure 3-4 Amplified chromatogram of the *Lb. brevis* R2Δ MRS-broth CFS extract: Total ion chromatogram (A), chromatogram of m/z 154 with peak 1 for cyclo(Leu-Pro) (B), chromatogram of m/z 194 with peak 2 for cyclo(Pro-Pro) (C), chromatogram of m/z 228 with peak 3 for cyclo(Met-Pro) (D) and chromatogram of m/z 244 with peak 4 for cyclo(Phe-Pro) (E).
Figure 3-5 Mass spectra obtained from the extract of MRS-broth fermented with *Lb. brevis* R2Δ: mass spectrum at 17.84 min (RI 2302) resulted from peak 1 + 2 (A), mass spectrum at 20.97 min (RI 2706.8) resulted from peak 3 (B) and mass spectrum at 21.83 min (RI 2823.6) resulted from peak 4 (C).
In order to determine the metabolic ability of \textit{L.b. brevis} R2Δ to generate the dipeptides, the components were quantified in cell-free supernatants of fermented MRS-medium and wort as well in the unfermented control samples. Table 3-4 summarizes the quantification results of the four proline-based cyclic dipeptides.

**Table 3-4 Concentration of cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro), cyclo(Met-Pro) and cyclo(Phe-Pro) in cultures of \textit{L.b. brevis} R2Δ, acid treated broth and in unfermented controls.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Cyclo (Leu-Pro) [mg/L]</th>
<th>Cyclo (Pro-Pro) [mg/L]</th>
<th>Cyclo (Met-Pro) [mg/L]</th>
<th>Cyclo (Phe-Pro) [mg/L]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wort - \textit{L.b. brevis} R2Δ</td>
<td>0.60±0.01\textsuperscript{A}</td>
<td>&lt; 0.06\textsuperscript{*}</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1\textsuperscript{*}</td>
<td>0.64±0.03\textsuperscript{A}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wort – unfermented</td>
<td>0.55±0.01\textsuperscript{B}</td>
<td>&lt; 0.06\textsuperscript{*}</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1\textsuperscript{*}</td>
<td>0.64±0.03\textsuperscript{A}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS-broth - \textit{L.b. brevis} R2Δ</td>
<td>8.13±0.07\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>0.63±0.04\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>14.20±0.28\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>11.85±0.24\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS-broth – acidified</td>
<td>7.77±0.11\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>0.61±0.03\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>13.60±0.09\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>11.21±0.50\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS-broth - unfermented</td>
<td>6.81±0.13\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>0.52±0.03\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>14.28±0.14\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>9.81±0.16\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values ± SD (n = 3); analysis performed by one-way ANOVA and pairwise comparisons using Fisher’s LSD procedure; mean values within columns labelled with a common upper case letter from the wort samples are not significantly different (P < 0.05); mean values within columns labelled with a common lower case letter from the broth samples are not significantly different (P < 0.05); * concentration lower than limit of detection.

In fermented wort, only cyclo(Leu-Pro) and cyclo(Phe-Pro) were quantified above their LODs in low concentration levels of 0.60 and 0.64 mg/L, respectively. In the wort control, the same concentration of cyclo(Phe-Pro) was determined. Although cyclo(Leu-Pro) was present in the control at 0.55 mg/L, statistical evaluation demonstrated a significant difference (P < 0.05). Furthermore, statistically significant differences in concentration levels could be observed between fermented and unfermented MRS-broth samples. The concentration of cyclo(Leu-Pro) was 8.1 mg/L in the fermented broth, 1.3 mg/L higher than in the unfermented control (P < 0.01). The concentration of cyclo(Phe-Pro) increased from 9.8 to 11.8 mg/L (P < 0.01) and from 0.52 to 0.63 mg/L (P < 0.05) for cyclo(Pro-Pro) when fermented with \textit{L.b. brevis} R2Δ. The highest concentration measured was for cyclo(Met-Pro) which was determined at a level of 14.2 mg/L in fermented and control MRS-broth. To
summarize, concentrations of cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro) and cyclo(Phe-Pro) were significantly higher in fermented MRS-broth (P < 0.05). However, a significant generation in wort was only found for cyclo(Leu-Pro). In general, wort had a lower content of cyclic dipeptides.

The results indicate that there is a connection between the formation of these three cyclic dipeptides and *Lb. brevis* R2Δ fermentation, although the determined increases induced by *Lb. brevis* R2Δ amounted only to about 20% in MRS broth and 10% in wort. The protein content in wort is about 0.5% and therefore lower than in MRS-broth, which contains about 2% protein. Consequently, MRS-broth provided a better substrate for production of cyclic dipeptides than wort. As such, the authors speculate that LAB fermentation of protein-rich foods could be better substrates to enhance the production of anti-fungal cyclic dipeptides, for example cheeses and fermented meats.

Cyclic dipeptides have been already isolated from cultures of different antifungal LAB (Dal Bello et al., 2007; Li et al., 2011; Magnusson et al., 2003; Niku-Paavola et al., 1999; Ryan et al., 2011; Strom et al., 2002; Yang and Chang, 2010). Strom et al. (2002) assumed, that their production might be a secondary effect related to quorum sensing or other unknown mechanisms. Their production in relation to *Lb. brevis* growth has not previously been described in the literature. The protein metabolism of LAB and their corresponding enzymes are well studied (Gänzle et al., 2007; Kunji et al., 1996; Liu et al., 2010). However, there is no report of non-ribosomal peptide synthases or cyclo-peptide synthases activities in LAB. Wang et al. (2010) determined cyclo(L-Phe–L-Pro) in the supernatants of *Burkholderia cepacia* CF-66 cultures at 3.5 mg/L. Additionally, this cyclic dipeptide was detected at levels of 15.7 mg/L in *Propionibacterium jensenii* in fermented modified SL broth (contains yeast extract) but 14.7 mg/L was measured in the unfermented control (Lind et al., 2007). Thus, the authors concluded that cyclo(L-Phe-L-Pro) was not produced by propionibacteria. Our results showed that the unfermented MRS media, and wort to a lesser degree, includes peptides partially composed of cyclic dipeptides. In the present study the concentrations of cyclo(Phe-Pro), cyclo(Leu-Pro) and cyclo(Pro-Pro) increased significantly by about 20% upon fermentation using MRS-broth. Ryan et al. (2009)
examined the levels of cyclo(L-Leu-L-Pro) and cyclo(L-Phe-L-Pro) in wheat sourdough and bread fermented with *Lb. plantarum* FST1.7. The levels of these cyclic dipeptides increased significantly from approximately 0.001 in the control to 0.035 (cyclo(L-Leu-L-Pro)) and 0.025 mg/kg (cyclo(L-Phe-L-Pro)), respectively for both biologically and chemically acidified dough samples, after 48 h of incubation. In our study, acid-treated (lactic: acetic acids, 4:1) MRS-media also increased the cyclic dipeptide concentration (Table 3-4). The acids were spiked into the broth prior incubation (37 °C) and the concentration of cyclic dipeptides was measured after 48 h. Wheat flour contains proteolytic enzymes which show optimal activity around pH 4 (Bleukx et al., 1997; Kawamura and Yonezawa, 1982). Thus the source of proteolytic enzymes to provide linear dipeptides as precursors in sourdough fermentation seems to be regardless, whether they originate from the flour itself or the metabolic activity of the starter culture. The same applies for sourdough fermentation to the pH reduction for acidic pH cyclization of linear dipeptides, whether it is biologically or chemically. This might explain, why Ryan et al. (2009) could not find any differences between biologically and chemically acidified sourdough. In our study, the concentration of cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro) and cyclo(Phe-Pro) tended to be higher in MRS-broth fermented with *Lb. brevis* R2∆ and the amount found for cyclo(Leu-Pro) was even significantly higher for biologically acidified broth compared to chemically acidified and unfermented control (Table 3-4). MRS-broth as a growth media for LAB does not provide enzyme activity. Conclusively, acidification of MRS-broth alone without proteolytic enzymes does not provide as many precursor as with LAB for the subsequent cyclization, thus supporting the hypothesis that *Lb. brevis* R2∆ metabolism influences their formation in MRS-broth, but as a side effect. MIC values for the single cyclic dipeptides against different fungi reported in the literature are ranged between 6-50 g/L (Ryan et al., 2011; Strom et al., 2002; Yan et al., 2004). These concentrations are above the threshold for bitter taste (Gautschi et al., 1997), conflicting their application as antifungal agents in food controversially. Only one study reports lower MIC between 2 and 128 mg/L (Kumar et al., 2013). Compared with the other reports demonstrating 1000 fold higher MIC’s, the latter result is questionable. Nevertheless, concentrations of cyclic dipeptides investigated in
Lb. brevis R2Δ supernatants in this study are much below the MIC necessary to inhibit many of the fungi reported, as an individual antifungal compound. Thus, the antifungal activity of the cyclic dipeptides in Lb. brevis R2Δ supernatants plays a minor role. Other produced compounds might be more responsible for its antifungal action. Additionally, the synergistic effect among antifungal compounds produced during LAB fermentation (i.e., organic acids) play a key role in retarding mould growth. Several studies have previously reported the promising antifungal activity of some Lb. brevis strains (Falguni et al., 2010; Gerez et al., 2009; Mauch et al., 2010). Mauch et al. (2010) presented the strong antifungal activity of Lb. brevis PS1, which was the most active strain against Fusarium sp. However, heating and proteolytic treatments of the inoculated supernatants showed reduced activity, thus it was concluded that larger proteinaceous compounds worked synergistically with organic acids as the primary antifungal agents present. A similar finding was also reported for Lb. brevis NCDC02 (Falguni et al., 2010). However, synergistic effects can play a crucial role in the inhibition of undesirable microorganisms. Strong activity against anaerobic Gram-negative and Gram-positive bacteria has previously been reported for combined formulations of cyclic dipeptides (Rhee, 2004). Thus, it would be interesting to study cyclic dipeptide synergistic effects in relation to antifungal activity in their naturally occurring levels in food systems. Furthermore, the stereochemistry of cyclic dipeptides also plays an important role in their inhibitory activities. For example, it has been reported that the trans-isomers, cyclo(L-Leu-D-Pro) or cyclo(D-Leu-L-Pro), exhibited lower inhibition than the enantiomers cyclo(L-Leu-L-Pro) or cyclo(D-Leu-D-Pro) (Yan et al., 2004).
3.5 Conclusion
The present study was designed to use an accurate HRGC/MS method for the identification of cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro), cyclo(Met-Pro) and cyclo(Phe-Pro) and quantification of the compounds by SIDAs using their deuterated counterparts. Samples analysed were LAB fermented MRS-broth growth media and wort. Thus, the method offers additional applications for analyses of cyclic dipeptides in other liquid matrices, including beverages. To compare the concentration of the target compounds in fermented and control samples, the antifungal strain *Lb. brevis* R2Δ was chosen as an example. The concentrations of cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro), and cyclo(Phe-Pro) increased moderately by fermentation activity of the microorganism most likely as a secondary side effect resulting from acid-induced cyclization of precursor formed linear dipeptides. However, the concentrations found are 1000 fold lower than the MICs indicating a minor significance of cyclic dipeptides in the antifungal action of *Lb. brevis* R2Δ. Further studies should focus on the analyses of cyclic dipeptides and other antifungal compounds to ascertain their synergistic effects using a range of LAB strains. The novel application of deuterated cyclic dipeptides for SIDA reported here can potentially be used to mass screen LAB fermentates for their cyclic dipeptide production profiles or even to design a custom-built synergistic LAB antifungal profile adjunct for use in a range of food and beverage systems.
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4.1 Abstract

The present study investigated the antifungal activity of *Lactobacillus amylovorus* DSM19280 as a starter culture for gluten-free quinoa sourdough bread under pilot-plant conditions to extend the microbial shelf life. Challenge tests against environmental moulds were conducted and a negative control with non-antifungal strain, *Lb. amylovorus* DSM20531T, as well as a chemically acidified and a non-acidified control were included. Organic acid production, antifungal metabolites, carbohydrates changes during fermentation and bread quality were compared to wheat counterparts. The application of quinoa sourdough fermented with the antifungal *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 extended the mould free shelf life by 4 days compared to the non-acidified control. No significant difference in lactic acid production was found between the lactobacilli strains. HPLC-UV/DAD was used to quantify antifungal compounds. The concentration of 4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid, phloretic acid, 3-phenyllactic acid and hydroferulic acid were significantly higher (P<0.01) in the quinoa sourdough fermented with the antifungal *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 when compared to the non-antifungal strain, thus indicating their contribution to the antifungal activity. Evaluation of bread characteristics such as specific volume or crumb hardness, revealed that the addition of *Lb. amylovorus* fermented sourdough also improved gluten-free bread quality. In conclusion, the combination of quinoa flour fermented with the antifungal *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 serves a great potential biopreservative ingredient to produce gluten-free breads with an improved nutritional value, better bread quality and higher safety due to an extended shelf life, and therefore meeting consumer needs for good quality and preservatives-free food products.
4.2 Introduction

Interest in the application of alternative gluten-free crops for the production of cereal-based foods is growing constantly, mainly due to the rising diagnosis of coeliac disease. As a result, the trend for ethnic and ancient grains has increasingly attracted bakery industries as well as consumers worldwide. Due to its high nutritional value, the pseudo-cereal quinoa as such holds exceptional promise for utilization in food and beverages (Arendt and Zannini, 2013). It is rich in proteins and essential amino acids. The lipid fraction contains high amounts of polyunsaturated fatty acids and in comparison to other grains, quinoa is found to be rich in the vitamins A, E and folate. During the last years, novel products appeared on the market labelled with proposed healthier and more natural features compared to their classic wheat counterparts. However, gluten-free bread production results in major challenges for bakers and cereal technologists. Complex recipe formulations, using different starches, proteins, gums and hydrocolloids, are necessary to mimic the structure-building and water binding properties of gluten (Zannini et al., 2012). Although progress in gluten-free bread formulations have been achieved so far, the inclusion of the above mentioned ingredients/additives presents several disadvantages such as excessive prices (Moroni et al., 2009), other allergic reactions (Ortolani and Pastorello, 2006) and predominantly, the use of additives does not match the actual consumers’ requirements for natural products (Zannini et al., 2012). Furthermore, consumers’ concerns about safety and additive contents in food has received much attention over the last years. In turn, such minimal processed food without chemical preservatives should be still of high-quality and have an extended shelf life (Pawlowska et al., 2012). The shelf life of bread is determined by both staling behaviour and microbial deterioration. The latter one is a serious and expensive problem implicated with an estimated loss of the world's bread production of 5 to 10 % (Pitt and Hocking, 2009). Apart from the unpleasant sight of visible mould growth, fungi are also responsible for off-flavour formation, the production of mycotoxins as well as other allergenic compounds, which might be produced even before fungal outgrowth is visible. Furthermore, due to higher water contents and also higher water availability, gluten-free breads are more susceptible for fungal spoilage (Hager et al., 2012a).
The “free-from” trend leads the bakery industry to reconsider traditional preservation methods and replace chemical preservatives with natural alternatives to guarantee a clean label. One of the most established food biopreservation method is fermentation, a process based on the growth of microorganisms in foods. Among bakery products the microorganisms most widely used are lactic acid bacteria (LAB) applied as starter cultures for sourdough. A further benefit from sourdough LAB, in particular those belonging to the genus *Lactobacillus*, is that many species have been referred to the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) for safety assessment without raising safety concerns. As a result, they have been included in the QPS (Qualified Presumption of Safety) list for authorised use in the food and feed chain within the European Union (EFSA, 2012). This promotes many lactobacilli starter cultures to be categorised as biological agents excluded for labelling by the EU regulation on food additives (EEC, 2008). The same applies to the U.S., where they enjoy the generally regarded as safe (GRAS) status regulated by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

Formerly, it was believed that the organic acids produced by LAB, particularly lactic and acetic acid, were the main agents responsible for antifungal activity due to the pH decrease. Besides organic acids, a range of other secondary metabolites produced by LAB has been identified additionally as the source of the antifungal activity. A comprehensive overview about individual substances, their possible antifungal mechanism and some applications of antifungal acting LAB was recently reviewed by Crowley et al. (2013). Antifungal compounds also include fatty acids, acids with phenyl groups, proteinaceous compounds and a variety of other low-molecular weight compounds. In recent years, remarkable effort has been directed to research the antifungal activity of LAB in order to reduce fungal spoilage of foods and extend shelf life. However, many of them were studied under laboratory conditions. Various applications in food *in situ* systems exist, but particular research in gluten-free sourdough bread systems is still limited (Moore et al., 2008). In fact, neither the suitability of antifungal strains as starter cultures for the fermentation of gluten-free flour nor the quality of the final breads have been completely evaluated to date.

The aim of the present study was to apply antifungal LAB fermented sourdough as natural preservative in gluten-free bread to inhibit spoilage and consequently improve
safety and quality. Therefore, the antifungal activity of *Lactobacillus amylovorus* DSM19280 was investigated in a simple gluten-free bread system, particularly in quinoa sourdough bread, under pilot-plant conditions. Bread characteristics such as specific volume and textural and visual crumb properties were evaluated and compared to their wheat counterpart. In addition, the flours used were fully characterised for their chemical composition. Sourdough was further analysed for pH value, total titratable acidity (TTA) as well as metabolite profile.
4.3 Materials and Methods

4.3.1 Materials

The flours used in this study were quinoa flour (Irish Independent Health Food Ltd, Ballyvourney, Ireland, moisture 10.7 %) and wheat flour (baker’s flour, Odlums, Dublin, Ireland, moisture 13.5 %). Dry yeast was supplied by Puratos, Groot-Bijgaarden, Belgium; sugar from Siucra, Dublin, Ireland and salt from Glacia British Salt Limited, Cheshire, UK.

Chemicals and analytical standards were mainly purchased from Sigma Aldrich (Dublin, Ireland). The antifungal compound 3-phenyllactic acid was acquired from BaChem (Weil am Rhein, Germany). All analytical standards had a purity of ≥ 95 %.

4.3.2 Cultures, media and growth conditions

The patented antifungal strain *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 (Arendt et al., 2009) was obtained from the culture collection of UCC (School of Food and Nutritional Science, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland) and *Lb. amylovorus* DSM20531T, provided from DSMZ (Deutsche Sammlung von Mikroorganismen und Zellkulturen, Braunschweig, Germany) was preliminarily evaluated for its *in vitro* antifungal activity (data not shown) and then chosen as a negative control.

The lactobacilli cultures stored in 35 % glycerol stock solution at -80 °C were routinely refreshed on de Man-Rogosa-Sharpe agar (MRS) 5 agar (Meroth et al., 2003). For optimal growth condition after the dormant state, sugars (maltose, glucose and fructose) were autoclaved separately to avoid Maillard reaction and a sterile filtered vitamin mixture (cobalamin, folic acid, nicotinic acid amide, pantothenic acid, pyridoxal phosphate, and thiamine, 0.2 g/L each) was added to the agar after sterilisation. For sourdough cell counts commercial MRS agar was used (CM0361, Oxoid, Basingstoke, Hampshire, England). Both MRS5 and MRS agar were dyed with 0.05 g/L bromocresol green (Sigma-Aldrich, Steinheim, Germany). Lactobacilli were grown at 30 °C for 48 h under anaerobic conditions.
4.3.3 Starch hydrolysis test

To test the amylolytic activity of the strains, starch agar was prepared containing 3 g/L meat extract, 10 g/L soluble starch as well as 12 g/L agar. After 48 h incubation time using 10 µL of a 16 h culture, the plate surface was flooded with Gram iodine solution to make starch hydrolysis visible by a colourless zone surrounding colonies.

4.3.4 Flour characterisation

For compositional analysis, crude fat, protein, moisture and ash content of the flours were determined according to the AACC (American Association of Cereal Chemists) methods 30-10, 46-12, 44-15A and 08-01, respectively. Protein content was calculated with a conversion factor of 6.25 for quinoa and 5.83 for wheat. Analysis of total amino acids was carried out according to the EU regulation Nr. 152/09 after hydrolysis with 6 M hydrochloric acid for 23 hours (EEC, 2009). The amino acids were separated by ion exchange chromatography and determined by reaction with ninhydrin using photometric detection at 570 nm (440 nm for proline). Methionine, cysteine as well as tryptophan were not analysed. Total and damaged starch levels as well as amylose/amylopectin ratio were determined using enzyme kits (K-TSTA, K-SDAM, K-AMYL). The endogenous activity of α- and β-amylase were also analysed enzymatically (K-CERA, K-BETA3). All enzyme kits were supplied by Megazyme, Bray, Ireland.

4.3.5 Sourdough Type II preparation and analysis

Sourdough preparation was performed as described by Moore et al. (2008) with some modifications. Single colonies were taken from MRS5 agar plates, pre-inoculated in 10 mL MRS5 broth at 30 °C for 24 h and subcultured (1 %) in 45 mL of MRS5 broth at 30 °C for 16 h. Cells were harvested by centrifugation (5000 rpm, 10 min), washed once and resuspended in 45 mL sterile tap water. The starter cultures were added to the sourdough to an initial inoculum size of 7 log cfu/g dough. Sourdoughs were prepared with an equal weight of flour and sterile tap water, dough yield (DY) of 200. The doughs were fermented at 30 °C for 48 h (stirring thoroughly after 24 h). LAB cell counts were determined at 0 h and 48 h of fermentation. The identity of starter
cultures was confirmed by colony morphology and metabolic patterns (Wolter et al., 2014a). Total titratable acidity (TTA) and pH values of the fermented sourdoughs were measured using standard procedure (Arbeitsgemeinschaft Getreideforschung e.V., Detmold, Germany, 1994).

In addition, the effect the organic acids, lactic and acetic acid, on bread shelf life was evaluated. Therefore, a chemically acidified (1.4 % with a mixture of lactic and acetic acid (4:1, v/v) control sourdough (CA) with a DY of 200 was produced and to exclude acidification by naturally occurring LAB, chloramphenicol and erythromycin (60 and 200 µg/g dough, respectively) were added to the dough, which was then fermented at 30 °C for 24 h (Ryan et al., 2008).

### 4.3.6 Metabolite analysis in sourdough

An Agilent 1260 high performance liquid chromatography system equipped with a refractive index detector (RID) and an ultra violet-diode array detector (UV/DAD) was used to quantify carbohydrates (0.125-2.5 mM), organic acids (2-32 mM) as well as antifungal compounds (5-50 ppm). Standard calibration curves were prepared with 5 different concentrations and measured in duplicates always at the beginning and end of a sample set. Calibration curves showed good linearity with correlation coefficients of ≥ 0.999 for all compounds. For sugar and acid analyses, freeze-dried sourdough samples and flour were extracted with distilled water, clarified with Carrez I and Carrez II (1:5 w/v) and syringed filtered (0.2 µm pore size filter). Sugars were quantified over the RID (35 °C) by elution of the extract from a Hi-Plex H column (300 x 7.7 mm, 8 µm; Agilent, Cork, Ireland), equipped with a guard column (50 x 7.7 mm, 8 µm; Agilent, Cork, Ireland), using water at a flow rate of 0.6 mL/min at 25 °C. Setting the UV/DAD at 210 nm, lactic acid in the sourdough was determined after elution with 0.004 M sulphuric acid at 65 °C from the same column and a flow of 0.5 mL/min. Injection volumes were 20 µL.

The analysis of 15 known antifungal compounds was carried out according to Brosnan et al. (2014). The sample (2 g) was mixed with 10 mL water and 10 mL ethyl acetate containing 1 % formic acid. The mixture was added to 4 g magnesium sulphate and 1 g of sodium chloride shaken for 1 min and centrifuged for 10 min (3,000 rpm).
The organic solvent supernatant was removed and added to a dispersive solid phase extraction (SPE) Kit (Cat #: 5982-4956, 15 mL, Agilent, Dublin) and shaken for 1 min. The SPE tube was then centrifuged for 10 min (3,000 rpm). The solvent was decanted into a new 15 mL tube to which dimethyl sulfoxide (100 µL) was added. This was dried under reduced pressure in a vacuum centrifuge (Scanvag, Scanspeed) at 45 °C at 500 rpm, reconstituted to 1 mL with water/acetonitrile (90/10; 900 µL) and syringed filtered (0.2 µm pore size filter), into a HPLC amber vials (1.5 mL capacity). 10 µL was injected onto the HPLC-UV/DAD system. A gradient flow with water and acetonitrile (B) (both containing 0.1 % formic acid) was performed to ensure separation of compounds (0 min – 5 % B; 5 min – 10 % B; 15 min – 15 % B; 35 min – 40 % B; 45 min – 95 %; 50 min – 95 % B) on a Gemini C18 column (150 x 2.0 mm, 5 µm; Phenomenex, Macclesfield, UK) equipped with a C18 guard column (4 x 3 mm, Phenomenex, Macclesfield, UK) at a flow rate of 0.2 mL/min kept at a temperature of 30 °C. Compounds were quantified at a wavelength of 210 nm. For peak identification UV spectra were recorded between 190 and 400 nm. Recovery tests were conducted by spiking the antifungal standards into the CA control samples (15 ppm/g sourdough) followed by the whole extraction procedure assessing the extraction quality.

### 4.3.7 Bread preparation

The bread-making procedure was carried out according to Hager et al. (2012a). For sourdough breads, 20 % of the flour was fermented. Yeast and sugar were dissolved in the water (35 °C) and activated for 10 min in a proofer (KOMA Sunriser, Roermond, the Netherlands) set to 30 °C at a relative humidity (RH) of 85 %. This suspension was added to the mixed dry ingredients along with the sourdough. Mixing was carried out using the batter attachment of a Kenwood chef classic (1 min at step 1; scrape down; 1.5 min at step 2). The batter was scaled to 400 g into baking tins (15 x 9.5 x 7 cm). After a 30 min proofing time (35 °C; 85 % RH) the breads were baked (45 min at 190 °C; top and bottom heat). The deck oven (MIWE condo, Arnstein, Germany) was previously steamed with 0.3 L of water. The same recipe was used for the wheat control, except water levels were 63 %. Fermentation and baking parameter
were performed according to Ryan et al. (2008). After 2 h cooling down at ambient temperature, bread loaves were analysed subsequently and heat sealed in plastic bags and stored at room temperature for further evaluations. Three loaves per batch were used for shelf life monitoring.

4.3.8 Bread evaluation
Breads were characterised as previously described by Hager et al. (2012a). For determination of bake loss, each loaf was weighed before and after baking procedure. Loaf-specific volume was analysed using a Volscan Profiler (Stable Micro Systems, UK). For the evaluation of the physical crumb texture, four bread slices (25 mm thickness) were taken from the centre of each loaf. Texture profile analysis (TPA) was performed using a TA-XT2i Texture Analyser (Stable Micro Systems, Surrey, UK) equipped with a 25 kg load cell and a 20 mm aluminium cylindrical probe. The applied settings were a test speed of 5 mm/s with a force of 0.98 N to compress the middle of the breadcrumb to 50 % of its initial height. Calculated by the TPA software the hardness of three loaves of each batch were analysed on day 0, day 2 and day 5 of storage. Evaluation of crumb grain was carried out by using a C-cell Bread Imaging System (Calibre Control International Ltd., UK). To describe the structure of bread slices the following parameters of digital image analysis were chosen: slice area (total area of a product slice), number of cells (number of discrete cells detected within the slice), area of cells (the total area of cells as a percentage of the total slice area), porosity (ratio pore area/slice area), cell volume, wall thickness and slice brightness (mean grey level of pixels, value 0 – 255). TTA and pH values of the bread crumb were measured in the same way as described for sourdoughs.

4.3.9 Shelf life
The shelf life of the breads was monitored using the mould environmental challenge method developed by Dal Bello et al. (2007). Each loaf was sliced transversely using a wooden slice box to attain equal slices of 20 mm thickness. Slices were put on a sterile metal wrack, exposed to the bakery environment for 5 min on each side and then packed separately into a sterile plastic bag and heat sealed. To ensure comparable
aerobic conditions in each bag two filter pipette tips were inserted. The bags were examined for mould growth during a 14-day storage period at an average temperature of 20 ± 2 °C. Non acidified bread and CA bread, were also challenged and used as controls. Mould growth was evaluated based on the percentage of the total surface area of each slice where fungal outgrowth occurred. Mouldy slices were visibly rated as “<10 % mouldy”, “10–24 % mouldy”, “25-49 % mouldy” and “>50 % mouldy” (Figure 4-1). No visible moulds was evaluated as “mould free”. In total a series of 12 slices per batch was prepared in duplicate (3 loafs, 4 central slices each).

![Figure 4-1 Evaluation of fungal outgrowth on quinoa bread slices.](image)

4.3.10 Statistical analysis

Analysis for flour characterisation was done in triplicates. Sourdough extractions were carried out from two independent fermentations, extracting each sample twice. Baking trials were carried out using 3 independent replicates (n = 3). Therefore 3 samples of each batch were analysed with the exception of texture profile analysis where 12 samples of each batch were analysed. Statistical analysis was performed using Minitab 16 software. Data were checked for outliers and evaluation of significant differences was performed using one-way analysis of variances (ANOVA). All differences were considered significant at P < 0.05. Where F-values were significant, pairwise comparisons were carried out with the help of Tuckey’s post hoc test to describe the statistical significance between the antifungal, non-antifungal and non-acidified control.
4.4 Results and Discussion

4.4.1 Flour composition and fermentation

Table 4-1 shows the detailed chemical composition of the quinoa flour in comparison to the wheat flour used in this study. The results are comparable to other flour compositions reported (Arendt and Zannini, 2013; Elgeti et al., 2014; Hager et al., 2012b).

Investigations of quinoa sourdough fermentation are still rare and inconsistent values for the carbohydrates levels in quinoa flour have been reported (Elgeti et al., 2014; Wolter et al., 2014a). In our study, sucrose and glucose were quantified at levels of 46 and 53 mmol/kg, respectively (Table 4-2). The two Lb. amylovorus strains grew well in the quinoa sourdough system. The initial inoculation level from 7 log cfu/g sourdough increased up to 2 log units after 48 h fermentation (data not shown). The high amount of damaged starch present in the quinoa flour used (Table 4-1) might have contributed to enzyme hydrolysis during sourdough fermentation providing substrates for bacterial metabolism. Additionally, different amylolytic activities in flour and microorganisms may also have contributed to this variation. The quinoa flour used exhibited no beta-amylase activity, whereas high concentration was measured in the wheat flour (Table 4-1).
Table 4-1 Quinoa and wheat flour composition (values based on fresh weight of samples)*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Quinoa flour</th>
<th>Wheat flour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total starch [%]</td>
<td>51.36±0.20</td>
<td>67.14±0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amylose [%]</td>
<td>15.80±0.42</td>
<td>20.23±0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged starch [%]</td>
<td>13.28±0.15</td>
<td>6.48±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha amylase [U/g]</td>
<td>0.21±0.02</td>
<td>0.14±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta amylase [U/g]</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>17.36±1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protein [%]</td>
<td>14.20±0.03</td>
<td>11.5±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alanine [%]</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspartic acid [%]</td>
<td>1.288</td>
<td>0.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arginine [%]</td>
<td>1.253</td>
<td>0.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glutamic acid [%]</td>
<td>2.154</td>
<td>3.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glycine [%]</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hystidine [%]</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isoleucine [%]</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leucine [%]</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>0.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lysine [%]</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenylalanine [%]</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proline [%]</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>1.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serine [%]</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>0.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threonine [%]</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrosine [%]</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valine [%]</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water [%]</td>
<td>10.66±0.05</td>
<td>13.45±0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fat [%]</td>
<td>6.04±0.06</td>
<td>1.08±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash [%]</td>
<td>2.82±0.00</td>
<td>1.92±0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean values ± standard deviation (n = 3), b essential amino acids; ND means not detected.

During sourdough fermentation beta-amylase degrades starch into maltose units (Gänzle, 2014). Accordingly, high amounts of maltose were measured in wheat sourdough and no maltose was detectable in the quinoa sourdough (Table 4-2).
Noticeable is the high accumulation of glucose in the quinoa sourdough after fermentation. Starch degradation in substrates with low amylase activity depend on extracellular amylases of lactic acid bacteria and amylolytic strains (Gänzle, 2014). Extracellular amylase activity was characterized in several lactobacilli, including \textit{Lb. amylovorus} (Gänzle and Follador, 2012). In an \textit{in vitro} starch digestibility agar plate test the antifungal \textit{Lb. amylovorus} DSM19280 showed excellent amylolytic activity, visible as a colourless zone surrounding the colony (Figure 4-2 a). A negative example is presented in (Figure 4-2 b).

![Figure 4-2 In-vitro starch digestibility agar plate test, a) positive Lb. amylovorus 19280; b) negative Lb. brevis R2Δ.](image)

Recently, Ryan et al. (2011) evaluated \textit{Lb. amylovorus} DSM19280 and \textit{Lb. amylovorus} DSM20531\textsuperscript{T} for the ability to ferment and compete in a wheat sourdough system. However, this study has shown that both lactobacilli seem to be also competitive in a quinoa sourdough system, since uniform colony morphology on agar plates were observed with absence of contamination. As expected, the higher buffering capacity of the quinoa flour due to the higher mineral content resulted in greater lactic acid production with corresponding higher TTA values compared to the wheat sourdough (Table 4-2). Overall, there were no significant differences for the amount of produced lactic acid between the antifungal and non-antifungal lactobacilli.
Table 4-2 Carbohydrate levels, lactate formation, TTA and pH in sourdoughs made from quinoa and wheat flour (DY 200) after 48 h fermentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metabolites [mmol/kg flour]</th>
<th>Fructose</th>
<th>Glucose</th>
<th>Sucrose</th>
<th>Maltose</th>
<th>Raffinose</th>
<th>Lactate</th>
<th>TTA [mL]</th>
<th>pH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quinoa unfermented</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>52±6</td>
<td>46±6</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>3.4±0.1</td>
<td>6.2±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinoa <em>Lb. amylovorus</em> DSM19280</td>
<td>47±1</td>
<td>333±15</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>473±21</td>
<td>35.7±0.9</td>
<td>3.9±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinoa <em>Lb. amylovorus</em> DSM20531&lt;sup&gt;T&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20±1</td>
<td>295±6</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>503±19</td>
<td>35.5±0.5</td>
<td>3.9±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat unfermented</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>42±8</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>5±1</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>2.4±0.0</td>
<td>6.2±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat <em>Lb. amylovorus</em> DSM19280</td>
<td>27±1</td>
<td>14±2</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>176±8</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>368±11</td>
<td>16.3±1.2</td>
<td>3.8±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat <em>Lb. amylovorus</em> DSM20531&lt;sup&gt;T&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7±0</td>
<td>16±1</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>161±10</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>379±21</td>
<td>14.3±0.0</td>
<td>3.9±0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Shown results are average values and standard deviations of two independent fermentations, each sample extracted twice; ND/n.d. means not detected/determined.
4.4.2 Microbial bread shelf life

In recent years, interest in food biopreservation has dramatically increased and too little attention has been given to establish biological methods to improve the microbial shelf life of gluten-free bread. Although Moore et al. (2008) has conducted the most comprehensive study to prolong the shelf life of gluten-free bread by the addition of sourdough to date, it must, however, be critically stated that they achieved only one more mould free day using a *Lb. plantarum* strain in a gluten-free flour mixture. The same strain failed in the study by Wolter et al. (2014a). In the present research, the known antifungal activity of *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 was investigated to prevent mould in 100 % quinoa sourdough breads. This strain has already proven to be active against a range of different moulds occurring in food (Belz et al., 2012; Lynch et al., 2014; Ryan et al., 2011; Waters et al., 2012).

Figure 4-3 represents an overview of the shelf life and mould growth characteristics for the biologically acidified breads as well as for the control breads. From a consumer’s point of view, first visible mould on bread slices was considered to be a critical point of shelf life evaluation. With the addition of sourdough fermented with the antifungal *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 the mould free shelf life was extended for 4 days compared to the non-acidified control where first moulds were visible after 2 days. A prolongation of 2 days was achieved with addition of *Lb. amylovorus* DSM20531T fermented and CA sourdough. In average bread slices stayed longer mould free in biologically acidified samples. At the end of the storage time, the control bread slices were completely mouldy. In contrast to Ryan et al. (2011), the negative control *Lb. amylovorus* DSM20531T as well as the CA control did show a low activity against environmental moulds. This delay of mould growth is likely associated with the presence of organic acids (Lynch et al., 2014). The TTA values between these in the sourdough breads were similar (Table 4-3). Overall, the use of the antifungal strain resulted in the longest mould free shelf-life.
Antifungal strain
*Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280

Non-antifungal strain
*Lb. amylovorus* DSM20531<sup>T</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of bread slices</th>
<th>Number of bread slices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-acidified control**

**Chemically acidified sourdough**

Figure 4.3 Shelf life of quinoa bread against environmental moulds during a 14-day storage period. Bread spoilage is indicated as percentage of the total surface area of each of the 12 slices where fungal outgrowth occurred: Mould free slices (white area), <10 % mouldy (grey diagonally striped area), 10–24 % mouldy (grey area), 25–49 % mouldy (black horizontally striped area) and >50 % mouldy (black area). Mean values are shown (n = 2), error bars indicate standard deviations.
Table 4-3 pH and TTA values of quinoa sourdoughs breads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>TTA [mL]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quinoa unfermented</td>
<td>5.95±0.01a</td>
<td>6.6±0.5c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinoa chemically acidified</td>
<td>5.40±0.01b</td>
<td>9.9±0.1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinoa <em>Lb. amylovorus</em> DSM19280</td>
<td>5.01±0.03c</td>
<td>11.2±0.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinoa <em>Lb. amylovorus</em> DSM20531†</td>
<td>5.03±0.01c</td>
<td>10.8±0.9ab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean values ± standard deviation (n = 3). Values in one column followed by the same letter are not significantly different (P < 0.05).

Apart from lactic acid, Ryan et al. (2011) identified 15 antifungal compounds and Lynch et al. (2014) quantified six including three further compounds present in the MRS cell free supernatants of *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280. The minimal inhibition concentration (MIC) vary appreciably between those compounds and fungi tested ranging from 0.1 mg/mL up to 200 mg/mL (Aziz et al., 1998; Broberg et al., 2007; Ryan et al., 2011). However, studies have shown that the amounts of several of those antifungal metabolites detected in culture broths were much lower (ppm range) than their MIC (Axel et al., 2014; Brosnan et al., 2014; Ndagano et al., 2011). Hence, a complex synergistic mechanism seems to be required for antifungal activity. The production of antifungal compounds is substrate specific (Vermeulen et al., 2006). Therefore, it is reasonable to quantify antifungal compounds present in sourdoughs.

Previous sourdough research has mainly focused on the evaluation of 3-phenyllactic acid. The concentration of this metabolite ranged in wheat sourdough from 16 to 33 ppm (Ryan et al., 2009; Vermeulen et al., 2006). The production of 3-phenyllactic acid and hydroxy-phenyllactic acid in inoculated quinoa slurries (DY 300), was 46 and 64 ppm, approximately 2.6 times higher than in the wheat samples (Dallagnol et al., 2013). Phenyl and substituted phenyl derivatives occur also naturally in plants (Gómez-Caravaca et al., 2011). In our study, the analysis of 15 antifungal phenyl and substituted phenyl derivates should provide more insight where the preservative effect in the sourdough originates. Figure 4-4 shows the chromatograms of extracted quinoa sourdough samples fermented with the antifungal *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 strain in comparison with the CA control and a standard mix. In the LAB fermented
quinoa samples, 4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid, 4-hydroxybenzoic acid, vanillic acid, phloretic acid, 3-phenyllactic acid and hydroferulic acid were clearly identified. 4-Hydroxybenzoic acid and vanillic acid are naturally occurring compounds, since they were also present in the CA quinoa control dough and quinoa flour (data not shown) and reported by literature mentioned earlier. The antifungal compounds phloretic and hydroferulic acid are, to the authors’ knowledge, newly identified compounds in quinoa sourdough. With 4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid, 3-phenyllactic acid and hydroferulic acid, only 3 compounds were found in the fermented wheat sourdoughs, whereas none of them was detectable in the CA wheat control and wheat flour (data not shown).

The recovery rates varied greatly between 23 and 127 % for quinoa and between 63 and 187 % for wheat (Table 4-4). Relative standard deviation values ranged between 1.0-21.8 % and 1.8-9.9 %, respectively. Due to matrix effects further studies are needed to increase low recoveries, as found for example for benzoic acid obtaining only 23 % in the quinoa matrix. Due to these difficulties encountered, the presents of more compounds in small concentrations overlayed by matrix is likely. Additionally,
mass spectrometry of the sample extracts is needed in order to confirm the identity of the compounds. Nevertheless, the quantification results are presented in Table 4-4 whereas average values were related to their recovery rates. In the quinoa sourdough fermented with the antifungal strain the concentration of the antifungal compounds were significantly higher (P < 0.01) when compared to the non-antifungal strain (Table 4-4). The higher concentration of these compounds might have contributed to the longer inhibition of mould in the antifungal quinoa sourdough bread. In contrast, the antifungal wheat sourdough contained less compounds. This confirms, that the production is substrate and strain dependent.
Table 4-4 Concentration of antifungal compounds (ppm).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound name</th>
<th>Quinoa sourdough fermented with <em>Lb. amylovorus</em></th>
<th>Wheat sourdough fermented with <em>Lb. amylovorus</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSM19280</td>
<td>DSM20531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Catechol</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 4-Hydroxyphenyllactic acid</td>
<td>51.1±4.0A</td>
<td>31.4±3.7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 4-Hydroxybenzoic acid</td>
<td>10.6±0.4b</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Hydrocaffeic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Vanillic acid</td>
<td>33.9±1.9b</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Caffeic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Phloretic acid</td>
<td>15.1±1.3A</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 3-Phenyllactic acid</td>
<td>142.2±7.8A</td>
<td>35.6±2.4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Hydroferulic acid</td>
<td>12.4±0.8A</td>
<td>14.7±2.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J p-Coumaric acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Ferulic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Benzoic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Salicylic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Hydrocinnamic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Methylcinnamic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total concentration 190.6</td>
<td>107.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Values in one row followed by the same upper case letter are not significantly different (p<0.01). Values in one row followed by the same lower case letter are not significantly different (p<0.05). Naturally present. Average results from three extractions. ND means concentration not determined/detected.
4.4.3 Bread properties

Sourdough addition to gluten-free bread is reported to better keep freshness over storage (Moore et al., 2007; Wolter et al., 2014b). The same applies for the wheat system (Ryan et al., 2011). As expected, the crumb of the quinoa breads was much firmer than for the wheat breads (Figure 4-5). Comparing the crumb hardness of the sourdough breads (quinoa and wheat) with the non-acidified controls, the obtained results clearly highlight that the addition of sourdough led to a softer crumb for fresh breads (day 0) as well as stored breads (day 2 and day 5). Due to the lack of the gluten network gluten-free breads are generally more prone to stale in comparison to wheat breads (Sciarini et al., 2010). A more rapid onset of staling in gluten-free breads appears with high starch contents (Hager et al., 2012a). The low starch content of quinoa flour seems to have a significant influence in its low rate of staling, which can be even improved by the addition of sourdough.

![Crumb hardness for quinoa and wheat sourdough breads and their controls](image)

To achieve good quality gluten-free breads with high volume and improved texture, industrial bakeries apply complex recipes and additives. However, these interferences by different matrix components were excluded, since a basic bread recipe was used. Generally, the addition of sourdough to gluten-free breads does not have a significant influence on specific volume (Moore et al., 2007; Wolter et al., 2014b). However, the addition of sourdough in our study yielded in a significant higher specific loaf volume.
when compared to the non-acidified breads (Table 4-5). Nevertheless, this increase amounted only to about 6%, making it rather negligible. Amongst other aspects, the influence of sourdough to either decrease or increase the specific volume of bread has been described as strain-dependent (Katina et al., 2006).

Digital image analysis was used for a quantitative description of the crumb grain (Table 4-5). A similar trend was observed for all quinoa breads, with no distinct differences in slice area, number of cells, porosity, cell volume, and slice brightness. Nevertheless, for mechanical strength of the bread grain, the surrounding matrix referred as cell walls are the most significant contributors (Scanlon and Zghal, 2001). The analysis showed that the cell wall for the non-acidified quinoa control was significantly thinner than for both biologically acidified breads. Consequently, the addition of sourdough resulted in quinoa breads with a higher mechanical stability. In disagreement to the study of Wolter et al. (2014b) the application of sourdough did not generally lead to an increase in the cell volumes and accordingly a more open crumb structure and lower values for crumb brightness. These differences could be correlated as also strain dependent.
Table 4-5: Bread and crumb characteristics of sourdough breads and control breads made from quinoa and wheat flour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Specific volume [mL/g]</th>
<th>Slice area [mm²]</th>
<th>Number of cells</th>
<th>Porosity (area of cells) [%]</th>
<th>cell volume [mm³]</th>
<th>Wall thickness [mm]</th>
<th>Slice brightness [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSM19280</td>
<td>4.01±0.10b</td>
<td>7797±325b</td>
<td>4220±219b</td>
<td>53.4±0.3b</td>
<td>6.2±0.6b</td>
<td>0.45±0.01a</td>
<td>104±2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat DSM20531T</td>
<td>4.45±0.06a</td>
<td>8555±177a</td>
<td>4343±178b</td>
<td>54.8±0.3a</td>
<td>6.9±0.3ab</td>
<td>0.46±0.01a</td>
<td>106±2ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.05±0.06b</td>
<td>7976±308b</td>
<td>4810±242a</td>
<td>53.3±0.6b</td>
<td>7.4±0.5a</td>
<td>0.45±0.01a</td>
<td>110±2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSM19280</td>
<td>1.12±0.01A</td>
<td>2763±140A</td>
<td>2410±177A</td>
<td>47.61±0.74A</td>
<td>5.0±0.5A</td>
<td>0.41±0.01A</td>
<td>66.8±2.6A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinoa DSM20531T</td>
<td>1.11±0.01A</td>
<td>2796±144A</td>
<td>2496±173A</td>
<td>47.39±0.65A</td>
<td>4.7±0.4A</td>
<td>0.40±0.01A</td>
<td>67.7±2.6A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1.06±0.01B</td>
<td>2654±137A</td>
<td>2473±157A</td>
<td>48.07±0.42A</td>
<td>4.5±0.3A</td>
<td>0.39±0.01B</td>
<td>65.5±2.8A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values given as mean ± confidence interval (α =0.05). Values in one column followed by the same upper case or lower case letter are not significantly different (P<0.05).*
4.5 Conclusion
The mould free shelf life of the quinoa breads increased for 4 days in comparison to the non-acidified control when the sourdough fermented with *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 was incorporated in the bread recipe. Quinoa breads containing *Lb. amylovorus* fermented sourdough also showed improved bread quality and reduced bread staling. Consequently, the known antifungal *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 is a suitable starter culture for quinoa fermentations. Quinoa flour is rich in essential amino acid and high in proteins making the sourdough a promising biopreservative ingredient for gluten-free baked goods.

HPLC-UV/DAD analysis of the sourdough extracts revealed the presents of antifungal compounds. The concentration of some of those compounds was higher in the antifungal active quinoa sourdough than in the non-antifungal fermentation product. In contrast to the quinoa sourdough, the antifungal wheat sourdough contained less compounds than the non-antifungal. This indicates that the production of these metabolites in the sourdough is strain and substrate specific and may contribute to the synergistic biopreservative effect, but not exclusively. Considering the addition of sourdough at 20 % flour based to the bread recipe and taking bake loss into account, the average concentration of these compounds in the antifungal quinoa bread would only amount about 30 ppm. More compounds might be required concomitantly to achieve the increase of the shelf life in the sourdough breads fermented with antifungal strains. Hence, further analysis and improved extraction procedures of the sourdough samples are vital to research and clarify which other components are present and might act synergistically.

4.6 Acknowledgements
Funding for Claudia Axel was received through a Science Foundation Ireland scholarship through a research program no. 11/RFP.1/EOB/3204. This research was also partly funded by Irish Department of Agriculture Food Institutional Research Measure, Ireland. The authors would also like to thank Marcus Schmidt for his support throughout the flour analysis.
4.7 References


Vermeulen, N., Gänzle, M.G., Vogel, R.F., 2006. Influence of peptide supply and cosubstrates on phenylalanine metabolism of *Lactobacillus sanfranciscensis*


Chapter 5  Antifungal carboxylic acids produced by *Lactobacillus reuteri* R29 during sourdough fermentation: Substrate dependency and *in situ* antifungal activity in bread

Claudia Axel, Brid Brosnan, Emanuele Zannini, Ambrose Furey, Aidan Coffey and Elke K. Arendt

Submitted as “Antifungal carboxylic acids produced by *Lactobacillus reuteri* R29 during sourdough fermentation: Substrate dependency and *in situ* antifungal activity in bread” for publication in *International Journal of Food Microbiology*
5.1 Abstract

The main objective of this study was to investigate the sourdough fermentation of quinoa, rice and wheat flour using the antifungal strain *Lactobacillus reuteri* R29 as starter culture. In addition to the levels of all major compounds (starch, protein, water, fat, mineral) also amino acid profile and flour enzyme activity were determined. The impact of the fermentation substrate was evaluated in terms of metabolic activity, acidification pattern and quantity of antifungal compounds. Furthermore, the sourdough was applied *in situ* as biopreservative to prolong the shelf life of bread using challenge tests against environmental moulds. *Lb. reuteri* R29 was able to grow highly competitively in all sourdough systems. However, cell growth was most favoured in the wheat system (P < 0.01). Lactic acid production and TTA values were lowest in rice sourdough followed by wheat and quinoa. The sourdough fermentation of different flour substrates using the antifungal strain *Lb. reuteri* R29 generated a complex and significantly different profile of antifungal compounds. Extracted quinoa sourdough detected the greatest number of antifungal compounds (n = 11) at a much higher concentration than what was detected from rice (n = 8) and wheat (n = 9) sourdough. Among them, 3-phenyllactic acid and 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid were present at a significant concentration. This was correlated with the superior protein content of quinoa flour and its high protease activity. With the addition of *Lb. reuteri* R29 inoculated sourdough the shelf life was extended by 2 days for quinoa (+ 100 %) and rice bread (+ 67 %). A prolongation of 3 days (+ 75 %) was achieved for the corresponding wheat sourdough bread. The findings of this study showed that *Lb. reuteri* R29 is a suitable bio-protective starter for the successful production of antifungal active sourdough using wheat or gluten-free flours as substrate.
5.2 Introduction

Highly processed food containing artificial preservatives are increasingly rejected by the consumers who increasingly prefer natural and wholesome food products. Nevertheless, microbial safety is required to be preserved within the product’s shelf life besides appearance, taste and texture quality aspects. This is a challenge for the food industry, which has led to the revival of food fermentations and biopreservation techniques. Among bakery products the most economically and ecologically friendly method is the use of lactic acid bacteria (LAB) applied as starter culture for sourdough (Zannini et al., 2012). Due to that many species of LAB, (especially from the genus \textit{Lactobacillus}) enjoy GRAS (Generally Regarded As Safe) and QPS (Qualified Presumption of Safety) status, their application is authorised for the safe use in the food and feed chain. The application of LAB fermented sourdough in bread products offers improved flavour, texture and nutritional properties as well as safety due to extended shelf life meeting presently consumer needs (Arendt et al., 2007; Ryan et al., 2011). This also applies for gluten-free bread (Axel et al., 2015a). Due to the rising diagnosis of coeliac disease, an autoimmune disorder of the small intestine associated with a permanent intolerance to gluten and gluten-like proteins, an increasing interest exists in the development of high quality gluten-free products (Moroni et al., 2009).

Bread spoilage is caused predominantly by fungal spores. LAB are known to produce a range of active compounds inhibiting fungal growth. This activity is believed to result from a synergistic effect between pH decrease and the antifungal metabolites produced by LAB (Cortés-Zavaleta et al., 2014; Ndagano et al., 2011). These include low molecular mass compounds such as carboxylic acids; phenyl and substituted phenyl derivates (3-phenyllactic, 4-hydroxyphenyllactic or benzoic acid), cyclic dipeptides, hydroxy fatty acids or antifungal peptides. The production of antifungal compounds depends on the microbial growth and metabolic activity of each strain which are further influenced by endogenous factors such as flour carbohydrates, enzymes and microbial interaction (Axel et al., 2015a; Meroth et al., 2003; Van der Meulen et al., 2007). Accordingly, the evaluation is highly complex. Sourdough containing naturally produced antifungal compounds can replace chemical
preservatives in bread products guaranteeing a clean label which can be claimed with “no preservatives” or “natural”.

In the last decades, considerable effort has been directed to screen the antifungal activity of LAB in order to find suitable starter cultures for biopreservation. This content was recently reviewed by a number of studies (Crowley et al., 2013; Dalic et al., 2010; Oliveira et al., 2014) and in terms of bread shelf life (Axel et al., 2015b). However, the application of antifungal starter strains for sourdough fermentation is still limited and more strains should be investigated in situ, research is further needed to improve the shelf life of gluten-free breads (Axel et al., 2015b).

Little attention has been directed to determine the concentration of antifungal compounds formed by LAB during different sourdough fermentations. A few studies report the extraction of antifungal carboxylic acids from the sourdough matrix (Axel et al., 2015a; Dallagnol et al., 2013; Ryan et al., 2009). Disadvantages encountered were either long extraction procedures, usage of large amounts of solvents or high matrix effects and partially low recoveries. With the method developed by Brosnan et al. (2015) a multi-compound (20) UHPLC-MS/MS method was introduced offering shorter analysis time and good recoveries for the determination of in situ formed compounds from sourdough.

The main focus of this study addresses the investigation of sourdough fermentation with antifungal potential to prolong the shelf life of bread. Therefore, three different flours (quinoa, rice and wheat) were selected as fermentation substrate and fully characterised. Lactobacillus reuteri R29 was chosen as the antifungal starter culture. The impact of the substrate on the quantity of antifungal carboxylic acid produced during LAB sourdough fermentation was evaluated applying the method of Brosnan et al. (2015) and related to LAB metabolism and substrate features. Finally, the biopreservatives were applied in sourdough breads and the shelf life was evaluated using a mould environmental challenge test, which was compared to non-acidified controls.
5.3 **Material and Methods**

5.3.1 **Materials**

The flours used in this study were quinoa flour (Irish Independent Health Food Ltd, Ballyvourney, Ireland), white rice flour (Doves Farm Foods Ltd, Berkshire, UK) and wheat flour (baker’s flour, Odlums, Dublin, Ireland), dry yeast (Puratos, Groot-Bijgaarden, Belgium), sugar (Siucra, Dublin, Ireland) and salt (Glacia British Salt Limited, Cheshire, UK).

Chemicals and analytical standards were mainly purchased from Sigma Aldrich (Dublin, Ireland). The antifungal compound 3-phenyllactic acid was acquired from BaChem (Weil am Rhein, Germany). All analytical standards had a purity of ≥ 95%.

5.3.2 **Flour characterisation**

For compositional analysis, crude fat, protein, moisture and ash content of the flours were determined according to the AACC (American Association of Cereal Chemists) methods 30-10, 46-12, 44-15A and 08-01, respectively. Protein contents were calculated with a protein factor of 6.25, except for wheat flour where 5.83 was used. Analysis of total amino acids was carried out according to the EU regulation Nr. 152/09 after hydrolysis with 6 M hydrochloric acid for 23 hours (EEC, 2009). The amino acids were separated by ion exchange chromatography and determined by reaction with ninhydrin using photometric detection at 570 nm (440 nm for proline). Methionine, cysteine as well as tryptophan were not analysed. Total and damaged starch levels as well as amylose/amylopectin ratio were determined using enzyme kits (K-TSTA, K-SDAM, K-AMYL). The endogenous activity of α- and β-amylase as well as amyloglucosidase were also analysed enzymatically (K-CERA, K-BETA3, R-AMGR3, Megazyme, Bray, Ireland). The activity of endo-proteinase was analysed spectrophotometrically using hemoglobin as substrate (Brijs et al., 1999).

5.3.3 **Sourdough Type II preparation**

*Lb. reuteri* R29 was obtained from the culture collection of UCC (School of Food and Nutritional Science, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland). This strain was shown to have antifungal activity *in vitro* and *in situ* malting trials (Oliveira et al., 2015a,
The strain was stored in a 35 % glycerol stock at -80 °C and routinely maintained on deMan-Rogosa (MRS) agar (48 h at 37 °C). For the preparation of working cultures, single colonies were picked from the agar plates, cultured in MRS broth (10 mL) at 37 °C for 24 h, and sub-cultured (1 %) for 16 h. Cells were harvested by centrifugation (5000 rpm, 10 min), washed, re-suspended in sterile water and added to the sourdough to an initial cell count of approximately 10^7 cfu/g dough. Sourdoughs were prepared with an equal weight of flour and water; dough yield (DY) of 200. The doughs were fermented at 37 °C for 48 h. LAB cell counts were determined at 0 h and 48 h of fermentation for determining the cell growth. The identity of starter cultures was confirmed by colony morphology and metabolic patterns (Wolter et al., 2014a). Fermentation microbiota were dominated by the starter culture since uniform colony morphology on agar plates were observed with absence of contaminations. Fermentations were carried out in duplicate independent experiments.

5.3.4 Sourdough analysis
Total titratable acidity (TTA) and pH values of the fermented sourdoughs were measured using a standard procedure (Arbeitsgemeinschaft Getreideforschung e.V., 1994). An Agilent 1260 high performance liquid chromatography system equipped a Hi-Plex H column (300 x 7.7 mm, 8 µm; Agilent, Cork, Ireland) and an appropriate guard column (50 x 7.7 mm, 8 µm; Agilent, Cork, Ireland) was used to quantify sugars (0.125-2.5 mM) and organic acids (2-32 mM) from extracted freeze dried sourdough and flour samples. Samples preparation was done according to Wolter et al. (2014b). Concentrations of fructose, glucose, maltose, raffinose and sucrose in flour and sourdough samples were analysed using a refractive index detector. Lactate and acetate acid were detected using a diode array detector (λ = 210 nm). Samples for sugar and acid determination were eluted with water or 0.004 M sulphuric acid at a flow rate of 0.6 mL/min and 25 °C or 65 ºC, respectively.

The analysis of 20 known antifungal compounds was carried out using a Waters Quattro premier XE UPLC system (Brosnan et al., 2015). The LC-MS/MS method was operated in negative electrospary ionisation mode as described by Brosnan et al.
(2015) to detect the antifungal compounds. QuEChERS method (quick, easy, cheap, effective, rugged and safe) was applied to extract \textit{in situ} antifungal compounds from the different sourdough matrices (Brosnan et al., 2015).

\subsection*{5.3.5 \textit{In situ} antifungal activity}

\textit{Lb. reuteri} R29 fermented sourdoughs (20 \% flour based) were incorporated into simple bread recipes and breads were baked as previously described by (Hager et al. 2012a). Water levels used were 95, 120 and 63 \% for quinoa, rice and wheat breads, respectively which were determined through preliminary baking trials for the gluten-free flours and through farinograph measurements for the wheat flour (Hager et al. (2012a). Control breads were prepared accordingly. Bread loaves were cooled at room temperature for 2 h. Three loaves per replicate were sliced transversely in a sterile manner to obtain uniform slices of 20 mm thickness (4 slices per bread). Each side of the slice was exposed to the air for 5 min, packed in a plastic bag and heat sealed. Ensuring comparable aerobic conditions in each bag two filter pipette tips were inserted. The bags were examined for mould growth during a 14-day storage period at an average temperature of 20 ± 2 °C. Mould growth was evaluated based on the percentage of the total surface area of each slice where fungal outgrowth occurred (Axel et al., 2015a).

\subsection*{5.3.6 Statistical analysis}

Analysis for flour characterisation was done in triplicates. Sourdough extractions for sugars and acids were carried out from two independent fermentations, extracting each sample twice and for antifungal compounds, each sample was extracted three times. \textit{In situ}-shelf life tests were done in duplicates. Statistical analysis was performed using Minitab 17 software. Data were checked for outliers (Grubb’s test) and evaluation of significant differences was performed using one-way analysis of variances (ANOVA). All differences were considered significant at P < 0.05. Where F-values were significant, pairwise comparisons were carried out with the help of Tuckey’s \textit{post hoc} test to describe the statistical significance between the antifungal, non-antifungal and non-acidified control.
5.4 Results and Discussion

The main objective of this study was to investigate the sourdough fermentation of quinoa, rice and wheat flour using the antifungal strain *Lb. reuteri* R29 as starter culture.

5.4.1 Flour analysis

Table 5-1 shows the detailed chemical composition of the flours used in this study. The results are comparable to other flour compositions reported (Arendt and Zannini, 2013; Hager et al., 2012b). However, the composition of the fermentation substrate including enzyme activities is important in order to understand how it influences the fermentation pathways, secondary systems for energy production as well as the formation of antifungal compounds. Thus, the following sections focus on the characterisation of the sourdoughs derived from the known metabolic pathways of *Lb. reuteri* and flour components.
Table 5-1 Quinoa, rice and wheat flour composition (values based on fresh weight of samples)\(^a\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Quinoa flour(^b)</th>
<th>Rice flour</th>
<th>Wheat flour(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total starch [%]</td>
<td>51.36±0.20</td>
<td>75.21±0.28</td>
<td>67.14±0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amylose [%]</td>
<td>15.80±0.42</td>
<td>27.65±0.90</td>
<td>20.23±0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged starch [%]</td>
<td>13.28±0.15</td>
<td>0.74±0.02</td>
<td>6.48±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha amylase [U/g]</td>
<td>0.21±0.02</td>
<td>0.01±0.00</td>
<td>0.14±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta amylase [U/g]</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0.02±0.00</td>
<td>17.36±1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amyloglucosidase [U/g]</td>
<td>3.78±0.05</td>
<td>9.67±0.14</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protease [U/g]</td>
<td>21.97±2.15</td>
<td>10.54±1.79</td>
<td>4.13±0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protein [%]</td>
<td>14.20±0.03</td>
<td>6.37±0.05</td>
<td>11.5±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alanine [%]</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>0.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arginine [%]</td>
<td>1.253</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspartic acid [%]</td>
<td>1.288</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glutamic acid [%]</td>
<td>2.154</td>
<td>1.353</td>
<td>3.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glycine [%]</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hystidine(^c) [%]</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isoleucine(^c) [%]</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leucine(^c) [%]</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lysine(^c) [%]</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenylalanine(^c) [%]</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proline [%]</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>1.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serine [%]</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threonine(^c) [%]</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrosine [%]</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valine(^c) [%]</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water [%]</td>
<td>10.66±0.05</td>
<td>13.90±0.06</td>
<td>13.45±0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fat [%]</td>
<td>6.04±0.06</td>
<td>0.71±0.02</td>
<td>1.08±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash [%]</td>
<td>2.82±0.00</td>
<td>0.40±0.01</td>
<td>1.92±0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Mean values ± standard deviation (n = 3), \(^b\) see also Table 4-1, \(^c\) essential amino acids, ND means not detected.
5.4.2 Characterization of the antifungal LAB sourdough

The obligately heterofermentative *Lb. reuteri* is highly adapted to the sourdough (wheat and rye) environment (Hüfner et al., 2008). However, the antifungal strain used in this study *Lb. reuteri* R29 was isolated from an acidic niche (human source) providing the strain an easy adaptability to acidic conditions (Oliveira et al., 2015a). In fact, *Lb. reuteri* is known for its acid tolerance due to the arginine deiminase pathway which produces intracellular produced ammonia (Gänzle et al., 2007). The antifungal strain *Lb. reuteri* R29 was inoculated into the three different sourdough matrices. Growth ability, acidification pattern and the production of antifungal metabolites were examined.

5.4.2.1 Carbohydrate metabolism

The initial concentration of fermentable carbohydrates in quinoa, rice and wheat flours were relatively low (Table 5-2). Accordingly, starch-degradation during sourdough fermentation is crucial. Depending on the activity of the starch degrading enzymes in the flours, different fermentable sugars are produced. Maltose is a major carbon source in wheat sourdoughs which remains available throughout fermentation (Sekwati-Monang et al., 2012). The wheat flour used in this study exhibited a very high β-amylase activity (Table 5-1). Accordingly, maltose was the only disaccharide detected in wheat sourdoughs, but also an increased glucose level was measured when compared to the unfermented wheat flour (Table 5-2). *Lb. reuteri* metabolizes maltose by choice via maltose phosphorylase and β-phosphoglucomutase, where glucose-6-phosphate is preferentially metabolized and simultaneously glucose is released (Gänzle and Follador, 2012) which explains the higher residual concentration of glucose in the wheat sourdough after fermentation. In contrast, due to the absence or minor activity of β-amylase analysed in the gluten-free flours (Table 5-1), maltose could not be detected in rice and quinoa sourdoughs (Table 5-2). Therefore, glucose was the dominant carbon source in these gluten-free sourdoughs. Amyloglucosidase was found to contribute mainly to the production of fermentable glucose in rice and quinoa flour (Elgeti et al., 2014; Kishio and Aoyagi, 2014). This enzyme catalyses the hydrolysis of terminal 1,4-linked glucose residues successively from the non-reducing
ends of maltooligo- and polysaccharides with release of glucose. In our study, rice flour exhibited the highest activity of amyloglucosidase followed by quinoa flour; whereas no amyloglucosidase activity could be detected in wheat flour (Table 5-1). Heterofermentative metabolism of glucose occurs via the pentose phosphate way (Gänzle et al., 2007). *Lb. reuteri* started to metabolize fructose when maltose was depleted using it as carbon source, since no formation of mannitol occurred (Stolz et al., 1995). Consumption of fructose in our study seemed not to be favoured by the antifungal *Lb. reuteri* R29 in quinoa and wheat sourdoughs. No fructose was detected in the fermented rice sourdough. The analytical profile index (API) test showed that *Lb. reuteri* R29 was able *in vitro* to ferment maltose, glucose and sucrose (data not shown).

Table 5-2 Initial and residual sugars [mmol/kg flour] from flours and sourdoughs (SD) fermented with *Lb. reuteri* R29.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Fructose</th>
<th>Glucose</th>
<th>Sucrose</th>
<th>Maltose</th>
<th>Raffinose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quinoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flourb</td>
<td>8±2</td>
<td>52±6</td>
<td>46±6</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>73±10</td>
<td>54±14</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flour</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>26±3</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>153±2</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flourb</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>42±8</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>5±1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>42±4</td>
<td>145±14</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>47±9</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Shown results are average values and standard deviations of two independent fermentations, each sample extracted twice; b see also Table 4-2, ND means not detected.

### 5.4.2.2 Impact of flour substrate on LAB viability and acidification rate

The pH value is the most used control parameter during sourdough fermentation technology (Capuani et al., 2012). In fact, the drop in pH is an essential step. The acid production causes an increase in the proteases and amylases activity of the flour which induces protein and starch degradation providing more substrate ensuring further LAB growth. Moreover, it leads to shorter dough mixing times, dough softening and
a reduction of staling in the final product (Arendt et al., 2007). *L. reuteri* R29 was able to grow highly competitively in all sourdough systems. However, the cell growth (Δlog cfu/g) was highest in wheat flour, followed by rice and quinoa; P < 0.01 (Figure 5-1). This favoured cell growth in the wheat sourdough system is likely associated with the high amylase activity in the wheat flour and *L. reuteri*’s preference of metabolising maltose. Phosphorolysis of maltose does not expend ATP for generation of glucose-6-phosphate and is energetically more favourable than hydrolysis (Stolz et al., 1996).

![Figure 5-1 Cell growth after sourdough fermentation (48 h) with *L. reuteri* R29 using different substrates; mean values ± confidence interval (α = 0.05), different lower case letters indicate statistical difference (P < 0.01).](image)

The nature of the flour also has an effect on the acidification rate of the sourdough. In particular, a high mineral content increases the buffering capacity of the sourdough system enabling an enhanced lactic acid production without altering the final pH (Gänzle et al., 1998). As a result of the production process for white rice flour, the mineral rich bran layer is removed from the grain. Therefore, white rice flour is generally inferior in its mineral content and does not significantly contribute to mineral nutrition for most essential elements, when compared to other grain counterparts (Arendt and Zannini, 2013). The white rice flour used in this study had the lowest mineral content of only 0.4 % (Table 5-1). Accordingly, lactic acid
production and TTA value were lowest in rice sourdough after fermentation, nevertheless the lowest pH value of 3.6 (Table 5-3). The highest mineral content was measured for quinoa flour (Table 5-1), where fermentation resulted in the greatest production of lactic acid with corresponding highest TTA when compared to rice and wheat (Table 5-3).

Acetate content in sourdoughs depends on the availability of substrates used as electron acceptors by the lactobacilli (Hamms et al., 1996). Potential electron acceptors are citrate, fructose, malate or fumerate. Wheat flour fermentation resulted in the lowest acetate level, followed by rice and quinoa sourdough (Table 5-3).

Table 5-3 Values for pH, total titratable acid (TTA) and organic acids (lactate and acetate) of flours and sourdough (SD) after fermentation using *Lb. reuteri* R29a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>TTA [mL]</th>
<th>Lactate [mmol/kg]</th>
<th>Acetate [mmol/kg]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quinoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flour</td>
<td>6.2±0.0</td>
<td>3.4±0.1</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.2±0.03</td>
<td>34.66±2.03</td>
<td>505±6</td>
<td>184±9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flour</td>
<td>6.46±0.01</td>
<td>1.55±0.1</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.56±0.02</td>
<td>14.98±1.02</td>
<td>251±12</td>
<td>64±11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flour</td>
<td>6.20±0.01</td>
<td>2.4±0.0</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.81±0.02</td>
<td>18.7±0.2</td>
<td>406±27</td>
<td>49±5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Shown results are average values and standard deviations of two independent fermentations, each sample extracted twice; *b* see also Table 4-2, n.d. means not determined.

### 5.4.2.3 Influence of flour substrate on the quantity of antifungal compounds

Antifungal carboxylic acids were analysed according to Brosnan et al. (2015). This method is thoroughly validated and recoveries of the compounds in the different sourdough matrices were found to range from 60.3 to 104.3%.

The results are presented in Table 5-4. The sourdough fermentation of different flour substrates using the antifungal strain *Lb. reuteri* R29 generated a complex and significantly different profile of antifungal compounds. Extracted quinoa sourdough detected the greatest number of antifungal compounds (n = 11) at a much higher
concentration than what was detected from rice (n = 8) and wheat (n = 9) sourdough. Chromatograms of the identified antifungal compounds from the sourdoughs fermented with the antifungal Lb. reuteri R29 are depicted in Figure 5-2.
Table 5-4 Antifungal compounds [ppm] analysed in freeze dried quinoa, rice and wheat sourdoughs fermented with *Lb. reuteri* R29a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substrate/Antifungal compounds</th>
<th>Quinoa</th>
<th>Rice</th>
<th>Wheat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Catechol</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 4-Hydroxyphenyllactic acid</td>
<td>30.7±7.7</td>
<td>73.2±20.0</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 4-Hydroxybenzoic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1.4±0.1</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Hydrocaffeic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0.1±0.0</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 2-Hydroxyisocaproic acid</td>
<td>651.9±3.8</td>
<td>648.2±44.8</td>
<td>360.0±0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Vanillic acid</td>
<td>133.6±2.1</td>
<td>9.4±0.2</td>
<td>6.9±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Caffeic acid</td>
<td>1.1±0.1</td>
<td>1.8±0.1</td>
<td>2.0±0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 3-Phenyllactic acid</td>
<td>422.1±11.1</td>
<td>85.4±8.4</td>
<td>194.1±3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Phloretic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1.9±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Hydroferulic acid</td>
<td>0.6±0.1</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Benzoic acid</td>
<td>1.6±0.3</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L p-Coumaric acid</td>
<td>10.4±4.2</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0.3±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Ferulic acid</td>
<td>21.9±2.4</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>12.9±0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Salicylic acid</td>
<td>7.0±1.1</td>
<td>3.0±0.4</td>
<td>3.3±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Azelaic acid</td>
<td>28.9±4.1</td>
<td>3.7±0.2</td>
<td>7.2±3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Methylcinnamic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Hydrocinnamic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 2-Hydroxydodecanoic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S β-Hydroxylauric acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Hydroxymyristic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total concentration | 1309.8 | 826.0 | 588.6 |

* Shown results are average values ± standard deviations of two independent fermentations, each sample extracted three times; ND means not detected.

This confirms previous research, that the production of antifungal compounds is substrate specific due to the different initial composition of the substrates (Axel et al., 2015a; Oliveira et al., 2015a; Vermeulen et al., 2006). Lactobacilli can generate energy through different metabolic pathways. The main antifungal compounds found in the quinoa sourdough, 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid and 3-phenyllactic acid, in
concentrations of 625 and 422 ppm, respectively, originate from the LAB amino acid metabolism. LAB need multiple amino acids meeting their nutritional requirements. As such, protein degradation poses another essential step during sourdough fermentation. However, many lactobacilli do not possess extracellular proteinase activity (Pepe et al., 2003). Thus, flour proteases initiated protein degradation contributes greatly for the peptide supply to be uptaken by LAB transport systems into the cell during sourdough fermentation (Gänzle et al., 2008). Intracellular, phenylalanine is converted by a transamination reaction to phenylpyruvic acid. Phenylpyruvic acid is further reduced to 3-phenyllactic acid by a dehydrogenase. 2-Hydroxyisocaproic acid is a by-product of the leucine pathway. The quinoa flour used had a superior protein content, which was almost double that of rice flour; in contrast, starch content was lowest in quinoa flour (Table 5-1). Quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa Willd.*) is a so-called pseudo-cereal, which is dicotyledonous, that is different to the monocotyledonous true cereal grains like wheat and rice. As already mentioned before, its high mineral content also allowed the quinoa sourdough a higher buffering capacity enabling the production of higher acids contents (Table 5-1, Table 5-3). Moreover, due to the highest protease activity of the flour (Table 5-1), protein degradation during fermentation was expected to be also higher in quinoa sourdough fermentation providing more peptides to uptake for LAB amino acids metabolism. The need to gain energy out of the higher amino acid metabolism might be associated to compensate the low starch content of the quinoa flour. Although rice flour had a lower protein content (6.4 %) than wheat flour (11.5 %), its protease activity was more than double as high as the wheat counterpart (Table 5-1). This could explain higher concentration of the antifungal compounds 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid and 4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid (Table 5-4).
Figure 5-2 Chromatograms with identified compounds in samples of quinoa, rice and wheat sourdough doughs fermented with *Lb. reuteri* R29; A) 4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid, B) hydrocaffeic acid, C) 4-hydroxybenzoic acid, D 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid, E) vanillic acid, F) caffeic acid, G) 3-phenyllactic acid, H) phloretic acid, I) hydroferulic acid, J) benzoic acid, K) *p*-coumaric acid, L) ferulic acid, M) salicylic acid, N) azelaic acid; chromatograms from quinoa sample mainly with B and C from rice and H from wheat sample.

The antifungal activity of 3-phenyllactic acid has been recently investigated and MIC between 2,500 to 10,000 ppm are reported (Broberg et al., 2007; Ryan et al., 2011; Ström et al., 2002). Sakko et al. (2014) demonstrated antifungal efficacy for 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid against *Aspergillus sp.* with MIC values greater than 18,000 ppm. Concentrations found in the sourdoughs were much lower.

Another group of antifungal compounds belong to phenolic acids which include derivatives of either cinnamic acid (*p*-coumaric, caffeic, ferulic acids) or benzoic acid (4-hydroxybenzoic, vanillic acids). They are commonly present in insoluble bound forms, typically components of more complex cross-linking polymers, particularly arabinoxylans (Li et al., 2008; Vogel, 2008) providing antioxidant and antimicrobial
activities (Viswanath et al., 2009). Their location is mainly concentrated in the bran fractions of the grains (Adom et al., 2005). Thus, they are present at lower levels in white flours. Ferulate and \(p\)-coumarate are also present in significant quantities in the primary cell walls in one dicot order, the *Caryophyllales*, which includes crops like quinoa. Hager et al. (2012b) found the lowest polyphenol content in wheat and rice flour which were five times lower than in quinoa flour. During sourdough fermentation free phenolics are released by cereal enzymes or chemical reactions which can be catalysed by LAB (Gänzle, 2014). Repeatedly, the composition of the quinoa sourdough samples, concentration of caffeic, \(p\)-coumaric, ferulic and vanillic acid reached the highest total amount of 167 ppm, whereas in the rice sourdough \(p\)-coumaric and ferulic could not be detected (Table 5-4). Further metabolism of these free phenolics is possible due to the activity of strain-specific phenolic acid decarboxylases and cinnamic acid reductases (Svensson et al., 2010). As a result hydrocaffeic acid, hydroferulic acid and phloretic acid can be formed. Caffeic acid, \(p\)-coumaric acid, and ferulic acid were not metabolized by *Lb. reuteri* FUA3168 (Svensson et al., 2010). In our study, *Lb. reuteri* R29-fermented quinoa sourdough with 0.6 ppm, had a very low level of hydroferulic acid, with 1.9 ppm a low level of phloretic acid in wheat sourdough and hydrocaffeic acid was only present at a very low level in the fermented rice flour (Table 5-4). These results indicate a low decarboxylation and reduction rate with *Lb. reuteri* R29.

### 5.4.3 *In situ* application of sourdough biopreservative

The *Lb. reuteri* R29-fermented quinoa, rice and wheat sourdoughs, containing varying levels of antifungal compounds, were used as biopreservatives and incorporated into simple bread recipes. Figure 5-3 represents an overview of the shelf life and mould growth characteristics for the biologically acidified breads as well as for the control breads. In the control breads, the mould free shelf life was shortest in quinoa bread (2 days), followed by rice (3 days) and wheat (4 days). These differences in shelf life when comparing the control breads are mainly associated with the different raw materials and water levels used in the production process. The optimal water level has
to be adjusted for each bread recipe (Hager et al., 2012a). In general, gluten-free breads contain more water in the recipe. Accordingly, gluten-free breads result in higher water activities. Thus, they are more susceptible for microbial spoilage. With the addition of *Lb. reuteri* R29 inoculated sourdough the shelf life was extended by 2 days for quinoa and rice bread. Although there were less antifungal carboxylic acids present in the wheat sourdough, a prolongation of 3 days was achieved for the corresponding sourdough bread (Figure 5-3). The presented results indicate, that the preservation effect of sourdough in the final bread product seems to be much more complex. Using a different antifungal strain, *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280, Axel et al. (2015a) and Ryan et al. (2011) have demonstrated a longer shelf life extension in quinoa and wheat bread, respectively. Less concentration of antifungal carboxylic acids were reported than in this present study. It was concluded, that *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 might produce more compounds concomitantly contributing to the increase of the shelf life in those sourdough breads (Axel et al., 2015a).
Shelf life of quinoa, rice and wheat control breads and sourdough breads fermented with *Lb. reuteri* R29 after challenging against environmental moulds during a 14-day storage period. Bread spoilage is indicated as percentage of the total surface area of each of the 12 slices where fungal outgrowth occurred: Mould free slices (white area), < 10 % mouldy (grey diagonally striped area), 10–24 % mouldy (grey area), 25–49 % mouldy (black horizontally striped area) and > 50 % mouldy (black area). Mean values are shown (n = 2), error bars indicate standard deviations.
5.5 Conclusion

The findings of this study showed that *Lb. reuteri* R29 is a competitive bio-protective starter for the successful production of antifungal active sourdough using wheat and gluten-free flours as substrate.

The origin of the antifungal carboxylic acids studied here, can be well explained by means of flour composition, enzyme activity and LAB metabolic activity during fermentation. The chemical composition of quinoa flour was superior for the production of antifungal carboxylic acids. 3-Phenyllactic acid and 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid were found in highest concentration in all three substrates. As found for rice and wheat sourdough, a lower protein content in the substrate resulted in an inferior production of antifungal compounds. In contrast, a higher protease activity during fermentation (rice) might compensate this lack of protein which can give rise to more amino acid or peptide availability and concomitantly higher antifungal compounds.

However, LAB sourdough fermentation of different flour substrates generates a complex and significantly different profile of antifungal compounds. This might be customized in evaluating more substrates (i.e., sorghum, rye or buckwheat), additional enzyme treatments in sourdough fermentation and possible flour blending for the development of safe cereal-based biopreservatives. Furthermore, it would be interesting to investigate the application of the high in antifungal compounds quinoa sourdough in other gluten-free and wheat breads.

Nevertheless, more research needs to be conducted, evidencing the contribution of antifungal carboxylic acids in sourdough bread in terms of their antifungal activity and concentration. Therefore, the impact of those compounds has to be studied more fundamentally and different species should be included to also compare species depended antifungal profiles.
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6.1 Abstract

This study was undertaken to assess the antifungal performance of three different *Lactobacillus* species. Experiments were conducted *in vitro* and *in situ* to extend the shelf of wheat bread. Standard sourdough analyses were performed characterising acidity and carbohydrate levels. Overall, the strains showed good inhibition *in vitro* against the indicator mould *Fusarium culmorum* TMW4.2043. Sourdough bread fermented with *Lactobacillus amylovorus* DSM19280 performed best in the *in situ* shelf life experiment. An average shelf life extension of six more mould-free days was reached when compared to the non-acidified control bread. A range of antifungal-active acids like 3-phenyllactic acid, 4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid and 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid in quantities between 0.1 ppm and 360 ppm were present in the freeze-dried sourdoughs. Their concentration differed greatly among the species. However, a higher concentration of these compounds could not completely justify the growth inhibition of environmental moulds. In particular, although *Lb. reuteri* R29 produced the highest total concentration of these active compounds in the sourdough, its addition to bread did not result in a longest shelf life. Nevertheless, when the artificial compounds were spiked into a chemically acidified dough, it succeeded in a longer shelf life than achieved only by acidifying the dough. This provides evidence of their synergistic antifungal activity in concentration levels far below their single minimal inhibition concentrations under acidic conditions.
6.2 Introduction

The application of antifungal-active starter cultures in sourdough is a promising strategy to extend the microbial shelf life of bread and lactic acid bacteria (LAB) are well known to produce a range of functional metabolites contributing to the inhibition of mould. Since active compounds responsible for biopreservation are produced in situ, the sourdough can replace chemical preservatives like calcium propionate guaranteeing a clean label besides other advantages like improved flavour, texture and nutritional properties along with higher consumer acceptance (Pawlowska et al., 2012). In general, biopreservatives should feature activity against a broad range of microbial contaminants. A comprehensive overview about individual substances, their possible antifungal mechanism and some applications of antifungal acting LAB was recently reviewed by Crowley et al. (2013). Antifungal compounds include organic acid, fatty acids, carboxylic and phenolic acids, proteinaceous compounds and a variety of other low-molecular weight compounds. As a part of antifungal research, great attention has been placed to study the production and activity of 3-phenyllactic acid in growth media and sourdough; for review see Mu et al. (2012). 3-Phenyllactic acid originates from the catabolism of phenylalanine initiated by a transamination reaction to phenylpyruvic acid where the α-amino group is transferred to a keto acid acceptor by an aminotransferase. Phenylpyruvic acid is further reduced to 3-phenyllactic acid by a dehydrogenase. Subsequently, investigations have demonstrated the substrate and strain dependency of the production of this antifungal compound. Due to its relatively high minimal inhibition concentration (MIC), a complex synergistic mechanism between 3-phenyllactic acid and other metabolites has been proposed to play the key role in antifungal action (Cortés-Zavaleta et al., 2014; Miescher Schwenninger et al., 2008; Ndagano et al., 2011; Niku-Paavola et al., 1999). Accordingly, more antifungal carboxylic acids resulting from the LAB amino acid metabolism, like 4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid from tyrosine, benzoic acid and salicylic acid also from phenylalanine or 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid from leucine, have been detected in LAB fermented MRS broth and sourdough and were related with synergistic antifungal activity (Axel et al., 2015; Brosnan et al., 2014; Dallagnol et al., 2013; Ryan et al., 2011).
Some antifungal starter cultures have been already applied successfully *in situ* bread systems (Axel et al., 2015; Black et al., 2013; Coda et al., 2011; Dal Bello et al., 2007; Ryan et al., 2011; Varsha et al., 2014). However, data for the antifungal metabolites profile produced by LAB in food substrates is still scarce.

Our research aimed to investigate the antifungal performance of three different species of lactobacilli in a wheat sourdough system and their contribution to shelf life extension on bread. Additionally, the synergistic antifungal effect among the compounds was tested *in situ*. Characterisation of the sourdough was carried out and the analysis of antifungal compounds was performed using UHPLC-MS/MS. *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 has previously been reported to be effective against a range of different food spoilage (Axel et al., 2015; Belz et al., 2012; Lynch et al., 2014; Oliveira et al., 2015; Ryan et al., 2011; Waters et al., 2012). *Lb. reuteri* R29 revealed antifungal activity in malting trials (Oliveira et al., 2015). Therefore, these strains were further investigated in wheat sourdough fermentations along with another strain *Lb. brevis* R2Δ, selected for its antifungal traits.
6.3  Materials and Methods

6.3.1  Materials

The characteristics of the wheat flour (baker’s flour, Odlums, Dublin, Ireland) used were the following: moisture, 13.5 %; protein (N x 5.83), 11.5 %; fat, 1.1 %; ash, 1.9 % and total starch, 67.1 %. Additionally, dry yeast (Puratos, Groot-Bijgaarden, Belgium), sugar (Suicra, Dublin, Ireland) and salt (Glacia British Salt Limited, Cheshire, UK) were used in the bread recipe.

Chemicals and analytical standards were mainly purchased from Sigma Aldrich (Dublin, Ireland). The antifungal compound 3-phenyllactic acid was acquired from BaChem (Weil am Rhein, Germany). All analytical standards had a purity of ≥ 95 %.

6.3.2  Cultures, media and growth conditions

The strains *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 patented by Arendt et al. (2009), *Lb. brevis* R2Δ and *Lb. reuteri* R29 were obtained from the culture collection of UCC (School of Food and Nutritional Science, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland). The cultures, stored in 35 % glycerol stock solution at -80 °C, were routinely refreshed on deMan-Rogosa-Sharpe agar (MRS) 5 agar (Meroth et al., 2003) at 30 °C (*Lb. amylovorus* and *Lb. brevis*) and 37 °C (*Lb. reuteri*) for 48 h under anaerobic conditions. For cell counts commercial MRS agar was used (Oxoid, Basingstoke, Hampshire, England) and plates were incubated at same conditions. Both MRS5 and MRS agar were dyed with 0.05 g/L bromocresol green (Sigma-Aldrich, Steinheim, Germany).

*Fusarium culmorum* TMW4.2043, isolated from barley and kindly provided by the culture collection of TU-München Weihenstephan (TMW), was used as indicator fungus. The mould was cultivated on potato-dextrose agar plates (Fluka Chemie AG, Buchs, Switzerland) at 25 °C until sporulation occurred and then stored at 4 °C until further use. The macroconidia were collected by brushing the plate surface with physiological solution and filtering through a 30 μm pore size filter paper (Filter Paper 113 wet strengthened, Whatman International Ltd, Maidstone, England) removing fungal mycelia. Macroconidia in this suspension were counted using a Thoma chamber haemocytometer (Hawksley, Sussex, UK).
6.3.3 Amylolytic and proteolytic activity test

To test the amylolytic activity of the strains, starch agar was prepared containing 3 g/L meat extract, 10 g/L soluble starch as well as 12 g/L agar. After 48 h incubation time using LAB spots (20 µL of a 16 h culture) in wells (4x4 mm), the plate surface was flooded with 10 mL Gram’s iodine solution to make starch hydrolysis visible by a colourless zone surrounding colonies.

The proteolytic activity was tested out on gluten containing agar, pH 4 and 7 according to Wehrle et al. (1999) and on milk agar plates containing 28 g/L skim milk powder, 5 g/L casein peptone, 2.5 g/L yeast extract, 1 g/L glucose, and 15 g/L agar. LAB were spotted and incubated like described for the amylolytic test. After incubation the agar layer was stained for 5 min with 10 mL of a solution of 5 g Coomassie brilliant blue R-250, 500 mL methanol and 92 mL acetic acid in 1 L distilled water. Subsequently the plates were destained overnight with 10 mL using a solution of 250 mL ethanol and 50 mL acetic acid in 1 L of distilled water. Proteolytic activity was indicated as clear zone surrounding LAB spots. The protease and amylase enzymes were not determined.

6.3.4 Preparation of culture cell-free supernatant

Overnight cultures of LAB were inoculated in 500 mL of modified MRS5 broth (1 %), where sodium acetate as well as potassium dihydrogenphosphate were omitted. LAB were grown for 48 h at their optimal temperature mentioned above. Cell-free supernatant (cfs) was prepared by centrifugation (7,500 g for 15 min; 4 °C) and sterile filtration (0.45 µm-pore-size filter; Millipore). Subsequently the cfs was frozen at -80 °C, freeze dried and stored at 4 °C for further antifungal activity investigation. A control was prepared accordingly containing only mMRS5 broth.

6.3.5 Sourdough Type II preparation and analysis

Single colonies from MRS5 agar plates were pre-inoculated in 10 mL MRS5 broth at 30/37 °C for 24 h and subcultured (1 %) in 45 mL of MRS5 broth at 30/37 °C for 16 h. Cells were harvested by centrifugation (5000 rpm, 10 min), washed once and resuspended in 45 mL sterile tap water. Sourdoughs were prepared with an equal
weight of wheat flour and sterile tap water, dough yield (DY) of 200. The starter cultures were added to the sourdough to an initial inoculum of 7 log cfu/g dough. The doughs were fermented at 30 °C (Lb. amylovorus DSM19280 and Lb. brevis R2Δ) and 37 °C (Lb. reuteri R29) for 48 h (stirring thoroughly after 24 h). LAB cell counts were determined at 0 h and 48 h of fermentation. The identity of starter cultures was confirmed by colony morphology and metabolic patterns (Wolter et al., 2014). Fermentation microbiota were dominated by the starter cultures since uniform colony morphology on agar plates were observed with absence of contaminations. Total titratable acidity (TTA) and pH values of the fermented sourdoughs were measured using a standard procedure (Arbeitsgemeinschaft Getreideforschung e.V., 1994).

### 6.3.6 Metabolite analysis in sourdough

An Agilent 1260 high performance liquid chromatography system equipped with a refractive index detector (RID) and an ultra violet-diode array detector (UV/DAD) was used to quantify sugars (0.125-2.5 mM) and organic acids (2-32 mM), respectively. Standard calibration curves were prepared with 5 different concentrations in duplicate. Calibration curves showed good linearity with correlation coefficients of ≥ 0.999 for all compounds. For sugar (fructose, glucose, maltose, raffinose and sucrose) and acid analyses (lactic acid and acetic acid), freeze-dried sourdough samples and flour were extracted with distilled water, clarified with 7 % perchloric acid overnight (16 h, 4 °C) and filtered (0.2 µm pore size filter). Sugars were quantified over the RID (35 °C) by elution of the extract from a Hi-Plex H column (300 x 7.7 mm, 8 µm; Agilent, Cork, Ireland), equipped with a guard column (50 x 7.7 mm, 8 µm; Agilent, Cork, Ireland), using water at a flow rate of 0.6 mL/min at 25 °C. Setting the UV/DAD at 210 nm, lactic and acetic acid in the sourdough were determined after elution with 0.004 M sulphuric acid at 65 °C from the same column and a flow of 0.5 mL/min. Injection volumes were 20 µL.

The analysis of 20 known antifungal compounds (azelaic acid, benzoic acid, caffeic acid, catechol, p-coumaric acid, ferulic acid, hydrocaffeic acid, hydrocinnamic acid, hydroferulic acid, 4-hydroxybenzoic acid, 2-hydroxydodecanoic acid, β-hydroxyxylauric acid, 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid, hydroxymyristic acid, 4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid,
methylcinnamic acid, 3-phenyllactic acid, phloretic acid, salicylic acid, vanillic acid) was carried out using a Waters (Milford MA, USA) Acquity UHPLC system employing an Acquity BEH shield RP18 analytical column (Brosnan et al., 2015). Antifungal compounds were detected using a Waters Quattro Premier triple quadrupole instrument operated in negative electrospray ionisation mode (Milford, MA, USA). QuEChERS method (quick, easy, cheap, effective, rugged and safe) was applied to extract in situ antifungal compounds from the freeze dried wheat sourdough. Recoveries of the compounds in the wheat matrices were found to range from 60.3 % (hydroxymyristic acid) – 97.2 % (p-coumaric acid) (Brosnan et al., 2015).

6.3.7 Evaluation of in vitro antifungal activity

Two different assays, the overlay method and the microtiter plate assay, were employed to determine the in vitro antifungal activity of the strains.

For the overlay method, overnight mMRS5 broth culture at 30°C (L.b. amylovorus DSM19280 and L.b. brevis R2Δ) and 37 °C (L.b. reuteri R29) at concentration $10^7$ cfu/mL were placed as two 5 µL cell spots in the centre of mMRS5 agar plates. These LAB spots were incubated anaerobically for 48 h at 30/37 °C. Subsequently, plates were overlaid with 10 mL cooled malt extract soft agar (0.7 % agar) containing $10^4$ cfu/mL Fusarium spores. Plates were incubated aerobically at room temperature for another 48 h and the antifungal activity was measured as clear zones of inhibition around the bacterial spots.

The microtiter plate assay was performed according to Mauch et al. (2010). The experiments were performed in duplicate.

6.3.8 Evaluation of in situ antifungal activity

A bread shelf life study using a mould environmental challenge method described by Dal Bello et al. (2007) was conducted to assess the in situ antifungal activity of the LAB strains.

To test the antifungal synergy effect of the LAB organic acids, four different types of artificially acidified sourdoughs were prepared. One type of this chemically acidified sourdough (CA) was acidified to 1.4 % (w/w) with a mixture of lactic and acetic acid
(4:1) according to Ryan et al. (2008). The remaining three types were chemically acidified in the same manner, but further spiked with a “cocktail” of the antifungal carboxylic acids according to their production [ppm] in the wheat sourdough which was individually fermented by the Lactobacillus strains – CAS\textsubscript{DSM19280}, CAS\textsubscript{R2∆} and CAS\textsubscript{R29}, as measured in Section 6.3.6 (the concentration were divided in half, considering the dilution factor of 2 from freeze dried sourdough to fresh sourdough). Aqueous stock solutions of the compounds (2 mg/mL) were prepared individually and equivalent aliquots were added to the acidified flour water mix. The water level was corrected accordingly. Sourdoughs were produced with a DY of 200 and to exclude acidification by naturally occurring LAB, chloramphenicol and erythromycin (60 and 200 µg/g dough, respectively) were added to the dough, which was then fermented at 30 °C for 24 h.

To conduct the in situ shelf life test, 20 % w/w flour-based LAB fermented sourdough and the artificial acidified sourdoughs were incorporated into a simple bread recipe (2 % salt, 2 % sugar and 3 % yeast, 63 % water based on flour weight). Non acidified bread was used as a control. Another control bread contained 0.3 % of calcium propionate (CAP) to compare the inhibitory activity of the sourdoughs to that of a chemical preservative.

After baking, the breads were cooled for 2 h at ambient temperature (Ryan et al., 2008). Bread slices of 20 mm thickness were put on a sterile metal rack, exposed to the bakery environment for 5 min on each side and then packed separately into a sterile plastic bag and heat sealed. Ensuring comparable aerobic conditions in each bag, two filter pipette tips were inserted. The bags were examined for mould growth during a 14-day storage period at an average temperature of 20 ± 2 °C. Mould growth was evaluated based on the percentage of the total surface area of each slice where fungal outgrowth occurred (Axel et al., 2015).

### 6.3.9 Statistical analysis

Sourdough extractions were carried out from two independent fermentations, extracting each sample twice. Statistical analysis was performed using Minitab 17 software. Data were checked for outliers and evaluation of significant differences was
performed using one-way analysis of variances (ANOVA). All differences were considered significant at $P < 0.05$. Where $F$-values were significant, pairwise comparisons were carried out with the help of Tuckey’s *post hoc* test to describe the statistical significance between the antifungal, non-antifungal and non-acidified control.
6.4 Results

6.4.1 Enzymatic activity

Figure 6-1 presents the amylase as well as the protease activity tested on starch and milk agar, respectively. All lactobacilli tested were proteolytically active on the casein containing agar; the highest activity were found for *L. reuteri* R29 showing the biggest halo, *L. brevis* R2Δ demonstrated the lowest activity visible in a weak clear zone around the inoculation spot. In addition to proteolytic activity, only *L. amylovorus* DSM19280 exhibited amylolytic activity on starch agar. However, the strains did not show any clear zone on any of the gluten containing plates (data not shown).

![Figure 6-1: Proteolytic activity on milk agar (left) and amylolytic activity on starch agar (right) of *L. amylovorus* DSM19280 (a), *L. brevis* R2Δ (b) and *L. reuteri* R29 (c).](image)

6.4.2 *In vitro* antifungal activity

The *in vitro* antifungal activity of three different LAB strains was investigated using *F. culmorum* TMW4.2043 as target organism.

Using the overlay method, the size of clear zone surrounding the LAB spots varied in degree of antifungal activity between the lactobacilli strains tested against the indicator mould (Figure 6-2). The biggest clear zone was observed for *L. brevis* R2Δ. Although the antifungal strain *L. amylovorus* DSM19280 showed the smallest inhibition zone, the fungal mycelia surrounding its spots were rather thin collapsed
when compared with the smooth and velvety mycelia surface from the other strains and the control plate.

Figure 6-2 Inhibitory zones formed around *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280, *Lb. brevis* R2Δ and *Lb. reuteri* R29 against *F. culmorum* TMW4.2043 after 2 days of incubation in comparison with substrate control (only mMRS5-agar).

The impact on the growth of *F. culmorum* TMW4.2043 in MEB containing different concentrations of antifungal cfs was determined using a microtiter plate assay (Figure 6-3). In the control, where no cfs was added to the MEB, the fungus had a lag phase of about 4 h reaching an optical density at 620 nm (OD620) of 0.6 after 48 h of growth. When 15 % cfs was used, no change in OD620 (meaning no growth of the fungus) was observed over 48 h for all the three cfs produced by the antifungal LAB strains. 7.5 % cfs of *Lb. reuteri* R29 still highly retarded the growth until 44 h. For half of this concentration, the fungus started to grow after 20 h. When the same cfs concentration produced by *Lb. brevis* R2Δ was added, the growth of *F. culmorum* TMW4.2043 was delayed for 24 h. The antifungal *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 only
inhibited its outgrowth for 16 h at 3.75 % cfs concentration. Reducing the concentration of cfs in MEB to less than 2 % caused the loss of antifungal activity for all three LAB strains (data not shown).

Figure 6-3 Growth of *F. culmorum* TMW4.2043 ($10^4$ cfu/mL) in malt extract broth (pH 4) containing: 15 % (●—●), 7.5 % (—x—), 3.75 % (○—○) or 0 % (▲•••▲•••) of cell-free supernatant of (A) *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280; (B) *Lb. brevis* R2Δ and (C) *Lb. reuteri* R29. Data represents the average of a duplicate with standard deviations.

### 6.4.3 Sourdough characterisation

Cell counts after 48 h of fermentation were comparable within the different LAB species and reached concentration between 9.6 and 9.9 log cfu/g (data not shown). Regarding the carbohydrate catabolism during sourdough fermentation different uptake and release of sugars were observed between the lactobacilli species (Table 6-1). In the sourdough sample fermented with the obligate homofermentative *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 glucose and fructose concentration were at the lowest level and maltose content were highest. Glucose contents were higher and similar in *Lb. brevis* R2Δ and *Lb. reuteri* R29 fermented sourdough. Highest amounts of fructose were found in sourdough inoculated with *Lb. brevis* R2Δ. Remarkably, *Lb. reuteri* R29 metabolized the highest amount of maltose resulting in the lowest level of this
disaccharide found in the sourdoughs analysed. Residual sucrose could not be found in any sourdough sample.

Table 6-1 Sourdough characterisation of the fermentation of wheat flour (DY 200) after 48 h fermentation for different species of LAB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wheat Metabolites</th>
<th>Unfermented flour(^b)</th>
<th>Lb. amyllovorus DSM19280(^b)</th>
<th>Lb. brevis R2Δ</th>
<th>Lb. reuteri R29(^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fructose</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>27±1c</td>
<td>52±5a</td>
<td>42±4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glucose</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>14±2b</td>
<td>121±5a</td>
<td>145±14a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sucrose</td>
<td>42±8</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltose</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>176±8a</td>
<td>148±2b</td>
<td>47±9c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raffinose</td>
<td>5±1</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lactate</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>368±11ab</td>
<td>323±20b</td>
<td>406±27a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetate</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>4±1b</td>
<td>49±5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA [mL]</td>
<td>2.4±0.0d</td>
<td>16.3±1.2b</td>
<td>14.9±0.1c</td>
<td>18.7±0.2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>6.20±0.01c</td>
<td>3.79±0.04a</td>
<td>3.93±0.01b</td>
<td>3.81±0.02a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Shown results are average values and standard deviations of two independent fermentations, each sample extracted twice. Values in one row followed by the same lower case letter are not significantly different (P < 0.05); \(^b\) see also Table 4-2; \(^c\) see also Table 5-2, ND means not detected.

In order to compare the sourdough fermentation performance by different LAB starter species in wheat as a substrate, further sourdough analysis were performed (Table 6-1). The final pH values ranged closely from 3.8 to 3.9 and the highest TTA (18.7 mL) was observed in the wheat sourdoughs fermented with Lb. reuteri R29. A pH of 3.9 was measured in the CA. The values correlated well with acetate and lactate production. Most lactate and acetate were produced in doughs fermented with Lb. reuteri R29, 406 and 49 mmol/kg flour, respectively. Whereas Lb. brevis R2Δ showed the lowest formation of acetate and lactate. Lb. amyllovorus DSM19280 as an obligate homofermentative LAB produced 368 mmol/kg flour lactate.
6.4.4  *In situ* antifungal activity and antifungal compounds of LAB fermented sourdough

Out of the 20 antifungal compounds analysed, extracted wheat sourdough fermented with *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 and *Lb. reuteri* R29 detected the greatest number of antifungal compounds (n = 9) at a higher concentration than what was detected from *Lb. brevis* R2Δ fermented sourdough (n = 8). The quantification results given in parts per million (ppm) are presented in Table 6.2.

Table 6.2 Antifungal compounds [ppm] analysed in freeze dried sourdoughs* and their single MIC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAB isolate/ Antifungal compounds</th>
<th><em>Lb. amylovorus</em> DSM19280</th>
<th><em>Lb. brevis</em> R2Δ</th>
<th><em>Lb. reuteri</em> R29</th>
<th>MIC (reference)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azelaic acid</td>
<td>19.0±6.2</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>7.2±3.9</td>
<td>0.1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzoic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1-100&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffeic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0.4±0.0</td>
<td>2.1±0.1</td>
<td>200&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catechol</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1,000&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>p</em>-Coumaric acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0.4±0.0</td>
<td>0.2±0.0</td>
<td>25-100&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferulic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>21.5±1.3</td>
<td>12.9±0.1</td>
<td>100&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocaffeic acid</td>
<td>1.2±0.1</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>10,000&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocinnamic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>100-1,000&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydroferulic acid</td>
<td>43.5±2.2</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1,000&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Hydroxybenzoic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1,000&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Hydroxydodecanoic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>5-25&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>β</em>-Hydroxylauric acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>10-50&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Hydroxyisocaproic acid</td>
<td>44.8±2.5</td>
<td>130.6±4.1</td>
<td>360.0±0.6</td>
<td>72,000&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydroxymyristic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0.1±0.0</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>10-100&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Hydroxyphenyllactic acid</td>
<td>22.2±2.2</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>5,000&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methylcinnamic acid</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>670&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Phenyllactic acid</td>
<td>67.6±1.6</td>
<td>7.78±0.19</td>
<td>194.1±3.5</td>
<td>2,500-10,000&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phloreptic acid</td>
<td>1.3±0.1</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1.9±0.0</td>
<td>100-10,000&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salicylic acid</td>
<td>0.6±0.1</td>
<td>1.2±0.2</td>
<td>3.3±0.0</td>
<td>0.1-1&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanillic acid</td>
<td>18.5±1.8</td>
<td>8.9±0.3</td>
<td>6.9±0.2</td>
<td>100&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total concentration</strong></td>
<td><strong>218.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>171.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>588.7</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Shown results are average values ± standard deviations of two independent fermentations, each sample extracted three times, see also Table 6-4.  
<sup>a</sup> Broberg et al. 2007,  
<sup>b</sup> Aziz et al. 1998,  
<sup>c</sup> Sjögren et al. 2003,  
<sup>d</sup> Sakko et al. 2014,  
<sup>e</sup> Ryan et al. 2011, ND means not detected.

The composition of the antifungal compounds produced during sourdough fermentation differed enormously among the LAB species. Overall, *Lb. reuteri* R29...
was the best producer reaching a total concentration of 589 ppm. 2-Hydroxyisocaproic acid and 3-phenyllactic acid were the main compounds formed by this strain reaching a concentration of 360 and 194 ppm, respectively. Hydrocaffeic acid (1 ppm) and hydroferulic acid (44 ppm) and 4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid (22 ppm) resulted only from the metabolism of *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280. For this strain the sum of antifungal carboxylic acids yielded a concentration of about 219 ppm. *Lb. brevis* R2Δ produced with 171 ppm a slightly lower total concentration of antifungal acids whereas 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid (131 ppm) and ferulic acid (22 ppm) were the main compounds. Furthermore, its 3-phenyllactic acid production yielded only 8 ppm. Chromatograms and mass spectra of 3-phenyllactic acid and 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid are depicted in Figure 6-4. The variance in peak size points out the differences in concentration of 3-phenyllactic acid and 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid between the three *Lactobacillus* strains.
Figure 6-4 Chromatograms of 3-phenyllactic acid (I) and 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid (II) derived from extracts of wheat sourdough fermented with *Lb. reuteri* 29 (A), *Lb. brevis* R2Δ (B) and *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 (C). Mass spectra of 3-phenyllactic acid (ID) and 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid (IID).

Figure 6-5 represents an overview of the shelf life for the LAB sourdough breads as well as for the control breads and artificial spiked breads. The higher spoilage rate of the non-acidified control bread in comparison to the biologically acidified breads revealed that LAB fermented sourdough breads retarded naturally, with different extent, the outgrowth of environmental fungi. The maximum average shelf life of 10 mouldy-free days was obtained for the sourdough bread fermented with the antifungal strain *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280. The non-acidified control showed first fungal spoilage after 4 days. Furthermore, fungi grew more rapidly on this control, whereas further fungal outgrowth was prevented for the sourdough breads. At the end of the storage period, about 30% of the control bread slices were completely spoiled. *Lb. brevis* R2Δ and *Lb. reuteri* R29 fermented sourdough breads, in the same experimental conditions, extended the bread shelf life for two and three days,
respectively. Compared to the non-acidified control breads, the addition of CA increased the shelf-life by one more day. The CAS were spiked additionally with antifungal acids to test synergy among the compounds in different concentration levels. Remarkably, due to the inclusion of this antifungal “cocktail”, the shelf life increased for another day for CAS\textsubscript{DSM19280} and CAS\textsubscript{R2A} and 2 days for CAS\textsubscript{R29} in comparison to the CA bread. Like that the shelf life of CAS\textsubscript{R29} and \textit{Lb. reuteri} R29 fermented sourdough bread was comparable. The bread with added CAP achieved a mould-free shelf life of 6 days.
Figure 6-5 Shelf life of wheat bread against environmental moulds during a 14-day storage period. Bread spoilage is indicated as percentage of the total surface area of each of the 12 slices where fungal outgrowth occurred: Mould-free slices (white area), <10 % mouldy (grey diagonally striped area), 10–24 % mouldy (grey area), 25–49 % mouldy (black horizontally striped area) and >50 % mouldy (black area). Mean values are shown (n = 2); error bars indicate standard deviations.
6.5 Discussion

As expected, due to the different metabolism of the lactobacilli species, the strains showed different carbohydrate catabolism and acid production (Table 6-1). The preference of glucose fermentation by *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 was evident showing the lowest concentration left in the sourdough sample. The high amylolytic activity of this strain (Figure 6-1) further contributed to glucose provision and depletion. Hexose metabolism in homofermentative LAB occurs via the Emden-Meyerhoff pathway wherein glucose is generally metabolised before fructose and maltose (Gänzle et al., 2007). In heterofermentative LAB like *Lb. brevis* and *Lb. reuteri* maltose is metabolized by choice via the maltose phosphorylase pathway and fructose is utilized as an electron acceptor to mannitol (Gänzle et al., 2007).

All the three lactobacilli strains showed good inhibition *in vitro* against the indicator mould *F. culmorum* TMW4.2043 (Figure 6-2 and Figure 6-3). Nevertheless, technological application of biopreservatives requires appropriate *in situ* tests against a broad range of contaminants. Thus, a bakery environmental challenge test was applied on the different produced bread samples. The antifungal abilities of *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 showed the best performance in the *in situ* shelf life experiment, although the *in vitro* activity against the indicator mould showed higher inhibition with the other species. This result reinforces the suitability of *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 as an antifungal adjunct for food products.

The higher glucose concentration in the sourdoughs fermented by the heterofermentative *Lb. brevis* R2Δ and *Lb. reuteri* R29 and accordingly in the bread recipe could have also contributed to the higher mould growth on their bread slices. However, it is likely that most of this glucose was depleted during the bread dough fermentation by the Baker’s yeast. Furthermore, due to the relatively low binding specificity of the fungi’s transport protein for glucose other sugars will be transported if glucose is absent (Deacon, 2005).

Overall, a specific different profile of antifungal compounds was found in the sourdough samples. These variations are partially explained by species specific metabolic differences; however, as only one strain was chosen for each of the species, strain specific variations may additionally influence the profile of antifungal
compounds in wheat sourdough (Ryan et al., 2009). Some of the antifungal compounds analysed in the sourdough samples are derivates resulted from amino acid metabolism during LAB fermentation. Thus, the higher the proteolysis in sourdough fermentation takes place, the more potential substrates for antifungal compounds formation like 3-phenyllactic acid and 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid are formed. Previous studies have reported the 3-phenyllactic production by *Lb. amylovorus*, *Lb. reuteri* and for some strains of *Lb. brevis* (Gerez et al., 2009; Ryan et al., 2011; Valerio et al., 2004). All the lactobacilli tested in our study showed proteolytic activity on milk agar. *Lb. reuteri* R29 was the highest proteolytic active strain (Figure 6-1). Likewise, this strain also produced the highest amounts of 3-phenyllactic acid and 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid (Table 6-2). Phenolic acids like caffeic, ferulic or *p*-coumaric acid occur naturally in wheat, predominantly in bound form (Li et al., 2008). During sourdough fermentation free phenolics are released by cereal enzymes or chemical reactions which can be catalysed by LAB (Gänzle, 2014). Further metabolism of these free phenolics is possible due to the activity of strain-specific phenolic acid decarboxylases and cinnamic acid reductases (Svensson et al., 2010). As a result of cinnamic acid reductase activity hydrocaffeic acid, hydroferulic acid and phloretic acid can be formed. Caffeic acid, *p*-coumaric acid, and ferulic acid were not metabolized by *Lb. reuteri* (Svensson et al., 2010). In our study, the sourdough samples of *Lb. brevis* R2Δ and *Lb. reuteri* R29 still contained these unreduced forms (Table 6-2) indicating low or absent reductase activity. It seems that *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 metabolism harbours cinnamic acid reductases activity. In the sourdough sample fermented with this strain, remarkable amounts of hydroferulic acid and also hydrocaffeic and phloretic acid were present indicating that free ferulic acid, caffeic acid and *p*-coumaric acid were further metabolised (Table 6-2). More research is required to confirm which enzymes are involved in the ability of *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 to degrade phenolic acids in foods. Decarboxylation of phenolic acids and reduced phenolic acids can result into vinyl and ethyl phenols, respectively (Curiel et al., 2010). Low ferulic acid decarboxylation rate was observed for strains *Lb. brevis*, whereas *p*-coumaric acid and caffeic acid were completely decarboxylated (Curiel et al., 2010). The extracted sourdough sample derived from the *Lb. brevis* R2Δ fermentation resulted in the
highest ferulic acid content and very low contents of $p$-coumaric acid and caffeic acid were detected. However, the method of Brosnan et al. (2015) does not include the detection of vinyl and ethyl phenols. This leads to the need of further studies to clarify the metabolism of phenolic compounds on LAB.

In relation to the shelf life extension of the wheat sourdough breads, the analysis of antifungal carboxylic acids revealed that a higher concentration of these compounds cannot justify completely the growth inhibition of environmental moulds on the bread slices. In particular, although *Lb. reuteri* R29 produced the highest total concentration of these active compounds in the sourdough (Table 6.2), the bread did not show the longest shelf life (Figure 6.5). Cortés-Zavaleta et al. (2014) tested *in vitro* the antifungal activity of 7 lactobacilli. The maximal antifungal activity was found in both the highest 3-phenyllactic acid producer *Lb. casei* 21/1 (46 ppm) and the non-PLA producer *Lb. acidophilus* ATCC-4495. In our study, the longest shelf life was achieved with the *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 fermented sourdough which yielded in less than half of the active antifungal acids (Table 6.2). In an additional experiment, antifungal carboxylic acids were spiked as a “cocktail” into a chemically acidified sourdough. A mould-free shelf life of 7 days was reached with the highest concentration CAS$_{R29}$ which was similar to the shelf life of the *Lb. reuteri* R29 fermented sourdough bread (Figure 6.5). The use of 20% sourdough in the bread recipe correlates to a 1:5 dilution (in bread). Taking bake loss into account (12%), the average concentration of the antifungal carboxylic acids in the bread would amount about 30 ppm and for lactic and acetic acid maximal 4500 and 360 ppm, respectively. An overview about the single MIC for the compounds is also presented in Table 6.2. For example, the MIC ranging from 2,500 to 10,000 ppm for 3-phenyllactic acid and 5,000 ppm for 4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid (Broberg et al., 2007; Ryan et al., 2011). 2-Hydroxyisocaproic acid has a broad antibacterial activity, but little is known of the efficacy against pathogenic fungi. Sakko et al. (2014) determined a very high single MIC (72,000 ppm) for 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid against *Aspergillus fumigatus* and *A. terreus*. At pH 5 the MIC values for acetic acid ranged 1200–7200 ppm and above 45,000 ppm for lactic acid (Lind et al., 2005). Our results confirm that under acidic conditions synergistic activity of these compounds in concentration levels far below their single MIC exist for mould inhibition.
3-Phenyllactic acid and the other compounds are not allowed by legislation to be used as food additives. Researching the metabolism pathway, health and possible toxicity effects of those antifungal compounds should be conducted to ascertain their food safety regardless the authorised use of many lactobacilli within the European Union (EFSA, 2012).

Ryan et al. (2011), Lynch et al. (2014) and Oliveira et al. (2015) investigated antifungal metabolites produced by antifungal *L.b. amylovorus* DSM19280 and *L.b. reuteri* R29 in MRS broth and wort. Due to the higher production of the antifungal carboxylic acids in this study, wheat flour seems to be a better substrate. This is not surprisingly, flour has a higher protein content than wort and MRS and since during sourdough fermentation flour enzymes are activated more cofactors are provided for LAB metabolism. In a previous study of our group, UV-active antifungal compounds extracted from quinoa and wheat sourdough were analysed using a HPLC-DAD method (Axel et al., 2015). Low recovery rates and high matrix effects complicated data evaluation. In the current study, matrix effects could be minimalized by matrix calibration and peak purity was confirmed with mass spectrometry, Figure 6-4 (Brosnan et al., 2015). However, the diversity of antifungal compounds and different methodical approaches to analyse them in the literature, leads the authors to speculate that other unknown antifungal compounds not analysed in this study could also be present and further contribute to mould inhibition. This could one reason, why *L.b. amylovorus* DSM19280 fermented wheat sourdough bread reached the longest shelf life. Further investigations could explore peptide-based antifungal compounds, which might act additionally for the distinct shelf life extension.

In conclusion, *L.b. amylovorus* DSM19280, *L.b. brevis R2Δ* and *L.b. reuteri* R29 produced a range of known antifungal active carboxylic acids in different quantities during wheat flour fermentation. Interestingly, the maximal antifungal activity *in situ* could not be related to *L.b. reuteri* R29 being the highest producer of these compounds. However, the addition of CAS to the bread recipe succeeded in a longer shelf life than achieved only by acidifying the dough evidencing their contribution to the antifungal activity and their synergy.
6.6 Acknowledgements

Funding for Claudia Axel was received through a Science Foundation Ireland scholarship through a research program no. 11/ RFP.1/EOB/3204. This research was also partly funded by Irish Department of Agriculture Food Institutional Research Measure, Ireland. The authors would also like to thank Bettina Röcker and Marcus Schmidt for their technical support.
6.7 References


Chapter 7  General Discussion
7.1 General Discussion

In recent years, interest in food biopreservation has dramatically increased. Evidence for this movement is shown in the bakery market since the advertisement of the absence of additives/preservatives represented 21% of new bread products launched in Europe in 2013/2014 (Mintel, 2014). Fermentation, a process based on the growth of microorganisms in foods, is considered to be one of the most established practices in food biopreservation. The microorganism most widely used as starter cultures are LAB. A literature review was conducted as part of this thesis (Chapter 2). This study revealed that sourdough fermented with antifungal strains of LAB is the most studied biopreservation method for bread products and serves as a high-potential biological ingredient to produce gluten-containing and gluten-free breads with an improved nutritional value, bread quality and safety due to an extended shelf life meeting present consumer needs (Arendt et al., 2007; Moroni et al., 2009; Pawlowska et al., 2012; Zannini et al., 2012). Nevertheless, only a few applications of selected LAB starters are currently documented both at artisan and industrial levels (Corsetti, 2013). This makes the investigation of more suitable LAB strains important. Moreover, increasing the knowledge about the origin of the antifungal effect is fundamental for further enhancement of biopreservation. The production of antifungal compounds depends on the microbial growth and metabolic activity of each strain which are further influenced by endogenous factors such as substrate composition, enzymes and microbial interaction (Meroth et al., 2003; Van der Meulen et al., 2007; Vermeulen et al., 2006).

The LAB strains *Lb. amylovorum* DSM19280, *Lb. brevis* R2Δ and *Lb. reuteri* R29 were investigated for *in situ* cereal fermentations based on preliminary *in vitro* trials and previous antifungal studies.

A HRGC/MS method for the identification and quantification of the antifungal active compounds cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro), cyclo(Met-Pro) and cyclo(Phe-Pro) was successfully developed by using stable isotope dilution assays with the deuterated counterparts (Chapter 3). This study represents the first report of quantification of
cyclic dipeptides using SIDAs in LAB fermentates. Overall, the concentrations of cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro), and cyclo(Phe-Pro) increased only moderately by the fermentation activity of the selected microorganism (Table A-I). Statistical analysis of the quantitative results showed, that in the \textit{Lb. brevis} R2Δ fermented MRS-broth, the concentrations of cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro) and cyclo(Phe-Pro) were significantly higher (P < 0.05), as in wort for cyclo (Leu-Pro) when compared to their controls. A connection was linked between the formation of these three cyclic dipeptides and \textit{Lb. brevis} R2Δ fermentation. However, the determined increases induced by \textit{Lb. brevis} R2Δ amounted only to about 20 \% in MRS broth and 10 \% in wort. This was associated most likely as a sight effect resulted by acid induced cyclization of more precursor formed linear dipeptides. In \textit{Lb. reuteri} R29 fermented MRS-broth the concentration of only two cyclic dipeptides, cyclo(Leu-Pro) and cyclo(Phe-Pro) increased significantly (P < 0.05). Whereas \textit{Lb. amylovorus} DSM19280 fermentation induced the least increase in cyclic dipeptides (Table A-I). Concentrations of cyclic dipeptides investigated in the LAB fermented supernatants in this study are much below the MIC necessary to inhibit many of the fungi reported, as an individual antifungal compound (Ryan et al., 2011; Ström et al., 2002; Yan et al., 2004). Thus, the antifungal activity of the cyclic dipeptides plays here a minor role. Synergistic effects along with other antifungal compounds are possible, but require further studies. The novel application of deuterated cyclic dipeptides for SIDA reported here can potentially be used for analyses of cyclic dipeptides in other liquid matrices, including beverages. However, the synthesis of the \textsuperscript{2}H-labelled cyclic dipeptides should be improved since it resulted in low yields and multicomponent mixtures of labelled isotopomers. A better H–D exchange might overcome the encountered problems by using heterogeneous catalyst systems (Pd/C-, Pt/C-, or/and Rh/C) in the presence of deuterium oxide and hydrogen gas (Modutlwa et al., 2010).

The potential and suitability of the antifungal strains to improve the microbial shelf life of gluten-containing and gluten-free bread was evaluated in the second part of this thesis (Chapter 4, Chapter 5 and Chapter 6). Therefore, three different flours
(quinoa, rice and wheat) were selected as fermentation substrates and fully characterised (Table 5.1). The shelf life of the breads was monitored using the mould environmental challenge method as developed by Dal Bello et al. (2007).

The suitability of *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 to ferment gluten-free quinoa flour, where the sourdough was then incorporated into a gluten-free bread recipe was investigated (Chapter 4). Evaluation of bread characteristics such as specific volume or crumb hardness, revealed that the addition of *Lb. amylovorus* fermented sourdough improved gluten-free bread quality like higher specific volumes, softer crumb structure and slower staling rates. Sourdough addition to gluten-free bread is reported to better keep freshness over storage (Moore et al., 2007; Wolter et al., 2014). High starch contents trigger staling in gluten-free breads (Hager et al., 2012). The low starch content of quinoa flour seemed to have a significant influence on its low rate of staling, which can be even improved by the addition of sourdough. Nevertheless, since a basic recipe was used without the inclusion of other ingredients/additives like fibres, hydrocolloids or egg protein usually added to gluten-free bread formulation (Zannini et al., 2012), the quinoa bread quality in this study was inferior in comparison to available commercial products. However, the antifungal quinoa sourdough serves as a high potential biopreservative ingredient for such commercial products. The mould free shelf life of the quinoa breads increased for 4 days (+200 %) in comparison to the non-acidified control when the sourdough fermented with *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 was incorporated in the bread recipe (Figure 4.3). A prolongation of only 2 days (+100 %) was achieved with addition of *Lb. amylovorus* DSM20531T fermented and CA sourdough. *Lb. amylovorus* DSM20531T was chosen as a non-antifungal negative control strain. The better biopreservative efficacy of *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 fermented quinoa sourdough was related to the higher concentration of antifungal compounds analysed in this sourdough. The concentration of 4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid, phloretic acid, 3-phenyllactic acid and hydroferulic acid were significantly higher (P<0.01) in the quinoa sourdough fermented with the antifungal *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 when compared to the control strain, thus indicating their contribution to the antifungal activity. These
results confirm previous studies conducted, that the antifungal activity is strain specific (Oliveira et al., 2015; Ryan et al., 2011, 2009). 15 UV-active antifungal compounds extracted from quinoa and wheat sourdough were analysed using a HPLC-DAD method (Figure 4-4); the extraction method was adapted from Brosnan et al. (2014). Low recovery rates and high matrix effects complicated data evaluation. Since the method of Brosnan et al. (2014) describes the extraction of antifungal compounds from MRS-broth matrices, the difficulties encountered with the analysis of the antifungal compounds in Chapter 4 were probably matrix related applying the extraction method to the freeze dried sourdough samples. These matrix effects were minimalized with an improved extraction procedure and matrix calibration (Brosnan et al., 2015). Moreover, peak purity of the antifungal compounds was confirmed with mass spectrometry which further implemented the detection of 5 more non-UV-active compounds (Brosnan et al., 2015).

Using this improved method, the production of the antifungal compounds was studied as part of the sourdough investigation using the antifungal strain \textit{Lb. reuteri} R29 for the fermentation of quinoa, rice and wheat flour (Chapter 5). The flour characterisation and known metabolic pathways generally described for \textit{Lb. reuteri} enabled correlations between the sourdough fermentation, \textit{Lb. reuteri} R29 metabolism and substrate features. \textit{Lb. reuteri} R29 sourdough fermentation of the different flour substrates generated a complex and significantly different profile of antifungal compounds (Table 5-4). The protein content of quinoa flour was found to be superior for the production of the antifungal carboxylic acids, 3-phenyllactic acid and 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid originated from the metabolism of the amino acids phenylalanine and leucine, respectively. As found for rice and wheat sourdough, a lower protein content in the substrate resulted in a lower production of these antifungal compounds. In contrast, a higher protease activity during fermentation (rice) might have compensated its lack of protein which could give rise to more amino acid or peptide availability and concomitantly higher antifungal compounds. This could explain the higher 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid content in the rice sourdough when compared to the wheat sourdough. Another group of antifungal compounds belong to phenolic acids which include derivatives of either cinnamic acid (\textit{p}-coumaric,
caffeic, ferulic acids) or benzoic acid (4-hydroxybenzoic, vanillic acids). Repeatedly, the composition of the quinoa flour favoured the formation of antifungal compounds, here p-coumaric, caffeic, ferulic acid and vanillic acid.

Regarding the shelf life, the addition of *Lb. reuteri* R29 fermented sourdough could prolong the mould-free days (Figure 5-3). However, a better preservative effect in quinoa sourdough bread was achieved when *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 fermented quinoa sourdough was used (Chapter 4), although the concentration of the antifungal compounds found in that biopreservative were much lower.

The same effect was observed in the last study conducted for this thesis (Chapter 6). *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280, *Lb. brevis* R2∆ and *Lb. reuteri* R29 were used for wheat flour fermentations and their *in situ* antifungal performance in the breads were tested. As expected, due to the different metabolism of the *Lactobacillus* species, the strains showed different carbohydrate catabolism and acid production (Table 6-1). Overall a specific different profile of antifungal compounds was found in the sourdough samples (Table 6-2). *Lb. reuteri* R29 was the best producer reaching a total concentration of the antifungal compounds of 589 ppm. 2-Hydroxyisocaproic acid and 3-phenyllactic acid were the main compounds formed by this strain reaching a concentration of 360 and 194 ppm, respectively. *Lb. brevis* R2∆ produced with 171 ppm the lowest total concentration of antifungal acids with 131 ppm 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid and 22 ppm ferulic acid being the main compounds. Furthermore, its 3-phenyllactic acid production yielded only 8 ppm. The variations in concentration of the antifungal compounds were partially explained by species-specific metabolic differences; however, as only one strain was chosen for each of the species, strain specific variations may additionally influence the profile of antifungal compounds in wheat sourdough (Ryan et al., 2009). This was also found in the study conducted in Chapter 4. The highest proteolytic activity of the antifungal *Lb. reuteri* R29 might have contributed to the higher level of 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid and 3-phenyllactic acid. However, this would need to be confirmed in further studies. In relation to the shelf life extension of the wheat sourdough breads, the analysis of antifungal carboxylic acids revealed, that a higher concentration of these compounds cannot justify completely the growth inhibition of environmental moulds on the bread
slices. In particular, although *Lb. reuteri* R29 produced the highest total concentration of these active compounds in the sourdough (Table 6-2), the bread did not show the longest shelf life (Figure 6-5) as this was assigned to *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280. In an additional experiment, antifungal carboxylic acids, based on the analysis of the biologically acidified samples, were spiked into a chemically acidified sourdough. A mould-free shelf life of 7 days (+ 75 %) was reached with the highest concentration CAS$_{R29}$ which was similar to the shelf life of the *Lb. reuteri* R29 fermented sourdough bread (Figure 6-5). The shelf life for CAS$_{DSM19280}$ and CAS$_{R2\Delta}$ increased only by + 50 %. Conclusively, the chemically application of the antifungal compounds succeeded in a longer shelf life than achieved only by acidifying the dough (+ 25 %) evidencing their contribution to the antifungal activity and their synergy. Considering the addition of sourdough at 20 % flour based to the bread recipe and taking bake loss into account, the average concentration of the antifungal compounds in the bread would amount about 30 ppm and for lactic and acetic acid maximal 4500 and 360 ppm, respectively. The results further confirm, that under acidic conditions synergistic activity of these compounds in concentration levels far below their single MIC exist for mould inhibition as proposed by other studies (Cortés-Zavaleta et al., 2014; Miescher Schwenninger et al., 2008; Ndagano et al., 2011; Niku-Paavola et al., 1999). Bread is baked at high oven temperatures (200-220 °C). Therefore, bread preservatives should be heat stable and losses due to evaporation should also be avoided. The antifungal carboxylic acids analysed in this study have boiling points generally higher than 250 °C. Heat stability of 3-phenyllactic acid was further proven (Cortés-Zavaleta et al., 2014; Gerez et al., 2013). Moreover, the bread crust which is formed during baking can act as a barrier to prevent compounds from being transferred from the crumb to external space (Onishi et al., 2011). For the outstanding antifungal performance of *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280, it leads to speculate, that other unknown antifungal compounds not analysed in this study are also produced by this strain and further contribute to mould inhibition. However, this requires further studies. Furthermore, it would be interesting to study, how the production of the antifungal compounds could be improved for examples by the
additional usage of protein/peptides and proteolytic enzymes or by the fermentation of phenolic rich flour bran fractions.

Overall, the findings of this study showed that *Lb. amylavorus* DSM19280, *Lb. brevis* R2Δ and *Lb. reuteri* R29 are competitive bio-protective starters for the successful production of antifungal active sourdough using wheat and gluten-free flours as substrate. Furthermore, this study contributed to further knowledge about the origin of the antifungal effect helping to further enhance biopreservation.
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### Appendix A  Additional table

Table A-1 Concentration of cyclo(Leu-Pro), cyclo(Pro-Pro), cyclo(Met-Pro) and cyclo(Phe-Pro) in cultures of *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280, *Lb. brevis* R2Δ, *Lb. reuteri* R29, acid treated broth and in unfermented controls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Cyclo (Leu-Pro) [mg/L]</th>
<th>Cyclo (Pro-Pro) [mg/L]</th>
<th>Cyclo (Met-Pro) [mg/L]</th>
<th>Cyclo (Phe-Pro) [mg/L]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. amylovorus</em> DSM19280</td>
<td>0.55±0.01b</td>
<td>&lt; 0.06*</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1*</td>
<td>0.68±0.01A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. brevis</em> R2Δ</td>
<td>0.60±0.01A</td>
<td>&lt; 0.06*</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1*</td>
<td>0.64±0.03A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. reuteri</em> R29</td>
<td>0.61±0.01A</td>
<td>&lt; 0.06*</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1*</td>
<td>0.67±0.03A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfermented</td>
<td>0.55±0.01b</td>
<td>&lt; 0.06*</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1*</td>
<td>0.64±0.03A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MRS-Broth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. amylovorus</em> DSM19280</td>
<td>7.57±0.12b</td>
<td>0.53±0.04b</td>
<td>14.32±0.16c</td>
<td>9.09±0.45b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. brevis</em> R2Δ</td>
<td>8.13±0.07a</td>
<td>0.63±0.04a</td>
<td>14.20±0.28a</td>
<td>11.85±0.24a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lb. reuteri</em> R29</td>
<td>8.12±0.05a</td>
<td>0.58±0.04ab</td>
<td>14.29±0.17a</td>
<td>11.71±0.21a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acidified</td>
<td>7.77±0.11b</td>
<td>0.61±0.03a</td>
<td>13.60±0.09b</td>
<td>11.21±0.50c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfermented</td>
<td>6.81±0.13c</td>
<td>0.52±0.03b</td>
<td>14.28±0.14c</td>
<td>9.81±0.16b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values ± SD (n = 3); analysis performed by one-way ANOVA and pairwise comparisons using Fisher’s LSD procedure; mean values within columns labelled with a common upper case letter from the wort samples are not significantly different (P < 0.05); mean values within columns labelled with a common lower case letter from the broth samples are not significantly different (P < 0.05);* concentration lower than limit of detection.
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Abstract

Issues with fungal contamination are of major concern to consumers who demand safe food products with reduced chemical preservatives. The use of lactic acid bacteria (LAB) starter cultures with antifungal activity have been employed to combat such issues by causing a delay/reduction in fungal contamination improving food quality, safety and extending product shelf-life. Most studies to date have been completed under laboratory conditions. The number of in situ applications to food is increasing but knowledge of the compounds produced by these antifungal LAB in situ is still very limited. Characterisation of these compounds in situ is vital to enhance the understanding of how antifungal activity is occurring. A QuEChERS method to detect and quantify antifungal compounds from LAB in MRS broth has previously been developed by this group. The method described herein demonstrates the application of this QuEChERS method to extract in situ antifungal compounds from sourdough (rice, wheat and quinoa). These in situ compounds (n = 20) were detected by the most comprehensively validated UHPLC-MS/MS chromatography developed to date that allows for a wide range of antifungal compounds to be identified in a single method with a short analysis time (7 minutes).

1. Introduction

Food safety is a common worldwide concern; therefore regulators and food scientists are constantly looking for safe methods to combat such issues. Fungal contamination of food is a major problem; as it causes enormous economic losses (i.e., yield and production losses, increased waste and food shortages) and may cause human intoxications following the consumption of foods contaminated with fungal mycotoxins, which are associated with several acute and chronic diseases in humans [1-3]. Consumers desire minimally processed foods, without the use of chemical preservatives that provide little or no compromise to the nutritional status [4]. This is a challenge for the food industry, which has led to the revival of food fermentations and biopreservation techniques. The shelf life of food can be enhanced by directly adding lactic acid bacteria (LAB) as starter cultures to food as they compete with other microflora (both bacterial and fungal) for nutrients and by their production of
antimicrobial metabolites [4]. LAB are an important group of industrial starter cultures that can be applied to the production of fermented foods such as yogurt, cheese, dry sausage, sauerkraut and sourdough [5]. The suitability of using LAB for this is mainly due to their GRAS (Generally Recognised As Safe) and QPS (Qualified Presumption of Safety) status. When used in foods they provide improved organoleptic attributes and help to extend the shelf-life of the food material [6].

The addition of sourdough to bread has been shown to be a promising procedure for reducing / delaying the occurrence of fungal spoilage [7-12]. Sourdough is a fermented flour and water mixture that can be inoculated with LAB starter cultures. As a technology, sourdough has been long established to improve and diversify the sensory quality of bread [13]. This is advantageous as it complements consumers’ demands for natural and additive-free food products [14]. LAB are the predominant microorganisms used as starter cultures for sourdough [15]. Recently some of these starter cultures have been shown to provide extended shelf life due to their antifungal activity [16, 17]. The antifungal activity observed is attributed to the lowering of the pH by lactic and acetic acids as well as from the production of low molecular weight compounds formed by antifungal LAB during fermentation [5]. Hence, use of the appropriate LAB starter cultures in sourdough fermentation can reduce the risks of the growth and survival of food borne pathogens and food spoilage organisms [18]. Comprehensive studies have shown the in vitro activity of LAB against various fungi [19-21]. However, their role in preventing food spoilage in situ needs more scientific investigations including the analysis of antifungal analytes present in situ.

Several studies have been completed to investigate the in situ use of antifungal LAB strains as starter cultures in sourdough [7-9, 11, 22-26]. There use has been shown to provide increased shelf-life and improve the quality for wheat bread [7, 22, 26] and gluten free bread [9]. Studies also showed a reduction in the amount of chemical preservatives required due to use of the antifungal LAB strain [8, 11, 24]. Some of these studies identified the antifungal compounds produced by the LAB strain in cell free supernatant by employing SPE, semi-preparative HPLC, NMR, MS and GC analysis [25]. From these studies very few studies have been completed where compounds were extracted directly from the food matrices [23]. The methods detailed
long multistep procedure for the isolation of antifungal compounds from bread. While these methods detect antifungal compounds use of multiple extraction steps are time consuming, require large amounts of solvents and material and the methods are more prone to losses. For these reasons, a high throughput and sensitive analytical method for the confirmation of antifungal compounds in several food matrices is required. Recently, an extraction procedure defined as quick, easy, cheap, effective, rugged and safe (QuEChERS) has been developed for the extraction of antifungal compounds from MRS broth [27]. QuEChERS has several advantages as a method. It is simple, uses small amounts of solvent, has minimal waste steps and is very effective for cleaning up complex samples [28-30].

This paper reports an ultra-high performance liquid chromatography (UHPLC)-ESI-MS/MS method for the confirmation of twenty previously identified antifungal compounds from LAB in sourdough (rice, wheat and quinoa as flour substrates). The method consisted of a newly developed QuEChERS clean-up step which examined the extraction methods efficiency over several different sourdough matrices. These sourdoughs have been inoculated with an antifungal strain that has shown good antifungal activity in vitro and in situ [25]. The final extracts were separated by UHPLC and analysed by ESI-MS/MS in 11 minutes. This was accomplished with matrix matched calibration curves to assess matrix effects.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Chemicals, Reagents and Standards

Ultra-pure water (18.2MΩ/cm) was generated in-house using a Millipore (Cork, Ireland) water purification system. LC-MS grade acetonitrile (ACN), dimethyl sulphoxide puriss P.A. (DMSO), magnesium sulphate puriss p.a, anhydrous (MgSO4), ethyl acetate (EA), de Man, Rogosa and Sharpe (MRS) broth was sourced from Sigma Aldrich (Dublin, Ireland). Acetic acid (AA) (eluent additive for LC-MS) was purchased from Fluka (Ireland). Formic acid (FA) (~99 %) was bought from Fluka (Germany). Sodium chloride p.a. (NaCl) came from AppliChem GmbH (Darmstadt,
Germany). The dispersive SPE Kit Cat #: 5982-4956 (15 mL; 150 mg C18, 900 mg MgSO₄ were received from Agilent (Dublin, Ireland).

1,2-dihydroxybenzene (A), DL-4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid (B), 4-hydroxybenzoic acid (C), 3,4-dihydroxyhydrocinnamic acid (D), (S)-(−)-2-hydroxisocapric acid (E), Vanillic acid (F), caffeic acid (G), 3-(4-hydroxyphenyl)propionic acid (I), 3-(4-hydroxy-3-methoxyphenyl)propionic acid (J), benzoic acid (K), p-coumaric acid (L), ferulic acid (M), salicylic acid (N), azelaic acid (O), hydrocinnamic acid (P), methylcinnamic acid (Q), 2-hydroxydodecanoic acid (R), DL- β-hydroxylauric acid (S) and DL- β-hydroxymyristic acid (T) were received from Sigma Aldrich (Dublin, Ireland). Phenyllactic acid (H) was obtained from Bachem (Weil am Rhein, Germany). Hydrocinnamic acid D9 and salicylic acid D6 deuterated internal standards were purchased from Sigma Aldrich (Dublin, Ireland). All analytes had a purity of ≥ 95%.

Molecular formula and weight of individual compounds are included in Table 1. Polypropylene tubes (50 and 15 mL) with screw caps were obtained from Starstedt Ltd., (Wexford, Ireland). A VWR International (Dublin, Ireland) multi-tube vortexer, a mistral 3000i centrifuge from Davidson and Hardy (Dublin, Ireland), Turbovap LV evaporator from Caliper Life Sciences (Runcorn, UK), a DeLonghi coffee grinder model KG49 EX:A and Transsonic 780 LH ultrasonic bath from Mason Technology (Dublin, Ireland) were used during sample preparation.

### 2.2 Preparation of Standard Solutions

Twenty 2 mg/mL stock solutions were prepared by dissolving 4 mg of each of the compounds individually in H₂O or ACN (2 mL) as appropriate. 100 µL of each of the individual stock solution (2 mg/mL) was combined (2 mL; 20 x 100 µL) in a vial to make a 100 µg/mL (100 ppm) standard mix solution. The deuterated internal standards were prepared as follows 50 µL of both deuterated stock solutions (2 mg/mL) were combined in a vial and 1900 µL of DMSO was added to make a 50 µg/mL (50 ppm) deuterated internal standard mix solution.
2.3 Preparation of extracted matrix calibrants and controls

*Sourdough (Rice, Wheat and Quinoa)*

Extracted sourdough matrix calibrants were prepared by spiking chemically acidified (1.4 % with a mixture of lactic and acetic acid (4:1, v/v)) control sourdough that was not inoculated with a LAB strain with 100 µL of the deuterated internal standard mix (50 ppm) and the appropriate amount of the standard mix (100 ppm) to make the calibration curve points and controls. A calibration range of 6 points for all standards was employed (1-25 µg/mL) and a 7 point calibration range (1-50 µg/mL) for (S)-(−)-2-hydroxyisocapric acid, DL-4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid and phenyllactic acid. 10, 50, 100, 150, 200, 250, 500 µL of the 100 ppm standard mix was added to make calibrant concentrations of 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 and 50 ppm. Standard controls were prepared in the same manner at concentrations of 2.5, 12.5, 17.5 and 30 ppm by adding 25, 125, 175 and 300 µL of the 100 ppm standard mix. 3 of each of these standard controls were prepared for each calibration run.

2.4 Sample Preparation

Sourdough samples were freeze dried and grinded to a fine powder. These freeze dried sourdough samples (2.0 g ± 0.01 g) were weighed into individually labelled polypropylene tubes (50 mL) and H₂O (10 mL) was added and vortexed for 30 seconds. Samples were then fortified with deuterated internal standard (100 µL) and left to stand for 15 minutes. EA (10 mL) with 0.1% FA was dispensed into the samples which were then vortexed for 30 seconds. NaCl (1 g) and MgSO₄ (4 g) were added and shaken immediately upon addition for 1 minute. The samples were then centrifuged for 10 minutes at 3500 rpm (2842 x g). The organic supernatant containing the targeted compounds was transferred to a 15 mL Agilent dSPE tube, vortexed for 30 seconds and centrifuged for 10 minutes at 3500 rpm (2842 x g). A 5 mL aliquot of the supernatant (equivalent to 1/2 of the original samples; 1.0 g) was transferred to a 15 mL polypropylene tube with 500 µL of DMSO and evaporated under nitrogen at 50 °C on a Turbovap LV system. Extracts were filtered through 0.2 µm PTFE 13 mm millex syringe filters (Millipore) and 5 µL was injected onto the UHPLC-MS/MS system.
2.5 UHPLC-MS/MS conditions

Separations were performed using a Waters (Milford MA, USA) Acquity UPLC system employing an Aquity BEH shield RP18 analytical column (2.1 x 100 mm, particle size 1.8 µm) maintained at a temperature of 50 °C and the pump was operated at a flow rate of 0.6 mL/min. A binary gradient system was used to separate analytes comprising of mobile phase A, 0.1 % acetic acid in water and mobile phase B, 0.1 % acetic acid in ACN. The gradient profile was as follows: (1) 0-2 min, 95 % A, (2) 2-5 min, 70 % A, (3) 5-7 min, 0 % A, (4) 7-7.5 min, 0 % A, (5) 7.51-11 min, 95 % A. The UHPLC autosampler was sequentially rinsed using strong and weak washes that consisted of methanol/isopropanol/water (80/10/10), and water/methanol (80/20) respectively. These washes were required to clean the needle and reduce carryover between injections.

Antifungal compounds were detected using a Waters Quattro Premier triple quadrupole instrument operated in negative electrospray ionisation mode (Milford, MA, USA). The UHPLC-MS/MS system was controlled by MassLynxTM software and data was processed using TargetLynxTM software (both from Waters). The electrospray voltage was set at 2.5 kV in negative mode. The desolvation and source temperatures were set at 400 and 150 °C, respectively. Nitrogen was employed as the desolvation and cone gases and was set at 1000 and 50 L/h, respectively. Argon was employed as the collision gas, at a flow rate of 0.21 µg/mL, which typically gave pressures of 3.52 x 10^-3 mBar. The MS conditions were optimised by teed infusion of 10 µg/mL standard solutions into 50 % mobile phase A and B at a flow rate of 20 µL/min and 0.2 mL/min, respectively.

2.6 Validation

A validation of the method was performed in compliance with the EC [31] and ICH [32] guidelines taking into account specificity, linearity, limits of detection and quantitation, trueness and precision. Validation was completed by analysing standard concentrations (1 ppm, 5 ppm, 10 ppm, 15 ppm, 20 ppm, 25 ppm, 50 ppm) in triplicate on 1 day and over three consecutive days. Controls (2.5 ppm, 12.5 ppm 17.5 ppm and 30 ppm) were run three times each on 1 day and over three consecutive
days. Signal to Noise (S/N) values of S/N = 3 was selected to determine the limit of detection (LOD) and S/N = 10 used to calculate the limit of quantitation (LOQ).

3. Results and discussion

**UHPLC-MS/MS optimisation**

A UHPLC-MS/MS method was established to determine the presence of 20 antifungal compounds in sourdough fermented with LAB. The MS conditions were optimised initially by infusing standards at a 10 µg/mL concentration and tuning the capillary voltage, cone voltage, desolvation gas flow, cone gas flow and collision energies using mobile phase A containing water with 0.1 % AA and mobile phase B containing acetonitrile with 0.1 % AA. Previous methods have employed water and acetonitrile with formic acid [25, 27, 33-36] or acetic acid [37-39] as the mobile phase. It was decided to compare using 0.1 % formic acid (FA) to 0.1 % acetic acid (AA) as the mobile phase additive to determine if any difference would be encountered when assessing and optimising the ESI ionising efficiencies for all twenty compounds. From the results (Figure 1) it can be seen that DL-4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid (B), 3,4-dihydroxyhydrocinnamic acid (D) and caffeic acid (G) have higher intensities (i.e., greater ionisation) with 0.1 % FA than with 0.1 % AA but a reduction in intensity is observed for 0.1 % FA for all other compounds with major ionisation losses (i.e., significant ionisation inefficiencies) for vanillic acid (F), 3-(4-hydroxyphenyl)propionic acid (I), ferulic acid (M) and hydrocinnamic acid (P). These results indicate that if 0.1% FA was employed samples containing vanillic acid (F), 3-(4-hydroxyphenyl) propionic acid (I), ferulic acid (M) and hydrocinnamic acid (P) could be reported as negative due to insufficient ionisation using electrospray. Due to this study 0.1 % AA provides better overall ionisation results for each of the twenty compounds allowing for both the qualitative and quantitative detection of all the target compounds. It also gives confidence that unknown compounds within LAB samples will have a better probability of being detected using 0.1 % AA (i.e., the optimised ionisation buffer) in the mobile phase than if 0.1 % FA was used.
Figure 1 Chromatographic peak area comparison of twenty antifungal compounds injected into mobile phases made of water and acetonitrile with (i) 0.1 % formic acid (FA) and (ii) 0.1 % acetic acid (AA). Compounds are as follows: A) 1,2-dihydroxybenzene, B) DL-4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid, C) 4-hydroxybenzoic acid, D) 3,4-dihydroxyhydrocinnamic acid, E) (S)-(−)-2-hydroxyisocapric acid, F) vanillic acid, G) caffeic acid, H) phenyllactic acid, I) 3-(4-hydroxyphenyl)propionic acid, J) 3-(4-hydroxy-3-methoxyphenyl)propionic acid, K) benzoic acid, L) p-coumaric acid, M) ferulic acid, N) salicylic acid, O) azelaic acid, P) hydrocinnamic acid, Q) methylcinnamic acid, R) 2-hydroxydodecanoic acid, S) DL-β-hydroxylauric acid and T) DL-β-hydroxymyristic acid.

The MS tune file was generated with the optimised conditions from the tuning by infusion for each precursor ion and the two most abundant product fragment ions (if available) produced were selected. The SRM (Selected reaction monitoring) windows were time-sectored, and dwell time and inter-scan delays were set to get maximum response from the instrument. These conditions are outlined in Table 1. Inter-scan delay was set to 5 ms between successive SRM windows and dwell times ranged from 1 ms to 10 ms.
Table 1 Name, chemical formula, molecular weight and MS conditions determined with the Waters Quattro Premier XE mass spectrometer for 20 LAB standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyte</th>
<th>Empirical formula</th>
<th>MW (g/mol)</th>
<th>Tr (min)</th>
<th>Transition (m/z)</th>
<th>Dwell time (s)</th>
<th>Cone (V)</th>
<th>CE (V)</th>
<th>SRM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) 1,2 dihydroxy-benzene</td>
<td>C₆H₆O₂</td>
<td>110.11</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>109 → 81, 109 → 90.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) DL-4-hydroxyphenylactic acid</td>
<td>C₆H₁₀O₄</td>
<td>182.17</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>181.5 → 135, 181.5 → 163</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) 4-hydroxybenzoic acid</td>
<td>C₆H₇O₃</td>
<td>138.12</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>137.4 → 93</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) 3,4-dihydroxyhydrocinnamic acid</td>
<td>C₆H₉O₄</td>
<td>182.17</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>181.5 → 109, 181.5 → 137</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) (S)-(−)-2-hydroxyisocapric acid</td>
<td>C₇H₁₄O₃</td>
<td>132.16</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>131 → 69.1, 131 → 85.1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) vanillic acid</td>
<td>C₈H₉O₄</td>
<td>168.15</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>167.4 → 108, 167.4 → 123</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) caffeic acid</td>
<td>C₆H₉O₄</td>
<td>180.16</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>179.4 → 135</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) phenyllactic acid</td>
<td>C₄₀H₂₂O₃</td>
<td>166.17</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>164.9 → 103, 164.9 → 147</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I) 3-(4-hydroxyphenyl)propionic acid</td>
<td>C₇H₁₀O₄</td>
<td>166.17</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>165.4 → 93, 165.4 → 121</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J) 3-(4-hydroxy-3-methoxyphenyl)-propionic acid</td>
<td>C₇H₁₁O₄</td>
<td>196.20</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>195.7 → 121, 195.7 → 136</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K) benzoic acid</td>
<td>C₇H₆O₂</td>
<td>122.12</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>121 → 77.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L) p-coumaric acid</td>
<td>C₇H₆O₄</td>
<td>164.16</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>163.3 → 118.9</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M) ferulic acid</td>
<td>C₇H₉O₄</td>
<td>194.18</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>193.7 → 134, 193.7 → 177.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N) salicylic acid</td>
<td>C₇H₆O₃</td>
<td>138.12</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>137.5 → 93</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salicylic acid D₆</td>
<td>C₇D₆O₃</td>
<td>144.16</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>141.4 → 97</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O) azelaic acid</td>
<td>C₉H₁₄O₄</td>
<td>188.22</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>187.3 → 97, 187.3 → 125</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P) hydrocinamic acid</td>
<td>C₇H₆O₂</td>
<td>150.17</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>149.7 → 105.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hydrocinamic acid D₉</td>
<td>C₈HO₂D₉</td>
<td>159.23</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>158.5 → 114.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q) methylcinamic acid</td>
<td>C₇H₁₀O₂</td>
<td>162.19</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>161.5 → 117</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R) 2-hydroxydodecanoic acid</td>
<td>C₁₂H₂₃O₃</td>
<td>216.32</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>215.4 → 169.1, 215.4 → 197.1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S) DL-β-hydroxyauric acid</td>
<td>C₁₂H₂₃O₃</td>
<td>216.32</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>215.8 → 59.2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T) DL-β-hydroxymerystic acid</td>
<td>C₁₄H₂₆O₃</td>
<td>244.37</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>243.9 → 59.2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MW = molecular weight, Tr = retention time, CE = collision energy, SRM 1 (1.25 – 2.0 min), SRM 2 (2.0 – 2.80 min), SRM 3 (2.5 – 3.2 min), SRM 4 (2.9 – 3.6 min), SRM 5 (3.3 – 4.1 min), SRM 6 (4.0 – 4.6 min), SRM 7 (4.2 – 5.1 min), SRM 8 (5.0 – 5.4 min), SRM 9 (5.8 – 6.2 min), SRM 10 (6.4 – 7.0 min)
Use of internal standards can provide improved quantitative accuracy and repeatability to help to counteract the effects of matrix ion suppression and/or enhancement. Unfortunately only two internal standards were available: hydrocinnamic acid-D9 and salicylic acid-D6. These were spiked into each standard, blank, control and samples at a known concentration (100 µL of 50 ppm IS mix) to provide continuous monitoring of the extraction method and mass spectrometer’s performance during analysis [40, 41]. Rice, wheat and quinoa sourdough samples were spiked after extraction and compared to standards in mobile phase (water/acetonitrile (90/10)). Figure 2 shows the simple calibration curves for four of the compounds from the method DL-4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid (B), phenyllactic acid (H), 2-hydroxydodecanoic acid (R) and hydrocinnamic acid (P). As can be seen from the figure differences between the slope of the lines for each of the calibration curves prepared in mobile phase or spiked into rice, wheat, and quinoa was observed. If the individual simple calibration curve for each standard prepared in mobile phase overlaid the corresponding standard calibration curve spiked into a samples matrix (i.e., rice, wheat and/or quinoa) then no ion suppression/enhancement effects is occurring. When simple calibration curve overlay does not occur (i.e., slope of the line is different) then either ion suppression/enhancement effects are occurring [42]. DL-4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid (B) (Figure 2 I) showed enhancement when spiked into rice, wheat and quinoa sourdough compared to the simple calibration curve generated in mobile phase. This is an issue as if the mobile phase calibration curve was used to quantify the presence of this compound; a larger concentration would be indicated than the concentration present. While rice and quinoa produce a similar calibration curve, the wheat sourdough curve is not comparable. Differences are again observed for phenyllactic acid (H) (Figure 2 II) and 2-hydroxydodecanoic acid (R) (Figure 2 III) calibration curves but the pattern is not the same for all 3 compounds as both enhancement and suppression are occurring. An internal standard is available for hydrocinnamic acid (P) and as can be seen from the calibration curves: simple calibration curve (Figure 2 IV) and with internal standard employed (Figure 2 V) the improvement in the curves.
Figure 2 Matrix assessment through the comparison of calibration curves of standards spiked into extracted rice, wheat and quinoa sourdough matrices. Compounds shown A) DL-4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid, B) phenyllactic acid, C) 2-hydroxydodecanoic acid, D) hydrocinnamic acid and E) hydrocinnamic acid with internal standard hydrocinnamic acid D9.
Employment of the internal standard helps minimise matrix effects occurring between the different matrices providing identical/similar slopes of the line for all matrices compared to the standard in mobile phase. As internal standards are not available for the majority of compounds (n = 18) the application of matrix matched calibration curves was undertaken to assess the extent of samples (i.e., rice, wheat and quinoa) matrix effects.

Matrix effect is an issue that can cause signal enhancement or suppression during LC-MS/MS analysis, mainly when employing electrospray ionisation (ESI) as the ionisation technique. Matrix effect was investigated as part of the method validation. The matrix effect appears to be compound dependant potentially due to target analytes co-eluting with matrix components from the sourdough samples. As compounds were subject to matrix effect, matrix matched calibration curves were used to accurately quantify the antifungal compounds. The topic of ion suppression/enhancement is discussed in more detail by the following articles; Trufelli et al. [43], Ciric et al. [44], Chambers et al. [45], Van Eeckhaut et al. [46], Fong et al. [47], Oldekop et al. [48], Furey et al. [42].

The majority of previous methods that identify antifungal compounds from LAB employ HPLC [11, 23, 33, 36-38, 49-56]. This is the second application of UHPLC for the identification of antifungal compounds. The previous method by Wang et al. [35] identified two compounds 3-phenyllactic acid and benzeneacetic acid, 2-propenyl ester with only 3-phenyllactic acid being confirmed by the UPLC system with an ESQUIRE-LC quadrupole ion trap mass spectrometer (Bruker Daltonic, CA, USA) with electrospray ionization. A BEH C18 column (50 x 2.1 mm, 1.7 mm; Thermo Fisher Scientific) at 25 °C was employed. The mobile phases used were: (A) acetonitrile with 0.1 % formic acid; and (B) water with 0.1 % formic acid. A linear gradient from 20 % - 80 % A was employed at a flow rate of 0.3 mL/min which was split to allow a flow rate of 0.2 mL/min to enter the MS. The second compound identified benzeneacetic acid, 2- propenyl ester was completed by GC-MS. The method developed here provides a sensitive and reliable quantitative multi-antifungal compound method for the simultaneous determination of 20 previously identified antifungal compounds (1,2-dihydroxybenzene (A), DL-4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid...
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(B), 4-hydroxybenzoic acid (C), 3,4-dihydroxyhydrocinnamic acid (D), (S)-(-)-2-hydroxyisocapric acid (E), Vanillic acid (F), caffeic acid (G), 3-(4-hydroxyphenyl)propionic acid (I), Phenyllactic acid (H), 3-(4-hydroxy-3-methoxyphenyl)propionic acid (J), benzoic acid (K), p-coumaric acid (L), ferulic acid (M), salicylic acid (N), azelaic acid (O), hydrocinnamic acid (P), methylcinnamic acid (Q), 2-hydroxydodecanoic acid (R), DL-β-hydroxyauric acid (S) and DL-β-hydroxymyristic acid (T)) within a single method. All analytes are eluted in less than 7 min with a run time of 11 min. Following the theory that antifungal activity is occurring due to the synergist interactions caused by the presence of multiple compounds, detection of more than 1 – 2 compounds is required to accurately profile LAB samples. [34, 49, 53, 57, 58].

Method validation

Linearity was evaluated by constructing matrix matched simple calibration curves over the concentration range of 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 for all compounds in blank (un-inoculated) chemically acidified sourdough with an extra point 50* µg/mL employed for DL-4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid (B), (S)-(-)-2-hydroxyisocapric acid and phenyllactic acid (H) due to the higher concentrations generally present of these compounds. The majority of analytes gave linear regression values greater than 0.99. Table 2 shows the linear range, the equation of the line and the R² value determined for each compound from i) quinoa, ii) wheat and iii) rice. Method accuracy and precision was evaluated using controls samples at low (2.5 µg/mL), medium (12.5 µg/mL), and high (17.5 or 30* µg/mL) concentrations. The intraday variability was evaluated from three replicate controls determined at three concentrations in a single run (n = 9). The recoveries and the repeatability of the method were established in order to evaluate the methods’ trueness and precision, respectively (Table 2 and 3). Table 2 details the intraday results achieved for rice, wheat and quinoa with relative percentage error values ranging from -0.27 – 9.3 % and RSD values of 2.0 – 12.7 achieved for rice. For wheat relative percentage error values ranging from -0.06 – 8.9
% with RSD values of 0.95 – 13.4 were achieved and quinoa obtained relative percentage error values ranging from -0.06 – 9.8 % with RSD values of 1.1 – 14.0. The interday variability was obtained from nine replicate controls at the same three concentrations analysed over three sequential days (n = 27). Table 3 details the interday results with relative percentage error values ranging from 0.06 – 9.8 % and RSD values of 0.15 – 14.7 achieved for rice, the relative percentage error values for wheat ranged from -0.03 – 10.9 % with relative RSD values of 1.3 – 14.6 and relative percentage error values ranging from 0.06 – 9.3 % with RSD values of 1.3 – 14.3 were found for quinoa. Limit of quantification (LOQ) and limit of detection (LOD) were selected by employing a signal to noise (S/N) values = 3 for the LOD and S/N = 10 used to calculate the LOQ. Values are shown in Table 2. To confirm the presence of a compound, its retention time was compared with its known standard retention time, within ± 0.3 min and the ion ratio conforms to within ± 20 %.
Table 2 Results for linear range, LOD, LOQ, trueness, and precision for known antifungal standards. These 20 standards were assessed in three sourdough matrix solutions: i) quinoa, ii) wheat and iii) rice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyte</th>
<th>equation of the line</th>
<th>Linear range µg mL⁻¹</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>LOD  µg mL⁻¹</th>
<th>LOQ  µg mL⁻¹</th>
<th>2.5 µg mL⁻¹</th>
<th>12.5 µg mL⁻¹</th>
<th>17.5 or 30 µg mL⁻¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RE % (n=9)</td>
<td>RSD % (n=9)</td>
<td>RE % (n=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) 1,2-dihydroxybenzene</td>
<td>i) 117.4 x - 97.5</td>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>0.9930</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) 160.2 x - 22.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.78</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) 211.8 - 32.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.11</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) DL-4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid *</td>
<td>i) 66.5 x + 26323</td>
<td>1 - 50</td>
<td>0.9954</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) 122.9 x + 1951</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) 312.2 x - 107.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) 4-hydroxybenzoic acid</td>
<td>i) 238.2 x + 6071</td>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>0.9958</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) 454.3 x + 5873</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) 1741 x + 1471</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) 3,4-dihydroxyhydrocinnamic acid</td>
<td>i) 26.1 x - 89.3</td>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>0.9942</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) 131.9 x - 5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.67</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>-2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) 361.8 x + 16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) (S)-(−)-2-hydroxyisocapric acid *</td>
<td>i) 4115 x + 42818</td>
<td>1 - 50</td>
<td>0.9981</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) 6756 x + 12339</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.78</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) 2127 x + 786.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>-6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Vanillic acid</td>
<td>i) 13.3 + 1158</td>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>0.9939</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-2.22</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) 18.1 x + 19.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) 46.9 x - 20.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyte</th>
<th>equation of the line</th>
<th>Linear range µg mL⁻¹</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>LOD µg mL⁻¹</th>
<th>LOQ µg mL⁻¹</th>
<th>2.5 µg mL⁻¹</th>
<th>12.5 µg mL⁻¹</th>
<th>17.5 or 30 * µg mL⁻¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RE % (n=9)</td>
<td>RSD % (n=9)</td>
<td>RE % (n=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) caffeic acid</td>
<td>i) 208.2 x - 188.7</td>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>0.9919</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) 957.7 x - 95.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) 2556 x + 189.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.44</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) Phenyllactic acid *</td>
<td>i) 4616 x + 4168</td>
<td>1 - 50</td>
<td>0.9925</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) 5458 x + 31232</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) 5406 x + 2328</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I) 3-(4-hydroxyphenyl)propionic acid</td>
<td>i) 27.5 x + 271.3</td>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>0.9921</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) 96.8 x + 24.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.56</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) 127.7 x + 332.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J) 3-(4-hydroxy-3-methoxyphenyl)-propionic acid</td>
<td>i) 29.5 x - 6.8</td>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>0.9966</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) 53.1 x + 414.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.56</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) 73.2 x + 30.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K) benzoic acid</td>
<td>i) 2340 x + 12911</td>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>0.9961</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) 2132 x + 24046</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) 2066 x + 7386</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L) p-coumaric acid</td>
<td>i) 2512 x + 60371</td>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>0.9903</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) 4008 x + 2601</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) 3006 x + 8338</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9937</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M) ferulic acid</td>
<td>i) 20.6 x + 788.7</td>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>0.9948</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) 48.7 x + 163.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.22</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) 30.4 x + 455.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.67</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyte</th>
<th>equation of the line</th>
<th>Linear range µg mL⁻¹</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>LOD µg mL⁻¹</th>
<th>LOQ µg mL⁻¹</th>
<th>( 2.5 , \mu g , mL⁻¹ )</th>
<th>RE % (( n = 9 ))</th>
<th>RSD % (( n = 9 ))</th>
<th>( 12.5 , \mu g , mL⁻¹ )</th>
<th>RE % (( n = 9 ))</th>
<th>RSD % (( n = 9 ))</th>
<th>( 17.5 ) or 30 * µg mL⁻¹</th>
<th>RE % (( n = 9 ))</th>
<th>RSD % (( n = 9 ))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N) salicylic acid</td>
<td>i) ( 0.23x - 0.67 )</td>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>0.9926</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) ( 0.08x - 0.05 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>-1.97</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) ( 0.11x - 0.02 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.11</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O) azelaic acid</td>
<td>i) ( 6378x + 167010 )</td>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>0.9977</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) ( 8216x + 202946 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) ( 5616x + 315637 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.67</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P) hydrocinnamic acid</td>
<td>i) ( 21.6x - 0.78 )</td>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>0.9904</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) ( 10.6x + 2.37 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) ( 1.66x + 2.99 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9942</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q) methyleinnamic acid</td>
<td>i) ( 17.1x + 5.90 )</td>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>0.9930</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) ( 12.0x + 1.23 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) ( 49.1x + 8.55 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9938</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R) 2-hydroxydodecanoic acid</td>
<td>i) ( 339.4x + 389.7 )</td>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>0.9904</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) ( 360.7x + 416.4 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>-3.81</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) ( 397.0x + 823.9 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S) DL-β-hydroxylauric acid</td>
<td>i) ( 189.4x - 88.7 )</td>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>0.9924</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-4.89</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) ( 287.0x - 50.2 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>-6.41</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) ( 290.0x - 55.0 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9938</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T) DL-β-hydroxymyristic acid</td>
<td>i) ( 189.8x + 42.9 )</td>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>0.9957</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-2.22</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) ( 462.6x + 171.9 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) ( 640.0x + 1088 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates where a different calibration range was employed with an extra calibration point of 50 µg/mL.
Table 3 Interday relative percentage error and RSD values. These 20 standards were assessed in three sourdough matrix solutions: i) quinoa, ii) wheat and iii) rice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>12.5</th>
<th>17.5 or 30*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE%</td>
<td>RSD%</td>
<td>RE%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) 1,2-dihydroxybenzene</td>
<td>i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>14.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) DL-4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid*</td>
<td>i)</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>7.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>11.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) 4-hydroxybenzoic acid</td>
<td>i)</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>9.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>12.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) 3,4-dihydroxyhydrocinnamic acid</td>
<td>i)</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>10.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>-3.85</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>8.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) (S)-(−)2-hydroxyisocapric acid*</td>
<td>i)</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>9.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>-4.15</td>
<td>12.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>12.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) vanillic acid</td>
<td>i)</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>8.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>10.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) caffeic acid</td>
<td>i)</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>10.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>-3.70</td>
<td>13.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>-7.85</td>
<td>9.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) Phenyllactic acid*</td>
<td>i)</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>10.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>-6.81</td>
<td>21.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>12.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I) 3-(4-hydroxyphenyl)propionic acid</td>
<td>i)</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>11.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>-2.96</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>10.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J) 3-(4-hydroxy-3-methoxyphenyl)propionic acid</td>
<td>i)</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>9.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>12.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K) benzoic acid</td>
<td>i)</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>8.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>12.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L) p-coumaric acid</td>
<td>i)</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>8.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>42.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M) ferulic acid</td>
<td>i)</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>8.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>11.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>9.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>compound</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th></th>
<th>12.5</th>
<th></th>
<th>17.5 or 30*</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE %</td>
<td>RSD %</td>
<td>RE %</td>
<td>RSD %</td>
<td>RE % (n=27)</td>
<td>RSD % (n=27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=27)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=27)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N) salicylic acid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O) azelaic acid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>-8.80</td>
<td>13.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P) hydrocinnamic acid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>9.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q) methylcinnamic acid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R) 2-hydroxydodecanoic acid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>-2.07</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S) DL-β-hydroxylauric acid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>-4.25</td>
<td>8.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T) DL-β-hydroxymyristic acid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates where a different control point was employed of 30 µg/mL due to an extra calibration point of 50 µg/mL being employed by the calibration curve.
Sample preparation

A previous method employed by Ryan et al. [23] to identify antifungal compounds from sourdough involved numerous steps to extract the compounds of interest – 1) samples frozen using liquid nitrogen, 2) freeze dried, 3) crushed using a mortar and pestle, 4) samples separated into crust and crumb, 5) blitzed in a food processor, 6) n-pentane wash, 7) centrifugation, 8) acetone/water (70/30) LLE, 9) centrifugation and supernatant dried under N$_2$, 10) redissolved in acetonitrile/water (50/50) and anhydrous sodium sulphate, 11) filter, 12) removal of acetonitrile under reduced pressure, 13) aqueous solution LLE with dichloromethane, 14) dry the organic layer, 15) redissolve in aqueous hydrochloric acid (0.001 mol/L), 16) add solution to dowex slurry, 17) collect eluent fractions and freeze dry, 18) dissolve in 50% acetonitrile, 19) inject on LC-MS system. The development of this QuEChERS method to analysis these compounds from an in situ matrix (sourdough) greatly reduces the number of steps, the solvent quantities, waste generated in comparison to such previous methods employed.

A QuEChERS-based approach that was previously developed by this group for the extraction of antifungal compounds from MRS broth [27] and wort substrate [59] was examined to isolate 20 antifungal analytes from rice, wheat and quinoa sourdough. QuEChERS methods have been successfully adapted and validated in multiple labs to extract hundreds of pesticides [60],[28],[30], drugs [61], veterinary drug residues [29],[30], pharmaceuticals [62], natural metabolites [63], mycotoxins [30],[64] and plant toxins [30]. It’s a quick and simple method which is advantageous if numerous samples are required to be analysed in a short time frame. However, this method reports the application of this sample preparation approach in relation to analysing antifungal compounds from an in situ matrix (sourdough).
Figure 3 Flow diagram outlining the steps involved in the extraction of sourdough samples (rice, wheat and quinoa).
Figure 3 describes the steps involved in the extraction procedure. An extraction study was performed to evaluate the performance of the procedure for the extraction of compounds from these complex matrices. Compounds were spiked into chemically acidified (CA) sourdough matrix (rice, wheat, quinoa as appropriate) prior to extraction and extracted following the procedure outlined in Figure 3. Compounds were also spiked into the extracted CA sourdough (rice, wheat, quinoa) to compare the results. Figure 4 illustrates the results of this study.

Good recoveries were obtained for all compounds with values ranging from 60.7 % (DL-β-hydroxymyristic acid (T)) -104.3 % (benzoic acid (K)) in rice, 60.3 % (hydroxymyristic acid (T)) – 97.2 % (p-coumaric acid (L)) in wheat, and 76.2 % (DL-β-hydroxylauric acid (S)) – 102.1 % (1,2-dihydroxybenzene (A)) in quinoa. RSD values of 0.9 – 8 % were obtained for rice, 0.2 – 8.6 % for wheat and 0.2 - 9.3 % for quinoa. These results indicate the method can adequately extract and identify the 20 known antifungal compounds from these sourdough matrices.

![Figure 4 Percentage recovery data from twenty antifungal compounds extracted from wheat, rice and quinoa sourdough. A) 1,2-dihydroxybenzene, B) DL-4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid, C) 4-hydroxybenzoic acid, D) 3,4-dihydroxyhydrocinnamic acid, E) (S)-(−)-2-hydroxyisocapric acid, F) Vanillic acid, G) caffeic acid, H) phenyllactic acid, I) 3-(4-hydroxyphenyl)propionic acid, J) 3-(4-hydroxy-3-methoxyphenyl)propionic acid, K) benzoic acid, L) p-coumaric acid, M) ferulic acid, N) salicylic acid, O) azelaic acid, P) hydrocinnamic acid, Q) methylcinnamic acid, R) 2-hydroxydodecanoic acid, S) DL-β-hydroxyauric acid and T) DL-β-hydroxymyristic acid.](image-url)
Analysis of samples

The achievement of positive in vitro results obtained by laboratory experiments does not guarantee for the efficient transfer of antifungal activity to in vivo food matrices [65]. Hence, the need for in situ testing is required. The same rational can be applied to identifying and quantification of the antifungal compounds produced by LAB. Their production and concentration depend on the conditions available for growth [59, 66]. Samples were extracted as per described in Figure 3. The antifungal strain *Lactobacillus amylovorus* DSM19280 was inoculated into the three different sourdough matrices to examine if similar compounds are produced and if they are produced at what concentration levels within the different matrices by the same strain.

**Table 4** Concentrations determined for compounds detected from rice, wheat and quinoa sourdough sample prepared using antifungal strain *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>quinoa (n=3) µg/mL</th>
<th>rice (n=3) µg/mL</th>
<th>wheat (n=3) µg/mL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSD</td>
<td>RSD</td>
<td>RSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) DL-4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) 4-hydroxybenzoic acid</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) (S)-(−)-2-hydroxyisocapric acid</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) vanillic acid</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) phenyllactic acid</td>
<td>221.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J) 3-(4-hydroxyphenyl)propionic acid</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K) benzoic acid</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N) salicylic acid</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O) azelaic acid</td>
<td>108.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the results (Table 4) *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 produced varying concentrations of antifungal compounds when used to ferment rice, wheat and quinoa sourdough. Ten antifungal compounds DL-4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid (B), 4-hydroxybenzoic acid (C), (S)-(−)-2-hydroxyisocapric acid (E), vanillic acid (F), phenyllactic acid (H), 3-(4-hydroxyphenyl)propionic acid (J), 3-(4-hydroxy-3-methoxyphenyl)propionic acid (J), benzoic acid (K), salicylic acid (N) and azelaic acid (O) in total were detected from the inoculated rice, wheat and quinoa sourdough matrices. Extracted quinoa sourdough detected all of the ten antifungal compounds...
at a much higher concentration than what was detected from rice and wheat sourdough. This confirms previous research, that the production of antifungal compounds is substrate specific. Figure 5 shows the chromatogram, mass spectrum and structures for the antifungal compounds produced from the antifungal strain *Lb. amyllovorus* DSM19280 used to prepare quinoa sourdough.

The main active compounds analysed in the sourdough (B, E, H) originate from the LAB amino acid metabolism. As such, phenylalanine is converted by a transamination reaction to phenylpyruvic acid. Phenylpyruvic acid is further reduced to phenyllactic acid by a dehydrogenase. 4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid originates from tyrosine, benzoic acid and salicylic acid also from phenylalanine and 2-hydroxyisocaproic acid is a by-product of the leucine pathway. Quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.) is a so-called pseudo-cereal, which is dicotyledonous that is different to the monocotyledonous true cereal grains like wheat and rice. Quinoa flour has superior protein content which is almost double as high as in rice flour; in contrast, starch content is lowest in quinoa flour [67]. Furthermore, its high mineral content allows the quinoa sourdough to have a higher buffering capacity enabling the production of higher acids contents [68]. Moreover, protein degradation during fermentation is expected to be also higher in quinoa due to the highest protease activity of the flour providing more free amino acids to metabolise for LAB [data not shown]. These differences in the chemical composition of the quinoa flour may provide an explanation for why there are more antifungal compounds (n = 10) in higher concentrations detected by the quinoa sourdough in comparison to rice (n = 8) and wheat (n = 7). Although rice flour has a lower protein content (6.4%) than wheat flour (11.5%), its protease activity is higher (data not shown) which could explain similar concentration of antifungal compounds in the corresponding sourdoughs.

However, the preservation effect of the sourdough in the final product when incorporated in the bread is much more complex. Raw materials differ, and in a practical context, the optimal water level has to be adjusted for each bread recipe. In general, gluten free breads have higher water activities due to the higher water level in the recipe, thus they are more susceptible for microbial spoilage. Axel et al. [69] has demonstrated that use of *Lb. amyllovorus* DSM19280 fermented quinoa sourdough in
bread production has extended the shelf life of the bread by 4 days compared to the non-acidified control which had only a mould free shelf life of 2 days. This indicates that the antifungal compounds produced contribute towards the preservation effect observed.

Wheat bread has a lower water activity than rice and quinoa bread [70]. Thus, although there are less antifungal compounds present in the wheat sourdough, Ryan et al. [25] showed the potential of *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 to extend the shelf life of wheat sourdough bread by up to fourteen days. This paper identified fifteen antifungal compounds from the MRS broth as contributing to the antifungal activity. Six of these identified compounds as well as fourteen extra antifungal compounds were examined in this method. The presence and concentration in the actual sourdough fermented with *Lb. amylovorus* DSM 19280 was determined as shown in Table 4. Ryan et al. [25] paper did not quantify the concentration of these compounds present in the MRS broth but it is likely that all these compounds are produced within the sourdough but are present at levels below the quantification capabilities of this method.
Figure 5 Chromatogram, mass spectrum and structure of the identified antifungal compounds from quinoa sourdough prepared with the antifungal strain *Lb. amyllovorus* DSM19280. B) DL-4-hydroxyphenyllactic acid, C) 4-hydroxybenzoic acid, E) (S)-(−)-2-hydroxyisocapric acid, F) vanillic acid, H) phenyllactic acid, I) 3-(4-hydroxyphenyl)propionic acid, J) 3-(4-hydroxy-3-methoxyphenyl)propionic acid, K) benzoic acid, N) salicylic acid and O) azelaic acid.
Figure 5 continued
4. Conclusions
Foods fermented with LAB have shown improved textures, flavours and tastes with longer shelf lives due to naturally occurring antimicrobial compounds which prevent food spoilage and maintain food safety. For this reason LABs have seen wide use in food fermentation. Comparison of LAB to previously employed methods *in situ* and their ability to retain the same or improve the nutritive value of the food has been determined [71]. In this study we developed a multi-compound (20) UHPLC-MS/MS method for the determination of *in situ* antifungal compounds from sourdough using QuEChERS.
This method provides separation of twenty antifungal compounds on an UHPLC system a vast improvement from the one compound previously detected by this technique. Use of QuEChERS to extract the sourdough samples also provides a much quicker and more efficient method compared to those techniques previously employed that required numerous long steps to extract antifungal compounds from the same matrices. Assessment of the matrix effect between the different matrices (rice, wheat and quinoa) was also undertaken. The use of two deuterated internal standards (Hydrocinnamic acid D9 and Salicylic acid D6) and matrix matched calibration curves were employed to highlight quantitation issues that can arise and combat these issues that may occur due to differences in the matrices.
Determination of the concentration of antifungal compounds produced by the same antifungal strain *Lb. amylovorus* DSM19280 inoculated at the same concentration into the three different matrices (rice, wheat and quinoa) produced varying amounts of the antifungal compounds detected. These results show the importance of undertaking *in situ* determination of antifungal compounds produced. Development of this method has provided an efficient method for the accurate achievement of this from sourdough with the potential applicability to various other food matrices. Due to LABs wide application possibilities, there is a need for a rapid universal method for the extraction of these compounds from several matrices. The analysis of antifungal compounds from LAB in food can be an extremely challenging task due to the minute amounts that can be present in samples and the potential for co-extraction of similar food flavour compounds present that are not involved in the antifungal activity.
observed. This new methodology will allow for the identification and quantification of the key substances causing antifungal activity. Development and application of this rapid multi-compound extraction procedure utilising UHPLC-MS/MS detection to monitor 20 known antifungal compounds from LAB in the fermentation of various sourdough materials will help provide insight into the topic and demonstrates the capabilities of the method to be further employed for other food matrices fermented with antifungal LAB.
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