CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	From seafood waste to active seafood packaging: an emerging opportunity of the circular economy
Authors	de la Caba, Koro;Guerrero, Pedro;Trung, Trang Si;Cruz-Romero, Malco C.;Kerry, Joseph P.;Fluhr, Joachim;Maurer, Marcus;Kruijssen, Froukje;Albalat, Amaya;Bunting, Stuart;Burt, Steve;Little, Dave;Newton, Richard
Publication date	2019-09-19
Original Citation	de la Caba, K., Guerrero, P., Trung, T. S., Cruz-Romero, M., Kerry, J. P., Fluhr, J., Maurer, M., Kruijssen, F., Albalat, A., Bunting, S., Burt, S., Little, D. and Newton, R. (2019) 'From seafood waste to active seafood packaging: An emerging opportunity of the circular economy', Journal of Cleaner Production, 208, pp. 86-98. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.09.164
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959652618328877 - 10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.09.164
Rights	© 2018 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license - http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/
Download date	2026-10-13 07:31:16
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/7135

UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

Accepted Manuscript



From seafood waste to active seafood packaging: An emerging opportunity of the circular economy

Koro de la Caba, Pedro Guerrero, Trang Si Trung, Malco Cruz, Joseph P. Kerry, Joachim Fluhr, Marcus Maurer, Froukje Kruijssen, Amaya Albalat, Stuart Bunting, Steve Burt, Dave Little, Richard Newton

PII:	S0959-6526(18)32887-7
DOI:	10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.09.164
Reference:	JCLP 14299
To appear in:	*Journal of Cleaner Production*
Received Date:	26 March 2018
Accepted Date:	18 September 2018

Please cite this article as: Koro de la Caba, Pedro Guerrero, Trang Si Trung, Malco Cruz, Joseph P. Kerry, Joachim Fluhr, Marcus Maurer, Froukje Kruijssen, Amaya Albalat, Stuart Bunting, Steve Burt, Dave Little, Richard Newton, From seafood waste to active seafood packaging: An emerging opportunity of the circular economy, *Journal of Cleaner Production* (2018), doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.09.164

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Word count = 12,293

From seafood waste to active seafood packaging: An emerging opportunity of the circular economy

Koro de la Caba[1], Pedro Guerrero[1], Trang Si Trung[2], Malco Cruz[3], Joseph P Kerry[3], Joachim Fluhr[4], Marcus Maurer[4], Froukje Kruijssen[5], Amaya Albalat[6], Stuart Bunting[6], Steve Burt[6], Dave Little[6], Richard Newton[6*]

1 BIOMAT research group, University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU), Escuela de Ingeniería de Gipuzkoa, Plaza de Europa 1, 20018 Donostia-San Sebastián, Spain

2 Nha Trang University, 02 Nguyen Dinh Chieu, Nha Trang, Vietnam

3 Food Packaging Group, School of Food and Nutritional Sciences, College of Science, Engineering and Food Science, University College Cork, Ireland

4 Allergie-Centrum-Charité, Department of Dermatology and Allergy, Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Charitéplatz 1, 10117 Berlin, Germany

5 Royal Tropical Institute, Sustainable Economic Development & Gender Unit, Mauritskade 64, 1092AD Amsterdam, The Netherlands

6 Institute of Aquaculture, University of Stirling, Stirling, FK9 4LA UK

* Corresponding author

e-mail: richard.newton@stir.ac.uk

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Abstract

Sustainable development is an overarching objective that requires an interdisciplinary approach in order to address the societal challenge concerning climate action, environment, resource efficiency and raw materials. In this context, valorization of abundant and available bio-wastes with high potential to manufacture value-added products is the first step to close the loop between waste and consumption in line with the main goal of the circular economy. In the last years, many research works have been published in the literature regarding novel food packaging. However, most of them are focused on packaging composition (scientific aspects) and some of them on the packaging manufacture (technological aspects), but very few studies are concerned about the influence of bringing novel food packaging systems into the market on environmental, social and economic issues. In this regard, this review intends to fill this gap, considering the potential of developing food packaging from food processing waste in order to create business for food industries, being aware of the food quality demanded by consumers and the environmental care demanded by institutions and society.

Keywords: Waste valorization; Resource efficiency; Sustainable packaging; Interdisciplinary approach; Life Cycle Assessment; Circular Economy.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

1 Introduction

As populations have grown and the economies of both developed and developing countries have continued to mature, consumer demand has created a growing strain on resources. Consumers have also demanded greater safety, sustainability and responsibility on food production along with convenience and lifestyle considerations (Aschermann-Witzel et al., 2016; Simoes et al., 2015). Sustainable food production encompasses three main pillars; environmental, economic, and social. These aspects are all required to maintain production in the long term without impacting on the wellbeing of societies, their surrounding environments (Bowen and Friel, 2012), and the health of the planet as a whole (Janssen et al., 2006). Therefore, innovation in food market requires a multi-scale, multi-disciplinary, and multi-factorial approach, involving initiatives from politicians, industries, researchers, and consumers, who all play a relevant role in the sustainability of the food chain (Fraser et al., 2016; Wikström et al., 2016). Although many governments place emphasis on local food production, food production around the globe is ever more dependent on the international flow of raw materials. Both better-off and poorer countries are dependent on food imports; the UK is just 60% food-self-sufficient and, according to Fader et al. (2013), at least 66 countries are not self-sufficient, with countries as diverse as Egypt and Bangladesh, as they are constrained by a lack of natural resources, such as land or water, to meet their food production needs. Some food sectors, such as monogastric livestock (pig, poultry, fish), are particularly dependent on imports of feed ingredients, notably soybean meal. Cradle-to-grave perspectives using tools such as global value chain analysis (GVCA) and life cycle assessment (LCA) are appropriate for the investigation of food production practices, which also must incorporate the technical and economic realities of globalized food production (Laso et al., 2016).

As resources become more precious, governments have placed pressure on industries and individuals to adopt the “reduce, reuse, repair, and recycle” hierarchy of

resource efficiency. This has more recently been adopted into the “circular economy” philosophy (Genovese et al., 2017). The essential principles of the circular economy are to reduce resource use and environmental emissions by “closing the loop” of production (Jurgilevich et al., 2016). According to Stahel (2016), there are two basic models for the circular economy: 1) where products at the end of their usable life are continually reused through repair and remodeling and 2) where materials are recycled to manufacture into replacement products. However, this ignores a third option where by-products and wastes from industries are utilized by related industries and may eventually be indirectly fed back into the original industry, which is more common in the food production sector (Fig. 1). Reuse of by-products within the sector is especially important in these related industries, as they are often in competition for similar resources, either directly, such as soybeans, or indirectly such as water and land for production of crops.



Fig.1. The inter- and multi-disciplinary approach addressed when researching packaging.

Food processing and packaging are the most important parts of the food industry (Perrot et al., 2016). More processed and packaged food is consumed as a proportion of the total in better-off, urbanizing, and industrializing economies (Kearney, 2010). In the specific field of food packaging, there are some clear emergent trends with regard to the sourcing and use of raw materials. These changes are probably less related to any depletion of non-renewable resources, but rather to increased interest in addressing sustainability aspects related to both resource efficiency and waste disposal and treatment (Stahel, 2016). In this regard, governments, industries, and consumers are very much concerned about the impacts of the products consumed. Consumer interest in the sustainable production of foods and food-related issues is expected to be an increasing trend, and legislation is beginning to reinforce this trend towards "socially responsible products" (FAO 2015). Furthermore, the improvements in the development of renewable and biodegradable materials to achieve the properties required for food packaging applications have largely increased the business potential of this industrial sector, and the global demand for the food packaging market. In particular, active packaging, antioxidant and antimicrobial packaging for food shelf-life extension, is expected to grow at 6.0% to reach a value of approximately US$ 29.0 billion by 2020 (Future Market Insights, 2017). In this context, materials science and technology are complementary to support improvements in food quality and safety from a sustainable point of view.

Fundamentally, any food packaging must contain, protect, preserve, inform, and provide convenience while acknowledging the constraints placed upon their usage from both legal and environmental perspectives (Kim and Seo, 2018). Additionally packaging technologies need to address consumer expectations for product quality (Wilson et al., 2018). In this regard, this highly inter-disciplinary review looks at how a circular economy principle can be applied to the seafood industry by utilizing food

processing by-products in environmentally friendly active packaging solutions to reduce food spoilage, post-processing, and to extend shelf life.

In this review, the potential of food processing waste to be valorized by means of extracting biopolymers that could be used to extend food shelf-life will be revised. In this regard, the possible allergenic risk when using these raw materials will be considered. Additionally, the processing methods used to manufacture packaging as well as the functional properties required to develop antioxidant and antimicrobial packaging will be assessed. In addition to these scientific and technological issues concerning food packaging, environmental aspects will be taken into consideration, as well as socio-economic impacts, in order to develop more sustainable packaging systems.

2 Methods and literature sources

This review brings together a highly interdisciplinary team of experts in biotechnology, allergen research, environmental management, aquaculture sciences, consumer behavior, retail studies, social sciences and food policy. Each author has brought their experiences of years of research in their fields to identify and critique the most relevant and up-to-date literature appropriate to food packaging and the circular economy, as well as extensive searches in academic literature databases. The methodology followed a narrative review approach to give an overview of the key research areas and identify research gaps that would be necessary to address before adoption of this circular economy opportunity. The narrative approach fits with the objectives of an inter-disciplinary review in addressing a broader but interconnected scope of research (Ferrari, 2015). There were no specific time scale criteria for inclusion, because literature relevant to different disciplines had heterogeneous publication histories. As can be seen in Figure 2, the bulk of the literature relating to technical advances in packaging is the most up-to-date, falling within the last 5 years,

whereas literature relating to food waste and environmental and social impacts is more wide-spread over the span of the review. However, some of the earliest references refer to early work on chitosan as an antimicrobial agent. It is worth noting that 80% of the articles studied were published in this decade, of which more than 50% correspond to papers published in the last five years (Figure 2). Scientific data bases, such as Web of Science, Scopus and Google Scholar, were used to search literature related to active packaging, food shelf-life, allergy, sustainability, waste, valorization, environmental impact, and circular economy, the principal keywords of this study. The information regarding these topics has been obtained mainly from original research papers, although some recent reports from international organizations have also been considered. In total, 111 peer-reviewed articles,16 reports and 4 book chapters were analyzed. It is worth noting that 80% of the articles studied were published in this decade, of which more than 50% correspond to papers published in the last three years (Figure 2). Regarding the most recent literature, the relative increase of the number of works related to food waste and environmental issues is noticeable, in accordance with the consumers' and institutions' concerns on these topics.



Fig.2. Distribution of the peer-reviewed papers analyzed by the publication year. The same articles may appear in more than one section.

Information related to the development of active packaging from a global and sustainable point of view, considering all the aspects from the extraction of raw materials to the end of life of products, including economic, social, health and environmental concerns, was analyzed. The references cited are related to those issues, in particular, food loss reduction, resource efficiency, sustainability, and circular economy. The journals consulted belong to diverse inter-disciplinary subject areas such as Green and Sustainable Science and Technology, Environmental Engineering, Food Science and Technology, and Applied Chemistry (Table 1). The most relevant information from those sources was selected after reading the full text and analyzing the results discussion supported by the data shown in the research works. The data was compiled into an extensive and inclusive review covering all aspects of the circular economy for seafood packaging and edited by the authors.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

145 Table 1. List of the journals cited in each section more than once and their corresponding subject area.

Manuscript section	Total references	Journal name	Reference amount	Subject area
Introduction	17	Trends Food Sci. Tech.	3	Food Science and Technology
Food waste	23	J. Clean. Prod.	2	Green and Sustainable Science and Technology
		J. Food Sci.	2	Food Science and Technology
		Polym. Rev.	2	Polymer Science
		Trends Food Sci. Tech.	2	Food Science and Technology
Manufacture	21	Food Hydrocolloid	4	Chemistry, Applied
		Carbohyd. Polym.	3	Chemistry, Applied
		Int. Food Res. J.	2	Food Science and Technology
Shelf-life	14	Food Hydrocolloid	2	Chemistry, Applied
		J. Food Eng.	2	Engineering, Chemical
Environmental issues	35	J. Clean. Prod.	8	Green and Sustainable Science and Technology
		Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.	6	Engineering, Environmental
		Environ. Sci. Technol.	2	Engineering, Environmental
		Food Res. Int	2	Food Science and Technology
Socio-economic issues	14	Aquacult. Int.	2	Fisheries

146

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

3 Food waste as a resource for seafood packaging: an interdisciplinary approach

Food waste most commonly refers to edible food products which are intended for human consumption, but have instead been discarded, lost, degraded, or consumed by pests. It does not include the inedible or undesirable portions of foodstuffs. Food losses occur in production, storage, transport, and processing, which are the four stages of the value chain with the lowest returns. Food waste generated at the end of the supply chain, within retail and final consumption, represents greater costs and lost value when diverted away from human consumption; conversely, it is synonymous with higher value-chain potential. In highly developed countries, food waste is most prevalent during consumption (Licciardello, 2017; FAO 2011), while the causes of food losses and waste in low-income countries are mainly connected to financial, managerial, and technical limitations in harvesting techniques, storage, packaging, and marketing systems.

The percentage of food losses and waste of the edible parts varies between food groups across different points within the value chain (FAO, 2016; Aschemann-Witzel et al., 2017) and may also vary according to culture (Wang et al., 2017) . The proportion of purchased food wasted at the consumer level is especially high for fish and seafood in industrialized countries. High losses at the distribution level can be explained by high levels of deterioration occurring during fresh fish and seafood distribution (FAO, 2011).

The production of bio-waste in the EU amounts to more than 100 million tons each year, of which the majority derives from food processing industries (Ravindran and Jaiswal, 2016). In particular, fish and seafood processing generates large amounts of by-products, mainly consisting of shells and bones, which could represent around 50-70% of the original material content (Sayari et al., 2016). This bio-waste has a potential added-value, but research and innovation are needed to valorize it. The

challenge is complex, affects a broad range of interconnected sectors, and requires a plurality of approaches (Mirabella et al., 2014).

Fish by-products contain relatively large concentrations of protein and fat. The most common products currently derived from fish by-products are collagen, gelatin, and biodiesel fuel (Trung, 2014). Well-known processes, based on successive steps of leaching of fish skin to remove water-soluble compounds, extraction of gelatin, cleansing, concentration, and drying, can give a yield of 125 tons of gelatin/time unit per 1 kiloton of fish skin. The world fish gelatin production is estimated to be in the range of 1.0-1.5 kiloton/year with a price of 10-20 USD/kg. Market opportunities exist to replace traditional bovine gelatins with fish gelatin due to safety concerns related to transferable spongiform encephalopathies (TSEs) and to replace porcine gelatins because of religious concerns. Market opportunities for fish gelatins and collagens are growing (Innovation Norway, 2014); they are often preferable to mammalian-derived products due to religious considerations as most can be used in both halal and kosher food (Rustad et al., 2011). Warm-water fish gelatins tend to have more similar properties to mammalian gelatins, although cold-water gelatins also have attractive properties for some food applications (Newton et al., 2014). The properties of fish gelatins vary between species and there are trade-offs between the different properties depending on the particular application.

Fish gelatin, obtained by collagen denaturation, is a highly available raw material for industrial applications, including the manufacture of films for food packaging. Residues from fish filleting represent up to 75% of harvested biomass, and approximately 30% of such residues consists of skin and bones with high collagen content (Newton et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2016). The composition of gelatin is similar to that of the collagen from which it is prepared, predominantly containing proline (Pro) and hydroxyproline (Hyp) (Alfaro et al., 2015). In general, the imino acid content (Pro + Hyp) is lower in cold-water fish gelatins than in mammalian gelatins and, thus, these

200 fish gelatins have lower melting points, which could be a benefit in the manufacture of
201 fish gelatin-based products by thermo-mechanical processes due to lower energy
202 consumption and cost, thereby increasing their commercial feasibility (Etxabide et al.,
203 2016). Hyp content also varies depending on the treatment used to extract gelatin from
204 collagen. This treatment can be carried out by basic (type B gelatin) or acid hydrolysis
205 (type A gelatin) (Avena-Bustillos et al., 2006). Both type A and B gelatins show good
206 film-forming ability and have been used to prepare food packaging films to protect food
207 from drying and exposure to light and oxygen (Gómez-Guillén et al., 2009).

208 Processing of crustaceans also leads to large quantities of under-utilized by-
209 products. This bio-waste mainly consists of shells and heads, which account for about
210 35-40% of total wet weight (Trung and Phuong, 2012). Crustacean shells are a major
211 source of chitin, which is the most abundant polysaccharide in nature after cellulose
212 (Dutta et al., 2002). Chitin is a polysaccharide chemically similar to cellulose, in which
213 the hydroxyl groups in the C2 position are replaced by acetamide groups. These
214 functional groups make chitin a non-soluble polymer and limit their application.
215 However, chitosan, obtained after chitin deacetylation, is soluble in acidic solutions,
216 which enhances processability, as well as other functional properties, such as
217 antimicrobial characteristics related to the presence of amine groups (Lim and Hudson,
218 2003). The antimicrobial activity of chitosan against a range of food-borne filamentous
219 fungi, yeasts, and bacteria has attracted attention as a potential food preservative of
220 natural origin (Rabea et al., 2003; No et al., 2007). The food preservation qualities of
221 chitosan, along with its non-toxic nature, ability to chelate metals, and biodegradability
222 are of interest for its incorporation into various food packaging strategies (Abdollahi et
223 al., 2012).

224 **4 Manufacture of films and coatings based on fish gelatin and chitosan and their**
225 **performance**

4.1 Manufacturing processes

Chitosan and gelatin films have been manufactured by solution casting and compression (Figure 3). On the one hand, solution casting involves the solubilization of the biopolymer in water under appropriate conditions of pH and temperature, followed by the drying process involving water evaporation. On the other hand, compression relies on the thermoplastic behavior that proteins and polysaccharides can display at low moisture contents (Hernández-Izquierdo and Krochta, 2008). At lab-scale, fish gelatin and chitosan films have been mainly prepared by solution casting due to the simplicity of the process and the use of water as the solvent. However, compression molding is less time-consuming and, thus, more appropriate for scaling-up the production. Recently, fish gelatin films (Chuaynukul et al., 2015) and chitosan films (Galvis-Sánchez et al., 2016) have been successfully produced by compression molding.

Once produced, the sealing ability of such films is an important characteristic for their application in materials used for making sachets, pouches, and bags. Heat-sealing is widely used to join polymer films in the packaging industry. The seal resistance must be strong enough to keep food products (liquids or solids) inside the package without leakage. Tongnuanchan et al. (2016) have recently found that fish gelatin films are heat-sealable and, thus, they can be used for different food packaging formats.

The protective effect of hydrocolloids on food preservation can also be achieved by coatings applied to food surfaces (Figure 3). The characteristics of specific edible coatings affect performance, and this is also impacted by application methods, which influence coating thickness and, thus, its physicochemical properties and food preservation effects over time. Dipping is the most common application method at lab-scale due to its simplicity. However, the control of coating thickness and continuous

production are two challenges when using this method (Zhong et al., 2014). Those drawbacks can be overcome by spraying methods, as these offer more uniform coatings (Andrade et al., 2012). For both methods, solution viscosity and application time are key parameters that influence coating thickness and, therefore, morphology, optical, mechanical, and barrier properties of the resulting coatings. The selection of the appropriate method and conditions affects not only the food preservation effect, but also the process efficiency and, thus, the production costs. Spraying allows deposit of thin coatings, reducing processing time in comparison with dipping and, thus, it opens a huge opportunity for continuous production on a commercial scale.



Fig.3. Manufacturing processes to develop active packaging, including edible coatings and biodegradable films.

4.2 Functional properties

Optical, barrier, and mechanical properties are the most relevant properties required for food packaging materials in order to preserve food quality (Atarés and Chiralt, 2016). Regarding optical properties, transparency and gloss of packaging films

have a great impact on food appearance and, thus, on product acceptability by the consumer. The polymer network arrangement during film drying defines both internal and surface structure, and these determine optical properties (Villalobos et al., 2005). In this sense, image analyses, such as scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and atomic force microscopy (AFM) analyses, are required to correlate optical and structural parameters (Fabra et al., 2009). Films based on fish gelatin and chitosan are colorless and transparent, but they exhibit excellent barrier properties against UV light (Etxabide et al., 2015b; Hong et al., 2014; Samira et al., 2014). In addition to light barrier properties, appropriately formulated films and coatings should meet those aspects related to oxygen barrier to control oxygen exchange between food and the surrounding atmosphere, protecting food and delaying its deterioration by discoloration or texture softening.

Food packaging requires specific mechanical properties related to food quality during transportation, distribution, and storage. In this context, plasticizers represent the most common additives to improve mechanical performance. Demand for natural plasticizers to replace oil-based products is growing. Water is one of the natural plasticizers for hydrophilic polymers. As it is well-known, water increases free volume and so, material flexibility. Besides water, other bio-based plasticizers can be obtained from industrial by-products, providing available and sustainable resources (Garlapati et al., 2016). Glycerol, obtained as a by-product of the biodiesel industry, is the most used plasticizer in edible and biodegradable materials for food packaging applications, since it is approved as a food additive by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) (Bocqué et al., 2016). Kaewprachu et al. (2016) have recently compared the mechanical performance of films based on proteins from different sources (both plant- and animal-derived proteins) when using glycerol as plasticizer. They found that all films were uniform and transparent, but gelatin films exhibited higher tensile strength and elongation at break. In particular, fish gelatin films showed better mechanical

295 performance than bovine gelatin films. This behavior was also reported by Rawdkuen
296 et al. (2010). Since chitosan films present a higher tensile strength than gelatin films
297 (Leceta et al., 2013a), and even higher than the values shown by commercial films
298 (Farhan and Hani, 2017; Kaewprachu et al., 2016), blending fish gelatin and chitosan
299 seems to be a potential alternative to synthetic polymers to obtain biocomposites with
300 enhanced properties. Additionally, nanoclays such as montmorillonite (Nouri et al.,
301 2018), cellulose nanofibers (Niu et al., 2018), and cellulose nanowhiskers (Bao et al.,
302 2018) have been incorporated into coating- or film-forming formulations to reinforce the
303 bionanocomposites.

304 **5 Shelf life extension and seafood quality related to active packaging**

305 Food shelf life is defined as the length of time that a food product in a container
306 will remain in an acceptable condition for its use or application, under specific
307 conditions of storage (Cruz-Romero and Kerry, 2011). Food shelf life is influenced by
308 three factors: 1) The product characteristics, including formulation and processing
309 parameters (intrinsic factors), 2) the properties of the package, and 3) the environment
310 to which the product is exposed during distribution and storage (extrinsic factors)
311 (Emblem, 2012a). Intrinsic factors include pH, water activity, enzymes,
312 microorganisms, and concentration of reactive compounds. Many of these factors can
313 be controlled by selection of raw materials and ingredients, as well as the choice of
314 processing parameters. Extrinsic factors include temperature, relative humidity, light,
315 total pressure, and partial pressure of different gases, as well as mechanical stresses
316 including consumer handling. Many of these factors can affect the rates of deteriorative
317 reactions that occur during the shelf life of a product.

318 When considering the preservation function of packaging, it is important to
319 recognize that, whilst packaging can and does contribute to shelf life, it cannot
320 overcome inherent product problems. If the product is unsafe or of poor quality at the

point of packing, it is likely that the product will remain unsafe or of poor quality inside the pack. In order to determine the optimum packaging required to extend shelf life, it is necessary to define the product in terms of what will cause it to deteriorate, i.e. what is the spoilage mechanism. We then need to understand what process (if any) will be used to prevent/delay spoilage and the extent to which will affect the packaging used, and therefore determine its key properties (Emblem, 2012b).

Oxidation is one of the processes that causes food degradation, affecting both sensory and nutritional properties. The oxidation of highly unsaturated food lipids, such as fish and seafood, causes food quality deterioration, including off-odors, off-flavors, nutrition losses, and color or textural changes. These problems can significantly reduce consumer acceptability of food products, increase the deterioration rate of food, decrease the shelf life, and lead to food losses (López de Dicastillo et al., 2010; Tian et al., 2012). Synthetic antioxidants can be incorporated into food to prevent oxidation, but the use of such chemicals is losing favor and interest is growing in their replacement by natural additives. Hydrophilic films and coatings based on fish gelatin and/or chitosan provide a good barrier to oxygen due to their tightly packed hydrogen-bonded network (Bonilla et al., 2012). The use of antioxidant packaging is a novel approach in controlling oxidation and increasing the stability of oxidation-sensitive products, thereby prolonging the shelf life of food products (Etxabide et al., 2017).

Oxygen is responsible for many degradation processes in food, such as lipid oxidation, but also for microbial growth. Many types of bacteria typically found in fish and shellfish (e.g. *Vibrio parahemolyticus*) or found in processing settings (e.g *Listeria monocytogenes*) have been found to cause deterioration of food quality and safety (Enos-Berlage et al., 2005; Rajkowski 2009). In this challenging context, the development of materials with film-forming capacity that have antimicrobial properties has been increasingly demanded by the food industry (Vodnar et al., 2015). Since most fresh or processed products microbial contamination occurs at higher intensity on the

product surface, the application of films or coatings on the food surface can be more efficient than the addition of antimicrobial additives directly in the foodstuff (Falguera et al., 2011). In this regard, key criteria for materials used for coating seafood products are sensory inertness and compatibility with the coated seafood product since food coatings should neither interfere with the flavor of the product nor alter any sensory properties. The combination of biopolymers, such as chitosan and gelatin, has been analyzed as antimicrobial packaging. The application of chitosan-gelatin film on fish has been found to delay or even prevent the growth of microorganisms, indicating the viability of these films for fish preservation (Gómez-Estaca et al., 2011). Chitosan-gelatin coatings have also been tested in some fishery products such as rainbow trout and Pacific white shrimp, both stored under refrigerated conditions (Farajzadeh et al., 2016; Nowzari et al., 2013). The positive effects of chitosan-gelatin coatings led to both oxidation and spoilage reduction, increasing food shelf-life. Therefore, it is clear that chitosan and/or gelatin coatings and films have potential for the control of food deterioration processes, increasing shelf life and safety; however, the impacts of using such products in terms of toxicological effects during handling or consumption also require attention.

6 Health and safety aspects of active packaging from by-products

Diverting waste, particularly animal by-products to food applications has various health and safety aspects regarding the suitability of those materials to be in contact with food. Legislation regarding those concerns vary regionally, but many draw on aspects of Codex Alimentarius and Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) approach, developed by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA). More stringent legislation is enshrined in EU law under EU regulation regarding food, by-products and packaging where concerns about safe treatment of by-products (EC 2009, 2011a) and migration of substances in the packaging materials to food are addressed (EC 2004). However, of most concern perhaps is in relation to seafood allergy. Seafood allergy is a

prevalent and potentially lethal condition (Thalayasingam and Lee 2015). Seafood-allergic individuals, when exposed to relevant allergens at levels that exceed their threshold for response, may suffer severe allergic reactions, even anaphylactic shock. Exposure to relevant levels of allergen and subsequent allergic reactions in seafood-allergic individuals usually occur by eating seafood or, less frequently, by direct skin contact or inhalation. Individual threshold levels may be low, and ingestion of food that contains traces of allergen, for example because it was prepared in a kitchen handling seafood, may result in allergic reactions in highly sensitized individuals. The use of seafood by-products carries the risk of contaminating foods with seafood allergens and allergic responses in seafood-allergic consumers. Any development and promotion of seafood by-product-based packaging and other products therefore requires risk assessment based on understanding the prevalence and sensitivity to seafood-based allergens, knowledge of relevant seafood allergens, testing of products made from seafood by-products for allergen levels, and assessment of the occurrence of allergic reactions in seafood-allergic individuals exposed to products made from seafood by-products (FAO, 2014).

The prevalence of seafood allergy, namely the sensitization and occurrence of allergic reactions to fish and shellfish, is estimated to be up to 5% in the human population and may be increasing (Woo and Bahna, 2011). Regarding allergology, the most relevant shellfish are shrimps, crabs, lobsters, clams, oysters, and mussels. Shellfish allergy often develops in early childhood and is usually persistent. Allergic reactions vary from mild and local responses to life-threatening anaphylactic reactions. The clinical signs and symptoms include flush, pruritus, angioedema, and urticaria; rhinitis and conjunctivitis; bronchospasm, cough, and dyspnea; nausea, diarrhea, emesis, and gastric pain and burning; and a decrease in blood pressure and shock (Lehrer et al., 2003).

401 Shellfish allergens are mostly flesh-derived, but in shrimps, allergens are also
402 reported from the shells (Khora, 2016). Tropomysin is the major shellfish allergen but
403 several others have been identified including arginine kinase, myosin light chain, and
404 sarcoplasmic binding protein in crustaceans as well as paramyosin, troponin, actine,
405 amylase, and hemoyanin in mollusks (Khora 2016). These allergens are highly heat-
406 stable and biochemically stable. However, since the first step in chitin extraction is
407 deproteinization, it might be expected that these compounds would be removed from
408 chitin after this process. However, levels of shellfish allergens must be assessed and
409 the reliability of their removal established; the most common analytical methods are
410 western blotting, the radio allergo-sorbent test, enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay,
411 mass spectrometry, and liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry (Korte et
412 al., 2016). Shellfish allergy is diagnosed based on the clinical history, oral provocation
413 challenges, in vivo analysis of skin reactivity, and in vitro quantification of specific
414 serum IgE (Barber and Kalicinsky, 2016). Based on these measures, patients can be
415 advised on their levels of sensitization and risk for allergic reactions and measures to
416 prevent and treat them (Moonessinghe et al., 2016). As abovementioned, since
417 deproteinization is carried out, substances that cause allergies are expected to be
418 removed. However, further research is needed since the lack of allergenic risks would
419 potentially expand the use of such packaging. In addition to the allergenic risks, the
420 environmental risks associated to the extraction of biopolymers from food processing
421 waste must be considered in order to produce healthier and more sustainable
422 packaging. Therefore, redirection of seafood processing wastes is likely to have
423 significant impacts on the size and quality of waste streams and substitution for
424 environmentally impactful synthetic products and these are now considered.

425 **7 Environmental benefits of the circular economy**

426 Life cycle assessment (LCA) has proven to be a powerful tool in measuring
427 emissions throughout the production value chain of goods and services. Its main

advantage is that it identifies areas of disproportionate impact within the chain that can then be acted upon without shifting the impact to other areas within the value chain. This is particularly pertinent for food packaging as some packaging may be less impacting to produce than another, but it may not offer the same degree of protection to the food, resulting in higher spoilage and, therefore, much higher environmental impact at other points within the value chain (Conte et al., 2015).

LCA can also be used to assess the consequences of commercial choices, such as switching to renewable energy from fossil fuels and the resulting environmental impact across a range of different categories. Most LCAs are termed attributional mid-point studies in that they classify the numerous emissions and resource use into categories that have the potential to do harm within the environment. The impact categories used in LCA are numerous and varied, with some being more applicable to certain industries than others. However, out of the many categories, those which are of relevance to food production are global warming potential (GWP), acidification potential (AP), eutrophication potential (EP), ozone depletion potential (ODP), photochemical oxidation potential (POP), increasingly land use (LU), and consumptive water use (CWU) (Table 2). Fossil fuel use (FFU) may also be considered as important for packaging raw material extractions and other categories, such as various toxicity potentials, are also important in many LCAs, including packaging. While the effects of different greenhouse gases can be standardized to a single indicator, the effects on biodiversity of disposal of different packaging materials is more difficult to quantify and standardize. Therefore, although the implications of biodegradation of bio-based polymers, such as GWP, ODP, EP, and others, may be measured against conventional plastics, quantifying the hazards to wildlife of each are more difficult, especially in relation to trade-offs between marine and terrestrial ecosystems (Curran et al., 2011).

Table 2. The impact categories which are of relevance in food production.

Environmental impact	Impact category

Damage to human health	Global warming potential (GWP) Ozone depletion potential (ODP) Photochemical oxidation potential (POP)
Damage to ecosystems	Acidification potential (AP) Eutrophication potential (EP)
Damage to resources	Land use (LU) Consumptive water use (CWU) Fossil fuel use (FFU)

454

455 Europe is the second largest producer of plastics in the world after China with
456 around a 40% market share for packaging purposes (Plastics Europe, 2017). Incorrect
457 disposal of non-biodegradable plastic packaging materials and bags have particularly
458 been associated with negative effects on marine life (EC, 2011b). Although in
459 developed countries common plastic packaging such as polypropylene (PP) (Humbert
460 et al., 2009), polyethylene terephthalate (PET) (Shen et al., 2011), or low density
461 polyethylene (LDPE) (Siracusa et al., 2014) may be recycled effectively, in Europe less
462 than 30% of plastics are recycled, with the rest being sent to landfill sites or to energy-
463 recovery plants (Plastics Europe, 2017). Furthermore, plastic packaging becomes more
464 difficult to recycle if multiple layers of different plastics are used for improving barrier
465 properties, for example (Diop et al., 2017). Persistence of plastic in the (particularly
466 marine) environment has recently been highlighted as a significant issue (Worm et al
467 2017). Therefore biodegradable bioplastics, particularly ones which are biocompatible
468 and non-harmful if digested such as chitosan films are of considerable interest.

469 Numerous LCA studies have been published regarding the manufacture of
470 different packaging materials from both traditional petrochemical-derived materials and
471 natural polymers, but only a few have looked at the implications of these materials on
472 spoilage and the various trade-offs between spoilage of the food product, reduction of
473 waste, and ability to recycle these materials. Although for packaging wastes, the
474 quantity of plastics is generally lower than that of paper, plastics have generally posed
475 a much greater challenge because of their lack of biodegradability, emissions
476 concerned with their incineration (Bohlman, 2004; Vidal et al., 2007), or persistence in

477 landfill sites or the wider environment (Günkaya and Banar, 2016). Conversely,
478 whereas bio-based films may degrade readily (Günkaya and Banar, 2016), the
479 composting or landfill of biodegradable polymers may result in greater GHG emissions,
480 such as carbon dioxide and methane (Ingrao et al., 2015). According to Ferreira et al.
481 (2014), landfill gas is approximately 50% each of CO_2 and methane. While CO_2
482 emissions are biogenic and considered as neutral, methane has a global warming
483 equivalence 25 times higher than CO_2 and may become a problem during degradation,
484 particularly if anaerobic conditions are allowed to develop in poorly managed
485 composting or landfill sites. Bio-based films also generally contribute more highly to
486 land use (Leceta et al., 2013b; 2014) and water use (Hermann et al., 2010) for growing
487 the crops from which the raw materials originated. Interestingly, few LCAs of bio-based
488 films include either land or water consumption, considering the reliance of the raw
489 materials on these resources compared to fossil fuel-derived materials. However, many
490 biopolymers may receive environmental credits from redirecting wastes, where the raw
491 materials originate from agricultural by-products.

492 Many LCAs focus on the various trade-offs between traditional plastics vs. bio-
493 based polymers from different aspects. Some of the studies are at a concept or pilot
494 level only and do not include commercial-scale production techniques necessary for
495 direct comparisons. Individual LCAs of bio-based packaging materials include
496 polylactic acid (PLA) (Hermann et al., 2010; Ingrao et al., 2015; Madival et al., 2009),
497 PLA and starch composites (Benetto et al., 2015; Vidal et al., 2007), pectin and maize
498 starch (Günkaya and Banar, 2016), wheat gluten (Deng et al., 2013),
499 polyhydroxyalkanoate (PHA) (Khoo et al., 2010), chitosan (Leceta et al., 2013b; 2014),
500 soy protein (Leceta et al., 2014), and agar (Leceta et al., 2014). In most cases,
501 including chitosan films (Leceta et al., 2013b), the impacts from biopolymer production,
502 apart from land and water utilization, were better or comparable to conventional plastic
503 except for PHA (Khoo et al., 2010) and pectin and maize starch (Günkaya and Banar,

2016), where the biopolymer was considerably worse performing due to energy-intensive processes during production. Considering chitosan films are made from waste materials, there are considerable advantages compared to some other bioplastics for which the raw material requires a dedicated industry or redirection from human food chains. This was borne out by Muñoz et al. (2018) that showed raw materials for chitosan were redirected from composting. In other circumstances, chitin may be redirected from shrimp meal. However, shrimp meal is poor nutritionally and better efficiencies can be obtained by separating the chitin for chitosan production and retaining the protein and lipid fractions for animal nutrition (Newton et al., 2014).

Biopolymers perform particularly well compared to plastics in toxicity impacts related to disposal by incineration. In many cases, studies focus only on the production and subsequent disposal of an equivalent quantity of packaging material (e.g. 1 m^2 of film) with little focus on the performance of the packaging itself in reducing food waste (Wikström et al., 2016; 2014). In the case of chitosan (and other active) packaging, it performs a more complex function than standard plastic in terms of the added shelf life provided for the packaged product. It is important to factor this extra functionality into the environmental impact assessment in terms of avoided waste from the retailer and, potentially, the consumer (Wikström et al., 2016, 2014; Zhang et al., 2015). As chitosan film has already shown to perform well against standard plastic films, environmental benefits from avoided waste and the associated emissions of its disposal, at both the raw material supply end and at the retailer would be expected to add considerable benefits to this type of packaging. Although extension of shelf life of seafood using chitosan packaging has not been shown, directly applied chitosan coatings have been shown to considerably extend the shelf life of herring (Jeon et al., 2002), salmon (Sathivel, 2005), and mackerel (Wu et al., 2016). As the impacts associated with the food product vastly outweigh those of the packaging (Zhang et al., 2015), even minor shelf life extension will significantly reduce global emissions as consumption efficiencies are gained. Quantifying these reductions in impact is highly researchable.

A WRAP report (2015) showed that considerable financial savings could be made through extending shelf life of food and that the greatest savings could be made on the most perishable goods, such as seafood, because of the proportionately greater time for sale or utilization within the home. Zhang et al. (2015) demonstrated that by using antimicrobial packaging, considerable environmental impact savings could be made by reducing wasted beef at the retailer by 1.8% because of the substantial impacts associated with beef production. In most livestock production, including aquaculture, the majority of environmental impacts occur throughout the feed production stage with little contribution from the actual farming system, processing, or packaging, although the embodied impact accumulates at every stage throughout the life cycle of the product up to and including disposal. Therefore, small reductions in food waste at and after the processing stage result in larger reductions in accumulated upstream impacts and, consequently, the performance of the packaging in terms of its ability to reduce food wastage is often of much more consequence than the impacts associated with manufacture of the packaging material itself (Williams et al., 2008; Wikström et al., 2014, 2016).

Considering the large quantities of waste highlighted above by Gustavson et al. (FAO, 2011), in developed nations at the retailer and consumer level, substantial environmental impact reductions could be made with better packaging technology. However, as the environmental footprint of a food item becomes lower, as with salmon (Pelletier et al., 2009) compared to beef (Pelletier et al., 2010), the relative importance of the packaging manufacture becomes higher compared to food waste savings (Wikström et al., 2014, 2016; Williams and Wikström, 2011).

It is important to note that, while food safety and quality aspects associated with reducing spoilage by utilizing active packaging are of importance, physical attributes related to consumer-friendly packaging can be critical. Wikström et al. (2014) pointed out that a high percentage of waste may occur in the household if the packaging is not

559 easy to use and/or does not meet the consumption requirements of a wide range of
560 demographic groups, from large families with young children, to frail and elderly people
561 living on their own. Therefore, ease-of-use characteristics are important to maintain
562 when developing shelf life extension technologies. Such factors include: being easy to
563 open without spillage, ability to reseal to prevent contamination, drying, and other
564 spoilage, and easy to empty (Wikström et al., 2014; Williams and Wikström, 2011).
565 Although packaging may extend shelf life considerably, its effect on consumer behavior
566 to reduce waste is of more importance and difficult to measure (Williams and Wikström,
567 2011), but as pointed out in the WRAP report (2015), it is likely that consumers may be
568 highly influenced by extended shelf life, particularly on more perishable goods.

569 **8 Discussion of socio-economic implications of a circular economy for seafood**
570 **packaging**

571 An interdisciplinary approach to enhancing the circular economy around use of
572 aquaculture by-products has been critical to this holistic analysis. A range of technical
573 challenges that draw on knowledge related to polymer chemistry through to food
574 processing and quality are of course central but there has also been a need to identify
575 potential public health risks and, critically, to articulate the social and economic
576 dimension (Figure 4). Reducing food losses, minimizing waste, and adding-value to
577 fisheries (and aquaculture) output are highlighted as being of critical importance for
578 humanity and the planet in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) adopted under
579 the United Nations' 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UN, 2015). In support
580 of the goal related to sustainable consumption and production patterns, two targets are
581 of relevance, in particular target 12.3 and target 12.5.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT



582

583 Fig.4. Assembly of the different aspects that must be considered when the
584 development of novel packaging systems is addressed.

585 Target 12.3 relates to food waste at the retail level and consumption at home.
586 Losses and waste of fish in developing countries mainly occurs in the postharvest
587 stages of the value chain, due to poor handling and processing techniques, and lack of
588 cold storage and ice, in part because small-scale producers are unable to access
589 technology to maintain quality effectively. In developed countries a major proportion of
590 food waste happens at the consumer level. For fish and seafood it has been estimated
591 that in Europe about one-third of overall waste and losses in the fish and seafood value
592 chain happen at the consumer-level (FAO, 2011). A reduction of fish waste at the
593 consumer level through improved packaging and extending shelf life would therefore
594 have potential to contribute to this target. A systematic assessment of opportunities for
595 active packaging to counter unsustainable aspects of prevailing seafood product value
596 chains could be conducted using the DPSIR (Driving forces-Pressures-State-Impacts-
597 Responses) framework (Bunting, 2016).

598 Target 12.5 is about waste and losses along production and distribution chains.
599 The large observed levels of by-product generated by the fish and seafood processing
600 sector result in significant amounts of waste, when considering that in 2014 globally,

capture fisheries and aquaculture together supplied about 167 million tons of fish, of which about 88% was utilized for human consumption. Of the latter, 54% (equal to 79 million tons) was supplied to consumers in different processed forms, and in Europe and North America this was as high as two-thirds of total fish for human consumption (FAO, 2016). The logistical challenges of adding enough value to processing by-products in undeveloped markets are such that much still becomes waste. Enhancing the value of fisheries value chains would therefore have potential to contribute to end hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture (UN, 2015).

When considering the social and economic costs and benefits of transforming fish by-products into packaging material, it should be noted that definitions of food losses and waste are not always straightforward, and what is edible also varies across contexts and time (Rutten, 2013). In addition, it depends on the reference frame of the analysis, as from a food security perspective biofuels, feed, and other non-food uses of resources intended for human consumption are considered a loss, while from a perspective of economics and value added they are not (Rutten, 2013). Who benefits from adopting alternative packaging solutions will also not be spread evenly or equitably across product value chains. Consequently, development of new techniques and packaging solutions should ideally occur in collaboration with value chain actors and be responsive to consumer needs and expectations. Approaches to engaging with stakeholders to understand their different perspectives, and challenge people to re-evaluate their knowledge and perceptions, can include focus groups, product testing, and stakeholder Delphi assessments (Bunting, 2008; 2010).

Appropriate safeguards must be devised to ensure there are no adverse social impacts associated with changing packaging solutions. These impacts could come from three sources. First, diverting edible parts of fish away from consumption by the poor. In Bangladesh, for example, it has been shown that prawn heads and legs,

628 removed as by-products during processing, are used for direct consumption (Ahmed et
629 al., 2010). Second, diverting materials away from local processing industries may
630 disadvantage poor and marginal groups employed in such activities. Value-added
631 items produced from such by-products (e.g. pastes and sauces) can in turn contribute
632 to the nutrition and food security of those directly involved and also communities not
633 involved in aquaculture or fisheries (Plews-Ogan, 2013). Third, by-products may be
634 diverted away from processing into formulated feed for fish, livestock, or poultry, thus
635 affecting feed security indirectly (Anh et al., 2011; Muir, 2013).

636 There is circumstantial evidence that seafood by-product-derived packaging
637 would find favor in the market place. Trends in corporate social responsibility (CSR) are
638 strongly towards reduction in environmental impact in food processing and retail and
639 food service sectors. Evidence shows that some seafood consumers have an interest
640 in buying more environmentally friendly fish and that a significant portion of consumers
641 is willing to pay more for it (Honkanen and Olsen, 2009; Olesen et al., 2010). Beneficial
642 attributes of active packaging derived from seafood by-products may encourage
643 consumers to seek out such products and to pay a premium for them. In markets
644 where environmental certification is already well accepted, inclusion under existing
645 schemes may be an efficient means to ensure that sustainable seafood packaging is
646 adopted as a core element of broader assurance protocols. Alternatively, seafood
647 brands and multiple retailers could invest in awareness-raising and labelling to
648 communicate the benefits of sustainable packaging to consumers.

649 Whilst a novel type of active packaging may be technologically possible and
650 environmentally beneficial, the packaging must also be commercially acceptable to
651 those stakeholders in the distribution channel who effectively control access to end
652 consumers, namely retailers, wholesalers, and food service providers. Organized forms
653 of retailing, whether through multiple chains or affiliated networks, control increasing
654 shares of product markets, store numbers, and floor-space in all parts of the world.

655 This concentrates buying power and decision-making into fewer nodes, therefore
656 acceptance by these stakeholders is crucial to the adoption of any form of packaging
657 innovation. Mainstream grocery retailers, in general terms, operate a high volume/low
658 margin business model, therefore incremental gains in cost reduction or increasing
659 sales value are attractive, especially when the scale of the overall business is taken
660 into account. Gains associated with high value/high margin product, such as shellfish,
661 are particularly attractive.

662 However, retailers are notoriously cautious and are late adopters of technology-
663 based food innovation (Esbjerg et al., 2016), particularly if they feel there is any risk or
664 potential risk to their established customer franchise. Consumers eat food not
665 packaging, therefore most retailer reluctance relates to new food production techniques
666 where it is feared that customers do not understand or appreciate the technology
667 concerned. However, consumers also have expectations and exhibit routine norms of
668 behavior relating to packaging and product presentation. These need to be taken into
669 account. Concerns have been expressed that packaging-related benefits can raise
670 customer concerns if accepted norms are breached, for example, if shelf life is deemed
671 to be too long and not “natural” (i.e. beyond the assumed/accepted norm).
672 Communication with customers in terms and language that they understand is
673 therefore important to raise awareness of any benefits and to encourage acceptance.

674 The benefits of novel packaging would, however, appear to positively align with
675 a number of current agendas within the retail grocery industry. The broad CSR and
676 waste agendas are growing in importance, not just through increased legal compliance,
677 but also as a point of differentiation and in response to increased consumer interest
678 and expectations. Additionally, the CSR agenda provides the opportunity for cost
679 savings or cost transfer within the distribution channel. Cost savings may be most
680 evident in terms of the potential for extended shelf life, reduced waste, and less
681 handling of products including shelf replenishment (which incurs direct costs and can

682 increase shrinkage and waste). A third consideration is the consumer facing benefits
683 relating to product quality and waste reduction, although commercial issues concerning
684 the attractiveness of the packaging, and its role in product presentation as both an item
685 and a category on a shelf display, play an important role. These considerations,
686 alongside the reassurance that any packaging meets legal requirements relating to
687 health and safety and carries minimal risk from allergies, will be taken into account by
688 channel stakeholders when deciding if to adopt. They are commercial considerations,
689 not technological considerations.

690 As a basic requirement it would be important to label packaging as
691 biodegradable. Currently no major sustainability seafood certifier has moved to
692 incorporate packaging into its standards, but this may simply recognize the current
693 availability of technologies. Such organizations have also shown interest in moving
694 from production-centric standards to whole value chain sustainability recognizing whole
695 product value and rewarding innovations through certification. Other food packaging
696 such as Tetrapak has moved to more sustainable raw material sourcing strategies and
697 sought to raise attention to this change in pack-level labeling.

698 Potential benefits of adopting biodegradable active packing will also depend on
699 the means of disposal. Often this depends on the municipal authorities or private
700 operators, and investment of public money to facilitate recycling may be needed.
701 Inappropriate disposal to landfill sites, for example, may result in significant negative
702 environmental impacts negating gains elsewhere across the product value chain. Even
703 where appropriate recycling facilities exist, consumer behavior can dictate how
704 effective such schemes are and appropriate awareness-raising and support mechanics
705 could be critical in realizing the potential of sustainable seafood packaging. Conditions
706 needed to facilitate the widespread and successful adoption of active and
707 biodegradable seafood packaging could be assessed using the STEPS (social,
708 technical, environmental, political, sustainability) framework.

In sum, adding value to fish processing by-products may benefit processors financially as increased sales will enhance their revenue and waste disposal costs may be avoided. However, a critical analysis of the long-term total costs and benefits of producing such materials needs to be made.

9 Conclusions and future prospects

This review highlights the need for an inter-disciplinary approach to the development of active seafood packaging within a circular economy. Massive waste generated during seafood processing can be properly managed in order to obtain renewable and biodegradable raw materials. This management implies the use of environmentally friendly and cost-effective processes for the extraction of materials to ensure that the innovative biorefinery practices designed to add value to by-products contributes to the sustainable development of materials. Nowadays, the production of chitosan and fish gelatin has been scaled up and these materials are commercially available. Furthermore, some bioactive compounds can be separated after chitosan or gelatin extraction and can be incorporated into the film-forming formulations to produce packaging and extend food shelf life and reduce food losses. Although some attempts have been successfully carried out to manufacture films and coatings based on chitosan and/or gelatin, more research in this field is needed in order to scale-up production using the techniques employed by the industries dedicated to the production of the conventional plastics and, thus, to produce sustainable and profitable seafood packaging. From a global and interdisciplinary point of view, adoption of technical, environmental, economical, and social considerations is needed to ensure that well intended initiatives to instigate a circular economy have positive impacts on the development of active food packaging, thereby contributing to food security and nutrition.

References

735 Abdollahi, M., Rezaei, M., Farzi, G,. 2012. A novel active bionanocomposite film
736 incorporating rosemary essential oil and nanoclay into chitosan. J. Food Eng. 111, 343-
737 350.

738 Ahmed, N., Allison, E.H., Muir, J.F., 2010. Rice fields to prawn farms: a blue revolution
739 in southwest Bangladesh? Aquacult. Int. 8, 555-574.

740 Alfaro, A.T., Balbinot, E., Weber, C.I., Tonial, I.B., Machado-Lunkes, A. 2015. Fish
741 gelatin: Characteristics, functional properties, applications and future potentials. Food
742 Eng. Rev. 7, 33-44.

743 Andrade, R.D., Skurtys, O., Osorio, F.A., 2012. Atomizing spray systems for application
744 of edible coatings. Compr. Rev. Food Sci. Food. Saf. 11, 323-337.

745 Anh, P.T., My Dieu, T.T,, Mol, A.P.J., Kroeze, C., Bush, S.R., 2011. Towards eco-agro
746 industrial clusters in aquatic production: The case of shrimp processing in Vietnam. J.
747 Clean. Prod. 19, 2107-2118.

748 Aschermann-Witzel, J., de Hooge, I.E., Normann, A., 2016. Consumer-related food
749 waste: Role of food marketing and retailers and potential for action. J. Int. Food
750 Agribus. Mark. 28, 271-285.

751 Aschemann-Witzel, J., de Hooge, I.E., Rohm, H., Normann, A., Bonzanini Bossle, M.,
752 Grønhøj, A., Oostindjer, M., 2017. Key characteristics and success factors of supply
753 chain initiatives tackling consumer-related food waste - A multiple case study. J. Clean.
754 Prod .155, 33-45.

755 Atarés, L., Chiralt, A., 2016. Essential oils as additives in biodegradable films and
756 coatings for active food packaging. Trends Food Sci. Tech. 48, 51-62.

757 Avena-Bustillos, R.J., Olsen, C.W., Olson, D.A., Chiou, B., Yee, E., Bechtel, P.J.,
758 McHugh, T.H., 2006. Water vapour permeability of mammalian and fish gelatin films. J.
759 Food Sci. 71, E202-E207.

760 Bao, Y., Zhang, H., Luan, Q., Zheng, M., Tang, H., Huang, F., 2018. Fabrication of
761 cellulose nanowhiskers reinforced chitosan-xylan nanocomposite films with
762 antibacterial and antioxidant activities. Carbohyd. Polym. 184, 66-73.

763 Barber, C., Kalicinsky, C., 2016. A novel combination of an IgE mediated adult onset
764 food allergy and a suspected mast cell activation syndrome presenting as anaphylaxis.
765 Allergy Asthma Clin. Immunol. 12, 46.

766 Benetto, E., Jury, C., Igos, E., Carton, J., Hild, P., Vergne, C., Di Martino, J., 2015.
767 Using atmospheric plasma to design multilayer film from polylactic acid and
768 thermoplastic starch: A screening life cycle assessment. J. Clean. Prod. 87, 953-960.

769 Bocqué, M., Voirin, C., Lapinte, V., Caillol, S., Robin, J.J., 2016. Petro-based and bio-
770 based plasticizers: Chemical structures to plasticizing properties. J. Polym. Sci. Pol.
771 Chem. 54, 11-33.

772 Bohlman, G.M., 2004. Biodegradable packaging life-cycle assessment. Environ. Prog.
773 23, 342-346.

774 Bonilla, J., Atarés, L., Vargas, M., Chiralt, A., 2012. Edible films and coatings to prevent
775 the detrimental effect of oxygen on food quality: Possibilities and limitations. J. Food
776 Eng. 110, 208-213.

777 Bowen, K.J., Friel, S., 2012. Climate change adaptation: Where does global health fit in
778 the agenda? Global Health 8, 1-7.

779 Bunting, S.W., 2010. Assessing the stakeholder Delphi for facilitating interactive
780 participation and consensus building for sustainable aquaculture development. Soc.
781 Natur. Resour. 23, 758-775.

782 Bunting, S.W., 2008. Horizontally integrated aquaculture development: Exploring
783 consensus on constraints and opportunities with a stakeholder Delphi. Aquacult. Int.
784 16, 153-169.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

785 Bunting, S.W., Luo, S., Cai, K., Kundu, N., Lund, S., Mishra, R., Ray, D., Smith, K.G.,
786 Sugden, F., 2016. Integrated action planning for biodiversity conservation and
787 sustainable use of highland aquatic resources: evaluating outcomes for the Beijiang
788 river, China. J. Environ. Plan. Manage. 59, 1580-1609.

789 Chuaynukul, K., Prodpran, T., Benjakul, S., 2015. Properties of thermo-compression
790 molded bovine and fish gelatin films as influenced by resin preparation condition. Int.
791 Food Res. J. 22, 1095-1102.

792 Conte, A., Cappelletti, G.M., Nicoletti, G.M., Russo, C., Del Nobile, M.A., 2015.
793 Environmental implications of food loss probability in packaging design. Food Res. Int.
794 78, 11-17.

795 Cruz-Romero, M., Kerry, J.P., 2011. Packaging of cooked meat and muscle-based,
796 convenience-style processed foods, in: Kerry, J.P., Kerry, J.F. (Eds.), Processed
797 Meats: Improving Safety, Nutrition and Quality. Woodhead Publishing, Cambridge, pp.
798 666-705.

799 Curran, M., de Baan, L., De Schryver, A.M., van Zelm, R., Hellweg, S., Koellner, T.,
800 Sonnemann, G., Huijbregts, M.A.J., 2011. Toward meaningful end points of biodiversity
801 in Life Cycle Assessment. Environ. Sci. Technol. 45, 70-79.

802 Deng, Y., Achten, W.M.J., Van Acker, K., Duflou, J.R., 2013. Life cycle assessment of
803 wheat gluten powder and derived packaging film. Biofuels Bioprod. Bioref. 7, 429-458.

804 Diop, C.I.K., Lavoie, J.M., Huneault, M.A., 2017. Separation and reuse of multilayer
805 food packaging in cellulose reinforced polyethylene composites. Waste Biomass
806 Valorization 8, 85-93.

807 Dutta, P.K., Ravikumar, M.N.V., Dutta, J. 2002. Chitin and chitosan for versatile
808 applications. Polym. Rev. 42, 307-354.

809 Emblem, A., 2012a. Plastic properties for packaging materials, in: Emblem, A.,
810 Emblem, H. (Eds.). Packaging technology: Fundamentals, materials and processes.
811 Woodhead Publishing, Cambridge, pp. 287-309.

812 Emblem, A., 2012b. Packaging functions, in: Emblem, A., Emblem, H. (Eds.).
813 Packaging technology: Fundamentals, materials and processes. Woodhead Publishing,
814 Cambridge, pp. 24-49.

815 Enos-Berlage, J.L., Guvener, Z.T., Keenan, C.E., McCarter, L.L., 2005. Genetic
816 determinants of biofilm development of opaque and translucent *Vibrio*
817 *parahaemolyticus*. Mol. Microbiol. 55, 1160-1182.

818 Esbjerg, L., Burt, S., Pearse, H., Glanz-CXhanos, V., 2016. Retailers and technology-
819 driven innovation in the food sector. Br. Food. J. 118, 1370-1383.

820 Etxabide, A., Guerrero, P., de la Caba, K., 2016. A novel approach to manufacture
821 porous biocomposites using extrusion and injection moulding. Eur. Polym. J. 82, 324-
822 333.

823 Etxabide, A., Urdanpilleta, M., Guerrero, P., de la Caba, K., 2015b. Effects of cross-
824 linking in nanostructure and physicochemical properties of fish gelatins for bio-
825 applications. React. Funct. Polym. 94, 55-62.

826 Etxabide, A., Uranga, J., Guerrero, P., de la Caba, K., 2017. Development of active
827 gelatin films by means of valorisation of food processing waste: A review. Food
828 Hydrocolloid 68, 192-198.

829 European Commission (EC) 2004. Regulation (EC) No 1935/2004 of the European
830 Parliament and of the Council of 27 October 2004 on materials and articles intended to
831 come into contact with food and repealing Directives 80/590/EEC and 89/109/EEC
832 https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-
833 content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32004R1935&from=en. 14pp.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

834 European Commission (EC) 2009. Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 of the European
835 Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 Laying Down Health Rules as
836 Regards Animal By-Products and Derived Products Not Intended for Human
837 Consumption and Repealing Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 (Animal by-products
838 Regulation). http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-
839 content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32009R1069andfrom=EN. 33pp.

840 European Commission (EC) 2011a. Commission Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 of 25
841 February 2011 Implementing Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 of the European
842 Parliament and of the Council Laying Down Health Rules as Regards Animal By-
843 Products and Derived Products Not Intended for Human Consumption and
844 Implementing Council Directive 97/78/EC as Regards Certain Samples and Items
845 Exempt from Veterinary Checks at the Border Under that Directive.
846 http://faolex.fao.org/docs/pdf/eur109216.pdf. 252pp

847 European Commision (EC). 2011b. Plastic waste: ecological and human health
848 impacts. Available from:
849 http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/research/newsalert/pdf/IR1_en.pdf.
850 Accessed 2018 May 19.

851 Fabra, M.J., Talens, P., Chiralt, A., 2009. Microstructure and optical properties of
852 sodium caseinate films containing oleic acid-beeswax mixtures. Food Hydrocolloid 23,
853 676-683.

854 Fader, M., Gerten, D., Krause, M., Lucht, W., Cramer, W., 2013. Spatial decoupling of
855 agricultural production and consumption: quantifying dependences of countries on food
856 imports due to domestic land and water constraints. Environ. Res. Lett. 8, 014046.

857 Falguera, V., Quintero, J.P., Jiménez, A., Aldemar Muñoz, J., Ibarz, A., 2011. Edible
858 films and coatings: Structures, active functions and trends in their use. Trends Food
859 Sci. Tech. 22, 292-303.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

860 Farajzadeh, F., Motamedzadegan, A., Shahidi, S.A., Hamzeh, S., 2016. The effects of
861 chitosan-gelatin coating on the quality of shrimp (*Litopenaeus vannamei*) under
862 refrigerated conditions. Food Control 67, 163-170.

863 Farhan, A., Hani, N.M., 2017. Characterization of edible packaging films based on
864 semi-refined kappa-carrageenan plasticized with glycerol and sorbitol. Food
865 Hydrocolloid 64, 48-58.

866 Ferrari, R., 2015. Writing narrative style literature reviews. Medical Writing 24, 230-235.

867 Ferreira, S., Cabral, M., da Cruz, N.F., Simoes, P., Marques, R.C., 2014. Life cycle
868 assessment of a packaging waste recycling system in Portugal. Waste Manage. 34,
869 1725-1735.

870 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). 2014. Assessment and
871 management of seafood safety and quality. Available from: http://www.fao.org/3/a-
872 i3215e.pdf. Accessed 2018 May 19.

873 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). 2015. Consumers'
874 concerns and external drivers in food markets. Available from: http://www.fao.org/3/a-
875 i4939e.pdf. Accessed 2018 May 19.

876 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). 2011. Global Food
877 losses and food waste. Available from:
878 http://www.fao.org/docrep/014/mb060e/mb060e.pdf. Accessed 2018 May 19.

879 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). 2016. The State of
880 World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2016. Available from: http://www.fao.org/3/a-
881 i5555e.pdf. Accessed 2018 May 19.

882 Fraser, E., Legwegoh, A., Krishna, K.C., CoDyre, M., Dias, G., Hazen, S., Johnson, R.,
883 Martin, R., Ohberg, L., Sethuratnam, S., Sneyd, L., Smithers, J., Van Acker, R.,
884 Vansteenkiste, J., Wittman, H., Yada, R., 2016. Biotechnology or organic? Extensive or

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

intensive? Global or local? A critical review of potential pathways to resolve the global food crisis. Trends Food Sci. Technol. 48, 78-87.

Future Market Insights. 2017. Protective Packaging Market: Global Industry Analysis and Opportunity Assessment 2015-2025. Available from: http://www.futuremarketinsights.com/reports/protective-packaging-market. Accessed 2018 May 19.

Galvis-Sánchez, A.C., Sousa, A.M.M., Hilliou, L., Gonçalves, M.P., Souza, H.K.S., 2016. Thermo-compression molding of chitosan with a deep eutectic mixture for biofilms development. Green Chem. 18, 1571-1580.

Garlapati, V.K., Shankar, U., Budhiraja, A., 2016. Bioconversion technologies of crude glycerol to value added industrial products. Biotechnol. Rep. 9, 9-14.

Genovese, A., Acquaye, A.A., Figueroa, A., Koh, S.C.L., 2017. Sustainable supply chain management and the transition towards a circular economy: Evidence and some applications. Omega 66, 344-357.

Gómez-Estaca, J., Gómez-Guillén, M.C., Fernández-Martín, F., Montero, P., 2011. Effects of gelatin origin, bovine-hide and tuna-skin, on the properties of compound gelatin-chitosan films. Food Hydrocolloid 25, 1461-1469.

Gómez-Guillén, M.C., Pérez-Mateos, M., Gómez-Estaca, J., López-Caballero, E., Giménez, B., Montero, P., 2009. Fish gelatin: a renewable material for developing active biodegradable films. Trends Food Sci. Tech. 20, 3-16.

Günkaya, Z., Banar, M., 2016. An environmental comparison of biocomposite film based on orange peel-derived pectin jelly-corn starch and LDPE film: LCA and biodegradability. Int. J. Life Cycle Assess. 21, 465-475.

908 Hermann, B.G., Blok, K.I., Patel, M.K., 2010. Twisting biomaterials around your little
909 finger: Environmental impacts of bio-based wrappings. Int. J. Life Cycle Assess. 15,
910 346-358.

911 Hernández-Izquierdo, V.M., Krochta, J.M., 2008. Thermoplastic processing of proteins
912 for film formation. J. Food Sci. 73, R30-R39.

913 Hong, P.K., Gottardi, D., Ndagijimana, M., Betti, M., 2014. Glycation and
914 transglutaminase mediated glycosylation on fish gelatin peptides with glucosamine
915 enhance bioactivity. Food Chem. 142, 285-293.

916 Honkanen, P., Olsen, S.O., 2009. Environmental and animal welfare issues in food
917 choice: The case of farmed fish. Brit. Food J. 111, 293-309.

918 Humbert, S., Rossi, V., Margni, M., Jolliet, O., Loerincik, Y., 2009. Life cycle
919 assessment of two baby food packaging alternatives: Glass jars vs. plastic pots. Int. J.
920 Life Cycle Assess. 14, 95-106.

921 Ingrao, C., Tricase, C., Cholewa-Wójcik, A., Kawecka, A., Rana, R., Siracusa, V., 2015.
922 Polylactic acid trays for fresh-food packaging: A carbon footprint assessment. Sci. Total
923 Environ. 537, 385-398.

924 Innovation Norway. 2014. Market Opportunities for Norwegian technology providers
925 and processors. Available from:
926 http://akvarena.no/uploads/Ekstern%20informasjon/Catfish_by-product.pdf. Accessed
927 2018 May 19.

928 Janssen, M.A., Schoon, M.L., Ke, W., Börner, K., 2006. Scholarly networks on
929 resilience, vulnerability and adaptation within the human dimensions of global
930 environmental change. Global Environmental Change 16, 240-252.

931 Jeon, Y.J., Kamil, J.Y.V.A., Shahidi, F., 2002. Chitosan as an edible invisible film for
932 quality preservation of herring and Atlantic cod. J. Agr. Food Chem. 50, 5167-5178.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

933 Jurgilevich, A., Birge, T., Kentala-Lehtonen, J., Korhonen-Kurki, K., Pietikäinen, J.,
934 Saikku, L., Schösler, H., 2016. Transition towards circular economy in the food system.
935 Sustainability 8, 1-14.

936 Kaewprachu, P., Osako, K., Benjakul, S., Tongdeesoontorn, W., Rawdkuen, S., 2016.
937 Biodegradable protein-based films and their properties: A comparative study. Packag.
938 Technol. Sci. 29, 77-90.

939 Kearney, J., 2010. Food consumption trends and drivers. Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B 365,
940 2793-2807.

941 Khoo, H.H., Tan, R.B.H., Chng, K.W.L., 2010. Environmental impacts of conventional
942 plastic and bio-based carrier bags. Int. J. Life Cycle Assess. 15, 284-293.

943 Khora, S.S., 2016. Seafood-associated shellfish allergy: A comprehensive review.
944 Immunol. Invest. 45, 504-530.

945 Kim, D., Seo, J., 2018. A review: Breathable films for packaging applications. Trends
946 Food Sci. Technol. 76, 15-27.

947 Korte, R., Monneuse, J.M., Gemrot, E., Metton, I., Humpf, H.U., Brockmeyer, J., 2016.
948 New high -performance liquid chromatography coupled mass spectrometry method for
949 the detection of lobster and shrimp allergens in food samples via multiple reaction
950 monitoring and multiple reaction monitoring cubed. J. Agr. Food Chem. 64, 6219-6227.

951 Laso, J., Margallo, M., Fullan, P., Bala, A., Gazulla, C., Irabien, A., Aldaco, R., 2016.
952 Waste management under a life cycle approach as a tool for a circular economy in the
953 canned anchovy industry. Waste Manage. Res. 34, 724-733.

954 Leceta, I., Etxabide, A., Cabezudo, S., de la Caba, K., Guerrero, P., 2014. Bio-based
955 films prepared with by-products and wastes: Environmental assessment. J. Clean.
956 Prod. 64, 218-227.

957 Leceta, I., Guerrero, P., Cabezudo, S., de la Caba, K., 2013b. Environmental
958 assessment of chitosan-based films. J. Clean. Prod. 41, 312-318.

959 Leceta, I., Guerrero, P., de la Caba, K., 2013a. Functional properties of chitosan-based
960 films. Carbohyd. Polym. 93, 339-346.

961 Lehrer, S.B., Ayuso, R., Reese, G., 2003. Seafood allergy and allergens: A review.
962 Mar. Biotechnol. 5, 339-348.

963 Licciardello, F., 2017. Packaging, blessing in disguise. Review on its diverse
964 contribution to food sustainability. Trends Food Sci. Technol. 65, 32-39.

965 Lim, S.H., Hudson, S.M., 2003. Review of chitosan and its derivatives as antimicrobial
966 agents. Polym. Rev. 43, 223-269.

967 López de Dicastillo, C., Alonso, J.N., Catalá, R., Gavara, R., Hernández-Muñoz, P.,
968 2010. Improving the antioxidant protection of packaged food by incorporating natural
969 flavanoids into ethylene-vinyl alcohol copolymer (EVOH) films. J. Food Eng. 104, 380-
970 386.

971 Madival, S., Auras, R., Singh, S.P., Narayan, R., 2009. Assessment of the
972 environmental profile of PLA, PET and PS clamshell containers using LCA
973 methodology. J. Clean. Prod. 17, 1183-1194.

974 Miravella, N., Castellani, V., Sala, S., 2014. Current options for the valorization of food
975 manufacturing waste. J. Clean. Prod. 65, 28-41.

976 Moonesinghe, H., Mackenzie, H., Venter, C., Kilburn, S., Turner, P., Weir, K., Dean, T.,
977 2016. Prevalence of fish and shellfish allergy: A systematic review. Ann. Allerg. Asthma
978 Im. 117, 264-272.

979 Muir, J., 2013. Fish, feeds and food security. Anim. Front. 3, 28-34.

980 Muñoz, I., Rodríguez, C., Gillet, D., Moerschbacher, B.M., 2018. Life cycle assessment
981 of chitosan production in India and Europe. Int. J. Life Cycle Assess. 23, 1151-1160.

982 Newton, R., Telfer, T., Little, D., 2014. Perspectives on the utilization of aquaculture
983 coproduct in Europe and Asia: Prospects for value addition and improved resource
984 efficiency. Crit. Rev. Food Sci. 54, 495-510.

985 Niu, X., Liu, Y., Song, Y., Han, J., Pan, H., 2018. Rosin modified cellulose nanofiber as
986 a reinforcing and co-antimicrobial agents in polylactic acid /chitosan composite film for
987 food packaging. Carbohyd. Polym. 183, 102-109.

988 No, K.K., Meyers, S.P., Prinyawiwatkul, W., Xu, Z., 2007. Applications of chitosan for
989 improvement of quality and shelf life of food: a review. J. Food Sci. 72, 87-100.

990 Nouri, A., Yaraki, M.T., Ghorbanpour, M., Agarwal, S., Gupta, V.K., 2018. Enhanced
991 antibacterial effect of chitosan film using montmorillonite/CuO naonocomposite. Int. J.
992 Biol. Macromol. 109, 1219-1231.

993 Nowzari, F., Shábanpour, B., Ojagh, S.M., 2013. Comparison of chitosan-gelatin
994 composite and bilayer coating and film effect on the quality of refrigerated rainbow
995 trout. Food Chem. 141, 1667-1672.

996 Olesen, I., Alfnes, F., Rora, M.B., Kolstad, K., 2010. Eliciting consumers' willingness to
997 pay for organic and welfare-labelled salmon in a non-hypothetical choice experiment.
998 Livest. Sci. 127, 218-226.

999 Pelletier, N., Pirog, R., Rasmussen, R., 2010. Comparative life cycle environmental
1000 impacts of three beef production strategies in the Upper Midwestern United States.
1001 Agr. Syst. 103, 380-389.

1002 Pelletier, N., Tyedmers, P., Sonesson, U., Scholz, A., Ziegler, F., Flysjo, A., Cancino,
1003 B., Silverman, H., 2009. Not all salmon are created equal: Life cycle assessment (LCA)
1004 of global salmon farming systems. Environ. Sci. Technol. 43, 8730-8736.

1005 Perrot, N., De Vries, H., Lutton, E., van Mil, H.G.J., Donner, M., Tonda, A., Martin, S.,
1006 Alvarez, I., Bourgine, P., van der Linden, E., Axelos, M.A.V., 2016. Some remarks on
1007 computational approaches toward sustainable complex agri-food systems. Trends
1008 Food Sci. Tech. 48, 88-101.

1009 Plastics Europe. 2017. Plastics - the Facts 2017. Available from:
1010 http://www.plasticseurope.org/en/resources/publications/plastics-facts-2017. Accessed
1011 2018 May 19.

1012 Plews-Ogan, E.J., 2013. Eat until you're full: the pursuit of autonomy and health
1013 through the adoption of organic agriculture in Mae Ta, Thailand. Available from:
1014 http://openworks.wooster.edu/independentstudy/1145. Accessed 2018 May 19.

1015 Rabea, E.I., Badawy, M.E.T., Stevens, C.V., Smagghe, G., Steurbaut, W. 2003.
1016 Chitosan as antimicrobial agent: applications and mode of action. Biomacromolecules
1017 4, 1457-1465.

1018 Rajkowski, K.T., 2009. Biofilms in fish processing, in: Fratamico, P.M., Annous, B.A.,
1019 Gunther, N.W. (Eds.). Biofilms in the food and beverage industries. Woodhead
1020 Publishing, Cambridge, pp. 499-516.

1021 Ravindran, R., Jaiswal, A.K., 2016. Exploitation of food industry waste for high-value
1022 products. Trends Biotechnol. 34, 58-69.

1023 Rawdkuen, S., Sai-Ut, S., Benjakul, S., 2010. Properties of gelatin films from giant
1024 catfish skin and bovine bone: a comparative study. Eur. Food Res. Technol. 231, 907-
1025 916.

1026 Rustad, T., Storro, I., Slizyte, R., 2011. Possibilities for the utilisation of marine by-
1027 products. Int. J. Food Sci. Tech. 46, 2001-2014.

1028 Rutten, M.M., 2013. What economic theory tell us about the impacts of reducing food
1029 losses and/or waste: Implications for research, policy and practise. Agr. Food Secur. 2,
1030 1-13.

1031 Samira, S., Thuan-Chew, T.C., Azhar, M.E., 2014. Effect of ribose-induced Maillard
1032 reaction on physical and mechanical properties of bovine gelatin films prepared by
1033 oven drying. Int. Food Res. J. 2, 269-276.

1034 Sathivel, S., 2005. Chitosan and protein coatings affect yield, moisture loss, and lipid
1035 oxidation of pink salmon (*Oncorhynchus gorbuscha*) fillets during frozen storage. J.
1036 Food Sci. 70, E455-E459.

1037 Sayari, N., Sila, A., Abdelmalek, B.E., Abdallah, R.B., Ellouz-Chaabouni, S., Bougatef,
1038 A., Balti, R., 2016. Chitin and chitosan from the Norway lobster by-products:
1039 antimicrobial and anti-proliferative activities. Int. J. Biol. Macromol. 87, 163-171.

1040 Shen, L., Nieuwlaar, E., Worrell, E., Patel, M.K., 2011. Life cycle energy and GHG
1041 emissions of PET recycling: Change-oriented effects. Int. J. Life Cycle Assess. 16, 522-
1042 536.

1043 Simoes, J.S., Mársico, E.T., da Cruz, A.G., Queiroz de Freitas, M., Loro, D.H., Conte-
1044 Junior, C.A., 2015. Effect of sustainability information on consumers' liking of
1045 freshwater prawn (*Macrobrachium rosenbergii*). J. Sci. Food Agric. 95, 3160-3164.

1046 Siracusa, V., Ingrao, C., Lo Giudice, A., Mbohwa, C., Dalla Rosa, M., 2014.
1047 Environmental assessment of a multilayer polymer bag for food packaging and
1048 preservation: An LCA approach. Food Res. Int. 62, 151-161.

1049 Stahel, W.R., 2016. Circular economy. Nature 531, 435-438.

1050 Thalayasingam, M., Lee, B.W., 2015. Fish and shellfish allergy. Chem. Immunol.
1051 Allerg. 101, 152-161.

1052 Tian, F., Decker, E.A., Goddard, J.M., 2012. Control of lipid oxidation by nonmigratory
1053 active packaging films prepared by photoinitiated graft polymerization. J. Agr. Food
1054 Chem. 60, 2046-2052.

1055 Tongnuanchan, P., Benjakul, S., Prodpran, T., Pisuchpen, S., Osako, K., 2016.
1056 Mechanical, thermal and heat sealing properties of fish skin gelatin film containing palm
1057 oil and basil essential oil with different surfactants. Food Hydrocolloid 56, 93-107.

1058 Trung, T.S., 2014. The innovative utilization of fishery by-products in Vietnam. Seminar
1059 on Improved utilization of fishery by-products as potential nutraceuticals and functional
1060 foods; Bangkok, Thailand, 25-29 October 2010. Taipei, Taiwan: Food and Fertilizer
1061 Technology Center.

1062 Trung, T.S., Phuong, P.T.D., 2012. Bioactive Compounds from By-Products of Shrimp
1063 Processing Industry in Vietnam. J. Food Drug Anal. 20, 194-197.

1064 United Nations (UN). 2015. Transforming our world: the 2030 agenda for sustainable
1065 development. Available from:
1066 https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld. Accessed 2018
1067 May 19.

1068 Vidal, R., Martínez, P., Mulet, E., González, R., López-Mesa, B., Fowler, P., Fang,
1069 J.M., 2007. Environmental assessment of biodegradable multilayer film derived from
1070 carbohydrate polymers. J. Polym. Environ. 15, 159-168.

1071 Villalobos, R., Chanona, J., Hernández, P., Gutiérrez, G., Chiralt, A., 2005. Gloss and
1072 transparency of hydroxypropyl methylcellulose films containing surfactants as affected
1073 by their microstructure. Food Hydrocolloid 19, 53-61.

1074 Vodnar, D.C., Pop, O.L., Dulf, F.V., Socaciu, C., 2015. Antimicrobial efficiency of edible
1075 films in food industry. Not. Bot. Horti. Agrobo. 43, 302-312.

1076 Wang, L., Liu, G., Liu, X., Liu, Y., Gao, J., Zhou, B., Gao, S., Cheng, S., 2017. The
1077 weight of unfinished plate: A survey based characterization of restaurant food waste in
1078 Chinese cities. Waste Manage. 66, 3-12.

1079 Wikström, F., Williams, H., Venkatesh, G., 2016. The influence of packaging attributes
1080 on recycling and food waste behaviour - An environmental comparison of two
1081 packaging alternatives. J. Clean. Prod. 137, 895-902.

1082 Wikström, F., Williams, H., Verghese, K., Clune, S., 2014. The influence of packaging
1083 attributes on consumer behaviour in food packaging life cycle assessment studies - A
1084 neglected topic. J. Clean. Prod. 73, 100-108.

1085 Williams, H., Wikström, F., 2011. Environmental impact of packaging and food losses
1086 in a life cycle perspective: a comparative analysis of five food items. J. Clean. Prod. 24,
1087 141-148.

1088 Williams, H., Wikström, F., Löfgren, M., 2008. A life cycle perspective on environmental
1089 effects of customer focused packaging development. J. Clean. Prod. 16, 853-859.

1090 Wilson, C.T., Harte, J., Almenar, E., 2018. Effects of sachet presence on consumer
1091 product perception and active packaging acceptability - A study of fresh-cut
1092 cantaloupe. LWT 92, 531-539.

1093 Woo, C.K., Bahna, S.L., 2011. Not all shellfish "allergy" is allergy! Clin. Transl. Allergy
1094 1, 1-7.

1095 Worm, B., Lotze, H.K., Jubinville, I., Wilcox, C., Jambeck, J., 2017. Plastics as a
1096 persistent marine pollutant. Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour. 42, 1-26.

1097 WRAP. 2015. Reducing food waste by extending product life. Available from:
1098 http://www.wrap.org.uk/sites/files/wrap/Product%20Life%20Report%20Final_0.pdf.
1099 Accessed 2018 May 19.

1100 Wu, C., Li, Y., Wang, L., Hu, Y., Chen, J., Liu, D., Ye, X., 2016. Efficacy of chitosan-
1101 gallic acid coating on shelf extension of refrigerated pacific mackerel fillets. Food
1102 Bioprocess. Technol. 9, 675-685.

1103 Zhang, H., Hortal, M., Dobon, A., Bermudez, J.M., Lara-Lledo, M., 2015. The effect of
1104 active packaging on minimizing food looses: Life cycle assessment (LCA) of essential
1105 oil component-enables packaging for fresh beef. Packag. Technol. Sci. 28, 761-774.

1106 Zhang, Q., Wang, Q., Lv, S., Lu, J., Jiang, S., Regenstein, J.M., Lin, L., 2016.
1107 Comparison of collagen and gelatin extracted from the skins of Nile tilapia
1108 (*Oreochromis niloticus*) and catfish (*Ictalurus punctatus*). Food Biosci. 13, 41-48.

1109 Zhong, Y., Cavender, G., Zhao, Y., 2014. Investigation of different coating application
1110 methods on the performance of edible coating on Mozzarella cheese. LWT-Food Sci.
1111 Technol. 56, 1-8.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Highlights

- The loop from food processing waste to food packaging can be closed
- Sustainable biorefinery processes can be used to extract value-added raw materials
- Food shelf-life extension and food loss reduction can be achieved through novel food packaging
- Environmental, social and economical benefits can be obtained from food shelf life extension
- An interdisciplinary approach is needed toward decision-making on novel food packaging

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Sustainable processes

Environmentally friendly products



Resource efficiency

Profitable value-added products