## EVALUATING SUBCRITICAL WATER EXTRACTION FOR RED ALGAE RESIDUE VALORIZATION: CHEMICAL COMPOSITION AND BIOLOGICAL ACTIVITY

**Esther Trigueros Andrés**,

A.P. Oliveira, P.B. Andrade, R.A. Videira, P. Guedes de Pinho,R. Moreira, M.T. Sanz and S. Beltrán













Applied Molecular Biosciences Unit



### Gelidium sesquipedale





XXVII ENCONTRO LUSO GALEGO DE

QUÍMICA 22-24 NOVEMBRO 2023 PORTO, PORTUGAL



### Gelidium sesquipedale





Microalgae Unicellular microorganisms

Macroalgae "Seaweeds"

STRUCTURAL CARBOHYDRATES

Agarophytes
 AGAR
 Carrageenophyte

Carrageenophytes Carrageenans AGAR



XXVII ENCONTRO LUSO GALEGO DE

QUÍMICA





### MACROALGA RESIDUE CHEMICAL COMPOSITION





XXVII ENCONTRO LUSO GALEGO DE

QUÍMICA 22-24 NOVEMBRO 2023





## MACROALGA RESIDUE BIOREFINERY CONCEPT VALORIZATION BIOREFINERY CONCEPT

Residues are treated as new raw materials to be reincorporated into industrial processes











### SUBCRITICAL WATER EXTRACTION (SWE)



**INTRODUCTION** 



**Objectives:** 



Investigate Subcritical Water Extraction as a novel technology to valorize

alga residue after agar extraction

EVALUATION OF Chemical composition Biological activity



**Compare** the extract obtained by SWE with other obtained by **ethanol** conventional extraction





### Subcritical Water Extraction (SWE)





METHODOLOGY



### **Subcritical Water Extraction (SWE)**



**METHODOLOGY** 

Discontinuous-mode

**Optimal conditions** 

(Trigueros et al. 2023)







### **Ethanol Extraction (EE)**



METHODOLOGY INTRODUCT







Compound (mg/g <sub>dry-extract</sub> )	DMR-SWE	DMR-EE
Total Carbohydrates	$164 \pm 10^{a}$	19 ± 2 <sup>b</sup>
Total Protein	$11.2 \pm 1.0^{a}$	$1.24 \pm 0.06^{b}$
Total Phenolic compounds	57 ± 7 <sup>a</sup>	$8.0 \pm 0.3^{b}$

Values expressed as mean ± SEM.

Values with different letters in each row are significantly different, p<0.01





	Compounds	RT	Most abundant ions (m/z)	Rmatch	$Area/10^7 \pm SEM$	Concentration (mg/kg <sub>dry-extract</sub> )
I	Formic acid	2.17	45/46	967	30.7 ± 0.2	697 ± 6
2	Acetic acid	2.60	43/45/60	913	87.5 ± 1.3	504 ± 7
3	I-Hydroxy-2-propanone	3.22	43	889	78 ± 2	527 ± 7
4	Acetoin	3.84	43/45	894	4.9 ± 0.2	-
5	Acetamide	5.17	43/44/59	944	10.1 ± 1.0	386 ± 5
6	Methylpyrazine	6.32	67/94	924	3.1 ± 0.2	0.31 ± 0.00
7	Furfural	6.41	95/96	947	71 ± 2	3.05 ± 0.11
8	2-Furanmethanol	6.97	41/53/98	971	48.4 ± 1.4	95 ± 5
9	I-(2-Furanyl)-ethanone	8.54	95/110	897	26.61 ± 0.08	0.49 ± 0.00
10	5-Methyl-2-furfural	10.11	109/110	947	23.9 ± 1.0	0.31 ± 0.01
11	3-Methyl-1,2-cyclopentanedione	12.04	41/55/69/112	947	24.5 ± 0.7	56 ± 2
12	Benzyl alcohol	12.38	77/79/108	890	7.17 ± 0.14	1.56 ± 0.02
13	Furyl hydroxymethyl ketone	13.78	95	945	134 ± 8	-
14	5-Hydroxymethylfurfural	18.01	41/97	862	2.7 ± 0.6	92.7 ± 0.5







	Compounds	RT	Most abundant ions (m/z)	Rmatch	Area/10 <sup>7</sup> ± SEM	Concentration (mg/kg <sub>dry-extract</sub> )
1	Formic acid	2.17	45/46	967	30.7 ± 0.2	697 ± 6
2	Acetic acid	2.60	43/45/60	913	87.5 ± 1.3	504 ± 7
3	I-Hydroxy-2-propanone	3.22	43	889	78 ± 2	527 ± 7
4	Acetoin	3.84	43/45	894	4.9 ± 0.2	-
5	Acetamide	5.17	43/44/59	944	10.1 ± 1.0	386 ± 5
6	Methylpyrazine	6.32	67/94	924	3.1 ± 0.2	0.31 ± 0.00
7	Furfural	6.41	95/96	947	71 ± 2	3.05 ± 0.11
8	2-Furanmethanol	6.97	41/53/98	971	48.4 ± 1.4	95 ± 5
9	I -(2-Furanyl)-ethanone	8.54	95/110	897	26.61 ± 0.08	$0.49 \pm 0.00$
10	5-Methyl-2-furfural	10.11	109/110	947	23.9 ± 1.0	0.31 ± 0.01
11	3-Methyl-1,2-cyclopentanedione	12.04	41/55/69/112	947	24.5 ± 0.7	56 ± 2
12	Benzyl alcohol	12.38	77/79/108	890	7.17 ± 0.14	1.56 ± 0.02
13	Furyl hydroxymethyl ketone	13.78	95	945	134 ± 8	-
14	5-Hydroxymethylfurfural	18.01	41/97	862	2.7 ± 0.6	92.7 ± 0.5



IONS RESULTS

(1)

H

O

`ОН

SUGAR/AMINO ACIDS

 $pH_{SWEextract} = 5.86 \pm 0.01$ 

(2)

H<sub>3</sub>C<sup>2</sup>

**DEGRADATION** COMPOUNDS

Ο

`OH





		Compounds	RT	Most abundant ions (m/z)	Rmatch	Area/10 <sup>7</sup> ± SEM	Concentration (mg/kg <sub>dry-ext</sub>	ract)	
	I	Formic acid	2.17	45/46	967	30.7 ± 0.2	697 ± 6		MAILLARD REACTION
	2	Acetic acid	2.60	43/45/60	913	87.5 ± 1.3	504 ± 7		Non-Enzymatic Browning
	3	I-Hydroxy-2-propanone	3.22	43	889	78 ± 2	527 ± 7		
	4	Acetoin	3.84	43/45	894	4.9 ± 0.2	-	(7) o	+
	5	Acetamide	5.17	43/44/59	944	10.1 ± 1.0	386 ± 5		-
	6	Methylpyrazine	6.32	67/94	924	3.1 ± 0.2	0.31 ± 0.00		
	7	Furfural	6.41	95/96	947	71 ± 2	3.05 ± 0.11	📕 Furfural 🗲	$$ Pentoses ( $\downarrow$ )
	8	2-Furanmethanol	6.97	41/53/98	971	48.4 ± 1.4	95 ± 5		
	9	I -(2-Furanyl)-ethanone	8.54	95/110	897	26.61 ± 0.08	$0.49 \pm 0.00$		
	10	5-Methyl-2-furfural	10.11	109/110	947	23.9 ± 1.0	0.31 ± 0.01	(1A)	
	П	3-Methyl-1,2-cyclopentanedione	12.04	41/55/69/112	947	24.5 ± 0.7	56 ± 2	(14)	
	12	Benzyl alcohol	12.38	77/79/108	890	7.17 ± 0.14	1.56 ± 0.02	но	
1	13	Furyl hydroxymethyl ketone	13.78	95	945	134 ± 8	-	0°	
	14	5-Hydroxymethylfurfural	18.01	41/97	862	2.7 ± 0.6	92.7 ± 0.5	👕 5-HMF 🗲	—► – – – Hexoses (↑)



16







	Compounds	RT	Most abundant ions (m/z)	Rmatch	Area/10 <sup>7</sup> ± SEM	Concentration (mg/kg <sub>dry-ext</sub>	tract)
I	Formic acid	2.17	45/46	967	30.7 ± 0.2	697 ± 6	
2	Acetic acid	2.60	43/45/60	913	87.5 ± 1.3	504 ± 7	
3	I-Hydroxy-2-propanone	3.22	43	889	78 ± 2	527 ± 7	
4	Acetoin	3.84	43/45	894	4.9 ± 0.2	-	
5	Acetamide	5.17	43/44/59	944	10.1 ± 1.0	386 ± 5	
6	Methylpyrazine	6.32	67/94	924	3.1 ± 0.2	0.31 ± 0.00	Roasted, burnt, sweet (OT=60-105000)
7	Furfural	6.41	95/96	947	71 ± 2	3.05 ± 0.11	
8	2-Furanmethanol	6.97	41/53/98	971	48.4 ± 1.4	95 ± 5	Weak, fermented, creamy, caramel (OT=2000)
9	I-(2-Furanyl)-ethanone	8.54	95/110	897	26.61 ± 0.08	0.49 ± 0.00	Smoky, roasty (OT=10000)
10	5-Methyl-2-furfural	10.11	109/110	947	23.9 ± 1.0	0.31 ± 0.01	Almond, sweet, bitter (OT=500)
11	3-Methyl-1,2-cyclopentanedione	12.04	41/55/69/112	947	24.5 ± 0.7	56 ± 2	
12	Benzyl alcohol	12.38	77/79/108	890	7.17 ± 0.14	1.56 ± 0.02	
13	Furyl hydroxymethyl ketone	13.78	95	945	134 ± 8	-	
14	5-Hydroxymethylfurfural	18.01	41/97	862	2.7 ± 0.6	92.7 ± 0.5	OT = Odor threshold in ppb

XXVII ENCONTRO LUSO GALEGO DE QUÍMICA

22-24 NOVEMBRO 2023 PORTO, PORTUGAL

RESULTS

18



**DMR-SWE** extract

Nitric Oxide (\*NO)

**Biological Activity** 

### Antioxidant activity

XXVII ENCONTRO LUSO GALEGO DE QUÍMICA 22:24 NOVEMBRO 2023 PORTO, PORTUGAL

## Scavenging potential = Concentration dependent manner (\*NO) Superoxide $(O_2^{*})$





**Biological Activity** 

### Antioxidant activity



# METHODOLOGY INTRODUCT

### Nitric Oxide (\*NO)

**DMR-SWE / DMR-EE extracts** 



### Superoxide (O<sub>2</sub>•-)







100

75-

50-

25-

0-

Lipid peroxidation

inhibition %

**DMR-SWE / DMR-EE extracts** 

DMR-SWE

↔ DMR-EE

**Lipid Peroxidation** 

**Biological Activity** 

(430µg/mL)

> 80%

< 20%

Ø

ΗO

### Antioxidant activity



ω

RESULTS



22

10 100 1000

Log [DMR extract] ( $\mu g_{dry-extract}/mL$ )



LINOLEIC ACID

Conjugated dienes





**Biological Activity** 

### Anti-inflammatory

#### XXVII ENCONTRO LUSO GALEGO DE QUÍMICA 22-24 NOVEMBRO 2023 PORTO, PORTUGAL

## HODOLOGY INTRODUCTIO

RESULTS



Leukotriene  $E_4$ 

### 5-Lipooxygenase



24



Cell viability

### **DMR-SWE** extract



Human colorectal adenocarcinoma



### The DMR-SWE extract:

- → Does not cause significant changes on cell viability of Caco-2 cell line
- → Shows no cytotoxicity on Caco-2 cells in the concentration range for which the extract exhibits bioactivity:

41-237 μg/mL Antioxidant activity
177 μg/mL Lipid Peroxidation inh. activity
233 μg/mL Anti-inflammatory activity



RESULT

26

The residue after agar extraction from *Gelidium* sesquipedale is a highly **valuable by-product**, owing to its rich content of bioactive compounds.



Final Conclusions...

SWE is a useful technology for the effective valorization of algal residue, providing extracts with substantial bioactivity, as an **alternative to conventional ethanolic extraction**.



The SWE extract demonstrates significant **antioxidant capacity** towards nitric oxide and superoxide radical species.



The efficacy of the SWE extract in inhibiting enzymes associated with various disorders or diseases establishes it as a promising tool in the **management and therapy of diverse pathologies**.

These findings, coupled with the extract's safety profile, underline the effectiveness of SWE extraction as an excellent technology to valorize red alga residue producing extracts that could be incorporated into medical formulations or food products.

### THANKS FOR YOUR ATTENTION

### Funding

This work received financial support from PT national funds (FCT/MCTES, Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia and Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia e Ensino Superior) through the project UIDP/50006/2020.

### Acknowledgements

To EU-NextGenerationEU, Ministry of Universities and Recovery, Transformation and Resilience Plan, for E. Trigueros post-doctoral contract. To FCT for A.P. Oliveira and R.A. Videira contracts through programs DL 57/2016 and Scientific Employment Stimulus-Institutional Call (CEECINST/00136/2021), respectively. To Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación and Junta de Castilla y León and ERDF for the grants PDC2022-133443-100 and BU027P23, respectively. This work also had financial support from UIDP/04378/2020 and UIDB/04378/2020 projects of Research Unit **Biosciences–UCIBIO** from Applied Molecular and on LA/P/0140/2020 project from the Associate Laboratory Institute for Health and Bioeconomy-i4HB.

### **CONTACT:**

e-mail: <u>eandres@ff.up.pt; etrigueros@ubu.es</u>

ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0003-1701-0523



Biotechnology and Food Science Dept., Chemical Engineering Division, University of Burgos, Burgos, Spain

REQUIMTE/LAQV, Laboratório de Farmacognosia, Dept. Química, Faculdade de Farmácia, Universidade do Porto, Porto, Portugal

