

Document downloaded from:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10251/194939>

This paper must be cited as:

Verdú Amat, S.; Gallego Ibáñez, M.; Barat Baviera, JM.; Talens Oliag, P.; Grau Meló, R. (2022). Modelling in vitro gastrointestinal digestion of egg white gel matrix by laser-backscattering imaging. *Journal of Food Engineering*. 316:1-9.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2021.110839>



The final publication is available at

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2021.110839>

Copyright Elsevier

Additional Information

1 **Modelling *in vitro* gastrointestinal digestion of egg white gel matrix by**
2 **laser-backscattering imaging**

3 Samuel Verdú, Marta Gallego*, José Manuel Barat, Pau Talens, Raúl Grau

4 *Departamento de Tecnología de Alimentos. Universitat Politècnica de València. Camino de Vera s/n,*
5 *46022 Valencia, Spain*

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 * Corresponding author:

21 Marta Gallego

22 *E-mail address:* margalib@upv.es

23

24 **Abstract**

25 The objective of this work was to test the capability of laser-backscattering imaging
26 technique to model changes produced throughout *in vitro* gastrointestinal digestion of
27 chicken egg white gel as protein matrix model. Evolution of the matrix sample was
28 monitored by analysing protein digestibility, zeta potential, particle size, and imaging
29 every 20 min during the digestion process. Laser-backscattering was based on capturing
30 the diffraction patterns generated by laser-light after being transmitted through matrix
31 samples. Differences in imaging data were observed for the different zones of the studied
32 diffraction patterns. This complexity was solved by a dimensional reduction using
33 multivariate statistics, obtaining $R^2 > 0.90$ in calibration studies. Results indicated that
34 imaging device captured the variance produced due to changes in concentrations of
35 protein compounds in despite of changes produced by pH and reagents addition.
36 Therefore, laser backscattering imaging was capable of monitoring the digestion of egg
37 white gel during gastric and intestinal phases.

38

39

40

41 **Keywords:** *protein matrix, in vitro digestion, imaging analysis, laser-backscattering,*

42 *modelling*

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50 **1. Introduction**

51 Gastrointestinal digestion is a complex process including mechanical, chemical and
52 enzymatic processes which involve food breakdown and release of nutrients for
53 subsequent absorption. Physical mechanisms, pH changes, and enzymes action as well as
54 food material properties and structure influence the rate and extent of digestion. In the
55 case of protein matrices, proteolysis begins in the gastric phase with the combined action
56 of HCl and pepsin enzyme, which breaks down proteins generating a mixture of peptides
57 and free amino acids. At the intestinal phase, the action of different enzymes, mainly
58 trypsin and chymotrypsin, completes protein digestion by further hydrolysing peptide
59 fractions for further intestinal absorption (Gropper and Smith, 2013).

60 *In vitro* digestion models, including static and dynamic methods, are simple and useful
61 tools to evaluate structural and physicochemical changes occurring during the process as
62 well as digestibility of protein compounds. In that regard, digested samples are analysed
63 in order to measure concentration profiles of the released proteolytic products, generally
64 by using traditional destructive approaches such as spectrophotometric, electrophoretic,
65 chromatographic, or mass spectrometry methods (Gallego et al., 2021, 2020; Sánchez-
66 Rivera et al., 2014). However, the use of non-destructive approaches to study profiles of
67 food hydrolysis has generated a considerable interest over the last years. Examples
68 include magnetic resonance techniques to evaluate the hydrolysis level in complex lipid
69 mixtures (Nieva-Echevarría et al., 2014) and time-series micro-computed tomography to
70 study structural breakdown during *in vitro* gastric digestion of apples (Olenskyj et al.,
71 2020).

72 In the case of imaging, several techniques have been applied to analyse physicochemical
73 properties and structure changes of foods during *in vitro* gastrointestinal digestion. For
74 instance, Somaratne et al. (2019) mapped the distribution of digestive fluids in food

75 structures using hyperspectral imaging. Focusing on protein matrices, Deng et al. (2020)
76 applied magnetic resonance imaging to explore *in vitro* gastric digestion of whey protein.
77 Somaratne et al. (2020) reported a time-lapse imaging system to evaluate *in-situ*
78 disintegration by pepsin of egg white gels with different microstructures and nutrient
79 release kinetics. Pasquier et al. (2019) evaluated the effects of gastric and intestinal
80 enzymes on disintegration kinetics of microstructured canola seed proteins by using
81 small-angle scattering and imaging techniques.

82 Within imaging techniques, laser-backscattering imaging characterises the extinction of
83 light transmittance across a changing magnitude measured in a given matrix. This
84 principle is the basis of a wide range of analytical methods. However, in this case,
85 imaging analysis and data mining techniques are followed to study the generated
86 diffraction patterns because matrix-light interactions. In food-processing research, laser-
87 backscattering imaging has been applied for modelling different food matrix
88 transformations due to enzymatic action. Some examples are the characterisation of the
89 tendering process of pork loin with papain enzyme addition (Grau et al., 2021), and of
90 texture evolution in dairy matrices such as the milk curdling phase of cheese and yogurt
91 fermentation (Verdú et al., 2021, 2019). These studies suggested the hypothesis of using
92 this technique to study the physicochemical evolution of a given food matrix resulting
93 from the action of enzymes throughout gastrointestinal digestion. There is little
94 information about the capacities of imaging techniques combined with analytical methods
95 to study digestion processes. This could improve existing methods and developing new
96 applications in non-destructive analysis terms. The ultimate goal of the application would
97 be the continuous monitoring of changes produced in a food matrix during *in vitro*
98 digestion without sample modification/destruction. However, it was necessary to test

99 previously the capability of the technique to model sample changes measured by
100 traditional analytical methods.

101 Thus, this work focused on testing the capability of laser-backscattering imaging
102 technique to model protein changes, occurring during gastric and intestinal digestion, of
103 egg white as model of protein gel matrix. For that, digested samples were evaluated in
104 terms of protein digestibility, by both analytical and *in silico* assays, and of zeta potential
105 and particle size distributions in order to improve understanding of information captured
106 in the image data.

107

108 **2. Materials and methods**

109 **2.1 Chemicals and reagents**

110 Enzymes pepsin from porcine gastric mucosa and pancreatin from porcine pancreas as
111 well as bile extract porcine, trinitrobenzenesulfonic acid (TNBS), Coomassie Brilliant
112 Blue G-250, bovine serum albumin (BSA), L-tyrosine, and L-leucine were purchased
113 from Sigma-Aldrich, Co. (St. Louis, MO, USA). Trichloroacetic acid (TCA), ethanol and
114 phosphoric acid were from Scharlau Chemie, S.A. (Sentmenat, Barcelona, Spain). All
115 other reagents and chemicals were of analytical grade.

116

117 **2.2 Sample preparation**

118 Pasteurised liquid egg white from chicken eggs was obtained from a local supermarket
119 and subjected to heat-induced gelation. For that, the sample was heated at 100 °C under
120 agitation for 12 min in order to form a homogeneous gel protein matrix. The sample was
121 kept at 4 °C before further analysis. This homogeneous and highly reproducible sample
122 was used with the aim of ensuring the capacity of the technique to capture the variance

123 generated by changes produced by the enzymatic activity, therefore reducing within-
124 sample variability before digestion.

125

126 **2.3 *In vitro* gastrointestinal digestion**

127 The simulated gastrointestinal digestion was carried out following the standardised
128 INFOGEST method (Minekus et al., 2014; Brodkorb et al., 2019). In duplicate, 1 g of
129 each sample was diluted with simulated salivary fluid (SSF) in a ratio 1:1 (w/v), and
130 mixed at 40 rpm for 2 min at 37 °C using an Intell-Mixer™ RM-2 (ELMI Ltd., Riga,
131 Latvia) within an incubator chamber (JP Selecta, S.A., Barcelona, Spain). In the gastric
132 phase (*G*), the oral bolus was diluted 1:1 (v/v) with simulated gastric fluid (SGF), CaCl₂
133 (0.15 mM) and pepsin enzyme (2000 U/mL). The pH was adjusted to 3.0 with HCl (1 M)
134 and the mixture was then incubated under agitation at 37 °C for 2 h as previously
135 described. In the intestinal phase (*I*), the gastric chyme was diluted (1:1, v/v) with
136 simulated intestinal fluid (SIF), CaCl₂ (0.6 mM), pancreatin (trypsin activity of 100
137 U/mL) and bile salts (10 mM). The pH was adjusted to 7.0 with NaOH (1 M), and the
138 sample was mixed at 37 °C for 2 h. After digestion, samples were immediately placed in
139 ice, centrifuged (8000 g, 4°C, 10 min), and the resultant supernatants were taken for
140 following analyses. Samples were taken every 20 min during the process, using separate
141 tubes for each sampling time point. The number of experimental data points was
142 established based on preliminary assays considering possible data-loss for the imaging
143 technique. Preliminary kinetics obtained for free amino groups showed non-loss of
144 information using that sampling frequency. Control samples containing digestive fluids,
145 enzymes, and bile (without sample) were run in parallel.

146

147 **2.4 Protein digestibility**

148 The protein digestibility of the control and egg white gel samples during *in vitro*
149 gastrointestinal digestion was evaluated, in duplicate, by determining the content of free
150 amino groups, soluble proteins, and TCA-soluble peptides.

151 The content of free amino groups was determined using the TNBS method (Adler-Nissen,
152 1979). For that, 25 μL of sample was mixed with 200 μL of sodium phosphate buffer (0.2
153 M, pH 8.2) and 200 μL of TNBS (0.1 %), and incubated at 50 °C for 1 h. After adding
154 640 μL of HCl (0.1 N), the mixture was incubated for 30 min and then the absorbance
155 was measured at 340 nm using a UV-Visible spectrophotometer (Helios Zeta, Thermo
156 Scientific, UK). Results were expressed as mg of leucine per mL of sample.

157 Total soluble proteins were evaluated according to the Bradford assay (Bradford, 1976).
158 Briefly, 40 μL of sample was mixed with 2 mL of Bradford reagent, which was comprised
159 of Coomassie Brilliant Blue G-250 (0.01 %), ethanol (4.7 %), and phosphoric acid (8.5 %).
160 The mixture was incubated for 5 min at room temperature and the absorbance measured
161 at 595 nm. Results were expressed as mg of BSA protein per mL of sample.

162 The content of TCA-soluble peptides was determined based on the methodology
163 described by Ketnawa and Ogawa (2019). For that, 50 μL of sample was mixed with 450
164 μL of TCA (5 %), vortexed and kept at 4 °C for 1 h. The mixture was centrifuged at 8000
165 g for 10 min, and the absorbance of the supernatant was measured at 280 nm. Results
166 were expressed as mg of tyrosine per mL of sample.

167

168 **2.5 *In silico* analysis**

169 The UniProt database (<https://www.uniprot.org/>) was used to obtain the sequence data in
170 FASTA format of ovalbumin (accession number P01012), which is the major protein in
171 egg white. Then, the gastrointestinal digestion was simulated by using the “enzyme(s)

172 action” tool of BIOPEP-UWM database
173 (<http://www.uwm.edu.pl/biochemia/index.php/en/biopep>) (Minkiewicz et al., 2019).
174 Pepsin (EC 3.4.23.14) was used to predict the proteolysis occurring during the gastric
175 phase, whereas trypsin (EC 3.4.21.4) and chymotrypsin (EC 3.4.21.1) were used
176 subsequently to pepsin in order to simulate the protein hydrolysis during the complete
177 digestion process. The ToxinPred software (<http://crdd.osdd.net/raghava/toxinpred/>) was
178 used to predict the molecular weight (MW) and isoelectric point (pI) of the peptides
179 obtained after *in silico* digestion.

180

181 **2.6 Particle size and zeta potential**

182 The supernatants extracted from digestion matrix were analysed in particle size (Ps) and
183 zeta potential (ζ -potential) terms. These parameters were measured to achieve a better
184 understanding of imaging information since laser-backscattering imaging is based on
185 capturing the alterations in diffraction patterns produced by light-particle interaction.
186 Measurements were carried out in a Zetasizer Nano ZS (Malvern Instruments Ltd.,
187 Worcestershire, UK). The instrument was set up for proteins as material and water as
188 dispersion medium. Ps was expressed as the average particle size (nm). The
189 Smoluchowski mathematical model was used to convert the particle mobility
190 measurements into ζ -potential values (mV) (Fuentes et al., 2020). All the determinations
191 were performed in triplicate at each sampling time.

192

193 **2.7 Imaging device and capture**

194 A low-cost imaging device was designed based on Verdú et al. (2020) in order to collect
195 information from each sampling time generated by light-matrix interactions. The
196 objective was to use images to collect the variance generated in the matrix during

197 digestion by capturing the diffraction patterns transmitted due to laser-matrix interaction
198 at each sampling time. For that purpose, samples were prepared placing 3 mL supernatant
199 (obtained at each sampling time during *in vitro* digestion) on a transparent well plate (12-
200 well plate, 21.2 mm ϕ , 6.9 mL, Corning Costar[®]). Figure 1-A shows a scheme of the
201 device setup. The elements were a digital capture system (digital camera), a laser light,
202 and a computer. The setup was installed inside a dark chamber away from light. All the
203 camera's light controls were set to the manual mode, avoiding uncontrolled alterations to
204 the work regime (gain, shutter speed, white balance, etc.). A digital Logitech C920
205 camera (maximum resolution: 1080p/30 fps - 720p/30 fps) was the capture system.
206 Images were captured in the RGB (red, green and blue) format and were saved as .JPEG
207 (1980x1080). The camera was vertically placed 15 cm over the sample, which lays in the
208 middle of the vision field. The laser beam was used in line mode (650 nm, 50 mW), and
209 it was perpendicularly placed 20 cm under the zone where the wells plate placed. This
210 configuration allowed projecting laser-line on the diameter of each well bottom surface.
211 The laser properties and placement distances in the device were selected after previous
212 studies in food applications (Verdú et al., 2021, 2020). The main objective of this
213 configuration was to transmit enough light to capture changes in the studied matrix
214 without saturating the camera sensor. Both the camera and the laser line were connected
215 to a computer. The capture procedure was static for all sampling time (well). It means
216 that images were manually captured by placing the well plates into imaging device.
217 Captures were taken every 20 min during the digestive process for both egg white and
218 control samples following the above-mentioned procedure. Five replicates of images per
219 well (at each sampling time) were taken from each of the two digestion replicates.
220

221 **2.8 Image processing and data collection**

222 The first step was to transform images from RGB to 8 bits (grayscale) format with the
223 aim of simplifying intensity information. Next operation was to create an image stack
224 from the images captured at each sampling time of the digestion process (Figure 1-B).
225 The second step was to select five regions of interest (ROIs) and extract five orthogonal
226 slices from each stack corresponding to each of them. Those slices formed images with
227 150 pixels in Y-axis, maintaining the laser-line in the middle of them (Figure 1-B, white
228 dotted lines delimited by *a* and *b*). Five replicates from each stack were parallelly
229 extracted, leaving 50 pixels between them across X-axis. That extraction was carried out
230 by slicing the stack across the time axis (Z-axis). Finally, five replicates of images
231 crossing the central zone of the captured diffraction pattern (Figure 1-C, example of
232 orthogonal image) was obtained from each sampling time of the digestion process. In
233 these new images (orthogonal images), the X-axis corresponded to time while Y-axis
234 corresponded to pixel position. Information across pixel position described the diffraction
235 pattern. The intensity data from each pixel across all positions were taken as single
236 variables to collect variance during the digestion process. Thus, any change in light
237 intensity at each sampling point was captured in these orthogonal images to simplify the
238 image-stack from the entire process to a single image. The obtained images contained the
239 intensity profile of the diffraction pattern along the selected pixels in the two studied
240 phases of the digestion. Each image represented a data matrix containing the changes in
241 the intensity profiles with time (Figure 1-E). The extracted matrix from each replicate
242 was organised and labelled in a common data matrix to study the evolution of the
243 information captured during digestion process, as well as the relationship to the
244 physicochemical properties in composition and particle properties terms. Thus, the data
245 matrix provided spectra of the intensities across pixel positions, which were used as a

246 basis for numerical analytics. These procedures were run with the ImageJ software
247 (<http://rsb.info.nih.gov/ij/>) (Schindelin et al., 2012).

248

249 **2.9 Statistical analysis**

250 The evolution of physicochemical data of the protein gel matrix (obtained by
251 determinations of free amino groups, soluble proteins, TCA-soluble peptides, *in silico*
252 analysis, Ps and ζ -potential) was analysed by studying time series. Moreover, the imaging
253 data were explored after applying multivariable statistical procedures to reduce data
254 dimensionality. For this purpose, a principal component analysis (PCA, a multivariate
255 unsupervised statistical method) was employed. This method allowed a simplification of
256 the analysis of variance collected by the image data matrix across digestion process.
257 Calibration studies were carried out by applying PLS-R (Partial Least Square Regression).
258 This method allowed to evaluate the dependence between the image information
259 (multivariate data matrix) and analytical data (contents of free amino groups, soluble
260 proteins, and TCA-soluble peptides) generating linear regressions. The calibrations were
261 evaluated based on the R^2 and root mean square error (RMSE). These procedures were
262 run with the PLS Toolbox, 6.3 (Eigenvector Research Inc., Wenatchee, Washington,
263 USA), a toolbox extension in the Matlab 7.6 computational environment (The Mathworks,
264 Natick, Massachusetts, USA).

265

266 **3. Results and discussion**

267 **3.1 Digestibility of the protein gel matrix**

268 Heating of proteins matrices, such as chicken egg white, leads to conformational changes
269 that affect the folded structure of proteins, producing aggregates that join together to form
270 gels (Ma and Holme, 1982). Physicochemical properties and gel structure influence the

271 extent of digestion, amount and nature of generated peptides (Nyemb et al., 2016). The
272 proteolysis occurring in the egg white gel matrix during *in vitro* gastrointestinal digestion
273 was evaluated by determining the content of total free amino groups, which include the
274 available amino groups of proteins, peptides, and amino acids (Adler-Nissen, 1979). The
275 content of soluble proteins and TCA-soluble peptides were also measured to obtain
276 information about the solubility of the digestive products. Results of protein digestibility
277 in the controls (without sample) and samples obtained before digestion (t0) and during
278 the gastric phase (*G*, 0-120 min) and intestinal phase (*I*, 120-240 min) were presented in
279 Figure 2. Results were expressed as mg/mL of sample in the digestive medium for a better
280 comparison with the data subsequently obtained by using laser-backscattering imaging to
281 model the digestion process. Controls presented values below 0.2 mg/mL in the content
282 of free amino groups, soluble proteins and peptides during *G*, whereas an increased
283 proteolysis and solubility was observed during *I* (Figure 2-A). Regarding the samples, a
284 gradual increment in the content of free amino groups was observed as the digestion
285 advanced, with values increasing from 0.27 to 1.63 mg/mL in *G* and reaching up to 14.52
286 mg/mL at the end of *I* (Figure 2-B). These results evidence the action of digestive
287 enzymes, mainly those of the intestinal phase, hydrolysing the protein gel matrix.
288 Moreover, the solubility of proteins increased during the *in vitro* digestion, with values
289 ranging from 1.68 to 2.19 mg/mL, whereas the content of TCA-soluble peptides varies
290 throughout the process with values between 7.44 and 13.62 mg/mL (Figure 2-B).

291

292 **3.2 *In silico* analysis**

293 *In silico* analyses were performed to predict the peptide sequences released during a
294 simplified gastrointestinal digestion of ovalbumin, which is the major protein present in
295 egg white. The theoretical hydrolysis of the protein with enzymes found in the

296 gastrointestinal tract, including pepsin (gastric phase) and trypsin and chymotrypsin
297 (intestinal phase), is shown in Figure 3-A. The MW and pI of the generated sequences
298 was also predicted *in silico* with the aim of knowing the properties of produced peptides
299 and thereby improving the physicochemical characterisation at the end of each digestion
300 phase. Figures 3-B and 3-C show the MW of the generated peptides expressed in
301 percentiles (*P*). The peptides generated during *G* showed higher average weight than *I*.
302 Compounds within *P*₆₅ of *G* had the highest MW obtained in *I* (~2 g/mol) while the rest
303 of compounds in *G* rose to 5 g/mol. During gastrointestinal digestion, protein chains were
304 cleaved by peptidase enzymes during the gastric and intestinal phases, releasing smaller
305 peptides as the digestion advances. Moreover, in the same way of MW, peptides obtained
306 from each phase presented differences in pI. Figures 3-D and 3-E show pI of each block
307 of peptides expressed in percentiles. In the case of *G*, 20% of peptides had a difference
308 of one pH unit between pI and the pH used in this phase (pH=3), whereas 50% of peptides
309 presented pI more than threefold (pI~6) (Figure 3-D). More differences between pI and
310 pH would mean more stability for the generated dispersion. In *I* (pH=7), 65% of peptides
311 presented differences of less than one unit between pI and pH, suggesting a low stability
312 of the dispersion. The observed theoretical effect of each digestion phase on both MW
313 and pI of the generated compounds should impact on the properties of the generated
314 particles (such as ζ -potential and particle size). That impact should modify matrix
315 properties not only at the end of the phase, but also at each sampling point. Since these
316 modifications were directly related to the matrix structure, the generated changes in the
317 laser-matrix interaction should correlate with information captured by the imaging
318 technique.

319

320 **3.3 Particle size and zeta potential distributions**

321 After observing the results from computational analysis of egg white digestion, the
322 extracts of the digested matrix were analysed in Ps and ζ -potential terms for evidencing
323 matrix structure modifications at each sampling point. The aim was to get a better
324 understanding of produced changes and thus improve the interpretation of laser-matrix
325 interaction captured in imaging data. Figures 4-A and 4-B show the time series of the
326 measurements, from which kinetics of both parameters during the digestion process were
327 studied. Ps of egg white gel was maintained nearly constant during *G*, whereas the
328 addition of reagents (digestive fluids, enzymes and bile) and the pH change from 3 to 7
329 in *I* drastically increased Ps (Figure 4-B). This effect was also observed in the control
330 samples (Figure 4-A), suggesting that it could be mainly due to the formation of large
331 flocs in presence of bile and pancreatin enzyme (Liu and Kong, 2019; Sharkar et al., 2018).
332 Accordingly, *in silico* results indicated that 50% of the peptides generated at the end of *G*
333 presented pI close to the pH of *I* (pH=7) (Figure 3-D). Thus, when matrix was modified
334 to that pH, stability of peptides would decrease due to reduction of solubility and
335 aggregation of particles (Nyemb et al., 2016), which would increase Ps.
336 These phenomena matched with ζ -potential evolution. In egg white gel samples, values
337 reduced magnitude of negative charge (from -15 to -10 mV) during the first 40 min of *G*,
338 from which it was constant up to the end of this phase. At the beginning of *I*, ζ -potential
339 drastically changed and then decreased up to values between 0 and -5 mV (Figure 4-B).
340 Similar to that suggested from the *in silico* results, ζ -potential values indicated lower
341 stability of the compounds in *I* than *G*, which also matched with the observed increase of
342 Ps. So, results evidenced the progressive physical changes in the studied matrix due to
343 the digestion process. Changes in chemical composition of samples produced by enzymes
344 and pH during digestion produced alterations in particles and matrix structure that should

345 affect the interaction with laser and therefore the information captured in diffraction
346 patterns. Thus, after characterising these modifications, the objective was evaluating the
347 capacity of the imaging technique to detect these changes and relate them to the released
348 protein compounds.

349

350 **3.4 Image analysis**

351 **3.4.1. Imaging data exploration**

352 Image data were explored in raw form in order to observe if there was evolution of
353 intensity data during the digestion process at different pixel positions into the diffraction
354 patterns. In this regard, Figure 5 shows the results obtained for the control sample (Figure
355 5-left) and egg white gel sample (Figure 5-right). A real sequence of images
356 corresponding to half capture (from central peak of diffraction pattern, pixel position 75,
357 to an extreme) were included. Three pixels positions from the central peak (A, B and C)
358 were selected to explore whether differences in data were produced depending on the
359 pattern zone. That study was necessary to evaluate if pixel positions collected redundant
360 data or, by contrast, different information was collected from different pixel positions and
361 therefore no positions should be obviated.

362 Figure 5 shows the intensity evolution observed at the selected pixel positions, presenting
363 different kinetics for each one. The digestion phases also presented differences within the
364 same position due to the changes in composition and pH. The same alteration in the time
365 series observed in the physicochemical study due to the changes produced at gastric-
366 intestinal intersection (pH and reagents addition) (Figures 2 and 4) was reproduced in the
367 image data. On the other hand, intensity captured within each phase presented a different
368 evolution depending on the position. The digestion of egg white gel was also differenced
369 from the control sample. In addition to the observed differences in kinetics, the digestion

370 of egg white gel generated higher intensity changes compared to control in A and B, while
371 less at C position (Figure 5).

372 Thus, the explored raw data evidenced the capacity of the imaging technique to capture
373 the variance generated from different factors such as the enzymatic action on both egg
374 white gel and themselves, and the changes produced because the digestive phases.
375 However, results suggest that different fractions of total variance collected by images
376 were contained in each pixel position. It meant that pixel positions provided different
377 information of the digestion process and therefore all of them (150 variables) had to be
378 considered from data matrix to attempt process modelling.

379 Since entire data matrix from imaging was considered, it was processed by a PCA with
380 the aim of analysing imaging data in a reduced dimensionality. PCA reduced 150
381 variables to one synthetic variable (linear combination from the original ones) called PC1,
382 which collects 72.2% and 75.1% total variance for control and digested sample,
383 respectively. Kinetics of PC1 scores are included in Figure 6. The differences between
384 control and egg white gel samples were better observed after this data transformation.
385 Control showed fluctuant evolution within each digestion phase while egg white gel
386 presented different descendent tendencies for each phase. The range of scores for *G* was
387 20-15, from $t=0$ to $t=120$ min, while *I* showed 55-21 from $t=120$ to $t=240$ min. The
388 observed kinetics for PC1 scores were in accordance with that observed in *Ps* and ζ -
389 potential results. Figure 6-A and 6-B include ζ -potential evolution as example. Those
390 similar evolutions evidenced the sensibility of the imaging technique to capture changes
391 in the matrix due to physicochemical modifications of the protein compounds during
392 digestion. The alterations in *Ps* and ζ -potential produced changes in the interaction
393 patterns of light-matrix because modifications in particle properties, enabling to be
394 modelled by the imaging technique. In the same way of the rest of analysis, this effect

395 was maximum at the beginning of *I*. Although changes in matrix did not impede the
396 capture of differences during *I*, the impact of pH changes and adding intestinal enzymes
397 and bile produced a new matrix that could produce important differences in the diffraction
398 pattern basis.

399 This effect was confirmed studying the patterns from all samples at t=120 min for both
400 phases. In this point, since enzymes in *G* were blocked and no time had passed for action
401 of intestinal enzymes in *I*, the observed differences in the diffraction patterns were
402 exclusively produced due to pH changes and reagents addition. Figure 6-A and 6-B shows
403 the diffraction patterns at t=120 min for both phases. Differences in the control were
404 visually limited because the absence of sample, while the digestion of egg white gel
405 generated strong differences in the intensity distribution. The central peak lost intensity
406 while the extremes increased. This phenomenon could be explained according to the Ps
407 modification; however, results did not match to the principle that is used by particle size
408 analysers. These analytical devices are based on the fact that the angle of light diffraction
409 is inversely proportional to the particle size (Emmerich et al., 2019). It matched with an
410 increase of diffraction angle, contrary to what was expected for larger particles. Therefore,
411 this effect evidenced the result of the combined effect of Ps modifications and addition
412 of new compounds like bile, which increased opacity of matrix and therefore led to a
413 more diffuse intensity pattern.

414 These interactions difficulted visualising a global evolution of the imaging signal for the
415 entire digestion process. For this reason, PC1 scores were normalised transforming data
416 to score increases (Δ). It was expressed in absolute value and assumed t=120 min as equal
417 for both phases. The transformation made it visualisable the changes captured by the
418 imaging technique, achieving a better comparison with physicochemical results. Figure
419 6-A and 6-B shows the evolution of transformed scores data (black continuous lines),

420 which was in accordance with free amino groups results (Figure 2). This relation could
421 be due to free amino groups were the unique analysed compounds accumulated over time,
422 unlike soluble protein and peptides that fluctuated depending on sampling point. In this
423 sense, the normalised scores represented the accumulation of changes during the entire
424 digestion process, whereby this data expression could be largely affected by the evolution
425 of this fraction of compounds.

426 Results reported the capability of the imaging technique to capture changes produced
427 during the digestion process of egg white gel, and its differences with control samples.
428 The information obtained by imaging captured variance along time following the
429 evolution of the physicochemical changes generated because enzyme action and reagents
430 addition. Therefore, after that data exploration in non-supervised way, studies of
431 dependence between concentration of released protein compounds and imaging data were
432 carried out to determine the possibility of calibration between both data blocks.

433

434 **3.4.2. Calibration studies**

435 After evidencing the capacity of the imaging technique to capture the variance generated
436 because digestion of egg white gel, calibration studies were carried out between the
437 concentration of released protein compounds and the data from diffraction patterns. *PLS-*
438 *R* was the method used to done it. Figure 7 shows the calibration plots reported by *PLS-*
439 *R* after reducing the dimensionality of imaging data to one latent variable (*LVI*). This
440 variable also represented a lineal combination from original variables (pixel positions) of
441 diffraction pattern, in this case, optimised to obtain the maximum correlation with each
442 measured protein parameter. The R^2 of calibration for all parameters were higher than
443 0.90, and *RMSE* also showed reduced values, which indicated strong relationship between
444 both data sets with independence of digestion phase. Note that soluble protein contents

445 (Figure 7-C) showed overlapping between phases around 1.75 mg/mL because
446 concentrations around those values were registered at both phases. This overlapping was
447 not observed across calibration model for free amino groups (Figure 7-A) and soluble
448 peptides (Figure 7-B) since their concentration ranges were different at each phase,
449 principally for free amino groups. In such a case, correlation was principally produced
450 with data from *I* because a reduced variation was observed during *G*. This fact decreased
451 the correlation coefficient comparing to the rest of parameters.

452 The weight of each pixel position on the explanation of variance retained in *LVI* were
453 explored by loadings. Figures 7-D, -E and -F show loading data of *LVI* for each regression
454 study overlapped on an example of diffraction pattern. The distribution of weights was
455 similar for all analytes. The central zone was maintained around zero (dotted line), which
456 meant reduced weight for those pixel positions in the explanation of digestion evolution.
457 Moreover, external zones presented higher weight towards negative zone of *LVI* axis.
458 This distribution of weights indicated that the pixel positions placed in the extremes of
459 the pattern were the main zones collecting information from physicochemical changes
460 occurring during digestion. It followed the observed in the Figure 6-D, where external
461 zones collected the effect of pH changes and reagents addition at the beginning of *I*. The
462 explanation could be attributed to the fact that central zones represented pixels with higher
463 level of light saturation than the external ones. This saturation could reduce the sensitivity
464 of the central zone of sensor, needing intense changes in light-matrix interaction to detect
465 significant changes. However, external zones, which collect the most diffracted light
466 fraction, kept away from saturation, maximising the capacity to detect soft changes due
467 to the moderate amount of arrived light.

468 Calibration results proved the linear relationship between captured imaging data and the
469 evolution of released protein compounds throughout gastrointestinal digestion of egg

470 white gel. These results suggested that the used imaging data captured information
471 dependent from protein compounds but independent from digestion phase. This concept
472 was important since clashed with the observed impact of phase change on diffraction
473 pattern showed in Figure 6-D. This meant that the used imaging technique captured
474 digestion process-dependent information in images; however, it was necessary
475 supervising the reduction of dimensionality to calibrate both datasets. Therefore, after a
476 supervised data-transformation, this information correlated linearly with the
477 concentration of analysed protein compounds but was not affected by changes in pH and
478 intestinal enzymes addition, obtaining $R^2 > 0.90$ for all of them. The calibrations were
479 obtained from a specific type of protein sample processed under certain conditions, which
480 was used as protein matrix model. The observed capacity of the technique to register
481 digestion changes should be maintained if different protein matrix were tested. However,
482 modifications in matrix samples resulting from egg specie, age, presence of colouring
483 agents or particles as well as from other type and origin of protein (e.g, casein or whey
484 protein) require a new calibration study to explore the effect on the observed models.

485

486 **4. Conclusions**

487 Gastrointestinal digestion of egg white gel showed different profiles of protein products
488 depending on the sampling time and phase (*G* and *I*). The evolution of compounds
489 concentration, pH changes, and reagents addition produced physicochemical changes in
490 matrix that induced modifications in Ps and ζ -potential. Those changes led to alterations
491 in the laser-matrix interaction that were registered by the imaging technique in form of
492 diffraction patterns. The captured diffraction patterns showed different evolution
493 depending on the pixel position and the digestion phase. After a dimensionality reduction
494 of image data, capability to capture variance generated because phase change and

495 enzymatic action was evidenced. Moreover, high calibration level ($R^2 > 0.90$) was
496 obtained between imaging data and analytical data (content of free amino groups, soluble
497 protein, and soluble peptides). This indicated that, although pH and added reagents
498 produced non-desirable variance in imaging data with phase changes, the variance
499 produced because changes on concentrations of protein compounds was successfully
500 registered. Therefore, results suggested that laser backscattering imaging was capable of
501 monitoring the gastrointestinal digestion of egg white gel as protein matrix model. This
502 technology could improve existing analytical methods for developing non-destructive
503 approaches within food digestibility research area. The next step should focus on
504 monitoring *in situ* the food matrix digestion, without sample modification/destruction,
505 with the aim of obtaining continuous image data during the entire process in a non-
506 destructive way. Moreover, new factors such as different protein origin, protein mixes
507 and sample pre-treatments need to be included in future studies to test the capability of
508 this technique to model sample variability sources.

509

510 **Acknowledgements**

511 Postdoctoral grant (PAID-10-19) from the Universitat Politècnica de València to M.G. is
512 acknowledged. Authors also thank the Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades,
513 Agencia Estatal de Investigación and Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional for the
514 financial support provided through the RTI2018-098842-B-I00 and RTI2018-101599-B-
515 C21-AR projects.

516

517 **Author contributions**

518 Conceptualization, S.V., M.G., P.T. and R.G.; Methodology, S.V. and M.G.; Formal
519 Analysis, S.V. and M.G.; Investigation, S.V. and M.G.; Writing – Original Draft

520 Preparation, S.V. and M.G; Writing – Review & Editing, S.V., M.G., JM.B., P.T. and
521 R.G.; Visualization, S.V. and M.G; Project Administration, JM.B., P.T. and R.G.;
522 Funding Acquisition, JM.B., P.T. and R.G.

523

524 **Conflicts of interest**

525 None

526

527 **References**

528 Adler-Nissen, J., 1979. Determination of the degree of hydrolysis of food protein
529 hydrolysates by trinitrobenzenesulfonic acid. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*
530 <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf60226a042>

531 Bradford, M. M., 1976. A rapid and sensitive method for the quantitation of microgram
532 quantities of protein utilizing the principle of protein-dye binding. *Anal. Biochem.*
533 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-2697\(76\)90527-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-2697(76)90527-3)

534 Brodkorb, A., Egger, L., Alming, M., Alvito, P., Assunção, R., Ballance, S., et al., 2019.
535 INFOGEST static in vitro simulation of gastrointestinal food digestion. *Nat. Protoc.*
536 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41596-018-0119-1>

537 Deng, R., Janssen, A.E.M., Vergeldt, F.J., Van As, H., de Graaf, C., Mars, M., Smeets,
538 P.A.M., 2020. Exploring in vitro gastric digestion of whey protein by time-domain
539 nuclear magnetic resonance and magnetic resonance imaging. *Food Hydrocoll.*
540 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2019.105348>

541 Emmerich, J., Tang, Q., Wang, Y., Neubauer, P., Junne, S., Maaß, S., 2019. Optical inline
542 analysis and monitoring of particle size and shape distributions for multiple
543 applications: Scientific and industrial relevance. *Chinese J. Chem. Eng.*
544 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cjche.2018.11.011>

545 Fuentes, C., Ruiz-Rico, M., Fuentes, A., Ruiz, M. J., Barat, J. M., 2020. Degradation of
546 silica particles functionalised with essential oil components under simulated
547 physiological conditions. J. Hazard. Mater.
548 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2020.123120>

549 Gallego, M., Mauri, L., Aristoy, M. C., Toldrá, F., Mora, L., 2020. Antioxidant peptides
550 profile in dry-cured ham as affected by gastrointestinal digestion. J. Funct. Foods.
551 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jff.2020.103956>

552 Gallego, M., Arnal, M., Barat, J. M., Talens, P., 2021. Effect of cooking on protein
553 digestion and antioxidant activity of different legume pastes. Foods.
554 <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods10010047>

555 Grau, R., Verdú, S., Pérez, A.J., Barat, J.M., Talens, P., 2021. Laser-backscattering
556 imaging for characterizing pork loin tenderness. Effect of pre-treatment with enzyme
557 and cooking. J. Food Eng. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2021.110508>

558 Gropper, S.S., Smith, J.L., 2013. *Advanced nutrition and human metabolism* (6th ed).
559 Wadsworth Cengage Learning Publishing, Belmont.

560 Ketnawa, S., Ogawa, Y., 2019. Evaluation of protein digestibility of fermented soybeans
561 and changes in biochemical characteristics of digested fractions. J. Funct. Foods.
562 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jff.2018.11.046>

563 Liu, L., Kong, F., 2019. Influence of nanocellulose on in vitro digestion of whey protein
564 isolate. Carbohydr. Polym. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.carbpol.2019.01.071>

565 Ma, C. Y., Holme, J., 1982. Effect of chemical modifications on some physicochemical
566 properties and heat coagulation of egg albumen. J. Food Sci.
567 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2621.1982.tb04959.x>

568 Minekus, M., Alvinger, M., Alvito, P., Ballance, S., Bohn, Bourlieu, C., et al., 2014. A
569 standardised static in vitro digestion method suitable for food—an international
570 consensus. *Food Funct.* <https://doi.org/10.1039/c3fo60702j>

571 Minkiewicz, P., Iwaniak, A., Darewicz, M., 2019. BIOPEP-UWM database of bioactive
572 peptides: Current opportunities. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.*
573 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms20235978>.

574 Nieva-Echevarría, B., Goicoechea, E., Manzanos, M.J., Guillén, M.D., 2014. A method
575 based on ¹H NMR spectral data useful to evaluate the hydrolysis level in complex
576 lipid mixtures. *Food Res. Int.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2014.09.031>

577 Nyemb, K., Guérin-Dubiard, C., Dupont, D., Jardin, J., Rutherford, S. M., Nau, F., 2014.
578 The extent of ovalbumin in vitro digestion and the nature of generated peptides are
579 modulated by the morphology of protein aggregates. *Food Chem.*
580 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2014.02.048>

581 Olenskyj, A. G., Donis-González, I. R., Bornhorst, G. M., 2020. Nondestructive
582 characterization of structural changes during in vitro gastric digestion of apples using
583 3D time-series micro-computed tomography. *J. Food Eng.*
584 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2019.109692>

585 Pasquier, J., Brûlet, A., Boire, A., Jamme, F., Perez, J., Bizien, T., Lutton, E., Boué, F.,
586 2019. Monitoring food structure during digestion using small-angle scattering and
587 imaging techniques. *Colloids Surfaces A Physicochem. Eng. Asp.*
588 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colsurfa.2019.02.059>

589 Sánchez - Rivera, L., Diezhandino, I., Gómez - Ruiz, J. Á., Fresno, J. M., Miralles, B.,
590 & Recio, I. (2014). Peptidomic study of S panish blue cheese (Valdeón) and changes
591 after simulated gastrointestinal digestion. *Electrophoresis.*
592 <https://doi.org/10.1002/elps.201300510>

593 Sarkar, A., Li, H., Cray, D., Boxall, S., 2018. Composite whey protein–cellulose
594 nanocrystals at oil-water interface: Towards delaying lipid digestion. *Food*
595 *Hydrocoll.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2017.10.020>

596 Schindelin, J., Arganda-Carreras, I., Frise, E., Kaynig, V., Longair, M., Pietzsch, T.,
597 Preibisch, S., Rueden, C., Saalfeld, S., Schmid, B., Tinevez, J.Y., White, D.J.,
598 Hartenstein, V., Eliceiri, K., Tomancak, P., Cardona, A., 2012. Fiji: An open-source
599 platform for biological-image analysis. *Nat. Methods.*
600 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2019>

601 Somaratne, G., Nau, F., Ferrua, M.J., Singh, J., Ye, A., Dupont, D., Singh, R.P., Flourey,
602 J., 2020. In-situ disintegration of egg white gels by pepsin and kinetics of nutrient
603 release followed by time-lapse confocal microscopy. *Food Hydrocoll.*
604 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2019.105228>

605 Somaratne, G., Reis, M.M., Ferrua, M.J., Ye, A., Nau, F., Flourey, J., Dupont, D., Singh,
606 R.P., Singh, J., 2019. Mapping the Spatiotemporal Distribution of Acid and Moisture
607 in Food Structures during Gastric Juice Diffusion Using Hyperspectral Imaging. *J.*
608 *Agric. Food Chem.* <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jafc.9b02430>

609 Verdú, S., Barat, J.M., Grau, R., 2019. Non destructive monitoring of the yoghurt
610 fermentation phase by an image analysis of laser-diffraction patterns:
611 Characterization of cow's, goat's and sheep's milk. *Food Chem.*
612 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2018.08.091>

613 Verdú, S., Pérez, A.J., Barat, J.M., Grau, R., 2021. Non-destructive control in cheese
614 processing: Modelling texture evolution in the milk curdling phase by laser
615 backscattering imaging. *Food Control.*
616 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2020.107638>

617 Verdú, S., Ruiz-Rico, M., Pérez, A.J., Barat, J.M., Grau, R., 2020. Application of laser

618 backscattering imaging for the physico-chemical characterisation of antimicrobial
619 silica particles functionalised with plant essential oils. J. Food Eng.
620 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2020.109990>
621

622 **FIGURE CAPTIONS**

623 **Figure 1.** Capture device and image processing schemes. A: Capture system
624 configuration. B: Images from each sampling time from complete digestion process
625 (white dotted lines: the five ROIs for data extracting, *a*: pixel position 1; *b*: pixel position
626 150). C: Example of ROI from original stack. D: Visualising intensity (grayscale)
627 differences captured at each pixel position of selected zone. E: Data matrix structure after
628 extraction. *G*-red series: gastric phase; *I*-blue series: intestinal phase. Red and blue dashed
629 lines mark specific sampling times as example (t=60 and t=180 min, respectively).

630 **Figure 2.** Evolution of the content of free amino groups (●), soluble proteins (■), and
631 TCA-soluble peptides (▲) during *in vitro* gastrointestinal digestion. A: control; B: egg
632 white gel. *G*-red series: gastric phase; *I*-blue series: intestinal phase. Green dashed line
633 marks change of phase.

634 **Figure 3.** Results of *in silico* studies. A: amino acid sequence of ovoalbumin protein
635 before digestion (up), after the gastric phase (middle), and after the intestinal phase
636 (bottom). B and C: MW of the peptides obtained after each phase expressed in percentile
637 profile. D and E: pI of the peptides obtained after each phase expressed in percentile
638 profile. *G*-red series: gastric phase; *I*-blue series: intestinal phase. Dashed lines indicate
639 pH at *G* (red) and *I* (blue). Watermarks indicate specific percentiles of pI near to pH in
640 each phase.

641 **Figure 4.** Evolution of particle size (Ps) (■) and zeta potential (●) during digestion. A:
642 control; B: egg white gel. *G*-red series: gastric phase; *I*-blue series: intestinal phase.
643 Green dashed line marks change of phase.

644 **Figure 5.** Evolution of intensity data from captured image sequences at different pixel
645 position. Left: raw image sequences of half pattern. Right: time series of intensity along
646 phases corresponding to A, B and C positions. A, B and C: pixel positions along pattern.

647 *G*-red series: gastric phase; *I*-blue series: intestinal phase. Green dashed line marks
648 change of phase.

649 **Figure 6.** Evolution of processed imaging data with PCA. A: control. B: egg white gel.
650 C: diffraction patterns of control from both phases at $t=120$ min. D: diffraction patterns
651 of egg white gel from both phases at $t=120$ min. Arrows mark $t=120$ min. *G*-red series:
652 gastric phase; *I*-blue series: intestinal phase. Grey dotted lines mark ζ -potential evolution.

653 **Figure 7.** Results of calibration studies between protein compounds and imaging data.
654 Regression studies (up) between *LVI* from *PLS-R* and free amino groups (A), soluble
655 peptides (B) and soluble protein (C). Green series: loadings from *LVI* (down) for free
656 amino groups (D), soluble peptides (E) and soluble proteins (F). Dotted black lines mark
657 no charge for variables (pixel position). Black series: example of captured diffraction
658 pattern. *RMSEC*: root mean square error calibration. R^2 : calibration coefficient. *G*-red
659 series: gastric phase; *I*-blue series: intestinal phase. Bars indicate standard deviation.

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669