Development of surfactant-coated alginate capsules containing Lactobacillus plantarum

Article

Accepted Version

Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0

Albadran, H. A., Chatzifragkou, A., Khutoryanskiy, V. and Charalampopoulos, D. (2018) Development of surfactant-coated alginate capsules containing Lactobacillus plantarum. Food Hydrocolloids, 82. pp. 490-499. ISSN 0268-005X doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2018.04.035 Available at http://centaur.reading.ac.uk/76851/

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See Guidance on citing.

To link to this article DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2018.04.035

Publisher: Elsevier

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in

the End User Agreement.

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

Development of surfactant-coated alginate capsules containing *Lactobacillus plantarum*

Hanady A. Albadran[a], Afroditi Chatzifragkou[a], Vitaliy V. Khutoryanskiy[b*], Dimitris Charalampopoulos[a*]

[a]Department of Food and Nutritional Sciences, University of Reading, Whiteknights, PO Box 226, Reading RG6 6AD, United Kingdom

[b]Reading School of Pharmacy, University of Reading, Whiteknights, PO Box 224, Reading RG6 6AD, United Kingdom

[*]**Corresponding authors:**
Prof Vitaliy V. Khutoryanskiy, Reading School of Pharmacy, University of Reading, Whiteknights, PO Box 224, Reading RG6 6AD, United Kingdom, Email: v.khutoryanskiy@reading.ac.uk, Tel.: +44 (0) 118 378 6119

Prof Dimitris Charalampopoulos, Department of Food and Nutritional Sciences, University of Reading, Whiteknights, PO Box 226, Reading RG6 6AD, United Kingdom, Email: d.charalampopoulos@reading.ac.uk, Tel.: +44 (0) 118 378 8216

24 **Abstract**

25 A novel concept is proposed in which alginate capsules containing a model probiotic *Lactobacillus*
26 *plantarum* strain are coated with different surfactants with the aim to enhance cell survival during
27 passage initially through simulated gastric (SGF) and then intestinal (SIF) fluid. The surfactants
28 investigated included the anionic sodium dodecyl sulphate (SDS) and ammonium lauryl sulphate
29 (ALS), the cationic dimethyldioctadecylammonium chloride (DDAC), benzalkonium chloride
30 (BZK) and hexadecyltrimethylammonium bromide (CTAB), and the zwitterionic lecithin. Coating
31 the alginate capsules with CTAB, BZK, ALS and SDS resulted in worst survival (~ 4-9 log CFU/g
32 decrease) compared to uncoated capsules (~3 log CFU/g decrease), after 1 hour exposure to SGF
33 and two hours in SIF, which was most likely associated with their gradual penetration inside the
34 microcapsules, as shown by confocal microscopy, and their antimicrobial effects. Coating the
35 alginate capsules with DDAC improved cell survival compared to uncoated capsules (~1.2 CFU/g
36 decrease), whereas coating with lecithin improved cell survival considerably, resulting in almost
37 complete recovery of viable cells in SGF and SIF (~ 0.3 log CFU/g decrease). Although the
38 interaction between alginate and lecithin was relatively weak as demonstrated by turbidity and
39 contact angle measurements, it is likely that the protection was associated with the fact that lecithin
40 was able to penetrate into the capsule rapidly, an observation that was supported by the fact that
41 lecithin enhanced the viability of free cells in SGF and SIF. Lecithin has significant potential of
42 being used as a coating material for probiotic containing capsules.

43

44

45 Keywords: probiotic, *Lactobacillus plantarum*, capsule, surfactants, lecithin, coating

46

47 **1. Introduction**

48 Encapsulation of probiotic bacteria can be used in order to protect the cells from harmful conditions
49 that can affect their viability, i.e. within a food product or during passage through the
50 gastrointestinal tract (GIT). The effectiveness of encapsulation depends on the method used (e.g.
51 extrusion, emulsification, spray drying), the type and concentration of the matrix encapsulation
52 materials and the presence of a coating layer (Cook, Tzortzis, Charalampopoulos, & Khutoryanskiy,
53 2012; Martin, Lara-Villoslada, Ruiz, & Morales, 2015; Chen, Wang, Liu, & Gong, 2017; Simoes et
54 al., 2017). Alginate, an anionic linear polysaccharide comprising of (1-4)-linked β-D-mannuronic
55 acid and α-L-guluronic acid residues, has been used widely as a matrix encapsulation material
56 (Cook, Tzortzis, Charalampopoulos, & Khutoryanskiy, 2011; Zhao et al., 2017, Zheng et al., 2017).
57 Moreover a number of polysaccharides and proteinaceous materials have been investigated as
58 coating materials of the capsules with the view to enhance cell protection, as it has been shown that
59 even if encapsulation enhances the survival rate of probiotics, this does not immediately imply that
60 the functional survival is also increased (de Vos et al., 2010). The focus has mainly been on
61 chitosan, a cationic linear amino-polysaccharide consisting of (1-4)-linked β-D-glucosamine and N-
62 acetyl-D-glucosamine residues (Hejazi & Amiji, 2003; Trabelsi et al., 2013; Abbaszadeh, Gandomi,
63 Misaghi, Bokaei, & Noori, 2014), but also gelatine and glucomannan (Nualkaekul, Cook,
64 Khutoryanskiy, & Charalampopoulos, 2013), poly-L-lysine (Ding & Shah, 2009) and whey proteins
65 (Gbassi, Vandamme, Ennahar, & Marchioni, 2009) have been investigated. Along with the
66 protection that such coatings can offer to the microorganisms, other beneficial properties may also
67 be imparted, such as giving greater control over bacterial release in the GIT (Cook et al., 2012).
68
69 Surfactants are surface-active materials that have the ability to reduce the surface tension of a liquid
70 and have found numerous applications as detergents, wetting agents, emulsifiers, foaming agents
71 and dispersants in food, pharmaceuticals, cosmetic and personal care formulations. All surfactants
72 contain two parts, the tail (hydrocarbon chain) which has hydrophobic properties and the head group
73 that carries the charge (positive, negative or both), and are classified according to their charge, as
74 anionic, cationic, zwitterionic and non-ionic (Schramm, Stasiuk, & Marangoni, 2003). Depending
75 on their structure (e.g. length of hydrophobic part, charge) and their concentration, surfactants can
76 also have antimicrobial properties, primarily antibacterial (Xia, Xia, & Nnanna, 1995; Ishikawa,
77 Matsumura, Katoh-Kubo, & Tsuchido, 2002; Joondan, Jhaumeer-Laulloo, & Caumul, 2014; Pinazo
78 et al., 2016). Surfactants can interact with the materials used as matrix encapsulation materials, such
79 as carbohydrates or proteins, and can therefore play the role of a coating material for capsules, a
80 novel concept proposed through this work. A few studies have been conducted investigating the
81 interactions between surfactants and polysaccharides, such as alginate, using a variety of techniques

82 including turbidity, isothermal titration calorimetry (Bonnaud, Weiss, & McClements, 2010), small-
83 angle neutron scattering, rheology (Bu, Kjoniksen, Elgsaeter, & Nystrom, 2006) and fluorescence
84 spectroscopy (Neumann, Schmitt, & Iamazaki, 2003). It was shown that the interactions are of both
85 hydrophobic and ionic nature, the level and extent of which depends on the structure and
86 hydrophilic/hydrophobic characters of both the surfactant and the carbohydrate, a fact that
87 emphasises the importance of selecting appropriate combinations for specific applications.

88

89 Over the last few years there have been a small number of studies in which different surfactants
90 (primarily lecithin) were added into the polysaccharide-based matrix for the encapsulation of
91 probiotic bacteria, using the emulsification technique coupled with internal or external gelation. In
92 the study by Donthidi, Tester, & Aidoo (2010) it was demonstrated that when lecithin was used as a
93 co-encapsulation material with alginate and starch, the survival of *Lactobacillus casei* was
94 significantly increased during 12 weeks storage at 23 °C in dried form, as well as in yoghurt during
95 storage 28 days at 4 °C. It was also shown that by incorporating lecithin vesicles to the wall material
96 of alginate-chitosan capsules the survival of *Lactobacillus* and *Bifidobacterium* strains in model
97 gastrointestinal solutions was considerably improved (Chen, Cao, Ferguson, Shu, & Garg, 2012a;
98 Zhao, Ferguson, Shu, Weir, & Garg, 2012b). According to some recent studies the type and
99 concentration of surfactant will influence the production yield as well as the size, shape and
100 mechanical properties of the produced probiotic containing capsules (Lupo, Maestro, Porras,
101 Gutierrez, & Gonzalez, 2014; Banerjee, Chowdhury, & Bhattacharya, 2017; Huq et al., 2017;
102 Zaeim, Sarabi-Jamab, Ghorani, Kadkhodaee, & Tromp, 2017). However, no studies have been
103 reported investigating the interactions between carbohydrate polymers and surfactants when the
104 latter are utilised as coating materials, and how these interactions influence the protection of
105 encapsulated probiotic bacteria during their passage through gastrointestinal tract.

106

107 The aim of this study was to investigate different types of surfactants as coating materials for
108 alginate capsules containing *L. plantarum*, including anionic surfactants (sodium dodecyl sulphate
109 and ammonium lauryl sulphate), cationic (dimethyldioctadecylammonium chloride,
110 hexadecyltrimethylammonium bromide, benzalkonium chloride) and zwitterionic (lecithin). The
111 objectives were to study the physicochemical interactions between the alginate capsule and the
112 surfactants, and investigate the mechanisms through which the surfactant coated capsules can offer
113 additional protection to the cells against the adverse conditions of the gastrointestinal tract.

114

115 **2. Materials and Methods**

116 **2.1 Materials**

117 *Lactobacillus plantarum* NCIMB 8826 was obtained from the UK National Collection of Industrial
118 and Marine Bacteria (NCIMB). MRS broth and agar and phosphate buffer saline (PBS) were
119 obtained from Oxoid. Sodium alginate (19-40 kDa), dimethyldioctadecylammonium chloride
120 (DDAC), hexadecyltrimethylammonium bromide (CTAB), benzalkonium chloride (BZK),
121 ammonium lauryl sulphate (ALS), sodium dodecyl sulphate (SDS), Nile Red (for microscopy) and
122 glycerol, pepsin (from porcine) and pancreatin lipase were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich. L-alpha-
123 lecithin was purchased from ACROS Organics. Glacial acetic acid 96% (v/v), sodium chloride and
124 sodium hydroxide were obtained from Fisher Scientific. Calcium chloride dihydrate was purchased
125 from VWR International.

126

127 **2.2 Methods**

128 **2.2.1 Preparation of microbial culture**

129 *L. plantarum* NCIMB 8826 was maintained in 20 % (w/v) glycerol suspension at −18 °C in 1.8 mL
130 cryo-vials. Upon thawing of a cryo-vial, a cell aliquot was cultivated in 100 mL of MRS broth at
131 200 rpm and 37 ºC for 16 hours until the optical density measured at 600nm was approximately
132 0.85. The cells were harvested by centrifugation for 15 minutes at 3200 g. The pellets were washed
133 once using 0.1 M PBS and re-suspended in 100 mL of PBS, yielding a cell suspension with a
134 concentration of around log 10.5 CFU/mL, determined by the spread plate method using MRS agar
135 after incubation (2 days at 37 °C).

136

137 **2.2.2 Antimicrobial effects of surfactants towards *L. plantarum***

138 The following method was used to assess the antimicrobial activity of the surfactants. Solutions of
139 0.05 g/L of each surfactant were prepared at pH ~ 7, except lecithin which was dissolved in acetic
140 acid and the pH was adjusted to 8. Subsequently, 1 mL of cell suspension was added to 9 mL of the
141 surfactant solution and the mixture was incubated at 37 °C. The concentration of bacterial cells was
142 measured at 0, 30, 60 and 120 minutes by sampling 1 mL from the suspension and centrifuging at
143 10,000 rpm for 10 minutes. The supernatant was collected and 1 mL of PBS was added. After
144 appropriate dilution of the suspension, an aliquot of 0.1 mL was spread on MRS agar and the plates
145 incubated at 37 °C for 2 days. Bacterial colonies were counted and expressed as CFU/mL. The
146 experiments were performed in triplicate.

147

148 **2.2.3 Preparation of capsules**

149 The extrusion technique was used for the preparation of capsules. Alginate solution (2% w/v) [19–
150 40 kDa) (SAFC, UK) (viscosity: 15–20 cP, 1% in H_2O (L); ratio of mannuronic acid:guluronic acid:
151 3.3 ± 0.3] was prepared and sterilised using a 0.2 μm Minisart microfilter (Sartorius Stedim

Biotech). Loaded capsules (with bacterial cells) were prepared by mixing 9 mL of alginate solution with 1 mL of cell suspension. The mixture was passed through a syringe with a 21 gauge needle (BD Precisionglide®, Sigma-Aldrich) and extruded manually into a $CaCl_2$ (0.15 M, 100 mL) pre-sterilised solution (121°C for 15 minutes). Upon extrusion, the capsules were formed and were left in the solution for 30 minutes to harden in accordance to previous studies (Cook, Tzortzis, Khutoryanskiy, & Charalampopoulos, 2012). The initial cell concentration in 1 g of capsules (approximately 50 capsules) was around log 9.0 CFU/g.

2.2.4 Coating of capsules with surfactants

All surfactants were used in concentrations below their critical micelles concentration (CMC) (Table 1), as within that range surfactants exist in the form of monomers whereas as above CMC they form micelles. For the preparation of the surfactant solutions, 0.05 g of DDAC, CTAB, BZK, ALS and SDS was dissolved in 1000 mL of water to prepare coating solutions at pH ~ 7. At that pH, DDAC, CTAB and BZK had a cationic character, whereas ALS and SDS served as anionic surfactants. On the other hand, lecithin was dissolved in 0.1 M acetic acid and the pH was adjusted to 8.0 using 1 M NaOH (to help lecithin to dissolve); at that pH lecithin should behave more as an anionic surfactant. All these solutions were sterilised using a 0.2 µm Minisart microfilter (Sartorius Stedim Biotech). Loaded capsules (formed as described above) were introduced into 15 mL of surfactant solution and the mixture stirred for 30, 60, 120 minutes at 50 rpm. The capsules were collected by filtration and washed with deionised water before use.

Table 1 Surfactants used in the study

Surfactant	**Acronym**	**Structure**	**Charge**	**CMC (g/L)**	**Reference**
Lecithin	LEC		Zwitterionic	0.61	Bustamante, Gonzalez, Cartes, & Diez (2011)
Dimethyldioctadecylammonium chloride	DDAC		Cationic	0.36	Han ,Yang, Liu, Wang, & Gao (2015)
Hexadecyl trimethyl ammonium bromide	CTAB		Cationic	0.29	Bahri et al., (2006)
Benzalkonium chloride	BZK		Cationic	0.20	Deutschle, Porkert, Reiter,

					Keck, & Riechelmann (2006)
Ammonium lauryl sulphate	ALS	NH_4^+	Anionic	2.34	Williams, Phillips, & Mysels (1955)*
Sodium dodecyl sulphate	SDS	NH_4^+	Anionic	2.60	Bahri et al., (2006)

175

176

177 **2.2.5 Measurement of capsule size**

178 The Image J software was used to measure the size of the capsules in images taken by the
179 microscope system (LEICA E Z4D) after exposing the capsules to the surfactant solution for 30
180 min. Since the shape of the capsules was regular, the size was determined using the average of 3
181 different diameters. To ensure better accuracy, for each batch of capsules the measurements were
182 repeated 3 times using different capsules.

183

184 **2.2.6 Contact wetting angles of alginate films coated with surfactants**

185 Contact wetting angles were used to evaluate the hydrophobicity of calcium alginate before and
186 after treatment with the surfactant solution at different exposure times. Firstly, calcium alginate film
187 was prepared using a chromatography paper; the paper was cut in 5.5 x 7.0 cm pieces and immersed
188 in 0.15 M $CaCl_2$. Three millilitres of sodium alginate were added on top of the paper using a syringe
189 and the paper was left to stand for 5 minutes. Then, the paper was covered with 30 mL of $CaCl_2$
190 (0.15 M) and left overnight at room temperature. The alginate films formed were immersed in 45
191 mL of 0.05 g/L surfactant solution and the suspension was shaken at 50 rpm for 30, 60 and 120
192 min. The concentration of the surfactant used was similar to that used for coating the capsules (0.05
193 g/L). Contact wetting angle measurements were recorded using a Theta Lite Optical Tensiometer.
194 Each experiment was performed in triplicate.

195

196 **2.2.7 Laser scanning confocal microscopy**

197 Laser scanning confocal microscopy was performed on the capsules before and after immersing the
198 capsules into different surfactant solutions (lecithin, DDAC, CTAB, BZK, ALS and SDS) for
199 different times (30, 60 and 120 min). A Nikon A1- R confocal microscope was used; an emission
200 wavelength of 595 nm and an excitation wavelength of 561 nm along the Z-axis were used to detect
201 the surfactant after staining with Nile Red dye (Greenspan, Mayer, & Fowler 1985). One hundred
202 microliters of Nile Red dye were added to a single capsule, the capsule was then washed with

203 deionized water and placed in a petri dish for image capture; images were captured with a PF lens
204 with a 10 x magnification.
205

206 **2.2.8 Viability of encapsulated *L. plantarum* in simulated gastrointestinal solutions**

207 The viability (expressed as CFU/g) of encapsulated cells was measured after encapsulation, after
208 treating the capsules with surfactants for 30, 60 and 120 min, and in simulated gastric (SGF) and
209 intestinal fluid (SIF) by the spread plate method.
210

211 To measure the cell viability of loaded capsules after encapsulation and surfactant treatment,
212 capsules (1 g) were collected and blended with 99 mL PBS in a stomacher (model 400 Circulation,
213 Seward, UK) at 300 rpm for 20 minutes. The cell suspension was then appropriately diluted, spread
214 onto MRS agar plates and the plates incubated for 2 days at 37 °C. Bacterial colonies were counted
215 and expressed as CFU per g.
216

217 Simulated gastric fluid (SGF) was prepared (0.2 % w/v NaCl, 0.3 g/L pepsin) and the pH was
218 adjusted to 2 by adding 1 M HCl. Simulated intestinal fluid (SIF) was prepared using 0.05 M
219 potassium phosphate buffer (KH_2PO_4) after adjusting the pH to 7.2 using 1 M NaOH and adding
220 0.125 g/L pancreatin lipase. The solutions were sterilised using a 0.2 µm Minisart microfilter
221 (Sartorius Stedim Biotech, Germany). One gram of capsules was added to 9 mL SGF and the
222 viability of encapsulated bacteria was measured after 60 min and incubation at 37 °C, following the
223 homogenisation and spread plate method described above. After exposure to SGF, the capsules
224 were transferred to 9 mL of simulated intestinal fluid (SIF) and the viability of the bacterial cells
225 was measured after 60 and 120 min by taking 1 mL from the suspension, diluting with 99 mL PBS,
226 followed by the homogenisation and spread plate method described above.
227

228 **2.2.9 Statistical analysis**

229 The results are reported throughout as mean ± standard deviation. Statistical analysis of the data
230 was conducted using ANOVA, Version.17 of SPSS. Values $P<0.05$ were considered to be
231 statistically significant.
232

233 **3. Results and Discussion**

234 **3.1 Antimicrobial effects of surfactants**

235 Initially, the surfactant solutions were evaluated for their potential antimicrobial effects on free *L.*
236 *plantarum* cells. As shown in Figure 1, both BZK and CTAB (cationic surfactants) exhibited strong
237 antimicrobial properties as no live bacteria were detected after 30 min of incubation. On the other

238 hand, incubation of free *L. plantarum* cells in lecithin did not affect the viability of the bacterial
239 cells significantly ($P > 0.05$) compared to the control. The viability of *L. plantarum* in the presence
240 of DDAC, SDS and ALS decreased significantly ($P < 0.05$) compared to the control, although the
241 decrease was less than 0.5 log.



242
243 **Figure 1** Antimicrobial effect of surfactants on free *L. plantarum* cells after exposure for 0, 30, 60
244 and 120 minutes in solutions containing 0.05 g/L of surfactant (DDAC, SDS, ALS, CTAB, BZK) at
245 pH 7, and pH 8 in the case of lecithin. No viable cells were detected in the case of BZK and CTAB
246 (cell concentration < 2 log CFU/mL).* Indicates significant difference ($P < 0.05$) compared to
247 control.
248
249 CTAB and BZK contain quaternary ammonium group and can act as antimicrobial agents as both of
250 them are positively charged. Labena, Hegazy, Horn, & Muller (2015) attributed the antimicrobial
251 mechanism of action of cationic surfactants against *S. aureus* to the electrostatic interactions
252 between the anionic lipoproteins of the cell membrane and the hydrophilic head of the cationic
253 surfactant. Moreover, the hydrophobic tail of CTAB and BZK, i.e. the N-alkyl group, penetrates
254 inside the bacteria, which results in changes in the lipid bilayer of the cell membrane, particularly of
255 Gram positive bacteria such as *S. aureus*, causing the leakage of intracellular fluid, and leading
256 eventually to cell death (Ioannou, Hanlon, & Denyer, 2007). Interestingly, DDAC did not affect cell
257 viability in SIF, which is surprising considering the cationic character of this surfactant.
258

259 On the other hand, the antimicrobial effect of anionic surfactants, such as SDS and ALS, against
260 Gram positive bacteria is likely to involve the interaction of the surfactant with the phospholipid
261 cell membrane, which leads to membrane disruption and depending on the surfactant concentration
262 to complete membrane solubilisation, as well as to the modification of membrane enzymes and
263 denaturation of membrane proteins (Cords; Burnett, Hilgren, Finley, & Magnuson, 2005). However,
264 the antibacterial effect depends greatly on the concentration of the surfactant and the pH of the
265 solution; low concentrations of anionic surfactants (much lower than CMC) result in low
266 antibacterial effect, while as the acidity increases (pH < 3.5) the antibacterial effect increases
267 (Cozolli, 1997). The low surfactant concentrations used in this experiment (0.05 g/L) as well as the
268 high pH of the solutions (pH ~ 7) is probably the reasons for the relatively small decrease in the
269 viability of the cells in the case of SDS and ALS.

270

271

272 **3.2 Hydrophobicity of alginate films coated with surfactants**

273 Calcium alginate films were prepared and were immersed in the different surfactants for various
274 times (30 to 120 minutes). Subsequently the coated films were treated with water and the wettability
275 of the surfaces was measured using the contact angle method, to identify any differences in the
276 hydrophobicity of alginate films after coating with surfactants (Figure 2). When the contact angle of
277 the water drop on the surface is less than 20°, the surface is considered to be mostly hydrophilic,
278 while a typical hydrophobic surface will display contact angle values greater than 70° (Carneiro-da-
279 Cunha et al., 2010).

280

281 Calcium alginate surface treated with water showed a high contact angle of 56.93 ± 6.03 ° (Figure
282 2b). When calcium alginate was treated for 30 min with various surfactants, the hydrophobicity
283 decreased in all cases significantly ($P < 0.05$), and in some of them by more than 40 %. However,
284 as the time of immersion increased the hydrophobicity for lecithin, DDAC and ALS did not change,
285 however that of CTAB and BZK increased significantly ($P < 0.05$), and after 120 minutes the
286 hydrophobicity of CTAB was greater than that of calcium alginate (64.26 ± 7.34 °), whereas in the
287 case of BZK it was similar (56.11 ± 7.63 °). The pattern observed with CTAB and BZK indicates
288 that initially (~30 minutes) there is strong electrostatic interaction between alginate-surfactant
289 which lead to increased turbidity (data not shown) and decreased hydrophobicity (Figure 2),
290 however hydrophobic interactions between the long alkyl chains of CTAB and BZK and the
291 hydrophobic backbone of alginate come into play as time progresses. The pattern observed with the
292 anionic SDS and ALS, i.e. the decrease in hydrophobicity of the surfactant-coated alginate film
293 suggests an increased hydrophilic interaction between these particular surfactants and alginate. This

294 has also been suggested by Neumann et al. (2003) investigating the interactions between alginate
295 and various surfactants by fluorescence, who hypothesised that this was due to increased interaction
296 between hydrophilic sulphonate groups (which are present in SDS and ALS) and the hydroxyl
297 groups of alginate.
298

(b)



301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317



318 **Figure 2** (a) Images showing the wettability of calcium alginate surfaces treated with different
319 surfactants (b) Contact wetting angle measurements of calcium alginate surfaces treated with
320 different surfactants. Data given as mean ± standard deviation (n=3). The image insert in (b) shows
321 the wetting of untreated calcium alginate surface.
322
323

324 **3.3 Size and swelling of capsules**

325 In order to understand the possible effect of different surfactants on the size of the capsules, calcium
326 alginate capsules were treated with various surfactants for 30 min. Calcium alginate capsules
327 (control) had a size of 3.26 ± 0.15 mm. After their exposure to surfactant solutions, in all the cases
328 the size of the capsules did not significantly differ (P > 0.05) from that of the control (Figure 3),

329 with the exception of lecithin coated capsules, the size of which increased significantly ($P < 0.05$)
330 by around 0.6 mm.
331



332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343 **Figure 3** Size of uncoated and surfactant-coated alginate capsules with and without surfactant. Data
344 given as mean ± standard deviation (n=5).* Indicates significant difference ($P < 0.05$) of the values
345 from the starting control (ALG).
346
347
348 The fact that the size of the capsules did not change in the case of cationic surfactants (DDAC,
349 CTAB and BZK) is in contrast with previous works. More specifically, in the study by Obeid et al.
350 (2014), the size of alginate capsules upon immersion to cetylpyridinium chloride (CPC), a cationic
351 surfactant, at pH 7 decreased from about 3.3 mm to around 2.7 mm. This was attributed to the
352 adsorption of CPC, occurring due to both electrostatic interactions and hydrophobic interactions
353 inducing the formation of surfactant aggregates in the capsules. Similar result was also obtained in
354 the study of Wang, Wang, Shi, & Wang (2013) in which alginate nanocomposite was immersed into
355 CTAB and dodecyltrimethylammonimum bromide (DTAB); it was observed that the swelling ratio
356 decreased particularly as the surfactant concertation increased. A possible reason for these
357 differences is the fact that the surfactant concentrations used for coating the alginate capsules
358 produced in this study (0.05 g/L) were much lower than the CMC of each surfactant (see Table 1)
359 and hence the electrostatic and hydrophobic interactions were significantly lower, leading to less
360 amount of surfactant aggregates being formed onto the capsules. The fact that the size of the
361 capsules was not affected when using ALS and SDS was expected, and is most likely because
362 anionic surfactants are difficult to enter the polymer network due to electrostatic repulsion with the
363 negatively charged carboxylate groups of alginate, as also suggested by Wang et al. (2013). The

364 significant increase in size that was observed in the case of lecithin coated capsules indicates
365 increased swelling of the alginate capsules. This could be due to the fact that the polymer network
366 expanded as a result of the increased hydrophilicity of the lecithin coated capsules, as also seen in
367 Figure 2, coupled with the increased electrostatic interaction at pH 8 between alginate, which
368 becomes more ionised (Hua, Ma, Li, Yang, & Wang, 2010), and the amine group of lecithin.
369
370 Laser scanning confocal microscopy was used to examine the structural interactions between the
371 surfactants and alginate capsules. More specifically, the aim was to determine whether the
372 surfactants formed a layer around the capsules, thus acting as a coating material, or whether they
373 were able to penetrate deeply into the matrix of the capsule. The pore size of calcium alginate gel is
374 known to be around 50-200 nm (Cuadros; Erices, & Aguilera, 2015), whereas Chamieh, Davanier,
375 Jannin, Demarne, & Cottet (2015) reported that the size of the micelles for some cationic
376 (cetyltrimethylammonium bromide), anionic (sodium dodecyl sulfate, sodium taurocholate) and
377 zwitterionic surfactants (N-dodecyl-N,N-dimethyl-3-ammonio-1-propanesulfonate, 3-(3-
378 cholamidopropyl)-dimethyl-ammonio)-propanesulfonate) is between 2.14 and 8.16 nm in diameter,
379 which indicates that surfactant monomers and micelles should be able to freely diffuse inside the
380 calcium alginate gel. Considering the potential antimicrobial activity of certain surfactants, this
381 knowledge is important for selecting appropriate surfactants for applications aiming to enhance
382 probiotic delivery.
383
384 In order to evaluate the above hypothesis, the capsules with and without a surfactant coating were
385 stained with a dye and the fluorescence intensity on the surface and inside the matrix of the capsule
386 monitored using confocal microscopy. Nile Red, a natural non-ionic dye that has the ability to
387 interact with hydrophobic compounds such as fatty acids was selected, as it is able to bind to all
388 types of surfactants (anionic, cationic, zwitterionic and nonionic) (Kundu, Ghosh, Jana, &
389 Chattopadhyay, 2015). In the absence of surfactant coating, no fluorescence was detected after
390 immersion of the capsules to Nile Red (data not shown). As seen in Figure 4A (1, 2 and 3), calcium
391 alginate capsules treated with lecithin exhibited high fluorescence intensity; it seemed that with
392 increasing the exposure time of capsules to the surfactants (30, 60 and 120 min) the penetration of
393 lecithin inside the matrix of the capsule increased. DDAC exposed capsules (Figure 4B 1, 2 and 3)
394 exhibited reduced fluorescence compared to lecithin although higher than that observed for CTAB,
395 BZK, ALS and SDS (Figure 4C, D, E and F, respectively); in all cases however penetration of the
396 surfactant into the matrix of the capsules was observed after prolonged exposure (120 min). These
397 images confirmed that surfactants have the ability to penetrate inside the capsules and that the level
398 of penetration increases with time. The increased fluorescence intensity in the case of the cationic

399 surfactants DDAC, CTAB and BZK, particularly after 120 min of immersion, can be attributed to
400 the electrostatic interaction between alginate and the surfactant, whereas the relatively lower
401 fluorescence intensity in the case the anionic ALS and SDS surfactants to hydrophobic interactions.
402 These visual observations are in accordance with the results from the hydrophobicity study (Figure
403 2). As mentioned in the previous sections, the increased interaction between alginate capsules and
404 lecithin, which led to increase in swelling and to increased fluorescence intensity, can be attributed
405 to the increased hydrophilicity of the lecithin coated capsules coupled with the increased
406 electrostatic interaction at pH 8 between alginate and the amine group of lecithin. The results from
407 confocal microscopy are in accordance with the results of Jana, Ghosh, & Chattopadhyay (2013),
408 who reported that the interactions of Nile Red with zwitterionic and cationic surfactants were
409 stronger than with anionic surfactants, as shown by fluorescence spectroscopy.
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418



Figure 4 Confocal microscopy images for alginate capsules treated with different surfactants and subsequently immersed into 0.5 mg/mL Nile red. (A) lecithin, (B) DDAC, (C) CTAB, (D) BZK, (E) ALS and (F) SDS, after (1) 30, (2) 60 and (3) 120 min.

3.4 Effect of surfactant coating on cell viability

Figure 5 demonstrates the cell viability of *L. plantarum* cells entrapped in alginate capsules during their exposure for 120 min in water (control) and 0.05 g/L surfactant solutions. The cell concentration of *L. plantarum* in the alginate capsules before exposure was ~ 9 log CFU/g. Exposing calcium alginate capsules to lecithin, DDAC and ALS for up to 120 min did not affect significantly ($P > 0.05$) the viability of encapsulated bacteria, while exposure to SDS reduced significantly ($P < 0.05$) the viability of encapsulated cells although the decrease was less than 0.5 log CFU/g. A significant ($P < 0.05$) decrease was observed in the case of BZK and CTAB, which increased with exposure time, resulting in ~ 5.3 log CFU/g and ~ 4.2 log CFU/g, after exposure to the surfactants for 120 min, respectively.

From this experiment, it can be deduced that the surfactants could be divided in two groups, with the first group consisting of lecithin, DDAC, SDS and ALS not affecting considerably cell viability, and the second group consisting of CTAB and BZK exhibiting strong antimicrobial activity and reducing considerably cell viability. Considering these results and comparing with the results with the free cells in the presence of surfactants shown in Figure 1 it can be observed that the alginate capsule reduced the very strong antimicrobial effect of the cationic surfactant CTAB and BZK. This was probably due to the relatively strong

453 electrostatic interactions of these surfactants with alginate and the hydrophobic character of
454 the alginate-surfactant complex which most likely resulted in a denser polymer network
455 (Figure 2). However, as seen by confocal microscopy (Figure 4), CTAB and BZK after
456 prolonged coating time were able to penetrate to an extent into the capsules where they most
457 likely affected the integrity of the bacterial cell membrane, resulting in cell death. The fact
458 that lecithin, ALS and DDAC did not affect cell viability, whereas SDS had a very small
459 negative effect, is in accordance with the results with the free cells in the presence of
460 surfactants at pH 7 and pH 8 for lecithin (Figure 1). It must be noted that in previous studies,
461 when lecithin was used as a component of the matrix to encapsulate probiotic bacteria, an
462 improvement in cell viability in simulated gastrointestinal conditions, i.e. low pH and high
463 bile salt concentrations was reported (Donthidi et al., 2010, Chen et al., 2012b).



464

465 **Figure 5** Cell viability of *L. plantarum* cells in alginate capsules during their exposure for
466 120 min in water (control) and 0.05 g/L surfactant solutions at pH 7 and at pH 8 in the case of
467 lecithin. Data given as mean ± standard deviation (n=3).* Indicates significant difference (P
468 < 0.05) of the values from the no surfactant. The cell concentration of *L. plantarum* in the
469 alginate capsules before exposure (time 0 min) was 9.00 ± 0.12 log CFU/g.

470

471 **3.5 Behaviour of probiotic containing capsules in simulated gastrointestinal fluids**
472 The purpose of this experiment was to evaluate the potential protective effect of the
473 surfactants on cell survival during passage of the probiotic containing capsules through
474 simulated gastrointestinal conditions, consisting of simulated gastric fluid (SGF) at pH 2 and
475 simulated intestinal fluid (SIF) at pH 7.2; the capsules, both non-coated (control) and
476 surfactant coated alginate capsules were exposed in SGF for 60 min and subsequently in SIF
477 for 120 min (Figure 6). The capsules did not dissolve in SGF; however all of them were
478 completely dissolved in SIF. The insolubility in SGF is related to the formation of acid
479 alginate gel that is enhanced by increasing the concentration of H^+ (Cook et al., 2011).
480 Pasparakis & Bouropoulos (2006) showed that the protonation of carboxylic groups under
481 acidic conditions decreases the electrostatic repulsion and this is responsible for the shrinkage
482 of calcium alginate capsules at pH 2. However, the presence of Na^+ in SIF and the neutral pH
483 (pH 7.2) caused the ionic replacement of Ca^{++} in the structure of calcium alginate which
484 eventually led to Ca^{++} leaching out of the gel and to the degradation of the capsules (Bajpai &
485 Sharma, 2004).
486 The viability of *L. plantarum* in non-coated alginate capsules (control) decreased from 9.00 ±
487 0.11 to 6.16 ± 0.26 log CFU/g after 60 min of exposure to SGF. Coating of the capsules with
488 lecithin improved considerably cell survival compared to the control, resulting in a cell
489 concentration of 8.68 ± 0.025 log CFU/g after 60 min in SGF. When DDAC was used, the
490 cell concertation after 60 min exposure in SGF was higher than the control (7.84 ± 0.17 log
491 CFU/g). All other surfactants (CTAB, BZK, SDS and ALS) demonstrated worst cell survival
492 in SGF compared to the control, indicating that the strong interactions between anionic
493 alginate and the cationic surfactants CTAB and BZK did not enhance the protection offered
494 by the alginate gel in SGF. As mentioned before, the pore size of calcium alginate gel was
495 larger than the size of the micelles of the surfactants, which allows the surfactants to
496 penetrate inside the capsules easily, as also seen in Figure 5, and exerts their strong
497 antimicrobial properties, causing bacterial death. It is interesting to note that although SDS
498 and ALS did not exert an antimicrobial effect at pH 7 (Figure 1), it did in SGF (Figure 6),
499 indicating that the pH influences considerably the antimicrobial properties of these particular
500 surfactants. In SIF, the capsules rapidly dissolved and thus the surfactants were able to act on
501 the free cells, which was the reason for the dramatic decrease in cell concentration to
502 undetectable levels (< 2 log CFU/g). In SIF, the lecithin coated capsules offered considerable
503 protection to the cells as the cell concentration was 8.7 log CFU/g after 120 min exposure (i.e

504 ~ 0.3 log CFU/g decrease), whereas in the case of DDAC coated capsules the cell
505 concertation was around 7.6 log CFU/g (~ 1.4 log CFU/g decrease).



506
507 **Figure 6** Viability of *L. plantarum* in calcium alginate capsules with and without surfactant
508 coating during exposure to simulated gastric fluid (SGF) at pH 2 for 60 min followed by
509 exposure to simulated intestinal fluid (SIF) at pH 7.2 for up to 120 min. No viable cells were
510 detected in SIF in the case of the BZK, CTAB, SDS and ALS (cell concentration < 2 log
511 CFU/mL). Data given as mean ± standard deviation (*n*=3).
512
513 In order to evaluate the contribution of the coating layer in the case of the lecithin and DDAC
514 coated capsules towards cell protection in SGF and SIF, an experiment was conducted in
515 which free *L. plantarum* cells were incubated in SGF and SIF in the presence and absence of
516 lecithin and DDAC (Figure 7). It can be observed that lecithin improved significantly the
517 survival of free cells in SGF and SIF compared to free cells without lecithin. Interestingly, in
518 the presence of lecithin no significant ($P > 0.05$) decrease in cell viability was observed in
519 SGF for 1 h and SIF for 2 hours; the values of viable cell concentrations were very similar to
520 those obtained for the capsules coated with lecithin (Figure 6). DDAC did not increase
521 significantly ($P > 0.05$) cell survival compared to the free cells, as after 1 h in SGF the cell
522 concertation was ~ 5 log CFU/mL whereas after 2 h in SIF no change in the viable cells were
523 detected; these values were considerably lower than those obtained for the capsules coated
524 with DDAC (Figure 6). These results indicate that in the case of coating the capsules with

525 DDAC, which was visualised by confocal microscopy (Figure 4), the protection was most
526 likely due the strong alginate-DDAC polymer network formed due to the strong electrostatic
527 interaction between alginate and DDAC, which delayed the penetration of hydrogen ions
528 inside the capsules; this protection was lost when DDAC was used with free cells (Figure 7).
529 On the other hand, in the case of lecithin coated capsules, lecithin rapidly penetrated inside
530 the capsules (Figure 4), where it was most likely able to exert a protective effect to the cells
531 against acid penetration. This is confirmed by the fact that lecithin was able to protect free
532 cells in SGF (Figure 7). To this end, a protective effect towards the viability of probiotic
533 lactic acid bacteria in conditions of high gastric acidity and bile salts was reported in the
534 presence of 2 % (w/v) lecithin by Chen et al. (2012a). It is likely that lecithin due to its
535 zwitterionic character was able to increase the stability of *L. plantarum* through its integration
536 in the phospholipid bilayer of the bacterial cell membrane thereby preserving the enzyme
537 activity and cytoplasm stability of the cells when present in adverse gastrointestinal
538 conditions (e.g. high acidity, pancreatic enzymes).



539

540 **Figure 7** Viability of *L. plantarum* free cells with and without surfactant. The cells were
541 initially exposed to simulated gastric fluid (SGF) at pH 2 for 60 min followed by exposure to
542 simulated intestinal fluid (SIF) and pH 7.2 for up to 120 min. Data given as mean ± standard
543 deviation (*n*=3).

544

545

546 **4. Conclusions**

547 In this study it was shown that surfactants, depending on their type and properties, can be
548 effectively used for coating alginate capsules containing probiotic bacteria exerting additional
549 protection to the cells. Coating alginate capsules with lecithin, a zwitterionic surfactant,
550 improved considerably the survival of *L. plantarum* cells in simulated gastrointestinal fluids
551 compared to non-coated capsules, resulting in complete recovery of viable cells after 1 hour
552 exposure to simulated gastric fluid and two hours in simulated intestinal fluid. Although the
553 interaction between alginate and lecithin was relatively weak, it is likely that the protection
554 was associated with the fact that lecithin was able to penetrate into the capsule rapidly. The
555 cationic surfactant DDAC was not able to penetrate rapidly the capsules, but interacted
556 strongly with alginate primarily due to electrostatic attraction; this most likely resulted in a
557 stronger polymer network which reduced the rate of acid ingress and thus to improved cell
558 survival compared to non-coated capsules. Coating of the capsules with the cationic
559 surfactants hexadecyltrimethylammonium bromide (CTAB) and benzalkonium chloride
560 (BZK), and the anionic surfactants ammonium lauryl sulphate (ALS) and sodium dodecyl
561 sulphate (SDS) resulted in worst survival compared to the uncoated capsules, which was most
562 likely associated with their gradual penetration inside the capsules and their antimicrobial
563 effects.

564

565

566 **5. References**

567 Abbaszadeh, S., Gandomi, H., Misaghi, A., Bokaei, S., & Noori, N. (2014). The effect of
568 alginate and chitosan concentrations on some properties of chitosan-coated alginate beads
569 and survivability of encapsulated *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* in simulated gastrointestinal
570 conditions and during heat processing. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture, 94,*
571 2210-2216.

572

573 Bahri, M. A., Hoebeke, M., Grammenos, A., Delanaye, L., Vandewalle, N., & Seret, A.
574 (2006). Investigation of SDS, DTAB and CTAB micelle microviscosities by electron spin
575 resonance. *Colloids and Surfaces A - Physicochemical and Engineering Aspects, 290,* 206-
576 212.

577

578 Bajpai, S. K., & Sharma, S. (2004). Investigation of swelling/degradation behaviour of
579 alginate beads crosslinked with Ca 2+ and Ba 2+ ions. *Reactive and Functional Polymers, 59,*
580 129-140.
581
582 Banerjee, D., Chowdhury, R., & Bhattacharya, P (2017). In-vitro evaluation of targeted
583 release of probiotic *Lactobacillus casei* (2651 1951 RPK) from synbiotic microcapsules in
584 the gastrointestinal (GI) system: Experiments and modeling. *LWT - Food Science and*
585 *Technology, 83,* 243-253.
586
587 Bonnaud, M., Weiss, J., & McClements, D. J. (2010). Interaction of a food-grade cationic
588 surfactant (lauric arginate) with food-grade biopolymers (pectin, carrageenan, xanthan,
589 alginate, dextran, and chitosan). *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry, 58,* 9770-9777.
590
591 Bu, H., Kjoniksen, A.-L., Elgsaeter, A., & Nystrom, B. (2006). Interaction of unmodified and
592 hydrophobically modified alginate with sodium dodecyl sulfate in dilute aqueous solution:
593 Calorimetric, rheological, and turbidity studies. *Colloids and Surfaces A: Physicochemical*
594 *and Engineering Aspects,* 278, 166-174.
595
596 Bustamante, M., Gonzalez, M. E., Cartes, A., & Diez, M. C. (2011). Effect of soya lecithin
597 on the enzymatic system of the white-rot fungi *Anthracophyllum discolour*. *Journal of*
598 *Industrial Microbiology & Biotechnology, 100,* 701-708.
599
600 Carneiro-da-Cunha, M. G., Cerqueira, M. A., Souza, B. W. S., Carvalho, S., Quintas, M. A.
601 C., Teixeira, J. A., & Vicente, A. A. (2010). Physical and thermal properties of a
602 chitosan/alginate nanolayered pet film. *Carbohydrate Polymers, 82,* 153-159.
603
604 Chamieh, J., Davanier, F., Jannin, V., Demarne, F., & Cottet, H. (2015). Size characterization
605 of commercial micelles and microemulsions by taylor dispersion analysis. *International*
606 *Journal of Pharmaceutics, 492,* 46-54.
607
608 Chen, S., Cao, Y., Ferguson, L. R., Shu, Q., & Garg, S. (2012a). Flow cytometric assessment
609 of the protectants for enhanced in vitro survival of probiotic lactic acid bacteria through
610 simulated human gastro-intestinal stresses. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology, 95,*
611 345-356.

612

613 Chen, S., Zhao, Q., Ferguson, L. R., Shu, Q., Weir, I., & Garg, S. (2012b). Development of a
614 novel probiotic delivery system based on microencapsulation with protectants. *Applied*
615 *Microbiology and Biotechnology, 93,* 1447-1457.
616
617 Chen, J., Wang, Q., Liu, C. M., & Gong, J. (2017). Issues deserve attention in encapsulating
618 probiotics: Critical review of existing literature. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and*
619 *Nutrition, 57,* 1228-1238.
620
621 Cook, M. T., Tzortzis, G., Charalampopoulos, D., & Khutoryanskiy, V. V. (2011).
622 Production and evaluation of dry alginate-chitosan microcapsules as an enteric delivery
623 vehicle for probiotic bacteria. *Biomacromolecules, 12,* 2834-2840.
624
625 Cook, M. T., Tzortzis, G., Charalampopoulos, D., & Khutoryanskiy, V. V. (2012).
626 Microencapsulation of probiotics for gastrointestinal delivery. *Journal of Controlled Release,*
627 *162,* 56-67.
628
629 Cords, B. R., Burnett, S. L., Hilgren, J., Finley, M., & Magnuson, J. (2005). Sanitizers:
630 Halogens, surface-active agents, and peroxides. In P. M. Davidson, J. N. Sofos, & A. L.
631 Branen (Eds.), Antimicrobials in food (3rd ed., pp. 507–572). Boca Raton, FL: Taylor &
632 Francis.
633
634 Cozolli, O. (1997). The roles of surfactants in self-preserving cosmetic formulas. In J. J.
635 Kabara, & d. S. Orth (Eds.), Preservative-Free and Self-Preserving Cosmetics and Drugs:
636 Principles and Practices (pp. 75-118). New York, Marcel Dekker, Inc.
637
638 Cuadros, T. R., Erices, A. A., & Aguilera, J. M. (2015). Porous matrix of calcium
639 alginate/gelatin with enhanced properties as scaffold for cell culture. *Journal of the*
640 *Mechanical Behavior of Biomedical Materials,* 46, 331-342.
641
642 Deutschle, T., Porkert, U., Reiter, R., Keck, T., & Riechelmann, H. (2006). In vitro
643 genotoxicity and cytotoxicity of benzalkonium chloride. *Toxicology in Vitro, 20,* 1472-1477.
644

645 Ding, W.K., & Shah, N.P. (2009). An improved method of microencapsulation of probiotic
646 bacteria for their stability in acidic and bile conditions during storage. *Journal of Food*
647 *Science, 74,* 53-61.
648
649 Donthidi, A. R., Tester, R. F., & Aidoo, K. E. (2010). Effect of lecithin and starch on
650 alginate-encapsulated probiotic bacteria. *Journal of Microencapsulation, 27,* 67-77.
651
652 Gbassi, G.K., Vandamme, T., Ennahar, S., E., & Marchioni, E. (2009). Microencapsulation
653 of *Lactobacillus plantarum* spp in an alginate matrix coated with whey proteins.
654 *International Journal of Food Microbiology, 129,* 103-105.
655
656 Greenspan, P., Mayer, E. P., & Fowler, S. D. (1985). Nile red - a selective fluorescent stain
657 for intracellular lipid droplets. *Journal of Cell Biology, 100,* 965-973.
658
659 Hejazi, R., & Amiji, M. (2003). Chitosan-based gastrointestinaldelivery systems. *Journal of*
660 *Control Release, 89,* 151–165.
661
662 Hua, S. B., Ma, H. Z., Li, X., Yang, H. X., & Wang, A. (2010). Ph-sensitive sodium
663 alginate/poly(vinyl alcohol) hydrogel beads prepared by combined Ca 2+ crosslinking and
664 freeze-thawing cycles for controlled release of diclofenac sodium. *International Journal of*
665 *Biological Macromolecules, 46,* 517-523.
666
667 Huq, T., Fraschini, C., Khan, A., Riedl, B., Bouchard, J., & Lacroix, M (2017). Alginate
668 based nanocomposite for microencapsulation of probiotic: Effect of cellulose nanocrystal
669 (CNC) and lecithin. *Carbohydrate Polymres, 168,* 61-69.
670
671 Ioannou, C. J., Hanlon, G. W., & Denyer, S. P. (2007). Action of disinfectant quaternary
672 ammonium compounds against staphylococcus aureus. *Antimicrobial Agents and*
673 *Chemotherapy, 51, 296-306.*
674
675 Ishikawa, S., Matsumura, Y., Katoh-Kubo, K., & Tsuchido, T. (2002). Antibacterial activity
676 of surfactants against *Escherichia coli* cells is influenced by carbon source and anaerobiosis.
677 *Journal of Applied Microbiology, 93,* 302-309.
678

679 Jana, B., Ghosh, S., & Chattopadhyay, N. (2013). Competitive binding of nile red between
680 lipids and β-cyclodextrin. *Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology B: Biology, 126,* 1-
681 10.
682
683 Joondan, N., Jhaumeer-Laulloo, S., & Caumul, P. (2014). A study of the antibacterial activity
684 of L-Phenylalanine and L-Tyrosine esters in relation to their CMCs and their interactions
685 with 1,2-dipalmitoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphocholine, DPPC as model membrane.
686 *Microbiological Research, 169,* 675-685.
687
688 Kabara, J. J., & Orth, D. S. (1997). Preservative-free and self-preserving cosmetics and
689 drugs: Principles and practices, New York, Marcel Dekker.
690
691 Kundu, P., Ghosh, S., Jana, B., & Chattopadhyay, N. (2015). Binding interaction of
692 differently charged fluorescent probes with egg yolk phosphatidylcholine and the effect of β-
693 cyclodextrin on the lipid–probe complexes: A fluorometric investigation. *Spectrochimica*
694 *Acta Part A: Molecular and Biomolecular Spectroscopy, 142,* 15-24.
695
696 Labena, A., Hegazy, M. A., Horn, H., & Muller, E. (2015). The biocidal effect of a novel
697 synthesized gemini surfactant on environmental sulfidogenic bacteria: Planktonic cells and
698 biofilms. *Materials Science and Engineering: C, 47,* 367-375.
699
700 Lupo, B., Maestro, A., Porras, M., Gutierrez, J. M., & Gonzalez, C. (2014). Preparation of
701 alginate microspheres by emulsification/internal gelation to encapsulate cocoa polyphenols.
702 *Food Hydrocolloids, 38,* 56-65.
703
704 Martin, M. J., Lara-Villoslada, F., Ruiz, M. A., & Morales, M. E . (2015).
705 Microencapsulation of bacteria: A review of different technologies and their impact on the
706 probiotic effects. *Innovative Food Science & Emerging Technologies, 27,* 15-25.
707
708 Neumann, M. G., Schmitt, C. C., & Iamazaki, E. T. (2003). A fluorescence study of the
709 interactions between sodium alginate and surfactants. *Carbohydrate Research, 338,* 1109-
710 1113.
711

712 Nualkaekul, S., Cook, M. T., Khutoryanskiy, V. V., & Charalampopoulos, D. (2013).
713 Influence of encapsulation and coating materials on the survival of *Lactobacillus plantarum*
714 and *Bifidobacterium longum* in fruit juices. *Food Research International, 53,* 304-311.
715
716 Nualkaekul, S., Lenton, D., Cook, M. T., Khutoryanskiy, V. V. & Charalampopoulos, D.
717 (2012). Chitosan coated alginate beads for the survival of microencapsulated *Lactobacillus*
718 *plantarum* in pomegranate juice. *Carbohydrate Polymers, 90,* 1281-1287.
719
720 Obeid, L., El Kolli, N., Dali, N., Talbot, D., Abramson, S., Welschbillig, M., Cabuil, V., &
721 Bee, A. (2014). Adsorption of a cationic surfactant by a magsorbent based on magnetic
722 alginate beads. *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science, 432,* 182-189.
723
724 Pasparakis, G., & Bouropoulos, N. (2006). Swelling studies and in vitro release of verapamil
725 from calcium alginate and calcium alginate–chitosan beads. *International Journal of*
726 *Pharmaceutics, 323,* 34-42.
727
728 Pinazo, A., Manresa, M. A., Marques, A. M., Bustelo, M., Espuny, M. J., & Perez, L. (2016).
729 Amino acid-based surfactants: New antimicrobial agents. *Advances in Colloid and Interface*
730 *Science, 228,* 17-39.
731
732 Schramm, L. L., Stasiuk, E. N., & Marangoni, D. G. (2003). Surfactants and their
733 applications. *Annual Reports Section "C" (Physical Chemistry), 99,* 3-48.
734
735 Simoes, L. D. S., Madalena, D. A., Pinheiro, A. C., Teixeira, J. A., Vicente, A. A., &
736 Ramos, O. L. (2017). Micro- and nano bio-based delivery systems for food applications: In
737 vitro behaviour. *Advances in Colloid and Interface Science, 243,* 23-45.
738
739 Trabelsi, I., Bejar, W., Ayadi, D., Chouayekh, H., Kammoun, R., Bejar, S., & Ben Salah,
740 R. (2013). Encapsulation in alginate and alginate coated-chitosan improved the survival of
741 newly probiotic in oxgall and gastric juice. *International Journal of Biological*
742 *Macromolecules, 61,* 36-42.
743

744 Wang, Y. Z., Wang, W. B., Shi, X. N., & Wang, A. Q. (2013). A superabsorbent
745 nanocomposite based on sodium alginate and illite/smectite mixed-layer clay. *Journal of*
746 *Applied Polymer Science, 130,* 161-167.
747
748 Williams, R. J., Phillips J. N., & Mysels, K. J. (1955). The critical micelle concentration of
749 sodium lauryl sulphate at 25 ^{o}C. *Transactions of the Faraday Society, 51,* 728-737.
750
751 Xia, J. D., Xia, Y. M., & Nnanna, I. A. (1995). Structure-function relationship of acyl amino-
752 acid surfactants - surface-activity and antimicrobial properties. *Journal of Agricultural and*
753 *Food Chemistry, 43,* 867-871.
754
755 Zaeim, D., Sarabi-Jamab, M., Ghorani, B., Kadkhodaee, R., & Tromp, R. H. (2017).
756 Electrospray assisted fabrication of hydrogel microcapsules by single- and double-stage
757 procedures for encapsulation of probiotics. *Food and Bioproducts Processing, 102,* 250-259.
758
759 Zhao, M., Qu, F. N., Wu, Z. J., Nishinari, K., Phillips, G. O., & Fang, Y. P. (2017).
760 Protection mechanism of alginate microcapsules with different mechanical strength for
761 *Lactobacillus plantarum* ST-III. *Food Hydrocolloids, 66,* 396-402.
762
763 Zheng, H. Z., Gao, M., Ren, Y., Lou, R. Y., Xie, H. G., Yu, W. T., Liu, X. D., & Ma, X. J.
764 (2017). An improved pH-responsive carrier based on EDTA-Ca-alginate for oral delivery of
765 *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* ATCC 53103. *Carbohrate Polymers, 155,* 329-335.
766