



Alkyl caffeates as antioxidants in O/W emulsions: Impact of emulsifier type and endogenous tocopherols

Sørensen, Ann-Dorit Moltke; Villeneuve, Pierre; Jacobsen, Charlotte

Published in:
European Journal of Lipid Science and Technology

Link to article, DOI:
[10.1002/ejlt.201600276](https://doi.org/10.1002/ejlt.201600276)

Publication date:
2017

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):
Sørensen, A.-D. M., Villeneuve, P., & Jacobsen, C. (2017). Alkyl caffeates as antioxidants in O/W emulsions: Impact of emulsifier type and endogenous tocopherols. *European Journal of Lipid Science and Technology*, 119(6), Article e201600276. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejlt.201600276>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Alkyl caffeates as antioxidants in o/w emulsions: Impact of emulsifier type and endogenous tocopherols

Journal:	<i>European Journal of Lipid Science and Technology</i>
Manuscript ID	ejlt.201600276.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Sørensen, Ann-Dorit Moltke; Technical University of Denmark, National Food Institute Villeneuve, Pierre; CIRAD, AMIS, UMR IATE Jacobsen, Charlotte; Technical University of Denmark, National Food Institute, Division of Industrial Food Research
Keywords:	Caffeic acid, Lipid oxidation, Tween, Citrem, Phenolipids
Additional Keywords (select from list):	Emulsifiers, Emulsion, Fish oil

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Alkyl caffeates as antioxidants in O/W emulsions: Impact of emulsifier type and endogenous
2 tocopherols

3

4 Ann-Dorit Moltke Sørensen^{1*}, Pierre Villeneuve², Charlotte Jacobsen¹

5

6 ¹ Division of Food Technology, National Food Institute (DTU Food), Technical University of
7 Denmark, DK-2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark

8 ² CIRAD, UMR IATE, Montpellier, F-34398, France

9 * Corresponding author: adms@food.dtu.dk, Phone: +45 4525 2591

10

11 Running title: Effect of emulsifier and antioxidants on lipid oxidation

12 Keywords: Caffeic acid; Lipid oxidation; Tween; Citrem; Phenolipids; Fish oil; Antioxidant
13 interactions

14

15 Abbreviations: CA Caffeic acid; C1 Methyl caffeate; C4 Butyl caffeate; C8 Octyl caffeate; C12
16 Dodecyl caffeate; C16 Hexadecyl caffeate; C20 Eicosyl caffeate; CAT Conjugated autoxidizable
17 triene; CCL Critical chain length; FO Fish oil; FO/RO Fish oil and rapeseed oil mixture (1:1); PC
18 Principal component; PCA Principal component analysis; PV Peroxide value; THF Tetrahydrofuran

1
2
3
4 **19 Abstract**

5
6
7 20 Antioxidant addition can be one strategy to limit lipid oxidation in emulsions. Research has proven
8
9 21 that an important factor regarding the efficacy of antioxidants is their localization in the emulsion;
10
11 22 however, other factors such as interactions with other components can also have an impact. Thus,
12
13 23 the aim was to evaluate the impact of emulsifiers (Citrem and Tween80) and presence of
14
15 24 endogenous tocopherols on the efficacies of caffeic acid and caffeates (C1-C20) as antioxidants in
16
17 25 emulsions. Lipid oxidation was evaluated during storage and partitioning of caffeic acid and
18
19 26 caffeates was estimated by measuring their concentrations in the aqueous phase.

20
21
22 27 Partitioning of caffeic acid and caffeates was influenced by emulsifier type and presence of
23
24 28 endogenous tocopherols. Caffeic acid was the most efficient antioxidant in Citrem and Tween
25
26 29 stabilized emulsions in the presence of endogenous tocopherol. In contrast, for Tween stabilized
27
28 30 emulsions, caffeic acid acted as a prooxidant and the evaluated caffeates acted as strong
29
30 31 antioxidants in the absence of endogenous tocopherol. Thus, when endogenous tocopherol was
31
32 32 present lipophilization of caffeic acid did not increase its efficacy as an antioxidant. It is suggested
33
34 33 that the differences observed in antioxidant efficiency with different emulsifiers and with and
35
36 34 without endogenous tocopherols is due to emulsifier-antioxidant interactions and antioxidant-
37
38 35 antioxidant interactions in the emulsions.

39
40
41 36 **Practical application:** Food emulsions contain endogenous tocopherols, thus, the impact of
42
43 37 endogenous tocopherols on the efficacy of applied antioxidants is of interest to the industry. So far
44
45 38 the hypotheses about antioxidant in emulsions are based on simple emulsions systems without the
46
47 39 presence of tocopherols. The finding in this study revealed that both emulsifier type and the
48
49 40 presence of endogenous tocopherol had an impact on the efficacy of caffeic acid and caffeates due
50
51 41 to emulsifier-antioxidant and antioxidant-antioxidant interactions. This highlights the importance of
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

42 evaluating the antioxidant in each emulsion system before selecting antioxidants for optimal
43 protection against lipid oxidation.

44
45

For Peer Review

46 **Introduction**

47 An o/w emulsion consists of three different phases. A dispersed phase (oil) is present as droplets in
48 a continuous phase (water) and separated by an interfacial region. Type of emulsions can range
49 from very simple, when prepared from only a few ingredients, to more complex, when prepared
50 with many different ingredients e.g. food emulsions. Lipid oxidation can occur rapidly in emulsions
51 due to their large interfacial area. The interface region facilitates interactions between the lipids and
52 water-soluble prooxidants [1].

53 Different strategies can be applied to limit lipid oxidation and thereby improve shelf life of
54 emulsions [2]. One of them is addition of antioxidants; however, selection of the right antioxidant
55 or mixture of antioxidants is difficult, since their efficacies are affected by the composition of the
56 emulsions e.g. their localization and interaction with other components. An enormous amount of
57 studies have been reported in the literature on antioxidants and their efficacies in model emulsions
58 and more complex food emulsions. So far, two hypotheses about antioxidant efficacies in
59 emulsions, namely the polar paradox hypothesis [3] and the cut-off effect [4] have been reported. In
60 brief, the polar paradox hypothesizes that apolar antioxidants are more efficient in O/W emulsions
61 than polar antioxidants [3] due to differences in the antioxidants' affinity towards the different
62 phases [5]. The cut-off effect can be seen as an extension of the polar paradox hypothesis, in which
63 an optimal degree of lipophilisation for optimal antioxidant activity is observed [4], which is called
64 critical chain length (CCL). The cut-off effect was observed from results obtained with chlorogenic
65 acid and rosmarinic acid and their unbranched saturated alkyl esters (chlorogenates and
66 rosmarinates). The efficacy of antioxidant homologues was related to the partitioning of these
67 antioxidants in an emulsion system [4, 6]. Based on these observations, it was assumed that when
68 the lipophilized antioxidants had the CCL they were present in the highest concentration at the oil-
69 aqueous interface, where lipid oxidation is initiated. In addition, antioxidant homologues with chain

1
2
3
4 70 length below and above CCL were driven away from the oil-aqueous interface [7]. These
5
6 71 antioxidant hypotheses are based on extensive research in simplified emulsions prepared with
7
8 72 stripped oils, whereas food emulsions contain e.g. endogenous tocopherols. Only few compounds
9
10 73 with different degree of lipophilization have been evaluated in several different emulsion systems.
11
12 74 Caffeic acid and unbranched saturated caffeates have been evaluated both in a model emulsion
13
14 75 (CAT assay) system [8], milk and mayonnaise [9] and CCL seemed to be influenced by the system.
15
16 76 In addition, rosmarinic acid has also been evaluated in different systems; model emulsions and low
17
18 77 moisture food (crackers). In model emulsions, a parabolic relationship between antioxidant efficacy
19
20 78 and hydrophobicity was observed, with the intermediate polarity (8 carbon – 18 carbon chain
21
22 79 length) giving optimum activity [6, 10, 11]. In crackers, a linear relationship between antioxidant
23
24 80 activity and hydrophobicity was observed [12].
25
26
27

28 81 Due to formerly obtained results with caffeic acid and caffeates in model emulsion, milk and
29
30 82 mayonnaise [8, 9], it is hypothesized that emulsifier type and the presence of endogenous
31
32 83 tocopherols can affect the partitioning of caffeic acid and caffeates and thereby change their
33
34 84 efficacy in the emulsion systems. Hence, the aim of this study was to evaluate the impact of both
35
36 85 emulsifier and presence of endogenous tocopherols on the efficacies of caffeic acid and caffeates
37
38 86 (C1-C20). Two experiments were carried out as shown in Table 1. In the first experiment, the aim
39
40 87 was to evaluate the effect of lipophilization of caffeic acid on its antioxidant efficacy in an O/W
41
42 88 emulsion prepared with unstripped oil and Citrem as emulsifier. The aim of the second experiment
43
44 89 was to investigate whether the presence of endogenous tocopherol affected the optimal chain length
45
46 90 of lipophilized caffeic acid when Tween was used as an emulsifier. Moreover, comparison of results
47
48 91 of the two experiments enabled an evaluation of whether the emulsifier type, Citrem vs Tween
49
50 92 affected the CCL in emulsions prepared with unstripped oil.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 93 In both experiments, the partitioning of the antioxidant was estimated by measuring its
5
6 94 concentration in the aqueous phase of the O/W emulsion, a buffer/oil system and a buffer/emulsifier
7
8 95 system to evaluate if emulsifier type and the presence of endogenous tocopherols, affected the
9
10 96 partitioning of caffeic acid and caffeates in the emulsion system.
11
12

13 97
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

98 **Material and Methods**

99 The oil used in this study was fish oil (FO) and a mixture between fish and rapeseed oil (FO/RO,
100 1:1). The two types of oil were supplied by Maritex A/S (TINE BA, Sortland, Norway). The quality
101 of the FO was as follows: 0.3 meq. peroxides / kg oil, 250 mg α -tocopherol / kg, 98 mg γ -
102 tocopherol / kg and 48 mg δ -tocopherol / kg. Fatty acid composition of the fish oil was as follows:
103 14:0, 3.5%; 16:0, 9.9%; 16:1n-7, 8.8%; 18:0, 2.0%; 18:1n-9, 16.3%; 18:1n-7, 4.9%; 18:2n-6, 1.8%,
104 18:3n-3, 2.6%, 18:4n-3, 2.6%, 20:1n-7, 12.6%; 20:5n-3 (EPA), 9.16%; 22:1n-9, 5.8%, 22:5n-3,
105 1.1% and 22:6n-3 (DHA) 11.1%. The total percentages of n-3 and n-6 PUFA in the FO were 24.0%
106 and 1.8 %, respectively. The quality of the FO/RO was as follows: 0.3 meq. peroxides / kg oil, 230
107 mg α -tocopherol / kg, 31 mg β -tocopherol / kg, 151 mg γ -tocopherol / kg and 6 mg δ -tocopherol /
108 kg. The fatty acid composition of the FO/RO was as follows: 14:0, 1.7%; 16:0, 7.1%; 16:1 (n-7),
109 4.6%; 18:0, 1.9%; 18:1 (n-9), 38.3%; 18:1 (n-7), 3.3%; 18:2 (n-6), 10.5%, 18:3 (n-3), 4.8%; 18:4
110 (n-3), 1.2%; 20:1, 6.9%; 20:5 (n-3, EPA), 4.7%; 22:1 (n-11), 3.0% and 22:6 (n-3, DHA), 5.9%. The
111 total content of n-3 and n-6 PUFA in the FO/RO were 17.8% and 10.9%, respectively.

112 The emulsifiers applied, Tween80 and Citrem LR 10 Extra (citric acid ester of mono- and
113 diglyceride) without antioxidants were supplied by Sigma Aldrich (Steinheim, Germany) and
114 Dupont (Danisco A/S, Grindsted, Denmark), respectively.

115 Alkyl caffeates were synthesized in an acid catalyzed reaction with caffeic acid and fatty alcohols
116 with alcohol in excess as reaction medium or THF (tetrahydrofuran) as reaction medium. For
117 further details refer to Sørensen et al. [8].

118 Tung oil (872 g/mol), Brij 35 (a nonionic polyoxyethylene surfactant, estimated Mw 1198 g/mol),
119 phosphate buffer solution (PBS, pH 7.2), alumina, BHT (butylated hydroxytoluene), AAPH (2,2'-
120 Azobis(2-methylpropionamide) dihydrochloride) and trolox were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich

1
2
3
4 121 (Steinheim, Germany). Synperonic was purchased from CRODA (East Yorkshire, UK). All
5
6 122 solvents used were of HPLC grade and purchased from Lab-Scan (Dublin, Ireland). The external
7
8 123 standards used for quantification of secondary oxidation products were from Sigma Aldrich
9
10 124 (Steinheim, Germany).

11
12
13 125

14 15 126 **Experimental design**

16
17
18 127 For specific details on emulsifier, oil and antioxidants applied refer to Table 1. Experiment 1 was
19
20 128 designed to evaluate the effect caffeic acid and different alkyl caffeates as antioxidant in Citrem
21
22 129 stabilized emulsions in the presence of endogenous tocopherols due to the natural content of
23
24 130 tocopherols in oil. In this experiment fish oil was used, and a storage period of 15 days selected
25
26 131 based on previous storage experiment with fish oil.

27
28
29
30 132 Experiment 2 was designed to evaluate the influence of endogenous tocopherols on the efficacy of
31
32 133 caffeic acid and caffeates in Tween stabilized emulsions. Tween was selected as emulsifier, since
33
34 134 Citrem contains tocopherols. Emulsions were prepared with and without endogenous tocopherols.
35
36 135 Thus, the oil without endogenous tocopherols was stripped (removal of tocopherols). Stripping of
37
38 136 fish oil will increase oxidation rates tremendously. To slow down oxidation rate, a mixture of fish
39
40 137 and rapeseed oil was therefore used instead in this experiment. The storage time was selected based
41
42 138 on preliminary laboratory trials (data not shown).

43
44
45
46 139 Based on experiment 1 and 2 with endogenous tocopherols, the impact of emulsifier type is
47
48 140 evaluated despite different oil type and length of storage time.

49
50
51 141

52 53 142 **Removal of tocopherols from oils**

1
2
3
4 143 FO/RO was stripped from tocopherols using an alumina packed glass column using hexane. For
5
6 144 further details refer to Sørensen et al [8]. The stripped oil was bottled, flushed with nitrogen and
7
8 145 stored at -80°C until use for production of emulsions. Furthermore, the absence of tocopherols in
9
10 146 the oil was checked by HPLC according to the AOCS method [13]. After oil stripping (removal of
11
12 147 tocopherols) the PV was 0.5 meq. peroxides / kg oil and tocopherols were not detected.
13
14
15 148

17 149 **Production of O/W emulsions**

19
20 150 Both in experiment 1 and 2, the emulsion compositions were 5% oil, 1% emulsifier and 94% 10
21
22 151 mM sodium acetate – imidazole buffer (pH 7). Antioxidants were diluted in methanol and added in
23
24 152 concentrations of 100 µM. For the control emulsions (without antioxidant added), methanol was
25
26 153 added in same amount as used for the methanolic antioxidant solutions added to the other
27
28 154 emulsions. The short to medium chain phenolipids (C0 - C12) were added to the buffer (Citrem
29
30 155 emulsions) and buffer-emulsifier mixture (Tween emulsions), whereas the long chain phenolipids
31
32 156 (C16 – C20) were added to the oil-emulsifier mixture (Citrem emulsions) and oil (Tween
33
34 157 emulsions) before the pre-homogenisation step.
35
36
37

38 158 Preparation of emulsions for storage experiment 1 were produced with pre-emulsification (2 min,
39
40 159 Ultra-Turrax, Janke & Kunkel IKA-Labor Technik, Staufen, Germany) followed by homogenization
41
42 160 on a two-valve table homogenizer at a pressure of 800 bar (GEA Niro Soavi Spa, Parma, Italy). For
43
44 161 further details refer to Sørensen et al. [14]. Production of emulsions for storage experiment 2 were
45
46 162 pre-emulsified as in experiment 1, but homogenized on a microfluidizer (9K, Microfluidics,
47
48 163 Newton, MA, USA). Changes in the production between experiment 1 and 2 (homogenizer vs.
49
50 164 microfluidizer) were done in order to operate with smaller emulsion volumes and thereby reduce the
51
52 165 amount of phenolipids. Moreover, it became possible to cool the emulsion during production which
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 166 was an advantage due to the fact that the oil was stripped from tocopherols and would therefore be
5
6 167 highly susceptible to oxidation during homogenization.
7

8
9 168 After production emulsions (100 g) were stored in 100 mL blue cap bottles at $20^{\circ}\text{C} \pm 2^{\circ}\text{C}$. Samples,
10
11 169 one bottle pr. code, were taken at specific time points and divided into brown glass bottles, flushed
12
13 170 with nitrogen and stored at -40°C until analyses, except for samples used to determine droplet size,
14
15 171 these samples were measured at the sampling day without pre-freezing.
16
17

18 172 **Droplet size measurements**

19
20
21 173 Droplet size of the oil droplets in the O/W emulsion was determined by laser diffraction
22
23 174 (Mastersizer2000, Malvern Instruments Ltd., Worcestershire, UK). Few droplets of the different
24
25 175 emulsions were suspended directly in recirculating water (2800 rpm, obscuration 12-14%). Water
26
27 176 ($\text{RI}_{\text{water}} = 1.330$) and sunflower oil ($\text{RI}_{\text{oil}} = 1.469$) were used in this measurements as dispersant and
28
29 177 particle, respectively. Each sample was measured in triplicate ($n=3$) and results are reported as
30
31 178 surface mean diameter, $D_{3,2}$ [15].
32
33
34

35 179

38 180 **Lipid extractions from O/W emulsions**

39
40
41 181 Peroxide value (PV) and tocopherol analyses are performed on lipid extracts. Thus, the lipids were
42
43 182 extracted from the emulsions prior to these analyses according to the method described by Bligh
44
45 183 and Dyer [16] using a reduced amount of solvent [17]. For each sample code two lipid extractions
46
47 184 were performed ($n=2$).
48
49

50 185

53 186 **Tocopherols**

1
2
3
4 187 Lipid extracts were evaporated under nitrogen, re-dissolved in heptane and analyzed by HPLC
5
6 188 (Agilent 1100 Series, Agilent Technology, Palo Alto, CA, USA) according to the AOCS Official
7
8 189 Method Ce 8-89 [13]. A silica column (Waters (Dublin, Ireland), 150mm, 4.6mm, 3 μ m silica film)
9
10 190 was used for separation of the tocopherol homologues. This analysis was performed in duplicate on
11
12 191 each lipid extract and results reported as μ g tocopherol / g emulsion.
13
14

15 192

16
17
18 193 **Primary oxidation products: Peroxide value (PV)**

19
20
21 194 PVs in the lipid extracts were determined by colorimetric method based on formation of an iron-
22
23 195 thiocyanate complex. The colored complex was measured on a spectrophotometer at 500 nm
24
25 196 (Shimadzu UV1800, Shimadzu Scientific Instruments, Columbia, MD, USA) [18]. The analysis
26
27 197 was performed in duplicate and reported as meq peroxides / kg oil.
28
29

30 198

31
32
33 199 **Secondary oxidation products: Volatiles**

34
35
36 200 Volatiles were released from the O/W emulsion using dynamic headspace (45°C for 30 min,
37
38 201 nitrogen flow of 150 mL/min). Volatiles were then collected and trapped on Tenax GR packed
39
40 202 tubes. To avoid foam and thus water on the tubes, 4 mL of antifoam (Synperonic, conc. 8 g /L
41
42 203 water) was added to each sample prior to the collection. Trapped volatiles were desorbed using an
43
44 204 automatic thermal desorber (ATD-400, Perkin Elmer, Waltham, MA, USA). The transfer line of
45
46 205 the ATD was connected to a gas chromatograph (Agilent 5890, Palo Alto, CA, USA) with a mass
47
48 206 selective detector (HP 5972). Volatiles were separated on a DB1701 column (30m x ID 0.25mm x
49
50 207 1 μ m film thickness, J&W Scientific, Folsom, CA, USA). The initial temperature of the oven was
51
52 208 45°C, which was kept for 5 minutes and then gradually increased as follows: 45-55°C 1.5°C/min,
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 209 55-90°C 2.5°C/min, 90-220°C 12°C/min and kept at 220°C for 4 minutes. Calibration curves
5
6 210 prepared from external standards was used for quantification of different volatiles. In experiment 1
7
8 211 (Table 1), different concentrations of external standard solutions were prepared and 1 µL was
9
10 212 placed in Tenax tubes and analyzed. In experiment 2 (Table 1), different concentrations of external
11
12 213 standard solutions were prepared and added to fresh emulsion without antioxidant. Volatiles were
13
14 214 collected in the same way as for samples. The 2,4-heptadienal external standard appears as two
15
16 215 peaks in the chromatogramme, these peaks are termed A and B. Each sample code was analyzed in
17
18 216 triplicate (n=3) and results reported as ng volatile / g emulsion.
19
20
21
22 217
23
24

25 218 **Partitioning**

26
27
28 219 Partitioning of caffeic acid and the different alkyl caffeates in buffer/oil, emulsifier/buffer and in
29
30 220 O/W emulsion was measured according to the method described by Schwarz et al. [19] with
31
32 221 modifications as described elsewhere. With this method it is assumed that the partitioning of the
33
34 222 antioxidants, equilibria reached, is not disrupted by centrifugation. For further details refer to
35
36 223 Sørensen et al. [20]. In short, the concentration of antioxidants was measured in the separated
37
38 224 aqueous phase of 3 different systems: buffer / oil (FO or FO/RO), buffer / emulsifier (Citrem or
39
40 225 Tween80) and 5% O/W emulsions. Antioxidants were dissolved in methanol and added in a
41
42 226 concentration of 100 µM. Separation of the aqueous phase was carried out 24 h after production of
43
44 227 the different systems.
45
46
47
48 228
49
50

51 229 **Determination of concentration of added antioxidant**

1
2
3
4 230 Caffeic acid and alkyl caffeates in the aqueous phases were analyzed by HPLC (Agilent 1100
5
6 231 Series, Agilent Technology, CA, USA) with a C18 Thermo Hypersil® ODS (250x4.6 mm, 5 μ)
7
8 232 column and using a gradient elution at a flow rate of 1 mL/min. Solvent A was 3 mM phosphoric
9
10 233 acid and solvent B was methanol. Gradient condition: 0-30 min 0-100% B, 30-40 min 100% B and
11
12 234 40-45 min 100-0% B. Injection volume was 20 μ L. Caffeic acid and different alkyl caffeates were
13
14 235 quantified by calibration curves of these compounds dissolved in methanol.
15
16
17
18 236

237 **Conjugated autoxidizable triene (CAT) Assay**

238 Stock solutions of the different compounds: caffeic acid, caffeates and trolox were prepared in
239 methanol. The CAT assay was performed as described in Sørensen et al. [8] with a modification.
240 This assay was performed with non-stripped tung oil, hence, the assay contained tocopherol and the
241 evaluated antioxidant in a mixture. Each microplate well contained a microemulsion with the
242 following composition: 115 μ M tung oil, 17 μ M Brij 35, 1 mM AAPH and antioxidant (caffeic
243 acid, caffeates or Trolox) in various concentrations. The progress of lipid oxidation was followed by
244 measuring the decrease in absorbance at 273 nm. Each antioxidant concentration was measured in
245 triplicate on the plate and via independent measurements (two different microplates), n = 6. Results
246 were expressed as CAT value (mean \pm SD). This method was developed by Laguerre et al. [21]. For
247 further details about the calculations refer to Laguerre et al. [4, 21].
248

249 **Data treatment**

250 **Statistics.** The results obtained were analyzed using one- and two-way ANOVA (GraphPad Prism,
251 Version 4.01, GraphPad Software Inc). Bonferroni multiple comparison post-test was used to
252 determine significant differences between samples or storage times. The significance level applied

1
2
3
4 253 was 95% ($p < 0.05$). Significant difference between samples is denoted with different superscripts
5
6 254 (i.e. a, b, c ect.).

7
8
9 255 ***Inhibition percentages.*** Since different oil and emulsifiers can influence amount of lipid oxidation,
10
11 256 inhibition percentages were used to compare the efficacy of the antioxidants in the different
12
13 257 emulsion systems. The antioxidants inhibition percentages were calculated according to the
14
15 258 following equation:

16
17
18
19 259
$$\text{Inhibition [\%]} = \left(\frac{\text{Emulsion}_{\text{Control}} - \text{Emulsion}_{\text{Antioxidant}}}{\text{Emulsion}_{\text{Control}}} \right) \times 100$$

20
21
22 260 $\text{Emulsion}_{\text{Control}}$ and $\text{Emulsion}_{\text{Antioxidant}}$ are emulsions without antioxidant and emulsion with
23
24 261 antioxidant added, respectively. The antioxidant has a prooxidative effect if the inhibition $< -5\%$
25
26 262 and an antioxidative effect $> 5\%$. The antioxidative effect can be categorized as weak (5-20%),
27
28 263 intermediate (20-50%) or strong ($> 50\%$) effects [22].

29
30
31 264
32
33
34 265 ***Multivariate data analysis, Principal Component Analysis (PCA).*** Inhibition percentages
35
36 266 calculated from results obtained from PV, volatiles and tocopherol analysis were subjected to PCA
37
38 267 using Unscrambler version X10.3 (Camo, Oslo, Norway). The PCA model was built on inhibition
39
40 268 percentages calculated on the average of the measured data. Full cross validation was used to
41
42 269 validate the model. A PCA allows detection of similarities and dissimilarities between the different
43
44 270 samples in a score plot, whereas correlations between the measured variables are visualized in a
45
46 271 loadings plot. Connecting these plots in this case shows the degree of oxidation between the
47
48 272 different samples.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

273 **Results**

274 **Physical stability of the emulsions**

275 The physical stability of the emulsions was evaluated by following the oil droplet size (D_{3,2},
276 (surface weighted mean)) over time. With Citrem as emulsifier (Exp. 1), the droplet size was
277 between 101 – 114 nm for the different Citrem stabilized emulsions (data not shown). The emulsion
278 prepared with Tween as emulsifier (Exp. 2), non-stripped FO/RO and stripped FO/RO had droplet
279 sizes between 124 – 131 nm and 126 - 131 nm, respectively (data not shown). Emulsions produced
280 on the homogenizer (Exp. 1), resulted in slightly smaller oil droplets than emulsions produced on
281 the microfluidizer (Exp. 2). The small differences in oil droplet sizes, however significant, for
282 Citrem and Tween stabilized emulsions is suggested to be due to the different emulsification
283 equipment applied, the different emulsifiers used or a combination. Changes in droplet size during
284 storage were minor, but significant. The changes ranged from -6 nm to +2 nm in size. Since, the oil
285 droplets mainly had a slight decrease in size during storage, the changes is suggested to be due to
286 day to day instrumental variation. Hence, all emulsions were physically stable during the whole
287 storage time, 42 hours, 6 and 15 days, respectively.

288

289 **Partitioning of caffeic acid and caffeates**

290 The concentration of caffeic acid (CA) and caffeates (CA C1 – CA C12) were determined in the
291 aqueous phase of three different systems to mimic the applied emulsion systems. Hence, the two
292 different emulsifiers and non-stripped and stripped oil was applied. The results obtained are
293 presented in Table 2. In general, the partitioning of caffeic acid and caffeates in the aqueous phase
294 decreased with increased degree of lipophilization until chain length C4 after which the caffeates in
295 most cases could not be detected in the aqueous phase. In the case of the buffer/Tween system

1
2
3
4 296 octyl- (C8) and dodecyl caffeates (C12) were detected in the aqueous phase and the concentrations
5
6 297 were not significantly different from that of butyl caffeate (C4). The concentration of caffeic acid
7
8 298 and methyl caffeate in the aqueous phase was significantly lower when Tween was applied as
9
10 299 emulsifier than when Citrem was applied. Moreover, the concentration of butyl caffeate tended to
11
12 300 be lower (not significant) in the aqueous phase with Tween as emulsifier than with Citrem as also
13
14 301 observed for caffeic acid and methyl caffeate. These partitioning results indicated interactions
15
16 302 between antioxidants and emulsifier to a higher extent with Tween than Citrem, thus, resulting in a
17
18 303 higher concentration of antioxidant at the interface with Tween than Citrem as emulsifier. In
19
20 304 addition, the results indicated that there was a tendency to a lower concentration of caffeic acid and
21
22 305 methyl caffeate in the aqueous phase of the non-stripped Tween80 emulsion, i.e. when endogenous
23
24 306 tocopherol was present. However, the differences were not significant (Table 2).
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 308 **Efficacy of caffeic acid and caffeates in emulsions**

32
33
34 309 The antioxidant efficacy of caffeic acid and caffeates were evaluated in the three different
35
36 310 emulsions shown in Table 1 and in a modified CAT assay (modification: non-stripped tung oil
37
38 311 applied) to investigate the effect of the presence of endogenous tocopherols in this assay. The
39
40 312 efficacy of caffeic acid and caffeates was evaluated from the measured lipid oxidation during
41
42 313 storage. Lipid oxidation was followed by measuring PV (primary oxidation product) and volatiles
43
44 314 (secondary oxidation products). Volatile oxidation products that increased during storage were
45
46 315 identified and quantified. The quantified volatiles were markers of lipid oxidation products, most of
47
48 316 them originated from oxidation of n-3 PUFAs.
49
50
51

52 317 *Citrem stabilized emulsions with endogenous tocopherols present.* The PV in this experiment
53
54 318 increased to 20-35 meq. peroxides / kg oil depending on the antioxidant treatment during the 15
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 319 days of storage (data not shown). The concentration of volatiles after 15 days of storage
5
6 320 depended upon the specific volatile quantified and the antioxidant applied (1-penten-3-one 20-
7
8 321 60 ng / g emulsion, 1-penten-3-ol 100-300 ng / g emulsion, hexanal 70-150 ng / g emulsion, 4-
9
10 322 heptenal 10-25 ng / g emulsion, 2,4-heptadienal 4000-6000 ng / g emulsion and nonanal 30-70 ng /
11
12 323 g emulsion).

13
14
15 324 A PCA of the PVs, α -tocopherol and volatile compounds measured during storage explained 71%
16
17 325 of the variation in the obtained results by the first two principal components (PCs), Figure 1. The 3
18
19 326 other tocopherols (β -, δ -, and γ -tocopherols) were excluded from the PCA model due to no or minor
20
21 327 changes during storage in the different emulsions. Figure 1A shows the correlation loadings i.e.
22
23 328 graphical mapping of the measured variables. Generally, all the volatiles were located in quadrant 1
24
25 329 (top-right part) and 4 (bottom-right part), PVs in quadrant 2 (top-left part) closer to PC 2 and α -
26
27 330 tocopherols in quadrant 2 and 3 (bottom-left part) a long PC 1. Thus, the first PC clearly described
28
29 331 lipid oxidation with tocopherol in the left side and volatiles in the right side. Comparing Figure 1A
30
31 332 with 1B, the scores, reveals the differences in efficacy between caffeic acid and caffeates. Butyl
32
33 333 caffeate was prooxidative due to its location in the 4th quadrant i.e. high concentration of many of
34
35 334 the volatile compounds. Octyl caffeate also acted as a prooxidant, however, not as strong as butyl
36
37 335 caffeate. Furthermore, hexadecyl caffeate's location in first quadrant, but close to PC 2, indicates a
38
39 336 slight prooxidative effect. Dodecyl and eicosyl caffeates seemed to have no effect due to their
40
41 337 proximity to the control emulsion in the 2nd quadrant. The location of caffeic acid in the 3 quadrant
42
43 338 of the scores plot away from the volatile compounds (1 and 4 quadrant) indicates that this
44
45 339 antioxidant was the most efficient followed by methyl caffeate. However, caffeic acid and methyl
46
47 340 caffeate were not strong antioxidants, since some of the measured volatiles were present in higher
48
49 341 concentration in these emulsions than in the control emulsion (Table 3, Inhibition percentages, Raw
50
51 342 data not shown).

1
2
3
4 343 ***Tween stabilized emulsions with endogenous tocopherols present.*** In the Tween stabilized
5
6 344 emulsion with endogenous tocopherols present, the PV increased to 5-30 meq. peroxides / kg oil
7
8 345 depending on the antioxidant treatment during the 6 days of storage. The concentration of volatiles
9
10 346 after 6 days of storage dependent upon the specific volatile quantified and the antioxidant applied
11
12 347 (1-penten-3-one 2-10 ng / g emulsion, 1-penten-3-ol 5-30 ng / g emulsion and 2,4-heptadienal 50-
13
14 348 350 ng / g emulsion).

15
16
17 349 A PCA of the PVs, α -tocopherol and volatile compounds (1-penten-3-one, 1-penten-3-ol and 2,4-
18
19 350 heptadienal) measured during storage explained 82% of the variation in the obtained results by the
20
21 351 first two PCs (Figure 2). Similar to the other PCA model on Citrem stabilized emulsions, the 3 other
22
23 352 tocopherol homologues (β -, δ -, and γ -tocopherols) were excluded from the PCA model due to no or
24
25 353 minor changes during storage in the different emulsions. The PV and all the volatiles were located
26
27 354 to the left in the plot of the correlation loadings (Figure 2A). Tocopherols were located opposite to
28
29 355 the PV and volatiles. From the correlation loadings plot it is clear that the first PC describe lipid
30
31 356 oxidation with tocopherol in the right side and volatiles in the left side, thus, increased lipid
32
33 357 oxidation moving from the right to the left in the plot. Scores plot (Figure 2B) reveals differences in
34
35 358 efficacy between caffeic acid and caffeates in the tween stabilized emulsions. The control emulsion
36
37 359 was located to the left side of the PC 2 axis in the scores plot and all emulsions with antioxidant
38
39 360 added were located to the right of the PC 2 axis except emulsion with butyl caffeate added (Figure
40
41 361 2B). In connection with correlation loadings plot, this indicates that all the emulsions with
42
43 362 antioxidant added acted as antioxidant in the tween stabilized emulsions. As described above, butyl
44
45 363 caffeate was located opposite to the PC 2 axis compared to the other emulsions with antioxidant
46
47 364 added, this is explained by the higher amount of 2,4-heptadienal at day 6 in this emulsion (Figure
48
49 365 2). Butyl caffeate worked as antioxidant for all other oxidation parameters measured; however, it
50
51 366 was the least efficient due to higher amount of the measured oxidation parameters compared to the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 367 other antioxidant applied (Table 3). Moreover, the PCA model reveals that caffeic acid without
5
6 368 esterification was more efficient in tween stabilized emulsions followed by methyl caffeate (short
7
8 369 chain esterification) due to their location most far away from the oxidation parameters measured.
9
10 370 Raw data supported the PCA model.

11
12
13 371 ***Tween80 stabilized emulsions without endogenous tocopherols present.*** In the Tween stabilized
14
15 372 emulsion with endogenous tocopherols present, the PV increased from 8 to 14 meq. peroxides / kg
16
17 373 oil without antioxidant added during the 42 hours of storage; whereas, the PV increased from 2 to 8
18
19 374 and 1 to 4 meq. peroxides / kg oil with caffeic acid and eicosyl caffeates, respectively. The other
20
21 375 antioxidant treatments resulted in no increase in PV during storage. The concentration of volatiles
22
23 376 after 42 hours of storage dependent upon the specific volatile quantified and the antioxidant applied
24
25 377 (1-penten-3-one 0-3 ng / g emulsion, 1-penten-3-ol 0-9 ng / g emulsion and 2,4-heptadienal 2-90 ng
26
27 378 / g emulsion), which was much lower than in the Citrem stabilized emulsions.

28
29
30
31 379 A PCA of the PVs and volatile compounds (1-penten-3-one, 1-penten-3-ol and 2,4-heptadienal)
32
33 380 measured during storage explained 83% of the variation in the obtained results by the first to
34
35 381 principal components (PCs), Figure 3. All the volatiles were located in quadrant 1 (top-right part)
36
37 382 and 4 (bottom-right part). The first PC clearly describes lipid oxidation (right side) versus no lipid
38
39 383 oxidation (left side), whereas, PC 2 describes the development of lipid oxidation over time, with PV
40
41 384 and volatiles in the beginning of the storage period located in the top of the plot and in the bottom
42
43 385 of the plot after 42 days (Figure 3A). Comparing Figure 3A with 3B, the scores plot, it is observed
44
45 386 that control emulsion and emulsion with caffeic acid is located in the same side as the oxidation
46
47 387 parameters measured. Thus, caffeic acid is acting as a prooxidant in Tween stabilized emulsions
48
49 388 without endogenous tocopherol present. Esterification of caffeic acid in Tween stabilized emulsion
50
51 389 without tocopherols improved its antioxidative properties, since all caffeates evaluated were acting
52
53 390 as antioxidants. However, it seems like caffeic acid esterified with C20 was slightly less efficient
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 391 than the other esters evaluated (Table 3). Raw data supports the observation from the PCA model
5
6 392 (data not shown).
7

8
9 393 ***Comparison of the influence of emulsifier type - Citrem versus Tween80 stabilized emulsions.***

10
11 394 Table 3 shows calculated inhibition percentages for caffeic acid and caffeates. It is clear that the
12
13 395 emulsifier impacted the efficacy of the antioxidants added. In Citrem stabilized emulsions, caffeic
14
15 396 acid and methyl caffeate were the only ones acting as antioxidants. Their antioxidative effect in this
16
17 397 model emulsion was weak to intermediate and they even promoted the formation of certain
18
19 398 volatiles. In contrast, caffeic acid and all the evaluated caffeates in Tween stabilized emulsions
20
21 399 acted as antioxidants. Caffeic acid was the strongest antioxidant followed by methyl caffeate.
22
23

24
25 400 ***Comparison of the influence of the presence of endogenous tocopherols.*** Calculated inhibition
26
27 401 percentages for selected oxidation variables measured in Tween stabilized emulsions with and
28
29 402 without endogenous tocopherols are presented in Table 3. A clear difference in the efficacy of
30
31 403 antioxidants was that caffeic acid acted as a strong antioxidant when tocopherols were present,
32
33 404 whereas, it acted as intermediate to strong prooxidant without tocopherols in this model emulsion.
34
35 405 In addition, the caffeates acted as stronger antioxidants without tocopherols compared to the same
36
37 406 model emulsion with tocopherols present (Table 3). Caffeates with chain lengths between C1 and
38
39 407 C18 were all strong antioxidants, whereas the antioxidant efficacy was decreased when the chain
40
41 408 length was increased to C20.
42
43
44

45 409 ***Antioxidant efficacy in a modified CAT assay.*** The CAT assay is an assay developed to measure
46
47 410 the efficacy of antioxidants in a micro emulsion system without endogenous tocopherols present.
48
49 411 The assay was slightly modified to investigate the efficacy of caffeic acid and caffeates in the
50
51 412 presence of endogenous tocopherols. The results are shown in Figure 4 together with results
52
53 413 obtained earlier with an unmodified CAT assay [8]. When tocopherol was present the antioxidative
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 414 efficacies of caffeic acid, methyl-, butyl-, octyl- and dodecyl caffeates were not significantly
5
6 415 different. This finding is different from earlier results obtained without the presence of tocopherols,
7
8 416 where octyl- and dodecyl caffeates exerted a significantly higher efficacy than caffeic acid and the
9
10 417 other caffeates evaluated. Furthermore, the efficacy of octyl- and dodecyl caffeates without
11
12 418 tocopherols present was also significantly higher than when tocopherols were present.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

419 Discussion

420 The results showed - as hypothesized - that partitioning of the antioxidants was affected by the type
421 of emulsifier and the presence of endogenous tocopherols. Earlier measurements of the radical
422 scavenging effect (DPPH assay) of caffeic acid and caffeates showed no differences between the
423 caffeic acid and the different saturated unbranched alkyl esters [8]. In spite of that the antioxidative
424 effect of caffeic acid and caffeates was different in the different emulsion systems. However, the
425 activity can differ due to the emulsion composition.

426 *Impact of emulsifier on the efficacy of caffeic acid and caffeates.* In the present study, caffeic acid
427 and caffeates were more efficient antioxidants in Tween stabilized emulsions than in Citrem
428 stabilized emulsions. This partly supports earlier findings with the same emulsifiers and caffeic acid
429 in 10% O/W emulsions, where caffeic acid in Citrem stabilized emulsions promoted the formation
430 of volatiles and no effect on lipid oxidation or slightly antioxidative effect of caffeic acid was
431 observed in Tween stabilized emulsions [23]. Besides different oil concentration in the previous and
432 current studies, antioxidant concentration (5.5 fold lower in this study) and oil / emulsifier ratio
433 were also different, which can have an influence on the differences observed in these studies.
434 Independently of emulsifier type, caffeic acid was performing better than the caffeates. Contrary,
435 the effect of the caffeates was affected by the emulsifier applied. To our knowledge only few
436 studies related to the antioxidative effect of caffeic acid and caffeates in emulsions have been
437 published [9, 24, 25]. These studies did not compare the effect of the emulsifier type applied.
438 However, one of them compared the effect of caffeates in mayonnaise and milk, where not only the
439 emulsifier type is different but the entire emulsion system. The efficiency of the caffeates was
440 affected by the type of emulsion system [9]. Results obtained in the present study also demonstrated
441 that changing the emulsifier affected the antioxidative effect and rank order of caffeates.
442 Experiments performed with gallic acid and ethyl gallate have also shown that changing emulsifier

1
2
3
4 443 affects the partitioning of the antioxidants and the resulting antioxidant activity measured in
5
6 444 emulsion systems [26]. The different emulsifier evaluated was SDS, CTAB, Brij58 and PHLC, and
7
8 445 their partitioning study revealed increased solubility effect of the emulsifiers in the following order:
9
10 446 PHLC < SDS < Brij58 < CTAB. The antioxidant activity of gallic acid and ethyl gallate based on
11
12 447 the formation of hydroperoxides and hexanal increased in the following order: CTAB (no activity
13
14 448 measured) < Brij58 < PHLC < SDS. Gallic acid only showed antioxidant activity with PHLC
15
16 449 stabilized emulsions. This was a reverse order compared to the partitioning measured. Hence, it was
17
18 450 suggested that the increased partitioning into the emulsifier layer and lipid counteract the hydrogen-
19
20 451 donating ability, and lower the activity of the antioxidants [26]. Moreover, Pekkarinen et al. [27]
21
22 452 evaluated antioxidative effect and partitioning of phenolics in different systems. Interaction between
23
24 453 caffeic acid and Tween 20 differed from other phenolics such as vanillic acid, ferulic acid and
25
26 454 sinapic acid evaluated, since Tween 20 exhibited higher solubilisation capacity for caffeic acid than
27
28 455 for other phenolic acids. Additionally, Pekkarinen et al. [27] concluded that these antioxidant-
29
30 456 emulsifier interactions have a strong influence on the partitioning of antioxidants. The partitioning
31
32 457 result obtained in this study confirmed that Citrem and Tween as emulsifiers results in differences
33
34 458 in the partitioning of caffeic acid and caffeates. Less caffeic acid and caffeates were present in the
35
36 459 aqueous phase when Tween was applied. This clearly demonstrated stronger antioxidant-emulsifier
37
38 460 interaction with Tween compared to Citrem. Moreover, Citrem is an anionic emulsifier, thus, the
39
40 461 interface is negatively charged and will repel negatively charged antioxidants i.e. caffeic acid,
41
42 462 which could explain why caffeic acid interacted less with Citrem than with Tween. An explanation
43
44 463 for the stronger interactions with Tween may be the molecular structure of the emulsifiers, since
45
46 464 Tween is a larger and more bulky molecule than Citrem; however, this has to be further evaluated.
47
48 465 Furthermore, Schwarz et al. [19, 28, 29] evaluated partitioning of different antioxidants in dispersed
49
50 466 lipid systems with different emulsifiers. Significant differences were observed in partitioning of the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 467 antioxidants between phases, both as a function of pH and emulsifier type and concentration. It was
5
6 468 concluded from the results that determination of antioxidant partitioning may be an important tool
7
8 469 to select antioxidants structurally designed to localize at the surfaces [19], however, the partitioning
9
10 470 of the antioxidants cannot alone explain the measured antioxidant activity in emulsions [29].
11
12 471 Results from another study by Schwarz et al. [30] evaluating antioxidant activity of antioxidants
13
14 472 with different lipophilicity in bulk oil, O/W and W/O emulsions with different emulsifiers led to the
15
16 473 assumption that differences in antioxidant activity for the same emulsion type might be additionally
17
18 474 influenced by interaction with the emulsifier dominating the interfaces in the emulsion system [30].
19
20
21 475 The obtained results for the two emulsifiers together with the partitioning study may also here lead
22
23 476 to the assumption that emulsifier-antioxidant interactions (e.g. hydrogen bonding) affected the
24
25 477 antioxidant activity of the caffeates. However, the type of interactions and the impact of
26
27 478 antioxidant-emulsifier interactions on the radical scavenging activity have to be studied in more
28
29 479 details to make further conclusions.
30
31

32
33 480 ***Impact of endogenous tocopherols on the efficacy of caffeic acid and caffeates.*** The presence of
34
35 481 endogenous tocopherol not only changed the antioxidant activity of caffeic acid and caffeates in
36
37 482 both the storage experiment and in the CAT assay, but also their partitioning in the emulsion
38
39 483 system. A tendency to less caffeic acid and caffeates (C1, C4 and C12) present in the aqueous phase
40
41 484 with endogenous tocopherol in the emulsion system was observed. This may indicate some
42
43 485 interactions between tocopherol and caffeic acid / caffeates both for the antioxidative effect and
44
45 486 localization in the emulsion system. The use of a combination of antioxidants to produce synergistic
46
47 487 interaction has been reported earlier e.g. tocopherol regeneration by ascorbic acid, polyphenols and
48
49 488 flavonoids [31-34]. Panya et al. [34] carried out the only study investigating interactions between
50
51 489 tocopherol and a phenol (rosmarinic acid) and its alkyl esters (rosmarinates, C4, C12 and C20) in
52
53 490 Tween20 stabilized emulsions. Rosmarinic acid exhibited strongest synergistic interaction with
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 491 tocopherol, and C4 and C12 esters exhibited small synergistic interaction. An antagonistic
5
6 492 interaction was observed with C20 ester and tocopherol. Thus, the more hydrophilic rosmarinic acid
7
8 493 exhibited more interactions with the tocopheryl radical than the esters. In the present study, the
9
10 494 emulsion with the more hydrophilic caffeic acid exhibited better oxidative stability than the
11
12 495 emulsions with the esters (more hydrophobic antioxidants) when tocopherol was present as also
13
14 496 observed with rosmarinic acid and rosmarinates. Actually, caffeic acid turned from being
15
16 497 prooxidative without tocopherol present to being the most efficient antioxidant with endogenous
17
18 498 tocopherol present in Tween stabilized emulsion. In emulsions, the majority of the emulsifier is
19
20 499 accumulated at the oil-water interface. However, a part of the emulsifier is not associated with the
21
22 500 oil-water interface if the emulsifier concentration is above the CMC (critical micellar concentration,
23
24 501 CMC Tween80 13-15 mg/L, Sigma) and will form micelles in the aqueous phase. In this study, the
25
26 502 concentration of Tween was much higher than CMC (10 g/L). The decreased antioxidant efficiency
27
28 503 of the different caffeates compared with caffeic acid is suggested to be due to the solubilisation of
29
30 504 caffeates in Tween micelles, thus, localized away from the interface unable to inhibit lipid
31
32 505 oxidation. Although, micelles are not isolated structures, they compromise structures that are in
33
34 506 dynamic equilibrium with other structures in the emulsion system. This means that components can
35
36 507 be exchanged between the different structures i.e. between micelles and emulsion droplets [35, 36].
37
38 508 Thus, more studies are needed to further elucidate the differences observed in partitioning and
39
40 509 antioxidant effect in the presence of endogenous tocopherols.
41
42
43
44

45 510 Additionally, it is assumed that caffeic acid is located in close proximity to the interface where it
46
47 511 regenerates tocopherol at the interface in spite of the repelling effect of two negatively charged
48
49 512 compounds (Citrem and caffeic acid). The proposed partial location of tocopherol at the interface is
50
51 513 supported by Jacobsen et al. [37] who reported that ca. 6 % of the alpha-tocopherol present in
52
53 514 mayonnaise was located at the interface whereas the remaining tocopherol was located in the oil
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 515 phase. Therefore, lipophilization is not needed to improve the oxidative stability of these emulsions,
5
6 516 due to tocopherols location at the interface. *Antioxidant hypotheses and efficacies of caffeic acid*
7
8 517 *and caffeates*. The polar paradox was not confirmed in this study since caffeic acid was more
9
10 518 efficient as antioxidant than caffeates in Citrem stabilized emulsions when endogenous tocopherol
11
12 519 was present. In Tween stabilized emulsions with endogenous tocopherol caffeic acid followed by
13
14 520 methyl caffeate were the most efficient antioxidants, whereas, caffeic acid acted as a prooxidant
15
16 521 when tocopherol was not present. No cut-off effect was observed for the lipophilized caffeic acid,
17
18 522 since the most efficient antioxidant in both Citrem and Tween stabilized emulsions when tocopherol
19
20 523 was present was C0 (caffeic acid). A similar finding was observed for the CAT assay with
21
22 524 endogenous tocopherol present. Without endogenous tocopherol present, the caffeates were most
23
24 525 efficient antioxidants in Tween stabilized emulsions, a cut-off effect was found at C16. However,
25
26 526 the efficiency of C20 was still an intermediate to strong antioxidant. The CAT assay showed a cut-
27
28 527 off effect at around C8 and C12 with no endogenous tocopherol present. The partitioning
29
30 528 experiment clearly showed an effect of the chain length, with less antioxidant present in the aqueous
31
32 529 phase with increasing antioxidant lipophilicity. Pekkarinen et al. [27] observed that the proportion
33
34 530 of antioxidant solubilized in the lipid phase and particularly in the interface did not necessarily
35
36 531 reflect the efficiency of the antioxidant. It was assumed from their evaluation of antioxidant activity
37
38 532 and partitioning that specific interactions of the antioxidant with other compounds e.g. emulsifiers,
39
40 533 and intermolecular hydrogen bonds may play an important role in reducing antioxidant activity.
41
42 534 Furthermore, antioxidant-emulsifier interaction has a strong influence on partitioning of the
43
44 535 antioxidant. It is suggested that the caffeates interacts with the emulsifier in form of micelles when
45
46 536 endogenous tocopherols are present, resulting in reduced or no antioxidant activity. When
47
48 537 endogenous tocopherols are not present the caffeates is more likely to be solubilized at the interface
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 538 instead of the tocopherols. However, this has to be evaluated more in depth to conclude further on
5
6 539 these differences in partitioning and antioxidant activity with the impact of endogenous tocopherols.
7

8
9 540 **Conclusions.** Partitioning and antioxidant activity of caffeic acid and caffeates were influenced
10
11 541 both by the emulsifier type and the presence of endogenous tocopherols. Thus, this study clearly
12
13 542 demonstrated different emulsifier-antioxidant and antioxidant-antioxidant interactions that affected
14
15 543 the efficacy of the evaluated caffeic acid and caffeates as antioxidant in emulsions. The hypotheses
16
17 544 about antioxidant in emulsions are based on simple emulsions systems without the presence of
18
19 545 tocopherols. However, the impact of the presence of tocopherols on the efficacy of other
20
21 546 antioxidants is important since most food systems contain tocopherol.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 547 **Acknowledgements**
5

6
7 548 We thank Thi Thu Trang Vu for skillful work in the laboratory, Maritex Norway (subsidiary of
8
9 549 TINE BA, Norway) and Danisco Ingredients (Dupont, Brabrand, Denmark) for providing the oils
10
11 550 and Citrem, respectively.
12

13
14 551 The study is a part of the project entitled “Phenolipids as antioxidants in omega-3 model and real
15
16 552 food systems – Effect of alkyl chain length and concentration” with project no 10-093655 financed
17
18 553 by the Danish Research Council, Technology and Production.
19

20
21 554 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Reference list

1. McClements, D. J.; Decker, E. A. Lipid oxidation in oil-in-water emulsions: impact of molecular environment on chemical reactions in heterogeneous food systems. *J. Food Sci.*, 2000, 65, 1270-1282.
2. Decker, E. A. Strategies for manipulating the prooxidative / antioxidative balance of foods to maximize oxidative stability. *Trends in Food Sci. Technol.*, 1998, 9, 241-248.
3. Porter, W. L. Paradoxical behavior of antioxidants in food and biological systems. *Toxicol. Ind. Health*, 1993, 9, 93-122.
4. Laguerre, M.; Giraldo, L. J. L.; Lecomte, J.; Figueroa-Espinoza, M. C.; Barea, B.; Weiss, J.; Decker, E. A.; Villeneuve, P. Chain Length Affects Antioxidant Properties of Chlorogenate Esters in Emulsion: The Cutoff Theory Behind the Polar Paradox. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 2009, 57, 11335-11342.
5. Frankel, E. N.; Huang, S.-W.; Kanner, J.; German, B. Interfacial phenomena in the evaluation of antioxidants: bulk oils vs emulsions. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 1994, 42, 1054-1059.
6. Laguerre, M.; Giraldo, L. J. L.; Lecomte, J.; Figueroa-Espinoza, M.-C.; Baréa, B.; Weiss, J.; Decker, E. A.; Villeneuve, P. Relationship between hydrophobicity and antioxidant ability of “phenolipids” in emulsion: a parabolic effect of the chain length of rosmarinate esters. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 2010, 58, 2869-2876.
7. Laguerre, M.; Sørensen, A.-D. M.; Bayrasy, C.; Lecomte, J.; Jacobsen, C.; Decker, E. A.; Villeneuve, P. Role of hydrophobicity on antioxidant activity in lipid dispersions from the polar paradox to the cut-off theory. In: *Lipid oxidation: challenges in food systems*. Ed. Logan, A.; Nienaber, U.; Pan, X. AOCS Press, Urbana, IL. 2013 (p. 261-296) ISBN 978 0 9830791 6 3.

- 1
2
3
4 577 **8.** Sørensen, A.-D. M.; Durand, E.; Laguerre, M.; Bayrasy, C.; Lecomte, J.; Villeneuve, P.;
5
6 578 Jacobsen, C. Antioxidant properties and efficacies of synthesized alkyl caffeates, ferulates and
7
8 579 coumarates. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 2014, 62, 12553-12562.
9
10
11 580 **9.** Alemán, M.; Bou, R.; Guardiola, F.; Durand, E.; Villeneuve, P.; Jacobsen, C.; Sørensen, A.-D.
12
13 581 M. Antioxidative effect of lipophilized caffeic acid in fish oil enriched mayonnaise and milk. *Food*
14
15 582 *Chem.*, 2015, 167, 236-244.
16
17
18 583 **10.** Panya, A.; Laguerre, M.; Bayrasy, C.; Lecomte, J.; Villeneuve, P.; McClements, D.J.; Decker,
19
20 584 E. A. An investigation of the versatile antioxidant mechanisms of action of rosmarinate alkyl esters
21
22 585 in oil-in-water emulsions. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 2012, 60, 2692-2700.
23
24
25 586 **11.** Lee, J. H.; Panya, A.; Laguerre, M.; Bayrasy, C.; Lecomte, J.; Villeneuve, P.; Decker, E. A.
26
27 587 Comparison of the antioxidant capacities of rosmarinate alkyl esters in riboflavin photosensitized
28
29 588 oil-in-water emulsion. *J. Am. Oil Chem. Soc.*, 2013, 90, 225-232.
30
31
32
33 589 **12.** Barden, L.; Barouh, N.; Villeneuve, P.; Decker, E. A. Impact of hydrophobicity on antioxidant
34
35 590 efficacy in low-moisture food. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 2015, 63, 5821-5827.
36
37
38 591 **13.** AOCS Official Method Ce 8-89. Determination of Tocopherols and Tocotrienols in Vegetable
39
40 592 Oils and Fats by HPLC. Champaign, IL, USA, 1997.
41
42
43 593 **14.** Sørensen, A.-D. M.; Nielsen, N. S.; Yang, Z.; Xu, X.; Jacobsen, C. The effect of lipophilization
44
45 594 of dihydrocaffeic acid on its antioxidative properties in fish-oil-enriched emulsion. *Eur. J. Lipid Sci.*
46
47 595 *Technol.*, 2012, 114, 134-145.
48
49
50 596 **15.** Rawle, A. Basic principles of particle size analysis. Malvern Instruments Ltd., 1996.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 597 **16.** Bligh, E. G.; Dyer, W. J. A rapid method of total lipid extraction and purification. *Can. J.*
5
6 598 *Biochem. Physiol.*, 1959, 37, 911-917.
7
8
9 599 **17.** Iverson, S. J.; Lang, S. L. C.; Cooper, M. H. Comparison of the bligh and dyer and folch
10
11 600 methods for total lipid determination in broad range of marine tissue. *Lipids*, 2001, 36, 1283-1287.
12
13
14 601 **18.** Shantha, N. C.; Decker, E. A. Rapid, sensitive, iron-based spectrophotometric methods for
15
16 602 determination of peroxide values of food lipids. *J. AOAC Int.*, 1994, 77, 421-424.
17
18
19 603 **19.** Schwarz, K.; Frankel, E. N.; German, J. B. Partition behaviour of antioxidative phenolic
20
21 604 compounds in heterophasic systems. *Fett-Lipid* 1996, 98, 115-121.
22
23
24 605 **20.** Sørensen, A.-D. M.; Nielsen, N. S.; Decker, E. A.; Let, M. B.; Xu, X.; Jacobsen, C. The efficacy
25
26 606 of compounds with different polarities as antioxidant in emulsions with omega-3 lipids. *J. Am. Oil*
27
28 607 *Chem. Soc.*, 2011, 88, 489-502.
29
30
31 608 **21.** Laguerre, M.; Lopez-Giraldo, L. J.; Lecomte, J.; Barea, B.; Cambon, E.; Tchobo, P. F.; Barouh,
32
33 609 N.; Villeneuve, P. Conjugated autoxidizable triene (CAT) assay: A novel spectrophotometric
34
35 610 method for determination of antioxidant capacity using triacylglycerol as ultraviolet probe. *Anal.*
36
37 611 *Biochem.*, 2008, 380, 282-290.
38
39
40 612 **22.** Jacobsen, C.; Let, M. B.; Nielsen, N. S.; Meyer, A. S.; Antioxidant strategies for preventing
41
42 613 oxidative flavor deterioration of food enriched with n-3 polyunsaturated lipids: a comparative
43
44 614 evaluation. *Trends Food Sci. Technol.*, 2008, 19, 76-93.
45
46
47 615 **23.** Sørensen, A.-D. M.; Haarh, A.-M.; Becker, E. M.; Skibsted, L. H.; Bergenståhl, B.; Nilsson, L.;
48
49 616 Jacobsen, C. Interactions between iron, phenolic compounds, emulsifiers, and pH in omega-3-
50
51 617 enriched oil-in-water emulsions. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 2008, 56, 1740-1750.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 618 24. Costa, M.; Losada-Barreiro, S.; Paiva-Martins, F.; Bravo-Díaz, C.; Romsted, L. S. a direct
5
6 619 correlation between the antioxidant efficiencies of caffeic acid and its alkyl esters and their
7
8 620 concentrations in the interfacial region of olive oil emulsions. The pseudophase model
9
10 621 interpretation of the “cut-off” effect. *Food Chem.*, 2015, 175, 233-242.
11
12 622 25. Costa, M.; Losada-Barreiro, S.; Paiva-Martins, F.; Bravo-Díaz, C. Optimizing the efficiency of
13
14 623 antioxidants in emulsions by lipophilization: tuning interfacial concentrations. *RSC Adv.*, 2016, 6,
15
16 624 91483-91493.
17
18 625 **26.** Stöckman, H.; Schwarz, K.; Huynh-Ba, T. The influence of various emulsifiers on the
19
20 626 partitioning and antioxidant activity of hydroxybenzoic acids and their derivatives in oil-in-water
21
22 627 emulsions. *J. Am. Oil Chem. Soc.*, 2000, 77, 535-542.
23
24 628 **27.** Pekkarinen, S.S.; Stöckman, H.; Schwarz, K.; Heinonen, I.M.; Hopia, A.I. Antioxidant activity
25
26 629 and partitioning of phenolic acids in bulk and emulsified methyl linoleate. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*,
27
28 630 1999, 41, 3036-3043.
29
30 631 **28.** Heins, A.; Garamus, V. M.; Steffen, B.; Stöckmann, H.; Schwarz, K. Impact of phenolic
31
32 632 antioxidants on structural properties of micellar solutions. *Food Biophys.*, 2006, 1, 189-201.
33
34 633 **29.** Oehlke, K.; Heins, A.; Stöckmann, H.; Schwarz, K. Impact of emulsifier microenvironments on
35
36 634 acid-base equilibrium and activity of antioxidants. *Food Chem.*, 2010, 118, 48-55.
37
38 635 **30.** Schwarz, K.; Huang, S.-W.; German, B.; Tiersch, B.; Hartmann, J.; Frankel, E.N. Activities of
39
40 636 antioxidants are affected by colloidal properties of oil-in-water and water-in-oil emulsions and bulk
41
42 637 oils. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 2000, 48, 4874-4882.
43
44 638 **31.** Medina, I.; Undeland, I.; Larsson, K.; Storrø, I.; Rustad, T.; Jacobsen, C. Activity of caffeic acid
45
46 639 in different fish lipid matrices: a review. *Food chem.*, 2012, 131, 730-740.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 640 **32.** Laranjinha, J.; Vieiva, O.; Madeira, V.; Almeida, L. Two related phenolic antioxidants with
5
6 641 opposite effects on vitamin E content in low density lipoproteins oxidized by ferrylmyoglobin:
7
8 642 composition vs regeneration. *Arch. Biochem. Biophys.*, 1995, 323, 373-381.
9
10 643 **33.** Iglesias, J.; Pazos, M.; Andersen, M. L.; Skibsted, L. H.; Medina, I. Caffeic acid as antioxidant
11
12 644 in fish muscle: mechanism of synergism with endogenous ascorbic acid and alpha-tocopherol. *J.*
13
14 645 *Agric. Food Chem.*, 2009, 57, 675-681.
15
16 646 **34.** Panya, A.; Kittipongpittaya, K.; Laguerre, M.; Bayrasy, C.; Lecomte, J.; Villeneuve, P.;
17
18 647 McClements, D.J.; Decker, E.A. Interactions between α -tocopherol and rosmarinic acid and its
19
20 648 alkyl esters in emulsions: synergistic, additive, or antagonistic effect? *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 2012,
21
22 649 60, 10320-10330.
23
24 650 **35.** Skhiri, Y.; Gruner, P.; Semin, B.; Brosseau, Q.; Pekin, D.; Mazutis, L.; Goust, V.;
25
26 651 Kleinschmidt, F.; Harrak, A. E.; Hutchison, J. B.; Mayot, E.; Bartolo, J.-F.; Griffiths, A. D.; Taly,
27
28 652 V.; Baret, J.-C. Dynamics of molecular transport by surfactants in emulsions. *Soft Matter*, 2012, 8,
29
30 653 10618-10627.
31
32 654 **36.** You, Y.; Bloomfield, A.; Liu, J.; Fu, L.; Herzon, S. B.; Yan, C. E. Real-time kinetics of
33
34 655 surfactant molecule transfer between emulsion particles probed by in situ second harmonic
35
36 656 generation spectroscopy. *J. Am. Oil Chem. Soc.*, 2012, 134, 4264-4268.
37
38 657 **37. Jacobsen, C.;** Schwarz, K.; Stoeckmann, H.; Meyer, A.S.; Adler-Nissen, J. Partitioning of
39
40 658 selected antioxidants in mayonnaise. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 1999, 47, 3601-3610.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 659 **Figure legends**
5

6
7 660 **Figure 1** PCA build on results obtained from PV, volatiles (1-penten-3-one, 1-penten-3-ol, 4-
8
9 661 heptenal, 2,4-heptadienal, hexanal and nonanal) and α -tocopherols measured on Citrem stabilized
10
11 662 emulsions during storage (15 days) using full cross validation. A) Correlation loadings and B)
12
13 663 Scores plot. Abbreviations for sample codes refer to Table 1.
14
15

16 664 **Figure 2** PCA build on results obtained from PV, volatiles (1-penten-3-one, 1-penten-3-ol and 2,4-
17
18 665 heptadienal) and α -tocopherols measured on Tween80 stabilized emulsions during storage (6 days)
19
20 666 using full cross validation. A) Correlation loadings and B) Scores plot. Abbreviations for sample
21
22 667 codes refer to Table 1.
23
24

25 668 **Figure 3** PCA build on results obtained from PV and volatiles (1-penten-3-one, 1-penten-3-ol and
26
27 669 2,4-heptadienal) measured on Tween80 stabilized emulsions during storage (42 hours) using full
28
29 670 cross validation. A) Correlation loadings and B) Scores plot. Abbreviations for sample codes refer
30
31 671 to Table 1.
32
33
34

35 672 **Figure 4** CAT Value of caffeic acid and caffeates (C1-C16) measured in the concentration range of
36
37 673 0.5 – 2 μ M. ● CAT Values determined without endogenous tocopherols (normal condition for the
38
39 674 CAT assay, published in Sørensen et al. [8]) and ○ CAT Values determined with endogenous
40
41 675 tocopherols (modified CAT assay).
42
43
44

45 676
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

677 **Table 1** Experimental design of experiment 1 and 2.

Experiment	Sample code	Emulsifier	Oil	Antioxidant
	C_Con	Citrem	FO	<i>No antioxidant</i>
	C_CA C0	Citrem	FO	<i>Caffeic acid</i>
E	C_CA C1	Citrem	FO	<i>Methyl caffeate</i>
X	C_CA C4	Citrem	FO	<i>Butyl caffeate</i>
P	C_CA C8	Citrem	FO	<i>Octyl caffeate</i>
	C_CA C12	Citrem	FO	<i>Dodecyl caffeate</i>
1	C_CA C16	Citrem	FO	<i>Hexadecyl caffeate</i>
	C_CA C20	Citrem	FO	<i>Eicosyl caffeate</i>
	T_Con	Tween80	FO/RO	<i>No antioxidant</i>
	T_CA C0	Tween80	FO/RO	<i>Caffeic acid</i>
	T_CA C1	Tween80	FO/RO	<i>Methyl caffeate</i>
	T_CA C4	Tween80	FO/RO	<i>Butyl caffeate</i>
E	T_CA C8	Tween80	FO/RO	<i>Octyl caffeate</i>
X	T_CA C12	Tween80	FO/RO	<i>Dodecyl caffeate</i>
P	T_CA C16	Tween80	FO/RO	<i>Hexadecyl caffeate</i>
	TS_Con	Tween80	S FO/RO	<i>No antioxidant</i>
2	TS_CA C0	Tween80	S FO/RO	<i>Caffeic acid</i>
	TS_CA C1	Tween80	S FO/RO	<i>Methyl caffeate</i>
	TS_CA C4	Tween80	S FO/RO	<i>Butyl caffeate</i>
	TS_CA C8	Tween80	S FO/RO	<i>Octyl caffeate</i>
	TS_CA C12	Tween80	S FO/RO	<i>Dodecyl caffeate</i>
	TS_CA C16	Tween80	S FO/RO	<i>Hexadecyl caffeate</i>
	TS_CA C20	Tween80	S FO/RO	<i>Eicosyl caffeate</i>

678 Abbreviations: FO Fish oil, FO/RO Fish oil and rapeseed oil (1:1, w/w) and S FO/RO Stripped fish
 679 oil and rapeseed oil (1:1, w/w)

680

681 **Table 2** Concentration [μM] of caffeic acid and caffeates (Methyl, Butyl, Octyl and Dodecyl) measured in the aqueous phase of different
 682 systems: 95% Buffer / 5% Oil, 99% Buffer / 1% Emulsifier and Emulsion (5% Oil, 1% Emulsifier and 94% Buffer). Citrem and Tween80
 683 were applied as emulsifier. Both non-stripped and stripped FO/RO was evaluated with Tween80 as emulsifier.

Antioxidant	Citrem and non-stripped oil			Tween80 and non-stripped oil			Tween80 and stripped oil	
	Buffer / Oil	Buffer / Emulsifier	Emulsion	Buffer / Oil	Buffer / Emulsifier	Emulsion	Buffer / Oil	Emulsion
CA C0	101 \pm 3.1 ^{a,b,x}	91.5 \pm 3.6 ^{b,x}	91.5 \pm 7.1 ^{b,x}	93.7 \pm 11.4 ^{b,x}	75.4 \pm 7.0 ^{c,x}	74.0 \pm 4.3 ^{c,x}	111 \pm 2.6 ^{a,x}	78.4 \pm 10.1 ^{c,x}
CA C1	86.2 \pm 0.9 ^{a,y}	53.3 \pm 3.0 ^{b,y}	43.8 \pm 8.2 ^{b,y}	82.8 \pm 1.9 ^{a,x}	15.4 \pm 3.3 ^{c,y}	10.1 \pm 2.5 ^{c,y}	91.1 \pm 2.6 ^{a,y}	15.3 \pm 3.1 ^{c,y}
CA C4	11.4 \pm 0.4 ^{a,b,z}	4.09 \pm 0.6 ^{a,b,c,z}	3.39 \pm 0.5 ^{b,c,z}	11.3 \pm 0.7 ^{a,b,y}	2.10 \pm 0.3 ^{c,z}	< detection	13.0 \pm 1.1 ^{a,z}	< detection
CA C8	< detection	< detection	< detection	< detection	2.60 \pm 3.6 ^z	< detection	< detection	< detection
CA C12	< detection	< detection	< detection	2.00 \pm 0.6 ^{b,z}	1.10 \pm 0.4 ^z	< detection	9.70 \pm 4.2 ^{a,z}	1.10 \pm 0.2 ^{b,y}


684 Different letters in superscript indicate significant differences. Significant differences within a row i.e. same antioxidant but different systems are denoted with a,b and
 685 c, whereas significant differences within a column i.e. same system but different antioxidant are denoted with x, y and z.

686 **Table 3** Calculated inhibition percentages for selected lipid oxidation parameters (PV, 1-penten-3-ol, 1-penten-3-one and 2,4-
 687 heptadienalA) measured at selected time points in the different emulsions. Citrem stabilized emulsions are reported at day 6 and 15, Tween
 688 stabilized emulsions with endogenous tocopherols at day 6 and Tween stabilized emulsions without endogenous tocopherols at 42 hours.


AO	Citrem (Day 6)				Tween with tocopherols				Tween without tocopherols			
	PV	1Pen3ol	1Pen3one	2,4HepA	PV	1Pen3ol	1Pen3one	2,4HepA	PV	1Pen3ol	1Pen3one	2,4HepA
CA	50	39	3	44	79	83	86	86	34	-63	-55	-48
C1	32	1	-210	-27	60	60	69	11	89	97	85	89
C4	21	-119	-502	-143	47	61	33	-10	89	99	83	93
C8	-28	-174	-603	-87	49	71	52	-3	88	100	94	94
C12	-53	-130	-515	-13	43	62	55	2	91	102	97	95
C16	-26	-104	-487	-39	44	58	39	4	87	101	96	98
C20	-31	-43	-340	8					66	59	44	45
AO	Citrem (Day 15)											
	PV	1Pen3ol	1Pen3one	2,4HepA								
CA	13	-166	52	13								
C1	31	-123	65	18								
C4	28	-61	-65	-41								
C8	54	-47	-51	-17								
C12	5	-10	-28	5								
C16	-7	3	-21	5								
C20	-5	12	-15	7								

689 Abbreviation: AO Antioxidant; PV Peroxide Value; 1Pen3ol 1-Penten-3-ol; 1Pen3one 1-Penten-3-one; 2,4HepA 2,4-HeptadienalA. The 2,4-heptadienal external
 690 standard appears as two peaks in the chromatogramme, these peaks are termed A and B (here only 2,4HepA presented).

691



692



693

694 **Figure 1**

695







Figure 2

700

701



702



703

704 **Figure 3**




Figure 4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 1 Alkyl caffeates as antioxidants in ~~e/w~~O/W emulsions: Impact of emulsifier type and endogenous
9 tocopherols

10 2
11
12 3
13
14 4 Ann-Dorit Moltke Sørensen^{1*}, Pierre Villeneuve², Charlotte Jacobsen¹

15 5
16
17 6
18
19 6 ¹ Division of Food Technology, National Food Institute (DTU Food), Technical University of
20 Denmark, DK-2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark

21 7
22 8 ² CIRAD, UMR IATE, Montpellier, F-34398, France

23 9 * Corresponding author: adms@food.dtu.dk, Phone: +45 4525 2591
24
25
26
27 10
28

29 11 Running title: ~~Oxidation is affected by emulsifier and antioxidant~~ Effect of emulsifier and
30 antioxidants on lipid oxidation
31 12

32
33
34 13 Keywords: Caffeic acid; Lipid oxidation; Tween; Citrem; Phenolipids; Fish oil; Antioxidant
35 interactions
36 14
37
38 15
39
40

41 16 Abbreviations: CA Caffeic acid; C1 Methyl caffeate; C4 Butyl caffeate; C8 Octyl caffeate; C12
42 Dodecyl caffeate; C16 Hexadecyl caffeate; C20 Eicosyl caffeate; CAT Conjugated autoxidizable
43 triene; CCL Critical chain length; FO Fish oil; FO/RO Fish oil and rapeseed oil mixture (1:1); PC
44 18 Principal component; PCA Principal component analysis; PV Peroxide value; THF Tetrahydrofuran
45
46 19
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

Abstract

Antioxidant addition can be one strategy to limit lipid oxidation in emulsions. Research has proven that an important factor regarding the efficacy of antioxidants is their localization in the emulsion; however, other factors such as interactions with other components can also have an impact. Thus, the aim was to evaluate the impact of emulsifiers (Citrem and Tween⁸⁰) and presence of endogenous tocopherols on the efficacies of caffeic acid and caffeates (C1-C20) as antioxidants in emulsions. Lipid oxidation was evaluated during storage and partitioning of caffeic acid and caffeates was estimated by measuring their concentrations in the aqueous phase.

Partitioning of caffeic acid and caffeates was influenced by emulsifier type and presence of endogenous tocopherols. Caffeic acid was the most efficient antioxidant in Citrem and Tween stabilized emulsions in the presence of endogenous tocopherol. In contrast, for Tween stabilized emulsions, caffeic acid acted as a prooxidant and the evaluated caffeates acted as strong antioxidants in the absence of endogenous tocopherol. Thus, when endogenous tocopherol was present lipophilization of caffeic acid did not increase its efficacy as an antioxidant. It is suggested that the differences observed in antioxidant efficiency with different emulsifiers and with and without endogenous tocopherols is due to emulsifier-antioxidant interactions and antioxidant-antioxidant interactions in the emulsions.

Practical application: Food emulsions contain endogenous tocopherols, thus, the impact of endogenous tocopherols on the efficacy of applied antioxidants is of interest to the industry. So far the hypotheses about antioxidant in emulsions are based on simple emulsions systems without the presence of tocopherols. The finding in this study revealed that both emulsifier type and the presence of endogenous tocopherol had an impact on the efficacy of caffeic acid and caffeates due to emulsifier-antioxidant and antioxidant-antioxidant interactions. This highlights the importance of

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

43 evaluating the antioxidant in each emulsion system before selecting antioxidants for optimal
44 protection against lipid oxidation.

For Peer Review

Introduction

An o/w emulsion consists of three different phases. A dispersed phase (oil) is present as droplets in a continuous phase (water) and separated by an interfacial region. Type of emulsions can range from very simple, when prepared from only a few ingredients, to more complex, when prepared with many different ingredients e.g. food emulsions. Lipid oxidation can occur rapidly in emulsions due to their large interfacial area. The interface region facilitates interactions between the lipids and water-soluble prooxidants [1].

Different strategies can be applied to limit lipid oxidation and thereby improve shelf life of emulsions [2]. One of them is addition of antioxidants; however, selection of the right antioxidant or mixture of antioxidants is difficult, since their efficacies are affected by the composition of the emulsions e.g. their localization and interaction with other components. An enormous amount of studies have been reported in the literature on antioxidants and their efficacies in model emulsions and more complex food emulsions. So far, two hypotheses about antioxidant efficacies in emulsions, namely the polar paradox hypothesis [3] and the cut-off effect [4] have been reported. In brief, the polar paradox hypothesizes that apolar antioxidants are more efficient in O/W emulsions than polar antioxidants [3] due to differences in the antioxidants' affinity towards the different phases [5]. The cut-off effect can be seen as an extension of the polar paradox hypothesis, in which an optimal degree of lipophilisation for optimal antioxidant activity is observed [4], which is called critical chain length (CCL). The cut-off effect was observed from results obtained with chlorogenic acid and rosmarinic acid and their unbranched saturated alkyl esters (chlorogenates and rosmarinates). The efficacy of antioxidant homologues was related to the partitioning of these antioxidants in an emulsion system [4, 6]. Based on these observations, it was assumed that when the lipophilized antioxidants had the CCL they were present in the highest concentration at the oil-aqueous interface, where lipid oxidation is initiated. In addition, antioxidant homologues with chain

length below and above CCL were driven away from the oil-aqueous interface [7]. These antioxidant hypotheses are based on extensive research in simplified emulsions prepared with stripped oils, whereas food emulsions contain e.g. endogenous tocopherols. Only few compounds with different degree of lipophilization have been evaluated in several different emulsion systems. Caffeic acid and unbranched saturated caffeates have been evaluated both in a model emulsion (CAT assay) system [8], milk and mayonnaise [9] and CCL seemed to be influenced by the system. In addition, rosmarinic acid has also been evaluated in different systems; model emulsions and low moisture food (crackers). In model emulsions, a parabolic relationship between antioxidant efficacy and hydrophobicity was observed, with the intermediate polarity (8 carbon – 18 carbon chain length) giving optimum activity [6, 10, 11]. In crackers, a linear relationship between antioxidant activity and hydrophobicity was observed [12].

Due to formerly obtained results with caffeic acid and caffeates in model emulsion, milk and mayonnaise [8, 9], it is hypothesized that emulsifier type and the presence of endogenous tocopherols can affect the partitioning of caffeic acid and caffeates and thereby change their efficacy in the emulsion systems. Hence, the aim of this study was to evaluate the impact of both emulsifier and presence of endogenous tocopherols on the efficacies of caffeic acid and caffeates (C1-C20). Two experiments were carried out as shown in Table 1. In the first experiment, the aim was to evaluate the effect of lipophilization of caffeic acid on its antioxidant efficacy in an o/w emulsion prepared with unstripped oil and Citrem as emulsifier. The aim of the second experiment was to investigate whether the presence of endogenous tocopherol affected the optimal chain length of lipophilized caffeic acid when Tween was used as an emulsifier. Moreover, comparison of results of the two experiments enabled an evaluation of whether the emulsifier type, Citrem vs Tween affected the CCL in emulsions prepared with unstripped oil.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

94 In both experiments, the partitioning of the antioxidant was estimated by measuring its
95 concentration in the aqueous phase of the ~~e/w~~O/W emulsion, a buffer/oil system and a
96 buffer/emulsifier system to evaluate if emulsifier type and the presence of endogenous tocopherols,
97 affected the partitioning of caffeic acid and caffeates in the emulsion system.

For Peer Review

Material and Methods

The oil used in this study was fish oil (FO) and a mixture between fish and rapeseed oil (FO/RO, 1:1). The two types of oil were supplied by Maritex A/S (TINE BA, Sortland, Norway). The quality of the FO was as follows: 0.3 meq. peroxides / kg oil, 250 mg α -tocopherol / kg, 98 mg γ -tocopherol / kg and 48 mg δ -tocopherol / kg. Fatty acid composition of the fish oil was as follows: 14:0, 3.5%; 16:0, 9.9%; 16:1n-7, 8.8%; 18:0, 2.0%; 18:1n-9, 16.3%; 18:1n-7, 4.9%; 18:2n-6, 1.8%, 18:3n-3, 2.6%, 18:4n-3, 2.6%, 20:1n-7, 12.6%; 20:5n-3 (EPA), 9.16%; 22:1n-9, 5.8%, 22:5n-3, 1.1% and 22:6n-3 (DHA) 11.1%. The total percentages of n-3 and n-6 PUFA in the FO were 24.0% and 1.8 %, respectively. The quality of the FO/RO was as follows: 0.3 meq. peroxides / kg oil, 230 mg α -tocopherol / kg, 31 mg β -tocopherol / kg, 151 mg γ -tocopherol / kg and 6 mg δ -tocopherol / kg. The fatty acid composition of the FO/RO was as follows: 14:0, 1.7%; 16:0, 7.1%; 16:1 (n-7), 4.6%; 18:0, 1.9%; 18:1 (n-9), 38.3%; 18:1 (n-7), 3.3%; 18:2 (n-6), 10.5%, 18:3 (n-3), 4.8%; 18:4 (n-3), 1.2%; 20:1, 6.9%; 20:5 (n-3, EPA), 4.7%; 22:1 (n-11), 3.0% and 22:6 (n-3, DHA), 5.9%. The total content of n-3 and n-6 PUFA in the FO/RO were 17.8% and 10.9%, respectively.

The emulsifiers applied, Tween80 and Citrem LR 10 Extra (citric acid ester of mono- and diglyceride) without antioxidants were supplied by Sigma Aldrich (Steinheim, Germany) and Dupont (Danisco A/S, Grindsted, Denmark), respectively.

Alkyl caffeates were synthesized in an acid catalyzed reaction with caffeic acid and fatty alcohols with alcohol in excess as reaction medium or THF (tetrahydrofuran) as reaction medium. For further details refer to Sørensen et al. [8].

Tung oil (872 g/mol), Brij 35 (a nonionic polyoxyethylene surfactant, estimated Mw 1198 g/mol), ~~AAPH (2,2'-azobis-2-methyl propanimidamide, dihydrochloride)~~, phosphate buffer solution (PBS, pH 7.2), alumina, BHT (butylated hydroxytoluene), AAPH (2,2'-Azobis(2-methylpropionamidine)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 122 dihydrochloride) and trolox were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Steinheim, Germany).
9
10 123 Synperonic was purchased from CRODA (East Yorkshire, UK). All solvents used were of HPLC
11 124 grade and purchased from Lab-Scan (Dublin, Ireland). The external standards used for
12
13 125 quantification of secondary oxidation products were from Sigma Aldrich (Steinheim, Germany).
14
15

16 126

17 18 127 **Experimental design**

19
20 128 For specific details on emulsifier, oil and antioxidants applied refer to Table 1. Experiment 1 was
21
22 129 designed to evaluate the effect caffeic acid and different alkyl caffeates as antioxidant in Citrem
23
24 130 stabilized emulsions in the presence of endogenous tocopherols due to the natural content of
25
26 131 tocopherols in oil. In this experiment fish oil was used, and a storage period of 15 days selected
27
28 132 based on previous storage experiment with fish oil.

29
30 133 Experiment 2 was designed to evaluate the influence of endogenous tocopherols on the efficacy of
31
32 134 caffeic acid and caffeates in Tween stabilized emulsions. Tween was selected as emulsifier, since
33
34 135 Citrem contains tocopherols. Emulsions were prepared with and without endogenous tocopherols.
35
36 136 Thus, the oil without endogenous tocopherols was stripped (removal of tocopherols). Stripping of
37
38 137 fish oil will increase oxidation rates tremendously. To slow down oxidation rate, a mixture of fish
39
40 138 and rapeseed oil was therefore used instead in this experiment. The storage time was selected based
41
42 139 on preliminary laboratory trials (data not shown).

43
44 140 Based on experiment 1 and 2 with endogenous tocopherols, the impact of emulsifier type is
45
46 141 evaluated despite different oil type and length of storage time.

47 48 142 49 50 143 **Removal of tocopherols from oils**

51
52
53
54 8

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 144 FO/RO was stripped from tocopherols using an alumina packed glass column using hexane. For
9
10 145 further details refer to Sørensen et al [8]. The stripped oil was bottled, flushed with nitrogen and
11 146 stored at -80°C until use for production of emulsions. Furthermore, the absence of tocopherols in
12
13 147 the oil was checked by HPLC according to the AOCS method [13]. After oil stripping (removal of
14
15 148 tocopherols) the PV was 0.5 meq. peroxides / kg oil and tocopherols were not detected.
16
17 149

19 150 **Production of ~~e/w~~O/W emulsions**

20
21
22 151 Both in experiment 1 and 2, the emulsion compositions were 5% oil, 1% emulsifier and 94% 10
23
24 152 mM sodium acetate – imidazole buffer (pH 7). Antioxidants were diluted in methanol and added in
25
26 153 concentrations of 100 µM. For the control emulsions (without antioxidant added), methanol was
27
28 154 added in same amount as used for the methanolic antioxidant solutions added to the other
29 155 emulsions. The short to medium chain phenolipids (C0 - C12) were added to the buffer (Citrem
30
31 156 emulsions) and buffer-emulsifier mixture (Tween emulsions), whereas the long chain phenolipids
32
33 157 (C16 – C20) were added to the oil-emulsifier mixture (Citrem emulsions) and oil (Tween
34
35 158 emulsions) before the pre-homogenisation step.
36

37 159 Preparation of emulsions for storage experiment 1 were produced with pre-emulsification (2 min,
38
39 160 Ultra-Turrax, Janke & Kunkel IKA-Labortechnik, Staufen, Germany) followed by homogenization
40
41 161 on a two-valve table homogenizer at a pressure of 800 bar (GEA Niro Soavi Spa, Parma, Italy). For
42
43 162 further details refer to Sørensen et al. [14]. Production of emulsions for storage experiment 2 were
44
45 163 pre-emulsified as in experiment 1, but homogenized on a microfluidizer (9K, Microfluidics,
46
47 164 Newton, MA, USA). Changes in the production between experiment 1 and 2 (homogenizer vs.
48 165 microfluidizer) were done in order to operate with smaller emulsion volumes and; thereby reduce
49
50 166 the amount of phenolipids. Moreover, it became possible to, and the ability to cool the emulsion
51

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 167 during production which was an advantage due to the fact that ~~when the oil was stripped from~~
9 tocopherols and would therefore be highly susceptible to oxidation during homogenization.
10 168

11
12 169 After production emulsions (100 g) were stored in 100 mL blue cap bottles at $20^{\circ}\text{C} \pm 2^{\circ}\text{C}$. Samples,
13
14 170 one bottle pr. code, were taken at specific time points and divided into brown glass bottles, flushed
15
16 171 with nitrogen and stored at -40°C until analyses, except for samples used to determine droplet size,
17
18 172 these samples were measured at the sampling day without pre-freezing.

19 20 173 **Droplet size measurements**

21
22
23 174 Droplet size of the oil droplets in the ~~e/w~~O/W emulsion was determined by laser diffraction
24
25 175 (Mastersizer2000, Malvern Instruments Ltd., Worcestershire, UK). Few droplets of the different
26
27 176 emulsions were suspended directly in recirculating water (2800 rpm, obscuration 12-14%). Water
28
29 177 ($\text{RI}_{\text{water}} = 1.330$) and sunflower oil ($\text{RI}_{\text{oil}} = 1.469$) were used in this measurements as dispersant and
30
31 178 particle, respectively. Each sample was measured in triplicate ($n=3$) and results are reported as
32
33 179 surface mean diameter, $D_{3,2}$ [15].
34
35
36

37 181 **Lipid extractions from ~~e/w~~O/W emulsions**

38
39 182 Peroxide value (PV) and tocopherol analyses are performed on lipid extracts. Thus, the lipids were
40
41 183 extracted from the emulsions prior to these analyses according to the method described by Bligh
42
43 184 and Dyer [16] using a reduced amount of solvent [17]. For each sample code two lipid extractions
44
45 185 were performed ($n=2$).
46
47
48
49

50 187 **Tocopherols**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 188 Lipid extracts were evaporated under nitrogen, re-dissolved in heptane and analyzed by HPLC
9
10 189 (Agilent 1100 Series, Agilent Technology, Palo Alto, CA, USA) according to the AOCS Official
11
12 190 Method Ce 8-89 [13]. A silica column (Waters (Dublin, Ireland), 150mm, 4.6mm, 3 μ m silica film)
13
14 191 was used for separation of the tocopherol homologues. This analysis was performed in duplicate on
15
16 192 each lipid extract and results reported as μ g tocopherol / g emulsion.
17
18 193

20 194 **Primary oxidation products: Peroxide value (PV)**

21
22
23 195 PVs in the lipid extracts were determined by colorimetric method based on formation of an iron-
24
25 196 thiocyanate complex. The colored complex was measured on a spectrophotometer at 500 nm
26
27 197 (Shimadzu UV1800, Shimadzu Scientific Instruments, Columbia, MD, USA) [18]. The analysis
28
29 198 was performed in duplicate and reported as meq peroxides / kg oil.
30
31 199

33 200 **Secondary oxidation products: Volatiles**

34
35
36 201 Volatiles were released from the ~~o/w~~o/w emulsion using dynamic headspace (45°C for 30 min,
37
38 202 nitrogen flow of 150 mL/min). Volatiles were then collected and trapped on Tenax GR packed
39
40 203 tubes. To avoid foam and thus water on the tubes, 4 mL of antifoam (Synperonic, conc. 8 g /L
41
42 204 water) was added to each sample prior to the collection. Trapped volatiles were desorbed using an
43
44 205 automatic thermal desorber (ATD-400, Perkin Elmer, Waltham, MA, USA). The transfer line of
45
46 206 the ATD was connected to a gas chromatograph (Agilent 5890, Palo Alto, CA, USA) with a mass
47
48 207 selective detector (HP 5972). Volatiles were separated on a DB1701 column (30m x ID 0.25mm x
49
50 208 1 μ m film thickness, J&W Scientific, Folsom, CA, USA). The initial temperature of the oven was
51
52 209 45°C, which was kept for 5 minutes and then gradually increased as follows: 45-55°C 1.5°C/min,
53
54

Formatted: Justified

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 210 55-90°C 2.5°C/min, 90-220°C 12°C/min and kept at 220°C for 4 minutes. Calibration curves
9
10 211 prepared from external standards was used for quantification of different volatiles. In experiment 1
11 212 (Table 1), different concentrations of external standard solutions were prepared and 1 µL was
12
13 213 placed in Tenax tubes and analyzed. In experiment 2 (Table 1), different concentrations of external
14
15 214 standard solutions were prepared and added to fresh emulsion without antioxidant. Volatiles were
16
17 215 collected in the same way as for samples. The 2,4-heptadienal external standard appears as two
18
19 216 peaks in the chromatogramme, these peaks are termed A and B. Each sample code was analyzed in
20
21 217 triplicate (n=3) and results reported as ng volatile / g emulsion.
22
23 218
24

25 219 **Partitioning**

26 220 Partitioning of caffeic acid and the different alkyl caffeates in buffer/oil, emulsifier/buffer and in
27
28 221 o/w/o/w emulsion was measured according to the method described by Schwarz et al. [19] with
29
30 222 modifications as described elsewhere. With this method it is assumed that the partitioning of the
31
32 223 antioxidants, equilibria reached, is not disrupted by centrifugation. For further details refer to
33
34 224 Sørensen et al. [20].
35
36
37

38 225 In short, the concentration of antioxidants was measured in the separated aqueous phase of 3
39
40 226 different systems: buffer / oil (FO or FO/RO), buffer / emulsifier (Citrem or Tween80) and 5%
41
42 227 o/w/o/w emulsions. Antioxidants were dissolved in methanol and added in a concentration of 100
43
44 228 µM. Separation of the aqueous phase was carried out 24 h after production of the different systems.
45
46 229
47

48 230 **Determination of concentration of added antioxidant**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 231 Caffeic acid and alkyl caffeates in the aqueous phases were analyzed by HPLC (Agilent 1100
9
10 232 Series, Agilent Technology, CA, USA) with a C18 Thermo Hypersil® ODS (250x4.6 mm, 5µ)
11 233 column and using a gradient elution at a flow rate of 1 mL/min. Solvent A was 3 mM phosphoric
12
13 234 acid and solvent B was methanol. Gradient condition: 0-30 min 0-100% B, 30-40 min 100% B and
14
15 235 40-45 min 100-0% B. Injection volume was 20 µL. Caffeic acid and different alkyl caffeates were
16
17 236 quantified by calibration curves of these compounds dissolved in methanol.
18

19 237 20 21 22 238 **Conjugated autoxidizable triene (CAT) Assay**

23
24 239 Stock solutions of the different compounds: caffeic acid, caffeates and trolox were prepared in
25
26 240 methanol. The CAT assay was performed as described in Sørensen et al. [8] with a modification.
27
28 241 This assay was performed with non-stripped tung oil, hence, the assay contained tocopherol and the
29 242 evaluated antioxidant in a mixture. Each microplate well contained a microemulsion with the
30
31 243 following composition: 115 µM tung oil, 17 µM Brij 35, 1 mM AAPH and antioxidant (caffeic
32
33 244 acid, caffeates or Trolox) in various concentrations. The progress of lipid oxidation was followed by
34
35 245 measuring the decrease in absorbance at 273 nm. Each antioxidant concentration was measured in
36
37 246 triplicate on the plate and via independent measurements (two different microplates), n = 6. Results
38
39 247 were expressed as CAT value (mean ± SD). This method was developed by Laguerre et al. [21]. For
40 248 further details about the calculations refer to Laguerre et al. [4, 21].
41
42 249

43 44 45 250 **Data treatment**

46
47 251 **Statistics.** The results obtained were analyzed using one- and two-way ANOVA (GraphPad Prism,
48
49 252 Version 4.01, GraphPad Software Inc). Bonferroni multiple comparison post-test was used to
50
51 253 determine significant differences between samples or storage times. The significance level applied
52
53

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

was 95% ($p < 0.05$). ~~When a significant difference was observed~~ between samples, ~~it~~ is denoted with different superscripts (i.e. a, b, c ect.).

Inhibition percentages. Since different oil and emulsifiers can influence amount of lipid oxidation, inhibition percentages were used to compare the efficacy of the antioxidants in the different emulsion systems. The antioxidants inhibition percentages were calculated according to the following equation:

$$\text{Inhibition [\%]} = \left(\frac{\text{Emulsion}_{\text{Control}} - \text{Emulsion}_{\text{Antioxidant}}}{\text{Emulsion}_{\text{Control}}} \right) \times 100$$

$\text{Emulsion}_{\text{Control}}$ and $\text{Emulsion}_{\text{Antioxidant}}$ are emulsions without antioxidant and emulsion with antioxidant added, respectively. The antioxidant has a prooxidative effect if the inhibition $< -5\%$ and an antioxidative effect $> 5\%$. The antioxidative effect can be categorized as weak (5-20%), intermediate (20-50%) or strong ($> 50\%$) effects [22].

Multivariate data analysis, Principal Component Analysis (PCA). Inhibition percentages calculated from results obtained from PV, volatiles and tocopherol analysis were subjected to PCA using Unscrambler version X10.3 (Camo, Oslo, Norway). The PCA model was built on inhibition percentages calculated on the average of the measured data. Full cross validation was used to validate the model. A PCA allows detection of similarities and dissimilarities between the different samples in a score plot, whereas correlations between the measured variables are visualized in a loadings plot. Connecting these plots in this case shows the degree of oxidation between the different samples.

Results

Physical stability of the emulsions

The physical stability of the emulsions was evaluated by following the oil droplet size (D_{3,2} (surface weighted mean)) over time. With Citrem as emulsifier (Exp. 1), the droplet size was between 101 – 114 nm for the different Citrem stabilized emulsions (data not shown). The emulsion prepared with Tween as emulsifier (Exp. 2), non-stripped FO/RO and stripped FO/RO had droplet sizes between 124 – 131 nm and 126 - 131 nm, respectively (data not shown). Emulsions produced on the homogenizer (Exp. 1), resulted in slightly smaller oil droplets than emulsions produced on the microfluidizer (Exp. 2). The small differences in oil droplet sizes, however significant, for Citrem and Tween stabilized emulsions is suggested to be due to the different emulsification equipment applied, the different emulsifiers used or a combination. Changes in droplet size during storage were minor, but significant. The changes ranged from -6 nm to +2 nm in size. Since, the oil droplets mainly had a slight decrease in size during storage, the changes is suggested to be due to day to day instrumental variation. Hence, all emulsions were physically stable during the whole storage time, 42 hours, 6 and 15 days, respectively.

Partitioning of caffeic acid and caffeates

The concentration of caffeic acid (CA) and caffeates (CA C1 – CA C12) were determined in the aqueous phase of three different systems to mimic the applied emulsion systems. Hence, the two different emulsifiers and non-stripped and stripped oil was applied. The results obtained are presented in Table 2. In general, the partitioning of caffeic acid and caffeates in the aqueous phase decreased with increased degree of lipophilization until chain length C4 after which the caffeates in most cases could not be detected in the aqueous phase. In the case of the buffer/Tween system

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 297 octyl- (C8) and dodecyl caffeates (C12) were detected in the aqueous phase and the concentrations
9
10 298 were not significantly different from that of butyl caffeate (C4). The concentration of caffeic acid
11
12 299 and methyl caffeate in the aqueous phase was significantly lower when Tween was applied as
13
14 300 emulsifier than when Citrem was applied. Moreover, the concentration of butyl caffeate tended to
15
16 301 be lower (not significant) in the aqueous phase with Tween as emulsifier than with Citrem as also
17
18 302 observed for caffeic acid and methyl caffeate. These partitioning results indicated interactions
19
20 303 between antioxidants and emulsifier to a higher extent with Tween than Citrem, thus, resulting in a
21
22 304 higher concentration of antioxidant at the interface with Tween than Citrem as emulsifier. In
23
24 305 addition, the results indicated that there was a tendency, ~~however, not significant,~~ to a lower
25
26 306 concentration of caffeic acid and methyl caffeate in the aqueous phase of the non-stripped Tween
27
28 307 80 emulsion, i.e. when endogenous tocopherol was present. ~~However, the differences were not~~
29
30 308 significant (Table 2).
31
32

33 310 **Efficacy of caffeic acid and caffeates in emulsions**

34
35 311 The antioxidant efficacy of caffeic acid and caffeates were evaluated in the three different
36
37 312 emulsions shown in Table 1 and in a modified CAT assay (modification: non-stripped tung oil
38
39 313 applied) to investigate the effect of the presence of endogenous tocopherols in this assay. The
40
41 314 efficacy of caffeic acid and caffeates was evaluated from the measured lipid oxidation during
42
43 315 storage. Lipid oxidation was followed by measuring PV (primary oxidation product) and volatiles
44
45 316 (secondary oxidation products). Volatile oxidation products that increased during storage were
46
47 317 identified and quantified. The quantified volatiles were markers of lipid oxidation products, most of
48
49 318 them originated from oxidation of n-3 PUFAs.
50
51
52
53

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 319 ***Citrem stabilized emulsions with endogenous tocopherols present.*** The PV in this experiment
9
10 320 increased to 20-35 meq. peroxides / kg oil depending on the antioxidant treatment during the 15
11 321 days of storage (data not shown). The concentration of volatiles after 15 days of storage
12
13 322 depended upon the specific volatile quantified and the antioxidant applied (1-penten-3-one 20-
14
15 323 60 ng / g emulsion, 1-penten-3-ol 100-300 ng / g emulsion, hexanal 70-150 ng / g emulsion, 4-
16
17 324 heptenal 10-25 ng / g emulsion, 2,4-heptadienal 4000-6000 ng / g emulsion and nonanal 30-70 ng /
18
19 325 g emulsion).

20
21 326 A PCA of the PVs, α -tocopherol and volatile compounds measured during storage explained 71%
22
23 327 of the variation in the obtained results by the first two principal components (PCs), Figure 1. The 3
24
25 328 other tocopherols (β -, δ -, and γ -tocopherols) were excluded from the PCA model due to no or minor
26
27 329 changes during storage in the different emulsions. Figure 1A shows the correlation loadings i.e.
28
29 330 graphical mapping of the measured variables. Generally, all the volatiles were located in quadrant 1
30
31 331 (top-right part) and 4 (bottom-right part), PVs in quadrant 2 (top-left part) closer to PC 2 and α -
32 332 tocopherols in quadrant 2 and 3 (bottom-left part) a long PC 1. Thus, the first PC clearly described
33
34 333 lipid oxidation with tocopherol in the left side and volatiles in the right side. Comparing Figure 1A
35
36 334 with 1B, the scores, reveals the differences in efficacy between caffeic acid and caffeates. Butyl
37
38 335 caffeate was prooxidative due to its location in the 4th quadrant i.e. high concentration of many of
39
40 336 the volatile compounds. Octyl caffeate also acted as a prooxidant, however, not as strong as butyl
41
42 337 caffeate. Furthermore, hexadecyl caffeate's location in first quadrant, but close to PC 2, indicates a
43 338 slight prooxidative effect. Dodecyl and eicosyl caffeates seemed to have no effect due to their
44
45 339 proximity to the control emulsion in the 2nd quadrant. The location of caffeic acid in the 3 quadrant
46
47 340 of the scores plot away from the volatile compounds (1 and 4 quadrant) indicates that this
48
49 341 antioxidant was the most efficient followed by methyl caffeate. However, caffeic acid and methyl
50
51 342 caffeate were not strong antioxidants, since some of the measured volatiles were present in higher

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 343 concentration in these emulsions than in the control emulsion (Table 3, Inhibition percentages, Raw
9
10 344 data not shown).

11
12 345 ***Tween stabilized emulsions with endogenous tocopherols present.*** In the Tween stabilized
13
14 346 emulsion with endogenous tocopherols present, the PV increased to 5-30 meq. peroxides / kg oil
15
16 347 depending on the antioxidant treatment during the 6 days of storage. The concentration of volatiles
17
18 348 after 6 days of storage dependent upon the specific volatile quantified and the antioxidant applied
19
20 349 (1-penten-3-one 2-10 ng / g emulsion, 1-penten-3-ol 5-30 ng / g emulsion and 2,4-heptadienal 50-
21 350 350 ng / g emulsion).

22
23
24 351 A PCA of the PVs, α -tocopherol and volatile compounds (1-penten-3-one, 1-penten-3-ol and 2,4-
25
26 352 heptadienal) measured during storage explained 82% of the variation in the obtained results by the
27
28 353 first two PCs (Figure 2). Similar to the other PCA model on Citrem stabilized emulsions, the 3 other
29 354 tocopherol homologues (β -, δ -, and γ -tocopherols) were excluded from the PCA model due to no or
30
31 355 minor changes during storage in the different emulsions. The PV and all the volatiles were located
32
33 356 to the left in the plot of the correlation loadings (Figure 2A). Tocopherols were located opposite to
34
35 357 the PV and volatiles. From the correlation loadings plot it is clear that the first PC describe lipid
36
37 358 oxidation with tocopherol in the right side and volatiles in the left side, thus, increased lipid
38
39 359 oxidation moving from the right to the left in the plot. Scores plot (Figure 2B) reveals differences in
40
41 360 efficacy between caffeic acid and caffeates in the tween stabilized emulsions. The control emulsion
42 361 was located to the left side of the PC 2 axis in the scores plot and all emulsions with antioxidant
43
44 362 added were located to the right of the PC 2 axis except emulsion with butyl caffeate added (Figure
45
46 363 2B). In connection with correlation loadings plot, this indicates that all the emulsions with
47
48 364 antioxidant added acted as antioxidant in the tween stabilized emulsions. As described above, butyl
49
50 365 caffeate was located opposite to the PC 2 axis compared to the other emulsions with antioxidant
51 366 added, this is explained by the higher amount of 2,4-heptadienal at day 6 in this emulsion (Figure

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 367 2). Butyl caffeate worked as antioxidant for all other oxidation parameters measured; however, it
9
10 368 was the least efficient due to higher amount of the measured oxidation parameters compared to the
11 369 other antioxidant applied (Table 3). Moreover, the PCA model reveals that caffeic acid without
12
13 370 esterification was more efficient in tween stabilized emulsions followed by methyl caffeate (short
14
15 371 chain esterification) due to their location most far away from the oxidation parameters measured.
16
17 372 Raw data supported the PCA model.

18
19 373 ***Tween80 stabilized emulsions without endogenous tocopherols present.*** In the Tween stabilized
20
21 374 emulsion with endogenous tocopherols present, the PV increased ~~to from 08- to~~ 14 meq. peroxidases
22
23 375 / kg oil ~~without antioxidant added depending on the antioxidant treatment~~ during the 42 hours of
24
25 376 storage; ~~whereas, the PV increased from 2-to 8 and 1- to 4 meq. Peroxides / kg oil with caffeic~~
26
27 377 ~~acid and eicosyl caffeates, respectively. The other antioxidant treatments resulted in no increase in~~
28
29 378 ~~PV during storage.~~ -The concentration of volatiles after 42 hours of storage dependent upon the
30
31 379 specific volatile quantified and the antioxidant applied (1-penten-3-one 0-3 ng / g emulsion, 1-
32 380 penten-3-ol 0-9 ng / g emulsion and 2,4-heptadienal 2-90 ng / g emulsion), which was much lower
33
34 381 than in the Citrem stabilized emulsions.

35
36
37 382 A PCA of the PVs and volatile compounds (1-penten-3-one, 1-penten-3-ol, ~~4 heptenal~~ and 2,4-
38
39 383 heptadienal) measured during storage explained 83% of the variation in the obtained results by the
40
41 384 first to principal components (PCs), Figure 3. All the volatiles were located in quadrant 1 (top-right
42 385 part) and 4 (bottom-right part). The first PC clearly describes lipid oxidation (right side) versus no
43
44 386 lipid oxidation (left side), whereas, PC 2 describes the development of lipid oxidation over time,
45
46 387 with PV and volatiles in the beginning of the storage period located in the top of the plot and in the
47
48 388 bottom of the plot after 42 days~~here increasing oxidation has decreasing PC 2 values~~ (Figure 3A).
49
50 389 Comparing Figure 3A with 3B, the scores plot, it is observed that control emulsion and emulsion
51
52 390 with caffeic acid is located in the same side as the oxidation parameters measured. Thus, caffeic
53

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 391 acid is acting as a prooxidant in Tween stabilized emulsions without endogenous tocopherol
9
10 392 present. Esterification of caffeic acid in Tween stabilized emulsion without tocopherols improved
11 393 its antioxidative properties, since all caffeates evaluated were acting as antioxidants. However, it
12
13 394 seems like caffeic acid esterified with C20 was slightly less efficient than the other esters evaluated
14
15 395 (Table 3). Raw data supports the observation from the PCA model (data not shown).
16

17
18 396 ***Comparison of the influence of emulsifier type - Citrem versus Tween⁸⁰ stabilized emulsions.***

19 397 Table 3 shows calculated inhibition percentages for caffeic acid and caffeates. It is clear that the
20
21 398 emulsifier impacted the efficacy of the antioxidants added. In Citrem stabilized emulsions, caffeic
22
23 399 acid and methyl caffeate were the only ones acting as antioxidants. Their antioxidative effect in this
24
25 400 model emulsion was weak to intermediate and they even promoted the formation of certain
26
27 401 volatiles. In contrast, caffeic acid and all the evaluated caffeates in Tween stabilized emulsions
28
29 402 acted as antioxidants. Caffeic acid was the strongest antioxidant followed by methyl caffeate.
30

31 403 ***Comparison of the influence of the presence of endogenous tocopherols.*** Calculated inhibition
32
33 404 percentages for selected oxidation variables measured in Tween stabilized emulsions with and
34
35 405 without endogenous tocopherols are presented in Table 3. A clear difference in the efficacy of
36
37 406 antioxidants was that caffeic acid acted as a strong antioxidant when tocopherols were present,
38
39 407 whereas, it acted as intermediate to strong prooxidant without tocopherols in this model emulsion.
40 408 In addition, the caffeates acted as stronger antioxidants without tocopherols compared to the same
41
42 409 model emulsion with tocopherols present (Table 3). Caffeates with chain lengths between C1 and
43
44 410 C18 were all strong antioxidants, whereas the antioxidant efficacy was decreased when the chain
45
46 411 length was increased to C20.
47

48 412 ***Antioxidant efficacy in a modified CAT assay.*** The CAT assay is an assay developed to measure
49
50 413 the efficacy of antioxidants in a micro emulsion system without endogenous tocopherols present.
51
52
53

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 414 The assay was slightly modified to investigate the efficacy of caffeic acid and caffeates in the
9
10 415 presence of endogenous tocopherols. The results are shown in Figure 4 together with results
11
12 416 obtained earlier with an unmodified CAT assay [8]. When tocopherol was present the antioxidative
13
14 417 efficacies of caffeic acid, methyl-, butyl-, octyl- and dodecyl caffeates were not significantly
15
16 418 different. This finding is different from earlier results obtained without the presence of tocopherols,
17
18 419 where octyl- and dodecyl caffeates exerted a significantly higher efficacy than caffeic acid and the
19
20 420 other caffeates evaluated. Furthermore, the efficacy of octyl- and dodecyl caffeates without
21
21 421 tocopherols present was also significantly higher than when tocopherols were present.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

Discussion

The results showed - as hypothesized - that partitioning of the antioxidants was affected by the type of emulsifier and the presence of endogenous tocopherols. Earlier measurements of the radical scavenging effect (DPPH assay) of caffeic acid and caffeates showed no differences between the caffeic acid and the different saturated unbranched alkyl esters [8]. In spite of that the antioxidative effect of caffeic acid and caffeates was different in the different emulsion systems. However, the activity can differ due to the emulsion composition.

Impact of emulsifier on the efficacy of caffeic acid and caffeates. In the present study, caffeic acid and caffeates were more efficient antioxidants in Tween stabilized emulsions than in Citrem stabilized emulsions. This partly supports earlier findings with the same emulsifiers and caffeic acid in 10% ~~o/w~~O/W emulsions, where caffeic acid in Citrem stabilized emulsions promoted the formation of volatiles and no effect on lipid oxidation or slightly antioxidative effect of caffeic acid was observed in Tween stabilized emulsions [23]. Besides different oil concentration in the previous and current studies, antioxidant concentration (5.5 fold ~~higher~~lower in ~~the present~~this study) and oil / emulsifier ratio were also different, which can have an influence on the differences observed in these studies. Independently of emulsifier type, caffeic acid was performing better than the caffeates. Contrary, the effect of the caffeates was affected by the emulsifier applied. To our knowledge ~~Only~~ few studies related to the antioxidative effect of caffeic acid and ~~caffeates~~ in emulsions have been published [9, 24, 25]. These studies did not compare the effect of the emulsifier type applied. However, one of them compared the effect of caffeates in mayonnaise and milk, where not only the emulsifier type is different but the entire emulsion system. The efficiency of the caffeates was affected by the type of emulsion system [9]. Results obtained in the present study also demonstrated that changing the emulsifier affected the antioxidative effect and rank order of caffeates. Experiments performed with gallic acid and ethyl gallate have also shown that

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 446 changing emulsifier affects the partitioning of the antioxidants and the resulting antioxidant activity
9
10 447 measured in emulsion systems [26]. The different emulsifier evaluated was SDS, CTAB, Brij58 and
11 448 PHLC, and their partitioning study revealed increased solubility effect of the emulsifiers in the
12
13 449 following order: PHLC < SDS < Brij58 < CTAB. The antioxidant activity of gallic acid and ethyl
14
15 450 gallate based on the formation of hydroperoxides and hexanal increased in the following order:
16
17 451 CTAB (no activity measured) < Brij58 < PHLC < SDS. Gallic acid only showed antioxidant
18
19 452 activity with PHLC stabilized emulsions. This was a reverse order compared to the partitioning
20
21 453 measured. Hence, it was suggested that the increased partitioning into the emulsifier layer and lipid
22
23 454 counteract the hydrogen-donating ability, and lower the activity of the antioxidants [246].
24 455 Moreover, Pekkarinen et al. [257] evaluated antioxidative effect and partitioning of phenolics in
25
26 456 different systems. Interaction between caffeic acid and Tween 20 differed from other phenolics such
27
28 457 as vanillic acid, ferulic acid and sinapic acid evaluated, since Tween 20 exhibited higher
29
30 458 solubilisation capacity for caffeic acid than for other phenolic acids. Additionally, Pekkarinen et al.
31
32 459 [257] concluded that these antioxidant-emulsifier interactions have a strong influence on the
33
34 460 partitioning of antioxidants. The partitioning results obtained in this study confirmed that Citrem
35 461 and Tween as emulsifiers results in differences in the partitioning of caffeic acid and caffeates. Less
36
37 462 caffeic acid and caffeates were present in the aqueous phase when Tween was applied. This clearly
38
39 463 demonstrated stronger antioxidant-emulsifier interaction with Tween compared to Citrem.
40
41 464 Moreover, Citrem is an anionic emulsifier, thus, the interface is negatively charged and will repel
42
43 465 negatively charged antioxidants i.e. caffeic acid, which could explain why caffeic acid interacted
44
45 466 less with Citrem than with Tween. An explanation for the stronger interactions with Tween may be
46 467 the molecular structure of the emulsifiers, since Tween is a larger and more bulky molecule than
47
48 468 Citrem; however, this has to be further evaluated. Furthermore, Schwarz et al. [19, 268, 279]
49
50 469 evaluated partitioning of different antioxidants in dispersed lipid systems with different emulsifiers.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 470 Significant differences were observed in partitioning of the antioxidants between phases, both as a
9
10 471 function of pH and emulsifier type and concentration. It was concluded from the results that
11 472 determination of antioxidant partitioning may be an important tool to select antioxidants structurally
12
13 473 designed to localize at the surfaces [19], however, the partitioning of the antioxidants cannot alone
14
15 474 explain the measured antioxidant activity in emulsions [279]. Results from another study by
16
17 475 Schwarz et al. [2830] evaluating antioxidant activity of antioxidants with different lipophilicity in
18
19 476 bulk oil, ~~o/w~~O/W and ~~w/o~~W/O emulsions with different emulsifiers led to the assumption that
20
21 477 differences in antioxidant activity for the same emulsion type might be additionally influenced by
22
23 478 interaction with the emulsifier dominating the interfaces in the emulsion system [2830]. The
24 479 obtained results for the two emulsifiers together with the partitioning study may also here lead to
25
26 480 the assumption that emulsifier-antioxidant interactions (e.g. hydrogen bonding) affected the
27
28 481 antioxidant activity of the caffeates. However, the type of interactions and the impact of
29
30 482 antioxidant-emulsifier interactions on the radical scavenging activity have to be studied more in
31
32 483 more details to make further conclusions.

33
34 484 ***Impact of endogenous tocopherols on the efficacy of caffeic acid and caffeates.*** The presence of
35
36 485 endogenous tocopherol not only changed the antioxidant activity of caffeic acid and caffeates in
37
38 486 both the storage experiment and in the CAT assay, but also their partitioning in the emulsion
39
40 487 system. A tendency to less caffeic acid and caffeates (C1, C4 and C12) present in the aqueous phase
41
42 488 with endogenous tocopherol in the emulsion system was observed. This may indicate some
43 489 interactions between tocopherol and caffeic acid / caffeates both for the antioxidative effect and
44
45 490 localization in the emulsion system. The use of a combination of antioxidants to produce synergistic
46
47 491 interaction has been reported earlier e.g. tocopherol regeneration by ascorbic acid, polyphenols and
48
49 492 flavonoids [2931-324]. Panaya et al. [324] carried out the only study investigating interactions
50
51 493 between tocopherol and a phenol (rosmarinic acid) and its alkyl esters (rosmarinates, C4, C12 and

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 494 C20) in Tween20 stabilized emulsions. Rosmarinic acid exhibited strongest synergistic interaction
9
10 495 with tocopherol, and C4 and C12 esters exhibited small synergistic interaction. An antagonistic
11 496 interaction was observed with C20 ester and tocopherol. Thus, the more hydrophilic rosmarinic acid
12
13 497 exhibited more interactions with the tocopheryl radical than the esters. In the present study, the
14
15 498 emulsion with the more hydrophilic caffeic acid exhibited better oxidative stability than the
16
17 499 emulsions with the esters (more hydrophobic antioxidants) when tocopherol was present as also
18
19 500 observed with rosmarinic acid and rosmarinates. Actually, caffeic acid turned from being
20
21 501 prooxidative without tocopherol present to being the most efficient antioxidant with endogenous
22
23 502 tocopherol present in Tween stabilized emulsion. In emulsions, the majority of the emulsifier is
24
25 503 accumulated at the oil-water interface. However, a part of the emulsifier is not associated with the
26
27 504 oil-water interface if the emulsifier concentration is above the CMC (critical micellar concentration,
28
29 505 CMC Tween80 13-15 mg/L, Sigma) and will form micelles in the aqueous phase. In this study, the
30
31 506 concentration of Tween was much higher than CMC (10 g/L). The decreased antioxidant efficiency
32
33 507 of the different caffeates compared with caffeic acid is suggested to be due to the solubilisation of
34
35 508 caffeates in Tween micelles, thus, localized away from the interface unable to inhibit lipid
36
37 509 oxidation. Although, micelles are not isolated structures, they compromise structures that are in
38
39 510 dynamic equilibrium with other structures in the emulsion system. This means that components can
40
41 511 be exchanged between the different structures i.e. between micelles and emulsion droplets [35, 36].
42
43 512 Thus, more studies are needed to further elucidate the differences observed in partitioning and
44
45 513 antioxidant effect in the presence of endogenous tocopherols.

45 514 Additionally, it is assumed that caffeic acid is located in close proximity to the interface where it
46
47 515 regenerates tocopherol at the interface in spite of the repelling effect of two negatively charged
48
49 516 compounds (Citrem and caffeic acid). The proposed partial location of tocopherol at the interface is
50
51 517 supported by Jacobsen et al. [37] who reported that ca. 6 % of the alpha-tocopherol present in

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 518 mayonnaise was located at the interface whereas the remaining tocopherol was located in the oil
9 phase. Therefore, lipophilization is not needed to improve the oxidative stability of these emulsions,
10 519
11 520 due to tocopherols location at the interface.
12
13

14 521 ***Antioxidant hypotheses and efficacies of caffeic acid and caffeates.*** The polar paradox was not
15 confirmed in this study since caffeic acid was more efficient as antioxidant than caffeates in Citrem
16 522 stabilized emulsions when endogenous tocopherol was present. In Tween stabilized emulsions with
17 523 endogenous tocopherol caffeic acid followed by methyl caffeate were the most efficient
18 524 antioxidants, whereas, caffeic acid acted as a prooxidant when tocopherol was not present. No cut-
19 525 off effect was observed for the lipophilized caffeic acid, since the most efficient antioxidant in both
20 526 Citrem and Tween stabilized emulsions when tocopherol was present was C0 (caffeic acid). A
21 527 similar finding was observed for the CAT assay with endogenous tocopherol present. Without
22 528 endogenous tocopherol present, the caffeates were most efficient antioxidants in Tween stabilized
23 529 emulsions, a cut-off effect was found at C16. However, the efficiency of C20 was still an
24 530 intermediate to strong antioxidant. The CAT assay showed a cut-off effect at around C8 and C12
25 531 with no endogenous tocopherol present. The partitioning experiment clearly showed an effect of the
26 532 chain length, with less antioxidant present in the aqueous phase with increasing antioxidant
27 533 lipophilicity. Pekkarinen et al. [247] observed that the proportion of antioxidant solubilized in the
28 534 lipid phase and particularly in the interface did not necessarily reflect the efficiency of the
29 535 antioxidant. It was assumed from their evaluation of antioxidant activity and partitioning that
30 536 specific interactions of the antioxidant with other compounds e.g. emulsifiers, and intermolecular
31 537 hydrogen bonds may play an important role in reducing antioxidant activity. Furthermore,
32 538 antioxidant-emulsifier interaction has a strong influence on partitioning of the antioxidant. It is
33 539 suggested that the caffeates interacts with the emulsifier in form of micelles when endogenous
34 540 tocopherols are present, resulting in reduced or no antioxidant activity. When endogenous
35 541

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 542 tocopherols are not present the caffeates is more likely to be solubilized at the interface instead of
9
10 543 the tocopherols. However, this has to be evaluated more in depth to conclude further on these
11 544 differences in partitioning and antioxidant activity with the impact of endogenous tocopherols.
12

13
14 545 **Conclusions.** Partitioning and antioxidant activity of caffeic acid and caffeates were influenced
15
16 546 both by the emulsifier type and the presence of endogenous tocopherols. Thus, this study clearly
17
18 547 demonstrated different emulsifier-antioxidant and antioxidant-antioxidant interactions that affected
19
20 548 the efficacy of the evaluated caffeic acid and caffeates as antioxidant in emulsions. The hypotheses
21 549 about antioxidant in emulsions are based on simple emulsions systems without the presence of
22
23 550 tocopherols. However, the impact of the presence of tocopherols on the efficacy of other
24
25 551 antioxidants is important since most food systems contain tocopherol.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 552 **Acknowledgements**

9
10 553 We thank Thi Thu Trang Vu for skillful work in the laboratory, Maritex Norway (subsidiary of
11
12 554 TINE BA, Norway) and Danisco Ingredients (Dupont, Brabrand, Denmark) for providing the oils
13
14 555 and Citrem, respectively.

15
16 556 The study is a part of the project entitled “Phenolipids as antioxidants in omega-3 model and real
17
18 557 food systems – Effect of alkyl chain length and concentration” with project no 10-093655 financed
19
20 558 by the Danish Research Council, Technology and Production.

21
22
23 559 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Reference list

1. McClements, D. J.; Decker, E. A. Lipid oxidation in oil-in-water emulsions: impact of molecular environment on chemical reactions in heterogeneous food systems. *J. Food Sci.*, 2000, 65, 1270-1282.
2. Decker, E. A. Strategies for manipulating the prooxidative / antioxidative balance of foods to maximize oxidative stability. *Trends in Food Sci. Technol.*, 1998, 9, 241-248.
3. Porter, W. L. Paradoxical behavior of antioxidants in food and biological systems. *Toxicol. Ind. Health*, 1993, 9, 93-122.
4. Laguerre, M.; Giraldo, L. J. L.; Lecomte, J.; Figueroa-Espinoza, M. C.; Barea, B.; Weiss, J.; Decker, E. A.; Villeneuve, P. Chain Length Affects Antioxidant Properties of Chlorogenate Esters in Emulsion: The Cutoff Theory Behind the Polar Paradox. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 2009, 57, 11335-11342.
5. Frankel, E. N.; Huang, S.-W.; Kanner, J.; German, B. Interfacial phenomena in the evaluation of antioxidants: bulk oils vs emulsions. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 1994, 42, 1054-1059.
6. Laguerre, M.; Giraldo, L. J. L.; Lecomte, J.; Figueroa-Espinoza, M.-C.; Baréa, B.; Weiss, J.; Decker, E. A.; Villeneuve, P. Relationship between hydrophobicity and antioxidant ability of “phenolipids” in emulsion: a parabolic effect of the chain length of rosmarinate esters. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 2010, 58, 2869-2876.
7. Laguerre, M.; Sørensen, A.-D. M.; Bayrasy, C.; Lecomte, J.; Jacobsen, C.; Decker, E. A.; Villeneuve, P. Role of hydrophobicity on antioxidant activity in lipid dispersions from the polar paradox to the cut-off theory. In: *Lipid oxidation: challenges in food systems*. Ed. Logan, A.; Nienaber, U.; Pan, X. AOCS Press, Urbana, IL. 2013 (p. 261-296) ISBN 978 0 9830791 6 3.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 582 **8.** Sørensen, A.-D. M.; Durand, E.; Laguerre, M.; Bayrasy, C.; Lecomte, J.; Villeneuve, P.;
9
10 583 Jacobsen, C. Antioxidant properties and efficacies of synthesized alkyl caffeates, ferulates and
11
12 584 coumarates. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 2014, 62, 12553-12562.
- 13
14 585 **9.** Alemán, M.; Bou, R.; Guardiola, F.; Durand, E.; Villeneuve, P.; Jacobsen, C.; Sørensen, A.-D.
15
16 586 M. Antioxidative effect of lipophilized caffeic acid in fish oil enriched mayonnaise and milk. *Food*
17
18 587 *Chem.*, 2015, 167, 236-244.
- 19
20 588 **10.** Panya, A.; Laguerre, M.; Bayrasy, C.; Lecomte, J.; Villeneuve, P.; McClements, D.J.; Decker,
21
22 589 E. A. An investigation of the versatile antioxidant mechanisms of action of rosmarinate alkyl esters
23
24 590 in oil-in-water emulsions. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 2012, 60, 2692-2700.
- 25
26 591 **11.** Lee, J. H.; Panya, A.; Laguerre, M.; Bayrasy, C.; Lecomte, J.; Villeneuve, P.; Decker, E. A.
27
28 592 Comparison of the antioxidant capacities of rosmarinate alkyl esters in riboflavin photosensitized
29
30 593 oil-in-water emulsion. *J. Am. Oil Chem. Soc.*, 2013, 90, 225-232.
- 31
32 594 **12.** Barden, L.; Barouh, N.; Villeneuve, P.; Decker, E. A. Impact of hydrophobicity on antioxidant
33
34 595 efficacy in low-moisture food. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 2015, 63, 5821-5827.
- 35
36
37 596 **13.** AOCS Official Method Ce 8-89. Determination of Tocopherols and Tocotrienols in Vegetable
38
39 597 Oils and Fats by HPLC. Champaign, IL, USA, 1997.
- 40
41 598 **14.** Sørensen, A.-D. M.; Nielsen, N. S.; Yang, Z.; Xu, X.; Jacobsen, C. The effect of lipophilization
42
43 599 of dihydrocaffeic acid on its antioxidative properties in fish-oil-enriched emulsion. *Eur. J. Lipid Sci.*
44
45 600 *Technol.*, 2012, 114, 134-145.
- 46
47 601 **15.** Rawle, A. Basic principles of particle size analysis. Malvern Instruments Ltd., 1996.
48
49
50
51
52
53

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 602 **16.** Bligh, E. G.; Dyer, W. J. A rapid method of total lipid extraction and purification. *Can. J.*
9
10 603 *Biochem. Physiol.*, 1959, 37, 911-917.
- 11
12 604 **17.** Iverson, S. J.; Lang, S. L. C.; Cooper, M. H. Comparison of the bligh and dyer and folch
13
14 605 methods for total lipid determination in broad range of marine tissue. *Lipids*, 2001, 36, 1283-1287.
15
16
17 606 **18.** Shantha, N. C.; Decker, E. A. Rapid, sensitive, iron-based spectrophotometric methods for
18
19 607 determination of peroxide values of food lipids. *J. AOAC Int.*, 1994, 77, 421-424.
- 20
21 608 **19.** Schwarz, K.; Frankel, E. N.; German, J. B. Partition behaviour of antioxidative phenolic
22
23 609 compounds in heterophasic systems. *Fett-Lipid* 1996, 98, 115-121.
- 24
25
26 610 **20.** Sørensen, A.-D. M.; Nielsen, N. S.; Decker, E. A.; Let, M. B.; Xu, X.; Jacobsen, C. The efficacy
27
28 611 of compounds with different polarities as antioxidant in emulsions with omega-3 lipids. *J. Am. Oil*
29 612 *Chem. Soc.*, 2011, 88, 489-502.
- 30
31
32 613 **21.** Laguerre, M.; Lopez-Giraldo, L. J.; Lecomte, J.; Barea, B.; Cambon, E.; Tchobo, P. F.; Barouh,
33
34 614 N.; Villeneuve, P. Conjugated autoxidizable triene (CAT) assay: A novel spectrophotometric
35
36 615 method for determination of antioxidant capacity using triacylglycerol as ultraviolet probe. *Anal.*
37 616 *Biochem.*, 2008, 380, 282-290.
- 38
39
40 617 **22.** Jacobsen, C.; Let, M. B.; Nielsen, N. S.; Meyer, A. S.; Antioxidant strategies for preventing
41
42 618 oxidative flavor deterioration of food enriched with n-3 polyunsaturated lipids: a comparative
43
44 619 evaluation. *Trends Food Sci. Technol.*, 2008, 19, 76-93.
- 45
46 620 **23.** Sørensen, A.-D. M.; Haarh, A.-M.; Becker, E. M.; Skibsted, L. H.; Bergenståhl, B.; Nilsson, L.;
47 621 Jacobsen, C. Interactions between iron, phenolic compounds, emulsifiers, and pH in omega-3-
48
49 622 enriched oil-in-water emulsions. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 2008, 56, 1740-1750.
- 50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 623 [24. Costa, M.; Losada-Barreiro, S.; Paiva-Martins, F.; Bravo-Díaz, C.; Romsted, L. S. a direct](#)
9
10 624 [correlation between the antioxidant efficiencies of caffeic acid and its alkyl esters and their](#)
11 625 [concentrations in the interfacial region of olive oil emulsions. The pseudophase model](#)
12
13 626 [interpretation of the “cut-off” effect. Food Chem., 2015, 175, 233-242.](#)
14
15 627 [25. Costa, M.; Losada-Barreiro, S.; Paiva-Martins, F.; Bravo-Díaz, C. Optimizing the efficiency of](#)
16
17 628 [antioxidants in emulsions by lipophilization: tuning interfacial concentrations. RSC Adv., 2016, 6,](#)
18
19 629 [91483-91493.](#)
20
21 630 [246. Stöckman, H.; Schwarz, K.; Huynh-Ba, T. The influence of various emulsifiers on the](#)
22
23 631 [partitioning and antioxidant activity of hydroxybenzoic acids and their derivatives in oil-in-water](#)
24 632 [emulsions. J. Am. Oil Chem. Soc., 2000, 77, 535-542.](#)
25
26 633 [257. Pekkarinen, S.S.; Stöckman, H.; Schwarz, K.; Heinonen, I.M.; Hopia, A.I. Antioxidant activity](#)
27
28 634 [and partitioning of phenolic acids in bulk and emulsified methyl linoleate. J. Agric. Food Chem.,](#)
29
30 635 [1999, 41, 3036-3043.](#)
31
32 636 [268. Heins, A.; Garamus, V. M.; Steffen, B.; Stöckmann, H.; Schwarz, K. Impact of phenolic](#)
33
34 637 [antioxidants on structural properties of micellar solutions. Food Biophys., 2006, 1, 189-201.](#)
35 638 [279. Oehlke, K.; Heins, A.; Stöckmann, H.; Schwarz, K. Impact of emulsifier microenvironments](#)
36
37 639 [on acid-base equilibrium and activity of antioxidants. Food Chem., 2010, 118, 48-55.](#)
38
39 640 [2830. Schwarz, K.; Huang, S.-W.; German, B.; Tiersch, B.; Hartmann, J.; Frankel, E.N. Activities](#)
40
41 641 [of antioxidants are affected by colloidal properties of oil-in-water and water-in-oil emulsions and](#)
42
43 642 [bulk oils. J. Agric. Food Chem., 2000, 48, 4874-4882.](#)
44
45 643 [2931. Medina, I.; Undeland, I.; Larsson, K.; Storrø, I.; Rustad, T.; Jacobsen, C. Activity of caffeic](#)
46 644 [acid in different fish lipid matrices: a review. Food chem., 2012, 131, 730-740.](#)
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 645 | [302](#). Laranjinha, J.; Vieiva, O.; Madeira, V.; Almeida, L. Two related phenolic antioxidants with
9
10 646 | opposite effects on vitamin E content in low density lipoproteins oxidized by ferrylmyoglobin:
11
12 647 | composition vs regeneration. *Arch. Biochem. Biophys.*, 1995, 323, 373-381.
- 13 648 | [313](#). Iglesias, J.; Pazos, M.; Andersen, M. L.; Skibsted, L. H.; Medina, I. Caffeic acid as antioxidant
14
15 649 | in fish muscle: mechanism of synergism with endogenous ascorbic acid and alpha-tocopherol. *J.*
16
17 650 | *Agric. Food Chem.*, 2009, 57, 675-681.
- 18
19 651 | [324](#). Panya, A.; Kittipongpittaya, K.; Laguerre, M.; Bayrasy, C.; Lecomte, J.; Villeneuve, P.;
20
21 652 | McClements, D.J.; Decker, E.A. Interactions between α -tocopherol and rosmarinic acid and its
22
23 653 | alkyl esters in emulsions: synergistic, additive, or antagonistic effect? *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 2012,
24
25 654 | 60, 10320-10330.
- 26 655 | [35](#). Skhiri, Y.; Gruner, P.; Semin, B.; Brosseau, Q.; Pekin, D.; Mazutis, L.; Goust, V.;
27
28 656 | [Kleinschmidt, F.; Harrak, A. E.; Hutchison, J. B.; Mayot, E.; Bartolo, J.-F.; Griffiths, A. D.; Taly,](#)
29
30 657 | [V.; Baret, J.-C. Dynamics of molecular transport by surfactants in emulsions. *Soft Matter*, 2012, 8,](#)
31
32 658 | [10618-10627.](#)
- 33
34 659 | [36](#). You, Y.; Bloomfield, A.; Liu, J.; Fu, L.; Herzon, S. B.; Yan, C. E. Real-time kinetics of
35
36 660 | [surfactant molecule transfer between emulsion particles probed by in situ second harmonic](#)
37
38 661 | [generation spectroscopy. *J. Am. Oil Chem. Soc.*, 2012, 134, 4264-4268.](#)
- 39 662 | [37](#). [Jacobsen, C.; Schwarz, K.; Stoeckmann, H.; Meyer, A.S.; Adler-Nissen, J. Partitioning of](#)
40
41 663 | [selected antioxidants in mayonnaise. *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 1999, 47, 3601-3610.](#)

1
2
3
4
5
6
78 664 **Figure legends**

9

10 665 **Figure 1** PCA build on results obtained from PV, volatiles (1-penten-3-one, 1-penten-3-ol, 4-
11 heptenal, 2,4-heptadienal, hexanal and nonanal) and α -tocopherols measured on Citrem stabilized
12 666 emulsions during storage (15 days) using full cross validation. A) Correlation loadings and B)
13
14 667 Scores plot. Abbreviations for sample codes refer to Table 1.
15
16 668

17

18 669 **Figure 2** PCA build on results obtained from PV, volatiles (1-penten-3-one, 1-penten-3-ol and 2,4-
19 heptadienal) and α -tocopherols measured on ~~tween-Tween80~~ stabilized emulsions during storage (6
20 670 days) using full cross validation. A) Correlation loadings and B) Scores plot. Abbreviations for
21
22 671 sample codes refer to Table 1.
23
24 672

25

26 673 **Figure 3** PCA build on results obtained from PV and volatiles (1-penten-3-one, 1-penten-3-ol and
27 2,4-heptadienal) measured on ~~tween-Tween80~~ stabilized emulsions during storage (42 hours) using
28 674 full cross validation. A) Correlation loadings and B) Scores plot. Abbreviations for sample codes
29
30 675 refer to Table 1.
31
32 676

33

34 677 **Figure 4** CAT Value of caffeic acid and caffeates (C1-C16) measured in the concentration range of
35 0.5 – 2 μ M. ● CAT Values determined without endogenous tocopherols (normal condition for the
36 678 CAT assay, published in Sørensen et al. [8]) and ○ CAT Values determined with endogenous
37
38 679 tocopherols (modified CAT assay).
39
40 680

41

42

43 681

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

Table 1 Experimental design of experiment 1 and 2.

Experiment	Sample code	Emulsifier	Oil	Antioxidant
	C_Con	Citrem	FO	No antioxidant
	C_CA C0	Citrem	FO	Caffeic acid
E	C_CA C1	Citrem	FO	Methyl caffeate
X	C_CA C4	Citrem	FO	Butyl caffeate
P	C_CA C8	Citrem	FO	Octyl caffeate
	C_CA C12	Citrem	FO	Dodecyl caffeate
1	C_CA C16	Citrem	FO	Hexadecyl caffeate
	C_CA C20	Citrem	FO	Eicosyl caffeate

	T_Con	Tween80	FO/RO	No antioxidant
	T_CA C0	Tween80	FO/RO	Caffeic acid
	T_CA C1	Tween80	FO/RO	Methyl caffeate
	T_CA C4	Tween80	FO/RO	Butyl caffeate
E	T_CA C8	Tween80	FO/RO	Octyl caffeate
X	T_CA C12	Tween80	FO/RO	Dodecyl caffeate
P	T_CA C16	Tween80	FO/RO	Hexadecyl caffeate

2	TS_Con	Tween80	S FO/RO	No antioxidant
	TS_CA C0	Tween80	S FO/RO	Caffeic acid
	TS_CA C1	Tween80	S FO/RO	Methyl caffeate
	TS_CA C4	Tween80	S FO/RO	Butyl caffeate
	TS_CA C8	Tween80	S FO/RO	Octyl caffeate
	TS_CA C12	Tween80	S FO/RO	Dodecyl caffeate
	TS_CA C16	Tween80	S FO/RO	Hexadecyl caffeate
	TS_CA C20	Tween80	S FO/RO	Eicosyl caffeate

Abbreviations: FO Fish oil, FO/RO Fish oil and rapeseed oil (1:1, w/w) and S FO/RO Stripped fish oil and rapeseed oil (1:1, w/w)

686 **Table 2** Concentration [μM] of caffeic acid and caffeates (Methyl, Butyl, Octyl and Dodecyl) measured in the aqueous phase of different
 687 systems: 95% Buffer / 5% Oil, 99% Buffer / 1% Emulsifier and Emulsion (5% Oil, 1% Emulsifier and 94% Buffer). Citrem and Tween80
 688 were applied as emulsifier. Both non-stripped and stripped FO/RO was evaluated with Tween80 as emulsifier.

Antioxidant	Citrem and non-stripped oil			Tween80 and non-stripped oil			Tween80 and stripped oil	
	Buffer / Oil	Buffer / Emulsifier	Emulsion	Buffer / Oil	Buffer / Emulsifier	Emulsion	Buffer / Oil	Emulsion
CA C0	101 \pm 3.1 ^{a,b,x}	91.5 \pm 3.6 ^{b,x}	91.5 \pm 7.1 ^{b,x}	93.7 \pm 11.4 ^{b,x}	75.4 \pm 7.0 ^{c,x}	74.0 \pm 4.3 ^{c,x}	111 \pm 2.6 ^{a,x}	78.4 \pm 10.1 ^{c,x}
CA C1	86.2 \pm 0.9 ^{a,y}	53.3 \pm 3.0 ^{b,y}	43.8 \pm 8.2 ^{b,y}	82.8 \pm 1.9 ^{a,x}	15.4 \pm 3.3 ^{c,y}	10.1 \pm 2.5 ^{c,y}	91.1 \pm 2.6 ^{a,y}	15.3 \pm 3.1 ^{c,y}
CA C4	11.4 \pm 0.4 ^{a,b,z}	4.09 \pm 0.6 ^{a,b,c,z}	3.39 \pm 0.5 ^{b,c,z}	11.3 \pm 0.7 ^{a,b,y}	2.10 \pm 0.3 ^{c,z}	< detection	13.0 \pm 1.1 ^{a,z}	< detection
CA C8	< detection	< detection	< detection	< detection	2.60 \pm 3.6 ^z	< detection	< detection	< detection
CA C12	< detection	< detection	< detection	2.00 \pm 0.6 ^{b,z}	1.10 \pm 0.4 ^z	< detection	9.70 \pm 4.2 ^{a,z}	1.10 \pm 0.2 ^{b,y}

689 Different letters in superscript indicate significant differences. Significant differences within a row i.e. same antioxidant but different systems are denoted with a,b and
 690 c, whereas significant differences within a column i.e. same system but different antioxidant are denoted with x, y and z.

691 **Table 3** Calculated inhibition percentages for selected lipid oxidation parameters (PV, 1-penten-3-ol, 1-penten-3-one and 2,4-
 692 heptadienalA) measured at selected time points in the different emulsions. Citrem stabilized emulsions are reported at day 6 and 15, Tween
 693 stabilized emulsions with endogenous tocopherols at day 6 and Tween stabilized emulsions without endogenous tocopherols at 42 hours.

AO	Citrem (Day 6)				Tween with tocopherols				Tween without tocoherols			
	PV	1Pen3ol	1Pen3one	2,4HepA	PV	1Pen3ol	1Pen3one	2,4HepA	PV	1Pen3ol	1Pen3one	2,4HepA
CA	50	39	3	44	79	83	86	86	34	-63	-55	-48
C1	32	1	-210	-27	60	60	69	11	89	97	85	89
C4	21	-119	-502	-143	47	61	33	-10	89	99	83	93
C8	-28	-174	-603	-87	49	71	52	-3	88	100	94	94
C12	-53	-130	-515	-13	43	62	55	2	91	102	97	95
C16	-26	-104	-487	-39	44	58	39	4	87	101	96	98
C20	-31	-43	-340	8					66	59	44	45
AO	Citrem (Day 15)											
	PV	1Pen3ol	1Pen3one	2,4HepA								
CA	13	-166	52	13								
C1	31	-123	65	18								
C4	28	-61	-65	-41								
C8	54	-47	-51	-17								
C12	5	-10	-28	5								
C16	-7	3	-21	5								
C20	-5	12	-15	7								

694 Abbreviation: AO Antioxidant; PV Peroxidase value; 1Pen3ol 1-Penten-3-ol; 1Pen3one 1-Penten-3-one; 2,4HepA 2,4-HeptadienalA. [The 2,4-heptadienal external](#)
 695 [standard appears as two peaks in the chromatogramme, these peaks are termed A and B \(here only 2,4HepA presented\).](#)




Figure 2




Figure 3





Figure 4

1
2
3
4 **Graphical abstract.** CAT Value determined in oil-in-water micro emulsions with caffeic acid and
5
6 caffeates (100 μM) and with and without endogenous tocopherol and. Lipid oxidation was initiated
7
8 with the water soluble radical AAPH.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review



254x142mm (96 x 96 DPI)