

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**Development of a microencapsulation technique
for probiotic bacteria *Lactobacillus casei* 431
using a protein-polysaccharide complex**

**A thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements of
the degree of Masters of Technology in Food Technology at
Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand**

Arup Nag

2011



Massey University

Abstract

According to the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the World Health Organization (WHO), probiotics are defined as “live microorganisms which when administered in adequate amounts confer a health benefit for the host” (FAO/WHO, 2001). *Lactobacilli* and *Bifidobacteria* are two major group of organisms considered to have probiotic properties. Probiotic bacteria are accepted universally for conferring beneficial effects to human gut health. However, the successful delivery of these bacteria to the human intestine via a proper food matrix is challenging because the stresses encountered by the probiotics during processing, storage and gastric transition cause major loss of viability. The primary objective of this study was to develop a novel protection system using a complexation product of dairy protein and a bacterial exopolysaccharide which should be able to protect the probiotic bacteria during their gastric transit and also release them under suitable conditions in the intestine. *Lactobacillus casei* 431, a commercial strain from Chr Hansen, Denmark, was chosen as the experimental strain and the protein-polysaccharide complex was made up of sodium caseinate and gellan gum. Gelation of the sodium caseinate and gellan gum mixture was achieved by a gradual decrease of pH with slow hydrolysis of glucono-delta-lactone (GDL) and *Lactobacillus casei* 431 cells were successfully entrapped into this gel matrix. An intermediate step of forming a water-in-oil emulsion was involved in this process for producing micron level gel particles. The appropriate combination of ingredients, based on final elastic modulus to attain adequate gel strength, was finally decided as 10% (w/w) sodium caseinate, 0.25% (w/w) gellan gum and 2.5% (w/w) GDL. This combination resulted in a very fine and uniform capsule size distribution and up to 89% encapsulation efficiency was achieved.

The gelled microcapsules were freeze dried to obtain better shelf stability and easy handling properties. The particles obtained had diameters ranging from 40 to 1100 μm for wet and 46 to 631 μm for freeze dried microcapsules. The mean diameters (D_{32}) of wet and freeze dried microcapsules were found as 287 and 152 μm , respectively.

Scanning electron microscopic examination of the freeze dried particles showed irregular surfaces and the presence of numerous pores.

Tolerance of free and encapsulated bacterial cells in simulated gastric juice at pH 2.0 was tested in an *in vitro* model and the results showed better survivability of encapsulated cells in both wet and dry microcapsules as compared to the free cells. The log CFU reduction figures after a 2 hour incubation period, were 4.56 for free cells, 3.03 for cells inside wet capsules and 2.28 for cells protected inside freeze dried particles. Incubation of free and encapsulated cells in the presence of 1% (w/v) bile extract for 8 hours showed 2.51 log CFU/gm reductions for free cells with almost no detrimental effect on wet microencapsulated cells and 2.44 log CFU reductions for freeze dried cells.

Further research work was undertaken to improve the post freeze drying survivability of the *L. casei* 431 cells by including cryoprotective solutes in both the culture growth and the drying media. Trehalose and lactose were chosen as cryoprotecting agents. Compared to an average 1.70 log CFU reduction in case of control (no cryoprotectant) samples, trehalose and lactose containing samples both showed a much better survival rate; only 0.84 and 0.37 log CFU/gm reduction respectively, in cell population, were recorded. A membrane coating over the produced microcapsules was applied and the properties of such coated samples were checked separately. The coating process aided in the post drying survivability and only 0.53 and 0.13 log CFU/gm reductions were recorded for trehalose and lactose supplemented samples, respectively. The presence of cryoprotecting compounds proved to be beneficial against the simulated gastric environment and the membrane coating gave additional improvement in this regard. During the gastric fluid incubation tests, cryoprotected samples (freeze dried) containing trehalose and lactose shown a higher survival of 3.13 log CFU/gm and 2.04 log CFU/gm respectively, compared to cells in free form. Improvements offered by the membrane coating were recorded as an additional 0.23 log CFU/gm and 0.66 log CFU/gm higher survival for trehalose and lactose respectively. The same trend was observed for bile salt tolerance also. Cryoprotected samples (freeze dried) containing trehalose and lactose showed a higher survival of 0.41 log CFU/gm and 0.84 log CFU/gm respectively, compared to cells in free form. Additionally, the membrane coating process contributed

towards further improvement in viability of 0.25 log CFU/gm and 0.26 log CFU/gm for trehalose and lactose respectively. Overall, lactose has been found to be a marginally better protectant of cells than trehalose against freeze drying, acid and bile salt stresses.

The membrane coating process helped in forming a very smooth surface morphology devoid of any visible pores. Perhaps the presence of a membrane coating was responsible for this better protective nature of coated microcapsules. But as a drawback, this coating process resulted into higher particle mean diameters, both for wet and freeze dried beads.

Storage of freeze dried samples at 37°C proved to be more detrimental to the entrapped cells than at 4°C. But the results obtained were better compared to the situation where no protective compounds were used. It was found that lactose and trehalose helped in maintaining high levels of viable cell populations during the storage period but the cell degradation rate was positively correlated with the storage temperature.

Therefore, it can be concluded that a low pH sodium caseinate-gellan gum gel matrix can offer adaptation and protection to the probiotic cells before encountering a high acid stomach environment and therefore can be utilized as an effective microencapsulation technique. The survivability of the *L. casei* 431 cells could be further improved during freeze drying as well as gastrointestinal transit by incorporation of protectants, viz., lactose or trehalose and applying a membrane coating of gellan gum. High acid food preparations such as, yogurt and fruit juice could be the probable applications for the current findings.

**To my wife Tuli, my son Antariksh and my parents
For your love and support**

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deep sense of respect, gratitude and appreciation to my chief supervisor Prof. Harjinder Singh and co-supervisors Dr. Shantanu Das and Dr. Kyoung-Sik Han, for their invaluable guidance and constant encouragement throughout my study. Thanks for your patience and making yourselves available at anytime I needed, in spite of your very busy work-schedule.

I am highly grateful to my chief supervisor Prof. Harjinder Singh for offering me a chance to work on this project. His guidance and help in conceiving the project, determining its objectives, methodology and directing me to the right way were invaluable. I am thankful to him for the time he shared in discussing about minute details of the project and guided me in the right direction during the periods of confusion. Working under his guidance was the most memorable experience I have ever had.

I would like to offer my special thanks to Dr. Shantanu Das for getting involved in this project at a later stage, for constant support, helpful guidance and valuable discussions throughout my Masters study tenure. Thanks for supporting and helping me to get accustomed with this new environment and to address any difficulties I faced during my initial days.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Kyoung-Sik Han for teaching me the day to day experimental protocols in minute details and sharing his valuable time during regular discussions. He has been very helpful to evaluate the gradual progress of my project.

I am offering my special thanks to the Co-directors of the Riddet Institute, Prof. Paul Moughan and Prof. Harjinder Singh for approving the financial assistance in the form of

Masters Scholarship and project funding. Their encouragement and inspiration was highly valuable for me.

I extend my sense of gratitude to Ms. Gililand Janiene, Mr. Chris Hall and Mrs. Ann-Marie Jackson for their support and encouragement during my working in the Riddet and SEAT laboratories. I am also thankful to Ms. Michelle Tamehana of IFNHH for helping me in using a few instruments in her lab.

I am expressing my sincere gratitude to Mr. Dough Hofcroft and Mr. Dimitri Sokolov from the Manawatu Microscopic Imaging Centre (MMIC) for their invaluable help and guidance in analyzing my samples for electron microscopic imaging.

I thank Mr. Mathew Levin, Mrs. Terri Palmer, Ms. Willi Twight, Mrs. Ansley Te Hiwi, Mr. John Henley King, Ms. Paula MacCool and Mrs. Felicia Stibbards for their administrative support.

I would like to take the opportunity to thank my friends and colleagues in New Zealand Anwasha, Jinita, Ranjita, Shampa, Debjit, Abhimanyu, Malesh, Prabhu, Peter, Jack, Rajesh, Amit and Nimmi for their help and valuable suggestions at many occasions during my study.

I would like to thank my wife Tuli, who encouraged and supported me in all my efforts of Masters study. I cannot express strongly enough my gratitude for your support and continuous encouragement and for your love. I express my gratitude to my parents and my younger brother for their constant support and encouragement throughout and handling a number of administrative tasks regarding scholarship and travelling. I express my gratitude to my parents-in-law for their love and support. Last but not the least, I express my thanks and love to my son Antariskh, who with his love, affection and support made my tenure of study an enjoyable period.

Contents

Abstract.....	I
Acknowledgements.....	V
Contents.....	VII
List of tables.....	XVI
List of figures.....	XVII
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2. Literature review.....	5
2.1 Introduction.....	5
2.2 What are probiotic bacteria?.....	5
2.2.1 Definitions.....	5
2.2.2 Characteristics of probiotic bacteria	6
2.2.2.1 General microbiological criteria	7
2.2.2.2 Technological aspects	7
2.2.2.3 Functional benefits of probiotic bacteria.....	7
2.2.3 Probiotics in human gastro-intestinal tract	8
2.2.4 Some common probiotic species and strains	10
2.2.4.1 <i>Lactobacillus</i> species.....	12
2.2.4.2 <i>Bifidobacterium</i> species.....	13
2.2.5 Health benefits and human clinical trials with probiotic bacteria.....	13
2.2.6 Regulations governing foods containing probiotics	16
2.2.7 Mechanism of probiotic bacteria functionalities	17
2.2.7.1 Reduction of luminal pH.....	18
2.2.7.2 Production of hydrogen peroxide.....	19
2.2.7.3 Production of bacteriocins.....	19
2.2.7.4 Fermentative production of carbon dioxide.....	19
2.2.7.5 Diacetyl production by fermentation.....	20
2.2.7.6 Deconjugation of bile acids.....	20

2.2.8 Challenges involved in incorporating probiotics into food.....	21
2.2.8.1 Food processing factors.....	21
2.2.8.2 Exposure to gastric acid present in stomach	21
2.2.8.3 Exposure to bile salts present in intestinal fluid.....	22
2.2.8.4 Oxygen intolerance of probiotic strains.....	22
2.2.9 Selection criteria of a probiotic strain for microencapsulation and subsequent food applications.....	23
2.3 Microencapsulation overview.....	24
2.3.1 Definition.....	24
2.3.2 Purpose of microencapsulation.....	25
2.3.3 Structure of microcapsules.....	25
2.3.4 Microencapsulation techniques.....	28
2.3.4.1 Extrusion technique for microencapsulation.....	28
2.3.4.2 Emulsion technique for microencapsulation.....	31
2.3.4.3 Use of drying technology for microencapsulation.....	32
2.3.4.3.1 Spray drying as a technique of microencapsulation.....	32
2.3.4.3.2 Microencapsulation of probiotics with freeze drying.....	35
2.3.4.3.3 Other drying methods used for microencapsulation.....	36
2.3.4.4 Microencapsulation with spray chilling.....	36
2.3.4.5 Coacervation technique for microencapsulation.....	37
2.3.4.6 Co-crystalization method.....	38
2.3.4.7 Molecular inclusion.....	39
2.3.4.8 Centrifugal extrusion technique.....	40
2.3.5 Selection criteria of choosing encapsulating matrix.....	41
2.3.6 Gelation mechanism of dairy proteins.....	42
2.3.6.1 Acid gelation of casein.....	42
2.3.6.2 Enzymatic gelation.....	43
2.3.7 Use of milk proteins in microencapsulation.....	44
2.3.7.1 Introduction.....	44
2.3.7.2 Whey protein as wall material for microencapsulation.....	44
2.3.7.3 Use of sodium caseinate as microencapsulating agent.....	46

2.3.8 Use of glucono-delta-lactone in gelation of milk proteins.....	47
2.3.9 Use of gellan gum as microencapsulation wall material.....	48
2.4 Drying of probiotic culture and related physiological stresses.....	50
2.4.1 Use of cryoprotective agents in the freeze drying media.....	50
2.4.2 Trehalose and lactose as cryoprotective compounds.....	52
2.4.3 Improving freeze drying viability by proper cell harvesting.....	53
2.4.4 Use of additives in the growth media for enhanced protection during drying.....	53
2.5 Summary and conclusion.....	54

Chapter 3.0 Development of the microencapsulation process and studying the properties of produced microcapsules.....56

3.1 Introduction.....	56
3.2 Materials and methods.....	56
3.2.1 Ingredients and chemicals.....	57
3.2.2 Studying the gel formation and gel behavior of the encapsulating media..	57
3.2.3 Preparation of cell suspension.....	59
3.2.4 Microencapsulation process of <i>L. casei</i> cells.....	59
3.2.5 Optimization of the Core -Wall ratio.....	60
3.2.6 Particle size distribution analysis.....	61
3.2.7 Evaluation protocol for protection of bacterial cells in simulated gastric juice.....	62
3.2.8 Survival of encapsulated and free cells in presence of bile salts.....	63
3.2.9 Statistical analysis.....	64
3.3 Results and discussion.....	65
3.3.1 Gelation of sodium caseinate and gellan gum mixture.....	65
3.3.2 Encapsulation efficiency.....	68
3.3.3 Particle size distribution.....	69
3.3.4 Survival of encapsulated and free cells in SGF and under simulated bile conditions.....	70

3.4 Conclusion.....	74
Chapter 4.0 Effect of freeze drying on the physical properties and viability of probiotic cells entrapped in the microcapsules	76
4.1 Introduction.....	76
4.2 Materials and methods.....	77
4.2.1 Ingredients and chemicals.....	77
4.2.2 Preparing <i>L. casei</i> cell suspension.....	77
4.2.3 Microencapsulation technique.....	77
4.2.4 Freeze drying of wet gelled microcapsules.....	77
4.2.5 Measuring size distribution of freeze dried microcapsules.....	78
4.2.6 Scanning Electron Microscopic (SEM) examination.....	78
4.2.7 <i>L. casei</i> cell viability during <i>in vitro</i> gastric transit and in presence of bile salts.....	78
4.2.8 Storage stability test and moisture content determination	79
4.2.9 Statistical analysis.....	79
4.3 Results and discussion.....	80
4.3.1 Particle size distribution of freeze dried microcapsules.....	80
4.3.2 Scanning electron microscopic examination.....	82
4.3.3 Effect of freeze drying on microencapsulated <i>L. casei</i> cell viability.....	84
4.3.4 Protection of microencapsulated and freeze dried <i>L. casei</i> cells in simulated gastric juice.....	87
4.3.5 Effect of bile salts on encapsulated cells in freeze dried microcapsules.....	89
4.3.6 Enumeration of viable cells.....	90
4.3.7 Storage stability of the freeze dried microcapsules.....	91
4.4 Conclusion.....	94

Chapter 5.0 Improvements in post drying cell survival and gastric tolerance by incorporating cryoprotectants and by applying membrane coating around the microcapsules.....96

5.1 Introduction.....	96
5.2 Materials and methods.....	98
5.2.1 Ingredients and chemicals.....	98
5.2.2 Growth media formulation and culturing of <i>L. casei</i> cells.....	98
5.2.3 Microencapsulation process.....	98
5.2.4 Membrane coating process around the microcapsules.....	100
5.2.5 Particle size distribution.....	100
5.2.6 Electron microscopic examination of the microcapsules.....	101
5.2.7 Survivability of <i>L. casei</i> cells in simulated gastric and bile salt environments.....	102
5.2.8 Storage stability test.....	102
5.2.9 Statistical analysis.....	102
5.3 Results and discussion.....	103
5.3.1 Particle size distributions of membrane coated microspheres.....	103
5.3.2 Microscopic examination of the membrane coated freeze dried particles.....	105
5.3.2.1 Light microscopic imaging of the freeze dried TMB and LMB microcapsules.....	105
5.3.2.2 Transmission electron microscopic view of dry TMB and LMB microcapsules.....	107
5.3.2.3 Scanning electron microscopic images of the dried TMB and LMB capsule surfaces.....	109
5.3.3 Analysis of cell survivability out of freeze drying.....	111
5.3.4 Role of compatible solutes added in cell growth media.....	114
5.3.5 Effect of cryoprotective compounds and membrane coating process on acid tolerance (simulated gastric conditions) of <i>L. casei</i> cells.....	115
5.3.5.1 Behavior of free <i>L. casei</i> cells in simulated gastric fluid.....	115
5.3.5.2 Effect of trehalose and membrane coating on acid tolerance of <i>L.</i>	

<i>casei</i> cells.....	116
5.3.5.3 Effect of lactose and membrane coating on acid tolerance of <i>L. casei</i> cells.....	117
5.3.6 Effect of bile salts on free and encapsulated <i>L. casei</i> cells.....	120
5.3.6.1 Behavior of free cells in presence of bile salts.....	120
5.3.6.2 Effect of trehalose and membrane coating on bile salt tolerance of <i>L. casei</i> cells.....	121
5.3.6.3 Effect of lactose and membrane coating on bile salt tolerance of <i>L. casei</i> cells.....	122
5.3.7 Storage stability of the <i>L. casei</i> cells in freeze dried microcapsules.....	127
5.3.7.1 Survival of encapsulated freeze dried cells stored at 4°C.....	127
5.3.7.2 Survival of encapsulated freeze dried cells stored at 37°C.....	128
5.3.8 Conclusion.....	130
Chapter 6.0 Overall conclusion and future recommendations.....	132
References.....	135

Appendices

Appendix 3.1 Measuring growth curve and identifying the stationary phase of <i>L. casei</i> 431 bacteria grown in MRS broth with 1% (v/v) inoculation.....	170
Appendix 3.2 Particle size distribution data for wet microcapsule samples prepared in Chapter 3.0 experiments.....	171
Appendix 3.3 Survival of <i>L. casei</i> cells in free form and inside wet microcapsules when subjected to simulated gastric juice at pH 2.0 without pepsin.....	172
Appendix 3.4 Action of simulated gastric juice at pH 2.0 with 0.32% pepsin on <i>L. casei</i> cells in free form and inside wet microcapsules.....	173
Appendix 3.5 Survival of <i>L. casei</i> cells in free form and microencapsulated in wet capsules in a simulated bile solution with 1.0% (w/w) bile extract.....	174
Appendix 4.1 Volume distribution data for freeze dried particles as prepared in Chapter 4.0.....	175
Appendix 4.2 Survival of <i>L. casei</i> cells microencapsulated in wet and freeze dried form during incubation in simulated gastric fluid.....	176
Appendix 4.3 Action of bile salts on <i>L. casei</i> cells encapsulated in wet and freeze dried microcapsules.....	177
Appendix 4.4 Moisture content analysis of wet and freeze dried microcapsules.....	178
Appendix 4.5 Changes in cell viability of freeze dried microencapsulated beads containing <i>L. casei</i> cells, during storage (Chapter 4.0).....	179

Appendix 5.1 Comparative particle size distribution data for both wet and dried uncoated, TMB and LMB samples.....180

Appendix 5.2 Loss of viability due to freeze drying (Chapter 5.0 experimental data)..181

Appendix 5.3 Survival of *Lactobacillus casei*, in free form and microencapsulated in wet and dried TB samples form when treated in simulated gastric fluid.....182

Appendix 5.4 Survival of *Lactobacillus casei*, in free form and microencapsulated in in wet and dried TMB samples form when treated in simulated gastric fluid.....183

Appendix 5.5 Survival of *Lactobacillus casei*, in free form and microencapsulated in in wet and dried LB samples form when treated in simulated gastric fluid.....184

Appendix 5.6 Survival of *Lactobacillus casei*, in free form and microencapsulated in in wet and dried LMB samples form when treated in simulated gastric fluid.....185

Appendix 5.7 Response of free, wet and dry encapsulated (TB) *L. casei* cells in presence of 1% porcine bile extract.....186

Appendix 5.8 Survivability of free and membrane coated (TMB) *L. casei* cells in simulated bile environment.....187

Appendix 5.9 Response of free, wet and dry encapsulated (LB) *L. casei* cells in presence of 1% porcine bile extract.....188

Appendix 5.10 Survivability of free and membrane coated (LMB) *L. casei* cells in simulated bile environment.....189

Appendix 5.11 Storage stability of control sample (freeze dried) with no cryoprotectant or membrane coating (Chapter 5.0).....190

Appendix 5.12 Storage stability of freeze dried TB samples prepared as per chapter 5.0.....191

Appendix 5.13 Storage stability of freeze dried TMB samples prepared as per chapter 5.0.....192

Appendix 5.14 Storage stability of freeze dried LB samples prepared as per chapter 5.0.....193

Appendix 5.15 Storage stability of freeze dried LMB samples prepared as per chapter 5.0.....194

List of tables

Table 2.1 Microorganisms used or considered for use as probiotics in human.....	11
Table 2.2 Different probiotic bacteria strains and their health benefits.....	15
Table 3.1 Optimization of the core-wall proportions by adding various concentrations of free cell suspensions.....	68
Table 4.1 Sieve analysis of freeze dried microcapsules done in Malvern Mastersizer Scirocco-2000 unit.....	81

List of figures

Figure 2.1 Microbial colonization of the human gastro-intestinal tract.....	9
Figure 2.2 Schematic diagram of two representative types of microcapsules, A: Matrix type and B: Aggregate type capsule.....	27
Figure 2.3 Various forms of microcapsules used in the food industry.....	27
Figure 2.4 2-D Skeletal image of Glucono-delta-lactone molecule.....	47
Figure 2.5 Structural unit of gellan gum molecules.....	48
Figure 3.1 Optimized process flow diagram of the cell culturing and microencapsulation of <i>Lactobacillus casei</i> bacteria.....	58
Figure 3.2 Changes in elastic modulus G' of 10% sodium caseinate solution mixed with 1.0% (◆), 1.5% (●), 2.0% (■) and 2.5% (▼) glucono-δ-lactone.....	65
Figure 3.3 Changes in elastic modulus (G') after the addition of 0.1% (■), 0.25% (◆) and 0.50% (▼) gellan gum into a control sample (●) containing 10% sodium caseinate and 2.5% glucono-δ-lactone	66
Figure 3.4 Changes in the pH by the action of 2.5% glucono-δ-lactone on 10% sodium caseinate (■) and 10% sodium caseinate mixed with 0.25% gellan gum (▲) during incubation for 240 min at 20 °C	67
Figure 3.5 Particle size distribution curve of the microcapsules, as obtained using a Malvern Mastersizer.....	69

Figure 3.6 Survival of encapsulated cells (Δ , with pepsin; \circ , without pepsin) and free cells (\blacktriangle , with pepsin; \bullet , without pepsin) of *Lactobacillus casei* in simulated gastric fluid incubated at pH 2.0 for 120 min. The error bars indicate standard deviations from the mean values of three replicated experiments.....71

Figure 3.7 Survival of encapsulated cells (\blacksquare) and free cells (\blacklozenge) of *Lactobacillus casei* under simulated bile conditions during 8 h of incubation. The error bars indicate standard deviations from the mean values of three replicated experiments.....73

Figure 4.1 Volume distribution curve of wet (\blacktriangle) and freeze dried (\times) particles plotted against surface based diameters measured in Malvern Mastersizer, U.K.....80

Figure 4.2.1 Surface of a particle viewed at 5000x magnification.....82

Figure 4.2.2 Agglomerated microcapsules viewed at 250x magnification.....82

Figure 4.2.3 Cross sectional view at 2500x magnification showing presence of a few *L. casei* cells (black arrows).....82

Figure 4.2.4 Uneven surface properties viewed at 1000x magnification.....82

Figure 4.2.5 Surface morphology at 2500x magnification showing presence of numerous pores.....83

Figure 4.2.6 Rod shaped *L. casei* cell visible on a cross sectional view at 20000x magnification.....83

Figure 4.3 Effect of freeze drying on the survival of microencapsulated *L. casei* cells..85

Figure 4.4 Survival of *L. casei* cells microencapsulated in wet (\blacklozenge) and freeze dried (\blacksquare) form during incubation in simulated gastric fluid. The values shown are the mean values of 3 replicates.....87

Figure 4.5 Action of bile salts on <i>L. casei</i> cells encapsulated in wet (◆) and freeze dried (■) microcapsules.....	89
Figure 4.6 <i>L. casei</i> colonies plated on MRS agar.....	91
Figure 4.7 Changes in cell viability of freeze dried microencapsules containing <i>L. casei</i> cells, during storage at -20°C (■), 4°C (◆) and 37°C (▲). Error bars representing standard deviations from the mean value of 3 replicated counts.....	92
Figure 5.1 Process flow diagram of the microencapsulation technique.....	99
Figure 5.2 Particle size distributions of wet (◆) and freeze dried (■) TMB microcapsules, compared with no-membrane coated wet (▲) and dried (x) samples.....	103
Figure 5.3 Particle size distributions of wet (◆) and freeze dried (■) LMB microcapsules, compared with without-membrane wet (▲) and dried (x) samples.....	104
Cross sectional images of TMB microcapsules at 200x (Fig. 5.4.1), at 400x (Fig. 5.4.2) magnifications and the same for LMB microcapsules at 200x (Fig. 5.4.3) and at 400x (Fig. 5.4.4) viewed by light microscopy with toluidine blue staining.....	106
Figure 5.4.5 TEM image of TMB capsule cross section showing caseinate, gellan & trehalose complexation.....	107
Figure 5.4.6 Cross sectional view of LMB capsule by TEM image.....	107
Figure 5.4.7 TEM image showing presence of <i>L. casei</i> cells inside TMB microcapsule.....	108
Figure 5.4.8 <i>L. casei</i> cells entrapped in LMB capsule, viewed via TEM imaging.....	108

Figure 5.4.9 TEM image view of membrane coating formation around TMB capsule.108

Figure 5.4.10 TEM image showing presence of membrane coating on LMB capsule..108

Figure 5.4.11 SEM image of TMB capsule surface viewed at 5000x magnification...109

Figure 5.4.12 Surface of LMB capsules, viewed at 5000x magnification on SEM.....115

Figure 5.4.13 Surface morphology of a TMB microcapsule at 10000x magnification..110

Figure 5.4.14 Surface morphology of a LMB microcapsule at 10000x magnification..110

Figure 5.4.15 Particle shape of TMB microbeads as viewed via SEM image.....110

Figure 5.4.16 Particle shape of LMB microbeads as viewed via SEM image.....110

Figure 5.5 Comparative cell viability before (Wet ■) and after freeze drying (Dry ■) of uncoated capsules containing trehalose (TB) & lactose (LB) and membrane coated capsules containing trehalose (TMB) and lactose (LMB). Error bars representing standard deviations from the mean value of 3 replicated counts.....111

Figure 5.6 Survival of *Lactobacillus casei*, in free form (◆) and microencapsulated in uncoated, trehalose containing beads (TB), in wet (■) and dried (▲) form when treated in simulated gastric fluid (SGF). Error bars representing standard deviations from the mean value of 3 replicated counts.....116

Figure 5.7 Survival of *L. casei* cells in free form (◆) and protected in membrane coated trehalose containing capsules (TMB), in both wet (■) and dried (▲) forms, when incubated in simulated gastric fluid. Error bars representing standard deviations from the mean value of 3 replicated counts.....117

Figure 5.8 Survival of *Lactobacillus casei*, in free form (◆) and microencapsulated in uncoated, lactose containing beads (LB), in wet (■) and dried (▲) form when treated in simulated gastric fluid (SGF). Error bars representing standard deviations from the mean value of 3 replicated counts.....118

Figure 5.9 Survival of *L. casei* cells in free form (◆) and protected in membrane coated lactose containing capsules (LMB), in both wet (■) and dried (▲) forms, when incubated in simulated gastric fluid. Error bars representing standard deviations from the mean value of 3 replicated counts.....119

Figure 5.10 Response of free (◆), wet (■) and dry (▲) encapsulated (TB) *L. casei* cells in presence of 1% porcine bile extract. Error bars representing standard deviations from the mean value of 3 replicated counts.....121

Figure 5.11 Survivability of free (◆) and membrane coated (TMB) *L. casei* cells in simulated bile environment. Membrane coated capsules were tested for wet (■) and dried (▲) forms. Error bars representing standard deviations from the mean value of 3 replicated counts.....122

Figure 5.12 Response of free (◆), wet (■) and dry (▲) encapsulated (LB) *L. casei* cells in presence of 1% porcine bile extract. Error bars representing standard deviations from the mean value of 3 replicated counts123

Figure 5.13 Survivability of free (◆) and membrane coated (LMB) *L. casei* cells in simulated bile environment. Membrane coated capsules were tested for wet (■) and dried (▲) forms. Error bars representing standard deviations from the mean value of 3 replicated counts.....124

Figure 5.14 Result summary for comparing the effect of cryoprotecting compounds in wet microcapsules (TB x, TMB ■, LB ▲, LMB *) on bile tolerance, against the wet control sample (●) with no protectant. Error bars representing standard deviations from the mean value of 3 replicated counts.....125

Figure 5.15 Result summary for comparing the effect of cryoprotecting compounds in dry microcapsules (TB x, TMB ■, LB ▲, LMB *) on bile tolerance, against the dry control sample (●) with no protectant. Error bars representing standard deviations from the mean value of 3 replicated counts.....126

Figure 5.16 Stability of microencapsulated *L. casei* cells in freeze dried microparticles when stored at 4°C. Graphs showing TB (●), LB (■), TMB (■) and LMB (▲) samples in comparison with the control sample (◆). Error bars representing standard deviations from the mean value of 3 replicated counts.....128

Figure 5.17 Stability of microencapsulated *L. casei* cells in freeze dried microparticles when stored at 37°C. Graphs showing TB (●), LB (■), TMB (■) and LMB (▲) samples in comparison with the control sample (◆). Error bars representing standard deviations from the mean value of 3 replicated counts.....129