

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.

**Bioactive Extracts of *Olea europaea*
Waste Streams**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Technology in Food Technology at
Massey University

Nicholas Paul Mossop

2006

Abstract

The production of olive oil has seen an increase in recent years due to a broader understanding of the health benefits of the Mediterranean Aliment Culture. With this expanding industry we also see an increase in the waste products associated with olive oil production. Given the high polluting content of the waste streams and the economic costs associated with its removal and processing, waste remediation and disposal has become a significant point of interest for both producers and local bodies. In this project, wastes of the olive oil production industry are examined for their use as the raw material for a novel product used in the control of horticulturally important diseases, examining the effect of extraction protocols on the activity of the final product.

Active fractions of the olive oil wastes were identified from literature and protocols for their extraction and recovery developed; incorporating both standard solvent extraction and novel ultrasound-assisted extraction. Criteria for the analysis of extract quality were outlined and potential target applications identified.

The biophenolic compounds of olive wastes were identified as providing the majority of the active fraction, so protocols were developed for the recovery of these compounds. Standard solvent extraction and ultrasound-assisted extraction were examined for their effectiveness of biophenolic recovery and their effect on product quality. Certain horticulturally important diseases were identified as potential targets, and bioassays undertaken to determine the ability of a crude extract to inhibit and control these diseases.

It was found that the action of ultrasound during extraction provides a greater degree of recovery of biophenolic compounds, with minimal loss of product quality; as determined by bioassays and total biophenol determination. This increase in recovery is due primarily to the destruction of cellular material resulting in higher rates and absolute yields of recovery. This work provides evidence of the occurrence of some

interesting phenomenon in the recovery of biophenols from olive wastes that deserves further examination.

The crude olive leaf extract was shown to have an inhibitory effect on bacteria and effectively no inhibitory effect on fungal species in the total biophenol ranges tested. Erwinia amylovora and Staphylococcus aureus both showed a large susceptibility to the olive leaf extract. Results showed a higher degree of susceptibility of Gram positive bacteria and a potential resistance in soil microbes. For bacterial species, total biophenol concentrations of 0.15 to 3.50 mg GAE/ml provided inhibitory effects, while with the fungal species tested, no inhibitory effects were found at total biophenol concentrations of up to 2.50 mg GAE/ml.

Some evidence exists that there is an opportunity for the economic recovery of olive biophenols for use as a novel product, but more work is required to determine specific applications and/or targets of use, as well as optimisation of the extraction and purification protocol. A sample removed from interfering compounds will allow the examination of activity of particular compounds and hence a better understanding of the action of the olive waste extract.

Acknowledgments

Foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor John Mawson of Fresh Technologies, Massey University, for his guidance and words of encouragement.

I would like to thank the New Zealand Olive Association and Certified Organics for their invaluable financial support and Alistair Bridge at Bridgegrove, Otaki, for his help in sourcing raw materials. Julian Heyes and Tatyana Pinkney at Crop and Food Research Ltd, Palmerston North, for their help with the HPLC analysis of samples. Tony Patterson for his ‘moral’ support and ‘encouraging’ words that helped me maintain my focus on my final goals. Steve Glasgow, Mike Sahayam, Peter Long, and Gary Radford for help with practical elements of the project. To Kathy Hamilton for helping me cut through bureaucratic red tape that could have turned me into an enemy of that state, and Yvonne Parkes for keeping me in budget and connected.

I wish to thank most of all, my friends and family whose support is immeasurable; without your encouragement I would not be here writing my acknowledgements. Mum, Dad, Paul, and Muk. All my friends at Massey, I’ve seen many faces come and go. And Alexa Gray, whose love and support helped me through some of the toughest times and steered me to my final destination. Thank you.

Table of Contents

<i>Abstract</i>	<i>I</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>III</i>
<i>Table of Contents</i>	<i>IV</i>
<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>VIII</i>
<i>List of Tables</i>	<i>XIII</i>
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review	5
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Olive Oil Production	6
2.2.1 Olive Oil Extraction	6
2.2.2 Problems to Face and Opportunities Exposed – Wastes and Recycle	9
2.3 Minor Components of <i>Olea europaea</i>	10
2.3.1 Structure of Major Biophenolic Constituents	11
2.3.2 Phenolic Metabolism and Stability.....	15
2.3.3 Phenolic Profile and Distribution	17
2.4 Activity of Olive Biophenolics	21
2.4.1 Antioxidant Activity.....	22
2.4.1.1 Data from Literature	23
2.4.1.2 Pro-oxidant Effects	24
2.4.2 Antimicrobial Activities	25
2.4.2.1 Antifungal Activities of Olive Biophenols from Literature	26
2.4.2.2 Antibacterial Activities of Olive Biophenols from Literature	28
2.4.3 Phytotoxic Activities	29
2.4.4 Human Toxicity Testing.....	31
2.4.5 Factors Affecting Biophenolic Activity	32
2.4.5.1 Variations Due to Plant Constituent	35
2.4.5.2 Variations Due to Extractive Procedures.....	35
2.5 Potential Applications for Olive Extract	36
2.5.1 Crop Management	36

2.5.1.1 Weed Control	37
2.5.1.2 Disease Control	38
2.5.1.3 Pest Control.....	38
2.5.2 Post-Harvest Stability of Fruit	39
2.5.3 Antioxidant Additive	41
2.5.4 Adjuvant of Pre-existing Product.....	42
2.6 Extraction/Purification Protocols for Recovery of Phenolic Compounds _____	43
2.6.1 Extraction of Bioactive Compounds from Plant Sources.....	44
2.6.2 Solvent Extraction	46
2.6.2.1 The Mechanics of Leaching	46
2.6.2.2 Solvent Selection.....	47
2.6.3 Ultrasound-Assisted Extraction	48
2.6.3.1 Ultrasound – Glossary of Terms	49
2.6.3.2 Mechanics of Ultrasound	49
2.6.3.3 Factors Affecting Cavitation	52
2.6.3.4 Degradation Effects of Ultrasound on Phenols	56
2.6.3.4.1 Phenol Degradation Pathways.....	59
2.6.3.4.2 Rates of Sonochemical Degradation of Phenol	61
2.6.3.5 Effects on Adsorption Characteristics	62
<i>Chapter 3 Analytical Methodologies.....</i>	65
3.1 Introduction _____	65
3.2 Analysis of Total Biophenol Content _____	65
3.2.1 Sources of Error	66
3.2.1.1 Sugars.....	67
3.2.1.2 Ascorbic Acid	67
3.2.1.3 Organic Compound Inhibition	69
3.2.2 Method Development	72
3.2.2.1 Repeatability and Reproducibility.....	73
3.3 HPLC Analysis of Extracts _____	74
3.3.3 Protocol.....	75
3.3.4 Analysis of Results	75
3.3.4.1 Standards for Extract Characterisation.....	76
3.3.4.2 Olive Extract	79
3.4 Miscellaneous Methods _____	80
3.4.5 Moisture Content	80
3.4.6 Measurement of pH	80
3.4.7 Ionic Composition	80

Chapter 4 Extract Preparation and Solvent Extraction.....	81
4.1 Introduction _____	81
4.2 Materials and Preparation _____	82
4.2.1 Sources and Harvesting.....	82
4.2.2 Pre-treatment and Storage.....	82
4.2.2.1 Leaf Material.....	82
4.2.2.2 Pomace Material.....	83
4.3 Extract Preparation Protocol _____	83
4.3.3 Contaminants and Impurities.....	84
4.3.3.1 Lipids and Oils.....	84
4.3.3.2 Salt and Inorganic Compounds.....	85
4.3.3.3 Ethanol.....	85
4.3.4 Recovery and Purification Method Development.....	85
4.3.4.1 Preconditioning.....	87
4.3.4.2 Extraction.....	87
4.3.4.3 Purification and Concentration.....	87
4.3.4.4 Product Finishing.....	92
4.4 Solvent Extraction _____	93
4.4.5 Solvent Selection.....	93
4.4.6 Yield and Phenol Profile.....	98
4.4.6.1 Recovery of Phenols.....	98
4.4.6.2 Profile of Phenolic Compounds.....	100
4.5 Conclusions _____	101
Chapter 5 Ultrasound-Assisted Solvent Extraction.....	103
5.1 Defining Conditions for Ultrasound-Assisted Extraction _____	103
5.1.1 Apparatus.....	104
5.1.2 Measuring Ultrasonic Power Output.....	106
5.1.2.1 Power Setting.....	110
5.1.2.2 Solvent Composition.....	110
5.1.2.3 Temperature Effects.....	111
5.1.2.4 Degassing Effects.....	112
5.1.3 Conditions for Extraction.....	114
5.2 Yield and Phenolic Profile _____	115
5.2.4 Recovery of Phenols.....	115
5.2.5 Profile of Phenolic Compounds.....	119
5.3 Stability of Phenol Species during US Extraction _____	120

5.4 Conclusions	122
Chapter 6 Biological Assays.....	125
6.1 Introduction	125
6.1.1 Target Cultures	125
6.1.2 Types of Bioassays	126
6.2 Antibacterial Testing	127
6.2.3 Method Development	127
6.2.3.1 Minimum Inhibitory Concentration	128
6.2.3.2 Bactericidal Activity	130
6.2.4 Analysis of Antibacterial Activity	132
6.2.4.1 Minimum Inhibitory Testing	132
6.2.4.2 Bactericidal Testing	133
6.3 Antifungal Testing	140
6.3.5 Method Development	140
6.3.6 Analysis of Antifungal Activity	143
6.3.6.1 <i>Alternaria alternata</i>	143
6.3.6.2 <i>Botrytis cinerea</i>	144
6.3.6.3 <i>Eutypa lata</i>	145
6.3.6.4 <i>Penicillium digitatum</i>	147
6.4 Conclusions	148
Chapter 7 Implementation.....	151
7.1 Introduction	151
7.2 Models for Extraction of Phenols from Olive Leaf	151
7.3 Process Design	160
7.4 Feasibility of Application	166
7.5 Conclusions	166
Chapter 8 Conclusions and Recommendations.....	168
References	172

List of Figures

Figure 2-1 Mass balance showing BP concentrations in various oil production streams.....	7
Figure 2-2 Structure of a simple phenol and 1,2-diphenol (Ryan <i>et al.</i> , 2002).....	10
Figure 2-3 Structure of main olive secoiridoids (Ryan <i>et al.</i> , 2002).....	12
Figure 2-4 Simple substituted phenols present in olive plant material (Ryan <i>et al.</i> , 2002).....	13
Figure 2-5 Main flavanoid compounds found in olive cultivars (Ryan <i>et al.</i> , 2002)..	14
Figure 2-6 Other important BP's found in olives (Ryan <i>et al.</i> , 2002).....	15
Figure 2-7 The oxidation states of phenolic compounds. (Appel, 1993)	34
Figure 2-8 Potential modes of phenolic binding. (Appel, 1993).....	35
Figure 2-9 Basics steps in isolation of biological products from a plant source.....	44
Figure 2-10 Pressure waves in air (Mason, 1990).....	50
Figure 2-11 Size reduction of NaS under the influence of ultrasound (Hagenson and Doraiswamy, 1998).	51
Figure 2-12 High-speed microcinemagraphic sequence of laser-induced cavitation near a solid surface showing microjet impact; 75,000 frames per second (Suslick, 1990).....	52
Figure 2-13 An increase in cavitation threshold.	56
Figure 2-14 A decrease in cavitation intensity.....	56
Figure 2-15 Combination of factors on US power delivery.....	56

Figure 2-16 Zones of reactivity under sonochemical irradiation.	57
Figure 2-17 Proposed oxidative degradation for <i>p</i> -coumaric acid	61
Figure 2-18 Proposed ring cleavage intermediates from the degradation of <i>p</i> -coumaric acid	61
Figure 3-1 Depression of colorimetric TBP determination in two olive leaf extracts, of different concentrations states, due to organic effects.....	70
Figure 3-2 Spike test of olive leaf extracts	71
Figure 3-3 Retention and absorbance spectra of HPLC standards	77
Figure 3-4 Retention and absorbance spectra of HPLC standards	77
Figure 3-5 HPLC profile of Oleuropein hydrolyse.....	78
Figure 3-6 HPLC profile of crude extract of olive leaf.	79
Figure 4-1 Schematic of the phenol purification protocol.....	86
Figure 4-2 Effect of pH on gallic acid binding.....	89
Figure 4-3 Effect of concentration on gallic acid binding.....	89
Figure 4-4 Effect of EtOH content on gallic acid binding.	89
Figure 4-5 Effect of resin ratio on recovery of gallic acid.	89
Figure 4-6 Effect of temperature on binding of gallic acid.	89
Figure 4-7 Kinetics of the binding of gallic acid.....	89
Figure 4-8 HPLC profile prior to resin application.	90
Figure 4-9 HPLC profile after resin application.....	90
Figure 4-10 Resin overflow.....	90
Figure 4-11 Schematic of a Soxhlet extractor.	94

Figure 4-12 Solvent flowrates through a Soxhlet extraction vessel.....	95
Figure 4-13 Extraction yields of phenol compounds from olive pomace in different pure solvent systems.....	95
Figure 4-14 Extraction yields of phenol compounds from olive leaf different pure solvent systems.....	96
Figure 4-15 Effect of solvent polarity, defined by Hildebrand Solubility Parameter, on the final of TBP content of concentrated extracts of olive pomace.	97
Figure 4-16 Effect of ethanol concentration on the recovery of phenols from plant tissues	98
Figure 4-17 Phenol content vs. time over the first 900 seconds of extraction	99
Figure 4-18 HPLC phenolic profile of a standard solvent olive leaf extract.	101
Figure 5-1 Power output of different probes.....	104
Figure 5-2 Schematic representation of horn placement.....	106
Figure 5-3 Temperature profile during ultrasound treatment of water	108
Figure 5-4 Rate of temperature change during ultrasound treatment of water.....	108
Figure 5-5 Power dissipated into system as heat during ultrasound treatment of water showing contribution of heat losses to total power dissipation.....	109
Figure 5-6 Initial power output of ½'ultrasound horn at different power settings dependant on solvent composition.	110
Figure 5-7 Power dissipation with and without 5g leaf material in ethanol/water (75:25) at power setting 9.....	111
Figure 5-8 The effect of temperature on the power dissipated in ethanol/water (75:25)	112
Figure 5-9 Power decrease due to inherent degassing effects of sonication	113

Figure 5-10 Expected power dissipation profile of an isothermal water system at power setting 3.	114
Figure 5-11 Yield of phenols during standard solvent extraction and US-assisted extraction	116
Figure 5-12 Mass fraction of phenols between solid matrix and solution, comparison between control and US extractions.	117
Figure 5-13 Recovery of phenol as % remaining in leaf	118
Figure 5-14 HPLC profile of A) standard solvent extract; B) US-assisted extract. ...	119
Figure 5-15 Degradation of phenols in a leaf extract during ultrasound treatment...	121
Figure 6-1 Microtitration plate used in MIC testing of bacterial cultures. <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> shown as example.	129
Figure 6-2 Optical density of TBP control samples.	131
Figure 6-3 Effect of nisin on growth of <i>E. amylovora</i>	134
Figure 6-4 Effect of nisin on growth of <i>S aureus</i>	135
Figure 6-5 Optical density of standard extract with <i>E. amylovora</i>	135
Figure 6-6 Optical density of US-assisted extract with <i>E. amylovora</i>	136
Figure 6-7 Fractional reduction in O.D. by TBP concentration at 180, 300, 360 and 420 minutes for <i>E. amylovora</i>	137
Figure 6-8 Comparison of nisin and leaf extract in rate of cellular collapse of <i>E. amylovora</i> measured as OD ₆₀₀	138
Figure 6-9 Optical density of standard extract with <i>S aureus</i>	138
Figure 6-10 Optical density of US-assisted extract with <i>S aureus</i>	140
Figure 6-11 Layout of plates for minimum inhibitory concentration antifungal testing.	142

Figure 6-12 The extent of growth of <i>Alternaria. alternata</i> in leaf extracts	143
Figure 6-13 The extent of growth of <i>Botrytis cinerea</i> in leaf extracts	145
Figure 6-14 The extent of growth of <i>Eutypa lata</i> in leaf extracts	146
Figure 6-15 The extent of growth of <i>Penicillium digitatum</i> in leaf extracts	147
Figure 7-1 Ultrasound-assisted extraction yields of olive leaf. Characteristics of extraction yields.	152
Figure 7-2 Characteristic two-stage extraction of (x) rutin and hyperoside (Smelcerovic <i>et al.</i> , 2006).	153
Figure 7-3 Linearised plot for identification of extraction rate constants for US-assisted solvent extraction.	155
Figure 7-4 Linearised plot for identification of extraction rate constants for control solvent extraction.	156
Figure 7-5 Comparison of extraction models with extraction data.	159
Figure 7-6 Sonochemical stirred tank reactor (Berger <i>et al.</i> , 1996).	161
Figure 7-7 The Harwell sonochemical reactor (Thompson and Doraiswamy, 1999)	162
Figure 7-8 Extraction/purification protocol for the recovery of olive leaf biophenolics.	163

List of Tables

Table 2-1 BP content by respective plant constituent.	18
Table 2-2 DPPH radical scavenging of common olive BP's, (Visioli <i>et al.</i> , 1998)....	23
Table 2-3 DPPH radical scavenging of common olive BP's, modified from (Bouaziz <i>et al.</i> , 2005).....	24
Table 2-4 ABTS ^{•+} radical scavenging of olive phenolic compounds expressed in Trolox equivalent antioxidant capacity, modified from (Benavente-Garcia <i>et al.</i> , 2000).....	24
Table 2-5 Standardised antimicrobial activities of various phenolic compounds. ^a	30
Table 2-6 The characteristics of bonds in which phenolic compounds can participate. (Appel, 1993).....	34
Table 2-7 Post-harvest diseases caused by fungal species of certain fruit (Kader, 1992).....	41
Table 2-8 Process parameters, their effects and magnitudes; modified from (Suslick, 1988; Raso <i>et al.</i> , 1999).....	55
Table 3-1 Heat treatment of olive leaf extract for ascorbic acid determination.	69
Table 3-2 % recovery of gallic acid added to different concentrations of olive leaf extract, exhibiting degree of organic suppression.	71
Table 3-3 95% confidence intervals for triplicates in TBP determination. % variation from mean.....	73
Table 3-4 Replicate determination of TBP content.....	74
Table 4-1 Phenolic fractionation during lipid removal.	85

Table 4-2 Recovery of gallic acid from solution using various polymeric adsorbent resins.....	88
Table 4-3 Treatment levels of leaf extract binding and recovery experiment.....	91
Table 4-4 Yates analysis of phenol binding to and recovery from SP207.....	92
Table 5-1 TBP content of 1 mg/ml pure oleuropein, before and after US treatment.	121
Table 5-2 Summary of yields from extraction protocols after 900s of extraction. ...	122
Table 6-1 Minimum inhibitory concentrations of US treated extract and standard solvent extract, average of two different leaf extracts tested in triplicate.....	132
Table 6-2 Comparison between dilution factors of US-treated and standard extract required to breach the MIC, average of 2 sets tested in triplicate.	133
Table 6-3 Concentrations used in bactericidal testing.....	134
Table 6-4 Growth and relative growth of <i>A. alternata</i> in the presence of different concentrations of olive leaf extract	144
Table 6-5 Growth and relative growth of <i>B. cinerea</i> in the presence of different concentrations of olive leaf extract	145
Table 6-6 Growth and relative growth of <i>E. lata</i> in the presence of different concentrations of olive leaf extract	146
Table 6-7 Growth and relative growth of <i>P. digitatum</i> in the presence of different concentrations of olive leaf extract	147
Table 7-1 Rate constants for US-assisted extraction and standard solvent extraction.	157