

1     **ENZYMATIC MODIFICATIONS OF PEA PROTEIN AND ITS APPLICATION IN**  
2                   **PROTEIN-CASSAVA AND CORN STARCH GELS**

3

4                   Pablo D. Ribotta<sup>1,2</sup>, Andrés Colombo<sup>2</sup> and Cristina M. Rosell<sup>1</sup>

5

6     <sup>1</sup> Cereal Group, Institute of Agrochemistry and Food Technology (IATA-CSIC), Paterna,  
7     Spain

8     <sup>2</sup> CONICET, Universidad Nacional de Cordoba, Cordoba, Argentina

9

10    Corresponding author contact details: Cristina M. Rosell. Institute of Agrochemistry and Food  
11    Technology, Avda Agustín Escardino, 7. 46980-Paterna, Spain. Email: [crocell@iata.csic.es](mailto:crocell@iata.csic.es).  
12    Tel. +34 963900022, Fax. +34 963636301.

13

14    **Keywords:** pea proteins; enzymes; cassava starch; corn starch; gels

15

16 **ABSTRACT**

17 The interactions between starch and proteins during processing influence pasting and  
18 rheological properties of starch and produce modifications on starch gel structure. Enzymatic  
19 modifications have been proposed for overcoming the limitations of using proteins as food  
20 ingredients. This work aimed to study the impact of native and enzymatically modified pea  
21 proteins on the properties of protein–starch (from cassava or corn) gels. Pea protein isolate  
22 (PPI) was incubated with endopeptidase (AL) or microbial transglutaminase (TG). Pasting  
23 profile, rheological behaviour and water retention capacity of protein–starch gels were  
24 analyzed. Protein (native and enzymatically modified) incorporation increased the viscosity of  
25 both corn and cassava starches during gel preparation. However, the hydrolyzed protein  
26 reduced drastically the increment of viscosity of protein-starch gels. The addition of PPI led  
27 to corn starch network that shifted from an elastic-like nature to a more viscous-like, whereas  
28 the opposite effect was observed in cassava gel network. TG- and AL-treated proteins led to a  
29 decreased of both  $G'$  and  $G''$  moduli of protein-starch gels, and AL-treated proteins showed  
30 the highest decrease on these parameters. Hydrolyzed proteins also favoured the syneresis of  
31 the protein-corn starch gel, whereas crosslinked proteins tended to reduce it. Enzymatic  
32 modifications of pea proteins affected significantly pasting and rheological properties of  
33 protein-starch gels.

34

35

## 36 1. INTRODUCTION

37 The development of protein-enriched products has gained considerable attention in recent  
38 years. The increase on protein content and/or improve of protein quality of food could lead to  
39 formulations with better nutritional properties. In this sense, although vegetable proteins are  
40 major components in the diet of food-producing animals, they are increasingly important in  
41 human nutrition (Colombo, Ribotta & León, 2010).

42 Peas (*Pisum sativum* L.) are commonly used in animal feed, being this seed most used for pig  
43 feeding in Europe. This legume is rich in protein and contains more lysine but less sulphur  
44 amino acids and tryptophan per unit of protein than soya bean meal (Gatel & Grosjean, 1990).

45 Peas have become interesting as potential protein source in food formulation since, besides  
46 their nutritional characteristics, pea protein has good gelling properties (Nunes, Raymundo &  
47 Sousa, 2006). However, the application of pea protein in food products is limited because of  
48 its weak functionality as a food ingredient (Sun & Arntfield, 2010).

49 Several modifications have been proposed for overcoming the limitations of using proteins as  
50 food ingredients. Among these, protein hydrolysis can improve nutritional and texture  
51 characteristics of food proteins (MacLeod & Ames, 1988; Periago et al., 1998). Protein  
52 hydrolysis is considered a mild transformation and does not destroy amino acids; it is also  
53 specific, which allows controlled processing. Enzymatic treatment of pea flour with acid  
54 protease reduced the molecular size of the proteins exposing ionisable amino and carboxyl  
55 groups that increase the hydrophilicity of the hydrolysed proteins, which significantly  
56 improved the protein solubility at acid pH, the oil absorption capacity and the emulsification  
57 capacity of pea flours (Periago et al., 1998). Humiski and Aluko (2007) confirmed that  
58 proteolytic enzymes played a major role in determining the functional, nutritional, and  
59 bitterness properties of pea protein hydrolysates. The most desirable hydrolysates were

60 produced by papain and  $\alpha$ -chymotrypsin because of reduced bitterness intensity coupled with  
61 high levels of angiotensin converting enzyme inhibition and modest free radical scavenging  
62 activities. Ribotta and Rosell (2010) showed that the soy protein hydrolysates modified the  
63 rheological and pasting parameters of different starches. Molina Ortiz and Añón (2000)  
64 reported that the solubility and ability to form and stabilize foams of soybean hydrolysates  
65 obtained from five proteases correlated well with the structural properties.

66 Another alternative for modifying protein functionality is the crosslinking catalyzed by  
67 enzymes. Crosslinking of protein molecules can profoundly affect the textural and rheological  
68 properties of food. It has been considered as one of the most important mechanisms for  
69 engineering food structures with desirable mechanical properties (Dickinson, 1997; Gerrard &  
70 Brown, 2002). Transglutaminase (TG, protein-glutamine  $\gamma$ -glutamyltransferase, EC 2.3.2.13)  
71 catalyzes an acyl-transfer reaction between the  $\gamma$ -carboxamide group of peptide-bound  
72 glutamine residues (acyl donors) and a variety of primary amines (acyl acceptors), including  
73 the  $\epsilon$ -amino group of lysine residues, being the pH optimum range for activity between pH 5  
74 and 8 (Data Sheet provided by Ajinomoto Co., Inc. Tokyo, Japan; Marco & Rosell, 2008).  
75 Crosslinking by TG was broadly studied in food protein from various sources (Han &  
76 Damodaran, 1996; Babin & Dickinson, 2001; Ramírez-Suárez & Xiong, 2003; Ribotta et al.,  
77 2010). Although pea protein isolate has limited ability to generate strong heat-induced gels  
78 (Shand, Ya, Pietrasik & Wanasundara, 2007), it was showed that TG treatment enhanced the  
79 strength and elasticity of pea protein isolated gels (Shand, Ya, Pietrasik & Wanasundara,  
80 2008; Sun & Arntfield, 2011).

81 In recent years, extensive research has been carried out in order to analyze the properties of  
82 vegetable protein/starch systems (Lim and Narsimhan, 2006; Ribotta, Colombo, León &  
83 Añón, 2007; Marco et al., 2008; Ribotta et al., 2010; Colombo, León & Ribotta, 2011).

84 Studies involving soy protein derivatives have been far more common than those concerning  
85 other vegetable protein sources. Although utilization of pea derivatives as food ingredients is  
86 poorly applied, they could play an important role (similar to what is done with soy protein)  
87 when using them as substitutes for meat proteins or as a nutritious and functional additive  
88 (Sun et al., 2010). Extensive research exploring the functional properties of enzymatically  
89 modified food proteins has been conducted. However, the relationship between modified  
90 protein characteristics and food texture modification has not been fully elucidated. This work  
91 aimed to study the effect of pea protein enzymatic modification by protease or  
92 transglutaminase and its application on the preparation of protein-starch gels. Cassava or corn  
93 starches were utilized for determining the impact of enzymatically modified pea proteins on  
94 two different sources of starch.

95

## 96 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### 97 **2.1. Materials**

98 Native corn and cassava starches were purchased in the local market (Señor de Sipan,  
99 Argentina). Corn starch had 123 g/kg moisture, 4.1 g/kg protein, 0.2 g/kg lipid, 0.1 g/kg ash,  
100 176 g/kg amylose and 824 g/kg amylopectin, dry basis) and cassava had 156 g/kg moisture,  
101 4.2 g/kg protein, 0.1 g/kg lipid, 0.9 g/kg ash, 164 g/kg amylose and 836 g/kg amylopectin, dry  
102 basis). Commercial pea protein isolate (PPI) Trades SA, Barcelona, Spain) had moisture,  
103 protein, lipid, and ash contents of 67, 848, 9, and 45 g/kg (dry basis), respectively.

104 Food grade powder microbial TG from *Streptomyces* spp. from Ajinomoto Co., Inc., (100  
105 U/g) was kindly supplied by Apliena, SA (Terrasa, Barcelona, Spain). The composition of TG  
106 was 1% enzyme and 99% maltodextrin (Safety Data Sheet). Protease from *B. licheniformis*

107 (AL) was kindly donated by Novozymes (Madrid, Spain). All reagents in this study were of  
108 analytical grade. The stabilizing agent for AL was glycerine and water (Safety Data Sheet).

## 109 **2.2. Alcalase and transglutaminase treatments of pea protein isolates**

110 Pea proteins (1.32 g) were dispersed into 20 mL of distilled water. The pH of the suspension  
111 was adjusted to ~ 6.5. Preliminary assays were conducted to optimize the incubation time and  
112 enzyme amount to produce extensive enzymatic reaction followed by protein solubility and  
113 electrophoresis studies. TG (0.83 TG units/gram PPI) or 30  $\mu$ L of AL (49.1 mAU/gram SPI)  
114 was added to the protein suspensions. The suspensions were incubated for 5 h at 35 °C. The  
115 enzyme was inactivated by keeping the mixture in boiling water bath for 10 min and the  
116 slurry was cooled down to room temperature. Native or non-enzymatically treated PPI  
117 followed the same procedure (incubation for 5 h at 35 °C and heating for 10 min) than the  
118 enzyme treated samples except that no enzyme was added.

## 119 **2.3. Protein and peptide solubility**

120 The enzyme-treated mixtures were centrifuged (4400 x g, for 15 min) to precipitate insoluble  
121 protein. The supernatants were analyzed for nitrogen content (micro-Kjeldahl method AACC  
122 46-13, AACC 2000). The reaction progress was estimated by measuring the nitrogen content  
123 of the supernatants, which was able to keep soluble in a solution of 10% trichloroacetic acid  
124 (TCA) as showed by Kong, Zhou and Qian (2007). Each determination was done in triplicate.

## 125 **2.4. Electrophoresis**

126 The enzyme-treated mixtures were centrifuged (4400 x g, for 15 min) to precipitate insoluble  
127 protein. The supernatants were analyzed by SDS-PAGE. It was performed using gels of T =  
128 12% and C = 2.7%. The gels were 0.75-mm thick and consisted of a 2-cm stacking gel and an  
129 8-cm running gel. The electrophoresis was conducted at a constant voltage of 150 V until the  
130 front reached the end of the gel (in approximately 90 min). A Mini Protean II Slab Cell

131 (BioRad Laboratories, Richmond, CA) was used. MW standards were obtained from BioRad  
132 (Broad range, BioRad Laboratories, Hercules, USA). Equal volumes of each extract were  
133 applied to the electrophoresis gels for quantitative comparisons. The gels were stained with  
134 0.25% Coomassie Brilliant Blue R in methanol/water/acetic acid (4:5:1 v/v) and were  
135 distained in the same solvent.

## 136 **2.5. Viscosity profile during the thermo–mechanical process**

137 A rapid visco-analyzer (RVA) instrument (Newport Scientific, Australia) was utilized to  
138 prepare the samples and follow the apparent viscosity profile of the samples as a function of  
139 temperature and time. Corn or cassava starch (1.32 g) and the slurry from enzymatic treatment  
140 (1.32 g of PPI and 20 mL of water, pH 6.5) and 5 mL of water were placed inside the  
141 aluminium canister and the pH was again adjusted to 6.5. Mixtures of starches and protein  
142 had 4.8% w/w starch and 4.8% w/w PPI to keep a 50:50 concentration. Corn and cassava  
143 starches were also analyzed by dispersing 1.32 g of starch with 25 mL of distilled water (5.0%  
144 w/w starch). RVA corn starch Pasting Method was applied as follows: automatic stirring  
145 action was set at 960 rpm for 10 s and then slowed down to 160 rpm. The temperature of the  
146 sample was equilibrated at 50 °C, heated to 95 °C for 4 min 42 s, held at 95 °C for 3 min,  
147 cooled to 50 °C over 3 min 42 s, and then held at 50 °C for 2 min. Viscosity and temperature  
148 were recorded over time; data gathering and analysis were performed using Thermocline for  
149 Windows software, provided by the instrument manufacturer. Pasting temperature (PT), peak  
150 viscosity (PV), final viscosity (FV), breakdown (BD), and setback (SB) were obtained from  
151 the viscograms.

152 After the measurement of viscosity profile, the suspension was poured while hot (50 °C) into  
153 polypropylene tubes, 30 mm diameter and then cooled to room temperature (25 °C) for 24 h.

154 The samples were analyzed for rheological properties or stored at 4 °C for further  
155 determination of syneresis properties. Each sample was done in duplicate.

## 156 **2.6. Rheological measurements**

157 After the thermo–mechanical preparation process, the samples were kept at 25 °C for 24 h.  
158 The viscoelastic behaviour of each sample was measured in duplicate. Measurements were  
159 carried out in a controlled stress rheometer RheoStress 1 (Thermo Haake, Germany), using  
160 serrated plate–plate geometry of 60 mm diameter and 0.5 mm gap, at a temperature of 25 °C.  
161 Samples were carefully poured into the lower plate to minimize the possible breakdown of the  
162 gel network. After descending the upper plate, samples were allowed to rest for 3 min. Fresh  
163 sample was loaded for each measurement. In order to determine the linear viscoelastic region,  
164 strain sweeps (0.01–100%) were run at 1 Hz. The frequency sweeps were then performed at  
165 0.04% over a frequency range of 0.01–10 Hz and the values of the storage modulus ( $G'$ ), the  
166 loss modulus ( $G''$ ), and the loss tangent ( $\tan \delta$ ), as a function of frequency, were calculated  
167 using the Rheowin Pro Software (version 2.93, Thermo Haake). Two fresh samples of each  
168 gel lot were measured and gels were elaborated in duplicate to ensure reliable results.

## 169 **2.7. Syneresis**

170 Syneresis was measured by a centrifugation test (Ribotta et al., 2007) using a Beckman J2-MI  
171 centrifuge (Beckman Instruments, USA). Starch and starch–pea protein gels were stored  
172 seven days at 4 °C. After storage, the gels were tempered at 25 °C for 2 h and centrifuged at  
173 1500 x  $g$  for 15 min at 25 °C. After centrifugation the free water was separated, weighed, and  
174 expressed as percentage of the total water present in the gel. Measurements were the mean of  
175 three repetitions for each duplicated gel.

## 176 **2.8. Statistical analysis**



177 The data obtained were statistically treated using analysis of variance while the means were  
178 compared by the LSD Fisher test at a significance level of 0.05 using Statgraphics Plus  
179 Software (v2.01).

180

### 181 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### 182 **3.1. Alcalase and transglutaminase treatments**

183 Pea protein isolates were enzymatically modified for altering the protein functionality. With  
184 that purpose pea protein were crosslinked by transglutaminase or hydrolyzed with alcalase.  
185 The enzymatic modification was followed by quantifying the nitrogen released and the  
186 electrophoretic pattern of the enzymatically modified proteins. When treated with TG,  
187 nitrogen solubility of pea protein isolates decreased by 46%, from  $3.17 \pm 0.33$  mg/mL (native  
188 proteins) to  $1.70 \pm 0.13$  mg/mL (TG-treated proteins), revealing the decrease of protein  
189 solubility after crosslinking. SDS-PAGE protein patterns are shown in Fig. 1. TG-treated PPI  
190 (line 2, figure 1) showed an intense band which remained at the stacking gel and an evident  
191 increase in intensity at the top of the running gel. Ya (2004) informed the formation of large  
192 molecular weight compounds when studying treatment of pea proteins with TG, and those  
193 compounds were too large to enter the on SDS-PAGE gel. In addition, TG-treated proteins  
194 showed a reduction of some bands as compared with the non-treated protein profile (lane 1,  
195 figure 1). Sun et al. (2011) showed that most of the PPI subunits cross-linked by TG are in the  
196 molecular weight range of 35-74 kDa, which corresponded to pea vicilin and legumin acidic  
197 subunit (41 kDa). Also, these authors found that low molecular weight subunits (smaller than  
198 25 kDa) were unaffected by the enzyme. These results are in accordance with the ones  
199 obtained in the present work and confirm the formation of protein polymers of higher  
200 molecular weight with a concomitant disappearance of the lower molecular weight

201 polypeptides. Besides, the increase in molecular weight of PPI proteins explained the  
202 reduction of nitrogen solubility.

203 Regarding the treatment of PPI with alcalase, the nitrogen content on 10%-TCA supernatants  
204 increased from  $0.68 \pm 0.06$  mg/mL (native protein) to  $6.53 \pm 0.28$  mg/mL (AL-treated  
205 protein). Moreover, it was noted great increase of low molecular weight peptides in SDS-  
206 PAGE pattern of AL-treated PPI (line 3 figure 1), together with a disappearance of bands  
207 along the running gel (lane 3). Clearly, these results are related to the hydrolytic activity of  
208 the protease.

### 209 **3.2. Pasting profile of protein-starch blends**

210 The onset temperatures of corn and cassava starches were  $64.9$  °C and  $57.5$  °C (Colombo et al  
211 2010). Heating of starch granules above the gelatinization temperature in the presence of  
212 water increases the viscosity of the system due to water absorption and swelling of starch  
213 granules. Pasting temperature (PT) obtained in the RVA can be considered the temperature at  
214 the onset of this rise in the viscosity. Viscosity increases to the point where the number of  
215 swollen-intact starch granules reaches its maximum level; this point is named peak viscosity  
216 (PV). During the holding period at  $95$  °C in RVA analysis the sample is subjected to  
217 mechanical shear stress, causing loss of starch granule integrity and subsequent disruption  
218 which lead to a reduction of paste viscosity, which is measured by the breakdown (BD) in  
219 RVA viscograms. As the sample is subsequently cooled down to  $50$  °C, reordering of amylose  
220 chains results in an increase in viscosity (which is defined as setback -SB-) until a gel is  
221 formed. Viscosity at the end of the test is called final viscosity (FV).

222 Cassava starch presented lower PT but higher PV and FV than corn starch (Table 1), which  
223 indicate that cassava starch has weaker granular structure and better water binding properties  
224 than corn starch. BD values of cassava starch samples were higher than those for corn

225 samples. Therefore, corn starch showed higher paste stability, which could be related to their  
226 low peak viscosities coupled with higher shear and temperature stability (Singh, Isono,  
227 Srichuwong, Noda & Katsuyoshi, 2008). The SB values showed higher retrogradation rate in  
228 cassava starch dispersion than in corn starch. Moreover, cassava starch showed superior  
229 thickening properties, as indicated the higher FV than corn starch.

230 Addition of PPI decreased pasting temperature in corn starch samples. On the other hand, PT  
231 was slightly increased by the protein isolates in cassava samples, with the exception of AL-  
232 treated samples. A similar result was recently found by Ribotta et al. (2010) when studying  
233 the addition of soy protein isolate to corn and cassava starches.

234 The presence of PPI increased PV, FV and SB of both starch pastes during heating-cooling  
235 process (Table 1). The effect on setback could be attributed to the reorganization of the  
236 denatured proteins from the isolates and their effect on amylose crystallization during cooling  
237 (Motoki, Nio & Takinami, 1984). A gelatinized starch suspension can be considered as a  
238 composite material comprised of a dispersed phase, swelled starch granules, in a continuous  
239 phase formed by a suspension of amylose/amylopectin (Ribotta & Rosell, 2010). The  
240 rheological properties of such system depend on the properties and the ratio of the  
241 components of the continuous phase, the interaction between them and between the dispersed  
242 phase and the matrix (Eliasson & Gudmundsson, 1996). In fact Ribotta and Rosell (2010)  
243 showed that corn gel displayed a continuous phase formed by swollen starch granules pressed  
244 against each other, while a completely disintegrated structure was identified on cassava gel.

245 The higher paste viscosity observed in PPI-containing samples as compared to starch pastes  
246 could be due to crosslinks between hydrophilic groups of proteins and starch molecules (Goel,  
247 Singhal & Kulkarni, 1999; Ribotta et al., 2007). Although thermodynamic compatibility could  
248 also affect the pasting behaviour, viscosity results did not allow to assess that effect. In

249 addition, hydration and solubilisation of pea protein could affect the effective concentration of  
250 starch in the continuous phase, resulting in an increased paste viscosity (Ribotta et al., 2010).  
251 Enzyme-treated proteins produced an increase of PV and FV of the starches, but in lesser  
252 extent than non-enzyme-treated proteins. Some differences were detected between the pasting  
253 properties of starches blended with crosslinked proteins and the ones obtained with  
254 hydrolyzed proteins. AL-treated PPI led to a noticeably decrease in peak viscosity, final  
255 viscosity and setback in both starches, compared to the values obtained for the protein-starch  
256 gels. Regarding the breakdown, enzyme treated proteins reduced that parameter of protein-  
257 cassava starch gels, but no significant effect was observed in the protein-corn starch gels. The  
258 effect promoted by the crosslinked proteins was less marked than the observed with the  
259 hydrolyzed proteins. It seems that crosslinked proteins caused minor alterations on the pasting  
260 of the protein-starch gels, whereas the hydrolysis strongly modified the resulting gels. In fact,  
261 the effect on the setback was different depending on the enzymatic modification. Hydrolyzed  
262 proteins induced a dramatic decrease of the SB in both protein-starches gels, whereas the  
263 effect promoted by crosslinked proteins was barely noticeable. Therefore, hydrolyzed proteins  
264 affected in greater extent the amylose retrogradation, likely due to interactions between the  
265 low molecular weight polypeptides and the amylose chains.  
266 From the results, it is clear that enzymatic modifications affect protein properties and  
267 therefore their interactions with starch and water. Non-treated and enzyme-treated PPI could  
268 interact with gelatinized starch components in a different way.

### 269 **3.3. Rheological properties of the gels**

270 Storage modulus ( $G'$ ) was higher than loss modulus ( $G''$ ) throughout the whole range of  
271 frequency for both starches with and without protein isolate addition, indicating that  
272 deformations were fundamentally elastic (figure 2).  $G'$  values were almost independent of the

273 frequency in corn starch samples (Figure 2A), suggesting that the gel can be considered  
274 strong gel. Cassava starch gels showed a steady increase of  $G'$  with frequency (Figure 2B),  
275 behaving like weak gels (Lopes da Silva and Rao, 1999). In addition, cassava gels showed  
276 higher relative viscous component and a lower consistency when compared to corn samples,  
277 as evidenced by higher  $\tan \delta$  and lower  $G'$  and  $G''$  values of the cassava gels (figure 3 and  
278 table 2). Therefore, cassava gels led to weaker structures with less gel-like character than the  
279 corn starch. Corn gel shows a continuous phase formed by swollen starch granules pressed  
280 against each other, whereas cassava gels are formed by completely disintegrated granules that  
281 yielded continuous polymer dispersion where no starch granules can be envisaged (Ribotta  
282 and Rosell 2010).

283 Pea protein isolate raised storage and loss moduli of both starches, affecting in greater extent  
284 the loss modulus in the case of corn starch but the storage modulus in the case of the cassava  
285 starch. The interaction between two different biopolymers can be either of segregative or  
286 associative nature, but generally in the case of proteins and polysaccharides there is a  
287 thermodynamic incompatibility (Grinberg and Tolstoguzov, 1997), thus under certain  
288 conditions, any protein-polysaccharide-water system is spontaneously demixed in two  
289 different phases. The overall effect of PPI in the starch gel would be the result of possible  
290 interactions among hydrophilic groups of proteins and starch molecules, starch and starch  
291 molecules, the self-aggregation of pea proteins, or the mutual exclusion of pea proteins and  
292 carbohydrates, which increases the effective concentration of both.

293 Nevertheless, results of  $\tan \delta$  indicated that the addition of PPI led to a corn starch network  
294 that shifted from an elastic-like nature to a more viscous-like with less gel-like character than  
295 the corn starch alone. Similar findings have been reported when rice starch gels were mixed  
296 with different hydrocolloids, indicating weaker structures where the starch network shifted

297 from an elastic-like nature to a more viscous-like (Rosell, Yokoyama & Shoemaker, 2011).  
298 Conversely, in the case of cassava gel the presence of PPI resulted in more structured and  
299 more solid like (lower  $\tan \delta$ ) gel. Likely the lower pasting temperature observed for cassava  
300 gel favoured the interaction of starch and proteins chains, leading to better network.  
301 Therefore, the structure of the protein-starch gel must be dependent on the starch source  
302 yielding more structured network of the PPI with cassava starch than with corn starch, as  
303 suggests the rheological behaviour

304 The addition of hydrolyzed proteins (AL-treated PPI) on both cassava and corn gels did not  
305 affect the shape of the moduli and loss tangent versus frequency curves compared to the gels  
306 obtained with non-treated proteins. In opposition, the presence of PPI or TG-treated proteins  
307 yielded gels that were more frequency dependent at high frequencies (figure 2 and 3). The  
308 absolute values of the moduli changed significantly when PPI were enzymatically treated  
309 (table 2). Both  $G'$  and  $G''$  moduli were shifted to lower values when TG- and AL-treated  
310 proteins were added to corn and cassava starch gels compared to non-enzymatically treated  
311 proteins-starch gels. However, AL-treated proteins showed more pronounced decrease on  
312 these parameters. The same trend was observed with the pasting properties, which agrees with  
313 the positive relationship described for the viscoelastic moduli and the pasting properties,  
314 namely peak viscosity, breakdown, final viscosity and also with the parameter related to  
315 amylose retrogradation or setback (Rosell, Yokoyama & Shoemaker, 2011).

316 Concerning the loss tangent, the effect of enzyme-treated proteins on protein-starch gels was  
317 only significant when they were prepared with cassava gels. Presumably, corn starch yields  
318 stronger or more structured gels, which were less susceptible to be modified with the PPI or  
319 enzyme treated PPI addition. Conversely, the enzyme treated proteins added to cassava starch  
320 produced marked changes in the loss tangent. The hydrolyzed protein added to cassava starch

321 led to gels with higher  $\tan \delta$  gels. That effect could be partially related to its ability for  
322 reducing or preventing amylose retrogradation, as has been suggested for the interaction  
323 between hydrocolloids and starch (Techawipharat, Suphantharika & BeMiller, 2008). The  
324 TG-treated proteins led to protein-starch gels with similar  $\tan \delta$  than that of the untreated  
325 proteins-starch gel. Clearly, the effect of PPI on the viscoelastic behaviour of starch gels is  
326 completely dependent on the starch nature.

### 327 **3.4. Syneresis**

328 Water self-separation as consequence of gel network contraction is known as syneresis and is  
329 produced by the reorganization of starch molecules or retrogradation (Zheng & Sosulski,  
330 1998). The water separated from starch gels or starch-containing products is usually viewed  
331 unfavourably since it is associated to produce product deterioration.

332 Cassava gels did not show water separation despite the addition of PPI during the storage  
333 period. However, syneresis was observed on corn starch gels. Only gels containing AL-  
334 treated PPI showed a significant increase in water released (Figure 4), which could be  
335 attributed to the loss of water retention capacity and the negative effect of hydrolyzed proteins  
336 on gel structure, as was previously described for pasting and rheological properties. A  
337 tendency to decrease the syneresis, although not significant, was observed in the gels  
338 containing TG treated PPI. Water released of soy protein/corn gels was decreased when  
339 soybean proteins were treated with TG (Ribotta et al., 2010) and it was related to the high  
340 water retention capacity of these proteins.

341

## 342 **4. CONCLUSIONS**

343 Pea proteins affected significantly the pasting behaviour of both corn and cassava starches,  
344 increasing the viscosity through the heating-cooling cycle. Enzymatically modified pea

345 proteins by crosslinking or hydrolysis affected the pasting behaviour of starches, having the  
346 hydrolyzed pea protein higher impact on the pasting properties than the crosslinked ones.  
347 Viscoelastic properties of protein-starch gels revealed that hydrolyzed proteins led to weaker  
348 gels. The TG-treated proteins led to protein-starch gels with similar  $\tan \delta$  than that of the  
349 native proteins-starch gel. Hydrolyzed proteins also favoured the syneresis of the protein-corn  
350 starch gel, whereas crosslinked proteins tended to reduce it. Clearly, the effect of PPI on  
351 starch properties was completely dependent on the starch nature and the enzymatic treatment  
352 of protein. Enzymatic changes of pea proteins could be an important tool to increase the  
353 incorporation of pea proteins in the starch-based foods.

354

### 355 **Acknowledgement**

356 Authors would like to thank the CSIC and the Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación  
357 (Project AGL 2008-00092 ALI), the Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Técnica (CONICET) and  
358 the Agencia Nacional de Promoción Científica y Tecnológica (ANPCyT) for financial  
359 support. P.D. Ribotta would like to thank Conselleria de Educació I Ciència of the  
360 Comunitat Valenciana for his postdoctoral grant.

361

### 362 **References**

363 AACC, Approved Methods of the American Association of Cereal Chemists, 10th ed.,  
364 American Association of Cereal Chemists, St. Paul, MN, 2000.  
365 Babin, H., & Dickinson, E. (2001). Influence of transglutaminase treatment on the  
366 thermoreversible gelation of gelatine. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 15, 271–276.



367 Colombo, A., León, A. E., & Ribotta, P. D. (2011). Rheological and calorimetric properties of  
368 corn, wheat- and cassava- starches / soybean protein concentrate composites. *Starch*, 63, 83-  
369 95.

370 Colombo, A., Ribotta, P. D., & León, A. E. (2010). Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC)  
371 studies on the thermal properties of peanut protein. *Journal of Agricultural and Food*  
372 *Chemistry*, 58, 4434-4439.

373 Dickinson, E. (1997). Enzymic cross-linking as a tool for food colloid rheology control and  
374 interfacial stabilization. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 8, 334–339.

375 Eliasson, A., & Gudmundsson, M. (1996). Starch: Physicochemical and functional aspects.  
376 In: Eliasson, A. (Ed.), *Carbohydrates in Food* (pp 431-503). New York: Marcel Dekker.

377 Gatel, F., & Grosjean, F. (1990). Composition and nutritive value of peas for pigs: A review  
378 of European results. *Livestock Production Science*, 26, 155-175.

379 Gerrard, J. A., & Brown, P. K. (2002). Protein cross-linking in food: mechanisms,  
380 consequences, applications. *International Congress Series 1245*, 211-215.

381 Goel, P. K., Singhal, R. S., & Kulkarni, P. R. (1999). Studies on interactions of corn starch  
382 with casein and casein hydrolysates. *Food Chemistry*, 64, 383–389.

383 Grinberg, V. Y., & Tolstoguzov, V. B. (1997). Thermodynamic incompatibility of proteins  
384 and polysaccharides in solutions. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 11, 145-158.

385 Han X. Q., & Damodaran, S. (1996). Thermodynamic compatibility of substrate proteins  
386 affects their cross-linking by transglutaminase. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*,  
387 44, 1211–1217.

388 Humiski, L. M., & Aluko R. E. (2007). Physicochemical and bitterness properties of  
389 enzymatic pea protein hydrolysates. *Journal of Food Science*, 72, S605–S611

390 Kong, X., Zhou, H., & Qian, H. (2007). Enzymatic preparation and functional properties of  
391 wheat gluten hydrolysates. *Food Chemistry*, *101*, 615–620.

392 Lim, H.S., & Narsimhan, G. (2006). Pasting and rheological behavior of soy protein-based  
393 pudding. *LWT-Food Science Technology*, *39*, 343-349.

394 Lopes da Silva, J.A., & Rao, M.A. (1999). Rheological Behavior of Food Gel Systems. In:  
395 Rao, M. A. (Ed.), *Rheology of Fluid and Semisolid Foods* (pp: 320-368). USA: Chapman &  
396 Hall.

397 MacLeod, G., & Ames, J. (1988). Soy flavor and its improvement. *Critical Reviews in Food*  
398 *Science and Nutrition*, *27*, 218–402.

399 Marco, C., & Rosell, C. M. (2008). Effect of different protein isolates and transglutaminase  
400 on rice flour properties. *Journal of Food Engineering*, *84*, 132–139.

401 Marco C., Pérez G., Ribotta P., Rosell C.M. (2007). Effect of microbial transglutaminase on  
402 the protein fractions of rice, pea and their blends. *Journal of Science and Food Agriculture*,  
403 *87*, 2576-2582.

404 Molina Ortiz, S.; Añón MC. 2000. Analysis of Products, Mechanisms of Reaction, and Some  
405 Functional Properties of Soy Protein Hydrolysates, *J. Am. Oil Chem. Soc* *77*, 1293-1301

406 Motoki, M., Nio, N., & Takinami, K. (1984). Functional properties of food proteins  
407 polymerized by transglutaminase. *Agricultural and Biological Chemistry*, *48*, 1257–1261.

408 Nunes, M. C., Raymundo, A., & Sousa, I. (2006). Gelled vegetable desserts containing pea  
409 protein,  $\kappa$ -carrageenan and starch. *European Food Research and Technology*, *222*, 622-628.

410 Periago, M. J., Vidal, M. L., & Ros, G. (1998). Influence of enzymatic treatment on the  
411 nutritional and functional properties of pea flour. *Food Chemistry*, *63*, 71–78.

412 Ramírez-Suárez, J. C., & Xiong, Y.L. (2003). Effect of transglutaminase-induced cross-  
413 linking on gelation of myofibrillar/soy protein mixtures. *Meat Science*, *65*, 899–907.

414 Ribotta, P. D., Colombo, A., León, A. E., & Añón, M. C. (2007). Effects of soy protein on  
415 physical and rheological properties of wheat starch. *Starch*, 59, 614-623.

416 Ribotta, P. D., & Rosell, C. M. (2010). Effects of enzymatic modification of soybean protein  
417 on the pasting and rheological profile of starch-protein system. *Starch*, 62, 373-383.

418 Rosell, C. M., Yokoyama, W., & Shoemaker, C. (2011). Rheology of different hydrocolloids-  
419 rice starch blends. Effect of successive heating-cooling cycles. *Carbohydrate Polymers*, 84,  
420 373-382.

421 Shand P. J., Yaa, H., Pietrasik Z., & Wanasundara, P.K.J.P.D. (2008). Transglutaminase  
422 treatment of pea proteins: Effect on physicochemical and rheological properties of heat-  
423 induced protein gels. *Food Chemistry*, 107, 692-699.

424 Shand, P. J., Ya, H., Pietrasik, Z., & Wanasundara, P.K.J.P.D. (2007). Physicochemical and  
425 textural properties of heat-induced pea protein isolate gels. *Food Chemistry*, 102, 1119-1130.

426 Singh, N., Isono, N., Srichuwong, S., Noda, T., & Katsuyoshi N. (2008). Structural, thermal  
427 and viscoelastic properties of potato starches. *Food Hydrocolloid*, 22, 979-988.

428 Sun, X. D., & Arntfield, S. D. (2010). Gelation properties of salt-extracted pea protein  
429 induced by heat treatment. *Food Research International*, 43, 509-515.

430 Sun, X. D., & Arntfield, S. D. (2011). Gelation properties of salt-extracted pea protein isolate  
431 induced by heat treatment: Effect of heating and cooling rate. *Food Chemistry*, 124, 1011-  
432 1016.

433 Techawipharat, J., Suphantharika, M., & BeMiller, J. N. (2008). Effects of cellulose  
434 derivatives and carrageenans on the pasting, paste, and gel properties of rice starches.  
435 *Carbohydrate Polymers*, 73, 417-426.

436 Ya, H. 2004. Effects of processing conditions and ingredients on the physicochemical and  
437 rheological properties of pea protein isolate gels. M.Sc. Thesis, University of Saskatchewan,  
438 Saskatoon, SK, Canada.

439 Zheng, G. H., & Sosulski, F.W. (1998). Determination of water separation from cooked starch  
440 and flour pastes after refrigeration and freeze-thaw. *Journal of Food Science*, 63, 134-139.