Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

# Food Chemistry: X



journal homepage: www.sciencedirect.com/journal/food-chemistry-x

# Waste to Wealth: Dynamics and metabolic profiles of the conversion of jackfruit flake into value-added products by different fermentation methods

Hao Suo<sup>a,b,c</sup>, Shan Xiao<sup>a,b,c</sup>, Bo Wang<sup>a,b,c</sup>, Yan-Xue Cai<sup>a,b,c</sup>, Ji-Hui Wang<sup>a,b,c,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> School of Life and Health Technology, Dongguan University of Technology, Dongguan 523808, China

<sup>b</sup> Engineering Research Center of Health Food Design & Nutrition Regulation, Dongguan University of Technology, Dongguan 523808, China

<sup>c</sup> Dongguan Prefabricated Food Innovation Development and Quality Control Key Laboratory, Dongguan 523808, China

## ARTICLE INFO

SEVIER

Keywords: Jackfruit flake Fermentation Value-added products Lactic acid bacteria HS-SPME-GC–MS Untargeted metabolite profile

# ABSTRACT

Thus far, little is known about whether jackfruit flake, a byproduct of jackfruit, can be used as a fermentation substrate to obtain value-added products through microbial fermentation. Here, jackfruit flake puree was fermented by three different ways: spontaneous fermentation (JF), inoculated with LAB (JFL), inoculated co-fermentation with LAB and yeast (JFC). In contrast to JF, the total polyphenol and flavonoid content and syndrome-associated enzyme inhibition are significantly increased in JFC at the end of fermentation. Electronic tongue analysis revealed that the JFC was significantly lower in astringency and higher in bitterness. 41 volatile compounds were identified during fermentation by HS-SPME-GC–MS, and JFC was richer in honey, rose, and fruity flavors. A total of 290 compounds were screened for discriminative pre- and post-fermentation differential metabolites by non-target metabolomics analysis. These results provide a potential reference for the conversion of jackfruit waste into functional products using fermentation.

# Introduction

Jackfruit (*Artocarpus heterophyllus Lam.*), commonly known as the largest tree-borne fruits in the world, is rich in nutrients including proteins, carbohydrates, fat, vitamins, minerals, fiber, as well as phytochemicals. Moderate consumption of jackfruit has been linked to nutritional and pharmacological benefits such as antioxidant, antiinflammatory, antibacterial, antifungal, antineoplastic, hypoglycemic, and wound healing effects (Baliga, Shivashankara, Haniadka, Dsouza, & Bhat, 2011).

While jackfruit flesh is a major product for edible purposes, large numbers of jackfruit wastes (e.g., rag, seed, peel, bulb, and central core), accounting for 60 % of jackfruit weight are non-edible, and commonly discarded as bio-waste, remaining underutilized, causing serious environmental issues (Tran, Nguyen, Tran, & Nguyen, 2023). Essentially, these jackfruit bio-waste products can be developed into robust value-added and eco-friendly products. The ripe seeds of jackfruit are edible after boiling and roasting, and may be consumed as a snack (Chai et al., 2021). Besides, jackfruit seed starch (JSS) can be developed as novel

gastroretentive nanoparticles loaded with metformin (Jain, Upadhyay, Mishra, & Jain, 2022), as well as pioglitazone-loaded JSS-alginate beads with significant hypoglycemic effect (Nayak, Pal, & Hasnain, 2013). Another work was reported by Le et al. (2023), where seed starch derived from jackfruit waste was used to increase lactic acid production by co-fermentation with *Lactobacillus plantarum* and *Bacillus subtili*. As for the jackfruit peel, which has also been shown to be a source of polyphenol with strong antioxidant activity, as well as a source of polysaccharides with hypoglycemic activity, with potential applications in the food and pharmaceutical industries (Jiang, Shi, Chen, & Wang, 2019; Wang & Jiang, 2022). Therefore, given the high value added properties of jackfruit by-products, it is worth considering whether there are still unexplored parts has not been fully investigated.

Jackfruit flake (rags), the outer packaged part of pulps, regarded as immature pulp, most of which is discarded as waste. However, jackfruit flake is heavy in polyphenol and flavonoid, and exert antioxidant and hypoglycemic activity *in vitro* (Zhang et al., 2017). It can also be served as a source of higher antioxidant and antibacterial biopolymers such as pectin (Tran et al., 2023). As a result, jackfruit flake has a great chance of

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fochx.2024.101164

Received 3 October 2023; Received in revised form 12 January 2024; Accepted 25 January 2024 Available online 30 January 2024

Available online 30 January 2024

2590-1575/© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Abbreviations: LAB, Lactic acid bacteria; TA, Titratable Acidity; TPC, Total polyphenol content; GAE, Gallic acid equivalent; DW, Dry weight; TFC, Total flavonoid content; RE, Rutin equivalent.

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author at: School of Life and Health Technology, Dongguan University of Technology, Address: #1 University Road, Songshan Lake, Dongguan, Guangdong, China.

E-mail address: wangjihui@dgut.edu.cn (J.-H. Wang).

being developed into superior value-added products.

Lactic acid bacteria (LAB), a common probiotic, has been widely applied in the fermented foods including fruit (Lan et al., 2023), vegetables (Zhao et al., 2016), dairy (Peng, Koubaa, Bals, & Vorobiev, 2020), bakery (Daba, Elnahas, & Elkhateeb, 2021), owing to produce metabolites capable of improving some parameters linked to the overall quality of food, such as aroma profile and sensory quality. Compared with monoculture fermentation, mixed fermentation acts as a more complicated system, allowing the exchange of multiple metabolites and provides mutual growth-promoting effects (Lan et al., 2023). Accumulating evidence substantiates that co-fermentation of LAB and yeast may provide additional benefits for food development. It was found that cofermentation application with Lactobacillus plantarum HLJ29L2 and yeast (DN-1) firmly improved the protein digestibility of crackers (Hu et al., 2023). Another work reported by Cassimiro et al. (2023), they developed superior-quality conilon coffee with co-cultivation of LAB and yeasts using the self-induced anaerobic fermentation methodology. However, there is a lack of extensive report on jackfruit and related byproducts fermentation by LAB or mixed strains.

Therefore, in this work, autochthonous LAB (*Lactococcus lactis* LA5) and yeast (*Hanseniaspora opuntiae* SA2) isolated from pineapple cores in previous work of our lab were used to co-ferment a mixture of jackfruit flake, and a separate LAB fermentation group and spontaneous group were set as control, and whey protein was added as the nitrogen source. The physicochemical properties, total polyphenol and flavonoid content, two metabolic syndrome-associated enzyme inhibitory ability, taste assessment, and volatile flavor compounds of jackfruit flake puree during fermentation process (0,12,24,36,48 h) were initially investigated. Untargeted metabolomic analysis was employed to reveal the differences in metabolites between different groups. This work provides fresh insight into the co-fermentation of jackfruit flake via LAB and yeast, and serves as a practical reference for the development of jackfruit value-added products via microbial fermentation.

## Materials and methods

# Materials and chemicals

Fully ripe jackfruits (*Malaysia* No.1) were purchased from a local supermarket, which harvested in June 2023 from Hainan, China. Whey protein (purity: 98 %),  $\alpha$ -amylase ( $\geq$ 12 U/mg), lipase ( $\geq$ 30,000 U/g) were purchased from Yuanye-Bio Technology (Shanghai, China). Culture Medium was purchased from Solarbio Science (Beijing, China). All the different reagents used in this study are of analytical grade.

# Preparation of fermented jackfruit flake

*Lactococcus lactis* LA5 and *Hanseniaspora opuntiae* SA2 were endophytic microorganisms isolated in our previous experiment (Luo et al., 2023). The jackfruit flake was pulped with a high-speed blender and mixed at a mass ratio of 1:2.5 (g: mL), then whey protein (2.6 %, w/w) was added, and the pH of the system was adjusted to 5.2. Afterward, the mixture of jackfruit flake puree was sterilized in a water bath at 70 °C for 20 min.

The experimental samples were categorized into three groups for comparative analysis: jackfruit flake puree fermented with LA5 (JFL), jackfruit flake puree co-fermented by LA5 and SA2 (JFC), and jackfruit flake puree without LA5 and SA2 (JF) as the control group. For JFC, the starter culture strains were simultaneously inoculated at a volume ratio of 6:1 (LAB: yeast) in an incubator, where the LAB inoculation ratio was 1.6 % (*w/w*), and the cell concentration of LA5 and SA2 was approximately  $1 \times 10^6$  CFU/mL determined by optical density (OD600). The LA5 inoculation volume for JFL was comparable to that for JFC, while an equal amount of sterile water was added to the jackfruit flake puree. Fermentation was conducted under static conditions at 37 °C, and samples were collected at 0, 12, 24, 36, and 48 h with each sample being

replicated three times. The lyophilized samples were stored at -80 °C for additional experimentation.

# Determination of pH and titratable acidity

The pH was measured at room temperature with a calibrated pH meter. The value of titratable acidity (TA) was determined by the 0.1 M NaOH and expressed as percentage (w/w) of lactic acid.

# Measurement of total polyphenol and flavonoid content

The Folin–Ciocalteu method was applied to determine the content of total polyphenol content (TPC). The TPC was expressed in mg of gallic acid equivalent (GAE) per g of dry weight (DW).

Measurement of the total flavonoid content (TFC) was carried out by the method reported in our previous work using sodium nitritealuminum chloride colorimetry. The TFC was expressed in mg of rutin equivalent (RE) per g of dry weight (DW).

# Enzyme-Inhibitory effects of jackfruit flake puree during fermentation

Pancreatic  $\alpha$ -amylase and pancreatic lipase inhibitory activities were assayed according to our previous work with minor modification (Suo et al., 2021). 120 µL of the JF, JFL and JFC fermentation frozen samples and control (sterilized deionized water) sample was mixed with 80 µL starch solution (3 g/L). The enzymatic reaction was initiated by the addition of 100 µL of  $\alpha$ -amylase solution (8 U/mL, PBS, 0.1 M, pH 6.9), and the reaction mixture was incubated at 37 °C for 30 min. Then, 250 µL of DNS reagent was added. The mixture was heated at 100 °C in a boiling water bath for 10 min and chilled immediately in an ice-water bath. The absorption was measured at 540 nm. As to pancreatic lipase, 150 µL of fermentation samples were mixed with 50 µL of substrate (pNPB, 10 mM). The reaction was initiated by the addition of 35 µL of pancreatic lipase solution (300 U/mL, PBS, 0.2 M, pH 7.2). After incubation at 37 °C for 30 min, absorbance was measured at 405 nm. Enzymatic inhibitory activity was calculated as follows:

Inhibition capacity% = 
$$\frac{\text{Acontrol-Asample}}{\text{Acontrol}} \times 100$$
 (1)

#### Measurement of taste changes during fermentation by e-tongue

The Insent taste sensing system (SA402B, Atsugi-chi, Japan) was used to evaluate the eight taste features of three groups including sourness, bitterness, astringency, aftertaste-A (astringent aftertaste), aftertaste-B (bitter aftertaste), umami, richness and saltiness. Samples weighing 100 mg from various stages of fermentation were sonicated in 8 mL of distilled water for 10 min before being centrifuged for five minutes at 4000 r/min. Approximately 30 mL of the diluted solution was used for taste value determination. The unfermented sample (JF-0 h) was used as a control.

# Headspace solid-phase microextraction (HS-SPME)

300 mg of JF, JFL and JFC samples were weighed and placed into a 20 mL headspace and 3 mL saturated NaCl solution was added. The cyclohexanone solution (10  $\mu$ L) was used as the internal standard for quantitative determination. An SPME fiber was inserted into the sample headspace for five minutes at 50 °C. After extraction, the fiber was removed from the vial and immediately inserted into the GC–MS sampler for desorption (250 °C for 30 min) and further analysis.

# Gas chromatography-mass spectrometer (GC-MS) analysis

A Model 8890 GC system (Agilent, Palo Alto, CA, USA) and a 7000D GC/TQ mass spectrometer (Agilent, Palo Alto, CA, USA) were used to

perform GC–MS analysis. DB-WAX UI (30 m × 0.25 mm, 0.25 µm; Agilent, USA) was employed as column. Chromatographic separations were performed as follow: 35 °C for 0–6 min, increased to 150 °C at a rate of 5 °C /min and held for 2 min, then increased to 250 °C at a rate of 10 °C /min and held for 3 min. The mass spectrometer ion source was 250 °C, and the electron impact ionization was tuned to 70 eV with mass ranges from 50 to 550 *m*/*z*. The relative concentration (ng/g) of each volatile compound was quantified by calculating the peak area ratio of each compound with that of the internal standard.

# Metabolomics analysis

The fermented samples (100 mg) were individually grounded with liquid nitrogen and the homogenate was re-suspended with 80 % methanol. The samples were incubated on ice for 5 min and then were centrifuged at 15,000 g, 4 °C for 20 min. Some of supernatant was diluted to final concentration containing 53 % methanol by LC-MS grade water. The samples were centrifuged at 15,000 g, 4 °C for 20 min, and the supernatant was collected for further analyses. UHPLC-MS/MS analyses were performed using a Vanquish UHPLC system (ThermoFisher, Germany) coupled with an Orbitrap Q Exactive TM HF mass spectrometer or Orbitrap Q Exactive TM HF-X mass spectrometer (Thermo Fisher, Germany).

# Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS 22.0 software (IBM, USA). Data are presented as mean  $\pm$  standard error of the mean (SEM). Differences among groups were analyzed by one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by Turkey's test. Each experiment was replicated three times independently.

# **Results and discussion**

#### Characteristics of jackfruit flake puree at different fermentation phase

#### pH and TA changes

In general, as shown in Fig. 1, the pH values of the two groups of inoculated fermented jackfruit flake puree decreased compared with spontaneous fermented jackfruit flake puree at the end of fermentation stage (48 h), while the TA content of two fermented groups increased higher rates than the spontaneous fermented group. The alter pH value was negatively correlated with the variation in TA content, which indicates that additional acids were generated after fermentation with LAB or co-fermentation of LAB and yeast for 48 h. The further acidity of these two fermented groups is potentially due to its elevated efficiency in

metabolizing sugar into organic acids (Wang, Wei, Wang, Zhang, & Gong, 2023). As expected, co-fermentation exhibited improved acidification characteristics than monoculture LAB or spontaneous fermentation and this trend was consistent with the results reported by Andeta et al. (2018).

#### Sugar content

Jackfruit possesses adequate fermentable sugar (Muhialdin, Meor Hussin, Kadum, Abdul Hamid, & Jaafar, 2021). Fig. 2A and B depict sugar content variation of three experiments groups in terms of total sugars and reducing sugars at different fermentation phase. In all fermentation groups, the total and reducing sugar levels decreased throughout the fermentation. At the 48 h of the fermentation, the total sugar content of JFL significantly (p < 0.05) decreased from 11.82  $\pm$ 0.41 g/100 g to 8.91  $\pm$  0.54 g/100 g, as to JFC, which was significantly (p < 0.05) decreased from 12.20  $\pm$  0.44 g/100 g to 9.02  $\pm$  0.52 g/100 g. Despite this, no significant difference in the total sugar content was observed at the end of fermentation in the JF group, although the average value of 48 h was lower than 0 h. The trend of reducing sugar during fermentation was practically the same as for the total soluble sugars. At the end of the fermentation, the reducing sugars of JFL significantly (p < 0.05) decreased from 8.77  $\pm$  0.16 g/100 g to 7.30  $\pm$ 0.36 g/100 g, while no significant difference was observed in JFC group. Interestingly, as to JFC, reducing sugar content significantly (p < 0.05) decreased to 6.96  $\pm$  0.17 g/100 g by the end of the 36 h. LAB fermentation is a process in which sugars are consumed and acids are produced. Due to the reducing sugar content during fermentation, it has been suggested that microorganisms may use these sugars produced from jackfruit itself for cell growth and biotransformation. It is important to note that no additional sugar was added during fermentation in this work, which demonstrates the promising health benefits of low-sugar fermented products that meet consumer demand for healthy foods.

# TPC and TFC

The polyphenol and flavonoid in fruits are key functional components due to their positive impact on various physiological processes related to human health, such as antioxidant activity, improving glucose metabolism, as well as regulating gut microbiota balance. As shown in Fig. 2C, D, compared with the initial fermentation, the TPC of fermented samples through monoculture LAB (JFL) and co-fermentation (JFC) were significantly (p < 0.05) increased at 12, 24, 36, and 48 h, and the final fermentation TP content were 11.20 ± 0.22 mg GAE/g DM,1.75 ± 0.26 mg GAE/g DM, respectively. Additionally, a similar increased trend in TFC was found in JFL and JFC with the extension of fermentation time. However, there is no significant shift in the TPC and TFC in the JF



Fig. 1. The values of pH (A) and total acidity (B) of three groups at different fermentation times. JF, spontaneous fermentation on jackfruit flake; JFL, jackfruit flake fermented with lactic acid bacteria; JFC, co-fermented with lactic acid bacteria and yeast on jackfruit flake.



**Fig. 2.** The total sugar content (A), reducing sugar content (B), total polyphenol content (C), total flavonoids content (D), α-amylase inhibition rate (E), pancreatic lipase inhibition rate (F) of three groups at different fermentation times. JF, spontaneous fermentation on jackfruit flake; JFL, jackfruit flake fermented with lactic acid bacteria; JFC, co-fermented with lactic acid bacteria and yeast on jackfruit flake.

from 0 h to 48 h.

The assessment of the shift in TAC and TFC during the fermentation phase appears to be increasingly significant, as it will allow us to better understand whether monoculture LAB fermentation or co-fermentation of yeast and LAB promotes the release of phenolic compounds from jackfruit flake. The increase in TPC may be due to cell wall of fruit degradation by microbial fermentation (Gao et al., 2022), besides, organic acids produced during the fermentation may prevent the degradation of polyphenol or flavonoid (Sun, Chou, & Yu, 2009).

Similarly, in another study by Vivek et al., they reported that TPC and TFC in Sohiong (*Prunus nepalensis*) juice were increased during fermentation with *Lactobacillus plantarum* MCC 2974 (Vivek, Mishra, Pradhan, & Jayabalan, 2019). However, Wu et al. (2020) found a dramatic decrease in TPC and TFC in apple juice fermented by *Lactobacillus helveticus* 76, which decreased TPC and TFC by 26.9 % and 33.2 %, respectively. Therefore, screening appropriate bacterial strains for their ability to produce additional bioactive compounds in different fruit fermentation processes is something we need to focus on in future work.

# Enzyme-Inhibitory assay during fermentation

Spectrophotometric analysis of the JF, JFL and JFC groups on pancreatic  $\alpha$ -amylase, pancreatic lipase was conducted, and the results are shown in Fig. 2E – F. For instance, the pancreatic  $\alpha$ -amylase inhibition rate of the JFL at 0 h was 61.14 %, it gradually increased to 73.82 % following 36 h, and decreased to 66.53 % at the end of fermentation. As to pancreatic lipase, the inhibition ability of JFL significantly (p < 0.05) increased from 64.47 % to 75.15 % (0–36 h), and which significantly (p < 0.05) increased from 64.45 to 78.12 from (0–48 h). However, no significant variation was observed in the lipase inhibition ability of JF at different times.

The prevalence of type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) has been on an alarmingly increasing trend worldwide and diet interventions have been shown to delay or prevent the onset of T2DM.Rao et al. (2021)

demonstrated that consumption of jackfruit flour can be selected as a medical nutritional therapy in place of equivalent amounts of rice or wheat flour of daily meal in patients with T2DM. Besides, jackfruit extracts has also been proved possess the ability for the management of diabetes mellitus (Ajiboye et al., 2018; Maradesha et al., 2023).Regulation of carbohydrate and fat digestion and/or absorption in the gastrointestinal tract may be another promising strategy for the prevention of T2DM. Recent studies have shown that the consumption of fermentation food is linked to reducing the risks of obesity, and the inhibition of digestive enzyme activities has been regarded as one of the most crucial action mechanisms underlying the beneficial effects (Yoon et al., 2022).

In this work, compared to non-fermented sample, both monoculture fermentation and co-fermentation could enhance the inhibition ability of  $\alpha$ -amylase and lipase, which proved that LAB fermentation could improve the inhibition of lipase and  $\alpha$ -amylase. This is consistent with the finding reported by Wang et al. (2023). Therefore, we believe that fermented jackfruit flake is a promising dietary ingredient for ameliorating metabolic disease through probiotics. A large number of studies show that TPC of the sample exhibits a significant positive correlation with metabolic disease related enzymes inhibitory activity (Shobana, Sreerama, & Malleshi, 2009). As we discussed above, the TPC was increased by inoculation fermentation, and which may partly explain the typically higher inhibitory activity against the  $\alpha$ -amylase and lipase assayed at different fermentation phase.

# E-tongue analysis

As shown in Fig. 3A, the fermentation time had more impact on the saltiness of JF with significant (p < 0.05) difference from 0 h to 48 h, and the astringency showed an increasing trend with the fermentation time increasing, while aftertaste-A seems no difference shift. As to JFL (Fig. 3B), compared to control (JF-0 h), the value of sourness, astringency, aftertaste-A, aftertaste-B, and richness changed significantly (p <



Fig. 3. Radar plot for electronic tongue sensory score of JF(A), JFL(B), JFC (C), and three groups together (D) at different fermentation times. JF, spontaneous fermentation on jackfruit flake; JFL, jackfruit flake fermented with lactic acid bacteria; JFC, co-fermented with lactic acid bacteria and yeast on jackfruit flake.

0.05) at 48 h, while the rest of the three taste values were no significant change. As is obviously shown in Fig. 3C, similarly like JFL, the trend of JFC in bitterness value decreased from 0 h to 24 h, and increased from 24 h to 48 h. In addition, compared to JF-0 h, all the eight taste values changed significantly (p < 0.05) at 48 h.

For a closer comparison of the flavor properties of fermented jackfruit flake, Fig. 3D additionally shows the differences across different experimental groups. After fermentation of jackfruit flake with LAB or LAB combined with yeast, the sourness of the fermented samples reached its maximum at 36 h, in agreement with the values in pH and TA. Large amounts of organic acids produced by microorganisms may be responsible for the sourness increase (Luo et al., 2023). Moreover, the reduction of bitterness in JFL and JFC at 36 h may be due to the formation of large amounts of acids masking alternative tastes (Lao, Zhang, Li, & Bhandari, 2020). Popescu et al. (2013) found that yeast can utilize the bitter substances in the beer fermentation process for growth and metabolism, thereby reducing the bitterness of the fermented product. Regarding astringency, the sensor values of JFL, JFC and JF at 36 h are 2.53, 3.02 and 1.27 respectively. Both JFL and JFC were significant (p <0.05) higher than JF, which may attribute to the increasing of TPC (Jöbstl, O'Connell, Fairclough, & Williamson, 2004). From this, we can conclude that inoculation with LAB or LAB combined yeast has a significant effect on the taste of fermented jackfruit flake.

# Volatile profiles detected by HS-SPME-GC-MS

Overall, based on the NIST Mass Spectral Database, a total of 41 volatile substances including 12 esters, 7 alcohols, 5 acids, 4 alkanes, 3 alkenes, 2 thiols, 1 ketone, 1 aldehyde, 1 thioether, and 5 other

compounds were identified in the three fermenting jackfruit flake. 1butanol, p-limonene, and butanoic acid were detected in all three groups at different fermentation times. 19 volatile organic compounds were detected in the unfermented jackfruit flake group (JF), and 11 volatile compounds were detected at the end of fermentation. Additionally, only 6 volatile compounds were found in the JFL group at 0 h, and increased to 18 volatile compounds at 12 h, and 5 were detected at 48 h. Similarly, as to JFC, the variety of volatile compounds increased from 10 (0 h) to 20 (24 h), and decreased to 8 at 48 h. Thus, the volatile components of jackfruit flake may be obscured by additional inoculation of LAB or LAB with yeast. However, as the fermentation time lengthened, both sets of inoculated aromatic substances showed a trend of first increasing and then decreasing. Clearly, this is normally associated with microbial metabolism (Liao, Luo, Huang, & Xia, 2023).

As shown in Table 1, acetoin was detected in both the JFL and JFC. Acetoin is an essential physiological metabolite generated through the metabolism of citrate by LAB, which imparts desirable buttery flavor and odor to various foods including cheese (Lo, Ho, Bansal, & Turner, 2018). In contrast to the remaining two groups, 3-methyl-1-butanol and 2-phenylethanol are the two characteristic volatile components of the JFC group. 3-methyl-1-butanol has a fruity and alcohol flavor or caramel odor (Yu et al., 2012), which could be produced from the amino acids catabolism. The increase in this particular aroma is mainly attributed to the addition of yeast (*Hanseniaspora opuntiae* SA2). In addition, 2-phenylethanol, a product of yeast metabolism, imparts honey, rose and fruity aromas (Moreira, Trugo, Pietroluongo, & De Maria, 2002). From this, we can conclude that 3-methyl-1-butanol and 2-phenylethanol can be used as volatile flavor markers by yeast co-fermentation. JFC is likely to exhibit a more pleasing and complex aroma than JFL and JF due to the

| Table 1   |
|---|
| List of volatile compounds of three groups during fermentation. |

6

|     |             |   |            |                                  | Relative content of volatile compounds in JF (ng/g)               |  |   |  | Relative content of volatile compounds in JFL (ng/g) |  |  |  | Relative content of volatile compounds in JFC (ng/g)              |   |  |  |  |  |   |
|-----|-------------|---|------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| No. | RT<br>(min) | Compound                                | CAS        | Formula                          | 0 h   | 12 h   | 24 h  | 36 h   | 48 h   | g)<br>0 h  | 12 h   | 24 h   | 36 h  | 48 h  | (11g/g)<br>0 h   | 12 h   | 24 h   | 36 h   | 48 h  |
| 1   | 10.756      | <i>n</i> -Butyl acetate                 | 123-86-4   | $C_6H_{12}O_2$                   | $\begin{array}{c} 130.30 \\ \pm \ 1.74 \end{array}$               | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 9.23 \\ \pm \ 0.11 \end{array}$                   | -  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 99.75 \\ \pm  1.46 \end{array}$  | -  | -   | -   | $\begin{array}{c} 39.96 \\ \pm  0.70 \end{array}$                  | $\begin{array}{c} 20.25 \\ \pm  0.80 \end{array}$                  | -  | -  | -   |
| 2   | 12.598      | lsoamyl acetate                         | 123–92-2   | $\mathrm{C_7H_{14}O_2}$          |   | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 19.01 \\ \pm 0.20 \end{array}$   | -  | -   | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   |
| 3   | 12.608      | 3,3',4,4'-<br>Tetrahydrospirilloxanthin | 13833–01-7 | $C_{42}H_{64}O_2$                | $\begin{array}{c} 5.81 \pm \\ 0.26 \end{array}$                   | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   | -   | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 8.67 \\ \pm \ 0.18 \end{array}$  | -  | -   |
| 4   | 13.387      | 1-Butanol                               | 71–36-3    | $C_4H_{10}O$                     | $25.34 \pm 0.35$  | $\begin{array}{c} 16.69 \\ \pm  0.22 \end{array}$  | $\begin{array}{c} 27.30 \\ \pm \ 0.35 \end{array}$                  | $\begin{array}{c} 48.78 \\ \pm \ 0.72 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 28.42 \\ \pm  0.26 \end{array}$    | $\begin{array}{c} 6.93 \\ \pm  0.10 \end{array}$   | $\begin{array}{c} 47.22 \\ \pm \ 0.35 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 10.01 \\ \pm \ 0.72 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 11.07 \\ \pm \ 0.35 \end{array}$                | $\begin{array}{c} 50.50 \\ \pm  1.01 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 28.64 \\ \pm  0.24 \end{array}$                  | $\begin{array}{c} 19.65 \\ \pm \ 0.24 \end{array}$                 | $\begin{array}{c} 18.86 \\ \pm \ 0.35 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 15.41 \\ \pm \ 0.53 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 10.64 \\ \pm  0.38 \end{array}$ |
| 5   | 15.095      | D-Limonene                              | 5989–27-5  | $C_{10}H_{16}$                   | $\begin{array}{c} 14.08 \\ \pm 0.04 \end{array}$                  | $26.63 \pm 0.43$                                   | $\begin{array}{c}13.33\\\pm0.06\end{array}$                         | $\begin{array}{c}10.87\\\pm0.10\end{array}$        | $15.43 \pm 0.57$                                     | $14.24 \pm 0.33$                                   | $\begin{array}{c}13.83\\\pm0.36\end{array}$        | 15.70<br>± 0.92                                    | 9.00 ± 0.53   | $11.12 \pm 0.23$                                  | $ \frac{1}{2} $ 8.51 $ \pm 0.37 $                                  | $ \frac{1}{8.45} $ $ \pm 0.50 $                                    | $ \frac{1}{2} $ 8.61 $ \pm 0.53 $                  | $\begin{array}{c}10.00\\\pm0.12\end{array}$        | $6.90 \pm 0.15$                                   |
| 6   | 15.460      | 3-Methyl-1-butanol                      | 123–51-3   | $C_5H_{12}O$                     | -   | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   | -   | $\begin{array}{c} 9.13 \\ \pm  0.32 \end{array}$                   | $\begin{array}{c} 15.39 \\ \pm  0.53 \end{array}$                  | $\begin{array}{c} 64.73 \\ \pm  0.87 \end{array}$  | $\begin{array}{c} 30.76 \\ \pm \ 0.40 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 22.29 \\ \pm  0.32 \end{array}$ |
| 7   | 15.583      | 3-Ethyl-5-(2'-ethylbutyl)<br>octadecane | 55282-12-7 | $C_{26}H_{54}$                   | $\begin{array}{c} 9.19 \pm \\ 0.13 \end{array}$                   | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 8.46 \\ \pm  0.04 \end{array}$                    | -  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 9.09 \\ \pm \ 0.35 \end{array}$  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{8.27} \pm \\ \textbf{0.28} \end{array}$ | -   | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 15.66 \\ \pm \ 0.55 \end{array}$                 |  | -  | -   |
| 8   | 15.593      | Dodecane                                | 112-40-3   | $C_{12}H_{26}$                   | -   | -  | -   | $\begin{array}{c} 13.88 \\ \pm \ 0.06 \end{array}$ | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   |
| 9   | 15.835      | n-Butyl butanoate                       | 109–21-7   | $\mathrm{C_8H_{16}O_2}$          | -   | -  | -   | $\begin{array}{c} 10.81 \\ \pm \ 0.25 \end{array}$ | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   |
| 10  | 16.764      | Phenylethylene                          | 100-42-5   | $C_8H_8$                         | -   | $\begin{array}{c} 16.47 \\ \pm \ 0.04 \end{array}$ | -   | $\begin{array}{c} 15.10 \\ \pm \ 0.23 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 8.93 \\ \pm \ 0.11 \end{array}$    | $\begin{array}{c} 9.21 \\ \pm  0.31 \end{array}$   | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 8.56 \\ \pm \ 0.21 \end{array}$  | -   | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   |
| 11  | 16.840      | Butyl isovalerate                       | 109–19-3   | $C_9H_{18}O_2$                   | $\begin{array}{c} 28.47 \\ \pm \ 0.12 \end{array}$                | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 22.35 \\ \pm \ 0.35 \end{array}$                  | -  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 33.67 \\ \pm \ 0.97 \end{array}$ | -  | -   | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   |
| 12  | 17.059      | Tetratetracontane                       | 7098–22-8  | C44H90                           | -   | -  | -   | $\begin{array}{c} 8.15 \\ \pm \ 0.33 \end{array}$  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   |
| 13  | 17.575      | Acetoin                                 | 513-86-0   | $C_4H_8O_2$                      | -   | -  | -   | -  | -  |  | $\begin{array}{c} 19.80 \\ \pm \ 0.15 \end{array}$ | -  | -   | -   |  | $\begin{array}{c} 8.01 \\ \pm \ 0.17 \end{array}$                  | $\begin{array}{c} 21.21 \\ \pm \ 0.34 \end{array}$ | -  | -   |
| 14  | 18.284      | 2-Methylbutyl isovalerate               | 2445–77-4  | $C_{10}H_{20}O_2$                | $\begin{array}{c} 16.92 \\ \pm \ 0.07 \end{array}$                | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 12.30 \\ \pm \ 0.08 \end{array}$                  | -  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 19.35 \\ \pm \ 0.35 \end{array}$ | -  | -   | -   | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 7.56 \\ \pm \ 0.21 \end{array}$  | -  | -   |
| 15  | 19.835      | Rhodopin                                | 105–92-0   | C40H58O                          | -   | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   | -   | -  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{6.97} \\ \pm  \textbf{0.35} \end{array}$ |  | -  | -   |
| 16  | 19.835      | 1-Hexanol                               | 111–27-3   | $C_6H_{14}O$                     | -   | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 14.00 \\ \pm \ 0.02 \end{array}$                  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   | -   | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 16.55 \\ \pm \ 0.26 \end{array}$ | -  | -   |
| 17  | 20.534      | Urea                                    | 57–13-6    | CH <sub>4</sub> N <sub>2</sub> O | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{8.26} \pm \\ \textbf{0.23} \end{array}$ | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   | $\begin{array}{c} 2.25 \\ \pm \ 0.17 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{4.82} \\ \pm  \textbf{0.68} \end{array}$ | -  | -  | -  | -   |
| 18  | 20.888      | Caprylic acid methyl ester              | 111–11-5   | $C_9H_{18}O_2$                   | -   | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 11.67 \\ \pm \ 0.09 \end{array}$                  | -  | -  |  | $\begin{array}{c} 8.47 \\ \pm \ 0.53 \end{array}$  | -  | -   | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   |
| 19  | 21.903      | 4-Heptanol                              | 589–55-9   | $C_7H_{16}O$                     | -   | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 8.61 \\ \pm \ 0.21 \end{array}$  | -  | -   | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   |
| 20  | 22.128      | Methyl formate                          | 107–31-3   | $C_2H_4O_2$                      | -   | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 45.43 \\ \pm \ 0.53 \end{array}$                  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 10.93 \\ \pm \ 0.25 \end{array}$ | -  | -  | -   | -   | -  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 49.76 \\ \pm \ 0.61 \end{array}$ | -   |
| 21  | 22.155      | Ethyl caprylate                         | 106-32-1   | $C_{10}H_{20}O_2$                | -   | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   | -   | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 69.42 \\ \pm  0.84 \end{array}$  | -  | -   |
| 22  | 22.199      | Acetic acid                             | 64–19-7    | $C_2H_4O_2$                      | $\begin{array}{c} 10.40 \\ \pm \ 0.27 \end{array}$                | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 40.83 \\ \pm \ 0.99 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 30.50 \\ \pm  0.46 \end{array}$  | $\begin{array}{c} 115.16 \\ \pm \ 1.53 \end{array}$               | -   | $\begin{array}{c} 35.29 \\ \pm  0.57 \end{array}$                  | -  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 74.41 \\ \pm  0.72 \end{array}$ |
| 23  | 22.569      | 1,1-Bis(dodecyloxy)<br>hexadecane       | 56554–64-4 | $C_{40}H_{82}O_2$                | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{6.10} \pm \\ \textbf{0.05} \end{array}$ | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   |
| 24  | 24.099      | Benzaldehyde                            | 100–52-7   | C <sub>7</sub> H <sub>6</sub> O  | -   | -  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{7.65} \\ \pm \ \textbf{0.04} \end{array}$ | -  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 16.26 \\ \pm \ 0.18 \end{array}$ | -  | -   | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -   |
| 25  | 24.647      | 2,3-Butanediol                          | 24347–58-8 | $C_4H_{10}O_2$                   | -   | -  | -   | $\begin{array}{c} 9.81 \\ \pm  0.33 \end{array}$   | $\begin{array}{c} 10.83 \\ \pm  0.82 \end{array}$    | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 11.32 \\ \pm \ 0.15 \end{array}$ | -   | -   | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 7.03 \\ \pm \ 0.06 \end{array}$  | -  | -   |

(continued on next page)

# Table 1 (continued)

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

|     |             |   |                 |   | Relative content of volatile compounds in JF (ng/g)               |  |  |  | Relative content of volatile compounds in JFL (ng/g)                |  |  |  | Relative content of volatile compounds in JFC (ng/g) |  |  |  |  |  |                  |
|-----|-------------|---|-----------------|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|------------------|
| No. | RT<br>(min) | Compound  | CAS             | Formula                                       | 0 h   | 12 h   | 24 h   | 36 h   | 48 h  | 0 h  | 12 h   | 24 h   | 36 h   | 48 h   | 0 h  | 12 h   | 24 h   | 36 h   | 48 h             |
| 26  | 24.663      | 2-Methyl-2-propanethiol                         | 75–66-1         | $C_4H_{10}S$                                  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 27.54 \\ \pm \ 1.44 \end{array}$   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -                |
| 27  | 24.663      | (S)-(+)-1,3-Butanediol                          | 24621–61-2      | $C_4H_{10}O_2$                                | -   | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 28.23 \\ \pm \ 0.69 \end{array}$ | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -                |
| 28  | 25.646      | Lycoxanthin                                     | 19891–74-8      | C <sub>40</sub> H <sub>56</sub> O             | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{7.04} \pm \\ \textbf{0.20} \end{array}$ | -  | -  | -  | -   | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 4.67 \\ \pm \ 0.28 \end{array}$  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 7.34 \\ \pm  0.35 \end{array}$   | -  | -                |
| 29  | 26.06       | a-cis-Bergamotene                               | 18252-46-5      | $C_{15}H_{24}$                                | $\begin{array}{c} 9.85 \ \pm \\ 0.13 \end{array}$                 | -  | -  | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -                |
| 30  | 26.715      | Butanoic acid                                   | 107–92-6        | $C_4H_8O_2$                                   | $\begin{array}{c} 15.54 \\ \pm \ 0.69 \end{array}$                | $\begin{array}{c} 11.48 \\ \pm \ 0.29 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 9.12 \\ \pm \ 0.14 \end{array}$  | $\begin{array}{c} 15.40 \\ \pm  0.27 \end{array}$  | $\begin{array}{c} 13.50 \\ \pm \ 0.30 \end{array}$                  | $\begin{array}{c} 13.67 \\ \pm \ 0.82 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 22.87 \\ \pm  0.34 \end{array}$  | $\begin{array}{c} 26.70 \\ \pm \ 0.35 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 32.06 \\ \pm \ 0.18 \end{array}$   | $\begin{array}{c} 22.33 \\ \pm \ 0.27 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 28.19 \\ \pm  0.46 \end{array}$  | $\begin{array}{c} 15.38 \\ \pm \ 0.33 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 42.03 \\ \pm \ 0.17 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 15.19 \\ \pm \ 0.22 \end{array}$ | $9.05 \pm 0.0$   |
| 31  | 27.267      | Ethyl caprate                                   | 110–38-3        | $C_{12}H_{24}O_2$                             | -   | -  | -  | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 6.87 \\ \pm \ 0.35 \end{array}$  | -  | -                |
| 32  | 29.173      | 3-(Ethylthio) propanol                          | 18721–61-4      | C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>12</sub> OS             | -   | -  | -  | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 15.75 \\ \pm \ 0.69 \end{array}$   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -                |
| 33  | 29.179      | Methyldithio-1-propene                          | 23838–19-9      | $C_4H_8S_2$                                   | $\begin{array}{c} 71.00 \\ \pm \ 0.20 \end{array}$                | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 73.59 \\ \pm \ 0.21 \end{array}$ | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 10.53 \\ \pm \ 0.15 \end{array}$                  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 77.10 \\ \pm \ 0.81 \end{array}$ | -  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 34.35 \\ \pm \ 0.86 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 19.51 \\ \pm \ 0.22 \end{array}$ | 37.60<br>±<br>0.78.                                | -  | -                |
| 34  | 29.27       | Phorboldidecanoate                              | 24928-17-4      | $C_{40}H_{64}O_8$                             | -   | -  | -  | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 6.83 \\ \pm \ 0.33 \end{array}$  | -  | -                |
| 35  | 31.188      | 3-Hydroxy-3-methyl-4-<br>phenyl-2-pyrrolidinone | 104194–16-<br>3 | $\mathrm{C}_{11}\mathrm{H}_{13}\mathrm{NO}_2$ | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{7.48} \pm \\ \textbf{0.20} \end{array}$ | -  | -  | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -                |
| 36  | 31.316      | Phenethyl acetate                               | 103–45-7        | $C_{10}H_{12}O_2$                             | -   | -  | -  | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 47.45 \\ \pm \ 0.37 \end{array}$ | -  | -                |
| 37  | 32.009      | Hexanoic acid                                   | 142–62-1        | $\mathrm{C_6H_{12}O_2}$                       | $\begin{array}{c} 33.89 \\ \pm \ 0.05 \end{array}$                | $\begin{array}{c} 8.20 \\ \pm \ 0.09 \end{array}$  | $\begin{array}{c} 28.21 \\ \pm \ 0.11 \end{array}$ | -  | -   | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 35.44 \\ \pm  0.18 \end{array}$  | -  | -  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 15.44 \\ \pm  0.69 \end{array}$  | $\begin{array}{c} 17.00 \\ \pm \ 0.20 \end{array}$ | -  | -                |
| 38  | 33.303      | 2-Phenylethanol                                 | 60–12-8         | $C_8H_{10}O$                                  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 7.27 \\ \pm \ 0.40 \end{array}$  | $\begin{array}{c} 13.46 \\ \pm \ 0.19 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 95.40 \\ \pm  0.93 \end{array}$  | $\begin{array}{c} 21.71 \\ \pm \ 0.45 \end{array}$ | $18.2 \pm 0.$    |
| 39  | 35.822      | Octanoic acid                                   | 124–07-2        | $\mathrm{C_8H_{16}O_2}$                       | $\begin{array}{c} 74.66 \\ \pm \ 0.05 \end{array}$                | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 55.29 \\ \pm \ 0.36 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 15.04 \\ \pm \ 0.22 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 14.17 \\ \pm \ 0.92 \end{array}$                  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 55.55 \\ \pm \ 0.35 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 14.66 \\ \pm  0.18 \end{array}$  | $\begin{array}{c} 18.08 \\ \pm \ 0.35 \end{array}$   | $\begin{array}{c} 20.12 \\ \pm  0.94 \end{array}$  | $\begin{array}{c} 28.00 \\ \pm  0.47 \end{array}$  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 32.96 \\ \pm \ 0.21 \end{array}$ | -  | $19.2 \pm 0.$    |
| 40  | 38.414      | Decanoic Acid                                   | 334–48-5        | $C_{10}H_{20}O_2$                             | -   | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 20.46 \\ \pm \ 0.16 \end{array}$ | -  | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{7.42} \\ \pm \ \textbf{0.29} \end{array}$ | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 9.86 \\ \pm  0.39 \end{array}$   | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 11.63 \\ \pm \ 0.25 \end{array}$   | -  | -  | $\begin{array}{c} 8.53 \\ \pm \ 0.35 \end{array}$  | $\begin{array}{c} 12.57 \\ \pm \ 0.19 \end{array}$ | -  | 10.6<br>$\pm 0.$ |
| 41  | 38.415      | Ethylpalmitate                                  | 628–97-7        | $C_{18}H_{36}O_2$                             | $\begin{array}{c} 46.52 \\ \pm \ 0.92 \end{array}$                | -  | -  | -  | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -                |

Data were expressed as mean ± SEM (n = 3); JF, spontaneous fermentation on jackfruit flake; JFL, jackfruit flake fermented with lactic acid bacteria; JFC, co-fermented with lactic acid bacteria and yeast on jackfruit flake.

presence of yeast. Unfortunately, with respect to the acid compounds, hexanoic, octanoic, and decanoic acids were detected in all three groups. These compounds contribute to rancid notes. Consequently, additional studies are needed in the future to ensure that fermented samples have a more pleasing aroma composition.

# Metabolomics analysis of the metabolites change before and after fermentation

In this work, the changes in the chemical components of unfermented jackfruit flake (JF), spontaneous fermentation of jackfruit flake for 48 h (JFW), fermented jackfruit flake with LAB for 48 h (JFL), and fermented jackfruit flake with LAB and yeast for 48 h (JFC) were assessed with UHPLC-MS/MS based untargeted metabolomics. The untargeted metabolomic data analysis is based on a companion R package (MetaboAnalystR) (Chong & Xia, 2018), such as principal component analysis (PCA) and orthogonal partial least squares-discriminant analysis (OPLS-DA), for identifying differential metabolites for further analysis.

As shown in the Fig. 4A, B, the unsupervised PCA plots indicated that JFC and the other groups were confined to two distinctive widely separated clusters in both the negative and the positive modes, which



Fig. 4. Score plot of principle component analysis (PCA) of serum metabolites (positive ion (A) and negative ion (B)) and orthogonal partial least-squares discriminant analysis (OPLS-DA) of metabolites (positive ion (C) and negative ion (D)). JF, spontaneous fermentation on jackfruit flake; JFL, jackfruit flake fermented with lactic acid bacteria; JFC, co-fermented with lactic acid bacteria and yeast on jackfruit flake.

#### Table 2

R2Y and Q2 of the OPLS-DA model.<sup>a</sup>

|                | Positive mod | le    | Negative me | ode   |
|----------------|--------------|-------|-------------|-------|
|                | R2Y          | Q2    | R2Y         | Q2    |
| JF_JFC_JFL_JFW | 0.993        | 0.717 | 0.998       | 0.712 |

<sup>a</sup> JF, jackfruit flake without fermentation; JFW, spontaneous fermentation of jackfruit flake for 48 h. JFL, jackfruit flake fermented with lactic acid bacteria for 48 h; JFC, co-fermented with lactic acid bacteria and yeast on jackfruit flake for 48 h.

suggested that the co-fermentation with LAB and yeast induced significant changes in the profiles of metabolites at the end of fermentation. OPLS-DA, a supervised method of improved classification performance, was further applied to examine the differences in the metabolites among the four groups (Fig. 4C, D). Different from the unsupervised PCA plots, the OPLS-DA score plots showed clear separation of the four groups in four clusters, indicating that the metabolites produced by three fermentation methods are obviously different. To avoid the potential pitfalls of overfitting associated with supervised models, the OPLS-DA model was validated using permutation tests, and the results are presented in Figure S1 and Table 2. The high R2Y (negative mode, 0.998; positive mode, 0.993) and Q2 values (>0.7) thus supported the reliability and predictability of the established OPLS-DA model herein. In addition, VIP (variable importance factor) was used to identify the most prominent variables and VIP greater > 1 (p < 0.05) were considered to exert a significant effect on the discrimination of different samples. Here, total 290 metabolites were identified in the four groups (VIP > 1, FDR < 0.05), including 155 effective peaks for the positive mode and 135 effective peaks for the negative mode. So far, untargeted metabolomics data combined OPLS-DA score plots have successfully applied to provide guidance for geographical discrimination of fruits (Li, Liang, Xu, Yang, & Wang, 2021), dairy products from different animal species (Yang et al., 2016), and disease control strategies (Wang et al., 2022), etc.

As shown in Fig. S2A, in the positive ion model, *N*-isovaleroylglycine, DL-stachydrine, D-carnitine, choline and L-norleucine are the top five compounds in relative abundance among the four experimental groups. As to the negative ion model (Fig. S2B), D-(-)-quinic acid, succinic acid, citric acid were the top three compounds in relative abundance in JF group. However, the relative abundance of the top three compounds in JFC group were D-(-)-quinic acid, D-(+)-malic acid, and citric acid.

The volcano plot could clearly depict the differential metabolites in different groups based on fold-change (FC) values and P-values. Compared with the JF group, 65 metabolites were significantly (p <0.05) upregulated, and 108 metabolites were significantly downregulated in the JFW group (Table S1). Moreover, JFL exhibited a significant (p < 0.05) increase in 113 and a significant (p < 0.05) decrease in 95 of the metabolites relative to the JF group (Table S2). The JFC group had 374 significantly (p < 0.05) increased and 365 significantly (p < 0.05) decreased metabolites compared with the JF group (Table S3). 3-Hydroxyphenylacetic acid (3-HPAA), the major metabolite of quercetin glycosides by microbiota. As shown in Table S3, cofermentation with LAB and yeast to the jackfruit flake led to significantly upregulated levels of 3-HPAA acid compared to JF group. A recent work by Liu et al. (2022) found that 3-HPAA has a protective potential in hepatocyte models, which may provide new possibilities for the prevention of alcohol-related chronic diseases. Besides, 3-HPAA was also believed to be a promising multi-target antimicrobial agent by studying the mechanism of action between 3-HPPA and Pseudomonas aeruginosa with shotgun proteomics (Ozdemir & Soyer, 2020). Thus, it can be inferred that the up-regulation of 3-HPAA due to co-fermentation with LAB and yeast mediates the health-promoting effects of jackfruit flake to some extent.

Based on these potential markers, pathway enrichment and pathway topology analyzes were then carried out to identify key metabolic pathway(s) that were influenced by the different fermentation methods (Figures S3-S5). 26 metabolic pathways (impact value > 0, P < 0.05) were found to be enriched in the JFW group relative to the JF group. 31 potential metabolic pathways were screened between the JFL and JF groups. Interestingly, 39 metabolic pathways were significantly altered in the JFC group compared to the JF group. Compared with "JFW vs. JF", pathway enrichment and pathway topology analyzes of the current work also showed that the inoculated fermentation (JFL, JFC) significantly modulated pathways associated with phenylpropanoid biosynthesis (ko00940). As to "JFC vs. JF", KEGG analysis discovered that six differentially accumulated metabolites (cinnamaldehyde, sinapyl alcohol, chlorogenic acid, trans-cinnamic acid, syringing, coniferin) were annotated in the phenylpropanoid biosynthesis pathway. In addition, L-phenylalanine, chlorogenic acid, and sinapyl alcohol are differentially accumulated compounds within the JFL group. To the best of our knowledge, polyphenol and flavonoid are generated via the shikimate pathway and the phenylpropanoid pathway. Wang et al. (2023) found combination of ultrasound and γ-aminobutyric acid enhanced the polyphenol content of mung bean sprouts, and these phenolics are closely related to phenylpropanoid biosynthesis. Recently, Wang et al. (2023) developed a compound wine made from Lycium barbarum and Polygonatum cyrtonema by different fermentation methods, including S. cerevisiae RW only, D. hansenii AS2.45 alone, and synergistic fermentation of D. hansenii AS2.45 and S. cerevisiae RW. Non-targeted metabolomics analysis indicated that the phenylpropanoid biosynthesis pathway was present in all three comparison groups and suggested that it was the metabolic pathway that was critical in affecting samples prepared from different yeast combinations. Thus, in this work, fermented mixed cultures of LAB and yeast were able to modulate the phenylpropanoid biosynthesis pathway to increase the amount of polyphenol and flavonoid, which subsequently enhanced the nutritional value of jackfruit flake.

# Conclusion

In this work, we perform a comparative dynamic study of the conversion of jackfruit flake into value-added products by three fermentation methods. The results showed a decrease in pH and total and reducing sugar content, as well as an increase in TA for longer fermentation times in all three groups. The content of total polyphenol and flavonoid, and the  $\alpha$ -amylase and pancreatic lipase inhibitory activity increased in JFL and JFC at the end of fermentation. The values of astringency, bitterness, aftertaste-A, and saltiness in the JFC were significantly changed compared to the JF at 48 h. A total of 41 volatile compounds were identified using a HS-SPME-GC-MS. Acetoin is a characteristic flavor in JFL and JFC.3-methyl-1-butanol and 2-phenylethanol exist only in the JFC. Samples fermented synergistically with LAB and yeast are richer in honey, rose, and fruity flavors. Non-targeted metabolomics indicates that different fermentation pathways affect the accumulation of metabolites in jackfruit flake. 290 metabolites were identified in four experimental groups based on the OPLS-DA method. Metabolite profiling and pathway enrichment analysis revealed that 50 metabolic pathways were found before and after three fermentation methods (JF vs. JFW vs. JFL vs. JFC). Our study thus provides, for the first time, strong evidence that jackfruit flake bio-waste is a promising fermentation substrate for obtaining value-added products through fermentation with LAB combined yeast.

# Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

# CRediT authorship contribution statement

Hao Suo: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Visualization, Writing – original draft. Shan Xiao: Supervision, Writing – review & editing. Bo Wang: Data curation, Investigation, Methodology. Yan-Xue Cai: Data curation, Investigation, Methodology. Ji-Hui Wang: Resources, Supervision, Writing – review & editing.

# Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

# Data availability

Data will be made available on request.

## Acknowledgment

We would like to express our gratitude to Dongguan Prefabricated Food Innovation Development and Quality Control Key Laboratory for providing us with equipment and technical support.

# Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fochx.2024.101164.

#### References

- Ajiboye, B. O., Ojo, O. A., Adeyonu, O., Imiere, O., Oyinloye, B. E., & Ogunmodede, O. (2018). Ameliorative activity of ethanolic extract of artocarpus heterophyllus stem bark on alloxan-induced diabetic rats. Advanced Pharmaceutical Bulletin, 8(1), 141–147. https://doi.org/10.15171/apb.2018.017
- Andeta, A. F., Vandeweyer, D., Woldesenbet, F., Eshetu, F., Hailemicael, A., Woldeyes, F., & Van Campenhout, L. (2018). Fermentation of enset (Ensete ventricosum) in the gamo highlands of Ethiopia: physicochemical and microbial community dynamics. *Food microbiology*, 73, 342–350. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. fm.2018.02.011
- Baliga, M. S., Shivashankara, A. R., Haniadka, R., Dsouza, J., & Bhat, H. P. (2011). Phytochemistry, nutritional and pharmacological properties of Artocarpus heterophyllus Lam (jackfruit): a review. *Food Research International*, 44(7), 1800–1811. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2011.02.035
- Cassimiro, D. M. D. J., Batista, N. N., Fonseca, H. C., Oliveira Naves, J. A., Coelho, J. M., Bernardes, P. C., & Schwan, R. F. (2023). Wet fermentation of Coffea canephora by lactic acid bacteria and yeasts using the self-induced anaerobic fermentation (SIAF) method enhances the coffee quality. *Food Microbiology*, 110, Article 104161. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2022.104161
- Chai, T. T., Xiao, J., Mohana Dass, S., Teoh, J. Y., Ee, K. Y., Ng, W. J., & Wong, F. C. (2021). Identification of antioxidant peptides derived from tropical jackfruit seed and investigation of the stability profiles. *Food Chemistry*, 340, Article 127876. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2020.127876
- Chong, J., & Xia, J. (2018). MetaboAnalystR: An R package for flexible and reproducible analysis of metabolomics data. *Bioinformatics*, 34(24), 4313–4314. https://doi.org/ 10.1093/bioinformatics/bty528
- Daba, G. M., Elnahas, M. O., & Elkhateeb, W. A. (2021). Contributions of exopolysaccharides from lactic acid bacteria as biotechnological tools in food, pharmaceutical, and medical applications. *International journal of biological* macromolecules, 173, 79–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2021.01.110
- Gao, Q., Song, Y., Liang, Y., Li, Y., Chang, Y., Ma, R., & Wang, S. (2022). Dynamics of Physicochemical Properties, Functional Compounds and Antioxidant Capacity during Spontaneous Fermentation of *Lycium ruthenicum* Murr (Qinghai-Tibet Plateau) natural vinegar. *Foods*, 11(9), 1344. https://doi.org/10.3390/ foods11091344
- Hu, L., Li, Y., Huang, X., Du, C., Huang, D., & Tao, X. (2023). The effect of cofermentation with *Lactobacillus plantarum* HLJ29L2 and yeast on wheat protein characteristics in sourdough and crackers. *Foods*, 12(3), 555. https://doi.org/ 10.3390/foods12030555
- Jain, A. K., Upadhyay, R., Mishra, K., & Jain, S. K. (2022). Gastroretentive metformin loaded nanoparticles for the effective management of type-2 diabetes mellitus. *Current Drug Delivery*, 19(1), 93–103. https://doi.org/10.2174/ 1567201818666210614095159
- Jiang, Z., Shi, R., Chen, H., & Wang, Y. (2019). Ultrasonic microwave-assisted extraction coupled with macroporous resin chromatography for the purification of antioxidant

phenolics from waste jackfruit (Artocarpus heterophyllus Lam.) peels. Journal of Food Science and Technology, 56(8), 3877–3886. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-019-03858-8

- Jöbstl, E., O'Connell, J., Fairclough, J. P., & Williamson, M. P. (2004). Molecular model for astringency produced by polyphenol/protein interactions. *Biomacromolecules*, 5 (3), 942–949. https://doi.org/10.1021/bm0345110
- Lan, T., Lv, X., Zhao, Q., Lei, Y., Gao, C., Yuan, Q., & Ma, T. (2023). Optimization of strains for fermentation of kiwifruit juice and effects of mono- and mixed culture fermentation on its sensory and aroma profiles. *Food Chemistry: X, 17*, Article 100595. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fochx.2023.100595
- Lao, Y., Zhang, M., Li, Z., & Bhandari, B. (2020). A novel combination of enzymatic hydrolysis and fermentation: Effects on the flavor and nutritional quality of fermented *Cordyceps militaris* beverage. *Lwt-Food Science and Technology*, 120, Article 108934. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2019.108934
- Li, Y., Liang, L., Xu, C., Yang, T., & Wang, Y. (2021). UPLC-Q-TOF/MS-based untargeted metabolomics for discrimination of navel oranges from different geographical origins of China. Lwt-Food Science and Technology, 137, Article 110382. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.lwt.2020.110382
- Le, T. A. N., Lee, J. J. L., & Chen, W. N. (2023). Stimulation of lactic acid production and Lactobacillus plantarum growth in the coculture with Bacillus subtilis using jackfruit seed starch. Journal of Functional Foods, 104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. iff.2023.105535
- Liao, H., Luo, Y., Huang, X., & Xia, X. (2023). Dynamics of quality attributes, flavor compounds, and microbial communities during multi-driven-levels chili fermentation: Interactions between the metabolome and microbiome. *Food Chemistry*, 405, Article 134936. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2022.134936
- Liu, Y., Myojin, T., Li, K., Kurita, A., Seto, M., Motoyama, A., & Nakamura, Y. (2022). A major intestinal catabolite of quercetin glycosides, 3-hydroxyphenylacetic acid, protects the hepatocytes from the acetaldehyde-induced cytotoxicity through the enhancement of the total aldehyde dehydrogenase activity. *International journal of molecular sciences*, 23(3), 1762. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms23031762
- Lo, R., Ho, V. T. T., Bansal, N., & Turner, M. S. (2018). The genetic basis underlying variation in production of the flavour compound diacetyl by *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* strains in milk. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 265, 30–39. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2017.10.029
- Luo, J., Xiao, S., Wang, J., Wang, B., Cai, Y., & Hu, W. (2023). The metabolite profiling and microbial community dynamics during pineapple by-product fermentation using co-inoculation of lactic acid bacteria and yeast. *Fermentation*, 9(2), 79. https://doi. org/10.3390/fermentation9020079
- Maradesha, T., Martiz, R. M., Patil, S. M., Prasad, A., Babakr, A. T., Silina, E., & Ramu, R. (2023). Integrated network pharmacology and molecular modeling approach for the discovery of novel potential MAPK3 inhibitors from whole green jackfruit flour targeting obesity-linked diabetes mellitus. *PLoS One*, 18(1), e0280847.
- Moreira, R. F. A., Trugo, L. C., Pietroluongo, M., & De Maria, C. A. B. (2002). Flavor composition of cashew (Anacardium occidentale) and marmeleiro (Croton species) honeys. Journal of Agriculture and Food Chemistry, 50(26), 7616–7621. https://doi. org/10.1021/jf020464b
- Muhialdin, B. J., Meor Hussin, A. S., Kadum, H., Abdul Hamid, A., & Jaafar, A. H. (2021). Metabolomic changes and biological activities during the lacto-fermentation of jackfruit juice using Lactobacillus casei ATCC334. LWT- Food Science and Technology, 141, Article 110940. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2021.110940
- Nayak, A. K., Pal, D., & Hasnain, M. S. (2013). Development, optimization and in vitro-in vivo evaluation of pioglitazone-loaded jackfruit seed starch-alginate beads. *Current Drug Delivery*, 10(5), 608–619. https://doi.org/10.2174/1567201811310050012
- Ozdemir, O. O., & Soyer, F. (2020). Pseudomonas aeruginosa presents multiple vital changes in its proteome in the presence of 3-hydroxyphenylacetic acid, a promising antimicrobial agent. ACS Omega, 5(32), 19938–19951. https://doi.org/10.1021/ acsomega.0c00703

Peng, K., Koubaa, M., Bals, O., & Vorobiev, E. (2020). Recent insights in the impact of emerging technologies on lactic acid bacteria: a review. *Food Research International*, 137, Article 109544. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2020.109544

Popescu, V., Soceanu, A., Dobrinas, S., & Stanciu, G. (2013). A study of beer bitterness loss during the various stages of the Romanian beer production process. *Journal of* the Institute of Brewing, 119(3), 111–115. https://doi.org/10.1002/jib.82

Rao, A. G., Naik, K. S., Unnikrishnan, A. G., & Joseph, J. (2021). Efficacy of green jackfruit flour as a medical nutrition therapy replacing rice or wheat in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Nutrition & Diabetes*, 11(1), 18. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41387-021-00161-4

Shobana, S., Sreerama, Y. N., & Malleshi, N. G. (2009). Composition and enzyme inhibitory properties of finger millet (Eleusine coracana L.) seed coat phenolics: mode of inhibition of  $\alpha$ -glucosidase and pancreatic amylase. *Food Chemistry*, 115(4), 1268–1273. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2009.01.042

- Sun, Y. P., Chou, C. C., & Yu, R. C. (2009). Antioxidant activity of lactic-fermented Chinese cabbage. *Food Chemistry*, 115(3), 912–917. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. foodchem.2008.12.097
- Suo, H., Shishir, M. R. I., Xiao, J., Wang, M., Chen, F., & Cheng, K. W. (2021). Red wine high-molecular-weight polyphenolic complex: an emerging modulator of human metabolic disease risk and gut microbiota. *Journal of Agriculture and Food Chemistry*, 69(37), 10907–10919. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jafc.1c03158
- Tran, N. T. K., Nguyen, V. B., Tran, T. V., & Nguyen, T. T. T. (2023). Microwave-assisted extraction of pectin from jackfruit rags: Optimization, physicochemical properties and antibacterial activities. *Food Chemistry*, 418, Article 135807. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.foodchem.2023.135807
- Vivek, K., Mishra, S., Pradhan, R. C., & Jayabalan, R. (2019). Effect of probiotification with Lactobacillus plantarum MCC 2974 on quality of Sohiong juice. Lwt-Food Science and Technology, 108, 55–60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2019.03.046

#### H. Suo et al.

- Wang, J., Wei, B. C., Wang, X., Zhang, Y., & Gong, Y. J. (2023). Aroma profiles of sweet cherry juice fermented by different lactic acid bacteria determined through integrated analysis of electronic nose and gas chromatography-ion mobility spectrometry. *Frontiers in microbiology*, 14, 1113594. https://doi.org/10.3389/ fmicb.2023.1113594
- Wang, J. J., Zhang, W. W., Guan, Z. J., Thakur, K., Hu, F., Khan, M. R., & Wei, Z. J. (2023). Exploring the effects of the fermentation method on the quality of *Lycium* barbarum and Polygonatum cyrtonema compound wine based on LC-MS metabolomics. Food Chemistry, 428, Article 136770. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. foodchem.2023.136770
- Wang, L., Li, X., Gao, F., Liu, Y., Lang, S., Wang, C., & Zhang, D. (2023). Effect of ultrasound combined with exogenous GABA treatment on polyphenolic metabolites and antioxidant activity of mung bean during germination. *Ultrason Sonochem*, 94, Article 106311. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ultsonch.2023.106311
- Wang, R., Yang, X., Liu, J., Zhong, F., Zhang, C., Chen, Y., & Ma, D. (2022). Gut microbiota regulates acute myeloid leukaemia via alteration of intestinal barrier function mediated by butyrate. *Nature Communications*, 13(1), 2522. https://doi.org/ 10.1038/s41467-022-30240-8
- Wang, Y., & Jiang, Z. (2022). Rapid large-scale preparation of polysaccharides from jackfruit peel waste by high-speed countercurrent chromatography and their antioxidant and hypoglycemic activities. *Journal of separation science*, 45(3), 771–779. https://doi.org/10.1002/jssc.202100636

- Wu, C., Li, T., Qi, J., Jiang, T., Xu, H., & Lei, H. (2020). Effects of lactic acid fermentation-based biotransformation on phenolic profiles, antioxidant capacity and flavor volatiles of apple juice. *Lwt - Food Science and Technology*, 122, Article 109064. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2020.109064
- Yoon, S., Cho, H., Nam, Y., Park, M., Lim, A., Kim, J. H., & Kim, W. (2022). Multifunctional Probiotic and Functional Properties of Lactiplantibacillus plantarum LRCC5314, isolated from Kimchi. Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology, 32(1), 72–80. https://doi.org/10.4014/jmb.2109.09025
- Yu, Y. J., Lu, Z. M., Yu, N. H., Xu, W., Li, G. Q., Shi, J. S., & Xu, Z. H. (2012). HS-SPME/ GC-MS and chemometrics for volatile composition of Chinese traditional aromatic vinegar in the Zhenjiang region. *Journal of the Institute of Brewing*, 118(1), 133–141. https://doi.org/10.1002/jib.20
- Zhang, L., Tu, Z., Xie, X., Wang, H., Wang, H., Wang, Z., & Lu, Y. (2017). Jackfruit (Artocarpus heterophyllus Lam.) peel: A better source of antioxidants and aglucosidase inhibitors than pulp, flake and seed, and phytochemical profile by HPLC-QTOF-MS/MS. Food Chemistry, 234, 303–313. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. foodchem.2017.05.003
- Zhao, N., Zhang, C., Yang, Q., Yang, B., Lu, W., Li, D., & Chen, W. (2016). Multiple roles of lactic acid bacteria microflora in the formation of marker flavour compounds in traditional chinese paocai. *Rsc Advances*, 6(92), 89671–89678. https://doi.org/ 10.1039/c6ra12474g