Pulsed electric field treatment of *Lacticaseibacillus rhamnosus* and *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei*, bacteria with probiotic potential
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**A B S T R A C T**

Lactic acid bacteria play an important role in functional food and fermentation products for human and animal nutrition, as probiotics, paraprobiotics, postbiotics or high-lactic acid-producing strains in biorefineries. Pulsed electric field (PEF) treatment is gaining recognition in the food industry, but little is known about the effects of PEF treatment on the probiotic characteristics of lactic acid (LA) bacteria or its application for the production of paraprobiotics and postbiotics. Thus, we studied the inactivation kinetics and permeabilization of *Lacticaseibacillus rhamnosus* and *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei* as high LA-producing strains with probiotic characteristics by batch and continuous PEF treatment. Significant linear correlations between the logN reduction and permeabilization of the studied bacteria and specific energy input and current were observed during PEF treatment. Sublethal PEF treatment (5 kV/cm, 8 × 1 ms, 1 Hz) induced 10% higher LA production in *L. paracasei*, as well as the release of proteins from both bacteria. Sublethal PEF treatment did not change the susceptibility to specific antibiotics in *L. rhamnosus*, while *L. paracasei* showed some decrease in susceptibility to antibiotics. The results obtained are valuable for PEF treatment of functional food with probiotics and the production of paraprobiotics and postbiotics to improve food safety and functionality.

1. **Introduction**

Lactic acid bacteria (LAB) are a taxonomically diverse group of microorganisms that produce lactic acid (LA) as a common characteristic of their glucose metabolism (König & Fröhlich, 2017). LA is an antimicrobial substance, and LA-producing microorganisms play an important role in food preservation, but are also exploited in biorefinery processes (Djukić-Vuković et al., 2013). LAB are present in fermented products and functional food as starter cultures for dairy products, sausages, beverages, etc.

LAB are generally recognized as safe, and some, because of their important role in the gut microbiota and human health, are also recognized as probiotics (Rajilić-Stojanović & de Vos, 2014). Probiotics are “live microorganisms that, when administered in adequate amounts, confer a health benefit on the host” (WHO/FAO, 2002). Probiotics can be present in fermented food (Hill et al., 2014; Marco et al., 2021) or can be administered by other routes, but they should survive harsh conditions in the gut; eliminate pathogens through the production of LA, H₂O₂ or bacteriocins; and attach to the intestinal mucosa. They also must have a favourable profile of antibiotic susceptibility to avoid the transfer of antibiotic resistance to microorganisms that are part of the human or animal microbiome (Lee et al., 2017; Sharma et al., 2014). LAB can influence host organisms when living, but some of their positive effects are present even when inactivated. LAB develop intracellular and extracellular mechanisms to survive in hostile conditions imposed by different stressors, such as oxidants (H₂O₂, pathogen-induced ROS, etc.) in the gut or O₂ during food storage (Feng & Microbes, 2020), low pH (hydrochloric acid, volatile fatty acids, acetic acid, benzoic acid, etc.) in the gut and food and other stressors, such as heat or high salt concentrations, during food processing (Tsakalidou & Papadimitriou, 2011). Enzymes such as superoxide dismutases, NADH oxidases, exopolysaccharides, those with metal-chelating abilities, etc. Enable the protection of LAB but can also be used in novel ways for health or technological purposes. For example, the antioxidant activity of milk or
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whey is significantly increased when fermented by selected probiotics (Rochat et al., 2006; Virtanen et al., 2007). Therefore, fractions, extracts or metabolites of probiotics called postbiotics or nonviable probiotics (paraprobiotics) (de Almada et al., 2016), could provide significant benefits for consumers. A meta-analysis of studies related to the health benefits of paraprobiotics was recently published (Andresen et al., 2020; Kazemi et al., 2020). Nevertheless, adequate technologies for the production of paraprobiotics and postbiotics are still needed. One of the strategies used to manipulate different bacteria, including LAB, is the application of a pulsed electric field (PEF) (Mahnic-Kalamiza et al., 2014), which acts as an abiotic stressor to cells (Galindo et al., 2009) and enables different biological responses in bacteria, from inactivation to stimulation (Peng et al., 2020).

The application of PEFs of adequate strength and duration to eukaryotic and prokaryotic cells causes an increase in cell membrane permeability if the induced transmembrane voltage surpasses a certain value (Kotnik et al., 2010). This phenomenon, known as electroporation, provides an increase in mass transfer across the cell membrane (Kotnik et al., 2019). Depending on the PEF treatment conditions and parameters, electroporation can be reversible, causing an increase in the permeability of cell membranes without lethal effects, while in the case of irreversible electroporation, cells are unable to recover after treatment (Rems & Miklavcic, 2016).

Irreversible electroporation of undesirable microorganisms is applied in food processing (Odriozola-Serrano et al., 2013; Sepulveda et al., 2005; Sharma et al., 2014). Additionally, PEF treatment can influence texture (Barba et al., 2015, pp. 773–798) or change drying and extraction kinetics from various foodstuffs (Mahnic-Kalamiza et al., 2014). In contrast, reversible electroporation has been used for drying LAB (Vaessen et al., 2018, 2020), electrotransformation and gene delivery (Yadav et al., 2017), the development of advanced probiotics for oral vaccines (Alimolaei et al., 2016; Lin et al., 2017) or other biotechnological purposes (Kotnik et al., 2015).

The effects of PEF on the probiotic characteristics of LAB have not yet been extensively studied. Other thermal (Andresen et al., 2020; Barros et al., 2021) or nonthermal technologies (Cuevas-Gonzalez et al., 2020; de Almada et al., 2016) have been studied for the production of paraprobiotics and postbiotics, but not PEFs. Improvement of the functional characteristics of LAB, such as an increase in exopolysaccharide production (Obba et al., 2016) or protease activity (Najim & Aryana, 2013), was reported as a consequence of electroporation. We were interested in examining the effects of electroporation on the probiotic strains Lacti-caseibacillus rhamnosus ATCC 7469 and Lacti-caseibacillus paracasei NRRL B-4564 (Djukić-Yuković et al., 2015) for food applications and the production of paraprobiotics and postbiotics.

We studied the effect of PEF treatment on LA production, viability, membrane permeabilization, protein extraction and susceptibility to antibiotics in batch and continuous mode, which is more convenient on an industrial scale where larger volumes need to be treated (Flisar et al., 2014; Sack & Mueller, 2016). Furthermore, their responses were compared with inactivation and permeabilization kinetics of two model pathogen microorganisms, Escherichia coli and Listeria innocua.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Treatment Voltage [V]</th>
<th>Distance between electrodes [mm]</th>
<th>E [kV/cm]</th>
<th>Number (n) and duration of pulses [μs]</th>
<th>Current [A]</th>
<th>Sample volume [μL]</th>
<th>Energy input [J]</th>
<th>Specific energy input [kJ/L]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8 x 100</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8 x 100</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 x 100</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8 x 100</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8 x 100</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8 x 100</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20 x 100</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>25.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 x 1000</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8 x 100</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Material and methods

2.1. Preparation of bacterial cells

Lacti-caseibacillus rhamnosus ATCC 7469, Listeria innocua ATCC 33090 (American Type Culture Collection, LGC Standards GmbH, Germany), Lacti-caseibacillus paracasei NRRL B-4564 (Northern Regional Research Laboratory, Peoria, USA) and Escherichia coli K12 Top10 with plasmid pEGFP-N1 (Clontech Laboratories Inc., CA, USA) were used in this study. Lacti-caseibacillus spp. at a 1% (v/v) concentration were inoculated in Man Rogosa Sharpe (MRS) broth and incubated at 37°C for 11 h (mid exponential phase, 1–3 x 10⁸ CFU/ml). E. coli bacteria were inoculated in Luria broth (LB) medium with 50 μg/ml kanamycin (Carl ROTH GmbH, Germany) and agitated for 5 h (mid exponential phase). Listeria innocua was inoculated in nutrient broth (NB) and grown at 37°C for 10 h (mid-exponential phase). MRS, LB and NB were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich Chemie GmbH, Germany.

A cell pellet was collected by centrifugation (4248 x g, 30 min, 4°C) and suspended in sterile distilled water to attain a conductivity of 0.4–0.7 mS/cm and viable cell number of approximately 5 x 10⁷ CFU/ml. Cell density was determined by the plate count method using serial dilutions, and 100 μl of the dilution was plated into MRS (Lacti-caseibacillus spp.), LB kanamycin (E. coli) or nutrient (L. innocua) agar medium. Plates with inoculated bacteria were incubated at 37°C for 24 h and counted manually.

2.2. Batch PEF treatment

Batch PEF treatment experiments were performed in sterile aluminium cuvettes with built-in electrodes (VWR International, Austria, cat. no.: 732–1136). The suspension of bacterial cells (Section 2.1.) was transferred into the cuvettes and exposed to electric pulses using a HVP-VG square wave electric pulse generator (IGEA s.r.l., Italy). A new cuvette was used for each treatment. Different pulse amplitudes (in the range from 300 V to 2500 V, resulting in electric field strengths from 0.3 to 25 kV/cm) as estimated according to equation (1) were applied while other treatment parameters were kept constant (Table 1). The pulse repetition rate was 1 Hz in all experiments.

Immediately after the treatment, 100 μl of treated bacterial suspension was withdrawn, and the number of viable bacteria was determined using the pour plate counting method (Section 2.1.). The viability is presented as the log (N/N₀), where N represents the CFU/ml in the sample exposed to electric pulses and N₀ represents the CFU/ml in the control (untreated bacterial suspension). All experiments were performed at room temperature (22°C). The applied electric field (E) was estimated as follows:
where \( U \) denotes the applied voltage and \( d \) is the distance between the electrodes, i.e., electrode gap. The energy input delivered is reported in Table 1. Energy input is electrical energy received by the treated product (J) and specific energy is electrical energy received per volume of the treated product (J/L). The specific energy was calculated as follows:

\[
W = U \times I \times \left( n \times T \right)/V
\]

(2)

where \( U \) denotes the applied voltage, \( I \) is the measured current, \( n \) is the number of applied pulses, \( T \) is the pulse duration and \( V \) is the sample volume (Raso et al., 2016).

During the treatments, temperature was monitored using a fibre optic sensor system (opSens, Québec, CAN) that consisted of a ProSens signal conditioner and an OTG-M170 fibre optic temperature sensor.

### 2.3. Continuous mode PEF treatment

Continuous mode PEF treatment experiments were performed in a flow-through chamber with built-in electrodes (d = 2 mm, volume 0.5 ml), as presented in Fig. 1. The suspension of bacterial cells (Section 2.1.) was run through the chamber to deliver the desired number of pulses (Table 2) (Pataro et al., 2011). The flow rate was set at 3.8 ml/min (Flisar et al., 2014), and 5 ml of bacterial cell suspension was exposed to electric pulses. The field strength ranged from 2.5 to 12.5 kV/cm according to Eq. (1). The conductivity of the samples was between 0.4 and 0.7 mS/cm and calculated using \( U \) and \( I \) for the lowest and the highest amplitudes, respectively. This shows that conductivity is a function of the applied electric field (Park et al., 2009). A viable cell number of approximately \( 5 \times 10^7 \) CFU/ml was observed in all samples.

![Flow-through treatment chamber with built-in electrodes used in the study.](image)

**Fig. 1.** Flow-through treatment chamber with built-in electrodes used in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8 × 100</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8 × 100</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8 × 100</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8 × 100</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8 × 100</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
The energy input of different continuous mode PEF treatments of L. rhamnosus ATCC 7469 bacterial suspensions (in Tables 2S, 3S, 4S for other microorganisms in suppl. file).
2.4. Lactic acid production by *Lacticaseibacillus* spp.

The parameters of lactic acid fermentation (LAF) by electroporated *Lacticaseibacillus* spp. and control were compared. Immediately after the continuous mode PEF treatment, bacterial suspensions were used as inoculum at a concentration of 5% (v/v) for LAF in MRS broth, while untreated bacterial suspensions were used as controls. The fermentations were performed at 37 °C with shaking (100 rpm) for 24 h. The LA concentration in fermentation broth was determined as titratable acidity using 0.1 M NaOH titration (Salmerón et al., 2015).

2.5. Membrane permeabilization

Membrane permeabilization was evaluated using propidium iodide
(PI) after PEF treatment of bacterial cells in accordance with the procedure described earlier (Haberl-Meglič et al., 2016). PI enters the cell if its membrane is permeabilized (Batista Napotnik & Miklavčič, 2018). Bacterial cells were prepared as described in Section 2.1. For batch treatments, immediately before electric pulse application, PI was added (final concentration of PI was 100 µg/ml), and 200 µl of bacterial suspension with PI was placed in a cuvette with built-in aluminium electrodes. In flow-through chamber experiments, a concentrated solution of PI was mixed with a bacterial suspension (Section 2.1) immediately before PEF treatment (final concentration of PI was 100 µg/ml), and a total of 5 mL of cell suspension with PI was placed in the chamber for continuous PEF treatment using a square wave prototype pulse generator (Flisar et al., 2014). A HVP-VG square wave electric pulse generator (IGEA s.r.l., Italy) was used for batch treatment to deliver PI into the cells. The same PEF treatment parameters were applied to study membrane permeabilization and bacterial inactivation (Tables 1 and 2, Tables in suppl. files). After pulses were applied, bacterial cells were incubated for 22 min in the dark at room temperature (22 °C) to allow PI to enter the cell through the permeabilized membrane and then centrifuged for 4 min at 8000 x g at 22 °C to remove extracellular PI and determine the amount of PI within cells. The pellet was resuspended in 400 µl of sterile distilled water, and the uptake of PI was evaluated with a spectrophotometer (Tecan infinite M200, Tecan GmbH, Austria) at 617 nm. The permeabilization (P, uptake of PI) was defined as follows:

\[ P(\%) = \frac{F_{\text{sample}} - F_{E=0}}{F_{\text{positive control}} - F_{E=0}} \times 100 \] (3)

where \( F_{\text{sample}} \) denotes the fluorescence intensity of cells subjected to electric pulses, \( F_{E=0} \) is the fluorescence intensity of cells at \( E = 0 \), i.e., control cells, and \( F_{\text{positive control}} \) is the maximal fluorescence intensity, i.e. where saturation fluorescence was achieved and cells were completely permeabilized (cells were exposed to electric field strength of 25 kV/cm, 8 x 100 µs).

2.6. Extraction of proteins by means of electroporation and determination of total protein content

Bacterial suspensions prepared as described in Section 2.1. were subjected to PEF treatment (Table 1, Table S1 Table 2.) and analysed with respect to the amount of extracted proteins using a similar procedure as reported (Haberl-Meglič et al., 2016). In brief, after the PEF treatment, samples were left to stand at room temperature for 10 min and then filtered through a 0.22 µm filter to remove the bacteria (Milllex-GV; Millipore Corporation, MA, USA). The protein concentration was determined with Bradford’s assay (Bradford, 1976), where bovine serum albumin (BSA, Sigma-Aldrich Chemie GmbH, Germany) was used as the standard. The concentration of extracted proteins (\( C_{\text{extracted}} \)) was

| L. rhamnosus | r = - | y = - | r = -0.86645 | y = 0.54095 |
| L. rhamnosus, 8 × 100 µs | 0.95826, p = 0.042 | -0.30139, r² = 0.626 |
| L. paracasei | r = - | y = - | r = -0.9882 | y = 0.16294 |
| L. paracasei, 8 × 100 µs | 0.99918, p = 0.026 | -0.30139, r² = 0.626 |
| L. rhamnosus, 8 × 100 µs | r = - | y = - | r = -0.8374 | y = 0.54095 |
| L. paracasei | r = - | y = - | r = -0.8374 | y = 0.54095 |

* Significant, \( p < 0.05. \)

**Table 3**

Correlation of logN reduction and specific energy input and current in studied bacterial suspensions during applied batch PEF treatments.
determined as follows:

\[ c_{\text{extract}} = c_{\text{PEF}} - c_{\text{control}} \]  

(4)

where \( c_{\text{PEF}} \) represents the protein concentration in a sample exposed to electric pulses and \( c_{\text{control}} \) represents the protein concentration in a sample not exposed to electric pulses.

2.7. Susceptibility of \( L. \) rhamnosus and \( L. \) paracasei to different antibiotics

The disc diffusion test procedure for susceptibility to different antibiotics described by Bauer et al. (1966) was slightly modified (Djukić-Vuković et al., 2015). Briefly, antibiotic test discs (Torkla, Serbia) of eight antibiotics, including erythromycin (15 μg), tetracycline (30 μg), chloramphenicol (30 μg), penicillin G (10 IU), cephalexin (30 μg), gentamicin (15 μg), kanamycin (30 μg) and streptomycin (10 μg), were placed on MRS agar plates inoculated with 2% electroporated \( L. \) rhamnosus and \( L. \) paracasei (bacterial suspensions prepared as described in Section 2.1; batch treatment, 5 kV/cm, 8 × 100 μs or 20 × 100 μs, 1 Hz) or \( L. \) rhamnosus and \( L. \) paracasei culture without treatment, as controls. After an overnight incubation at 37 °C, the diameter of the inhibition zone was measured. The results were interpreted according to the proposed cut-off levels. Strains were considered resistant if the inhibition zone diameters were equal to or less than 22 mm for the tested antibiotics.

2.8. Statistical analysis

Experiments were repeated two or three times on different days to prove repeatability. The results were evaluated using an unpaired t-test analysis (OriginLab 8.0, USA) and were considered significantly different at \( p < 0.05 \). Error bars represent the standard deviation of the mean value from two or three experiments.

3. Results and discussion

Many \( Lactobacillus \) spp. (\( acidophilus \), \( gasseri \), \( johnsonii \)) and species separated into new genera, such as \( Lactocaseibacillus \) spp. (\( L. \) casei, \( L. \) rhamnosus, \( L. \) paracasei), \( Ligilactobacillus \) spp. (\( L. \) salivarius), \( Lactiplantibacillus \) spp. (\( L. \) plantarum), \( Limosilactobacillus \) spp. (\( L. \) fermentum) (Zheng et al., 2020) and \( Bifidobacterium \) (\( adolescentis \), \( animalis \), \( bifidum \), \( breve \) and \( longum \)), are accepted as probiotics if their daily intake is at least 1 × 10^9 CFU per day (Health Canada, 2009). Probiotic biomass with lower viability or inactivated probiotics with beneficial effects on health could still be administered as paraprobiotics. Although mostly live bacteria are used for the treatment of gut diseases (Sanders et al., 2019) or in functional food, paraprobiotics can be more convenient in some cases. Paraprobiotics are safe for immunocompromised consumers and can be added after the sterilization of food without the risk of recontamination. Additionally, both viable LAB and LAB-derived postbiotics can adsorb mycotoxins or other contaminants and improve the safety of food in that way (Moradi et al., 2020; Sevim et al., 2019).

When fruits and vegetables are harvested, they begin to lose quality mainly due to microbiological spoilage. Today, many food preservation methods aim to extend the shelf-life of food and ensure its safety. The ideal preservation method should inactivate spoilage and pathogenic microorganisms and not change food’s organoleptic and nutritional properties (i.e., affecting food vitamins, flavour, colour or texture) (Raso & Barbosa-Cánovas, 2003). Although thermal treatments are most often used in the food industry, for some foods, the application of rather high heat is needed, which can considerably affect food properties. Therefore, nonthermal preservation methods are being sought to preserve nutritional and organoleptic food properties (Morales-de la Peña et al., 2019). One of the promising nonthermal methods in the food industry is PEF, where the food temperature during treatment is lower than that during traditional thermal treatments. PEF can inactivate various microorganisms in different foods (Gómez et al., 2019) without significant loss of food flavour, colour, and nutrients. Furthermore, the treatment time is substantially shorter (a few seconds) than that of traditional thermal treatments; thus, PEF is gaining interest as a gentle treatment.
A significant correlation of logN reduction and specific energy input or current in studied bacterial suspensions during applied continuous mode PEF treatments.

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>logN reduction (y)</th>
<th>Specific energy input (x) [kJ/L]</th>
<th>Current (x) [A]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson’s correlation coefficient</td>
<td>Linear fitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. rhamnosus</td>
<td>r = 0.99592, p = 0.0049</td>
<td>y = -0.00907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.00907, p = 0.0059</td>
<td>r = 0.0309x, r² = 0.9961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. paracasei</td>
<td>r = 0.99798, p = 0.0049</td>
<td>y = -0.0907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0907, p = 0.0059</td>
<td>r = 0.0309x, r² = 0.9961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. coli</td>
<td>r = 0.9988, p = 0.0049</td>
<td>y = -0.0907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0907, p = 0.0059</td>
<td>r = 0.0309x, r² = 0.9961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. innocua</td>
<td>r = 0.99917, p = 0.0049</td>
<td>y = -0.0907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0907, p = 0.0059</td>
<td>r = 0.0309x, r² = 0.9961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permeabilization (y) | Specific energy input (x) [kJ/L] | Current (x) [A] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson’s correlation coefficient</td>
<td>Linear fitting</td>
<td>Pearson’s correlation coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. rhamnosus</td>
<td>r = 0.99979, p = 0.0049</td>
<td>y = -0.0907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.0907, p = 0.0059</td>
<td>r = 0.0309x, r² = 0.9961</td>
<td>-11.2028 + 16.5775x, r² = 0.9696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. paracasei</td>
<td>r = 0.99942, p = 0.0049</td>
<td>y = -0.0907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.0907, p = 0.0059</td>
<td>r = 0.0309x, r² = 0.9961</td>
<td>-11.2028 + 16.5775x, r² = 0.9696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. coli</td>
<td>r = 0.99976, p = 0.0049</td>
<td>y = -0.0907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.0907, p = 0.0059</td>
<td>r = 0.0309x, r² = 0.9961</td>
<td>-11.2028 + 16.5775x, r² = 0.9696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. innocua</td>
<td>r = 0.99749, p = 0.0049</td>
<td>y = -0.0907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.0907, p = 0.0059</td>
<td>r = 0.0309x, r² = 0.9961</td>
<td>-11.2028 + 16.5775x, r² = 0.9696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant, p < 0.05.

For in-depth studies of permeabilization and its effects on selected LAB, a pulse duration of 100 μs was selected to preserve the viability of probiotic bacteria. The permeabilization and logN reduction curves for L. rhamnosus and L. paracasei induced by batch PEF treatment are presented in Fig. 3.

The application of an electric field strength of up to 8 kV/cm resulted in permeabilization of approximately 90% and mainly preserved the viability of both bacteria. Larger L. rhamnosus was permeabilized at a lower field strength than L. paracasei, which is consistent with theoretical predictions. With a further increase in field strength above 8 kV/cm, the viability of L. rhamnosus was also more affected than the viability of L. paracasei. The peak temperature recorded during the PEF treatment at maximal applied electric field strength (25 kV/cm, 8 pulses, 100 μs pulse duration, used for positive control in PEF treatment) was 38.6 °C. Therefore, thermal inactivation is not plausible under the studied conditions. The viability of L. rhamnosus and L. paracasei can be significantly preserved if field strengths of 3-8 kV/cm are applied. Under these conditions, the membranes of both bacteria are permeabilized.

### 3.2. The effects of PEF treatment in continuous mode on the permeabilization and viability of L. rhamnosus and L. paracasei

The same electric field strengths as in batch PEF treatment (Section 3.3) were applied for PEF treatment in continuous mode, which is most often used on an industrial scale. Bacterial suspensions of the studied LAB and undesired E. coli and L. innocua, model pathogen microorganisms, were subjected to continuous mode PEF treatment, and the obtained results are presented in Fig. 4.

For L. paracasei, a slightly higher field strength was necessary in continuous mode PEF treatment (Fig. 4) than in the batch system (Fig. 3) to achieve the same permeabilization and logN reduction. Although the difference between batch and continuous treatment was also in the electrodes used, stainless steel in continuous and aluminum electrodes in the batch system, no statistically significant difference was noticed when batch treatments with aluminium or stainless-steel electrodes were compared under the same conditions (data not shown).

In the continuous PEF treatment, L. rhamnosus and E. coli had similar inactivation kinetics, while L. paracasei and L. innocua had similar inactivation rates, although some differences in permeabilization were observed. Please note that different ranges of electric fields are shown in Figs 3 and 4. Elongated cells are expected to be oriented with their longer axis perpendicular to the direction of the electric field in laminar flow.
flow; therefore, slightly higher field strength is needed to achieve the same permeabilization as in batch PEF treatment where the cells are randomly distributed. This effect was noticed for L. paracasei, while for L. rhamnosus, there was no difference between permeabilization in the batch and flow systems. When cells are aggregated, such as L. rhamnosus, due to exopolysaccharide production, the effect of cell orientation during flow treatment can be less pronounced at low flow rates, which could explain the absence of a difference between the batch and flow PEF treatment for L. rhamnosus.

To analyse the observed effects, logN reduction and permeabilization were correlated with the specific energy input or current (Table 2, Table 2S, 3S, 4S) for continuous mode treatment and are presented in Fig. 5. (A) and 5. (B). The results of the linear fit are provided in Table 4.

A similar amount of specific energy is needed for logN reduction of L. rhamnosus and E. coli, and their behaviour was similar over the whole range of applied energies. L. paracasei and L. innocua showed two- and three-fold higher resilience to applied energy and current, respectively, during PEF treatment than L. rhamnosus or E. coli. In addition,
differences in the slopes of linear fitting of logN reduction and specific energy input show a range of energies that are tolerable for different bacteria, with *L. innocua* and *L. paracasei* being less susceptible to inactivation by PEF (Fig. 5A). *L. paracasei* can act as a surrogate microorganism for the model food-borne pathogen *E. coli*, since *L. paracasei* has shown higher resistance to PEF treatment than *E. coli*.

From the permeabilization dataset, a linear correlation was only significant for *L. rhamnosus* and *E. coli*, which were permeabilized at low specific energies (Table 4). To fit better observed results, sigmoid fitting of permeabilization with specific energy (A) and current (B) is presented in Fig. 6. The equations for sigmoid fitting are given in Table 5.

In bacteria where the electroporation threshold is reached at low specific energies (*L. rhamnosus* and *E. coli*), a linear correlation explains the good permeabilization as a function of specific energy. In bacteria that need a higher specific energy input to initiate electroporation, sigmoidal fitting better explains the correlation of
However, for higher inactivation above predictive manner. Significant linear correlations obtained in batch and electroporation threshold is reached, permeabilization linearly correlates with both specific energy and current until it reaches 100%. Variations in permeabilization and inactivation within the population of PEF-treated bacteria due to the distribution of cell size were suggested previously by Puc et al. (2003).

For numerous PEF applications, there is a need to translate results obtained in batch PEF treatment to continuous mode PEF treatment in a predictive manner. Significant linear correlations obtained in batch and continuous mode treatment for *L. rhamnosus* are presented in Fig. 7.

At lower specific energies and inactivation rates, there was no significant difference between the batch and continuous mode treatments. However, for higher inactivation above \(-1.8 \log N\), continuous mode treatment is more efficient in terms of specific energy input. Qin et al. (1998) also observed that continuous mode PEF treatment was more efficient in terms of microbial inactivation than the batch system.

The obtained correlations enable prediction of the inactivation rate, which can be expected in continuous mode PEF treatment from data acquired in a batch system, for scale up and transition from batch to continuous setup and vice versa, under the studied conditions. Furthermore, PEF treatment parameters were examined for extraction of specific compounds or enhancement of particular metabolic activity in LAB related to their probiotic characteristics.

### 3.3. Effect of sublethal PEF treatment on the probiotic characteristics of *L. rhamnosus* and *L. paracasei*

#### 3.3.1. Lactic acid production

LA production is an important probiotic characteristic responsible for antimicrobial activity against pathogens (Djukić-Vuković et al., 2015; Rajlić-Stojanović & de Vos, 2014). We first tested the effects of sublethal PEF treatment conditions (8 × 100 μs, 1 Hz, 5 kV/cm), and LA production was completely preserved (data not shown). Therefore, a longer pulse duration (8 × 1 ms, 1 Hz, 5 kV/cm) was examined to evaluate the effect of higher energy input but still without a high loss of viability (Table 1, Table 2 S., Fig. 2 (A), (B)). These results are presented in Fig. 8. LA production was 10% higher after 24 h of LAF with 1 ms pulse-treated *L. rhamnosus*, while with *L. paracasei*, no significant difference in LA production was observed. Additionally, sugar consumption was increased during LAF with electroporated *L. rhamnosus*. A similar result was reported for *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, where low electric field strengths (below 6 kV/cm) caused an increase in sugar consumption (Mattar et al., 2014, 2015). PEF treatment of *L. plantarum* at field strengths of 14 kV/cm or less also enhanced the metabolic activity and acidification rate during the first 24 h of fermentation (Seratić et al., 2013).

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permeabilization (y)</th>
<th>Specific energy input (x) [kJ/L]</th>
<th>Current (x) [A]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>L. rhamnosus</em></td>
<td>y = 98.4568/(1 + e^(-3.6457)/1.9045), r² = 0.9507, P = 0.0238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>L. paracasei</em></td>
<td>y = 99.9724/(1 + e^(-10.4205)/2.5246), r² = 0.9586, P = 0.0657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>E. coli</em></td>
<td>y = 99.9134/(1 + e^(-5.9276)/2.6197), r² = 0.9845, P = 0.0238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>L. innocua</em></td>
<td>y = 0.9958/(1 + e^(-5.9276)/2.6197), r² = 0.9845, P = 0.0238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant, normality test, P > 0.05.*

permeabilization with specific energy over the whole studied range of specific energies, as in the case of *L. innocua* (Fig. 6A, B). Once the electroporation threshold is reached, permeabilization linearly correlates with both specific energy and current until it reaches 100%. Variations in permeabilization and inactivation within the population of PEF-treated bacteria due to the distribution of cell size were suggested previously by Puc et al. (2003).

For numerous PEF applications, there is a need to translate results obtained in batch PEF treatment to continuous mode PEF treatment in a predictive manner. Significant linear correlations obtained in batch and continuous mode treatment for *L. rhamnosus* are presented in Fig. 7.

![Fig. 7. Correlations of logN reduction and specific energy for batch and continuous mode PEF treatment of *L. rhamnosus*. Symbols: black, dashed line – linear fitting for batch treatment, red, solid line – linear fitting for continuous mode treatment, dotted lines – errors. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the Web version of this article.)](image-url)
3.3.2. Extraction of proteins

Enhancement of the performance of bacteria or yeasts due to electroporation is often attributed to the increase in transport of different molecules through membranes (Serulic et al., 2013). However, it can also lead to leakage of intracellular contents, with proteins being most often studied (Coustets et al., 2015; Haberl-Meglic et al., 2015; Haberl-Meglic et al., 2016). Therefore, the determined content of proteins released after different numbers of 100 μs and 1 ms pulses while preserving the viability of bacteria (field strength 5 kV/cm, Fig. 2.) and the obtained results are presented in Table 6. The electroextraction of proteins in filtered extracts of L. rhamnosus 10 min after PEF was significantly above the control for longer pulse durations. Pulse duration was also important for better extraction from E. coli (Haberl-Meglic et al., 2016).

The release of intracellular proteins could be particularly important for functional food with probiotics, enabling the treated product to have enhanced characteristics (Molaei Parvarei et al., 2021). Glucosidase, an enzyme responsible for the biotransformation of heterosides into their active aglycons (Ewe et al., 2012), is mostly intracellular in lactobacilli (Carevic et al., 2017; Michlmayr & Kneifel, 2014). The release of enzymes by reversible electroporation could be an important application of PEFs in functional food.

3.3.3. Susceptibility to antibiotics

Increased mass transfer between bacteria and their surroundings as a consequence of electroporation can also affect the susceptibility of the studied bacteria to antibiotics or other inhibitory molecules. Susceptibility to antibiotics is studied in probiotics to prevent the introduction of transferable resistance with probiotic-rich food into the host microbiome. When PEF treatment of \(8 \times 10^3\) cells/cm\(^2\) at 5 kV/cm was performed, there were no differences in the susceptibility to antibiotics between treated bacteria and controls (data not shown). With a higher number of pulses (\(20 \times 10^3\) μs, 5 kV/cm), some changes in the susceptibility are obtained and presented in Fig. 9 (A) and 9 (B). For L. rhamnosus, there were no significant changes in the susceptibility to antibiotics after PEF application, except for chloramphenicol (Fig. 9 (A)), although it was more sensitive to PEF (Figs. 2., 3., 4.). After PEF application, L. paracasei was less susceptible to some antibiotics (Fig. 9 (B)) and generally showed less susceptibility to PEF treatment (Figs. 2., 3., 4.). One could hypothesize that bacteria will be more susceptible to antibiotics after electroporation due to permeabilization, as was observed for organic acids or antimicrobial compounds (Arroyo & Lyng, 2017; Martens et al., 2020; Terezbik et al., 2016). Therefore, we examined the effect of permeabilization/sealing time to compare it for both studied bacteria. 12.5 min and 30 min after electroporation. The results showed the same antibiotic susceptibility.

### Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bacteria</th>
<th>Number of pulses</th>
<th>Pulse duration [μs]</th>
<th>Electric field [kV/cm]</th>
<th>Protein concentration [μg/ml]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>batch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. rhamnosus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>not detected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>not detected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>not detected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. paracasei</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>not detected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>not detected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>not detected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>not detected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>not detected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. rhamnosus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>not detected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. paracasei</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>not detected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>not detected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Experiments were repeated two times on different days to prove repeatability.
profile, regardless of time within the studied intervals. The permeability was 14.45 ± 0.34% (12.5 min) and 13.81 ± 1.06% (30 min) for *L. paracasei*. For *L. rhamnosus*, the permeability was 34.75 ± 3.24% (12.5 min) and 37.36 ± 1.69% (30 min).

Therefore, the observed decreased susceptibility to antibiotics is probably related to other changes in the cell caused by the application of PEF, not simply by membrane permeabilization and the potential influx of antibiotics into the cell. Regardless of the mechanism of action, all bactericidal antibiotics induce the production of highly reactive oxygen species (ROS) related to cell death (Dwyer et al., 2010; Kohanski et al., 2010). In contrast, PEF treatment causes stress to the cell mediated by the generation of ROS (Teissie, 2017). Upregulation of many genes was reported in PEF-treated bacteria, from TCA cycle and methylcitrate cycle proteins related to β-oxidation of lipids and peroxidation in the membrane to genes related to protection from abiotic stress in general (UspB), oxidative stress (AcmB) and changes in membrane stability (OmpF, MacA) (Liu et al., 2019; Pakhomova et al., 2012; Tanino et al., 2012). Elevated amounts of ROS and increased expression of proteins responsible for the recovery of bacteria after sublethal PEF treatment (Chueca et al., 2015) could interact with conventional pathways of antibiotic action and decrease the efficiency of antibiotics. The pre-treatment of bacteria with 1–5 mM H$_2$O$_2$ before exposure to antibiotics caused the expression of natural oxidative stress-protecting enzymes and resulted in a 1 log decrease in susceptibility to antibiotics (Yang et al., 2014). However, other mechanisms unrelated to oxidative stress could also induce lower susceptibility to antibiotics after PEF treatment. For
example, PEF-treated E. coli showed expression of macrolide-specific efflux protein (MacA), which was not detected in the control untreated sample (Liu et al., 2019). This implies that PEF treatment could activate resistance genes for selected antibiotics by mechanisms associated with membrane transport, permeability and fluidity and not just through the oxidative stress response. This could be the case for other bacteria, including LAB, since L. paracasei in this study also showed lower susceptibility to macrolide antibiotic erythromycin after PEF treatment.

Further studies are needed to gain more insights into the mechanisms involved in changes in susceptibility to antibiotics due to PEF treatment, but it is evident that the interaction of probiotic LAB and PEF goes beyond the increase in membrane permeability and transmembrane transport. PEFs have the potential to be exploited in processing in novel ways, other than inactivation or electrotransformation, especially in the growing field of functional food production and biotransformation by bacteria.

4. Conclusions

The inactivation and permeabilization kinetics of L. rhamnosus and L. paracasei by batch and continuous mode PEF treatment showed the higher susceptibility of L. rhamnosus to PEF treatment in both studied treatment systems. A slightly larger size probably enables easier permeabilization of L. rhamnosus.

In parallel, the permeabilization and inactivation kinetics of E. coli and L. innocua as model foodborne pathogens were studied, and they followed those of L. rhamnosus and L. paracasei, respectively. Therefore, L. paracasei can be used as a surrogate microorganism in processes for validation of PEF treatment potentially challenged by E. coli.

Similar linear correlations between a reduction in viability and specific energy input were established for all studied bacteria. The results obtained in batch treatment mode can be used to predict logN reduction in continuous mode under the defined conditions. In terms of specific energy input, continuous treatment was more efficient for achieving the same inactivation of L. rhamnosus. These results could be useful in the selection of promising candidates for the application of PEFs for the treatment of inoculated functional food for biotransformation, the production of paraprobiotics or probiotics, etc.

The effects of the determined sublethal PEF treatment conditions on probiotic characteristics were also studied. The application of sublethal PEF treatment of 5 kV/cm with 8 × 1 ms pulses increased LA production and sugar consumption by L. rhamnosus in LAF. Significant extraction of proteins was obtained by application of longer pulses. PEF treatment did not change the susceptibility of L. rhamnosus to specific antibiotics, while for L. paracasei, a decrease in the susceptibility to antibiotics was observed. This is probably a result of the PEF-induced stress and recovery mechanisms initiated by PEF treatment. The obtained results are valuable for PEF treatment of functional food with probiotics to improve its safety or functionality. This study sets the foundation for novel PEF applications in the production of probiotics or parabiotics by tuning PEF treatment parameters. Further studies are needed, but biotransformation in functional food with PEF-assisted electroextraction of enzymes or other LAB metabolites could be a very promising option in the future.
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