



HAL
open science

A standardised static in vitro digestion method suitable for food - an international consensus

Didier Dupont

► **To cite this version:**

Didier Dupont. A standardised static in vitro digestion method suitable for food - an international consensus. EFSA Workshop on allergenicity assessment of GM plants, Jun 2015, Bruxelles, Belgium. , 2015. hal-01209876

HAL Id: hal-01209876

<https://hal.science/hal-01209876v1>

Submitted on 3 Jun 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



A standardised static *in vitro* digestion method suitable for food An international consensus




Didier DUPONT


INRA Agrocampus Ouest – Milk and Egg Science & Technology
Rennes FRANCE



Scientific Context



Diet-related diseases ↑
Prevent these pathologies rather than cure them



Gut = interface between food and human body


Digestion releases food components that can have a beneficial or a deleterious effect on human health

... but the mechanisms of food disintegration in the gastrointestinal tract remain unclear and the digestive process has been considered as a black box so far

By increasing our knowledge on food digestion, we will increase our knowledge on the effect of food on human health

However...

☞ During the last 10 y, ↑ in the number of publication on food digestion, associating food scientists, nutritionists and gut physiologists: a multidisciplinary new scientific community has been created



☞ This community is scattered: many ongoing projects at the national level but no current research action on this topic in Europe and no network for exchanges

☞ There is no scientific international congress on food digestion where scientists could have exchanges

☞ There were no scientific journal dedicated to food digestion before the creation of « Food Digestion » and « Food & Function » (2010)

☞ There is a dramatic lack of harmonization between the *in vitro* digestion models used throughout Europe and a real need of validation of these models

This is the perfect time for developing a trans-European network to improve dissemination of critical findings, develop truly multidisciplinary collaborations and harmonise approaches between groups and...

COST IS THE BEST MECHANISM FOR THAT

Improving health properties of food by sharing our knowledge on the digestive process

COST Action FA1005

Dr. Didier DUPONT, Senior Scientist, INRA, France

●
INFOGEST
●



June 2011 – May 2015

Objectives

- Compare the existing digestion models, harmonize the methodologies and propose guidelines for performing experiments
- Validate *in vitro* models towards *in vivo* data (animal and/or human)
- Identify the beneficial/deleterious components that are released in the gut during food digestion
- Determine the effect of the matrix structure on the bioavailability of food nutrients and bioactive molecules

But these goals can only be reached by...

- Gathering scientists from different disciplines (food science, nutrition, gastroenterology, immunology...) to share and improve our knowledge on food digestion



Administrative
Manager



Nathalie
Le Marre



Vice-chair
Alan Mackie - UK

Chair
Didier Dupont - France



Dairy, Egg
Fruits & Vegetables
Meat, Cereals

Characterization of raw
materials and processed
food matrices for optimized
nutrient bioaccessibility
WG1

In vitro, in vivo and in silico
models of mammalian
gastrointestinal digestion
WG2

Evaluation of the health
effects
WG3

BFC identification
Stability during processing
Food multi-scale characterization

Digestion models harmonization
Comparison *in vitro* / *in vivo*
Digestion products identification
BFC absorption / bioavailability

Immunomodulatory properties
Regulation of appetite and satiety
Effect of BFC on human microbiota



B. Murray



F Capozzi
Italy



A. Brodkorb
Ireland



I. Recio
Spain



A. Bordoni
Italy



Tor Lea
Norway



EUROPEAN COOPERATION IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

www.cost-infogest.eu



Tech Univ Denmark Univ Aarhus Univ Copenhagen MTT Univ Oulu Univ Eastern Finland
 Norwegian Univ Life Sci Chalmers Univ Tech VTT Nofima Riga Stradin Univ Univ Ljubljana
 Univ Zagreb
 NIZO TNO Lund Univ



Canada

Wageningen UR
 Teagasc Univ Reading
 James Hutton Inst
 Univ College Cork

Cent Rech Lippmann
 Univ Birmingham
 Univ Greenwich
 Univ Nottingham

Univ Ghent
 Agroscopie Posieux
 Agrocampus Ouest
 Leatherhead Food Res

FIBL
 Univ Greifswald
 IRD
 INRA

AgroParisTech
 Univ Murcia
 CSIC Univ Granada

NIH Ricardo Jorge
 Univ Alto Douro
 ITQB Milan State Univ

CONICET
 Univ Buenos Aires

Argentina

Anabio
 Rothamsted Res
 Univ Leeds
 Univ Manchester

Univ Glasgow
 Univ Nottingham
 Agroscopie Posieux
 Agrocampus Ouest

ACW
 Univ Sevilla
 Univ Valencia
 Max Rubner-Institut

CNRS Univ Basque Country
 CTCPA
 Univ Murcia

Univ Granada
 NIH Ricardo Jorge
 Univ Alto Douro

ITQB Milan State Univ
 FEM CNR
 Univ Milan

Univ Queensland
 Deakin Univ

Australia

Iceland
 Rothamsted Res
 Univ Leeds
 Univ Manchester

Univ Glasgow
 Univ Nottingham
 Agroscopie Posieux
 Agrocampus Ouest

ACW
 Univ Sevilla
 Univ Valencia
 Max Rubner-Institut

CNRS Univ Basque Country
 CTCPA
 Univ Murcia

Univ Granada
 NIH Ricardo Jorge
 Univ Alto Douro

ITQB Milan State Univ
 FEM CNR
 Univ Milan

Univ Queensland
 Deakin Univ

Australia

Norway
 Rothamsted Res
 Univ Leeds
 Univ Manchester

Univ Glasgow
 Univ Nottingham
 Agroscopie Posieux
 Agrocampus Ouest

ACW
 Univ Sevilla
 Univ Valencia
 Max Rubner-Institut

CNRS Univ Basque Country
 CTCPA
 Univ Murcia

Univ Granada
 NIH Ricardo Jorge
 Univ Alto Douro

ITQB Milan State Univ
 FEM CNR
 Univ Milan

Univ Queensland
 Deakin Univ

Australia

Sweden
 Rothamsted Res
 Univ Leeds
 Univ Manchester

Univ Glasgow
 Univ Nottingham
 Agroscopie Posieux
 Agrocampus Ouest

ACW
 Univ Sevilla
 Univ Valencia
 Max Rubner-Institut

CNRS Univ Basque Country
 CTCPA
 Univ Murcia

Univ Granada
 NIH Ricardo Jorge
 Univ Alto Douro

ITQB Milan State Univ
 FEM CNR
 Univ Milan

Univ Queensland
 Deakin Univ

Australia

Finland
 Rothamsted Res
 Univ Leeds
 Univ Manchester

Univ Glasgow
 Univ Nottingham
 Agroscopie Posieux
 Agrocampus Ouest

ACW
 Univ Sevilla
 Univ Valencia
 Max Rubner-Institut

CNRS Univ Basque Country
 CTCPA
 Univ Murcia

Univ Granada
 NIH Ricardo Jorge
 Univ Alto Douro

ITQB Milan State Univ
 FEM CNR
 Univ Milan

Univ Queensland
 Deakin Univ

Australia

Laval Univ
 Univ Guelph
 Czech Univ Prague
 Inst Chem Technol

KTU Food Inst
 Lithuanian Univ HS
 Gdansk Univ Tech
 Maize Res Inst

NGO
 Polish Academy of Sci
 Univ Belgrade
 Univ Novi Sad

Aristotele Univ Thessaloniki
 Centr Food Res Inst
 Ben Gurion Univ
 Technion

Pom Med Univ
 Ege Univ
 Univ California Davis

Riddett Inst
 Plant Food Res

New Zealand



USA

Albania
 Agric Univ Tirana

Albania

Montenegro
 Ege Univ

Montenegro




340 scientists - 130 institutes – 37 countries

Industry involvement

~ 40 European companies are involved in INFOGEST



The digestive process



Gastric phase = a very complex but crucial step for the whole digestion process



Models for simulating digestion

*In vitro
static
models*



*In silico
models*

$$\Phi_{12} = k_{12whey} \times (V_1 - m_{caswpd1} \times \alpha) + k_{12aggr} \times m_{caswpd1} \times \alpha$$



*In vitro dynamic
models*

*Human
models*




Animal models



Static *in vitro* digestion models: pro's & con's



In vivo



In vitro

Main Reasons :

- Ethical - Technical – Financial

Advantages:

Standardisation of the experimental conditions
Good reproducibility and repeatability
Easy sampling, possibility to follow kinetics

Disadvantages:

You can't mimic the complexity of the GI tract
in a test tube!!!
Needs harmonization

In vitro gastro-intestinal digestion

Consensus INFOGEST protocol

Oral phase





Mix 1:1 with Simulated Salivary Fluid (SSF)
salivary amylase (75 U/mL)
2 min, pH 7

Gastric Phase


Mix 1:1 with Simulated Gastric Fluid (SGF)
Pepsin (2000 U/mL)
2h, pH 3

Intestinal Phase

Mix 1:1 with Simulated Intestinal Fluid (SIF)
Enzymes
Pancreatin (based on trypsin 100 U/mL) or
Pure enzymes
Bile (10mM)
2h, pH 7



The Infogest consensus *in vitro* digestion model



Consensus model based on available physiological data (*in vivo*)

OPEN ACCESS article

Calibration of the digestive enzymes, bile provided as supplementary material

29 authors

Minekus et al. 2014
Food Funct. 5, 1113-24
46 citations
Hot paper (0.1%)

Simulated digestion fluids

Table 2 Preparation of stock solutions of simulated digestion fluids. The volumes are calculated for a final volume of 500 mL for each simulated fluid. We recommend to make up the stock solution with distilled water to 400 mL instead, *i.e.* 1.25× concentrate, for storage at $-20\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$. In the Experimental section, these 1.25× concentrates are referred to as Simulated Salivary Fluid (SSF), Simulated Gastric Fluid (SGF) and Simulated Intestinal Fluid (SIF) electrolyte stock solutions. The addition of enzymes, bile salts, Ca^{2+} solution etc. and water will result in the correct electrolyte concentration in the final digestion mixture. $\text{CaCl}_2(\text{H}_2\text{O})_2$ is not added to the electrolyte stock solutions as precipitation may occur. Instead, it is added to the final mixture of simulated digestion fluid and food^a

Constituent	Stock conc.		SSF		SGF		SIF	
			pH 7		pH 3		pH 7	
	g L ⁻¹	mol L ⁻¹	Vol. of stock mL	Conc. in SSF mmol L ⁻¹	Vol. of stock mL	Conc. in SGF mmol L ⁻¹	Vol. of stock mL	Conc. in SIF mmol L ⁻¹
KCl	37.3	0.5	15.1	15.1	6.9	6.9	6.8	6.8
KH ₂ PO ₄	68	0.5	3.7	3.7	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8
NaHCO ₃	84	1	6.8	13.6	12.5	25	42.5	85
NaCl	117	2	—	—	11.8	47.2	9.6	38.4
MgCl ₂ (H ₂ O) ₆	30.5	0.15	0.5	0.15	0.4	0.1	1.1	0.33
(NH ₄) ₂ CO ₃	48	0.5	0.06	0.06	0.5	0.5	—	—
For pH adjustment								
	mol L ⁻¹		mL	mmol L ⁻¹	mL	mmol L ⁻¹	mL	mmol L ⁻¹
NaOH	1		—	—	—	—	—	—
HCl	6		0.09	1.1	1.3	15.6	0.7	8.4
CaCl₂(H₂O)₂ is not added to the simulated digestion fluids, see details in legend								
	g L ⁻¹	mol L ⁻¹		mmol L ⁻¹		mmol L ⁻¹		mmol L ⁻¹
CaCl ₂ (H ₂ O) ₂	44.1	0.3		1.5 (0.75*)		0.15 (0.075*)		0.6 (0.3*)

^a * in brackets is the corresponding Ca^{2+} concentration in the final digestion mixture.

The oral phase



- ☞ Always include an oral phase (\pm enzymes)
- ☞ Ratio Food / Simulated Salivary Fluid (SSF): **50/50 w/v**
- ☞ Time of chew: **2 min**



Add 5 g food + 5 mL SSF

Add Human salivary alpha amylase 150 IU/ mL in the SSF

Add 0,5 μ L of CaCl₂ (588 g/ L) per mL SSF

Simulate mastication



After addition of simulated salivary fluid (with salivary amylase)



The gastric phase

Ratio oral content / Simulated gastric fluid (SGF) : **50/50 w/v**

Porcine pepsin: **2000 U/mL**

Time of gastric digestion: **2 hours**

pH of the reaction: **3**



Why 2 hours?

Duration highly depends on the type of food/meal

- * Gastric emptying of a western type solid meal: 3-4h, of a liquid 0.5-1h
- * Addition of nutrients to a liquid meal increases the transit time
- * Strong inter and intra-individual variability

A time of 2h for gastric digestion represents the half emptying of a moderately nutritious and semi-solid meal


Why pH 3?

Fasted pH commonly found is around or below 2

pH increases to 5 and above because of the buffering capacity of the food/meal


pH 3 represents the mean value for a general meal exhibiting a gastric emptying half-time of 2 h

pH and duration of the gastric phase




Gardner et al. 2002

125g steak, 200g boiled potatoes, 200g fresh vegetables, 50g salad, 200mL dessert, 200 mL water




Tyssandier et al. 2003

Tomato puree, carrot puree or chopped spinach



Dressman et al. 1990

6 oz hamburger, 2 slices bread, 2 oz potatoes, ketchup, mayonnaise



Malagelada et al. 1976

Solid meal 400 mL 458 kcal pH 6

The intestinal phase

- ☞ Ratio Food (gastric content) / Simulated duodenal fluid (SDF): **50/50 w/v**
- ☞ Time of duodenal digestion: **2 hours**
- ☞ pH of the solution: **7**

20 mL gastric content

+ 3.0 μ L of **CaCl₂** (H₂O)₂ (588 g/L, w/v)

+ Bile: (final concentration in total fluid 10 mM). There are two options for bile for the duodenal stage, which is to use either:

Bile extract (e.g. B8631-100G from Sigma) or

Fresh porcine bile (available from several InfoGest members including IFR (160 mM stock). The SDF the concentration is made up to 20mM.

+ fill up to a final volume of 40 mL with SDF to reach the same volume as the gastric digesta (20mL).


At this point there are two options in how to proceed:

1. Use pancreatin: sufficient pancreatin to provide 100 U/ml of trypsin (TAME Units). The proteolytic, lipolytic and amylolytic activity should be determined
2. Use individual enzymes

pH and duration of the intestinal phase


Why pH 7?

- ☞ pH measured in the duodenum is close to 6,5 (see below)
- ☞ In the small intestine, pH increases slightly over its length to a value of around 7,5 in the distal ileum



Tyssandier et al. 2003

Tomato puree, carrot puree or chopped spinach



Dressman et al. 1990


6 oz hamburger, 2 slices bread, 2 oz potatoes, ketchup, mayonnaise

Key points

The calibration of the digestive enzymes is crucial and not that easy to perform


International inter-laboratory assay (7 labs in Europe)

Pepsin reference
From porcine gastric mucosa
P7012
Batch number Lot#SLBJ4999V



▶ 2976 U/mg of pepsin powder

Pancreatin reference
Porcin pancreatin
P7545
Batch number Lot#SLBJ7293V




▶ 7.0 trypsin U/mg of pancreatin powder

Same batch of pepsin and pancreatin analyzed by trained people


Key points

Differences in digestive enzymes calibration leads to different peptidomes

Gastric phase



Intestinal phase



- ▶ The extremely sensitive metabolomics approach clearly discriminates laboratory 6 and 7 as being outliers during gastric as well as intestinal phase

The consensus model can be learned with videos on YouTube

The screenshot shows a web browser window displaying the YouTube channel page for 'In vitro food digestion - COST action INFOGEST'. The browser's address bar shows the URL: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCdc-NP9kTDGyH_kZCgpQWg. The YouTube logo is in the top left, and the search bar contains the text 'cost infogest'. The channel banner features a QR code and the text 'INFOGEST Method'. Below the banner, the video title 'In vitro food digestion - COST action INFOGEST' is displayed, along with navigation tabs for 'Accueil', 'Vidéos', 'Playlists', 'Chaînes', 'Discussion', and 'À propos'. A 'S'abonner' button with a subscriber count of 36 is visible. The main content area shows a list of video uploads, each with a thumbnail, title, and description. The first video is 'Alpha Amylase Activity Assay for In Vitro Food Digestion' (5:12), and the second is 'Static In Vitro Digestion Method for Food' (8:55). Both videos include a diagram of the digestive system with phases labeled: Oral phase, Gastric Phase, and Intestinal Phase. On the right side, there is a 'Chaînes populaires sur YouTube' section listing various channels like 'Seb la Frite', 'MissCreatives', and 'LanguedePub / M...'. The bottom of the browser window shows the Windows taskbar with various application icons and the system clock showing 10:38.

Conclusion

- ☞ The Infogest model has been applied successfully to several foods like milk, meat, pasta, bread... and it works! (46 citations in 1.5 year)
- ☞ The Infogest *in vitro* digestion model is now used all over the world, in Europe, USA, Australia, New Zealand, Argentina...
- ☞ Interlaboratory trials have been performed at the European level on the digestion of milk and meat
- ☞ People can easily learn how to run the model, calibrate the digestive enzymes and the bile with the open access publication and the videos available on YouTube
- ☞ Validation towards *in vivo* data is under investigation. Data on pigs will be available before the end of 2015



INFOGEST
International Conference
Rennes, France
April 2017

We are pleased to announce the next

5th International Conference on Food Digestion



in Rennes, France, April 2017