



HAL
open science

Subcritical water and supercritical carbon dioxide: efficient and selective eco-compatible solvents for coffee and coffee by-products valorization

Alexandre Vandeponseele, Micheline Draye, Christine Piot, Gregory Chatel

► To cite this version:

Alexandre Vandeponseele, Micheline Draye, Christine Piot, Gregory Chatel. Subcritical water and supercritical carbon dioxide: efficient and selective eco-compatible solvents for coffee and coffee by-products valorization. *Green Chemistry*, 2020, 22, pp.8544-8571. 10.1039/D0GC03146A . hal-03143710

HAL Id: hal-03143710

<https://hal.science/hal-03143710v1>

Submitted on 16 Feb 2021

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.

CRITICAL REVIEW

Subcritical Water and Supercritical Carbon Dioxide: Efficient and Selective Eco-Compatible Solvents for Coffee and Coffee By-products Valorization

Received 00th January 20xx,
Accepted 00th January 20xx

DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

Alexandre Vandepoosele,[†] Micheline Draye,[†] Christine Piot[†] and Gregory Chatel^{†*}

This review aims to establish the state of the art of the existing literature on the valorization of coffee and coffee by-products (*i.e.* green coffee, coffee husk, pulp, silverskin and spent coffee grounds) through the use of pressurized fluids as solvents, including subcritical water (SCW) and supercritical carbon dioxide (SC-CO₂). The first part reviews the exploitation, the composition, the properties and the ways of valorization of coffee beans and their by-products, highlighting their high potential as raw material. The second part is dedicated to subcritical H₂O and supercritical CO₂ applied to coffee and coffee by-products valorization, discussing the involved mechanisms, the parameters influence and the superiority of subcritical H₂O and supercritical CO₂ in comparison to other solvents and techniques. Indeed, subcritical H₂O is considered as a *super* solvent, catalyst and reagent at the same time, being the most efficient technology for carbohydrates and polyphenols recovery as well as biocrude-oil production. Supercritical CO₂ is considered as a *chameleon* solvent, with unlimited tunability, able to selectively extract high value molecules but also compete with organic solvents in amount and quality of the produced extract. In addition, subcritical H₂O and supercritical CO₂ are complementary solvents, targeting together all the types of molecules in coffee and coffee by-products, leading to the development of a Green Solvent Bio-Refinery (GreSBiR) with sequential uses of subcritical H₂O and supercritical CO₂, proposed for the first time in this review.

Table of contents

1. Introduction
2. Coffee
 - 2.1. Coffee exploitation
 - 2.2. Coffee treatments and composition
 - 2.3. Valorization of coffee and coffee by-products
 - 2.4. Characterization of coffee and coffee by-products extracts
 - 2.4.1. Carbohydrates extracts
 - 2.4.2. Antioxidant extracts
 - 2.4.3. Biocrude oil and biochar
 - 2.4.4. Lipid extracts
3. Pressurized fluids applied to coffee and coffee by-products
 - 3.1. Subcritical H₂O (SCW)
 - 3.1.1. Carbohydrate valorization
 - 3.1.2. Polyphenols valorization:
 - 3.1.2.1. Extraction of the main polyphenols
 - 3.1.2.2. Extraction of secondary antioxidant metabolites
 - 3.1.2.3. Use of non-conventional methods and solvents
 - 3.2. Supercritical CO₂ (SC-CO₂)
 - 3.2.1. Yield of extraction
 - 3.2.2. Fatty Acid Content (FAC) and triglycerides content
 - 3.2.3. Bioactive molecules
 - 3.2.3.1. Terpenoids
 - 3.2.3.2. Sterols and tocopherols

- 3.2.3.3. Caffeine
- 3.2.3.4. Polyphenols
- 3.2.4. Fractionation
- 3.3. Major trends, comparison and sequential combination of SCW and SC-CO₂ applied to coffee and coffee by-products valorization
4. Conclusions and perspectives

List of Abbreviations

AAE = Ascorbic Acid Equivalent
 AbsYield = Absolute Yield
 ABTS = 2,2'-azino-bis(3-ethylbenzothiazoline-6-sulfonic acid)
 AOC = AntiOxydant Capacity
 AV = Acid Value
 C16:0 = Palmitic Acid
 C18:2 = Linoleic Acid
 C-3-R = Cyanidin-3-Rutinoside
 CAF = Caffeine
 CE = Catechin Equivalent
 CGA = Chlorogenic Acids
 CH = Coffee Husk
 CP = Coffee Pulp
 CQA = CaffeoylQuinic Acid
 CS = Corn Starch
 CSS = Coffee SilverSkin
 DAG = DiAcylGlycerol (= DiGlyceride)

DES = Deep Eutectic Solvent
 DM = Dry Matter
 DMC = DiMethyl Carbonate
 DPPH = 2,2-diphenyl-1-picrylhydrazyl
 EC50 = Half Effective Concentration
 FAC = Fatty Acids Composition
 FAME = Fatty Acid Methyl Ester
 FFA = Free Fatty Acids
 FRAP = Ferric ion Reducing Antioxidant Power
 FT-IR = Fourier Transform – InfraRed spectroscopy
 GAE = Gallic Acid Equivalent
 GAS = Gaseous AntiSolvent
 GC = Gas Chromatography
 GCB = Green Coffee Bean
 GLU = Glucose equivalent
 GPC = Gel Permeation Chromatography
 GReSBiR = Green Solvent Bio-Refinery
 HHV = Higher Heating Value
 HMF = HydroxyMethylFurfural
 HPLC = High Performance Liquid Chromatography
 HTC = HydroThermal Carbonization
 HTL = HydroThermal Liquefaction
 IC₅₀ = Inhibition Concentration
 IPA = IsoPropyl Alcohol
 IV = Iodine Value
 LCA = Life Cycle Assessment
 MAE = MicroWave Assisted Extraction
 MB = Methylene Blue
 MIC = Minimum Inhibitory Concentration
 MRPS = Maillard Reaction Products
 MS = Mass Spectrometer
 MW = MicroWave
 NMR = Nuclear Magnetic Resonance
 ORAC = Oxygen Radical Absorbance Capacity
 OSI = Oxidative Stability Index
 PHA = PolyHydroxyAlkanoate
 PV = Peroxide Value
 QE = Quercetin Equivalent
 RelYield = Relative Yield
 RESS = Rapid Expansion of Supercritical Solution
 ROS = Reactive Oxygen Species
 RSs = Reducing Sugars
 SC-CO₂ = Supercritical carbon dioxide
 SCG = Spent coffee grounds
 SEM = Scanning Electron Microscopy
 SCW = SubCritical Water
 TAA = Total Antioxydant Activity
 TAG = TriAcylGlycerol (= TriGlyceride)
 TBARS = Thiobarbituric Acid Reactive Substances
 TEAC = Trolox Equivalent Antioxidant Capacity
 TFC = Total Flavonoid Content
 TGA = ThermoGravimetric Analysis
 TPC = Total Polyphenol Content
 TSC = Total Sugar Content
 UAE = Ultrasound Assisted Extraction
 UPLC = Ultra Performance Liquid Chromatography
 US = UltraSound

XRD = X-Ray Diffraction

1. Introduction

Bioeconomy is one of the most popular concepts of the XXIth century. It is defined as the production of chemicals, materials and/or energy from bio-resources, and the valorization of their by-products and waste. In this context, agricultural, forestry, aquatic or agrifood waste can be used rather than raw materials used to produce food. Agricultural by-products can be used to generate biohydrogen by fermentation processes for energy production¹ or biopolymers such as polyhydroxyalkanoate (PHA) for materials preparation.² Wheat waste can be employed to produce succinic acid, a platform molecule. Olive mill waste is a source of high value polyphenols such as hydroxytyrosol, a phenolic phytochemical with antioxidant properties.³ Viticultural waste such as grape canes and stocks contains resveratrol and ϵ -viniferin, two powerful antioxidants.⁴ Needles from pine tree waste are rich in proanthocyanidins, which are a class of polyphenols.⁵ Invasive plants such as *Fallopia japonica* or *Fallopia sachalinensis* can be also valorized by extraction of the antioxidant extracts rich in triterpenoids and polyphenols they contain.⁶ Aquatic waste such as microalgae have been studied for the production of biodiesel and glycerol as sub-product.⁷ Moreover, other microalgae are rich in astaxanthine, terpenoid, and protein that are valuable compounds.⁸ Indeed, many examples have reported the successful recovery of different biomolecules from agrifood waste, with high potential in pharmaceutical, nutraceutical and/or cosmetic fields.⁹ In the same way, coffee and their by-products (*i.e.*, coffee pulp, husks, silverskins and spent coffee grounds) have been also widely studied these last years.¹⁰

Green chemistry aims to design of chemical products and processes that are more environmentally benign, and that present reduced negative impacts to human health and environment.¹¹ Thus, the choice of coffee and its by-products as renewable feedstocks rather than petrosourced ones is in accordance with the seventh principle of green chemistry.¹¹

Many extraction processes are based on the use of organic solvents, which may have certain drawbacks such as their use in large volumes, obtaining poor extraction selectivities and the generation of large amount of undesirable waste, making then the process expensive.¹² Moreover, organic solvent are hazardous for the operators in laboratories and industries due to their potential flammability, explosiveness, corrosivity and carcinogenic, mutagenic or reprotoxic properties.¹³

Hence, a myriad of new technologies and solvents have been developed to perform extraction more respectful for the environment. These include extractions assisted by non-conventional methods of activation such as ultrasound (US),^{14, 15,16} microwaves (MW),^{6, 17,18} pulse electric field (PEF)¹⁹ or high voltage electric discharge (HVED).²⁰ Those methods are of great interest to increase extraction yields, reducing extraction times and energy costs.

Alternative solvents of extraction have been developed and studied over the years such as ionic liquids (ILs),²¹ deep eutectic solvents (DES),^{22,23} subcritical water (SCW),²⁴ supercritical CO₂ (SC-CO₂)²⁵ or solvent-free (pressing, extrusion, ball milling, instant controlled drop pressure).^{26, 27} However, after extraction, deep eutectic solvent and ionic liquid extracts often suffer from the impossibility to recover the solute by a simple evaporation of solvent. It requires then an additional step such as solid-liquid extraction, liquid-liquid extraction or adsorption on column or addition of an antisolvent.^{28, 29} The physical extraction in the absence of solvent is generally not an efficient solution either since mechanical frictions induce high shearing and high temperature that can lead to the decomposition of heat-labile phenolic compounds and polymerization of phenolic compounds, reducing their extractability.³⁰

Pressurized fluids such as subcritical water and supercritical carbon dioxide represent a very suitable alternative to the use of organic solvents. Water and carbon dioxide are cheap, available and non-toxic solvents. Subcritical water is perfectly adapted to recover polar and medium-polar solute and supercritical carbon dioxide is more adapted to recover apolar molecules. In a world aware of current and future environmental concerns, subcritical water and supercritical carbon dioxide represent top choice extraction solvents in the near future to reduce the environmental impact of the process.

Subcritical water (SCW) also called “superheated water”, “hot compressed water” or “pressurized hot water” is liquid water at temperatures between 100 °C (373 K) under 1 bar and 374 °C (647 K) under 220 bars. This maximum temperature is related to the critical point of water that is reached at 374 °C and 220 bars when the heat of vaporization become equal to zero. The increase of temperature affects positively i) the diffusion coefficient of water, ii) the solubility of solutes, iii) the diffusion of solutes and iv) the water viscosity. In addition, a modification of specific physico-chemical properties of SCW are observed such as i) the reduction of dielectric constant of water ($\epsilon = 80$ at 25 °C, P_{atm} to $\epsilon = 27$ at 250 °C, 50 bars) to become closer to that of ethanol ($\epsilon = 24$) and methanol ($\epsilon = 33$) and ii) the acidification of water by self-ionization of water molecules.³¹

Supercritical carbon dioxide (SC-CO₂) means CO₂ at the supercritical state, with pressure and temperature exceeding the critical point of CO₂, relatively easy to reach at 31.1 °C and 73.8 bars. The supercritical CO₂ is in a homogeneous and hybrid state that presents both properties of liquids and gas. It reaches viscosities close to those of gas (0.02-0.12 mPa.s at 40 °C) and its densities are close to those of liquids (700 to 1100 kg.m⁻³).^{32, 33} Variations of temperature and pressure allow to set the properties of supercritical CO₂ and to fit with different applications.³⁴ The most known extraction process with CO₂ used as supercritical fluid is the RESS (Rapid Expansion of Supercritical Solution) method, consisting in a two-steps process with i) a first solubilization of the solute in SC-CO₂, followed by ii) a precipitation of the solute by oversaturation in CO₂ gas.³⁵

The aim of this review is to evaluate the contribution of subcritical H₂O and supercritical CO₂ for coffee and coffee by-products valorization. The review article is thus organized in two main parts: i) the full description of the coffee and coffee by-products processes, composition and valorization (section 2) and ii) the benefits of subcritical H₂O and supercritical CO₂ for the valorization of coffee and coffee by-products (section 3).

2. Coffee

Coffee is one of the most consumed beverages over the world after water, and it is the second most traded commodity after petroleum. According to International Coffee Organization, 9.4 million of tons of green coffee beans have been produced in 2018.³⁶ This raw resource is cheap, available and consequent amounts of by-products are resulting from the preparation of coffee beverage.

The following sections discuss the exploitation and the valorization of coffee and its by-products.

2.1. Coffee exploitation

Nowadays, 90% of coffee is produced in developing countries (Table 1).³⁷ Brazil is the biggest producer of coffee bean with 2.68 million tons in 2018 and represent almost a third of the world coffee production (total production of 9.2 million tons).³⁸ Close to 80 varieties of coffee exist, but two of them are mainly cultivated nowadays: *Coffea canephora*, mostly known as *Robusta* and *Coffea arabica*.

Arabica coffee from Brazil and South American countries represents around 75% of the world production whereas Robusta coffee from Vietnam and African countries coffee represents the remaining 25%. Growing conditions of their trees are different. Arabica tree needs shade and soft temperatures, whereas Robusta tree can resist to harsh conditions of temperatures and humidity. Variation of composition is observed in terms of polysaccharides, lipids, bioactive molecules and caffeine as a function of the variety. For example, Arabica contains 0.8 to 1.5% of caffeine whereas Robusta contains 2.5 to 3.0% of this molecule. In any case, the treatment required for the transformation from green coffee bean to coffee beverage remains the same for both varieties.

Table 1: The most important world coffee producers in 2018.⁷

	Production (million tons)	World production (%)
Brazil	2.68	29.1
Vietnam	1.54	16.7
Colombia	0.75	8.2
Indonesia	0.67	7.3
Honduras	0.47	5.2
Ethiopia	0.47	5.1
Others	2.62	28.4

2.2. Coffee treatments and composition

Many processes are required before obtaining the beverage from the coffee cherry, leading to the formation of by-

products (Table 2). In addition, those by-products are composed of caffeine, tannins and polyphenols that could be possibly toxic for the environment.³⁹ After harvest coffee cherry, the three main steps required for obtaining the beverage are i) drying or wet process, ii) roasting process and iii) brewing process.¹⁰ Several by-products such as coffee husks (CH), pulp, silverskin (CSS) and spent coffee grounds (SCG) result from the processes of coffee treatment (Figure 1) that have been largely described in literature.¹⁰

Dry or wet processes aim to extract the core of coffee cherry and to recover the green coffee bean. Dry method also called *cherry method* consists in drying and mixing the freshly harvested coffee cherry for 12-15 days until it is totally dry.¹⁰ The peel removed during the dry process is called coffee husk. About 0.18 ton of husk is produced for 1 ton of coffee cherry. The husk is composed of more than 70% of carbohydrates, about 15% moisture, 7.0% protein, 5% ash, 0.3% lipids, and about 0.65% of caffeine (w/w).^{10, 40} Wet method consists in removing coffee cherry pulp with a pulper before drying operation that lasts 24 to 36 h for Arabica and 72 h for Robusta. When process is the wet method the coffee is called *washed or parchment coffee*. The pulp recovered during the wet process is called coffee pulp. About 0.33 ton of pulp is produced for 1 ton of coffee cherry. The pulp is composed of 50% carbohydrates, 20% fibers, 10% proteins, 5% tannins 2% lipids and 1.3% caffeine (w/w).⁴¹

Green coffee beans obtained are composed of about 30-50% of insoluble polysaccharides, 10% of soluble carbohydrates, 10-15% of lipids, 10% of proteins, 6-12% of chlorogenic acids and 0.8-4% of caffeine (w/w). Contents in lipids and insoluble polysaccharides are higher for Arabica whereas contents in chlorogenic acids and caffeine are higher for Robusta.⁴² Despite this interesting composition, green coffee bean is tasteless and odorless and a roasting process is necessary to give it flavor and odor.

Table 2: Composition of green coffee and coffee by-products.

	Sugars %	Lipids %	Proteins %	Caffeine %	Chlorogenic acids %
GCB	40-60	10-15	10	0.8-4	6-12
CH	70	0.3	7	0.65	/
CP	70	2	10	1.3	/
CSS	60	2	18	0.8-1.3	/
SCG	45-50	10-15	7-13	0-0.5	0.5-3

Roasting process consists in a pyrolysis of the green coffee beans at 200 to 250 °C during 0.75 to 25 min. Many of the compositional changes occur during this step and are due to the Maillard reaction that gives thus to the coffee beans their aromas.⁴³ Roasting step also removes a peel to beans that is called coffee silverskin. Although it only represents 1% of initial mass,¹⁰ the large amounts of coffee beans that are roasted make it an important by-product of coffee production. Coffee silverskin is composed of 60% carbohydrates, 18% proteins, 2% lipids, 7% ashes, 7% moisture and 0.8-1.3% caffeine (w/w).⁴⁴ Roasted coffee beans obtained keep almost same composition as green coffee beans in terms of carbohydrates, lipids and proteins. Main differences are the important degradation of

chlorogenic acids, up to 90% and caffeine, up to 25% depending on the roasting intensity that can be light, medium or dark.⁴⁵




Figure 1: Coffee processes and their by-products.

To finally obtain coffee beverage, grinding and brewing process are required. Brewing process consists in an extraction with water at 100 °C. Boiling water is flowed through the grinded roasted coffee beans by gravity or under pressure giving a flavored coffee beverage. Remaining grinded roasted coffee beans that are not soluble in water and constitute then a solid waste with high moisture content that is called spent coffee grounds. Thereby, 0.65 ton of spent coffee grounds is produced for 1 ton of green coffee beans.¹⁰ The spent coffee grounds is composed of 45-50%

carbohydrates, 10-15% lipids, 7-13% proteins, 0.5-3% chlorogenic acids and 0-0.5% caffeine (w/w).⁴⁶

2.3. Valorization of coffee and coffee by-products

The valorization of coffee and coffee by-products is mainly related to i) their chemical composition and ii) their availability, accessibility and quantity generated.

Despite the discrepant composition between green coffee bean (GCB), coffee husk (CH), coffee pulp (CP), coffee silverskin (CSS) and spent coffee grounds (SCG), similar way of valorization are studied since the nature and proportion are quite similar between the different coffee by-products CH, CP, CSS and SCG (Table 2).⁴⁷ Main difference of way of valorization is related to the high lipidic content of GCB and SCG. GCB is also atypical with high chlorogenic acid content. The concentration of high molecular mass molecules (HMM) such as melanoidins increases in coffee beans after roasting due to Maillard reaction.^{43, 48} The concentration of chlorogenic acids significantly decreases after roasting, hence, the antioxidant activity remains similar.⁴⁸ This is due to the formation of Maillard reaction products and transformation of chlorogenic acids into derivatives such as chlorogenic acids, lactones or phenylindans that exhibit high antioxidant properties.^{48, 49} As a consequence, even if CSS and SCG present different chemical composition of polyphenols compared to GCB, CH and CP, the way of valorization into high antioxidant extract remains the same (Table 3).

As presented in Figure 1, SCG is the main coffee by-product representing 49-53% w/w of the coffee fruit, followed by coffee pulp (25% w/w), coffee husk (18% w/w) and coffee silverskin (1% w/w).

In addition, coffee by-products are produced at different stages of coffee processes resulting in major differences of their accessibility. For example, coffee husk and coffee pulp are generated by coffee growers, limiting geographically the valorization of such by-products to coffee producer countries. Coffee silverskin are obtained all around the globe but only roaster companies are generating this by-product. Spent coffee grounds are produced all over the planet by everybody, in particular in household, coffeeshops, hotels or soluble coffee industries. Then, the possibility to give higher economic value to this waste is not only valuable for industry but also for the collectivities and public authorities, especially in terms of waste management.⁵⁰

2.4. Characterization of coffee and coffee by-products extracts

Numerous technics of characterizations are used to evaluate the nature of the final product like antioxidant extract or biocrude oil. The following section gives a brief description of all the major analysis performed with coffee extracts in order to better discuss the effects of subcritical H₂O and supercritical CO₂.

2.4.1. Carbohydrates extracts

Total Sugar Content (TSC)

The total sugar content (TSC) is a colorimetric test in food science that aims to measure all carbohydrates such as mono-, di-, oligo-, polysaccharides, proteoglycans, glycoproteins

and glycolipids without distinguishing the nature of the species.⁵¹ Two simple procedures have been developed as phenol-sulfuric acid assay also called "Dubois method"^{52, 53} and anthrone-sulfuric acid.⁵⁴⁻⁵⁶ The phenol and anthrone-sulfuric tests lean on the hydrolysis of sugars into furfural or hydroxymethyl furfural that form a conjugated system with phenol or anthrone. The result is expressed with a calibration curve of glucose (g_{GLU}.100g_{dry material}). For lignocellulosic material, this assay is efficient i) to define the total sugars of a biomass or ii) to evaluate the influence of extraction parameters on the sugar content of a produced extract.

Reducing Sugars (RSs)

A reducing sugar is defined as any sugar reacting as reducing agent because of a free aldehyde or free ketone function its bears. As such, all monosaccharides are considered as reducing sugar. It is important to note that monosaccharides are dietary sugars with applications in agrifood and nutraceutical. Furthermore, the transformation step for the production of reducing sugar from lignocellulosic material is called the saccharification. It is generally performed by enzymatic, or acid or alkaline hydrolysis. The saccharification is the preliminary step before the transformation of reducing sugars into bioethanol.

The "Reducing Sugars" (RSs) is a colorimetric assay in food science that aimed to measure all the reducing sugars without distinguishing between species (*DNS method*).^{57, 58} RSs is a relevant test to i) determine dietary sugars amount in an extract and ii) to evaluate the interest of subcritical H₂O to induce saccharification.

Sugar profile

Lignocellulosic material is a complex matrix of lignin, hemicellulose and cellulose. Di-, oligo-, polysaccharides such as hemicellulose and cellulose are macromolecules composed of 2 (di-), 3-10 (oligo-) or > 10 (poly-) monosaccharides building blocks. Cellulose is a homopolymer composed of 100-3000 glucose molecules combined at the β(1→4) position. Hemicellulose is a heteropolymer that can be composed of glucose, xylose, mannose, galactose, rhamnose or arabinose. Coffee polysaccharides are mainly composed of galactose, mannose, glucose and arabinose patterns.⁵⁹

The nature of those monosaccharides can be determined after hydrolysis of the biomass or extract by HPLC with Refractive Index (RI),⁶⁰ Evaporative Light Scattering Detection (ELSD),⁶¹ Electrochemical Detection (ECD)⁶² or UV-Visible/Diode Array Detector (DAD) after derivatization with 1-phenyl-3-methyl-5-pyrazolone (PMP).^{63, 64}

Equation 1: Sugar profile.

$$\text{Sugar profile} = \frac{\text{Amount of specific sugar}}{\text{Amount of total specific sugar}} \times 100$$

Many other chromatographic method have also been studied in the literature.⁶⁵ Sugar properties are related to their chemical structure. Hence, the determination of sugar profile (Equation 1) is relevant i) to define the chemical

structure of sugars in extract and ii) to evaluate the influence of SCW on the sugars extraction selectivity or their *in-situ* transformation.

Table 3: Main ways of valorization of coffee and coffee by-products

Raw material	Valorized fraction	Area	Applications	Value	References
CP, CH, CSS, SCG	Entire resource (raw)	Animal food	Protein food for ruminants	+	66-68
CP, CH, CSS, SCG	Entire resource (raw or transformed)	Agriculture	Fertilizers, soil amendment, compost	+	69, 70
SCG	Entire material (raw)	Agri-food	Substrate for edible mushrooms culture (<i>Pleurotus</i> , <i>Flammulina</i> <i>velutipes</i>)	+	40, 71
CP, CH	Entire resource (raw)	Agri-food	Cascara beverage (infusion)	+	72-74
SCG	Entire resource (transformed)	Building Material	Raw (fill road embankment), geopolymer (cement), composite (thermal insulator, clay brick)	+	75-78
SCG	Entire resource (raw or transformed)	Depolluting material	Raw (Cu^{2+} adsorption), bioelastomer (60% _{SCG} /40% _{silicone} $\text{Pb}^{2+}/\text{Hg}^{2+}$ adsorption), composite (SCG/chitosan drugs adsorption), activated carbon (volatile organic compounds VOC adsorption)	+	79-82
CP, CH, CSS, SCG	Entire resource (transformed)	Energy/Depolluting Material	Biocrude oil, biochar (pyrolysis) Biogas (anaerobic digestion)	++	83-85
CP, CH, CSS, SCG	Carbohydrates	Energy	Bioethanol (fermentation)	++	86, 87
SCG	Lipids	Energy	Biodiesel (triglycerides transesterification)	++	88
CP, CH, CSS, SCG	Carbohydrates	Polymers	Biopolymer PolyHydroxyAlkanoate (PHA, enzyme <i>B.cepacia</i>)	++	89
SCG	Lipids	Polymers	Biopolymer PolyHydroxyAlkanoate (PHA, enzyme <i>C.necator</i>)	++	90
GCB, RCB, CP, CH, CSS, SCG	Caffeine	Agri-food, Pharmaceutical, Nutraceutical, Cosmetic	Ingredient in sodas, energy drinks, painkillers, slimming cream	+++	91-93
CP, CH, CSS, SCG	Carbohydrates	Nutraceutical	Bioactive sugars, dietary fibers (hydrolysis)	+++	94-96
GCB, SCG	Lipids	Cosmetic	High value oil (ingredient moisturizing cream)	+++	97, 98
GCB, CP, CH, CSS, SCG	Polyphenols (chlorogenic acids, melanoidins)	Nutraceutical, Cosmetic	Antioxidants and anti-inflammatory extracts, Pills for body weight loss (Svetol®), anti-aging and anti-UV cream	+++	99-103

2.4.2. Antioxidant extracts:

Total Polyphenol Content (TPC)

The Total Polyphenol Content (TPC) also called “Folin-Ciocalteu assay” is a colorimetric assay in food science that aims measuring the total polyphenols without distinguishing the species.^{99, 104} The result is expressed with a calibration curve of standard like gallic acid ($\text{mg}_{\text{GAE}} \cdot \text{g}^{-1}_{\text{extract}}$ or $\text{mg}_{\text{GAE}} \cdot \text{g}^{-1}_{\text{dry matter}}$ or $\text{mg}_{\text{GAE}} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$) that is the most common standard. Some papers also refer the use of caffeic acid or catechin as standards.

Total Flavonoid Content (TFC)

The Total Flavonoid Content (TFC) is a colorimetric assay in food science that aims measuring the total flavonoids without distinguishing the species.^{105, 106} The assay is based on the complexation of aluminium (AlCl_3) with flavonoids. Two main procedures have been described in the literature¹⁰⁵ The result is expressed *via* the calibration of standard such as catechin, quercetin or rutin for examples.

Antioxidant Capacity (AOC)

Antioxidant Capacity (AOC) assay is a colorimetric assay that aims measuring the level of oxidative species inhibition of a solution or extract. Several tests have been developed such as 2,2-diphenyl-1-picrylhydrazyl (DPPH), ferric ion reducing antioxidant power (FRAP) and/or 2,2'-azino-bis(3-ethylbenzothiazoline-6-sulfonic acid) (ABTS), oxygen radical absorbance capacity (ORAC) assays.^{107, 108} DPPH results have been reported as percentage of radical inhibition like DPPH

(Table 4, Entries 3 and 4),¹⁰⁹ half effective concentration EC_{50} (Table 4, Entry 5)¹¹⁰ or inhibition concentration at 50% IC_{50} (Table 4, Entry 15).¹¹¹ IC_{50} or EC_{50} is the most used expressed result of DPPH with calibration curve of Trolox, an antioxidant specie. The use of Trolox is also reported in literature as Trolox Equivalent Antioxidant Capacity (TEAC) for the different antioxidant capacity assays (DPPH, ABTS, FRAP, ORAC). TEAC can be expressed in $\mu\text{mol}_{\text{TE}} \cdot \text{g}^{-1}$, $\text{mmol}_{\text{TE}} \cdot \text{g}^{-1}$, $\mu\text{g}_{\text{TE}} \cdot \text{g}^{-1}$ or $\text{mg}_{\text{TE}} \cdot \text{g}^{-1}$, (Table 4, Entry 1).¹¹² Otherwise, another standard such as ascorbic acid equivalent in $\text{mmol}_{\text{AAE}} \cdot \text{g}^{-1}$ or $\mu\text{mol}_{\text{AAE}} \cdot \text{g}^{-1}$ is also used (Table 4, Entry 6).¹¹³

High Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) – Polyphenols

Chlorogenic acids are the main polyphenols in coffee and coffee by-products.^{114, 115} Chlorogenic acids are composed of hydroxycinnamic acids like caffeic, coumaric or ferulic acids bonded to the –OH function of quinic acid core in position 3, 4 or 5 (Figure 2).




Figure 2: Main polyphenols in coffee and coffee by-products.

Hence, chlorogenic acids can be quantified by HPLC-MS or HPLC-DAD (325 nm) in equivalent of one marketed chlorogenic acid, 5-caffeoylquinic acid.¹¹⁶ Secondary polar

metabolites from methylxanthines, flavonoids, and anthocyanins families have been observed in the extracts by HPLC-UV. The major secondary metabolites identified and quantified in coffee extracts are caffeine (methylxanthines) and catechin (flavonoids) at 280 nm and cyanidin-3-rutinoside (anthocyanins) at 520 nm (Figure 3).¹¹⁷⁻¹¹⁹




Figure 3: Main secondary metabolites in coffee and coffee by-products.

2.4.3. Biocrude oil and biochar:

Higher Heating Value (HHV)

The heating value also called “calorific value” or “heat of combustion” is defined as the energy content of a biomass fuel. This parameter is considered as one of the most important characteristic parameters for designing calculations and numerical simulations of thermal system.¹²⁰ The largest heating value (HHV) refers to the heat released from the fuel combustion with the original and generated water in a condensed state.¹²⁰ HHV is usually expressed in MJ.kg⁻¹.

Energy Yield Recovery

The energy yield recovery is defined as the yield of remaining energy after the transformation of the raw material into a biocrude oil or biochar (Equation 2). This result is as much important as the HHV of the final product.

Equation 2: Energy yield recovery formula.

$$\text{Energy yield recovery} = \frac{\text{HHV}_{\text{fuel}} \times \text{fuel mass}}{\text{HHV}_{\text{raw material}} \times \text{raw material mass}} \times 100$$

2.4.4. Lipid extracts:

Yield of extraction (relative and absolute)

The yield of extraction is defined by two different expressions: relative and absolute yields (Equations 3 and 4).

Equation 3: Equation of relative yield.

$$\text{Relative yield} = \frac{\text{oil mass extracted by SC-CO}_2}{\text{oil mass extracted by hexane Soxhlet}} \times 100$$

Equation 4: Equation of absolute yield.

$$\text{Absolute yield} = \frac{\text{oil mass extracted by SC-CO}_2}{\text{raw material mass}} \times 100$$

In the studied literature, SC-CO₂ is considered as an apolar solvent, able to remove exclusively apolar solute *i.e.* the lipidic fraction composed mainly of triglycerides. Hence, for

relative yield, the yield of extraction of SC-CO₂ is compared to the yield obtained by hexane with Soxhlet system, considering as a reference method for lipid extraction.¹²¹ The relative yield presents the huge advantage of evaluating and comparing properly the operating conditions of SC-CO₂ described in the literature about same biomass, and this despite the difference of chemical composition.

The absolute yield remains an interesting measurement to define the quantitative amount of lipid fraction in biomass by hexane Soxhlet extraction or SC-CO₂ extraction. Absolute yield can also be used to compare operation conditions within the same study.

Fatty Acid Composition (FAC)

Oleaginous are plant materials including seeds or fruits rich in fats. Those vegetable fats are mainly composed of triglycerides, also called triacylglycerols, which are esters of glycerol bonded to fatty acids. Triglycerides of green coffee beans and spent coffee grounds represent by themselves 75% of the total fats.¹²² Fatty acids in spent coffee grounds and green coffee beans have been reported to be mainly palmitic (C16:0) and linoleic (C18:2) acids, followed by stearic (C18:0) and oleic (C18:1) acids (Figure 4).¹²²




Figure 4: Main fatty acids pattern of triglycerides in coffee and coffee by-products.

The nature and profile of those fatty acids in triglycerides can be determined by Gas Chromatography – Flame Ionization Detector. More precisely, only fatty acid methyl esters (FAME) obtained by transesterification or methanolysis of triglycerides with MeOH and an acid catalyst (HCl, H₂SO₄) are analyzed.^{123, 124}

Terpenoids, sterols and tocopherols

Coming mainly from plant kingdom, the bioactive terpenes and terpenoids are the most important constituents of essential oils. Terpenes are naturally occurring as hydrocarbon based on combinations of the isoprene units. Terpenoids are terpenes that have been denaturated by oxidation, including oxygen functions. Main terpenoids of coffee reported in literature are: kahweol, cafestol, 16-O-methylcafestol (Figure 5).¹²²




Figure 5: Main terpenoids in coffee and coffee by-products.

Phytosterols also called “natural” sterols are a family of sterols found in the fat fraction of plant kingdom. Sterols are lipid molecules composed of a sterane core, with hydroxyl function linked to the third carbon. Main sterols of coffee reported in literature are: campesterol, stigmasterol and β -sitosterol (Figure 6).¹²²




Figure 6: Main sterols in coffee and coffee by-products.

Vitamin E is a vitamin that regroups four forms of tocopherol and four forms of tocotrienol. Tocopherols are antioxidant lipophilic molecules present in abundance in vegetable oils. Tocopherols are composed of chromanol core bonded to a lateral chain of sixteen saturated carbons. Main tocopherols of coffee reported in literature are: α - and β -tocopherol (Figure 7).¹²²




Figure 7: Main tocopherols in coffee and coffee by-products.

In natural material, terpenes, terpenoids, sterols and tocopherols can be found conjugated to fatty acid or acyl derivatives as esters.¹²⁵ Hence, saponification has to be performed before further HPLC-UV or HPLC-DAD analysis.¹²⁵

The analysis of terpenoids, sterols and tocopherols in coffee oil is of high order to evaluate oil bioactivity. Indeed, terpenoids have demonstrated antihypertensive, anticancer (Taxol), antifungal and antimicrobial properties.^{97, 126} This results are reported by more than 2000 patents between 1980-2003 for terpenoids applied in pharmaceutical and cosmetic field.¹²⁷

Strong rates of LDL-cholesterol are responsible for clogging the coronary arteries, leading to cardiovascular disease. Phytosterols have been demonstrated to lowering by 5 to 15% concentration of LDL-Cholesterol in human body, resulting in applications in pharmaceutical, cosmetic and nutraceutical fields.¹²⁸

Tocopherols are responsible for protecting membranes against lipids peroxidation, which could slow the aging process in humans or animals.¹²⁹ Moreover, tocopherols also

exhibit photoprotective properties in cosmetic cream, usefulness to treat Parkinson disease and eye disease or prevent negative effects of ischemia-reperfusion.

3. Pressurized fluids applied to coffee and coffee by-products

This section discusses the different results reported in the literature during the last decades and focused on coffee and coffee by-products valorization using subcritical H_2O and supercritical CO_2 . It also highlights the new and future trends and applications of pressurized fluids in this field of research.

3.1. Subcritical Water (SCW)

Table 4 reports examples involving the use of SCW for coffee or coffee by-products valorization. The roasted coffee valorization by SCW, widely investigated at the end of the XXth century,^{21, 26} has not been reported in this Table 4.

Most of the studies dedicated to the use of subcritical H_2O for coffee and coffee by-products valorization described in the literature report the use of spent coffee grounds as raw material, in 70% of reported cases.

Table 4 shows the wide diversity of compounds that are obtained using SCW for coffee and coffee waste valorization. They can be classified into three groups depending on what they will be intended for: i) carbohydrate extracts; ii) antioxidant extracts (75% of the reported cases from the literature); ii) biocrude oils and biochars.

3.1.1. Carbohydrate valorization

Extraction of carbohydrates with subcritical H_2O has been widely investigated. For spent coffee grounds (SCG), Chun *et al.* have reported best Total Sugar Content (TSC) results of $47.7 \text{ g}_{\text{GLU}} \cdot 100 \text{ g}^{-1}_{\text{extract}}$ after an ultrasonic pretreatment (20 kHz, 750 W output power), for 5 min of extraction at 180 °C and 20 bars (Table 4, Entry 14).¹³⁰ Those results can be explained by benefits of hydrothermal extraction combined with ultrasonic pretreatment used. In fact, authors suggest that ultrasonic pretreatment (20 kHz, 750 W output power) facilitates the extraction of carbohydrates by increasing mass transfer from SCG to solvent media. In addition, the pretreatment could make it possible to avoid the use of extreme conditions, responsible of degradation products.

Chun *et al.* have reported the use of modifiers such as CO_2 and N_2 with subcritical H_2O for the extraction of carbohydrates (Table 4, Entry 2).¹³¹ Maximal RSs ($37.91 \text{ g} \cdot 100 \text{ g}^{-1}_{\text{extract}}$) have been observed at 220 °C with N_2 . The authors have proposed that the presence of nitrogen in SCW extraction can act as a shield against the reaction with atmosphere. At contrary, at the same 220 °C temperature, subcritical H_2O with CO_2 has resulted in lower RSs. For the authors, the onset of the formation of reducing sugars required a lower residence times due to the faster cleavage of glycosidic bonds due to carbonic acid formation of CO_2 in water. Then, the CO_2/H_2O technology is gaining interest in the

field of biomass valorization to improve lignocellulosic fractionation.¹³²

Simões and Paiva *et al.* have also reported a semi-continuous extraction (10 mL.min⁻¹) during 180 min with a low total sugar content around 3 g_{GLU}.100g⁻¹_{SCG} at 150 °C and 30 g_{GLU}.100g⁻¹_{SCG} at 200 °C (Table 4, Entry 12).¹³³ They have shown that SCG has low soluble amount of sugars due to the coffee brewing process. Simões and Paiva *et al.* have suggested that subcritical H₂O at 200 °C acts as reagent performing the depolymerization of lignocellulosic matrix leading to the release of structural carbohydrates. Furthermore, their researches have proved that monosaccharides represent less than 5% of the total carbohydrates, concluding that subcritical H₂O has hydrolyzed the polysaccharides into oligomers, rather than to monomers. However, another hypothesis could be that a larger amount of monosaccharides has been produced and degraded at the same time. Indeed, the main products of degradation of hexoses in subcritical H₂O have been demonstrated to be 5-hydroxymethyl-2-furaldehyde (5-HMF) and furfural (Figure 8).^{134, 135}




Figure 8: Extraction and degradation mechanism of cellulose in subcritical H₂O adapted from Banerjee and Goud *et al.*, Aida *et al.*, Lü *et al.*^{134, 136, 137}

However, the self-ionization of H₂O into H₃O⁺ and HO⁻ can be also important in subcritical H₂O (pH = 5.5 at 250 °C, pH = 7 at 25 °C) to act as catalyst for chemical reactions, such as hydrolysis of carbohydrates including hemicellulose and cellulose.¹⁴⁰ Forster-Carneiro *et al.* has reported that the dielectric constant, the viscosity and the surface tension have been reported to decrease for water above 100 °C.¹³⁸ King *et al.* have observed that the diffusion rate increase under these conditions.¹³⁹ In addition, they also have noted that glucose solubility is five-fold times higher in water at 180 °C compared to 100 °C.¹³⁹

Mussatto *et al.* have reported the influence of subcritical H₂O on the distribution of monosaccharides pattern in extracts (Table 4, Entry 15).¹¹¹ They have found that in every extracts, galactose was the main monosaccharides and arabinose the less representative. Authors have suggested that galactomannan and arabinogalactan are initially present in the SCG. Mussatto *et al.* have also reported the temperature influence on the sugar composition with 48%/32%/10%/10% (160 °C, 30 min) and 47%/17%/28%/8%

(180 °C, 30 min) of galactose/mannose/glucose/arabinose in the extracts. The main difference of composition between mannose and glucose has not been explained by the authors. To the best of our knowledge, four hypotheses can be proposed to explain these results obtained at 180 °C: i) the hydrolysis on cellulose or hemicellulose containing glucose pattern that could be more selective, ii) the kinetic of the degradation that may be faster for mannose than for glucose, iii) the isomerization reaction of monosaccharides that may occur; iv) hypotheses i), ii) and iii) can occur simultaneously. Even if the kinetic of hydrolysis of cellulose has been investigated,¹⁴¹ no publication reported in the literature can support the hypothesis i), since no publication reports the comparison of kinetic hydrolysis between galactan, mannan, arabinan and glucan or heteropolymers.¹³⁵ In addition, kinetics of polysaccharides hydrolysis have been observed to be different depending on the degree of polymerization.¹⁴² The hypothesis ii) is documented by the literature demonstrating the difference of kinetic degradation of several monosaccharides such as glucose, galactose and mannose.¹³⁵ However, similar rates of degradation for glucose and mannose have been reported at 220 °C.¹³⁵ The hypothesis iii) has been supported by literature. Monosaccharides under subcritical ethanol/water and under SCW lead to an epimerization of glucose/mannose.^{134, 143}

Subcritical H₂O extractions have been compared to traditional chemical extraction such as alkaline treatment.¹⁴⁴ Mussatto *et al.* have used an alkaline treatment of 4 M NaOH at 25 °C overnight and have obtained interesting TSC results of 39.0 g_{GLU}.100g⁻¹_{extract}.¹⁴⁴ The authors have specified that the extraction parameters have not been optimized. Despite significant results i) the yields are lower than the best result obtained under subcritical H₂O (47.7 g_{GLU}.100g⁻¹) with pretreatment and ii) the use of NaOH generates a significant amount of salts that makes difficult the valorization of polyphenols after carbohydrates precipitation.

Based on the studies reported in Table 4, supplementary knowledge is required since the system looks like a black box where only the final results are considered. Several phenomena are known to operate at the same time without knowing the specific influence of i) solubilization at high temperature of already soluble carbohydrate in subcritical H₂O without hydrolysis, ii) hydrolysis of polysaccharides into oligosaccharides, then into monosaccharide, iii) chemical reactions such as dehydration due to acid subcritical H₂O that act as reagent and iv) chemical reactions such as decarboxylation due to thermal degradation.

To conclude, the subcritical H₂O appears to be the most suitable, efficient and competitive solution to perform hydrolysis and extraction of carbohydrates from coffee and coffee by-products with high yields and low environmental impact.

3.1.2. Polyphenols valorization:

3.1.2.1. Extraction of the main polyphenols

Extraction of polyphenols with subcritical H₂O has been investigated (Table 4, Entries 1, 5-12 and 17). Chlorogenic acids (Figure 2) constitute the most important family of

polyphenols, mostly responsible of Total Polyphenol Content (TPC) and AntiOxidant Capacity (AOC) values. Among them, *n*-caffeoylquinic acids (CQA) represent the most studied molecules in coffee and coffee by-products extraction.¹⁴⁵ Clifford fully have investigated chlorogenic acids, a family of molecules composed of a quinic acid core, acylated with one or more caffeoyl groups.¹¹⁵ Chlorogenic acids such as CQA and di-CQA are predominant, these two compounds are about 120 times more concentrated (43.52 mg.g⁻¹) than free caffeic acid in spent coffee grounds extract (0.36 mg.g⁻¹).¹⁴⁶

Simões and Paiva *et al.* have reported a subcritical H₂O semi-continuous extraction of polyphenols (Table 4, Entry 12).¹³³ At 200 and 220 °C, they have recovered more polyphenols in comparison to classical hydroalcoholic extraction as reference method. According to the authors, this improvement may be explained by i) the release of phenolic compounds entrapped within the SCG matrix and ii) the potential degradation of lignin into phenolic compounds.

Gao *et al.* have reported that an increase of the temperature leads to an enhancement of the diffusion coefficient of solvent, solubility of solutes, diffusion rate of analytes, and a reduction of solvent viscosity and surface tension.¹¹² They have also pointed out from literature that the dielectric constant close to methanol may enhance the solubility of phenolic compounds. However, the concentration of *n*-CQA (3, 4 and 5-CQA) drops significantly above 190 °C since high temperature can promote the degradation of phenolic compounds. Indeed, longer extraction at high temperature favors oxidation and degradation of phenolics. However, degradation products of *n*-CQA have not been analyzed in this work. This information is crucial, even more since the ratio *n*-CQA/TPC is way lower above 190 °C (*n*-CQA/TPC = 0.070-0.095 at 110-170 °C, *n*-CQA/TPC = 0.038 at 190 °C). This suggests that above 190 °C, another source of polyphenols than *n*-CaffeoylQuinic Acid (*n*-CQA) impacts the result of the Total Polyphenol Content (TPC) and AntiOxidant Capacity (AOC) of the spent coffee grounds (SCG) extract.

Literature about fundamental research has been investigated to understand polyphenols behavior including *n*-CQA and role of degradation products as new antioxidants in subcritical H₂O. Sato *et al.* have reported the hydrolysis phenomenon of 3-caffeoylquinic acid into caffeic acid and quinic acid.¹⁴⁷ Khuwijitjaru *et al.* have highlighted that caffeic acid has a higher antioxidant capacity (2.37 g_{AEEAC}.g⁻¹_{caffeic acid}) than chlorogenic acid (1.39 g_{AEEAC}.g⁻¹_{chlorogenic acid}).¹⁴⁸ Unfortunately, they also have shown that degradation kinetic is faster for caffeic acid than chlorogenic acid. The products resulting from caffeic acid degradation in subcritical water have also been studied (Figure 9).¹⁴⁹

Chun *et al.* (220 °C, 10 min) and Mussatto *et al.* (200 °C, 50 min) have reported different temperature with different time of extraction under optimal conditions for polyphenols recovery. This suggests that the combination temperature/time of extraction is one of the most important factor to take into account.^{131, 150}




Figure 9: Extraction and degradation mechanism of chlorogenic acid and caffeic acid in subcritical H₂O adapted from Khuwijitjaru *et al.*¹⁴⁹

Inouye *et al.* have reported the use of subcritical H₂O for the production of antioxidant extract from coffee silverskin (CSS, Table 4, Entry 9).¹⁵¹ They have observed a larger amount of 5-CQA at 80 °C (1.7 mg.g⁻¹_{extract}) than at 180 °C (1.5 mg.g⁻¹_{extract}) and even their absence at 210 °C (not detected) after 10 min. However, TPC have been reported to inversely increase from 180 °C (22 mg.g⁻¹_{extract}) to 210 °C (36 mg.g⁻¹_{extract}), contradicting the conclusion with SCG. The authors have supported the hypothesis that hydrolysis or degradation of lignin and lignan generate smaller and soluble phenolic compounds, without further investigations.

Sato *et al.* have investigated the subcritical H₂O semi-continuous extraction from green coffee beans at 1 g.min⁻¹ during 20-60 min (Table 4, Entry 11).¹⁴⁷ They have reported three different ranges of temperature of extraction: i) 70 to 140 °C with elevation of Antioxidant Capacity (AOC), ii) 140 to 200 °C with reduction of AOC and iii) 200 to 300 °C with significant raise of AOC. The authors have described that the structural distribution of CaffeoylQuinic Acid (CQA) in natural plants is typically composed of oligomeric structures like glycosides. Hence, in first range (70-140 °C) recover of CQA requires lignocellulose hydrolysis that is enhanced by increasing temperature. For the second range (140-200 °C), AntiOxidant Capacity (AOC) and CaffeoylQuinic Acid (CQA) have been reported to decrease simultaneously. The authors have reported that the increase of the temperature leads to the water density decrease and its ionic product increase. Then, the solvation structure and protonation of CaffeoylQuinic Acid (CQA) might be more sensitive resulting in CQA degradation by hydrolysis. Finally, for the third range, AntiOxidant Capacity (AOC) and melanoidins index have been observed to rise simultaneously. Coffee melanoidins have been reported in literature to exhibit antioxidant activity.¹⁵² Melanoidin is a brown colored high weight heteropolymer that occurs during the Maillard reaction between sugars and amino acids.¹⁵³ The authors have studied the contribution of high molecular weight melanoidins, which is up to 36% of the total Trolox Equivalent Antioxidant Capacity (TEAC) in coffee brews. Moreover, the authors have pointed out that chlorogenic acids are up to 39% covalently bounded to melanoidins (220 °C, 15 min), which can be partially responsible of the antioxidant activity of melanoidins.¹⁵³

Coimbra *et al.* have shown that during roasting process the polysaccharides depolymerize then repolymerize, forming new polymers through non-enzymatic

transglycosylation reactions with phenolic compounds (Figure 10).¹⁵⁴ In addition, for non-roasted material such as algae biomass, Herrero et al have suggested that Maillard, caramelization and thermoxidation reactions affect the overall antioxidant capacity of subcritical H₂O extracts depending on the nature of the sample.¹⁵⁵




Figure 10: Formation of new antioxidant compounds through transglycosylation of melanoidins with phenolic compounds during roasting step adapted from Coimbra *et al.*¹⁵⁴

3.1.2.2. Extraction of secondary antioxidant metabolites

Caffeine, with its antioxidant properties,¹⁵⁶ is the only molecule from the methylxanthines that is present in large amount in coffee and coffee by-products (Figure 3). Inouye *et al.* have reported the extraction of caffeine in coffee silverskin with subcritical H₂O (Table 4, Entry 9).¹⁵¹ Caffeine concentration with water extraction at high temperature (270 °C, 23%_{yield}, 4.1 mg.g⁻¹_{extract}) has been proven to be as efficient than ambient water extraction (25 °C, 16%_{yield}, 4.1 mg.g⁻¹_{extract}), showing the high thermal and chemical stability of caffeine.^{151, 157}

Sato *et al.* have reported the subcritical H₂O extraction of caffeine in green coffee beans (Table 4, Entry 11).¹⁴⁷ Caffeine concentration for extraction that have been performed at 280 °C (60mg.g⁻¹_{GCB}) are more efficient than at 230 °C (18mg.g⁻¹_{GCB}). The authors have also proposed that higher yield can be correlated to better hydrolysis of cellulosic walls at higher temperature, thus, the trapped caffeine inside the matrix being released. However, these results have to be interpreted carefully since the 60 mg.g⁻¹_{GCB} (6% w/w) reported by Sato *et al.* exceeds the caffeine content value in coffee generally reported in the literature.

Chun *et al.* have reported results of Total Flavonoid Content (TFC) and catechin, the main flavonoid in coffee and coffee by-products during the extraction of green coffee beans (Table 4, Entry 10).¹⁵⁸ The authors have obtained better results at 180 °C (43 mg.g⁻¹_{GCB}) than 220 °C (15 mg.g⁻¹_{GCB}). They have proposed the hypothesis that phenolic compounds and flavonoids have been decomposed in very hot water, with a slower rate of decomposition for flavonoids.

Punbusayakul *et al.* have investigated anthocyanins extraction (15 min, 65–155 °C) from coffee pulp by subcritical water acidified with 7% v/v acetic acid (Table 4, Entry 18).¹⁵⁹ Major anthocyanin in coffee pulp is the cyanidin-3-rutinoside (C-3-R, Figure 3). The authors have ascribed that to the dielectric constant of subcritical water at 120 °C close to those of methanol and ethanol. In addition, it has been reported

that anthocyanins have high solubility in methanol. The authors have also suggested that temperature higher than 120 °C can lead to degradation of the C-3-R linkage.

3.1.2.3. Use of non-conventional methods and solvents:

The subcritical H₂O has been demonstrated to be an eco-compatible solvent of extraction for biomass valorization. Hence, polyphenols extraction has been compared from subcritical H₂O, non-conventional (ultrasound (US), microwave (MW), Deep Eutectic Solvent (DES), ...) and traditional methods of extraction to evaluate the competitiveness of subcritical H₂O. The following results have to be interpreted with cautious since the raw material of each publication is different and the corresponding conclusions can be slightly biased.

For Ultrasound Assisted Extraction (UAE), Ponmurugan *et al.* have performed ethanol extraction under different conditions of temperature (30–50 °C), time (5–45 min), liquid/solid ratio (5–30 mL.g⁻¹) and ultrasonic power output (100–300 W) with TPC range of 32.81–36.23 mg_{GAE}.g⁻¹_{SCG}.¹⁶⁰ The reported results are higher than traditional one, but no blank under silent conditions has been carried out. Hence, the authors have suggested that during ultrasonic irradiation from 100 to 250 W, the SCG cell is exposed to shock waves and liquid jets, resulting in higher yield. In any case, reported results are still considered as lower than the one of subcritical H₂O. However, UAE can be implemented as pre- or post-treatment of subcritical H₂O extraction of coffee and coffee by-products, as reported by Chun *et al.* and Arauzo *et al.*^{130, 161}

For Microwave Assisted Extraction (MAE), Casazza *et al.* have conducted hydroalcoholic (EtOH 54% v/v) extraction under different conditions of temperature (120, 135 and 150 °C) and heating time (1, 10 and 20 min).¹⁶² Highest extraction yield of polyphenols (3.9 mg_{CAE}.mL⁻¹_{extract}) have been reported at 150 °C for 10 min. Those results are two times higher than the blank (room temperature, 24 h) with hydroalcoholic (EtOH 54% v/v, 2.0 mg_{CAE}.g⁻¹), water (1.4 mg_{CAE}.g⁻¹) or ethanol (0.67 mg_{CAE}.g⁻¹), despite differences of experimental conditions. The authors have suggested that more intense microwave irradiation power promotes a faster heating with (i) more intense wall-cell rupture and (ii) faster analytes release.

For DES, Lee *et al.* have tested 13 choline-chloride based DES.¹⁶³ In similar experimental conditions (room temperature, 45 min, UAE), the HeCh DES (15 mg_{GAE}.g⁻¹_{SCG}) has showed better TPC results than hydroalcoholic solution (EtOH 20% v/v, 9 mg_{GAE}.g⁻¹_{SCG}) and water (6 mg_{GAE}.g⁻¹_{SCG}) used as reference. The authors have observed that the nature of DES is a significant parameter for polyphenols extraction. But no explanation has been proposed to justify the better results observed with HeCh. The authors have also pointed out the necessity of an extra-step with elution column to separate polyphenols from DES. This step has resulted in an optimal polyphenols recovery of 79%.

Globally, subcritical H₂O has offered higher results for polyphenols recovery than other physical assisted methods of

extraction. However, the comparison is limited since no reference extraction method has been defined yet. The subcritical H₂O is the greenest and most competitive solvent reported for the polyphenols extraction of coffee and coffee by-products.

3.1.3. Biocrude oil and biochar production:

Biomass can be converted into energy *via* the production of bio-oil or biocrude oil, a liquid fuel that could replace petroleum. Biocrude oil is obtained *via* two main methods described in the literature, which are, fast or flash pyrolysis and hydrothermal liquefaction (HTL). Pyrolysis pathway consists in a thermal decomposition without oxygen. Conventional pyrolysis is performed from 280 to 680 °C at 0.1–1 °C.min⁻¹. Rapid pyrolysis is performed from 580 to 980 °C at a 10–200 °C.min⁻¹ increase of temperature. Flash pyrolysis is performed from 780 to 1030 °C with ramp >1000 °C.min⁻¹.¹⁶⁴ Flash pyrolysis is the most common method employed at industrial scale. The HTL pathway consists in a reaction between biomass and water at temperatures over 100 °C.¹⁶⁵ Hydrochar can be used as solid fuel because of both its higher HHV and lower volatile matter/ashes ratio than those of raw material.¹⁶⁶

Hydrothermal liquefaction (HTL) is the most suitable method for wet biomass. For this reason, spent coffee grounds with its high moisture content has been studied for the production of biocrude oil and biochar.

Xu and He *et al.* have investigated the influence of retention time (5–25 min), reaction temperature (200–300 °C), water/feedstock mass ratio (5–20 mL.g⁻¹) and pressure (5–20 bars) during the HTL of spent coffee grounds (Table 4, Entry 19).¹⁶⁷ Under optimal conditions, the HHV has been significantly increased from the raw material (20.2 MJ.kg⁻¹) to biocrude oil (31.0 MJ.kg⁻¹). To obtain higher yields, a shorter time (10 min) is preferable to a longer time (30 min) under the experimental conditions described (300 °C, 5 mL.g⁻¹).¹⁶⁷ Xu and He *et al.* have explained that a longer time generates smaller and lighter products and gases. In addition, solid residues have shown a slight increase after 30 min that might be caused by the repolymerization of biocrude oil into biochars, reducing then the biocrude oil yield.

In addition, the yield of biocrude oil continuously raises with feedstock/water mass ratio (35.29% for 5 mL.g⁻¹, 47.28% for 20 mL.g⁻¹).¹⁶⁷ The authors explained that the lower yields obtained with a lower biomass/solvent ratio are the result of insufficient mixing of reagents. More specifically, these conditions have led to unfavorable heat/mass transfer conditions and to slow down the liquefaction and solvolysis processes, generating less biocrude oil and more solid residues.

Park *et al.* have characterized a biochar formed during the hydrothermal carbonization (HTC) at different temperatures (180–330 °C).¹⁶⁸ The calorific value of raw material (21.8 MJ.kg⁻¹) continuously increases with the temperature from 180 °C (22.9 MJ.kg⁻¹) to 330 °C (31.3 MJ.kg⁻¹). At contrary, the biochar product yield continuously decreases by increasing the temperature. The authors explained these results by the dehydration and decarboxylation reactions leading to CO₂

releases. Hence, the optimal energy yield recovery (ERE) is a compromise between 210 °C (94%) and 240 °C (90%).

No author has experimentally compared inside the same paper the differences between pyrolysis and hydrothermal processes with the same coffee by-product. Hence, Choi *et al.* have reported the interesting results with an oil yield of 54.85% obtained after a spent coffee grounds pyrolysis.¹⁶⁹ Unfortunately, due to high moisture content (50–60% w/w) of spent coffee grounds, a pre-drying step is required to perform the pyrolysis, leading to an important energy consumption limiting the economic viability of the overall process.

As a global conclusion, subcritical H₂O can act as super solvent, reagent and catalyst able to solubilize, hydrolyze and decarboxylate molecular matrix allowing recovering a wide range of molecules such as low weight carbohydrates and high value polyphenols. Hence, the green subcritical H₂O can cover almost all the pre-existing applications of coffee and coffee by-products valorization that is typically achieved with traditional solvents or methods. Moreover, subcritical H₂O is also often more efficient than the physical activation methods of coffee and coffee by-product valorization.

3.2. Supercritical carbon dioxide (SC-CO₂)

Table 5 reports examples involving the use of supercritical carbon dioxide (SC-CO₂) for coffee or coffee by-products valorization. This Table 5 does not present the examples from decaffeination process by SC-CO₂ that has been widely investigated and described in several papers and patents.^{170–173} Table 5 shows that a wide range of final products is obtained using SC-CO₂ extraction under different experimental conditions, essentially from the extraction or fractionation of the lipophilic fractions. These final products can be classified by field of application: i) bioactive oil extracts including sterols, caffeine, polyphenols for cosmetic industry used in pharmaceutical, cosmetic, nutraceutical or agrifood application; ii) triglycerides oil for biodiesel production.

3.2.1. Yield of extraction:

Simões *et al.* have investigated the influence of pressure (150–300 bars) and temperature (40–55 °C) on the supercritical CO₂ (SC-CO₂) extraction of spent coffee grounds (Table 5, Entry 3).¹⁷⁴ A maximum SC-CO₂ extraction yield of 85% has been reached after 3 h under 250 bars at 50 °C and 300 bars at 55 °C. Experimental results have pointed out an increase of extraction yield with pressure. According to the authors, the increase of pressure leads to an increase of density of CO₂, resulting in higher yield. The extraction curve has also been observed to be splitted in two distinct parts: i) the extraction of available oil at the solid surface and ii) the extraction of oil inside the matrix. Along all this process, extraction rate has been dominated by i) external mass transfer resistance and ii) diffusional and internal mass transfer. In addition, the temperature influence is balanced between two opposite effects.

CRITICAL REVIEW

Table 4: SCW for coffee and coffee by-products valorization.

Entry	Raw material	Parameters	Analysis	Final products	Main results	Ref.
1	Spent coffee grounds	110-190 °C 50 bars 15-75 min 10-70 mL.g ⁻¹ DM	TPC, ABTS, DPPH, HPLC (CGA)	High antioxidant extract	TPC = 88.3 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ extract ABTS = 886.5 μmol _{TE} .g ⁻¹ extract DPPH = 382.8 μmol _{TE} .g ⁻¹ extract (179 °C, 36 min, and 14.1 mL.g ⁻¹ SCG)	112
2	Spent coffee grounds	180-240 °C 20-60 bars 10 min 27 mL.g ⁻¹ DM US/MW N ₂ /CO ₂ modifier	TPC, TFC, RSs, proteins, ABTS, DPPH, MIC	High antioxidant hydrolysate	TPC = 33.1-51.2 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ extract TFC = 15.1-25.5 mg _{CE} .g ⁻¹ extract RSs = 8.9-39.9 g _{GLU} .100g ⁻¹ extract DPPH = 400-500 μmol _{TE} .g ⁻¹ extract ABTS = 400-800 μmol _{TE} .g ⁻¹ extract (220 °C)	131
3	Spent coffee grounds	120 °C 20 min 20 mL.g ⁻¹ DM	TPC, TFC, DPPH, FRAP	High antioxidant extract	TPC = 32.9 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ extract TFC = 8.3 mg _{QE} .g ⁻¹ extract DPPH = 70% inhibition	109
4	Coffee silverskin	120 °C 20 min 20 mL.g ⁻¹ DM	TPC, TFC, DPPH, FRAP	High antioxidant extract	TPC = 19.2 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ extract TFC = 2.7 mg _{QE} .g ⁻¹ extract DPPH = 60% inhibition	109
5	Spent coffee grounds	Sampled 140 °C then 220 °C (one extraction) 30 min 3g 1 mL.min ⁻¹ 90 min	TPC, TSC, HPLC, DPPH, ROS	Bioactive extract (skin anti-aging)	Yield = 15% / 40% (g _{extract} /100g _{SCG}) TPC = 19.9 / 5.7 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ extract TSC = 3.8 / 28.6 (g _{GLU} .100g ⁻¹ extract) EC ₅₀ = 20.6 / 132.2 μg _{extract} .mL ⁻¹ (DPPH) (140/220 °C)	110
6	Spent coffee grounds	80-160 °C 35-170 bars 5-20 min 0.5-2.5 g 25-75% EtOH %Flush 20-100 11 mL cell	TPC, HPLC (CAF, 5-CQA), ABTS, DPPH	Antioxidant extract	TPC = 19-26 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ SCG EC ₅₀ = 16-38 mg _{AAE} .g ⁻¹ SCG (DPPH) EC ₅₀ = 10-28 mg _{AAE} .g ⁻¹ SCG (ABTS) CAF = 3.2-9.7 mg.g ⁻¹ SCG 5-CQA = 51-201 mg.g ⁻¹ SCG (195 °C, 0.8 g)	113
7	Spent coffee grounds	60-90 °C 5-30 min 0-16% EtOH 20 mL.g ⁻¹ DM Resin purif	TPC, DPPH, ORAC, HPLC (HMF)	Polyphenols + Reduction HMF	TPC = 14 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ SCG EC ₅₀ = 52 μmol _{TE} .g ⁻¹ SCG (DPPH) 5-CQA = 30 μg.g ⁻¹ SCG HMF reduction = 95% (90 °C, 16% ethanol)	175
8	Spent coffee grounds	160-200 °C 10-50 min 5-15 mL.g ⁻¹ DM	TPC, TFC, TAA, DPPH, ABTS, FRAP, HPLC (CGA)	Bioactive extract	TPC = 40.4 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ SCG TFC = 1.87 mg _{QE} .g ⁻¹ SCG EC ₅₀ = 113 μmol _{TE} .g ⁻¹ SCG (DPPH) EC ₅₀ = 277 μmol _{TE} .g ⁻¹ SCG (ABTS) FRAP = 69.5 mg Fe(II).g ⁻¹ SCG TAA = 66.2 mg α-TOC.g ⁻¹ SCG CGA = 2.25 mg.g ⁻¹ SCG (200 °C, 15 mL.g ⁻¹ SCG, 50 min)	150
9	Coffee silverskin	25-80 °C (H ₂ O, 0.1 M HCl, 0.1 M NaOH) - 50 mL.g ⁻¹ DM 180-270 °C 10-53 bars 17-42 min 50 mL.g ⁻¹ DM	HPLC (CAF, 5-CQA, 5-HMF), TSC, RSs, proteins, TPC, DPPH, H-ORAC	High antioxidant extract	Yield = 16/19/29/23% (g _{extract} /100g _{CSS}) (25/80/210/270 °C) Yield = 28/44% (g _{extract} /100g _{CSS}) (80 °C + 0.1 M HCl/ 80 °C + 0.1 NaOH) TPC = 36 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ extract (best TPC, 210 °C) H-ORAC = 262.9 μmol _{TE} .g ⁻¹ extract DPPH = 379.0 μmol _{TE} .g ⁻¹ extract TPC = 28 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ extract (best AOC, 270 °C) 5-CQA = 9.0 mg.g ⁻¹ extract (best CQA, 80 °C)	151
10	Green coffee bean	180-220 °C 30-60 bars 10 min 25 mL.g ⁻¹ DM 5 types of coffee	TPC, TFC, HPLC (CAF, CGA), ABTS, DPPH, MRPs, MIC	Bioactive molecules	TPC = 120.4-144.4 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ GCB TFC = 15-43 mg _{CE} .g ⁻¹ GCB DPPH = 80-88% inhibition CAF = 1.04-2.52 g.100g ⁻¹ GCB CGA = 46-70 mg.g ⁻¹ GCB (180 °C)	158
11	Green coffee bean	50-300 °C 10-100 bars 20-60 min	HPLC/UV (CAF, CQA), UPLC/MS (CQA), DPPH, TPC,	Bioactive molecules (degradation 3-CQA)	TPC = 6.7 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ GCB (157 °C, 23 bars, 60 min) DPPH = 73.7 μmol _{TE} .g ⁻¹ GCB	147

		1 g.min ⁻¹ 0.8 g			(160 °C, 21 bars, 59 min CQAs = 54 mg.g ⁻¹ _{GCB} (212 °C, 20 bars, 55 min)	
12	Spent coffee grounds	150-220 °C 70 bars 30 min 70 g 10 mL.min ⁻¹	TPC, TSC, HPLC, DPPH, MIC	Antioxidant extract + carbohydrates	Yield = 55.6% (g _{extract} /100g _{SCG}) TPC = 70.3 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ _{extract} TSC = 33.7 g _{GLU} .100g ⁻¹ _{SCG} EC ₅₀ = 1.99 mg _{extract} .mg ⁻¹ _{extract} (DPPH) CGA = 0.7-1.5 mg.g ⁻¹ _{SCG} (200 °C)	133
13	Green coffee residues	150-250 °C 225-300 bars 36 min (sample every 2 min) 5 g 10 mL.min ⁻¹ Coffee powder Defatted cake	TPC, TSC, RSs, HPLC (carbohydrates, 5-HMF, furfural)	Polyphenols + polysaccharides	TPC = 26.6 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ _{GCB} (powder, 200 °C, 22.5 MPa) TSC = 9.0 g _{GLU} .100g ⁻¹ _{extract} RSs = 6.3 g _{GLU} .100g ⁻¹ _{extract} (powder, 150°C, 30 MPa) TPC = 55.3 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ _{GCB} TSC = 17.2 g _{GLU} .100g ⁻¹ _{GCB} RSs = 8.8 g _{GLU} .100g ⁻¹ _{GCB} (defatted, 175°C)	176
14	Spent coffee grounds	150-210 °C 20-60 bars 5-15 min 27 mL.g ⁻¹ DM US/MW/SC-CO ₂ pretreatment	TPC, TSC, RSs, FT-IR, TGA, SEM, DPPH, ABTS, HPLC (monosaccharides)	Bioactive polysaccharides	Yield = 18% (g _{extract} /100g _{SCG}) TPC = 2.2 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ _{extract} TSC = 47.7 g _{GLU} .100g ⁻¹ _{extract} RSs = 18.8 g _{GLU} .100g ⁻¹ _{extract} (180°C, 20 bars, 5 min)	130
15	Spent coffee grounds	160-200 °C 10-50 min 5-15 mL.g ⁻¹ DM	TSC, TPC, RSs, TAA, DPPH, ABTS, FRAP, HPLC, XRD, FT-IR	Bioactive polysaccharides	Yield = 35.9% (g _{extract} /100g _{SCG}) TPC = 234 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ _{extract} TSC = 29,3 g _{GLU} .100g ⁻¹ _{extract} RSs = 9.4 g _{GLU} .100g ⁻¹ _{extract} EC ₅₀ = 516 μmol _{FE} .g ⁻¹ _{extract} (DPPH) (160°C, 15 mL.g ⁻¹ _{SCG} , 10 min)	111
16	Spent coffee grounds	100-180 °C 15-75 min 100-140 mg H ₂ SO ₄ .g ⁻¹ 10-14 mL.g ⁻¹ DM	HPLC	Bioactive polysaccharides	Hydrolysis conversion: Galactan = 100% Mannan = 77.4% Arabinan = 89.5% Hemicellulose = 87.4%	177
17	Green coffee bean	130-170 °C 40-90 min 7-23 mL.g ⁻¹ DM 0-30% EtOH	HPLC (CGA)	Chlorogenic acids	CGA = 50 mg.g ⁻¹ _{GCB} (160 °C, 40 min, 0% eth, 14 mL.g ⁻¹ _{GCB})	178
18	Coffee pulp	65-155 °C 103 bars 15 min	HPLC	Anthocyanin (C-3-R cyanidin-3-rutinoside)	C-3-R = 3 mg.g ⁻¹ _{CP} (120 °C)	159
19	Spent coffee grounds	200-300 °C 5-25 min 5-20 mL.g ⁻¹ DM N ₂ (5-20 bars)	GC-MS, FT-IR, Elemental composition, HHV	Bio-crude oil	Yield = 47.3% (g _{bio-oil} /100g _{SCG}) E _{recovery} = 72.6% HHV = 31.0/20.2 MJ.kg ⁻¹ (biocrude oil/biochar) (275 °C, 10 min, 20 mL.g ⁻¹ _{SCG})	167
20	Spent coffee grounds	225-325 °C 50-100 bars 10 min 5 mL.g ⁻¹ DM 5% NaOH Co-liquefaction (PF or CS or WPB)	GC-MS, GPC, TGA, viscosity, Elemental composition, HHV	Bio-crude oil	Yield → +20% SCG + CS (250 °C, 5% NaOH) HHV = 40.4/31.9/29.5 MJ.kg ⁻¹ Yield = 20.0/25.0/29.5% (g _{bio-oil} /100g SCG) (SCG / SCG + 5% NaOH / mix SCG-CS 1-1 + 5% NaOH)	179
21	Spent coffee grounds	180-330 °C 60 min 1 mL.g ⁻¹ DM	Elemental composition, HHV, FT-IR	Bio-char	E _{recovery} ≈ 95/90/60% HHV = 26.5/27.5/31.3 MJ.kg ⁻¹ (biocrude oil, 210/240/330 °C)	168
22	Coffee husk	150-225 °C 20-300 min 1-4 mL.g ⁻¹ DM	N ₂ isotherms, elemental composition, SEM, FT-IR, TGA, pH _{ZPC} , MB adsorption	Hydrochar	S _{BET} = 31.3 m ² .g ⁻¹ _{hydrochar} Methylene blue adsorption = 34.9 mg.g ⁻¹ _{hydrochar} (210°C, 243 min, 3.41 mL.g ⁻¹ _{CH})	180
23	Spent coffee grounds	120-240°C 180-720 min 2-5 mL.g ⁻¹ DM H ₂ O ₂ adding	(RSM), TGA, CO ₂ adsorption	Precursors of activated carbons	CO ₂ captured = 2.95% (180°C - 12h)	181
24	Spent coffee grounds	163 °C 45 min 10 mL.g ⁻¹ DM	TSC, HPLC, GC (major and minor volatiles)	1 st step: extraction for spirit (drink)	TSC = 3.4 g _{GLU} .L ⁻¹	182
25	Spent coffee grounds	160-200 °C 180 min 8.3-16.7 mL.g ⁻¹ DM H ₂ O	HPLC-RI, TGA	Production of levulinic and formic acid (LA and FA)	Yield (w/w) LA = 47% FA = 29% (180°C, 8.3 mL.g ⁻¹ _{SCG} , 3 h)	183

CRITICAL REVIEW

Increasing the temperature decreases the density of the supercritical fluid and thus its solvation capacity. On the other hand, it increases the vapor pressure of the solutes, therefore increasing their solubility in the supercritical solvent.

Mazzafera *et al.* have explained that the addition of the co-solvent such as isopropyl alcohol and ethanol enhances solvent density and modifies physical and chemical intermolecular interaction forces in the system (Table 5, Entry 15).¹⁸⁴ More precisely, it increases the local density around the solute molecule, by increasing the physical interactions that are short range forces. In addition, the co-solvent can also lead to hydrogen bonding interaction.¹⁸⁵ However, since the addition of polar co-solvent targets phenolic and other polar compounds that are usually not extracted during pure SC-CO₂, the measure of oil yield with SC-CO₂ associated to a co-solvent is probably overestimated.

More globally, several parameters such as i) pressure, ii) temperature and iii) co-solvent influence have been pointed out to be the controlled parameters that influence the yield of supercritical CO₂ (SC-CO₂) extraction.¹⁸⁶ In particular, pressure is the key parameter to significantly improve extraction yield. In addition, the reported results of yield are often competitive with the one obtained by the use of hexane with Soxhlet. The real challenge for researchers is to obtain the maximum extraction yield with the minimum amount of CO₂ used per g of raw material.

3.2.2. Fatty Acid Content (FAC) and triglycerides content

The fatty acid content (FAC) has been investigated for supercritical CO₂ (SC-CO₂) extraction of coffee and coffee by-products. Banchero *et al.* have reported the FAC of spent coffee grounds extract obtained with SC-CO₂ (Table 5, Entry 2).¹⁸⁷ The SC-CO₂ extract is composed of 45.0, 23.0, 19.6 and 12.3% (w/w) of palmitic (C16:0), linoleic (18:2), stearic (C18:0) and oleic acid (C18:1). The FAC has been demonstrated to be similar in proportion in comparison to the extract obtained with hexane Soxhlet.

Simões *et al.* have analyzed the Fatty Acid Content (FAC) of SC-CO₂ extract from spent coffee grounds (SCG) at different pressure (150-300 bars) and temperature (40-55 °C), but no significant difference in FAC has been observed due to these different modifications (Table 5, Entry 3).¹⁷⁴ More generally, Zaidu *et al.* have demonstrated that modifying pressure of SC-CO₂ can influence the nature of fatty acids, depending of the number of carbons. Here, the main fatty acids in spent coffee grounds have almost the same number of carbon (C16:0, C18:0, C18:1 and C18:2), making them difficult to be selectively extracted.

In conclusion, the Fatty Acid Content (FAC) is ascribable to raw material nature that shows differences in terms of species origin, cultivation process, location of the coffee plants, etc.

3.2.3. Bioactive molecules

3.2.3.1. Terpenoids

Main terpenoids in SC-CO₂ extract of coffee has been observed to be kahweol, cafestol and 16-O-methylcafestol (Figure 5, Table 5, Entries 4, 6, 7, 10 and 11).¹⁸⁸⁻¹⁹⁰

Acevedo *et al.* have compared simple, Soxhlet, direct saponification and SC-CO₂ extraction of cafestol (CFT) and kahweol (KW, Table 5, Entry 7).¹⁸⁹ Best results have been obtained by direct saponification (CFT = 214.3 mg.100g⁻¹SCG, KW = 466.6 mg.100g⁻¹SCG), followed by Soxhlet (CFT = 164.1 mg.100g⁻¹SCG, KW = 249.0 mg.100g⁻¹SCG), classical (CFT = 34.4 mg.100g⁻¹SCG, KW = 42.4 mg.100g⁻¹SCG) and SC-CO₂ extraction (CFT = 11.4-42.5 mg.100g⁻¹SCG, KW = 20.7-82.8 mg.100g⁻¹SCG). According to the authors, kahweol and cafestol are highly unstable molecules that easily form oxides. Hence, direct saponification has been described in literature as an efficient alternative to extract the unsaponifiable fraction of green coffee beans, avoiding diterpene oxidation. The other procedures (classical, Soxhlet, SC-CO₂) produce extracts that are going through a further saponification process after extraction, but exposing diterpenes to a possible higher oxidation rate.

In conclusion, supercritical CO₂ is not the most efficient solvent for terpenoids extraction. Hence, supercritical CO₂ offers a greater selectivity to produce high value oil enriched in terpenoids.

3.2.3.2. Sterols and tocopherols

Akgün *et al.* have identified campesterol, stigmasterol, sitosterol, α -Tocopherol, β -tocopherol but also the absence of γ -tocopherol and δ -tocopherol in the SC-CO₂ extract (Table 5, Entry 8).¹⁹¹ The authors, through a response surface methodology (RSM), have estimated that moderate pressures (> 200 bars), near-critical temperatures (40 °C) and with long extraction times (4 h) are required for efficient extraction of sterols and tocopherols. Moreover, they have demonstrated that SC-CO₂ extract is richer in sterols (STR = 12.21-15.60%_{oil}) and tocopherol (TCPR = 1.51-2.12%_{oil}) with global yield of 10.62-11.41% compared to hexane Soxhlet (STR = 8.76-8.85%_{oil} and TCPR = 0.90-2.34%_{oil}, global yield = 12.29-14.97%).

More generally, sterols and tocopherols have not been enough investigated to draw accurate conclusions, but SC-CO₂ has been shown to be efficient and can more selectively extract those compounds compare to hexane Soxhlet.

3.2.3.3. Caffeine

Caffeine identification and quantification have been investigated for supercritical CO₂ (SC-CO₂) extraction of spent coffee grounds (SCG) and green coffee beans (GCB, Table 5, Entries 5 and 15).^{184,192} Mazzafera *et al.* have investigated the influence of pressure (152-352 bars), temperature (50-60 °C) and co-solvent (ethanol, isopropyl alcohol) on the SC-CO₂

extraction of caffeine in GCB (Table 5, Entry 15).¹⁸⁴ The most efficient SC-CO₂ extraction (17 g_{caffeine}·g⁻¹_{solvent}) has been reported to be the combination of high pressure (352 bars) and the addition of a co-solvent (EtOH 5%w/w). Without the co-solvent, the yield is ten times lower (1.7 g_{caffeine}·g⁻¹_{solvent}). According to the authors, that might be due to caffeine molecules in GCB that are complexed by chlorogenic acids, and then hydrogen bonds between caffeine and chlorogenic acid molecules have to be broken. The addition of EtOH allows the solvation of caffeine and intermolecular interaction between EtOH and caffeine such as hydrogen bonding, resulting in higher yield.

In conclusion, contrary to one might think due to supercritical CO₂ decaffeination, SC-CO₂ is not the most appropriate solvent to remove caffeine. Hence, it is the most suitable solution to enrich selectively coffee oil in caffeine.

3.2.3.4. Polyphenols

Polyphenols and antioxidant activity have been investigated for supercritical CO₂ (SC-CO₂) extraction of spent coffee grounds (SCG, Table 5, Entry 25).¹⁹³ Coelho *et al.* have performed 2,2-diphenyl-1-picrylhydrazyl (DPPH) analysis of SCG extract obtained by SC-CO₂ extraction at different pressure (300–400 bars), temperature (40–60 °C) and co-solvent (EtOH).¹⁹⁴ The most antioxidant extract (Inhibition Concentration IC₅₀ = 12.39 mg_{extract}·mL⁻¹_{DPPH}) has been observed at 300 bars, 60 °C with 10% EtOH. The SC-CO₂ extractions without EtOH (IC₅₀ = 96.23–163.1 mg_{extract}·mL⁻¹_{DPPH}) have been reported to be four to six times less efficient than hexane Soxhlet (IC₅₀ = 25.07 mg_{extract}·mL⁻¹_{DPPH}). Hence, co-solvent is the most influent parameter compared to pressure and temperature, during a SC-CO₂ extraction of antioxidants molecules. According to the authors, the addition of EtOH is necessary to increase the solvent polarity that is essential for extraction of polar molecules, responsible for the antioxidant capacity.

In conclusion, SC-CO₂ is not suitable solvent for polyphenols extraction. Hence, the addition of EtOH co-solvent is an interesting opportunity for enrichment of oil in polyphenols.

To conclude, SC-CO₂ and SC-CO₂/EtOH are not the most efficient solvents for bioactive molecules recovery in term of quantity, but are more selective than hexane Soxhlet. It is possible to obtain dual enrichment into lipophilic and hydrophilic compounds, by performing sequential extraction with pure SC-CO₂ followed by SC-CO₂/EtOH extraction, both at low pressure.

3.2.4. Fractionation

Fractionation with SC-CO₂ is a more rarely investigated step for the valorization of coffee and coffee by-products. This is mainly due to the necessity for the operators to possess a supercritical system with at least two or more separators. Hence, it represents another alternative to i) enrich an extract selectively in specific compounds or ii) to completely

recover expected compounds or removing unwanted compounds as described in by Reverchon *et al.*¹⁹⁵

Bitencourt *et al.* have reported the use of supercritical CO₂/EtOH (SC-CO₂/EtOH, 90.6/9.4 w/w) followed by fractionation into 4 separators (Table 5, Entry 4).¹⁹⁶ Pressurization of the separators have been performed with SC-CO₂/EtOH (90.6/9.4 w/w, condition A) and with pure SC-CO₂ (condition B) at 300, 200, 100 bars and P_{atm}, respectively called F1, F2, F3 and F4 (Figure 11). Results have shown that nearly the entire extract precipitates in F3 and F4. According to the authors, the spent coffee grounds (SCG) extract is mainly composed of a lipid portion that is highly soluble in SC-CO₂/EtOH, even at 300 and 200 bars. More specifically, the extract precipitation in separators F3 and F4 can also be explained by the observations of phase equilibrium behavior for CO₂/EtOH system. Under condition A, the Total polyphenol content (TPC) of the extract obtained from F1 (TPC 3.2 = mg_{GAE}·g⁻¹_{extract}) is four times more concentrated than the original SC-CO₂/EtOH extract without fractionation (TPC = 0.8 mg_{GAE}·g⁻¹_{extract}). The drop of pressure from 400 to 300 bars induces a more selective precipitation of polyphenols than other compounds. Yet, the results have to be interpreted with cautious; the F1 extract is the most enriched in polyphenols but is not the fraction with the largest amount of polyphenols, representing only 9.55% of the polyphenols extracted from SCG (for examples, TPC_{SCG} = 0.01952 mg_{GAE}·g⁻¹_{SCG} in F1 extract, TPC_{SCG} = 0.2043 mg_{GAE}·g⁻¹_{SCG} in total extract). Under condition B, the use of pure SC-CO₂ to pressurize the separators have been performed to reduce drastically the EtOH concentration, thus, decreasing polarity of solvent to expect a higher polyphenols precipitation in F1. The TPC measured in F1, condition B (TPC = 3.4 mg_{GAE}·g⁻¹_{extract}) is slightly better than the one in F1, condition A (TPC = 3.2 mg_{GAE}·g⁻¹_{extract}), but the improvement is not significant and is in the uncertainties interval. By the way, a more significant precipitation of extract has been reported under F3 (100 bars) of condition B (yield = 13.6%) than F3 under condition A (yield = 8.6%). According to the authors, this might be due to the decrease of ethanol content in the solvent mixture (condition B) that significantly decreases the solubility of coffee lipids and phenolic compounds at 100 bars.




Figure 11: Fractionation process of SC-CO₂ extraction of SCG for production of extracts enriched in phenolic compounds, adapted from Bitencourt *et al.*¹⁹⁶

CRITICAL REVIEW

Table 5: SC-CO₂ applied to coffee and coffee by-products valorization.

Entry	Raw material	Parameters	Analysis	Final products	Main results	Ref.
1	Spent coffee grounds	40-55 °C 190 bars 0-450 min 60 g 12 g.min ⁻¹	GC-FID (FAC)	Lipids	AbsYield = 11.5% RelYield = 75% (190 bars, 40 °C, 400 min) FAC: C18:2 → 44.5% C16:0 → 37.5%	197
2	Spent coffee grounds	40-60 °C 350-500 bars 0-500 min 16 g 1 g.min ⁻¹	GC (FAC)	Lipids	AbsYield = 4.8% RelYield = 85% (500 bars, 60°C, 350 min)	187
3	Spent coffee grounds	40-60 °C 150-300 bars 180 min (sample each 15 min x 4 + 60 min x 2) 20 g 10 g.min ⁻¹ CO ₂ 0.7 g.min ⁻¹ EtOH	GC (FAC)	Lipids	AbsYield = 15.4% (55°C, 300 bars) AbsYield = 19.4% (40°C, 200 bars, EtOH) FAC: C18:2 → 35% C16:0 → 35%	174
4	Spent coffee grounds	40-70 °C 140-190 bars 60g 12 g.min ⁻¹ 0-5% EtOH	HPLC-UV (kahweol, cafestol, 16-O- Methylcafestol),	Lipids + Terpenoids	AbsYield = 12.0% (55 °C, 190 bars, 5% EtOH) Terpenes = 107.4 mg.g ⁻¹ (55°C, 140 bars, 0% EtOH)	188
5	Spent coffee grounds	40-80 °C 100-200 bars 0-300 min Static extraction (10- 90 min) Dynamic 2.0 mL.min ⁻¹ EtOH/SCG (0.25/ 1 to 2/1)	GC (FAC), IV, SV, TPC, ABTS, DPPH, polyphenols, CAF	Lipids + Polyphenols	AbsYield = 15.9% RelYield = 109.5% (SC-CO ₂ /EtOH 2/1, 80°C, 200 bars, 30 min static, 20 min dynamic) FAC: C18:2 → 45.4% C16:0 → 33.0% TPC = 64-411 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ oil ABTS = 397-4610 μmol _{TEAC} .100g ⁻¹ oil DPPH = 345-3215 μmol _{TEAC} .100g ⁻¹ oil CAF = 64-711 mg.100g ⁻¹ oil	192
6	Spent coffee grounds	40-60 °C 300-400 bars 0-220 min 15 g 1.8 g.min ⁻¹ 0-10% EtOH	DPPH, ¹ H NMR, terpenes	Lipids	AbsYield = 9.5-10.7% RelYield = 91.3-102.9% (pure SC-CO ₂) AbsYield = 12.0% RelYield = 115.4% EC ₅₀ = 96.2/12.4 mg _{extract} .mL ⁻¹ (DPPH) CAF = 0.13/1.45% _{mol extract} Cafestol = 5.30/2.26% _{mol extract} 16-O-methylcafestol = 3.70/2.00% _{mol extract} Kahweol = 0.86/1.20% _{mol extract} (SC-CO ₂ /SC-CO ₂ + EtOH)	194
7	Spent coffee grounds	40-80 °C 98-379 bars 60 min 12 g	GC (FAC), OSI, PV, HPLC (kahweol, cafestol), LC-MS-MS (polyphenols), TPC, DPPH	Lipids + polyphenols	FAC: (Classic, Soxhlet, SC-CO ₂) C18:2 → 45/45/46% C16:0 → 30/32/36% Kahweol = 214/164/34/11-43 mg.100g ⁻¹ SCG Cafestol = 467/249/42/21-83 mg.100g ⁻¹ SCG (Saponification, Classic, Soxhlet, SC-CO ₂)	189
8	Spent coffee grounds	33-67 °C 116-284 bars 19-221 min 24 mL.min ⁻¹	GC (FAC, sterols, tocopherols)	Lipids + sterols + tocopherols	FAC: (Soxhlet/SC-CO ₂) C18:2 = 24.5/27.2% C16:0 = 48.4/49.0% Tocopherols SCG1 = 0.90/1.51% _{oil} Tocopherols SCG2 = 2.34/2.12% _{oil} Sterols SCG1 = 8.85/12.21% _{oil} Sterols SCG2 = 8.76/15.60% _{oil}	191

9	Spent coffee grounds	200-300 °C 100-200 bars 40-50 min CO ₂ /MeOH = 0.11-0.30 (mol/mol) <i>In-situ</i> transesterification	GC (FAC, FAME)	Lipids (biodiesel)	FAME Yield = 84.9% (330 °C, 300 bars, SC-MeOH) FAME Yield = 93.4% (300 °C, 100 bars, SC-CO ₂ /MeOH = 0.11 mol/mol)	198
10	Green coffee bean	60-90 °C 235-380 bars 25 min 0.2 g 1.5 mL.min ⁻¹	HPLC (kahweol, cafestol)	Lipids + Terpenoids	GCB (Soxhlet/SC-CO ₂ 70 °C/327 bars) Terpenes = 860/491 mg.100g ⁻¹ oil	190
11	Roasted coffee bean	60-90 °C 235-380 bars 25 min 0.2 g 1.5 mL.min ⁻¹	HPLC (kahweol, cafestol)	Lipids + Terpenoids	RC (Soxhlet/SC-CO ₂ 80 °C/379 bars) Terpenes = 726/288 mg.100g ⁻¹ oil	190
12	Spent coffee grounds	40-60 °C 100 bars 150 min 15 g 6.6-16.6 g.min ⁻¹ SC-CO ₂ 4-15% EtOH	DPPH, ABTS, TPC, HPLC (polyphenols)	High antioxidant extract	(SC-CO ₂ pure) RelYield = 10.5% (40 °C, 300 bars) (SC-CO ₂ + EtOH) AbsYield = 14% (60 °C, 100 bars, 15% CoSolv) (SC-CO ₂ /Soxhlet/US) TPC = 57/120/587 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ oil (SC-CO ₂ , 40 °C, 200 bars, 4% EtOH)	199
13	Coffee husk	40-60 °C 100-300 bars 270 min 4-8% EtOH 15 g 6.6-16.6 g.min ⁻¹ SC-CO ₂	DPPH, ABTS, TPC, HPLC (polyphenols)	High antioxidant extract	(SC-CO ₂ pure) RelYield = 2.0% (50 °C, 300 bars) (SC-CO ₂ + EtOH) AbsYield = 2.2% (50 °C, 200 bars, 8% CoSolv) (SC-CO ₂ /Soxhlet/US) TPC = 36/151/133 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ oil (SC-CO ₂ , 50 °C, 200 bars, 8% EtOH)	199
14	Green coffee bean	50-70 °C 152-352 bars 100 min 15 g 1.8 g.min ⁻¹	HPLC (FAC, CAF)	Lipids + CAF	AbsYield = 15.1% YieldCAF = 92.2% (SC-CO ₂ , 152 bars, 70 °C)	200
15	Green coffee bean	50-60 °C 152-352 bars 15 g 1.8 g.min ⁻¹ Pure or 5% IPA or EtOH	HPLC (CAF, CGA)	Lipids + CAF + CGA	SC-CO ₂ + None/IPA/EtOH RelYield = 70/93/99% CAF = 1.7/2/17 g.100g ⁻¹ oil of solvent CGA = 0/traces/0 (60 °C, 352 bars)	184
16	Green coffee bean	40-60 °C 150-300 bars 360 min 4-25 g 3-5 mL.min ⁻¹ CO ₂ 1 mL.min ⁻¹ H ₂ O	HPLC (CAF, CLA)	CAF + CGA	Most influent: pressure	201
17	Coffee husk	40-100 °C 60-300 bars 100-300 min Humidity	HPLC (CAF)	CAF	CAF = 84% (197g CO ₂ .g ⁻¹ CH) CAF = 78% (58g CO ₂ .g ⁻¹ CH) (SC-CO ₂ , 100 °C, 300 bars, 32% humidity)	202
18	Spent coffee grounds	50 °C 250 bars 180 min 1.9-5.3 g.min ⁻¹	FAC, MDTC	Lipids (PHA)	RelYield = 90% AbsYield = 12.6% FAC: C18:2 → 38.4% C16:2 → 39.7%	203
19	Spent coffee grounds	40-60 °C 200-300 bars 0-18 mL.100g ⁻¹ CO ₂ + H ₂ O, Ethanol or Hexane) + MW, US	GC (FAC)	Lipids	AbsYield = 15.1% RelYield = 90.6% (60 °C, 300 bars) AbsYield = 16.4% RelYield = 98.1% (40 °C, 250 bars, 18mL EtOH) FAC: C18:2 → 25.8-44.1% C16:0 → 33.6-36.9%	204
20	Spent coffee grounds	55 °C 250 bars 60 min	FFA, UPL, GC (FAC)	Lipids (cosmetic)	AbsYield = 12.1% FAC: C18:2 = 44.7%	205

		500 g 4.2 g.min ⁻¹			C16:0 = 33.1%	
21	Spent coffee grounds	50 °C 200 bars 120 min 45 mL.min ⁻¹ 1000 g 10% EtOH	GC (FAC), biological assays	High value extract	FAC: C18:2 → 43.3% C16:0 → 35.2%	206
22	Spent coffee grounds	40-60 °C 175-250 bars 60-300 min 1500 g 1833-2833 mL.min ⁻¹	GC (FAC), FFA, AV, IV, PV, TBARS	Lipids	AbsYield = 12.1% RelYield = 79% (50 °C, 200 bars, 120 min) FAC: C18:2 → 35-43% C16:0 → 33-42%	207
23	Green coffee bean	66-94 °C 179-325 bars 20 min static 360 min dynamic 5 g.min ⁻¹	GC-MS (terpenoids, CAF, FAC), TPC	Lipids, Terpenoids, CAF	AbsYield = 6.5% CAF max = 1.6% (300 bars, 90 °C) TPC = 16.6 mg _{GAE} .100g ⁻¹ _{GCB} TPC = 2.62 mg _{GAE} .g ⁻¹ _{oil} (200 bars, 90 °C) Terpenes = 114/21 mg.g ⁻¹ _{oil} (SC-CO ₂ , 200 bars, 90 °C / manual pressing)	208
24	Spent coffee grounds	60 °C 400 bars 25 g 15g.min ⁻¹ SC-CO ₂ 15/1.7 g.min ⁻¹ SC-CO ₂ /EtOH 7.8 g.min ⁻¹ EtOH 4 separators (300, 200, 100 and 1 bars)	TPC, GC-FID (FAC)	Lipids, Polyphenols	AbsYield = 25% TPC = 4.56 mg _{GAE} /g _{extract} (EtOH) Extract enriched 4 times in TPC with separators TPC = 24.1-56.7 mg _{GAE} /g _{extract} (SC-CO ₂) TPC = 42-57 mg _{GAE} /g _{extract} (SC-CO ₂ /EtOH)	196
25	Spent coffee grounds	40-60 °C 500 bars (max) SC-CO ₂ + IsoPropanol, EtOH or Ethyl Lactate	NMR, GC-FID (FAC), DPPH	Lipids, antioxidant activity	C16:0 + C18:2 = 76% oil FAC CAF = 0.56-3.96 g/100g _{oil}	193
26	Green coffee bean	20-75 °C 70-250 bars SC-CO ₂ + US	UPLC-MS/MS	CAF	DPPH increased 12.5 times with co-solvent %Decaffeination = 8.86% (SC-CO ₂ , 75 °C, 250 bars, 1 h) = 18.19% (SC-CO ₂ + US, 75 °C, 250 bars, 1h) = 63.10% (SC-CO ₂ + US, 75 °C, 250 bars, 4 h)	209

CRITICAL REVIEW

Fractionation represents an interesting but underdeveloped process for the valorization of coffee and coffee by-products. In theory, it could allow industrials to realize a single extraction with separation of final products such as phenolic, triglycerides and essential oil extracts for example. Hence, the use of multiple separators at different pressures allows the selective recovery of fatty acids, based on their number of carbons or higher added value compounds with different volatility or affinity with the supercritical CO₂.²¹⁰

To conclude, the supercritical CO₂ is a true chameleon. By its astonishing capacity to modify its own properties in function of pressure, temperature and co-solvent, the supercritical CO₂ allows to selectively enrich or recover high value molecules such as terpenoids or polyphenols in extracts. Moreover, it is a solvent able to mimicry the efficiency of organic solvents for oil recovery in term of quantity (yield) and quality (Fatty Acid Content FAC) of oil recovered, without the major toxic drawbacks.

3.3. Major trends, comparison and sequential combination of SCW and SC-CO₂ applied to coffee and coffee by-products valorization

Table 6 compares subcritical water (SCW) and supercritical CO₂ (SC-CO₂) extraction used for coffee products and by-products valorization. The two pressurized technics are very different. Indeed, physico-chemical properties of H₂O and CO₂ are initially different. Water remains a polar solvent, even in subcritical conditions. At contrary, carbon dioxide is an apolar solvent. Hence, the obtained final products are also very various, favoring sugars extraction using SCW and lipids extraction using SC-CO₂.

By using them in a sequential manner, these complementary processes could contribute to maximize the recovery of high value molecules from a same raw material obtained from coffee and/or coffee by-products.²¹¹ Thus, multiple-ways of valorizations of coffee by-products, such as spent coffee grounds, have already been published in reviews and/or investigated on the basis of experimental results obtained using traditional methods, from coffee by-products,^{10, 212} spent coffee grounds²¹³⁻²¹⁵ or coffee silverskin.⁴⁴ These researches have suggested the concept of biorefinery to generate phenolic compounds, biofuels and/or biocomposites.^{46, 216} The biorefinery concept is in agreement with the long term goal of European Commission of building a sustainable bio-based economy.²¹⁷

Table 6: SCW and SC-CO₂ major trends of operating parameters, carried analyses and obtained final products.

	Subcritical H ₂ O	Supercritical CO ₂
Parameters	100–250 °C 20–50 bars 10–50 mL.g ⁻¹	40–80 °C 100–400 bars

	Static or Dynamic Modifiers: N ₂ , CO ₂ Pretreatment: US, MW, SC-CO ₂	Dynamic Cosolvent: EtOH
Analyses	TPC (polyphenols) TFC (flavonoids) TSC, RSs (sugars) DPPH, ABTS, FRAP, ORAC (antioxidant capacity) HPLC (chlorogenic acids, caffeine, oligosaccharides, monosaccharides)	Yield (oil) GC and HPLC (fatty acids composition, (terpenoids, sterols, tocopherols,, caffeine) TPC (polyphenols) DPPH (antioxidant capacity)
Final products	Bioactive molecules (ingredient) Bio-crude oil (energy)	Bioactive oil (ingredient) Biodiesel (energy)

Hence, experiments have been performed on combination of double or triple ways of valorization. For example, spent coffee grounds have been tested for production of polyhydroxyalkanoates (PHA) and carotenoids.⁸⁹ It has also been used to generate phenolic compounds and bioenergy.²¹⁸ Finally, SCG has been proposed for production of biodiesel, biocrude oil and biochar.⁸⁸

In agreement with the results of the literature of the last twenty years, Green Solvent Bio-Refinery concept (GreSBiR) using subcritical H₂O and supercritical CO₂ for the full valorization of coffee and coffee by-products can be proposed (Figure 12). SC-CO₂ under different pressures with or without co-solvent allows producing sequentially, multiple oils with different properties. Otherwise, an extraction at high pressure with co-solvent can be followed by fractionation at different pressure and solvent composition. SCW at different time and temperatures of exposition allows producing sequentially, bioactive extracts, bioactive sugars, bioethanol, biocrude oil and/or biochar.

This biorefinery could be able transforming coffee and coffee by-products into various products with higher value owing their applications in energy, cosmetic, nutraceutical or pharmaceutical fields. Nevertheless, life cycle assessment (LCA) and economic analysis are required to estimate the industrial interest of such biorefinery.²¹⁹

4. Conclusions and perspectives

The current review reports the great interest of subcritical water and supercritical carbon dioxide used for coffee and coffee by-products and reports the following advantages: i) similar or better amount and quality of extracts produced by SCW and SC-CO₂ in comparison with traditional methods; ii) customized properties of SC-CO₂ to selectively extract high value molecules; iii) triple action of SCW as solvent, reagent and catalyst; iv) wide range of final products covered by the two

technologies (SCW and SC-CO₂) and v) the reduction of environmental impact by limiting toxic solvents and/or required catalyst with the use of SCW and SC-CO₂.

For subcritical H₂O, the prime influent parameter is the combination of temperature/time. Carbohydrates and polyphenols recovery has been performed with SCW at moderate temperature (150-220 °C) with shorter time of extraction (10-30 min). Biocrude oil and biochar production have been performed with SCW at high temperature (220-300 °C). The reported results for carbohydrates and polyphenols under those conditions have been demonstrated to be more efficient than any other traditional or non-conventional technologies.

Perspectives could be a step back to reinforce the fundamental knowledge about the black box phenomena that occurred during SCW applied to biomass. More specifically, deeper studies are required on i) the solubilization under the chosen conditions; ii) the kinetic of the hydrolysis of polysaccharides and oligosaccharides; iii) the kinetic of degradation of monosaccharides.

For the SCW solubilization of oligosaccharides of different molecular weights, no experiment has been carried out to measure the unique solubilization part without SCW hydrolysis and corresponding solubilization of lower weight degradation products. The addition of a hydrolysis inhibitor could allow assessing the influence of the solubilization properties of oligosaccharides in SCW at different temperatures.

For kinetic of hydrolysis, it could be interesting to quantify the different poly- or oligo-saccharides as a function of time to determine if a monosaccharide pattern (galactose vs mannose) is more selectively hydrolyzed. The influence of the nature of glycosidic binding on the hydrolysis rate should be also evaluated.

The measurement of kinetic of degradation is essential too. Hence, a comparison between kinetic of hydrolysis and kinetic of degradation could help the researchers anticipating their results instead of taking an empirical approach. For example, if the kinetic of degradation is ten times faster than the one of hydrolysis, there is no chance to recover some high value molecules, despite their production after hydrolysis.

The lack of control during SCW applied to coffee and coffee by-products makes the production of monosaccharides difficult. It results in several limitations such as low yield in SCW at low temperature and high degradation in SCW at high temperatures. With a selective and reversible protective agent of monosaccharides, higher temperature or longer time of extraction could be further used to get extremely high yield. No research has been carried out yet, hence, the acetylation of monosaccharides could be the solution.²²⁰

For supercritical CO₂, the studied literature dealing with coffee and coffee by-products has highlighted a chameleon technology with unlimited tunability to selectively extract solutes for biomass valorization. The prime influent parameters are reporting the pressure and the co-solvent addition. Supercritical carbon dioxide has been used at relatively high pressure (300-400 bars) for lipids extraction and with EtOH addition as modifier for phenolic compounds recovery. The

reported results with SC-CO₂ have been demonstrated the same efficiency in term of amount and quality of oil but present a better selectivity of high value molecules such as terpenoids sterols, tocopherols, caffeine, polyphenols in comparison with the use of hexane Soxhlet method.

Volatile lipophilic compounds such as terpenoids, sterols and tocopherols can be extracted more selectively at low pressure (100-200 bars). Triglycerides and volatile compounds are both extracted at high pressure (300-400 bars). Volatile, triglycerides and phenolic compounds are all extracted under high pressure (300-400 bars) with addition of EtOH.

The influence of the residual water in the dry coffee by-products used under supercritical CO₂ is rarely reported in the literature. Hence, Dunford *et al.* have observed that majority of water moisture remains in the material, but, a small part is extracted from the media.²²¹ In addition, after deduction of the extracted mass of water, significant differences of yield (5.5-7.1 g) have been reported at different moisture levels (12.7-37.8 % w/w) at 75 °C, 600 bars for examples. Since the pressure and temperature of critical point depend of the proportion of CO₂/H₂O the mixture, it is possible than residual water play a significant part to influence the extraction and nature of extracts.²²² More specifically, the residual subcritical or supercritical H₂O in presence of CO₂ becomes a strong acid able to hydrolyze lignocellulosic materials such as cellulose, hemicellulose, lignin as suggested by Morais *et al.*¹³²

Perspectives of SC-CO₂ applied to coffee and coffee by-products could focus on i) the improvement of extraction and ii) the development of novel technologies of fractionation.

Yield of extraction, selectivity and CO₂ consumption can be improved with pretreatment such as ultrasound (US) or microwave (MW) or ionic liquid (IL) or deep eutectic solvent (DES).^{209, 223}

Polarity modification during SC-CO₂ extraction has already been performed by the addition of water or alcohols such as ethanol or isopropylalcohol. Hence, the addition of novel hydrophilic solvent such as DES during SC-CO₂ has never been performed. Moreover, DES is not soluble in SC-CO₂ but SC-CO₂ is slightly soluble in DES. Hence, the addition of DES could be used in static mode without be totally consumed with dynamic extraction by SC-CO₂, resulting DES-free extract enriched in polar compounds.

Hemi-synthesis is an understudied field in SC-CO₂ for coffee and coffee by-products valorization. The co-solvent could become reagent introduced simultaneously with SC-CO₂ to extract and functionalize triglycerides. For example, unsaturated fatty acids could be oxidized to form higher value products than the biodiesel obtained through transesterification reactions. Such possibility has been studied for the oxidation of oleic acid into pelargonic and azelaic acids, with ozone or potassium permanganate under supercritical CO₂.²²⁴

The fractionation through the use of SC-CO₂ technology should be more investigated. The pressurization with a more apolar solvent than CO₂ could allow selectively precipitating polar compounds in separators. Otherwise, the addition of a resin or adsorbent inside the separator could trap phenolic

compounds, despite an extra step to desorb the high value compounds.

To conclude, subcritical H₂O and supercritical CO₂ are greener, more efficient and more selective than traditional methods for the valorization of coffee and coffee by-products. Moreover, the two technologies are complementary. Used sequentially, the subcritical H₂O and supercritical CO₂ unable

covering almost all the possibilities of valorization of coffee and coffee by-products. Hence, the knowledge and way to use those technologies have to be further investigated to ensure the rightful place of subcritical H₂O and supercritical CO₂ in the field of biomass valorization, including coffee and coffee by-products.




Figure 2: Green Solvent Bio-Refinery (GreSBiR) with subcritical water (SCW) and supercritical carbon dioxide (SC-CO₂) applied to coffee and coffee by-products.

CRITICAL REVIEW

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes French Region for the awarding of the PhD scholarship to Alexandre Vandepoosele and for sc-CO₂ unit funding through the *Pack Ambition Recherche* program. They also acknowledge the TRIALP company and the Université Savoie Mont Blanc Foundation for their financial supports.

References

- X. M. Guo, E. Trably, E. Latrille, H. Carrere and J.-P. Steyer, *International journal of hydrogen energy*, 2010, **35**, 10660-10673.
- M. Koller, R. Bona, G. Braunegg, C. Hermann, P. Horvat, M. Kroutil, J. Martinz, J. Neto, L. Pereira and P. Varila, *Biomacromolecules*, 2005, **6**, 561-565.
- P. Ramos, S. A. Santos, Â. R. Guerra, O. Guerreiro, L. Felício, E. Jerónimo, A. J. Silvestre, C. P. Neto and M. Duarte, *Industrial Crops and Products*, 2013, **46**, 359-368.
- M. Zwingelstein, M. Draye, J.-L. Besombes, C. Piot and G. Chatel, *ACS Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering*, 2019, **7**, 8310-8316.
- N.-Y. Kim, M.-K. Jang, D.-G. Lee, K. H. Yu, H. Jang, M. Kim, S. G. Kim, B. H. Yoo and S.-H. Lee, *Nutrition research and practice*, 2010, **4**, 16-22.
- T. J. Mason, F. Chemat and M. Vinatoru, *Current Organic Chemistry*, 2011, **15**, 237-247.
- Y. Chisti, *Biotechnology Advances*, 2007, **25**, 294-306.
- Y. Chen, L.-p. Sun, Z.-h. Liu, G. Martin and Z. Sun, in *Chemistry and Chemical Technologies in Waste Valorization*, Springer, 2017, pp. 151-188.
- R. A. Carciochi, L. G. D'Alessandro, P. Vauchel, M. M. Rodriguez, S. M. Nolasco and K. Dimitrov, in *Ingredients Extraction by Physicochemical Methods in Food*, Elsevier, 2017, pp. 191-228.
- P. S. Murthy and M. Madhava Naidu, *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 2012, **66**, 45-58.
- P. T. Anastas and J. C. Warner, *Green chemistry: theory and practice*, Oxford University Press, Oxford [England]; New York, 1998.
- A. Shitu, S. Izhar and T. Tahir, 2015.
- D. R. Joshi and N. Adhikari, *Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International*, 2019, 1-18.
- P. Cintas and J.-L. Luche, *Green Chemistry*, 1999, **1**, 115-125.
- F. Chemat, N. Rombaut, A.-G. Sicaire, A. Meullemiestre, A.-S. Fabiano-Tixier and M. Abert-Vian, *Ultrasonics Sonochemistry*, 2017, **34**, 540-560.
- G. Chatel, *Sonochemistry: New Opportunities For Green Chemistry*, World Scientific Publishing Company, 2016.
- R. S. Varma, *Green Chemistry*, 1999, **1**, 43-55.
- G. Chatel and R. S. Varma, *Green Chemistry*, 2019, **21**, 6043-6050.
- E. Vorobiev and N. Lebovka, *Enhancing extraction processes in the food industry*, 2011, 25-84.
- Z. Li, Y. Fan and J. Xi, *Food chemistry*, 2019, **277**, 246-260.
- K. N. Marsh, J. A. Boxall and R. Lichtenthaler, *Fluid Phase Equilibria*, 2004, **219**, 93-98.
- Y. Marcus, in *Deep Eutectic Solvents*, ed. Y. Marcus, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2019, DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-00608-2_6, pp. 185-191.
- K. D. O. Vigier, G. Chatel and F. Jerome, *ChemCatChem*, 2015, **7**, 1250-1260.
- J. Zhang, C. Wen, H. Zhang, Y. Duan and H. Ma, *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 2020, **95**, 183-195.
- K.-Y. Khaw, M.-O. Parat, P. N. Shaw and J. R. Falconer, *Molecules*, 2017, **22**, 1186.
- A. Stolle, T. Szuppa, S. E. S. Leonhardt and B. Ondruschka, *Chemical Society Reviews*, 2011, **40**, 2317-2329.
- F. Chemat, A. S. Fabiano-Tixier, M. A. Vian, T. Allaf and E. Vorobiev, *TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry*, 2015, **71**, 157-168.
- M. Ruesgas-Ramón, M. C. Figueroa-Espinoza and E. Durand, *Journal of agricultural and food chemistry*, 2017, **65**, 3591-3601.
- X. Peng, M.-H. Duan, X.-H. Yao, Y.-H. Zhang, C.-J. Zhao, Y.-G. Zu and Y.-J. Fu, *Separation and Purification Technology*, 2016, **157**, 249-257.
- T. Wang, F. He and G. Chen, *Journal of Functional Foods*, 2014, **7**, 101-111.
- C. C. Teo, S. N. Tan, J. W. H. Yong, C. S. Hew and E. S. Ong, *Journal of Chromatography A*, 2010, **1217**, 2484-2494.
- E. Kiran, J. F. Brennecke, E. American Institute of Chemical and M. Annual, 1993.
- M. Tsar, M. Ghasemiziarhani and K. Ofori, presented in part at the EAGE Annual Conference & Exhibition incorporating SPE Europec, London, UK, 2013/6/10/, 2013.
- J. Peach and J. Eastoe, *Beilstein journal of organic chemistry*, 2014, **10**, 1878-1895.
- P. Rabinarayan and S. Padilama, *Journal of Advanced Pharmaceutical Science And Technology*, 2013, **1**, 13-36. <http://www.ico.org/> Accessed the 31/01/2020).
- S. Ponte, *World Development*, 2002, **30**, 1099-1122. <http://www.fao.org/home/en/> Accessed the 30/01/2020).
- L. Fan, A. T. Soccol, A. Pandey and C. R. Soccol, *Micologia Aplicada Internacional*, 2003, **15**, 15-21.
- F. Leifa, A. Pandey and C. R. Soccol, *Brazilian Archives of Biology and Technology*, 2001, **44**, 205-212.
- A. Pandey, C. R. Soccol, P. Nigam, D. Brand, R. Mohan and S. Roussos, *Biochemical Engineering Journal*, 2000, **6**, 153-162.
- S. I. Mussatto, E. M. S. Machado, S. Martins and J. A. Teixeira, *Food and Bioprocess Technology*, 2011, **4**, 661.

43. M. D. del Castillo, J. M. Ames and M. H. Gordon, *Journal of agricultural and food chemistry*, 2002, **50**, 3698-3703.
44. Y. Narita and K. Inouye, *Food Research International*, 2014, **61**, 16-22.
45. A. S. Franca, J. C. F. Mendonça and S. D. Oliveira, *LWT - Food Science and Technology*, 2005, **38**, 709-715.
46. T. M. Mata, A. A. Martins and N. S. Caetano, *Bioresource technology*, 2018, **247**, 1077-1084.
47. M. Echeverria and M. Nuti, *The Open Waste Management Journal*, 2017, **10**.
48. I. Hečimović, A. Belščak-Cvitanović, D. Horžić and D. Komes, *Food chemistry*, 2011, **129**, 991-1000.
49. A. Farah, T. de Paulis, L. C. Trugo and P. R. Martin, *Journal of agricultural and food chemistry*, 2005, **53**, 1505-1513.
50. R. Padmapriya, J. A. Tharian and T. Thirunalasundari, *Int. J. Curr. Sci*, 2013, **9**, 83-91.
51. T. Masuko, A. Minami, N. Iwasaki, T. Majima, S.-I. Nishimura and Y. C. Lee, *Analytical biochemistry*, 2005, **339**, 69-72.
52. M. Dubois, K. Gilles, J. Hamilton, P. Rebers and F. Smith, *Nature*, 1951, **168**, 167-167.
53. M. Dubois, K. A. Gilles, J. K. Hamilton, P. t. Rebers and F. Smith, *Analytical chemistry*, 1956, **28**, 350-356.
54. R. Dreywood, *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Analytical Edition*, 1946, **18**, 499-499.
55. D. L. Morris, *Science (Washington)*, 1948, **107**, 254-255.
56. F. A. Loewus, *Analytical Chemistry*, 1952, **24**, 219-219.
57. G. L. Miller, *Analytical chemistry*, 1959, **31**, 426-428.
58. R. Hu, L. Lin, T. Liu, P. Ouyang, B. He and S. Liu, *Journal of Biobased Materials and Bioenergy*, 2008, **2**, 156-161.
59. A. G. Bradbury and D. J. Halliday, *Journal of agricultural and food chemistry*, 1990, **38**, 389-392.
60. A. Sluiter, B. Hames, R. Ruiz, C. Scarlata, J. Sluiter and D. Templeton, *Golden: National Renewable Energy Laboratory*, 2006.
61. P. Shanmugavelan, S. Y. Kim, J. B. Kim, H. W. Kim, S. M. Cho, S. N. Kim, S. Y. Kim, Y. S. Cho and H. R. Kim, *Carbohydrate Research*, 2013, **380**, 112-117.
62. W. Buchberger, K. Winsauer and C. Breitwieser, *Fresenius' Zeitschrift für analytische Chemie*, 1983, **315**, 518-520.
63. S. Honda, E. Akao, S. Suzuki, M. Okuda, K. Kakehi and J. Nakamura, *Analytical biochemistry*, 1989, **180**, 351-357.
64. W. Wang, F. Chen, Y. Wang, L. Wang, H. Fu, F. Zheng and L. Beecher, *Food chemistry*, 2018, **254**, 158-164.
65. C. M. Montero, M. R. Dodero, D. G. Sánchez and C. Barroso, *Chromatographia*, 2004, **59**, 15-30.
66. H. L. A Didanna, *Conference Proceedings*, 2014.
67. L. S. Oliveira and A. S. Franca, in *Coffee in health and disease prevention*, Elsevier, 2015, pp. 283-291.
68. D. I. Givens and W. P. Barber, *Agricultural Wastes*, 1986, **18**, 69-72.
69. R. Cruz, P. Baptista, S. Cunha, J. A. Pereira and S. Casal, *Molecules*, 2012, **17**, 1535-1547.
70. H. Kassa, H. Suliman and T. Workayew, *Ethiopian Journal of Environmental Studies and Management*, 2011, **4**.
71. L. Fan, A. Pandey, R. Mohan and C. Soccol, *Acta Biotechnologica*, 2000, **20**, 41-52.
72. M. Velissariou, R. J. Laudano, P. M. Edwards, S. M. Stimpson and R. L. Jeffries, *Journal*, 2010.
73. J. A. M. Fuentes, R. A. Alemán, L. A. Chavarría, I. M. V. Murillo, N. P. Alvarado and I. M. Fernández, *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 2020, **12**.
74. A. Heeger, A. Kosińska-Cagnazzo, E. Cantergiani and W. Andlauer, *Food chemistry*, 2017, **221**, 969-975.
75. T.-A. Kua, A. Arulrajah, S. Horpibulsuk, Y.-J. Du and S.-L. Shen, *Construction and Building Materials*, 2016, **115**, 565-575.
76. A. Lachheb, A. Allouhi, M. El Marhoune, R. Saadani, T. Kousksou, A. Jamil, M. Rahmoune and O. Oussouaddi, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 2019, **209**, 1411-1419.
77. D. Eliche-Quesada, L. Pérez-Villarejo, F. Iglesias-Godino, C. Martínez-García and F. Corpas-Iglesias, *Advances in Applied Ceramics*, 2011, **110**, 225-232.
78. A. Arulrajah, F. Maghoolpilehrood, M. M. Disfani and S. Horpibulsuk, *Journal of cleaner production*, 2014, **72**, 181-186.
79. N. E. Dávila-Guzmán, F. de Jesús Cerino-Córdova, E. Soto-Regalado, J. R. Rangel-Mendez, P. E. Díaz-Flores, M. T. Garza-Gonzalez and J. A. Loredano-Medrano, *CLEAN—Soil, Air, Water*, 2013, **41**, 557-564.
80. A. A. Chavan, J. Pinto, I. Liakos, I. S. Bayer, S. Lauciello, A. Athanassiou and D. Fragouli, *ACS Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering*, 2016, **4**, 5495-5502.
81. E. F. Lessa, M. L. Nunes and A. R. Fajardo, *Carbohydrate polymers*, 2018, **189**, 257-266.
82. X. Ma and F. Ouyang, *Applied Surface Science*, 2013, **268**, 566-570.
83. Y. S. Choi, S. K. Choi, S. J. Kim, Y. W. Jeong, R. Soysa and T. Rahman, *Environmental Progress & Sustainable Energy*, 2017, **36**, 655-661.
84. W.-T. Tsai, S.-C. Liu and C.-H. Hsieh, *Journal of Analytical and Applied Pyrolysis*, 2012, **93**, 63-67.
85. J. Calzada, O. León, M. Arriola, F. Micheo, C. Rolz, R. León and J. Menchu, *Biotechnology letters*, 1981, **3**, 713-716.
86. D. Dadi, A. Beyene, K. Simoens, J. Soares, M. Demeke, J. Thevelein, K. Bernaerts, P. Luis and B. Van der Bruggen, *International journal of environmental science and technology*, 2018, **15**, 821-832.
87. B. Gouvea, C. Torres, A. Franca, L. Oliveira and E. Oliveira, *Biotechnology letters*, 2009, **31**, 1315-1319.
88. D. R. Vardon, B. R. Moser, W. Zheng, K. Witkin, R. L. Evangelista, T. J. Strathmann, K. Rajagopalan and B. K. Sharma, *ACS Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering*, 2013, **1**, 1286-1294.
89. S. Obruca, P. Benesova, D. Kucera, S. Petrik and I. Marova, *New biotechnology*, 2015, **32**, 569-574.
90. S. Obruca, S. Petrik, P. Benesova, Z. Svoboda, L. Eremka and I. Marova, *Applied microbiology and biotechnology*, 2014, **98**, 5883-5890.
91. M. A. Heckman, J. Weil and E. G. De Mejia, *Journal of food science*, 2010, **75**, R77-R87.
92. L. Bresciani, L. Calani, R. Bruni, F. Brighenti and D. Del Rio, *Food Research International*, 2014, **61**, 196-201.
93. M. Clifford and J. Ramirez-Martinez, *Food Chemistry*, 1991, **40**, 35-42.
94. J. Simões, P. Madureira, F. M. Nunes, M. do Rosário Domingues, M. Vilanova and M. A. Coimbra, *Molecular nutrition & food research*, 2009, **53**, 1036-1043.
95. A. R. Prihadi, A. Maimulyanti and B. Mellisani, *Rasayan Journal of Chemistry*, 2020, **13**, 955-959.
96. D. Scully, A. Jaiswal and N. Abu-Ghannam, *Bioengineering*, 2016, **3**, 33.

97. M. Martin-Smith and W. Sneader, *Progress in Drug Research/Fortschritte der Arzneimittelforschung/Progrès des recherches pharmaceutiques*, 2013, **13**, 11.
98. J. Marto, L. Gouveia, B. Chiari, A. Paiva, V. Isaac, P. Pinto, P. Simões, A. Almeida and H. Ribeiro, *Industrial Crops and Products*, 2016, **80**, 93-100.
99. O. Folin and V. Ciocalteu, *Journal of biological chemistry*, 1927, **73**, 627-650.
100. A. Panusa, A. Zuurro, R. Lavecchia, G. Marrosu and R. Petrucci, *Journal of agricultural and food chemistry*, 2013, **61**, 4162-4168.
101. P. S. Murthy and M. M. Naidu, *Food and Bioprocess Technology*, 2012, **5**, 897-903.
102. O. Dellalibera, B. Lemaire and S. Lafay, *Phytotherapie*, 2006, **4**, 194-197.
103. M. E. dos Santos Diamantino, A. C. T. A. Chaves, D. de Melo Silva, G. da Silveira Lemos and R. F. Queiroz, *International Journal of Advanced Engineering Research and Science*, 2019, **6**.
104. V. L. Singleton, R. Orthofer and R. M. Lamuela-Raventós, in *Methods in enzymology*, Elsevier, 1999, vol. 299, pp. 152-178.
105. A. Pękal and K. Pyrzyńska, *Food Analytical Methods*, 2014, **7**, 1776-1782.
106. B. Christ and K. Müller, *Archiv der Pharmazie*, 1960, **293**, 1033-1042.
107. K. Thaipong, U. Boonprakob, K. Crosby, L. Cisneros-Zevallos and D. H. Byrne, *Journal of food composition and analysis*, 2006, **19**, 669-675.
108. O. P. Sharma and T. K. Bhat, *Food chemistry*, 2009, **113**, 1202-1205.
109. T. Conde and S. I. Mussatto, *Preparative Biochemistry and Biotechnology*, 2016, **46**, 406-409.
110. H. M. Ribeiro, M. Allegro, J. Marto, B. Pedras, N. G. Oliveira, A. Paiva, S. Barreiros, L. d. M. Gonçalves and P. Simões, *ACS Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering*, 2018, **6**, 6289-6295.
111. L. F. Ballesteros, J. A. Teixeira and S. I. Mussatto, *Carbohydrate polymers*, 2017, **157**, 258-266.
112. H. Xu, W. Wang, X. Liu, F. Yuan and Y. Gao, *Industrial Crops and Products*, 2015, **76**, 946-954.
113. Y.-F. Shang, J.-L. Xu, W.-J. Lee and B.-H. Um, *South African Journal of Botany*, 2017, **109**, 75-80.
114. M. N. Clifford, K. L. Johnston, S. Knight and N. Kuhnert, *Journal of agricultural and food chemistry*, 2003, **51**, 2900-2911.
115. M. Clifford, in *Coffee*, Springer, 1985, pp. 153-202.
116. N. P. Rodrigues and N. Bragagnolo, *Journal of Food Composition and Analysis*, 2013, **32**, 105-115.
117. K. Belguidoum, H. Amira-Guebailia, Y. Boulmouk and O. Houache, *Journal of the Taiwan Institute of Chemical Engineers*, 2014, **45**, 1314-1320.
118. M. C. Roman, J. Hildreth and S. Bannister, *Journal of AOAC International*, 2013, **96**, 933-941.
119. A. Z. Tulio Jr, R. N. Reese, F. J. Wyzgoski, P. L. Rinaldi, R. Fu, J. C. Scheerens and A. R. Miller, *Journal of agricultural and food chemistry*, 2008, **56**, 1880-1888.
120. C. Sheng and J. Azevedo, *Biomass and bioenergy*, 2005, **28**, 499-507.
121. M. M. Cascant, C. Breil, S. Garrigues, M. de la Guardia, A. S. Fabiano-Tixier and F. Chemat, *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry*, 2017, **409**, 3527-3539.
122. K. Speer and I. Kölling-Speer, *Brazilian Journal of Plant Physiology*, 2006, **18**, 201-216.
123. P. S. Sukhija and D. Palmquist, *Journal of agricultural and food chemistry*, 1988, **36**, 1202-1206.
124. W. W. Christie, *Advances in lipid methodology*, 1993, **2**, e111.
125. Z. Jiang, C. Kempinski and J. Chappell, *Current protocols in plant biology*, 2016, **1**, 345-358.
126. M. Huang, J.-J. Lu, M.-Q. Huang, J.-L. Bao, X.-P. Chen and Y.-T. Wang, *Expert opinion on investigational drugs*, 2012, **21**, 1801-1818.
127. A. Silva-Santos, A. Antunes, H. Bizzo, C. D'ávila and L. Souza-Santos, *Rev Bras Farmacogn*, 2004, **14**, 48-50.
128. S. Abumweis, R. Barake and P. Jones, *Food & Nutrition Research*, 2008, **52**, 1811.
129. M. L. Thakur and U. S. Srivastava, *Nutrition research*, 1996, **16**, 1767-1809.
130. A. T. Getachew, Y. J. Cho and B. S. Chun, *International journal of biological macromolecules*, 2018, **109**, 711-719.
131. A. T. Getachew and B. S. Chun, *Journal of cleaner production*, 2017, **142**, 3719-3727.
132. A. R. Morais, A. M. da Costa Lopes and R. Bogel-Lukasik, *Chemical reviews*, 2015, **115**, 3-27.
133. B. M. Pedras, M. Nascimento, I. Sá-Nogueira, P. Simões, A. Paiva and S. Barreiros, *Journal of Industrial and Engineering Chemistry*, 2019, **72**, 453-456.
134. X. Lü and S. Saka, *The Journal of Supercritical Fluids*, 2012, **61**, 146-156.
135. S. H. Khajavi, Y. Kimura, T. Oomori, R. Matsuno and S. Adachi, *Journal of Food Engineering*, 2005, **68**, 309-313.
136. T. M. Aida, Y. Sato, M. Watanabe, K. Tajima, T. Nonaka, H. Hattori and K. Arai, *The Journal of supercritical fluids*, 2007, **40**, 381-388.
137. M. Mohan, R. Timung, N. N. Deshavath, T. Banerjee, V. V. Goud and V. V. Dasu, *RSC advances*, 2015, **5**, 103265-103275.
138. D. Lachos-Perez, G. Tompsett, P. Guerra, M. Timko, M. Rostagno, J. Martínez and T. Forster-Carneiro, *Bioresource technology*, 2017, **243**, 1069-1077.
139. D. Zhang, F. Montanés, K. Srinivas, T. Fornari, E. Ibáñez and J. W. King, *Industrial & engineering chemistry research*, 2010, **49**, 6691-6698.
140. M. Plaza and C. Turner, *TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry*, 2015, **71**, 39-54.
141. M. Sasaki, B. Kabyemela, R. Malaluan, S. Hirose, N. Takeda, T. Adschiri and K. Arai, *The Journal of Supercritical Fluids*, 1998, **13**, 261-268.
142. S. Haghghat Khajavi, S. Ota, Y. Kimura and S. Adachi, *Journal of agricultural and food chemistry*, 2006, **54**, 3663-3667.
143. D.-M. Gao, T. Kobayashi and S. Adachi, *Bioscience, biotechnology, and biochemistry*, 2015, **79**, 1005-1010.
144. L. F. Ballesteros, M. A. Cerqueira, J. A. Teixeira and S. I. Mussatto, *Carbohydrate polymers*, 2015, **127**, 347-354.
145. B. M. Dorsey and M. A. Jones, in *Handbook of coffee processing by-products*, Elsevier, 2017, pp. 27-62.
146. C. Monente, I. A. Ludwig, A. Irigoyen, M. a.-P. De Peña and C. n. Cid, *Journal of agricultural and food chemistry*, 2015, **63**, 4327-4334.
147. T. Sato, T. Takahata, T. Honma, M. Watanabe, M. Wagatsuma, S. Matsuda, R. L. Smith Jr and N. Itoh,

- Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 2018, **57**, 7624-7632.
148. P. Khuwijitjaru, J. Plernjit, B. Suaylam, S. Samuhaseneetoo, R. Pongsawatmanit and S. Adachi, *The Canadian Journal of Chemical Engineering*, 2014, **92**, 810-815.
149. P. Khuwijitjaru, B. Suaylam and S. Adachi, *Journal of agricultural and food chemistry*, 2014, **62**, 1945-1949.
150. L. F. Ballesteros, M. J. Ramirez, C. E. Orrego, J. A. Teixeira and S. I. Mussatto, *Journal of Food Engineering*, 2017, **199**, 1-8.
151. Y. Narita and K. Inouye, *Food chemistry*, 2012, **135**, 943-949.
152. C. Delgado-Andrade, J. A. Rufián-Henares and F. J. Morales, *Journal of agricultural and food chemistry*, 2005, **53**, 7832-7836.
153. D. Perrone, A. Farah and C. M. Donangelo, *Journal of agricultural and food chemistry*, 2012, **60**, 4265-4275.
154. A. S. Moreira, F. M. Nunes, C. Simões, E. Maciel, P. Domingues, M. R. M. Domingues and M. A. Coimbra, *Food chemistry*, 2017, **227**, 422-431.
155. M. Plaza, M. Amigo-Benavent, M. D. Del Castillo, E. Ibáñez and M. Herrero, *Food Research International*, 2010, **43**, 2341-2348.
156. S. Azam, N. Hadi, N. U. Khan and S. M. Hadi, *Medical Science Monitor*, 2003, **9**, BR325-BR330.
157. J.-X. Dong, Q. Li, Z.-C. Tan, Z.-H. Zhang and Y. Liu, *The Journal of Chemical Thermodynamics*, 2007, **39**, 108-114.
158. A. T. Getachew and B. S. Chun, *Innovative food science & emerging technologies*, 2016, **38**, 24-31.
159. N. Punbusayakul, N. Saim, Z. A. Haiyee, W. Sarnkhuankaew and R. Osman, *Science Letters*, 2014, **8**, 34-40.
160. N. A. Al-Dhabi, K. Ponnurugan and P. M. Jeganathan, *Ultrasonics sonochemistry*, 2017, **34**, 206-213.
161. P. Arauzo, M. Lucian, L. Du, M. Olszewski, L. Fiori and A. Kruse, *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 2020, **139**, 105616.
162. M. Pettinato, A. A. Casazza and P. Perego, *Food and bioproducts processing*, 2019, **114**, 227-234.
163. D. E. Yoo, K. M. Jeong, S. Y. Han, E. M. Kim, Y. Jin and J. Lee, *Food chemistry*, 2018, **255**, 357-364.
164. A. Demirbas and G. Arin, *Energy sources*, 2002, **24**, 471-482.
165. S. Xiu and A. Shahbazi, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 2012, **16**, 4406-4414.
166. Z. Liu, A. Quek, S. K. Hoekman and R. Balasubramanian, *Fuel*, 2013, **103**, 943-949.
167. L. Yang, L. Nazari, Z. Yuan, K. Corscadden and C. C. Xu, *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 2016, **86**, 191-198.
168. D. Kim, K. Lee, D. Bae and K. Y. Park, *Journal of Material Cycles and Waste Management*, 2017, **19**, 1036-1043.
169. J. P. Bok, H. S. Choi, Y. S. Choi, H. C. Park and S. J. Kim, *Energy*, 2012, **47**, 17-24.
170. Zosel, US Pat., 4,260,639, 1981).
171. Zosel, US Pat., 3,806,619, 1974).
172. S. N. Katz, in *Coffee: Volume 2: Technology*, eds. R. J. Clarke and R. Macrae, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 1987, DOI: 10.1007/978-94-009-3417-7_3, pp. 59-71.
173. I. De Marco, S. Riemma and R. Iannone, *The Journal of Supercritical Fluids*, 2018, **133**, 393-400.
174. R. M. Couto, J. Fernandes, M. G. Da Silva and P. C. Simões, *The Journal of Supercritical Fluids*, 2009, **51**, 159-166.
175. M. Mariotti-Celis, M. Martínez-Cifuentes, N. Huamán-Castilla, M. Vargas-González, F. Pedreschi and J. Pérez-Correa, *Molecules*, 2018, **23**, 21.
176. P. Mayanga-Torres, D. Lachos-Perez, C. Rezende, J. Prado, Z. Ma, G. Tompsett, M. Timko and T. Forster-Carneiro, *The Journal of Supercritical Fluids*, 2017, **120**, 75-85.
177. S. I. Mussatto, L. M. Carneiro, J. P. Silva, I. C. Roberto and J. A. Teixeira, *Carbohydrate polymers*, 2011, **83**, 368-374.
178. A. Lekar, O. Filonova, S. Borisenko, E. Maksimenko, E. Vetrova, N. Borisenko and V. Minkin, *Russian Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 2015, **9**, 1043-1047.
179. L. Yang, P. Havard, K. Corscadden, C. C. Xu and X. Wang, *Bioresource technology*, 2017, **237**, 108-121.
180. A. Ronix, O. Pezoti, L. S. Souza, I. P. Souza, K. C. Bedin, P. S. Souza, T. L. Silva, S. A. Melo, A. L. Cazetta and V. C. Almeida, *Journal of environmental chemical engineering*, 2017, **5**, 4841-4849.
181. N. Querejeta, M. V. Gil, F. Rubiera and C. Pevida, *Greenhouse Gases: Science and Technology*, 2018, **8**, 309-323.
182. A. Sampaio, G. Dragone, M. Vilanova, J. M. Oliveira, J. A. Teixeira and S. I. Mussatto, *LWT-Food Science and Technology*, 2013, **54**, 557-563.
183. B. Kim, J. Yang, M. Kim and J. W. Lee, *Bioresource technology*, 2020, **303**, 122898.
184. A. De Azevedo, P. Mazzafera, R. Mohamed, S. Melo and T. Kieckbusch, *Brazilian Journal of Chemical Engineering*, 2008, **25**, 543-552.
185. M. J. Cocero and L. Calvo, *Journal of the American Oil Chemists' Society*, 1996, **73**, 1573-1578.
186. J. M. DeSimone and W. Tumas, *Green chemistry using liquid and supercritical carbon dioxide*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2003.
187. L. Manna, C. A. Bugnone and M. Banchemo, *The Journal of Supercritical Fluids*, 2015, **104**, 204-211.
188. H. M. Barbosa, M. M. de Melo, M. A. Coimbra, C. P. Passos and C. M. Silva, *The Journal of Supercritical Fluids*, 2014, **85**, 165-172.
189. F. Acevedo, M. Rubilar, E. Scheuermann, B. Cancino, E. Uquiche, M. Garcés, K. Inostroza and C. Shene, *Journal of Biobased Materials and Bioenergy*, 2013, **7**, 420-428.
190. J. M. Araújo and D. Sandi, *Food Chemistry*, 2007, **101**, 1087-1094.
191. N. A. Akgün, H. Bulut, I. Kikic and D. Solinas, *Chemical Engineering & Technology*, 2014, **37**, 1975-1981.
192. M. N. Araújo, A. Q. P. L. Azevedo, F. Hamerski, F. A. P. Voll and M. L. Corazza, *Industrial Crops and Products*, 2019, **141**, 111723.
193. J. P. Coelho, R. M. Filipe, M. P. Robalo, S. Boyadjieva, G. S. Cholakov and R. P. Stateva, *The Journal of Supercritical Fluids*, 2020, 104825.
194. S. S. Georgieva, J. A. Coelho, F. C. Campos, M. P. Robalo and R. P. Stateva, *Journal of Chemical Technology & Metallurgy*, 2018, **53**.
195. E. Reverchon and F. Senatore, *Flavour and Fragrance Journal*, 1992, **7**, 227-230.
196. R. G. Bitencourt, F. M. Mello, F. A. Cabral and A. J. Meirelles, *The Journal of Supercritical Fluids*, 2020, **157**, 104689.
197. M. M. de Melo, H. M. Barbosa, C. P. Passos and C. M. Silva, *The Journal of Supercritical Fluids*, 2014, **86**, 150-159.

198. F. Calixto, J. Fernandes, R. Couto, E. J. Hernández, V. Najdanovic-Visak and P. C. Simões, *Green Chemistry*, 2011, **13**, 1196-1202.
199. K. S. Andrade, R. T. Gonçalves, M. Maraschin, R. M. Ribeiro-do-Valle, J. Martínez and S. R. Ferreira, *Talanta*, 2012, **88**, 544-552.
200. A. De Azevedo, T. Kieckbush, A. K. Tashima, R. Mohamed, P. Mazzafera and S. V. de Melo, *The Journal of Supercritical Fluids*, 2008, **44**, 186-192.
201. S. Machmudah, K. Kitada, M. Sasaki, M. Goto, J. Munemasa and M. Yamagata, *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 2011, **50**, 2227-2235.
202. J. Tello, M. Viguera and L. Calvo, *The Journal of Supercritical Fluids*, 2011, **59**, 53-60.
203. M. V. Cruz, A. Paiva, P. Lisboa, F. Freitas, V. D. Alves, P. Simões, S. Barreiros and M. A. Reis, *Bioresource technology*, 2014, **157**, 360-363.
204. B. Ahangari and J. Sargolzaei, *Journal of food processing and preservation*, 2013, **37**, 1014-1021.
205. H. Ribeiro, J. Marto, S. Raposo, M. Agapito, V. Isaac, B. G. Chiari, P. F. Lisboa, A. Paiva, S. Barreiros and P. Simões, *European journal of lipid science and technology*, 2013, **115**, 330-336.
206. H.-C. Huang, C.-M. Wei, J.-H. Siao, T.-C. Tsai, W.-P. Ko, K.-J. Chang, C.-H. Hii and T.-M. Chang, *Evidence-based Complementary and Alternative Medicine*, 2016, **2016**.
207. R. Muangrat and I. Pongsirikul, *CyTA-Journal of Food*, 2019, **17**, 334-346.
208. P. M. A. de Oliveira, R. H. de Almeida, N. A. de Oliveira, S. Bostyn, C. B. Goncalves and A. L. de Oliveira, *The Journal of Supercritical Fluids*, 2014, **95**, 137-145.
209. J. Menzio, A. Binello, A. Barge and G. Cravotto, *Processes*, 2020, **8**, 1062.
210. P. C. Cheung, *Food chemistry*, 1999, **65**, 399-403.
211. K. Srinivas and J. W. King, *Functional food product development*, 2010, **39**.
212. B. Janissen and T. Huynh, *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 2018, **128**, 110-117.
213. R. Campos-Vega, G. Loarca-Pina, H. A. Vergara-Castañeda and B. D. Oomah, *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 2015, **45**, 24-36.
214. A. Kovalcik, S. Obruca and I. Marova, *Food and Bioprocess Technology*, 2018, **110**, 104-119.
215. J. McNutt, *Journal of industrial and engineering chemistry*, 2019, **71**, 78-88.
216. S. K. Karmee, *Waste Management*, 2018, **72**, 240-254.
217. A. Zabaniotou and P. Kamaterou, *Journal of cleaner production*, 2019, **211**, 1553-1566.
218. A. Zuorro and R. Lavecchia, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 2012, **34**, 49-56.
219. P. T. Anastas and R. L. Lankey, *Green Chemistry*, 2000, **2**, 289-295.
220. C.-C. Wang, J.-C. Lee, S.-Y. Luo, S. S. Kulkarni, Y.-W. Huang, C.-C. Lee, K.-L. Chang and S.-C. Hung, *Nature*, 2007, **446**, 896-899.
221. N. T. DUNFORD and F. TEMELLI, *Journal of food science*, 1997, **62**, 155-159.
222. S.-D. Yeo, S.-J. Park, J.-W. Kim and J.-C. Kim, *Journal of Chemical & Engineering Data*, 2000, **45**, 932-935.
223. E. Tommasi, G. Cravotto, P. Galletti, G. Grillo, M. Mazzotti, G. Sacchetti, C. Samori, S. Tabasso, M. Tacchini and E. Tagliavini, *ACS Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering*, 2017, **5**, 8316-8322.
224. D. L. Sparks, L. A. Estévez and R. Hernandez, *Green Chemistry*, 2009, **11**, 986-993.