

Sustainable Food Technology

Accepted Manuscript

This article can be cited before page numbers have been issued, to do this please use: A. Ramadoss, V. G. Poosarla, A. Kumari, S. Sadiya, M. Kalita and N. Shivshetty, *Sustainable Food Technol.*, 2025, DOI: 10.1039/D5FB00468C.



This is an Accepted Manuscript, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this Accepted Manuscript with the edited and formatted Advance Article as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about Accepted Manuscripts in the [Information for Authors](#).

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard [Terms & Conditions](#) and the [Ethical guidelines](#) still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this Accepted Manuscript or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.

Sustainability Spotlight Statement

View Article Online
DOI: 10.1039/D5FB00468C

Protein hydrolysates (PHs) obtained from chicken byproducts (CBP) via enzymatic hydrolysis using *Bacillus siamensis* F2 protease were incorporated into pectin and sodium alginate (SA) biopolymer matrix to fabricate active packaging films. These films exhibited strong antimicrobial and antioxidant properties, and the active coatings extended the postharvest shelf life of okra. This study valorises poultry byproducts into functional coatings that substitute petroleum-based polymers. Such coatings reduce food waste and advance sustainable packaging technologies aligned with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)- 2, 3, 6, 9, 14, and 15, targeting specifically SDG-2 (End hunger, achieve food security, and improved nutrition). Ultimately, this study enhances food security by transforming poultry byproducts into value-added resources for sustainable packaging.



**Valorization of Chicken Byproducts for Bioactive Coatings to Extend the Shelf Life of
Okra (*Abelmoschus esculentus*)**

Aparna Ramadoss¹, Venkata Giridhar Poosarla^{1*}, Ananya Kumari¹, Shaik Sadiya¹, Manisha
Kalita¹, Nagaveni Shivshetty¹

¹Department of Life Sciences, GITAM School of Science, GITAM (Deemed to be University),
Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India, 530045.

*To whom correspondence should be addressed: gpoosarl@gitam.edu

A. Ramadoss <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-2305-3104>

V. G. Poosarla <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9827-6336>

S. Sadiya <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5071-4157>

N. Shivshetty <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1254-4262>



Sustainability spotlight statement

Protein hydrolysates (PHs) obtained from chicken byproducts (CBP) via enzymatic hydrolysis using *Bacillus siamensis* F2 protease were incorporated into pectin and sodium alginate (SA) biopolymer matrix to fabricate active packaging films. These films exhibited strong antimicrobial and antioxidant properties, and the active coatings extended the postharvest shelf life of okra. This study valorises poultry byproducts into functional coatings that substitute petroleum-based polymers. Such coatings reduce food waste and advance sustainable packaging technologies aligned with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)- 2, 3, 6, 9, 14, and 15, targeting specifically SDG-2 (End hunger, achieve food security, and improved nutrition). Ultimately, this study enhances food security by transforming poultry byproducts into value-added resources for sustainable packaging.

Abstract

View Article Online
DOI: 10.1039/D5FB00468C

Environmental concerns associated with petroleum-based packaging have led to the development of sustainable alternatives and active packaging solutions. The aim of this research is to formulate and characterize bioactive packaging films based on pectin (P, 2 %), sodium alginate (SA, 1.5 %), and varying concentrations of chicken byproducts protein hydrolysates (CBP-PHs) that are derived from the enzymatic hydrolysis of CBP using protease generated from *Bacillus siamensis* F2 and extend the shelf life of okra using coatings. The films F1, P+SA; F2, P+SA+1%CBP-PHs; F3, P+SA+1.5%CBP-PHs; and F4, P+SA+2%CBP-PHs were analyzed for physical, antibacterial, antioxidant, and structural properties. Among them, the F4 film showed the highest antioxidant (diphenylpicrylhydrazyl, 53 ± 0.75 %), antibacterial (*Staphylococcus aureus*, 24.5 ± 0.16 mm and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, 21 ± 0.12 mm), and surface hydrophobicity (132°) properties due to the highest concentration of CBP-PHs. Based on this, F4 film coatings were applied to okra to evaluate their ability to extend shelf life, and F1-coating and uncoated okra were used as controls. F4-coated okra exhibited lower weight loss (78 ± 0.4 %), chlorophyll loss, and ascorbic acid (7.6 ± 0.1 mg/100 g), while effectively retaining firmness (51 ± 0.8 N) and color. These findings highlight the potential of CBP-PH-impregnated active coatings as a sustainable alternative with excellent shelf life extension, supporting the development of green packaging technology that aligns with global sustainability goals. Future research will aim to optimize the F4 film formulation for commercial production and investigate its application on various perishable products.

Keywords: Active packaging, chicken byproducts protein hydrolysates, shelf life extension, okra



Open Access Article. Published on 24 December 2025. Downloaded on 12/25/2025 11:56:41 AM.
This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported Licence.



1. Introduction

Biodegradable packaging is a sustainable alternative to conventional packaging, offering biodegradability, biocompatibility, and aesthetic appeal, and facilitates the protection and transport of food.^{1,2} Active packaging integrates compounds that absorb or release components from the packed food or the surrounding environment. They effectively preserve food safety, quality, and sensory characteristics while enhancing shelf life.³ Various materials have been studied for active packaging; however, the focus has shifted towards naturally derived polymers like polysaccharides (cellulose, starch, pectin, and alginate), protein (sodium caseinate, whey protein, soy protein, corn zein, and gelatin), and nanoparticles.⁴ Among biopolymers, alginate is a linear copolymer that comprises β -D-mannuronic acid (M) residues and α -L-guluronic acid (G), arranged in homopolymeric (GG, MM) and heteropolymeric (MG) block sequences. They are naturally derived polysaccharides extracted from brown algae (*Phaeophyceae*), typically found as sodium, calcium, or magnesium salts of alginic acid.⁵ Alginate offers good film formation, flexibility, water solubility, tear resistance, tensile strength, rigidity, low water vapor and oxygen permeability, and a neutral taste and odor. Enriched with essential oils, proteins, enzymes, chelating agents, plant extracts, or metallic nanoparticles, they help retain moisture, reduce shrinkage and oxidation, and preserve color and texture. It enhances the antimicrobial activity, mechanical strength, barrier performance, and sensory quality while minimizing cooking losses.⁶ Pectin has excellent gelling and thickening properties, as well as a distinct flavour, making it valuable in food packaging. It reduces the environmental footprint of conventional packaging, minimizing the use of hazardous substances, reducing food spoilage, and ultimately improving shelf life and food quality.^{7,8} To further optimize the performance of polysaccharides such as alginates, pectin, and biocomposites, recent research is exploring incorporating protein

Sustainable Food Technology Accepted Manuscript

1 hydrolysates (PHs) to produce active packaging films. This innovative strategy utilises protein
2 byproducts to improve sustainability.^{9, 10}

3 Protease enzymes are essential for producing peptides and amino acids by hydrolysing proteins.
4 This releases bioactive substances and improves the valorisation of protein-rich byproducts.
5 Several commercial proteases, such as Flavourzyme®, Pancreas Trypsin®, Alcalase®, and
6 Novo ProD®, are used to produce hydrolysates with antioxidant activity (AA) and emulsifying
7 properties.¹¹ Microbial proteases have emerged as cost-effective, highly specific, and
8 sustainable alternatives, offering excellent stability under extreme conditions, such as high
9 salinity and pH, making them suitable for industrial protein hydrolysis.¹²⁻¹⁵ The resulting PHs,
10 composed of peptides of varying lengths, exhibit modified structures that influence their
11 physicochemical and functional properties.

12 Studies have demonstrated the strong potential of bioactive film development for packaging,
13 offering enhanced antimicrobial, antioxidant, barrier, and mechanical properties, which leads
14 to the extension of food shelf life.^{16, 17} Recent studies have shown that PHs derived from poultry
15 demonstrate superior AA, barrier properties, and antimicrobial activity against *Escherichia coli*
16 and *Staphylococcus saprophyticus*.^{10, 16} These PHs also extended the shelf life of sweet cherry
17 at both room temperature and under refrigerated conditions.¹⁰ Similarly, incorporation of fish
18 PHs has been reported to extend the shelf life of chicken fillets to 21 days.¹⁷

19 Okra (*Abelmoschus esculentus*), a nutritionally rich crop with a high water content (85%),
20 consists of non-cellulosic and non-starch polysaccharides. It possesses several nutritional
21 properties and serves as a source of vitamins A and C, protein, calcium, iron, dietary fiber, and
22 antioxidants. It helps lower serum cholesterol, thereby minimizing the risk of cardiovascular
23 diseases, digestive disorders, and type 2 diabetes. Due to its high moisture content and
24 respiration rate, okra is highly perishable and prone to rapid quality deterioration. It is
25 particularly susceptible to water loss, discolouration, and textural degradation, which



Open Access Article. Published on 24 December 2025. Downloaded on 12/25/2025 11:56:41 AM.
This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported Licence.



significantly reduces its commercial value. Therefore, effective preservation strategies are crucial for minimizing postharvest losses, preventing food waste, and contributing to improved food security.¹⁸⁻²⁰

Several studies have investigated the development of packaging films using individual components such as sodium alginate (SA), pectin (P), and protein hydrolysates (PHs) from various sources. The research gap is to generate PHs from chicken byproducts (CBP) using the protease of *Bacillus siamensis* F2 isolated in our laboratory and explore its potential as a functional component to extend the shelf life of okra. This research aims to impregnate chicken byproducts protein hydrolysates (CBP-PHs) into the P and SA matrix to produce active films. They were characterized for their physical, optical, antioxidant, antibacterial and structural properties. This film formulation was applied as a coating to okra to evaluate its ability to extend shelf life by studying parameters such as weight loss, pH, firmness, ascorbic acid content, antioxidant activity, color, and microbial analysis. These findings offer an innovative, eco-friendly solution for sustainable packaging and contribute to Sustainable Development Goal 2 (Zero Hunger) by valorising CBP and reducing food spoilage.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Materials

Extrapure SA (sodium polymannuronate) (Finar, Gujarat, India), pure pectin (high methoxyl content (7 %) and a minimum of 50 % galacturonic acid) and 2,2-diphenyl-1-picrylhydrazyl (DPPH) (Sisco research laboratory, Maharashtra, India), calcium chloride (CaCl₂) (Emparta, Mumbai, India), glycerol (Qualigens, Maharashtra, India), and Muller Hinton agar (HiMedia, Maharashtra, India) were purchased. Chicken byproducts (CBP) were obtained from a local poultry slaughterhouse, and okra was sourced from the local vegetable market in Visakhapatnam, India. According to our previous studies, the bacterium *Bacillus siamensis* F2²⁰ was isolated from the water of a fish processing plant in Visakhapatnam, India, and the

protease produced by this bacterium F2 was optimized and characterized.²¹ After obtaining promising results, this F2 protease (5.2 U/mL)¹⁴ was used to produce CBP-PHs using CBP to make active packaging films.

2.2 Preparation of active films

The active packaging films were developed using the solvent casting method accordingly^{8, 22} with slight modifications. Pectin (2 g) and SA (1.5 g) were added to distilled water (DW) (0.1 L) and heated for 25-30 min at 60 °C on a hot plate. This solution was brought to room temperature, and CBP-PHs, extracted accordingly,²¹ were incorporated in varying concentrations (1, 1.5, and 2 %) with glycerol (2 %) as a plasticizer. The obtained solution was transferred into a Petri plate (145 mm diameter) and left for drying in a biological oxygen demand (Model-925100, Labocare, India) at 30 °C. Once the films had dried, they were carefully peeled off and kept in an incubator at 35 °C for further analysis. After peeling the films off the casting plates, the dried films were labelled as **F1**, P+SA; **F2**, P+SA+1%CBP-PHs; **F3**, P+SA+1.5%CBP-PHs; and **F4**, P+SA+2%CBP-PHs, as shown in **Figure 1**.

2.3 Characterization of films

2.3.1 Physical properties

2.3.1.1 Thickness

A digital vernier caliper (Mitutoyo absolute, range: 0–150 mm) with a least count of 0.00 mm at three random points was used to measure the thickness of the developed films.²²

2.3.1.2 Moisture content (MC)

The initial and final weights of the developed films (2 x 2 cm²) were recorded before and after drying at 105 °C for 3 h in a hot air oven.²² MC was calculated using equation (1):

$$\text{Moisture content (\%)} = \frac{W_i - W_f}{W_i} \times 100 \quad (1)$$

where W_i is the initial weight before drying, and W_f is the final weight after drying.

2.3.1.3 Water solubility (WS)



The film samples (2 x 2 cm²) were weighed, placed in 10 mL of DW, and kept in a shaking incubator (Model-1254504, Venchal Scientific, India) at 180 rpm for 24 h. This solution was centrifuged at 1500 rpm for 20 min, and the undissolved pellet was dehydrated at 105 °C for 24 h using a hot air oven and then weighed.²² The WS was calculated by using equation (2):

$$\text{Water solubility (\%)} = \frac{W_1 - W_2}{W_1} \times 100 \quad (2)$$

where W_1 is the initial weight of the film before drying, and W_2 is the final weight of the dried film.

2.3.1.4 Swelling index (SI)

2 x 2 cm² film samples were weighed and placed in 25 mL of DW for 2 min. Then, the surface water was discarded, and the films were reweighed.²² The SI was calculated using equation (3):

$$\text{Swelling index (\%)} = \frac{W_1 - W_2}{W_2} \times 100 \quad (3)$$

where W_1 is the weight of the swollen film, and W_2 is the weight of the dry film.

2.3.1.5 Water contact angle (WCA)

The WCA of the fabricated films was evaluated using a contact angle meter (Acam-HSC 19, Apex Instruments, Kolkata, India) using the sessile drop technique, accordingly with slight modifications.²³ A 7 µL DW was gently dispensed on the film surface using a glass syringe at 25 °C and 50 % relative humidity, and the average of five replicates was reported.

2.3.1.6 Density

The developed active films were cut into 4 x 1 cm², and the density was calculated using mass, area, and thickness²² using equation (4):

$$\text{Density (g/cm}^3\text{)} = \frac{M}{A \times d} \quad (4)$$

where M is the mass (g), A is the area (cm²), and D is the thickness of the film.

2.3.1.7 Water vapor permeability (WVP)



WVP was used to determine the amount of water that diffuses within the film. The film was sealed on the mouth of the test tube containing anhydrous CaCl_2 . Then, these sealed test tubes were kept in a desiccator at 30 °C and 75 % relative humidity.⁸ The samples were weighed every 24 h until the weight change was 0.001 g using equation (5):

$$\text{Water vapor permeability (g/(m s Pa))} = \frac{(m_1 - m_0) L}{A t \Delta P} \quad (5)$$

where m_1 and m_0 are the final and the initial weight of the test tube, g; L is the thickness of the film, m; A is the area of the exposed film, m^2 ; t is the time, s; and ΔP is the water vapor pressure on either side of the film, Pa.

2.3.2 Optical properties-transparency and opacity

The opacity and transparency were determined using an Ultraviolet-visible (UV-Vis) spectrophotometer (Shimadzu UV-1800, Nakagyo-Ku, Kyoto, Japan) by cutting the films into rectangular strips (4 x 1 cm^2) and measuring at 670 and 800 nm²² using equations (6) and (7):

$$\text{Opacity} = \frac{Abs_{670}}{x} \quad (6)$$

$$\text{Transparency} = \frac{\log (\%T_{800})}{x} \quad (7)$$

where Abs_{670} is the absorbance at 670 nm, $\%T_{800}$ is the transmittance at 800 nm, and x is the film thickness, mm.

2.3.3 Antioxidant activity

2.3.3.1 Diphenylpicrylhydrazyl (DPPH) assay

The AA of the developed films was determined by DPPH assay.²² In 3 mL of DPPH (0.1 mM) solution, 6 mg of the film was immersed for 24 h, and the optical density was measured at 517 nm using a UV-Vis spectrophotometer. The DPPH solution was taken as a control, and the AA of the film samples was calculated using equation (8):

$$\text{Antioxidant activity (\%)} = \frac{Ab_{\text{control}} - Ab_{\text{sample}}}{Ab_{\text{control}}} \times 100 \quad (8)$$



where $Ab_{control}$ is the absorbance value for the DPPH solution, and Ab_{sample} is the absorbance value for the film samples.

2.3.3.2 Metal chelating activity (MCA)

The chelating activity of the biodegradable films on Fe^{2+} ions was determined²². 1 mL of the film solution was mixed with 3.7 mL of DW and maintained at room temperature. Then, 0.1 mL of 2 mM $FeCl_2$ and 0.2 mL of 5 mM ferrozine [3-(2-pyridyl)-5,6-bis(4-phenyl-sulfonic acid)-1,2,4-triazine] were added. The mixture was incubated for 20 min, and the absorbance was measured at 562 nm using a UV-vis spectrophotometer. The chelating activity (%) was calculated using the following equation (9), where 1 mL of distilled water served as the control.

$$Metal\ chelating\ activity\ (\%) = 1 - \frac{Absorbance\ of\ sample\ at\ 562\ nm}{Absorbance\ of\ control\ at\ 562\ nm} \times 100 \quad (9)$$

2.3.3.3 Hydroxyl radical-scavenging activity (HRSA)

The hydroxyl radical-scavenging activity of the biodegradable films was determined²². Briefly, a mixture containing 0.75 mM 1,10-phenanthroline and 0.75 mM $FeSO_4$ was prepared in 0.1 M phosphate buffer (pH 7.4) and mixed thoroughly. To this, 0.01% H_2O_2 and the film solution (1.5 mg/mL) were added, and the reaction mixture was incubated at 37 °C for 1 h. The absorbance of the resulting solution was measured at 536 nm using a UV-vis spectrophotometer. The scavenging activity was calculated using equation (10).

$$Hydroxyl\ radical - scavenging\ activity = 0.5 \times \left[\frac{A_s - A_1}{A_0 - A_1} \right] \times 100 \quad (10)$$

where A_s represents the absorbance of the sample, A_1 represents the absorbance of the control solution containing 1,10-phenanthroline, $FeSO_4$, and H_2O_2 , and A_0 represents the absorbance of the blank solution containing 1,10-phenanthroline and $FeSO_4$.

2.3.4 Antibacterial activity

The antibacterial activity of films was assessed using the Kirby-Bauer disc diffusion assay. *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (ATCC 13883) and *Staphylococcus aureus* (ATCC 25923) inocula were standardized using McFarland standards ($0.5 = 1.5 \times 10^8$ CFU/mL) and swabbed onto



Mueller-Hinton agar plates. A 1 cm film was placed on the plate and incubated at 37 °C for 24 h, and the zone of inhibition (ZOI) was measured.²²

2.3.5 Liquid Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry (LC-MS)

LC-MS of the CBP-PHs was performed to detect and identify the presence of bioactive peptides to confirm the film's antioxidant and antibacterial activity. Peptide detection was performed using a Waters XEVO G3 Quadrupole-Time-of-flight High-Resolution Mass Spectrometry (QToF HRMS) system (Waters Corporation, USA). Chromatographic separation was performed on an ACQUITY BEH C18 column (100 × 2.1 mm, 1.7 μm, 100 Å). The mobile phase consisted of (A) water containing 0.1 % formic acid and (B) acetonitrile containing 0.1 % formic acid. Nitrogen was used as the source gas, and argon served as the collision gas for collision-induced dissociation (CID). The spectral data were acquired in positive ion mode, with a m/z ratio ranging from 100 to 2000.²⁴

2.3.6 Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy

Functional groups were analysed using a Bruker Alpha-II Attenuated Total Reflectance-Fourier transform infrared (ATR-FTIR) spectrophotometer. The spectral data were collected over wavenumbers from 4000 to 500 cm⁻¹. Each sample underwent 80 scans with a scanning resolution set at 4 cm⁻¹ using a zinc selenide beam splitter, and the data were processed using the software OPUS 7.1.⁸

2.3.7 X-ray diffraction (XRD)

XRD analysis was performed employing an XRD device (Bruker D8 Advance, USA) using Cu Kλ radiation (λ=1.5406 Å) with a 0.02° increment of 2 s/step, 40 kV voltage, and current of 40 mA, ranging from 5 to 70°.⁸

2.4 Shelf life studies

Shelf life refers to the duration a product remains suitable for use. *Abelmoschus esculentus*, commonly known as okra, was chosen for this shelf life study because it is highly perishable.



1 It is a highly nutritious crop that can lose its quality due to respiration and moisture loss through
2 transpiration after harvest.²⁵

3 **2.4.1 Formulation of the coating solution**

4 The coating formulation included pectin (2%), SA (1.5%), and CBP-PHs of F1 (0 %) and F4
5 (2 %).

6 **2.4.2 Application of coating on okra**

7 Shelf life studies using okra were conducted to evaluate the distinctive qualities of the newly
8 developed active film. Okra is a nutrient-rich crop that suffers significant losses during
9 storage.²⁶ On March 10, 2025, 174 okras were acquired from a local grocery market in
10 Visakhapatnam, India. The chosen pods were uniform in size, maturity, color, and free from
11 microbial contamination. The pods were washed with 2 % sodium hypochlorite, followed by
12 DW, and dried at 37 °C. Then, they were randomly divided into three groups with 58 each and
13 treated with the coating solution using a dipping and cross-polymerization method that utilized
14 CaCl_2 .¹⁹ Approximately 210 mL of the film-forming solution was used to coat the 116 okras
15 (1.8 mL per pod), whereas 90 mL of the film-forming solution was used to wrap only two
16 okras; hence, dip-coating was selected over wrapping with films. After coating, the samples
17 were dried and stored at room temperature (30 °C) for further analysis. A comprehensive
18 analysis was conducted across all groups to evaluate the final quality attributes, with a primary
19 focus on weight loss, pH, firmness, ascorbic acid content, total chlorophyll content, color, and
20 microbial analysis. This systematic approach aims to ascertain the efficiency of CBP-PHs in
21 enhancing the storage of okra, contributing to understanding the efficiency of active film
22 application in food preservation.²⁶

23 **2.4.3 Weight loss**



The weight loss of okra was determined using the initial weight (W_i) (day 0) and final weight (W_f) (day of analysis) difference of the samples using a precision balance (Venchal Scientific),²⁶ using the following equation (11):

$$\text{Weight loss (\%)} = \frac{W_i - W_f}{W_i} \times 100 \quad (11)$$

2.4.4 pH

pH was determined using a digital pH meter (ESICO 1010). Whole okras were used after removing the seeds, were homogenized using a blender, and the electrode probe of the pH meter was inserted to observe the pH.¹⁹

2.4.5 Firmness

The firmness of okra was determined with a texture analyzer (TA-CT3, Brookfield Engineering Laboratories, Inc., MA, USA) to investigate the textural characteristics of the okra. The okra sample was placed on the base of the analyzer, and force was applied by a cylindrical probe with a 2 mm radius. The test parameters were as follows: 5 N trigger force, 2 mm/s test speed, 5 mm/s pre-test speed, 2 mm/s post-test speed, and 25% strain deformation. The dual compression method was employed, with a 5-second interval maintained between the two compression cycles of the samples.²⁷

2.4.6 Ascorbic acid

The ascorbic acid content of the okra was determined using a 5 mL solution of 100 µg/mL ascorbic acid in oxalic acid as a standard. 5 mL of 100 µg/mL ascorbic acid was added to 10 mL of 4 % oxalic acid and titrated against the dye (42 mg of sodium bicarbonate was mixed with 52 mg of 2, 6-dichlorophenol indophenol, and made up to 200 mL using DW) (V_1) until the pink color persisted. 5 g of the okra sample was dissolved in 80 mL of 4% oxalic acid and brought to a volume of 100 mL. The mixture was then centrifuged, and 5 mL of the supernatant was added to 10 mL of 4% oxalic acid and titrated against the dye (V_2).²⁸ The amount of ascorbic acid in the sample was calculated using equation (12):



1
$$\text{Ascorbic acid (mg/100 g)} = \frac{0.5 \text{ mg}}{V_1 \text{ mL}} \times \frac{V_2 \text{ mL}}{5 \text{ mL}} \times \frac{100 \text{ mL}}{\text{Weight of the sample}} \times 100$$

2 **2.4.7 Antioxidant activity**

3 The AA of okra was determined by the DPPH assay accordingly with slight modifications.²⁹
4 50 µL of okra extract was mixed with 250 µL of 0.1 mM methanolic DPPH solution and
5 incubated in the dark at room temperature for 1 h. The absorbance was measured at 517 nm
6 and the AA was calculated using equation (13):

7
$$\text{Antioxidant activity (\%)} = \frac{Ab \text{ control} - Ab \text{ sample}}{Ab \text{ control}} \times 100$$
 (13)

8 **2.4.8 Color**

9 The color parameters for okra were measured using a HunterLab Colorimeter (ColorFlex EZ,
10 USA)³⁰ based on the International Commission on Illumination (CIE) L*, a*, and b* system
11 with the illuminant D65, and a standard observer 10°. The colorimeter was calibrated using a
12 white standard calibration plate. The black to white was indicated by L*, red (positive) to green
13 (negative) by a*, and yellow (positive) to blue (negative) by b*.³¹ The Browning index (BI) of
14 okra was also calculated using equations (14) and (15):

15
$$\text{Browning index (BI)} = \frac{[100 (x - 0.31)]}{0.17}$$
 (14)

16
$$x = \frac{a^* + 1.75 L^*}{5.645 L^* + a^* - 3.012 b^*}$$
 (15)

17 **2.4.9 Total chlorophyll content**

18 Total chlorophyll content was quantified by homogenizing 3 g of okra with 10 mg of
19 magnesium sulphate (MgSO₄) and 30 mL of 80 % acetone using a mortar and pestle. Then, the
20 solution was filtered and quantified in a 50 mL volumetric flask. The absorbance of the extract
21 was measured at 663 and 645 nm using a UV-Vis spectrophotometer³² and calculated using the
22 equation (16):

23
$$\text{Total chlorophyll content (mg/100 g)} = \frac{(20.2 \times Abs_{645}) + (8.02 \times Abs_{663}) \times 50 \times 100}{1000 \times \text{Weight of sample}}$$

24 (16)



where Abs_{645} is the absorbance at 645 nm, and Abs_{663} is the absorbance at 663 nm. View Article Online
DOI: 10.1039/D5FB00468C

2.4.10 Total microbial count

The microbial count was determined using the pour plate technique, employing nutrient agar (NA) for bacterial counts and yeast extract peptone dextrose (YEPD) for yeast and mold counts, both of which were performed using the serial dilution technique. 1 mL of the okra sample was added to 9 mL of 0.1 % sterile peptone water. From this homogenized sample, a 1 mL aliquot was transferred into sterile Petri plates, and molten NA and YEPD were gently poured. The plates were gently swirled to ensure uniform mixing, and then the agar plates were incubated for 2 days at 37 °C (NA) and 5 days at 25 °C for (YEPD). The microbial growth was expressed as the logarithm of colony-forming units per gram (log CFU/g).⁸

2.5 Statistics

The statistical analysis was conducted using OriginPro 8.5. One-way ANOVA, followed by Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) test, and two-way ANOVA, followed by the Bonferroni test, were used to evaluate differences between group means. All the analyses were conducted in triplicates, and the results were considered statistically significant at $p < 0.05$. Pearson correlation was performed to assess the physical, optical, antioxidant, and antibacterial properties of the films.

3. Results and discussion

In this study, CBP-PHs were extracted from CBP using the protease of the bacterium *Bacillus siamensis* F2 (5.2 U/mL) accordingly.²¹ The produced CBP-PHs were impregnated in the pectin and SA matrix to produce active packaging films. The produced active films are characterized and applied to food as a coating to monitor the ability to extend shelf life.

3.1 Developed films

The films were developed using pectin (P) (2 %), sodium alginate (SA) (1.5 %), and CBP-PHs of varying composition - **F1**, P+SA; **F2**, P+SA+1%CBP-PHs; **F3**, P+SA+1.5%CBP-PHs; and



F4, P+SA+2%CBP-PHs (**Fig. 1**). The pH of the developed film forming solutions was measured as follows - **F1** (4.2), **F2** (4.31), **F3** (4.36), and **F4** (4.4).

3.2 Film characterization

3.2.1 Thickness

The thickness of the developed film increased with the concentration of CBP-PHs from 0.32 ± 0.015 mm (F1) to 0.42 ± 0.005 mm (F4) (**Table 1**). This increase resulted from incorporating the CBP-PHs into the SA and pectin matrix, which enhanced the overall solid content of the film. The increase in the dissolved solid components contributed to stronger intermolecular interactions and molecular spacing within the film's structure, resulting in a thicker structure.^{10, 33, 34} A similar increase in thickness from 0.12 to 0.23 mm was observed when 1.5 % alginate was incorporated with varying concentrations of cottonseed PHs (0, 0.15, 0.3, and 0.6 %).³³ Another study also demonstrated a similar increase in thickness with the addition of hydrolysates.³⁵

3.2.2 Moisture content (MC), water solubility (WS), swelling index (SI), and water contact angle (WCA)

The MC, WS, and SI decrease with increased CBP-PHs concentration (**Table 1**). The control film F1 (without CBP-PHs) shows a higher MC of 22 ± 0.19 % compared to F2, F3, and F4 (19 ± 0.47 , 18 ± 0.43 , and 16 ± 0.32 % respectively). The WS decreases from 74 ± 0.5 % in the F1 film to 57 ± 0.26 % in the F4 film, and the SI decreases from 486 ± 1.09 % (F1) to 372 ± 0.29 % (F4). This occurred due to the linear polysaccharides, such as SA and pectin, forming moderate branching and covalent bonds with polyvalent metal cations (magnesium, calcium, iron, etc.) present in CBP-PHs. The agglomerate formed increases the water resistance of the films by narrowing the distance between molecules, thereby forming a three-dimensional dense network. This enhances film stability in water by restricting water penetration and increasing surface hydrophobicity.^{10, 36, 37} A similar decrease in WS from 84 to 60 % was observed when



3 % maize starch was incorporated with varying concentrations of chicken feather PHs (0, 1, 3, and 6 %).³⁸ Similarly, another study observed a decreasing trend of SI from 570 to 328 % when fish gelatin film was impregnated with liquid fish hydrolysate.³⁷ As the concentration of CBP-PHs increases from 0 to 2 % in the films, the WCA of the films showed an increase from 110° to 132°, demonstrating the hydrophobicity (**Fig. 1b**). The films containing pectin and SA form an agglomerate when CBP-PHs are added, thereby increasing water resistance by forming a dense matrix.^{10, 36, 37} This imparts moisture resistance, leading to higher surface hydrophobicity, increased contact angle, and reduced wettability.³⁹ A similar increase in the hydrophobicity was observed in a study where the contact angle increased from 68° to 96° with the addition of white cheek shark PHs in white cheek shark gelatin films.²³ Another study also observed a similar increase in hydrophobicity in SA films with the addition of gold-titanium dioxide nanoparticles.⁴⁰

3.2.3 Density

The density progressively increased from 0.1 ± 0.001 g/cm³ in the control F1 film to 0.13 ± 0.001 g/cm³ in the F4 film due to increased CBP-PHs concentration (**Table 1**). This increasing trend can be attributed to the addition of the active component, CBP-PHs, to the pectin and SA matrix, which enhances aggregation and increases the overall solid content. Moreover, the presence of dissolved solids promoted stronger intermolecular interactions and greater molecular packing within the film structure, thereby increasing the film's volume and density.^{10, 33, 34} A similar increase in density was observed when the SA and active components, quercetin and *Vitis vinifera* leaf extracts were impregnated in the film matrix.⁴¹ Another study also observed a similar increasing trend where the density of SA films increased from 0.045 to 0.056 g/cm³ with the incorporation of fish PHs.¹⁷

3.2.4 Water vapor permeability (WVP)



The WVP of the developed bioactive films increased by incorporating CBP-PHs (**Table 1**). The control film formulation, F1, without CBP-PHs, demonstrated the lowest WVP value of approximately $2 \times 10^{-8} \pm 0.07 \text{ g/(m s Pa)}$, whereas WVP increased subsequently in F2 ($2.1 \times 10^{-8} \pm 0.05 \times 10^{-8} \text{ g/(m s Pa)}$), followed by F3 ($2.3 \times 10^{-8} \pm 0.01 \times 10^{-8} \text{ g/(m s Pa)}$), and finally F4 ($2.5 \times 10^{-8} \pm 0.02 \times 10^{-8} \text{ g/(m s Pa)}$), with 1, 1.5, and 2 % CBP-PHs respectively. The increase in WVP can be attributed to the increased thickness of the CBP-PHs films and the plasticization effect of the peptides present in CBP-PHs. This increases the film matrix's free volume, making the matrix's network less dense and thereby increasing the water diffusion rate into the CBP-PHs films.^{33, 42} The results align with a previous study where the WVP increases from $6.3 \times 10^{-5} \text{ g mm/m}^2$ to $10.9 \times 10^{-5} \text{ g mm/m}^2$ with the addition of cottonseed hydrolysates in alginate films.³³ Another study showed a similar increase from $2.2 \times 10^{-8} \text{ g mm h}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ Pa}^{-1}$ to $3.3 \times 10^{-8} \text{ g mm h}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ Pa}^{-1}$ when hydrolysate from giant squid was impregnated in gelatin films.⁴²

3.2.5 Transparency and opacity

Transparency and opacity are essential in film development as they affect the appearance and the consumer's perception.⁴³ Transparency and opacity are inversely related to each other. It was observed that the transparency decreased from F1 ($5.5 \pm 0.017 \%$) to F4 ($4.4 \pm 0.02 \%$), and the opacity of the film increased from F1 ($0.3 \pm 0.001 \%$) to F4 ($0.5 \pm 0.008 \%$) with an increase in CBP-PHs concentration (**Table 1**). This phenomenon can be attributed to the increased content of solid peptide particles, which contributes to the more compact matrix and enhances light scattering, thereby reducing transparency and increasing opacity.⁴⁴ The increase in opacity acts as an effective light barrier, which helps in protecting food when applied in the form of coatings.¹⁷ The results are corroborated by a study where the transparency decreased when whey proteins were added to SA films.³⁶ Similarly, another reported an increase in



opacity from 0.56 to 0.7 % with an increase in the silver carp PHs incorporated with fish gelatin films.⁴⁵

3.2.6 Antioxidant properties

The F4 film with 2 % CBP-PHs showed the highest AA of 53 ± 0.75 %, while the F3 (1.5 % CBP-PHs), F2 (1 % CBP-PHs), and F1 (0 % CBP-PHs) films showed values of 48 ± 0.6 , 42 ± 0.7 , and 39 ± 0.3 %, respectively, against DPPH (**Table 2**). Film F4 demonstrated the highest AA against MCA of 44.5 ± 0.7 % followed by F3 36.4 ± 0.5 % F2 31.1 ± 0.2 %, and F1 21.3 ± 0.4 %. Similarly, the F4 was observed to have the highest HRSA of 48.5 ± 0.5 % and the lowest was observed in F1, at 24.1 ± 0.2 %. This was due to the hydrolysis of CBP, forming CBP-PHs, which are lower-molecular-weight peptides. The lower molecular weight of peptides possessing antioxidant capacity plays a crucial role in the antioxidant properties of the developed films.^{21, 46} These peptides exhibit strong radical-scavenging activity, inhibit lipid oxidation, and can effectively chelate metal ions.⁴⁷ Similar results were observed when polyvinyl alcohol was impregnated with 6 % chicken feather PHs, increasing AA by 23 %.³⁸ Another study also showed an increase in antioxidant properties from 8 to 46 % with the increased concentration of fish gelatin film incorporated with silver carp PHs.⁴⁵

3.2.7 Antibacterial activity

The antibacterial property of F1 to F4 films was investigated through inhibition zone assays against *Staphylococcus aureus* (ATCC 25923) and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (ATCC 13883) (**Table 3**). Against *S. aureus*, the F4 film demonstrated the largest ZOI of 24.5 ± 0.16 mm, followed by F3 (16.4 ± 0.24 mm), F2 (5.8 ± 0.12 mm), and no ZOI was observed in the F1 control film. Similarly, the F4 film exhibited 21.1 ± 0.12 mm against *K. pneumoniae*, followed by F3 (15.7 ± 0.12 mm) and F2 (5.1 ± 0.16 mm), while F1 again showed no visible ZOI. The antibacterial activity of CBP-PHs was attributed to the small peptides that penetrate the cell wall, altering the bacterial plasma membrane structure. The disruption of the plasma membrane



facilitates the entry of the peptide into the bacterium, impacting replication, transcription, and translation, ultimately leading to bacterial death. This was attributed to the electrostatic interactions between the plasma membrane of the bacteria and the bioactive peptides present in CBP-PHs.^{10, 34, 48} The inhibitory effect of *S. aureus* was greater than that of *K. pneumoniae* due to the additional protective cell layer in the gram-negative bacteria. This membrane protects the bacteria from environmental stress and regulates the entry of chemicals into the cell.^{34, 49} This might also explain the increase in the ZOI with an increase in CPB-PHs concentration. The findings of this study align with previous research studies in which PHs derived from Argentine croaker muscle using Alcalase and Protamex showed notable inhibition zones against several bacterial strains.⁵⁰ In another study, wild almond protein isolate was incorporated into Persian gum films, showing a ZOI of 16 and 26 mm for 0.3 and 0.6 % (w/v) PHs against *S. aureus*.³⁵

3.2.8 Liquid Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry (LC-MS)

LC-MS of CBP-PHs was conducted to identify the bioactive peptides responsible for their antioxidant and antibacterial properties in the film formulation. The identification of these bioactive sequences confirms the successful hydrolysis of proteins into short-chain peptides with significant functional roles. The presence of lower molecular weight amino acids in CBP-PHs may contribute to the radical scavenging ability of the developed films. The LC-MS spectra demonstrated distinct mass-to-charge (m/z) peaks corresponding to the identified peptides, validating their molecular weights and confirming their presence in the hydrolyzed matrix. LC-MS analysis of the CBP-PHs sample revealed the presence of several bioactive peptides with potential bioactive properties. The identified peptides included LKA, EDRMSLVDSRCQEA, PDLVF, APGAPGPVG, AR, GIL, LF, IGL, YQKFPQYL, VYPFPGPLPN, LAPSLPGKPKPD, DAACAAHCLFRG, LMSYMWSTSM, and LAGNPHQQQQN (Table S1 and Fig. S1). These peptides are known to contribute to the



antibacterial, antioxidant, and ACE inhibitor activities observed in the formulated films. Among them, the peptide EDRMSLVDSRCQEA, corresponding to Cystatin S (108-121), has been associated with strong antibacterial potential (Fig. 2).⁵¹ Similarly, PDLVF and APGAPGPVG have been recognized in earlier studies for their antioxidant potential, which contributes to the radical scavenging ability of the developed films (Fig. 2). The identification of these bioactive sequences confirms the successful hydrolysis of proteins into short-chain peptides with significant functional roles.⁵² The presence of such multifunctional peptides supports the observed enhancement in the film's bioactivity, indicating that enzymatic hydrolysis effectively liberated bioactive fragments responsible for the antimicrobial and antioxidant functionalities of the composite coating.

3.2.9 Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy

The FTIR spectrum of the pectin and SA-based films exhibited characteristic absorption bands confirming the presence of functional groups inherent to both polysaccharides (Fig. 3). A broad and intense band around 3298 cm⁻¹ was observed, corresponding to the stretching vibrations of hydroxyl (–OH) groups, a feature typical of polysaccharide matrices due to extensive hydrogen bonding.⁵³ Another prominent peak near 1600 and 1742 cm⁻¹ was attributed to the asymmetric stretching of carboxylate (–COO⁻) groups, confirming the presence of uronic acids from alginate and galacturonic acid units from pectin.^{54, 55} Peaks around 1413 cm⁻¹ further supported symmetric COO⁻ stretching, while bands near 1018 cm⁻¹ were indicative of C–O–C stretching vibrations associated with glycosidic linkages within the backbone of both polymers.^{55, 56} These spectral features are consistent with previous FTIR analyses of pectin and SA composites reported in the literature, indicating a strong intermolecular hydrogen bonding that contributes to the structural integrity of the composite film.^{57, 58}

In the films containing CBP-PHs, intensified peaks were observed at 3398 cm⁻¹ (amide A, N–H stretching), 2930 cm⁻¹ (CH₂ stretching), and 1600 cm⁻¹ (amide I, C=O vibration). A



1 prominent peak was observed at 1413 cm⁻¹ (amide II, C–N elongation and N–H stretching),
2 while peaks observed at 1101 cm⁻¹ and 1018 cm⁻¹ corresponded to the symmetric and
3 asymmetric stretching of S–O, which could be due to the presence of cysteine bonded by
4 disulphide bridges (the composition of keratin of chicken feathers).³⁸ These spectral
5 observations support previous findings on protein-polysaccharide blend films, indicating
6 strong biochemical interactions and compatibility between the CBP-PHs and the pectin and SA
7 matrix.^{10, 38, 59}

8 3.2.10 X-ray Diffraction (XRD)

9 The XRD pattern was used to study the crystallinity of the developed films (**Fig. 4**). The control
10 film, composed of SA and pectin, exhibited characteristic diffraction peaks at approximately
11 13° and 20°, characteristic of polysaccharide matrices. This was consistent with the previous
12 studies on SA and pectin.^{60, 61} Incorporating CBP-PHs into the pectin and SA matrix led to
13 subtle changes in the XRD pattern. A prominent diffraction peak was observed at 31° for the
14 CBP-PHs films. The relative crystallinity increases with the addition of CBP-PHs. Similar
15 peaks at 13.67, 21.49, and 30.92° were observed in a study using SA and fish PHs generated
16 with *Bacillus siamensis* F2 protease.¹⁷ Similarly, a peak at 32° was observed when 15 % garden
17 cress seed PHs produced using alcalase were analyzed.⁶²

18 3.2.11 Pearson's correlation

19 Based on the Pearson correlation analysis of the formulated films (F1-F4), strong correlations
20 were observed among the physicochemical and functional properties (**Table S2**). AA exhibited
21 a strong positive correlation with density and opacity, indicating that denser and more opaque
22 films possess higher antioxidant potential. Conversely, moisture content and swelling index
23 showed strong negative correlations with AA and density, suggesting reduced water affinity
24 and increased hydrophobicity of the film matrices. Furthermore, the antibacterial activities
25 against *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* correlated positively with the AA,



implying that the presence of CBP-PHs enhanced both antioxidant and antimicrobial functionalities. Overall, these correlations confirm that incorporating CBP-PHs into the pectin and SA matrix improves the film's compactness, increases hydrophilicity, and enhances its bioactive properties.

3.3 Shelf life studies of the developed films on okra

To evaluate the efficacy of the bioactive films in preserving the quality of okra during a storage period of 7 days, three representative groups were selected for comparative analysis: the uncoated, F1-coated (P+SA without CBP-PHs), and F4-coated (P+SA+2%CBP-PHs) (**Fig. 5**). This selection was made to establish a clear contrast between the untreated sample, a base composition without bioactive compounds, and the best formulation.

3.3.1 Weight loss

Weight loss is linked to texture modification, surface shrivelling, loss of gloss and nutrients, and negatively impacts food quality and shelf life.²² On day 7 of storage, the uncoated okra showed the maximum weight loss (87 ± 0.29 %) when compared to the F1 (84 ± 0.5 %) and F4 (78 ± 0.4 %) (**Fig. 6a**). This suggests that the presence of a coating acts as a barrier, thus minimizing water loss and respiration, which retains the firmness and membrane integrity of the okra.³¹ Moreover, bioactive peptides (CBP-PHs) in F4 coating reduce the growth of microorganisms, further preventing the weight loss of F4-coated okra.¹⁰ A similar observation has been reported in a study where coated okra incorporated with chitosan and crude bioactive algae extract from *Spirogyra* sp. showed a lower weight loss compared to the uncoated okra when stored at 27°C by Day 5 of storage.³⁰

3.3.2 pH

The acidity of okra increased when stored for 7 days at 30 °C (**Fig. 6b**). The pH of the uncoated samples reduced from 6.76 ± 0.03 to 5.75 ± 0.03 , F1 from 6.73 ± 0.06 to 6.17 ± 0.03 ; however, F4-coated okras maintained their pH by day 7 (6.78 ± 0.05 to 6.35 ± 0.04). The pH of the



1 samples decreased due to the increase in total acids, which in turn increased the hydrogen ion
 2 concentration of the okra.⁶³ The results are in corroboration with a study where the pH of
 3 uncoated okra reduced from 6.9 to 5.5, and low density polyethylene (LDPE) maintained the
 4 pH at 6.5 for 28 days when stored at 10 °C.²⁶ A similar decrease in pH with the increase in
 5 storage period was observed in a study when okra was wrapped in LDPE bags.⁶³

6 3.3.3 Firmness

7 Firmness serves as a key indicator of quality and freshness, where its decline signifies the onset
 8 of cellular membrane degradation and spoilage, which is correlated with weight loss.^{26, 64} By
 9 day 7, the firmness decreased from 119 ± 2.06 to 51 ± 0.78 N in F4-coated samples, 113 ± 1.73
 10 to 37 ± 0.35 N in F1-coated samples, and 115 ± 1.81 to 19 ± 0.35 N in uncoated okra (**Fig. 6c**).
 11 The firmness is affected by the turgor pressure of the cell and the strength of the cell wall.
 12 Enzymatic degradation of cellular components causes the decay of tissues, leading to the
 13 breakdown of organic substances and the softening of fruits and vegetables. Coatings act as a
 14 semi-permeable membrane that retard the respiration rate of fruits and vegetables, thereby
 15 protecting the losses due to oxidation during the storage period of okra.^{8, 27} Similarly, in a study,
 16 the firmness decreased from 173 to 77 N by day 4 of storage when okra was coated with almond
 17 and guar gum.²⁷

18 3.3.4 Ascorbic acid

19 Ascorbic acid loss is a reliable indicator of spoilage in okra, as it demonstrates the nutritional
 20 loss and oxidative degradation during storage. It is sensitive to temperature, light, oxygen, and
 21 storage periods.^{25, 65} The ascorbic acid content reduces with the increase in the storage period
 22 from 15 ± 0.21 mg/100 g to 4.6 ± 0.29 (uncoated okra), 5.9 ± 0.22 (F1-coated okra), and $7.6 \pm$
 23 0.33 mg/100 g (F4-coated okra) (**Fig. 7a**). This decrease is attributed to the enzyme ascorbate
 24 oxidase that converts ascorbic acid to dehydroascorbic acid.^{26, 66} A similar reduction in ascorbic



acid from 12 to 9.6 mg/100 g was observed in a study where okra was packed in LDPE packaging.²⁶

3.3.5 Antioxidant activity

The AA serves as an important indicator of the oxidative stability and freshness of okra, as okra is naturally rich in antioxidant compounds. A gradual decline in AA was observed over a 7-day storage period, indicating progressive oxidative degradation. It was observed that there was a reduction in the AA with each day. By day 7, the AA of okra decreased from $83 \pm 0.87\%$ to $25 \pm 0.87\%$ in uncoated okra, $83 \pm 0.5\%$ to $34 \pm 1.32\%$ in F1-coated okra and $84 \pm 0.87\%$ to $48 \pm 0.87\%$ in F4-coated okra (**Fig. 7b**). The presence of coating solutions (F1 and F4) acts as a barrier and extends the shelf life of okra when compared to the uncoated. CBP-PHs possess antioxidant and antimicrobial activity, which further retains the AA and prevents the growth of microbes, thereby enhancing the shelf life of okra.^{10, 48, 67} A similar reduction in the AA was observed in a study where the AA of okra decreased from 62 to 49.5% in methylcyclopropene-treated samples. In comparison, it was reduced to 41 % in the control samples.⁶⁸

3.3.6 Color

During the storage period, shrivelling and browning (darkening) of the ridges negatively impact the appearance of okra. A higher value of L^* represents whiteness, and a lower value represents blackness. The value of a^* indicates greenness (negative) or redness (positive), and b^* indicates blueness (negative) or yellowness (positive).³¹ The L^* value representing lightness decreases with the increase in the storage period from day 0 to 7. By day 7, the L^* of F4-coated okra reduced from 34 ± 0.7 to 24 ± 0.1 ; however, F1-coated okra reduced from 34 ± 0.2 to 18 ± 0.1 , and uncoated okra reduced from 33 ± 0.2 to 15 ± 0.1 (**Table 4**). Similarly, a^* value increased from -5 ± 0.3 to -2.5 ± 0.08 in F4-coated, -5 ± 0.05 to -2.1 ± 0.04 in F1-coated, and -4.9 ± 0.04 to -1.8 ± 0.02 in uncoated okra. The b^* value decreased from 14.8 ± 0.5 to 13.4 ± 0.1 in F4-coated okra, 14.8 ± 0.5 to 13.1 ± 0.1 in F1-coated, and 14.9 ± 0.06 to 12.9 ± 0.4 in the uncoated.



The L^* of okra decreased due to the darkening of ridges, the a^* increased due to the loss of the green color of the okra, and the b^* decreased due to the discoloration of okra with the increase in the storage period.³¹ These results indicate that the F4-coating preserved the color of okra better than the F1-coated and uncoated okra, which suggests the efficacy of CBP-PHs in maintaining the visual appeal of okra during the storage period. A similar trend was observed in okra with SA-coating, using basil oil nano-emulsified with Tween 20, where the L^* value decreased from 41.1 to 30.6 in uncoated okra, while the coated okra observed a decrease from 40.5 to 33.5 by day 3 of storage at 24 °C. In the same study, the a^* value increased from -8.2 to -6.4 in the uncoated okra, while the coated okra preserved the a^* value (-8.1 to -6.7).³¹ Similarly, in another study, on day 7, when okra was coated with guar gum, almond gum, and oregano oil, the b^* value decreased from 9.1 to 8.4, and in the control okra, it decreased from 9.1 to 7.5.²⁷

The BI indicates the quality of fruits and vegetables, such as apples, avocados, and okra.³¹ The BI increased from 45 ± 0.5 to 72 ± 0.4 in F4-coated okra, 44 ± 0.5 to 114 ± 0.9 in F1-coated okra, and the highest increase was observed in uncoated okra, from 45 ± 0.7 to 139 ± 0.1 (**Table 4**). The BI decreased due to the darkening of the ridges, resulting in discoloration of the okra with an increase in storage period.³¹ The results are in corroboration with an increase in BI from 85 to 144 in the coated okra using SA impregnated with basil oil nano-emulsified with tween 20 by day 3 of storage at 24 °C, and from 83 to 189 in the control.³¹

3.3.7 Total chlorophyll content

Chlorophyll loss during storage is a key indicator of senescence, which is driven by the enzyme chlorophyllase.²⁶ The uncoated samples lost the maximum amount of chlorophyll (13.4 ± 0.11 to 4 ± 0.09 mg/100 g), followed by F1-coated okra (13.4 ± 0.04 to 5.8 ± 0.17 mg/100 g), while the F4-coated okra (13.4 ± 0.07 to 8.1 ± 0.05 mg/100 g) retained the maximum amount of chlorophyll (**Fig. 8**). Temperature and pH play an essential role in influencing the stability of



chlorophyll during the storage period. The degradation of chlorophyll pigment increases with temperature (30 °C), while higher pH levels help in retaining chlorophyll more effectively.⁶⁹⁻

⁷¹ The chlorophyllase enzyme plays a crucial role during senescence as it utilizes chlorophyll a as its substrate, resulting in a visible loss of green color in okra.²⁶ A similar decline in chlorophyll content was observed in a study where okra was packed in different thicknesses of LDPE packaging.²⁶ Another study observed a similar decrease in chlorophyll when spinach was coated with whey protein concentrate and rosemary essential oil.⁶⁹

3.3.8 Total microbial count

The microbial analysis reveals the growth of organisms during 7 days of storage at 30 °C on okra, which directly affects its shelf life. It was observed that on day 0, the total mesophilic count was 3.9 ± 0.02 log CFU/g, which increased in all the samples with the increase in storage period (**Fig. 9a**). The uncoated samples showed the highest mesophilic count of 6.3 ± 0.07 log CFU/g on day 7, followed by F1-coated okra (6 ± 0.02 log CFU/g). In contrast, F4-coated exhibited the lowest by maintaining the mesophilic count at 5.7 ± 0.03 log CFU/g. Similarly, by day 7, the count of yeast and mold also increased from 3.6 ± 0.02 log CFU/g (day 0) to 5.8 ± 0.05 log CFU/g in uncoated, followed by F1-coated (5.5 ± 0.06 log CFU/g) and F4-coated okra (5.3 ± 0.01 log CFU/g) (**Fig. 9b**). This shows that the F4 coating enhanced the shelf life of okra due to its antimicrobial properties, which effectively suppressed microbial proliferation. The bioactive peptides of CBP-PHs penetrate the microbial cell wall and alter the cell membrane structure, ultimately leading to the death of bacterial cells.¹⁰ The results are in corroboration with a study where chitosan and zinc oxide-coated okra samples restricted the bacterial and fungal cells at approximately 10×10^7 CFU/mL and 2×10^7 CFU/mL, respectively.⁷²

4. Conclusion



The current study aimed to develop and characterize an active packaging using pectin, SA, and CBP-PHs obtained through enzymatic hydrolysis of CBP using the protease from *Bacillus siamensis* F2. Among the formulations tested, F4 (P+SA+2%CBP-PHs) demonstrated enhanced antibacterial properties against *Staphylococcus aureus* (24.5 ± 0.02 mm) and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (21 ± 0.12 mm), as well as antioxidant (DPPH, $53 \pm 0.75\%$), surface hydrophobicity (132°) and optical and physical properties. When this coating was applied to okra, F4 effectively minimized weight loss (78 ± 0.4 %), retained firmness (51 ± 0.8 N), preserved chlorophyll (8.1 ± 0.05 mg/100 g) and ascorbic acid content (7.6 ± 0.1 mg/100 g), and suppressed microbial proliferation during storage. These findings underscore the importance of bioactive CBP-PHs when incorporated into food-grade biopolymers. Beyond material innovation, this study highlights the importance of food preservation through waste valorisation (CBP-PHs from CBP), thereby addressing food security, sustainability, and reducing environmental burden by replacing conventional plastics. Future prospects of the current research include optimizing film formulation for commercial production and utilising it on various perishable products to extend their shelf life.

Author Contributions

AR: Data curation, analysis, writing, and editing of the manuscript. **VGP:** Funding, designing the experiments, data curation, analysis, overall supervision, writing, and editing of the manuscript. **AK:** Data curation, analysis, writing, and editing of the manuscript. **SS:** Data curation, analysis, and editing of the manuscript. **MK:** Data curation and analysis. **NS:** Data analysis and editing of the manuscript.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Data availability



This manuscript contains all the data necessary to support the findings. Further information needed in this study's findings is available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Acknowledgements

The authors are thankful to the “MURTI” (Multi-disciplinary Unit of Research on Translation Initiative) facility, MURTI-SAIF facility, and the Department of Mechanical Engineering of the Gandhi Institute of Technology and Management for providing instrumental facilities (FTIR, XRD, LC-MS, and contact angle meter) for conducting experiments required for this article.

Funding Sources

This work was supported by projects: UGC-BSR Start-up grant with Ref No: No.F.30-456/2018 (BSR) and GITAM: Research Seed Grants (RSG) Ref No: F.No 2021/0087.



Figure Legends

Figure 1a). Preparation of active packaging films, **b)** Contact angle values of different films. F1, P+SA; F2, P+SA+1%CBP-PHs; F3, P+SA+1.5%CBP-PHs; and F4, P+SA+2%CBP-PHs. P, pectin; SA, sodium alginate; CBP-PHs, chicken byproducts protein hydrolysates.

Figure 2. Identification of bioactive peptides of chicken byproducts protein hydrolysates (CBP-PHs) detected by Quadrupole-Time-of-flight High-Resolution Mass Spectrometry (QToF HRMS) system with a m/z ratio ranging from 100 to 2000.

Figure 3. Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectra of the prepared films. F1, P+SA; F2, P+SA+1%CBP-PHs; F3, P+SA+1.5%CBP-PHs; and F4, P+SA+2%CBP-PHs. P, pectin; SA, sodium alginate; CBP-PHs, chicken byproducts protein hydrolysates.

Figure 4. X-ray diffraction (XRD) patterns of the developed films. F1, P+SA; F2, P+SA+1%CBP-PHs; F3, P+SA+1.5%CBP-PHs; and F4, P+SA+2%CBP-PHs. P, pectin; SA, sodium alginate; CBP-PHs, chicken byproducts protein hydrolysates.

Figure 5. Effect of storage period (7 days) on okra with uncoated (UC) and coated (F1, P+SA and F4, P+SA+2%CBP-PHs) at room temperature. P, pectin; SA, sodium alginate; CBP-PHs, chicken byproducts protein hydrolysates.

Figure 6. Study of shelf life parameters of okra **(a)** weight loss, **(b)** pH, and **(c)** firmness of uncoated (UC) and coated (F1, P+SA and F4, P+SA+2%CBP-PHs) after 7 days of storage at room temperature. All data are averages of three measurements and reported as mean \pm standard deviation (SD). Different letters (a, b, c, d, e, and f) indicate significant differences between groups at $p < 0.05$ according to the Bonferroni test. P, pectin; SA, sodium alginate; CBP-PHs, chicken byproducts protein hydrolysates.

Figure 7. Study of shelf life parameters of okra **(a)** ascorbic acid and **(b)** antioxidant activity of uncoated (UC) and coated (F1, P+SA and F4, P+SA+2%CBP-PHs) after 7 days of storage at room temperature. All data are averages of three measurements and reported as mean \pm



standard deviation (SD). Different letters (a, b, and c) indicate significant differences between groups at $p < 0.05$ according to the Bonferroni test. P, pectin; SA, sodium alginate; CBP-PHs, chicken byproducts protein hydrolysates.

Figure 8. Effect of storage period (7 days) on total chlorophyll content of okra with uncoated (UC) and coated (F1, P+SA and F4, P+SA+2%CBP-PHs) at room temperature. P, pectin; SA, sodium alginate; CBP-PHs, chicken byproducts protein hydrolysates.

Figure 9. Effect of storage period (7 days) on microbial growth **(a)** total mesophilic count and **(b)** yeast and mold count of okra with uncoated (UC) and coated (F1, P+SA and F4, P+SA+2%CBP-PHs) at room temperature. All data are averages of three measurements and reported as mean \pm standard deviation (SD). Different letters (a, b, c, d, e, f, and g) indicate significant differences between groups at $p < 0.05$ according to the Bonferroni test. P, pectin; SA, sodium alginate; CBP-PHs, chicken byproducts protein hydrolysates.



References

1. M. P. M. García, M. C. Gómez-Guillén, M. E. López-Caballero and G. V. Barbosa-Cánovas, *Edible films and coatings: fundamentals and applications*, Crc Press, 2016.
2. Y. Zhao, B. Li, C. Li, Y. Xu, Y. Luo, D. Liang and C. Huang, *Foods*, 2021, **10**, 1845.
3. C. E. Realini and B. Marcos, *Meat science*, 2014, **98**, 404-419.
4. N. Omerović, M. Djisalov, K. Živojević, M. Mladenović, J. Vunduk, I. Milenković, N. Ž. Knežević, I. Gadjanski and J. Vidić, *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*, 2021, **20**, 2428-2454.
5. R. Abka-Khajouei, L. Tounsi, N. Shahabi, A. K. Patel, S. Abdelkafi and P. Michaud, *Mar Drugs*, 2022, **20**.
6. M. G. Kontominas, *Foods*, 2020, **9**.
7. K. Y. Perera, A. K. Jaiswal and S. Jaiswal, *Foods*, 2023, **12**, 2422.
8. A. Ramadoss, V. G. Poosarla, S. Sadiya and N. Shivshetty, *Journal of Food Science*, 2025, **90**, e70179.
9. J. Tkaczewska, *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 2020, **106**, 298-311.
10. O. Zinina, S. Merenkova and D. Galimov, *Sustainability*, 2023, **15**, 15086.
11. L. O. L. d. Rosa, M. C. Santana, T. L. Avezedo, A. I. S. BRÍGIDA, R. Godoy, S. Pacheco, C. Mellinger-Silva and L. M. C. CABRAL, *Food Science and Technology*, 2018, **38**, 31-36.
12. D. S. Ningthoujam, P. Kshetri, S. Sanasam and S. Nimaichand, *World Appl Sci J*, 2009, **7**, 907-916.
13. B. G. Rathod, V. G. Poosarla, S. K. Kuppili, K. S. Y. R. Chouhan and N. Shivshetty, *Biomass Conversion and Biorefinery*, 2024, **14**, 1343-1358.
14. S. Sankaralingam, B. Harinathan, S. Palpperumal, D. Kathiresan, S. Rajendran, T. Shankar, D. Prabhu and N. Sivakumar, *Am.-Eur. J. Agric. Environ. Sci*, 2017, **17**, 293-299.
15. M. Vidyasagar, S. Prakash and K. Sreeramulu, *Letters in applied microbiology*, 2006, **43**, 385-391.
16. X. Chen, D. Jiang, P. Xu, Z. Geng, G. Xiong, Y. Zou, D. Wang and W. Xu, *Food Chemistry*, 2021, **343**, 128417.
17. S. Sadiya, V. G. Poosarla, A. Ramadoss, B. G. Rathod, N. Shivshetty and G. Rajagopalan, *ACS Food Science & Technology*, 2025, **5**, 2820-2832.
18. H. F. Gemede, N. Ratta, G. D. Haki, A. Z. Woldegiorgis and F. Beyene, *J Food Process Technol*, 2015, **6**, 2.



- 1 19. L. M. R. Gonzales and M. M. Benitez, *Mindanao Journal of Science and Technology*,
2 2023, **21**. View Article Online
DOI: 10.10598/5FB00468C
- 3 20. M. L. Zambrano-Zaragoza, R. González-Reza, N. Mendoza-Muñoz, V. Miranda-
4 Linares, T. F. Bernal-Couoh, S. Mendoza-Elvira and D. Quintanar-Guerrero,
5 *International journal of molecular sciences*, 2018, **19**, 705.
- 6 21. B. Rathod, V. Poosarla, S. Kuppili, K. Chouhan and N. Shivshetty, *Biomass*
7 *Conversion and Biorefinery*, 2023, **14**, 1-16.
- 8 22. V. G. Poosarla, S. Bisoi, A. Siripurapu, B. G. Rathod, A. Ramadoss, S. Kilaparthi, N.
9 Shivshetty and G. Rajagopalan, *Journal of Food Science*, 2024, **89**, 6232-6252.
- 10 23. M. Alinejad, H. Shahiri Tabarestani and A. Motamedzadegan, *LWT*, 2025, **232**,
11 118419.
- 12 24. S. Roytrakul, S. Charoenlappanit, S. Kittisenachai, N. Siangpro, J. Sichaem, S.
13 Chuakrut, S. Sarin and R. Jutakanoke, *Plos one*, 2024, **19**, e0314482.
- 14 25. M. R. Zare-Bavani, *Journal of food science and technology (Iran)*, 2024, **20**, 149-169.
- 15 26. D. Paulus, S. B. Ferreira and D. Becker, *AIMS Agriculture and Food*, 2021, **6**, 321-
16 336.
- 17 27. M. M. Shinde, M. Malik, K. Kaur, V. K. Gahlawat, N. Kumar, P. Chiraang and A.
18 Upadhyay, *International Journal of Biological Macromolecules*, 2024, **262**, 129630.
- 19 28. S. Sadasivam, *Biochemical methods*, New age international, 1996.
- 20 29. R. Reis, H. Sipahi, O. Dinc, T. Kavaz, M. Charehsaz, A. Dimoglo and A. Aydın,
21 *Human & Experimental Toxicology*, 2021, **40**, 452-463.
- 22 30. S. Soiklom, W. Siri-Anusornsak, K. Petchpoung, S. Soiklom and T. Maneeboon,
23 *Foods*, 2025, **14**, 804.
- 24 31. G. Gundewadi, S. G. Rudra, D. J. Sarkar and D. Singh, *Food Packaging and Shelf*
25 *Life*, 2018, **18**, 1-12.
- 26 32. D. I. Arnon, *Plant Physiol*, 1949, **24**, 1-15.
- 27 33. J. G. d. Oliveira Filho, J. M. Rodrigues, A. C. F. Valadares, A. B. d. Almeida, T. M.
28 d. Lima, K. P. Takeuchi, C. C. F. Alves, H. A. d. F. Sousa, E. R. d. Silva, F. H. Dyszy
29 and M. B. Egea, *Food Hydrocolloids*, 2019, **92**, 267-275.
- 30 34. P. Raei, M. Khomeiri, A. S. Mahounak, A. Moayedi and M. Kashiri, *Applied Food*
31 *Research*, 2025, **5**, 100727.
- 32 35. Z. Tahsiri, S. Hedayati and M. Niakousari, *Food Hydrocolloids for Health*, 2025,
33 100199.
- 34 36. S. Bishnoi, J. Trifol, R. Moriana and A. C. Mendes, *Food Chemistry*, 2022, **391**,
35 133196.



- 1 37. S. Kim, H. Lim, S. Park, D.-S. Kim and H. W. Kwak, *Industrial Crops and Products*, 2025, **225**, 120564.
- 2
- 3 38. M. M. F. Santos, C. V. B. Grisi, D. A. S. Lima, G. I. B. Florentino, V. C. d. S. Ferreira, M. S. Madruga and F. A. P. d. Silva, *Food Bioscience*, 2024, **62**, 105048.
- 4
- 5 39. S. Rbihi, A. Aboulouard, L. Laallam and A. Jouaiti, *Surfaces and Interfaces*, 2020, **21**, 100708.
- 6
- 7 40. S. Tang, Z. Wang, P. Li, W. Li, C. Li, Y. Wang and P. K. Chu, *Nanomaterials*, 2018, **8**, 930.
- 8
- 9 41. T. Dursun Capar, *Food Packaging and Shelf Life*, 2023, **37**, 101068.
- 10 42. B. Giménez, J. Gómez-Estaca, A. Alemán, M. C. Gómez-Guillén and M. P. Montero, *Food Hydrocolloids*, 2009, **23**, 1322-1327.
- 11
- 12 43. H. M. S. Akhtar, A. Riaz, Y. S. Hamed, M. Abdin, G. Chen, P. Wan and X. Zeng, *International journal of biological macromolecules*, 2018, **118**, 469-477.
- 13
- 14 44. C. Chang and M. T. Nickerson, *Food Science and Technology International*, 2015, **21**, 33-44.
- 15
- 16 45. A. Hasanzati Rostami, A. Motamedzadegan, S. E. Hosseini, M. Rezaei and A. Kamali, *Journal of Aquatic Food Product Technology*, 2017, **26**, 457-467.
- 17
- 18 46. M. M. F. Santos, C. V. B. Grisi, E. G. T. de Souza, J. d. M. Lima, V. C. d. S. Ferreira, L. E. Kurozawa, M. S. Madruga and F. A. P. da Silva, *Food Bioscience*, 2024, **59**, 103897.
- 19
- 20
- 21 47. M. Nikoo, J. M. Regenstein and M. Yasemi, *Foods*, 2023, **12**, 4470.
- 22 48. K. U. Al Awwaly and A. Manab, *Jurnal Ilmu dan Teknologi Hasil Ternak*, 2024.
- 23 49. P. Castellano, L. Mora, E. Escudero, G. Vignolo, R. Aznar and F. Toldrá, *Food Microbiology*, 2016, **59**, 133-141.
- 24
- 25 50. M. Da Rocha, A. Alemán, V. P. Romani, M. E. López-Caballero, M. C. Gómez-Guillén, P. Montero and C. Prentice, *Food hydrocolloids*, 2018, **81**, 351-363.
- 26
- 27 51. M. F. Blankenvoorde, W. Van't Hof, E. Walgreen-Weterings, T. Van Steenberg, H. Brand, E. Veerman and A. Nieuw Amerongen, *Biological chemistry*, 1998, **379**, 1371-1376.
- 28
- 29
- 30 52. T. Anna, K. Alexey, B. Anna, K. Vyacheslav, T. Mikhail and M. Ulia, *Current Research in Nutrition and Food Science Journal*, 2016, **4**, 77-86.
- 31
- 32 53. N. Thombare, A. Mahto, D. Singh, A. R. Chowdhury and M. F. Ansari, *Journal of Polymers and the Environment*, 2023, **31**, 3372-3380.
- 33



54. Z. Mahcene, A. Khelil, S. Hasni, P. K. Akman, F. Bozkurt, K. Birech, M. B. Goudil and F. Tornuk, *International Journal of Biological Macromolecules*, 2020, **145**, 124-132.
55. Y. Roman Maldonado, S. J. Villanueva-Rodríguez, H. M. Hernández-Hernández, E. Terrés and J. Cervantes Martinez, *Foods*, 2024, **13**, 3914.
56. S. Azeez and R. Shenbagaraman, in *Characterization Techniques in Bionanocomposites*, ed. S. Ahmed and C. M. Hussain, Woodhead Publishing, United Kingdom, 2025, pp. 209-227.
57. M. M. Ahmad, K. Chauhan, A. Naz and M. Nayeem, *Pharma Innov*, 2021, **10**, 262-272.
58. R. Pereira, A. Tojeira, D. C. Vaz, A. Mendes and P. Bártolo, *International Journal of Polymer Analysis and Characterization*, 2011, **16**, 449-464.
59. A. Bhimrao Muley, A. Bhalchandra Pandit, R. Satishchandra Singhal and S. Govind Dalvi, *Ultrasonics Sonochemistry*, 2021, **71**, 105385.
60. S. Liu, Y. Li and L. Li, *Carbohydrate Polymers*, 2017, **160**, 62-70.
61. R. K. Mishra, A. B. A. Majeed and A. K. Banthia, *International Journal of Plastics Technology*, 2011, **15**, 82-95.
62. M. Z. Mulla, J. Ahmed, S. F. Habeebullah and A. Vahora, *Journal of Food Measurement and Characterization*, 2022, **16**, 5058-5065.
63. G. Babarinde and O. Fabunmi, *Agricultura Tropica et Subtropica*, 2009, **42**, 151-156.
64. S. K. Jha, S. Sethi, M. Srivastav, A. K. Dubey, R. R. Sharma, D. V. K. Samuel and A. K. Singh, *Journal of Food Engineering*, 2010, **97**, 208-212.
65. A.-H. A. H. El-Shaieny, N. A. A. Abd-Elkarim, E. M. Taha and S. Gebril, *Agriculture*, 2022, **12**, 1699.
66. F. Adetuyi, A. Osagie and A. Adekunle, *Journal of Food Technology*, 2008, **6**, 227-230.
67. M. M. F. Santos, C. V. B. Grisi, D. A. S. Lima, G. I. B. Florentino, V. C. da Silva Ferreira, M. S. Madruga and F. A. P. da Silva, *Food Bioscience*, 2024, **62**, 105048.
68. R. Kanwal, H. Ashraf, M. Sultan, I. Babu, Z. Yasmin, M. Nadeem, M. Asghar, R. R. Shamshiri, S. M. Ibrahim and N. Ahmad, *Sustainability*, 2020, **12**, 7547.
69. A. Abedi, L. Lakzadeh and M. Amouheydari, *Journal of Food Processing and Preservation*, 2021, **45**, e15284.
70. D. Gernah and A. Daagama, *Curr. Res. J. Biol. Sci*, 2012, **4**, 444-448.
71. P. Nisha, R. S. Singhal and A. B. Pandit, *Journal of food engineering*, 2004, **64**, 135-142.



1 72. L. Al-Naamani, J. Dutta and S. Dobretsov, *Nanomaterials*, 2018, **8**, 479. View Article Online
DOI: 10.1039/D5FB00468C
2



1 **Table 1.** Physical and optical properties of the developed films.View Article Online
DOI: 10.1039/D5FB00468C

Parameters	F1	F2	F3	F4
Density (g/cm ³)	0.10 ± 0.001 ^a	0.11 ± 0.005 ^b	0.12 ± 0.002 ^c	0.13 ± 0.001 ^d
Moisture Content (%)	22.37±0.19 ^a	19.48±0.47 ^b	18.18±0.43 ^c	15.92±0.32 ^d
Opacity (%)	0.3 ± 0.001 ^a	0.36 ± 0.002 ^b	0.43 ± 0.003 ^c	0.54 ± 0.008 ^d
Swelling Index (%)	485.7 ± 1.09 ^a	450.5 ± 0.25 ^b	416.9 ± 0.05 ^c	372.1 ± 0.29 ^d
Transparency (%)	5.54 ± 0.017 ^a	5.21 ± 0.05 ^b	4.82 ± 0.01 ^c	4.42 ± 0.02 ^d
Thickness (mm)	0.32 ± 0.015 ^a	0.35 ± 0.01 ^b	0.39 ± 0.005 ^c	0.42 ± 0.005 ^d
Water Solubility (%)	74.11 ± 0.5 ^a	64.81 ± 0.8 ^b	61.44 ± 0.56 ^c	57.48 ± 0.26 ^d
WVP (10 ⁻⁸ g/(m s Pa))	1.99 ± 0.07 ^a	2.14 ± 0.05 ^b	2.3 ± 0.01 ^c	2.5 ± 0.02 ^d

2

3 **Note:** **F1**, P+SA; **F2**, P+SA+1%CBP-PHs; **F3**, P+SA+1.5%CBP-PHs; and **F4**,
4 P+SA+2%CBP-PHs. **P**, pectin; **SA**, sodium alginate; **CBP-PHs**, chicken byproducts protein
5 hydrolysates; **WVP**, Water vapor permeability. All data are averages of three measurements
6 and reported as mean ± standard deviation (SD). Different letters (a, b, c, and d) indicate
7 significant differences between groups at $p < 0.05$ according to Tukey's honestly significant
8 difference (HSD) test.

9



1 **Table 2.** Antioxidant activity of the developed films.

View Article Online
DOI: 10.1039/D5FB00468C

Parameters	F1	F2	F3	F4	Ascorbic acid standard
DPPH (%)	39.2 ± 0.3 ^a	46.26 ± 0.7 ^b	48.42 ± 0.6 ^c	52.87 ± 0.75 ^d	92 ± 1.32 ^e
MCA (%)	21.3 ± 0.4 ^a	31.1 ± 0.2 ^b	36.4 ± 0.5 ^c	44.5 ± 0.7 ^d	82 ± 0.75 ^e
HRSA (%)	24.1 ± 0.2 ^a	31.7 ± 0.3 ^b	39.4 ± 0.4 ^c	48.5 ± 0.5 ^d	86 ± 0.87 ^e

2

3 **Note:** **F1**, P+SA; **F2**, P+SA+1%CBP-PHs; **F3**, P+SA+1.5%CBP-PHs; and **F4**,
4 P+SA+2%CBP-PHs. **P**, pectin; **SA**, sodium alginate; **CBP-PHs**, chicken byproducts protein
5 hydrolysates. **DPPH**, diphenylpicrylhydrazyl assay; **MCA**, metal chelating activity; **HRSA**,
6 hydroxyl radical-scavenging activity. All data are averages of three measurements and reported
7 as mean ± standard deviation (SD). Different letters (a, b, c, and d) indicate significant
8 differences between groups at $p < 0.05$ according to Tukey's honestly significant difference
9 (HSD) test.



1 **Table 3.** Antibacterial properties of the developed films.View Article Online
DOI: 10.1039/D5FB00468C

Films	Antibacterial properties (mm)	
	<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>
F1	Not detected	Not detected
F2	5.77 ± 0.12^a	5.1 ± 0.16^a
F3	16.4 ± 0.24^b	15.67 ± 0.12^b
F4	24.5 ± 0.16^c	21.07 ± 0.12^c

2

3 **Note:** **F1**, P+SA; **F2**, P+SA+1%CBP-PHs; **F3**, P+SA+1.5%CBP-PHs; and **F4**,
4 P+SA+2%CBP-PHs. **P**, pectin; **SA**, sodium alginate; **CBP-PHs**, chicken byproducts protein
5 hydrolysates. All data are averages of three measurements and reported as mean \pm standard
6 deviation (SD). Different letters (a, b, and c) indicate significant differences between groups
7 at $p < 0.05$ according to Tukey's HSD test.

8




Open Access Article. Published on 24 December 2025. Downloaded on 12/25/2025 11:56:41 AM.
This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported Licence.



Table 4. Color analysis of the developed coatings on okra after a storage period of 7 days


Films	Storage period (days)	L*	a*	b*	Browning index (BI)
UC	0	33.3 ± 0.2 ^a	-4.9 ± 0.04 ^a	14.9 ± 0.06 ^a	44.9 ± 0.7 ^a
	1	28.9 ± 0.1 ^a	-4.6 ± 0.01 ^a	14.5 ± 0.02 ^a	55.4 ± 0.2 ^a
	2	26.2 ± 0.1 ^{ab}	-4.1 ± 0.13 ^a	14.3 ± 0.02 ^{ab}	61.5 ± 0.3 ^a
	3	24.8 ± 0.1 ^{ab}	-3.5 ± 0.01 ^{ab}	14.1 ± 0.02 ^{ab}	67.5 ± 0.2 ^a
	4	23.8 ± 0.1 ^{ab}	-3.1 ± 0.02 ^{ab}	13.8 ± 0.1 ^{ab}	70.5 ± 0.2 ^a
	5	19.2 ± 0.1 ^{ab}	-2.6 ± 0.06 ^{ab}	13.5 ± 0.2 ^{ab}	98.9 ± 0.6 ^{ab}
	6	16.4 ± 0.1 ^{ab}	-2.1 ± 0.02 ^{ab}	13.2 ± 0.1 ^c	126.9 ± 0.4 ^{ab}
	7	15.4 ± 0.1 ^{ab}	-1.8 ± 0.02 ^{ab}	12.9 ± 0.4 ^d	139 ± 0.1 ^{ab}
F1	0	34.5 ± 0.2 ^a	-5.0 ± 0.05 ^a	14.8 ± 0.5 ^a	44.5 ± 0.5 ^a
	1	30.4 ± 0.1 ^a	-4.8 ± 0.05 ^a	14.6 ± 0.1 ^a	49.4 ± 0.1 ^a
	2	28.8 ± 0.3 ^{ab}	-4.5 ± 0.06 ^a	14.4 ± 0.2 ^{ab}	53.4 ± 1.1 ^a
	3	27.4 ± 0.1 ^{ab}	-4.1 ± 0.01 ^{ab}	14.3 ± 0.4 ^{ab}	57.5 ± 0.1 ^a
	4	26.8 ± 0.1 ^{ab}	-3.5 ± 0.04 ^{ab}	14.1 ± 0.4 ^{ab}	60.6 ± 0.3 ^a
	5	23.8 ± 0.6 ^{ab}	-3.1 ± 0.01 ^{ab}	13.9 ± 0.4 ^{ab}	71.5 ± 0.3 ^{ab}
	6	19.1 ± 0.1 ^{ab}	-2.4 ± 0.05 ^{ab}	13.5 ± 0.1 ^c	99 ± 0.3 ^{ab}
	7	17.7 ± 0.1 ^{ab}	-2.1 ± 0.04 ^{ab}	13.1 ± 0.1 ^d	113.9 ± 0.9 ^{ab}
F4	0	33.9 ± 0.7 ^a	-5 ± 0.3 ^a	14.8 ± 0.5 ^a	44.8 ± 0.5 ^a
	1	31.1 ± 0.5 ^a	-4.9 ± 0.06 ^a	14.7 ± 0.1 ^a	48.3 ± 0.5 ^a
	2	30.4 ± 0.1 ^{ab}	-4.7 ± 0.02 ^a	14.5 ± 0.2 ^{ab}	49.4 ± 0.2 ^a
	3	29.1 ± 0.6 ^{ab}	-4.4 ± 0.07 ^{ab}	14.4 ± 0.4 ^{ab}	53 ± 0.9 ^a
	4	28.8 ± 0.3 ^{ab}	-4.1 ± 0.01 ^{ab}	14.3 ± 0.4 ^{ab}	53.8 ± 0.2 ^a
	5	26.3 ± 0.1 ^{ab}	-3.8 ± 0.01 ^{ab}	14 ± 0.3 ^{ab}	60.5 ± 0.3 ^{ab}
	6	24.8 ± 0.1 ^{ab}	-3.1 ± 0.01 ^{ab}	13.7 ± 0.1 ^c	66.1 ± 0.4 ^{ab}
	7	23.9 ± 0.1 ^{ab}	-2.5 ± 0.08 ^{ab}	13.4 ± 0.1 ^d	72 ± 0.4 ^{ab}

Note: UC, uncoated okra; F1, P+SA; and F4, P+SA+2%CBP-PHs. P, pectin; SA, sodium alginate; CBP-PHs, chicken byproducts protein hydrolysates. All data are averages of three measurements and reported as mean ± standard deviation (SD). Different letters (a, b, c, and d) indicate significant differences between groups at $p < 0.05$ according to the Bonferroni test.




48x32mm (300 x 300 DPI)





130x46mm (300 x 300 DPI)







215x279mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Open Access Article. Published on 24 December 2025. Downloaded on 12/25/2025 11:56:41 AM.
This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported Licence.




215x279mm (300 x 300 DPI)




21x32mm (300 x 300 DPI)






215x279mm (300 x 300 DPI)






215x279mm (300 x 300 DPI)





18x32mm (300 x 300 DPI)





185x196mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Data Availability Statement

[View Article Online](#)
DOI: 10.1039/D5FB00468C

This manuscript contains all the data necessary to support the findings. Further information needed in this study's findings is available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

