

Prebiotic and antioxidant effects of the extracts from fruits and flowers of *Cereus hildmannianus*

ÉVERTON DA SILVA SANTOS¹, GABRIELA KRAUSOVÁ^{2*}, IVANA HYRŠLOVÁ²,
MARIA DE FÁTIMA PIRES DA SILVA MACHADO³, ARILDO JOSÉ BRAZ DE OLIVEIRA^{1,4},
GIZEM ÖZLÜK⁵, REGINA APARECIDA CORREIA GONÇALVES^{1,4}

¹Graduate Program in Pharmaceutical Sciences, State University of Maringá, Maringá, Brazil

²Department of Microbiology and Technology, Dairy Research Institute, Prague, Czech Republic

³Department of Biotechnology, Genetic and Cell Biology, State University of Maringá, Maringá, Brazil

⁴Department of Pharmacy, State University of Maringá, Maringá, Brazil

⁵Food Engineering Department, Hitit University, Çorum, Türkiye

*Corresponding author: krausova@milcom-as.cz

Citation: Santos É.S., Krausová G., Hyršlová I., Machado M.F.P.S., de Oliveira A.J.B., Özlük G., Gonçalves R.A.C. (2024): Prebiotic and antioxidant effects of the extracts from fruits and flowers of *Cereus hildmannianus*. Czech J. Food Sci., 42: 415–422.

The authors are fully responsible for both the content and the formal aspects of the Electronic Supplementary Material. No editorial adjustments were made.

Electronic Supplementary Material

Supplementary Tables S1–S5

Table S1. Lactobacilli and bifidobacterial strains used in the study

Strain	Species	Origin
CCDM 213	<i>Lactobacillus paracasei</i> ssp. <i>paracasei</i>	human faeces
CCDM 146	<i>Lactobacillus rhamnosus</i>	human faeces
CCDM 466	<i>Lactobacillus helveticus</i>	grasslands, Czech Republic
CCDM 364	<i>Lactobacillus delbrueckii</i> ssp. <i>bulgaricus</i>	yoghurt
CCDM 318	<i>Bifidobacterium dentium</i>	dental caries
BB-12	<i>Bifidobacterium animalis</i> ssp. <i>lactis</i>	original culture
CCDM 775	<i>Bifidobacterium longum</i> ssp. <i>longum</i>	human faeces
CCDM 559	<i>Bifidobacterium bifidum</i>	child faeces

CCDM – Culture Collection of Dairy Microorganisms Laktoflora®

Table S2. Compounds putatively identified by UHPLC-ESI-QToF-MS/MS in extracts of flowers (PE and SE) and fruits (EE and ME) from *Cereus hildmannianus*

Compound	No.	Mf	M_T (m/z)	Precursor ion (m/z)	Error (ppm)	t_R (min)	Fragment ions	Sample	Reference
Succinic acid	1	$C_4H_6O_4$	118.0266	117.0188 [M-H] ⁻	-1.70	0.95	73; 99	PE	HMDB0000254
				117.0188 [M-H] ⁻	-1.70	0.99		SE	
				117.0184 [M-H] ⁻	1.70	0.95		EE	
				117.0184 [M-H] ⁻	1.70	0.96		ME	
Benzoic acid	2	$C_7H_6O_2$	122.0368	121.0288 [M-H] ⁻	-1.65	4.55	77; 91; 92; 93	PE	HMDB0001870
				121.0288 [M-H] ⁻	-1.65	4.56		SE	
				121.0290 [M-H] ⁻	-3.30	4.56		EE	
				121.0285 [M-H] ⁻	0.82	4.56		ME	
Malic acid	3	$C_4H_6O_5$	134.0215	115.0032 [M-H] ⁻	-2.88	1.12	71; 72; 87; 89; 115	PE	HMDB0000744
				115.0033 [M-H] ⁻	0.86	0.84		SE	
				115.0029 [M-H] ⁻	4.34	0.84		EE	
				115.0029 [M-H] ⁻	4.34			ME	
Salicylic acid	4	$C_7H_6O_3$	138.0336	137.0230 [M-H] ⁻	3.64	4.03	93; 94	PE	HMDB0001895
				137.0236 [M-H] ⁻	-0.72	4.06		SE	
				137.0230 [M-H] ⁻	3.64	6.68		EE	
				137.0235 [M-H] ⁻	0.00	6.67		ME	
Vanillin	5	$C_8H_8O_3$	152.0473	151.0387 [M-H] ⁻	1.98	5.16	95; 108; 136; 137	SE	HMDB0012308
Gallic acid	6	$C_7H_6O_5$	170.0215	169.0130 [M-H] ⁻	1.77	5.93	93; 97; 107;	PE	HMDB0005807
				169.0132 [M-H] ⁻	0.59	5.92	111; 123; 125;	SE	
				169.0134 [M-H] ⁻	-0.59	5.93	139; 151	EE	
2-isopropylmalic acid	7	$C_7H_{12}O_5$	176.0684	175.0601 [M-H] ⁻	0.00	4.31	83; 113; 123; 139	PE	NIST 1052052
				175.0605 [M-H] ⁻	-2.28	3.76		SE	
				175.0609 [M-H] ⁻	-4.45	4.35		EE	
				175.0601 [M-H] ⁻	0.00	4.38		ME	
Azelaic acid	8	$C_9H_{16}O_4$	188.1049	187.0965 [M-H] ⁻	0.00	4.86	97; 123; 125; 169	SE	HMDB0000784
				187.0965 [M-H] ⁻	0.00	4.87		EE	
				187.0962 [M-H] ⁻	1.60	4.89		ME	
Citric acid	9	$C_6H_8O_7$	192.0270	191.0194 [M-H] ⁻	-4.18	1.44	85; 87; 111; 129; 147	PE	HMDB0000094
				191.0191 [M-H] ⁻	-2.61	1.38		SE	
				191.0194 [M-H] ⁻	-4.18	0.86		EE	
				191.0186 [M-H] ⁻	0.00	1.53		ME	

Table S2. To be continued

Compound	No.	Mf	$M_T (m/z)$	Precursor ion (m/z)	Error (ppm)	t_R (min)	Fragment ions	Sample	Reference
Ferulic acid	10	$C_{10}H_{10}O_4$	194.0579	193.0498 [M-H] ⁻	-2.59	4.72	85; 89; 95; 131; 133; 149; 161	PE	HMDB0000954
				193.0493 [M-H] ⁻	0.00	6.09		SE	
				193.0496 [M-H] ⁻	-1.55	6.09		EE	
				215.0321 [M-H] ⁻	0.46	1.62		ME	
Glucoheptonic acid	11	$C_7H_{14}O_8$	208.0583	225.0609 [M-H] ⁻	-1.77	0.71	87; 89; 119; 161; 179	PE	Santos et al. (2022)
				225.0611 [M-H] ⁻	-2.66	0.74		SE	
				225.0616 [M-H] ⁻	-4.88	0.76		EE	
				225.0607 [M-H] ⁻	-0.88	0.76		ME	
Piscidic acid	12	$C_{11}H_{12}O_7$	256.0583	237.0398 [M-H ₂ O-H] ⁻	-4.21	5.86	133; 193; 121	PE	HMDB0030809
				237.0395 [M-H ₂ O-H] ⁻	-2.95	5.86		SE	
				237.0397 [M-H ₂ O-H] ⁻	-3.79	5.85		EE	
				237.0389 [M-H ₂ O-H] ⁻	-0.42	3.99		ME	
Hydroxybenzoic acid-hexose	13	$C_{13}H_{16}O_8$	300.0845	299.0759 [M-H] ⁻	-4.01	3.80	93; 94; 137; 138; 209; 261	ME	Santos et al. (2022)
Tianshic acid	14	$C_{18}H_{34}O_5$	330.2406	329.2322 [M-H] ⁻	-3.03	5.53	171; 211; 229	PE	Santos et al. (2022)
				329.2320 [M-H] ⁻	-2.42	5.51		SE	
				329.2328 [M-H] ⁻	-4.85	5.55		EE	
				329.2326 [M-H] ⁻	-4.25	5.50		ME	
Caffeoyl-glucose	15	$C_{15}H_{18}O_9$	342.0950	341.0865 [M-H] ⁻	-2.34	3.68	119; 135; 143; 161; 179	PE	Santos et al. (2022)
				341.0869 [M-H] ⁻	-3.51	4.22		SE	
				341.0865 [M-H] ⁻	-2.34	4.00		ME	
Ferulic acid-hexose	16	$C_{16}H_{20}O_9$	356.1107	355.1025 [M-H] ⁻	-2.81	4.18	134; 149; 175; 160; 178; 193	PE	Santos et al. (2022)
				355.1029 [M-H] ⁻	-3.94	4.17		SE	
				355.1032 [M-H] ⁻	-4.78	4.24		EE	
				355.1020 [M-H] ⁻	-1.40	4.87		ME	
Sinapic acid-hexoside	17	$C_{17}H_{22}O_{10}$	386.1212	385.1138 [M-H] ⁻	-5.97	4.93	164; 179; 190; 205; 208; 223	EE	Santos et al. (2022)
Dihydroxybenzoic acid-O-dipentoside	18	$C_{17}H_{22}O_{12}$	418.1111	385.1125 [M-H] ⁻	-2.59	4.97	152; 163; 179; 241; 285	ME	Santos et al. (2022)
				417.1027 [M-H] ⁻	-4.07	4.46		ME	
Benzyl alcohol-dihexose	19	$C_{19}H_{28}O_{11}$	432.1631	431.1550 [M-H] ⁻	-0.69	4.04	101; 135; 149; 164; 179; 208; 223	EE	Santos et al. (2022)

Table S2. To be continued

Compound	No.	Mf	$M_T (m/z)$	Precursor ion (m/z)	Error (ppm)	t_R (min)	Fragment ions	Sample	Reference
Lucuminic acid	20	$C_{19}H_{26}O_{12}$	446.1424	445.1335 [M-H] ⁻	-2.24	3.74	75; 103; 119; 131; 161; 401	ME	HMDB0035007
Kaempferol 3-O-rutinoside	21	$C_{27}H_{30}O_{15}$	594.1585	593.1508 [M-H] ⁻	-3.87	4.44	235; 255; 267; 285; 286	PE	Santos et al. (2022)
				593.1506 [M-H] ⁻	-3.54	4.43		SE	
				593.1509 [M-H] ⁻	-4.04	4.26		EE	
				593.1493 [M-H] ⁻	-1.34	4.47		ME	
Quercetin 3-O-rutinoside	22	$C_{27}H_{30}O_{16}$	610.1533	609.1450 [M-H] ⁻	-3.44	4.35	178; 241; 242; 285; 297	PE	HMDB0003249
				609.1455 [M-H] ⁻	-4.26	4.38		SE	
				609.1463 [M-H] ⁻	-5.58	4.42		EE	
				609.1440 [M-H] ⁻	-1.80	4.40		ME	
Narcissin	23	$C_{28}H_{32}O_{16}$	624.1690	623.1610 [M-H] ⁻	-4.81	4.50	165; 225; 242; 243; 286	PE	Santos et al. (2022)
				623.1616 [M-H] ⁻	-5.77	4.48		SE	
				623.1611 [M-H] ⁻	-4.97	4.49		EE	
Isorhamnetin 3-O-sophoroside- 7-O-rhamnoside	24	$C_{34}H_{42}O_{21}$	786.2218	785.2119 [M-H] ⁻	-3.18	4.34	179; 357; 623	PE	Santos et al. (2022)
				785.2133 [M-H] ⁻	-4.96	4.36		SE	
				785.2140 [M-H] ⁻	-5.85	4.39		EE	

UHPLC-ESI-QToF/MS/MS – ultra-high performance liquid chromatography-coupled with electrospray ionisation/quadrupole-time-of-flight/mass spectrometry/mass spectrometry; Mf – molecular formula; M_T – theoretical exact mass; m/z – mass-to-charge ratio; PE – petal extract; SE – sepal extract; EE – epicarp extract; ME – meso-carp extract

Table S3. Putative identification of compounds by UHPLC-ESI-QToF-MS/MS in extracts of fruits (EE and ME) and flowers (PE and SE) from *Cereus hildmannianus*

Compound	No.	Mf	M_T (m/z)	Fruits		Flowers		Class
				EE	ME	PE	SE	
Succinic acid	1	C ₄ H ₆ O ₄	118.0266	√	–	√	√	carboxylic acid
Benzoic acid	2	C ₇ H ₆ O ₂	122.0368	√	√	√	√	carboxylic acid
Malic acid	3	C ₄ H ₆ O ₅	134.0215	√	√	√	√	carboxylic acid
Salicylic acid	4	C ₇ H ₆ O ₃	138.0336	√	√	√	√	carboxylic acid
Vanillin	5	C ₈ H ₈ O ₃	152.0473	–	–	–	√	phenolic aldehyde
Gallic acid	6	C ₇ H ₆ O ₅	170.0215	√	–	√	√	phenolic acid
2-isopropylmalic acid	7	C ₇ H ₁₂ O ₅	176.0684	√	√	√	√	carboxylic acid
Azelaic acid	8	C ₉ H ₁₆ O ₄	188.1049	√	√	–	√	phenolic acid
Citric acid	9	C ₆ H ₈ O ₇	192.0270	√	√	√	√	phenolic acid
Ferulic acid	10	C ₁₀ H ₁₀ O ₄	194.0579	√	√	√	√	phenolic acid
Glucosheptonic acid	11	C ₇ H ₁₄ O ₈	208.0583	√	√	√	√	phenolic acid
Piscidic acid	12	C ₁₁ H ₁₂ O ₇	256.0583	√	√	√	√	phenolic acid
Hydroxybenzoic acid-hexose	13	C ₁₃ H ₁₆ O ₈	300.0845	–	√	–	–	phenolic acid
Tianshic acid	14	C ₁₈ H ₃₄ O ₅	330.2406	√	√	√	√	phenolic acid
Caffeoyl-glucose	15	C ₁₅ H ₁₈ O ₉	342.0950	–	√	√	√	phenolic acid
Ferulic acid-hexose	16	C ₁₆ H ₂₀ O ₉	356.1107	√	√	√	√	phenolic acid
Sinapic acid-hexoside	17	C ₁₇ H ₂₂ O ₁₀	386.1212	√	√	–	–	phenolic acid
Dihydroxybenzoic acid-O-dipentoside	18	C ₁₇ H ₂₂ O ₁₂	418.1111	–	√	–	–	phenolic acid
Benzyl alcohol-dihexose	19	C ₁₉ H ₂₈ O ₁₁	432.1631	√	–	–	–	aromatic alcohol
Lucuminic acid	20	C ₁₉ H ₂₆ O ₁₂	446.1424	–	√	–	–	phenolic acid
Kaempferol 3-O-rutinoside	21	C ₂₇ H ₃₀ O ₁₅	594.1585	√	√	√	√	flavonol
Quercetin 3-O-rutinoside	22	C ₂₇ H ₃₀ O ₁₆	610.1533	√	√	√	√	flavonol
Narcissin	23	C ₂₈ H ₃₂ O ₁₆	624.1690	√	–	√	√	flavonol
Isorhamnetin 3-O-sophoroside-7-O-rhamnoside	24	C ₃₄ H ₄₂ O ₂₁	786.2218	√	–	√	√	flavonol
Number of phenolic compounds, organic acids and derivatives				15	17	13	15	20
Number of flavonoids				4	2	4	4	4
Total number of phenolic compounds				19	19	17	19	24

UHPLC-ESI-QToF/MS/MS – ultra-high performance liquid chromatography-coupled with electrospray ionisation/quadrupole-time-of-flight/mass spectrometry/mass spectrometry; Mf – molecular formula; M_T – theoretical exact mass; m/z – mass-to-charge ratio; EE – epicarp extract; ME – mesocarp extract; PE – petal extract; SE – sepal extract; √ – identified in sample

Table S4. Measurement of the pH of extracts from *Cereus hildmannianus* stems by bifidobacteria and lactobacilli strains, the values are presented as a change of pH after 24 h of cultivation (Δ pH)

Bacterial strains	BM	WCH	GR	Fruit		Flower	
				EE	ME	SE	PE
<i>Lactocaseibacillus paracasei</i> ssp. <i>paracasei</i> CCDM 213	0.63	2.14	2.46	1.87	3.48	1.65	1.57
<i>Lactocaseibacillus rhamnosus</i> CCDM 146	0.78	2.20	1.35	1.87	2.24	1.67	1.66
<i>Lactocaseibacillus helveticus</i> CCDM 466	0.71	2.31	1.68	1.96	2.36	1.78	1.74
<i>Lactocaseibacillus delbrueckii</i> ssp. <i>bulgaricus</i> CCDM 364	0.66	2.20	1.06	1.93	2.32	1.73	1.71
<i>Bifidobacterium dentium</i> CCDM 318	1.23	2.25	1.78	2.08	2.40	2.03	2.02
<i>Bifidobacterium longum</i> ssp. <i>longum</i> CCDM 775	1.05	2.09	0.95	2.76	2.38	1.50	1.74
<i>Bifidobacterium bifidum</i> CCDM 559	1.43	2.24	1.00	2.02	2.39	1.82	1.80
<i>Bifidobacterium animalis</i> ssp. <i>lactis</i> BB-12®	1.22	2.37	1.33	2.10	2.43	2.03	2.03

CCDM – Culture Collection of Dairy Microorganisms; BM – basal medium with no sugar (negative control); WCH – Wilkins-Chalgren anaerobic broth (growth control); GR – BM with Orafit® GR chicory inulin (positive control); EE – epicarp extract; ME – mesocarp extract; SE – sepal extract; PE – petal extract

Table S5. Fermentability of extracts from *Cereus hildmannianus* by *Bifidobacterium* and *Lactobacillus* species, given as a change in absorbance (at 620 nm) after 24 h of cultivation ($\Delta A_{620 \text{ nm}}$)

Bacterial species/strains	BM	WCH	GR	Fruit		Flower	
				EE	ME	SE	PE
<i>Lactocaseibacillus paracasei</i> ssp. <i>paracasei</i> CCDM 213	0.32 ± 0.12 ^a	0.73 ± 0.10 ^d	0.86 ± 0.07 ^e	0.61 ± 0.04 ^c	0.81 ± 0.06 ^{de}	0.48 ± 0.11 ^b	0.53 ± 0.07 ^{bc}
<i>Lactocaseibacillus rhamnosus</i> CCDM 146	0.36 ± 0.11 ^a	0.85 ± 0.09 ^d	0.48 ± 0.15 ^b	0.70 ± 0.07 ^c	0.93 ± 0.08 ^d	0.67 ± 0.05 ^c	0.66 ± 0.09 ^c
<i>Lactocaseibacillus helveticus</i> CCDM 466	0.24 ± 0.04 ^a	0.79 ± 0.23 ^d	0.35 ± 0.03 ^{ab}	0.49 ± 0.06 ^{bc}	0.75 ± 0.22 ^d	0.53 ± 0.07 ^c	0.50 ± 0.14 ^{bc}
<i>Lactocaseibacillus delbrueckii</i> ssp. <i>bulgaricus</i> CCDM 364	0.27 ± 0.05 ^a	0.80 ± 0.16 ^c	0.38 ± 0.17 ^{ab}	0.45 ± 0.16 ^{ab}	0.78 ± 0.23 ^c	0.51 ± 0.18 ^b	0.50 ± 0.23 ^b
<i>Bifidobacterium dentium</i> CCDM 318	0.44 ± 0.14 ^a	0.86 ± 0.09 ^d	0.54 ± 0.12 ^b	0.78 ± 0.06 ^{cd}	1.02 ± 0.05 ^e	0.79 ± 0.04 ^{cd}	0.71 ± 0.02 ^c
<i>Bifidobacterium longum</i> ssp. <i>longum</i> CCDM 775	0.27 ± 0.05 ^a	0.78 ± 0.13 ^c	0.36 ± 0.14 ^{ab}	0.41 ± 0.23 ^{ab}	0.83 ± 0.24 ^c	0.49 ± 0.10 ^b	0.47 ± 0.08 ^b
<i>Bifidobacterium bifidum</i> CCDM 559	0.27 ± 0.09 ^a	0.80 ± 0.09 ^c	0.34 ± 0.08 ^a	0.63 ± 0.07 ^b	0.83 ± 0.10 ^c	0.66 ± 0.04 ^b	0.62 ± 0.07 ^b
<i>Bifidobacterium animalis</i> ssp. <i>lactis</i> BB-12®	0.34 ± 0.03 ^a	0.91 ± 0.07 ^d	0.42 ± 0.13 ^a	0.71 ± 0.07 ^{bc}	0.98 ± 0.11 ^d	0.72 ± 0.06 ^c	0.61 ± 0.11 ^b

^{a–e}Different superscript letters indicate statistically significant differences ($P < 0.05$) by the multiple comparison (LSD) test; values are mean ± SD (standard deviation); CCDM – Culture Collection of Dairy Microorganisms; BM – basal medium with no sugar (negative control); WCH – Wilkins-Chalgren anaerobic broth (growth control); GR – BM with Orafit® GR chicory inulin (positive control); EE – epicarp extract; ME – mesocarp extract; SE – sepal extract; PE – petal extract