



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Production of nanoparticles from resistant starch via a simple three-step physical treatment*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/195906/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Apostolidis, E, Stergiou, A, Kioupis, D et al. (4 more authors) (2023) Production of nanoparticles from resistant starch via a simple three-step physical treatment. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 137. 108412. ISSN 0268-005X

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2022.108412>

© 2022, Elsevier. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

1 **Full Title:** Production of nanoparticles from resistant starch via a simple three-step
2 physical treatment

3 Apostolidis Eftychios^{1,2}, Stergiou Anastasios³, Kioupis Dimitrios⁴, Amin Sadeghpour²,
4 Paximada Paraskevi², Kakali Glikeria⁴, Mandala Ioanna^{1*}

5 **Author Affiliations**

6 ¹Agricultural University of Athens, Dept. Food Science & Human Nutrition, Laboratory
7 of Food Process Engineering, Iera Odos 75, 11855, Votanikos, Athens, Greece.

8 ²School of Food Science and Nutrition, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK.

9 ³Theoretical and Physical Chemistry Institute, National Hellenic Research Foundation,
10 48 Vassileos Constantinou Avenue, 11635 Athens, Greece.

11 ⁴National Technical University of Athens, School of Chemical Engineering, Laboratory
12 of Inorganic and Analytical Chemistry, 9 Heroon Polytechniou St., 15773, Athens,
13 Greece.

14 *Author to whom correspondence should be addressed to.

15 **Abstract**

16 The purpose of this study was to physically process Hi-maize 260[®] granules and
17 investigate the size reduction towards obtaining starch nano-particles, stable in
18 aqueous suspensions. We developed a novel sequential three-step physical process
19 consisting of hydrothermal gelatinization, nano-precipitation and ultrasonic
20 treatment. Ultrasonication proved to be a key-step to dismantle the ununiform
21 agglomerates nanoparticles produced by the nanoprecipitation of the hydrothermally
22 gelatinized starch, furnishing uniform nanoparticles (170nm). This was unveiled by
23 complementary Dynamic Light Scattering (DLS) and electrophoretic mobility (Z-
24 potential) studies, as well as fluorescence spectroscopy. Notably, this 3-step process
25 reduced the size of the starch particles to nano dimensions without destroying their
26 crystallographic structure, as shown by X-ray diffraction (XRD) and Small Angle X-ray
27 Scattering (SAXS), or changing. their chemical integrity, as validated by Fourier
28 transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR) and Thermogravimetric Analysis (TGA)
29 analyses. Finally, we evaluated the hydrophobicity of the isolated nanoparticles by
30 employing the sessile drop method, witnessing an increment to the hydrophobicity as
31 a result of size reduction. Collectively, we developed a handy protocol enroot to
32 reduce the size of RS2 starch particles enabling its application in an array of meaningful
33 real-world food applications.

34 **Keywords:** Physical modification, Resistant starch type 2, Starch nano-particles,
35 Morphology

36 **Introduction**

37 Starch is one of the most abundant storage polysaccharides in plant seed amyloplasts.
38 It is a type of natural carbohydrate mainly composed of variable ratios of two distinct
39 glucose molecules, amylose and amylopectin (Junejo et al., 2022). Structurally, starch
40 is a homopolysaccharide that contains amylose (AM), a D-glucosyl linear polymer chain
41 connected by α -(1,4)-glycosidic linkage and amylopectin (AP), a highly branched
42 polymer with α -(1,4)-glucosidic linkages in the glucan chain and α -(1,6)-glucosidic
43 bonds at the branch points after every 20 to 30 glucose units (Vamadevan & Bertoft,
44 2015). The molecular structure is based on these components on different ratios

45 (~70%/30%, AP/AM for native starch) that occur in the form of discrete, semi-
46 crystalline aggregate forms named starch granules (Lawal, 2019; Zhong et al., 2020).
47 Starch granules exhibit an “onion-like” structure with semi-crystalline growth rings, of
48 alternating amorphous and crystalline lamellae while the cluster arrangement of
49 amylopectin side chains is responsible for the crystallinity (Angellier et al., 2005;
50 Bertoft, 2017; Copeland et al., 2009; Hernandez-Hernandez et al., 2022).

51 Concerning its nutritional aspect, starch is divided into three categories based on the
52 hydrolysis rate: rapidly digested starch (RDS), slowly digested starch (SDS), and
53 resistant starch (RS) (Englyst et al., 1982, 1992). Among them, RS is a valuable
54 ingredient to the food industry that exhibits various benefits for metabolic health,
55 whereas its importance is further substantiated by the fact that the RS type holds a
56 health claim from the EFSA. The digestion of starch is influenced by many parameters,
57 including the amylose:amylopectin ratio, its granular architecture, shape, size,
58 molecular composition, and crystalline structure. These structural patterns
59 significantly affect its thermal, digestive and soluble properties in water at room
60 temperature, leading to functional limitations in its application in the food industry
61 (Benmoussa et al., 2007; Chung et al., 2011; L. J. Zhu et al., 2011). Efforts are geared
62 towards adjusting all these parameters, that affect the rate and amount of digestion
63 of starch granules, in order to overcome limitations (e.g as stabilizer) and to fulfil novel
64 approaches.

65 The uses of starch are numerous and being a natural polymer has been primarily
66 utilized as a filler, a thickener, a sizing agent and a stabilizer due to its availability, low
67 cost and biodegradability. In order to implement starch in such applications (Dong et
68 al., 2022; Lin et al., 2022; Torres & De-la-Torre, 2022; Troncoso & Torres, 2020). a
69 series of physical, chemical, genetical, and enzymatical modification methodologies
70 have been proposed (Maniglia et al., 2020).

71 Physical treatment is among the most practical and environmentally benign
72 techniques for creating novel nano-sized starches because of its ease, safety, and
73 sustainability. Generally, starch can be physically treated to tailor-make its water
74 solubility and granule size, which can lead to nano-particles or hydrophobic starch

75 particles that have been effectively used to stabilize Pickering emulsions (Bu et al.,
76 2020; Ko & Kim, 2021; Saari et al., 2017; Timgren et al., 2013).

77 Food-grade nano-particles can be produced using several different physical methods,
78 such as irradiation, anti-solvent nano-precipitation, microemulsion, electrospinning or
79 electrostatic spraying mechanical treatments employing extrusion, high pressure
80 homogenization, ultrasonication and ball milling (Akhavan & Ataevarjovi, 2012;
81 Apostolidis & Mandala, 2020; Chutia & Mahanta, 2021; Dong et al., 2021; Duyen &
82 Van Hung, 2021; Huang et al., 2022; Lin et al., 2022). The range for applications is very
83 wide, with environment-friendly “green” based SNPs being used as fluorescent
84 indicators and probes for biomedical applications, chemical sensing and food
85 packaging, due to their ease of preparation, low cost, and efficient fluorescence
86 emission (Chao et al., 2020; Guida et al., 2021; X. Liu et al., 2018; Qiu et al., 2019;
87 Shibata et al., 2022; Yan et al., 2015).

88 Herein, we developed a novel sequential three-step physical process consisting of:
89 hydrothermal gelatinization, nano-precipitation and ultrasonic treatment. During the
90 first step, the RS starch granules were treated with water in an autoclave reactor. The
91 heating process promotes gelatinization of the starch, increases the water solubility,
92 the water binding, and the emulsion capacity, based to the temperature and the time
93 of the treatment (Dundar & Gocmen, 2013). The effect of high temperatures in
94 increasing swelling power and solubility has been noted in RS produced by Job’s tears
95 starch (Q. Yang et al., 2021), whereas in pea starch, high temperature treatment has
96 been found to promote the formation of crystalline regions, as shown by the X-ray
97 diffraction (Zhou et al., 2019). Although the digestion kinetics are out of the scope of
98 the current work, it should be noted that recent reports suggest that hydrothermal
99 autoclave treatment impacts positively the digestibility of starch (Akanbi et al., 2019).

100 The second step of the physical process involved the nanoprecipitation of the
101 gelatinized starch by adding ethanol as the non-solvent. Nanoprecipitation has been
102 applied to a multitude of starch varieties, including waxy corn, potato, sweet potato
103 high amylose corn, and pea (Qin et al., 2016). It is however known that during
104 nanoprecipitation there is strong tendency towards agglomeration of the individual
105 nanoparticles additional treatment is required to obtain uniformly distributed

106 nanoparticles. To this, the third step of our approach was to treat the agglomerated
107 nanoparticles, produced by the nanoprecipitation of the hydrothermally gelatinized
108 starch, with ultrasounds. Combining nanoprecipitation and ultrasonication in
109 processing of starches has been proposed as an efficient and low-cost option (Chang
110 et al., 2017; Noor et al., 2022; R. Wang & Zhou, 2022). Ultrasonic treatment of starches
111 has reportedly a beneficial impact to the physical properties of RS 2 type starches
112 (Noor et al., 2021) and affects the crystallinity of the starch (Babu et al., 2019; Noor et
113 al., 2021; H. Wang et al., 2020; Q. Y. Yang et al., 2019) without prompting damage (Hu
114 et al., 2014; J. Zhu et al., 2012).

115 Collectively, our three-step physical process combines all the major advantages of the
116 three individual physical processes. To the best of our knowledge, a such approach
117 has not been applied to RS2 type starches. Our findings provide a better
118 understanding of the mechanisms taking place during size reduction of starch particles
119 through physical processing methods.

120 **2. Materials and methods**

121 **2.1. Materials**

122 High amylose maize starch (Hi-Maize 260[®]) was kindly provided by Ingredion
123 Incorporated (Manchester, UK). The amylose amount was 65.2%, calculated by the
124 method described in Subsection 2.3. and its moisture content was 12.44% w/w
125 calculated using the AACC standard method (AACC, 2000). Absolute ethanol (98%) was
126 obtained from Sigma-Aldrich and Milli-Q water was used for all the experiments.

127 **2.2. Preparation of physical starch nano-particles via autoclaving (heat 128 gelatinization) and precipitation-ultrasonication**

129 Starch nano-particles were prepared using a similar method to the one previously
130 described by Saari et al. (2017), with slight modifications (Saari et al., 2017). In
131 particular, High amylose maize starch suspension (5%, w/v) were prepared by adding
132 dry starch in distilled deionized water under mechanical stirring (RCT Basic S1 Digital
133 Hot Plate Magnetic Stirrer, IKA[®]-Werke GmbH & Co. KG, Germany), at a speed of 1000
134 rpm, at room temperature (27 ± 1 °C). The starch suspension was transferred to an

135 autoclave reactor with bomb geometry. The reactor was placed in a preheated oven
136 at 150 °C and gelatinized for 30 min, starting from the time the suspension reached
137 equilibrium according to the thermocouple's indication. After heating, the autoclave
138 was transferred in an ice bath for 5 min in order to cool down. The gelatinized starch
139 paste was then placed in a beaker and stirred at 1500 rpm using an IKA Eurostar digital
140 stirrer (IKA Labortechnik Janke & Kunkel, Staufen, Germany).

141 Then, the antisolvent ethanol was poured dropwise into the agitated starch solution
142 at a concentration of 1:1 for precipitation to take place, and the solution was left for
143 2 hours under stirring. The slurry was centrifuged at 9000 rpm for 10 min at 4 °C
144 (Hettich Universal 320-R, Germany). Next, the sediment starch nano-particles were
145 freeze-dried at -60 °C for 48 hrs using a freeze dryer (MC4L, UNICRYO, Germany) and
146 pulverized using a mortar and pestle; the resulting nano-particles were named
147 aggregated-SNPs (a-SNPs).

148 In the next step, the produced a-SNPs were dispersed in Milli-Q water to create 1%
149 w/v dispersion. Subsequently, the produced dispersion was homogenized in an ice
150 bath using ultrasound treatment for different time intervals, up to 75 min (15 min, 30
151 min, 45 min, 60 min, 75 min), to control particle size. Specifically, ultrasonication was
152 conducted using a probe sonicator (Sonopuls 3200, Bandelin GmbH & Co, Berlin,
153 Germany) operating at an amplitude of 40%, pulsation 3 sec on/ 3 sec off. Notably,
154 particle samples processed for 30 min and 60 min were named a-SNPs 30 min and US-
155 SNPs respectively. Ultrasonicated samples were freeze-dried to obtain dry samples for
156 characterization.

157 **2.3. Amylose content**

158 The amylose content of native untreated starch and starch nano-particles was
159 determined using a concanavalin A method using the Megazyme
160 amylose/amylopectin assay kit (Megazyme Ltd., Bray, Ireland). The amylose content
161 was determined using the Megazyme equation (Eq. 1.) and by measuring the
162 absorbance of the sample at 510 nm using a UV-Vis scanning spectrophotometer
163 (Shimadzu, UV-2600, Kyoto, Japan).

164
$$\text{Amylose content} = \frac{\text{Absorbance (Con A Supernatant)}}{\text{Absorbance (Total Starch Aliquot)}} \times 66.8 \quad \text{Eq. 1.}$$

165 **2.4. Particle size distribution**

166 Particle size distribution of native starch and nano-particles was determined, using
167 Dynamic Light Scattering (DLS) (Zetasizer nano Zs, Malvern Instruments Ltd.,
168 Worcestershire, UK) (Jeong & Shin, 2018). Water and starch have refractive indices of
169 1.33 and 1.53, respectively, while the absorbance of starch granules was 0.1. The
170 particle size was reported as the mean hydrodynamic diameter (Z-average) for the
171 starch samples at a concentration 0.01% w/v in Milli-Q water. Furthermore, we
172 studied the decomposition of agglomerated particles as a function of time using
173 ultrasonication for a time interval of 15 to 75 min. Each measurement was repeated
174 three times.

175 **2.5. Zeta Potential measurements**

176 The zeta-potentials of starch dispersions in Milli-Q water (0.01% w/v) were measured
177 at 25 °C using a laser Doppler electrophoresis apparatus (Malvern Nano-Zetasizer ZS,
178 Worcestershire, UK). All measurements were performed in triplicate for each sample.

179 **2.6. Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy analysis (FTIR)**

180 The infrared spectra of samples were acquired using a JASCO 4200 Type A Fourier
181 transform infrared spectrophotometer (Jasco, Easton, MD, USA) that can identify any
182 structural changes. The FTIR spectra were obtained within a wavenumber range from
183 400 to 4000 cm^{-1} and a resolution of 4 cm^{-1} , using the KBr pellet technique in
184 Transmittance mode. The samples were combined with dried FTIR-grade potassium
185 bromide (10 mg sample to 300 mg KBr) using an agate mortar and pestle, and the
186 mixtures were pressed to form disk shape pellets at 10 tn/cm^2 using a manual,
187 hydraulic pressure system (PE-MAN, Perkin Elmer, Germany).

188 **2.7. Swelling power and water solubility**

189 The solubility and swelling power of starch samples were analyzed by the procedure
190 followed by (Aytunga et al., 2010; Mandala & Bayas, 2004) with slight modifications.
191 Starch suspensions (2% w/v in Milli-Q water) were placed in 250-mL DURAN® glass

192 bottles to prevent evaporation. The samples were next heated in an oil bath in a
193 Temperature range of 50 °C to 140 °C, with measurements recorded every 10 °C. The
194 total heating time was 30 min under stirring (300 rpm) using an RCT Basic S1 Digital
195 Hot Plate Magnetic Stirrer (IKA®-Werke GmbH & Co. KG, Germany). After
196 gelatinization, the samples were allowed to equilibrate for 30 min at room
197 temperature and then centrifuged at 5000 rpm for 15 min at 4 °C. The precipitate was
198 separated by centrifugation from the supernatant and weighted (W_p). The dry solids
199 in precipitated paste W_{ps} and supernatant W_s were estimated after drying both phases
200 at 130 °C for 1 h in an air oven (Memmert, Schwabach, Germany). Before weighing the
201 glass Petri dishes that contained the samples, samples were stored in a desiccator for
202 30 min. The fraction of dry mass of solubles in supernatant to the dry mass of whole
203 starch sample W_o is expressed as solubility, and calculated with the Eq. 2.:

$$204 \quad \text{Solubility} = \frac{W_s}{W_o} \times 100 \% \quad \text{Eq. 2.}$$

205 The ratio of the weight of swollen starch granules after centrifugation (g) to their dry
206 mass (g) is expressed as swelling power and calculated with the Eq. 3.:

$$207 \quad \text{Swelling Power} = \frac{W_p}{W_{ps}} \quad \text{Eq. 3.}$$

208 **2.8. Crystallinity of starch particles using X-Ray Diffraction**

209 XRD analysis of native starch, a-SNP and SNP was performed as previously described
210 (Apostolidis et al., 2021; Apostolidis & Mandala, 2020). For the subsequent analysis,
211 an advanced X-ray Diffractometer (D8 Adv., Bruker, Germany), operating at 40 mA and
212 40 kV, was employed. Samples scanning using Cu Ka irradiation with a wavelength of
213 0.1542 nm as the X-ray source, was firstly applied. The X-ray generator was set to run
214 at a diffraction angle (2θ) of 3°–35° with a step size of 0.05°/sec. In brief, the degree
215 of crystallinity of a sample, based on the XRD pattern, was evaluated using the
216 software Bruker Diffrac. Eva Version 3.1. Firstly, an automatic plot of the baseline of
217 the curve (black line) and the background of the crystalline peaks (red line) was
218 designed. Subsequently, the white area of the crystalline peaks along with white and

219 grey total area of the peaks were calculated, as shown in Supplementary Fig. 1. The
220 degree of crystallinity was calculated using Eq. (4).

221

$$222 \quad \% \text{ crystallinity} = \frac{\text{area of crystalline peaks}}{\text{total area of the peaks}} \times 100 \quad \text{Eq. 4}$$

223 **2.9. Small Angle X-ray Scattering (SAXS)**

224 We conducted the SAXS experiments with the SAXSpace small angle X-ray camera
225 from Anton Paar (Graz, Austria). The set-up and standard data reduction procedures
226 are described (Sanver et al., 2020). Briefly, we used a line focused collimation X-ray
227 beam with the beam length of 20 mm and 0.5 mm width. The sample to detector
228 distance of around 317 mm was used, although the exact distance was obtained using
229 silver behenate powder. Each sample was put into 1.5 mm capillary and exposed for
230 3600 s. The instrument was equipped with a sealed-tube Cu anode X-ray generator,
231 operated at 40 kV and 50 mA, producing X-rays at wavelength $\lambda = 0.154$ nm. The setup
232 was also operated at high intensity mode providing us with minimum accessible
233 scattering vector value, q_{\min} of 0.12 nm^{-1} ($q = 4\pi/\lambda \sin(\theta)$, where 2θ is the scattering
234 angle). All the SAXS experiments were performed 25°C .

235 The experimental scattering profiles were modelled using a unified equation
236 described by Beaucage and co-workers (Beaucage, 2004; Beaucage & Schaefer, 1994).
237 The model comprised of functions describing scattering from starch granules at
238 different structural levels. The power law with exponential functions are used to
239 explain the decay behavior at ultra-small angles and the Lorentzian functions are
240 applied to simulate the diffraction peaks from lamellae and the interhelical
241 correlations. The general form of the unified function can be represented according
242 to the Eq. 5.

243

$$244 \quad I(q) = \sum_{\text{levels}} B_i \exp\left(\frac{-q^2 R_i^2}{3}\right) \left\{ \frac{[\text{erf}(qR_i/\sqrt{6})]^3}{q} \right\}^p + \frac{L_i}{1 + \left[\frac{(q - q_i)}{w} \right]^2} \quad \text{Eq. 5}$$

245 In the above equation, the first term accounts for the decay in the scattering intensity
246 with two structural limits; the low-q limit is considered by the error function and the
247 high-q limit is described by exponential functions. Both are associated with
248 characteristic radius of gyration R_g . This characteristic length also determines the
249 inflexion point where two Porod decay rates are identified. The second term describes
250 the broad diffractions peaks. Two Lorentzian terms were used, the first one simulates
251 the diffraction from lamellar spacing accounting for alternating amorphous and semi-
252 crystalline domains of amylopectin at around 0.4 nm^{-1} (equivalent to 15.7 nm). The
253 second Lorentzian peak function simulates the diffraction from the interhelical
254 correlations in B-type starch. This peak occurs at around 3.9 nm^{-1} (equivalent to 1.6
255 nm spacing).

256 The average d-spacing (d) between the polymer aggregates was estimated from the
257 peak position (q_0), according to the Bragg equation Eq. 6.

$$258 \quad d = \frac{2\pi}{q_0} \quad \text{Eq. 6.}$$

259 The average thickness of the polymer aggregates was measured by using the Scherrer
260 equation (Eq. 7), where K is the shape factor and w is the broadening of the correlation
261 peak (Maurya et al., 2019).

$$262 \quad h = k * \frac{2\pi}{w} \quad \text{Eq. 7.}$$

263 **2.10. Steady-state and time-resolved Fluorescence**

264 Three different samples were prepared and analyzed by steady-state and time-
265 resolved fluorescence: the untreated nano-starch, as well as the nano-particles
266 prepared by ultrasonication for 30 and 60 min. Each nano-starch powder sample was
267 dispersed in Milli-Q water at a final concentration of 0.01 w/v using mild magnetic
268 stirring for 30 min before measuring. Each dispersion sample (3 mL) placed in a quartz
269 cuvette (1 cm path length). Steady-state emission spectra were recorded on a Horiba
270 GL3-21 Fluorolog-3 Jobin-Yvon-Spex spectrofluorometer (Horiba, Kyoto, Japan),
271 equipped with a 450-W Xenon lamp as the excitation source and a TBX photomultiplier
272 (250-850 nm) as the detector, for photoluminescence (PL) measurements. Starch

273 nano-particles were excited at 320 nm. Data were recorded and collected via the
274 Horiba Fluorescence V3 software (Horiba Ltd., Kyoto, Japan). For the pico-second
275 time-resolved fluorescence spectra, a time-correlated single-photon-counting (TCSPC)
276 method via a Fluorohub single-photon counting controller, a laser diode as an
277 excitation source (NanoLED, 376 nm, pulse duration < 200 ps), and a TBX-PMT
278 detector (250-850 nm) all by Horiba Ltd., Kyoto, Japan was applied. Data were
279 recorded and collected with the Data Station software, whereas the lifetimes were
280 determined by the Data Acquisition Software (DAS), all provided by Horiba Scientific,
281 Piscataway, NJ, USA.

282 **2.11 Stability of starch using thermogravimetric analysis (TGA)**

283 TGA is typically used to assess the thermal stability of different starch samples by
284 measuring the weight variations upon progressing temperature rise.
285 Characteristically, TGA was performed for dried samples (~6 mg) under nitrogen gas
286 circumstances in order to establish an inert atmosphere in the chamber, with a flow
287 of 20 mL/min, and the samples were heated from 25 °C to 600 °C at a heating rate of
288 10 °C/min using a thermogravimetric analyzer (TGA/DTA model, Mettler Toledo,
289 Schwerzenbach, Switzerland).

290 **2.12. Contact angle measurements**

291 The sessile drop method was used to determine the contact angles of native starch
292 and nano-starch using the OCA 20 drop-shape tensiometer (Data Physics Instruments,
293 GmbH, Germany), equipped with a high-speed camera, a micro-syringe and a Peltier
294 cooling system, ensuring that measurements can be taken at a constant temperature
295 of 25°C. The particles were pelletized in a hydraulic press under 6 metric tons of
296 pressure to create a suitable substrate surface, and placed in a rectangular optical
297 glass cell. Milli-Q water dripped using a high precision micro-syringe system (Hamilton
298 500 µL DS 500/GT) by a straight stainless-steel dosing needle with a 0.52 mm outer
299 diameter and 0.26 mm internal diameter was used to generate a sessile drop (5 µL, at
300 a rate of 2 µL/s) onto the particle disc surfaces (about 2 mm thick). For determining
301 the contact angles, a high-speed camera attached on the tensiometer captured the
302 change of water droplet shapes at a rate of 10 frames per second, while SCA software

303 was used to fit the droplet contour. The droplet profile was calculated using Young-
304 Laplace equation.

305 **3. Results and Discussion**

306 **3.1. The size of nano-particles**

307 Initially, the high amylose corn starch (Hi-Maize 260[®]) was subjected to hydrothermal
308 gelatinization in an autoclave reactor. The starch was mixed with water at different
309 concentrations and the temperature and processing time were studied. In principal, a
310 high temperature is required in order to generate pressure inside the autoclave
311 reactor. We found that above 160 °C the starch was quickly converted to a brown
312 suspension indicating decomposition, while it was found to be stable at 150 °C for
313 heating periods sufficient to promote gelatinization. More specific, keeping the
314 mixture at 150 °C for 30 minutes resulted in full gelatinization. Heating for longer
315 periods didn't improve further the gelatinization, whereas the starch started to
316 degrade after 1 hour at 150 °C. Low quality gelatinized mixtures were observed at
317 lower temperatures even at longer heating periods.

318 After, nano-precipitated starch was produced via the addition of ethanol, collected via
319 centrifugation and freeze-dried. In details, in the starch mixtures gelatinized at 150 °C
320 for 30 minutes in the autoclave reactor the non-solvent was added dropwise under
321 vigorous stirring at room temperature. Ethanol was selected as the non-solvent since
322 it is biocompatible in contrast to other solvents (e.g. acetone). Further, slow addition
323 of ethanol was prepared since fast addition of the solvent produced very
324 inhomogeneous mixtures. After the dropwise addition of ethanol the mixtures were
325 centrifuged until the separation of the solid from the liquid.

326 Finally, the isolated nano-precipitated starch powders were redispersed in water and
327 treated with ultrasounds. Herein, a probe sonicator was used and the suspensions
328 were sonicated at different amplitude and time intervals. Up to 40% amplitude we
329 were able to sonicate the suspensions for prolonged periods, up to 2 hours, without
330 promoting degradation and ensuring appropriate cooling of the mixture. At lower
331 amplitude less homogeneous dispersions were evident, namely larger lumps were
332 present.

333 The particle size and size distributions of the nano-precipitated starch after the
334 hydrothermal gelatinization and the freeze-drying processes were investigated by
335 Dynamic Light Scattering (DLS). First we used a very low concentration of starch (0.1%
336 w/v), which was gelatinized at 150 °C for 30 minutes and nanoprecipitated by ethanol.
337 From the DLS analysis we witnessed displayed two peaks concerning the distribution
338 of the particles, a major at ~200 nm and a minor at ~1 μm. Afterwards, the
339 nanoprecipitated starch was ultrasonicated at 40% amplitude for different time
340 intervals and a uniform population of ~200 nm was recorded. Then, we increased the
341 concentration of starch up to the critical point of getting a gel after the hydrothermal
342 gelatinization. Accordingly, above 6% w/v gels were produced and thus we couldn't
343 proceed to the nanoprecipitation stage. Therefore, the maximum concentration of
344 starch was as high as 5% w/v. The hydrothermally gelatinized 5% w/v starch mixture
345 was then nanoprecipitated by ethanol and collected by centrifugation. After
346 redispersion in water it was ultrasonicated at different time intervals with 40%
347 amplitude. The particle size distribution of the ultrasonicated samples derived by the
348 hydrothermal gelatinization/nanoprecipitation steps is depicted in Fig.1. The DLS
349 graph of the nanoprecipitated 5% w/v gelatinized starch displayed two peaks
350 concerning the distribution of the particles, a major at ~200 nm and a minor at ~5 μm,
351 in analogous fashion to the nanoprecipitated 0.1% w/v gelatinized starch. According
352 to this observation it is evident that a 50-fold increment to the concentration of the
353 gelatinized mixture affords the same sized nanoprecipitated particles. Furthermore,
354 the initial high amylose starch is composed of large granules ~8 μm (Apostolidis &
355 Mandala, 2020), and we assumed that the nanoprecipitated ~5 μm particles could be
356 indicative of agglomeration of the smaller ones (~200 nm). In this essence,
357 ultrasonication could be a potential physical treatment towards homogeneous starch
358 nano-particles. Evidently, upon ultrasonication the size of the starch nano-particles
359 was further reduced down to a uniform distribution (~170 nm, at 60 min
360 ultrasonication), free of any agglomerates. In details, after 15 min of ultrasonication
361 (US), the small peak noted at 5 μm was still evident. Notably, a similar size distribution
362 was observed for the samples treated for a longer period of time (30 min), which was
363 once again due to the agglomeration of the particles. After 60 min of US treatment,

364 the peak corresponding to the large particles (5 μm) disappeared, showing a unimodal
365 distribution. The size distribution was effectively narrowed by ultrasonication over
366 time; the hydrodynamic diameters of the ultrasound-treated nano-particles did not
367 display a statistically significant difference between 60 min (169.9 nm) and 75 min
368 (169.4 nm) of US treatment, and for this reason we considered 60 min as an
369 appropriate time for full individualizing. To this, we denoted the as-prepared nano-
370 precipitated starch nano-particles as agglomerated starch nano-particles (a-SNPs),
371 while these produced via 60 min ultrasonication are considered starch nano-particles
372 (US-SNPs). Summarizing, during the three-step physical process the initial large starch
373 granules were changed to homogeneous SNPs, displaying a unimodal size distribution.

374 In Fig. 2, the molecular behavior of the particles at all stages of the processes was
375 inferred schematically. Starch is composed by amorphous domains (around
376 amylopectin branches) and semi-crystalline double helix (amylopectin-amylose)
377 domains, stabilized through helix-helix hydrogen bonds. Upon the hydrothermal
378 gelatinization step, water molecules were penetrating the starch granules and
379 gradually displaced the helix-helix hydrogen bonds by forming helix-water hydrogen
380 bonds. As a result, the granule got swollen and amylose leaches from the helix-helix
381 semi-crystalline phase, mediating the gelatinization of the starch (Jenkins & Donald,
382 1998; Ren et al., 2021). During the addition of ethanol, which acts as a non-solvent,
383 the precipitation of the formed a-SNPs resulted to the formation of agglomerates; this
384 phenomenon is attributed to particle-particle hydrogen bonds. Finally, the ultrasonic
385 treatment disrupts the weak particle-particle hydrogen bonds and uniformly
386 distributed SNPs were released. Collectively, the large numbers of oxygen, hydroxyl
387 and hydrogen groups being present in starch tend to reform the supramolecular
388 connections in its structure, namely via the formation of different types of hydrogen
389 bonds (Qiu et al., 2016; Wei et al., 2014). In this regard, it is noteworthy that the nano-
390 precipitation method efficiently reduced the particle size of the initial starch, although
391 the derived nano-particles had a tendency to agglomerate, previously reported for
392 quinoa and high amylose starches (F. Jiang et al., 2022; Ruan et al., 2022). According
393 to our findings, we stress that a simple treatment of such a-SNPs with ultrasounds
394 caused physical breakdown of the nano-particle aggregates, driving the particle size

395 distribution to grow narrower. The question is whether an ultrasonication caused
396 further structural changes to starch particles such as crystallinity changes, which will
397 be discussed later on.

398 Digital photos of starch suspensions under the Tyndall effect are shown in Fig. 3.
399 Interestingly, the Tyndall effect of starch nano-particles is used as a light scattering
400 signaling readout identification technology for naked-eye detection. This technique
401 has been successfully used in nano-starch suspensions, where, when the suspension
402 containing particles was illuminated by a light beam, the Tyndall effect could be
403 detected through light scattering induced by the scattered particles (Andrade et al.,
404 2020; Boufi et al., 2018). Characteristically, light traveled through pure water without
405 scattering and no Tyndall effect was noticed, but in the native starch dispersion, a
406 conical beam induced by Tyndall scattering was observed. In the case of a-SNP
407 particles, the laser beam was effectively blocked from passing through, resulting in a
408 narrow light path with a conical beam that presented a lower transmittance. The area
409 of the conical beam shrank as the ultrasound time increased, while the optical path
410 lengthened, while starch suspension's turbidity and transparency changed. A strong
411 and long light path was detected when the time was prolonged to 60 min, with an
412 unobstructed laser light route showing the presence of nano-sized particles. To
413 summarize, adding ultrasound treatment after nano-precipitation, is an effective
414 approach for producing tailor-made sized nano-particles, whereas the Tyndall effect
415 can be used as a rapid method for nano-particle identification.

416 **3.2. Amylose content**

417 Amylose content is an important factor affecting starch's structural characteristics and
418 its digestion pattern (Fitzgerald et al., 2011; Zhao et al., 2022). A major drawback of
419 this method is the frequent overestimation of the amylose concentration of starch,
420 because of the branch-chains of amylopectin that bind iodine. An alternative
421 colorimetric approach is based on dual wavelength measurements (T. Zhu et al.,
422 2008). However, despite the efforts to produce more precise measurements, these
423 two colorimetric techniques can only assess the apparent amylose content (AAC),
424 while a Concanavalin A (ConA) based assay has been proposed as an alternative that
425 allows us to evaluate true amylose content (TAC) (Y. Li et al., 2022).

426 The true amylose content (TAC) of High amylose corn starch was measured at 65.2 %,
427 a value quite similar to its estimated apparent amylose content (AAC) (59.5%), as
428 described in a previous work by members of our research team (Apostolidis &
429 Mandala, 2020). The TAC estimation was calculated from the UV spectra as depicted
430 in Fig. 4. Concerning the a-SNP samples, a smaller amount of TAC was found, equal to
431 39.4%. The reduction in amylose content could be due to amylose leaching as a result
432 of hydrothermal treatment, causing breaking of the hydrogen bonds in the helices
433 leading to the release of amylose. This process leads to the creation of amylose-
434 amylose and amylose-amylopectin interactions leading to under estimation of TAC.
435 An analogous observation has been reported for hydrothermally processed talipot
436 starch (Aaliya et al., 2022). Crystallinity changes are discussed later on to find out
437 structural changes of RS according to the autoclave, precipitation and ultrasonication
438 processes that were used.

439 **3.3. Zeta Potential**

440 The zeta-potential (ζ) is an effective measurement related to the stability of the
441 colloid starch dispersions (Dai et al., 2018; Ullah et al., 2018). Surface charge controls
442 the dispersion and aggregation, namely an increment to the absolute value of the zeta
443 potential is indicative of increased surface charge and hence colloid stability and vice
444 versa. All our samples displayed negative zeta potential values, as presented in Fig. 5,
445 indicative of non-chemically functionalized starch derivatives dispersed in water
446 (Brust et al., 2020; Pérez & Bertoft, 2010). Characteristically, the zeta potential of the
447 US-SNPs gradually shifted to more negative values as a result of the prolonged
448 ultrasonic treatment. In details, the zeta potential value of the untreated starch was -
449 13.34 ± 0.63 and after the two-step hydrothermal/nano-precipitation treatment the
450 registered value for the isolated a-SNPs were found to be -14.4 ± 0.54 mV. Then,
451 ultrasonication of a-SNPs for 60 min resulted to a zeta potential equal to -21.56 mV
452 (US-SNPs). The gradual negative increment of the zeta potential dictated that the
453 performed physical treatments minimized the tendency of SNPs to self-aggregate due
454 to Van der Waals attractive forces at the particle-particle interfaces. Furthermore, the
455 electrostatic repulsion was augmented, aggregation was minimized, and the
456 hydrodynamic diameter was decreased. It is noteworthy that zeta potential values are

457 obtained from the measured velocity of particles in an external electric field so called,
458 electrophoretic mobility. Similar to the zeta potential values, the electrophoretic
459 mobility data demonstrate a shift towards more negative values with physical
460 treatment (see Supporting information). The enhanced zeta potential might be due to
461 the increased electrostatic repulsion for the US-SNPs as a result of exposure of
462 charged groups emerging from conformational changes caused by ultrasonication (Agi
463 et al., 2019; Noor et al., 2022; Ullah et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2022). However, it can
464 also be partially due to the reduced hydrodynamic radius of the particles that
465 encounter lower friction and hence, higher mobility when exposed to an external
466 electric field. The most negative zeta potential value (-21.56 mV) recorded for the
467 smallest US-SNPs (169.9 nm), is characterizing the system as moderately stable with
468 time, blocking the fast particle aggregation. In contrast, the as-prepared SNPs (-14.4
469 mV, 252.8 nm) finally lead to clustered particles caused by increased attractive Van
470 der Waals forces. Concluding, the results indicate that the sequential hydrothermal
471 gelatinization, nano-precipitation and ultrasonic processes efficiently produced nano-
472 particles, resulting in good suspension stability and provides a correlation between
473 the zeta potential and particle size.

474 **3.4. Fourier transformation infrared spectroscopy analysis (FTIR)**

475 The FTIR spectra were used to examine the molecular structure after native resistant
476 starch was nano-precipitated and ultrasonically processed and the results are shown
477 in Fig. 6. FTIR spectroscopy provided five main bands for each sample that were
478 registered roughly in the same wavenumbers. Untreated starch, a-SNP, a-SNP 30 min
479 and US-SNP showed characteristic bands at 3800-3000 cm^{-1} which are related to
480 vibrational stretching of the O-H bond (free, inter and intramolecular hydroxyl groups)
481 (Dong et al., 2022; Fang et al., 2002; Nain et al., 2022). In comparison to native starch,
482 the peaks of O-H stretching shifted for all SNP samples to lower wavenumbers. This
483 change revealed that the SNP's hydrogen bonds were stronger than those in the native
484 starch granules which is in agreement with previous findings (Ahmad et al., 2020; Ma
485 et al., 2007). The absorption bands at around 2930 cm^{-1} were characteristic to C-H
486 asymmetric stretches associated with the pyranose rings of native and nano-starches.
487 Additionally, the absorption band at 1640 cm^{-1} was observed, which is most likely a

488 result of tightly bound water in the starch, as suggested by previous reports (Ahmad
489 et al., 2020; Kaczmarska et al., 2018; Nain et al., 2022) and it does not demonstrate
490 any obvious differences in the peak intensity after the size reduction of starch.
491 Furthermore, the spectral region at 1450- 1300 cm^{-1} exhibits a pattern characteristic
492 of C-H bending. In particular, the band at 1423 cm^{-1} is attributable to CH_2 , whereas the
493 one at 1373 cm^{-1} is associated with C-O-H bending vibrations (Kaczmarska et al., 2018).
494 The IR band region at $\sim 1200\text{-}900 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ is of high interest since it includes bond
495 vibrations that are sensitive to starch structure. However, these vibrations are highly
496 overlapped, making the assignment of individual bands very difficult. Nevertheless,
497 the main absorption peaks at 1150, 1078 and 1020 cm^{-1} can be attributed to the
498 stretching vibrations of the C-O of the anhydroglucose ring while this at 930 cm^{-1} is
499 assigned to the skeletal mode vibrations of the $\alpha\text{-}1,4\text{-glycosidic}$ linkage C-O-C group
500 (930 cm^{-1}) (Nain et al., 2022; Q. Sun et al., 2014; Warren et al., 2016). Concomitantly,
501 the IR band at 850 and 760 cm^{-1} represents the C-H of CH_2 deformation and C-C
502 stretching respectively, while the region at 760-550 cm^{-1} is attributed to the skeletal
503 mode of pyranose ring (Kizil et al., 2002; Warren et al., 2016).

504 In order to have an indication of the short range ordered molecular structure of the
505 produced starches, the 995:1020 cm^{-1} peak ratio was calculated. The peak ratio values
506 decreased after the SNP formation. In particular, native starch presents a value of 0.96
507 while all SNP samples present a value of 0.93. The aforementioned results are in good
508 accordance with XRD analysis that follows, where a decrease in crystallinity was
509 observed at SNP samples (15% to $\sim 12\%$), a phenomenon reported both for physically
510 and chemically processed starches (Ahmad et al., 2020; Dong et al., 2022; Warren et
511 al., 2016). All in all, FTIR spectroscopy is a helpful tool to validate the chemical integrity
512 of the (nano) starch. Herein, it is evident that no chemical degradation mechanisms
513 were taken place during nano-procedure and the final nano-particles are free of any
514 oxidized chemical species (i.e. COOH and C=C groups).

515 **3.5. Swelling power and water solubility**

516 The capacity of starch to absorb water at a specific temperature is known as swelling
517 power. Initially, the swelling power profiles of native and starch nano-particles at
518 different temperatures ranging from 50 to 140 $^{\circ}\text{C}$ are presented in Fig. 7 a. As it is

519 observed, the swelling power of a-SNPs and Native starches increase with the increase
520 in temperature. The breakdown of the extensive hydrogen bonding holding together
521 the amylose and amylopectin in starch granules occurs in excess water and high
522 temperatures, which destroy the crystalline areas and induce swelling of starch
523 granules, leading to an increase in the swelling power of starch. For native starch, a
524 gradual increase in the swelling power behavior was observed at 100 to 140 °C.
525 Comparatively, changes occurring in the swelling power of the studied nano-particle
526 samples revealed that gradual increase in the swelling power behavior was observed
527 at a temperature range of 90 to 140 °C. Remarkably, it should be noted that nano-
528 particles have higher values of swelling power in all temperature ranges compared to
529 untreated starch particles and exhibit a significant difference from each other ($p \leq$
530 0.05). This phenomenon is attributed to the decrease of amylose portion that we
531 measured in a-SNPs, which denotes that the weak intermolecular interaction force
532 leads to amylopectin's reduced moisture absorption and retention ability (Navaf et al.,
533 2020; Xing et al., 2017). The increased swelling power of a-SNP samples when
534 compared to native samples is attributed to the reduced amylose concentration
535 within the amorphous regions, as a result of the nano-procedure approach, and the
536 concomitant rise in the amylopectin content, which controls swelling. Afterall, the
537 swelling power is often assumed to be predominantly a characteristic of amylopectin
538 (J. Y. Li & Yeh, 2001; Xing et al., 2017).

539 For solubility, a similar pattern as a function of temperature was discovered for the
540 starch swelling power (Figure 7 b). When the temperature was raised to 140 °C, the a-
541 SNP and untreated starches presented the maximum solubility value. Higher solubility
542 values were found for a-SNPs compared to untreated starch, throughout the
543 temperature spectrum. It is interesting that, at the lowest temperature of 40 °C, native
544 particles presented practically no solubility, while a-SNPs presented values at around
545 10%. Moreover, at the highest temperature, a-SNPs had a 27.5% increase of solubility
546 compared to the untreated. Native starch samples, in the temperature range of 50 °C
547 to 90 °C, presented no solubility and showed an increase of around 1.57% during that
548 range. Concluding, as the temperature increased from 50 to 140 °C, the swelling

549 power and solubility of native starch and a-SNPs increased continuously, where
550 remarkable differences between the two starches were found.

551 **3.6. Crystallinity of starch particles using X-Ray Diffraction**

552 Originally, the X-ray diffraction patterns of native starch, a-SNPs, and US-SNPs are
553 presented in Fig. 8. The main peaks at about 5.4° , 17° , 20° and 23° (2θ) indicate that
554 the structure of RS2 starch displayed patterns typical of B-type crystallinity, in
555 accordance to previously published data of our research group (Apostolidis et al.,
556 2021; Apostolidis & Mandala, 2020). The main peaks detected were comparable
557 across all samples, demonstrating that particle size does not affect maize starch
558 structure, while in parallel maintaining a B-type pattern albeit with lower crystallinity
559 (Fig. 7). More specifically, the crystallinity measurement showed a value of 15.2% for
560 the untreated starch, while a slight decrease was observed for the a-SNPs with a value
561 of 12.4% and a value of 12.2% for US-SNPs. Additionally, for treated samples it is clear
562 that ultrasounds had no impact on structure, with all the diffracted peaks presenting
563 similar intensity. Since ultrasonic treatment is a relatively mild process, alteration of
564 the crystal structure is not likely to occurred and this presumably explains analogous
565 reports (Carmona-García et al., 2016; Falsafi et al., 2019; Monroy et al., 2018;
566 Rahaman et al., 2021). This behavior could be explained by the treatment's influence
567 of the lamellar array of starch granules. Generally, amylopectin determines the
568 ordered crystalline parts of starch, while amylose determines the disordered
569 amorphous regions (F. Jiang et al., 2022). Our samples were found to have decreased
570 crystallinity, despite the fact that their amylose content was lower. We conclude that
571 the decreased crystallinity is a synergistic phenomenon were contributing both the
572 low amylose content and the reduced size of the particles. The latter is likely to be the
573 critical factor (D. Liu et al., 2009).

574 **3.7. Small Angle X-ray Scattering (SAXS)**

575 The most common structural feature in starch granules appear to be a few nano-
576 meters lamellar spacing arising from the alternating amylopectin amorphous and
577 semi-crystalline domains. The SAXS peak relating to this structural feature typically
578 occurs between $0.6\text{-}0.8\text{ nm}^{-1}$ (Luo et al., 2021). Such lamellar arrangement has been

579 reported at very high intensities for normal maize or potato starches (Doutch &
580 Gilbert, 2013). In our studies, the lamellar peak is pronounced well at 0.47 nm^{-1} for
581 high amylose starch accounting for 13.6 nm spacing (Fig. 9). Although this peak is
582 highly pronounced for non-treated starch, its intensity reduces considerably for a-SNP
583 sample and completely disappears when ultrasound treatment is applied and
584 presented in Table 1. This implies that the lamellar arrangement of amylopectin
585 molecules almost disappears after nano-precipitation of the granules.

586 Another diffraction peak at x-ray scattering profiles is observed around 3.8 nm^{-1} which
587 is a characteristic peak for B-type starch samples. The position of this peak remains
588 almost the same for all samples. This peak accounts for the hexagonal arrangements
589 of helices from hydrocarbon chains, correlates with interhelical distancing and is
590 equivalent to 1.65 nm spacing. Its position remains nearly the same in all samples,
591 demonstrating that the nano-precipitation or ultrasonic treatment does not influence
592 the chain packing.

593 **3.8. Steady-state and time-resolved Fluorescence**

594 Starch resembles a maximum absorbance at $\sim 340 \text{ nm}$ and negligible fluorescence in
595 the solid state, therefore has been explored as a silent fluorescence matrix for light-
596 emitting probes (M. Sun et al., 2014). Herein, dispersion of a-SNPs in water (0.01 w/v)
597 and subsequent excitation at 340 nm revealed an intense broad fluorescence emission
598 peak centered at 417 nm (Fig. 10). The recorded fluorescence lifetime for a-SNPs was
599 best fitted with three exponential components ($\tau_1 = 2.75 \text{ ns}$, 42.85%; $\tau_2 = 13.72 \text{ ns}$,
600 31.81%; $\tau_3 = 400 \text{ ns}$, 25.34%;) giving a mean lifetime (τ_{av}) of 5.64 ns. We assume that
601 the fluorescence emission properties of a-SNPs are a synergistic phenomenon of
602 structural deformation, hydrogen bonding and particle size. As a result of the
603 hydrothermal/nano-precipitation process, a-SNPs are able to form a dense H-bond
604 network when dispersed in water (Fig 2). The latter may induce a short-range charge
605 delocalization responsible for the emerging fluorescence. Analogous photo-physical
606 properties have been reported for other natural non-aromatic biomolecules favoring
607 H-bond networks in water media (Pinotsi et al., 2016). Furthermore, subjecting the a-
608 SNPs to ultrasonication for 30 min, the fluorescence emission increased by 14% and

609 the peak maximum red-shifted by 7 nm (424 nm). Interestingly, the corresponding τ_{av}
610 was found to be 5.56 ns, meaning it is practically unchanged. DLS studies suggested
611 that a-SNPs are gradually disaggregated during the ultrasonic treatment. Dismantling
612 of the SNP aggregates increased the fluorescence intensity as a result of less static
613 quenching due to particle-particle interactions. Further, the coverage of the particles
614 surface with water molecules explains the observed red-shift. Finally, at 60 min of
615 ultrasonication the resulting US-SNPs displayed a further red-shift in the maximum of
616 the fluorescence emission spectrum (428 nm) accompanied by a slight intensity
617 increment (2%), while the τ_{av} calculated to be 5.62 ns. With the average fluorescence
618 lifetime of a-SNPs and US-SNPs being practically unchanged, it is concluded that
619 ultrasonication is mostly involved in dismantling the aggregated SNPs, which directly
620 translated into an increment to the fluorescence emission intensity.

621 **3.9. Stability of starch using thermogravimetric analysis (TGA)**

622 The thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) curves for starch and SNPs are displayed in Fig.
623 11a. The TGA provided significant information about the thermal stability of starches.
624 In particular, the TGA curve revealed similar behavior for the studied samples,
625 containing two main weight loss steps which concern: a) the evaporation of the
626 absorbed water at $T < 120$ °C indicating the dehydration of starch (weight loss $\sim 10\%$)
627 and b) the degradation of amylose and amylopectin which is related to the major
628 weight loss ($\sim 60\%$) at ~ 280 °C to 340 °C (Azad et al., 2022; Chinnasamy et al., 2022;
629 S. Jiang et al., 2016). Furthermore, the TGA curves can also be used to determine the
630 T_{max} , or the temperature at which these starch biopolymers lose the most weight
631 during thermal degradation, 300 °C for native and nano starches.

632 The first derivative of the TGA signals (DTGA) curve has two characteristic for starch
633 samples features (Kumar Malik et al., 2022). These two peaks are the result of the
634 absorbed water molecules escaping the starch network at 67 °C and the subsequent
635 decomposition of the starch at 300 °C. It is noteworthy that US-SNPs presented a lower
636 rate of 2nd degradation step, suggesting a slightly improved thermal resistance of the
637 starch network (Fig. 11b). All in all, the prepared starch nano-particles follow the
638 decomposition trend of the parent starch, proving that the particle dimensions were

639 reduced (nano scale) without changing the chemical composition of the starch nano-
640 particles This is, again, in agreement with the FTIR and XRD analysis.

641 **3.10. Contact angle**

642 Contact angle (CA) is a quantitative indicator of the wettability of a solid surface by a
643 liquid, and it is a commonly used method for determining whether a solid surface is
644 hydrophilic or hydrophobic. (Faille et al., 2019; Shahbazi et al., 2018). The contact
645 angles for a-SNP and native starch were estimated to be 63.09° and 50.17°
646 respectively, measured through water phase (Fig. 12). CAs larger than 90 degrees have
647 long been thought to be hydrophobic, owing to the water-material adhesion
648 interaction. The lower the contact angle, the better the wettability.

649 Native starch surface was replete of OH-rich macromolecules and it was possible to
650 generate hydrogen bonds with water. These findings, when combined with the prior
651 discussion of zeta-potential, show that reducing the particle size of native starch
652 causes higher compensatory H-bonding connections between the SNPs matrix (a-
653 SNPs), thus resulting in a bio-nanocomposite tablet with fewer accessible OH groups.

654 **4. Conclusions**

655 Herein, we proposed a sequential three-step physical process consisting of:
656 hydrothermal gelatinization, nano-precipitation and ultrasonic treatment of Hi-
657 Maize260®, an RS2 type starch. The sequential hydrothermal
658 gelatinization/nanoprecipitation produced nano-sized RS2 particles, displaying two
659 major populations of 200nm and 5µm, while during the final step of ultrasonication
660 uniform nanoparticles of 170nm were isolated. We also showed that after nano-
661 production, the amylose content was reduced from 65.2% to 39.4%, due to amylose
662 leaching, as a result of hydrothermal treatment. Notably, a diminutive change in
663 crystallinity was observed by XRD, while a slight decrease in the scattering intensity
664 noticed in SAXS spectrum is likely to originate from the size reduction. Further, the
665 nanoparticles were found to be chemically identical to the starting starch, since no
666 new chemical species were identified by FT-IR spectroscopy, manifesting that no
667 damage occurred during the three-step process. Furthermore, the solubility and
668 swelling power behavior of the isolated nanoparticles improved as the temperature

669 rises, as compared to the starting starch. The nanoparticles retained a hydrophilic
670 behavior and displayed increased thermal stability. Notably, size reduction and
671 dismantling of agglomerates reflected also to the increased fluorescence intensity .
672 Summarizing, these results provide meaningful insights on how the physical
673 properties of starch particles are affected during physical processing towards size
674 reduction. This handy three-step physical process has the potential to contribute in
675 new advances in the evolving area of starch-based Pickering emulsions.

676 **Declaration of competing interest**

677 The authors declare no conflict of interest and no competing financial interest.

678 **Acknowledgement**

679 Part of the experiments were carried out at the University of Leeds in the School of
680 Food Science and Nutrition, through the Scholarship of Mr. Apostolidis Eftychios:
681 Greek-British Cooperation for short-term mobility in the United Kingdom. The Greek
682 State's Scholarships Foundation (IKY) and the British Council in Greece are gratefully
683 acknowledged for financially supporting part of this work.

684 **References**

685

686 AACC. (2000). American Association of Cereal Chemists. Approved Methods Committee.
687 *Approved Methods of the American Association of Cereal Chemists, 1.*

688 Aaliya, B., Sunooj, K. V., Navaf, M., Akhila, P. P., Sudheesh, C., Sabu, S., Sasidharan, A., Sinha,
689 S. K., & George, J. (2022). Influence of plasma-activated water on the morphological,
690 functional, and digestibility characteristics of hydrothermally modified non-conventional
691 talipot starch. *Food Hydrocolloids, 130,* 107709.
692 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOODHYD.2022.107709>

693 Agi, A., Junin, R., Gbadamosi, A., Abbas, A., Azli, N. B., & Oseh, J. (2019). Influence of
694 nanoprecipitation on crystalline starch nanoparticle formed by ultrasonic assisted weak-
695 acid hydrolysis of cassava starch and the rheology of their solutions. *Chemical*
696 *Engineering and Processing - Process Intensification, 142,* 107556.
697 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CEP.2019.107556>

698 Agostoni, C., Bresson, J.-L., Fairweather-Tait, S., Flynn, A., Golly, I., Korhonen, H., Lagiou, P.,
699 Løvik, M., Marchelli, R., Martin, A., Moseley, B., Neuhäuser-Berthold, M., Przyrembel, H.,
700 Salminen, S., Sanz, Y., Strain, S., Strobel, S., Tetens, I., Tomé, D., ... Verhagen, H. (2011).
701 Scientific Opinion on the substantiation of health claims related to resistant starch and
702 reduction of post-prandial glycaemic responses (ID 681), “digestive health benefits” (ID
703 682) and “favours a normal colon metabolism” (ID 783) pursuant to Article 13(1) of
704 Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006. *EFSA Journal, 9(4),* 2024.
705 <https://doi.org/10.2903/J.EFSA.2011.2024>

706 Ahmad, M., Gani, A., Hassan, I., Huang, Q., & Shabbir, H. (2020). Production and
707 characterization of starch nanoparticles by mild alkali hydrolysis and ultra-sonication
708 process. *Scientific Reports 2020 10:1, 10(1),* 1–11. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-60380-0)
709 [60380-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-60380-0)

710 Akanbi, C. T., Kadiri, O., & Gbadamosi, S. O. (2019). Kinetics of starch digestion in native and
711 modified sweetpotato starches from an orange fleshed cultivar. *International Journal of*
712 *Biological Macromolecules, 134,* 946–953.
713 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJBIOMAC.2019.05.035>

714 Akhavan, A., & Ataevarjovi, E. (2012). The effect of gamma irradiation and surfactants on the
715 size distribution of nanoparticles based on soluble starch. *Radiation Physics and*

716 *Chemistry*, 81(7), 913–914. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RADPHYSICHEM.2012.03.004>

717 Andrade, I. H. P., Otoni, C. G., Amorim, T. S., Camilloto, G. P., & Cruz, R. S. (2020). Ultrasound-
718 assisted extraction of starch nanoparticles from breadfruit (*Artocarpus altilis* (Parkinson)
719 Fosberg). *Colloids and Surfaces A: Physicochemical and Engineering Aspects*, 586,
720 124277. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COLSURFA.2019.124277>

721 Angellier, H., Putaux, J. L., Molina-Boisseau, S., Dupeyre, D., & Dufresne, A. (2005). Starch
722 Nanocrystal Fillers in an Acrylic Polymer Matrix. *Macromolecular Symposia*, 221(1), 95–
723 104. <https://doi.org/10.1002/MASY.200550310>

724 Apostolidis, E., Kioupis, D., Kakali, G., Stoforos, N. G., & Mandala, I. (2021). Effect of starch
725 concentration and resistant starch filler addition on the physical properties of starch
726 hydrogels. *Journal of Food Science*, 86(12), 5340–5352. [https://doi.org/10.1111/1750-](https://doi.org/10.1111/1750-3841.15954)
727 3841.15954

728 Apostolidis, E., & Mandala, I. (2020). Modification of resistant starch nanoparticles using high-
729 pressure homogenization treatment. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 103, 105677.
730 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2020.105677>

731 Aytunga, E., Kibar, A., Gönenç, İ., & Us, F. (2010). *Gelatinization of waxy, normal and high*
732 *amylose corn starches*.

733 Azad, M. M., Ejaz, M., Shah, A. ur R., Afaq, S. K., & Song, J. (2022). A bio-based approach to
734 simultaneously improve flame retardancy, thermal stability and mechanical properties
735 of nano-silica filled jute/thermoplastic starch composite. *Materials Chemistry and*
736 *Physics*, 289, 126485. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.MATCHEMPHYS.2022.126485>

737 Babu, A. S., Mohan, R. J., & Parimalavalli, R. (2019). Effect of single and dual-modifications on
738 stability and structural characteristics of foxtail millet starch. *Food Chemistry*, 271, 457–
739 465. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOODCHEM.2018.07.197>

740 Beaucage, G. (2004). Determination of branch fraction and minimum dimension of mass-
741 fractal aggregates. *Physical Review E - Statistical Physics, Plasmas, Fluids, and Related*
742 *Interdisciplinary Topics*, 70(3), 10.
743 <https://doi.org/10.1103/PHYSREVE.70.031401/FIGURES/6/MEDIUM>

744 Beaucage, G., & Schaefer, D. W. (1994). Structural studies of complex systems using small-
745 angle scattering: a unified Guinier/power-law approach. *Journal of Non-Crystalline*
746 *Solids*, 172–174(PART 2), 797–805. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3093\(94\)90581-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3093(94)90581-9)

- 747 Benmoussa, M., Moldenhauer, K. A. K., & Hamaker, B. R. (2007). Rice amylopectin fine
748 structure variability affects starch digestion properties. *Journal of Agricultural and Food*
749 *Chemistry*, 55(4), 1475–1479.
750 <https://doi.org/10.1021/JF062349X/ASSET/IMAGES/LARGE/JF062349XF00001.JPEG>
- 751 Bertoft, E. (2017). Understanding Starch Structure: Recent Progress. *Agronomy 2017, Vol. 7,*
752 *Page 56, 7(3), 56.* <https://doi.org/10.3390/AGRONOMY7030056>
- 753 Boufi, S., Bel Haaj, S., Magnin, A., Pignon, F., Impéror-Clerc, M., & Mortha, G. (2018). Ultrasonic
754 assisted production of starch nanoparticles: Structural characterization and mechanism
755 of disintegration. *Ultrasonics Sonochemistry*, 41, 327–336.
756 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ULTSONCH.2017.09.033>
- 757 Brust, H., Orzechowski, S., & Fettke, J. (2020). Starch and Glycogen Analyses: Methods and
758 Techniques. *Biomolecules 2020, Vol. 10, Page 1020, 10(7), 1020.*
759 <https://doi.org/10.3390/BIOM10071020>
- 760 Bu, X., Wang, X., Dai, L., Ji, N., Xiong, L., & Sun, Q. (2020). The combination of starch
761 nanoparticles and Tween 80 results in enhanced emulsion stability. *International Journal*
762 *of Biological Macromolecules*, 163, 2048–2059.
763 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJBIOMAC.2020.09.111>
- 764 Carmona-García, R., Bello-Pérez, L. A., Aguirre-Cruz, A., Aparicio-Saguilán, A., Hernández-
765 Torres, J., & Alvarez-Ramirez, J. (2016). Effect of ultrasonic treatment on the
766 morphological, physicochemical, functional, and rheological properties of starches with
767 different granule size. *Starch - Stärke*, 68(9–10), 972–979.
768 <https://doi.org/10.1002/STAR.201600019>
- 769 Chang, Y., Yan, X., Wang, Q., Ren, L., Tong, J., & Zhou, J. (2017). High efficiency and low cost
770 preparation of size controlled starch nanoparticles through ultrasonic treatment and
771 precipitation. *Food Chemistry*, 227, 369–375.
772 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOODCHEM.2017.01.111>
- 773 Chao, D., Chen, J., Dong, Q., Wu, W., Qi, D., & Dong, S. (2020). Ultrastable and ultrasensitive
774 pH-switchable carbon dots with high quantum yield for water quality identification,
775 glucose detection, and two starch-based solid-state fluorescence materials. *Nano*
776 *Research 2020 13:11, 13(11), 3012–3018.* <https://doi.org/10.1007/S12274-020-2965-8>
- 777 Chinnasamy, G., Dekeba, K., Sundramurthy, V. P., & Dereje, B. (2022). Physicochemical

778 properties of tef starch: morphological, thermal, thermogravimetric, and pasting
779 properties. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10942912.2022.2098973>, 25(1), 1668–1682.
780 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10942912.2022.2098973>

781 Chung, H. J., Liu, Q., Lee, L., & Wei, D. (2011). Relationship between the structure,
782 physicochemical properties and in vitro digestibility of rice starches with different
783 amylose contents. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 25(5), 968–975.
784 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOODHYD.2010.09.011>

785 Chutia, H., & Mahanta, C. L. (2021). Properties of starch nanoparticle obtained by
786 ultrasonication and high pressure homogenization for developing carotenoids-enriched
787 powder and Pickering nanoemulsion. *Innovative Food Science & Emerging Technologies*,
788 74, 102822. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IFSET.2021.102822>

789 Copeland, L., Blazek, J., Salman, H., & Tang, M. C. (2009). Form and functionality of starch.
790 *Food Hydrocolloids*, 23(6), 1527–1534.
791 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOODHYD.2008.09.016>

792 Dai, L., Li, C., Zhang, J., & Cheng, F. (2018). Preparation and characterization of starch
793 nanocrystals combining ball milling with acid hydrolysis. *Carbohydrate Polymers*, 180,
794 122–127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CARBPOL.2017.10.015>

795 Dong, H., Zhang, Q., Gao, J., Chen, L., & Vasanthan, T. (2021). Comparison of morphology and
796 rheology of starch nanoparticles prepared from pulse and cereal starches by rapid
797 antisolvent nanoprecipitation. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 119, 106828.
798 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOODHYD.2021.106828>

799 Dong, H., Zhang, Q., Gao, J., Chen, L., & Vasanthan, T. (2022). Preparation and characterization
800 of nanoparticles from cereal and pulse starches by ultrasonic-assisted dissolution and
801 rapid nanoprecipitation. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 122, 107081.
802 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOODHYD.2021.107081>

803 Douth, J., & Gilbert, E. P. (2013). Characterisation of large scale structures in starch granules
804 via small-angle neutron and X-ray scattering. *Carbohydrate Polymers*, 91(1), 444–451.
805 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CARBPOL.2012.08.002>

806 Dundar, A. N., & Gocmen, D. (2013). Effects of autoclaving temperature and storing time on
807 resistant starch formation and its functional and physicochemical properties.
808 *Carbohydrate Polymers*, 97(2), 764–771.

809 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CARBPOL.2013.04.083>

810 Duyen, T. T. M., & Van Hung, P. (2021). Morphology, crystalline structure and digestibility of
811 debranched starch nanoparticles varying in average degree of polymerization and
812 fabrication methods. *Carbohydrate Polymers*, 256, 117424.
813 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CARBPOL.2020.117424>

814 Englyst, H., Kingman, S. M., & Cummings, J. H. (1992). Classification and measurement of
815 nutritionally important starch fractions. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 46 Suppl
816 2(SUPPL. 2), S33-50. <https://europepmc.org/article/med/1330528>

817 Englyst, H., Wiggins, H. S., & Cummings, J. H. (1982). Determination of the non-starch
818 polysaccharides in plant foods by gas-liquid chromatography of constituent sugars as
819 alditol acetates. *Analyst*, 107(1272), 307–318. <https://doi.org/10.1039/AN9820700307>

820 Faille, C., Lemy, C., Allion-Maurer, A., & Zoueshtiagh, F. (2019). Evaluation of the hydrophobic
821 properties of latex microspheres and Bacillus spores. Influence of the particle size on the
822 data obtained by the MATH method (microbial adhesion to hydrocarbons). *Colloids and
823 Surfaces B: Biointerfaces*, 182, 110398.
824 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COLSURFB.2019.110398>

825 Falsafi, S. R., Maghsoudlou, Y., Rostamabadi, H., Rostamabadi, M. M., Hamed, H., & Hosseini,
826 S. M. H. (2019). Preparation of physically modified oat starch with different sonication
827 treatments. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 89, 311–320.
828 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOODHYD.2018.10.046>

829 Fang, J. M., Fowler, P. A., Tomkinson, J., & Hill, C. A. S. (2002). The preparation and
830 characterisation of a series of chemically modified potato starches. *Carbohydrate
831 Polymers*, 47(3), 245–252. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0144-8617\(01\)00187-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0144-8617(01)00187-4)

832 Fitzgerald, M. A., Rahman, S., Resurreccion, A. P., Concepcion, J., Daygon, V. D., Dipti, S. S.,
833 Kabir, K. A., Klingner, B., Morell, M. K., & Bird, A. R. (2011). Identification of a major
834 genetic determinant of glycaemic index in rice. *Rice*, 4(2), 66–74.
835 <https://doi.org/10.1007/S12284-011-9073-Z/FIGURES/4>

836 Guida, C., Aguiar, A. C., & Cunha, R. L. (2021). Green techniques for starch modification to
837 stabilize Pickering emulsions: a current review and future perspectives. *Current Opinion
838 in Food Science*, 38, 52–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COFS.2020.10.017>

839 Hernandez-Hernandez, O., Julio-Gonzalez, L. C., Doyagüez, E. G., & Gutiérrez, T. J. (2022).

840 Structure-digestibility relationship from noodles based on organocatalytically esterified
841 regular and waxy corn starch obtained by reactive extrusion using sodium propionate.
842 *Food Hydrocolloids*, 131, 107825. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOODHYD.2022.107825>

843 Hu, A., Li, L., Zheng, J., Lu, J., Meng, X., & Liu, Y. (2014). Different-frequency ultrasonic effects
844 on properties and structure of corn starch. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*,
845 94(14), 2929–2934. <https://doi.org/10.1002/JSFA.6636>

846 Huang, Q., Huang, Q., Wang, Y., & Lu, X. (2022). Development of wet media milled purple
847 sweet potato particle-stabilized pickering emulsions: The synergistic role of bioactives,
848 starch and cellulose. *LWT*, 155, 112964. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LWT.2021.112964>

849 Jenkins, P. J., & Donald, A. M. (1998). Gelatinisation of starch: a combined SAXS/WAXS/DSC
850 and SANS study. *Carbohydrate Research*, 308(1–2), 133–147.
851 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0008-6215\(98\)00079-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0008-6215(98)00079-2)

852 Jeong, O., & Shin, M. (2018). Preparation and stability of resistant starch nanoparticles, using
853 acid hydrolysis and cross-linking of waxy rice starch. *Food Chemistry*, 256, 77–84.
854 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOODCHEM.2018.02.098>

855 Jiang, F., Du, C., Zhao, N., Jiang, W., Yu, X., & Du, S. kui. (2022). Preparation and
856 characterization of quinoa starch nanoparticles as quercetin carriers. *Food Chemistry*,
857 369, 130895. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOODCHEM.2021.130895>

858 Jiang, S., Dai, L., Qin, Y., Xiong, L., & Sun, Q. (2016). Preparation and Characterization of
859 Octenyl Succinic Anhydride Modified Taro Starch Nanoparticles. *PLOS ONE*, 11(2),
860 e0150043. <https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0150043>

861 Junejo, S. A., Flanagan, B. M., Zhang, B., & Dhital, S. (2022). Starch structure and nutritional
862 functionality – Past revelations and future prospects. *Carbohydrate Polymers*, 277,
863 118837. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CARBPOL.2021.118837>

864 Kaczmarek, K., Grabowska, B., Szychaj, T., Zdanowicz, M., Sitarz, M., Bobrowski, A., &
865 Cukrowicz, S. (2018). Effect of microwave treatment on structure of binders based on
866 sodium carboxymethyl starch: FT-IR, FT-Raman and XRD investigations. *Spectrochimica*
867 *Acta Part A: Molecular and Biomolecular Spectroscopy*, 199, 387–393.
868 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SAA.2018.03.047>

869 Kizil, R., Irudayaraj, J., & Seetharaman, K. (2002). Characterization of Irradiated Starches by
870 Using FT-Raman and FTIR Spectroscopy. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*,

871 50(14), 3912–3918. <https://doi.org/10.1021/JF011652P>

872 Ko, E. B., & Kim, J. Y. (2021). Application of starch nanoparticles as a stabilizer for Pickering
873 emulsions: Effect of environmental factors and approach for enhancing its storage
874 stability. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 120, 106984.
875 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOODHYD.2021.106984>

876 Kumar Malik, M., Kumar, T., Kumar, V., Singh, J., Kumar Singh, R., & Saini, K. (2022).
877 Sustainable, highly foldable, eco-friendly films from Mandua starch derivative.
878 *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, 53, 102398.
879 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SETA.2022.102398>

880 Lawal, M. V. (2019). Modified Starches as Direct Compression Excipients – Effect of Physical
881 and Chemical Modifications on Tablet Properties: A Review. *Starch - Stärke*, 71(1–2),
882 1800040. <https://doi.org/10.1002/STAR.201800040>

883 Li, J. Y., & Yeh, A. I. (2001). Relationships between thermal, rheological characteristics and
884 swelling power for various starches. *Journal of Food Engineering*, 50(3), 141–148.
885 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0260-8774\(00\)00236-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0260-8774(00)00236-3)

886 Li, Y., Zhao, L., Shi, L., Lin, L., Cao, Q., & Wei, C. (2022). Sizes, Components, Crystalline
887 Structure, and Thermal Properties of Starches from Sweet Potato Varieties Originating
888 from Different Countries. *Molecules* 2022, Vol. 27, Page 1905, 27(6), 1905.
889 <https://doi.org/10.3390/MOLECULES27061905>

890 Lin, Q., Liu, Y., Zhou, L., Ji, N., Xiong, L., & Sun, Q. (2022). Green preparation of debranched
891 starch nanoparticles with different crystalline structures by electrostatic spraying. *Food*
892 *Hydrocolloids*, 127, 107513. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOODHYD.2022.107513>

893 Liu, D., Wu, Q., Chen, H., & Chang, P. R. (2009). Transitional properties of starch colloid with
894 particle size reduction from micro- to nanometer. *Journal of Colloid and Interface*
895 *Science*, 339(1), 117–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JCIS.2009.07.035>

896 Liu, X., Zheng, J., Yang, Y., Chen, Y., & Liu, X. (2018). Preparation of N-doped carbon dots based
897 on starch and their application in white LED. *Optical Materials*, 86, 530–536.
898 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.OPTMAT.2018.10.057>

899 Lockyer, S., & Nugent, A. P. (2017). Health effects of resistant starch. *Nutrition Bulletin*, 42(1),
900 10–41. <https://doi.org/10.1111/NBU.12244>

901 Luo, X., Cheng, B., Zhang, W., Shu, Z., Wang, P., & Zeng, X. (2021). Structural and functional

902 characteristics of Japonica rice starches with different amylose contents.
903 [Http://Mc.Manuscriptcentral.Com/Tcyt](http://Mc.Manuscriptcentral.Com/Tcyt), 19(1), 532–540.
904 <https://doi.org/10.1080/19476337.2021.1927194>

905 Ma, X., Yu, J., He, K., & Wang, N. (2007). The Effects of Different Plasticizers on the Properties
906 of Thermoplastic Starch as Solid Polymer Electrolytes. *Macromolecular Materials and*
907 *Engineering*, 292(4), 503–510. <https://doi.org/10.1002/MAME.200600445>

908 Mandala, I. G., & Bayas, E. (2004). Xanthan effect on swelling, solubility and viscosity of wheat
909 starch dispersions. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 18(2), 191–201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S0268->
910 [005X\(03\)00064-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0268-005X(03)00064-X)

911 Maniglia, B. C., Castanha, N., Le-Bail, P., Le-Bail, A., & Augusto, P. E. D. (2020). Starch
912 modification through environmentally friendly alternatives: a review.
913 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2020.1778633>, 61(15), 2482–2505.
914 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2020.1778633>

915 Maurya, A. K., Weidenbacher, L., Spano, F., Fortunato, G., Rossi, R. M., Frenz, M., Dommann,
916 A., Neels, A., & Sadeghpour, A. (2019). Structural insights into semicrystalline states of
917 electrospun nanofibers: a multiscale analytical approach. *Nanoscale*, 11(15), 7176–7187.
918 <https://doi.org/10.1039/C9NR00446G>

919 Monroy, Y., Rivero, S., & García, M. A. (2018). Microstructural and techno-functional
920 properties of cassava starch modified by ultrasound. *Ultrasonics Sonochemistry*, 42,
921 795–804. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ULTSONCH.2017.12.048>

922 Morita, T., Ito, Y., Brown, I. L., Ando, R., & Kiriya, S. (2007). In Vitro and In Vivo Digestibility
923 of Native Maize Starch Granules Varying in Amylose Contents. *Journal of AOAC*
924 *INTERNATIONAL*, 90(6), 1628–1634. <https://doi.org/10.1093/JAOAC/90.6.1628>

925 Nain, V., Kaur, M., Sandhu, K. S., Thory, R., & Sinhmar, A. (2022). Development of Starch
926 Nanoparticle from Mango Kernel in Comparison with Cereal, Tuber, and Legume Starch
927 Nanoparticles: Characterization and Cytotoxicity. *Starch - Stärke*, 74(3–4), 2100252.
928 <https://doi.org/10.1002/STAR.202100252>

929 Navaf, M., Sunooj, K. V., Aaliya, B., Sudheesh, C., & George, J. (2020). Physico-chemical,
930 functional, morphological, thermal properties and digestibility of Talipot palm (*Corypha*
931 *umbraculifera* L.) flour and starch grown in Malabar region of South India. *Journal of*
932 *Food Measurement and Characterization*, 14(3), 1601–1613.

933 <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11694-020-00408-1>

934 Nicolas, J., Mura, S., Brambilla, D., Mackiewicz, N., & Couvreur, P. (2013). Design,
935 functionalization strategies and biomedical applications of targeted
936 biodegradable/biocompatible polymer -based nanocarriers for drug delivery. *Chemical*
937 *Society Reviews*, 42(3), 1147–1235. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C2CS35265F>

938 Noor, N., Gani, A., Jhan, F., Ashraf Shah, M., & ul Ashraf, Z. (2022). Ferulic acid loaded pickering
939 emulsions stabilized by resistant starch nanoparticles using ultrasonication:
940 Characterization, in vitro release and nutraceutical potential. *Ultrasonics Sonochemistry*,
941 84, 105967. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ULTSONCH.2022.105967>

942 Noor, N., Gani, A., Jhan, F., Jenno, J. L. H., & Arif Dar, M. (2021). Resistant starch type 2 from
943 lotus stem: Ultrasonic effect on physical and nutraceutical properties. *Ultrasonics*
944 *Sonochemistry*, 76, 105655. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ULTSONCH.2021.105655>

945 Pérez, S., & Bertoft, E. (2010). The molecular structures of starch components and their
946 contribution to the architecture of starch granules: A comprehensive review. *Starch -*
947 *Stärke*, 62(8), 389–420. <https://doi.org/10.1002/STAR.201000013>

948 Pinotsi, D., Grisanti, L., Mahou, P., Gebauer, R., Kaminski, C. F., Hassanali, A., & Kaminski
949 Schierle, G. S. (2016). Proton Transfer and Structure-Specific Fluorescence in Hydrogen
950 Bond-Rich Protein Structures. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 138(9), 3046–
951 3057. https://doi.org/10.1021/JACS.5B11012/SUPPL_FILE/JA5B11012_SI_004.AVI

952 Qin, Y., Liu, C., Jiang, S., Xiong, L., & Sun, Q. (2016). Characterization of starch nanoparticles
953 prepared by nanoprecipitation: Influence of amylose content and starch type. *Industrial*
954 *Crops and Products*, 87, 182–190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.INDCROP.2016.04.038>

955 Qiu, C., Hu, Y., Jin, Z., McClements, D. J., Qin, Y., Xu, X., & Wang, J. (2019). A review of green
956 techniques for the synthesis of size-controlled starch-based nanoparticles and their
957 applications as nanodelivery systems. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 92, 138–151.
958 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TIFS.2019.08.007>

959 Qiu, C., Yang, J., Ge, S., Chang, R., Xiong, L., & Sun, Q. (2016). Preparation and characterization
960 of size-controlled starch nanoparticles based on short linear chains from debranched
961 waxy corn starch. *LWT*, 74, 303–310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LWT.2016.07.062>

962 Rahaman, A., Kumari, A., Zeng, X. A., Adil Farooq, M., Siddique, R., Khalifa, I., Siddeeg, A., Ali,
963 M., & Faisal Manzoor, M. (2021). Ultrasound based modification and structural-

964 functional analysis of corn and cassava starch. *Ultrasonics Sonochemistry*, *80*, 105795.
965 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ULTSONCH.2021.105795>

966 Ren, Y., Yuan, T. Z., Chigwedere, C. M., & Ai, Y. (2021). A current review of structure, functional
967 properties, and industrial applications of pulse starches for value-added utilization.
968 *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*, *20*(3), 3061–3092.
969 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1541-4337.12735>

970 Ruan, S., Tang, J., Qin, Y., Wang, J., Yan, T., Zhou, J., Gao, D., Xu, E., & Liu, D. (2022). Mechanical
971 force-induced dispersion of starch nanoparticles and nanoemulsion: Size control,
972 dispersion behaviour, and emulsified stability. *Carbohydrate Polymers*, *275*, 118711.
973 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CARBPOL.2021.118711>

974 Saari, H., Fuentes, C., Sjöö, M., Rayner, M., & Wahlgren, M. (2017). Production of starch
975 nanoparticles by dissolution and non-solvent precipitation for use in food-grade
976 Pickering emulsions. *Carbohydrate Polymers*, *157*, 558–566.
977 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CARBPOL.2016.10.003>

978 Sanver, D., Sadeghpour, A., Rappolt, M., Di Meo, F., & Trouillas, P. (2020). Structure and
979 Dynamics of Dioleoyl-Phosphatidylcholine Bilayers under the Influence of Quercetin and
980 Rutin. *Langmuir*, *36*(40), 11776–11786.
981 https://doi.org/10.1021/ACS.LANGMUIR.0C01484/SUPPL_FILE/LAOC01484_SI_002.ZIP

982 Shahbazi, M., Majzoobi, M., & Farahnaky, A. (2018). Physical modification of starch by high-
983 pressure homogenization for improving functional properties of κ-carrageenan/starch
984 blend film. *Food Hydrocolloids*, *85*, 204–214.
985 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOODHYD.2018.07.017>

986 Shibata, H., Abe, M., Sato, K., Uwai, K., Tokuraku, K., & Iimori, T. (2022). Microwave-assisted
987 synthesis and formation mechanism of fluorescent carbon dots from starch.
988 *Carbohydrate Polymer Technologies and Applications*, *3*, 100218.
989 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CARPTA.2022.100218>

990 Sun, M., Qu, S., Hao, Z., Ji, W., Jing, P., Zhang, H., Zhang, L., Zhao, J., & Shen, D. (2014). Towards
991 efficient solid-state photoluminescence based on carbon-nanodots and starch
992 composites. *Nanoscale*, *6*(21), 13076–13081. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C4NR04034A>

993 Sun, Q., Li, G., Dai, L., Ji, N., & Xiong, L. (2014). Green preparation and characterisation of waxy
994 maize starch nanoparticles through enzymolysis and recrystallisation. *Food Chemistry*,

995 162, 223–228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOODCHEM.2014.04.068>

996 Timgren, A., Rayner, M., Dejmek, P., Marku, D., Sj, M., & Marilyn Rayner, C. (2013). Emulsion
997 stabilizing capacity of intact starch granules modified by heat treatment or octenyl
998 succinic anhydride. *Food Science & Nutrition*, 1(2), 157–171.
999 <https://doi.org/10.1002/FSN3.17>

1000 Torres, F. G., & De-la-Torre, G. E. (2022). Synthesis, characteristics, and applications of
1001 modified starch nanoparticles: A review. *International Journal of Biological*
1002 *Macromolecules*, 194, 289–305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJBIOMAC.2021.11.187>

1003 Troncoso, O. P., & Torres, F. G. (2020). Bacterial Cellulose—Graphene Based Nanocomposites.
1004 *International Journal of Molecular Sciences 2020, Vol. 21, Page 6532*, 21(18), 6532.
1005 <https://doi.org/10.3390/IJMS21186532>

1006 Ullah, I., Yin, T., Xiong, S., Huang, Q., Zia-ud-Din, Zhang, J., & Javaid, A. B. (2018). Effects of
1007 thermal pre-treatment on physicochemical properties of nano-sized okara (soybean
1008 residue) insoluble dietary fiber prepared by wet media milling. *Journal of Food*
1009 *Engineering*, 237, 18–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JFOODENG.2018.05.017>

1010 Vamadevan, V., & Bertoft, E. (2015). Structure-function relationships of starch components.
1011 *Starch - Stärke*, 67(1–2), 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.1002/STAR.201400188>

1012 Wang, H., Xu, K., Ma, Y., Liang, Y., Zhang, H., & Chen, L. (2020). Impact of ultrasonication on
1013 the aggregation structure and physicochemical characteristics of sweet potato starch.
1014 *Ultrasonics Sonochemistry*, 63, 104868.
1015 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ULTSONCH.2019.104868>

1016 Wang, R., & Zhou, J. (2022). Waxy maize starch nanoparticles incorporated tea polyphenols to
1017 stabilize Pickering emulsion and inhibit oil oxidation. *Carbohydrate Polymers*, 296,
1018 119991. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CARBPOL.2022.119991>

1019 Warren, F. J., Gidley, M. J., & Flanagan, B. M. (2016). Infrared spectroscopy as a tool to
1020 characterise starch ordered structure—a joint FTIR–ATR, NMR, XRD and DSC study.
1021 *Carbohydrate Polymers*, 139, 35–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CARBPOL.2015.11.066>

1022 Wei, B., Hu, X., Li, H., Wu, C., Xu, X., Jin, Z., & Tian, Y. (2014). Effect of pHs on dispersity of
1023 maize starch nanocrystals in aqueous medium. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 36, 369–373.
1024 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOODHYD.2013.08.015>

1025 Xing, J. jie, Liu, Y., Li, D., Wang, L. jun, & Adhikari, B. (2017). Heat-moisture treatment and acid

- 1026 hydrolysis of corn starch in different sequences. *LWT - Food Science and Technology*, 79,
1027 11–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LWT.2016.12.055>
- 1028 Yan, Z., Shu, J., Yu, Y., Zhang, Z., Liu, Z., & Chen, J. (2015). Preparation of carbon quantum dots
1029 based on starch and their spectral properties. *Luminescence*, 30(4), 388–392.
1030 <https://doi.org/10.1002/BIO.2744>
- 1031 Yang, Q., Liu, L., Li, X., Li, J., Zhang, W., Shi, M., & Feng, B. (2021). Physicochemical
1032 characteristics of resistant starch prepared from Job's tears starch using autoclaving–
1033 cooling treatment. *Http://Mc.Manuscriptcentral.Com/Tcyt*, 19(1), 316–325.
1034 <https://doi.org/10.1080/19476337.2021.1897688>
- 1035 Yang, Q. Y., Lu, X. X., Chen, Y. Z., Luo, Z. G., & Xiao, Z. G. (2019). Fine structure, crystalline and
1036 physicochemical properties of waxy corn starch treated by ultrasound irradiation.
1037 *Ultrasonics Sonochemistry*, 51, 350–358.
1038 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ULTSONCH.2018.09.001>
- 1039 Zhang, M., Xu, Z., & Wang, L. (2022). Ultrasonic treatment improves the performance of starch
1040 as depressant for hematite flotation. *Ultrasonics Sonochemistry*, 82, 105877.
1041 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ULTSONCH.2021.105877>
- 1042 Zhao, T., Zhang, H., Chen, F., Tong, P., Cao, W., & Jiang, Y. (2022). Study on Structural Changes
1043 of Starches with Different Amylose Content during Gelatinization Process. *Starch -*
1044 *Stärke*, 2100269. <https://doi.org/10.1002/STAR.202100269>
- 1045 Zhong, Y., Bertoft, E., Li, Z., Blennow, A., & Liu, X. (2020). Amylopectin starch granule lamellar
1046 structure as deduced from unit chain length data. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 108, 106053.
1047 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOODHYD.2020.106053>
- 1048 Zhou, D., Ma, Z., Yin, X., Hu, X., & Boye, J. I. (2019). Structural characteristics and
1049 physicochemical properties of field pea starch modified by physical, enzymatic, and acid
1050 treatments. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 93, 386–394.
1051 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOODHYD.2019.02.048>
- 1052 Zhu, J., Li, L., Chen, L., & Li, X. (2012). Study on supramolecular structural changes of ultrasonic
1053 treated potato starch granules. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 29(1), 116–122.
1054 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FOODHYD.2012.02.004>
- 1055 Zhu, L. J., Liu, Q. Q., Wilson, J. D., Gu, M. H., & Shi, Y. C. (2011). Digestibility and
1056 physicochemical properties of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) flours and starches differing in

1057 amylose content. *Carbohydrate Polymers*, 86(4), 1751–1759.
1058 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CARBPOL.2011.07.017>

1059 Zhu, T., Jackson, D. S., Wehling, R. L., & Geera, B. (2008). Comparison of Amylose
1060 Determination Methods and the Development of a Dual Wavelength Iodine Binding
1061 Technique. *Cereal Chemistry*, 85(1), 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1094/CCHEM-85-1-0051>

1062