



This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Boukid, Fatma. 2021. "Chickpea (*Cicer Arietinum* L.) Protein As A Prospective Plant-Based Ingredient: A Review". International Journal Of Food Science & Technology. doi:10.1111/ijfs.15046, which has been published in final form at. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijfs.15046>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions <http://www.wileyauthors.com/self-archiving>.

Document downloaded from:



1 **Title: Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) protein as a prospective plant-based**
2 **ingredient: a review**

3 **Running title: Chickpea protein as a food ingredient**

4 Fatma Boukid^{1*}

5 ¹Food Safety and Functionality Programme, Food Industry Area, Institute of Agriculture and Food
6 Research and Technology (IRTA), Finca Camps i Armet s/n, 17121 Monells, Catalonia, Spain

7 *Corresponding author: fatma.boukid@irta.cat

8

9 **Abstract:**

10 Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) is one of the most grown and consumed pulses and they are traditionally
11 commercialized as seeds, flour, or canned foods. In the frame of alternative protein sources, chickpea
12 emerged as a rich source of dietary proteins (17–22%) that can be dry or wet extracted. The application of
13 chickpea proteins as food ingredients is still in early stages, where their properties and how they interact
14 within food matrices is scarcely studied. Therefore, this review provides recent advances in processing,
15 characteristics and applications of chickpea proteins. Nutritionally, these proteins have various biological
16 activities, adequate levels of essential amino acids and protein digestibility. Technologically, their bland
17 flavor, neutral taste, and light color make them suitable ingredients for new products development including
18 noodles, breads, cookies, and sausages. Chickpea proteins and particularly hydrolysates are a promising
19 alternative to be used more broadly as functional ingredients.

20 **Keywords:** chickpea protein, functional properties, bioactive peptides, allergy, food, encapsulation

21 1. Introduction

22 The realm of alternative proteins keeps expanding in response to the high demand for proteins that is
23 expected to double by 2050 to cover the needs of the world population growth expected to reach 10 billion
24 by 2050 (United Nations, 2019). Plant-based proteins are viewed as a more sustainable and healthy proteins
25 than those deriving from animals. Moreover, the trend of flexitarianism, vegetarianism and veganism has
26 been rising at a rapid pace due to growing awareness about environmental conservation, concerns related
27 to animal welfare and high demand of meat alternative products (Research and Markets, 2018). Associating
28 meat consumption with health concerns due to the use of antibiotics and hormones in livestock feed also
29 consolidated the position of plant proteins in the market particularly those deriving from legumes and pulses
30 (Boukid, 2020; Sofi *et al.*, 2020b). Proteins from legumes have been gaining traction as a necessity more
31 than a choice due to their high nutritional benefits, hypo-allergenicity, gluten-free and non-genetically
32 modified organism labels, affordability, high productivity and versatility (Nosworthy and House, 2017;
33 Boukid *et al.*, 2019). Proteins from legumes also exhibit a wide range of techno- and bio-functional
34 applications comparable with proteins from animal and dairy sources providing a multitude of health
35 benefits (Sharif *et al.*, 2018; Boukid *et al.*, 2019; Glusac *et al.*, 2020). The industry of proteins from legumes
36 keep expanding beyond pea to lupine, mung, faba and chickpea proteins (Research and Markets, 2018;
37 Boukid *et al.*, 2019).

38 Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) is the third most abundantly grown pulse with global production of 15
39 million tons after dry beans (27 million tons) and dry peas (16 million tons) (FAO, 2020). Chickpea is the
40 main legume crop in the diet of consumers from different parts of the world, mostly in the African and
41 Asian countries (Sofi *et al.*, 2020b). The main chickpea seeds are Kabuli and desi varieties with wide
42 differences in chemical composition, color, size and geographic distribution (Boukid *et al.*, 2019).
43 Chickpeas contain from 18 to 29% protein, 4to 7% lipids and 50to 60% starch (Espinosa-Ramírez and
44 Serna-Saldívar, 2019; Sofi *et al.*, 2020b). However, chickpea contains antinutritional factors yet
45 pretreatments strategies as well as protein extraction ensure the removal or the reduction of these
46 components. Chickpea protein has advantages of high production volumes, low cost, excellent balance in
47 composition of essential amino acid, high bioavailability, and low allergenicity compared to soybeans
48 (Wang *et al.*, 2018, 2020; Xing *et al.*, 2020). Several studies have reported biological activities in chickpea
49 proteins including antioxidant activity, antifungal activity, antigenic activity and metal-chelating ability
50 (Kou *et al.*, 2013; Ghribi *et al.*, 2015c). Chickpea protein is, therefore, a promising health-beneficial
51 ingredient for new products development (Glusac *et al.*, 2020; Xing *et al.*, 2020).

52 Until now, the focus on chickpea ingredients was mainly attributed to chickpea flour (Cunha *et al.*, 2019;
53 Guardado-Félix *et al.*, 2020; Xing *et al.*, 2020). In the light of the shift toward more plant proteins
54 consumption, chickpea proteins are increasingly gaining traction as a functional, clean label, sustainable
55 and healthy ingredient for food formulation. The addition of chickpea protein was designed to increase the
56 content of protein and to improve both functional and sensory properties of the reformulated product
57 (Shaabani *et al.*, 2018; Wang *et al.*, 2018; El-Sohaimy *et al.*, 2020). The successful use of chickpea protein
58 is closely related to its physicochemical, functional, thermal, and structural properties and its interactions
59 with the different components of the matrices (Ghribi *et al.*, 2015b; Sofi *et al.*, 2020b). Thus, the scope of
60 this review is to provide insights into the recent advances in technologies applied for the extraction and
61 treatments of chickpea protein as well as to address the challenges and opportunities for its applications in
62 food development.

63 **2. Market dynamics of chickpea proteins**

64 The global chickpea protein ingredients market has been witnessing a sharp growth over the last few years
65 and is projected to reach \$737.8 Million by 2025 at a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 11.2%
66 (Market Research Future, 2019). The drivers are the general transition of market from animal products
67 toward plant proteins as a clean and sustainable protein source due animal welfare, human health, and
68 environmental concerns or increasing incidences towards lactose intolerance and soy allergy. However, the
69 key challenges toward the expansion of chickpea protein market is related to the environmental limitations
70 leading to a rise in prices and high dependence on the imports of chickpea (Market Research Future, 2019).
71 Chickpeas grow at the end of the rainy season, and grow on the residual soil moisture (Upadhyaya *et al.*,
72 2012). Most of the global production is focused on Asia-Pacific (mainly India), the Middle East, and some
73 parts of Africa, while it is limited to Russia and US in Europe and North America (Reports Insights, 2020).
74 In turns, Europe and North America had the highest demand and consumption of chickpea protein
75 ingredients, which creates a wide gap between demand and supply chain (Market Research Future, 2019).

76 Based on type, chickpea proteins are available as concentrates, isolates, and flour, where the isolates hold
77 the largest share (50% in 2018) as illustrated in Table 1. By category, the global chickpea protein ingredients
78 market has been bifurcated into organic and conventional, where the conventional segment accounted for a
79 larger market share in 2018 and estimated to reach \$500.87 million by 2025 (Market Research Future,
80 2019). In terms of form, the solid segment dominated the market in 2018 with a value of \$415 thousand
81 and forecasted to reach the value of \$535 thousand by 2023, registering a CAGR of 5.3% during the
82 forecasting period between 2018 until 2023 (Research and Markets, 2018). Based on application, the market
83 has been divided into food & beverages, animal feed, and others. The food & beverages segment is further

84 divided into dairy products, bakery and confectionery, beverages, dietary supplements, sweet and savory
85 snacks, infant nutrition, and others. Meat substitute, dairy alternatives, processed food, and bakery industry
86 captures the highest share of application of chickpea protein due to growing concern about the lactose
87 intolerance and gluten sensitivity. The animal feed segment is expected to register the highest CAGR of
88 11.9% during the forecast period of 2019 to 2025) (Market Research Future, 2019). The global chickpea
89 protein ingredients market has been dominated by North America and it is projected to grow by \$131.92
90 million from 2018 to 2025. Increasing consumer preference for organic protein products and high
91 incidences of lactose intolerance are expected to create lucrative opportunities for the vendors active in the
92 global market (Market Research Future, 2019). The prominent players in the global chickpea protein
93 ingredients market include Archer Daniels Midland Company (US), Nutriati, Inc. (US), Batory Foods (US),
94 InnovoPro Ltd (Israel), Cambridge Commodities Limited (UK), AGT Food and Ingredients Inc. (Canada),
95 Ingredion Incorporated (US), Chickplease (US), and Nutraonly (Xi'an) Nutritions Inc. (China) (Market
96 Research Future, 2019).

97 **Table 1**

98 3. Processing technologies for chickpea proteins extraction

99 3.1. Pre-treatment

100 Prior to protein extraction, chickpea seeds can be subjected to soaking, splitting, dehulling, milling,
101 defatting or/ and germination. Soaking, using hot or cold water, enable the softening of the outer layers of
102 the seeds thereby facilitating the wet dehulling. Dry dehulling of chickpea seeds is commonly performed
103 by air separation of the hulls from split seeds (Boye *et al.*, 2010b). Both soaking and dehulling enhance
104 protein extraction and reduce anti-nutritional factors (Boukid *et al.*, 2019). Unlike other pulses (*e.g.* peas,
105 lentils and beans) having a fat content up to 3%, chickpea contains a relatively high amounts of fat (4 to
106 7%) that affect the production of proteins (Espinosa-Ramírez and Serna-Saldívar, 2019). Defatting can be
107 carried out using hexane and results in improving the yield and purity of proteins (Wang *et al.*, 2020). High-
108 power sonication was also reported an efficient pretreatment to favor defatting and consequently the yield
109 of protein isolates increase without changing peptide profile (Byanju *et al.*, 2020). For germination,
110 chickpea seeds were cleaned, soaked in saline aqueous (at 25°C for 12 h) and then germinated (at 30 °C for
111 48 h), dried and milled (Serrano-Sandoval *et al.*, 2019; Sofi *et al.*, 2020a). Germination enhanced the
112 nutritional, functional and antioxidant properties of proteins (Sofi *et al.*, 2020a).

113 3.2. Extraction

114 The most applied technique to obtain protein isolates is the alkaline-extraction or salt extraction followed
115 by isoelectric precipitation or, ultrafiltration and ultrafiltration/diafiltration. Briefly, defatted chickpea flour
116 is solubilized in alkaline solution (pH of 8.5-9), centrifuged and the supernatant is filtered and precipitated
117 under acid conditions (pH of 4.5) (Papalamprou *et al.*, 2010; Ghribi *et al.*, 2015a). After centrifugation
118 (11,200 g for 10 min), the recovered protein was neutralized, washed, dried until moisture content reached
119 3 g/100 g, and milled to produce protein isolates (~88 g/100 g proteins) (Espinosa-Ramírez and Serna-
120 Saldívar, 2019; Sofi *et al.*, 2020a). As an alternative to isoelectric precipitation, ultrafiltration (using a 50
121 kDa hollowfiber membrane module) can be used to recover isolates or to further fractionate total protein
122 into glutelin, albumin and globulin fractions through different membranes (Serrano-Sandoval *et al.*, 2019).
123 Salt extraction also can be applied to extract isolates, where the key steps are solubilization of defatted
124 chickpea flour in salt (e.g., potassium sulphate and sodium chloride) solution, centrifugation, dialysis and
125 ultrafiltration (Karaca *et al.*, 2011; Hadnadev *et al.*, 2018). Finally, different drying technologies can be
126 applied such as spray drying and freeze drying (Tontul *et al.*, 2018).

127 Wet milling is a hybrid process designed to produce as mainstreams starch and oil, while protein and fiber
128 fractions are side streams. The first stage consists of soaking chickpea seeds with sulfur dioxide to increase
129 the rate of water diffusion in the seeds (Espinosa-Ramírez and Serna-Saldívar, 2019). After soaking (50 °C
130 for 48 h), seeds were milled, and the obtained slurry was filtered through different sieves to remove the
131 fraction rich in fiber. The mixture of starch granules and protein was delivered in an inclined stainless-steel
132 separation table resulting in starch settlement and protein draining due to differences in sedimentation
133 rate. The protein rich suspension was centrifuged, neutralized, dried and defatted (Espinosa-Ramírez and
134 Serna-Saldívar, 2019). Compared to isoelectric precipitation method, wet-milled protein isolates had higher
135 protein recovery, protein purity, lower fat content and higher fat absorption capacity. The color of the wet-
136 extracted isolate powder was also lighter compared to the isoelectric-extracted counterpart due to the final
137 defatting process leading to the removal of colored fat-soluble compounds (Ghribi *et al.*, 2015a; Espinosa-
138 Ramírez and Serna-Saldívar, 2019). The method seems suitable to obtain high-value protein, but more
139 works are need for the up-scaling of this process and modulating the impact of the process on the functional
140 properties of proteins particularly water holding capacity and foaming stability (Table 2).

141 Dry milling followed by air classification of chickpeas yielded 31% protein and 51% starch-enriched
142 concentrates (Pelgrom *et al.*, 2015) which are comparable to a recent study (28.4% of protein- and 47.7%
143 of starch-enriched fractions) (Xing *et al.*, 2020). The purity of protein-enriched fraction (45.3 g/100 g) was
144 found higher than chickpea flour (21.6 g/100 g) (Pelgrom *et al.*, 2015). This method is considered a

145 sustainable route to prepare concentrates since the use of water and energy is minimized (Xing *et al.*, 2020),
146 and enable the preservation of the native functional properties of proteins due to the absence of additives
147 and extensive processing (Schutyser *et al.*, 2015). Compared to wet-milling, dry milling requires less energy
148 and water, but protein recovery is lower (11-31%) and produces more damaged starch that can negatively
149 impact the quality of the derived products (Espinosa-Ramírez and Serna-Saldívar, 2019). Anti-nutritional
150 factors (e.g. phytic acid, tannins, trypsin inhibitors and raffinose) are not removed unlike wet protein
151 extraction and thus remained in the dry-enriched fractions (Hall *et al.*, 2017; Sozer *et al.*, 2017; Xing *et al.*,
152 2020).

153 **Table 2**

154 3.3. Post-treatment

155 To boost the nutritional and functional attributes, chickpea protein isolate can be subjected to several
156 physical, biochemical and physical post-treatments. A treatment with alcalase results in the improvement
157 of protein solubility especially at pH near to the isoelectric point compared to that untreated. A small degree
158 of hydrolysis (4%) enhanced emulsification activity and stability (Ghribi *et al.*, 2015b). The right degree of
159 hydrolysis still requires more investigations for tailoring the functional properties of chickpea proteins.
160 Solid state fermentation of chickpea proteins was found efficient to reduce the anti-nutritional factors (α -
161 galactosides and phytic acid) up to 88.3–99.1%, and to increase water holding capacity and decrease
162 foaming capacity (Xing *et al.*, 2020). Germination also increased solubility through an endogenous
163 enzymatic activity during germination with exposed protein molecules to surface which in turn enhanced
164 emulsifying capacity (Sofi *et al.*, 2020b). Compared to native proteins, proteins isolated from germinated
165 chickpea seeds had higher water holding capacity probably due to the increase in soluble proteins during
166 germination and higher oil holding capacity due to non-polar amino acids groups exposed to protein chain
167 (Sofi *et al.*, 2020b). Enzymatic crosslinking was also used as a strategy to improve the functionality of
168 chickpea protein. The application of transglutaminase improved both physical stability and rheological
169 properties of protein-stabilized emulsions leading to gelation of the system (Glusac *et al.*, 2020). High
170 ultrasound technology also enabled the increase in solubility (from 7.5 to 9.5 mg/mL), foaming capacity
171 (62 from to 136.7%), emulsifying index (from 22.3 to 24.17 m²/g) water holding capacity and breaking
172 force of the heat induced chickpea protein isolates gel (from 58.4 to 80.9%) (Wang *et al.*, 2020). These
173 changes can be attributed to increasing free sulfhydryl content, surface hydrophobicity, surface potential
174 and decreasing particle size of chickpea proteins as function of ultrasonic time (Wang *et al.*, 2020). These
175 results demonstrate the relationship between the structure and functional properties, and thus further studies
176 to decipher these association might promote its application in the food industry (Wang *et al.*, 2020).

177 4. Characteristics of chickpea proteins

178 4.1. Structure and composition

179 Chickpea proteins contain globulins (~56 g/100 g), albumins (~12 g/100 g), glutelins (~18 g/100 g),
180 prolamins (~3 g/100 g), and residual proteins. Among pulses, chickpea proteins have higher glutelin content
181 (Chang *et al.*, 2011). Globulins are the main storage proteins of chickpea and they are composed of two
182 major groups the 11S legumin (320–400 kDa) and the 7S vicilin (145–190 kDa) proteins (Yust *et al.*, 2003).
183 Legumins are oligomeric proteins made up of six $\alpha\beta$ subunits (54–60 kDa), where α and β chain are linked
184 by disulfide bonds (Yust *et al.*, 2003). Vicilins are trimeric proteins that lack cysteines and thus disulfide
185 bonds (Chang *et al.*, 2012). The albumin fraction plays an essential role in seeds because they include most
186 of the enzymatic and metabolic proteins (Singh *et al.*, 2008). Albumins are a rich source of essential amino
187 acids like other legume proteins particularly sulfur containing amino acids (tryptophan, threonine, and
188 lysine), and therefore have a higher nutritive value compared to globulins (Liu *et al.*, 2008). Glutelins
189 belong to the 11–12S globulin family; structurally glutelin is similar to globulin (Chang *et al.*, 2011).
190 Prolamin was found in traces regardless of the variety of chickpea (Singh *et al.*, 2008).

191 Chickpea protein was rich in essential amino acids such as isoleucine, lysine, total aromatic amino acids
192 and tryptophan (Alajaji and El-Adawy, 2006). Leucine (8.7% of protein) was found in highest
193 concentration, followed by arginine (8.3% of protein) and lysine (7.2% of protein) (Iqbal *et al.*, 2006).
194 Therefore, total aromatic amino acid content was found higher than the requirement of FAO/WHO for
195 preschool children (8 vs 6 g/100g) (WHO/FAO/UNU, 2007). However, leucine, total sulfur amino acids,
196 methionine, cystine, threonine and valine were first limiting amino acids (Alajaji and El-Adawy, 2006).
197 PDCAAS (protein digestibility-corrected amino acid score) of chickpea isolates (92%) and concentrates
198 (PDCAAS = 0.76) was higher than pea proteins (PDCAAS = 0.73) and common beans (0.63–0.68) but
199 slightly lower than soy protein isolates as well casein (PDCAAS = 1.0) (Tavano *et al.*, 2016; Nosworthy *et*
200 *al.*, 2017; Espinosa-Ramírez and Serna-Saldívar, 2019). This confirms the high nutritional value of
201 chickpea proteins and suggest its readiness to compete with the most marketed ones, namely soy and pea
202 proteins.

203 4.2. Tech-functionality

204 The solubility of chickpea protein isolates was found to be the lowest (2–30%) around the isoelectric point
205 (pH 4–6) and reached its maximum (up to 90%) at pH ranging from 1 to 3 and 8 to 12 (Boye *et al.*, 2010b;
206 Shevkani *et al.*, 2015). The high solubility of protein isolates at alkaline and acidic pH might be due to their

207 lower protein denaturation (Tontul *et al.*, 2018; Sofi *et al.*, 2020b). At neutral pH (pH 7), chickpea proteins
208 had low solubility (around 60%) unlike yellow pea and red lentil proteins (Boye *et al.*, 2010a). Water
209 holding capacity of chickpea protein isolates was in the range of critical values (1.49-4.71 g water/g protein
210 isolate) (Tontul *et al.*, 2018). It was reported that there is no difference among different varieties of
211 chickpea. Nevertheless, chickpea proteins had lower values than green and lentils and yellow pea proteins
212 (Boye *et al.*, 2010b). The oil holding capacity of the chickpea protein isolates was determined to be 3.15-
213 3.65 g oil/g protein isolate slightly high than soy proteins (1.9-2.61 g oil/g protein isolate) (Tontul *et al.*,
214 2018). It was reported that depending on the process of extraction, oil holding capacity significantly varied,
215 where micellized protein isolate (2 g oil/g protein isolate) had higher value than that isoelectric precipitated
216 protein isolate (1.7 g oil/g protein isolate) (Boye *et al.*, 2010b). Emulsion activity index and emulsion
217 stability index of chickpea protein isolates ranged from 15.86 to 44.13 m²/g and from 5.28 to 518.63 min,
218 respectively, depending on pH. The values were found comparable or better than that of yellow pea and
219 soy proteins (Boye *et al.*, 2010b; Ladjal Ettoumi *et al.*, 2016; Ladjal-Ettoumi *et al.*, 2016; Tontul *et al.*,
220 2018; Felix *et al.*, 2019). At neutral pH, the emulsifying activity index of chickpea proteins (5.7 m²/g) was
221 higher than yellow pea (4.6 m²/g) (Boye *et al.*, 2010b). Foam formation and stability of the chickpea protein
222 isolates were determined as 30- 58% and 5-32%, respectively (Tontul *et al.*, 2018). The high range of
223 variability can be attributed to different processing of extraction, analytical method of determining foaming
224 properties (concentration of the solution, whipping speed, and pH). This suggests the need to standardized
225 method to determine the properties of pulses flours and proteins and not rely on methods tailored for cereals
226 flours. Chickpea protein had intermediate gelling properties since it forms a gel at a concentration of 14%
227 compared to yellow pea and lentil proteins (forming a gel at 8% concentration) (Boye *et al.*, 2010b). As a
228 function of pH, chickpea forms hard but adhesive gels at pH 2 (Tontul *et al.*, 2018).

229 Considering the impact of the method of extraction, both protein structure (molecular weight, particle size,
230 zeta potential, surface hydrophobicity and free sulfhydryl content) and functional characteristics (solubility,
231 emulsifying, foaming and gel properties) can be affected (Siddique *et al.*, 2016; Malik *et al.*, 2017; Ochoa-
232 Rivas *et al.*, 2017). Further studies on these properties are required considering different varieties and
233 processing (extraction methods and drying temperatures). Such studies will provide insightful information
234 to suitably incorporate these proteins in food formulation (Wang *et al.*, 2020).

235 **4.3. Bio-functionality**

236 Chickpea proteins, hydrolysates and peptides have demonstrated to be a notable source of bioactive peptides
237 with antioxidant, hypolipidemic and hypocholesterolemic activities (del Mar Yust *et al.*, 2012; Torres-
238 Fuentes *et al.*, 2015; Gupta and Bhagyawant, 2019; Shi *et al.*, 2019). Chickpea peptides had important

239 antioxidant activities based on free radical scavenging activities and metal chelating abilities, anti-
240 inflammatory potentials, anti-proliferative effects, anti-bacterial and angiotensin converting enzyme (ACE)
241 inhibitory activities (Boschin *et al.*, 2014; Ghribi *et al.*, 2015b; Jamdar *et al.*, 2017; Mamilla and Mishra,
242 2017). Peptide sequences (ALEPDHR, TETWNPNHPEL, FVPH and SAEHGSLH) deriving from legumin
243 showed copper chelating activity and antioxidant properties with the potential to inhibit the copper-
244 mediated lipid peroxidation (Torres-Fuentes *et al.*, 2011, 2012, 2015). Albumin exhibited antioxidant
245 activities where the peptide (RQSHFANAQP) was identified with the highest antioxidant activity (Kou *et*
246 *al.*, 2013). Recently, a novel antioxidant peptide (NF2-4-1) was identified as natural antioxidant peptides
247 for food and nutraceutical applications (Wali *et al.*, 2020) . Peptides deriving from enzymatic hydrolysis
248 (by pepsin alcalase, flavourzyme or/and pancreatin) drastically inhibited THP-1 and Caco-2 cells
249 proliferation (by 45 and 78%, respectively), suggesting that chickpea-derived peptides might inhibit the
250 growth of tumors in the colon (Girón-Calle *et al.*, 2010; Gupta and Bhagyawant, 2019). The consumption
251 of chickpea protein hydrolysates might confer a protective effect against colon carcinogenesis (Sánchez-
252 Chino *et al.*, 2019). As hypolipemic agents, chickpea peptides were found efficient in decreasing serum
253 total cholesterol, total triglyceride, and low-density lipoprotein cholesterol due the ability of these peptides
254 to inhibit the activities of fatty acid synthetase and 3-hydroxy-3-methyl-glutaryl-CoA reductase and the
255 regulation of peroxisome proliferator-activated receptors and LDL receptor expressions (Shi *et al.*, 2019).
256 Peptides exhibited better hypocholesterolaemic activity when compared with chickpea protein isolate (del
257 Mar Yust *et al.*, 2012). The peptide VFVRN was found to have high hypolipidemic effects (Shi *et al.*, 2019;
258 Zhang *et al.*, 2020). Overall, these studies suggest the important potential of chickpea protein hydrolysates
259 as bioactive ingredients as a promising center of bioactive peptides and unlock new opportunities to develop
260 new nutraceuticals and functional foods (del Mar Yust *et al.*, 2012; Torres-Fuentes *et al.*, 2015; Gupta and
261 Bhagyawant, 2019). The selection of the enzyme and the degree of hydrolysis require more investigation
262 to ensure a stable and high production of bioactive peptides.

263 **4.4. Allergenicity**

264 Chickpea proteins are not included in the WHO/IUIS Allergen Nomenclature database (Wangorsch *et al.*,
265 2020). Chickpea allergy was mostly reported in specific geographic areas, the Mediterranean area and India,
266 where the consumption of chickpea-based products is high (Cuadrado *et al.*, 2009; Verma *et al.*, 2012; Bar-
267 El Dadon *et al.*, 2014; Wangorsch *et al.*, 2020). In India, the prevalence of chickpea allergy reached 13%
268 (Patil *et al.*, 2001). As for symptomatology, chickpea can cause IgE-mediated hypersensitivity reactions
269 ranging from rhinitis to anaphylaxis (Patil *et al.*, 2001; Verma *et al.*, 2012). The symptoms after chickpea
270 ingestion were predominantly respiratory (Patil *et al.*, 2001). Among legumes, chickpea allergy is merely
271 studied and in most cases, it is associated with cross reactivity with other pulses mostly with allergy to lentil

272 (Bar-El Dadon *et al.*, 2014). Recent data also suggested the potential cross-reactivity of chickpea proteins
273 and peanut (Wangorsch *et al.*, 2020). Globulin were found putative allergens (Verma *et al.*, 2013; Bar-El
274 Dadon *et al.*, 2014; Wangorsch *et al.*, 2020). Albumins (2S and Pa2) were also considered to evoke allergic
275 reactions in chickpea-sensitive individuals (Bar-El Dadon *et al.*, 2013; Verma *et al.*, 2016). Seven putative
276 chickpea allergens (Q9SMK8, Q39450, Q9SMJ4, Q304D4, G1K3R9, G1K3S0 and O23758) were
277 identified, where the sequences Q9SMK8, Q39450, Q9SMJ4 and Q304D4 were predicted to have cross-
278 reactivity with the allergens Ara h 8, Gly m 4, Vig r 1 and Bet v 1 (Kulkarni *et al.*, 2013). Noteworthy, it
279 was reported that that thermal processing such as boiling (up to 60 min) and autoclaving (1.2 and 2.6 atm,
280 up to 30 min) can mitigate these epitopes particularly harsh autoclaving (Cuadrado *et al.*, 2009). However,
281 allergenic vicilins, Cic PR-10 and Cic a 1.01, were found in boiled chickpeas (Wangorsch *et al.*, 2020)

282 5. Applications of chickpea proteins

283 The use of chickpea proteins as protein supplements or carrier of nutrients in food design has become
284 increasingly attractive in the last five years. Nevertheless, the application of chickpea protein is still in its
285 infancy stages and few applications are reported in literature compared to chickpea flour. Market request
286 for alternative proteins is boosting to widen the application of chickpea proteins thanks to their high
287 functional properties, low flavor profile and relative freedom from toxins and allergens (Singh *et al.*, 2008;
288 Mokni Ghribi *et al.*, 2018). The incorporation of chickpea protein isolate (up to 10%) in gluten free noodles
289 decreased *in vitro* starch digestibility and glycemic index (from 70.8 to 61.0) compared to rice flour-based
290 noodles (Sofi *et al.*, 2020a). This addition enhanced the nutritional properties by increasing protein content
291 (from 7.52 to 19.3%) and antioxidant activity (from 22.6 to 31.3%) of the noodles. Regarding cooking
292 behavior, increased level of addition resulted in increasing cooking time (from 13.4 to 15.1 min) and
293 decreasing cooking loss and color. From a sensory perspective, noodles prepared with 6% chickpea protein
294 isolate showed improved overall acceptability (Sofi *et al.*, 2020a,b). Likewise, substituting durum semolina
295 wheat with chickpea protein isolate (10%) decreased optimum cooking time but increased in cooking losses
296 and hardness and doubled the chewiness (El-Sohaimy *et al.*, 2020). *In vitro* protein digestibility of enriched
297 pasta was improved compared to control (from 91.89 to 95.57%). Furthermore, 10% chickpea fortified
298 pasta recorded high acceptance scores (El-Sohaimy *et al.*, 2020). The fortification of gluten free muffins
299 with chickpea protein isolate (0–7%) decreased the specific volume and porosity and decreased the hardness
300 whilst decreasing browning index of crust by increasing its concentration. It can be concluded that chickpea
301 protein can form a protein network in the gluten-free muffins with the addition of transglutaminase and
302 xanthan, yet more investigation is needed on the formulation to boost the use of proteins and reduce starchy
303 ingredients (Shaabani *et al.*, 2018). In bread, chickpea protein concentrate substitution (2/3 of soy
304 substitution) increased hardness, chewiness and lowered specific loaf volume, while a 1/3 of soy

305 substitution did not induce negative effects on texture. These differences might be attributed to the reduction
306 of fat content [soy (9 g/100 g w/w fat) vs chickpea (3 g/100 g fat)] particularly polar lipids contributing into
307 the improvement of gluten-starch plasticization thereby increasing softness and specific volume of breads.
308 This substitution (2/3 of soy by chickpea protein) also increased lightness and reduced yellowness due
309 difference in the natural pigmentation of both proteins (Serventi *et al.*, 2013, 2018). It significantly reduced
310 total saponin content (-60%) (Serventi *et al.*, 2013), but increased B-type saponins known as inhibitor to
311 cholesterol micellar solubility (Serventi *et al.*, 2018). Sausages made with 5% chickpea protein concentrates
312 had increased protein content and improved yield, and recorded similar taste score but better texture and
313 global acceptability compared to the control (Mokni Ghribi *et al.*, 2018).

314 Chickpea proteins have been also used to produce protein microencapsulate for carrying nutrients in food
315 preparations owing to their biocompatibility, non-toxicity and nutritional advantage (Ariyaratna and Nedra
316 Karunaratne, 2015). Chickpea protein was found efficient in improving the stability of folate (vitamin B9)
317 as confirmed by the encapsulation efficiency and loading capacity (62 and 10%, respectively) (Ariyaratna
318 and Nedra Karunaratne, 2015). The complex chickpea protein-high methoxylated pectin improved the
319 physical integrity and stability of emulsion buriti oil droplets, and showed a slight increase of the conjugated
320 dienes content in all microcapsules after 6 months of storage (Moser *et al.*, 2020). This complex was
321 reported efficient in the microencapsulation of carotenoids, where the obtained microparticles had a regular
322 and stable morphology for protecting the carotenoids (Moser *et al.*, 2019). This suggest that chickpea
323 protein can be used to prepare various types of microcapsules for food and drug encapsulations.

324 **6. Conclusions**

325 In the present animal-vegetable protein transition, isolated vegetal proteins are broadly used as functional
326 ingredients. Considering the potential of chickpea protein as prospective alternative food ingredients, the
327 industrial production for manufacturing chickpea protein-based products will witness a sharp growth in the
328 future. Chickpea protein is expected to be the next generation of plant proteins owing to its functionality,
329 hypo-allergenicity and nutritional properties. Bottom line is that chickpea protein isolate can be suitable
330 ingredient in a wide spectrum of food products such as cereal products, meat products and meat analogues
331 targeting high nutritional value and high-quality functional products with enhanced nutritional,
332 physicochemical, texture and sensory attributes. Technology innovation undoubtedly will play an important
333 role in unlocking more opportunities for applying chickpea proteins. For the future, in-depth investigations
334 are deemed necessary to optimize protein extraction methods and conditions and to understand how
335 processing can impact the purity, protein content, amino acid composition, tech-functionality, and bio-

336 functionality. Such information will be of great help in boosting chickpea protein production and
337 commercialization, keeping in mind cost and sustainability.

338

339 **Acknowledgments**

340 This work was supported by CERCA Programme (Generalitat de Catalunya).

341

342 **Ethics declarations**

343 **Conflict of interest**

344 None.

345

346 **Compliance with ethics requirements**

347 This article does not contain any studies with human or animal subjects.

348

349 **References**

- 350 Alajaji, S.A. & El-Adawy, T.A. (2006). Nutritional composition of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) as
351 affected by microwave cooking and other traditional cooking methods. *Journal of Food*
352 *Composition and Analysis*, **19**, 806–812.
- 353 Ariyaratna, I.R. & Nedra Karunaratne, D. (2015). Use of chickpea protein for encapsulation of folate to
354 enhance nutritional potency and stability. *Food and Bioproducts Processing*, **95**, 76–82.
- 355 Bar-El Dadon, S., Pascual, C.Y., Eshel, D., Teper-Bamnolker, P., Paloma Ibáñez, M.D. & Reifen, R.
356 (2013). Vicilin and the basic subunit of legumin are putative chickpea allergens. *Food Chemistry*,
357 **138**, 13–18.
- 358 Bar-El Dadon, S., Pascual, C.Y. & Reifen, R. (2014). Food allergy and cross-reactivity-chickpea as a test
359 case. *Food Chemistry*, **165**, 483–488.
- 360 Boschini, G., Scigliuolo, G.M., Resta, D. & Arnoldi, A. (2014). ACE-inhibitory activity of enzymatic
361 protein hydrolysates from lupin and other legumes. *Food Chemistry*, **145**, 34–40.
- 362 Boukid, F. (2020). Plant-based meat analogues: from niche to mainstream. *European Food Research and*
363 *Technology*.
- 364 Boukid, F., Zannini, E., Carini, E. & Vittadini, E. (2019). Pulses for bread fortification: A necessity or a
365 choice? *Trends in Food Science and Technology*.
- 366 Boye, J., Zare, F. & Pletch, A. (2010a). Pulse proteins: Processing, characterization, functional properties
367 and applications in food and feed. *Food Research International*.
- 368 Boye, J.I., Aksay, S., Roufik, S., Ribéreau, S., Mondor, M., Farnworth, E. & Rajamohamed, S.H.
369 (2010b). Comparison of the functional properties of pea, chickpea and lentil protein concentrates

- 370 processed using ultrafiltration and isoelectric precipitation techniques. *Food Research International*,
371 **43**, 537–546.
- 372 Byanju, B., Rahman, M.M., Hojilla-Evangelista, M.P. & Lamsal, B.P. (2020). Effect of high-power
373 sonication pretreatment on extraction and some physicochemical properties of proteins from
374 chickpea, kidney bean, and soybean. *International Journal of Biological Macromolecules*, **145**,
375 712–721.
- 376 Chang, Y.W., Alli, I., Konishi, Y. & Ziomek, E. (2011). Characterization of protein fractions from
377 chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) and oat (*Avena sativa* L.) seeds using proteomic techniques. *Food*
378 *Research International*, **44**, 3094–3104.
- 379 Chang, Y.W., Alli, I., Molina, A.T., Konishi, Y. & Boye, J.I. (2012). Isolation and Characterization of
380 Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) Seed Protein Fractions. *Food and Bioprocess Technology*, **5**, 618–
381 625.
- 382 Cuadrado, C., Cabanillas, B., Pedrosa, M.M., Varela, A., Guillamón, E., Muzquiz, M., Crespo, J.F.,
383 Rodríguez, J. & Burbano, C. (2009). Influence of thermal processing on IgE reactivity to lentil and
384 chickpea proteins. *Molecular Nutrition and Food Research*, **53**, 1462–1468.
- 385 Cunha, L.M., Fonseca, S.C., Lima, R.C., Loureiro, J., Pinto, A.S., Vaz Patto, M.C. & Brites, C. (2019).
386 Consumer-driven improvement of maize bread formulations with legume fortification. *Foods*, **8**.
- 387 El-Sohaimy, S.A., Brennan, M., Darwish, A.M.G. & Brennan, C. (2020). Physicochemical, texture and
388 sensorial evaluation of pasta enriched with chickpea flour and protein isolate. *Annals of Agricultural*
389 *Sciences*, **65**, 28–34.
- 390 Espinosa-Ramírez, J. & Serna-Saldívar, S.O. (2019). Wet-milled chickpea coproduct as an alternative to
391 obtain protein isolates. *LWT*, **115**.
- 392 FAO. (2020). *FAOSTAT Food and Agriculture data*.
- 393 Felix, M., Cermeño, M., Romero, A. & FitzGerald, R.J. (2019). Characterisation of the bioactive
394 properties and microstructure of chickpea protein-based oil in water emulsions. *Food Research*
395 *International*, **121**, 577–585.
- 396 Ghribi, A.M., Gafsi, I.M., Blecker, C., Danthine, S., Attia, H. & Besbes, S. (2015a). Effect of drying
397 methods on physico-chemical and functional properties of chickpea protein concentrates. *Journal of*
398 *Food Engineering*, **165**, 179–188.
- 399 Ghribi, A.M., Gafsi, I.M., Sila, A., Blecker, C., Danthine, S., Attia, H., Bougatef, A. & Besbes, S.
400 (2015b). Effects of enzymatic hydrolysis on conformational and functional properties of chickpea
401 protein isolate. *Food Chem.*, **187**, 322–330.
- 402 Ghribi, A.M., Sila, A., Przybylski, R., Nedjar-Arroume, N., Makhoulouf, I., Blecker, C., Attia, H., Dhulster,
403 P., Bougatef, A. & Besbes, S. (2015c). Purification and identification of novel antioxidant peptides
404 from enzymatic hydrolysate of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) protein concentrate. *Journal of*
405 *Functional Foods*, **12**, 516–525.
- 406 Girón-Calle, J., Alaiz, M. & Vioque, J. (2010). Effect of chickpea protein hydrolysates on cell
407 proliferation and in vitro bioavailability. *Food Research International*, **43**, 1365–1370.
- 408 Glusac, J., Isaschar-Ovdat, S. & Fishman, A. (2020). Transglutaminase modifies the physical stability and
409 digestibility of chickpea protein-stabilized oil-in-water emulsions. *Food Chemistry*, **315**.
- 410 Guardado-Félix, D., Lazo-Vélez, M.A., Pérez-Carrillo, E., Panata-Saquicili, D.E. & Serna-Saldívar, S.O.

- 411 (2020). Effect of partial replacement of wheat flour with sprouted chickpea flours with or without
 412 selenium on physicochemical, sensory, antioxidant and protein quality of yeast-leavened breads.
 413 *LWT*, **129**.
- 414 Gupta, N. & Bhagyawant, S.S. (2019). Enzymatic treatment improves ACE-I inhibition and
 415 antiproliferative potential of chickpea. *Vegetos*, **32**, 363–369.
- 416 Hadnađev, M., Dapčević-Hadnađev, T., Lazaridou, A., Moschakis, T., Michaelidou, A.M., Popović, S. &
 417 Biliaderis, C.G. (2018). Hempseed meal protein isolates prepared by different isolation techniques.
 418 Part I. physicochemical properties. *Food Hydrocolloids*, **79**, 526–533.
- 419 Hall, C., Hillen, C. & Robinson, J.G. (2017). Composition, nutritional value, and health benefits of
 420 pulses. *Cereal Chemistry*.
- 421 Iqbal, A., Ateeq, N., Khalil, I.A., Perveen, S. & Saleemullah, S. (2006). Physicochemical characteristics
 422 and amino acid profile of chickpea cultivars grown in Pakistan. *Journal of Foodservice*, **17**, 94–101.
- 423 Jamdar, S.N., Deshpande, R. & Marathe, S.A. (2017). Effect of processing conditions and in vitro protein
 424 digestion on bioactive potentials of commonly consumed legumes. *Food Bioscience*, **20**, 1–11.
- 425 Karaca, A.C., Low, N. & Nickerson, M. (2011). Emulsifying properties of chickpea, faba bean, lentil and
 426 pea proteins produced by isoelectric precipitation and salt extraction. *Food Research International*,
 427 **44**, 2742–2750.
- 428 Kou, X., Gao, J., Zhang, Z., Wang, H. & Wang, X. (2013). Purification and identification of antioxidant
 429 peptides from chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) albumin hydrolysates. *LWT - Food Science and*
 430 *Technology*, **50**, 591–598.
- 431 Kulkarni, A., Ananthanarayan, L. & Raman, K. (2013). Identification of putative and potential cross-
 432 reactive chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*) allergens through an in silico approach. *Computational Biology*
 433 *and Chemistry*, **47**, 149–155.
- 434 Ladjal-Ettoumi, Y., Boudries, H., Chibane, M. & Romero, A. (2016). Pea, Chickpea and Lentil Protein
 435 Isolates: Physicochemical Characterization and Emulsifying Properties. *Food Biophysics*, **11**, 43–51.
- 436 Ladjal Ettoumi, Y., Chibane, M. & Romero, A. (2016). Emulsifying properties of legume proteins at
 437 acidic conditions: Effect of protein concentration and ionic strength. *LWT - Food Science and*
 438 *Technology*, **66**, 260–266.
- 439 Liu, L.H., Hung, T. V. & Bennett, L. (2008). Extraction and characterization of chickpea (*Cicer*
 440 *arietinum*) albumin and globulin. *Journal of Food Science*, **73**, C299–C305.
- 441 Malik, M.A., Sharma, H.K. & Saini, C.S. (2017). High intensity ultrasound treatment of protein isolate
 442 extracted from dephenolized sunflower meal: Effect on physicochemical and functional properties.
 443 *Ultrasonics Sonochemistry*, **39**, 511–519.
- 444 Mamilla, R.K. & Mishra, V.K. (2017). Effect of germination on antioxidant and ACE inhibitory activities
 445 of legumes. *LWT - Food Science and Technology*, **75**, 51–58.
- 446 Mar Yust, M. del, Millán-Linares, M. del C., Alcaide-Hidalgo, J.M., Millán, F. & Pedroche, J. (2012).
 447 Hypocholesterolaemic and antioxidant activities of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) protein
 448 hydrolysates. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, **92**, 1994–2001.
- 449 Market Research Future. (2019). Chickpea Protein Ingredients Market Size, Share, Global Analysis, 2025
 450 | MRFR [Internet document] URL [https://www.marketresearchfuture.com/reports/chickpea-protein-](https://www.marketresearchfuture.com/reports/chickpea-protein-ingredients-market-6484)
 451 [ingredients-market-6484](https://www.marketresearchfuture.com/reports/chickpea-protein-ingredients-market-6484). Accessed 19/10/2020.

- 452 Mokni Ghribi, A., Amira, A. Ben, Maklouf Gafsi, I., Lahiani, M., Bejar, M., Triki, M., Zouari, A., Attia,
453 H. & Besbes, S. (2018). Toward the enhancement of sensory profile of sausage “Merguez” with
454 chickpea protein concentrate. *Meat Science*, **143**, 74–80.
- 455 Moser, P., Ferreira, S. & Nicoletti, V.R. (2019). Buriti oil microencapsulation in chickpea protein-pectin
456 matrix as affected by spray drying parameters. *Food and Bioproducts Processing*, **117**, 183–193.
- 457 Moser, P., Nicoletti, V.R., Drusch, S. & Brückner-Gühmann, M. (2020). Functional properties of
458 chickpea protein-pectin interfacial complex in buriti oil emulsions and spray dried microcapsules.
459 *Food Hydrocolloids*, **107**, 105929.
- 460 Nosworthy, M.G. & House, J.D. (2017). Factors influencing the quality of dietary proteins: Implications
461 for pulses. *Cereal Chemistry*.
- 462 Nosworthy, M.G., Neufeld, J., Frohlich, P., Young, G., Malcolmson, L. & House, J.D. (2017).
463 Determination of the protein quality of cooked Canadian pulses. *Food Science and Nutrition*, **5**,
464 896–903.
- 465 Ochoa-Rivas, A., Nava-Valdez, Y., Serna-Saldívar, S.O. & Chuck-Hernández, C. (2017). Microwave and
466 Ultrasound to Enhance Protein Extraction from Peanut Flour under Alkaline Conditions: Effects in
467 Yield and Functional Properties of Protein Isolates. *Food and Bioprocess Technology*, **10**, 543–555.
- 468 Papalamprou, E.M., Doxastakis, G.I. & Kiosseoglou, V. (2010). Chickpea protein isolates obtained by
469 wet extraction as emulsifying agents. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, **90**, 304–313.
- 470 Patil, S.P., Niphadkar, P. V. & Bapat, M.M. (2001). Chickpea: A major food allergen in the Indian
471 subcontinent and its clinical and immunochemical correlation. *Annals of Allergy, Asthma and
472 Immunology*, **87**, 140–145.
- 473 Pelgrom, P.J.M., Boom, R.M. & Schutyser, M.A.I. (2015). Method Development to Increase Protein
474 Enrichment During Dry Fractionation of Starch-Rich Legumes. *Food and Bioprocess Technology*,
475 **8**, 1495–1502.
- 476 Reports Insights. (2020). Europe Chickpea Flour Market – Historical factors Poised for Strong Growth
477 throughout the forecast period 2020 - 2028 [Internet document] URL
478 <https://www.reportsinsights.com/industry-forecast/Chickpea-Flour-Market-111969>. Accessed
479 31/10/2020.
- 480 Research and Markets. (2018). Global Chickpea Protein Powder Market - Size, Trends, Competitive
481 Analysis and Forecasts (2018-2023) [Internet document] URL
482 <https://www.researchandmarkets.com/reports/4614976/global-chickpea-protein-powder-market-size>.
483 Accessed 06/10/2020.
- 484 Sánchez-Chino, X.M., Jiménez Martínez, C., León-Espinosa, E.B., Garduño-Siciliano, L., Álvarez-
485 González, I., Madrigal-Bujaidar, E., Vásquez-Garzón, V.R., Baltiérrez-Hoyos, R. & Dávila-Ortiz,
486 G. (2019). Protective Effect of Chickpea Protein Hydrolysates on Colon Carcinogenesis Associated
487 With a Hypercaloric Diet. *Journal of the American College of Nutrition*, **38**, 162–170.
- 488 Schutyser, M.A.I., Pelgrom, P.J.M., Goot, A.J. van der & Boom, R.M. (2015). Dry fractionation for
489 sustainable production of functional legume protein concentrates. *Trends in Food Science and
490 Technology*, **45**, 327–335.
- 491 Serrano-Sandoval, S.N., Guardado-Félix, D. & Gutiérrez-Urbe, J.A. (2019). Changes in digestibility of
492 proteins from chickpeas (*Cicer arietinum* L.) germinated in presence of selenium and antioxidant
493 capacity of hydrolysates. *Food Chemistry*, **285**, 290–295.

- 494 Serventi, L., Chitchumroonchokchai, C., Riedl, K.M., Kerem, Z., Berhow, M.A., Vodovotz, Y., Schwartz,
495 S.J. & Failla, M.L. (2013). Saponins from Soy and Chickpea: Stability during Beadmaking and in
496 Vitro Bioaccessibility. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, **61**, 6703–6710.
- 497 Serventi, L., Vittadini, E. & Vodovotz, Y. (2018). Effect of chickpea protein concentrate on the loaf
498 quality of composite soy-wheat bread. *LWT*, **89**, 400–402.
- 499 Shaabani, S., Yarmand, M.S., Kiani, H. & Emam-Djomeh, Z. (2018). The effect of chickpea protein
500 isolate in combination with transglutaminase and xanthan on the physical and rheological
501 characteristics of gluten free muffins and batter based on millet flour. *LWT - Food Science and
502 Technology*, **90**, 362–372.
- 503 Sharif, H.R., Williams, P.A., Sharif, M.K., Abbas, S., Majeed, H., Masamba, K.G., Safdar, W. & Zhong,
504 F. (2018). Current progress in the utilization of native and modified legume proteins as emulsifiers
505 and encapsulants – A review. *Food Hydrocolloids*, **76**, 2–16.
- 506 Shevkani, K., Singh, N., Kaur, A. & Rana, J.C. (2015). Structural and functional characterization of
507 kidney bean and field pea protein isolates: A comparative study. *Food Hydrocolloids*, **43**, 679–689.
- 508 Shi, W., Hou, T., Guo, D. & He, H. (2019). Evaluation of hypolipidemic peptide (Val-Phe-Val-Arg-Asn)
509 virtual screened from chickpea peptides by pharmacophore model in high-fat diet-induced obese rat.
510 *Journal of Functional Foods*, **54**, 136–145.
- 511 Siddique, M.A.B., Maresca, P., Pataro, G. & Ferrari, G. (2016). Effect of pulsed light treatment on
512 structural and functional properties of whey protein isolate. *Food Research International*, **87**, 189–
513 196.
- 514 Singh, G.D., Wani, A.A., Kaur, D. & Sogi, D.S. (2008). Characterisation and functional properties of
515 proteins of some Indian chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*) cultivars. *Journal of the Science of Food and
516 Agriculture*, **88**, 778–786.
- 517 Sofi, S.A., Singh, J., Chhikara, N., Panghal, A. & Gat, Y. (2020a). Quality characterization of gluten free
518 noodles enriched with chickpea protein isolate. *Food Bioscience*, **36**, 100626.
- 519 Sofi, S.A., Singh, J., Muzaffar, K., Majid, D. & Dar, B.N. (2020b). Physicochemical characteristics of
520 protein isolates from native and germinated chickpea cultivars and their noodle quality.
521 *International Journal of Gastronomy and Food Science*, **22**.
- 522 Sozer, N., Holopainen-Mantila, U. & Poutanen, K. (2017). Traditional and new food uses of pulses.
523 *Cereal Chemistry*.
- 524 Tavano, O.L., Neves, V.A. & Silva Júnior, S.I. da. (2016). In vitro versus in vivo protein digestibility
525 techniques for calculating PDCAAS (protein digestibility-corrected amino acid score) applied to
526 chickpea fractions. *Food Research International*, **89**, 756–763.
- 527 Tontul, İ., Kasimoglu, Z., Asik, S., Atbakan, T. & Topuz, A. (2018). Functional properties of chickpea
528 protein isolates dried by refractance window drying. *International Journal of Biological
529 Macromolecules*, **109**, 1253–1259.
- 530 Torres-Fuentes, C., Alaiz, M. & Vioque, J. (2011). Affinity purification and characterisation of chelating
531 peptides from chickpea protein hydrolysates. *Food Chemistry*, **129**, 485–490.
- 532 Torres-Fuentes, C., Alaiz, M. & Vioque, J. (2012). Iron-chelating activity of chickpea protein hydrolysate
533 peptides. *Food Chemistry*, **134**, 1585–1588.
- 534 Torres-Fuentes, C., Contreras, M.D.M., Recio, I., Alaiz, M. & Vioque, J. (2015). Identification and

- 535 characterization of antioxidant peptides from chickpea protein hydrolysates. *Food Chemistry*, **180**,
536 194–202.
- 537 United Nations. (2019). Growing at a slower pace, world population is expected to reach 9.7 billion in
538 2050 and could peak at nearly 11 billion around 2100 | UN DESA | United Nations Department of
539 Economic and Social Affairs [Internet document] URL
540 <https://www.un.org/development/desa/en/news/population/world-population-prospects-2019.html>.
541 Accessed 19/10/2020.
- 542 Upadhyaya, H.D., Kashiwagi, J., Varshney, R.K., Gaur, P.M., Saxena, K.B., Krishnamurthy, L., Gowda,
543 C.L.L., Pundir, R.P.S., Chaturvedi, S.K., Basu, P.S. & Singh, I.P. (2012). Phenotyping chickpeas
544 and pigeonpeas for adaptation to drought. *Frontiers in Physiology*, **3** JUN.
- 545 Verma, A.K., Kumar, S., Das, M. & Dwivedi, P.D. (2013). A comprehensive review of legume allergy.
546 *Clinical Reviews in Allergy and Immunology*.
- 547 Verma, A.K., Kumar, S., Tripathi, A., Chaudhari, B.P., Das, M. & Dwivedi, P.D. (2012). Chickpea (*Cicer*
548 *arietinum*) proteins induce allergic responses in nasobronchial allergic patients and BALB/c mice.
549 *Toxicology Letters*, **210**, 24–33.
- 550 Verma, A.K., Sharma, A., Kumar, S., Gupta, R.K., Kumar, D., Gupta, K., Giridhar, B.H., Das, M. &
551 Dwivedi, P.D. (2016). Purification, characterization and allergenicity assessment of 26 kDa protein,
552 a major allergen from *Cicer arietinum*. *Molecular Immunology*, **74**, 113–124.
- 553 Wali, A., Mijiti, Y., Yanhua, G., Yili, A., Aisa, H.A. & Kawuli, A. (2020). Isolation and Identification of
554 a Novel Antioxidant Peptide from Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) Sprout Protein Hydrolysates.
555 *International Journal of Peptide Research and Therapeutics*, 1–9.
- 556 Wang, S., Chelikani, V. & Serventi, L. (2018). Evaluation of chickpea as alternative to soy in plant-based
557 beverages, fresh and fermented. *LWT*, **97**, 570–572.
- 558 Wang, Y., Wang, Y., Li, K., Bai, Y., Li, B. & Xu, W. (2020). Effect of high intensity ultrasound on
559 physicochemical, interfacial and gel properties of chickpea protein isolate. *LWT*, **129**.
- 560 Wangorsch, A., Kulkarni, A., Jamin, A., Spiric, J., Bräcker, J., Brockmeyer, J., Mahler, V., Blanca-López,
561 N., Ferrer, M., Blanca, M., Torres, M., Gomez, P., Bartra, J., García-Moral, A., Goikoetxea, M.J.,
562 Vieths, S., Toda, M., Zoccatelli, G. & Scheurer, S. (2020). Identification and Characterization of
563 IgE-Reactive Proteins and a New Allergen (Cic a 1.01) from Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*).
564 *Molecular Nutrition & Food Research*, **64**, 2000560.
- 565 WHO/FAO/UNU. (2007). Protein and amino acid requirements in human nutrition - PubMed. *World*
566 *Health Organ Tech Rep Ser* , **935**, 1–265.
- 567 Xing, Q., Dekker, S., Kyriakopoulou, K., Boom, R.M., Smid, E.J. & Schutyser, M.A.I. (2020). Enhanced
568 nutritional value of chickpea protein concentrate by dry separation and solid state fermentation.
569 *Innovative Food Science and Emerging Technologies*, **59**.
- 570 Yust, M.M., Pedroche, J., Girón-Calle, J., Alaiz, M., Millán, F. & Vioque, J. (2003). Production of ace
571 inhibitory peptides by digestion of chickpea legumin with alcalase. *Food Chemistry*, **81**, 363–369.
- 572 Zhang, X., Shi, W., He, H., Cao, R. & Hou, T. (2020). Hypolipidemic effects and mechanisms of Val-
573 Phe-Val-Arg-Asn in C57BL/6J mice and 3T3-L1 cell models. *Journal of Functional Foods*, **73**.

574

575 **ANNOTATED REFERENCES:**

576

577 Verma, A.K., Sharma, A., Kumar, S., Gupta, R.K., Kumar, D., Gupta, K., Giridhar, B.H., Das, M. &
578 Dwivedi, P.D. (2016). Purification, characterization and allergenicity assessment of 26 kDa protein,
579 a major allergen from *Cicer arietinum*. *Molecular Immunology*, **74**, 113–124. This paper covers the
580 identification of epitopes relative to chickpea proteins triggering allergic reactions

581 Wang, S., Chelikani, V. & Serventi, L. (2018). Evaluation of chickpea as alternative to soy in plant-based
582 beverages, fresh and fermented. *LWT*, **97**, 570–572. This paper presents important data about the
583 application chickpea as an alternative to soy for beverage formulation

584 Wang, Y., Wang, Y., Li, K., Bai, Y., Li, B. & Xu, W. (2020). Effect of high intensity ultrasound on
585 physicochemical, interfacial and gel properties of chickpea protein isolate. *LWT*, **129**. This paper
586 describes the application of emerging technology such as ultrasound for enhancing the properties of
587 chickpea proteins

588 Wangorsch, A., Kulkarni, A., Jamin, A., Spiric, J., Bräcker, J., Brockmeyer, J., Mahler, V., Blanca-López,
589 N., Ferrer, M., Blanca, M., Torres, M., Gomez, P., Bartra, J., García-Moral, A., Goikoetxea, M.J.,
590 Vieths, S., Toda, M., Zoccatelli, G. & Scheurer, S. (2020). Identification and Characterization of
591 IgE-Reactive Proteins and a New Allergen (Cic a 1.01) from Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*).
592 *Molecular Nutrition & Food Research*, **64**, 2000560. This paper gives new insights on a new
593 epitopes recently identified in chickpea protein

594