

Chapter 6

Comparison of Total Soluble Protein Content and SDS–PAGE Pattern Between Four Different Types of Honey

Fisal Haji Ahmad

Universiti Malaysia Terengganu, Malaysia

Mohd Amiruddin Abdul Wahab

Universiti Malaysia Terengganu, Malaysia

Tuan Zainazor Tuan Chilek

Universiti Malaysia Terengganu, Malaysia

Amir Izzwan Zamri

Universiti Malaysia Terengganu, Malaysia

Shamsul Bahri Abd Razak

Universiti Malaysia Terengganu, Malaysia

Azril Dino Abd Malik

Naluri Pantas Sdn. Bhd, Malaysia

ABSTRACT

Generally, there are two types of beekeeping: the Apini tribe and the Meliponini tribe. Both tribes produce honey and have a good demand due to their health benefit properties. Considering the influence of diverse factors on honey composition and the lack of studies, establishing quality standards for stingless bee honey (Meliponini tribe) is still challenging and need to do to protect the consumer. In this sense, this

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-6684-6265-2.ch006

Comparison of Total Soluble Protein Content and SDS-PAGE Pattern

study aimed to determine the total soluble protein content and compare the SDS-PAGE profile between two species of Apini tribe and two species of Meliponini tribe. Protein concentrations in honey samples were varied and resulted in a micro component in honey. SDS-PAGE profile for Meliponini tribe showed more number of protein bands compared to protein from Apini tribe. The unique protein bands that appeared in the Meliponini tribe may have potential as a biomarker to justify the authenticity and quality of that honey, which is known as Unique Kelulut Factor (UKF).

INTRODUCTION

Honey is a natural sweetener that is consumed worldwide. Malaysia has various types of honey that are already commercial in the global market. There are two types of honey which blossom honey and honeydew honey. The former is produced from the nectar of flowers, while the latter is produced from secretions of the living parts of plants other than flowers or is a product of bees' excretions (Azevedo et al., 2017). Honeybees (Apini tribe) and stingless bees (Meliponini tribe) are two common main honey producers. Honeybees, also known as *Apis mellifera* bees, are normally bigger and sting, while stingless bees such as *Heterotrigona itama* are smaller in size and without a sting. As Naila et al. (2018) mentioned, *Apis mellifera* bee honey is sweet, while stingless bee honey is a mixture of sweet and sour tastes.

Generally, honey is a viscous solution containing various molecules, including fructose and glucose (80-85%); water (15-17%); ash (0.2%); proteins and amino acids (0.1-0.5%) and trace amounts of enzymes, vitamins, and other substances, such as phenolic compounds (Rao et al., 2016). According to Alimentarius (2001), honey is the natural sweet substance produced by honeybees from the nectar of plants, from secretions of living parts of plants, or from excretions of plant-sucking insects. This official definition is restricted to the honey produced by *A. mellifera*. It may not apply to stingless bee honey, better known as pot honey, which is very popular for its distinct sweetness mixed with an acidic taste, and fluid texture (Ávila et al., 2019). However, the honey composition varies depending on the plants from which the bee consumes nectar. For this reason, the classification and evaluation of honey have always been a challenge for chemical analysis, especially when honey adulteration is increasing (Ramón-Sierra et al., 2015). Among these two types of bees that produce honey, the demand for stingless bees compared to *Apis* bees is increasing nowadays because of their medicinal value, which can act as an antimicrobial, anti-cancer, anti-inflammatory and wound healing (Queiroz-Junior et al., 2015).

15 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: www.igi-global.com/chapter/comparison-of-total-soluble-protein-content-and-sds-page-pattern-between-four-different-types-of-honey/315993

Related Content

Energy-Saving Systems Using Photovoltaic Modules

Pavel Valentinovich Tikhonov, Vladimir Aleksandrovich Mayorov and Konstantin Sergeevich Morenko (2020). *Handbook of Research on Smart Computing for Renewable Energy and Agro-Engineering* (pp. 464-485).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/energy-saving-systems-using-photovoltaic-modules/239114

Wireless Sensor Networks Technologies and Applications for Smart Farming

Dharm Singh Jatand Chucknorris Garikayi Madamombe (2019). *Smart Farming Technologies for Sustainable Agricultural Development* (pp. 25-39).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/wireless-sensor-networks-technologies-and-applications-for-smart-farming/209544

Exploring Mexican Attitudes Toward the Front Labeling System for Food and Beverages: A Twitter Analysis

Monica D. Hernandez and Edith Galy (2023). *Influences of Social Media on Consumer Decision-Making Processes in the Food and Grocery Industry* (pp. 111-118).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/exploring-mexican-attitudes-toward-the-front-labeling-system-for-food-and-beverages/328375

Automatic Knowledge Acquisition in the Form of Fuzzy Rules From Cases for Solving Classification Problem

Tatiana Vladimirovna Avdeenko (2020). *Fuzzy Expert Systems and Applications in Agricultural Diagnosis* (pp. 33-49).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/automatic-knowledge-acquisition-in-the-form-of-fuzzy-rules-from-cases-for-solving-classification-problem/233213

Emblica officinalis Orchard-Based Agroforestry for Augmented Productivity

Kumud Dubey and K. P. Dubey (2022). *Handbook of Research on Principles and Practices for Orchards Management* (pp. 174-184).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/emblica-officinalis-orchard-based-agroforestry-for-augmented-productivity/309168