

Evaluation of Anticancer and Antioxidant Effects of Unsaturated Fatty Acids from *Yarrowia lipolytica*: Co-Culture vs. Metabolite-Based Approaches

Morteza Nadeb, Soheil Aghaei, Tahereh Komeili, MohamadReza Zolfaghary

Department of Microbiology, QomS.c, Islamic Azad University, Qom, Iran

Introduction	Material and methods																																																					
<p>Project</p> <p>This research supports sustainable biotechnology by utilizing <i>Yarrowia lipolytica</i>, a GRAS-status, non-pathogenic yeast, as a microbial cell factory for producing health-promoting unsaturated fatty acids. Compared to animal-based or chemically synthesized fatty acids, microbial production offers a low-cost, renewable, and eco-friendly alternative. This approach reduces environmental impact, avoids overfishing (in the case of omega-3 from fish oil), and aligns with green chemistry and circular bioeconomy principles.</p> <p>Background</p> <p><i>Yarrowia lipolytica</i> is a promising oleaginous yeast capable of producing various unsaturated fatty acids (UFAs), including omega-3 and omega-6, which are known for their health-promoting properties. Recent evidence suggests these UFAs may exhibit anticancer and antioxidant activities. This study explores the potential of <i>Y. lipolytica</i>-derived UFAs in combating human cancer cells through both direct co-culture and metabolite-based treatments.</p> <p>Research Question</p> <p>Do the unsaturated fatty acids produced by <i>Yarrowia lipolytica</i> exhibit significant anticancer and antioxidant effects by reducing the viability of human colon cancer cells (HT-29) and decreasing intracellular reactive oxygen species (ROS), and is there a notable difference between the effects observed in direct co-culture and those from cell-free metabolites?</p>	<p>1. Microorganism and Culture Conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Strain: <i>Yarrowia lipolytica</i> (laboratory or wild-type strain).Culture medium: Yeast extract peptone dextrose (YPD) broth or lipid-inducing nitrogen-limited medium.Incubation conditions: Cultures were incubated at 28–30 °C with agitation at 150 rpm for 72–120 h.Metabolite extraction: Culture supernatants were obtained by centrifugation at 5000 rpm for 10 min, followed by sterile filtration through 0.22 µm membrane filters. <p>2. Cell Disruption and Lipid Extraction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Cell disruption: Yeast biomass was harvested and subjected to homogenization and ultrasonic treatment to break the cell walls and release intracellular lipids.Lipid extraction: Lipids were extracted from the disrupted biomass using either the Bligh and Dyer method or the Folch method.Solvent removal and concentration: Crude lipid extracts were purified and concentrated using a rotary evaporator under reduced pressure. <p>3. FAME Preparation and Combined GC-MS / FTIR Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">FAME preparation: Transesterification of extracted lipids was performed using methanolic HCl or NaOH to obtain fatty acid methyl esters (FAMEs).Gas Chromatography–Mass Spectrometry (GC-MS): FAMEs were analysed using GC-MS to determine the fatty acid profile. Separation was performed on a capillary column with helium as the carrier gas, and compounds were identified by comparing retention times and mass spectra with reference standards and NIST library data.																																																					
<p>Results</p> <p>Antimicrobial effects of oleic acid and linoleic fatty acid derived from <i>yarrowia lipolytica</i></p> <p>Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC) of Lipid Extracts</p>  <table><caption>Approximate MIC values (µg/mL) from chart</caption><tr><th>Bacteria</th><th>Linoleic Acid (µg/mL)</th><th>Oleic Acid (µg/mL)</th></tr><tr><td><i>S. aureus</i></td><td>~250</td><td>~500</td></tr><tr><td><i>B. licheniformis</i></td><td>~100</td><td>~250</td></tr><tr><td><i>E. coli</i></td><td>~500</td><td>~1000</td></tr><tr><td><i>E. faecalis</i></td><td>~250</td><td>~500</td></tr><tr><td><i>P. aeruginosa</i></td><td>~1100</td><td>~1100</td></tr><tr><td><i>Salmonella spp.</i></td><td>~500</td><td>~1000</td></tr><tr><td><i>K. pneumoniae</i></td><td>~1100</td><td>~1100</td></tr><tr><td><i>S. enteritidis</i></td><td>~250</td><td>~500</td></tr></table> <p>Linoleic acid (blue bars) shows stronger antibacterial activity, especially against Gram-positive bacteria (MIC: 125–250 µg/mL), while oleic acid (red bars) is less effective (MIC: 250–1000 µg/mL). Neither fatty acid fully inhibited <i>P. aeruginosa</i> or <i>K. pneumoniae</i> up to 1000 µg/mL. This highlights linoleic acid's superior antimicrobial potential.</p>	Bacteria	Linoleic Acid (µg/mL)	Oleic Acid (µg/mL)	<i>S. aureus</i>	~250	~500	<i>B. licheniformis</i>	~100	~250	<i>E. coli</i>	~500	~1000	<i>E. faecalis</i>	~250	~500	<i>P. aeruginosa</i>	~1100	~1100	<i>Salmonella spp.</i>	~500	~1000	<i>K. pneumoniae</i>	~1100	~1100	<i>S. enteritidis</i>	~250	~500	<p>Discussion</p> <p>Total lipid content</p> <p>Fatty Acid Composition of <i>Yarrowia lipolytica</i> Strain W29</p>  <table><caption>Fatty Acid Composition of Strain W29 (%)</caption><tr><th>Fatty Acid</th><th>Percentage (%)</th></tr><tr><td>Oleic acid (C18:1)</td><td>38.83%</td></tr><tr><td>Linoleic acid (C18:2)</td><td>17.41%</td></tr><tr><td>Arachidonic acid (C20:4)</td><td>0.2%</td></tr><tr><td>Stearic acid (C18:0)</td><td>1.94%</td></tr><tr><td>Heptadecenoic acid (C17:1)</td><td>0.2%</td></tr><tr><td>Saturated fatty acids (C16:0, C16:1)</td><td>34.76%</td></tr></table> <p>Fatty Acid Composition of <i>Yarrowia lipolytica</i> Strain PO1d</p>  <table><caption>Fatty Acid Composition of Strain PO1d (%)</caption><tr><th>Fatty Acid</th><th>Percentage (%)</th></tr><tr><td>Oleic acid (C18:1)</td><td>61.80%</td></tr><tr><td>Palmitic acid (C16:0)</td><td>10.89%</td></tr><tr><td>Stearic acid (C18:0)</td><td>1.94%</td></tr><tr><td>Palmitoleic acid (C16:1)</td><td>0.86%</td></tr><tr><td>Stearic acid (C18:0)</td><td>4.38%</td></tr></table> <p>The pie charts compare the fatty acid profiles of <i>Yarrowia lipolytica</i> strains W29 and PO1d. Strain PO1d contains a higher percentage of oleic acid (61.80%) compared to W29 (38.83%), indicating a richer monounsaturated fatty acid content. In contrast, W29 shows a more diverse composition, including higher levels of linoleic acid (17.41%) and saturated fatty acids (34.76%). This suggests that PO1d may be more suitable for applications needing high oleic acid content, while W29 offers a broader fatty acid profile.</p>	Fatty Acid	Percentage (%)	Oleic acid (C18:1)	38.83%	Linoleic acid (C18:2)	17.41%	Arachidonic acid (C20:4)	0.2%	Stearic acid (C18:0)	1.94%	Heptadecenoic acid (C17:1)	0.2%	Saturated fatty acids (C16:0, C16:1)	34.76%	Fatty Acid	Percentage (%)	Oleic acid (C18:1)	61.80%	Palmitic acid (C16:0)	10.89%	Stearic acid (C18:0)	1.94%	Palmitoleic acid (C16:1)	0.86%	Stearic acid (C18:0)	4.38%
Bacteria	Linoleic Acid (µg/mL)	Oleic Acid (µg/mL)																																																				
<i>S. aureus</i>	~250	~500																																																				
<i>B. licheniformis</i>	~100	~250																																																				
<i>E. coli</i>	~500	~1000																																																				
<i>E. faecalis</i>	~250	~500																																																				
<i>P. aeruginosa</i>	~1100	~1100																																																				
<i>Salmonella spp.</i>	~500	~1000																																																				
<i>K. pneumoniae</i>	~1100	~1100																																																				
<i>S. enteritidis</i>	~250	~500																																																				
Fatty Acid	Percentage (%)																																																					
Oleic acid (C18:1)	38.83%																																																					
Linoleic acid (C18:2)	17.41%																																																					
Arachidonic acid (C20:4)	0.2%																																																					
Stearic acid (C18:0)	1.94%																																																					
Heptadecenoic acid (C17:1)	0.2%																																																					
Saturated fatty acids (C16:0, C16:1)	34.76%																																																					
Fatty Acid	Percentage (%)																																																					
Oleic acid (C18:1)	61.80%																																																					
Palmitic acid (C16:0)	10.89%																																																					
Stearic acid (C18:0)	1.94%																																																					
Palmitoleic acid (C16:1)	0.86%																																																					
Stearic acid (C18:0)	4.38%																																																					
<p>Anticancer effects of oleic acid and linoleic fatty acid derived from <i>yarrowia lipolytica</i> and Direct Co-Culture</p> <p>Anticancer Effects of <i>Yarrowia lipolytica</i>-Derived Fatty Acids on HT29 and HFF Cell Lines</p>  <table><caption>Approximate Cell Viability (%) from charts</caption><tr><th>Strain</th><th>Treatment</th><th>HT29 (%)</th><th>HFF (%)</th></tr><tr><td rowspan="3">W29</td><td>Oleic Acid</td><td>~60</td><td>~85</td></tr><tr><td>Linoleic Acid</td><td>~50</td><td>~80</td></tr><tr><td>Direct Co-Culture</td><td>~35</td><td>~75</td></tr><tr><td rowspan="3">PO1d</td><td>Oleic Acid</td><td>~55</td><td>~82</td></tr><tr><td>Linoleic Acid</td><td>~45</td><td>~78</td></tr><tr><td>Direct Co-Culture</td><td>~30</td><td>~70</td></tr></table> <p>the impact of oleic acid, linoleic acid, and direct co-culture from two strains of "<i>Yarrowia lipolytica</i>" (W29 and PO1d) on HT29 (colon cancer) and HFF (normal fibroblast) cell lines. Lower cancer cell viability alongside higher normal cell viability indicates selective anticancer potential.</p>	Strain	Treatment	HT29 (%)	HFF (%)	W29	Oleic Acid	~60	~85	Linoleic Acid	~50	~80	Direct Co-Culture	~35	~75	PO1d	Oleic Acid	~55	~82	Linoleic Acid	~45	~78	Direct Co-Culture	~30	~70	<p>Antioxidant effects of oleic acid and linoleic fatty acid derived from <i>yarrowia lipolytica</i> and Direct Co-Culture</p> <p>Antioxidant Effects of Oleic and Linoleic Acid from <i>Yarrowia lipolytica</i></p>  <table><caption>Approximate Antioxidant Activity (%) from chart</caption><tr><th>Strain and Cell Line</th><th>Oleic Acid (%)</th><th>Linoleic Acid (%)</th></tr><tr><td>W29 on HT29</td><td>~65</td><td>~55</td></tr><tr><td>W29 on HFF</td><td>~70</td><td>~60</td></tr><tr><td>PO1d on HT29</td><td>~60</td><td>~50</td></tr><tr><td>PO1d on HFF</td><td>~68</td><td>~58</td></tr><tr><td>Direct Co-Culture HT29</td><td>~75</td><td>~65</td></tr><tr><td>Direct Co-Culture HFF</td><td>~78</td><td>~68</td></tr></table> <p>Results show that both fatty acids exhibit notable antioxidant activity, with linoleic acid generally performing slightly better. The direct co-culture condition yields the highest antioxidant effects on both cell lines, suggesting potential synergistic effects. Strain W29 also shows higher activity compared to PO1d.</p>	Strain and Cell Line	Oleic Acid (%)	Linoleic Acid (%)	W29 on HT29	~65	~55	W29 on HFF	~70	~60	PO1d on HT29	~60	~50	PO1d on HFF	~68	~58	Direct Co-Culture HT29	~75	~65	Direct Co-Culture HFF	~78	~68								
Strain	Treatment	HT29 (%)	HFF (%)																																																			
W29	Oleic Acid	~60	~85																																																			
	Linoleic Acid	~50	~80																																																			
	Direct Co-Culture	~35	~75																																																			
PO1d	Oleic Acid	~55	~82																																																			
	Linoleic Acid	~45	~78																																																			
	Direct Co-Culture	~30	~70																																																			
Strain and Cell Line	Oleic Acid (%)	Linoleic Acid (%)																																																				
W29 on HT29	~65	~55																																																				
W29 on HFF	~70	~60																																																				
PO1d on HT29	~60	~50																																																				
PO1d on HFF	~68	~58																																																				
Direct Co-Culture HT29	~75	~65																																																				
Direct Co-Culture HFF	~78	~68																																																				
<p>Conclusions</p> <p><i>Yarrowia lipolytica</i>-derived linoleic and oleic acids exhibit significant anticancer and antioxidant effects on HT-29 colon cancer cells. Linoleic acid demonstrates stronger antimicrobial activity (MIC: 125–250 µg/mL) than oleic acid (MIC: 250–1000 µg/mL). Direct co-culture with <i>Y. lipolytica</i> (especially strain W29) enhances these effects compared to cell-free metabolites, indicating synergistic potential. As a non-pathogenic, GRAS-status yeast, <i>Y. lipolytica</i> is an optimal candidate for use as a probiotic and in large-scale biotechnology applications, serving as a sustainable resource for the eco-friendly production of bioactive unsaturated fatty acids for cancer therapy and oxidative stress management.</p>																																																						