



Deposited via The University of Leeds.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/180778/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Mulet-Cabero, A-I, Mackie, AR, Brodkorb, A et al. (2020) Dairy structures and physiological responses: a matter of gastric digestion. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*, 60 (22). pp. 3737-3752. ISSN: 1040-8398

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2019.1707159>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

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.

1 **Dairy structures and physiological responses: a matter of gastric digestion**

2 Ana-Isabel Mulet-Cabero^{a,b}, Alan R. Mackie^c, André Brodkorb^b and Peter J. Wilde^{a*}

3

4 ^a *Quadram Institute Bioscience, Norwich Research Park, Norwich, Norfolk, NR4 7UQ, UK*

5 ^b *Teagasc Food Research Centre, Moorepark, Fermoy, Co. Cork, Ireland*

6 ^c *School of Food Science and Nutrition, University of Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK*

7

8 *Corresponding author: Peter J. Wilde

9 Tel.: +44 (0)1603 255258

10 E-mail address: peter.wilde@quadram.ac.uk

11

12 **Abstract**

13 Digestion and health properties of food do not solely rely on the sum of nutrients but are also influenced
14 by food structure. Dairy products present an array of structures due to differences in the origin of milk
15 components and the changes induced by processing. Some dairy structures have been observed to
16 induce specific effects on digestion rates and physiological responses. However, the underlying
17 mechanisms are not fully understood. Gastric digestion plays a key role in controlling digestion kinetics.
18 The main objective of this review is to expose the relevance of gastric phase as the link between dairy
19 structures and physiological responses. The focus is on human and animal studies, and physiological
20 relevant *in vitro* digestion models. Data collected showed that the structure of dairy products have a
21 profound impact on rate of nutrient bioavailability, absorption and physiological responses, suggesting
22 gastric digestion as the main driver. Control of gastric digestion can be a tool for delivering specific
23 rates of nutrient digestion. Therefore, the design of food structure targeting specific gastric behaviour
24 could be of great interest for particular population needs e.g. rapid nutrient digestion will benefit elderly,
25 and slow nutrient digestion could help to enhance satiety.

26 **Key words:**

27 dairy foods, food structure, food matrix, gastric digestion, bioaccessibility, bioavailability,

28 **Abbreviations:**

29 AA, amino acid; GI, gastrointestinal; GE, gastric emptying; UHT, Ultra High Temperature; β -Lg, β -
30 Lactoglobulin; MFGM, milk fat globule membrane; TAG, triacylglyceride; CVD, cardiovascular
31 diseases.

32

33 **1.Introduction**

34 Dairy products have been established as excellent foods due to their high nutritional value. However,
35 several controversies have been arisen from their consumption in relation for instance to their high
36 contribution of saturated fats, which are linked to cardiovascular diseases (CVD), through the increase
37 of blood lipids in particular low-density lipoprotein (Griffin, 2017). Nevertheless, there is a paradox in
38 the fact that increasing evidence has shown the consistent neutral or even beneficial associations
39 between dairy food consumption and CVD as shown in meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies
40 (Givens, 2017), and several other diseases (Thorning, et al., 2016). A multinational cohort study in 21
41 countries from five continents was recently published showing that the consumption of dairy products
42 (milk, yoghurt and cheese) was associated with lower risk of mortality and CVD (Dehghan, et al., 2018).
43 This discrepancy is probably due to the generalised approach of evaluating the health benefits of a food
44 according to its individual components rather than the structure (or matrix). The food matrix is defined
45 as the arrangement of food constituents and their interactions at multiple spatial length scales (Parada
46 & Aguilera, 2007), see Figure 1. The structure of food either occurs naturally (i.e. milk) or is created or
47 destroyed by processing (e.g. yoghurt and cheese) and preparation. Furthermore, specific conditions of
48 processing (e.g. the pressure of milk homogenisation and ripening time in cheese) will modulate the
49 physico-chemical properties and the structure of the final product at the different length scales. This
50 will probably affect the digestion and metabolism of the foods in different ways. Therefore, when
51 investigating the health effects of dairy products, the whole matrix and its specific structure has to be
52 considered (Thorning, et al., 2017).

53 The physico-chemical characteristics of food components and the whole matrix impact how individual
54 components interact and behave within the gastrointestinal (GI) tract. Research has mainly focussed on
55 the small intestine digestion in order to control nutrient digestion using different mechanisms such as
56 the ileal break (Maljaars, et al., 2008) by manipulating interfacial composition of lipid droplets for
57 instance, that alters the access to enzymes and bile and might slow the release of lipid.

58 However, possibly having a more significant impact, the stomach can play a key role in controlling the
59 rate of nutrient absorption and subsequent physiological responses. A schematic diagram illustrating
60 this approach is displayed in Figure 2. There are several complex processes occurring in the gastric
61 compartment: enzymatic (pepsin and gastric lipase), physical (e.g. peristalsis) and chemical (e.g. pH
62 decrease and ionic composition).

63 The behaviour of food structures will depend on their physico-chemical properties in the gastric
64 environment. This might cause restructuring, i.e. change of the initial structure, which will alter the
65 food's functional characteristics. Several types of colloidal behaviour might be observed depending on
66 the stability of the structure. Golding, et al. (2011) showed that colloidal structures can be tailored to
67 exert different behaviour under the acidic conditions of the stomach. The properties of food structure
68 adopted in the stomach will profoundly impact gastric disintegration and the rate of gastric emptying
69 (GE), i.e. gastric contents gradually delivered into the duodenum. Marciani, et al. (2007) showed that
70 gastric acid-unstable emulsions led to the formation of an intragastric oil layer to be formed on top of
71 the chyme in the stomach. This accelerated GE of the aqueous phase followed by a slow emptying of
72 the intragastric oil layer in contrast to the slow GE of gastric acid stable emulsions. Then, due to
73 differences in the rate of delivery of nutrients to the duodenum, they might be absorbed and metabolised
74 at different rates, altering hormonal secretion and physiological responses. For instance, the slower GE
75 of the acid stable emulsion in the study by Marciani, et al. (2007) study led to a greater secretion of
76 CCK and greater satiety. A slow GE has been also shown to help diabetics by reducing peaks in lipemia
77 (Rayner, et al., 2001). Therefore, control of GE by intragastric behaviour of digesta can be essential for
78 ensuring optimal digestion addressed to specific physiological responses. For instance, foods with slow
79 nutrient digestion might induce fullness for longer, which could be useful for obese/overweight
80 population. In contrast, fast protein digestion and uptake would be beneficial for elderly individuals and
81 athletes by enhancing muscle synthesis. This approach should be further studied and exploited to design
82 healthier food structures in the future.

83 To achieve this, a deep understanding of the mechanisms of food breakdown in the stomach is critical.
84 This research should progress further in the light of the development of sophisticated in vivo techniques

85 such as magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). Despite the gold standard for investigating nutrient
86 digestion being the human body, there are several reasons that constrain its use; it is highly variable,
87 costly, time-consuming and might generate ethical issues. *In vitro* models are widely used, and they are
88 mainly classified into static and dynamic. Sophisticated dynamic models can simulate the dynamics of
89 stomach physiology, but they are also expensive and restrictive. One example is the human gastric
90 simulator (HGS) developed at the University of California, Davis (Kong & Singh, 2010). In contrast,
91 static models are cheap, simple and useful in predicting the overall nutrient hydrolysis and end-points
92 values of the digestion *in vivo* (Egger, et al., 2017), however they do not consider the structural changes
93 and nutrient breakdown kinetics that occur in response to dynamic changes in gastric digestion
94 conditions.

95 In an effort to fill the gap between *in vitro* digestion models, a semi-dynamic method was recently
96 developed (Mulet-Cabero, et al., 2019; Mulet-Cabero, et al., 2017), which can mimic the main gastric
97 dynamics of gradual acidification, fluids and enzyme secretion and emptying at low-cost. The
98 development of a standardised protocol for this semi-dynamic model is ongoing and the method will be
99 published in 2019 by INFOGEST members.

100 This literature review therefore aims to illustrate how the physiological responses and patterns of
101 digestion observed following consumption of dairy products with different structures might be linked
102 to gastric digestion and the need for its further study. The review will focus on assessing how dairy
103 structures at several length scales affect nutrient bioaccessibility and bioavailability kinetics leading to
104 different metabolic effects, in light of gastric digestion. In that view, *in vivo* studies and *in vitro* studies
105 using dynamic and semi-dynamic models are mainly considered. Dairy structures from bovine origin
106 are only considered, excluding studies where milk from other animal sources was used. The key
107 conclusions of the main research articles to date have been summarized in Table 1, and these findings
108 will be discussed in more detail in the following sections.

109 **2.Effect of dairy proteins on digestion and physiological responses**

110 Milk proteins are classified as high-quality proteins considering human amino acid (AA) requirements
111 and digestibility. They have high true digestibility and postprandial protein utilization of 95-96% and
112 74%, respectively (Bos, et al., 1999). Milk proteins can be generally considered as a better source of
113 protein compared to plant proteins since the later proteins are less digestible and deficient in one or
114 more essential amino acids (EAAs) and their leucine (Leu) content is 6-8%, compared to 10-13% in
115 dairy proteins (Gorissen & Witard, 2018). The EAAs, in particular branched chain AAs (BCAAs), are
116 important since they exert a key role in muscle protein synthesis (Wolfe, 2002). Milk protein ingestion
117 has been suggested to have benefits on cardiometabolic health (Fekete, et al., 2016). Moreover, milk
118 proteins have important biological functions, casein micelle carries calcium and phosphate for efficient
119 absorption. Several peptides from milk proteins have been reported to exert certain functions such as
120 antihypertensive, opioid-like activity and antithrombotic properties (Fekete, et al., 2015; Jauhiainen &
121 Korpela, 2007).

122 **2.1.Bioaccessibility of dairy proteins**

123 The nature of dairy proteins in terms of their molecular structure and physico-chemical properties has
124 a strong impact on gastric and intestinal digestion which subsequently affects the bioaccessibility of
125 nutrients. The main milk proteins have different physico-chemical properties, which are governed by
126 their structure. Caseins have a relatively open and flexible conformation forming ordered structures
127 known as casein micelles and are insoluble at their isoelectric point, pH 4.7. In contrast, whey proteins
128 have globular, compact structure and are soluble under acidic conditions.

129 At the molecular level, caseins have been reported to be more easily digested than whey proteins during
130 the simulated gastric phase (Egger, et al., 2017; Macierzanka, et al., 2009). In addition, the same authors
131 Macierzanka, et al. (2009) showed that the degree of proteolysis in β -Lactoglobulin (β -Lg) was
132 increased when emulsified with oil, which was due to the partial unfolding of the β -Lg secondary
133 structure improving accessibility to pepsin. These studies were performed in static conditions in which
134 the pH of the gastric phase remain constant at pH 3.

135 This contrasts with *in vivo* results showing that caseins are slowly digested and whey proteins are
136 rapidly digested. In general, it is assumed that caseins coagulate in the gastric conditions whereas whey
137 proteins remain relatively soluble. The coagulation of caseins could be mainly driven by the action of
138 pepsin that cleaves the Phe¹⁰⁵-Met¹⁰⁶ band in k-casein, together with the gradual pH decrease occurring
139 in the stomach (Figure 3).

140 Despite the fact that there are several indirect indications suggesting this behaviour occurs, no direct
141 visual evidence of the restructuring of caseins occurring in the human stomach has been reported so far.
142 Some studies reported the markedly different GE and digestion kinetics between the main milk proteins
143 (Mahé, et al., 1991; Mahé, et al., 1996). However, there are contradictory studies in which no
144 differences in GE for the different milk proteins were found (Calbet & Holst, 2004; Lang, et al., 1998).
145 In the latter studies, sodium or calcium caseinate was used whereas milk or micellar casein were
146 digested in those studies where the GE was different. Therefore, the state of the caseins and its
147 processing history seems to strongly influence its digestion behaviour in the stomach. Caseins in the
148 micellar state are coagulated by pepsin (Tam & Whitaker, 1972) and low pH (Dalglish & Corredig,
149 2012). This contrasts with caseinate, i.e. a mixture of caseins with the calcium phosphate removed,
150 which does not have the same micellar-type structure and is not coagulated by pepsin. In this review,
151 studies using caseins in micellar form will be mainly discussed because it is the most relevant structural
152 form found in natural dairy products.

153 In that context, Miranda and Pelissier (1981) showed in rats that the rate of GE in skimmed milk was
154 slower compared with that of a mixture of denatured caseins and the proteolysis in the stomach was
155 much lower in the skimmed milk reporting that α_{s1} -casein and β -casein were almost undergraded and
156 κ -casein was converted into para- κ -casein.

157 The distinct rate and composition of the products delivered to the small intestine after the ingestion of
158 different milk proteins suggest a different time of residence and behaviour in the stomach. Mahé, et al.
159 (1996) investigated the digestion kinetics of intrinsically labelled ¹⁵N β -Lg and casein drinks, which
160 were fed to healthy young volunteers. The effluents from the jejunum were collected by a nasal tube
161 and their protein contents and flow rate were assessed. The jejunal flow rate peaked in the first 20 min

162 after β -Lg digestion, which was present mostly in the intact form. In contrast, caseins were more slowly
163 recovered in the jejunum in a more degraded form. These results were supported by a more recent
164 human study (Boutrou, et al., 2013) where the authors found that, after casein ingestion, the delivery of
165 dietary protein in the jejunum was progressive for 6 hours and in the form of medium size-peptides
166 (750-1,050 Da). In contrast, the ingestion of whey protein induced the release of larger-size peptides
167 (1,050-1,800 Da) and was completed after 3 hours. The authors suggested that the coagulation of caseins
168 could lead to a slower rate of emptying compared to a more rapid emptying of the whey proteins in
169 solution. Therefore, caseins coagula could be more exposed to pepsin hydrolysis leading to the
170 emptying of more degraded products.

171 **2.2. Absorption and protein metabolic utilization of dairy proteins**

172 The distinct pattern of protein digestion in the GI tract has been reflected in different rates of AA
173 absorption, which might modulate the postprandial metabolism of whole body protein synthesis,
174 breakdown and oxidation in the liver. Boirie, et al. (1997) performed a study on young healthy subjects
175 using intrinsically ^{13}C -Leu labelled whey protein and micellar casein drinks, which were matched for
176 Leu content but were not isonitrogenous. The postprandial whole-body Leu balance, considered as an
177 index of protein deposition, was assessed by tracing samples from blood and breath. The plasma AA
178 appearance, i.e. aminoacidemia, was fast, high and transitory after whey protein drink ingestion, which
179 led to an increase in whole body protein synthesis (68%) but no support in whole body protein
180 breakdown. In contrast, the ingestion of a casein drink resulted in a lower, slower and prolonged release
181 of AAs. This was associated with a markedly higher inhibition of whole protein breakdown (34% for 7
182 hours), but just slight stimulation of whole protein synthesis (31%) compared to whey protein drink.
183 However, the Leu balance was positive for the casein drink over 7 hours, promoting protein deposition
184 whereas no effect was provided from whey protein drink. The authors classified, in relation to that
185 postprandial behaviour, whey proteins and casein as 'fast' and 'slow' digested proteins respectively,
186 which has been widely considered in the literature. Similarly, Lacroix, Bos, et al. (2006) showed in
187 healthy volunteers that the aminoacidemia for the first hour in whey proteins ingestion was rapid and

188 high followed by a decrease reaching values below the baseline of total plasma AAs after 3 hours, which
189 resulted in hypoaminoacidemia.

190 Whey proteins have a higher Leu content than caseins, therefore, one might think that this compositional
191 difference, not their protein digestion kinetics, might induce different dietary nitrogen postprandial
192 metabolism. This was addressed in a study by Dangin, et al. (2001). Casein and whey protein drinks
193 were matched in AA composition and nitrogen contents but designed to have different digestion rates.
194 The fast-digested drinks were whey protein and casein hydrolysate, and the slow-digested drinks were
195 caseins and whey proteins consumed at repeated times during digestion. In accordance with the previous
196 studies illustrated, they showed that fast-digested drinks induced rapid, pronounced and transient
197 increase of aminoacidemia, which led to high and immediate stimulation of protein synthesis. In
198 contrast, slow-digested drinks induced moderated and prolonged aminoacidemia resulting in the
199 inhibition of protein breakdown. Similarly, Bos, et al. (2003) demonstrated that the availability of AAs
200 by digestion kinetics was the main driver for protein metabolism by using milk protein compared to soy
201 protein.

202 The inclusion of other nutrients in the protein matrix might affect protein utilization. Gaudichon, et al.
203 (1999), investigated whether the addition of sucrose or milk fat affected the net postprandial protein
204 utilization of milk protein. Sucrose, but not fat, significantly reduced the postprandial transfer of [¹⁵N]-
205 milk nitrogen to urea, which could be mainly due to a delayed GE of the meal because of the higher
206 energy density. Nevertheless, the total amount of dietary nitrogen recovered over an eight-hour period
207 after meal ingestion was not different. The absence of any effect in the presence of fat was unexpected
208 because the energy density was similar to that of the sucrose meal and the authors suggested that lipid
209 may have separated and formed a layer on top of the meal in the stomach and emptied after the aqueous
210 phase of the meal. However, having similar behaviour to the control milk protein sample, fat could be
211 entrapped in the coagula possibly formed in the stomach.

212 Mariotti, et al. (2015) investigated the effect of caseins and whey proteins in triacylglycerides (TAG)
213 response in a mixed high-fat meal using a crossover design in healthy overweight men. The authors
214 showed that caseins, compared to whey proteins, markedly reduced postprandial TAG and formation

215 of plasma chylomicrons, which was suggested to be caused by low solubility and phase separation of
216 casein in gastric conditions. This contrasts with other studies showing whey proteins to be more efficient
217 in lowering effects on blood lipids (Mortensen, et al., 2009; Pal, et al., 2010). Therefore, there is a gap
218 in understanding the influence of other nutrients included in the food matrix on metabolic effects, which
219 should be studied considering the digestive kinetics and gastric behaviour.

220 **2.3. Dairy proteins and skeletal muscle mass**

221 Muscle mass maintenance is regulated by the balance between muscle protein breakdown (catabolism)
222 and synthesis (anabolism) rates, which has been dependent on physical activity and food intake. The
223 postprandial muscle protein synthetic response to feeding is regulated on factors including dietary
224 protein amount, source and digestion, AA absorption and uptake by muscle and intramyocellular
225 signalling (Gorissen, et al., 2015). Muscle protein synthesis (MPS) is of particular interest to athletes,
226 active people and the elderly. Ageing can result in a diminished muscle protein synthetic response after
227 protein intake, which is often accompanied with the progressive decline of skeletal muscle mass, known
228 as sarcopenia. Some studies have shown that faster digestion of whey proteins resulted in an
229 enhancement of MPS responses in elderly men (Burd, et al., 2012; Dangin, et al., 2003; Pennings, et
230 al., 2011; West, et al., 2011), in elderly men after resistance exercise (Burd, et al., 2012) and also in
231 young men at rest and after resistance exercise (Tang, et al., 2009). In general, it has been shown that
232 the specific pattern in plasma aminoacidemia after the consumption of whey proteins, i.e. rapid and
233 pronounced AA peak, was the main driver. Moreover, a strong correlation was reported between plasma
234 Leu levels and muscle protein accretion (Pennings, et al., 2011). The stimulation of MPS is driven
235 primarily by essential AAs (Volpi, et al., 2003), from which Leu has been reported as the main signal
236 (Drummond & Rasmussen, 2008). Therefore, a direct comparison between the effects of the absorption
237 rates of these two proteins related to MPS is conflicted by their differing AA contents. In healthy men
238 after resistance exercise, whey proteins ingested as a single bolus was compared to the same amount of
239 protein but taken in repeated small drinks, which aimed to simulate slower digested protein (West, et
240 al., 2011). The authors showed that whey proteins consumed as a bolus caused a rapid and greater
241 increase in aminoacidemia, which was reflected in a greater stimulation in MPS response at an early

242 stage (1-3 hours) compared to the whey protein consumed repeated times (3-5 hours). They concluded
243 that the pattern of aminoacidemia, not the net AA exposure, was the main driver for the effect in skeletal
244 muscle. These results were supported by other studies using casein and casein hydrolysate (Pennings,
245 et al., 2011).

246 The ingestion of other macronutrients together with dairy proteins is another factor to consider in
247 relation to MPS (Churchward-Venne, et al., 2015; Gorissen, et al., 2014). Co-ingestion of carbohydrates
248 with casein resulted in no differences in muscle synthetic response in both young and elderly men
249 (Gorissen, et al., 2014). However, this resulted in a delay of protein digestion and absorption, attributed
250 to the decrease of GE rate. In contrast, other studies showed a greater AA uptake into peripheral tissues
251 in resting subjects when milk proteins were combined with lipid and sucrose (Mariotti, et al., 2000).
252 Elliot, et al. (2006) showed that milk ingested as a whole food stimulated net MPS following resistance
253 exercise, suggesting that its consumption would be suitable during recovery. Interestingly, the uptake
254 of AAs, based on Thr and Phe, was greater for whole milk compared to fat-free milk. However, the
255 reason of this outcome was not clear for the authors suggesting that the extra energy could help the
256 nitrogen balance process. Therefore, further work should be performed in investigating the role of lipid
257 in AA uptake.

258 **2.4.Dairy proteins and satiety**

259 The ingestion of protein stimulates the release of gut hormones involved in appetite and food intake
260 regulation, such as CCK, GLP-1, PYY and insulin (Anderson & Moore, 2004). Whey proteins might
261 be considered to have a greater effect on satiety compared to caseins since a higher content of BCAAs
262 can greatly stimulate insulin secretion (Nilsson, et al., 2004). However there is no consistent evidence
263 supporting one milk protein to be more satiating than the other (Bendtsen, et al., 2013). Hall, et al.
264 (2003) investigated in healthy lean volunteers the appetite responses of whey proteins and casein drinks
265 containing both lipid and carbohydrate with their total energy matched. The authors found that a whey-
266 based drink was satiating for 180 min after ingestion according to the appetite subjective score and was
267 more efficient at decreasing energy intake in an *ad libitum* lunch, served 90 min after ingestion, than a
268 casein drink. The secretion of the most important hormones in the role of satiety, i.e. CCK and GLP-1,

269 increased by 60% and 65% respectively after whey proteins ingestion compared to caseins. Similarly,
270 Veldhorst, et al. (2009) reported a decrease in appetite after, in particular, 20 min of consumption of 15
271 g of whey proteins (as a part of a standard breakfast) compared to casein or soy protein, which was in
272 accordance to the higher concentration of GLP-1 and insulin observed following whey protein
273 consumption. Accordingly, Luhovyy, et al. (2007) showed that whey proteins greatly suppressed food
274 intake more quickly, i.e. at 90 min compared to the latter time of 150 min observed in casein after meal
275 consumption. In contrast, casein consumption was reported to induce a greater satiety promoting effect
276 than whey proteins in a study by Acheson, et al. (2011), in which subjective appetite sensations were
277 measured for 330 min. This was supported by Alfenas, et al. (2010) with normal weight subjects, in
278 which casein consumption led to a daily lower energy intake with 7-day supplementation compared to
279 whey protein. Calbet and Holst (2004) did not find significant differences in the hormonal secretion of
280 GLP-1 and PYY when the casein and whey proteins were compared with their hydrolysates. The
281 variability of results can be explained by the protein source, quantity and time of measurements used in
282 the studies. Overall, it seems that fast digested protein could have a greater satiety promoting power in
283 the short term in contrast to the long-term effect shown by the slow digested protein of casein. Then the
284 different digestion and subsequent AA absorption rate of casein and whey proteins might affect the
285 secretion of GI hormones and subsequent satiety and food intake.

286 The ingestion of milk as a whole was more effective in increasing satiation and reducing subsequent
287 food intake than consuming the isocaloric drinks containing casein or whey proteins alone (Lorenzen,
288 et al., 2012), which could be as the result of a greater increase of CCK and GLP-1 (Diepvens, et al.,
289 2008). Moreover, milk consumption has been reported to promote satiety and decrease food intake
290 when compared to other drinks such as fruit juice (Dove, et al., 2009).

291 **2.5. Conclusions**

292 In this section, we showed evidence of how the single milk proteins affect the physiological functions
293 differently after their digestion. Casein and whey proteins have been categorised as ‘slow’ and ‘fast’
294 protein respectively, according to their plasma AA appearance rate. Several studies have shown that the
295 different aminoacidemia patterns, rather than protein composition, have a profound effect on protein

296 metabolism, in particular protein synthetic response of skeletal muscle. Despite the fact that it is widely
297 suggested that gastric digestion could be the main driver for these outcomes, there is still no direct
298 evidence. As far as it is known, there is no *in vivo* study showing the changes in gastric behaviour during
299 the digestion of the main dairy proteins.

300 **3. Micro-scale dairy structures: digestion, absorption and physiological responses**

301 Some of the most common processes used in the dairy industry are homogenisation and heat treatment.
302 These processing conditions will vary the physico-chemical properties and macronutrient organisation
303 at the microscopic length scale, providing different microstructure. This could, in consequence, affect
304 the nutritional properties.

305 **3.1. Dairy microstructure changes induced by heat processing**

306 **3.1.1 Changes of heat processing**

307 Structural and functional modifications of milk proteins following heating have been extensively
308 reported (de la Fuente, et al., 2002; Singh, 2004). However, the impact of heat treatments on the
309 digestion of milk proteins has been much less studied and it is still subject of debate. The main chemical
310 modifications to milk proteins during heating are denaturation of whey proteins, in particular β -Lg,
311 casein-whey protein interactions and glycosylation by Maillard reaction. Despite the significant
312 biochemical alterations induced by heat, some studies have shown no impairment of digestibility in the
313 intestine (Efigênia, et al., 1997; Rutherfurd & Moughan, 2005), and nitrogen availability (Lacroix,
314 Léonil, et al., 2006) after pasteurisation and ultra-high temperature (UHT) treatment in rats.

315 **3.1.2. *In vivo* digestion**

316 From our knowledge, there is only one study in humans assessing the nutritional impact of milk heat
317 treatment. Lacroix, et al. (2008) compared the treatments of pasteurisation (72°C for 20 s) and UHT
318 (140°C for 5 s) with non-heated milk. The kinetics of postprandial utilization of dietary nitrogen for the
319 transfer into serum protein and AA, body urea and urinary urea over 8 hours were significantly faster
320 for UHT milk compared to pasteurised milk and non-heated milk, which had a similar protein metabolic

321 pattern. This shows that the digestive kinetics were more rapid after UHT milk ingestion. There were
322 no firm conclusions regarding the mechanisms behind this observation.

323 The faster nitrogen utilisation in highly heat treated milk might be due to faster gastric digestion.
324 Miranda and Pelissier (1987), using a rat model, compared skimmed milk samples heated using UHT
325 and autoclaved (120°C for 20 min) conditions with non-heated skimmed milk. The heat treatment, in
326 particular autoclaved, accelerated the GE rate of total nitrogen and casein hydrolysis. This contrasts
327 with the work by Barbé, et al. (2013), in mini-pigs, in which a higher mean retention time in the stomach
328 of heated skimmed milk (90°C, 10 min) was observed when compared to a non-heated system.
329 However, in the latter study, they used chromium-EDTA, which is a non-hydrolysable and non-
330 absorbable marker of the liquid phase and thus might not be representative of the entire gastric contents
331 of the heterogenous structures formed in the stomach. In general, there is limited research on the GE
332 rate of heated milk samples to draw any firm conclusions.

333 However, a faster GE induced by heating might be more in accordance with some evidence showing
334 reduced milk protein coagulation in the stomach. The study by Kaufmann (1984), using mini-pigs,
335 appears to be the only *in vivo* study reporting visually that heat treatment modifies the structure of the
336 coagulum formed in the gastric compartment. This study also demonstrated the restructuring of milk in
337 the stomach, whereby the coagulum formed with UHT sterilized milk in the stomach was less firm and
338 had crumbly structure compared to pasteurised milk and more so with raw milk. Moreover, Meisel and
339 Hagemeister (1984) reported a significant effect of UHT treatment on acidification and protein
340 emptying during gastric digestion. The pH at 360 min of gastric digestion was 4.32 and 1.80 for raw
341 and UHT+homogenised milk, respectively. The protein content in chyme after 360 min digestion was
342 approximately 75% in raw milk compared to 25% in UHT+homogenised milk. This could potentially
343 be related to the differences in pepsin activity found. The analysis of the chyme at 360 min showed that
344 pepsin activity was approximately 1,000 U/g protein in raw milk in contrast to the approximate value
345 of 33,000 U/g protein measured in UHT+homogenised milk.

346 **3.1.3. *In vitro* digestion**

347 Using the *in vitro* dynamic model HGS, Ye, et al. (2016b) showed the formation of different structures
348 of the coagula formed in the simulated stomach between unheated and heated skimmed milk (90°C for
349 20 min). Unheated milk formed a dense, solid structure with small pores in contrast to the loose and
350 particulate structure of the heated milk. Gastric behaviour also had an impact on the composition of
351 nutrient emptying, such that whey proteins were preferentially emptied in unheated milk since they
352 were not involved in the formation of the coagulum (Ye, et al., 2016b). This contrasts to the small
353 amounts of caseins and almost no intact whey proteins that were firstly emptied in heated milk. The
354 rate of release of fat globules from the coagulum was also influenced by the matrix structure. In whole
355 milk, fat globules were entrapped in the protein matrix but fat globules of unheated milk were
356 distributed more evenly within the matrix compared to those in heated milk (Ye, et al., 2016a). This
357 seemed to affect the release of lipid from the coagula, which was faster in heated milk. Therefore, this
358 study demonstrated the significant influence of heat treatment on the gastric digestion behaviour and
359 nutrient digestion kinetics of milk. However, the heating conditions of this study (90°C for 20 min)
360 were not comparable to those used conventionally in the milk industry, which might have different
361 effects on changes in the protein molecular structure.

362 Mulet-Cabero, et al. (2019) using a semi-dynamic gastric model, investigated the gastric behaviour of
363 whole milk after controlled and standard industrial heat treatments, pasteurisation (72°C for 15 s) and
364 UHT (140°C for 3 s). The authors showed the formation of coagula during gastric digestion, in which
365 the consistency was profoundly affected by heat treatment. They reported, by rheology, that the higher
366 the temperature of the treatment, the softer the coagulum obtained. Moreover, this different gastric
367 restructuring had an impact on the emptied products. The gastric emptying of caseins from raw and
368 pasteurised milk was delayed due to a more compact coagulation in the stomach whereas caseins were
369 mostly emptied in hydrolysed form in UHT-treated milk. The gastric behaviour also had an impact on
370 the emptying kinetics of the total lipid and protein content.

371 **3.1.4. Protein hydrolysis and products of digestion**

372 As pointed out in the previous studies, pepsin seems to play a key role in the disintegration of protein
373 matrices in the gastric digesta. Aggregation induced by heat treatment might limit or modify the

374 accessibility to some cleavage sites by digestive enzymes, which might affect the peptides released
375 during digestion. There is very little research in this aspect on *in vivo* systems. Barbé, et al. (2014),
376 using mini-pigs, compared the release of peptides into the duodenum from raw or heated (90°C, 10
377 min) skimmed milk. The number of peptides identified was slightly lower in heated milk compared to
378 the non-heated sample. However, β - and α_{s1} -caseins, which are very similar in their sequence length
379 and abundance in milk, produced a different number of peptides. The number of peptides deriving from
380 α_{s1} -casein was less abundant than β -casein, showing more resistance to proteolysis probably due to
381 differences in secondary structure and phosphorylation. This contrasts to Sánchez-Rivera, et al. (2015),
382 using the same samples but digested in the dynamic gastric model available in INRA (France), that
383 found a higher resistance of β -casein regions to digestion compared to other caseins. The latter results
384 were in accordance with the study performed by Dupont, et al. (2010) using an infant *in vitro* static
385 digestion. Moreover, Sánchez-Rivera, et al. (2015) found rapid hydrolysis of caseins after just 4 min in
386 non-heated milk whereas intact caseins were visible for up to 50 min in heated milk, which was assessed
387 by SDS-PAGE. The authors suggested that heat induced aggregation between caseins and whey proteins
388 might be the cause of this behaviour. However, this is opposite to the results reported above with other
389 dynamic gastric models. It seems that the gastric colloidal behaviour was completely different,
390 unfortunately there was no reference to that in the study by Sánchez-Rivera, et al. (2015). This
391 highlights the need for full characterisation of the structure and behaviour of the matrices and also the
392 physical and chemical environments of the dynamic models that could induce differences in the
393 coagulation and digestion behaviour.

394 As illustrated, there are still conflicting results regarding casein digestion, as this appears to be sensitive
395 to the matrix structure, which in turn is very sensitive to the environmental conditions and processing.
396 In fact, Li and Zhao (2019) showed the profound effect of heating on the behaviour of casein
397 coagulation, both by acid and rennet. However, the effect of heat on whey protein digestion is much
398 simpler and more generally accepted. Native β -Lg is resistant to pepsin digestion while heating β -Lg
399 promotes its hydrolysis. Temperatures above 75°C denature whey proteins, in particular β -Lg which
400 unfolds and exposes hydrophobic groups. This susceptibility to proteolysis has been observed in several

401 digestion systems; mini-pigs (Barbé, et al., 2013), dynamic gastric model (Ye, et al., 2016b) and static
402 digestion model (Islam, et al., 2017).

403 **3.2. Dairy microstructure changes induced by homogenisation processing**

404 **3.2.1. Changes of homogenisation**

405 Homogenization is another common process used in the dairy industry, which disrupts the milk fat
406 globule membrane (MFGM) and reduces the fat globule size. This leads to the formation of a new
407 interface on the fat globules, which mainly consists of adsorbed milk proteins and native MFGM
408 fragments (Lopez, 2005). Studies of the effect of droplet size on dairy nutrient digestion have been
409 mainly performed using *in vitro* static models in particular with regard to lipolysis in infant formula and
410 human milk (Bourlieu, et al., 2015). It is generally believed that the reduction in droplet size following
411 homogenisation enhances lipid digestion because of the overall larger interface area available for lipase
412 action. However, other factors such as protein matrix and droplet interfacial composition play an
413 important role and it is complex to distinguish the main driver of the digestion outcomes (Garcia, et al.,
414 2014).

415 **3.2.2. *In vitro* digestion**

416 To our knowledge, the effect of homogenisation of a milk matrix on the digestive kinetics has not been
417 studied in adult humans to date. However, *in vitro* systems have been used to get some understanding
418 of this relationship. Mulet-Cabero, et al. (2019), using a semi-dynamic model, showed a strong impact
419 of homogenisation in the gastric behaviour. Homogenised milks ($d_{4,3}$ of 0.4 μm approximately) showed
420 creaming in the gastric phase. This was regardless the heat treatment applied but it was more
421 pronounced when homogenisation was combined with UHT treatment compared to pasteurisation or
422 without heat treatment. The authors suggested that this colloidal behaviour was driven by both droplet
423 destabilisation and aggregate density. However, the phase separation observed in Mulet-Cabero, et al.
424 (2019) was not reported in Ye, et al. (2017) using the HGS. It is important to note that this dynamic
425 model does not allow the visualisation of the digesta in the course of gastric digestion. Nevertheless,
426 they reported, in line with Mulet-Cabero, et al. (2019), that the structure of the coagula of the

427 homogenised milk was more fragmented than raw milk but this effect was much less profound than
428 when heat was applied. In terms of protein hydrolysis, homogenisation did not affect the pattern of
429 digestion (Mulet-Cabero, et al., 2019; Ye, et al., 2017). However, the gastric behaviour had an impact
430 on the nutrient content emptied. The homogenised samples seemed to release more lipid at the end of
431 the gastric digestion (Mulet-Cabero, et al., 2019). Moreover, they reported a lower lipid/protein ratio in
432 the serum of the homogenised sample suggesting an easier incorporation of the droplets in the coagulum
433 and closely linked to the protein matrix. This coagulum could be present with a lower density in the
434 gastric phase. Indeed, Michalski, et al. (2002) reported that homogenised fat globules interacted with
435 the casein network, participating in the coagulum structure (rennet and acid gelation) whereas native
436 milk fat globules were entrapped in serum pores of milk coagulum without much interaction.

437 The protein network in which lipid droplets are embedded seems to be a critical factor in the hydrolysis
438 of lipid. This protein matrix can be induced by restructuring in the stomach as the studies cited above
439 or formed initially (emulsion gel). Guo, et al. (2014) investigated the effect of the droplet size (1, 6 and
440 12 μm) in whey protein emulsion gels in the oral and gastric compartments using the HGS. The initial
441 gel structure strongly influenced its disintegration during the gastric phase, resulting in significant break
442 down of particles and coalescence during digestion for the 6 μm - and 12 μm -droplet gels, which caused
443 the creaming observed after 300 min of gastric digestion. In contrast, the oil droplets of the 1 μm -droplet
444 gel bolus, with an initial evenly distributed structure, largely remained within the protein matrix during
445 gastric digestion. Moreover, the hydrolysis rate of whey proteins was higher in 12 μm -droplet gel. This
446 could be attributed to the loose protein structure induced to the higher droplet size, which could promote
447 the access to pepsin to the cleavage sites.

448 **3.2.3. Intra-gastric colloidal stability and physiological responses**

449 The effect of the droplet size in relation to colloidal stability in gastric environment has been less studied
450 which can be attributed to the limitations of *in vitro* systems, in particular static models. Some clinical
451 studies have shown a significant impact of emulsion droplet size and intra-gastric stability not only on
452 nutrient delivery and absorption (Golding, et al., 2011; Marciani, et al., 2007) but also on satiety
453 (Marciani, et al., 2008), and subsequent regulation of energy intake (Hussein, et al., 2015).

454 Unfortunately, there are a few studies in which dairy based ingredients is the main focus. This highlights
455 the gap of knowledge in understanding the physiological response to consumption of dairy structures.

456 Peters, et al. (2014) studied the effect of droplet size (3 versus 0.1 μm) in a milk shake. They did not
457 find any significant effect in CCK released, satiety and food intake for 180 min after drink ingestion.
458 This is in contrast to the significant enhancement in satiety for the smaller size droplets observed by
459 Maljaars, et al. (2012). In the latter study, the same milk shake but without lipid was orally administered
460 and the lipid droplets were infused directly to the small intestine. In the Peters, et al. (2014) study the
461 sample including protein could potentially coagulate in the stomach entrapping the lipid droplets, which
462 could delay or change the effect on satiety that was expected. Unfortunately, the gastric behaviour was
463 not investigated in the study. Again, this illustrates the crucial importance of studying the gastric phase
464 and the importance of the effect of the matrix within which the components of interest are arranged.

465 Droplet size is also thought to influence food intake behaviour. However, the study of satiety is quite
466 complex because it also involves cognitive factors as well as physiological factors. Lett, et al. (2016)
467 aimed to modulate satiation and satiety by controlling oil droplet size ($d_{4,3}$ of 2 versus 50 μm) of an
468 emulsion (1% wt sodium caseinate and 15% wt sunflower oil). The smaller droplet size within an
469 emulsion preload resulted in a significant reduction in food intake (62.4 kcal) at a subsequent *ad libitum*
470 meal. The authors did not find any conclusive primary mechanism responsible for this effect on satiety,
471 but it is likely from earlier discussions, that this difference in droplet size would affect the lipid profile
472 emptied from the stomach, and the subsequent feedback and control of gastric emptying could influence
473 satiety.

474 **3.3. Conclusions**

475 The literature reviewed in this section illustrated that processing of milk can be seen as a tool to
476 modulate digestion kinetics which does not imply an impairment of protein quality. In terms of heat
477 processing, only drastic temperatures seem to have significant effects on protein bioavailability as
478 reported by the increase of nitrogen availability and utilisation in the body after high heat treatment in
479 humans. This is supported by the restructuring in the gastric phase observed in relevant *in vitro* models.

480 The important role of pepsin, and the mechanisms by which it controls this process needs to be further
481 investigated. Also, the effect of heat on caseins digestion is still controversial and needs further
482 investigation taking into account the digestion model and heating conditions. Moreover, there are no
483 reports about the effect of heat treatment on satiety in dairy products.

484 Homogenisation has been observed to cause a profound effect on milk gastric behaviour *in vitro* but it
485 needs confirmation in humans. It is generally accepted that lipolysis is enhanced by reduction of droplet
486 size. However, droplet interface interactions with protein matrix are less considered and play a crucial
487 role in the lipolysis. Therefore, the effect of droplet size should be investigated together in a food matrix
488 to assess the gastric colloidal behaviour that will impact not only on lipid absorption rate but
489 physiological responses such as satiety.

490 **4. Micro-scale dairy structures: digestion, absorption and physiological responses**

491 Milk processing will not only vary the macronutrient organisation at the microscopic level but at larger
492 scale (i.e. macrostructure) providing products with different rheological properties with liquid, semi-
493 solid and solid consistencies (i.e. yoghurt, cream, butter and cheese). These process-induced physical
494 structures might influence nutrient release and absorption.

495 **4.1. Effect of macrostructure on digestion**

496 Scaff, et al. (1990) showed, using calves, that caseins from yoghurt were emptied constantly from the
497 stomach in both intact and degraded forms in contrast to the longer retention of caseins in milk. In
498 humans, Mahé, et al. (1994) compared the digesta of proximal jejunum and terminal ileum between
499 milk and yoghurt. They found, in milk, an early emptying of whey proteins, which remained in solution
500 whereas caseins coagulated. In contrast, the greater viscosity of yoghurt provided a more delayed and
501 regular release of nitrogen into the duodenum compared to milk. This was suggested to be due to the
502 different GE pattern, the gastric half emptying time (measured using ¹⁴C-PEG-4000) was shorter in
503 milk (35 min) than in yoghurt (60 min). However, this did not affect the overall extensive digestion of
504 milk proteins from both matrices; approximately 91% of nitrogen was absorbed between the stomach
505 and the terminal ileum in 240 min. These outcomes were supported in humans (Gaudichon, et al., 1995)

506 and mini-pigs (Gaudichon, et al., 1994), in which the dependence of liquid to solid ratio of the gastric
507 digesta in GE was highlighted. The viscosity of yoghurt also influenced the postprandial lipid profile in
508 humans by delaying the peak in plasma TAG whereas milk provided a lower but more long-lasting rise
509 of TAG in plasma (Sanggaard, et al., 2004). Interestingly, Mahé, et al. (1994) reported, in humans, that
510 the absorption of calcium in the duodenum was significantly higher after ingestion of yoghurt (67%)
511 compared to that of milk (44%), probably due to a higher casein availability in yoghurt. This shows that
512 the effect of intestinal delivery rates does not only affect macronutrients but micronutrients as well.

513 Using similar macrostructures, Barbé, et al. (2013) compared the effect of unheated skimmed milk and
514 its correspondent gel produced using rennet in mini-pigs. The gel matrix ingestion induced significantly
515 lower and prolonged Leu levels in plasma throughout a 7-hour period after meal ingestion, whereas the
516 liquid structure peaked after 30 min of meal ingestion. It was suggested that the gel structure could slow
517 down proteolysis and AA absorption, which could be reflected physiologically. However, the levels of
518 the GI hormones measured in this study, CCK and ghrelin, did not present any significant difference
519 between the matrices over a 4-hour period after meal ingestion. Despite the different AA uptake rate
520 that was obtained, the authors found no significant differences in the mean retention time in the stomach.
521 The measurement was based on chromium-EDTA which, as mention before, might not be
522 representative of the entire gastric contents. The effect of these matrices (milk liquid versus gel) was
523 further studied in relation to the pattern of peptides released into the duodenum at different times using
524 mini-pigs (Barbé, et al., 2014). The authors reported that the food matrix did not affect the accessibility
525 of enzymes to the cleavage sites as seen, due to the identification of the same peptides over the digestion
526 time but the structure had a great impact on the quantity of identified peptides. The gel structure
527 presented lower amounts of free AAs but higher number of peptides, when compared to the matrix
528 ingested in a liquid state, even though the latter was supposed to coagulate in the stomach. The
529 mechanisms behind these results were not clearly identified, which illustrates the difficulty of
530 interpretation of results in a system with several contributory factors, such as matrix structure, gastric
531 restructuring and emptying and enzyme accessibility. The mechanisms behind the results of these dairy
532 structures were investigated by mathematical modelling, which accounted for the main digestive events

533 including gastric behaviours of coagulation and syneresis in the stomach (Le Feunteun, et al., 2014). It
534 was shown that the gastric retention controlled by the physico-chemical properties of the matrix was
535 the limiting step explaining the differences in the mini-pig data. Importantly, the gastric phase was
536 determined to have the crucial, rate-limiting effect in explaining the kinetics of AA absorption observed
537 *in vivo*.

538 **4.2. Effect of macrostructure on appetite**

539 Only a few studies have investigated the impact of the physical structure of dairy matrices in relation
540 to appetite. Sanggaard, et al. (2004), did not find any difference in appetite sensation, measured by
541 visual analogue scale, and insulin and glucose between yoghurt and whole milk in eight healthy men,
542 despite the significant slower rate of GE observed after yoghurt consumption. However, the level of
543 GIP was twice higher in yoghurt between 30 and 120 min but the measured gut hormones remained
544 elevated for longer time after milk ingestion, in agreement with the postprandial lipid profile. The rapid
545 first emptying of whey proteins and the subsequent slow emptying of the casein coagulum might
546 counteract the effect of viscosity in the yoghurt with the more homogenous nutrient emptying and lead
547 to similar appetite sensations. Dougkas, et al. (2012) studied the effect of three isocaloric dairy products
548 (semi-skimmed milk, yoghurt and cheese) consumed as a snack on appetite and subsequent *ab libitum*
549 lunch energy intake in overweight men. The yoghurt intake reduced the rating of hunger of 8 and 10%
550 compared with cheese and milk, respectively, whereas they did not present any difference in the overall
551 energy intake or the satiety hormones of ghrelin, PYY and insulin. Similarly, Mackie, et al. (2013)
552 compared two isocaloric samples (same lipid, protein and carbohydrate content) with a different
553 physical structure. The liquid sample was a milk protein-stabilised emulsion and the semi-solid sample
554 was a mixture of grated cheese and yoghurt. The authors showed a different behaviour in the stomach
555 using MRI; the semi-solid matrix presented sedimentation whereas liquid matrix presented creaming.
556 The semi-solid sample promoted greater fullness over the three-hour study, which was linked to the
557 volume of the gastric contents remaining by the slower GE rate over the first hour. However, the
558 effective reduction of hunger of the semi-solid meal was not reflected in the plasma CCK level, which
559 was lower over the first hour and then similar for both meals. This shows that the rationale of the satiety

560 biomarkers does not always guarantee high perceived satiety, since there is not a mathematical
561 association (Veldhorst, et al., 2008). The understanding of the underlying mechanisms of the GE
562 patterns would imply consecutive measurements of the chyme, which is difficult in humans. Mulet-
563 Cabero, et al. (2017) further investigated the same liquid and semi-solid samples using a semi-dynamic
564 gastric model that could simulate the behaviour observed in the human stomach. The liquid system
565 showed a delayed nutrient release, in particular lipid, due to the formation of the cream layer during
566 gastric digestion. In contrast, the sedimentation in semi-solid system led to the early emptying of high
567 nutrient content since lipid was prolonged entrapped in the protein matrix. This caused a faster nutrient
568 hydrolysis in the small intestine, which might enhance nutrient absorption. This shows that the
569 evaluation of the nutrient delivery during gastric digestion could provide useful information to shed
570 light on the *in vivo* observations. Therefore, the approach of combining the strengths of *in vivo* and *in*
571 *vitro* models could provide more relevant data in order to understand the mechanisms linking food
572 structure and physiological responses.

573 Currently, there are no conclusive results of the impact of dairy products on appetite and energy intake,
574 and research of the satiating power of solid versus liquid matrix remains inconsistent (Almiron-Roig,
575 et al., 2003). The potential for dairy products to help individuals control body weight needs further
576 investigation, which should importantly include the study of the behaviour in the stomach. Also, the
577 study of the rate of GE usually provides contradictory outcomes when compared to the rate of nutrient
578 absorption; most of the labelled substrates used only reflect the behaviour of the liquid phase of the
579 digesta so it is important to understand the structural changes of the whole food matrix within the
580 stomach.

581 **4.3. Solid dairy foods with different textures**

582 **4.3.1. Effect of viscosity and gel strength**

583 Protein gel texture induced by processing might affect disintegration kinetics during gastric digestion
584 and subsequent AA bioavailability. Guo, et al. (2015) used the HGS to study the gastric disintegration
585 between two whey protein emulsion gels, i.e. hard gel (69.9 N hardness) and soft gel (19.2 N hardness).

586 Prior to the gastric digestion simulation, the samples went through an oral phase simulating the bolus
587 obtained in an *in vivo* study (Guo, et al., 2013). In the gastric phase, the soft gel disintegrated faster than
588 the hard gel, suggesting that the main mechanism of disintegration for hard gel was abrasion whereas
589 soft gel presented both abrasion and fragmentation during gastric digestion. The disintegration in the
590 stomach was accelerated by the action of pepsin, in particular after 180 min of digestion for the soft gel.
591 This could be attributed to the weakly crosslinked protein structure observed in the soft gel, compared
592 to the intimately linked protein matrix of the hard gel, which could hamper pepsin accessibility. The
593 behaviour of the gastric disintegration had a significant impact on the GE, which was related to the
594 retention of solids in the HGS as a function of time. The GE was faster in soft gel after 180 min of
595 digestion whereas the gastric content retention before 120 min in soft gel was higher, which was
596 attributed to a larger particles size of the original bolus (Guo, et al., 2013). This shows the relevant
597 importance of the oral phase in the process of gastric disintegration. The rate of GE between the matrices
598 was almost the same at the end of gastric digestion (300 min) indicating that slower emptying of the
599 soft gel at the beginning of digestion due to particle size of bolus was compensated by the more rapid
600 disintegration due to easier hydrolysis by pepsin.

601 Cheeses have different consistencies with different structures, which might affect the disintegration rate
602 and release of nutrients. Tran Do and Kong (2018) used the HGS to study the gastric disintegration of
603 Cheddar, Mozzarella and Parmesan cheeses. Mozzarella cheese formed a more dense outer layer during
604 the dynamic gastric digestion that led to a lower protein hydrolysis, compared to the other cheeses.

605 A recent study using pigs investigated the effect of viscosity in yoghurt on GE by gama scintigraphy
606 and protein digestion using the dynamic model DIDGI[®] (Ménard, et al., 2018). The low and high
607 viscosity yoghurt with the same nutrient composition but different viscosity (2.2 versus 0.3 Pa·s) were
608 compared a control yoghurt with lower protein and fiber content, and intermediate viscosity (1.3 Pa·s).
609 The authors showed that the enrichment of protein and fibre slowed down GE whereas the viscosity
610 seemed not to be a controlling parameter in emptying since low and high viscosity yoghurts presented
611 no significant difference. However, since the control yoghurt differed in both nutrient composition and
612 viscosity, it is not possible to draw any conclusive outcome. Moreover, the pepsin hydrolysis of whey

613 proteins was higher in the high viscosity yoghurt compared to the low viscosity sample, which was
614 suggested by the authors to be due to the different behaviour observed when entering the small intestine.

615 **4.3.2. Effect on lipid digestion and physiological responses**

616 Examples of dairy products in which oil droplets are dispersed in a semi-solid/solid protein matrix are
617 yoghurt and cheese. The influence of the protein matrix on the release of lipids might impact absorption
618 and lipaemia, which can have potential effects on risk markers of cardiovascular diseases. Drouin-
619 Chartier, et al. (2017) compared the lipid absorption from hard and soft cheeses and butter, matched in
620 total calories and macronutrient content. There were no differences in serum TAG, free fatty acid and
621 apoB-48 in the incremental area under the curve over 8 hours. However, it seemed that the soft cheese
622 induced greater increase in TAG concentration at 2 hours and attenuated the low dense lipoprotein of
623 apoB-48 compared to the firm cheese. These results showed that the physical structure may not
624 necessarily influence the overall magnitude of postprandial lipemia but more importantly the timing
625 and magnitude of the TAG peak value. This could be related to the protein network and lipid droplet
626 arrangement within the cheese matrix. The authors suggested that the homogenised lipid droplets in soft
627 cheese are enclosed in a loose protein gel, which causes easier access for both pepsin and gastric lipase
628 in the stomach. Moreover, the lipid droplets were smaller, giving the food an overall larger surface area,
629 which might facilitate lipolysis. Interestingly, they did not find any differences between hard cheese
630 and butter. This could be attributed to a limited availability of the nutrients; hard cheese could take
631 longer to be disintegrated in the stomach and the formation of layering could be possible in the case of
632 butter delaying the delivery of lipid. Similar results were obtained in a study comparing milk, butter
633 and mozzarella-cheese (Clemente, et al., 2003). There was no significant difference in the average of
634 postprandial plasma TAG but in the peak time (315, 277 and 225 min for butter, mozzarella and milk
635 respectively). This contrasts with the GE rate, using ultrasonographic measurements of the antrum-
636 pylorus section, in which mozzarella cheese presented a faster emptying compared to milk and butter.
637 This study showed that GE might not play a critical role in modulating postprandial lipids in blood,
638 using this specific methodology. However, it should also be noted that the study was performed with
639 type 2 diabetic patients, which could modify the outcome when compared with healthy subjects. It is

640 important to note that lipemia can be affected by other factors such as fatty acid composition (degree of
641 saturation and length of fatty acid chain) and the properties of the lipid droplet interface.

642 There are some studies suggesting that the consumption of fat in cheese form has different effect on
643 blood lipids by reducing low density lipoprotein cholesterol, when compared to the same amount of fat
644 consumed in butter form (Hjerpsted, et al., 2011; Tholstrup, et al., 2004). Indeed, Feeney, et al. (2018)
645 showed that dairy fat in form of cheese lower the total cholesterol levels compared with that of equal
646 amount of fat, casein and calcium content in different matrices, suggesting the synergistic effect of the
647 constituents in the cheese matrix. The role of calcium in the fat absorption has been seen one important
648 factor controlling the metabolic responses observed (Thorning, et al., 2016) but this has to be proven in
649 humans and, in general, more research is needed to understand the role of the food matrix on gastric
650 digestion and lipaemia, and metabolic effects, which should be in the context of the lipid/protein
651 organisation and interaction and their behaviour in the gastric compartment.

652 **4.4. Conclusions**

653 This section illustrated that dairy products with different physical structures can affect the rates of
654 nutrient hydrolysis as well as absorption, which is mainly driven by the physico-chemical effect of the
655 structure on gastric digestion. It seems that solid and semi-solid dairy structures have slower digestion
656 than liquid meals. However, the restructuring of liquid meals in the stomach through, for instance
657 coagulation and phase separation, should also be considered. Moreover, factors of the initial food matrix
658 such as hardness, viscosity and pH are also relevant for the breakdown of the food, and how these
659 properties evolve within the GI tract are crucial in nutrient digestion. For instance, studying the
660 rheological properties of the chyme during gastric digestion could provide valuable information about
661 the effect on gastric digestion time. Protein digestion is usually overlooked when assessing lipid
662 digestion in complex matrices. However, research has shown that disintegration of a protein matrix in
663 the stomach is crucial for lipid accessibility and subsequent digestion. This is important not only for the
664 initial design of structures but also the structures that can be formed within the gastric compartment. It
665 has been evident from the literature that there is a complex relationship between structuring in the
666 stomach, the content and rate of nutrients emptied from the stomach and the rate of nutrient absorption.

667 This could be due to the methodology used for measuring GE and also the characterisation of the food
668 matrix. It is difficult to assess both absorption of nutrients and bioaccessibility in relation to gastric
669 behaviour. For that, using both *in vivo* and relevant *in vitro* gastric digestion systems could be an
670 interesting approach to gain more insight into the mechanisms of nutrient digestion. There is currently
671 no evidence of how the different physical dairy structures can influence nitrogen metabolism, and also,
672 more research on satiety responses is needed. Moreover, some research in cheese (Fang, et al., 2016;
673 Lamothe, et al., 2012) has shown that lipid digestion rates can depend on the hardness, cohesiveness
674 and elasticity of the cheese type, which constitutes an important factor in gastric disintegration.
675 However, these studies applied an *in vitro* static model for digestion and there are no clinical studies
676 showing this influence.

677 **5. General conclusions and perspectives**

678 Dairy structures impact nutrient digestion and physiological responses. This impact has been shown at
679 different length scales, from molecular level of the individual milk proteins to physical macrostructure
680 of, for instance, cheese. There are several physiological responses associated with dairy structures but
681 little is known about the mechanisms behind them. Some research has suggested that the gastric phase
682 is the critical step explaining the outcomes observed. However, the gastric phase has been mostly
683 overlooked and few studies have shown direct evidence. The research shown in the present review
684 highlights the importance of the interactions between the dairy products and the gastrointestinal tract,
685 in which the stomach was shown to play a key role. The conditions of the gastric phase drive the
686 restructuring of the initial matrix, which will govern the flow of the digesta and, consequently, nutrient
687 digestion kinetics. It has been shown that there is a gap in the literature about the structural changes and
688 nutrient emptying kinetics of dairy products of dairy matrices that will allow us to understand the
689 postprandial responses. In general, more research is needed to understand the behaviour of foods inside
690 the stomach, and potentially control it. This will provide the means for regulating nutrients digestion
691 and metabolism kinetics.

692 The control of emptying kinetics from the stomach should be targeted by engineering specific gastric
693 behaviour. In this vein, several approaches can be used to design specific structures, having particular

694 physico-chemical properties, to induce certain behaviour in the gastric environment. For instance,
695 modulation of rheological properties of viscosity or hardness since they are key in gastric emptying.
696 This could be achieved by designing gels with physical properties or induce gelation with different
697 consistencies in the gastric environment or droplet interfacial properties that could induce specific
698 intragastric behaviour such as creaming.

699 Future foods may be structured in such a way to have specific gastric digestion profiles that may allow
700 the development of mainstream foods with particular physiological properties targeted to specific
701 population needs such as the elderly, athletes and those at risk of metabolic disorders such as type 2
702 diabetes.

703 **Acknowledgements**

704 Ana-Isabel Mulet-Cabero was funded under Teagasc Walsh Fellowship scheme (award number
705 2014029) and BBSRC in the UK (grant BB/J004545/1).

706

707 Acheson, K. J., Blondel-Lubrano, A., Oguey-Araymon, S., Beaumont, M., Emady-Azar, S., Ammon-
708 Zufferey, C., Monnard, I., Pinaud, S., Nielsen-Moennoz, C., & Bovetto, L. (2011). Protein
709 choices targeting thermogenesis and metabolism^{1–3}. *The American journal of clinical*
710 *nutrition*, *93*(3), 525-534.

711 Alfenas, R. d. C. G., Bressan, J., & Paiva, A. C. d. (2010). Effects of protein quality on appetite and
712 energy metabolism in normal weight subjects. *Arquivos Brasileiros de Endocrinologia &*
713 *Metabologia*, *54*(1), 45-51.

714 Almiron-Roig, E., Chen, Y., & Drewnowski, A. (2003). Liquid calories and the failure of satiety: how
715 good is the evidence? *Obesity reviews*, *4*(4), 201-212.

716 Anderson, G. H., & Moore, S. E. (2004). Dietary proteins in the regulation of food intake and body
717 weight in humans. *The Journal of nutrition*, *134*(4), 974S-979S.

718 Barbé, F., Le Feunteun, S., Rémond, D., Ménard, O., Jardin, J., Henry, G., Laroche, B., & Dupont, D.
719 (2014). Tracking the in vivo release of bioactive peptides in the gut during digestion: Mass
720 spectrometry peptidomic characterization of effluents collected in the gut of dairy matrix
721 fed mini-pigs. *Food Research International*, *63*, 147-156.

722 Barbé, F., Ménard, O., Le Gouar, Y., Buffière, C., Famelart, M.-H., Laroche, B., Le Feunteun, S.,
723 Dupont, D., & Rémond, D. (2013). The heat treatment and the gelation are strong
724 determinants of the kinetics of milk proteins digestion and of the peripheral availability of
725 amino acids. *Food Chemistry*, *136*(3), 1203-1212.

726 Bendtsen, L. Q., Lorenzen, J. K., Bendtsen, N. T., Rasmussen, C., & Astrup, A. (2013). Effect of Dairy
727 Proteins on Appetite, Energy Expenditure, Body Weight, and Composition: a Review of the
728 Evidence from Controlled Clinical Trials. *Advances in Nutrition*, *4*(4), 418-438.

729 Boirie, Y., Dangin, M., Gachon, P., Vasson, M.-P., Maubois, J.-L., & Beaufrère, B. (1997). Slow and fast
730 dietary proteins differently modulate postprandial protein accretion. *Proceedings of the*
731 *National Academy of Sciences*, *94*(26), 14930-14935.

732 Bos, C., Mahé, S., Gaudichon, C., Benamouzig, R., Gausserès, N., Luengo, C., Ferrière, F., Rautureau,
733 J., & Tomé, D. (1999). Assessment of net postprandial protein utilization of 15 N-labelled
734 milk nitrogen in human subjects. *British Journal of Nutrition*, *81*(3), 221-226.

735 Bos, C., Metges, C. C., Gaudichon, C., Petzke, K. J., Pueyo, M. E., Morens, C., Everwand, J.,
736 Benamouzig, R., & Tomé, D. (2003). Postprandial Kinetics of Dietary Amino Acids Are the
737 Main Determinant of Their Metabolism after Soy or Milk Protein Ingestion in Humans. *The*
738 *Journal of nutrition*, *133*(5), 1308-1315.

739 Bourlieu, C., Ménard, O., De La Chevasnerie, A., Sams, L., Rousseau, F., Madec, M.-N., Robert, B.,
740 Deglaire, A., Pezennec, S., Bouhallab, S., Carrière, F., & Dupont, D. (2015). The structure of
741 infant formulas impacts their lipolysis, proteolysis and disintegration during in vitro gastric
742 digestion. *Food Chemistry*, *182*, 224-235.

743 Boutrou, R., Gaudichon, C., Dupont, D., Jardin, J., Airinei, G., Marsset-Baglieri, A., Benamouzig, R.,
744 Tomé, D., & Leonil, J. (2013). Sequential release of milk protein-derived bioactive peptides
745 in the jejunum in healthy humans. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, *97*(6), 1314-
746 1323.

747 Burd, N. A., Yang, Y., Moore, D. R., Tang, J. E., Tarnopolsky, M. A., & Phillips, S. M. (2012). Greater
748 stimulation of myofibrillar protein synthesis with ingestion of whey protein isolate v.
749 micellar casein at rest and after resistance exercise in elderly men. *British Journal of*
750 *Nutrition*, *108*(6), 958-962.

751 Calbet, J. A. L., & Holst, J. J. (2004). Gastric emptying, gastric secretion and enterogastrone response
752 after administration of milk proteins or their peptide hydrolysates in humans. *European*
753 *journal of nutrition*, *43*(3), 127-139.

754 Churchward-Venne, T. A., Snijders, T., Linkens, A. M., Hamer, H. M., van Kranenburg, J., & van Loon,
755 L. J. (2015). Ingestion of Casein in a Milk Matrix Modulates Dietary Protein Digestion and
756 Absorption Kinetics but Does Not Modulate Postprandial Muscle Protein Synthesis in Older
757 Men-3. *The Journal of nutrition*, *145*(7), 1438-1445.

758 Clemente, G., Mancini, M., Nazzaro, F., Lasorella, G., Riviaccio, A., Palumbo, A. M., Rivellese, A. A.,
759 Ferrara, L., & Giacco, R. (2003). Effects of different dairy products on postprandial lipemia.
760 *Nutrition, Metabolism and Cardiovascular Diseases*, 13(6), 377-383.

761 Dalgleish, D. G., & Corredig, M. (2012). The structure of the casein micelle of milk and its changes
762 during processing. *Annual review of food science and technology*, 3, 449-467.

763 Dangin, M., Boirie, Y., Garcia-Rodenas, C., Gachon, P., Fauquant, J., Callier, P., Ballèvre, O., &
764 Beaufrère, B. (2001). The digestion rate of protein is an independent regulating factor of
765 postprandial protein retention. *American Journal of Physiology-Endocrinology And*
766 *Metabolism*, 280(2), E340-E348.

767 Dangin, M., Guillet, C., Garcia-Rodenas, C., Gachon, P., Bouteloup-Demange, C., Reiffers-Magnani, K.,
768 Fauquant, J., Ballèvre, O., & Beaufrère, B. (2003). The rate of protein digestion affects
769 protein gain differently during aging in humans. *The Journal of physiology*, 549(2), 635-644.

770 de la Fuente, M. A., Singh, H., & Hemar, Y. (2002). Recent advances in the characterisation of heat-
771 induced aggregates and intermediates of whey proteins. *Trends in Food Science &*
772 *Technology*, 13(8), 262-274.

773 Dehghan, M., Mente, A., Rangarajan, S., Sheridan, P., Mohan, V., Iqbal, R., Gupta, R., Lear, S.,
774 Wentzel-Viljoen, E., & Avezum, A. (2018). Association of dairy intake with cardiovascular
775 disease and mortality in 21 countries from five continents (PURE): a prospective cohort
776 study. *The Lancet*, 392(10161), 2288-2297.

777 Diepvens, K., Häberer, D., & Westerterp-Plantenga, M. (2008). Different proteins and biopeptides
778 differently affect satiety and anorexigenic/orexigenic hormones in healthy humans.
779 *International Journal of Obesity*, 32(3), 510.

780 Dougkas, A., Minihane, A. M., Givens, D. I., Reynolds, C. K., & Yaqoob, P. (2012). Differential effects
781 of dairy snacks on appetite, but not overall energy intake. *British Journal of Nutrition*,
782 108(12), 2274-2285.

783 Dove, E. R., Hodgson, J. M., Puddey, I. B., Beilin, L. J., Lee, Y. P., & Mori, T. A. (2009). Skim milk
784 compared with a fruit drink acutely reduces appetite and energy intake in overweight men
785 and women-. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, 90(1), 70-75.

786 Drouin-Chartier, J.-P., Tremblay, A. J., Maltais-Giguère, J., Charest, A., Guinot, L., Rioux, L.-E., Labrie,
787 S., Britten, M., Lamarche, B., & Turgeon, S. L. (2017). Differential impact of the cheese matrix
788 on the postprandial lipid response: a randomized, crossover, controlled trial. *The American*
789 *journal of clinical nutrition*, 106(6), 1358-1365.

790 Drummond, M. J., & Rasmussen, B. B. (2008). Leucine-enriched nutrients and the regulation of
791 mTOR signalling and human skeletal muscle protein synthesis. *Current opinion in clinical*
792 *nutrition and metabolic care*, 11(3), 222.

793 Dupont, D., Mandalari, G., Mollé, D., Jardin, J., Rolet-Répécaud, O., Duboz, G., Léonil, J., Mills, C. E., &
794 Mackie, A. R. (2010). Food processing increases casein resistance to simulated infant
795 digestion. *Molecular Nutrition & Food Research*, 54(11), 1677-1689.

796 Efigênia, M., Pova, B., & Moraes-Santos, T. (1997). Effect of heat treatment on the nutritional
797 quality of milk proteins. *International Dairy Journal*, 7(8-9), 609-612.

798 Egger, L., Schlegel, P., Baumann, C., Stoffers, H., Guggisberg, D., Brügger, C., Dürr, D., Stoll, P.,
799 Vergères, G., & Portmann, R. (2017). Physiological comparability of the harmonized
800 INFOGEST in vitro digestion method to in vivo pig digestion. *Food Research International*.

801 Elliot, T. A., Cree, M. G., Sanford, A. P., Wolfe, R. R., & Tipton, K. D. (2006). Milk ingestion stimulates
802 net muscle protein synthesis following resistance exercise. *Medicine & Science in Sports &*
803 *Exercise*, 38(4), 667-674.

804 Fang, X., Rioux, L.-E., Labrie, S., & Turgeon, S. L. (2016). Commercial cheeses with different texture
805 have different disintegration and protein/peptide release rates during simulated in vitro
806 digestion. *International Dairy Journal*, 56, 169-178.

807 Feeney, E. L., Barron, R., Dible, V., Hamilton, Z., Power, Y., Tanner, L., Flynn, C., Bouchier, P.,
808 Beresford, T., & Noronha, N. (2018). Dairy matrix effects: response to consumption of dairy

809 fat differs when eaten within the cheese matrix—a randomized controlled trial. *The*
810 *American journal of clinical nutrition*, 108(4), 667-674.

811 Fekete, Á., Givens, D., & Lovegrove, J. (2015). Casein-derived lactotriptides reduce systolic and
812 diastolic blood pressure in a meta-analysis of randomised clinical trials. *Nutrients*, 7(1), 659-
813 681.

814 Fekete, Á. A., Givens, D. I., & Lovegrove, J. A. (2016). Can milk proteins be a useful tool in the
815 management of cardiometabolic health? An updated review of human intervention trials.
816 *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 75(3), 328-341.

817 Garcia, C., Antona, C., Robert, B., Lopez, C., & Armand, M. (2014). The size and interfacial
818 composition of milk fat globules are key factors controlling triglycerides bioavailability in
819 simulated human gastro-duodenal digestion. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 35, 494-504.

820 Gaudichon, C., Mahé, S., Benamouzig, R., Luengo, C., Fouillet, H., Daré, S., Van Oycke, M., Ferrière,
821 F., Rautureau, J., & Tomé, D. (1999). Net postprandial utilization of [15N]-labeled milk
822 protein nitrogen is influenced by diet composition in humans. *The Journal of nutrition*,
823 129(4), 890-895.

824 Gaudichon, C., Mahé, S., Roos, N., Benamouzig, R., Luengo, C., Huneau, J.-F., Sick, H., Bouley, C.,
825 Rautureau, J., & Tome, D. (1995). Exogenous and endogenous nitrogen flow rates and level
826 of protein hydrolysis in the human jejunum after [15 N] milk and [15 N] yoghurt ingestion.
827 *British Journal of Nutrition*, 74(2), 251-260.

828 Gaudichon, C., Roos, N., Mahé, S., Sick, H., Bouley, C., & Tomé, D. (1994). Gastric emptying regulates
829 the kinetics of nitrogen absorption from 15N-labeled milk and 15N-labeled yogurt in
830 miniature pigs. *The Journal of nutrition*, 124(10), 1970-1977.

831 Givens, D. I. (2017). Saturated fats, dairy foods and health: A curious paradox? *Nutrition Bulletin*,
832 42(3), 274-282.

833 Golding, M., Wooster, T. J., Day, L., Xu, M., Lundin, L., Keogh, J., & Clifton, P. (2011). Impact of gastric
834 structuring on the lipolysis of emulsified lipids. *Soft Matter*, 7(7), 3513-3523.

835 Gorissen, S. H., Burd, N. A., Hamer, H. M., Gijsen, A. P., Groen, B. B., & van Loon, L. J. (2014).
836 Carbohydrate coingestion delays dietary protein digestion and absorption but does not
837 modulate postprandial muscle protein accretion. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology &*
838 *Metabolism*, 99(6), 2250-2258.

839 Gorissen, S. H., Rémond, D., & Van Loon, L. J. (2015). The muscle protein synthetic response to food
840 ingestion. *Meat science*, 109, 96-100.

841 Gorissen, S. H., & Witard, O. C. (2018). Characterising the muscle anabolic potential of dairy, meat
842 and plant-based protein sources in older adults. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 77(1),
843 20-31.

844 Griffin, B. (2017). Serum low-density lipoprotein as a dietary responsive biomarker of cardiovascular
845 disease risk: Consensus and confusion. *Nutrition Bulletin*, 42(3), 266-273.

846 Guo, Q., Ye, A., Lad, M., Dalgleish, D., & Singh, H. (2013). The breakdown properties of heat-set whey
847 protein emulsion gels in the human mouth. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 33(2), 215-224.

848 Guo, Q., Ye, A., Lad, M., Dalgleish, D., & Singh, H. (2014). Behaviour of whey protein emulsion gel
849 during oral and gastric digestion: effect of droplet size. *Soft Matter*, 10(23), 4173-4183.

850 Guo, Q., Ye, A., Lad, M., Ferrua, M., Dalgleish, D., & Singh, H. (2015). Disintegration kinetics of food
851 gels during gastric digestion and its role on gastric emptying: an in vitro analysis. *Food &*
852 *function*, 6(3), 756-764.

853 Hall, W., Millward, D., Long, S., & Morgan, L. (2003). Casein and whey exert different effects on
854 plasma amino acid profiles, gastrointestinal hormone secretion and appetite. *British Journal*
855 *of Nutrition*, 89(02), 239-248.

856 Hjerpsted, J., Leedo, E., & Tholstrup, T. (2011). Cheese intake in large amounts lowers LDL-
857 cholesterol concentrations compared with butter intake of equal fat content—. *The American*
858 *journal of clinical nutrition*, 94(6), 1479-1484.

859 Hussein, M. O., Hoad, C. L., Wright, J., Singh, G., Stephenson, M. C., Cox, E. F., Placidi, E., Pritchard, S.
860 E., Costigan, C., & Ribeiro, H. (2015). Fat emulsion intragastric stability and droplet size
861 modulate gastrointestinal responses and subsequent food intake in young adults. *The*
862 *Journal of nutrition*, 145(6), 1170-1177.

863 Islam, M. A., Devle, H., Comi, I., Ulleberg, E. K., Rukke, E.-O., Vegarud, G. E., & Ekeberg, D. (2017). Ex
864 vivo digestion of raw, pasteurised and homogenised milk - Effects on lipolysis and
865 proteolysis. *International Dairy Journal*, 65, 14-19.

866 Jauhainen, T., & Korpela, R. (2007). Milk peptides and blood pressure. *Journal of Nutrition*, 137.

867 Kaufmann, W. (1984). Influences of different technological treatments of milk on the digestion in the
868 stomach. VI. Estimation of amino acid and urea concentrations in the blood: conclusions
869 regarding the nutritional evaluation. *Milchwissenschaft (Germany, FR)*.

870 Kong, F., & Singh, R. P. (2010). A Human Gastric Simulator (HGS) to Study Food Digestion in Human
871 Stomach. *Journal of Food Science*, 75(9), E627-E635.

872 Lacroix, M., Bon, C., Bos, C., Léonil, J., Benamouzig, R., Luengo, C., Fauquant, J., Tomé, D., &
873 Gaudichon, C. (2008). Ultra High Temperature Treatment, but Not Pasteurization, Affects the
874 Postprandial Kinetics of Milk Proteins in Humans. *The Journal of nutrition*, 138(12), 2342-
875 2347.

876 Lacroix, M., Bos, C., Léonil, J., Airinei, G., Luengo, C., Daré, S., Benamouzig, R., Fouillet, H., Fauquant,
877 J., Tomé, D., & Gaudichon, C. (2006). Compared with casein or total milk protein, digestion
878 of milk soluble proteins is too rapid to sustain the anabolic postprandial amino acid
879 requirement. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, 84(5), 1070-1079.

880 Lacroix, M., Léonil, J., Bos, C., Henry, G., Airinei, G., Fauquant, J., Tomé, D., & Gaudichon, C. (2006).
881 Heat markers and quality indexes of industrially heat-treated [15N] milk protein measured in
882 rats. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 54(4), 1508-1517.

883 Lamothe, S., Corbeil, M.-M., Turgeon, S. L., & Britten, M. (2012). Influence of cheese matrix on lipid
884 digestion in a simulated gastro-intestinal environment. *Food & function*, 3(7), 724-731.

885 Lang, V., Bellisle, F., Oppert, J. M., Craplet, C., Bornet, F. R., Slama, G., & Guy-Grand, B. (1998).
886 Satiating effect of proteins in healthy subjects: a comparison of egg albumin, casein, gelatin,
887 soy protein, pea protein, and wheat gluten. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, 67(6),
888 1197-1204.

889 Le Feunteun, S., Barbé, F., Rémond, D., Ménard, O., Le Gouar, Y., Dupont, D., & Laroche, B. (2014).
890 Impact of the dairy matrix structure on milk protein digestion kinetics: mechanistic
891 modelling based on mini-pig in vivo data. *Food and bioprocess technology*, 7(4), 1099-1113.

892 Lett, A. M., Yeomans, M. R., Norton, I. T., & Norton, J. E. (2016). Enhancing expected food intake
893 behaviour, hedonics and sensory characteristics of oil-in-water emulsion systems through
894 microstructural properties, oil droplet size and flavour. *Food quality and preference*, 47, 148-
895 155.

896 Li, Q., & Zhao, Z. (2019). Acid and rennet-induced coagulation behavior of casein micelles with
897 modified structure. *Food Chemistry*.

898 Lopez, C. (2005). Focus on the supramolecular structure of milk fat in dairy products. *Reproduction*
899 *Nutrition Development*, 45(4), 497-511.

900 Lorenzen, J., Frederiksen, R., Hoppe, C., Hvid, R., & Astrup, A. (2012). The effect of milk proteins on
901 appetite regulation and diet-induced thermogenesis. *European journal of clinical nutrition*,
902 66(5), 622.

903 Luhovyy, B. L., Akhavan, T., & Anderson, G. H. (2007). Whey Proteins in the Regulation of Food Intake
904 and Satiety. *Journal of the American College of Nutrition*, 26(6), 704S-712S.

905 Macierzanka, A., Sancho, A. I., Mills, E. C., Rigby, N. M., & Mackie, A. R. (2009). Emulsification alters
906 simulated gastrointestinal proteolysis of β -casein and β -lactoglobulin. *Soft Matter*, 5(3), 538-
907 550.

908 Mackie, A., Rafiee, H., Malcolm, P., Salt, L., & van Aken, G. (2013). Specific food structures suppress
909 appetite through reduced gastric emptying rate. *Am J Physiol Gastrointest Liver Physiol*,
910 304(11), G1038-1043.

911 Mahé, S., Marteau, P., Huneau, J.-F., Thuillier, F., & Tomé, D. (1994). Intestinal nitrogen and
912 electrolyte movements following fermented milk ingestion in man. *British Journal of*
913 *Nutrition*, 71(2), 169-180.

914 Mahé, S., Messing, B., Thuillier, F., & Tomé, D. (1991). Digestion of bovine milk proteins in patients
915 with a high jejunostomy. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, 54(3), 534-538.

916 Mahé, S., Roos, N., Benamouzig, R., Davin, L., Luengo, C., Gagnon, L., Gausserges, N., Rautureau, J., &
917 Tome, D. (1996). Gastrojejunal kinetics and the digestion of N-15 beta-lactoglobulin and
918 casein in humans: The influence of the nature and quantity of the protein. *American Journal*
919 *of Clinical Nutrition*, 63(4), 546-552.

920 Maljaars, P. W., Peters, H. P., Mela, D. J., & Masclee, A. A. (2008). Ileal brake: a sensible food target
921 for appetite control. A review. *Physiology & Behavior*, 95(3), 271-281.

922 Maljaars, P. W. J., van der Wal, R. J. P., Wiersma, T., Peters, H. P. F., Haddeman, E., & Masclee, A. A.
923 M. (2012). The effect of lipid droplet size on satiety and peptide secretion is intestinal site-
924 specific. *Clinical Nutrition*, 31(4), 535-542.

925 Marciani, L., Faulks, R., Wickham, M. S., Bush, D., Pick, B., Wright, J., Cox, E. F., Fillery-Travis, A.,
926 Gowland, P. A., & Spiller, R. C. (2008). Effect of intragastric acid stability of fat emulsions on
927 gastric emptying, plasma lipid profile and postprandial satiety. *British Journal of Nutrition*,
928 101(06), 919-928.

929 Marciani, L., Wickham, M., Singh, G., Bush, D., Pick, B., Cox, E., Fillery-Travis, A., Faulks, R., Marsden,
930 C., Gowland, P. A., & Spiller, R. C. (2007). Enhancement of intragastric acid stability of a fat
931 emulsion meal delays gastric emptying and increases cholecystokinin release and gallbladder
932 contraction. *American Journal of Physiology - Gastrointestinal and Liver Physiology*, 292(6),
933 G1607-G1613.

934 Mariotti, F., Mahé, S., Luengo, C., Benamouzig, R., & Tomé, D. (2000). Postprandial modulation of
935 dietary and whole-body nitrogen utilization by carbohydrates in humans. *The American*
936 *journal of clinical nutrition*, 72(4), 954-962.

937 Mariotti, F., Valette, M., Lopez, C., Fouillet, H., Famelart, M.-H., Mathé, V., Airinei, G., Benamouzig,
938 R., Gaudichon, C., Tomé, D., Tsikas, D., & Huneau, J. F. (2015). Casein Compared with Whey
939 Proteins Affects the Organization of Dietary Fat during Digestion and Attenuates the
940 Postprandial Triglyceride Response to a Mixed High-Fat Meal in Healthy, Overweight Men.
941 *The Journal of nutrition*, 145(12), 2657-2664.

942 Meisel, H., & Hagemester, H. (1984). [Influences of different technological treatments of milk on the
943 digestion in the stomach. II. Gastric passage of different milk constituents]. [German].
944 *Milchwissenschaft*.

945 Ménard, O., Famelart, M.-H., Deglaire, A., Le Gouar, Y., Guérin, S., Malbert, C.-H., & Dupont, D.
946 (2018). Gastric Emptying and Dynamic In Vitro Digestion of Drinkable Yogurts: Effect of
947 Viscosity and Composition. *Nutrients*, 10(9), 1308.

948 Michalski, M.-C., Michel, F., & Geneste, C. (2002). Appearance of submicronic particles in the milk fat
949 globule size distribution upon mechanical treatments. *Le Lait*, 82(2), 193-208.

950 Miranda, G., & Pelissier, J.-P. (1981). In vivo studies on the digestion of bovine caseins in the rat
951 stomach. *Journal of Dairy Research*, 48(2), 319-326.

952 Miranda, G., & Pelissier, J.-P. (1987). Influence of heat treatment of bovine skim-milk on in vivo
953 digestion in rat stomach. *Lait*, 67(3), 365-377.

954 Mortensen, L. S., Hartvigsen, M. L., Brader, L. J., Astrup, A., Schrezenmeir, J., Holst, J. J., Thomsen, C.,
955 & Hermansen, K. (2009). Differential effects of protein quality on postprandial lipemia in
956 response to a fat-rich meal in type 2 diabetes: comparison of whey, casein, gluten, and cod
957 protein-. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, 90(1), 41-48.

958 Mulet-Cabero, A.-I., Mackie, A. R., Wilde, P. J., Fenelon, M. A., & Brodkorb, A. (2019). Structural
959 mechanism and kinetics of in vitro gastric digestion are affected by process-induced changes
960 in bovine milk. *Food Hydrocolloids*, *86*, 172-183.

961 Mulet-Cabero, A.-I., Rigby, N. M., Brodkorb, A., & Mackie, A. R. (2017). Dairy food structures
962 influence the rates of nutrient digestion through different in vitro gastric behaviour. *Food*
963 *Hydrocolloids*, *67*, 63-73.

964 Nilsson, M., Stenberg, M., Frid, A. H., Holst, J. J., & Björck, I. M. (2004). Glycemia and insulinemia in
965 healthy subjects after lactose-equivalent meals of milk and other food proteins: the role of
966 plasma amino acids and incretins. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, *80*(5), 1246-
967 1253.

968 Pal, S., Ellis, V., & Dhaliwal, S. (2010). Effects of whey protein isolate on body composition, lipids,
969 insulin and glucose in overweight and obese individuals. *British Journal of Nutrition*, *104*(5),
970 716-723.

971 Parada, J., & Aguilera, J. M. (2007). Food Microstructure Affects the Bioavailability of Several
972 Nutrients. *Journal of Food Science*, *72*(2), R21-R32.

973 Pennings, B., Boirie, Y., Senden, J. M., Gijzen, A. P., Kuipers, H., & van Loon, L. J. (2011). Whey protein
974 stimulates postprandial muscle protein accretion more effectively than do casein and casein
975 hydrolysate in older men—. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, *93*(5), 997-1005.

976 Peters, H. P. F., Bouwens, E. C. M., Schuring, E. A. H., Haddeman, E., Velikov, K. P., & Melnikov, S. M.
977 (2014). The effect of submicron fat droplets in a drink on satiety, food intake, and
978 cholecystokinin in healthy volunteers. *European journal of nutrition*, *53*(3), 723-729.

979 Rayner, C. K., Samsom, M., Jones, K. L., & Horowitz, M. (2001). Relationships of upper
980 gastrointestinal motor and sensory function with glycemic control. *Diabetes care*, *24*(2), 371-
981 381.

982 Rutherford, S., & Moughan, P. (2005). Digestible reactive lysine in selected milk-based products.
983 *Journal of Dairy Science*, *88*(1), 40-48.

984 Sánchez-Rivera, L., Ménard, O., Recio, I., & Dupont, D. (2015). Peptide mapping during dynamic
985 gastric digestion of heated and unheated skimmed milk powder. *Food Research*
986 *International*, *77*, 132-139.

987 Sanggaard, K., Holst, J., Rehfeld, J., Sandström, B., Raben, A., & Tholstrup, T. (2004). Different effects
988 of whole milk and a fermented milk with the same fat and lactose content on gastric
989 emptying and postprandial lipaemia, but not on glycaemic response and appetite. *British*
990 *Journal of Nutrition*, *92*(3), 447-459.

991 Scanff, P., Savalle, B., Miranda, G., Pelissier, J. P., Guilloteau, P., & Toullec, R. (1990). In vivo gastric
992 digestion of milk proteins. Effect of technological treatments. *Journal of Agricultural and*
993 *Food Chemistry*, *38*(8), 1623-1629.

994 Singh, H. (2004). Heat stability of milk. *International Journal of Dairy Technology*, *57*(2-3), 111-119.

995 Tam, J. J., & Whitaker, J. R. (1972). Rates and Extents of Hydrolysis of Several Caseins by Pepsin,
996 Rennin, Endothia parasitica Protease and Mucor pusillus Protease¹. *Journal of Dairy Science*,
997 *55*(11), 1523-1531.

998 Tang, J. E., Moore, D. R., Kujbida, G. W., Tarnopolsky, M. A., & Phillips, S. M. (2009). Ingestion of
999 whey hydrolysate, casein, or soy protein isolate: effects on mixed muscle protein synthesis
1000 at rest and following resistance exercise in young men. *Journal of Applied Physiology*, *107*(3),
1001 987-992.

1002 Tholstrup, T., Høy, C.-E., Andersen, L. N., Christensen, R. D. K., & Sandström, B. (2004). Does Fat in
1003 Milk, Butter and Cheese Affect Blood Lipids and Cholesterol Differently? *Journal of the*
1004 *American College of Nutrition*, *23*(2), 169-176.

1005 Thorning, T. K., Bertram, H. C., Bonjour, J.-P., De Groot, L., Dupont, D., Feeney, E., Ipsen, R., Lecerf, J.
1006 M., Mackie, A., & McKinley, M. C. (2017). Whole dairy matrix or single nutrients in
1007 assessment of health effects: current evidence and knowledge gaps. *The American journal of*
1008 *clinical nutrition*, *105*(5), 1033-1045.

1009 Thorning, T. K., Raben, A., Tholstrup, T., Soedamah-Muthu, S. S., Givens, I., & Astrup, A. (2016). Milk
1010 and dairy products: good or bad for human health? An assessment of the totality of scientific
1011 evidence. *Food & nutrition research*, 60(1), 32527.

1012 Tran Do, D. H., & Kong, F. (2018). Texture changes and protein hydrolysis in different cheeses under
1013 simulated gastric environment. *LWT*, 93, 197-203.

1014 Veldhorst, M., Smeets, A., Soenen, S., Hochstenbach-Waelen, A., Hursel, R., Diepvens, K., Lejeune,
1015 M., Luscombe-Marsh, N., & Westerterp-Plantenga, M. (2008). Protein-induced satiety:
1016 effects and mechanisms of different proteins. *Physiology & Behavior*, 94(2), 300-307.

1017 Veldhorst, M. A. B., Nieuwenhuizen, A. G., Hochstenbach-Waelen, A., van Vught, A. J. A. H.,
1018 Westerterp, K. R., Engelen, M. P. K. J., Brummer, R.-J. M., Deutz, N. E. P., & Westerterp-
1019 Plantenga, M. S. (2009). Dose-dependent satiating effect of whey relative to casein or soy.
1020 *Physiology & Behavior*, 96(4-5), 675-682.

1021 Volpi, E., Kobayashi, H., Sheffield-Moore, M., Mittendorfer, B., & Wolfe, R. R. (2003). Essential amino
1022 acids are primarily responsible for the amino acid stimulation of muscle protein anabolism in
1023 healthy elderly adults. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, 78(2), 250-258.

1024 West, D. W., Burd, N. A., Coffey, V. G., Baker, S. K., Burke, L. M., Hawley, J. A., Moore, D. R.,
1025 Stellingwerff, T., & Phillips, S. M. (2011). Rapid aminoacidemia enhances myofibrillar protein
1026 synthesis and anabolic intramuscular signaling responses after resistance exercise-. *The
1027 American journal of clinical nutrition*, 94(3), 795-803.

1028 Wolfe, R. R. (2002). Regulation of muscle protein by amino acids. *The Journal of nutrition*, 132(10),
1029 3219S-3224S.

1030 Ye, A., Cui, J., Dalgleish, D., & Singh, H. (2016a). The formation and breakdown of structured clots
1031 from whole milk during gastric digestion. *Food & function*, 7(10), 4259-4266.

1032 Ye, A., Cui, J., Dalgleish, D., & Singh, H. (2016b). Formation of a structured clot during the gastric
1033 digestion of milk: Impact on the rate of protein hydrolysis. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 52, 478-486.

1034 Ye, A., Cui, J., Dalgleish, D., & Singh, H. (2017). Effect of homogenization and heat treatment on the
1035 behavior of protein and fat globules during gastric digestion of milk. *Journal of Dairy Science*,
1036 100(1), 36-47.

1037

1038

1039 Table 1. Influence of dairy matrices at the different length scales on the bioaccessibility,

1040 bioavailability of nutrients, and physiological responses.^a

	Molecular Level (Caseins vs whey proteins)	Microstructure (Matrix reorganisation due to processing, i.e. heat treatment and homogenisation)	Macrostructure (Different rheological properties: liquid, semi-solid and solid consistencies, i.e. yoghurt, cream, butter and cheese).
Bioaccessibility (Nutrient digestion)	<i>In vitro</i> : Caseins were more easily digested than whey proteins during the static gastric digestion. The digestibility of	<i>In vitro</i> : - Harsh thermal treatment of milk formed loose and particulate coagula in contrast to the dense, solid structure of	<i>In vitro</i> : - Dairy protein gel texture induced by processing affected disintegration kinetics during gastric digestion.

	<p>the latter increased by the partial unfolding of the whey proteins.</p> <p><i>In vivo:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rapid appearance of mostly intact protein form in jejunum after β-Lg digestion whereas caseins were more slowly recovered in a more degraded form. 	<p>unheated milk. - The gastric behaviour also impacted the emptying kinetics of both lipid and protein; The gastric emptying of caseins from raw and pasteurised milk was delayed whereas caseins were mostly emptied in hydrolysed form in UHT-treated milk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Homogenised milks showed creaming in the gastric phase and seemed to release more lipid at the end of the gastric digestion. - Droplet interactions with protein matrix could play a crucial role in lipolysis. <p><i>In vivo:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Drastic heat treatment softened casein coagula and increased gastric emptying in pigs. 	<p>Soft gels disintegrated faster than hard gels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Solid and semi-solid dairy structures had slower digestion than liquid meals. However, the restructuring of liquid meals in the stomach through coagulation and phase separation, should also be considered. - In cheese, lipid digestion rates can depend on the hardness, cohesiveness and elasticity of the cheese type. <p><i>In vivo:</i></p> <p>Caseins in yoghurt were emptied constantly from the stomach in both intact and degraded forms in contrast to the longer retention in the stomach for caseins in milk.</p>
Bioavailability (Nutrient Absorption)	<p><i>In vivo:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to plasma AA appearance, whey proteins and caseins are considered as 'fast' and 'slow' digested proteins respectively. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only drastic temperatures seem to have significant effects on protein bioavailability as reported by the increase of nitrogen availability and utilisation in the body in humans following UHT treatment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gel matrix ingestion induced significantly lower and prolonged AAs levels in plasma compared to liquid structures - Soft cheese induced greater increase in TAG concentration compared to firm cheese.
Physiological Responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Caseins consumption inhibited whole protein breakdown but only a slight increase in whole protein synthesis compared to whey proteins. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Smaller emulsion droplets in liquid drinks resulted in a significant reduction in food intake. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yoghurt intake reduced the rating of hunger compared with cheese and milk. - Semi-solid meal promoted greater fullness compared to a liquid meal which was related to the behaviour in the stomach


	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whey proteins stimulated muscle protein synthesis. - Whey proteins seemed to have a greater satiety promoting power in the short term in contrast to the long-term effect shown by the slow protein digestion of caseins. 		<p>sedimentation and creaming, respectively.</p>
--	--	--	--

1041

1042 ^a Conclusions based on data from the literature presented in this review.

1043

1044




1045

1046 Figure 1. Structural elements and relevant length scales of milk, as an example of the concept
 1047 of food matrix, i.e. the arrangement and interactions of structural elements at multiscales.

1048 Electron micrographs of an individual casein micelle and milk fat globule are from Dalgleish *et*
 1049 *al.* (2004) and Luo *et al.* (2014), respectively.

1050



1063

1064 Figure 3. Schematic representation of the possible mechanism for the coagulation of casein
 1065 micelles in the stomach. (A) Caseins are assembled in micelles, with κ -casein on the surface
 1066 providing steric and electrostatic stability. (B) During gastric digestion, pepsin is secreted
 1067 and there is a gradual decrease of pH due to gradual acid secretion and emptying. Pepsin
 1068 cleaves the Phe105-Met106 bond, which separates para- κ -casein from
 1069 caseinomacropeptide. (C) These gastric conditions destabilise the casein micelles leading to
 1070 coagulation.