



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Combination of egg white protein and microgels to stabilize foams: impact of processing treatments*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/154162/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Li, X, Yanjun, Y, Murray, BS orcid.org/0000-0002-6493-1547 et al. (1 more author) (2020) Combination of egg white protein and microgels to stabilize foams: impact of processing treatments. *Journal of Food Engineering*, 275. 109860. ISSN 0260-8774

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2019.109860>

© 2019, Elsevier Ltd. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

Reuse

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

Takedown

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



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

1 **Combination of egg white protein and microgels to**
2 **stabilize foams: impact of processing treatments**

3
4
5
6 *Xin Li^{a,b}, Yanjun Yang^{a*}, Brent S. Murray^{b*}, Anwesha Sarkar^{b*}*

7 ^aSchool of Food Science, Jiangnan University, Wuxi, Jiangsu, 214122, PR China

8 ^bFood Colloids and Bioprocessing Group, School of Food Science and Nutrition,
9 University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 *Corresponding authors:

19 Prof. Yanjun Yang (E-mail: yangyj@jiangnan.edu.cn)

20 Prof. Brent S. Murray (E-mail: b.s.murray@leeds.ac.uk)

21 Dr. Anwesha Sarkar (E-mail: A.Sarkar@leeds.ac.uk)

23 **Abstract**

24 The aim of this study was to compare the properties of foams stabilized by egg white
25 protein (EWP) and egg white protein microgels (EWPM), and combinations thereof
26 (EWP+EWPM; 1.0+0, 0.7+0.3, 0.5+0.5, 0.3+0.7 or 0+1.0, wt%) without or with
27 processing treatments (freezing at $-20\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}/30\text{ min}$, oven-heating at $80\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}/30\text{ min}$, or
28 microwaving at $700\text{ W}/15\text{ s}$). In order to provide a twofold benefit of high initial foam
29 volume (dictated by rapid adsorption of EWP) and high foam stability (governed by
30 Pickering stabilization by EWPM), various ratios of EWP+EWPM on foam
31 stabilization were investigated. The EWP+EWPM systems generated similar initial
32 foam volumes as compared to that prepared solely with EWP ($p>0.05$), and foams
33 generated with increasing ratios of EWPM+EWP showed higher stability to bubble
34 shrinkage and coalescence at longer time scales (9 h). Confocal images revealed that
35 EWPM were preferentially located at the air/water interface with the increasing
36 EWPM+EWP ratio, suggesting pure Pickering stabilization at 1.0 wt% EWPM.
37 Plateauing of bubble size at *ca.* $75\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ occurred only at $\text{EWPM}>0.5\text{ wt}\%$ for
38 $\text{EWP+EWPM}=1.0\text{ wt}\%$ total protein, when stability became EWPM-dominated.
39 Frozen foams showed the most stable bubbles, irrespective of the systems ($p>0.05$).
40 The combination of EWP+EWPM significantly improved the stability of the bubbles
41 during oven-heating as compared to the EWP-stabilized counterparts ($p<0.05$), whilst
42 the EWPM system was most stable during microwaving. These results suggest that
43 microgels could be used to formulate food foams with enhanced stability to processing
44 conditions, whereas a combination with protein can improve the initial foamability.

45 **Keywords:** Foam stability; egg white protein; microgel; bubble shrinkage;
46 disproportionation; food processing

47

48 **1. Introduction**

49 Aqueous foams are dispersions of a high volume fraction of gas bubbles in a small
50 volume of liquid stabilized by surfactants, proteins or small particles (Ashok Bhakta
51 and Ruckenstein, 1997; Briceno-Ahumada and Langevin, 2017; Karthick et al., 2019).

52 Despite the presence of these stabilizing species, foams are still characteristically
53 metastable systems, tending to destabilize *via* disproportionation and coalescence
54 within the required lifetime of a product (Dickinson, 2010; Horozov, 2008; Murray et
55 al., 2002). In foods, proteins are widely used to stabilize aqueous foams to make various
56 foamed products, such as cakes, meringue, soufflés, mousse, whipped cream, *etc.*, due
57 to the ability of the proteins to adsorb and unfold at the air-water (A-W) interface,
58 resulting in the formation of viscoelastic interfacial films (Sarkar and Singh, 2016) that
59 provide some kinetic resistance to bubble disproportionation and coalescence. Besides
60 protein monolayers, there is burgeoning interest in using Pickering stabilization, *i.e.*
61 stabilization of bubbles by solid particles (Lesov et al., 2017; Li et al., 2019b). Adsorbed
62 particles can enhance the stability of foams against disproportionation and coalescence
63 for longer periods by virtue of the ultra-high desorption energies of the particles once
64 adsorbed (Binks et al., 2017). In this domain, food-grade microgels prepared from
65 proteins have raised interest in providing Pickering-type stabilization of foams and/or
66 emulsions, such as soy protein- (Matsumiya and Murray, 2016), zein- (Dai et al., 2018)

67 and whey protein-based microgels (Araiza-Calahorra and Sarkar, 2019; Sedaghat Doost
68 et al., 2019), and so on. Although considerable research attention has been given to
69 Pickering emulsions in the food literature (Araiza-Calahorra et al., 2018; Murray, 2019;
70 Sarkar et al., 2019), not as much emphasis has been placed on designing particle-
71 stabilized food foams (Binks et al., 2017) and hence this needs further attention.

72 Egg white protein (EWP) is the classic foaming agent used in a wide variety of
73 foods to generate high foamability. But EWP on its own is unable to provide longer-
74 term stability against bubble shrinkage or collapse. One strategy to improve foam
75 stability can be to physically structure EWP into egg white protein microgels (EWPM)
76 to generate ‘Pickering’ particle-stabilized bubbles (Li et al., 2019c). Therefore, EWPM
77 prepared by physical treatment from EWP itself could be taken as a kind of “clean”
78 stabilizing materials, however EWPM suffers from relatively poor foamability. One
79 alternative approach is to investigate the combination of EWP and EWPM, which might
80 not only result in optimized foaming properties, but would also be cheaper and more
81 sustainable compared to using EWPM alone, the latter requiring thermal processing
82 and homogenization for preparation. As far as we are aware, to date such combinations
83 have not been investigated in the literature.

84 In addition to the foaming properties of different systems under ambient conditions,
85 there is an unresolved research challenge of retaining bubbles and prevention of textural
86 deterioration of aerated foods during food processing. Such processing varies from low
87 temperatures (e.g., freezing) to high temperatures (e.g., oven- or microwave-heating)
88 (De Vries et al., 2018; Misra et al., 2017). As reported in the literature (Assegehegn et

89 al., 2019), bubble morphology and size distribution in aerated foods can change
90 significantly during freezing processes. For instance, Wang et al. (2014) reported that
91 freezing-associated rearrangement of the conformation of γ -gliadin resulted in $\sim 26\%$
92 loss of foam volume upon frozen storage (frozen at $-35\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ for 12 h and stored at $-18\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$
93 for 45 days). Conventional oven-heating is another common treatment in food
94 processing for aerated systems. For instance, significant liquid drainage and bubble
95 coalescence can occur, especially for making breads and cakes (Campbell et al., 2016;
96 Deleu et al., 2019; Lambrecht et al., 2018), where heat treatments may range from 80
97 to $190\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ for 30 min to 2 h (Hesso et al., 2015; Marston et al., 2016; Sahagún et al.,
98 2018). Also, microwave processing has been reported to toughen the texture of bread-
99 like products, due to bubble coalescence and disproportionation (Uzzan et al., 2007).
100 However, so far we believe that there has been no investigation of the stability of foams
101 stabilized by a combination of proteins and particles when subjected to various food
102 processing conditions.

103 Given the context, the objective of this study was to compare the foaming
104 properties of combinations of EWP and EWPM without or with being subjected to
105 different food processing treatments (freezing, oven-heating and microwave cooking).
106 In theory a combination of EWP and EWPM might be ideal since the EWP should reach
107 the A-W interface rapidly and provide good foamability, whilst the more slowly
108 adsorbing EWPM would provide longer term foam stability by providing a more robust,
109 particle-dominated interfacial film capable of protecting against the disrupting effects
110 of processing.

111 **2. Materials and methods**

112 *2.1 Materials*

113 Fresh chicken eggs were purchased from a local supermarket (Tesco Ltd., UK). Di-
114 sodium hydrogen phosphate, sodium dihydrogen phosphate, Rhodamine 6G and
115 sodium azide were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Dorset, UK). Milli-Q water with a
116 resistivity of not less than 18.2 M Ω cm at 25 °C (Milli-Q apparatus, Millipore, Bedford,
117 UK) was used to prepare 20 mM phosphate buffer at pH 7 as the aqueous phase, and
118 0.02 wt% sodium azide was added as a bactericide. Multiwell chambered microscope
119 slides with coverslips were used to observe foams via light microscopy, purchased from
120 Life Technologies Corporation (Invitrogen, USA).

121

122 *2.2 Preparation of samples*

123 *2.2.1 Preparation of egg white protein dispersion (EWP)*

124 Egg white was extracted from the freshly purchased eggs, by manually separating it
125 from the yolks and then homogenized under magnetic stirring (500 rpm speed) for 2 h,
126 as reported previously (Li et al., 2019a). No further purification of the egg white protein
127 dispersion (EWP) was performed and EWP contained 12.5 wt% protein (Li et al.,
128 2019a).

129

130 *2.2.2 Preparation of egg white protein microgels (EWPM)*

131 Sub-micron sized egg white protein microgel (EWPM) particles (Li et al., 2019c) were
132 prepared using a top-down approach of heat-set gel formation followed by shearing into

133 microscopic gel particles based on previous methods (Sarkar et al., 2017a; Sarkar et al.,
134 2016b). The z-average hydrodynamic diameter the EWPM dispersion was ~ 350 nm
135 (see supplementary Figure S1), measured using dynamic light scattering (*DLS*). Note
136 that this was the size measured for the sample diluted into the *DLS* cell, as is the usual
137 procedure, to avoid multiple scattering, so that this should be taken as the primary
138 particle size, since it was obvious from confocal imaging, etc. (see later), that at the
139 higher concentrations used for foaming the EWPM had a tendency to aggregate. Briefly,
140 a EWP dispersion (6.25 wt% protein) was obtained by diluting EWP in 20 mM
141 phosphate buffer at pH 7.0, followed by formation of a thermally cross-linked
142 proteinaceous hydrogel by heating the aqueous dispersion of EWP at 90 °C for 30 min.
143 The hydrogel was broken down into coarse gel particles using a hand blender (HB724,
144 Kenwood) and then EWPM particles were created by passing the macroscopic gel
145 pieces twice through a high-pressure two-chamber homogenizer (Leeds Jet
146 homogenizer, University of Leeds, UK) at 300 bar.

147

148 *2.2.3 Preparation of mixed dispersions of EWP and EWPM*

149 EWP (protein concentration 1.0 wt%) and EWPM (protein concentration 1.0 wt%) on
150 their own and their mixtures at different w/w ratios (EWP: EWPM = 7:3, 1:1 and 3:7),
151 keeping the total protein concentration constant at 1.0 wt% were prepared at pH 7.0 (20
152 mM phosphate buffer as described in section 2.1).

153

154 *2.2.4 Preparation of foams*

155 Exactly 5 mL (total protein concentration is 1.0 wt%) of the above-mentioned EWP +
156 EWPM dispersions were collected separately in 15 mL test tube, sealed well and
157 manually shaken for 30 s in order to examine the foam volume for foamability and to
158 determine the foam stability of the samples as a function of storage time.

159

160 2.3 *Foaming properties*

161 Changes in heights of the foams were measured as a function of time to determine
162 stability of foams. The initial height was used as a measure of foamability. Foam
163 volumes of sample were calculated relative to an equal volume of pure water at room
164 temperature (25 ± 1 °C).

165

166 2.4 *Bubble disproportionation measurement*

167 Bubble disproportionation experiments were conducted in a bubble apparatus
168 (University of Leeds, UK) using a methodology developed by Dickinson et al. (2002).
169 Briefly, bubbles stabilized by EWP or EWPM on their own or their mixtures at different
170 w/w ratios (EWP: EWPM = 7:3, 1:1 and 3:7) were introduced into the cell filled with
171 the same mixture *via* a specially designed “bubble syringe” into the middle of a stainless
172 steel cell through a hole in the wall of the pressurization chamber (when the piston is
173 clear off the cylinder), and bubbles were allowed to rise to the planar A-W interface at
174 the top of the cell. These bubbles were trapped within the perimeter of a circular hole
175 in a paraffin wax coated mica sheet floating in the middle of the planar A-W interface.
176 Bubble size was monitored with an optical microscope and a video camera for at least

177 9 h. Microsoft Office and ImageJ were used to analyze the real size of the bubbles. To
178 compare the samples, changes in individual bubble size versus time and changes in the
179 overall bubble size distribution as a function of time are reported.

180

181 2.5 *Bubble coalescence measurement*

182 Bubble coalescence experiments were performed in the apparatus as mentioned above,
183 where a pressure drop was used to induce and accelerate instability of the foams
184 (Murray et al., 2005). Briefly, bubbles were injected beneath the A-W interface as for
185 the disproportionation experiments, then the piston was moved down to fill the
186 adjoining cylinder and a glass plate was used to seal the top of the cell. By withdrawing
187 the piston to a predetermined distance at a specific speed, the pressure in the system
188 falls and the bubbles at the interface expand, inducing a proportion of them to coalesce,
189 due to the relatively sudden depletion in the adsorbed film coverage. The time for the
190 pressure to drop to its full extent in these experiments was 22 s. Note that in this
191 experiment the concentration of stabilizer used was high enough so that coalescence
192 under quiescent conditions was negligible (over at least 10 min) and a short time (< 5
193 s) after the pressure had stopped decreasing no further coalescence occurred. The
194 remaining bubbles were stable to coalescence (over at least the next 10 min) so that the
195 number fraction (F_c) of bubbles that coalesced could be determined from the images
196 before and shortly after the pressure drop. The experiments were repeated at least eight
197 times and mean values of F_c are reported. This type of ‘accelerated coalescence’
198 experiment has been shown to be a very useful and highly discriminating method of

199 measuring differences between foamed systems that under constant pressure typically
200 exhibit very little coalescence, or differences in coalescence, over several h (Ettelaie et
201 al., 2003).

202 It should be noted that in the above measurements (and those that follow below)
203 the EWPM dispersion was diluted to a maximum concentration of 1 wt% protein (i.e.,
204 in the EWP + EWPM = 0 + 1.0 wt% system). However, this means that the actual
205 microgel particle concentration was still 16 wt%, since the original gel from which the
206 EWPM particles were formed was 6.25 wt% protein (see Methods above). Since
207 microgel dispersions can have very high viscosities at high weight (volume) fractions
208 (Sarkar et al., 2017a), we performed some measurements (not shown) of the viscosity
209 of 1.0 wt% EWPM, 1.0 wt% EWP and an equal mixture of 0.5 wt% EWPM and 0.5
210 wt% EWP over the shear rate range 10^{-3} to 10^3 s⁻¹. Although all these three systems
211 were shear thinning to a certain extent, there were no differences between them in terms
212 of their bulk viscosities at any shear rate in this range (data not shown). Thus any
213 differences in foam stability of these systems cannot be attributed to differences in the
214 bulk viscosity of the continuous phase, but rather the adsorption and interfacial
215 properties of the EWP and EWPM.

216

217 2.6 *Confocal laser scanning microscopy (CLSM)*

218 Foams stabilized by combinations of EWP and EWPM at different ratios were observed
219 using a Zeiss LSM 700 confocal microscope (Carl Zeiss MicroImaging GmbH, Jena,
220 Germany), where foam samples were imaged after mixing with 0.1 mL of 1.0% (w/v)

221 Rhodamine 6G protein stain. In order to immobilize bubbles, xanthan gum solution (0.1
222 wt%) was added in the aqueous phase. The samples were observed at room temperature
223 (25 ± 1 °C), using $\times 63$ objective at an excitation wavelength of 543 nm (Sarkar et al.,
224 2016a). Images were recorded at a resolution 1024×1024 pixels.

225

226 2.7 Interfacial shear viscosity (η_i)

227 A two-dimensional Couette-type interfacial viscometer, which has been described in
228 detail many times previously (Burke et al., 2014; Murray et al., 2009; Sarkar et al.,
229 2017b), was used to measure the surface shear viscosity of three representative sample
230 systems *i.e.* EWP + EWPM, 1.0 + 0, 0.5 + 0.5 and 0 + 1.0, wt%. Briefly, a wire of
231 suitable torsion constant suspends a biconical disk positioned with its edge touching the
232 A-W interface of the sample solution contained in a concentric circular dish. The
233 rheometer was operated in a constant shear-rate mode (Jourdain et al., 2009), and the
234 surface shear viscosity, η_i , is given by the following equation:

235

$$236 \quad \eta_i = g_f K \theta_i / \omega \quad (1)$$

237

238 where, K is the torsion constant of the wire; θ_i is the angle of rotation of the disk; g_f is
239 the geometric factor of the equipment *i.e.* $(R_i^2 - R_0^2) \cdot (4\pi)^{-1}$, where R_i is the radius of
240 the disk (14.5 mm) and R_0 is the radius of the dish (72.5 mm); ω is the angular velocity
241 of the dish. A fixed value of $\omega = 1.27 \times 10^{-3}$ rad s⁻¹ was used to compare with
242 measurements made on the other systems at the same shear rate.

243 2.8 *Food processing treatments*

244 Fresh foams generated after homogenization were immediately transferred into the
245 Multiwell chambered cells and sealed with a cover slip. Three food processing
246 conditions typical of those employed in various aerated products were applied to the
247 three systems EWP + EWPM = 1.0 + 0, 0.5 + 0.5 and 0 + 1.0 wt%. These were heating
248 the foams in an oven at 80 °C for 30 min, heating in a microwave oven (700 W for 15
249 s, at 2450 Hz) and freezing (−20 °C for 30 min) followed by thawing at room
250 temperature for 2 min. The processed foams were observed *via* a Nikon SMZ-2T
251 stereomicroscope (Nikon, Japan). The experiments were repeated at least five times and
252 mean values of the number percentage of bubbles surviving the processing conditions
253 were assessed by counting the number of bubbles before and after subjecting to the
254 processing treatments.

255

256 2.9 *Statistical analysis*

257 All experiments were conducted at least in triplicate. SPSS 19.0 package was used for
258 statistical analysis and results are presented as the means and standard deviations of
259 these measurements unless mentioned otherwise. One-way analysis of variance
260 (ANOVA) tests were carried out, and significant differences between means were
261 considered when the *p*-value was < 0.05, as obtained using Tukey's Multiple
262 Comparison Test.

263

264 3. Results and discussions

265 3.1 Foam volume

266 In our work, foams were produced by a simple and reproducible method: hand-shaking
267 for the same time (30 ± 1 s), allowing a quantitative description in terms of foamability
268 (*i.e.*, how much foam is produced) and foam stability (*i.e.*, how the foam evolves
269 kinetically) (Schmidt et al., 2018). Results of the foam volume for mixtures (total
270 protein concentration = 1.0 wt%) of EWP and EWPM at different ratios as a function
271 of time are shown in Figure 1a, and their initial foam volumes are shown in Figure 1b.
272 (supplementary Figure S2 shows the corresponding optical microscopic images.)
273 Combination of EWP and EWPM resulted in different degrees of foam stability based
274 on the foam volume as a function of time. All the mixtures showed a decrease in foam
275 volume over 7 days (*i.e.*, 168 h) but the foams with a higher proportion of EWPM (*i.e.*,
276 EWPM = 0.3 to 0.7 wt%) did not decrease in volume as significantly as those with
277 higher proportions of EWP (e.g., EWP + EWPM = 0.7 + 0.3 wt%, $p < 0.05$).
278 Especially for the foams stabilized solely by EWPM (EWP + EWPM = 0 + 1.0 wt%),
279 the foam volume after 30 min did not decrease any further, in agreement with our
280 previous work (Li et al., 2019c)

281 Comparing the initial foam volumes (*i.e.*, foamability at 0 min, Figure 1b), samples
282 containing any EWPM showed significantly lower volume ($p < 0.05$) as compared to
283 those containing only EWP, whereas 0.3, 0.5 and 0.7 wt% EWP improved the
284 foamability of EWPM slightly, but significantly ($p < 0.05$). This can be attributed to
285 the longer time-scales for particles to adsorb to the A-W interface due to their much
286 larger size (100 nm to several μm) compared to the size of the constituent EWP proteins,

287 the latter being only a few nm (Ravera et al., 2006). This larger size will slow down
288 mass transport of EWPM to the interface and possibly also increase the time taken for
289 them to adopt an orientation favourable for adsorption. In addition, microgel particles,
290 consisting of already unfolded and cross-linked protein, may take longer than individual
291 protein molecules to re-arrange and unfold at the interface once they are anchored there.
292 All this decreases the capacity for rapid bubble stabilization, i.e., foamability.

293

294 *3.2 CLSM observations*

295 Confocal images and schematic representation of the fresh foams stabilized by EWP
296 and EWPM are shown in Figure 2. No brightness (*i.e.*, protein-labeled fluorescence)
297 could be observed around the bubbles that were solely stabilized by EWP. With
298 increasing concentration of EWPM, a uniform fluorescent ring that gradually increased
299 in thickness could be observed around the bubbles, suggestive of increasing adsorbed
300 amounts of the larger EWPM particles. This particle coating was apparently at its
301 thickest when the bubbles were solely stabilized by EWPM, i.e., with ‘pure’ Pickering-
302 type stabilization. We propose that in these systems the A-W interface ranges from a
303 protein-dominated interface to a microgel-dominated one (particularly when the
304 concentration of EWPM > EWP), EWPM giving higher foam stability. Thus, the
305 increasing foam stability of the mixed EWP+EWPM systems with increasing
306 concentration of EWPM observed in Figure 1a is not surprising, due to increasing
307 proportion of microgel particles at the A-W interface.

308

309 3.3 Bubble coalescence

310 Foams are mainly destabilized by coalescence and disproportionation (Foegeding et al.,
311 2017; Rodriguez Patino et al., 2008). Coalescence depends on the physical properties
312 of the gas and liquid phases, the bubble size and the adsorbed film properties, and
313 occurs on rupturing of the thin liquid film between two adjacent bubbles (Yang and
314 Foegeding, 2011). Figure 3 compares the number fraction (F_c) of bubbles that coalesced
315 after the application of the pressure drop (810 mbar) for mixtures with different
316 proportions of EWP and EWPM. F_c decreased from approximately 28% to 10% with
317 increasing proportions of EWPM in the mixtures ($p < 0.05$). Even addition of a
318 relatively small proportion of microgel (EWP + EWPM = 0.7 + 0.3 wt%) made the
319 bubbles less prone to coalescence as compared to the ones solely stabilized by EWP
320 alone ($p < 0.05$) (Figure 3). As the proportion of EWPM increased, a larger number of
321 bubbles could be observed in Figure S2 for the different combinations. The thicker
322 microgel particle layers (Figure 2) are expected to give mechanically stronger
323 interfacial films and prevent the close approach of bubbles necessary for coalescence
324 (Kudryashova and de Jongh, 2008). On the other hand, although the ultra-high
325 detachment energies of such particles will prevent their removal, this cannot stop the
326 expansion of the bubbles due to the pressure drop. Therefore, either the microgel
327 particle layer re-arranges fast enough to maintain a strong, coherent and thick enough
328 layer, or possibly additional microgel particles adsorb on the time-scale (22 s) of the
329 expansion. Since additional adsorption is apparently not fast enough in the case of EWP
330 alone to give the same or lower F_c as with EWPM, the latter possibility is perhaps less

331 likely.

332 To illustrate more clearly the coalescence events and the differences between EWP,
333 EWPM and their combinations, videos of three representative systems (EWP + EWPM,
334 1.0 + 0, 0.5 + 0.5 and 0 + 1.0, wt%) are supplied in the supplementary information
335 (supplementary videos S1, S2 and S3, respectively).

336

337 *3.4 Bubble disproportionation*

338 Disproportionation is the main factor that contributes to foam destabilization in the long
339 term, driven by the differences in Laplace pressure of bubbles of different size. It is
340 clearly evident that for bubbles with just EWP (*i.e.*, EWP + EWPM = 1.0 + 0 wt%),
341 fewer bubbles remained at longer times (Figure 4), while combinations of EWP and
342 EWPM resulted in more bubbles remaining visible at the end of 9 h. Initial and final
343 bubble size distributions are shown on the left and right hand sides of the images,
344 respectively. The number of bubbles remaining after 9 h in the pure EWPM system was
345 lower than that with the mixture of EWP + EWPM = 0.5 + 0.5 or 0.3 + 0.7 wt% ($p >$
346 0.05). This might have been a result of the initial injection state with the pure EWPM
347 system, where there seemed to be a greater tendency for the injected bubbles to cluster
348 together, which will accelerate mass transfer of gas between adjacent bubbles. On the
349 other hand, it is now well known (Murray and Ettelaie, 2004) that in order to stabilize
350 bubbles completely against shrinkage by the Pickering mechanism, a delicate balance
351 has to be achieved between (i) the rate of bubble shrinkage, (ii) the rate of co-adsorption
352 of desorbable foaming agents (in this case EWP) and (iii) the rate of adsorption of non-

353 desorbable particles (in this case EWPM). Small (e.g., less than 50 μm diameter) air
354 bubbles without a complete enough adsorbed particle layer shrink very rapidly. Thus,
355 some EWP adsorption, which will be faster than EWMP microgel adsorption, may help
356 to stabilize bubbles initially to some extent until a high enough interfacial coverage by
357 EWPM is reached. Mixtures may therefore, in the end, be better than the pure (EWPM)
358 system in stabilizing against disproportionation.

359 It is noteworthy that, the final bubble size distribution shifted towards smaller
360 diameters (from 0 to 100 μm) for systems with a higher proportion of EWPM. Thus,
361 the systems stabilized solely by EWPM seemed to result in the narrowest bubble size
362 distribution with the smallest-sized bubbles, again suggesting full stability was only
363 achieved in the later stages of shrinkage with the pure particle system. Jakubczyk et al.
364 (2019) and Parra et al. (2018) showed that a narrower bubble size distribution gave a
365 lower degree of disproportionation, but every bubble, regardless of whether or not it is
366 ‘touching’ its neighbours or the edge of the mica hole is included in the data shown in
367 the left and right side in Figure 4, so that again differences in the degree of clustering
368 will also affect the final size distribution (Söderberg et al., 2003). Bubbles touching
369 each other influence their mutual shrinkage kinetics (Ettelaie et al., 2003). The
370 clustering, number and exact size distribution of the bubbles injected is very difficult
371 to control; indeed the tendency for clustering may also be a function of the type of
372 stabilizer. However, it should be noted that we have excluded such bubbles from the
373 quantitative analysis in Figure 5 (see below), all of which were at least 2 bubble
374 diameters from their neighbours or the edge of the mica hole.

375 In order to quantify better the foam stability and thus obtain a better understanding
376 of relative contributions of the EWP and EWPM in the mixed systems, shrinkage
377 kinetics of bubbles are shown in Figure 5, measured from images like those in Figure
378 4. It is therefore even more clear from Figure 5 that, in the absence or in the presence
379 of a small (0.3 wt%) proportion of EWPM, all bubbles showed dramatic shrinkage as a
380 function of time, irrespective of their initial size. In the experimental window of 9 h,
381 bubble shrinkage did not seem to slow down at all for the pure EWP-stabilized foams.
382 For equal concentrations (0.5 wt%) of EWP + EWPM the shrinkage rates definitely
383 seemed to be decreasing after *ca.* 100 min for most bubbles, whilst for EWP + EWPM
384 = 0.3 + 0.7 wt% all bubble sizes reached a plateau relatively quickly, when one might
385 suppose that the interfaces were now dominated more by EWPM over EWP.
386 Interestingly, the pure EWPM-stabilized system seemed to take slightly longer (approx.
387 540 min) before all the bubble shrinkage seemed to cease. This may again point to the
388 slight advantage in having a mixture of desorbable (EWP) and non-desorbable (EWPM)
389 material at the start of the shrinkage process, as discussed above in connection with the
390 data in Figure 4.

391 Overall, it is seen that the addition of microgels contributed to a delay in the
392 shrinking (disproportionation) process as compared to bubbles stabilized solely by
393 EWP, where the bubbles disappeared relatively rapidly owing to the lack of a
394 permanent and rigid interfacial film (Kudryashova and de Jongh, 2008).

395

396 *3.5 Interfacial shear rheology*

397 To understand the mechanical properties of the adsorbed films and to check if this
398 agrees with the explanation of the higher stability of systems containing higher
399 proportions of EWPM as proposed above, measurements of the interfacial shear
400 viscosities (η_i) of the adsorbed films stabilized solely by EWP or EWPM and one
401 representative mixture (0.5 wt% EWP + 0.5 wt% EWPM) were measured as a function
402 of time. The results are shown in Figure 6, including a control experiment with just
403 buffer, where between 0 and 24 h, as expected, $\eta_i = 0$.

404 In Figure 6a, the system with pure EWP (1.0 wt%) exhibited a large and rapid
405 increase in the surface shear viscosity in the first 80 min, to $4.7 \pm 0.2 \times 10^3 \text{ mN s m}^{-1}$,
406 which was attributed to the rapid adsorption of EWP on the A-W interface. This was
407 then followed by a decrease to *ca.* $3.5 \times 10^3 \text{ mN s m}^{-1}$ in the next 2 h during the
408 continued measurement. This is indicative of a brittle nature of the films, which yield
409 to some extent as a result of repeated measurement, whilst at the same time further
410 EWP adsorption is tending to ‘heal’ these breakages and further raise η_i . Thus, after
411 leaving undisturbed overnight, η_i for this pure EWP sample had increased to *ca.* $6.3 \times$
412 10^3 mN s m^{-1} , but on further measurements this was followed by a decrease to 3.4×10^3
413 mN s m^{-1} . The brittle structure of EWP protein films is in line with previous results (Li
414 et al., 2019c). We have zoomed in on the last 30 min around 1400 min to more clearly
415 differentiate the samples in Figure 6b.

416 For the mixed EWP + EWPM system very interesting behaviour was observed.
417 The initial rise in perfectly matched ($p > 0.05$) that for 1.0 wt% EWP alone,
418 corroborating the rapid adsorption of EWP as evidenced in Figure 1b. However, beyond

419 the time (80 min) when the value for EWP alone started to decrease, η_i for the mixture
420 continued to increase until a relatively stable value of $5.5 \pm 0.2 \times 10^3 \text{ mN s m}^{-1}$ was
421 reached. This value had not decreased the next day (i.e., after 1400 min). The pure (1.0
422 wt%) EWPM system gave a slower rate of initial increase of η_i , reaching $1.5 \pm 0.2 \times$
423 10^3 mN s m^{-1} in 80 min (cf. $4.7 \times 10^3 \text{ mN s m}^{-1}$ for 1 wt% EWP alone) but rather than
424 decreasing (as for EWP) after this time, η_i showed a further steady increase in first 4 h
425 of adsorption, to $3.1 \pm 0.2 \times 10^3 \text{ mN s m}^{-1}$. Overnight this had increased further to
426 around $5.8 \times 10^3 \text{ mN s m}^{-1}$ and was apparently still increasing (Figure 6b).

427 The interfacial viscosity results therefore seemed to confirm the explanation of
428 many of the foam stability results, in terms of slower adsorption of EWPM compared
429 to EWP, but the latter ultimately forming more mechanically strong films in the
430 mixtures, particularly at longer times of adsorption, where the microgels are assumed
431 to dominate the adsorbed interfacial film. All values for these three systems are very
432 high compared to many other proteins (Murray, 2011), *i.e.*, these films are very strong
433 whilst the increases followed by decreases with EWP are reminiscent of stress
434 overshoot and the exhibition of a yield stress of strong films (Martin et al., 2002) when
435 they are continuously measured *via* such techniques.

436

437 *3.6 Foam stability after food processing treatments*

438 In order to compare the effect of the different processing treatments (freezing, oven
439 heating and microwaving) on foam stability, three representative samples (EWP +
440 EWPM, 1.0 + 0, 0.5 + 0.5 and 0 + 1.0, wt%, respectively) were investigated using

441 stereomicroscopy images of the samples sealed within the Multiwell slides (Figure 7a).
442 Irrespective of the stabilizer, bubble sizes showed an increase in the following order of
443 treatments: frozen < oven-heating < microwave, i.e., microwaving produced the largest
444 increase in bubble sizes. As reported elsewhere (Carvalho et al., 2017), freeze-drying
445 often maintains a very aerated structure. Altan (2014) showed that the bulk density of
446 puffed grains decreases significantly with microwave puffing and food pellets have
447 been reported to expand from 30 mm in length and 3 mm in diameter to 50-60 mm in
448 length and 6 mm in diameter after microwave treatment (Gutiérrez et al., 2017). This is
449 line with the high localized temperatures with microwave heating, that will lead to large
450 degrees of gas expansion (Lopez-Gil et al., 2015). It is noteworthy in Figure 7a that
451 more bubbles and smaller bubbles were present after processing when the EWP was
452 combined with EWPM, with the possible exception of the frozen EWP-stabilized
453 system. This appeared to contain more small bubbles after freezing, but this may have
454 been due to greater disproportionation of the original bubbles during the freeze-thaw
455 process in the absence of EWPM.

456 In Figure 7b we have attempted to quantify the changes more accurately by
457 counting the number % of fresh bubbles surviving the processing treatments. It can
458 clearly be seen that indeed the number of bubbles surviving freezing increased as the
459 EWPM concentration increased, although this was not statistically significant. It is
460 confirmed that oven heating caused more bubble loss than freezing, but 0.5 wt% EWP
461 + 0.5 wt% EWPM and 1.0 wt% EWPM gave greater stability than no EWPM. One
462 should also note here that during oven heating the EWP will denature (Deleu et al.,

463 2016) which would influence its foamability and foam stability. However, EWPM has
464 been already denatured during the thermal processing step in the preparation of these
465 microgel particles, and therefore it makes sense that oven-heating might have less
466 influence on the foaming behavior of systems containing EWPM.

467 Similarly, the microwave heating is the most destructive process, but the system
468 stabilized by 1.0 wt% EWPM was significantly (3 ×) more stable than the system
469 stabilized by the equal mixture or just EWP. This highlights the ability of the protein
470 microgel particles alone to help stabilize the foams in the microwave treatment, which
471 was not achieved by the combination.

472

473 **Conclusions**

474 Properties of aqueous foams stabilized by mixtures of protein (EWP) and protein
475 microgel particles (EWPM) have been examined. The results highlight that increasing
476 the proportion of EWPM gives rise to greater long-term foam stability, via the EWPM
477 providing a Pickering-type stabilization mechanism (*i.e.*, Pickering foams). Foam
478 stability and interfacial rheology experiments support the hypothesis that an optimum
479 combination of EWP + EWPM (approximately an equal mixture at 1.0 wt% protein
480 overall) not only provides higher foam stability against disproportionation but also high
481 initial foam volume. In such mixtures we propose that the EWP rapidly adsorbs at the
482 A-W interface whilst the EWPM co-adsorbs or adsorbs later but remains irreversibly
483 attached to the interface, whereas the EWP may detach or remain synergistically co-
484 adsorbed with the EWPM. The combination of EWP with EWPM also provided better

485 stability to foams during oven-heating as compared to the ones solely stabilized by
486 EWP. However, the combination could not provide better stability as compared to the
487 Pickering foams solely stabilized by the microgel counterparts under the microwaving
488 conditions.

489 In summary, the fundamental insights of this study could pave a way for improving
490 the initial foamability and foam stability of egg white protein, by combining the original
491 protein with microgel particles made from it, to generate new kinds of superior food
492 foams.

493

494 **Acknowledgements**

495 Authors would like to thank Ms. Morfo Zembyla and Mr. Sam Stublely from School of
496 Food Science and Nutrition at University of Leeds, UK for their technical support with
497 the rheological measurements. Author (XL) gratefully acknowledges the financial
498 support from the National Key Research and Development Program of China (Grants
499 2018YFD0400303), as well as the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant
500 number 31671809). Author (XL) would also like to thank China Scholarship Council
501 (CSC) for one-year travel fellowship to conduct this research study at the University of
502 Leeds, UK.

503 **References**

- 504 Altan, A., (2014). Effects of pretreatments and moisture content on microstructure and physical
505 properties of microwave expanded hull-less barley. *Food Research International* 56, 126-135.
- 506 Araiza-Calahorra, A., Akhtar, M., Sarkar, A., (2018). Recent advances in emulsion-based delivery
507 approaches for curcumin: From encapsulation to bioaccessibility. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*
508 71, 155-169.
- 509 Araiza-Calahorra, A., Sarkar, A., (2019). Pickering emulsion stabilized by protein nanogel particles for
510 delivery of curcumin: Effects of pH and ionic strength on curcumin retention. *Food Structure* 21.
- 511 Ashok Bhakta, Ruckenstein, E., (1997). Decay of standing foams: drainage, coalescence and collapse.
512 *Advances in Colloid and Interface Science* 70, 1-124.
- 513 Assegehegn, G., Brito-de la Fuente, E., Franco, J.M., Gallegos, C., (2019). The importance of
514 understanding the freezing step and its impact on freeze-drying process performance. *Journal of*
515 *Pharmaceutical Sciences* 108(4), 1378-1395.
- 516 Binks, B.P., Muijlwijk, K., Koman, H., Poortinga, A.T., (2017). Food-grade Pickering stabilisation of foams
517 by in situ hydrophobisation of calcium carbonate particles. *Food Hydrocolloids* 63, 585-592.
- 518 Briceno-Ahumada, Z., Langevin, D., (2017). On the influence of surfactant on the coarsening of aqueous
519 foams. *Advances in Colloid and Interface Science* 244, 124-131.
- 520 Burke, J., Cox, A., Petkov, J., Murray, B.S., (2014). Interfacial rheology and stability of air bubbles
521 stabilized by mixtures of hydrophobin and β -casein. *Food Hydrocolloids* 34, 119-127.
- 522 Campbell, L., Euston, S.R., Ahmed, M.A., (2016). Effect of addition of thermally modified cowpea protein
523 on sensory acceptability and textural properties of wheat bread and sponge cake. *Food Chemistry* 194,
524 1230-1237.
- 525 Carvalho, M.J., Perez-Palacios, T., Ruiz-Carrascal, J., (2017). Physico-chemical and sensory characteristics
526 of freeze-dried and air-dehydrated yogurt foam. *LWT - Food Science and Technology* 80, 328-334.
- 527 Dai, L., Zhan, X., Wei, Y., Sun, C., Mao, L., McClements, D.J., Gao, Y., (2018). Composite zein - propylene
528 glycol alginate particles prepared using solvent evaporation: Characterization and application as
529 Pickering emulsion stabilizers. *Food Hydrocolloids* 85, 281-290.
- 530 De Vries, H., Mikolajczak, M., Salmon, J.-M., Abecassis, J., Chaunier, L., Guessasma, S., Lourdin, D.,
531 Belhabib, S., Leroy, E., Trystram, G., (2018). Small-scale food process engineering — Challenges and
532 perspectives. *Innovative Food Science & Emerging Technologies* 46, 122-130.
- 533 Deleu, L.J., Luyts, A., Wilderjans, E., Van Haesendonck, I., Brijs, K., Delcour, J.A., (2019). Ohmic versus
534 conventional heating for studying molecular changes during pound cake baking. *Journal of Cereal*
535 *Science* 89.
- 536 Deleu, L.J., Wilderjans, E., Van Haesendonck, I., Brijs, K., Delcour, J.A., (2016). Protein network formation
537 during pound cake making: The role of egg white proteins and wheat flour gliadins. *Food Hydrocolloids*
538 61, 409-414.
- 539 Dickinson, E., (2010). Food emulsions and foams: Stabilization by particles. *Current Opinion in Colloid &*
540 *Interface Science* 15(1-2), 40-49.
- 541 Dickinson, E., Ettelaie, R., Murray, B.S., Du, Z., (2002). Kinetics of disproportionation of air bubbles
542 beneath a planar air-water interface stabilized by food proteins. *J Colloid Interface Sci* 252(1), 202-213.
- 543 Ettelaie, R., Dickinson, E., Du, Z., Murray, B.S., (2003). Disproportionation of clustered protein-stabilized
544 bubbles at planar air-water interfaces. *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science* 263(1), 47-58.
- 545 Foegeding, E.A., Plundrich, N., Schneider, M., Campbell, C., Lila, M.A., (2017). Protein-polyphenol
546 particles for delivering structural and health functionality. *Food Hydrocolloids* 72, 163-173.

547 Gutiérrez, J.D., Catalá-Civera, J.M., Bows, J., Peñaranda-Foix, F.L., (2017). Dynamic measurement of
548 dielectric properties of food snack pellets during microwave expansion. *Journal of Food Engineering* 202,
549 1-8.

550 Hesso, N., Garnier, C., Loisel, C., Chevallier, S., Bouchet, B., Le-Bail, A., (2015). Formulation effect study
551 on batter and cake microstructure: Correlation with rheology and texture. *Food Structure* 5, 31-41.

552 Horozov, T., (2008). Foams and foam films stabilised by solid particles. *Current Opinion in Colloid &*
553 *Interface Science* 13(3), 134-140.

554 Jakubczyk, E., Gondek, E., Kamińska-Dwórznička, A., Samborska, K., Wiktor, A., Królikowski, K., (2019). A
555 complex approach to assessing properties of aerated agar-fructose gels: Application of acoustic
556 emission technique. *Food Hydrocolloids* 91, 66-75.

557 Jourdain, L.S., Schmitt, C., Leser, M.E., Murray, B.S., Dickinson, E., (2009). Mixed layers of sodium
558 caseinate + dextran sulfate: influence of order of addition to oil-water interface. *Langmuir* 25(17),
559 10026-10037.

560 Karthick, A., Roy, B., Chattopadhyay, P., (2019). A review on the application of chemical surfactant and
561 surfactant foam for remediation of petroleum oil contaminated soil. *Journal of Environmental*
562 *Management* 243, 187-205.

563 Kudryashova, E.V., de Jongh, H.H., (2008). Modulation of the adsorption properties at air-water
564 interfaces of complexes of egg white ovalbumin with pectin by the dielectric constant. *Journal of Colloid*
565 *Interface Science* 318(2), 430-439.

566 Lambrecht, M.A., Deleu, L.J., Rombouts, I., Delcour, J.A., (2018). Heat-induced network formation
567 between proteins of different sources in model systems, wheat-based noodles and pound cakes. *Food*
568 *Hydrocolloids* 79, 352-370.

569 Lesov, I., Tcholakova, S., Kovadjieva, M., Saison, T., Lamblet, M., Denkov, N., (2017). Role of Pickering
570 stabilization and bulk gelation for the preparation and properties of solid silica foams. *Journal of Colloid*
571 *and Interface Science* 504, 48-57.

572 Li, X., Li, J., Chang, C., Wang, C., Zhang, M., Su, Y., Yang, Y., (2019a). Foaming characterization of fresh
573 egg white proteins as a function of different proportions of egg yolk fractions. *Food Hydrocolloids* 90,
574 118-125.

575 Li, X., Murray, B.S., Yang, Y., Sarkar, A., (2019b). Egg white protein microgels as aqueous Pickering foam
576 stabilizers bubble stability and interfacial properties. *Food Hydrocolloids* submitted.

577 Li, X., Murray, B.S., Yang, Y., Sarkar, A., (2019c). Egg white protein microgels as aqueous pickering foam
578 stabilizers: Bubble stability and interfacial properties. *Food Hydrocolloids*.

579 Lopez-Gil, A., Silva-Bellucci, F., Velasco, D., Ardanuy, M., Rodriguez-Perez, M.A., (2015). Cellular structure
580 and mechanical properties of starch-based foamed blocks reinforced with natural fibers and produced
581 by microwave heating. *Industrial Crops and Products* 66, 194-205.

582 Marston, K., Khouryieh, H., Aramouni, F., (2016). Effect of heat treatment of sorghum flour on the
583 functional properties of gluten-free bread and cake. *LWT - Food Science and Technology* 65, 637-644.

584 Martin, A., Bos, M., Cohen Stuart, M., van Vliet, T., (2002). Stress-strain curves of adsorbed protein
585 layers at the air/water interface measured with surface shear rheology. *Langmuir* 18(4), 1238-1243.

586 Matsumiya, K., Murray, B.S., (2016). Soybean protein isolate gel particles as foaming and emulsifying
587 agents. *Food Hydrocolloids* 60, 206-215.

588 Misra, N.N., Koubaa, M., Roohinejad, S., Juliano, P., Alpas, H., Inacio, R.S., Saraiva, J.A., Barba, F.J., (2017).
589 Landmarks in the historical development of twenty first century food processing technologies. *Food*
590 *Research International* 97, 318-339.

591 Murray, B.S., (2011). Rheological properties of protein films. *Current Opinion in Colloid & Interface*
592 *Science* 16(1), 27-35.

593 Murray, B.S., (2019). Pickering emulsions for food and drinks. *Current Opinion in Food Science* 27, 57-
594 63.

595 Murray, B.S., Campbell, I., Dickinson, E., Maisonneuve, K., Nelson, P.V., Soderberg, I., (2002). Technique
596 for studying the effects of rapid surface expansion on bubble stability. *Langmuir* 18, 5007-5014.

597 Murray, B.S., Dickinson, E., Lau, C.K., Nelson, P.V., Schmidt, E., (2005). Coalescence of protein-stabilized
598 bubbles undergoing expansion at a simultaneously expanding planar air-water interface. *Langmuir* 21,
599 4622-4630.

600 Murray, B.S., Dickinson, E., Wang, Y.W., (2009). Bubble stability in the presence of oil-in-water emulsion
601 droplets: Influence of surface shear versus dilatational rheology. *Food Hydrocolloids* 23(4), 1198-1208.

602 Murray, B.S., Ettelaie, R., (2004). Foam stability: proteins and nanoparticles. *Current Opinion in Colloid*
603 *& Interface Science* 9(5), 314-320.

604 Parra, O.D.H., Ndoye, F.-T., Benkhelifa, H., Flick, D., Alvarez, G., (2018). Effect of process parameters on
605 ice crystals and air bubbles size distributions of sorbets in a scraped surface heat exchanger.
606 *International Journal of Refrigeration* 92, 225-234.

607 Ravera, F., Santini, E., Loglio, G., Ferrari, M., Liggieri, L., (2006). Effect of nanoparticles on the interfacial
608 properties of liquid/liquid and liquid/air surface layers. *Journal of Agricultural and food chemistry* 110,
609 19543-19551.

610 Rodriguez Patino, J.M., Carrera Sanchez, C., Rodriguez Nino, M.R., (2008). Implications of interfacial
611 characteristics of food foaming agents in foam formulations. *Advances in Colloid Interface Science*
612 140(2), 95-113.

613 Sahagún, M., Bravo-Núñez, Á., Báscones, G., Gómez, M., (2018). Influence of protein source on the
614 characteristics of gluten-free layer cakes. *LWT - Food Science and Technology* 94, 50-56.

615 Sarkar, A., Arfsten, J., Golay, P.-A., Acquistapace, S., Heinrich, E., (2016a). Microstructure and long-term
616 stability of spray dried emulsions with ultra-high oil content. *Food Hydrocolloids* 52, 857-867.

617 Sarkar, A., Kanti, F., Gulotta, A., Murray, B.S., Zhang, S., (2017a). Aqueous lubrication, structure and
618 rheological properties of whey protein microgel particles. *Langmuir* 33(51), 14699-14708.

619 Sarkar, A., Murray, B., Holmes, M., Ettelaie, R., Abdalla, A., Yang, X., (2016b). In vitro digestion of
620 Pickering emulsions stabilized by soft whey protein microgel particles: influence of thermal treatment.
621 *Soft Matter* 12(15), 3558-3569.

622 Sarkar, A., Singh, H., (2016). *Emulsions and Foams Stabilised by Milk Proteins*, pp. 133-153.

623 Sarkar, A., Zhang, S., Holmes, M., Ettelaie, R., (2019). Colloidal aspects of digestion of Pickering
624 emulsions: Experiments and theoretical models of lipid digestion kinetics. *Advances in Colloid and*
625 *Interface Science* 263, 195-211.

626 Sarkar, A., Zhang, S., Murray, B., Russell, J.A., Boxal, S., (2017b). Modulating in vitro gastric digestion of
627 emulsions using composite whey protein-cellulose nanocrystal interfaces. *Colloids and Surfaces B:*
628 *Biointerfaces* 158, 137-146.

629 Schmidt, J.M., Damgaard, H., Greve-Poulsen, M., Larsen, L.B., Hammershøj, M., (2018). Foam and
630 emulsion properties of potato protein isolate and purified fractions. *Food Hydrocolloids* 74, 367-378.

631 Sedaghat Doost, A., Nikbakht Nasrabadi, M., Kassozi, V., Dewettinck, K., Stevens, C.V., Van der Meeren,
632 P., (2019). Pickering stabilization of thymol through green emulsification using soluble fraction of
633 almond gum – Whey protein isolate nano-complexes. *Food Hydrocolloids* 88, 218-227.

634 Söderberg, I., Dickinson, E., Murray, B.S., (2003). Coalescence stability of gas bubbles subjected to rapid

635 pressure change at a planar air/water interface. *Colloids and Surfaces B: Biointerfaces* 30(3), 237-248.
636 Uzzan, M., Ramon, O., Kopelman, I.J., Kesselman, E., Mizrahi, S., (2007). Mechanism of crumb
637 toughening in bread-like products by microwave reheating. *Journal of Agricultural and food chemistry*
638 55, 6553-6560.
639 Wang, P., Tao, H., Wu, F., Yang, N., Chen, F., Jin, Z., Xu, X., (2014). Effect of frozen storage on the foaming
640 properties of wheat gliadin. *Food Chemistry* 164, 44-49.
641 Yang, X., Foegeding, E.A., (2011). The stability and physical properties of egg white and whey protein
642 foams explained based on microstructure and interfacial properties. *Food Hydrocolloids* 25(7), 1687-
643 1701.
644