

This is a repository copy of New approach to food difficulty perception: food structure, food oral processing and individual's physical strength.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper: http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/97509/

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Laguna, L, Asensio Barrowclough, R, Chen, J et al. (1 more author) (2016) New approach to food difficulty perception: food structure, food oral processing and individual's physical strength. Journal of Texture Studies, 47 (5). pp. 413-422. ISSN 0022-4901

https://doi.org/10.1111/jtxs.12190

Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

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/

Age	Gender	Dominant hand	Tongue	Bite force (kg)	
		grip force (kg)	pressure		
			(kPa)		
21	Female	40.10	51.67	7.16	
22	Female	32.87	26	7.67	
21	Female	35.17	64.33	6.15	
21	Female	27.1	30.33	5.69	
21	Female	31.17	54.67	6.04	
18	Female	28.73	69	5.80	
24	Male	56.65	73.33	7.13	
21	Male	50.03	46.67	6.18	
22	Male	40.93	53.33	6.12	
21	Male	43.13	65.67	6.08	
25	Male	47.43	68.67	6.87	

1 Table 1. Characteristics of young participants: age, gender and physical strengths

16 Table 2.Correlation matrix with the measured hand force, tongue pressure and bite

17 force (N=11).

	Tongue			
	Hand grip	pressure	Bite force	
Variables	force (kg)	(kPa)	(kg)	
Hand grip forcé (kg)	1	0.461	0.469	
Tongue pressure (kPa)	0.461	1	-0.084	
Bite force (kg)	0.469	-0.084	1	

Values in bold are different from 0 with a significance level alpha=0.05

- -

	Area	Number	Gradient
	(N.sec)	of peaks	(N/sec)
Pineapple	25.77 ^{abc}	5.40 ^a	12.62 ^{ab}
	(8.35)	(1.67)	(8.23)
Mild	21.27 ^{ab}	1.60 ^a	5.43 ^a
Cheddar	(2.88)	(0.55)	(1.01)
Soft cheddar	20.14 ^{ab}	1.80 ^a	4.65 ^a
	(2.62)	(0.45)	(0.54)
Hard	42.65 ^{abcd}	2.60 ^a	28.61 ^{ab}
Cheddar	(9.84)	(2.07)	(6.23)
Mozzerella	6.59 ^a	1.80 ^a	13.59 ^{ab}
	(1.60)	(0.84)	(27.59)
Cheese paste	2.57 ^a	1.00 ^a	0.46 ^a
	(0.20)	(0.00)	(0.02)
Pear	82.71 ^e	16.40 ^b	43.59 ^b
	(18.85)	(6.54)	(14.67)
Carrot	372.20 ^{fcde}	27.60 ^{bc}	190.21 ^c
	(54.56)	(5.77)	(49.16)
Apple	61.17 ^{ab}	32.00 ^c	27.69 ^{ab}
	(15.08)	(2.92)	(10.26)
Banana	13.59 ^{ab}	3.20 ^a	6.41 ^a
	(3.67)	(0.84)	(2.62)
Watermelon	18.95 ^{ab}	28.75 ^a	9.28 ^{ab}
	(5.67)	(7.09)	(1.97)
Canned	18.78 ^{ab}	5.40 ^a	10.10 ^{ab}
potato	(5.55)	(0.55)	(0.89)
Gherkin	64.44 ^{de}	5.40 ^a	25.48 ^{ab}
	(16.64)	(2.30)	(7.05)
Baby	47.40 ^{abcde}	2.80 ^a	12.56 ^{ab}
sweetcorn	(20.05)	(0.84)	(4.07)
Heart of	24.81 ^{abc}	3.40 ^a	12.99 ^{ab}
palm	(22.85)	(2.07)	(11.44)

36 Values in parentheses are standard deviations. Means (N=5) in the same column without a

37 common letter differ (p < 0.05) according to the Tukey test.

41 Table 4. Correlation matrix (Pearson) with the food oral processing characteristics and

42 the fracture profile of the different food products (N=11).

43

Variables	N.chew	N.swallow	Time in	Area	N. peaks	Max peak	Gradient
			mouth	under the			
				curve			
N.chew	1	0.913	0.986	0.893	0.903	0.894	0.914
N. swallow		1	0.966	0.672	0.705	0.671	0.697
Time in mouth			1	0.815	0.830	0.816	0.840
Area				1	0.988	1.000	0.998
N. peaks					1	0.986	0.986
Max peak						1	0.998
Gradient							1

Values in bold are different from 0 with a significance level alpha=0.05

44

45