

University of Parma Research Repository

Breadmaking with an old wholewheat flour: Optimization of ingredients to improve bread quality

This is the peer reviewd version of the followng article:

Original

Breadmaking with an old wholewheat flour: Optimization of ingredients to improve bread quality / Parenti, O.; Guerrini, L.; Cavallini, B.; Baldi, F.; Zanoni, B.. - In: LEBENSMITTEL-WISSENSCHAFT + TECHNOLOGIE. - ISSN 0023-6438. - 121:(2020), pp. 1-10. [10.1016/j.lwt.2019.108980]

Availability: This version is available at: 11381/2937442 since: 2024-10-09T09:06:26Z

Publisher:

Published DOI:10.1016/j.lwt.2019.108980

Terms of use:

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available

Publisher copyright

note finali coverpage

(Article begins on next page)

Elsevier Editorial System(tm) for LWT - Food

Science and Technology

Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number: LWT-D-19-04419R1

Title: Breadmaking with an old wholewheat flour: optimization of ingredients to improve bread quality

Article Type: Research paper

Keywords: unrefined flour; bread improvers; Brabender Farinograph; healthy foods

Corresponding Author: Dr. Lorenzo Guerrini,

Corresponding Author's Institution:

First Author: ottavia parenti

Order of Authors: ottavia parenti; Lorenzo Guerrini; benedetta cavallini; fabio baldi; bruno zanoni

Abstract: Processing strategies are necessary to improve the quality of baked old wholewheat flour products, since they are required by consumers but have poor technological properties. The present study tested the addition of common improvers on an old wholewheat flour performance to optimize bread quality. At first, the effect of seven improvers on dough rheology and bread specific volume was evaluated using a screening design method. All of the improvers affected the farinographic parameters; the most promising effects were shown by sucrose, salt and guar gum. Bread specific volume was significantly improved by sucrose, extra virgin olive oil and ice; hence, the effects of these variables on dough rheology and bread quality were evaluated in-depth in a full factorial trial. Dough stability and dough weakening were significantly improved by sucrose and extra virgin olive oil. Sucrose and extra virgin olive oil interaction optimized bread specific volume, crumb specific volume and hardness. The addition of 2% sucrose and 3% extra virgin olive oil resulted in optimized bread, on which a qualitative sensory evaluation was performed. This optimization approach could be applied to other wholewheat flours to improve product quality, hence promoting the consumption of high nutritional value breads.

Cover Letter

Lorenzo Guerrini University of University of Florence Piazzale delle Cascine 16, 50144, Florence, Italy +39 349 8847218 lorenzo.guerrini@unifi.it

Dr. Rakesh K. Singh Editor-in-Chief LWT - Food Science and Technology

October 29, 2019

Dear Dr. Rakesh K. Singh:

I am pleased to submit an original research article entitled "Breadmaking with ancient wholewheat flour: optimization of ingredients to improve bread quality" for consideration for publication in *LWT* - *Food Science and Technology*.

This manuscript investigated the effects of seven bread improvers on the performance of ancient wholewheat (cv. Verna) doughs and breads in order to optimize the final product quality. Two different experimental trials were performed: (i) a screen design trial (T1) allowed us to select the improvers with the best effect on bread quality (i.e. sucrose, extra virgin olive oil and ice); (ii) a full factorial design trial (T2) studied the effect of these three improvers on dough rheology and bread quality. The optimization of bread quality was obtained with the addition of sucrose (2%) and extra virgin olive oil (3%). The present study presents a two-step optimization approach that could be applied to other ancient wheat varieties, to improve the quality of their final products and promote the consumption of healthy foods.

We believe that this manuscript is appropriate for publication by *LWT* - *Food Science and Technology* because it is innovative in the fields of food technology. To the author knowledge, the effect of common bread improvers on the performance of an ancient wholewheat flour has never been tested before. The relevance of this study is the optimization method for the improvement of ancient wholewheat bread quality.

This manuscript has not been published and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere. We have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Thank you for your consideration!

Sincerely,

Dr. Lorenzo Guerrini Department of Agricultural, Food and Forestry Systems Management (DAGRI) University of Florence, Italy The authors would like to thank Reviewers, for the time spent in improving the paper and for the important suggestions and corrections proposed. We hope to have addressed all the issues that reviewers outlined. Here following, a point by point reply to the comments received.

Reviewer #1: Dear Authors,

the paper gives important knowledge to the field of old wheat varieties, is well written, statistical analysis is appropriate and results and discussion adequately presented and discussed. The paer may be accepted, rpvided some minor revisions are made:

- Please change ancient with old, you used and old variety, the term acncient is related to ancient wheat species.

-We changed the word "ancient" with "old", accordingly with reviewer observation.

- 2.4.2 - Change rheological properties with lare deformatin tests.

-2.4.2 According to reviewer suggestion, we changed the "rheological properties" with "large deformation tests"

- Some important recent references are missing, please add in the intridution section and discuss the two following:

Mefleh M., Conte P., Fadda C., Giunta F., Piga A., Hassoun G., Motzo R. 2019. From ancient to old and modern durum wheat varieties: interaction among cultivar traits, management, and technological quality. Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture, 99:2059-2067.

Farbo M.G, Fadda C., Marceddu S., Conte P., Del Caro A., Piga A. 2020. Improving the quality of dough obtained with old durum wheat using hydrocolloids. Food Hydrocolloids, 101:1-8.

-We added the references that reviewer proposed in the Introduction section (L-52-53 and L-60).

Reviewer #2: Review LWT

The paper presented on the use of ancient wheat is an interesting study and well written in general.

Still I would like to rise a few issues and give some comments/suggestions for improvement:

General: ancient wheats are interesting and their use for human nutrition is justified for increasing the diversity in nutrition. Their chemical composition differs from other cereals, so they can offer "other" nutrients and thus increase the variability in nutrients (e.g. other phytochemicals, different ratio of dietary fibre fractions, etc.), BUT to say that they are "healthier" or "better" than modern cereals is NOT correct and NOT scientifically justified. This is what consumer think are what they are made to think, but scientific papers should underline all these statements with facts and data. I would thus indeed request the authors to deliver proven facts and to deliver sincere evaluation.

In particular: Abstract: line 13: ancient wheat show positive effects on human health, line 26 "healthier breads" introduction line 45 "high nutritional value" line 50 "rich nutritional profile" - None of these statements is proven here in the text with scientific data!

The paper need to define and explain ancient cereals more detailed. In particular intro line 45-51 should be extended, clarified, improved, explaining exactly WHAT are ancient cereals, WHAT is the difference to modern cereals, BASED ON SCIENTIFIC DATA.

General:

As reviewer rightly pointed out, the paper focused on the use of an old wholewheat flour in the breadmaking process. The authors completely agree with the reviewer that we can not generally define old wheat as better than modern, but this was not the authors' intention.

Probably, the authors did not clearly explain the characteristics of the raw material used for the study, which may justify the statements that reviewer pointed out. The flour selected was characterised by two distinctive features: (i) it was "wholewheat" as regard to the flour refinement degree; the consumption of wholewheat products has been associated to health benefits in several scientific studies; and (ii) it was "old" as regard to the time of this wheat cultivar selection; in recent years some scientific studies have compared the characteristics of some old wheat cultivars to modern wheat cultivars.

In detail, these studies investigated the nutritional composition, especially focusing on phenolic compounds, of some old wheat varieties as well as they tested the effect of the regular consumption of some old wheat cultivars in intervention studies on humans (Leoncini et al., 2012; Dinelli et al., 2011; Sofi et al., 2010; Gotti et al., 2018; Sereni et al., 2016). These papers have shown that the tested old wheat cultivars (including *cv* Verna – the same of our tests) could present an interesting nutritional composition, particularly rich in phenolic compounds (Leoncini et al., 2012; Dinelli et al., 2011; Gotti et al., 2018). Furthermore, the regular consumption of this old variety has been associated to nutritional benefits, specifically for the prevention of chronic diseases (i.e. cardiovascular diseases, type 2 diabetes, various type of cancers) (Sofi et al., 2010; Sereni et al., 2016).

Accordingly, we modified the Manuscript.

Abstract:

L 13-16 According to reviewer suggestion the authors changed Line 13 "Ancient wholewheat flours (AWWF) show positive effects on human health" into "Processing strategies are necessary to improve the quality of baked old wholewheat flour products, since they are increasingly required by consumers but have poor technological properties." We change the focus of the sentence from the nutritional benefits to the market's requests.

L 26 Line The sentence has been rephrased.

Introduction:

According to the reviewer comment, the authors clearly define old wheats at L 48-50. At L 50-53 it is now explained that "the old wheat term includes a large number of cultivars, with a broad genetic base, and therefore showing a broad range of characteristics (Dinu, Whittaker, Pagliai, Benedettelli, & Sofi, 2018; Mefleh, Conte, Fadda, & Giunta, 2018)", and finally at L 53-55 we explained that "Within them, some varieties were reported to have high nutritional value and potential health benefits (Leoncini et al., 2012; Dinelli et al., 2011; Sofi et al., 2010; Sereni et al., 2016; Gotti et al., 2018)." Furthermore, the authors added several scientific papers to support the statements in the Introduction. Line 51: different quality and quantity of gluten: that is correct, but this is not really and advantage. Gluten in ancient wheat is less suitable for baking (THAT is one issue that has been improved by breeding to modern cereals) and they are NOT necessarily better digestible or tolerable. (still not gluten-free).

L 51 The authors totally agree with reviewer observation; in fact, the word "different" has not a meaning of an advantage, but it just outlines a characteristic of ancient cultivars compared to the modern ones. However, the sentence has been removed.

Describe in detail the used cereals. Where and when grown, year? Where? Experimental farms? Etc.

According with reviewer suggestion the authors added the specifications about the wheat used in the study (L 74-76).

Why have you used to different batches? To mix these batches and then use a mixture of it for T1 and T2 would have been better.

As the reviewer pointed out, the authors used two different batches of the same wheat (i.e. cv Verna, grown the same year in the same location) for the two experimental trials they performed (T1 and T2). This choice was made in order to increase the robustness of the Validation trail (T2) by increasing the variability of the raw matter. In fact, T2 showed that results were consistent with T1 independently from the inherent variability of the two flour batches.

Line 67-72: define or write complete the used abbreviations (you do so later in results, but it should already be here)

L 67-72: the authors specified the used abbreviations (now at L 75-77).

Line 79: a short description here would be better, so one is not urged to retrieve another paper.

L 79: according to reviewer suggestion, the authors added the description of the gelatinization process in the material and method section (now at L 81-84).

Experimental Design:

Principally well chosen. Only T1: to evaluate 7 parameters at once is a bit risky, in particularly in baking and limits the evaluation or results. But authors have stated it also themselves. Single addition would have made it easier (and not really much more work)

Experimental Design:

When we decided the experimental design, we also evaluated the possibility of testing the single addition of improvers instead of using the Screening Design approach.

First of all, we observed that in breadmaking the use of many improvers into the bread formulation is very common.

Testing the improvers one at time allowed to isolate the effect of each of them, but in real recipes they are often used in combination, and their effects cannot be considered additive *a priori* (later, in the full factorial validation we demonstrated that the effect were not additive). In fact, the

addition of one improver may masks the effect of the addition of another one, and *vice versa*. To avoid this problem, we should test the improvers in a full factorial design. To test the effects of the 7 improvers in recipes where they are simultaneously present in a full factorial design, we needed 2⁷ (128 x number of replicates) tests.

Hence, we decided to split the investigation in 2 trials. In the first one we applied the Screening Design since it allows a direct comparison between improvers in recipes when they are simultaneously present in 2³ (8 x number of replicates) tests. In the second one we focused on the most promising improvers with a full factorial (allowing us to test the selected improvers on more than 2 levels). Hence, the choice of these way of work allowed us, an evaluation of the improver main effect in the presence of other additives, and better mimic the real working conditions in breadmaking.

Line 97: mention T2 info here (move the section line 247-253 here), mention the name of the design.

L 97: according with reviewer suggestion we moved the section L 247-253 into Material and Methods (now at L 110-115).

Line 114: bread making machine is not really scientific baking equipment. At least describe here the exact conditions applied: kneading parameters, fermentation time, T, baking time, T, etc.

L 114: The authors added specifications about the exact conditions applied during the breadmaking with bread making machine. We chose to use bread machine because they allow to standardize the breadmaking procedure reducing the errors and differences connected with a straight dough method carried out manually. This allows to assess the effects of the improvers reducing possible causes of interference. Furthermore, bread machines are usually accepted in scientific literature. Several papers used them, for example see Martins et al., "Original article Effect of spent yeast fortification on physical parameters, volatiles and sensorial characteristics of home-made bread". International Journal of Food Science and Technology (2015), 50, 1855–1863; Lodi et al., "Characterization of water distribution in bread during storage using magnetic resonance imaging". Magnetic resonance Imaging (2007), 25, 1449–1458; Wang et al., (2004). "Water dynamics in white bread and starch gels as affected by water and gluten content" LWT -Food Science and Technology, 37, 377–384; Kadan et al., "Effects of Yeast and Bran on Phytate Degradation and Minerals in Rice Bread Materials and Methods" Journal of Food Science (2007), 72, 208–211; Noonan et al., "The Determination of Semicarbazide (N-Aminourea) in Commercial Bread Products by Liquid Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry" Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry, (2005), 53, 2064–2067; Noonan et al., Semicarbazide Formation in Flour and Bread, Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry (2008), 56, 2064–2067.

2.4. Analytical methods

Line 137-138. The right measurement for this is bake loss (weight of bread before and after baking)

L 137-138 did not refer to the bake loss, but in these lines, we wanted to point out on the different losses of water from bread crumb and crust due to the improvers. On the other hand, bake loss is comprehensive of the total water losses of bread.

Line 139: describe method here, instead of referring to another paper.

L 139: the authors added the explanation of the method (now at L 158-161).

Good: number of replications for baking and methods.

Addition of ice: have you measured T of water before and after its addition? Dough T before and after kneading?

Addition of Ice: in a preliminary trial we tested different levels of Ice addition and we measured the water T as well as the dough T before and after kneading. In detail, the water was at room T (20°C); the sample containing 20% of Ice with the rest part of water at 20°C was at 14°C before the kneading step and at the end of the kneading step its T was 20°C. The T of the control sample was 20°C before the kneading step and 25°C after the kneading step. We did it in a separate preliminary test (with the same flour, yeasts, and procedures) to avoid interferences during the presented experimental trials. The authors added this specification at L 211-212.

Line 160- 162: delete this sentence

L 160-162: the authors delated the sentence.

3.1. I think there was interaction of GF and GG and these two have strong interaction with water

Reviewer observation is true, and for this reason the authors decided to perform the farinographic test on the dough samples in the presence of the different combination of improvers, according to the Screening Design adopted for T1. This rheological analysis allowed us to estimate WA in the presence of the different improvers. One of the limitations of using the Screening Design method is that it does not allow the estimation of the interactions between the tested variables. The authors already explained these limitations in the Material and Method section.

Moreover, according to the confounding pattern of T1 experimental design, the interaction between GG and GF may result in an overstate of the Suc effect. However, we confirmed the robustness of our results with T2 trail, where Suc was tested without interferences neither from GG nor from GF having the same results.

EVOO: this is characterized by long chain fatty acids, and has a very different effect to bread then short chain fats like shortening or butter. This should be considered in the results. (e.g. line 214)

L 214: The authors reworded the sentence according to reviewer comment (now at L 238-240).

Line 234... growth of microorganisms - there was not sourdough addition, so SUC could only have supported yeast growth.

L 234 the authors modified the sentence according to the reviewer comment (now at L 260).

Line 246. Why did you measure rheology in T1 if you then did not consider these results at all for T2?

L 246: In T1 the authors measured dough rheology in order to evaluate the effects of the improvers on the dough behaviour, which reflects the dough workability and predicts the

breadmaking performance. In the authors' opinion, since the scientific literature about breadmaking with old wholewheat flour is poorly investigated, it is important to report the effects of the tested improvers on dough rheology, independently of their effects on bread specific volume. However, since the aim of the study was the optimization of the final product quality, for T2, the authors decided to focus on the improvers that showed positive effect on one of the most important parameter of bread quality, i.e. bread volume.

Chapter 3.2.2:

Authors do not describe the interaction effects correctly. E.g. Line 283: how was the interaction effect? (does the statistical evaluation tool shows graphs where this can be seen? Then add them here). Also true for Line 296, line 305, 316, 321: - interaction effect of addition effect? (is not the same)

Chapter 3.2.2: Experimental data described in L 283, 296, 305, 316 and 321 are reported in Table 4 and the effects on bread specific volume, crumb specific volume, crumb hardness and chewiness are represented as graphs shown in Fig. 3; the paper reported it in L 281-282.

In the Discussion section, the significant effects of the interactions are reported, but the paper did not aim to explain the interaction effect. Conversely, it followed the optimization approach, focusing on the recipe that allowed the obtainment of the best bread quality. With this approach we just measured the effect of the interactions to consider them in the final recipe. However, in the first version of the paper the explanations of the interactions were included, but we had to remove them due to the limited number of words allowed by the journal.

Line 285: increase of 11% - where can this be seen? (table)

L 285: the increase of 11% can be seen in Table 4 as stated in L 281-282.

Line 286: ß'crystals in EVOO??? (normally in short chain fatty acids)

L 286: we reworded the sentence about the use lipids in breadmaking which probably was misleading; B'crystals were related to the use of shortening not to the composition of EVOO (now at L 312).

Line 289: unique composition of EVOO - all fats have unique composition.... Peculiar effects - which?

L 289: we reworded the sentence according to reviewer observation (now at L 315).

Tables: T1: lowest level was 0?

 Table 1: Yes, in T1 each variable was tested in 2 levels; the lowest level is 0 and the highest was

 selected according to the scientific literature as reported in L 111-116.

Table 2: T1 trials in T1 were only 8 trials, here in Table 2, which results are here presented? Is this the right way to evaluate this statistical test?

Table 2: Rheological results are shown in Table 2. The statistical analysis was made according to Antony (2014) as reported in L 108.

Fig 1. Table values would be clearer to see results.

Fig 1. We modified Fig. 1 in order to make table values clearer, according to reviewer comment.

Editorial comments:

L.29: remove

L 29 We removed the line and the abbreviations throughout the Manuscript.

L.37, elsewhere: All citations in the text should refer to:

1. Single author: the author's name (without initials, unless there is ambiguity) and the year of publication (Smith, 2003);

2. Two authors: both authors' names and the year of publication (Smith & Jones, 2004);

3. Three, four or five authors: all authors names and year of publication (Smith, Jones, & Brown, 2005). For all subsequent citations of this work use et al. (Smith et al., 2005).

4. Six or more authors: first author's name followed by et al. and the year of publication (Black et al., 2007).

-All citations in the text were changed in journal style.

- L.68, elsewhere: do not use "%" for concentration (here for moisture), replace by e.g. g/100 g as for other data. Check that there is always a space between number and unit (e.g. L.69: V2=10.5g/100g -> V2 = 10.5 g/100 g). L.110: g water per 100 g flour

-The authors modified the moisture unit of measurement according to Editorial comment. We also delated the space between the number and the unit.

- L.121: include AACC methods manual in references

-We included AACC methods in the references.

- References: give journal issue numbers (in brackets) for all references, or remove from all

-We modified the references according to Editorial comment.

- Prepare tables in journal style (check current publications in LWT please - e.g. no vertical lines)

We modified the tables in journal style

Highlights

- Two trials (T1, T2) tested common bread improvers on an ancient wholewheat flour
- Salt, sucrose and guar gum improved dough rheology in the fractional trial (T1)
- Sugar, extra virgin olive oil and ice increased bread specific volume in T1
- A full factorial trial (T2) was performed to optimize bread quality
- 2% sucrose and 3% extra virgin olive oil gave the best bread quality

1	Breadmaking with <mark>an old</mark> wholewheat flour:
2	optimization of ingredients to improve bread quality
3	Authors:
4	Ottavia Parenti, Lorenzo Guerrini*, Benedetta Cavallini, Fabio Baldi, Bruno Zanoni
5	
6	Department of Agricultural, Food and Forestry Systems Management (DAGRI), University of
7	Florence, Piazzale Delle Cascine 16, 50144, Florence, Italy
8	
9 10 11	*Corresponding author. E-mail address: lorenzo.guerrini@unifi.it (L. Guerrini). Tel: +39 349 8847218.
12	Abstract
13	The consumption of old wholewheat flours have shown positive effects on human health, but they
14	have poor technological properties. Processing strategies are necessary to improve the quality of
15	baked <mark>old wholewheat flour</mark> products, <mark>since they are required by consumers but have poor</mark>
15 16	baked <mark>old wholewheat flour</mark> products, <mark>since they are required by consumers but have poor</mark> <mark>technological properties.</mark> The present study tested the addition of common improvers on <mark>an old</mark>
15 16 17	baked old wholewheat flour products, since they are required by consumers but have poor technological properties. The present study tested the addition of common improvers on an old wholewheat flour performance in order to optimize bread quality. At first, the effect of seven
15 16 17 18	baked old wholewheat flour products, since they are required by consumers but have poor technological properties. The present study tested the addition of common improvers on an old wholewheat flour performance in order to optimize bread quality. At first, the effect of seven improvers on dough rheology and bread specific volume was evaluated using a screening design
15 16 17 18 19	baked old wholewheat flour products, since they are required by consumers but have poor technological properties. The present study tested the addition of common improvers on an old wholewheat flour performance in order to optimize bread quality. At first, the effect of seven improvers on dough rheology and bread specific volume was evaluated using a screening design method. All of the improvers affected the farinographic parameters; the most promising effects
15 16 17 18 19 20	baked old wholewheat flour products, since they are required by consumers but have poor technological properties. The present study tested the addition of common improvers on an old wholewheat flour performance in order to optimize bread quality. At first, the effect of seven improvers on dough rheology and bread specific volume was evaluated using a screening design method. All of the improvers affected the farinographic parameters; the most promising effects were shown by sucrose, salt and guar gum. Bread specific volume was significantly improved by
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	baked old wholewheat flour products, since they are required by consumers but have poor technological properties. The present study tested the addition of common improvers on an old wholewheat flour performance in order to optimize bread quality. At first, the effect of seven improvers on dough rheology and bread specific volume was evaluated using a screening design method. All of the improvers affected the farinographic parameters; the most promising effects were shown by sucrose, salt and guar gum. Bread specific volume was significantly improved by sucrose, extra virgin olive oil and ice; hence, the effects of these the above three variables on
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	baked old wholewheat flour products, since they are required by consumers but have poor technological properties. The present study tested the addition of common improvers on an old wholewheat flour performance in order to optimize bread quality. At first, the effect of seven improvers on dough rheology and bread specific volume was evaluated using a screening design method. All of the improvers affected the farinographic parameters; the most promising effects were shown by sucrose, salt and guar gum. Bread specific volume was significantly improved by sucrose, extra virgin olive oil and ice; hence, the effects of these the above three variables on dough rheology and bread quality were evaluated in-depth in a full factorial trial. Dough stability
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	baked old wholewheat flour products, since they are required by consumers but have poor technological properties. The present study tested the addition of common improvers on an old wholewheat flour performance in order to optimize bread quality. At first, the effect of seven improvers on dough rheology and bread specific volume was evaluated using a screening design method. All of the improvers affected the farinographic parameters; the most promising effects were shown by sucrose, salt and guar gum. Bread specific volume was significantly improved by sucrose, extra virgin olive oil and ice; hence, the effects of these the above three variables on dough rheology and bread quality were evaluated in-depth in a full factorial trial. Dough stability and dough weakening were significantly improved by sucrose and extra virgin olive oil. Sucrose
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	baked old wholewheat flour products, since they are required by consumers but have poor technological properties. The present study tested the addition of common improvers on an old wholewheat flour performance in order to optimize bread quality. At first, the effect of seven improvers on dough rheology and bread specific volume was evaluated using a screening design method. All of the improvers affected the farinographic parameters; the most promising effects were shown by sucrose, salt and guar gum. Bread specific volume was significantly improved by sucrose, extra virgin olive oil and ice; hence, the effects of these the above three variables on dough rheology and bread quality were evaluated in-depth in a full factorial trial. Dough stability and dough weakening were significantly improved by sucrose and extra virgin olive oil. Sucrose and extra virgin olive oil interaction optimized bread specific volume, crumb specific volume and
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	baked old wholewheat flour products, since they are required by consumers but have poor technological properties. The present study tested the addition of common improvers on an old wholewheat flour performance in order to optimize bread quality. At first, the effect of seven improvers on dough rheology and bread specific volume was evaluated using a screening design method. All of the improvers affected the farinographic parameters; the most promising effects were shown by sucrose, salt and guar gum. Bread specific volume was significantly improved by sucrose, extra virgin olive oil and ice; hence, the effects of these the above three variables on dough rheology and bread quality were evaluated in-depth in a full factorial trial. Dough stability and dough weakening were significantly improved by sucrose and extra virgin olive oil. Sucrose and extra virgin olive oil interaction optimized bread specific volume, crumb specific volume and hardness. The addition of 2% sucrose and 3% extra virgin olive oil resulted in optimized bread, on
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	baked old wholewheat flour products, since they are required by consumers but have poor technological properties. The present study tested the addition of common improvers on an old wholewheat flour performance in order to optimize bread quality. At first, the effect of seven improvers on dough rheology and bread specific volume was evaluated using a screening design method. All of the improvers affected the farinographic parameters; the most promising effects were shown by sucrose, salt and guar gum. Bread specific volume was significantly improved by sucrose, extra virgin olive oil and ice; hence, the effects of these the above three variables on dough rheology and bread quality were evaluated in-depth in a full factorial trial. Dough stability and dough weakening were significantly improved by sucrose and extra virgin olive oil. Sucrose and extra virgin olive oil interaction optimized bread specific volume, crumb specific volume and hardness. The addition of 2% sucrose and 3% extra virgin olive oil resulted in optimized bread, on which a qualitative sensory evaluation was performed. This optimization approach could be

28

of high nutritional value breads.

30 Key words: unrefined flour, bread improvers, Brabender Farinograph, healthy foods

31 Abbreviations: OWF, old wheat flour; old wholewheat flour, old wholewheat flour

32 **1. Introduction**

33 Wheat bread represents the staple food in many diets, with a far-reaching impact on human 34 health. Depending on the degree of refinement of the flour used in the bread recipe, the 35 composition of the final product changes immensely.

36 Refined flours are mainly composed of the starchy endosperm, while they are deprived of the 37 germ fraction and the outer kernel layers. Conversely, unrefined flours are extremely rich in 38 compounds such as dietary fibres, fats, minerals, vitamins, lignans and phenolic compounds, which 39 are positive for human health (Zhou et al., 2014).

In recent years, several scientific studies have shown that a regular consumption of wholewheat products protects from chronic diseases such as cardiovascular disease, type 2 diabetes and some types of cancers (Ye, Chacko, Chou, Kugizaki, & Liu, 2012). Unfortunately, unrefined flours show a poor technological performance, since the presence of the bran fraction has a negative effect on the breadmaking process, and changes the taste and flavour of the resulting bread (Gómez, Ronda, Blanco, Caballero, & Apesteguía, 2003). Therefore, refined wheat flour still represents the preferred choice for bread production.

47 Due to increasing consumer attention towards healthy food, in the recent years there has been renewed interest in old wheats (Guerrini et al., 2019). Old wheats are generally defined as those 48 49 wheat varieties cultivated before the intense genetic selection that took place during the Green 50 Revolution of the 1960s (Dinu, Whittaker, Pagliai, Benedettelli, & Sofi, 2018). Hence, the old wheat 51 term includes a large number of cultivars, with a broad genetic base, and therefore showing a 52 broad range of characteristics (Dinu, Whittaker, Pagliai, Benedettelli, & Sofi, 2018; Mefleh, Conte, Fadda, & Giunta, 2018). Within them, some varieties were reported to have high nutritional value 53 54 and potential health benefits (Leoncini et al., 2012; Dinelli et al., 2011; Sofi et al., 2010; Gotti et al., 55 2018; Sereni et al., 2016). These varieties show lower yields and poor technological performance compared to modern wheats, but they are characterized by a broader genetic base, making them 56 57 an important safeguard of Triticum genus biodiversity and giving them a rich nutritional profile as 58 well as a different quality/quantity of gluten

59 Considering the poor technological properties of old wholewheat flours compared to conventional 60 flour blends, it is still a challenge to use them in breadmaking (Cappelli et al., 2018; Fabro et al., 61 2020). Thus, different operating procedures should be specifically designed to maximize the 62 technological performance of old wheat flour, for example by using some ingredients in the recipe 63 with the aim of ameliorating the final product quality (i.e. improvers). In this study an optimization approach was carried out to find the best combination of improvers employed in breadmaking on sp. *Triticum aestivum* L., cv. Verna old wholewheat flour, evaluating their effects on the quality of dough and bread. At first, seven common improvers were evaluated following an optimized experimental design, in order to reveal which of them had the greatest effect on bread quality. This evaluation enabled the selection of three bread improvers, which were evaluated in-depth in a full factorial design trial. Finally, an optimized bread recipe was identified.

71

72

2. Materials and methods

73 2.1 Materials

74 Experimental trials were carried out with two batches (V1 and V2 batches) of a sp. Triticum aestivum L., cv. Verna old wholewheat flour; wheat seeds were grown in Montespertoli (Florence, 75 Italy), during the growing season 2018-2019. The chemical and physical characterization of the 76 77 flour old wholewheat flour Verna batch 1 "V1" and Verna batch 2 "V2" was as follows: moisture 78 (V1=12.83g/100g%, V2=13.46g/100g%), ash (V1=1.01g/100g d.m., V2=1.28g/100g d.m.) and 79 protein (V1=12.3g/100g d.m., V2=10.5g/100g d.m.) contents; WA (V1=57.75%, V2=55.00%), DDT 80 (V1=3.00min, V2=2.50min), DS (V1=2.00min, V2=1.17min) and DW (V1=165BU, V2=203BU); P (V1=39.0mmH₂O, V2=46.0mmH₂O), L (V1=30.0mm, V2=25.0mm) and W (V1=42.3 10⁻⁴J, V2=44.8 81 10^{-4} J) and P/L (V1=1.3, V2=1.9). 82

The old wholewheat flours were processed using a stone grinding mill and a sieve (two 83 consecutive passages through a 1,100-1,200 µm sieve) at the Molino Paciscopi (Montespertoli, 84 85 Florence, Italy). Mineral water (Levissima, Bormio, Italy), fresh brewer's yeast (Lievital, Trecasali, 86 Italy), extra virgin olive oil (EVOO), guar gum (GG), sucrose (Suc) and sodium chloride (NaCl) were 87 purchased at a local market (Florence, Italy). Ascorbic acid (AH₂) was purchased in a drugstore. Ice 88 (prepared with the above mineral water) and gelatinized flour (GF) were prepared in the lab the 89 day before each trial. The GF was prepared with a 1:4 ratio of old wholewheat flour to mineral 90 water (Levissima, Bormio, Italy). The mixture was continuously stirred as it was heated to 85 °C for 91 3 min. Temperature was measured with a Type J penetration probe (Testo, Lenzkirch, Germany). 92 GF was cooled to room temperature, stored at 4 °C and used the following day as bread improver 93 (Parenti et al. 2019).

94

95 2.2 The experimental design

96 2.2.1 The screening design trial (T1)

A Plackett-Burman screening design (Antony, 2014) was adopted to simultaneously test the main
effects of the seven bread improvers on dough performance and bread quality. The screening
design allowed the seven factors to be tested at two levels using only eight samples. The chosen
variables, their level settings and the combinations used in the eight trials are shown in Table 1.

101 The *T1* trial was carried out on the *V1* Verna old wholewheat flour batch. Rheological analyses of 102 doughs were carried out using a Farinograph (Brabender, Duisburg, Germany). The baking process 103 was standardized as reported below. Bread quality was evaluated by measuring the bread specific 104 volume immediately after baking.

105

106 2.2.2 The full factorial design trial (T2)

107 The screening design made it possible to evaluate a large number of factors with a small number 108 of tests. However, there are several limitations. Specifically, the design is a resolution III design 109 (Antony, 2014), meaning that the main effects could be confused with two-factor and higher order 110 interactions. Hence, the three variables with the highest impact on bread quality in T1 were tested 111 in detail in a validation trial (T2), following a full factorial design. - as explained in the Results and 112 Discussion section. The experimental design is shown in Table 3. The chosen maximum level of 113 EVOO (2%) and Ice (20%) was the same as in the T1 trial, while the chosen maximum level of Suc 114 was lowered from 6% to 4%. This choice was made since the addition of 6% Suc resulted in the 115 excessive browning of the bread crust and the perception of too much sweetness during the bread tasting, while 4% Suc did not show these drawbacks (data not shown). Moreover, a medium level 116 117 of Suc (i.e., 2%) and Ice (i.e., 10%) was also included. 118 The *T2* trial was carried out on the *V2* Verna old wholewheat flour batch. Rheological analyses of

the dough were carried out on the v2 verna old wholewheat hour batch. Rheological analyses of the dough were carried out using a Farinograph (Brabender, Duisburg, Germany). The baking process was standardized as reported below. The bread quality parameters were evaluated immediately after baking. Bread specific volume, crumb specific volume, crumb and crust moisture, instrumental bread texture (Texture Profile Analysis - TPA), crumb image analysis and bread colour were evaluated. A sensory evaluation was also carried out on the optimized sample.

124

125 2.3 Preparation methods

126 2.3.1 Breadmaking

127 The bread dough was prepared in 500g batches. The basic formulation was: flour (310g), fresh 128 brewer's yeast (13g) and the amount of water required to reach the farinograph consistency value 129 of 500BU (51-59.5%, w/flour w). The straight dough method was applied.

The improvers were added together with the main ingredients. The *GF* was warmed to room temperature, the *Ice* was finely broken up in a mixer and the *AH*₂ was carefully solubilized in mineral water before adding the improvers to the bread dough. The breadmaking phases were all carried out with a bread machine (Pain doré, Moulinex, Ecully, France) using the WWF programme (mixing step: 25min at room T, resting and leavening: 1h and 20min at 40°C, baking: 55min at 180°C). The bread samples were cooled to room temperature prior to the bread quality evaluation. Two replicates were performed in the *T1* trial, and four in the *T2* trial.

137

138 2.4 Measurement method

139 2.4.1 Chemical characterization of old wholewheat flour

140 Moisture (AACC 44–15.02), protein (ISTISAN 1996/34, N x 6.25) and ash (ISTISAN 1996/34) 141 contents were measured according to AACC International Approved Methods.

142

143 2.4.2 Large deformation tests Rheological analysis of OLD WHOLEWHEAT FLOUR and dough
 144 samples

Old wholewheat flour rheological characterization was performed according to the official method
 using a Farinograph (AACC 54-21.02) and Alveograph (AACC 54-30.02). Dough farinographic
 analyses were carried out in two replicates in the *T1* trial and three replicates in the *T2* trial.

148

149 2.4.3 Bread quality measurements

Bread volume (L) was measured using the standard millet displacement method (AACC, 2000). Specific volume (L/kg) was determined as the ratio between total volume and mass. Crumb specific volume (L/kg) was determined by cutting a small piece of crumb (5–10 g) and determining the ratio between its volume (L) (calculated using the standard millet displacement method (AACC, 2000)) and its mass (kg).

155 Crumb and crust moisture (g/100 g) were measured by gravimetry at 105 °C until constant weights 156 were reached. Since the dough was prepared with different amounts of water (i.e. the quantity to 157 reach 500BU), comparison between moisture parameters was made using the ratio between the

- was calculated as the ratio between the final crumb or crust moisture (g/100g) and the original
 dough moisture (g/100g), in order to allow a proper comparison between the tested samples.
- 161 The Texture Profile Analysis (TPA) of the bread samples was carried out by two-bite compression
- 162 using a Texture Analyzer (Stable Micro Systems, UK), equipped with a circular flat-plate probe
- 163 (diameter: 30 mm). Hardness (N), cohesiveness, gumminess (N), chewiness (N*mm) and
- 164 springiness (mm) were measured on three slices (1.5 cm thickness) of each bread sample in five
- 165 replicates. according to Parenti et al. (2019).
- 166 Crumb porosity was evaluated by digital image analysis (Image J software, Color Inspector 3D.jar). 167 Images of the central bread slice (thickness 1.0 cm) were acquired at a resolution of 1.2MP. 168 Rectangular sections of the bread crumb were selected, converted into an 8bit grey scale and 169 subjected to spatial calibration before the analysis. The threshold was chosen according to 170 Gonzales-Barron & Butler (2006), using the Otsu method. The following measurements were determined: pore area at the 50th percentile (mm²), and total pore area (%), determined as the 171 172 ratio between the total pore area (mm²) in the analysed bread crumb section and the total area of the analysed bread crumb section (mm²). Three replicates were performed on each bread sample. 173 174 Crumb and crust colour were determined by digital image analysis. Photos of the bread samples 175 were taken in standard light conditions. The crumb colour was evaluated on the central slice of 176 the bread, while crust colour was assessed on the upper surface of the bread. L* or lightness 177 (black 0/white 100), a* (green-/red+) and b* (blue-/yellow+) values were calculated according to 178 (CIE Commission, 1978). All measurements were carried out in triplicate.
- 179

180 2.4.4 Bread sensory evaluation - a descriptive analysis

181 The sensory profile of the optimized sample was compared to the control sample (i.e. bread 182 without improvers - CTR) and a qualitative analysis was performed (Dinnella, Borgogno, Picchi, & 183 Monteleone, 2010). Fresh bread samples were prepared on the same day as the test, allowed to 184 cool at room temperature and then used for the sensory evaluation. The descriptive panel 185 consisted of seven panellists (3 males and 4 females, age 20-40) familiar with cereal products. The 186 participants were informed about the procedures and were asked to sign an informed consent 187 form when they agreed on participation. A training before the test was performed to define the 188 sensory attributes (Table S1 in the supplementary material). A nine-point scale (1-9, from 189 extremely weak to extremely strong, respectively) was used to rate intensity. The freshly baked 190 bread samples were given three-digit codes and 2.5 cm slices were presented to the assessors in

random order. Water was provided to cleanse the palate between the samples. The panel wasinstructed to smell each sample before tasting it, and then they were requested to swallow the

193 samples. A qualitative evaluation was performed using the medians of the raw data obtained.

194

195 2.4.5 Data processing

196 Two replicates were carried out to in the *T1* trial. A multi-factor ANOVA was performed to assess
197 significant differences (p < 0.05) resulting from the seven tested factors.

In the *T2* trial three replicates were carried out for dough rheology and four replicates for bread
quality evaluation. A three-way ANOVA was performed to assess significant differences (p < 0.05)
resulting from these factors and their two-factor and three-factor interactions. The Tukey HSD test
was used as the post-hoc test.

202

203 3. Results and discussion

204 *3.1 The T1 trial*

Seven bread improvers were simultaneously tested on old wholewheat flour performance. Five of
the seven improvers can be considered well-known bread improvers (i.e., *EVOO*, *Suc*, *AH*₂, *GG* and *NaCl*); *GF* and *Ice*, were also included.

GF from different sources has been tested in breadmaking (Carrillo-Navas et al., 2016; Fu, Che, Li,
 Wang, & Adhikari, 2016; Kim, Kwak, & Jeong, 2017). In particular, the addition of *GF* showed a
 significant improvement in the quality of the bread from brown wheat (Parenti et al., 2019).

The inclusion of *lce* can be seen as a way to control a crucial factor of the kneading step: the temperature (Zhou et al., 2014). In preliminary trials different amounts of *lce* (data not shown) in the breadmaking process were tested. The best result was obtained with a ratio of 20% (w/water w) of *lce*: it reduced the dough temperature during the kneading step (20% of *lce* addition reduced

215 dough T before dough kneading from 20°C to 14°C and after dough kneading from 25°C to 20°C),

without affecting this parameter during the leavening step and it gave the highest bread specificvolume and softness.

218 The highest level of each factor was selected according to the literature as follows: 3%w/flour w

219 EVOO (Pareyt, Finnie, Putseys, & Delcour, 2011), 2%w/flour w NaCl (Silow, Axel, Zannini, & Arendt,

220 2016); 6%w/flour w Suc (Zhou et al., 2014), 100ppm AH₂ (Tebben, Shen, & Li, 2018); 1%w/flour w

221 GG (Tebben, Shen, & Li, 2018); 6% of the total flour added to the bread dough was used to

222 prepare the *GF* (Parenti et al., 2019).

224 3.1.1 Rheological characteristics of old wholewheat flour and the dough samples

The farinographic values showed that the *V1* batch of Verna old wholewheat flour was consistent with the "weak flour" definition: the reference consistency is reached quickly, to then decline considerably, with little or no stability (Zhou et al., 2014). Then, in "weak flours" an improvement in dough performance is usually related to an increase in dough stability (DS) and a reduction in dough weakening (DW). The alveographic values also showed a low value of dough strength (W) and an unbalanced ratio between dough tenacity and extensibility (P/L).

Addition of the improvers affected dough behaviour during the kneading step (Table 2).

Except for the reduction of WA (approx. 2.9%), *NaCl* effect was consistent with the literature (Silow, Axel, Zannini, & Arendt, 2016): it strengthened the dough, increased DDT (approx. 1 min), triplicated DS and greatly reduced DW (approx. 90 DU). Similarly, *GG* significantly extended the DDT (more than 1 min), and increased DS (approx. 1 min). All these effects were consistent with previous studies (Tebben, Shen, & Li, 2018).

- Considering the *Suc* effect, consistent with the literature (Peng, Li, Ding, & Yang, 2017) a decrease
 in WA, an increase in DS (approx. 1 min) and a decrease in DW (approx. 30 BU) were observed.
 Conversely, the decrease in DDT (approx. 1.5 min) was not in accordance with Mariotti &
 Alamprese (2012).
- The addition of *EVOO*, *GF* and AH_2 did not result in an improvement in the farinographic performance. Specifically, *EVOO* decreased WA (2.6%) and slightly reduced DDT, without affecting
- 243 DS or DW. The most common lipids used in breadmaking are shortening and surfactants; hence,

244 while there has been little investigation into the effect of EVOO, very little investigation has been

- performed on the long chain fatty acids EVOO. The decrease in DDT could be the direct
 consequence of the lower amount of water required by dough with added *EVOO*.
- 247 *GF* significantly increased the WA parameter (2.9%), consistently with Parenti et al. (2019), and 248 reduced the DDT (approx. 1 min), whereas no significant effects were observed on DS or DW.
- Finally, AH_2 significantly decreased DDT and DS (approx. 1 min) without affecting the other parameters, worsening the old wholewheat flour's technological properties. These results were in contrast to the positive effect of an oxidant agents on white flours. It is likely that the fibre fraction of old wholewheat flour containing a high quantity of reducing compounds, lowered the effects of oxidant agents (Tebben, Shen, & Li, 2018).

254 Boosting dough rheological parameters thanks to *NaCl, GG* and *Suc* improvers could be seen as a 255 good strategy to facilitate dough workability for the old wholewheat flour breadmaking process.

256

257 3.1.2 Bread quality

Fig. 1 compares the effects of the improvers on bread specific volume. An effect was observed for GF, EVOO, Suc and Ice, while the other improvers did not significantly affect the bread volume. Specifically, a significant increase was obtained with Suc (from 2.93 \pm 0.08 L/kg to 3.15 \pm 0.08 L/kg), EVOO (from 3.00 \pm 0.08 L/kg to 3.09 \pm 0.08 L/kg), and Ice (from 3.00 \pm 0.08 L/kg to 3.09 \pm 0.08 L/kg), while GF decreased the parameter from 3.19 \pm 0.08 L/kg to 2.89 \pm 0.08 L/kg.

263 The greatest rise in bread specific volume was obtained with Suc (7.4%), whereas EVOO and Ice 264 produced a similar increase (3%). The effect of Suc probably promoted the growth of 265 microorganisms yeasts, which led to a better performance during the leavening step (Zhou et al, 266 2014). The literature has reported no effect or a worsening effect on bread volume when 267 vegetable oils are added to bread dough (Pareyt, Finnie, Putseys, & Delcour, 2011). Conversely, 268 Matsakidou, Blekas, & Paraskevopoulou (2010), observed a significant volume increase when 269 EVOO was added to cake dough production. The inclusion of Ice, which lowered the mixing 270 temperature, could have improved the gluten matrix development (Quayson, Marti, Bonomi, 271 Atwell, & Seetharaman, 2016). The negative effect of the GF, inconsistent with the literature 272 (Parenti et al., 2019), could be the result of the different amylose/amylopectin ratio, which is a 273 genetic characteristic of each wheat variety and deeply influences the starch gelatinization process 274 (Goesaert et al., 2005).

275

276 *3.2 The T2 trial*

This study aimed to optimize the bread quality, hence, only the improvers that positively affected
the bread specific volume (i.e. *Suc, EVOO* and *Ice*) were selected for the *T2* trial.

279 The experimental design is shown in Table 3. The chosen maximum level of EVOO (2%) and Ice

280 (20%) was the same as in the *T1* trial, while the chosen maximum level of *Suc* was lowered from

- 281 6% to 4%. This choice was made since the addition of 6% Suc resulted in the excessive browning of
- 282 the bread crust and the perception of too much sweetness during the bread tasting, while 4% Suc
- 283 did not show these drawbacks (data not shown). Moreover, a medium level of Suc (i.e., 2%) and
- 284 Ice (i.e., 10%) was also included.
- 285

286 3.2.1 Rheological characteristics of old wholewheat flour and dough samples

According to the *T1* trial, the farinographic test only considered *Suc* and *EVOO* as factors, while the addition of *Ice* was not tested. The *V2* batch of Verna old wholewheat flour showed rheological properties consistent with the *V1* batch.

All of the farinographic parameters were affected by *Suc*; *EVOO* significantly changed the WA, DS and DW. WA was significantly reduced by both factors (data not shown), in accordance with the *T1* trial.

These results were consistent with the scientific literature; Peng, Li, Ding, & Yang (2017) reported a decrease in the WA parameter when a sugar (i.e. trehalose) was added to the bread dough; lipid improvers (i.e. shortening) decrease the flour components' adsorption capacity by settling around the starch granules and the gluten protein during the hydration phase (Pareyt, Finnie, Putseys, &

297 <mark>Delcour, 2011)</mark>.

The DDT was significantly enhanced by the addition of 4% *Suc* (from 2.8 ± 0.3 min to 3.1 ± 0.3 min): the greater the addition of the improver, the lower the water availability for the development of the gluten network, which requires a longer time (Mariotti & Alamprese, 2012).

301 DS was significantly improved by the highest level of Suc (from 2.1 ± 0.3 min to 2.4 ± 0.3 min) as 302 well as by EVOO (from 2.0 \pm 0.3 min to 2.5 \pm 0.3 min). These results confirmed the effect of Suc 303 already observed in the T1 trial. Furthermore, they revealed that EVOO exercised a comparable 304 role. Finally, both improvers were effective in reducing DW: the highest level of Suc decreased the 305 value from 177 ± 10BU to 166 ± 10BU, in accordance with the literature (Mariotti & Alamprese, 306 2012); a similar decrease was also observed with the inclusion of EVOO (from 177 \pm 10BU to 164 \pm 307 10BU). Hence, a general improvement of the rheological properties can be obtained by 308 supplementing Suc and EVOO (Fig. 2). The positive effects exercised by Suc to the tested old 309 wholewheat flour were consistent with those reported in the literature for conventional flour 310 blends. Considering that there are few descriptions of the effects of EVOO in the literature, the 311 results revealed it to be an improver of particular interest for old wholewheat flour rheological 312 performance.

313

314 3.2.2 Bread quality

315 The experimental data of the bread quality characteristics are shown in Table 4.

316 Considering bread specific volume, the *Suc*EVOO* interaction had a significant effect (Fig. 3).

317 Specifically, the above parameter was optimized by *EVOO*, since regardless of *Suc* levels, the value

increased by approx. 11%. This effect was not consistent with the literature on vegetable oils;
indeed furthermore, the presence of solid ß' crystals in the shortening seemed crucial for the
stabilization of gas bubbles and the increase in bread volume (Pareyt, Finnie, Putseys, & Delcour,
2011). However, the literature also reports that different lipid typologies show very different
effects (Autio & Laurikainen, 1997). Considering the unique chemical composition of *EVOO*,
peculiar different effects may be associated with this improver, as shown by Matsakidou, Blekas,
& Paraskevopoulou (2010).

- The highest level of *Suc* significantly increased bread specific volume (7%). This result was probably linked to the well-known effects of *Suc* on the breadmaking process: (i) an increase in starch gelatinization temperature, resulting in a higher crumb porosity (Psimouli & Oreopoulou, 2012), (ii) higher fermentative activity with a rise in CO₂ production and (iii) a greater increase in the volume of the final product (Zhou et al., 2014).
- The *Suc*EVOO* interaction had a significant effect on the crumb specific volume. In contrast with the bread specific volume, the inclusion of *Suc* as a single improver reduced the parameter. The addition of *EVOO* together with *Suc*, regardless of the level of *Suc*, gave the best result, increasing the crumb specific volume (Fig. 3). Probably, a synergic effect between the two improvers occurred.
- Looking at the moisture parameters, *Suc* and *lce* slightly but significantly increased the crumb moisture (1%), whereas *EVOO* significantly reduced the crust moisture, lowering the value by around 10%.
- 338 All the improvers had a significant effect in the TPA analysis. The hardness was significantly 339 affected by the Suc*EVOO interaction (Fig. 3). The parameter was optimized with both Suc and 340 EVOO, which reduced the value by about 17-20%. Considering cohesiveness, EVOO and Ice had a 341 significant effect. Specifically, EVOO significantly reduced the parameter, while Ice determined a 342 significant increase. Since cohesiveness is inversely related to water content, these results are 343 consistent with the amount of water in the sample; indeed, the addition of EVOO significantly 344 lowered the dough water requirement (WA), while Ice significantly increased crumb moisture. 345 With regard to springiness, the EVOO*Ice interaction had a significant effect: without EVOO 346 addition, the highest level of *Ice* boosted springiness by about 24%. Chewiness was significantly 347 affected by EVOO*Suc and Suc*Ice interactions. The best value, the lowest one according to the 348 literature (Peng, Li, Ding, & Yang, 2017), was achieved by adding EVOO and the highest level of Suc 349 (50.6%). Interestingly, the best improvement in chewiness was achieved with the combination of

Suc and *EVOO*, as already observed on the specific volume parameters (Fig. 3). The *Suc*Ice* interaction showed that the highest level of *Ice* only combined with the highest level of *Suc* increased chewiness (58%), hence reducing the product quality.

Table 5 reports the experimental data on bread image and bread colour analysis. Considering the median pore area, the *EVOO*Ice* and *Suc*Ice* interactions exercised a significant effect. In detail, the highest level of *Ice* significantly reduced the parameter when combined with *EVOO* as compared to the value observed without the addition of *EVOO*. The second interaction showed that the highest level of *Ice* increased the pore area when *Ice* was the sole improver added. The addition of *EVOO* reduced the ratio between pore area/total pore area, revealing a similar effect to that of shortening in decreasing the pore size and probably improving crumb evenness (Pareyt,

360 Finnie, Putseys, & Delcour, 2011).

Concerning colour analysis, all of the bread samples displayed an acceptable both crust and crumb colour. The crumb colour results outlined a significant increase in the *L** parameter, as a consequence of the highest level of *Suc* (4.2%). All parameters related to crust colour were significantly affected by *Suc* and *EVOO*. Specifically, *L** was reduced by *Suc* (6.4%), and increased by *EVOO* (5.2%). Moreover, the *a** parameter was increased by *Suc* (62.3%), while *EVOO* lowered it (19.1%). Finally, the *b** parameter showed a similar trend to *a**: an increase with *Suc* (15.2%) and a reduction with *EVOO* (6.7%).

Hence, this analysis revealed that *Suc* had a significant effect: it enhanced crumb brightness, reduced crust brightness and increased its yellow and red components. However, only the highest level of *Suc* exercised a significant effect on bread colour, probably because the lower level was entirely depleted by yeasts during fermentation, without leaving any reducing sugars in the final dough for non-enzymatic browning reactions. The addition of *EVOO* significantly affected crust colour, too; it increased crust brightness as well as reduced the red and yellow components.

374

375 3.2.3 Optimization of bread ingredients and bread sensory evaluation

The results of the *T2* trial were analysed with the aim of optimizing bread quality. Bread specific volume, crumb specific volume and bread hardness were considered the most representative parameters of product quality. The bread specific volume was maximized with *EVOO*, while for the optimization of the crumb specific volume and hardness, the combination of *Suc* and *EVOO* was required. Indeed, the highest crumb specific volume and the lowest hardness was obtained with 381 *Suc* 2% and *EVOO*. No significant difference was obtained when the *Suc* was increased from 2% 382 and 4%.

Since the aim of the study was to combine the optimization of technological properties with the preservation of the nutritional value of old wholewheat flour, the choice was to minimize the addition of improvers. Hence, *Suc* at 2% and *EVOO* at 3% were chosen for the optimized recipe.

386 The optimized sample was subjected to a qualitative sensory evaluation in comparison to the 387 control sample (i.e. without improvers). Fig. 4 outlines the bread slice, bread crumb and bread 388 crust results. The panel perceived differences for all the bread portions analysed. For the bread 389 slices, the attributes that most discriminated the two samples were acidulous and cereal aromas, 390 both perceived as more intense in the optimized bread. The bread crumb revealed the greatest 391 differences in the following attributes: elasticity, moisture, solubility, brewer's yeast flavour and 392 sourness. All these attributes except elasticity resulted more intense in the optimized sample than 393 in the control. Considering the crust evaluation, the greatest differences were perceived in the 394 friability, saltiness and brewer's yeast flavour, which received a higher score for the optimized 395 bread.

The highest intensity of acidulous aroma, sourness and brewer's yeast flavour could be linked to the inclusion of Suc, which probably increased the yeast growth and metabolic activity (Zhou et al., 2014).

The solubility descriptor of bread crumb was perceived as higher, in accordance with the TPA results, which showed the lowest hardness value. The highest value for the crumb moisture attribute is consistent with the physical parameter, which revealed an increase of 1%. The bread crust of the optimized sample, perceived as more friable, could be the result of its lower moisture content (10%). This moisture difference may also have emphasized the taste of the crust, making it seem saltier: the lower the water content, the higher the solute concentration. Finally, the elasticity value proved to be lower than the control sample, consistently with the TPA analysis.

406

407 **4.** Conclusions

Old wholewheat flours are characterized by an interesting nutritional profile, but they showed a
 very poor technological performance. Hence, the use of old wholewheat flour for the breadmaking
 process requires appropriate techniques, specifically designed for the different characteristics of
 the raw material compared to conventional flours.

By applying a two-step experiment (a screening step and a validation step), we selected the optimal combination of flour improvers to increase the bread quality. *Suc* (2%) and *EVOO* (3%) were identified as the optimized mixture of ingredients to improve bread quality.

The possibility of adopting this optimization method with other old wholewheat flours may be an interesting tool to design old wholewheat flour breadmaking. Indeed, if the breadmaking process is designed to optimize the specific characteristics of bread, an improvement could be obtained in product quality. Thereby, the use of old wholewheat flour in the bakery industry could be increased, promoting the consumption of healthier breads as well as safeguarding *Triticum* genus biodiversity.

421	References
422	
423	AACC Approved Methods of Analysis, 11th Edition - AACC Method 44-15.02. Moisture - Air-Oven
424	Methods.
425	
426	Antony J. (2014). Design of Experiments for Engineers and Scientists, Elsevier.
427	
428	Autio, K., Laurikainen, T., (1997). Relationships between flour/dough microstructure and dough
429	handling and baking properties. Trends in Food Science & Technology, 8, 181–185.
430	
431	Cappelli, A., Cini, E., Guerrini, L., Masella, P., Angeloni, G., Parenti, A., (2018). Predictive models of
432	the rheological properties and optimal water content in doughs: An application to old grain flours
433	with different degrees of refining. Journal of Cereal Science, 83, 229–235.
434	
435	Carrillo-Navas, H., Guadarrama-Lezama, A. Y., Vernon-Carter, E. J., García-Díaz, S., Reyes, I., &
436	Alvarez-Ramírez, J. (2016). Effect of gelatinized flour fraction on thermal and rheological
437	properties of wheat-based dough and bread. <i>Journal of Food Science and Technology</i> , 53 <mark>(11)</mark> ,
438	3996–4006.
439	
440	Cauvain, S., 2015. Technology of Breadmaking. Springer Sciences, New York.
441	
442	CIE, Commission Internationale de l'Eclairage, Paris, (1978). Recommendations on Uniform Colour
443	Spaces-colour Difference Equations, Psychometric Colour Terms. Supplement No. 2 to CIE
444	Publication No. 15 (E-1.3.1) 1971/(TC-1.3).
445	
446	Dinelli, G., Segura-carretero, A., Di, R., Marotti, I., Arráez-román, D., Benedettelli, S., Fernadez-
447	gutierrez, A. (2011). Profiles of phenolic compounds in modern and old common wheat varieties
448	determined by liquid chromatography coupled with time-of-flight mass spectrometry. Journal of
449	Chromatography A, 1218, 7670–7681.

451	Dinnella, C., Borgogno, M., Picchi, M. & Monteleone, E. (2010). Descrizione del profilo sensoriale
452	durante la conservazione di pane non salato di farina semi-integrale da antiche varietà di
453	frumento. <i>Tecnica Molitoria</i> , 67, 722–735.
454	
455	Dinu, M., Whittaker, A., Pagliai, G., Benedettelli, S., Sofi, F., (2018). Old wheat species and human
456	health: biochemical and clinical implications. Journal of Nutritional Biochemistry, 52, 1–9.
457	
458	Fabro, Maria, G., Fadda, C., Marceddu, S., Conte, P., Del, A., & Piga, A. (2020). Food Hydrocolloids
459	Improving the quality of dough obtained with old durum wheat using hydrocolloids. <i>Food</i>
460	Hydrocolloids, 101, 105467.
461	
462	Fu, Z. qiang, Che, L. ming, Li, D., Wang, L. jun, & Adhikari, B. (2016). Effect of partially gelatinized
463	corn starch on the rheological properties of wheat dough. LWT - Food Science and Technology, 66,
464	324–331.
465	
466	Goesaert, H., Brijs, K., Veraverbeke, W. S., Courtin, C. M., Gebruers, K., & Delcour, J. A. (2005).
467	Wheat flour constituents: How they impact bread quality, and how to impact their functionality.
468	Trends in Food Science and Technology, 16, 12–30.
469	
470	Gómez, M., Ronda, F., Blanco, C. A., Caballero, P. A., & Apesteguía, A. (2003). Effect of dietary fibre
471	on dough rheology and bread quality. European Food Research and Technology, 216, 51–56.
472	
473	Gonzales-Barron, U., & Butler, F. (2006). A comparison of seven thresholding techniques with the
474	k-means clustering algorithm for measurement of bread-crumb features by digital image analysis.
475	Journal of Food Engineering, 74, 268–278.
476	
477	Gotti, R., Amadesi, E., Fiori, J., Bosi, S., Bregola, V., Marotti, I., & Dinelli, G. (2018). Differentiation
478	of modern and ancient varieties of common wheat by quantitative capillary electrophoretic profile
479	of phenolic acids. <i>Journal of Chromatography</i> A, 1532, 208–215.
480	
481	Guerrini, L., Parenti, O., Angeloni, G., & Zanoni, B. (2019). The bread making process of old wheat:
482	A semi-structured interview to bakers. Journal of Cereal Science, 87, 9–17. ??? dove si cita?

181	Kim S Kwak H S & Jeong V (2017) Effect of Water Roux Starter (Tangzhong) on Texture and
405	Concurrent Assentance of Disc Dan Bread, Journal of Taxture Studies, 49, 20, 46
485	Consumer Acceptance of Rice Pan Bread. Journal of Texture Studies, 48, 59–46.
487	Leoncini, E., Prata, C., Malaguti, M., Marotti, I., Segura-Carretero, A., Catizone, P., Hrelia, S.
488	(2012). Phytochemical Profile and Nutraceutical Value of Old and Modern Common Wheat
489	Cultivars. PLoS ONE, 7.
490	
491	Mariotti, M., & Alamprese, C. (2012). About the use of different sweeteners in baked goods.
492	Influence on the mechanical and rheological properties of the doughs. LWT - Food Science and
493	Technology, 48, 9–15.
494	
495	Matsakidou, A., Blekas, G., & Paraskevopoulou, A. (2010). Aroma and physical characteristics of
496	cakes prepared by replacing margarine with extra virgin olive oil. LWT - Food Science and
497	Technology, 43, 949–957.
498	
499	Mefleh, M., Conte, P., Fadda, C., & Giunta, F. (2019). From ancient to old and modern durum
499 500	Mefleh, M., Conte, P., Fadda, C., & Giunta, F. (2019). From ancient to old and modern durum wheat varieties: interaction among cultivar traits, management, and technological quality. <i>Journal</i>
499 500 501	Mefleh, M., Conte, P., Fadda, C., & Giunta, F. (2019). From ancient to old and modern durum wheat varieties: interaction among cultivar traits, management, and technological quality. <i>Journal of Science and Agriculture</i> .
499 500 501 502	Mefleh, M., Conte, P., Fadda, C., & Giunta, F. (2019). From ancient to old and modern durum wheat varieties: interaction among cultivar traits, management, and technological quality. <i>Journal of Science and Agriculture</i> .
499 500 501 502 503	Mefleh, M., Conte, P., Fadda, C., & Giunta, F. (2019). From ancient to old and modern durum wheat varieties: interaction among cultivar traits, management, and technological quality. <i>Journal</i> <i>of Science and Agriculture</i> . Parenti, O., Guerrini, L., Canuti, V., Angeloni, G., Masella, P., & Zanoni, B. (2019). The effect of the
499 500 501 502 503 504	Mefleh, M., Conte, P., Fadda, C., & Giunta, F. (2019). From ancient to old and modern durum wheat varieties: interaction among cultivar traits, management, and technological quality. <i>Journal</i> <i>of Science and Agriculture</i> . Parenti, O., Guerrini, L., Canuti, V., Angeloni, G., Masella, P., & Zanoni, B. (2019). The effect of the addition of gelatinized flour on dough rheology and quality of bread made from brown wheat
499 500 501 502 503 504 505	 Mefleh, M., Conte, P., Fadda, C., & Giunta, F. (2019). From ancient to old and modern durum wheat varieties: interaction among cultivar traits, management, and technological quality. <i>Journal of Science and Agriculture</i>. Parenti, O., Guerrini, L., Canuti, V., Angeloni, G., Masella, P., & Zanoni, B. (2019). The effect of the addition of gelatinized flour on dough rheology and quality of bread made from brown wheat flour. <i>LWT - Food Science and Technology</i>, 106, 240–246.
499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506	 Mefleh, M., Conte, P., Fadda, C., & Giunta, F. (2019). From ancient to old and modern durum wheat varieties: interaction among cultivar traits, management, and technological quality. <i>Journal of Science and Agriculture</i>. Parenti, O., Guerrini, L., Canuti, V., Angeloni, G., Masella, P., & Zanoni, B. (2019). The effect of the addition of gelatinized flour on dough rheology and quality of bread made from brown wheat flour. <i>LWT - Food Science and Technology</i>, 106, 240–246.
499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507	 Mefleh, M., Conte, P., Fadda, C., & Giunta, F. (2019). From ancient to old and modern durum wheat varieties: interaction among cultivar traits, management, and technological quality. <i>Journal of Science and Agriculture</i>. Parenti, O., Guerrini, L., Canuti, V., Angeloni, G., Masella, P., & Zanoni, B. (2019). The effect of the addition of gelatinized flour on dough rheology and quality of bread made from brown wheat flour. <i>LWT - Food Science and Technology</i>, 106, 240–246. Pareyt, B., Finnie, S. M., Putseys, J. A., & Delcour, J. A. (2011). Lipids in bread making: Sources,
499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508	 Mefleh, M., Conte, P., Fadda, C., & Giunta, F. (2019). From ancient to old and modern durum wheat varieties: interaction among cultivar traits, management, and technological quality. <i>Journal of Science and Agriculture</i>. Parenti, O., Guerrini, L., Canuti, V., Angeloni, G., Masella, P., & Zanoni, B. (2019). The effect of the addition of gelatinized flour on dough rheology and quality of bread made from brown wheat flour. <i>LWT - Food Science and Technology</i>, 106, 240–246. Pareyt, B., Finnie, S. M., Putseys, J. A., & Delcour, J. A. (2011). Lipids in bread making: Sources, interactions, and impact on bread quality. <i>Journal of Cereal Science</i>, 54, 266–279.
499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509	 Mefleh, M., Conte, P., Fadda, C., & Giunta, F. (2019). From ancient to old and modern durum wheat varieties: interaction among cultivar traits, management, and technological quality. <i>Journal of Science and Agriculture</i>. Parenti, O., Guerrini, L., Canuti, V., Angeloni, G., Masella, P., & Zanoni, B. (2019). The effect of the addition of gelatinized flour on dough rheology and quality of bread made from brown wheat flour. <i>LWT - Food Science and Technology</i>, 106, 240–246. Pareyt, B., Finnie, S. M., Putseys, J. A., & Delcour, J. A. (2011). Lipids in bread making: Sources, interactions, and impact on bread quality. <i>Journal of Cereal Science</i>, 54, 266–279.
499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510	 Mefleh, M., Conte, P., Fadda, C., & Giunta, F. (2019). From ancient to old and modern durum wheat varieties: interaction among cultivar traits, management, and technological quality. <i>Journal of Science and Agriculture</i>. Parenti, O., Guerrini, L., Canuti, V., Angeloni, G., Masella, P., & Zanoni, B. (2019). The effect of the addition of gelatinized flour on dough rheology and quality of bread made from brown wheat flour. <i>LWT - Food Science and Technology</i>, 106, 240–246. Pareyt, B., Finnie, S. M., Putseys, J. A., & Delcour, J. A. (2011). Lipids in bread making: Sources, interactions, and impact on bread quality. <i>Journal of Cereal Science</i>, 54, 266–279. Peng, B., Li, Y., Ding, S., & Yang, J. (2017). Water mobility in wheat flour dough and bread affected
499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511	 Mefleh, M., Conte, P., Fadda, C., & Giunta, F. (2019). From ancient to old and modern durum wheat varieties: interaction among cultivar traits, management, and technological quality. <i>Journal of Science and Agriculture</i>. Parenti, O., Guerrini, L., Canuti, V., Angeloni, G., Masella, P., & Zanoni, B. (2019). The effect of the addition of gelatinized flour on dough rheology and quality of bread made from brown wheat flour. <i>LWT - Food Science and Technology</i>, 106, 240–246. Pareyt, B., Finnie, S. M., Putseys, J. A., & Delcour, J. A. (2011). Lipids in bread making: Sources, interactions, and impact on bread quality. <i>Journal of Cereal Science</i>, 54, 266–279. Peng, B., Li, Y., Ding, S., & Yang, J. (2017). Water mobility in wheat flour dough and bread affected by trehalose. <i>Food Chemistry</i>, 233, 369–377.
 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 	 Mefleh, M., Conte, P., Fadda, C., & Giunta, F. (2019). From ancient to old and modern durum wheat varieties: interaction among cultivar traits, management, and technological quality. <i>Journal of Science and Agriculture</i>. Parenti, O., Guerrini, L., Canuti, V., Angeloni, G., Masella, P., & Zanoni, B. (2019). The effect of the addition of gelatinized flour on dough rheology and quality of bread made from brown wheat flour. <i>LWT - Food Science and Technology</i>, 106, 240–246. Pareyt, B., Finnie, S. M., Putseys, J. A., & Delcour, J. A. (2011). Lipids in bread making: Sources, interactions, and impact on bread quality. <i>Journal of Cereal Science</i>, 54, 266–279. Peng, B., Li, Y., Ding, S., & Yang, J. (2017). Water mobility in wheat flour dough and bread affected by trehalose. <i>Food Chemistry</i>, 233, 369–377.

516	Quayson E.T., Marti A., † Bonomi F., Atwell W., & Seetharaman K. (2016). Structural Modification
517	of Gluten Proteins in Strong and Weak Wheat Dough as Affected by Mixing Temperature. Cereal
518	Chemistry, 93, 189–195.

Sereni, A., Cesari, F., Gori, A. M., Maggini, N., Casini, A., Sofi, F., ... Maggini, N. (2017).
 Cardiovascular benefits from ancient grain bread consumption: findings from a double-blinded
 randomized crossover intervention trial. *International Journal of Food Sciences and Nutrition*, 68,

- 523 <mark>97–103.</mark>
- 524

525 Silow, C., Axel, C., Zannini, E., & Arendt, E. K. (2016). Current status of salt reduction in bread and 526 bakery products – A review. *Journal of Cereal Science*, 72, 135–145.

527

Sofi, F., Ghiselli, L., Cesari, F., Gori, A. M., Mannini, L., Casini, A., ... Benedettelli, S. (2010). Effects of
Short-Term Consumption of Bread Obtained by an Old Italian Grain Variety on Lipid, Inflammatory,
and Hemorheological Variables: An Intervention Study. *Journal of Medicinal Food*, 13, 615–620.

531

Tebben, L., Shen, Y., & Li, Y. (2018). Improvers and functional ingredients in whole wheat bread: A
review of their effects on dough properties and bread quality. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 81, 10–24.

535

Ye, E., Chacko, S., Chou, E., Kugizaki, M., & Liu, S. (2012). Greater whole-grain intake is associated
with lower risk of type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and weight gain. *Journal of Nutrition*,
142, 1304–1313.

539

540 Zhou, "W"., Therdthai, N., & Hui, Y. H. (2014). *Bakery products science and technology*, Blackwell.

- 541
- 542

543 FIGURE CAPTIONS

544

FIGURE 1. Bar charts of T1 factors affecting bread specific volume (L/kg) (a). Line charts show the effect of addition of *Suc* (b), *EVOO* (c), and *Ice* (d) on bread specific volume (L/kg). Dashed line represents mean value of bread specific volume. The x-axis reports tested levels of each factor (*Suc* -1 = 0%, +1 = 6% w/flour w; *EVOO* -1 = 0%, +1 = 3% w/flour w; *Ice* -1 = 0%, +1 = 20% w/water w).

550

551 FIGURE 2. Dough Stability (DS) and Dough Weakening (DW) farinographic parameters as affected 552 by the addition of *Suc* (0%, 2%, 4% w/flour w) in a and c, and *EVOO* (0%, 3% w/flour w) in b and d.

553

554 FIGURE 3. Effects of *Suc*EVOO* interaction on: a) bread specific volume (L/kg), b) crumb specific

volume (L/kg), c) hardness (N) and d) chewiness (Nmm).

556

557 FIGURE 4. Sensory evaluation of bread slices (a), bread crumb (b) and bread crust (c). Sectors with 558 different colours correspond to different classes of descriptors: aroma (white) and appearance 559 (light grey) descriptors for bread slices; touch (light grey), taste (grey) and flavour (white) 560 descriptors for bread crumb and crust. Reported values are medians of the raw data. Table 1

Table 1. *T1* trial settings; gelatinized flour = *GF*; extra virgin olive oil = *EVOO*, sucrose = *Suc*, ascorbic acid = AH_2 , guar gum = *GG*. The symbol "-" represents the lowest level of each factor (i.e. 0%), the symbol "+" represents the highest level of each factor, which is shown in the table.

Samples	GF (6%, w/ flour w)	<i>EVOO</i> (3%, w/ flour w)	<i>Suc</i> (6%, w/ flour w)	<i>AH</i> ₂ (100 ppm)	GG (1%, w/ flour w)	<i>NaCl</i> (2%, w/ flour w)	<i>lce</i> (20%, w/ water w)
1	+	+	+	-	-	_	+
2	-	+	+	+	+	-	_
3	+	_	+	+	_	+	_
4	-	-	+	-	+	+	+
5	+	+	-	-	+	+	-
6	-	+	-	+	-	+	+
7	+	_	_	+	+	_	+
8	_	_	_	_	_	_	_

FACTOR	WA (%)	P WA	DDT (MIN)	P DDT	DS (MIN)	P DS	DW (BU)	P DW
GF +	56.81 ± 1.03^{a}	*	2.50 ± 0.01^{a}	* * *	4.37 ± 0.41^{a}	n.s.	118 ± 12 ^a	n.s.
GF -	55.19 ± 1.03 ^b		3.37 ± 0.01 ^b		4.44 ± 0.41^{a}		101 ± 12 ^a	
EVOO +	55.25 ± 1.03 ^a	*	2.87 ± 0.01^{a}	***	4.31 ± 0.41^{a}	n.s.	102 ± 12 ^a	n.s.
EVOO -	56.75 ± 1.03 ^b		3.00 ± 0.01^{b}		4.50 ± 0.41^{a}		117 ± 12 ^a	
Suc +	54.94 ± 1.03^{a}	**	2.25 ± 0.01^{a}	***	4.87 ± 0.41^{a}	**	94 ± 12 ^a	**
Suc -	57.06 ± 1.03 ^b		3.62 ± 0.01 ^b		3.94 ± 0.41 ^b		126 ± 12 ^b	
AH₂ +	55.56 ± 1.03^{a}	n.s.	2.87 ± 0.01 ^a	***	3.94 ± 0.41 ^a	**	116 ± 12 ^a	n.s.
AH2 -	56.44 ± 1.03^{a}		3.00 ± 0.01^{b}		4.87 ± 0.41 ^b		103 ± 12 ^a	
GG +	56.86 ± 1.03^{a}	*	3.50 ± 0.01^{a}	***	4.87 ± 0.41^{a}	**	107 ± 12 ^a	n.s.
GG -	55.37 ± 1.03 ^b		2.37 ± 0.01 ^b		3.94 ± 0.41 ^b		112 ± 12 ^a	
NaCl +	55.19 ± 1.03^{a}	*	3.37 ± 0.01 ^a	***	6.69 ± 0.41^{a}	***	63 ± 12 ^a	***
NaCl -	56.81 ± 1.03^{b}		2.50 ± 0.01^{b}		2.12 ± 0.41^{b}		156 ± 12 ^b	

Table 2. Farinographic parameters of *T1* trial dough samples with addition "+" or not "-" of the seven improvers.

Selected factors: gelatinized flour = GF; extra virgin olive oil = EVOO, sucrose = Suc, ascorbic acid = AH_2 , guar gum = GG and salt = NaCl. Experimental data are expressed as mean ± standard error. *, ** and *** indicate significant differences at p<0.05, p<0.01 and p<0.001, respectively. "n.s." indicates no significant difference at p<0.05. Means in column with different superscripts are significantly different at p<0.05. Specifically, "a" and "b" refer to main effect of each factor.

Table 3. *T2* trial settings showing all 18 variable combinations. The variables tested in *T2* were: sucrose = *Suc* (3 levels: 0%, 2% and 4%, w/flour w); extra virgin olive oil = *EVOO* (2 levels: 0% and 3%, w/flour w) and *Ice* (3 levels: 0%, 10% and 20%, w/water w).

Sample	<i>Suc</i> (w/flour w)	EVOO (w/flour w)	Ice (w/water w)
1	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	3%	0%
3	0%	0%	10%
4	0%	3%	10%
5	0%	0%	20%
6	0%	3%	20%
7	2%	0%	0%
8	2%	3%	0%
9	2%	0%	10%
10	2%	3%	10%
11	2%	0%	20%
12	2%	3%	20%
13	4%	0%	0%
14	4%	3%	0%
15	4%	0%	10%
16	4%	3%	10%
17	4%	0%	20%
18	4%	3%	20%

Table 4. *T2* trials bread quality evaluation.

Sample	Suc	EVOO	Ice	Bread specific	Crumb specific	Crumb/dough	Crust/dough	Hardness (N)	Cohesiveness	Springiness (mm)	Chewiness (N mm)
	(w/flour w)	(w/flour w)	(w/water w)	volume (L/kg)	volume (L/kg)	moisture	moisture				ah.d
1	0%	0%	0%	3.184 ± 0.097^{ax}	3.322 ± 0.252	96.9 ± 0.8^{a}	$67.4 \pm 4.4^{\circ}$	3.69 ± 0.73^{ax}	$0.235 \pm 0.058^{*}$	0.764 ± 0.066^{x}	0.638 ± 0.256^{abx}
2	0%	3%	0%	3.188 ± 0.097 ^{ay}	2.968 ± 0.252	96.9 ± 0.8^{ai}	55.8 ± 4.4 ^v	5.24 ± 0.73^{ay}	0.185 ± 0.058 ^{vi}	0.679 ± 0.066 ^{yi}	0.661 ± 0.256^{abyi}
3	0%	0%	10%	3.172 ± 0.097 ^{ax}	3.562 ± 0.252	97.6 ± 0.8^{aj}	$66.3 \pm 4.4^{\times}$	3.73 ± 0.73^{ax}	0.221 ± 0.058 ^{xi}	0.725 ± 0.066 ^{xij}	0.594 ± 0.256 ^{abxij}
4	0%	3%	10%	3.133 ± 0.097 ^{ay}	3.023 ± 0.252	97.4 ± 0.8^{aj}	$62.0 \pm 4.4^{\circ}$	4.49 ± 0.73^{ay}	0.207 ± 0.058 ^{yi}	0.743 ± 0.066 ^{yij}	0.776 ± 0.256^{abyij}
5	0%	0%	20%	3.238 ± 0.097 ^{ax}	3.325 ± 0.252	97.5 ± 0.8 ^{ak}	$70.5 \pm 4.4^{\times}$	4.36 ± 0.73^{ax}	0.271 ± 0.058 ^{×j}	0.826 ± 0.066 ^{×j}	0.981 ± 0.256^{abxj}
6	0%	3%	20%	3.248 ± 0.097 ^{ay}	3.001 ± 0.252	97.4 ± 0.8^{ak}	59.5 ± 4.4 ^v	4.15 ± 0.73^{ay}	0.249 ± 0.058 ^{yj}	0.782 ± 0.066 ^{yj}	0.812 ± 0.256^{abyj}
7	2%	0%	0%	2.850 ± 0.097 ^{bx}	2.856 ± 0.252	97.3 ± 0.8^{abi}	$66.6 \pm 4.4^{\times}$	5.51 ± 0.73^{ax}	0.239 ± 0.058 ^{×i}	0.728 ± 0.066 ^{×i}	0.950 ± 0.256 ^{axi}
8	2%	3%	0%	3.215 ± 0.097 ^{by}	3.196 ± 0.252	98.2 ± 0.8^{abi}	61.6 ± 4.4^{9}	2.92 ± 0.73^{ay}	0.204 ± 0.058 ^{vi}	0.739 ± 0.066 ^{yi}	0.439 ± 0.256 ^{ayi}
9	2%	0%	10%	2.888 ± 0.097^{bx}	3.093 ± 0.252	98.6 ± 0.8^{abj}	68.5 ± 4.4^{x}	5.26 ± 0.73^{ax}	0.300 ± 0.058^{xi}	0.822 ± 0.066 ^{xij}	1.346 ± 0.256^{axij}
10	2%	3%	10%	3.149 ± 0.097 ^{by}	3.176 ± 0.252	98.5 ± 0.8^{abj}	$66.2 \pm 4.4^{\circ}$	3.16 ± 0.73^{ay}	$0.212 \pm 0.058^{\rm yi}$	0.739 ± 0.066 ^{yij}	0.491 ± 0.256^{ayij}
11	2%	0%	20%	2.987 ± 0.097 ^{bx}	2.926 ± 0.252	98.8 ± 0.8^{abk}	71.4 ± 4.4^{x}	3.96 ± 0.73^{ax}	0.381 ± 0.058^{xj}	0.896 ± 0.066 ^{×j}	1.361 ± 0.256^{axj}
12	2%	3%	20%	3.048 ± 0.097 ^{by}	3.225 ± 0.252	98.2 ± 0.8^{abk}	$62.2 \pm 4.4^{\circ}$	3.68 ± 0.73^{ay}	0.182 ± 0.058^{yj}	0.648 ± 0.066 ^{yj}	0.440 ± 0.256^{ayj}
13	4%	0%	0%	3.050 ± 0.097^{cx}	3.148 ± 0.252	98.1 ± 0.8^{bi}	67.8 ± 4.4^{x}	3.65 ± 0.73^{bx}	0.252 ± 0.058^{xi}	0.769 ± 0.066 ^{xi}	0.653 ± 0.256 ^{bxi}
14	4%	3%	0%	3.185 ± 0.097 ^{cy}	3.055 ± 0.252	98.0 ± 0.8^{bi}	64.5 ± 4.4 ^v	3.16 ± 0.73 ^{by}	0.144 ± 0.058 ^{yi}	0.655 ± 0.066 ^{yi}	0.279 ± 0.256 ^{byi}
15	4%	0%	10%	3.045 ± 0.097^{cx}	3.021 ± 0.252	98.9 ± 0.8^{bj}	72.2 ± 4.4^{x}	4.07 ± 0.73^{bx}	0.232 ± 0.058^{xi}	0.793 ± 0.066 ^{xij}	0.759 ± 0.256 ^{bxij}
16	4%	3%	10%	3.207 ± 0.097 ^{cy}	3.280 ± 0.252	98.5 ± 0.8^{bj}	$61.1 \pm 4.4^{\circ}$	2.42 ± 0.73 ^{by}	0.198 ± 0.058 ^{yi}	0.754 ± 0.066 ^{yij}	0.355 ± 0.256 ^{byij}
17	4%	0%	20%	3.093 ± 0.097^{cx}	2.968 ± 0.252	98.9 ± 0.8^{bk}	$69.6 \pm 4.4^{\times}$	3.87 ± 0.73^{bx}	0.336 ± 0.058^{xj}	0.835 ± 0.066 ^{×j}	1.086 ± 0.256^{bxj}
18	4%	3%	20%	3.183 ± 0.097 ^{су}	3.231 ± 0.252	98.2 ± 0.8^{bk}	$61.5 \pm 4.4^{\circ}$	3.41 ± 0.73 ^{by}	0.195 ± 0.058^{yj}	0.689 ± 0.066 ^{yj}	0.446 ± 0.256 ^{byj}
p	Suc (a,b,c)			***	n.s.	***	n.s.	***	n.s.	n.s.	**
р	EVOO (x,y)			***	n.s.	n.s.	***	***	***	***	***
p	lce (i,j,k)			n.s.	n.s.	*	n.s.	n.s.	**	*	**
р	Suc*EVOO			***	***	n.s.	n.s.	***	n.s.	n.s.	***
р	Suc*Ice			n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
p	EVOO*Ice			n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	*	n.s.
p	EVOO*Suc*Ic	е		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	**?	n.s.	*?	n.s.

Data are expressed as mean ± standard error. Suc = sucrose, EVOO = extra virgin olive oil and Ice = ice. p Suc, p EVOO, p Ice, p Suc*EVOO, p Suc*Ice, p EVOO*Ice and p EVOO*Suc*Ice refer to main effects of Suc (p Suc), EVOO (p EVOO) and Ice (p Ice) factors and their two-factor (p Suc*EVOO, p Suc*Ice, p EVOO*Ice) and three-factor (p EVOO*Suc*Ice) interactions. *, ** and *** indicate significant differences at p<0.05, p<0.01 and p<0.001, respectively; "n.s." indicates no significant difference at p<0.05. Means in a column with different superscripts are significantly different (p<0.05). Specifically, "a", "b" and "c" refer to main effect of Suc, "x" and "y" refer to main effect of EVOO and "i", "j" and "k" refer to main effect of Ice.

Table 5. *T2* trials bread quality evaluation.

Sample	Suc	EVOO	lce	Pore area	Pore area/area tot		Crumb			Crust	
	(w/flour w)	(w/flour w)	(w/water w)	0.5 (mm²)	(%)	L*	a*	b*	L*	a*	b*
1	0%	0%	0%	2.71 ± 0.35^{x}	29.55 ± 2.88 [×]	60.00 ± 2.97^{a}	4.75 ± 0.96	15.50 ± 3.79	52.00 ± 2.29^{ax}	9.75 ± 1.80^{ax}	30.25 ± 3.10^{ax}
2	0%	3%	0%	2.88 ± 0.35 ⁹	27.33 ± 2.88 ^y	63.75 ± 2.97 ^ª	4.00 ± 0.96	14.75 ± 3.79	55.00 ± 2.29 ^{ay}	6.50 ± 1.80^{ay}	27.50 ± 3.10^{ay}
3	0%	0%	10%	$3.05 \pm 0.35^{*}$	29.55 ± 2.88 [×]	59.75 ± 2.97^{a}	3.50 ± 0.96	12.75 ± 3.79	50.25 ± 2.29 ^{ax}	9.00 ± 1.80^{ax}	29.50 ± 3.10^{ax}
4	0%	3%	10%	2.91 ± 0.35 ^y	29.74 ± 2.88 ^v	59.75 ± 2.97^{a}	4.00 ± 0.96	16.25 ± 3.79	55.50 ± 2.29 ^{ay}	7.00 ± 1.80^{ay}	27.75 ± 3.10 ^{ay}
5	0%	0%	20%	$3.76 \pm 0.35^{*}$	$28.39 \pm 2.88^{\circ}$	58.13 ± 2.97^{a}	4.13 ± 0.96	13.50 ± 3.79	51.75 ± 2.29 ^{ax}	8.63 ± 1.80^{ax}	29.13 ± 3.10^{ax}
6	0%	3%	20%	2.98 ± 0.35 ⁹	26.23 ± 2.88 ^y	64.00 ± 2.97^{a}	3.25 ± 0.96	13.50 ± 3.79	56.25 ± 2.29 ^{ay}	5.50 ± 1.80^{ay}	27.25 ± 3.10^{ay}
7	2%	0%	0%	$3.04 \pm 0.35^{*}$	$28.28 \pm 2.88^{\circ}$	63.50 ± 2.97 ^{ab}	3.50 ± 0.96	14.25 ± 3.79	50.50 ± 2.29 ^{ax}	9.50 ± 1.80^{ax}	31.00 ± 3.10^{ax}
8	2%	3%	0%	2.98 ± 0.35 ⁹	26.60 ± 2.88 ⁹	62.25 ± 2.97 ^{ab}	3.50 ± 0.96	13.25 ± 3.79	54.40 ± 2.29 ^{ay}	7.00 ± 1.80^{ay}	27.00 ± 3.10^{ay}
9	2%	0%	10%	$2.95 \pm 0.35^{*}$	$28.36 \pm 2.88^{\circ}$	61.75 ± 2.97 ^{ab}	4.00 ± 0.96	14.50 ± 3.79	51.50 ± 2.29 ^{ax}	9.75 ± 1.80^{ax}	31.75 ± 3.10 ^{ax}
10	2%	3%	10%	2.80 ± 0.35 ^y	24.91 ± 2.88 ^v	61.75 ± 2.97 ^{ab}	3.75 ± 0.96	16.75 ± 3.79	52.25 ± 2.29 ^{ay}	7.75 ± 1.80^{ay}	27.25 ± 3.10^{ay}
11	2%	0%	20%	$3.20 \pm 0.35^{\circ}$	$30.18 \pm 2.88^{\circ}$	61.75 ± 2.97 ^{ab}	3.25 ± 0.96	14.25 ± 3.79	52.00 ± 2.29^{ax}	9.50 ± 1.80^{ax}	30.50 ± 3.10^{ax}
12	2%	3%	20%	2.60 ± 0.35 ⁹	26.97 ± 2.88 ^v	62.50 ± 2.97 ^{ab}	3.50 ± 0.96	15.00 ± 3.79	53.75 ± 2.29 ^{ay}	8.75 ± 1.80 ^{ay}	32.00 ± 3.10^{ay}
13	4%	0%	0%	$3.15 \pm 0.35^{\circ}$	$29.03 \pm 2.88^{\circ}$	65.50 ± 2.97 ^b	4.00 ± 0.96	15.25 ± 3.79	50.75 ± 2.29 ^{bx}	13.00 ± 1.80^{bx}	34.00 ± 3.10^{bx}
14	4%	3%	0%	2.91 ± 0.35 ^y	28.77 ± 2.88 ^y	63.75 ± 2.97 ^b	3.50 ± 0.96	17.00 ± 3.79	52.00 ± 2.29 ^{by}	9.75 ± 1.80 ^{by}	29.00 ± 3.10 ^{by}
15	4%	0%	10%	$3.09 \pm 0.35^{*}$	$30.96 \pm 2.88^{\circ}$	61.25 ± 2.97^{b}	3.75 ± 0.96	16.25 ± 3.79	48.00 ± 2.29^{bx}	14.25 ± 1.80^{bx}	33.50 ± 3.10^{bx}
16	4%	3%	10%	3.19 ± 0.35 ^y	27.74 ± 2.88 ^y	62.75 ± 2.97 ^b	3.50 ± 0.96	14.25 ± 3.79	50.25 ± 2.29 ^{by}	12.75 ± 1.80 ^{by}	33.75 ± 3.10 ^{by}
17	4%	0%	20%	$2.95 \pm 0.35^{*}$	$30.93 \pm 2.88^{\circ}$	64.25 ± 2.97^{b}	3.75 ± 0.96	13.50 ± 3.79	49.25 ± 2.29^{bx}	12.75 ± 1.80^{bx}	34.00 ± 3.10^{bx}
18	4%	3%	20%	2.74 ± 0.35 ^v	28.68 ± 2.88 ^y	63.25 ± 2.97 ^b	3.75 ± 0.96	16.50 ± 3.79	50.00 ± 2.29 ^{by}	12.75 ± 1.80 ^{by}	33.25 ± 3.10 ^{by}
р	Suc (a,b,c)			n.s.	n.s.	*	n.s.	n.s.	***	***.	***
р	EVOO (x,y)			*	**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	***	***	**
р	lce (i,j,k)			n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
р	Suc*EVOO			n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
р	Suc*Ice			*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
р	EVOO*Ice			*	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
р	EVOO*Suc*Ic	е		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Data are expressed as mean ± standard error. Suc = sucrose, EVOO = extra virgin olive oil and Ice = Ice. p Suc, p EVOO and p Ice refer to the main effects of these factors; p Suc*EVOO, p Suc*Ice and p EVOO*Ice refer to the effect of the two-factor interactions; p EVOO*Suc*Ice Suc refers to three-factor interaction. *, ** and *** indicate significant differences at p<0.05, p<0.01 and p<0.001, respectively; "n.s." indicates no significant difference at p<0.05. Means in a column with different superscripts are significantly different (p<0.05). Specifically, "a", "b" and "c" refer to main effect of Suc, "x" and "y" refer to main effect of EVOO and "i", "j" and "k" refer to main effect of Ice.



Figure 1.



Figure 2.







Supplementary Material Click here to download Supplementary Material: Table S1.docx

Conflict of Interest and Authorship Conformation Form

Lorenzo Guerrini University of University of Florence Piazzale delle Cascine 16, 50144, Florence, Italy +39 349 8847218 lorenzo.guerrini@unifi.it

October 29, 2019

X All authors have participated in (a) conception and design, or analysis and interpretation of the data; (b) drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and (c) approval of the final version.

X This manuscript has not been submitted to, nor is under review at, another journal or other publishing venue.

X The authors have no affiliation with any organization with a direct or indirect financial interest in the subject matter discussed in the manuscript

Author's name	Affiliation
Ottavia Parenti	University of Florence
Lorenzo Guerrini	University of Florence
Benedetta Cavallini	University of Florence
Fabio Baldi	University of Florence
Bruno Zanoni	University of Florence

Author contributions

Use this form to specify the contribution of each author of your manuscript. A distinction is made between five types of contributions: Conceived and designed the analysis; Collected the data; Contributed data or analysis tools; Performed the analysis; Wrote the paper.

For each author of your manuscript, please indicate the types of contributions the author has made. An author may have made more than one type of contribution. Optionally, for each contribution type, you may specify the contribution of an author in more detail by providing a one-sentence statement in which the contribution is summarized. In the case of an author who contributed to performing the analysis, the author's contribution for instance could be specified in more detail as 'Performed the computer simulations', 'Performed the statistical analysis', or 'Performed the text mining analysis'.

If an author has made a contribution that is not covered by the five pre-defined contribution types, then please choose 'Other contribution' and provide a one-sentence statement summarizing the author's contribution.

Manuscript title: Breadmaking with an old wholewheat flour:optimization of ingredients to improve bread quality

Author 1: Ottavia Parenti

- Conceived and designed the analysis Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
 Collected the data Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
 Contributed data or analysis tools
 - Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
- Performed the analysis
 Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
- Wrote the paper Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
- Other contribution
 Specify contribution in more detail (required; no more than one sentence)

Author 2: Lorenzo Guerrini

\boxtimes	Conceived and designed the analysis Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
	Collected the data Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
\boxtimes	Contributed data or analysis tools Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
	Performed the analysis Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
\boxtimes	Wrote the paper Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
	Other contribution Specify contribution in more detail (required; no more than one sentence)

Author 3: Benedetta Cavallini

- Conceived and designed the analysis
 Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
 Collected the data
- Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
- Contributed data or analysis tools
 Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
- Performed the analysis
 Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
- Wrote the paper
 Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
- Other contribution
 Specify contribution in more detail (required; no more than one sentence)

Author 4: Fabio Baldi

 \square Conceived and designed the analysis Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence) Collected the data Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence) \square Contributed data or analysis tools Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence) \times Performed the analysis Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence) \square Wrote the paper Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence) Other contribution Specify contribution in more detail (required; no more than one sentence)

Author 5: Bruno Zanoni

- Conceived and designed the analysis
 Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
 Collected the date
- Collected the data Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
- Contributed data or analysis tools
 Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
- Performed the analysis
 Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
- Wrote the paper Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
- Other contribution
 Specify contribution in more detail (required; no more than one sentence)

Author 6: Enter author name

 \square Conceived and designed the analysis Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence) \square Collected the data Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence) \square Contributed data or analysis tools Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence) Performed the analysis Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence) \square Wrote the paper Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence) Other contribution Specify contribution in more detail (required; no more than one sentence)

Author 7: Enter author name

- Conceived and designed the analysis Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
 Collected the data Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
- Contributed data or analysis tools
 Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
- Performed the analysis
 Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
- Wrote the paper
 Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
- Other contribution
 Specify contribution in more detail (required; no more than one sentence)

Author 8: Enter author name

 \square Conceived and designed the analysis Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence) \square Collected the data Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence) \square Contributed data or analysis tools Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence) Performed the analysis Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence) \square Wrote the paper Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence) Other contribution Specify contribution in more detail (required; no more than one sentence)

Author 9: Enter author name

- Conceived and designed the analysis Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
 Collected the data Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
- Contributed data or analysis tools
 Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
- Performed the analysis
 Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
- Wrote the paper
 Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
- Other contribution
 Specify contribution in more detail (required; no more than one sentence)

Author 10: Enter author name

Conceived and designed the analysis Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
Collected the data Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
Contributed data or analysis tools Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
Performed the analysis Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
Wrote the paper Specify contribution in more detail (optional; no more than one sentence)
Other contribution

Specify contribution in more detail (required; no more than one sentence)