

University of Parma Research Repository

The effect of kneading speed on breadmaking from unrefined wheat flour dough

This is the peer reviewd version of the followng article:

Original

The effect of kneading speed on breadmaking from unrefined wheat flour dough / Parenti, O.; Zanoni, B.; Giuffre, M. R.; Guerrini, L. - In: EUROPEAN FOOD RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY. - ISSN 1438-2377. - 248:2(2022), pp. 543-551. [10.1007/s00217-021-03901-z]

Availability: This version is available at: 11381/2937588 since: 2024-10-09T08:26:44Z

Publisher: Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH

Published DOI:10.1007/s00217-021-03901-z

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



Draft Manuscript for Review

## The effect of kneading speed on breadmaking from unrefined wheat flour dough

Journal:	European Food Research and Technology
Manuscript ID	EFRT-21-0987.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	21-Oct-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Parenti, Ottavia; National Research Council, Institute for Bioeconomy Zanoni, Bruno; University of Florence, DAGRI Giuffrè, Maria Rosaria; University of Florence, DAGRI Guerrini, Lorenzo; Università di Firenze, GESAAF
Keywords:	Whole wheat flours, mixing, water amount, kneading time, wheat bread

SCHOLARONE<sup>™</sup> Manuscripts

1 ว		
2 3 4	1	Title
5 6 7	2	The effect of kneading speed on breadmaking from unrefined wheat <mark>flour</mark> dough
, 8 9	3	
10 11 12	4	Authors
12 13 14	5	Ottavia Parenti <sup>*1</sup> , Bruno Zanoni <sup>2</sup> , Maria Rosaria Giuffrè <sup>2</sup> , Lorenzo Guerrini <sup>2</sup>
15 16	6	
17 18 19	7	1 Institute for Bioeconomy, National Research Council, Via Madonna del Piano 10, 50019
20 21	8	Sesto Fiorentino, Florence, Italy
22 23 24	9	2 Department of Agricultural, Food and Forestry Systems Management (DAGRI), University
25 26	10	of Florence, Piazzale Delle Cascine 16, 50144, Florence, Italy
27 28 29	11	
30 31	12	* Corresponding author. E-mail address: ottavia.parenti@unifi.it, tel +39 328 8336829,
32 33	13	Institute for Bioeconomy, National Research Council, Via Madonna del Piano 10, 50019
34 35 36	14	Sesto Fiorentino, Florence, Italy
37 38	15	
39 40 41	16	Abstract
42 43	17	The good nutritional value of unrefined wheat flours makes it necessary to implement
44 45 46	18	breadmaking strategies to improve bread quality. The present study investigated the effect
47 48	19	of kneading speed, dough water amount and kneading time on both the specific mechanical
49 50 51	20	energy of unrefined <mark>wheat flour</mark> dough and the quality of unrefined <mark>wheat flour</mark> bread
52 53	21	produced from two wheat flour cv. of different technological quality. The kneading speed
54 55 56	22	turned out to be a critical factor to optimize the kneading operation. The effect of kneading
57 58	23	speed was significantly linked with the kneading time and water amount as a function of the
59 60	24	technological quality of flour. Advantageous operating conditions of kneading were also

extrapolated to minimize both time and energy consumption of kneading, assuming 3.00

L/kg of bread specific volume as a reference value for soft bread: Application of high speed,

short time and high dough water content was suggested for the kneading optimization for

Whole wheat flours; mixing; water amount; kneading time; wheat bread

ater am.

3 4	25
5 6 7	26
7 8 9	27
10 11	28
12 13	29
14 15 16	30
17 18	31
19 20 21	
22 23	
24 25	
26 27	
28 29	
30 31 32	
32 33 34	
35 36	
37 38	
39 40	
41 42	
43 44	
45 46	
47 48	
49 50	
51 52	
55 55	
56 57	
50	

1 2

unrefined wheat flour.

Key words

In recent years, the market demand for healthy food is constantly growing [1]. The interest in the use of unrefined wheat flours for breadmaking has also increased, since these flours showed a better chemical composition in terms of fibre, minerals, vitamins, and lipids than refined flours [2, 3]. Furthermore, scientific studies have reported that the regular consumption of unrefined flour-based food products is associated to positive effects on human health, by reducing the risk to develop cardiovascular diseases, type 2 diabetes, and some type of cancers [4, 5]. Although unrefined flours have an interesting nutritional profile, they showed poor breadmaking performance, resulting in sticky doughs difficult to work, and in low volume bread with coarse and hard texture, dark colour, nutty odour, and bitter/sour taste. In the literature, the most studied strategies to improve the breadmaking performance of unrefined flours involved treatments on milling by-products [6, 7], the addition of bread improvers such as enzymes, emulsifiers, hydrocolloids, and oxidants [8], and the use of the sourdough fermentation [9]. However, although both bakers and consumers are mainly interested in unrefined flour breads with clean label formulas [10, 11], scant literature research only limited information was performed is available on how to adjust trying to change the breadmaking operating conditions during breadmaking as a function of the inherent characteristics of raw materials [2].

50 Within the different unit operations of the breadmaking process, kneading represents one 51 of the most important steps during which several phenomena occur to the dough 52 constituents. A viscoelastic dough is obtained as a result of mixing of dough ingredients, 53 proper hydration of ingredients, glass transition of amorphous regions of starch and 54 amorphous proteins, gluten network development and inclusion of air bubbles within the 55 dough structure [11, 12, 13].

In the literature, it was has been reported that the appropriate control of the following kneading parameters significantly improved this operation: kneading time, dough temperature, the speed of the kneading speed machine, dough aeration, flour water absorption, water temperature, and total water content [13 14]. Considering the effect of the speed of the kneading speed machine, a variable that changes the rate of energy supply to the developing dough [12 13], the studies performed on refined wheat flours reported that to achieve the dough readiness, mixing intensity and the amount of work imparted to the dough should be above a minimum critical level, which changed as a function of the flour type [14–17 15–18]. Increasing the speed of kneading speed machine resulted in significant effects on dough properties such as reduction of dough mixing stability [15, 18 16, 19], increase of dough peak torque [19-21-20-22], and decrease of the kneading time [15, 20, 22, 23 16, 21, 23, 24]. Although the speed of kneading speed machine significantly impacted refined bread quality, few and contradictory effects were reported in the literature about this issue [14, 16, 22, 24, 25, 15, 17, 23, 25, 26]. Kneading can be considered even more critical for unrefined flour dough, since the presence of the fibres negatively affects the gluten network development [7]. Indeed, the unrefined flour doughs generally showed short dough stability at kneading and high dough weakening, as well as they are usually characterised by a high tenacity and low extensibility values [2, 3, 7]. However, only few studies tested the effect of kneading variables when the breadmaking 

was performed with unrefined flours [26-30 27-31], and none of those papers evaluated the effect of changing the speed of kneading speed machine. 

Therefore, the aim of the present study was to investigate if the variation of kneading speed could help in overcoming the technological issues of using unrefined wheat flours in the breadmaking process. In detail, the effect of kneading speed, linked with the water amount 

 and kneading time, was tested on both the specific mechanical energy (*SME*) of unrefined
 flour dough and the quality of unrefined flour bread produced from two wheat flour cv. of
 different technological quality.

# 2. Materials and Methods

#### 2.1 Materials

Two batches of a sp. Triticum aestivum L., belonging to cv. Andriolo and Bologna, were used to perform the experimental trials. The wheat was grown in Montespertoli (Florence, Italy) during the 2020-2021 growing season. Brown flours (i.e., extraction rate 85 g/100 g dry kernel, ash content max 0.95 g/100 g dm [31 32] were processed using a stone grinding mill and a sieve (two consecutive passages through 1,100-1,200 µm sieve) at the Molino Paciscopi (Montespertoli, Florence, Italy). According to the Farinograph and Alveograph characterisation reported in Table 1 and according to the literature [12-32], Andriolo was the wheat flour of low technological quality, classified as weak or biscuit flour, whereas Bologna was the flour of good technological quality, classified as common breadmaking flour. 

43 96

#### 97 2.2 The experimental design

<sup>47</sup> 98 Baking trials, based on Doehlert Matrix (DM) Design [ $\frac{32}{33}$ ], were performed to test the <sup>49</sup> 99 effect of the following kneading variables: (i) Dough water amount – W (%, w/flour w), (ii) <sup>51</sup> 100 Kneading time – T (min), (iii) Kneading speed – S (rpm).

The DM Design allowed to investigate the effect of the 3 independent variables at different levels; 5 levels (- 1, - 0.5, 0, + 0.5, + 1) of W and T, and 3 levels of S (- 0.707, 0, + 0.707) were tested. The DM Design for 3 factors, of which 2 at 5 levels and one at 3 levels, required 16 104 experimental runs, including 4 replications of the centre point. A total of 16 experimental 105 runs x 2 flour cv. resulted in 32 processed bread samples. Since two experimental trials were 106 also performed to properly investigate Andriolo behaviour at kneading, the total number of 107 processed bread samples was 32 + 16 = 48. The proper experimental range and distance 108 levels of the tested variables were identified in preliminary trials; they were selected both to 109 be approximately the same range for the tested flour cv. and to give bread moisture values 110 which were consistent with Italian legislation [ $\frac{12}{34}$ ].

Experimental trials were divided in two blocks, performed on two consecutive days. Each block contained 8 trials; 6 trials were obtained by the randomization of the 16 variable combinations and 2 trials represented the centre points. The distance between 0 and +/- 1 points was 8% for the W variable, and 6 min for the T variable. The distance between 0 and +/- 0.707 was 50 rpm for the S variable. The response variables were the bread specific volume and the specific mechanical energy (SME) of dough. 

35 117

#### 118 2.3 Breadmaking

All the ingredients used to make bread were stored at room temperature (22 ± 2°C) and fresh brewer's yeast was stored at 4°C; 500 g batches of dough were prepared. The basic dough formula was brown flour (310 g), and fresh brewer's yeast (13 g); the amount of water was selected according to the DM Design. The kneading operation was performed at room temperature using a Kitchen Aid Professional Mixer (5KSM185PS, KitchenAid, St. Joseph, Michigan, USA) operating with a dough hook (model KSM35CDH) at the speed selected in the DM Design. After kneading, each dough was placed in a breadmaking machine (Pain doré, Moulinex, Ecully, France) to perform the proofing step for 90 min at room conditions (T =  $22 \pm 2^{\circ}$ C, relative humidity = 50%), and baked at 150°C for 50 min. 

1		
2 3	120	
4	128	
5 6 7	129	2.4 Measurement methods
8 9	130	2.4.1 Dough rheology
10 11 12	131	The Brabender Farinograph test was performed according to the standard method (AACC
12 13 14	132	54–21.02). The following parameters were measured [12]: water absorption (WA, % w/flour
15 16	133	w) – the amount of water necessary to reach the reference of optimal dough consistency
17 18 19	134	(500 BU); dough development time (DDT, min) – the time taken by the dough to reach the
20 21	135	point of optimal dough consistency; dough stability (DS, min) – the time during which the
22 23 24	136	dough consistency remained at the optimal value of 500 BU; mixing tolerance index (MTI,
25 26	137	BU) – the difference between the peak of optimal dough consistency (500 BU) and the
27 28 29	138	dough consistency measured 5 min after the peak; dough weakening (DW, BU) – the
30 31	139	difference between the peak of optimal dough consistency (500 BU) and the dough
32 33	140	consistency measured at the end of the assay (20 min) [12-32].
35 36	141	The Alveograph test was performed following the standard method (AACC 54–30.02). The
37 38	142	parameters measured were as follows $\frac{33}{33}$ : the dough tenacity ( <i>P</i> , mm H <sub>2</sub> O) – the maximum
39 40 41	143	overpressure; dough extensibility ( $L$ , mm) – the average bubble length at rupture; swelling
42 43	144	index (G, mm) – the square root of the volume of air necessary to inflate the dough bubble
44 45 46	145	until it ruptures; flour strength (W, $10^{-4}$ J) – the energy required to inflate the dough bubble
47 48	146	to the point of rupture; and ratio between dough tenacity and extensibility ( $P/L$ ) [35].
49 50 51	147	
52 53	148	2.4.2 Power consumption
54 55 56	149	The power consumption of dough samples was monitored every 5 s of kneading by means
57 58	150	of an energy analyser (Fluke 434-II/435-II/437-II, Danaher Corporation, Everett, Washington,
59 60	151	US). The parameters measured during kneading were electric current (A) – I, and voltage (V)

2		
3 4	152	– V. Power consumption (W) was determined as the product between I and V (I x V), and
5 6 7	153	total energy (kJ) was determined as the product between $V$ and the kneading time – $T$ ( $V$ x
8 9	154	T). Dough specific mechanical energy – $SME$ (kJ/kg) was determined as the ratio between
10 11 12	155	the total energy imparted to the dough during kneading – $E$ (kJ) and the mass of the dough
12 13 14	156	(kg).
15 16	157	
17 18 19	158	2.4.3 Bread quality
20 21	159	Bread volume (L) was measured using the standard millet displacement method (AACC 10-
22 23 24	160	05.01), and bread specific volume (L/kg) was determined as the ratio between total bread
25 26	161	volume (L) and its mass (kg).
27 28 20	162	
29 30 31	163	2.5 Data processing
32 33	164	The response variables, bread specific volume and SME, were related with the tested
34 35 36	165	variables by polynomial models using a multiple regression analysis (Standard Least Square
37 38	166	Fitting). The significance of the tested variables was determined by ANOVA; it included first
39 40 41	167	order (W, T, and S), second order ( $W^2$ , $T^2$ , and $S^2$ ) coefficients, and their first order ( $W^*T$ ,
42 43	168	$W^*S$ , $T^*S$ ) and second order ( $W^*T^*S$ ) interactions. Experimental data were processed with R
44 45 46	169	software version 4.0.3.
47 48	170	
49 50 51	171	3. Results
52 53	172	3.1 Specific mechanical energy (SME)
54 55 56	173	Dough SME of cv. And riolo showed a significance of the first order (p < 0.001) and second
50 57 58	174	order (p < 0.05) regression models. The minimum values of Andriolo dough SME ranged
59 60	175	from a value of approx. 3.0 kJ/kg at 100 rpm to a value of approx. 3.5 kJ/kg at 150 rpm and

200 rpm, whereas its maximum value was approx. 9.0 kJ/kg at all the tested kneading speeds. Independently of kneading speed and water amount, the increase of the kneading time caused an increase of dough SME. The higher the water amount, the lower the SME of the dough, but the extent of SME decrease changed as a function of kneading time and speed. In particular, the lower the kneading speed and the longer the kneading time, the higher the decrease of dough SME as the water amount increased as increasing the water amount. Up to 10 min of kneading time, a SME decrease of approx. 2.0-2.5 kJ/kg was observed at the medium (150 rpm) and lowest (100 rpm) kneading speed, whereas at the highest kneading speed (200 rpm) a lower SME decrease of approx. 1.0 kJ/kg occurred. In the kneading time ranging from 10 to 20 min, a dough SME decrease occurred with values of approx. 3.0 kJ/kg, 2.0-2.5 kJ/kg and 1.5 kJ/kg at the lowest, medium and highest kneading speeds, respectively.

Considering Bologna, results showed a significance of the first order regression model (p < 0.001). Values of the dough SME ranged from a minimum of approx. 2.0 kJ/kg to a maximum of approx. 8.5 kJ/kg at all the tested kneading speeds. An increase of the kneading time caused an increase of dough SME, and an increase of the water amount caused a decrease of SME. However, cv. Bologna dough had a different variation of SME as a function of both kneading speed and time; in particular, the lower the kneading time and speed, the higher the effect of water amount on the dough SME. Up to 16 min of kneading time, a SME decrease of approx. 1.5-2.0 kJ/kg was observed at 100 and 150 rpm kneading speed, whereas at 200 rpm kneading speed a lower SME decrease of approx. 1.0 kJ/kg occurred. In kneading time longer than 16 min, a dough SME decrease occurred with values of approx. 0.5-1.5 kJ/kg at 100 and 150 rpm and of 0.0-1.0 kJ/kg at 200 rpm.

*3.2 Bread quality* 

201 The bread quality from cv. Andriolo dough showed a relationship with *W*, *T* and *S* variables.

202 The surface plots at the three different kneading speeds are shown in Figure 1.

The first order coefficient of water amount (*W*) was significant (p < 0.001); regardless of kneading time and speed, the addition of different water amounts caused a variation of bread specific volume of approx. 0.50-0.60 L/kg, starting from values of approx. 2.50-2.60 L/kg and achieving values of approx. 3.00-3.10 L/kg. The second order coefficient of water amount ( $W^2$ ) was also significant (p < 0.001); a maximum value of bread specific volume (3.00-3.10 L/kg) as a function of *W* was obtained at values of approx. 65.0-66.0%.

The interaction between kneading time and speed ( $T^*S$ ) had a significance of p < 0.05 and showed that effect of kneading time on bread specific volume changed as a function of kneading speed. After 5 min of kneading, the maximum bread specific volume was approx. 2.95 L/kg at 100 rpm, and 3.00 L/kg at both 150 rpm and 200 rpm. Instead, when kneading time increased, the bread specific volume showed the following different trend as a function of kneading speed: (i) at the lowest speed (100 rpm), bread specific volume gradually increased, reaching after 15 min of time a value of approx. 3.10 L/kg, which remained constant up to 20 min of kneading; (ii) at the medium speed (150 rpm), the maximum value of bread specific volume (3.05 L/kg) occurred after 6 min of kneading, remaining constant up to 19 min of kneading and then, decreasing; (iii) at the highest speed (200 rpm) the maximum bread specific volume (3.00 L/kg) was reached in the first few minutes of kneading, remaining constant up to 15 min of kneading and then, decreasing.

The bread quality from cv. Bologna dough showed a different behaviour compared to cv. Andriolo dough, as showed by the surface plots of at the three different kneading speeds (Figure 2). Although in the tested conditions the optimization of operating variables was not

2 3 4	224
5 6 7	225
7 8 9	226
10 11	227
12 13 14	228
15 16	229
17 18 10	230
20 21	231
22 23	232
24 25 26	233
27 28	234
29 30 31	235
32 33	236
34 35	237
36 37 38	238
39 40	239
41 42 43	240
44 45	241
46 47 48	242
48 49 50	243
51 52	244
53 54 55	245
56 57	246
58 59 60	247
~~	

24 achieved, results showed that kneading variables significantly affected the quality of breads 25 form cv. Bologna. The second order coefficients of water amount ( $W^2$ ) and time ( $T^2$ ) were 26 significant (p < 0.05). The interaction between water amount and kneading speed ( $W^*S$ ) was 27 significant (p < 0.05); the bread specific volume had a different trend at the tested kneading 28 speeds as a function of the water amount. At the lowest speed and 15 min of kneading time, 29 the bread specific volume showed a value of 2.80 L/kg when the water amount was low (55.5%); then, it started to increase showing values of 3.00 L/kg, 3.10 L/kg, 3.20 L/kg at 60%, 30 31 63% and 68% of water amount, respectively. The maximum value of 3.30 L/kg occurred 32 close to the maximum levels of kneading time and water amount (i.e., 19-20 min and 69.0-33 71.5%).

At the medium speed and 15 min of kneading time, the bread specific volume was 2.70 L/kg when the water amount was low (55.5%), and then increased, reaching 3.00 L/kg, 3.10 L/kg, 3.20 L/kg, 3.30 L/kg at 61.0%, 63.0%, 66.5% and 71.5% of water amount, respectively. The maximum value of bread specific volume corresponded to 3.40 L/kg and it was achieved closed to the highest levels of kneading time and water amount (i.e., 20 min and 71.5%).

At the highest speed and 15 min of kneading time, the bread specific volume had a value of 240 2.70 L/kg when the water amount was low (55.5-56.5%), and then it increased in relation 241 with the water amount increase, showing the following values: 3.00 L/kg at 61.0%, 3.10 L/kg 242 at 63.0%, 3.20 L/kg at 65.0%, 3.30 at 67.5%, and 3.40 L/kg at 71.0%. The maximum value of 243 bread specific volume corresponded to 3.40 L/kg and it was achieved at the highest 244 kneading time (20 min) and water amount (71.5%) similarly to the results at the medium 245 speed.

<sup>9</sup> 247 **4. Discussion** 

#### 248 4.1 The effect of kneading speed

Addition of flour improvers is usually proposed in the literature data [2, 3, 8] in order to process bread from unrefined wheat flours with acceptable technological quality. However, since consumers as well as bakers demand clean label breads, studies on adapting the processing conditions to the characteristics of raw materials are useful to improve the quality of unrefined flour bread, avoiding the use of improvers [10].

Water amount and kneading time have well known crucial roles during the wheat dough development [11-13, 17, 34 12-14, 18, 36]. The water amount allows both the proper hydration of flour constituents and the glass transition of amorphous regions of starch and amorphous proteins [11, 12, 34, 12, 13, 36]. In unrefined wheat flour dough, the hydration of gluten proteins is reported to be hindered by the presence of fibre components, which compete with the gluten proteins for the water uptake; consequently, dough with poor tenacity to extensibility ratio and low bread volume are obtained [7, 12, 35 13, 37]. Considering the effect of **H**the kneading time, the determination of the optimal kneading time allows the optimal development of the gluten matrix, avoiding the detrimental effects of under- or over- kneading times [12, 34, 13, 36]. 

<sup>2</sup>264 Our experimental data showed that also the kneading speed (S) significantly affected the quality of unrefined wheat flour bread, but the effect of kneading speed was linked with the kneading time (T) and water amount (W) as a function of the technological quality of flour.

The weak flour cv. Andriolo was significantly affected by the interaction  $S^*T$ , which proved that an increase of kneading speed decreased the kneading time required to obtain similar bread specific volume; these results are consistent with those reported in the literature about refined wheat flours [ $\frac{15, 20, 22, 25}{16, 21, 23, 26}$ ]. Furthermore, the maximum value of bread specific volume occurred at the minimum kneading speed, suggesting that cv.

Andriolo achieved the optimal dough development at the lowest energy-input supply; the above behaviour was consistent with literature data about the low energy requirements of refined weak flours during the kneading operation [14, 24 15, 25].

Instead, the flour of good breadmaking quality, cv. Bologna, was significantly affected by the interaction S\*W. For bread specific volumes up to 3.00 L/kg (i.e. an acceptable bread specific volume according to [12]), an increase of the kneading speed required an increase of the water amount in order to reach the same values of bread specific volume. Conversely, for bread specific volume  $\geq$  3.10 L/kg, the higher the kneading speed the lower the water amount in order to reach the same values of bread specific volume. Furthermore, the increase of kneading speed significantly enhanced bread specific volume from 3.30 L/kg to 3.50 L/kg, reaching the maximum value of bread specific volume (3.50 L/kg) at the highest kneading speed. Therefore, the interaction between the rate of energy-input supply and water amount may affect both the hydration kinetics of unrefined flour constituents and the development of gluten proteins.

4.2 An approach to choose the kneading operating conditions 

4.2.1 Maximum and acceptable bread volume 

Bread volume is considered the most representative parameter to evaluate the overall bread quality [12-38, 39]. In our study a maximum value of bread specific volume was obtained at different kneading operating conditions as a function of wheat flour technological quality (Table 2). Cv. Andriolo reached a maximum bread specific volume of 3.10 L/kg at the following kneading conditions: The lowest kneading speed (100 rpm), 66% of water amount and 17.5 min of kneading time which imparted to the dough 7.51 kJ/kg of SME. Instead, cv. Bologna reached a maximum bread specific volume of 3.50 L/kg at the 

highest kneading speed (200 rpm), 71.5% of water amount and 20 min of kneading time that corresponded to 8.14 kJ/kg of SME. The above differences between the tested flours were consistent with the literature about the effect of flour technological quality on the dough kneading requirements [12, 14, 24 13, 15, 25]. The specific kneading conditions required by the tested flours can be associated to their different technological quality, that is their different quantity and quality of wheat gluten proteins. Cv. Bologna showed the highest values of kneading speed, water amount, kneading time and SME to achieve an optimal dough development, according to its good technological quality; conversely, the weak flour cv. Andriolo showed the lowest values of the above variables [12, 14, 24, 13, 15, <mark>25</mark>]. According to the classification of Italian bakery products made with wheat flours of different refinement degrees as well as with flours enriched with different fractions of milling by-products (bran, germ, middlings, etc.) literature data, a bread can be defined "soft" when values of bread specific volume of approx. are higher than 2.50-3.00 L/kg and values of bread moisture are higher than 15% <mark>corresponded to light and soft bread</mark>, <mark>largely</mark> appreciated by consumers [12 38]. All bread samples tested in the present study had a moisture higher than 15% (data not shown). As regard to bread specific volume, we <mark>considered the highest value of the reported range</mark>, <mark>If</mark> i.e. 3.00 L/kg<mark>, i<del>s assumed</del> as <del>an</del> the</mark> minimum threshold for acceptable bread specific volume, . Following this criterion, a greater number of suitable combinations of dough water amount, kneading time and speed can be chosen from the experimental data (Table 3). For cv. Bologna, when the dough water amount was approx. above 61%, all tested time and speed conditions of kneading were able to develop acceptable bread specific volumes above equal or higher than the selected a specific threshold of bread acceptability of the dough water amount (approx. 61%); . tThe 

2	
3	320
4	520
5	~~ 4
6	321
7	
8	322
9	
10	<b></b>
11	323
12	
13	324
14	
15	225
16	525
17	
18	326
19	
20	227
21	527
22	
23	328
24	
25	329
26	020
27	
28	330
29	
30	331
31	
32	
33	332
34	
35	333
36	
37	221
38	554
39	
40	335
41	
42	336
43	550
44	
45	337
46	
47	338
48	
49	
50	339
51	
52	340
53	-
54	244
55	341
56	
57	342
58	

320 corresponding dough SME ranged between 2.0 kJ/kg and 8.5 kJ/kg depending on both 321 kneading time and water amount. Cv. Andriolo was more sensitive to kneading operating 322 conditions than cv. Bologna, due to its low technological quality. The threshold of the dough 323 water amount was approx. 62%, which were able to develop acceptable bread specific 324 volume at suitable combinations of kneading time and speed as follows: 7-20 min, 4-20 min, 325 4-15 min at 100 rpm, 150 rpm, 200 rpm, respectively. The corresponding dough SME changed as a function of kneading speed, with values approx. in the range of 3.0-8.5 kJ/kg, 326 327 3.5-8.5 kJ/kg, and 3.5-7.0 kJ/kg at 100 rpm, 150 rpm and 200 rpm, respectively.

4.2.2 Advantageous operating conditions of kneading 329

An acceptable bread specific volume in the shortest kneading time was used as a criterion of 330 331 an advantageous kneading. Advantageous kneading conditions were identified as the 332 conditions that allowed to obtain a bread specific volume equal or higher than the selected threshold of bread acceptability (3.00 L/kg) in the shortest kneading time. Bread samples 333 334 from cv. Andriolo unrefined flour reached the value of 3.00 L/kg after 4 min of kneading at 335 both 150 rpm and 200 rpm (Table 3). However, whereas a quite careful evaluation of dough 336 water amount (62.5-65%) was required at 150 rpm, the widest range of water amounts 337 (60.5-68%) resulted in an unvaried bread specific volume at the highest kneading speed (200 338 rpm). Therefore, the choice of 200 rpm kneading speed allowed to obtain an acceptable 339 bread volume in only 4 min of kneading time, without the necessity to carryied out an 340 accurate determination of dough water amounts. Bread samples from cv. Bologna unrefined flour showed a different trend. A bread specific volume of 3.00 L/kg occurred with a 341 kneading time of 8 min, independently of the kneading speed; the specific range of water 342 59 amounts of fapprox. 62-72%) resulted in an unvaried bread specific volume at all tested 343 60

kneading speeds (Table 3). Therefore, cv. Bologna was able to reach an acceptable bread
volume at all tested speeds in a similar and wide range of water amounts values, which
should be above a minimum value of 62%.

The above advantageous operating conditions were also consistent with the environmental impact of energy consumption associated to the kneading operation, because they were able to cause produce an acceptable bread specific volume with the lowest values of energy consumption. For cv. Andriolo, 200 rpm for 4 min of kneading time was a good combination of variables for the acceptable resulting in bread specific volume equal or higher than the selected threshold (3.00 L/kg) of product acceptability and requiring with the lowest SME, ranging which ranged from approx. 3.7 to 4.2 kJ/kg as a function of dough water amount. The highest values of SME were obtained at the other kneading speeds (i.e., 4.0-4.5 kJ/kg at both 100 and 150 rpm). For cv. Bologna, the minimum value of SME, which was approx. 2.0 kJ/kg, was obtained at the highest water amount (71.5%) and at the minimum kneading time of 8 min, independently of the kneading speed. However, the highest mixing speed (200 rpm) can be considered the best operating condition to minimize the energy requirements, because the lowest range of SME values (2.0-3.0 kJ/kg) was also obtained independently of the water amount; a greater range of SME value was obtained as a function of water amount at both the minimum (2.0-4.0 kJ/kg) and medium (2.0-3.5 kJ/kg) kneading speed.

<sub>0</sub> 363

**5. Conclusions** 

The originality of this paper is that the combined effect of kneading speed with kneading time and dough water amount was studied in order to improve the quality of bread from unrefined wheat flour dough. Experimental data showed that a suitable choice of the above

kneading operating conditions allows an optimization of bread specific volume as a functionof the technological quality of unrefined wheat flour.

The kneading speed was a critical factor to optimize the kneading operation. A significant relationship between kneading speed and time resulted for the weak flour cv. Andriolo: Increase of the kneading speed decreased the kneading time to obtain high values of bread specific volume. Instead, a significant relationship between kneading speed and dough water amount resulted for the cv. Bologna flour (i.e. a common breadmaking flour): The greater the kneading speed, the lower the dough water requirements to obtain high values of bread specific volume. Advantageous operating conditions of kneading were also extrapolated in order to minimize both time and energy consumption (i.e., SME values) of kneading, assuming 3.00 L/kg of bread specific volume as a reference value for soft the acceptability threshold for unrefined flour bread; kneading optimization for unrefined wheat flour may be reached applying high speed, short time and high dough water content elien conditions.

1 ว		
2 3 4	382	
5 6 7	383	References
7 8 9	384	1. Schaffer-Lequart, C., Lehmann, U., Ross, A. B., Roger, O., Eldridge, A. L., Ananta, E.,
10 11 12	385	Bietry, M. F., King, L. R., Moroni, A. V., Srichuwong, S., Wavreille, A. S., Redgwell, R.,
12 13 14	386	Labat, E., & Robin, F. (2017). Whole grain in manufactured foods: Current use,
15 16 17	387	challenges and the way forward. Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition, 57,
17 18 19	388	1562–1568. https://doi. org/10.1080/10408398.2013.781012
20 21 22	389	2. Parenti, O., Guerrini, L., & Zanoni, B. (2020). Techniques and technologies for the
22 23 24	390	breadmaking process with unrefined wheat flours. Trends in Food Science &
25 26 27	391	Technology, 99, 152–166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2020.02.034
27 28 29	392	3. Gómez, M., Gutkoski, L. C., & Bravo-Núñez, Á. (2020). Understanding whole-wheat
30 31	393	flour and its effect in breads: A review. Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and
32 33 34	394	Food Safety, 19, 3241–3265. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/1541-4337.12625</u>
35 36	395	4. Hauner, H., Bechthold, A., Boeing, H., Brönstrup, A., Buyken, A., Leschik-Bonnet, E.,
37 38 39	396	Linseisen, J., Schulze, M., Strohm, D., & Wolfram, G. (2012). Evidence-Based
40 41	397	Guideline of the German Nutrition Society: Carbohydrate Intake and Prevention of
42 43 44	398	Nutrition-Related Diseases. Annals of Nutrition & Metabolism, 60, 1–58.
45 46	399	https://doi.org/10.1159/000335326
47 48 40	400	5. Ye, E. Q., Chacko, S. A., Chou, E. L., Kugizaki, M., & Liu, S. (2012). Greater whole-grain
49 50 51	401	intake is associated with lower risk of type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and
52 53	402	weight gain. Journal of Nutrition, 142, 1304–1313.
54 55 56 57 58 59	403	<u>https://doi.org/10.3945/jn.111.155325</u>

2							
3 4	404	6.	Boukid, F., Follo	ni, S., Ranieri,	R., & Vittadini, E. (20	018). A compendiu	ım of wheat
5 6 7	405		germ: Separation	n, stabilization	, and food applicatio	ons. Trends in Foo	d Science &
, 8 9	406		Technology, 78, 1	.20–133. <u>https:</u>	//doi.org/10.1016/j.ti	fs.2018.06.001	
10 11	407	7.	Hemdane, S., Jac	obs, P. J., Dori	nez, E., Verspreet, J.,	Delcour, J. A., & Co	ourtin, C. M.
12 13 14	408		(2016). Wheat (	Triticum aesti	vum L.) Bran in Brea	ad Making: A Crit	ical Review.
15 16	409		Comprehensive R	eviews in Food	Science and Food Saf	<i>fety,</i> 15, 28–42. htt	ps://doi.org/
17 18 10	410		10.1111/1541-43	37.12176			
20 21	411	8.	Tebben, L., Shen	, Y., & Li, Y. (2	018). Improvers and f	functional ingredie	nts in whole
22 23	412		wheat bread: A r	eview of their e	effects on dough prop	erties and bread qu	uality. Trends
24 25 26	413		in Food Science &	Technology, 8	1, 10–24. <u>https://doi.c</u>	org/10.1016/j.tifs.2	018.08.015
27 28	414	9.	Ma, S., Wang, Z.,	Guo, X., Wang	, F., Huang, J., Sun, B.,	, & Wang, X. (2021)	). Sourdough
29 30	/15		·				
31	415		improves the qua	ality of whole-v	vheat flour products: I	Mechanisms and ch	nallenges—A
31 32 33	415		review.	Food	vheat flour products: I Chemistry,	Mechanisms and cl 360,	nallenges—A 130038.
31 32 33 34 35 36	413 416 417		review. https://doi.org/1	Food <u>Food</u> 0.1016/j.foodc	vheat flour products: I <i>Chemistry,</i> <u>hem.2021.130038</u>	Mechanisms and cł 360,	nallenges—A 130038.
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38	413 416 417 418	10	review. <u>https://doi.org/1</u> . Guerrini, L., Pare	<i>Food</i> 0.1016/j.foodc nti, O., Angelor	vheat flour products: I <i>Chemistry,</i> <u>hem.2021.130038</u> ni, G., & Zanoni, B. (20	Mechanisms and ch 360, 019). The bread ma	hallenges—A 130038. king process
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41	413 416 417 418 419	10	nmproves the qua review. <u>https://doi.org/1</u> . Guerrini, L., Pare of ancient wheat	<i>Food</i> <i>Food</i> 0.1016/j.foodc nti, O., Angelor :: A semi-struct	wheat flour products: I <i>Chemistry,</i> <u>hem.2021.130038</u> ni, G., & Zanoni, B. (20 tured interview to ba	Mechanisms and ch 360, 019). The bread ma kers. <i>Journal of Ce</i>	hallenges—A 130038. king process real Science,
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43	413 416 417 418 419 420	10	review. https://doi.org/1 . Guerrini, L., Pare of ancient wheat 87, 9-17. https://	Food Food 0.1016/j.foodc nti, O., Angelor :: A semi-struct	chemistry, <u>Chemistry,</u> <u>hem.2021.130038</u> ni, G., & Zanoni, B. (20 tured interview to ba <u>6/j.jcs.2019.02.006</u>	Mechanisms and ch 360, 019). The bread ma kers. <i>Journal of Ce</i>	hallenges—A 130038. king process real Science,
<ul> <li>31</li> <li>32</li> <li>33</li> <li>34</li> <li>35</li> <li>36</li> <li>37</li> <li>38</li> <li>39</li> <li>40</li> <li>41</li> <li>42</li> <li>43</li> <li>44</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> </ul>	413 416 417 418 419 420 421	10 <mark>11</mark>	review. <u>https://doi.org/1</u> . Guerrini, L., Pare of ancient wheat 87, 9-17. <u>https://</u>	Food Food 0.1016/j.foodc nti, O., Angelor :: A semi-struct doi.org/10.101 nann-Witzel, J.	vheat flour products: I <i>Chemistry,</i> hem.2021.130038 ni, G., & Zanoni, B. (20 tured interview to ba <u>6/j.jcs.2019.02.006</u> , Caputo, V., Vecchio,	Mechanisms and ch 360, 019). The bread ma kers. <i>Journal of Ce</i> , R., Annunziata, A	hallenges—A 130038. king process real Science,
<ul> <li>31</li> <li>32</li> <li>33</li> <li>34</li> <li>35</li> <li>36</li> <li>37</li> <li>38</li> <li>39</li> <li>40</li> <li>41</li> <li>42</li> <li>43</li> <li>44</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> </ul>	413 416 417 418 419 420 421 422	10 <mark>11</mark>	review. <u>https://doi.org/1</u> . Guerrini, L., Pare of ancient wheat 87, 9-17. <u>https://</u> . Asioli, D., Ascher Varela, P. (2017)	Food Food 0.1016/j.foodc nti, O., Angelor :: A semi-struct doi.org/10.101 nann-Witzel, J. . Making sense	vheat flour products: I <i>Chemistry,</i> <u>hem.2021.130038</u> ni, G., & Zanoni, B. (20 tured interview to ba <u>6/j.jcs.2019.02.006</u> , Caputo, V., Vecchio, e of the "clean label"	Mechanisms and ch 360, 019). The bread ma kers. <i>Journal of Ce</i> , R., Annunziata, A trends: A review o	hallenges—A 130038. king process real Science, , Næs, T., & of consumer
<ul> <li>31</li> <li>32</li> <li>33</li> <li>34</li> <li>35</li> <li>36</li> <li>37</li> <li>38</li> <li>39</li> <li>40</li> <li>41</li> <li>42</li> <li>43</li> <li>44</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>49</li> <li>50</li> <li>51</li> </ul>	413 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423	10 <mark>11</mark>	review. <u>https://doi.org/1</u> . Guerrini, L., Pare of ancient wheat 87, 9-17. <u>https://</u> . Asioli, D., Ascher Varela, P. (2017) food choice be	Food Food 0.1016/j.foodc nti, O., Angelor :: A semi-struct doi.org/10.101 nann-Witzel, J. . Making sense havior and di	vheat flour products: I <i>Chemistry</i> , hem.2021.130038 ni, G., & Zanoni, B. (20 tured interview to ba 6/j.jcs.2019.02.006 , Caputo, V., Vecchio, e of the "clean label" scussion of industry	Mechanisms and ch 360, 019). The bread ma kers. <i>Journal of Ce</i> , R., Annunziata, A trends: A review of implications. <i>Foo</i>	hallenges—A 130038. king process real Science, , Næs, T., & of consumer
<ul> <li>31</li> <li>32</li> <li>33</li> <li>34</li> <li>35</li> <li>36</li> <li>37</li> <li>38</li> <li>39</li> <li>40</li> <li>41</li> <li>42</li> <li>43</li> <li>44</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>49</li> <li>50</li> <li>51</li> <li>52</li> <li>53</li> </ul>	413 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424	10 <mark>11</mark>	review. https://doi.org/1 . Guerrini, L., Pare of ancient wheat 87, 9-17. https:// . Asioli, D., Ascher Varela, P. (2017) food choice be <i>International</i> , 99,	Food Food 0.1016/j.foodc nti, O., Angelon :: A semi-struct doi.org/10.101 nann-Witzel, J. . Making sense havior and di . 58–71. https:/	vheat flour products: I <i>Chemistry</i> , hem.2021.130038 ni, G., & Zanoni, B. (20 tured interview to ba <u>6/j.jcs.2019.02.006</u> , Caputo, V., Vecchio, e of the "clean label" scussion of industry //doi.org/10.1016/j.foo	Mechanisms and ch 360, 019). The bread ma kers. <i>Journal of Ce</i> , R., Annunziata, A trends: A review of implications. <i>Foo</i> odres.2017.07.022	hallenges—A 130038. king process real Science, , Næs, T., & of consumer
<ul> <li>31</li> <li>32</li> <li>33</li> <li>34</li> <li>35</li> <li>36</li> <li>37</li> <li>38</li> <li>39</li> <li>40</li> <li>41</li> <li>42</li> <li>43</li> <li>44</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>49</li> <li>50</li> <li>51</li> <li>52</li> <li>53</li> <li>54</li> <li>55</li> </ul>	413 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 423 424 425	10 11	review. https://doi.org/1 . Guerrini, L., Pare of ancient wheat 87, 9-17. https:// . Asioli, D., Ascher Varela, P. (2017) food choice be <i>International</i> , 99, . Cuq, B., Abecassi	Food Food 0.1016/j.foodc nti, O., Angelon :: A semi-struct doi.org/10.101 nann-Witzel, J. . Making sense havior and di . 58–71. https:/ s, J., & Stéphan	vheat flour products: I Chemistry, hem.2021.130038 ni, G., & Zanoni, B. (20 tured interview to ba 6/j.jcs.2019.02.006 , Caputo, V., Vecchio, caputo, V., Vecchio, caputo, V., Vecchio, caputo, of industry /doi.org/10.1016/j.for ne, G. (2003). State di	Mechanisms and ch 360, 019). The bread ma kers. Journal of Ce , R., Annunziata, A. trends: A review of implications. Foo odres.2017.07.022	hallenges—A 130038. king process real Science, , Næs, T., & of consumer od Research
<ul> <li>31</li> <li>32</li> <li>33</li> <li>34</li> <li>35</li> <li>36</li> <li>37</li> <li>38</li> <li>39</li> <li>40</li> <li>41</li> <li>42</li> <li>43</li> <li>44</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>49</li> <li>50</li> <li>51</li> <li>52</li> <li>53</li> <li>54</li> <li>55</li> <li>56</li> <li>57</li> <li>58</li> </ul>	413 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 423 424 425 426	10 11 12	review. https://doi.org/1 . Guerrini, L., Pare of ancient wheat 87, 9-17. https:// . Asioli, D., Ascher Varela, P. (2017) food choice be <i>International</i> , 99, . Cuq, B., Abecassi bread processing	Food Food 0.1016/j.foodc nti, O., Angelor c: A semi-struct doi.org/10.101 nann-Witzel, J. Making sense havior and di 58–71. https:/ s, J., & Stéphan g. International	Chemistry, hem.2021.130038 hi, G., & Zanoni, B. (20 tured interview to ba 6/j.jcs.2019.02.006 , Caputo, V., Vecchio, e of the "clean label" scussion of industry //doi.org/10.1016/j.foo he, G. (2003). State di I Journal of Food Scie	Mechanisms and ch 360, 019). The bread ma kers. Journal of Ce , R., Annunziata, A trends: A review of implications. Foo odres.2017.07.022 agrams to help des ence and Technolog	Anallenges—A 130038. king process <i>real Science,</i> , Næs, T., & of consumer od <i>Research</i> scribe wheat scribe wheat

2		
3	428	13. <del>Zhou, W., Therdthai, N., &amp; Hui, Y. H. (2014). <i>Bakery products science and technology</i>.</del>
4		
5 6 7	429	Blackwell. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118792001</u>
8 9	430	Haegens, N. (2006). Mixing, dough making, and dough makeup. Bakery Products:
10 11 12	431	Science and Technology, 245-248.
13 14	432	14. Cappelli, A., Bettaccini, L., & Cini, E. (2020). The kneading process: A systematic
15 16 17	433	review of the effects on dough rheology and resulting bread characteristics,
18 19	434	including improvement strategies. Trends in Food Science & Technology, 104, 91-
20 21 22	435	101. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2020.08.008</u>
22 23 24	436	15. Kilborn, R. H., & Tipples, K. H. (1972). Factors Affecting Mechanical Dough
25 26	437	Development. I. Effect of Mixing Intensity and Work Input. American Associations of
27 28 29	438	Cereal Chemists, 49, 34–47.
30 31	439	16. Hwang, C. H., & Gunasekaran, S. (2001). Determining Wheat Dough Mixing
32 33 34	440	Characteristics from Power Consumption Profile of a Conventional Mixer. Cereal
35 36	441	Chemistry, 78, 88–92. <u>https://doi.org/10.1094/CCHEM.2001.78.1.88</u>
37 38 30	442	17. Connelly, R. K., & McIntier, R. L. (2008). Rheological properties of yeasted and
39 40 41	443	nonyeasted wheat doughs developed under different mixing conditions +. Journal of
42 43	444	the Science of Food and Agriculture, 88, 2309–2323. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa</u>
44 45 46	445	18. Parenti, O., Guerrini, L., Mompin, S. B., Toldrà, M., & Zanoni, B. (2021a). The
47 48	446	determination of bread dough readiness during kneading of wheat flour: A review of
49 50 51	447	the available methods. <i>Journal of Food Engineering</i> , 110692.
52 53	448	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2021.110692
54 55	449	19. Gélinas, P., & McKinnon, C. (2013). Experiments on dough rheology to improve
56 57 58	450	screening of bread wheat cultivars. International Journal of Food Science and
59 60	451	Technology, 48, 1956–1961. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/ijfs.12176</u>

1 2		
2 3 4	452	20. Anderssen, R. S., Gras, P. W., & MacRitchie, F. (1998). The Rate-Independence of the
5 6 7	453	Mixing of Wheat Flour Dough to Peak Dough Development. Journal of Cereal Science,
8 9	454	27, 167-177. https://doi.org/10.1006/jcrs.1997.0160
10 11 12	455	21. Wilson, A. J., Morgenstern, M. P., & Kavale, S. (2001). Mixing Response of a Variable
12 13 14	456	Speed 125 g Laboratory Scale Mechanical Dough Development Mixer. Journal of
15 16	457	Cereal Science, 34, 151–158. <u>https://doi.org/10.1006/jcrs.2001.0389</u>
17 18 19	458	22. Chin, N. L., & Campbell, G. M. (2005). Dough aeration and rheology: Part 1. Effects of
20 21	459	mixing speed and headspace pressure on mechanical development of bread dough.
22 23 24	460	Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture, 85, 2184–2193.
25 26	461	https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.2236
27 28 29	462	23. Brabec, D., Rosenau, S., & Shipman, M. (2015). Effect of Mixing Time and Speed on
30 31	463	Experimental Baking and Dough Testing with a 200 g Pin Mixer. Cereal Chemistry, 92,
32 33	464	449–454. <u>https://doi.org/10.1094/CCHEM-02-15-0021-R</u>
34 35 36	465	24. Sadot, M., Cheio, J., & Le-Bail, A. (2017). Impact on dough aeration of pressure
37 38	466	change during mixing. Journal of Food Engineering, 195, 150–157.
39 40 41	467	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2016.09.008
42 43	468	25. Osella, C. A., Sanchez, H. D., & De la Torre, M. A. (2007). Effect of Dough Water
44 45 46	469	Content and Mixing Conditions on Energy Imparted to Dough and Bread Quality.
40 47 48	470	Cereal Foods World, 52, 70–73. <u>https://doi.org/10.1094/CFW-52-2-0070</u>
49 50	471	26. Ktenioudaki, A., Butler, F., & Gallagher, E. (2010). The effect of different mixing
51 52 53	472	processes on dough extensional rheology and baked attributes. Journal of the
54 55	473	Science of Food and Agriculture, 90, 2098–2104. https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.4057
56 57		
58 59		
60		

27. Angioloni, A., & Rosa, M. D. (2007). Dough thermo-mechanical properties: influence of sodium chloride, mixing time and equipment. Journal of Cereal Science, 41, 327-331. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcs.2004.10.004 28. Parenti, A., Guerrini, L., Granchi, L., Venturi, M., Benedettelli, S., & Nistri, F. (2013). Control of mixing step in the bread production with weak wheat flour and Agricultural Engineering, sourdough. Journal of 44, 327-220. https://doi.org/10.4081/jae.2013.s2.e65 29. Cappelli, A., Guerrini, L., Cini, E., & Parenti, A. (2019). Improving whole wheat dough tenacity and extensibility: A new kneading process. Journal of Cereal Science, 90, 102852. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcs.2019.102852 30. Parenti, O., Carini, E., Marchini, M., Tuccio, M. G., Guerrini, L., & Zanoni, B. (2021b). Wholewheat bread: Effect of gradual water addition during kneading on dough and bread properties. LWT - Food Science and Technology, 142, 111017. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2021.111017 31. Parenti, O., Guerrini, L., Carini, E., & Zanoni, B. (2021c). The effect of gradual flour addition during kneading on wholewheat dough properties and bread quality. LWT -Food Science Technology, 147, 111564. and https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2021.111017 32. Pagani, M. A., Marti, A., & Bottega, G. (2014). Wheat milling and flour quality evaluation. Bakery products science and technology, 17-53. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118792001.ch2 33. Ferreira, S. L. C., dos Santos, W. N. L., Quintella, C. M., Neto, B. B., & Bosque-Sendra, J. M. (2004). Doehlert matrix: a chemometric tool for analytical chemistry — review. Talanta, 63, 1061–1067. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2004.01.015 

1 2						
3	498	. <mark>L. 4 luglio 1967, n. 580 "Disciplina per la lavorazione e commercio dei cereali, degli</mark>				
5 6 7	499	sfarinati, del pane e delle paste alimentari."				
8 9	500	35. Bordes, J., Branlard, G., Oury, F. X., Charmet, G., & Balfourier, F. (2008). Agronomic				
10 11 12	501	characteristics, grain quality and flour rheology of 372 bread wheats in a worldwide				
13 14	502	core collection. <i>Journal of Cereal Science</i> , 48, 569–579.				
15 16 17	503	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcs.2008.05.005				
17 18 19	504	36. Parenti, O., Guerrini, L., Zanoni, B., Marchini, M., Tuccio, M. G., & Carini, E. (2021d).				
20 21 22	505	Use of the <sup>1</sup> H NMR technique to describe the kneading step of wholewheat dough:				
22 23 24	506	The effect of kneading time and total water content. <i>Food Chemistry</i> , 338, 128120.				
25 26	507	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2020.128120				
27 28 29	508	Schmiele, M., Jaekel, L. Z., Patricio, S. M. C., Steel, C. J., & Chang, Y. K. (2012). Rheological properties of wheat flour and quality characteristics of pan bread as				
30 31	509					
32 33 34	510	modified by partial additions of wheat bran or whole grain wheat flour. International				
35 36	511	Journal of Food Science and Technology, 47, 2141–2150. https://doi.org/10.1111/				
37 38 39	512	j.1365-2621.2012.03081.x				
40 41	513	. Pagani, M. A., Lucisano, M., & Mariotti, M. (2014). Italian bakery products. <i>Bakery</i>				
42 43 44	514	products science and technology, 685-721.				
45 46	515	9. Sahi, S. S., Little, K., & Ananingsih, V. K. (2006). Quality control. Bakery Products:				
47 48 40	516	Science and Technology, 319-336.				
49 50 51	517					
52 53						
54 55 56						
57 58						

#### **Figure captions**

Figure 1. Contour plots obtained from the Response Surface Methodology for cv. Andriolo unrefined wheat flour. Estimation of bread specific volume was evaluated within the whole selected range of kneading time (4-20 min) and water amount (55.5-71.5%) at the three different kneading speeds: a) 100 rpm, b) 150 rpm and c) 200 rpm. Black lines represent points of the surface with the same bread specific volume. 

Figure 2. Contour plots obtained from the Response Surface Methodology for cv. Bologna unrefined wheat flour. Estimation of bread specific volume was evaluated within the whole selected range of kneading time (8-20 min) and water amount (55.5-71.5%) at the three different kneading speeds: a) 100 rpm, b) 150 rpm and c) 200 rpm. Black lines represent points of the surface with the same bread specific volume. 

é len

2								
3 4	532	Declarations						
5 6	533							
7								
8 9	534	Funding	unding					
10 11 12	535	Not appliable						
12 13 14	536							
15 16 17	537	Conflict of inter	rest/Competing interests					
18 19	538 P	lease check the fo	llowing as appropriate:					
20 21 22	539	🗸 🛛 The J	All authors have participated in (a) conception and design, or analysis					
22 23 24	540	and inte	rpretation of the data; (b) drafting the article or revising it critically for					
25 26	541	importa	nt intellectual content; and (c) approval of the final version.					
27 28 29	542							
30 31	543	<ul> <li>The This manuscript has not been submitted to, nor is under review at,</li> </ul>						
32 33 34	544	another journal or other publishing venue.						
35 36								
37 38 39	546	$\checkmark$ $\boxtimes$ The	The authors have no affiliation with any organization with a direct or					
40 41	547	indirect financial interest in the subject matter discussed in the manuscript						
42 43 44	548							
45 46	549 <ul> <li>The The following authors have affiliations with organizations with direct</li> </ul>							
47 48 49	47 48 550 indirect financial interest in the subject matter discussed in the manuscript 49							
50 51	551							
52 53								
54	4 Authors's Affiliation							
55 56 57		name						
58 59		Ottavia	Institute for Bioeconomy, National Research Council, Via Madonna del					

2		
3 ⊿		Parenti
5		
6 7		Bruno Zano
7 8		
9		
10		
12		
13		Maria Rosa
14		
15 16		Giuffrè
17		
18		
19 20		
20		Lorenzo
22		
23		Guerrini
24 25		
26		
27		
28 29	552	
30	EE2	Availabilit
31	222	Availabilit
32 33	554	All data ge
34		
35	555	
36 27		
38	556	Code avai
39		
40 41	557	Not applia
41		
43	558	
44 45	550	
45 46	559	Authors C
47	560	Concentus
48 40	500	conceptut
49 50	561	acquisitior
51		·
52	562	Rosaria G
53 54		
55	563	Guerrini, E
56		
57 58	564	Guerrini),
59		
60		
59 60		

Parenti	Piano 10, 50019 Sesto Fiorentino, Florence, Italy					
Bruno Zanoni Department of Agricultural, Food and Forestry Systems Management						
(DAGRI), University of Florence, Piazzale Delle Cascine 16, 50144, Florence						
	Italy					
Maria Rosaria Department of Agricultural, Food and Forestry Systems Management						
Giuffrè	(DAGRI), University of Florence, Piazzale Delle Cascine 16, 50144, Florence,					
	Italy					
Lorenzo	Department of Agricultural, Food and Forestry Systems Management					
Guerrini	(DAGRI), University of Florence, Piazzale Delle Cascine 16, 50144, Florence,					
	Italy					
All data genera	ated or analysed during this study are included in this published article					
Code availabil	ity					
Not appliable						
Authors' conti	ributions					
Conceptualisation (Lorenzo Guerrini), Formal analysis (Lorenzo Guerrini), Funding						
acquisition (Lorenzo Guerrini, Bruno Zanoni), Investigation (Ottavia Parenti, Maria						
Rosaria Giuffrè), Methodology (Lorenzo Guerrini), Project administration (Lorenzo						
Guerrini, Bruno Zanoni), Resources (Lorenzo Guerrini, Bruno Zanoni), Software (Lorenzo						
Guerrini), Sup	Guerrini), Supervision (Lorenzo Guerrini, Bruno Zanoni), Writing- original draft (Ottavia					

1 2		
- 3 4	565	Parenti, Maria Rosaria Giuffrè, Lorenzo Guerrini, Bruno Zanoni), Writing – review and
5 6	566	editing (Ottavia Parenti, Lorenzo Guerrini, Bruno Zanoni)
7 8 0	567	
9 10 11		
12 13		
14 15		
16 17		
18 19		
20 21 22		
22 23 24		
25 26		
27 28		
29 30		
31 32 33		
34 35		
36 37		
38 39		
40 41		
42 43 44		
45 46		
47 48		
49 50		
51 52		
53 54		
56 57		
58 59		
60		

2	
З	
1	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
10	
1/	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
26	
30	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
12	
42 42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
<u>4</u> 8	
40	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
55	
20	
57	
58	

1

## **Table 1** Rheological characterisation of cv. Andriolo and cv. Bologna flour samples.

Farinograph	Sample			
Parameter	cv. Bologna	cv. Andriolo		
WA (%)	59.0	57.5		
DDT (min)	3.5	2.0		
DS (min)	9.0	3.0		
MTI (BU)	0	65		
DW (BU)	50	145		
Alveograph	Sample			
parameter	cv. Bologna	cv. Andriolo		
P (mm H₂O)	104.2 ± 4.9	67.1 ± 3.5		
L (mm)	38.2 ± 4.1	27.1 ± 1.6		
G (mm)	13.8 ± 0.8	11.6 ± 0.3		
W (10 <sup>-4</sup> J)	163.2 ± 8.1	75.0 ± 1.4		
P/L	2.8 ± 0.4	2.5 ± 0.3		

Farinograph parameters: water absorption – WA (%), dough development time – DDT (min), dough stability – DS (min), mixing tolerance index – MTI (BU), dough weakening – DW (BU). Alveograph parameters: dough tenacity – P (mm H<sub>2</sub>O), dough extensibility – L (mm), flour strength – W ( $10^{-4}$  J), tenacity to extensibility ratio – P/L.

e perez

http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/efrt

**Table 2** Experimental kneading operating conditions and specific mechanical energy that resulted in the maximum bread specific volume for cv. Andriolo and cv. Bologna flour samples.

Sample	Dough water amount* (%)	Kneading time (min)	Kneading speed (rpm)	Specific mechanical energy (kJ/kg)	Bread specific volume (L/kg)
cv. Andriolo	66.0	17.5	100	7.51	3.10
cv. Bologna	71.5	20.0	200	8.14	3.50

\* The dough water amount (% - w/flour w)

**Table 3** Kneading operating conditions to obtain <mark>an</mark> acceptable bread specific volume quality (bread specific volume = 3.00 L/kg according to which was defined as a specific volume equal or higher than the maximum value of the acceptability range reported by [38] (i.e., 2.50-3.0 L/kg) Zhou, Therdthai, & Hui, (2014).

Sample	Kneading speed (rpm)	Kneading time (min)	Time range ∆T (min)	Dough water amount <sup>*</sup> (%)	Dough water range ∆W (%)
	100	7-20	12	62.5-65.0	2.5
cv. Andriolo	150	4-20	16	62.5-65.0	2.5
	200	4-16	12	60.5-68.0	7.5
	100	8-20	12	60.5-71.5	16.0
cv. Bologna	150	8-20	12	61.0-71.5	15.0
	200	8-20	12	61.5-71.5	14.0

\* The dough water amount (% - w/flour w)

http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/efrt



er periez

Figure 1.



ee perez

Figure 2.

http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/efrt