

University of Parma Research Repository

The determination of bread dough readiness during kneading of wheat flour: A review of the available methods

This is the peer reviewd version of the followng article:

Original

The determination of bread dough readiness during kneading of wheat flour: A review of the available methods / Parenti, O.; Guerrini, L.; Mompin, S. B.; Toldra, M.; Zanoni, B.. - In: JOURNAL OF FOOD ENGINEERING. - ISSN 0260-8774. - 309:(2021), pp. 1-19. [10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2021.110692]

Availability: This version is available at: 11381/2937439 since: 2024-10-09T08:27:31Z

Publisher:

Published DOI:10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2021.110692

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)

Journal of Food Engineering The determination of bread dough readiness during kneading of wheat flour: a review of the available methods --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	JFOODENG-D-20-01887R2
Article Type:	Review Article
Keywords:	Mixing, Bread-making, Dough development, Process control
Corresponding Author:	Lorenzo Guerrini
	Firenze, ITALY
First Author:	Ottavia Parenti
Order of Authors:	Ottavia Parenti
	Lorenzo Guerrini
	Sara Bossa Mompin
	Mònica Toldrà
	Bruno Zanoni
Abstract:	Bread dough Kneading is one of the most important steps in the bread-making process of wheat flour. The quality of wheat breads mostly depends on the proper development of the gluten network, making the measurement of dough readiness or development a key processing factor. This paper provides a review of both standard and alternative methods of measuring bread dough readiness. Although optimum dough development is commonly measured using descriptive rheological tests (i.e., Farinograph and Mixograph tests), the reference methods showed several limits, resulting in a poor correlation with bread quality. Some alternative methods were proposed considered for a more accurate determination of bread dough readiness and their potentiality is discussed as a function of the field of application. online bread dough monitoring and measuring the dough's chemical properties can be interesting approaches . However, the scant information about alternative methods reported in the literature outlines the necessity to encourage further investigations on this topic.

Lorenzo Guerrini University of Florence Piazzale delle Cascine 16, 50144, Florence, Italy Tel: +39 055 2755932 lorenzo.guerrini@unifi.it

Dr. R.P. Singh Editor-in-Chief Journal of Food Engineering

September 10, 2020

Dear Dr. R.P. Singh:

I am pleased to submit an original research article entitled "The determination of bread dough readiness during kneading: a review of the available methods" for consideration for publication in *Journal of Food Engineering*.

This manuscript reviewed the standard and alternative methods of measuring the dough readiness. In the scientific literature it is well-known that dough kneading is one of the most important steps of the bread-making process since the quality of wheat breads mostly depends on the proper development of the gluten network. Therefore, the correct determination of the dough readiness represents a key factor for process control in both academic and industrial areas. This topic could be considered even more important considering the increasing interest in the nutritional value of foods. Indeed, at present time there has been an increasing use of flours with a low degree of refinement as well as flours from different sources (cereals, pseudo-cereals, pulses etc.), which often show poor technological properties, making the control of the kneading step crucial for the quality of the final product.

We believe that this manuscript is appropriate for publication by *Journal of Food Engineering* since the reviewed topic focused on the determination of bread dough readiness during the kneading step, which is at the interface between food and engineering and has particular relevance for the baking industry. To the best of the authors' knowledge this is the first review article that reviewed all the available methods for the determination of dough readiness. The paper also includes a critical evaluation of the reviewed methods, including their potential and most appropriate application in the scientific research and baking industry.

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

Ms. Ref. No.: JFOODENG-D-20-01887R1

Title: The determination of bread dough readiness during kneading of wheat flour: a review of the available methods

We summarized in the following points the modifications made to the first version of the Manuscript according to the reviewers' comments:

- We tried to address every issue outlined by the reviewers, giving a point by point answer and accordingly modifying the Manuscript;
- The literature research was carried out again. The total number of references cited increased from 57 to 168. Within the new references added, we included 40 references published in the last 5 years. We also included older articles which were considered particularly relevant for the revised scientific topic. In fact, to the best of the authors' knowledge a similar review of the literature has been not performed before, hence we tried to be as most comprehensive as possible. An important outcome showed by the review article is that scant and old information is reported in the current literature about the topic revised. However, the topic is very relevant for artisan and industrial bread-making, hence with this review we would like to encourage further investigation on this topic;
- Paragraph 2 (i.e., Paper selection criteria) and Table 1 (i.e., A schematic representation of the main references obtained from the literature search about wheat dough kneading) were added to the Manuscript, in order to give a clear explanation of the literature search and to ensure literature research replicability;

We used the entire time allowed by the Journal to do our best in the revision of the Manuscript. We think that the Manuscript has been substantially improved from the first version.

Highlights

- Key role of the kneading step for the correct development of bread dough structure
- Bread dough readiness represents the optimal dough development during kneading
- Review of all the available methods to determine bread dough readiness
- Discussion of strengths and weaknesses of the methods for dough readiness
- Evaluation of the potential applicability of the methods to improve process control

1 Title

2 The determination of bread dough readiness during kneading of wheat flour: a review of the 3 available methods

4

5 Authors

- 6 Ottavia Parenti¹, Lorenzo Guerrini^{1*}, Sara Bossa Mompin^{1,2}, Mònica Toldrà², Bruno Zanoni¹
- 7 ¹ Dipartimento di Scienze e Tecnologie Agrarie, Alimentari, Ambientali e Forestali, Università degli
- 8 Studi di Firenze, Piazzale Delle Cascine 16, 50144, Firenze, Italia
- 9 ² Institut de Tecnologia Agroalimentària, Escola Politècnica Superior, Universitat de Girona, Placa
- 10 Sant Domenec, 3, Girona, Spain
- 11 *Correspondence to: Lorenzo Guerrini, lorenzo.guerrini@unifi.it
- 12 Tel: +39 055 2755932
- 13

14 Abstract

15 Bread dough Kneading is one of the most important steps in the bread-making process of wheat 16 flour. The quality of wheat breads mostly depends on the proper development of the gluten network, making the measurement of dough readiness or development a key processing factor. This 17 18 paper provides a review of both standard and alternative methods of measuring bread dough 19 readiness. Although optimum dough development is commonly measured using descriptive 20 rheological tests (i.e., Farinograph and Mixograph tests), the reference methods showed several 21 limits, resulting in a poor correlation with bread quality. Some alternative methods were proposed considered for a more accurate determination of bread dough readiness and their potentiality is 22 discussed as a function of the field of application. online bread dough monitoring and measuring 23 24 the dough's chemical properties can be interesting approaches. However, the scant information 25 about alternative methods reported in the literature outlines the necessity to encourage further investigations on this topic. 26

27

28 Keywords

- 29 Wheat flour, Mixing, Bread-making, Dough development, Process control
- 30
- 31 **1. Introduction**

32 Kneading is one of the most important steps in the bread-making process; in this step, the dough 33 ingredients are mixed homogeneously, the flour constituents are hydrated, the gluten network is formed giving a viscoelastic wheat dough structure, and air bubbles are trapped within the dough 34 matrix (Quaglia, 1984; Pézolet et al., 1992; Cuq et al., 2003; Robertson et al., 2006; Haegens, 2006a; 35 36 Kokawa et al., 2012; Schiedt et al., 2013; Zhou et al., 2014; Cauvain, 2015a,b; Mijnsbrugge et al., 37 2016; Guerrini et al., 2019; Parenti et al., 2021). The terms "kneading" and "mixing" are often used 38 as synonyms in the scientific literature, even though they actually explain a temporal sequence of 39 physico-chemical phenomena: dough mixing refers to the initial phenomena of homogenization and 40 hydration of the ingredients, whereas dough kneading refers to the subsequent development of the gluten network (Cuq et al., 2003; Haegens, 2006a; Cauvain, 2015a). Following the literature 41 <mark>approach, i</mark>n this review, <mark>both</mark> kneading <mark>and mixing terms are used is used as the term to refer to all</mark> 42 of the above phenomena. 43

44 Cuq et al. (2003) set out a theoretical state diagram describing the physical changes and phase 45 transitions occurring to the main wheat flour biopolymers during kneading as a function of 46 temperature and water amount. At room temperature, the presence of a sufficient amount of water 47 allows the flour constituents to hydrate; the amorphous polymers (i.e., wheat flour proteins) and amorphous region of the semi-crystalline polymers (starch) achieve glass transition, going from a 48 49 glassy to a rubbery state (Cuq et al., $200\frac{3}{2}$). Simultaneously, the input of mechanical energy leads to 50 new interactions between the gluten proteins (i.e., gliadins and glutenins) through disulphide 51 bonds, resulting in the gradual development of the gluten network; an optimum structure is 52 reached, but if the mechanical energy is excessive, protein depolymerization occurs (Quaglia, 1984; Cuq et al., 2003; Haegens, 2006a; Cauvain, 2015a,b). 53

54 Following the definition proposed by some scientific articles (Perez Alvarado et al., 2016; Rachok et 55 <mark>al., 2018a; Hammed et al., 2016; Oliinyk et al., 2020), in the present review</mark> the term "dough 56 readiness" is used order to define a specific dough status which is characterized by the optimum 57 development of the gluten network, meaning that the wheat dough is in the best physico-chemical 58 conditions to give an high-quality end product with the desired characteristics. Despite the high 59 differentiation of bread typologies, in the literature dough readiness is commonly evaluated using 60 standard quality parameters of dough and bread. The evaluation of dough quality mainly relays on rheological properties, whereas bread quality is usually evaluated in terms of specific volume, and 61 62 crumb texture. The peak of dough consistency, and the maximum loss and elastic moduli are the parameters associated to optimal dough development. The higher the bread specific volume, the 63

softness of the crumb and the fineness of the crumb structure, the higher the product quality (Sahi 64 et al., 2006; Pagani et al., 2014a; Cauvain, 2015c,e). Undermixed dough does not have an optimally 65 developed gluten structure, resulting in doughs with a low gas bubble retention capacity, and low-66 67 volume breads with too hard a texture; similarly, in overmixed doughs the gluten network is 68 gradually depolymerized, with an increase in free water, resulting in poor-quality breads (Haegens, 2006a; Kaddour et al., 2007; Cauvain, 2015a,b; Perez Alvarado et al., 2016; Zhou et al., 2014). 69 70 Therefore, dough readiness is a key parameter in controlling the bread quality, a complex concept 71 associated to different characteristics as a function of bread typology bread-making process. 72 Measuring dough readiness still represents a challenge for both the academic sphere and the bread-

73 making industry. The complexity of obtaining a reliable determination of the optimal dough 74 development is further enhanced by the wide variety of bread-making conditions, which account 75 for the diversification of breads (Haegens, 2006b; Zhang & Chen, 2014; Pagani et al., 2014b; Osorio-76 Diaz et al., 2014; inan & Yurdugül, 2014; Cauvain, 2015c,d). Several variables affect dough 77 development, including the technological quality of the flour, the bread dough formula, the 78 operating conditions adopted during kneading, the bread-making method and the environmental conditions (Zhou et al., 2014; Dobraszczyk & Morgenstern, 2003; Haegens, 2006a; Amjid et al., 2013; 79 Tucker et al., 2014; Cauvain, 2015a,b,e,f). 80

81 In the scientific literature and in the baking industry, the reference methods for measuring dough 82 readiness mainly rely on descriptive rheological tests (i.e., Farinograph and Mixograph tests); baking 83 trials and visual evaluation of the dough by expert bakers are also included among the standard bread-making methods (AACC 10-09.01 and 10-10.03). However, the above reference methods 84 85 have some weaknesses. The experimental data obtained from the descriptive rheological methods 86 are inevitably affected by the operating conditions adopted during the tests, which are different 87 from those used in the experimental trials and the bakeries; as a result, a biased measurement of 88 the dough readiness may give an unexpected bread quality. Baking trials require large amounts of 89 resources in terms of time and ingredients and are affected by several variables that are difficult to 90 control; expert evaluation is also an empirical approach, based on subjective judgements and 91 affected by the baker's personal skills and level of fatigue (Dobraszczyk & Morgenstern, 2003; 92 Haegens, 2006a; Amjid et al., 2013; Tucker et al., 2014; Pagani et al., 2014a; Cauvain, 2015e). Therefore, alternative methods have been proposed, including offline and inline/online techniques, 93 the latter being particularly interesting owing to the possibility of performing real-time monitoring 94

95 in real experimental and industrial kneading conditions.

Commented [OP1]: Ripetitivo?

96 Furthermore, recently there have been great changes in the baking industry's main objectives. After 97 the Industrial Revolution, the main efforts were directed towards developing processes which were able to produce cereal-based products of high technological quality through the standardization of 98 the chemical composition of the raw materials (Zhou et al., 2014; Pagani et al., 2014a; Cauvain, 99 100 2015e). Now, since the products' nutritional quality has gained equal or even greater importance than the technological quality, the process needs to adapt to the inherent characteristics of the 101 102 different cereal flours used (Cappelli et al., 2019; Guerrini et al., 2019; Gómez et al., 2020; Parenti 103 et al., 2020a). Increasing consumer sensitivity to the nutritional value of foods has incremented the 104 use of flours with a low degree of refinement as well as flours from different sources, such as other 105 cereals, pseudo cereals, pulses etc. (Torres et al., 2017; Schaffer-Lequart et al., 2017; Boukid et al., 2019; Guerrini et al., 2019; Parenti et al., 2020b), which show a richer nutritional value than the 106 107 standard refined wheat flours. However, they are generally characterized by an inferior 108 technological performance and low stability during kneading (Guerrini et al., 2019; Parenti et al., 109 2020b; Gómez et al., 2020). As a result, the use of the above flours makes it even more important 110 to measure dough readiness properly, since the time interval corresponding to optimum dough 111 development will be much shorter than with flours of a high technological quality (Pagani et al., 2014a; <mark>Zhou et al., 2014</mark>; Cauvain, 2015<mark>e</mark>; Guerrini et al., 2019; Gómez et al., 2020; Parenti et al., 112 113 <mark>2020b</mark>).

This paper presents a complete review of the procedures available for the measurement of bread dough readiness, including both the standard and alternative methods. Then, the above methods are discussed in order to evaluate the suitability of the different techniques as a function of the field of application. Finally, the paper proposes some advancements in the bread readiness measurement procedures.

2. Paper selection criteria

119 120

121 In the present review, literature search focused on the kneading step of wheat flours using the most 122 popular databases without applying temporal restrictions. "Wheat dough kneading" and "Wheat 123 dough mixing" were used as keywords for article selection. The initial research gave hundreds of 124 scientific studies; papers out of the review scope were discarded. Table 1 listed the most relevant 125 papers resulting from the first selection which were classified in six categories as a function of the 126 main focus studied: (i) Correlation between different methods and dough/bread quality; (ii) Effects 127 of different kneading conditions on dough/bread properties; (iii) Prediction of bread-making

128	performance; (iv) Wheat protein structure/development; (v) Dough development; (vi)
129	Methods/promising approaches for the determination of dough readiness. Only the articles that
130	proposed methods/promising approaches for the determination of dough readiness were included
131	in the review. Despite wheat dough kneading has been widely investigated in the literature, to the
132	authors' best knowledge, articles facing with the determination of dough readiness were limited in
133	number and quite old. This latter issue disclosed that there has been a constant interest in the
134	literature in wheat dough kneading; however, few attempts have been made on improving the
135	determination of the optimal dough development.

136

137 3. The Reference methods

The measurement of bread dough readiness is included in two groups of standard bread-makingmethods: the AACC methods and the Chorleywood Bread Process method.

The AACC methods are standard bread-making methods proposed by the Cereals & Grains Association; they are as follows: (i) the basic straight dough bread-making method with long fermentation (the AACC 10-09.01 method) and (ii) the optimized straight dough bread-making method (the AACC 10-10.03 method).

The AACC 10-09.01 method is designed both to evaluate the quality of flours using a straight dough 144 145 process with a long fermentation time and to assess the effect of ingredients and processing 146 conditions on bread quality. It includes standardization of the apparatus, the bread recipe and the 147 processing conditions. The dough has to be mixed in a Swanson pin-type kneader or equivalent (100-148 500 g capacity); orbital speeds of 100-125 rpm and 80-90 rpm are recommended for 100 g and 200 149 g of dough, respectively. The measurement of dough readiness is based on: (i) descriptive 150 rheological tests; (ii) baking tests; (iii) work input measurement by means of a W-h meter or similar 151 device connected to the kneader and (iv) visual inspection of the dough's appearance.

152 The AACC 10-10.03 method is conceived to evaluate the wheat flour quality and the effect of 153 different variables such as environmental factors, bread dough ingredients, wheat variety, wheat 154 flour proteins, and processing techniques on the bread quality. It uses a McDuffee-type bowl 155 kneader (500 g capacity) or a pin-type kneader (10 g or 100 g capacity) with a head speed of 100-156 125 rpm. The dough readiness measurement can be obtained through a descriptive rheological test 157 and a visual inspection of the dough's appearance (Finney, 1984). The method outlines that the 158 mixing requirements determined in a 100 g pin-type kneader are approximately equal to those 159 determined in a 100 g Mixograph. For mixers that develop doughs more slowly or more rapidly than 100 g mixers, it is necessary to calculate the factor to correct the Mixograph kneading time to the kneading time in real baking conditions. Hence, the AACC 10-10.03 method considers the impact of the kneader variables on the determination of dough readiness; however, it does not specify how to determine the correction factor between the different mixers.

164 The Chorleywood Bread Process (CBP) is a no-time dough-making process based on the mechanical development of wheat dough widely used in many industries (Cauvain, 2015). The dough is 165 166 developed rapidly since the mixing and kneading operations are performed simultaneously; the 167 bread recipe includes the addition of an oxidizing agent, a high shortening and/or emulsifier melting point, and large amounts of water and yeast. Dough readiness is achieved by applying a fixed 168 169 amount of energy to develop the dough in an interval of between 2 and 5 min. The readiness is 170 measured as the work input, which is defined as the energy required to mix the dough to the point 171 of peak torque, and it is conventionally expressed on a dough-weight basis (Fortmann et al., 1964; 172 Heaps et al., 1967; Kilborn & Tipples, 1972, 1973; Frazier et al., 1975; Atkins & Larsen, 1990; Oliver 173 & Allen, 1992; Wilson et al., 1997; Zounis and Quail, 1997; Anderssen et al., 1998; Wilson et al., 174 2001; Chin et al., 2005a; Muscalu et al., 2017; Cauvain, 2015a). Preliminary results from a limited 175 number of flours have revealed that the ideal energy input at a kneading speed of 300 rpm is 11 Wh/kg. Further studies on flours of different technological qualities have shown that the optimal 176 177 energy input varies as a function of the flour properties, with "extra-strong" flours requiring the 178 highest energy inputs (Cauvain, 2015a). A modified CBP method – the Mechanical Dough 179 Development (MDD) method – which applies different energy amounts as a function of the flour quality has also been proposed (Wilson et al., 2001). The main features of MDD are high-speed 180 181 mixers which work intensively on the dough for a short period, the use of an oxidizing agent and the 182 absence of any brew or pre-ferment.

183 184

3.1 Visual inspection

A widely implemented practice to directly measure dough readiness is visual inspection of the dough by the test baker. Visual inspection is an empirical approach based on the subjective visual (i.e., homogeneity, smoothness, brightness) and sometimes tactile (i.e., dough consistency, stickiness) sensory evaluation of the dough. The dough quality evaluation varies greatly depending on the baker's personal skills and experience, hence it does not provide a reliable dough readiness measurement (Perez Alvarado et al., 2016). Indeed, when Perez Alvarado et al. (2016) used the bakers' visual evaluation of the dough readiness to determine the optimal kneading time, it resulted
in a high standard deviation (300 ± 200 s).

193

194 3.2 Baking trials

Baking trials are widely adopted in the baking industry to indirectly measure dough readiness, which is expressed as the optimum kneading time. The dough is kneaded at a constant speed and for different kneading times, with intervals of 0.5 min; after kneading, the standard bread-making steps are performed. The bread quality parameters (i.e., loaf volume and crumb hardness) are processed as a function of the kneading time in order to identify the time that optimizes bread quality. Although this method leads to reliable results, it requires a large amount of effort in terms of ingredients and time.

202 203

3.3 Descriptive Rheological tests

204 Descriptive rheological tests have been extensively applied in the cereal industry, since they provide 205 a direct measurement of the dough readiness, which is expressed as consistency, hardness or 206 texture, and can predict an optimal kneading time to reach the desired dough texture. Figure 1 shows the dough consistency profile as a function of the kneading time measured using a 207 208 consistency probe. Descriptive rheological tests are performed with robust instruments, are easy to 209 perform and do not require highly trained personnel (Dobraszczyk & Morgenstern, 2003). Some of 210 the differences from the fundamental rheological tests are that: (i) the sample geometry is variable 211 and not well defined; (ii) the stress and strain states are uncontrolled, complex and not uniform and 212 (iii) it is impossible to define any rheological parameters such as stress, strain, strain rate, modulus 213 and viscosity (Dobraszczyk & Morgenstern, 2003). Therefore, the descriptive rheological tests give 214 parameters that are strictly dependent on the conditions adopted during the test, such as type of instrument, size and geometry of the test sample, standard dough recipe and temperature, which 215 216 are not necessarily able to simulate the real kneading operating conditions (Dobraszczyk & 217 Morgenstern, 2003). The Farinograph (twin z-arm mixer, 60 rpm mixer speed) and the Mixograph 218 (pin mixer, 88 rpm mixer speed) are the laboratory-scale mixers most recommended in the 219 literature for the measurement of bread dough readiness expressed as an apparent optimal 220 kneading time.

Several studies have been carried out to investigate and improve the accuracy of the measurementof dough readiness using descriptive rheological tests. Tanaka & Tipples (1969) found that increasing

223 the Farinograph speed (from 60 rpm to 90-120 rpm) improved the relationship between the 224 predictive kneading time and the bread quality parameters. Similarly, Zounis & Quail (1997) found 225 that the standard Farinograph speed showed no correlation with the kneading time in real baking 226 conditions; instead, the Farinograph test at a high kneading speed (i.e., 120-180 rpm), the 227 Mixograph test and direct use of the bakery pin mixer gave good predictions of the kneading time with the highest bread score. The Mixograph test gave a reliable measurement of dough readiness 228 229 in the study by Burrows & Gras (1990), with a good correlation occurring between the time of peak 230 dough resistance predicted by the Mixograph and the peak resistance obtained in the pin mixer. 231 Oliver & Allen (1992) showed that the optimal kneading time (i.e., the time maximizing the loaf 232 volume) corresponded to doughs kneaded to the end of the Farinograph plateau period, 233 independently of the kneading speed; it was found easier to identify the above time at a Farinograph 234 speed of 140-180 rpm than at the standard speed.

235 The bread ingredients have also been found to affect the optimal kneading time. Oliver & Allen 236 (1992) observed different peak torque and work inputs for the Farinograph standard recipe (wheat 237 flour and distilled water) compared to commercial bread recipes. Oliver & Allen (1993) and Oliver & 238 Allen (1994) reported a different farinographic consistency when adding commercial improvers to the standard formula, and found the best correlation with the real kneading requirements using the 239 240 Farinograph at 180 rpm with a flour-water-2% salt recipe. In the research by Zounis & Quail (1997), 241 a bakery recipe (i.e., 100% flour, 2% salt, 2% fat, 1% improvers and 2.5% compressed yeast) tested 242 in the Farinograph at 120 rpm decreased the height of the peak consistency, increased the kneading 243 time and the energy requirements, and showed the presence of a second peak; the kneading time 244 of the second peak was better correlated with the bread score than the first peak. The bakery recipe 245 in the Mixograph test also gave similar results to the Farinograph test. The above results were consistent with Tanaka & Tipples (1969), who observed that bread recipes with salt and/or yeast 246 247 had a much higher tendency to exhibit a double-peak curve.

The alternative application of fundamental rheological tests has been proposed by some authors since they give parameters independently of the kneading conditions. Ross et al. (2004) used a controlled stress rheometer to perform both strain and frequency sweep experiments. The authors observed, in different flour samples, that both the storage (G') and loss (G'') moduli peaked at the point of optimum dough development, which was expressed as the time corresponding to the highest dough elasticity (maximum G') and viscous component (maximum G'') of the dough. Other authors (Hwang & Gunasekaran, 2001; Alava et al., 2001) have proposed the above tests too;

255	however, they are not commonly used as a standard method for the measurement of dough
256	readiness. Many reasons may be put forward for this; fundamental rheological tests are complex
257	and expensive, they are difficult to maintain in an industrial environment, they require a high level
258	of technical skill, the experimental data are often difficult to interpret, and slip and edge effects
259	occur during testing (Dobraszczyk & Morgenstern, 2003).
260	Mixolab is a new tool for quality control of cereals and cereal products. It offers enhanced
261	functionality over existing devices because of the geometry of the mixing blades and mixing bowl
262	and the variable operating condition options (kneader speed and temperature), which allowed to
263	assess kneading parameters, dough behaviour during heating cycles, and the effect of ingredients
264	addition (Dubat, 2016). Several authors reported a good correlation between standard rheological
265	tests and the Mixolab in the determination of the kneading time of wheat flour dough (Dapčević et
266	al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2009; Koksel et al., 2009; Rosell et al., 2010; Caffe-treml et al., 2010; Ohm et
267	al., 2012; Moreira et al., 2012; Blandino et al., 2015; Vàzquez & Veira, 2015; Doubat et al., 2016;
268	Torbica et al., 2016; Xhabiri et al., 2016; Singh et al., 2019).
269	Some authors evaluated the potential of other methods for the evaluation of the bread-making
270	quality of wheat flour, including kneading time (Ram et al., 2005; Tietze et al., 2019). Ram et al.
271	(2005) found a good correlation between Lactic Acid Solvent Retention Capacity with Farinograph
272	and Mixograph parameters related to gluten strength, including the peak time. Tiezte et al. (2019)
273	showed that micro-scale shear mixing (MSSM) technique can be a reliable method for the rapid
274	evaluation of flour and dough properties. Indeed, the authors found a good correlation between
275	rheological properties of MSSM dough and those of dough mixed in a z-blade mixer, including the
276	determination of optimum dough development time.
277	
278	3.4 Work input measurement
279	The work is the energy required to mix the dough to the kneader's point of peak torque (Wilson et
280	al., 2001). <mark>#</mark> The work is related to the kneader power (<i>P</i>) as follows:
281	
282	$P = T \cdot \omega $ ^[1]
283	
284	where T is the peak torque and ω is the angular velocity, which is:
285	
286	$\omega = 2\pi \cdot s \tag{2}$

287

288 where *s* is the kneading speed at the point of peak torque.

289 Then, the work input (*WI*) can be determined as follows:

290

 $WI = P \cdot t = T \cdot \omega \cdot t$

292

where *t* is the kneading time. The work input is commonly expressed in W-h/kg of dough weight.
If the work input amount is indirectly related to the dough readiness, in ideal conditions this work
amount is independent of the kneader type, since, by applying equation 3, it can be obtained from
different combinations of the kneader power - P at peak torque - T and the kneading time - t.
Therefore, several studies have been carried out in order to test the suitability of work input to
measure bread dough readiness.

The CBP method, based on the mechanical development of the dough, reported that for kneading speeds above a certain threshold value, dough readiness was produced by a fixed energy amount. Conversely, the MDD method showed the necessity of a preliminary measurement for a specific wheat flour's energy requirements since the fixed CBP energy value is not appropriate for highstrength flours (Wilson et al., 2001).

304 Heaps et al. (1967) found that, when using the descriptive rheological parameters of the Extensograph test (i.e., maximum of the stress work component and minimum of the extensibility), 305 306 the dough readiness corresponded to the rate of work input that gave inflection points of the 307 parameters (i.e., minimum or maximum values, where the derivative of the function representing 308 the parameter trend is equal to zero). However, in baking trials, the highest bread volume was 309 obtained at a different work input rate corresponding to a lower level of total work input. Different 310 independent factors may account for this different result: a change in the bread recipe and/or 311 different dough readiness requirement in real bread-making situations compared those adopted 312 during the rheological test.

Oliver & Allen (1992) showed that, consistently with the above CBP results, at higher Farinograph
kneading speeds (140-180 rpm) than the standard, the work input was independent of the variation
in kneading speed; work input rather than kneading time appeared a suitable parameter for
obtaining the dough readiness.

Zounis & Quail (1997) found a high correlation between work input and kneading time for optimumdough consistency in both the Farinograph and Mixograph tests. The energy amount to reach dough

[3]

319 readiness increased as the kneading speed increased in 8 of the 28 flour samples and remained 320 constant in the others. These results were not consistent with what was observed by Oliver & Allen 321 (1992) and Kilborn & Tipples (1972), who found that at high kneading speeds the work input was 322 independent of the rotational speed. However, both Zounis & Quail (1997) and Kilborn & Tipples 323 (1972) stated that kneading to the maximum peak consistency represents a better method for 324 measuring dough readiness than kneading with a fixed work input, since the latter is affected by the 325 processing conditions and the technological quality of the flour. The mixing method used by Kilborn 326 & Tipples (1972) included a short premix period at a slow speed, before application of the desired 327 kneading speed. Frazier et al. (1975), who did not use slow-speed premixing, found that the work 328 input to reach the maximum dough consistency increased as the kneading speed increased; higher 329 work inputs were probably required for high kneading speeds due to the time-dependent hydration 330 effect.

In performing the Mixograph test at low kneading speeds, Anderssen et al. (1998) reported a
significant difference in the work input amount as a function of the flour technological quality.
However, at speeds higher than 90 rpm the work input was found to be independent of the kneading
speed for all flour types.

Wilson et al. (2001) found that as the kneading speed increased, the work input decreased, and then 335 336 remained constant for a specific mixer speed range and before growing again. Slightly different work 337 input trends as a function of the mixer speed were observed according to the flour strength. Above 338 different thresholds, the number of kneading arm revolutions at which the peak torque occurred 339 was constant as a function of the flour strength; the work input appeared independent of the 340 kneader speed in one range only, which was instead dependent on the kneader type and flour used. 341 Fortmann et al. (1964) and Kilborn & Tipples (1973) found different work input requirements for the 342 same flour using both different laboratory mixers and the same laboratory mixer with different arm 343 shapes. Wilson et al. (1997) found that the work inputs obtained in laboratory and industrial-scale MDD mixers were highly correlated ($R^2 = 0.88$) but they showed a large offset since the industrial 344 345 mixer required a higher energy amount. This result could be interpreted in terms of the different 346 rate of work inputs and the different mixing actions between the two kneaders, but it could be also 347 related to the fact that the initial processes of hydration and ingredient homogenization occurring within the dough are more time-dependent than energy-dependent. According to this latter 348 349 interpretation and to the results shown by Kilborn & Tipples (1972) using a slow pre-mixing step,

350	Wilson et al. (1997) proposed mixing the ingredients slowly before selecting a high mixer speed as
351	a strategy to reduce the industrial-scale MDD mixers' higher energy requirements.

Chin et al. (2005a) monitored work inputs of dough during mixing in a lab-scale Tweedy-type MDD 352 353 mixer. The peak torque increased with increasing mixing speed and headspace pressure. 354 Furthermore, results showed reported that the number of kneading arm revolutions needed for 355 dough readiness in a Tweedy-type mixer decreased as the kneading speed increased, showing that 356 the work input was not independent of the rate in this mixer type; they confirmed what was 357 reported by Skeggs & Kingswood (1981): mixing at a fast speed was more efficient, since a lot of 358 work was supplied to the dough with each revolution of the kneading arm. 359 Atkins & Larsen (1990) compared the Farinograph with Mechanical Dough Development tests for

flour quality evaluation. They found that a Farinograph can be successfully used to predict the water
 absorption, stability, development time and breakdown for MDD system. However, only

362 development time was significantly correlated with bread volume, probably because the363 Farinograph did not simulate the intensive mixing of MDD.

Muscalu et al. (2017) tested different levels of work input in order to optimize the bread volume of a weak flour dough. A system for kneading process optimization called SOPF was used to monitor the energy amount during kneading, which was stopped at the point of dough readiness. However, a preliminary evaluation of the optimal energy amount required by the flour sample was needed.

- 368 A schematic overview of all the above methods is reported in Table 2.
- 369

370 4. The Alternative methods

 $\frac{371}{3}$ $\frac{3}{4}$.1 Torque and power consumption measurements

372 The torque and power consumption methods indirectly measure dough readiness by monitoring its 373 trend as a function of time and can therefore predict an optimal kneading time to reach the desired 374 dough texture using the same principle as descriptive rheological tests (Wesley et al., 1998; Alava 375 et al., 2001; Kaddour et al., 2007; Kaddour et al., 2008<mark>a</mark>; Perez Alvarado et al., 2016). Figure 2 shows the power consumption profile as a function of the kneading time measured using a current 376 377 transducer (Hwang & Gunasekaran, 2001). Indeed, a positive proportionality exists between the 378 dough consistency and the torque/power consumption value although this relationship is not 379 always easy to prove since the power consumption also includes energy losses in the motor and 380 drive chain. Differently from descriptive rheological tests, the above methods are online inline

381	methods, which can be applied in real kneading conditions; the torque/power consumption values
382	are monitored during kneading by applying a power or electrical current transducer to the kneader.
383	Wang et al. (1993) proposed the instantaneous input power data acquisition system (DAS) and
384	digital signal processing (DSP) system combined with fuzzy set theory as a non-intrusive real-time
385	gluten development sensing control, since the three phase instantaneous input power has a
386	significant relationship with gluten development.
387	Zounis & Quail (1997) found that the kneading time giving the highest bread score was longer than

the peak of power consumption in 70% of the tested samples, which included those dough samples wheat flours with the highest protein content, the highest farinographic water absorption, and the best overall bread quality. Depending on the flour technological quality, different regions of the power consumption curve could be considered to correspond to the best measurement of the dough readiness; the flours most suited to bread-making needed longer kneading times than those predicted using the peak of power consumption method.

Wilson et al. (2001) observed that as the kneading speed increased, the rate at which the torque increased was slower than the rate commonly predicted using a power method. The authors hypothesized that at a higher kneading speed more air is included within the dough; this phenomenon decreased the density and apparent viscosity of the dough, changing the relationship between torque and kneading speed.

Hwang & Gunasekaran (2001) analysed some peaks in the power consumption trend during dough
kneading. Comparison with the storage (G') and viscous (G'') moduli showed that power
consumption can be used to determine the optimum dough development.

402 Pereira et al. (2013) monitored dough kneading at constant speed using the electrical changes of 403 the motor as affected by machine torque. This system was sensitive to the dough formula and was 404 proposed to provide useful information for quality control and decision-making during food 405 processing.

- Altuna et al. (2016) developed a methodology to measure torque during large-scale kneading. The
 dough was kneaded in a large-scale dynamic rheometer measuring instant torque and speed in real
 time through a personal computer (PC) interface. Maximum torque during mixing showed
 significant fit to linear model on the basis of which the effect of resistant maize starch and bread
 enzymes could be estimated.
- 411 Aljaafreh (2017) proposed a non-invasive sensor for real-time monitoring of mixing and agitation
- 412 processes based on current sensing and online learning through reinforcement learning (RL). The

413	method enabled the sensor to learn how to control and automate the mixing and agitation
414	processes based on Q-learning. The sensor learns the electric current pattern and utilizes user
415	feedback to learn the optimal stopping time based on the characteristics of the mixture.

416

417 3 4.2 NIR Spectroscopy

418 Near infrared (NIR) spectroscopy measures the interaction between the dough and NIR radiation in the wavelength range of 400-2500 nm, detecting molecular vibrations at specific overtones. In the 419 420 literature it is widely known that the majority of changes occurring during dough development 421 involve chemical modifications of the flour constituents (Haegens, 2006a; Kaddour & Cuq, 2011; 422 Zhou et al., 2014; Cauvain, 2015<mark>a</mark>). The main issues concern both identification of the NIR 423 wavelengths that are mostly correlated with dough readiness and the selection of a common 424 method to perform the chemometric spectra analysis. The Principal component analysis (PCA) raw 425 spectra, second derivative spectra and peak area at a specific wavelength range are processed in 426 order to create a NIR curve as a function of the kneading time (Figure 3).

Commented [OP2]: Dato che queste analisi sono utilizzate da alcuni articoli ma non da altri forse eliminerei questa frase

Different devices have been proposed in the literature to monitor dough development using the NIR technique. Wesley et al. (1998) designed a support tray which was placed over the kneading bowl with the dough at the nominal focal point of the NIR instrument. Kaddour et al. (2007) used a fibre optic probe in direct contact with the dough, whereas Alava et al. (2001) proposed a system in which the fibre optic remains 4 cm above the dough surface.

432 Several studies have been performed in the NIR range of 400-2500 nm, at 2 or 5 nm intervals 433 (Kaddour & Cuq, 2011). The wavelengths have been related to different chemical reactions 434 occurring during the dough development while the data extracted from the raw NIR spectra have 435 been associated with physical changes in the dough during kneading (Alava et al., 2001; Kaddour et 436 al., 2007; Kaddour & Cuq, 2011). Conversely, the second derivative NIR spectra have mainly been 437 associated with changes in water interactions and chemical reactions between the wheat 438 components (Kaddour & Cuq, 2011).

439 Delwiche & Weaver (1994) investigated the potential of using NIR technique in the range of 1100-

440 2498 nm to determine flour technological parameters, including dough kneading time. Reasonably

441 good models could be developed for water absorption, moderately good models for loaf height, and

442 poor models for the other indices, including kneading time, probably due to the complexity of

443 interactions between flour constituents.

Dempster et al. (1998) used NIR technique to monitor dough development during kneading. The
procedure used a ratio of two specific NIR wavelengths at 1455 nm and 1205 nm to obtain NIR
dough development curve. The authors hypothesised that this parameter tracks protein-starch
interactions in the presence of water. NIR kneading time was validated with the empirical judgment
of an expert operator, hence required further confirmations.

Wesley et al. (1998) found two peaks at 1160 nm and 1200 nm and the kneading curves at these 449 450 wavelengths were developed by plotting the NIR peak area as a function of the kneading time. The 451 peak areas of both 1160 nm and 1200 nm decreased as the kneading proceeded, showing a minimum at the optimum dough development point, before increasing when the dough was 452 453 overmixed. The peak area at 1160 nm was related to changes in water mobility during kneading; 454 the peak at 1200 nm was difficult to interpret, since it could be linked to the overlapping 455 absorbances of the glutenins and gliadins. The NIR kneading time was close to the maximum power 456 consumption time, but slightly longer (by approx. 20%). Similar results were also found using 457 different kneaders and flour types. Wesley et al. (2002) patented an NIR spectroscopy method for 458 monitoring dough development. The research recommended monitoring the absorbance of the 459 second derivative spectra at the following wavelengths: (i) absorbance at 1160 nm, related to the stretch-bend combination band of water and highly sensitive to the local environment of the water 460 461 molecules; (ii) absorbance at 1200 nm, related to a C-H stretch second overtone which was 462 predominantly due to proteins and (iii) absorbance at 1430 nm, related to the two absorbances due 463 to water and proteins. All these bands were reported as showing a minimum at the dough readiness point. The method also suggested monitoring both the absorbance of the glutenins, which showed 464 a minimum at 2350 nm, and the absorbance of gliadins, which displayed minimum values at 2340 465 466 nm and at 2310 nm, and a maximum at 2195 nm.

Alava et al. (2001) observed the most consistent NIR changes in the 1125-1180 nm wavelength region. The NIR kneading time was longer than the kneading time obtained using the traditional methods (i.e., torque and elastic modulus of gel protein fraction G' measurements), but it showed a better correlation with the bread quality. NIR spectroscopy allowed the kneading conditions to be optimized as a function of the characteristics of the wheat flour variety or flour blend.

472 Kaddour et al. (2007) monitored the kneading step of different wheat varieties using an FT-NIR 473 spectrometer in the range of 1000-2500 nm. The raw NIR spectra showed the dominant 474 contribution of physical mechanisms such as the granular state and surface appearance of the 475 dough. The second derivative spectra in the 1000-2325 nm wavelength range and in some specific 476 wavelength ranges (1352-1485 nm, 17778-2052 nm, 2109-2325 nm) allowed a physico-chemical 477 description of the NIR absorbance variations which was associated with the evolution of the 478 hydrogen bond vibrations. The greatest changes were reported in the 1778-2052 nm wavelength 479 due to O-H vibrations. The predicted kneading time resulting from the NIR raw spectra was higher 480 than the time of maximum consistency, whereas the NIR kneading time from the second derivative 481 treatment was more similar to the time of maximum dough consistency.

482

483 3 4.3MIR spectroscopy

The Mid-infrared (MIR) spectroscopy range (2500 and 5000 nm) is the principal spectroscopic region 484 485 for evaluating molecular vibration; it is able to give precise and directly accessible information on X-H chemical bonds (X: C, H, O and N), which is useful in determining the chemical composition of 486 487 food products (Kaddour et al., 2008a). In a batter dough system, Robertson et al. (2006) showed 488 that FT-MIR spectroscopy can be used to monitor relative changes in the protein secondary 489 structures. Since gluten development is the key factor determining the dough properties, the 490 possibility of monitoring the formation of the gluten network could make it an interesting tool for a 491 precise and reliable determination of dough readiness.

While different approaches have been used in the literature for the offline monitoring of dough kneading with MIR spectroscopy and for the chemometric analysis of the data, the information available is scant. One such approach was taken by Kaddour et al. (2008a) who collected a dough sample with a spatula and immediately transferred it to the measurement cell; after 60 s a MIR spectrum was obtained.

Different results about protein secondary structure changes have been reported in the literature (Wellner et al., 1996; Seabourn et al., 2004; Robertson et al., 2006); the reason for this could be the different amide bands studied (amide I and amide III) or the different products analysed (i.e., bread dough, batter and gluten). Hence, it is reported that large changes occur in protein secondary structures during both hydration of the wheat gluten proteins and gluten mechanical development (Belton et al., 1995; Wellner et al., 1996).

Seabourn et al. (2008) used a different offline system in which all dough samples were measured after 1 min of kneading. They used Fourier Transform Horizontal Attenuated Total Reflectance (FT-HATR) spectroscopy in the amide III band to measure the dough development after a short Mixograph mixing cycle (1 min). The ratio between the α -helix (1336 cm⁻¹) and β -sheet (1242 cm⁻¹) second derivative band areas (SDBA) was calculated, and its relationship to optimum Mixograph

508	<mark>kneading time was studied</mark> <mark>increased in a non-linear manner with the mixing time</mark> . The
509	${}_{ m spectrophotometric kneading time was highly correlated with the Mixograph kneading time; the lpha$
510	helix/ β -sheet SDBA ratio resulted highly correlated with the Mixograph kneading time, hence it was
511	highly predictive of the dough readiness, and confirmed that $\beta\mbox{-sheet structures}$ are the structures
512	that develop most during kneading (Seabourn, 2002; Popineau et al., 1994; Wellner et al., 2005).
513	Flours with a short kneading time showed a faster $\beta\mbox{-sheet}$ structure development than those with
514	a long developing time (Seabourn et al., 2008).
515	Kaddour et al. (2008a) showed that the amide III band correlated better with the chemical

516 properties of the dough than the amide I band; there was no interference from water and the 517 different protein secondary structures overlapped less, resulting in better resolved bands. The second derivative spectra of the amide III bands were analysed to identify changes in the peak 518 maximum absorbance during kneading; the α -helical (1319 cm⁻¹), β -turn (1288 cm⁻¹) and β -sheet 519 (1242 cm⁻¹) structures increased, whereas the random coil structure (1265 cm⁻¹) decreased, 520 521 suggesting that the gluten network becomes a highly ordered structure. The maximum value of the α -helical, β -turn and β -sheet structures and the minimum value of the random coil structure were 522 523 used to determine the MIR kneading time, which showed a good correlation with the time at which the torque started to collapse (Figure 4). MIR monitoring of the amide III band during kneading could 524 525 provide an interesting method for measuring dough readiness.

526

527 <mark>3</mark> 4.4 Computer vision

528	Since visual inspection is a widespread but not reliable method, computer vision-based imaging
529	methods have been developed in the food industry as an objective technique for quality control. A
530	computer vision system generally consists of basic components: (i) an illumination source, (ii) a
531	camera, (iii) an image capture board, (iv) computer hardware and software. The image analysis
532	includes the following steps: (i) capturing, (ii) processing and (iii) analysing the acquired images ir
533	order to produce an objective evaluation. This technique is an automated, non-contact, non
534	destructive and cost-effective method for accurate, fast and objective quality determination
535	<mark>(Brosnan & Sun, 2004).</mark>
536	Perez Alvarado et al. (2016) proposed an online system to monitor dough kneading, consisting of a
537	camera placed above the kneader. The bakers' visual inspection and the torque trend were used to
538	stop kneading in lab and spiral kneaders with the minimum error in optimum kneading time. A grey

539 level co-occurrence matrix (GLCM) texture analysis allowed the development of an algorithm to

540	<mark>emulate the bakers' visual inspection of the dough readiness. At the beginning of kneading, the</mark>
541	ingredients were not uniformly mixed, showing a low value of homogeneity, while the homogeneity
542	increased after some minutes. A linear relationship was obtained between the variation in
543	homogeneity and the kneading time; the optimum kneading time was determined by the torque
544	trend of the kneader. The above algorithm was tested in many experiments and it produced an
545	average error of 33.9 s compared to the optimal kneading time.
546	Van der Mijnsbrugge et al. (2016) showed that during kneading, the gluten agglomerates grew
547	steadily and finally turned into a filamentous network at the point of optimal dough development.
548	Although the authors did not correlate the gluten structures with a method for measuring the dough
549	readiness, these findings increased the comprehension of complex phenomena occurring during
550	<mark>dough kneading and they could be useful in the development of online computer vision techniques.</mark>
551	Brosnan & Sun (2004) emphasized that computer vision has the potential to become a vital
552	component of automated food processing since computer capabilities and algorithm processing
553	speeds are continually developing and approaching the necessary online speeds. The continued
554	development of computer vision techniques such as X-ray, 3-D and colour vision will ensure the
555	higher implementation and uptake of this technology in order to meet the ever-expanding
556	requirements of the food industry (Brosnan & Sun, 2004). For example, Perez Alvarado et al. (2016)
557	suggested reducing the wavelength of the visual spectrum (using a helium laser as a coherent light
558	source) to increase the accuracy of the visual surface analysis and to reduce the time gap between
559	determination of the steady state and dough readiness time.

560

561 3.5 4.4 Ultrasounds

Ultrasounds (US) are an oscillating sound pressure wave with a greater frequency than the upper 562 563 limit of the human hearing range. The basic principle of this technique is that different materials absorb US waves radiation differently and that the waves travel at different speeds in different 564 materials as well (Koksel et al., 2016). The US frequency interval includes frequencies from 20 kHz 565 to 10 MHz which have been further subdivided into three characteristic regions: (i) low-frequency 566 567 high-power US (20 kHz-100 kHz), (ii) intermediate-frequency medium-power US (100 kHz-1 MHz), and (iii) high-frequency low-power US (1 MHz-10 MHz) (Chandrapala, 2015; Koksel et al., 2016; 568 Scanlon, 2013; Scanlon & Page, 2015). The US waves can be longitudinal (compressional) waves, 569 570 shear waves or surface waves. Only the longitudinal waves are sensitive to bubbles and can 571 propagate into useful depths in foods (Koksel et al., 2016). Longitudinal waves are quite easy to

generate, detect and propagate through solid as well as fluid media, while shear waves are much
more attenuating and they are not able to propagate into liquids and gases (Létang et al., 2001).
US sensors are widely used in the food industry as a cheap, rapid, non-destructive and non-contact
technique for quality control and they have proven suitable for studying optically opaque systems

such as bread dough (Létang et al., 2001; Salazar et al., 2002; Chandrapala, 2015; Koksel et al., 2016).
The longitudinal waves are the most suitable for dough testing; wheat flour dough is a highly
attenuating material, hence low-frequency US should be used for this food matrix (Létang et al.,
2001).

580 Létang et al. (2001) used high-frequency low-power longitudinal US (2-10 MHz) to evaluate the 581 physical properties of dough during kneading and resting. The US parameters were sensitive to 582 overmixing at frequencies lower than 5 MHz, producing a sharp increase in both the US velocity and attenuation. The variation in the US parameters during overmixing was strongly dependent on the 583 584 water content; an increase in both parameters was observed in 50% water doughs, no changes in 585 53% water doughs and a decrease in attenuation with no change in velocity in 56% water doughs. 586 These results are consistent with Kidmose et al. (2001) who reported that the amount of water 587 affected the US parameters more significantly than the differences in dough structure and 588 rheological properties.

589 Salazar et al. (2002) and Garcia-Alvarez et al. (2006) investigated the rheological properties of dough 590 using the US technique (100 kHz). The US velocity and attenuation changed as a function of the 591 dough water content, confirming previous findings (Kidmose et al., 2001, Létang et al., 2001). The 592 highest value of velocity was found for the stiffest dough at the lowest water content, whereas 593 attenuation increased as the water content increased. The US velocity was significantly affected by 594 the technological quality of the flour. The maximum value of the US velocity may correspond to the 595 optimum development of the gluten network, but further research is required to confirm this 596 hypothesis, while evaluating the possibility of using this parameter to measure dough readiness.

Ross et al. (2004) used high-frequency US (3 MHz) to monitor dough kneading in a Mixograph. The US velocity, US attenuation and rheological parameters (storage G' and loss G" moduli) showed inflection points at the optimum dough development time. The US velocity and attenuation showed a maximum value at the optimum dough development point, which is probably associated with the state of hydration of the dough since both parameters were shown to be affected by the water content (Johnston et al., 1979; Hoseney, 1998; Sakai et al., 1989; Létang et al., 2001; Salazar et al., 2002). The US velocity may reflect the optimum hydration state of the dough, whereas attenuation

has been reported to change as a function of the friction of the system: the higher the friction forces
(at the beginning of kneading), the lower the attenuation value (Johnston et al., 1979). During
kneading, the hydration promotes the glass transition of the amorphous polymers which become
rubbery and a more lubricated system with a higher attenuation value (Hoseney, 1998). The good
correlation found between the rheological and US parameters showed the potentiality of the US
technique as an alternative method for determining dough readiness (Ross et al., 2004).

610 Nassar et al. (2006) proposed an acoustic device to study the mechanical development of the dough

611 during kneading. A piezoelectric sensor captured the noise during kneading; the recorded electric

612 signal reflected the physical properties of the dough. The evolution of the maximum amplitude of

the signal reached a maximum value indicating the critical phase transition which corresponded tooptimal dough development.

615 Mehta et al. (2009) tested the effect of shortening as an ingredient and kneading time on the 616 mechanical properties of bread dough using the US technique (50 kHz). US velocity and attenuation 617 were evaluated in comparison with the kneading. The US velocity followed the trend of the dough 618 density: it decreased as the air bubbles within the dough increased and then showed a discernible 619 relative peak at the optimum dough development point, which was interpreted as the maximum alignment of the glutenin polymers. The different trend in US velocity observed by Ross et al. (2004) 620 621 could be due to the use of different US frequencies and tested dough water contents (Figure 5). The 622 US attenuation tended to increase, showing a minimum at the optimum dough development time; 623 however, the trend was not as pronounced as the increase in the US velocity (Mehta et al., 2009). 624 Ross et al. (2004), using US frequencies of 3-5 MHz, observed the opposite result: the US reached 625 maximum attenuation at the dough readiness point.

626 Peressini et al. (2016) using principal component analysis (PCA) showed that mean values of

627 ultrasonic attenuation and phase velocity at frequencies between 0.3 and 3 MHz are good

628 predictors for rheological and bread scoring characteristics prepared with a wide range of dough

629 formulations. Indeed, lower frequency attenuation coefficients correlated well with conventional

630 quality indices of both the dough and the bread.

631 Bowler et al. (2020) showed the potential of using an industrially applicable ultrasonic sensing

632 technique combined with machine learning (ML) to predict dough readiness in a batter system. Two

633 ultrasonic sensors were used for data acquisition and different ML engineering methods were

634 compared. The superior accuracy obtained as a result outlined the efficacy of this approach for the

635 monitoring of dough kneading.

636	A schematic overview of all the above alternative methods is reported in Table 3.
637	
638	4.5 Other alternative methods
639	In the literature we found single paper proposing alternative methods to determine dough
640	readiness which were reported below.
641	Ndiaye et al. (2009) investigated the qualitative modelling of French bread-making process
642	represented as a sequence of steps. Each step is defined through control variables, state variables
643	of its output, and causal relation between the control and state variables. A qualitative model of the
644	kneading step was developed through cognitive operations representing human expertise and
645	qualitative algebra. The validation of this approach was made performing 81 simulation cases which
646	showed positive results.
647	The same research group applied qualitative algebra to predict the wheat flour dough behaviour
648	from kneading settings (Kansou & Della Valle, 2012). The state of the dough was modelled at the
649	end of two successive operations of kneading: (i) ingredient homogenization, (ii) dough
650	development from the initial consistency and operating conditions. The qualitative model was
651	validated and implemented as a knowledge-based system accessible and understandable by
652	scientists and technologists in bread-making.
653	Kansou et al. (2014) reported an extensive evaluation of the above expert system by comparing
654	simulation results first to experts' prediction and second to experimental results. The good matching
655	level proved the accuracy and the robustness of the expert-system in predicting actual dough
656	properties starting from ingredient characteristics.
657	Ruan et al. (1995) designed a neural network trained with the recorded mixer torque (input) and
658	the measured rheological properties (output) to predict dough rheological properties. An accuracy
659	of the prediction higher than 94% was obtained outlining the potential of this method to minimize
660	process variability during dough kneading.
661	Oestersotebier et al. (2016) aimed to develop an intelligent kneading machine able to set kneading
662	speed and time to obtain consistent dough quality regardless the variability of environmental
663	conditions and flour characteristics. The system was based on intelligent information processing
664	algorithms validated with the expertise of professional bakers. Reliable detection of phase-shift and
665	model-based prediction of dough was obtained.
666	Garcia et al. (2016) proposed 3-D-front-face-fluorescence (3D-FFF) spectroscopy in the 250-550 nm
667	domain to follow the dough development as influenced by formulation and kneading time. Three

668	regions of maximum fluorescence intensities are concerned by the above variables. The first two
669	regions were probably due to aromatic amino acid residues of gluten proteins, and ferulic acid
670	esterified to arabinoxylans, whereas the third has still to be found. The final aim of this approach is
671	to develop an online-sensor based on fluorescence measurements to obtain real-time monitoring
672	of dough development.
673	Sangpring et al. (2017), investigated the relationship between the development of wheat dough
674	expressed as the net energy of kneading and the colour of the mixture. The authors added caramel
675	colour reagent as the indicator of dough development and monitored the colour changes using a
676	colour difference meter. As the net energy increased, the L^* and H values decreased, whereas the
677	a^* and ΔE values increased. The decreasing trend of the L^* value as increasing net energy showed
678	that the caramel solution was well mixed. These results indicated that the colour change can be
679	used to determine the kneading state of wheat dough.
680	Perez Alvarado et al. (2016) proposed an online system to monitor dough kneading, consisting of a
681	camera placed above the kneader. The bakers' visual inspection and the torque trend were used to
682	stop kneading in lab and spiral kneaders with the minimum error in optimum kneading time. A grey-
683	level co-occurrence matrix (GLCM) texture analysis allowed the development of an algorithm to
684	emulate the bakers' visual inspection of the dough readiness. At the beginning of kneading, the
685	ingredients were not uniformly mixed, showing a low value of homogeneity, while the homogeneity
686	increased after some minutes. A linear relationship was obtained between the variation in
687	homogeneity and the kneading time; the optimum kneading time was determined by the torque
688	trend of the kneader. The above algorithm was tested in many experiments and it produced an
689	average error of 33.9 s compared to the optimal kneading time.
690	
691	5. Critical evaluation of the methods
692	Table <mark>4</mark> shows a synoptic comparison of all the above reference and alternative methods mostly
693	investigated methods for the determination of dough readiness measurement.
694	In the baking industry, the most common approach is to use flour blends of specific technological

695 quality, determined in the bakery or provided by the producer with reference methods (i.e.

696 Farinograph and Mixograph). Similarly, in the scientific literature, descriptive rheological tests using

697 the Farinograph and Mixograph laboratory-scale mixers are the reference methods for measuring

- 698 dough readiness. These instruments have been developed to evaluate the technological quality of
- 699 wheat flours, which includes measuring dough readiness (AACC method 10-09.01, 10-10.03; Zhou

700 et al., 2014; Quaglia et al., 1984; Pagani et al., 2014a; Cauvain, 2015e). These tests are easy to 701 perform and the tools are available in many laboratories, but they are strictly dependent on the 702 operating conditions adopted during the test. The standard dough recipe of wheat flour and distilled 703 water, the kneader geometry, the arm shape, the kneading speed and temperature conditions 704 applied enable the prediction of an apparent optimal dough kneading time, which may be not 705 applicable in the real processing conditions (Quaglia et al., 1984; Dobraszczyk & Morgenstern, 2003; 706 Pagani et al., 2014a; Zhou et al., 2014; Cauvain, 2015e). The Farinograph, which was designed before 707 high-intensity mixers became widely used, has a low kneading speed (60 rpm), imparting a gentle 708 kneading action on the dough (Oliver & Allen, 1992; Zounis & Quail, 1997). It has been reported that 709 the standard Farinograph speed does not develop dough strength, resulting in inaccurate 710 measurements of the dough readiness, and that higher speeds of 90-180 rpm should be used 711 instead (Tanaka & Tipples, 1969; Oliver & Allen, 1992; Zounis & Quail, 1997). The Mixograph, having 712 a higher rate of work input (88 rpm) than the Farinograph, reflects modern mixers more closely and 713 gives a better correlation with dough readiness (Burrows & Gras, 1990; Zounis & Quail, 1997). Some 714 scientific data have shown that a significant improvement in dough readiness measurements by the 715 above laboratory mixers may be obtained using similar kneader speeds to the modern kneaders 716 (Tanaka & Tipples, 1969; Oliver & Allen, 1992; Zounis & Quail, 1997) and real bread recipes (Oliver 717 & Allen, 1992, 1993, 1994; Zounis & Quail, 1997). 718 In the baking industry, measurement approach is beside the information on flour technological 719 quality, the baker's visual inspection is often used as an aid to set standard operating conditions. 720 Visual inspection is a direct measurement to predict the optimal kneading time, but it is a subjective 721 practice with a high degree of variability. 722 Baking tests are widely used in both the industrial and scientific areas. They are included in the AACC 723 methods and are commonly applied since bread quality parameters are often used to calibrate the 724 other methods of measuring dough readiness. However, baking trials are time- and resource-725 consuming methods and they may be affected by a high degree of experimental error, since the 726 different processing conditions adopted in the various phases of bread-making after kneading may 727 alter the prediction of the optimal kneading time. 728 In the scientific literature, descriptive rheological tests using the Farinograph and Mixograph 729 laboratory scale mixers are the reference methods for measuring dough readiness. These 730 instruments have been developed to evaluate the technological quality of wheat flours, which

731 includes measuring dough readiness (AACC method 10-09.01, 10-10.03; Zhou et al., 2014; Cauvain,

732	2015). These tests are easy to perform and the tools are available in many laboratories, but they are
733	strictly dependent on the operating conditions adopted during the test. The standard dough recipe
734	of wheat flour and distilled water, the kneader geometry, the arm shape, the kneading speed and
735	temperature conditions applied enable the prediction of an apparent optimal dough kneading time,
736	which may be not applicable in the real processing conditions (Dobraszczyk & Morgenstern, 2003)
737	<mark>Zhou et al., 2014; Cauvain, 2015). The Farinograph, which was designed before high-intensity mixers</mark>
738	became widely used, has a low kneading speed (60 rpm), imparting a gentle kneading action on the
739	<mark>dough (Oliver & Allen, 1992; Zounis & Quail, 1997). It has been reported that the standard</mark>
740	Farinograph speed does not develop dough strength, resulting in inaccurate measurements of the
741	dough readiness, and that higher speeds of 90-180 rpm should be used instead (Tanaka & Tipples,
742	1969; Oliver & Allen, 1992; Zounis & Quail, 1997). The Mixograph, having a higher rate of work input
743	(88 rpm) than the Farinograph, reflects modern mixers more closely and gives a better correlation
744	with dough readiness (Burrows & Gras, 1990; Zounis & Quail, 1997). Some scientific data have
745	shown that a significant improvement in dough readiness measurements by the above laboratory
746	mixers may be obtained using similar kneader speeds to the modern kneaders (Tanaka & Tipples,
747	1969; Oliver & Allen, 1992; Zounis & Quail, 1997) and real bread recipes (Oliver & Allen, 1992, 1993)
748	1994; Zounis & Quail, 1997).
749	The work input method has been used for measuring dough readiness independently of the
750	uncertain a constraint conditions. Indeed, it has been reported that for a constitution that flour and mixed

kneading operating conditions. Indeed, it has been reported that for a specific wheat flour and mixer type, after a certain kneading speed threshold, the amount of work input to achieve dough readiness is constant and independent of the mixer speed (Oliver & Allen, 1992; Zounis & Quail, 1997; Anderssen et al., 1998). However, contradictory results are present in the literature; Oliver & Allen (1992) and Anderssen et al. (1998) considered work input better than kneading time to express dough readiness, whereas the opposite conclusion was reported by Kilborn & Tipples (1972) and Zounis & Quail (1997).

- The following alternative methods have been proposed to measure dough readiness (Table ⁴ ²),
 even though the baking industry and scientific research still prefer the above reference methods,
 which have a known standard procedure.
- Torque and power consumption are parameters which may be related to dough texture in order to measure the dough readiness in the actual processing conditions. This method of measurement has been widely used since it is online, cost-effective and easy to perform; it does not require highly trained personnel and gives a clear kneading curve as a result (Wang et al., 1993; Pereira et al., 2013;

Wesley et al., 1998; Alava et al., 2001; Kaddour et al., 2007; Kaddour et al., 2008a; Mehta et al., 764 765 2009; Perez Alvarado et al., 2016; Hwang & Gunasekaran, 2001; Zounis & Quail, 1997; Altuna et al., 766 2016; Aljaafreh, 2017). However, there are still contradictions about the correlation between the 767 torque/power consumption profiles and dough readiness, since there is not a clear reference point 768 for the torque/power consumption trends which can be associated with dough readiness (Hwang & 769 Gunasekaran, 2001; Pereira et al., 2013; Zounis & Quail, 1997). The majority of the studies have 770 correlated dough readiness with the time corresponding to the peak of the torque/power 771 consumption trends, following the approach of the descriptive rheological methods (Wang et al., 772 1993; Perez Alvarado et al., 2016; Hwang & Gunasekaran, 2001; Pereira et al., 2013; Altuna et al., 773 2016; Bowler et al., 2020), but Zounis & Quail (1997) found that for high-protein flours the time at 774 the end of the plateau period correlated best with dough readiness, showing a possible interaction 775 with the technological quality of the flour.

776 Spectroscopic methods to measure dough readiness include the NIR and MIR techniques. NIR 777 spectroscopy is an online method that can monitor dough in real time; when processing the raw NIR 778 spectra data, they resulted mostly associated with the physical properties of the dough, whereas 779 the second derivative treatment gave important insights into the chemical reactions occurring 780 during the dough kneading (Kaddour & Cuq, 2011). The second derivative spectra showed a better 781 correlation with the dough readiness, expressed as NIR kneading time, than the raw NIR spectra 782 (Wesley et al., 1998; Alava et al., 2001; Kaddour et al., 2007; Wesley et al., 2002; Kaddour & Cuq, 783 2011). The main changes occurring during kneading are related to modifications of the protein 784 secondary structures which lead to the development of the gluten network (Kaddour & Cuq, 2011), 785 and the absorbances due to water and proteins were reported to reach a minimum at the dough 786 readiness point (Wesley et al., 2002). The time for dough readiness proved longer than the times 787 measured using the descriptive rheological tests (Wesley et al., 1998; Alava et al., 2001; Kaddour et 788 al., 2007; Wesley et al., 2002), but it resulted better correlated with the bread quality parameters 789 (Alava et al., 2001). The main barriers against using the NIR technique concern identifying the 790 specific wavelength range and the data analysis method. Since chemical reactions in the NIR range 791 have been differently associated with the various flour constituents (Kaddour & Cuq, 2011), 792 different wavelength ranges have been used to determine dough readiness (Demster et al., 1998; 793 Wesley et al., 1998; Alava et al., 2001; Kaddour et al., 2007; Wesley et al., 2002; Kaddour & Cuq, 794 2011). Water, protein and starch molecules absorb in the same wavelength range, making it difficult 795 to isolate the main actors in the dough development, that is, the gluten proteins (Kaddour & Cuq, 2011). Although all these studies found a better correlation using the second derivative NIR spectra,
different techniques were adopted, increasing the variability of the method (Demster et al., 1998;
Wesley et al., 1998; Alava et al., 2001; Kaddour et al., 2007; Wesley et al., 2002; Kaddour & Cuq,
2011). Furthermore, the different NIR devices need to be improved, since the presence of flour
particles in the environment could damage the instruments (Kaddour & Cuq, 2011).

Little information is present in the literature about the use of MIR spectroscopy to measure dough 801 802 readiness (Seabourn et al., 2008; Kaddour et al., 2008a), but this technique appeared even more 803 appropriate than NIR spectroscopy. It is an offline method which is able to directly monitor changes 804 in the protein secondary structures; monitoring of the amide III band has been associated with the 805 gluten network development (Kaddour et al., 2008a). Kaddour et al. (2008a) found longer MIR 806 kneading times than the peak dough consistency time of the descriptive rheological test, whereas 807 Seabourn et al. (2008), using α -helix/ β -sheet SDBA ratio, found a good correlation with the 808 Mixograph kneading time.

809 The computer vision method used the external appearance of the dough as an indicator of the 810 dough readiness by means of online or offline techniques. This method has only been proposed by 811 Perez Alvarado et al. (2016) and it is based on an algorithm which combines the parameter mostly 812 used in the baker's visual inspection method (i.e., dough homogeneity) with the dough texture. The 813 computer vision monitors the dough in the actual processing conditions and it is sensitive to the 814 dough recipe, but it has been subjected to scant investigation (Perez Alvarado et al., 2016). 815 The ultrasound (US) method has been proposed studied as a tool to monitor dough development 816 (Létang et al., 2001; Salazar et al., 2002; Nassar et al., 2006; Garcia-Alvarez et al., 2006; Ross et al., 2004; Mehta et al., 2009; Peressini et al., 2016; Bowler et al., 2020), since US parameters are able 817 818 to detect both the physical and chemical properties of the bread dough samples (Koksel et al., 2016). 819 Nassar et al. (2006) showed that the maximum amplitude of the signal received by acoustic sensor 820 corresponded to the optimal dough development. The US parameter that seemed most appropriate 821 for measuring dough readiness was Ross et al. (2004) and Mehta et al., (2009) reported that US 822 velocity, which showed a maximum at the optimum dough development point, whereas they found 823 US attenuation revealed a poorer correlation and an inconsistent trend <mark>of US attenuation (Ross et</mark> 824 al., 2004; Mehta et al., 2009). However, Létang et al. (2001) found no change of US velocity in highly 825 hydrated doughs. Following this contradictory results, Bowler et al. (2020) decided to combine US 826 method to Machine Learning techniques in order to achieve a better determination of dough 827 readiness; results showed a superior prediction accuracy, outlining the efficacy of this approach.

828	The US method was reported to be sensitive to several variables: (i) US frequencies (Ross et al.,
829	2004; Peressini et al., 2016); (ii) water amount in the dough (Kidmose et al., 2001; Létang et al.,
830	2001; Salazar et al., 2002; Garcia-Alvarez et al., 2006; <mark>Bowler et al., 2020</mark>); (iii) kneading work input
831	(Salazar et al., 2002; Garcia-Alvarez et al., 2006); (iv) flour quality (Salazar et al., 2002; Garcia-Alvarez
832	et al., 2006; Ross et al., 2004); and (v) the bread recipe (Létang et al., 2001; Kidmose et al., 2001;
833	Mehta et al., 2009; Peressini et al., 2016). Since the literature data have adopted different US
834	frequencies and tested different dough samples, no exhaustive results can be drawn. The main issue
835	in applying the US method is that dough is a highly attenuating material; hence, the major part of
836	the studies proposed offline methods have only been proposed to analyse a thin dough sample.
837	However, in the recent paper by Bowler et al. (2020) highly hydrated dough were monitored using
838	inline sensors. The authors proposed the application of this approach for industrial kneading
839	performed at low pressure or under vacuum, since in these conditions the dough remains in contact
840	with the kneader. The complexity of the US techniques outlined that further investigations are
841	required to achieve a better comprehension of its applicability to determine dough readiness. At
842	present, the complexity of a US offline technique makes the US method suitable for scientific
843	research only and not appropriate for the baking industry.
844	Methods included in the paragraph "Other alternative methods" could be promising but they have
845	been scarcely investigated in the literature, hence further investigations are necessary.
846	
847	6. Future perspectives
848	
849	The present review outlines the importance of measuring dough readiness for the scientific and
850	industrial fields. Although kneading is considered one of the most important steps in the bread-
851	making process <mark>and it has been extensively studied</mark> , the methods for measuring dough readiness
852	have been poorly investigated. <mark>A useful method should perform a reliable dough readiness</mark>
853	measurement in the real processing conditions. Owing to the increasing interest of consumers in
854	high-nutrition breads made from weak flours which often are characterized by poor technological
855	properties, the possibility of performing inline/online monitoring of dough development could be
856	important above issue is becoming even more important; bread recipes with low technological

properties require accurate process controls to obtain highly nutritional products with anacceptable technological and sensory quality.

859 The Farinograph and Mixograph tests are the most widely used reference methods in the scientific 860 literature and baking industry, but they do not provide a reliable measurement of dough readiness. 861 These methods need to be adjusted; the use of both modern mixer speeds and real bread recipes 862 can improve the ability of the above methods to predict the optimal kneading. Most literature 863 studies have also evaluated the optimal dough development according to dough properties which did not always reflect bread quality. Therefore, at present, despite being time- and resource-864 865 consuming, the "baking trials" reference method is still able to give a reliable measurement of 866 dough readiness.

867 The Alternative methods to measure dough readiness need further research to improve their
 868 implementation. A focus is required both on standardizing the alternative parameters to monitor
 869 the dough kneading, and on the data processing (if performed), and on deeper investigations of
 870 methods proposed by single papers.

The suitability of a specific method changes as a function of the field of application. However, In the 871 872 baking industry the use of the torque/power consumption method may be a first good alternative 873 to the reference methods to improve the use of weak flours, since it enables the identification of 874 dough readiness in real operating conditions. For this reason, the above method could help in the 875 situation of increased weak flour use in the baking industry. Concerning the strong flours used in 876 dough recipes, they can be evaluated simply using baking trials, since their high stability and low 877 degree of softness make the measurement of the dough readiness less sensitive to the great 878 <mark>variability of this method.</mark> For In the scientific <mark>research studies the suitability of a method has to be evaluated in function of</mark> 879 the aim of the study. For studies requiring a focused on kneading standardization <mark>of the kneading</mark> 880 881 step, both the torque/power consumption method and the spectroscopic methods may be useful. 882 On the other hand, research studies testing kneading variables may require a more accurate evaluation of the dough development by monitoring evaluating the chemical properties of the 883 884 dough; hence, the spectroscopy methods may be more appropriate. Further research is required to 885 improve the challenging issue of determining dough readiness. Finally, the computer vision and US methods appear promising techniques 886

887 is necessary in order to improve the scientific knowledge on their potential application in monitoring

888 <mark>dough kneading.</mark>

889

890	Refere	ences
891	1.	AACC. (1999a). Basic Straight-Dough Bread-Baking Method-Long Fermentation. Method
892		10-09.01.
893	2.	AACC. (1999c). Optimized Straight-dough Bread-making Method. Method 10-10.03 (pp. 1-
894		8).
895	3.	Alava, J. M., Millar, S. J., Salmon, S. E. (2001). The Determination of Wheat Breadmaking
896		Performance and Bread Dough Mixing Time by NIR Spectroscopy for High Speed Mixers.
897		Journal of Cereal Science, 33, 71–81. https://doi.org/10.1006/jcrs.2000.0341
898	<mark>4.</mark>	Aljaafreh, A. (2017). Agitation and mixing processes automation using current sensing and
899		reinforcement learning. Journal of Food Engineering, 203, 53–57.
900		https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2017.02.001
901	<mark>5.</mark>	Altuna, L., Romano, R. C. O., Pileggi, R. G., Ribotta, P. D., & Tadini, C. C. (2016). Torque
902		Measurement in Real Time during Mixing and Kneading of Bread Dough with High Content
903		of Resistant Maize Starch and Enzymes. International Journal of Food Engineering, 12, 719–
904		728. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijfe-2016-0132
905	<mark>6.</mark>	Amend, T., & Belitz, H. D. (1991). Microstructural Studies of Gluten and a Hypothesis on
906		Dough Formation. Food Structure, 10, 277–288.
907	<mark>7.</mark>	Amjid, M. R., Shehzad, A., Hussain, S., Shabbir, M. A., & Khan, M. R. (2013). A comprehensive
908		review on wheat flour dough rheology A comprehensive review on wheat flour dough
909		rheology. Pakistan Journal of Food Science, 23, 105–123.
910	8.	Anderssen, R. S., Gras, P. W., Macritchie, F. (1998). The Rate-Independence of the Mixing of
911		Wheat Flour Dough to Peak Dough Development. Journal of Cereal Science, 27, 167–177.
912		https://doi.org/10.1006/jcrs.1997.0160
913	<mark>9.</mark>	Atkins, T. D., & Larsen, N. G. (1990). Prediction of Mechanical Dough Development, Water
914		Absorption and Baking Performance from Farinograph Parameters. Journal of the Science of
915		Food and Agriculture, 53, 243–252.
916	<mark>10</mark>	Auger, F., Morel, M., Lefebvre, J., Dewilde, M., & Redl, A. (2008). A parametric and
917		microstructural study of the formation of gluten network in mixed flour –water batter.
918		Journal of Cereal Science, 48, 349–358. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcs.2007.10.006</u>
919	<mark>11</mark>	. Autio, K., Flander, L., Kinnunen, A., & Heinonen, R. (2001). Bread Quality Relationship with
920		Rheological Measurements of Wheat Flour Dough. Cereal Chemistry, 78, 654–657.
921		https://doi.org/10.1094/CCHEM.2001.78.6.654

922	12. Aydogan, S., Sahin, M., Akcacik, A. G., Hamzaoglu, S., & Taner, S. (2015). Relationships
923	between Farinograph Parameters and Bread Volume, Physicochemical Traits in Bread
924	Wheat Flours. Journal of Bahri Dagdas Crop Research, 3, 14–18.
925	13. Bache, I. C., & Donald, A. M. (1998). The Structure of the Gluten Network in Dough: a Study
926	using Environmental Scanning Electron Microscopy. Journal of Cereal Science, 28, 127–133.
927	14. Belton, P. S. (2005). New approaches to study the molecular basis of the mechanical
928	properties of gluten. Journal of Cereal Science, 41, 203–211.
929	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcs.2004.06.003
930	15. Belton, P. S. (2012). The molecular basis of dough rheology. In Breadmaking (pp. 337-351).
931	Woodhead Publishing.
932	16. Belton, P. S., Colquhoun, I. J., Grant, A., Wellner, N., Field, J. M., Shewry, P. R., Tatham, A. S.
933	(1995). FTIR and NMR studies on the hydration of a high-Mr subunit of glutenin.
934	International Journal of Biological Macromolecules, 17, 74–80.
935	https://doi.org/10.1016/0141-8130(95)93520-8
936	17. Blandino, M., Marinaccio, F., Ingegno, B. L., Pansa, M. G., Vaccino, P., Tavella, L., & Reyneri,
937	A. (2015). Evaluation of common and durum wheat rheological quality through Mixolab st
938	analysis after field damage by cereal bugs. Field Crops Research, 179, 95–102.
939	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2015.04.014
940	18. Boukid, F., Zannini, E., Carini, E., & Vittadini, E. (2019). Pulses for bread fortification: A
941	necessity or a choice? Trends in Food Science & Technology, 88, 416–428.
942	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2019.04.007
943	19. Bowler, A. L., Bakalis, S., & Watson, N. J. (2020). Sensors and Machine Learning. Sensors, 20,
944	<mark>1813</mark> .
945	20. Bozkurt, F., Ansari, S., Yau, P., Yazar, G., Ryan, V., & Kokini, J. (2014). Distribution and location
946	of ethanol soluble proteins (Osborne gliadin) as a function of mixing time in strong wheat
947	flour dough using quantum dots as a labeling tool with confocal laser scanning microscopy.
948	Food Research International, 66, 279–288. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2014.09.028</u>
949	21. Brabec, D., Rosenau, S., & Shipman, M. (2015). Effect of Mixing Time and Speed on
950	Experimental Baking and Dough Testing with a 200 g Pin Mixer. Cereal Chemistry, 92, 449–
051	454

952	22. Brosnan, T., Sun, D. (2004). Improving quality inspection of food products by computer vision
953	
954	<mark>8774(03)00183-3</mark>
955	23. Burrows, J.R.G., Gras, P.W. (1990). Mixing characteristics of doughs with different strengths.
956	Proceedings of the 40th RACI Cereal Chemistry Conference, 207–214. RACI: Melbourne
957	24. Caffe-treml, M., Glover, K. D., Krishnan, P. G., & Hareland, G. A. (2010). Variability and
958	Relationships Among Mixolab, Mixograph, and Baking Parameters Based on
959	Multienvironment Spring Wheat Trials. Cereal Chemistry, 87, 574–580.
960	https://doi.org/10.1094/CCHEM-04-10-0068
961	25. Calderón-Domínguez, G., Vera-Domínguez, M., Ferrara-Rebollo, R., Arana-Errasqín, R., &
962	Mora-Escobedo, R. (2004). Rheological Changes of Dough and Bread Quality Prepared from
963	a Sweet Dough: Effect of Temperature and Mixing Time. Journal of Food Properties, 7, 165–
964	174. <u>https://doi.org/10.1081/JFP-120025393</u>
965	26. Cappelli, A., Guerrini, L., Cini, E., & Parenti, A. (2019). Improving whole wheat dough tenacity
966	and extensibility: A new kneading process. Journal of Cereal Science, 90(September),
967	102852. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcs.2019.102852
968	27. Cappelli, A., Guerrini, L., Parenti, A., Palladino, G., & Cini, E. (2020). Effects of wheat
969	tempering and stone rotational speed on particle size, dough rheology and bread
970	characteristics for a stone-milled weak flour. Journal of Cereal Science, 91, 102879.
971	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcs.2019.102879
972	Cauvain, S. (2015). Technology of breadmaking. New York: Springer Sciences
973	28. Cauvain, S. (2015a). Mixing and dough processing. In Technology of Breadmaking (pp. 101-
974	146). Springer, Cham.
975	29. Cauvain, S. (2015b). Principles of dough formation. In Technology of breadmaking (pp. 303-
976	337). Springer, Cham.
977	30. Cauvain, S. (2015c). Bread: the product. In Technology of Breadmaking (pp. 1-22). Springer,
978	Cham.
979	31. Cauvain, S. (2015d). Baking Around the World. In Technology of Breadmaking (pp. 229-251).
980	Springer, Cham.
981	32. Cauvain, S. (2015e). Wheat milling and flour testing. In Technology of Breadmaking (pp. 339-
982	375). Springer, Cham.

Commented [OP3]: blending

983	33. Cauvain, S. (2015f). Process control and software applications in baking. In Technology of
984	Breadmaking (pp. 213-227). Springer, Cham.
985	34. Chandrapala, J. (2015). Low intensity ultrasound applications on food systems. Food
986	Research International, 22, 888–895.
987	http://www.ifrj.upm.edu.my/22%20(03)%202015/(2).pdf
988	35. Chenlo, F., Moreira, R., & Torres, M. D. (2007). Rheological Properties of Chestnuts
989	Processed by Osmotic Dehydration and Convective Drying. Food Science and Technology
990	International, 13, 369–374. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/1082013207085744</u>
991	36. Chin, N. L., & Campbell, G. M. (2005a). Dough aeration and rheology: Part 1. Effects of mixing
992	speed and headspace pressure on mechanical development of bread dough. Journal of the
993	Science of Food and Agriculture, 85, 2184–2193. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.2236</u>
994	37. Chin, N. L., & Campbell, G. M. (2005b). Dough aeration and rheology: Part 2. Effects of flour
995	type, mixing speed and total work input on aeration and rheology of bread dough. Journal
996	of Cereal Science, 2202, 2194–2202. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.2237</u>
997	38. Connelly, R. K., & Mcintier, R. L. (2008). Rheological properties of yeasted and nonyeasted
998	wheat doughs developed under different mixing conditions †. Journal of the Science of Food
999	and Agriculture, 88, 2309–2323. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa</u>
1000	39. Cuq, B., Abecassis, J., & Stéphane, G. (2003). State diagrams to help describe wheat bread
1001	processing. International Journal of Food Science and Technology, 38, 759–766.
1002	40. Cuq, B., Yildiz, E., Kokini, J. (2002). Influence of Mixing Conditions and Rest Time on Capillary
1003	Flow Behavior of Wheat Flour Dough. Cereal Chemistry, 79, 129–137.
1004	https://doi.org/10.1094/CCHEM.2002.79.1.129
1005	41. Dapčević, T., Hadnadev, M., & Pojić, M. (2009). Evaluation of the Possibility to Replace
1006	Conventional Rheological Wheat Flour Quality Control Instruments with the New
1007	Measurement Tool – Mixolab. Agriculturae Conspectus Scientifi Cus , 74, 169–174.
1008	42. Delwiche, S. R., & Weaver, G. (1994). Bread Quality of Wheat Flour by Near-Infrared
1009	Spectrophotometry: Feasibility of Modeling. Journal of Food Science, 59, 410–415.
1010	43. Dempster, E.; Olewnik, M.C.; Smail, V.W. Development of a controlled dough mixing system.
1011	In Using Cereal Science and Technology for the Benefit of Consumers; Woodhead Publishing:
1012	Sawston, UK, 1998; pp. 304–314
1013	44. Dobraszczyk, B. J., Morgenstern, M. P. (2003). Rheology and the breadmaking process.

1014 Journal of Cereal Science, 38, 229–245. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0733-5210(03)00059-6

1015	45. Dubat, A. Mixolab: A New Approach to Rheology. Academic Press, 2016.
1016	46. Esselink, E., Aalst, H. Van, Maliepaard, M., Henderson, T. M. H., Hoekstra, N. L. L., &
1017	Duynhoven, J. Van. (2003). Impact of Industrial Dough Processing on Structure: A Rheology,
1018	Nuclear Magnetic Resonance, and Electron Microscopy Study. Cereal Chemistry, 80, 419-
1019	423. https://doi.org/10.1094/CCHEM.2003.80.4.419
1020	47. Finney, K. F. (1984). An Optimized, Straight-Dough, Bread-Making Method After 44 Years.
1021	Cereal Chemistry, 61, 20-27. Cereal Chemistry, 61, 20–27.
1022	48. Fortmann, K. L., Gerrity, A. B., Dischuck, V. R. (1964). Factors influencing work requirement
1023	for mixing white-bread dough. Journal of Cereal Science, 9, 268–272.
1024	49. Frazier, P. J., Daniels, N. W. R., Russell Eggitt, P. W. (1975). Rheology and the continuous
1025	breadmaking process. Cereal Chemistry, 52, 106r–130r.
1026	50. Garcia-Alvarez, J., Alava, J. M., Chavez, J. A., Turo, A., Garcia, M. J., Salazar, J. (2006).
1027	Ultrasonic characterisation of flour – water systems: A new approach to investigate dough
1028	properties. Ultrasonics, 44, e1051–e1055. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ultras.2006.05.099
1029	51. Garcia, R., Boussard, A., Rakotozafy, L., Nicolas, J., Potus, J., Rutledge, D. N., & Cordella, C. B.
1030	Y. (2016). 3D-front-face fluorescence spectroscopy and independent components analysis:
1031	A new way to monitor bread dough development. Talanta, 147, 307–314.
1032	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2015.10.002
1033	52. Gómez, M., Gutkoski, L. C., & Bravo-Núñez, Á. (2020). Understanding whole-wheat flour and
1034	its effect in breads: A review. Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety.
1035	https://doi.org/10.1111/1541-4337.12625
1036	53. Gras, P. W., Carpenter, H. C., & Anderssen, R. S. (2000). Modelling the developmental
1037	rheology of wheat-flour dough using extension tests. Journal of Cereal Science, 31, 1–13.
1038	https://doi.org/10.1006/jcrs.1999.0293
1039	54. Guerrini, L., Parenti, O., Angeloni, G., & Zanoni, B. (2019). The bread making process of
1040	ancient wheat: A semi-structured interview to bakers. Journal of Cereal Science, 87, 9–17.
1041	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcs.2019.02.006
1042	55. Guttieri, M. J., Bowen, D., Gannon, D., Brien, K. O., & Souza, E. (2001). Solvent Retention
1043	Capacities of Irrigated Soft White Spring Wheat Flours. Crop Science, 41, 1054–1061.
1044	56. Haegens, N. (2006a). Mixing, dough making, and dough makeup. Bakery Products: Science
1045	and Technology, 245-248.

1046	57. Haegens, N. (2006b). Specialities from All Over the World. Bakery Products: Science and
1047	Technology, 443.
1048	58. Hammed, A. M., Ozsisli, B., & Simsek, S. (2016). Utilization of Microvisco-Amylograph to
1049	Study Flour, Dough, and Bread Qualities of Hydrocolloid/Flour Blends. International Journal
1050	of Food Properties, 19, 591–604. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/10942912.2015.1038721</u>
1051	59. Heaps, W. P., Webb, T., Russell Eggitt, P. W., Coppock, J. B. M. (1967). Studies on mechanical
1052	factors affecting dough development *. Journal of Food Technology, 2, 37–43.
1053	60. Hoseney, R. C. (1998). Glass transition and its role in cereals. Principles of cereal science and
1054	technology, 2nd edition, 307–320.
1055	61. Hwang, C. H., Gunasekaran, S. (2001). Determining Wheat Dough Mixing Characteristics
1056	from Power Consumption Profile of a Conventional Mixer. Cereal Chemistry, 78, 88–92.
1057	https://doi.org/10.1094/CCHEM.2001.78.1.88
1058	62. İnan, G., & Yurdugül, S. (2014). Bakery Products of Turkey. Bakery Products Science and
1059	Technology, 735.
1060	63. Jekle, M., & Becker, T. (2011). Dough microstructure: Novel analysis by quantification using
1061	confocal laser scanning microscopy. Food Research International, 44, 984–991.
1062	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2011.02.036
1063	64. Johnston, D. H., Tokst, M. N., Timur, A. (1979). Attenuation of seismic waves in dry and
1064	saturated rocks: II. Mechanisms. Gephysics, 44, 691–711.
1065	65. Kaddour, A. A., Barron, C., Morel, MH., Cuq, B. (2007). Dynamic Monitoring of Dough
1066	Mixing Using Near-Infrared Spectroscopy: Physical and Chemical Outcomes. Cereal
1067	Chemistry, 84, 70–79. https://doi.org/10.1094/CCHEM-84-1-0070
1068	66. Kaddour, A. A., Cuq, B. (2011). Dynamic NIR Spectroscopy to Monitor Bread Dough Mixing:
1069	A Short Review. American Journal of Food Technology, 6, 173-185.
1070	https://doi.org/10.3923/ajft.2011.173.185
1071	67. Kaddour, A. A., Mondet, M., Cuq, B. (2008 <mark>a</mark>). Description of Chemical Changes Implied During
1072	Bread Dough Mixing by FT-ATR Mid-Infrared Spectroscopy. Cereal Chemistry, 85, 673–678.
1073	https://doi.org/10.1094/CCHEM-85-5-0673
1074	68. Kaddour, A., Barron, C., Robert, P., & Cuq, B. (2008b). Physico-chemical description of bread
1075	dough mixing using two-dimensional near-infrared correlation spectroscopy and moving-
1076	window two-dimensional correlation spectroscopy. Journal of Cereal Science, 48, 10–19.
1077	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcs.2007.07.008

1078	69. Kansou, K., & Della Valle, G. (2012). Integrating expert knowledge in cereal food
1079	manufacturing processes. ASME 2012 11th Biennal Conference on Engineering Systems
1080	Design and Analysis, 1–8.
1081	70. Kansou, K., Chiron, H., Della Valle, G., Ndiaye, A., & Roussel, P. (2014). Predicting the quality
1082	of wheat flour dough at mixing using an expert system. Food Research International, 64,
1083	772–782. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2014.08.007
1084	71. Kidmose, U., Pedersen, L., Nielsen, M. (2001). Ultrasonics in evaluating rheological
1085	properties of dough from different wheat varieties and during ageing. Journal of Texture
1086	Studies, 32, 321–334. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-4603.2001.tb01239.x
1087	72. Kilborn, R. H., Tipples, K. H. (1972). Factors Affecting Mechanical Dough Development. I.
1088	Effect of Mixing Intensity and Work Input. American Associations of Cereal Chemists, 49, 34–
1089	47.
1090	73. Kilborn, R. H., Tipples, K. H. (1973). Factors affecting mechanical dough development. III.
1091	Mechanical efficiency of laboratory dough mixers. Cereal Chemistry, 50, 50–69.
1092	74. Kim, Y. R., Cornillon, P., Campanella, O. H., Stroshine, R. L., Lee, S., & Shim, J. K. (2008). Small
1093	and Large Deformation Rheology for Hard Wheat Flour Dough. Journal of Food Science, 73,
1094	1–8. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-3841.2007.00599.x</u>
1095	75. Kokawa, M., Fujita, K., Sugiyama, J., Tsuta, M., Shibata, M., Araki, T., & Nabetani, H. (2012).
1096	Quantification of the distributions of gluten, starch and air bubbles in dough at different
1097	mixing stages by fluorescence fingerprint imaging. Journal of Cereal Science, 55, 15–21.
1098	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcs.2011.09.002
1099	76. Koksel, F., Scanlon, M. G., Page, J. H. (2016). Ultrasound as a tool to study bubbles in dough
1100	and dough mechanical properties: A review. Food Research International, 89, 74–89.
1101	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2016.09.015
1102	77. Koksel, H., Kahraman, K., Sanal, T., Ozay, D. S., & Dubat, A. (2009). Potential Utilization of
1103	Mixolab for Quality Evaluation of Bread Wheat Genotypes. Cereal Chemistry, 86, 522–526.
1104	https://doi.org/10.1094/CCHEM-86-5-0522
1105	78. Ktenioudaki, A., Butler, F., & Gallagher, E. (2010). The effect of different mixing processes on
1106	dough extensional rheology and baked attributes. Journal of the Science of Food and
1107	Agriculture 90 2098–2104 https://doi.org/10.1002/isfa.4057

1108	79. Kuktaite, R., Larsson, H., Marttila, S., & Johansson, E. (2005). Effect of Mixing Time on Gluten
1109	Recovered by Ultracentrifugation Studied by Microscopy and Rheological Measurements.
1110	Cereal Chemistry, 82, 375–384. <u>https://doi.org/10.1094/CC-82-0375</u>
1111	80. Larsen, N. G., & Greenwood, D. R. (1991). Water Addition and the Physical Properties of
1112	Mechanical Dough Development Doughs and Breads. Journal of Cereal Science, 13, 195–205.
1113	https://doi.org/10.1016/S0733-5210(09)80036-2
1114	81. Lee, L., Ng, P. K. W., & Steffe, J. F. (2002). Biochemical Studies of Proteins in Nondeveloped,
1115	Partially Developed, and Developed Doughs. Cereal Chemistry, 79, 654–661.
1116	82. Létang, C., Piau, M., & Verdier, C. (1999). Characterization of wheat four-water doughs. Part
1117	I: Rheometry and microstructure. Journal of Food Engineering, 41, 121–132.
1118	83. Létang, C., Piau, M., Verdier, C., Lefebvre, L. (2001). Characterization of wheat-flour-water
1119	doughs: a new method using ultrasound. Ultrasonics, 39, 133–141.
1120	https://doi.org/10.1016/s0041-624x(00)00058-5
1121	84. Lucas, I. (2018). Gluten Polymer Networks — A Microstructural Classification in Complex
1122	Systems. Polymers, 10, 10.3390. <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/polym10060617</u>
1123	85. Lucas, I., Petermeier, H., Becker, T., & Jekle, M. (2019). Definition of network types –
1124	Prediction of dough mechanical behaviour under shear by gluten microstructure. Scientific
1125	Reports, 9, 1–13. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-41072-w</u>
1126	86. Meerts, M., Cardinaels, R., Oosterlinck, F., Courtin, C. M., & Moldenaers, P. (2017). The
1127	Impact of Water Content and Mixing Time on the Linear and Non-Linear Rheology of Wheat
1128	Flour Dough. Food Biophysics, 12, 151–163. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11483-017-9472-9</u>
1129	87. Mehta, K. L., Scanlon, M. G., Sapirstein, H. D., Page, J. H. (2009). Ultrasonic Investigation of
1130	the Effect of Vegetable Shortening and Mixing Time on the Mechanical Properties of Bread
1131	Dough. Journal of Food Science, 74, 455–461. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-
1132	3841.2009.01346.x
1133	88. Migliori, M., & Correra, S. (2013). Modelling of dough formation process and structure
1134	evolution during farinograph test. International Journal of Food Science and Technology, 48,
1135	121–127. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2621.2012.03167.x
1136	89. Moreira, R., Chenlo, F., Torres, M. D., & Prieto, D. M. (2012). Technological Assessment of
1137	Chestnut Flour Doughs Regarding to Doughs from Other Commercial Flours and
1138	Formulations. Food Bioprocess Technology, 5, 2301–2310. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11947-
1139	<mark>011-0524-8</mark>

1140	90. Moreira, R., Chenlo, F., Torres, M. D., & Rama, B. (2013). Influence of the chestnuts drying
1141	temperature on the rheological properties of their doughs. Food and Bioproducts
1142	Processing, 91, 7–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fbp.2012.08.004
1143	91. Muscalu, G., Voicu, G., Istudor, A. (2017). Bread dough kneading process optimization in
1144	industrial environment, using a device for dough consistency control. Upb Scientific Bulletin,
1145	79, 225–236.
1146	92. Nassar, G., Skaf, A., Lefebvre, F., Nongaillard, B., & Dib, R. (2006). Design of low frequency
1147	acoustic sensor for wheat dough study in kneading and fermentation phases. In 13th World
1148	Congress of Food Science & Technology 2006 (pp. 445-445).
1149	93. Ndiaye, A., Della Valle, G., & Roussel, P. (2009). Qualitative modelling of a multi-step process:
1150	The case of French breadmaking. Expert Systems With Applications, 36, 1020–1038.
1151	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2007.11.006
1152	94. Oestersotebier, F., Traph, P., Reinhart, F., Wessels, S., & Trachtler, A. (2016). Design and
1153	Implementation of Intelligent Control Software for a Dough Kneader. Procedia Technology,
1154	<mark>00(000–000).</mark>
1155	95. Ohm, J., Simsek, S., & Mergoum, M. (2012). Modeling of Dough Mixing Profile Under Thermal
1156	and Nonthermal Constraint for Evaluation of Breadmaking Quality of Hard Spring Wheat
1157	Flour. Cereal Chemistry, 89, 135–141. <u>https://doi.org/10.1094/CCHEM-07-11-0095</u>
1158	96. Oliinyk, S., Samokhvalova, O., Lapitska, N., & Kucheruk, Z. (2020). Studying the influence of
1159	meats from wheat and oat germs, and rose hips, on the formation of quality of rye- wheat
1160	dough and bread. Technology and Equipment of Food Production, 103, 59–65.
1161	https://doi.org/10.15587/1729-4061.2020.187944
1162	97. Oliver, J. R., Allen, H. M. (1992). The Prediction of Bread Baking Performance Using the
1163	Farinograph and Extensograph. Journal of Cereal Science, 15, 79–89.
1164	https://doi.org/10.1016/S0733-5210(09)80058-1
1165	98. Oliver, J.R., Allen, H. M. (1993). Measurement of dough strength. Proceedings of the 43rd
1166	RACI Cereal Chemistry Conference, 128–131. RACI: Melbourne.
1167	99. Oliver, J.R., Allen, H.M. (1994). The mixing requirement of the Australian hard wheat cultivar,
1168	Dollarbird. Cereal Chemistry 71, 51–54.
1169	100. Osella, C. A., Sanchez, H. D., & De la Torre, M. A. (2007). Effect of Dough Water
1170	Content and Mixing Conditions on Energy Imparted to Dough and Bread Quality. Cereal

1171 Foods World, 52, 70–73.

1172	101.	Osorio-Diaz, P., Sanchez-Pardo, M. E., & Bello-Perez, L. A. (2014). Mexican Bakery
1173	<mark>Produ</mark>	cts. Bakery Products Science and Technology, 723.
1174	102.	Pagani, M. A., Lucisano, M., & Mariotti, M. (2014b). Italian bakery products. Bakery
1175	Produ	cts Science and Technology, Secondth edn, 685-721.
1176	<mark>103.</mark>	Pagani, M. A., Marti, A., & Bottega, G. (2014a) Wheat milling and flour quality
1177	<mark>evalua</mark>	tion. Bakery products Science and Technology, 17-53.
1178	<mark>104.</mark>	Parenti, A., Guerrini, L., Granchi, L., Venturi, M., Benedettelli, S., & Nistri, F. (2013).
1179	Contro	ol of mixing step in the bread production with weak wheat flour and sourdough.
1180	<mark>Journa</mark>	al of Agricultural Engineering. <u>https://doi.org/10.4081/jae.2013.s2.e65</u>
1181	105.	Parenti, O., Guerrini, L., Cavallini, B., Baldi, F., & Zanoni, B. (2020a). Breadmaking with
1182	<mark>an old</mark>	wholewheat flour: Optimization of ingredients to improve bread quality. LWT - Food
1183	<mark>Scienc</mark>	e and Technology, 121, 108980. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2019.108980
1184	106.	Parenti, O., Guerrini, L., & Zanoni, B. (2020b). Techniques and technologies for the
1185	<mark>bread</mark> i	making process with unrefined wheat flours. Trends in Food Science & Technology, 99,
1186	<mark>152–1</mark>	66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2020.02.034
1187	107.	Parenti, O., Guerrini, L., Zanoni, B., Marchini, M., Grazia, M., & Carini, E. (2021). Use
1188	<mark>of the</mark>	1 H NMR technique to describe the kneading step of wholewheat dough: The effect
1189	<mark>of kı</mark>	neading time and total water content. Food Chemistry, 338, 128120.
1190	<mark>https:</mark> ,	//doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2020.128120
1191	<mark>108.</mark>	Pastukhov, A., & Dogan, H. (2014). Studying of mixing speed and temperature
1192	impac	ts on rheological properties of wheat flour dough using Mixolab. Agronomy Research,
1193	<mark>12, 77</mark>	<mark>9–786.</mark>
1194	<mark>109.</mark>	Peighambardoust, S. H., Dadpour, M. R., & Dokouhaki, M. (2010). Application of
1195	epifluo	prescence light microscopy (EFLM) to study the microstructure of wheat dough: a
1196	<mark>compa</mark>	arison with confocal scanning laser microscopy (CSLM) technique. Journal of Cereal
1197	<mark>Scienc</mark>	e, 51, 21–27. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcs.2009.09.002</u>
1198	<mark>110.</mark>	Peighambardoust, S. H., Van Brenk, S., Van Der Goot, A. J., Hamer, R. J., & Boom, R.
1199	<mark>M. (20</mark>	007). Dough processing in a Couette-type device with varying eccentricity: Effect on
1200	<mark>gluten</mark>	in macro-polymer properties and dough micro-structure. Journal of Cereal Science,
1201	<mark>45, 34</mark>	-48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcs.2006.05.009

1202	111.	Peighambardoust, S. H., Van Der Goot, A. J., Van Vliet, T., Hamer, R. J., & Boom, R. M.	
1203	<mark>(200</mark>	6). Microstructure formation and rheological behaviour of dough under simple shear	
1204	<mark>flow</mark>	. Journal of Cereal Science, 43, 183–197. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcs.2005.10.004</u>	
1205	112.	Pereira, L. A. M., Pinto, C. N., Piza, L. V., Silva, A. C. S., Gonzales-Barron, U., Costa, E.	
1206	J. X.	(2013). A New Alternative Real-Time Method to Monitoring Dough Behavior during	
1207	Proc	essing Using Wireless Sensor Technology. International Journal of Food Engineering, 9,	
1208	505-	-509. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijfe-2012-0238	
1209	113.	Peressini, D., Braunstein, D., Page, J. H., Strybulevych, A., Lagazio, C., & Scanlon, M.	
1210	<mark>G. (</mark> 2	2016). Relation between ultrasonic properties, rheology and baking quality for bread	
1211	dou	ghs of widely differing formulation. Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture, 97,	
1212	<mark>2366</mark>	5–2374. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.8048</u>	
1213	<mark>114.</mark>	Peressini, D., Peighambardoust, S. H., Hamer, R. J., Sensidoni, A., & Van Der Goot, A.	
1214	<mark>J. (2</mark> 0	008). Effect of shear rate on microstructure and rheological properties of sheared wheat	
1215	<mark>dou</mark> ք	ghs. Journal of Cereal Science, 48, 426–438. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcs.2007.10.008</u>	
1216	115.	Perez Alvarado, F. A., Hussein, M. A., Becker, T. (2016). A Vision System for Surface	
1217	Homogenity Analysis of Dough based on the Grey Level Co-Occurrence Matrix (GLCM) for		
1218	Opti	mum Kneading Time Prediction. Journal of Food Process Engineering, 39, 166–177.	
1219	http	s://doi.org/10.1111/jfpe.12209	
1220	<mark>116.</mark>	Pézolet, M., Bonenfant, S., Dousseau, F., & Popineaub, Y. (1992). Conformation of	
1221	<mark>whe</mark>	at gluten proteins Comparison between functional and solution states as determined by	
1222	<mark>infra</mark>	red spectroscopy. Federation of European Biochemical Societies, 299, 247–250.	
1223	117.	Popineau, U., Bonenfant, S., Cornec, M., Pezolet, M. (1994). A study by infrared	
1224	spec	troscopy of the confirmations of gluten proteins differing in their gliadin and glutenin	
1225	com	positions. Journal of Cereal Science, 20, 15–22.	
1226	118.	Popov-Raljić, J. V., Mastilović, J. S., Laličić-Petronijević, J. G., & Popov, and V. S.	
1227	<mark>(200</mark>	9). Investigations of Bread Production with Postponed Staling. Sensors, 9, 8613–8623.	
1228	<u>http</u>	s://doi.org/10.3390/s91108613	
1229	119.	Prakash, S., & Kokini, J. L. (1999). Determination of Mixing Efficiency in a Model Food	
1230	Mixe	er. Advances in Polymer Technology, 18, 209–224.	
1231	120.	Prihoda, J., Hampl, J., Holas J. (1971). Effects of ascorbic acid and potassium bromate	
1232	on v	iscous properties of dough measured with a Hoeppler Consistometer. Cereal Chemistry,	
1233	48.6	58-74.	

1234	121.	Quaglia, G. (1984). Scienza e Tecnologia Della Panificazione, 296-306. Pinerolo, Italy:
1235	<mark>Chiri</mark>	otti Editori.
1236	122.	Rachok, V. (2018b). Influence of working elements of various configurations on the
1237	<mark>proc</mark>	ess of yeast dough kneading. Ukrainian Food Journal, 7, 120–134.
1238	http:	s://doi.org/10.24263/2304-974X-2018-7-1-11
1239	<mark>123.</mark>	Rachok, V., Gudzenko, V., Telychkun, Y., Telychkun, V. (2018a). Formation of the
1240	<mark>struc</mark>	ture of wheat dough during the process of kneading. Processes and Equipment for Food
1241	<mark>Indu</mark>	stries, 24, 154–162. <u>https://doi.org/10.24263/2225-2924-2018-24-2-19</u>
1242	<mark>124.</mark>	Ram, S., Dawar, V., Singh, R. P., & Shoran, J. (2005). Application of solvent retention
1243	<mark>capa</mark>	city tests for the prediction of mixing properties of wheat flour. Journal of Cereal
1244	<mark>Scier</mark>	nce, 42, 261–266. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcs.2005.04.005</u>
1245	125.	Robertson, G. H., Gregorski, K. S., Cao, T. K. (2006). Changes in Secondary Protein
1246	Struc	ctures During Mixing Development of High Absorption (90%) Flour and Water Mixtures.
1247	Cere	al Chemistry, 83, 136–142. https://doi.org/10.1094/CC-83-0136
1248	<mark>126.</mark>	Rosell, C. M., Santos, E., & Collar, C. (2010). Physical characterization of fiber-
1249	<mark>enric</mark>	hed bread doughs by dual mixing and temperature constraint using the Mixolab Ò.
1250	<mark>Euro</mark>	pean Food Research and Technology, 231, 535–544. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00217-
1251	<mark>010-</mark>	1310-у
1252	127.	Ross, K. A., Pyrak-Nolte, L. J., Campanella, O. H. (2004). The use of ultrasound and
1253	shea	r oscillatory tests to characterize the effect of mixing time on the rheological properties
1254	of	dough. Food Research International, 37, 567–577.
1255	http	s://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2004.02.013
1256	<mark>128.</mark>	Ruan, R., Almaer, S., & Zhang, J. (1995). Prediction of Dough Rheological Properties
1257	<mark>Usin</mark>	g Neural Networks. Cereal Chemistry, 72, 308–311.
1258	<mark>129.</mark>	Sahi, S. S., Little, K., & Ananingsih, V. K. (2006). Quality control. Bakery Products:
1259	<mark>Scier</mark>	nce and Technology, 319-336.
1260	130.	Sakai, H., Minimisawa, A., Takagi, K. (1990). Effect of moisture content on ultrasonic
1261	velo	city and attenuation in woods. Ultrasonics, 28, 382–385. https://doi.org/10.1016/0041-
1262	6242	(90)90060-2
1263	131.	Salazar, J., Alava, J. M., Sahi, S. S., Turó, A., Chávez, J. A., García, M. J. (2002).
1264	Ultra	sound Measurements for Determining Rheological Properties of Flour-Water Systems.

1265	Proc	eedings	of	the	IEEE	Ultrasonics	Symposium.
1266	http	s://doi.org/1	0.1109/ULT	SYM.2002.1	1193537		
1267	<mark>132.</mark>	Sangpring	<mark>, Y., Fukuol</mark>	ka, M., Bar	n <mark>, N., Oishi, H</mark>	<mark>I., & Sakai, N. (2017</mark>	'). Evaluation of
1268	<mark>rela</mark> t	tionship betv	veen state	of wheat f	lour-water sy	stem and mechanica	al energy during
1269	<mark>mixi</mark>	ng by color m	nonitoring a	nd low- fiel	d 1 H NMR teo	chnique. Journal of Fo	ood Engineering,
1270	<mark>211,</mark>	7–14. https:,	//doi.org/10	.1016/j.jfo	odeng.2017.04	<mark>4.009</mark>	
1271	133.	Scanlon, N	/l. G. (2013).	What Has	Low-Intensity	Ultrasound Informed	Us about Wheat
1272	Flou	r Dough Rhee	ology? Cerea	al Foods We	orld, 58, 61–65	5. https://doi.org/10.	1094/CFW-58-2-
1273	0063	1					
1274	134.	Scanlon, N	И. G., Page, J	. H. (2015).	Probing the P	roperties of Dough wi	ith Low-Intensity
1275	Ultra	asound. Cere	al Chemistry	, 92, 121–1	L33. https://do	oi.org/10.1094/CCHE	VI-11-13-0244-IA
1276	135.	Šćepanovi	<mark>c, P., Goud</mark> o	oulas, T. B.,	, & Germann,	N. (2018). Numerical	investigation of
1277	<mark>micr</mark>	ostructural o	<mark>damage du</mark> i	<mark>ring knead</mark>	<mark>ing of wheat</mark>	dough. Food Struc	<mark>:ture, 16, 8–16.</mark>
1278	<mark>http</mark>	<u>s://doi.org/1</u>	0.1016/j.foc	<u>str.2018.0</u> 2	<u>1.003</u>		
1279	136.	Schaffer-L	equart, C., L	ehmann, U	I., Ross, A. B., F	Roger, O., Eldridge, A.	L., Ananta, E.,
1280	Rob	in, F. (2017).	Whole grair	n in manufa	actured foods:	Current use, challen	ges and the way
1281	forw	vard. Critica	l Reviews	in Foc	od Science	and Nutrition, 5	7, 1562–1568.
1282	http	s://doi.org/1	0.1080/1040	08398.2013	3.781012		
1283	137.	Schiedt, B	<mark>., Baumann,</mark>	A., Conde-	petit, B., & Vilg	gis, T. A. (2013). Short	- and long-range
1284	inte	ractions gove	rning the v	iscoelastic	properties du	ring wheat dough ar	<mark>nd model dough</mark>
1285	<mark>deve</mark>	elopment. Jou	irnal of Text	<mark>ure Studies</mark>	s <mark>, 44, 317–332</mark>	. https://doi.org/10.1	<u>111/jtxs.12027</u>
1286	138.	Seabourn	B. W., Xie, F	., Chung, C). K. (2008). Raj	pid Determination of	Dough Optimum
1287	Mixi	ng Time fo	r Early Ge	neration	Wheat Breed	ing Lines Using FT	-HATR Infrared
1288	Spec	ctroscopy. Cro	op Science, 4	18, 1575–1	578. https://de	oi.org/10.2135/crops	ci2007.12.0669
1289	139.	Seabourn	B.W. (2002). Determir	nation of prote	in secondary structur	e in wheat flour-
1290	wate	er systems du	ring mixing	using Fouri	er transform h	orizontal attenuated	total reflectance
1291	infra	ared spectros	copy. Ph.D.	diss. Kansa	s State Univ., N	Manhattan.	
1292	140.	Seabourn	B.W., Chu	ng, O.K., S	eib, P.A., Mat	thewson, P.R. (2004)). A method for
1293	mor	itoring the r	neology and	protein se	condary struct	cure of dough during	mixing using FT-
1294	HAT	R spectrosco	py. Program	n Book of t	the 88th AACC	C Annual Meeting. A	bstract No. 320.
1295	p.13	6. Meeting A	bstract				

1296	<mark>141.</mark>	Shehzad, A., Chiron, H., Della Valle, G., Kansou, K., Ndiaye, A., & Réguerre, A. L.
1297	(2010). Porosity and stability of bread dough during proofing determined by video image
1298	a	nalysis for different compositions and mixing conditions. Food Research International, 43,
1299	1	999–2005. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2010.05.019</u>
1300	<mark>142.</mark>	Shehzad, A., Chiron, H., Valle, G. Della, Lamrini, B., & Lourdin, D. (2012). Energetical
1301	a	nd rheological approaches of wheat flour dough mixing with a spiral mixer. Journal of Food
1302	E	ngineering, 110, 60–70. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2011.12.008</u>
1303	<mark>143.</mark>	Singh, N., Singh Gujral, H., Mehak, K., & Bharati, S. (2019). Relationship of Mixolab
1304	<mark>c</mark>	haracteristics with protein, pasting, dynamic and empirical rheological characteristics of
1305	f	lours from Indian wheat varieties with diverse grain hardness. Journal of Food Science and
1306	T	echnology, 56, 2679–2686. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-019-03756-z</u>
1307	144.	Skeggs P. K., Kingswood, K. K., (1981). Mechanical dough development—Pilot scale
1308	S	tudies. Cereal Chemistry, 58, 256–260.
1309	<mark>145.</mark>	Stojceska, V., & Butler, F. (2008). Digitization of farinogram plots and estimation of
1310	n	nixing stability. Journal of Cereal Science, 48, 729–733.
1311	h	ttps://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcs.2008.04.001
1312	146.	Tanaka, K., Tipples, K.H. (1969). Relation between farinograph mixing curve and
1313	n	nixing requirements. Cereal Science Today, 14, 296–300.
1314	<mark>147.</mark>	Tietze, S., Jekle, M., & Becker, T. (2017). Development of wheat dough by means of
1315	<mark>s</mark>	hearing. Journal of Food Engineering, 201, 1–8.
1316	h	ttps://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2017.01.001
1317	<mark>148.</mark>	Tietze, S., Jekle, M., & Becker, T. (2019). Advances in the development of wheat
1318	d	lough and bread by means of shearing. Journal of Food Engineering, 247, 136–143.
1319	h	ttps://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2018.12.001
1320	<mark>149.</mark>	Tlapale-Valdivia, A. D., Chanona-Pérez, J., Mora-Escobedo, R., Farrera-Rebollo, R. R.,
1321	C	utiérrez-López, G. F., & Calderón-Domínguez, G. (2010). Dough and crumb grain changes
1322	d	luring mixing and fermentation and their relation with extension properties and bread
1323	q	uality of yeasted sweet dough. International Journal of Food Science and Technology, 45,
1324	5	30–539. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2621.2009.02161.x
1325	<mark>150.</mark>	Torbica, A., Drasković, M., Tomić, J., Dodig, D., Bosković, J., & Zecević, V. (2016).
1326		
	<u> </u>	Itilization of Mixolab for assessment of durum wheat quality dependent on climatic factors.

1328	<mark>151.</mark>	Torres, D., Arufe, S., Chenlo, F., & Moreira, R. (2017). Coeliacs cannot live by gluten-
1329	<mark>free b</mark>	pread alone – every once in awhile they need antioxidants. International Journal of Food
1330	<mark>Scien</mark>	ce and Technology, 52, 81–90. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/ijfs.13287</u>
1331	<mark>152.</mark>	Tucker, G. (2014). Process Optimization and Control. Bakery Products Science and
1332	<mark>Techr</mark>	nology, 373.
1333	153.	Van Der Mijnsbrugge, A., Auger, F., Frederix, S., Morel, MH. (2016). Image analysis
1334	of do	ugh development: Impact of mixing parameters and wheat cultivar on the gluten phase
1335	distril	bution. Journal of Food Engineering, 171, 102–110.
1336	https	://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2015.10.006
1337	<mark>154.</mark>	Vàzquez, D., & Veira, M. C. (2015). Applicability of Mixolab test with local wheat
1338	<mark>flours</mark>	s. International Journal of Food Studies, 4, 78–87.
1339	155.	Wang, CK., & Fowler, E. R. (1993). Sensing gluten development during bread dough
1340	<mark>mixin</mark>	g. IEEE Instrumentation and Measurement Technology Conference, 554–557.
1341	<mark>156.</mark>	Weipert, D. (1990). The Benefits of Basic Rheometry in Studying Dough Rheology.
1342	<mark>Cerea</mark>	al Chemistry, 67, 311–317.
1343	157.	Wellner, N., Belton, P. S., Tatham, A. S. (1996). Fourier transform IR spectroscopic
1344	study	of hydration-induced structure changes in the solid state of $\omega\mbox{-gliadin}.$ Biochemical
1345	Journ	al, 319, 741747. https://doi.org/10.1042/bj3190741
1346	158.	Wellner, N., Mills, E. N. C., Brownsey, G., Wilson, R. H., Brown, N., Freeman, J.,
1347	Belto	n, P. S. (2005). Changes in Protein Secondary Structure during Gluten Deformation
1348	Studio	ed by Dynamic Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy. Biomacromolecules, 6, 255–
1349	261. ł	https://doi.org/10.1021/bm049584d
1350	159.	Wesley, I. J., Larsen, N. G., Osborne, B. G., Skerritt, J. H. (2002). US 6,342,259 B1.
1351	160.	Wesley, I. J., Larsen, N., Osborne, B. G., Skerritt, J. H. (1998). Non-invasive Monitoring
1352	of Do	bugh Mixing by Near Infrared Spectroscopy. Journal of Cereal Science, 27, 61–69.
1353	https	://doi.org/10.1006/jcrs.1997.0151
1354	161.	Wilson, A. J., Morgenstern, M. P., Kavale, S. (2001). Mixing Response of a Variable
1355	Speed	d 125 g Laboratory Scale Mechanical Dough Development Mixer. Journal of Cereal
1356	Scien	ce, 34, 151–158. https://doi.org/10.1006/jcrs.2001.0389
1357	162.	Wilson, A. J., Wooding, A. R., Morgenstern, M. P. (1997). Comparison of Work Input
1358	Requi	irement on Laboratory-Scale and Industrial-Scale Mechanical Dough Development
1359	Mixer	rs. Cereal Chemistry, 74, 715–721. https://doi.org/10.1094/CCHEM.1997.74.6.715

1360	163. Wooding, A. R., Kavale, S., Macritchie, F., & Stoddard, F. L. (1997). Link Between
1361	Mixing Requirements and Dough Strength. Cereal Chemistry, 76, 800–806.
1362	https://doi.org/10.1094/CCHEM.1999.76.5.800
1363	164. Xhabiri, G. Q., Idrizi, X., Ferati, I., & Hoxha, I. (2016). Rheological Qualities of Dough
1364	from Mixture of Flour and Wheat Bran and Possible Correlation between Bra Bender and
1365	Mixolab Chopin Equipments. MOJ Food Processing & Technology, 2, 42.
1366	165. Zhang, L., & Chen, X. D. (2014). Bakery Products of China. Bakery Products Science
1367	and Technology, 673-684.
1368	166. Zhang, Y., Wang, Y., Chen, X., Wang, D., Humieres, G. D., Feng, J., & He, Z. (2009).
1369	Relationships of Mixolab parameters with Farinograph, Extensograph Parameters, and
1370	bread-making quality. Acta Agronomica Sinica, 35, 1738-1743.
1371	167. Zheng, H., Morgenstern, M. P., Campanella, O. H., & Larsen, N. G. (2000). Rheological
1372	Properties of Dough During Mechanical Dough Development. Journal of Cereal Science, 32,
1373	293–306. <u>https://doi.org/10.1006/jcrs.2000.0339</u>
1374	Zhou, W., Hui, Y. H., DeLeyn, I., Pagani, M. A. (2014). Bakery Products Science and Technology
1375	(Second). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118792001
1376	168. Zounis, S., Quail, K. J. (1997). Predicting Test Bakery Requirements from Laboratory
1377	Mixing Tests. Journal of Cereal Science, 25, 185–196
1378	https://doi.org/10.1006/jcrs.1996.0075
1379	
1380	
1381	
1382	
1383	

1384



Figure 1 Changes in wheat dough consistency as a function of kneading time measured using a consistency probe. (Reprinted from Kaddour et al., 2007, with permission from Elsevier).



Figure 2 Moving averaged power consumption profile during kneading time of wheat flour dough measured using a current transducer. (Reprinted from Hwang & Gunasekaran, 2001, with permission from Elsevier).



Figure 3 NIR peak area at 1125-1180 nm wavelength (thin line) and fitting curves (thick line) versus kneading time of wheat flours with different bread-making performances: standard weak biscuit-making, cv Riband (a); slightly weak bread-making, cv Rialto (b); bread-making, cv Hereward (c); strong bread-making, cv Soisson (d), kneaded in a laboratory-scale Morton mixer. (Reprinted from Alava et al., 2001, with permission from Elsevier).



Figure 4 Changes in amide III band maximum absorbance values during bread dough kneading time; (a) α -helical (1319 cm⁻¹), (b) β -turn (1288 cm⁻¹), (c) random coil (1265 cm⁻¹) and (d) β -sheet (1242 cm⁻¹). (Reprinted from Kaddour et al., 2008, with permission from Elsevier).



Figure 5 a) Ultrasound velocity as a function of kneading time for different types of flour: black circles = all purpose flour – optimum kneading time 4 min; empty circles = bread flour – optimum kneading time 4.5 min; black triangles = cake flour – optimum kneading time 2 min. b) Ultrasound velocity as a function of kneading time for doughs containing different percentage of shortening: balck circles = doughs with 0% shortening; balck triangles = doughs with 2% shortening; balck squares = doughs with 4% shortening; balck diamonds – doughs with 8% shortening (% flour weight basis) (a. Reprinted from Ross et al., 2004 with little modifications and b. reprinted from Mehta et al., 2009, with permission from Elsevier).

Figure captions

Figure 1 Changes in wheat dough consistency as a function of kneading time measured using a consistency probe. (Reprinted from Kaddour et al., 2007, with permission from Elsevier).

Figure 2 Moving averaged power consumption profile during kneading time of wheat flour dough measured using a current transducer. (Reprinted from Hwang & Gunasekaran, 2001, with permission from Elsevier).

Figure 3 NIR peak area at 1125-1180 nm wavelength (thin line) and fitting curves (thick line) versus kneading time of wheat flours with different bread-making performances: standard weak biscuitmaking, cv Riband (a); slightly weak bread-making, cv Rialto (b); bread-making, cv Hereward (c); strong bread-making, cv Soisson (d), kneaded in a laboratory-scale Morton mixer. (Reprinted from Alava et al., 2001, with permission from Elsevier).

Figure 4 Changes in amide III band maximum absorbance values during bread dough kneading time; (a) α -helical (1319 cm-1), (b) β -turn (1288 cm-1), (c) random coil (1265 cm-1) and (d) β -sheet (1242 cm-1). (Reprinted from Kaddour et al., 2008, with permission from Elsevier).

Figure 5 a) Ultrasound velocity as a function of kneading time for different types of flour: black circles = all purpose flour – optimum kneading time 4 min; empty circles = bread flour – optimum kneading time 4.5 min; black triangles = cake flour – optimum kneading time 2 min. b) Ultrasound velocity as a function of kneading time for doughs containing different percentage of shortening: balck circles = doughs with 0% shortening; balck triangles = doughs with 2% shortening; balck squares = doughs with 4% shortening; balck diamonds – doughs with 8% shortening (% flour weight basis) (a. Reprinted from Ross et al., 2004 with little modifications and b. reprinted from Mehta et al., 2009, with permission from Elsevier).

Main focus	Reference
Conseletion between different methods and develophened available	Frazier et al. (1975); Atkins et al. (1990); Weipert (1990); Autio et al. (2001);
Correlation between different methods and dougn/bread quality	(2016); Tietze et al. (2017)
Effects of different kneading conditions on dough/bread properties	Frazier et al. (1975); Larsen et al. (1991); Létang et al. (1999); Zheng et al. (2000); Autio et al. (2001); Cuq et al. (2002); Lee et al. (2002); Esselink et al. (2003); Calderón-Domínguez et al. (2004); Kuktaite et al. (2005); Chin et al. (2005b); Peighambardoust et al. (2006); Chenlo et al. (2006); Peighambardoust et al. (2007); Osella et al. (2007); Auger et al. (2008); Kim et al. (2008); Peressini et al. (2008); Connelly et al. (2008); Ktenioudaki et al. (2010); Shehzad et al. (2010); Tlapale-Valdivia et al. (2010); Jekle et al. (2011); Shehzad et al. (2012); Parenti et al. (2013); Bozkurt et al. (2014); Pastukhov et al. (2014); Brabec et al. (2015); Van Der Mijnsbrugge et al. (2016): Meerts et al. (2017): Rachok et al. (2018b): Cappelli et al. (2019)
Prediction of bread-making performance	Wooding et al. (1997); Stojceska et al. (2008); Migliori et al. (2013); Lucas et al. (2019)
Wheat protein structure/development	Amend et al. (1991); Pézolet et al. (1992); Bache et al. (1998); Lee et al. (2002); Belton et al. (2005); Robertson et al. (2006); Peighambardoust et al. (2007); Auger et al. (2008); Peighambardoust et al. (2010); Jekle et al. (2011); Belton et al. (2012); Kokawa et al. (2012); Bozkurt et al. (2014); Van Der Mijnsbrugge et al. (2016); Lucas et al. (2018)
Dough development	Prakash et al. (1999); Létang et al. (1999); Gras et al. (2000); Zheng et al. (2000); Cuq et al. (2003); Esselink et al. (2003); Kaddour et al. (2008b); Peighambardoust et al. (2010); Belton et al. (2012); Schiedt et al. (2013); Rachok et al. (2018a); Šćepanovic et al. (2018); Parenti et al. (2021)
Methods/promising approaches for the determination of dough readiness	Fortmann et al. (1964); Heaps et al. (1967); Tanaka et al. (1969); Kilborn et al. (1972, 1973); Frazier et al. (1975); Burrows et al. (1990); Atkins et al., (1990); Wang et al., (1993); Oliver et al. (1992, 1993, 1994); Delwiche et al. (1994); Ruan et al. (1995); Wilson et al. (1997); Zounis and Quail (1997); Anderssen et al. (1998); Demster et al. (1998); Wesley et al. (1998); Wilson et al. (2001); Létang et al. (2001); Hwang et al. (2001); Alava et al. (2001); Wilson et al. (2001); Salazar et al. (2002); Wesley et al. (2002); Ross et al. (2004); Chin et

Table 1 Schematic representation of the main references obtained from the literature search about wheat dough kneading.

al. (2005a); Garcia-alvarez et al. (2006); Nassar et al. (2006); Aït Kaddour et
al. (2007); Seabourn et al. (2008); Aït Kaddour et al. (2008a); Mehta et al.
<mark>(2009); Ndiaye et al. (2009); Pereira et al. (2013); Altuna et al. (2016);</mark>
Peressini et al. (2016); Oestersotebier et al. (2016); Doubat et al. (2016);
Garcia et al. (2016); Perez Alvarado et al. (2016); Aljaafreh et al. (2017);
Sangspring et al. (2017); Muscalu et al. (2017); Bowler et al. (2020)

Table 2 Schematic overview of the main results reported in the literature for reference methods.

Reference	Reference Method	Instrument used	Parameter considered	Determination of dough readiness	<mark>Quality</mark> evaluation	Results/Quality of the determination of dough readiness
Farinograph AACC 10-09.01, 10- 10.03	Descriptive rheology	Farinograph	Dough consistency	Peak of consistency	Maximum of dough consistency	
Mixograph AACC 10-09.01, 10- 10.03	<mark>Descriptive</mark> rheology	<mark>Mixograph</mark>	Dough consistency	Peak of consistency	Maximum of dough consistency	-
Tanaka and Tipples (1969)	Descriptive rheology	Farinograph	Dough consistency	Peak of dough consistency	Bread quality parameters	Farinograph speeds higher than the standard value (90 - 120 rpm) improved the relationship between Farinograph kneading time and bakery optimum kneading time
Burrows and Gras (1990)	Descriptive rheology	Farinograph, Mixograph, pin mixer	Dough consistency (resistance)	Peak of dough consistency	Baking scores	High correlation between the kneading time predicted in a Mixograph and that of the pin mixer
Oliver & Allen (1992)	Descriptive rheology	Farinograph, national pin mixer	Dough consistency	The end of the Farinograph plateau period	Maximum loaf volume, Extensograph height and extensibility	Good prediction of optimum dough development when Farinograph mixing speed was higher (140-180 rpm) than the standard (60 rpm)
Zounis & Quail (1997)	Descriptive rheology	Farinograph, Mixograph, bakery pin mixer	Dough consistency	Peak of consistency (Farinograph and Mixograph), peak of power consumption (bakery pin-mixer)	Highest bread score evaluated by experienced baker.	Good prediction of optimum dough development using Farinograph at 120- 180 rpm, Mixograph and bakery pin- mixer (bakery formula). Best prediction: bakery pin mixer. Selecting the Farinograph point at the end of the plateau region or the second peak obtained with bakery formula gave a better prediction of bread quality.
Dapčević et al. (2009), Zhang et al. (200), Koksel et al. (2009), Rosell et al. (2010), Caffe-treml et al. (2010), Ohm et al. (2012), Moreira et al. (2012), Blandino et al. (2015), Vàzquez & Veira (2015), Doubat et al. (2016), Torbica et al. (2016); Xhabiri et al. (2016), Singh et al. (2019)	Descriptive rheology	Mixolab	Dough consistency	Peak of dough consistency	Mixolab optimum kneading time	Good correlation with standard rheological tests (Farinograph and Mixograph)
Cauvian (2015a)	Work input (Chorleywood Bread Process, CBP)	High speed mixer	Fixed amount of energy (300 rpm, 11 W-h/kg); total	Peak of consistency	Maximum of dough consistency	-

			kneading time 2-5 min			
Wilson et al. (2001)	Mechanical Dough Development (MDD) (CBP modified method)	High speed mixer	Specific amount of energy as a function of the flour technological quality	Peak of consistency	Maximum of dough consistency	-
Oliver & Allen (1992)	Work input	Farinograph	Work input	Specific work input amount to optimum dough development	Maximum loaf volume	Work input in a Farinograph at faster speeds (140-180 rpm) than the standard is independent from the mixing speed. Fixed work input
Zounis & Quail (1997)	Work input	Farinograph, Mixograph, bakery pin mixer	Work input	Specific work input amount to optimum dough development	Highest bread score evaluated by experienced baker:	Work input in a Farinograph at faster speeds (140-180 rpm) than the standard is independent from the mixing speed on 20 of the 28 flours. Conversely work inputs depended on mixing speed on 8 of the 28 flours (interaction work input*flour type)
<mark>Anderssen et al. (1998)</mark>	Work input	Mixograph	Work input	Amount of work input expressed as number of mixer revolutions to reach optimum dough development	Optimum kneading time determined in a Mixograph; extension test (R _{max})	When mixing speeds were higher than 90 rpm the number of mixer revolutions (work input) to reach optimum dough development was constant. The resistance of the dough at peak development time well correlated with R _{max} of extension test (R=0.64), whereas the number of mixer revolutions to reach dough readiness showed a poor negative correlation with R _{max} (R=-0.33) (doughs prepared in a 2 g Mixograph)
Wilson et al. (1997)	Work input	MDD laboratory- scale and industrial-scale mixers	Work input	Amount of work input to reach maximum dough consistency	Maximum dough consistency	High correlation between the work input determined in a laboratory-scale and industrial-scale mixers, although a large off-set was shown since industrial mixers required higher work input.
Wilson et al. (2001)	Work input	MDD mixer	Work input	Amount of work input to reach peak torque	Peak of torque	Above specific mixing speed threshold, the work input was independent of the mixing speed but depended on flour quality and kneader type
Chin et al. (2005a)	Work input	Tweedy-type mixer	Work input	Amount of work input to reach peak torque	Peak of torque	Work input was not independent of mixing rate in this mixer
Atkins & Larsen (1990)	<mark>Work input</mark>	Farinograph	MDD parameters	Development time in MDD system	Bread volume	Farinograph can be used to determine MDD development time

Visual inspection AACC 10-09.01, 10-10.03	Visual inspection	-	-	-	Subjective visual/tactile sensory	Poor; Perez Alvarado et al. (2016) reported high standard deviation 300 ± 200 s
Baking trials AACC 10-09.01, 10- 10.03	Experimental trials	<mark>Mixers</mark>	The dough is kneaded at a constant speed and for different kneading times, with intervals of 0.5 min	-	Bread quality parameters	Reliable results of the optimal kneading time but large amounts of efforts (ingredients and time)
Ross et al. (2004)	Fundamental rheology	Controlled stress rheometer: strain and frequency sweep experiments	Storage modulus (G'), loss modulus (G'')	Maximum of G', Maximum of G''	Mixograph optimum kneading time	Maximum of G' and G'' corresponds to Mixograph optimum kneading time
Ram et al. (2005)	Lactic Acid Solvent Retention Capacity (LASRC)	SRC test	SRC method as described by Guttieri et al. (2001)	LASRC	Farinograph and Mixograph optimum kneading time	LASRC showed significant positive correlation with Farinograph and Mixograph optimum kneading time
Tietze et al. (2019)	Micro-scale shear mixing (MSSM) technique	<mark>Rheometer</mark>	Relaxation spectra during kneading	The point of the relaxation spectra where the peaks stop drifting	Optimum kneading time determined in a z- blade mixer	Good correlation between kneading time of doughs obtained in MSS and those developed in a z-blade mixer

Table 3 Schematic overview of the main results report	ed in the literature for alternative methods.
---	---

Reference	<mark>Alternative</mark> Method	<mark>Instrument used</mark>	Parameter considered	Determination of dough	Quality evaluation	Results/Quality of the determination
Wang et al. (1993)	Power consumption	Horizontal mixer	Three phase input power	Instantaneous input power data acquisition system (DAS) and digital signal processing (DSP)	DAS: development of gluten protein (empirically related to the instantaneous input power signal) DSP: dough strength, cohesiveness, viscoelasticity	DAS, DSP and Fuzzy logic control system were proposed for dough mixing control
Zounis & Quail (1997)	Power consumption	Bakery pin mixer	Power consumption	Maximum power consumption	Highest bread score evaluated by experienced baker	For kneading time below 400 s a good correlation between power consumption and the kneading time that maximized bread quality was found. In 20 (high protein contents) of the 28 samples the kneading time that optimized bread quality was longer than the peak of power consumption
Hwang & Gunasekaran (2001)	Power consumption	Hobart mixer with a pin-type attachment	Power consumption	Maximum power consumption	Maximum storage and viscous moduli (G' and G'')	The spectral analysis of the power consumption can be used to identify the peak mixing time from the signal amplitude data; good correlation between power consumption and G'; the trend of G'' were similar to G' hence results were not reported
<mark>Pereira et al.</mark> (2013)	Power consumption	<mark>Mixer machine</mark> CSLA1CD	Power consumption	<mark>Maximum power</mark> consumption	Peak of torque	Power consumption was highly correlated with torque
<mark>Aljaafreh</mark> (2017)	Power consumption	Current sensing and online learning through reinforcement learning (RL)	Power consumption	<mark>User feedback</mark>	Characteristics of the mixture	Non-invasive sensor for real-time monitoring of kneading based on power consumption and RL
<mark>Altuna et al.</mark> (2016)	Torque	Large-scale dynamic rheometer	Torque	Peak of torque	Peak of torque	New methodology to measure torque during dough kneading
<mark>Delwiche &</mark> Weaver (1994)	NIR spectroscopy	Hobart mixer	NIR reflectance spectra in the range of 1100-2498 nm	Regression model were developed using the score of each spectrum	Optimal dough consistency	Poor models for the determination of dough readiness were obtained

Demoster et al		Hohart miyer	NIR radiation in the range of	Algorithm based on the ratio	Empirical evaluation of	Good correlation between NIR neak
(1008)	spostroscopy	nobul e mixer	400 1700 pm	1455 nm/1205 nm	a trained mixer	surve and entimum knowing time as
(1990)	spectroscopy		400-1700 mm	wavelength to obtain peak of	operator	iudge by trained mixer operator
					operator	(ampirical evaluation)
Marshave at all	NUD	Culture Lance attention				
wesley et al.		Spiral, morton z-	Second derivative of raw NIR	Minimum Nik peak areas at	Maximum of power	NIR kneading time from second
<mark>(1998)</mark>	spectroscopy	arm, and pin-	spectra. Peak areas at 1160 nm	1160 nm (water) and 1200	consumption	derivative spectra (minimum at 1160
		<mark>mixer</mark>	and 1200 nm plotted against	nm (probably glutenin		nm and 1200 nm) was close to the
			mixing time	macropolymer and		maximum power consumption
				extractable gliadins)		although slightly longer independently
						from the kneader and flour typology
<mark>Alava et al.</mark>	NIR	<mark>Two high speed</mark>	Second derivative of raw NIR	<mark>Minimum NIR peak area at</mark>	Maximum torque and	NIR kneading time from second
<mark>(2001)</mark>	<mark>spectroscopy</mark>	<mark>CBP mixers</mark>	spectra and PCA. Peak areas at	<mark>1125-1180 nm</mark>	<mark>elastic modulus of gel</mark>	derivative spectra (minimum at 1125-
			1125-1180 nm (hydration of the		protein fraction G',	1180 nm) was longer than the
			flour to form a dough) plotted		bread quality	optimum kneading time predicted
			against mixing time		parameters (loaf	with traditional methods (torque and
					volume and crumb cell	G') but a better prediction of bread
					area)	quality was obtained
Kaddour et al.	FT-NIR	6-kg Mahot mixer	Raw spectra (physical	Minimum of NIR kneading	Maximum torque and	NIR kneading time from raw NIR
(2007)	spectroscopy	8	properties), second derivative of	curve (NIR kneading time)	dough consistency	spectra was longer than the optimum
	<mark>opect: 0000p)</mark>		raw NIR spectra	obtained from PC1 scores at		kneading time predicted by maximum
			(physicochemical properties) at	1000-2500 nm and 1778-		dough consistency: NIR kneading time
			1352-1485 1778-2052 2109-	2052 nm (associated to		from second derivative treatment
			2325 nm (greatest change at	interactions of water		(1000-2500 nm and 1778-2052 nm)
			1779 2052 nm associated to O H	moloculos with flour		was more similar to the time at
			vibrations) by using PCA	components)		maximum consistency
Maday at al	Dotont NUD		Absorbances of NID second	Minimum of NID second	Peced on providue	NID knowling time obtained at
	Patelli Nin		Absorbances of NIR second	derivative spectra at 1100	results (Mesley 1008)	nin kileauling tille obtailled at
(2002)	spectroscopy		(water) 1200 pm	1200, 1420 pm and at at	results (wesley 1998)	11111111111111111111111111111111111111
	method		(water), 1200 nm	1200, 1430 nm and at at		at 2350, 2340, 2310 and maximum at
			(predominantly proteins), 1430	2350, 2340, 2310 and		2195 nm gave a good prediction of the
			nm (water and proteins);	maximum at 2195 nm		kneading time that optimized bread
			preferentially also adsorbances	indicated the optimum		quality (Wesley et al. 1998)
			at 2350 nm (glutenin), 2340,	kneading time;		
			2310 and 2195 nm (gliadins)			
<mark>Seabourn et al.</mark>	<mark>FT-HATR MIR</mark>	<mark>Mixograph</mark>	MIR absorbances in amide III	Ratio of the Second	<mark>Optimum kneading</mark>	High correlation between SBDA α-helix
<mark>(2008)</mark>	<mark>spectroscopy</mark>		band region were analysed after	Derivative Band Area (SDBA)	time predicted in a	<mark>(1336 cm⁻¹) and β-sheet (1242 cm⁻¹)</mark>
			a short-duration mixing cycle (1	<mark>between α-helix (1336 cm⁻¹)</mark>	<mark>Mixograph</mark>	and optimum kneading time predicted
			min)	and β-sheet (1242 cm ⁻¹)		by the Mixograph (R ² =0.81)
Kaddour et al.	<mark>ATR FT-MIR</mark>	<mark>6-kg Mahot mixer</mark>	MIR spectra analysed after	MIR maximum score value on	Maximum torque	Analysis of the amide III band (α -
<mark>(2008)</mark>	<mark>spectrometer</mark>		standard normal variate (SNV)	the PC1 score plot ; MIR	<mark>value</mark>	<mark>helical 1319 cm⁻¹, β-turn 1288 cm⁻¹, β-</mark>
			using PCA and after second	maximum absorbance in		sheet 1242 cm ⁻¹ , random coil
			derivative treatment of amide III	amide III band; maximum of		structures 1265 cm ⁻¹) related to
			<mark>(α-helical 1319 cm⁻¹, β-turn</mark>	<mark>α-helical 1319 cm⁻¹, β-turn</mark>		changes in the secondary protein
			1288 cm ⁻¹ , β-sheet 1242 cm ⁻¹ ,	1288 cm ⁻¹ , β-sheet 1242 cm ⁻¹		structures gave the optimum MIR

			random coil structures 1265 cm ⁻	, minimum of random coil		mixing time associated to the time at
			<mark>1)</mark>	structures 1265 cm ⁻¹		which the torque began to collapse.
						Good prediction of the optimum
Colores et al		N a stars series s			M(ante in nut, lange al	kneading time
Salazar et al.	Ultrasounds	Norton mixer	Monitoring of ultrasound	Ultrasound velocity seemed	work input, bread	Limited levels of work input were
(2002), Garcia-			velocity and attenuation	to be dependent on hour	quality parameters	considered. No conclusive result
alvarez et al.			parameters	quality and to be correlated	(loat volume, cell	
(2006)				to optimum kneading time	diameter)	
Ross et al.	Ultrasounds	Mixograph	Monitoring of ultrasound	Maximum ultrasound velocity	Optimum kneading	Ultrasound velocity and attenuation
<mark>(2004)</mark>			velocity and attenuation	and attenuation parameters	time determined in a	parameters showed maximum values
			parameters		Mixograph;	at the optimum kneading time of the
					fundamental	Mixograph
					rheological	
					G ^{''})	
Nassar et al.	Ultrasounds	Alveograph	Monitoring of the ultrasound	Maximum of the ultrasound	Phase transition of the	Acoustic measurement can potentially
<mark>(2006)</mark>		<mark>kneader bowl</mark>	<mark>signal amplitude</mark>	signal amplitude	signal corresponded to	be used as an effective on line dough
					optimal dough	quality control technique
					<mark>development</mark>	
					according to Zheng et	
					<mark>al. (2000)</mark>	
<mark>Mehta et al.</mark>	<mark>Ultrasounds</mark>	GRL-200 mixer	Monitoring of ultrasound	Discernible peak in the	10% past peak	The discernible peak of ultrasound
<mark>(2009)</mark>			velocity and attenuation	decreasing trend of	<mark>resistance in the</mark>	velocity was correlated with the
			<mark>parameters</mark>	ultrasound velocity;	<mark>mixing curve</mark>	optimum kneading time determined as
				reduction in the increasing		10% past peak resistance in the mixing
				trend of attenuation		<mark>curve</mark>
				parameter		
<mark>Peressini et al.</mark>	<mark>Ultrasounds</mark>	<mark>Farinograph</mark>	Monitoring of ultrasound	Mean values of ultrasound	Large-strain	Ultrasound parameters had predictive
<mark>(2016)</mark>		<mark>kneader bowl</mark>	velocity and attenuation	velocity and phase velocity in	<mark>conventional</mark>	capacity for bread-making
			<mark>parameters</mark>	the range of 0.3-3 MHz	rheological tests and	performance
					bread quality	
<mark>Bowler et al.</mark>	<mark>Ultrasounds</mark>	Kneader machine	Acoustic paramaters (speed of	Ultrasound technique	Maximum of power	Ultrasound technique combined with
(2020)			<mark>sound, acoustic impedance,</mark>	combined with Machine	consumption	ML showed the potential to determine
			reflection coefficient)	Learning (ML) engineering		the dough readiness
				method		

Table 4 A synoptic comparison between the reference methods and the main alternative methods of dough readiness measurement.

Reference Methods	Dough readiness measurement principle	Predictive action on kneading	Strengths	Weaknesses	References
Visual inspection	Visual and tactile dough sensory attributes	Optimal kneading time	Direct measurement	Subjective measurement	AACC 10-09.01 and 10-10-03 methods
Baking trials	Bread quality parameters	Optimal kneading time	End product quality prediction	Time- and resource- consuming	AACC 10-09.01 method
Descriptive rheological tests	Trend of dough texture as a function of time	Apparent optimal kneading time	Direct measurement	Different operating conditions between lab test and bakery	AACC 10-09.01 and 10-10-03 methods; Tanaka & Tipples (1969); Burrows & Gras (1990); Oliver & Allen (1992, 1993, 1994); Zounis and Quail (1997); <mark>Doubat et al., 2016</mark>
Work input measurement	Energy to mix dough to kneader point of peak torque	Fixed energy amount to achieve dough readiness	Independent of kneading type	Not applicable at all kneading speeds	Fortmann et al. (1964); Heaps et al. (1967); Kilborn & Tipples (1972, 1973); Frazier et al. (1975); Atkins et al., (1990); Oliver & Allen (1992); Wilson et al. (1997); Zounis and Quail (1997); Anderssen et al. (1998); Wilson et al. (2001); Chin et al. (2005 <mark>a</mark>); Muscalu et al. (2017)
Alternative Methods	Dough readiness measurement principle	Predictive action on kneading	Strengths	Weaknesses	References

Torque and power consumption measurements	Trend of torque and power consumption as a function of time	Optimal kneading time in terms of dough texture	Online measurement	Relationship between torque/power and dough texture not always applicable	Wang et al., (1993); Zounis and Quail (1997); Wilson et al. (2001); Hwang & Gunasekaran (2001); Pereira et al. (2013); <mark>Altuna et al. (2016);</mark> Aljaafreh et al. (2017)
NIR spectroscopy	Spectra analysis in NIR range of 400 - 2500 nm	Optimal kneading time in terms of dough physico- chemical changes	Independent of kneading operating conditions	Identification of specific wavelength range and data processing	<mark>Delwiche et al. (1994); Demster et al. (1998);</mark> Wesley et al. (1998); Alava et al. (2001); Wesley et al. (2002); Aït Kaddour et al. (2007)
MIR spectroscopy	Spectra analysis in MIR range of 2500 - 5000 nm	Optimal kneading time in terms of dough physico- chemical changes	Good monitoring of gluten network formation	Offline measurement	Seabourn et al. (2008); Aït Kaddour et al. (2008 <mark>a</mark>)
<mark>Computer</mark> vision	lmage analysis of dough homogeneity	Optimal kneading time in terms of visual inspection and torque trend	<mark>Automated and</mark> cost effective method	<mark>Little research on the</mark> <mark>method</mark>	<mark>Perez Alvarado et al. (2016)</mark>
Ultrasounds	US velocity and attenuation of longitudinal waves from 20 kHz to 10 MHz	Optimal kneading time in terms of dough texture	Good evidence of water effect on dough development	Contradictory experimental data	Létang et al. (2001); Salazar et al. (2002) and Garcia-alvarez et al. (2006); Ross et al. (2004); <mark>Nassar et al. (2006);</mark> Mehta et al. (2009); <mark>Peressini</mark> <mark>et al. (2016)</mark> ; <mark>Bowler et al. (2020)</mark>

Conflict of Interest and Authorship Conformation Form

Please check the following as appropriate:

- ✓ ⊠ The 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.
- \checkmark \boxtimes The This manuscript has not been submitted to, nor is under review at, another journal or other publishing venue.
- \checkmark \boxtimes The The authors have no affiliation with any organization with a direct or indirect financial interest in the subject matter discussed in the manuscript
- \checkmark \boxtimes The The following authors have affiliations with organizations with direct or indirect financial interest in the subject matter discussed in the manuscript:

Authors's	Affiliation		
name			
Ottavia Parenti	Dipartimento di Scienze e Tecnologie Agrarie, Alimentari, Ambientali		
	e Forestali, Università degli Studi di Firenze, Italia		
Lorenzo	Dipartimento di Scienze e Tecnologie Agrarie, Alimentari, Ambientali		
Guerrini	e Forestali, Università degli Studi di Firenze, Italia		
Sara Bossa	Institut de Tecnologia Agroalimentària, Escola Politècnica Superior,		
Mompin	Universitat de Girona, Spain		
Mònica Toldrà	Institut de Tecnologia Agroalimentària, Escola Politècnica Superior,		
	Universitat de Girona, Spain		
Bruno Zanoni	Dipartimento di Scienze e Tecnologie Agrarie, Alimentari, Ambientali		
	e Forestali, Università degli Studi di Firenze, Italia		