

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

# Development of Gluten-Free Wrap Bread

A Thesis  
submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements  
for the degree of  
Master of Food Technology

Massey University  
Albany, New Zealand

Tianyi Yang

September 2016

## Dedication

*To my mother and father, Xiangdong and Xiaofang.*

*For their love, support and kindness.*

## Abstract

Gluten, the storage protein in wheat, barley and rye is associated with coeliac disease, wheat allergy and non-coeliac gluten sensitivity. The clinical symptoms include diarrhoea, anaemia, nausea, mouth sore and psychological symptoms and in some cases a gluten free diet may reduce the severity of irritable bowel disease (IBD). Gluten-related disorders can be prevented by the omission of gluten from the diet. Currently, there is an increasing demand for gluten-free foods due to consumer awareness of gluten-related disorders as well as people seeking to reduce possible dietary risks. New Zealand's market for gluten-free foods is presently estimated at nearly four million US dollars.

The development and production of gluten-free bread presents major technological challenges due to the role of gluten in developing the characteristic structure of both the raw dough and subsequent loaf texture. The main ingredients of bread are water and cereal flours which provide the primary structure to the baked product. Wheat grain is a traditional and common cereal that is milled into bread flour. When wheat flour is hydrated with water, gluten, the protein component hydrates to become a continuous cohesive viscoelastic network entrapping starch granules. This highly elastic network retains CO<sub>2</sub> gas produced by yeast and sugar during leavening, thus forming the foam structure of bread. Gluten replacements that mimic the viscoelastic properties of gluten have been widely investigated for gluten free baked products including flatbread. Flatbread is popular for use in ready-to-eat convenient foods due to its large crust to crumb ratio. Wrap bread is a typical flatbread that can be rolled to hold various fillings. The manufacture of gluten-free wrap breads mainly suffers from poor rollability which is an essential property of the product. Thus, the present study investigated the development of gluten-free wrap bread (GFW) using xanthan gum, guar gum, carboxymethyl cellulose (CMC) as possible replacers for gluten, coconut oil was also added to improve flexibility of the bread. The formulations were investigated and optimised in four integrated phases.

In phase 1, guar and xanthan gums were studied as possible gluten replacers during the development of GFWs. GFW samples ( $n = 16$ ) made from four formulations under four baking conditions (200°C/2 min, 200°C/4 min, 220°C/2 min, 220°C/4 min) were analysed for baking weight loss and rollability. Baking weight loss was determined as moisture loss during baking, while rollability was measured as the ability of the freshly cooked bread to conform to shape (1-5 scale) as it was rolled around a 3-cm diameter wooden dowel (rod). A mixture of guar and xanthan gums (1:1) produced GFWs with better rollability and less baking weight loss than either gum alone. GFW samples baked at the higher temperature for the longer time generally had higher rollability. The highest average rollability score (3) obtained for this phase was considered low for wrap breads developed in phase 2.

In phase 2, GFWs ( $n = 20$ ) made from five formulations containing both xanthan and guar gums (1:1), CMC, and coconut oil were baked at 230°C for 2 or 4 min or at 240°C for 2 or 4 min. Freshly baked GFWs were analysed for baking weight loss, water activity, and colour. Rollability using 1 1-cm diameter dowel and visible mould growth of the GFWs were determined during storage for 28 days (4°C). Products produced in phase 2 had no visible mould growth during storage for 3 weeks (4°C). The inclusion of xanthan-guar gum, CMC and coconut oil into GFWs baked at 240°C/2 min may have contributed to high rollability and low baking weight loss. The effect of each test ingredient (xanthan-guar, CMC, and coconut oil) on the properties of GFWs was the subject of phase 3.

In phase 3, a basic formulation made with three levels (9 formulations) each of coconut oil, CMC and xanthan-gum gum were optimized using the Taguchi method to test the effect

of each ingredient in the basic formulation. GFWs made using the 9 formulations were analysed by physical and sensory tests over three weeks storage at 4°C during which mould growth was assessed visually. Products in phase 3 had no visible mould growth during storage for three weeks (4°C). GFWs with high level of coconut oil (12%) were characterised by high baking weight loss, high whiteness index and a shorter firmer texture (high rupture force and low rupture distance). CMC (0.3%) and xanthan-guar gum (1%) may have contributed to low water activity, high rollability, high rupture distance and high rupture force during storage. Results indicated that 0.3% CMC and 1% xanthan-guar gum were the optimum levels for these ingredients. As the optimized levels of coconut oil could not be confirmed in this phase, three promising formulations with different levels of coconut oil (8, 10, 12%) were evaluated in phase 4.

In phase 4, three products were produced using 3 optimised formulations from phase 3 and were analysed by physical tests and sensory evaluation during storage for two weeks (4°C). The 3 optimised formulations selected from phase 3 were: (1) base formulation plus 8% coconut oil, 0.3% CMC and 1% xanthan-guar gum; (2) base formulation plus 10% coconut oil, 0.3% CMC and 1% xanthan-guar gum; (3) base formulation plus 12% coconut oil, 0.3% CMC and 1% xanthan-guar gum. Among the three formulations, samples containing 12% coconut oil, 0.3% CMC and 1% xanthan-guar gum had the highest consumer sensory acceptability and were characterised by high rollability, and a more flexible texture (moderate rupture force and greater rupture distance) and low baking weight loss.

## **Acknowledgments**

Firstly, I would like to acknowledge Vernerdi (NZ) Ltd. for offering the opportunity and support to conduct this study.

I would also like to thank:

my supervisor, Dr. Tony Mutukumira for his guidance and constant support in my study and life. He is not only the best teacher but also my important friend. I also thank my co-supervisor, Allan Hardacre, for his guidance and sharing his immense knowledge in product development and bakery products.

Rachel Liu for her kind advice and technical assistance;

Massey University for their resources and equipment;

my colleagues, Suzanne Jaouen, Casey Yuan, Irene Mei, Tony Tan, Prince Wang, and Yuan Quan for their suggestions and help in my study;

the volunteers for consumer sensory evaluation of the products; and,

my friends, Maggie Cao, Jixiang Wang, Vesper Wu, and Chang Zhang for their kindness.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge my parents for their support and love throughout my academic career, in particular, during my stay in distant New Zealand.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	iii
Acknowledgments.....	v
Table of comments.....	vi
List of figures.....	viii
List of tables.....	ix
List of abbreviations .....	x
Chapter 1 Introduction .....	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review .....	5
2.1    Current trends.....	5
2.2    History of bread .....	8
2.3    Classification of bread .....	9
2.3.1    Flatbread .....	9
2.3.2    Gluten-free bread .....	10
2.4    Functional properties of ingredients of breads.....	12
2.4.1    Introduction.....	12
2.4.2    Flour and starch.....	13
2.4.3    Hydrocolloids.....	25
2.4.4    Other Ingredients .....	30
2.5    Technology and science of making flatbread.....	35
2.5.1    Mixing.....	36
2.5.2    Dividing and moulding .....	37
2.5.3    Proofing and retarding .....	37
2.5.4    Baking .....	38
2.5.5    Cooling and packaging .....	39
2.6    Characteristics and analysis of bread.....	39
2.6.1    Moisture content .....	39
2.6.2    Colour .....	40
2.6.3    Baking weight loss .....	40
2.6.4    Water activity .....	40
2.6.5    Growth of spoilage microorganisms .....	41
2.6.6    Texture .....	41
2.6.7    Sensory evaluation and consumer acceptance .....	46
Chapter 3 Materials and Methods .....	48
3.1    Introduction.....	48
3.2    Description of basic formulation and production of GFWs.....	48
3.2.1    Ingredients used in basic formulations .....	48
3.2.2    Production of GFW .....	50
3.3    Phases 1 and 2: Initial selection of gluten replacers and baking conditions .....	53
3.3.1    Experimental design.....	53
3.3.2    Characterization of GFWs .....	54
3.4    Phase 3: Screening of formulations using the Taguchi design.....	57
3.4.1    Experimental design.....	57
3.4.2    Characterization of GFWs in phase 3 .....	59
3.5    Phase 4: Sensory evaluation of optimised GFWs .....	60

3.5.1	Experimental design.....	60
3.5.2	Characterization of GFWs in phase 4 .....	60
3.6	Data analysis .....	62
3.6.1	Phases 1 and 2 .....	62
3.6.2	Phase 3 .....	63
3.6.3	Phase 4 .....	63
Chapter 4 Results and Discussion.....		64
4.1	Results and Discussion: Phase 1 .....	64
4.1.1	Baking weight loss.....	64
4.1.2	Subjective rollability .....	66
4.1.3	Conclusion .....	68
4.2	Results and Discussion: Phase 2 .....	68
4.2.1	Baking weight loss .....	69
4.2.2	Water activity .....	70
4.2.3	Colour .....	72
4.2.4	Subjective rollability during storage .....	75
4.2.5	Mould growth.....	77
4.2.6	Conclusion .....	77
4.3	Results and Discussion: Phase 3 .....	78
4.3.1	Baking weight loss .....	78
4.3.2	Colour .....	80
4.3.3	Water activity during storage .....	83
4.3.4	Subjective rollability during storage .....	85
4.3.5	Objective textural properties of GFWs during storage .....	88
4.3.6	Optimisation of formulations.....	92
4.3.7	Conclusion .....	92
4.4	Results and Discussion: Phase 4 .....	93
4.4.1	Physical characteristics of GFWs .....	93
4.4.2	Sensory evaluation of GFWs .....	94
4.4.3	Conclusion .....	97
Chapter 5 Overall conclusions .....		98
Chapter 6 Recommendations .....		99
References.....		100
Appendix.....		139
Appendix A .....		140
Appendix B .....		141
Appendix C .....		152
Appendix D.....		155
Appendix E .....		158
Appendix E-1 Original data and statistical analysis of phase 1 .....		159
Appendix E-2 Original data and statistical analysis of phase 2 .....		162
Appendix E-3 Original data and statistical analysis of phase 3 .....		170
Appendix E-4 Original data and statistical analysis of phase 4 .....		177

## List of Figures

Figure 1 Typical curve of TPA .....	43
Figure 2 Typical curve of three-point bending test .....	44
Figure 3 Typical curve of two-dimensional extensibility .....	45
Figure 4 Tortilla/pastry burst rig .....	45
Figure 5 Laboratory scale production of GFW .....	50
Figure 6 Disc dough.....	52
Figure 7 CIE L* a* b* colour model .....	56
Figure 8 Baking weight loss (%) of four formulations of GFWs under four baking conditions in phase 1 .....	65
Figure 9 Rollability scores using a 3-cm dowel in four formulations of GFWs under four baking conditions in phase 1 .....	67
Figure 10 Baking weigh loss (%) of five formulations of GFWs under four baking conditions in phase 2 .....	69
Figure 11 Water activity of five formulations of GFWs under four baking conditions in phase 2.....	71
Figure 12 L* (lightness) of five formulations of GFWs under four baking conditions in phase 2.....	73
Figure 13 Whiteness indices of five formulations of GFWs under four baking conditions in phase 2 .....	74
Figure 14 Baking weight loss (%) of GFWs for nine formulations in phase 3 .....	79
Figure 15 Main effects plot for mean baking weight loss (%) .....	80
Figure 16 L* (lightness) of GFWs for nine formulations in phase 3 .....	81
Figure 17 Whiteness indices of GFWs for nine formulations in phase 3 .....	81
Figure 18 Main effects plot for mean whiteness index.....	82
Figure 19 Water activity of GFWs for nine formulations during storage for 21 days (4°C) ...	83
Figure 20 Main effects plot for mean water activity during storage.....	85
Figure 21 Rollability scores of GFWs for nine formulations during storage for 21 days (4°C) .....	86
Figure 22 Main effects plot for mean rollability score during storage .....	87
Figure 23 Rupture distance (mm) of GFWs for nine formulations during storage for 21 days (4 °C).....	88
Figure 24 Main effects plot for mean rupture distance (mm) during storage .....	90
Figure 25 Rupture force ( $\times 10^2$ g) of GFWs for nine formulations during storage for 21 days (4 °C).....	90
Figure 26 Main effects plot for mean rupture force ( $\times 10^2$ g) during storage .....	92
Figure 27 Texture of GFW samples during storage for 14 days (4°C) in phase 4 .....	95
Figure 28 Aroma of GFW samples during storage for 14 days (4°C) in phase 4 .....	95
Figure 29 Taste of GFW samples during storage for 14 days (4°C) in phase 4.....	96
Figure 30 Appearance of GFW samples during storage for 14 days (4°C) in phase 4 .....	96
Figure 31 Overall acceptability of GFW samples during storage for 14 days (4°C) in phase 4 .....	97

## List of Tables

Table 1 Ingredients (%, w/w) of typical breads .....	6
Table 2 Characteristics of starch granules from typical plants .....	22
Table 3 Spoilage types for typical water activity levels .....	41
Table 4 Relations between texture parameters and popular nomenclatures .....	42
Table 5 Descriptions of mechanical parameters of TPA .....	43
Table 6 Basic formulation of GFW .....	49
Table 7 Experimental design used in phase 1 .....	53
Table 8 Experimental design used in phase 2 .....	54
Table 9 Taguchi L9 ( $3^4$ ) orthogonal array applied in phase 3 .....	59
Table 10 TA.XT plus Texture Analyser settings .....	60
Table 11 Experimental design in phase 4 .....	60
Table 12 <sup>1</sup> Mean subjective rollability scores of GFWs in phase 2 during storage for 28 days (4 °C).....	75
Table 13 Descriptive statistics of rollability during storage for 21 days (4°C) in phase 2 .....	76
Table 14 Descriptive statistics of water activity during storage for 21 days (4 °C) in phase 3 .....	84
Table 15 Descriptive statistics of rollability scores during storage for 21 days (4°C) in phase 3 .....	86
Table 16 Descriptive statistics (mm) of rupture distance during storage for 21 days (4 °C) in phase 3 .....	89
Table 17 Descriptive statistics of rupture force ( $\times 10^2$ g) during storage for 21 days (4 °C) in phase 3 .....	91
Table 18 Test ingredients (%, w/w flour basis) of basic formulation used in phase 4 .....	93
Table 19 <sup>1</sup> Mean values for physical parameters of GFWs in phase 4 .....	94

## List of Abbreviations

AACC	American Association for Clinical Chemistry
ANOVA	analysis of variance
AOAC	Association of Official Agricultural Chemists
B.C.	Before Christ
BWL	baking weight loss
<i>ca</i>	circa
CD	coeliac disease
CFU	colony forming units
CIE	International Commission on Illumination
cm	centimetre
CMC	carboxymethyl cellulose
DATEM	diacetyl tartaric acid ester of mono- and diglycerides
ERH	equilibrium relative humidity
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FSANZ	Food Standards Australia New Zealand
GFW	gluten-free wrap bread
GLM	General linear model
HDP	hydroxypropyl distarch phosphate
Hi-Maize	high amylose maize resistant starch
HPMC	hydroxypropyl methycellose
IBD	Irritable bowel disease
L	litre
LDL	low density lipoprotein
M	molar, mole/litre
MCTs	medium chain triglycerides
min	minute
mL	millilitre
mm	millimetre
NaCl	sodium chloride
NCGS	non-coeliac gluten sensitivity
NMR	Nuclear Magnetic Resonance
No.	number
PA	Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
RS	resistant starch
SD	standard deviation of mean
SEM	standard error of mean
sec	second
SSL	sodium and calcium stearoyl lactylate
temp.	temperature
TPA	texture profile analysis
UK	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
USA/US	United States of America
WHO	World Health Organization
xanthan-guar gum	mixture of xanthan gum and guar gum (1:1)