

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.

SENSORY, RHEOLOGICAL AND MICROSTRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS OF MODEL EMULSIFIED DAIRY SYSTEMS

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Food Technology at
Massey University, Palmerston North
New Zealand

ROGERIO B. PEREIRA

2000



+

ABSTRACT

Texture is an important sensory property of foods. It is sensed mostly in the mouth during the process of mastication and is an indicator of food quality. To enable faster and cheaper prediction of textural characteristics, extensive research has been done to establish instrumental techniques to produce data that correlates well with the sensory appraisal of texture. In this study, model emulsified dairy systems, represented by processed cheese analogues, were characterised using sensory, microstructural and rheological techniques. Correlation between instrumental and sensory textural data was investigated.

A range of experimental cheeses with differing textural attributes was produced by modifications to the moisture content of the products and the mixing speed during manufacture. Twelve experimental cheeses were used in a partial response surface design in four experimental blocks. These cheeses were subjected to compositional analysis. Two weeks after manufacture, the cheeses were texturally evaluated using a trained sensory panel and quantitative descriptive analysis (sensory), confocal laser scanning microscopy and image analysis (microstructure) and fundamental physical tests including frequency sweep, creep compliance and compression to 70% (rheology). Sensory-instrumental correlations included the chemical data and were performed using pairwise correlation, stepwise regression, principal component analysis and canonical correlation analysis.

Significant differences in moisture, total protein, fat content and pH were found between the experimental cheeses, as expected by the formulation changes. The confocal micrographs showed that fat globule size decreased with decreasing moisture content, but little effect was found for mixing speed. Reduction of the globule size resulted in cheeses that were firmer, better emulsified and stickier.

Sensory evaluation of the cheeses in the mouth was not used in this study because of oral fatigue. Instead, seven hand evaluated attributes were selected from a sensory profiling session. Fracturability, rubberiness and

greasiness proved not to be good sensory attributes to discriminate between these cheeses. Significant differences between the cheeses were found for firmness, curdiness and stickiness. Cheeses with lower moisture content were, in general, firmer, more curdy and less sticky than cheeses with higher moisture content.

Frequency sweep, creep compliance and compression to fracture were all useful tests for providing rheological discrimination between the experimental cheeses. Cheeses with lower moisture content showed higher values of storage and loss moduli, Young's modulus, peak stress and work in compression as well as lower values for compliance. These results provide an indication that these cheeses are firmer, better emulsified and more stable products than those with higher moisture content.

Pairwise correlation was used to correlate the microstructural results to the sensory, chemical and rheological data. It was shown that the area occupied by the protein matrix in the micrographs correlates significantly with most chemical and rheological parameters as well as those sensory attributes that adequately discriminated between the experimental cheeses. Microstructural information was insufficient for use in regression analysis.

Stepwise regression analysis was a useful technique for generating simple models to fit the sensory scores with rheological and chemical data. The regression equations for firmness, stickiness and curdiness produced R-square values above 85%, indicating good predictive ability. Principal component analysis was used to tackle the problem of multicollinearity of the predictive parameters. However, combining those instrumental parameters that were not independent from each other did not improve the quality of the correlation coefficients obtained. Firmness in compression and curdiness were the only two sensory attributes satisfactorily modelled using the first rheological principal component, with R-squares of 88.4% and 90.0%, respectively.

Canonical correlation analysis proved to be a useful statistical tool for maximising the correlation between individual sensory textural attributes and instrumental data. Similarly to the stepwise regression analysis,

fracturability, rubberiness and greasiness could not be satisfactorily modelled. In general, firmness (compression and cutting), stickiness and curdiness were very satisfactorily modelled using only the results from the frequency sweep and creep compliance tests. Compression test data appeared not to lead to any improvement in the correlation coefficients.

Overall, the present study showed that sensory, microstructural and rheological characteristics of the processed cheese analogues investigated do correlate. It is possible to generate predictive models for some individual hand evaluated sensory attributes using chemical and instrumental (rheological) parameters. Prediction using microstructural information has yet to be verified.

*“The public sees only the accomplished trick;
they have no conception of the tortuous, demanding
preliminary self-training that was
necessary to conquer that fear.”*

“The secrets of Houdini” (J.C.Cannell)

To J.

*For the love and support,
for the beauty and joy brought into my life,
for the infinite patience
and for making a better me.*

Thank you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to Mr Rod J. Bennett, my chief supervisor, for the invaluable guidance and constant encouragement throughout my research work. Thank you so much for sharing your knowledge, for understanding the difficulties of being far from the family and the loved ones, and, above all, for caring.

I also wish to extend my gratitude to my co-supervisors, Dr Osvaldo H. Campanella and Prof Ken J. Kirkpatrick, and special advisor, Mrs Kay McMath, for their assistance and contribution in their areas of expertise. My special thanks to Dr Osvaldo H. Campanella for the support, friendship and for believing in my potential from the very beginning.

I am extremely thankful to the New Zealand Dairy Board for the research funding granted and the New Zealand Dairy Research Institute (NZDRI), in the person of Mr Robbie Buwalda, for providing the equipment, the materials and technical support for the research work.

For their invaluable contribution at different stages of the research work, I would like to thank

- ☉ Mrs Maree Luckman, for her support with the statistical analysis, suggestions and helpful discussions, the friendship and the constant words of encouragement.
- ☉ Dr Yacine Hemar, for his very helpful contribution in the discussion of the rheological data, for his friendship and constant support.
- ☉ Mr Guy Hessell and Mrs Elisabeth M. Nickless, for their help with the sample preparation for microstructural analysis and with the confocal microscopy and image analysis sessions.
- ☉ Mr Garry C. Radford, Mr Byron D. McKillop, Mr Mark Dorsey, Mr John F. Dawber, Mr Steven Glasgow, Mrs Geedha Sivalingam-Reid and Mrs

Wibha Desai, for their help and guidance in specific analyses during the experimental work.

- ☉ The staff of the Auckland Product Evaluation Centre (NZDB), for all the help with the sensory evaluation of my samples, and the members of the cheese panel, for putting up with an organoleptic unpleasant product and yet doing their best to generate good, accurate sensory results.
- ☉ Mrs Miria Busby, for her invaluable assistance, for the friendship and for always cheering me up
- ☉ Mrs Karen Pickering, for the assistance with the set up of the final version of the thesis
- ☉ Mrs Marlene T. Turei, Mrs Helen T. Tong, Mrs Loren S. Winter and Mrs Christine R. Ramsay from the Finance Section of the IFNHH-Massey University, for their assistance with travel arrangements and research expenses.
- ☉ Ms Lisa M. Duizer, who, in spite of the sad events in the course of our friendship, always believed in me and my potential to achieve my Ph.D. degree.
- ☉ The staff of the International Students' Office, for the efficient management of my scholarship and for helping me during my establishment in New Zealand. Special thanks to Mrs Margaret Smillie, who always went beyond her duties to make my life in New Zealand a most enjoyable experience and who understood, every step of the way, the sacrifices of being far from family and friends. Thank you so much for caring.

I would like to thank the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade and the Government of New Zealand for the NZODA scholarship awarded and Mr Brian Sinclair, ex-Honorary Consul of New Zealand in Sao Paulo/Brazil, for supporting me in my application to come to New Zealand.

To all my friends at Massey University, for sharing the good and bad times and for their support, my sincere appreciation.

To old friends back in Sao Paulo, in special to Maria Spinola Miranda and Orlando Vian Junior, for putting up with my being so far away all these years and for never giving up the faith in my success, thank you very much. Special thanks to Peter G. Holmes and Catherine M. Bentley for their invaluable support, encouragement and friendship. I love you all.

Last but not least, I want to thank, with all my heart, everyone in my family (my mother, brother and sister) as well as D. Cida and the girls (Maga and Simone). I can not express strongly enough my gratitude for your support and constant words of encouragement, for your love and caring for me, and for helping me realise, every day over the past four years, how blessed I am to have you all in my life. I could not have accomplished this without you.

CONTENTS

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	viii
List of contents	xi
List of tables	xv
List of figures	xx
1.0. INTRODUCTION	1
2.0. LITERATURE REVIEW	3
2.1. PROCESSED CHEESE	3
2.1.1. Introduction	3
2.1.2. Processed cheese products	4
2.1.3. Manufacturing protocol	5
2.1.4. Cooking	6
2.1.4.1. Processing equipment	7
2.1.4.2. Emulsifying salts	9
2.1.4.2.1. Ion exchange	9
2.1.4.2.2. pH shift and stabilisation	9
2.1.4.2.3. Protein dispersion and hydration	10
2.1.4.2.4. New structure formation	12
2.1.4.3. Types of emulsifying salts	13
2.1.4.4. Rework	17
2.1.5. Imitation/analogue cheeses	18
2.1.5.1. Imitation/analogue processed cheese	19
2.1.5.1.1. Vegetable oils	20
2.1.5.1.2. Vegetable protein	21
2.1.5.1.3. Casein and caseinates	21
2.1.6. Perspectives for imitation cheeses	24
2.2. MICROSTRUCTURAL EVALUATION	25
2.2.1. Introduction	25
2.2.2. Structure and texture	26

2.2.3.	Transmission electron microscopy	27
2.2.4.	Scanning electron microscopy	28
2.2.5.	Confocal laser scanning microscopy	29
2.2.5.1.	Principles of confocal microscopy	31
2.2.5.2.	Confocal fluorescent microscopy	34
2.2.5.2.1.	Fluorescent probes	35
2.2.5.2.2.	Multiple labelling	37
2.2.5.3.	Imaging and quantitative analysis	38
2.2.6.	Microstructural studies of milk and dairy products	39
2.2.6.1.	Scanning electron microscopy	39
2.2.6.2.	Combined electron microscopy techniques	41
2.2.6.3.	Fluorescence and confocal laser scanning microscopy....	43
2.2.7.	Final remarks	46
2.3.	SENSORY EVALUATION	47
2.3.1.	Introduction	47
2.3.2.	Definition	48
2.3.3.	Importance of sensory evaluation of foods	50
2.3.4.	Factors influencing sensory response	51
2.3.4.1.	Physiological factors	52
2.3.4.2.	Psychological factors	52
2.3.4.2.1.	Expectation error	53
2.3.4.2.2.	Habituation error	53
2.3.4.2.3.	Logical error	53
2.3.4.2.4.	Stimulus error	53
2.3.4.2.5.	Halo effect	54
2.3.4.2.6.	Time-order error	54
2.3.4.2.7.	Central tendency error	55
2.3.4.2.8.	Suggestion and lack of motivation	55
2.3.5.	Types of sensory tests	56
2.3.5.1.	Affective testing	56
2.3.5.2.	Discrimination testing	57
2.3.5.3.	Descriptive testing	58
2.3.5.3.1.	Texture profile analysis (TPA)	62
2.3.5.3.2.	Free choice profiling (FCP)	63
2.3.5.3.3.	Time-intensity methods	64
2.3.5.3.4.	Quantitative descriptive analysis (QDA)	66
2.3.6.	Texture	68
2.3.7.	Final remarks	71

2.4.	RHEOLOGICAL EVALUATION	72
2.4.1.	Introduction	72
2.4.2.	Stresses and strains	72
2.4.3.	Test methods and viscoelasticity	74
2.4.4.	Rheology in cheese analysis	80
2.4.4.1.	Factors affecting rheological measurements in cheese	81
2.4.4.1.1.	Effect of slip and friction	82
2.4.4.1.2.	Effect of test method	83
2.4.4.1.3.	Effect of structural defects and sampling method	84
2.4.4.1.4.	Effect of sample shape and dimension	85
2.4.4.1.5.	Effect of temperature	86
2.4.4.1.6.	Effect of cheese composition	87
2.4.5.	Rheological studies on natural and processed cheese	89
2.4.5.1.	Uniaxial compression tests	90
2.4.5.2.	Texture profile analysis (TPA)	94
2.4.5.3.	Dynamic tests	95
2.4.5.4.	Static transient tests	98
2.4.5.5.	Meltability/stretchability/spreadability determinations ...	100
2.4.5.6.	Rheological studies on processed cheese	100
2.4.6.	Perspectives in cheese rheology research	103
2.5.	SENSORY x INSTRUMENTAL TEXTURE CORRELATION	104
2.5.1.	Introduction	104
2.5.2.	Importance of sensory x instrumental data correlation	105
2.5.3.	Difficulties in sensory x instrumental data correlation	106
2.5.4.	Research on sensory x instrumental correlation of textural data.	108
2.5.4.1.	Miscellaneous food materials	109
2.5.4.2.	Natural and processed cheese products	112
2.5.5.	Perspectives for the future	117
3.0.	OBJECTIVES and EXPERIMENTAL APPROACH	118
4.0.	MATERIALS and METHODS	119
4.1.	MANUFACTURING EQUIPMENT and CHEESE INGREDIENTS	119
4.2.	DEFINITION of the EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN	121
4.3.	CHEESE MANUFACTURE	123
4.4.	CHEMICAL ANALYSIS	126

4.5.	MICROSTRUCTURAL ANALYSIS	127
4.6.	RHEOLOGICAL EVALUATION	129
4.7.	SENSORY EVALUATION	135
4.8.	STATISTICAL ANALYSIS	138
5.0.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	143
5.1.	CHEESEMAKING	143
5.2.	CHEMICAL EVALUATION	149
5.3.	MICROSTRUCTURAL EVALUATION	156
5.4.	SENSORY EVALUATION	165
5.5.	RHEOLOGICAL EVALUATION	179
5.5.1.	Preliminary considerations	179
5.5.2.	Frequency sweep	181
5.5.3.	Creep test	188
5.5.4.	Compression to 70%	200
5.5.5.	Interrelationship between rheological methods	208
5.6.	CORRELATION of SENSORY, CHEMICAL and INSTRUMENTAL DATA...	213
5.6.1.	Microstructural x sensory/rheology pairwise correlation	214
5.6.2.	Sensory x rheological and chemical correlation	218
5.6.2.1.	Pairwise correlation (sensory x chemical x rheological) ...	218
5.6.2.2.	Stepwise regression	221
5.6.2.3.	Principal component analysis	230
5.6.2.4.	Canonical correlation	242
6.0.	CONCLUSIONS	258
7.0.	SCOPE FOR FUTURE WORK	262
8.0.	REFERENCES	264
9.0.	APPENDIX	319

LIST OF TABLES

Table No	Title	Page No
1	Ingredients, chemical parameters and common processing temperatures of different processed cheese types	5
2	Cheese formulations and mixing speeds used	123
3	Total moisture, MNFS, total protein and fat content (in %) of the experimental processed cheese analogues (experimental values) and corresponding <i>p</i> -values	150
4	Values of pH at days 1, 3, 7, 14 and 21 after manufacture for the experimental processed cheese analogues and corresponding <i>p</i> -values	151
5	Analysis of variance (<i>p</i> -values) and Tukey's HSD results for the variable "area of protein matrix" obtained from the micrographs from the confocal laser scanning microscope, across individual experimental blocks	161
6	Response surface regression coefficients and R-square values for the microstructural parameter "area of protein matrix", for each experimental block, as a function of moisture content and mixing speeds	162
7	Cheese temperatures (°C) during the sensory evaluation sessions, across experimental blocks and across trays within a session	167
8	Probability scores for seven hand evaluated sensory attributes, tested against panel noises and adjusted for the effect of temperature (covariate)	168

9	Adjusted score means (for temperature) for seven hand evaluated sensory attributes and corresponding p -values	170
10	Response surface regression coefficients and R-square values for seven sensory attributes as a function of experimental blocks, moisture content and mixing speeds	174
11	Probability values (p -values) from the analysis of covariance for the results of the frequency sweep tests on the twelve experimental cheeses and required transformations for data analysis	183
12	Mean values and Tukey's HSD test results for G' and G'' for the twelve experimental cheeses across the experimental blocks	183
13	Mean values for the slopes of G' and G'' for the twelve experimental cheeses across the experimental blocks	185
14	Response surface regression coefficients ¹ and R-square values for the frequency sweep parameters G' and G'' (storage and loss moduli, respectively) as a function of experimental blocks, moisture content and mixing speeds	186
15	Fitted equations, based on the Burgess model, to the creep compliance and deformation curves for the twelve experimental cheeses	191
16	Probability values (p -values) from the analysis of covariance for the results of the creep tests on the twelve experimental cheeses and required transformations for data analysis	192
17	Mean values for 9 parameters obtained from the creep compliance test, for the twelve experimental cheeses, across the experimental blocks	194

18	Response surface regression coefficients and R-square values for the creep compliance and deformation parameters as a function of experimental blocks, moisture content and mixing speeds	196
19	Probability values (p -values) from the analysis of covariance for the results of the compression tests on the twelve experimental cheeses and required transformations for data analysis	202
20	Mean values for six parameters obtained in a compression to 70% test for the twelve experimental cheeses across the experimental blocks	203
21	Response surface regression coefficients and R-square values for the six parameters obtained in the compression test as a function of experimental blocks, moisture content and mixing speeds	204
22	Probability values (p -values) for the pairwise correlation between the rheological parameters	209
23	Principal component results for the set of rheological parameters	212
24	Correlation coefficients and probability values for the pairwise correlation between the microstructural results for each experimental block and the respective sensory scores	217
25	Correlation coefficients and probability values for the pairwise correlation between the microstructural results for each experimental block and the respective chemical results	218

26	Correlation coefficients and probability values for the pairwise correlation between the microstructural results for each experimental block and the respective rheological results	220
27	Correlation coefficients and probability values for the pairwise correlation between the microstructural results for each experimental block and the respective rheological results	222
28	Correlation coefficients and probability values for the pairwise correlation between the sensory scores and the rheological parameters from dynamic testing (frequency sweep and creep compliance test)	223
29	Correlation coefficients and probability values for the pairwise correlation between the sensory scores and the rheological parameters from the compression testing	224
30	Regression equations and adjusted R-square values for the best single chemical predictor and the simplest model (when appropriate) from the stepwise regression, for each sensory attribute	226
31	Regression equations and adjusted R-square values for the best single rheological predictor and the simplest model (when appropriate) from the stepwise regression, for each sensory attribute	229
32	Principal components for the chemical parameters, with coefficients and proportion of variance explained	234

33	Probability values (p -values) for the correlation of individual sensory attributes with the main chemical and rheological principal components and R-square values for the linear regression models	236
34	Principal components for the sensory parameters, with coefficients and proportion of variance explained	243
35	Rheological canonical variables for each individual sensory attribute, correlation R-square values and respective amount of variance explained with the CVs	247
36	Correlation coefficients for the terms of each canonical variable against their own and the opposite CVs, amount of variance explained and correlation R-square value	252
37	Canonical variables (rheological + chemical parameters) for each individual sensory attribute, correlation R-square values and respective amount of variance explained with the CVs	255

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No	Title	Page No
1	Schematic representation of ion exchange and protein peptisation (Guinee, 1987)	11
2	Schematic representation of emulsification in processed cheese (Guinee, 1987)	11
3	Comparative diagram of illumination in conventional light microscopy (wide field) and confocal laser microscopy (point scanning) (Wright <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	32
4	Schematic diagram demonstrating the confocal principle (elimination of out-of-focus rays) (Wright <i>et al.</i> , 1993)	33
5	Shear stress response of a viscoelastic material under oscillatory shear strain (Shoemaker <i>et al.</i> , 1992)	76
6	Typical creep curves for elastic, viscous and viscoelastic materials (Steffe, 1996)	78
7	Blentech cooker (external view)	119
8	Blentech cooker (twin screw – internal view)	120
9	Experimental design used to generate the cheese samples	122
10	Discharge of molten cheese from Blentech cooker	124
11	Experimental imitation processed cheese in tray, set as a block (with addition of annatto)	125
12	Confocal laser scanning microscope used for microstructural analysis	128
13	TA-XT2 used for the compression tests	131
14	Stress controlled rheometer SR-5000 (with humidity trap)	132
15	Typical creep curve showing where various elements of the Burgers model describe flow behaviour	135
16	Confocal micrographs of experimental cheeses 1 to 4, with higher moisture content and larger fat globules (magnification 400 X)	145
17	Confocal micrographs of experimental cheeses 9 to 12, with lower moisture content and smaller fat globules (magnification 400 X)	146

18	Confocal micrographs of experimental cheeses 1 (A) and 12 (B) (magnification 400 X)	155
19	Confocal laser scanning micrographs of experimental cheeses 1 (+10% water, 100 rpm), 2 (+10% water, 127 rpm) and 3 (+10% water, 155 rpm), stained with FastGreen FCF, obtained with a 40x oil immersion objective (magnification 400 X)	157
20	Confocal laser scanning micrographs of experimental cheeses 4 (+5% water, 100 rpm) and 5 (+5% water, 155 rpm), stained with FastGreen FCF, obtained with a 40x oil immersion objective (magnification 400 X)	158
21	Confocal laser scanning micrographs of experimental cheeses 6 and 7 (base formulation/no added water, 127 rpm) stained with FastGreen FCF, obtained with a 40x oil immersion objective (magnification 400 X)	158
22	Confocal laser scanning micrographs of experimental cheeses 8 (-5% water, 100 rpm) and 9 (-5% water, 155 rpm), stained with FastGreen FCF, obtained with a 40x oil immersion objective (magnification 400 X)	159
23	Confocal laser scanning micrographs of experimental cheeses 10 (-10% water, 100 rpm), 11 (-10% water, 127 rpm) and 12 (-10% water, 155 rpm), stained with FastGreen FCF, obtained with a 40x oil immersion objective (magnification 400 X)	160
24	Response surface plot for the parameter “area of protein matrix” as a function of moisture content and mixing speed	163
25	Graphical representation of the mean scores (diamonds) for the seven sensory attributes hand evaluated (asterisks represent mean score for each experimental block), on a 15-cm line scale	171
26	Response surface plot for the attribute firmness in compression as a function of moisture content and mixing speed	175
27	Response surface plot for the attribute firmness in cutting as a function of moisture content and mixing speed	175

28	Response surface plot for the attribute stickiness as a function of moisture content and mixing speed	176
29	Response surface plot for the attribute curdiness as a function of moisture content and mixing speed	176
30	Storage moduli (G') and loss moduli (G'') for the experimental cheeses from a frequency sweep test (frequency range 0.1 to 22 Hz)	182
31	Response surface plot for the parameter G' (storage modulus as a function of moisture content and mixing speed	186
32	Response surface plot for the parameter G'' (loss modulus) as a function of moisture content and mixing speed	187
33	Creep compliance curves for the experimental cheeses from a creep test (stress 2000 Pa) over a period of 6 minutes	189
34	Deformation curves for the experimental cheeses from a creep test (stress 2000 Pa) over a period of 8 minutes	189
35	Fitting of the Burgers model (with equations) to experimental samples 1 (high moisture/low speed) and 12 (low moisture/high speed)	190
36	Response surface plot for the parameters P1, P2 and P4 (creep compliance) as a function of moisture content and mixing speed	198
37	Response surface plot for the parameters P1, P2, P3 and P4 (shear deformation) as a function of moisture content and mixing speed	199
38	Compression curves for the experimental cheeses from the TA-XT2 Texture Analyser at a crosshead speed of 10 mm/s and load force of 250 N (testing temperature 6-7°C)	201
39	Response surface plot for the parameter "Young's modulus" as a function of moisture content and mixing speed	205
40	Response surface plot for the parameter "peak stress" as a function of moisture content and mixing speed	206
41	Response surface plot for the parameter "work to peak stress" as a function of moisture content and mixing speed	206

42	Response surface plot for the parameter “work in compression” as a function of moisture content and mixing speed	207
43	Response surface plot for the parameter “work in decompression” as a function of moisture content and mixing speed	207
44	Linear regression between the storage (G') and Young's (E) moduli from the frequency sweep and compression tests, respectively (n = 36)	210
45	Sensory firmness in compression as a function of moisture content of the experimental cheeses (• raw data), with prediction interval	227
46	Sensory curdiness as a function of moisture content of the experimental cheeses (• raw data), with prediction interval	227
47	Sensory stickiness as a function of fat content of the experimental cheeses (• raw data), with prediction interval	228
48	Sensory firmness in cutting as a function of moisture and fat content of the experimental cheeses (• raw data)	228
49	Sensory firmness in compression as a function of Young's modulus of the experimental cheeses (• raw data), with prediction interval	231
50	Sensory curdiness as a function of the area (of the compression curve) for the experimental cheeses (• raw data), with prediction interval	232
51	Sensory stickiness as a function of P2 in deformation and P4 in compliance for the experimental cheeses (• raw data)	232
52	Sensory firmness (compression) as a function of the main chemical and rheological principal components (PCChem and PCRheo, respectively) for the experimental cheeses (• raw data), with prediction intervals	238
53	Sensory firmness (cutting) as a function of the main chemical and rheological principal components (PCChem and PCRheo, respectively) for the experimental cheeses (• raw data), with prediction intervals	239

54	Sensory rubberiness as a function of the main chemical and rheological principal components (PCChem and PCRheo, respectively) for the experimental cheeses (• raw data), with prediction intervals	240
55	Sensory stickiness as a function of the main chemical and rheological principal components (PCChem and PCRheo, respectively) for the experimental cheeses (• raw data), with prediction intervals	241
56	Sensory curdiness as a function of the main chemical and rheological principal components (PCChem and PCRheo, respectively) for the experimental cheeses (• raw data), with prediction intervals	242
57	Sensory PC1 as a function of the main rheological principal component (PC1 Rheo) for the experimental (• raw data), with prediction intervals	244
58	Canonical correlation between firmness in compression and the reduced set of rheological parameters (raw data and regression line)	248
59	Canonical correlation between firmness in cutting and the reduced set of rheological parameters (raw data and regression line)	249
60	Canonical correlation between stickiness and the reduced set of rheological parameters (raw data and regression line)	249
61	Canonical correlation between curdiness and the reduced set of rheological parameters (raw data and regression line)	250
62	Canonical correlation between a reduced set of sensory attributes (sensory canonical variable) and the reduced set of rheological parameters (rheological canonical variable)(raw data and regression line)	253
63	Canonical correlation between fracturability and the reduced set of rheological + chemical parameters (raw data and regression line)	256
64	Canonical correlation between firmness in compression and the reduced set of rheological + chemical parameters (raw data and regression line)	257

65	Canonical correlation between firmness in cutting and the reduced set of rheological + chemical parameters (raw data and regression line)	257
66	Canonical correlation between rubberiness and the reduced set of rheological + chemical parameters (raw data and regression line)	258
67	Canonical correlation between stickiness and the reduced set of rheological + chemical parameters (raw data and regression line)	258
68	Canonical correlation between curdiness and the reduced set of rheological + chemical parameters (raw data and regression line)	259
69	Canonical correlation between greasiness and the reduced set of rheological + chemical parameters (raw data and regression line)	259
70	Creep compliance curves (constant stress of 2000 Pa) of experimental cheese 6 using different gaps (2 and 4 mm) for assessment of slippage	322
71	Strain sweep (frequency 1 Hz) for experimental cheese 6, at 25°C, for assessment of linear viscoelastic region	323
72	Creep compliance curves (constant stress 2000 Pa) for experimental cheese 12 using different sample temperatures	324