



This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Hurtado, Adriana, Maria Dolores Guàrdia, Pierre Picouet, Anna Jofré, Sancho Bañón, and José María Ros. 2019. "Shelf-Life Extension Of Multi-Vegetables Smoothies By High Pressure Processing Compared With Thermal Treatment. Part II: Retention Of Selected Nutrients And Sensory Quality". Journal Of Food Processing And Preservation 43 (11). Wiley. doi:10.1111/jfpp.14210. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions <http://www.wileyauthors.com/self-archiving>.

Document downloaded from:



Shelf-life extension of multi-vegetables smoothies by high pressure processing compared with thermal treatment. Part II: Retention of selected nutrients and sensory quality.

Shelf-life of multi-vegetables smoothies (part II)

Adriana Hurtado^a, Maria Dolors Guàrdia^b, Pierre Picouet^{bc}, Anna Jofré^d, Sancho Bañón^a, José María Ros^{a,*}

^a Department of Food Science & Technology and Human Nutrition. Faculty of Veterinary Science. University of Murcia, Espinardo, E-30100 Murcia, Spain.

^b IRTA-Food Technology Program, Finca Camps i Armet, Monells, E-17121 Girona, Spain.

^c USC 1422 GRAPPE, INRA, Ecole Supérieur d'Agricultures, SFR 4207 QUASAV, 55 rue Rabelais, F-49100 Angers, France.

^d IRTA-Food Safety Program, Finca Camps i Armet, Monells, E-17121 Girona, Spain.

*Corresponding author:

Phone: +34 868 887662

Fax: +34 868 884147

E-mail: jmros@um.es (José María Ros)

Abstract

Consumers are increasingly demanding food products based on minimally processed fruit and vegetables (Part I), which are associated with "fresh-like" qualities and convenience. Smoothies may well fit these needs and contribute to increasing fruit and vegetable intake. In this Part II, the objective was to assess the sensory and nutritional quality for up to 28 days at 4°C in a vegetable smoothie with apple that was stabilized by high-pressure processing (HPP) (350MPa/10°C/5min) or mild heating (MH) (85°C/7min). HPP provided smoothies without a cooked fruit odour that maintained their "fresh-like" characteristics for at least 14 days. Furthermore, HPP resulted in a higher retention of vitamin C but not of total phenols and flavonoids, while sucrose rapidly was degraded to glucose and fructose during storage. Thus, mild pressurizing may be used to obtain "fresh-like" vegetable smoothies, although the treatment should be improved to retain their sensory traits and nutrients for longer.

Practical applications

The food industry is adapting its production strategies offer "fresh-like" vegetable smoothies with better sensory and nutritional qualities. This involves substituting conventional thermal treatments for other treatments, such as HPP, that may provide products with an adequate shelf life. Sensory and nutritional aspects are crucial for "fresh-like" smoothies to be developed at industrial scale.

Keywords

High hydrostatic pressure, vegetable smoothie, shelf life, sensory, nutrients.

Abbreviations

HPP: High-pressure processing, MH: Mild heating

1 INTRODUCTION

One of the more attractive features of HPP applied to the stabilisation of vegetable products, in particular smoothies, is the preservation of compounds of nutritional interest and sensory properties. However, depending on the pressurizing conditions, HPP treatments might modify enzymatic and chemical reactions that could result in the formation of compounds associated with undesirable changes in colour, odour and flavour (Oey et al., 2008). The stability of the sensory properties is another very important feature of HPP applied to vegetable-based products, since they are exposed to altering reactions catalysed by enzymes, which are frequently not inactivated by the HPP treatments (Terefe et al., 2014). The effects of HPP on sensory properties have been reported in strawberry purée (Lambert et al. 1999), mandarin juice (Takahashi et al., 1993), orange–lemon–carrot juice and multi-fruit smoothies (Fernández-García et al., 2001; Hurtado et al., 2015, 2017a,b; Picouet et al., 2016). In most of these studies it was seen that the use of 450-600 MPa at room and cold temperatures carries a certain risk of altering odour and flavour, leading to the conclusion that mild pressurization conditions are more adequate for stabilizing “fresh-like” fruit and vegetable products, such as smoothies. HPP treatments have little effect on fruit and vegetable compounds of nutritional interest, depending on the pressurizing conditions and the nature of fruit or vegetable matrix (Oey et al., 2008; Keenan et al., 2012a,b; García-Parra et al., 2016). However, the remaining enzymatic activities may lead to the greater destruction of nutrients during storage. Vitamin C loss is considered as a handicap for the nutritional quality of fruit derivatives, particularly in products made from fruits rich in vitamin C, such as orange or strawberry. In general, vegetables contain substantial amounts of phenolic antioxidants, such as flavonols, tannins and anthocyanins, which are considered to be good promoters of human health (Nile and Park, 2014), but these, too, may be degraded during storage. Similarly, the inability of HPP treatments to inactivate some enzymes, such as β -fructosidase,

1
2
3 might modify the sugar profile in fruit products (Butz et al., 2003). A decrease in
4 the amount of ascorbic acid, phenolic compounds, carotenoids and carbohydrates
5 has been reported after HPP (Fernández-García et al., 2001; Butz et al., 2003),
6 while the content of total phenols increased or were not affected (Patras et al.,
7 2009; Vega-Gálvez et al., 2014, 2016). It is very interesting, even necessary, to
8 know whether HPP treatment permits the better retention of nutrients during cold
9 storage of vegetable smoothies than thermal treatments, which frequently modify
10 sensory and nutritional properties of fruits and vegetables (Deliza et al., 2005) and
11 affect their acceptability (Gao et al., 2016). The enzymes involved in fruit spoilage
12 (Part I) may produce noticeable sensory and nutritional changes, a feature which
13 requires further evaluation.

14
15 The aim of the Part II of the present study was to compare the effects of an
16 HPP treatment (350MPa/5min/10°C) and a MH treatment (85°C/7min) on the
17 sensory quality and the level of selected nutrients in a vegetable smoothie (apple,
18 carrot, zucchini, pumpkin and leek), kept in refrigeration for up to 28 days.

19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 **2 MATERIALS AND METHODS**

36 37 **2.1 Sample preparation**

38
39 The smoothie formulation was based on commercial smoothies selected for their
40 sensory properties. Smoothie composition by weight consisted of 20 % blanched
41 carrot (*Daucus carota*), 20 % apples (*Pyrus malus* golden delicious), 20 % *Citrus*
42 pectin solution 1 %, 19.9 % zucchini (*Cucurbita pepo*), 15 % pumpkin (*Cucurbita*
43 *moschata* butternut), 5 % blanched leek (*Allium ampeloprasum* porrum) and 0.1 %
44 salt. Fruit and vegetables were purchased at a local market.

45
46 Juices were obtained using a C40 juicer (Robot Coupé, Montceau-en-
47 Bourgogne, France) and blended in a tank to achieve the above-mentioned
48 composition. During sample preparation room temperature was stabilized at 14 °C.
49 Smoothies subjected to HPP were packaged in 250 ml polyethylene terephthalate
50 (PET) bottles (Sunbox, Madrid, Spain), while a specific HT300 pouch (Seal Air
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Cryovac, Milano, Italy) was used in MH samples. Both packages were selected for
4 high pressure and heat processing, respectively, to avoid the effect of packaging
5 materials on the quality of the smoothie.
6
7
8
9

10 11 **2.2 Thermal and high-pressure treatments**

12
13 For the MH treatment, the samples were introduced into an Ilpraplus autoclave
14 (Ilpra Systems, Mataró, Spain) and heated at 85°C for 7 min, including the initial
15 ramp of 5.7°C/min, the total heating lasted 27 min. The conditions of mild heat
16 treatment were selected in previous works with fruit smoothies (Picouet et al.,
17 2016) to find, under mild heat conditions, microbiological safety (destruction of
18 pathogens). HPP stabilisation consisted of the pressurization at 350 MPa for 5 min
19 at an initial temperature of 9 - 10 °C in a 120 l HPP system Wave 6500/120
20 (Hyperbaric, Burgos, Spain). The pressure ramp was 200 MPa/min and the total
21 processing time was 7.3 min. The HPP treatment was selected based on the results
22 obtained in a previous study with a fruit smoothie, in which three HPP treatments
23 ranging from 350 to 600 MPa (350MPa/5min/10°C, 450MPa/5min/10°C,
24 600MPa/3min/10°C) were tested (Hurtado et al., 2015), and in a preliminary HPP
25 treatment of the multi-vegetable smoothie (Part I). After the respective treatments,
26 samples were cooled in water (5°C) for 1 hour (HPP) or 2 hours (MH), and then
27 stored for up to 28 days at 4±1 °C in darkness.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 46 **2.3 Experimental design**

47
48 The different parameters studied were measured in untreated products (only at day
49 1), after MH and HPP treatments (day 1) and throughout refrigerated storage at
50 4±1 °C (day 7, 14, 21 and 28) in darkness, representing retailed conditions as
51 mentioned before. Selected nutrient compounds (vitamin C, sugars, flavonoids and
52 total phenols) measurements were taken on three independent samples (3 different
53 250 ml bottles/pouches) per day of sampling. Two replicates of the experiment
54 were performed.
55
56
57
58
59
60

2.4 Determination of the nutritional quality

2.4.1 Vitamin C

The total vitamin C content, L-ascorbic acid (AA) and L-dehydroascorbic acid (DHAA) were analysed according to the method described by Zapata and Dufour (1992) with slight modifications (Gil et al., 1998; González Hidalgo et al., 2019). For AA determination, a purified extract of a sample in methanol:water at 5:95 (V:V), 0.5 g l⁻¹ citric acid and 0.5 g l⁻¹ ethylenediaminetetracetic acid was used. For DHAA determination, 3 ml of the above extract was reacted with 1 ml of a solution of o-phenylenediamine (OPDA) in methanol:water at 5:95 v:v (333.72 mg OPDA per 100 ml solution), which was kept at 4 °C in darkness for 40 min before analysis. The reverse-phase high performance liquid chromatography (RP-HPLC) system was made up as follows: L-6200 pump (Merck-Hitachi, Darmstadt, Germany); 2050 plus autosampler (Jasco Inc., Easton, UK); L-7420 UV detector (Merck-Hitachi); and a Gemini C18 column (300 x 4.6 mm, 5 µm) connected to a C18 reverse phase guard column, both from Phenomenex, Torrance, CA, USA. The mobile phase used was methanol/water containing cetrimide and KH₂PO₄. The operating conditions were: 20 µl injection volume, 260 nm (AA) or 340 nm (DHAA) nm detector wavelength and 0.9 ml min⁻¹ flow rate. Results were expressed as mg of L-ascorbic acid 100 ml⁻¹, mg of L-dehydroascorbic acid 100 ml⁻¹, and the total vitamin C content (mg 100 ml⁻¹) was calculated as the sum of L-ascorbic acid and L-dehydroascorbic acid.

2.4.2 Total phenols (TPC)

Total phenols were determined according to Singleton and Rossi (1965) using a UV2 spectrophotometer (Pye Unicam Ltd, Cambridge, UK). The absorbance of a yellow compound formed by the reaction between a sample of the ethanolic extract and Folin-Ciocalteu reagent (containing phosphomolybdate and phosphotungstate)

1
2
3 was measured at 765 nm. Results were expressed as mg gallic acid equivalents
4
5 (GAE) 100 ml⁻¹.
6
7
8

9 **2.4.3 Total flavonoids**

10
11 Total flavonoids were determined according to the method of Chang et al. (2002)
12
13 using a UV2 spectrophotometer. The absorbance of a yellow compound formed by
14
15 reacting a sample of the methanolic extract with aluminium chloride, potassium
16
17 acetate and water was measured at 415 nm. Results were expressed as mg
18
19 quercetin equivalents (QE) 100 ml⁻¹.
20
21
22

23 **2.4.4 Sugars**

24
25 The main sugars (sucrose, glucose and fructose) were determined by HPLC using
26
27 the method described by Hellín et al. (2001). A water extract sample was directly
28
29 injected into the HPLC system equipped with an L-7490 Lachrome refractive index
30
31 detector (Merck-Hitachi) and a Carbosep CHO682 lead column (Transgenomic,
32
33 Elancourt, France). The mobile phase used was pure water (MilliQ). The operating
34
35 conditions were: 20 µl injection volume, 0.4 ml min⁻¹ flow rate; and 80 °C
36
37 temperature. Results were expressed as g 100 ml⁻¹.
38
39
40

41 **2.5 Sensory analysis**

42
43 The descriptors for the Quantitative Descriptive Analysis (QDA) were generated by
44
45 open discussion in two previous sessions. The retained descriptors and their
46
47 descriptions are shown in Table 1. Six selected and trained assessors (ISO 8586-
48
49 1:1993, ISO 8586-146 2:1994 and ISO 8586:2012) undertook the sensory analysis
50
51 of 50 ml of a multi-vegetable smoothie. A non-structured scoring scale (Amerine et
52
53 al., 1965) was used, where 0 meant the absence of the descriptor and 10 meant a
54
55 high intensity of the descriptor. The sensory evaluation was separately performed
56
57 for each sampling time in two sessions (per sampling time) using one bottle/pouch
58
59 of 250 ml of each treatment per session. A complete block design was used (Steel
60

1
2
3 and Torrie, 1983), where each taster assessed all of the batches in each session.
4
5 Eight sensory sessions per taster were performed in total. The samples were coded
6
7 using three random numbers and presented to the assessors, who balanced the
8
9 first-order effects and the carry-over effects according to MacFie et al. (1989). The
10
11 average score of six experts for each sample and session was recorded and used in
12
13 the data analysis.
14
15

16 17 **2.6 Statistical analysis**

18
19 Data were analyzed by means of ANOVA using the GLM procedure of SAS 9.01
20
21 (SAS Institute Inc, Cary, USA). The model for nutritional data included the
22
23 treatment (Untreated, MH, HPP), storage time (1, 7, 14, 21 and 28 days) and
24
25 replicate as fixed effects. For the sensory data, the model included the treatment,
26
27 storage time, taste session and replicate as fixed effects. Non-significant
28
29 interactions ($P>0.05$) were removed from the model. Mean differences were tested
30
31 using the Tukey test ($P<0.05$).
32
33

34 35 **3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

36 37 **3.1 Nutritional quality: Vitamin C, total phenols, flavonoids and sugars**

38
39 The vitamin C content was very low, 4.3, 3.1 and 2.3 mg 100 ml⁻¹ in untreated,
40
41 HPP and MH smoothies, respectively (Table 2) and it was due mainly to the
42
43 dehydroascorbic acid. These results were expected because the smoothies were
44
45 made with vegetables that, in general, are not very rich in vitamin C; for example,
46
47 zucchini has 15 mg 100 g⁻¹, pumpkin 12 mg 100 g⁻¹ or carrot 7 mg 100 g⁻¹ of
48
49 vitamin C (Spanish food composition database [BEDCA]), and also, as reported by
50
51 González-Tejedor et al. (2017), due to the mincing and blended procedure followed
52
53 to prepare vegetable smoothies, low ascorbic acid levels were detected, because
54
55 the ascorbic acid oxidation to dehydroascorbic acid is rapidly catalysed by the
56
57 enzyme ascorbate oxidase. There were no significant ($p>0.05$) differences in the
58
59 total content of vitamin C between treated and untreated smoothies at day 1.
60

1
2
3 However, this vitamin degraded in both types of smoothie during storage, although
4 the remaining content of this vitamin was higher in the HPP smoothies, with its
5 consequent nutritional benefit. The fact that processing and storage could promote
6 vitamin C degradation lowers the content and, as seen in other studies (Hurtado et
7 al., 2015; Landl et al., 2010; Picouet et al., 2016; González-Tejedor et al., 2017),
8 ascorbic acid is reduced to dehydroascorbic acid. In addition, vitamin C is the most
9 labile antioxidant and so seems to be the most affected and prone to degradation
10 during processing and storage, which could be taken as an indicator of the quality
11 of all the antioxidants present in the product (Esteve and Frígola, 2007; Kalt,
12 2005). It has been observed that HPP retains the vitamin C content better than MH
13 (Barba et al., 2010), as reported in orange juice treated at 300-500MPa/5min/20-
14 35°C (Velázquez-Estrada et al., 2013; Polydera et al., 2005a, 2005b), in strawberry
15 purée treated at 300MPa/1,5,15min and 400MPa/15 min/20°C (Marszalek et al.,
16 2015; Patras et al., 2009) and in pumpkin treated at 450MPa/15min/20°C (Zhou et
17 al., 2014). Our results were consistent with these studies. HPP treatment resulted
18 in a lower degradation of vitamin C compared with the MH.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
The total phenol and flavonoid contents were about 10 mg GAE 100 ml⁻¹ and
1-1.5 mg QE 100 ml⁻¹, respectively, for both treatments throughout storage (Table
2). The total level of phenols and flavonoids observed in our study was low
compared to those reported in other studies for multi-fruit and red-fruit smoothies
with high antioxidant capacity (Picouet et al., 2016; Hurtado et al., 2017a). Unlike
vitamin C, the levels of both groups of phenolic antioxidants remained stable in
smoothies throughout storage, possibly due to the protective action of the vitamin
C against oxidation. Some studies indicate higher retention of phenols in
pressurized than in pasteurized fruit or vegetable derivatives; for example, in
pumpkin treated at 400MPa/5min/20°C (Contador et al., 2014), fruit smoothies
after 450MPa/1,3,5min/20°C (Keenan et al., 2010), and carrot juice, where the
phenol content increased after pressurizing at 350MPa/10min/20°C and decreased
significantly after heat treatment (100°C/4min) (Jabbar et al., 2014). The phenol

1
2
3 content decreased to a greater extent in turnip treated at 400MPa/5min/20°C than
4 when pasteurized at 90°C/3min (Clariana et al., 2011). Our results agree with
5 those of Suárez-Jacobo et al. (2011), who reported no differences in the total
6 flavonoid content between pressurized (300MPa/4°C) and pasteurized apple juice.
7 Phenolic losses due to heat treatment may be caused by chemical degradation of
8 phenols, depending on the type of vegetable raw materials and the intensity of the
9 treatment applied (Roy et al., 2007). In our study, heat treatment was mild and did
10 not produce any additional degradation of phenolic antioxidants, with the
11 consequent nutritional benefit for smoothies in question.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 The total content of sugars (Table 3) was coherent with the result obtained
22 for total soluble solids (Part I). Sucrose levels were higher in the MH smoothies and
23 remained stable during storage. However, in the HPP smoothies, sucrose was
24 completely hydrolysed to glucose and fructose, falling to below the detection limit
25 from day 7 onwards. This result has already been observed in other studies with
26 fruit smoothies (Hurtado et al., 2015, 2017b; Picouet et al., 2016) and fruit juices
27 (Butz et al., 2003), where, probably, the enzyme β -fructosidase was not inactivated
28 by the treatment, thus hydrolysing the sucrose to below the detection limit (<0.5
29 $\text{mg } 100 \text{ ml}^{-1}$). Our results also suggest that this hydrolase could have been
30 inactivated by the heat treatment in the vegetable smoothies MH, which retained
31 their initial sucrose content (Table 3), while the amount of glucose and fructose
32 remain constant once the sucrose has been totally hydrolyzed by active enzymes,
33 what happened in the HPP smoothies after day 7 and following days (Table 3).

3.2 Effects on sensory quality

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Freshness is one of the most important factors for consumers' expectations as
regard the sensory quality of fruit and vegetable juices. Consequently, major
concerns with the pasteurization process of fruits and vegetables have been
reported with respect to sensory and nutritional aspects (Sentandreu et al. 2005;

1
2
3 Aamir et al. 2013). Freshness could be explained in relation to attributes of
4 appearance, odour and flavour.
5

6
7 The results for the sensory analysis of vegetable smoothies are shown in
8 Tables 4 and 5. In general, the sensory differences observed between both
9 treatments concerned attributes related with smoothie freshness. Odour intensity
10 and pumpkin odour were slightly more intense ($P < 0.05$) in the HPP smoothies than
11 in the MH smoothies on day 1 (Table 4). The characteristic cucurbits odour (green
12 melon) was similar in the HPP smoothies (2.3) and the untreated smoothies (2.4)
13 at day 1, and, although this attribute decreased during the lifetime for both
14 treatments, higher scores were achieved for the HPP smoothies (0.8) than for the
15 MH smoothies (0.2) at the end of storage. As more relevant aspect is that the HPP
16 smoothies had intermediate scores (1.3) for the cooked odour at day 1, compared
17 with the untreated (0.8) and MH smoothies (2.1). Whatever the case, flavour
18 alteration by thermal treatment was weak compared with those observed for fruit
19 smoothies (Hurtado et al., 2017b; Picouet et al., 2016). The differences observed
20 for the cooked odour between both treatments were only significant ($P > 0.05$) at
21 days 1, 7 and 14 of storage. As described by Hurtado et al. (2017a,b), HPP is an
22 emerging non-thermal technology which has a minimal influence on odour
23 properties.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 By contrast, the impact of treatment on colour and appearance attributes
42 was hardly noticeable. Orange and rust-brown colour scored similarly ($P > 0.05$) in
43 the HPP and MH smoothies at all storage times; however, there were some
44 differences in colour stability, since MH smoothies suffered a degree of browning
45 (rust colour) from 3.2 at day 1 to 5.5 at day 28. These results were coherent with
46 the instrumental colour data (Part I), which also showed a better colour retention in
47 the HPP smoothies. The lower Browning Index (Part I) of the HPP samples was
48 indicated by a lower rust-brown colour, which was also evident in the sensory
49 analysis. HP processing has a limited effect on the pigments (e.g. chlorophyll,
50 carotenoids, anthocyanins, etc.) responsible for the colour of fruits and vegetables.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 HPP is less damaging than thermal processes to low molecular weight food
4 compounds like pigments, since covalent bonds are not affected by pressure
5 (Tauscher, 1995). The colour compounds of HP processed fruits and vegetables
6 change during storage due to incomplete inactivation of the enzymes, which can
7 result in undesired chemical reactions in the food matrix.
8
9
10
11
12

13 The presence of small particles associated with the loss of turbidity was
14 higher initially ($P < 0.05$) in the HPP and untreated smoothies than in the MH
15 smoothies throughout storage (Part I). This result was confirmed by the mouth feel
16 score, where there were significant ($P < 0.05$) differences in grittiness, which was
17 clearly lower in the MH smoothies than in the HPP smoothies at the end of storage.
18 This could be due to the greater clarification in the HPP and untreated smoothies
19 caused by the residual activities of pectic enzymes during treatment and
20 subsequent chilled storage, which may result in products with a greater quantity of
21 particles and a greater feeling of grittiness.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Another important objective in the processing of fresh vegetables is to
32 maintain their original taste and flavour. Most of the taste and flavour attributes
33 assessed scored similarly ($P > 0.05$) in the smoothies for both treatments, except for
34 the carrot and apple flavours (Table 5). Carrot flavour was associated with
35 freshness and was more intense in the untreated and HPP smoothies at the
36 beginning of storage (days 1 and 7), while apple juice flavour was described as
37 cooked flavour and scored higher in the MH smoothies at days 1, 7 and 14, as
38 expected. A similar finding was previously reported in multi-fruit (Picouet et al.,
39 2016) and red fruit (Hurtado et al., 2017a,b) smoothies. Finally, when the overall
40 sensory quality was assessed in the smoothies, there were no significant ($P > 0.05$)
41 differences between treatments, although scores decreased ($P < 0.05$) in the HPP
42 smoothies during storage, probably due to their gradual loss of freshness
43 associated with the remaining enzymatic activity, which did not occur in the
44 thermally treated product.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 It is known that the fresh taste of fruits and vegetables is not greatly altered
4
5 by HPP, since the structure of small molecules responsible for flavour is not affected
6
7 by pressure (Oey et al., 2008). Masegosa et al. (2014) showed that the sensory
8
9 properties of two vegetable products elaborated with pumpkin and broccoli, and
10
11 with zucchini, eggplant, spinach and chard, were not affected by HPP treatment. In
12
13 addition, Houska et al. (2006) found no sensory differences in a broccoli and apple
14
15 juice stored for up to 70 days pressurized at 500 MPa/10min and in a juice that was
16
17 kept frozen. However, HP treatment could enhance the chemical and enzymatic
18
19 reactions responsible for the appearance of off-flavours and off-odours. In any
20
21 case, the resulting sensory properties and further stability of the pressurized
22
23 smoothies would depend on factors such as the type of vegetables used (matrix),
24
25 as well as the pressuring and retailing conditions applied (Fernández et al., 2018).
26
27
28

29 **4 CONCLUSION**

31 The use of a HPP allows the freshness of vegetable smoothies to be extended. HPP
32
33 provided "fresh-like" vegetable smoothies with a low intensity of cooked fruit odour
34
35 at least up to 14 days. Furthermore, HPP resulted in a higher retention of vitamin C
36
37 but not of total phenols and flavonoids, while sucrose rapidly was degraded to
38
39 glucose and fructose during storage. The content of the above mentioned
40
41 antioxidants was low due to the natural composition of the fresh vegetables and the
42
43 apple juice used. Considering some of the above advantages, HPP may be regarded
44
45 as an alternative technology to obtain fresh vegetable products, although some
46
47 sensory degradation occurs more quickly than in the mild-heated product.
48
49 Notwithstanding, the "fresh-like" sensations are positive for HPP, which provided a
50
51 superior quality product. Future research on HPP treated vegetable smoothies will
52
53 be focussed on the effect in enzyme activities related to nutritional compounds.
54
55
56
57

58 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

59
60

1
2
3 This study was carried out with the financial support of the Spanish Government via
4 the national project FRUITECH (INIA RTA2011- 00038-C02-01 and 02).
5
6
7

8 9 **REFERENCES**

- 10
11 Aamir, M., Ovissipour, M., Sablanbi, S.S., & Rasco, B. (2013). Predicting the quality
12 of pasteurized vegetables using kinetic models: A review. *International*
13 *Journal of Food Science*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/271271>
14
15
16
17 Amerine, M. A., Pangborn, R. M., & Roessler, E. B. (1965). Principles of sensory
18 evaluation of food. In: *Food Science and Technology Monographs*. Academic
19 Press, New York, pp. 338-339.
20
21
22
23 Barba, F. J., Esteve, M. J., & Frigola, A. (2010). Ascorbic acid is the only bioactive
24 that is better preserved by high hydrostatic pressure than by thermal
25 treatment of a vegetable beverage. *Journal of Agricultural and Food*
26 *Chemistry*, 58(18), 10070-10075.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Butz, P., Fernández-García, A., Lindauer, R., Dieterich, S., Bognár, A., & Tauscher, B. (2003). Influence of ultra high pressure processing on fruit and vegetable products. *Journal of Food Engineering*, 56, 233-236.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0260-8774\(02\)00258-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0260-8774(02)00258-3)
- Chang, C. C., Yang, M. H., Wen, H. M., & Chern, J. C. (2002). Estimation of total flavonoid content in propolis by two complementary colourimetric methods. *Journal of Food Drug Analysis*, 10(3), 178-182.
- Clariana, M., Valverde, J., Wijngaard, H., Mullen, A. M., & Marcos, B. (2011). High pressure processing of swede (*Brassica napus*): Impact on quality properties. *Innovative Food Science & Emerging Technologies*, 12, 85-92.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifset.2011.01.011>
- Contador, R., Gonzalez-Cebrino, F., García-Parra, J., Lozano, M., & Ramírez, R. (2014). Effects of hydrostatic high pressure and thermal treatments on two

1
2
3 types of pumpkin pure and changes during refrigerated storage. *Journal of*
4 *Food Processing and Preservation*, 38, 704-712.

5
6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfpp.12021>

8
9 Deliza, R., Rosenthal, A., Abadio, F. B. D., Silva, C. H. O., & Castillo, C. (2005).

10 Application of high pressure technology in the fruit juice processing: benefits
11 perceived by consumers. *Journal of Food Engineering*, 67, 241-246.

12
13
14
15 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2004.05.068>

16
17 Esteve, M. J., & Frígola, A. (2007). Refrigerated fruit juices: Quality and safety
18 issues. *Advances in Food Nutrition and Research*, 52, 103-139.

19
20
21 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1043-4526\(06\)52003-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1043-4526(06)52003-0)

22
23 Fernández, M. V., Denoya, G. I., Agüero, M. V., Jagus, R. J., Vaudagna, S. R.

24 (2018). Optimization of high pressure processing parameters to preserve
25 quality attributes of a mixed fruit and vegetable smoothie. *Innovative Food*
26 *Science & Emerging Technologies*, 47, 170-179.

27
28
29
30
31 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifset.2018.02.011>

32
33 Fernández-García, A., Butz, P., Bognér, A., & Tauscher, B. (2001). Antioxidative
34 capacity, nutrient content and sensory quality of orange juice and an
35 orange-lemon-carrot juice product after high pressure treatment and
36 storage in different packaging. *European Food Research and Technology*,
37 213, 290-296.

38
39
40
41
42 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002170100332>

43
44 Gao, G., Ren, P., Cao, X., Yan, B., Liao, X., Sun, Z., & Wang, Y. (2016). Comparing
45 quality changes of cupped strawberry treated by high hydrostatic pressure
46 and thermal processing during storage. *Food and Bioproducts Processing*,
47 100(A), 221-229.

48
49
50
51
52 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fbp.2016.06.017>

53
54 García-Parra, J., González-Cebrino, F., Delgado, J., Cava, R., & Ramírez, R. (2016).

55 High pressure assisted thermal processing of pumpkin purée: Effect on
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 microbial counts, color, bioactive compounds and polyphenoloxidase
4 enzyme. *Food and Bioproducts Processing*, 98, 124-132.

5
6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fbp.2016.01.006>
8

9 Gil, M. I., Ferreres, F., & Tomás-Barberán, F. A. (1998). Effect of modified
10 atmosphere packaging on the flavonoids and vitamin C content of minimally
11 processed Swiss chard (*Beta bulgaris Subspecies cycla*). *Journal of*
12 *Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 46, 2007-2012.

13
14
15
16
17 <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf970924e>
18

19 González-Hidalgo, I., Moreno, D. A., García Viguera, C., & Ros-García, J. M. (2019).
20 The effect of industrial freezing on the physical and nutritional quality traits
21 in broccoli. *Food Science and Technology International* 25(1), 56-65.

22
23
24
25
26 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1082013218795807>
27

28 González-Tejedor, G. A., Martínez-Hernández, G. B., Garre, A., Egea, J. A.,
29 Fernández, P. S., & Artés-Hernández, F. (2017). Quality Changes and Shelf-
30 Life Prediction of a Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Purple Smoothie. *Food and*
31 *Bioprocess Technology* 10(10), 1892-1904.

32
33
34
35
36 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11947-017-1965-5>
37

38 Hellín, P., Ros, J. M., & Laencina, J. (2001). Changes in high and low molecular
39 weight carbohydrates during *Rhizopus nigricans* cultivation on lemon peel.
40 *Carbohydrate Polymers*, 45, 169-174.

41
42
43
44 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0144-8617\(00\)00317-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0144-8617(00)00317-9)
45

46 Houška, M., Strohalm, J., Kocurová, K., Totušek, J., Lefnerová, D., Tříška, J.,
47 Vrchotová, N., Fiedrleová, V., Holasova, M., Gabrovská, D., & Paulíčková, I.
48 (2006). High pressure and foods—fruit/vegetable juices. *Journal of Food*
49 *Engineering*, 77, 386-398.

50
51
52
53
54 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2005.07.003>
55

56 Hurtado, A., Picouet, P., Jofré, A., Guàrdia, M. D., Ros, J. M., & Bañón, S. (2015).
57 Application of High Pressure Processing for Obtaining “Fresh-Like” Fruit
58 Smoothies. *Food and Bioprocess Technology*, 8, 2470-2482.
59
60

1
2
3 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11947-015-1598-5>

4
5 Hurtado, A., Guàrdia, M. D., Picouet, P., Jofré, A., Ros, J. M., & Bañón, S. (2017a).
6
7 Stabilization of red fruit-based smoothies by high-pressure processing. Part
8
9 A. Effects on microbial growth, enzyme activity, antioxidant capacity and
10
11 physical stability. *Journal of Science of Food and Agriculture*, 97, 770-776.

12
13 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.7796>

14
15 Hurtado, A., Guàrdia, M. D., Picouet, P., Jofré, A., Ros, J. M., & Bañón, S. (2017b).
16
17 Stabilisation of red fruit-based smoothies by high-pressure processing. Part
18
19 II: Effects on sensory quality and selected nutrients. *Journal of Science of*
20
21 *Food and Agriculture*, 97, 777-783.

22
23 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.7795>

24
25 ISO 8586-1:1993. Sensory analysis -- General guidance for the selection, training and
26
27 monitoring of assessors -- Part 1: Selected assessors.

28
29 ISO 8586-2:1994. Sensory analysis -- General guidance for the selection, training and
30
31 monitoring of assessors -- Part 2: Experts

32
33 ISO 8586:2012. Sensory analysis -- General guidelines for the selection, training and
34
35 monitoring of selected assessors and expert sensory assessors.

36
37 Jabbar, S., Abid, M., Hu, B., Hashim, M. M., Saeeduddin, M., Lei, S. C., Wu, T., &
38
39 Zeng, X. X. (2014). Influence of sonication and high hydrostatic pressure on
40
41 the quality of carrot juice. *International Journal of Food Science and*
42
43 *Technology*, 49, 2449-2457.

44
45 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijfs.12567>

46
47 Kalt, W., 2005. Effects of production and processing factors on major fruit and
48
49 vegetable antioxidants. *Journal of Food Science*, 70(1), 11-19.

50
51 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2621.2005.tb09053.x>

52
53 Keenan, D. F., Brunton, N. P., Gormley, T. R., Butler, F., Tiwari, B. K., & Patras, A.
54
55 (2010). Effect of thermal and high hydrostatic pressure processing on
56
57 antioxidant activity and colour of fruit smoothies. *Innovative Food Science &*
58
59 *Emerging Technologies*, 11, 551-556.

1
2
3 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifset.2010.07.003>
4

5 Keenan, D. F., Brunton, N. P., Mitchell, M., Gormley, T. R., & Butler, F., (2012a).
6
7 Flavour profiling of fresh and processed fruit smoothies by instrumental and
8
9 sensory analysis. *Food Research International*, 45, 17-25.

10
11 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2011.10.002>
12

13 Keenan, D. F., Röβle, C., Gormley, T. R., Butler, F., & Brunton, N. P. (2012b).
14
15 Effect of high hydrostatic pressure and thermal processing on the nutritional
16
17 quality and enzyme activity of fruit smoothie. *LWT-Food Science and*
18
19 *Technology*, 45, 50-57.

20
21 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2011.07.006>
22

23 Lambert, Y., Demazeau, G., Largeteau, A., & Bouvier, J. M. (1999). Changes in
24
25 aromatic volatile composition of strawberry after high pressure treatment.
26
27 *Food Chemistry*, 67, 7-16.

28
29 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0308-8146\(99\)00084-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0308-8146(99)00084-9)
30

31 Landl, A., Abadias, M., Sárraga, C., Viñas, I., & Picouet, P. A. (2010). Effect of high
32
33 pressure processing on the quality of acidified Granny Smith apple purée
34
35 product. *Innovative Food Science & Emerging Technologies*, 11, 557-564.

36
37 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifset.2010.09.001>
38

39 MacFie, H. J., Bratchell, N., Greenhoff, H., & Vallis, L. V. (1989). Designs to balance
40
41 the effect of order of presentation and first-order carry-over effects in hall
42
43 test. *Journal of Sensory Studies*, 4(2), 129-148.

44
45 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-459X.1989.tb00463.x>
46

47 Marszalek, K., Mitek, M., & Skapska, S. (2015). The effect of thermal pasteurization
48
49 and high pressure processing at cold and mild temperatures on the chemical
50
51 composition, microbial and enzyme activity in strawberry puree. *Innovative*
52
53 *Food Science & Emerging Technologies*, 27, 48-56.

54
55 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifset.2014.10.009>
56

57 Masegosa, R., Delgado-Adámez, J., Contador, R., Sánchez-Íñiguez, F., & Ramírez,
58
59 R. (2014). Effect of processing by hydrostatic high pressure of two ready to
60

eat vegetable meals and stability after refrigerated storage. *Food Science and Technology International*, 20, 605-615.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1082013213497493>

Nile, S. H., & Park, S. W. 2014. Edible berries: Bioactive components and their effect on human health. *Nutrition*, 30(2), 134-144.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nut.2013.04.007>

Oey, I., Lille, M., Van Loey, A., & Hendrickx, M. (2008). Effect of high pressure processing on colour, texture and flavour of fruit and vegetable-based food products: a review. *Trends in Food Science and Technology*, 19(6), 320-328.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2008.04.001>

Patras, A., Brunton, N. P., Pieve, S. D., & Butler, F. (2009). Impact of high pressure processing on total antioxidant activity, phenolic, ascorbic acid, anthocyanin content and colour of strawberry and blackberry purées. *Innovative Food Science & Emerging Technologies*, 10, 308-313.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifset.2008.12.004>

Picouet, P. A., Hurtado, A., Jofré, A., Bañón, S., Ros, J. M., & Guàrdia, M. D. (2016). Effects of Thermal and High-pressure Treatments on the Microbiological, Nutritional and Sensory Quality of a Multi-fruit Smoothy. *Food and Bioprocess Technology*, 9 (7), 1219-1232.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11947-016-1705-2>

Polydera, A. C., Stoforos, N. G., & Taoukis, P. S. (2005a). Effect of high hydrostatic pressure treatment on post processing antioxidant activity of fresh Navel orange juice. *Food Chemistry*, 91, 495-503.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2004.04.040>

Polydera, A. C., Stoforos, N. G., & Taoukis, P. S. (2005b). Quality degradation kinetics of pasteurized and high pressure processed fresh Navel orange juice: Nutritional parameters and shelf life. *Innovative Food Science & Emerging Technologies*, 60, 1-9.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifset.2004.10.004>

- 1
2
3 Roy, M. K., Takenaka, M., Isobe, S., & Tsushida, T. (2007). Antioxidant potential,
4 antiproliferative activities, and phenolic content in water-soluble fractions of
5 some commonly consumed vegetables: Effects of thermal treatment. *Food*
6 *Chemistry*, *103*(1), 106-114.
7
8
9
10
11 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2006.08.002>
12
- 13 Sentandreu, E., Carbonell, L., Carbonell, J. V., & Izquierdo, L. (2005). Effects of
14 heat treatment conditions on fresh taste and on pectinmethylesterase
15 activity of chilled mandarin and orange juices. *Food Science and Technology*
16 *International*, *11*, 217-222.
17
18
19
20
21 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1082013205054291>
22
- 23 Singleton, V. L., & Rossi, J. A. (1965). Colourimetry of total phenolics with
24 phosphomolibdic-phosphotungstic acid reagent. *American Journal of Enology*
25 *and Viticulture*, *16*, 144-158.
26
27
28
- 29 Spanish food composition database [BEDCA] <http://www.bedca.net/bdpub/>
30
- 31 Steel, R. G. D., & Torrie, J. H. (1983). *Principles and procedures of statistics*.
32 McGraw-Hill, New York.
33
- 34 Suárez-Jacobo, A., Rufer, C. E., Gervilla, R., Guamis, B., Roig-Sagués, A. X., &
35 Saldo, J. (2011). Influence of ultra-high pressure homogenisation on
36 antioxidant capacity, polyphenol and vitamin content of clear apple juice.
37 *Food Chemistry*, *127*, 447-454.
38
39
40
41
42 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2010.12.152>
43
44
- 45 Takahashi, Y., Ohta, H., Yonei, H., & Ifuku, Y. (1993). Microbicidal effect of
46 hydrostatic pressure on Satsuma mandarin juice. *International Journal of*
47 *Food Science and Technology*, *28*(1), 95-102.
48
49
50
51
52 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2621.1993.tb01254.x>
53
- 54 Tauscher, B. (1995). Pasteurization of food by hydrostatic high pressure: chemical
55 aspects. *Zeitschrift für Lebensmittel-Untersuchung und – Forschung*, *200*(1),
56 3-13.
57
58
59
60 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01192901>

- 1
2
3 Terefe, N. S., Buckow, R., Versteeg, C. (2014). Quality-related enzymes in fruit and
4
5 vegetable products: effects of novel food processing technologies. Part 1:
6
7 High-pressure processing. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*, 54,
8
9 24-63.
10
11 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2011.566946>
12
- 13 Vega-Gálvez, A., López, J., Torres-Ossandón, M. J., Galotto, M. J., Puente-Díaz, L.,
14
15 Quispe-Fuentes, I., & Di Scala, K. (2014). High hydrostatic pressure effect
16
17 on chemical composition, color, phenolic acids and antioxidant capacity of
18
19 Cape gooseberry pulp (*Physalis peruviana* L.). *LWT-Food Science and*
20
21 *Technology*, 58, 519-526.
22
23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2014.04.010>
24
- 25 Vega-Gálvez, A., Díaz, R., López, J., Galotto, M. J., Reyes, J. E., Pérez-Won, M.,
26
27 Puente-Díaz, L., & Di Scala, K. (2016). Assesment of quality parameters and
28
29 microbial characteristics of Cape gooseberry pulp (*Physalis peruviana* L.)
30
31 subjected to high hydrostatic pressure treatment. *Food and Bioproducts*
32
33 *Processing*, 97, 30-40.
34
35 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fbp.2015.09.008>
36
- 37 Velázquez-Estrada, R. M., Hernández-Herrero, M. M., Rüfer, C. E., Guamis-López,
38
39 B., & Roig-Sagués, A. X. (2013). Influence of ultra high pressure
40
41 homogenization processing on bioactive compounds and antioxidant activity
42
43 of orange juice. *Innovative Food Science & Emerging Technologies*, 18, 89-
44
45 94.
46
47 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifset.2013.02.005>
48
- 49 Zapata, S., & Dufour, J. P. (1992). Ascorbic, dehydroascorbic and isoascorbic acid
50
51 simultaneous determinations by reverse phase ion interaction HPLC. *Journal*
52
53 *of Food Science*, 57(2), 506-511.
54
55 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2621.1992.tb05527.x>
56
- 57 Zhou, C. I., Liu, W., Yuan, C., Song, Y., Chen, D., Ni, Y. Y., & Li, Q. H. (2014). The
58
59 effect of high hydrostatic pressure on the microbiological quality and
60

1
2
3 physical-chemical characteristics of Pumpkin (*Cucurbita maxima* Duch.).

4
5 *Innovative Food Science & Emerging Technologies*, 21, 24-34.

6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifset.2013.11.002>
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

TABLE 1 Definition of the sensory attributes included in the sensory profile

Attributes	Definition
Appearance	
Orange colour	Evaluation of the intensity of orange colour.
Rust-brown colour	Evaluation of the intensity of rust-brown colour.
Particles	Evaluation of the loss of turbid cloud.
Odour	
Intensity	Evaluation of the intensity of overall odour.
Pumpkin	Evaluation of the intensity of odour characteristic of pumpkin.
Green melon	Evaluation of the intensity of odour characteristic of cucurbits.
Cooked odour	Evaluation of the intensity of odour characteristic of cooked vegetables.
Taste and flavour	
Intensity	Evaluation of the intensity of flavour.
Sweet taste	Basic taste sensation elicited by sugar.
Bitter taste	Basic taste sensation elicited by caffeine
Carrot flavour	Intensity of flavour characteristic of carrot.
Leek flavour	Intensity of flavour characteristic of leek.
Apple juice flavour	Intensity of flavour characteristic of cooked apple juice.
Aftertaste	Evaluation of the remaining taste in the mouth after swallowing the drink.
Mouth-feel	
Sliminess	Mouth-feel property rated by the degree to which the juice is thick.
Grittiness	Mouth feel sensation related with the perception of particles the size of fine sand.
Overall sensory quality	Scoring of the sensory quality of the sample by reference to the standard of quality for this product.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

TABLE 2 Effect of the treatments (HPP vs MH) on nutritional quality of vegetable smoothies kept at 4°C for up to 28 days of storage

Storage day		Ascorbic acid (mg 100 ml ⁻¹)	Dehydroascorbic acid (mg 100 ml ⁻¹)	Total vitamin C (mg 100 ml ⁻¹)	Total phenols (mg GAE 100 ml ⁻¹)	Flavonoids (mg QE 100 ml ⁻¹)
Untreated	1	1.0±0.7	3.3±1.1	4.3±1.2	12.1±1.3	1.2±1.2
HPP	1	0.6±0.6 ^a	2.4±0.9 ^a	3.1±1.2 ^a	10.9±1.2	1.3±0.2
MH	1	1.2±0.6 ^a	1.1±0.4 ^a	2.3±0.3 ^a	9.0±1.2	1.6±0.2
HPP	7	<dl	1.5±0.4 ^{ab x}	1.5±0.4 ^{ab x}	12.8±2.6	1.4±0.3
MH	7	<dl	0.5±0.2 ^{b y}	0.5±0.2 ^{b y}	11.2±0.9	1.5±0.1
HPP	14	<dl	1.1±0.3 ^{b x}	1.1±0.3 ^{b x}	10.4±0.9	1.4±0.1
MH	14	<dl	0.5±0.2 ^{b y}	0.5±0.2 ^{b y}	10.2±1.1	1.5±0.2
HPP	21	<dl	0.7±0.2 ^{b x}	0.7±0.2 ^{b x}	12.0±2.2	1.3±0.1
MH	21	<dl	0.1±0.1 ^{b y}	0.1±0.1 ^{b y}	11.0±1.5	1.7±0.3
HPP	28	<dl	0.2±0.0 ^{b x}	0.2±0.0 ^{b x}	11.4±0.6	1.1±0.1 ^y
MH	28	<dl	<dl	<dl	10.3±0.7	1.8±0.2 ^x

Treatments:
 Untreated: Untreated smoothie (raw)
 HPP: High Pressure Processing (350MPa/5min/10°C)
 MH: Mild Heating (85°C/7min)
 M±SEM: Mean ± Standard Error of Mean.
 GAE: Gallic acid equivalents, QE: Quercetin equivalents

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

^{xy} treatment effects (within time) for $P \leq 0.05$.
^{abc} storage time effects (within treatment) for $P \leq 0.05$.
dl: limit of detection

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

TABLE 3 Effect of the treatments (HPP vs MH) on sugar content of vegetable smoothies kept at 4°C for up to 28 days of storage

	Storage day	Sucrose (g 100 ml ⁻¹)	Glucose (g 100 ml ⁻¹)	Fructose (g 100 ml ⁻¹)
Untreated	1	1.51±0.01	2.11±0.02	3.05±0.02
HPP	1	0.12±0.01 ^y	2.19±0.01 ^x	3.67±0.02 ^x
MH	1	1.75±0.02 ^x	1.40±0.01 ^{ab y}	2.74±0.01 ^y
HPP	7	nd	2.55±0.01 ^x	4.53±0.03 ^x
MH	7	1.96±0.01 ^x	1.52±0.01 ^{ab y}	3.11±0.02 ^y
HPP	14	nd	2.53±0.02 ^x	4.21±0.02 ^x
MH	14	1.71±0.01 ^x	1.76±0.01 ^{ab y}	3.23±0.01 ^y
HPP	21	nd	2.40±0.01 ^x	3.87±0.02 ^x
MH	21	1.47±0.01 ^x	2.81±0.01 ^{b y}	2.81±0.01 ^y
HPP	28	nd	2.40±0.01 ^x	3.84±0.05 ^x
MH	28	1.64±0.01 ^x	1.54±0.01 ^{ab y}	2.81±0.01 ^y

Treatments:

Untreated: Untreated smoothie (raw)

HPP: High Pressure Processing (350MPa/5min/10°C)

MH: Mild Heating (85°C/7min)

M±SEM: Mean ± Standard Error of Mean.

^{xy} treatment effects (within time) for P≤0.05.^{abc} storage time effects (within treatment) for P≤0.05.

nd: no detected

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

TABLE 4 Effect of the treatments (HPP vs MH) on different sensory attributes related with odour, colour and appearance, and mouth feel of vegetable smoothies kept at 4°C for up to 28 days of storage.

Storage day	Odour					Colour and Appearance			Mouth-feel	
	Intensity	Pumpkins	Green Melon	Cooked	Orange	Rust-brown	Particles	Sliminess	Grittiness	
Untreated	1	5.8±0.4	3.3±0.5	2.4±0.3 ^x	0.8±0.3 ^y	6.0±0.3	2.6±0.5	2.2±0.6 ^x	3.2±0.4	1.2±0.4
HPP	1	5.6±0.3	3.2±0.5	2.3±0.3 ^{ab xy}	1.3±0.3 ^{xy}	5.2±0.4	4.0±0.6	3.0±0.8 ^x	2.8±0.4	1.3±0.4
MH	1	5.3±0.3	2.7±0.4	1.3±0.3 ^{a y}	2.1±0.2 ^x	5.8±0.3 ^a	3.2±0.5 ^c	0.4±0.1 ^y	2.8±0.4	0.4±0.2
HPP	7	5.6±0.4	3.5±0.3 ^x	2.6±0.5 ^{a x}	1.0±0.3 ^y	5.0±0.4	4.0±0.6	3.9±0.8 ^x	3.3±0.4	2.2±0.6 ^x
MH	7	5.2±0.4	2.1±0.4 ^y	0.7±0.2 ^{ab y}	2.9±0.4 ^x	4.8±0.4 ^{ab}	4.2±0.4 ^{bc}	1.0±0.4 ^y	2.7±0.4	0.5±0.2 ^y
HPP	14	5.7±0.3	3.5±0.4	1.5±0.2 ^{ab x}	1.1±0.3 ^y	4.2±0.3	4.4±0.5	3.7±0.8 ^x	2.5±0.3	2.5±0.5 ^x
MH	14	5.5±0.3	2.7±0.5	0.6±0.2 ^{ab y}	2.7±0.4 ^x	3.7±0.4 ^{bc}	5.3±0.4 ^{ab}	1.0±0.3 ^y	2.5±0.4	0.7±0.2 ^y
HPP	21	5.3±0.3	2.8±0.5	1.0±0.3 ^b	1.2±0.4	4.1±0.2	5.2±0.5	3.7±0.7	2.5±0.3	2.3±0.5 ^x
MH	21	5.4±0.4	2.1±0.6	0.3±0.1 ^b	2.2±0.3	3.2±0.4 ^c	5.9±0.4 ^a	2.0±0.7	2.4±0.4	0.5±0.3 ^y
HPP	28	4.8±0.6	2.7±0.7	0.8±0.4 ^b	0.8±0.5	3.8±0.4	5.1±0.6	3.7±0.8 ^x	3.1±0.6	3.3±0.8 ^x
MH	28	5.3±0.6	2.0±0.8	0.2±0.1 ^b	2.1±0.3	3.4±0.5 ^{bc}	5.5±0.4 ^{ab}	0.2±0.2 ^y	2.1±0.5	0.5±0.3 ^y

Treatments:
 Untreated: Untreated smoothie (raw)
 HPP: High Pressure Processing (350MPa/5min/10°C)
 MH: Mild Heating (85°C/7min)
 M±SEM: Mean ± Standard Error of Mean.
^{xy} treatment effects (within time) for P≤0.05.
^{abc} storage time effects (within treatment) for P≤0.05.

TABLE 5 Effect of processing treatment on different sensory attributes related to taste and flavour in mouth and the overall sensory quality of vegetables smoothies kept at 4°C for up to 28 days of storage

	Storage day	Taste and Flavour							O.S.Q.
		Intensity	Sweet	Bitter	Carrot	Leek	Apple juice	Aftertaste	
Untreated	1	6.1±0.2	3.3±0.3	1.9±0.4	2.3±0.3 ^x	2.4±0.3	0.6±0.2 ^y	1.9±0.4	5.7±0.4
HPP	1	6.1±0.3	3.2±0.3	1.6±0.4	1.9±0.3 ^{xy}	2.2±0.3	0.8±0.3 ^y	1.7±0.4	6.0±0.2 ^a
MH	1	6.0±0.2	2.9±0.4	1.6±0.2	1.0±0.2 ^y	1.7±0.2	2.0±0.2 ^x	1.6±0.3	5.3±0.3
HPP	7	5.9±0.3	3.0±0.4	1.6±0.5	2.2±0.3 ^x	2.8±0.4	0.6±0.3 ^y	2.0±0.5	5.1±0.4 ^{ab}
MH	7	6.0±0.3	3.1±0.3	1.2±0.3	0.9±0.2 ^y	2.2±0.3	1.7±0.3 ^x	1.6±0.4	5.0±0.3
HPP	14	5.4±0.3	2.7±0.3	2.0±0.4	1.5±0.2	2.2±0.4	0.6±0.2 ^y	2.0±0.5	5.0±0.3 ^{ab}
MH	14	6.0±0.2	2.9±0.2	1.4±0.3	1.1±0.3	1.9±0.3	1.4±0.2 ^x	1.6±0.4	4.9±0.3
HPP	21	5.5±0.3	2.4±0.4	1.9±0.4	1.4±0.2	2.3±0.3	0.5±0.2	1.9±0.5	4.5±0.3 ^b
MH	21	5.6±0.2	2.9±0.3	1.3±0.3	0.8±0.3	1.9±0.3	1.0±0.3	1.4±0.3	4.7±0.4
HPP	28	5.3±0.4	2.5±0.6	2.2±0.7	1.6±0.3	2.4±0.5	0.5±0.2	2.4±0.7	4.4±0.5 ^b
MH	28	5.8±0.2	2.8±0.5	1.3±0.5	0.5±0.3	1.6±0.6	0.9±0.4	2.2±0.4	4.6±0.5

Treatments:

Untreated: Untreated smoothie (raw)

HPP: High Pressure Processing (350MPa/5min/10°C)

MH: Mild Heating (85°C/7min)

M±SEM: Mean ± Standard Error of Mean.

O.S.Q.: Overall sensory quality

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

^{xy} treatment effects (within time) for $P \leq 0.05$.
^{abc} storage time effects (within treatment) for $P \leq 0.05$.