



# *The effect of nutrient fortification of sauces on product stability, sensory properties and subsequent liking by older adults*

Article

Accepted Version

Tsikritzi, R., Wang, J., Collins, V. J., Allen, V. J., Mavrommatis, Y., Moynihan, P. J., Gosney, M. A., Kennedy, O. B. and Methven, L. (2015) The effect of nutrient fortification of sauces on product stability, sensory properties and subsequent liking by older adults. *Journal of Food Science*, 80 (5). S1100-S1110. ISSN 0022-1147 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1750-3841.12850> Available at <http://centaur.reading.ac.uk/39480/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1750-3841.12850>

Publisher: Wiley

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in

the [End User Agreement](#).

[www.reading.ac.uk/centaur](http://www.reading.ac.uk/centaur)

## **CentAUR**

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

1 **The effect of nutrient fortification of sauces on product stability, sensory properties and**  
2 **subsequent liking by older adults**

3 *Roussa Tsikritzi<sup>a</sup>, Jianqiu Wang<sup>a</sup>, Vanessa J.Collins<sup>a</sup>, Victoria J. Allen<sup>d</sup>, Yiannis Mavrommatis<sup>b</sup>,*  
4 *Paula J Moynihan<sup>c</sup>, Margot A Gosney<sup>d</sup>, Orla B Kennedy<sup>a</sup>, Lisa Methven<sup>a\*</sup>*

5 *<sup>a</sup>Department of Food and Nutritional Sciences, University of Reading, Whiteknights, Reading RG6*  
6 *6AP, UK*

7 *<sup>b</sup>School of Sport, Health and Applied Science, St Mary's University College, Waldegrave Road,*  
8 *Twickenham, London, TW1 4SX, UK*

9 *<sup>c</sup>Institute for Ageing and Health, Newcastle University, Framlington Place, Newcastle upon Tyne,*  
10 *NE2 4BW, UK*

11 *<sup>d</sup>Clinical Health Sciences, University of Reading, London Road, Reading, Berkshire, RG1 5AQ, UK*

12

13

14 \* Corresponding author at: Department of Food and Nutritional Sciences, University of  
15 Reading, Whiteknights, PO Box 226, Reading, Berkshire RG6 6AP, UK. Email  
16 [l.methven@reading.ac.uk](mailto:l.methven@reading.ac.uk); Fax +44 (0) 118 378 7708; Telephone +44 (0) 118 378 8714

17

18 **Intended section : Sensory and Food Quality**

19 **Word Count : 6302**

20 **Short Title: Fortified sauces for older patients**

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 **Abstract**

29 There are potential nutritional and sensory benefits of adding sauces to hospital meals. The  
30 aim of this study was to develop nutrient fortified sauces with acceptable sensory properties  
31 suitable for older people at risk of under-nutrition. Tomato, gravy and white sauce were  
32 fortified with macro and micro-nutrients using food ingredients rich in energy and protein as  
33 well as vitamin and mineral premixes. Sensory profile was assessed by a trained panel.  
34 Hedonic liking of fortified compared with standard sauces was evaluated by healthy older  
35 volunteers. The fortified sauces had higher nutritional value than the conventional ones, for  
36 example the energy content of the fortified tomato, white sauce and gravy formulations were  
37 increased between 2.5 and 4 fold compared to their control formulations. Healthy older  
38 consumers preferred the fortified tomato sauce compared with unfortified. There were no  
39 significant differences in liking between the fortified and standard option for gravy. There  
40 were limitations in the extent of fortification with protein, potassium and magnesium, as  
41 excessive inclusion resulted in bitterness, undesired flavours or textural issues. This was  
42 particularly marked in the white sauce to the extent that their sensory characteristics were not  
43 sufficiently optimised for hedonic testing. It is proposed that the development of fortified  
44 sauces is a simple approach to improving energy intake for hospitalised older people, both  
45 through the nutrient composition of the sauce itself and due to the benefits of increasing  
46 sensorial taste and lubrication in the mouth.

47

48 **Keywords:** malnutrition, micronutrient, macronutrient, fortification, older people

49 **Practical Applications:**

50 This study developed macro- and micro- nutrient fortified sauces where the intended use is  
51 for older adults at risk of under-nutrition. The energy content was increased between 2.5 and  
52 4 fold compared to control formulations. Whey protein was successfully added to tomato and

53 white sauces. We note that excessive protein addition leads to textural issues and excessive  
54 potassium or magnesium inclusion results in undesired flavours. We propose that fortified  
55 sauces are a simple approach to improving energy intake for hospitalised older people.

56

## 57 **1. Introduction**

58 Older people (>65 years) often do not consume enough energy and / or nutrients to support  
59 their minimum requirements. Current estimates suggest that undernutrition affects 1.3million  
60 of people over 65 years of age in the UK (BAPEN 2011). This under-nutrition has been well  
61 documented to be associated with increased incidence of complications, longer hospital stays,  
62 reduced mobility, increased social isolation and reduced quality of life, and affects not only  
63 the older person, but also impacts on community and health service resources (Cowan and  
64 others 2004).

65 Maximising food intake is important for prevention and treatment of malnutrition, and this is  
66 sometimes difficult due to small appetite. One way of overcoming a small appetite is to  
67 fortify foods. Nutrient fortification can refer to the addition of either macronutrients or  
68 micronutrients to foods; or merely the addition of suitable condiments, such as a sauce, to  
69 foods. Previous studies have reported that the addition of sauces to a meal increased energy  
70 intake in older adults without affecting pre-meal hunger, desire to eat, or post-meal  
71 pleasantness (Appleton 2009). The increased energy consumption was mainly from fat and  
72 protein.

73 Within hospitalised older adults, it has been reported that meal macronutrient  
74 fortification can improve energy (+26%) and protein (+23%) intake (Gall 1998). When  
75 considering how to increase protein levels in foods for older people, both protein level and  
76 protein quality should be considered. Recent studies of individuals with sarcopenia have

77 found that whey protein stimulates muscle protein synthesis more effectively than casein or  
78 vegetable protein (Pennings and others 2011) .  
79 Best and Appleton (2011) found that the addition of both seasoning and sauce to an older  
80 person's meal resulted in comparable increases in energy, protein and fat intake, thus  
81 supporting a role for flavour enhancement in increasing the food intake of older people, as  
82 well as the role of the sauce itself. However, sauces may be more beneficial than dry  
83 seasonings when promoting food intake in older people due to the semi-solid nature of the  
84 sauce. In older individuals, where gastro-intestinal secretions and motility are known to be  
85 reduced or impaired (Cowan 2004), semi-solid foods may facilitate chewing and swallowing  
86 and aid the passage of foods through the digestive system (Appleton 2009).

### 87 *1.1 Micronutrient fortification*

88 Older hospital patients may be at risk of micronutrient deficiency due to low food intake,  
89 chronic diseases or medication (Bates and others 1999). Moreover, eating micronutrient-dense  
90 foods becomes increasingly important where appetite is small but vitamin and mineral needs  
91 remain high.

92 Considering the development of micronutrient fortified foods for older hospital patients, two  
93 approaches could be taken. One approach would be to provide a "full" nutrient supplement,  
94 the principle taken by oral nutritional supplement (ONS) beverages. An alternative approach,  
95 and the one taken in this study, is to fortify products with micronutrients for which there is  
96 substantial evidence within the older adult institutionalised community.

97 Evidence from the UK National Diet and Nutrition Survey (NDNS) indicates that the  
98 micronutrients that institutionalised older people are most likely to be at risk of deficiency of  
99 are iron, vitamin D, riboflavin, folate and vitamin C (Bates and others 1999). The study by  
100 Bates and others (1999) considered micronutrients where intake was low (more than 25 % of  
101 institutionalised participants with intakes below the RNI) or where more than 25 % of

102 institutionalised participants had biochemical indices low enough to be associated with  
103 deficiency. More recently the Food Standards Agency (FSA) guidelines for food provision  
104 for older adults in residential care (Food Standards Agency 2007) recommend levels five  
105 minerals (sodium, potassium, magnesium, iron and zinc) and three vitamins (riboflavin,  
106 vitamin D and folate). It should also be noted that the Department of Health recommended  
107 nutrient intake (RNI) values for minerals and vitamins give guidelines for the 50+ age group,  
108 but there are no such guidelines in place for an older age group. The most recent UK NDNS  
109 report from May 2014 (Public Health England 2014) summarises intake and deficiency of  
110 nutrients in adults over 65 years of age, but not in an institutionalised cohort. It concludes that  
111 in the over 65 age group mean intake of all vitamins met the RNI, except for vitamin D which  
112 only met 33% of the RNI. Regarding minerals, mean intakes of potassium, magnesium and  
113 selenium were below the RNI, although this was the case in all age groups. It was reported  
114 that mean intake of iron, calcium, vitamin C and folate were higher in the over 65 age group  
115 than reported in previous surveys. Although this is good news, there is no evidence to suggest  
116 that institutionalised older adults are meeting their RNI for these nutrients.

### 117 *1.2 Sauce Types*

118 Tomato based sauce, white sauce and gravy are three commonly used sauces in the UK  
119 (CookinInfo 2014), aside from the bottled sauces applied at the table (e.g. Ketchup). Tomato  
120 sauces are typically served on pasta or with meat or fish, with the tomatoes being an  
121 important source of carotenoids. White sauces are produced using fat, a thickener and milk.  
122 They are widely used in the UK within fish recipes and, to a lesser extent, within pasta.  
123 Gravy is typically applied to meat dishes as well as to vegetable and potato side dishes.  
124 Although traditionally produced using meat stock, meat fat and thickener, gravy is widely  
125 available as a commercial dried product containing stock, yeast extract and thickeners to  
126 which water is added before serving. Typically neither tomato sauce nor commercial

127 “instant” gravy, would be particularly energy or protein dense, while white sauces are  
128 generally more energy and protein dense.

129 In view of the potential for sauces to increase nutrient provision in older hospital patients the  
130 aim of this study was to develop a range of savoury sauces fortified with energy, protein and  
131 micronutrients, delivering high taste impact and acceptable sensory profiles for older adults.

## 132 **2. Materials and methods**

### 133 *2.1 Materials for Tomato Sauce*

134 A tomato base was prepared using chopped tomatoes (Napolina Ltd., UK), extra virgin olive  
135 oil (Filippo Berio Ltd., UK), garlic granules and onion granules (McCormick UK Ltd.), salt  
136 basil, parsley, oregano and lemon juice (local retailer). Fortified formulations (Table 1)  
137 contained combinations of sunflower oil, double cream, unsalted butter (local retailer),  
138 double concentrated tomato puree (Napolina Ltd., UK), whey protein isolate (WPI) (protein  
139 content minimum 94%, fat 0.2%) (Volac International Ltd., UK), maltodextrin (C\* dry,  
140 Cargill PLC, UK), and a de-oiled soybean lecithin (Emulpur IP, Cargill PLC, UK). Tomato  
141 puree was used to restore the red colour where ingredients resulted in a pale coloured sauce.  
142 The lecithin prevented separation of the sauces when extra lipid was added.

### 143 *2.2 Materials for White Sauce:*

144 White sauce (Table 2) was prepared using semi-skimmed (1.7% fat) or whole pasteurised  
145 milk (4% fat), salted butter, white flour, salt, nutmeg, white pepper and bay leaves (local  
146 retailer). Mineral water was used to compensate for the losses during cooking (Harrogate  
147 Spring Water Ltd., UK). Double cream (local retailer) or WPI (as above, Volac, UK) were  
148 added to increase energy and protein content.

### 149 *2.3 Materials for Gravy:*



150 Gravy (Table 3) was produced using commercial gravy granules (Bisto, or Bisto reduced salt  
151 gravy granules, Premier Foods, UK) and water (Harrogate Spring Water Ltd., UK).  
152 Fortification utilised unsalted butter or double cream (local retailer) soy sauce (Pearl River,  
153 sodium content 5.8g per 100ml, Guangdong PRB Bio-tech co, Ltd., China), Kikkoman low  
154 salt soy sauce (sodium 3.6g per 100ml, Kikkoman Foods Europe B.V., Netherlands) and de-  
155 oiled soybean lecithin (Emulpur IP, Cargill PLC, UK).  
156 Taste enhancement was achieved through the use of soy sauce and a commercial flavour  
157 enhancer (sodium 3g/100g, glutamate 16g/100g; Givaudan Schweiz AG, Switzerland).

#### 158 *2.4 Micronutrient addition to Sauce:*

159 A micronutrient blend (Lycored, Kent, UK) (an orange-yellow coloured powder) was used at  
160 0.1% (w/w). The premix (100 mg) contained iron (6 mg), zinc (6.4 mg), riboflavin (0.8 mg),  
161 vitamin B6 (0.86 mg), folic acid (134 µg), vitamin C (26.6 mg) and vitamin D (6.6 µg). In  
162 addition, the sauces were enriched with potassium and magnesium. Initially dipotassium  
163 hydrogen phosphate ( $K_2HPO_4$ ) (45% K by weight) (5.16% (w/w) addition), and magnesium  
164 oxide (MgO) (60% Mg by weight) (0.34% (w/w) addition) were used to provide one-third of  
165 the RNI of potassium and magnesium in 50g of sauce. However, due to excessive bitter and  
166 metallic taste these concentrations were lowered to 1.2% and 0.08% (w/w) for  $K_2HPO_4$  and  
167 MgO respectively following tasting trials. These percentages corresponded to 18.4% and  
168 14.2% of RNI for potassium and magnesium respectively in a portion of sauce (50g). The  
169 potassium salt was later replaced with 1.5% (ww) tri-potassium citrate monohydrate  
170 ( $C_6H_5K_3O_7 \cdot H_2O$ ) (36% K by weight) aiming to improve taste acceptability.

#### 171 *2.5 Tomato Sauce preparation*

172 Chopped tomatoes were blended (laboratory microniser), all other ingredients were added  
173 and the sauce blend was cooked (20 min, low heat, stirred at 10 min).

174 *2.6 White Sauce preparation*

175 Butter and bay leaves were heated (low heat) until butter melted. White flour added, stirred  
176 and heated (2 min). Milk added gradually, continuous stirred until the sauce reached boiling  
177 point (ca. 10 min). Other ingredients (double cream, WPI, micronutrients) then added, heated  
178 for a further 2 minutes, stirring occasionally. Sauce seasoned with salt, white pepper and  
179 nutmeg. Bay leaves removed and the sauce was re-diluted with water to account for 15%  
180 weight loss due to evaporation.

181 *2.7 Gravy preparation*

182 Boiling water was added to the commercial gravy granules, all additional ingredients were  
183 added, continuously stirring until dissolved and blended (electric hand blender, 1 min).

184 *2.8 Nutritional Profile*

185 Calculations were made in order to define the nutritional profile of sauces using the software  
186 Dietplan 6 (Forestfield Software Ltd., Horsham, UK).

187 *2.9 Sensory profile analysis*

188 All samples were frozen post manufacture (-18°C). For sensory analysis, samples were  
189 defrosted at ambient temperature for 2 hours, heated in a microwave (5 min, stirred at 2.5  
190 min) to a temperature of 75°C, and held in a heated trolley for up to 20 min.

191 Sensory profiling of sauces was conducted by a trained panel (n= 8 to 11; average age 48  
192 years). The panel developed a consensus vocabulary for all samples. Attribute scoring was on  
193 140 mm unstructured line-scales (scaled 0-100) using Compusense® software (Version 5.0,  
194 Canada). Panellists were seated in individual testing booths under artificial daylight, except  
195 for white sauce samples which were evaluated under red light. Samples were presented in a  
196 balanced order, coded with random 3 digit numbers. Scoring was carried out in duplicate on  
197 separate days.

198 *2.9.1 Sensory profiling of fortified tomato sauces*

199 Macronutrient fortified samples were initially compared to control tomato sauce (Table 1).  
200 The cream and WPI plus maltodextrin fortified sauces were further fortified with  
201 micronutrients and profiled.

202 *2.9.2 Sensory profiling of fortified white sauces*

203 Four samples were evaluated: Control, Energy Fortified, Energy, Protein and Micronutrient  
204 fortified and maximum nutrient fortified (Table 2).

205 *2.9.3 Sensory profiling of fortified gravies*

206 Macronutrient fortified gravy was initially compared to control gravy (Table 3). Energy  
207 enhancers were used (vegetable oil, butter, double cream) with soy sauce (Pearl River  
208 Bridge) to darken the colour. The macronutrient fortified gravy was then compared to options  
209 further fortified with micronutrients and / or flavour enhancement.

210 *2.10 Hedonic liking evaluation*

211 The part of the study to test the hedonic liking was given a favourable ethical opinion for  
212 conduct by the University of Reading Research Ethics Committee (study number 0830).  
213 Healthy older volunteers (n=31 for tomato sauce; n= 36 for gravy), age 62-87 years (mean  
214 age 71 years), rated their liking for tomato sauce and gravy samples on a hedonic category  
215 scale ranging from 1 (dislike extremely) to 9 (like extremely). The consumer tests were  
216 carried out in a central location where the tables were laid out to form a restaurant-like  
217 environment. All samples were presented monadically in a balanced order and labelled with 3  
218 digit random codes.

219 The tomato sauce samples initially rated were the control and the three macronutrient  
220 fortified samples (Table 1). Samples (30g) were served at  $75\pm 5$  °C in paper cups (100ml). In  
221 a separate assessment, the control tomato sauce was compared to the double cream plus

222 micronutrient fortified sample, where sauce (40+/-5g) and pasta (40+/-5g) were served in  
223 paper cups (100ml) with a plastic fork.

224 Two gravies were rated, the control and the macronutrient fortified option (table 3). Samples  
225 (20g) were served at 75±5 °C, poured over mashed potato (30 g) in transparent plastic dishes  
226 (200ml). Hedonic testing of the white sauces was not carried out (see discussion section 3.3).

### 227 *2.11 Data analysis:*

228 Statistical analysis of sensory profiling data was performed using two-way analysis of  
229 variance, with main effects tested against the sample by assessor interaction, and Fisher's  
230 LSD test for multiple comparisons, using Senpaq (SenPaq, v4.2; Qi Statistics Ltd; Reading,  
231 UK). The 9-point hedonic liking data was analysed using the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test  
232 using XLStat (XLStat version 2009, Addinsoft, France).

233

## 234 **3. Results and Discussion**

### 235 *3.1 Nutritional Information*

#### 236 *3.1.1 Tomato sauce*

237 The nutritional profile of the tomato sauces is shown in Table 5. The energy content of the  
238 fortified formulations was increased 3 to 4 fold compared with the control, predominantly  
239 through the use of high lipid ingredients; butter, vegetable oils and/or cream (Table 1).

240 Protein and carbohydrate levels were increased 1.9 and 1.5 fold respectively when WPI and  
241 maltodextrin were used. Table 4 compares the double cream plus micronutrients sauce  
242 variant (the variant selected for hedonic testing, section 3.2) to the dietary reference values  
243 (DRV) for macronutrients and reference nutrient intake (RNI) values for micronutrient, for  
244 older people (Department of Health 1991). Assuming a 50 g portion size of sauce, the  
245 maximum energy and protein provided was rather limited, 4% and 2% of the DRV

246 respectively. However it is expected from previous authors (Appleton, 2009) that the use of  
247 sauce would not only provide macronutrients itself, but also lead to a greater intake of  
248 nutrients from the meal to which it was applied. A portion size of 50 g is conservative, if used  
249 as a pasta sauce for example the portion size could be 2 to 4 fold higher, providing up to 16%  
250 and 8% of DRV for energy and protein respectively. Micronutrient addition enriched the  
251 sauces with vitamins and minerals. However, the ingredients used to achieve the  
252 macronutrient fortification also contributed to the micronutrient content of the sauce; all  
253 fortified sauces were higher in potassium and vitamin E, and to a lesser extent thiamine,  
254 riboflavin, niacin, pantothenic acid and biotin. The sauce fortified with double cream was  
255 higher in copper, iodine, retinol and vitamin D. The sauce fortified with WPI was higher in  
256 carotene and folate. A 50g portion of the double cream plus micronutrient sauce would  
257 provide 33% to 40% of vitamins D, B<sub>6</sub>,C, riboflavin, folate, iron and zinc as well as 13% and  
258 10% of potassium and magnesium requirements respectively.

### 259 *3.1.2 White sauce*

260 The energy content of fortified white sauces (Table 6) was 2.5 fold higher than the control,  
261 primarily due to whole milk and double cream (Table 2), which also increased the fat content  
262 more than three fold. Although WPI was used to increase the protein content, the overall  
263 increase was small, from 3.8 to 4.5 % (w/w). Whole milk and double cream increased the  
264 levels of retinol, carotene and vitamin E delivered, as they are fat soluble vitamins. The  
265 major contribution to micronutrients was through the addition of the vitamin and mineral  
266 premix (Table 6). It was noted however, that the macronutrient fortification led to a decrease  
267 in calcium delivered compared with the control, this was not intentional and could be  
268 rectified through the mineral premix addition in future developments. A 50 g portion of the  
269 maximum nutrient fortified would provide 35% to 43% of the vitamins (D, riboflavin, B<sub>6</sub>,  
270 folate and C), iron and zinc as well as 10 % of both potassium and magnesium RNI for older

271 people (DH 1991) (Table 4), however it should be noted that this sauce did not have an  
272 optimised sensory profile (section 3.3) and required further development. The 50g of portion  
273 of sauce would provide a limited amount of energy and protein, 6% and 4% of the DRV  
274 respectively. It was noted that as a dairy sauce it is relatively high in fat and provides 30 % of  
275 the DRV for saturated fats. However, it is also noted that the sauces were developed  
276 primarily for provision to undernourished older hospital patients where increasing energy  
277 intake is paramount. DRVs were predominantly used as a guide for the micronutrient  
278 fortification.

### 279 *3.1.3 Gravy*

280 The nutrient profile of the fortified gravies (Table 7) showed a 2.8 fold energy increase  
281 compared with the control, achieved predominantly through the increase in fat (over 5 fold),  
282 through the addition of cream, oil and butter (Table 3). The maximum fortification that was  
283 practically possible did not have a significant impact on overall protein level. The  
284 micronutrient content of the gravies changed substantially after the incorporation of the  
285 vitamin and mineral premix (Table 8). The maximum fortified gravy (the final variant tested,  
286 Table 3) was compared to daily recommendations based on the FSA (2007) guidelines for  
287 nutrients for food provided to older people in residential care in Table 4. A 50 g portion of  
288 this gravy would provide 33% to 34% of the vitamins (D, riboflavin, B<sub>6</sub>, folate and C) iron  
289 and zinc as well as 8% of both potassium and magnesium RNI for older people in residential  
290 care (Food Standards Agency 2007). The 50g of portion of sauce would provide only 3%  
291 energy and 1% protein of the DRV.

292 Across all three sauce types the macronutrient enhancement was partly achieved through the  
293 addition of high fat ingredients. The UK FSA recommendations (Food Standards Agency  
294 2007) for food provision to older adults in long term residential care recommend restricting  
295 fat intake to a maximum of 76 g per day, with a maximum of 24 g saturated fat per day. So,

296 certainly in long term care and in the community, routinely increasing fat content should not  
297 be recommended without taking into account the persons baseline nutritional and medical  
298 status. However, within acute hospital care setting that the sauces were designed for, the  
299 energy intake of older patients is of primary importance as opposed to fat intake restriction.

### 300 *3.2 Sensory and hedonic evaluation of tomato sauces*

301 Between the four tomato sauce samples initially tested (control and three macronutrient  
302 fortified samples) there were significant differences between 25 of the 32 consensus attributes  
303 (data not shown). In appearance and mouthfeel the control was thicker, darker, lumpier,  
304 grainier, more gelatinous and fuller bodied than the macronutrient fortified samples, due to its  
305 increased content of chopped tomato. Unsurprisingly, samples which had the oiliest  
306 appearance and mouthfeel were the ones which contained both oil and either butter or cream.  
307 The sample containing WPI and maltodextrin was not oilier than the control, despite oil  
308 addition. In terms of orthonasal smell and retronasal flavour, the control was less creamy and  
309 buttery; more herby and pungent, but had a significantly weaker tomato smell (mean values  
310 29 compared to 38- 44,  $p=0.006$ ), implying successful utilisation of tomato puree in place of  
311 chopped tomatoes in the fortified sauces. With regard to taste, the control was less sweet,  
312 more bitter and sour than the macronutrient fortified products. It was also significantly more  
313 salty than the WPI plus maltodextrin and the butter products. The control had the most  
314 astringent and burning after effect. When the four tomato sauce samples were presented to  
315 older volunteers, significant differences in mean hedonic liking were found ( $p< 0.0001$ ). Two  
316 of the macronutrient fortified options, those containing double cream and WPI plus  
317 maltodextrin, were liked more than the control (mean liking scores of 5.9 and 5.7 compared  
318 to 4.5). The sample containing butter was not significantly different in liking score (mean  
319 4.9) from the control.

320 The two preferred macronutrient options were progressed to micronutrient fortification. It  
321 was important to study the effect of mineral addition to sauce containing WPI to examine  
322 possible textural issues (coagulation, flocculation, viscous appearance) or taste issues (bitter,  
323 metallic). The resulting four samples were directly compared through sensory profiling.  
324 There were significant differences in 18 of the 46 consensus attributes (Table 8). The nutrient  
325 premix had a yellowish-orange colour due to the iron inclusion. The iron undergoes oxidation  
326 when in contact with air, forming iron (III) oxide which has a red-brown colour, explaining  
327 the darker colour of the sauce.

328 The addition of micronutrients appeared to reduce the viscosity and lumpy texture of the  
329 samples; although this was only significant in the cream variant. This may be attributed to the  
330 stabilising action of the citrate salt on dairy ingredients. It has been shown that the addition of  
331 chelating agents, such as tri potassium citrate, in optimum concentration, can improve heat  
332 stability and texture in dairy systems by reducing the concentrations of ionic calcium  
333 (Mekmene and Gaucheron 2011).

334 In terms of orthonasal smell and retronasal flavour the addition of micronutrients tended to  
335 lower sweet smell and, in the case of the cream sample, tomato smell, whereas meaty, fried  
336 onion and smoky flavours were enhanced. Of greater concern, the addition of micronutrients  
337 led to significantly higher bitter taste, which was more substantial in the WPI plus  
338 maltodextrin sample. Potassium and magnesium are known to have bitter taste at relatively  
339 low taste thresholds of 340 – 680mg and 100mg per litre respectively in pure solutions  
340 (Lawless and others 2003; Schiffman and others 1995), and they were present in the  
341 micronutrient enhanced formulation at 8840 and 730 mg per litre respectively. Bitter taste  
342 and meaty flavour remained higher in the micronutrient fortified samples as aftertaste effects.

343 With regards to mouthfeel, micronutrient addition tended to reduce grainy mouthfeel and the  
344 WPI plus maltodextrin variants were grainier than the cream ones. This may be due to the



345 powder form of both WPI and maltodextrin compared to the liquid form of double cream.  
346 Oily and gelatinous mouthfeel were highest in the micronutrient enhanced cream sample.  
347 As the cream variant with micronutrients tended to be less bitter, starchy and grainy than the  
348 WPI option, it was progressed to consumer testing. Two tomato sauce samples (control and  
349 double cream + micronutrients) were presented to older volunteers (n=31), however, the  
350 differences in mean hedonic liking did not reach significance ( $p= 0.096$ ). The control sample  
351 received a lower mean liking score (5.3) than the fortified product (6.0). The potentially  
352 negative attributes associated with micronutrient fortification, and detected by the sensory  
353 panel do not, therefore, appear to have reduced liking by the older consumers.

### 354 *3.3 Sensory evaluation of white sauces*

355 The four white sauce variants were described by 38 consensus attributes, of which 29 were  
356 significantly different between samples (Table 9). Although the micronutrient enhanced  
357 white sauces had a more yellow colour, this difference was not rated; red lights were used to  
358 avoid biasing panel scores of other attributes. Concerning appearance and mouthfeel, the  
359 control white sauce was significantly thicker, lumpier, more glutinous, more mouthcoating  
360 and less smooth than the modified formulations. This was attributed to the higher amount of  
361 flour used in the control. All sauces were frozen post manufacture, thawed and reheated for  
362 sensory profiling. Although the native starch in flour is cooked during sauce preparation, any  
363 remaining native starches would be extensively damaged after a freeze/thaw cycle (Arocas  
364 and others 2009). In future, a combination of native starches and hydrocolloids could be used  
365 to improve stability. In the present study the sauce was more stable with higher fat (cream and  
366 whole milk) and less flour.

367 Concerning orthonasal smell and retronasal flavour, the main significant differences were  
368 caused by the addition of micronutrients which led to higher ratings of fish, metallic and  
369 chemical aroma. The fish aroma was very high in the maximum fortified sample and was

370 attributed to the addition of K-citrate. Fishy aromas are typically caused by lipid oxidation  
371 and it is likely that this was catalysed by potassium. The chemical aroma occurred in both of  
372 the micronutrient fortified samples, hence is likely to be attributed to the inclusion of the  
373 vitamin and mineral premix and / or the magnesium oxide. Concerning taste, the maximum  
374 nutrient fortified sample was less sweet, and more salty, sour and bitter. The salty taste was  
375 attributed to micronutrient addition and not due to sodium which was virtually constant  
376 between samples (117-123mg Na/100g of sauce). Similarly, the minor difference in total  
377 sugars content (Table 6) does not explain the differences in sweetness, implying the tastes  
378 associated with the use of K-citrate (bitter, sour and salty) suppressed sample sweetness. Milk  
379 flavour was also lower where K-citrate, MgO and the vitamin/mineral premix were added.  
380 Creamy flavour was, as expected, higher following the addition of cream in the macronutrient  
381 fortified options, but suppressed where K-citrate was added. The control sample had a more  
382 starchy flavour, explained by the slightly higher level of added flour. Nutmeg and pepper  
383 flavour were suppressed by both the macro- and micro-nutrient fortification. The maximum  
384 fortified sample was most mouthdrying. This might be explained by the high levels of  
385 potassium salt, by the higher levels of protein (4.5%) in this sample, or a combination of the  
386 two factors. Previous studies have shown whey proteins to cause mouthdrying (Ye and others  
387 2012). The control sauce led to the most burning after effect, perhaps attributed to its lower  
388 concentration of fat (5.8%). Results of previous research indicated that increased fat content,  
389 up to approximately 20%, increases lubrication and decreases sensations of roughness and  
390 dryness in semi-solid foods (Wijk and Prinz 2005).

391 Summarising the results, macronutrient fortification led to a smoother sauce with, not  
392 surprisingly, a creamier flavour. Addition of micronutrients (vitamin and mineral premix plus  
393 MgO) did not substantially change the sauce attributes. However the addition of K-citrate at  
394 (1.6%; 698mg K per 100g sauce) led to fish and chemical off-flavours. Hedonic liking on the

395 white sauce formulations was not carried out as the micronutrient fortification remained sub-  
396 optimal.

#### 397 *3.4 Sensory and hedonic evaluation of gravies*

398 Of 38 sensory attributes used to describe the profile of the control and macronutrient  
399 enhanced gravies, only 7 were significantly different between samples (data not shown). The  
400 macronutrient enhanced options was equally as brown as the control, through the use of soy  
401 sauce (Pearl River); whereas initial samples developed were too pale once ingredients such as  
402 cream, butter and oil were added. Although this particular soy sauce was high in sodium, the  
403 macronutrient fortified gravy used reduced salt gravy granules to equalise the salt content of  
404 the two samples. The fortified option was thinner and less oily than the control in appearance,  
405 with a richer mouthfeel. It was less savoury and starchy in smell, with more buttery and dairy  
406 flavour.

407 Hedonic liking of the control gravy and the macronutrient fortified gravy found no significant  
408 difference ( $p=0.57$ ) with mean liking scores of 6.5 and 6.3 respectively.

409 The macronutrient fortified gravy was further modified by flavour enhancement (using a low  
410 salt soy sauce, rich in glutamate, plus a commercial flavour enhancer) and micronutrient  
411 fortification. The presence of micronutrients caused several changes to the sensory profile of  
412 the gravies (Table 10). Of 42 consensus attributes, 24 were significantly different between  
413 samples. The addition of micronutrients led to a lower brown appearance. When the  
414 commercial flavour enhancer was used, the addition of micronutrients suppressed aroma  
415 attributes such as savoury, onion, beef stock, red wine and acidic. Considering taste,  
416 bitterness was significantly higher with the incorporation of the flavour enhancer, but the  
417 differences were not substantial. Concerning flavour, the addition of micronutrients led to  
418 suppression of beef and red wine flavour, but caused mushroom and nutty flavours. The

419 addition of the powdered micronutrient premix caused a less smooth mouthfeel. Where the  
420 flavour enhancer was present, addition of micronutrients caused a less rich mouthfeel. In  
421 terms of after effects, both gravy types had stronger mushroom flavour after-effect where  
422 micronutrients were added. Overall the use of flavour enhancer significantly led to higher  
423 ratings of umami (savoury) taste and beef flavour, which might benefit the acceptability by  
424 older adults (Dermiki and others 2013). The incorporation of micronutrients only led to  
425 higher levels of potentially negative attributes (eg bitter), but to a relatively small extent.

### 426 *3.5 Limitations in the fortification of Whey Protein and Micronutrients*

427 The addition of WPI and the combination of WPI and micronutrients can lead to sauce  
428 instability. The macronutrient enhanced sauces developed in this study can be characterised  
429 as oil-in-water emulsions after the incorporation of high fat ingredients. Many food  
430 emulsions consist of droplets of fat or oil suspended in an aqueous medium. The interface  
431 between the oil and the water at the droplet surface must be occupied by surfactant molecules  
432 to prevent immediate aggregation or coalescence. Surfactants can be either small amphiphilic  
433 molecules (such as lecithin used in this study), and large surface active molecules, such as  
434 proteins (Biesalski and others 2003). Aggregation occurs where the surfactant layer cannot  
435 prevent the droplets from approaching one another. The net charge of a protein, and hence an  
436 adsorbed protein layer, is highly dependent on pH. If the pH is close to the isoelectric point of  
437 the protein, its net charge approaches zero, which favours aggregation. Emulsions containing  
438 whey proteins are generally unstable at pH values close to 5, especially if the emulsion is  
439 heated (Biesalski and others 2003). The presence of calcium ions is inversely related to the  
440 pH (Geerts and others 1983) and therefore affects the stability of the emulsions. This is  
441 explained by binding of the calcium ions to the phosphoserine residues of the caseins, which  
442 reduces the negative charge on the protein, and so reduces stability. In our case, emulsion  
443 instability occurred in all three types of sauce when a certain concentration of whey protein

444 isolate was exceeded. The addition of micronutrients in combination with WPI resulted in  
445 coagulation of the sauces and this phenomenon was observed during the freezing/thawing  
446 procedure. It has been reported that the casein micelles of milk are destabilised by slow  
447 freezing (cryodestabilisation) and storage at a temperature in the range -10 to -20°C. This  
448 causes a decrease in pH and an increase in the calcium ion concentration in the unfrozen  
449 phase of milk (Fox and Brodkorb 2008). The most unstable sauce was the white sauce and  
450 this might be due to its high concentration of milk constituents and their sensitivity to the  
451 presence of minerals. The samples that were unstable were unacceptable for sensory  
452 evaluation, therefore were not assessed. The maximum limit of WPI addition in each type of  
453 sauce was established in the presence of other energy fortifying ingredients. Above this  
454 maximum level, not only the texture and consistency of the sauce were affected but several  
455 sensory properties as well such as smell, flavour and after effects.

456

#### 457 **4. Conclusion**

458 This study demonstrated that a substantial increase in the energy and macronutrient content  
459 could be achieved in conventional sauces. This increase was implemented by the addition of  
460 ingredients such as double cream (all sauces), butter (tomato sauce and gravy), vegetable oil  
461 (tomato sauce and gravy), maltodextrin (tomato sauce), whole milk (white sauce), soy sauce  
462 (gravy) and WPI (tomato and white sauces), which are rich in macronutrients such as fat,  
463 carbohydrates and protein. This macronutrient fortification is considered suitable for the  
464 needs of many older adults at risk of malnutrition in an acute care setting. However, it is  
465 recognised that further development of such fortified sauces is needed to meet the needs of  
466 older adults with chronic conditions such as renal or cardio-vascular disease.

467 Micronutrient fortification appropriate to the needs of older adults was achieved in tomato  
468 sauce and gravy through the use of vitamin and mineral premixes, however the micronutrient  
469 fortification of the white sauce required further optimisation.

470 For all micronutrient enhanced sauces, matching 1/3 of RNI could not be achieved for  
471 potassium and magnesium (Table 4) due to unacceptability taste, flavour and after effects.  
472 Therefore, the concentration of these minerals had to be adjusted to a desired level in terms of  
473 acceptable sensory properties, in order to minimise bitter and metallic taste and after effects  
474 and to avoid any texture and instability problems. For the micronutrient fortified tomato  
475 sauce, the addition of 33-40% of RNI for some vitamins (riboflavin, B<sub>6</sub>, folate and C), Fe and  
476 Zn, plus 10-13% of RNI for K and Mg in a 50 g sauce portion (Table 4), resulted in a sauce  
477 that was higher in meaty flavour and more bitter. However, this did not reduce the liking of  
478 the sauce as rated by older volunteers. For the micronutrient fortified white sauce, the  
479 addition of 35-43% of RNI for vitamins, Fe and Zn, plus 10% of RNI for K and Mg in a 50 g  
480 sauce portion (Table 4), resulted in a sauce that was higher in fishy and chemical flavour as  
481 well as more bitter and metallic. However, when the K-citrate was excluded the fishy flavour  
482 and metallic taste were significantly lower. For the micronutrient fortified gravy, the addition  
483 of 33-34% of RNI for some vitamins, Fe and Zn, plus 8% of RNI for K and Mg in a 50 g  
484 gravy portion (Table 4), resulted in a sauce that was higher in mushroom and nutty flavour.  
485 Further studies of the hedonic liking of the fortified sauces with the target community of  
486 older hospital patients should be carried out, and in particular the sauces needed to be tested  
487 within real meals. It is recommended that this is done with the fortified options of sauces  
488 developed in this study, but also with an option excluding potassium. Potassium was found to  
489 contribute substantially to negative flavour and taste, cause issues of sauce instability, and is  
490 not recommended for older patients with renal disease (Sinha and Agarwal 2013).

491 Older patients with a diminished sense of taste and flavour perception could benefit from  
492 flavour enhancement of the sauces. In this study, flavour enhancement of the nutrient  
493 fortified gravy was carried out successfully using a commercial natural flavour enhancer as  
494 well as yeast extracts. Further development needs to include optimisation of flavour  
495 enhancers.

496 Finally, evaluating the effects of nutrient enhanced sauces on satiety post meal and appetite at  
497 next meal, as well evaluating of the effects on overall food and nutrient consumption is  
498 essential.

499 It is proposed that the development of fortified sauces is a simple approach to improving  
500 energy intake for hospitalised older people, both through the nutrient composition of the  
501 sauce itself and due to the benefits of increasing sensorial taste and lubrication in the mouth.

502

### 503 **Acknowledgements:**

504 This work has been supported by the New Dynamics of Ageing programme, a joint research  
505 council initiative via the ESRC as part of MAPPMAL (a Multidisciplinary Approach to  
506 develop a Prototype for the Prevention of MALnutrition in older people: products, people,  
507 places and procedures). We are grateful to sensory panelists and healthy older consumers for  
508 their contributions to this study, and to Lycored for the supply of micronutrients and, in  
509 particular, to the technical guidance provided by David Berry at Lycored.

510

### 511 **Author Contributions:**

512 LM, YM, PM, OK and MG designed the research; RT, JW, VC and VA conducted the  
513 research; RT and LM analysed the data; RT and LM wrote the manuscript; RT, LM, PM and  
514 OK had primary responsibility for the final content.

515

516 **References**

- 517 Appleton KM. 2009. Increases in energy, protein and fat intake following the addition of  
518 sauce to an older person's meal. *Appetite* 52:161-5.
- 519 Arocas A, Sanz T, Fiszman SM. 2009. Clean label starches as thickeners in white sauces.  
520 Shearing, heating and freeze/thaw stability. *Food Hydrocolloids* 23(8):2031-7.
- 521 BAPEN 2011. BAPEN's nutrition screening week 2011. Available from:  
522 [http://www.bapen.org.uk/screening-for-malnutrition/nutrition-screening-week/nsw-](http://www.bapen.org.uk/screening-for-malnutrition/nutrition-screening-week/nsw-reports/nsw11?showall=&start=1)  
523 [reports/nsw11?showall=&start=1](http://www.bapen.org.uk/screening-for-malnutrition/nutrition-screening-week/nsw-reports/nsw11?showall=&start=1). Accessed 2014 November 28.
- 524 Bates CJ, Prentice A, Cole, TJ, van der Pols JC, DoyleW, Finch S, Smithers G, Clarke PC.  
525 1999. Micronutrients: highlights and research challenges from the 1994-5 National  
526 Diet and Nutrition Survey of people aged 65 years and over. *Br J Nutr.* 82(1):7-15.
- 527 Best RL, Appleton KM. 2011. Comparable increases in energy, protein and fat intakes  
528 following the addition of seasonings and sauces to an older person's meal. *Appetite*  
529 56:179-82.
- 530 Biesalski HK, Brummer RJ, Konig J, O'Connell MA, Ovesen L, Rechkemmer G, Stos K,  
531 Thurnham DI. 2003. Micronutrient deficiencies - Hohenheim Consensus Conference.  
532 *Eur. J. Nutr.* 42(6):353-63.
- 533 Cowan DT, Roberts J D, Fitzpatrick J M, While A E, Baldwin J. 2004. Nutritional status of  
534 older people in long term care settings: current status and future directions.  
535 *International Journal of Nursing Studies* 41:225-37.
- 536 Department of Health. 1991. Dietary Reference Values for Food Energy and Nutrients for the  
537 United Kingdom, HMSO.
- 538 Dermiki M, Mounayar R, Suwankanit C, Scott J, Kennedy OB, Mottram DS, Gosney MA,  
539 Blumenthal H, Methven L. 2013. Maximising umami taste in meat using natural



540 ingredients: effects on chemistry, sensory perception and hedonic liking in young and  
541 old consumers. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture* 93(13):3312-21.  
542 English Sauces. 2014 Available from: <http://www.cooksinfo.com/english-sauces>. Accessed  
543 on 2015 January 28.

544 Food Standards Agency. 2007. *Nutritional Guidelines for Food Served in Public Institutions:  
545 Food served to older people in residential care*. Available from:  
546 <http://collections.europarchive.org/tna/20100927130941/http://food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/olderresident.pdf>. Accessed 2014 November 28.

547

548 Fox PF, Brodtkorb A. 2008. The casein micelle: Historical aspects, current concepts and  
549 significance. *International Dairy Journal* 18(7):677-84.

550 Gall MJ, Grimble GK, Reeve NJ, Thomas SJ. 1998. Effect of providing fortified meals and  
551 between-meal snacks on energy and protein intake of hospital patients. *Clin Nutr*  
552 17:259-64.

553 Geerts JP, Bekhof JJ, Scherjon JW. 1983. Determination of calcium-ion activities in milk  
554 with an ion-selective electrode-A linear relationship between the logarithm of time  
555 and the recovery of the calcium-ion activity after heat-treatment. *Netherlands Milk  
556 and Dairy Journal* 37(4):197-211.

557 Lawless HT, Rapacki F, Horne J, Hayes A. 2003. The taste of calcium and magnesium salts  
558 and anionic modifications. *Food Quality and Preference* 14:319 - 25.

559 Mekmene O, Gaucheron, F. 2011. Determination of calcium-binding constants of caseins,  
560 phosphoserine, citrate and pyrophosphate: A modelling approach using free calcium  
561 measurement. *Food Chemistry* 127(2):676-82.

562 Pennings B, Boirie Y, Senden JMG, Gijzen AP, Kuipers H, van Loon L. 2011. Whey protein  
563 stimulates postprandial muscle protein accretion more effectively than do casein and  
564 casein hydrolysate in older men. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 93(5):997-1005.

565 Public Health England. 2014. National Diet and Nutrition Survey. Results from Years 1, 2, 3  
566 and 4 (combined) of the Rolling Programme (2008/2009 – 2011/2012). In: Bates B,  
567 Lennox A, Prentice. A. B, C., Page P, Nicholson S, Swan G, editors. London.

568 Schiffman SS, Manning MP, Warwick ZS, Crumbliss AL. 1995. Detection of thresholds of  
569 potassium salts are related to the molar conductivity of the anion. *Brain Research*  
570 *Bulletin* 37:623 - 6.

571 Sinha AD, Agarwal R. 2013. Chronic Renal Disease Progression: Treatment Strategies and  
572 Potassium Intake. *Semin. Nephrol.* 33(3):290-9.

573 Wijk RAd, Prinz JF. 2005. The role of friction in perceived oral texture. *Food Quality and*  
574 *Preference* 16(2):121-9.

575 Ye AQ, Zheng T, Ye JZ, Singh H. 2012. Potential role of the binding of whey proteins to  
576 human buccal cells on the perception of astringency in whey protein beverages.  
577 *Physiol. Behav.* 106(5):645-50.

578

579

580 **Table 1 Tomato sauce formulations**

	<b>Control</b> (g/kg)	<b>Butter</b> <b>formulation</b> (g/kg)	<b>Double cream</b> <b>formulation<sup>a</sup></b> (g/kg)	<b>WPI +</b> <b>Maltodextrin</b> <b>formulation<sup>a</sup></b> (g/kg)
Chopped tomatoes	723	581	515	524
Unsalted butter	-	64	-	-
Olive oil	16	13	12	12
Sunflower oil	-	64	114	116
Tomato puree	-	64	114	116
Double cream	-	-	57	-
Maltodextrin	-	-	-	29
Whey Protein Isolate (WPI)	-	-	-	10
Onion granules	43	35	31	31
Garlic granules	16	13	12	12
Emulsifier	-	3	3	3
Salt	8	6	6	6
Basil (dried)	2	2	1	1
Oregano (dried)	2	2	1	1
Parsley (dried)	2	2	1	1
Lemon juice	8	8	6	6
Mineral water	180	145	129	131

581 <sup>a</sup>Formulations progressed to micronutrient fortification through addition of 1g/kg of vitamin and  
582 mineral premix, 15g/kg tri-potassium citrate monohydrate and 0.8g/kg magnesium oxide.

583 **Table 2 White sauce formulations**

	<b>Control (g/kg)</b>	<b>Energy Fortified (g/kg)</b>	<b>Energy, Protein and micronutrient fortified (g/kg)</b>	<b>Maximum Nutrient Fortified (g/kg)</b>
Semi-skimmed pasteurised milk	897	-	-	-
Whole pasteurised milk	-	610	603	592
Salted butter	51	41	40	40
Plain white flour	50	41	40	40
Double cream	-	305	301	296
WPI	-	-	10	15
Salt	1.0	1.0	1	1
Nutmeg	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
White pepper	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Bay leaves	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Vitamin and mineral premix	-	-	1	1
Magnesium oxide	-	-	0.8	0.8
Tri-potassium citrate monohydrate	-	-	-	15

584

585

586 **Table 3 Gravy formulations**

	<b>Control (g/kg)</b>	<b>Macronutrient fortified (g/kg)</b>	<b>Macronutrient &amp; Flavour Enhancer (g/kg)</b>	<b>Macronutrient &amp; Micronutrient (g/kg)</b>	<b>Macronutrient &amp; Micronutrient &amp; Flavour Enhancer (g/kg)</b>
Bisto gravy granules	86.3	76.8	0	0	0
Bisto reduced salt gravy granules	-	-	73.6	75.7	72.6
Double cream	-	34.7	33.2	34.1	32.7
Vegetable oil	-	23.1	22.1	22.8	21.8
Unsalted butter	-	46.2	44.3	45.5	43.7
Water	909	809	775	797	764
Pearl River Bridge Soy Sauce	-	5.8	5.8	5.7	5.7
Lecithin	5.1	5.0	4.9	5.0	4.8
Kikkoman low salt soy sauce	-	-	33.2	-	32.7
Flavour enhancer	-	-	7.8	-	7.6
Vitamin and mineral premix	-	-	-	1	1
Dipotassium hydrogen phosphate	-	-	-	12.8	12.6
Magnesium Oxide	-	-	-	0.8	0.8

587

588

**Table 4 Nutrients provided by the sauces compared to average daily requirements**

Nutrient	Average Daily Requirements <sup>a</sup>	Nutrients per 50 g portion			% of Daily Requirement		
		Tomato Sauce : Double cream plus Micronutrients Formulation	White Sauce : Maximum Nutrient Fortified Formulation	Gravy : Macro- and Micro-nutrient fortified with flavour enhancer	Tomato Sauce : Double cream plus Micronutrients Formulation	White Sauce : Maximum Nutrient Fortified Formulation	Gravy : Macro- and Micro-nutrient fortified with flavour enhancer
Vitamin D (µg)	> 10 µg	3.3	3.5	3.3	33	35	33
Riboflavin (B <sub>2</sub> ) (mg)	> 1.2mg	0.42	0.52	0.40	35	43	33
Vitamin B <sub>6</sub> (mg)	nr (> 1.3mg) <sup>b</sup>	0.46	0.47	0.43	35	36	33
Folate (B <sub>9</sub> ) (µg)	> 200 µg	71	74	67	36	37	34
Vitamin C (mg)	nr (> 40 mg) <sup>b</sup>	16	15	14	40	36	34
Potassium (mg)	> 3500 mg <sup>c</sup>	440	349	293	13	10	8
Magnesium (mg)	> 300 mg	30	30	26	10	10	9
Iron (mg)	> 9 mg	3.3	3.2	3.0	37	36	34
Zinc (mg)	> 9.5 mg	3.3	3.5	3.2	35	37	34
Energy (kcal)	> 1955 kcal	87	123	54	4	6	3
Protein (g)	> 50 g	0.9	2.3	0.5	2	5	1
Fat (g)	<74.5 g	8.0	11	4.5	11	15	6
SFA (g)	<23.5 g	1.8	7.2	2.3	17	30	10

591 <sup>a</sup>Food Standards Agency (2007) guidelines for nutrients for food provided to older people in residential care (Department of Health 1991 values)

592 <sup>b</sup>nr = no recommendation specified; but highlighted as low intake and/or deficient in older adults (Bates and others, 1999, Russell & Suter 1993)

593 <sup>c</sup>except in cases of renal disease where daily RNI < 274mg

	<b>Control (/100g)</b>	<b>Butter formulation (/100g)</b>	<b>Double cream formulation (/100g)</b>	<b>WPI +Maltodextrin formulation (/100g)</b>	<b>WPI + Maltodextrin + Micronutrients Formulation (/100g)</b>	<b>Double cream + Micronutrients formulation (/100g)</b>
Energy (kcal)	45	149	174	164	164	174
Protein (g)	1.5	1.6	1.8	2.8	2.8	1.8
Carbohydrates (g)	5.6	5.4	5.6	8.4	8.4	5.6
Of which sugars (g)	4	4.2	4.5	7.4	7.4	4.5
Fat (g)	1.8	13.4	15.9	13.1	13.1	15.9
Of which saturated (g)	0.3	4.5	3.5	1.6	1.6	3.5
Fibre (g)	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6
Sodium (g)	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Salt (g)	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
<b>Minerals</b>						
Sodium (Na) (mg)	351	281	290	292	291	290
Potassium (K) (mg)	282	311	343	346	884 <sup>a</sup>	879 <sup>a</sup>
Calcium (Ca) (mg)	30	28	26	29	29	26
Magnesium (Mg) (mg)	13	12	12	13	73 <sup>a</sup>	60 <sup>a</sup>
Phosphorus (P) (mg)	31	31	35	35	35	34
Iron (Fe) (mg)	0.73	0.74	0.65	0.68	6.66 <sup>a</sup>	6.65 <sup>a</sup>
Copper (Cu) (mg)	0.08	0.1	0.39	0.18	0.17	0.38
Zinc (Zn) (mg)	0.22	0.21	0.22	0.27	6.65 <sup>a</sup>	6.61 <sup>a</sup>
Chloride (Cl) (mg)	561	483	482	483	480	481
Manganese (Mn) (mg)	0.14	0.14	0.12	0.14	0.14	0.12
Selenium (Se) (ug)	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.5
Iodine (I) (ug)	3.6	2.9	4.6	2.6	2.6	4.5
<b>Vitamins</b>						
Retinol (ug)	-	-	44	-	-	44
Carotene (ug)	328	391	322	430	424	318
Vitamin D (ug)	-	-	0.02	-	6.59 <sup>a</sup>	6.62 <sup>a</sup>
Vitamin E (mg)	1.1	4.38	7.1	7.12	7	6.98
Thiamin (mg)	0.03	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.05
Riboflavin (mg)	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.82 <sup>a</sup>	0.83 <sup>a</sup>
Niacin (mg)	0.43	0.61	0.62	0.77	0.75	0.61
Tryptophan (mg)	0.252	0.251	0.277	0.262	0.26	0.268
Vitamin B6 (mg)	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.92 <sup>a</sup>	0.91 <sup>a</sup>
Vitamin B12 (ug)	-	-	Trace	-	-	Trace
Total Folate(ug)	8	9	8	11	145 <sup>a</sup>	142 <sup>a</sup>
Pantothenic acid, Pantothenate (mg)	0.18	0.21	0.25	0.24	0.24	0.25
Biotin (ug)	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
Vitamin C (mg)	6	5	5	6	32 <sup>a</sup>	32 <sup>a</sup>

595 <sup>a</sup>Micronutrients added directly as a premix

596

597

	<b>Control (/100g)</b>	<b>Energy Fortified (/100g)</b>	<b>Energy, Protein and micronutrient fortified (/100g)</b>	<b>Maximum Nutrient Fortified (/100g)</b>
Energy (kcal)	98	248	249	246
Protein (g)	3.8	3.1	4	4.5
Carbohydrates (g)	8.5	6.9	6.8	6.7
Of which sugars (g)	4.6	3.6	3.6	3.5
Fat (g)	5.8	23.3	23	22.6
Of which saturated (g)	3.9	14.8	14.6	14.3
Fibre (g)	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Sodium (g)	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12
Salt (g)	0.31	0.3	0.3	0.29
<b>Minerals</b>				
Sodium (Na) (mg)	123	118	119	117
Potassium (K) (mg)	156	127	128	698 <sup>a</sup>
Calcium (Ca) (mg)	122	98	102	102
Magnesium (Mg) (mg)	12	10	58a	59a
Phosphorus (P) (mg)	95	81	83	82
Iron (Fe) (mg)	0.15	0.15	6.51a	6.39a
Copper (Cu) (mg)	0.01	0.01	0.06	0.09
Zinc (Zn) (mg)	0.41	0.35	7.17a	7.05a
Chloride (Cl) (mg)	150	147	146	143
Manganese (Mn) (mg)	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.05
Selenium (Se) (ug)	1.1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Iodine (I) (ug)	29	31.7	31.3	30.7
<b>Vitamins</b>				
Retinol (ug)	18	270	267	261
Carotene (ug)	10	169	167	164
Vitamin D (ug)	-	0.1	7.09a	6.94a
Vitamin E (mg)	0.05	0.59	0.58	0.57
Thiamin (mg)	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
Riboflavin (mg)	0.23	0.21	1.05a	1.03a
Niacin (mg)	0.18	0.2	0.2	0.2
Tryptophan (mg)	0.667	0.565	0.558	0.547
Vitamin B6 (mg)	0.06	0.05	0.96a	0.94a
Vitamin B12 (ug)	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.7
Total Folate (ug)	10	8	150a	147a
Pantothenic acid, Pantothenate (mg)	0.66	0.46	0.45	0.45
Biotin (ug)	2.9	1.9	1.9	1.9
Vitamin C (mg)	2	2	30a	29a

<sup>a</sup>Micronutrients added directly as a premix



601  
602**Table 7 Nutritional profile of gravies**

	Control (/100g)	Macronutrient fortified (/100g)	Macronutrient & Flavour Enhancer (/100g)	Macronutrient & Micronutrient (/100g)	Macronutrient & Micronutrient & Flavour Enhancer (/100g)
Energy (kcal)	38	107	109	106	107
Protein (g)	0.2	0.3	0.9	0.3	0.9
Carbohydrates (g)	5.6	5.2	5.6	5.1	5.5
Of which sugars (g)	1.4	1.3	1.6	1.4	1.5
Fat (g)	1.7	9.5	9.1	9.3	8.9
Of which saturated (g)	1	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6
Fibre (g)	-	-	Trace	-	Trace
Sodium (g)	0.48	0.46	0.49	0.35	0.48
Salt (g)	1.2	1.16	1.23	0.86	1.2
<b><u>Minerals<sup>a</sup></u></b>					
Sodium (Na) (mg)	482	462	490	347	482
Potassium (K) (mg)	19	20	19	594	585
Calcium (Ca) (mg)	7	8	7	8	7
Magnesium (Mg) (mg)	3	3	3	51	51
Phosphorus (P) (mg)	6	7	7	7	7
Iron (Fe) (mg)	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.02	6.06
Copper (Cu) (mg)	0.02	0.02	0.02	-	0.02
Zinc (Zn) (mg)	0.03	0.03	0.03	6.42	6.42
Manganese (Mn) (mg)	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
Selenium (Se) (ug)	-	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Iodine (I) (ug)	-	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.4
<b><u>Vitamins<sup>a</sup></u></b>					
Retinol (ug)	-	27	26	27	25
Carotene (ug)	-	17	16	16	16
Vitamin D (ug)	-	0.01	0.01	6.61	6.61
Vitamin E (mg)	-	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.05
Thiamin (mg)	-	Trace	Trace	Trace	Trace
Riboflavin (mg)	-	0.01	0.01	0.8	0.8
Niacin (mg)	-	-	-	-	-
Tryptophan (mg)	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
Vitamin B6 (mg)	-	Trace	Trace	0.86	0.86
Vitamin B12 (ug)	-	Trace	Trace	Trace	Trace
Total Folate (ug)	-	Trace	Trace	134	134
Pantothenic acid, Pantothenate (mg)	-	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Biotin (ug)	-	Trace	Trace	Trace	Trace
Vitamin C (mg)	-	Trace	Trace	27	27

603  
604  
605

<sup>a</sup> Nutrient information for commercial gravy granules combined from pack declaration (macronutrient) and McCance & Widdowson food tables (micronutrient)

**Table 8 Sensory profile of the micronutrient enhanced tomato sauces (rated on 0-100 scale)**

Modality	Attribute	Double cream	Double cream + Micronutrients	WPI + Maltodextrin	WPI + Maltodextrin + Micronutrients
<b>Appearance</b>	<b>Lightness of Brown Colour</b>	59.8 <sup>b</sup>	69.5 <sup>a</sup>	54.8 <sup>b</sup>	56.1 <sup>b</sup>
	<b>Thickness</b>	63.1 <sup>a</sup>	49.1 <sup>b</sup>	64.3 <sup>a</sup>	57 <sup>ab</sup>
	<b>Lumpy</b>	28.7 <sup>a</sup>	21.7 <sup>b</sup>	31.6 <sup>a</sup>	27.5 <sup>ab</sup>
	<b>Green bits*</b>	20.8 <sup>b</sup>	25.6 <sup>ab</sup>	28.8 <sup>a</sup>	23 <sup>ab</sup>
	<b>Oily</b>	20.8 <sup>b</sup>	31.2 <sup>a</sup>	23 <sup>b</sup>	22.8 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Odour</b>	<b>Tomato</b>	57.1 <sup>a</sup>	45.8 <sup>b</sup>	50 <sup>ab</sup>	52.2 <sup>ab</sup>
	<b>Sweet</b>	38.1 <sup>a</sup>	30.1 <sup>b</sup>	37 <sup>ab</sup>	32.5 <sup>ab</sup>
<b>Taste</b>	<b>Bitter</b>	27.2 <sup>b</sup>	37.5 <sup>ab</sup>	28.2 <sup>b</sup>	43.5 <sup>a</sup>
	<b>Starchy</b>	20.1 <sup>b</sup>	26.4 <sup>ab</sup>	24.1 <sup>ab</sup>	31.6 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Flavour</b>	<b>Meaty (intense seafood type)</b>	11.1 <sup>b</sup>	25 <sup>a</sup>	7.1 <sup>b</sup>	28.2 <sup>a</sup>
	<b>Fried onions</b>	16.8 <sup>b</sup>	32.8 <sup>a</sup>	19.8 <sup>b</sup>	24 <sup>ab</sup>
	<b>Smoky</b>	10.2 <sup>ab</sup>	13.9 <sup>ab</sup>	8.4 <sup>b</sup>	16.6 <sup>a</sup>
	<b>Grainy</b>	29.6 <sup>ab</sup>	22 <sup>b</sup>	35.1 <sup>a</sup>	29.6 <sup>ab</sup>
	<b>Oily (mouthfeel)</b>	20.6 <sup>c</sup>	37.8 <sup>a</sup>	29.2 <sup>b</sup>	29.6 <sup>ab</sup>
<b>Mouthfeel</b>	<b>Gelatinous</b>	4.5 <sup>b</sup>	13 <sup>a</sup>	7.2 <sup>ab</sup>	7.8 <sup>ab</sup>
	<b>Pieces</b>	14.7 <sup>b</sup>	14 <sup>b</sup>	25.6 <sup>a</sup>	16.3 <sup>b</sup>
<b>After effects</b>	<b>Meaty (intense seafood type)</b>	9.8 <sup>b</sup>	20.5 <sup>a</sup>	8.3 <sup>c</sup>	19 <sup>ab</sup>
	<b>Bitter</b>	20.6 <sup>b</sup>	35.6 <sup>ab</sup>	21.1 <sup>b</sup>	37.5 <sup>a</sup>

607

608 <sup>abc</sup> Mean values with the same letter within the same row are not significantly different at p < 0.05609 \*Green bits were due to herb addition, differences are expected to be due to minor batch to batch  
610 variation611 Attributes were no significant differences were found between products were appearance: black  
612 bits, separated, watery; smell : herbs, onion, butter, chicken stock, cheesy, savoury, burnt; taste :  
613 salty, sour , sweet, umami, metallic; flavour : creamy, buttery, ripe tomato, cooked tomato, herbs,  
614 cheesy, burnt; mouthfeel : full body ; aftereffect : astringent (mouthdrying), burning, oily lips,  
615 mouth coating, metallic

616

617

618

619 **Table 9 Sensory profile of fortified white sauces (rated on 0-100 scale)**

		Control	Energy Fortified	Energy, Protein and micronutrient fortified	Maximum Nutrient Fortified
<b>Appearance</b>	Thick	79.6 <sup>a</sup>	39.1 <sup>c</sup>	54.5 <sup>b</sup>	40.2 <sup>c</sup>
	Lumpy	61.2 <sup>a</sup>	17.7 <sup>c</sup>	23.0 <sup>b</sup>	19.2 <sup>b</sup>
	Whisked	7.1 <sup>b</sup>	20.7 <sup>a</sup>	17.2 <sup>a</sup>	19.1 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Smell</b>	Milk	49.5 <sup>a</sup>	48.8 <sup>ab</sup>	45.5 <sup>ab</sup>	39.5 <sup>b</sup>
	Fish	10.0 <sup>b</sup>	10.2 <sup>b</sup>	19.5 <sup>b</sup>	42.9 <sup>a</sup>
	Vegetable soup (dry pack)	5.8 <sup>b</sup>	6.9 <sup>ab</sup>	11.5 <sup>a</sup>	8.1 <sup>ab</sup>
	Chemical	8.0 <sup>bc</sup>	5.1 <sup>c</sup>	14.8 <sup>ab</sup>	19.8 <sup>a</sup>
	Savoury	26.4 <sup>a</sup>	17.3 <sup>b</sup>	26.1 <sup>a</sup>	27.5 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Taste</b>	Salty	12.8 <sup>b</sup>	9.6 <sup>b</sup>	10.9 <sup>b</sup>	20.4 <sup>a</sup>
	Sweet	23.0 <sup>a</sup>	24.1 <sup>a</sup>	17.9 <sup>ab</sup>	12.1 <sup>b</sup>
	Sour	10.5 <sup>bc</sup>	6.4 <sup>c</sup>	12.8 <sup>ab</sup>	17.6 <sup>a</sup>
	Bitter	13.9 <sup>ab</sup>	9.9 <sup>b</sup>	14.8 <sup>ab</sup>	20.7 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Flavour</b>	Milk	53.2 <sup>a</sup>	48.8 <sup>ab</sup>	40.1 <sup>bc</sup>	33.8 <sup>c</sup>
	Cream	26.4 <sup>ab</sup>	38.3 <sup>a</sup>	32.9 <sup>a</sup>	20.0 <sup>b</sup>
	Starchy	38.3 <sup>a</sup>	18.4 <sup>c</sup>	29.2 <sup>b</sup>	31.1 <sup>b</sup>
	Nutmeg	37.3 <sup>a</sup>	28.7 <sup>ab</sup>	21.9 <sup>b</sup>	19.5 <sup>b</sup>
	Pepper	23.6 <sup>a</sup>	13.6 <sup>b</sup>	15.5 <sup>b</sup>	15.8 <sup>b</sup>
	Chemical	7.5 <sup>b</sup>	6.3 <sup>b</sup>	10.6 <sup>b</sup>	18.1 <sup>a</sup>
	Metallic	10.6 <sup>b</sup>	9.8 <sup>b</sup>	11.7 <sup>b</sup>	17.4 <sup>a</sup>
	Fish	7.8 <sup>b</sup>	7.0 <sup>b</sup>	13.3 <sup>b</sup>	34.8 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Mouthfeel</b>	Thick	73.8 <sup>a</sup>	32.5 <sup>c</sup>	50.6 <sup>b</sup>	38.3 <sup>c</sup>
	Smooth	22.2 <sup>b</sup>	52.5 <sup>a</sup>	43.0 <sup>a</sup>	45.1 <sup>a</sup>
	Glutenous	48.4 <sup>a</sup>	18.3 <sup>c</sup>	28.3 <sup>b</sup>	27.1 <sup>bc</sup>
	Mouthcoating	43.3 <sup>a</sup>	30.4 <sup>b</sup>	37.2 <sup>ab</sup>	37.3 <sup>ab</sup>
	Mouthdrying	27.6 <sup>ab</sup>	21.5 <sup>b</sup>	27.2 <sup>ab</sup>	32.4 <sup>a</sup>
<b>After effects</b>	Salty	10.5 <sup>ab</sup>	8.0 <sup>b</sup>	9.1 <sup>b</sup>	12.6 <sup>a</sup>
	Metallic	9.2 <sup>ab</sup>	5.7 <sup>b</sup>	8.4 <sup>b</sup>	13.6 <sup>a</sup>
	Salivating	18.1 <sup>ab</sup>	13.9 <sup>b</sup>	17.4 <sup>ab</sup>	19.8 <sup>a</sup>
	Burning	24.4 <sup>a</sup>	10.4 <sup>b</sup>	10.6 <sup>b</sup>	8.5 <sup>b</sup>

620 <sup>abc</sup> Mean values with the same letter within the same row are not significantly different at p <0.05621 Attributes were no significant differences were found between products were smell : mushroom, chicken, egg, cheese;  
622 flavour : butter, egg, cheese; mouthfeel : greasy ; aftereffect : umami

623

624 **Table 10 Sensory profile of micronutrient enhanced gravies (rated on 0-100 scale)**

		Macronutrient fortified	Macronutrient & Flavour Enhancer	Macronutrient & Micronutrient	Macronutrient & Micronutrient & Flavour Enhancer
<b>Appearance</b>	Brown	55.4 <sup>b</sup>	41.5 <sup>c</sup>	66.3 <sup>a</sup>	49.8 <sup>b</sup>
	Oily	21.5 <sup>ab</sup>	28.9 <sup>a</sup>	20.3 <sup>b</sup>	27.4 <sup>ab</sup>
<b>Smell</b>	Caramel	14.3 <sup>a</sup>	5.3 <sup>b</sup>	7.2 <sup>b</sup>	7.7 <sup>b</sup>
	Savoury	29.3 <sup>b</sup>	31.0 <sup>b</sup>	40.7 <sup>a</sup>	30.8 <sup>b</sup>
	Mushroom	23.1 <sup>ab</sup>	31.8 <sup>a</sup>	17.0 <sup>b</sup>	25.5 <sup>ab</sup>
	Onion	12.6 <sup>b</sup>	10.1 <sup>b</sup>	20.3 <sup>a</sup>	12.7 <sup>b</sup>
	Chicken	12.4 <sup>ab</sup>	15.5 <sup>a</sup>	7.7 <sup>b</sup>	13.5 <sup>ab</sup>
	Beef stock	16.7 <sup>ab</sup>	10.1 <sup>b</sup>	26.3 <sup>a</sup>	13.4 <sup>b</sup>
	Red wine	4.4 <sup>b</sup>	0.8 <sup>b</sup>	26.7 <sup>a</sup>	6.6 <sup>b</sup>
	Buttery	21.2 <sup>a</sup>	14.5 <sup>ab</sup>	12.1 <sup>b</sup>	11.3 <sup>b</sup>
	Acidic	8.0 <sup>b</sup>	8.1 <sup>b</sup>	16.3 <sup>a</sup>	9.7 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Taste</b>	Acidic	12.3 <sup>bc</sup>	10.4 <sup>c</sup>	26.0 <sup>a</sup>	18.4 <sup>b</sup>
	Bitter	13.4 <sup>b</sup>	20.1 <sup>ab</sup>	24.4 <sup>a</sup>	26.7 <sup>a</sup>
	Salty	22.1 <sup>b</sup>	23.0 <sup>b</sup>	31.0 <sup>a</sup>	30.5 <sup>a</sup>
	Umami	29.3 <sup>b</sup>	29.3 <sup>b</sup>	37.0 <sup>a</sup>	33.4 <sup>ab</sup>
<b>Flavour</b>	Creamy	17.8 <sup>a</sup>	14.7 <sup>ab</sup>	10.8 <sup>b</sup>	12.5 <sup>b</sup>
	Buttery	25.5 <sup>a</sup>	18.1 <sup>ab</sup>	18.5 <sup>ab</sup>	16.1 <sup>b</sup>
	Beef	17.6 <sup>b</sup>	11.1 <sup>b</sup>	29.2 <sup>a</sup>	17.4 <sup>b</sup>
	Mushroom	17.8 <sup>b</sup>	32.6 <sup>a</sup>	15.7 <sup>b</sup>	32.8 <sup>a</sup>
	Nutty	5.2 <sup>ab</sup>	11.6 <sup>a</sup>	1.8 <sup>b</sup>	10.9 <sup>a</sup>
	Red wine	4.9 <sup>b</sup>	2.1 <sup>b</sup>	26.5 <sup>a</sup>	8.7 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Mouthfeel</b>	Greasy	30.1 <sup>a</sup>	33.5 <sup>a</sup>	23.0 <sup>b</sup>	28.5 <sup>ab</sup>
	Smooth	52.2 <sup>a</sup>	40.8 <sup>b</sup>	55.2 <sup>a</sup>	41.8 <sup>b</sup>
	Rich	28.9 <sup>b</sup>	25.6 <sup>b</sup>	40.6 <sup>a</sup>	30.8 <sup>b</sup>
	Starchy	12.2 <sup>ab</sup>	14.4 <sup>a</sup>	10.5 <sup>b</sup>	11.8 <sup>ab</sup>
<b>After effects</b>	Salty	15.8 <sup>b</sup>	19.6 <sup>b</sup>	30.5 <sup>a</sup>	33.9 <sup>a</sup>
	Sweet	19.8 <sup>ab</sup>	13.5 <sup>b</sup>	21.4 <sup>a</sup>	17.1 <sup>ab</sup>
	Sour	4.8 <sup>b</sup>	9.3 <sup>ab</sup>	12.6 <sup>a</sup>	10.3 <sup>ab</sup>
	Mushroom	14.5 <sup>b</sup>	26.3 <sup>a</sup>	13.6 <sup>b</sup>	27.7 <sup>a</sup>

625 <sup>abc</sup> Mean values with the same letter within the same row are not significantly different at p < 0.05

626 Attributes where no significant differences were found between products were appearance: thick, opaque, bits; smell :  
627 fatty, starchy, boiled vegetables, nutty; taste: sweet; flavour: acidic, meat, burnt caramel; mouthfeel: mouthcoating,  
628 gritty, dry

629

630

631