

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

FLAVOR INTERACTION OF SOY PROTEIN AND TOMATO SAUCE

by

NORA CHAN

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF FOODS AND NUTRITION

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

JUNE, 1979



FLAVOR INTERACTION OF SOY PROTEIN AND TOMATO SAUCE

BY

LAI-YUE NORA CHAN

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

© 1979

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this dissertation, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this dissertation and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this dissertation.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the dissertation nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere thanks to her advisor, Dr. Mina McDaniel, of the Department of Foods and Nutrition, University of Manitoba, for her guidance throughout the entire project.

Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Ernest Hoehn, Department of Food Science, for his advice on the project, Dr. M. Samanta, Department of Statistics, for statistical consultation and Dr. Bruce Johnston, Department of Statistics, for assistance in computational work.

The author would like to extend special thanks to Ms. Karen Donaldson Erin, Ms. Janet Fabro, Ms. Marilyn Latta, Ms. Ruth Loewen, Ms. Linda Malcolmson and Dr. Mina McDaniel who faithfully attended taste panel sessions and contributed valuable ideas and opinions to the study.

ABSTRACT

Flavor interaction in a model system of soy/tomato mixtures was studied. The system consisted of a constant level of soy protein (5% w/w) in various concentrations of tomato sauces (55 - 100%). Since textural differences resulting from varying tomato concentrations might interfere with taste judgment, two series of tomato sauces of identical concentration were made up. Varying quantities of a thickener were added to one of the series, so that all the sauces were of equivalent viscosity.

A six-member trained panel defined the dominant odors of soy protein as whole grain-like, raw green beany, sweet and cooked cold potato-like; and its tastes as whole grain-like, beany, sweet and bitter. The odors of tomato sauce were described as fruit-like, heavy/earthy, acidic, metallic and canned tomato-like; while its tastes were described as acidic, harsh, bitter, astringent and canned tomato-like.

Perceived intensities of the tastes of tomato sauces as a function of tomato concentration were determined. The taste characteristics evaluated were overall taste, acidic, harsh, bitter and astringent. The intensities of the different tastes were found to increase with tomato concentration.

Combination of the soy and tomato components resulted in the repression of certain tomato flavors: harsh, bitter

and astringent. The presence of soy protein significantly reduced the intensities of the overall and acidic tastes of the tomato sauces. Reduction appeared to be greater at the lower concentration region. The slopes of the intensity functions were not significantly affected. Similarly, the individual odors and tastes of the soy protein became indistinguishable in the soy/tomato mixtures. The overall soy odor, taste and aftertaste were substantially reduced in intensities with the increase in tomato concentration in the mixtures. Pleasantness of the mixtures increased linearly with the increase in tomato concentration at a rate approximating those of the overall and acidic tastes of the tomato component in the mixtures. The addition of a thickener generally did not affect the intensities of the different tastes or the pleasantness of the mixtures.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	x
LIST OF APPENDICES	xii
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	3
A. Flavor of Soy Protein Products	3
B. Off-Flavor Development in Soy Protein	8
(1) Mechanism	8
(2) Flavor components	9
(a) Carbonyl compounds	10
(b) Alcohols	10
(c) Furan	11
(d) Phospholipids	11
(e) Phenolic acids	13
(f) Amines	13
C. Flavor Improvement	15
D. Flavor Interaction	16
(1) Taste interaction-masking	16
(a) Basic tastes	16
(b) Food systems	22
(2) Odor interaction-masking	24
(3) Flavor interaction in soy protein	27
E. Composition of Tomatoes	28
METHODS AND MATERIALS	32
A. Sensory Panel Selection	32
(1) Taste acuity	32
(2) Bitterness threshold	32

	Page
B. Sample Preparation	35
(1) Soy protein	35
(2) Tomato sauces	35
(a) Preparation of sauces	35
(b) Standardization of tomato sauce	
viscosity	36
(i) instrumental evaluation	36
(ii) sensory evaluation	37
(3) Soy/tomato mixture	37
(4) Storage of samples	39
(5) Presentation of samples	39
C. Soy Protein Characterization	39
(1) Aroma and taste description	39
D. Tomato Sauce Characterization	40
(1) Aroma and taste description	40
(2) Effect of tomato concentration on per-	
ceived odors and tastes	42
E. Soy/Tomato Mixture	45
F. Statistical Analysis	46
RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	48
A. Sensory Panel Selection	48
(1) Taste acuity	48
(2) Bitterness threshold	48
B. Standardization of Tomato Sauce Viscosity	49
(1) Instrumental measurement	49
(2) Sensory evaluation	49
C. Soy Protein Characterization	49
(1) Aroma and taste description	49
D. Tomato Sauce Characterization	52
(1) Aroma and taste description	52
(2) Effect of tomato concentration on per-	
ceived odors	52
(3) Effect of tomato concentration on per-	
ceived tastes	53
E. Soy/Tomato Mixture	60
(1) Tomato taste intensity	60
(2) Soy flavor	68
(3) Soy odor and aftertaste	70
(4) Pleasantness	73

	Page
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	76
REFERENCES	79
APPENDIX	86

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1. Effect of Steaming on the Flavor of Soy Flour	4
2. Odors and Tastes of Commercial Samples of Soy Protein Products	6
3. Content of Some Alcoholic Compounds in Raw Soybean	12
4. Content and Flavor Thresholds of Some Phenolic Acids in Defatted Soy Flour	14
5. Composition of Tomatoes	30
6. Percent Concentrations of the Four Basic Taste Compounds Used in Panel Screen- ing Test	33
7. Percent Concentrations of Caffeine Solu- tions Used in Bitterness Threshold Determination	34
8. Standards Used to Develop Aroma and Taste Descriptors of Soy Protein	41
9. Standards Used to Develop Aroma and Taste Descriptors of Tomato Sauce	43
10. Calculated Viscosity Values of Tomato Sauces of Various Tomato Concentra- tions	50
11. The Scores of Soy Odor Intensity in Soy/ Tomato Mixtures	71
12. The Scores of Soy Aftertaste Intensity in Soy/Tomato Mixtures	72

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
1. Level of Thickener vs. Percent Tomato Concentration	38
2a. Overall Taste Intensity Values of Tomato Sauces vs. Percent Tomato Concentration (Log-Log Co-ordinates)	54
2b. Acidity Intensity Values of Tomato Sauces vs. Percent Tomato Concentration (Log-Log Co-ordinates)	55
2c. Harshness Intensity Values of Tomato Sauces vs. Percent Tomato Concentration (Log-Log Co-ordinates)	56
2d. Astringency Intensity Values of Tomato Sauces vs. Percent Tomato Concentration (Log-Log Co-ordinates)	57
2e. Bitterness Intensity of Tomato Sauces vs. Percent Tomato Concentration (Log-Log Co-ordinates)	58
3a. Overall Taste Intensity Values of Tomato Sauces Before and After Soy Protein Addition vs. Percent Tomato Concentration (Log-Log Co-ordinates)	61
3b. Acidity Intensity Values of Tomato Sauces Before and After Soy Protein Addition vs. Percent Tomato Concentration (Log-Log Co-ordinates)	62
3c. Overall Taste Intensity Values of Tomato Sauces Before and After Soy Protein Addition vs. Percent Tomato Concentration (Reanalysed Data, Log-Log Co-ordinates)	63
3d. Acidity Intensity Values of Tomato Sauces Before and After Soy Protein Addition vs. Percent Tomato Concentration (Reanalysed Data, Log-Log Co-ordinates)	64

	Page
4. Soy Flavor Intensity Values of Soy/Tomato Mixture vs. Percent Tomato Concentration (Log-Log Co-ordinates)	69
5. Pleasantness Values of Soy/Tomato Mixture vs. Percent Tomato Concentration (Log-Log Co-ordinates)	74

LIST OF APPENDICES

- 1a. Composition of Unthickened Tomato Sauces.
- 1b. Composition of Thickened Tomato Sauces.
- 1c. Ballot for the Evaluation of Tomato Sauce Viscosity.
- 1d. Composition of Thickened Tomato Sauces.

- 2a. Ballot for Developing Aroma Descriptors of Soy Protein.
- 2b. Ballot for Developing Taste Descriptors of Soy Protein.

- 3a. Ballot for Developing Aroma Descriptors of Tomato Sauce.
- 3b. Ballot for Developing Taste Descriptors of Tomato Sauce.

- 4a. Ballot for Evaluating Odor Intensities of Tomato Sauces.
- 4b. Ballot for Evaluating Taste Intensities of Tomato Sauces.

- 5a. Ballot for Evaluating Odor and Taste Intensities of Soy Protein in Tomato Sauces.
- 5b. Ballot for Evaluating Pleasantness of Soy/Tomato Mixtures and Taste Intensities of Tomato Sauces With Added Soy Protein.

6. 5x5x2 Factorial Analysis of Variance of Panel Viscosity Judgment of Various Tomato Sauces.

- 7a. Comparison of Regression Lines - Overall Taste Intensity Values of Thickened and Unthickened Tomato Sauces.

- 7b. Comparison of Regression Lines - Acidity Intensity Values of Thickened and Unthickened Tomato Sauces.
- 7c. Comparison of Regression Lines - Harshness Intensity Values of Thickened and Unthickened Tomato Sauces.
- 7d. Comparison of Regression Lines - Astringency Intensity Values of Thickened and Unthickened Tomato Sauces.
- 7e. Comparison of Regression Lines - Bitterness Intensity Values of Thickened and Unthickened Tomato Sauces.
- 8a. Comparison of Regression Lines - Overall Taste Intensity Values of Thickened Tomato Sauces Before and After Soy Protein Addition.
- 8b. Comparison of Regression Lines - Overall Taste Intensity Values of Unthickened Tomato Sauces Before and After Soy Protein Addition.
- 8c. Comparison of Regression Lines - Acidity Intensity Values of Thickened Tomato Sauces Before and After Soy Protein Addition.
- 8d. Comparison of Regression Lines - Acidity Intensity Values of Unthickened Tomato Sauces Before and After Soy Protein Addition.
- 8e. Comparison of Regression Lines - Overall Taste Intensity Values of Thickened Tomato Sauces Before and After Soy Protein Addition (Reanalysed Data).
- 8f. Comparison of Regression Lines - Overall Taste Intensity Values of Unthickened Tomato Sauces Before and After Soy Protein Addition (Reanalysed Data).
- 8g. Comparison of Regression Lines - Acidity Intensity Values of Thickened Tomato Sauces Before and After Soy Protein Addition (Reanalysed Data).
- 8h. Comparison of Regression Lines - Acidity Intensity Values of Unthickened Tomato Sauces Before and After Soy Protein Addition (Reanalysed Data).

- 9a. Comparison of Regression Lines - Overall Intensity Values of Thickened and Unthickened Tomato Sauces After Soy Protein Addition.
- 9b. Comparison of Regression Lines - Acidity Intensity Values of Thickened and Unthickened Tomato Sauces After Soy Protein Addition.
- 9c. Comparison of Regression Lines - Overall Intensity Values of Thickened and Unthickened Tomato Sauces After Soy Protein Addition (Reanalysed Data).
- 9d. Comparison of Regression Lines - Acidity Intensity Values of Thickened and Unthickened Tomato Sauces After Soy Protein Addition (Reanalysed Data).
10. Comparison of Regression Lines - Soy Taste Intensity Values of Soy Protein in Thickened and Unthickened Tomato Sauces.
11. Comparison of Regression Lines - Pleasantness Values of Thickened and Unthickened Soy/Tomato Mixtures.

INTRODUCTION

The importance of soy protein has emerged with the increasing demand for new protein sources. The U.S. alone produced 42 million metric tons of soybeans in 1975 and the figure was expected to reach 61 million metric tons by 1985.

Soy protein offers an economical and nutritional alternative to the conventional meat protein. It has been estimated that an annual 500 pounds of soy protein could be produced from the same acre of land which could only raise 58 pounds of beef protein. With heat treatment and proper processing, the nutritive value of soy protein could be improved to approach that of meat and milk.

In spite of the great potential for food use, the application of soy protein in human foods is still limited. The greatest deterrent was found in the unpleasant flavors, especially beaniness and bitterness, associated with the product. Many attempts have been made to ameliorate this problem. Most of the methods aim at removing the off-flavor components or preventing their formation. However, recent studies indicate that these endeavours have not been entirely successful. Unpleasant flavors still exist in various commercial soy protein products (Kalbrener et al., 1971) and the addition of certain brands of textured soy protein to beef patties has been demonstrated to greatly detract from flavor desirability

ratings (Smith et al., 1976).

A practical alternative appears to be masking the off-flavor of soy protein with a food system that possesses flavors that are both pleasant and strong. The tomato seems to be a suitable food to serve this purpose. It has a strong flavor and is well liked by most people in North America. Tomato juice has demonstrated a superior masking ability for bitterness when compared to another food (Mackey and Valassi, 1956). The major amino acids in tomatoes are glutamic and aspartic acids which have been found useful for masking bitterness (Watanabe, 1974). A glutamic acid rich oligopeptide also displays potent bitter-masking activity (Noguchi et al., 1975). As well, the most common use of soy protein lies in the extension of communitated meat products such as ground meat patties, meat sauce and sausages where the use of tomato sauce is customary. It was decided, therefore, to observe the masking effect of tomato flavors on the flavors of soy protein.

The major objectives of the present study are as follows:

1. To develop a model system in which to test the interaction between soy and tomato flavors.
 - a. To determine the sensory attributes of the model system — flavor characteristics and intensities of the soy and tomato components.
 - b. To test the effect of cornstarch, used as a thickening agent, on the sensory attributes of the model system.
2. To determine qualitatively and quantitatively the soy/tomato flavor interaction in the presence and absence of the thickening agent.
3. To observe the pleasantness of the soy/tomato mixtures.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A. Flavor of Soy Protein Products

Much effort has been expended to achieve a bland soy protein product. However, experimental evidence consistently confirmed the presence of undesirable flavors in soy protein, the most predominant ones being beaniness and bitterness. Slight variations in flavor had been observed in various product forms due to the different kinds of processing applied.

Moser et al. (1967) evaluated the effect of steaming on the flavors of full fat soy flour. A 16-member trained panel was selected to evaluate a 25% aqueous soy flour slurry on a 10-point scale (1 = strong; 10 = bland). The raw full fat soy flour which served as the control was rated a low 1.5 with flavors described as beany, bitter and green in order of their prominence (Table 1). The flavor was significantly improved to a score of 6.3 with steaming up to a duration of 20 minutes. The green flavor disappeared, bitterness was reduced while new flavors: nutty, toasted, sweet emerged. Honig et al. (1969) described raw defatted soybean meal as possessing green, beany, bitter flavors, with a throat-catching, lingering aftertaste. However, the conditions of the tasting procedures were not detailed. Kalbrener et al. (1971) substantiated the above findings in their study of the odors and tastes of various commercial de-

TABLE 1
EFFECT OF STEAMING ON THE FLAVOR OF SOY FLOUR

Steaming duration (min.)	Flavor score ^a	Flavor description
0	1.5	beany, bitter, green
3	4.5	beany, bitter, nutty, sweet, toasted
10	6.0	beany, nutty, bitter, toasted, sweet
20	6.3	beany, nutty, bitter, toasted, sweet
40	6.1	beany, nutty, bitter, toasted, sweet

^a 1 = strong; 10 = bland.

(from Moser et al., 1967)

fatted soybean flavors, concentrates and isolates. Samples were presented to a 17-member panel as 2% dispersion in water. The panelists rated the odor and taste intensities of each sample on a 10-point scale (1 = strong; 10 = bland) and described the predominant odors and tastes present. Table 2 contains the intensity scores of the samples with a list of their odor and taste descriptors. Apparently, the additional processing procedures necessary to produce concentrates and isolates did not substantially affect the odor and taste intensities of soy protein, as all the three types of products achieved a similar maximum score. The effect of processing, however, was reflected in the descriptions. While some odor descriptors such as beany, cornmeal, CW (a combination of cereal and singed wool in water) were common to all, each type of product possessed a slightly different odor profile from the others. The predominant tastes in all the products were beaniness and bitterness. However, differences again appeared in the description of each type. The green beany taste was peculiar only to the soy flour. Astringency was noted only in the concentrates and isolates. The isolates received the most varied responses including cardboard, chalky, mealy, toasted, flour and nutty.

The range of odor and taste intensity scores within individual product type reflected the variability in quality among the commercial products. The flour samples exhibited the widest score range and the isolates the least. The considerable improvement in the scores of some flour samples was