



HAL
open science

Addressing various challenges related to food bolus and nutrition with the AM2 mastication simulator

Marie-Agnès Peyron, Véronique Santé-Lhoutellier, Dominique Dardevet, M. Hennequin, Didier Remond, François Olivier, A. Woda

► To cite this version:

Marie-Agnès Peyron, Véronique Santé-Lhoutellier, Dominique Dardevet, M. Hennequin, Didier Remond, et al.. Addressing various challenges related to food bolus and nutrition with the AM2 mastication simulator. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 2019, 97, pp.105229. 10.1016/j.foodhyd.2019.105229 . hal-02318545

HAL Id: hal-02318545

<https://hal.science/hal-02318545>

Submitted on 25 Oct 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 ADDRESSING VARIOUS CHALLENGES RELATED TO FOOD BOLUS AND
2 NUTRITION WITH THE AM² MASTICATION SIMULATOR

3

4 M.-A. Peyron^a, V. Santé-Lhoutellier^b, D. Dardevet^a, M. Hennequin^{c,d}, D. Rémond^a, O.
5 François^c, A. Woda^c

6

7 ^a Université Clermont Auvergne, INRA, UNH, Unité de Nutrition Humaine, CRNH
8 Auvergne, F-63000 Clermont-Ferrand, France

9 ^b INRA, QuaPA, UR370, F-63122 Saint Genès Champanelle, France

10 ^c Université Clermont Auvergne, CROC, F-63000 Clermont-Ferrand, France

11 ^d CHU Clermont-Ferrand, Service Odontologie, F-63003 Clermont-Ferrand, France

12

13 Corresponding author:

14 Marie-Agnès PEYRON

15 INRA, Human Nutrition Unit, Theix

16 63122 Saint Genès Champanelle

17 France

18 Phone (+33) 4 73 62 42 05

19 marie-agnes.peyron@inra.fr

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 Abstract

27 Preparing a food bolus for swallowing is the first and major goal of oral processing ensured
28 by mastication. To fulfill this goal, mastication is accurately adjusted to the structure and
29 texture of the food. Since the bolus is the main outcome of food oral processing, there is
30 growing interest in improving understanding the food bolus and its features at the end of the
31 masticatory sequence and throughout its formation. Although this step is trivial, its execution
32 is somewhat more complex than it appears. Until now, the food bolus produced has not
33 subjected to full analysis, mainly due to the lack of accessibility during *in vivo* oral
34 processing.

35 To overcome this difficulty, we developed a masticator apparatus, named AM², on the basis
36 of *in vivo* compression and shear stresses applied on food during oral processing. The
37 apparatus was validated against particle size analyses of boluses produced by individuals
38 presenting normal mastication. The present paper provides a comprehensive overview of the
39 various potential uses of the AM² apparatus to produce food boluses for a large range of
40 scientific needs.

41 The food bolus contains much valuable information regarding the progress of mastication, the
42 completion of the function and its role in food disruption, the oral release of food compounds,
43 changes and bioaccessibility, and finally its impact on nutrition. The AM² apparatus can also
44 be used to simulate mastication in specific populations, such as the elderly and children, and
45 to address various objectives related to this initial step of digestion.

46

47

48 Keywords

49 artificial mastication, food bolus, oral release, oral bioaccessibility, oral digestion, nutrition

50

51

52

53 Highlights

- 54 • The mastication simulator provides food bolus for many foods and various purposes.
- 55 • Food disruption, the oral release of food compounds, and digestion can be analyzed.
- 56 • Food bolus analysis provides pertinent knowledge on deficient mastication.
- 57 • AM² reveals *in vitro* bolus features (dynamics, formation) in various oral conditions.
- 58 • AM² is a very attractive model for mechanistic digestion/nutrition studies.

59

60

61 1. Introduction

62

63 Food oral processing and more specifically the ready-to-swallow food bolus have become
64 major topics of interest in food and dental science (Engelen, Fontijn-Tekamp, & Bilt, 2005)
65 and in the field of nutrition (Bonnet, Batisse, Peyron, Nicolas, & Hennequin, 2018; Chen,
66 2009, 2015; Engelen, Fontijn-Tekamp, & Bilt, 2005; Ng et al., 2017). Food bolus analysis is
67 at the crossroads between food structure (Gao, Wong, Lim, Henry, & Zhou, 2015), food
68 formulation, the oral perception of food, food oral processing (Hwang et al., 2012; Jalabert-
69 Malbos, Mishellany-Dutour, Woda, & Peyron, 2007; Koç et al., 2014; Shiozawa, Kohyama,
70 & Yanagisawa, 2003) and the further stages of digestion (Hoebler, Devaux, Karinhi,
71 Belleville, & Barry, 2000; Hoebler et al., 1998), including oral digestion and related nutrient
72 bioaccessibility (Ellis et al., 2004; Grundy et al., 2015). However, the mere fact that food
73 bolus formation occurs inside the mouth and that access inside the mouth is not possible
74 during mastication hampers most study designs. Collecting the ready-to-swallow bolus in
75 normal or deficient subjects is not a simple procedure. Among other reasons, the bolus is

76 often partly swallowed before the final swallow event (Hiemae et al., 1996), the bolus itself
77 is mixed in an unknown proportion with saliva, making it impossible to determine the
78 proportion of saliva, food fluids and solid nutrients present within the bolus during the
79 masticatory process. During chewing, several physico-chemical processes are at work,
80 transforming the characteristics of the final bolus in an uncontrolled way. In addition, asking
81 volunteers to masticate is sometimes impossible for several reasons such as the use of
82 “experimental” or non-natural food, the presence of food contaminants, the chewers studied
83 are disabled, young children or elderly people, or simply because it is too time consuming.
84 Therefore, *in vitro* mastication using a mastication simulator is a valuable alternative to an *in*
85 *vivo* approach for the experimental production and analysis of food boluses. This kind of
86 simulator also provides solutions for multiple analyzes of food bolus properties at the time of
87 swallowing or of the kinetics involved during its formation, and it provides a more realistic
88 oral simulation than that frequently ~~done~~ performed before (Funami, 2016; Hedrén, Diaz, &
89 Svanberg, 2002; Hoebler et al., 2002; Minekus et al., 2014). The possible questions of interest
90 include saliva impregnation, the oral release of nutrients and oral digestion assessment,
91 investigations on the impact of food formulation on the food bolus and its characteristics, for
92 example, in the design of new foods for targeted populations (the elderly, children, non-
93 cooperative human subjects, and even animals). It can also be used to examine the oral release
94 of nutrients and of active, toxic substances and food contaminants from the matrix being
95 chewed, for example, to evaluate the role of the oral cavity in the balance between the oral
96 bioaccessibility and bioavailability of nutrients. Using a mastication simulator is also very
97 useful for the production of specific food boluses to address the fate of the food in the
98 digestive tract. Numerous studies are conducted with a simulated bolus produced by mincing,
99 mixing or crushing a food sample without any control of particle size distribution and saliva
100 action in the pre-swallow food bolus before its subjection to artificial digestion (Bornhorst &

101 Singh, 2013; Mandalari et al., 2018; Minekus et al., 2014). A food bolus produced by a
102 mastication simulator is more realistic, closer to the material passing through the esophagus
103 and arriving in the stomach, and it can be subjected to artificial, static or dynamic digestion
104 more pertinently. Indeed the oral step of food destructurement by mastication is very often
105 badly simulated in digestion studies and sometimes not considered at all, even when
106 remarkable *in vitro* digestion models are used (Dupont et al., 2018; Hoebler et al., 2002; Kong
107 & Singh, 2008b; Minekus et al., 2014; Shani-Levi et al., 2017). Since the AM² can produce a
108 realistic food bolus, its association with digestion equipment such as the DIDGI® apparatus
109 (Ménard et al., 2014; Sayd, Chambon, & Santé-Lhoutellier, 2016) makes it possible to assess
110 the role of mastication in the subsequent steps of digestion. From this perspective, studies
111 could be performed on the role of oral microbiota in bolus formation, nutrient release and
112 digestion when mixed with the intestinal microbiota.

113 As already reviewed, several artificial mastication simulators have been developed but
114 most of them are unable to produce a food bolus for further analysis or use (Morell,
115 Hernando, & Fiszman, 2014; Peyron & Woda, 2016). The Artificial Masticatory Advanced
116 Machine (AM²) was developed and validated against *in vivo* data to address multiple issues
117 regarding in-mouth food processing and the resulting food bolus (Woda et al., 2010a). Its
118 purpose was to simulate the result of mastication, *i.e.* to produce a food bolus with properties
119 similar to those produced by natural mastication, taking into account food oral management as
120 described in the literature (Chen, 2009). The anatomical features of the teeth and mouth were
121 not duplicated. On the contrary, the basic characteristics of jaw movement and other oral
122 parameters at work during chewing were mimicked so that the production of a pre-swallow
123 food bolus with the AM² obeys natural physiological laws (Lund & Kolta, 2006; Woda,
124 Foster, Mishellany, & Peyron, 2006). Consequently, after correctly selecting the
125 programming, the granulometry of the food boluses obtained at different times during the

126 chewing process were similar *in vitro* and *in vivo*, thus providing the basis for validating the
127 apparatus (Mishellany-Dutour et al., 2011; Woda et al., 2010a). Until now, very few of the
128 results obtained with this tool have been published (Peyron, Santé-Lhoutellier, François, &
129 Hennequin, 2018). This article presents an overview of several types of original results
130 obtained with the AM² in the fields of food and nutrition science related to oral processing.
131 The results presented in Fig.12 are the only ones adapted from the paper published previously
132 (Peyron et al., 2018). Other versions of the AM² masticator apparatus could be produced to
133 demand. Designing modified prototypes is also undoubtedly a realistic goal in view to
134 satisfying specific needs to answer various potential scientific questions.

135

136 **2. The masticator apparatus AM²**

137

138 *2.1 Description of the masticatory apparatus AM²*

139

140 The complete description of the apparatus and its validation were provided in previous
141 papers (Mishellany-Dutour et al., 2011; Woda et al., 2010a). Briefly, this tool is composed of
142 a cylindrical cavity that constitutes a masticatory chamber (Fig. 1). The two ends of the
143 cylindrical chamber are formed by a fixed masticatory **disk** (=“maxillary disk”) on one side,
144 and a mobile masticatory **disk** (=“mandibular disk”) on the other, to simulate the dental arch.
145 These masticatory disks have surfaces whose shape differs from human dental anatomy but
146 are similar to the contact surface area at work in human mastication. They are designed to
147 produce the same types of shear and compression stresses as those exerted *in vivo*. The mobile
148 masticatory **disk** is moved like a piston by two motors imparting translational and rotational
149 movements like those described during food management in the mouth during mastication. A
150 spring is located behind the fixed maxillary disk. The force generated for food compression

151 during mastication depends on the stiffness of the spring which is chosen as a function of food
152 resistance (Mishellany-Dutour et al., 2011; Woda et al., 2010a). The actions of shearing food
153 material, as well as gathering particles and transporting them to the masticatory surface are
154 performed by the rotational movement of the mandibular disk, as the tongue would do. Water
155 or a validated artificial saliva (Roger-Leroi, Mishellany-Dutour, Woda, Marchand, & Peyron,
156 2012) can be injected at the beginning and / or by staggered injections during the masticatory
157 sequence.

158

159 *2.2 Programming of the masticatory apparatus AM²*

160

161 Whatever the objective of the study, a common procedure is used for all foods when
162 programming the AM² masticatory apparatus. It is always based on preliminary *in vivo* data
163 collected both from subjects presenting the oral conditions selected for the experiment
164 (healthy oral condition, edentate, etc.) and from the granulometric characteristics of the food
165 bolus collected (Jalabert-Malbos et al., 2007; Ngom, Diagne, Aïdara-Tamba, & Sene, 2007;
166 van der Bilt, Abbink, Mowlana, & Heath, 1993). The cumulative particle size distribution
167 curves obtained are used for comparing *in vivo* and *in vitro* food boluses. The median particle
168 size d₅₀, extracted from the cumulative curve by extrapolation and projection on the x-axis,
169 and defined as the theoretical sieve size through which 50% of the bolus mass can pass, is
170 also used for comparisons. To obtain the most efficient programming, comparisons are made
171 after successive adjustments of the AM² parameters until the *in vivo* and *in vitro* curves and
172 d₅₀ values match each other.

173 The adjustments made to the mechanical parameters can be of many types and depend on
174 the food masticated.. Briefly, the range of forces to be applied will depend on the spring
175 chosen according its stiffness (from 10.38 to 35.2 N/mm). As examples derived from

176 experimental tests, the mastication of a French baguette sample would be done with the 10.38
177 N/mm spring and a raw carrot sample with the 25 N/mm spring. The number of masticatory
178 cycles is always obtained from the *in vivo* measurements of mastication of the food
179 considered. A large angle (around 200°) is chosen for a “fibrous” food, such as meat needing
180 more shear stress to be disrupted compared to a brittle food such as cookies for which an
181 angle of 90° is enough. Various rotational angles are also tested for gathering particles. The
182 temperature of the masticatory chamber can be regulated at 36°C if the oral processing
183 studied is temperature dependent. Water, human or artificial saliva can be used for
184 mastication. The flow and composition of artificial saliva with respect to mucin and enzyme
185 contents (amylase and lipase, for example) can be chosen according to the scientific issue to
186 be addressed (Roger-Leroi et al., 2012). Fig. 2 shows an example of the programming
187 approach in which two numbers of masticatory cycles and two levels of spring-induced forces
188 were sequentially changed in the programming of the masticator apparatus to find the best fit
189 with the *in vivo* particle size distribution curve in meat bolus analyzed at swallowing time. As
190 shown in Fig. 2, by performing the same number of masticatory cycles as observed *in vivo*,
191 the stiff spring (23.5 N/mm) overly-disrupted the meat bolus compared to the softer spring
192 (18.2 N/mm). Finally, after progressive adjustment, the mean particle size distribution curves
193 of the meat boluses obtained *in vivo* and *in vitro* in the conditions selected were identical at
194 swallowing time (Fig. 2).

195 Similar *in vivo* - *in vitro* agreements have also been reported for pork meat and green olive
196 (Peyron & Woda, 2016). Several examples are shown in Fig. 3 for gherkins, a mouthful of
197 beef, minced beef, Frankfurt sausages, coconut and a pasta product. *In vivo* - *in vitro*
198 agreements were also observed when mastication was interrupted at different times while
199 chewing carrots or peanuts (Mishellany-Dutour et al., 2011a) and with pork meat in Fig. 4 (A
200 and B). Fig. 4c shows that the difference observed in the particle size distributions, as well as

201 in d50 values, between two types of bread *in vivo* can be completely reproduced *in vitro*.

202 A complete validation of the apparatus should also be performed by considering other
203 physical properties of the food bolus, for example, using an instrumental Texture Profile
204 Analysis (TPA) test consisting in applying double compression on the food bolus. Despite its
205 empirical nature, this test is useful to compare the properties of food boluses collected at
206 different times of the masticatory sequence, for different food matrixes or in different oral
207 conditions, both for *in vivo* or *in vitro* food boluses (Peyron et al., 2011). Hardness,
208 recoverability, adhesiveness and springiness values can be extracted from each TPA curve for
209 bolus mechanical characterization. As an example of this interesting use, Fig. 5A illustrates
210 that a piece of French bread (baguette) is softened, rendered less elastic and less cohesive as
211 the *in vivo* masticatory sequence progresses. Physical characteristics obtained for *in vivo* and
212 *in vitro* boluses can be compared to attest the effectiveness of the masticator apparatus (Fig.
213 5B). The possible addition of water, or human or artificial saliva in the AM² is undoubtedly a
214 key parameter in preparing a food bolus for instrumental measurements since it provides the
215 specific rheological environment of the food after mastication. A comparison of the physical
216 characteristics of the *in vitro* food boluses obtained with these different fluids would be
217 informative regarding the role of the specific components such as enzymes and proteins.
218 Nevertheless, great care must be taken in the treatment of TPA test variables which are not
219 absolute values, they are often misinterpreted, and they can only be used in a comparative
220 way (Nishinari & Fang, 2018).

221 All the *in vivo* data used to validate or to program the masticator apparatus were obtained
222 after collecting the informed consent of each subject and experiments were performed in
223 accordance with different local and national ethical agreements (CE-CIC-GREN-10/06-
224 #5044; DREAM-2013-A00096-39).

225

226 3. Substance release in the mouth

227

228 Chewing a solid matrix causes the release of numerous substances within the mouth,
229 normally resulting in a satisfactory sensory experience from food containing juice or tasty
230 molecules, for example. It can also favor nutrient extraction as early as the oral step.
231 Conversely, such release must be avoided when the foods or the non-nutritive products
232 contain toxic or pollutant substances as can happen, for example, when a child is chewing or
233 gnawing something containing a non-edible or toxic substance. However, obtaining the
234 delivery of an active substance could be the objective pursued, for example, with medicated
235 chewing-gums (Konar, Palabiyik, Toker, & Sagdic, 2016).

236 An artificial device is mandatory when the precise concentration of a compound released
237 during mastication has to be determined. Fig. 6A shows the release curve along the
238 mastication of a non-alimentary product containing two different concentrations of a toxic
239 substance. The kinetics and level of release could be determined and used for toxicity risk
240 analysis. This approach is obviously applicable for quantifying the release of toxic or
241 contaminant compounds from any alimentary product.

242 Most often the substances analyzed released from food or from any non-nutritive product
243 during chewing are dissolved or dispersed in an oral liquid composed of a mix of saliva and
244 liquids expressed in the food matrix. Determining the true oral concentration of the substance
245 of interest implies the separation of these two types of liquids. In usual conditions, the volume
246 of saliva cannot be determined because the saliva flow undergoes a large number of
247 unpredictable variations and due to frequent intermediate swallows (Hiemae & Palmer,
248 1999). AM² can be used to distinguish between saliva and the juice extracted from food.

249 In the examples shown in Fig. 6 (B and C), mango juice was collected *in vivo* after
250 chewing with the fruit placed within an impermeable plastic bag (Fig. 6B) and *in vitro* with

251 the fruit in the AM² (Fig. 6C). The weight of the mango juice collected *in vitro* after 24
252 masticatory cycles was similar to the amount obtained after *in vivo* chewing performed with
253 24 cycles. With this AM² based design, the juice released from the matrix disruption was
254 estimated to be about 20% of the initial weight of the mango sample (Fig. 6Bb). Without the
255 bag, the *in vivo* mastication produced a liquid phase composed of juice and saliva,
256 representing about 40% of the bolus weight. As expected, the amount of mango juice
257 extracted also depended on the number of chewing cycles (Fig. 6C).

258 Fig. 7 shows the kinetics of glucose release in saliva during *in vivo* and *in vitro* mastication
259 of a chewing gum. In this experiment, the gum was weighed before and after 1, 3, 6, 10 and
260 12 min chewing. The gum weight was expressed as the cumulative course of weight loss
261 observed along the masticatory sequences (Fig. 7A). The glucose was determined in saliva
262 samples at the same time points of the masticatory sequence (Fig. 7B). It was obtained with a
263 glucometer using the electrochemical determination of glucose oxidase activity compared to
264 the pre-established standard curve for glucose in saliva. The results were expressed as the
265 cumulative time course of the amount of glucose measured in saliva at the different time
266 points of the masticatory sequences. Mastication occurred either *in vivo* with 8 food bolus
267 samples obtained from five volunteers or *in vitro* with 8 repetitions performed with the
268 masticator apparatus. The greater proportion of glucose release occurred during the three first
269 minutes of mastication and the gum weight decreased mostly at the same time. Weight loss
270 and glucose release changes had similar time courses for *in vivo* and *in vitro* gum chewing.

271 This kind of experiment can be conducted, for example, for the development of a
272 medicated chewing gum designed to provide a slow steady release of the medicine contained
273 in it, favoring the release of a substance in saliva and its progressive absorption. A relevant
274 time-curve would be obtained with the AM² apparatus.

275

276 4. Oral bioaccessibility of nutrients, digestion studies

277

278 The role of mastication and considerable food matrix disruption in the absorption of
279 nutrients is important (Pennings et al., 2013; Rémond et al., 2007). Sieving through a tissue
280 mesh enables the separate collection of liquid and solid phases of the food bolus, giving
281 access to the role of oral processes in nutrient bioaccessibility and digestion. This method has
282 been successfully applied in *in vitro* food boluses. Fig. 8 (ABC) shows free-iron release from
283 ~~the~~ a meat matrix during the mastication of either a beef sample or its minced counterpart.
284 Although the bolus of minced meat was normally chewed in fewer masticatory cycles than the
285 same meat not minced (10 *versus* 32 cycles), it produced a bolus composed of more small
286 particles (Fig. 8A). Free-iron release from the matrix (Fig. 8B and C) rose significantly in
287 both saliva and bolus material when the meat had been minced before mastication (12
288 replicates for iron determination). Fig. 8D shows that the amount of β -carotenes released in
289 saliva during the *in vivo* mastication of raw carrot increased along the masticatory process,
290 obviously due to matrix disruption. This kind of measurement is totally feasible *in vitro* with
291 the masticatory simulator. The analysis of the bioaccessibility of carotenoids could
292 undoubtedly be performed *in vitro* with the AM², since the release of nutrients from plant
293 foods is largely dependent on food breakage during mastication and could be decisive for
294 their bioavailability (Faulks & Southon, 2005; Hedrén et al., 2002; Palafox-Carlos, Ayala-
295 Zavala, & González-Aguilar, 2011). Oral bioaccessibility is also a relevant issue for other
296 macro and micronutrients such as in the case of lipids in almonds (Cassady, Hollis, Fulford,
297 Considine, & Mattes, 2009; Ellis et al., 2004; Grundy et al., 2015).

298 Fig. 9 illustrates the first step of digestion occurring in the mouth during mastication and
299 quantified by the production of maltose after the oral hydrolysis of starch by salivary amylase.
300 Pieces of different breads (2.5 g) were introduced in the AM². Mastication was carried out (20

301 masticatory cycles) either with water (Volvic®) or human saliva (1.6 mL as estimated by
302 weighting *in vivo* food boluses collected during the programming of the AM² apparatus).
303 Logically, as expected, the concentration of maltose was higher with human saliva than with
304 water, but also differed regarding the type of bread chewed. The mastication of pieces of
305 white bread led to significantly higher hydrolysis of maltose than the mastication of whole
306 wheat bread of the same weight. This observation confirmed the initiatory role of mastication
307 in digestion by disintegrating food into smaller particles that are impregnated by saliva
308 (Hoebler et al., 1998; Pentikäinen et al., 2019; Tournier, Grass, Zope, Salles, & Bertrand,
309 2012).

310 Although the major mechanical reduction of food occurs during mastication, it is
311 completed in the stomach (Kong & Singh, 2011). This continuum of activity is exemplified in
312 Fig. 10a, which shows the granulometric characteristics measured first in the *in vitro* food
313 bolus of pasta obtained with the AM² just before swallowing, and then in the gastric
314 compartment after *in vitro* digestion. Moreover, this example also highlighted that the
315 stomach cannot totally overcome the failure in food reduction during deficient mastication
316 resulting in a bolus with numerous large particles. This must be taken into account,
317 considering that the level of disintegration of a food in the stomach depends on the structure
318 of the matrix (Kong & Singh, 2008a) and impacts gastric emptying (Pera et al., 2002), thus
319 assigning a specific role to mastication and the quality of the food bolus arriving in the
320 stomach. Large particles have also been shown to lengthen gastric emptying and to produce
321 lower glycemic and insulin blood responses than smaller particles (Ranawana, Clegg, Shafat,
322 & Henry, 2011). This could be an acceptable explanation for the lengthening of the whole
323 digestive process and the delay in nutrient postprandial appearance observed in edentulous
324 people (Rémond et al., 2007).

325 Fig. 10B shows the kinetics of protein concentration measured *in vitro* in the stomach

326 simulating digestion of an elderly person (in terms of pH kinetics and pepsin amount) after
327 the oral ingestion of meat. Using the masticator apparatus AM² with different programmings
328 to simulate either *in vitro* normal or deficient mastication, combined with an instrumental
329 gastric system, it appeared that large food fragments constituting the food bolus after deficient
330 *in vitro* mastication resulted in a significant deficit in protein release in elderly digestive
331 conditions.

332

333 **5. Biochemical modifications during oral processing**

334

335 The mastication simulator offers the possibility of exploring the chemical role of saliva and
336 modification of the food compounds occurring within the mouth while the food is being
337 transformed into a bolus ready to be swallowed. The various roles of saliva can be explored
338 since it can be added or not in the apparatus for *in vitro* mastication. For example, human
339 saliva is assumed to protect food compounds against oxidation (Moore, Calder, Miller, &
340 Rice-Evans, 1994). Thus the AM² allows testing the role of saliva by using *in vitro* no-saliva,
341 human saliva or any composition of artificial saliva containing enzymes or not, for example.
342 Fig. 11 (A and B) shows the effect of chewing on the oxidation of beef meat when the
343 artificial mouth was devoid of saliva. Lipid and protein oxidation in the food bolus was
344 assessed by changes in TBARS (ThioBarbituric Acid Reactive Substances) and by the
345 quantification of carbonyl groups (aldehydes and ketones), respectively. Three meat samples
346 were measured before chewing (raw meat, cooked meat, cooked + minced meat) and 12
347 boluses were obtained after *in vitro* mastication (just before swallowing). Without saliva,
348 significantly higher lipid oxidation was observed when the meat sample was chewed in
349 minced format rather than as a non-minced meat (Fig. 11A). The oxidation of proteins
350 occurring during chewing without saliva was also significant although less marked than for

351 lipids (Fig. 11B). These results confirm the potential occurrence of lipid and protein oxidation
352 and underline the essential antioxidant role of saliva in protecting food compounds from
353 oxidation (Qu et al., 2016). The more a food is chewed the more likely it will be impregnated
354 by saliva and the nutrients protected against oxidation. This aspect should be thoroughly
355 studied for various foods since it may have serious consequences for certain nutritional issues
356 as nutrient oxidation has known consequences on intestinal absorption (Bax et al., 2012).

357

358 **6. Effect of deficient mastication on food bolus processing**

359

360 The AM² can also simulate different dental states related to oral diseases, healthy
361 childhood and ageing conditions. Fig. 12 indicates the effects of different modalities of
362 impairment on the granulometry of poultry meatball boluses (Peyron et al., 2018). The *in vivo*
363 boluses were collected from seven subjects at swallowing threshold after normal mastication
364 (NM) composed of 17 masticatory cycles. As usual, preliminary *in vivo* experiments allowed
365 determining the main settings for *in vitro* mastication, and the simulation of deficient
366 mastication was performed with modifications of certain parameters. This introduced specific
367 deteriorations of the masticatory sequence in terms of the force and motility of oral elements,
368 as illustrated in Figure 2 for the choice of spring-induced forces. Two levels were set for
369 deficient force by using the spring of lowest stiffness together with an increasing offset
370 between the jaws at closing (Def Force 1 and Def Force 2) and deficient motility simulated by
371 two different low values of rotation angle (compared to normal programming) applied during
372 jaw confrontation (Def Motil 1 and Def Motil 2). A considerable decline in masticatory force
373 (Def Force 2 in Fig. 12) significantly changed the particle size distribution in the meatball
374 boluses towards a greater proportion of large particles ($p < 0.001$). Motility deficiency also
375 significantly limited food fragmentation, with an impact corresponding to the level of the

376 deficiency ($p < 0.001$). This difference was even more dramatic when the masticatory force and
377 motility deficiencies (Def Motil & Force) were added together during mastication compared
378 to other conditions ($p < 0.001$). The description of the impact of gradual and cumulative
379 deficiencies on the physical properties of boluses obtained with poultry meatballs has been
380 described elsewhere (Peyron et al., 2018) and the results agreed with those obtained *in vivo*
381 (Mishellany-Dutour, Renaud, Peyron, Rimek, & Woda, 2008; Woda et al., 2010b).

382

383 **7. Measurement of forces applied during mastication**

384

385 The AM² can measure forces developed during mastication with a strength sensor (Fig. 1).
386 The specific approach described in Figs. 13 and 14 is mandatory. The large artifacts recorded
387 from the force sensor included in the AM² came from frictions induced by the mobile jaw's
388 forward and backward movements. This implied stopping all the movements for one or two
389 seconds during which the force was measured. Fig. 13A shows the method used to calibrate
390 the force sensor to a null force with an empty mastication chamber to overcome the artifacts.
391 Fig. 13B shows an experiment on force measurements performed with gelatin samples as
392 models (10 mm high, 20 mm diameter) presenting three levels of hardness but the same
393 recoverability—(Peyron, Lassauzay, & Woda, 2002). The forces recorded during five
394 successive cycles differed according to the level of hardness of the food models.

395 Fig. 14A shows an experiment where the forces ~~used~~ during a long sequence of 36 cycles
396 were recorded during the chewing sequence of a banana sample (10 mm high and 20 mm
397 diameter). During this experiment the moving jaw compressed the sample, while the fixed
398 jaw moved back due to spring compression, leading to a partial deformation of the sample.
399 The masticatory forces progressively decreased from 25.42 ± 0.81 N—at the first bite to near
400 zero N at the last bite (5 replicates). A comparable force value (26.99 ± 1.08 N) was measured

401 with the Instron machine (Fig. 14B) performing a single compression test at 65% deformation
402 (the same deformation range applied on the banana sample by the AM²) on two banana
403 samples taken from the same bunch as the sample used for the experiment presented in Fig.
404 14A. The resistance force obtained with the Instron machine when the sample was
405 compressed ($26.99 \pm 1.08\text{N}$) was comparable to that obtained with the AM² at the first bite. In
406 another experiment presented in Fig. 14 (C and D), the AM² was used to mimick testing
407 machine mode to test the effect of fruit ripening. The ripe and firm banana samples were
408 subjected to five successive compressions. The resistance was higher ($7.93 \pm 1.22\text{N}$) for the
409 firm banana than for the ripe one ($4.28 \pm 1.04\text{N}$).

410

411 **8. Conclusion**

412

413 For various reasons ranging from financial to ethical considerations, but also because it is
414 not possible to access the interior of the mouth during mastication, the AM² masticator
415 apparatus offers a unique approach in numerous fields of research in food science, including
416 food design, oral health and nutrition issues. It facilitates experiments in particular when large
417 samples of subjects or high numbers of replicates would be required *in vivo*. Also, the number
418 of repetitions can be much smaller because the variations between them are due only to
419 mechanical hazards that are much easier to control than biological intersubject variations.
420 Finally, no ethical requirements are needed with *in vitro* experiments.

421 The AM² has certain limits. Contrary to many other artificial masticators (Salles et al., 2007;
422 van Ruth & Buhr, 2004), it does not currently offer the possibility of collecting volatile
423 aromatic compounds during food disruption within the masticatory chamber. This limit,
424 however, could be overcome technically if needed. At present, the choice of masticatory
425 programming is based on several *in vivo* recordings followed by the adjustment of the AM²

426 parameters. In the future, it may be possible to introduce a retrocontrol based on neural
427 networks in the AM² which would allow adaptation to ongoing food bolus transformation, as
428 is the case in *in vivo* mastication

429

430 **Funding:** This work was supported by the European Community [FP7-222 654-DREAM];
431 the "Qualiment" French Carnot Institute [Qualigras-Phy, AAP 2012]; and the French National
432 Research Agency [AlimaSSenS - ANR-14-CE20-0003-01]. The AM² has been developed
433 with the support of the Auvergne Region (Bourse Innovation), the Université d'Auvergne and
434 the French National Institute for Agricultural Research (INRA), and is a platform of the
435 Université Clermont Auvergne (UCA-PARTNER).

436

437 **Declarations of interest:** none

438

439 **References**

440

- 441 Bax, M.-L., Aubry, L., Ferreira, C., Daudin, J.-D., Gatellier, P., Rémond, D., & Santé-
442 Lhoutellier, V. (2012). Cooking temperature is a key determinant of *in vitro* meat
443 protein digestion rate: investigation of underlying mechanisms. *Journal of Agricultural
444 and Food Chemistry*, *60*(10), 2569–2576. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf205280y>
- 445 Bonnet, G., Batisse, C., Peyron, M.-A., Nicolas, E., & Hennequin, M. (2018). Which
446 variables should be controlled when measuring the granulometry of a chewed bolus? A
447 systematic review. *Journal of Texture Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jtxs.12376>
- 448 Bornhorst, G. M., & Singh, R. P. (2013). Kinetics of *in Vitro* Bread Bolus Digestion with
449 Varying Oral and Gastric Digestion Parameters. *Food Biophysics*, *8*(1), 50–59.
450 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11483-013-9283-6>

- 451 Cassady, B. A., Hollis, J. H., Fulford, A. D., Considine, R. V., & Mattes, R. D. (2009).
452 Mastication of almonds: effects of lipid bioaccessibility, appetite, and hormone
453 response. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 89(3), 794–800.
454 <https://doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.2008.26669>
- 455 Chen, J. (2009). Food oral processing—A review. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 23(1), 1–25.
456 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2007.11.013>
- 457 Chen, J. (2015). Food oral processing: Mechanisms and implications of food oral destruction.
458 *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 45(2), 222–228.
459 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2015.06.012>
- 460 Dupont, D., Alric, M., Blanquet-Diot, S., Bornhorst, G., Cueva, C., Deglaire, A., ... Van den
461 Abbeele, P. (2018). Can dynamic *in vitro* digestion systems mimic the physiological
462 reality? *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*, 1–17.
463 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2017.1421900>
- 464 Ellis, P. R., Kendall, C. W. C., Ren, Y., Parker, C., Pacy, J. F., Waldron, K. W., & Jenkins, D.
465 J. A. (2004). Role of cell walls in the bioaccessibility of lipids in almond seeds. *The*
466 *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 80(3), 604–613.
467 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/80.3.604>
- 468 Engelen, L., Fontijn-Tekamp, A., & Bilt, A. van der. (2005). The influence of product and
469 oral characteristics on swallowing. *Archives of Oral Biology*, 50(8), 739–746.
470 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archoralbio.2005.01.004>
- 471 Faulks, R. M., & Southon, S. (2005). Challenges to understanding and measuring carotenoid
472 bioavailability. *Biochimica Et Biophysica Acta*, 1740(2), 95–100.
473 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbadis.2004.11.012>
- 474 Funami, T. (2016). The Formulation Design of Elderly Special Diets: Formulation design for
475 elderly. *Journal of Texture Studies*, 47(4), 313–322. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jtxs.12202>

- 476 Gao, J., Wong, J. X., Lim, J. C.-S., Henry, J., & Zhou, W. (2015). Influence of bread structure
477 on human oral processing. *Journal of Food Engineering*, *167*, 147–155.
478 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2015.07.022>
- 479 Grundy, M. M. L., Grassby, T., Mandalari, G., Waldron, K. W., Butterworth, P. J., Berry, S.
480 E. E., & Ellis, P. R. (2015). Effect of mastication on lipid bioaccessibility of almonds in
481 a randomized human study and its implications for digestion kinetics, metabolizable
482 energy, and postprandial lipemia. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, *101*(1),
483 25–33. <https://doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.114.088328>
- 484 Hedrén, E., Diaz, V., & Svanberg, U. (2002). Estimation of carotenoid accessibility from
485 carrots determined by an in vitro digestion method. *European Journal of Clinical*
486 *Nutrition*, *56*(5), 425–430. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.ejcn.1601329>
- 487 Hiiemae, K., Heath, M. R., Heath, G., Kazazoglu, E., Murray, J., Sapper, D., & Hamblett, K.
488 (1996). Natural bites, food consistency and feeding behaviour in man. *Archives of Oral*
489 *Biology*, *41*(2), 175–189.
- 490 Hiiemae, K. M., & Palmer, J. B. (1999). Food transport and bolus formation during complete
491 feeding sequences on foods of different initial consistency. *Dysphagia*, *14*(1), 31–42.
492 <https://doi.org/10.1007/PL00009582>
- 493 Hoebler, C., Devaux, M. F., Karinithi, A., Belleville, C., & Barry, J. L. (2000). Particle size of
494 solid food after human mastication and in vitro simulation of oral breakdown.
495 *International Journal of Food Sciences and Nutrition*, *51*(5), 353–366.
- 496 Hoebler, C., Karinithi, A., Devaux, M.-F., Guillon, F., Gallant, D. J. G., Bouchet, B., ... Barry,
497 J.-L. (1998). Physical and chemical transformations of cereal food during oral digestion
498 in human subjects. *British Journal of Nutrition*, *80*(05), 429.
499 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007114598001494>

- 500 Hoebler, C., Lecannu, G., Belleville, C., Devaux, M.-F., Popineau, Y., & Barry, J.-L. (2002).
501 Development of an in vitro system simulating bucco-gastric digestion to assess the
502 physical and chemical changes of food. *International Journal of Food Sciences and*
503 *Nutrition*, 53(5), 389–402. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0963748021000044732>
- 504 Hwang, J., Kim, D.-K., Bae, J. H., Kang, S. H., Seo, K. M., Kim, B. K., & Lee, S. Y. (2012).
505 The effect of rheological properties of foods on bolus characteristics after mastication.
506 *Annals of Rehabilitation Medicine*, 36(6), 776–784.
507 <https://doi.org/10.5535/arm.2012.36.6.776>
- 508 Jalabert-Malbos, M.-L., Mishellany-Dutour, A., Woda, A., & Peyron, M.-A. (2007). Particle
509 size distribution in the food bolus after mastication of natural foods. *Food Quality and*
510 *Preference*, 18(5), 803–812. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2007.01.010>
- 511 Koç, H., Çakir, E., Vinyard, C. J., Essick, G., Daubert, C. R., Drake, M. A., ... Foegeding, E.
512 A. (2014). Adaptation of Oral Processing to the Fracture Properties of Soft Solids: Oral
513 Processing and Fracture Properties. *Journal of Texture Studies*, 45(1), 47–61.
514 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jtxs.12051>
- 515 Konar, N., Palabiyik, I., Toker, O. S., & Sagdic, O. (2016). Chewing gum: Production, quality
516 parameters and opportunities for delivering bioactive compounds. *Trends in Food*
517 *Science & Technology*, 55, 29–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2016.07.003>
- 518 Kong, F., & Singh, R. P. (2008). A model stomach system to investigate disintegration
519 kinetics of solid foods during gastric digestion. *Journal of Food Science*, 73(5), E202-
520 210. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-3841.2008.00745.x>
- 521 Kong, Fanbin, & Singh, R. P. (2011). Solid Loss of Carrots During Simulated Gastric
522 Digestion. *Food Biophysics*, 6(1), 84–93. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11483-010-9178-8>

- 523 Lund, J. P., & Kolta, A. (2006). Generation of the central masticatory pattern and its
524 modification by sensory feedback. *Dysphagia*, 21(3), 167–174.
525 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00455-006-9027-6>
- 526 Mandalari, G., Parker, M. L., Grundy, M. M.-L., Grassby, T., Smeriglio, A., Bisignano, C., ...
527 Wilde, P. J. (2018). Understanding the Effect of Particle Size and Processing on
528 Almond Lipid Bioaccessibility through Microstructural Analysis: From Mastication to
529 Faecal Collection. *Nutrients*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu10020213>
- 530 Ménard, O., Cattenoz, T., Guillemin, H., Souchon, I., Deglaire, A., Dupont, D., & Picque, D.
531 (2014). Validation of a new in vitro dynamic system to simulate infant digestion. *Food*
532 *Chemistry*, 145, 1039–1045. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2013.09.036>
- 533 Minekus, M., Alming, M., Alvito, P., Ballance, S., Bohn, T., Bourlieu, C., ... Brodkorb, A.
534 (2014). A standardised static in vitro digestion method suitable for food - an
535 international consensus. *Food & Function*, 5(6), 1113–1124.
536 <https://doi.org/10.1039/c3fo60702j>
- 537 Mishellany-Dutour, A., Peyron, M.-A., Croze, J., François, O., Hartmann, C., Alric, M., &
538 Woda, A. (2011a). Comparison of food boluses prepared in vivo and by the AM2
539 mastication simulator. *Food Quality and Preference*, 22(4), 326–331.
540 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2010.12.003>
- 541 Mishellany-Dutour, A., Peyron, M.-A., Croze, J., François, O., Hartmann, C., Alric, M., &
542 Woda, A. (2011b). Comparison of food boluses prepared in vivo and by the AM2
543 mastication simulator. *Food Quality and Preference*, 22(4), 326–331.
544 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2010.12.003>
- 545 Mishellany-Dutour, A., Renaud, J., Peyron, M.-A., Rimek, F., & Woda, A. (2008). Is the goal
546 of mastication reached in young dentates, aged dentates and aged denture wearers? *The*

- 547 *British Journal of Nutrition*, 99(1), 121–128.
548 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007114507795284>
- 549 Moore, S., Calder, K. A., Miller, N. J., & Rice-Evans, C. A. (1994). Antioxidant activity of
550 saliva and periodontal disease. *Free Radical Research*, 21(6), 417–425.
- 551 Morell, P., Hernando, I., & Fiszman, S. M. (2014). Understanding the relevance of in-mouth
552 food processing. A review of in vitro techniques. *Trends in Food Science &*
553 *Technology*, 35(1), 18–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2013.10.005>
- 554 Ng, G. C. F., Gray-Stuart, E. M., Morgenstern, M. P., Jones, J. R., Grigg, N. P., & Bronlund,
555 J. E. (2017). The slip extrusion test: A novel method to characterise bolus properties.
556 *Journal of Texture Studies*, 48(4), 294–301. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jtxs.12254>
- 557 Ngom, P. I., Diagne, F., Aïdara-Tamba, A. W., & Sene, A. (2007). Relationship between
558 orthodontic anomalies and masticatory function in adults. *American Journal of*
559 *Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*, 131(2), 216–222.
560 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajodo.2005.03.027>
- 561 Nishinari, K., & Fang, Y. (2018). Perception and measurement of food texture: Solid foods.
562 *Journal of Texture Studies*, 49(2), 160–201. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jtxs.12327>
- 563 Palafox-Carlos, H., Ayala-Zavala, J. F., & González-Aguilar, G. A. (2011). The role of
564 dietary fiber in the bioaccessibility and bioavailability of fruit and vegetable
565 antioxidants. *Journal of Food Science*, 76(1), R6–R15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-3841.2010.01957.x>
- 567 Pennings, B., Groen, B. B. L., van Dijk, J.-W., de Lange, A., Kiskini, A., Kuklinski, M., ...
568 van Loon, L. J. C. (2013). Minced beef is more rapidly digested and absorbed than beef
569 steak, resulting in greater postprandial protein retention in older men. *The American*
570 *Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 98(1), 121–128. <https://doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.112.051201>

- 571 Pentikäinen, S., Koistinen, V., Kolehmainen, M., Poutanen, K., Hanhineva, K., & Aura, A.-
572 M. (2019). Mastication-induced release of compounds from rye and wheat breads to
573 saliva. *Food Chemistry*, 270, 502–508. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2018.07.110>
- 574 Pera, P., Bucca, C., Borro, P., Bernocco, C., De, L. A., & Carossa, S. (2002). Influence of
575 mastication on gastric emptying. *Journal of Dental Research*, 81(3), 179–181.
- 576 Peyron, M. A., Lassauzay, C., & Woda, A. (2002). Effects of increased hardness on jaw
577 movement and muscle activity during chewing of visco-elastic model foods.
578 *Experimental Brain Research*, 142(1), 41–51. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-001-0916-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-001-0916-5)
579 5
- 580 Peyron, M.-A., Gierczynski, I., Hartmann, C., Loret, C., Dardevet, D., Martin, N., & Woda,
581 A. (2011). Role of physical bolus properties as sensory inputs in the trigger of
582 swallowing. *PloS One*, 6(6), e21167. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0021167>
- 583 Peyron, M.-A., Santé-Lhoutellier, V., François, O., & Hennequin, M. (2018). Oral declines
584 and mastication deficiencies cause alteration of food bolus properties. *Food & Function*,
585 9(2), 1112–1122. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c7fo01628j>
- 586 Peyron, Marie-Agnès, & Woda, A. (2016). An update about artificial mastication. *Current*
587 *Opinion in Food Science*, 9, 21–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cofs.2016.03.006>
- 588 Qu, X. M., Wu, Z. F., Pang, B. X., Jin, L. Y., Qin, L. Z., & Wang, S. L. (2016). From Nitrate
589 to Nitric Oxide: The Role of Salivary Glands and Oral Bacteria. *Journal of Dental*
590 *Research*, 95(13), 1452–1456. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022034516673019>
- 591 Ranawana, V., Clegg, M. E., Shafat, A., & Henry, C. J. (2011). Postmastication digestion
592 factors influence glycemic variability in humans. *Nutrition Research (New York, N.Y.)*,
593 31(6), 452–459. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nutres.2011.05.006>
- 594 Rémond, D., Machebeuf, M., Yven, C., Buffière, C., Mioche, L., Mosoni, L., & Patureau
595 Mirand, P. (2007). Postprandial whole-body protein metabolism after a meat meal is

- 596 influenced by chewing efficiency in elderly subjects. *The American Journal of Clinical*
597 *Nutrition*, 85(5), 1286–1292. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/85.5.1286>
- 598 Roger-Leroi, V., Mishellany-Dutour, A., Woda, A., Marchand, M., & Peyron, M. A. (2012).
599 Substantiation of an artificial saliva formulated for use in a masticatory apparatus.
600 *Odonto-Stomatologie Tropicale = Tropical Dental Journal*, 35(138), 5–14.
- 601 Salles, C., Tarrega, A., Mielle, P., Maratray, J., Gorria, P., Liaboeuf, J., & Liodenot, J.-J.
602 (2007). Development of a chewing simulator for food breakdown and the analysis of in
603 vitro flavor compound release in a mouth environment. *Journal of Food Engineering*,
604 82(2), 189–198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2007.02.008>
- 605 Sayd, T., Chambon, C., & Santé-Lhoutellier, V. (2016). Quantification of peptides released
606 during in vitro digestion of cooked meat. *Food Chemistry*, 197 Pt B, 1311–1323.
607 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2015.11.020>
- 608 Shani-Levi, C., Alvito, P., Andrés, A., Assunção, R., Barberá, R., Blanquet-Diot, S., ...
609 Lesmes, U. (2017). Extending in vitro digestion models to specific human populations:
610 Perspectives, practical tools and bio-relevant information. *Trends in Food Science &*
611 *Technology*, 60, 52–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2016.10.017>
- 612 Shiozawa, K., Kohyama, K., & Yanagisawa, K. (2003). Relationship between Physical
613 Properties of a Food Bolus and Initiation of Swallowing. *Japanese Journal of Oral*
614 *Biology*, 45(2), 59–63. <https://doi.org/10.2330/joralbiosci1965.45.59>
- 615 Tournier, C., Grass, M., Zope, D., Salles, C., & Bertrand, D. (2012). Characterization of bread
616 breakdown during mastication by image texture analysis. *Journal of Food Engineering*,
617 113(4), 615–622. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2012.07.015>
- 618 van der Bilt, A., Abbink, J. H., Mowlana, F., & Heath, M. R. (1993). A comparison between
619 data analysis methods concerning particle size distributions obtained by mastication in

- 620 man. *Archives of Oral Biology*, 38(2), 163–167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/0003->
621 9969(93)90202-W
- 622 van Ruth, S. M., & Buhr, K. (2004). Influence of mastication rate on dynamic flavour release
623 analysed by combined model mouth/proton transfer reaction–mass spectrometry.
624 *International Journal of Mass Spectrometry*, 239(2–3), 187–192.
625 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijms.2004.08.009>
- 626 Woda, A., Foster, K., Mishellany, A., & Peyron, M. A. (2006). Adaptation of healthy
627 mastication to factors pertaining to the individual or to the food. *Physiology &*
628 *Behavior*, 89(1), 28–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2006.02.013>
- 629 Woda, A., Mishellany-Dutour, A., Batier, L., François, O., Meunier, J.-P., Reynaud, B., ...
630 Peyron, M.-A. (2010a). Development and validation of a mastication simulator. *Journal*
631 *of Biomechanics*, 43(9), 1667–1673. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2010.03.002>
- 632 Woda, A., Mishellany-Dutour, A., Batier, L., François, O., Meunier, J.-P., Reynaud, B., ...
633 Peyron, M.-A. (2010b). Development and validation of a mastication simulator. *Journal*
634 *of Biomechanics*, 43(9), 1667–1673. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2010.03.002>
- 635 Woda, A., Nicolas, E., Mishellany-Dutour, A., Hennequin, M., Mazille, M.-N., Veyrone, J.-
636 L., & Peyron, M.-A. (2010). The masticatory normative indicator. *Journal of Dental*
637 *Research*, 89(3), 281–285. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022034509357022>

638

639

640 **Legends**

641 Figure1: Schematic representation of the AM² artificial masticator with insert of an open view
642 of the mastication chamber in which the fixed and mobile masticatory **disks** are shown. The
643 whole apparatus is 130 cm long and 30 cm in height. The masticatory chamber (19.5 x 9.5
644 cm) is located in the continuation of the shaft holding the mobile masticatory **disk**.

645 Figure 2: Example of AM² programming for meat mastication. Mean particle size distribution
646 curves are expressed as cumulative weight percentages of particles passing through each sieve
647 during manual sieving. The force generated for food compression during mastication depends
648 on the stiffness of the spring which must be chosen as a function of food resistance. The curve
649 obtained with the spring 3 (18.2 N/mm of spring stiffness; n = 4) and 22 masticatory cycles
650 gave the best fit with the mean *in vivo* curve (n = 8). Spring 3 with only 20 cycles gave a
651 higher median value (= *d50*, theoretical sieve letting pass 50% particle mass), indicating a
652 poorly prepared food bolus with larger particles (n = 4). Spring 4 (23.5 N/mm of spring
653 stiffness) was harder and gave a lower *d50* value when used with 22 masticatory cycles,
654 indicating excess in food bolus disruption (n = 4). For the sake of readability, standard
655 deviations are not drawn.

656 Figure 3: Comparisons between mean particle size distribution curves of boluses obtained *in*
657 *vivo* and *in vitro* from different food types. Piece of beef: cooked samples, 2cm square and
658 1cm thick. Minced beef: same cooked meat, molded in the same sample shape as non-minced
659 meat. Frankfurt sausage: cylindrical samples of 6.5g. Pasta products: cooked Fusilli pasta in
660 7g bite. Coconut: 1cm square and 1cm thick sample. Gherkins: cylindrical sample of 3.5g.
661 Each point represents the weight of the particles (in %) retained in the corresponding sieve
662 size added to the sum of all the preceding points (cumulative curve). The similarity required
663 between *in vivo* and *in vitro* bolus granulometry was not limited to the median particle size
664 (*d50=50% on cumulative curve*) but sought for the whole mean particle size distribution
665 curves. In these examples, better fitting could be obtained for minced meat and gherkins if
666 further studies were carried out. For the sake of readability, standard deviations are not drawn.

667 Figure 4: Comparisons between mean particle size distribution curves for boluses obtained *in*
668 *vivo* (A) and *in vitro* (B). The masticatory sequence of pork meat (2cm cubes) was interrupted

669 after one, two, three and four quarters of the *in vivo* (A) and *in vitro* (B) chewing sequences
670 (0.25, 0.5, 0.75 and 1; n=10). In C, particle size distributions were obtained for two types of
671 bread (white and whole wheat breads, sample = 1 /4 of a 2cm thick slice cut in a French
672 baguette) after *in vivo* and *in vitro* mastication (n=10). The difference observed *in vivo*
673 between the two types of bread can be completely reproduced *in vitro*. For the sake of
674 readability, standard deviations are not drawn.

675 Figure 5. A: Evolution of four physical characteristics of bread boluses produced *in vivo* from
676 a French baguette after one, two or three thirds of the complete chewing sequence (1/3, 2/3,
677 swallowing; n = 10 subjects x 2 repetitions; sample = 1 /0 of a 2cm thick slice). B:
678 Comparison of hardness and recoverability of pasta boluses produced *in vivo* and *in vitro* (n =
679 5 subjects or replicates; cooked Fusilli pasta in 7g bite). The food bolus was subjected to a
680 double compression test during a Texture Profile Analysis test (TPA) performed with an
681 Instron machine equipped with a flat piston head (\emptyset 28 mm) moved at a constant
682 displacement rate of 50 mm.min⁻¹, a cylindrical container (int. \emptyset 35 mm, ext. \emptyset 40 mm) and a
683 500 N load cell. The bolus was spread at the bottom of the cylindrical container and subjected
684 to 65% deformation of its initial height. In this example, hardness (N), adhesiveness (N.s),
685 elasticity and recoverability (both unitless) were extracted from the TPA curves (mean and
686 SD). Physical characteristics can be obtained in the same manner for *in vitro* boluses
687 produced with the masticator apparatus AM².

688 Figure 6. A: Curve of a contaminant released in saliva along the mastication of a non-
689 alimentary product. The two curves were obtained for the same product containing two
690 different concentrations of the same toxic substance. B: Liquid content in a bolus of fruit (in
691 % of bolus weight, mean and SD) after 24 *in vivo* masticatory cycles performed in normal
692 conditions and with the fruit sample placed in a bag while chewing to separate juice from

693 saliva (n=10; mean and SD). C: Percentage of juice extracted from fruit after 15 and 24 *in*
694 *vitro* masticatory cycles with AM² (n = 10, mean and SD).

695 Figure 7. Chewing a non-alimentary gum. Cumulative loss of gum weight (A; in %, mean and
696 SD) and cumulative concentration of glucose released in saliva (B; in g, mean and SD) were
697 obtained from different time point measurements along 12 minutes of *in vivo* and *in vitro*
698 mastication of the gum sample (n=8).

699 Figure 8. Impact of food structure on free-iron and carotene release in saliva. A: Bolus of
700 minced meat analyzed after normal mastication consisting of 10 cycles while the meat sample
701 (2x2x2 cm) needed 32 masticatory cycles to produce swallowable boluses (mean and SD). B
702 and C: At the end of mastication, free-iron release was greater for minced than for mouthful
703 meat, both in the solid part of the bolus and in saliva. D: Examples of the oral release of
704 carotene measured by HPLC in the salivary part of the bolus. For readability, spectra of beta-
705 carotenes determined in three saliva samples were superimposed according to the elution time
706 on the x-axis. It clearly shows an increase of beta-carotene release in saliva with the progress
707 of the masticatory sequence from the boluses collected at the beginning, in the middle of the
708 masticatory sequence, and when the bolus was ready to be swallowed.

709 Figure 9. Production of maltose in the mouth during the artificial mastication of whole wheat
710 and white bread samples, with the addition of water or saliva as the oral liquid (n=10; mean
711 and SD). All differences were significant.

712 Figure 10. A: Mean particle size distribution curve in the swallowable bolus after *in vitro*
713 mastication of pasta and in the gastric compartment after *in vitro* gastric digestion. B: Kinetics
714 of protein appearance in a simulated aged gastric compartment after normal and deficient
715 mastication simulated with the AM² (n = 3; mean and SD). Protein concentration was

716 significantly lower (*) from 90 min digestion in deficient mastication compared to normal
717 mastication.

718 Figure 11. Lipid and protein oxidation during *in vitro* mastication in the absence of saliva. A:
719 Lipid oxidation during *in vitro* mastication without saliva, measured by malondialdehyde
720 appearance (MDA) as thiobarbituric acid reactive substances (TBARS). B: Protein oxidation
721 during *in vitro* mastication without saliva measured by the quantity of carbonyl groups
722 (aldehydes and ketones present in the food bolus (reaction with dinitrophenylhydrazine
723 (DNPH).

724 Figure 12. Effects of two levels of deficient force (Def Force 1 & 2) and motility (Def Motil 1
725 & 2), and their combination, on the granulometry of poultry meatball boluses obtained with *in*
726 *vitro* mastication (n=10; mean and SD). *d50* value (in mm) is the median value of the particle
727 size distribution in the food bolus and defined as the theoretical sieve size through which 50%
728 of the mass can pass. Comparison was performed with normal mastication (NM). Significant
729 differences against NM *d50* values were observed from Def Force 2 condition. *Data adapted*
730 *from Peyron et al, 2018*

731 Figure 13. Calibration (A) and measurement (B) of the resistance to compression of three
732 gelatine products (Ø 2 cm; height 1 cm) of different harnesses. Forces are measured with the
733 strength sensor along the shaft actuating the mobile masticatory **disk**. A: the AM² is activated
734 with a pure translation movement, with an empty chamber and for five successive cycles. At
735 the end of each cycle, the mobile (mandibular) jaw is stopped at initial contact, and contact
736 for two seconds, without applying forces. Forces recorded in the translational axis with the
737 strength sensor are in Newtons (N). The whole procedure lasted 23 seconds (s). The force
738 sensor records four types of events: ① friction of the mobile jaw against the mastication
739 chamber wall while the jaw is moving towards the useful range of movements; ② forces

740 resulting from the air compressed by the progress of the mobile jaw in the chamber; ③ forces
741 resulting from negative air pressure while the jaw moves backwards; ④ null force while the
742 jaw is stopped for 2 seconds with no pressure against the fixed jaw. B: Measuring the force
743 during compression of three gelatines of different hardnesses. The events are the same as
744 those described above except for event 4 which displays the forces in Newtons (N) applied
745 during the mastication of the three gelatines differing in hardness. The translational
746 movement was performed at 100 mm/s.

747 Figure 14. Forces recorded with the strength sensor of the AM² (Fig. 1) while chewing banana
748 samples with 1.8 ml saliva, at 100 mm/s translational speed. A: Successive bites performed in
749 2 minutes chewing. The progressively decreasing force—from $25.42 \pm 0.81\text{N}$ to almost zero, is
750 highlighted by black circles and illustrates that the banana sample was progressively crushed
751 and less resistant with the successive bites. B: Measures with an Instron machine performing
752 a single compression test in replicates on 2 banana samples (2 cm diameter, 1 cm high) with a
753 cylindrical piston head of 2.8 cm diameter. The values of forces in Newtons ($26.99 \pm 1.08\text{ N}$)
754 were similar to the value obtained during the first bite with AM² ($25.42 \pm 0.81\text{ N}$). C and D:
755 Measures of forces developed during a five-bite compression to test the effect of banana
756 ripening on sample resistance with the AM² mimicking a testing machine mode (no saliva,
757 spring of lowest stiffness, mobile disk actuated at 100mm/s).



PROOFREADING CERTIFICATE

To whom it may concern,
the document bearing the title:

ADDRESSING VARIOUS CHALLENGES RELATED TO FOOD BOLUS AND NUTRITION

WITH THE AM² MASTICATION SIMULATOR

was proofread and corrected by a native English speaker working for Accent Europe on 13 June 2019.

Articles proofread or translated by Accent Europe have been published in the following journals:

<p>Agronomy Cereals European Journal of Agronomy European Journal of Soil Science Geoderma Pedologia Plants and Soil Soil and Tillage Research Soil Science Society of America</p> <p>Biology Cell Fundamental and Applied Limnology Global Change Biology Hydrobiologia International Journal of Limnology Journal of Clinical Microbiology Mutation Research - Genetic Toxicology and Environmental Mutagenesis</p> <p>Chemistry Analytical Chemistry Chemical engineering journal Chemical engineering science Journal of the American Chemical Society Kinetics and Catalysis Polymer Testing</p> <p>Cognitive sciences, ergonomics, health, medicine Accident Analysis and Prevention Aerosol and Air Quality Research Aerosol Science and Technology Allergy American Journal of Epidemiology Annals of Occupational Hygiene Applied acoustics Applied ergonomics Archives of toxicology British Medical Journal Diabetes Disease-a-Month Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis Ergonomics Filtration and separation Gerodontology Health Policy Injury Prevention International Journal of Audiology International Journal of Engineering Design International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics International journal of occupational medicine and environmental health International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics International Journal of Pharmacoetics International Journal of Ventilation International Society for Respiratory Protection JASA (Journal of Acoustical Society of America) Journal of Aerosol Materials</p>	<p>Journal of aerosol science Journal of Analytical Toxicology Journal of environmental and occupational hygiene Journal of environmental Hygiene Journal of Nanoparticle Research Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene Journal of Pharmacological and Toxicological Methods Journal of Physics: Conference Series Journal of sound and vibration Neurotoxicology NT & T Occupational and Environmental Medicine (OEM) Occupational Environmental Medicine Occupational Medicine Physiology & Behaviour Powder technology Radiology Radioprotection Revue Thomas Safety Science The Journal of Infectious Diseases Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health Springer Computer Science Toxicology and environmental chemistry Toxicology in vitro Traffic Injury Prevention Journal of oral rehabilitation Waste Management WDPF Pastry</p> <p>Computer Science and Mathematics Computer & Structures Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering Computer methods in applied mechanics and engineering Computes and Information in Engineering Conference Computer and chemical engineering</p> <p>Civil Engineering Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering Journal of Hydraulic Engineering European Journal of Environmental and Civil Engineering Hydropower and Dams Transport in Porous Media</p> <p>Economics Economic Modelling International Journal of Public Sector Performance Labour International Journal of Transport Economics</p> <p>The environment Aqua-Lac - UNIBICO Aquatic Toxicology Chemosphere Environmental Science and Pollution Research Journal of Water Resource and Protection Archives of environmental contaminants and toxicity Earth Science Review Ecotoxicology Environment Environment International</p>	<p>Forest Ecology and Management Journal of Environmental Management Journal of Environmental Quality Journal of Hazardous Materials Marine Ecology Progress Series Microbial Ecology Sciences of the Total Environment Urban Water Journal Water Science and technology Journal of Hazardous Materials STOTEN Vadose Zone Journal Water Research</p> <p>Food Science International Journal of Food Science and Technology</p> <p>Oceanography Deep Sea Research Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom</p> <p>Structural mechanics, numerical simulation ASME Journal of Applied Mechanics ASME Journal of Computational Methods and Nonlinear Dynamics ASME Journal of Vibration and Acoustics Comptes Rendus de Mécanique Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering Granular Matter International Journal of Solids and Structures Journal of Applied Physics Journal of Heat Transfer Journal of Magnetism and Magnetic Materials Journal of Mechanical Design (ASME) Proceedings of the ASME 2012 Turbine Technical Conference and Exposition ASME, IMackE Journal of Mechanism and Machine Theory Journal of Sound and Vibration Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing Journal of Vibration and Control Materials Science and Engineering Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing Mechanism and Machine Theory Nonlinear Dynamics Proceedings of the ASME 2011 International Design Engineering Technical Conference Proceedings of the ASME 2011 Turbine Technical Conference and Exposition The Shock and Vibration Bulletin Transactions of the ASME</p> <p>Tribology Journal of Tribology Tribology International Wear</p>
--	---	--

ACCENT EUROPE EURL - 3, rue Joseph Rimaud 69130 ECULLY - Tél. : 04 78 33 02 75 - Fax : 04 78 33 50 48
e-mail : accent.europe@orange.fr - site web : http://www.accent-europe.fr
euri d'un capital de 30 000 € - n° siret 413 843 772 00018 - code APE 921 B -
N° TVA intracommunautaire : FR0441384377200026




Figure 1




Figure 2









Figure 3






Figure 4




Figure 5






Figure 6





Figure 7




Figure 8




Figure 9



A**B**

Figure 10




Figure 11




Figure 12







Figure 13

Chewing of banana sample in AM² in 36 cycles



B Instron: compression test; 2 banana samples



Five-bite compression of ripe and firm bananas samples in AM²





Figure 14

