

Double emulsions fortified with plant and milk proteins as fat replacers in cheese

by Paximada, P., Howarth, M. and Dubey, B.N.

Copyright, publisher and additional Information: This is the author accepted manuscript. The final published version (version of record) is available online via Elsevier. This version is made available under the [CC-BY-ND-NC licence](#)

Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher

[DOI link to the version of record on the publisher's website](#)



**Harper Adams
University**

1 Double emulsions fortified with plant and milk proteins as fat replacers in cheese

2 Paraskevi Paximada^{i,ii 1}, Martin Howarthⁱ, Bipro N. Dubeyⁱ

3

4 ⁱ National Centre of Excellence for Food Engineering, Sheffield Hallam University, 811
5 Attercliffe Rd, Sheffield S9 2AA, UK.

6 ⁱⁱ Department of Food Technology and Innovation, Harper Adams University, Newport,
7 Shropshire, TF10 8NB, UK.

8

9

10

1 **1. Introduction**

2
3 Fat is one of the major macronutrients of food products (Martin & Issanchou, 2019).
4 However, high consumption of fat has been associated with increased risk of heart
5 disease, type-2 diabetes and stroke risks (Mozaffarian, 2016). The vast majority of
6 countries have established guidelines to reduce fat consumption, and studies have
7 shown that buyers seek reduced fat or fat-free products (Fenko, Nicolaas, &
8 Galetzka, 2018). Cheese is a complex, multiphase system, whose fat content varies
9 between 11 and 47% (Widdowson, 2015). One of the popular cheese types that is
10 consumed worldwide is Cheddar cheese (Fox & McSweeney, 2004). In the UK,
11 cheese consumption is 1.7 kg per capita, with 54% being Cheddar cheese in 2016,
12 with the vast majority being consumed during summer. Taking these facts into
13 account, food companies and cheese producers, aspire to manufacture fat reduced
14 products to augment their market share (Pinto et al., 2016).

15 A major pitfall of low fat cheese is its stiff and rubbery texture due to changes
16 developed in the protein structure, as fewer fat droplets are immersed in the protein
17 matrix (Gunasekaran & Ding, 1999). Additional drawbacks of low-fat cheese are its
18 poor sensory characteristics (e.g. umami flavor) and its higher meltability and free
19 oil. The ability of a cheese to retain the free oil upon heating, is a functional property
20 that affects the use of the cheese as topping ingredient (Rowney et al., 2004). These
21 characteristics are connected with the biochemical alterations during maturation
22 and with the low ratio of fat to moisture (Fenelon & Guinee, 2000; Guinee &
23 O'Callaghan, 2013).

24 Hence, there is a need to look for ingredients that act as an active filler and are
25 embedded in the cheese protein matrix, in order to produce high quality low-fat
26 cheese (Lobato-Calleros et al., 2008; Ramel & Marangoni, 2018). Several approaches
27 have been evaluated for their capability to produce high quality low-fat cheese, for
28 example homogenization of the cheese milk, which led to microstructure and flavor
29 improvements but did not affect the free oil (Emmons, et al., 1980; Madadlou et al.,
30 2007). Several studies reported the use of oleogels for reducing fat content and
31 improving the cheese quality, although in their vast majority they are using
32 ingredients which are not approved to be included in cheese recipes (Bemer et al.,
33 2016; Ramel & Marangoni, 2018).

34 A plausible approach to overcome these limitations is the use of double emulsions.
35 Water-in-oil-in-water ($W_1/O/W_2$) emulsions comprise of water-in-oil emulsion
36 dispersed in an external water phase. Double emulsions have been recommended as
37 an approach to reduce the fat content of various food products, such as cheese
38 (Lobato-Calleros et al., 2008), yogurt (Lobato- Calleros et al., 2009), and meat
39 systems (Faraji et al., 2004). The inner water phase is able to reduce the fat content

1 in an equal oil-in-water (o/w) emulsion. **The main limitation of double emulsions is**
2 **their high susceptibility to destabilization due to phase separation**, droplet
3 flocculation or diffusion of the inner water droplets to the outer aqueous phase. The
4 stability of double emulsions is affected by the emulsifiers used to stabilize the
5 interfaces, the size of the oil droplets, and the emulsification method. Although
6 several studies have been performed in order to produce low-fat cheese with the aid
7 of double emulsions, to the best of the authors' knowledge, they all use liquid oils
8 that are not approved to be added in cheese recipes (Giroux et al., 2013; Karahan et
9 al., 2011; Lobato-Calleros et al., 2007).

10 For the formulation of low-fat cheese, the ingredients used ought not to interact or
11 be embedded in the protein matrix, thus reaching optimal functionality from each
12 ingredient. This will lead to **achieving the desired properties**, such as texture and
13 sensory. Protein has been extensively used as **a fat replacer** and fortification method
14 in cheese products (Rinaldoni et al., 2014; Talbot-Walsh et al., 2018). Milk proteins,
15 such as whey proteins and caseins, are the most broadly used ingredient for the
16 fortification of food products (Khouryieh et al., 2015; Xu et al., 2016). What is more,
17 rice, wheat, corn, pea, canola, and potato proteins are the major plant-based
18 proteins used as alternatives to animal-based fortification proteins (Day, 2013). Rice
19 protein is known for being hypoallergenic (Watanabe, 1993), and for its capability of
20 lowering the cholesterol level. **Rice has also higher biological value and protein**
21 **digestibility compared to milk proteins** (Eggum, 1979) and it is an affordable raw
22 ingredient (Agboola, et al., 2005).

23 Pumpkin seed protein is available in pumpkin seed cake, after the extraction of the
24 pumpkin seed oil (Ozuna and León-Galván, 2017). This oil is known for its high
25 content of unsaturated fatty acids and other bioactive compounds (Rabrenović et al.,
26 2014). Due to the large quantities of pumpkin seed oil that are produced, especially
27 in Austria and Slovenia (Fruhirth and Hermetter, 2008), a great amount of pumpkin
28 seed cake is subsequently created, which contains up to 60% protein. Until now,
29 these proteins are mainly being utilized in livestock feed (Caili, Huan, & Quanhong,
30 2006). Therefore, there are opportunities to incorporate these proteins into food
31 products in order to increase their functionality. However, there is limited research
32 using these proteins in food systems (Bučko et al., 2015; Bučko et al., 2016).
33 Therefore, the food industry needs to explore alternative plant-based protein
34 sources.

35 The objective of the present study is to produce low-fat cheese using double
36 emulsions, as well as to study the effect of the addition of whey protein isolate
37 (WPI), rice protein (RP), or pumpkin seed protein (PSP) in the properties of primary
38 and double emulsions as fat replacers in cheese.

39 **2. Materials and Methods**

1 2.1 Materials

2 Anhydrous milk fat (AMF) (99.88% fat, 0.12% moisture) was obtained from Spear
3 Associates Ltd. (Bala, UK). Whey protein isolate (WPI) (Lacprodan- DI-9224 with
4 protein content of $92 \pm 2\%$ and 0.3% moisture content) was provided by Arla Foods
5 Ingredients (Viby, Denmark). Rice protein (RP) (68% protein, 0.5% moisture) and
6 pumpkin seed protein (PSP) (65% protein, 0.8% moisture) were both purchased from
7 Indigo Herbs (Glastonbury, UK). The lipophilic surfactant sorbitan monooleate (Span
8 80) was purchased from Sigma- Aldrich (St Louis, USA), while surfactant polyglycerol
9 polyricinoleate (PGPR) was kindly donated by Palsgaard (Juelsminde, Denmark).
10 Unhomogenised milk (2.4% fat) was purchased from a local dairy and used as such.
11 Mesophilic and thermophilic starter culture (Choozit RA21, Danisco, France). All
12 aqueous solutions were prepared with tap water.

13 2.2 Preparation of primary emulsions

14 The WPI, RP and PSP stock solutions were prepared by dissolving the appropriate
15 amount of powder in water under continuous stirring at room temperature (18°C)
16 for 60 min. The solutions were stored in the refrigerator at 4°C overnight to ensure
17 complete hydration. The protein concentration of the dispersions was between 10,
18 15, 20, and 25% wt. The fat phase contained two lipophilic surfactants (PGPR and
19 Span 80) in a 1:1 ratio. The total surfactant content of the primary emulsions was 2%
20 wt. After heating the AMF to 45°C , the lipophilic surfactants were added while
21 stirring with a propeller stirrer (Eurostar 60, IKA, Staufen, Germany) at 2000 rpm.
22 Primary water-in-oil (w_1/o) emulsions were produced by adding 40% wt. of the
23 aqueous phase to the fat phase in a 2 L beaker while mixing. The emulsion was then
24 homogenized with the aid of a rotor-stator homogenizer (Magic lab, IKA, Staufen,
25 Germany) at 45°C for 20 min at 25000 rpm. The samples were immediately cooled to
26 room temperature after homogenization. The different proteins gave similar
27 dispersed-to-continuous phase viscosity ratio of the of the primary emulsion ($\lambda = 0.1 -$
28 1.0). The final primary emulsions contained 60%wt. fat.

29 2.3 Preparation of double emulsions

30 Double emulsions were prepared by dispersing 5% wt. of the primary emulsions
31 (w_1/o) into 95% wt. of the external aqueous phase (milk) using a rotor-stator
32 homogenizer (L5M-A, Silverson, Chesham, UK) at 8000 rpm for 10 min. The
33 temperature of the double emulsions was 38°C . All emulsions were prepared in
34 duplicate.

35 2.4 Cheese making

1 The double emulsions with each protein content that gave better stability and
2 smaller droplet size were selected in order to make 3 low fat cheeses enriched with
3 proteins. At the same time, a standard full fat (FF) and a low fat (LF) Cheddar cheese
4 were produced and used as references. 10 L vats (FT-20 cheese vat, Armfield,
5 Ringwood, UK) were filled with 9.5 kg milk and 0.5 kg w/o/w emulsions and
6 preheated to 32°C. 0.1 g of the starter culture was added to the vat and allowed to
7 ripen for 60 min, for all the produced samples. The pH of the samples after the
8 ripening, was recorded and kept at statistically same values. The rennet (CHY-MAX
9 powder Extra NB, Chr. Hansen) was diluted was diluted 1:5 with water and was then
10 added and the milk was allowed to stand for 40 min. When a firm coagulum was
11 achieved, the curd was cut with 1.6 cm wire knives, then allowed to rest for 5 min.
12 The way to ensure that the firm coagulum was successful was when the knife could
13 not cut the coagulum.

14 At this point, stirring and heating began until the temperature reached 38°C after 35
15 min. It was then held at 38°C until the pH reached 6.30, at which time the whey was
16 drained. The cheese was formed into one slab and it was then Cheddared by flipping
17 the pieces every 10 min and stacking until the pH of the curd reached 5.40. The curds
18 were milled and salted (3% salt). The last step was to place the curds in molds and
19 pressed at 10 psi for 1 h, followed by 40 psi for 18 h. Finally, the cheese was
20 removed, vacuum packed and left to mature at 12° C for at least 14 days. The
21 cheeses were sampled after 1 and 14 days by removing a slice from each cheese
22 using a knife. All samples were produced in triplicate. The same procedure was
23 followed to make the FF cheddar (using 10L whole milk) and LF (using whole milk
24 and skim to 2.4% wt. fat).

25 *2.5 Characterization of emulsions*

26 *2.5.1. Droplet size analysis of emulsions*

27 The droplet size distribution of the primary emulsions was determined using static
28 light scattering (Malvern Mastersizer 3000, Malvern Instruments Ltd, UK) equipped
29 with a Hydro-dispersion unit. Before starting the experiment, the formulations were
30 diluted in sunflower containing 1% wt. Span 80. The refractive indices of fat and
31 water were taken as 1.467 and 1.330, respectively, and the Mie theory was used for
32 the analysis. The size distribution was expressed as the median diameter (d_{50}). The
33 polydispersity index was also evaluated used the following equation:

$$34 \quad PDI = \frac{D_{90} - D_{10}}{D_{50}} \quad (\text{Eq. 1}).$$

35 The same apparatus was used to measure the droplet size of the double emulsions.
36 In that case, double emulsions were diluted to water, while the refractive index of

1 milk was taken as 1.345. At least three measurements were performed on freshly
2 prepared primary and double emulsions, and the results are expressed as the
3 average value.

4 2.5.2. Emulsion stability

5 The stability of emulsions at ambient temperature was measured by centrifugation.
6 Emulsion samples (approximately 30 g) were put into test tubes and centrifuged
7 (Megastar 1.6, VWR, USA) for 20 min at 3005 g, at 38°C. The height of the serum
8 layer of centrifugation after storage was recorded using a ruler for all the tested
9 emulsions. The stability is presented in the serum Index (SI), which is calculated using
10 following equation:

$$SI\% = \frac{H_s}{H_e} * 100 (Eq. 2)$$

11 where H_s is the height of the serum layer and H_e is the total height of the emulsion.
12 A lower SI, therefore, represents a more stable emulsion.

13 2.5.3. Structure of double emulsions

14 Samples of freshly prepared double emulsions were observed using an optical
15 microscope (Olympus BX51, Essex, UK) at 25°C. The emulsion was being diluted with
16 water (1:6 volume) and a drop was placed on the glass slide and gently covered with
17 a cover slip. Several pictures were taken from random sample positions and 300
18 droplets were measured per repetition representing the overall appearance of the
19 emulsions.

20 2.5.4. Rheological properties of solutions and emulsions

21 Rheological measurements of the emulsions were performed on a stress-controlled
22 rheometer (Physica MCR 301, Anton Paar, Graz, Austria) equipped with a double-gap
23 geometry with 26 mm diameter (DG-26.7). The temperature was kept constant (32.0
24 $\pm 0.1^\circ$ C) using a water bath. To achieve thermal and structure equilibrium, 7 ml of
25 the sample was left at rest in the measurement system for 5 min prior to analysis.
26 The apparent viscosity of the internal aqueous phase and the double emulsion was
27 determined versus the imposed shear rate from 0.1 to 1000 s^{-1} . 10 points per decade
28 were measured while the whole measuring time was 10 min. The viscosity
29 measurements are reported as the average of at least three different samples. All
30 rheological measurements were conducted with freshly prepared emulsions. The
31 calculation of the viscosity ratio (λ) of each emulsion was based on the following
32 equation:

$$\lambda = \frac{\eta_d}{\eta_c} (Eq. 3)$$

1 where η_d is the viscosity of the dispersed phase at shear rate of 100 s^{-1} and η_c is the
2 viscosity of the continuous phase at the same shear rate.

3 2.6. Cheese analyses

4 2.6.1. Composition of cheeses and yield

5 The pH of the cheese was evaluated with a pH-meter (Jenway 550, Fisher Scientific,
6 Loughborough, UK) after 14 days of maturation. The cheeses were also tested for
7 compositional analyses at 14 days. The moisture content of the cheeses was
8 measured using a moisture balance with halogen heat source (MB25, Ohaus, China).
9 1 g of cheese sample was grated and put in a sample pan in the balance. The
10 temperature was set at 102°C . The evaluation of the cheese's nutritional properties
11 (fat, salt, and protein content) had been performed with a FOSS Food Scan using a
12 near infrared transmittance (Hilleroed, Denmark). For that purpose, a 20 g sample of
13 cheese were put in a petri dish and added in the equipment, where the fat, protein
14 and salt content of the cheese were evaluated.

15 The cheese yield was calculated from the following equation:

$$\text{cheese yield}(\%) = \frac{\text{Weight of cheese}(kg)}{\text{Weight of milk}(kg)} \text{ (Eq. 4)}$$

16 2.6.2. Textural properties

17 A Texture profile analyzer (Stable MicroSystems, Texture Technologies, USA) was
18 used to measure the textural properties of the cheeses. Before the measurement
19 the cores of cheeses were taken from the inner part of the cheese and were cut in 3-
20 cm cubes with a razor. The cubes were individually wrapped in plastic film to avoid
21 surface drying and equilibrated for about an hour at room temperature (20°C)
22 before testing. The cubes were compressed in two cycle test at a speed of 1.2 mm/s
23 with 30% deformation from their initial height. Hardness (H) was recorded as the
24 maximum force during the first compression cycle.

25 2.6.3. Melting profile

26 Schreiber's test with minor modifications (Altan, Turhan, & Gunasekaran, 2005) was
27 used to determine the meltability of the cheeses. Cores of the cheese were cut (20
28 mm cubes) and the cubes positioned at the centre of a glass petri dish. Reference
29 figures of concentric cylinders with 10 mm diameter increments were prepared and
30 placed at the bottom of the dish. The dishes were then covered and refrigerated (4°
31 C) for 10 min. The dishes were then transferred to a preheated oven and left there
32 for 3 min at 100°C . The samples were left to cool down to room temperature (20°C)
33 for 20 min and then the diameter of the cheese was measured at 4 different places.

1 After creating the average of these readings, the meltability was calculated as the %
2 increase of the diameter from the initial diameter.

3 2.6.4. Oil loss

4 The evaluation of oil loss was done by using a modified filter paper analysis (Ramel &
5 Marangoni, 2018). Core of the cheeses (20 mm cubes) were cut and weighed.
6 Whatman filter papers (Grade 4, VWR, Lutterworth, UK) were weighted separately.
7 Cheese samples were positioned on top of the paper and stored in a refrigerator (4°
8 C) for 1 week. The papers were weighted again after removing the cheeses following
9 1 week of storage. Oil loss was calculated using the following equation:

$$oilloss(\%) = \frac{(W_f - W_i) - (W_{cf} - W_{ci})}{W_i} (Eq. 5)$$

10

11 where W_f is the final weight of the paper after 1 week of storage (when all the oil
12 has migrated), W_i is the weight of the paper before adding the cheese, W_{cf} is the
13 final weight of the empty paper, and W_{ci} is the initial weight of the empty paper.

14 2.7. Statistical analysis

15 Statistical analysis of the results was performed with Statgraphics Centurion XV
16 (Statgraphics, Rockville, MD, USA) and a one-way ANOVA with Tukey test was
17 applied in order to estimate the significant differences at a 95% level of confidence.

18

1 3. Results & Discussion

2 3.1 Characteristics of W_1/O primary emulsions

3 In this study, different protein types (WPI, PSP, RP) were added to the aqueous
4 phase of the primary emulsions. It is known that every protein has a different
5 stabilizing mechanism. It is a key requirement to achieve small droplet sizes and
6 emulsions that are stable against coalescence, in order to increase the yield of the
7 inner droplets in the final double emulsion. Physical properties of the primary
8 emulsions were evaluated to gain insight into the adsorption and stabilizing
9 mechanisms. Fig. 1 depicts the mean droplet size (d_{50}) of emulsions based on
10 number prepared with different protein types and concentrations from 10-25% wt.

11 From Fig. 1 shows that the droplet size is decreasing as protein concentration
12 increases, until it reaches a critical point from where it remains stable. That trend
13 applies in all emulsion samples, regardless of the protein type. This indicates that
14 even the lowest protein concentration (20% wt.), efficiently covers the droplets'
15 surface. After the critical concentration of 20% wt., the excess protein remains in the
16 aqueous phase. This phenomenon was previously mentioned (Paximada, et al.,
17 2016). In all the tested primary emulsions, the droplet size shows monomodal
18 distribution for all protein type and concentrations used (data not shown).

19 WPI emulsions achieved the lowest d_{50} values in the range of 0.128 μm (at 25%wt.
20 protein), with their saturation concentration achieved at 20% wt. A probable
21 explanation is that whey proteins have enhanced emulsifying properties compared
22 to vegetable proteins such as rice and pumpkin seed proteins, which favours the
23 better stabilization of WPI emulsions (Richert, 1979; Sahagún et al., 2018). Addition
24 of WPI shows more efficient surface coverage and quicker diffusion of the protein on
25 the interface, which leads to smaller droplet sizes (Gulseren & Corredig, 2013).
26 Another explanation is the poor solubility of proteins from vegetable origin in water
27 (Xu et al., 2016). In fact, native proteins, such as vegetable ones, consist of a rigid
28 polypeptide structure, which is joined with several subunits by hydrophobic
29 interactions and intermolecular bonds (Paraman et al., 2007).

30 The term emulsion stability refers to its ability to resist changes in its properties
31 through time (McClements, 2005). The stability of emulsions is an important
32 property since it contributes to the shelf-life of the products. The time during which
33 the emulsion is stable depends mainly on the nature of the ingredients added, such
34 as stabilizers and thickeners (Dickinson, 1992). Hence, the stability of the primary
35 emulsions have been recorded and presented as the serum index (SI) in Table 1.

36 A decrease of the SI is evident by increasing the concentration of protein. Emulsions
37 containing more than 20% wt. protein were stable (SI= 0%), regardless of the protein
38 type. These results are in accordance with the droplet size measurements, which
39 show that any addition of protein above 20% wt. does not have a significant effect

1 on the emulsion. Similar values for the SI have been found previously for emulsions
2 stabilized with WPI, where SI values of 12% were reported (Kaltsa et al., 2014).

3 Another property that significantly affects the emulsion's structure and stability is
4 the viscosity. The viscosity of the emulsions as a function of different protein
5 concentrations and types is presented in Table 1. All the emulsions, independent of
6 the protein concentration or type, exhibit a nearly Newtonian-like behavior as their
7 viscosity is practically independent from the shear rate (data not shown). **Viscosity**
8 **values increase** as the emulsifier concentration increases.

9 It is known that the emulsion droplet breakup is affected by the deformability of the
10 water droplets and the forces that are applied at the water/oil interface. Droplet
11 breakup is associated with the capillary number. Capillary breakup of a droplet
12 occurs when the droplet has no time to adapt its shape to the rapidly varying flow
13 field. This then results in a highly elongated shape on which perturbing ripples
14 develop. If the capillary number exceeds a critical value, the droplets tend to
15 develop into unstable drops and break up (Schröder et al., 2012). The Capillary
16 number relies on the viscosity ratio as summarized in Eq. 3. As shown, when the
17 viscosity of the continuous phase increases, the viscosity ratio reduces, and lead to a
18 higher droplet breakup rate. Many studies have shown that viscosity ratios between
19 0.1 and 1 facilitate the droplet break up (McClements, 2015; Oppermann et al.,
20 2018; Schröder et al., 2012).

21 Taking all the above into account, it is important to gain information on the effect of
22 viscosity ratios on the droplet size of the emulsions. In Table 2 the viscosity ratios of
23 the emulsions versus their size are summarized. This graph is divided into two areas:
24 the first being for protein concentrations up to 15%. In that first area, the droplet
25 size is significantly reduced as the viscosity ratio increases. This has been confirmed
26 by other researchers (Chen et al., 2015; Pal, 2007; Schröder et al., 2012; Tan et al.,
27 2020) . Above a critical viscosity ratio, there are no significant alterations on the
28 droplet size. It is worth noting that the protein type plays a major role on the droplet
29 size. It is shown in Table 2 that the interfacial properties of the proteins are crucial,
30 since the droplet size differs for the same viscosity ratio when using different types
31 of protein.

32 Overall, the protein type and concentration highly affect the physical properties of
33 the fat-based emulsions. Primary emulsions were used to prepare the double
34 emulsions. The best concentration of each protein type was selected in order to
35 produce the double emulsions. Based on the results from this section, **it is concluded**
36 that 25%wt. addition of protein resulted in stable (SI=0%) primary emulsions with
37 the lowest particle sizes (0.128 – 0.90 nm). Hence, the 25% wt. protein concentration
38 was selected for the following experiments.

39 *3.2 Characteristics of $W_1/O/W_2$ double emulsions*

1 Milk was chosen as the external aqueous phase to produce the double emulsions. It
2 is noted that the energy input that is being used for the production of double
3 emulsions need to be relatively low, in order to avoid the movement of the inner
4 water droplets to the outer aqueous phase. The average droplet size of the double
5 emulsions produced using 5% of the primary emulsion has been evaluated and
6 presented in Fig. 2.

7 The protein type significantly affects the droplet size of the double emulsions, with
8 WPI giving the smallest size. **The results show** that average droplet size of the double
9 emulsions is in the range of 1.8 - 4.2 μm , which is similar to the milk fat globules
10 found in whole milk (3-5 μm). Since they have the same size, we assume that the
11 double emulsions substitute the milk fat in the cheese without affecting its micro-
12 structure. A study using double emulsions in order to substitute milk fat in cheeses,
13 however they only achieved larger droplet sizes (8-30 μm) (Giroux et al., 2013).
14 Samples of freshly prepared double emulsions were observed using an optical
15 microscope and presented in Fig. 3. Double emulsions containing WPI exhibited
16 smaller droplets and less flocculation phenomena compared to those containing PSP
17 or RP. This is in accordance with the droplet size measurements and is attributed to
18 the differences at the size of the primary emulsions.

19 Internal phase composition had major consequences on the serum index and
20 viscosity of the double emulsions (Table 3). For emulsions containing WPI, the SI was
21 significantly lower (0.6%), compared to those formulations that contain PSP or RP
22 (1.7 and 5.2% respectively). The lower stability of PSP and RP double emulsions **is**
23 **explained** by the flocculation phenomena that are evident in Fig. 3. Several studies
24 have described that flocculation of droplets is being augmented when having a high
25 fat concentration, such as more than 15% fat (Giroux et al., 2013).

26 *3.3 Incorporation of double emulsions in cheeses*

27 Model cheeses were produced using milk with 3 different double emulsions
28 (containing WPI, PSP or RP in the inner aqueous phase). In order to compare with
29 the model cheeses, two control cheddars (FF and LF) were also made. The effect of
30 the substitution of milk fat with double emulsions on their properties was evaluated.
31 The composition of the model and control cheeses is presented in Table 4

32 The yield of the model cheeses is not affected by the protein used (approximately
33 11%). The yield is being increased compared to the LF. It is well established that LF
34 cheeses end up with lower yields. This **is attributed** to the fact that the casein, whey,
35 and milk fat concentrations are decreased during the production of LF cheddars
36 (Romeih et al., 2002). The exhibited higher yield is of utmost importance for the food
37 industry, this leads to the reduction of their costs. These results are in accordance
38 with other studies dealing with the production of low-fat cheese using fat mimics. pH

1 of the cheeses is not affected by the emulsion addition or by the reduction of the fat
2 (Table 4), as their values remain statistically the same, for all the tested samples.

3 Our model cheeses produced with WPI exhibit a decrease of the fat content.
4 Specifically, the cheeses with double emulsions yield fat contents between 16 and
5 20%, while the FF cheese yields 31% fat and the LF yields 17%. The fraction of the fat
6 phase that was added to the LF and the model cheeses was the same. However, the
7 fat phase of the WPI cheeses had a significant amount of water droplets in it, leading
8 to the reduction of the fat content (Lobato-Calleros et al., 2008). With respect to the
9 type of protein used, WPI reaches lower fat content compared to both PSP and RP.
10 **The reason behind this phenomenon is that the WPI forms a layer on the surface of**
11 **the inner water droplet which leads to the retention of the protein matrix of the**
12 **cheese.** Protein content, on the other side, is higher for the WPI cheeses. Given that
13 the protein concentration added to all the samples was the same, it is assumed that
14 WPI had higher retention rates in the cheese matrix.

15 Fig. 4 depicts the hardness of model cheeses and the control cheeses. It is evident
16 that FF cheese statistically exhibits the lowest hardness (20 N). All emulsion cheeses
17 show statistically the same hardness ranges (29-35 N), while the LF cheese exhibits
18 the highest hardness (41 N). It has been recorded that the use of o/w emulsions as a
19 substitution of fat globules, leads to the reduction of the hardness of the final
20 cheeses, due to the low melting point of the o/w emulsion (Lobato-Calleros et al.,
21 2007). However, studies show an increase of the hardness when making low fat
22 cheese or substituting milk fat with double emulsions (Sharma Khanal et al., 2019).
23 This phenomenon **is attributed to** the augmented degree of calcium-induced cross-
24 linking, which mitigate the higher concentration and volume fraction of the casein
25 network, thus producing firmer cheeses (McCarthy et al., 2015).

26 An essential functionality of cheese and cheese products is their meltability.
27 Meltability was calculated as the % of the increase in cheese diameter and is
28 summarized in Fig. 4 for the model cheese and the controls. The emulsion cheeses
29 did not have any significant difference in their meltability, while FF cheddar exhibits
30 the lowest increase in cheese diameter. LF cheese, on the other hand, exhibits
31 statistically the highest increase in its diameter. (Ramel & Marangoni, 2018) have
32 identified that the total meltability of the system is affected by the protein network,
33 rather than the fat.

34 Oil loss of model and control cheeses was calculated and is depicted in Fig. 4. It is
35 evident that the highest oil loss values are observed in LF cheese (20%), and the
36 lowest in FF cheese (5%). As far as emulsion-based cheeses are concerned, PSP and
37 RP do not exhibit any statistical difference of the oil loss values. In these cases, the
38 protein macromolecules reduce the interactions between fat and the protein
39 network (Rogers et al., 2010). In such a case, reduced protein is available for
40 emulsification and leads to destabilization of the oil and subsequent oil leakage in
41 the final cheese.

42

1

2 **4. Conclusions**

3 The aim of this study is to determine the effect of various proteins as emulsifiers of
4 the inner aqueous phase of double emulsions. Double emulsions consisted of WPI,
5 PSP or RP dissolved in the inner aqueous phase, anhydrous milk fat with PGPR and
6 Span 80 as the oil phase and milk as the outer aqueous phase. It was observed that
7 the protein type and concentration highly affected the physical properties of the fat-
8 based emulsions: an increase of the protein concentration led to larger viscosity
9 ratios and emulsions with smaller droplet size. This study shows that the nutritional,
10 physical and mechanical properties of low-fat cheese **are tailored** by incorporating
11 double emulsions. The results show that the authors' approach to producing food
12 grade double emulsions is an effective technique for the production of dairy
13 products which have specific low-fat attributes. These emulsions have significant
14 future applications in the food industry, particularly in a healthy diet conscious
15 society.

16 **5. Acknowledgements**

17 The research is funded by Innovate-UK (Proj. ref. 102700).

1 6. References

- 2 Agboola, S., Ng, D., & Mills, D. (2005). Characterisation and functional properties of
3 Australian rice protein isolates. *Journal of Cereal Science*, 41 (3), 283-290.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcs.2004.10.007> .
- 5 Altan, A., Turhan, M., & Gunasekaran, S. (2005). Comparison of Covered and Uncovered
6 Schreiber Test for Cheese Meltability Evaluation. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 88 (3),
7 857-861. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(05\)72751-X](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(05)72751-X) .
- 8 Eggum., E. (1979). The nutritional value of rice in comparison with other cereals. *Proceedings*
9 *of the Workshop on Chemical Aspects of Rice Grain Quality*, 99-111.
- 10 Banovic, M., Arvola, A., Pennanen, K., Duta, D. E., Brückner-Gühmann, M., Lähteenmäki, L.,
11 & Grunert, K. G. (2018). Foods with increased protein content: A qualitative study on
12 European consumer preferences and perceptions. *Appetite*, 125, 233-243.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2018.01.034> .
- 14 Bemer, H. L., Limbaugh, M., Cramer, E. D., Harper, W. J., & Maleky, F. (2016). Vegetable
15 organogels incorporation in cream cheese products. *Food Research International*,
16 85, 67-75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2016.04.016> .
- 17 Bučko, S., Katona, J., Popović, L., Vaštag, Ž., & Petrović, L. (2016). Functional properties of
18 pumpkin (*Cucurbita pepo*) seed protein isolate and hydrolysate. *Journal of the*
19 *Serbian Chemical Society*, 81 (1), 35-46. <https://doi.org/10.2298/JSC150615081B> .
- 20 Bučko, S., Katona, J., Popović, L., Vaštag, Ž., Petrović, L., & Vučinić-Vasić, M. (2015).
21 Investigation on solubility, interfacial and emulsifying properties of pumpkin
22 (*Cucurbita pepo*) seed protein isolate. *LWT - Food Science and Technology*, 64 (2),
23 609-615. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2015.06.054> .
- 24 Caili, F., Huan, S., & Quanhong, L. (2006). A Review on Pharmacological Activities and
25 Utilization Technologies of Pumpkin. *Plant Foods for Human Nutrition*, 61 (2), 70-77.
26 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11130-006-0016-6> .
- 27 Chen, Y., Wu, L., Zhang, L., (2015). Dynamic behaviors of double emulsion formation in a
28 flow-focusing device. *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, 82, 42-50.
29 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2014.11.027> .
- 30 Day, L. (2013). Proteins from land plants – Potential resources for human nutrition and food
31 security. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 32 (1), 25-42.
32 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2013.05.005> .
- 33 Dickinson, E. (1992). An Introduction to Food Colloids. 36 (5), 514-514.
34 <https://doi.org/10.1002/food.19920360540>
35
- 36 Emmons, D. B., Kalab, M., Larmond, E., & Lowrie, R. J. (1980). Milk gel structure. X. texture
37 and microstructure in cheddar cheese made from whole milk and from
38 homogenised low-fat milk. *Journal of Texture Studies*, 11 (1), 15-34.
39 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-4603.1980.tb00305.x> .
- 40
- 41 Faraji, H., McClements, D. J., & Decker, E. A. (2004). Role of continuous phase protein on the
42 oxidative stability of fish oil-in-water emulsions. *Journal of Agricultural Food*
43 *Chemistry*, 52 (14), 4558-4564. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf035346j> .
- 44 Farouk, M. M., Yoo, M. J. Y., Hamid, N. S. A., Staincliffe, M., Davies, B., & Knowles, S. O.
45 (2018). Novel meat-enriched foods for older consumers. *Food Research*
46 *International*, 104, 134-142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2017.10.033> .
- 47 Fenelon, M. A., & Guinee, T. P. (2000). Primary proteolysis and textural changes during
48 ripening in Cheddar cheeses manufactured to different fat contents. *International*
49 *Dairy Journal*, 10 (3), 151-158. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0958-6946\(00\)00040-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0958-6946(00)00040-6) .

- 1 Fenko, A., Nicolaas, I., & Galetzka, M. (2018). Does attention to health labels predict a
2 healthy food choice? An eye-tracking study. *Food Quality and Preference*, *69*, 57-65.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2018.05.012> .
- 4 Fox, P. F., & McSweeney, P. L. H. (2004). Cheese: An Overview. In P. F. Fox, P. L. H.
5 McSweeney, T. M. Cogan & T. P. Guinee (Eds.), *Cheese: Chemistry, Physics and*
6 *Microbiology* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-18): Academic Press. [https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-417012-4.00001-6)
7 [417012-4.00001-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-417012-4.00001-6) .
- 8 Fruhwirth, G. O., & Hermetter, A. (2008). Production technology and characteristics of
9 Styrian pumpkin seed oil. *European Journal of Lipid Science and Technology*, *110* (7),
10 637-644. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejlt.200700257> .
- 11 Giroux, H. J., Constantineau, S., Fustier, P., Champagne, C. P., St-Gelais, D., Lacroix, M., &
12 Britten, M. (2013). Cheese fortification using water-in-oil-in-water double emulsions
13 as carrier for water soluble nutrients. *International Dairy Journal*, *29* (2), 107-114.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2012.10.009> .
- 15 Guinee, T. P., & O'Callaghan, D. J. (2013). Effect of increasing the protein-to-fat ratio and
16 reducing fat content on the chemical and physical properties of processed cheese
17 product. *Journal of Dairy Science*, *96* (11), 6830-6839.
18 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2013-6685> .
- 19 Gulseren, I., & Corredig, M. (2013). Interactions of chitin nanocrystals with beta-
20 lactoglobulin at the oil-water interface, studied by drop shape tensiometry. *Colloids*
21 *& Surfaces B Bio interfaces*, *111*, 672-679.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colsurfb.2013.06.058> .
- 23 Gunasekaran, S., & Ding, K. (1999). Three-Dimensional Characteristics of Fat Globules in
24 Cheddar Cheese. *Journal of Dairy Science*, *82* (9), 1890-1896.
25 [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(99\)75423-8](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(99)75423-8) .
- 26 Kaltsa, O., Paximada, P., Mandala, I., & Scholten, E. (2014). Physical characteristics of
27 submicron emulsions upon partial displacement of whey protein by a small
28 molecular weight surfactant and pectin addition. *Food Research International*, *66*,
29 401-408. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2014.10.005> .
- 30 Karahan, A. G., Arzu, K., Akoglu, A., & Cakmakci, M. L. (2011). Physicochemical properties of
31 low-fat soft cheese Turkish Beyaz made with bacterial cellulose as fat mimetic.
32 *International Journal of Dairy Technology*, *64* (4), 502-508.
33 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0307.2011.00718.x> .
- 34 Khouryieh, H., Puli, G., Williams, K., & Aramouni, F. (2015). Effects of xanthan-locust bean
35 gum mixtures on the physicochemical properties and oxidative stability of whey
36 protein stabilised oil-in-water emulsions. *Food Chemistry*, *167*, 340-348.
37 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2014.07.009> .
- 38 Lobato- Calleros, C., Recillas-Mota, M. T., Espinosa-Solares, T., Alvarez-Ramirez, J., & Vernon-
39 Carter, E. J. (2009). Microstructural and rheological properties of low-fat stirred
40 yogurts made with skim milk and multiple emulsions. *Journal of Texture Studies*, *40*
41 (6), 657-675. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-4603.2009.00204.x> .
- 42 Lobato-Calleros, C., Reyes-Hernández, J., Beristain, C. I., Hornelas-Urbe, Y., Sánchez-García,
43 J. E., & Vernon-Carter, E. J. (2007). Microstructure and texture of white fresh cheese
44 made with canola oil and whey protein concentrate in partial or total replacement of
45 milk fat. *Food Research International*, *40* (4), 529-537.
46 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2006.10.011> .
- 47 Lobato-Calleros, C., Sosa-Pérez, A., Rodríguez-Tafoya, J., Sandoval-Castilla, O., Pérez-Alonso,
48 C., & Vernon-Carter, E. J. (2008). Structural and textural characteristics of reduced-
49 fat cheese-like products made from W1/O/W2 emulsions and skim milk. *LWT - Food*

- 1 *Science and Technology*, 41 (10), 1847-1856.
2 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2008.01.006> .
- 3 Madadlou, A., Mousavi, M. E., Khosrowshahi asl, A., Emam-Djome, Z., & Zargaran, M. (2007).
4 Effect of cream homogenization on textural characteristics of low-fat Iranian White
5 cheese. *International Dairy Journal*, 17 (5), 547-554.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2006.07.006> .
- 7 Mariotti, F. (2017). 35 - Plant Protein, Animal Protein, and Protein Quality. In F. Mariotti
8 (Ed.), *Vegetarian and Plant-Based Diets in Health and Disease Prevention* (pp. 621-
9 642): Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-803968-7.00035-6> .
- 10 Martin, C., & Issanchou, S. (2019). Nutrient sensing: What can we learn from different tastes
11 about the nutrient contents in today's foods? *Food Quality and Preference*, 71, 185-
12 196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2018.07.003> .
- 13 McCarthy, C. M., Wilkinson, M. G., Kelly, P. M., & Guinee, T. P. (2015). Effect of salt and fat
14 reduction on the composition, lactose metabolism, water activity and microbiology
15 of Cheddar cheese. *Dairy Science & Technology*, 95 (5), 587-611.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13594-015-0245-2> .
- 17 McClements, D. J. (2015). *Food emulsions: principles, practices, and techniques*: CRC press.
- 18 Mozaffarian, D. (2016). Dietary and Policy Priorities for Cardiovascular Disease, Diabetes,
19 and Obesity: A Comprehensive Review. *Circulation*, 133 (2), 187-225.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.115.018585> .
- 21 Oppermann, A. K. L., Noppers, J. M. E., Stieger, M., & Scholten, E. (2018). Effect of outer
22 water phase composition on oil droplet size and yield of (w1/o/w2) double
23 emulsions. *Food Research International*, 107, 148-157.
24 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2018.02.021> .
- 25 Ozuna, C., & León-Galván, M. F. (2017). Cucurbitaceae Seed Protein Hydrolysates as a
26 Potential Source of Bioactive Peptides with Functional Properties. *BioMed research*
27 *international*, 2017, 2121878-2121878. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/2121878> .
- 28 Pal, R., (2007). Rheology of double emulsions. *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science*,
29 307(2), 509-515. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcis.2006.12.024>.
- 30 Paraman, I., Hettiarachchy, N. S., Schaefer, C., & Beck, M. I. (2007). Hydrophobicity,
31 Solubility, and Emulsifying Properties of Enzyme-Modified Rice Endosperm Protein.
32 *Cereal Chemistry*, 84 (4), 343-349. <https://doi.org/10.1094/CCHEM-84-4-0343> .
- 33
- 34 Paximada, P., Koutinas, A. A., Scholten, E., & Mandala, I. G. (2016). Effect of bacterial
35 cellulose addition on physical properties of WPI emulsions. Comparison with
36 common thickeners. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 54, 245-254.
37 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2015.10.014> .
- 38 Pinto, V. R. A., Melo, L. F., Balbino, D. F., Novaes, J. F. d., Negrete, M. C., & Sousa, T. D. d.
39 (2016). The Evaluation of Consumer Behavior Influence on the Buying Process of
40 Dairy Products in Minas Gerais State, Brazil. *Journal of Food and Nutrition Research*,
41 4 (1), 51-59.
- 42 Rabrenović, B. B., Dimić, E. B., Novaković, M. M., Tešević, V. V., & Basić, Z. N. (2014). The
43 most important bioactive components of cold pressed oil from different pumpkin
44 (*Cucurbita pepo* L.) seeds. *LWT – Food Science and Technology*, 2014 v.55, pp. 521-
45 527. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2013.10.019>
- 46 Ramel, P. R., & Marangoni, A. G. (2018). Processed cheese as a polymer matrix composite: A
47 particle toolkit for the replacement of milk fat with canola oil in processed cheese.
48 *Food Research International*, 107, 110-118.
49 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2018.02.019> .

- 1 Richert, S. H. (1979). Physical-chemical properties of whey protein foams. *Journal of*
2 *Agricultural Food Chemistry*, 27 (4), 665-668. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf60224a036> .
- 3 Rinaldoni, A. N., Palatnik, D. R., Zaritzky, N., & Campderrós, M. E. (2014). Soft cheese-like
4 product development enriched with soy protein concentrates. *LWT - Food Science*
5 *and Technology*, 55 (1), 139-147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2013.09.003> .
- 6 Rogers, N.R., McMahon, D.J., Daubert, C.R., Berry, T.K., Foegeding, E.A., (2010). Rheological
7 properties and microstructure of Cheddar cheese made with different fat contents.
8 *Journal of Dairy Science*, 93(10), 4565-4576. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2010-3494>.
- 9 Romeih, E. A., Michaelidou, A., Biliaderis, C. G., & Zerfiridis, G. K. (2002). Low-fat white-
10 brined cheese made from bovine milk and two commercial fat mimetics: chemical,
11 physical and sensory attributes. *International Dairy Journal*, 12 (6), 525-540.
12 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0958-6946\(02\)00043-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0958-6946(02)00043-2) .
- 13 Rowney, M.K., Roupas, P., Hickey, M.W., Everett, D.W., (2004). Salt-induced structural
14 changes in 1-day old Mozzarella cheese and the impact upon free oil formation.
15 *International Dairy Journal*, 14(9), 809-816.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2004.02.004>.
- 17 Sahagún, M., Bravo-Núñez, Á., Bascónes, G., & Gómez, M. (2018). Influence of protein
18 source on the characteristics of gluten-free layer cakes. *LWT*, 94, 50-56.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2018.04.014> .
- 20 Schröder, J., Kleinhans, A., Serfert, Y., Drusch, S., Schuchmann, H. P., & Gaukel, V. (2012).
21 Viscosity ratio: A key factor for control of oil drop size distribution in effervescent
22 atomization of oil-in-water emulsions. *Journal of Food Engineering*, 111 (2), 265-271.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2012.02.023> .
- 24 Sharma Khanal, B. K., Budiman, C., Hodson, M. P., Plan, M. R. R., Prakash, S., Bhandari, B., &
25 Bansal, N. (2019). Physico-chemical and biochemical properties of low fat Cheddar
26 cheese made from micron to nano sized milk fat emulsions. *Journal of Food*
27 *Engineering*, 242, 94-105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2018.08.019> .
- 28 Sharma, R. (2019). Chapter 17 - Whey Proteins in Functional Foods. In H. C. Deeth & N.
29 Bansal (Eds.), *Whey Proteins* (pp. 637-663): Academic Press.
30 <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-812124-5.00018-7> .
- 31 Talbot-Walsh, G., Kannar, D., & Selomulya, C. (2018). A review on technological parameters
32 and recent advances in the fortification of processed cheese. *Trends in Food Science*
33 *& Technology*, 81, 193-202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2018.09.023> .
- 34 Tan, S., Gao, C., Liu, H., Ye, B., Sun, D., (2020). Research of double emulsion formation and
35 shell-thickness influence factors in a novel six-way junction microfluidic device.
36 *Colloids and Surfaces A: Physicochemical and Engineering Aspects*, 124917.
37 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colsurfa.2020.124917>.
- 38 Watanabe, M. (1993). Hypoallergenic rice as a physiologically functional food. *Trends in Food*
39 *Science & Technology*, 4 (5), 125-128. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0924-2244\(93\)90030-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0924-2244(93)90030-E)
40 [E](https://doi.org/10.1016/0924-2244(93)90030-E) .
- 41 Widdowson, M. (2015). Milk and milk products. In *McCance and Widdowson's The*
42 *Composition of Foods (7)* (Vol. 7, pp. 108-147): The Royal Society of Chemistry.
43 <https://doi.org/10.1039/9781849737562-00108> .
- 44 Xing, Q., de Wit, M., Kyriakopoulou, K., Boom, R. M., & Schutyser, M. A. I. (2018). Protein
45 enrichment of defatted soybean flour by fine milling and electrostatic separation.
46 *Innovative Food Science & Emerging Technologies*.
47 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifset.2018.08.014> .

1 Xu, X., Zhong, J., Chen, J., Liu, C., Luo, L., Luo, S., Wu, L., & McClements, D. J. (2016).
2 Effectiveness of partially hydrolyzed rice glutelin as a food emulsifier: Comparison to
3 whey protein. *Food Chemistry*, 213, 700-707.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2016.07.047> .

1 **Table 1.** Physical properties (serum index, apparent viscosity) of primary emulsions (W_1/O),
 2 made with milk fat, PGPR, and Span 80 as the continuous phase and whey protein isolate
 3 (WPI), pumpkin seed protein (PSP), or rice protein (RP) dissolved in water as the dispersed
 4 phase. The concentration of the protein in the emulsions varied between 10% wt. (WPI10,
 5 PSP10, RP10) and 25%wt. (WPI25, PSP25, RP25).

Emulsions	% wt. protein	SI (%)	Viscosity at 1000 s^{-1} (mPa s)
WPI10	10	2.3 ^c (0.5)	10 ^A (0.5)
WPI15	15	1.6 ^b (0.3)	15 ^B (1)
WPI20	20	0.0 ^a (0.0)	70 ^C (8)
WPI25	25	0.0 ^a (0.0)	120 ^E (9)
PSP10	10	7.6 ^f (0.9)	87 ^C (8)
PSP15	15	3.2 ^d (0.2)	110 ^D (5)
PSP20	20	0.0 ^a (0.0)	330 ^G (10)
PSP25	25	0.0 ^a (0.0)	750 ^I (103)
RP10	10	8.9 ^g (0.7)	230 ^F (53)
RP15	15	5.4 ^e (0.6)	360 ^G (23)
RP20	20	0.0 ^a (0.0)	530 ^H (27)
RP25	25	0.0 ^a (0.0)	910 ^J (98)

6 In parenthesis standard deviation values.

7 Mean values followed by the same letters are not significantly different ($P > 0.05$).

8

9

1 **Table 2.** Average droplet size of primary emulsions (W₁/O) emulsified with whey protein
 2 isolate, pumpkin seed protein, or rice protein as a function of apparent viscosity ratio.

3

WPI		PSP		RP	
λ_{1000} (-)	d_{50} (μm)	λ_{1000} (-)	d_{50} (μm)	λ_{1000} (-)	d_{50} (μm)
0.033	1.3 ^d	0.29	3.8 ^D	0.767	5.5 ^d
0.051	0.904 ^c	0.348	1.62 ^C	0.787	2.51 ^c
0.247	0.386 ^b	1.103	0.98 ^B	1.757	1.04 ^b
0.4	0.128 ^a	2.9	0.69 ^A	3.033	0.91 ^a

4 Mean values followed by the same letters are not significantly different (P > 0.05).

1 **Table 3.** Physical properties (serum index, apparent viscosity) of double emulsions
2 ($W_1/O/W_2$), containing 95% wt. milk and 5% wt. of the whey protein primary emulsion (wow
3 WPI), pumpkin seed protein primary emulsion (wowPSP) or rice protein primary emulsion
4 (wowRP).

Emulsions	SI (%)	Viscosity at 1000 s ⁻¹ (Pa s)
wowWPI	0.6 ^a (0.0)	0.5 ^A (0.0)
wowPSP	1.7 ^b (0.5)	1.4 ^B (0.3)
wowRP	5.2 ^c (0.8)	1.8 ^B (0.7)

5 Standard deviation values in parenthesis.

6 Mean values followed by the same letters are not significantly different ($P > 0.05$).

7

8

1 **Table 4. Composition of full fat cheese (FF),** low-fat cheese (LF) and reduced fat cheese
 2 products containing 5% of whey protein double emulsion (WPIcheese), pumpkin seed
 3 protein double emulsion (PSPcheese) or rice protein double emulsion (RPcheese) after 14
 4 days of production.

5


Cheese	Yield (%)	Moisture (%)	Fat (%)	Protein (%)	Salt (%)	pH
WPI	11.2 ^b	40.9 ^B	15.8 ^a	33.4 ^D	1.7 ^a	5.27 ^A
PSP	11.3 ^b	42.7 ^C	19.3 ^c	29.3 ^C	1.7 ^a	5.31 ^A
RP	11.6 ^b	43.5 ^C	20.1 ^c	25.1 ^B	1.8 ^a	5.33 ^A
FF	13.5 ^c	36.2 ^A	31.2 ^d	21.3 ^A	1.8 ^a	5.24 ^A
LF	9.3 ^a	40.4 ^B	17.3 ^b	29.7 ^C	1.8 ^a	5.30 ^A

6 Mean values followed by the same letters are not significantly different ($P > 0.05$).

7

8


1



2

3 **Fig. 1.** Average ($n=3$, $i=3$) droplet size of primary emulsions (W_1/O), made with milk fat,
4 PGPR, and Span 80 as the continuous phase and whey protein isolate (WPI- \blacklozenge), pumpkin
5 seed protein (PSP- \blacksquare), or rice protein (RP- \blacktriangle) as the dispersed phase. The concentration of
6 the protein in the emulsions varied between 10% wt. and 25%wt. Bars indicating standard
7 deviations.

8




1

2 **Fig. 2.** Average ($n=3$, $i=3$) droplet size of water-in-oil-in-water emulsions ($W_1/O/W_2$)
 3 emulsions containing 95% milk and 5% wt primary emulsion with **whey protein isolate**
 4 **(WPI)**, **pumpkin seed protein (PSP)**, or **rice protein (RP)**. Bars indicating standard deviations.

5 Mean values followed by the same letters are not significantly different ($P > 0.05$).

6




2 **Fig. 3.** Optical microscopic images of the water-in-oil-in-water emulsions prepared with 95%
3 milk and 5% wt primary emulsion with whey protein (wowWPI), pumpkin seed protein
4 (wowPSP), and rice protein (wowRP).

5

6

7

8



1 Fig. 4. Texture characteristics of full fat cheese (FF), low-fat cheese (LF) and reduced fat
 2 cheese products containing 5% of whey protein double emulsion (WPIcheese), pumpkin
 3 seed protein double emulsion (PSPcheese) or rice protein double emulsion (RPcheese) after

- 1 14 days of production: hardness (a), meltability (b), and oil loss (c). Bars indicating standard
- 2 deviations.
- 3 Mean (n=3) values followed by the same letters are not significantly different ($P > 0.05$).

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest

Paraskevi Paximada: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing.

Martin Howarth: Writing - review & editing, Supervision.

Bipro Dubey: Conceptualization, Writing - review & editing, Supervision.