

1 **TITLE PAGE**

2 **Gastric emptying and nutrient absorption of pea protein products differing in**  
3 **heat treatment and texture: a randomized *in vivo* crossover trial and *in vitro***  
4 **digestion study**

5 Julia J.M. Roelofs, MSc<sup>a</sup>, Elise J.M. van Eijnatten, MSc<sup>a</sup>, Patteela Prathumars MSc<sup>b</sup>,  
6 Joris de Jong, MSc<sup>a</sup>, Ron Wehrens<sup>c</sup>, PhD, Diederik Esser, PhD<sup>d</sup>, Anja E.M. Janssen,  
7 PhD<sup>b</sup>, Paul A.M. Smeets, PhD<sup>a</sup>

8

9 Author affiliations:

10 <sup>a</sup>Division of Human Nutrition and Health, Wageningen University,  
11 Droevendaalsesteeg 4, 6708 PB Wageningen, the Netherlands

12 <sup>b</sup>Food Processing Engineering, Wageningen University, Bornse Weilanden 9,  
13 6708 WG Wageningen, the Netherlands

14 <sup>c</sup>Wageningen Plant Research, Wageningen Research, Droevendaalsesteeg 1,  
15 6708 PB Wageningen, the Netherlands

16 <sup>d</sup>Wageningen Food & Biobased Research, Wageningen Research, Bornse  
17 Weilanden 9, 6708 WG Wageningen, the Netherlands

18

19 Pubmed indexing:

20 Roelofs JJM ([julia.roelofs@wur.nl](mailto:julia.roelofs@wur.nl))

21 van Eijnatten EJM ([elise.vaneijnatten@wur.nl](mailto:elise.vaneijnatten@wur.nl))

22 Prathumars P ([patteela.prathumars@wur.nl](mailto:patteela.prathumars@wur.nl))

23 de Jong J ([joris.dejong@wur.nl](mailto:joris.dejong@wur.nl))

24 Wehrens R ([ron.wehrens@wur.nl](mailto:ron.wehrens@wur.nl))

25 Esser D ([diederik.esser@wur.nl](mailto:diederik.esser@wur.nl))

26 Janssen AEM ([anja.janssen@wur.nl](mailto:anja.janssen@wur.nl))

27 Smeets PAM ([paul.smeets@wur.nl](mailto:paul.smeets@wur.nl))

28

29 Conflict of interest: none

30 Source of support: Wageningen University and Research

31

32 Corresponding Author

33 Name: Julia Roelofs

34 Mailing address: Stippeneng 4, 6708 WE Wageningen

35 Telephone number: +31657378595

36 E-mail address: [julia.roelofs@wur.nl](mailto:julia.roelofs@wur.nl)

37

38 Running title: Gastric emptying and absorption of pea protein

39

40 List of abbreviations:

41 AA Amino Acid

42 DIAAS Digestible Indispensable Amino Acid Score

43 EAA Essential Amino Acids

44 SGF Simulated Gastric Fluid

45 TAA Total Amino Acids

46

47 Ethical statement and registration:

48 "Ethical approval for the involvement of human subjects in this study was

49 granted by the Medical Ethical Committee of Wageningen University

50 (Reference number: NL74440.081.20, dated April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2021) and is in

51           accordance with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975 as revised in 2013. This  
52           study was registered with the Dutch Trial Registry under number NL9413  
53           (record can be retrieved from the International Clinical Trials Registry Platform  
54           at <https://trialssearch.who.int/Trial2.aspx?TrialID=NL9413>).

55

56   Number of figures: 9

57   Number of tables: 1

58   Supplementary data submitted: yes

59 **Abstract**

60 **Background:** Pea protein is an interesting alternative for animal-based proteins due  
61 to its good availability, low cost and relatively balanced amino acid (AA) profile. Its  
62 digestibility may be affected by heat treatment and food texture.

63 **Objectives:** To study *in-vivo* AA absorption kinetics and gastric behavior of pea  
64 protein products differing in heat treatment and texture and compare this with *in-vitro*  
65 digestion.

66 **Design:** Fourteen males participated in a randomized crossover trial. Iso-caloric and  
67 iso-volumetric treatments were a 420-mL heated drink, 420-mL unheated drink and  
68 105-g heated gel (semi-solid) consumed with 315 mL water, all containing 20 g pea  
69 protein. Gastric MRI scans were made until 90 minutes post-prandial. Blood samples  
70 were collected at baseline and up to five hours. All treatments were tested with an *in-*  
71 *vitro* digestion model (INFOGEST).

72 **Results:** Heat treatment did not alter AA absorption kinetics and gastric emptying.  
73 Time to maximum peak was delayed for the gel treatment (total AAs: 66.9 versus  
74 48.0 min for both drinks, essential AAs: 75.4 versus 50.0 and 46.6 min for the drinks).  
75 For the gel treatment initial emptying was faster due to the rapid passage of water.  
76 *In-vitro*, the degree of hydrolysis was highest for the unheated drink in the gastric  
77 phase and for the gel treatment in the intestinal phase.

78 **Conclusion:** Heat treating pea protein products does not affect digestion. In contrast,  
79 texture of pea protein products can be altered to influence the rate of gastric  
80 emptying and AA absorption without affecting total AA absorption.

81

82 **Keywords:** pea protein, digestion, gastric behavior, amino acid absorption, MRI

## 83 **1. Introduction**

84 Protein is an essential building block for the growth and renewal of tissue (Atherton &  
85 Smith, 2012). For certain populations, such as older adults, athletes and critically ill, it  
86 can be difficult to obtain the necessary amount of protein from the diet (Coelho-  
87 Júnior, Rodrigues, Uchida, & Marzetti, 2018; Liao, et al., 2017; Sieber, 2019). It is  
88 therefore important that the protein we ingest is properly digested and absorbed, so  
89 that it can be used for protein synthesis (Fardet, Dupont, Rioux, & Turgeon, 2019;  
90 Mahe, et al., 1996; van Vliet, Burd, & van Loon, 2015). Digestion consists of a series  
91 of mechanical, physiological, and biochemical processing steps leading to the  
92 breakdown of food structures that eventually allows for absorption and utilization of  
93 nutrients (Mackie, 2019). Despite all these processing steps, some proteins are still  
94 poorly digested. This is especially the case for plant-based proteins, which often have  
95 a lower digestibility (Berrazaga, Micard, Gueugneau, & Walrand, 2019; Pasiakos,  
96 Agarwal, Lieberman, & Fulgoni, 2015). However, due to the growing population  
97 worldwide, animal-based protein puts a strain on the environment (Katz, 2019).  
98 Because of this, the demand for more sustainable plant-based proteins is rapidly  
99 growing. Therefore, it is important to explore how the digestibility of plant-based  
100 proteins may be improved.

101

102 The lower digestibility of proteins from plants is explained by the intact cell wall that  
103 hinders direct contact between intracellular macronutrients and the digestive  
104 enzymes. This slows down or even completely prevents the access of proteases to  
105 the cell contents and limits intracellular protein hydrolysis. Thus, the digestibility of  
106 plant-based proteins depends on the fraction of broken cells generated during their  
107 processing (Zahir, Fogliano, & Capuano, 2018). Food processing such as the

108 isolation of proteins, alters the chemical and physical characteristics and can  
109 increase the nutritional value of food products (Joye, 2019). Plants also contain anti-  
110 nutritional factors. These are compounds that reduce nutrient utilization and/or food  
111 intake of plants or plant products used as human foods which can be removed or  
112 inactivated by processing (Thakur, Sharma, & Thakur, 2019). In addition, the quality  
113 of plant-based protein is often lower compared to animal-based protein. Animal-  
114 based protein has the highest protein quality as determined by the Digestible  
115 Indispensable Amino Acid Score (DIAAS). The DIAAS of animal-based proteins is  
116 typically greater than 100, indicating excellent quality, while for plant-based proteins it  
117 is generally below 75, indicating lower quality (Herreman, Nommensen, Pennings, &  
118 Laus, 2020).

119

120 Several plant-based proteins, from crops such as wheat, soy and pea, are  
121 increasingly used in foods. With its good availability, low cost and relatively good  
122 quality for a plant-base protein (DIAAS = 70), pea protein is one of the better  
123 alternatives for animal-based proteins in functional food applications (Bailey, Fanelli,  
124 & Stein, 2023; Lu, He, Zhang, & Bing, 2020). Although there is ample information  
125 about the digestion of traditional protein sources, the digestion of pea protein and the  
126 influence of intensive processing on its digestion is not known in detail (Rivera del  
127 Rio, et al., 2020). This is essential to evaluate its potential as a nutritious sustainable  
128 protein source.

129

130 Digestion of food products is predominantly studied with *in vitro* digestion models  
131 (Muttakin, Moxon, & Gouseti, 2019). Although these models are based on *in vivo*  
132 data, they obviously do not account for all factors, such as the mixing of the food in

133 the stomach. Therefore, *in vivo* research is needed to understand to what extent *in*  
134 *vitro* models represent *in vivo* digestion. Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) allows  
135 for visualization and quantification of gastric processes such as gastric emptying,  
136 emulsion stability and coagulation (Smeets, Deng, van Eijnatten, & Mayar, 2021). In  
137 addition, measuring AA concentrations provides information on differences in  
138 absorption kinetics. Although it is not possible to directly relate gastric emptying with  
139 subsequent AA absorption because of all intermediate processes involved,  
140 combining these measurements does provide more insight in the overall differences  
141 between products.

142

143 Gastric emptying is largely determined by the chemical characteristics of food, such  
144 as the energy density and macronutrient content, but also by physical characteristics,  
145 such as texture (Camps, Mars, De Graaf, & Smeets, 2016; Marciari, et al., 2001;  
146 Roy, et al., 2022). The food matrix plays an important role in digestibility because of  
147 its influence on the kinetics of transit and hydrolysis of macronutrients. For example,  
148 liquids empty faster from the stomach compared to semi-solid foods (Camps, et al.,  
149 2016; Clegg & Shafat, 2014; Mackie, Rafiee, Malcolm, Salt, & van Aken, 2013; Zhu,  
150 Hsu, & Hollis, 2013).

151

152 The isolation of plant-based proteins often includes a thermal denaturation step.  
153 Thermal denaturation of proteins may either improve or decrease their digestibility,  
154 depending on the type of protein and severity of the heat treatment. Proteins either  
155 lose their tightly folded structure, resulting in a higher accessibility of the peptide  
156 chain for enzymes, or they will aggregate, thereby impairing digestion (Joye, 2019).  
157 *In vitro* work on pea protein showed that heating disrupts the structure, thereby

158 increasing the number of smaller better digestible particles. Conversely, these heat-  
159 induced aggregates are up to 50% less digestible compared to before the heat  
160 treatment (Mulet-Cabero, Mackie, Wilde, Fenelon, & Brodkorb, 2019; Rivera del Rio,  
161 et al., 2020).

162

163 The aim of this study was to measure *in vivo* AA absorption kinetics and gastric  
164 behavior of pea protein products differing in heat treatment and texture. In addition,  
165 we aimed to compare *in vitro* digestion data with the *in vivo* data.



## 166 **2. Methods**

### 167 2.1. In vivo trial

#### 168 2.1.1. *Design*

169 The study was a randomized crossover trial in which healthy men underwent gastric  
170 MRI scans and blood sampling before and after consumption of three pea protein  
171 products. Primary outcomes were plasma AA absorption kinetics and gastric volume  
172 over time. Secondary outcomes included MRI markers of digestion ( $T_2$ , MT), plasma  
173 glucose and insulin concentrations and appetite and nausea ratings (hunger,  
174 fullness, thirst, desire to eat, prospective consumption and nausea). The procedures  
175 followed were approved by the Medical Ethical Committee of Wageningen University  
176 in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975 as revised in 2013. This study  
177 was registered with the Dutch Trial Registry under number NL9413. The record can  
178 be retrieved from the International Clinical Trials Registry Platform at  
179 <https://trialssearch.who.int/Trial2.aspx?TrialID=NL9413>. All participants signed  
180 informed consent.

181

#### 182 2.1.2. *Participants*

183 Healthy (self-reported) males aged 18-55 y and with a BMI between 18.5-25.0 kg/m<sup>2</sup>  
184 were included. Participants were excluded if they reported a pea allergy, gastric  
185 disorders or regular gastric complaints, used medication that affects gastric behavior,  
186 used recreational drugs within 1 month prior to the study screening day, smoked  
187 more than 2 cigarettes per week, had an alcohol intake >14 glasses per week, or had  
188 a contra-indication to MRI scanning (including but not limited to pacemakers and  
189 defibrillators, ferromagnetic implants and claustrophobia). Since female sex  
190 hormones are known to influence gastrointestinal function, only males were included

191 in the study (Gonenne, et al., 2006; Lajterer, Levi, & Lesmes, 2022; Soldin &  
192 Mattison, 2009). Participants were recruited via digital advertisements (e-mail and  
193 social media).

194

### 195 *2.1.3. Sample size*

196 A priori sample size was estimated for both primary outcomes, i.e. AA absorption  
197 kinetics and gastric volume over time. The estimation for postprandial AA was based  
198 on the peak value and the total free AA assessed in the serum after consumption of  
199 protein products. For the peak value, a difference of 100 µg/mL was regarded as  
200 relevant with an individual difference in peak values of 100 µg/mL (Farnfield,  
201 Trenerry, Carey, & Cameron-Smith, 2009; He, Spelbrink, Witteman, & Giuseppin,  
202 2013). Given an  $\alpha$  of 0.05 and a power of 0.9, we estimated a requirement of 11  
203 participants.

204 For gastric emptying the sample size estimation was based on gastric emptying half  
205 times of liquids from Camps, et al. (2016), and gels from Hoad, et al. (2009) taking  
206 into account intake volume and caloric content. We estimated 10 min as the minimum  
207 detectable difference which is physiologically relevant, and an average SD of 11  
208 minutes. With a two-sided test, an  $\alpha$  of 0.05 and a power of 0.9, this resulted in a  
209 minimum of 12 participants. To accommodate drop-out, we aimed to include 14  
210 participants. The calculation were done using software from:  
211 [http://hedwig.mgh.harvard.edu/sample\\_size/js/js\\_crossover\\_quant.html](http://hedwig.mgh.harvard.edu/sample_size/js/js_crossover_quant.html).

212

### 213 *2.1.4. Treatments*

214 The three treatments were a 420-mL unheated pea protein drink, 420-mL heated pea  
215 protein drink and 105 g heated semi-solid pea protein food (gel) consumed with 315

216 mL water (Table 1). All treatments contained 20 g of pea protein isolate (Nutralys®  
217 F85M, Roquette, France) and were iso-caloric (153 kcal) and iso-volumetric (420  
218 mL). In addition to pea protein isolate and water, the test foods contained vanilla  
219 aroma, chocolate aroma, cocoa powder and sweetener (See **Supplement** for exact  
220 product preparation). The heated treatments were heated in a steam oven at 90 °C  
221 for 30 minutes.

222

223 Table 1. Treatment overview

<b>Treatment</b>	<b>Texture</b>	<b>Volume/weight</b>	<b>Heat treatment</b>	<b>Water consumed separately (mL)</b>
Unheated drink	Liquid	420 mL	None	0
Heated drink	Liquid	420 mL	90 °C – 30 min	0
Heated gel	Semi-solid	105 g	90 °C – 30 min	315

224

#### 225 2.1.5. Study procedures

226 The evening before the test day participants consumed a standard pasta meal (Iglo  
227 Green Cuisine Linguine Bolognese) after which their overnight fast started. During  
228 the fasting period of at least 12 hours, participants were allowed to drink water and  
229 herbal tea up to 1.5 hours prior to their visit. Upon arrival at Hospital Gelderse Vallei  
230 (Ede), a cannula was placed, a baseline MRI scan was performed, appetite and  
231 nausea ratings were taken and a blood sample was drawn. Subsequently,  
232 participants consumed one of the three treatments. For the drink, the participants  
233 were instructed to consume it over a period of 5 minutes through a straw to ensure  
234 an eating time comparable to that of the gel (mean ingestion time was  $4.7 \pm 0.6$  and

235 4.7 ± 0.9 min for the heated and unheated drink respectively). For the gel treatment,  
236 participants were instructed to consume it within 10 minutes and alternate eating and  
237 drinking (mean ingestion time 6.7 ± 1.3 min). Subsequently, gastric MRI scans were  
238 performed at t = 10, 15, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80 and 90 minutes after the start of  
239 ingestion. Blood samples were taken at t = 30, 60, 75, 90, 120, 150, 180, 240 and  
240 300 min. In addition, participants verbally rated their appetite and nausea on a scale  
241 from 0 to 100 every 10 minutes, up to 90 minutes (Noble, et al., 2005) (**Figure 1**).

242

#### 243 2.1.6. MRI

244 Participants were scanned in a supine position with the use of a 3-Tesla Philips  
245 Ingenia Elition X MRI scanner (Philips, Eindhoven, The Netherlands). A 2-D Turbo  
246 Spin Echo sequence (37 4-mm slices, 1.4 mm gap, 1 x 1 mm in-plane resolution, TR:  
247 550 ms, TE 80 ms, flip angle: 90 degrees) was used with breath hold command on  
248 expiration to fixate the position of the diaphragm and the stomach. The scan lasted  
249 approximately 20 seconds.

250

251 Total gastric content was manually delineated on every slice by two researchers with  
252 the use of the program MIPAV (Medical Image Processing, Analysis and  
253 Visualization Version 7.4.0, 2016) (**Supplementary Figure 1**). When the volumes  
254 differed by more than 10% between the two researchers, the segmentation was re-  
255 evaluated to reach consensus. Total gastric volume for each time point was  
256 calculated by multiplying the number stomach content voxels with voxel volume,  
257 taking into account slice thickness and gap distance. The gastric volumes of the two  
258 researchers were averaged.

259

260 For the gel treatment, volumes of liquid and semi-solid content of the stomach were  
261 estimated based on voxel intensity using thresholding (Reddy & Reddi, 2017). The  
262 baseline scan was used to calculate the cut-off value for each participant. The cut-off  
263 value that was chosen included the 10% voxels with the lowest intensity, since this  
264 resulted, on average, in a volume for the semi-solid content at  $t = 10$  minutes close to  
265 the volume of ingested (mean solid volume of 102.6 mL, SD = 17.5). This cut-off  
266 value was used for all scans in that scan session. An example of a stomach with its  
267 semi-solid and solid content marked in red can be found in **Supplementary Figure 2**.

268

269 As an approach to quantify gastric coagulation, image texture metrics of the stomach  
270 content were calculated with the use of the LIFEx software (version 7.2.10) (Nioche,  
271 et al., 2018). These image metrics provide information on the spatial patterns of voxel  
272 intensity (Thomas, et al., 2019). Four metrics were calculated: busyness, coarseness,  
273 contrast and homogeneity. Neighborhood Grey-level Difference Matrix (NGLDM)  
274 difference of grey-levels between one voxel and its 26 neighbors in 8 dimensions was  
275 used for busyness, coarseness and contrast. Busyness translates to the spatial  
276 frequency of changes in intensity. Coarseness translates to the spatial rate of change  
277 in intensity. Contrast is the local variation in grey level. The Gray-Level Co-  
278 occurrence Matrix (GLCM) method was used for homogeneity and reflects the  
279 differences in voxel intensity between the neighboring voxels. The number of grey  
280 levels for texture metric calculation was set at 64, intensity rescaling relative (ROI:  
281 min/max) and dimension processing 2D.

282

283 These texture metrics were calculated for each slice. Subsequently, a weighted mean  
284 was calculated based on gastric volume in each slice, i.e. small stomach volume

285 areas will contribute less to the mean compared to larger areas. In the context of this  
286 paper we interpret changes in image texture metrics as reflecting changes in the  
287 degree of coagulation. An example of two stomachs with their corresponding image  
288 texture measures indicating relatively high and low coagulation can be found in  
289 **Supplementary figure 3.**

290

291 The gel treatment was not considered for this analysis, since the presence of dark gel  
292 particles in the stomach would yield very different image texture metrics than those of  
293 the two drinks. In addition, the analysis was only performed for the postprandial  
294 scans. Due to the exploratory nature of these measures, we did not correct for  
295 multiple testing.

296

### 297 *2.1.7. Clinical chemistry*

298 Blood samples were drawn from the cannula into sodium-fluoride (3 ml) and EDTA (4  
299 ml) tubes. After collection, sodium-fluoride tubes were centrifuged at 1000 g for 10  
300 min at 22°C, to obtain blood plasma. The EDTA tubes were centrifuged at 1000 g for  
301 10 min at 4°C. Following centrifugation, aliquots of 250 µl and 500 µl were pipetted in  
302 2.0 ml cryo-vials and 5 ml tubes and stored at -80°C until they were analyzed in bulk.

303

304 Free AA concentrations were analysed as described previously (Mes, et al., 2022)  
305 and based on the Waters AccQ Tag method for AA analysis. To determine glucose  
306 concentrations, the plasma samples were processed using the Atellica CH Glucose  
307 Hexokinase\_3 (GluH\_3) assay kit and quantified using the Atellica CH analyzer  
308 (Siemens Healthineers, Netherlands) by a hospital laboratory (Ziekenhuis Gelderse  
309 Vallei, Ede, The Netherlands). The lower detection limit was 0.2 mmol/l and inter-

310 assay CVs were at most 4.5%. The plasma samples were processed and quantified  
311 using an enzymatic immunoassay kit (ELISA, Mercodia AB, Sweden) to determine  
312 insulin concentrations. The lower detection limit was 6 pmol/l and inter-assay CVs  
313 ranged between 0.3 and 20.0%.

314

## 315 2.2. In vitro digestion

316 A static *in vitro* digestion was performed using the INFOGEST digestion protocol for  
317 all three treatments (Brodkorb, et al., 2019). Gastric digestion was performed for 2  
318 hours followed by 2 hours of intestinal digestion. The degree of hydrolysis and size  
319 distribution of the soluble peptides were measured at 30-minute intervals in the  
320 gastric phase and at 60-minute intervals in the intestinal phase. Moreover, the  
321 unheated and heated drink were tested in a semi-dynamic system. The complete  
322 protocol can be found in the **Supplement**.

323

324 To measure the particle size of the precipitation in the drinks, a mastersizer was used  
325 with an obscuration limit of 4-20%, a reflective index of 1.46 and absorption of 0.1.  
326 Non-spherical particle size was selected. The samples were measured at 0, 60 and  
327 120 minutes after the start of gastric digestion. Cocoa powder was tested separately  
328 to check for any influences on the measurements of the drinks. Results are reported  
329 as volume density.

330

## 331 2.3. Statistical analysis

332 AA concentrations over time were analyzed using the software described in Wehrens  
333 (Submitted for publication, 2023). In short, peak heights, time to maximum peak and  
334 area under the curve of serum AA were calculated for total AAs (TAA) and essential

335 AAs (EAA). For these three parameters of interest, a linear mixed model was used to  
336 assess differences between treatments. Analysis was performed in R version 4.1.3.

337

338 Further analyses were performed in R statistical software (version 4.0.2). Differences  
339 in gastric content volume over time were tested with the use of linear mixed models,  
340 testing for main effects of time, treatment and treatment\*time interactions, with  
341 baseline gastric volume as a covariate. Tukey HSD-corrected post-hoc tests were  
342 used to compare individual time points. AUC of gastric content volume over time was  
343 calculated using the trapezoidal rule. Differences in AUC between treatments were  
344 tested by using one-way repeated measures ANOVA.

345

346 Differences in the texture metrics (busyness, coarseness, contrast and homogeneity)  
347 of the postprandial gastric volume over time were tested using linear mixed models,  
348 with time, treatment and treatment\*time as fixed factors. Tukey HSD corrected post-  
349 hoc tests were used to compare individual time points.

350 Differences in glucose concentrations, insulin concentrations and appetite and  
351 nausea ratings over time were tested by using linear mixed models, testing for main  
352 effects of time, treatment and treatment\*time interactions. Baseline values were  
353 added as covariate. Tukey HSD-corrected post-hoc tests were used to compare  
354 individual time points.

355

356 For each variable, normality of the data was confirmed with quantile-quantile (Q-Q)  
357 plots of the residuals. For insulin, contrast and nausea a logarithmic transformation  
358 was applied to create a normal distribution. The significance threshold was set at  $p =$   
359 0.05. Data are expressed as mean  $\pm$  SD unless stated otherwise.



### 360 **3. Results**

361 In total, 14 men participated in the study (age:  $23.0 \pm 3.8$  y, BMI:  $22.2 \pm 1.7$  kg/m<sup>2</sup>).  
362 Two participants dropped out after one test session. Hence, an additional two  
363 participants were recruited. Two participants completed only two test sessions due to  
364 Covid-19 infection related quarantine (**Supplementary Figure 4**).

365

#### 366 3.1. Blood amino acid kinetics

367 **Figure 2** shows the curves of TAA and EAA over time. AUC did not differ between  
368 the three treatments (**Figure 3 and Supplementary Figure 5**). Individual curves of  
369 TAA and EAA can be found in **Supplementary Figure 6**. For the individual AA, only  
370 tyrosine showed a significant lower AUC for the gel treatment compared to unheated  
371 and heated drink ( $234 \mu\text{M}\cdot\text{min}$  (CI: 201 – 268) compared to  $304 \mu\text{M}\cdot\text{min}$  (CI: 249 –  
372 359) and  $311 \mu\text{M}\cdot\text{min}$  (CI: 262 – 360) respectively). AUCs of the other AAs did not  
373 differ significantly. Curves of the individual AAs are shown in **Supplementary Figure**  
374 **7**.

375

376 Maximum peak height for EAA was 131 and 145  $\mu\text{M}$  lower for the gel treatment  
377 compared to the unheated and heated drinks ( $330 \mu\text{M}$  (CI: 290 – 369) compared to  
378  $460 \mu\text{M}$  (CI: 389 – 531) and  $475 \mu\text{M}$  (CI: 407 – 543) respectively). No difference in  
379 maximum peak height was found for TAA. Eleven individual AAs showed a  
380 significantly 21.8 – 33.6% lower maximum peak height for the gel treatment  
381 compared to the unheated drink.

382

383 In addition, the time to maximum peak for TAA absorption was 18.8 and 18.9 minutes  
384 later for the gel treatment compared to the unheated and heated drink respectively

385 (66.9 min (CI: 59.2 – 74.6) compared to 48.0 min (CI: 37.9 – 58.2) and  $48.0 \pm 8.4$  min  
386 (CI: 41.0 – 55.0) respectively). For EAA, time to maximum peak was significantly  
387 delayed by 25.4 and 28.8 minutes for the gel treatment compared to the unheated  
388 and heated drink respectively (75.4 min (CI: 66.8 – 83.9) compared to 50.0 min (CI:  
389 39.9 – 60.0) and 46.6 min (CI: 38.4 – 54.9)) (**Supplementary Figure 5**). Of the 19  
390 individual AAs measured, 14 AAs showed a 14.4 – 30.3-minute later time to  
391 maximum peak height for the gel treatment compared to both drinks.

392

### 393 3.2. Gastric emptying

394 Baseline gastric volume was  $36.2 \pm 19.5$  mL for the gel treatment,  $26.3 \pm 26.7$  mL for  
395 the unheated and  $40.0 \pm 26.4$  mL for the heated drink ( $p = 0.373$ ). An example time  
396 series for the unheated drink and the gel treatment is shown in **Figure 4**.

397

398 **Figure 5** shows an almost linear emptying for the drinks, while the gel treatment  
399 shows a quick initial emptying. There was a significant treatment effect on gastric  
400 volume over time for the gel treatment compared to the drinks, with a lower volume  
401 for the gel treatment ( $p = 0.002$ ). This effect was driven by timepoints  $t = 15$  up to 70  
402 minutes.

403

404 AUC of gastric volume over time showed a trend toward a treatment effect ( $p =$   
405  $0.071$ ). On average, AUC of the gel treatment was 16% and 15% lower compared to  
406 the heated and unheated drink respectively ( $17608 \pm 3059$  mL\*min compared to  
407  $21037 \pm 3999$  mL\*min and  $20605 \pm 3892$  mL\*min,  $p = 0.086$  and  $0.149$ , respectively)  
408 (**Figure 6**). There was no difference between the two drinks ( $p = 0.959$ ).

409

410 **Figure 7** shows that for the gel treatment the liquid content of the stomach emptied  
411 quickly during the first 30 minutes, while the solid content emptied slower. Over 90  
412 minutes, the liquid volume decreased from  $300 \pm 15$  mL to  $66 \pm 8$  mL (78.1%  
413 decrease). The solid volume, that is, the protein gel fraction, decreased from  $103 \pm 5$   
414 mL to  $69 \pm 9$  mL (32.4% decrease). For the unheated and heated drink the decrease  
415 of liquid volume over 90 minutes was 69.2% and 68.9% respectively.

416

### 417 3.3. Gastric behavior

418 **Figure 8** shows an overall change in the texture metrics over time (all  $p < 0.001$ ),  
419 where busyness and homogeneity decreased over time and coarseness and contrast  
420 increased over time for both drinks. This suggests an increase in the degree of  
421 coagulation.

422

423 No treatment or treatment by time interaction effect was found for contrast ( $p = 0.204$   
424 and  $p = 0.973$ ) and coarseness ( $p = 0.295$  and  $p = 0.564$ ). However, for homogeneity  
425 a treatment by time interaction was found ( $p = 0.002$ ). It was lower for the unheated  
426 drink at  $t = 15$  min, while it was higher at  $t = 50$  and  $60$  min compared to the heated  
427 drink. Treatment by time interaction was also significant for, with higher values for the  
428 heated compared to the unheated drink ( $p = 0.019$ ). This was driven by timepoints  $t =$   
429 10 until  $t = 50$  min.

430

### 431 3.4. Glucose and Insulin

432 For glucose concentrations there was a trend towards lower concentrations for the  
433 unheated drink ( $p = 0.069$ ). However, the interaction with time was not significant ( $p =$   
434  $0.602$ ) (**Supplementary Figure 8**). There was a trend towards lower insulin

435 concentrations over time for the gel treatment ( $p = 0.058$ ), driven by  $t = 30$  min  
436 (**Supplementary Figure 9**).

437

### 438 3.5. Appetite and nausea

439 The graphs of the appetite and nausea ratings are shown in **Supplementary Figure**  
440 **10**. There was a treatment effect for hunger, fullness, desire to eat, prospective  
441 consumption ( $p < 0.001$ ,  $p = 0.018$ ,  $p = 0.003$  and  $p < 0.001$ , respectively). Hunger  
442 (MD -8.3 and -7.1 respectively,  $p < 0.001$ ), desire to eat (MD -6.7 and -5.2  
443 respectively,  $p < 0.001$ ) and prospective consumption (MD -7.3 and -8.3 respectively,  
444  $p < 0.001$ ) were all lower for the gel treatment compared to the unheated and heated  
445 drink. Fullness was higher for the gel treatment compared to the unheated drink (MD  
446 4.8,  $p = 0.014$ ), but not the heated drink (MD 3.5,  $p = 0.108$ ). However, interaction  
447 with time was not significant for hunger, fullness, desire to eat and prospective  
448 consumption ( $p = 0.714$ ,  $p = 0.960$ ,  $p = 0.999$  and  $p = 0.998$ , respectively). Thirst did  
449 not differ between treatments (treatment effect:  $p = 0.359$ , treatment by time  
450 interaction  $p = 0.998$ ). Nausea showed a treatment effect ( $p = 0.003$ ) with lower  
451 levels for the gel treatment compared to the unheated drink (MD -2.9,  $p = 0.002$ ), but  
452 not the heated drink (MD -1.5,  $p = 0.230$ ). However, there was no interaction with  
453 time ( $p = 0.283$ ).

454

### 455 3.6. In vitro static digestion

456 **Figure 9** shows the *in vitro* degree of hydrolysis of the three treatments for 2 hours of  
457 gastric digestion (0 – 120 min) and 2 hours of intestinal digestion (120 – 240 min).  
458 The digestibility, expressed as degree of protein hydrolysis of the unheated drink was  
459 slightly higher compared to that of the heated drink and gel treatment during the

460 gastric phase (9.6% compared to 5.2% and 3.0% at 120 min, respectively). In the  
461 intestinal phase, the gel treatment had a higher degree of hydrolysis compared to the  
462 unheated and heated drinks (57.6 compared to 38.3 and 38.9% at 240 min  
463 respectively). Precipitation of the drinks was similar at  $t = 0$ . However, for the heated  
464 drink precipitation increased over time, while it was stable for the unheated drink  
465 (**Supplementary Figure 11**). This was confirmed with the semi-dynamic digestion  
466 model (**Supplementary Figure 12**). Moreover, the heated drink had larger particles  
467 compared to the unheated drink (**Supplementary Figure 13**). Supplementary Figure  
468 13-B and 13-C show the volume density of the particles in both drinks at 0, 60 and  
469 120 minutes after the start of digestion. In both drinks, most particles were around 10  
470  $\mu\text{m}$ . Both drinks showed a decrease over time for larger particles, while the volume  
471 density for smaller particles increased. The maximum particle size for the unheated  
472 drink was 270  $\mu\text{m}$ , while the heated drink showed particles sizes up to 500  $\mu\text{m}$ . The  
473 cocoa powder showed a large peak around 24  $\mu\text{m}$  and a small peak around 1  $\mu\text{m}$ .

474

475 Moreover, in the gastric phase (0-120 min), the heated drink showed a higher  
476 number of soluble peptides (**Supplementary Figure 14**). In addition, for the gel  
477 treatment it took about an hour in the gastric phase until the same amount of  
478 dissolved peptides was present. During the intestinal phase (180 and 240 min), the  
479 AUC was higher for the gel treatment compared to the unheated and heated drink  
480 (8415 compared to 5660 and 5791  $\text{mAu}\cdot\text{min}$  at 240 min, respectively), which is in  
481 agreement with the higher degree of hydrolysis (Figure 9). For the drinks, the number  
482 of large molecules decreased over digestion time and more small size peptides  
483 became soluble (**Supplementary Figure 14**).

#### 484 **4. Discussion**

485 This study assessed gastric behavior and subsequent AA kinetics for three iso-caloric  
486 and iso-volumetric pea protein products differing in heat treatment and texture. Heat  
487 treatment did not affect gastric emptying, but texture did. A gel consumed together  
488 with water showed overall faster initial emptying compared to a drink. This initial  
489 quick emptying was attributed to passage of the water, while the gel fraction emptied  
490 more slowly. Consequently, the time to maximum peak for AA was delayed by 18.8-  
491 28.8 minutes for the gel treatment compared to the two drinks.

492

493 The industrial processing required to manufacture pea protein isolate includes heat  
494 treatment. Since the heat-treated drink did not show altered gastric emptying or AA  
495 absorption kinetics, this confirms that additional heat treatment did not further affect  
496 digestibility. *In vitro* work by Rivera del Rio, et al. (2020) showed that heat treatment  
497 of pea protein isolate not only results in small and suspended particles that can be  
498 better hydrolyzed by pepsin in the stomach but also induces aggregates, which are  
499 less digestible. Thus, although they found that heat treatment of pea protein isolate  
500 affects the structure of the proteins, it did not significantly affect the overall *in vitro*  
501 gastric digestibility, which is in line with our findings.

502

503 Gastric volume was lower for the gel treatment in the first hour after consumption  
504 compared to the drinks. Consumption of a semi-solid gel with water resulted in an  
505 initial quick emptying of the watery contents and slower emptying of the gel  
506 compared to the drinks (32% of the gel had emptied at  $t = 90$  min, compared to 69%  
507 of the drinks). This is in line with previous research of Mackie, et al. (2013) who found  
508 slower gastric emptying after consumption of a semi-solid compared to an iso-caloric

509 liquid meal containing animal-based proteins (grated gouda cheese and low-fat  
510 yogurt consumed with water compared to a homogenous liquid mixture of sunflower  
511 oil, sodium caseinate, whey protein isolate and sugar). In addition, Marciani, et al.  
512 (2012) showed that when the solid and water fraction are not homogenized, the  
513 water sieves past the gastric content and empties quickly. When the same meal was  
514 blended into a soup, gastric content volume decreased more slowly in a linear  
515 fashion (Marciani, et al., 2012). This is in line with our results for the pea protein  
516 drinks, which had an approximately linear emptying curve. In addition, the lower  
517 accessibility of pepsin to penetrate a food bolus explains why hydrolysis of a semi-  
518 solid protein food was slower compared to that of the protein drinks, leading to slower  
519 gastric emptying (Bornhorst, et al., 2016; Luo, Boom, & Janssen, 2015). No clear  
520 correlation was found between the slower emptying of the pea protein gel and AA  
521 absorption kinetics. However, the delay that was found in gastric emptying was also  
522 reflected in the absorption of AA in the blood, which showed an 18.8 – 28.8 min delay  
523 and lower maximum peak compared to the drinks. This is in line with our expectation  
524 that delayed gastric emptying results in delayed AA absorption.

525

526 The attenuated rise in postprandial AA concentrations after consumption of a solid  
527 versus liquid form was reported in multiple studies (Conley, et al., 2011; de Hart, et  
528 al., 2021; Hermans, et al., 2022; A. M. H. Horstman, et al., 2021). However, these  
529 studies compared products that did not only differ in texture, but also macro- and  
530 micronutrient composition, protein composition and/or volume. In contrast, van  
531 Lieshout, et al. (2023) compared liquid vs solid iso-caloric and iso-volumetric  
532 products based on whey isolate and calcium caseinate and found no difference in  
533 postprandial AA concentrations in health females. This difference might be explained

534 by the nature of the proteins. Animal-based proteins, especially caseins, are known  
535 to coagulate, thereby delaying gastric emptying (Huppertz & Chia, 2021) and AA  
536 absorption kinetics (A. M. Horstman & Huppertz, 2022).

537

538 Although no coagulates were visible on the MRI images, all four texture metrics  
539 showed a change over time that suggests a higher degree of coagulation over time  
540 for both drinks. That is, lower homogeneity and busyness over time and a higher  
541 contrast and coarseness. Moreover, based on busyness and homogeneity, one might  
542 conclude that the unheated drink showed a greater degree of coagulation in the first  
543 60 minutes compared to the heated drink. This is in contrast to our *in vitro* findings  
544 where the unheated drink did not show an increase in precipitation over time, while  
545 the heated drink did. In literature, the results of *in vitro* digestion research on pea  
546 protein coagulation are also inconsistent. An *in vitro* study by Overduin, Guérin-  
547 Deremaux, Wils, and Lambers (2015) showed that a 3% solution of the same pea  
548 protein isolate as used in this study forms coagulates of 50-500  $\mu\text{m}$  within 2 hours.  
549 This is in agreement with our measurements that showed a maximum particle size of  
550 500  $\mu\text{m}$ . Coagulates of this size will not be visible on the MRI images, with a  
551 resolution of 1 by 1 by 4 mm. However, formation of such small coagulates could still  
552 affect the intensity of these  $T_2$ -weighted scans. This might explain the observed  
553 changes in the image texture metrics. In addition, since these texture metrics look at  
554 intensity contrast in the stomach, gastric juice might influence these metrics, since it  
555 appears as a high image intensity. This requires further validation. However, even  
556 when these small coagula would be present, it is not likely to affect gastric emptying  
557 since particles  $<1\text{-}2$  mm can be emptied through the pylorus (Kong & Singh, 2008).  
558 This is in line with our results, where no differences in gastric emptying were



559 observed between both drinks. In addition, AA absorption kinetics were also not  
560 different. Based on these findings we conclude that even if pea protein isolate  
561 coagulates in the stomach, this does not affect further digestion.

562

563 Our results indicate that consumption of a semi-solid food results in increased  
564 feelings of satiety compared to the consumption of iso-caloric and iso-volumetric  
565 liquid foods. This is in contrast to a study of Marciani, et al. (2012) that showed that a  
566 mixed solid/liquid food is less satiating compared to the same meal in homogenized  
567 form (AUC of hunger,  $1166 \pm 76$  compared to  $1106 \pm 65$  VAS score\*min (mean  $\pm$   
568 SEM),  $P < 0.02$ ). They suggested that the lower satiation might be due to the quick  
569 initial emptying of the liquid portion of the meal, which reduces gastric volume and  
570 thus lowers sensation of fullness. However, a study of Zijlstra, et al. (2009)  
571 comparing liquid and semi-solid texture found that consuming semi-solids was more  
572 satiating, even though there was no difference in CCK-8 or GLP-1 responses  
573 (fullness  $P = 0.03$ , desire to eat  $P = 0.04$ ). Camps, et al. (2016) also showed that  
574 increasing viscosity increased satiation and satiety. One explanation for this is the  
575 greater degree of oral exposure when consuming the gel. The mean ingestion time  
576 was 1.4 times longer for the gel treatment compared to the drinks. In addition,  
577 participants consumed the drink with a straw, while they needed to chew on the gel.  
578 Longer mastication for an isocaloric load leads to higher feelings of satiety (Forde &  
579 Stieger, 2022; Lasschuijt, de Graaf, & Mars, 2021; Wanders, et al., 2013). However,  
580 it should be noted that overall differences between the semi-solid treatment and  
581 drinks were small, with a mean difference  $<10$ , which is often considered as a cut-off  
582 point for clinical relevance (Flint, Raben, Blundell, & Astrup, 2000).

583

584 This study used MRI to examine gastric behavior. This requires participants to be  
585 scanned in a supine position. Although the effect is small, studies have shown that  
586 protein ingestion in an upright sitting position accelerates gastric emptying and  
587 increases the postprandial rise in plasma AA availability by increasing protein  
588 digestion and AA absorption rates compared to a supine position (Holwerda,  
589 Lenaerts, Bierau, & Van Loon, 2016; Holwerda, Lenaerts, Bierau, Wodzig, & van  
590 Loon, 2017; Jones, et al., 2006; Spiegel, et al., 2000). The study of Holwerda, et al.  
591 (2017) showed a higher peak plasma leucine concentration for upright sitting  
592 compared to a supine position ( $213 \pm 15$  compared to  $193 \pm 12$   $\mu\text{mol/L}$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ).  
593 However, the participants were scanned in the same position for all treatments.  
594 Therefore, the relative differences between treatments are expected to remain the  
595 same.

596

597 In the *in vitro* digestion the unheated drink showed a slightly higher degree of  
598 hydrolysis in the gastric phase, while the gel treatment showed an increased degree  
599 of hydrolysis during the intestinal phase. This suggests, that in the stomach, the gel  
600 structure reduces the access of pepsin. However, after two hours in the gastric phase  
601 the gel might have swollen, leading to a looser structure that is more accessible for  
602 trypsin in the intestine. In addition, the peristaltic movements in the intestine might  
603 result in increased fractionation, allowing for a larger surface area. This is in  
604 agreement with the *in vivo* results, where the gel treatment showed lower AA  
605 concentrations during the first ~60 minutes, but comparable concentrations after that.

606

607 The heated drink showed higher concentrations of soluble peptides at the start of  
608 digestion. The higher solubility of the heated drink is likely a result of the heating

609 process (Rivera del Rio, Möller, Boom, & Janssen, 2022). In addition, both drinks  
610 showed precipitation at the start, which can be explained by the low solubility that  
611 plant-based proteins are known for. However, in both the static and semi-dynamic  
612 digestion the heated drink visually showed more sedimentation over time, indicating  
613 higher levels of aggregation. This was also confirmed with the particle size  
614 distribution measurements, which showed that the heated drink had larger particles.

615

616 To conclude, this study demonstrates that heat treatment of pea protein isolate does  
617 not affect gastric emptying or AA absorption. However, consuming pea protein isolate  
618 in a product with a semi-solid texture slowed down both gastric emptying and  
619 subsequent AA absorption compared to liquids, but did not affect total absorption  
620 kinetics. These results suggest that texture influences the rate at which pea protein is  
621 absorbed, but not total absorption. In addition, comparison with *in vitro* data showed  
622 that *in vitro* digestion models gave additional support and insight to *in vivo* digestion  
623 results.

624 **Acknowledgements and statement of authors' contributions to manuscript**

625 PS, AJ, EE and DE: conceptualization, methodology; JR, PP, JJ: investigation; JR, JJ  
626 and RW: data curation; JR and RW formal analysis; JR Writing - Original Draft; EE,  
627 PP, JJ, DE, AJ and PS: Writing - Review & Editing; JR: visualization; PS had primary  
628 responsibility for final content. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.  
629 None of the authors declare a conflict of interest. We thank Caya Lindner for  
630 assisting with data collection. The use of the 3T MRI was made possible by WUR  
631 Shared Research Facilities.

## References

- Atherton, P., & Smith, K. (2012). Muscle protein synthesis in response to nutrition and exercise. *The Journal of physiology*, *590*(5), 1049-1057.
- Bailey, H. M., Fanelli, N. S., & Stein, H. H. (2023). Effect of heat treatment on protein quality of rapeseed protein isolate compared with non-heated rapeseed isolate, soy and whey protein isolates, and rice and pea protein concentrates. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*.
- Berrazaga, I., Micard, V., Gueugneau, M., & Walrand, S. (2019). The role of the anabolic properties of plant-versus animal-based protein sources in supporting muscle mass maintenance: a critical review. *Nutrients*, *11*(8), 1825.
- Bornhorst, G. M., Drechsler, K. C., Montoya, C. A., Rutherford, S. M., Moughan, P. J., & Singh, R. P. (2016). Gastric protein hydrolysis of raw and roasted almonds in the growing pig. *Food chemistry*, *211*, 502-508.
- Brodkorb, A., Egger, L., Alminger, M., Alvito, P., Assunção, R., Ballance, S., Bohn, T., Bourlieu-Lacanal, C., Boutrou, R., & Carrière, F. (2019). INFOGEST static in vitro simulation of gastrointestinal food digestion. *Nature protocols*, *14*(4), 991-1014.
- Camps, G., Mars, M., De Graaf, C., & Smeets, P. A. (2016). Empty calories and phantom fullness: a randomized trial studying the relative effects of energy density and viscosity on gastric emptying determined by MRI and satiety. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, *104*(1), 73-80.
- Clegg, M. E., & Shafat, A. (2014). The effect of agar jelly on energy expenditure, appetite, gastric emptying and glycaemic response. *European journal of nutrition*, *53*(2), 533-539.
- Coelho-Júnior, H. J., Rodrigues, B., Uchida, M., & Marzetti, E. (2018). Low protein intake is associated with frailty in older adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Nutrients*, *10*(9), 1334.
- Conley, T. B., Apoizan, J. W., Leidy, H. J., Greaves, K. A., Lim, E., & Campbell, W. W. (2011). Effect of food form on postprandial plasma amino acid concentrations in older adults. *British Journal of Nutrition*, *106*(2), 203-207.
- de Hart, N. M. M. P., Mahmassani, Z. S., Reidy, P. T., Kelley, J. J., McKenzie, A. I., Petrocelli, J. J., Bridge, M. J., Baird, L. M., Bastian, E. D., Ward, L. S., Howard, M. T., & Drummond, M. J. (2021). Acute Effects of Cheddar Cheese Consumption on Circulating Amino Acids and Human Skeletal Muscle. *Nutrients*, *13*(2), 614.
- Fardet, A., Dupont, D., Rioux, L.-E., & Turgeon, S. L. (2019). Influence of food structure on dairy protein, lipid and calcium bioavailability: A narrative review of evidence. *Critical reviews in food science and nutrition*, *59*(13), 1987-2010.
- Farnfield, M. M., Trenerry, C., Carey, K. A., & Cameron-Smith, D. (2009). Plasma amino acid response after ingestion of different whey protein fractions. *International journal of food sciences and nutrition*, *60*(6), 476-486.
- Flint, A., Raben, A., Blundell, J., & Astrup, A. (2000). Reproducibility, power and validity of visual analogue scales in assessment of appetite sensation in single test meal studies. *International journal of obesity and related metabolic disorders : journal of the International Association for the Study of Obesity*, *24*, 38-48.
- Forde, C. G., & Stieger, M. (2022). Metabolic impacts of food oral processing. In *Oral Processing and Consumer Perception* (pp. 137-186).
- Gonenne, J., Esfandyari, T., Camilleri, M., Burton, D., Stephens, D., Baxter, K., Zinsmeister, A., & Bharucha, A. E. (2006). Effect of female sex hormone supplementation and withdrawal on gastrointestinal and colonic transit in postmenopausal women. *Neurogastroenterology & Motility*, *18*(10), 911-918.
- He, T., Spelbrink, R. E., Witteman, B. J., & Giuseppin, M. L. (2013). Digestion kinetics of potato protein isolates in vitro and in vivo. *International journal of food sciences and nutrition*, *64*(7), 787-793.
- Hermans, W. J. H., Fuchs, C. J., Hendriks, F. K., Houben, L. H. P., Senden, J. M., Verdijk, L. B., & van Loon, L. J. C. (2022). Cheese Ingestion Increases Muscle Protein Synthesis Rates Both at Rest and During Recovery from Exercise in Healthy, Young Males: A Randomized Parallel-Group Trial. *The Journal of nutrition*, *152*(4), 1022-1030.
- Herreman, L., Nommensen, P., Pennings, B., & Laus, M. C. (2020). Comprehensive overview of the quality of plant-And animal-sourced proteins based on the digestible indispensable amino acid score. *Food science & nutrition*, *8*(10), 5379-5391.
- Hoad, C., Rayment, P., Cox, E., Wright, P., Butler, M., Spiller, R., & Gowland, P. (2009). Investigation of alginate beads for gastro-intestinal functionality, Part 2: In vivo characterisation. *Food Hydrocolloids*, *23*(3), 833-839.

- Holwerda, A. M., Lenaerts, K., Bierau, J., & Van Loon, L. J. (2016). Body position modulates gastric emptying and affects the post-prandial rise in plasma amino acid concentrations following protein ingestion in humans. *Nutrients*, *8*(4), 221.
- Holwerda, A. M., Lenaerts, K., Bierau, J., Wodzig, W. K., & van Loon, L. J. (2017). Food ingestion in an upright sitting position increases postprandial amino acid availability when compared with food ingestion in a lying down position. *Applied Physiology, Nutrition, and Metabolism*, *42*(7), 738-743.
- Horstman, A. M., & Huppertz, T. (2022). Milk proteins: Processing, gastric coagulation, amino acid availability and muscle protein synthesis. *Critical reviews in food science and nutrition*, 1-16.
- Horstman, A. M. H., Ganzevles, R. A., Kudla, U., Kardinaal, A. F. M., van den Borne, J. J. G. C., & Huppertz, T. (2021). Postprandial blood amino acid concentrations in older adults after consumption of dairy products: The role of the dairy matrix. *International Dairy Journal*, *113*, 104890.
- Huppertz, T., & Chia, L. W. (2021). Milk protein coagulation under gastric conditions: A review. *International Dairy Journal*, *113*, 104882.
- Jones, K. L., O'Donovan, D., Horowitz, M., Russo, A., Lei, Y., & Hausken, T. (2006). Effects of posture on gastric emptying, transpyloric flow, and hunger after a glucose drink in healthy humans. *Digestive diseases and sciences*, *51*(8), 1331-1338.
- Joye, I. (2019). Protein Digestibility of Cereal Products. *Foods (Basel, Switzerland)*, *8*(6), 199.
- Katz, D. L. (2019). Plant-based diets for reversing disease and saving the planet: past, present, and future. *Advances in Nutrition*, *10*(Supplement\_4), S304-S307.
- Kong, F., & Singh, R. P. (2008). Disintegration of solid foods in human stomach. *Journal of food science*, *73*(5), R67-R80.
- Lajterer, C., Levi, C. S., & Lesmes, U. (2022). An in vitro digestion model accounting for sex differences in gastro-intestinal functions and its application to study differential protein digestibility. *Food Hydrocolloids*, *132*, 107850.
- Lasschuijt, M. P., de Graaf, K., & Mars, M. (2021). Effects of oro-sensory exposure on satiation and underlying neurophysiological mechanisms—what do we know so far? *Nutrients*, *13*(5), 1391.
- Liao, C.-D., Tsauo, J.-Y., Wu, Y.-T., Cheng, C.-P., Chen, H.-C., Huang, Y.-C., Chen, H.-C., & Liou, T.-H. (2017). Effects of protein supplementation combined with resistance exercise on body composition and physical function in older adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, *106*(4), 1078-1091.
- Lu, Z., He, J., Zhang, Y., & Bing, D. (2020). Composition, physicochemical properties of pea protein and its application in functional foods. *Critical reviews in food science and nutrition*, *60*(15), 2593-2605.
- Luo, Q., Boom, R. M., & Janssen, A. E. (2015). Digestion of protein and protein gels in simulated gastric environment. *LWT-Food Science and Technology*, *63*(1), 161-168.
- Mackie. (2019). The digestive tract: A complex system. In *Interdisciplinary approaches to food digestion* (pp. 11-27): Springer.
- Mackie, Rafiee, H., Malcolm, P., Salt, L., & van Aken, G. (2013). Specific food structures suppress appetite through reduced gastric emptying rate. *American Journal of Physiology-Gastrointestinal and Liver Physiology*, *304*(11), G1038-G1043.
- Mahe, S., Roos, N., Benamouzig, R., Davin, L., Luengo, C., Gagnon, L., Gausserges, N., Rautureau, J., & Tomé, D. (1996). Gastrojejunal kinetics and the digestion of [15N] beta-lactoglobulin and casein in humans: the influence of the nature and quantity of the protein. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, *63*(4), 546-552.
- Marciani, L., Gowland, P. A., Spiller, R. C., Manoj, P., Moore, R. J., Young, P., & Fillery-Travis, A. J. (2001). Effect of meal viscosity and nutrients on satiety, intragastric dilution, and emptying assessed by MRI. *American Journal of Physiology-Gastrointestinal and Liver Physiology*, *280*(6), G1227-G1233.
- Marciani, L., Hall, N., Pritchard, S. E., Cox, E. F., Totman, J. J., Lad, M., Hoad, C. L., Foster, T. J., Gowland, P. A., & Spiller, R. C. (2012). Preventing Gastric Sieving by Blending a Solid/Water Meal Enhances Satiation in Healthy Humans. *The Journal of nutrition*, *142*(7), 1253-1258.
- Mes, J. J., Esser, D., Oosterink, E., van den Dool, R. T., Engel, J., de Jong, G. A., Wehrens, R., & van der Meer, I. M. (2022). A controlled human intervention trial to study protein quality by amino acid uptake kinetics with the novel Lemna protein concentrate as case study. *International Journal of Food Sciences and Nutrition*, *73*(2), 251-262.
- Mulet-Cabero, A.-I., Mackie, A. R., Wilde, P. J., Fenelon, M. A., & Brodkorb, A. (2019). Structural mechanism and kinetics of in vitro gastric digestion are affected by process-induced changes in bovine milk. *Food Hydrocolloids*, *86*, 172-183.
- Muttakin, S., Moxon, T. E., & Gouseti, O. (2019). In vivo, in vitro, and in silico studies of the GI tract. *Interdisciplinary approaches to food digestion*, 29-67.

- Nioche, C., Orhac, F., Boughdad, S., Reuzé, S., Goya-Outi, J., Robert, C., Pellot-Barakat, C., Soussan, M., Frouin, F., & Buvat, I. (2018). LIFEx: a freeware for radiomic feature calculation in multimodality imaging to accelerate advances in the characterization of tumor heterogeneity. *Cancer research*, 78(16), 4786-4789.
- Noble, B., Clark, D., Meldrum, M., ten Have, H., Seymour, J., Winslow, M., & Paz, S. (2005). The measurement of pain, 1945–2000. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*, 29(1), 14-21.
- Overduin, J., Guérin-Deremaux, L., Wils, D., & Lambers, T. T. (2015). NUTRALYS® pea protein: characterization of in vitro gastric digestion and in vivo gastrointestinal peptide responses relevant to satiety. *Food & nutrition research*, 59(1), 25622.
- Pasiakos, S. M., Agarwal, S., Lieberman, H. R., & Fulgoni, V. L. (2015). Sources and amounts of animal, dairy, and plant protein intake of US adults in 2007–2010. *Nutrients*, 7(8), 7058-7069.
- Reddy, L. P., & Reddi, D. P. (2017). Texture Image Segmentation Based on threshold Techniques. In.
- Rivera del Rio, A., Möller, A. C., Boom, R. M., & Janssen, A. E. (2022). In vitro gastro-small intestinal digestion of conventional and mildly processed pea protein ingredients. *Food chemistry*, 387, 132894.
- Rivera del Rio, A., Opazo-Navarrete, M., Cepero-Betancourt, Y., Tabilo-Munizaga, G., Boom, R. M., & Janssen, A. E. (2020). Heat-induced changes in microstructure of spray-dried plant protein isolates and its implications on in vitro gastric digestion. *LWT*, 118, 108795.
- Roy, D., Moughan, P. J., Ye, A., Hodgkinson, S. M., Stroebinger, N., Li, S., Dave, A. C., Montoya, C. A., & Singh, H. (2022). Structural changes in milk from different species during gastric digestion in piglets. *Journal of dairy science*, 105(5), 3810-3831.
- Sieber, C. C. (2019). Malnutrition and sarcopenia. *Aging clinical and experimental research*, 31(6), 793-798.
- Smeets, P. A., Deng, R., van Eijnatten, E. J., & Mayar, M. (2021). Monitoring food digestion with magnetic resonance techniques. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 1-11.
- Soldin, O. P., & Mattison, D. R. (2009). Sex differences in pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics. *Clinical pharmacokinetics*, 48(3), 143-157.
- Spiegel, T. A., Fried, H., Hubert, C. D., Peikin, S. R., Siegel, J. A., & Zeiger, L. S. (2000). Effects of posture on gastric emptying and satiety ratings after a nutritive liquid and solid meal. *American Journal of Physiology-Regulatory, Integrative and Comparative Physiology*, 279(2), R684-R694.
- Thakur, A., Sharma, V., & Thakur, A. (2019). An overview of anti-nutritional factors in food. *Int. J. Chem. Stud*, 7(1), 2472-2479.
- Thomas, R., Qin, L., Alessandrino, F., Sahu, S. P., Guerra, P. J., Krajewski, K. M., & Shinagare, A. (2019). A review of the principles of texture analysis and its role in imaging of genitourinary neoplasms. *Abdom Radiol (NY)*, 44(7), 2501-2510.
- van Lieshout, G. A., Trommelen, J., Nyakayiru, J., van Kranenburg, J., Senden, J. M., Verdijk, L. B., & van Loon, L. J. (2023). The Postprandial Plasma Amino Acid Response Does Not Differ Following the Ingestion of a Solid Versus a Liquid Milk Protein Product in Healthy Adult Females. *International Journal of Sport Nutrition and Exercise Metabolism*, 1(aop), 1-8.
- van Vliet, S., Burd, N. A., & van Loon, L. J. (2015). The skeletal muscle anabolic response to plant-versus animal-based protein consumption. *The Journal of nutrition*, 145(9), 1981-1991.
- Wanders, A. J., Jonathan, M. C., van den Borne, J. J., Mars, M., Schols, H. A., Feskens, E. J., & de Graaf, C. (2013). The effects of bulking, viscous and gel-forming dietary fibres on satiety. *British Journal of Nutrition*, 109(7), 1330-1337.
- Wehrens, R. E., Jasper, Mes, Jurriaan; de Jong, Aard; Esser, Diederik (Submitted for publication, 2023). Analysing postprandial amino-acid responses in crossover studies with the aaresponse package for R.
- Zahir, M., Fogliano, V., & Capuano, E. (2018). Food matrix and processing modulate in vitro protein digestibility in soybeans. *Food & function*, 9(12), 6326-6336.
- Zhu, Y., Hsu, W. H., & Hollis, J. H. (2013). The impact of food viscosity on eating rate, subjective appetite, glycemic response and gastric emptying rate. *PLoS One*, 8(6), e67482.
- Zijlstra, N., Mars, M., de Wijk, R. A., Westerterp-Plantenga, M. S., Holst, J. J., & de Graaf, C. (2009). Effect of viscosity on appetite and gastro-intestinal hormones. *Physiology & behavior*, 97(1), 68-75.

## Table and figure captions

Table 1. Treatment overview

Figure 1. Overview of a test session.

Figure 2. Total amino acids (top) and essential amino acid (bottom) levels over time after consumption of the three pea protein products (mean  $\pm$  SD).

Figure 3. Mean  $\pm$  SD time to maximum peak (min) (A and B), maximum peak height ( $\mu$ M) (C and D) and AUC ( $\text{mM} \cdot \text{min}$ ) (E and F) of the three pea protein products for total AA (left panel) and essential AA (right panel).

Figure 4. Illustration of gastric emptying over time showing MRI images for the unheated drink and the gel treatment. The stomach content is delineated in red.

Figure 5. Mean  $\pm$  SD gastric volume over time of pea protein products. \* $p < 0.05$ , as analyzed with a linear mixed model and Tukey HSD correction for multiple comparison. There was a significant treatment effect for the gel treatment compared to both drinks at  $t = 10$  until  $t = 70$  min.

Figure 6. Average AUC  $\pm$  SD of gastric volume over time for the three treatments.



One-way ANOVA showed no significant difference between treatments.



Figure 7. Mean  $\pm$  SD liquid and semi-solid gastric volume over time of the gel treatment after ingestion of 105 g of pea protein gel with 315 mL water.









Figure 8. Mean  $\pm$  SD texture metrics (arbitrary units) of the stomach contents over time for the unheated and heated drinks. \*P < 0.05, as analyzed with a linear mixed model and Tukey HSD correction for multiple testing.

Figure 9. Degree of hydrolysis (%) of the three pea protein products measured via a static in vitro protocol.





**Total AA****Essential AA**

### Unheated drink



t = 10



t = 30



t = 60



t = 90

### Heated drink



t = 10



t = 30



t = 60



t = 90

### Gel treatment



t = 10




t = 30





t = 60







t = 90












— Heated drink    - - - Unheated drink



● Heated gel ▲ Heated drink □ Unheated drink

<b>Treatment</b>	<b>Texture</b>	<b>Volume/weight</b>	<b>Heat treatment</b>	<b>Water consumed separately (mL)</b>
Unheated drink	Liquid	420 mL	None	0
Heated drink	Liquid	420 mL	90 °C – 30 min	0
Heated gel	Semi-solid	105 g	90 °C – 30 min	315