

TITLE PAGE

Gastric coagulation and postprandial amino acid absorption of milk is affected by mineral composition: a randomized crossover trial

Elise J.M. van Eijnatten, MSc, Julia J.M. Roelofs, MSc, Guido Camps, PhD, Thom Huppertz, PhD, Tim T. Lambers, PhD, Paul A.M. Smeets, PhD

Author affiliations:

- Division of Human Nutrition and Health, Wageningen University, Stippeneng 4, 6708 PB Wageningen, the Netherlands (EE, JR, GC, PS)
- Food Quality and Design group, Wageningen University, Bornse Weilanden 9, 6708 WG Wageningen, the Netherlands (TH)
- FrieslandCampina, Stationsplein 4, 3818 LE Amersfoort, the Netherlands (TT, TH)

Disclaimers: none

Corresponding Author:

Name: Elise van Eijnatten

Mailing address: Stippeneng 4, 6708 WE Wageningen

Telephone number: 0031642565543

E-mail address: elise.vaneijnatten@wur.nl

All sources of financial support: FrieslandCampina

Short running head: Digestion and absorption of coagulated casein

List of abbreviations:

95% CI	95% confidence interval
BMI	Body mass index
GE	Gastric emptying
GE-t50	Gastric emptying half time
CM	Casein mineralization
MD	Mean difference
MRI	Magnetic resonance imaging

Clinical trial registry number: NL8959 (Dutch Trial Registry) accessible through <https://onderzoekmetmensen.nl/en/trial/20073>.

Pubmed indexing:

van Eijnatten EJM

Roelofs JJM

Camps G

Lambers TT

Huppertz T

Smeets PAM

Word count: 4282

Number of figures: 6

Number of tables: 0

Supplementary data submitted: yes

The data described in the manuscript, code book, and analytic code will be made available upon request.

1

2 **ABSTRACT**

3 **Background:** *In vitro* studies suggest that casein coagulation of milk is influenced by its
4 mineral composition, and may therefore affect the dynamics of protein digestion, gastric
5 emptying and appearance of amino acids (AA) in the blood, but this remains to be
6 confirmed *in vivo*.

7 **Objective:** This study aimed to compare gastrointestinal digestion between two milks
8 with the same total calcium content but different casein mineralization (CM).

9 **Design:** Fifteen males (age 30.9±13.8 y, BMI 22.5±2.2 kg/m²) participated in this
10 randomized cross-over study with two treatments. Participants underwent gastric
11 magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scans at baseline and every 10 min up to 90 min
12 after consumption of 600 ml milk with low or high CM. Blood samples were taken at
13 baseline and up to 5 hours postprandially. Primary outcomes were postprandial plasma
14 AA concentrations and gastric emptying rate. Secondary outcomes were postprandial
15 glucose and insulin levels, gastric coagulation as estimated by image texture metrics,
16 and appetite ratings.

17 **Results:** Gastric content volume over time was similar for both treatments. However,
18 gastric content image analysis suggested that the liquid fraction emptied quicker in the
19 high CM milk, while the coagulum emptied slower. Relative to high CM, low CM showed
20 earlier appearance of AAs that are more dominant in casein, such as proline (MD 4.18
21 μmol/L, 95%CI [2.38-5.98], p<0.001), while there was no difference in appearance of
22 AAs that are more dominant in whey protein, such as leucine. The image texture metrics

23 homogeneity and busyness differed significantly between treatments (MD 0.007, 95%CI
24 [0.001, 0.012], $p=0.022$; MD 0.005, 95%CI [0.001, 0.010], $p=0.012$) likely because of a
25 reduced coagulation in the low CM milk.

26 **Conclusions:** Mineral composition of milk can influence postprandial serum AA kinetics,
27 likely due to differences in coagulation dynamics.

28

29 **Keywords:** milk, digestion, casein, micellar calcium, gastric emptying, amino acids,
30 glucose, insulin

31 INTRODUCTION

32 Protein is an essential macronutrient for many functions in the human body^{1, 2}.
33 Consuming sufficient protein can be a challenge. Therefore, optimal digestion and
34 absorption of the consumed protein support bioavailability of amino acids (AA)^{3, 4}. A
35 common source of protein is bovine milk⁵, which generally contains about 3.5% protein,
36 of which caseins represent around 80% and whey proteins around 20%⁶. While whey
37 protein remains soluble, casein coagulates in the stomach when casein micelles are
38 destabilized by pepsin proteolysis⁷. This leads to the formation of curds containing
39 protein and fat globules that impact overall digestion kinetics, such as protein digestion
40 and absorption⁸.

41
42 Previous studies, predominantly *in vitro*, suggest that casein coagulation is affected by
43 several factors, including processing-induced protein modifications, overall product
44 composition, including mineral composition, and variations in gastric acidification and
45 protease secretion⁹⁻¹². It is important to fully understand the effect of processing-induced
46 protein modifications of milk on coagulation since coagulation could influence the rate at
47 which protein empties from the stomach and thereby affect protein digestion and
48 absorption kinetics¹³. Gastric emptying (GE) is the rate-limiting step in the delivery of
49 nutrients to the small intestine for further breakdown and absorption¹⁴. GE rate of liquids
50 is mainly driven by energy density and viscosity¹⁵. However, compared to whey proteins,
51 the coagulated casein fraction of milk empties later, because the stomach only empties
52 particles sized below 1–2 mm^{14, 16}. Accordingly, whey proteins, which remain soluble,
53 have a higher GE rate than caseins^{17, 18}. Processing of milk alters its functional

54 properties including casein and its coagulation¹⁹, which could influence GE and related
55 digestion kinetics. This is supported by recent *in vivo* work showing that the processing
56 of casein and the resulting alterations in the product matrix can have a strong effect on
57 postprandial AA responses. For instance, cross-linked sodium caseinate was more
58 rapidly digested than micellar casein and calcium caseinate and upon the ingestion of
59 dairy products containing 25 g protein, and a higher increase in EAA concentrations in
60 blood was observed after consumption of yoghurt, compared to milk and cheese^{20, 21}.
61 The rate at which AA are absorbed greatly affects their availability for muscle protein
62 synthesis²². A faster release of milk proteins results in a more prominent muscle
63 synthetic response, whereas a slower release of protein from the stomach results in a
64 better net postprandial protein utilization⁷. Thus, the degree of casein coagulation in the
65 stomach could affect the dynamics of gastric protein digestion, stomach emptying, and
66 subsequent intestinal digestion and absorption of AA.

67
68 Both the physical (e.g., compactness, hardness and elasticity, size of fat globules) and
69 the chemical parameters (e.g., protein/lipid ratio, P/Ca ratio) can influence the milk
70 matrix and could therefore affect the bioavailability of AA³. *In vitro* studies indicate that
71 casein coagulation is affected by mineral composition²³ since caseins form casein
72 micelles with calcium, phosphate, and magnesium²⁴. Partial decalcification of casein
73 micelles results in looser-formed gastric clots and greater proteolysis²⁵. Casein
74 mineralization (CM) also affected the coagulation of milk proteins in a model infant
75 formula²⁶. The effect of CM on coagulation was followed up by a study on the
76 coagulating behavior of bovine casein micelles under infant, adult, and elderly conditions

77 where gastric coagula became looser and the formation of free amino groups and small
78 peptides increased with an increasing level of decalcification²⁷. However, thus far, only
79 *in vitro* or indirect (by measuring AA kinetics) *in vivo* studies have been done, in which
80 other product differences than only mineralization were studied. MRI could be a helpful
81 tool in assessing casein coagulation. Currently, the main use of MRI in gastric research
82 is measuring GE^{28, 29}. But MRI can also be used to visualize intragastric processes, such
83 as changes from liquid to solid state, gastric sieving and phase separation^{30, 31}, which is
84 an advantage over ultrasound or tracer-methodology. Since gastric protein coagulation
85 involves a change from a liquid to a semi-solid state, MRI could potentially be used to
86 quantify the degree of coagulation. So far, gastric coagulation has only been visually
87 assessed using MRI³², however image texture analysis may provide a more objective
88 and accurate quantification²⁹.

89
90 This study aimed to compare gastrointestinal digestion (coagulation, GE, and
91 postprandial AA dynamics) between skimmed bovine milks with the same total calcium
92 content but a different degree of CM. We hypothesized that gastric protein coagulation
93 would be more prominent in milk with higher CM and consequently delay gastric protein
94 emptying, serum AA appearance, and related glycemc responses.

95 **PARTICIPANTS AND METHODS**

96 **Design**

97 This study was a randomized, single-blinded, crossover study with two treatments.
98 Washout was at least one week, and sessions were a maximum two months apart.
99 Primary outcomes were postprandial plasma amino-acid concentrations and gastric
100 emptying rate. Secondary outcomes were postprandial glucose and insulin levels,
101 gastric coagulation, and other product instabilities if visible and appetite ratings obtained
102 after each MRI measurement. The results are presented in the order of (I) coagulation,
103 (II) gastric emptying, (III) AAs, (IV) insulin / glucose and (V) appetite ratings.

104

105 **Participants**

106 Healthy males, aged 18-55 years, BMI 18.5-25.0 kg/m², were recruited from the
107 Wageningen area from December 2020 to March 2021. Exclusion criteria were bovine
108 milk allergy, lactose intolerance (either self-reported or diagnosed), gastric disorders or
109 regular gastric complaints, such as heartburn, use of proton pump inhibitors or other
110 medication which alters the normal functioning of the stomach, recreational use of
111 drugs, within one month prior to the pre-study screenings day, alcohol consumption of
112 more than 14 standard units/week, being vegan, smoking, or having a contraindication
113 to MRI. Because there are sex differences in gastrointestinal function^{33, 34}, males were
114 chosen as the study group. The sample size was calculated for the first primary
115 outcome, the postprandial AA profile, based on the expected difference in peak serum
116 AA concentration. We estimated the peak difference to be 0.4 pmol/ml, with an SD of

117 0.3 pmol/ml based on an earlier study performed with differently treated dairy products
118 that are comparable to these study products²¹. The power was set to 0.9. This resulted
119 in an estimated sample size of n=14. However, to account for a possible smaller
120 difference, it was decided to include 15 participants. Fifteen males (age: 30.9±13.8
121 years; BMI: 22.5±2.2 kg/m²) completed this study. See the flow diagram in
122 **Supplementary figure 1**. The study was conducted according to the principles of the
123 Declaration of Helsinki (October 2013) and registered with the Dutch Trial Registry
124 under number NL8959 accessible through
125 <https://trialssearch.who.int/Trial2.aspx?TrialID=NL8959>. All participants provided written
126 informed consent.

127

128 **Study procedures**

129 On the day before each test session, participants consumed a standardized 500-kcal
130 rice dinner, which they could finish or eat less if they preferred. Drinks were free of
131 choice. After this, participants fasted for at least 12 hours until the test session the
132 following morning. Drinking water was allowed up to 1.5 hours before the session.
133 Participants arrived at the hospital Gelderse Vallei, Ede, The Netherlands, at 8 or 10 AM
134 and were measured at the same time on both study days. **Figure 1** shows an overview
135 of a test session. Upon arrival, an intravenous (IV) cannula was placed in an antecubital
136 vein. Baseline measurements consisted of appetite ratings, an abdominal MRI scan, and
137 a blood sample. Subsequently, participants were instructed to consume 600 ml of a test
138 product within five minutes, but all finished between one and four minutes. Gastric MRI
139 scans were performed at baseline and every ten minutes, starting at T = 10 min up to 90

140 minutes after the start of consumption. During the MRI session, participants verbally
141 rated subjective appetite: hunger, thirst, fullness, desire to eat, and prospective
142 consumption on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 100 (most imaginable) at each time point³⁵.
143 Blood samples were drawn at baseline and at T = 15, 30, 45, 60, 75, 90, 120, 150, 180,
144 210, 240, 270, and 300 min.

145
146 The test products were two skimmed milks with different micellar mineral composition,
147 provided by FrieslandCampina. The low CM product was skimmed milk with 20 mM
148 added trisodium citrate, resulting in a degree of CM of 4.3 mmol protein-associated
149 Ca/10 g casein, determined as described previously³⁶. Adding citrate alters the micellar
150 calcium content and thereby the casein micelle integrity³⁷. To maintain a similar
151 buffering capacity in the high CM product, disodium hydrogen phosphate was added to
152 skimmed milk at a level of 20 mM, resulting in a degree of CM of 8.9 mmol protein-
153 associated Ca/10 g casein. Solutions were made at the same time in the afternoon
154 preceding the test day and were slowly mixed with a magnetic stirrer at 4° C overnight to
155 create an equilibrium of micellar and non-micellar calcium. The difference in gastric
156 protein coagulation was determined by wet weight measurements of the coagulates
157 during *in vitro* gastric digestion (**Supplementary figure 2**). The nutritional value of both
158 test products per 600 ml prepared product was 831 kJ/195 kcal, 0 g fat, 27 g
159 carbohydrate, 21 g protein and 762 mg calcium. Participants were randomly allocated by
160 block randomization using randomizer.org to receive either the low CM or the high CM
161 milk first. The milks were similar in appearance and taste and participants were blinded
162 to the milk they received.

163

164 **MRI**

165 Participants were scanned in a supine position with the use of a Philips Ingenia Elition X
166 3.0T MRI scanner. A T₂-weighted ~20-s 2-D Turbo Spin Echo sequence (37 4-mm
167 slices, 2 mm gap, 1 x 1 mm in-plane resolution, TR = 550 ms, TE = 80 ms, flip angle: 90
168 degrees) was used with breath-hold command on expiration to fixate the position of the
169 diaphragm and the stomach. The software Medical Imaging Processing And
170 Visualization (MIPAV, version 11.0.3) was used to manually delineate gastric content on
171 every slice³⁸. Volumes on each time point were calculated by multiplying the surface
172 area of gastric content per slice with slice thickness, including gap distance, and
173 summed over the total number of slices showing gastric content. To assess changes in
174 gastric coagulation, image texture analysis of the stomach content was performed using
175 the software LIFEx (version 7.2.0, Institut national de la santé et de la recherche
176 médicale, France)³⁹. Homogeneity, coarseness, contrast, and busyness were
177 calculated. These image metrics provide information on the spatial patterns of voxel
178 intensity⁴⁰. The Gray-Level Co-occurrence Matrix (GLCM) method was used for
179 homogeneity (degree of similarity between voxels) and Neighborhood Gray-level
180 Difference Matrix (NGLDM) difference of grey-levels between one voxel and its 26
181 neighbors in 8 dimensions was used for contrast (local variations), coarseness (spatial
182 rate of change in intensity) and busyness (spatial frequency of changes in intensity). The
183 number of grey levels for texture metric calculation was set at 64, intensity rescaling at
184 relative (ROI: min/max), and dimension processing at 2D. On each postprandial time
185 point, texture metrics were calculated per slice for the stomach content. Subsequently, a

186 weighted average texture metric was calculated based on the gastric content volume in
187 each slice such that slices with little stomach content contributed less to the average
188 than those with more stomach content. To quantify the (relative) volume of liquid and
189 semi-solid stomach contents the number of lighter (more liquid), intermediate and darker
190 (semi-solid) voxels was calculated by determining intensity thresholds with the use of
191 Otsu's method⁴¹ in Matlab (version R2023a, `multitresh` function) an approach previously
192 used on *in vitro* MRI images of milk digestion⁴². The number of intermediate and darker
193 voxels were summed and interpreted as reflecting coagulation. This was done because
194 visual inspection of the thresholding results showed that in these images a separation in
195 two categories was not accurate. In the context of this study, changes in image texture
196 metrics were interpreted as reflecting changes in the degree of coagulation. An example
197 of stomachs with and without coagulation and their corresponding image texture
198 measures can be found in **Supplementary figure 3**.

199

200 **Blood collection and analysis**

201 Blood samples (10 ml) were drawn from the IV cannula into sodium-fluoride, serum-,
202 and lithium-heparin tubes. After collection, sodium-fluoride and lithium-heparin tubes
203 were centrifuged at 1000 x *g* for 10 min at 22°C within 30 min, to obtain blood plasma.
204 To obtain blood serum, serum tubes were first allowed to clot for 30 min before being
205 centrifuged at the same conditions as the other tubes. Following centrifugation, serum
206 aliquots of 500 µl and 250 µl were pipetted in 5 ml tubes and stored at -80°C until they
207 were analyzed in bulk.

208

209 Analysis and quantification of serum AA concentrations were done using liquid
210 chromatography mass spectrometry (LC-MS) triple quad, with an internal standard and
211 ¹³C reference mixture⁴³. For determination of the glucose concentrations, plasma
212 samples were processed using an Atellica CH Glucose Hexokinase_3 (GluH_3) assay
213 kit and quantified using an Atellica CH analyzer (Siemens Healthineers, The
214 Netherlands). The lower limit of detection was 0.2 mmol/l and intra-assay CVs were at
215 most 4.5%. Serum insulin was processed and its concentrations were quantified using
216 an enzymatic immunoassay kit (ELISA, Mercodia AB, Sweden) with a limit of detection
217 of 0.008 mmol/l and intra assay CVs of at most 6.8%.

218

219 **Statistical analysis**

220 To estimate gastric emptying half time (GE-t50), a commonly used summary measure
221 for each scan session, a curve was fitted according to an established linear-exponential
222 model as developed based on earlier models of GE to the data of gastric volume over
223 time using R statistical software^{16, 44-46}. This method works well for gastric content that
224 increases due to gastric excretion in the early phase (lag phase) and afterward empties
225 almost linearly. Further analyses were performed in SPSS (version 22, IBM, Armonk,
226 USA). GE-t50 was compared between low and high CM milk with a paired t-test. The
227 serum AA were categorized into three groups: branched-chain amino acids (BCAA),
228 essential amino acids (EAA), and non-essential amino acids (NEAA) and their content
229 was summed. Overall blood parameters, gastric volume, image texture metrics, and

230 appetite ratings were tested using linear mixed models with treatment, time, and
231 treatment*time as fixed factors and baseline values as covariate. An extra analysis on
232 the first 90 min of the blood parameters was conducted since this is when differences in
233 gastric coagulation were expected. Proline, an AA more dominant in casein, and
234 leucine, an AA more dominant in a whey protein, were used as a showcase since the
235 expected difference in AA kinetics would be driven by differing casein coagulation and
236 not whey. After this, we estimated the contribution of casein and whey proteins by
237 determining the casein/whey AA ratio 'Q' of serum AA from the concentrations of
238 proline, phenylalanine, aspartic acid, asparagine, and alanine according to the method
239 of Jacobs et al.⁴⁷ described for food products. Normality was confirmed by quantile-
240 quantile plots of the residuals, except for insulin, which was log-transformed to meet
241 normality. Missing data was handled using a Maximum Likelihood estimation. The
242 significance threshold was set at $p = 0.05$. Data are expressed as mean \pm SD unless
243 stated otherwise.

244 RESULTS

245 Coagulation metrics

246 Qualitatively, coagulation was visible on the MRI images for both high and low CM milk
247 (**Supplementary figure 4**). The image texture metrics homogeneity and busyness were
248 higher for high CM milk (MD 0.007, 95% CI [0.001, 0.012], $p=0.022$ and MD 0.005, 95%
249 CI [0.001, 0.010], $p=0.012$, respectively). Coarseness (MD 0.001, 95% CI [-0.001,
250 0.002], $p=0.512$),) and contrast (MD -0.086, 95% CI [-0.203, 0.031], $p=0.149$) were not
251 significantly different. There were no time*treatment interaction effects. **Figure 2** shows
252 homogeneity over time as an example. Figures of busyness, coarseness, and contrast
253 can be found in **Supplementary figure 5**.

254

255 Gastric emptying

256 There was no significant difference in gastric volume over time between treatments (MD
257 3.8, 95% CI -8.2, 15.8, $p = 0.53$). This is in line with the GE-t50: low CM milk 45.6 ± 7.8
258 min and high CM milk 46.6 ± 8.7 min (MD 1.0, 95% CI [-1.9, 4.0], $p = 0.46$) (**Figure 3**).
259 There was a higher proportion of liquid over time between treatments in the low CM
260 condition (MD 2.2 %, 95% CI [0.30, 4.1], $p = 0.023$) (**Supplementary figure 6**).

261

262 Amino acids

263 The total EAA postprandial response over time was similar for low and high CM milk
264 (MD -2.6 $\mu\text{mol/L}$, 95% CI [-8.5, 3.2], $p = 0.379$, time $p < 0.001$, time * treatment $p =$

265 0.374) and total NEAA response over time was higher for the low CM milk with a trend
266 for the interaction of time and treatment (MD $\mu\text{mol/L}$ -4.3, 95% CI [-7.4, -1.1], $p = 0.008$,
267 time*treatment $p = 0.095$), driven by time point $T = 60$ min, $p < 0.001$ (**Figure 4**). The
268 BCAA valine (MTD -1.784, 95% CI [-3.531, -0.038], $p = 0.045$, time $p < 0.001$, time*
269 treatment $p = 0.135$) driven by $t = 60$ min, $p = 0.001$) was significantly higher for the low
270 CM milk. Figures of separate AAs can be found in **Supplementary figures 7, 8 and 9**.

271
272 Analysis of the first 90 min, when the effect of a reduced casein coagulation is to be
273 expected, showed higher total serum AA for low CM for both EAA (MD $45.3 \mu\text{mol/L}$,
274 95% CI [14.9 – 75.6], $p=0.004$ and $T = 60$ $p = 0.001$) and NEAA (MD $56.7 \mu\text{mol/L}$, 95%
275 CI [24.7 – 88.6], $p < 0.001$, $T = 60$, $p = 0.005$).

276
277 Relative to high CM milk, low CM milk showed earlier appearance of AAs more
278 dominant in casein, such as proline (MD $4.18 \mu\text{mol/L}$, 95 % CI [2.38-5.98], treatment $p <$
279 0.001), while there was no difference in AA appearance of AAs more dominant in whey
280 protein, such as leucine (MD $0.563 \mu\text{mol/L}$, 95 % CI [-0.99-2.12], treatment $p = 0.477$).
281 In line with these observations, analysis of the estimated serum casein/whey AA ratio
282 showed a difference between the treatments (MD 0.056, 95% CI [0.022-0.091],
283 treatment $p = 0.002$, $T = 30$ min $p = 0.015$) (**Figure 5**).

284

285 **Glucose and insulin**

286 Glucose over time did not differ between treatments (MD -0.047 mmol/L, 95% CI [-
287 0.373, 0.278], $p = 0.915$) and there was no time*treatment interaction ($p = 0.99$). The
288 insulin response over time was significantly lower for the high CM milk (MD 0.072
289 (mIU/L), 95% CI [0.019, 0.125], $p = 0.008$). Post-hoc t-tests showed that this is driven by
290 time points T = 30 (MD 8.4, 95% CI [2.8, 14.0], $p = 0.004$) and T = 45 min (MD 6.9, 95%
291 CI [1.3, 12.5], $p = 0.016$). There was no time*treatment interaction ($p = 0.38$). Graphs of
292 both insulin and glucose can be found in **Figure 6**.

293

294 **Appetite ratings**

295 Hunger (MD 2.7, 95% CI [-0.418, 5.87], $p = 0.089$), fullness (MD 0.97, 95% CI [-2.06,
296 3.99], $p = 0.53$), desire to eat (MD 0.26, 95% CI [-2.80, 3.32], $p = 0.87$), prospective
297 consumption (MD -1.22, 95% CI [-3.99, 1.56], $p = 0.388$), thirst (MD -2.56, 95% CI [-
298 5.96, 0.84], $p = 0.139$) did not differ between treatments (**Supplementary figure 10**).
299 There were no interaction effects for any rating.

300

301 **Time effects**

302 There was a significant time effect for all mixed model analyses of AA, GE, glucose, and
303 insulin, coagulation metrics and appetite ratings (all $p < 0.001$).

304 **DISCUSSION**

305 To the best of our knowledge this is the first *in vivo* study that directly evaluated the
306 effect of milk mineral composition on gastric casein coagulation, GE, AA and glycemc
307 responses. Among the image texture metrics used to estimate the degree of
308 coagulation, homogeneity and busyness were higher for the high CM milk compared to
309 the low CM milk. As expected, the rate of gastric emptying, as measured by gastric
310 volume curves over time and GE-t50, was similar for the two milks since they only
311 differed in mineral composition. The serum AAs that are more dominant in casein, such
312 as proline, and estimated serum casein/whey AA ratio were significantly higher for the
313 low CM milk, predominantly driven by time point T = 60 min. There was no difference in
314 glucose response. The insulin response was significantly lower for the high CM milk:
315 driven by time points T = 30 and T = 45 min which were in line with differences in
316 postprandial BCAA valine.

317

318 We used image texture metrics as an objective measure to quantify the degree of
319 coagulation. A difference in homogeneity and busyness implies a difference in
320 coagulation between the high CM milk and the low CM milk. This is in line with previous
321 *in vitro* work applying model IF formula and simulated infant digestion²⁶ and our *in vitro*
322 digestions of the test products under simulated adult conditions (Supplementary figure
323 2). Both *in vitro* studies showed a substantial difference in coagula between low and
324 high CM samples, in line with an overall reduced casein coagulation and formation of a
325 more open structured curd for the low CM milk. However, these measures should be
326 further validated, since such image analyses to quantify the degree of structure

327 formation have been used in other areas^{48, 49}, but are novel for characterizing gastric
328 protein coagulation²⁹. In the current study, homogeneity and busyness were both higher,
329 which seems contradictory: a higher homogeneity may imply a lower degree of
330 coagulation, while higher busyness may imply a higher degree of coagulation. What
331 should be considered is that higher homogeneity could not only reflect a homogenous
332 liquid, but also result from the presence of large coagulates. Another aspect to consider
333 is that not only the size, but also the structure is an important characteristic of coagula.
334 For instance, we know that some coagulates are firm and have a dense structure, and
335 greater weight than less dense coagulates with approximately the same volume⁵⁰.
336 Indeed, lower CM resulted in smaller and softer curd particles *in vitro*, likely because of
337 higher concentration of non-micellar casein, which hinder enzymatic coagulation of
338 casein micelles²⁶. MRI is sensitive to water content, so could provide information on
339 water contained in the coagulum and therefore its density. It should be noted that MRI
340 image texture parameters are affected by the resolution of the input images and could
341 detect differences in image intensity patterns that are not clearly distinguishable by
342 viewing the MRI images. This needs further validation by concomitant analysis of MRI
343 images and coagulates that differ in size and density. Other MRI techniques are being
344 developed that can provide molecular-level information such as measurement of the
345 magnetization transfer ratio and relaxation rates^{42, 51, 52}. These measurements require
346 additional MRI spectra to be recorded, but could be used in follow-up research to
347 examine more subtle differences in protein coagulation *in vivo*.

348

349 The differences in coagulation between the two milks did not affect gastric emptying
350 rate; the GE curves were similar for both milks. However, the threshold analysis showed
351 that most of the liquid fraction emptied sooner than the semi-solid (coagulated) fraction.
352 It is known from *in vitro* and animal *in vivo* models that complete breakdown and
353 subsequent GE of the coagulated casein fraction can take longer than complete
354 emptying of the liquid fraction^{4, 7, 13, 17, 26, 53}. This is likely a consequence of the increased
355 particle size exceeding the maximum size that can pass the pyloric filter¹⁴ and may be
356 physiologically important to provide a sustained release of amino acids to the neonate.
357 Accordingly, whey proteins, which remain soluble, have a higher GE rate than caseins¹⁸.
358 Studies comparing whey and casein show a difference in overall GE as assessed with
359 MRI and ultrasonography^{17, 54, 55}. However, one study with preterm infants using whey
360 and casein-dominant formulas found similar GE⁵⁶. Likely, overall GE rates vary between
361 studies likely as a consequence of the different formulations used.

362
363 Gastric casein coagulation differences can likely explain the observed difference in
364 overall postprandial AA profiles. Looking at the first 90 min, when the effect of
365 differences in casein coagulation could be expected, both EAA and NEAA responses
366 were significantly lower for high CM milk. This is in line with our hypothesis and is
367 probably caused by the delay in emptying of the coagulated casein fraction. Indeed,
368 proline, an AA more dominant in casein AA was significantly different between the
369 treatments, whereas leucine, an AA that is more dominant in whey protein, was not,
370 further illustrating that micellar calcium only affects the coagulation and digestion of the
371 casein fraction. This is strengthened by the findings of differences in the estimated

372 serum whey/casein AA ratio. A reduced casein mineralization can also explain recent *in*
373 *vivo* observations where overall digestion of mineral-depleted milk protein concentrate
374 was faster than that of a regular CM milk⁵⁷.

375
376 No differences in glucose responses were observed, which is not surprising since
377 carbohydrate (lactose) concentration was the same for both treatments. The lower
378 insulin levels observed in response to high CM milk are likely due to the difference in
379 BCAAs and/or other insulinotropic AAs present in the milk. In this study the BCAA valine
380 was significantly higher for the low CM milk. The BCAA have the potential to influence
381 insulin responses^{58, 59}.

382
383 In conclusion, milks with different mineral compositions show different coagulating
384 properties, as measured with higher serum AA in low CM milk, confirming *in vitro* results.
385 Coagulation differences were further supported by MRI image analyses. Although the
386 different coagulation properties did not influence overall GE the liquid fraction emptied
387 quicker, while the coagulum persisted. This is in line with the difference in AA kinetics
388 where the effects were predominantly driven by AAs more dominant in casein. The
389 results suggest that the mineral composition of milk can influence gastric coagulation
390 and protein digestion. This knowledge may help to determine the optimal processing of
391 dairy products and their effect on digestion and health. Future studies should focus on
392 improving measurements of the degree of coagulation and coagulum structure with MRI
393 and examining the physiological relevance of the observed differences.

394 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

395 TL, and PS designed the research; EE and JR conducted the research. TL and TH
396 provided essential materials. EE analyzed the data and drafted the paper. EE, JR, GC,
397 TL, TH, and PS revised the manuscript critically for important intellectual content. PS
398 had primary responsibility for the final content. All authors read and approved the final
399 manuscript. This study was funded by FrieslandCampina and TL and TH are employed
400 by FrieslandCampina. All other authors declare no further conflict of interest. We thank
401 Lisa van den Berg, Caya Lindner, Jinke Oosterhof, and Jesper Rietmeijer for assisting
402 with data collection, Jacques Vervoort and Sebas Wesseling for their work on the AA
403 analysis and Christophe Nioche for his support with the LIFEx software. The use of the
404 3T MRI was made possible by WUR Shared Research Facilities.

REFERENCES

1. H. J. Coelho-Junior, B. Rodrigues, M. Uchida and E. Marzetti, *Nutrients*, 2018, **10**.
2. D. H. Sullivan, S. Sun and R. C. Walls, *JAMA*, 1999, **281**, 2013-2019.
3. A. Fardet, D. Dupont, L.-E. Rioux and S. L. Turgeon, *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*, 2019, **59**, 1987-2010.
4. S. Mahé, N. Roos, R. Benamouzig, L. Davin, C. Luengo, L. Gagnon, N. Gaussergès, J. Rautureau and D. Tomé, *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 1996, **63**, 546-552.
5. K. N. van Rossum, C. Wilson, M. Ocké, *EFSA supporting publication*, 2018, DOI: 10.2903/sp.efsa.2018.EN-1488, 25 pp.
6. A. Haug, A. T. Høstmark and O. M. Harstad, *Lipids in Health and Disease*, 2007, **6**, 25.
7. Y. Boirie, M. Dangin, P. Gachon, M.-P. Vasson, J.-L. Maubois and B. Beaufrère, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 1997, **94**, 14930-14935.
8. A. Ye, W. Liu, J. Cui, X. Kong, D. Roy, Y. Kong, J. Han and H. Singh, *Food Chemistry*, 2019, **286**, 216-225.
9. A.-I. Mulet-Cabero, A. Torcello-Gómez, S. Saha, A. R. Mackie, P. J. Wilde and A. Brodkorb, *Food Chemistry*, 2020, **319**, 126514.
10. M. Corredig and E. Salvatore, in *Advanced Dairy Chemistry: Volume 1B: Proteins: Applied Aspects*, eds. P. L. H. McSweeney and J. A. O'Mahony, Springer New York, New York, NY, 2016, DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4939-2800-2_11, pp. 287-307.
11. A. M. H. Horstman and T. Huppertz, *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*, 2022, DOI: 10.1080/10408398.2022.2078782, 1-16.
12. T. Huppertz and L. W. Chia, *International Dairy Journal*, 2021, **113**, 104882.
13. D. Roy, P. J. Moughan, A. Ye, S. M. Hodgkinson, N. Stroebling, S. Li, A. C. Dave, C. A. Montoya and H. Singh, *Journal of Dairy Science*, 2022, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2021-21388>.
14. F. Kong and R. P. Singh, *Journal of food science*, 2008, **73**, R67-80.
15. Camps, M. Mars, C. de Graaf and P. A. M. Smeets, *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 2016, **104**, 73-80.
16. J. D. Elashoff, T. J. Reedy and J. H. Meyer, *Gastroenterology*, 1982, **83**, 1306-1312.
17. Y. Sakata, T. Yago, S. Mori, N. Seto, Y. Matsunaga, H. Nakamura, T. Tominaga, K. Miyaji and Y. Takeda, *J Nutr*, 2022, **152**, 2367-2375.
18. J. M. Aguilera, *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*, 2019, **59**, 3612-3629.
19. D. G. Dalgleish and M. Corredig, *Annu Rev Food Sci Technol*, 2012, **3**, 449-467.
20. J. Trommelen, M. E. G. Weijzen, J. van Kranenburg, R. A. Ganzevles, M. Beelen, L. B. Verdijk and L. J. C. van Loon, *Nutrients*, 2020, **12**.
21. A. M. H. Horstman, R. A. Ganzevles, U. Kudla, A. F. M. Kardinaal, J. J. G. C. van den Borne and T. Huppertz, *International Dairy Journal*, 2021, **113**, 104890.
22. M. Lacroix, C. Bos, J. Léonil, G. Airinei, C. Luengo, S. Daré, R. Benamouzig, H. Fouillet, J. Fauquant, D. Tomé and C. Gaudichon, *Am J Clin Nutr*, 2006, **84**, 1070-1079.
23. M. Yang, A. Ye, Z. Yang, D. W. Everett, E. P. Gilbert and H. Singh, *Food & Function*, 2023.
24. H. M. Farrell, E. L. Malin, E. M. Brown and P. X. Qi, *Current Opinion in Colloid & Interface Science*, 2006, **11**, 135-147.
25. J. Zhang, D. Liu, Y. Xie, J. Yuan, K. Wang, X. Tao, Y. Hemar, J. M. Regenstein, X. Liu and P. Zhou, *Food Chemistry*, 2023, **416**, 135865.
26. T. Huppertz and T. T. Lambers, *International Dairy Journal*, 2020, **107**, 104717.
27. K. Wang, D. Liu, X. Tao, J. Zhang, T. Huppertz, J. M. Regenstein, X. Liu and P. Zhou, *Food Hydrocolloids*, 2023, **139**, 108515.
28. R. Spiller and L. Marciani, *Nutrients*, 2019, **11**.
29. P. A. M. Smeets, R. Deng, E. J. M. van Eijnatten and M. Mayar, *The Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 2020, DOI: 10.1017/s0029665120007867, 1-11.
30. G. Camps, M. Mars, C. de Graaf and P. A. M. Smeets, *Physiology & Behavior*, 2017, **176**, 26-30.
31. Marciani, N. Hall, S. E. Pritchard, E. F. Cox, J. J. Totman, M. Lad, C. L. Hoad, T. J. Foster, P. A. Gowland and R. C. Spiller, *The Journal of Nutrition*, 2012, **142**, 1253-1258.
32. M. Coletta, F. K. Gates, L. Marciani, H. Shiwani, G. Major, C. L. Hoad, G. Chaddock, P. A. Gowland and R. C. Spiller, *The British journal of nutrition*, 2016, **115**, 55-61.
33. O. P. Soldin and D. R. Mattison, *Clinical Pharmacokinetics*, 2009, **48**, 143-157.
34. C. Lajterer, C. Shani Levi and U. Lesmes, *Food Hydrocolloids*, 2022, **132**, 107850.
35. J. Blundell, C. de Graaf, T. Hulshof, S. Jebb, B. Livingstone, A. Lluch, D. Mela, S. Salah, E. Schuring, H. van der Knaap and M. Westerterp, *Obes Rev*, 2010, **11**, 251-270.
36. T. Huppertz and C. Timmer, *International Dairy Journal*, 2020, **110**, 104805.
37. H. Priyashantha, Å. Lundh, A. Höjer, M. Hetta, M. Johansson and M. Langton, *J Texture Stud*, 2019, **50**, 508-519.
38. M. J. McAuliffe, F. M. Lalonde, D. McGarry, W. Gandler, K. Csaky and B. L. Trus, 2001.
39. C. Nioche, F. Orhac, S. Boughdad, S. Reuzé, J. Goya-Outi, C. Robert, C. Pellot-Barakat, M. Soussan, F. Frouin and I. Buvat, *Cancer Research*, 2018, **78**, 4786.

40. R. Thomas, L. Qin, F. Alessandrino, S. P. Sahu, P. J. Guerra, K. M. Krajewski and A. Shinagare, *Abdom Radiol (NY)*, 2019, **44**, 2501-2510.
41. N. Otsu, *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, 1979, **9**, 62-66.
42. M. Mayar, P. Smeets, J. van Duynhoven and C. Terenzi, *Food Structure*, 2023, **36**, 100314.
43. G. Hermann, M. Schwaiger, P. Volejnik and G. Koellensperger, *Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis*, 2018, **155**, 329-334.
44. G. Camps, M. Mars, B. J. M. Witteman, C. de Graaf and P. A. M. Smeets, *Neurogastroenterology and motility : the official journal of the European Gastrointestinal Motility Society*, 2018, DOI: 10.1111/nmo.13317.
45. H. Fruehauf, D. Menne, M. A. Kwiatek, Z. Forras-Kaufman, E. Kaufman, O. Goetze, M. Fried, W. Schwizer and M. Fox, *Neurogastroenterol. Motil.*, 2011, **23**, 854-861.
46. R development Core Team, *Journal*, 2017.
47. W. Jacobs, P. Johns, P. Haselberger, J. J. Thompson, D. Sullivan and S. Baugh, *Journal of AOAC INTERNATIONAL*, 2019, **96**, 502-507.
48. J. Gao, X. Huang, H. Meng, M. Zhang, X. Zhang, X. Lin and B. Li, *Frontiers in oncology*, 2020, **10**, 198.
49. Q. N. Do, M. A. Lewis, A. J. Madhuranthakam, Y. Xi, A. A. Bailey, R. E. Lenkinski and D. M. Twickler, *PLoS one*, 2019, **14**, e0211060-e0211060.
50. X. Wang, A. Ye, Q. Lin, J. Han and H. Singh, *Journal of Dairy Science*, 2018, **101**, 6842-6852.
51. R. Deng, A. Seimys, M. Mars, A. E. M. Janssen and P. A. M. Smeets, *Food Hydrocolloids*, 2022, **125**, 107393.
52. R. Deng, M. Mars, A. E. M. Janssen and P. A. M. Smeets, *Food Hydrocolloids*, 2023, **141**, 108689.
53. A. Ye, J. Cui, D. Dalgleish and H. Singh, *Food & Function*, 2016, **7**, 4259-4266.
54. S. Kuyumcu, D. Menne, J. Curcic, O. Goetze, M. Klebach, E. Abrahamse, Z. Hofman, M. Fried, W. Schwizer and A. Steingoeetter, *JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr*, 2015, **39**, 544-551.
55. A. C. Brun, K. Størdal, G. B. Johannesdottir, B. S. Bentsen and A. W. Medhus, *Clin Nutr*, 2012, **31**, 108-112.
56. T. Thorkeleson, F. Mimouni, R. Namgung, M. Fernández-Ulloa, S. Krug-Wispé and R. C. Tsang, *Pediatric research*, 1994, **36**, 329-333.
57. A. H. Chan, R. F. D'Souza, J. W. Beals, N. Zeng, U. Prodhan, A. C. Fanning, S. D. Poppitt, Z. Li, N. A. Burd, D. Cameron-Smith and C. J. Mitchell, *The Journal of Nutrition*, 2019, **149**, 1511-1522.
58. S. S. Fajans, J. C. Floyd, R. F. Knopf and J. W. Conn, in *Schering Symposium on Endocrinology, Berlin, May 26 to 27, 1967*, ed. G. Raspé, Pergamon, 1969, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-013395-9.50021-6>, pp. 231-238.
59. B. v. Sloun, G. H. Goossens, B. Erdos, M. Lenz, N. v. Riel and I. C. W. Arts, *Nutrients*, 2020, **12**, 3211.

LEGENDS FOR FIGURES

Figure 1. Overview of a test session

Figure 2. Mean \pm SEM of image texture metric homogeneity of gastric content as visible on MRI after low and high CM milk ingestion. * $p < 0.05$ placed above the value denotes a significant time point, at the right of the graph it denotes a significant treatment effect. A difference in image texture metrics may reflect a difference in casein coagulation.

Figure 3. Mean \pm SEM gastric content over time after ingestion of 600 ml of low and high CM milk. There were no significant differences between the two treatments.

Figure 4. Mean \pm SEM of serum essential amino acid (A), non-essential amino acid (B), branch chained amino acids (C) and valine (D) concentrations after low and high CM milk ingestion. * $p < 0.05$ placed above the value denotes a significant time point, at the right of the graph it denotes a significant treatment effect.

Figure 5. Estimated serum whey/casein AA ratio over time after low and high CM milk ingestion. * $p < 0.05$ placed above the value denotes a significant time point, at the right of the graph it denotes a significant treatment effect.

Figure 6. Mean \pm SEM plasma glucose (mmol/L) and serum insulin (mIU/L) concentrations over time after low and high CM milk ingestion. * $p < 0.05$ placed above the value denotes a significant time point, at the right of the graph it denotes a significant treatment effect.











