

Sensory perception of bitterness and astringency in sorghum

by

Rosemary Ikalafeng Kobue-Lekalake

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

PhD

Food Science

in the

Department of Food Science
Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences
University of Pretoria
Pretoria
South Africa

April 2008

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the thesis submitted at the University of Pretoria for the award of PhD degree is my work and has not been submitted by me for a degree at any other university or institution of higher learning.

Rosemary Ikalafeng Kobue-Lekalake

April 2008

ABSTRACT

Sensory perception of bitterness and astringency in sorghum

Rosemary Ikalafeng Kobue-Lekalake

Supervisor: Dr. H.L. de Kock

Co-Supervisor: Prof. J.R.N. Taylor

There is a conflict of interest between the sorghum producers, for whom condensed tannins in sorghum have agronomic advantages, and sorghum users for whom condensed tannins in sorghum are perceived as nutritionally harmful and unpalatable. However, in recent years there has been growing interest in food phenolics due to their antioxidant potential. Thus, enhancing the content of phenolic compounds in plant foods through selective breeding and/or genetic improvement is now being viewed as a potent dietary option for disease prevention and control. However, the objectionable sensory attributes (bitterness and astringency) of phenolic compounds, especially condensed tannins, have resulted in low consumption of foods rich in these compounds. This study investigated the sensory attributes of products of sorghums varying in total phenol and condensed tannin content as well as their acceptance.

A descriptive sensory panel described the sensory attributes including bitterness and astringency of two products, sorghum rice and bran infusions of six sorghum cultivars: three containing tannins and three with no detectable tannins. The products of all the sorghums (tannin and tannin-free) were perceived to different degrees as both bitter and astringent. The products of sorghums with the highest total phenol and tannin content were most bitter and astringent while those from tannin-free sorghums with the lowest total phenol content were least bitter and astringent. The products of NS 5511 (tannins - 1.8% catechin equivalents CE), were perceived similar in both bitterness and astringency to those of a tannin-free sorghum (PAN 8564). Using the Dual Attribute Time Intensity (DATI) sensory method the descriptive sensory panel determined the intensity and time course of bitterness and astringency of bran infusions of sorghums varying in total phenol and condensed tannin content. The infusion from the sorghum with the highest condensed tannin content (PAN 3860) was perceived as most bitter and most astringent and that from

the tannin-free sorghum with the least total phenol content (Phofu) was least bitter and astringent. Bitterness of the sorghum infusions developed and reached maximum intensity significantly faster than astringency. The total duration of the astringency sensation lasted significantly longer than bitterness. The more bitter and more astringent the sorghum was, the longer the persistence of the bitter and astringent after-taste. The infusion of NS 5511 was again perceived similar to tannin-free sorghums in both bitterness and astringency. These findings seem to suggest that there is a condensed tannin threshold level at which the tannins are not 'strongly' perceived and thus are not objectionable.

A consumer panel classified by 6-*n*-propylthiouracil (PROP) taster status assessed the colour, texture, flavour and overall liking of sorghum rice of two tannin-containing (tannin) sorghums and two tannin-free sorghums. The sorghum rice from PAN 3860, with the highest tannin content, received significantly lower acceptance ratings for all the sensory attributes than the other sorghums. With the exception of appearance, the acceptance of the sorghum rice from the tannin sorghum NS 5511 was not significantly different from that of the two tannin-free sorghums. The PROP tasters (medium and super) could distinguish differences among the sorghum cultivars varying in tannin content levels which presumably led to the significant difference in their acceptance ratings for the most bitter and astringent sorghum compared to others. On the other hand the non tasters preferred the cultivars equally, presumably because they could not detect taste differences (in bitterness and astringency) between the sorghum cultivars. The results of the consumer panel confirm the predictions made from the descriptive sensory panel results that not all the tannin sorghum products would be objectionable to consumers.

It is proposed that the condensed tannin threshold level is 2.0% CE inclusive of the tannin content level of NS 5511 (1.8% CE). It is recommended that future breeding programmes investigate production of sorghums like NS 5511 with condensed tannin levels that fall within this threshold limit. The level of condensed tannins in these sorghums would provide the agronomic advantages for the farmer by reducing pre-harvest and post-harvest losses as well as provide the antioxidant benefits associated with them without negatively affecting the nutritional value of the food/feed. Since the negative sensory properties of these sorghums are not strongly perceived they would not be objectionable to consumers, thus making them a promising health option for millions of people.



DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my late father Arrat Esrom Kobue, who encouraged me to reach higher heights.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I praise and thank my Lord and my God for giving me the wisdom, guidance, direction, endurance, good health and well being throughout my studies. To God be all the glory!

My sincere thanks to my supervisor Dr. H.L. de Kock, for her willingness to work with me, for her wisdom and wealth of knowledge in the secret world of sensory science. I appreciate her patience and open door policy.

My deepest gratitude goes to my co-supervisor Prof J.R.N. Taylor for his sincere interest in my work, for his excellent and timely guidance, his insight and challenging questions, his constructive criticism, and for challenging me to reach higher.

I wish to thank Dr. M. van der Linde and Dr. F.H.J. Kanfer of the Department of Statistics of the University of Pretoria for their assistance with some of the statistical analysis of the research data.

I sincerely thank Linda Dykes and Dr. Lloyd W. Rooney, Cereal Quality Laboratory, Soil & Crop Sciences Department, Texas A&M University, USA for the HPLC analysis of the sorghum samples.

This material is based on work supported by the South African National Research Foundation (NRF GUN number 2073269).

A big thank you to the staff and fellow students in the Food Science department, especially Martin Kebakile, Janet Taylor, Mathoto Thaoge-Lefyedi and Gyebi Duodu for their friendship and encouragement, and to all those who shared the love of Christ with me.

Last but certainly not least, my loving husband Mothusi Lekalake for understanding that I needed to do this; for the sacrifices he was willing to make not only financially but allowing the kids and I to re-locate to Pretoria; his unwavering support, his patience, ... I thank my children: Rorisang, Tetlanyo and Lefika for understanding why I needed to do this. I thank the rest of my family for being there, cheering me on.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Statement of the problem	1
1.2. Literature review	3
1.2.1. Sorghum (<i>Sorghum bicolor</i> [L] Moench)	3
1.2.1.1. Sorghum anatomical structure	3
1.2.1.2. The chemistry of phenolic compounds of sorghum	6
1.2.1.3. Content of phenolic compounds in sorghum	11
1.2.2. Harmful and beneficial effects of phenolic compounds	13
1.2.3. Sensory properties of phenolic compound	16
1.2.4. Bitterness	20
1.2.4.1. Bitter taste transduction and other basic tastes	20
1.2.4.2. Genetic variation	23
1.2.4.3. Sensitivity to PROP and bitterness of other compounds	24
1.2.4.4. Sensitivity to PROP and phenolic compounds	26
1.2.4.5. PROP sensitivity on acceptability of bitter foods	27
1.2.5. Astringency	28
1.2.5.1. Compounds that cause astringent sensations	29
1.2.5.2. Sensory perception of astringency	30
1.2.5.3. Acceptability of astringency in food	33
1.2.6. Time intensity sensory evaluation procedure	33
1.2.6.1. Single attribute time intensity and dual attribute time intensity sensory methods	34
1.2.6.2. 'Panellist's signature'	35
1.3. Conclusions	36
1.4. Hypotheses	37
1.5. Objectives	38

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2.	RESEARH	39
2.1.	Effects of phenolics in sorghum grain on its bitterness, astringency and other sensory properties	40
2.1.1.	Abstract	40
2.1.2.	Introduction	41
2.1.3.	Materials and methods	42
2.1.3.1.	Materials	42
2.1.3.2.	Grain characterization	42
2.1.3.3.	Bran isolation	43
2.1.3.4.	Determination of phenolics	43
2.1.3.5.	Descriptive sensory panel selection and training	43
2.1.3.6.	Sample preparation, presentation and assessment	47
2.1.3.6.1.	<i>Sorghum bran infusions</i>	47
2.1.3.6.2.	<i>Sorghum (whole-grain) rice</i>	47
2.1.3.7.	Statistical analysis	49
2.1.4.	Results and discussion	49
2.1.5.	Conclusions	61
2.1.6.	References	62
2.2.	Bitterness and astringency of bran infusions of tannin-free and condensed tannin sorghums determined using a dual attribute time intensity sensory method	66
2.2.1.	Abstract	66
2.2.2.	Introduction	67
2.2.3.	Materials and methods	68
2.2.3.1.	Sorghum grain	68
2.2.3.2.	Sorghum bran infusions	68
2.2.3.3.	Descriptive sensory panel selection and training	68
2.2.3.4.	Sample presentation and assessment	70
2.2.3.5.	HPLC analysis	70
2.2.3.6.	Statistical analysis	71
2.2.4.	Results and discussion	72



TABLE OF CONTENTS

2.2.4.1.	Main effects	72
2.2.4.1.1.	<i>Cultivar effect</i>	72
2.2.4.1.2.	<i>Panellist effect</i>	81
2.2.4.1.3.	<i>Session effect</i>	88
2.2.4.1.4.	<i>Replicate effect</i>	89
2.2.4.1.5.	<i>Sample order effect</i>	90
2.2.4.2.	Interaction effects	90
2.2.4.2.1.	<i>Panellist x cultivar</i>	91
2.2.4.2.2.	<i>Panellist x session</i>	91
2.2.4.2.3.	<i>Panellist x replicate</i>	91
2.2.4.2.4.	<i>Panellist x sample order</i>	93
2.2.4.	Conclusions	98
2.2.6.	References	99
2.3.	Consumer acceptability of sorghum rice from condensed tannin and tannin-free sorghums and the influence of PROP taster status	103
2.3.1.	Abstract	103
2.3.2.	Introduction	104
2.3.3.	Materials and methods	105
2.3.3.1.	Sorghum	105
2.3.3.2.	Consumer recruitment	105
2.3.3.3.	Sample preparation, presentation and assessment	106
2.3.3.4.	PROP classification	106
2.3.3.5.	Statistical analysis	107
2.3.4.	Results and discussion	107
2.3.5.	Conclusions	119
2.3.6.	References	120
3.	GENERAL DISCUSSION	123
3.1.	Methodologies	123



TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.2. Effects of total phenol and condensed tannin content on the sensory properties, bitterness and astringency, and acceptability of different sorghums	131
3.3. Condensed tannin threshold limit	139
4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	141
5. REFERENCES	143
6. APPENDIX	163
Papers published	163

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1.	Tannin content in different sorghum cultivars	12
Table 1.2.	Total phenolic content in the grain and bran of selected cereal grains	13
Table 2.1.	Sensory properties of bran infusions from different sorghum cultivars	45
Table 2.2.	Sensory properties of rice from different sorghum cultivars	46
Table 2.3.	Characterization of sorghum grain samples	51
Table 2.4.	Total phenol content of sorghum whole grain, sorghum bran and sorghum bran infusions	52
Table 2.5.	Sensory properties of bran infusions of different sorghum cultivars as evaluated by a trained descriptive sensory panel	54
Table 2.6.	Sensory properties of sorghum rice of different sorghum cultivars as evaluated by a trained descriptive sensory panel	59
Table 2.7.	Degrees of freedom (df), R-square and F-values from analysis of variance of parameters extracted from time-intensity curves for bitterness in sorghum bran infusions	73
Table 2.8.	Degrees of freedom (df), R-square and F-values from analysis of variance of parameters extracted from time-intensity curves for astringency in sorghum bran infusions	74
Table 2.9.	Least Square Means (\pm SE) of parameters extracted from time-intensity curves for bitterness of sorghum bran infusions of tannin containing and tannin-free sorghums	75
Table 2.10.	Pearson correlation coefficients between parameters extracted from T-I curves for astringency and bitterness of different sorghums	76
Table 2.11.	Least Square Means (\pm SE) of parameters extracted from time intensity curves for astringency of sorghum bran infusions of tannin containing and tannin-free sorghums	78
Table 2.12.	Time intensity parameters extracted from time intensity curves (mean) for astringency of sorghum bran infusions	80

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.13.	Panellists' Least Square Means of parameters extracted from time-intensity curves for astringency and bitterness of sorghum bran infusions	83
Table 2.14.	Least square means of time intensity parameters of different sessions for astringency and bitterness of sorghum bran infusions	89
Table 2.15.	Least square means of time intensity parameters of different replicates for astringency and bitterness of sorghum bran infusions	90
Table 2.16.	Consumer classification by gender and PROP taster status: non, medium and super tasters (relative percentages in parentheses)	107
Table 2.17.	PROP taster status effect on consumer ratings of appearance, texture, flavour and overall liking of sorghum rice	118

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1.	Cross-section of a sorghum kernel	4
Figure 1.2.	Fluorescence photomicrograph of sorghum bran cross-section	5
Figure 1.3.	Basic structures of phenolic acids	7
Figure 1.4.	Structures of flavonoids	8
Figure 1.5.	Basic structures of anthocyanidins	8
Figure 1.6.	Basic structure of flavan-4-ols	9
Figure 1.7.	Basic structure of flavan-3-ols	9
Figure 1.8	Structures of proanthocyanidins commonly found in sorghum grain	10
Figure 1.9	Molecular structures of procyanidin dimers with a C4-C8 and C4-C6 linkages	18
Figure 1.10	Basic structures of small phenolic compounds	32
Figure 2.1.	A training session of the descriptive sensory panel	44
Figure 2.2.	Sorghum rice preparation for sensory evaluation	48
Figure 2.3.	Determination of pigmented testa presence in the sorghum grain using the bleach test	51
Figure 2.4.	Principal component analysis (correlation matrix) of phenol content, endosperm texture and descriptive sensory evaluation of sorghum bran infusions of six sorghum cultivars	57
Figure 2.5.	Principal component analysis (correlation matrix) of phenol content, endosperm texture and descriptive sensory evaluation of sorghum rice of six cultivars	60
Figure 2.6.	Normal phase HPLC procyanidin profiles of PAN 3860, Ex Nola 97 GH, NS 5511 and PAN 8564	79
Figure 2.7.	Time intensity curves for bitterness and astringency of different sorghum cultivars for panellists (1-3)	84
Figure 2.7.	Time intensity curves for bitterness and astringency of different sorghum cultivars for panellists (4-6)	85

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.7.	Time intensity curves for bitterness and astringency of different sorghum cultivars for panellists (7-9)	86
Figure 2.7.	Time intensity curves for bitterness and astringency of different sorghum cultivars for panellists (10-12)	87
Figure 2.8.	Least square means of panellist x cultivar interaction effect on (a) T_{max} , (b) I_{max} and (c) AUC for bitterness	92
Figure 2.9.	Least square means of panellist x session interaction effect for I_{max} for bitterness	93
Figure 2.10.	Least square means of panellist x session interaction effects for (a) I_{max} astringency and (b) D_{tot}	94
Figure 2.11.	Least square means of panellist x replicate interaction effects for AUC for bitterness	95
Figure 2.12.	Least square means of panellist x replicate interaction effects for (a) T_{max} , (b) I_{max} and (c) AUC for astringency	96
Figure 2.13.	Least square means of panellist x sample order interaction effects on (a) I_{max} and (b) AUC for astringency	97
Figure 2.14.	Sorghum cultivar effect on consumer ratings of appearance, texture, flavour and overall liking of the sorghum rice	110
Figure 2.15.	Good/positive and bad/negative comments (relative %) made by the consumers on the appearance, texture and flavour of the sorghum rice	111
Figure 2.16.	Consumer ratings for appearance of sorghum rice from different sorghums by PROP taster status	113
Figure 2.17.	Consumer ratings for texture of sorghum rice from different sorghums by PROP taster status	114
Figure 2.18.	Consumer ratings for flavour of sorghum rice from different sorghums by PROP taster status	115
Figure 2.19.	Consumer ratings for overall liking of sorghum rice from different sorghums by PROP taster status	116



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1.	Proanthocyanidins and the esters of gallic acid and protein-polyphenol complexation	134
Figure 3.2.	Two mechanisms proposed for protein precipitation by phenols	135
Figure 3.3.	The concept of protein-polyphenol interactions leading to haze formation	137