

Document downloaded from:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10251/166833>

This paper must be cited as:

Ribes-Llop, S.; Fuentes López, A.; Barat Baviera, JM. (2021). Physical stability, rheology and microstructure of salad dressing containing essential oils: study of incorporating nanoemulsions. *British Food Journal*. 123(4):1626-1642. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-09-2020-0777>



The final publication is available at

<https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-09-2020-0777>

Copyright Emerald

Additional Information

1 **Physical stability, rheology and microstructure of salad dressing containing essential oils:**
2 **study of incorporating nanoemulsions**

3

4 **Abstract**

5 **Purpose** - This study aims to evaluate the effect of adding oregano and clove oil-in-water
6 (O/W) nanoemulsions on the physico-chemical, technological, and microstructural properties
7 of minimally processed salad dressings during storage at 8 °C and 25 °C.

8 **Design/methodology/approach** - Samples were formulated with either free or encapsulated
9 oregano and clove essential oils in O/W nanoemulsions.

10 **Findings** - Noticeable differences in the physical stability and microstructure of salad dressings
11 were observed after 11 storage days, and were less marked for the samples formulated with
12 encapsulated oregano or clove oils in the O/W nananoemulsions. Moreover, rheological
13 measurements revealed minor changes in the viscoelastic characteristics of the salad dressings
14 containing the O/W nanoemulsions.

15 **Originality/value** - These findings confirm the potential of oregano and clove O/W
16 nanoemulsions for use in minimally processed salad dressings as stabilising and technological
17 agents.

18

19

20

21 **Keywords:** Essential oils; Oil-in-water nanoemulsions; Sauces; Stability; Rheology

22

23 **1. Introduction**

24 In recent years, food processors have paid growing attention to salad dressings because they
25 improve the attractiveness and tastiness of different food commodities (de Melo *et al.*, 2015).
26 Salad dressings can be defined as oil-in-water (O/W) emulsions in which small droplets are
27 dispersed in an aqueous phase. Salad dressings' physical stability is very closely related to their
28 ability to maintain structural integrity over time (McClements, 1999). To this end, several
29 thickening agents like pectin, starch, xanthan gum or carrageenan have been used to confer
30 dressings long-term stability (da Fonseca *et al.*, 2009; Paraskevopoulou *et al.*, 2007). Moreover,
31 commercial salad dressings are composed of other ingredients like weak organic acids,
32 chelators and preservatives to dressings' overall stability. However, increasing consumer
33 demands for "clean label" foods have forced manufacturers to search for naturally-occurring
34 alternatives that guarantee product stability and safety (Ribes *et al.*, 2019).

35 The use of plant extracts has attracted the interest of both academia and food industry fields
36 thanks to their functional properties (Valduga *et al.*, 2019). These include essential oils (EO),
37 which belong to one of the most promising classes of functional ingredients given their natural
38 character and acceptability by consumers, which make them desirable for use in foods (Burt,
39 2004; Ribes *et al.*, 2016). Nevertheless, their poor water solubility, high volatility and
40 sensitivity to oxygen and light limited the application of EO to food products. Nowadays, one
41 of the most effective technologies to improve the solubility and stability of EO is their
42 encapsulation in O/W nanoemulsions due to their small particle sizes, increased surface area,
43 and less sensitivity to physico-chemical changes (Bazana *et al.*, 2019). Recently, Ribes *et al.*
44 (2019) evidenced the antifungal effect of oregano and clove nanoemulsions in salad dressings.
45 However, the addition of O/W nanoemulsions to minimally processed salad dressings as

46 systems to improve their physico-chemical and technological characteristics during storage has
47 not yet been investigated.

48 Hence the main objective of this work was to evaluate the effect of incorporating oregano
49 and clove O/W nanoemulsions on the physico-chemical, technological, and microstructural
50 properties of minimally processed salad dressings during storage time.

51 **2. Materials and Methods**

52 2.1 Materials

53 For salad dressing formulations, sunflower oil (La Masia, Spain), vinegar (Alcampo, S.A.,
54 Madrid, Spain), pasteurised egg yolk (Calidad Pascual, S.A.U., Madrid, Spain), sugar (Acor,
55 Sociedad Cooperativa General Agropecuaria, Valladolid, Spain) and sodium chloride (Sal
56 Bueno, S.L., Xirivella, Spain) were purchased from a local Spanish market. Soluble starch and
57 citric acid were obtained from Sigma-Aldrich (Madrid, Spain).

58 To prepare O/W nanoemulsions, oregano EO was obtained from Ernesto Ventós S.A.
59 (Barcelona, Spain), and clove EO and Tween 80 were supplied by Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis,
60 USA). Xanthan gum (XG, Satiaxane™ CX 911) was purchased from Cargill (Barcelona,
61 Spain).

62 2.2 Preparing oregano and clove nanoemulsions

63 The O/W nanoemulsions were prepared by mixing oregano or clove EO, Tween 80 and XG
64 for 15 min by a magnetic stirrer. The mixture was processed at 50 MPa by a High-Pressure
65 Homogenisation (HPH) system (Panda Plus 2000, Gea Niro Soavi S.p.A., Parma, Italy). The
66 O/W nanoemulsions contained 10 mg/g of Tween 80 and 5 mg/g of XG. The amount of
67 oregano and clove EO added to the O/W nanoemulsions was calculated to achieve a final

68 concentration of 1.95 mg/g in the salad dressing. These concentrations were established
69 according to the results achieved in a previous work (Ribes *et al.*, 2019).

70 2.3 Manufacturing salad dressings

71 Five salad dressing types were prepared in this study: i) control; ii) two salad dressings
72 containing 1.95 mg/g of free or encapsulated clove EO in O/W nanoemulsions; iii) two salad
73 dressing containing 1.95 mg/g of free or encapsulated oregano EO in O/W nanoemulsions.

74 Minimally processed salad dressings were prepared by mixing deionised water (50% w/w),
75 sunflower oil (30% w/w), vinegar (10% w/w), pasteurised egg yolk (3% w/w), starch (5%
76 w/w), sugar (1% w/w), sodium chloride (0.50% w/w) and citric acid (0.50% w/w) in an
77 electrical food processor (Thermomix TM 31, Vorwerk M.S.L, Spain). The free and
78 encapsulated oregano or clove EO was incorporated into salad dressings before being
79 homogenised to reach a final EO concentration of 1.95 mg/g. The amount of nanoemulsion
80 added to salad dressing was calculated to reach the previously indicated EO concentration.
81 Samples were poured into sterilised glass containers and stored at 8 °C and 25 °C until analysed
82 after 1 day and 11 days. Each formulation was manufactured twice and all the analyses were
83 run in triplicate.

84 2.4 Physico-chemical characterisation of salad dressings

85 A Crison Basic 20+ pH meter (Crison S.A. Barcelona, Spain) was used to measure the pH of
86 salad dressings. For the total titratable acidity (TTA) determinations, 10 g of each sample were
87 mixed with 40 mL of distilled water and titrated with a 0.1 N NaOH solution until a pH value
88 of 8.30. Total titratable acidity was expressed as g acetic acid/100 g of dressing. The water
89 activity (a_w) of samples was measured by an Aqualab dew point hygrometer model 4 TE
90 (Decagon Devices, Inc., Washington, USA) at 25 °C. The sodium chloride analysis was carried

91 out by an automatic Chloride Analyser (Sherwood Scientific Ltd., Cambridge, UK) and the
92 results were expressed as g NaCl/100 g of sample.

93 To study the stability of salad dressings against creaming, 5 g of each sample were transferred
94 to a cylindrical glass container, sealed with a plastic cap and stored until analysed. The extent
95 of creaming was calculated by employing Eq. (1):

$$96 \quad H\% = (H_t/H_0) \times 100 \quad (1)$$

97 where H_t represents the visible separation layer and H_0 is the initial emulsion height.

98 Finally, the colour parameters (L^* , a^* , and b^*) of salad dressings were measured by a
99 spectrophotometer (CM-3600d, Minolta Co., Tokyo, Japan) with an observer 10° and
100 illuminant D65. The Whiteness index (WI) was calculated by Eq. (2) and colour variations
101 (ΔE^*) by Eq. (3):

$$102 \quad WI = 100 - ((100 - L^*)^2 + a^{*2} + b^{*2})^{0.5} \quad (2)$$

$$103 \quad \Delta E^* = ((\Delta L^*)^2 + (\Delta a^*)^2 + (\Delta b^*)^2)^{0.5} \quad (3)$$

104 2.5 Rheological and viscoelastic measurements of salad dressings

105 The rheological and viscoelastic measurements of salad dressings were taken by a stress
106 controlled rheometer RS1 (ThermoHaake, Karlsruhe, Germany). Assays were performed at
107 8°C and 25°C using a C60/2°Ti cone-plate geometry with a 2 mm gap. Samples were allowed
108 to stand for 300 s for structure recovery and temperature equilibration purposes before being
109 tested.

110

111

112 2.5.1 Steady shear rheological tests

113 The steady shear rheological tests were performed within the 0.01-200 s⁻¹ range for 120 s.
114 To avoid any possible dependence on flow time, a 4-step operation (two upward, two
115 downward curves) was applied to samples. The flow curve was fitted to the power law model,
116 and consistency (K) and flow behaviour indices (n) were calculated (Ma *et al.*, 2013). The
117 apparent viscosity (η_{app50}) values were calculated according to Eq. (4):

$$118 \quad \eta_{app50} = (K \times 50^{n-1}) \quad (4)$$

119 2.5.2 Dynamic rheological tests

120 To determine the linear viscoelastic region (LVR), stress sweeps were performed within a
121 stress range from 0.01 to 10 Pa at 1 Hz. Frequency sweep tests were conducted at 1 Pa (in the
122 LVR) to cover a 0.1-10 Hz frequency range. The viscoelastic parameters, particularly elastic or
123 storage modulus (G'), viscous or loss modulus (G''), complex viscosity ($|\eta^*|$) and loss tangent
124 (Tan δ), were obtained from the rheometer software (RheoWin 3 Data Manager).

125 2.5.3 Creep and recovery tests

126 Creep and recovery tests were carried out by applying a constant stress (1 Pa within the
127 LVR) for 180 s. Afterwards, stress was stopped and samples were released for recovery for 180
128 s. The system's final percentage of recovery (R) was calculated by employing Eq. (5):

$$129 \quad R (\%) = (J_{max} - J_{\infty} / J_{max}) \times 100 \quad (5)$$

130 where J_{max} is the maximum deformation corresponding to the compliance value for the longest
131 time (180 s) in creep rest; J_{∞} is the residual deformation (Kurt *et al.*, 2016).

132

133 2.6 Microstructure analysis of salad dressings

134 The microstructural features of the different salad dressings were evaluated by optical
135 microscopy under a Motic BA310E trinocular light microscope equipped with a Moticom3+
136 camera (Motic Group, Kowloon, Hong Kong). Micrographs were obtained at the 40x
137 magnification.

138 2.7 Statistical analysis

139 The data obtained in the physico-chemical and technological characterisation of salad
140 dressings were analysed by a multifactor analysis of variance (multifactor ANOVA) to evaluate
141 differences among formulations, storage days, and their interaction. The least significance
142 procedure (LSD) was employed to test for differences between averages at the 5% level of
143 significance. The results were statistically processed by the Statgraphics Centurion XVI
144 software.

145 3. Results and Discussion

146 3.1 Physico-chemical characterisation of salad dressings

147 Table I shows the changes in the pH, a_w , TTA, NaCl content and stability of the different
148 salad dressings.

149 Salad dressings are considered creamy pale yellow products with a pH range of 3.2 to 3.9,
150 being all the formulations evaluated within this range. The main factor in salad dressings that
151 causes death to pathogenic bacteria is low pH, allowing commercial salad dressings do not
152 undergo a heat treatment step. The target pH for dressings and sauces is usually below the 4.75
153 pKa of acid acetic, which suffices to stop most pathogens and spoilage organisms from
154 growing (Smittle, 2000). It is highlighted that slightly lower pH values were noticed in the
155 samples manufactured with 1.95 mg/g of encapsulated oregano and clove EO in O/W

156 nanoemulsions. This decrease could be related to the acid nature and dissociation in the
157 aqueous solution of some EO compounds as a result of encapsulation (Ribes [et al.](#), 2017;
158 Sánchez-González *et al.*, 2011). Furthermore, the pH values of all the samples significantly
159 lowered ($p < 0.05$) after 11 storage days, and were less marked in the salad dressing kept
160 refrigerated.

161 The a_w values remained quite stable throughout the evaluation period in spite of the dressing
162 formulation and storage conditions (Table I). Similar results have been reported by Fernandez
163 *et al.* (2012) for low-in-fat dressings prepared with high-pressure homogenised yeast.

164 For the TTA values, noticeable differences were found among samples' formulations. The
165 salad dressings containing free or encapsulated oregano and clove EO exhibited lower acidity
166 than the control ones. At the end of the study, a slight rise in the TTA values of the non-
167 encapsulated oregano and the clove EO was perceived compared to the encapsulated EO,
168 regardless of storing temperature. The latter may suggest that the encapsulation of oregano and
169 clove EO in O/W nanoemulsions would display greater antioxidant activity in salad dressings
170 owing to preservation and progressive emission to the matrix during the assessed time.

171 Concerning the evaluation period, slightly higher TTA values were observed for the salad
172 dressings stored for 11 days (Table I). In line with this, Abu-Salem and Abou-Arab (2008)
173 reported higher acid values for mayonnaise with storage time due to the activity of hydrolytic
174 and oxidative enzymes present in eggs.

175 Adding salt to salad dressings could destabilise protein-stabilised emulsions due to the
176 reduced electrostatic repulsion among droplets and the modification of the hydrophobic
177 interactions between non-polar amino acids residues, which changes the structural organisation
178 of water molecules at the interface (Martínez *et al.*, 2007; Srinivasan *et al.*, 2000). Srinivasan *et*
179 *al.* (2000) pointed out that emulsion low stability was generally found in either salt-free
180 emulsions or emulsions containing small amounts of salts (i.e. 0.4%), except for those systems

181 stabilised by high egg yolk contents. Thus, as the concentration of all the dressings herein
182 formulated was 0.50 g NaCl/100 g of product (Table I), we can state that the salad dressing
183 rates would not lead to their destabilisation.

184 In relation to sample stability, no creaming phenomenon was detected in any formulation
185 after 1 storage day at both temperatures. Conversely, creaming was clearly perceived after 11
186 storage days, and was more marked for the samples kept refrigerated. Early studies reported
187 that temperature was an important factor in salad dressing stability during storage. Palanuwech
188 and Coupland (2003) observed how low temperatures could cause the crystallisation of the two
189 emulsion phases, which could destabilise O/W emulsions like salad dressings. The greatest
190 instability was noticed for the control sample and the least for the encapsulated EO. The
191 stabilisation action of XG, given the viscosity modification in the continuous phase with lower
192 creaming and coalescence rates (Dickinson, 2009; Espert *et al.*, 2019), could contribute to the
193 better stability of the samples containing the encapsulated EO. Several authors have attributed
194 the creaming phenomenon to the overall oil volume fraction of the emulsion, its droplet-size
195 distribution, and the nature of inter droplet interplays, including effects of non-absorbed
196 polymers and surfactants (Guerra-Rosas *et al.*, 2016).

197 Regarding colour parameters, slightly lower L* and WI values were detected during salad
198 dressings' storage time (Figure 1), which could be associated with samples' instability
199 (McClements, 1999; Gavahian *et al.*, 2018). It is also important to highlight that the colour
200 differences (ΔE^*) of the salad dressings prepared with the encapsulated oregano and clove EO
201 did not exceed the just noticeable difference (Baldevbhai and Anand, 2012). The higher ΔE^*
202 exhibited by the refrigerated control and samples containing free EO could be ascribed to these
203 dressings' instability, caused by an increase in their average oil droplet size and/or oil droplet
204 aggregation during storage time (Guerra-Rosas *et al.*, 2016).

205

206 3.2 Rheological and viscoelastic measurements of salad dressings

207 3.2.1 Steady shear rheological tests

208 Table II summarises the results of the rheological parameters from the steady shear tests of
209 the different salad dressings. Higher K values were observed for the control sample throughout
210 the study. Significant differences ($p < 0.05$) were noticed between the K values of the samples
211 prepared with the free and encapsulated EO during both storage periods. Incorporation of
212 encapsulated EO improved salad dressings' consistency, probably due to the capacity of XG to
213 increase the stability and structure of these products by forming larger sized aggregates in their
214 continuous phase (Ma and Barbosa-Cánovas, 1995; Yüceer *et al.*, 2016).

215 Regarding the evaluation period, lower K values were generally detected in the dressings
216 stored for 11 days at both temperatures. This could be explained by fewer interactions and
217 entanglements among ingredients over time (Ma *et al.*, 2013). Ma and Boye (2013) also
218 reported lower K values of salad dressings supplemented with pulse flours after 12 storage
219 days. Indeed when comparing both temperatures, the K values of the samples stored at 25 °C
220 lowered more (Table II). Upon cooling, the polymer network present in food emulsions could
221 lead to its chain arrangement and stretching (Bae *et al.*, 2008), providing more consistent
222 products. This behaviour was also reported by Izidoro *et al.* (2008) in mayonnaises formulated
223 with green banana pulp. The flow behaviour index (n) went below 1 in all the tested salad
224 dressings, which indicates the pseudoplastic behaviour of the formulated samples (Primacella *et*
225 *al.*, 2019). The n values remained quite stable for all the samples throughout the evaluation
226 period in spite of the storage conditions (Table II). Our results fall in line with those reported in
227 previous works (Ma and Barbosa-Cánovas, 1995; Izidoro *et al.*, 2008).

228 An increase in salad dressings' apparent viscosity (η_{app50}) was observed when incorporating
229 encapsulated EO into O/W nanoemulsions, which could be attributed to the viscosity provided

230 by EO and/or the polymer used to prepare the O/W nanoemulsion. It is well-known that even at
231 low polymer concentrations, XG dispersions exhibit high viscosity values (Laneuville *et al.*,
232 2013). Despite the minor changes observed in the η_{app50} of the different manufactured salad
233 dressings during the evaluation period, the strong repulsive forces between the oil droplets and
234 other ingredients present in dressings could cause droplets to easily slide, which could generate
235 less viscosity and/or make dressings prone to creaming emulsions (Deprez and Savage, 2001).
236 The latter could be connected to the instability of salad dressings during storage time, as
237 previously observed when evaluating their stability (Section 3.1). Similar results were observed
238 by Heggset *et al.* (2020) while evaluating the apparent viscosity of mayonnaises with cellulose
239 nanofibrils as rheology modifiers over the storage time. Finally, slightly lower η_{app50} values
240 were noticed in the samples stored at 25 °C. These findings fall in line with the data obtained
241 by Izidoro *et al.* (2008), who revealed that the apparent viscosity of all the tested mayonnaises
242 decreased as temperature and the shear rate rose. This scenario could be associated with the
243 structural breakdown of molecules due to the generated hydrodynamic forces and the increased
244 alignment of constituent molecules.

245 3.2.2 Dynamic rheological tests

246 Figures 2-3 show the viscoelastic properties of the different manufactured salad dressings.
247 For comparison purposes, the storage modulus (G'), loss modulus (G''), complex viscosity ($|\eta^*|$)
248 and loss tangent ($\tan \delta$) values were considered at a frequency of 1 Hz. A predominant elastic
249 behaviour ($G' > G''$) was observed throughout the study, which is a common fact in weak
250 viscoelastic systems (Park *et al.*, 2020). The control sample obtained significantly ($p < 0.05$)
251 higher G' and G'' values than the salad dressings formulated with the free and encapsulated
252 oregano and clove EO in O/W nanoemulsions. The addition of EO (free or encapsulated)
253 probably weakened the interaction among ingredients, as observed by Santipanichwong and

254 Suphantharika (2007) in reduced-fat mayonnaise. Moreover, slightly higher G' and G'' values
255 were observed in the samples containing the encapsulated bioactive agents after 1 storage day,
256 which can be probably attributed to the ability of XG to create molecular entanglements, as
257 previously discussed.

258 Regarding storage temperature, the interactions among droplets were weaker in the samples
259 maintained at 25 °C, which led to lower G' and G'' values (Figure 2). The G' and G'' values of
260 all the samples dropped during storage, which resulted in a weaker network structure. Ageing
261 of salad dressings resulted in a decrease of the viscoelastic parameters (G' and G''), which
262 suggests that droplet rearrangements continuously took place immediately after samples were
263 prepared. Thus, storage could lead to increased shear sensitivity in the viscoelastic network of
264 the manufactured salad dressings. A similar behaviour has been observed in other studies (Ma
265 and Boye, 2013; Heyman *et al.*, 2010).

266 The control samples have higher $|\eta^*|$ values, followed by those samples prepared with the
267 encapsulated and free oregano and clove EO (Figure 3). The differences between the samples
268 containing the encapsulated and free bioactive agents were ascribed to the presence of XG,
269 which had a thickening effect on salad dressings and increased their internal cohesive forces.
270 Similar $|\eta^*|$ values were reported by Ariizumi *et al.* (2017) when studying the influence of
271 processing factors on the stability of model mayonnaise with whole egg during long-term
272 storage.

273 $\tan \delta$ indicates if elastic or viscous properties predominate in a sample (Ma and Barbosa-
274 Cánovas, 1995). All the formulations had $\tan \delta$ values below 1, which reinforced the notion
275 that elastic properties would prevail over viscous ones. The $\tan \delta$ values for all the
276 formulations remained practically constant throughout storage at both 8 °C and 25 °C (Figure
277 3).

278

279 3.2.3 Creep and recovery tests

280 Figure 4 shows the creep and recovery curves of all the studied salad dressings. High J
281 values indicate a weaker product structure (Sozer, 2009). The samples formulated with free EO
282 presented the weakest structure, which led to greater deformation than the other dressings. The
283 control sample and the dressings containing the encapsulated EO in O/W nanoemulsions
284 reflected a more elastic behaviour. Thus, the addition of encapsulated EO to salad dressings
285 reinforced their structure, probably due to interactions among the different ingredients
286 composing the dressings and the XG used to prepare each nanoemulsion. These results agree
287 with those observed in Section 3.2.2. Concerning storage time, the J values rose after 11
288 storage days. Hence product ageing caused their structure to soften owing to fewer interactions
289 and enlargements among molecules. Indeed the lower compact packing of oil droplets in the
290 dressing network could be responsible for the changes detected in samples' elastic properties
291 and deformation resistance, which would also affect their stability. Lastly, this phenomenon
292 became more evident at 25 °C, which falls in line with the data obtained in the viscoelastic
293 properties evaluation (Section 3.2.2).

294 Figure 5 presents the final percentage recovery (R) of the different manufactured salad
295 dressings. The higher the degree of the recovery strain, the greater salad dressings' elasticity
296 (Zhang *et al.*, 2008). Generally, all the samples exhibited good elastic properties at the
297 beginning of the study with mean R rates between 45% and 60%, in spite of the storing
298 temperature. However, slightly lower R rates were detected in the samples prepared with the
299 non-encapsulated clove EO, probably due to their aforementioned fragility. Despite the
300 differences found between samples, most of their strain was recovered, which was likely owing
301 to the predominantly elastic behaviour of the manufactured dressings. Lower R rates were

302 noticed at the end of the study, which reflects the decreased of the dressings to resist stress,
303 probably due to the fewer interactions among their constituents.

304 3.3 Microstructure analysis of salad dressings

305 The microstructure of salad dressings were analysed to better understand the impact of
306 adding free and encapsulated EO in O/W nanoemulsions on salad dressings' overall structure
307 with time at 8 °C and 25 °C (Figure 6). In general, the control and salad dressings manufactured
308 with the encapsulated oregano and clove EO showed a well dispersed oil-in-water structure
309 characterised by the presence of highly packed oil droplets. On the contrary, the salad dressings
310 containing the non-encapsulated oregano and clove EO exhibited a heterogeneous distribution
311 of fat globules, which gave rise to the alteration to samples' microstructure. Therefore, the
312 more the dispersed particles are, the less cohesive their structure is. This behaviour was also
313 pointed out by Román *et al.* (2018) in sauce model systems.

314 During storage, noticeable changes in samples' microstructure were observed. Ageing
315 negatively affected droplet size uniformity and distribution of the particles present in salad
316 dressings, which were less marked in the samples containing the O/W nanoemulsions (Figure
317 6). Indeed more heterogeneous structures were seen after storing samples at 8 °C for 11 days,
318 which agrees with the observed stability data. Thus, it can be stated that salad dressing prepared
319 with the encapsulated EO in O/W nanoemulsions are the most stable product.

320 4. Conclusions

321 The use of oregano and clove O/W nanoemulsions to prepare minimally processed salad
322 dressings enhances physico-chemical and microstructure characteristics compared to the
323 control and the dressings containing the same amount of free oregano and clove EO. At the
324 same time, the colour parameters and viscoelastic properties of the samples prepared with the

325 encapsulated EO were only minimally affected compared to the control sample. The effect of
326 ageing on the physico-chemical and microstructural features of salad dressings was mitigated
327 by incorporating nanoemulsions.

328 Our results confirm that the incorporation of EO encapsulated in O/W nanoemulsions
329 improves the physico-chemical and microstructure features of salad dressings. These results,
330 together with those obtained in previous studies demonstrating that these nanoemulsions
331 enhance antifungal activity compared to non-encapsulated oils, provide the food industry with
332 natural alternatives to prepare “clean label” salad dressings. Nevertheless, adjustments to
333 product formulation or optimising EO:polymer ratios should be considered to further enhance
334 the physico-chemical and technological properties of salad dressings throughout storage time.

335 **Conflict of interest**

336 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

337 **References**

338 Abu-Salem, F. M., and Abou-Arab, A. A. (2008), “Chemical, microbiological and sensory
339 evaluation of mayonnaise prepared from ostrich eggs”, *Grasas y Aceites*, Vol. 59 No. 4,
340 pp. 352-360.

341 Ariizumi, M., Kubo, M., Handa, A., Hayakawa, T., Matsumiya, K., and Matsumura, Y. (2017),
342 “Influence of processing factors on the stability of model mayonnaise with whole egg
343 during long-term storage”, *Bioscience, Biotechnology, and Biochemistry*, Vol. 81 No. 4,
344 pp. 803-811.

345 Bae, I. Y., Oh, I. K., Lee, S., Yoo, S. H., and Lee, H. G. (2008), “Rheological characterization
346 of levan polysaccharides from *Microbacterium laevaniformans*”, *International Journal of*
347 *Biological Macromolecules*, Vol. 42, pp. 10–13.

348 Baldevbhai, P. J., and Aanand, R. S. (2012), “Color Image Segmentation for Medical Images
349 using L*a*b* Color Space”, *Journal of Electronics and Communication Engineering*, Vol.
350 1, pp. 24-25.

351 Bazana, M. T., da Silva, S. S., Codevilla, C. F., de Deus, C., Lucas, B. N., Ugalde, G. A.,
352 Mazutti, M. A., Flores, E. M. M., Barin, J. S., da Silva, C. de B., and de Menezes, C. R.
353 (2019), “Development of nanoemulsions containing *Physalis peruviana* calyx extract: A
354 study on stability and antioxidant capacity”, *Food Research International*, Vol. 125, p.
355 108645.

356 Burt, S. (2004), “Essential oils: Their antibacterial properties and potential applications in
357 foods-a review”, *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, Vol. 94 No. 3, pp. 223-253.

358 da Fonseca, V. de C., Haminiuk, C. W. I., Izydor, D. R., Waszczynskyj, N., Scheer, A. de P.,
359 and Sierakowski, M. R. (2009), “Stability and rheological behaviour of salad dressing
360 obtained with whey and different combinations of stabilizers”, *International Journal of*
361 *Food Science and Technology*, Vol. 44 No. 4, pp. 777–783.

362 de Melo, A. N. F., de Souza, E. L., da Silva Araujo, V. B., and Magnani, M. (2015), “Stability,
363 nutritional and sensory characteristics of French salad dressing made with mannoprotein
364 from spent brewer's yeast”, *LWT - Food Science and Technology*, Vol. 62, pp. 771-774.

365 Depree, J., and Savage, G. (2001), “Physical and flavour stability of mayonnaise”, *Trends in*
366 *Food Science & Technology*, Vol. 12 No. 5–6, pp. 157–163.

367 Dickinson, E. (2009), “Hydrocolloids as emulsifiers and emulsion stabilizers”, *Food*
368 *Hydrocolloids*, Vol. 23 No. 6, pp. 1473-1482.

369 Espert, M., Salvador, A., and Sanz, T. (2019), “Rheological and microstructural behaviour of
370 xanthan gum and xanthan gum-Tween80 emulsions during in vitro digestion”, *Food*
371 *Hydrocolloids*, Vol. 95, pp. 454-461.

372 Fernandez, V. E., Palazolo, G. G., Bosisio, N. A., Martínez, L. M., and Wagner, J. R. (2012),
373 “Rheological properties and stability of low-in-fat dressings prepared with high-pressure
374 homogenized yeast”, *Journal of Food Engineering*, Vol. 11, pp. 57-65.

375 Gavahian, M., Chen, Y. M., Khaneghah, A. M., Barba, F. J., and Yang, B. B. (2018), “In-pack
376 sonication technique for edible emulsions: Understanding the impact of acacia gum and
377 lecithin emulsifiers and ultrasound homogenization on salad dressing emulsions stability”,
378 *Food Hydrocolloids*, Vol. 83, pp. 79-87.

379 Guerra-Rosas, M. I., Morales-Castro, J., Ochoa-Martínez, L. A., Salvia-Trujillo, L., & Martín-
380 Belloso, O. (2016), “Long-term stability of food-grade nanoemulsions from high methoxyl
381 pectin containing essential oils”, *Food Hydrocolloids*, Vol. 52, pp. 438–446.

382 Heggset, E. B., Aaen, R., Veslum, T., Henriksson, M., Simon, S., & Syverud, K. (2020),
383 “Cellulose nanofibrils as rheology modifier in mayonnaise – A pilot scale demonstration”,
384 *Food Hydrocolloids*, Vol. 108, 106084.

385 Heyman, B., Depypere, F., Delbaere, C., and Dewettinck, K. (2010), “Effects of non-starch
386 hydrocolloids on the physicochemical properties and stability of a commercial béchamel
387 sauce”, *Journal of Food Engineering*, Vol. 99, pp. 115-120.

388 Izidoro, D. R., Scheer, A. P., Sierakowski, M. R., and Haminiuk, C.W. I. (2008), “Influence of
389 green banana pulp on the rheological behaviour and chemical characteristics of emulsions
390 (mayonnaises)”, *LWT- Food Science and Technology*, Vol. 41, pp. 1018-1028.

391 Laneuville, S. I., Turgeon, S. L., and Paquin, P. (2013), “Changes in the physical properties of
392 xanthan gum induced by a dynamic high-pressure treatment”, *Carbohydrate Polymers*,
393 Vol. 92 No. 2, pp. 2327–2336.

394 Ma, L., and Barbosa-Cánovas, G. V. (1995), “Rheological Characterization of Mayonnaise.
395 Part II: Flow and Viscoelastic Properties at Different Oil and Xanthan Gum
396 Concentrations”, *Journal of Food Engineering*, Vol. 25, pp. 409-425.

397 Ma, Z., and Boye, J. I. (2013), “Microstructure, Physical Stability, and Rheological Properties
398 of Salad Dressing Emulsions Supplemented with Various Pulse Flours”, *Journal of Food*
399 *Research*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 167-181.

400 Ma, Z., Boye, J. I., Fortin, J., Simpson, B. K., and Prasher, S. O. (2013), “Rheological, physical
401 stability, microstructural and sensory properties of salad dressings supplemented with raw
402 and thermally treated lentil flours”, *Journal of Food Engineering*, Vol. 116, pp. 862-872.

403 Martínez, I., Riscardo, M. A., and Franco, J. M. (2007), “Effect of salt content on the
404 rheological properties of salad dressing-type emulsions stabilized by emulsifier blends”,
405 *Journal of Food Engineering*, Vol. 80, pp. 1272-1281.

406 McClements, D. J. (1999), *Food emulsions: Principles, practice and techniques*, D. J.
407 McClements, New York: CRC Press.

408 Palanuwech, J., and Coupland, J. N. (2003), “Effect of surfactant type on the stability of oil-in-
409 water emulsions to dispersed phase crystallization”, *Colloids and Surfaces A*, Vol. 223, pp.
410 251-262.

411 Paraskevopoulou, D., Boskou, D., and Paraskevopoulou, A. (2007), “Oxidative stability of
412 olive oil–lemon juice salad dressings stabilized with polysaccharides”, *Food Chemistry*,
413 Vol. 101 No. 3, pp. 1197–1204.

414 Park, J. J., Olawuyi, I. F., and Lee, W. Y. (2020), “Characteristics of low-fat mayonnaise using
415 different modified arrowroot starches as fat replacer”, *International Journal of Biological*
416 *Macromolecules*, Vol. 153, pp. 215-223.

417 Primacella, M., Wang, T., and Acevedo, N. C. (2019), “Characterization of mayonnaise
418 properties prepared using frozen-thawed egg yolk treated with hydrolyzed egg yolk
419 proteins as anti-gelator”, *Food Hydrocolloids*, Vol. 96, pp. 529-536.

420 Ribes, S., Fuentes, A., Talens, P., and Barat, J. M. (2016), “Use of oil-in-water emulsions to
421 control fungal deterioration of strawberry jams”, *Food Chemistry*, Vol. 211 No. 15, pp. 92-
422 96.

423 Ribes, S., Fuentes, A., Talens, P., and Barat, J. M. (2017), “Application of cinnamon bark
424 emulsions to protect strawberry jam from fungi”, *LWT - Food Science and Technology*,
425 Vol. 78, pp. 265-272.

426 Ribes, S., Fuentes, A., and Barat, J. M. (2019), “Effect of oregano (*Origanum vulgare* L. ssp.
427 *hirtum*) and clove (*Eugenia* spp.) nanoemulsions on *Zygosaccharomyces bailii* survival in
428 salad dressings”, *Food Chemistry*, Vol. 295, pp. 630-636.

429 Román, L., Reguilón, M. P., and Gómez, M. (2018), “Physicochemical characteristics of sauce
430 model systems: Influence of particle size and extruded flour source”, *Journal of Food*
431 *Engineering*, Vol. 219, pp. 93-100.

432 Sánchez-González, L., Chiralt, A., González-Martínez, C., Chiralt, A., and Cháfer, M. (2011),
433 “Effect of essential oils on properties of film forming emulsions and films based on
434 hydroxypropylmethylcellulose and chitosan”, *Journal of Food Engineering*, Vol. 105, pp.
435 246-253.

436 Santipanichwong, R., and Suphantharika, M. (2007), “Carotenoids as colorants in reduced-fat
437 mayonnaise containing spent brewer’s yeast β -glucan as a fat replacer”, *Food*
438 *Hydrocolloids*, Vol. 21, pp. 565–574.

439 Sozer, N. (2009), “Rheological properties of rice pasta dough supplemented with proteins and
440 gums”, *Food Hydrocolloids*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 849–855.

441 Smittle, R. B. (2000), “Microbiological safety of mayonnaise, salad dressings, and sauces
442 produced in the United States: a review”, *Journal of food protection*, Vol. 63 No. 8, pp.
443 1144-1153.

444 Srinivasan, M., Singh, H., and Munro, P. A. (2000), “The effect of sodium chloride on the
445 formation and stability of sodium caseinate emulsions”, *Food Hydrocolloids*, Vol. 14, pp.
446 497–507.

447 Valduga, A. T., Gonçalves, I. L., Magri, E., and Finzer, J. R. D. (2019), “Chemistry,
448 pharmacology and new trends in traditional functional and medicinal beverages”, *Food*
449 *Research International*, Vol. 120, pp. 478–503.

450 Yücer, M., Ilyasoğlu, H., Özçelik, B. (2016), “Comparison of flow behavior and
451 physicochemical characteristics of low-cholesterol mayonnaises produced with
452 cholesterol-reduced egg yolk”, *Journal of Applied Poultry Research*, Vol. 25, pp. 518-
453 527.

454 Zhang, C., Quek, S. Y., Lam, G., and Eastel, J. A. (2008), “The rheological behaviour of low
455 fat soy-based salad dressing” *International Journal of Food Science and Technology*,
456 Vol. 43, pp. 2204–2212.

457 **Table captions**

458 **Table I** pH, water activity (a_w), total titratable acidity (TTA), NaCl content and stability (H) of
459 the different salad dressings manufactured during 11 storage days at 8 °C and 25 °C. Mean
460 values ($n=3$) \pm standard deviation.

461 **Table II** Rheological parameters from the steady shear tests of the different salad dressing
462 formulations for 11 storage days at 8 °C and 25 °C: consistency coefficient (K), flow behaviour
463 index (n) and apparent viscosity (η_{app50}) values. Mean values ($n=3$) \pm standard deviation.

464 **Figure captions**

465 **Figure 1** Luminosity (L^*) and whiteness index (WI) of the different salad dressings stored for
466 11 days at 8 °C (A) and 25 °C (B); and colour variations (ΔE^*) of the different salad dressings

467 after 11 storage days at 8 °C and 25 °C (C). Mean values (n=3) ± standard deviation. Lowercase
468 letters (a, b, c) indicate significant differences among formulations ($p<0.05$). Capital letters (A,
469 B) denote significant differences between storage times expressed in days ($p<0.05$). The
470 concentration of EO in their free or encapsulated form: 1.95 mg/g. (NE: nanoemulsion).

471 **Figure 2** Viscoelastic properties, at a frequency of 1 Hz, of the different salad dressing
472 formulations during 11 storage days at 8 °C (A) and 25 °C (B): elastic or storage modulus (G')
473 and viscous or loss modulus (G''). Mean values (n=3) ± standard deviation. Lowercase letters
474 (a, b, c) indicate significant differences among formulations ($p<0.05$). Capital letters (A, B)
475 denote significant differences between storage times expressed in days ($p<0.05$). The
476 concentration of EO in their free or encapsulated form: 1.95 mg/g. (NE: nanoemulsion).

477 **Figure 3** Complex viscosity ($|\eta^*|$) and loss tangent ($\text{Tan } \delta$), at a frequency of 1 Hz, of the
478 different salad dressing formulations during 11 storage days at 8 °C (A) and 25 °C (B). Mean
479 values (n=3) ± standard deviation. Lowercase letters (a, b, c) indicate significant differences
480 among formulations ($p<0.05$). Capital letters (A, B) denote significant differences between
481 storage times expressed in days ($p<0.05$). The concentration of EO in their free or encapsulated
482 form: 1.95 mg/g. (NE: nanoemulsion).

483 **Figure 4** Creep and recovery curves of the different manufactured salad dressings. Figures A.1
484 and B.1 present the dressings stored for 1 day at 8 °C and 25 °C, respectively. Figures A.2 and
485 B.2 show the salad dressings stored for 11 days at 8 °C and 25 °C, respectively. Mean values
486 (n=3). The concentration of EO in their free or encapsulated form: 1.95 mg/g. (NE:
487 nanoemulsion).

488 **Figure 5** Recovery rates (R , %) of the different salad dressings after 11 storage days at 8 °C (A)
489 and 25 °C (B). Mean values (n=3) ± standard deviation. Lowercase letters (a, b) indicate

490 significant differences among formulations ($p < 0.05$). Capital letters (A, B) denote significant
491 differences between storage times expressed in days ($p < 0.05$). The concentration of EO in their
492 free or encapsulated form: 1.95 mg/g. (NE: nanoemulsion).

493 **Figure 6** Microphotographs of control salad dressings and salad dressings formulated with free
494 and encapsulated oregano and clove EO after 11 storage days at 8 °C and 25 °C.
495 Microphotographs performed at 40x magnification. (NE: nanoemulsion).