

1 **PHYSICOCHEMICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF CITRUS JELLY WITH NON**
2 **CARIOGENIC AND FUNCTIONAL SWEETENERS**

3

4 **ABSTRACT**

5 In this study the effect of sweeteners with low glycemic index and non-cariogenic
6 characteristics (isomaltulose, oligofructose and tagatose) in jelly prepared with citrus
7 juice has been evaluated considering as reference a citrus jelly formulated with sucrose.
8 For that, analyses of soluble solids, moisture content, pH, water activity, antioxidant
9 capacity, optical and mechanical properties of different blenders of these new sweeteners
10 have been carried out, initially and after 15, 30 and 45 days of storage. Besides,
11 mesophilic aerobics and moulds and yeasts have been also counted to determine their
12 stability over time. A sensory evaluation of the citrus jelly has also been done. The results
13 showed the antioxidant activity decreased over storage time in all formulations.
14 Throughout time tagatose increased luminosity whereas coordinates a*, b* and chrome
15 of all the new formulations were lower than in jellies with sucrose. Moreover, the
16 formulations of citrus jelly with only oligofructose or tagatose or with the mixture of
17 isomaltulose and tagatose were most closely resembled to the control jelly respect to
18 mechanical properties. Finally, the jelly prepared with the combination of isomaltulose
19 and tagatose in equal proportions obtained the best scored in the sensorial analysis.

20

21 **Keywords:** isomaltulose, oligofructose, tagatose, antioxidants, mechanical properties,
22 sensory evaluation.

23

24

25 **Introduction**

26 Traditionally, jelly desserts are mainly produced with edible gelatine, water, sugar and
27 flavors. Although jelly desserts have low content of gelatine this type of protein contains
28 18 different amino acids, including 8 essential amino acids (GME 2015) being
29 particularly rich in glycine, proline and hydroxyproline. Furthermore, gelatine is a natural
30 colloide with properties of gelling and a stabilizing effect. Therefore, gelatine has a quite
31 high nutritional value but with a low caloric power (17 kJ/ kg or 4 kcal/ g). Other
32 important components of jelly desserts are sugars. It is widely known that their excessive
33 consumption is related to tooth decay, diabetes and obesity (Edwards 2002; O'Donnell
34 and Kearsley 2012), among other illnesses. Concretely, white sugar, which contains high
35 percentage of sucrose, is one of the most usual sweetening agent in confectionary
36 products but it requires calcium and potassium to be digested in detriment for vital organs
37 (Shukla and Kandra 2015).

38 Despite the fact that this type of dessert is not considered with a high nutritional value, it
39 is important to point out that this situation might change if natural vitamins and
40 antioxidants provided from fruit juice were included in its formulation instead of the
41 water.

42 Citrus fruits such as orange, lemon and mandarin orange have many beneficial properties
43 due to their high content of fibre, vitamins, minerals, ascorbic acid and specially high
44 content in antioxidant compounds, such as carotenoids, flavonoids and phenolic
45 compounds (Álvarez et al. 2014). As far as we know, a jelly dessert prepared with a
46 mixture of different citrus juices does not exist in the market and it could expand the
47 possibilities of commercialization.

48 Currently awareness of health-related issues in society has increased the demand of new
49 functional foods and consequently food industry must be constantly innovating to offer
50 consumers new alternative products (Shukla and Kandra 2015). In the confectionary and
51 beverage sectors this concern is mainly focused on the achievement of an adequate
52 sweetness while improving health and appearance, and as a result the use of artificial
53 sweeteners has increased. However artificial sweeteners, such as aspartame, acesulfame-
54 k, saccharin and sodium cyclamate, or polyalcohols have negative connotations due to
55 their possible risk to health and they must be subject to a rigorous assessment before their
56 use in food products and beverages (de Queiroz Pane et al. 2015). Bearing this in mind,
57 the reformulation of jelly desserts with new non-cariogenic sweeteners available in the
58 market could be a good chance to achieve this goal.

59 To cope with these issues nowadays there are natural sweeteners such as tagatose,
60 isomaltulose and oligofructose (FDA 2005; FDA 2010; FDA 2011), which need to be
61 studied in order to check their capacity to replace sucrose and other sugars in traditional
62 foods as jelly desserts. In this sense, previous studies had been carried out to reformulate
63 confectionary products with isomaltulose such as strawberry jam (Peinado et al. 2012;
64 Peinado et al. 2013), gummy confections (Periche et al. 2014) or marshmallows (Periche
65 et al. 2015a). Tagatose and oligofructose have been also studied in orange marmalade
66 (Rubio-Arreaez et al. 2015) and the combination of isomaltulose, stevia and oligofructose
67 in marshmallows (Periche et al. 2015b).

68 Oligofructose is an oligosaccharide derived from sucrose, which acts as dietary fibre
69 regulating intestinal transit. It presents a prebiotic effect because it favours the selective
70 growth of bifidus bacteria (Ledur et al. 2013). Besides, it reduces cholesterol and blood
71 sugar levels (Chacón-Villalobos 2006) and improves calcium absorption (Van Den
72 Heuvel et al. 1999). Nevertheless, it is highly soluble and possesses technological

73 properties (sweet taste, stability...) analogous to sucrose (Pimentel et al. 2015). In 2011,
74 oligofructose was recognized as safe (GRAS) (FDA 2011).

75 D-Tagatose (D-tag) is a ketohexose, a stereoisomer of D-fructose and it is found naturally
76 in several foods, including cheese and yoghurt. Its texture is very similar to sucrose and
77 almost as sweet as sucrose, with only 1.5 kcal/g and it does not provoke dental caries
78 (Levin 2002; Oh 2007; Taylor et al. 2008; Calzada-Leon et al. 2013). Tagatose is very
79 suitable for confectionary products, ice creams, soft drinks and breakfast cereals
80 (Vastenavond et al. 2012). Tagatose is minimally absorbed by the upper gastrointestinal
81 tract. The unabsorbed tagatose is fermented in the intestines, causing a change in the
82 proportions of various short chain fatty acids (Taylor et al. 2008). Thus, it is considered
83 a functional food and besides it performs functions as soluble fibre favouring lactic acid
84 bacteria and *Lactobacillus* specie bacteria (Petersen-Skytte 2006). D-tagatose received
85 GRAS status by the Food and Drug Administration in 2001 (Levin 2002; FDA 2010).

86 Isomaltulose is a reducing disaccharide which is naturally present in honey, and sugar
87 cane juice, and its appearance, taste and viscosities of aqueous solutions are comparable
88 to sucrose (Periche et al. 2014). Based on its chemical definition compared to sucrose or
89 glucose, it is less insulinemic, less glycemic and is non-cariogenic (Lina et al. 2002).
90 However, it has a third of the sweetening power of sucrose (Lina et al. 2002; De Oliva-
91 Neto and Menão 2009; Peinado et al. 2012). In 2005, isomaltulose was recognized as safe
92 (GRAS) (FDA 2005).

93 In accordance with the properties of these three sweeteners (oligofructose, isomaltulose
94 and tagatose), the aim of this paper was to evaluate their potential use as an alternative to
95 sucrose in the development of jelly dessert along with the addition of fresh citrus juice on

96 composition, antioxidant capacity, mechanical and optical properties, and sensory
97 analysis.

98 **Materials and methods**

99 *Materials of citrus jelly*

100 Jelly was manufactured with citrus fruits juice (*Citrus reticulata clementina*, *Citrus limon*
101 *eureka*, *Citrus sinensis navelate*), sugar/sweeteners and gelatine (Junca Gelatines S.L.,
102 Girona, Spain). In control jelly sucrose (Azucarera Iberia S.L., Madrid, Spain) whereas
103 in the new jellies the amount of sucrose was replaced by different mixtures of
104 oligofructose obtained from Sensus (Frutalose, Roosendaal, Netherlands), isomaltulose
105 obtained from Beneo (Palatinose, Mannheim, Germany) and tagatose obtained from
106 Damhert Nutrition (Tagatesse, Heusden-Holder, Belgium). The jelly dessert was prepared
107 using the same proportions of ingredients as in a commercial orange flavoured jelly
108 powder (Royal, Kraft Foods, Madrid, Spain) which were: 85.2% of sugars and 9.5% of
109 gelatine. It is important to point out that commercial jelly also contained vitamin C,
110 acidity regulators (fumaric acid, sodium citrate), flavourings and colourants (E100:
111 curcumine and E120: carminic acid) but these components were not included in the jelly
112 of this study. Following the manufacturer's instructions, the content of the powder was
113 diluted with 500 g of water, leading to a final composition of 12.6% of sugars and 1.6%
114 of gelatine. In the jelly prepared with citrus juice, the amount of sugars contained in the
115 juice were taken into account when adding sweeteners in order to maintain the same
116 proportion of sugars and gelatine as in the commercial formula. Furthermore, 50% of the
117 amount of water was replaced by citrus juice. The citrus juice was prepared with the
118 following proportionos of each fruit: lemon juice 14%, orange juice 43% and mandarin
119 orange juice 43%.

120 Depending on the combination of sucrose/sweeteners used in jelly, the following notation
121 was used: Control: 100% sucrose; I50T50: 50% isomaltulose and 50% tagatose; T: 100%
122 tagatose; I: 100% isomaltulose; I50O50: 50% isomaltulose and 50% oligofructose, and O
123 jelly: 100% oligofructose.

124 *Jelly preparation*

125 Figure 1 shows the flow chart of the stages required to prepare jelly for this study. The
126 amounts of each component were weight in an analytical scale (Precisa Gravimetrics
127 AG, model BJ 6100D, Dietikon, Switzerland). Juice was extracted using a liquidiser
128 (Molinox, model vitapress, Mayenne, France). For the stages of mixing and blending, a
129 thermal blender (Thermomix, model TM31, Vorwerk, Wuppertal, Germany) was used.
130 Once the mixture was obtained, containers were filled with it and stored at refrigeration
131 at 4°C.

132 *Analytical determinations*

133 Analysis of moisture content, Brix, pH, water activity, antioxidant capacity, optical and
134 mechanical properties and microbiological analysis were performed for each formulation
135 of citrus jelly at 1, 15, 30 and after 45 days of storage at 4 °C by triplicate. Next the
136 methodologies followed for each case are described.

137 *Moisture and soluble solids content, pH and water activity.*

138 Moisture content (x_w : g water/g citrus jelly) was analysed gravimetrically following an
139 adaptation of the AOAC method (2000). Soluble solids content of samples were measured
140 by a refractometer at 20°C (Atago3T, Tokyo, Japan), the results being obtained in Brix.
141 pH was registered using a pH-meter (Mettler Toledo, model SevenEasy, Barcelona,
142 Spain), previously calibrated with buffered solutions of pH 7.0 and 4.0. Water activity

143 (a_w) was determined using a hygrometer (Decagon Devices, Inc., model 4TE, Pullman,
144 Washington, USA), at 25°C.

145 *Determination of antioxidant capacity*

146 The antioxidant activity of citrus jelly was analysed following the method described by
147 Shahidi et al. 2006, based on the scavenging activity of the stable 2,2-diphenyl-1-
148 picrylhydrazyl (DPPH) free radical and measuring the absorbance change of samples at
149 515 nm in a spectrophotometer Thermo Fisher Scientific, Inc. (Helios Zeta UV-VIS,
150 Waltham, Massachusetts, USA). The results were expressed as mg of Trolox equivalent
151 per 100 g of citrus jelly.

152 *Optical Properties*

153 The optical properties of citrus jelly placed in 20 mm-wide cuvettes was measured using
154 a spectrophotometer UV (Konica Minolta Inc., CM-3600d model, Tokyo, Japan).
155 CIEL*a*b* coordinates were obtained using D65 illuminant and a 10° observer as
156 reference system. Registered parameters were: L* (brightness), a* (red component), b*
157 (yellow component), Chroma ($C^*=(a^{*2}+b^{*2})^{1/2}$) and hue ($h^*=\arctg(b^*/a^*)$).

158 *Mechanical Properties*

159 The samples were examined with Texture Profile Analysis test (TPA) using a TA.XT plus
160 Texture Analyser (Stable Micro Systems, Godalming, U.K.). For this purpose, a load cell
161 of 50 kg and a 45 mm diameter cylindrical probe were used. The test conditions involved
162 two consecutive cycles of 50% compression with 15 seconds between cycles. The test
163 speed was 1 mm/s. Based on the resulting force-time curve it was possible to measure the
164 following parameters: hardness, cohesiveness, adhesiveness and springiness.

165 *Microbiological analysis*

166 Mesophilic aerobic populations and yeast and molds colonies were determined following
167 the procedure described by Rubio-Arrea et al., 2015. Microbial counts were expressed
168 as CFU/g.

169 *Sensorial Analysis*

170 An preliminary acceptance test using a 9-point hedonic scale (ISO 4121 2003; ISO 5492
171 2008) was used to evaluate the following attributes in the samples: color, flavor, texture,
172 sweetness, global preference and intention of buying. The panel consisted of 30 trained
173 panellists (aged from 20 to 50) who are regular consumers of this kind of dessert. Testing
174 was conducted in a sensory evaluation laboratory built according to the international
175 standards for test rooms. In this analysis the citrus jelly formulated using sweeteners
176 containing only isomaltulose (I) and combination isomaltulose-oligofructose (I50O50),
177 were not considered because the other samples of jelly were of a better quality.

178 *Statistical analysis*

179 Analyses of variance (multifactor ANOVA) were carried out by Statgraphics plus
180 software (Statpoint Technologies, Inc., Centurion, Warrenton, Virginia, USA) to discern
181 whether the effect of formulation or storage was significant on the citrus jelly studied
182 with a significance level of 95%. Interactions between factors were also considered.

183 **Results and discussion**

184 *Compositional characterisation of citrus jelly*

185 Table 1 shows the results of solids soluble content (Brix), moisture content (x_w), and water
186 activity (a_w), pH, and antioxidant capacity of the jelly formulations with sucrose or new
187 sweeteners (tagatose, oligofructose and isomaltulose). Initially, all jelly desserts reached
188 a concentration of soluble solids around 22 °Brix, but formulation that contained only

189 oligofructose (O) had the highest values of °Brix (≈ 23 °Brix) unlike formulations
190 containing only isomaltulose (I) or tagatose (T) that showed the lowest values of °Brix
191 (≈ 21 °Brix). The storage decreased significantly °Brix of formulation I50T50 but they
192 increased in formulation T, being control and I50O50 the most stable formulations. Even
193 though, values of soluble content were quite similar in all cases. In terms of moisture
194 content, there were no significant differences due to formulation and only after 30 days
195 of storage there was a significant increase but moisture content was the same as initially
196 after 45 days in all cases. This fact could be due to the permeability to water vapour of
197 the package and also because the relative humidity was not controlled to simulate the
198 conditions of commercialization. Besides, values of water activity were always 0.98,
199 although formulation T showed the highest a_w initially. Again, the pH was very similar
200 in all formulations of jelly, but it was initially lower in formulation T and control jelly,
201 although all jellies presented similar values after 45 days of storage.

202 As can be seen in table 1 initially all samples of jelly prepared with citrus juice showed
203 the same antioxidant capacity except for I50T50 and T jellies which had the highest
204 values due to their content in tagatose, which would be responsible for this behaviour.
205 Other authors (Zeng et al. 2012) also detected an improvement in the radical scavenging
206 activity and oxidation reduction potential of the hydrolysates of tunic backbone with rare
207 sugars (especially D-tag). However, in all cases there was a significant reduction of the
208 antioxidant capacity over the storage period considered, reaching similar values after 45
209 days for all formulations as was also observed in previous studies of orange marmalade
210 (Rababah et al. 2011) as a consequence of the oxidation of the components responsible
211 of this capacity.

212 *Optical properties*

213 The interaction charts of the colorimetric coordinates L^* , a^* and b^* , chroma (C^*) and hue
214 (h^*) of the citrus jellies considering as factors the formulation of sucrose/sweeteners used
215 and the storage time are shown in Figure 2. Initially control jelly desserts had more
216 similarities in terms of luminosity with samples containing tagatose, but for coordinates
217 a^* and b^* and for chroma formulation I50O50 was closed to control jelly. It was also
218 observed that the citrus jelly formulated with tagatose (T and I50T50) showed an increase
219 of their luminosity after 45 days of storage time in contrast with the decrease observed in
220 formulations with isomaltulose and the combination of isomaltulose with oligofructose (I
221 and I50O50) at the end of storage. This behaviour could be related with the low solubility
222 of isomaltulose as was reported (Peinado et al. 2012). Coordinate a^* in jellies containing
223 only oligofructose or isomaltulose was the most stable in time but coordinate b^* increased
224 over time in formulation I whereas it decreased in formulation O. At the end of storage
225 a^* , b^* and C^* of the new formulations of jellies were lower than in control jellies, except
226 for a^* of formulation I50T50 which was equal to the control jelly. In terms of h^* , it was
227 noteworthy that all formulations showed values around the results of the control jelly,
228 being formulation I above control jelly in the whole period of storage and formulation O
229 the most similar to control jelly. Thus, the effect of the different ingredients on the food
230 system depends not only on their concentration or distribution but also on the interactions
231 of the components (Peinado et al. 2013)

232 *Mechanical properties*

233 Figure 3 shows the average curves of the TPA analysis carried out on the samples of jelly
234 used in this study. Moreover, Figure 4 shows the interaction charts (with a significant
235 level of 95%) of the mechanical parameters. As can be seen, initially the curves obtained
236 for O jelly (formulated only with oligofructose), showed more pronounced peaks than the
237 other samples and consequently they had the highest values of hardness without statistical

238 differences respect to citrus jelly formulated with tagatose (T and I50T50), whereas
239 samples prepared with isomaltulose showed the lowest hardness in coherence with the
240 results obtained by Peinado et al. (2012) in strawberry jams formulated with isomaltulose
241 compared with those prepared with sucrose and also by Periche et al. (2014) in gummy
242 confections in which sucrose and glucose syrup were replaced by isomaltulose and/or
243 fructose. This behaviour gives evidence of the lowest capacity of isomaltulose to form gel
244 structure. Besides, the second peak of control jelly was placed on the right of the others
245 formulations. After 15 days of storage, the O jelly curve was overcome by the control
246 jelly curve and its second peak was shifted to the right. However at 30 days of storage the
247 second peaks of all formulation were placed together. Additionally, formulations with
248 only tagatose (T) and oligofructose (O) showed highest peaks at the end of the storage
249 (45 days). Even though, factor time did not have a significant effect on most of the
250 mechanical parameters analyzed in these jellies. However, the formulation composed by
251 isomaltulose and oligofructose (I50O50) showed the highest values of adhesiveness.
252 Furthermore, cohesiveness and springiness were also higher in that formulation and when
253 there was only isomaltulose in the sweetener content of jelly (I). In contrast, gumminess
254 was very low in formulation I50O50. Therefore, the most similar jellies to control samples
255 were those prepared with the mixture of isomaltulose and tagatose (I50T50) followed by
256 those prepared with only oligofructose (O) or tagatose (T).

257 *Microbiological analysis*

258 Microbial counts of mesophilic aerobics, yeasts and moulds were not found in any of the
259 citrus jelly at 1, 15, 30 days of storage. However, at the end of storage (45 days) there
260 were presence of mesophilic aerobics, yeasts and moulds, except for the formulation that
261 only contained oligofructose. This protective effect of oligofructose could be due to its
262 selective preference for the growth of bifidus bacteria (Ledur et al. 2013), which were not

263 enhanced in the agars used for this analysis, specific for mesophilic aerobics, yeasts and
264 moulds. According to Pascual and Calderón (2000), the microbial counts for jelly desserts
265 must not exceed $5 \cdot 10^2$ CFU/g mesophilic aerobics and $5 \cdot 10^1$ CFU /g yeasts and moulds.
266 Even though, the microbial count was bellow those limits ($3 \cdot 10^1$ CFU/g mesophilic
267 aerobics and $2 \cdot 10^1$ CFU /g yeasts and moulds) after 45 days in all cases. These results
268 give evidence that the product was microbiologically stable for the studied period. The
269 microbiological stability of the samples could be attributed to the acidity of citrus juice
270 which gave place to a low pH (≈ 3.5) in citrus jellies.

271 *Sensory analysis*

272 The results of sensory analysis of citrus jelly, depending on their formulation (control,
273 T, I50T50, O), are presented in Figure 5. As can be seen, T and I50T50 formulations
274 showed the highest sweetness, due to their higher content of tagatose. This would
275 coherent with the recommendations given by the manufacturer of the commercial
276 tagatose (two tablespoons of sucrose provides the same sweetness as one tablespoon of
277 tagatose), though as was mentioned in the introduction, tagatose should have similar
278 sweetening power to sucrose (Oh 2007; Taylor et al. 2008; Calzada-León et al. 2013). It
279 is noteworthy that the global preference and intention of buying of jelly formulated with
280 equal proportion of tagatose and isomaltulose (I50T50) presented the better score.
281 Therefore, the replacement of sucrose by a mixture of isomaltulose and tagatose in equal
282 proportion would be feasible from a sensory point of view.

283 **Conclusions**

284 The reformulation of citrus jelly with non-cariogenic and low glycemic index sweeteners
285 used in this research is viable. Besides, tagatose favoured the antioxidant capacity of
286 citrus jelly initially, but not differences among all formulations were found after storage.

287 In general, at the end of storage coordinates a^* , b^* and chrome of the new formulations
288 of jellies were lower than in jellies with sucrose. From the mechanical point of view the
289 recommended formulation would be oligofructose (O) or tagatose (T) or the mixture of
290 isomaltulose and tagatose (I50T50). However the use of isomaltulose (I) or its
291 combination with oligofructose (I50O50) reduced the capacity of gel formation. In citrus
292 jellies with only oligofructose there was no microbial presence in the considered storage
293 period. According to sensorial analysis, I50T50 was the best scored jelly.

294 **References**

- 295 Álvarez J, Pastoriza S, Alonso-Olalla R, Delgado-Andrade C, Rufián-Henares J A (2014)
296 Nutritional and physicochemical characteristic of commercial Spanish citrus juices.
297 Food Chem 164: 396–405
- 298 AOAC (2000) Official Methods of Analysis of AOAC International, 17th ed.
299 Gaithersburg, MD, USA
- 300 Calzada-León R, Ruiz-Reyes ML, Altamirano-Bustamante N, Padrón-Martínez MM
301 (2013) Features of the noncaloric sweeteners and their use in children. Acta Pediat.
302 Méx 34(3): 141–153
- 303 Chacón-Villalobos A (2006) Current Perspectives agribusiness oligofructosaccharides
304 (FOS). Agron Mesoam 17(2): 265-286
- 305 De Oliva-Neto P, Menão PTP (2009) Isomaltulose production from sucrose by
306 Protaminobacter rubrum immobilized in calcium alginate. Biores Technol
307 100:252–4256
- 308 de Queiroz Pane D, Dias CB, Meinhart AD, Ballus CA, Godoy HT (2015) Evaluation of
309 the sweetener content in diet/light/zero foods and drinks by HPLC-DAD. J Food Sci
310 Tech Mys, 52(11): 6900-6913
- 311 Edwards WP (2002) The science of goodies. Acribia. S.A.Spain.

312 Food and Drug Administration (FDA) (2005) GRAS Notification Isomaltulose
313 (PALATINOSE). <http://www.fda.gov/ucm/groups/fdagov-public/@fdagovfoods>
314 [gen/documents/document/ucm268989.pdf](http://www.fda.gov/ucm/groups/fdagov-public/@fdagovfoods/gen/documents/document/ucm268989.pdf). Accessed 12 July 2015

315 Food and Drug Administration (FDA) (2010) GRAS Notification Tagatose. GRN
316 No.352.<http://www.fda.gov/ucm/groups/fdagov-public/@fdagov-foods-gen/>
317 [documents/document/ucm269560.pdf](http://www.fda.gov/ucm/groups/fdagov-public/@fdagov-foods-gen/documents/document/ucm269560.pdf) . Accessed 12 July 2015

318 Food and Drug Administration (FDA) (2011) GRAS Notification Oligofructose. GRN
319 No.392. <http://www.fda.gov/ucm/groups/fdagov-public/@fdagov-foods-gen/>
320 [documents /document /ucm277112.pdf](http://www.fda.gov/ucm/groups/fdagov-public/@fdagov-foods-gen/documents/document/ucm277112.pdf). Accessed 12 July 2015

321 GME (2015) Gelatine Manufactured Europe Gelatine Properties.
322 <http://www.gelatine.org/en/about-gelatine/properties.html>. Accessed 12 July 2015

323 ISO (2003) Sensory analysis. Guidelines for the use of quantitative response scales [ref.
324 no.ISO 4121:2003]. International Organization for Standardization. Geneva,
325 Switzerland

326 ISO (2007) Sensory analysis. General guidance for the design of test rooms. [ref. no.ISO
327 8589:2007]. International Organization for Standardization. Geneva, Switzerland

328 ISO (2008) Sensory analysis. Vocabulary. [ref. no.ISO 5492:2008]. International
329 Organization for Standardization. Geneva, Switzerland

330 Ledur MJ, Tessaro I, Zapata CP (2013) Physicochemical characterization of Saccharides
331 Powder Obtained from Yacon Roots (*Smallanthus sonchifolius*) by Membrane
332 Technology. *Braz Archiv Biol Technol* 56(6): 1024–1033

333 Levin GV (2002) Tagatose, the new GRAS sweetener and health product. *J Med Food*
334 5(1): 23–36

335 Lina BAR, Jonker G, Kozianowski G (2002) Isomaltulose (Palatinose review of
336 biological and toxicological studies). *Food Chem Toxicol* 40(10):1375–381

337 O'Donnell K, Kearsley M (2012) *Sweeteners and Sugar Alternatives in Food Technology*,
338 2th ed . Wiley-Blackwell (Eds.), Chichester, West Sussex, U.K

339 Oh DK (2007) Tagatose: properties, applications, and biotechnological processes.
340 *Applied Microb Biotechnol* 76(1): 1–8

341 Pacual MR, Calderón-Pascual V (2000) *Food Microbiology. Analytical Methodology for*
342 *Foods and Drinks*, 2rd ed. Diaz de Santos (Ed.), Madrid, Spain

343 Peinado I, Rosa E, Heredia A, Andrés A. (2012) Rheological characteristics of healthy
344 sugar substituted spreadable strawberry product. *J Food Eng* 113(3): 365–373

345 Peinado I, Rosa E, Heredia A, Escriche I, Andrés A (2013) Optical, mechanical and
346 sensorial properties of strawberry spreadable products formulated with isomaltulose.
347 *Food Bioprocess Tech*, 6(9): 2353-2364

348 Periche A, Heredia A, Escriche I, Andrés A, Castelló ML (2014) Optical, mechanical and
349 sensory properties of based-isomaltulose gummy confections. *Food Biosci* 7: 37–44

350 Periche A, Heredia A., Escriche I, Andrés A, Castelló ML (2015a) Potential use of
351 isomaltulose to produce healthier marshmallows. *LWT-Food Sci Technol*, 62(1):
352 605-612

353 Periche Á, Castelló ML, Heredia A, Escriche I (2015b) Stevia rebaudiana, Oligofructose
354 and Isomaltulose as Sugar Replacers in Marshmallows: Stability and Antioxidant
355 Properties. *Journal of Food Processing and Preservation*. doi:10.1111/jfpp.12653

356 Petersen-Skytte U (2006) Tagatose. In: Mitchell H, (ed). *Sweeteners and sugar*
357 *alternatives in food technology*, pp. 262–292. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, UK

358 Pimentel TC, Madrona GS, Prudencio SH (2015) Probiotic clarified apple juice with
359 oligofructose or sucralose as sugar substitutes: Sensory profile and acceptability.
360 *LWT – Food Sci Technol* 62(1):838–846

- 361 Rababah TM, Al-Mahasneh MA, Kilani I, Yang W, Alhamad MN, Ereifeja E, Al-U'datta
362 M (2011) Effect of jam processing and storage on total phenolics, antioxidant
363 activity, and anthocyanins of different fruits. *J. Sci. Food Agric.* 91: 1096–1102
- 364 Rubio-Arreaez S, Sahuquillo S, Capella JV, Ortolá MD, Castelló, ML, (2015) Influence of
365 Healthy Sweeteners (Tagatose and Oligofructose) on the Physicochemical
366 Characteristics of Orange Marmalade. *J Texture Stud*, 46(4): 272-280
- 367 Shahidi F, Liyana-Pathirana CM, Wall DS (2006) Antioxidant activity of white and black
368 sesame seeds and their hull fractions. *Food Chem* 99(3):478–483
- 369 Shukla,V, Kandra P (2015) Development, physico-chemical and sensory evaluation of
370 natural nutra candy. *J Food Sci Tech Mys*, 52(11): 7535-7539
- 371 Taylor TP, Fasina O, Bell LN (2008) Physical properties and consumer liking of cookies
372 prepared by replacing sucrose with tagatose. *J Food Sci* 73(3):145–151
- 373 Van Den Heuvel EGHM, Muys T, Van Dokkum W, Schaafsma G (1999) Oligofructose
374 stimulates calcium absorption in adolescents. *Amer J Clinic Nutr* 69: 544–548
- 375 Vastenavond CM, Bertelsen H, Hansen SJ, Laursen RS, Saunders J, Eriknauer K (2012)
376 Tagatose (D-tagatose). In: Nabors L (ed.). *Alternative sweeteners*. Boca Ratón,
377 Florida, USA, pp 197–222
- 378 Zeng Y, Zhang X, Guan Y, Sun Y (2012) Enzymatic hydrolysates from tuna backbone
379 and the subsequent Maillard reaction with different ketohexoses. *Int. J. Food Sci.*
380 *Technol.* 47: 1293–1301

381

382 **Figure captions**

383 **Fig.1** Flow chart of the manufacturing process of citrus jelly

384 **Fig.2** Interaction graphics (95% of significant level) of colour parameters: L*, a*, b*
385 coordinates, chroma (C*) and hue (h*) of the citrus jelly as a function of the formulation
386 and storage time.

387 **Fig. 3** Representative curves of TPA test for citrus jelly studied as a function of
388 sweeteners used in its formulation initially (A), at 15 days (B), at 30 days (C) and after
389 45 days of storage (D).

390 **Fig. 4** Interaction graphics (95% of significant level) of hardness, adhesiveness,
391 cohesiveness, gumminess and springiness of citrus jelly as a function of the formulation
392 and storage time.

393 **Fig. 5** Sensory assessment of citrus jelly as a function of the formulation. Level of
394 significance (ns) of the ANOVA considering all jelly: *level of significance: 95%,
395 **level of significance: 99%.

396 **Table 1** Values for moisture content (x_w), Brix, Water activity (a_w) and pH of citrus jelly
397 formulated with sucrose (control) or with new sweeteners and their combinations
398 (isomaltulose, oligofructose and tagatose) initially, 15 days, 30 days and 45 days of
399 storage. Equal letters indicate homogeneous groups.