

Title	Soft tribology using rheometers: a practical guide and introduction
Authors	Fox, Daniel;Lynch, Kieran M.;Sahin, Aylin W.;Arendt, Elke K.
Publication date	2020-11-30
Original Citation	Fox, D., Lynch, K. M., Sahin, A. W. and Arendt, E. K. (2020) 'Soft Tribology Using Rheometers: A Practical Guide and Introduction', Journal of the American Society of Brewing Chemists, (18 pp). doi: 10.1080/03610470.2020.1843959
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/ full/10.1080/03610470.2020.1843959 - 10.1080/03610470.2020.1843959
Rights	© 2020 American Society of Brewing Chemists, Inc. This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Journal of the American Society of Brewing Chemists on 30 Nov 2020 available online: http:// www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/03610470.2020.1843959
Download date	2025-07-16 04:58:02
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/10846



University College Cork, Ireland Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

Soft tribology using rheometers: a practical guide and introduction

Daniel Fox^a, Kieran M. Lynch^a, Aylin W. Sahin^a and Elke K. Arendt^{b*}

^a School of Food and Nutritional Sciences, University College Cork, Ireland

^b School of Food and Nutritional Sciences and APC Microbiome Ireland, University College Cork, Ireland

*Corresponding author: Elke K. Arendt; Mailing address: School of Food and Nutritional Science and APC Microbiome Ireland, University College Cork, Western Road, Cork, Ireland; Phone: +353-21-4902064; Fax: +353-21-4270213; Email: <u>e.arendt@ucc.ie</u>

Keywords: Soft tribology, tribological attachments, rheometer, mouthfeel

Abstract

Soft tribology (i.e. the measurement of friction as a function of speed between two compliant surfaces) has found applications in food science and there is a growing wealth of theoretical and practical knowledge of fundamental mechanisms of lubrication as well as increasingly strong correlations between tribology and sensory data. Soft tribology is generally conducted using either commercial or in-house built tribometers however, the recent decade has seen a rise in the use of rheometers with tribology attachments. As such, soft tribological measurements using rheometers with tribological attachments are fast becoming a tool in the food scientists' toolbox when it comes to measuring mouthfeel, but the lack of fundamental studies and standardised measuring protocols makes interpretation and comparison across studies challenging. This review aims to provide an introduction to the basics of soft tribology as well as summarise current methodologies and fundamental knowledge on using rheometers for tribological measurements. Based on current literature, knowledge gaps and potential avenues for future research have been identified. These include investigations on hydrophobicity of surfaces, surface wear (running-in), cleaning procedure of the attachment and tribopairs, speed (range and method of increase/decrease) and measuring system configuration. Leaving the aim and design of experiments at the discretion of the individual researcher, recommendations for food scientists aiming to conduct studies on soft tribology of food are given, with a focus on reporting for better comparison between studies.

Table of Contents

1	Intr	oduct	ion	1
2	Fun	dame	ntals of soft tribology	5
	2.1	Tribo	plogy is a system property	5
	2.2	Quai	ntifying mouthfeel	6
	2.3	Surfa	aces – approximation to the physiology of the mouth	7
	2.3.	1	Saliva	9
	2.4	Strib	eck curves1	1
	2.5	Anal	ysing tribological data – deviating from the classic Stribeck curve1	2
	2.6	Rheo	ometers with tribo-attachments (instruments)1	4
3	Trib	ology	using rheometers1	5
	3.1	Appr	oaches to tribological studies1	5
	3.2	Metl	hodologies1	7
	3.2.	1	Tribological attachments1	8
	3.2.	2	Surfaces1	8
	3.2.	3	Running-in2	1
	3.2.	4	Entrainment speed and normal force2	2
	3.2.	5	Temperature2	5
	3.2.	6	Cleaning of the tribopairs2	5
	3.3	Data	processing2	7
4	Link	ing tri	ibology and sensory2	8
5	Con	clusio	ns3	1
6	Refe	erence	253	4

1 1 Introduction

2 "Mouthfeel" is a self-explanatory term for something very difficult to define: it encompasses the tactile 3 sensations experienced during mastication, but going beyond "good" and "bad" and separating those 4 sensations into meaningful terms and correlating them with instrumental measurements requires a 5 developed palate, vocabulary and methodology. The mouthfeel of a given product is an important 6 determinant of the liking and acceptance by consumers (Guinard & Mazzucchelli, 1996), and product 7 developers of food and beverages (referred to collectively as food in this review) are therefore often 8 interested in measuring mouthfeel in order to optimise this important parameter comprising a wealth of 9 different sensory phenomena. Currently, trained sensory panels are used to determine mouthfeel; 10 however, these are expensive and time-consuming, especially when dealing with large sample-sizes 11 (Prakash, 2016). For certain foods (i.e. semi-solid to liquid), the flow-characteristics (rheology) have been 12 successfully correlated with certain mouthfeel attributes (e.g. stickiness, thickness and mouthcoating (He, 13 Hort, & Wolf, 2016)) and while rheological measurements in some cases can distinguish between samples 14 with different mouthfeels, viscosity alone often fails to accurately explain the complex phenomenon of oral physical interactions that constitutes mouthfeel (Prakash, Tan, & Chen, 2013; Selway & Stokes, 2014). 15 16 This shortcoming can be explained by the fact that rheology is a property principally related to the 17 substrate (i.e. the food) while mouthfeel arises from physical and chemical interactions between the food 18 and oral cavity that cannot be described solely by the flow-characteristics of the food in question (Selway 19 & Stokes, 2014). This is not to say that bulk properties such as viscosity and density are not important 20 parameters influencing mouthfeel. Mouthfeel is inherently difficult to define due to its' multifaceted 21 nature and requires a highly trained panel in order to accurately identify minute differences between 22 similar samples. As such, development of a high-throughput, inexpensive and reproducible method would 23 offer advantages to both industry and academic researchers. In the last decades considerable effort has 24 been put into development of such a system by food scientists. A promising method is the use of tribology

which can be succinctly defined as follows: "The science of tribology principally involves studying the characteristics of the film situated between contacting bodies and the consequence of its failure or absence" (Stokes, 2012). The word tribology is a contraction of the Greek root words for "rubbing" (tribo) and "study of" (logia). "Soft" tribology can further be defined as the study of lubrication and friction using compliant (i.e. deformable) surfaces to better mimic the conditions in the oral cavity (Joyner, Pernell, & Daubert, 2014a; R. E. Rudge, Scholten, & Dijksman, 2019).

31 The term tribology was coined in 1966 (Jost, 1966) but the study of friction reaches far back in history. 32 One can imagine how the pyramid-builders would have invested considerable effort into reducing friction 33 when moving large blocks of stone. Some of Leonardo Da Vinci's drawings show experimental setups for 34 measuring friction between two surfaces but it was not until the age of the machines that tribology really 35 took off (Dowson, 1998). Classic tribology is a branch of mechanical engineering and is concerned with 36 the reduction of friction and thereby wear and tear of machine components; early proponents argued 37 that significant economic gains could be achieved by systematic study of lubricants to prevent or better 38 postpone break-down and replacement of machine parts (Jost, 1966). Classic tribology generally involves 39 hard, non-deformable surfaces and lubricants displaying Newtonian behaviour (R. E. Rudge et al., 2019). 40 Development of more sensitive measuring systems and advances in polymer-science to produce surfaces 41 that mimic biological systems (i.e. deformable surfaces with defined wetting characteristics) has led to 42 the emergence of bio-tribology or "soft" tribology, a branch of tribology that studies the frictional 43 properties of biological systems. Examples of applications include prosthetics (Samaroo et al., 2017; 44 Stevenson et al., 2019; Voutat, Nohava, Wandel, & Zysset, 2019), contact lenses (Pitenis et al., 2017), cosmetics (Timm, Myant, Spikes, & Grunze, 2011), dentistry (Cai, Li, & Chen, 2017), medicine (Batchelor, 45 Venables, Marriott, & Mills, 2015) and more, as well as the study of friction during oral processing (Sarkar, 46 47 Andablo-Reyes, Bryant, Dowson, & Neville, 2019).

48 The last decade has seen an increased use of tribo-attachments to rheometers rather than tribometers 49 such as the Mini Traction Machine (MTM, PCS instruments, UK), commonly used for tribological 50 measurements (Shewan, Pradal, & Stokes, 2019). Rheometers are generally ubiquitous in academic food science labs and often present in large food companies (although they may be out of the price-range for 51 52 small to medium sized companies) and offer precise normal force control as well as an increased speed 53 range compared to many conventional tribometers; however, as noted recently by (Shewan et al., 2019), 54 several disadvantages exist, namely: a lack of fundamental studies (as compared to the wealth of 55 fundamental studies on tribometers), limitations in the movement profile (i.e. only rotational), limited 56 knowledge on challenges related to interpretation and understanding of the output, and lack of reporting 57 or consideration of surface wear (Sarkar & Krop, 2019; Shewan et al., 2019).

58 This review aims to introduce tribology to food scientists, assuming no prior knowledge of the area but a 59 basic understanding of rheology and food physics/chemistry. The focus will be on comparison (as far as 60 possible) of methodologies across categories of food and tribological attachments, with an emphasis on preparation protocols and measuring system parameter settings. Most tribology studies so far has 61 62 focused on dairy-related products or hydrocolloid solutions (Sarkar & Krop, 2019; Shewan et al., 2019) 63 however, measurements on beverages such as wine, tea and soft drinks are possible (see e.g. Chong et 64 al., 2019; Laguna & Sarkar, 2017; Steinbach, Guthrie, Smith, Lindgren, & Debon, 2014) and as such, the 65 field of tribology could well be extended to include other beverages (e.g. beer and other malt-based 66 beverages). Fermented wort with its low viscosity; low concentrations of polysaccharides, proteins, 67 polyphenols, and their complexes; presence of fermentation by-products; and hop-extracts presents a 68 new challenge for tribologists, with many avenues worthy of exploration. For example, hops (Humulus 69 lupulus) polyphenols and bitter acids play an important role in the perceived fullness, bitterness, 70 astringency, and stickiness of beers (Goiris et al., 2014; Oladokun et al., 2016); these are sensory 71 phenomena that have already been correlated with tribological measurements in other food systems

(Sarkar & Krop, 2019) and so the relationship between these hop compounds and mouthfeel of beer could potentially be further elucidated using tribology. Another potential area of investigation is the effect of adjuncts on mouthfeel of beer; for example, recently the effect of arabinoxylans from un-malted rye on mouthfeel was investigated and was found to positively influence the perceived fullness of beers (Langenaeken, De Schutter, & Courtin, 2020). Additionally, ways to instrumentally measure the mouthfeel of beers could help in the improvement of beers that are generally perceived as having poor mouthfeel, e.g. non-alcoholic beers (Bellut & Arendt, 2019; Krebs, Müller, Becker, & Gastl, 2019)

79 The following section (section 2) introduces the fundamentals of tribology, the concept of mouthfeel, and 80 frameworks deemed necessary to undertake tribological research. Section 3 will summarise current 81 knowledge based on research using tribo-attachments on rheometers conducted during the last decade 82 in order to identify knowledge gaps and provide an overview of methodologies and methods of analysis 83 used across different rheometers and lubricants/food. A short overview of the current state of 84 establishing a link between sensory data and tribology is then given (section 4). The review ends with an overview of knowledge gaps identified and a list of general recommendations and guidelines specific to 85 86 the purpose of the research, meant as a source of inspiration for development of product-specific 87 methods.

For reviews and articles dealing with the difference between rheology and tribology (J. Chen & Stokes,
2012), in depth introductions to the theoretical background of tribology (Sarkar, Andablo-Reyes, et al.,
2019; Stokes, 2012), theoretical work on lubrication of soft viscoelastic surfaces (Pandey, Karpitschka,
Venner, & Snoeijer, 2016) as well as linking tribology and sensory data (Sarkar & Krop, 2019; Shewan et
al., 2019), and more complex modelling in tribology (L. Chen & Opara, 2013; Smith, Guthrie, Steinbach,
Lindgren, & Debon, 2015; Vakis et al., 2018) the references cited here are recommended.

94 2 Fundamentals of soft tribology

95 2.1 Tribology is a system property

An important theoretical framework to be considered before embarking on tribological work is that
 tribology is a system property (I. Hutchings, Gee, & Santner, 2006). This means that careful consideration,

98 especially when interpreting and comparing tribological data, should be given to the nature of

a) The measuring system – (e.g. type of machine, tribopair configuration and type of movement)

b) The surfaces – (e.g. roughness, hydrophobicity, viscoelasticity)

101 c) The lubricant (food) – (e.g. rheological properties, heterogeneity (emulsion, particle size,

102 presence of gas, surface-active ingredients)) (Sarkar & Krop, 2019; Shewan et al., 2019)

103 Figure 1 illustrates the wide array of parameters that influence mouthfeel and play a role doing tribological 104 measurements. An important implication of this is that, when performing a tribological measurement, the 105 output (data) is not only a reflection (product) of the food-systems lubricating properties (as affected by 106 structural and compositional characteristics), but also a measurement of the mechanical and surface 107 properties of the surfaces used (as affected by composition, production method, treatment before use, 108 humidity, temperature and other environmental factors) as well as a result of the choice of measuring 109 system, protocol and data-gathering strategy (Joyner et al., 2014a; Sarkar, Andablo-Reyes, et al., 2019; 110 Sarkar & Krop, 2019; Shewan et al., 2019).

This paradigm can be difficult to grasp and may evoke a poignant feeling when first encountered. Especially daunting is the task of familiarising oneself with a plethora of research fields ranging from mechanical engineering and physics, materials science, mathematics and statistics to the fields of food science: food chemistry, food physics and finally sensory science that itself is built on a knowledge base from physiology, psychology, sociology and behavioural science. In the next sections, the concept of mouthfeel is introduced, focusing on the physical and chemical dimensions, as well the characteristics of the oral cavity (with the aim of justifying choice of surfaces for mimicking these) and saliva. Following this, the basic mathematical principles of tribology and common approaches to interpretation of the data are presented, and finally a brief overview of the rheometers and tribo-attachments as well as other tribology devices used in literature is given.

121 [Figure 1 here]

122 2.2 Quantifying mouthfeel

123 Guinard and Mazzucchelli (1996) state that "mouthfeel includes all of the tactile (feel) properties 124 perceived from the time at which solid, semi-solid or liquid foods or beverages are placed in the mouth 125 until they are swallowed" and further define residual effects of mouthfeel as after-feel, much in the same 126 way as after-taste refers to residual taste sensations. Before entering the mouth, food is defined by its 127 history (i.e. composition and structure as affected by production and processing method and ingredients 128 used). Upon entering the mouth, it is generally accepted that the mouthfeel of semi-solid and fluid foods 129 like beverages is initially dominated by rheological properties where sensory sensations such as thickness 130 and creaminess are perceived and, as the food is swallowed and surface interactions become more 131 important, tribological properties begin to dominate (J. Chen & Stokes, 2012; Stokes, Boehm, & Baier, 132 2013). For solid foods the initial stage (first bite) is dominated by characteristics such as mechanical 133 strength and fracture properties until the bolus is formed whereupon tribology becomes important (Witt 134 & Stokes, 2015). The work of Kokini, Kadane, & Cussler (1977), dealing with quantitively describing texture 135 perception of foods, is often cited as the starting point of relating friction parameters to oral processing 136 (Sarkar & Krop, 2019). The authors of this paper recognised that viscosity was not the only parameter 137 necessary in order to predict sensory perceptions such as smoothness and slipperiness. Hutchings & 138 Lillford (1988) proposed a theoretical framework for analysing the texture of food succinctly described

along three axes: Time (e.g. changes in temperature and number of chews), degree of structure (bulk and 139 140 particulate properties) and degree of lubrication (e.g. influence of saliva and sample moisture and fat 141 content). The Hutchings and Lillford Breakdown Path provided a qualitative conceptual approach to the 142 eating experience/perceived texture/mouthfeel using intuitive physical properties of food and 143 additionally gave the important insight that texture exists in the brain and is therefore a psychophysical 144 phenomenon that needs an integrative research approach combining psychology, rheology and 145 physiology in order to be properly explained (Boehm, Yakubov, Stokes, & Baier, 2019; J. B. Hutchings & 146 Lillford, 1988; Sarkar, Andablo-Reyes, et al., 2019). This also illustrates the importance of realising the 147 difference between sensory properties (as perceived by the brain) and material properties (as measured 148 by instruments) and the complexity involved in trying to directly correlate these two properties, not to 149 mention the complexity of looking for causality in these empirical relationships (J. Chen, 2020). Trying to 150 quantify mouthfeel is further complicated by the continuous transformation food undergoes after 151 entering the mouth (i.e. structural breakdown and incorporation of saliva causing changes in lubricating 152 properties), meaning that determination of exactly which property (e.g. chemical, rheological, mechanical 153 or structural) of the food-bolus at any given time correlates with a given textural sensation is an open 154 question (Stokes et al., 2013). Recently, Boehm et al. (2019) proposed to adapt the HL BP into a 155 quantitative model based on an analytical research approach, stressing the importance of conducting 156 fundamental studies into foods interaction with saliva and the underlying mechanisms of lubrication of 157 food, as well as combining several approaches (e.g. rheology, tribology) in order to provide quantifiable 158 attributes of the breakdown of food during oral processing.

159 2.3 Surfaces – approximation to the physiology of the mouth

As previously mentioned, the choice of surface material for tribological measurements will affect the output. Two considerations are important in this aspect: getting as close to the properties of the mouth as possible and reproducibility of those conditions (Sarkar, Andablo-Reyes, et al., 2019). The need for easily accessible and cheap surface materials means that a trade-off between these two considerationswill often be necessary.

In terms of surface properties, roughness (R_a) characterised by the topography of the surface (i.e.
asperities' height or well depth, width and between-distance [μm]) (Krzeminski, Wohlhüter, Heyer, Utz,
& Hinrichs, 2012; van Stee, de Hoog, & van de Velde, 2017), hydrophobicity (wettability) measured as the
contact angle (θ) between surface and specimen (Bongaerts, Fourtouni, & Stokes, 2007; Bongaerts,
Rossetti, & Stokes, 2007), and Elastic (Young's) modulus (E) i.e. "stiffness" [Pa] are important parameters
that influence friction (Selway & Stokes, 2014).

171 The tongue (figure 2) is covered by four types of papillae with differing spatial distributions: filiform, 172 fungiform, foliate and circumvallate and it is believed that the filiform papillae are responsible for 173 mouthfeel perception as they the most numerous and lack taste receptors (Hanh & Frank, 2014). This 174 renders the human tongues topography highly variable (Laguna, Bartolomé, & Moreno-Arribas, 2017). 175 Roughness values are generally reported as ranging between 42-95 µm (distance between asperities) with 176 a well depth between 200-300 µm (Godoi, Bhandari, & Prakash, 2017; Pradal & Stokes, 2016; X. Wang, 177 Wang, Upadhyay, & Chen, 2019). The oral cavity is generally hydrophobic with contact angle ranging 178 between 72-83° depending on time of day measured (Mei, White, & Busscher, 2004), but will become 179 increasingly hydrophilic (θ = 51°) upon addition of saliva (Sarkar, Andablo-Reyes, et al., 2019). Despite this 180 relatively rough surface (comparable to 100 grit sandpaper) the tongue does not feel rough, mainly due 181 to its reduced Elastic modulus of approximately 2.67 kPa (2.53 kPa for the soft palate) (Cheng, Gandevia, 182 Green, Sinkus, & Bilston, 2011). The movement of the tongue is in the range of 30 mm/s at the beginning 183 of food intake and 5 mm/s just before swallowing, with contact pressure between 15-60 kPa between tongue and palate translating to a normal force of 0.5 N (van Stee et al., 2017); however, the tongue is 184 185 capable of producing normal force ranging between 0.1-90 N (Pradal & Stokes, 2016).

186 [Figure 2 here]

187 Several studies have investigated the use of biological tongues (pig's tongue)(Carpenter et al., 2019; 188 Dresselhuis, de Hoog, Cohen Stuart, & van Aken, 2008; Ranc et al., 2006), however, it is noted that 189 variability, accessibility and issues with decomposition makes research using pig's tongue challenging. The 190 most commonly used material for either one or both surfaces is polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS) due to its 191 many favourable characteristics such as easily alterable hydrophobicity, roughness and surface topology 192 (Stokes et al., 2013). PDMS is highly compliant (E = 0.57-3.7 MPa) depending on cross linkage (Z. Wang, 193 Volinsky, & Gallant, 2014) and can relatively easily be made hydrophilic by plasma-treatment, however 194 hydrophilicity is generally short-lasting depending on treatment (Tan, Nguyen, Chua, & Kang, 2010). The 195 Young's modulus of PDMS is highly dependent on ratio of elastomer base to curing agent, an aspect to be 196 considered if production of PDMS is done in-house (Z. Wang et al., 2014). In addition, the surface of PDMS 197 can easily be altered by casting in moulds with desired surface topography (Fitzgerald et al., 2019) and its 198 transparent nature allows microscopical observation of lubricating behaviour in real-time (Carpenter et 199 al., 2019). Other commonly used materials for the lower (soft) surface(s) include surgical tape (typically 200 3M Transpore Surgical Tape 1527-2), whey protein isolate (WPI), Polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE), 201 polyurethane and rubber (natural, foamed and styrene butadiene). For upper (hard) surfaces glass or steel 202 is commonly used, but polypropylene or PDMS are also sometimes used. Carpenter et al. (2019) found 203 that PDMS mimics the tongue better compared to agarose gels, however, Di Cicco et al. (2019) found that 204 whey protein isolate was a better replacement for the human tongue and yielded more reproducible 205 results compared to PDMS when applied to yoghurts.

206 2.3.1 Saliva

207 Saliva plays a key role during oral processing of food: it is a hydrating, lubricating, antibacterial and 208 buffering agent, providing a medium for diffusion and/or mechanical transfer of taste-molecules to

209 receptors, precipitation of proteins resulting in the sensation of astringency, as well as contributing 210 significantly to enzymatic degradation and finally bolus formation and thereby safe swallowing of food 211 (Boehm et al., 2019; Laguna & Sarkar, 2017). The composition of saliva varies significantly depending on 212 which salivary gland it is excreted from as well as circadian rhythm, collection method, age, gender, diet, 213 blood type and medicines (De Almeida, Grégio, Machado, De Lima, & Azevedo, 2008; Schipper, Silletti, & 214 Vingerhoeds, 2007). In addition, it is often difficult to determine whether constituents of saliva are of 215 human or bacterial origin and the composition of saliva will change over time as a result of contamination 216 (Schipper et al., 2007). Generally, saliva is composed of 99% water with the remaining 1% being composed 217 of minerals (sodium, potassium, calcium, magnesium, bicarbonate, and phosphates), nitrogenous 218 compounds (urea and ammonia), enzymes (e.g. α-amylases and lipases) and immunoglobins, proteins and 219 mucins, a glycoprotein thought to be largely (but not solely) responsible for the lubricating and flow 220 behaviour of saliva (Humphrey & Williamson, 2001; Sarkar, Xu, & Lee, 2019). Although human saliva is 221 readily available, the use of biological samples will introduce some degree of variability, complicating 222 interpretation and comparison of results across studies (Boehm et al., 2019). Recently, a critical review 223 examined the use of human saliva and model saliva (i.e. artificial) and concluded that 1) although there 224 have been advances, model saliva systems still exhibit significant differences in terms of lubricating 225 properties, 2) out of the commercially available mucin sources, bovine submaxillary mucin is superior to 226 pig gastric mucin and 3) more systematic research investigating model saliva systems containing mucins 227 and polycationic additives is needed before a standardised model saliva formulation can be agreed upon 228 (Sarkar, Xu, et al., 2019). However, recipes for synthetic saliva do exist for other purposes (e.g. in vitro 229 digestion studies) (Minekus et al., 2014). Table 1 presents an overview of recipes for artificial literature 230 and their differences. Although some recipes are quite different, often the ionic composition is the same. 231 [Table 1 here]

232 2.4 Stribeck curves

A Stribeck curve is the two-dimensional representation of friction coefficient as a function of (relative) sliding entrainment speed of the tribopairs (the two surfaces). The friction coefficient (μ) is a dimensionless number defined as the ratio between the kinetic (sliding) force (F_k) exerted orthogonally to the normal (load) force (F_N) (figure 3) (Blau, 2001). Assuming a constant F_N and that the kinetic force is equal to the friction force (F_f), this linear relationship gives a quantitative measure of friction:

$$\mu = \frac{F_k}{F_N}$$

The entrainment speed (U) is commonly presented as a dimensionless number, either the Sommerfield number (η UR/W) or, in the case of deformable surfaces, the elasto-hydrodynamic number (η UE^{1/3}R^{5/3}/W^{4/3}). Load or normal force (W), radius (R) and Young's modulus (E) is often considered constant so that the entrainment speed (U) is either presented alone or scaled by the viscosity of the fluid (η) in the case when viscosity changes as a function of speed (i.e. shear rate) (Shewan et al., 2019; Stokes, 2012).

245 [Figure 3 here]

246 The classic Stribeck curve (shown in figure 4a) is often divided into three regimes depending on the film 247 thickness between the surfaces: Boundary, mixed and hydrodynamic. In the case of deformable surfaces 248 where the visco-elasticity of the surface influences measurements, the hydrodynamic regime is referred 249 to as the elasto-hydrodynamic regime (Sarkar & Krop, 2019; Shewan et al., 2019; Stokes, 2012). Depending 250 on the capabilities of the measuring system (i.e. range of speeds), a fourth regime can be included: The static regime as shown in figure 4b, which occurs at very low speeds (typically below 10⁻⁶-10⁻⁵ m/s) in 251 252 which movement is imperceptible (Pondicherry, Rummel, & Laeuger, 2018). This regime shows an 253 increase in friction from 0 until a yield point signifying transition into the kinetic regime. In principle, there 254 is no macroscopic movement in this regime and the speed depicted is due to deformation of the surfaces 255 and the lubricant (Kieserling, Schalow, & Drusch, 2018). The boundary regime is dominated by surface 256 properties as there is physical contact between the two surfaces' asperities and is therefore characterised 257 by high friction coefficients, as observed by a peak or plateau. It should be noted that there is fluid 258 between the surfaces in the boundary regime, however the effect of it is negligible compared to the 259 impact of the two surfaces. In the mixed regime the fluid begins to be entrained between the two surfaces 260 and thus an increase in distance and thereby contact between surface asperities is observed, resulting in 261 decreasing friction due to thin film lubrication. In the mixed regime, effects of size of particles can be 262 observed as the distance (D) approaches the dimensions of a given particle (Yakubov, Branfield, 263 Bongaerts, & Stokes, 2015). In some instances "stick-slip" events are also observed in this regime, resulting 264 in erratic behaviour and variation of the curve, the friction coefficient jumping up and down (Sanahuja et 265 al., 2017). In the hydrodynamic regime the high speeds entrain the lubricant and generates enough lift 266 force and hydrodynamic pressure to support the applied load and increase the distance between surfaces 267 and is thus largely dominated by fluid dynamics. In the hydrodynamic regime the internal resistance 268 (viscous drag) of the fluid begins to play a role leading to an increase in friction (Selway, Chan, & Stokes, 269 2017). It is generally assumed that the mixed and boundary regimes are highly relevant to food oral 270 processing due to the rough and deformable nature of the tongue (Malone, Appelqvist, & Norton, 2003; 271 Selway & Stokes, 2014).

272 [Figure 4 here]

273 2.5 Analysing soft tribological data – deviating from the classic Stribeck curve

The classic Stribeck curve was proposed in the early 1900s by Stribeck and colleagues and was generated using relatively simple Newtonian lubricant and hard, non-deformable surfaces using speeds relevant to balls in ball-bearings; however, the complex and variable microstructures (e.g. emulsion-systems) of food

277 often displaying non-Newtonian behaviour means that Stribeck curves obtained in soft-tribology using 278 compliant surfaces will often deviate from the classic Stribeck curves (Jacobson, 2003; R. E. Rudge et al., 279 2019). One approach when investigating surface properties is the Master Curve Approach, where 280 entrainment speed for several Stribeck curves for a range of Newtonian fluids with different viscosities is 281 scaled by their respective viscosities and then collapsing these onto a single curve in a log-log coordinate 282 system (figure 4c), thereby generating a classic Stribeck curve specific to the measuring system, lubricant 283 and tribopairs (Bongaerts, Fourtouni, et al., 2007; Shewan et al., 2019). This Master Curve can then be 284 approximated by fitting a set of equations involving Power law coefficients describing each part of the 285 curve. Comparison of a Master Curve generated with hydrophilic and hydrophobic fluids with data 286 obtained from actual complex food systems enables elucidation of the dominant phase in each regime as 287 well as comparison with other tribopairs (Sarkar & Krop, 2019; Shewan et al., 2019).

In a slightly different approach, the entrainment speed can be scaled (multiplied) by the food system's dynamic viscosity at that shear rate (if available), thereby generating a Master Curve for that food system (Joyner et al., 2014a). Care should be taken however, as the assumption that effects of viscosity are effectively "normalised" through this scaling is not necessarily valid, as viscosity and wetting behaviour of a fluid impacts the viscoelastic behaviour such as hysteresis and squeeze-out dynamics of the compliant surfaces and these effects will also alter the shape of the Stribeck curve (Selway et al., 2017).

Other approaches have also been attempted to account for the Stribeck curves obtained for complex food systems that are not easily interpretable using the terminology of classic tribology. Nguyen et al. (2017) proposed a new interpretation scheme based on data obtained for yoghurts (figure 4d). In the first zone it is assumed that initially only the fluid is entrained, and friction decreases as more and more fat globules enter the gap. With increasing speeds, a thin lubricating film is forming and the friction rises again (zone 2) until the surfaces are partly separated and the curve enters zone 3 (corresponding to the mixed regime) and finally the hydrodynamic regime (zone 4) is reached. In case of gel structure breakdown, the friction may decrease (broken line) and friction in this zone is assumed to not only be governed by viscosity but also by gel strength. A similar shape of Stribeck curve was found by Ng, Nguyen, Bhandari, & Prakash (2017). Pondicherry, Rummel and Laeuger (2018) extended the Stribeck curve to include the static regime (figure 4b), however, as the build-up of friction in this regime is assumed to be largely due to elastic and plastic deformation of the surfaces, it is still unknown whether this regime will offer insights into lubricating behaviour of food systems, but it could possibly be a valuable tool in studying the frictional properties of surfaces at nanoscales.

308 Different ways of interpreting Stribeck curves generated from different food systems will be further 309 discussed in section 3.3, with an emphasis on how to obtain quantities that can be subjected to statistical 310 analysis.

311 2.6 Rheometers with tribo-attachments (instruments)

Several rheometers have been used for tribological measurements using different measuring systems (figure 5a-c). Measuring system in this context refers to the attachment holding the surfaces; these include both commercial tribology attachments or modified rheology attachments. The measuring system setup varies, being comprised of single ball on three pins or three plates, two or three balls on plate, and ring or half-ring on plate. Rheometers used in the studies included in this review include: MCR301, MCR302 and MCR502 (Anton Paar, Austria) and Discovery Hybrid Rheometer (DHR-3) (TA Instruments, USA).

319 [Figure 5 here]

320 2.6.1 Other tribology devices

Tribology measurements can also be undertaken using dedicated tribometers such as the MTM and the Tribolab (UMT, Bruker, Billerica USA). The MTM uses a ball-on-disk configuration that allows rotational and rolling/sliding movements as the surfaces can move independently of each other. This differs from

rheometers where one surface is static. The Tribolab offers among other things a pin-on-disk setup and more complex multi-directional movement profiles that simulates the motion patterns of the tongue and can be used to study e.g. soft solid foods and boli (Campbell, Foegeding, & van de Velde, 2017; Fuhrmann, Aguayo-Mendoza, Jansen, Stieger, & Scholten, 2020; van Stee et al., 2017).

328 An alternative approach is to design a device or attachment in-house in order to fulfil requirements 329 specific to the investigation. Many interesting and innovative solutions can be found in literature, ranging 330 from custom-built attachments for rheometers (R. E. D. Rudge, Scholten, & Dijksman, 2020) or texture 331 analysers (Morell, Chen, & Fiszman, 2017) to devices using optical interferometry to study wetting 332 transitions (Martin, Clain, Buguin, & Brochard-Wyart, 2002), devices fitted with cameras or confocal 333 microscopes for imaging-based techniques (Dresselhuis et al., 2007; Wandersman, Candelier, Debrégeas, 334 & Prevost, 2011; Yashima et al., 2015), devices for investigating molecular organisation of soft polymer 335 interfaces in contact (Cohen, Restagno, Poulard, & Léger, 2011) and wholly in-house built tribometers (de 336 Wijk & Prinz, 2005).

337

3 Tribology using rheometers

338 3.1 Approaches to tribological studies

339 Generally, 3 approaches towards increasing understanding of mouthfeel with the aim of generating 340 explanatory and/or predictive models can be distinguished: Conceptual, fundamental, and empirical 341 (applied). The conceptual approach provides a theoretical framework and aims to build models that can 342 then be tested and validated by experiments (Boehm et al., 2019; Gabriele, Spyropoulos, & Norton, 2010; 343 J. B. Hutchings & Lillford, 1988; Kokini et al., 1977). The fundamental approach will often be applied using model fluids (e.g. concentration gradients of compound(s) of interest) and can be divided into two often 344 345 overlapping categories: Methodology; development of reproducible methodologies by varying test 346 protocols (e.g. cleaning, sample preparation, surfaces etc) (See e.g. Helen S Joyner, Pernell and Daubert,

347 2014a, 2014b, 2014c; Kieserling, Schalow and Drusch, 2018) and/or Mechanism; investigation of the 348 underlying mechanisms of mouthfeel as described by tribological (and complimentary) data to generate 349 explanatory models of mouthfeel. The latter includes e.g. investigations into the lubricating properties of 350 saliva and its interaction with either synthetic surfaces (Bongaerts, Rossetti, et al., 2007; Carpenter et al., 351 2019), biological materials (e.g. pigs tongue) (Dresselhuis et al., 2008; Ranc et al., 2006) or the food matrix 352 (Laguna, Bartolomé, et al., 2017; Morell et al., 2017), the characteristics of the tribological surfaces 353 (Dresselhuis et al., 2007; Kim, Wolf, & Baier, 2015), relationship between lubricating behaviour and 354 micro/nano-structures of the food (Garrec & Norton, 2012; Stokes, Macakova, Chojnicka-Paszun, De Kruif, 355 & De Jongh, 2011), influence of fluid viscosity and wetting on viscoelastic lubrication (Selway et al., 2017), 356 as well as studies on the topography and physiological characteristics of the oral cavity (X. Wang et al., 357 2019) among others. The empirical (applied) approach is aimed at practical applications and strives to 358 generate predictive models that correlate tribological (as well as chemical, rheological and physical 359 parameters) to sensory data depending on differences in production process or composition of the given 360 food.

The next section will summarise the methodologies and interpretation strategies of the original studies included in table 2. All of these studies have used rheometers with tribology attachments (either made in-house or commercial) to conduct research covering a wide range of purposes and foods (e.g. bread, yoghurt, soymilk, soft drinks); from fundamental studies focusing on development of reproducible methods or elucidation of lubrication mechanisms to practical applications. The selection process of the studies was not systematic, but to the best knowledge of the authors, those studies presented provide a sufficient and exhaustive overview of the use of rheometers with tribological attachments. 368 3.2 Methodologies

369 Table 2 gives an overview of the studies included for this review. Additional information on cleaning 370 regimes, specific attachments used (lab-made or commercial), interpretation strategy, run-in procedure 371 and surface investigations (if applicable) can be found in supplementary material. A common approach 372 when selecting measurement parameters is to choose conditions that mimic oral conditions the best as 373 this enables elucidation of lubrication mechanisms and interpretation of results in relation to what 374 actually happens in the mouth. There is considerable variation in measurement parameters among studies 375 and the aim of this review is not to provide a golden standard or one-size-fits-all solution, but rather to 376 present different methods to achieve a similar goal.

12 of the 24 studies included worked with dairy products (yoghurt, milk, cream cheese, custard or dairy substitutes), 7 investigated with model systems (e.g. corn syrup, mineral oil or model emulsions, as well as yoghurt), 2 worked with chocolate, and 1 each for gluten-free bread, soft drinks, and saliva. When testing a particular system for e.g. reproducibility, effect of surface characteristics, and/or measuring parameters, a common practice is to use either mineral oil alone (due to its' relatively standardised lubricating properties) or a combination of demineralised water, mineral oil and yoghurt as examples of two opposites (hydrophilic/hydrophobic) and an emulsion system exhibiting both properties.

Of the rheometers used, only two commercial producers were represented: The Modular Compact Rheometer, MCR301, MCR302 and MCR502 (Anton Paar, Austria) and the Discovery Hybrid Rheometer (TA Instruments, USA). Steinbach, Guthrie, Smith, Lindgren, & Debon (2014) compared the use of an MCR301 with ball-on-3 plates and the MTM with single contact ball on plate on de-gassed soft drinks (cola and lemon lime). These authors reported a measured difference in friction coefficients in the boundary regime for both machines, however, the MCR301 showed an increased analytical sensitivity (as calculated by the difference in friction coefficient divided by the pooled standard deviation) by up to a factor of 200,

indicating that the MCR301 with ball-on-3 plates could provide better discrimination of aqueous solutionsin the lower regimes.

393 [Table 2 here]

394 3.2.1 Tribological attachments

395 The tribological attachment chosen will influence the output and hence comparison between studies 396 using different systems (e.g. ball-on-3 plates and half-ring-on-plate) is generally not feasible. Only one of 397 the included studies has systematically compared two different systems; Joyner et al. (2014a) compared 398 the use of ball-on-3 plates and double-ball-on-plate on the MCR302 (Anton Paar, Austria). These authors 399 found differences in the magnitude of friction coefficients of mineral oil but not in the regimes observed; 400 they attributed this difference to the fact that the plates in the ball-on-plate system are at an angle, 401 meaning that the small amount of oil used would have flowed to the bottom of the plates, thereby 402 reducing the lubricating contact. More research is needed in order to quantify the potential effects of 403 different attachments on the shape, magnitude, reproducibility, comparability, and variability of the 404 Stribeck curves obtained.

405 3.2.2 Surfaces

406 The question of whether to produce surface materials in the lab or buy commercially available surfaces 407 comes down to a question of the aim of the study and practical considerations. While producing surface 408 materials in-house offers control over Elastic modulus and roughness, the disadvantage is potential 409 introduction of variability and the requirement for investigation of surface properties from batch to batch 410 to ensure uniformity, reproducibility and accurate comparison between studies. Taking PDMS as an 411 example, in short, the production of this polymer consists of mixing a silicone elastomer base and a curing 412 agent, followed by degassing in vacuum to remove air bubbles and subsequent curing in an oven. The 413 mixing ratio has profound effects on the Elastic modulus; the Elastic modulus (in MPa) can be expressed

as 20 MPa/PDMS base:curing agent ratio (Z. Wang et al., 2014). Kim et al. (2015) investigated the effects
of PDMS production protocols (base:curing agent ratio, curing temperature and time, and mould finishing
amongst others) on friction measurements and found that the consistency of the Stribeck curves are
highly sensitive to these parameters, suggesting the implementation of a standardised material/synthesis
protocol to overcome these potential biases. Similar introduction of variability could be imagined for other
in-house made polymer solutions.

420 The choice of surfaces used varies considerably between studies, with combinations of steel (either as a 421 ball or ring), polypropylene and glass on PDMS (either lab-made or commercial), polyurethane, surgical 422 tape, natural rubber, foamed rubber, styrene butadiene rubber, PTFE, WPI, and HDPE. Krzeminski et al. 423 (2012) compared the use of PTFE (hard surface) and various rubbers (natural (NR), foamed (FR) and 424 styrene butadiene (SBR)) with varying Elastic moduli (soft surfaces) and surface roughness. The authors 425 reported that harder surfaces resulted in unstable friction curve progressions and observed a negative 426 correlation (Pearson's correlation coefficient from Multiple factor analysis) between surface roughness 427 and friction coefficient at low speeds, concluding that SBR was the most suitable material for 428 discriminating between yoghurt samples measured; however, the authors did not investigate effects of 429 wettability of the surfaces. Joyner et al. (2014a) compared the use of HDPE, WPI and PDMS using a double 430 ball-on-plate setup and reported that WPI is the most suitable due to its' low Elastic modulus and 431 hydrophilic nature, making it comparable to the tongue. These results are corroborated by Di Cicco et al. 432 (2019); these authors reported a higher discriminative power of WPI compared to PDMS using a ball-on-433 3 plates setup when measuring several commercial yoghurt samples. Kieserling et al. (2018) compared 434 the use of glass or steel balls on PTFE, PDMS and SBR on a ball-on-3 plates/pins system working with 435 demineralised water, sunflower oil, and yoghurt. Through systematic investigation of wear and 436 reproducibility, these authors concluded that PDMS showed the least variation, however, the authors did

437 not investigate discriminatory power when comparing similar samples (e.g. yoghurts with varying fat or438 protein content).

439 The effects of hydrophobicity of PDMS have been studied using the MTM; adherence of hydrophobic 440 lubricants to surfaces with low wettability (i.e. hydrophobic) results in lower friction coefficients in the 441 boundary and mixed regimes (Bongaerts, Fourtouni, et al., 2007; Dresselhuis et al., 2007); however 442 aqueous solutions of guar gum and xanthan gum resulted in higher friction coefficients between steel and 443 a hydrophilic surface compared to steel and a hydrophobic surface (De Vicente, Stokes, & Spikes, 2005), 444 indicating that the relationship between wettability and friction coefficient is not straight-forward and 445 needs further elucidation. Besides comparing different polymers exhibiting differences in wettability (such 446 as PDMS and WPI) another strategy is to alter the hydrophobicity of a surface material, thereby 447 eliminating confounding variables such as Elastic modulus and surface roughness. In this regard, PDMS 448 can be made long-term hydrophilic to varying degrees. (Hemmilä, Cauich-Rodríguez, Kreutzer, & Kallio, 449 2012; Shahsavan, Quinn, d'Eon, & Zhao, 2015), however, these techniques require specialised knowledge and equipment. Another possible method is the inclusion of saliva during measurements, as saliva has 450 451 been shown to render surfaces hydrophilic (Macakova, Yakubov, Plunkett, & Stokes, 2011). In a study 452 investigating the lubricating properties of whey protein microgel particles under biological conditions, 453 Sarkar, Kanti, Gulotta, Murray, & Zhang (2017) rendered PDMS surfaces hydrophilic by plasma-treatment 454 and reported an immediate drop in water-contact angle (from 108° to 30°) followed by a rapid recovery 455 of hydrophobicity over 3 days before stabilisation at 63° for up to a week. By addition of a mucin layer, 456 the contact angle of the PDMS surfaces dropped to 47° and thereby mimicked oral mucosa-coated 457 surfaces well.

458 3.2.3 Running-in

459 An often overlooked potential cause of variation in Stribeck curves is surface wear during measurements 460 (Pradal & Stokes, 2016). Running-in refers to the initial conditioning and "smoothing" of surfaces before 461 or during measurements until a steady-state is reached, thereby minimising effects of any differences in 462 surface topology arising from production (Blau, 2005). Running-in presents a challenge when investigating 463 food; consideration should be given to how often surfaces should be changed (i.e. whether it is possible 464 to run several samples on a single surface or change with every new sample) and how to condition (i.e. 465 prepare them for tests and reach a steady-state) the surfaces (if at all) before measurements. The first 466 problem is relatively easily solved by comparing surfaces before and after a given number of runs (a run 467 in this case meaning one sweep up or down the chosen speed range) and determining the appropriate 468 number of runs by either statistical analysis or topography determination. The latter does, however, 469 require access to equipment capable of accurately characterising surfaces, such as a scanning electron 470 microscope and atomic force microscope (Kieserling et al., 2018) or a profilometer (Arvidsson, Ringstad, 471 Skedung, Duvefelt, & Rutland, 2017). If new surfaces are used with every new measurement (a 472 measurement in this case can be either one single run or several consecutive runs) running in of the 473 surfaces is necessary. Kieserling et al. (2018) conducted an in-depth investigation of running-in of PDMS, 474 SBR and PTFE surfaces using mineral oil as lubricant. These authors did measurements comprised of 10 475 consecutive runs and found that a steady state was reached after approximately 5 runs, after which the 476 obtained Stribeck curves stabilised and the wear rate of the surfaces became defined. The first 5 runs 477 were characterised by an undefined wear rate with high variation and a decreasing trend in friction 478 coefficient. Additionally, the effect of multiple compressions and between-run sample exchange were 479 investigated; between each run, the lubricant was exchanged and the tribopairs were cleaned resulting in 480 an increase in coefficient of variation of the Stribeck curves (Kieserling et al., 2018). Carvalho-da-silva, 481 Damme, Taylor, Hort, & Wolf (2013) employed a similar strategy working with chocolate samples; a

482 measurement consisted of 7-8 runs and only the last 3 were included for further analysis. A different 483 approach was used by Steinbach et al. (2014); when investigating lubricating properties of soft drinks, a 484 10 minute interval at constant speed (0.47 mm/s) was employed after samples had been loaded, followed 485 by a recording interval (single run). Goh et al. (2010) employed a similar strategy only with a 1 minute 486 running-in period at 10 mm/s when working with corn syrup solutions. When working with chocolate 487 samples, He et al. (2018) used a higher speed (100 mm/s) for 10 seconds. A common strategy when 488 working with dairy products (custard, milk, cream cheese, yoghurt) is to pre-shear the samples for 1-2 489 mins at 1 rad/s (speed will vary depending on upper tribopair geometry) in order to ensure homogeneous 490 distribution of sample material as well as condition the tribopairs (Godoi et al., 2017; Lee, Park, & 491 Whitesides, 2003; Nguyen, Bhandari, & Prakash, 2016; Nguyen et al., 2017; Ningtyas, Bhandari, Bansal, & 492 Prakash, 2017). The above examples and results carry significant implications in the case of research 493 focused on foods with e.g. gelling properties or foods that might experience structural changes resulting 494 in altered lubricating behaviour when subjected to shearing; if the objective of a given study is to measure 495 lubricating properties before structural changes are induced, then reaching the steady state (defined wear 496 rate of the surfaces) without sample exchange would prove a challenge. If, on the other hand, surfaces 497 are pre-conditioned with a run-in period using a defined lubricant (e.g. mineral oil or a glycerol solution), 498 then subsequent cleaning and compression of the tribopairs may introduce variation and lower 499 reproducibility.

500 3.2.4 Entrainment speed and normal force

501 Entrainment speed is generally increased or decreased (ramp-up or ramp-down, respectively) in a 502 logarithmic fashion, so that the faster the speed is, the shorter is the time between measurement 503 recordings. Speed ranges used vary between studies from below 1 order of magnitude to 9 orders of 504 magnitude (table 2) and even though most rheometers are capable of speeds down to the nanoscale, the 505 static regime is often left unexplored. In general, the speed ranges used are chosen based on food oral

506 processing speeds and preliminary studies to determine the best range in order to obtain the friction 507 regimes of interest. For samples such as chocolate, yoghurt, cream cheese, custard, and corn syrup, a 508 speed range from 0.001-0.1 up to 100-500 mm/s adequately captures the boundary, mixed and elasto-509 hydrodynamic regimes (Carvalho-da-silva et al., 2013; Godoi et al., 2017; Goh et al., 2010; He et al., 2018; 510 Laiho, Williams, Poelman, Appelqvist, & Logan, 2017; Ng et al., 2017; Nguyen et al., 2017; Ningtyas et al., 511 2017; Ningtyas, Bhandari, Bansal, & Prakash, 2019; Pang et al., 2019; Sonne, Busch-Stockfisch, Weiss, & 512 Hinrichs, 2014), while for more liquid samples such as milk or soft drinks, even at speeds up to 750 mm/s, 513 the elasto-hydrodynamic regime is not observed (Baier et al., 2009; Li, Joyner, Carter, & Drake, 2018; Li, 514 Joyner, Lee, & Drake, 2018; Nguyen et al., 2016; Steinbach et al., 2014). Although, as previously 515 mentioned, it is generally assumed that the boundary and mixed regimes are the most relevant to 516 measuring mouthfeel, the lack of a minimum in friction coefficient to define the beginning of the elasto-517 hydrodynamic regimes could cause problems in interpretation. In addition, this potentially signifies that 518 friction at lower speed towards the static regimes could hold significant information regarding low-519 viscosity fluids.

520 Only one of the studies included have investigated potential effects of employing wide versus narrow 521 speed ranges: Di Cicco et al. (2019) investigated the effect of a wide (1000-1 mm/s) and narrow (200-2 522 mm/s) range on a ball-on-3 plates setup using a steel ball and WPI plates on yoghurts with different fat-523 contents in a ramp-down fashion (i.e. rather than starting from a resting position, the starting speed was 524 high and then brought down to low speeds). These authors found that the narrow speed range could 525 discriminate between non-fat and fat containing samples, but not between fat containing samples. The 526 wide speed range resulted in higher discriminatory power, possibly due to release of fat globules during 527 the higher shearing (Di Cicco et al., 2019). Another interesting method of this study is the use of ramp-528 down rather than ramp-up, however, this method is not replicated in any of the other studies. As no 529 studies have systematically investigated the influence of speed range, it is hard to make any conclusive

recommendations, except to state that preliminary studies before any measurements should aim to minimise effects from speed range as well as determine the optimum range in order to capture the relevant friction regimes. In a unique investigation, Joyner et al. (2014a) investigated the effect of using continuous or step-wise increases in entrainment speed and found that step-wise increase resulted in the lowest variation of normal force and friction coefficient, possibly due to the system being unable to equilibrate during continuous increase. These authors recommend that the method of speed ramp should be reported to increase comparability between studies.

537 The effect of normal force variation has been systematically investigated on a range of attachments and 538 surfaces. Krzeminski et al. (2012) observed that with an increase in normal force from 3 to 9 N on 539 deformable surfaces, overall friction is reduced. This trend is likely due to higher deformation of asperities 540 resulting from the higher pressure as also observed by R. E. D. Rudge, Scholten, & Dijksman (2020) and 541 Urueña et al. (2018). Joyner et al. (2014c) investigated the effect of measurement parameters on normal 542 force when using mineral oil as a lubricant and recommends proper selection of surface, rheometer base 543 (dynamic rather than static) and dynamic normal force control (set to 100%) to reduce variation of normal 544 force during measurements. Fluctuations in normal force during measurements can cause variability of 545 the data, especially when using soft, deformable surfaces due to changes in contact area and normal load 546 distribution however, Joyner et al. (2014c) notes that as normal force is part of the equation for calculating 547 friction coefficient, small variations in normal force are mitigated. Joyner et al. (2014a) observed that 548 friction coefficients are generally unaffected by normal force (3 and 5 N tested) when working with 549 mineral oil. A strategy to account for any variation due to fluctuations in normal force could be to remove 550 any data points collected when normal force was above or below a specified range (e.g. ±5%) (Joyner et 551 al., 2014c, 2014a). Nguyen et al. (2016) tested differences in friction of dairy products (milk and cream 552 cheese) depending on normal force (1 and 2 N) and found only small differences in friction coefficient and 553 no differences in the regimes obtained. In a similar study, Ningtyas, Bhandari, Bansal, & Prakash (2017)

554 investigated the effects of normal force (1, 2, 3 and 5 N) on friction coefficients of cream cheese and found 555 that an increase in normal force led to a decrease in friction coefficients. No clear explanations for the 556 behaviour of non-Newtonian materials under different normal forces is currently known, but it could be 557 due to effects on the pressure in the gap distance altering the tribological behaviour of the materials 558 (Myant, Spikes, & Stokes, 2010). Across studies included in this review, a variety of normal forces have 559 been applied, generally between 1-5 N. Preliminary studies should aim to pinpoint the normal force at 560 which variation is the smallest and the highest discriminatory power is achieved. In addition, fundamental 561 studies to investigate the effects of normal force on Newtonian and non-Newtonian materials should be 562 undertaken.

563 3.2.5 Temperature

A wide range of temperatures is used in the included studies, ranging from 4-40 °C. A general trend seems to be to use higher temperatures (e.g. 35-40 °C) when investigating mechanisms of lubrication and roomtemperature when defining methodologies. It is generally accepted that viscosity, density, emulsion stability, and solubility show temperature-dependent behaviour, and as such, temperature is expected to affect tribological measurements to various degrees. Although the rationale for using a specific temperature is generally justified (e.g. mimicking in-mouth conditions), the variation in temperatures used makes comparison between studies infeasible.

571 3.2.6 Cleaning of the tribopairs

The cleaning regime used when preparing the tribopairs and tribopair holders before and between measurements will inevitably have an impact on the output, especially if even minute residues of cleaning agents (e.g. surfactants) or previous samples are left on the surfaces. As such, it is crucial that a thorough and consistent cleaning regime is employed. In some cases, the cleaning regime is not specified, or it is unclear which cleaning agents were used (see supplementary material). Several strategies are employed

577 and the choice of which cleaning agent (if any) to use will also depend on the specific food to be tested or 578 the nature of the tribopairs, as well as the choice of whether or not to reuse the surface a number of 579 times. Taking PDMS, one of the most commonly used surfaces, as an example, solvent compatibility 580 (solvent here referring to any compounds being soluble in PDMS or able to solubilise PDMS present in 581 either the sample or cleaning agent) has three aspects to it: (1) solubility of a given solvent in PDMS 582 causing swelling and ensuing induction of changes to the surfaces' properties, (2) loss of solutes to PDMS 583 causing changes in composition of the measured sample, and (3) dissolution of PDMS oligomers (potential 584 contaminants present in the cross-linked PDMS) into the measured sample, also causing compositional 585 changes (Lee et al., 2003). For an overview of the compatibility and swelling of PDMS with commonly used 586 solvents, see Lee, Park and Whitesides (2003). Going from the "lightest" to most rigorous cleaning 587 regimes, the studies included here have employed: rinsing with deionised water and wiping with lab-wipes 588 when working with dairy products (Nguyen et al., 2016, 2017); rinsing with isopropanol when working 589 with mineral oil/emulsions and dairy (Joyner et al., 2014c, 2014b, 2014a; Krzeminski et al., 2012; Laiho et 590 al., 2017; Sonne et al., 2014); rinse with ethanol when working with dairy (Di Cicco et al., 2019; Li, Joyner, 591 Lee, et al., 2018); rinsing with detergent, followed by either a rinsing with deionised water alone (Baier et 592 al., 2009) or using ethanol wipes (Li, Joyner, Carter, et al., 2018) when working with milk; rinsing in an 593 acetone ultrasonic bath when working with corn syrup solutions (Goh et al., 2010); or rinsing with 594 deionised water, followed by washing with detergent, rinsing with deionised water, followed by 595 isopropanol, wiping with lab-wipes and drying with compressed air when working with yoghurt (Kieserling 596 et al., 2018). The wide variety of surfaces and measurement protocols makes comparison between 597 cleaning regimes difficult, and ultimately the choice of cleaning agents and method will be at the 598 researchers' discretion.

599 3.3 Data processing

600 Processing of the Stribeck curves obtained from tribological measurements can generally be done in two 601 ways: semi-quantitatively by visually comparing curves for different samples in conjunction with 602 theoretical knowledge and hypotheses, or by extraction of quantitative data for further analysis (which 603 again can be broadly divided into two approaches). While the first is a valuable and often used tool for 604 elucidating mechanisms of lubrication (and taking into account that visual exploration of data should 605 always be the first step in any statistical analysis if possible), visual assessment will quickly become 606 infeasible in the context of large sample sized and multivariate data analysis. This is not to say that visual 607 exploration of Stribeck curves is not a valid approach, but rather that generation of statistical models 608 requires numeric data. In addition, the first approach requires in-depth knowledge of tribology and the 609 food-matrix, while for most practical applications food scientists will be more interested in finding 610 correlations between variables (e.g. sensory data and physical/chemical parameters). Attempts to infer 611 statistically significant differences between samples have resulted in a few different strategies. A common 612 pre-processing step when each data point of each run consists of several data collections is to exclude 613 outliers above or below a certain threshold. As per good common practice, Stribeck curves are presented 614 as mean ± standard deviation of triplicate (or more) measurements for each data point and any parts of 615 the curves of different samples not overlapping are assumed to be significantly different (Carvalho-da-616 silva et al., 2013; Goh et al., 2010; He et al., 2018; Joyner et al., 2014c, 2014a, 2014b; Li, Joyner, Carter, et 617 al., 2018; Li, Joyner, Lee, et al., 2018; Ningtyas et al., 2019; Pang et al., 2019). Stribeck curves can then 618 either be visually assessed and discussed considering complementing data or quantitatively analysed to 619 obtain variables for further (multivariate) data analysis. Further extraction of numerical information 620 generally follows two approaches; (1) comparison of friction coefficients at given set speeds (e.g. 1, 10, 621 100... mm/s) (Baier et al., 2009; Krzeminski et al., 2012; Laiho et al., 2017; Sonne et al., 2014; Steinbach 622 et al., 2014) or (2) determination of μ and U at transition points between regimes and slopes within

623 regimes (note that axes are generally semi-log or log-log) (Di Cicco et al., 2019; Godoi et al., 2017; 624 Kieserling et al., 2018; Ng et al., 2017; Nguyen et al., 2016, 2017; Ningtyas et al., 2017). The first approach 625 seems most applicable when Stribeck curves between samples follow the same trend (i.e. transition points 626 occur around the same speeds) or when magnitude of friction within a given regime is the object of 627 investigation. The second approach yields information about when transitions occur depending on e.g. 628 composition and how fast friction increases or decreases in a given regime. Taking the analysis a step 629 further, Di Cicco et al. (2019) first extracted 8 variables from the Stribeck curves (average friction in each 630 regime, slope in the mixed regime, and μ and U at transition points between regimes) of 9 commercial 631 yoghurts with varying fat-content and applied analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by Tukey's pairwise 632 comparison to determine which of these 8 variables best discriminated between samples. These authors 633 then applied 2 times Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to the dataset, both the 8 variables extracted as 634 well as the full set of measurements (9 samples x 3 runs/sample x 61 data point/run). PCA on the 8 635 variables in a biplot proved a valuable tool to extract information about which variables explained 636 variation of a given sample, as well as reveal clusters of samples and correlations between variables. 637 Similarly, PCA on the full dataset provided good separation of groups and proved a valuable tool in 638 identifying which regimes (speed intervals) explained the largest part of the variance of the dataset.

A strategy that has so far seemingly been left unexplored is the application of calculus (e.g. area under
the curve) or fitting of e.g. polynomials to bell shaped parts of the Stribeck curve.

641 4 Linking tribology and sensory

Recent reviews have examined the application of tribology as a means of explaining mouthfeel sensations and providing a link between sensory data and instrumental measurements (Sarkar & Krop, 2019; Shewan et al., 2019). Looking at the relationship between friction coefficient and sensory data across instruments and foods, Sarkar & Krop (2019) identified three clusters based on food, sensory characteristic and friction

regime: Cluster 1 contained full fat milk and yoghurt, o/w emulsions, chocolate, and cream cheese and 646 647 correlations with viscosity, astringency and smoothness; cluster 2 contained low fat cream cheese, low 648 fat yoghurt, and no fat milk and correlations with creaminess, graininess, and smoothness; cluster 3 649 contained emulsion-filled gels, bread, and hydrogels and correlations with roughness, fattiness, stickiness, 650 firmness, chewiness, dryness, pastiness, slipperiness and salivating effect, with some overlap between 651 cluster 1 and 3. Although these relationships are system-specific and have often been obtained using 652 different sensory analysis techniques, interpretation strategies and data analyses (e.g. Pearson's 653 correlations, PCA and Partial least squares regression (PLS)), the evidence points towards tribology as a 654 valuable tool in determining certain mouthfeel characteristics of foods (Sarkar & Krop, 2019).

655 Several studies have explored the link between sensory data and tribology. The link between the 656 mouthfeel of wine (especially the attribute astringency) and instrumental measurements has been 657 explored recently: the use of tribology has helped in elucidating some of the mechanisms responsible for 658 this sensation, specifically the interaction between saliva and polyphenols found in wine and the 659 correlation with friction (Laguna & Sarkar, 2017). Using a modified Texture Analyzer with stainless steel 660 on PDMS, Stribeck curves of mixtures of whole human saliva and tannin-solutions or red wines were 661 measured and a positive correlation was found between the friction coefficient at 0.075 mm/s and both 662 perceived intensity of astringency and level of tannins in the samples (Brossard, Cai, Osorio, Bordeu, & 663 Chen, 2016). In contrast, in a study using model wine systems consisting of ethanol, glycerol and oak 664 tannins mixed with artificial saliva measured on an MTM using PDMS on PDMS, no correlation was found 665 between presence of tannins and perceived astringency (Laguna, Sarkar, et al., 2017). A possible 666 explanation for this could be the difference in measuring systems and experimental protocol (Laguna, 667 Sarkar, et al., 2017), highlighting the importance of instrumental choice and setup in tribology. More 668 recently, in a study using the MTM and PDMS surfaces, S. Wang, Olarte Mantilla, Smith, Stokes, & Smyth 669 (2020) investigated the effect of tannins and pH in wine with human saliva on level of astringency; no

670 overall correlation could be found between astringency and friction, however, by dividing astringency into 671 sub-qualities "rough", "drying" and "pucker", it was found that "drying" is driven by levels of tannins and 672 is related to the boundary regime while "pucker" is explained by pH and rate of increase of friction. The 673 authors conclude that explaining astringency based on interactions between saliva and astringent 674 compounds may not be adequate and that astringency itself is multi-modal. He et al. (2018) measured 675 Stribeck curves of expectorated chocolate boluses and found that differences in mouthcoating was 676 reflected in the mixed regime while thickness could be correlated to the hydrodynamic regime. This is 677 perhaps not surprising, as thickness has previously been shown to be correlated with viscosity and bulk 678 properties (He et al., 2016; Wagoner, Çakır-Fuller, Shingleton, Drake, & Foegeding, 2019), which are the 679 main contributors to friction in the hydrodynamic regime. These results are corroborated by Carvalho-da-680 silva et al. (2013), who investigated the melting and friction properties of two iso-viscous chocolate 681 samples and found among other things, that mouthcoating and friction coefficients were negatively 682 correlated at higher speeds. For yoghurts of various composition (e.g. differences in fat, protein, 683 hydrocolloids and production method) it has been shown that friction coefficients at specific speeds can 684 be successfully correlated to perceived creaminess and viscosity (Laiho et al., 2017; Sonne et al., 2014) as 685 well as stickiness, oiliness and thickness (Ng et al., 2017; Nguyen et al., 2017). Similar results correlating 686 creaminess/thickness to rheology/tribology data have also been found for cream cheese (Ningtyas et al., 687 2019). These results come together to show that correlations do exist and can be achieved by careful 688 consideration of measuring system and protocols.

689 5 Conclusions

There has been a recent surge in studies successfully relating tribological measurements to mouthfeel of food and beverages. The need for (1) fundamental studies to determine underlying mechanisms and (2) development of standardised methods and measurement protocols to increase comparability across studies (and potentially improve correlations between sensory and tribological data) is becoming increasingly necessary. Compared to the solid knowledge base and amount of publications using the MTM, information on fundamental properties of tribological attachments on rheometers is sparse (Shewan et al., 2019). Although some of the knowledge obtained on the MTM is highly relevant and

697 perhaps transferrable to rheometers, further investigations are needed in order to verify this assumption.

Based on the above, several directions for further potential investigations have been identified:

Effect of hydrophobicity (by incorporation of saliva, modification of surfaces, comparison of
 surfaces from different polymers with different wettability)

701 - Running-in procedures as a means to reduce variability of measurements

- Differences between tribology attachments as well as comparisons of tribometers and
 rheometers to determine differences in Stribeck curves and analytical sensitivity of different
 systems
- 705 Influence of temperature on Stribeck curves
- 706 Potential effects of different cleaning regimes and the chemicals used
- 707 Potential valuable information extracted by ramp-up and ramp-down of speed, and the influence
- 708 of speed range on measurements

709 General considerations when choosing a suitable methodology should be based on the aim of the study.

710 More precisely, whether the measurement parameters and conditions are meant to mimic the in-mouth

conditions during oral processing as closely as possible (e.g. by using surfaces, speed ranges, normal force,

and temperature etc with similar characteristics to the mouth), or whether the focus should be on capturing as much data as possible (e.g. wide speed range) with as a high a discriminating power and reproducibility as possible (e.g. for correlations with sensory and compositional data etc). This trade-off will influence the possible interpretations of the Stribeck curve, and the data obtained will reflect these considerations. Naturally, the data analysis and information extraction should be tailored to the specific aim, whether it be explanatory or predictive power. Figure 6 gives a graphical representation of parameters to consider at each step of planning a tribological study.

719 For better comparability between studies, it is recommended to:

- Conduct preliminary studies to determine best speed range, running-in procedure, cleaning
 regime
- Report in detail on production method of surface polymers, cleaning regime, temperature,
 running-in procedure, and method of speed ramp
- Use surfaces with standardised characteristics and in the case of in-house made surfaces report
- surface roughness, wettability and Elastic modulus
- Gather as much data as possible on the samples to provide high statistical power, and potentially
- 727 conduct multivariate data analysis on friction data alone (to eliminate redundant variables and
- 728 identify relevant variables/friction regimes) and in conjunction with other data collected

729 [Figure 6 here]

730 Declarations

731 This work was supported by the Baillet Latour Fund within the framework of a scholarship for doctoral

732 students.

6 References

- Arvidsson, M., Ringstad, L., Skedung, L., Duvefelt, K., & Rutland, M. W. (2017). Feeling fine the effect of topography and friction on perceived roughness and slipperiness. *Biotribology*, *11*(January), 92–101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotri.2017.01.002
- Baier, S. K., Elmore, D., Guthrie, B., Lindgren, T., Smith, S., Steinbach, A., ... Läuger, J. (2009). A new tribological device for assessing mouthfeel attributes of foods. *Paper Presented at the 5th International Symposium on Food Rheology and Structure, ETH Zürich*, 432–435.
- Batchelor, H., Venables, R., Marriott, J., & Mills, T. (2015). The application of tribology in assessing texture perception of oral liquid medicines. *International Journal of Pharmaceutics*, 479(2), 277–281. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2015.01.004
- Bellut, K., & Arendt, E. K. (2019). Chance and Challenge: Non-Saccharomyces Yeasts in Nonalcoholic and Low Alcohol Beer Brewing–A Review. *Journal of the American Society of Brewing Chemists*, 77(2), 77–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/03610470.2019.1569452
- Biegler, M., Delius, J., Käsdorf, B. T., Hofmann, T., & Lieleg, O. (2016). Cationic astringents alter the tribological and rheological properties of human saliva and salivary mucin solutions. *Biotribology*, 6, 12–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotri.2016.03.002
- Blau, P. J. (2001). The significance and use of the friction coefficient. *Tribology International*, *34*(9), 585–591. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-679X(01)00050-0
- Blau, P. J. (2005). On the nature of running-in. *Tribology International*, *38*, 1007–1012. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.triboint.2005.07.020
- Boehm, M. W., Yakubov, G. E., Stokes, J. R., & Baier, S. K. (2019). The role of saliva in oral processing: Reconsidering the breakdown path paradigm. *Journal of Texture Studies*, (January), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1111/jtxs.12411
- Bongaerts, J. H. H., Fourtouni, K., & Stokes, J. R. (2007). Soft-tribology: Lubrication in a compliant PDMS PDMS contact. *Tribology International*, 40(10-12 SPEC. ISS.), 1531–1542.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.triboint.2007.01.007
- Bongaerts, J. H. H., Rossetti, D., & Stokes, J. R. (2007). The lubricating properties of human whole saliva. *Tribology Letters*, *27*(3), 277–287. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11249-007-9232-y

- Brossard, N., Cai, H., Osorio, F., Bordeu, E., & Chen, J. (2016). "Oral" Tribological Study on the Astringency Sensation of Red Wines. *Journal of Texture Studies*, 47(5), 392–402. https://doi.org/10.1111/jtxs.12184
- Cai, H., Li, Y., & Chen, J. (2017). Rheology and Tribology Study of the Sensory Perception of Oral Care Products. *Biotribology*, *10*(May), 17–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotri.2017.03.001
- Campbell, C. L., Foegeding, E. A., & van de Velde, F. (2017). A comparison of the lubrication behavior of whey protein model foods using tribology in linear and elliptical movement. *Journal of Texture Studies*, *48*(4), 335–341. https://doi.org/10.1111/jtxs.12278
- Carpenter, G., Bozorgi, S., Vladescu, S., Forte, A. E., Myant, C., Potineni, R. V., ... Baier, S. K. (2019). A study of saliva lubrication using a compliant oral mimic. *Food Hydrocolloids*, *92*(January), 10–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2019.01.049
- Carvalho-da-silva, A. M., Damme, I. Van, Taylor, W., Hort, J., & Wolf, B. (2013). Oral processing of two milk chocolate samples. *Food & Function*, *4*, 461–469. https://doi.org/10.1039/c2fo30173c
- Chen, J. (2020). It is important to differentiate sensory property from the material property. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, *96*(July), 268–270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2019.12.014
- Chen, J., & Stokes, J. R. (2012). Rheology and tribology: Two distinctive regimes of food texture sensation. *Trends in Food Science and Technology*, *25*(1), 4–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2011.11.006
- Chen, L., & Opara, L. U. (2013). Approaches to analysis and modeling texture in fresh and processed foods
 A review. Journal of Food Engineering, 119(3), 497–507. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2013.06.028
- Cheng, S., Gandevia, S. C., Green, M., Sinkus, R., & Bilston, L. E. (2011). Viscoelastic properties of the tongue and soft palate using MR elastography. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 44(3), 450–454. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2010.09.027
- Chong, P. H., Chen, J., Yin, D., Upadhyay, R., Mo, L., & Han, L. (2019). "Oral" tribology study on saliva-tea compound mixtures: Correlation between sweet aftertaste (Huigan) perception and friction coefficient. *Food Research International, 125*(January), 108642. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2019.108642

Cohen, C., Restagno, F., Poulard, C., & Léger, L. (2011). Incidence of the molecular organization on friction

at soft polymer interfaces. Soft Matter, 7(18), 8535–8541. https://doi.org/10.1039/c1sm05874f

- De Almeida, P. D. V., Grégio, A. M. T., Machado, M. Â. N., De Lima, A. A. S., & Azevedo, L. R. (2008). Saliva composition and functions: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Contemporary Dental Practice*, 9(3), 72–80. https://doi.org/10.5005/jcdp-9-3-72
- De Vicente, J., Stokes, J. R., & Spikes, H. A. (2005). Lubrication properties of non-adsorbing polymer solutions in soft elastohydrodynamic (EHD) contacts. *Tribology International*, 38(5), 515–526. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.triboint.2004.11.001
- de Wijk, R. A., & Prinz, J. F. (2005). The role of friction in perceived oral texture. *Food Quality and Preference*, *16*(2), 121–129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2004.03.002
- Di Cicco, F., Oosterlinck, F., Tromp, H., & Sein, A. (2019). Comparative study of whey protein isolate gel and polydimethylsiloxane as tribological surfaces to differentiate friction properties of commercial yogurts. *Food Hydrocolloids*, *97*(July), 105204. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2019.105204
- Dowson, D. (1998). History of Tribology (2nd editio). London: Professional Engineering Publishers.
- Dresselhuis, D. M., de Hoog, E. H. A., Cohen Stuart, M. A., & van Aken, G. A. (2008). Application of oral tissue in tribological measurements in an emulsion perception context. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 22, 323– 335. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2006.12.008
- Dresselhuis, D. M., Klok, H. J., Stuart, M. A. C., De Vries, R. J., Van Aken, G. A., & De Hoog, E. H. A. (2007).
 Tribology of o/w emulsions under mouth-like conditions: Determinants of friction. *Food Biophysics*, 2(4), 158–171. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11483-007-9040-9
- Fitzgerald, M. L., Tsai, S., Bellan, L. M., Sappington, R., Xu, Y., & Li, D. (2019). The relationship between the Young's modulus and dry etching rate of polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS). *Biomedical Microdevices*, 21(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10544-019-0379-8
- Fuhrmann, P. L., Aguayo-Mendoza, M., Jansen, B., Stieger, M., & Scholten, E. (2020). Characterisation of friction behaviour of intact soft solid foods and food boli. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 100(October 2019), 105441. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2019.105441
- Gabriele, A., Spyropoulos, F., & Norton, I. T. (2010). A conceptual model for fluid gel lubrication, 4205– 4213. https://doi.org/10.1039/c001907k

Garrec, D. A., & Norton, I. T. (2012). Boundary lubrication by sodium salts: A Hofmeister series effect.

Journal of Colloid and Interface Science, 379(1), 33–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcis.2012.04.049

- Godoi, F. C., Bhandari, B. R., & Prakash, S. (2017). Tribo-rheology and sensory analysis of a dairy semisolid. *Food Hydrocolloids*, *70*, 240–250. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2017.04.011
- Goh, S. M., Versluis, P., Appelqvist, I. A. M., & Bialek, L. (2010). Tribological measurements of foods using a rheometer. *Food Research International, 43*(1), 183–186. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2009.09.024
- Goiris, K., Jaskula-Goiris, B., Syryn, E., Van Opstaele, F., De Rouck, G., Aerts, G., & De Cooman, L. (2014). The flavoring potential of hop polyphenols in beer. *Journal of the American Society of Brewing Chemists*, 72(2), 135–142. https://doi.org/10.1094/ASBCJ-2014-0327-01
- Guinard, J., & Mazzucchelli, R. (1996). The sensory perception of texture and mouthfeel. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 7(July), 213–219.
- Hanh, A. R., & Frank, M. E. (2014). Fundamentals of oral histology and physiology. Wiley Blackwell, USA.
- He, Q., Bramante, F., Davies, A., Elleman, C., Fourtouni, K., & Wolf, B. (2018). Material properties of exvivo milk chocolate boluses examined in relation to texture perception. *Food and Function*, *9*, 3532–3546. https://doi.org/10.1039/C8FO00548F
- He, Q., Hort, J., & Wolf, B. (2016). Predicting sensory perceptions of thickened solutions based on rheological analysis. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 61, 221–232. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2016.05.010
- Hemmilä, S., Cauich-Rodríguez, J. V., Kreutzer, J., & Kallio, P. (2012). Rapid, simple, and cost-effective treatments to achieve long-term hydrophilic PDMS surfaces. *Applied Surface Science*, 258(24), 9864– 9875. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsusc.2012.06.044
- Humphrey, S. P., & Williamson, R. T. (2001). A review of saliva: Normal composition, flow, and function. *The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry*, *85*(2), 162–169.
- Hutchings, I., Gee, M., & Santner, E. (2006). Friction and Wear. In H. Czichos, T. Saito, & L. Smith (Eds.), Springer Handbook of Materials Measurement Methods. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-30300-8_13
- Hutchings, J. B., & Lillford, P. J. (1988). The Perception of Food Texture The Philosophy of the Breakdown Path. *Journal of Texture Studies*, *19*(2), 103–115. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-

- Jacobson, B. (2003). The Stribeck memorial lecture, *36*, 781–789. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-679X(03)00094-X
- Jost, H. (1966). Lubrication (tribology), education and research; a report on the present position and industry's needs. H.M. Stationery Office, London.
- Joyner, H. S., Pernell, C. W., & Daubert, C. R. (2014a). Beyond surface selection: The impact of different methodologies on tribological measurements. *Journal of Food Engineering*, *134*, 45–58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2014.03.003
- Joyner, H. S., Pernell, C. W., & Daubert, C. R. (2014b). Impact of Oil-in-Water Emulsion Composition and Preparation Method on Emulsion Physical Properties and Friction Behaviors. *Tribology Letters*, *56*, 143–160. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11249-014-0393-1
- Joyner, H. S., Pernell, C. W., & Daubert, C. R. (2014c). Impact of parameter settings on normal force and gap height during tribological measurements. *Journal of Food Engineering*, *137*, 51–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2014.03.019
- Kieserling, K., Schalow, S., & Drusch, S. (2018). Method Development and Validation of Tribological Measurements for Differentiation of Food in a Rheometer. *Biotribology*, 16(January), 25–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotri.2018.09.002
- Kim, J. M., Wolf, F., & Baier, S. K. (2015). Effect of varying mixing ratio of PDMS on the consistency of the soft-contact Stribeck curve for glycerol solutions. *Tribology International*, *89*, 46–53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.triboint.2014.12.010
- Kiumarsi, M., Shahbazi, M., Yeganehzad, S., Majchrzak, O. L., & Benjamin, W. (2019). Relation between structural, mechanical and sensory properties of gluten-free bread as affected by modified dietary fibers. *Food Chemistry*, 277, 664–673. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2018.11.015
- Kokini, J. L., Kadane, J. B., & Cussler, E. L. (1977). Liquid Texture Perceived in the Mouth. *Journal of Texture Studies*, 8(2), 195–218. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-4603.1977.tb01175.x
- Krebs, G., Müller, M., Becker, T., & Gastl, M. (2019). Characterization of the macromolecular and sensory profile of non-alcoholic beers produced with various methods. *Food Research International*, *116*(August 2018), 508–517. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2018.08.067

- Krop, E. M., Hetherington, M. M., Holmes, M., Miquel, S., & Sarkar, A. (2019). On relating rheology and oral tribology to sensory properties in hydrogels. *Food Hydrocolloids*, *88*(April 2018), 101–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2018.09.040
- Krzeminski, A., Wohlhüter, S., Heyer, P., Utz, J., & Hinrichs, J. (2012). Measurement of lubricating properties in a tribosystem with different surface roughness. *International Dairy Journal*, 26(1), 23–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2012.02.005
- Laguna, L., Bartolomé, B., & Moreno-Arribas, M. V. (2017). Mouthfeel perception of wine: Oral physiology, components and instrumental characterization. *Trends in Food Science and Technology*, *59*, 49–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2016.10.011
- Laguna, L., & Sarkar, A. (2017). Oral tribology: update on the relevance to study astringency in wines. *Tribology* - *Materials, Surfaces and Interfaces, 11*(2), 116–123. https://doi.org/10.1080/17515831.2017.1347736
- Laguna, L., Sarkar, A., Bryant, M. G., Beadling, A. R., Bartolomé, B., & Victoria Moreno-Arribas, M. (2017).
 Exploring mouthfeel in model wines: Sensory-to-instrumental approaches. *Food Research International*, *102*(January), 478–486. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2017.09.009
- Laiho, S., Williams, R. P. W., Poelman, A., Appelqvist, I., & Logan, A. (2017). Effect of whey protein phase volume on the tribology, rheology and sensory properties of fat-free stirred yoghurts. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 67, 166–177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2017.01.017
- Langenaeken, N. A., De Schutter, D. P., & Courtin, C. M. (2020). Arabinoxylan from non-malted cereals can act as mouthfeel contributor in beer. *Carbohydrate Polymers*, 239(December 2019), 116257. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.carbpol.2020.116257
- Lee, J. N., Park, C., & Whitesides, G. M. (2003). Solvent Compatibility of Poly(dimethylsiloxane)-Based Microfluidic Devices. *Analytical Chemistry*, 75(23), 6544–6554. https://doi.org/10.1021/ac0346712
- Li, Y., Joyner, H. S., Carter, B. G., & Drake, M. A. (2018). Effects of fat content, pasteurization method, homogenization pressure, and storage time on the mechanical and sensory properties of bovine milk. *Journal of Dairy Science*, *101*, 2941–2955. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2017-13568
- Li, Y., Joyner, H. S., Lee, A. P., & Drake, M. A. (2018). Impact of pasteurization method and fat on milk: Relationships among rheological, tribological, and astringency behaviors. *International Dairy Journal*,

78, 28-35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2017.10.006

- Macakova, L., Yakubov, G. E., Plunkett, M. A., & Stokes, J. R. (2011). Influence of ionic strength on the tribological properties of pre-adsorbed salivary films. *Tribology International*, 44(9), 956–962. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.triboint.2010.12.006
- Malone, M. E., Appelqvist, I. A. M., & Norton, I. T. (2003). Oral behaviour of food hydrocolloids and emulsions. Part 1. Lubrication and deposition considerations. *Food Hydrocolloids*, 17(6), 763–773. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0268-005X(03)00097-3
- Martin, A., Clain, J., Buguin, A., & Brochard-Wyart, F. (2002). Wetting transitions at soft, sliding interfaces.
 Physical Review E Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics, 65(3), 031605/1-031605/4.
 https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.65.031605
- Mei, H. C. Van Der, White, D. J., & Busscher, H. J. (2004). On the wettability of soft tissues in the human oral cavity, 671–673. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archoralbio.2004.03.002
- Minekus, M., Alminger, M., Alvito, P., Ballance, S., Bohn, T., Bourlieu, C., ... Brodkorb, A. (2014). A standardised static in vitro digestion method suitable for food - an international consensus. *Food* and Function, 5(6), 1113–1124. https://doi.org/10.1039/c3fo60702j
- Morell, P., Chen, J., & Fiszman, S. (2017). The role of starch and saliva in tribology studies and the sensory perception of protein-added yogurts. *Food and Function*, *8*(2), 545–553. https://doi.org/10.1039/c6fo00259e
- Myant, C., Spikes, H. A., & Stokes, J. R. (2010). Influence of load and elastic properties on the rolling and sliding friction of lubricated compliant contacts. *Tribology International*, *43*(1–2), 55–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.triboint.2009.04.034
- Ng, S., Nguyen, P., Bhandari, B., & Prakash, S. (2017). Influence of different functional ingredients on physical properties, rheology, tribology and oral perceptions of no fat stirred yoghurt. *Journal of Texture Studies*, *49*(3), 274–285. https://doi.org/10.1111/jtxs.12307
- Nguyen, P. T. M., Bhandari, B., & Prakash, S. (2016). Tribological method to measure lubricating properties of dairy products. *Journal of Food Engineering*, *168*, 27–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2015.07.011

Nguyen, P. T. M., Kravchuk, O., Bhandari, B., & Prakash, S. (2017). Effect of different hydrocolloids on

texture, rheology, tribology and sensory perception of texture and mouthfeel of low-fat pot-set yoghurt. *Food Hydrocolloids*, *72*, 90–104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2017.05.035

- Ningtyas, D. W., Bhandari, B., Bansal, N., & Prakash, S. (2017). A tribological analysis of cream cheeses manufactured with different fat content. *International Dairy Journal*, 73, 155–165. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2017.06.005
- Ningtyas, D. W., Bhandari, B., Bansal, N., & Prakash, S. (2019). Sequential aspects of cream cheese texture perception using temporal dominance ofsensations (TDS) tool and its relation with flow and lubrication behaviour. *Food Research International*, *120*, 586–594. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2018.11.009
- Oladokun, O., Tarrega, A., James, S., Smart, K., Hort, J., & Cook, D. (2016). The impact of hop bitter acid and polyphenol profiles on the perceived bitterness of beer. *Food Chemistry*, *205*, 212–220. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2016.03.023
- Pandey, A., Karpitschka, S., Venner, C. H., & Snoeijer, J. H. (2016). Lubrication of soft viscoelastic solids. Journal of Fluid Mechanics, 799, 433–447. https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2016.375
- Pang, Z., Xu, R., Zhu, Y., Li, H., Bansal, N., & Liu, X. (2019). Comparison of rheological, tribological, and microstructural properties of soymilk gels acidified with glucono-δ-lactone or culture. *Food Research International*, *121*(June 2018), 798–805. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2018.12.062
- Pitenis, A. A., Urueña, J. M., Hormel, T. T., Bhattacharjee, T., Niemi, S. R., Marshall, S. L., ... Sawyer, W. G. (2017). Corneal cell friction: Survival, lubricity, tear films, and mucin production over extended duration in vitro studies. *Biotribology*, *11*(November 2016), 77–83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotri.2017.04.003
- Pondicherry, K. S., Rummel, F., & Laeuger, J. (2018). Extended stribeck curves for food samples. *Biosurface* and *Biotribology*, 4(1), 34–37. https://doi.org/10.1049/bsbt.2018.0003
- Pradal, C., & Stokes, J. R. (2016). Oral tribology: Bridging the gap between physical measurements and sensory experience. *Current Opinion in Food Science*, 9, 34–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cofs.2016.04.008
- Prakash, S. (2016). From Rheology to Tribology: Applications of Tribology in Studying Food Oral Processing and Texture Perception. In J. Ahmed, P. Ptaszek, & S. Basu (Eds.), *Advances in Food Rheology and Its*

Applications (pp. 65-86). Elsevier Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-100431-9.00004-8

- Prakash, S., Tan, D. D. Y., & Chen, J. (2013). Applications of tribology in studying food oral processing and texture perception. *Food Research International*, 54(2), 1627–1635. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2013.10.010
- Ranc, H., Elkhyat, A., Servais, C., Mac-Mary, S., Launay, B., & Humbert, P. (2006). Friction coefficient and wettability of oral mucosal tissue: Changes induced by a salivary layer. *Colloids and Surfaces A: Physicochemical and Engineering Aspects, 276*(1–3), 155–161. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colsurfa.2005.10.033
- Rudge, R. E. D., Scholten, E., & Dijksman, J. A. (2020). Natural and induced surface roughness determine frictional regimes in hydrogel pairs. *Tribology International*, 141(July 2019), 105903. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.triboint.2019.105903
- Rudge, R. E., Scholten, E., & Dijksman, J. A. (2019). Advances and challenges in soft tribology with applications to foods. *Current Opinion in Food Science*, 27, 90–97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cofs.2019.06.011
- Samaroo, K. J., Tan, M., Andresen Eguiluz, R. C., Gourdon, D., Putnam, D., & Bonassar, L. J. (2017). Tunable Lubricin-mimetics for Boundary Lubrication of Cartilage. *Biotribology*, 9, 18–23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotri.2017.02.001
- Sanahuja, S., Upadhyay, R., Briesen, H., Chen, J., Street, X., & Street, X. (2017). Spectral analysis of the stick-slip phenomenon in "oral" tribological texture evaluation. *Journal of Texture Studies*, 48(4), 318–334. https://doi.org/10.1111/jtxs.12266
- Sarkar, A., Andablo-Reyes, E., Bryant, M., Dowson, D., & Neville, A. (2019). Lubrication of soft oral surfaces.
 Current Opinion in Colloid and Interface Science, 39(February), 61–75.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cocis.2019.01.008
- Sarkar, A., Kanti, F., Gulotta, A., Murray, B. S., & Zhang, S. (2017). Aqueous lubrication, structure and rheological properties of whey protein microgel Particles. *Langmuir*, 33(51), 14699–14708. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.langmuir.7b03627
- Sarkar, A., & Krop, E. M. (2019). Marrying oral tribology to sensory perception: a systematic review. *Current Opinion in Food Science*, *27*, 64–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cofs.2019.05.007

- Sarkar, A., Xu, F., & Lee, S. (2019). Human saliva and model saliva at bulk to adsorbed phases similarities and differences. Advances in Colloid and Interface Science, 273, 102034. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cis.2019.102034
- Schipper, R. G., Silletti, E., & Vingerhoeds, M. H. (2007). Saliva as research material: Biochemical, physicochemical and practical aspects. *Archives of Oral Biology*, 52, 1114–1135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archoralbio.2007.06.009
- Selway, N., Chan, V., & Stokes, J. R. (2017). Influence of fluid viscosity and wetting on multiscale viscoelastic lubrication in soft tribological contacts. *Soft Matter*, 13(8), 1702–1715. https://doi.org/10.1039/c6sm02417c
- Selway, N., & Stokes, J. R. (2014). Soft Materials Deformation, Flow, and Lubrication Between Compliant Substrates: Impact on Flow Behavior, Mouthfeel, Stability, and Flavor. *Annual Review of Food Science* and Technology, 5(1), 373–393. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-food-030212-182657
- Shahsavan, H., Quinn, J., d'Eon, J., & Zhao, B. (2015). Surface modification of polydimethylsiloxane elastomer for stable hydrophilicity, optical transparency and film lubrication. *Colloids and Surfaces A: Physicochemical and Engineering Aspects*, *482*, 267–275. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colsurfa.2015.05.024
- Shewan, H. M., Pradal, C., & Stokes, J. R. (2019). Tribology and its growing use toward the study of food oral processing and sensory perception. *Journal of Texture Studies*, (March), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/jtxs.12452
- Smith, S. A., Guthrie, B., Steinbach, A., Lindgren, T., & Debon, S. (2015). Determining causal relationships between physical structure and sensory function in food systems via partial least squares (PLS) path modelling. ACS Symposium Series, 1191, 313–332. https://doi.org/10.1021/bk-2015-1191.ch022
- Sonne, A., Busch-Stockfisch, M., Weiss, J., & Hinrichs, J. (2014). Improved mapping of in-mouth creaminess of semi-solid dairy products by combining rheology, particle size, and tribology data. *LWT Food Science and Technology*, *59*(1), 342–347. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2014.05.047
- Steinbach, A., Guthrie, B., Smith, S., Lindgren, T., & Debon, S. (2014). Normal force-controlled tribological measurement of soft drinks and lubrication additives. *Journal of Food Measurement and Characterization*, 8(2), 142–148. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11694-014-9174-7

- Stevenson, H., Jaggard, M., Akhbari, P., Vaghela, U., Gupte, C., & Cann, P. (2019). The role of denatured synovial fluid proteins in the lubrication of artificial joints. *Biotribology*, 17, 49–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotri.2019.03.003
- Stokes, J. R. (2012). 'Oral 'Tribology. In J. Chen & L. Engelen (Eds.), Food Oral Processing: Fundamentals of Eating and Sensory Perception (First edit, pp. 265–287). Blackwell Publishing Ltd. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444360943.ch12
- Stokes, J. R., Boehm, M. W., & Baier, S. K. (2013). Oral processing, texture and mouthfeel: From rheology to tribology and beyond. *Current Opinion in Colloid and Interface Science*, 18(4), 349–359. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cocis.2013.04.010
- Stokes, J. R., Macakova, L., Chojnicka-Paszun, A., De Kruif, C. G., & De Jongh, H. H. J. (2011). Lubrication, adsorption, and rheology of aqueous polysaccharide solutions. *Langmuir*, *27*(7), 3474–3484. https://doi.org/10.1021/la104040d
- Tan, S. H., Nguyen, N. T., Chua, Y. C., & Kang, T. G. (2010). Oxygen plasma treatment for reducing hydrophobicity of a sealed polydimethylsiloxane microchannel. *Biomicrofluidics*, 4(3), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3466882
- Timm, K., Myant, C., Spikes, H. A., & Grunze, M. (2011). Particulate lubricants in cosmetic applications. *Tribology International*, 44(12), 1695–1703. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.triboint.2011.06.017
- Torres, O., Yamada, A., Rigby, N. M., Hanawa, T., Kawano, Y., & Sarkar, A. (2019). Gellan gum: A new member in the dysphagia thickener family. *Biotribology*, 17(November 2018), 8–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotri.2019.02.002
- Upadhyay, R., & Chen, J. (2019). Smoothness as a tactile percept: Correlating 'oral' tribology with sensory measurements. *Food Hydrocolloids*, *87*(February 2018), 38–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2018.07.036
- Urueña, J. M., McGhee, E. O., Angelini, T. E., Dowson, D., Sawyer, W. G., & Pitenis, A. A. (2018). Normal
 Load Scaling of Friction in Gemini Hydrogels. *Biotribology*, *13*(October 2017), 30–35.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotri.2018.01.002
- Vakis, A. I., Yastrebov, V. A., Scheibert, J., Nicola, L., Dini, D., Minfray, C., ... Ciavarella, M. (2018). Modeling and simulation in tribology across scales: An overview. *Tribology International*, *125*(February), 169–

199. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.triboint.2018.02.005

- van Stee, M. A., de Hoog, E., & van de Velde, F. (2017). Oral Parameters Affecting Ex-vivo Tribology. *Biotribology*, *11*, 84–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotri.2017.05.001
- Voutat, C., Nohava, J., Wandel, J., & Zysset, P. (2019). The Dynamic Friction Coefficient of the Wet Bone-Implant Interface: Influence of Load, Speed, Material and Surface Finish. *Biotribology*, 17, 64–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotri.2019.03.002
- Wagoner, T. B., Çakır-Fuller, E., Shingleton, R., Drake, M., & Foegeding, E. A. (2019). Viscosity drives texture perception of protein beverages more than hydrocolloid type. *Journal of Texture Studies*, (July), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1111/jtxs.12471
- Wandersman, E., Candelier, R., Debrégeas, G., & Prevost, A. (2011). Texture-induced modulations of friction force: The fingerprint effect. *Physical Review Letters*, 107(16), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.164301
- Wang, S., Olarte Mantilla, S. M., Smith, P. A., Stokes, J. R., & Smyth, H. E. (2020). Astringency sub-qualities drying and pucker are driven by tannin and pH Insights from sensory and tribology of a model wine system. *Food Hydrocolloids*, *109*(April), 106109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2020.106109
- Wang, X., Wang, X., Upadhyay, R., & Chen, J. (2019). Topographic study of human tongue in relation to oral tribology. *Food Hydrocolloids*, *95*, 116–121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2019.04.022
- Wang, Z., Volinsky, A. A., & Gallant, N. D. (2014). Crosslinking Effect on Polydimethylsiloxane Elastic Modulus Measured by Custom-Built Compression Instrument. *Journal of Applied Polymer Science*, 41050, 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1002/app.41050
- Witt, T., & Stokes, J. R. (2015). Physics of food structure breakdown and bolus formation during oral processing of hard and soft solids. *Current Opinion in Food Science*, 3, 110–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cofs.2015.06.011
- Yakubov, G. E., Branfield, T. E., Bongaerts, J. H. H., & Stokes, J. R. (2015). Tribology of particle suspensions in rolling-sliding soft contacts. *Biotribology*, *3*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotri.2015.09.003
- Yashima, S., Romero, V., Wandersman, E., Frétigny, C., Chaudhury, M. K., Chateauminois, A., & Prevost, A.
 M. (2015). Normal contact and friction of rubber with model randomly rough surfaces. *Soft Matter*, *11*(5), 871–881. https://doi.org/10.1039/c4sm02346c

Compound name	Chemical formula	Upadhyay & Chen (2019)	Minekus et al. (2014)	Krop et al. (2019; Torres et al. 2019)	Laguna et al. (2017)	Cai et al. (2017)	Sarkar et al. (2019)
рН		7	7	6.8			
Sodium chloride	NaCl	0.117		0.16	1.594	0.111	1.594
Ammonium nitrate	NH4NO3			0.33			0.328
Dipotassium phosphate	K2HPO4			0.64	0.636		0.636
Potassium citrate monohydrate	KH2PO4		0.5032				
Monopotassium phosphate	KCI	0.149	1.13	0.2	0.202	1.492	0.202
Potassium citrate monohydrate	K3C6H5O7.H2O			0.31			0.308
Uric acid	C5H3N4O3Na			0.02	0.021		0.021
Urea	H2NCONH2			0.2	0.198		0.198
Sodium lactate	C3H5O3Na			0.15			0.146
Sodium carbonate	NaHCO3	2.1	1.14			3.948	
Magnesium chloride	MgCl2(H2O)6		0.031			0.096	
Ammonium carbonate	(NH4)2CO3		0.006				
Calcium chloride	CaCl2		0.083			0.278	
Carboxymethylcellulose	-					0.65	
Glycerin	C3H8O3					1	
Porcine gastric mucin type II	-	1.5		3	3	1.2	0-30
Alpha-amylase	-	2 g/L	75 U/mL	75 U/mL		2.0 g/L	

Table 1: Overview of various recipes for artificial saliva from literature.

2	F . 1	Tribological	Tribopairs		F _N	т			
Purpose	Food	attachment	Upper Lower		(N)	(°C)	U (mm/s)	Reference	
Saliva lubricity and cationic astringents (Mech/app)	Saliva, astringent cations	Ball-on-3 pins	Steel ball	PDMS (lab made)	6	N/A	0.01-1000, 60 mins @ 1	(Biegler, Delius, Käsdorf, Hofmann, & Lieleg, 2016)	
Modified dietary fibres e.o. structural, mechanical, sensory (Appl)	Gluten-free bread	Three-balls on sample	Steel ball	Bread	0.2	20	1	(Kiumarsi, Shahbazi, Yeganehzad, Majchrzak, & Benjamin, 2019)	
Ex-vivo chocolate boluses, material properties and texture perception (Appl)	Chocolate	Ball-on-3 plates	Steel ball	PDMS (lab made)	3	40	0.02-750	(He et al., 2018)	
Differentiation of two chocolate samples with identical composition and viscosity (Appl)	Chocolate	Ball-on-3 plates	Steel ball	Polyurethane	0.5	37	0.001-420	(Carvalho-da-silva et al., 2013)	
Investigate discrimination by sensory compared to tribo and rheo (Appl)	Custard, starch, carrageenan, fat	Half-ring- on-plate	Steel ring	Surgical tape	2	35	0.15-100	(Godoi et al., 2017)	
Development of tribological method for dairy (Meth)	Milk, cream cheeses	Half-ring- on-plate	Steel ring	Surgical tape	1, 2	35	1-600	(Nguyen et al., 2016)	
Mapping in-mouth creaminess (Appl)	Yoghurt	Ball-on-3 plates	Steel ball	SBR	3	10	0.0007-667	(Sonne et al., 2014)	
Surface properties (R _a) to sensory (Meth/appl)	Demin, sunflower oil, yoghurt	Ball-on-3 plates	Steel ball	NR, FR, SBR, PTFE	3, 9	20	0.07-2000	(Krzeminski et al., 2012)	
Compare whey protein isolate and PDMS for yoghurts (Meth)	Demin, sunflower oil, yoghurt	Ball-on-3 plates	Steel ball	WPI, PDMS	0.1	20	100-1, 1000-1, 200-2	(Di Cicco et al., 2019)	
Whey protein phase volume, fat free yoghurts, rheology, tribo, sensory (Appl)	Fat-free yoghurts	Ball-on-3 plates	Steel ball	SBR	3	10	0.0007-667	(Laiho et al., 2017)	
Gelatine, xanthan gum, carrageenan and modified starch e.o. texture of yoghurts (Mech/appl)	Yoghurt	Half-ring- on-plate	Steel ring	Surgical tape	2	35	0.008-60	(Nguyen et al., 2017)	
Storage, homogenisation, pasteurisation, fat e.o. mechanical, sensory (Appl)	Milk	Double-ball- on-plate	Polypro- pylene	PDMS (lab made)	1	25	0,15-750	(Li, Joyner, Carter, et al., 2018)	
Pasteurisation, storage and fat content e.o. rheo/tribo and astringency (Appl)	Milk	Double-ball- on-plate	Polypro- pylene	PDMS (lab made)	1	22	0.15-750	(Li, Joyner, Lee, et al., 2018)	
Inulin, pectin, galacto-oligosacchs, beta glucan e.o. physical, rheo, tribo, sensory (Mech/appl)	Yoghurt	Half-ring- on-plate	Steel ring	Surgical tape	2	35	0.8-90	(Ng et al., 2017)	
Temporal dominance sensations (TDS) and tribo (Mech/appl)	Cream cheese	Half-ring- on-plate	Steel ring	Surgical tape	2	35	0.1-600	(Ningtyas et al., 2019)	

Fat e.o. tribo, rheo, structure (Mech)	Cream cheese	Half-ring- on-plate	Steel ring	Surgical tape	1, 2, 3, 5	35	0.3-300	(Ningtyas et al., 2017)
Introduction of attachment (Meth/appl)	Milk, maltodextrin, xanthan gum	Ball-on-3 plates	Steel ball	Thermoplastic elastomer	3	20	0.4-20	(Baier et al., 2009)
Tribo/rheo properties, glucone-delta-lactone or EPS cultures (Mech)	Soy yoghurt	Full ring-on- plate	Steel ring	Surgical tape	1	4	0.2-200	(Pang et al., 2019)
Demonstration reproducible results on soft drinks, comparison of MTM and MRC301 (Meth)	Soft drinks, guar gum, locust bean gum, sodium carboxymethyl cellulose	Ball-on-3 plates	Steel ball	SEBS	3	20	0.47-263	(Steinbach et al., 2014)
Method development and validation (Meth)	Demin, sunflower oil, yoghurt	Ball-on- plates/pins	Steel/ glass	PTFE, PDMS, SBR	3	20	10 ⁻⁶ -1000	(Kieserling et al., 2018)
Validation of tribo using rheometer (Meth)	Corn syrup	Double-ball- on plate	Steel ball	Silicon	3	20	0.23-2300	(Goh et al., 2010)
Influence of measurement methodology (Meth)	Mineral oil	Double-ball- on- plate/ball- on-3 plate	Polypro- pylene	PDMS, HDPE, WPI	3, 5	22	0.8-9	(Joyner et al., 2014a)
Emulsion pH, salt, homogenisation pressure e.o. friction, rheology and physics (Meth/appl)	Oil in water	Double-ball- on plate	Polypro- pylene	WPI	2, 1	25	10-1	(Joyner et al., 2014b)
Effect of parameter settings on F _N , D, μ (Meth)	Mineral oil	Double-ball- on plate	Polypro- pylene	WPI, steel	1, 2, 3, 5	22	0, 1, 10 RPM	(Joyner et al., 2014c)

Table 2: Table of original papers using rheometers with tribology attachments. Abbreviations: Approaches of investigation; Mech: Mechanism, Appl: Application, Meth: Method. E.o.: Effect on/of. Rheo: Rheological properties. Tribo: Tribological properties. EPS: Exopolysaccharides. F_N: Normal force. D: Gap distance between tribopairs. μ: Friction coefficient. T: Temperature. U: Entrainment speed; in cases where speed was not given in mm/s, this is based on own calculations. PDMS: Polydimethylsiloxane. WPI: Whey protein isolate. PTFE: Polytetrafluoroethylene. HDPE: High Density Polyethylene. SBR: Styrene butadiene rubber. NR: Natural rubber. FR: Foamed rubber. SEBS: Styrene–ethylene– butylene–styrene block co-polymer. Figure 1:



Figure 2:













Figure 6:



Figure captions

ALL FIGURES IN COLOUR PLEASE

Figure 1: Graphical representation of the characteristics of (a) the food, (b) the mouth, and (c) their interaction that are important for measuring mouthfeel with tribology. Adapted from (Pradal & Stokes, 2016)

Figure 2: Graphical representation of the physiology of the mouth. (a) Schematic illustration of oral cavity highlighting the soft (tongue) and hard (tooth enamel and palate) oral surfaces with the lubricant (saliva). (b) Building blocks of soft tongue surface (θ_w is the water contact angle, θ_{wl} is the water contact angle upon adsorption of salivary film of nanometre scale). (c) Bulk saliva and adsorbed salivary pellicle. Reproduced with permission from Sarkar et al. (2019)

Figure 3: Graphical representation of friction showing $F_{kinetic}$ (torque of the measuring system), F_N (the load, W), the lubricant and the $F_{Friction}$.

Figure 4: Four representations of Stribeck curves. (a) Classic Stribeck curve with graphical representation of gap distance (D) and asperity interactions. Adapted from Pondicherry et al. (2018). (b) Extended Stribeck curve showing the static regime and transition points. Adapted from Kieserling, Schalow, & Drusch (2018). (c) Example of Stribeck curve obtained by collapsing several measurements on fluids with varying viscosity (entrainment speed scaled by viscosity). Adapted from Goh, Versluis, Appelqvist, & Bialek (2010). This Master curve (d) can then be approximated by fitting power law coefficients as per Bongaerts, Fourtouni and Stokes (2007). (d) Stribeck curve for a complex fluid (yoghurt) showing phase-dependent behaviour. Adapted from Nguyen, Kravchuk, Bhandari, & Prakash (2017).

Figure 5: Main tribological attachments used in literature. (a) Ball-on-3 plates, adapted from Shewan, Pradal and Stokes (2019). (b) Double ball-on-plate, adapted from Joyner, Pernell and Daubert (2014c). (c) Half-ring-on-plate, adapted from Godoi, Bhandari and Prakash (2017)

Figure 6: Graphical representation of suggested flow chart highlighting important steps and considerations at each step.