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Summary

The present paper is focused on rheology dough properties of winter wheat cultivars in relation to bread crumb properties. The rheological characteristics of wheat flour were evaluated by using Farinograph and Extensograph tests. The image analysis for bread crumb grain assessment was applied as alternative technique for more rapid and efficient measurement of bread characteristics. The highest significant positive correlation (P<0.05) was found between bread crumb properties and extensographic parameters: dough energy, maximum dough resistance and resistance to extensibility ratio. Cultivars ‘Klara’, ‘Barbara’, ‘Žitarka’ and ‘Golubica’ have shown finer and uniform bread crumbs with regard to optimal dough physicochemical characteristics.
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**Introduction**

The bread-making quality of wheat is strongly affected by gluten characteristics. Sufficient expansion and good distribution of the gas cells within dough depend on degree of the gluten strength and extensibility (Veraverbeke and Delcour, 2002; Prabhasankar et al., 2002; Lasztity, 2003). Bread crumbs and their properties depend on wheat cultivar, fermentation conditions, baking and storage parameters (Giovanelli et al., 1997; Magdić et al., 2006; Karaoglu, 2006). Different tests as farinograph, extensograph, alveograph and mixograph can be used to provide an assessment of gluten quality through determination of physical dough properties. For the evaluation of wheat end use quality the bread crumb properties are certainly one of the most important. In general, the gluten quality is inherent in a genotype and is not greatly affected by environmental conditions or cultural practices. In assessment of bread crumb the image analysis has been used as an objective and highly confident method (Zayas, 1993; Zghal et al., 1999, 2001; Magdić et al., 2004).

For applying image analysis in bread crumb evaluation, bread loaves should be correctly sliced and slices must be properly illuminated for obtaining objective results of image analysis. Later image processing is optional and depends on a sample area that can be rectangular medium part or total surface of a slice. Finally, main bread crumb attributes can be evaluated by computer programs based on different algorithms (Heijden, 1998; Zghal et al., 1999; Crowley et al., 2002; Gallagher et al., 2003).

**Material and methods**

Cultivars ‘Žitarka’, ‘Srpanjka’, ‘Barbara’, ‘Klara’, ‘Golubica’, ‘Kata’, ‘Monika’, ‘Ana’, ‘Demetra’, ‘Divana’ and ‘Sana’ were grown in the experimental field of the Agricultural Institute Osijek in 2001 and 2002. The experiment was set up as Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD) with three replications. Cultural practices were as recommended for optimum wheat production in this area. All plots were machine-planted and harvested. Rheological dough properties and bread crumb properties of the eleven cultivars were analyzed on samples pooled over replications.

The water absorption of flours and the mixing behaviour of dough, made from them, were determined by using Brabender Farinograph (Brabender, Duisburg, Germany) in accordance with HRN ISO 5530-1:1999. Farinogram evaluation was performed using software Brabender Farinograph for Windows ver. 2.3.7. The stretching and elasticity characteristics of dough were measured by Brabender Extensograph (Brabender, Duisburg, Germany) according to HRN ISO 5530-2:1999. Extensogram evaluation was automatically performed using software Brabender Extensograph for Windows ver. 2.1.5. All analyses were done in duplicates. Data analysis was performed using SAS Stat Software ver. 8.2. Baking test was done according to ICC No 131. This method is applicable for untreated flour, experimentally or commercially milled from wheat for the production of yeast raised bread.

In preparing for quality assessment by image analysis, bread loaves were sliced in the middle, providing two cross sections. Slices were properly illuminated (700 lux) by low voltage, halogen, and indirect illumination with four lamps.

Images were captured and presented with a surfaces size of 10 x 8 cm (960 pixels per cm²). Three loaves were produced from each of ten wheat cultivars and images of each loaf cross-section were recorded as 8-bit bitmap file with 256 grey levels. The threshold value 128 was chosen as appropriate for all samples. The same image processing operations were applied to all records (Fig. 1).

After image pre-processing, evaluation of bread crumb appearance was performed. The slice crumb analysis was done by calculating the total area of cells (sum of all spots where more than 5 pixels were connected), number of cells bigger than 5 pixels, average cell area, average radius, perimeter, minimum and maximum radius and roundness of crumbs/cells (measure of roundness is in the range between 0 - not round and 1 - perfectly circular). The value was calculated as roundness = \( \frac{4 \pi \text{total area}}{\text{perimeter}} \).
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Results and discussion

Prominent differences among cultivars were found for dough rheological properties as well as for bread crumb characteristics (Table 1 and Figure 2). Farinograph water absorption of the analyzed cultivars varied between 60.0 % for cultivar Ana and 66.7 % for cultivar Golubica. Flour water absorption is favourable genotype characteristic from miller’s and baker’s point of view because the increase of water absorption for 1 or 2 % causes 1 or 2 % higher profit. Concerning the mixing behaviour of dough, cultivars ‘Divana’ and ‘Golubica’ have shown properties of strong flour with the longest dough development time (12 min and 5 min, respectively) as well as the lowest degree of softening (7 FU and 53 FU, respectively) The lowest mixing tolerance index has been shown for the cultivars ‘Kata’, ‘Monika’ and ‘Sana’ with degree of softening over 100 FU (Table 1).

Regarding the resistance to stretching and elasticity of dough, the maximum height (over 400 EU) and area under the extensogram curve (over 100 cm²) have been shown for the cultivars ‘Srpanjka’, ‘Demetra’, ‘Divana’ and ‘Ana’.

The cultivars ‘Klara’, ‘Barbara’, ‘Žitarka’ and ‘Golubica’ with medium gluten characteristics, according to both, the farinographic and extensographic properties, had smaller crumbs on slices (12.60-15.32 pixels in total per crumb), while the cultivars ‘Srpanjka’, ‘Ana’, ‘Demetra’ and ‘Divana’ with very strong gluten characteristics had bigger crumbs (17.16-21.07 pixels per crumb) (Table 1 and Figure 2). In our previous dough rheological studies (Jurković et al., 2000; Horvat et al., 2006), the cultivars ‘Srpanjka’, ‘Ana’, ‘Demetra’ and ‘Divana’ have also shown very strong gluten characteristics regarding gluten index value, farinographic and extensographic properties.

The highest positive correlation (P<0.05) was found between all bread crumb attributes, except roundness, and gluten strength expressed as dough energy (r=0.59-0.84), dough resistance expressed as maximum resistance to ext-

### Table 1. Mean values of rheological dough properties of analyzed wheat cultivars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultivars</th>
<th>WA (%)</th>
<th>DDT (min)</th>
<th>STA (min)</th>
<th>R (min)</th>
<th>DS (FU)</th>
<th>E (cm²)</th>
<th>EXT (mm)</th>
<th>RMAX (EU)</th>
<th>R/EXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Žitarka</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srpanjka</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klara</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golubica</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kata</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monika</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demetra</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divana</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sana</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X̄</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>30.70</td>
<td>37.27</td>
<td>28.97</td>
<td>123.87</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aWA=Water absorption (%); DDT=Dough development time (min); STA=Stability (min); R=Resistance (min); DS=Degree of softening (FU); E=Dough energy (cm²); EXT=Extensibility (mm); RMAX=Maximum resistance (EU); R/EXT=Resistance to Extensibility ratio

![Figure 2](image-url). Bread slice image analysis results (all in pixels except Roundness (dimensionless)) for eleven wheat cultivars
tension ($r=0.73-0.89$) and dough elasticity expressed as resistance to extensibility ratio ($r=0.73-0.86$) (Table 2), which is in agreement with results of other authors (Scanlon et al., 2000; Zghal et al., 2001).

Among farinographic dough properties, the highest positive correlations ($P<0.05$) were noticed between stability and area ($r=0.59$), radius ($r=0.64$) and minimum radius ($r=0.60$). Significant negative correlations ($P<0.05$) were found between water absorption and perimeter ($r=-0.60$) and maximum radius ($r=-0.64$), as well as between minimum radius and degree of softening ($r=-0.62$) (Table 2).

### Conclusions

The cultivars ‘Klara’, ‘Barbara’, ‘Žitarka’ and ‘Golubica’ have shown the best loaf medium part porosity with optimal gluten quality regarding analyzed dough and bread crumb parameters. The highest positive correlation was found between bread crumbs attributes and gluten strength properties evaluated by extensographic analysis. In accordance with the obtained results of dough rheological and bread crumb properties it would be possible to evaluate the cultivars suitability for bread making industry.
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### Table 2. Correlation between bread crumb properties and rheological dough properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>WA*</th>
<th>DDT</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>DS</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>EXT</th>
<th>RMAX</th>
<th>R/EXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.59*</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.64*</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.78*</td>
<td>0.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.64*</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.70*</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.83*</td>
<td>0.86*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter</td>
<td>-0.60*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.62*</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.73*</td>
<td>0.78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min radius</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.65*</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-0.62*</td>
<td>0.84*</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.89*</td>
<td>0.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max radius</td>
<td>-0.64*</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.59*</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.74*</td>
<td>0.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundness</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rheological dough properties: WA=Water absorption (%); DDT=Dough development time (min); STA=Stability (min); R=Resistance (min); DS=Degree of softening (FU); E=Dough energy (cm2); EXT=Extensibility (mm); RMAX=Maximum resistance (EU); R/EXT=Resistance to Extensibility ratio