Galmarini, M. V. ; Symoneaux, R. ; Visalli, M. ; Zamora, M. C. ; Schlich, P.

Could time-intensity by a trained panel be replaced with a progressive profile done by consumers? A case on chewing-gum

Could Time-Intensity by a trained panel be replaced with a progressive profile done by consumers? A case on chewing-gum

Galmarini, M.V.[1,2,4], Symoneaux, R.[3], Visalli, M.[4], Zamora, M.C. [1,2], Schlich, P.[4]*

[1] *Facultad de Ciencias Agrarias, Pontificia Universidad Católica Argentina, Buenos Aires, Argentina*

[2] *CONICET, Buenos Aires, Argentina*

[3]*Groupe ESA, UPSP GRAPPE, SFR QUASAV 4207, Angers, France*

[4]*INRA, UMR1324 Centre des Sciences du Goût et de l'Alimentation, Dijon, France*

* Corresponding author: mgalmarini@gmail.com

Tel: +54 11 4552 2711

Abstract

How to evaluate a chewing-gum profile in a reliable cost and time-efficient manner giving the industry the insight they need on their new products? The aim of the present work was to compare the temporary descriptive results obtained by a reference method such as Time-Intensity (T-I) done by a trained panel to those acquired by a progressive profile (PP) by regular consumers in *in-home* conditions. The evolution of four different attributes (sweetness, mint aroma, hardness and freshness) during time was studied by each method. Results were compared on the basis of three different parameters: the maximum intensity reached (I_{max}), the time to reach this maximum intensity ($T_{Imax,}$); and the area under the curve (AUC), which integrated both time and intensity. Sample discrimination was good for the trained panel and for the consumers. Comparable results were obtained for the parameter AUC for all attributes, showing a similar global description of all samples by both methods and groups. However, differences were found in the T_{Imax}. According to the obtained results, T-I still gives