Gastric digestion and changes in serum amino acid concentrations after consumption of casein from cow and goat milk: a randomized crossover trial in healthy men

Short title: Digestion of casein from cow and goat milk

Elise J.M. van Eijnatten, PhD, Guido Camps, PhD, Wolf Rombouts, PhD, Linette Pellis, PhD, Paul A.M. Smeets, PhD

List of all authors; their positions and institutions at the time of work performed:

Elise J.M. van Eijnatten, PhD, PhD candidate at the Division of Human Nutrition and Health, Wageningen University

Guido Camps, PhD, researcher at the Division of Human Nutrition and Health, Wageningen University

Wolf Rombouts, PhD, scientist at Ausnutria Dairy Corporation Ltd

Linette Pellis, PhD, scientist at Ausnutria Dairy Corporation Ltd

Paul A.M. Smeets, PhD, senior scientist at the Division of Human Nutrition and Health, Wageningen University

Paul Smeets is associate editor at The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition and played no role in the Journal's evaluation of the manuscript.

Location of department and institution where the work was performed:

Division of Human Nutrition and Health, Wageningen University, Stippeneng 4, 6708 WE, Wageningen, The Netherlands.

Financial support: the study was funded by Ausnutria Dairy Corporation Ltd.

List of abbreviations:

95% CI	95% confidence interval
AA	Amino acids
AUC	Area under the curve
BCAA	Branch chained amino acids
BMI	Body mass index
Cow MC	Cow milk-derived micellar casein
EAA	Essential amino acids

FFA	Free fatty acids
GE	Gastric emptying
GE-t50	Gastric emptying half time
Goat MC	Goat milk-derived micellar casein
MD	Mean difference
MRI	Magnetic resonance imaging
NEAA	Non-essential amino acids
TG	Triglycerides
UHT	Ultra-high temperature processing

Clinical trial registry number: NL8137 (Netherlands Trial Registry), accessible through https://trialsearch.who.int/Trial2.aspx?TrialID=NL-OMON28580

Corresponding author contact information:
Name: Elise van Eijnatten
Mailing address: Stippeneng 4, 6708 WE Wageningen
Telephone number: +31642565543
E-mail address: elisevaneijnatten@hotmail.com

Disclosures:

Elise J.M. van Eijnatten: no conflicts of interest
Guido Camps: no conflicts of interest
Wolf Rombouts: during the study employed as a scientist at Ausnutria Dairy Corporation Ltd
Linette Pellis: during the study employed as a scientist at Ausnutria Dairy Corporation Ltd
Paul A.M. Smeets: no conflicts of interest

Author contributions to manuscript:

WR, GC and PS designed the research; EE conducted the research. EE analysed the data and drafted the paper. WR and LP helped interpreting results. GC, WR and PS revised the manuscript critically for important intellectual content. PS had primary responsibility for final content. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Data Transparency Statement: deidentified individual participant data that underlie the reported results will be made available upon reasonable request.

Word count: 5075

Number of figures: 5

Number of tables: 1

Supplementary data submitted: yes

ABSTRACT

Background: *In vitro* studies show that goat milk proteins form less compact coagulates in the stomach compared to cow milk proteins, which may facilitate gastric digestion and amino acid (AA) absorption. However, this has not been confirmed *in vivo* in humans.

Objective: To examine gastric digestion and changes in AA concentrations after cow milk-derived (cow MC) and goat milk-derived casein (goat MC) ingestion.

Methods: In this single-blind randomized cross-over study 18 men (age 23 ± 1.6 years, BMI 23 ± 1.6 kg/m^2) consumed 300 ml of a drink containing 30 g of cow MC or goat MC. Participants underwent gastric MRI scans at baseline and every 10 minutes up to 60 minutes postprandially. Blood was drawn at baseline and up to 4 hours postprandially. In addition, participants verbally rated their appetite after each MRI measurement. Primary outcomes were gastric emptying and AA concentrations. Secondary outcome was gastric coagulation as inferred by image texture metrics.

Results: Gastric emptying half-time was 80 ± 25 minutes for goat and 85 ± 24 minutes for cow MC ($p = 0.395$). In line with this, gastric emptying of the drinks over time was similar (MD 0.77 ml, 95% CI [-6.9, 8.5], $p=0.845$). Serum essential AA (MD -110 µmol/L, 95% CI [-162, -58]) was higher over time for cow MC ($p<0.001$). The image texture metric contrast was lower for cow MC (MD 0.010, 95% CI [0.001, 0.020], $p=0.036$).

Conclusion: Cow MC and goat MC have different coagulating properties, as inferred by AA concentrations and supported by image texture analysis. This did not influence overall gastric emptying or the emptying of the liquid and coagulated fractions, which were similar. This warrants further *in vivo* research on casein coagulation in the food matrix to help determine the optimal use for cow and goat milk and their protein fractions.

INTRODUCTION

Protein is an essential macronutrient used in many processes in the human body (Atherton and Smith 2012, Do, Lewis et al. 2019). It is important that ingested protein is properly digested and absorbed so that it can be used for protein synthesis (Mahé, Roos et al. 1996, van Vliet, Burd et al. 2015, Fardet, Dupont et al. 2019). Dairy products constitute a significant protein source globally (Lagrange, Whitsett et al. 2015). Cow milk dairy products are the most commonly used, but goat milk popularity is increasing (Miller and Lu 2019). One of the reasons for this is the consumers' perception of its health benefits. These benefits are hypothesized to originate from a difference in the milks' digestion due to their different casein composition (Roy, Moughan et al. 2022).

Cow and goat milk generally contain about 3.5 % protein of which caseins represent about 80% and whey proteins about 20% (Ceballos, Morales et al. 2009). During digestion in the stomach the casein micelles (CM) are destabilized by pepsin proteolysis and acidification. This results in the formation of coagulates containing protein, and if present, fat globules (Ye, Liu et al. 2019). The physical properties of these casein coagulates could affect gastric protein digestion, gastric emptying and subsequent intestinal digestion and absorption of amino acids (AA) (Huppertz and Chia 2021). Previous studies, predominantly *in vitro*, have shown that casein coagulation is affected by several factors including processing-induced protein modifications, overall product composition (food matrix), and differences in protein composition for instance between animal species (Almaas, Cases et al. 2006, Ceballos, Morales et al. 2009, Wang, Ye et al. 2018, Mulet-Cabero, Mackie et al. 2019, Eijnatten, Roelofs et al. 2023, Hettinga, Pellis et al. 2023). Human *in vivo* studies on protein

47 modifications, resulting in different cow casein forms, showed that coagulation and gastric
48 emptying can have strong effects on the postprandial rise in AA bioavailability (Trommelen,
49 Weijzen et al. 2020). Even though goat micellar casein seemed to have similar protein
50 structures on a molecular level in an *in vitro* study using X-ray scattering (Ingham,
51 Smialowska et al. 2018), casein micelles differ in size, hydration, and mineralization
52 compared to bovine caseins (Claeys, Verraes et al. 2014, Roy, Moughan et al. 2022). During
53 static *in vitro* digestion, more β-casein and less αs1-casein may contribute to the formation
54 of looser gastric clots in goat casein micelles and therefore greater proteolysis than cow
55 casein micelles (Zhang, Liu et al. 2023). Increased access of the enzymes to the proteins
56 might lead to faster gastric digestion of goat as compared to cow milk-derived caseins and
57 milk, as seen in *in vitro* coagulum analysis (Park 2017). In line with this, infant formula based
58 on goat milk formed smaller flocs of aggregated protein and oil droplets under gastric
59 conditions, leading to faster protein digestion in goat milk infant formula than seen in cow
60 milk based infant formula (Ye, Cui et al. 2019). Similarly, goat milk proteins were digested
61 faster than cow milk proteins in *in vitro* digestion by human gastric and duodenal enzymes
62 (Almaas, Cases et al. 2006). This was also seen in two *in vitro* studies under simulated infant
63 conditions where proteins in goat milk and goat milk-based infant formula had different
64 digestive behaviour compared to those present in cow milk and cow milk-based formula
65 (Maathuis, Havenaar et al. 2017, Hodgkinson, Wallace et al. 2018). Maathuis et al. controlled
66 for gastric emptying. Therefore differences in digestion were probably due to differences in
67 coagulation. However, not all studies showed a faster digestion of goat milk protein.
68 Inglingstad et al. found in an *in vitro* study that more goat milk casein remained undigested
69 after 30 min of digestion compared to cow milk casein (Inglingstad, Devold et al. 2010).
70 Since most research has been done *in vitro* and results are not conclusive, verification *in vivo*

71 in humans is warranted. Understanding differences in coagulation and gastric emptying of
72 cow and goat milk proteins is of interest because they may influence subsequent serum AA
73 availability.

74

75 In summary, *in vitro* results suggest that the differences in digestion between cow and goat
76 milk are due to differences in their casein. Therefore, the current *in vivo* study aimed to
77 quantify gastric digestion and absorption of cow and goat milk-derived casein *in vivo* in
78 humans. We used MRI to evaluate intragastric processes and gastric emptying and examined
79 blood AA concentrations. We hypothesized that goat milk-derived casein has different
80 coagulum characteristics, faster gastric emptying and higher serum AA concentrations
81 compared to cow milk-derived casein.

82

83 **METHODS**

84 **Design**

85 The study was a randomized cross-over study in which healthy men underwent gastric MRI
86 scans before and after consumption of 300 ml of a cow milk-derived-casein (cow MC) or goat
87 milk-derived-casein (goat MC) drink. Primary outcomes were gastric emptying (measured by
88 gastric emptying half time (GE-t50) and gastric volume over time) and serum AA
89 concentrations. The secondary outcome was gastric coagulation. Other outcomes were
90 serum glucose, insulin, free fatty acids (FFA) and triglyceride (TG) concentrations and
91 appetite ratings (hunger, fullness, desire to eat, prospective consumption and thirst). The
92 study was conducted according to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki (October

93 2013) and registered with the Dutch Trial Register under number NL8137 (accessible through
94 https://trialsearch.who.int/Trial2.aspx?TrialID=NL-OMON28580). All participants signed written
95 informed consent.

96

97 **Sample size**

98 Sample size was calculated based on the primary outcomes, gastric emptying and post
99 prandial AA profile. Given our previous work on gastric emptying of caloric liquids in adults,
100 we know that the gastric emptying half time of 500 ml dairy-based shakes differing in energy
101 density and viscosity (protein content either 6 or 30 g and energy density 0.2 kcal/ml or 1
102 kcal/ml) has an overall gastric emptying half-time (GE-t50) of 54.7 ± 3.8 min, with the
103 different shakes ranging between 26.5 ± 3.0 min and 81.9 ± 8.3 min. The goat MC drink
104 contains 0.58 kcal/ml. Based on nutrient density the expected SD of the cow MC and the
105 goat MC drinks should be somewhere between 3 and 6. Therefore, we assumed an SD of 6
106 min for both drinks. In Camps et al. 2016 the average difference in GE-t50 between a 500-ml
107 thin and thick shake was 14.5 (low-calory) and 12.4 min (high-calory). For a 300-ml load the
108 GE-t50 will be smaller. We considered a 4 min difference in gastric emptying half-time
109 between the treatments as the minimum detectable difference. A two-sided test was
110 deemed appropriate, with $Z\alpha=1.96$, $p=0.05$ and a power of 90% gives a $Z\beta$ of 1.28. Combined
111 with the SD of 6 this leads to the following formula for paired comparisons (Gogtay 2010): n
112 = (1.96 + 1.28)^2 x (6/4)^2 = (3.24)^2 x 1.5= 18 participants.

113

114 To ensure sample size was sufficient for the other primary outcome, post prandial AA profile,
115 a second sample size calculation was performed. The estimation for postprandial AA was

116 based on the peak value and the total free AA assessed in the serum after consumption of
117 protein products. For the peak value, a difference of 100 µg/ml was regarded as relevant
118 with an individual difference in peak values of 100 µg/ml (Farnfield, Trenerry et al. 2009, He,
119 Spelbrink et al. 2013). Again we used a two-sided test, with Zα=1.96, p=0.05 and power of
120 90% gives a Zβ=1.28. This leads to the following formula for paired comparisons: n = (1.96 +
121 1.28)^2 x (100/100)^2 = (3.24)^2 x 1= 11 participants. Based on the above, we aimed to
122 include 18 participants.

123

124 **Participants**

125 Healthy males were recruited from November 2019 until March 2020 via e-mail using a
126 database of individuals who expressed interest in participating in scientific research.
127 Healthy, non-smoking men with a BMI of 18.5-25 kg/m^2 were included. Exclusion criteria
128 were cow or goat milk allergy or lactose intolerance (self-reported), gastric disorders or
129 regular gastric complaints, use of proton pump inhibitors or other gastric medication, or a
130 contra-indication to MRI scanning (including, but not limited to pacemakers and
131 defibrillators, intraorbital or intraocular metallic fragments ferromagnetic implants or being
132 claustrophobic). Eighteen healthy men (age 23 ± 1.6 y, BMI 23 ± 1.6 kg/m^2) participated in
133 the study. The flow diagram can be found in **Supplemental figure 1**.

134

135 **Treatments**

136 Treatments were 300 ml drinks containing 30 g of protein originating from cow micellar
137 casein concentrate powder (FrieslandCampina Refit MCI80) or 30 g goat micellar casein
138 concentrate powder (Ausnutria Dairy Corporation Ltd, pilot plant). The drinks were matched

139 on caloric content, protein, lactose and dry matter content. The amount of the AA leucine
140 was equal. Vanilla extract was added to ensure similarity of taste. The drinks were prepared
141 by slowly reconstituting the caseins at 50°C and thereafter allowing them to fully rehydrate
142 at 4°C overnight using magnetic stirrer. This method assured a more similar viscosity in the
143 drinks (when resolving fast by shaking there was a larger viscosity of the cow MC drink: 200-
144 500 mPa.s and goat MC drink 8-15mPa.s). Three samples of each drink were measured with
145 a rheometer to assess their viscosity using an Anton Paar Physica MCR 301 rheometer
146 equipped with a Couette geometry with a volume of 1 ml. Viscosity was determined at
147 constant shear rate of 100s-1 at 20 °C. The difference in viscosity of the drinks (15.9 ± 3.9
148 mPa.s for the cow MC drink and 7.2 ± 1.8 mPa.s for the goat MC drink) was deemed not
149 physiologically relevant (for instance milk 's viscosity is 2 mPa.s while that of yoghurt is 150
150 mPa.s which is a much larger difference).
151
152 The composition per 300 ml serving of the cow MC drink was 176 kcal, 30 g protein, 90:10
153 casein to whey ratio, 12 g lactose, 0.77 g fat and 81 g dry matter. For the goat MC drink this
154 was 174 kcal, 30 g protein, 90:10 casein to whey ratio, 12 g lactose, 0.60 g fat, 81 g dry
155 matter. The amino acid profiles of the drinks can be found in **Table 1.** The data were
156 analyzed by Qlip B.V. (lactose, dry matter, fat, protein) and NIZO (casein-to-whey ratio of the
157 goat micellar casein concentrate; for cow micellar casein concentrate the 90:10 casein to
158 whey ratio was stated on the product data sheet).
159

160 **Study procedures**

161 Participants arrived after an overnight fast. Eating was allowed until 8 PM on the day before
162 the study. Drinking water was allowed up to one hour before the visit. Participants started
163 their scan session at 8 or at 10 AM and were measured at the same time on both study days.
164 First, a canula was placed in an antecubital vein. Then, participants verbally provided
165 baseline appetite ratings after which the baseline MRI scan was performed and the baseline
166 blood sample was drawn. Subsequently, they consumed one of the 300-ml drinks within two
167 minutes. Participants were randomly allocated by block randomization using
168 https://randomizer.org to receive either the cow or goat MC first. Participants were blind for
169 which drink they received. Gastric MRI scans were performed at baseline and at t = 3, 10, 20,
170 30, 40, 50 and 60 minutes after the start of ingestion. During the MRI session participants
171 verbally rated hunger, fullness, prospective consumption, thirst and nausea on a scale from 0
172 (not at all) to a 100 (most imaginable) at each time point (Noble, Clark et al. 2005, Blundell,
173 de Graaf et al. 2010). An overview of a test session is given in **Figure 1**.

174

175 **MRI**

176 Participants were scanned in a supine position with the use of a 3 Tesla Siemens Verio MRI
177 scanner (Siemens AG, Munich, Germany) using a T_2-weighted spin echo sequence (HASTE, 24
178 6-mm slices, 2.4 mm gap, 1.19 x 1.19 mm in-plane resolution, TR 850 ms, TE 87 ms, flip angle
179 112 °C) with breath hold command on expiration to fixate the position of the diaphragm and
180 the stomach. The duration of the scan was approximately 18 seconds. The software Medical
181 Imaging Processing And Visualization (MIPAV, version 11.0.3) (McAuliffe, Lalonde et al. 2001)
182 was used to manually delineate gastric content on each slice and create a corresponding

183 mask image. Gastric content volume on each time point was calculated by multiplying
184 surface area of gastric content per slice with slice thickness including gap distance and
185 summing up the volumes of all slices showing gastric content. In Matlab (version R2023a,
186 multitresh function) a bias field correction was performed using multiplicative intrinsic
187 component optimization (MICO) (Li, Gore et al. 2014). To assess changes in gastric
188 coagulation, image texture analysis of the stomach content was performed using the masks
189 in the software LIFEx (version 7.2.0, Institut national de la santé et de la recherche médicale,
190 France) (Nioche, Orlhac et al. 2018). Homogeneity, coarseness, contrast, and busyness were
191 calculated. These image metrics provide information on the spatial patterns of voxel
192 intensity (Thomas, Qin et al. 2019). The Gray-Level Co-occurrence Matrix (GLCM) method
193 was used for homogeneity (degree of similarity between voxels) and Neighborhood Gray-
194 level Difference Matrix (NGLDM) difference of grey-levels between one voxel and its 26
195 neighbors in 8 dimensions was used for contrast (local variations), coarseness (spatial rate of
196 change in intensity) and busyness (spatial frequency of changes in intensity). The number of
197 grey-levels for texture metric calculation was set at 64, intensity rescaling at relative (ROI:
198 min/max), and dimension processing at 2D. On each postprandial time point, texture metrics
199 were calculated per slice for the stomach content. Subsequently, a weighted average texture
200 metric was calculated based on the gastric content volume in each slice such that slices with
201 little stomach content contributed less to the average than those with more stomach
202 content. To quantify the (relative) volume of liquid and semi-solid stomach contents the
203 number of lighter (more liquid), intermediate and darker (semi-solid) voxels was calculated
204 by determining two intensity thresholds with the use of Otsu's method (Otsu 1979) in
205 Matlab, an approach previously used on *in vitro* and *in vivo* MRI images of gastric milk
206 digestion (Mayar, Smeets et al. 2023, van Eijnatten, Camps et al. 2023, Mayar, de Vries et al.

207 2024). The number of intermediate and darker voxels were summed and interpreted as
208 reflecting voxels in which coagulation took place. This was done because visual inspection of
209 the thresholding results using one threshold showed a poorer separation between lighter
210 and darker gastric contents. In the context of this study, changes in image texture metrics
211 were interpreted as reflecting changes in the degree of coagulation. An example of stomach
212 contents with and without coagulation and the corresponding image texture metrics can be
213 found in **Supplemental figure 2.**

214

215 **Blood parameters**

216 Blood samples were collected at baseline and at t = 15, 30, 60, 90, 120, 180 and 240 min in
217 sodium-fluoride (for glucose), serum (for AA, FFA and insulin) and lithium-heparin (for
218 triglyceride) tubes. After collection, blood in the serum tube was allowed to clot for 30
219 minutes. Subsequently, all tubes were centrifuged at 1300 g for 10 minutes at 20 °C. After
220 centrifugation, the supernatant was divided into aliquots and stored in a -80°C freezer until
221 analysis. AA, FFA and insulin concentrations were measured at Wageningen University.
222 Glucose and TG concentrations were measured at the clinical chemistry lab of the Gelderse
223 Vallei hospital (Ede, The Netherlands).

224

225 AA concentrations were determined using triple quadrupole mass spectrometry (TQMS),
226 with an internal standard and ^{13}C reference mix. Glucose concentrations were determined
227 using an Atellica CH Glucose Hexokinase_3 (GluH_3) assay kit and Atellica CH analyzer
228 (Siemens Healthineers, Netherlands). The lower limit of detection (LLOD) was 0.2 mmol/l
229 and intra-assay CVs were at most 4.5%. Serum insulin concentrations were determined using

230 an enzymatic immunoassay kit (ELISA, Mercodia AB, Sweden) with a LLOD of 0.008 mmol/l
231 and intra assay CVs of maximal 6.9%. Serum FFA concentrations were determined using an
232 enzymatic assay kit (Instruchemie, Delfzijl) with a LLOD of 4 mg/dl and intra assay CVs of at
233 most 1.4%. TG concentrations were quantified using an Atellica CH TG enzymatic assay kit
234 and quantified using an Atellica CH analyzer (Siemens Healthineers, Netherlands) with a
235 LLOD of 8 mg/dl and intra assay CVs of at most 1.0%.

236

237 **Statistical analysis**

238 In order to estimate GE-t50, a commonly used summary measure, a curve was fitted to the
239 gastric volume over time of the cow MC and goat MC drink using R statistical software
240 according to the linear-exponential model as developed on the basis of earlier models
241 (Elashoff, Reedy et al. 1982, Fruehauf, Menne et al. 2011). Further analyses were performed
242 in SPSS (version 22, IBM, Armonk, USA). Essential amino acid (EAA), non-essential amino acid
243 (NEAA) and branched-chain amino acid (BCAA) concentrations were calculated by adding
244 individual AA concentrations. GE-t50 was compared between cow MC and goat MC drink
245 with a paired t-test. Normality was confirmed by inspecting QQ plots of the residuals. Overall
246 gastric volume, coagulation (image texture of the gastric contents as reflected in
247 homogeneity, contrast, coarseness and busyness), blood parameters and appetite ratings
248 over time were tested using linear mixed models with treatment, time and treatment*time
249 as fixed factors and baseline values as covariate. Post-hoc t-tests were performed with
250 Tukey's HSD correction when there were significant effects. In addition, Pearson correlation
251 coefficients were calculated for the associations between image texture metrics at 30 min
252 (chosen because that was the first time point that coagulation was clearly visible) and GE-t50

and blood parameters (4-h AUC of EAA, NEAA, BCAA, glucose and insulin). The significance threshold was set at p = 0.05. Data are expressed as mean ± SEM unless stated otherwise.

RESULTS

Gastric emptying

The curves of gastric emptying over time of the cow MC and goat MC drink is shown in **Figure 2**. Gastric emptying half-time was 84.6 ± 23.7 minutes for the cow MC drink, compared to 79.8 ± 24.7 minutes for the goat MC drink (p = 0.395). The mixed model analysis showed no difference in gastric emptying over time between the drinks (MD 0.77, 95% CI [-6.9, 8.5], p = 0.845) and there was no time*treatment interaction effect (p = 0.65). There was a significant effect of time (p < 0.001).

An example of a thresholded stomach image can be found in **Supplemental figure 3**. The percentage of liquid and coagulum volume did not differ between the cow MC and goat MC drink over time (coagulum: MD 0.407 %, 95 % CI [-1.2, 2.0], p = 0.607) and there was no treatment*time interaction effect (p = 0.52). There was a significant decrease in coagulum volume over time (time effect p = 0.002).

Amino acids

Figures of serum EAA, NEAA and BCAA can be found in **Figure 3**. Figures of all individual AAs can be found in **Supplemental figure 4 and 5**. Serum concentration of EAA over time was lower for goat MC (MD -110 µmol/L, 95% CI [-162, -58], p < 0.001). Post-hoc t-test showed that this was driven by time points t = 30 (p = 0.002) and t = 180 (p = 0.025) and that there

276 tended to be a lower serum concentration of NEAA for goat MC over time (MD -62.1 µmol/L,
277 95% CI [-127, 3.4], p = 0.063), driven by time point t = 180 min (p = 0.045). Serum
278 concentration of BCAA was also lower for goat MC (MD -65 µmol/L, 95% CI [-101, -29], p <
279 0.001). This was driven by time point t = 30 (p = 0.005), and there was a trend at t = 180 (p =
280 0.051). Time effects where significant for EAA, NEAA and BCAA (p < 0.001). There were no
281 interaction effects.

282

283 **Coagulation**

284 **Figure 4** shows examples of MRI images at the level of the stomach showing homogenous
285 stomach content after casein drink consumption and subsequent coagulum formation.

286

287 The curves of the image texture metric contrast of the stomach content over time can be
288 found in **Figure 5**. The other image texture metrics can be found in **Supplemental figure 6.**
289 Contrast was significantly lower for the cow MC than for the goat MC drink (MD 0.010, 95%
290 CI [0.001, 0.020], p = 0.036). Homogeneity (MD -0.003, 95% CI [-0.012, 0.006], p = 0.503),
291 coarseness (MD 0.001, 95% CI [0.000, 0.001], p = 0.310) and busyness (MD -0.008, 95% CI [-
292 0.023, 0.007], p = 0.315) were not significantly different between the drinks. Time effects
293 where significant for all texture metrics (all p < 0.001). There were no interaction effects.

294

295 **Glucose and insulin**

296 Overall, glucose concentrations did not differ between the drinks (MD -0.055 mmol/L, 95%
297 CI [-0.14, 0.028], p = 0.19). Only when examining specific timepoints, glucose concentration

298 for the goat MC drink was slightly higher compared to the cow MC drink at t = 30 minutes
299 (MD 0.015 mmol/L, 95% CI [0.42, 0.22], p=0.036). Insulin concentrations did not differ
300 between the cow MC and goat MC drinks (MD -1.66 mIU/L, 95% CI [1.35, -0.16], p = 0.84)
301 (see **Supplemental figure 7**). Time effects where significant for glucose and insulin (p <
302 0.001). There were no interaction effects.

303

304 **Triglycerides and free fatty acids**

305 FFA concentrations were not different between the cow MC and goat MC drinks (MD -0.032
306 mmol/L, 95% CI [0.034, 0.001], p = 0.948). TG concentrations over time were significantly
307 higher for goat MC (MD 0.074 mmol/L, 95% CI [0.039, 0.109], p = 0.009), even with baseline
308 differences as a covariate in the mixed model analysis. However, there were no differences
309 for any of the time points (see **Supplemental figure 8**). Time effects were significant for FFA
310 and TG (p < 0.001) and there were no interaction effects.

311

312 **Appetite ratings**

313 Hunger and thirst did not differ between the treatments (p = 0.61 and 0.29, respectively).
314 Fullness, desire to eat and prospective consumption were significantly lower after goat MC
315 ingestion (p = 0.036, *p* < 0.001, p < 0.001, respectively). However, as can be seen in
316 **Supplemental figure 9**, the differences are small (below 10 units as a mean difference over
317 time).

318

319 **Correlations between image texture metrics, blood concentrations and gastric emptying**

320 To explore the associations between image texture metrics as an indicator of the degree of
321 coagulation, blood concentrations and gastric emptying, Pearson correlation coefficients
322 were calculated for image texture metrics at 30 min (because at t=30 min coagulation was
323 visible) and 4-h AUC of blood parameters (EAA, NEAA, BCAA, glucose and insulin). Overall,
324 GE-t50 correlated negatively with contrast (r=-0.413, 95% CI [-0.662, -0.081]) and coarseness
325 (r=-0.38, 95% CI [-0.640, -0.043]). NEAA correlated with insulin (r=0.491, 95% CI [0.152,
326 0.727]). When divided between treatments: goat MC, EAA, NEAA and BCAA were negatively
327 correlated with coarseness (r=-0.698, 95% CI [-0.887, -0.175], r=- 0.572, 95% CI [-0.837, -
328 0.002] and r = -0.690, 95% CI [-0.891, -0.162] respectively). GE-t50 was positively correlated
329 with insulin (r = 0.558, 95% CI [0.130, 0.790]). For cow MC GE-t50 was positively correlated
330 with image homogeneity and busyness (r = 0.498, 95% CI [0.061, 0.760] and r = 0.568, 95% CI
331 [0.141, 0.787] respectively) and negatively correlated with contrast and coarseness (r = -
332 0.627, 95% CI [-0.822, - 0.217] and r = - 0.554, 95% CI [-0.780, - 0.134]). All correlations can
333 be found in **Supplemental figure 10.**

334

335 **DISCUSSION**

336 This is the first study to explore digestion of cow and goat MC by quantifying gastric
337 emptying, gastric casein coagulation and blood concentrations in humans. Overall, serum
338 concentrations of EAA and BCAA were higher for cow MC. Gastric emptying curves and
339 gastric emptying half-time (GE-t50) were similar for the cow MC and goat MC drinks. The
340 image texture metric contrast was significantly different, suggesting a difference in

341 coagulation. No significant differences between cow MC and goat MC were seen for serum
342 insulin, glucose and FFA concentrations. Serum TG concentrations were significantly higher
343 in goat MC.
344
345 Coagulation was visible on the MRI scans for both drinks (see Figure 4). In an attempt to
346 objectively quantify this, image texture metrics were calculated for the stomach contents. A
347 lower homogeneity and higher contrast could reflect 'more' coagulation. Even though the
348 actual meaning of differences in image texture metrics in reference to coagulating
349 properties of stomach content requires more research, the difference in the metric
350 'contrast' does support the notion of a difference in coagulation between cow MC and goat
351 MC. However, the metrics homogeneity, coarseness and busyness did not differ between
352 the drinks. It should be taken into account that higher homogeneity could not only reflect a
353 more homogenous liquid, but also the presence of a large and fairly homogenous coagulum.
354 Another aspect to consider is that not only the size, but also the structure is an important
355 characteristic of coagulates. For instance, some coagulates can be firm and have a greater
356 weight and denser structure than less dense coagulates with approximately the same
357 volume (Wang, Ye et al. 2018). Image texture metrics could possibly be used to quantify the
358 density of the coagulum, as MRI can reflect the water content of the coagulum. Notably, MRI
359 image texture parameters are affected by the resolution of the input images and could
360 detect differences in image intensity patterns not appreciable by eye. This requires further
361 validation by concomitant analysis of MRI images and coagulates that differ in size and
362 density. To provide molecular-level information, other MRI techniques are being developed
363 such as measurement of the magnetization transfer ratio and relaxation rates (Deng, Seimys
364 et al. 2022, Deng, Mars et al. 2023, Mayar, Smeets et al. 2023, Mayar, de Vries et al. 2024).

365 These measurements require additional MRI measurements to be recorded, but could be
366 used in follow-up research to examine more subtle differences in protein coagulation *in vivo*.
367
368 Cow MC and goat MC coagulates likely differ, since *in vitro* and animal *in vivo* research
369 showed that goat milk coagulum had a softer consistency and less fused protein networks,
370 especially toward a later stage of digestion (Ye, Liu et al. 2019, Roy, Moughan et al. 2022) .
371 We therefore hypothesized that this would lead to a longer gastric retention of coagulum
372 and relatively faster GE for goat milk casein in comparison to cow milk casein. This is seen in
373 recent human *in vivo* work (van Eijnatten, Roelofs et al. 2024). However, we observed that
374 the overall GE was similar and the emptying of coagulum and liquid volume fraction did not
375 differ between cow MC and goat MC. This is in line with recent findings that bovine milk
376 coagulation differences did not affect GE, and GE did not explain differences in AA
377 concentrations (Milan, Barnett et al. 2024).
378
379 As expected, even though AA composition of the treatments were largely similar,
380 postprandial serum AA concentrations differed between casein derived from goat and cow
381 milk, which appears to be due in part to differences in their coagulation. Goat milks' softer
382 and smaller coagulates (Park 2017) would make the proteins more accessible to digestive
383 enzymes (proteases) and lead to more efficient break down of peptide bonds such that goat
384 milk proteins would be faster digested than cow milk proteins (Almaas, Cases et al. 2006).
385 However, our study showed a higher total response of serum AA in the 5 hours after cow
386 milk consumption, which seems contradictive. On the other hand, in an *in vitro* study of
387 Inglingstad et al., who used a two-step digestion model (gastric and duodenal), caseins from

388 goat milk were less digested compared to caseins from cow milk during gastric digestion
389 (Inglingstad, Devold et al. 2010). Interestingly, in our study serum EAA concentrations were
390 higher for cow MC, while we expected higher concentrations for goat MC based on *in vitro*
391 studies (Almaas, Cases et al. 2006, Zhang, Liu et al. 2023). However, we examined caseins in
392 relative isolation where milk fat content was negligible and the mineral profile was different
393 than in the casein micelles present in whole milk. The formation of coagulates interacts with
394 minerals and fat and thus coagulation might be different for a whole food (i.e. in the 'food
395 matrix', (Aguilera 2019)). For instance, the interaction of peptides with small fat globules can
396 slow protein breakdown and thereby influence AA availability (Le Feunteun, Barbé et al.
397 2014, Tunick, Ren et al. 2016). A second factor leading to differences in coagulation might be
398 the difference in buffering capacity between cow and goat milk. Goat milk contains a higher
399 non-protein nitrogen (NPN) amount than cow milk and more NPN contributes to a slower
400 acidification in the stomach (Park 1991). Roy et al also discuss the high degree of variation in
401 casein micelle characteristics within the same species (Roy, Moughan et al. 2022). Within
402 and across species differences in breeds, genetic variants, and phosphorylation sites of the
403 caseins may also add to the variation (Crowley, Kelly et al. 2017). In summary, to our
404 knowledge three factors could have contributed to the discrepancies of our study with other
405 studies: 1) the fact that this is the first human *in vivo* study on gastric digestion, 2) that we
406 assessed casein outside of the food matrix, 3) the buffering capacity and the variation in
407 casein characteristics even within species.
408
409 Fullness, desire to eat and prospective consumption were significantly lower for goat MC,
410 but these differences were small. For instance, the mean difference of desire to eat had a
411 mean difference of 7 pts over the 60 measured minutes. A difference below 10% is usually

412 not considered as practically relevant (Flint, Raben et al. 2000). Thus, this finding is in line
413 with the lack of differences in gastric volume over time and coagulum volume over time
414 between the drinks.

415

416 We here focused on the casein fractions from cow and goat milk, to be able to study casein
417 coagulation in the absence of interaction effects. Future research should explore casein
418 coagulation within a food matrix, as this could significantly influence protein digestion,
419 involving interactions with components like fat (Cecchinato, Penasa et al. 2012).

420

421 In conclusion, cow MC and goat MC show a difference in coagulation as inferred by AA
422 concentrations and supported by image texture analysis *in vivo* in humans. This difference in
423 coagulation did not influence overall gastric emptying or the emptied fraction of the liquid
424 and coagulum volume. Therefore, gastric emptying was not the main driver of AA
425 differences. This warrants further research to examine differences in casein coagulation *in*
426 *vivo* in the food matrix and how this may affect digestion of milk products, such as infant
427 formula or medical nutrition. This may help to determine the optimal use for cow and goat
428 milk and their protein fractions.

429

430 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

431 EE, GC, WR and PS designed the research; EE conducted the research. EE analysed the data
432 and drafted the paper. GC, WR, LP and PS revised the manuscript critically for important
433 intellectual content. PS had primary responsibility for final content. All authors read and

434 approved the final manuscript. This study was funded by Ausnutria Dairy Corporation Ltd
435 and WR and LP were employed by Ausnutria Dairy Corporation Ltd. All other authors declare
436 no further conflict of interest. We thank Julia Roelofs, Mireille Schipper, Jip Jordaan and Lisa
437 van den Berg for assisting with data collection and Jacques Vervoort and Sebas Wesseling for
438 the amino acid analysis. The use of the 3T MRI was made possible by WUR Shared Research
439 Facilities.

REFERENCES

Aguilera, J. M. (2019). "The food matrix: implications in processing, nutrition and health." Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition **59**(22): 3612-3629.

Almaas, H., A.-L. Cases, T. G. Devold, H. Holm, T. Langsrud, L. Aabakken, T. Aadnoey and G. E. Vegarud (2006). "In vitro digestion of bovine and caprine milk by human gastric and duodenal enzymes." International Dairy Journal **16**(9): 961-968.

Atherton, P. J. and K. Smith (2012). "Muscle protein synthesis in response to nutrition and exercise." The Journal of physiology **590**(5): 1049-1057.

Blundell, J., C. de Graaf, T. Hulshof, S. Jebb, B. Livingstone, A. Lluch, D. Mela, S. Salah, E. Schuring, H. van der Knaap and M. Westerterp (2010). "Appetite control: methodological aspects of the evaluation of foods." Obes Rev **11**(3): 251-270.

Ceballos, L. S., E. R. Morales, G. de la Torre Adarve, J. D. Castro, L. P. Martínez and M. R. S. Sampelayo (2009). "Composition of goat and cow milk produced under similar conditions and analyzed by identical methodology." Journal of Food Composition and Analysis **22**(4): 322-329.

Cecchinato, A., M. Penasa, C. Cipolat Gotet, M. De Marchi and G. Bittante (2012). "Short communication: Factors affecting coagulation properties of Mediterranean buffalo milk." Journal of Dairy Science **95**(4): 1709-1713.

Claeys, W. L., C. Verraes, S. Cardoen, J. De Block, A. Huyghebaert, K. Raes, K. Dewettinck and L. Herman (2014). "Consumption of raw or heated milk from different species: An evaluation of the nutritional and potential health benefits." Food Control **42**: 188-201.

Crowley, S. V., A. L. Kelly, J. A. Lucey and J. A. O'Mahony (2017). "Potential Applications of Non-Bovine Mammalian Milk in Infant Nutrition." Handbook of Milk of Non-Bovine Mammals: 625-654.

Deng, R., M. Mars, A. E. M. Janssen and P. A. M. Smeets (2023). "Gastric digestion of whey protein gels: A randomized cross-over trial with the use of MRI." Food Hydrocolloids **141**: 108689.

Deng, R., A. Seimys, M. Mars, A. E. M. Janssen and P. A. M. Smeets (2022). "Monitoring pH and whey protein digestion by TD-NMR and MRI in a novel semi-dynamic in vitro gastric simulator (MR-GAS)." Food Hydrocolloids **125**: 107393.

Do, Q. N., M. A. Lewis, A. J. Madhuranthakam, Y. Xi, A. A. Bailey, R. E. Lenkinski and D. M. Twickler (2019). "Texture analysis of magnetic resonance images of the human placenta throughout gestation: A feasibility study." PloS one **14**(1): e0211060-e0211060.

Eijnatten, E. J. M. v., J. J. M. Roelofs, G. Camps, T. Huppertz, T. T. Lambers and P. A. M. Smeets (2023). "Gastric coagulation and postprandial amino acid absorption of milk is affected by mineral composition: a randomized crossover trial." medRxiv: 2023.2009.2013.23295475.

Elashoff, J. D., T. J. Reedy and J. H. Meyer (1982). "Analysis of gastric emptying data." Gastroenterology **83**(6): 1306-1312.

Fardet, A., D. Dupont, L.-E. Rioux and S. L. Turgeon (2019). "Influence of food structure on dairy protein, lipid and calcium bioavailability: A narrative review of evidence." Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition **59**(13): 1987-2010.

Farnfield, M. M., C. Trenerry, K. A. Carey and D. Cameron-Smith (2009). "Plasma amino acid response after ingestion of different whey protein fractions." International Journal of Food Sciences and Nutrition **60**(6): 476-486.

Flint, A., A. Raben, J. E. Blundell and A. Astrup (2000). "Reproducibility, power and validity of visual analogue scales in assessment of appetite sensations in single test meal studies." International Journal of Obesity **24**(1): 38-48.

Fruehauf, H., D. Menne, M. A. Kwiatek, Z. Forras-Kaufman, E. Kaufman, O. Goetze, M. Fried, W. Schwizer and M. Fox (2011). "Inter-observer reproducibility and analysis of gastric volume measurements and gastric emptying assessed with magnetic resonance imaging." Neurogastroenterol Motil **23**(9): 854-861.

Gogtay, N. J. (2010). "Principles of sample size calculation." Indian J Ophthalmol **58**(6): 517-518.

He, T., R. E. J. Spelbrink, B. J. Witteman and M. L. F. Giuseppin (2013). "Digestion kinetics of potato protein isolates in vitro and in vivo." International Journal of Food Sciences and Nutrition **64**(7): 787-793.
Hettinga, K., L. Pellis, W. Rombouts, X. Du, G. Grigorean and B. Lönnerdal (2023). "Effect of pH and protein composition on proteolysis of goat milk proteins by pepsin and pancreatin." Food Research International **173**: 113294.
Hodgkinson, A. J., O. A. M. Wallace, I. Boggs, M. Broadhurst and C. G. Prosser (2018). "Gastric digestion of cow and goat milk: Impact of infant and young child in vitro digestion conditions." Food chemistry **245**: 275-281.
Huppertz, T. and L. W. Chia (2021). "Milk protein coagulation under gastric conditions: A review." International Dairy Journal **113**: 104882.
Ingham, B., A. Smialowska, N. M. Kirby, C. Wang and A. J. Carr (2018). "A structural comparison of casein micelles in cow, goat and sheep milk using X-ray scattering." Soft Matter **14**(17): 3336-3343.
Inglingstad, R. A., T. G. Devold, E. K. Eriksen, H. Holm, M. Jacobsen, K. H. Liland, E. O. Rukke and G. E. Vegarud (2010). "Comparison of the digestion of caseins and whey proteins in equine, bovine, caprine and human milks by human gastrointestinal enzymes." Dairy science & technology **90**(5): 549-563.
Lagrange, V., D. Whitsett and C. Burris (2015). "Global Market for Dairy Proteins." Journal of Food Science **80**(S1): A16-A22.
Le Feunteun, S., F. Barbé, D. Rémond, O. Ménard, Y. Le Gouar, D. Dupont and B. Laroche (2014). "Impact of the Dairy Matrix Structure on Milk Protein Digestion Kinetics: Mechanistic Modelling Based on Mini-pig In Vivo Data." Food and Bioprocess Technology **7**(4): 1099-1113.
Li, C., J. C. Gore and C. Davatzikos (2014). "Multiplicative intrinsic component optimization (MICO) for MRI bias field estimation and tissue segmentation." Magn Reson Imaging **32**(7): 913-923.
Maathuis, A., R. Havenaar, T. He and S. Bellmann (2017). "Protein Digestion and Quality of Goat and Cow Milk Infant Formula and Human Milk Under Simulated Infant Conditions." J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr **65**(6): 661-666.
Mahé, S., N. Roos, R. Benamouzig, L. Davin, C. Luengo, L. Gagnon, N. Gaussergès, J. Rautureau and D. Tomé (1996). "Gastrojejunal kinetics and the digestion of [15N]beta-lactoglobulin and casein in humans: the influence of the nature and quantity of the protein." The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition **63**(4): 546-552.
Mayar, M., M. de Vries, P. Smeets, J. van Duynhoven and C. Terenzi (2024). "MRI assessment of pH and coagulation during semi-dynamic in vitro gastric digestion of milk proteins." Food Hydrocolloids **152**: 109866.
Mayar, M., P. Smeets, J. van Duynhoven and C. Terenzi (2023). "In vitro 1H MT and CEST MRI mapping of gastro-intestinal milk protein breakdown." Food Structure **36**: 100314.
McAuliffe, M. J., F. M. Lalonde, D. McGarry, W. Gandler, K. Csaky and B. L. Trus (2001). Medical Image Processing, Analysis and Visualization in clinical research. Proceedings 14th IEEE Symposium on Computer-Based Medical Systems. CBMS 2001.
Milan, A. M., M. P. G. Barnett, W. C. McNabb, N. C. Roy, S. Coutinho, C. L. Hoad, L. Marciani, S. Nivins, H. Sharif, S. Calder, P. Du, A. A. Gharibans, G. O'Grady, K. Fraser, D. Bernstein, S. M. Rosanowski, P. Sharma, A. Shrestha and R. F. Mithen (2024). "The impact of heat treatment of bovine milk on gastric emptying and nutrient appearance in peripheral circulation in healthy females: a randomized controlled trial comparing pasteurized and ultra-high temperature milk." Am J Clin Nutr.
Miller, B. A. and C. D. Lu (2019). "Current status of global dairy goat production: an overview." Asian-Australas J Anim Sci **32**(8): 1219-1232.
Mulet-Cabero, A.-I., A. R. Mackie, P. J. Wilde, M. A. Fenelon and A. Brodkorb (2019). "Structural mechanism and kinetics of in vitro gastric digestion are affected by process-induced changes in bovine milk." Food hydrocolloids **86**: 172-183.
Nioche, C., F. Orlhac, S. Boughdad, S. Reuzé, J. Goya-Outi, C. Robert, C. Pellot-Barakat, M. Soussan, F. Frouin and I. Buvat (2018). "LIFEx: A Freeware for Radiomic Feature Calculation in Multimodality

Imaging to Accelerate Advances in the Characterization of Tumor Heterogeneity." Cancer Research **78**(16): 4786.
Noble, B., D. Clark, M. Meldrum, H. Ten Have, J. Seymour, M. Winslow and S. Paz (2005). "The measurement of pain, 1945-2000." Journal of Pain and Symptom Management **29**(1): 14-21.
Otsu, N. (1979). "A Threshold Selection Method from Gray-Level Histograms." IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics **9**(1): 62-66.
Park, Y. W. (1991). "Relative Buffering Capacity of Goat Milk, Cow Milk, Soy-Based Infant Formulas, and Commercial Nonprescription Antacid Drugs1, 2." Journal of Dairy Science **74**(10): 3326-3333.
Park, Y. W. (2017). Goat Milk – Chemistry and Nutrition. Handbook of Milk of Non-Bovine Mammals**:** 42-83.
Roy, D., P. J. Moughan, A. Ye, S. M. Hodgkinson, N. Stroebinger, S. Li, A. C. Dave, C. A. Montoya and H. Singh (2022). "Structural changes during gastric digestion in piglets of milk from different species." Journal of Dairy Science.
Thomas, R., L. Qin, F. Alessandrino, S. P. Sahu, P. J. Guerra, K. M. Krajewski and A. Shinagare (2019). "A review of the principles of texture analysis and its role in imaging of genitourinary neoplasms." Abdom Radiol (NY) **44**(7): 2501-2510.
Trommelen, J., M. E. G. Weijzen, J. van Kranenburg, R. A. Ganzevles, M. Beelen, L. B. Verdijk and L. J. C. van Loon (2020). "Casein Protein Processing Strongly Modulates Post-Prandial Plasma Amino Acid Responses In Vivo in Humans." Nutrients **12**(8).
Tunick, M. H., D. X. Ren, D. L. Van Hekken, L. Bonnaillie, M. Paul, R. Kwoczak and P. M. Tomasula (2016). "Effect of heat and homogenization on in vitro digestion of milk." Journal of Dairy Science **99**(6): 4124-4139.
van Eijnatten, E. J. M., G. Camps, M. Guerville, V. Fogliano, K. Hettinga and P. A. M. Smeets (2023). "Milk coagulation and gastric emptying in women experiencing gastrointestinal symptoms after ingestion of cow's milk." Neurogastroenterology & Motility **n/a**(n/a): e14696.
van Eijnatten, E. J. M., J. J. M. Roelofs, G. Camps, T. Huppertz, T. T. Lambers and P. A. M. Smeets (2024). "Gastric coagulation and postprandial amino acid absorption of milk is affected by mineral composition: a randomized crossover trial." Food Funct **15**(6): 3098-3107.
van Vliet, S., N. A. Burd and L. J. van Loon (2015). "The Skeletal Muscle Anabolic Response to Plant- versus Animal-Based Protein Consumption." The Journal of Nutrition **145**(9): 1981-1991.
Wang, X., A. Ye, Q. Lin, J. Han and H. Singh (2018). "Gastric digestion of milk protein ingredients: Study using an in vitro dynamic model." Journal of Dairy Science **101**(8): 6842-6852.
Ye, A., J. Cui, E. Carpenter, C. Prosser and H. Singh (2019). "Dynamic in vitro gastric digestion of infant formulae made with goat milk and cow milk: Influence of protein composition." International Dairy Journal **97**: 76-85.
Ye, A., W. Liu, J. Cui, X. Kong, D. Roy, Y. Kong, J. Han and H. Singh (2019). "Coagulation behaviour of milk under gastric digestion: Effect of pasteurization and ultra-high temperature treatment." Food Chemistry **286**: 216-225.
Zhang, J., D. Liu, Y. Xie, J. Yuan, K. Wang, X. Tao, Y. Hemar, J. M. Regenstein, X. Liu and P. Zhou (2023). "Gastrointestinal digestibility of micellar casein dispersions: Effects of caprine vs bovine origin, and partial colloidal calcium depletion using in vitro digestion models for the adults and elderly." Food Chemistry **416**: 135865.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. *Overview of a test session*

Figure 2. *Mean ± SEM gastric content volume over time for the 300 ml cow (cow MC) and goat (goat MC) and milk-derived casein drinks. T=0 min is the start of ingestion. A linear mixed model analysis showed no significant difference between the drinks.*

Figure 3. *Mean concentration ± SD of (A) serum essential amino acid, (B) non-essential amino acid and (C) branch-chained amino acid concentrations after cow (cow MC) and goat (goat MC) milk-derived casein drink ingestion. *$p < 0.05$ placed at the right of the graph denotes a significant treatment effect. Above a data point it denotes a significant time point (post-hoc t-test).*

Figure 4. *Examples of T_2-weighted MRI images showing cross-sections through an empty stomach after an overnight fast (baseline) and after 300 ml casein drink consumption. At t = 30 and 60 min coagulation can be observed.*

Figure 5. *Mean ± SEM of the image texture metric contrast calculated over the stomach content over time after cow (cow MC) and goat (goat MC) milk-derived casein drink ingestion. A linear mixed model analysis showed a significant higher contrast of goat MC ($p = 0.036$) driven by t = 40 min as seen with a post hoc t-test. A higher contrast reflects a greater degree of structure in the image, which we interpret as a difference in coagulation.*

TABLE

Table 1. *Amino acid profile of cow and goat milk-derived casein drinks (g AA per 300 ml)*

AA type	Amino acid	Cow milk-derived casein drink	Goat milk-derived casein drink
Essential	Isoleucine	1.58	1.49
	Leucine	2.96	2.96
	Valine	1.61	1.60
	Histidine	0.93	0.85
	Lysine	2.60	2.61
	Methionine	0.87	0.80
	Phenylalanine	1.61	1.60
	Threonine	1.33	1.45
	Tryptophan	0.41	0.43
Total		13.9	13.8
Non-essential (or conditionally essential)	Arginine	1.14	0.89
	Cysteine	0.19	0.25
	Glutamine	6.86	6.24
	Glycine	0.58	0.50
	Proline	3.47	3.76
	Tyrosine	1.68	1.30
	Alanine	0.98	0.94
	Aspargine	2.24	2.19
	Hydroxyproline	<0.05	<0.05
	Ornithine	<0.05	<0.05
	Serine	1.78	1.50
Total		18.9	17.6

[1]*Analysis was performed by Eurofins Analytico B.V. (Zwolle, the Netherlands)*


Baseline
300 ml
t =3
10
15
20
30
40
50
60
90
120
180
240
Exit scanner
Appetite ratings
Blood draw
MRI scan


Gastric content (ml)
300
200
100
0
cow MC
goat MC
Baseline
0
3
10
20
30
40
50
60
Time (min)


A
Serum EAA (µmol/l)
2500
2000
1500
1000
500
0
*
*
*
cow MC
goat MC
baseline
ingestion drink
30
60
90
120
150
180
210
240
Time (min)
B
Serum NEAA (µmol/l)
2500
2000
1500
1000
500
0
baseline
ingestion drink
30
60
90
120
150
180
210
240
Time (min)
C
Serum BCAA (µmol/l)
1500
1000
500
0
*
*
baseline
ingestion drink
30
60
90
120
150
180
210
240
Time (min)


stomach
liver
Baseline (fasted)
stomach
T = 3 min
stomach
T = 30 min
stomach
T = 60 min


0.25
0.20
0.15
0.10
0.05
Contrast
cow MC
goat MC
*
*
0
3
10
20
30
40
50
60
Time (min)