INTELLIGENCE BRIEF 04

Beyond the Sum of Its Parts: Designing Food as an Integrated System

When the same parts do not always make the same food.

Why It Matters

Modern food science has created enormous value by separating foods into components, studying those components, and recombining them to improve safety, affordability, nutrition, convenience, and performance. This approach has transformed food development and remains one of the industry's most powerful innovation tools. But composition does not tell the whole story. Foods are not simply collections of proteins, fats, carbohydrates, vitamins, minerals, and other ingredients. The way those components are organized and interact can influence how a food is processed, perceived, digested, absorbed, and ultimately performs nutritionally.

When a food is fractionated, isolated, refined, fortified, or reconstructed, those relationships can change. A redesigned product may recreate the major components or achieve selected nutritional targets without reproducing all of the sensory, functional, or nutritional behavior of the original food.

Consumer interest in whole and minimally processed foods, recognizable ingredients, and simpler formulations makes this increasingly relevant. Consumers continue to value convenience, affordability, taste, and shelf life, but these preferences may also signal a deeper question: what happens when foods are repeatedly taken apart and rebuilt? This does not mean consumer preferences provide scientific proof that whole foods are always superior. But it does signal a trust and design challenge: how can food science deliver these benefits without assuming that recreating the major parts necessarily recreates the food?

Food design often prioritizes components according to their abundance and ease of measurement. Yet importance is not always proportional to quantity. Flavor science offers a familiar example: compounds present at very low concentrations can have a profound influence on aroma, while larger analytical peaks may contribute comparatively little to the overall experience. Nutrition may present a similar challenge. Recreating the major components of a food does not necessarily mean recreating its nutritional behavior, because structures, interfaces, and interactions that appear relatively minor may influence how nutrients are released, digested, and absorbed.

The product-development question therefore expands from "Have we recreated the major parts?" to "Have we preserved or rebuilt the relationships required for the food to perform as intended?"

What We Know

Foods are organized systems, not simply collections of components. – Foods contain proteins, fats, carbohydrates, fiber, vitamins, minerals, water, and other compounds organized within cells, tissues, particles, droplets, networks, and interfaces. Much of this organization serves biological functions in the plant or animal, including protection, transport, growth, reproduction, and energy storage. When consumed as food, these structures can also influence texture, stability, flavor release, nutrient accessibility, digestion, absorption, and other nutritional outcomes.

Processing changes food structure in multiple ways. – Heating, grinding, refining, homogenization, fermentation, extrusion, fractionation, and other operations can preserve, alter, remove, or create structures and interactions within food. These changes may improve safety, digestibility, stability, convenience, nutrient availability, or sensory quality. They can also alter cellular structures, interfaces, and the way nutrients are released and accessed.

Similar composition can produce different nutritional behavior. – A reconstructed food may match selected nutrient or calorie targets without reproducing the organization of the original food. As a result, compositionally similar foods can differ in nutrient release, digestion, bioaccessibility, absorption, post-meal responses, or energy extraction. These effects have been observed in foods such as nuts, grains, legumes, and dairy products, although their magnitude depends on the food, processing method, nutrient, and outcome being measured. This does not mean reconstructed foods are inherently inferior. It means compositional equivalence does not necessarily establish nutritional equivalence.

Functional importance is not always proportional to quantity. – Food design often prioritizes components that are abundant, easily measured, or already recognized as important. Yet concentration alone does not determine influence. Flavor science provides a familiar example: the largest peak in a chromatogram is not necessarily the compound with the greatest impact on aroma. This does not prove that low-abundance food components have outsized nutritional effects. It illustrates a broader principle: functional importance cannot always be inferred from abundance alone. The significance of a component, structure, interface, or interaction should therefore be determined by evidence, not quantity alone.

The value of structure depends on the intended outcome. – There is no single ideal food structure. Breaking down a food may improve nutrient delivery when rapid availability is desired, while preserving more of its original structure may support slower digestion, moderated nutrient release, greater satiety, or lower energy availability. Differences in digestion, absorption, or post-meal responses do not automatically translate into different long-term health outcomes. The design challenge is to identify which structures and relationships influence the intended outcome, whether those effects persist under real-world conditions, and which features should be preserved, altered, or deliberately rebuilt.

What It Could Mean for Food & Beverage

- **Structure could become an explicit design variable.** – Product design may increasingly ask not only what a food contains, but how its components are organized and delivered. Structure could be designed to support the form, rate, location, and duration of nutrient release most appropriate for the intended outcome.
- **More deliberate reconstruction.** – R&D teams may make more deliberate decisions about what to preserve, what to redesign, and what must be recreated after separation. The design question expands from "Have we recreated the major components?" to "Have we created the relationships required for the food to perform as intended?"
- **New value for less-fractionated ingredient systems.** – Ingredient systems that retain useful native structures and relationships could gain value alongside highly purified ingredients. Their relevance will depend on demonstrating that those retained features provide meaningful functional, nutritional, sensory, or formulation advantages.
- **Stronger finished-product validation.** – Comparing original and reconstructed food structures may become a more important part of product validation. The objective would be to determine whether structural differences meaningfully affect nutrient release, digestion, bioaccessibility, absorption, or other outcomes relevant to the product's intended function.
- **Food fingerprints could become practical design specifications.** – Rather than relying on composition alone, multidimensional characterization could help define the combination of components, structures, interfaces, and interactions associated with a desired nutritional outcome. These fingerprints would not require recreating nature in full. They could help identify which relationships matter, which can be altered, and which should be preserved or rebuilt.

> The design question expands from "Have we recreated the major components?" to "Have we created the relationships required for the food to perform as intended?"

What to Watch

Whether multidimensional analytical systems can define meaningful food fingerprints. – Watch for combinations of analytical, imaging, modeling, and digestion methods that characterize composition, physical structure, interfaces, and component interactions within commercially relevant foods. These systems could help determine how closely a reconstructed food reproduces relevant features of the original food or identify the structural fingerprint required to deliver a desired outcome.

Whether structural differences produce meaningful and sustained outcomes. – Watch for evidence connecting defined changes in food structure to nutrient release, digestion, bioaccessibility, absorption, post-meal responses, or other relevant outcomes. Longer-term studies will be important for determining whether immediate differences persist under real-world patterns of consumption.

Whether useful structures can survive commercial processing. – Watch for processing and formulation technologies that preserve, restore, or deliberately create useful structures while meeting requirements for safety, sensory quality, shelf life, manufacturability, and cost.

Whether research produces actionable design rules. – Watch whether growing understanding of food structure becomes a practical part of product development, comparison, and substantiation, with clear guidance on what should be preserved, altered, or rebuilt for specific outcomes. Its value will depend on producing measurable design principles rather than becoming another broad marketing claim.

FUNCTIONALFRONTIERS POINT OF VIEW

> The question is not nature versus innovation. It is whether a deeper understanding of nature's original design can make food innovation more intentional.

Selected Sources

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

Aguilera, J. M. (2025). Food matrices as delivery units of nutrients in processed foods. *Journal of Food Science*, 90(2), e70049.

Parada, J., & Aguilera, J. M. (2007). Food microstructure affects the bioavailability of several nutrients. *Journal of Food Science*, 72(2), R21 - R32.

Gebauer, S. K., Novotny, J. A., Bornhorst, G. M., & Baer, D. J. (2016). Food processing and structure impact the metabolizable energy of almonds. *Food & Function*, 7(10), 4231 - 4238.

Cai, M., Dou, B., Pugh, J. E., Lett, A. M., & Frost, G. S. (2021). The impact of starchy food structure on postprandial glycemic response and appetite: A systematic review with meta-analysis of randomized crossover trials. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 114(1), 472 - 487.

Thorning, T. K., Bertram, H. C., Bonjour, J.-P., et al. (2017). Whole dairy matrix or single nutrients in assessment of health effects: Current evidence and knowledge gaps. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 105(5), 1033 - 1045.

Grosch, W. (2001). Evaluation of the key odorants of foods by dilution experiments, aroma models and omission. *Chemical Senses*, 26(5), 533 - 545.

Pimentel, G., Burton, K. J., Vergères, G., & Dupont, D. (2018). The role of foodomics to understand the digestion/bioactivity relationship of food. *Current Opinion in Food Science*, 22, 67 - 73.

Selected sources are provided to represent the scientific foundation of this brief. They are not intended to constitute a comprehensive systematic review.