Electronic Supplementary Material (ESI) for Food & Function. This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2019

> 1 2

Supplemental Table 1. Nutrient contents of test meals in clinical assessment of glycemic response from commercial Russet Burbank potato

			pro	ducts				
	Serving size of the	Serving size of	Calories	Protein	Fat	Carbohydrate	Fiber	Sugar
	test potato products	the whole test	(calorie/	(g/serving)	(g/serving)	(g/serving)	(g/serving)	(g/serving)
	(g/serving)	meal (g/serving)	serving)					
				Breakfast ¹				
French fries	213	319	483	20.7	26.2	51	4	0.4
Home fries	234	340	416	21.4	19	51	5.4	2.7
Hash browns	213	319	483	20.7	26.2	51	4	0.4
Pancakes control	60	226	420	22	20.5	51	6	11
				Lunch ²				
Standard meal	NA ³	300	530	23	21.5	63	3	6

3 ¹ In breakfast, a test commercial potato product was served as the only carbohydrate source to participants with scrambled eggs (50 g/serving) and

4 sausage patty (56 g/serving), while the control pancakes were served to participants with scrambled eggs (50 g/serving), sausage patty (56

5 g/serving) as well as sugar-free maple syrup (60 g/serving).

6² In lunch, a standard meal was provided to all participants including turkey (56 g/serving), cheese (21 g/serving), mayonnaise (14 g/serving),

7 lettuce (8 g/serving), bread (57 g/serving), pretzels (42 g/serving), Jell-O (92 g/serving), whipped cream (9 g/serving), and kool-aid (1 g/serving).³

8 ³NA indicated that neither the test potato products nor control pancakes were served to participants.

_mg/100 g DW		3-CQA	4-CQA	5-CQA	Total		
		Freshly prepared potato products					
Russet Burbank	Peel	$93.8 \pm 18b$	2.52 ± 1.1	$141 \pm 19b$	$237 \pm 38b$		
	Flesh	$8.91 \pm 1.0a$	0.880 ± 0.16	$30.4 \pm 2.4a$	$40.2 \pm 3.6a$		
Shepody	Peel	$63.8 \pm 13b$	1.30 ± 0.32	$77.5 \pm 11b$	$143 \pm 24b$		
	Flesh	$4.33 \pm 1.3a$	0.885 ± 0.33	$29.0 \pm 3.8a$	$34.2 \pm 4.9a$		
Con			ommercial potato products				
Russet Burbank	French fries	$5.78 \pm 1.5b$	$32.0 \pm 6.7b$	$179 \pm 30b$	$217 \pm 39b$		
	Home fries	2.52 ± 1.4 ab	$9.69 \pm 3.5a$	$54.4 \pm 13a$	$66.6 \pm 18a$		
	Hash browns	$1.26 \pm 0.098a$	$6.81 \pm 0.86a$	$54.9 \pm 5.8a$	$62.9 \pm 6.8a$		
Shepody	French fries	$0.851 \pm 0.22a$	$6.08 \pm 0.63a$	49.5 ± 5.6	56.5 ± 6.3		
· ·	Home fries	$4.76\pm0.53b$	$14.0 \pm 1.6b$	46.5 ± 6.0	65.3 ± 8.1		

Supplemental Table 2. Contents of caffeoylquinic acids in fresh potatoes and commercial potato products $\frac{4}{4}$

⁴ Presence of different letters indicated statistical difference in phenolic contents among potato products derived from the same cultivar (p < 0.05).

		3-CQA	4-CQA	5-CQA	
		Relative bioaccessibility (%)			
Russet Burbank	French fries	$44.8\pm15~\%$	$103\pm8.4~\%$	$34.4 \pm 4.4 \%$	
	Home fries	$51.7\pm12~\%$	$123\pm25~\%$	$56.8\pm13~\%$	
	Hash browns	$29.4\pm8.2~\%$	$117\pm15~\%$	$42.0\pm10~\%$	
Shepody	French fries	$35.3 \pm 11 \%$	$93.0\pm20~\%$	$44.6\pm23~\%$	
	Home fries	$23.4\pm7.1~\%$	$105\pm24~\%$	$12.3\pm3.4~\%$	
		Absolute bioac	cessibility (µg p	er 1 oz serving)	
Russet Burbank	French fries	$143\pm47b$	$150 \pm 12b$	929 ± 120	
	Home fries	$80.8 \pm 18b$	$334 \pm 67c$	821 ± 190	
	Hash browns	$35.4\pm9.9a$	86.9 ± 11a	404 ± 99	
Shepody	French fries	28.1 ± 8.5	51.7 ± 11	305 ± 160	
	Home fries	91.8 ± 28	46.3 ± 10	112 ± 31	

Supplemental Table 3. Phenolic bioaccessibility of re-constituted commercial potato products ⁵

⁵ Presence of different letters indicated statistical difference in starch contents among potato products derived from the same cultivar (p < 0.05).

Clinic study design

(randomized intervention of commercial potato products)



1 day intervention details



Breakfast formulations (50 g available carbohydrate per serving)
Test: a commercial Russet Burbank potato product + calorie-free beverage

• Control: whole grain wheat pancake from Hodgson's Mill + calorie-free beverage

Supplemental Figure 1