

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Segregation of ‘Hayward’ kiwifruit for storage potential

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Plant Science

at

Massey University

New Zealand

Jinquan Feng

2003



"Science is but an image of the truth."

Francis Bacon

Abstract

This study aimed to develop technologies to segregate ‘Hayward’ kiwifruit (*Actinidia deliciosa* (A.Chev) C.F. Liang et A.R. Ferguson) for storage potential. Such segregation will allow the industry to better match market opportunities with the storage potential of particular fruit thereby reducing fruit loss and assuring fruit quality in the market place.

The first part of the research rationalised methodologies to study storage potential of kiwifruit. These included firmness measurement, fruit temperature equilibration, calculation of storage life, sample preparation for mineral analysis and the feasibility of using compression force as an alternative to flesh firmness for firmness monitoring.

The second part of the research developed a model to segregate kiwifruit on a grower line basis. Based on data collected over 2 years from 108 grower lines, canonical discriminant analysis indicated that the first two canonical functions (CDF_1 and CDF_2) accounted for 95% variation of four softening-rate groups and correctly classified over 50% of the grower lines to the correct groups compared with a chance criterion of 25%. Grower lines with high CDF_1 (characterised by high Ca/N, high Mg, advanced maturity, late harvest and low lightness) softened at low rates and had long storage life. CDF_2 discriminated grower lines on prestorage delay. For grower lines with low CDF_1 , extending prestorage delay improved storage potential. In contrast, extended prestorage delay reduced the storage potential of grower lines with high CDF_1 .

The third part of the research developed a model to segregate kiwifruit on an individual fruit basis. NIR spectra taken at harvest were used to quantify many at-harvest fruit attributes, allowing for prediction of fruit firmness at the end of storage and discriminating disordered fruit from healthy fruit for fruit segregation on an individual fruit basis. Further work is needed to improve prediction and segregation accuracies by selecting appropriate NIR instrument and to incorporate the instrument with grading machines in a way that measurement error can be minimised. Factors affecting NIR measurement and possible improvements were also investigated.

The strategic application of segregation technologies and further research directions are discussed for the kiwifruit industry to develop cost-effective procedures to solve problems associated with fruit variation in storage potential.

Acknowledgements

First of all, I thank my supervisors Dr Bruce MacKay, Dr Kate Maguire and Dr Simon Brown for their continued support, encouragement and excellent advice throughout my PhD study. I also thank Dr Nigel Banks who initiated the research, supervised the PhD programme at the first year and continued his support, encouragement, and advice on the research following his move to Zespri Innovation Company Ltd.

I am grateful to Dr Sandy Lang of HortResearch who encouraged me to this study and provided me with many help and advice.

I thank all staff and students of Fresh Technologies in the Institute of Food, Nutrition and Human Health for friendship and continued support and stimulating discussions. Special thanks to Professor Errol Hewett, Dr Maarten Hertog, Dr Jason Benge, Dr Dave Tanner, Dr Richard Love, Peter Jeffery, Sue Nicholson, Andrew Nevins and Andrew East for their help in research planning, laboratory techniques, and data analysis.

I would like to acknowledge the friendship and support I have received from the Institute of Fundamental Science and the Soil Science Laboratory at Massey University, Compac Sorting Equipment Ltd, Zespri Innovation Company Ltd and the Institute of Geological and Nuclear Sciences where the visible-near-infrared spectroscopy measurement, mineral analysis and differential energy X-ray analysis were made.

Special thanks go to Zespri International Ltd that funded the work reported here through a Zespri postgraduate fellowship (doctoral).

Finally, and most importantly, my thanks go to my wife Qingmin Cheng and my daughters for sacrificing their precious family time to support me working after hours and during weekends.

Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of contents.....	v
List of tables.....	xiii
List of figures.....	xvi
List of symbols and abbreviations.....	xxiii

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1	BACKGROUND.....	1
1.2	RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS.....	1
1.3	REFERENCES.....	2

Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1	INTRODUCTION.....	4
2.2	MEASUREMENT OF STORAGE LIFE.....	4
2.2.1	Firmness measurement.....	4
2.2.2	Calculating SL from firmness monitoring data.....	6
2.3	STORAGE DISORDERS AFFECTING STORAGE LIFE.....	7
2.3.1	Fruit rot.....	8
2.3.2	Soft Patches.....	8
2.3.3	Low temperature breakdown.....	8
2.3.4	Purple patches.....	9
2.3.5	Physiological pitting.....	9
2.4	MECHANISM OF FRUIT SOFTENING.....	10
2.4.1	Changes in cell wall.....	10
2.4.1.1	Pectin.....	11
2.4.1.2	Cellulose and hemicelluloses.....	12
2.4.1.3	Cell wall synthesis.....	12

2.4.2	Starch.....	13
2.4.3	The role of ethylene.....	13
2.5	MATHEMATICAL DESCRIPTION OF FRUIT SOFTENING.....	14
2.5.1	Empirical models.....	14
2.5.2	Mechanistic models.....	14
2.6	FACTORS AFFECTING STP.....	15
2.6.1	Soluble solids content.....	15
2.6.1.1	Variation of at-harvest SSC.....	16
2.6.1.2	Changes in SSC during the postharvest stage.....	16
2.6.1.3	SSC and STP.....	17
2.6.2	Dry matter.....	18
2.6.2.1	Measurement of DM.....	18
2.6.2.2	Variation in DM.....	19
2.6.2.3	DM and storage potential.....	19
2.6.3	Fruit size.....	19
2.6.3.1	Variation in fruit size.....	20
2.6.3.2	Fruit size and STP.....	20
2.6.4	Fruit colour and flesh colour.....	21
2.6.5	Minerals.....	22
2.6.5.1	Assimilation of minerals to kiwifruit.....	22
2.6.5.2	Within fruit distribution of minerals.....	22
2.6.5.3	Minerals and STP.....	23
2.6.6	Respiration and ethylene production.....	24
2.6.6.1	Respiration.....	24
2.6.6.2	Ethylene.....	25
2.7	NON-DESTRUCTIVE MEASUREMENT OF FRUIT ATTRIBUTES.....	27
2.7.1	Near-infrared spectroscopy.....	27
2.7.1.1	Principle of VNIR.....	27
2.7.1.2	Instrumentation and measurement procedure.....	29
2.7.1.3	Data analysis.....	31
2.7.1.4	Applications.....	32
2.7.2	X-ray technologies.....	33
2.7.2.1	Principles of CT measurement.....	34
2.7.2.2	Instrumentations for X-ray measurements.....	34

2.7.2.3 X-ray data processing.....	35
2.8 DISCUSSION.....	35
2.9 REFERENCES.....	37

Chapter 3 Suggestions on rationalized methodologies to investigate kiwifruit storage life

3.1 INTRODUCTION.....	50
3.2 MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	51
3.2.1 Improvement on firmness measurement.....	51
3.2.2 Temperature equilibration for measurement of various fruit attributes.....	52
3.2.3 Improvement on calculation of storage life.....	52
3.2.4 Comparison between mineral analysis results from wet and dry samples.....	52
3.3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	53
3.3.1 Improvement on firmness measurement.....	53
3.3.2 Temperature equilibration for measurement of fruit attributes.....	53
3.3.3 Improvement on calculation of storage life.....	58
3.3.4 Comparison between mineral analysis results from wet and dry samples.....	60
3.4 CONCLUSIONS.....	61
3.5 REFERENCES.....	62

Chapter 4 The application of compression force in the study of kiwifruit storage life

4.1 INTRODUCTION.....	64
4.2 MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	65
4.2.1 Year 2000 experiment.....	65
4.2.2 Year 2001 experiment.....	66
4.2.3 Influence of weight loss on the relationship between CF and FF.....	67
4.2.4 Data analysis.....	67
4.3 RESULTS.....	68
4.3.1 Comparison of the CF- FF relationships observed over two years.....	68

4.3.2	Influence of weight loss on CF-FF relationship.....	69
4.3.3	Changes in CF during storage.....	71
4.3.4	Ability of compression force to estimate storage life.....	72
4.4	DISCUSSION.....	74
4.5	CONCLUSION.....	75
4.6	REFERENCES.....	76

Chapter 5 Discriminating grower lines of ‘Hayward’ kiwifruit for storage potential

5.1	INTRODUCTION.....	78
5.2	MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	80
5.2.1	Experiment 1.....	80
5.2.2	Experiment 2.....	81
5.2.3	Data analysis.....	82
5.3	RESULTS.....	84
5.3.1	Storage life.....	84
5.3.2	Multivariate discriminant analysis.....	86
5.3.3	Discriminant accuracy.....	88
5.3.4	Validation of the canonical discriminant model.....	89
5.3.5	Comparison between experiments.....	90
5.4	DISCUSSION.....	92
5.5	CONCLUSION.....	97
5.6	REFERENCES.....	98

Chapter 6 Measurement of at-harvest fruit attributes using visible-near-infrared spectroscopy

6.1	INTRODUCTION.....	106
6.2	MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	109
6.2.1	Experiment 1.....	109
6.2.2	Experiment 2.....	110

6.2.3	Experiment 3.....	110
6.2.4	Experiment 4.....	111
6.2.5	Data analysis.....	112
6.2.5.1	Pre-treatment of spectral data.....	112
6.2.5.2	Development of calibrations on pre-treated spectra.....	114
6.3	RESULTS.....	115
6.3.1	Predictive models established in experiment 1.....	115
6.3.2	Predictive models established in experiment 2.....	117
6.3.3	Predictive models established in experiment 3.....	119
6.3.4	Predictive models established in experiment 4.....	121
6.3.5	Comparison of VNIR spectra from different experiments.....	124
6.4	DISCUSSION.....	126
6.4.1	Comparison between current study and the literature	126
6.4.2	Comparison of the four experiments.....	126
6.4.3	Chemical and spectroscopic analysis of predictive models.....	129
6.4.4	Effects of pre-calibration transformations of spectral data.....	130
6.4.5	Measurement error.....	131
6.5	CONCLUSION.....	132
6.6	REFERENCES.....	132

Chapter 7 Segregation of 'Hayward' kiwifruit for storage potential using visible-near-infrared spectroscopy

7.1	INTRODUCTION.....	137
7.2	MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	137
7.2.1	Experiment 1.....	137
7.2.2	Experiment 2.....	139
7.2.3	Experiment 3.....	139
7.2.4	Data analysis.....	140
7.3	RESULTS.....	142
7.3.1	Predictive models for fruit firmness measured at the end of storage.....	142
7.3.2	Discrimination of disordered fruit.....	144
7.3.2.1	Discrimination of disordered fruit in experiment 1	144

7.3.2.2 Discrimination of disordered fruit in experiment 2.....	147
7.3.2.3 Discrimination of disordered fruit in experiment 3.....	151
7.3.2.4 Discrimination of disordered fruit in experiment 3 with respect to time.....	154
7.3.3 Comparison of the predictive models between experiments.....	157
7.4 DISCUSSION.....	159
7.5 CONCLUSION.....	164
7.6 REFERENCES.....	165

Chapter 8 Factors affecting VNIR measurements of kiwifruit attributes

8.1 INTRODUCTION.....	168
8.2 MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	170
8.2.1 VNIR transmittance of different chemical solutions and reflectance of kiwifruit subjected to different chemical dipping and storage treatments ...	170
8.2.2 VNIR reflectance of different fruit tissues.....	172
8.2.3 Effect of post harvest delay and weight loss on interactance VNIR spectra.....	172
8.2.4 Effect of compression and abrasion on VNIR spectra.....	173
8.2.5 Effect of hair brushing on interactance VNIR spectra.....	174
8.2.6 Data analysis.....	174
8.3 RESULTS.....	175
8.3.1 VNIR transmittance of different chemical solutions.....	175
8.3.2 VNIR reflectance of fruit from chemical dipping and storage treatments....	176
8.3.3 VNIR reflectance of different fruit tissues.....	181
8.3.4 VNIR reflectance of fruit from different weight loss treatment.....	182
8.3.5 Effect of compression and abrasion treatments on VNIR absorbance.....	185
8.3.6 Effect of hair brushing on VNIR absorbance.....	189
8.4 DISCUSSION.....	190
8.4.1 Physical and chemical basis of VNIR absorbance.....	190
8.4.2 Effects of prestorage delay, storage and weight loss.....	193
8.4.3 Effects of mechanical damages and hair-brushing.....	195
8.4.4 Impacts on predicting fruit attributes from VNIR absorbance.....	196

Chapter 9 Non-destructive measurement of kiwifruit attributes using differential energy X-ray analysis

Chapter 10 General discussion

10.1	INTRODUCTION.....	214
10.2	SEGREGATION ON A GROWER LINE BASIS.....	214
10.2.1	Discriminant model on a grower line basis.....	214
10.2.2	Speculation on improving the discriminant model on a grower line basis....	219
10.2.3	Rationalised methodologies for measuring fruit attributes involved in discriminant model on a grower line basis.....	222
10.3	SEGREGATION ON AN INDIVIDUAL FRUIT BASIS.....	225
10.3.1	Measurement of at-harvest fruit attributes using VNIR.....	225
10.3.2	Predicting fruit firmness at the end of storage based on VNIR spectra.....	228
10.3.3	Discriminating fruit for storage disorders based on VNIR spectra.....	229
10.3.4	Spectroscopic basis of the discriminant models.....	231
10.3.5	Rationalised methodologies for VNIR measurement and data processing...	232

10.3.6 Evaluation of differential energy X-ray analysis for kiwifruit segregation...234

10.4 STRATEGIC APPLICATION OF FRUIT SEGREGATION AT AN
INDUSTRY LEVEL.....235

10.4.1 Establishing a database.....235

10.4.2 Strategic segregation.....235

10.4.3 STP test on library fruit.....236

10.4.4 Condition check.....236

10.4.5 Information fed back from market places.....238

10.4.6 Database analysis.....238

10.5 CONCLUSIONS.....238

10.6 REFERENCES.....239

List of Tables

Table 2.1	Important VNIR wavelengths used for measuring different attributes.....	28
Table 2.2	Instruments and operating conditions used in previous studies.....	35
Table 4.1	Estimated parameters of the Richards functions that describe the relationship between compression force (CF) and flesh firmness (FF) in different years.	68
Table 4.2	Influence of weight loss (WL) on parameters of a power function describing the relationship between CF and FF	70
Table 4.3	Intercept and slope of linear relationships between FF and CF estimated for year 2000 and 2001 fruit. CF values equivalent to 8.5 N FF (CF _{end}) were calculated from the linear relationship for calculating storage life using CF data.	73
Table 5.1	Softening-rate groups (KG) formed for multivariate discriminant analysis...	84
Table 5.2	Means of canonical scores of the first two canonical discriminant functions (CDF ₁ and CDF ₂) for four softening-rate groups (KG ₁ softened at the lowest rate while KG ₄ softened at the highest rate).	87
Table 5.3	The standardized canonical coefficients (SCC) and the correlation coefficients (r) between the canonical functions (CDF ₁ and CDF ₂) and the variables	88
Table 5.4	Discriminant accuracy based on the first two canonical functions for 72 grower lines in the model building dataset	89
Table 5.5	Discriminant accuracy based on the first two canonical functions for 36 grower lines in the validation dataset.....	90
Table 5.6	Discriminant accuracy based on the first two canonical functions for 37 grower lines in experiment 1.....	91
Table 5.7	Discriminant accuracy based on the first two canonical functions for 71 grower lines in experiment 2.....	91

Table 6.1	VNIR data pre-calibration transformations used in this study.....	112
Table 6.2	Wavelength range, truncation and boxcar-averaging of spectral data in different experiments	113
Table 6.3	Predictive models for at-harvest fruit attributes based on VNIR spectra of a monochromator in experiment 1 (n=268 for model-building data set and 132 for validation data set).	116
Table 6.4	Predictive models for at-harvest fruit attributes based on VNIR spectra of a commercial VNIR fruit sorting system in experiment 2 (fruit number in model data set was two times that of the validation data set listed).	118
Table 6.5	Predictive models for at-harvest fruit attributes based on VNIR spectra of a USB2000 fibre optic spectrometer in experiment 3 (fruit number in the model data set was two times that of the validation data set listed).	120
Table 6.6	Predictive models for at-harvest fruit attributes based on VNIR spectra of a USB2000 fibre optic spectrometer in experiment 4 (fruit number in the model data set was two times that of the validation data set listed).	122
Table 7.1	Predictive models for fruit firmness after 6 (Experiment 1 and Experiment 3) or 9 months (Experiment 2) storage at 0.5°C based on VNIR spectra (fruit number in model data set was two times that of the validation data set listed).	142
Table 7.2	Segregation effects for fruit in the validation data set according to predicted CFS or FFS after 6 (experiment 1 and experiment 3) or 9 months (experiment 2) storage at 0.5°C using the predictive models listed in table 7.1.	143
Table 7.3	The means of the first two canonical discriminant functions (CDF_1 and CDF_2) of the four groups of fruit in the model building data set of experiment 1.	144
Table 7.4	The standardized canonical coefficients (SCC) and the correlation coefficients (r) between spectral data and the first two canonical functions (CDF_1 and CDF_2) of experiment 1.....	145
Table 7.5	Effect of a four-group segregation based on the first two canonical functions for 154 fruit in the validation data set of experiment 1.....	147
Table 7.6	The means of the first two canonical discriminant functions (CDF_1 and CDF_2) of the three groups of fruit in the model building data set of experiment 2.	148
Table 7.7	The standardized canonical coefficients (SCC) and the correlation coefficients (r) between spectral data and the first two canonical functions (CDF_1 and CDF_2) of experiment 2.....	149

Table 7.8	Effect of a four-group segregation based on the first two canonical functions for 840 fruit in the validation data set of experiment 2.....	151
Table 7.9	Effect of a four-group segregation based on three canonical functions for 9,612 fruit in the validation data set of experiment 3.	154
Table 7.10	Four fruit groups formed for canonical discriminant analysis in experiment 3 with respect to time.....	154
Table 7.11	Effect of a four-group segregation with respect to time based on three canonical functions for 9444 fruit in the validation data set of experiment 3.	157
Table 7.12	Effect of a two-group segregation with respect to time based on three canonical functions for 9444 fruit in the validation data set of experiment 3.....	157
Table 8.1	Chemical dipping and storage treatments.....	170
Table 8.2	Difference in compression force (CF), flesh firmness (FF), soluble solids content (SSC), fruit colour (L, C, H) and flesh colour (FL, FC, FH) between storage treatments	179
Table 9.1	DEXA variables retrieved from DEXA images of ‘Hayward’ kiwifruit....	203
Table 9.2	Parameters estimated for a prediction model of fruit weight using DEXA variables at the first DEXA measurement	206
Table 9.3	Parameters of a predictive model for dry matter content using DEXA variables selected by stepwise regression. Data from 60 fruit located in the second row at the first DEXA measurement were used for the regression...	206
Table 9.4	Relationship between nitrogen concentration and DEXA variables at the first DEXA measurement based on data from 30 fruit located in the second row	208
Table 9.5	Relationship between nitrogen concentration and DEXA variables at the second DEXA measurement based on data from 52 fruit located in the second row	209

List of Figures

Figure 2.1 Diagrammatic representation of softening of kiwifruit (adapted from MacRae et al., 1990).7

Figure 2.2 The apparatus used for measuring (a) reflectance, (b) transmittance, and (c) interactance spectra of kiwifruit, showing (i) the light source, (ii) fruit, (iii) fibre bundle leading to detector, (iv) black foam holder, (v) light seal, (vi) condensing lens, (vii) glass top, and (viii) mirror (Schaare and Fraser, 2000).30

Figure 3.1 Relationship between two firmness readings measured on two sides of fruit by a drill-mounted Effegi penetrometer (A) and a texture analyser (B). FF1 is the firmness value measured on side 1 and FF2 is the value for side 2. Solid lines represent the fitted linear relationships between FF1 and FF2 with intercepts fixed to 0 ($FF2=0.977\pm0.011\cdot FF1$, $n=180$, $R^2=0.98$ in A; $FF2=0.969\pm0.008\cdot FF1$, $n=180$, $R^2=0.99$ in B).54

Figure 3.2 Changes in fruit temperature (A) and weight loss (B) of count 36 kiwifruit recorded at 2-minute intervals during equilibration in different packages. Each temperature point is the mean of the 9 plungers inserted into the core, flesh and under skin positions of 3 fruit in each package. Weight loss data were measured on a package basis.55

Figure 3.3 Changes in flesh firmness (FF) of count 36 kiwifruit during equilibration in in moulded pulp trays (M tray, A) or single-layered kiwifruit trays with polyliner (K tray, B). Each point is the mean of 20 (A) or 24 (B) fruit. Vertical bars are standard errors of the means. Solid lines are fitted exponential curves.56

Figure 3.4 Changes in fruit colour (L, solid; C, dash; H, dot) during temperature equilibration in moulded pulp trays (M tray, A) or single-layered kiwifruit trays with polyliner (K tray, B). Each point is the mean of 20 (A) or 30 (B) fruit. Vertical bars are standard errors of the means.57

- Figure 3.5 Changes in measured respiration rate during temperature equilibration in moulded pulp trays (M trays; A) or single-layered kiwifruit trays with a polyliner (K trays; B). Each point is the mean of 6 fruit. Vertical bars are standard errors of the means. The final point in B was measured after 10 h equilibration in an M tray in addition to 25 h equilibration in a K tray.....58
- Figure 3.6 Effects of the number of monitoring periods on standard error of the mean predicted value (STDP) and the means of the squared prediction error (MSPR) for flesh firmness (FF) at the end of storage (each point represents an averaged value for fruit of the six growers whose FF had been monitored for six or more periods)59
- Figure 3.7 Relationship between repeated mineral (A - N, B - P, C - K, D - Ca, E - Mg) analysis results measured on wet (triangle) or dry (square) samples. Dry matter content (DM, %) measured on two halves of the same fruit for calculating mineral concentrations on fresh weight basis for the dry sample method is shown in F.60
- Figure 3.8 Difference in mineral concentrations among fruit tissues of 'Hayward' kiwifruit. Each column represents the means of 5 repeat measurements; vertical bars are standard errors of the means.....61
- Figure 4.1 A Richards function (solid lines) fitted to compression force (CF) and flesh firmness (FF) data (circles) collected in year 2000 (A) and 2001 (B).....69
- Figure 4.2 Effect of weight loss on the relationship between CF and FF. Each point represents a fruit. Solid lines represent predicted FF by power functions fitted to data in each treatment.70
- Figure 4.3 Plots and model fit for CF measured after three months storage versus DAH on grower line basis for fruit sampled in year 2000 (each point is the mean of 20 fruits. Vertical bars represent the standard errors of the means).71
- Figure 4.4 Plot of FF and CF measured at the end of storage. Each point represents a fruit. Solid lines represent linear relations between CF and FF. Dash lines represent confidence intervals of predicted FF means. Dotted lines represent 8.5 N FF and equivalent CF values.....72
- Figure 4.5 Storage life (SL) estimated from compression force (CF) matched to SL estimated from flesh firmness (FF) for grower lines of year 2000 (squares) and 2001 (round points).....73

- Figure 5.1 Relationship between fruit softening rate (k) and initial fruit firmness (FF_0) estimated for 108 grower lines based on flesh firmness data collected after three to six months storage. Each point represents a grower line. The solid line represents a linear model fitted to data ($FF_0 = 13.3 \pm 0.5 + 3378 \pm 168 \cdot k$, $n=109$, $r=0.89$)85
- Figure 5.2 Relationship between storage life (SL) and softening rate (k). Each point represents a grower line. The solid line represents a curvilinear model fitted to the data86
- Figure 5.3 Separation of the fastest, second fastest, second slowest and the slowest softening grower lines by the first two canonical functions (CDF_1 and CDF_2) for 72 grower lines in the model building dataset.....87
- Figure 5.4 Separation of the fastest, second fastest, second slowest and the slowest softening grower lines by the first two canonical functions (CDF_1 and CDF_2) for 36 grower lines in the validation dataset.....89
- Figure 6.1 Measured and predicted values of fruit colour (L, C, H), flesh colour (FL, FC, FL), compression force (CF), flesh firmness (FF), soluble solid content (SSC), dry matter content (DM) and mineral concentrations (N, P, K, Ca, and Mg) using the predictive models (Table 3) established in experiment 1 for validation data set.....117
- Figure 6.2 Measured and predicted values of fruit colour (L, C, H), flesh colour (FL, FC, FL), compression force (CF), flesh firmness (FF), soluble solid content (SSC), dry matter content (DM) and mineral concentrations (N, P, K, Ca and Mg) using the optimal predictive model (Table 6.4) established in experiment 2 for validation data set.119
- Figure 6.3 Measured and predicted values of fruit colour (L, C, H), flesh colour (FL, FC, FL), compression force (CF), flesh firmness (FF), soluble solid content (SSC), dry matter content (DM) and mineral concentrations (N, P, K, Ca and Mg) using the predictive model (Table 6.5) established in experiment 3 for validation data set.....121

- Figure 6.4 Measured and predicted values of flesh colour (FL, FC, FL), flesh firmness (FF), soluble solid content (SSC) and dry matter content (DM) using the predictive model (Table 6.6) established in experiment 4 for validation data set.123
- Figure 6.5 Comparison between VNIR absorbance spectra from the four experiments. Each line represents the mean of all fruit in the experiment. Absorbance spectra were normalised to minimum and maximum per experiment for comparison.124
- Figure 6.6 PLS regression coefficients for estimation of flesh lightness (FL), flesh chroma (FC), flesh hue (FH), flesh firmness (FF) soluble solid content (SSC) and dry matter content (DM) obtained in different experiments.125
- Figure 7.1 Separation of healthy fruit, fruit with soft patches, low temperature breakdown and purple patches by the first two canonical functions (CDF_1 and CDF_2) for fruit in the model building data set (A) and the validation data set (B) in experiment 1.146
- Figure 7.2 Separation of healthy fruit, fruit with soft patches and low temperature breakdown based on the first two canonical functions (CDF_1 and CDF_2) for fruit in the model building data set (A) and the validation data set (B) in experiment 2. Three quarters of the data points were omitted for clarity...150
- Figure 7.3 Means of the three canonical functions (CDF_1 , CDF_2 and CDF_3) of healthy fruit group and groups of fruit with soft patch (SP), stem end botrytis (SEB) and side rots (SR) in the model-building data set (A) and the validation data set (B) of experiment 3.152
- Figure 7.4 The standardized canonical coefficients (SCC) in three canonical functions (CDF_1 , CDF_2 and CDF_3) used to discriminate groups of disordered fruit in experiment 3.153
- Figure 7.5 Means of the three canonical functions (CDF_1 , CDF_2 and CDF_3) of high-risk, medium-risk, low-risk and healthy fruit groups in the model-building data set (A) and the validation data set (B) of experiment 3.155

Figure 7.6 The standardized canonical coefficients (SCC) in three canonical functions (CDF₁, CDF₂ and CDF₃) used to discriminate fruit of high-risk, medium-risk, low-risk and healthy fruit groups in experiment 3.....156

Figure 7.7 Partial least square regression coefficients for the prediction of compression force (A) and flesh firmness (B) at the end of storage obtained in experiment 1 (solid line), experiment 2 (dash line) and experiment 3 (dot line).....158

Figure 8.1 VNIR spectra of chemical solutions (*I*_λ) relative to that of water (*I*_{H₂O})..176

Figure 8.2 Absorbance spectra of fruit from different storage treatments. Each line is the mean of eight fruit.....177

Figure 8.3 Relationship between cumulative degree-days (DD) of storage treatment and VNIR absorbance at 766 nm (ABS₇₆₆). Each point is the mean of eight fruit. Vertical bars represent standard error of the means. The solid line is a curvilinear relationship between ABS₇₆₆ and DD:
$$ABS_{766} = 0.36 \pm 0.03 + 0.059 \pm 0.006 \cdot \log_e (DD) \dots\dots\dots177$$

Figure 8.4 Second derivative spectra (D₂) of fruit from different storage treatments as a function of cumulative degree-days (DD). Each line in A is the mean of eight fruit. Each point in B is the mean of the log transformed difference between D₂ values at the peak (700 nm) and the trough (684 nm) of the eight fruit in each treatment (LN(D₂)= log_e (D₂₍₇₀₀₎-D₂₍₆₈₄₎). Vertical bars represent standard errors of the means. The solid line in B is a linear relationship between LN(D₂) and DD: $LN(D_2) = -6.01 \pm 0.06 - 0.0045 \pm 0.0004 \cdot DD \dots\dots\dots178$

Figure 8.5 Changes in compression force (CF), flesh firmness (FF), soluble solids content (SSC), fruit colour (L, C, H) and flesh colour (FL, FC) in respond to cumulative degree-days of storage treatments. Each point is the mean of eight fruit. Vertical bars represent standard errors of the means. Solid lines are fitted non-linear, linear or curvilinear relationships between fruit attributes and DD:180

Figure 8.6 Absorbance spectra of outer pericarp (OP) with skin, OP without skin, inner pericarp (IP) and core. Each line is the mean of three repeated measurements..... 181

- Figure 8.7 VNIR reflectance of fruit subjected to different weight loss treatments for two (A), three (B), four (C) and eight (D) days. Each line is the means of 50 fruit. The first two measurements were made under fluorescent light while the last two measurements were made under tungsten light.182
- Figure 8.8 Average VNIR reflectance taken on fruit after two, three, four and eight days of weight loss treatment. Each line is the mean of 200 fruit. The first two measurements were made under fluorescent light while the last two measurements were made under tungsten light183
- Figure 8.9 Effects of weight loss treatments on fruit weight loss (WL), colour (L, C, H), compression force (CF) and flesh firmness (FF). Each point is the mean of 50 fruit except for FF, which is the mean of 25 fruit. Vertical bars represent standard errors of the means.184
- Figure 8.10 Compression distance (D) and compression force (CF) applied to fruit for compression and abrasion treatments. Each point is the mean of 20 fruit. Vertical bars represent standard errors of the means. Solid line represent fitted linear relationship between CF and D: $CF = 34.1 \pm 0.7 \cdot D$, $n=80$, $R^2=0.82$.185
- Figure 8.11 VNIR reflectance taken one (A and B), three (C and D) and seven (E and F) days after abrasion (A, C and E), and compression (B, D and F) treatments with compression distances of 4.5, 3.5, 2.5 and 0 (CK) mm. Each line is the mean of 20 fruit. The first measurements were made under fluorescent light while the last two were made under tungsten light.....186
- Figure 8.12 VNIR absorbance at 671 nm (ABS_{671}) and 824 nm (ABS_{824}) one, three and seven days after the abrasion (A and C) and compression (B and D) treatments with different compression distances. Each line is the mean of 20 fruit. Vertical bars are standard errors of the means. The first measurement was made under fluorescent light while the last two were made under tungsten light.....187
- Figure 8.13 Effects of abrasion (A, C, E, G and I) and compression (B, D, F, H and J) treatments on compression force (CF), flesh firmness (FF) and fruit colour (L, C, H). Each point is the mean of 20 fruit. Vertical bars represent standard errors of the means.188

Figure 8.14 Effect of hair-brushing on VNIR absorbance. Each line is the mean of 20 fruit. Regions with significant difference are highlighted with dots.	189
Figure 8.15 Effect of hair-brushing on compression force (CF), flesh firmness (FF) and fruit colour (L, C and H). Each column is the mean of 20 fruit. Vertical bars represent standard errors of the means.	190
Figure 9.1 DEXA scanner used to measure kiwifruit (Rapiscan Security Products Inc., 2003).	204
Figure 9.2 Measured and predicted fruit weight (W) using DEXA variables at the first (A) and second (B) DEXA measurement. Details of the predictive model are listed in table 9.1. Each point represents a fruit. The solid line represents a 1:1 line.....	205
Figure 9.3 Predicted dry matter content (DM) and measured DM using DEXA variables for fruit located in the second row at the first DEXA measurement , the first row at the first DEXA measurement or the second row at the second DEXA measurement. Each point represents a fruit. The solid line represents a 1:1 line.....	207
Figure 9.4 Predicted and measured nitrogen concentrations for fruit in the first (A and C) and second (B and D) DEXA measurement based on the relationships established with data from the first (A and B) or the second (C and D) DEXA measurements. Each point represents a fruit. The solid line represents a 1:1 line.....	208
Figure 10.1 Strategies application of segregation technologies for storage potential (STP) at an industry level (solid arrows indicate fruit flow and hollow arrows represent information flow; dark red indicates fruit unsuitable for sale, red indicates fruit to be sold first, yellow indicates fruit to be sold later and green indicates fruit to be sold last).....	237

List of Symbols and Abbreviations

α	A coefficient between internal ethylene concentration and the concentration of a hypothetical enzyme catalysing fruit softening	
A	Surface area of a fruit	m^2
A	The upper asymptote of a Richards function	
AA	Ascorbic acid	
ABS	Absorbance	
ABS+NM	ABS normalised to minimum and maximum	
ABS+QBC	Quadratic baseline compensation of ABS	
ABS+SNV	Standard normal variate transformation of ABS	
ABS_{671}	VNIR absorbance at 671 nm	
ABS_{824}	VNIR absorbance at 824 nm	
ACC	1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylic acid	
ACO	ACC oxidase	
ASTD	Average standard deviation	
b	Positions parameter of a Richards function	
C	Fruit chroma	
CC_p	Percentage chance criterion	%
Ca	Calcium concentration	mmol kg^{-1}
CA	Controlled atmosphere	
Ca/N	The ratio of calcium and nitrogen concentrations	%
CDA	Canonical discriminant analysis	
CDF_1	The first canonical function	
CDF_2	The second canonical function	
CDF_3	The third canonical function	
CDF_{1i}	CDF_1 of observation i	
CDF_{2i}	CDF_2 of observation i	
$\overline{\text{CDF}}_{1j}$	The mean CDF_1 of group j	
$\overline{\text{CDF}}_{2j}$	The mean CDF_2 of group j	
CF	Compression force	N

CF ₀	Initial compression force	N
CF _{end}	A CF value equivalent to a flesh firmness of 8.5 N at 20 °C	N
CFS	CF measured at simulated shelf life	N
CI	Chilling injury	
CT	Computed tomography	
d	Day	
D	Compression distance	mm
D ₁	First order derivative	
D ₂	Second derivative of ABS	
D ₂₍₆₈₄₎	The second derivative at 684 nm	
D ₂₍₇₀₀₎	The second derivative at 700 nm	
D ₂ +NM	D ₂ normalised to minimum and maximum	
D ₂ +SNV	Standard normal variate transformation of D ₂	
D_{ij}	Mahalanobis distance of observation <i>i</i> to the centre of group <i>j</i>	
DD	Cumulative degree-days	°C d
DEXA	Differential energy X-ray analysis	
df	degree of freedom	
DL	Postharvest delay	d
DM	Dry matter content	%
DW	Dry weight	kg
ECC	Eccentricity	
Enz	A hypothetical enzyme catalysing fruit softening	
Enz(t)	The concentration of Enz at time t	mol L ⁻¹
Enz ₀	Initial concentration of Enz	mol L ⁻¹
Enz _{pre}	Precursor of Enz	
F	Fruit firmness (compression force or flesh firmness) as a substrate of a hypothetical fruit softening reaction	
F(t)	F value at time t	
F ₀	Initial fruit firmness	N
FC	Flesh chroma	
FF	Flesh firmness	N
FF ₀	Initial flesh firmness	N
FF ₁	The first FF reading measured on a fruit	N
FF ₂	The second FF reading measured on a fruit	N

FFS	FF measured at the simulated shelf life	N
FH	Flesh hue angle	
FL	Flesh lightness	
FR	Fungal rots	
FT	Fourier transformation	
FW	Fresh weight	kg
H	Fruit hue angle	
h	hour	
HD	Harvest date (days after 1 April)	d
HEM	High energy counts of middle part of a fruit	
HEO	High energy counts of outer part of a fruit	
HEW	High energy counts of the whole fruit	
I_d	VNIR spectrum of a dark reference	
I_f	VNIR spectrum of a fruit	
I_i	Spectral datum at point i	
I_s	VNIR spectrum of a chemical solution	
I_w	VNIR spectrum of a white reference	
I_{H_2O}	VNIR spectrum of water	
$\bar{I}_g$	Means of the spectral data of group g	
ΔI_g	Difference in spectral data between adjacent groups	
IEC	Internal ethylene concentration	mol L ⁻¹
IP	Inner pericarp	
k	Increase rate of a Richards function	
k	The rate coefficient of fruit softening	
k_p	The rate constant of a hypothetical fruit softening reaction	
K	Potassium concentration	mmol kg ⁻¹
K tray	Single-layered kiwifruit trays with a polyliner	
KG ₁	The first group of grower lines that softened at the lowest rate	
KG ₂	The second group of grower lines that softened at the second lowest rate	
KG ₃	The third group of grower lines that softened at the second highest rate	
KG ₄	The fourth group of grower lines that softened at the highest rate	
L	Fruit lightness	
LEO	Low energy counts of outer part of a fruit	

LEM	Low energy counts of middle part of a fruit	
LEW	Low energy counts of the whole fruit;	
LSD _{0.05}	Least significant difference at $P=0.05$	
LTB	Low temperature breakdown	
Lth	The length of a fruit in pixels	
M	The mass of a fruit	kg
M tray	Interleaving tray commercially used in 20 kg apple packages	
Mg	Magnesium concentration	mmol kg ⁻¹
MLR	Multiple linear regression	
MPLS	Modified partial least square regression	
MSC	Multiplicative scatter correlation technique	
MSPR	The means of the squared prediction error	
N	Nitrogen concentration	mmol kg ⁻¹
N	Newton	
NIR	Near-infrared	
NLIN	Non-linear regression	
NS	Not significant	
NSD	Normalised second derivative	
OP	Outer pericarp	
ρ	Power factor of a power function	
P	Phosphorus concentration	mmol kg ⁻¹
p_e	Partial pressures of ethylene of the environment	Pa
p_i	Partial pressures of ethylene inside the fruit	Pa
$P'_{C_2H_4}$	The permeance of the fruit skin to ethylene	mol s ⁻¹ m ⁻² Pa ⁻¹
$\Delta p_{C_2H_4}$	The difference in partial pressures of ethylene between P_e and P_i	Pa
PC	Principal component	
PCA	Principal component analysis	
PCR	Principal component regression	
PG	Polygalacturonase	
PixM	Area of middle part of a fruit in pixels;	
PixO	Area of outer part of a fruit in pixels;	
PixW	Area of the whole fruit in pixels;	
PKG ₁	Predicted KG ₁	

PKG ₂	Predicted KG ₂	
PKG ₃	Predicted KG ₃	
PKG ₄	Predicted KG ₄	
PLS	Partial least square regression	
PME	Pectin methyl esterase	
PP	Purple patches	
PPT	Physiological pitting	
PRESS	Sum squares of predicted residual	
<i>r</i>	Correlation coefficient	
<i>R</i> ²	Coefficient of determination	
<i>R</i> ² _p	Coefficient of determination for validation data set	
<i>r</i> _{C₂H₄}	Ethylene production rate	mol kg ⁻¹ s ⁻¹
<i>r</i> ' _{C₂H₄}	Rate of ethylene transfer from fruit to the environment	mol s ⁻¹
<i>r</i> _{CO₂}	Respiration rate	nmol kg ⁻¹ s ⁻¹
REG	Regression	
<i>RH</i>	Relative humidity	%
RMSEP	Root mean square error of prediction	
<i>s</i> _{<i>g</i>}	Standard deviations of spectral data of group <i>g</i> at a wavelength	
SABS	Smoothed ABS	
SABS+NM	SABS normalised to minimum and maximum	
SABS+QBC	Quadratic baseline compensation of SABS	
SABS+SNV	Standard normal variate transformation of SABS	
SCC	Standardized canonical coefficient	
SDR	Data set standard deviation divided by RMSEP	
se	Standard error	
SEB	Stem end botrytis	
SEP	Standard error of prediction	
SL	Storage life	d
SP	Soft patches	
SR	Side rot	
SRD	The sum of relative difference between groups	
SSC	Soluble solids content	%
SSF	Soluble solids in whole fruit	%

SSFDM	The percentage of dry matter that have solubilized	%
STDP	Standard error of the mean predicted value	
STEPPDISC	Stepwise discriminant analysis	
STP	Storage potential	
t	Storage time	d
$t_{7.8}$	Seven-eighth temperature equilibration time	h
TND	Trend	
ULO	Ultra low oxygen	
v	Inflexion point of a Richards function	
VNIR	Visible-near-infrared	
W_0	Initial fruit weight	kg
WL	Weight loss	%
WPI	Whey protein isolated	
Wth	The width of a fruit in pixels	
XET	Xyloglucan endotransglycosylase	