

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.

**EVALUATION ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF BRUISE
MEASUREMENTS IN APPLE FRUIT**

A THESIS

PRESENTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR

THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF APPLIED SCIENCE

IN

INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY AND ENGINEERING

AT

MASSEY UNIVERSITY

PALMERSTON NORTH

NEW ZEALAND

MIN KUANG

1998

ABSTRACT

A study has been conducted to compare different methods to measure bruise susceptibility of fruit. In order to compare measured values with actual commercial bruising, an appropriate test method to simulate impact damage during handling was developed, employing a revolving tumbler.

From the analysis of bruise damage produced by the tumbler on four apple cultivars under different storage treatments, it was found that a large percentage of bruises were less than 1.5 cm² in area, and the number of bruises above 1.5 cm² did not change between treatments. It was concluded that laboratory measurements involving high impact energy levels may be insensitive as indicators of bruising levels on fruit during commercial operations. The impact loads produced by this method was very similar to those incurred by a practical grader, as indicated by Instrumented Sphere measurements. The tumbler test permitted examination of actual grader damage relationships with standard tests.

Three standard impact tests (vertical drop test, double and single pendulum test) were conducted on four cultivar apples: Splendour, Granny Smith, Pacific Rose, and Braeburn. Four different shapes of impact surface were used for each impact test. It was found that bruise susceptibility varied with different impact tests. Regression analysis was made on the data obtained from standard impact tests and tumbler test to find the correlation between the bruise susceptibility and the bruise area/apple.

Bruise susceptibility obtained from the vertical drop test using the hockey ball was closely related to the bruise area per apple produced by the tumbler test ($R^2 = 0.72$). The bruise factor obtained from the single pendulum test using the flat indenter also showed a correlation with the bruise area per apple produced by the tumbler test ($R^2 = 0.78$). However, the bruise susceptibility produced by the double pendulum test and single pendulum test was not well correlated with the bruise area/apple and bruise number /apple produced by tumbler test. The bruise susceptibility produced by using the pyramid indenters from three standard impact tests was not well correlated with the bruise area

per apple and the number of bruises per apple produced by the tumbler test.

Bruise susceptibility, bruise area, and the shape of the bruise depended upon the shape of the indenter used for the experiment and the method used to conduct the impact tests. Splendour, Granny Smith and Pacific Rose all had similar bruise susceptibilities, but Braeburn was significantly less susceptible to bruising. Generally, bruise susceptibility increased with storage time in all cultivars. Apples stored in a low humidity environment (65% RH) generally had lower bruise susceptibilities after 2 months storage for the flat and hockey ball indenters but not for pyramid indenters on Splendour and Braeburn apples, when compared with 90% RH storage. Bruise susceptibilities at 0.5° C were higher than at room temperature. Fruit firmness also decreased with storage time.

Bruise shape depended upon the indenter surface shape. The flatter indenters produced bruises which were less deep than the hockey ball and pyramids. The bruise shape was elliptical for the flat plate, a circle for the hockey ball, and a rhombic for the pyramid indenters. There was no cracking below the bruise region for any apples when the flat plate indenter was used in the three standard impact tests. However cracks were found below the bruise region in Splendour, Pacific Rose, and Braeburn apple (but not for Granny Smith apples) when any pyramid indenter was used. The pyramid indenters produced a more linear relationship between a $2/3$ power impact energy and bruise area (without skin removal) than either a spherical or a flat indenter.

Bruise visibility depended on the impact surface shape and energy levels. Some bruises produced from standard impact tests, when the flat indenter used, were not visible unless the apple skin was removed. Braeburn required a greater impact energy to produce an initial bruise than other cultivars. Once bruising began the visibility of bruising increased with an increase in energy levels.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr Cliff J. Studman, my supervisor (Institute of Technology and Engineering, Massey University), for his generous advice, thoughtful guidance, encouragement and provided constructive criticism of all aspects of this study, Dr. Linus U. Opara, associate supervisor (Institute of Technology and Engineering, Massey University), for his valuable suggestions, helpful discussions, and encouragement, for his support of this project.

I wish to express my appreciation to Professor Gavin Wall, head of the Department, for his encouragement and support of this study. I also acknowledge all staff and post-graduate students at the Institute of Technology and Engineering, Massey University, for their help and friendship. Special thanks to Mr Leo. Bolter, and Mr Russell Watson for their assistance with laboratory experiments and construction of apparatus. My thanks are also extended to Ms Anna Kingsley, Ms Kate Macguire, and Mr Peter Jeffery for their help in conducting the laboratory experiments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF FIGURES.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Statement of the problem	1
1.2 Objectives	3
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	4
2.1 Introduction.....	4
2.2 Apple Bruising.....	5
2.2.1 Effects of impact on tissue structure.....	5
2.2.2 Estimation of apple bruise	6
2.2.3 Bruise colour change.....	10
2.3 Bruise Susceptibility.....	11
2.3.1 Cultivar.....	11
2.3.2 Maturity	12
2.3.3 Storage time and temperature	12
2.3.4 Methods for determining bruise susceptibility.....	15
2.4 Different impact test methods	18
2.5 Methods for bruise prediction.....	21
2.6 Bruise boundary in apple fruit.....	23

2.7	Practical Studies of Apple Packing Lines	25
2.7.1	Apple damage in American packing lines	26
2.7.2	Apple Bruise damage in New Zealand Packinglines	26
2.8	Discussion and Conclusions.....	28
CHAPTER THREE: MATERIALS AND METHODS		29
3.1	Introduction.....	29
3.2	Development of reference system	29
3.3	Fruit Preparation.....	35
3.3.1	Relative Humidity	35
3.4	Bruising methods.....	36
3.4.1	Tumbler test (T)	37
3.4.2	Vertical drop tests (V).....	37
3.4.3	Double pendulum tests (D)	41
3.4.4	Single pendulum tests (S).....	43
3.4.5	Other tests	45
3.5	Bruise measurement	45
3.6	Statistical Analysis.....	47
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS		48
4.1	Description of bruises	48
4.1.1	Bruise shapes	48
4.1.2	Cracking	49
4.2	Bruises produced by tumbler (T).....	49
4.2.1	Observations of impacts during Instrumented Sphere experiments	51
4.3	Bruising produced from standard impact tests	58
4.3.1	Bruise susceptibility produced by the vertical drop test (V)	58

4.3.2	Bruise susceptibility produced from the double pendulum tests (D) ...	69
4.3.3	Bruises produced by the single pendulum test (S)	79
4.3.4	Bruise factor test	86
4.4	Firmness tests.....	87
4.5	Bruise visibility	87
4.6	Relationship between bruising area (skin on) and impact energy	93
CHAPTER FIVE: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION		100
5.1	Bruise produced by tumbler	100
5.2	Relationship between the bruise produced from standard impact tests and the tumbler test	101
5.3	Bruise factor test.....	107
5.4	Bruise susceptibility produced from three standard impact tests	110
5.5	Physiological causes of variation in bruise susceptibility	111
5.6	Temperature and storage humidity effects on fruit bruising.....	113
5.6.1	Temperature effects.....	113
5.6.2	Effect of storage humidity.....	114
5.7	Bruise visibility	115
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS		117
REFERENCES.....		120
APPENDIX 1		129
APPENDIX 2.....		130

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1	Cross-section of idealized bruise showing symbols used by Holt and Schoorl (1977).....	9
Figure 2.2	Different methods of impact tests used for fruits (Manor, 1978).....	19
Figure 2.3	Apple bruising initiation threshold lines (0-10,50 and 100% bruising) for velocity change versus peak acceleration compared to impact surface response lines created using a 89 mm diameter IS (Schulte-Pason et al., 1990)	24
Figure 2.4	Potential problem points on grading equipment between the sorting table and the final size bins/tray filler on New Zealand packing line (Banks, 1991).	27
Figure 3.1	Tumbler test device.....	31
Figure 3.2a	The impacts recorded by IS from a tumbler padded with paper pulp trays after rolled on the ground four revolutions.....	32
Figure 3.2b	The impacts recorded by IS from a New Zealand typical fruit packing line	32
Figure 3.3a	Peak G distribution of a tumbler padded with paper pulp trays after rolled on the ground four revolutions.	33
Figure 3.3b	Peak G distribution of apple packing line impacts (Sober et al., 1989).	33
Figure 3.4	The different impact indenters selected for impact tests.	38
Figure 3.5	Hockey ball impact device used for test V.	39
Figure 3.6	Pyramid indenter drop device used for test V.	40
Figure 3.7	Double pendulum impact device.	42
Figure 3.8	Single pendulum impact device.	44

Figure 4.1	Profile of a bruise region in one half of an apple produced by an impact test.....	49
Figure 4.2	Frequency distribution of bruise areas (cm ²) produced by a tumbler on Splendour apple for different treatments.....	50
Figure 4.3	Frequency distribution of bruise areas (cm ²) produced by the tumbler test on (a) fresh (F) and (b) stored (HW) of four apple cultivars.....	53
Figure 4.4	The total number of visible bruises produced by the tumbler on four apple cultivars.....	54
Figure 4.5	The total number of visible bruises produced by the tumbler on Splendour apples for different treatments.....	54
Figure 4.6	The number of bruises produced by the tumbler test on cold (HC) and warmed (HW) Splendour and Granny Smith apples.....	55
Figure 4.7	The number of bruises produced from the tumbler test on stored Splendour and Braeburn apples with two RH levels.....	55
Figure 4.8	The bruise areas/apple and bruise numbers/apple produced by the tumbler test.....	57
Figure 4.9	Bruise susceptibility (ml/J) from test V using different indenters on (a) F and (b) HW fruit.....	62
Figure 4.10	Bruise areas (cm ²) from test V using different indenters on (a) F and (b) HW fruit.....	63
Figure 4.11	Bruise depth (mm) from test V on (a) F and (b) HW fruit.....	64
Figure 4.12	Bruise susceptibility (ml/J) on HC and HW (a) Splendour and (b) GrannySmith apples from test V.....	66
Figure 4.13	Bruise susceptibility (ml/J) on LW and HW fruit for (a) Splendour and (b) Braeburn from test V.....	67

Figure 4.14	Bruise susceptibility (ml/J) from test D on (a) F and (b) HW fruit.	74
Figure 4.15	Bruise areas (cm ²) from test D on (a) F and (b) HW fruit.	75
Figure 4.16	Bruise depth (mm) from test D on (a) F and (b) HW fruit.	76
Figure 4.17	Bruise susceptibility (ml/J) on cold (HC) and warmed (HW) (a) Splendour and (b) Granny Smith apples from test D.	77
Figure 4.18	Bruise susceptibility (ml/J) on LW and HW fruit for (a) Splendour and (b) Braeburn from test D.	78
Figure 4.19	Bruise susceptibility (ml/J) on HC and HW (a) Splendour and (b) Granny Smith apples from test S.	84
Figure 4.20	Bruise susceptibility (ml/J) on LW and HW (a) Splendour and (b) Braeburn apples from test S.	85
Figure 4.21	Bruise visibility (%) produced from the single pendulum test on (a) F and (b) HW Splendour apples.	89
Figure 4.22	Bruise visibility (%) produced from the single pendulum test on (a) F and (b) HW Granny Smith apples.	90
Figure 4.23	Bruise visibility (%) produced from the single pendulum test on (a) F and (b) HW Pacific Rose apples.	91
Figure 4.24	Bruise visibility (%) produced from the single pendulum test on (a) F and (b) HW Braeburn apples.	92
Figure 4.25	Bruise areas plotted against impact energy for (a) F and (b) HW Splendour apples.	94
Figure 4.26	Bruise areas plotted against impact energy for (a) F and (b) HW Granny Smith apples.	95
Figure 4.27	Bruise areas plotted against impact energy for (a) F and (b) HW Pacific Rose apples.	96

Figure 4.28 Bruise areas plotted against impact energy for (a) F and (b) HW Braeburn apples.....	97
Figure 5.1 Bruise susceptibility produced from test V and bruise area/apple from the tumbler test.....	102
Figure 5.2 Bruise susceptibility produced from test D and bruise area/apple from test T.....	103
Figure 5.3 Bruise susceptibility produced from test S and bruise area/apple from test T.....	104
Figure 5.4 Bruise factor from test S and bruise area/apple from test T.....	105
Figure 5.5 Fruit firmness (N) and the bruise area/apple from test T.....	106
Figure 5.6 The number of bruise area less than 1 cm ² from test S and the bruise area/apple from test T.....	109

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	The apple sample were used for the tumbler tests and three standard impact tests.	36
Table 4.1	Bruise area per apple and Bruise number per apple produced tumbler test on different apple cultivars.	56
Table 4.2	Bruise susceptibility (ml/J) produced from the vertical drop test (V) (input energy = 0.31J).	59
Table 4.3	Bruise area (cm ²) (skin removed) produced from the vertical drop tests(V).	60
Table 4.4	Bruise depth (mm) produced from the vertical drop tests (V).	61
Table 4.5	Bruise susceptibility (ml/J) produced from the double pendulum test (D) (input energy = 0.31J).	71
Table 4.6	Bruise area (cm ²) (skin removed) produced from the double pendulum tests (D) (input energy=0.31J).	72
Table 4.7	Bruise depth (mm) produced from the double pendulum tests (D) (input energy=0.31J).	73
Table 4.8	Bruise susceptibility (ml/J) produced from the single pendulum tests (S) (the eighth drop angle).	80
Table 4.9	Bruise area (cm ²) (skin removed) produced from the single pendulum tests (S) (the eighth drop angle).	81
Table 4.10	Bruise depth (mm) produced from the single pendulum tests (S) (the eighth drop angle).	82
Table 4.11	Total number of visible bruises from the single pendulum test using different indenters.	83

Table 4.12	Number of bruises with area above 1 cm ² from the single pendulum test. ..	83
Table 4.13	Bruise factor measured from the single pendulum test on four cultivar apples.....	86
Table 4.14	Fruit firmness of four variety apples for both fresh and stored measured by penetrometer (N)	87
Table 4.15	Relationship between bruise area (cm ²) and impact energy for fresh four apple cultivars.	98
Table 4.16	Relationship between bruise area (cm ²) and impact energy (J ^{2/3}) on HW fruit.....	99