

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.

PREDICTION OF CHILLING TIMES OF FOODS

SUBJECT TO

BOTH CONVECTIVE AND EVAPORATIVE COOLING

AT THE PRODUCT SURFACE

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Biotechnology and Bioprocess Engineering at Massey University.

Sawitri (Rojanasaroj) Chuntranuluck

1995

ABSTRACT

No published chilling time prediction method which covers a wide range of practical conditions, and which can be applied using only simple algebraic calculations for chilling with evaporation at the product surface has been proven accurate. The objective of the present work was to develop and test a simple chilling time prediction method with wide application for situations where significant evaporation as well as convective cooling occurs from the product surface.

A numerical method (finite differences) was used to simulate convection and evaporation at the product surface in cooling of solid products of simple shape (infinite slab, infinite cylinder, and sphere) with constant surface water activity. Semi-log plots relating temperature change to be accomplished to time were linearised by appropriate scale transformations based on the Lewis relationship. The effect of evaporation on cooling rate was measured by considering the slope and intercept of such plots, and comparing these to the slope and intercept that would arise in convection-only cooling. The enhancement of cooling rate due to the evaporative effect depended on six parameters; initial product temperature, cooling medium temperature, Biot number, relative humidity, product shape factor, and surface water activity.

Four simple algebraic equations were curved-fitted to the numerically simulated data for predicting temperature-time profiles at centre and mass average positions in the product. The numerically generated results and the simple algebraic equations agreed well with a mean difference close to 0 % for all three shapes, and 95% confidence bounds of about ± 3 % for the infinite cylinder, and ± 5 % for the infinite slab and the sphere geometries.

To test the simple models, chilling experiments were conducted in a controlled air flow tunnel across a range of conditions likely to occur in industrial practice. Trials were conducted using infinite cylinders of a food analogue as an idealised product (with saturated salt solutions percolating over a wet cloth on the product surface to maintain constant surface water activity), and carrots (both peeled and unpeeled) as examples of real food products.

Measured centre temperatures for both the idealised products and peeled carrots were predicted by the proposed method, assuming a constant surface water activity, within a range of differences which was almost totally explainable by experimental uncertainty. For unpeeled carrots, predictions made using three different surface water activities in the model (one to represent the initial condition, one to represent the active chilling phase, and one to represent the quasi-equilibrium state at the end of chilling) agreed sufficiently well with experimental centre temperature data for the lack of fit to be largely attributable to experimental uncertainty. No experimental verification for prediction of mass-average temperatures was attempted.

The proposed method is recommended for predicting chilling times of food products of infinite slab, infinite cylinder or sphere shapes, across a wide range of commonly occurring chilling conditions provided the product has constant surface water activity. The establishment of bounds on a theoretical basis for limiting the ranges in which surface water activity values are selected for making predictions for products with non-constant surface water activity is proposed, and some guidance on application of these bounds established. Further work to refine the use of these bounds for a range of food products, to consider a wider range of shapes, to test the ability of the proposed method to predict mass-average temperatures is recommended.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank :

Professor Andrew C Cleland, Department of Food Technology and **Dr. Colin Wells**, Department of Agricultural Engineering, Massey University, for their advice, assistance, and patient during the course of this project;

Professor Donald Cleland, Department of Process Environmental Technology, Massey University, for his advice in solving some problems with the refrigeration plant plus his comments on this thesis; and

Mr. Bruce Collins, Electronics Technician, **Mr. Don McLean**, Technician, and **Mr. John Alger**, Technical Officer, for their technical assistance during the experimental phase of the project.

I would like to thank **the Royal Thai Government** and **Kasetsart University, Thailand**, for the scholarship & funding.

Finally, thank to **my family** across the ocean for their continual moral and financial support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
APPENDICES	x
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xix

CHAPTER	PAGE
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 LITERATURE SURVEY	3
2.1 INTRODUCTION	3
2.2 CHILLING WITHOUT INTERNAL HEAT GENERATION OR EVAPORATION	3
2.2.1 Analytical Solutions	3
2.2.1.1 Low Biot Number (typically $Bi < 0.2$)	3
2.2.1.2 Higher Biot Number (typically $Bi > 0.2$)	5
2.2.2 Empirical Solutions	9
2.2.3 Numerical Solutions	13
2.3 CHILLING WITH INTERNAL HEAT GENERATION BUT NO EVAPORATION	14
2.3.1 Description of Internal Heat Generation by Respiration	14
2.3.2 Analysis of Cooling with Internal Heat Generation	15
2.4 COOLING INCLUDING RADIATION	16
2.5 COOLING INCLUDING EVAPORATION	16
2.5.1 Moisture Transport Phenomena	16
2.5.2 Modelling of Evaporative Heat Transfer at the Product Surface	17
2.5.3 Evaporation of Mass Transfer Coefficients	20

2.5.4	Influence of Product Shape	21
2.5.5	Contribution of Evaporation to Chilling Rate	21
2.5.6	Effect of Internal Heat Generation	22
2.5.7	Steady State Models for Moisture Loss with and without Internal Heat Generation	22
2.5.8	Analytical and Empirical Models for Moisture Loss during Chilling	24
2.5.9	Analytical and Empirical Chilling Time Prediction Methods	24
2.5.10	Numerical Chilling Time Prediction Methods	26
2.5.11	Incorporation of Internal Heat Generation in Numerical Prediction Methods	28
3	PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS	29
4	THEORETICAL MODELLING OF IDEALISED SYSTEMS	31
4.1	INTRODUCTION	31
4.2	THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT	31
4.2.1	Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations	31
4.2.1.1	Energy Balance	32
4.2.1.2	Mass Balance	34
4.2.2	Finite Difference Schemes	35
4.2.2.1	Energy Transfer Equations	36
4.2.2.2	Mass Transfer Equations	39
4.2.3	Vapour Pressure Equations	41
4.2.4	Use of the Lewis Relationship	42
4.3	Computer Program Development and Testing	43
4.4	Simulation Performed	43
4.5	Discussion of Simulation Behaviour	44
4.5.1	Steady State (Equilibrium) Condition	44
4.5.2	Active Chilling Period (Unsteady State Condition)	45

5	MODEL DEVELOPMENT & RESULT	49
5.1	INTRODUCTION	49
5.2	DESCRIPTION OF CONVECTION-ONLY COOLING	49
5.3	COMPLICATIONS INTRODUCED BY EVAPORATIVE COOLING	51
5.4	DEVELOPMENT OF AN EQUILIBRIUM REFERENCE TEMPERATURE	52
5.5	DEVELOPMENT OF A MODIFIED γ VALUE	55
5.6	ISOLATION OF THE EVAPORATIVE EFFECT ON COOLING RATE	56
5.7	MODEL DEVELOPMENT OF EMPIRICAL EQUATIONS FOR f_{Evap}/f_{Conv} AND j_{Evap}/j_{Conv}	57
5.7.1	The Effects of Product Properties on f_{Evap} and j_{Evap} Values	58
5.7.2	The Reference Shape	58
5.7.3	Models for Centre Temperature Position	58
5.7.3.1	Model Development for f_{cEvap}/f_{cConv}	59
5.7.3.2	Model Development for j_{cEvap}/j_{cConv}	60
5.7.4	Models for Mass-Average Temperature Position	62
5.7.4.1	Model Development for f_{avEvap}/f_{avConv}	62
5.7.4.2	Model Development for j_{avEvap}/j_{avConv}	63
5.7.5	Time and Temperature Prediction Equations	64
5.7.6	Quality of Prediction from The Simple Models Relative to The Numerical Simulations Results and Conclusions	64
5.8	SUMMARY	66
6	EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN AND METHODS - IDEALISED PRODUCTS	86
6.1	INTRODUCTION	86
6.2	EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN	86
6.3	EXPERIMENTS	87
6.3.1	Test Samples and Temperature Measurement Probes	87
6.3.2	Maintenance of Constant Surface Water Activity	88
6.3.3	Air Tunnel	91
6.3.3.1	Air Velocities	91
6.3.3.2	Relative Humidity	91
6.4	MEASURING EQUIPMENT	92

6.4.1	Relative Humidity	92
6.4.2	Data Logging	93
6.4.3	Air Velocity	94
6.5	EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE	94
6.6	HEAT TRANSFER COEFFICIENTS	95
6.7	SUMMARY	97
7	TESTING OF SIMPLE MODEL AGAINST EXPERIMENTAL DATA FOR IDEALISED MODEL SYSTEMS	107
7.1	INTRODUCTION	107
7.2	EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN AND RESULTS	107
7.3	HEAT TRANSFER COEFFICIENTS	108
7.4	EQUILIBRIUM TEMPERATURE ANALYSIS	110
7.5	LINEARIZATION OF SEMI-LOG PLOTS	110
7.6	COOLING WITH EVAPORATIVE EFFECTS	111
7.7	CHILLING TIME PREDICTION	112
7.8	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	113
8	EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN AND METHODS FOR EXPERIMENTS WITH A REAL PRODUCT	149
8.1	INTRODUCTION	149
8.2	EVAPORATIVE COOLING OF REAL FOOD PRODUCTS	149
8.2.1	Products without Skin Resistance	150
8.2.2	Products with Skin Resistance	150
8.3	SELECTION OF TEST MATERIAL	151
8.4	EXPERIMENTAL METHODS - PEELED CARROT	151
8.4.1	Sample Preparation	151
8.4.2	Weight Loss, Water Content, and Surface Water Activity Measurement	152
8.4.3	Temperature and Relative Humidity Measurement	153
8.4.4	Cooling Trials	153
8.4.5	Heat Transfer Coefficient Measurement	154

8.4.6	Experimental Design	154
8.5	EXPERIMENTAL METHODS - UNPEELED CARROT	155
8.5.1	Sample Preparation	155
8.5.2	Weight Loss, Water Content, and Surface Water Activity Measurement	155
8.5.3	Experimental Design	156
8.6	THERMOPHYSICAL PROPERTIES OF CARROTS	156
8.7	HEAT TRANSFER COEFFICIENTS FOR PEELED AND UNPEELED CARROTS	156
8.8	FINISHING REMARKS	158
9	TESTING OF THE PROPOSED MODEL AGAINST EXPERIMENTAL DATA FOR A REAL PRODUCT WITHOUT SKIN RESISTANCE	163
9.1	INTRODUCTION	163
9.2	SURFACE WATER ACTIVITY AND EQUILIBRIUM TEMPERATURE ANALYSIS	163
9.3	LINEARIZATION OF SEMI-LOG PLOTS	164
9.4	COOLING WITH EVAPORATIVE EFFECTS	164
9.5	WEIGHT LOSS	166
9.6	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	166
10	TESTING OF THE PROPOSED MODEL AGAINST EXPERIMENTAL DATA FOR A REAL PRODUCT WITH SKIN RESISTANCE	186
10.1	INTRODUCTION	186
10.2	SURFACE WATER ACTIVITY IN THE QUASI-EQUILIBRIUM STAGE	187
10.3	LINEARIZATION OF SEMI-LOG PLOTS	188
10.4	f AND j VALUES FOR ACTIVE CHILLING PHASE	188
10.4.1	a_{wf}	189
10.4.1	a_{wj}	189
10.5	COOLING WITH EVAPORATIVE EFFECTS AND CHILLING TIME PREDICTION	190
10.6	WEIGHT LOSS	192

11 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	207
11.1 DISCUSSION	207
11.2 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER WORK	209
NOTATION	212
REFERENCES	217
 APPENDICES	
1 COMPUTER PROGRAM USED FOR CHILLING PROCESS SIMULATION AND ANALYSIS	231
2 SAMPLE OF CALCULATION	243

LIST OF FIGURES

4.1	Example plot for convection-only cooling showing the approach of the centre, surface, and mass-average temperatures to the cooling medium temperature.	47
4.2	Example plots showing the effect of $(a_w - H_r)$ on the cooling process.	47
4.3	Example semi-plots of cooling by both convection and evaporation with $H_r = a_w$.	48
4.4	Example semi-plots of cooling by both convection and evaporation with $a_w < H_r$, $a_w > H_r$, and $a_w = H_r$.	48
5.1	Alignment chart to estimate the equilibrium temperature (T_{eq}) at $a_w = 0.6$.	70
5.2	Alignment chart to estimate the equilibrium temperature (T_{eq}) at $a_w = 0.8$.	71
5.3	Alignment chart to estimate the equilibrium temperature (T_{eq}) at $a_w = 1.0$.	72
5.4	Example plots of $\ln Y_c$ vs Fo for evaporative cooling.	73
5.5	Plot of numerically predicted f_{cEvap}/f_{cConv} vs Bi for an infinite cylinder.	73
5.6	Effect of Bi on the slope ratios of semi-log plots (centre position) at different T_a (predicted by finite difference simulations for an infinite cylinder).	74
5.7	Effect of T_a on the slope ratios of semi-log plots (centre position) at different Bi (predicted by finite difference simulations for an infinite cylinder).	74
5.8	Effect of T_a on the slope ratios of semi-log plots (centre position) at high Bi and different H_r (predicted by finite difference simulations for an infinite cylinder).	75
5.9	Effect of H_r on the slope ratios of semi-log plots (centre position) at high Bi and different a_w (predicted by finite difference simulations for an infinite cylinder).	75
5.10	Effect of T_a on the slope ratios of semi-log plots (centre position) at high Bi and different a_w (predicted by finite difference simulations for an infinite cylinder).	76
5.11	Effect of Bi on the slope ratios of semi-log plots (centre position) at different T_{in} (predicted by finite difference simulations for an infinite	76

	cylinder).	
5.12	Effect of a_w on the slope ratio of semi-log plots (centre position) at high Bi and different T_{in} (predicted by finite difference simulations for an infinite cylinder).	77
5.13	Effect of shape on the slope ratio of semi-log plots (centre position) (predicted by finite difference simulations for an infinite cylinder).	77
5.14	Plot of numerically predicted j_{cEvap}/j_{cConv} data for an infinite cylinder vs Bi .	78
5.15	Effect of Bi on the intercept ratios of semi-log plots (centre position) at different H_r (predicted by finite difference simulations for an infinite cylinder).	78
5.16	Effect of Bi on the intercept ratios of semi-log plots (centre position) at different T_a (predicted by finite difference simulations for an infinite cylinder).	79
5.17	Effect of Bi on the intercept ratios of semi-log plots (centre position) at different a_w (predicted by finite difference simulations for an infinite cylinder).	79
5.18	Effect of Bi on the intercept ratios of semi-log plots (centre position) at different T_{in} (predicted by finite difference simulations for an infinite cylinder).	80
5.19	Effect of H_r on the intercept ratios of semi-log plots (centre position) at different T_a (predicted by finite difference simulations for an infinite cylinder).	80
5.20	Effect of T_{in} on the intercept ratios of semi-log plots (centre position) at different T_a (predicted by finite difference simulations for an infinite cylinder).	81
5.21	Effect of shape on the intercept ratios of semi-log plots (centre position) (predicted by finite difference simulations for an infinite cylinder).	81
5.22	Plot of numerically predicted j_{cEvap}/j_{cConv} data for an infinite cylinder vs Bi .	82
5.23	Effect of Bi on the intercept ratios of semi-log plots (mass-average position) at different T_a (predicted by finite difference simulations for an infinite cylinder).	82
5.24	Effect of Bi on the intercept ratios of semi-log plots (mass-average position)	83

	at different T_{in} (predicted by finite difference simulations for an infinite cylinder).	
5.25	Effect of T_a on the intercept ratios of semi-log plots (mass-average position) at different H_r (predicted by finite difference simulations for an infinite cylinder).	83
5.26	Effect of shape on the intercept ratios of semi-log plots (mass-average position), (predicted by finite difference simulations for an infinite cylinder).	84
5.27	Shape of cooling curve for centre and mass-average temperature during convective plus evaporative cooling under conditions where the evaporative effect is very small.	84
5.28	Shape of cooling curve for centre and mass-average temperature during convective plus evaporative cooling under conditions where the evaporative effect is substantial.	85
6.1	Schematic diagram of experimental apparatus installed in the air tunnel showing sample oscillator and wetting agent supply system.	103
6.2	The apparatus inside the air tunnel.	103
6.3	Example of measured and predicted cylinder temperatures for a run in which the reservoir temperature was too cold.	104
6.4	Example of measured and predicted cylinder temperatures for a run in which the reservoir temperature was too hot.	104
6.5	Results of an experiment for the large cylinder (with finite difference prediction) in which the reservoir temperature was ideal.	105
6.6	Results of an experiment for the small cylinder (with finite difference prediction) in which the reservoir temperature was ideal.	105
6.7	Experimental air tunnel used in experiments.	106
7.1	Plots of h_c vs air velocity for heat transfer coefficient measurement runs in which the wetting fluid was water.	129
7.2	Plots of h_c vs air velocity for heat transfer coefficient measurement runs in which the wetting fluid was a saturated solution of NaCl.	129
7.3	Plots of h_c vs air velocity for heat transfer coefficient measurement runs in which the wetting fluid was a saturated solution of KCl.	130
7.4	Plots of difference between $T_{eq,pred}$ and $T_{eq,exp}$ vs a_w for all experimental runs.	130

7.5	Plots of difference between $T_{eq,pred}$ and $T_{eq,exp}$ vs H_r for all experimental runs.	131
7.6	Plots of difference between $T_{eq,pred}$ and $T_{eq,exp}$ vs Bi for all experimental runs.	131
7.7	Plots of difference between $T_{eq,pred}$ and $T_{eq,exp}$ vs v_a for all experimental runs.	132
7.8	Plots of difference between $T_{eq,pred}$ and $T_{eq,exp}$ vs T_a for all experimental runs.	132
7.9	Plots of difference between $T_{eq,pred}$ and $T_{eq,exp}$ vs T_{in} for all experimental runs.	133
7.10	Typical plot of temperature vs time for cooling without evaporation ($T_{eq,exp} = T_a$).	133
7.11	Typical plot of temperature vs time for cooling with evaporation ($T_{eq,exp} > T_a$ and $a_w < H_r$).	134
7.12	Typical plot of temperature vs time for cooling with evaporation ($T_{eq,exp} < T_a$ and $a_w > H_r$).	134
7.13	Typical plot of temperature vs time for cooling with evaporation ($T_{eq,exp} = T_a$ and $a_w = H_r$).	135
7.14	Plot of $\ln Y_{c,exp}$ vs Fo using $T_{eq,exp}$ as the reference temperature for the conditions in Fig. 7.11.	135
7.15	Plot of $\ln Y_{c,exp}$ vs Fo using $T_{eq,exp}$ as the reference temperature for the conditions in Fig. 7.12.	136
7.16	Plot of $\ln Y_{c,exp}$ vs Fo using $T_{eq,exp}$ as the reference temperature for the conditions in Fig. 7.13.	136
7.17	Comparisons of the % differences in f_{cEvap}/f_{cConv} between the simple model and the finite difference model.	137
7.18	Comparisons of the % differences in j_{cEvap}/j_{cConv} between the simple model and the finite difference model.	137
7.19	Comparisons of the values of f_{cEvap}/f_{cConv} between the simple model and the experimental results.	138
7.20	Comparisons of the values of j_{cEvap}/j_{cConv} between the simple model and the experimental results.	138
7.21	Plots of % difference in f_{cEvap}/f_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values at different a_w .	139
7.22	Plots of % difference in f_{cEvap}/f_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values at different H_r .	139
7.23	Plots of % difference in f_{cEvap}/f_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model	140

	compared to experimental values at different T_a .	
7.24	Plots of % difference in f_{cEvap}/f_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values at different T_{in} .	140
7.25	Plots of % difference in f_{cEvap}/f_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values at different Bi .	141
7.26	Plots of % difference in f_{cEvap}/f_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values at different v_a .	141
7.27	Plots of % difference in j_{cEvap}/j_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values at different a_w .	142
7.28	Plots of % difference in j_{cEvap}/j_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values at different H_r .	142
7.29	Plots of % difference in j_{cEvap}/j_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values at different T_a .	143
7.30	Plots of % difference in j_{cEvap}/j_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values at different T_{in} .	143
7.31	Plots of % difference in j_{cEvap}/j_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values at different Bi .	144
7.32	Plots of % difference in j_{cEvap}/j_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values at different v_a .	144
7.33	Comparisons of % differences in time to reach the temperature corresponding to $Y_{c,exp} = 0.10$ between the simple model and the finite difference model.	145
7.34	Comparisons of % differences in time to reach the temperature corresponding to $Y_{c,exp} = 0.35$ between the simple model and the finite difference model.	145
7.35	Comparisons of % differences in time to reach the temperature corresponding to $Y_{c,exp} = 0.70$ between the simple model and the finite difference model.	146
7.36	Comparisons of time (hrs.) to reach the temperature corresponding to $Y_{c,exp} = 0.10$ between the simple model and the experimental results.	146
7.37	Comparisons of time (hrs.) to reach the temperature corresponding to $Y_{c,exp} = 0.35$ between the simple model and the experimental results.	147

7.38	Comparisons of time (hrs.) to reach the temperature corresponding to $Y_{c,exp} = 0.70$ between the simple model and the experimental results.	147
7.39	The best result of comparisons between the simple model, the finite difference with evaporation and without evaporation, and the experimental data.	148
7.40	The worst result of comparisons between the simple model, the finite difference with evaporation and without evaporation, and the experimental data.	148
8.1	A typical infinite cylindrical carrot sample used in experimental work.	160
8.2	Plot of Nu vs Re for runs with peeled carrots.	160
8.3	Plot of percentage difference in h_c (between calculated results using equation 8.4 and experimental results) for peeled carrots vs Re .	161
8.4	Plot of Nu vs Re for runs with unpeeled carrots.	161
8.5	Plots of percentage difference in h_c (between calculated results using equation 8.5 and experimental results) for unpeeled carrots vs Re .	162
8.6	Plot of Nu vs Re for runs with peeled & unpeeled carrots.	162
9.1	Plot of measured a_w and back-calculated a_w vs H_r .	173
9.2	Plot of difference between $T_{eq,pred}$ and $T_{eq,exp}$ vs H_r for all experimental runs.	173
9.3	Plot of difference between $T_{eq,pred}$ and $T_{eq,exp}$ vs Bi for all experimental runs.	174
9.4	Plot of difference between $T_{eq,pred}$ and $T_{eq,exp}$ vs v_a for all experimental runs.	174
9.5	Plot of difference between $T_{eq,pred}$ and $T_{eq,exp}$ vs T_a for all experimental runs.	175
9.6	Plot of difference between $T_{eq,pred}$ and $T_{eq,exp}$ vs T_{in} for all experimental runs.	175
9.7	Typical plot of temperature vs time for cooling of a peeled carrot without evaporation ($T_{eq,exp} = T_a$).	176
9.8	Typical plot of temperature vs time for cooling of a peeled carrot with evaporation at the product surface.	176
9.9	Plot of $\ln Y_c$ vs FO using $T_{eq,exp}$ as the reference temperature for the conditions in Fig. 9.7.	177
9.10	Plot of % difference in f_{cEvap}/f_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values vs H_r .	177
9.11	Plot of % difference in f_{cEvap}/f_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values vs T_a .	178

9.12	Plot of % difference in f_{cEvap}/f_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values vs T_{in} .	178
9.13	Plot of % difference in f_{cEvap}/f_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values vs Bi .	179
9.14	Plot of % difference in f_{cEvap}/f_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values vs v_a .	179
9.15	Plot of % difference in j_{cEvap}/j_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values vs H_r .	180
9.16	Plot of % difference in j_{cEvap}/j_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values vs T_a .	180
9.17	Plot of % difference in j_{cEvap}/j_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values vs T_{in} .	181
9.18	Plot of % difference in j_{cEvap}/j_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values vs Bi .	181
9.19	Plot of % difference in j_{cEvap}/j_{cConv} values calculated by the simple model compared to experimental values vs v_a .	182
9.20	Comparisons of the values of f_{cEvap}/f_{cConv} between the simple model and the experimental results.	182
9.21	Comparisons of the values of j_{cEvap}/j_{cConv} between the simple model and the experimental results.	183
9.22	Comparisons of time (min.) to reach the centre temperature corresponding to $Y_{c,exp} = 0.10$ between the simple model and the experimental results.	183
9.23	Comparisons of time (min.) to reach the centre temperature corresponding to $Y_{c,exp} = 0.35$ between the simple model and the experimental results.	184
9.24	Comparisons of time (min.) to reach the centre temperature corresponding to $Y_{c,exp} = 0.70$ between the simple model and the experimental results.	184
9.25	Weight loss of peeled carrots vs air velocity.	185
10.1	Comparison of the cooling curves of peeled and unpeeled carrot under the same environmental conditions (Runs 15 of Table 9.1 and 10.1).	202
10.2	Plot of a_w vs time during a typical chilling experiment in which internal water movement rate to the product cannot always exceed evaporation rate.	202
10.3	Relationship between a_w back-calculated from $T_{eq,exp}$ using equation (5.4) and	203

	H_r for runs with unpeeled carrot.	
10.4	Typical plot of temperature vs time for cooling of an unpeeled carrot without evaporation ($T_{eq,exp} = T_a$).	203
10.5	Typical plot of temperature vs time for cooling of an unpeeled carrot with evaporation at the product surface.	204
10.6	Plot of $\ln Y_c$ (using $T_{eq,exp}$ as the reference temperature) vs $ Fo$ for the conditions in Figure 10.5.	204
10.7	Plot of a_{wf} vs H_r during the active chilling phase.	205
10.8	Plot of a_{wf} vs Bi during the active chilling phase.	205
10.9	Plot of a_{wj} vs H_r during the active chilling phase.	206
10.10	Plot of a_{wj} vs Bi during the active chilling phase.	206

LIST OF TABLES

5.1	Percentage differences between results calculated by the proposed curve-fit algebraic equations and results calculated by finite differences for the centre temperature of all three shapes.	67
5.2	Percentage differences between results calculated by the proposed curve-fit algebraic equations and results calculated by finite differences for the mass-average temperature of all three shapes. Equation (5.23) was used to calculate f_{avEvap} .	68
5.3	Percentage differences between results calculated by the proposed curve-fit algebraic equations and results calculated by finite differences for the mass-average temperature of all three shapes. Equation (5.24) was used to calculate f_{avEvap} .	69
6.1	Ranges of experimental conditions used for model testing.	98
6.2	Experimental conditions used for the half-factorial experiment (v_h = high velocity, v_l = low velocity, v_m = mid-range velocity, L = large size, S = small size).	99
6.3	Experimental conditions for the runs used to extend the half-factorial experiment to a plan approximating a central composite design.	100
6.4	Experimental conditions for the 'centre point' runs in the central composite experimental design.	100
6.5	Water activity of saturated salt solutions used in the experiments.	101
6.6	The solubility of salts used in the experiments at different temperature.	101
6.7	Conditions used to obtain required relative humidities.	102
7.1	Designation of ranges of Biot number in the experimental described in Chapter 6.	115
7.2	95% confidence bounds on h_c ($W m^{-2} K^{-1}$) at the midrange value of v_a ($2 m s^{-1}$).	115
7.3	Experimental data and predicted results for runs using water as the wetting agent.	116
7.4	Experimental data and predicted results for runs using saturated salt sodium	118

	chloride as the wetting agent.	
7.5	Experimental data and predicted results for runs using saturated salt potassium chloride as the wetting agent.	120
7.6	Differences between results calculated by the finite difference method and results from the experiments (all data).	122
7.7	Difference between results calculated by the proposed curve-fitted algebraic equations (simple model) and results from the experiments (all data).	122
7.8	Prediction and measured chilling times to $Y_{c,exp} = 0.10, 0.35, \text{ and } 0.70$ for runs using water as the wetting agent.	123
7.9	Prediction and measured chilling times to $Y_{c,exp} = 0.10, 0.35, \text{ and } 0.70$ for runs using saturated salt sodium chloride as the wetting agent.	125
7.10	Prediction and measured chilling times to $Y_{c,exp} = 0.10, 0.35, \text{ and } 0.70$ for runs using saturated salt potassium chloride as the wetting agent.	127
8.1	Experimental plan for cooling trials with carrots.	159
9.1	Experimental data and predicted results for runs using peeled carrot as the product with $a_w = 0.977$.	167
9.2	Predicted and measured chilling times to reach certain centre temperatures which corresponded to $Y_{c,exp} = 0.10, 0.35, \text{ and } 0.70$ for runs using peeled carrot as the product.	170
9.3	Differences between results calculated by the finite difference method (assuming $a_w = 0.977$) and results from the experiments (for peeled carrots).	172
9.4	Differences between results calculated by the proposed curve-fit equations (simple model) and results from the experiments (for peeled carrots).	172
10.1	Experimental data for experiments with unpeeled carrot and comparisons of measured quasi-equilibrium temperature ($T_{eq,exp}$) to predictions of T_{eq} calculated using (A) $a_w = 0.977$, (B) $a_w = H_r$, (C) a_w calculated from equation (10.1).	193
10.2	Comparisons between experimental results and model predictions of f_{cEvap}/f_{cConv} (at $a_w = 0.30$ and 0.16) and j_{cEvap}/j_{cConv} (at $a_{wj} = 0.977$).	195
10.3	Comparisons of time (to the temperature that corresponds to $Y_{c,exp} = 0.10, 0.35, \text{ and } 0.70$) between the experimental results and simple model using $a_{wf} = 0.16$ & $a_{wj} = 0.977$, $a_{wf} = 0.30$ & $a_{wj} = 0.977$, and $T_{eq,pred}$ at (A) $a_w =$	197

0.977, (B) $a_w = H_r$, and (C) $a_w = 0.792H_r + 0.215$.

- 10.4 Predicted (using $a_{wf} = 0.30$, $a_{wj} = 0.977$, and a_w from equation 10.1) and measured chilling time to the time that corresponds to $Y_{c,exp} = 0.10, 0.35$, and 0.70 for an unpeeled carrot. 199
- 10.5 Predicted (using $a_{wf} = 0.16$, $a_{wj} = 0.977$, and a_w from equation 10.1 in equation 10.2) and measured chilling time to the time that corresponds to $Y_{c,exp} = 0.10, 0.35$, and 0.70 for an unpeeled carrot. 200