



## MODELING OF CARROT FIRMNESS BASED ON WATER CONTENT AND TOTAL SOLUBLE SOLIDS OF CARROT

Majid Rashidi

Department of Mechanical Engineering, East Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

E-Mail: [majidrashidi81@yahoo.com](mailto:majidrashidi81@yahoo.com), [m.rashidi@qdiau.ac.ir](mailto:m.rashidi@qdiau.ac.ir)

### ABSTRACT

Carrot firmness (FIR) is often determined using difficult and time consuming laboratory tests, but it may be more appropriate and economical to develop a method which uses easily available and known quality characteristics of carrot such as water content (WC) and total soluble solids (TSS). In this study, a typical two variables linear regression model with zero constant for predicting FIR of Nantes carrot based on WC and TSS of carrot was suggested. The statistical results of the study indicated that in order to predict carrot FIR based on WC and TSS of carrot the two variables linear regression model with zero constant  $FIR = 40.34 WC - 40.25 TSS$  with  $R^2 = 0.99$  can be strongly recommended.

**Keywords:** carrot, modeling, firmness, water content, total soluble solids, linear regression model with zero constant.

### INTRODUCTION

Carrot (*Daucus carota* L.) is an important vegetable because of its large yield per unit area throughout the world and its increasing importance as human food (Ahmad *et al.*, 2005; Rashidi and Bahri, 2009 a). It belongs to the family Umbelliferae. The carrot is believed to have originated in Asia and now under cultivation in many countries (Hassan *et al.*, 2005; Rashidi and Bahri, 2009 b). It is orange-yellow in color, which adds attractiveness to foods on a plate, and makes it rich in carotene, a precursor of vitamin A (Bahri and Rashidi, 2009). It contains abundant amounts of nutrients such as protein, carbohydrate, fiber, vitamin A, potassium, sodium, thiamine and riboflavin (Ahmad *et al.*, 2005; Hassan *et al.*, 2005; Rashidi *et al.*, 2009 a, b), and is also high in sugar (Suojala, 2000). It is consumed fresh or cooked, either alone or with other vegetables, in the preparation of soups, stews, curries and pies. Fresh grated roots are used in salads and tender roots are pickled (Sharma *et al.*, 2006). Its use increases resistance against the blood and eye diseases (Hassan *et al.*, 2005).

Fruits and vegetables contain large quantities of water in proportion to their weight. Vegetables generally contain 90-96% water while for fruits normally contain 80-90% water (Mohsenin, 1986). Carrot contains 75-88% water and 8.5-12.5% soluble solids (Rashidi and Khabbaz, 2010; Rashidi *et al.*, 2010 a, b). Water content and soluble solids exert a profound influence on the storage period length, mechanical properties and quality characteristics of fruits and vegetables (Mohsenin, 1986; Hussain *et al.*,

2005; Mostofi and Toivonen, 2006; Sharma *et al.*, 2006; Ullah *et al.*, 2006; Rashidi *et al.*, 2010a, b). Therefore, the present study was conducted to develop a two variables linear regression model with zero constant for predicting carrot firmness based on water content and total soluble solids of carrot.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### Plant materials

Carrots (cv. Nantes) were purchased from a local market in Karaj, Iran. They were visually inspected for freedom of defects and blemishes. Carrots were then washed with tap water and treated for the prevention of development of decay by dipping for 20 min at 20°C in 0.5 g L<sup>-1</sup> aqueous solution of iprodione and then air dried for approximately 1 h. After that, they were transferred to the laboratory and held at 5±1°C and 90±5% relative humidity until laboratory tests.

#### Experimental procedure

In order to obtain required data for determining two variables linear regression model with zero constant, water content, total soluble solids and firmness of seventy-five randomly selected carrots were measured using laboratory tests (Table-1). Also, in order to verify regression model by comparing its results with those of the laboratory tests, ten carrots were taken at random. Again, water content, total soluble solids and firmness of them were determined using laboratory tests (Table-2).

**Table-1.** The mean values, standard deviation (S.D.) and coefficient of variation (C.V.) of water content (WC), total soluble solids (TSS) and firmness (FIR) of the seventy-five randomly selected carrots used to determine regression model.

Parameter	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	S.D.	C.V. (%)
WC (%)	76.3	88.5	83.6	3.23	3.87
TSS (%)	8.60	12.3	9.83	1.05	10.6
FIR (N)	2543	3271	2975	195	6.57



**Table-2.** The mean values, standard deviation (S.D.) and coefficient of variation (C.V.) of water content (WC), total soluble solids (TSS) and firmness (FIR) of the ten randomly selected carrots used to verify regression model.

Parameter	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	S.D.	C.V. (%)
WC (%)	75.6	88.5	83.3	3.84	4.61
TSS (%)	8.60	12.2	9.83	1.24	12.6
FIR (N)	2467	3271	2980	209	7.00

### Water content

The water content (WC) of carrots was determined using the equation 1:

$$WC = 100 \times (M_1 - M_2) / M_1 \quad (1)$$

Where:

WC = Water content, %

$M_1$  = Mass of sample before drying, g

$M_2$  = Mass of sample after drying, g

### Total soluble solids

The total soluble solids (TSS) of carrots were measured using an ATC-1E hand-held refractometer (ATAGO, Japan) at temperature of 20°C.

### Firmness

The firmness (FIR) of carrots was analyzed using a Hounsfield texture analyzer (Hounsfield Corp., UK). The test used was a shear or cut test on the 50 g carrot pieces closely placed into a 6×6×6 cm test box with 8 chisel knife blades. The variations in carrots size and geometry were minimized by testing the pieces of same thickness from the carrots. The test mode used for the texture analysis was "Force in Compression". A 5000 N load cell, test speed of 10 cm min<sup>-1</sup> and post-test speed 60 cm min<sup>-1</sup> were used. The "Trigger Type" was set to "Button" and distance to be traveled was set to 68 mm. The cutting force range was set to 2000-3400 N and the maximum cutting force measured during each test was considered as carrot FIR.

### Regression model

A typical two variables linear regression model with zero constant is shown in equation 2:

$$Y = k_1X_1 + k_2X_2 \quad (2)$$

Where:

Y = Dependent variable, for example FIR of carrot

$X_1, X_2$  = Independent variables, for example WC and TSS of carrot

$k_1, k_2$  = Regression coefficients

In order to predict carrot FIR based on WC and TSS of carrot the two variables linear regression model with zero constant  $FIR = k_1WC + k_2TSS$  was suggested.

### Statistical analysis

A paired sample t-test and the mean difference confidence interval approach were used to compare the FIR values predicted using the model with the FIR values measured by laboratory tests. The Bland-Altman approach (Bland and Altman, 1999) was also used to plot the agreement between the FIR values measured by laboratory tests with the FIR values predicted using the model. The statistical analyses were performed using Microsoft Excel 2007.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The two variables linear regression model with zero constant, p-value of independent variables and coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) of the model are shown in Table-3. In this model carrot FIR can be predicted as a function of carrot WC and TSS. The p-value of independent variables (WC and TSS) and coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) of the model were 1.81E-38, 2.18E-05 and 0.99, respectively. Based on the statistical result, the model was judged acceptable.

**Table-3.** The two variables linear regression model with zero constant, p-value of independent variables and coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) of the model

Model	p-value of independent variables		$R^2$
	WC	TSS	
$FIR = 40.34 WC - 40.25 TSS$	1.81E-38	2.18E-05	0.99

Moreover, a paired samples t-test and the mean difference confidence interval approach were used to compare the FIR values predicted using the model and the FIR values measured by laboratory tests. The Bland-Altman approach (Bland and Altman, 1999) was also used

to plot the agreement between the FIR values measured by laboratory tests with the FIR values predicted using the model. The FIR values predicted by the model were compared with FIR values determined by laboratory tests and are shown in Table-4. A plot of the FIR values




determined by the model and laboratory tests with the line of equality (1.0: 1.0) is shown in Figure-1. The mean FIR difference between two methods was -13.7 N (95% confidence intervals for the difference in means: -82.6 N and 55.3 N;  $P = 0.6646$ ). The standard deviation of the FIR differences was 96.3 N. The paired samples t-test results showed that the FIR values predicted with the model were not significantly different than that measured with laboratory tests. The FIR differences between two methods were normally distributed and 95% of these differences were expected to lie between  $\mu - 1.96\sigma$  and


$\mu + 1.96\sigma$ , known as 95% limits of agreement (Bland and Altman, 1999; Koc, 2007; Rashidi and Gholami, 2008; Rashidi and Seilsepour, 2009; Rashidi and Khabbaz, 2010; Rashidi *et al.*, 2010 a, b). The 95% limits of agreement for comparison of FIR determined with laboratory test and the model was calculated at -202.5 N and 175.2 N (Figure-2). Thus, FIR predicted by the model may be 202.5 N lower or 175.2 N higher than FIR measured by laboratory test. The average percentage differences for FIR prediction using the model and laboratory tests was 3.0%.

**Table-4.** Water content (WC), total soluble solids (TSS) and firmness (FIR) of the ten randomly selected carrots used in evaluating the model

Sample No.	WC (%)	TSS (%)	FIR (N)	
			Laboratory tests	Model
1	75.6	12.2	2467	2558
2	80.0	11.0	2972	2786
3	81.0	10.4	2938	2850
4	82.3	10.9	2896	2880
5	82.7	9.70	2999	2945
6	84.5	9.20	3020	3038
7	85.4	8.80	3024	3091
8	86.1	8.80	3112	3117
9	87.2	8.70	3271	3169
10	88.5	8.60	3097	3225



**Figure-1.** Measured FIR and predicted FIR using the model with the line of equality (1.0: 1.0).



**Figure-2.** Bland-Altman plot for the comparison of measured FIR and predicted FIR using the model; the outer lines indicate the 95% limits of agreement (-202.5, 175.2) and the center line shows the average difference (-13.7).

## CONCLUSIONS

A typical two variables linear regression model with zero constant was used to predict carrot firmness

(FIR) based on water content (WC) and total soluble solids (TSS) of carrot. The FIR values predicted using the model was compared to the FIR values measured by laboratory



tests. The difference between two methods was not statistically significant ( $P > 0.05$ ). Therefore, the two variables linear regression model with zero constant  $FIR = 40.34 WC - 40.25 TSS$  with  $R^2 = 0.99$  provides a simple, rapid and economical method to predict carrot firmness based on easily available and known quality characteristics of carrot, i.e., total soluble solids and water content.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is very much thankful to the Islamic Azad University, East Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran for giving all types of support in publishing this study.

#### REFERENCES

- Ahmad B., Hassan S. and Bakhsh K. 2005. Factors affecting yield and profitability of carrot in two districts of Punjab. *Int. J. Agric. Biol.* 7: 794-798.
- Bahri M.H. and Rashidi M. 2009. Effects of coating methods and storage periods on some qualitative characteristics of carrot during ambient storage. *Int. J. Agric. Biol.* 11: 443-447.
- Bland J.M. and Altman D.G. 1999. Measuring agreement in method comparison studies. *Stat. Methods Med. Res.* 8: 135-160.
- Hassan I., Bakhsh K., Salik M.H., Khalil M. and Ahmad N. 2005. Determination of factors contributing towards the yield of carrot in Faisalabad (Pakistan). *Int. J. Agric. Biol.* 7: 323-324.
- Hussain I., Gilani S.N., Khan M.R., Khan M.T. and Shakir I. 2005. Varietal suitability and storage stability of mango squash. *Int. J. Agric. Biol.* 7: 1038-1039.
- Koc A.B. 2007. Determination of watermelon volume using ellipsoid approximation and image processing. *J. Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 45: 366-371
- Mohsenin N.N. 1986. *Physical Properties of Food and Agricultural Materials*. Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, NY, U.S.A.
- Mostofi Y. and Toivonen P.M.A. 2006. Effects of storage conditions and 1-methylcyclopropene on some qualitative characteristics of tomato fruits. *Int. J. Agric. Biol.* 8: 93-96.
- Rashidi M. and Khabbaz B.G. 2010. Prediction of total soluble solids and firmness of carrot based on carrot water content. In: Proc. of XVII<sup>th</sup> World Congress of the International Commission of Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering (CIGR), Hosted by the Canadian Society for Bioengineering (CSBE/SCGAB), Quebec City, Canada. 13-17 June.
- Rashidi M. and Gholami M. 2008. Determination of kiwifruit volume using ellipsoid approximation and image-processing methods. *Int. J. Agric. Biol.* 10: 375-380.
- Rashidi M. and Bahri M.H. 2009a. Interactive effects of relative humidity, coating method and storage period on quality of carrot (cv. Nantes) during cold storage. *ARPN J. Agric. Biol. Sci.* 4(2): 26-34.
- Rashidi M. and Bahri M.H. 2009b. Interactive effects of coating method and storage period on quality of carrot (cv. Nantes) during ambient storage. *ARPN J. Agric. Biol. Sci.* 4(3): 29-35.
- Rashidi M. and Seilsepour M. 2009. Total nitrogen pedotransfer function for calcareous soils of Varamin region. *Int. J. Agric. Biol.* 11: 89-92.
- Rashidi M., Ranjbar I., Gholami M. and Abbassi S. 2010a. Prediction of carrot firmness based on carrot water content. *American-Eurasian J. Agric. and Environ. Sci.* 7(4): 402-405.
- Rashidi M., Ranjbar I., Gholami M. and Abbassi S. 2010b. Prediction of carrot total soluble solids based on carrot water content. *American-Eurasian J. Agric. and Environ. Sci.* 7(3): 366-369.
- Rashidi M., Bahri M.H. and Khabbaz B.G. 2009a. Effects of coating methods and storage periods on some quality characteristics of carrot during ambient storage. In: Proc. of Biennial Conference of the Australian Society for Engineering in Agriculture (SEAg), 13-16 September 2009, Brisbane, QLD, Australia.
- Rashidi M., Bahri M.H. and Abbassi S. 2009b. Effects of relative humidity, coating methods and storage periods on some qualitative characteristics of carrot during cold storage. *American-Eurasian J. Agric. and Environ. Sci.* 5: 359-367.
- Sharma H.K., Kaur J., Sarkar B.C., Singh C., Singh B. and Shitandi A.A. 2006. Optimization of pretreatment conditions of carrots to maximize juice recovery by response surface methodology. *J. Eng. Sci. Tech.* 1: 158-165.
- Suojala T. 2000. Variation in sugar content and composition of carrot storage roots at harvest and during storage. *Sci. Hort.* 85: 1-19.
- Ullah H., Ahmad S., Anwar R. and Thompson A.K. 2006. Effect of high humidity and water on storage life and quality of bananas. *Int. J. Agric. Biol.* 8: 828-831.