Effect of HP/T treatments of in-package food on additive migration from conventional and bio-sourced materials

Miguel Mauricio-Iglesias, Simon Jansana, Stéphane Peyron, Nathalie Gontard, Valérie Guillard

► To cite this version:

Miguel Mauricio-Iglesias, Simon Jansana, Stéphane Peyron, Nathalie Gontard, Valérie Guillard. Effect of HP/T treatments of in-package food on additive migration from conventional and bio-sourced materials. Food additives & contaminants. Part A. Chemistry, analysis, control, exposure & risk assessment, 2009, 27 (01), pp.118-127. 10.1080/19440040903268054 . hal-00572618

HAL Id: hal-00572618

<https://hal.science/hal-00572618>

Submitted on 2 Mar 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Effect of HP/T treatments of in-package food on additive migration from conventional and bio-sourced materials

Journal:	<i>Food Additives and Contaminants</i>
Manuscript ID:	TFAC-2009-191.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Research Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	17-Aug-2009
Complete List of Authors:	Mauricio-Iglesias, Miguel; University Montpellier 2, UMR IATE Jansana, Simon; University Montpellier 2, UMR IATE; University Montpellier 2, UMR IATE Peyron, Stéphane; University Montpellier 2, UMR IATE Gontard, Nathalie; University Montpellier 2, UMR IATE Guillard, Valérie; University Montpellier 2, UMR IATE
Methods/Techniques:	Risk assessment
Additives/Contaminants:	Packaging - food simulants, Packaging additives
Food Types:	

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Effect of high pressure/temperature (HP/T) treatments of in-package food on additive migration from conventional and bio-sourced materials

Mauricio-Iglesias, M. Jansana, S. Peyron, S. Gontard, N. Guillard, V.

UMR 1208 IATE (Agropolymer Engineering and Emerging Technology), University of Montpellier 2,
CIRAD, INRA, Montpellier Supagro
CC023, Pl. E Bataillon F-34095 Montpellier FR

Abstract

Migration was assessed during and after two high pressure/temperature (HP/T) treatments intended to perform a pasteurization (800 MPa for 5 min, from 20 to 40 °C) and a sterilization treatment (800 MPa for 5 min, from 90 to 115 °C) and were compared with conventional pasteurization and sterilization respectively. The specific migration of actual packaging additives used as antioxidants and UV absorbers (Irganox 1076, Uvitex OB) was investigated in a number of food-packaging system combining one synthetic common packaging (LLDPE) and a bio-sourced one (PLA) in contact with the four food simulating liquids defined by EC regulations. After standard HP/T processing, migration kinetics was followed during the service life of the packaging material using FTIR spectroscopy. LLDPE withstood the HP sterilization whereas it melted during the conventional sterilization. No difference was observed on migration from LLDPE for both treatments. In the case of PLA, migration of Uvitex OB was very low or not detectable for all the cases which were studied.

Introduction

In order to fulfill the increasing demand for high quality food, high pressure (HP) treatments stand as one of the most promising new preservation technologies. Indeed, HP has been proven to be a mild treatment able to render micro organisms inactive as well as the enzymes responsible for shelf-life shortening with almost no modifications of the sensory and nutritional attributes of the product (Rastogi et al. 2007) . In order to extend the applicability of HP, a number of papers have recently appeared proposing the combination of pressure and temperature as a less aggressive method to sterilize food than the conventional thermal sterilization (Ven et al. 2007; Wilson et al. 2008) . Since food is packed before high pressure/thermal (HP/T) batch processing, the packaging material is also exposed to non-conventional conditions of pressure and temperature. The packaging structure may be

1
2
3 24 altered and consequently its mechanical and mass transfer (barrier and migration) properties as well
4
5 25 (Guillard et al. 2009) . Therefore, it is essential to assess properly the impact of this novel process on
6
7
8 26 migration in order to ensure its safety and avoid any potential health concern, especially since some
9
10 27 migration issues have recently raised public awareness on this subject (Anonymous 2005; Anonymous
11
12 28 2008) .
13
14
15 29

16
17 30 Migration of a substance from packaging into food is a subject of growing interest for the scientific
18
19 31 and legislative communities. Low and medium molecular weight substances, (e.g. plastic additives,
20
21 32 residual monomers) are not chemically bound to the polymer chains and can therefore migrate from
22
23 33 the polymer matrix, especially, when packaging undergoes severe conditions of temperature during
24
25 34 treatment. To date, research on mass transfer phenomena in packaging submitted to the couple effect
26
27 35 of HP/T found that these treatments had no or slight effect on barrier properties of packaging materials
28
29 36 e.g. Lopez-Rubio et al (2005) on gas permeation and conditions up to 800 MPa and 75°C;
30
31 37 Schauwecker et al.(2002) on permeation of the pressure transmitting fluid (up to 827 MPa and 75°C);
32
33 38 Caner et al(2004) and Kübel et al (1996) on aroma sorption (up to 800 MPa and 60°C). To our
34
35 39 knowledge, only one study (Caner and Harte 2005) was devoted to the impact of HP/T on specific
36
37 40 migration of one additive (Irganox 1076 in PP) and did not observe any difference for treated samples
38
39 41 at 800 MPa and 40 or 60°C.
40
41 42
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 43 The aim of this paper is to present a complete assessment of migration under pasteurization and
49
50 44 sterilization conditions. Therefore, it aims at extending the knowledge on migration including (i) the
51
52 45 four food simulating liquids (FSL) set by European Directive 85/572/EEC (1985); (ii) more severe
53
54 46 conditions of pressure/temperature coupled (up to 800 MPa and 115°C) and (iii) on new materials as
55
56 47 bio-sourced PLA. It is important to point out that even if olive oil is the fatty FSL set in priority by
57
58
59
60

legislation, none of the previously cited studies has tested it, despite being the most aggressive FSL for plastic materials. The conditions selected in this study were intended to represent sterilization and pasteurization (800 MPa/115°C or 800 MPa/40°C respectively) in order to assess the migration of two additives from one commercial synthetic polymer (LLDPE) and one commercial bio-sourced polymer (PLA). In this purpose, the kinetics of mass transfer of the two model migrants from HP/T treated and non-treated LLDPE and PLA in contact with the four recommended FSL was investigated. One of the advantages of HP/T is the possibility to treat foodstuff in its final packaging and prevent the risk of recontamination. With this scope, it seemed natural to assess not only the effect of the treatment itself but also of the HP/T treatment and further storage. For evaluating migration a specific approach was used based on the use of a non destructive method for mass transfer kinetic evaluation and a mathematical model for identification of migrant diffusivity.

Materials and Methods

Chemicals

All surrogate compounds (Irganox 1076, Uvitex OB) and solvents were of reagent grade or highest purity available. 2,5-Bis-(5-tert.-butyl-benzoxazol-2-yl)-thiophen (Uvitex OB, 430.6 g mol⁻¹) was purchased from Fluka. Octadecyl 3-(3,5-di-tertbutyl-4-hydroxyphenyl)propionate (Irganox 1076, 530 g mol⁻¹), was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich. Methanol (99.9%), petroleum ether (40-60°C, puriss), tetrahydrofurane (THF, 98%) and toluene (99%) were purchased from Carlo Erba. Ethanol (99.8% v) and acetic acid (99-100% v) were purchased from Riedel-de Haën. Olive oil was purchased in a local supermarket. LLDPE pellets were purchased from Sigma Aldrich and PLA from Cargill Dow.

Films fabrication

LLDPE pellets were mixed with additives at 140°C (50 rpm) during 5 min. PLA pellets were mixed with additives at 160°C (50 rpm) during 5 min. The dough material obtained after mixing was then

thermoformed (hot press) at 100 bars during 10 min at 140°C for LLDPE and 160°C for PLA. Films preparation was kindly carried out by IMCB (Naples, Italy). Two additives were used as surrogate: Irganox 1076 and Uvitex OB. Three different samples were studied: LLDPE + Irganox 1076, LLDPE + Uvitex OB and PLA + Uvitex OB, all at a nominal concentration of 0.4% w/w, higher than generally recommended by the supplier (about 0.1% w/w). Final film's thickness was $656 \pm 64 \mu\text{m}$ for LLDPE + Uvitex OB, $492 \pm 25 \mu\text{m}$ for LLDPE + Irganox 1076 and $274 \pm 48 \mu\text{m}$ for PLA + Uvitex OB measured by using a micrometer (Braive Instruments, Chécy, Fr).

Sample treatments

High pressure treatments. High pressure treatments were performed in a Resato hydrostatic pressure apparatus in A&F (Wageningen, Netherlands). For each case, the polymer strip was treated immersed in the FSL. Immediately after the treatment, both were removed and put together in a glass flask, in order to imitate the contact of an actual food product treated in its final packaging. Two different treatments were applied:

- HP/HT treatment: 5 min at 800 MPa and 115°C with a pressure build-up regime of 800 MPa min^{-1} and a starting temperature of 90°C which rises to 115°C due to pressure; this treatment stands for a high pressure sterilization.

- HP/LT treatment: 5 min at 800 MPa and 40°C with a pressure build-up regime of 800 MPa min^{-1} and a starting temperature of 20°C which rises to 40°C due to pressure; this treatment stands for a high pressure pasteurization.

Control. The treated samples were compared to an untreated control (UTC, 40°C) that was immersed in the FSL during 7 min in order to take into account the 5 min of treatment and time needed to build-up and release the pressure (2 min overall).

94 *Conventional treatments.* The high pressure treatments were also compared to classical equivalent
95 stabilization processes, i.e. thermal pasteurization and sterilization. The volume of FSL and surface of
96 films treated were identical to the other experiments. The conditions chosen were:

97 -Pasteurization: 30 min at 0.1 MPa and 63°C in a stove.

98 -Sterilization: 20 min at 121°C in a Hydrolock ACB (Atelier de Technologie Alimentaire, Montpellier,
99 France).

101 *Migration kinetics*

102 Following the conditions set in directives 85/572/EEC (1985) and 2002/72/EC (2002), strips of
103 polymers (3.5 cm²) were immersed in 6 mL of food simulating liquid, FSL, and stored at 40°C. Four
104 FSL were used: distilled water, 3% acetic acid, 15% ethanol and olive oil. The time of exposition was
105 extended from 10 to 26 days in order to obtain further information about the kinetic profile. The
106 desorption of Uvitex OB and Irganox 1076 was determined in the film in triplicate using a non-
107 destructive method (FTIR measurements) or a destructive method (extraction + UV). Before each
108 measurement in FTIR, the strip of polymer is wiped, analyzed and then put again in the FSL. At the
109 end of the migration test, the content of the remaining additive was determined in the polymer sample
110 by using extraction + UV. The kinetics of Uvitex OB release from PLA was tentatively followed by
111 FTIR (non-destructive method) but, unfortunately, high complexity of the PLA spectra prevented
112 quantification of Uvitex OB concentration using this non-destructive method. As consequence, all
113 results of Uvitex OB concentration in PLA are based on UV analysis of extracts. For each of the
114 samples the concentration of additives was determined at 3, 6, 10, 15 and 26 days after the treatment
115 by FTIR.

116 *FTIR measurements*

1
2
3 117 LLDPE film samples were analyzed by transmission FTIR. Spectra were recorded using a Nexus 5700
4
5
6 118 spectrometer (ThermoElectron Corp.) equipped with HeNe beam splitter and a cooled MCT detector.
7
8 119 Spectral data were accumulated from 128 scans with a resolution of 4 cm⁻¹ in the range 800-4000 cm⁻¹.
9
10 120 Three samples were employed for the measure and three spectra were recorded for each sample
11
12
13 121 All spectra pre-treatments were performed using Omnic v7.3 and TQ Analyst v7.3 softwares
14
15 122 (ThermoElectron) Processing included: (1) a multipoint linear baseline correction, (2) a normalization
16
17 123 according to the area of the LLDPE doublet (1369-1378 cm⁻¹) due to the CH₃ symmetric deformation
18
19
20 124 vibration.
21
22 125
23
24 126 The release of Uvitex OB from the sample was followed by the disappearance of a double bond
25
26
27 127 aromatic peak at 1590 cm⁻¹. A Partial Least Square (PLS) model was calibrated on the basis of the
28
29 128 intensity ratio 1579/1378 cm⁻¹. The regression produced a linear relationship ($R^2 = 0.96$, RMSE=
30
31 129 0.034% w/w) between spectral data and additives concentration measured by UV analysis as explained
32
33
34 130 afterwards.
35
36 131
37
38 132 Likewise, the release of Irganox 1076 from LLDPE samples was followed by the disappearance of the
39
40
41 133 peak at 1235 cm⁻¹ following a similar procedure. The PLS results for Irganox 1076 were $R^2 = 0.97$,
42
43 134 RMSE= 0.019% w/w.
44
45
46 135 FTIR measurements were successfully validated by measuring migration after 26 days of storage at
47
48 136 40°C using the UV method to determine the final content in the film.
49
50
51 137

52
53 138 ***Raman spectroscopy***
54

55 139 Uvitex concentration profiles in the LLDPE were determined as follows. Thin slices of LLDPE were
56
57
58 140 prepared using a razor blade and stuck on a microscope slide. Raman spectra were recorded between
59
60

95 and 3500 cm^{-1} Raman shift using a confocal Raman microspectrometer Almega (Thermo-Electron) with the following configuration: excitation laser He-Ne $\lambda_0 = 633 \text{ nm}$, grating 500 grooves/mm, pinhole 25 μm , objective $\times 50$. The collection time was about 50 s. Measurements were carried out in the depth sample with a step size of 10 μm from the sample center to the interface. All spectra pre-treatments were performed with Omnic v7.1 (Thermo-Electron). Processing included: (i) a multipoint linear baseline correction, (ii) normalization according to the area of the LLDPE specific band at 1129 cm^{-1} representing the symmetric C-C stretching of all-trans PE chains. The relative content of Uvitex OB was assessed using the area of the specific doublet (1569-1614 cm^{-1}) assigned to the aromatic C=C and C=N bands respectively.

Solubility of Uvitex OB in olive oil

Uvitex OB solubility in olive oil was measured by a Varian Cary Eclipse Fluorimeter. The measurements of fluorescence intensity were done at two excitation wavelengths, 332 and 373 nm, and detected at an emission wavelength of 434 nm. The collection time was 1 s. The results were averaged on the readings at the two excitations wavelengths.

Solutions of olive oil were oversaturated with Uvitex OB and kept for 20 days at 40°C. A small volume of the supernatant was taken and diluted to 1:1000 or 1:2000 and then measured in the fluorimeter (in sextuplicate).

Quantification of Uvitex OB and Irganox 1076 using standard methods

These standard methods were developed at the FP5 Foodmigsure project (Anonymous 2004).

Uvitex OB and Irganox 1076 were extracted from the polymers via dissolution in toluene at 103°C for 7 min for LLDPE and 5 min for PLA followed by a precipitation in methanol for LLDPE and in petroleum ether for PLA. The cooled solution was filtered to remove the precipitate and evaporated

1
2
3 165 under vacuum at 50°C (for 7 min approximately). Calibration of the extraction procedure showed that
4
5
6 166 these conditions enabled stable and reproducible recovery (88.5% ± 0.6). The calibration and recovery
7
8 167 were determined following the same procedure as Nerin et al. (2003) . Dry extracts containing Uvitex
9
10 168 OB were then dissolved in 10.0 ml of THF and dry extracts containing Irganox 1076 were dissolved in
11
12
13 169 10.0 ml methanol. The additive content was quantified by UV spectroscopy (Varian Cary 100 Scan,
14
15 170 UV-Visible spectrophotometer) at 374 nm for Uvitex OB and 277 nm for Irganox 1076.
16
17
18 171

19
20 172 ***Diffusivity identification***

21
22 173 In the case of a sheet of polymer immersed in a liquid of infinite volume and constant concentration,
23
24
25 174 the evolution of additive content with time is given by (Crank 1980) :

26
27 175
$$\frac{C_t - C_{in}}{C_{L,\infty} - C_{in}} = 1 - \frac{8}{\pi^2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2n+1)^2} \exp\left[-\frac{(2n+1)^2 \pi^2}{L^2} D.t\right] \quad (1)$$

28
29
30

31 176 where C_t is average concentration in diffusing substance in the packaging at time t , C_{in} is the initial
32
33 177 concentration in additive and $C_{L,\infty}$ is the concentration of the diffusing substance on the surface of the
34
35
36 178 polymer required to maintain equilibrium with the concentration of this substance in the liquid at any
37
38 179 time t .

39
40 180 Additive diffusivity was identified from experimental data by minimizing the root mean square error
41
42
43 181 (RMSE) between experimental and predicted data (Equation 1) using an optimization method
44
45 182 (Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm predefined in Matlab (Mathworks, USA) software). A Monte Carlo
46
47
48 183 sampling was applied to the input parameters (concentration, thickness and time) in order to determine
49
50 184 the 95% confidence intervals of the determined diffusivity as detailed elsewhere (Hessler 1997; Press
51
52 185 et al. 1989) .
53
54
55 186
56
57 187
58
59
60

Results and Discussion

Uvitex OB is an optical brightener and UV stabilizer approved for use in food contact material (FCM) with a specific migration limit (SML) of 0.6 mg kg^{-1} (2002/72/EEC). Irganox is an antioxidant approved for FCM with a specific migration limit (SML) of 6 mg kg^{-1} (2002/72/EEC).

These two molecules were selected to spike the studied samples (LLDPE and PLA) because of (i) their excellent thermal stability (for example, according to the supplier datasheet, the thermogravimetric analysis on Uvitex OB shows a loss of only 1% weight at 280°C) (ii) their relatively high diffusivities in polymers allowing to easily observe migration kinetics in LLDPE (Dole et al. 2006; Helmroth et al. 2002) and (iii) their easy detection and quantification using both standard methods (HPLC, UV) and spectroscopic method such as FTIR and Raman (Mauricio-Iglesias et al. 2009). The objective was to assess the influence of HP/T treatments comparing:

- HP sterilization-like treatment (800 MPa , 115°C , 5 min)
- HP pasteurization like treatment (800 MPa , 40°C , 5 min)
- Conventional sterilization (20 min at 121°C) in autoclave
- Conventional mild pasteurization (30 min at 63°C)
- Untreated control (abbreviated to UTC, 40°C , 7 min to take into account the time of build-up and release of pressure, approx 2 min)

Determination of Uvitex OB solubility in olive oil

Before tackling the assessment of migration of additives it was essential to gather some information about its solubility. A rather low upper bound for the solubilities in water of both Irganox 1076 and Uvitex OB can be found in the safety data sheet, however there is no indication of their solubility in olive oil. Irganox 1076 is consistently more soluble in non polar solvents than in polar ones, what

1
2
3 212 allows considering its solubility in olive oil as very high (probably of the same order of magnitude as
4
5
6 213 in n-hexane, 320 g kg⁻¹). For Uvitex OB, a quite complex molecule, it is not easy to find a trend (a
7
8 214 solubility scale could be built as chloroform>ethyl acetate>acetone>n-hexane>methanol). Therefore,
9
10 215 the solubility was obtained experimentally giving a result of 5±2 g L⁻¹ of Uvitex in olive oil.
11
12

13 216
14
15 217 ***LLDPE treatment and migration tests***
16

17
18 218 Migration experiments were performed on untreated control (UTC) and treated samples (HP/HT,
19
20 219 HP/LT and conventional pasteurization and sterilization) of LLDPE spiked with Uvitex OB (initial
21
22 220 quantity of 0.41±0.10 % w/w) or Irganox 1076 (initial quantity of 0.37±0.023 % w/w. The kinetic
23
24 221 release of Uvitex OB and Irganox 1076 was monitored with FTIR measurements that supplied the
25
26 222 content of Uvitex or Irganox in the polymer strip. Concerning the thermal sterilization treatment, none
27
28 223 of the migration results could be obtained since the sterilized samples melted during the sterilization
29
30 224 process, which indeed made them useless for packaging purposes. This was not surprising since the
31
32 225 melting point of the LLDPE used had been determined near 115°C. However, it should be emphasized
33
34 226 that the LLDPE samples, which underwent the HP at high temperature (HP/HT, sterilization-like
35
36 227 treatment) kept their integrity in turn. This result underpinned the fact that if a packaging material
37
38 228 cannot withstand a thermal treatment; an equivalent treatment might be done with high pressure.
39
40
41
42
43
44 229

45
46 230 The migration of Irganox 1076 during the HP/T treatment alone (no further storage), was assessed by
47
48 231 comparing the quantity of remaining additive before and after the treatment (Figure 1A). As it can be
49
50 232 seen, migration is much higher in olive oil than in the aqueous FSL (in almost all cases lower actually
51
52 233 than the limit of quantification for the FTIR method estimated at 0.03 % w/w in the film). Indeed,
53
54 234 Irganox 1076 is much more soluble in hydrophobic solvents such as olive oil than in polar aqueous
55
56
57
58
59
60

solvents; Irganox 1076 solubility in n-hexane is equal to 320 g kg^{-1} of solution compared to less than 0.3 g kg^{-1} in water (Sanches Silva et al. 2006) .

According to Figure 1, no effect of HP/T treatment was observed on Irganox 1076 migration from LLDPE into FSL after HP/T treatment and subsequent storage compared to the control. This result was in accordance with that obtained by Caner and Harte (2005) for PP after HP treatment (800 MPa) and 20 days of storage at 40 and 60°C: no significant differences in the migration level of Irganox 1076 were observed by these authors after HP treatment into the tested FSL (95% and 10% ethanol) compared to the controls. Regarding temperature, which is a known activating factor of migration, when the release after the treatment and 10 days of storage is considered, the losses in pasteurized samples appear as significantly higher ($p=0.05$) than the untreated control (UTC) but this result was not confirmed after storage. A question to be answered is if this higher release is caused during the treatment or if the treatment modifies the polymer in a way that the release during storage is enhanced. Unfortunately, the high deviation of the results after treatment (as the concentration becomes steadily lower) hinders the potential conclusions about temperature (losses in pasteurization are only higher than those after HP/LT and UTC for a p-value of 0.2).

Likewise, the migration of Uvitex OB during the HP/T treatment alone (no further storage), was assessed by comparing the quantity of remaining additive before and after the treatment (Figure 2A). For both HP/T treatments and the UTC, the release of the initial content of Uvitex OB was of around 10% in aqueous FSL and 15% in olive oil. Concerning conventional pasteurization, the pasteurized samples gave similar results to the UTC and HP treated samples whereas significantly higher losses were found in olive oil. In short, HP treatments represented an advantage as i) the LLDPE samples studied could withstand HP sterilization but not the conventional treatment and ii) migration of

1
2
3 259 pasteurized samples was higher in olive oil and not significantly different in the rest, compared to the
4
5
6 260 UTC or the HP samples.
7
8 261
9
10 262 The quantity of remaining Uvitex OB in the HP/T treated LLDPE and the non treated ones was
11
12
13 263 compared after 10 days and 26 days of storage in the same FSL in which they were treated. The
14
15 264 resulting losses in Uvitex OB are reported after 10 days (Figure 2B) and 26 days (Figure 2C)
16
17 265 migration.
18
19
20 266
21
22 267 The losses of Uvitex OB after 10 days storage at 40°C ranged from 35 to 53 % in water, acetic acid
23
24 268 and ethanol FSL and as expected, reached higher losses (from 73 to 77%) in olive oil. The solubility of
25
26
27 269 Uvitex OB in olive oil has been estimated in this study as $5 \pm 2 \text{ g L}^{-1}$ of olive oil. On the contrary,
28
29 270 solubility in water and aqueous simulants is hardly measurable ($< 0.3 \text{ g L}^{-1}$ of water according to the
30
31
32 271 supplier data sheet). After 26 days storage at 40°C, losses of Uvitex OB in LLDPE ranged from 57 to
33
34 272 70% in water, acetic acid and ethanol FSL and almost 90% in olive oil what confirmed the conclusions
35
36 273 already drawn at 10 days of storage.
37
38
39 274
40
41 275 Concerning the HP/T treatment, no significant effect of HP treatment was observed after HP/T
42
43 276 treatment and 10 or 26 days of storage, either with the control or the pasteurized samples. Effectively,
44
45
46 277 the significant differences detected between the pasteurized samples and the others (Figure 2A)
47
48 278 became no longer noticeable after the time of storage, suggesting that the importance of the storage
49
50
51 279 step is higher than that of the treatment itself, either HP or conventional.
52
53 280
54
55 281 Taking into account the low solubility of Uvitex OB in aqueous FSL, unexpected high losses of Uvitex
56
57
58 282 OB from LLDPE into FSL were observed (Figures 2A, B & C) even for aqueous simulants in which
59
60

Uvitex OB solubility is very low ($<0.03 \text{ g L}^{-1}$ in water which is likely close to solubility in 3% acetic acid and 15% ethanol). A mass balance was made to check the results between the losses in the films and the migrates in the FSL. However, the quantity of Uvitex OB released could not be found back dissolved in the aqueous FSL. The examination of the tissue sheets used to wipe the polymer strips before the FTIR analysis showed traces of Uvitex OB powder. As an illustration, the amount released by the samples in water for the UTC would represent a concentration of 0.5 g kg^{-1} FSL, more than ten folds higher than the already overestimated value of solubility ($<0.03 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$). Actually, Uvitex OB turned out to be stuck to the surface of the polymer film, where it had previously emerged. This phenomenon characterized by a loss of additive from the bulk of the polymer that emerges or “blooms” on the surface is called blooming (sometimes also referred to as bleeding). In principle, blooming occurs when the additive concentration is higher than its solubility in the polymer (Billingham 2001) although it has been observed that supersaturated metastable solutions were possible (Spatfore and Pearson 1991). Blooming is well known in industry and sometimes difficult to avoid as the quantities of additive needed to be effective may be higher than the solubility in the polymer. Raman microspectroscopy analysis has confirmed blooming of Uvitex OB in LLDPE (Figure 3 and Figure 4) showing an accumulation of additive nearby the interface of the film. In this case study, blooming could have been intensified for the high concentrations of additive used. In any case, an important conclusion arises from the precedent discussion; blooming is a realistic phenomenon that may occur (although infrequently) in real packaging and must be taken into account in migration tests.

According to control points made after 26 days of storage in the polymers and the FSL using the standard method, the mass balance regarding what remained in the polymer strip and what migrated into the FSL was incomplete confirming that a partial quantity of Uvitex OB had been taken off during the migration test by wiping. This phenomenon can lead to migration artifacts and highlights the

1
2
3 307 importance of checking the mass balance between the film and the FSL. It can be noticed that
4
5 308 migration tests based only on quantifying the amount of additive in the FSL would not have detected it
6
7
8 309 whereas it can be critical in some cases i.e. when packaging solid foodstuff that can mechanically wipe
9
10 310 the “bloomed” additive or if the additive sticks to the surface of the foodstuff.
11
12

13 311
14
15 312 ***PLA treatment and migration tests***
16

17 313 The same tests (UTC, HP/HT, HP/LT, thermal pasteurization and thermal sterilization) were carried
18
19
20 314 out on PLA spiked with Uvitex OB (initial concentration of 0.52 ± 0.04 % w/w based on UV analysis of
21
22 315 extracts as stated previously). It is important to point out that PLA withstood the sterilization process,
23
24
25 316 whether thermal or HP/HT since it has a melting point, T_m , at about 175°C whereas LLDPE T_m lies
26
27 317 between $100\text{--}120^\circ\text{C}$). However, the appearance of PLA underwent unequivocal changes after both
28
29
30 318 sterilization treatments. PLA became whitish, translucent and brittle which made it unsuitable for
31
32 319 packaging applications. Indeed PLA is heated above its glass transition temperature ($T_g \sim 60^\circ\text{C}$) for
33
34 320 sterilization processes, whether it be thermal sterilization or high pressure sterilization (even if the T_g
35
36 321 of PLA is not known at 800 MPa, the HP treatment requires the sample to be at 90°C before the
37
38
39 322 pressure build-up, and thus, above the T_g). This transition may promote tempering and recrystallization
40
41 323 of PLA, therefore changing its structure and modifying its appearance. If this crystallization also
42
43
44 324 occurs during the HP treatment is not easy to know. Indeed, T_g increases with pressure first linearly
45
46 325 and then asymptotically but the value of T_g at 800 MPa is not known to date (Iannace and Mensitieri,
47
48 326 Personal communication) .
49

50
51 327
52
53 328 For all the treatments and FSL and even after 26 days of storage, release of Uvitex OB from PLA was
54
55 329 so slow that the differences in concentration with initial concentration lay within the error of the
56
57
58 330 quantification method (estimated in 0.03% w/w). PLA appears thus as a good barrier material
59
60

concerning migration of a medium molecular weight additive, and, to the accuracy of this study, its performance was not modified by high pressure treatments. It is not known however if the structural modifications undergone at high temperature could however enhance the migration of smaller molecules than Uvitex OB (431 g mol^{-1}) and it should be studied in further detail.

Determination of mass transfer parameters

Mass transfer from packaging to foodstuff can be well simulated provided that three parameters are known, diffusivity in the polymer (D), the partition coefficient polymer/foodstuff (KPL) and the mass transfer coefficient (k), although the latter can be ignored in many practical cases as its influence is low compared to the diffusivity in the material (Pocas et al. 2008) . Roughly the KPL represents the values of migration at equilibrium and D, how fast equilibrium is reached. The use of this parameter makes easier the comparison of results inter-studies since it allows to get rid of the influence of variable experimental set-ups (e.g. polymer thickness, polymer/FSL mass ratio). With the scope of fully characterizing this case study, the mass transfer parameters were determined when possible. Otherwise, at least a rough estimation is provided whenever the results prevented an accurate determination of the parameters. The mathematical model used to determine the diffusivity consisted on Fick's law (Equation 1) and the assumption that the FSL surrounding the sample was close to zero. The diffusivity values obtained are not the "actual" diffusivities but for the UTC, since in the other cases the kinetics includes not only the storage but also the treatment (HP/LT and HP/HT). According to Figures 1 and 2, this influence would be negligible. Anyway, these values are suitable for the comparison of the whole migration story of the packaging/FSL system. Figure 5 shows an example of model fitting for HP/HT treated samples.

1
2
3 354 On the other hand, the phenomena assessed here are more complex in the case of Uvitex OB in
4
5
6 355 LLDPE because of blooming of the additive. To the best of our knowledge, little has been published
7
8 356 on the kinetics of blooming. Spatafore and Pearson (1991) found that the kinetics of blooming of
9
10 357 Irganox 1076 from polypropylene followed Fickian kinetics, at least apparently since they stated that
11
12 358 the molecular mechanism must be different than simple diffusion; there were evidences that whole
13
14 359 crystals could migrate instead of disperse molecules. As a consequence, if blooming is controlled by
15
16 360 Fickian kinetics, the results obtained are also valuable for the assessment of the effect of HP/T
17
18 361 treatments on migration.
19
20
21
22 362
23
24 363 Uvitex OB diffusivity in LLDPE was determined for each FSL and for treated or non treated polymers
25
26 364 using the kinetic profile obtained by FTIR. The diffusivity values found for Uvitex OB (Table 1)
27
28 365 were in good accordance with those found in the literature: $3.2 \times 10^{-14} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ (measured with Moisan
29
30 366 cells) and $5 \times 10^{-14} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ (measured with sorption kinetics) in LLDPE (Dole et al. 2006) . Besides the
31
32 367 root mean square error (RMSE) was in all the cases of the same order of magnitude of the
33
34 368 experimental error. For the same FSL, no significant difference was found between the HP/T treated
35
36 369 samples and the control although clear differences were detected between different FSL. Likewise,
37
38 370 diffusivity values are in agreement with the migration tests showing that there is no significant
39
40 371 difference within FSL for each of the treatments but, that the release is faster in olive oil. Olive oil is
41
42 372 widely regarded as a plasticizer of plastics that could increase diffusion and then. However, a number
43
44 373 of authors have found that olive oil did not have a significant influence on migration of medium weight
45
46 374 molecules from polyolefins (Helmroth et al. 2002; Mauricio-Iglesias et al. 2009; O'Brien et al. 1999)
47
48 375 Therefore, the discrepancy of diffusivity in olive oil and the other FSL can be linked likely to the
49
50 376 inaccuracy of the assumption that Equation (1) correctly describes the blooming phenomena.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58 377
59
60

The diffusivity of Irganox 1076 in LLDPE was only determined in olive oil (Table 2) since the release in the aqueous FSL was too low to be measured. In any case, the results of diffusivity confirm the data shown previously (Figure 1) and no significant effect of HP/T is reflected in the values obtained. Since no difference of concentration could be measured in the case of PLA, the diffusivity values of Uvitex OB could not be determined either. However, the maximum experimental error, which provides consequently the maximum difference in concentration, can be used to roughly estimate an upper bound for the value of diffusivity. This maximum experimental error was evaluated as 0.08% w/w, i.e. the distance between the two bound of the confidence interval of Uvitex OB concentration in PLA. An upper estimation of diffusivity was then determined as if 0.08% w/w had been released to any of the FSL after 26 days of storage. Thus, taking into account the common criterion of considering the partition coefficient polymer/foodstuff (KPL) as $KPL=1000$ if the additive is not soluble in the FSL and $KPL = 1$ otherwise (Practical Guide, 2003), two diffusivity values were estimated, one for aqueous FSL and another for olive oil. Using these values in equation 1 gave an estimation of $4 \times 10^{-15} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ for the maximum diffusivity of Uvitex OB in aqueous FSL and $5 \times 10^{-17} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ for olive oil. These two values show how, even considering a worst case as a $KPL=1000$, the diffusivity in PLA is much lower than in LLDPE.

Conclusion

According to migration test results no effect of HP/T treatments and HP/T treatments + 26 days of storage on Uvitex OB and Irganox 1076 migration from LLDPE into four standard FSL was observed. Furthermore, when the HP/T treated samples were compared to an equivalent stabilization process, i.e. thermal pasteurization and sterilization, the advantages were clear. The LLDPE samples did not withstand the thermal sterilization process whereas no change on migration and/or appearance was

1
2
3 401 detected for HP/HT sterilization. For pasteurized samples, there were no differences between
4
5
6 402 conventional pasteurized and HP/LT treated samples.
7
8 403
9
10 404 Concerning PLA, the effect of HP/T could not be properly assessed since migration was too low and
11
12
13 405 within the experimental error to be detected. Diffusivity of Uvitex OB in PLA is then much lower than
14
15 406 in LLDPE and show good barrier properties. However, both sterilization processes (HP/HT and
16
17 407 conventional) affect clearly the structure of PLA what suggests that PLA should be restricted to low
18
19
20 408 temperature treatments.
21
22 409

23
24
25 410 **Acknowledgments**

26
27 411 Authors would like to acknowledge Prof. Salvatore Iannace and co-workers from IMCB (Naples, Italy)
28
29 412 for the preparation of the packaging samples used in this study and the analysis of their thermal
30
31 413 properties. This study has been carried out with financial support from the Commission of the
32
33
34 414 European Communities, Framework 6, Priority 5 'Food Quality
35
36 415 and Safety', Integrated Project NovelQ FP6-CT-2006-015710.
37
38
39 416

40
41 417 **References**

42
43 418 Anonymous 2004. Determination of 2-hydroxy-4-(octyloxy)benzophenone (c81) and 2,5-bis(5-tert-
44
45 419 butyl-2-benzoxazolyl)thiophene (UOB) in high density polyethylene (HDPE) and
46
47 420 polypropylene (PP) in *FP5 Foodmigrosure QLK1-CT2002-*
48
49 421 *2390*.http://www.ivv.fraunhofer.de/no_html/16_81_UOB_CP.PDF
50
51
52
53 422 Anonymous 2005. ITX - Isopropyl Thioxanthone in *IDFA-Infant and dietetic foods*
54
55 423 *association*.http://www.idfa.org.uk/news_full.aspx?id=79&cat=4
56
57
58
59
60

- 424 Anonymous 2008. Bisphenol A in food packaging in *Sense about*
425 *Science*. <http://www.senseaboutscience.org.uk/index.php/site/other/141>
- 426 Billingham, N. C. The Physical Behaviour of Polymer Additives. 2001 Plastic Additives Handbook
427 Munich Hanser H. Zweifel, Ed.; Chapter The Physical Behaviour of Polymer Additives. pp
428 1017-1046.
- 429 Caner, C.; Hernandez, R. J.; Pascall, M.; Balasubramaniam, V. M.; Harte, B. R. 2004. The effect of
430 high-pressure food processing on the sorption behaviour of selected packaging materials.
431 Packaging Technology and Science 17, 139-153.
- 432 Caner, C.; Harte, B. 2005. Effect of high-pressure processing on the migration of antioxidant Irganox
433 1076 from polypropylene film into a food simulant. Journal of the Science of Food and
434 Agriculture 85, 39-46.
- 435 Crank, J. 1980. The Mathematics of Diffusion, 1st ed.; USA, Oxford University Press.
- 436 Dole, P.; Feigenbaum, A. E.; De la Cruz, C.; Pastorelli, S.; Paseiro, P.; Hankemeier, T.; Voulzatis, Y.;
437 Aucejo, S.; Saillard, P.; Papaspyrides, C. 2006. Typical diffusion behaviour in packaging
438 polymers - application to functional barriers. Food Additives and Contaminants 23, 202-211.
- 439 European 1985. 85/572/EEC Council Directive of 19 December 1985 laying down the list of
440 simulants to be used for testing migration of constituents of plastic materials and articles
441 intended to come into contact with foodstuffs.
- 442 European 2002. 2002/72/EC Commission Directive of 6 August 2002 relating to plastic materials and
443 articles intended to come into contact with foodstuffs.
- 444 European 2003. A Practical Guide for Users of European Directives, Unit "Chemical and physical
445 risks; surveillance" of the Health & Consumer Protection Directorate-General of the European
446 Commission,

- Guillard, V.; Mauricio-Iglesias, M.; Gontard, N. 2009. Effect of novel food processing methods on packaging: structure, composition and migration properties. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition* In Press.
- Helmroth, I. E.; Dekker, M.; Hankemeier, T. 2002. Influence of solvent absorption on the migration of Irganox 1076 from LDPE. *Food Additives and Contaminants* 19, 176-183.
- Hessler, J. P. 1997. The use of Monte Carlo simulations to evaluate kinetic data and analytic approximations. *International Journal of Chemical Kinetics* 29, 803-817.
- Iannace, S.; Mensitieri, G. Personal Communication.
- Kuebel, J.; Ludwig, H.; Marx, H.; Tauscher, B. 1996. Diffusion of aroma compounds into packaging films under high pressure. *Packaging Technology and Science* 9, 143-152.
- Lopez-Rubio, A.; Lagaron, J. M.; Hernandez-Munoz, P.; Almenar, E.; Catala, R.; Gavara, R.; Pascall, M. A. 2005. Effect of high pressure treatments on the properties of EVOH-based food packaging materials. *Innovative Food Science & Emerging Technologies* 6, 51-58.
- Mauricio-Iglesias, M.; Peyron, S.; Guillard, V.; Gontard, N. 2009. Application of FTIR and Raman microspectroscopy to the study of food/packaging interactions. *Food Additives and Contaminants* (submitted).
- Nerin, C.; Fernandez, C.; Domeno, C.; Salafranca, J. 2003. Determination of Potential Migrants in Polycarbonate Containers Used for Microwave Ovens by High-Performance Liquid Chromatography with Ultraviolet and Fluorescence Detection. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 51, 5647-5653.
- O'Brien, A.; Goodson, A.; Cooper, I. 1999. Polymer additive migration to foods - a direct comparison of experimental data and values calculated from migration models for high density polyethylene (HDPE). *Food Additives and Contaminants* 16, 367-380.

- Pocas, M. F.; Oliveira, J. C.; Oliveira, F. A. R.; Hogg, T. 2008. A Critical Survey of Predictive Mathematical Models for Migration from Packaging. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition* 48, 913-928.
- Press, W. H.; Flannery, B. P.; Teukolsky, S. A.; Vetterling, W. T. Numerical Recipes in Pascal. 1989 Cambridge University Press; Chapter Numerical Recipes in Pascal. pp 547-599.
- Rastogi, N. K.; Raghavarao, K.; Balasubramaniam, V. M.; Niranjan, K.; Knorr, D. 2007. Opportunities and challenges in high pressure processing of foods. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition* 47, 69-112.
- Sanches Silva, A.; Sendon Garcia, R.; Cooper, I.; Franz, R.; Paseiro Losada, P. 2006. Compilation of analytical methods and guidelines for the determination of selected model migrants from plastic packaging. *Trends in Food Science & Technology* 17, 535-546.
- Schauwecker, A.; Balasubramaniam, V. M.; Sadler, G.; Pascall, M. A.; Adhikari, C. 2002. Influence of high-pressure processing on selected polymeric materials and on the migration of a pressure-transmitting fluid. *Packaging Technology and Science* 15, 255-262.
- Spatafore, R.; Pearson, L. T. 1991. Migration and Blooming of Stabilizing Antioxidants in Polypropylene. *Polymer Engineering and Science* 31, 1610-1617.
- Ven, C. v. d.; Courvoisier, C.; Matser, A. 2007. High pressure versus heat treatments for pasteurisation and sterilisation of model emulsions. *Innovative Food Science & Emerging Technologies* 8, 230-236.
- Wilson, D. R.; Dabrowski, L.; Stringer, S.; Moezelaar, R.; Brocklehurst, T. F. 2008. High pressure in combination with elevated temperature as a method for the sterilisation of food. *Trends in Food Science & Technology* 19, 289-299.

Figure captions.

Figure 1. Comparison of Irganox 1076 losses from LLDPE in contact with four different FSL after high pressure (800 MPa, 5 min) at low temperature (LT, 20-40°C) and high temperature (HT, 90-115°C) with conventional pasteurisation (63°C, 30 min) and untreated control (UTC, 40°C, 7 min) after treatment (A); or treatment and storage at 40°C for 10 days (B) or 26 days (C).

Figure 2. Comparison of Uvitex OB losses from LLDPE in contact with four different FSL after high pressure (800 MPa, 5 min) at low temperature (LT, 20-40°C) and high temperature (HT, 90-115°C) with conventional pasteurisation (63°C, 30 min) and untreated control (UTC, 40°C, 7 min) after treatment (A); or treatment and storage at 40°C for 10 days (B) or 26 days (C).

Figure 3: Raman spectra at different depths of LDPE film

Figure 4: Initial concentration profile of Uvitex OB in the depth of LLDPE samples according to Raman measurements

Figure 5: Examples of Uvitex OB migration kinetic from HP/HT treated LDPE into FSL at 40°C measured by non-destructive FTIR method (symbols, □ water, ▲ 3% acetic acid, ○ 15% ethanol, ◆ olive oil, experimental data; solid lines, model fitting)

Figure 1. Comparison of Irganox 1076 losses from LLDPE in contact with four different FSL after high pressure (800 MPa, 5 min) at low temperature (LT, 20-40°C) and high temperature (HT, 90-115°C) with conventional pasteurisation (63°C, 30 min) and untreated control (UTC, 40°C, 7 min) after treatment (A); or treatment and storage at 40°C for 10 days (B) or 26 days (C).

Figure 2. Comparison of Uvitex OB losses from LLDPE in contact with four different FSL after high pressure (800 MPa, 5 min) at low temperature (LT, 20-40°C) and high temperature (HT, 90-115°C) with conventional pasteurisation (63°C, 30 min) and untreated control (UTC, 40°C, 7 min) after treatment (A); or treatment and storage at 40°C for 10 days (B) or 26 days (C).

Figure 3: Raman spectra at different depths of LDPE film

Figure 4: Initial concentration profile of Uvitex OB in the depth of LLDPE samples according to Raman measurements

Figure 5: Examples of Uvitex OB migration kinetic from HP/HT treated LDPE into FSL at 40°C measured by non-destructive FTIR method (symbols, $\square$ water, $\blacktriangle$ 3% acetic acid, $\circ$ 15% ethanol, $\blacklozenge$ olive oil, experimental data; solid lines, model fitting)

Table 1. Diffusivity of Uvitex OB in the system LLDPE/simulant after HP/T and 26 days of storage at 40°C

Diffusivity (10^{-14}) m^2s^{-1}	Water	3% Acetic Acid	15% Ethanol	Olive Oil
UTC	$1.8 \pm 0.4^{a,b}$	2.3 ± 0.5^b	3.1 ± 0.7^b	8.2 ± 1.7^c
HP/LT (20-40°C)	$1.4 \pm 0.3^{a,b}$	$1.8 \pm 0.5^{a,b}$	2.1 ± 0.4^b	6.2 ± 1.3^c
HP/HT (90-115°C)	2.3 ± 0.5^b	2.1 ± 0.4^b	2.2 ± 0.4^b	8.3 ± 1.6^c
Pasteurization (63°C)	1.1 ± 0.3^a	n.d.	n.d.	8.2 ± 1.6^c

Means with different letters are significantly different ($p < 0.05$)

Table 2. Diffusivity of Irganox 1076 in the system LLDPE/olive oil after HP/T and 26 days of storage at 40°C

	Diffusivity (10^{-14}) $\text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$
UTC	4.6±0.9
HP/LT (20-40°C)	3.7±0.7
HP/HT (90-115°C)	4.4±0.9
Pasteurization (63°C)	5.5±1.2