

# Influence of Some Physical Properties of Cassava Tubers on Mechanical Compressive Cracking force of TMS 30572 and TMS 4(2)1425 Cassava Varieties

Ilori Olutosin O.<sup>1,\*</sup>, Adetan Dare A.<sup>2</sup>, Soji-Adekunle Ayowumi R.<sup>1</sup>, Ojo Oluwaseun O.<sup>1</sup>, Adeleke Kehinde M.<sup>1</sup>, Towoju Olumide O.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mechanical Engineering, Adeleke University, Ede, Nigeria <sup>2</sup>Department of Mechanical Engineering, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria \*Corresponding author: ilori.olutosin@adelekeuniversity.edu.ng

**Abstract** The influence of some physical properties of cassava tubers on the mechanical compressive cracking force of TMS 30572 and TMS 4(2)1425 cassava varieties were investigated. 1200 tubers were freshly harvested from the Teaching and Research Farm of the Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria. Each of the cassava cultivars was about 1.5 years old. The tubers were cleaned and sliced into different lengths ranging from 25 - 150 mm in steps of 25 mm. Slices of a particular length were sorted into 8 diameter groups: 21 - 30, 31 - 40, 41 - 50, 51 - 60, 61 - 70, 71 - 80, 81 - 90, and 91 - 100 mm, for each variety. The compressive cracking force of the sliced tubers was determined using an adapted Tensometer. The mechanical compressive cracking force required to break the tubers of the two cassava varieties (TMS 30572 and TMS 4(2)1425) increases with increase in length and peel thickness of tubers while it decreases with increase in diameter of tubers. Thus, these physical properties must be given a serious attention in the design and development of cassava peeling machine.

**Keywords:** cassava varieties (TMS 30572 and TMS 4(2)1425), compressive cracking force, lengths of tubers, diameters and peel thickness of tubers

**Cite This Article:** Ilori Olutosin O., Adetan Dare A., Soji-Adekunle Ayowumi R., Ojo Oluwaseun O., Adeleke Kehinde M., and Towoju Olumide O., "Influence of Some Physical Properties of Cassava Tubers on Mechanical Compressive Cracking force of TMS 30572 and TMS 4(2)1425 Cassava Varieties." *American Journal of Food Science and Technology*, vol. 5, no. 6 (2017): 233-237. doi: 10.12691/ajfst-5-6-2.

## 1. Introduction

Cassava (Manihot esculenta Crantz) is gaining wider acceptance and adoption as wonder crop by the day particularly in developing economies of the world. Nigeria is reported to be the highest producer of the crop in the world with production level estimated at 49 million tons per year [1]. Cassava has been primarily produced for food as it is consumed on daily basis, its importance as a major cheap source of calorie intake for both human and livestock in many tropical countries has been widely acknowledged. It is mostly processed traditionally into gari, lafun, fufu, abacha and akpu in Nigeria, kokonte and agbelima in Ghana [2] while the sweet varieties are boiled and pounded into dough and consumed with vegetable soup. There are many varieties of cassava in the world today which are differentiated from one another by their botanical characteristic and the level of hydrocyanic acid that causes toxicity in the root. This toxicity vary from place to place (a bitter variety may become sweet or vice versa). This is as a result of environmental factors such as soil type, soil moisture, soil fertility, tillage practice and vegetation of the farm [3,4]. Soil factors also influence

shape and size of the tuber which constitutes major bottleneck in cassava peeling [5].

Cassava processing operation consist of peeling, grating, washing, drying, milling, pressing, sieving, frying and pulverizing. Virtually all of these operations are still being done manually and are usually labour intensive, arduous in nature, time consuming and unsuitable for large scale production [2,6] due to their low output capacity among other negative attributes. Cassava processing operations are mostly preceded by peeling which makes a very important operation. Peeling operation remains the most important un-mechanized process which has constituted a serious global challenge in food industries. This has invariably slow down medium-large scale utilization of the crop.

However, there is no efficient cassava peeler presently in the market [6,7,8,9]. [10] reported that the peeling machines developed to date face problems of high tuber losses and moderate peeling efficiency which means that the peel is not removed accurately or totally due to the high variability of the root sizes and its thickness. Also, efforts at mechanizing the peeling operation has been acknowledged but not to be fully developed yet [11]. This has been attributed to the irregularity in the shape of the tubers as well as the wide variations in the thickness of the peel, tuber size and dimension across the different varieties of the crop [12,13]. Hence, this study examined the influence of some physical properties of cassava tubers on the mechanical compressive cracking force of two cassava varieties.

#### 2. Materials and Method

Fresh cassava tubers were harvested from the teaching and research farm of the Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria. They were commonly grown cassava cultivars (TMS 30572 and TMS 4(2)1425) and were about 1.5 years (18 months) old at the time of harvest. The tubers were made ready for the test by washing off all the soil particles adhering to them. The moisture content of the two varieties was determined and was found to be about seventy-four per cent (74%) before the experiment was carried out. The tubers were sliced through the transverse section into different lengths ranging from 25 mm to 150 mm in steps of 25 mm. For each cassava variety, the tuber slices of a particular length were sorted into eight (8) diameter groups: 21 - 30, 31 - 40, 41 - 50, 51 - 60, 61 - 70, 71 - 80, 81 - 90 and 91 - 100 mm. The diameter of each specimen was measured using a pair of vernier caliper. A tape measure was used to measure the lengths of tubers. Also, the peel thickness was determined using a micrometer screw gauge.

An adapted Tensometer was used to measure the resistance of the tubers to breakage by compression. Each of the tuber slices was inserted in the holding device as shown in Figure 1, mechanical load was then applied by a gear driven screw pressing the holding device into the specimen. This was done till the specimen made internal

#### 2.1. Model Specification

The mechanical compressive cracking force output ( $F_c$ ) of the cassava tubers was assumed to be a function of three (3) independent variables, namely; length of tubers, diameters of tubers and peel thickness of tubers. A model was therefore specified mathematically as follows;

$$F_{c} = f(L, d_{t}, t_{p})$$
(1)

where:

 $F_c$  = Compressive cracking force

L = Length of tubers

 $d_t = Diameter of tubers$ 

 $t_p$  = Peel thickness of tubers

The impacts of the explanatory variables on mechanical compressive cracking force outputs were estimated using linear functional relationship between one dependent and three independent variables as shown below:

$$F_{c} = a_{o} + b_{1}L + b_{2}d_{t} + b_{3}t_{p}.$$
 (2)

where:

 $a_o = Constant term/ intercept$  $b_i = Regression coefficients of the variables (where i = 1,2,3)$ L, d<sub>t</sub>, t<sub>p</sub> = Independent variables.



Figure 1. Length of tuber slice inserted in the holding device of the adapted Tensometer



Figure 2. The point of breakage of a certain tuber slice

#### 2.2. Data Analysis

A multiple regression analysis was used to establish a linear functional relationship between mechanical compressive cracking force and the physical properties of cassava tuber considered.

### **3. Results and Discussion**

Table 1 and Table 2 display the average results obtained during the experiment for the two cassava varieties TMS 30572 and TMS 4(2)1425. These results were further analysed using a linear multiple regression to examine the influence of each of the physical properties on mechanical compressive cracking force for both varieties. The linear multiple regression analysis on the values of  $F_c$ , L,  $d_t$  and  $t_p$  provided the following

relationship among them for TMS 30572 cassava variety (Table 3):

$$F_c = 12.08L - 20.57d_t + 106.13t_p + 789.72$$
 (3)

where  $F_c$  in (N) is the compressive cracking force, L in (mm) is the length of tubers,  $d_t$  in (mm) is the diameter of tuber and  $t_p$  in (mm) is the peel thickness. The correlation coefficient (r) value is 0.9970 and the coefficient of determination (r<sup>2</sup>) value is 0.9940 (Table 4). This shows that 99.40% of the compressive force at the stated condition is explained by the relationship. A test of significance of correlation shows that this linear relationship is significant at 0.05 significance level. Thus,  $F_c$  increases with increase in L and  $t_p$  while it decreases as  $d_t$  decreases. Therefore, the value of compressive breaking force can be predicted using eqn (3) for a given length of tuber, diameter and peel thickness with 99.40% confidence level.

| Table 1. Average | Values of Physical Pro | perties and Com | pressive Cracking | Force for TMS 30572 |
|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|
|                  |                        |                 |                   |                     |

| Length of tuber L (mm) | Average diameter of tuber $D_m$ (mm) | Average peel thickness t <sub>p</sub> (mm) | Average compressive cracking force $F_c(N)$ |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 25                     | 44.0                                 | 2.76                                       | 505   |
| 50                     | 49.0                                 | 3.00                                       | 654   |
| 75                     | 55.0                                 | 3.42                                       | 975   |
| 100                    | 59.0                                 | 3.98                                       | 1164  |
| 125                    | 62.0                                 | 4.34                                       | 1499  |
| 150                    | 65.0                                 | 4.72                                       | 1770  |

Table 2. Average Values of Physical Properties and Compressive Cracking Force for TMS 4(2)1425

| Length of tuber L (mm) | Average diameter of tuber $D_m$ (mm) | Average peel thickness t <sub>p</sub> (mm) | Average compressive cracking force $F_c(N)$ |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 25                     | 41                                   | 2.20                                       | 505   |
| 50                     | 45                                   | 2.69                                       | 618   |
| 75                     | 48                                   | 2.97                                       | 926   |
| 100                    | 53                                   | 3.55                                       | 1235  |
| 125                    | 58                                   | 3.80                                       | 1350  |
| 150                    | 62                                   | 4.29                                       | 1722  |

| Table 3. Regression Analysi | s for TMS 30572 | (Coefficients) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|

| Model                   | Beta (B) | Standard error | Т      |
|-------------------------|----------|----------------|--------|
| (Constant)              | 789.72   | 1445.34        | 0.546  |
| Length of tuber         | 12.08    | 8.19           | 1.475  |
| Diameter of tuber       | -20.57   | 24.54          | -0.838 |
| Peel thickness of tuber | 106.13   | 383.52         | 0.277  |

a. Dependent variable: Compressive cracking force

| Table 4. Regression Analysis for TMS 30572 (Model Summary) |          |                   |                                |          |                       |
|--|----------|-------------------|--------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|
| R  | R Square | Adjusted R square | Standard error of the estimate | F Change | Significance F change |
| 0.997 <sup>a</sup>   | 0.994    | 0.984             | 61.065                         | 104.866  | 0.009                 |

b. Predictors: (Constant), Length of tuber, Diameter of tuber and Peel thickness of tuber.

| Table 5. Regression Analysis for TMS 4(2)1425 (Coefficients) |
|--|
|--|

| Model                   | Beta (B) | Standard error | Т      |
|-------------------------|----------|----------------|--------|
| (Constant)              | 216.41   | 2800.11        | 0.077  |
| Length of tuber         | 7.66     | 15.43          | 0.496  |
| Diameter of tuber       | -14.60   | 74.26          | -0.197 |
| Peel thickness of tuber | 283.06   | 637.40         | 0.444  |

a. Dependent variable: Compressive cracking force.

| Table 6. Regression | Analysis for | TMS 4(2)1425 | (Model Summary) |
|---------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|
|---------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|

| R      | R Square | Adjusted R square | Standard error of the estimate | F Change | Significance F change |
|--------|----------|-------------------|--------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|
| 0.991a | 0.983    | 0.958             | 95.424                         | 38.660   | 0.025                 |
|        |          |                   |                                |          |                       |

b. Predictors: (Constant), Length of tuber, Diameter of tuber and Peel thickness of tuber.

Also, for TMS 4(2)1425 cassava variety, the multiple regression analysis on  $F_c$ , L, d<sub>t</sub> and t<sub>p</sub> gave the following relationship among them (Table 5):

$$F_{c} = 7.66L - 14.60d_{t} + 283.06t_{p} + 216.41$$
 (4)

where  $F_c$ , L,  $d_t$  and  $t_p$  are as previously defined. The correlation coefficient (r) value is 0.9910 and the coefficient of determination (r<sup>2</sup>) value is 0.9830 (Table 6). This shows that 98.30% of the compressive force at the stated condition is explained by the relationship. A test of significance of correlation shows that this linear relationship is significant at 0.05 significance level. Thus,  $F_c$  also increases with increase in L and  $t_p$  while it decreases as  $d_t$  decreases for TMS 4(2)1425. We can also predict the value of compressive force using eqn (4) for a given length of tuber, diameter and peel thickness with 98.90% confidence level.

#### 3.1. Effect of Length of Cassava Tubers on Compressive Cracking Force

The average compressive cracking force for TMS 30572 ranges from 505 N for length of tuber 25 mm to 1770 N for the 150 mm tuber slice. Also for TMS 4(2)1425,  $F_c$  ranges from 505 N for length of tuber 25 mm to 1772 N for the 150 mm tuber slice. This implies that as the length of tuber slices increases, the average root breaking compressive force for the varieties (TMS 30572 and TMS 4(2)1425) also increases. This is justified by equations 3 and 4; a unit increase in the length of tuber increases the compressive cracking force for both varieties by 12.08 and 7.66 units respectively. Ilori and Adetan [15] reported the variations of average compressive cracking force ( $F_c$ ) with the lengths of tuber for the two cassava varieties and

established that the mean root radial compressive cracking force of cassava tubers increases significantly with tuber length. The  $F_c$  for TMS 30572 is slightly higher than the  $F_c$  for TMS 4(2)1425 at most lengths of tubers possibly because TMS 30572 has tougher starchy flesh covered by tuber peel than tuber samples for TMS 4(2)1425.

#### **3.2. Effect of Diameter of Tuber on** Compressive Cracking Force

The changes in average compressive cracking force  $(F_c)$ at different levels of average diameter of tuber (dt) for TMS 30572 and TMS 4(2)1425 are shown (Table 1 and Table 2). The linear multiple regression analysis shows that the diameter of tuber slices for both varieties have negative impact on compressive cracking force, which is significant. A unit increase in diameter of tubers for both varieties decreases the compressive cracking force by -20.57 and -14.60 units respectively. This means that the compressive force required to crack the sliced tuber decreases as the diameter of tuber increases. This validated the report by [15] that cracking force drops as the diameter of tuber increases because some of the big diameter roots are so matured that naturally before harvesting them, they had already developed inner central cracks which served as easy crack initiation points. But differed with the report of earlier works that establish the cassava root strength properties generally increase with increase in tuber diameter because tubers increase in diameter and fibre content with age of plants [6,11] and also, that it may be due to the fact that growth and development of the root are a function of climatic conditions and type of soil [16,17].

## **3.3. Effect of Peel Thickness of Cassava Tubers on Compressive Cracking Force**

The average peel thickness  $(t_p)$  ranges from 2.76 mm to 4.72 mm and 2.20 mm to 4.29 mm for TMS 30572 and TMS 4(2)1425 respectively. The  $t_p$  for both varieties are within the range reported by [18]. Although  $t_p$  in this work are slightly higher than the ones they reported, even though the TMS 30572 cassava variety (18 months old) was one of the three varieties used in their experiments. The beta coefficients of peel thickness for the two varieties in equations 3 and 4 indicate that a unit increase in t<sub>p</sub> increases the compressive cracking force by 106.13 and 283.06 units. The compressive cracking force was more sensitive to changes in peel thickness among the three physical properties considered. Thus, the compressive force to crack the sliced tuber increases tremendously as the peel thickness increases. This implies that the peel thickness increased with the age of the tubers just like the diameter and length of tubers [18].

## 4. Conclusion

The study has established that the length of cassava tubers, diameter of tubers and peel thickness have significant effect on the mechanical compressive cracking force for TMS 30572 and TMS 4(2)1425 cassava varieties considered. The mechanical compressive cracking force increases with increase in length and peel thickness of tubers while it decreases with increase in diameter of tubers. Thus, these physical properties must be given a serious attention in the design and development of efficient cassava peeling machine.

## **Statement of Competing Interests**

The authors have no competing interests.

## References

- Uthman, F., "Design and fabrication of cassava lump breaking and sieving machine". *Oasis Journal of Research and Development*, 1(2), pp. 42-50, 2011.
- [2] Quaye, W., Gayin, J., Yawson, I. and Plahar, W. A., "Characteristics of various cassava processing methods and the

adoption requirements in Ghana". Journal of Root Crops, vol. 35(1), pp. 59-68, 2009.

- [3] Grace, M. R. (2004), FAO Plant Production and Production Series No. 3.
- [4] Ademosun, O. C., Jimoh, M. O. and Olukunle, O. J, "Effect of physical and mechanical properties of cassava tubers on the performance of an automated peeling machine", *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, Vol. 1(3), pp. 810-822, 2012.
- [5] Olukunle, O. J. and Oguntunde, P. G., "Analysis of peeling pattern in an automated cassava peeling machine. *Nigerian Journal of Technological Development*, Vol. 6 (1&2), pp. 41-52, 2007.
- [6] Adetan, D. A., Adekoya, L. O. and Aluko, O. B., "Characterisation of some properties of cassava root tubers", *Journal of Food Engineering*, 59, pp. 349-353, 2003.
- [7] Ejovo, O. N., Oboli, S. and Mgbeke, A. C. C., "Studies and preliminary design for a cassava tuber peeling machine". *Transactions of the American Society of Agric. Engineers*, 31(2): pp. 380-385, 1988.
- [8] Agbetoye, L. A. S., "Improving the technology of cassava harvesting and processing mechanization for food security in Nigeria. Paper presented at the International Conference on Science and Technology, held at the Federal University of Technology, Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria, August 14-19, 2005. pp 196-204.
- [9] Oriola, K. O. and Raji, A. O. (2013a). Trends at mechanizing cassava postharvest processing operations. *International Journal* of Engineering and Technology, Vol.3 (9), pp. 879-887.
- [10] Egbeocha, C. C., Asoegwu, S. N. and Okereke, N. A. A., "A review on performance of cassava peeling machines in Nigeria", *Futo Journal Series (FUTOJNLS)*, 2(1), pp. 140-168, 2016.
- [11] Kolawole, O. P., Agbetoye, L. A. S. and Ogunlowo, A. S., "Sustaining world food security with improved cassava processing technologies", *The Nigerian experience sustainability*, 2, pp. 3681-3694, 2010.
- [12] Adetan, D. A., Adekoya, L. O. and Aluko, O. B., "Theory of mechanical method of peeling cassava tubers with knives", *International Journal of Agrophysics*, Vol. 20, pp. 269-276, 2006.
- [13] Kamal, A. R. and Oyelade, O. A., "Present status of cassava peeling in Nigeria". *Journal of Agricultural Engineering and Technology*, Vol. 18 (2): 7-13, 2010.
- [14] Norton, R. L., Machine Design: An Integrated Approach. Prentice Hall Publishers, New Jersey, 1998, pp. 101-103.
- [15] Ilori, O. O. and Adetan, D. A., "A study of the radial compressive cracking force of two cassava varieties". *Journal of Food Science* and Engineering, 3, pp. 541-549, 2013.
- [16] Odigboh, E. U., "A Cassava Peeling Machine: Development, Design and Construction". *Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research*, 21, pp. 361-369, 1976.
- [17] Santisopasri, V., Kurotjanawong, K., Chotineeranat, S., Piyachomkwan, K., Sriroth, K. and Oates, C. G., "Impact of Water Stress on Yield and Quality of Cassava Starch". *Industrial Crops* and Products, 13(2), pp. 115-129, (2001).
- [18] Oriola, K. and Raji, A. (2013b). Effects of tuber age and variety on physical properties of cassava *Manihot Esculenta (Crantz)* roots. Innovative Systems Design and Engineering, special issue - 2nd International Conference on Engineering and Technology Research, Vol.4 (9), pp. 15-24.