

*Review Article*

## **HIGH PRESSURE PROCESSING FOOD TECHNOLOGIES**

**R. Yasothai and R. Giriprasad\***

Veterinary University Training and Research Centre, Erode  
(Tamilnadu Veterinary and Animal Sciences University)  
Veterinary Assistant Surgeon, Chozhapandi\*

### **High pressure processing (HPP)**

**Synonym:** Pascalization, High hydrostatic pressure processing, Ultra high pressure processing.

**History:** 1<sup>st</sup> invented by Bertie Hite (1899) – U.S. 1<sup>st</sup> Experimented in milk and inferred an reduced microbial load and increased shelf life.

### **Introduction**

Relatively novel non-thermal food processing, developed as an alternative to traditional food processing methods. Designed for both solids and liquids. Main advantage is that it can be used in foods with (or) without packaging (in former case eliminates possibility of post-treatment contamination). It uses a wide pressure range of 50-1000 mpa., and it varies with type of food and with microbes intended for destruction.

### **Principle**

#### **Lechatliers principle**

States that when a system at equilibrium is disturbed the system will respond in such a way that tends to minimize the disturbance (Pauling, 1964). This means that high pressure stimulates reactions that results in decrease in volume but opposes the reactions that involves an increase in volume.

#### **Pascal (or) Iso-static principle**

States that Instantaneous (rapid) and uniform pressure throughout the sample. Irrespective of the weather sample contact with pressure medium (or) sealed hermetically (Olsson, 1995). This means that as the pressure is distributed uniformly through out the food sample so the processing time is totally independent of sample size. Where as in case of conventional processing technologies it involves surface heating where by product quality is

*Received Jan 21, 2015 \* Published Feb 2, 2015 \* [www.ijset.net](http://www.ijset.net)*

lost and also the heat transfer is by conduction and convection so the processing time is totally dependent on the volume of sample.

### Methods of HPP:

- a) Batch method – for solid foods.
- b) Semi-continuous – For liquid foods (Ting and Marshall, 2002).

### Process of HPP

- a) Pressurization by compression: Done by 2 ways
  1. By reducing of the volume of (MONOBLOC) pressure vessel
  2. Pumping the pressure medium (WATER) into the vessel
- b) Holding for certain period of time
- c) Depressurization (relieving by decompression)
- d) Aseptic packaging

**NOTE 1: Holding time** varies between microorganisms and foods. (e.g) for fruit juices it is around 400-600 Mpa for 5 min at 20°C. This results in inactivation of vegetative cells of key food borne pathogens (Table 1)

**Table 1 The efficiency of high pressure processing (HPP) against *E. coli* O157:H7, *L. monocytogenes* and *C. jejuni*.**

Pathogen	Food product	Treatment conditions	Log reduction
<i>E. coli</i> O157:H7	Apricot juice (pH 3.8)	250 MPa, 5 min, 30 °C	4.85
	Orange juice (pH 3.76)	250 MPa, 5 min, 30 °C	5.1
	Sour cherry juice (pH 3.3)	250 MPa, 5 min, 30 °C	5.28
	Apple juice (pH 3.5)	500 MPa, 5 min, 20 °C	5
	Tomato juice (pH 4.1)	500 MPa, 5 min, 20 °C	5
	Orange juice (pH 3.8)	500 MPa, 5 min, 20 °C	1–2
	Raw minced meat	700 MPa, 1 min, 15 °C	5
	Hungarian salami	600 MPa, 6 min, 25 °C	> 4
<i>L. monocytogenes</i>	Human milk	400 MPa, 1.5 min, 31 °C	≈ 6
	Turkish white cheese	600 MPa, 5 min, 25 °C	4.3–4.4
	Raw milk	500 MPa, 10 min, 20 °C	> 4
	Fish slurry	400 MPa, 5 min, 20 °C	≈ 3
<i>C. jejuni</i>	UHT whole milk	325 MPa, 10 min, 25 °C	≈ 2.5

Pathogen	Food product	Treatment conditions	Log reduction
	UHT skim milk	325 MPa, 10 min, 25 °C	≈ 2.5
	Soya milk	325 MPa, 10 min, 25 °C	≈ 3
	Chicken puree	325 MPa, 10 min, 25 °C	≈ 3.5
	Phosphate buffer	325 MPa, 10 min, 25 °C	8
	Milk	300 MPa, 10 min, 20 °C	0.4–1 <sup>a</sup>
	Broth	300 MPa, 10 min, 20 °C	3–6.7 <sup>a</sup>
	Chicken meat slurry	200 MPa, 10 min, 20 °C	0.2–2.2 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Results obtained in different strains.

### NOTE 2: Aseptic packaging

Package should withstand pressure and it should maintain quality. Needs airtight packages which can withstand volume changes which occur during compression and decompression (Hugas *et al.*, 2002). O<sub>2</sub> impermeable, opaque to light are necessary to keep the product fresh – plastic films are suitable for this purpose. Metal cans & glass wares are generally not used.

### Mechanism of inactivation

High pressure processing is generally considered to affect bacterial cell membranes and impair their permeability and ion-exchange and its effect on microorganisms is affected by critical pressure threshold, when the pressure applied exceeds critical pressure threshold it gets destroyed and when the pressure applied is less than critical pressure threshold only sub-lethal injury occurs (McClements *et al.*, 2001) and also inactivates some of the enzymes vital for the survival and reproduction of bacterial cells.

### HPP and Adiabatic Heating

The work of compression will increase the temperature of foods by approximately 3°C/100MPa by adiabatic heating (Balasubramaniam and Balasubramaniam, 2003). It depends on the composition of foods. Adiabatic heating has synergistic effect on inactivation of microbes. Keeping sample under extended period of time, does not require any additional energy (Cheftel and Culioli, 1997).

Although all food borne pathogens are inactivated by HPP *E. coli O157:H7* were resistant (Linton *et al.*, 2001) and *Staphylococcus* exhibits relative resistant to high pressure processing (Erkmen and Keratas, 1997).

**Table 2: Factors affecting microbial inactivation**

Micro organisms	Pressure required for log reduction (Mpa)	Temperature ( °C )	Time (min)
<i>Yersinia</i>	275	20	15
<i>Salmonella</i>	350	20	15
<i>Listeria</i>	375	20	15
<i>E.coli (O157:H7)</i>	650	20	15
<i>S. aureus</i>	700	20	15

**Stage of Microbial growth**

Organisms were resistant during stationary phase of growth and susceptible during Log phase of growth (McClements *et al.*, 2001).

**Gram +ve and Gram –ve**

Gram +ve bacteria more resistant than Gram –ve bacteria (Patterson and Kilpatrick 1998).

**Spores**

Spores requires pressure of greater than 800 MPa. Heat along with pressure is very effective on spores. So heat of 80-100 C and pressure of 600 MPa is used. *Bacillus* and *Clostridial* spores were for inactivated at these conditions (Meyer *et al.*, 2000).

**Fungi**

Yeast & Mould were inactivated at relatively low pressures. At about 100 MPa the nuclear membrane of yeast gets destroyed and about 300 – 600 MPa mould gets inactivated (Smelt, 1998).

**Viruses**

Made of protein coat called capsid which is made of to of subunits called capsomeres. Viruses possess a remarkable Baro resistance to HPP (Smelt, 1998). They require pressure rates of 800 MPa at this pressure viruses were not destroyed, it gets merely inactivated and the virus thus retains its immunogenic properties. This virus inactivation technology used in preparation of vaccines. Development of vaccine for AIDS is in process.

**Prions**

Causes BSE in cattle Creutz feld – Jakob disease in humans. More difficult to destroy. Meat requires >1200 MPa for prions inactivation (Brown *et al.*, 2003)

## EFFECTS OF HPP ON FOOD QUALITY

- **Colour**

It causes denaturation of proteins. In case of red meat, destruction of globin in myoglobin leads to cooked like appearance of meat (Mor-Mur and Yuste, 2003). In case of cured meat and white meat (fish) there is no colour change (Cheftel and Culioli, 1997). Stimulates lipid oxidation in fish and meat. This is avoided by active anti-oxidant (O<sub>2</sub> scavenging) vacuum package.

- **Texture**

HPP treated meat develops rubbery consistency (Hugas *et al.*, 2002), this is because of adiabatic heat induced gelation of sarcoplasmic proteins (Angusapanich *et al.*, 1999). It causes coagulation of albumin in eggs in combination with temperature. HPP causes proteolysis of bovine milk (Okamoto *et al.*, 1990).

**Advantages:** Environment friendly, can be used for both solids and liquids, with or without packaging.

**Disadvantages:** High cost of initial investment, needs to be optimized for many products.

**Commercial status in food industry:** The commercial production of pressurized foods has become a reality in Japan, France, Spain, the USA and many other countries. This is a result of an extensive scientific research, technological and technical advances in HPP equipment production and decrease in the processing costs (Cheftel and Culioli, 1997). Nowadays, a commercial application of high hydrostatic pressure has found its place in the production of juices, sauces, smoothies, ready-to-eat meat products, guacamole, oysters etc (Patterson *et al.*, 2007).

### References

- [1] Angusapanich, K., M. Edde and D.A. Ledward, 1999. Effects of high pressure on the myofibrillar proteins of cod and turkey muscle. *Journal of Agriculture and Food Chemistry*, 47: 92-99.
- [2] Balasubramanian, S. and V.M. Balasubramaniam, 2003. Compression heating influence of pressure transmitting fluids on bacteria inactivation during high pressure processing.
- [3] Brown, P., R. Meyer, F. Cardone and M. Pocchiari, 2003. Ultra-high-pressure inactivation of prion infectivity in processed meat: a practical method to prevent human infection. *Proceedings of national academy of sciences*, 100: 6093-6097.

- [4] Cheftel, J.C. and J. Culioli, 1997. Effects of high pressure on meat: a review. *Meat Science*, 46: 211–236.
- [5] Erkmen, O. and S. Keratas, 1997. Effect of high hydrostatic pressure on *Staphylococcus aureus* in milk. *Journal of Food Engineering*, 33: 257-262.
- [6] Hugas, M., M. Garriga and J.M. Monfort, 2002. New mild technologies in meat processing: high pressure as a model technology. *Meat Science*, 62: 359-371.
- [7] McClements, J.M.J., M.F. Patterson and M. Linton, 2001. The effect of growth stage and growth temperature on high hydrostatic pressure inactivation of some psychotrophic bacteria in milk. *Journal of Food Protection*, 64: 514-522.
- [8] Meyer, R., K.L. Copper, D. Knorr and H.L.M. Leliveld, 2000. High pressure sterilization of foods. *Food Technology*, 54: 181-187.
- [9] Mor-Mur, M. and J. Yuste, 2003. High pressure processing applied to cooked sausage manufacture: physical properties and sensory analysis. *Meat Science*, 65: 1187-1191.
- [10] Okamoto, M., Y. Kawamura and R. Hayashi, 1990. Application of high pressure on food processing: textural comparison of pressure and heat-induced gels of food proteins. *Agricultural and Biological chemistry*, 54: 183-189.
- [11] Olsson, S., 1995. Production equipment for commercial use. In: High pressure processing of foods (Ledward DA, Johnston DE, Earnshaw RG, Hastings APM, eds). Nottingham: Nottingham university press, Chennai-12, pp.167-180.
- [12] Patterson, M. and D. Kilpatrick, 1998. The combined effect on high hydrostatic pressure and mild heat treatment on inactivation of pathogens in milk and poultry. *Journal of Food Protection*, 61: 432-436.
- [13] Patterson, M.F., M. Linton and C.J. Doona, 2007. Introduction to high pressure processing of foods. In: C.J. Doona and F.E. Freeherry, Editors, *High Pressure Processing of Foods*, Blackwell Publishing Professional, Ames, Iowa, USA, pp. 1–14.
- [14] Pauling, L., 1964. *College Chemistry: An introductory textbook of general chemistry*. San Francisco: Freeman and company.
- [15] Smelt, J.P.P.M., 1998. Recent advances in the microbiology of high pressure processing. *Trends in Food Science and Technology*, 9: 152-158.
- [16] Ting, E.Y. and R.G. Marshall, 2002. Production issues related to UHP FOOD. In: *Engineering and food for the 21st Century* (Wolti-Chanovas GV, Agulera JM, eds). Food preservation Technology series, Boca Raton: CRC Press, Ch 44, pp. 727-738.