

Selection of a the Best Suitable Thin-Layer Drying Mathematical Model for Vacuum Dried Red Chili Pepper

Ilknur Alibas*

Uludag University, Faculty of Agriculture, Department of Biosystems Engineering, 16059 Bursa, TURKEY

Received: 17.11.2011; Accepted: 23.06.2012; Available Online: 11.07.2012

ABSTRACT

Red Chili pepper (*Capsicum frutescens* L.) with $50 (\pm 0.02)$ g weight and $6.12 \pm (0.02)$ humidity on dry basis were dried in vacuum oven using combined 2 different temperature (50 - 75°C) and 3 different pressure (0.05, 7 and 13 kPa) until the humidity fell down to $0.16 \pm (0.01)$ on dry basis. Vacuum drying processes were completed between 3 and 19.17 h. In this study, measured values were compared with predicted values obtained from twenty one thin layer drying theoretical/semi-empirical/empirical equations. Models whose coefficient of correlation (R^2) values are highest were chosen to be the best models. According to this, the best models of combined 50°C temperature with vacuum levels (0.05, 7 and 13 kPa) was found to be “Modified Henderson & Pabis” Model, combined 75°C temperature with vacuum levels (0.05, 7 and 13 kPa) was found to be “Alibas” Model.

Key Words: Chili pepper, moisture content, thin-layer drying models, vacuum drying.

Notation

M	initial moisture content, $\text{kg}_{(\text{moisture})} \text{kg}^{-1}_{(\text{dry matter})}$
W_0	initial weight of sample, kg
W	amount of evaporated water, kg
W_1	dry matter content of sample, kg
MR	moisture ratio
M_e	equilibrium moisture content, $\text{kg}_{(\text{moisture})} \text{kg}^{-1}_{(\text{dry matter})}$
k, k_0, k_1, k_2	drying constant, min^{-1}
a, a_0, b, c, g, h	coefficients, dimensionless
n	exponent, dimensionless
t	drying time, min
L	sample thickness, m
R^2	coefficient of correlation, decimal
χ^2	chi square
$RMSE$	root mean square error
$M_{R_{exp,i}}$	stands for the experimental moisture ratio found in any measurement
$M_{R_{pre,i}}$	predicted moisture ratio for this measurement
N	total number of observations
n_i	number of constants
SEE	standard error of estimated

INTRODUCTION

Chili pepper is the fruit of plants from the genus *Capsicum*, members of the nightshade family, Solanaceae. Chili peppers originated in the Americas. It used in both food and medicine (Anonymous 2011). Red chilies contain high amounts of vitamin C and carotene (provitamin A). In addition, peppers are a good source of most B vitamins, and vitamin B₆ in particular. They are very high in potassium, magnesium, and iron (Anonymous 2011). The substances that give chili peppers their intensity when ingested or applied topically are capsaicin (8-methyl-N-vanillyl-6-nonenamide) and several related chemicals, collectively called capsaicinoids (Kosuge et al. 1961). Capsaicin is a safe and effective topical analgesic agent in the management of arthritis pain, herpes zoster-related pain, diabetic neuropathy, postmastectomy pain, and headaches (Yarbro et al. 2005).

Drying is defined as a process of moisture removal due to simultaneous heat and mass transfer. It is also one of the methods of food preservation, which provides longer shelf-life, lighter weight for transportation and smaller space for storage (Ertekin and Yaldiz 2004). Different drying methods are used in agricultural products. Sun drying is the most common methods used to preserve agricultural products in most tropical countries. But

* Corresponding author: ialibas@uludag.edu.tr

this technique is extremely weather dependent, and has the problems of contamination with dust, soil, sand particles and insects (Toğrul 2006). Convective drying of foods are low energy efficiency and long drying time.

Moreover, this method leads to serious injuries such as the worsening of the taste, colour and nutritional content of the product, decline in the density and water absorbance capacity and shifting of the solutes from the internal part of the drying material to the surface, due to the long drying period and high temperature (Drouzas et al. 1999, Lin et al. 1998, Yongsawatdigul and Gunasekaran 1996, Alibas 2007). The major disadvantages of air-drying are the longer drying period and higher drying temperature. Quality of the dry-product declines as a result of these disadvantages (Sharma and Prasad 2001).

Vacuum drying is a drying technique which is used for drying of various products, retaining their colour and vitamin content (Methakhup et al. 2005). Vacuum enhances the mass transfer because of an increased pressure gradient between the inside and outside of the sample to dry and maintains a low temperature level essential for thermolabile products (Pere and Rodier 2002). Better product quality with respect to traits such as taste, flavour and rehydration can be retained via high-degree vacuum treatment (Drouzas and Schubert 1996). The key benefits of vacuum drying include lower process temperatures, less energy usage and hence greater energy efficiency, improved drying rates, and in some cases, less shrinkage of the product (Montgomery et al. 1997). Vacuum drying has been successfully applied to many fruits and vegetables and other heat-sensitive foods. Vacuum dried materials are characterised by better quality retention of nutrients and volatile aroma. However, the cost of the process is high (Tsami et al. 1998).

Thin layer drying is the process of drying in one layer of sample particles or slices. Many mathematical models are used in order to describe the thin layer drying process. Mathematical modeling of thin layer drying is important for performance improvements of drying systems (Cihan et al. 2007). Thin layer drying models fall into three categories as theoretical, semi-empirical and empirical (Ozdemir and Devres 1999, Midilli and Kucuk 2003).

The aim of this study is (1) to investigate the kinetics of thin layer drying of Chili pepper, (2) to compare the developed several empirical and semi-empirical mathematical models and estimate the constant of several models, (3) to determine the best fit using statistical analysis.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Fresh chili pepper

Plants of fresh Chili peppers used in the drying experiments were provided from local supermarket of Bursa. They were stored at a temperature of $4 \pm 0.5^\circ\text{C}$ until the drying process (Alibas 2010). Five different samples, each being $50 \pm 0.02\text{g}$, were kept in the drying oven at 105°C for 24 h, after which the moisture content of Chili pepper fell down to 0.16 ± 0.01 on dry basis.

Drying equipment and drying method

Drying treatment was performed in a laboratory type vacuum oven (Nuve EV 0180, Turkey) with technical features of 220 V ~, 50 Hz, 3.5 A and 800 W. The temperature of vacuum oven has a sensitivity of 1°C , max temperature being 250°C . The area on which vacuum drying is carried out was 300 x 200 x 250 mm in size. An analogous vacuum-meter which indicates the vacuum value in terms of mmHg exists on the vacuum oven. Time adjustment is done with the aid of a programmable clock located on the oven.

Vacuum-temperature combinations were obtained in vacuum trials by combining three different vacuum levels i.e. 0.05, 7 and 13 kPa and two different temperature regimes at 50 and 75°C , and the trials were realised under the combinations of 50°C -0.05kPa, 50°C -7kPa, 50°C -13kPa, 75°C -0.05kPa, 75°C -7kPa and 75°C -13kPa. A laboratory type greasy vacuum pump (Carpanelli MMDE80B4, Italy) was used in the vacuum drying trials whose operating conditions were 220/240 V ~, 50/60 Hz and 5.1/4.8 A. The vacuum pump is increased the least vacuum value within 20 sec.

Chili peppers which were being dried were removed from the oven periodically (every 5 min) during the drying period, and the moisture loss was determined by weighing the plate using digital balance (Sartorius EX 2000A, Germany) with 0.01g precision (Alibas 2010). All weighing processes were completed in 10 s during the drying process.

Drying tests were replicated three times at each vacuum drying trial and averages weight loss are reported. Moisture content [$\text{kg}_{(\text{moisture})} \text{kg}_{(\text{dry matter})}^{-1}$] was determined using the following equation:

$$M = \frac{(W_o - W) - W_1}{M_1} \quad (1)$$

where M is initial moisture content [$\text{kg}_{(\text{moisture})} \text{kg}^{-1}_{(\text{dry matter})}$], W_o is initial weight of sample, W is amount of evaporated water, W_1 is dry matter content of sample. The moisture ratio (MR) in these model equations is defined as follows:

$$MR = \frac{M - M_e}{M_o - M_e} \quad (2)$$

where M is initial moisture content [$\text{kg}_{(\text{moisture})} \text{kg}^{-1}_{(\text{dry matter})}$], M_e is equilibrium moisture content [$\text{kg}_{(\text{moisture})} \text{kg}^{-1}_{(\text{dry matter})}$].

Data analysis

Twenty one empirical and semi empirical thin-layer drying models given in Table 1 have been taken into account in this study. Non-Linear regression analyses of these equations [Eq (3)-Eq (24)] were made by using SPSS 17.0. Non-linear regression analysis was performed to estimate the parameters $k, k_0, k_1, k_2, a, a_0, b, c, g, h, L$ and n of empirical and semi empirical equations in Table 1.

Table 1. Mathematical thin-layer drying models used for the approximation.

No	Model name	Model equation	Eq No	References
1	Lewis	$M_R = \exp(-kt)$	(3)	(Lewis 1921)
2	Page	$M_R = \exp(-kt^n)$	(4)	(Page 1949)
3	Modified Page	$M_R = \exp[-(kt)^n]$	(5)	(Overhults et al. 1973)
4	Henderson & Pabis	$M_R = a \exp(-kt)$	(6)	(Henderson and Pabis 1961)
5	Yagcioglu et al. (Logarithmic)	$M_R = a \exp(-kt) + c$	(7)	(Yagcioglu et al. 1999)
6	Two-term	$M_R = a \exp(-k_0t) + b \exp(-k_1t)$	(8)	(Henderson 1974)
7	Two-term exponential (Approximation of diffusion)	$M_R = a \exp(-kt) + (1 - a) \exp(-kat)$	(9)	(Sharaf-Elden et al. 1980)
8	Wang & Singh	$M_R = 1 + at + bt^2$	(10)	(Wang and Singh 1978)
9	Thomson	$t = a \cdot \ln(M_R) + b[\ln(M_R)]^2$	(11)	(Thomson et al. 1968)
10	Diffusion approach	$M_R = a \exp(-kt) + (1 - a) \exp(-kbt)$	(12)	(Kasem 1998)
11	Verma et al.	$M_R = a \exp(-kt) + (1 - a) \exp(-gt)$	(13)	(Verma et al. 1985)
12	Modified Henderson & Pabis	$M_R = a \exp(-kt) + b \exp(-gt) + c \exp(-ht)$	(14)	(Karathanos 1999)
13	Simlified Fick's diffusion (SFFD) equation	$M_R = a \exp[-c(t/L^2)]$	(15)	(Diamente and Munro 1991)
14	Modified Page equation-II	$M_R = \exp[-k(t/L^2)^n]$	(16)	(Diamente and Munro 1993)
15	Midilli et al.	$M_R = a \exp(-kt^n) + bt$	(17)	(Midilli et al. 2002)
16	Weibull distribution	$M_R = a - b \exp[-(kt)^n]$	(18)	(Babalıs et al. 2006)
17	Aghbashlo et al.	$M_R = \exp(-k_1t/1 + k_2t)$	(19)	(Aghbashlo et al. 2009)
18	Logistic	$M_R = a_0 / (1 + a \exp(kt))$	(20)	(Chandra and Singh 1995)
19	Jena & Das	$M_R = a \exp(-kt + b\sqrt{t}) + c$	(21)	(Jena and Das 2007)
20	Demir et al.	$M_R = a \exp(-kt)^n + c$	(22)	(Demir et al. 2007)
21	Alibas	$M_R = a \exp((-kt)^n + bt) + g$	(23)	New Model

M_R , moisture ratio; a, a_0, b, c, g, h , coefficients and n , microwave drying exponent specific to each equation; k, k_0, k_1, k_2 , drying coefficient specific to each equation; t , time; L , thickness.

Mathematical formulations

The regression coefficient (R^2) was primary criterion for selecting the most suitable equation to describe the microwave drying curves of Chili peppers. The correlation can be used to test the linear relation between measured and estimated values, which can be calculated from the equation:

$$R^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (M_{R_{exp,i}} - M_{R_{exp,mean,i}})^2 - (M_{R_{pre,i}} - M_{R_{exp,i}})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^N (M_{R_{exp,i}} - M_{R_{exp,mean,i}})^2} \quad (24)$$

where R^2 is called the coefficient of correlation, $M_{R_{exp,i}}$ stands for the experimental moisture ratio found in any measurement, $M_{R_{pre,i}}$ is the predicted moisture ratio for this measurement and N is the total number of observations.

Standard error of estimated (SEE) provides information on the long term performance of the correlations by allowing a comparison of the actual deviation between predicted and measured values term by term. The ideal value of SEE is "zero". The SEE is given as:

$$SEE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (M_{R_{exp,i}} - M_{R_{pre,i}})^2}{N - n_i}} \quad (25)$$

where n_i is called number of constants.

The root mean square error ($RMSE$) may be computed from the following equation which provides information on the short term performance.

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{[\sum_{i=1}^N (M_{R_{exp,i}}) - \sum_{i=1}^N (M_{R_{pre,i}})]^2}{N}} \quad (26)$$

Chi square (χ^2) is the mean square of the deviations between the experimental and predicted moisture levels. The lower are the values of the reduced χ^2 , the better is the goodness of fit.

$$\chi^2 = \frac{[\sum_{i=1}^N (M_{R_{exp,i}}) - \sum_{i=1}^N (M_{R_{pre,i}})]^2}{N - n_i} \quad (27)$$

Mathematical modeling of vacuum drying curves

The thin-layer drying models, describing the drying process, can be distinguished in three main categories, namely the theoretical, the semi theoretical and the fully empirical ones (Sharaf-Eldeen and Hamdy 1979). In this study, experimental data which were measured 50°C-0.05kPa, 50°C-7kPa, 50°C-13kPa, 75°C-0.05kPa, 75°C-7kPa and 75°C-13kPa vacuum drying levels were measured theoretical/semi-empirical/empirical thin-layer drying models defined in Table 1 and statistical data of these models such as SEE , R^2 , $RMSE$ and χ^2 and constant and coefficients (a , a_0 , b , c , g , h , n , k , k_0 , k_1 , k_2 , and L) were determined. The model in which R^2 was highest was chosen to be the best model in the study where vacuum drying levels of 50°C-0.05kPa, 50°C-7kPa, 50°C-13kPa, 75°C-0.05kPa, 75°C-7kPa and 75°C-13kPa were used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Vacuum drying curves

Value of moisture ratio (M_R) depending on time (t) of Chili pepper dried with 50°C-0.05kPa, 50°C-7kPa, 50°C-13kPa, 75°C-0.05kPa, 75°C-7kPa and 75°C-13kPa vacuum drying levels were given in Fig 1. Fig.1, a reduction in drying time occurred with the increasing temperature and decreasing vacuum level. The time required for the lowering of moisture content of Chili peppers to 0.16 from 6.12 on dry basis varied between 3 and 19.17 h

depending on the vacuum and temperature level. A marked decline was observed in the drying period of Chili peppers with the increasing temperature level and decreasing vacuum level (Alibas 2007, Alibas 2009, Methakhup et al. 2005). Drying time at 50 °C temperature was found as 7.5, 11.67 and 19.17 h for 0.05, 7 and 13 kPa, respectively, and at 75 °C, it was found as 3, 3.67 and 4.33 h for 0.05, 7 and 13 kPa vacuum values, respectively. Increase in temperature level in vacuum drying had an important effect on the reduction of drying time. The extent of drying realised at 50 °C temperature and 13 kPa vacuum value with the longest drying period was 6.39 times higher compared with the drying process realised at 75 °C and 0.05 kPa, with the shortest drying period. Similar findings was found by several researchers (Alibas 2007, Alibas 2009, Arévalo-Pinedo and Murr 2006, Jena and Das 2007, Wu et al. 2007, Arévalo-Pinedo and Murr 2007, Lee and Kim 2009, Bazyma et al. 2006, Artnaseaw et al. 2010).




Figure 1. Moisture ratio versus time, comparing experimental curve with the predicted one (—) through “Modified Henderson & Pabis” model’s equation (model no:12) for 50°C-0.05kPa, 50°C-7kPa and 50°C-13kPa vacuum drying levels.




Figure 2. Moisture ratio versus time, comparing experimental curve with the predicted one (—) through “Alibas” model’s equation (model no:21) for 75°C-0.05kPa, 75°C-7kPa and 75°C-13kPa vacuum drying levels.

Mathematical modeling

In this study, twenty one thin-layer drying models defined by various researchers in Table 1. Coefficient of correlation (R^2), standard error of estimated (SEE), root mean square error ($RMSE$) and chi-square (χ^2) in the

vacuum drying of thin layer drying models, shown in Table 2. The coefficient of correlation (R^2) was one of the primary criterion for selecting the best model to define the vacuum drying curves of Chili peppers. In the study thin-layer drying model in which (R^2) value is most close to “1.0000” and RMSE, (χ^2) and (SEE) values are smallest was chosen to be the most optimum model. According to Table 2, among all drying tests, the drying model where constant of coefficient (R^2) is the highest at 50°C-0.05 kPa, 50°C-7 kPa and 50°C-13 kPa vacuum drying levels was Modified Henderson & Pabis’s Model. Within vacuum drying trials dried of 75°C-0.05 kPa, 75°C-7 kPa and 75°C-13kPa drying levels, coefficient of correlation (R^2) of Alibas model is more close to values “1.0000” compared with the other twenty thin-layer drying model defined in the literature. Therefore Modified Henderson & Pabis’s Model was defined as the most optimal model in which estimation value are closest to experimental data for 50°C-vacuum levels and Alibas’s Model was defined as the most optimal model in which estimation value are closest to experimental data for 75°C-vacuum levels. The vacuum drying constants and the coefficients of the thin-layer drying models, shown in Table 3. Mathematical modeling of vacuum drying was conducted by several researchers in drying literature (Jena and Das 2007, Chen and Lamb 2007, Liu et al. 2009).

Table 3. Coefficients obtained from different thin-layer drying models for the different microwave power density

No	Constant and Coefficients											
	50°C-0.05kPa				50°C-7kPa				50°C-13kPa			
1	k=0.4165				k=0.2303				k=0.1651			
2	k=0.4554 n=0.9197				k=0.2361 n=0.9848				k=0.2463 n=0.8008			
3	k=0.6780 n=0.6143				k=0.4754 n=0.4846				k=0.4098 n=0.4028			
4	k=0.4049 a=0.9720				k=0.2282 a=0.9911				k=0.1499 a=0.9156			
5	k=0.3742 a=0.9925 c=-0.0287				k=0.2067 a=1.0184 c=-0.0391				k=0.1666 a=0.8994 c=0.0320			
6	k=0.3924 m=-0.5836 a=0.9658 b=-0.0004				k=0.2282 m=0.2282 a=0.5284 b=0.4627				k=0.1286 m=0.9535 a=0.7812 b=0.2254			
7	k=0.4760 a=0.6765				k=0.2358 a=1.1611				k=0.1651 a=1.0002			
8	a=-0.2996 b=0.0234				a=-0.1749 b=0.0083				a=-0.1210 b=0.0039			
9	a=-1.2101 b=-0.0896				a=-2.3467 b=-0.2557				a=-3.2537 b=-0.2327			
10	k=0.4165 a=0.9999 b=0.9998				k=0.2303 a=0.9998 b=0.9998				k=0.1651 a=0.9997 b=1.0001			
11	k=0.3737 a=0.8963 g=26.6110				k=0.2250 a=0.9774 g=2.2761				k=0.1651 a=1.0597 g=0.1651			
12	k=0.0051 a=-0.1480 b=0.1863 c=0.9617 g=24.6206 h=0.2460				k=0.0151 a=-2.2903 10² b=0.4967 c=2.2953 10² g=0.4561 h=0.0152				k=0.0069 a=-2.0050 b=2.5284 c=0.4824 g=0.0184 h=0.5127			
13	a=0.9720 c=0.0162 L=0.2000				a=0.9911 c=0.0091 L=0.2000				a=0.9156 c=0.0060 L=0.2000			
14	k=0.0236 n=0.9197 L=0.2000				k=0.0099 n=0.9848 L=0.2000				k=0.0187 n=0.8008 L=0.2000			
15	k=0.4632 n=0.6928 a=0.9980 b=-0.0201				k=-0.0553 n=-4.6990 a=0.7675 b=-0.0716				k=-0.1582 n=-2.7719 a=0.6610 b=-0.0376			
16	k=0.3261 n=0.6589 a=-0.4060 b=1.4043				k=0.2246 n=0.9112 a=-0.1021 b=1.1033				k=0.2275 n=0.6340 a=-0.2497 b=1.2603			
17	k ₁ =0.4283 k ₂ =0.0081				k ₁ =0.2277 k ₂ =-0.0020				k ₁ =0.2095 k ₂ =0.0311			
18	k=0.4049 a ₀ =0.2833 10 ⁶ a=0.2915 10 ⁶				k=0.2292 a ₀ =1.1114 10 ² a=1.1151 10 ²				k=0.1499 a ₀ =0.2071 10 ⁶ a=0.2262 10 ⁶			
19	k=0.1221 a=1.2361 b=-0.2569 c=-0.2380				k=0.1345 a=1.1315 b=-0.1035 c=-0.1261				k=0.0420 a=1.1834 b=-0.2165 c=-0.1680			
20	k=0.8769 a=0.9925 n=0.4267 c=-0.0287				k=0.2825 a=1.0184 n=0.7319 c=-0.0391				k=0.2079 a=0.8994 n=0.8015 c=0.0320			
21	k=0.0029 n=0.6904 a=1.8853 10 ² b=0.0009 g=-1.8753 10 ²				k=0.3408 10 ² n=0.9990 a=1.3816 b=0.3389 10 ³ g=0.3748				k=0.2263 n=0.7109 a=1.4838 b=0.0409 g=-0.4751			
	75°C-0.05kPa				75°C-7kPa				75°C-13kPa			
1	k=1.0176				k=0.8141				k=0.5940			
2	k=1.0188 n=0.9934				k=0.7793 n=1.1090				k=0.4983 n=1.2725			
3	k=0.9879 n=1.0300				k=0.9127 n=0.8921				k=0.4548 n=1.3059			
4	k=1.0012 a=0.9842				k=0.8287 a=1.0181				k=0.6407 a=1.0789			
5	k=0.8767 a=1.0162 c=-0.0496				k=0.6535 a=1.0835 c=-0.0972				k=0.4698 a=1.1855 c=-0.1476			
6	k=1.2898 m=1.2853 a=-0.7919 10 ² b=0.8016 10 ²				k=0.8287 m=0.8287 a=0.8081 b=0.2101				k=0.6407 m=0.6407 a=0.6126 b=0.4663			
7	k=1.0906 a=1.2938				k=1.0093 a=1.5854				k=0.8512 a=1.8322			
8	a=-0.7450 b=0.1453				a=-0.5963 b=0.0920				a=-0.4442 b=0.0511			
9	a=-0.4973 b=-0.0405				a=-0.6048 b=-0.0538				a=-0.8568 b=-0.0991			
10	k=1.0176 a=0.9998 b=0.9999				k=0.8141 a=0.9999 b=1.0001				k=0.5940 a=1.0001 b=0.9999			
11	k=0.9931 a=1.0005 g=-1.4537				k=1.2056 a=-0.1370 10 ³ g=1.2095				k=1.0717 a=0.1430 10 ³ g=1.0772			
12	k=0.0185 a=-0.0943 b=0.0923 c=1.0018 g=10.3094 h=0.7551				k=0.2512 a=-0.4494 b=0.7148 c=0.7179 g=0.5611 h=0.5611				k=0.0997 a=-0.3019 b=0.6674 c=0.6708 g=0.4332 h=0.4332			
13	a=0.9842 c=0.0401 L=0.2000				a=1.0181 c=0.0332 L=0.2000				a=1.0789 c=0.0256 L=0.2000			
14	k=0.0416 n=0.9934 L=0.2000				k=0.0220 n=1.1090 L=0.2000				k=0.0083 n=1.2725 L=0.2000			
15	k=0.9023 n=0.8599 a=0.9958 b=-0.0296				k=0.7135 n=0.9975 a=0.9899 b=-0.0203				k=0.4933 n=1.1989 a=1.0041 b=-0.0082			
16	k=0.7779 n=0.8379 a=-0.1526 b=1.1494				k=0.6474 n=0.9727 a=-0.1123 b=1.1041				k=0.4791 n=1.1898 a=-0.0446 b=1.0489			
17	k ₁ =0.9787 k ₂ =-0.0275				k ₁ =0.6862 k ₂ =-0.0917				k ₁ =0.4505 k ₂ =-0.1105			
18	k=1.0894 a ₀ =5.9726 a=5.1512				k=1.0918 a ₀ =2.0964 a=1.1644				k=0.9452 a ₀ =1.7256 a=0.7119			
19	k=0.6093 a=1.1096 b=-0.2136 c=-0.1106				k=0.5990 a=1.1100 b=-0.0522 c=-0.1130				k=0.6311 a=1.0770 b=0.1767 c=-0.0831			
20	k=0.7805 a=1.0162 n=1.1233 c=-0.0496				k=0.9753 a=1.0835 n=0.6701 c=-0.0972				k=0.9519 a=1.1855 n=0.4936 c=-0.1476			
21	k=0.1310 n=0.2847 a=1.0946 b=-0.7101 g=-0.0946				k=0.0206 n=-0.0942 a=1.1051 b=-0.6380 g=-0.1050				k=0.1709 10³ n=1.0006 a=1.0509 b=0.1704 10³ g=-0.0512			

CONCLUSIONS

The effects of different vacuum and temperature levels on the drying of Chili peppers were evaluated based on the drying parameters such as the drying time and moisture ratio. Drying period was completed between 3 and 19.17 h at combined different temperature (50-75°C) with vacuum (0.05, 7 and 13 kPa) levels.

Drying tests were done at the microwave power density values of 50°C-0.05kPa, 50°C-7kPa, 50°C-13kPa, 75°C-0.05kPa, 75°C-7kPa and 75°C-13kPa. Twenty-one different drying models were used in the study and coefficient of correlation (R^2), standard error estimated (SEE), root mean square error and chi-square (χ^2) values and constant and coefficients of these models were calculated.

Among all drying tests, the drying model where constant of coefficient (R^2) is the highest at 50°C-0.05kPa, 50°C-7kPa and 50°C-13kPa drying levels was Modified Henderson & Pabis Model and at 75°C-0.05kPa, 75°C-7kPa and 75°C-13kPa drying levels was Alibas Model.

REFERENCES

- Aghlasho M, Kianmehr MH, Khani S, and Ghasemi M (2009). Mathematical modeling of carrot thin-layer drying using new model. *Int. Agrophysic* 23:313-317.
- Alibas I (2007). Energy consumption and colour characteristics of nettle leaves during microwave, vacuum and convective drying. *Biosystems Engineering* 96(4): 495-502.
- Alibas I (2009). Microwave, vacuum, and air drying characteristics of collard leaves. *Drying Technology* 27(11): 1266-1273.
- Alibas I (2010). Determination of drying parameters, ascorbic acid and color characteristics of nettle leaves during microwave-, air- and combined microwave-air-drying. *Journal of Food Process Engineering* 33(2): 213-233.
- Anonymous (2011). http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chili_pepper (4.11.2011).
- Artnaseaw A, Theerakulpisut S, and Benjapiyaporn C (2010). Drying characteristics of Shiitake mushroom and Jinda chili during vacuum heat pump drying. *Food and Bioproducts Processing* 88(2-3): 105-114.
- Arévalo-Pinedo A, and Murr FEX (2006). Kinetics of vacuum drying of pumpkin (*Cucurbita maxima*): Modeling with shrinkage. *Journal of Food Engineering* 76(4):562-567.
- Arévalo-Pinedo A, and Murr FEX (2007). Influence of pre-treatments on the drying kinetics during vacuum drying of carrot and pumpkin. *Journal of Food Engineering* 80(1):152-156.
- Babalís SJ, Papanicolaou E, Kyriakis N, and Belessiotis VG (2006). Evaluation of thin-layer drying models for describing drying kinetics of figs (*Ficus carica*). *Journal of Food Engineering* 75:205-214.
- Bazyma LA, Guskov VP, Basteev AV, Lyashenko AM, Lyakhno V, and Kutovoy VA (2006). The investigation of low temperature vacuum drying processes of agricultural materials. *Journal of Food Engineering* 74(3): 410-415.
- Chandra PK, and Singh RP (1995). *Applied numerical methods for food and agricultural engineers*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, pp. 163-167.
- Chen Z, and Lamb FM (2007). Analysis of the Vacuum Drying Rate for Red Oak in a Hot Water Vacuum Drying System. *Drying Technology* 25(3): 497-500.
- Cihan A, Kahveci K, and Hacıhafızoğlu O (2007). Modelling of intermittent drying of thin layer rough rice. *Journal of Food Engineering* 79:293-298.
- Demir V, Gunhan T, and Yagcioglu AK (2007). Mathematical modelling of convection drying of green table olives. *Biosystems Engineering* 98(1):47-53.
- Diamante LM, and Munro PA (1991). Mathematical modeling of hot air drying of sweet potato slices. *International Journal of Food Science and Technology* 26:99.
- Diamante LM, and Munro PA (1993). Mathematical modeling of the thin layer solar drying of sweet potato slices. *Solar Energy* 51:271-276.
- Drouzas AE, and Schubert H (1996). Microwave application in vacuum drying of fruits. *Journal of Food Engineering* 28: 203-209.
- Drouzas AE, Tsami E, and Saravacos GD (1999). Microwave/vacuum drying of model fruit gels. *Journal of Food Engineering* 39(2): 117-122.
- Ertekin C, and Yaldiz O (2004). Drying of Eggplant and selection of a suitable thin layer drying model. *Journal of Food Engineering* 63:349-359.
- Henderson SM (1974). Progress in developing the thin layer drying equation. *Transection of ASAC*, 17:1167-1172.
- Henderson SM, and Pabis S (1961). Grain drying theory. II. Temperature effects on drying coefficients. *Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research* 6:169-174.
- Jena S, and Das H (2007). Modelling for vacuum drying characteristics of coconut presscake. *Journal of Food Engineering* 79:92-99.
- Karathanos VT (1999). Determination of water content of dried fruits by drying kinetics. *Journal of Food Engineering* 39:337-344.
- Kassem AS (1998). Comparative studies on thin layer drying models for wheat. In: 13th international congress on agricultural engineering. Vol. 6, 2-6 February, Morocco.
- Kosuge S, Inagaki Y, and Okumura H (1961). Studies on the pungent principles of red pepper. Part VIII. On the chemical constitutions of the pungent principles. *Nippon Nogei Kagaku Kaishi (J. Agric. Chem. Soc.)* 35: 923-927.
- Lee JH, and Kim HJ (2009). Vacuum drying kinetics of Asian white radish (*Raphanus sativus* L.) slices. *LWT - Food Science and Technology* 42(1): 180-186.
- Lewis WK (1921). The rate of drying of solid materials. *Industrial Engineering Chemistry* 13:427-432.
- Lin TM, Durance TD, and Seaman CH (1998). Characterization of vacuum microwave air and freeze dried carrot slices. *Food Research International* 4: 111-117.
- Liu X, Qiu Z, Wang L, Cheng Y, Qu H, and Chen Y (2009). Mathematical modeling for thin layer vacuum belt drying of Panax notoginseng extract. *Energy Conversion and Management* 50(4): 928-932.
- Methakhup S, Chiewchan N, and Devahastin S (2005) Effects of drying methods and conditions on drying kinetics and quality of Indian gooseberry flake. *LWT - Food Science and Technology* 38(6): 579-587.

- Midilli A, and Kucuk H (2003). Mathematical modeling of thin layer drying of pistachio by using solar energy. *Energy Conversion and Management* 44(7):1111-1122.
- Midilli A, Kucuk H, and Yapar Z (2002). A new model for single layer drying. *Drying Technology* 20(7):1503-1513.
- Montgomery SW, Goldschmidt VW, and Franchek MA (1997). Vacuum assisted drying of hydrophilic plates: static drying experiments. *International Journal of Heat Mass Transfer* 41: 735-744.
- Overhults DD, White GM, Hamilton ME, and Ross IJ (1973). Drying soybeans with heated air. *Transactions of the ASAE* 16:195-200.
- Özdemir M and Devres YO (1999). The thin layer drying characteristics of hazelnuts during roasting. *Journal of Food Engineering* 42: 225-233.
- Page G (1949). Factors influencing the maximum rates of air-drying shelled corn in thin layer. M.Sc. Thesis. Department of Mechanical Engineering, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, USA.
- Pere C, and Rodier E (2002). Microwave vacuum drying of porous media: experimental study and qualitative considerations of internal transfers. *Chemical Engineering and Processing* 41: 427-436.
- Sharaf-Eldeen YI, Blaisdell JL, and Hamdy MY (1980). A model for ear corn drying. *Transactions of the ASAE* 23:1261-1271.
- Sharaf-Eldeen YI, and Hamdy MY (1979). Falling rate drying of fully exposed biological materials: A review of mathematical models. 1979 Winter Meeting of ASAE. ASAE Paper No. 79-6622.
- Sharma GP, and Prasad S (2001). Drying of garlic (*Allium sativum*) cloves by microwave-hot air combination. *Journal of Food Engineering* 50: 99-105.
- Thomson TL, Peart PM, and Foster GH (1968). Mathematical simulation of corn drying: A new model. *Transaction of the ASAE* 11:582-586.
- Toğrul H (2006). Suitable drying model for infrared drying of carrot. *Journal of Food Engineering* 77:610-619.
- Tsami E, Krokida MK, and Drouzas AE (1998). Effect of drying method on the sorption characteristics of model fruit powders. *Journal of Food Engineering* 38: 381-392.
- Verma LR, Bucklin RA, Endan JB, and Wratten FT (1985). Effects of drying air parameters on rice drying models. *Transactions of the ASAE* 28:296-301.
- Wang CY, and Singh RP (1978). A single layer drying equation for rough rice. ASAE Paper No. 78-3001, ASAE, St. Joseph, MI.
- Wu L, Orikasa T, Ogawa Y, and Tagawa A (2007). Vacuum drying characteristics of eggplants. *Journal of Food Engineering* 83(3): 422-429.
- Yagcioglu A, Degirmencioglu A, and Cagatay F (1999). Drying characteristic of laurel leaves under different conditions of conditions. In: *Proceeding of the 7th International Congress of Agricultural Mechanization and Energy*, (Eds.: A Bascetincelik) Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey, 26-27 May, pp.565-569.
- Yarbro C., Frogge MH, and Goodman M (2005). *Canser Nursing Principles and Practise* (8 th edition). Ed.MH Frogge. Jones and Bartlett Learning, p.1879.
- Yongsawatdigul J, and Gunasekaran S (1996). Microwave-vacuum drying of cranberries: Part II. quality evaluation. *Journal of Food Processing and Preservation* 20: 145-156.