

**CAN FICK LAW-BASED MODELS ACCURATELY DESCRIBE
MIGRATION WITHIN A COMPLETE FOOD PRODUCT LIFE
CYCLE?**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Food Processing and Preservation</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Gavriil, Gavriil Kanavouras, Antonios; Agriculture University of Athens Coutelieris, Frank
Keywords:	Food-packaging interactions, food quality control, migration models, packaging

1
2
3 **CAN FICK LAW-BASED MODELS ACCURATELY DESCRIBE MIGRATION**
4
5 **WITHIN A COMPLETE FOOD PRODUCT LIFE CYCLE?**
6
7
8
9

10 Gavriil Gavriil¹, Antonios Kanavouras² and Frank A. Coutelieris^{1*}
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 1. Department of Environmental & Natural Resources Management, School of
19 Engineering, University of Patras, 2 Seferi Str., GR-30100 Agrinio, Greece, e-mail:

20 fcoutelieris@upatras.gr
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 2. Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition, Agricultural University of Athens,
28 55 Iera Odos Str., GR-11855, Athens, Greece, phone: +302105294738.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **ABSTRACT**
41
42

43 The concept of migration from polymeric packaging materials to food and food simulants,
44 under the environmental conditions expected during the food products' complete life cycle, is
45 discussed here. The most approved models that cope migration as a diffusion-driven process,
46 neglecting more complicated mass transport mechanisms, and environmental involvement that
47 are occurring in parallel or simultaneously in the whole system, are considered and weighted
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56
57 _____
58 * Corresponding author.
59
60

1
2
3 against the extensiveness of their use. Having identified the areas of inadequacies of usage in
4
5 validating migration during food process applications affecting food quality rather than safety,
6
7 this work outlines and proposes specific and eventually more complete directions for working
8
9 towards the modeling of the food – packaging interactions comprehensively involving the
10
11 storage environment in terms of both conditions and constituents.
12
13

14 15 16 17 18 **KEYWORDS**

19
20
21 Food-packaging interactions; migration models; packaging; food quality control
22
23

24 25 26 27 **PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS**

28
29
30 Several papers indicate differences between experimental observations and theoretical
31
32 predictions, while significant research effort estimates the parameters' values for achieving
33
34 better agreement. Instead of considering diffusion process as being the single mechanism to
35
36 describe the migration from packaging to foodstuffs, this work proposes to incorporate more
37
38 complicated phenomena (sorption, surface reactions, etc.) to overcome the above-mentioned
39
40 discrepancies. Potential future models, may then allow for a comprehensive quality control,
41
42 compared to the presently acceptable safety reassurance.
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Introduction**

50
51
52 Among the most important physical-chemical interactions within a food-packaging-
53
54 environment system, migration, sorption and permeation of substances through and from the
55
56 various material phases, have gained high legal and therefore scientific concern, too.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Migration of chemical compounds from packaging material to food has been broadly
4 attributed to a diffusion process, occurring due to the dissolution of the migrant in the food
5
6
7 (see, for example, Brandsch et al., 2002, Arvanitoyannis and Bosnea, 2004).
8
9

10 The mathematical models developed on that process use the Fick's approach to describe mass
11 transfer, they have to solve the elliptical differential equation for diffusion and spent
12 significant effort in determining the parameters applied (e.g. the diffusion coefficient), on
13 which base the differences among several models exist (see, for instance, Baner et al., 1996).
14 Aspects of migration, such as partitioning, heterogeneous reactions, packaging-material
15 morphology, shape/polarity of the migrant, etc., have not yet been considered in full within
16 these models, although discrepancies in predictions and experimental observations have been
17 revealed (Franz, 2007).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 The main point of this note concerns the mathematical models on substances' migration from
30 packaging material to foods under various storage conditions, on the side of the post legal
31 limitations of acceptance of food safety, but rather on the overall food quality control
32 assessment. For that, our opinion encounters the identification of the theoretical drawbacks of
33 the approaches themselves behind the models and also an improvement via the inclusion of
34 more relevant, though complex, transport phenomena. In this context, a critical discussion on
35 the widely-accepted Fickian approach and its applicability and drawbacks, for identifying
36 impending shortcomings towards a potential indication of a direction towards the forthcoming
37 research on that topic, are presented herein.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **Materials and Methods**

54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Migration may be divided to several fundamental mass transport processes simultaneously
4 evolving within an environment-packaging-food system, including diffusion, convection, and
5 chemical reactions (see, for example, Del Nobile et al., 2003). Migration modeling engages a
6 deterministic approach, usually considering the migration process to be controlled by
7 migrant's diffusion through the packaging material, as described by Fick's second law (Pocas
8 et al., 2008), relying on specific assumptions needed for assisting the model development and
9 application, yet, not being necessarily extensively valid, in each and every case of substances'
10 migration between various phases. Accordingly, based on Fick's first law, the diffusion
11 coefficient of a compound in a particular matrix during a certain time period, through a
12 control volume, should be proportional to the gradient of its concentration. The fundamental
13 considerations for a Fick's law valid use, are actually dependent on the following specific
14 assumptions:
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 29
30 1. The migrant was distributed homogeneously in either the packaging material or
31 the food phase.
- 32
33 2. There was no boundary resistance in the transfer of the migrant between
34 packaging and food phases.
- 35
36 3. There were no interactions between packaging and food.
- 37
38 4. No swelling phenomena occurred within the food-packaging system.
- 39
40 5. A specific partition coefficient between food and polymer might be assumed.
- 41
42 6. There has been no external supply of migrant during migration process, i.e. the
43 sum of the total migrant amount in the food-packaging system is constant.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 The above assumptions are made in order to achieve a solution for the resulting second order
52 partial differential equation for the diffusive mass transport and include the consideration of
53 the diffusion coefficient as in general being constant in either the food or the packaging
54 material (see, for instance, Chan et al., 2015). Additionally, both the diffusion and the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 partition coefficients of the migrant should be known in order to practically apply this
4
5 equation. Furthermore, it has been often assumed that the solubility of the migrant in the
6
7 polymer is very high, which consequently results to a partition coefficient =1, avoiding any
8
9 difficulties in estimating this coefficient for a given migrant - packaging material - food
10
11 system (Brandsch et al, 2002).
12

13
14
15 Up today, two simplified though widely accepted and applied models are the Piringer's model
16
17 (Piringer, 1994) and Limm & Hollified's model (Limm and Hollifield, 1996). The first one
18
19 correlated the diffusion coefficients with the relative molecular mass of the migrant with a
20
21 specific parameter along with the absolute temperature, while the later one proposed a similar
22
23 approach but with limited use in other packaging materials beyond polymers.
24

25
26
27 Nevertheless, a number of studies have shown moderate to low accuracy of either model and
28
29 quite frequently, an either under- or over-estimation of the migration results (see, for example,
30
31 O' Brien et al., 2001, Pennarun et al., 2004, Franz, 2007). The apparent inadequacy of the
32
33 Fickian approach in achieving such agreements, has been attributed to the values of the
34
35 parameters, such as diffusivity, assigning a lot of effort in highly sufficient estimations.
36
37 Within the above works, environment was included as being solely the migration defining
38
39 factor, while its active role in the total food-packaging material-environment system has been
40
41 neglected. In support of that, major "contaminants" may originate from the surrounding
42
43 environment (e.g. oxygen) or may end up into the environment, such as flavors desorbed into
44
45 packaging. Hence, independent of the food type, overall environment has a direct and
46
47 independent impact on packaging materials at the packaging-environment interphase.
48
49
50

51 52 53 54 55 **Results and Discussion** 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 Certain theoretical concerns are raised regarding the approaches converge to the widely
4 accepted consideration on the migrant mass transfer being diffusion driven, for then the
5 process to be adequately described by Ficks laws. Up today, the main effort has been placed
6 on identifying the diffusion coefficients and other parameters within the models in order to
7 identify the application area for each and every model. At the same time the Fickian approach
8 has been considered without much hesitation since models provide an over estimation of the
9 migrants present in foods at the upper acceptance limits for food safety in terms of legal
10 purposes.
11

12
13
14 In contrast, though, it seems apparently rather less likely for this consideration to be
15 incorporated in more complicated phenomena, such as sorption of specific food contaminants
16 by the packaging material, partitioning on the food-packaging interface, chemical reactions of
17 packaging material or of some of its byproducts with the food content, etc., all of which
18 possess a high potential within a real food-packaging system's life cycle. We may safely
19 propose then, that the above assumptions cannot be valid, in a universal way. In support of
20 that, we have identified cases where at least one of the above assumptions cannot be valid as,
21 for example, the case that the assumption #1 could not be valid for packaging materials other
22 than plastic polymers, or assumption #2 that might not be valid for sticking migrants, and so
23 on.
24
25

26
27
28 Another significant drawback widely adopted by published literature, is regarding the system
29 consideration that the environment is usually considered as the entity that just imposes the
30 conditions (boundary/initial conditions as well as values of the parameters involved in the
31 equations) without being part of the system. Consequently, environmental influences have not
32 been directly engaged in the mass transport process, but only through the conditions and
33 parameters, being therefore, somehow arbitrary. Hence, it is in need to rework and potentially
34 restructure the traditionally accepted "packaging-food" system with a proposed reformed one
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

1
2
3 now being “environment-packaging-food”, which shall allow for a more detailed and quite
4
5 more solid consideration of the totality of the transport phenomena through a complete system
6
7 consideration.
8
9

10 Equations of parameters describing complex migration and the consideration of a more
11
12 complex system are missing for the current references as it focuses on the migration
13
14 acceptable limit for safe human consumption. This note does not wish to deal with the
15
16 potential improvement of the legal requirements approach but rather to initiate a work
17
18 direction for a food processing tool from a food quality point of view as affected by migration
19
20 phenomena in agreement with a similar direction recognized in works discussing specific
21
22 cases and presenting the peculiarities for certain food migration studies (see Del Nobile et al.,
23
24 2003).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Conclusions**

33
34
35 Main migration models discussed before may well enough predict the migration of known and
36
37 already characterized migrants from commonly used plastic containers, while when the
38
39 contact material contains a number of completely unknown compounds, these models may not
40
41 be capable for accurately predicting the overall migration of each substance. Therefore, such
42
43 models in their philosophy tend to inaccurately estimate migration, of a migrating additive
44
45 potentially adversely impacting on the optimum product quality. In such cases a highly
46
47 accurate prediction of the migration process must be in hand in order to reassure the optimum
48
49 quality of a food within the complete supply chain environment.
50
51

52
53
54 Therefore, we be apt to conclude on the actual non-Fickian behavior of migrants on a
55
56 universal scale and a consequent need for a mass transport process to be modeled via more
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 complicated mathematical expressions, potentially containing non-linear terms, for a more
4
5 complete expression of the migration phenomena, when working beyond legal requirements
6
7 and towards a holistic food process quality control.
8
9

16 17 **References**

- 18
19 ARVANITOYIANNIS, I.S. and BOSNEA, L. 2004. Migration of substances from food
20 packaging materials to foods. *Crit. Rev. Food Sci.* 44(2), 63-73.
21
22
23
24 BANER, A., BRANDSCH, J., FRANZ, R. and PIRINGER O. 1996. The application of a
25 predictive migration model for evaluating the compliance of plastic materials with
26 European food regulations. *Food Addit. Contam.* 13(5), 587-601.
27
28
29
30
31 BRANDSCH, J., MERCEA, P., RUTER, M., TOSA V. and PIRINGER O. 2002. Migration
32 modelling as a tool for quality assurance of food packaging. *Food Addit. Contam.* 19,
33 29-41.
34
35
36
37
38 CHAN T.C., LI H.T. and LI, K.Y. 2015. Effects of shapes of solute molecules on diffusion: A
39 study of Dependences on solute size, solvent and temperature. *J Phys. Chem. B.*
40 119(51), 15718-15728.
41
42
43
44
45 DEL NOBILE, M.A., BOVE, S., LA NOTTE, E. and SACCHI, R. 2003. Influence of
46 packaging geometry and material properties on the oxidation kinetics of bottled virgin
47 olive oil. *J. Food Eng.* 57, 189–197.
48
49
50
51
52 FRANZ R. 2007. Migration modelling from food-contact plastics into foodstuffs as a new tool
53 for consumer exposure estimation. *Food Addit. Contam.* 22(10), 920-937.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 LIMM, W., HOLLIFIED, H. 1996. Modelling of additive diffusion in poleolefins. *Food
Addit. Contam.* 13(8), 949-967.

1
2
3 O' BRIEN, A. and COOPER, I. 2001. Polymer additive migration to food - a direct
4
5 comparison of experimental data and values calculated from migration models for
6
7 polypropylene. *Food Addit. Contam.* 18(4), 343-355.
8

9
10 PENNARUN, P.Y., DOLE, P. and FEIGENBAUM, A. 2004. Overestimated diffusion
11
12 coefficients for the prediction of worst-case migration from PET: application to
13
14 recycled PET and to functional barriers assessment. *Packag. Technol. Sci.* 17(6), 307-
15
16 320.
17

18
19 PIRINGER, O.G. 1994. Evaluation of plastics for food packaging. *Food Addit. Contam.*
20
21 11(2), 221-230.
22

23
24 POCAS, M.F., OLIVEIRA, J.C., OLIVEIRA, F.A.R. and HOGG, T. 2008. A critical survey
25
26 of predictive mathematical models for migration from packaging. *Crit. Rev. Food Sci.*
27
28 48(10), 913-928.
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