

Manuscript Number: LWT-D-18-03283R2

Title: Development of a dairy fouling model to assess the efficacy of cleaning procedures using alkaline and enzymatic products

Article Type: Research paper

Keywords: Dairy fouling; cleaning; enzyme; Maillard reaction

Corresponding Author: Professor José Juan Rodríguez-Jerez, PhD

Corresponding Author's Institution: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

First Author: Alfons Eduards Guerrero-Navarro, PhD

Order of Authors: Alfons Eduards Guerrero-Navarro, PhD; Abel Guillermo Rios-Castillo, PhD; Carolina Ripolles-Avila, PhD; Anne-Sophie Hascoët, Vmd; Xavier Felipe, PhD; José Juan Rodríguez-Jerez, PhD

Abstract: Dairy fouling is defined as the accumulation of thermally insulating materials or deposits from process fluids which are especially formed on heat transfer surfaces. The selection of suitable cleaning strategies to remove dairy fouling requires the understanding of its composition and the relationships with the surfaces where it is formed. For the industry, the development of novel strategies to test cleaning products, as well reducing water and energy consumption during the dairy processing operations is of enormous interest. The results showed the development of a laboratory-milk fouling model (MFM) with an average content of 52.8 mg/cm² of fouling in the test coupons. Seven different cleaners were tested with a fouling removal effectiveness of between 55% and 97%. Additionally, for evaluating the cleaning process of the model, the turbidity of the cleaning solutions was assessed. We presented an enzymatic alternative to the use of traditional cleaning products, with a similar efficacy against the dairy fouling. 78% of fouling removal after the use of enzymatic solution, in comparison to the 72% of fouling removal after the use of alkaline cleaning products. A reduction in water (-33.3%) and temperature (-28.5%), as well as shorter cleaning times (-33%) than its chemical alternative, was observed.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- Highlights**
- A laboratory model of milk fouling is developed
 - Evaluation of commercial and new enzymatic cleaning products
 - Enzymatic cleaners reduce the use of water and energy
 - Turbidity measurement could be used to optimize the industrial cleaning procedures

1 **Development of a dairy fouling model to assess the efficacy of cleaning procedures using**
2 **alkaline and enzymatic products**

3

4 A. E. Guerrero-Navarro^a, A. G. Ríos-Castillo^a, C. Ripolles Avila^a, A. S. Hascoët^a, X. Felipe^b, J. J.
5 Rodríguez Jerez^{a*}

6

7 ^aArea of Human Nutrition and Food Science. Veterinary Faculty, Universitat Autònoma de
8 Barcelona. Travessera dels Turons s/n, Cerdanyola del Vallès, 08193, Spain.

9

10 ^bIRTA-Monells. Finca Camps i Armet, Monells, Girona, 17121, Spain.

11

12 *Corresponding autor: José Juan Rodríguez Jerez. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Travessera
13 dels Turons s/n, Cerdanyola del Vallès, 08193, Spain. Phone: +34 935 811 448. E-mail:
14 josejuan.rodriguez@uab.cat

15 **Abstract**

16 Dairy fouling is defined as the accumulation of thermally insulating materials or deposits from
17 process fluids which are especially formed on heat transfer surfaces. The selection of suitable
18 cleaning strategies to remove dairy fouling requires the understanding of its composition and the
19 relationships with the surfaces where it is formed. For the industry, the development of novel
20 strategies to test cleaning products, as well reducing water and energy consumption during the dairy
21 processing operations is of enormous interest. The results showed the development of a laboratory-
22 milk fouling model (MFM) with an average content of 52.8 mg/cm² of fouling in the test coupons.
23 Seven different cleaners were tested with a fouling removal effectiveness of between 55% and 97%.
24 Additionally, for evaluating the cleaning process of the model, the turbidity of the cleaning solutions
25 was assessed. We presented an enzymatic alternative to the use of traditional cleaning products, with
26 a similar efficacy against the dairy fouling. 78% of fouling removal after the use of enzymatic
27 solution, in comparison to the 72% of fouling removal after the use of alkaline cleaning products. A
28 reduction in water (-33.3%) and temperature (-28.5%), as well as shorter cleaning times (-33%) than
29 its chemical alternative, was observed.

30

31 **Keywords:**

32 Dairy fouling, cleaning, enzyme, Maillard reaction

33

34 1. Introduction

35 Fouling is generally defined as the unwanted accumulation of deposits on surfaces of interest. In the
36 dairy industry, the problems caused by fouling are related to the inner surface of pipes, machinery,
37 and the kind of treatment (De Jong, Waalewijn, & van der Linden, 1993; Barish & Goddard, 2013).
38 In general terms, the problems caused by the presence of fouling can be classified into three different
39 categories: operating problems, food safety, and product shelf-life (Bansal & Chen, 2006; Barish &
40 Goddard, 2013). The operating problems related to fouling are blockages at industrial facilities or
41 cross-contamination from batches of different food-products (Fryer & Asteriadou, 2009). These are
42 particularly associated with heat treatments such as pasteurization where fouling could avoid the
43 correct destruction of microorganisms in raw milk. One of the more serious issues of dairy fouling is
44 that bacteria in milk have the ability to adhere to surfaces. This provides the conditions for the
45 formation of biofilms in milk process tanks, milk process lines, and heat exchangers. Biofilms may
46 contain spoilage and pathogenic microorganisms, resulting in a serious food safety issue (Bansal &
47 Chen, 2006; Marchand et al., 2012; Gonzalez-Rivas, Ripolles-Avila, Fontecha-Umaña, Ríos-Castillo,
48 & Rodríguez-Jerez, 2018). In those cases, microorganisms could either cause foodborne diseases or
49 could reduce the shelf-life of the processed foods (Jindal, Anand, Metzger, & Amamcharla, 2018;
50 Zouaghi et al., 2018).

51 In food processing industries this problem affects the day-to-day functioning (Takahashi, Nagai,
52 Sakiyama, & Nakanishi, 1996). It has been suggested that the best procedure to clean the pipes after
53 heating is a double cleaning process, using acid and alkali chemical products (Bylund, 1995;
54 Graßhoff, 2002; Jeurnink & Brinkmann, 1994). However, it is not entirely clear which to apply first,
55 the alkali or the acid chemicals. A two-stage cleaning process is sometimes inefficient and a clean
56 surface may not be achieved (Timperley, Hasting, & de Goederen, 1994). Therefore, the cleaning of
57 the facilities is an essential step to ensure an efficient process. Nevertheless, additional costs are
58 required to eliminate cleaning chemicals and to neutralize chemically contaminated effluents

(Changani, Belmar-Beiny, & Fryer, 1997; Graßhoff, 2002). Another approach for cleaning in the food industry involves the use of enzymatic products (Graßhoff, 2002; Turner, Serantoni, Boyce, & Walsh, 2005). This approach is often used to avoid polluting wastes and other problems that arise from the usage of corrosive products (D'Souza & Mawson, 2005; Potthoff, Serve, & Macharis, 1997). It has been found that certain cleaners damage both non-fouling coatings and food-grade stainless steel surfaces (Barish & Goddard, 2014; Jindal et al., 2018). Although, the use of enzymes could prevent these damages and prolong their utility (Potthoff et al., 1997).

The presence of carbohydrates is underestimated in terms of dairy fouling. It is controversial today as to whether the main component that starts the process of adherence to surfaces is the proteins or the calcium (De Jong, 1997; Jimenez et al., 2003; Visser & Jeurink, 1997). However, during the maintenance or cleaning of the facilities from various fouling obstructions, it is seen that most of the material attached to the steel is brown in color (Barish & Goddard, 2013). This characteristic color is produced by Maillard reactions between the proteins and carbohydrates from milk, and could possibly be important elements of adhesion (Bylund, 1995). Consequently, this could be a good target to attack the problem. In fact, Takahashi et al. (1996) demonstrated that other compounds besides the proteins are attached during the heat treatment. There are two types of dairy fouling depending on the intensity of the heat in the process from which it is formed. For type A, the temperature range is between 75 °C and 110 °C and the composition is 50% - 70% proteins, 30% - 40% minerals, and 4% - 8% fat. Type B takes place at temperatures above 110 °C and the content is 70% - 80% minerals, 15% - 20% proteins, and 4% - 8% fat (Visser & Jeurink, 1997). Furthermore, Bansal and Chen (2006) concluded that fouling of heat exchangers is a complex phenomenon and the mechanisms are not completely understood. It is believed that the formation of protein aggregates reduce fouling. However, the mass transfer of proteins between the fluid and heat transfer surface also plays an important role. According to this, different approaches have been suggested with the aim of creating a fouling model for the dairy industry to study its formation (Jun & Puri, 2005). In

84 this study, we focus on the fouling problems encountered in dairy industries. With our new method,
85 we aim to design a protocol to produce fast and ready-to-use type A laboratory-scale milk fouling
86 model (MFM), to test new enzymatic cleaning products, and find new ways of tracking the evolution
87 of cleaning protocols.

88

89 2. Materials and methods

90 Two fouling formation models were developed, one for drying in open conditions and one for the
91 recirculation of milk.

92

93 2.1. Source Materials

94 During this study, raw liquid bovine whole milk, refrigerated at 5 °C and supplied by a dairy farm
95 (Granja Can Bordoï, Sant Antoni de Vilamajor, Spain) was used. Its composition was analyzed by
96 Near Infrared Spectrometry (NIRS) using the model NIR 5000 (1100-2500 nm) (FOSS-NIR Systems
97 Inc., Silver Springs, MD, USA). A total of ten samples were analyzed in triplicate (n = 30).

98

99 2.2. Open Drying Conditions Fouling Model

100 2.2.1. Container Surfaces

101 Stainless steel Type AISI 316 grade 2B is one of the main materials used for plate heat exchangers
102 (PHE). Consequently, this material was employed as the reference for the study of fouling growth
103 developing cleaning formulations (Barish & Goddard, 2013; Jimenez et al., 2013). In this case,
104 square coupons of stainless steel that were 5 cm x 5 cm wide and 0.1 cm thick were used. The
105 coupons were cleaned and disinfected according to the EN 13697:2015 standard (Anonymous,
106 2015). In order to retain a significant amount of fouling on a flat surface and prevent the loss of milk
107 in each stage, auto-adhesive removable aluminum belts were used (Ceys, L'Hospitalet de Llobregat,

Spain), giving a box shape without a lid. Each one of the 4 pieces was 7 cm x 1 cm wide and 70 μ m thick (Figure 1). Once the fouling formation process ended the aluminum belts were removed.

110

111 2.2.2. Fouling Formation

112 The containers (Figure 1) were weighed using an analytical balance (Mettler AE 100, Mettler-Toledo
113 S.A.E., Hospitalet del Llobregat, Spain). To produce the MFM Type A (Figure 2A), the containers
114 were pre-heated to 90 °C in a fan-assisted oven (IDL-FI-80, Labolan S.L., Esparzar de Galar, Spain).
115 When the containers reached the desired temperature (90 °C), 3 mL of raw bovine whole milk was
116 added to each container and then reinserted into the oven. Once the milk was air-dried on the
117 surfaces, an extra 3 mL of raw milk was added, and dried again. This process was repeated to
118 complete five cycles in total. Each drying cycle took 45 min.

119 The dried milk containers were then inserted into plastic flasks with 30 mL of deionized water at 50
120 °C. The containers were shaken using a vortex (REAX Top, Heidolph Instruments, Schwabach,
121 Germany) at 2500 rpm for 1 min. The containers were then rinsed with deionized water in order to
122 eliminate the unattached residues. Five more drying cycles and a final rinsing process was
123 performed. Before determining the total fouling formed, the containers were dried to remove any
124 excess water. The MFMs were weighed on an analytical balance before and after the aluminum belts
125 were removed (Figure 1 and Figure 2).

126

127 2.3. Recirculation Milk Fouling Model

128 The methodology of Takahashi et al. (1996) was used with some incorporated modifications.
129 Stainless steel discs of 2 cm in diameter were placed in the bottom of a Kitasato flask. Firstly, the
130 stainless steel discs were cleaned and disinfected according to the EN 13697:2015 standard
131 (Anonymous, 2015). In order to acquire room temperature, the raw milk was recirculated with the
132 Kitasato flask using a peristaltic pump. The flask was immersed in a thermostatic water bath adjusted

133 to 90 °C for 18 h. The discs were then recovered and rinsed with deionized water. Finally, they were
134 dried and weighed using an analytical balance.

135

136 2.4. Cleaning Solutions (CS)

137 Seven cleaning products were used for the tests (Table 1). Two of them are already commercialized
138 products: a one-pass alkaline commercial product (CS1), currently used for removing fouling in the
139 industry and selected as the chemical cleaning product control, and one enzymatic product,
140 composed of protease, amylase and lipase (CS2). A non-foaming nonionic product was used as
141 surfactant (CS5). Taking into account the objective of this study, and the composition of the
142 commercial enzymatic product, we formulated four enzymatic solutions (CS3, CS4, CS6 and CS7).
143 The purpose of these was to act on proteins and carbohydrates in fouling, with enzymes developed
144 for the detergent industry: protease (Savinase®, Novozymes, Bagsværd, Denmark) and amylase
145 (Termamyl Ultra®, Novozymes). These enzymatic solutions were used with the nonionic surfactant
146 to increase the wettability and solubility of the residues in the aqueous medium. All enzymatic
147 cleaning solutions were concentrated tenfold compared to the working concentration, in 7.5 mL
148 sterile tubes and stored at -18 °C for the posterior use in the assays.

149

150 2.5. Milk Fouling Models (MFM) Cleaning Procedure

151 For each cleaning protocol, all the enzymatic cleaning solutions were thawed at room temperature
152 (18 °C - 22 °C). Then, they were diluted with 67.5 mL of deionized water adjusted to pH 9.5
153 (according to manufacturer's instructions to obtain the highest enzymatic efficiency), reaching a final
154 volume of 75 mL before being added to the MFM.

155 The cleaning solutions (Table 1) were placed in 160 mL plastic flasks containing the MFM (Figure
156 3A) and then sealed. All the plastic flasks were placed in a stirred thermostatic water bath (Unitronic
157 320 OR, J.P Selecta S.A, Abrera, Spain) at maximum stirring (111 units/min). For enzymatic

158 cleaning, the temperature was adjusted to 50 °C for 30 min (as indicated by the manufacturer in the
159 commercial enzymatic product and followed for the other enzymatic formulas) in two 15 min phases.
160 For chemical cleaning methods, the temperature was adjusted to 70 °C for 45 min (as indicated by
161 the manufacturer), in three 15-min phases.
162 For the enzymatic cleaning process (Figure 2B), the plastic flasks were placed in the stirred water
163 bath for 15 min at 50 °C. The MFM was then removed from the cleaning solution and placed in a
164 new plastic flask with 30 mL of deionized water at 50 °C and vortexed at maximum power for 1 min.
165 This allowed the removal of the detached elements and simulated the liquid flow within the pipes in
166 the facility. The coupon was then placed into the cleaning solution once again for 15 min. The
167 procedure finished with another wash in water at 50 °C and an agitation for 1 min. The procedure for
168 the chemical cleaning protocol was performed in the same way, but for 45 min in three 15 min
169 phases in the stirred water bath at 70 °C. After each 15 min phase in the water bath, a washing step
170 as in the enzymatic cleaning protocol was performed. After finishing the MFM cleaning procedures,
171 the cleaned MFMs were then placed in an oven at 50 °C and weighed.

172

173 2.6. Monitoring the Cleaning Protocol

174 Tracking the cleaning processes of facilities is of great importance for possible future industrial
175 application. Turbidity measurement appears to be an easy, low cost solution (Van Asselt, Van
176 Houwelingen, & Te Giffel, 2002; Fickak, Al-Raisi, & Chen, 2011). For this purpose, a laboratory
177 analysis using a turbidimeter in McFarland units (Densimat, bioMérieux, Marcy-l'Étoile, France)
178 was performed.

179

180 2.7. Statistical Analysis

181 All the data collected from these protocols were processed using R free software (R Development
182 Core Team). To compare differences between the variability of the average samples, one-way

183 ANOVA test was used with a posteriori contrast using the Tukey test. A *p* value ≤ 0.05 was
184 considered significant.

185

186 3. Results and discussion

187 One of the main objectives of this study, when creating a new fouling model, was to reduce the
188 technical requirements of other published methods and to focus on some variations that can easily be
189 controlled. The advantages of simplifying the laboratory model can help with future research by
190 speeding up the process of obtaining the model and requiring less resources for its production.

191

192 3.1. *Drying Open Conditions Fouling Formation*

193 The analysis of milk components shows a composition of 36.3 ± 1.38 g/L of fats, 33.8 ± 1.01 g/L of
194 proteins, 56.31 ± 1.89 g/L of sugars and 126.4 ± 1.9 g/L of total solids, similar to a cow's whole milk
195 standard as reported by Bylund (1995). The efficacy of the new proposed protocol of fouling
196 production was calculated by the difference between the dry weight of the milk fouling attached at
197 the beginning and at the end of the experiments. This procedure has been suggested in previous
198 studies (Barish & Goddard, 2014; Liu, Jindal, Amamcharla, Anand, & Metzger, 2017). The results
199 showed that the time to produce sufficient fouling to test new cleaning solutions was established in 8
200 h (10 cycles). Results revealed that after the ten dehydration cycles an average of 1.32 ± 0.45 g (52.8
201 mg/cm^2) ($n = 64$, surface of 25 cm^2) of fouling was obtained. The highest fouling layer previously
202 reported was $19.21 \text{ mg}/\text{cm}^2$ (Liu et al., 2017). Zouaghi et al. (2018) reported an accumulation of 30.8
203 mg/cm^2 . However, they used a dilution of whey proteins and calcium as opposed to whole milk,
204 therefore producing a fouling model over stainless steel of a grayish appearance. Additionally, the
205 real fouling seen in the dairy industry has a caramelized aspect, with a brown color (Barish &
206 Goddard. 2013).

207 In our study, a strongly attached, brownish-colored layer on the stainless steel surfaces of the MFM
208 was observed (Figure 3A). That result was similar to previous observations obtained from real-life
209 situations in dairy fouling (Barish & Goddard, 2013). The color may be related to a Maillard reaction
210 between milk proteins and milk sugars, mostly lactose. The brownish color began to appear during
211 the sixth cycle and small quantities of milk fat appeared as little droplets of clear liquid on the
212 fouling during the drying process. According to our results, the Maillard reaction is a key element
213 which may causes the adhesion of the fouling components. One of the most important stages of this
214 protocol of MFM generation is the agitation step. The water rinses ensure the removal of proteins
215 and other constituents of the milk poorly attach to the surface. Components that were retained in the
216 surface received a higher thermal load, increasing the Maillard reaction, and leading to the formation
217 of fouling.

218

219 3.2. Recirculation Milk Fouling Formation

220 Each stainless steel disc had a 6.9 cm² area on all sides. The total area of discs in this experiment was
221 55.26 cm² (eight discs), which was more than double the 25 cm² of the square coupons for the MFM.
222 When using the alternative method to create a milk fouling model using a Kitasato flask, the milk
223 showed a brownish after 18 h and all the inner surfaces of the system were covered in a thin layer of
224 milk fouling. Once the discs were gently rinsed, dried, and weighed at room temperature, there was
225 no appreciable change in their weight. When comparing the results obtained to produce the MFM
226 using the drying method in open conditions and the method of milk recirculation, it can be seen that
227 with less time and technical requirements a much larger amount of dairy fouling is generated on
228 stainless steel.

229

230 3.3. Cleaning Efficiency

231 A cleaning agent that is currently used to clean milk fouling must be used as a reference when testing
232 new formulas with a new model. In this case, two commercial cleaners (one chemically composed
233 and one enzymatically composed) were used (Table 1). The results in Figure 4 showed that the
234 effectiveness of the reference chemical cleaning agent CS1 for removing milk fouling was 73.31%
235 and the outcome of the reference enzymatic cleaning agent CS2 was 77.99%. The MFM was tested
236 with some new cleaning agents based on enzymes (Figure 3B), an environmentally friendly approach
237 to the problem of fouling (Graßhoff, 2002; Boyce, Piterina, & Walsh, 2010). The advantages of
238 using these products are mainly related to less wastewater production, reduced energy consumption
239 by working at lower temperatures, reduced cleaning times, and less toxicity of the cleaning products
240 by cleaning at a mild pH. They are also more environmentally safe because they are neutralized by
241 biodegradation (Potthoff et al., 1997; Graßhoff, 2002; D'Souza & Mawson, 2005).

242

243 The enzymatic products leveled as CS3, CS6 and CS7 are shown in Table 1, composed by amylase,
244 protease and surfactant, with a pH between 8.5 and 9.5 and tested at 50 °C, produced good results
245 among the newly formulated enzymatic cleaners, with average effectiveness percentages of 75.35%
246 to 80.43%. The formulas CS3 and CS7 had a similar minimum value, although CS7 had the best
247 maximum value (Figure 4). Finally, the other new formulas, with efficiency percentages of 72.89%
248 (CS4) and 69.5% (CS5) were tested at a pH of 9.5. After the cleaning treatment was performed (30
249 min), a large amount of the fouling formed on the coupon had been removed. A reduction near 70%
250 of the fouling was ensured using any of the enzymatic cleaning treatments. This was achieved using
251 lower concentration of enzymes and at lower temperature than is required in chemical protocols
252 (Table 1). The products that contain amylase showed the highest values among the enzymatic ones,
253 and the lowest pH values favored the elimination of fouling type A. After processing all the data,
254 there were no statistical differences ($p > 0.05$). This was a positive outcome for the fouling model in
255 different conditions and cleaning solutions.

256 This demonstrates that using enzymatic cleaning products to attack this kind of residue in dairy
257 facilities is a valid strategy. It can also be more economically beneficial than using chemical products
258 due to the reduced energy costs of operating at a lower temperature (-28.57%) and the reduced
259 number of rinse steps, hence producing less waste water (-33.3%), during cleaning protocols.
260 Comparing the direct economic costs, the enzymatic products tested, represent an equal efficiency to
261 the alkaline products, since a very low concentration of enzymes was used. The economic cost of the
262 enzymatic treatment was calculated in 0.045 €/L. Alkaline chemical cleaning cost was estimated in
263 0.047 €/L. Consequently, enzymatic cost may be adjusted as a function of the enzymes selected, and
264 its concentration. In the dairy sector, an average of 6.5 MWh and 2 m³ of water is spent to produce
265 one ton of processed milk. In this sense, a total of 98% of the water spent is of drinking quality and
266 the 80% of the energy is for heating processes and cleaning operations (Vasquez, 2016). Other
267 benefits of this system is reduced cleaning times (-33.33%), which is useful when aiming to shorten
268 cleaning periods. Additionally, the system avoids the use of neutralization products before the
269 cleaning waste is released into the sewerage system. Consequently, the correct use of enzymes offers
270 a cost-saving alternative because they work effectively at low wash temperatures and mild pH. This
271 allows reduced use of water, raw materials and energy, while improving the efficiency of cleaning
272 and extending the useful life of the equipment. Additionally, it represents a considerable contribution
273 to the recovery of the environment. Furthermore, recent trials with new chemicals or enzyme
274 combinations promise an even broader application (Timmerman, Mogensen, & Graßhoff, 2016).
275 The pH range of the enzymatic activity was very effective in this cleaning protocol (Table 1) and
276 was wide enough to see differences for future formulations. The products CS3, CS6, and CS7,
277 evaluated at a pH 9.5, 9.2 and 8.5 respectively, and with the same formula, showed good average
278 efficiencies. It is interesting to see that the laboratory-scale pH control is more accurate than the
279 industrial scale indicating that these products could continue operating without very strict
280 requirements. This information is useful because when digesting fouling proteins, functional groups

could be exposed and this may alter the pH of the medium, moving away from the ideal range for enzyme action. Additionally, the results with amylase and the color of the real fouling, alongside the laboratory one, help to support the theory about the presence of carbohydrates in dairy fouling. These data do not determine the role of caramelized carbohydrates, but simply knowing that it is present opens up new possibilities to attack and eliminate these residues that adversely affect the effective daily functioning of food companies. After this comparison, fixing a basic formulation for pilot plant scale trials should be possible.

288

3.4. Monitoring the Cleaning Protocol

Tracking the cleaning protocol with turbidity measurements was a quick and easy way to obtain immediate information about the process (Figure 5). At the beginning, the cleaning solution was translucent (0 McFarland units), but during the cleaning protocol it became turbid. During the agitation stages (Figure 2B), the water was full of detached pieces of fouling. Analyzing the turbidity is a simple index of the progress of the cleaning process, helping with optimization of this. Van Asselt et al. (2002) monitored the real-time turbidity by spectrophotometry of a cleaning solution to test the removal of protein fouling in an automated CIP system. Fickak et al. (2011) used the turbidity and conductivity measurements of the rinsing step to indicate the efficiency of the cleaning process completion.

299

4. Conclusions

A laboratory model of milk fouling has been developed. This artificial target (MFM) can be used for the evaluation of commercial and new cleaning products. This methodology has been demonstrated to be useful for assessing how effective the cleaning products are. New formulations using enzymes to attack dairy fouling have been proven to be a viable solution for this problem. No statistical differences between the cleaning solutions (chemical and enzymatic) were observed. Furthermore,

306 the use of new enzymatic solutions had the same effectiveness as chemical products, but with a
307 reduction of water and industrial energy consumption. Turbidity measurement is an easy tool to track
308 the cleaning processes used in the food industry, with minimum requirements of specialized workers
309 and analytic techniques.

310

311

312 **Acknowledgements**

313 All authors thank the support of Dolors Busquets for technical laboratory assistance and to Sarah
314 Davies for her grammatical review.

315

316 **Funding Sources**

317 This work was supported by the European Union project FP7-KBBE-2013-7 (ENTHALPY).

318

319 **References**

320 Anonymous. (2015). Chemical disinfectants and antiseptics - Quantitative non-porous surface test
321 for the evaluation of bactericidal and/or fungicidal activity of chemical disinfectants used in food,
322 industrial, domestic and institutional areas - Test method and requirements without mechanical
323 action (phase 2, step 2). European standard, EN 13697:2015, 36 pp.

324 Bansal, B., & Chen, X. D. (2006). A critical review of milk fouling in heat exchangers.

325 *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*, 5(2), 27–33.

326 <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-4337.2006.tb00080.x>

327 Barish, J. A., & Goddard, J. M. (2013). Anti-fouling surface modified stainless steel for food
328 processing. *Food and Bioprocess Processing*, 91(4), 352–361.

329 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.fbp.2013.01.003>

330 Barish, J. A., & Goddard, J. M. (2014). Stability of nonfouling stainless steel heat exchanger plates
 331 against commercial cleaning agents. *Journal of Food Engineering*, 124, 143–151.
 332 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2013.10.009>

333 Boyce, A., Piterina, A. V, & Walsh, G. (2010). Assessment of the potential suitability of selected
 334 commercially available enzymes for cleaning-in-place (CIP) in the dairy industry. *Biofouling*,
 335 26(7), 837–50. <http://doi.org/10.1080/08927014.2010.522705>

336 Bylund, G. (1995). *Dairy processing handbook*. Lund, Sweden: Tetra Pak Processing Systems AB,
 337 (Chapter 2).

338 Changani, S. D., Belmar-Beiny, M. T., & Fryer, P. J. (1997). Engineering and chemical factors
 339 associated with fouling and cleaning in milk processing. *Experimental Thermal and Fluid*
 340 *Science*, 14(4), 392–406. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0894-1777\(96\)00141-0](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0894-1777(96)00141-0)

341 De Jong, P., Waalewijn, R., & van der Linden, H. J. L. J. (1993). Validity of a kinetic fouling model
 342 for heat-treatment of whole milk. *Lait*, 73, 293–302.

343 De Jong, P. (1997). Impact and control of fouling in milk processing. *Trends in Food Science and*
 344 *Technology*, 8(12), 401–405. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-2244\(97\)01089-3](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-2244(97)01089-3)

345 D’Souza, N. M., & Mawson, A. J. (2005). Membrane cleaning in the dairy industry: a review.
 346 *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*, 45(2), 125–134.
 347 <http://doi.org/10.1080/10408690490911783>

348 Fickak, A., Al-Raisi, A., & Chen, X. D. (2011). Effect of whey protein concentration on the fouling
 349 and cleaning of a heat transfer surface. *Journal of Food Engineering*, 104(3), 323–331.
 350 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2010.11.004>

351 Fryer, P. J., & Asteriadou, K. (2009). A prototype cleaning map: A classification of industrial
 352 cleaning processes. *Trends in Food Science and Technology*, 20(6–7), 255–262.
 353 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2009.03.005>

354 Gonzalez-Rivas, F., Ripolles-Avila, C., Fontecha-Umaña, F., Ríos-Castillo, A. G., & Rodríguez-
 355 Jerez, J. J. (2018). Biofilms in the spotlight: detection, quantification, and removal methods.
 356 *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*, 17, 1261–1276.
 357 <http://doi.org/10.1111/1541-4337.12378>

358 Graßhoff, A. (2002). Enzymatic cleaning of milk pasteurizers. *Icheme*, 80, 247–252.

359 Jeurnink, T. J. M., & Brinkman, D. W. (1994). The cleaning of heat exchangers and evaporators after
 360 processing milk or whey. *International Dairy Journal*, 4(4), 347–368.
 361 [http://doi.org/10.1016/0958-6946\(94\)90031-0](http://doi.org/10.1016/0958-6946(94)90031-0)

362 Jimenez, M., Delaplace, G., Nuns, N., Bellayer, S., Deresmes, D., Ronse, G., Alogaili, G., Collinet-
 363 Fressancourt, M., & Traisnel, M. (2013). Toward the understanding of the interfacial dairy fouling
 364 deposition and growth mechanisms at a stainless steel surface: A multiscale approach. *Journal of*
 365 *Colloid and Interface Science*, 404, 192–200. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcis.2013.04.021>

366 Jindal, S., Anand, S., Metzger, L., & Amamcharla, J. (2018). Short communication: A comparison of
 367 biofilm development on stainless steel and modified-surface plate heat exchangers during a 17-h
 368 milk pasteurization run. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 101(4), 2921–2926.
 369 <http://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2017-14028>

370 Jun, S., & Puri, V. M. (2005). Fouling models for heat exchangers in dairy processing: A review.
 371 *Journal of Food Process Engineering*, 28(1), 1–34. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-4530.2005.00473.x)
 372 [4530.2005.00473.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-4530.2005.00473.x)

373 Liu, D. Z., Jindal, S., Amamcharla, J., Anand, S., & Metzger, L. (2017). Short communication:
 374 Evaluation of a sol-gel-based stainless steel surface modification to reduce fouling and biofilm
 375 formation during pasteurization of milk. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 100(4), 2577–2581.
 376 <http://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2016-12141>

377 Marchand, S., De Block, J., De Jonghe, V., Coorevits, A., Heyndrickx, M., & Herman, L. (2012).
 378 Biofilm Formation in Milk Production and Processing Environments; Influence on Milk Quality
 379 and Safety. *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*, 11(2), 133–147.
 380 <http://doi:10.1111/j.1541-4337.2011.00183.x>

381 Potthoff, A., Serve, W., & Macharis, P. (1997). The cleaning revolution. *Dairy Industries*
 382 *International*, 62(6), 25–29.

383 Takahashi, T., Nagai, T., Sakiyama, T., & Nakanishi, K. (1996). Formation of fouling deposit from
 384 several soft drinks on stainless steel surfaces. *Food Science and Technology International*, 2(2),
 385 116–119.

386 Timmerman, H., Mogensen, P. K., & Graßhoff, A. (2016). Enzymatic Cleaning in Food Processing.
 387 In H. Lelieveld, J. Holah, & D. Gabrić (Eds.), *Handbook of Hygiene Control in the Food Industry*
 388 (pp. 555–568). Amsterdam: Woodhead Publishing.

389 Timperley, D. A., Hasting, A. P. M., & de Goederen, G. (1994). Developments in the cleaning of
 390 dairy sterilization plant. *Journal of the Society of Dairy Technology*, 47(2), 44–50.

391 Turner, K., Serantoni, M., Boyce, A., & Walsh, G. (2005). The use of proteases to remove protein-
 392 based residues from solid surfaces. *Process Biochemistry*, 40(10), 3377–3382.
 393 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.procbio.2005.03.040>

- 394 Van Asselt, A. J., Van Houwelingen, G., & Te Giffel, M. C. (2002). Monitoring system for
395 improving cleaning efficiency of cleaning-in-place processes in dairy environments. *Food and*
396 *Bioproducts Processing*, 80(4), 276–280. <http://doi.org/10.1205/096030802321154772>
- 397 Vasquez, A. L. (2016). Integrated engineering approach validating reduced water and energy
398 consumption in milk processing for wider food supply chain replication - Project overview and
399 key results update. Retrieved from [http://www.greendairy.net/wp-](http://www.greendairy.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/5_Vasquez_Enremilk.pdf)
400 [content/uploads/2016/12/5_Vasquez_Enremilk.pdf](http://www.greendairy.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/5_Vasquez_Enremilk.pdf)
- 401 Visser, J., & Jeurink, T. J. M. (1997). Fouling of heat exchangers in the dairy industry.
402 *Experimental Thermal and Fluid Science*, 14(4), 407–424. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0894-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0894-1777(96)00142-2)
403 [1777\(96\)00142-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0894-1777(96)00142-2)
- 404 Zouaghi, S., Six, T., Nuns, N., Simon, P., Bellayer, S., Moradi, S., Hatzikiriakos S. G., Andre, C.,
405 Delaplace, G., & Jimenez, M. (2018). Influence of stainless steel surface properties on whey
406 protein fouling under industrial processing conditions. *Journal of Food Engineering*, 228, 38–49.
407 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2018.02.009>

408 **Table 1.** Cleaning solutions (CS) selected for this study*

Cleaning solutions (CS)	Components and concentrations	Working temperature	Working pH	Cleaning time (min)
CS1	Higher recommended commercial alkaline cleaner dilution	70 °C	10 to 12	45
CS2	Higher recommended commercial enzymatic cleaner dilution	50 °C	9.5	30
CS3	1.2 mL/L protease 1 mL/L amylase Nonionic surfactant	50 °C	9.5	30
CS4	1.2 mL/L protease Nonionic surfactant	50 °C	9.5	30
CS5	Nonionic surfactant	50 °C	9.5	30
CS6	1.2 mL/L protease 1 mL/L amylase Nonionic surfactant	50 °C	9.2	30
CS7	1.2 mL/L protease 1 mL/L amylase Nonionic surfactant	50 °C	8.5	30

409 * Amount of nonionic surfactant for the products CS3 to CS7: 250 mL/L

410

411

412 **Figure captions**

413 **Figure 1.** Box-shaped container to form milk fouling made with stainless steel coupon and
414 aluminum tape.

415 **Figure 2.** Schematic workflow. A) Milk Fouling Model (MFM) production on a laboratory-scale. B)
416 Milk Fouling Model (MFM) cleaning protocol using enzymes.

417 **Figure 3.** Milk fouling Model (MFM). A) After the fouling formation protocol. B) After the
418 enzymatic cleaning.

419 **Figure 4.** Efficiency of detaching milk fouling of different cleaning solutions (CS). CS1: commercial
420 alkaline cleaner. CS2: commercial enzymatic cleaner. CS3 to CS7: new enzymatic formulas to test.
421 In each boxplot, whiskers are the minimum and maximum value inside the 95% of the confidence
422 interval for the median. Median is represented as a line inside of each boxplot. Efficiency is shown
423 as percentage (0% to 100%). Each product was used in quintuplicate. **No significant statistical**
424 **difference were observed between products ($p > 0.05$).**

425 **Figure 5.** Turbidity of different enzymatic Cleaning Solutions (CS) using the McFarland standard
426 (each sample was tested in triplicate).

427

428

429

Highlights

430

- A laboratory model of milk fouling **was** developed

431

- Evaluation of commercial and new enzymatic cleaning products

432

- Enzymatic cleaners **reduced** the use of water and energy

433

- Turbidity measurement could be used to optimize the industrial cleaning procedures

434

435

436

Figure 1
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)





Figure 2
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

A



B




Figure 3
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 4
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 5
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

