\_Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

# MATHEMATICAL MODELLING OF DERIVED ENERGY CONTENT FROM MOISTURE CONTENT OF PALM KERNEL TREE

# O.A. Raimi<sup>1</sup>, J.F. Eiche<sup>2</sup> and O.D. Olowoniyi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Civil Engineering Department, Rufus Giwa Polytechnic, Owo, Nigeria <sup>2</sup>Department of Mechanical Engineering, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria <sup>3</sup>Vehicle Inspection Services Department, Ondo State Ministry of Transport, Akure, Nigeria

**ABSTRACT:** It is important to model out the optimization of energy process of palm kernel tree so as to evaluate the optimal values of the energy content parameters which will determines the performance and the useful lifespan of the palm kernel tree. This present study aims to develop models to investigate the effect of moisture content on the energy content of palm kernel tree that are 10 years and 20 years old using regression technique. In order to check the adequacy of the regression model, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. The experimental results are based on adequate laboratory methodology to increase the reliability of the experiments. It was clear from the ANOVA that the regression model is capable to predict the energy content with high accuracy.

KEYWORDS: Energy content, Moisture content, Palm kernel tree, ANOVA, Regression

## **INTRODUCTION**

Maximizing energy recovery from the waste of palm kernel trees is desirable for both the environmental and economic reasons [1]. Research study has showed that biomass has attracted increasing interest in recent years as an alternative feedstock for production of energy, chemicals and other bio-based products in the form of electricity and heat [2]. In Nigeria, oil palm is an important tree because of the value of the crude palm oil, fronds, stems and leaves [3]. The palm tree plantation produces huge quantity of palm wastes such as oil palm frond, palm kernel shell, empty fruit bunch, palm trunk and mesocarp fibres [4-5]. In general, oil forms about 10% of the whole palm oil trees while the other 90% remains as biomass [6]. It has been found that these wastes can be reintegrated to contribute in solving the energy problem in Nigeria [7]. Palm oil wastes are considered as a great potential to become alternative source of renewable energy [6]. Thus, it is important to model out the optimization of energy process so as to evaluate the optimal values of energy content parameters to determine the performance and useful lifespan of palm kernel trees. Luangwilai et al. [8] modelled the effects of moisture content in compost piles using one and tow dimensional spatially dependent models and incorporating terms that accounted for self-heating due to both biological and oxidative mechanisms. Analyses were undertaken for different initial water contents within the compost pile. The experimental investigation showed that when the water content is too low, the reaction is almost negligible whereas, for the case when the water content is too high, the reaction only commences when the water content evaporates and the water ratio drops into an appropriate range. The result also showed that for an intermediate water content range, biological reaction is at its optimum and there is a possibility of spontaneous combustion of the compost pile. Mariem and Mabrouk [9] conducted a study on convective drying kinetics of tomato slices in order to identify the characteristic parameters of such high moisture content product and to establish mathematical models of the drying kinetic for various range of temperatures typically

\_Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

encountered in industrial dryers. The results revealed that to reach a final moisture content of 11% at 38°C, 44°C, 50°C, 57°C and 64°C, the drying time for 1m/s respectively, was 22.4h, 18.5h, 16.7h, 13.5h and 9.9h. Chayjan and Esna-Ashari [10] employed artificial neural networks (ANN) and four empirical mathematical models (Henderson, GAB, Halsey and Oswin) for the estimation of equilibrium moisture content (EMC) of dried grape (black currant). The results showed that the EMC of the grape were more accurately predicted by ANN models than by the empirical models. Yan et al., [11] carried out a mathematical modelling of the kinetic of quality deterioration of intermediate moisture content (IMC) banana during storage. The moisture content of the investigated samples was monitored over time. The experimental results showed that IMC banana absorbed moisture faster when stored at high temperature and at high relative humidity, at the beginning of storage. The result also showed that the water activity of IMC banana during storage was found to follow an exponential increase, which was described by the lumped capacity model. Sridhar and Madhu [12] experimentally investigated on Casuarina wood chips of dimension 5.08 cm x 5.08 cm with 2.54 cm thickness between  $80^{\circ}$ C to  $100^{\circ}$ C in a tray drier using air flow velocity of 0.5 m/s. Eleven thin-layer drying kinetic models were fitted with the experimental drying kinetics values and individual model constants. The models were compared using statistical measures to estimate the best model that would fit for the experiment. The investigated showed that logarithmic, modified Henderson and Pabis models predicted the drying rate in a best manner among the models used in the temperature range 80°C to 100°C. Sagia and Fragkou [13] presented an experimental data from several studies about drying behaviour of various species of mushroom which were selected and used to compare different drying methods and different mathematical thin layer drying models to stimulate mushroom drying rate for drying air temperatures ( $45^{\circ}$ C to  $90^{\circ}$ C) and drying air velocities (0.2m/s to 5m/s). The study showed that the drying air temperature and the drying air velocity have an effect on the moisture removal from mushrooms and also on the drying time. Mathematical models in the study have also been proved to be useful for design and analysis of heat and mass transfer during drying processes. Meisami-asi et al. [14] experimentally investigated the moisture content of thin layer drying kinetics of apple slices in a convective dryer and the mathematical modelling was performed by using thin layer drying models in the literature. Drying characteristics of apple slices were determined using heated ambient air at temperatures between 40°C and 80°C, velocities at 0.5 m/s and thickness of thin layer 2, 4, 6 mm. The results showed that increasing drying air temperature resulted to shorter drying times. Among the investigated models, the Midilli model was found to be the best model for describing the drying curves of apples. Baronas et al. [15] modelled moisture movement in wood for two-dimensional in space formulation. The finitedifference technique was adopted in the study so as to obtain the solution of the problem. The model was applied to predict the moisture content in sawn boards from pine during long term storage under outdoor climatic conditions. The investigation result showed satisfactory agreement between the numerical solution and experimental data obtained. Triwahyudi et al. [16] investigated the effect of temperature and relative humidity on the equilibrium moisture content (EMC) of local cardamom and also suggested appropriate mathematical models using dynamic method for a laboratory air dryer at temperature of 40°C to 60°C and at relative humidity of 20% to 60%. The accuracy of the model (modified Henerson, modified Chung-Pfost, modified Oswin and modified Halsey) was evaluated by comparing the value of the coefficient of determination ( $\mathbb{R}^2$ ) and the value of the root mean square error ( $\mathbb{R}MSE$ ) between the experimental and the predicted value of EMC by using nonlinear regression analysis. The investigation showed that the modified Chung-Pfost equation has the ability to properly described EMC of local cardamom on a selected range of temperature and relative humidity.

\_Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

Saad et al. [17] determined and modelled desorption and adsorption equilibrium moisture isotherms of Ziziphus leaves using gravimetric-static method at 300C, 400C and 500C for water activity ranging from 0.057 to 0.898. At a given water activity, the results showed that the moisture content decreases with increasing temperature. After evaluating the models (GAB, BET, Henderson-Thompson, modified-Chung Pfost, Halsey, Oswin, Peleg, and Adam and Shove) according to several criteria, the Peleg and Oswin models were found to be the most suitable for describing the sorption curves.

Although, several studies have been investigated and experimented on palm kernel tree to develop models for energy content but no mathematical model investigations are devoted to moisture content. The intention of the present work is to develop an energy content predictive model and to investigate the influence of moisture content on the energy content of palm kernel tree for 10 years and 20 years respectively using regression method.

# Experimentation

In this study, palm trees which were completely uprooted and cut into the following samples namely, palm root, palm kernel shell, stem 1 (lower layer), stem 2 (upper layer), oil palm bunch, palm kernel and chaff were used. The samples were sun dried, pulverized, sieved and stored in respective sample labelled container. Moisture content analyses were carried out on the samples with the aid of petridish, spatula, beam balance, muffle furnace, desiccator and stop watch. The mass of the petridish were determined with the aid of a digital beam balance and recorded as  $w_1$ . The determination of the moisture content was carried out by adding 1.00g each of the powered sample of the palm tree of 20µm to the petridish and the mass was noted and recorded as  $w_2$ . The petridish containing the sample was heated in a muffle at 105<sup>0</sup>C for three hours and thereafter taken out, then allowed to cool at room temperature and weigh again which was recorded as  $w_3$ . The loss in mass represents moisture. The percentage moisture content (MC) was calculated using the relation in Eq. (1) [18] as shown on Table 1 and Table 2:

$$\% MC = \frac{w_2 - w_3}{w_2 - w_1} \times 100\% \tag{1}$$

where:

 $w_1$  is the mass of the petridish in grams;

 $w_2$  is the mass of the petridish with the sample in grams; and

 $w_3$  is the mass of the petridish with the sample after being heated in the oven in grams.

Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

| S/N | Sample(s)   | Mass of    | Mass of                | Sample                 | Mass of                    | %        |
|-----|-------------|------------|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|----------|
|     |             | Petridish  | Petridish +            | Mass (w <sub>2</sub>   | heated                     | Moisture |
|     |             | $(w_1)(g)$ | Sample                 | - w <sub>1</sub> ) (g) | sample with                | Content  |
|     |             |            | Mass (w <sub>2</sub> ) |                        | crucible (w <sub>3</sub> ) | (% MC)   |
|     |             |            | (g)                    |                        | (g)                        |          |
| 1   | Palm Root   | 31.5428    | 32.5428                | 1.0000                 | 32.4326                    | 11.02    |
|     |             | 31.5428    | 32.5428                | 1.0000                 | 32.4328                    | 11.00    |
| 2   | Palm Kernel | 30.4345    | 31.4345                | 1.0000                 | 31.3517                    | 8.28     |
|     | Shell       | 30.4345    | 31.4345                | 1.0000                 | 31.3515                    | 8.30     |
| 3   | Stem1       | 31.542     | 32.542                 | 1.0000                 | 32.3962                    | 14.58    |
|     | (Lower      | 31.542     | 32.542                 | 1.0000                 | 32.396                     | 14.60    |
|     | Layer)      |            |                        |                        |                            |          |
| 4   | Palm Frond  | 31.543     | 32.543                 | 1.0000                 | 32.4501                    | 9.29     |
|     |             | 31.543     | 32.543                 | 1.0000                 | 32.4500                    | 9.30     |
| 5   | Stem 2      | 30.5425    | 31.5425                | 1.0000                 | 31.3967                    | 14.58    |
|     | (Upper      | 30.5425    | 31.5425                | 1.0000                 | 31.3968                    | 14.57    |
|     | Layer)      |            |                        |                        |                            |          |
| 6   | Oil Palm    | 30.525     | 31.525                 | 1.0000                 | 31.4096                    | 11.54    |
|     | Bunch       | 30.525     | 31.525                 | 1.0000                 | 31.4096                    | 11.54    |
| 7   | Palm Kernel | 31.0025    | 32.0025                | 1.0000                 | 31.9365                    | 6.60     |
|     |             | 31.0025    | 32.0025                | 1.0000                 | 31.9364                    | 6.61     |
| 8   | Chaff       | 30.2545    | 31.2545                | 1.0000                 | 31.163                     | 9.15     |
| _   |             | 30.2545    | 31.2545                | 1.0000                 | 31.1628                    | 9.17     |

| ge 10 years |
|-------------|
|             |

# Table 2: Percentage of moisture for palm tree of age 20 years

| S/N | Sample(s)   | Mass of    | Mass of                | Sample                 | Mass of     | %          |
|-----|-------------|------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------|
|     |             | Petridish  | Petridish +            | Mass (w <sub>2</sub>   | heated      | Moisture   |
|     |             | $(w_1)(g)$ | Sample                 | - w <sub>1</sub> ) (g) | sample with | Content (% |
|     |             |            | Mass (w <sub>2</sub> ) |                        | crucible    | MC)        |
|     |             |            | (g)                    |                        | $(w_3)(g)$  |            |
| 1   | Palm Root   | 31.5428    | 32.5428                | 1.0000                 | 32.4327     | 11.01      |
|     |             | 31.5428    | 32.5428                | 1.0000                 | 32.4326     | 11.02      |
| 2   | Palm Kernel | 30.4345    | 31.4345                | 1.0000                 | 31.3515     | 8.30       |
|     | Shell       | 30.4345    | 31.4345                | 1.0000                 | 31.3516     | 8.29       |
| 3   | Stem1       | 31.542     | 32.542                 | 1.0000                 | 32.3961     | 14.59      |
|     | (Lower      | 31.542     | 32.542                 | 1.0000                 | 32.396      | 14.60      |
|     | Layer)      |            |                        |                        |             |            |
| 4   | Palm Frond  | 31.543     | 32.543                 | 1.0000                 | 32.45       | 9.30       |
|     |             | 31.543     | 32.543                 | 1.0000                 | 32.4498     | 9.32       |
| 5   | Stem 2      | 30.5425    | 31.5425                | 1.0000                 | 31.3964     | 14.61      |

International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology Studies

|            |                   |                |                 |               |                | e                 |
|------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------|
| <u>P</u> ı | ublished by Europ | ean Centre for | r Research Trai | ning and Deve | elopment UK (w | ww.eajournals.org |
|            | (Upper<br>Layer)  | 30.5425        | 31.5425         | 1.0000        | 31.3965        | 14.60             |
| 6          | Oil Palm          | 30.525         | 31.525          | 1.0000        | 31.4097        | 11.53             |
|            | Bunch             | 30.525         | 31.525          | 1.0000        | 31.4095        | 11.55             |
| 7          | Palm Kernel       | 31.0025        | 32.0025         | 1.0000        | 31.9363        | 6.62              |
|            |                   | 31.0025        | 32.0025         | 1.0000        | 31.9362        | 6.63              |
| 8          | Chaff             | 30.2545        | 31.2545         | 1.0000        | 31.1629        | 9.16              |
|            |                   | 30.2545        | 31.2545         | 1.0000        | 31.1629        | 9.16              |
|            |                   |                |                 |               |                |                   |

Vol.6, No.1, pp.16-25, August 2018

| S/N | Sample(s)      | Energy      | Energy    | Average     | Energy    | Energy   |
|-----|----------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|----------|
|     |                | (kCal/100g) | (kCal/100 | Energy      | (kCal/kg) | (kJ/kg)  |
|     |                | (1)         | g) (2)    | (kCal/100g) |           |          |
|     |                |             |           | (1+2)/2     |           |          |
| 1   | Palm Root      | 412.1       | 410.3     | 411.2       | 4112      | 17216.94 |
|     | Palm Kernel    | 453.2       | 451.5     | 452.35      | 4523.5    | 18939.89 |
| 2   | Shell          |             |           |             |           |          |
|     | Stem 1 (Lower  | 380.6       | 381.4     | 381         | 3810      | 15952.47 |
| 3   | Layer)         |             |           |             |           |          |
| 4   | Palm Frond     | 418         | 418.2     | 418.1       | 4181      | 17505.85 |
|     | Stem 2 (Upper  | 363.2       | 359.6     | 361.4       | 3614      | 15131.82 |
| 5   | Layer)         |             |           |             |           |          |
| 6   | Oil Palm Bunch | 391.8       | 389.7     | 390.75      | 3907.5    | 16360.70 |
| 7   | Palm Kernel    | 616.8       | 618.6     | 617.7       | 6177      | 25863.10 |
| 8   | Chaff          | 439.3       | 437.9     | 438.6       | 4386      | 18364.18 |

Table 3: Energy content of palm tree of age 10 years

| <br>Published by | <i>European</i> | Centre for | Research | Training | and Develo | pment U | JK ( <mark>ww</mark> | w.eajourna | als.org) |
|------------------|-----------------|------------|----------|----------|------------|---------|----------------------|------------|----------|
| •                | <u>^</u>        |            |          |          |            | ^       |                      | -          |          |

| S/N | Sample(s)      | Energy      | Energy      | Average     | Energy    | Energy   |
|-----|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|----------|
|     |                | (kCal/100g) | (kCal/100g) | Energy      | (kCal/kg) | (kJ/kg)  |
|     |                | (1)         | (2)         | (kCal/100g) |           |          |
|     |                |             |             | (1+2)/2     |           |          |
| 1   | Palm Root      | 412.2       | 411.4       | 411.8       | 4118      | 17242.07 |
|     | Palm Kernel    | 452.5       | 451.4       | 451.95      | 4519.5    | 18923.15 |
| 2   | Shell          |             |             |             |           |          |
|     | Stem 1 (Lower  | 380.8       | 381.6       | 381.2       | 3812      | 15960.84 |
| 3   | Layer)         |             |             |             |           |          |
| 4   | Palm Frond     | 418.2       | 418.4       | 418.3       | 4183      | 17514.22 |
|     | Stem 2 (Upper  | 363.2       | 361         | 362.1       | 3621      | 15161.13 |
| 5   | Layer)         |             |             |             |           |          |
| 6   | Oil Palm Bunch | 391.2       | 390.1       | 390.65      | 3906.5    | 16356.52 |
| 7   | Palm Kernel    | 617.4       | 617.6       | 617.5       | 6175      | 25854.73 |
| 8   | Chaff          | 440         | 438.2       | 439.1       | 4391      | 18385.12 |

 Table 4: Energy content of palm tree of age 20 years

# **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

## **Regression model**

The model of predicted energy content,  $E_c$ , against the average percentage moisture content,  $MC_A$ , can be expressed as Eq. (1).

$$E_c = \alpha + \beta M C_A \tag{2}$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are model parameters.

By considering the energy content of the palm tree samples for 10 years and 20 years, Eq. (2) can be written as:

$$E_{c10years} = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 M C_{A10years} \tag{3}$$

$$E_{c20years} = \alpha_1 + \beta_2 M C_{A20years} \tag{4}$$

The model parameters in Eq. (3) and Eq. (4) were evaluated by using ordinary least square technique.

| Table 5: | Average | moisture | content | percentage | for palm | tree of | age 10 | years |
|----------|---------|----------|---------|------------|----------|---------|--------|-------|
|          | 0       |          |         | 1 0        |          |         | 0      | •     |

|           | Palm  |      |        | Palm  |        |       |      |       |
|-----------|-------|------|--------|-------|--------|-------|------|-------|
| Sample(s) | Root  | PKS  | Stem 1 | Frond | Stem 2 | OPB   | PK   | Chaff |
| Average % |       |      |        |       |        |       |      |       |
| MC        | 11.01 | 8.29 | 14.59  | 9.29  | 14.57  | 11.54 | 6.61 | 9.16  |

Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

|           | Palm  |      |        | Palm  |        |       |      |       |
|-----------|-------|------|--------|-------|--------|-------|------|-------|
| Sample(s) | Root  | PKS  | Stem 1 | Frond | Stem 2 | OPB   | РК   | Chaff |
| Average % |       |      |        |       |        |       |      |       |
| MC        | 11.02 | 8.30 | 14.60  | 9.31  | 14.61  | 11.54 | 6.63 | 9.16  |

Table 6: Average moisture content percentage for palm tree of age 20 years

The data presented in Table 3, Table 4, Table 5 and Table 6 was used for developing the regression models. Accordingly, Eq. (5) and Eq. (6) was obtained for estimating the energy content in kJ/kg.

| $E_{c10years} = 28268.122 - 950.036 M C_{A10years}$ | (5) |
|---|-----|
|   |     |

$$E_{c20years} = 28231.081 - 944.592MC_{A20years} \tag{6}$$

## Table 7: ANOVA analysis of palm tree of age 10 years

| Source of  |             |    |             |       |      |  |  |  |
|--|-------------|----|-------------|-------|------|--|--|--|
| variation  | SS          | df | MS          | F     | Sig. |  |  |  |
| Regression   | 52141468.51 | 1  | 52141468.51 | 11.83 | 0.01 |  |  |  |
| Residual   | 26443639.24 | 6  | 4407273.20  |       |      |  |  |  |
| Total  | 78585107.75 | 7  |             |       |      |  |  |  |
| Fable 8: ANOVA analysis of palm tree of age 20 years |             |    |             |       |      |  |  |  |
|  |             | 10 | MC          |       | с.   |  |  |  |

| Source of variation | SS          | df | MS          | F     | Sig. |
|---------------------|-------------|----|-------------|-------|------|
| Regression          | 51671801.56 | 1  | 51671801.56 | 11.69 | 0.01 |
| Residual            | 26510104.52 | 6  | 4418350.75  |       |      |
| Total               | 78181906.08 | 7  |             |       |      |
|                     |             |    |             |       |      |



Fig. 1: Comparison of experimental and predicted values of energy content of palm tree of age 10 years by regression model

\_Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)



Fig. 2: Comparison of experimental and predicted values of energy content of palm tree of age 20 years by regression model

In order to determine the influence of the moisture content on the energy content, ANOVA was employed. The results of the ANOVA are presented in Table 7 and Table 8. Based on the F-ratio of the predictive models and that of the experimental results, the model was found to be adequate and sufficient. The experimental and predicted values of the regression models are depicted in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2. It is obvious from Fig.1 and Fig. 2 that there is a close agreement between the experimental values and that of the predicted values.

## CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, a predictive mathematical model for determining the energy contents was developed for moisture content of palm tree of 10 years and 20 years respectively and the following conclusions were drawn from this experimental investigation:

- (i) The energy content increases with decrease in the moisture content;
- (ii) The energy content was found to be largely influenced by the samples with the lowest moisture content; and
- (iii) On the basis of statistical parameters, it was concluded that the ANOVA results confirm that the regression models is adequate and is capable to predict the energy content.

## REFERENCES

[1] Abdullah, N., & Sulaiman, F., (2013). Biomass now-sustainable growth and use. http://dx.doi.org/10.5772/55302 \_Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

- [2] Zwart, R., (2013). Opportunities and challenges in the development of a viable Malaysian palm oil biomass industry. Journal of Oil Palm & The Environment, (4), 41-46, doi:10.5366/jope.2013.05
- [3] Okoroigwe, E.C., Saffron, C.M., & Kamdem, P.D., (2014). Characterization of palm kernel shell for materials reinforcement and water treatment. Journal of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science, 5(11), 1-6, doi:10.5897/JCEMS2014.0172
- [4] Mahmood, W.M.F.W., Ariffin, M.A., Harun, Z., Md-Ishak, N.A.I., Ghani, J.A., & Ab-Rahman, M.N., (2015). Characterisation and potential use of biochar from gasified oil wastes. Journal of Engineering Science and Technology, Special Issue 6, 45-54,
- [5] Mohammed, M.A.A.; Salmiaton, A.; Azlina, W.A.K.G.W.; Amran, M.S.M.; and Fakhru, A. (2011). Air gasification of empty fruit bunch for hydrogenrich gas production in a fluidized-bed reactor. *Energy Conversion Managment*, 52(2), 1555-1561.
- [6] Fauzianto, R., (2014). Implementation of bioenergy from palm oil waste in Indonesia. Journal of Sustainable Development Studies, 5(1), 100-115
- [7] Ugwu, K.E., & Agbo, K.E., (2011). Briquetting of palm kernel shell. J. appl. Sci. Environ. Manage., 15(3), 447-450
- [8] Luangwilai, T., Sidhu, H.S., Nelson, M.I., & Chen, X.D., (2011). Modelling the effects of moisture content in compost plies. CHEMECA: Australian Chemical Engineering Conference Australia: Engineers Australia
- [9] Mariem, S.B., & Mabrouk, S.B., (2014). Drying characteristics of tomatoes slices and mathematical modelling. International Journal of Energy Engineering, 4(2A), 17-24
- [10] Chayjan, R.A., & Esna-Ashari, M., (2011). Effect of moisture content on thermodynamic characteristics of grape: mathematical and artificial neural network modelling. Czech J. Food Sci. 29(3), 250-259
- [11] Yan, Z., Sousa-Gallagher, M.J., & Oliveira, F.A.R., (2008). Mathematical modelling of the kinetic of quality deterioration of intermediate moisture content banana during storage. Journal of Food Engineering, (84), 359-367
- [12] Sridhar, D., & Madhu, G.M., (2015). Drying kinetics and mathematical modelling of casuarinas equisetifolia wood chips at various temperatures. Periodica Polytechnica Chemical Engineering, 59(4), 288-295
- [13] Sagia, A.S., & Fragkou, D.V., (2015). Influence of drying conditions and mathematical models on the drying curves and the moisture diffusivity of mushrooms. Journal of Thermal Engineering, Yildiz Technical University Press, Istanbul, Turkey, 1(4), 236-244
- [14] Meisami-asi, E., Rafiee, S., Keyhani, A., & Tabatabaeefar, A., (2009). Mathematical modelling of moisture content of apple slices (Var. Golab) during drying. Pakistan Journal of Nutrition, 8(6), 804-809
- [15] Baronas, R., Ivanauskas, F., Juodeikiene, I., & Kajalavicius, A., (2001). Modelling of moisture movement in wood during outdoor storage. Nonlinear Analysis: Modelling and Control, 6(2), 3-14
- [16] Triwahyudi, S., Rahardjo, B., Nelwan, L.O., & Wulandani, D., (2015). Mathematical modelling of equilibrium moisture content of local cardamom (Amomum carddamomum wild). International Journal of Scientific Engineering and Technology, 4(2), 40-44
- [17] Saad, A., Touati, B., Draouci, B., Tabti, B., Abdenebi, A., & Benaceur, S., (2014). Mathematical modelling of moisture sorption isotherms and determination of isosteric

International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology Studies

Vol.6, No.1, pp.16-25, August 2018

Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

heats of sorption of Ziziphus leaves. Modelling and Simulation in Engineering, 1-18, <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2014/427842</u>

[18] Gupta, O. P. (2010). Element of fuel and Refractories, pp 35 - 36, 73 - 75