

1 **Monitoring texture and other quality parameters in spinach plants**
2 **using NIR spectroscopy.**

3

4 María-Teresa Sánchez^{a,*}, Irina Torres^a, Miguel Vega^a, Dolores Pérez-Marín^{b,*}

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 ^a *Department of Bromatology and Food Technology, University of Cordoba, Campus of*
14 *Rabanales, 14071 Córdoba, Spain.*

15 ^b *Department of Animal Production, University of Cordoba, Campus of Rabanales, 14071*
16 *Córdoba, Spain.*

17

18 **Corresponding authors. Tel.: +34 957 212576; fax: 34 957 212000*

19 E-mail addresses: teresa.sanchez@uco.es (M.T. Sánchez) or dcperez@uco.es (D. Pérez-
20 Marín).

21 **Abstract**

22

23 Green colour, texture and dry matter are important attributes to appreciate freshness and
24 quality in spinach. However, there is currently no fast, economical and non-destructive
25 method which allows producers to measure these parameters simultaneously in the plant,
26 in a matter of seconds. However, Near-infrared (NIR) spectroscopy might bridge this gap.
27 NIR spectra of intact spinach leaves and modified partial least square regression models
28 were developed for colour (a^* and b^*), texture (maximum fracture force, toughness,
29 stiffness and displacement) and dry matter. A calibration equation with a high prediction
30 performance was devised for dry matter content ($r^2_{cv} = 0.74$), while calibration models
31 for all the textural parameters analysed were considered suitable for screening purposes
32 ($r^2_{cv} > 0.6$). For colour-related parameters, the models allowed test samples to be rough
33 screened. We, therefore, suggest that the analysis of green colour, texture and dry matter
34 of spinach leaves *in situ* on the plant using NIRS technology could prove to be a valuable
35 tool for optimizing cultural practices such as fertilization and irrigation and to assess the
36 quality of the spinach leaves when harvested.

37

38

39 *Keywords:* Portable NIRS; *In situ* analysis; Spinach texture; MEMS instrument

40

41

42

43 **1. Introduction**

44

45 In horticultural products, quality is the sum of the characteristics, attributes and
46 properties that give the fruit or vegetable its food value. The relative importance of each
47 quality component depends on the product itself and on the use for which it is intended,
48 fresh vs. processed (Bruhn, 2002; Kader, 2002b).

49 Colour is among the chief attributes used to assess the commercial quality of a
50 horticultural product (Joseph et al., 2002). This is a physical concept that simultaneously
51 involves observer psychology, the physiology of vision and the radiant energy emitted by
52 the light source (Zelanski and Fisher, 1989). In the case of spinach, environmental factors,
53 primarily temperature, humidity and light intensity, are essential for colour development
54 (Fan et al., 2014). Optimum air temperatures for spinach growth range from 16 to 20°C;
55 low temperatures can damage the photosynthetic apparatus and thylakoid membranes and
56 can inhibit protein synthesis (Decoteau, 2000), while Gruda (2005) reported that an
57 increase in temperature during cultivation drastically alters plant development and
58 negatively influences crop quality. Other contributory factors include soil type (Liu et al.,
59 2016).

60 In fresh spinach, external colour is generally assessed visually, using standard
61 colour-charts specific to this vegetable (Kader, 2002b). One drawback to the subjective
62 appreciation of colour is that it is difficult to standardize; moreover, the shape, size and
63 other superficial characteristics of the product can influence the effect produced by a
64 colour on the observer (Francis, 1991). This method is also labour-intensive and time-
65 consuming and cannot be used for routine analysis, although nowadays, values such as
66 colour parameters L^* (from white to black or light to dark), a^* (from green to red) and b^*
67 (from blue to yellow) can be measured using digital colorimeters (Barrett et al., 2007).

68 Leaf texture is fast becoming another of the key parameters in spinach quality
69 control (Gutiérrez-Rodríguez et al., 2013). Senescence in vegetables is a degradation
70 process whereby the cell walls are broken down, leading to cell death; water and solids
71 are also released into the intercellular space, resulting in loss of texture (Toivonen and
72 Brummell, 2008). The texture of spinach is measured using a punch test technique, which
73 utilizes a rounded probe that distributes the force homogeneously across a given area.
74 From punch tests, force-displacement curves are generated and used to derive the
75 mechanical properties of the material being evaluated: these include firmness, toughness,
76 stiffness and displacement of the probe (Read and Sanson, 2003; Schopfer, 2006). The
77 degree of firmness is usually associated with ripeness, freshness, retention of good quality
78 and, therefore, with saleability, since firmness gradually declines during ripening and
79 subsequent shelf storage (Blankenship et al., 1997; Kader 2002a). Moreover, in this crop,
80 excessive nitrogen fertilization, which is generally used to achieve increased production,
81 causes a drop in cell wall strength due to rapid growth, diminished macro- and
82 micronutrient absorption and greater allocation of N to the cell wall (Reeve, 1970; Wright
83 and Cannon, 2001; Onoda et al., 2004).

84 Another texture-related parameter measured in spinach is water content, as an
85 indicator of succulence or turgidity (Kader, 2002b). Leafy vegetables are highly
86 susceptible to water loss after harvest.

87 In spinach, colour, texture and water content have traditionally been assessed
88 using destructive instrumental or sensory techniques (Conte et al., 2008; Gutiérrez-
89 Rodríguez et al., 2013), thus permitting the quality evaluation of only a small number of
90 samples from any given batch. To address this issue, numerous efforts have been made
91 over recent years to develop non-destructive, environmentally-friendly analytical
92 methods that will neither damage nor spoil the product, which can subsequently be sold

93 or used for other measurements (Nicolai et al., 2007; Saranwong and Kawano, 2007;
94 Teixeira Dos Santos et al., 2013; Yan and Siesler, 2018). Rapid and non-destructive
95 techniques permit the constant monitoring of spinach leaves directly on the plant and
96 enable action to be taken immediately when any deviation from the product standard is
97 observed at any point in the growing process.

98 Measuring the optical properties of food products has always been one of the most
99 successful non-destructive techniques for quality assessment and is able to provide a
100 number of quality readings simultaneously. In this area, NIR spectroscopy has shown
101 great potential for the non-invasive measurement of quality parameters in horticultural
102 products (Nicolai, et al., 2007; Sánchez and Pérez-Marín, 2011; Magwaza et al., 2012).
103 It combines fast, accurate measurement with considerable versatility, simplicity of sample
104 presentation, speed of data (spectrum) collection and low cost, making it one of the
105 approaches best suited to the needs of the horticultural sector (Walsh et al., 2000). The
106 technology is simple, so fewer errors are introduced than in conventional analytical
107 techniques (Osborne et al., 1993). Moreover, the use of NIR spectroscopy for quality
108 control and assurance purposes during spinach growth and in the fresh spinach industry
109 enables greater quantities of this vegetable to be analysed and also allows for large-scale
110 individual analysis. At the same time, NIR spectroscopy is a powerful tool for general
111 process monitoring in real time (De la Roza et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2017); this is of
112 particular interest for many agro-industrial applications such as quality control systems
113 or for making real-time decisions during spinach cultivation.

114 Hence, the objective of this study was to evaluate the feasibility of NIR
115 spectroscopy for predicting *in-situ* colour, texture and dry matter content of intact spinach
116 at harvesting using a low-cost miniaturised, handheld, near-infrared device based on

117 micro-electrical-mechanical system (MEMS) technology, ideal for measuring *in-situ* the
118 quality of the plants.

119

120 **2. Material and methods**

121

122 *2.1. Sampling*

123

124 A total of 149 spinach plants (*Spinacia oleracea* L, cv. 'Solomon', 'Novico',
125 'Meerkat' and 'Gorilla'), grown outdoors on different farms in the provinces of Cordoba
126 and Seville (Spain) were used in this study. The spinach plants were harvested during the
127 months of January, February and March 2017.

128 The harvested spinach was kept in refrigerated storage at 4°C and 85% RH until
129 the following day, when laboratory testing was performed. Prior to each test, the spinach
130 was allowed to reach room temperature. Both the NIR spectral acquisition and the
131 reference analyses were carried out using a single leaf chosen from each plant registered
132 (Gutiérrez-Rodríguez et al., 2013).

133

134 *2.2. NIR spectrum acquisition*

135

136 Spectra were collected on spinach leaves in reflectance mode (Log 1/R) using a
137 handheld MEMS spectrophotometer (Phazir 2400, Polychromix, Inc., Wilmington, MA,
138 USA). The instrument scans at non-constant intervals of approximately 8 nm across the
139 range of NIR wavelengths 1600–2400 nm, with a scan time per sample of 3 s. Instrument
140 performance was checked every 10 min, following the diagnostic protocols provided by
141 the manufacturer, and white reference measurement was carried out using Spectralon as

142 the reference. Using the MEMS-NIR instrument and in order to assess the spinach leaves
143 analysed, four spectral measurements were made on each spinach leaf in two locations
144 (distal and proximal), on both sides (right and left) of the leaf blade relative to the main
145 vein, on the adaxial side. In all evaluations the NIRS spectra were collected on blade
146 tissue without conspicuous veins. The average distance between measurements was 3 cm.
147 The four spectra were averaged to provide a mean spectrum for each plant.

148

149 *2.3. Reference data*

150

151 Leaf colour was measured with a Minolta CR-400 chroma meter (Konica Minolta
152 Sensing INC., Osaka, Japan), using illuminant C as an illuminant (Glowacz et al., 2015)
153 with an observation angle of 2° (CIE, 2004). Leaf colour changes were quantified for the
154 leaf chosen from each sample following the same procedure previously described for the
155 NIR spectra acquisition, in the a^* ($-a^*$ = greenness and $+a^*$ = redness) and b^* ($-b^*$ =
156 blueness and $+b^*$ = yellowness) colour space (Koukounaras et al., 2009).

157 Later, the leaves were analysed using the punch test to assess their textural
158 properties. This procedure involves forcing a probe of known cross-sectional area through
159 a section of a leaf, as described by Read and Sanson (2003). The punch test was conducted
160 at room temperature using a universal testing machine (Model 3343, Single column,
161 Instron Corporation, Norwood, MA, USA), fitted with a 1000N load-cell.

162 A 6 mm diameter probe was used to penetrate the spinach leaf, using a pre-test
163 speed of 2 mm s⁻¹, a test speed of 1 mm s⁻¹ when the probe came into contact with the
164 leaf and a post-test speed of 10 mm s⁻¹. Each leaf was placed between two clamped metal
165 plates with coinciding holes (area of 0.95 cm²) to keep the leaf flat. The probe moved a

166 standard distance of 8 mm. The clearance between the probe and the hole in the plates
167 was 0.15 mm, following the protocol of Gutiérrez-Rodríguez et al., (2013).

168 A force-displacement graph for each selected spinach leaf was generated from this
169 test and the fracture properties (1) maximum force required to puncture the leaf, (2)
170 toughness, (3) stiffness, and (4) the displacement of the probe necessary to fracture each
171 leaf were recorded. The maximum force was measured as the force needed to puncture
172 the leaf, toughness as the area under the force-displacement curve and stiffness as the
173 slope of that curve. Punch test measurements were performed at the same locations on
174 the leaf as for NIRS analysis. The four measurements were averaged to provide mean
175 data of the texture parameters selected for each plant.

176 Dry matter (DM) content was determined gravimetrically by desiccation at 105°C
177 for 24 h (AOAC, 2000), and the final dry weight was calculated as a percentage of the
178 initial wet weight.

179 Samples were analysed in duplicate and the standard error of laboratory (SEL)
180 was estimated from these duplicates (Table 2). All measurements were performed
181 immediately after NIRS measurements.

182

183 *2.4. Data analysis: definition of calibration and validation sets*

184

185 Prior to carrying out NIR calibrations, the CENTER algorithm included in the
186 WinISI II software package ver. 1.50 (Infrasoft International LLC, Port Matilda, PA,
187 USA) was applied to ensure a structured population selection based solely on spectral
188 information, for the establishment of calibration and validation sets (Shenk and
189 Westerhaus, 1991). This algorithm performs an initial principal component analysis
190 (PCA) to calculate the centre of the population and the distance of samples (spectra) from

191 that centre in an n-dimensional space, using the Mahalanobis distance (GH); samples with
192 a statistical value greater than 3 were considered outliers or anomalous spectra.

193 The CENTER algorithm was applied in the spectral region 1600–2400 nm. The
194 mathematical treatments SNV (Standard Normal Variate) and DT (De-trending) were
195 applied for scatter correction (Barnes et al., 1989), together with the mathematical
196 derivation treatment ‘1,5,5,1’, where the first digit is the number of the derivative, the
197 second is the gap over which the derivative is calculated, the third is the number of data
198 points in a running average or smoothing, and the fourth is the second smoothing (Shenk
199 and Westerhaus, 1995b; ISI, 2000).

200 Once spectral outliers had been removed (i.e., 4 of the original 149 samples), a set
201 consisting of 145 samples was used to build the calibration models. These samples were
202 selected following the method outlined by Shenk and Westerhaus (1991), using the
203 CENTER algorithm included in the WinISI software package to calculate the Global
204 Mahalanobis distance (GH). Samples were ordered based on the Mahalanobis distance to
205 the centre of the population, where three of every four were selected to be part of the
206 calibration set (N = 109 samples) and the test set was made up of the remaining 25% (N
207 = 36 samples).

208 Modified partial least squares (MPLS) regression (Shenk and Westerhaus, 1995a)
209 was used to obtain equations for predicting colour, texture and dry matter content. Six
210 cross-validation steps were included in the process in order to avoid overfitting (Shenk
211 and Westerhaus 1995a). For each analytical parameter, different mathematical treatments
212 were evaluated. For scatter correction, the standard normal variate (SNV) and detrending
213 (DT) methods were tested (Barnes et al., 1989). Additionally, four derivative
214 mathematical treatments were tested in the development of NIRS calibrations: 1,5,5,1;
215 2,5,5,1; 1,10,5,1; 2,10,5,1 (Shenk and Westerhaus, 1995b).

216 Best equations were selected according to the following statistics: coefficient of
217 determination for calibration (r^2_c), Standard Error of Calibration (SEC), coefficient of
218 determination for cross-validation (r^2_{cv}) and Standard Error of Cross-validation (SECV).
219 However, in order to standardize the SECV value; other statistic such as the Residual
220 Predictive Deviation (RPD_{cv}), calculated as the ratio between the standard deviation (SD)
221 of the calibration set to the SECV, was also calculated (Williams, 2001).

222 The best models obtained for the calibration set, as selected by statistical criteria,
223 were subjected to evaluation using samples not involved in the calibration procedure and
224 evaluated following the protocol outlined by Windham et al. (1989).

225

226 **3. Results and discussion**

227

228 *3.1. Population characterization*

229

230 Calibration and validation set characteristics, i.e. number of samples, mean, range,
231 SD, and CV for the parameters analysed, are shown in Table 1. Structured selection based
232 wholly on spectral information, using the CENTER algorithm, proved suitable, in that the
233 calibration and validation sets displayed similar values for range, mean and SD for all
234 study parameters; moreover, the ranges of the validation set lay within those of the
235 calibration set.

236 Table 1 shows how the parameters with the greatest variability were those linked
237 to leaf texture (CV for calibration = 58.52–77.85%; CV for validation = 58.80–81.76%),
238 while the parameters with the least variability were those related to colour (CV for
239 calibration = 10.57–15.44%; CV for validation = 9.22–12.26%), because, as shown in

240 Table 1, the SD values for the colour parameters are negligible compared to their mean
241 value, due to the great uniformity in colouration shown by the plants analysed.

242

243 *3.2. Prediction of quality parameters using MPLS regression and NIR spectra*

244

245 Table 2 shows the results of the best prediction models obtained for each
246 parameter analysed (colour, texture and dry matter content) using different pre-treatments
247 of the spectral signal. For each of the parameters studied, a total of 4 calibration models
248 were obtained, the best of which was selected by statistical criteria: priority was given to
249 those with lower SECV and CV values and higher r^2_{cv} and RPD_{cv} values.

250 As regards the predictive capacity of the models designed for colour, it is worth
251 noting that for parameter a* (green-red variation), the model ($r^2_{cv} = 0.47$; $RPD_{cv} = 1.36$)
252 allowed spinach leaves to be separated into high and low values, as indicated by Shenk
253 and Westerhaus (1996) and Williams (2001). It is also important to note that the plants
254 were mature and ready for sale, with their characteristic deep-green leaf colour and with
255 parameter a* showing a low standard deviation.

256 Fearn (2014) points out, while the r^2_{cv} statistic can be a useful measure of the
257 performance of a calibration, it does have its limitations. One major constraint is its
258 dependence on the range of values of the calibration set, as well as on the standard
259 deviation (SD) of the reference values.

260 No articles have been found in the scientific literature which deal with using NIR
261 spectroscopy to measure this parameter in spinach, despite the fact that predicting the
262 colour parameter in this vegetable is of great importance, since it is a highly influential
263 parameter in consumer choice (Ferrante et al., 2004).

264 It should be stressed that the accuracy of the model obtained for parameter a^* is
265 limited, since the working range of the MEMS-NIR equipment does not include
266 wavelengths in the visible region, which is important when measuring parameters related
267 to colour, although the results do allow us to distinguish between two types of values for
268 parameter a^* measured *in situ* on the plant, which is particularly useful for spinach
269 growers. Greenness intensity related with parameter a^* in leafy vegetables is attributed to
270 chlorophyll pigmentation, which is a measure of the photosynthetic potential and of plant
271 productivity (Xue and Yang, 2009; Gilbert and Martin, 2015), as well as being a direct
272 measure of the nutrient status, because much of the leaf nitrogen is contained in
273 chlorophyll (Filella et al., 1995). Xue and Yang (2009) show that chlorophyll pigments
274 in green plants are gaining increasing importance in the human diet, not only as food
275 colorants, but also as healthy food ingredients, and so the *in-situ* measurement of
276 parameter a^* linked to the presence of chlorophyll would seem to be of major importance
277 when deciding on the best time to harvest spinach.

278 It is also important to note that during postharvest senescence, the green
279 chlorophyll pigments are oxidized into colourless substances, revealing yellow
280 carotenoids (Toivonen and Brummell, 2008), so the non-destructive measurement of
281 parameter b^* would be of great use when measuring the different stages of the plant's
282 senescence. Here, the model designed allows to distinguish between high and low values
283 of this parameter, following Shenk and Westerhaus (1996) and Williams (2001), which
284 shows that this model could be considered acceptable for screening purposes.

285 These colour measurements (a^* and b^*) can therefore be made using a rapid, non-
286 destructive hand-held sensor over the whole spinach plant, thus giving the farmers an
287 instant response and allowing the spinach harvest to be started at the optimum time.

288 Texture is an important point in the eating quality of spinach. The textural
289 properties can include several parameters, such as maximum force required to puncture
290 the leaf, toughness, stiffness and the displacement of the probe necessary to fracture each
291 leaf. All of these are closely correlated between each other, meaning that any of these
292 physical measurements could be effectively used for texture evaluation.

293 To measure parameters related to texture, the models developed for maximum
294 force to puncture the leaf ($r^2_{cv} = 0.67$; $RPD_{cv} = 1.72$), toughness ($r^2_{cv} = 0.62$; $RPD_{cv} =$
295 1.62), stiffness ($r^2_{cv} = 0.69$, $RPD_{cv} = 1.79$) and the displacement of the probe necessary
296 to fracture each leaf ($r^2_{cv} = 0.62$, $RPD_{cv} = 1.61$) allow to discriminate between low,
297 medium and high values for these parameters, following Shenk and Westerhaus (1996)
298 and Williams (2001).

299 The results obtained can be considered as satisfactory, given that various authors
300 (Pérez-Marín et al., 2007; Flores-Rojas et al., 2009) have already shown the difficulty and
301 complexity of predicting physical parameters related to texture in other vegetables.

302 As it has already been pointed out, the texture of a product is not a single, well-
303 defined attribute, but encompasses the structural and mechanical properties of a food item
304 and the sensory perception of that food in the hand or mouth (Abbott and Harker, 2016).
305 Generally, assessment of texture is based on the measurement of firmness, which is in
306 turn linked to the resistance of fresh produce to mechanical stress during transport and
307 distribution (Thompson, 2002).

308 However, the use of NIR spectroscopy allows us to measure not just one textural
309 parameter but several at the same time, which means that spinach texture can be better
310 defined, and measurements taken directly on the plant.

311 No references have been found in the scientific literature on measuring texture in
312 spinach leaves using NIR spectroscopy.

313 For the dry matter parameter, the calibration model showed a good predictive
314 capacity ($r^2_{cv} = 0.74$; $RPD_{cv} = 1.96$) when interpreting the coefficient of determination
315 and RPD_{cv} values, as proposed by Shenk and Westerhaus (1996) and Williams (2001).
316 The non-destructive measurement of this parameter *in situ* is, in fact, of great importance
317 both for growers and for the later handling of the post-harvest crop, since DM values of
318 around 10-12% fw ensure a good resistance to handling and allow maintenance of visual
319 quality at a high standard during storage (Conte et al., 2008). In addition, Bergquist et al.
320 (2006) have underlined the positive correlation between the high content of DM and
321 vitamin C at harvest time and the visual quality retention of spinach leaves during storage.
322 This again reveals the importance of measuring the DM content in a non-destructive way
323 in order to decide on the best time to harvest and ensure that the spinach has a high vitamin
324 content.

325 No publications have been found in the scientific literature which deal with using
326 NIR spectroscopy to measure this quality parameter in spinach. There are other studies
327 on the prediction of dry matter in leaves of other vegetables (Steidle et al., 2017), although
328 these leaves (sunflower) have very different characteristics to spinach leaves.

329

330 3.3. External validation

331

332 Validation statistics for the prediction of the quality parameters analysed in intact
333 spinach are shown in Fig. 1.

334 The models constructed for predicting all the textural parameters analysed, with
335 the exception of the displacement, and also for the prediction of dry matter in intact
336 spinach, met the validation requirements in terms of r^2_p ($r^2_p > 0.6$) and both the SEP(c)
337 and the bias were within confidence limits: the equations thus ensure accurate prediction,

338 and can be applied routinely. For the parameter ‘displacement of the probe necessary to
339 fracture the leaf’, it should be stressed that the SEP(c) and bias lay within the confidence
340 limits, although $r^2_p = 0.5$ did not attain the recommended minimum value.

341 However, the models predicted colour parameters in validation-set samples with
342 low values for r^2_p , in neither case meeting the recommendations of Windham et al.,
343 (1989). These models are thus not suitable for routine applications. The comparatively
344 low r^2_p value displayed for a* and b* may be due to the narrower range and lower SD
345 recorded for these parameters (Table 1). This is also clearly illustrated in Fig. 1, where it
346 is evident that the a* and b* exhibited by most samples lie in the ranges of -12–(-14) for
347 parameter a* and 16-20 for parameter b*, with very little coverage of the range for other
348 values. These results highlight the importance not only of ensuring a sufficient number
349 of samples in the calibration set, but also of guaranteeing the adequate distribution and
350 structure of the sample set.

351 The SEL values for the parameters tested are shown in Table 2. For the parameters: a*,
352 b*, maximum puncture force, toughness and stiffness, SEP fell between 3 and 4 SEL,
353 indicating acceptable performance of the NIRS models developed. For the displacement,
354 SEP fell between 2 and 3 SEL, showing good performance of the NIRS model and for
355 dry matter, SEP was between 1 and 2 SEL, showing excellent predictive capacity of the
356 NIRS model (Westerhaus, 1989, Williams, 2001).

357

358 **4. Conclusions**

359

360 It should be stressed that the NIR equations constructed should be regarded as a
361 first step in the fine-tuning of NIR spectroscopy for the *in situ* monitoring of quality
362 parameters in intact spinach. Given the general importance in the eating quality of spinach

363 and consumers' general acceptance of dry matter content and textural properties, the use
364 of the MEMS-NIR portable NIR device tested here, which is rapid, lightweight and user-
365 friendly, should be considered for use in the routine, non-destructive analysis of spinach
366 on the plant.

367

368 **Acknowledgements**

369

370 This research was under the research project 'Quality determination of spinach
371 grown in Santaella (Córdoba), funded by Gelagri Ibérica, S.L. The authors are grateful to
372 Mrs. M^a Carmen Fernández of the Animal Production Department for her technical
373 assistance. Furthermore, the authors wish to express their gratitude to the Spanish
374 Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports for the support offered to Irina Torres in the
375 form of the Training Programme for Academic Staff (FPU).

376

377 **References**

378

379 Abbott, J.A., Harker, F.R., 2016. Texture. In: Gross, K.C., Wang, C.Y., Saltveit, M.E.
380 (Eds.), *The Commercial Storage of Fruits, Vegetables, Florist, and Nursery Stock*,
381 *Agricultural Handbook 66*. Agricultural Research Service, Washington DC, pp.
382 89–110.

383 AOAC. 2000. *Official Methods of Analysis of AOAC International*, 17th ed. AOAC,
384 Gaithersburg, MD.

385 Barnes, R.J., Dhanoa, M.S., Lister, S.J., 1989. Standard normal variate transformation
386 and de-trending of near infrared diffuse reflectance spectra. *Appl. Spectrosc.* 43,
387 772–777.

388 Barrett, D.M., Weakley, C., Díaz, J.V., Watnik, M., 2007. Qualitative and nutritional
389 differences in processing tomatoes grown under commercial organic and
390 conventional production systems. *J. Food Sci.* 72, C441–C451.

391 Bergquist, S.Å.M., Gertsson, U.E., Olsson, M.E., 2006. Influence of growth stage and
392 postharvest storage on ascorbic acid and carotenoid content and visual quality of
393 baby spinach (*Spinacia oleracea* L.). *J. Sci. Food Agr.* 86, 346–355.

394 Blankenship, S.M., Parker, M., Unrath, C.R., 1997. Use of maturity indices for predicting
395 poststorage firmness of ‘Fuji’ apples. *HortSci.* 32, 909–910.

396 Bruhn, C.M., 2002. Consumer issues in quality and safety: Definition and evaluation for
397 fresh horticultural crops. In: Kader, A.A. (Ed.), *Postharvest Technology of*
398 *Horticultural Crops*, 3rd ed. Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources,
399 University of California, Oakland, CA, pp. 31–37.

400 CIE., 2004. *Colorimetry*, 3rd ed. Commission Internationale De L’Eclairage, Vienna:

401 Conte, A., Conversa, G., Scrocco, C., Brescia, I., Laverse, J., Eliba, A., Nobile, M.A.D.,
402 2008. Influence of growing periods on the quality of baby spinach leaves at
403 harvest and during storage as minimally processed produce. *Postharvest Biol.*
404 *Technol.* 50, 190–196.

405 Decoteau, D.R., 2000. *Vegetable Crops*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ.

406 De la Roza-Delgado, B., Garrido-Varo, A., Soldado, A., Arrojo, A.G., Valdés, M.C.,
407 Maroto, F., Pérez-Marín, D., 2017. Matching portable NIRS instruments for *in*
408 *situ* monitoring indicators of milk composition. *Food Control* 76, 74–81.

409 Fan, D., Kandasamy, S., Hodges, D.M., Critchley, A.T., Prithiviraj, B., 2014. Pre-harvest
410 treatment of spinach with *Ascophyllum nodosum* extract improves post-harvest
411 storage and quality. *Sci. Hort.* 170, 70–74.

412 Fearn, T., 2014. The overuse of R². *NIR News* 25, 32.

413 Ferrante, A., Incrocci, L., Maggini, R., Serra, G., Rognoni, F., 2004. Colour changes of
414 fresh-cut leafy vegetables during storage. *J. Food Agric. Environ.* 2, 40–44.

415 Filella, L., Serrano, L., Serra, J., Peñuelas, J., 1995. Evaluating wheat nitrogen status with
416 canopy reflectance indices and discriminant analysis. *Crop Sci.* 35, 1400–1405.

417 Francis, F.J., 1991. Color measurement and interpretation. In: Fung, D.Y.C., Matthews,
418 R.F. (Eds.), *Instrumental Methods for Quality Assurance in Foods* Marcel Dekker,
419 Inc., New York, NJ, pp. 189–206.

420 Flores-Rojas, K., Sánchez, M.T., Pérez-Marín, D., Guerrero, J.E., Garrido-Varo, A.,
421 2009. Quantitative assessment of intact green asparagus quality by near infrared
422 spectroscopy. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 52, 300–306.

423 Gilbert, A., Martin, D.E., 2015. *Experimental Organic Chemistry: A Miniscale and*
424 *Microscales Approach*. Cengage Learning, Boston.

425 Gruda, N., 2005. Impact of environmental factors on product quality of greenhouse
426 vegetables for fresh consumption. *Crit. Rev. Plant Sci.* 2, 227–247.

427 Glowacz, M., Colgan, R., Rees, D., 2015. Influence of continuous exposure to gaseous
428 ozone on the quality of red bell peppers, cucumbers and zucchini. *Postharvest*
429 *Biol. Technol.* 99, 1–8.

430 Gutiérrez-Rodríguez, E., Lieth, H.J., Jernstedt, J.A., Labavitch, J.M., Suslow, T.V.,
431 Cantwell, M.I., 2013. Texture, composition and anatomy of spinach leaves in
432 relation to nitrogen fertilization. *J. Sci. Food Agr.* 93, 227–237.

433 Hruschka, W.R., 2001. Data analysis: Wavelength selection methods. In: Williams, P.C.
434 Norris, K.H. (Eds.), *Near-Infrared Technology in the Agricultural and Food*
435 *Industries*. American Association of Cereal Chemists, Inc., St. Paul, MN, pp. 39–
436 58.

437 ISI. 2000. The Complete Software Solution Using a Single Screen for Routine Analysis,
438 Robust Calibrations and Networking. Manual, FOSS NIRSystems/Tecator.
439 Infrasoft International, Silver Spring, MD.

440 Joseph, J.A., Nadeau, D.A., Underwood, A., 2002. The Color Code: A Revolutionary
441 Eating Plan for Optimum Health. Hyperion Press, Ltd., New York.

442 Kader, A.A., 2002a. Postharvest biology and technology: An overview. In: Kader, A.A.
443 (Ed.), Postharvest Technology of Horticultural Crops, 3rd ed. Division of
444 Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of California, Oakland, CA, pp.
445 39–47.

446 Kader, A.A., 2002b. Quality and safety factors: Definition and evaluation for fresh
447 horticultural crops. In: Kader, A.A. (Ed.), Postharvest Technology of Horticultural
448 Crops, 3rd ed. Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of
449 California, Oakland, CA, pp. 279–285.

450 Koukounaras, A., Siomos, A.S., Sfakiotakis, E., 2009. Impact of heat treatment on
451 ethylene production and yellowing of modified atmosphere packaged rocket
452 leaves. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 54, 172–176.

453 Liu, X., Yang, X., Wang, L., Duan, Q., Huang, D., 2016. Comparative analysis of
454 metabolites profile in spinach (*Spinacia oleracea* L.) affected by different
455 concentrations of gly and nitrate. *Sci. Hort.* 204, 8–15.

456 Magwaza, L.S., Opara, U.L., Nieuwoudt, H., Cronje, P.J.R., Saeys, W., Nicolai, B., 2012.
457 NIR spectroscopy applications for internal and external quality analysis of citrus
458 fruit-a review. *Food Bioprocess Tech.* 5, 425–444.

459 Nicolai, B.M., Beullens, K., Bobelyn, E., Peirs, A., Saeys, W., Theron, K.I., Lammertyn,
460 J., 2007. Nondestructive measurement of fruit and vegetable quality by means of
461 NIR spectroscopy: a review. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 46, 99–118.

462 Onoda, Y., Hikosaka, K., Hirose, T., 2004. Allocation of nitrogen to cell walls decreases
463 photosynthetic nitrogen-use efficiency. *Funct. Ecol.* 18, 419–425.

464 Osborne, B.G., Fearn, T., Hindle, P.H., 1993. Practical NIR spectroscopy with
465 applications. In: Osborne, B.G., Fearn, T., Hindle, P.H., (Eds.), *Food and*
466 *Beverage Analysis*. Longman, Essex, pp. 11–35.

467 Pérez-Marín, D.C., Garrido-Varo, A., Guerrero-Ginel, J.E., 2007. Review. Non-linear
468 regression methods in NIRS quantitative analysis. *Talanta* 72, 28–42.

469 Read, J., Sanson, G., 2003. Characterizing sclerophylly: the mechanical properties of a
470 diverse range of leaf types. *New Phytol.* 16, 81–99.

471 Reeve, R.M., 1970. Relationships of histological structure to texture of fresh and
472 processed fruits and vegetables. *J. Texture Stud.* 1, 247–284.

473 Sánchez, M.T., Pérez-Marín, D., 2011. Nondestructive measurement of fruit quality by
474 NIR spectroscopy. In: Vázquez, M., Ramírez, J.A. (Eds.), *Advances in Post-*
475 *Harvest Treatments and Fruit Quality and Safety*. Nova Science Publishers, Inc.,
476 Hauppauge, NY, pp. 101-163.

477 Saranwong, S., Kawano, S., 2007. Applications to agricultural and marine products: fruits
478 and vegetables. In: Ozaki, Y., McClure, W.F., Christy, A.A. (Eds.). *Near-Infrared*
479 *Spectroscopy in Food Science and Technology*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., NJ, pp.
480 219–242.

481 Schopfer, P., 2006. Biomechanics of plant growth. *Am. J. Bot.* 93, 1415–1425.

482 Shenk, J.S., Westerhaus, M.O., 1991. Population structuring of near infrared spectra and
483 modified partial least squares regression. *Crop Sci.* 31, 1548–1555.

484 Shenk, J.S., Westerhaus, M.O., 1995a. *Analysis of Agriculture and Food Products by*
485 *Near Infrared Reflectance Spectroscopy*. Monograph. NIRSystems Inc., Silver
486 Spring, MD.

487 Shenk, J.S., Westerhaus, M.O., 1995b. Routine Operation, Calibration, Development and
488 Network System Management Manual. NIRSystems Inc., Silver Spring, MD.

489 Shenk, J.S., Westerhaus, M.O., 1996. Calibration the ISI way. In: Davies, A.M.C.,
490 Williams, P.C. (Eds.), *Near Infrared Spectroscopy: The Future Waves*. NIR
491 Publications, Chichester, pp. 198–202.

492 Steidle, A.J., Lopes, D.C., Pinto, F.A.C., Zolnier, S., 2017. Vis/NIR spectroscopy and
493 chemometrics for non-destructive estimation of water and chlorophyll status in
494 sunflower leaves. *Biosyst. Eng.* 155, 124–133.

495 Teixeira Dos Santos, C., Lopo, M., Páscoa, R.N.M.J., Lopez, J.A., 2013. Review on the
496 applications of portable near-infrared spectrometers in the agro-food industry.
497 *Appl. Spectrosc.* 67, 1215–1233.

498 Thompson, J.F. 2002. Transportation. In: Kader, A.A. (Ed.), *Postharvest Technology of*
499 *Horticultural Crops*, 3rd ed. Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources,
500 University of California, Oakland, CA, pp. 259–269.

501 Toivonen, P.M.A., Brummell, D.A., 2008. Biochemical bases of appearance and texture
502 changes in fresh-cut fruit and vegetables. *Postharvest Biol. Technol.* 48, 1–14.

503 Walsh, K.B., Guthrie, J., Burney, J., 2000. Application of commercially available, low
504 cost, miniaturized NIR spectrometers to the assessment of the sugar content of
505 intact fruit. *Aust. J. Plant Physiol.* 27, 1175–1186.

506 Williams, P.C., 2001. Implementation of near-infrared technology. In: Williams, P.C.,
507 Norris, K.H. (Eds.), *Near-Infrared Technology in the Agricultural and Food*
508 *Industries*. AACC, Inc., St. Paul, Minnesota, pp. 145–171.

509 Windham, W.R., Mertens, D.R., Barton II, F.E., 1989. Protocol for NIRS calibration:
510 sample selection and equation development and validation. In: Martens, G.C.,
511 Shenk, J.S., Barton, F.E. (Eds.), *Near Infrared Spectroscopy (NIRS): Analysis of*

512 Forage Quality. Agriculture Handbook, vol. 643. Government Printing Office,
513 Washington, D.C.

514 Wright, I.J., Cannon, K., 2001. Relationships between leaf lifespan and structural
515 defences in a low-nutrient, sclerophyll flora. *Funct. Ecol.* 15, 351–359.

516 Xue, L.H., Yang, L.Z., 2009. Deriving leaf chlorophyll content of green-leafy vegetables
517 from hyperspectral reflectance. *J. Photogramm. Remote Sens.* 64, 97–106.

518 Yan, H., Siesler, H.W., 2018. Hand-held near-infrared spectrometers: State-of-the-art
519 instrumentation and practical applications. *NIR news* 29, 1–15.

520 Zhang, Y., Luo, L., Li, J., Li, S., Qu, W., Ma, H., Ye, X., 2017. In-situ and real-time
521 monitoring of enzymatic process of wheat gluten by miniature fiber NIR
522 spectrometer. *Food Res. Int.* 99, 147–154.

523 Zelanski, P., Fisher, M.P., 1989. *Color*. Prentice Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

524

525

526

527 **Table 1.**

528 Range, mean, standard deviation (SD) and coefficient of variation (CV) for the
529 parameters of colour, texture and dry matter content studied in the calibration and
530 validation sets

Parameter	Set	N	Range	Mean	SD	CV (%)
a*	Calibration	109	-18.33–(-8.66)	-13.05	1.38	10.57
	Validation	36	-17.32–(-10.78)	-13.34	1.23	9.22
b*	Calibration	109	11.55–26.40	17.94	2.77	15.44
	Validation	36	13.77–23.02	17.94	2.20	12.26
Maximum puncture force (N)	Calibration	109	0.20–4.98	1.98	1.29	65.15
	Validation	36	0.37–4.51	1.99	1.37	68.84
Toughness (mJ)	Calibration	109	0.16–10.79	2.98	2.32	77.85
	Validation	36	0.38–8.73	3.18	2.60	81.76
Stiffness (N/mm)	Calibration	109	0.09–1.30	0.55	0.34	61.81
	Validation	36	0.09–1.03	0.52	0.33	63.46
Displacement (mm)	Calibration	109	0.32–6.58	2.58	1.51	58.52
	Validation	36	0.57–6.05	2.67	1.57	58.80
Dry matter content (% fw)	Calibration	109	6.14–19.67	12.50	3.10	24.80
	Validation	36	7.35–18.83	12.60	2.91	23.09

531
532

533 **Table 2.**

534 Statistics of best calibration models to predict colour, texture and dry matter content and
 535 standard error of laboratory

Parameter	Mathematic treatment	N	Range	Mean	SD	r^2_{vc}	SECV	RPD _{cv}	SEL
a*	2,10,5,1	108	-18.33-(-8.66)	-13.06	1.38	0.47	1.01	1.36	0.29
b*	1,5,5,1	105	11.55-25.71	17.89	2.56	0.38	2.02	1.26	0.62
Maximum puncture force (N)	2,5,5,1	105	0.20-4.62	1.93	1.26	0.67	0.73	1.72	0.23
Toughness (mJ)	2,5,5,1	107	0.16-10.79	2.92	2.26	0.62	1.39	1.62	0.44
Stiffness (N/mm)	2,5,5,1	105	0.09-1.30	0.55	0.34	0.69	0.19	1.79	0.06
Displacement (mm)	2,5,5,1	103	0.32-6.58	2.54	1.50	0.62	0.93	1.61	0.51
Dry matter content (% fw)	2,5,5,1	105	6.14-19.67	12.43	2.98	0.74	1.52	1.96	0.90

536

537

538 **Fig. 1.** Reference values *versus* NIR-predicted data for the validation set.

539



