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#### Abstract

Vitamin C content in citrus juices processed in Florida was studied. A total of 2299 samples from February 1986 through October 1995 ( 908 frozen concentrated orange juices, 401 orange juices from concentrate, 319 pasteurized orange juices, 213 pasteurized grapefruit juices, and 458 grapefruit juices from concentrate) were obtained from 21 Florida processors for analysis of vitamin C. Means, standard deviations of the means, and maximum and minimum values are presented for each product on the basis of milligrams of vitamin C per 100 mL of product. Variations are reported for month, year, and manufacturing plant for each type of juice.
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## INTRODUCTION

Since vitamin C (L-ascorbic acid) is one of the principal nutrients in citrus and highly related to quality changes during processing and storage, its content and stability are subjects of active study. Several reviews have been published that give discussions of many factors on variability in vitamin C contents of citrus fruits and their products (Nagy, 1980), analytical methods for the determination of vitamin C (Pachla et al., 1985), and the chemistry of ascorbic acid related to foods (Liao and Seib, 1988). Seasonal variabilities of nutrients included in Florida oranges (Harding et al., 1940) and in frozen concentrated orange juice product (Huggart et al., 1960; Ting et al., 1974) were investigated. However, many of these data were collected over 25 years ago before major changes occurred in cultural practices, types of juices, processing techniques, and packaging materials. Devastating freezes in Florida in the 1980s also contributed greatly to the varieties of oranges available for processing. Furthermore, blending with juices of non-Florida-grown oranges was not as prevalent as it is today. The Florida citrus industry, which accounts for nearly three-fourths of the U.S. citrus production, expects its citrus production to grow significantly over the next decade. Much of the Florida citrus crop is processed into juice products. In citrus juice products, frozen concentrated orange juice (FCOJ ) is orange juice concentrated in a high vacuum evaporator and frozen until needed. Orange juice from concentrate (OJ FC) refers to the juice prepared by reconstituting either frozen concentrate orange juice or concentrated orange juice for manufacturing. Pasteurized orange juice (POJ ) and orange (or grapefruit) juice from concentrate, major types of chilled juice in Florida, are single-strength, ready-to-serve juice which are kept refrigerated during distribution and sale to the consumer. This study was initiated to provide a guide for values and ranges of vitamin $C$ in commercially processed juices from Florida processing plants. This will be used for nutritional value and to respond to the concern regarding the validity of data in nutrient composition. An early part of this study including

[^0]minerals and other nutrients has been reported by our own group (Fellers et al., 1990, 1991). This paper presents a comprehensive, up-to-date study on the variation of vitamin C content in five major citrus juice products manufactured in Florida from 1986 to 1995.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

From February 1986 through October 1995, samples of orange juice products were obtained on a monthly basis from Florida processors and grapefruit juice products were obtained twice per month from November through J une. Samples were randomly selected by USDA personnel and delivered in the retail package to the Citrus Research and Education Center (CREC), Lake Alfred, FL, by Florida Department of Citrus employees. J uice samples were subjected to different treatments upon arrival at the CREC. Single-strength products were poured into pol yethylene bottles and frozen for analysis at a later date. (FCOJ) was reconstituted with 3 volumes of water using a precision pipet and water purified by a Milli-Q purification system (Millipore Corp., Bedford, MA) prior to placing in bottles on the day of analysis. Vitamin C was analyzed using the HPLC method devel oped by Lee and Coates (1987) and expressed as milligrams per 100 mL . The HPLC procedure was based on using a $\mathrm{C}_{18}$ column, a phosphatebuffered, aqueous mobile phase, and UV 245 nm detection. For this study, the ${ }^{\circ}$ Brix values for orange juice and grapefruit juice products were normalized on the basis of U.S. grade standards (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1982, 1983) and Florida standards (State of Florida, Department of Citrus, 1996) as follows: OJ FC and reconstituted FCOJ , 11.8; grapefruit juice (GJ ), 9.0; grapefruit juice from concentrate (GJ FC), 10.0; and POJ, 11.0. Statistical analyses including means, standard deviations of the means, and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were performed using SigmaStat PC software from J andel Scientific Software (San Rafael, CA). Differences between mean were evaluated using Duncan's multiple range test.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data in Table 1 summarize the mean, standard deviations, maximum, and minimum values expressed as milligrams per 100 mL . A total of 2299 juice samples from five different citrus products were analyzed over a 10-year period from February 1986 through October 1995. Results in Table 1 include samples from all types of retail packages. A majority of POJ samples are packaged in cartons, whereas OJ FC is more often

Table 1. Ascorbic Acid Data for Commercial Florida Processed Citrus J uice Products from February 1986 through October 1995a

|  | FCOJ | POJ | OJ FC | PGJ | GJ FC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| no. of samples | 908 | 319 | 401 | 213 | 458 |
| mean ${ }^{\text {b }}$ (\% DV) ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 43.9 (173.0) | 35.1 (138.4) | 40.9 (161.2) | 28.3 (111.5) | 34.1 (134.4) |
| SD | 5.5 | 7.0 | 7.1 | 5.5 | 5.1 |
| maximum (\% DV) ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 66.8 (263.3) | 58.7 (231.4) | 63.1 (248.7) | 41.5 (163.6) | 64.8 (255.4) |
| minimum (\% DV) ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 27.9 (110.0) | 18.6 (73.3) | 21.5 (84.7) | 13.8 (54.4) | 20.5 (80.8) |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Abbreviations: FCOJ , frozen concentrated orange juice; OJ FC, orange juice from concentrate; POJ , pasteurized orange juice; GJ FC, grapefruit juice from concentrate; GJ, grapefruit juice. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ Ascorbic acid values ( $\mathrm{mg} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) are based on normalization of ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{Brix}$ to 11.8 for OJ FC and FCOJ, to 11.0 for POJ, to 10.0 for GJ FC, and to 9.0 for GJ. c Percent daily value in 80 serving.


Figure 1. Distribution of vitamin C in OJ FC, POJ, and FCOJ from 1986 to 1995.


Figure 2. Distribution of vitamin C in GJ FC and GJ from1986 to 1995.
packaged in cans or in bottles. Also, almost all POJ is sold as a chilled product in the market, but some OJ FC is retailed at room temperature. In average vitamin C content in orange products, FCOJ was the highest followed by OJ FC and POJ. Grapefruit is generally lower in vitamin $C$ than orange fruits, which reflects the lower content in GJ products compared to vitamin C in orange juice products in Table 1. The POJ values do not necessarily represent the actual values as they
were adjusted to $11.0^{\circ} \mathrm{Brix}$. The lower ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{Brix}$ of GJ would account partly for some of the lower vitamin C values.

The data shown in parentheses in Table 1 represent values for the percent of daily value (DV) per 8 fl oz serving in the citrus juice products. Vitamin C was calculated as percentage of the reference daily intake (RDI) and expressed as percent of DV based on the Nutrition Labeling and Education Act of 1990. Percent

Table 2. Monthly Variation of Ascorbic Acid Values (Milligrams per $100 \mathbf{m L}$ ) from Processed Florida Citrus J uice Products for a 10-Year Period ${ }^{\text {a }}$

|  | J an | Feb | March | April | May | J une | July | Aug | Sept | Oct | Nov | Dec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FCOJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| no. of samples | 84 | 86 | 78 | 78 | 73 | 72 | 64 | 75 | 79 | 72 | 72 | 75 |
| mean | $45.3{ }^{\text {a,b }}$ | $45.4^{\text {a }}$ | $44.3{ }^{\text {a-e }}$ | $44.0{ }^{\text {a-f }}$ | 42.76-k | $42.2{ }^{\text {e-k }}$ | $42.7{ }^{\text {c-j }}$ | $44.6{ }^{\text {a-d }}$ | $42.7{ }^{\text {c-i }}$ | $43.6{ }^{\text {a-h }}$ | $43.8{ }^{\text {a-g }}$ | $44.7{ }^{\text {a }-\mathrm{c}}$ |
| SD | 5.6 | 5.6 | 6.1 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 5.9 | 5.7 | 4.5 | 5.2 | 6.0 | 5.3 |
| maximum | 61.4 | 65.9 | 61.2 | 56.8 | 51.5 | 53.2 | 54.0 | 66.8 | 57.2 | 59.4 | 60.6 | 57.9 |
| minimum | 32.7 | 32.5 | 34.2 | 34.2 | 30.7 | 33.1 | 27.9 | 32.6 | 28.5 | 33.8 | 34.6 | 29.0 |
| POJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| no. of samples | 29 | 28 | 27 | 22 | 29 | 33 | 20 | 31 | 26 | 26 | 24 | 24 |
| mean | $44.1^{\text {a }}$ | $43.2{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $38.4{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $34.3{ }^{\text {c }}$ | $30.9{ }^{\text {c-i }}$ | $29.8{ }^{\text {c-i }}$ | $32.9 \mathrm{c}-\mathrm{f}$ | 33.7c, ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | $31.8{ }^{\text {c-g }}$ | $33.2{ }^{\text {c-e }}$ | $31.6{ }^{\text {c-g }}$ | $37.6{ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| SD | 6.3 | 6.8 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 5.6 | 4.3 | 5.0 | 5.2 | 4.8 | 4.3 | 4.7 | 5.5 |
| maximum | 58.7 | 57.9 | 48.3 | 42.5 | 41.3 | 38.6 | 41.9 | 50.4 | 42.9 | 40.6 | 39.2 | 47.9 |
| minimum | 28.2 | 25.6 | 28.0 | 26.2 | 18.6 | 19.9 | 22.4 | 22.4 | 23.4 | 24.9 | 21.8 | 26.9 |
| OJ FC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| no. of samples | 28 | 36 | 29 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 36 | 34 | 41 | 35 | 31 | 38 |
| mean | $41.5{ }^{\text {a-e }}$ | $42.9{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $41.5{ }^{\text {a-f }}$ | $40.3{ }^{\text {a-h }}$ | $38.7^{\text {b-j }}$ | $40.7{ }^{\text {a-g }}$ | $38.1^{\text {b-k }}$ | $42.8{ }^{\text {a,c }}$ | $38.5{ }^{\text {b-k }}$ | $41.9{ }^{\text {a - }}$ | $39.6{ }^{\text {b-i }}$ | $44.6{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| SD | 9.0 | 6.7 | 7.9 | 6.2 | 6.6 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 6.4 | 7.3 | 6.7 | 6.5 | 7.2 |
| maximum | 63.1 | 54.7 | 58.6 | 52.8 | 54.4 | 51.1 | 48.5 | 58.5 | 53.1 | 55.5 | 55.4 | 58.1 |
| minimum | 23.5 | 24.9 | 26.4 | 27.3 | 21.8 | 28.0 | 24.8 | 23.5 | 24.3 | 21.5 | 27.4 | 24.9 |
| GJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| no. of samples | 34 | 36 | 33 | 27 | 25 | 21 | 3 |  |  |  | 11 | 23 |
| mean | $29.9{ }^{\text {a-c }}$ | $30.4{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $28.1{ }^{\text {a-e }}$ | $28.5{ }^{\text {a-d }}$ | $24.8{ }^{\text {d-f }}$ | $24.8{ }^{\text {d-f }}$ | 25.3 |  |  |  | $28.2{ }^{\text {a-c }}$ | $30.5{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| SD | 4.3 | 5.2 | 5.2 | 2.9 | 4.8 | 5.5 | 6.3 |  |  |  | 8.5 | 5.8 |
| maximum | 40.9 | 41.5 | 39.1 | 33.8 | 31.1 | 34.0 | 31.9 |  |  |  | 38.1 | 38.9 |
| minimum | 18.2 | 21.1 | 15.7 | 23.8 | 14.0 | 14.2 | 19.3 |  |  |  | 13.8 | 15.7 |
| GJ FC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| no. of samples | 53 | 63 | 57 | 69 | 64 | 67 | 2 |  |  |  | 34 | 49 |
| mean | $35.5{ }^{\text {a }}$ - | $36.5{ }^{\text {a,b }}$ | $35.0{ }^{\text {a-d }}$ | $31.7{ }^{\text {e,f }}$ | $32.0{ }^{\text {e,f }}$ | $32.3{ }^{\text {e }}$ | 30.4 |  |  |  | $35.2{ }^{\text {a-d }}$ | $36.6{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| SD | 3.9 | 7.0 | 5.4 | 3.5 | 4.7 | 3.2 | 0.4 |  |  |  | 4.5 | 4.7 |
| maximum | 43.3 | 64.8 | 52.3 | 39.9 | 41.5 | 38.2 | 30.7 |  |  |  | 43.5 | 45.0 |
| minimum | 26.4 | 20.5 | 24.8 | 21.2 | 22.3 | 22.4 | 30.1 |  |  |  | 25.4 | 22.3 |

a Means in the same row with the same letter are not significantly different ( $p>0.05$ ).
Table 3. Yearly Variations of Ascorbic Acid Values (Milligrams per $100 \mathbf{m L}$ ) from Processed Florida Citrus J uice Products for a 10-Year Period ${ }^{\text {a }}$

|  | 1986 | 1987 | 1988 | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FCOJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| no. of samples | 104 | 105 | 118 | 113 | 88 | 77 | 75 | 77 | 84 | 67 |
| mean | $42.1{ }^{\text {e }}$ | $43.5{ }^{\text {d }}$ | 41.9 e ,f | $40.9 \mathrm{e}^{-9}$ | $43.5{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $47.8{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $47.4{ }^{\text {a,b }}$ | $46.9^{\text {a-c }}$ | $46.1^{\text {b,c }}$ | $41.7^{-9}$ |
| SD | 7.9 | 5.0 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 3.2 | 4.6 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.6 |
| maximum | 65.9 | 59.4 | 57.9 | 66.8 | 60.6 | 61.4 | 56.3 | 55.0 | 55.0 | 50.2 |
| minimum | 27.9 | 32.9 | 33.1 | 29.8 | 34.4 | 36.8 | 38.2 | 36.6 | 34.8 | 33.0 |
| POJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| no. of samples | 11 | 16 | 18 | 23 | 24 | 30 | 55 | 44 | 49 | 49 |
| mean | $32.2{ }^{\text {b-i }}$ | $41.6{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $36.6{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $36.0{ }^{\text {a-e }}$ | $36.0^{\text {b-d }}$ | $34.3{ }^{\text {b-h }}$ | $36.1^{\text {b,c }}$ | $35.3^{\text {b-f }}$ | $35.2{ }^{\text {b-g }}$ | $31.7{ }^{\text {b,d-i }}$ |
| SD | 12.0 | 8.6 | 6.4 | 8.2 | 5.1 | 4.4 | 5.9 | 6.6 | 7.3 | 5.9 |
| maximum | 57.9 | 58.7 | 47.6 | 52.9 | 46.6 | 45.3 | 51.1 | 49.9 | 51.5 | 44.6 |
| minimum | 18.6 | 26.6 | 28.0 | 21.8 | 25.7 | 24.9 | 25.6 | 24.3 | 22.0 | 20.7 |
| OJ FC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| no. of samples | 36 | 62 | $56$ | $43$ | $54$ | 31 | $48$ | 35 | 22 | 14 |
| mean | $36.2{ }^{\text {i, , , m m }}$ | $43.8{ }^{\text {a,b }}$ | 38.8.i.k,l | 39.7 ${ }^{\text {b,d,f, } \mathrm{h}-\mathrm{k}}$ | 39.9 b,d,f, h, i | $43.5{ }^{\text {a,b }}$ | 42.1 ${ }^{\text {a,b,d,f-h }}$ | $43.4{ }^{\text {a-d }}$ | $43.2{ }^{\text {a,b,d,f }}$ | 37.3 ${ }^{\text {b,c,e,e,g, ij, I, m }}$ |
| SD | 9.1 | 7.3 | 7.4 | 6.0 | 5.7 | 5.6 | 5.0 | 5.8 | 7.5 | 6.9 |
| maximum | 58.6 | 58.5 | 54.7 | 50.6 | 55.4 | 63.1 | 56.2 | 55.2 | 54.4 | 45.9 |
| minimum | 21.8 | 30.2 | 21.5 | 24.9 | 26.4 | 33.0 | 31.3 | 26.5 | 24.9 | 26.0 |
| GJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| no. of samples | 17 | $15$ | 20 | $28$ | $13$ | $17$ | 30 | $27$ | $17$ | $29$ |
| mean | $32.1{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $30.5{ }^{\text {a - d }}$ | $30.7{ }^{\text {a,b }}$ | $29.7{ }^{\text {a-e }}$ | $30.6{ }^{\text {a-c }}$ | $28.0{ }^{\text {b-g }}$ | $24.1{ }^{1}$ | $27.5^{\text {b-h }}$ | $28.5{ }^{\text {a-f }}$ | $26.3{ }^{\text {c-i }}$ |
| SD | 4.4 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 3.8 | 4.6 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 4.8 | 4.5 | 4.6 |
| maximum | 39.5 | 39.0 | 41.5 | 37.2 | 38.9 | 40.9 | 35.8 | 35.9 | 34.1 | 35.4 |
| minimum | 25.7 | 23.7 | 24.8 | 21.8 | 22.1 | 15.7 | 14.0 | 13.8 | 18.5 | 15.7 |
| GJ FC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| no. of samples | 52 | 57 | 66 | 38 | 67 | 49 | 46 | 42 | 26 | 15 |
| mean | $35.9{ }^{\text {a-c }}$ | $30.7{ }^{-i}$ | $32.2{ }^{\text {e-i }}$ | $32.4{ }^{\text {e-h }}$ | $34.9{ }^{\text {b-d }}$ | $34.4{ }^{\text {b-f }}$ | $37.4{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $36.0{ }^{\text {a,b }}$ | $34.7{ }^{\text {a-e }}$ | $33.4{ }^{\text {b-g }}$ |
| SD | 8.4 | 5.5 | 4.8 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 2.2 | 3.2 |
| maximum | 64.8 | 47.7 | 45.8 | 40.1 | 43.1 | 43.3 | 46.3 | 42.3 | 38.2 | 40.1 |
| minimum | 22.3 | 20.5 | 21.2 | 26.5 | 24.9 | 27.3 | 31.8 | 27.4 | 30.7 | 29.4 |

${ }^{a}$ Means in the same row with the same letter are not significantly different ( $p>0.05$ ).
of DV was introduced as a reference value to replace the term "U.S. RDA", which was introduced in 1973 as a label reference value for nutrients in voluntary nutritional labeling. Mean values for the percent of DV for vitamin C in Florida processed citrus products are high enough, ranging from $111.5 \%$ to $173 \%$ of DV per 8 fl oz serving, to easily qualify as supplying 100\% of the DV of vitamin C as determined by the U.S. FDA (1992). F or the entire 10-year study, 98 samples of 2299 total juice samples (about 4.3\% of total sample size) were bel ow the $100 \%$ DV. By type, GJ had the largest number of samples below $100 \%$ DV, with 56 samples (26.3\%) falling below 100\% DV, 17 (5.3\%) for POJ , 16
(3.5\%) for GJ FC, and 9 (2.2\%) for OJ FC; no samples fell below $100 \%$ DV for FCOJ.

In the sample size for this study, FCOJ populated the largest proportion (39.5\%) in our samples, which could reflect the share in total citrus production from Florida citrus processors. On the basis of the Florida Citrus Processors Association statistical summary of the 19941995 season, FCOJ occupied $59.6 \%$ of the total production. By form, ready-to-serve juices displayed the greatest market growth, but FCOJ was still a major citrus product from Florida. Mean value for vitamin C in FCOJ for the 10-year period was $43.9 \mathrm{mg} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ and ranged from a maximum of $66.8 \mathrm{mg} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ to a
Table 4. Variations in Ascorbic Acid (Milligrams per 100 mL ) by Processing Plant in Processed Florida Citrus Juice Products for February 1986 through October 1995 a

|  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | 1 | J | K | L | M | N | 0 | P | Q | R | S | T | U |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FCOJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| no. of samples |  | 7 | 32 | 86 | 51 | 64 | 102 | 22 |  | 4 | 99 | 86 | 5 |  | 83 | 2 | 2 | 33 | 104 | 60 | 14 |
| mean | 45.0a, | 47.7a | 40.89,n-r | $44.2{ }^{\text {2a,b,e-g.i.k-m }}$ | $43.4{ }^{\text {a,e- } 9, k-k-n}$ | $45.6{ }^{\text {a,c-e }}$ |  | 39.79.p-5 |  | 39.5 | $45.7{ }^{\text {a-c }}$ | 43.00.f.g,m-0 | 45.0a,ce-9 |  | 45.00., ee- | 42.5 | 45.8 | 8 42.09, i - | $44.88^{\text {a,ce-g.i-k }}$ | 40.19.p-s | s $42.88^{\text {a a,b,d,f-n, }, 1-n, p}$ |
| SD | 5.7 | 6.8 | 6.2 | 5.0 | 4.2 | 6.6 | 5.3 | 5.2 |  | 4.6 | 5.1 | 3.9 | 13.9 |  | 5.8 |  | 13.2 | 25.1 | 5.3 | 4.4 | 4.5 |
| maximum | 57.9 | 57.0 | 65.9 | 56.0 | 53.4 | 66.8 | 58.3 | 51.1 |  | 45.8 | 59.4 | 51.5 | 59.2 |  | 56.5 | 43.7 | 55.1 | 153.7 | 59.1 | 49.2 | 53.2 |
| minimum | 33.0 | 39.4 | 29.8 | 33.1 | 36.6 | 33.6 | 33.0 | 30.3 |  | 35.0 | 33.4 | 32.6 | 27.9 |  | 29.0 | 41.3 | 36.4 | 430.7 | 28.5 | 31.6 | 37.6 |
| POJ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| no. of samples | 2 | 3 | 46 |  | 37 | 46 |  |  |  | 3 | 38 | 1 |  | 17 | 126 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mean | 31.7 | 43.9 | 30.9 |  | $36.7{ }^{\text {ab }}$ | $33.7{ }^{\text {a-d }}$ |  |  |  | 33.4 | 35.88-d | 24.9 |  | $37.2^{\text {a }}$ | $36.3{ }^{\text {a-c }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SD | 6.6 | 8.2 | 5.7 |  | 4.3 | 7.2 |  |  |  | 11.4 | 7.0 | 0.0 |  | 10.4 | 6.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| maximum | 36.4 | 49.5 | 44.1 |  | 47.9 | 51.8 |  |  |  | 46.6 | 51.5 | 24.9 |  | 58.7 | 57.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| minimum | 27.0 | 34.5 | 20.7 |  | 29.0 | 23.1 |  |  |  | 26.2 | 21.8 | 24.9 |  | 21.2 | 18.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OJ FC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| no. of samples | 1 | 15 |  |  |  | 36 |  | 4 | 17 | 70 | 66 | 81 |  | 85 | 2 | 1 |  | 23 |  |  |  |
| mean | 39.8 | $43.1{ }^{\text {a-c }}$ |  |  |  | 42.2 ${ }^{\text {a }, \text { b, }}$ |  | 39.4 | $42.1{ }^{1-\mathrm{c}}$ | $40.2{ }^{\text {b-e }}$ | $40.8{ }^{\text {b-e }}$ | e 36.3 |  | $45.1^{\text {a }}$ | 40.6 | 52.5 |  | $40.3{ }^{\text {b-f }}$ |  |  |  |
| SD | 0.0 | 7.4 |  |  |  | 6.1 |  | 9.4 | 8.2 | 7.1 | 7.4 | 5.8 |  | 5.7 | 2.7 | 0.0 |  | 4.7 |  |  |  |
| maximum | 39.8 | 53.4 |  |  |  | 54.7 |  | 53.1 | 55.2 | 58.6 | 55.5 | 53.6 |  | 63.1 | 42.5 | 52.5 |  | 50.4 |  |  |  |
| minimum | 39.8 | 27.6 |  |  |  | 26.8 |  | 31.8 | 24.8 | 21.5 | 24.3 | 21.8 |  | 30.2 | 38.7 | 52.5 |  | 32.1 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| no. of samples |  | 17 | 38 |  |  | 38 | 2 | , | 1 |  | 30 |  | 3 | 36 | 47 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mean |  | $31.0{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 23.4 |  |  | $28.2^{\text {a-d }}$ | 26.3 | 23.9 | 32.0 |  | 28.20-d |  | 30.9 | $30.7{ }^{\text {a-c }}$ | 29.6ab |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SD |  | 3.1 | 6.2 |  |  | 5.5 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 5.7 |  | 7.5 | 3.9 | 3.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| maximum |  | 39.0 | 35.9 |  |  | 37.7 | 29.7 | 23.9 | 32.0 |  | 39.0 |  | 39.5 | 41.5 | 35.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| minimum |  | 26.7 | 13.8 |  |  | 14.0 | 23.0 | 23.9 | 32.0 |  | 18.5 |  | 25.7 | 25.7 | 19.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GJ FC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| no. of samples | 1 | 19 |  |  |  | 62 |  | 3 | 23 | 53 | 44 | 60 | 5 | 100 | 85 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| mean | 36.2 | 29.9 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  | $34.6{ }^{\text {a-e }}$ |  | 28.7 | 33.3-f | $34.6{ }^{\text {a-d }}$ | $35.3{ }^{\text {a-c }}$ |  | 35.5ab | $36.0{ }^{\text {a,c }}$ | $33.33^{\text {b,d-9 }}$ | 30.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SD | 0.0 | 5.5 |  |  |  | 3.9 |  | 7.2 | 6.2 | 5.4 | 4.6 | 3.8 | 5.6 | 5.5 | 4.5 | 8.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| maximum | 36.2 | 43.7 |  |  |  | 45.0 |  | 33.7 | 52.0 | 52.3 | 49.5 | 39.0 | 41.0 | 64.8 | 45.8 | 38.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| minimum | 36.2 | 22.4 |  |  |  | 24.9 |  | 20.5 | 26.3 | 27.0 | 27.3 | 22.5 | 28.4 | 23.3 | 21.2 | 22.3 |  |  |  |  |  |

minimum of $27.9 \mathrm{mg} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$, but most samples ( $>35 \%$ of FCOJ ) fell within the range of $40-45 \mathrm{mg} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$, as can be seen in Figure 1.

Figure 1 shows the sampling distribution of vitamin C content based on 1628 orange juice products. OJ FC had a maximum of $63.1 \mathrm{mg} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ and a minimum of $21.5 \mathrm{mg} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$, with most samples ( $29.7 \%$ of the total sample) falling in the ranges of $40-45$ and $35-40 \mathrm{mg} /$ 100 mL (23.4\%), whereas POJ had a maximum of 58.7 $\mathrm{mg} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ and a minimum of $18.6 \mathrm{mg} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$, with the majority appearing in the ranges of 30-35 (30.7\%) and $35-40 \mathrm{mg} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ (24.1\%). The distribution of vitamin $C$ contents is not symmetrical about its mean values but showed a somewhat bell-shaped distribution for FCOJ and OJ FC as we draw a smooth curve that might appear in Figure 1. Its spread can be estimated by the value of its standard deviation, and POJ, which showed a nearly equal standard deviation compared to OJ FC, showed a large magnitude and somewhat different shape of distribution as we can draw from Figure 1. An explanation could bethat FCOJ and reconstitutes (OJ FC) can be blended to produce more uniform products throughout the season but POJ is processed on the basis of fruit availability, which could reflect the natural variability of vitamin C in fruits throughout the season.

Figure 2 shows the distribution of vitamin C content based on 671 GJ products for the 10-year period. GJ FC had a maximum of $64.8 \mathrm{mg} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ and a minimum of $20.5 \mathrm{mg} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$, with a majority of the samples (42.1\%) falling into the range of $30-35 \mathrm{mg} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$. A maximum of $41.5 \mathrm{mg} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ and a minimum of $13.8 \mathrm{mg} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ were noted in PGJ, with the highest number of samples ( $35.2 \%$ ) appearing in the range of $25-30 \mathrm{mg} / 100 \mathrm{~mL}$.

Table 2 presents monthly variations for each type of processed Florida citrus juice over the 10-year period. A significant ( $p<0.05$ ) amount of month-to-month variation in vitamin C content was found in all types of product. Vitamin C data in POJ and GJ in Table 2 could be an exact representation of oranges and grapefruit grown in Florida. Since considerable amounts of Brazilian and other non-Florida orange juices are currently used for blending in Florida, the vitamin C data in Table 2 could also represent values found in current blended juice products such as FCOJ and OJ FC in Florida processing. As an early study indicated (Ting et al., 1974), the variation of vitamin C in FCOJ was not of large magnitude. Trends of month-to-month variation in blended samples (FCOJ , OJ FC, GJ FC) were not very discernible, which is probably due to the common blending practices in the citrus industry. In POJ, there was a noticeable difference from month to month. POJ showed a higher level of vitamin C during the months of December through March, when vitamin C-rich Hamlin oranges were a major contributor to the orange juice market. Generally, the low values of vitamin C were found in POJ samples collected between May and J uly and probably reflected the use of large amounts of Valencia oranges, which possess lower amounts of vitamin C of the three major Florida sweet orange cultivars. A seasonal change was also noted in GJ with a decrease in vitamin C concentration as the season progressed. This observation is in agreement with that of an early study which indicated a seasonal decline of vitamin C content with maturity in some varieties of grapefruit (Harding, 1944). During the offseason from August to October, GJ samples were not available.

Data in Table 3 show variation in vitamin C by year for the 10-year period from February 1986 through October 1995. Significant differences ( $p<0.05$ ) in
vitamin C content were noted between production years for each type of juice. The variation by year between the highest and lowest amount was about $14.4 \%$ for FCOJ, 17.4\% for OJ FC, and 23.8\% for POJ. Florida experienced three freezes with damage to citrus trees during the course of this investigation. One indirect effect of the freezes has been the loss of mature Pineapple orange trees, which is one of three major orange varieties, from northern citrus-producing counties of Florida and the planting of young Ambersweet trees in more southern counties. Such varietal changes, regional changes, and age of the tree, as well as variations in the weather during the growing season, could probably affect year-to-year variation of vitamin C content in POJ but are less likely to affect blended products such as FCOJ or OJ FC.

Manufacturing plants can also contribute to the variation of vitamin C as is noted in Table 4. Initially, 17 different plants contributed FCOJ to the study. This number diminished to 10 plants as the study continued due to mergers, closing of plants, market trends, etc. This same market force change also decreased the number of OJ FC samples. For POJ, however, this trend was reversed, initially involving only 2 plants in 1986 and culminating in the participation of 7 plants in 1995. This is presumably due to the large change in market trend for the sale of POJ because of consumers' perceptions of improved convenience and "fresher" quality than concentrate. Consumers began to purchase more of the single-strength not from concentrate, which was reflected in the number of processors participating in the study over time. A similar trend in GJ FC and GJ was also observed, although GJ showed a decrease in the number of plants participating, dropping from 6 to 5.

The magnitude of differences in vitamin C contents between plants was significant. When the highest vitamin C level in FCOJ from plant B was compared to the lowest level at plant H, there was a 16\% difference. Only plants with five or more samples were considered for statistical evaluation. There are perhaps several factors responsible for plant-to-plant variation; major contributors to this variation could be the variety of fruit used in juice preparation and seasonal differences as pointed out by Fellers et al. (1991). The Hamlin orange, as previously noted, has a higher level of vitamin C, whereas the Valencia fruit possesses less vitamin C. Thus, a plant that utilizes more vitamin C-rich Hamlin fruit than average could produce higher vitamin C products. Grapefruit juices could be affected by the amount of early (higher vitamin C) or late season (lower vitamin C) fruit that is used by each plant. Also, geographic location of plants, types of cultivars, and the quality of fruits delivered for processing may also be reflected in these values.

In summary, the present study provides a considerable amount of information on vitamin C of citrus juices produced for 10 processing seasons in Florida. The data can also be used to estimate the vitamin C content in current blended products in Florida processing operations. The samples used in this study represent products collected at the point of manufacture and do not take into account any changes in vitamin C levels that might occur during marketing. Vitamin C retention can vary considerably depending on types of container in addition to market conditions. This survey indicates that about $95.7 \%$ of the total samples of citrus juice products processed in Florida could provide $>100 \%$ of DV for vitamin C per 8 fl oz serving at time of packing.
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