

Production of milk foams by steam injection: the effects of steam pressure and nozzle design

Article

Accepted Version

Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0

Jimenez-Junca, C., Sher, A., Gummy, J.-C. and Niranjana, K.
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6525-1543> (2015)
Production of milk foams by steam injection: the effects of
steam pressure and nozzle design. *Journal of Food
Engineering*, 166. pp. 247-254. ISSN 0260-8774 doi:
10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2015.05.035 Available at
<https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/43510/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2015.05.035>

Publisher: Elsevier

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

24 pressure and nozzle design changed the hydrodynamic conditions during foam production,
25 resulting in foams having a range of properties. Steam pressure influenced foam
26 characteristics, although the net effect depended on the nozzle design used. These results
27 suggest that, in addition to the physicochemical determinants of milk, the foam properties
28 can also be controlled by changing the steam pressure and nozzle design.

29 Keywords: cappuccino, milk foams, steam injection, nozzle design, foam properties

30 **1. Introduction**

31 Foams are gas-liquid systems, which have applications in different fields: cosmetics,
32 drugs, oil extraction, chemical industry and food (Herzhaft, 1999). The incorporation of
33 bubbles into foods helps to improve the texture, appearance and taste whilst decreasing
34 the caloric content (Campbell and Mougeot, 1999). There are several methods employed
35 to incorporate bubbles within food structures: mechanical whipping, air injection, chemical
36 decomposition, fermentation and so on (Campbell and Mougeot, 1999). A less understood
37 method to generate foams is steam injection, may be because of its exclusive applicability
38 to froth the milk used in the preparation of coffee based hot beverage such as cappuccino,
39 latte and mochaccino (Huppertz, 2010).

40 Steam injection frothing is a non-isothermal method, which employs steam flow to draw air
41 and simultaneously heat up the milk (Silva et al., 2008). Like any foam, the milk foams
42 produced by steam injection begin to destabilize soon after the steam flow is switched off,
43 causing their characteristics to change continuously with time. This process is also
44 accompanied by a drop in temperature which further influences foam properties (Silva et
45 al., 2008).

46 Foam properties depend on the physico-chemical characteristics of the continuous phase,
47 the method of production and process conditions (Borcherding et al., 2008; Malysa, 1992).
48 A great volume of the available information on foaming of food is focused on studying the

49 effect of the surface active agents (surfactants and proteins) on foams properties (Carrera-
50 Sanchez and Rodriguez-Patino, 2005; Dickinson, 1999; Marinova et al., 2009; Rodríguez
51 Patino et al., 2008; Wilde et al., 2004). Moreover the published studies on the link between
52 processing conditions and foam properties are restricted to mechanical agitation based
53 methods employed for the production of foams (Balerin et al., 2007; Bals and Kulozik,
54 2003; Indrawati et al., 2008; Thakur et al., 2003).

55 Many designs of coffee machines are commercially available to prepare milk foams, which
56 employ a variety of steam injector designs (Borgmann, 1990; Giuliano, 1993; Hsu, 2004;
57 Mahlich and Borgmann, 1989; Stieger and Yoakim, 2006; Stubaus, 1993). Inevitably, each
58 design produces foam by a different mechanism. The oldest method to produce foam by
59 steam injection is to use a nozzle that is placed just below the milk surface. The flow of
60 steam through the nozzle induces air entry. The operator (or barista) moves the milk
61 container vertically and horizontally at an appropriate frequency to introduce the air and
62 produce the foam (Giuliano, 1993).

63 Other sparger designs take advantage of a steam ejector principle to restrict the passage
64 of steam and generate the necessary pressure drop to suck air, or a mix of air and milk, to
65 generate the foam. The simplest ejector based system consists of a nozzle where the
66 steam is allowed to expand, thereby generating a very low pressure and drawing the air
67 through a tube that is connected at the nozzle. The two fluid phases enter a mixing
68 chamber before being introduced into the milk for generating the foam (Borgmann, 1990).

69 Despite the availability of a large number of patented devices and machines to produce
70 milk foams by steam injection, there are relatively few studies focusing on the effect of
71 process conditions on the properties of foams generated (Deeth and Smith, 1983; Goh et
72 al., 2009; Huppertz, 2010; Kamath et al., 2008; Levy, 2003; Silva et al, 2008). Moreover,
73 the preparation of barista-style milk foams in coffee shops use homogenized pasteurized

74 semi-skimmed milk, which does not permit the control of foam properties formed by merely
75 controlling the biochemical characteristics of the milk. The only way to produce foams with
76 diverse properties, with a given type of milk, is to employ different machine and steam
77 sparger designs. The aim of this study is to evaluate the relationship between the main
78 process parameters (steam pressure and nozzle design) and the principal properties of
79 foams formed.

80 2. Materials

81 2.1 Milk supply

82 Homogenized pasteurized semi-skimmed milk (brand Freshways) was bought from a local
83 shop; this was stored in a fridge ($5 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$) and processed within 3 days of the purchase.
84 Each batch of milk was characterized by measuring fat, protein, lactose and SNF (solid not
85 fat) contents using a DairyLab (FOSS, Warrington, UK) and the pH was measured using a
86 normal potentiometer.

87 Commercial red food colouring (Supercook, Leeds, England) was added to the milk in the
88 proportion 10 drops/L, in order to enhance the visualization of the liquid/foam interface in
89 experiments observing the foam generation and stability. The addition of dye at this
90 concentration does not have effect on milk surface tension or foaming properties (Silva et
91 al., 2008).

92 2.2 Foam generation equipment

93 A steam injection device constructed previously (Silva et al., 2008) which allowed the
94 formation of foams under controlled and reproducible conditions was used for the
95 experimental study. A control valve connected to a supply of steam regulated the
96 pressures between 0 and 280 kPa gauge, and steam was injected at the following specific

97 pressures (100, 180 and 280 kPa) whilst employing three different sparging units
98 described in the following paragraphs.

99 **2.2.1 Confined-jet**

100 This sparger (Figure 1A) is based on a commercial design (Francis X1 espresso machine).
101 It consists of a plunging-jet nozzle which introduces steam through a 2 mm hole into a
102 confined cylindrical chamber, 10 mm diameter and 30 mm height, placed 5 mm above the
103 milk surface. The negative pressure generated in the chamber draws ambient air through
104 3 holes, 1 mm diameter, located on the cylinder wall, which is dispersed along with the
105 steam into the milk.

106 **2.2.2 Ejector-type nozzle**

107 It was adapted from a commercial espresso machine (Krupps Vivo): Two stainless steel
108 tubes were connected to a rubber sparger as shown in the Figure 1B, steam was
109 introduced through one of the tubes, and air was drawn in through the other (7 cm length)
110 like an ejector system. A mixture of steam and air left the nozzle through a 1mm orifice at
111 the tip of the rubber unit. The sparging unit was placed in such a way that the orifice on the
112 rubber unit was located 10 mm below the surface of the milk.

113 **2.2.3 Plunging-jet nozzle**

114 A 5 mm commercial nozzle (Figure 1C) with 3 holes of 1 mm each was used. The nozzle
115 tip was fixed 5 mm above the milk surface, which gave repeatable foam properties.

116 **2.3 Foam generation methodology**

117 A fixed volume of milk, 200 mL, was taken in a 1 L graduated cylinder (reading error of ± 10
118 mL), and the sparging unit was placed above or below the milk surface depending on the
119 nozzle studied. The steam was injected at a constant flow rate over a period of time which
120 gave a maximum temperature of about 70 °C in the milk. The injection time depended of

121 the steam pressure and nozzle type (Table 1). Temperatures were measured continuously
122 with K type thermocouples connected to a data acquisition system (Grant Systems 10003
123 Squirrel). One of the thermocouples was placed approximately 2 cm above the anticipated
124 interface level and the other 2 cm below the interface, in order to to measure the foam and
125 liquid temperatures, respectively.

126 **2.4 Foam properties**

127 **2.4.1 Foamability and stability**

128 The foam was allowed to destabilize in the same graduated cylinder where it was formed.
129 The volume of the dispersion was read continuously from the graduations on the cylinder,
130 and the cylinder and contents were weighed before and after steam injection, in order to
131 determine the mass of the steam condensed in the milk. **Total (liquid plus foam) and clear**
132 **liquid (only liquid) volumes (V_T and V_L , respectively)** in the cylinder, and the liquid and
133 foam temperatures were monitored over time as the foam was left to stand in a controlled
134 temperature room (18 °C).

135 Foamability was evaluated by obtaining the air volume fraction (ϕ_0) (Table 2). Although
136 there are different parameters used to measure the transient stability of foams (Britten and
137 Lavoie, 1992; Buchanan, 1965; Carrera-Sanchez and Rodriguez-Patino, 2005; Waniska
138 and Kinsella, 1979), most of the earlier workers have characterized the stability on the
139 basis of liquid drainage from the foam and the collapse of the foam column. Following the
140 same vein, the stability of foams was studied by measuring over time: i) the volume
141 fraction of the liquid drained (LDF) and ii) air release fraction (ARF).

142 The foamability and foam destabilization parameters were determined by undertaking a
143 mass balance on the basis of the volume measurements made before and after switching
144 off the steam supply using the equations defined by **Silva et al.**, (2008), (Table 2). When

145 the top of the foam was found to be uneven, an average reading of three points around the
146 cylinder circumference was taken to represent the mean position of the foam top. **The**
147 **maximum variation in the readings was 10 mL.**

148 **2.4.2 Foam texture**

149 Foam texture was assessed by performing a compression test using a texture analyzer
150 (TA XT2i, Stable Microsystems, Surrey, UK) at fixed time of 3 minutes of destabilization. A
151 51 mm diameter cylindrical probe was used in all experiments. The probe compressed the
152 sample by 5 mm at the test speed of 0.5 mm/s.

153 The equipment was fitted with a 5 kg load cell (**sensitivity 0.1 g**) for better texture detection
154 in weaker samples. **The maximum force was then selected as the parameter to compare**
155 **the texture of different foams.**

156 **2.4.3 Bubble size distribution**

157 An optical system with a CCD camera was adapted to measure the bubble size
158 distribution. The system consisted of a set of TV lenses which allowed visualizing a
159 minimum size of approximately 10 microns; these lenses were coupled to a CCD camera
160 which captured the digital images and sent them to a computer to be stored for a further
161 analysis.

162 The foam was sampled 2 minutes after the steam injection ceased, by using a
163 polycarbonate spoon designed **specially** to take the foam directly from the cylinder without
164 the need to transfer it to another container. The foam was left in the spoon for a minute to
165 stabilize, prior to taking pictures of 4 different areas in the spoon.

166 The images were edited and processed using the software ImageJ 1.42 and Bubbles Edit
167 1.1 (a copy licence of BubbleSEdit was given kindly by its author Dr. Xenophon Zabulis

168 from Institute of Computer Science, Foundation for Research and Technology, Crete,
169 Greece).

170 **3. Results and discussion**

171 **3.1 Nozzles characterization**

172 **3.1.1 Steam flow**

173 There were significant effects of the steam pressure ($p = 0.001$) and the type of nozzle
174 used ($p = 0.001$) on the flow rate of injected steam (Figure 2).

175 Plunging-jet and confined-jet nozzles introduced steam between 1.8 (at 100kPa) and 2.3
176 (at 280 kPa) times quicker than ejector-type. The flow rate of steam increased linearly with
177 the pressure, but the rates of increase were different, with the lowest rate being **noted** for
178 the ejector-type nozzle. The plunging-jet and the confined-jet nozzles can inject steam
179 almost freely without any flow restriction produced by the air. On the other hand, the
180 ejector-type nozzle has a mixing chamber where the steam is mixed with the air drawn
181 (Varga et al., 2009), thus the presence of air in this chamber impedes the steam flow more
182 **than in other nozzles**.

183 All foams produced were assessed after the milk was warmed between 65 and 70 °C in
184 order to reproduce the conditions used in the preparation of the traditional barista-style
185 milk foams in coffee shops.

186 **3.1.2 Performance of nozzles**

187 **When milk foams are produced by steam injection**, the steam is used to warm the milk **as**
188 **well as** induce the air entry. The final temperature of milk is controlled by the injection time
189 (at a fixed pressure), and the volume of air introduced depends on the injection time as
190 well as the mechanism of air entry. The efficiency of any steam-air injecting nozzle can be

191 expressed by the mean value of the ratio of the air and the steam flow rates during
192 injection.

193 As the air flow depends on the flow of steam, Figure 3 shows a direct variation of the
194 entrainment ratio with the steam pressure for all nozzles. The rate of change was different
195 for each nozzle: increasing the pressure, produced slight increase in the entrainment ratio
196 for ejector-type and confined-jet nozzles which eventually tend towards constant values at
197 higher pressures. **On the other hand**, the results for plunging-jet nozzle showed a
198 significant effect of pressure on entrainment ratio with higher rates of changes at higher
199 pressures.

200 This is a consequence of the mechanism of air entrance: confined-jet and ejector-type
201 nozzles introduce air by the vacuum caused by steam expansion. As the air and steam are
202 mixed in a closed space before their injection into milk, an increase in steam pressure
203 generates greater pressure drop and steam hold-up inside the nozzle, which effectively
204 reduces the entrainment ratio (Varga et al., 2009). However, the mechanism of air
205 inclusion is different in the plunging-jet nozzle: the air is introduced as a thin layer
206 entrained **by** the steam jet **at its** surface. As the steam pressure **rises**, the impact velocity
207 of the steam jet also increases dragging more air and consequently getting higher
208 entrainment ratios, as shown by Brattberg and Chanson (1998) and Bagatur et al. (2002).

209 **3.2 Bubble size**

210 Two variables were measured to study the bubble populations in foams obtained under the
211 different conditions of pressure and nozzle type: the Sauter mean diameter (D_{32}) which is
212 related to the bubbles size distribution and the inter-percentile range 10-90 (IPR10-90)
213 which is a measure of the dispersion in the bubbles size (polydispersity).

214 The effect of pressure on D_{32} in foams produced with the three nozzles is showed in Figure
215 4. There was a linear increase in bubble size with steam pressure for each nozzle, but this

216 effect was less marked for plunging-jet nozzle, since the D_{32} increased by only 3 μm for a
217 20 kPa increase in pressure. In contrast, the foams produced with confined-jet and ejector-
218 type nozzles changed bubble size by 11 and 10 μm respectively for 20 kPa increase in
219 pressure. These inferences can be drawn from the gradient of the best fit lines drawn
220 through the points shown in Figure 4, for each nozzle. Further, the ejector-type nozzle
221 produced the biggest bubbles at each steam pressure, while the plunging-jet generated
222 the smallest bubbles.

223 It is interesting to note that bubble size was affected by pressure more significantly in
224 foams produced with the confined-jet and ejector-type nozzles than with the plunging jet
225 nozzle.

226 From the definition of Weber number, which relates the deformation forces acting on
227 bubbles and the surface tension forces counteracting the bubble deformation, the
228 maximum stable bubble diameter (Evans et al., 1992) (d_m) is given by:

229
$$d_m = \frac{We_c \sigma}{\rho \bar{u}^2}$$

230 where ρ and σ are the surface tension and liquid density, respectively; \bar{u}^2 is the average of
231 the squares of the velocity differences in the vicinity of the bubbles; and We_c is the critical
232 Weber number at which a bubble splits up, which can be taken as 1.18 - 1.20 for bubble
233 breakup in a turbulent flow (Evans et al., 1992; Hinze, 1955). Thus, the maximum stable
234 bubble diameter is inversely proportional to the level of turbulence in the system, which
235 also depends on the fluid velocity (Evans et al., 1992). Thus, a decrease in the bubble size
236 is expected with increase in steam pressure on the basis of the existence of We_c , but this
237 was not observed, as evident in Figure 4. However, it is necessary to take into account
238 other processes which occur concurrently or after bubble formation: Varley (1995) found
239 that bubble size declined with increasing fluid velocity only if the entrainment ratio (ER)

240 remained constant. This was not the case in the present study (Figure 3). Varley (1995)
241 also suggests that if ER increased with the steam flow, the local gas phase hold up is high
242 and the probability of bubble collision and coalescence is greater leading to the formation
243 of larger bubbles. This effect is more pronounced in confined-jet and ejector-type nozzles
244 compared to plunging-jet, where the mixture of steam and air are confined in smaller
245 spaces, and the coalescence probability is higher.

246 The other consequence of higher bubble coalescence with increasing ER is a higher
247 spread in bubbles size (Varley, 1995) as shown in Figure 5. This was more relevant in the
248 case of confined-jet and ejector-type nozzles than for the plunging jet nozzle. These
249 results show that the foams became more polydispersed with increasing steam pressure,
250 and it was more marked in the case of the confined-jet and ejector-type nozzles.

251 Figure 6 presents representative images of the bubbles in foams produced at 280 kPa.

252 The image of bubbles obtained with the plunging-jet nozzle shows smaller bubbles and
253 more homogeneous bubble size distribution, which allows a better packing of bubbles in
254 the foam. Further, neither deformation nor compression is observed in the bubbles. The
255 ejector-type nozzle gave the largest bubbles which appeared deformed and slightly
256 compressed, whereas the bubbles produced with the confined-jet nozzle were slightly
257 smaller in size but less packed than those obtained using the ejector-type nozzle.

258 3.3. Foamability

259 Foamability is related directly to the quantity of air injected and the capacity of the proteins
260 to retain this air once the foam is created (Marinova et al., 2009). Since the same type of
261 milk was used in all experiments, the amount of air incorporation in the foam (Figure 7),
262 which is also equal to the volume of air injected, depends only on the steam pressure and
263 nozzle type used to generate the foams.

264 There was a significant effect ($p < 0.001$) of the pressure and nozzle type on ϕ (Figure 7).
265 The direct relationship of ϕ with the increasing pressure was more evident in the case of
266 the plunging jet nozzle. No significant changes were observed in foams generated with
267 ejector-type nozzle. It is important to highlight that ϕ_0 was also controlled by the design and
268 placement of the nozzles: the quantity of air introduced in the case of the confined-jet and
269 plunging jet nozzles depends on the air entry tube length in the injector-type nozzle (7 cm
270 in this experiment) and the initial position of the nozzle tip above the milk surface (in this
271 case, 5 mm). This is because air entrainment ceases when the foam height increases to a
272 level where it covers the air entry point. This consideration allows explaining the different
273 effects of pressure change on ϕ_0 for each nozzle: as the foam height reaches the position
274 of the air entrance tube in the ejector-type nozzle, the air flow decreases drastically
275 regardless of the pressure, resulting in a minimum effect of pressure increase on ϕ_0 . On
276 the other hand, a high speed jet of steam hits the milk surface in the case of the confined-
277 jet and plunging jet nozzles, creating a cavity in the liquid as consequence of the
278 stagnation pressure (Ohl et al., 2000). As the speed of the jet increases with the steam
279 pressure, the cavity size becomes bigger which entraps more air and results in a
280 significant increasing of ϕ_0 with pressure.

281 **3.4 Foam stability**

282 **3.4.1 Liquid drainage**

283 Liquid drainage was studied by calculating the liquid drained fraction (LDF) during
284 destabilization process. Figure 8 shows that foams produced at 100 kPa drained quickly
285 within the first 2 minutes, whereas those generated at 280 kPa drained more slowly in the
286 same interval of time. Profiles were more homogeneous after 4 minutes with the exception
287 of foams produced with the ejector-type nozzle which drained slowly, shedding liquid in
288 smaller quantities (less than 93%).

289 The influence of pressure was more significant in foams produced with plunging-jet nozzle
290 in the early stages of destabilization. Thus foams made at 100 kPa drained 92% of liquid
291 at 2 minutes, whereas foams produced at 280 kPa only drained nearly 80% during the
292 same time. On the other hand, the steam pressure did not affect the profiles of liquid
293 drainage in foams generated with ejector-type nozzle, since all foams drained about ~ 78%
294 after 2 minutes of destabilization for different steam injection pressures.

295 Data on the volumes of liquid drained were fitted to the model developed by Elizalde and
296 others (1991) to make a quantitative comparison of destabilization and drainage in the
297 foams (Figure 9). There was a significant effect of the interaction ($p < 0.019$) of the steam
298 pressure and the nozzle type used on the kinetic parameters. As the initial rate of liquid
299 drainage (R_{OL}) relates to the ability to retain excess liquid in foams with low gas volume
300 fraction (Britten and Lavoie, 1992), this parameter was used instead of half-life time of
301 drainage (B_L) to compare the rates of drainage. There was a significant effect of the
302 pressure and nozzle type on rates of liquid drainage ($p < 0.001$): it decreased with
303 pressure for confined-jet and plunging-jet nozzles, and remained practically constant for
304 foams produced with the ejector-type nozzle. It is interesting to note the marked effect of
305 steam pressure on R_{OL} for foams made with plunging-jet nozzle since it decreased from
306 2410 to 670 mL/min when the pressure increased from 100 to 280 kPa. On the other hand,
307 the lowest initial drainage rates were observed in foams produced using ejector-type
308 nozzle, this is due to the low initial content of liquid in these foams.

309 A variety of factors are associated with the speed and the extent of liquid drainage in
310 foams: gas flow rate during the foam production, bubble size, initial height of foam column
311 and liquid properties (Narsimhan, 1991). As these parameters were different and not
312 controlled in present experiments it is not possible to attribute the observed performance
313 to any one factor, and a combined effect of these variables is expected. However, a partial

314 explanation can be given by relating the initial rate of liquid drainage with the product of
315 D_{32} and ϕ_0 . Figure 10 shows an inverse relationship: R_{OL} is higher for smaller products
316 $D_{32} * \phi_0$ as observed in present study, for example the greatest R_{OL} was 2488 mL/min which
317 was observed in foams produced with the plunging jet nozzle at 100 kPa, these had the
318 smallest bubble size and the highest initial liquid content.

319 If bubbles are greater than the optimum size as stated by Germick and others (1994), the
320 extent and rate of liquid drainage increases as the bubbles become smaller. This is
321 because the gradient of plateau border suction (which opposes gravity) is smaller in bigger
322 bubbles. On the other hand, a high initial content of liquid in the foam generates more
323 homogeneous foams; the gradient of plateau border suction is smaller and the gravity
324 accelerates drainage.

325 **3.4.2 Air release**

326 **As** a consequence of liquid drainage, the liquid film between bubbles becomes thinner and
327 eventually ruptures. This phenomenon plus the disproportionation process result in foam
328 collapse (Carrier and Colin, 2003), which is accompanied by air release. Figure 11 shows
329 how the air release fraction (ARF) for the different foams changes with destabilization time.

330 The value of this fraction after 10 min depended on the steam pressure employed and the
331 nozzle used to create the foam. When the ejector-type nozzle was used, ARF only
332 increased for steam pressures between 100 kPa and 180 kPa, remaining unaltered at 280
333 kPa. In the case of the plunging-jet nozzle, the ARF increased for the same three pressure
334 values. When the confined-jet nozzle was used, the ARF remained unaltered for all three
335 steam pressure values. Figure 11 also shows the rate of air release was higher in the case
336 of confined-jet and ejector-type nozzles during the first 5 minutes, when the steam
337 pressure employed was 100 kPa; thereafter, the profiles were similar for these two
338 nozzles, with the ejector-type nozzle giving slightly higher values.

339 Even though Britten and Lavoie (1992) found three distinct zones of rates for gas release
340 from milk protein foams, Figure 11 only shows a roughly constant rate of foam collapse
341 which corresponds to the second stage of the rate profiles observed by Halling (1981).
342 These differences may be attributed to the different foaming temperatures: Britten and
343 Lavoie (1992) worked at 20 °C, so the collapse of the foam column was slower, and all
344 three stages were observed. On the other hand, the temperature of the present foams was
345 65 °C at the beginning of destabilization, so the foam collapse was rapid and the time
346 necessary to achieve the critical lamella thickness was likely to be so short that the first
347 stage is not noticeable. Moreover, the final stage was also not observed in this study
348 because it generally occurred after very long times, for instance, Britten and Lavoie (1992)
349 observed this stage after 40 min of destabilization.

350 **3.5 Foam texture**

351 Figure 12 presents the compression force at a strain of 5% for foams produced with the
352 different combinations of steam pressure and nozzle design.

353 There was a significant effect of steam pressure ($p < 0.001$) on compression force, which
354 increased with the pressure in all foams, but the change was greater in foams made with
355 plunging-jet nozzle, which also produced the strongest foams at each pressure. Although
356 there is no information available which can explain the differences between compression
357 force values, the differences can be related to the bubble size, extent of polydispersity and
358 gas volume fraction. Figure 13 shows the changes in compression force with specific
359 interfacial area in the different foams. There is a decrease in the force with the interfacial
360 area, which means that the foams are easier to compress when the bubble size is small
361 and/or the holdup is high. The fact that there is a curve for each nozzle suggests there are
362 other factors intrinsic to each steam nozzle influencing the compression forces.

363 **4. Conclusions**

364 The use of different type of nozzles and steam injection pressures produce foams with
365 significantly different properties. The increase in steam pressure reduced the steam
366 injection time required to produce the foams and improved foamability, stability and texture
367 in the foams.

368 The mechanism of air entry determined the extent of changes in foams properties when
369 steam pressure increased. Thus, in nozzles where the mixture of steam and air was
370 confined (confined-jet and ejector-type nozzles), increasing steam pressure strongly
371 influenced foam bubble size and texture, whereas the change in these properties was less
372 marked when the air was introduced unconfined as in the case of the plunging-jet.

373 In general, foams produced between steam pressures of 180 and 280 kPa with the
374 plunging-jet nozzle had desired combination of low bubble size, high foam stability and
375 stiffness (measured as a compression force).

376 Finally, it was found that gas volume fraction and bubble size are related to liquid drainage
377 and compression force, since the initial rate of liquid drainage changed inversely with the
378 product of ϕ_0 and D_{32} , and the compression force decreased with the specific interfacial
379 area which is proportional to ϕ_0/D_{32} .

380 **5. Acknowledgements**

381 Dr. Xenophon Zabulis from the Inst. of Computer Science, Foundation for Research and
382 Technology (Greece), is acknowledged for providing a copy of the software Bubbles Edit
383 1.1 to analyze the bubble size. The financial support of Nestle and the Engineering and
384 Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC), U.K., is also gratefully acknowledged.

385 **6. References**

386 Bagatur, T., Baylar, A., Sekerdag, N., 2002. The Effect of Nozzle Type on Air Entrainment
387 by Plunging Water Jets. Water Qual. Res. J. Canada 37, 599–612.

388 Balerin, C., Aymard, P., Ducept, F., Vaslin, S., Cuvelier, G., 2007. Effect of formulation and
389 processing factors on the properties of liquid food foams. *J. Food Eng.* 78, 802–809.

390 Bals, A., Kulozik, U., 2003. Effect of pre-heating on the foaming properties of whey protein
391 isolate using a membrane foaming apparatus. *Int. Dairy J.* 13, 903–908.

392 Borcharding, K., Hoffmann, W., Lorenzen, P.C., Schrader, K., 2008. Effect of milk
393 homogenisation and foaming temperature on properties and microstructure of foams from
394 pasteurised whole milk. *LWT - Food Sci. Technol.* 41, 2036–2043.

395 **Borgmann, M., 1990. Cappuccino making adapter for use with coffee makers. US Patent**
396 **4945824.**

397 Brattberg, T., Chanson, H., 1998. Air entrapment and air bubble dispersion at two-
398 dimensional plunging water jets. *Chem. Eng. Sci.* 53, 4113–4127.

399 Britten, M., Lavoie, L., 1992. Foaming Properties of Proteins as Affected by Concentration.
400 *J. Food Sci.* 57, 1219–1241.

401 Buchanan, R.A., 1965. Lipolysis and the frothing of milk. *Aust. J. Dairy Technol.* 62–66.

402 Campbell, G.M., Mougeot, E., 1999. Creation and characterisation of aerated food
403 products. *Trends Food Sci. Technol.* 10, 283–296.

404 Carrera-Sanchez, C., Rodriguez-Patino, J.M., 2005. Interfacial, foaming and emulsifying
405 characteristics of sodium caseinate as influenced by protein concentration in solution.
406 *Food Hydrocoll.* 19, 407–416.

407 Carrier, V., Colin, A., 2003. Coalescence in Draining Foams. *Langmuir* 19, 4535–4538.

408 Deeth, H.C., Smith, R.A.D., 1983. Lipolysis and Other Factors Affecting the Steam
409 Frothing Capacity of Milk. *Aust. J. Dairy Technol.* 38, 14–19.

410 Dickinson, E., 1999. Adsorbed protein layers at fluid interfaces: interactions, structure and
411 surface rheology. *Colloids Surfaces B Biointerfaces* 15, 161–176.

412 Elizalde, B.E., Giaccaglia, D., Pilosof, A.M.R., Bartholomai, G.B., 1991. Kinetics of Liquid
413 Drainage from Protein-Stabilized Foams. *J. Food Sci.* 56, 24–30.

414 Evans, G.M., Jameson, G.J., Atkinson, B.W., 1992. Prediction of the bubble size
415 generated by a plunging liquid jet bubble column. *Chem. Eng. Sci.* 47, 3265–3272.

416 Germick, R.J., Rehill, A.S., Narsimhan, G., 1994. Experimental investigation of static
417 drainage of protein stabilized foams - Comparison with model. *J. Food Eng.* 23, 555–578.

418 Giuliano, M., 1996. Automatic espresso and cappuccino machine. US Patent 5490447.

419 Goh, J., Kravchuk, O., Deeth, H.C., 2009. Comparison of mechanical agitation, steam
420 injection and air bubbling for foaming milk of different types. *Milchwissenschaft* 64, 121–
421 124.

422 Halling, P.J., 1981. Protein-Stabilized Foams and Emulsions. *Crit. Rev. Food Sci. Nutr.* 15,
423 155–203.

424 Herzhaft, B., 1999. Rheology of Aqueous Foams: a Literature Review of some
425 Experimental Works. *Oil Gas Sci. Technol.* 54, 587–596.

426 Hinze, J.O., 1955. Fundamentals of the hydrodynamic mechanism of splitting in dispersion
427 processes. *AICHE J.* 1, 289–295.

428 Hsu, T., 2004. Milk foam delivery pipe for an espresso coffee maker. US Patent 6810795.

429 Huppertz, T., 2010. Foaming properties of milk: A review of the influence of composition
430 and processing. *Int. J. Dairy Technol.* 63, 477–488.

431 Indrawati, L., Wang, Z., Narsimhan, G., Gonzalez, J., 2008. Effect of processing
432 parameters on foam formation using a continuous system with a mechanical whipper. J.
433 Food Eng. 88, 65–74.

434 Kamath, S., Wulandewi, A., Deeth, H., 2008. Relationship between surface tension, free
435 fatty acid concentration and foaming properties of milk. Food Res. Int. 41, 623–629.

436 Levy, M.C.N., 2003. The effects of composition and processing of milk on foam
437 characteristics as measured by steam frothing. Interdep. Progr. Anim. Dairy Sci. Louisiana
438 State University, Baton Rouge, USA.

439 Mahlich, G.C., Borgmann, M., 1989. Espresso machine with cappuccino making
440 attachment. US Patent 4800805.

441 Malysa, K., 1992. Wet foams: Formation, properties and mechanism of stability. Adv.
442 Colloid Interface Sci. 40, 37–83.

443 Marinova, K.G., Basheva, E.S., Nenova, B., Temelska, M., Mirarefi, A.Y., Campbell, B.,
444 Ivanov, I.B., 2009. Physico-chemical factors controlling the foamability and foam stability of
445 milk proteins: Sodium caseinate and whey protein concentrates. Food Hydrocoll. 23,
446 1864–1876.

447 Narsimhan, G., 1991. A model for unsteady state drainage of a static foam. J. Food Eng.
448 14, 139–165.

449 Ohl, C.D., Oğr c uz, H.N., Prosperetti, A., 2000. Mechanism of air entrainment by a
450 disturbed liquid jet. Phys. Fluids 12.

451 Rodr guez Patino, J.M., Carrera S nchez, C., Rodr guez Ni o, M.R., 2008. Implications of
452 interfacial characteristics of food foaming agents in foam formulations. Adv. Colloid
453 Interface Sci. 140, 95–113.

454 Silva, S., Espiga, A., Niranjana, K., Livings, S., Gummy, J.C., Sher, A., 2008. Formation and
455 stability of milk foams, in: Campbell, G.M., Scanlon, M.G., Pyle, D.L. (Eds.), Bubbles in
456 Food 2: Novelty, Health and Luxury. AACCI International, St. Paul, Minnesota, pp. 153–
457 161.

458 Stieger, M., Yoakim, A., 2006. Replaceable nozzle for producing a frothed liquid. US
459 Patent 20060230943.

460 Stubaus, L.H., 1994. Cappuccino attachment for an espresso machine. US Patent
461 5330266.

462 Thakur, R.K., Vial, C., Djelveh, G., 2003. Influence of operating conditions and impeller
463 design on the continuous manufacturing of food foams. J. Food Eng. 60, 9–20.

464 Varga, S., Oliveira, A.C., Diaconu, B., 2009. Influence of geometrical factors on steam
465 ejector performance - A numerical assessment. Int. J. Refrig. 32, 1694–1701.

466 Varley, J., 1995. Submerged gas-liquid jets: bubble size prediction. Chem. Eng. Sci. 50,
467 901–905.

468 Waniska, R.D., Kinsella, J.E., 1979. Foaming properties of proteins: evaluation of a
469 column aeration apparatus using ovalbumin. J. Food Sci. 44, 1398–1402.

470 Wilde, P., Mackie, A., Husband, F., Gunning, P., Morris, V., 2004. Proteins and emulsifiers
471 at liquid interfaces. Adv. Colloid Interface Sci. 108-09, 63–71.