

JAST (Journal of Animal Science and Technology) TITLE PAGE

Upload this completed form to website with submission

1
2
3

ARTICLE INFORMATION	Fill in information in each box below
Article Type	Research article
Article Title (within 20 words without abbreviations)	Internal and external egg quality responses to egg washing and storage temperature over 42 days
Running Title (within 10 words)	Storage temperature and washing effects on egg quality
Author	Myunghwan Yu ¹ , Jiseon Son ¹ , Hyunsoo Kim ¹ , Hee-Jin Kim ¹ , Sung-June Byun ² , Eui-Chul Hong ¹
Affiliation	¹ Poultry Research Center, Department of Animal Resources Development, National Institute of Animal Science, Pyeongchang 25342, Korea ² Animal Genetic Resources Research Center, National Institute of Animal Science, Hamyang 50000, Korea
ORCID (for more information, please visit https://orcid.org)	Myunghwan Yu (https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4479-4677) Jiseon Son (https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5285-8186) Hyunsoo Kim (https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8887-1318) Hee-Jin Kim (https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6959-9790) Sung-June Byun (https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6909-1025) Eui-Chul Hong (https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1982-2023)
Competing interests	No potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.
Funding sources State funding sources (grants, funding sources, equipment, and supplies). Include name and number of grant if available.	This research was supported by the Cooperative Research Program for Agriculture Science and Technology Development (Project No. RS-2024-00400914), Rural Development Administration, Republic of Korea.
Acknowledgements	This study was supported by 2026 the RDA Fellowship Program of National Institute of Animal Science, Rural Development Administration, Republic of Korea.
Availability of data and material	Upon reasonable request, the datasets of this study can be available from the corresponding author.
Authors' contributions Please specify the authors' role using this form.	Conceptualization: Son J, Hong EC. Data curation: Yu M, Son J. Formal analysis: Yu M. Methodology: Kim H, Kim HJ, Byun SJ. Software: Yu M. Validation: Byun SJ, Hong EC. Investigation: Son J, Kim HJ, Hong EC. Writing - original draft: Yu M. Writing - review & editing: Yu M, Son J, Kim H, Kim HJ, Byun SJ, Hong EC.
Ethics approval and consent to participate	This article does not require IRB/IACUC approval because there are no human and animal participants.

4
5

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR CONTACT INFORMATION

For the corresponding author (responsible for correspondence, proofreading, and reprints)	Fill in information in each box below
First name, middle initial, last name	Eui-Chul Hong
Email address – this is where your proofs will be sent	drhong@korea.kr
Secondary Email address	None

Address	Poultry Research Center, Department of Animal Resources Development, National Institute of Animal Science, Pyeongchang 25342, Korea
Cell phone number	+82-33-330-9555
Office phone number	None
Fax number	None

6

ACCEPTED

7 **Abstract**

8 This study investigated how storage temperature and egg washing influence the internal and external
9 quality of eggs during a 42-day storage period. The study aimed to determine whether modest
10 temperature differences within the 15–20 °C range, typical of distribution environments, accelerate
11 freshness loss and whether sodium hypochlorite washing alters egg quality decline. A total of 1,560
12 freshly laid eggs from 62-week-old Hy-Line Brown hens were assigned to a 2 × 3 factorial arrangement
13 comprising two washing treatments (washed vs. unwashed) and three storage temperatures (15, 18, and
14 20 °C). Eggs were stored for 42 days, and internal and external quality traits were evaluated. Data were
15 analyzed using two-way ANOVA to determine main and interaction effects. Orthogonal polynomial
16 contrasts were used to evaluate the significance of linear or quadratic effects of the increasing storage
17 temperature. Eggs held at 20 °C consistently showed greater weight loss, lower specific gravity,
18 enlarged air cells, elevated albumen pH, and marked reductions in albumen height and Haugh unit
19 compared with those stored at 15 °C ($p < 0.05$). Yolk index values declined more rapidly at higher
20 temperatures. Washed eggs stored at 20 °C showed lower albumen height and Haugh unit on day 3, and
21 higher albumen pH early in storage ($p < 0.05$). However, washing did not influence long-term
22 deterioration. Across treatments, albumen pH increased progressively, paralleled by thinning of the
23 thick albumen and a reduction in Haugh unit, whereas yolk index declined as storage progressed. Within
24 the 15–20 °C interval, storage temperature was more consistently associated with the rate and extent of
25 egg quality deterioration than sodium hypochlorite washing, whereas washing related effects were
26 mainly observed during the early storage period. Maintaining storage temperature at or below 18 °C
27 may help preserve albumen structure, yolk integrity, and freshness during extended storage.

28

29 **Keywords:** Egg quality, Storage temperature, Unwashed egg, Washed egg, Yolk index

Introduction

Eggs are a cost-effective and nutrient-dense food that contributes significantly to the dietary quality of populations at risk of inadequate nutrient intake, including children, pregnant women, and older individuals [1,2]. They provide an excellent source of high-quality protein and substantial amounts of unsaturated fatty acids, vitamins, and minerals that are essential for growth, tissue maintenance, and overall health [3,4]. However, due to their high moisture and protein content, eggs are highly perishable, and their physical and chemical properties deteriorate rapidly during storage [5,6], leading to considerable losses in quality and economic value [7]. Therefore, maintaining optimal storage conditions is crucial to preserving the nutritional and sensory quality of eggs.

Egg freshness, which determines consumer acceptability, is evaluated using various physical and chemical indicators such as shell color, weight, thickness, albumen height, yolk color, albumen pH, and viscosity. These parameters are influenced by multiple genetic and environmental factors, including strain, hen age, storage temperature, humidity, and storage duration [8]. Among these factors, storage temperature is considered the most critical determinant of egg quality deterioration [9,10]. Higher temperatures accelerate albumen thinning, reduce Haugh unit (HU), elevate albumen and yolk pH, and increase weight loss [9,11]. In particular, elevated storage temperatures accelerate the loss of freshness and exacerbate quality changes during subsequent washing and handling processes. Therefore, understanding how external factors such as washing interact with temperature to influence egg quality is essential for effective postharvest management.

The eggshell cuticle acts as a natural barrier that limits microbial penetration [12]. However, contamination may occur during collection and handling, which has led to the widespread use of washing and sanitizing treatments in commercial practice. Although washing with sodium hypochlorite is commonly applied to improve shell cleanliness [13], it may partially remove or alter the cuticle, a natural antimicrobial and physical barrier, thereby increasing shell permeability and potentially accelerating internal quality deterioration during storage [14,15]. Thus, understanding how washing affects the quality of eggs stored under practical distribution temperatures is essential for improving

56 postharvest handling and freshness preservation.

57 Prolonged storage increases albumen pH, decreases HU and yolk index (YI), and intensifies
58 weight loss [16,17], with these changes being strongly affected by storage temperature. However, the
59 interactive effects of washing and storage temperature on egg quality remain poorly understood.
60 Therefore, this study aimed to investigate the effects of storage temperature and egg washing on egg
61 quality using multiple internal and external quality parameters over the entire storage period. It was
62 hypothesized that higher temperatures and washing treatments would accelerate the loss of internal
63 freshness and shell integrity, particularly under warm storage conditions. The findings provide a
64 scientific basis for improving temperature management and handling practices to ensure both food
65 safety and quality preservation within the egg supply chain.

66

67 **Materials and Methods**

68 **Egg preparation and experimental design**

69 A total of 1,560 freshly laid eggs were obtained from 62-week-old Hy-Line Brown laying hens
70 and used for quality evaluation. The eggs were divided into two groups according to washing treatment:
71 washed and unwashed eggs. For the washing treatment, eggs were washed using water maintained at
72 40–50 °C, and the sodium hypochlorite solution was adjusted to a sanitizer concentration of 10–50 ppm.
73 For the unwashed treatment, physical brushing was applied without exposure to wash water or sodium
74 hypochlorite solution. All eggs were stored under three temperature conditions (15, 18, 20 °C) in a
75 convection oven (VS-1202D4N, Vision; Bionex, Bucheon, Korea). The relative humidity was
76 maintained at 40–50%. The experiment was conducted following a 2 × 3 factorial arrangement, with
77 two washing treatments (washed vs. unwashed) and three storage temperatures, for a total duration of
78 42 days.

79

80 **Percentage of egg weight loss**

81 Egg weight loss was determined using 15 randomly selected eggs per treatment group. Weight

82 loss was calculated as the percentage difference between initial egg weight and the weight recorded at
83 each storage interval (1, 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, 28, and 42 days) relative to the initial weight.

84

85 **Egg quality measurements**

86 Egg quality measurements were performed using 10 randomly selected eggs per treatment
87 group at each storage interval (0, 1, 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, 28, and 42 days). The specific gravity of eggs
88 was determined using the saline flotation method [18]. For this purpose, analytical grade sodium
89 chloride (purity 99.5%) was dissolved in 3 L of distilled water to prepare solutions with specific
90 gravities of 1.007, 1.015, 1.029, 1.035, 1.043, 1.060, 1.073, and 1.080 by dissolving 30, 60, 120, 150,
91 180, 240, 300, and 330 g of NaCl, respectively. The specific gravities were verified using a hydrometer
92 and adjusted precisely by adding distilled water or additional NaCl. Egg weight, HU, albumen height,
93 and yolk color were measured using an automatic egg quality analyzer (QCM+; Technical Services &
94 Supplies Ltd., Dunnington, UK). After separating the yolk and albumen, albumen pH was determined
95 using a pH meter (ST3100; Ohaus Corporation, Parsippany, NJ, USA). Yolk diameter and height were
96 measured with a digital caliper (CD-20APX; Mitutoyo Corp., Kanagawa, Japan), and YI was calculated
97 using the following equation:

$$98 \quad YI = \frac{Yolk\ Height}{Yolk\ Width}, \quad (1)$$

99 Air cell diameter was measured by determining horizontal and vertical widths with a digital
100 caliper (CD-20APX; Mitutoyo Corp.), and the mean value was used. Air cell depth was assessed using
101 a digital height gauge (ACE-G3501; AICEYI, Guangdong, China) by recording the minimum and
102 maximum depths of the air cell, with the average value expressed as the final result.

103

104 **Statistical analyses**

105 All data, except for egg weight loss, were analyzed using 10 eggs per treatment at each storage
106 time, whereas egg weight loss was analyzed using 15 eggs per treatment. The individual egg was
107 considered the experimental unit for measured egg quality traits. Statistical analyses were performed
108 using the general linear model (GLM) procedure for two-way ANOVA in SPSS software (version 28.0;

109 SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). The main effects considered were washing treatment (washed vs.
110 unwashed) and storage temperature. Results are presented as means \pm standard errors. Post hoc
111 comparisons among means were performed using Tukey's multiple range test at a 95% confidence level.
112 Statistical significance was considered at $p < 0.05$.

113

114

Results

115 Egg weight loss

116 The effects of egg washing and storage temperature on egg weight loss are presented in Table
117 1. Eggs stored at 20 °C consistently exhibited greater ($p < 0.01$) weight loss compared with those stored
118 at 15 °C. A significant interaction between egg washing and storage temperature was detected on days
119 1 and 3 ($p < 0.05$).

120

121 Egg weight

122 Table 2 summarizes the effects of egg washing and storage temperature on egg weight. At 18,
123 21, and 42 days of storage, eggs stored at 20 °C showed lower ($p < 0.05$) weights than those stored at
124 15 °C.

125

126 Specific gravity

127 The effects of egg washing and storage temperature on specific gravity are presented in Table
128 3. On day 21 of storage, unwashed eggs showed a higher ($p < 0.05$) specific gravity than that of washed
129 eggs. Eggs stored at 20 °C exhibited lower ($p < 0.05$) specific gravity values than those stored at 15 °C
130 at all storage periods except for days 0 and 1. A significant interaction between egg washing and storage
131 temperature was observed on day 6 ($p < 0.05$).

132

133 Albumen height

134 The effects of egg washing and storage temperature on albumen height are summarized in

135 Table 4. Eggs stored at 15 °C maintained greater ($p < 0.05$) albumen height than those stored at 20 °C,
136 except on days 0, 1, 6, and 42. A significant interaction between egg washing and storage temperature
137 was detected on day 3 ($p < 0.01$), as washed eggs stored at 20 °C exhibited markedly lower albumen
138 height than all other treatments.

139

140 **Haugh unit**

141 Table 5 summarizes the effects of egg washing and storage temperature on HU. Eggs stored at
142 15 °C exhibited significantly higher ($p < 0.01$) HU than those stored at 20 °C on all storage days except
143 days 0, 1, 6, and 42. A significant interaction between egg washing and storage temperature was detected
144 on day 3 ($p < 0.01$), as washed eggs stored at 20 °C showed markedly lower HU compared with all
145 other treatments.

146

147 **Albumen pH**

148 Table 6 presents the effects of egg washing and storage temperature on albumen pH. On day 3
149 of storage, washed eggs showed higher ($p < 0.01$) albumen pH values than those of unwashed eggs.
150 Eggs stored at 20 °C exhibited higher ($p < 0.001$) albumen pH than those stored at 15 °C at all storage
151 periods except day 0. A significant interaction between egg washing and storage temperature was
152 observed on day 9 ($p < 0.05$).

153

154 **Yolk color**

155 Table 7 summarizes the effects of egg washing and storage temperature on yolk color. Eggs
156 stored at 20 °C showed significantly higher ($p < 0.05$) yolk color values than those stored at 15 °C on
157 day 42 of storage. A significant interaction between egg washing and storage temperature was also
158 observed on day 42 ($p < 0.01$), with washed eggs stored at 20 °C exhibiting higher yolk color values
159 than those for washed eggs stored at 15 °C.

160

161 **Yolk index**

162 The effects of egg washing and storage temperature on YI are summarized in Table 8. On day
163 21 of storage, washed eggs exhibited a lower ($p < 0.05$) YI than that of unwashed eggs. Eggs stored at
164 20 °C showed significantly lower ($p < 0.001$) YI values than those for eggs stored at 15 °C on days 12,
165 15, 21, 28, and 42.

166

167 **Air cell dimension**

168 Table 9 displays the effects of egg washing and storage temperature on air cell dimensions. On
169 days 15 and 28 of storage, unwashed eggs had larger ($p < 0.05$) air cell dimensions than those for washed
170 eggs. Eggs stored at 20 °C had significantly larger ($p < 0.001$) air cell dimensions than those stored at
171 15 °C at all storage periods except days 0 and 3. A significant interaction between egg washing and
172 storage temperature was detected on day 3 ($p < 0.05$), as unwashed eggs stored at 20 °C and washed
173 eggs stored at 15 and 20 °C exhibited larger air cell dimensions than those for unwashed eggs stored at
174 15 °C.

175

176 **Air cell depth**

177 The effects of egg washing and storage temperature on air cell depth are presented in Table 10.
178 On day 6 of storage, unwashed eggs exhibited a deeper ($p < 0.05$) air cell than that in washed eggs,
179 whereas the opposite trend was observed on day 12, with washed eggs showing a deeper ($p < 0.05$) air
180 cell than that in unwashed eggs. Eggs stored at 20 °C developed a significantly deeper ($p < 0.01$) air
181 cell than those stored at 15 °C on all storage days except days 0, 1, and 6. Significant interactions
182 between egg washing and storage temperature were detected on days 28 and 42 ($p < 0.05$).

183

184 **Discussion**

185 This study examined how storage temperature (15–20 °C) and sodium hypochlorite washing
186 shape internal and external egg quality over time. Temperature emerged as a dominant driver of egg
187 quality deterioration within the 15–20 °C storage range, exerting substantially greater influence than

188 did sodium hypochlorite washing treatment. The current study demonstrated that higher storage
189 temperatures were consistently associated with greater weight loss, lower specific gravity, enlarged air
190 cells, elevated albumen pH, and coordinated declines in albumen height and HU. YI values were also
191 lower when eggs were stored at elevated temperatures. These observations are consistent with previous
192 studies identifying temperature as the primary determinant of freshness loss during storage and confirm
193 that significant quality degradation occurs at temperatures well below the conventional room
194 temperature threshold of 21–25 °C. Previous studies comparing refrigeration (0–5 °C) with markedly
195 higher temperatures (21–29 °C) have consistently demonstrated steep declines in albumen height, HU,
196 and specific gravity at elevated temperatures [17,19,20]. The present experiment extends this
197 understanding by demonstrating that deterioration initiates even before eggs reach classic room-
198 temperature thresholds, with quality loss becoming substantially accelerated within the narrow 15–20 °C
199 band typical of distribution and retail environments.

200 Storage temperature increases the diffusion rate of water vapor and carbon dioxide through
201 eggshell pores in a temperature-dependent manner [21]. In the present study, eggs stored at 20 °C
202 consistently exhibited significantly greater weight loss compared with those stored at 15 °C. Because
203 water vapor and carbon dioxide loss were not directly measured in the present study, the observed
204 increase in egg weight loss should be interpreted as an indirect indicator of greater evaporative loss
205 under higher storage temperature, as previously described in [17, 22]. The resulting decline in specific
206 gravity directly reflects sustained evaporative loss with minimal compensatory volume change [23].
207 Specifically, the current results demonstrated that specific gravity decreased significantly with
208 increasing storage temperature, with eggs stored at 20 °C showing lower values than those stored at 15 °C
209 at all periods except days 0 and 1. Similarly, air-cell expansion, quantified by increased diameter and
210 depth, is consistent with progressive enlargement of the internal gas space during storage, which has
211 been associated in previous studies with moisture loss and carbon dioxide diffusion through the egg
212 shell [22]. Remarkably, eggs stored at 20 °C developed significantly larger air cell dimensions than
213 those stored at 15 °C throughout most of the storage period (days 6–42), with linear and quadratic
214 increases observed as the temperature increased. These findings are consistent with kinetic models of

215 egg storage showing that temperature substantially impacts diffusion-limited processes controlling
216 freshness indicators [21]. At 5, 19.5, and 30 °C, Gogo et al [24] reported that storage temperature exerted
217 significant effects on egg physical components, with effects becoming increasingly adverse as
218 temperature rose. Moreover, storage at 19.5 °C led to an extensive reduction in HU, YI, and egg white
219 height, while simultaneously increasing weight loss and albumen diameter compared with those at 5 °C
220 storage, consistent with the present results showing deterioration within the 15–20 °C range.

221 Albumen pH elevation may provide an important indicator linking storage temperature with
222 subsequent changes in albumen quality [25]. Samli et al. [17] reported that eggs from old laying hens
223 stored at 32 °C exhibited albumen pH increases from approximately 7.47 at day 0 to 8.0–9.0 by day 7
224 of storage, whereas eggs maintained at 4 °C showed only marginal pH increases throughout the same
225 period. In the present study conducted with 62-week-old hens, eggs stored at 20 °C showed significantly
226 elevated albumen pH compared with those stored at 15 °C at all periods except day 0, indicating that
227 even modest temperature differences within the 15–20 °C range can influence albumen alkalization.
228 Similar findings at intermediate temperatures have been reported by Cedro et al. [26], who reported that
229 eggs stored at 25 °C presented lower HU and YI, and higher albumen and yolk pH compared with those
230 kept at lower temperatures. Based on previous studies, the increase in albumen pH during storage is
231 generally attributed to carbon dioxide diffusion from the egg and consequent changes in the carbonic
232 acid-bicarbonate buffer system [25,27]. Although carbon dioxide loss, buffering capacity, and albumen
233 protein chemistry were not directly measured in the present study, the observed increase in albumen pH
234 is consistent with this previously proposed mechanism. Therefore, the higher albumen pH observed at
235 20 °C may partly explain the concurrent reductions in albumen height and HU, but this interpretation
236 should be considered inferential rather than directly demonstrated.

237 The rise in albumen pH may be associated with changes in the ovomucin–lysozyme protein
238 complex, as proposed by [28]. Under acidic conditions (pH ~7.5), electrostatic repulsion within the
239 complex is maximized, maintaining high viscosity and gel strength. As albumen becomes more alkaline
240 during storage, alterations in electrostatic interactions within this complex have been suggested to
241 reduce albumen viscosity and weaken gel integrity [28]. Although the present study did not directly

242 measure ovomucin, lysozyme, β -ovomucin stability, or protein interactions, the observed reductions in
243 albumen height and HU are consistent with his proposed explanation. In the present study, eggs stored
244 at 15 °C maintained significantly greater albumen height compared with those stored at 20 °C on most
245 days (except days 0, 1, 6, and 42), with significant decreases in albumen height observed as temperature
246 increased, particularly on days 9, 15, 18, 21, and 28. Correspondingly, HU was significantly higher in
247 eggs stored at 15 °C compared with those under 20 °C storage (except days 0, 1, 6, and 42). These
248 results extend earlier observations by Samli et al. [17], who noted the relationship between storage
249 temperature and albumen structural integrity by providing quantitative evidence that even 5 °C
250 differences within the distribution-relevant 15–20 °C range produce measurable declines in HU and
251 albumen height. The more alkaline milieu reduces β -ovomucin stability and weakens electrostatic
252 interactions within the ovomucin–lysozyme complex, lowering viscosity and gel strength [28]. This
253 biochemical relaxation explains the paired declines in albumen height and HU observed in the present
254 study and previous research on storage temperature effects.

255 Water progressively migrates from the albumen to the yolk during storage, driven by albumen
256 protein hydration changes and diffusional water loss [29, 30]. Exposure to an increasingly alkaline
257 albumen environment has been associated with reductions in vitelline membrane strength, likely
258 through physicochemical changes that occur during storage [31]. The weakened membrane gradually
259 loses structural rigidity, allowing the yolk to flatten and lose its characteristic spherical shape. These
260 changes lead to lower YI values, providing a mechanistic explanation for the temperature-dependent
261 alteration of yolk morphology. In the present study, YI was significantly lower in eggs stored at 20 °C
262 compared with those under 15 °C storage on days 12, 15, 21, 28, and 42, with significant linear and
263 quadratic decreases occurring in both unwashed and washed eggs as temperature increased. Notably,
264 washed eggs showed a significantly lower YI than did unwashed eggs on day 21, suggesting that
265 washing may increase susceptibility of the membrane to temperature-induced weakening. In addition
266 to changes in yolk structure, prolonged storage also influences yolk pigmentation. Water moving from
267 the albumen into the yolk dilutes yolk pigments, resulting in reduced yolk color intensity [32,33]. In the
268 present study, however, the higher yolk color values observed at 20 °C on day 42 may reflect the

269 combined effects of pigment concentration due to dehydration and morphological changes occurring
270 during storage. Storage time and temperature jointly affected YI, with higher temperatures associated
271 with increased water transfer and greater susceptibility of the vitelline membrane to weakening,
272 consistent with the progressive decline in YI observed at 20 °C.

273 The coherence among weight loss, specific gravity decline, air-cell expansion, pH elevation,
274 and albumen thinning suggests that these changes arise from interconnected processes related to shell
275 permeability, temperature-driven moisture diffusion, and pH-dependent alterations in albumen structure
276 [17]. Although these quality parameters are measured independently, their concurrent deterioration
277 aligns with well-documented effects of temperature on gaseous and moisture exchange through the shell
278 and on albumen protein stability. This linkage helps explain the proportional decline observed across
279 all quality indices within the 15–20 °C range and clarifies why storage temperature exerts a stronger
280 influence on long-term egg quality than washing procedures, which primarily modify only the initial
281 shell surface barrier. In the present study, washing treatment did not produce significant differences in
282 weight loss, specific gravity (except on day 21), albumen height, or HU for most of the storage period,
283 whereas storage temperature (15 vs. 20 °C) consistently generated marked differences across all
284 measured variables. These findings support the view that storage temperature determines the longer-
285 term trajectory of egg quality degradation regardless of washing status. The effects of storage time on
286 weight loss, specific gravity, HU, albumen height, air-cell development, YI, and albumen and yolk pH
287 have been extensively documented in eggs from hens of diverse physiological and genetic backgrounds
288 [34]. Across these studies, storage temperature has consistently been shown to accelerate internal
289 quality loss, while refrigeration substantially slows these changes compared with unrefrigerated
290 conditions. This pattern is consistent with the present results, which demonstrate measurable
291 deterioration even within the relatively narrow 15–20 °C range typical of distribution environments.

292 Sodium hypochlorite washing was associated with early changes in albumin quality,
293 particularly under higher temperature storage conditions. In the present study, washed eggs stored at
294 20 °C on day 3 exhibited significantly lower albumen height and HU than those of unwashed eggs,
295 along with higher albumen pH values. These early changes are consistent with previous reports showing

296 that egg washing can modify eggshell cuticle integrity and surface properties [13], which may
297 temporarily increase shell permeability and facilitate water vapor and carbon dioxide loss during the
298 initial period after washing. The resulting elevation in albumen pH could contribute to early reductions
299 in gel stability. However, washing-related responses were not consistently observed across later storage
300 times. Under the present experimental conditions, storage temperature showed a more consistent
301 association with long-term changes in egg quality than washing treatment, as reflected by progressive
302 weight loss, reduced specific gravity, air cell enlargement, increased albumen pH, and decreases in
303 albumen height, HU, and YI. Because washing-related responses may be influenced by cuticle integrity,
304 shell permeability, sanitizer concentration, wash-water temperature, drying conditions, and storage-unit
305 variability, further studies incorporating direct measurements of cuticle coverage, shell conductance,
306 and microbial status, together with larger independent storage-unit replication, are needed to clarify the
307 sustained effects of washing on egg quality during extended storage. Throughout the 42-day storage
308 period, temperature-dependent differences persisted across all measured traits, whereas washing effects
309 remained limited and short-lived. Variability in washing outcomes observed across studies is also
310 influenced by substantial differences among commercial washing protocols, including sanitizer
311 concentration, contact time, wash-water temperature, brushing intensity, rinsing, and drying procedures,
312 as well as inherent variation in eggshell cuticle structure among hen strains [35-37]. These factors
313 collectively contribute to the wide range of washing-related quality effects reported in literature.

314

315

Conclusion

316

317

318

319

320

321

Within the 15–20 °C range, storage temperature was the primary determinant of internal and external egg quality over 42 days. Warmer storage consistently led to greater weight loss, lower specific gravity, enlarged air cells, higher albumen pH, reduced albumen height and HU, and a lower YI. Sodium hypochlorite washing produced only a transient early effect at warm temperatures and did not alter the longer-term deterioration trajectory governed by temperature. These findings identify temperature control as the primary control point for quality preservation along the supply chain. Maintaining storage

322 at or below 18 °C, and closer to 15 °C when shelf life beyond 2 weeks is required, is a practical target.
323 For routine monitoring, the early weight-loss slope, together with albumen pH, provides useful leading
324 indicators of subsequent declines in HU and albumen structure. Standardizing washing parameters such
325 as sanitizer level, contact time, wash-water temperature, and drying method can further minimize short-
326 term variability while the dominant temperature effect is controlled.

327

328

Conflict of Interests

329

No potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

330

331

Funding

332

This research was supported by the Cooperative Research Program for Agriculture Science
333 and Technology Development (Project No. RS-2024-00400914), Rural Development Administration,
334 Republic of Korea.

335

336

Acknowledgments

337

This study was supported by 2026 the RDA Fellowship Program of National Institute of
338 Animal Science, Rural Development Administration, Republic of Korea.

339

340

341

References

- 342 1. Réhault-Godbert S, Guyot N, Nys Y. The golden egg: nutritional value, bioactivities, and
343 emerging benefits for human health. *Nutrients* 2019;11:684.
344 <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu11030684>
- 345 2. Papanikolaou Y, Fulgoni III VL. Eggs are cost-efficient in delivering several shortfall
346 nutrients in the American diet: a cost-analysis in children and adults. *Nutrients*
347 2020;12:2406. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu12082406>
- 348 3. Kuang H, Yang F, Zhang Y, Wang T, Chen G. The impact of egg nutrient composition and
349 its consumption on cholesterol homeostasis. *Cholesterol* 2018;2018:6303810.
350 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/6303810>
- 351 4. Feddern V, Prá MCD, Mores R, et al. Egg quality assessment at different storage
352 conditions, seasons and laying hen strains. *Ciência e Agrotecnologia* 2017;41:322-33.
353 <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-70542017413002317>
- 354 5. Yimenu SM, Kim JY, Koo J, Kim BS. Predictive modeling for monitoring egg freshness
355 during variable temperature storage conditions. *Poult. Sci.* 2017;96:2811-9.
356 <https://doi.org/10.3382/ps/pex038>
- 357 6. Xu D, Wang J, Ren D, Wu X. Effects of chitosan coating structure and changes during
358 storage on their egg preservation performance. *Coatings* 2018;8:317.
359 <https://doi.org/10.3390/coatings8090317>
- 360 7. Oliveira CH, Boiago MM, Guaragni A. Effects of heat treatments and edible shell coatings
361 on egg quality after storage at room temperature. *Food Sci. Technol.* 2020;40 (Supplement
362 1):344-8. <https://doi.org/10.1590/fst.13019>
- 363 8. Tamiru H, Duguma M, Furgasa W, Yimer L. Review on chicken egg quality determination,
364 grading and affecting factors. *Asian J. Med. Sci. Res. Rev.* 2019;1:1-9.
- 365 9. Lee MH, Cho EJ, Choi ES, Sohn SH. The effect of storage period and temperature on egg
366 quality in commercial eggs. *Korean J. Poult. Sci.* 2016;43:31-8.

- 367 <https://doi.org/10.5536/KJPS.2016.43.1.31>
- 368 10. Guedes LLM, Souza CMM, Saccomani APO, et al. Internal quality of laying hens'
369 commercial eggs according to storage time, temperature and packaging. *Acta Scientiarum.*
370 *Anim. Sci.* 2016;38:87-90. <https://doi.org/10.4025/actascianimsci.v38i1.28922>
- 371 11. Akter Y, Kasim A, Omar H, Sazili AQ. Effect of storage time and temperature on the
372 quality characteristics of chicken eggs. *J. Food Agric. Environ.* 2014;12:87-92.
- 373 12. Samiullah S, Roberts JR. The eggshell cuticle of the laying hen. *Worlds Poult. Sci. J.*
374 2014;70:693-708. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0043933914000786>
- 375 13. Yu HC, Chen IC, Tan FJ. Evaluation of washing with sodium hypochlorite, ultraviolet
376 irradiation, and storage temperature on shell egg quality during storage. *Foods*
377 2025;14:2156. <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods14132156>
- 378 14. Kulshreshtha G, Rodriguez-Navarro A, Sanchez-Rodriguez E, Diep T, Hincke MT. Cuticle
379 and pore plug properties in the table egg. *Poult. Sci.* 2018;97:1382-
380 90. <https://doi.org/10.3382/ps/pex409>
- 381 15. Dominguez-Gasca N, Muñoz A, Rodriguez-Navarro AB. Quality assessment of chicken
382 eggshell cuticle by infrared spectroscopy and staining techniques: a comparative study. *Br.*
383 *Poult. Sci.* 2017;58:517-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071668.2017.1342219>
- 384 16. Liu YC, Chen TH, Wu YC, Lee YC, Tan FJ. Effects of egg washing and storage
385 temperature on the quality of eggshell cuticle and eggs. *Food Chem.* 2016;211:687-
386 93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2016.05.056>
- 387 17. Samli HE, Agma A, Senkoylu N. Effects of storage time and temperature on egg quality
388 in old laying hens. *J. Appl. Poult. Res.* 2005;14:548-53.
389 <https://doi.org/10.1093/japr/14.3.548>
- 390 18. Hempe JM, Lauxen RC, Savage JE. Rapid determination of egg weight and specific gravity
391 using a computerized data collection system. *Poult. Sci.* 1988;67:902-7.
392 <https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.0670902>

- 393 19. Scott TA, Silversides FG. The effect of storage and strain of hen on egg quality. *Poult. Sci.*
394 2000;79:1725-9. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/79.12.1725>
- 395 20. Jin YH, Lee KT, Lee WI, Han YK. Effects of storage temperature and time on the quality
396 of eggs from laying hens at peak production. *Asian Australas. J. Anim. Sci.* 2010;24:279-
397 84. <https://doi.org/10.5713/ajas.2011.10210>
- 398 21. Yimenu SM, Koo J, Kim JY, Kim JH, Kim BS. Kinetic modeling impacts of relative
399 humidity, storage temperature, and air flow velocity on various indices of hen egg
400 freshness. *Poult. Sci.* 2018;97:4384-91. <https://doi.org/10.3382/ps/pey334>
- 401 22. Grashorn M, Juergens A, Bessei W. Effects of storage conditions on egg quality. *Lohmann*
402 *Information.* 2026;50(1):26-7.
- 403 23. Akyurek H, Okur AA. Effect of storage time, temperature and hen age on egg quality in
404 free-range layer hens. *J. Anim. Vet. Adv.* 2009;8(10):1953-8.
- 405 24. Gogo JA, Atitwa BE, Gitonga CN, Mugo DM. Modelling conditions of storing quality
406 commercial eggs. *Heliyon* 2021;7:e07868. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07868>
- 407 25. Obianwuna UE, Oleforuh-Okoleh VU, Wang J, et al. Potential implications of natural
408 antioxidants of plant origin on oxidative stability of chicken albumen during storage: a
409 review. *Antioxidants* 2022;11:630. <https://doi.org/10.3390/antiox11040630>
- 410 26. Cedro TMM, Calixto LFL, Gaspar A, Curvello FA, Hora AS. Internal quality of
411 conventional and omega-3-enriched commercial eggs stored under different temperatures.
412 *Braz. J. Poult. Sci.* 2009;11:181-5. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1516-635X2009000300007>
- 413 27. Quan TH, Benjakul S. Duck egg albumen: physicochemical and functional properties as
414 affected by storage and processing. *J. Food Sci. Technol.* 2019;56:1104-15.
415 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-019-03669-x>
- 416 28. Omana DA, Wang J, Wu J. Ovomucin—a glycoprotein with promising potential. *Trends*
417 *Food Sci. Technol.* 2010;21:455-63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2010.07.001>

- 418 29. Wengerska K, Batkowska J, Drabik K. The eggshell defect as a factor affecting the egg
419 quality after storage. *Poult. Sci.* 2023;102:102749.
420 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psj.2023.102749>
- 421 30. Drabik K, Batkowska J, Próchniak T, Horecka B. Citric acid as a factor limiting changes
422 in the quality of table eggs during their storage. *Poult. Sci.* 2021;100:100995.
423 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psj.2021.01.018>
- 424 31. Kirunda DFK, McKee SR. Relating quality characteristics of aged eggs and fresh eggs to
425 vitelline membrane strength as determined by a texture analyzer. *Poult. Sci.* 2000;79:1189-
426 93. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/79.8.1189>
- 427 32. Jones DR, Anderson KE, Davis GS. The effects of genetic selection on production
428 parameters of single comb White Leghorn hens. *Poult. Sci.* 2001;80:1139-43.
429 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/80.8.1139>
- 430 33. Abebe F, Mulatu H, Kelemework S. Review of factors affecting egg quality and its effect.
431 *J. Anim. Health* 2023;3:17-32.
- 432 34. Menezes PCd, Lima ERd, Medeiros JPd, Oliveira WNK, Evêncio-Neto J. Egg quality of
433 laying hens in different conditions of storage, ages and housing densities. *Rev. Bras.*
434 *Zootecn.* 2012;41:2064-9. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1516-35982012000900014>
- 435 35. Rodríguez-Navarro AB, Domínguez-Gasca N, Muñoz A, Ortega-Huertas M. Change in
436 the chicken eggshell cuticle with hen age and egg freshness. *Poult. Sci.* 2013;92:3026-35.
437 <https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.2013-03230>
- 438 36. Tu M, Zang Y, Mo Q, et al. Effect of combined electrolyzed reduced water and slightly
439 acidic electrolyzed water spraying on the control of Salmonella, eggshell quality, and shelf
440 life of eggs during storage. *Poult. Sci.* 2024;103:104012.
441 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psj.2024.104012>
- 442 37. Narasimhan SL, Salvi D, Schaffner DW, Karwe MV, Tan J. Efficacy of cold plasma-
443 activated water as an environmentally friendly sanitizer in egg washing. *Poult. Sci.*

ACCEPTED

445

Table 1. Effects of egg washing and storage temperature on egg weight loss (%).

Treatment		Storage period (Day)									
Egg washing	Storage temperature (°C)	1	3	6	9	12	15	18	21	28	42
Unwashed eggs	15	0.22 ^{ab}	0.58 ^{ab}	1.01	1.60	2.00	2.43	2.86	3.46	4.49	6.44
	18	0.18 ^{ab}	0.58 ^{ab}	1.08	1.74	2.23	2.76	3.30	3.94	5.10	7.46
	20	0.27 ^b	0.81 ^{cd}	1.54	2.52	3.22	3.93	4.65	5.59	7.29	10.69
Washed eggs	15	0.13 ^a	0.49 ^a	0.97	1.54	1.97	2.38	2.87	3.39	4.44	6.38
	18	0.23 ^{ab}	0.67 ^{bc}	1.24	1.90	2.38	2.94	3.43	4.10	5.22	7.55
	20	0.26 ^b	0.90 ^d	1.71	2.81	3.62	4.45	5.15	6.36	8.16	11.85
SEM ¹⁾		0.011	0.016	0.026	0.035	0.048	0.057	0.07	0.082	0.105	0.152
Main Effect											
Egg washing											
Unwashed eggs		0.23	0.66	1.21	1.95	2.48	3.04	3.60	4.33	5.63	8.20
Washed eggs		0.21	0.69	1.31	2.08	2.66	3.26	3.82	4.62	5.94	8.60
SEM ¹⁾		0.012	0.022	0.038	0.061	0.081	0.099	0.115	0.143	0.182	0.268
Storage temperature (°C)											
15		0.17 ^a	0.53 ^a	0.99 ^a	1.57 ^a	1.99 ^a	2.40 ^a	2.86 ^a	3.43 ^a	4.46 ^a	6.41 ^a
18		0.21 ^{ab}	0.63 ^a	1.16 ^b	1.82 ^b	2.30 ^b	2.85 ^b	3.37 ^b	4.02 ^b	5.16 ^b	7.51 ^b
20		0.27 ^b	0.86 ^b	1.63 ^c	2.67 ^c	3.42 ^c	4.19 ^c	4.90 ^c	5.98 ^c	7.72 ^c	11.27 ^c
SEM ¹⁾		0.011	0.016	0.026	0.036	0.049	0.059	0.070	0.085	0.107	0.153
<i>p</i> -value											

Egg washing	0.399	0.298	0.065	0.070	0.075	0.060	0.124	0.084	0.137	0.197
Storage temperature	0.003	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Egg washing × Storage temperature	0.033	0.033	0.165	0.148	0.208	0.132	0.330	0.103	0.170	0.206

446 ¹⁾ Pooled standard error of the mean.

447 ^{a-d} Values in a row with different superscripts differ significantly ($p < 0.05$).

ACCEPTED

Table 2. Effects of egg washing and storage temperature on egg weight (g)

Treatment		Storage period (Day)										
Egg washing	Storage temperature (°C)	0	1	3	6	9	12	15	18	21	28	42
Unwashed eggs	15	70.77	63.34	64.00	63.17	63.40	62.90	62.35	62.64	61.59	60.50	59.23
	18	70.29	63.81	63.65	63.53	62.59	62.41	62.33	62.82	61.45	60.37	59.14
	20	71.50	64.61	63.92	62.00	62.66	63.06	60.93	60.65	58.97	60.22	56.72
Washed eggs	15	70.65	63.07	63.47	62.52	63.06	63.16	62.15	61.96	62.42	59.63	60.04
	18	69.55	63.71	62.77	62.34	63.62	63.14	61.61	62.01	61.13	61.46	59.41
	20	71.31	63.86	62.99	62.48	61.17	61.89	61.96	59.34	60.57	59.33	58.35
SEM ¹⁾		0.392	0.261	0.267	0.266	0.294	0.275	0.295	0.286	0.291	0.278	0.288
Main Effect												
Egg washing												
Unwashed eggs		70.86	63.92	63.86	62.90	62.88	62.79	61.87	62.04	60.67	60.37	58.36
Washed eggs		70.50	63.55	63.08	62.45	62.62	62.73	61.90	61.10	61.38	60.14	59.27
SEM ¹⁾		0.387	0.259	0.26	0.264	0.301	0.272	0.292	0.313	0.310	0.282	0.305
Storage temperature (°C)												
15		70.71	63.21	63.74	62.85	63.23	63.03	62.25	62.30 ^b	62.00 ^b	60.06	59.64 ^b
18		69.92	63.76	63.21	62.94	63.11	62.77	61.97	62.42 ^b	61.29 ^{ab}	60.92	59.27 ^b
20		71.41	64.24	63.45	62.24	61.92	62.48	61.44	59.99 ^a	59.77 ^a	59.78	57.53 ^a
SEM ¹⁾		0.383	0.256	0.266	0.264	0.294	0.273	0.291	0.286	0.292	0.278	0.289

p-value

Egg washing	0.654	0.473	0.150	0.395	0.649	0.911	0.952	0.108	0.231	0.686	0.123
Storage temperature	0.310	0.280	0.725	0.515	0.141	0.709	0.531	0.001	0.009	0.231	0.010
Egg washing × Storage temperature	0.940	0.872	0.945	0.430	0.225	0.343	0.467	0.896	0.407	0.258	0.625

449 ¹⁾ Pooled standard error of the mean.

450 ^{a,b} Values in a row with different superscripts differ significantly ($p < 0.05$).

ACCEPTED

Table 3. Effects of egg washing and storage temperature on egg specific gravity

Treatment		Storage period (Day)										
Egg washing	Storage temperature (°C)	0	1	3	6	9	12	15	18	21	28	42
	15	1.078	1.080	1.080	1.077 ^{ab}	1.069	1.064	1.058	1.055	1.060	1.048	1.016
Unwashed eggs	18	1.080	1.080	1.080	1.070 ^{ab}	1.072	1.058	1.057	1.048	1.048	1.036	1.015
	20	1.080	1.079	1.078	1.073 ^{ab}	1.057	1.055	1.043	1.030	1.031	1.020	0.998
Washed eggs	15	1.079	1.080	1.079	1.077 ^{ab}	1.075	1.064	1.058	1.055	1.049	1.042	1.018
	18	1.080	1.080	1.080	1.077 ^b	1.067	1.065	1.055	1.051	1.045	1.035	1.015
	20	1.080	1.080	1.076	1.069 ^a	1.061	1.047	1.041	1.040	1.028	1.015	0.998
SEM ¹⁾		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010
Main Effect												
Egg washing												
	Unwashed eggs	1.079	1.080	1.079	1.073	1.066	1.059	1.053	1.044	1.047	1.035	1.010
	Washed eggs	1.080	1.080	1.078	1.074	1.068	1.059	1.051	1.048	1.040	1.030	1.010
SEM ¹⁾		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020
Storage temperature (°C)												
	15	1.079	1.080	1.080 ^b	1.077 ^b	1.072 ^b	1.064 ^b	1.058 ^b	1.055 ^b	1.055 ^c	1.045 ^c	1.017 ^b
	18	1.080	1.080	1.080 ^b	1.074 ^{ab}	1.070 ^b	1.061 ^b	1.056 ^b	1.049 ^b	1.046 ^b	1.035 ^b	1.015 ^b
	20	1.080	1.080	1.077 ^a	1.071 ^a	1.059 ^a	1.051 ^a	1.042 ^a	1.035 ^a	1.030 ^a	1.017 ^a	0.998 ^a
SEM ¹⁾		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010	0.0010

p-value

Egg washing	0.542	0.322	0.269	0.380	0.427	0.937	0.498	0.080	0.019	0.064	0.776
Storage temperature	0.207	0.375	0.005	0.016	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Egg washing × Storage temperature	0.688	0.375	0.592	0.020	0.148	0.074	0.889	0.252	0.398	0.671	0.921

452 ¹⁾ Pooled standard error of the mean.

453 ^{a-c} Values in a row with different superscripts differ significantly ($p < 0.05$).

ACCEPTED

Table 4. Effects of egg washing and storage temperature on albumen height (mm)

Treatment		Storage period (Day)										
Egg washing	Storage temperature (°C)	0	1	3	6	9	12	15	18	21	28	42
	15	7.91	7.76	7.21 ^b	6.38	6.54	6.28	5.95	5.69	4.84	4.89	3.93
Unwashed eggs	18	7.79	7.60	7.10 ^b	6.33	5.85	5.64	4.97	5.05	4.21	4.31	3.88
	20	8.14	7.58	7.24 ^b	5.87	5.30	5.32	4.57	4.24	3.51	4.06	3.56
	15	7.81	7.52	7.94 ^b	6.18	6.53	6.14	6.16	5.91	5.19	4.99	4.21
Washed eggs	18	8.06	7.05	7.08 ^b	6.31	5.96	5.60	5.64	4.96	4.01	4.72	3.98
	20	8.06	7.41	5.90 ^a	5.88	5.88	4.85	4.43	4.24	3.91	3.85	3.87
SEM ¹⁾		0.111	0.129	0.108	0.077	0.095	0.100	0.094	0.090	0.099	0.074	0.061
Main Effect												
Egg washing												
	Unwashed eggs	7.95	7.65	7.18	6.19	5.90	5.75	5.17	4.99	4.18	4.42	3.79
	Washed eggs	7.98	7.33	6.98	6.12	6.12	5.53	5.41	5.04	4.37	4.52	4.02
SEM ¹⁾		0.109	0.127	0.13	0.079	0.107	0.115	0.125	0.121	0.121	0.09	0.062
Storage temperature (°C)												
	15	7.86	7.64	7.58 ^b	6.28 ^{ab}	6.53 ^b	6.21 ^b	6.06 ^c	5.80 ^c	5.02 ^b	4.94 ^b	4.07
	18	7.93	7.33	7.09 ^{ab}	6.32 ^b	5.91 ^a	5.62 ^{ab}	5.31 ^b	5.00 ^b	4.11 ^a	4.51 ^b	3.93
	20	8.10	7.50	6.57 ^a	5.87 ^a	5.59 ^a	5.08 ^a	4.50 ^a	4.24 ^a	3.71 ^a	3.95 ^a	3.71
SEM ¹⁾		0.109	0.128	0.121	0.075	0.095	0.099	0.095	0.088	0.099	0.074	0.062

p-value

Egg washing	0.903	0.218	0.342	0.665	0.243	0.284	0.199	0.801	0.355	0.522	0.065
Storage temperature	0.670	0.610	0.002	0.040	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	0.064
Egg washing × Storage temperature	0.753	0.810	0.001	0.829	0.420	0.657	0.222	0.777	0.411	0.242	0.743

455 ¹⁾ Pooled standard error of the mean.

456 ^{a-c} Values in a row with different superscripts differ significantly ($p < 0.05$).

ACCEPTED

Table 5. Effects of egg washing and storage temperature on Haugh unit

Treatment		Storage period (Day)										
Egg washing	Storage temperature (°C)	0	1	3	6	9	12	15	18	21	28	42
	15	86.07	87.13	83.52 ^b	78.30	79.45	77.43	75.25	72.82	65.80	66.79	57.93
Unwashed eggs	18	85.20	86.02	82.95 ^b	77.73	74.39	72.91	67.26	67.46	59.19	61.68	57.61
	20	87.07	85.53	83.68 ^b	74.95	69.99	69.50	63.92	60.71	52.59	59.09	55.05
Washed eggs	15	85.43	85.89	88.27 ^b	77.07	79.55	76.65	77.20	75.21	68.96	68.48	60.79
	18	87.21	81.78	83.05 ^b	78.20	74.60	72.25	73.12	67.28	57.57	65.28	58.71
	20	86.98	84.51	74.22 ^a	74.96	75.07	66.03	61.26	61.49	56.97	57.04	57.81
SEM ¹⁾		0.697	0.904	0.767	0.556	0.738	0.814	0.850	0.780	1.092	0.719	0.690
Main Effect												
Egg washing												
Unwashed eggs		86.12	86.23	83.38	76.99	74.61	73.28	68.81	67.00	59.19	62.52	56.86
Washed eggs		86.54	84.06	81.84	76.74	76.40	71.64	70.53	67.99	61.16	63.60	59.10
SEM ¹⁾		0.680	0.888	0.916	0.567	0.823	0.934	1.123	1.025	1.274	0.877	0.687
Storage temperature (°C)												
	15	85.75	86.51	85.89 ^b	77.68	79.50 ^b	77.04 ^b	76.22 ^c	74.02 ^c	67.38 ^b	67.63 ^b	59.36
	18	86.21	83.90	83.00 ^{ab}	77.96	74.50 ^a	72.58 ^b	70.19 ^b	67.37 ^b	58.38 ^a	63.48 ^b	58.16
	20	87.03	85.02	78.95 ^a	74.96	72.53 ^a	67.77 ^a	62.59 ^a	61.10 ^a	54.78 ^a	58.06 ^a	56.43
SEM ¹⁾		0.683	0.896	0.849	0.543	0.744	0.805	0.866	0.765	1.084	0.720	0.690

p-value

Egg washing	0.760	0.236	0.321	0.824	0.229	0.319	0.317	0.527	0.371	0.456	0.110
Storage temperature	0.751	0.502	0.002	0.059	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	0.228
Egg washing × Storage temperature	0.717	0.720	0.001	0.814	0.299	0.730	0.132	0.795	0.499	0.273	0.845

458 ¹⁾ Pooled standard error of the mean.

459 ^{a-c} Values in a row with different superscripts differ significantly ($p < 0.05$).

ACCEPTED

Table 6. Effects of egg washing and storage temperature on albumen pH

Treatment		Storage period (Day)										
Egg washing	Storage temperature (°C)	0	1	3	6	9	12	15	18	21	28	42
	15	8.37	8.98	9.26	9.63	9.64 ^a	9.62	9.67	9.64	9.71	9.70	9.72
Unwashed eggs	18	8.40	9.03	9.32	9.70	9.71 ^{abc}	9.67	9.73	9.73	9.74	9.72	9.74
	20	8.34	9.09	9.41	9.75	9.84 ^d	9.78	9.77	9.72	9.77	9.77	9.76
Washed eggs	15	8.42	8.88	9.32	9.62	9.69 ^{ab}	9.66	9.68	9.66	9.70	9.70	9.71
	18	8.47	9.05	9.37	9.71	9.75 ^{bc}	9.73	9.68	9.73	9.74	9.72	9.74
	20	8.41	9.14	9.47	9.77	9.79 ^{cd}	9.77	9.75	9.76	9.77	9.77	9.78
SEM ¹⁾		0.021	0.014	0.009	0.007	0.008	0.012	0.007	0.009	0.006	0.005	0.004
Main Effect												
Egg washing												
Unwashed eggs		8.37	9.03	9.33	9.69	9.73	9.69	9.72	9.70	9.74	9.73	9.74
Washed eggs		8.43	9.02	9.39	9.70	9.74	9.72	9.70	9.72	9.74	9.73	9.74
SEM ¹⁾		0.02	0.017	0.012	0.01	0.012	0.013	0.009	0.011	0.007	0.006	0.005
Storage temperature (°C)												
15		8.40	8.93 ^a	9.29 ^a	9.63 ^a	9.66 ^a	9.64 ^a	9.67 ^a	9.65 ^a	9.71 ^a	9.70 ^a	9.72 ^a
18		8.43	9.04 ^b	9.34 ^b	9.70 ^b	9.73 ^b	9.70 ^a	9.71 ^a	9.73 ^b	9.74 ^{ab}	9.72 ^a	9.74 ^a
20		8.38	9.11 ^b	9.44 ^c	9.76 ^c	9.82 ^c	9.78 ^b	9.76 ^b	9.74 ^b	9.77 ^b	9.77 ^b	9.77 ^b
SEM ¹⁾		0.021	0.014	0.01	0.007	0.008	0.012	0.008	0.009	0.006	0.005	0.004

p-value

Egg washing	0.127	0.733	0.003	0.723	0.389	0.207	0.114	0.319	0.674	0.892	0.629
Storage temperature	0.503	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Egg washing × Storage temperature	0.982	0.069	0.978	0.657	0.011	0.441	0.221	0.764	0.951	0.974	0.289

461 ¹⁾ Pooled standard error of the mean.

462 ^{a-d} Values in a row with different superscripts differ significantly ($p < 0.05$).

ACCEPTED

Table 7. Effects of egg washing and storage temperature on yolk color

Treatment		Storage period (Day)										
Egg washing	Storage temperature (°C)	0	1	3	6	9	12	15	18	21	28	42
	15	9.20	8.40	8.80	8.40	8.00	7.50	7.90	8.60	8.10	9.10	9.60 ^{ab}
Unwashed eggs	18	8.70	8.20	7.90	8.20	7.30	7.60	8.20	8.40	9.40	9.20	9.60 ^{ab}
	20	8.80	8.50	7.80	7.90	8.00	8.30	8.30	7.90	9.50	8.90	9.50 ^{ab}
Washed eggs	15	8.40	8.70	8.60	8.10	7.50	7.90	8.10	8.50	9.40	8.40	9.00 ^a
	18	8.60	8.20	8.20	7.60	7.80	8.10	7.80	8.40	9.40	9.20	9.40 ^{ab}
	20	8.60	8.50	8.50	8.10	8.20	8.80	8.10	8.60	10.00	9.00	10.00 ^b
SEM ¹⁾		0.106	0.115	0.115	0.118	0.182	0.156	0.163	0.171	0.315	0.092	0.065
Main Effect												
Egg washing												
	Unwashed eggs	8.90	8.37	8.17	8.17	7.77	7.80	8.13	8.30	9.00	9.07	9.57
	Washed eggs	8.53	8.47	8.43	7.93	7.83	8.27	8.00	8.50	9.60	8.87	9.47
SEM ¹⁾		0.105	0.113	0.119	0.117	0.181	0.158	0.159	0.168	0.31	0.095	0.074
Storage temperature (°C)												
	15	8.80	8.55	8.70	8.25	7.75	7.70	8.00	8.55	8.75	8.75	9.30 ^a
	18	8.65	8.20	8.05	7.90	7.55	7.85	8.00	8.40	9.40	9.20	9.50 ^{ab}
	20	8.70	8.50	8.15	8.00	8.10	8.55	8.20	8.25	9.75	8.95	9.75 ^b
SEM ¹⁾		0.108	0.112	0.116	0.118	0.180	0.155	0.160	0.169	0.311	0.094	0.070

p-value

Egg washing	0.090	0.665	0.250	0.327	0.856	0.139	0.684	0.562	0.344	0.282	0.445
Storage temperature	0.842	0.410	0.053	0.464	0.465	0.067	0.846	0.775	0.426	0.145	0.024
Egg washing × Storage temperature	0.353	0.828	0.284	0.383	0.521	0.989	0.747	0.586	0.698	0.164	0.004

464 ¹⁾ Pooled standard error of the mean.

465 ^{a,b} Values in a row with different superscripts differ significantly ($p < 0.05$).

ACCEPTED

Table 8. Effects of egg washing and storage temperature on yolk index

Treatment		Storage period (Day)										
Egg washing	Storage temperature (°C)	0	1	3	6	9	12	15	18	21	28	42
Unwashed eggs	15	0.39	0.39	0.39	0.38	0.37	0.37	0.36	0.37	0.32	0.31	0.30
	18	0.39	0.38	0.39	0.36	0.36	0.34	0.34	0.33	0.29	0.29	0.27
	20	0.39	0.39	0.37	0.35	0.35	0.32	0.31	0.30	0.27	0.25	0.22
Washed eggs	15	0.39	0.40	0.38	0.37	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.37	0.33	0.32	0.29
	18	0.41	0.39	0.38	0.37	0.35	0.33	0.34	0.39	0.30	0.29	0.28
	20	0.40	0.38	0.37	0.36	0.34	0.32	0.33	0.31	0.29	0.28	0.23
SEM ¹⁾		0.003	0.003	0.004	0.003	0.003	0.004	0.003	0.012	0.003	0.003	0.003
Main Effect												
Egg washing												
Unwashed eggs		0.39	0.39	0.38	0.36	0.36	0.34	0.34	0.33	0.29	0.28	0.26
Washed eggs		0.40	0.39	0.38	0.37	0.35	0.34	0.34	0.35	0.31	0.29	0.27
SEM ¹⁾		0.003	0.003	0.004	0.004	0.003	0.004	0.004	0.012	0.004	0.004	0.005
Storage temperature (°C)												
15		0.39	0.40	0.38	0.37	0.36	0.37 ^b	0.36 ^b	0.37	0.33 ^c	0.31 ^c	0.30 ^c
18		0.40	0.38	0.39	0.36	0.36	0.34 ^a	0.34 ^a	0.36	0.30 ^b	0.29 ^b	0.28 ^b
20		0.40	0.38	0.37	0.36	0.35	0.32 ^a	0.32 ^a	0.30	0.28 ^a	0.26 ^a	0.23 ^a
SEM ¹⁾		0.003	0.003	0.004	0.003	0.003	0.004	0.003	0.012	0.003	0.003	0.003

p-value

Egg washing	0.051	0.483	0.468	0.699	0.174	0.520	0.629	0.351	0.016	0.080	0.351
Storage temperature	0.638	0.099	0.450	0.134	0.173	<0.001	<0.001	0.057	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Egg washing × Storage temperature	0.583	0.570	0.781	0.241	0.972	0.928	0.332	0.560	0.441	0.143	0.127

467 ¹⁾ Pooled standard error of the mean.

468 ^{a-c} Values in a row with different superscripts differ significantly ($p < 0.05$).

ACCEPTED

Table 9. Effects of egg washing and storage temperature on air cell dimension (mm)

Treatment		Storage period (Day)										
Egg washing	Storage temperature (°C)	0	1	3	6	9	12	15	18	21	28	42
	15	17.35	17.86	18.30 ^a	20.71	21.74	22.69	24.91	24.71	27.52	28.65	31.61
Unwashed eggs	18	16.17	17.11	19.04 ^{ab}	20.76	22.31	23.72	25.32	26.32	27.61	30.10	31.16
	20	16.56	17.76	20.16 ^b	22.47	24.77	25.33	29.53	26.98	30.74	32.68	33.85
Washed eggs	15	17.34	17.33	19.57 ^b	20.69	22.12	22.71	22.92	24.66	28.15	27.54	31.61
	18	17.07	17.64	19.03 ^{ab}	21.09	22.99	24.41	25.24	26.85	29.01	28.89	32.76
	20	16.69	17.77	20.15 ^b	22.43	24.70	26.30	26.38	26.75	31.73	31.37	33.62
SEM ¹⁾		0.141	0.155	0.114	0.143	0.162	0.199	0.300	0.234	0.289	0.242	0.228
Main Effect												
Egg washing												
Unwashed eggs		16.69	17.58	19.17	21.32	22.94	23.91	26.59	26.01	28.62	30.48	32.21
Washed eggs		17.03	17.58	19.58	21.40	23.27	24.47	24.85	26.09	29.63	29.27	32.66
SEM ¹⁾		0.146	0.153	0.138	0.172	0.222	0.256	0.373	0.26	0.342	0.317	0.257
Storage temperature (°C)												
15		17.34	17.60	18.93 ^a	20.70 ^a	21.93 ^a	22.70 ^a	23.91 ^a	24.69 ^a	27.83 ^a	28.10 ^a	31.61 ^a
18		16.62	17.37	19.03 ^a	20.93 ^a	22.65 ^a	24.07 ^b	25.28 ^a	26.59 ^b	28.31 ^a	29.49 ^a	31.96 ^a
20		16.62	17.77	20.16 ^b	22.45 ^b	24.74 ^b	25.81 ^c	27.95 ^b	26.87 ^b	31.23 ^b	32.03 ^b	33.73 ^b
SEM ¹⁾		0.142	0.153	0.121	0.139	0.160	0.199	0.325	0.229	0.29	0.249	0.230

p-value

Egg washing	0.237	0.997	0.073	0.764	0.319	0.164	0.005	0.864	0.087	0.015	0.324
Storage temperature	0.063	0.587	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Egg washing × Storage temperature	0.372	0.385	0.037	0.841	0.642	0.606	0.118	0.787	0.861	0.985	0.211

470 ¹⁾ Pooled standard error of the mean.

471 ^{a,b} Values in a row with different superscripts differ significantly ($p < 0.05$).

ACCEPTED

Table 10. Effects of egg washing and storage temperature on air cell depth (mm)

Treatment		Storage period (Day)										
Egg washing	Storage temperature (°C)	0	1	3	6	9	12	15	18	21	28	42
Unwashed eggs	15	2.59	2.78	3.14	4.23	4.03	4.01	4.38	5.27	5.48	6.86 ^{abc}	9.38 ^{ab}
	18	2.80	3.00	3.45	4.63	4.49	4.53	5.23	5.87	7.26	8.3 ^{bcd}	8.47 ^{ab}
	20	2.89	2.77	3.64	4.57	5.25	5.59	6.67	6.51	7.67	8.78 ^{cd}	11.87 ^c
Washed eggs	15	2.89	2.80	2.95	3.99	4.13	4.81	5.04	5.63	6.63	6.51 ^{ab}	8.25 ^a
	18	2.67	2.67	3.44	3.96	4.52	4.90	5.03	6.56	7.67	6.04 ^a	10.10 ^{abc}
	20	2.68	2.94	3.62	4.49	5.36	5.46	5.94	6.47	8.10	9.01 ^d	10.31 ^{bc}
SEM ¹⁾		0.066	0.073	0.074	0.081	0.070	0.084	0.121	0.122	0.200	0.198	0.200
Main Effect												
Egg washing												
	Unwashed eggs	2.76	2.85	3.41	4.48	4.59	4.71	5.43	5.88	6.80	7.98	9.91
	Washed eggs	2.75	2.80	3.34	4.15	4.67	5.06	5.33	6.22	7.47	7.19	9.55
SEM ¹⁾		0.066	0.071	0.079	0.083	0.095	0.105	0.151	0.133	0.220	0.238	0.250
Storage temperature (°C)												
	15	2.74	2.79	3.04 ^a	4.11	4.08 ^a	4.41 ^a	4.71 ^a	5.45 ^a	6.05 ^a	6.68 ^a	8.82 ^a
	18	2.74	2.83	3.45 ^{ab}	4.30	4.51 ^b	4.72 ^a	5.13 ^a	6.22 ^b	7.47 ^b	7.17 ^a	9.28 ^a
	20	2.79	2.86	3.63 ^b	4.53	5.31 ^c	5.53 ^b	6.31 ^b	6.49 ^b	7.88 ^b	8.90 ^b	11.09 ^b
SEM ¹⁾		0.066	0.072	0.073	0.083	0.068	0.088	0.123	0.122	0.201	0.211	0.217

p-value

Egg washing	0.902	0.749	0.616	0.046	0.564	0.043	0.691	0.171	0.102	0.05	0.385
Storage temperature	0.942	0.938	0.007	0.113	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	0.003	0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Egg washing × Storage temperature	0.261	0.368	0.853	0.326	0.966	0.086	0.069	0.475	0.688	0.033	0.004

473 ¹⁾ Pooled standard error of the mean.

474 ^{a-c} Values in a row with different superscripts differ significantly ($p < 0.05$).

ACCEPTED