Biodiesel, an alternative fuel derived from lipid feedstocks, such as vegetable oil or animal fat, is mainly composed of saturated and unsaturated fatty acid alkyl esters. Fuel suppliers, terminal operators, and users are becoming more concerned with monitoring and maintaining good biodiesel fuel quality with respect to oxidative degradation during storage. The oil stability index (OSI), a parameter that measures the relative oxidative stability of fatty materials, is typically measured isothermally at elevated temperatures to accelerate oxidation. The present work investigates the effects of block temperature \( T \) on the OSI of biodiesel from soybean oil fatty acid methyl esters (SME) and used cooking oil fatty acid methyl esters (UCOME). Results were compared to those for pure methyl oleate (MO). An increasing temperature accelerated the oxidation reaction causing a decrease in OSI. Response factors (RF) determined with MO as the reference methyl ester showed little variation with respect to the temperature ranges studied. At constant \( T \), SME yielded lower OSI values than either UCOME or MO. However, despite having comparable iodine values, UCOME yielded a significantly higher OSI than MO. Two mathematical models for determining OSI as a function of \( T \) demonstrated linear correlations for all three methyl esters. Results from the second model, \( \ln(\text{OSI}) \) versus \( T^{-1} \), were employed to calculate the activation energy \( (E_a) \) of first-order oxidation reactions. Although both models exhibited relatively small deviations between calculated and measured OSI values, the models were not reliable at temperatures below 50 °C.

## Introduction

Biodiesel is defined as fatty acid monoalkyl esters derived from the transesterification of agricultural lipids such as vegetable oil, used cooking oil, waste greases, or animal fat. In the United States, the most common forms are fatty acid methyl esters (FAME) and ethyl esters. Biodiesel is ideal as an alternative fuel or fuel extender for combustion in compression-ignition (diesel) engines in many applications, including trucks and automobiles, farm vehicles, locomotives, aircrafts, stationary power generators, boilers, and heaters.

Several recent reviews\(^1\)–\(^3\) have outlined the many technical merits of biodiesel. Biodiesel is a renewable fuel that can be made from local feedstocks, is environmentally innocuous because of its low toxicity and propensity to biodegrade, and is relatively safe to store and handle because of a high flash point. Biodiesel has high heat of combustion, specific gravity, and kinematic viscosity comparable to conventional diesel (petrodiesel). It blends well with petrodiesel and enhances the cetane number, which decreases ignition delay times. Biodiesel is known to enhance lubricity and antwear characteristics when blended with low-sulfur petrodiesel.\(^3\)\(^,\)\(^4\) It was reported that biodiesel returns more than 3 times the energy required to produce it and has a net negative carbon dioxide balance.\(^5\) A comprehensive review by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency\(^6\) showed that biodiesel reduces regulated exhaust emissions including hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter when blended with petrodiesel. The degree in which emissions are reduced was approximately linear with respect to the blend ratio. Biodiesel similarly reduces smoke opacity, sulfur dioxide, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon emissions.\(^1\)\(^–\)\(^3\) Its main disadvantages include poor long-term storage stability characteristics, poor cold weather performance, and causing slight increases in emissions of nitrogen oxides compared to petrodiesel.

Storage stability of a liquid fuel is defined by its ability to resist physical and chemical changes brought about by interactions with its environment.\(^7\) Stability may be affected by interactions with contaminants, light, factors that cause sediment formation, changes in color, and other changes that reduce cleanliness of the fuel.\(^8\) Mechanisms that degrade fuel properties during storage include oxidation or autoxidation from contact with ambient air, thermal-oxidative decomposition from excess heat, hyrolysis from contact with water or moisture in tanks
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and fuel lines, or microbial contamination from the migration of bacterial fungi on dust particles or within water droplets. The present work emphasizes the thermo-oxidative component of biodiesel storage stability.

Biodiesel is a mixture of fatty acid monoalkyl esters with relatively high concentrations of long-chain mono- and polyunsaturated compounds to promote better cold flow properties. For example, methyl esters from soybean oil (SME) are typically composed of mostly fatty acid groups with 16- and 18-carbon chain lengths, where 80–85 wt % of the total mixture is unsaturated FAME. These relatively high concentrations of mono- and polyunsaturated compounds make SME highly susceptible to oxidation.

Maintaining and monitoring the fuel quality of biodiesel and its blends during storage presents a concern among fuel producers, suppliers, and users. Adaptation of existing American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) method D 2274 (Oxidation Stability of Distillate Fuel—Accelerated Method) for application to biodiesel was viewed as unsuitable because of the formation of difficult to isolate soluble polymers during oxidation and because attempts to correlate results with those from standard vegetable oils and fats industry methods to characterize oxidation were frustrated. Although results from ASTM method D 4625 (Diesel Fuel Storage Stability at 45 °C) correlated well with field tests, the relatively long test periods associated with this method (4–16 weeks) eliminate it as a means to monitor or spot-check fuel stability during storage. ASTM method D 5304 (Assessing Distillate Fuel by Oxygen Overpressure), an accelerated test for fuel stability, may not be suitable because fatty derivatives tend to absorb oxygen or exhibit very broad decreases in pressure with time.

Standard methods used by the vegetable oils and fats industry emphasize the isothermal measurement of an induction period whose termination is defined by the detection of secondary decomposition products. American Oil Chemists’ Society (AOCS) method Cd 12b-92 [Oil Stability Index (OSI)] is an automated method for measuring the induction period using either the oxidative stability or Rancimat instruments. An extensive collaborative study by Jebe et al. showed that analysis of OSI by an oxidative stability instrument had lower interlaboratory coefficients of variation than those for OSI by the Rancimat instrument for hydrocarbon petroleum middle distillates. The present work is a more detailed investigation on the oxidative stability instrument.

Experimental Section

Materials. Nexsol (SME) from Peter Cremer (Cincinnati, OH) was obtained through Procter and Gamble Chemical (Cincinnati, OH). Gas chromatographic (GC) analysis revealed a fatty acid composition of 12.3 wt % palmitic, 4.1% stearic, 23.6% oleic, 53.5% linoleic, and 6.5% linolenic acids for SME. Unsaturated FAME (UCOME) was obtained directly from Griffin Industries (Chicago, IL). GC analysis revealed a fatty acid composition of 6.0% myristic, 15.7% palmitic, 0.9% palmitoleic, 7.8% stearic, 45.8% oleic isomers (7.5% trans), 24.4% linoleic (1.4% trans), and 2.0% linolenic acids plus a trace (<0.05%) of lauric acid and 2.9% unidentified. Fuel characteristics of SME and UCOME are summarized in Table 1. MO (>99 wt % 9Z-octadecenoic acid methyl ester) was used as received from Nu Chek Prep (Elysian, MN) and carefully stored after opening. None of the FAME samples were treated with antioxidants after acquisition.

Methods. Before analysis by an oxidative stability instrument, samples were vacuum-distilled to remove volatile contaminants that could interfere with analysis. Distillation was conducted under 0.05–0.10 mmHg absolute pressure at 60 °C for 90 min in a Kugelrohr apparatus from Aldrich (Milwaukee, WI).

Analyses of OSI were conducted according to AOCS method Cd 12b-92, with an oxidative stability instrument from Omnion, Inc. (Rockland, ME). A 5 g sample was placed in a glass test tube held stationary within a thermostat-controlled (±0.1 °C) block heater. The test tube was capped with a two-hole rubber stopper to allow for a steady stream of clean dry air to pass through the sample.
Results and Discussion

Table 2 is a summary of OSI data obtained from the analysis of SME, UCOME, and MO with respect to temperature ranges outlined in the previous section. Also summarized are response factors (RF) for SME and UCOME calculated by the following equation:

\[
RF = \frac{\text{OSI of SME}}{\text{OSI of MO}}
\]

where OSI data are taken at the same \( T \).

Increasing \( T \) accelerates the oxidation reaction, resulting in a decrease in OSI for SME, UCOME, and MO. Although RF values decreased slightly with an increasing \( T \), under conditions of the present work, these values were nearly constant at 0.041 ± 0.0075 for SME and 1.6 ± 0.20 for UCOME. This suggests that the oxidation reaction pathways for SME and UCOME were similar to those for MO over corresponding \( T \) ranges. Furthermore, reaction pathways for SME and UCOME each do not vary significantly as \( T \) increased over the corresponding ranges studied in this work.

A comparison of OSI data of SME and MO was consistent with respect to their iodine values. That is, SME has a much higher iodine value (129.4) than MO (85.6);\(^{31}\) hence, SME had a significantly lower OSI than MO. In contrast, the iodine value of UCOME (87.3) is nearly equivalent to that of MO, yet UCOME had higher OSI values across the \( T \) range studied. The most likely explanation for the contrast in results is the possible presence of antioxidants in UCOME as received for the present study compared to zero antioxidant content in the pure MO.

Results in Table 2 may be explained by comparing the fatty acid compositions with respect to di- and trienic hydrocarbon chains present in FAME. Iodine value accounts only for the total number of double bonds present in the oil relative to the molecular weight. Oxidation of fatty derivatives generally proceeds at rates depending upon the position of double bonds as well as their total number.\(^{32}\) The allylic positions (methylene positions adjacent to a double bond) are especially susceptible to oxidation. Furthermore, polyunsaturated fatty acid chains with bis-allylic methylene positions (for example, linoleic acid has one bis-allylic position at C-11 between double bonds at \( \Delta9 \) and \( \Delta12 \)) are more prone to oxidation than allylic positions. The relative rate of the oxidation reaction of linolenate/linoleate/oleate (methyl and ethyl esters) was reported to be 98:41:1.\(^{32}\) An earlier study\(^{33}\) showed that OSI of various FAME correlates better with respect to bis-allylic position equivalents than the iodine value.

When data in Table 2 were compared again, SME had much higher C18:2 and C18:3 contents (53.5 and 6.5 wt %) than either UCOME (24.4 and 2.0 wt %) or MO (zero). An application of equations reported by Knothe\(^{31}\) for SME yielded a bis-allylic position equivalent (BAPE) = 66.5 compared to BAPE = 28.4 for UCOME and 0 for MO. Given its higher BAPE value, SME is substantially more susceptible to oxidation and has a significantly lower OSI than UCOME or MO (at 75 and 80 °C).

A direct comparison of fatty acid compositions for UCOME and MO is more problematic. First, UCOME did not have a higher iodine value (87.3) is nearly equivalent to that of MO, yet UCOME had higher OSI values across the \( T \) range studied. The most likely explanation for the contrast in results is the possible presence of antioxidants in UCOME as received for the present study compared to zero antioxidant content in the pure MO.

A comparison of OSI data of SME and MO was consistent with respect to their iodine values. That is, SME has a much higher iodine value (129.4) than MO (85.6);\(^{31}\) hence, SME had a significantly lower OSI than MO. In contrast, the iodine value of UCOME (87.3) is nearly equivalent to that of MO, yet UCOME had higher OSI values across the \( T \) range studied. The most likely explanation for the contrast in results is the possible presence of antioxidants in UCOME as received for the present study compared to zero antioxidant content in the pure MO.

Results in Table 2 may be explained by comparing the fatty acid compositions with respect to di- and trienic hydrocarbon chains present in FAME. Iodine value accounts only for the total number of double bonds present in the oil relative to the molecular weight. Oxidation of fatty derivatives generally proceeds at rates depending upon the position of double bonds as well as their total number.\(^{32}\) The allylic positions (methylene positions adjacent to a double bond) are especially susceptible to oxidation. Furthermore, polyunsaturated fatty acid chains with bis-allylic methylene positions (for example, linoleic acid has one bis-allylic position at C-11 between double bonds at \( \Delta9 \) and \( \Delta12 \)) are more prone to oxidation than allylic positions. The relative rate of the oxidation reaction of linolenate/linoleate/oleate (methyl and ethyl esters) was reported to be 98:41:1.\(^{32}\) An earlier study\(^{33}\) showed that OSI of various FAME correlates better with respect to bis-allylic position equivalents than the iodine value.

When data in Table 2 were compared again, SME had much higher C18:2 and C18:3 contents (53.5 and 6.5 wt %) than either UCOME (24.4 and 2.0 wt %) or MO (zero). An application of equations reported by Knothe\(^{31}\) for SME yielded a bis-allylic position equivalent (BAPE) = 66.5 compared to BAPE = 28.4 for UCOME and 0 for MO. Given its higher BAPE value, SME is substantially more susceptible to oxidation and has a significantly lower OSI than UCOME or MO (at 75 and 80 °C).

A direct comparison of fatty acid compositions for UCOME and MO is more problematic. First, UCOME did not have a relatively high total saturated FAME content (24.1 wt %) in the present study. Again, an application of equations reported by Knothe\(^{31}\) of allylic position equivalents (APE) for UCOME and MO was 146.2 and 200, respectively, suggesting a higher stability for UCOME with respect to oxidation. However, as
noted above, UCOME has a significantly higher BAPE value than MO. Because bis-allylic methylene positions are approximately 2.5 times more reactive to oxidation than allylic positions, it is difficult to suggest that the lower APE value overrides a higher BAPE value in determining the OSI of UCOME with respect to pure MO. Thus, the possible presence of antioxidants in UCOME remains the most likely explanation for the UCOME, yielding substantially higher OSI values with respect to MO, despite their nearly equivalent iodine values.

The aforementioned similarities between reaction pathways for FAME studied in the present work suggested that OSI–T data may be mathematically modeled. The following two equations were examined:

\[
\text{Model A : } \ln(\text{OSI}) = A_0 + A_1(T)
\]

where \(T\) is in °C and \(A_0\) and \(A_1\) are constants, and

\[
\text{Model B : } \ln(\text{OSI}) = B_0 + B_1(T^{-1})
\]

where \(T\) is the absolute temperature in K and \(B_0\) and \(B_1\) are constants. Results from the application of these models are discussed separately below.

**Model A.** Nakatani et al. showed that plotting log(OSI) versus \(T\) according to eq 2 yields a linear relationship for blends of 95% methyl linoleate in silicone oil. Similar results were reported from studies of various oils by Jebe et al., Hassenhuettl and Wan, Mendez et al., and Reynhout. Jebe et al. reported from studies of various oils by Jebe et al., Hassenhuettl and Wan, Mendez et al., and Reynhout. Jebe et al. reported a slope of 1.0 for their soybean oil, and Mendez et al. reported a slope of 0.07 for their fish enzymes. Jebe et al. reported a slope of 1.0 for their soybean oil, and Mendez et al. reported a slope of 0.07 for their fish oils.

The results in Table 3 show that the regression analysis of OSI with respect to \(T\) for both SME and MO yields a linear correlation (coefficients of deviation, \(R^2 > 0.99\)) with respect to UCOME and MO. Although SME exhibits near-linear correlation, \(R^2 = 0.94\) was low mainly because of the scatter in the data. Results for SME in Figure 1 compared well to those from an earlier study, where regression analysis of ln(OSI) versus \(T\) for neat SME yielded intercept = 6.7 and slope = −0.079. Although slopes \(A_1\) of all three FAME were similar in the range from −0.081 to −0.0999, intercepts \(A_0\) were very dissimilar. Nakatani et al. reported a slope = −0.069 from studies on methyl linoleate and its blends in silicone oil. Jebe et al. reported a slope = −0.07 for soybean oil, and Mendez et al. reported a slope = −0.07 for fish oils.

The results in Table 3 show that the regression analysis of OSI with respect to \(T\) for both SME and MO yields a linear correlation (coefficients of deviation, \(R^2 > 0.99\)) with respect to UCOME and MO. Although SME exhibits near-linear correlation, \(R^2 = 0.94\) was low mainly because of the scatter in the data. Results for SME in Figure 1 compared well to those from an earlier study, where regression analysis of ln(OSI) versus \(T\) for neat SME yielded intercept = 6.7 and slope = −0.079. Although slopes \(A_1\) of all three FAME were similar in the range from −0.081 to −0.0999, intercepts \(A_0\) were very dissimilar. Nakatani et al. reported a slope = −0.069 from studies on methyl linoleate and its blends in silicone oil. Jebe et al. reported a slope = −0.07 for soybean oil, and Mendez et al. reported a slope = −0.07 for fish oils.
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**Figure 1.** Results plotted according to model A, ln(OSI) versus \(T\). OSI = oil stability index; \(T\) = block temperature; SME = soybean oil fatty acid methyl ester (FAME); UCOME = used cooking oil FAME; MO = methyl oleate (+99%).
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**Figure 2.** Results plotted according to model B, ln(OSI) versus \(T^{-1}\). See Figure 1 for other abbreviations.

### Table 3. Results from the Regression Analysis of OSI and \(T\) Data Shown in Table 2 with Respect to Models A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAME</th>
<th>(A_0)</th>
<th>(A_1)</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
<th>(\sigma_y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>7.4 ± 0.82</td>
<td>−0.09 ± 0.012</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCOME</td>
<td>11.87 ± 0.062</td>
<td>−0.0999 ± 0.00073</td>
<td>0.9998</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>9.7 ± 0.22</td>
<td>−0.081 ± 0.0028</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(n\) = total number of data points analyzed; \(A_0\) and \(B_0\) = intercepts; \(A_1\) and \(B_1\) = slope; \(R^2\) = coefficient of deviation adjusted for degrees of freedom; \(\sigma_y\) = standard error of the \(y\) estimate. See Tables 1 and 2 for abbreviations.

\[\text{Model B : } \ln(\text{OSI}) = B_0 + B_1(T^{-1})\]

where \(T\) is in K.
for SME, UCOME, and MO data (from Table 2). Results from a least-squares linear regression of these curves summarized in Table 3b confirm the linear behavior ($R^2 > 0.99$) for UCOME and MO and nearly linear behavior ($R^2 = 0.94$) for SME.

In addition to providing a correlation for estimating OSI as a function of $T$, modeling according to model B provides a means for quantifying kinetic parameters for the oxidation reaction. For first-order reaction kinetics, the rate of increasing the degree of conversion ($\alpha$) may be expressed by the following equation:

$$\frac{da}{dt} = k(1-\alpha)$$

where $t$ is the reaction time and $k$ is the reaction coefficient. Rearranging and integrating from $t_0$ to $t^*$ and from 0 to $\alpha^*$, where $t^*$ and $\alpha^*$ are defined by the induction period for oxidation (OSI), yields the following:

$$OSI = \frac{\zeta}{k}$$

where $OSI = \Delta t = (t^* - t_0)$ and $\zeta$ is defined as follows:

$$\zeta = -\ln(1-\alpha^*)$$

For a given FAME, $\alpha^*$ is constant at all temperatures where OSI is analyzed; hence, $\zeta$ is also constant.

The rate of the oxidation reaction (eq 4) is exponentially related to temperature.\(^{38}\) Consequently, $k$ is dependent upon $T$ and generally expressed by the Arrhenius relation

$$k = Z[e^{-E_a/R_g T}]$$

where $Z$ is the frequency factor, $E_a$ is the reaction activation energy, and $R_g$ is the gas constant. Substituting eqs 6 and 7 into eq 5 and taking the natural log of the resulting equation yields the following:

$$\ln(OSI) = \ln(\zeta/Z) + (E_a/R_g)T^{-1}$$

A comparison of eq 8 with model B as expressed in eq 3 leads to the following expressions:

$$B_0 = \ln(\zeta/Z) \Rightarrow \zeta/Z = e^{B_0}$$

$$B_1 = (E_a/R_g) \Rightarrow E_a = R_g B_1$$

For first-order oxidation reactions, regression coefficients summarized in Table 3b may be used in eqs 9 and 10 to determine the “$\zeta/Z$” ratio and $E_a$ associated with a FAME mixture. Corresponding results for SME, UCOME, and MO are summarized in Table 4. Litwinienko\(^{42}\) studied kinetics of oxidation of fatty acids and esters by isothermal differential scanning calorimetry and reported $E_a = 85.5$ kJ/mol for ethyl oleate, a compound very similar to MO. That value that compared well to $E_a = 82 \pm 3$ kJ/mol for MO is shown in Table 4.

The pre-exponential factor $Z$ may only be calculated from eq 9 when $\alpha^*$ at OSI is known. A precise evaluation of $\alpha$ from the oxidation of complex FAME mixtures was beyond the scope of the present study. A comprehensive study on rates of conversion during the oxidation of FAME under conditions simulating OSI analyses should be performed in the future.

**Calculated OSI.** Regardless of whether $\alpha^*$ may be accurately determined at $\Delta t = OSI$ or whether $E_a$ or pre-exponential factor $Z$ are precisely known for a given FAME, if regression coefficients are known, OSI may be calculated ($OSI_{calc}$) at a given temperature by directly applying eqs 2 or 3 outlined above. Figures 3–5 are graphs showing OSI$_{calc}$ as a function of $T$ for SME, UCOME, and MO from corresponding coefficients listed in Table 3. In comparison between both models, curves in Figures 3–5 show very good agreement at higher $T$, while model B predicts a slightly more rapid increase in OSI$_{calc}$ at lower $T$.

Measured OSI data (Table 2) superimposed in Figures 3–5 demonstrated very good agreement with corresponding OSI$_{calc}$
curves. Calculated results may also be compared in terms of residuals (δ) determined as follows:

\[ \delta = (\text{OSI}_{\text{calc}} - \text{OSI}) \]  

Application of eq 11 with OSI_{calc} data from both models indicated a slight trend toward increasing δ with decreasing T. With respect to model A, maximum δ values were −0.57 h at 65 °C for SME, −0.94 h at 75 °C for UCOME, and 9.72 h at 70 °C for MO. With respect to model B, maximum δ values were −0.60 h at 65 °C for SME, 0.19 h at 75 °C for UCOME, and 8.60 h at 70 °C for MO.

Although maximum absolute δ values tended to increase with decreasing T, relative deviation as percent values behaved more erratically. SME demonstrated the 10–19% deviation with respect to T ≥ 65 °C for both models; UCOME generally showed very small relative deviations (<1.2%) with respect to both models; and MO first increased and then decreased in relative deviation as T increased. Both the absolute and relative (%) deviations were generally smaller for model B than model A.

Linear relationships explored by models A and B may also be explored by extrapolation to estimate OSI_{calc} at temperatures outside the analyzed T ranges in the present study. For example, models A and B yielded OSI_{calc} = 15.5 and 17.2 h for neat SME at 50 °C. These values compared well to measured OSI = 17.2 h reported in an earlier study.25

Extrapolation of OSI_{calc} to reasonable storage temperatures was more problematic. At 30 °C, model A yields OSI_{calc} = 99 h for SME, 7180 h for UCOME, and 1520 h for MO. At the same temperature, model B yields OSI_{calc} = 160 h for SME, 19100 h for UCOME, and 2650 h for MO. The results for SME appear to be an unrealistic estimation of the oxidation induction period at 30 °C. Furthermore, RF calculated as a ratio of OSI_{calc} values for SME to MO (see eq 1) were 0.065 for model A and 0.060 for model B. These values were 50% higher at 30 °C than the RF value for the analyzed temperature range discussed earlier (Table 2). Similar increases were noted for RF ratios based on OSI_{calc} of UCOME and MO at lower temperatures. Thus, it is apparent that calculating OSI from either model decreases in reliability as the temperature moves further away from the T range employed to develop the models. Nevertheless, results from the present study provide a means for determining effects of the temperature on OSI analyses of FAME under accelerated conditions relative to a reference standard, such as pure MO.

Conclusions

Increasing the temperature accelerated the oxidation reaction, which decreased OSI of the three FAME studied in the present work. RF values with respect to MO as a reference did not vary greatly for SME or UCOME over the corresponding T ranges studied. SME had a higher BAPE than MO, resulting in a significantly lower OSI at constant T. UCOME had a significantly higher OSI than MO, despite having a similar iodine value. The most likely explanation for this was the presence of antioxidants in UCOME before it was acquired for the present study.

The effects of T on OSI were examined by application of two models. Results from model A showed linear correlation between ln(OSI) and T and were in good agreement with those from similar studies published in the literature. Results from model B showed linear correlation between ln(OSI) and T^{-1}. This model was also used to calculate \( E_a \) data for the oxidation reaction based on first-order kinetics. \( E_a \) determined for MO in the present study agreed well with values for oleic acid ethyl esters in the literature.

Results from models A and B were used to calculate OSI values with respect to temperature. Model B predicted a slightly more rapid increase in OSI_{calc} with decreasing T than model A. A comparison of OSI_{calc} with measured OSI showed good agreement for all three FAME studied in the present work. Deviations between OSI_{calc} and OSI showed no distinct pattern with respect to T and were generally smaller for comparisons with model B. Extrapolation of results for SME at T = 50 °C yielded OSI_{calc} that compared well to OSI data reported in an earlier study. However, application of both models demonstrated less reliability at temperatures below 50 °C.
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