OPTIMIZATION OF THE GRINDING PROCESS DURING PRODUCTION OF COOKED SAUSAGES FROM POULTRY MEAT AND LACTIC PROTEIN CONCENTRATE

K.WASSILEV, R.DIMITROV, A.EXAROV

Higher Institute of Food and Flavour Technologies, Plovdiv, Bulgaria

INTRODUCTION

Due to the increased production and consumption of poultry meat throughout the world, the pos-sibility to offer part of it in the form of processed meat products has gained considerable importance. This tendency has been further increased by the introduction of mechanical techniques for deboning of poultry carcasses (1,2,3). The Major part of the mechanically deboned finely cut poutry meat is used finely cut pourty more cooked for the production of ters bausages and frankfurters. Recently there has been Browing interest towards the Production of cooked poultry ves with different additives mainly proteinaceous pre-parations of animal and vegeta-ble opinion on one hand, there is the possibility to better utilize protein resour-Ces, and, on the other, said Wer products more fully ans-Wer products more fully care logical requirements of physioto contract in the nutrition in relation to contemporary changes in the social Social and living conditions. On the ground of the above con-Siderations we developed a new furter) from poultry meat and the concentrate. In lactic protein concentrate. In the protein concentrate. Jectivesent work we set the ob-Jective to study the influence

of certain factors on the process of grinding of the raw maprocess in order to establish the most favourable conditions that will give meat emulsion with satisfactory stability.

MATERIALS AND METHODS Poultry meat and proteine concentrate, obtained by heat denaturation of rennet whey, were used as raw materials in the experiment. During the grinding process salt and spices were added. The following materials were used for the preparation of the filling mass: 65% poultry (mechanically deboned); 25% chicken necks (mechanically deboned); 10% goose meat from fatted geese; 2% salt; 0,2% black pepper; 0,04% nutmeg; 0,005% potassium nitrite.

The protein concentrate used in the experiments had the following chemical composition: 76-78% water; 13-15% proteins; 4-5% fats; 0,3-0,5% mineral substances. Five to 15% of the protein concentrate was added to the meat depending on the purpose of the experiment. The materials were processed using a laboratory grinder, MTZ-20, at 3000 min rotation speed of the bladed roller.

First of all, the influences of the amount of added water and lactic protein concentrate, and processing (cutting) time were studied by single factor experiments (4,5). The influence of each factor on the studied process was evaluated according to the meat emulsion stability determined by Kozin's method (6) by measuring the volume of centrifugally separated liquid phase.

The influence of each factor was studied at three levels. The added water and lactic protein concentrate levels were 5%, 10%, and 15%, respectively, in relation to the amount of meat, while processing (cutting time was 3, 5, 8 min, respectively. To evaluate each factor, the other two were taken with their average values. After the preparation of the filling mass 20 g samples were taken out and were centrifuged in a laboratory centriguge "Janetzki-T23" at a rotation speed of 3000 min ". The samples were double centrifuged, initially without heating, and after that by preheating to an internal temperature of 72°C.

The single factor experiments carried out allowed us to determine the influence of the above-mentioned factors on meat emulsion stability, and made it easy for us to choose a test center when programming the experiment. In order to find the optimal values for the studied factors, resulting in stable emulsion, we carried out experiment programming and optimization of the grinding (emulsifying) process using Box-Wilson's method (7,8)

Processing of the experimental data was preceded by verification of the type of distributi on of a given random value the volume of centrifugally separated liquid phase. The verification was made in accordance to the empirical criterion (5) and the distribution was found to be normal. With single factor analyses we checked the dispersions in advance according to Kochren's criterion (5).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

 Δ = confidence level

1.Effect of the added water level - As pointed out above, the effect of this factor was studied at three levels:5,10 and 15%. The remaining two fac tors were as follows: added protein concentrate 10%, processing (grinding) time 5 min. The results obtained are given in Table 1.

Added water (%)	5		10		15	
No	^x 1	x1 ²	^x 2	x2 ²	x ₃	X3
1 2 3 4	1,9 2,1 1,9 2,1	3,61 4,41 3,61 4,41	3,6 3,4 3,6 3,4	12,96 13,66 12,96 13,66	5,8 5,6 5,6 5,8	33,64 31,36 31,36 31,64
Rj Pj2	8	16,04	14	53,30	22,8	130
R _j ²	64	an a	196	anne neur -alle (Senni) anne anne alle commu	519,84	

Table 1

 $\Sigma_{R_{j}}^{R_{j}} = 44,8; \Sigma_{j}^{P_{j}} = 199,34;$ $\Sigma_{R_{j}}^{R_{j}} = 779,84$

p = number of factors

q = number of dublicate tests

$$SS_{w} \sum_{j=1}^{D} P_{j} - \frac{1}{p \cdot q} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{D} R_{j}\right)^{2} = 32,09$$

$$SS_{w} \sum_{j=1}^{D} P_{j} - \frac{1}{p \cdot q} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{D} R_{j}\right)^{2} =$$

$$= 27,71$$

$$SS_{w} \sum_{j=1}^{D} P_{j} - \frac{1}{q} \sum_{q=1}^{D} R_{j}^{2} = 4,38$$

$$NS_{w} \sum_{p=1}^{S} P_{-1} = 13,85$$

$$NS_{w} \sum_{p=1}^{S} \frac{SS_{w}}{p(q-1)} = 0,48$$

$$P_{H} = \frac{MS_{B}}{MS_{w}} = 28,63$$

$$P_{cr}/\mathcal{L}, p-1, p(q-1)/ = 4,26$$

$$P_{H} > P_{cr} \text{ i.e the factor stunding has an effect on the grinometry (emulsifying) process. Unlike factor between different di$$

2.Effect of the added protein concentrate level - This was also studied at three levels: 5,10 and 15%. The remaining two factors were: added water 10%, processing (grinding) time 5 min. The results obtained are given in Table 2.

Table 2

Protein concentrate added (%)	5	10	15
No	x ₁	x ₂	x ₃
1 2 3 4	2,1 1,9 2,1 1,9	3,6 3,4 3,6 3,4	5,4 5,2 5,4 5,2

 $F_{H} = 26,14 > F_{cr} = 4,6$, i.e.

the factor has an effect on the process.

 $\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2 = 1,5 > R_y = 1,23$,

 $\bar{x}_2 - \bar{x}_3 = 1,8 > R_0$

indicating that the factor has an effect on each level studied.

3. Effect of processing (grinding time) - It was studied for 3,5 and 8 min grinding time, and the other two factors were 10% each. The results obtained are given in Table 3.

Table 3

Grinding time (min)	3	5	8	
No	x ₁	x2	x ₃	1
1 2 3 4	2,6 2,6 2,4 2,4	3,6 3,4 3,6 3,4	5,2 5,2 5,0 5,0	

 $F_{H} = 14,6 > F_{cr} = 4,6$ i.e. at

a confidence level $\lambda = 0.05$ this factor also has an effect on the process.

 $\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2 = 1,0 < R_0 = 1,23;$

$\bar{x}_{2} - \bar{x}_{3} = 1,6 > R_{v}$

The verification of this factor on the process at different levels indicated that the effect was significant for 3 and 5 min levels. 3/5 min grinding did not lead to statisticall significant results in relation to the centrifugally separated liquid phase.

Full Factor Experiment and Process Optimization.

As a center for the experiment programming we selected a point with the following parameters: added water 10%; added protein concentrate 10%; processing (grinding) time 5 min.

x, denotes the amount of added water, x - the amount of added protein concentrate, x - grin-ding time, the warist 3 inter ding time, the variation intervals are x -5% vals are $x_1 = 5\%$, $x_2 = 5\%$, $x_3 = 3$ min respectively Table 4 shows 8 variants of the operating matrix used in Prog ramming, and the experimental data (cm3 liquid phase from emulsion and the emulsion centrifugation) obtained from the actual experiment carried out twice (y_1, y_2) . N=8; m=2; $\sum_{i=0,14}^{2} = 0,14; \sum_{i=0}^{2} =$ = 0,0175

 $S_{max} = 0,02$

 $G_{H} = 0,344 < G_{cr} / 0,05;2;8/ = 0,517$ i.e. there is equality of dis By means of the results obtain ed we calculate results obtain persions. ed we calculated the following regression coefficienta: - 5 .

$$b_0=4,5; b_1=0,85; b_2=0,57; b_3=0,67; b_{12}=-0,2; b_{23}=-1,25; b_{13}=-0,4; b_{123}=0,025$$

After we established the experiment disputies and the exercise of the second se riment dispersion, we checked the coefficients' significance The verification The verification indicated that all coefficients all coefficients are significant except b cant except b Thus we de-termined the following model for the "y" function for the "y" function (centrift" gally separated it is a separated gally separated liquid phase $y=4,5+0,85x_1+0,55x_2+0,67x_3$ volume):

-0, 2x1 x2-1, 25x2 x3-0, 4x1 x3

The model's adequacy was then confirmed by verification.

1								
Added water (%)	Added prot.con. (%)	Process time (min)	^y 1	y ₂	ÿ	s² i	∑(y _i -ÿ	.) ²
5555555	15 15 5 15 15 15 5 5	8 8 8 3 3 3 3 3 3	5,9 5,7 5,7 4,1 5,8 4,6 1,9	6,1 5,3 3,9 5,3 3,4 4,4 1,7	6,0 5,5 4,0 5,6 4,5 4,5 1,8	0,01 0,01 0,04 0,01 0,01 0,04 0,01 0,01	0,0 0,0 0,0 0,0 0,0 0,0 0,0	22822
prose a 5% of fine the ten e rest	we proceed optimization asic factor The respect er factors of rom the basic alts from the ents are give Table 5	led with th on, where of with step tive steps can be calc the factor ne imaginan ven in Tabl	of cu-					
4 XT	x ₂ x ₃	^x 1 ^x 2	x ₁ x	3 ^x 2	x ₃ y (mir	$(\%)^{c}$	c (%} (c ₃ min)
07N	0 0 -0,65 -0,5 -1,29 -1,5	0 75 0,65 50 2,58	0,3,	0 75 0 1	4, ,48 1, ,90-2,2	50 10 59 5 20 0	10 6,8	5 3 3,5
17 000		en gemel belauffet water is also effective version (1997) and of the output water fields, i water is) 2
that and it it is that come it is that a stand it is that a stand it is that a stand is that a	be seen from ter the seco negative. I was necessa itional imag between the steps with a xi . The res	n the result ond step "y because of ary to carry ginary expe e first and a new step sults from	Lts 7" cy 2-	these e Table 6	xperime	ents an	re giver) 2 1 in
that come iddbecat adds $hat cond hthat cond hthat cond hh_{XI}h_{XI}h_{XI}$	be seen from ter the seco negative. I was necessa itional imag between the steps with a xi . The res	n the resul ond step "y because of ary to carr ginary expe e first and a new step sults from	Lts 7" Cy 2-	these e Table 6	xperime • T:	ents an able 6	re giver) 2 1 in
thac an a st d s that a contact a st d s that a cont	be seen from ter the seco negative. I was necessa itional imag between the steps with a xi . The res	n the resul ond step "y because of ary to carry ginary expe e first and a new step sults from	ts 7" 2- 1 x ₁ x	these e Table 6	xperime • • Ta x ₃ 3 (m)	able 6 y C in) (%	re giver	c ₃ (min
that one idds hat mend to hat one idds hat mend to hat mend hat	be seen from ter the seco negative. I was necessa itional imag between the steps with a xi . The res	n the result ond step "y because of ary to carry ginary expe e first and a new step sults from 3 x ₁ x ₂ ,9 0,94		these e Table 6 3 ^x 2 0,7	xperime • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	able 6 y c. in) (%	re giver	c 3 (min 3,24

Obviously, we have the best meat emulsion stability with the following factor values: $c_1=3,8\%$; $c_2=5,98\%$; $c_3=3,24$ min. For these values the result from the grinding process is most favourable, i.e. it corresponds to minimum liquid phase volume (0,3 cm3) separated during centrifugation of the ready meat emulsion.

The subsequent actual experiments confirmed these values to be optimal in relation to the desirable outcome of the grinding process.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Based on a full factor experiment (x₁: added water level; x₂: level of added protein concentrate from rennet whey; x₃: material processing (grinding) time), we established the following relationship between the volume of unbound liquid phase (y, cm3), separated during centrifugation of poultry meat emulsion, and lactic protein concentrate:

 $y=4,5+0,85x_{1}+0,55x_{2}+0,67x_{3}-0,2x_{1}x_{2}-1,25x_{2}x_{3}-0,4x_{1}x_{3}$

2. The optimal values for the studied factors resulting in stable meat emulsion are: added water level - 3,8%; added protein concentrate level - 6%; material processing (grinding) time - 3,2 min.

REFERENCES

1. Maurer A.J. - Poultry Sci., 52,2061,1973.

2. Backer R.S., J.M.Darfler -Poultry Sci.,54,1283,1975.

3. Dhillen A.S., A.J.Maurer -Poultry Sci.,54,1263,1975 b.

4. Bondar A.G., G.A.Statyuha -Planirovanie eksperimenta v himicheskoi tehnologii, "Visha shkola", Kiev, 1976.

5. Schwart D. - Methodes stati-

stiques a l'usage des medicine⁵ et des biologistes, Flamarion medicine Soilnoes, Paris,1969.

6. Kozin N.I. - Primenenie emulsii v pistevoi promishleno sti, "Pisht.prom.", M., 1966.

7. Grachev Y.P. - Matematiches kie metodi planirovaniya ekspe rimentov, "Pisht.prom.",M.1979

8. Hardtman K., E.Letzki, V. Sheffer - Planirovanie eksperimenta v isledovanii tehnologi cheskih protsesov, "Mir", M., 1977.