THE INVESTIGATION OF SOME PROPERTIES OF MEAT FROM WATER BUFFALO (BUBALIS BUBALIS) FED WITH TWO DIFFERENT FEED.

TÖMEK S.O., BULGAY A., SERDAROĞLU M. and DEMYRTAŞ S.

Ege University, Engineering Faculty, Food Engineering Department Bornova, yzmir, TURKEY

S-IVA.36

SUMMARY

In this research, some properties of meat from water buffalo fed with two different types of feed was investigated. For the study, two groups of water-buffalo each consisting of five animals were used. The first group was fed with a mixture of 50 % straw, 50 % concentrated feed, whereas the second group was fed with a mixture of 70 % straw and 30 % concentrated feed untilthe age of 24 months. All animals were slaughtered at the same day and after 24 hrs of slaughter the Psoas major, Longissimus dorsi and Semitendinosusmuscles were dissected. The pH, Hunter color, total water content, pressjuice, protein, fat, ash, connective tissue, TBA content, Warner-Bratzlershear force, and sensory properties were determined. The first group showed higher values for pH and fatcontent than thesecond group in all three muscles. There were no significant differences were found betweenthe three different muscles, but not (within muscles) between treatmentgroups.

IntroductionWater buffalo is a useful animal for mankind in providing labour, meat, milkand leather . They can kept under bad conditions because they are easy tobreed and low in susceptibility to diseases and extreme climatic conditions(Müller et al., 1993). Therefore, a future increase in the population of thewater-buffalo in suitable regions of Türkiye is considered of importance. Physical and chemical properties and quality characteristics of meat frombuffalo which are grown in Türkiye are unknown.

In literature there were some studies about physical and chemicalproperties of buffalo meat. Anjaneyulu et al.(1990) stated that buffalomeat is good and suitable to use in meat products compared with beef. Inthe study of Romunno et al.(1984), beef and buffalo meat were compared andit was found that buffalo meat is less tender and has more water holding capacity. However Grasso et al. (1984) was stated that buffalo meat is more tender and has more water holding capacity. Parabhakar and Narayana (1985)stated that pressible juice of buffalo meat is higher than beef. In theresearch of Lapitan (1977), it was stated that, there is no important differences between buffalo meat and beef.

In this research, physical, chemical and sensory properties of meatfrom water-buffalo fed with two different types of feed was investigated. By doing so its aimed to aid animal breeding and meat processing industry.

Material and Methods

Ten native race male water buffaloes (Bubalis bubalis) were used as thematerial of this study. Infant buffaloes were fed with buffalo milk in firstthree months and after that, they were devided to two groups each containsfive buffalo. First group was fed a mixture of 50 % straw and 50 % concentrated feed whereas the second group was fed a mixture of 70 % strawand 30 % concentrated feed until the age of 24 months. All animals wereslaughtered at the same day and carcasses were stored at +4 °C until the endof the rigor mortis. After 24 hours of slaughter, carcasses were seperated into two parts and the cross sectional area of the 13th and 14th vertebrawas marked and the area was calculated with planimeter. Afterwards,Longissimus dorsi (LD), Psoas major (PM) and Semitendinosus (ST) muscleswere dissected and the pH values were determined with (Sanderson and Vail, 1963), protein (Anon, 1974), fat (Flaynnand Bramblett, 1975), ash (Anon, 1974), TBA number (Tarladgis et al. 1960), and Hydroxyproline content (Reutersward et al. 1982) were determined andthe sensory properties of fresh and cooked samples were evaluated by fivepanel members with 5 point scaled scoring method. The Warner-Bratzler shearforce of the samples having a diameter of 2 cm taken parallel to the fibredirection from cooked meat were determined.Result and

Discussion

The pH values and the fat content of buffalo muscles for two groups are given on Table 1. In both groups, ST muscles which have a highest activity have a lower ph and fat content than the other muscles. However this differences is not significant. It is observed that the first group have the higher pH values and fat content than the first group have the increasing of than the second group significantly (P<0.05) for all muscles. This result shows the increasing of theorem the second group significantly (P<0.05) for all muscles. This result and its are more than the muscles. The TBA number which is the indicator of theoxidation degree of fat were very low in all samples. According to theresults of pressible juice content, there is no significant differences between two groups in all muscles. But it Was seen that the diet which contains more straw increases the pressible juice content a little bit inall muscles. There were a opposite relationship between pressible juicecontent and the pH value of muscles. The pH values were him Were higher but the pressible juice contents were lower in first group then the second one. There as on of this expected results are that, the pressible juice contents of the samples were determined just after the completion of DH do. pH decrease and lowpressible juice indicates high water holding capacity. Same relationship wasalso observed between muscles in each treatment group. There were no significant differences in total water, ash and Drotain Proteincontent between two groups and muscles in each group. The hydroxyprolinecontent of the muscles of ^{two} groups were given on Table 1. In both groupsST contains slightly more hydroxyproline than LD and PM but it is 500 c10 for LD 350 for PMand 870 for Sartoriou but it was notsignificant. Hydroxyproline content of beef is 520-610 for LD, 350 for PM and 870 for Sartorious as horsignificant. Hydroxypronne content of occi is 520 of the approximately same for PM muscles, lower st (Lawrie, 1976). The determined values of buffalo muscles are approximately same for PM muscles, lower than for PMmuscles and higher than Sartorious for ST muscles. The result of the crossectional area of the 13th the 13th and 14th vertebrashows that there were significant differences between two groups and thegroup fed with the site of the task of t With the diet contains concentrated feed has the largercrossectional area. This means that it is wel-feeded. The results of the Hunter color measurement are also given on Table 1. When it is converted to the CIE system the color measurement are also given on Table 1. When it is converted to the CIE system the color of the all samples werepink. According to the (L) values, muscles are significantly different (P<0.05) from each the all samples werepink. from each other. The lightest color was found in ST and the darkest was PM. When the muscles of two group were con-Were compared, there is no significant differences between PM muscles but the LD and ST muscles in two groups to the state of the state groups have the lighter color then second group significantly (P<0.05). According to the(a) values, all samples have the light red color. Redness of LD is lower than the others. There is no significant differences between PM and STmuscles. Warner-Bratzler shear force values of muscles in two groups areapproximately close each other Th other. There is no significant differences for PMand LD muscles in two groups and provide the signature of the second from the values than theothers so tenderness is lower in ST muscles. This is also observed from the panel results of the tenderness is lower in ST muscles. This is also observed from the panel results of PM and LD tenderness property. Results of the sensory evaluations are given on Table 2. Allevaluations of PM and LD ^{muscles} property. Results of the sensory evaluations are given on Fable 2. And the sensory evaluation of the senso red color and lowtenderness took a lower results that is between moderate and good (3-4point) than the other muscles. There is no significant differences betweentwo groups for all muscles in sensory properties.

References

Anjaneyulu, A.S.R., Lakshmanan, V., Sharma, N. and Kondaiah, N. (1990). Buffalomeat production and meat quality: a rewiev. Indian Food Packer 44 (4) 21-31Anon, (1974). TS 1743 Et ve et ürünlerinde nem tayini. TSE Ant ^{TSE} Ankara. Anon, (1974). TS 1746 Et ve et ürünlerinde kül tayini. TSE Ankara. Anon, (1974). Tecator Manuae Kil Manuae Kjeltec System. Distilling unit 1002.Flaynn ve Bramblett V.D. (1975). Effect of frozen storage, Cooking Vieltec System. Distilling unit 1002.Flaynn ve Bramblett V.D. (1975). Cooking Methodand Muscle Quality on Attributes of Pork lions. J. of Food Science, 40:631.Grasso, F., Colatro 1. Colatruglio, P. and Gambacorta, E. (1984). Comparative studieson meat quality of buffaloes and cattle feed hay and concentrates. XIII. Produzione Animale 3(1/2) 23-28.

Lapitan, J.E. (1977). Physical, chemical and sensory properties of beef and carabeef. Unpub. undergraduate thesis JDV P. (1977). Physical, chemical and sensory properties of beef and carabeef. Unpub. undergraduate thesis JDV P. (1977). Physical, chemical and sensory properties of beef and carabeef. Unpub. undergraduate thesis JDV P. (1977). Physical chemical and sensory properties of beef and carabeef. Unpub. undergraduate thesis JDV P. (1977). Physical chemical and sensory properties of beef and carabeef. Unpub. undergraduate thesis JDV P. (1977). Physical chemical and sensory properties of beef and carabeef. Unpub. undergraduate the sensory properties of beef and carabeef. Unpub. undergraduate the sensory properties of beef and carabeef. Unpub. undergraduate the sensory properties of beef and carabeef. Unpub. undergraduate the sensory properties of beef and carabeef. Unpub. undergraduate the sensory properties of beef and carabeef. Unpub. undergraduate the sensory properties of beef and carabeef. Unpub. undergraduate the sensory properties of beef and carabeef. Unpub. undergraduate the sensory properties of beef and carabeef. Unpub. undergraduate the sensory properties of beef and carabeef. Unpub. undergraduate the sensory properties of beef and carabeef. Unpub. Unpub. undergraduate the sensory properties of beef and carabeef. Unpub. Un hesis. UPLB Collage of Agric. Lawrie, R.A. (1976). Meat Science. 2nd Ed. Pergamon Press. Müller, L., Aguirre J. D. Collage of Agric. Lawrie, R.A. (1976). Meat Science bubalis prest quality when submitted Aguirre,L.F., Feijo,G.L. ve Perobelli,Z. (1993). Buffalo(Bubalus bubalis) meat quality when submitted to three feeding and the submitted in the submitted for the submitted in the submitted for ^{6eding} regimes. 39thICMST s2p15.wpParabhakar,K. and Narayana, Rao P.L. (1986). Comparison of ^{6rganol} organoleptic andrelated characters of buffalo meat with beef. J.of Food Sci.and Tech.India. 23 (2) 90-93. Reutersward, A.L., Asp, N.G., Björr, I. and Ruderus, H. (1982). Effect of collagen content and heat treatment on protein discussion. Asp, N.G., Björr, I. and Ruderus, H. (1982). Effect of Collagen content and heat treatment on the second technology. In the second technology of technolo Protein digestibility and biologicalvalue of meat products. J. Food Tech., 17, 115-123.Ramunno, L. (1984). Comparative studies on meat quality of buff. and cattlefeed hay and concent. XI. Prod. Animale 3(1/2) 9-14Sand 9.14Sanderson, M. and Vail, G.E. (1963). A method for determining press fluid incooked beef. J. of Food Sci. 28:596T. 28:596Tarladgis, B.G., Watts, B.M. and Younathan, M.T. (1960). A distillation method for the quantitative determined determination of malonaldehyde in rancid foods. TheJ.of A.O.C.S. 37: 44-48.