3.I - P7

THE INFLUENCE OF THE AUTOCHTHONOUS STARTER CULTURES IN THE PRODUCTION OF REGIONAL SAUSAGES - MECHANICAL PROPERTIES AND SENSORIAL EVALUATION

Elias¹, M.; Marinho¹, A.; Santos¹, A.C.; Barreto², A.; Ouakinin², J.; Ferreira², M.

¹⁾Universidade de Évora, Apartado 94, 7002-554 Évora, Portugal ²⁾Faculdade de Medicina Veterinária, Alto da Ajuda, 1330-477 Lisboa P

Si

lev

Backgroung

The main goals of using starter cultures to control the fermentative process in the sausage production are: to improve sensorial characteristics; to promote higher homogeneity, a big challenge for regional production; to guarantee the health safety of thes reproducts by the action of lactic acid bacteria that increase acidification and produce oxigen peroxid and also by the action of som a lactic acid bacteria that produce bacteriocines. Some results can be achieved using techniques based on biologic antagonism amont some saprophytic microbial genera and pathogen microrganisms whose presence should be avoid (Rogriguez, 1996). Starter culture using *Micrococcaceae* could be use to shorter ripening time and cure process (Carrascosa-Santiago, 1989;) which will be a advantage for the industrial process.

Objectives

To know the influence of the autochthonous cultures of *Staphylococcus xylosus* and *Lactobacillus sake* on mechanical propertie and on sensorial characteristics of one typical kind of sausage "Paio de Barrancos" produced in the south-east of Portugal.

Methods

"Paio de Barrancos", is a regional and traditional Portuguese sausage with a cilindrical form (diameter: 4-5cm; length: 25-30cm) raw material is meat and fat from Alentejano pig bread. Two factories were studied. Factory A doesn't use smoke during the curintime. Factory B use smoke from holm-oak wood. At both factories the process conditions for the ripening period are the same (days; temperature: 3-5°C; relative humidity: 90-95%). However the curing period conditions at factory A (30 days; temperature 10 12°C; relative humidity 78-80%) are different from those of factory B (8 days, temperature 30-35°C and smoking; 21 daystemperature 17-18°C).

Four 25Kg portions of meat and fat were prepared in each of those factories. Three out of them were inoculated, one with 10^{-10} cells/g of *Staphylococcus xylosus*, other with 10^{8} cell/g of *Lactobacillus sake*, and other one with 10^{8} cells/g of *Staphylococcu xylosus* and 10^{8} cells/g of *Lactobacillus sake*. The fourth portion, the control, wasn't inoculated. Those portions are reference respectively as inoculation modality 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Mechanical evaluation was performed using a Texture Analyser Stable Micro System mod. TA-Hdi and respective software. That tests performed were a Texture Profile Analysis (TPA) with a compressed platen (samples were cylindrical with 3,5cm of diameter and 3,5cm of height and were compressed twice to 10% of the initial height) and a cutting test with a blade knife (samples were slice) with 4mm of height and the miting must stable the new of height and the miting must stable the new of height and the miting must stable the new of height and the miting must stable the new of height and the miting must stable the new of height and a cutting test with a blade knife (samples were slice) with 4mm of height stable the new of height stable test of test

with 4mm of height and the cutting was total; the maximum force was measured). 10 samples were used from each modality. Ta A trained panel composed by 14 persons performed a sensorial evaluation, using a descriptive and quantitative method with mo

scale from 0 to 100. For the sensorial evaluation 5 samples of each modality were used.

The program STATISTICA was used to perform Anova analysis and for means comparison test (LSD).

Results and discussions

Significative differences were found in factory A in unsmocked sausages for hardness, cohesiveness, gumminess and chewimness parameters (Table 1). The hardness was significantly lower in the modalities 1 and 2 than in the modality 4 (Table2). On the other hand, gumminess and chewimness show values significantly lower in the modality 1 than in the modality 4, which could be related with the lower hardness in the modality 1. In spite of none significant differences were found for the other mechanical parameters (value of fracturability in the modality 1, that can be related with the high values (value of shear force on cutting test of the product inoculated with *Staphylococcus xylosus*. In factory B only the result of shear force in cutting test show significative differences (Table 1). However lower values were found on the products belonging 1 modality 1. All the other parameters didn't exhibit also significant differences. In a general approach we can conclude that the work results were found in the sausages not inoculated from the control portion.

The sensorial evaluation of products from factory A revealed significant differences for juiciness and general appreciation (Tab)P3) both with best values for modality 1 (inoculated with *S. xylosus*). The results from factory B didn't show any signification differences, maybe the action of smoke in the products inhibit the action of the microrganisms that were inoculated.

Conclusions

The sausages inoculated with *Staphylococcus xylosus* were those that exhibit best results for mechanical properties and also fill sensorial evaluation, mainly those from factory A, that were not smoked.

On the other side, products from factory B didn't show any kind of difference for all the parameters studied what can be explained by an inhibitory action of the smoke in the starter cultures used.

Pernitent literature

Carrascosa-Santiago, A. V. (1989). PhD Tesis.Complutense University of Madrid, Faculty of Biological Science. Lucke, F. K., (1985). Fermented sausage. In: Microbiology of fermented foods, 2: 41-83.

Lucke, F. K. and Hechelmann, H (1987). Starter cultures for dry sausages and raw hams. Fleischwirtsch, 66: 307-314. Rodríguez, J. M. (1996). Antimicrobial spectrum, structure, properties and mode of action of nisin, a bacteriocin produced ^k Lactococcus lactis. Food Sci. and Tech. Inter., 2: 61-68.

3.I - P7

	and the second se		property of the local division of the local division of the	the state of the s	and the second second second	and the second se	and the second se				-						
P	Hardness	Fractura	Adhesive	Springi	Cohesive	Gummi	Chewi	Shear	Hardness	Fractura	Adhesive	Springi	Cohesive	Gummi	Chewi	Shear	
-+		bility	ness	ness	ness	ness	Ness	force		bility	ness	ness	ness	ness	ness	force	
-				FACT	ORY A		19.55			1.1	as paint	FACTO	DRY B	ineres.	and the second second		
ue	6,044	1,503	1,330	0,663	3,660	5,503	4,279	2,373	0,231	0,819	0,856	0,776	1.070	0.199	0.270	3.371	
ue	0,011	0,268	0,314	0,592	0,048	0,015	0,031	0,087	0,873	0,503	0,485	0.525	0.392	0.895	0.846	0.029	
evel	*	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	*	*	*	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	*	
	ue ue evel	Hardness ue 6,044 ue 0,011 evel *	Hardness Fractura bility ue 6,044 1,503 ue 0,011 0,268 evel * N.S.	Hardness Fractura Adhesive bility ness ue 6,044 1,503 1,330 ue 0,011 0,268 0,314 evel * N.S. N.S.	Hardness Fractura Adhesive bility ness Springi ness bility ness FACTO ue 6,044 1,503 1,330 0,663 ue 0,011 0,268 0,314 0,592 evel * N.S. N.S. N.S.	Hardness Fractura Adhesive bility Springi cohesive ness Cohesive ness Image: bility ness 1,830 0,663 3,660 Image: bility 0,011 0,268 0,314 0,592 0,048 evel * N.S. N.S. N.S. *	Hardness Fractura bility Adhesive ness Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness FACTORY A ue 6,044 1,503 1,330 0,663 3,660 5,503 ue 0,011 0,268 0,314 0,592 0,048 0,015 evel * N.S. N.S. N.S. * *	Hardness Fractura bility Adhesive ness Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness FACTORY A ue 6,044 1,503 1,330 0,663 3,660 5,503 4,279 ue 0,011 0,268 0,314 0,592 0,048 0,015 0,031 evel * N.S. N.S. * *	Hardness Fractura bility Adhesive ness Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness Shear force FACTORY A ue 6,044 1,503 1,330 0,663 3,660 5,503 4,279 2,373 ue 0,011 0,268 0,314 0,592 0,048 0,015 0,031 0,087 evel * N.S. N.S. * * N.S.	Hardness Fractura bility Adhesive ness Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness Shear force Hardness FACTORY A ue 6,044 1,503 1,330 0,663 3,660 5,503 4,279 2,373 0,231 ue 0,011 0,268 0,314 0,592 0,048 0,015 0,031 0,087 0,873 evel * N.S. N.S. * * N.S. N.S.	Hardness Fractura bility Adhesive ness Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Ness Shear force Hardness Fractura bility Image: Fractura bility bility ness ness ness Ness force bility bility FACTORY A ue 6,044 1,503 1,330 0,663 3,660 5,503 4,279 2,373 0,231 0,819 ue 0,011 0,268 0,314 0,592 0,048 0,015 0,031 0,087 0,873 0,503 evel * N.S. N.S. * * N.S. N.S. N.S.	Hardness Fractura bility Adhesive ness Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness Shear force Hardness Fractura bility Adhesive ness FACTORY A ue 6,044 1,503 1,330 0,663 3,660 5,503 4,279 2,373 0,231 0,819 0,856 ue 0,011 0,268 0,314 0,592 0,048 0,015 0,031 0,087 0,873 0,503 0,485 * N.S. N.S. N.S. * * * N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S.	Hardness Fractura bility Adhesive ness Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi Ness Shear force Hardness Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Interse of the force Fractura Adhesive bility ness ness	Hardness Fractura bility Adhesive ness Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness Shear force Hardness Fractura bility Adhesive ness Springi ness Cohesive ness wass ness ness Ness force Hardness Fractura bility Adhesive ness Springi ness Cohesive ness wass ness ness Ness force Bardness Fractura bility Adhesive ness Springi ness Cohesive ness wass FACTORY A FACTORY A wass factora force Structura bility ness ness ue 6,044 1,503 1,279 2,373 0,231 0,819 0,856 0,776 1,070 ue 0,011 0,268 0,392 0,031 0,873 0,503 0,485 0,525 <th 0.0000000000000000000000000<="" colspa="5" td=""><td>Hardness Fractura bility Adhesive ness Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Shear force Hardness Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Interse force Interse Interse</td><td>Hardness Fractura bility Adhesive ness Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness Shear force Hardness Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness FACTORY A Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness Ness Fractura force Springi bility Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness FACTORY A FACTORY A Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Image: Fractura ness Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Chewi ness Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Chewi ness Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Chewi ness Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Sprin</td></th>	<td>Hardness Fractura bility Adhesive ness Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Shear force Hardness Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Interse force Interse Interse</td> <td>Hardness Fractura bility Adhesive ness Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness Shear force Hardness Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness FACTORY A Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness Ness Fractura force Springi bility Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness FACTORY A FACTORY A Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Image: Fractura ness Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Chewi ness Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Chewi ness Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Chewi ness Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Sprin</td>	Hardness Fractura bility Adhesive ness Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Shear force Hardness Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Interse force Interse Interse	Hardness Fractura bility Adhesive ness Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness Shear force Hardness Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness FACTORY A Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness Ness Fractura force Springi bility Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness FACTORY A FACTORY A Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Image: Fractura ness Springi ness Cohesive ness Gummi ness Chewi ness Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Chewi ness Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Chewi ness Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Chewi ness Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Springi ness Image: Fractura Adhesive bility Sprin

Table 1 - Texture Profile Analysis and Cutting Test - Variance analysis for inoculation modality factor in two factories

nsorie Significant level: * for p < 0,05; N.S. – non significant

f thes Table 2 – Texture Profile Analysis and Cutting Test – Means and Standard Deviation for different inoculation f som modality and two factories

ilture	Inoculation Modality	Hardness (N)	Fracturability	Adhesiviness (N)	Springiness	Cohesiveness	Gumminess (N)	Chewiness (N)	Shear force		
De a		FACTORY A									
	1	2332 a	16,2	-34,0	0,766	0,738 a	1721 a	1336 a	5721		
-		± 440	±2,7	±16,4	± 0,087	± 0,024	± 325	± 350	± 1181		
pertie	2	6806 a	19,4	-22,2	0,774	0,724 a	4912 ab	3863 ab	8055		
-		± 5369	± 4,9	± 23,2	± 0,039	± 0,017	± 3817	± 3023	± 4402		
	3	6997 ab	16,9	-17,3	0,786	0,712 ab	5048 ab	4047 ab	8437		
-		± 3393	± 5,0	±10,5	$\pm 0,050$	± 0,030	± 2565	± 2210	± 2600		
Ocm)	4	12566 b	25,7	-12,6	0,731	0,69 b	8649 b	6355 b	9570		
curio		± 2431	± 11,4	± 5,1	± 0,032	± 0,013	± 1517	± 1382	± 3468		
me (5		FACTORY B									
re 10	1	4845	19,5	-81,3	0,798	0,720	3593	3112	5832 a		
days		± 3888	± 5,1	± 59,0	± 0,137	± 0,051	± 3037	± 2963	± 2721		
-	2	3866	15,3	-106,7	0,727	0,692	2697	1966	9548 b		
th 10-		± 1615	± 2,4	± 93,0	± 0,050	± 0,023	± 1185	± 908	± 3628		
occu	3	5133	16,6	-58,0	0,736	0,702	3632	2770	7282 abc		
feree		± 1627	± 4,9	± 6,7	± 0,109	± 0,039	± 1318	± 1462	± 2830		
1032	4	5354	17,6	-46,7	0,703	0,680	3636	2586	6216 ac		
Th		± 2591	± 4,0	± 52,1	± 0,101	± 0,022	± 1721	± 1312	± 1450		

At the same factory and in the same column, different letters represent means significant different

slice

 Table 3 - Sensorial Evaluation - Variance analysis for inoculation

 with modality factor in two factories

	Color Intensity	Aroma Intensity	Taste Intensity	Tender ness	Juiciness	General Apprecia tion
nne		F	factory .	A		
othe	1,263	2,285	0,973	0,859	2,675	3,435
ers value	0,288	0,080	0,406	0,463	0,048	0,018
st level	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	*	*
ngt	Sengelses Seneral S	F	actory	B		
value	0,531	0,783	0,473	0,028	0,300	0,128
icalvalue	0,662	0,505	0,701	0,994	0,826	0,944
bign. level	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Simil	our other statements of the local division o			1.577 Dia 14	and the second	

so ft significant level : * for p < 0.05; N.S. – non significant

laine

 Table 4 – Sensorial Evaluation – Means and Standard Deviation

 for inoculation modality factor in two factories

Inoculation Modality	Color Intensity	Aroma Intensity	Taste Intensity	Tender ness	Juiciness	General Appreciat ion
ALLA ST		F	actory A		an at a fin k	
1	75	70	74	70	72a	72a
	± 10	±16	±11	±14	±13	±12
2	76	66	71	67	65b	65b
2 39 tak	± 12	±17	±12	±14	±16	±15
3	77	71	73	66	70 ab	68 ab
1	± 10	±13	±12	±17	±14	±14
4	79	73	74	66	67 ab	65b
onle di orl	±10	±13	±10	±16	±16	±13
		F	actory B	1 A	oble and	e onisida
1	75	66	70	69	69	66
	±13	±15	±14	±19	±18	±17
2	73	69	71	68	69	65
	± 13	±14	±14	±20	±20	±18
3	73	67	68	68	67	66
	± 16	±15	±15	±17	±19	±15
4	76	65	71	68	67	66
	±15	±15	±13	±17	±17	±15

At the same factory and in the same column, different letters represent means significant different