

## **PE1.67 Acceptability of Beef from Different Breeds and mh-Genotypes and its Relationship with Physicochemical Quality Attributes. 419.00**

*Verónica Sierra* (1) [veroniss@serida.org](mailto:veroniss@serida.org), *Verónica Fernández-Suárez* (1), *Luis Guerrero* (2), *Pedro Castro* (1), *Koldo Osoro* (1), *Ana Coto-Montes* (3), *Mamen Oliván* (1)

(1)SERIDA

(2)IRTA

(3)Universidad de Oviedo

**Abstract—Sensory properties of meat remain as one of the most influencing factors on consumer satisfaction after purchase. The aim of this study was to assess the evolution along maturation of consumer's acceptance of beef from yearling bulls of different genetic groups and its relationship with physicochemical quality traits. Physicochemical traits (pH, water holding capacity (WHC), composition, Warner-Bratzler (WB), oxidation (TBARS)) were measured, and sensory attributes (flavour, tenderness, juiciness, and overall acceptability) were evaluated in five different genetic categories of two local meat breeds “Asturiana de los Valles” (AV) and “Asturiana de la Montaña” (AM) and their cross (AVxAM) along aging (3, 7, 14 and 21 days). Significant differences between genotypes were found for physicochemical variables, and a significant effect of aging time was found on sensory attributes, WB and TBARS. The sensory parameters evaluated were highly correlated between them ( $r = 0.817$   $p < 0.001$ ) but they did not correlate significantly to physicochemical data. Intramuscular fat (IMF) was positively related to myoglobin. IMF also showed significant but negative correlation to meat juice losses. From this study we can conclude that for the different beef types from local breeds AV (different presence of muscular hypertrophy (mh)) and AM and its cross AVxAM, which produce meat of different physicochemical quality, an appropriate ageing time, was more relevant for consumers' acceptability than the effect of genetic type. In addition, the physicochemical parameters that were more related to final meat quality perception were IMF, instrumental toughness and water holding capacity.**

1Area de Sistemas de Producción Animal, SERIDA, Villaviciosa, Apdo.13, Asturias 33300, Spain. (\*Corresponding autor: M. Oliván, phone: +34985890066; fax: +34985891854. e-mail: [mcolivan@serida.org](mailto:mcolivan@serida.org)). 2I.R.T.A., Centre de tecnologia de los alimentos, Finca Camps i Armet, 17121-Monells, Girona, Spain. Telf.: +34 972630052, Fax: +34 972630373; e-mail:

[lluis.guerrero@irta.es](mailto:lluis.guerrero@irta.es). 3 Departamento de Morfología y Biología Celular, Facultad de Medicina, Universidad de Oviedo, C/ Julián Clavería s/n, 33006 Oviedo, Asturias, Spain. Telf.: +34985102779; e-mail: [acoto@uniovi.es](mailto:acoto@uniovi.es)

**Index Terms— breed, double-muscled, oxidation, quality, acceptability**

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

INCREASINGLY, the choices made by meat consumers are influenced by food safety, health, environmental impact and animal welfare [1]. However, the sensory quality of meat still remains as one of the primary factors influencing consumer satisfaction after purchase. Furthermore, the premium price paid for superior carcass yield and the consumer preferences for leaner meat have increased the interest on genetic factors, such as the presence of mutations of the myostatin gene producing muscular hypertrophy (mh). The aim of this study was to quantify the physicochemical characteristics and to evaluate consumer's acceptance of beef from different genetic categories of the local breeds “Asturiana de los Valles” and “Asturiana de la Montaña” and to establish the relationship between them.

### **II. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

#### **ANIMALS AND MEAT SAMPLES:**

Forty yearling bulls of two local breeds “Asturiana de los Valles” (AV) and “Asturiana de la Montaña” (AM), and its crossbreed (AVxAM) were used in this study. Within AV breed, animals had different presence of the double-muscling character (due to a mutation in the myostatin gene), being homozygous (mh/mh), heterozygous (mh/+) and normal (+/+). Eight animals of each genotype and breed were used. Animals were fattened by feeding concentrate meal and barley straw ad libitum and slaughtered between 14 and 18 months of age, at approximately 500 kg live weight. After 24h stored at 4°C, the ultimate pH (pH<sub>24</sub>) of the Longissimus dorsi (LD) muscle of the 5th rib was determined using a

penetration electrode. The muscle was sliced, vacuum packed, aged at 4°C for 3, 7, 14, 21 days, frozen and stored at -20°C for subsequent analysis.

#### *A. Physicochemical analysis*

Myoglobin concentration was assessed following the Hornsey method [2]. Moisture content was measured with an oven drying method (ISO 1442-1973), intramuscular fat content (IMF) by Soxhlet extraction (ISO 144-1973) and protein content using Kjeldahl analysis (ISO 937-1978). Water holding capacity (WHC) was measured at 7 days post-mortem as expressible juice (EJ, gKg<sup>-1</sup>) according to a modification of the method of Grau and Hamm described by Sierra [3] and drip loss (DP) was determined at 48h post-mortem as proposed by Honickel [4]. The instrumental evaluation of texture (maximum load kg) (WB) was conducted in an Instron 1011 equipment with a Warner-Bratzler shearing device. Thiobarbituric acid reactive substances (TBARS, mg malonaldehyde/kg muscle) were measured by the method of Botsoglou et al. [5].

#### *B. Sensory Analysis*

Samples for sensory analysis were thawed at 4°C for 24 h, then wrapped in aluminum foil and cooked in an industrial oven grill at 200°C to reach an internal temperature of 70 °C. 40 animals (8 from each genotype) and 4 aging times per animal were evaluated by a sensory panel of 140 untrained consumers (49 males and 65 females, age range between 18-60 years) organized in 14 sessions of 10 consumers each and testing six samples per session. Consumers were asked to evaluate flavour, juiciness, tenderness and overall acceptability using a hedonic scale of nine points, ranging from like extremely to dislike extremely.

#### *C. Statistical Analysis*

The effect of genetic group on the physicochemical variables was analyzed by means of Analysis of variance (ANOVA) using the General Linear Model (GLM) procedure of SPSS (12.0). For physicochemical variables measured along aging (TBARS and WB) the effect of genotype, aging time and its interaction was studied. For sensory attributes, once the interaction between genotype and ageing was discarded, the effect of genetic group and the effect of ageing period (with animal and ageing time as fixed factors) were tested over the mean values per sample corrected by the residuals of the session effect. When significant,

differences were tested by means of Tukey post-hoc tests (Games-Howell when variances were not homogeneous). Relationship between variables was evaluated using Pearson Correlation Coefficients.

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Genetic type significantly affected most of the physicochemical traits of meat (Table 1 and 2). Animals with muscular hypertrophy (homozygous or heterozygous) showed lower ultimate pH, which could be due to the higher proportion of fast twitch fibres and the higher and faster glycolytic metabolism of the LD of double-musled animals [6, 7]. Genotype also affected significantly ( $P<0.001$ ) the water holding capacity of meat, with mh-animals showing higher juice losses, measured both as expressible juice and as drip loss, which also reflects the more glycolytic metabolism of these animals. There was also a significant effect of genotype on the chemical composition of meat, with lower IMF content for mh-animals and higher for AM bulls, having meat from AVxAM crossbreed intermediate values between breeds. Meat from AV(mh/mh) bulls had also lower pigment content than the rest of categories and therefore lighter meat. Regarding meat oxidation, measured as TBARS, no significant effect of genotype was found but there was a general increase with storage time (Table 2), being significant for the -mh genotype, which could be related to the higher PUFA proportion described in meat of double-musled animals [8]. However, the level of lipid oxidation was low, even after long storage period, due to the fact that in this study meat was conserved under anoxic conditions (vacuum) where lipid oxidation is limited and it did not produce rancidity or off-flavours that could be detected by consumers. Table 2 shows also the evolution of WB shear force of meat along ageing. No significant effect of genotype was found but there was a significant decrease of toughness along ageing in almost all the genetic categories, being meat of mh-animals (mh/mh and mh/+) the most tender at short aging times. There was no significant effect of genotype on sensory traits evaluated by consumers (Table 3). On the contrary, significant differences were found between different ageing times for juiciness, tenderness and acceptability for the mh-genotypes (mh/mh and mh/+). According to these results, it seems that the optimal ageing time for doubled-musled genotypes is in between 7 to 14 days while other genotypes

(AV +/+, AM) reached the maximum acceptability at longer times (14 to 21 days). This is in clear agreement with the assumption that double-muscling is highly related to a faster metabolism requiring shorter aging times [7]. When studying the Pearson correlation matrix (Table 4) high positive correlations were found between the sensory parameters evaluated, being tenderness and acceptability the best correlated ( $r=0.817$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). Tenderness seems to be the main parameter affecting meat sensory consumers' opinion. Also, sensory tenderness was negatively correlated with WB, as expected ( $r=-0.572$ ;  $p<0.01$ ). Intramuscular fat was positively related to myoglobin content ( $r=0.649$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), due to the fact that meat with higher pigment content came from the rustic breed (AM) and its crossbreed (AVxAM), with higher fat content. IMF also showed significant but negative correlation to meat juice losses (EJ and DP) ( $r=-0.360$  and  $r=-0.338$ ,  $p<0.05$ , respectively), probably due to the fact that meat with more glycolytic metabolism (mh-genotypes) has lower IMF content and it has been postulated that higher fat content facilitate water retention in meat [9].

#### IV. CONCLUSION

We can conclude that for the different beef types from local breeds AV (different presence of muscular hypertrophy (mh)) and AM and its cross AVxAM, which produce meat of different physicochemical quality, an appropriate ageing time, was more relevant for consumers' acceptability than the effect of genetic type. Meat from mh-genotypes requires shorter aging periods than others. In addition the physicochemical parameters that were more related to final meat quality perception were IMF (positively), and instrumental toughness and WHC (both negatively).

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study was supported by INIA (Spain) under RTA2007-00087-C02 project and FEDER funds. V. Sierra thanks a predoctoral fellowship awarded

by INIA. The authors thank M.J. García and M.J. Martínez for assistance on physicochemical analysis.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Grunert, K. G., Bredahl, L., & Brunso, K. (2004). Consumer perception of meat quality and implications for product development in the meat sector – A review. *Meat Science*, 66(2), 259–272.
- [2] Hornsey H.C. (1956). The colour of cooked curded pork estimation of the nitric-oxide haem pigments. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, 7, 534-540.
- [3] Sierra, I. (1973). Producción de cordero joven y pesado en la raza Rasa Aragonesa. Instituto de economía y producciones ganaderas del Ebro (IEPGE), 18.
- [4] Honikel K.O. (1998). Reference methods for assessment of physical characteristics of meat. *Meat Science* 49, 447-457.
- [5] Botsoglou, N. A., Fletouris, D. J. Papageorgiou, G. E., Vassilopoulos, V. N.; Mantis, A. J. & Trakatellis, A. G. (1994). Rapid, sensitive, and specific thiobarbituric acid method for measuring lipid peroxidation in animal tissue, food, and feedstuff samples. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 42, 1931-1937.
- [6] Oliván, M., Martínez, A., Osoro, K., Sanñudo, C., Panea, B., Olleta, J. L., et al. (2004). Effect of muscular hypertrophy on physico-chemical, biochemical and texture traits of meat from yearling bulls. *Meat Science*, 68, 567–575.
- [7] Caballero, B., Sierra, V., Oliván, M., Vega-Naredo, I., Tomás-Zapico, C., Alvarez-García, et al., (2007). Activity of cathepsin during beef aging related to mutations in the myostatin gene. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, 8, 192-199.
- [8] Aldai, N., Murray, B. E., Oliván, M., Martínez, A., Troy, D. J., Osoro, K., et al. (2006). The influence of breed and mh-genotype on carcass conformation, meat physicochemical characteristics, and the fatty acid profile of muscle from yearling bulls. *Meat Science*, 72, 486–495.
- [9] Oliván, M., Mocha, Martínez, M., Castro, P. & Osoro, K. (2003) Evolución post-mortem de la dureza instrumental de la carne de distintos genotipos de las razas bovinas asturianas. In *Información técnica económica Agraria (ITEA)* (Vol 249 (pp. 25-27), Zaragoza, Spain.

**Table 1:** Effect of genetic group on physicochemical variables.

|                          | GENOTYPES           |                    |                   |         |          | Sign. |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------|----------|-------|
|                          | AV ( <i>mh/mh</i> ) | AV ( <i>mh/+</i> ) | AV ( <i>+/+</i> ) | AM      | AVxAM    |       |
| <b>pHLD</b>              | 5.57a               | 5.58 a,b           | 5.62 b            | 5.60 b  | 5.59 b   | ***   |
| <b>Drip loss</b>         | 2.574a              | 2.13 a, c          | 1.22 b            | 0.91 b  | 1.59 c   | ***   |
| <b>Expressible juice</b> | 26.30a              | 24.44 a,b          | 23.41 b           | 20.55 c | 23.12 b  | ***   |
| <b>Moisture</b>          | 74.32a              | 73.56 b            | 73.85 b           | 73.28 b | 73.51 b  | ***   |
| <b>IMF</b>               | 1.71a               | 2.70 b             | 2.77 b,d          | 3.73 c  | 3.19 c,d | ***   |
| <b>Protein</b>           | 22.85a              | 22.82 a            | 22.51 b           | 22.41 b | 22.46 b  | ***   |
| <b>Mioglobin</b>         | 3.24a               | 4.26 b,c           | 3.73 b            | 4.78 c  | 4.36 c   | ***   |

a-c: Means in the same row followed by different letters are significantly different; \*\*\*:  $P \leq 0.001$ .

**Table 2:** Effect of genetic group (in rows) and aging time (in columns) over the mean values of TBARS and WB.

|              | Aging period | GENOTYPES           |                    |                   |        |          | Sign. |
|--------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------|----------|-------|
|              |              | AV ( <i>mh/mh</i> ) | AV ( <i>mh/+</i> ) | AV ( <i>+/+</i> ) | AM     | AVxAM    |       |
| <b>TBARS</b> | 3d           | 0.22 a              | 0.15 a             | 0.15              | 0.19   | 0.17     | NS    |
|              | 7d           | 0.19 a              | 0.19 a,b           | 0.14              | 0.19   | 0.18     | NS    |
|              | 14d          | 0.33 b              | 0.28 a,b           | 0.24              | 0.20   | 0.17     | NS    |
|              | 21d          | 0.39 b              | 0.37 b             | 0.24              | 0.24   | 0.28     | NS    |
|              | <b>Sign.</b> | ***                 | *                  | NS                | NS     | NS       |       |
| <b>WB</b>    | 3d           | 5.27                | 5.14 a             | 6.05 a            | 7.35 a | 5.88 a   | NS    |
|              | 7d           | 4.62                | 5.12 a             | 5.09 b            | 5.34 b | 5.10 a,b | NS    |
|              | 14d          | 4.25                | 4.84 a,b           | 5.01 b            | 4.88 b | 4.79 a,b | NS    |
|              | 21d          | 4.39                | 4.17 b             | 4.84 b            | 4.40 b | 4.52 b   | NS    |
|              | <b>Sign.</b> | NS                  | **                 | *                 | ***    | NS       |       |

a-b: Means in the same column with different letters are significantly different. \*\*\*:  $P \leq 0.001$ ; \*\*:  $P \leq 0.01$ ; \*:  $P \leq 0.05$ ; NS: not significant.

**Table 3:** Effect of genetic group (in rows) and aging time (in columns) on sensory attributes evaluated by consumers.

| Sensory Attributes    | Aging period | GENOTYPES           |                    |          |      |       | Sign. |
|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------|------|-------|-------|
|                       |              | AV ( <i>mh/mh</i> ) | AV ( <i>mh/+</i> ) | AV (+/+) | AM   | AVxAM |       |
| Flavour               | 3d           | 5,67                | 5,70               | 5,85     | 5,84 | 6,30  | NS    |
|                       | 7d           | 6,37                | 6,42               | 6        | 6,07 | 5,97  | NS    |
|                       | 14d          | 6,14                | 6,50               | 6,05     | 6    | 6,45  | NS    |
|                       | 21d          | 5,80                | 6,10               | 6,40     | 6,45 | 6,22  | NS    |
|                       | Sign.        | *                   | NS                 | NS       | NS   | NS    |       |
| Juiciness             | 3d           | 4,95 a              | 5,22 a             | 5,80     | 5,36 | 5,52  | NS    |
|                       | 7d           | 5,50 a,b            | 5,92 a,b           | 5,40     | 5,7  | 5,52  | NS    |
|                       | 14d          | 6,14 b              | 6,60b              | 5,475    | 5,85 | 6,25  | NS    |
|                       | 21d          | 5,55 a,b            | 5,82 a,b           | 5,86     | 6,10 | 5,42  | NS    |
|                       | Sign.        | *                   | *                  | NS       | NS   | NS    |       |
| Tenderness            | 3d           | 4,75 a              | 4,87 a             | 5,87     | 5,18 | 5,7   | NS    |
|                       | 7d           | 5,77 a,b            | 5,90 a,b           | 5,57     | 5,65 | 5,5   | NS    |
|                       | 14d          | 6,06 b              | 6,625 b            | 5,32     | 5,85 | 6,32  | NS    |
|                       | 21d          | 5,6 0a,b            | 5,9 a,b            | 5,82     | 6,32 | 5,65  | NS    |
|                       | Sign.        | *                   | *                  | NS       | NS   | NS    |       |
| Overall Acceptability | 3d           | 4,95                | 5,17 a             | 5,8      | 5,56 | 5,87  | NS    |
|                       | 7d           | 5,9                 | 5,9 a,b            | 5,65     | 5,77 | 5,57  | NS    |
|                       | 14d          | 5,98                | 6,47 b             | 5,47     | 5,72 | 6,35  | NS    |
|                       | 21d          | 5,45                | 5,8 a,b            | 5,98     | 6,37 | 5,62  | NS    |
|                       | Sign.        | NS                  | *                  | NS       | NS   | NS    |       |

a-b: Means in the same column with different letters are significantly different. \*:  $P \leq 0.05$ ; NS: not significant.

**Table 4:** Pearson correlation matrix.

|               | Flav. | Juic.    | Tend.    | Accep.   | phLD   | DL      | EJ       | Moist. | IMF       | Prot.     | Mio.      | TBARS  | WB      |
|---------------|-------|----------|----------|----------|--------|---------|----------|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------|---------|
| Flavour       | 1,000 | ***0,679 | **0,546  | ***0,660 | -0,211 | 0,399   | 0,266    | 0,041  | -0,170    | 0,018     | -0,264    | 0,159  | *-0,540 |
| Juiciness     |       | 1,000    | ***0,738 | ***0,774 | 0,056  | 0,124   | 0,133    | -0,007 | 0,035     | -0,266    | 0,138     | -0,118 | -0,368  |
| Tenderness    |       |          | 1,000    | ***0,817 | 0,148  | 0,188   | 0,061    | 0,153  | -0,202    | 0,038     | -0,097    | -0,110 | **0,572 |
| Acceptability |       |          |          | 1,000    | 0,009  | 0,126   | -0,003   | 0,185  | -0,174    | -0,012    | -0,068    | -0,020 | -0,428  |
| phLD          |       |          |          |          | 1,000  | *-0,384 | -0,270   | 0,291  | -0,076    | -0,223    | -0,114    | -0,153 | 0,208   |
| Drip loss     |       |          |          |          |        | 1,000   | ***0,615 | 0,131  | *-0,36    | *0,391    | -0,286    | -0,097 | -0,222  |
| Expr. Juic.   |       |          |          |          |        |         | 1,000    | 0,216  | *-0,338   | 0,149     | -0,296    | -0,054 | -0,247  |
| Moisture      |       |          |          |          |        |         |          | 1,000  | ***-0,889 | 0,227     | ***-0,561 | -0,046 | 0,061   |
| IMF           |       |          |          |          |        |         |          |        | 1,000     | ***-0,575 | ***0,649  | 0,047  | 0,053   |
| Protein       |       |          |          |          |        |         |          |        |           | 1,000     | **0,432   | -0,123 | 0,057   |
| Mioglobin     |       |          |          |          |        |         |          |        |           |           | 1,000     | 0,085  | 0,259   |
| TBARS         |       |          |          |          |        |         |          |        |           |           |           | 1,000  | -0,240  |
| WB            |       |          |          |          |        |         |          |        |           |           |           |        | 1,000   |

\*\*\* :  $p < 0.001$ ; \*\*:  $p < 0.01$ ; \*:  $p < 0.05$ .