

# THE COMBINATION OF ARGININE AND LEUCINE SUPPLEMENTATION OF REDUCED CRUDE PROTEIN DIETS IN PIGS IMPROVES MEAT EATING QUALITY

Marta S. Madeira, Cristina M. Alfaia, Paula A. Lopes, Denis A. Ramos, Rui J.B. Bessa and

José A.M. Prates

Centre for Interdisciplinary Research in Animal Health (CIISA), Faculdade de Medicina Veterinária, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal

**Abstract** – Intramuscular fat (IMF) has been shown to be positively related to quality of meat and plays an important role in consumers' perceptions of cooked pork palatability. This study was designed in order to investigate the effect of dietary arginine supplementation, protein reduction (PR) and leucine supplementation on meat quality, IMF and sensory analysis in pork *longissimus dorsi* muscle. Fifty four entire male pigs from a commercial crossbred (Duroc × Pietrain × Large White × Landrace) with an initial and final average live weight of 59 kg and 92 kg, respectively, were used in this experiment. The IMF was extracted according to the Soxhlet method with previous acid hydrolysis. pH and temperature were measured at 45 min and 24 h *postmortem* and color measurements at 24 h *postmortem*. For sensory analysis were used a trained sensory panel analysis. Dietary arginine supplementation had no effect ( $P>0.05$ ) on IMF content but produced meat off-flavor and, under normal protein diet, increased meat tenderness and overall acceptability. The PR increased ( $P<0.001$ ) IMF. Leucine addition did not affect ( $P>0.05$ ) IMF. There was an increase of juiciness in PR and leucine addition, which accompanied the increase of IMF content. Dietary PR enhances pork eating quality but negatively affected carcass characteristics of pigs.

**Key Words** – amino acids, intramuscular fat, sensory analysis

## I. INTRODUCTION

Pork is one of the most consumed meats in the world, and thus, an important source of dietary fat [1]. Pigs reared in intensive systems have become leaner to satisfy consumers and faster growing to improve feed efficiency [2]. However, it is well known that pork eating quality was negatively affected by IMF reduction [3]. IMF content of pork plays an

important role in consumers' perceptions of cooked pork palatability [4], and it has been suggested that an IMF content between 2.5 and 3.0% is necessary for consumer acceptability of cooked pork [5]. Earlier studies have shown that the IMF levels can be increased without increasing subcutaneous fat with dietary protein restriction [6,7] and Leu supplementation [8,9] during the growing-finishing period of pigs. However, dietary Arg supplementation has been reported as being beneficial for promoting IMF content, skeletal muscle gain, carcass lean content and improved meat quality [10,11].

Our group reported recently that the increased IMF promoted by dietary crude protein reduction in pigs is due to lysine limitation, which improves pork sensory attributes [12]. Thus, the objective of this study was to investigate the additive/interaction effects with Arg and/or Leu supplementation on reduced protein diets as a strategy for increasing IMF and improving meat quality characteristics and sensory attributes on *longissimus dorsi* muscle of pork.

## II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Fifty four crossbred entire male pigs with four genetic lines (50% Large White × 50% Landrace gilts mated to 50% Duroc × 50% Pietrain boars) with a mean live body weight of  $58.9 \pm 1.6$  kg were selected. Before the beginning of the experiment, all animals were housed and fed the same conventional feed management (based on starter and growth concentrates). Afterward, groups of pigs (3 pens with individual control of feed intake, containing 3 pigs each), were randomly assigned to 1 of the 6 isoenergetic (14 MJ ME/kg) dietary treatments. There were six dietary treatments, normal crude protein (CP)

diet (16% CP, NPD), reduced CP diet (13% CP, RPD), reduced CP diet with Leu addition to 2.0% (RPDL), normal CP diet supplemented with 1% Arg (16% CP, Arg-NPD), reduced CP diet supplemented with 1% Arg (13% CP, Arg-RPD) and reduced CP diet with Leu addition to 2.0% and supplemented with 1% Arg (13% CP, Arg-RPDL). The diets not supplemented with Arg were supplemented with an equivalent amount of Ala (2.05%) in order to be an isonitrogenous control. During the experimental period, animals were allowed to feed twice a day and water *ad libitum*. Throughout the experiment, pigs were weighted weekly just before feeding and slaughtered at an average live body weight of  $91.7 \pm 1.6$  kg. Feed was removed 17 h before slaughter. After electrical stunning and exsanguinations, samples from *longissimus dorsi* muscle were collected from the right carcass for IMF and 24 hours after for sensory analysis. All samples were vacuum-packed immediately and stored at -20 °C. The pH and temperature were measured in the *longissimus dorsi* muscle at 45 minutes and 24 hours *post-mortem* at half the length of each loin, using a pH meter equipped with a penetrating electrode. The meat color was measured at 24 h *post-mortem*, using a Minolta CR-300 chromometer and applying the CIE L\*, a\* and b\* system 1 hour after air exposure to allow blooming. IMF was extracted according to the Soxhlet method with previous acid hydrolysis [13]. For sensory analysis, the samples were thawed and grilled to an internal temperature of 70 °C. All samples were trimmed of external connective tissue and cut into cores with approximately  $2 \times 2 \times 2$  cm<sup>3</sup>, maintained at 60°C and tasted as soon as possible. Twelve trained panelists for pork performed the sensory analysis in 6 sessions (9 samples for each session). The results were analyzed using the MIXED procedure of SAS version 9.1, (SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC, USA) with three orthogonal contrasts were constructed in order to test the dietary effects of Arg supplementation (Arg = (NPD + RPD + RPDL) vs. (Arg-NPD + Arg-RPD + Arg-RPDL)), protein reduction (PR = (NPD + Arg-NPD) vs. (RPD + RPDL + Arg-RPD + Arg-PRDL)), and Leu supplementation (Leu = (RPD + Arg-RPD) vs. (RPDL + Arg-PRDL)).

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results for meat quality traits are shown in Table 1. Any pork quality traits were affected by Arg supplementation, PR and Leu supplementation ( $P>0.05$ ). Dietary Arg and Leu supplementation had no effect on IMF content ( $P>0.05$ ). However, RPD increased IMF content ( $P<0.001$ ). However, some studies with dietary Arg supplementation [10,11] found an increased IMF content without changing pork quality. In contrast, Go *et al.* [14] did not find an increased IMF content in pigs fed diets with Arg, which is in agreement with our results. It is well known that Arg regulates the partitioning of dietary energy in favor of muscle protein accretion [15]. In contrast, the reduction of dietary CP from 16 % in NPD and Arg-NPD to 13% in RPD, RPDL, Arg-RPD and Arg-RPDL diets increased the IMF content by 45-48%. These results are in agreement with studies, in which low CP diets also increased IMF content in commercial crossbred pigs [6]. Wood *et al.* [16] reported that a diet with 16% less protein and lower levels of essential amino acids produced fatter pigs with greater IMF contents in the longissimus muscle. Also, it was recently shown by our research group that the increased IMF promoted by RPD in pigs is due to lysine limitation [12]. The consumer's purchase decision depends on meat color, which is an important factor of freshness and meat quality [17]. The pigs fed the diet with Leu addition tended to show a lower a\* ( $P=0.057$ ), the meat was less red, which can compromise the consumer choice. The Arg supplementation did not affect the color parameters, in contrast to a previous study, where Arg tended to increase the lightness of muscle at 24 h postmortem, which is consistent with a more rapid pH decline [14].

The trained sensory panel scores for *longissimus lumborum* muscle of pigs are presented in Table 2. Arg supplementation had higher tenderness ( $P<0.01$ ) and overall acceptability ( $P<0.05$ ). Also, the Arg supplementation had a significant ( $P<0.05$ ) role on pork off-flavor. The meat from Arg supplemented groups had higher off-flavor values (0.96 vs. 0.71). PR increased juiciness ( $P<0.001$ ) and flavor ( $P<0.05$ ) scores and also Leu supplementation increased juiciness ( $P<0.05$ ). Fernandez *et al.* [18] reported that

when IMF levels increase above approximately 2.5%, the tenderness, juiciness and flavor are significantly improved. In our study, the IMF levels are below 2.5% and, therefore, the scores of tenderness, juiciness and flavor were low. As a consequence, the overall acceptability was also low. Our results showed an increase of tenderness with Arg supplementation, and therefore in overall acceptability, but IMF did not increase. Moreover, the PR and Leu addition increased juiciness, which is in accordance with the increased IMF content in reduced protein treatment.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Dietary Arg supplementation during the growing-finishing phase of commercial crossbred pigs does not affect IMF and pork quality traits, but slightly affect some sensory attributes. In addition, our data confirm that low CP diets increase IMF content in lean pig genotypes. Dietary Leu supplementation of low CP diets does not seem to have any additional effect on IMF or meat quality traits. However, the small increment in pork eating traits obtained with these feeding strategies indicates that this dietary approach might have limited use for the meat industry and consumers.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Financial support from FCT grant (PTDC/CVT/2008/99210) and individual fellowship (SFRH/BPD/97432/2013) to MSM are acknowledged.

#### REFERENCES

- GPP (2007). Anuário pecuário 2006/07. Ministério da Agricultura, Desenvolvimento Rural e das Pescas, Lisboa, Portugal, 262 p.
- Wood, J. D., Enser, M. A., Fisher, V., Nute, G. R., Sheard, P. R., Richardson, R. I., Hughes, S. I. & Whittington, F. M. (2008). Fat deposition, fatty acid composition and meat quality: A review. *Meat Science* 78:343–358.
- Hocquette, J. F., Gondret, F., Baéza, E., Médale, F., Jurie, C. & Pethick, D. W. (2010). Intramuscular fat content in meat-producing animals: Development, genetic and nutritional control, and identification of putative markers. *Animal* 4:303-319.
- Lonergan, S. M., Stalder, K. J., Huff-Lonergan, E., Knight, T. J., Goodwin, R. N., Prusa, K. J., & Beitz, D. C. (2007). Influence of lipid content on pork sensory quality within pH classification. *Journal of Animal Science* 85:1074-1079.
- DeVol, D. L., McKeith, F. K., Bechtel, P. J., Novakofski, J., Shanks, R. D. & Carr, T. R. (1988). Variation in composition and palatability traits and relationships between muscle characteristics and palatability in a random sample of pork carcasses. *Journal of Animal Science* 66:385-395.
- Doran, O., Moule, S. K., Teye, G. A., Whittington, F. M., Hallett, K. G. & Wood, J. D. (2006). A reduced protein diet induces stearoyl-CoA desaturase protein expression in pig muscle but not in subcutaneous adipose tissue: Relationship with intramuscular lipid formation. *British Journal of Nutrition* 95:609-617.
- Alonso, V., Campo, M. D. M., Provincial, L., Roncalés, P. & Beltrán, J. A. (2010). Effect of protein level in commercial diets on pork meat quality. *Meat Science* 85:7-14.
- Hyun, Y., Ellis, M., McKeith, F. K. & Baker D. H. (2003). Effect of dietary leucine level on growth performance, and carcass and meat quality in finishing pigs. *Canadian Journal of Animal Science* 83:315–318.
- Hyun, Y., Kim, J. D., Ellis, M., Peterson, B. A., Baker, D. H. & McKeith, F. K. (2007). Effect of dietary leucine and lysine levels on intramuscular fat content in finishing pigs. *Canadian Journal of Animal Science* 87:303-306.
- Tan, B., Yin, Y., Liu, Z., Li, X., Xu, H., Kong, X., Huang, R., Tang, W., Shinzato, I., Smith S. B. & Wu, G. (2009). Dietary L-arginine supplementation increases muscle gain and reduces body fat mass in growing-finishing pigs. *Amino acids* 37:169–175.
- Ma, X., Lin, Y., Jiang, Z., Zheng, C., Zhou, G., Yu, D., Cao, T., Wang, J. & Chen, F. (2010). Dietary arginine supplementation enhances antioxidative capacity and improves meat quality of finishing pigs. *Amino Acids* 38:95–102.
- Madeira, M. S., Costa, P., Alfaia, C. M., Lopes, P. A., Bessa, R. J. B., Lemos, J. P. C. & Prates, J. A. M. 2013. The increased intramuscular fat promoted by dietary lysine restriction in lean but not in fatty pig genotypes improves pork sensory attributes. *Journal of Animal Science* 91:3177-3187.
- AOAC (2000). Official methods of analysis, Assoc. Offic. Anal. Chem. 17<sup>th</sup> ed. Arlington, VA, USA.

14. Go, G., Wu, G., Silvey, D. T., Choi, S., Li, X. & Smith, S. B. (2012). Lipid metabolism in pigs fed supplemental conjugated linoleic acid and/or dietary arginine. *Amino Acids* 43:1713–1726.
15. Wu, G., Bazer, F. W., Davis, T. A., Jaeger, L. A., Johnson, G. A., Kim, S. W., Knabe, D. A., Meininger, C. J., Spencer, T. E., & Yin, Y. L. (2007). Important roles for the arginine family of amino acids in swine nutrition and production. *Livestock Science* 112:8–22.
16. Wood, J. D., Lambe, N. R., Walling, G. A., Whitney, H., Jagger, S., Fullarton, P. J., Bayntun, J., Hallet, K. & Bunger, L. (2013). Effects of low protein diets on pigs with a lean genotype. 1. Carcass composition measured by dissection and muscle fatty acid composition. *Meat Science* 95:123-128.
17. Khlijji, S., van de Ven, R., Lamb, T. A., Lanza, M. & Hopkins, D. L. (2010). Relationship between consumer ranking of lamb colour and objective measures of colour. *Meat Science* 85:224-229.
18. Fernandez, X., Monin, G., Talmant, A., Mourot, J. & Lebret, B. (1999). Influence of intramuscular fat content on the quality of pig meat — 2. Consumer acceptability of m. longissimus lumborum. *Meat Science* 53:67-72.

Table 1. Meat quality traits of *longissimus lumborum* muscle from pigs<sup>1</sup>

| Item               | NPD        | RPD        | RPDL       | Arg-NPD    | Arg-RPD    | Arg-RPDL   | Significance levels |                 |                  |
|--------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|
|                    |            |            |            |            |            |            | Arg <sup>2</sup>    | PR <sup>3</sup> | Leu <sup>4</sup> |
| IMF (%)            | 1.34±0.181 | 1.85±0.181 | 2.20±0.181 | 1.53±0.181 | 2.30±0.181 | 2.05±0.181 | 0.276               | <0.001          | 0.781            |
| Temperature, °C    |            |            |            |            |            |            |                     |                 |                  |
| 45 min             | 21.6±0.94  | 22.2±0.94  | 21.8±0.94  | 20.7±0.94  | 22.5±0.94  | 20.9±0.94  | 0.534               | 0.405           | 0.289            |
| 24 h               | 7.88±0.808 | 7.81±0.808 | 7.40±0.808 | 7.50±0.808 | 8.07±0.808 | 7.24±0.808 | 0.889               | 0.934           | 0.449            |
| pH                 |            |            |            |            |            |            |                     |                 |                  |
| 45 min             | 6.10±0.074 | 5.87±0.074 | 6.03±0.074 | 5.93±0.074 | 6.12±0.074 | 6.09±0.074 | 0.417               | 0.823           | 0.398            |
| 24 h               | 5.77±0.063 | 5.60±0.063 | 5.65±0.063 | 5.62±0.063 | 5.65±0.063 | 5.64±0.063 | 0.494               | 0.267           | 0.759            |
| Color measurements |            |            |            |            |            |            |                     |                 |                  |
| L*                 | 55.5±1.43  | 54.2±1.43  | 55.8±1.43  | 52.9±1.43  | 53.5±1.43  | 54.7±1.43  | 0.213               | 0.793           | 0.330            |
| a*                 | 6.99±0.559 | 7.55±0.559 | 5.54±0.559 | 6.29±0.559 | 6.12±0.559 | 5.95±0.559 | 0.218               | 0.476           | 0.057            |
| b*                 | 4.10±0.584 | 4.39±0.584 | 3.46±0.584 | 3.27±0.584 | 3.25±0.584 | 3.17±0.584 | 0.121               | 0.816           | 0.392            |

<sup>1</sup> NPD = normal CP diet; RPD = reduced CP diet; RPDL = reduced CP diet with Leu supplementation.

<sup>2</sup> Contrast “Arg” = (NPD + RPD + RPDL) vs. (Arg-NPD + Arg-RPD + Arg-RPDL)

<sup>3</sup> Contrast “PR” = (NPD + Arg-NPD) vs. (RPD + RPDL + Arg-RPD + Arg-RPDL)

<sup>4</sup> Contrast “Leu” = (RPD + Arg-RPD) vs. (RPDL + Arg-RPDL)

Table 2. Sensory panel scores of *longissimus lumborum* muscle from pigs<sup>1</sup>

| Item                  | NPD  | RPD  | RPDL | Arg-NPD | Arg-RPD | Arg-RPDL | SEM   | Significance levels |                 |                  |
|-----------------------|------|------|------|---------|---------|----------|-------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|
|                       |      |      |      |         |         |          |       | Arg <sup>2</sup>    | PR <sup>3</sup> | Leu <sup>4</sup> |
| Tenderness            | 5.08 | 5.31 | 4.74 | 5.29    | 5.16    | 5.75     | 0.158 | 0.005               | 0.680           | 0.959            |
| Juiciness             | 3.10 | 3.61 | 4.12 | 3.65    | 3.81    | 3.87     | 0.128 | 0.111               | <0.001          | 0.025            |
| Flavor                | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.39 | 4.11    | 4.36    | 4.23     | 0.130 | 0.480               | 0.047           | 0.508            |
| Off-flavor            | 0.64 | 0.61 | 0.87 | 0.87    | 1.16    | 0.84     | 0.151 | 0.037               | 0.393           | 0.856            |
| Overall acceptability | 4.25 | 4.44 | 4.22 | 4.51    | 4.35    | 4.83     | 0.146 | 0.026               | 0.526           | 0.362            |

<sup>1</sup> NPD = normal CP diet; RPD = reduced CP diet; RPDL = reduced CP diet with Leu supplementation.

<sup>2</sup> Contrast “Arg” = (NPD + RPD + RPDL) vs. (Arg-NPD + Arg-RPD + Arg-RPDL)

<sup>3</sup> Contrast “PR” = (NPD + Arg-NPD) vs. (RPD + RPDL + Arg-RPD + Arg-RPDL)

<sup>4</sup> Contrast “Leu” = (RPD + Arg-RPD) vs. (RPDL + Arg-RPDL)

Sensory scores: scale with 8 points, with 1 = extremely tough, dry, weak, or negative for tenderness, juiciness, flavor, and overall acceptability, respectively, and with 8 = extremely tender, juicy, strong, or positive for tenderness, juiciness, flavor, and overall acceptability, respectively.