

1     **EFFECT OF FINISHING AND AGEING TIME ON QUALITY ATTRIBUTES**  
2             **OF LOIN FROM THE MEAT OF HOLSTEIN-FRESIAN CULL COWS**

3  
4     <sup>1</sup>Daniel Franco\*, <sup>1</sup>Esperanza Bispo, <sup>1</sup>Laura González, <sup>2</sup>Jose Antonio Vázquez, and  
5                                     <sup>1</sup>Teresa Moreno

6     <sup>1</sup>Instituto Gallego de la Calidad Alimentaria (INGACAL), Centro de Investigaciones  
7             Agrarias de Mabegondo, Apdo 10 15080 A Coruña, (SPAIN)

8     <sup>2</sup> Grupo de Reciclado y Valorización de Residuos. Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas  
9                                     (IIM-CSIC) Vigo, (SPAIN)

10  
11     **Keywords:** Cull dairy cows; Finishing feeding; Meat ageing; Textural properties

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19     \* Corresponding author. Tel.:+34-988-548277; fax: +34-988-548276

20     E-mail address:danielfranco.ruiz@ceteca.net

21

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 The effects of finishing time, (T0= 0, T1=30 and T2=60 days), on Holstein-Friesian cull  
3 cows (n=18) and *post-mortem* ageing, (1, 7, 14, 21, 35 and 42 days), under vacuum  
4 conditions of *Longissimus thoracis* (LT) muscles were investigated. The objective of this  
5 research was to study how finishing feeding (based on a commercial concentrate and  
6 corn silage), following a pasture period of 90 days, affected carcass and meat quality.  
7 Ageing time effect was also evaluated on the main quality attribute of added value  
8 pieces, such as “*striploin of ox*” from cull cows. Finishing treatment affected  
9 intramuscular fat content (IMF), moisture percentage, water holding capacity (WHC),  
10 colour parameters and shear force of meat at 24 hours *postmortem*, whereas ageing time  
11 enhanced meat tenderness, when this was measured by two textural tests, Warner-  
12 Braztler (WB) and textural profile analysis (TPA). A minimum shear force was  
13 achieved at 7 and 14 days of ageing for T1 and T2, respectively. No differences (P>  
14 0.05) could be found in colour parameters from 7 to 42 days. The results show that a  
15 finishing time of two months is very beneficial, due to the increase in meat fatness,  
16 improved overall carcass quality and luminosity (L\*). Furthermore, 14 ageing days  
17 were sufficient to improved tenderness. Ageing time did not have an effect on lipid  
18 oxidation (P> 0.05) and this leads us to conclude that meat shelf life exceeded 42 days  
19 under vacuum conditions'.

20

21

1 **1. INTRODUCTION**

2 The finishing of cull cows in the dairy herds can be an important activity to raise the  
3 profits of a cattle farm. The productive life of these cows is about five years. Then over  
4 50% are culled for various reasons, none of which prevent them from being used for  
5 butchering. Finishing these animals increases their weight and improves their condition  
6 score and fatty state (Malterre, 1986; Cranwell, Unruh, Brethour & Simms, 1996), with  
7 a subsequent rise in price. This higher value can be very significant for fatty cows when  
8 they are sold to the special market of “*entrecote for gourmet*”, as happens in the north of  
9 Spain. Therefore, this situation can give rise to an important increase in the price per  
10 kilogram of the meat carcass. This is due to a qualitative difference between carcasses  
11 of animals that are classified as O or P ,with a poor fat content, (C.E.E. n° 2273/91),  
12 compared to those ones classified as R or U, with good fat content (Carballo & Moreno,  
13 2006). The economic interest of finishing cull cows has been studied primarily in beef  
14 breeds (Cranwell et al., 1996; Sawyer, Mathis & Davis, 2004). In Galicia (region of the  
15 north of Spain), there is a census of around 500,000 dairy cows (AEG, 2003), that  
16 mainly belong to the Holstein-Fresian breed. Therefore, we can estimate that about  
17 50,000 cull cows from dairy and suckler herds are eligible to enter the beef supply  
18 chain. To produce "*entrecote for gourmet*" the carcass must have a fatness score of 4 or  
19 5 (fatness scale 1 to 5) and it can not be finished off pasture during spring and summer  
20 due to a low body condition score. For this reason, the prolongation of finishing should  
21 be considered using conserved forages and concentrates. Furthermore, the sirloin, a  
22 highly appreciated piece of meat in Spain, is commercialized targeting consumers who  
23 exclusively value the sensory characteristics of the meat, in which the ageing process  
24 has an important effect. Tenderness is the most appreciated attribute by the consumer  
25 (Koochmaraie, 1996) and is affected by ageing. A minimum of tenderness is required to

1 appreciate the flavour adequately. The instrumental measure best related to tenderness is  
2 the one obtained using the Warner-Braztler (WB) probe (Boleman et al., 1997). There  
3 are other measures of meat texture, such as the hardness or chewiness, measured with a  
4 compression probe, using a textural profile analysis (TPA). This test can be more useful  
5 in older animals, where connective tissue is more abundant, and which is not altered by  
6 ageing (Caine, Aalhus, Best, Dugan & Jeremiah, 2003). During ageing, we can obtain a  
7 satisfactory tenderness and flavour, however, a loss in meat coloration is also likely,  
8 changing from bright red to brown, due to the oxidation of the oxymyoglobin to  
9 myoglobin. Moreover, there can be damage due to lipid oxidation in the intramuscular  
10 fat content (IMF). Both types of oxidation are intimately related and are responsible for  
11 the appearance of smells and strange flavours of fat (Kanner & Harel, 1985) that can  
12 cause rejection by the consumer. These alterations are especially important in meats that  
13 with a have a high fat content. On the other hand, there is also a need for prolonged  
14 ageing owing to the cow's age and to the convenience of being able to access points of  
15 sale at long distances from the production site. It was, therefore, considered best to  
16 study the process of ageing under vacuum conditions because vacuum packaging of  
17 fresh meat provides sufficient shelf life for primal cuts for long-term storage and  
18 intercontinental transport (Lee & Yoon, 2001; Hotchkiss, 1994).

19 Therefore, the aim of this study is to investigate the effect of length of finishing on the  
20 daily gain and on the commercial parameters of the meat from the carcass of Holstein-  
21 Friesian culls cows. and the effect of ageing time on the main attributes of quality, such  
22 as textural properties, colour and fatty acid oxidation status.

23

## 24 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### 25 **2.1. Animals: experimental design and live and post-slaughtered controls**

1 Eighteen cows of the Holstein-Friesian breed, culled from the experimental herd of  
2 Agricultural Research Centre of Mabegondo, were used for this study. Thirteen cows  
3 were culled due to age, four due to problems related to the udder health and one due to  
4 reproductive. Cows were not pregnant when the study started, most of them had had  
5 their last calving between 10 and 13 months ago, two had had an abortion six and four  
6 months before being finished. The dry-off proceeding was as described: cows were  
7 separated from the herd and fed with hay and water only for a week. During this week,  
8 milk production decreased to 3-5 litres. At this time 12 grams of antibiotic (Ceptravin ®)  
9 were administered. After veterinary treatment, cows were fed with hay for two or three  
10 days until they returned to the pasture. Animals were together in a single group, in  
11 spring pasture for at least three months before they were separated into three groups of  
12 six animals, blocked by live weight. Six of this animals, were immediately slaughtered,  
13 (control group or T0). This group was not used for ageing treatment and was not  
14 possible to include in *postmortem* study. Animals from the others groups were not  
15 finished indoors; they were finished in an area without pasture. One group spent two  
16 months (T2), while the second group spent only one month before being slaughtered  
17 (T1). Animals from T0, T1 and T2 were  $8.8\pm 2.3$ ,  $7.7\pm 2.7$  and  $8.7\pm 4.6$  years-old,  
18 respectively. Live weight at start of pasture was  $679\pm 55$ ,  $653\pm 77$  and  $633\pm 58$  for T0, T1  
19 and T2, respectively. The concentrate ration consisted of corn silage “*ad libitum*” and  
20 three kilograms of concentrate per head per day. The chemical composition of grass and  
21 corn silage was respectively, in percentage (49.01 and 36.05 of dry matter (DM); 9.6  
22 and 7.32 of crude protein (CP); 26.6 and 23.4 of acid detergent fiber (ADF); 49.7 and  
23 44.94 of neutral detergent fiber (NDF)). The chemical composition of concentrate was  
24 88.16 of DM, 16.22 of CP and 5.06 of FC. The net energy value of corn silage and  
25 concentrate, expressed as Unité Fourragère Viande (UFV) (Vermorel, 1978) was 0.64

1 and 1.14 respectively. The live weight of each animal was simple-weighing and  
2 measured during pasture (at start and end) and in the end of the finishing period. There  
3 were not any diseases or veterinary treatments during the experiment. Animals were  
4 conventionally slaughtered at a commercial abattoir four kilometres from the field  
5 where they had been grazing. Carcasses were classified using a conformation score,  
6 according to the EUROP scale (Conformation: P=1, O=2, R=3, U=4, E=5) (C.E.E. n°  
7 2273/91), and a fatness score average, according to the European classification fatness  
8 score scale, which ranges from 1 (low fat) to 5 (high fat) (C.E.E. n° 2273/91).  
9 Immediately after slaughter, carcasses were weighed and chilled at 4°C in a cold  
10 chamber for 24 h. At this point, the *Longissimus thoracis* (LT) muscle was extracted  
11 from the left half of each carcass, between the fifth and the tenth rib. Samples were  
12 taken immediately to the laboratory under refrigerated conditions.

## 13 **2.2. Analytical methods**

### 14 **2.2.1. pH, colour, myoglobin content and chemical composition**

15 LT muscle was cut into seven steaks and all steaks were systematically assigned, the  
16 first steak was aged for one day, the second steak for seven days and so on and so forth  
17 for the other steaks". Steaks were cut using a cutting machine (Leader, Milano, Italy)  
18 into six steaks of 2.5 cm of thickness. On the first steak, pH, colour and proximate  
19 composition were determined. The other six steaks were individually packed under  
20 vacuum conditions (98%) (Tecnotrip EV-15-1CD, Terrasa, Spain) and were stored at 4  
21 °C until analysis at 7, 14, 21, 28, 35 and 42 days. The pH was measured using a pH-  
22 meter (Hanna Instrument HI-9024, Portugal) equipped with a glass probe for  
23 penetration. A portable colorimeter (Minolta CR-300 Osaka, Japan settings machine  
24 from CR-300 measuring head are: pulsed xenon arc lamp, angle of 0° viewing angle  
25 geometry and aperture size of 8 mm) was used to measure meat colour in the CIELAB

1 space (Lightness, L\*; redness, a\*; yellowness, b\* (CIE 1978). Hue ( $h_{ab}$ ) and chroma  
2 ( $C^*$ ) were calculated from the a\* and b\* values according to expressions:

3 
$$C^* = \sqrt{(a^*)^2 + (b^*)^2} \text{ and } h_{ab} = \arctan\left(\frac{b^*}{a^*}\right)$$

4 Samples were allowed to bloom for 1 h before measuring directly in contact with air  
5 (Insausti et al., 1999). All measurements were made in triplicate. Heminic pigments  
6 (expressed as myoglobin) were measured in duplicate, according to the methodology of  
7 Hornsey (1956). A near infrared spectrophotometer (Foss Tecator NIRS 6500,  
8 Denmark) was used to determine chemical composition, in duplicate, according to the  
9 methodology proposed by Moreno et al., (2007).

10

### 11 **2.2.2. Texture analysis**

12 To measure properties of texture, the meat was cooked in a water bath at 75 °C for 1 h  
13 by immersion in water with automatic temperature control (Selecta Tectron Bio,  
14 Barcelona, Spain). Then samples were cooled to room temperature by placing the  
15 vacuum package bags in a circulatory water bath set at 18 °C for a period of 30 minutes.  
16 The samples for WB shear test were obtained by cutting pieces of approximately  
17 1x1x2.5 cm (height x width x length) of cross section, parallel to the muscle fibre  
18 direction. They were completely cut through using a WB shear blade with a triangular  
19 slot cutting edge and three parameters were measured. The first was the maximum shear  
20 force (Møller, 1980), represented by the highest peak of the force-time curve thus  
21 representing the maximum resistance of the sample to the cut. The second parameter  
22 measured was the firmness to the cut; the shear firmness (Brady & Hunecke, 1985),  
23 represented by the slope from the beginning of the cut up to the highest point of the  
24 force-time curve, and finally the total work required to cut the sample, represented by  
25 the area under the curve obtained. Textural parameters, measured using the WB probe

1 (of 3 mm of thickness) were obtained with the sample at room temperature. Samples for  
2 TPA (Bourne, 1978) were obtained by cutting cubes of 1x1x1 cm approximately  
3 perpendicular to the muscle fibre direction and then compressing to 80 % with a  
4 compression probe of 19.85 cm<sup>2</sup> of surface contact. Between the first and second  
5 compression, there was an interval of 2 seconds. In this test the following variables  
6 were obtained: hardness, cohesiveness, springiness, gumminess and chewiness. A  
7 texture analyser (Stable Micro Systems TA-XT2, UK) was used for both tests, and all  
8 samples were cut or compressed perpendicular to the muscle fibre direction at a  
9 crosshead speed of 2.5 and 1 mm/s for WB and TPA test, respectively. The average  
10 value for each LT sample was recorded between six and eight times.

11

### 12 **2.2.3. Water holding capacity**

13 The water-holding capacity (WHC) was measured in two ways: Cooking loss (CL) and  
14 pressing loss (PL). CL was evaluated by cooking the LT muscle as described in the  
15 texture analysis. CL was calculated by measuring the difference in weight between the  
16 cooked and raw samples, as follows:

$$17 \quad CL(\%) = \frac{(initial\ fresh\ meat\ weight - meat\ after\ cooking\ weight)}{(initial\ fresh\ meat\ weight)} \times 100$$

18 To determine PL, a sample of intact meat of 5 g was placed onto two disk of Whatman  
19 No. 1 filter paper (Filter Lab, Spain). After weighing the meat, a mass of 2.5 kg was  
20 applied for 5 min. The percentage of released water was calculated as:

$$21 \quad PL(\%) = \frac{(initial\ fresh\ meat\ weight - meat\ after\ pressing\ weight)}{(initial\ fresh\ meat\ weight)} \times 100$$

22

### 23 **2.2.4 Lipid oxidation analysis**



1 Lipid stability was evaluated in the steaks using a small 2 g portion. Lipid oxidation,  
2 measured by aldehydes generated in the process of polyunsaturated fatty acid oxidation,  
3 was determined by measuring 2-thiobarbituric acid reactive substances (TBARS) using  
4 the method proposed by Vyncke (1970) with the modification that samples were  
5 incubated at 70 °C in a forced oven (Selecta 2000210, Barcelona, Spain). Results are  
6 expressed as (mg malonaldehyde / kg of fresh meat).

7

### 8 **2.3. Statistical analysis**

9 For the statistical analysis of the results of animal performance and carcass quality an  
10 analysis of variance (ANOVA) using the General Linear Model (GLM) procedure of the  
11 SPSS package (SPSS, version 15.0, USA) was performed for all variables considered in  
12 the study (statistical analysis conditions: parameterization by sigma restricted model,  
13 sums of squares type III and ANOVA error term using residual term). Age was no  
14 blocked at the start of pasture period, however when we include age in the model as co  
15 variable they only have influence on average daily gain (ADG) pasture. The model used  
16 was:

$$17 \quad Y_{ij} = \mu + T_i + A_{ij}(C) + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

18 where:

19  $Y_{ij}$  is the observation of dependent variables,  $\mu$  is the overall mean,  $T_i$  is the effect of  
20 finishing treatment,  $A_{ij}(C)$  is the effect of age as co variable and  $\varepsilon_{ij}$  is the residual  
21 random error associated with the observation

22 When we studied the effect of ageing time, over meat quality a GLM procedure was  
23 carried out. Fixed effect of finishing treatment, ageing time and their interaction were  
24 included in the initial model. However, as only significant interactions of finishing

1 treatment and ageing time were detected for L\* and CL they were excluded for the final  
2 model. The model used was:

$$3 \quad Y_{ij} = \mu + T_i + t_j + (T \times t)_{ij} + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

4 where:

5  $Y_{ij}$  is the observation of dependent variables,  $\mu$  is the overall mean,  $T_i$  is the effect of  
6 finishing treatment,  $t_j$  is the effect of ageing time, and  $(T \times t)_{ij}$  is the interaction term of  
7 finishing treatment and ageing time and  $\varepsilon_{ij}$  is the residual random error associated with  
8 the observation.

9 The least squares mean (LSM) were separated using Duncan's t-test. All statistical test  
10 of LSM were performed for a significance level  $\alpha < 0.05$ . Correlations between variables  
11 ( $P < 0.05$ ) were determined by correlation analyses using the Pearson's linear correlation  
12 coefficient (SPSS 15.0)

13

### 14 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### 15 **3.1. Live weight, daily gain during finishing feeding.**

16 The finishing pasture period was 42 days for the three treatments, whereas the finishing  
17 concentrate period was for 34 and 62 days, for treatments T1 and T2, respectively.

18 During the finishing period with concentrates, each cow ate an average amount of 1209  
19 and 2540 kg of dry matter (DM) of corn silage (0.64 UFV) and 102 and 186 kg of feed  
20 concentrate (1.14 UFV) for T1 and T2, respectively. There were no significant

21 differences in age and live weight between cows on different treatments (Table 1). As  
22 the finishing period increased, the average daily weight gain decreased and this is a  
23 widely reported result (Monserrat, 1994; Matulis, McKeith, Faulkner, Berger, & George  
24 1987). During finishing, the growth performance was 1.31 and 1.07 kg/d for T1 and T2,  
25 respectively. This is in accordance with findings in other dairy Holstein cows (Jones,

1 1983) and beef cows studies (Graham & Price, 1982). Vestergaard et al. (2007) found  
2 an average daily gain value of 1.16 kg when they worked with culled Fresian dry dairy  
3 cows finishing over a period of two and four months.

### 4 5 **3.2. Carcass quality characteristics**

6 All carcass quality characteristics were improved with finishing period (T2 against T0)  
7 (Table 1). Carcass weight is a poor estimator of meat yield (Hopkins & Roberts, 1995),  
8 but the results are included for comparison with other researchers' findings. The effect  
9 of finishing time is more illustrative when the conformation, fatness score and carcass  
10 yield are considered. An important and significative difference ( $P < 0.01$ ) was found in  
11 carcass yield in cows from T2 against T0 (49.43 vs. 39.54). This result could be of  
12 importance for the live animal market price. These results were as expected, because it  
13 is known that a period of finishing improves the characteristics of the carcass and are  
14 similar to findings in other studies (Boleman, Miller, Buyck, Cross, & Savell, 1996).  
15 The carcass classification for a loin to be designated as “sirloin of ox” was obtained in  
16 all animal carcasses from T1 and T2 (100 %). A marketing of this carcass in a more  
17 demanding market (corresponding to carcasses with classification R3), was only  
18 obtained in zero of T0, one (16.7 %) of T1 and four (66.7 %) of the T2. This shows a  
19 substantial improvement in the level of consumer valuation according to Carballo and  
20 Moreno (2006), who also indicates a high difference in price, on the Spanish market,  
21 between carcasses of cows R and U as opposed to P and 0 (C.E.E. n° 2273/91).

### 22 23 **3.3. Meat Quality**

24 In Table 2 the effects of finishing time on the main physical-chemistry characteristics of  
25 the LT are shown. We found significant variations between treatments in the pH

1 (P<0.001), although these values were below 6, in a "normal" range of pH (Rennerre,  
2 1986). Even the maximum pH value recorded was only 5.69 (for T2) which, according  
3 to Thomson, Dobbie, Cox, and Simmons (1999) may be regarded as acceptable as it is  
4 lower than the 5.7, maximum value suggested.

5 With regard to the parameters of chemical composition studied, the percentage of  
6 protein, ash (P<0.05) and water, IMF (P<0.1) of LT was affected by finishing treatment.  
7 The percentage of IMF was increased by the finishing treatment, therefore the cows  
8 with T2 had 29 % more IMF than those of T0 (8.52 vs. 6.02 %). This result was  
9 expected, and also reported by Matulis et al., 1987): This is the main objective of  
10 finishing periods and it has been established that the meat percentages of protein and  
11 ash have a constant value, whereas IMF has large fluctuations. On the other hand, water  
12 content decreased with a longer finishing period, also to be expected, since it is accepted  
13 that the increase in IMF content in the meat means a decrease in water content (Varela,  
14 2002). In this study the correlation between moisture content and IMF ( $r = -0.944$ ) was  
15 highly significant (P<0.01).

16 As for the chromatic characteristics of the meat, we found significant differences  
17 between treatments in the meat colour parameters and subcutaneous fat (SCF), except  
18 for the  $b^*$  of LT and SCF. Cows from the T2 group provided a meat with higher  $L^*$  and  
19 less red meat than those ones from T1, whereas the  $a^*$  of the SCF increased over the  
20 finishing period. The lighter, brighter and redder colour of meat from finishing-fed  
21 cows has also been detected by others (Cranwell et al., 1996). WHC, measured by CL  
22 was larger in T0 than in T2 (28.37 vs 25.97 %), whereas moisture content was higher in  
23 T2 than T0 (70.32 vs 72.57%; P<0.05). There is an inverse relationship between  
24 moisture content and CL, and this result has been widely reported (Jeremiah, Dugan,  
25 Aalhus, & Gibson, 2003). An inverse relationship is observed between WHC and IMF

1 content, and as we have already indicated IMF was higher in T2 than in T0, whereas CL  
2 is higher in T0 than T2, this finding was reported by (Hildrum, Solvang, Nilsen,  
3 Froystein, & Berg, 1999).

4 Significant differences (10.62 vs 8.00  $P < 0.05$ ) in maximum shear force at day 1  
5 between animals from different treatments were found. Generally finishing feeding  
6 improves shear force values of meat (Boleman et al., 1996; Cranwell et al., 1996).  
7 However, Schnell, Belk, Tatum, Miller, & Smith (1997) worked with cull beef cows, in  
8 an identical finishing feeding as our work (28–56 days) and which did not improve  
9 tenderness and reduce shear force values compared with cows slaughtered immediately  
10 after purchase. Cows from T2 had lower shear force, which is undoubtedly related to the  
11 higher percentage of fat, from T2 than T1, as already indicated by these authors, as IMF  
12 provides a higher degree of tenderness to the muscle. The increased IMF may be  
13 responsible for the improved tenderness with finishing feeding as the correlation was  
14 negative and not very high for the improved between IMF and shear force value ( $r = -$   
15 0.35). These correlations are lower to results obtained in other studies (Vestergaard et  
16 al., 2007; Wheeler, Cundiff, & Koch, 1994). In addition, moisture content was  
17 positively related to tenderness in feedlot finished (Galli et al., 2008). These authors  
18 found a negative correlation between moisture content and WB shear force of  $r = -0.67$ ,  
19 whereas we obtained a correlation of  $r = -0.38$  in this study.

20 However, analyses of consumer preferences have shown that the packing house should  
21 target a WB of 4.2 kg or below in meat in order to attain high levels of consumer  
22 acceptance (Huffman et al., 1996). This degree of acceptance will be increased to 5.1  
23 kg, when meat is eaten in restaurants (Miller et al., 1995). Our results show that ageing  
24 time is necessary.

1 In general, we have an improvement in tenderness and meat colour characteristics of  
2 meat from finishing-fed cows (Table 2). This conclusion agrees with the one outlined  
3 by Vestergaard et al., (2007) indicating the beneficial effect of the finishing treatment.

4

#### 5 **3.4. Effect of finishing and ageing time on meat CL and textural properties,** 6 **measured by WB test**

7 Table 3 shows the values obtained from the CL and from each of the texture parameters  
8 measured by the WB method, for different days of ageing, for both treatments. CL was  
9 higher in meat from T1 than T2 for all ageing days, being significantly different ( $P$   
10  $<0.1$ ), with the exception of the last day of ageing. We can see how CL from T1 showed  
11 a greater range of variation, with a difference of 7.82 points between the lowest and  
12 highest values (23.25 vs. 31.07 %), than in T2 with 1.42 points (25.07 vs. 26.49 %) for  
13 the different ageing days. Comparable CL was found by Lepetit, Grajales, & Favier,  
14 2000 in cooked meat from Fresian cull cows. These authors found that CL was higher  
15 as the temperature increased, and in the range of 70-80 °C they found an increment in  
16 CL of 20 to 32 %. This situation can explain how small differences in the control of  
17 cooking temperature over a long time can affect the final result. Therefore, a rigorous  
18 control of temperature is necessary.

19 The finishing treatment affected the values of maximum shear force between days 1 and  
20 7 post-slaughtering ( $P<0.05$ ), and did not show significant changes for either treatment  
21 from the 14 days of ageing. The time of ageing only affects the first 15 days for the  
22 animals from T1, whereas the animals from T2, on the seventh day of ageing reached a  
23 shear force of 5.60 kg/cm<sup>2</sup>. After these periods there was no further significant decrease  
24 ( $P>0.05$ ) in either treatment. This is an interesting result, how animals with a longer  
25 finishing time and consequently with a higher IMF percentage reached the minimum

1 shear force in a shorter ageing time. This outcome can also explain that the ageing time  
2 required to achieve the lowest shear force value in the cows of this study should be  
3 similar to that reported for younger animals by Campo et al. (2000), when it has been  
4 widely established that to obtain the maximum tenderness in meat from old animals a  
5 longer period of ageing compared to young animals is required (Young & Bass, 1984).  
6 Shear firmness and total work data are dependent on maximum shear force value and  
7 thus, the analysis of the result is analogous to shear force. Less shear firmness was  
8 obtained in the meat at 1 and 7 days of ageing for T2 against T1, although it was only  
9 significant ( $P<0.05$ ) in 7 and 35 days. If we observe the total work necessary to cut the  
10 sample, we find that less work is required for all ageing days in the animals belonging  
11 to T2, with the exception of day 25 of ageing but that must be considered an anomalous  
12 value.

13

### 14 **3.5. Effect of finishing and ageing time on meat textural properties measured by** 15 **TPA test**

16 The hardness of the meat showed significant differences ( $P<0.01$ ) between treatments at  
17 24 hours of ageing, though there were not significant differences for the rest of the  
18 ageing period between treatments (Table 4). An analogous situation existed for values  
19 of chewiness, gumminess and cohesiveness. There were significant differences at 24  
20 hours between the two treatments ( $P<0.05$ ). Meat hardness, a parameter related very  
21 closely to the connective tissue content, was higher in the meat of T2 than in T1,  
22 probably as a consequence of the unplanned higher age of the cows from group T2. It is  
23 well known that the age of the animal at the time of slaughtering is the factor that most  
24 influences the amount and chemical composition of the connective tissue (Sentandreu,  
25 Coulis, & Ouani, 2002). As chewiness is the product of hardness, cohesiveness and

1 springiness, we can observe how the results for this parameter are affected by the value  
2 of hardness. If we compare the hardness values, with the ones found by other authors  
3 (Campo et al., 2000; Sañudo, Monson, Panea, Pardos, & Olieta, 2003), we can see that our  
4 values are higher. This is due to different factors, such as temperature/time of cooking,  
5 since this has an important effect on collagen solubilization (Martens, Staburvik, &  
6 Martens, 1982). The breed type is also of importance because meat breeds have lower  
7 collagen content compared to dairy production breeds (Hocquette, Renand, Levéziel,  
8 Picard, & Cassar-Malek, 2005) and also the age of the animal, itself, since the solubility  
9 and cross linking of the collagen fibres increases as the animal gets older (Aberle et al.,  
10 2001). The last factor is the most important and the age of the animals in this study was  
11 high. Our results for hardness are comparable to those found by Lepetit et al., (2000). The  
12 experiment was not similar to ours because these authors utilized a 95 % compression  
13 ratio, a different crosshead speed (50 mm/min) and used different mechanical devices: they  
14 used a longitudinal test (Lepetit., 1989). These authors found maximum stress values of  
15 25-30 kg/cm<sup>2</sup> for six-year-old Friesian cull cows, when LT was cooked at 75 °C for 90  
16 minutes.

17

### 18 **3.6. Effect of finishing and ageing time on pH, colour parameters and lipid** 19 **oxidation of meat**

20 A summary of values for pH, colour parameter, the myoglobin content and IMF  
21 oxidation status is presented in table 5. Average values for pH measured in the meat  
22 varied between 5.45 and 5.80. The pH values of T2 were more constant than pH values  
23 of T1. We found significant differences between treatment at 24 hours ( $p < 0.001$ ) and at  
24 21 and 42 days. However, at 21 and 42 days the differences are less significant, so the  
25 pH values of the meat were stable at 24 hour *post* -slaughtered.



1 Meat luminosity ( $L^*$ ) increased from day 1 to 42 in T1 (33.27 vs 35.20;  $P < 0.05$ ),  
2 whereas it decreased in T2 (36.91 vs 31.16;  $P < 0.05$ ). There were higher values in T1  
3 than T2 at 1 day ( $p < 0.01$ ), but it was higher in T2 than T1 for the days 21, 35 and 42.  
4 ( $P < 0.05$ ). Index of red ( $a^*$ ), yellowness ( $b^*$ ) and chroma ( $C^*$ ) increased from day 1 to 7  
5 and after maintained a constant value until day 42 for both treatments. In general meat  
6 from T1 cows was redder and had more yellowness and thus had a higher chroma than  
7 T2 cows, although there were no significant differences between the treatments. Hue  
8 ( $h_{ab}$ ) increased from day 1 to 14 in T1 and from day 1 to 7 in T2 and then stayed  
9 constant until day 42 for both treatments. For T2,  $a^*$  did not change significantly  
10 ( $P < 0.05$ ) over the 42 days of storage. This indicates that the myoglobin was not  
11 suffering alteration in the vacuum package. For T1 we had significant changes during  
12 storage days, but values of  $a^*$  varied between 18.26 and 21.02, so red colour was not  
13 diminished. The effect of ageing time on  $a^*$  and  $b^*$  in the first days post-slaughter is a  
14 widely reported result. It has been reported that the increases in these values are more  
15 important during ageing process is under vacuum conditions (Oliete et al., 2006) due to  
16 the loss of respiratory activity of the mitochondria during the ageing. The content in  
17 hemic pigments indicates how the myoglobin is altered. Myoglobin content was  
18 always higher in T2 than T1 (Table 5). It has been established that hemic pigment of  
19 the muscle, increases with age (Cross, Durland, & Seideman, 1986; Gil, Serra,  
20 Piedrafita, Quintanilla, & Oliver, 1998). This is due to the fact that when animals get  
21 older, the IMF increases and the capillary permeability decreases, so a higher amount of  
22 myoglobin is required to ensure a suitable contribution to the cells (Renerre & Valin,  
23 1979). For this reason the meat seems redder and in T2 the values of myoglobin are  
24 higher, with the exception of the value at 24 hours.

1 With regard to the lipid oxidation of IMF, we did not find significant changes during the  
2 whole ageing period. This outcome was not surprising, as the meat storage conditions  
3 during the storage period in a vacuum environment protect the meat from oxygen and  
4 light. Therefore the IMF did not undergo lipid oxidation. Our values are similar to the  
5 ones found by Realini, Duckett, Brito, Dalla Rizza, & De Mattos, 2004; Descalzo et al.,  
6 2005 in fresh beef meat at 24 hour *posmortem*.

7

## 8 **CONCLUSIONS**

9 The finishing period after pasture period is beneficial due to the increment of 1kg/day of  
10 live weight and to the improvement of the characteristics of the carcass. A finishing  
11 period of two months with concentrates can be advantageous, when the carcass is  
12 destined to a market with the basic end of commercializing one "*entrecote for gourmet*  
13 ". The meat has a major percentage of fat and is more luminous, with lower values on  
14 the index of red and yellow. An ageing time of 14 and 7 days for T1 and T2,  
15 respectively, can be sufficient for the meat of cull cows of Holstein-Friesian breed to  
16 acquire optimum texture values. At this time, the shear force value for both treatments  
17 was low and indicated an overall good tenderness in these cows. The result from TPA  
18 was not clear and to verify that ageing period improved tenderness, a trained panel must  
19 be used to confirm this hypothesis.

20 .

21

## 1 REFERENCES

2 Aberle, E., Forrest, J., Gerrard, D., Mills, E., Hedrick, H., Judge, M., et al. (2001).  
3 Principles of meat science (4th ed.). Iowa: Kendall-Hunt Publishing Company.

4  
5 AEG- Anuario de Estadística Agraria. (2003). Ed. Xunta de Galicia- Conselleria do  
6 Medio Rural.

7  
8 Boleman, S. J., Miller, R. K., Buyck, M. J., Cross, H. R., & Savell, J. W. (1996).  
9 Influence of realimentation of mature cows on maturity, color, collagen solubility, and  
10 sensory characteristics. *Journal of Animal Science*, 74, 2187–2194.

11  
12 Boleman, S. J., Boleman, S. L., Miller, R. K., Taylor, J. F., Cross, H. R., Wheeler, T. L.,  
13 Koochmaraie, M., Shackelford, S. D., Miller, M. F., West, R. L., Johnson, D. D., &  
14 Savell, J. W. (1997). Consumer evaluation of beef of known categories of tenderness.  
15 *Journal of Animal Science*, 75, 1521–1524.

16  
17 Bourne, M. C. (1978). Texture profile analysis. *Food Technology*, 32(72), 62–66.

18  
19 Brady, P. L., & Hunecke, M. E. (1985). Correlations of sensory and instrumental  
20 evaluations of roast beef texture. *Journal of Food Science*, 50, 300–303.

21  
22 Caine, W.R., Aalhus, J.L. Best, D.R., Dugan, & M.E.R Jeremiah, L.E. (2003).  
23 Relationship of texture profile analysis and Warner-Bratzler shear force with sensory  
24 characteristics of beef rib steaks. *Meat Science*, 64,333–339.

25  
26 Campo M. M., Santolaria, P., Sañudo, C., Lepetit, J., Olleta J. L., Panea, B. & Alberti P.  
27 (2000). Assessment of breed type and ageing time effects on beef meat quality using  
28 two different texture devices. *Meat Science*, 55, 371-378.

29  
30 Carballo, J. A. & Moreno, T. (2006). Características cuantitativas de las canales de  
31 vacas de desecho en Galicia. *Archivos de Zootecnia*, 55(212), 339-350.

32  
33 CEE (1991). Regulation no. 2237/1991 of the European Commission of the 27th July  
34 1991.

35  
36 CIE (1978). International commission on illumination, recommendations on uniform  
37 color spaces, color difference equations, psychometric color terms. Supplement Nr.15 to  
38 CIE publication Nr.15 (E-1.3.1) 1971/ (TO-1.3). Bureau Central de la CIE, Paris,  
39 France.

40  
41 Cranwell, C. D., Unruh, J. A., Brethour, J. R., & Simms, D. D. (1996). Influence of  
42 steroid implants and concentrate feeding on carcass and longissimus muscle sensory and  
43 collagen characteristics of cull beef cows. *Journal of Animal Science*, 74, 1777–1783.

44  
45 Cross, H. R.; Durland, P. D. & Seideman, S. C. (1986). Sensory qualities of meat. In:  
46 Muscle as food. Ed. Bechtel P. Academy Press, Orlando, Florida. p. 286.

47  
48 Descalzo, A. M., Insani, E. M., Biolatto, A., Sancho, A. M., Garcia, P. T., Pensel, N. A.,  
49 et al. (2005). Influence of pasture or grain-based diets supplemented with vitamin E on  
50 antioxidant/oxidative balance of Argentine beef. *Meat Science*, 70(1), 35–44.

- 1  
2 Galli, I., Teira, G., Perlo, F., Bonato, P., Tisocco, O., Monje, A., & Vittone, S. (2008).  
3 Animal performance and meat quality in cull cows with early weaned calves in  
4 Argentina. *Meat Science*, 79,3, 521-528.  
5  
6 Gil, M., Serra, X., Piedrafita, J., Quintanilla, R. & Oliver, M. A. (1998). Fiber  
7 characterization of muscle Longissimus thoracis from bruna dels Pirineus cattle breed.  
8 In Proc. 44<sup>th</sup> ICOMST: 704-706.  
9  
10 Hildrum, K. I., Solvang, M., Nilsen, B. N., Froystein, T. & Berg, J. (1999). Combined  
11 effects of chilling rate, low voltage electrical stimulation and freezing on sensory  
12 properties of bovine M.longissimus dorsi. *Meat Science*, 52, 1–7.  
13  
14 Hocquette, J. F., Renand, G., Levéziel, H., Picard, B., & Cassar-Malek, I. (2005). In  
15 Proceedings of BSAS presented at the “Science of Beef Quality” Conference  
16  
17 Hornsey, H.C. (1956). The colour of cooked cured pork. I. Estimation of the nitric  
18 oxide-haem pigments. *J.Sci. Food Agriculture*, 7, 534-540.  
19  
20 Hopkins, D. L., & Roberts, A. H. K. (1995). The value of carcass weight, fat depth  
21 measures and eye muscle area for predicting the percentage of saleable meat in  
22 Australian grass-fed beef carcasses for Japan. *Meat Science*, 41(2), 137–145.  
23  
24 Hotchkiss, J. H. (1994). Packaging muscle foods. In D. M. Kinsman, A. W. Kotula, &  
25 B. C. Breidenstein, Muscle foods (pp. 480–482). New York and London: Chapman &  
26 Hall.  
27  
28 Huffman, K. L., Miller, N. F., Hoover, L. C., Wu, C. K., Brittin, H. C., & Ramsey, C. B.  
29 (1996). Effect of beef tenderness on consumer satisfaction with steaks consumed in the  
30 home and restaurant. *Journal of Animal Science*, 74(1), 91–97.  
31  
32 Insausti, K., Beriaín, M. J., Purroy, A., Albertí, P., Lizaso, L., & Hernández, B. (1999).  
33 Colour stability of beef from different Spanish native cattle breeds stored under vacuum  
34 and modified atmosphere. *Meat Science*, 53, 241-249.  
35  
36 Jeremiah, L. E., Dugan, M. E. R., Aalhus, J. L. & Gibson, L. L. (2003). Assessment of  
37 the chemical and cooking properties of the major beef muscle and muscle groups. *Meat*  
38 *Science*, 65, 985–992.  
39  
40 Kanner, J., & Harel, S. (1985). Initiation of membranal lipid peroxidation by activated  
41 metmyoglobin and methemoglobin. *Archives of Biochemistry and Biophysics*, 237, 314–  
42 319.  
43  
44 Koohmaraie, M. (1996). Biochemical factors regulating the toughening and  
45 tenderization processes of meat. *Meat Science*, 43: S193-S201.  
46  
47 Koop, J. & Bonnet, M (1982). Bulletins Technioques CRZV Thies INRA 48:34.  
48  
49 Lee, K-T. & Yoon, C-S. (2001). Quality changes and shelf life of imported vacuum-  
50 packaged beef chuck during storage at 0°C. *Meat Science*, 59, 71–77.

1  
2 Lepetit, J. (1989). Deformation of collagenous, elastin and muscle fibres in raw meat in  
3 relation to anisotropy and length ratio. *Meat Science*, 26, 47-66.  
4  
5 Lepetit, J. Grajales, A & Favier, R. (2000). Modelling the effect of sarcomere length on  
6 collagen thermal shortening in cooked meat: consequence on meat toughness. *Meat*  
7 *Science*, 54 239-250.  
8  
9 Martens, H. Staburvik, E. & Martens, M. (1982). Texture and colour changes in meat  
10 during cooking related to thermal denaturation of muscle proteins1. *Journal of Texture*  
11 *Studies*, 13(3), 291-309  
12  
13 Matulis, R. J., McKeith, F. K., Faulkner, D. B., Berger, L. L., & George, P. (1987).  
14 Growth and carcass characteristics of cull cows after different times-on-feed. *Journal of*  
15 *Animal Science*, 65, 669–674.  
16  
17 Miller, M. F., Hoover, L. C., Cook, K. D., Guerra, A. L., Huffman, K. L., Tinney, K. S.,  
18 et al. (1995). Consumer acceptability of beef steak tenderness in the home and  
19 restaurant. *Journal of Food Science*, 60(5), 963–965.  
20  
21 Møller, A. (1980). Analysis of Warner Bratzler shear force pattern with regard to  
22 myofibrillar and connective tissue components of tenderness. *Meat Science*, 5, 247–260.  
23  
24 Monserrat, L. (1994). Características reproductivas y variaciones ponderales del ganado  
25 Rubio Gallego en sistemas extensivos de producción de carne. Doctoral Thesis.  
26 University of Leon (Spain).  
27  
28 Moreno, T., Perez, N., Oliete, B., Carballo, J. A., Franco, D., & Monserrat, L. (2007).  
29 Effects on quality attributes of commercial veal pieces under different ageing  
30 treatments. *International Journal of Food Science and Technology*, 42, 373–379.  
31  
32 Oliete, B. Carballo, J. A., Varela A., Moreno T., Monserrat L. & Sanchez L. (2006)  
33 Effect of weaning status and storage time under vacuum upon physical characteristics of  
34 meat of the Rubia Gallega breed. *Meat Science*, 73, 102–108.  
35  
36 Realini, C. E., Duckett, S. K., Brito, Q. W., Dalla Rizza, M., & De Mattos, D. (2004).  
37 Effect of pasture vs. concentrate feeding with or without antioxidants on carcass  
38 characteristics, fatty acid composition, and quality of Uruguayan beef. *Meat Science*,  
39 66, 567–577.  
40  
41 Renerre M. (1986). Influence de facteurs biologiques et technologiques sur la couleur de  
42 viande bovine. Bull Techn. CRZV Theix, INRA, 65: 41-48.  
43  
44 Renerre, M. & Valin, C. (1979). Influence de l'âge sur les caracteritiques de la couleur  
45 des viandes bovines de la race *Limousin*. *Technol*, 28, 319-332.  
46  
47 Sañudo C., Monson, F., Panea, B. Pardos, J. J. & Olieta, J. L. (2003). *ITEA*, 24(I), 28-  
48 30.  
49

- 1 Sawyer, J. E., Mathis, C. P., & Davis, B. (2004). Effects of feeding strategy and age on  
2 live animal performance, carcass characteristics, and economics of short-term feeding  
3 programs for culled beef cows. *Journal of Animal Science*, 82, 3646–3653.  
4
- 5 Schnell, T. D., Belk, K. E., Tatum, J. D., Miller, R. K., & Smith, G. C. (1997).  
6 Performance, carcass, and palatability traits for cull cows fed high-energy concentrate  
7 diets for 0, 14, 28, 42, or 56 days. *Journal of Animal Science*, 75, 1195–1202.  
8
- 9 Sentandreu, M. A., Coulis, G. & Ouani, A. (2002). Role of muscle endopeptidases and  
10 their inhibitors in meat tenderness. *Trends in Food Science and Technology*, 13, 400-  
11 421.  
12
- 13 Thomson, B. C., Dobbie, P. M., Cox, N. R., & Simmons, N. J. (1999). Differences in  
14 the post-mortem kinetics of the calpain system in meat from bulls and steers. *New  
15 Zealand Journal of Agricultural Research*, 42(1), 47–54.  
16
- 17 Varela, A. (2002). Estudio de las variables que afectan a la producción del tipo ‘Cebón’.  
18 Doctoral Thesis. University of Santiago de Compostela (Spain).  
19
- 20 Vermorel, M. (1978). Feed evaluation for ruminants. II. The new energy systems  
21 proposed in France. *Livestock Prod. Sci.* 5, 347-349.  
22
- 23 Vestergaard, M., Madsen, N. T. Bligaard, H. B. Bredahl, L., Rasmussen, P. T. &  
24 Andersen, H.R., (2007) Consequences of two or four months of finishing feeding of  
25 culled dry dairy cows on carcass characteristics and technological and sensory meat  
26 quality. *Meat Science*, 76 ,635–643  
27
- 28 Vyncke, W. (1975). Evaluation of the direct thiobarbituric acid extraction method for  
29 determining oxidative rancidity in mackerel (*Scomber scombrus* L) *Fette seifen  
30 Anstichm*, 77, 239-240.  
31
- 32 Wheeler, T. L., Cundiff, L. V., & Koch, R. M. (1994). Effect of marbling degree on  
33 beef palatability in *Bos taurus* and *Bos indicus* cattle. *Journal of Animal Science*, 72,  
34 3145–3151.  
35
- 36 Young, O. A. & Bass, J. J. (1984). Effect of castration on bovine muscle composition.  
37 *Meat Science*, 11, 139-156.  
38  
39

1 **Table captions**

2 **Table 1.** Age, live weight, average daily gain, carcass weight, EUROP  
3 conformation, fatness scores and loin weight in culled cows without (T0) and with  
4 1 (T1) or 2 (T2) month finishing period.

5

6 **Table 2.** Meat quality characteristics (chemical composition, colour parameters,  
7 WHC and maximum shear force of LT, from culled cows without (T0) and with 1  
8 (T1) or 2 (T2) month finishing period.

9

10 **Table 3.** Cooking Losses shear force, shear firmness and total work of LT, from  
11 culled cows with 1 (T1) or 2 (T2) month finishing period during ageing time (1 to  
12 42 days).

13

14 **Table 4.** Hardness, springiness, chewiness, gumminess and cohesiveness of LT,  
15 from culled cows with 1 (T1) or 2 (T2) month finishing period during ageing time (1  
16 to 42 days).

17

18 **Table 5** pH, colour parameter ( $L^*$ ,  $a^*$ ,  $b^*$ ,  $C^*$  and  $h_{ab}$ ) and lipid oxidation of LT,  
19 from culled cows with 1 (T1) or 2 (T2) month finishing period during ageing time (1  
20 to 42 days).

21

22 |

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

**Table 1.**

|                                 | <b>T0</b> | <b>T1</b> | <b>T2</b> | <b>SED</b> | <b>Sig</b> |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|
| <b>Age (year)</b>               | 8.83      | 7.66      | 8.66      | 0.75       | n.s        |
| <b>Live weight</b>              |           |           |           |            |            |
| LW (at start pasture period) kg | 679       | 653       | 633       | 15.03      | n.s        |
| LW (at end pasture period) kg   | 769       | 727       | 693       | 15.40      | n.s        |
| LW (at slaughtered) kg          | 769       | 762       | 751       | 13.64      | n.s        |
| <b>Average daily increment</b>  |           |           |           |            |            |
| ADG pasture period kg/d         | 1.46      | 1.51      | 1.22      | 0.08       | n.s.       |
| ADG finishing period kg/d       | ---       | 1.02      | 0.94      | 0.05       | n.s.       |
| ADG total period kg/d           | 1.46 a    | 1.31 ab   | 1.07 b    | 0.05       | *          |
| <b>Carcass Characteristics</b>  |           |           |           |            |            |
| Carcass weight (kg.)            | 305       | 330       | 333       | 7.78       | n.s        |
| Conformation                    | 1.83      | 2.16      | 2.50      | 0.12       | n.s        |
| Fatness scale                   | 3.00      | 4.00      | 4.00      | 0.16       | n.s        |
| Carcass yield (%)               | 39.54 a   | 43.40 b   | 49.43 c   | 1.14       | **         |
| Loin weight <sup>a</sup> (kg)   | 7.25      | 7.61      | 7.69      | 0.22       | n.s        |

Significance: \*\*\* (p<0.001), \*\* (p<0.01), \* (p<0.05), + (p<0.1), n.s (not significant).<sup>a</sup>rib weight 5-10 Conformation: P=1, O=2, R=3, U=4, E=5, S=6  
Different letter after the mean value within the same row indicates significant differences (P<0.05) between treatment



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

**Table 2.**

|                                                | <b>T0</b> | <b>T1</b> | <b>T2</b> | <b>SED</b> | <b>Sig</b> |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|
| <b>pH</b>                                      | 5.53 a    | 5.52 a    | 5.69 b    | 0.02       | ***        |
| <b>Chemical Composition (%)</b>                |           |           |           |            |            |
| Water                                          | 72.57 a   | 72.41 ab  | 70.32 b   | 0.45       | +          |
| Ash                                            | 1.07 a    | 1.03 ab   | 0.99 b    | 0.01       | *          |
| Protein                                        | 21.64 a   | 19.73 b   | 20.42 ab  | 0.30       | *          |
| Intramuscular Fat (IMF)                        | 6.02 a    | 6.84 ab   | 8.52 b    | 0.44       | +          |
| <b>Water-holding capacity (%)</b>              |           |           |           |            |            |
| Cooking Losses (%)                             | 28.37     | 28.54     | 25.47     | 0.72       | n.s        |
| Pressing Losses (%)                            | 21.48 a   | 18.48 b   | 22.35 a   | 0.65       | *          |
| <b>Maximum shear force (kg/cm<sup>2</sup>)</b> | 7.91 a    | 10.62 b   | 8.00 a    | 0.50       | *          |
| <b>Colour <i>Longissimus Thoracis</i></b>      |           |           |           |            |            |
| Luminosity (L*)                                | 35.29 ab  | 32.27 a   | 36.91 b   | 0.52       | **         |
| Index of red (a*)                              | 14.64 a   | 18.26 b   | 15.91 a   | 0.50       | **         |
| Index of yellow (b*)                           | 7.17      | 8.76      | 8.06      | 0.29       | n.s        |
| Mioglobyn (mg/g fresh meat)                    | 6.82      | 7.01      | 5.94      | 0.25       | n.s        |
| <b>Colour Subcutaneous fat</b>                 |           |           |           |            |            |
| Luminosity (L*)                                | 58.18     | 54.52     | 55.95     | 0.68       | n.s        |
| Index of red (a*)                              | 5.98 a    | 6.49 a    | 9.00 b    | 0.51       | *          |
| Index of yellow (b*)                           | 22.58     | 21.21     | 20.96     | 0.91       | n.s        |

Significance: \*\*\* (p<0.001), \*\* (p<0.01), \* (p<0.05), + (p<0.1), n.s (not significant) Different letter after the mean value within the same row indicates significant differences (P<0.05) between ageing time.

**Table 3.**

|                                           | Ageing Time (days) |         |         |         |         |         |         | SED  |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------|
|                                           | 1                  | 7       | 14      | 21      | 28      | 35      | 42      |      |
| <b>Cooking Losses (%)</b>                 |                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |      |
| T1                                        | 28.54ab            | 31.07a  | 23.70 c | 23.25 c | 28.81ab | 29.08ab | 27.47 b | 0.50 |
| T2                                        | 25.47              | 26.49   | 26.28   | 25.89   | 26.13   | 25.82   | 25.07   | 0.38 |
| Sig                                       | +                  | **      | +       | *       | +       | **      | n.s.    |      |
| <b>Shear Force (kg/cm<sup>2</sup>)</b>    |                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |      |
| T1                                        | 10.61 a            | 8.07 b  | 5.87 c  | 5.40 c  | 5.57 c  | 5.87 c  | 5.20 c  | 0.33 |
| T2                                        | 8.00 a             | 5.60 b  | 5.70 b  | 5.93 b  | 5.18 b  | 5.09 b  | 5.20 b  | 0.27 |
| Sig                                       | *                  | **      | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    |      |
| <b>Shear Firmness (kg/cm<sup>2</sup>)</b> |                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |      |
| T1                                        | 3.66 a             | 2.97 b  | 2.36 c  | 2.12 c  | 2.05 c  | 2.19 c  | 2.21 c  | 0.10 |
| T2                                        | 3.05 a             | 2.28 b  | 2.35 b  | 2.25 b  | 2.19 b  | 1.80 b  | 1.86 b  | 0.09 |
| Sig                                       | n.s.               | *       | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    | +       | n.s.    |      |
| <b>Total work (kg*s)</b>                  |                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |      |
| T1                                        | 35.51 a            | 32.88 a | 21.46 b | 17.20 b | 16.02 b | 16.05 b | 20.07 b | 1.35 |
| T2                                        | 23.85 b            | 17.41 a | 20.24ab | 24.22 b | 15.98 a | 14.39 a | 15.29 a | 0.92 |
| Sig                                       | *                  | ***     | n.s.    | **      | n.s.    | n.s.    | *       |      |

- 1 Significance: \*\*\* (p<0.001), \*\* (p<0.01), \* (p<0.05), + (p<0.1), n.s (not significant). Different letter
- 2 after the mean value within the same row indicates significant differences (P<0.05) between ageing
- 3 time.

**Table 4.**

|                                      | Ageing Time (days) |         |         |         |         |         |         | SED   |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
|                                      | 1                  | 7       | 14      | 21      | 28      | 35      | 42      |       |
| <b>Hardness (kg/cm<sup>2</sup>)</b>  |                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |       |
| T1                                   | 15.62 a            | 16.45 a | 17.62ab | 21.09cb | 25.31 d | 21.83cd | 20.07 a | 0.69  |
| T2                                   | 20.39ab            | 16.24 a | 18.30   | 19.84ab | 21.96   | 22.34 b | 19.10   | 0.63  |
| Sig                                  | **                 | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    |       |
| <b>Springiness</b>                   |                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |       |
| T1                                   | 0.49               | 0.51 ba | 0.46    | 0.46 c  | 0.52    | 0.50 ba | 0.49    | 0.004 |
| T2                                   | 0.50               | 0.52 a  | 0.50    | 0.46 b  | 0.52    | 0.51 ab | 0.50    | 0.006 |
| Sig                                  | n.s.               | n.s.    | +       | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    |       |
| <b>Chewiness (kg)</b>                |                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |       |
| T1                                   | 3.58               | 4.03 bc | 4.02    | 2.91 c  | 6.47    | 5.08 ab | 3.88    | 0.25  |
| T2                                   | 4.93               | 4.11 a  | 4.42    | 3.98 a  | 5.30    | 5.42 a  | 4.48    | 0.20  |
| Sig                                  | **                 | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    |       |
| <b>Gumminess (kg/cm<sup>2</sup>)</b> |                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |       |
| T1                                   | 7.37 bc            | 7.80 bc | 9.15abc | 6.00 c  | 12.13 a | 9.90 ab | 7.83 bc | 0.47  |
| T2                                   | 9.66 a             | 7.88 a  | 8.65 a  | 8.40 a  | 9.98 a  | 10.48 a | 8.70 a  | 0.34  |
| Sig                                  | *                  | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    |       |
| <b>Cohesiveness</b>                  |                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |       |
| T1                                   | 0.47               | 0.45 a  | 0.46    | 0.45 a  | 0.45    | 0.45 a  | 0.46    | 0.002 |
| T2                                   | 0.44b              | 0.43 ab | 0.49    | 0.44 ab | 0.45    | 0.46 ab | 0.44    | 0.004 |
| Sig                                  | *                  | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    |       |

1 Significance: \*\*\* (p<0.001), \*\* (p<0.01), \* (p<0.05), + (p<0.1), n.s (not significant). Different letter  
 2 after the mean value within the same row indicates significant differences (P<0.05) between ageing  
 3 time.

4

5

6

**Table 5.**

|                                                     | Ageing Time (days) |         |         |         |         |         |         | SED   |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
|                                                     | 1                  | 7       | 14      | 21      | 28      | 35      | 42      |       |
| <b>pH</b>                                           |                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |       |
| T1                                                  | 5.52 a             | 5.57 b  | 5.62 c  | 5.77 d  | 5.56 b  | 5.73 d  | 5.66 c  | 0.01  |
| T2                                                  | 5.69 ab            | 5.71 ab | 5.67 ab | 5.45 a  | 5.61 ab | 5.80 b  | 5.73 ab | 0.03  |
| Sig                                                 | ***                | n.s.    | n.s.    | **      | n.s.    | n.s.    | *       |       |
| <b>Colour Parameters</b>                            |                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |       |
| <b>Luminosity (L*)</b>                              |                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |       |
| T1                                                  | 32.27bc            | 32.12ab | 30.92 a | 32.32ab | 33.49bc | 35.81 d | 35.20cd | 0.33  |
| T2                                                  | 36.91 b            | 32.04 a | 30.98 a | 30.24 a | 32.92 a | 31.07 a | 31.16 a | 0.44  |
| Sig                                                 | **                 | n.s.    | n.s.    | *       | n.s.    | **      | **      |       |
| <b>Index of red (a*)</b>                            |                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |       |
| T1                                                  | 18.26 a            | 20.05ab | 21.02 b | 20.84 b | 20.93 b | 18.92ab | 20.24ab | 0.27  |
| T2                                                  | 15.91              | 19.83   | 19.99   | 18.90   | 19.44   | 18.42   | 19.70   | 0.49  |
| Sig                                                 | *                  | n.s.    | n.s.    | +       | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    |       |
| <b>Index of Yellow (b*)</b>                         |                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |       |
| T1                                                  | 8.76 a             | 10.23 b | 11.57 b | 11.35 b | 11.47 b | 10.56 b | 11.02 b | 0.20  |
| T2                                                  | 8.06 a             | 10.99 b | 11.34 b | 10.40 b | 10.05ab | 10.35 b | 10.77 b | 0.29  |
| Sig                                                 | n.s.               | n.s.    | n.s.    | +       | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    |       |
| <b>Chroma <math>\sqrt{(a^*)^2 + (b^*)^2}</math></b> |                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |       |
| T1                                                  | 20.15 a            | 22.52ab | 23.98 b | 23.74 b | 23.87 b | 21.67ab | 23.05 b | 0.33  |
| T2                                                  | 17.84 a            | 22.67 b | 22.99 b | 21.58ab | 21.89ab | 21.13ab | 22.45ab | 0.56  |
| Sig                                                 | *                  | n.s.    | n.s.    | *       | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    |       |
| <b>Hue (<math>\tan^{-1}(b^*/a^*)</math>)</b>        |                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |       |
| T1                                                  | 27.50 a            | 29.66 b | 32.55 c | 32.23 c | 32.47 c | 33.29 c | 33.21 c | 0.34  |
| T2                                                  | 29.52 a            | 32.98 b | 34.07 b | 32.80 b | 29.93 a | 33.85 b | 32.40 b | 0.34  |
| Sig                                                 | *                  | ***     | *       | n.s.    | *       | n.s.    | n.s.    |       |
| <b>Myoglobin</b>                                    |                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |       |
| T1                                                  | 7.01 ab            | 6.89 ab | 6.67 ab | 6.09 b  | 7.39 a  | 6.45 ab | 6.69 ab | 0.13  |
| T2                                                  | 5.94 d             | 7.32 bc | 8.23 a  | 7.39 bc | 8.01 ba | 6.92 c  | 6.73 c  | 0.14  |
| Sig                                                 | **                 | n.s.    | *       | ***     | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    |       |
| <b>Lipid Oxidation</b>                              |                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |       |
| <b>Index of TBA</b>                                 |                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |       |
| T1                                                  | 0.25c              | 0.28abc | 0.24 c  | 0.31 ab | 0.23 c  | 0.26 bc | 0.32 a  | 0.008 |
| T2                                                  | 0.19 b             | 0.23 ab | 0.25 ab | 0.31 a  | 0.29 ab | 0.25 ab | 0.27 ab | 0.01  |
| Sig                                                 | n.s.               | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    | n.s.    |       |

Means with different letter in the same row show significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ; Duncan test) for the effect ageing time. - (+ =  $p < 0.1$ , \* =  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* =  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\* =  $p < 0.001$ ).

Units: myoglobin (mg myoglobin/ g fresh meat); index of TBA (mg MDA/kg fresh meat).