

Research Article

Sensorial Assessment of Beef Sausage Processed by Wheat Germ Flour

Shawgi Ibrahim Elbakheet*, Elgasim Ali Elgasim, Algadi M.Z

Faculty of Agriculture, University of Khartoum, Sudan

*Corresponding author: Shawgi Ibrahim Elbakheet, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Khartoum, Sudan, Tel: +249 922544908; E-mail: shawgi1416@gmail.com

Citation: Elbakheet SI, Ali Elgasim E, Algadi MZ (2016) Sensorial Assessment of Beef Sausage Processed by Wheat Germ Flour. Food Nutr J 1: 109. DOI: 10.29011/2575-7091.100009

Received Date: 23 August, 2016; Accepted Date: 26 October, 2016; Published Date: 31 October, 2016

Abstract

The term sausage is derived from the Latin word (salsus) meaning salt or literally translated, refers to chopped or minced meat preserved by salting. In this study beef sausage was processed by additions of different replacement levels of meat by Wheat Germ Flour (WGF) replacement levels were: 0% (as control) 10% and 15%. The processed beef sausage was packaged in foam trays, over-wrapped with Polyvinyl Chloride (PVC) and stored refrigerated at 4°C ± 1 for up to 7 days. Several variables were determined using subjective and objective measurements, to evaluate the effects of replacement levels and storage periods on the sensory attributes of the processed beef sausage. The evaluation was conducted immediately after processing, three and seven days post processing day. Results demonstrated that lower scores in over all acceptability, aroma and flavor; but higher score ($p < 0.05$) in deviation from meat aroma. Fifteen % replacement level sample had the highest ($p < 0.05$) on overall acceptability, flavor and aroma scores. Overall acceptability score, flavor score and aroma score, were increase with the increased of replacement levels. WGF act as binder in beef sausage production and could be a good substitute to others plant binders which are used as meat binder or extenders.

Keywords: Polyvinyl Chloride; Processing; Sensory Assessment; Sausage

Introduction

Meat is an excellent source of protein, iron and Vitamin B [1]. Nutritionally, meat is a very good source of essential amino acids, to a lesser extents, of certain minerals. Although vitamins and essential fatty acids are also present, meat also provides calories from protein, fat and limited quantities of carbohydrate [2]. Germ constitutes about 2.5% of the grain weight and comprises minimal amount of protein, but greatest share of fat, vitamins especially tocopherols [3]. Shurpalekar and Rao [4] showed that wheat germ contained three times as much protein of high biological value, seven times as much sugar and six times as much mineral compared with flours from endosperm. Quality, like beauty, is a very subjective attribute which varies from country to country and region to region. Various definitions have been put forward over the years, but all have suffered from the lack of any objective approach and have generally concluded that quality meat was that for which the public was prepared to pay the highest price [5]. Meat and meat products are highly perishable materials so sanitation and cooling is essentials in handling, marketing and processing of meat. The sanitation in the Sudan, in general is very poor

with regard to slaughtering, handling, marketing and processing of meat, except for very few meat plant and slaughter houses. Generally, meat products are widely consumed throughout the world; but unfortunately, their cost is high. To reduce this cost there is increasing interest in use of various non-meat proteins especially plant protein. Non-meat protein include vegetable protein soya beans, cereal and legume protein and are often referred to in the trade name as “meat extenders” or “meat substitutes” [6]. Lin and Zayas [7] reported that increasing cost of animal protein sources has encouraged researchers to study alternative protein sources, to be used in comminuted meat products, because of their lower formulation cost. The objectives of this study to evaluate the effects of partial replacement of meat by wheat germ flour on the quality characteristics of beef sausage.

Material and Methods

Materials

Food Materials

Meat loins and round were obtained from Animal Production Research Center Kuku. The beef meat was stored frozen at $-11 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$ in freezer at Regional Training Center for Meat Quality, Grading and Meat Technology, Elkadaro. Wheat germ was ob-

tained from Seen flour mills stored frozen. Spices, salt and sugar were obtained from local market of Khartoum North. The additional fat needed in the formulation was obtained from the local market. Uniform rendered fat free of protein was used.

Chemicals and Reagents

Chemicals and reagent used were brought from the central lab stores of Khartoum University, sodium nitrite and ascorbic acid, were obtained from Looly Company, Khartoum.

Casings

Cellulose casings 23 mm in diameter were obtained from

Looly Company, Khartoum.

Methods

Raw Materials Preparation

Meat Preparation

Stored beef was allowed to thaw and sliced then ground through a 0.75 In, plate using a meat grinder. Ground beef was stored refrigerated at 4 °C ±1, for about 20 hr, a sample was taken to be analyses for protein fat and moisture content following A.O.A.C. Method (1995) Table 1.

Material	Protein%	Fat %	Moisture content%	Ash %	Curd Fiber %	Carbohydrate	pH
Beef meet	22.6	3.2	71	0.98	-	0.3	6.29
Wheat grem	27.2	9.3	10.35	2.17	2.53	48.3	6.17

Table 1: proximate analysis and pH of beef meat and wheat germ.

Wheat Germ Preparation

Stored wheat germ was ground, to form Wheat Germ Flour (WGF). Then a sample was taken and analyzed for protein, fat and moisture content, following A.O.A.C. method (1995) [8] Table 1.

Calculation for Sausage Formulation

The experiment designed to produce sausage with the following specification, protein 15%, fat 20% moisture, 58.3% added starch 4.7%, salt 1.5%, and spices 0.5% (Table 2,3). Three batches with three replacements of meat by wheat germ were used every batch weight 2000g.

Components	%	Weight in grams
Protein	15	300
Fat	20	400
Starch	4.7	94
Water	58.3	1160
Salt	1.5	30
Spices	0.5	10

Table 2: Sausage Formula.

Ingredient	Replacement level of meet		
	0% Protien	10% Protien	15% Protien
Beef meet	1327.43	1194.7	1128.32
Wheat germ	-	110.3	165.44
Starch	94	94	94100
Fat	357.52	355.15	94
Water	217.53	300.34	341.3
Salt	30	30	30
Sugar	10	10	10
Black pepper	3	3	3
Nutmeg	2	2	2
Cinnamon	2	2	2
Garlic	2	2	2
Sodium nitrite	0.13	0.12	0.11
Vitamin C	0.62	0.55	0.52

• Replacement level of meat by wheat germ on the protein to protein basses

Table 3: Sausage formulation for all treatments.

Therefore protein required = $15 \times 2000 / 100 = 300\text{g}$

Fat required = $20 \times 2000 / 100 = 400\text{g}$

Water required = $58.3 \times 2000 / 100 = 1166\text{g}$

Starch required = $4.7 \times 2000 / 100 = 94\text{g}$

Salt required = $1.5 \times 200 / 100 = 30\text{g}$

Spices required = $0.5 \times 200 / 100 = 10\text{g}$

Sodium nitrite 100ppm.

Vitamin C 0.466g /kg

First Replacement Level Wheat germ 0% so the required protein was 100% from meat beef therefore beef require = $300 \times 100 / 22.6 = 1327.43$

Fat in 1327.43g beef = $3.2 \times 1327.43 / 100 = 42.48$

Fat to be added = $400 - 42.48 = 357.52$

Moisture in 1327.43g beef = $71 \times 1327.43 / 100 = 942.47$

Moisture from starch = 6

Total moisture = 948.47

Moisture to be added = $1166 - 948.47 = 217.53$

Required sodium nitrite = 0.13g

Required Vitamin C = 0.62g

Second Replacement Level

Wheat germ 10% so the required protein was 90% from beef and 10% from wheat germ

There for beef required = $300 \times 90 / 22.6 = 1194.7$

Wheat germ required = $300 \times 10 / 22.7 = 110.3$

Fat in 1194.7g beef = $3.2 \times 1194.7 / 100 = 38.23$

Fat in 110.3 wheat germ = $6 \times 110.3 / 100 = 6.62$

Total fat = 44.85

Fat to be added = $400 - 44.85 = 355.15$

Moisture in 1194.7g beef = $71 \times 1194.7 / 100 = 848.24$

Moisture in 110.3g wheat germ = $10.35 \times 110.3 / 100 = 11.42$

Moisture in 100g starch = 6

Total moisture = 865.66

Moisture to be added = $1166 - 865.66 = 300.34$

Sodium nitrite to be added = 0.12g

Vitamin C to be added = 0.56g

Third Replacement Wheat germ 15% so the required protein in 85% from beef 15% from wheat germ.

Therefore beef required = $300 \times 85 / 22.6 = 112.32$

Wheat germ required = $300 \times 15 / 27.2 = 165.44$

Fat in 1128.32g beef = $3.2 \times 1128.32 / 100 = 36.11$

Fat in 165.44g wheat germ = $6 \times 165.44 / 100 = 9.95$

Fat to be added = $400 - 46.04 = 353.96$

Moisture in 1128.32g beef = $71 \times 1128.32 / 100 = 801.11$

Moisture in 165.44g wheat germ = $10.35 \times 165.44 / 100 = 17.12$

Moisture in 100g starch = 6.

Total moisture = 824.23

Moisture to be added = $1166 - 824.23 = 341.8$

Sodium nitrate = 0.11g

Vitamin C to be added = 0.52g

Sausage Preparation:

Minced meat, salt, sugar, minced fat, spices, vitamin C, sodium nitrate and half of calculated ice water were introduced to a Hobart Chopper; the Chopper was then started for about 4 min. The added materials were dispersed uniformly. Then the ground wheat germ, starch were added together with the remainder of the calculated water. The entire mass was chopped for about 5 min. then transferred to manual stuffer to be stuffed into cellulose casing of 23 mm in diameter and linked at lengths of 15cm. The framed sausages were heated in water at 98 °C for about 40 min, followed by immediate cooling in ice water, for 15 min. The cooled processed sausage was peeled and packed in foam trays over-wrapped with Polyvinyl Chloride (PVC) and stored refrigerated for up to 7 days. The WGF replacement levels in beef sausage formulation and processing were performed following the same procedures explained above.

Method of Analysis

Sausages were assessed at 0 day (i.e. immediately after processing) after three and seven days post processing.

Sensory Evaluation

Ten member sensory panel consisting of M.Sc. And B.Sc. student of food science and technology Department, Faculty of

Agriculture, University of Khartoum, semi-trained according to the procedure of Cross et al. [9]. The panel evaluated the cooked sausage sample with the different treatment for juiciness, tenderness, test, odor, differential from meat taste and over all acceptability. By mean of the scale (7=extremely like, 1=extremely dislike), Table 4. Panelists received samples which were randomly numbered. Water at room temperature was made available to panel for cleaning the palate between the tested samples.

There are three types of beefsausage. Please evaluate, Aroma, Flavor, Deviation from meat aroma, juiciness, tenderness, and overall acceptability. Using scores are follows:

7=Extremity like

6=moderaty like

5=Like

4=Slightly like

3=Slightly Dislike

2=Dislike

1=Extremity dislike

If you have any questions please ask

Samples	A	B	C
Aroma			
Flavor			
Deviation from meaty Aroma			
Juiciness			
Tenderness			
Overall acceptability			

Table 4: Sensory Evaluation Form.

Statistical Analysis:

The data collected from the different treatments was subjected to analysis of variance and whenever appropriate the mean separation procedure of Duncan was employed [10]. The SAS program (SAS, 1988). Was used to perform the General Linear Model (GLM) analysis.

Results and Discussions

Sensory evaluation:

The sensory evaluation of beef sausage extended with three replacement level is shown in Table 5, the control samples scored

high values in deviation from meat aroma that could be due to flavor of wheat germ flour. According to Ganasambandam and Zayas [11] aroma and flavor are probably the most important attributes that influence the sensory properties of comminuted meat product extended with non meat protein additives. Fifteen % replacement levels had the highest score in: aroma, flavor, Juiciness, tenderness and over all acceptability among the treatment. Generally, it was relatively similar to control sample in juiciness and deviation from meat aroma, and these agrees with the finding of Ganasambandam and zayas [12] a trained panel found suggested an effect due to increasing levels of wheat germ protein flour on aroma and flavor of frankfurters. 10% replacement level sample usually, scores higher than 0% and less than 15% in: aroma, flavor, and deviation from meat aroma, Juiciness, tenderness and over all acceptability. The relative high scores of tenderness and Juiciness in the sample with replacement levels 15% may be due to high water binding of these samples. Judge et al. [13] indicated that many of the physical property of meat include color; texture and firmness of raw meat, Juiciness and tenderness of cooked meat are partially dependent on W H C. And mention that the portion of water present in free form and the ability of meat to bind water and factors that increase this ability will increase juiciness.

Independent variables	Replacement levels of meat by WGF			S.E
	0%	10%	15%	
Test	4.5	4.95	5.6	±(0.34)
Order	4.6	5.05	5.65	±(0.3)
variation from meat taste	5.20	4.60	5.15	±(0.19)
Juiciness	5.15	4.85	5.37	±(0.15)
Tenderness	5.20	5.35	5.85	±(0.2)
Overall acceptability	4.85	5.00	6.10	±(0.39)

Table 5: Sensory characteristic of cooked beef.

References

1. NIIR (2004) Fresh meat technology hand book. Board of consultant and engineering of National Institute of Industrial Research. Asia Pacific Business Press Inc. Regd. Office: 106-E, Kamla Nagar, Delhi, India.
2. Judge MD, Albert ED, Forrest JC, Hedrick MB, Merkel RA (1990) Principle of meat science. (2nd ed). Kendall Hunt, Owa, USA.
3. Anon (1987) Wheat facts. In: Official Publications of National Association of Wheat Growers.10: 17.

4. Shurpalekar S, Rao PH (1977) Wheat germ advances in food research. J Food Sci 23: 187-191.
5. Cooper MA, Willis MB (1984) Profitable beef production. farming press book, Redwood burn Ltd. Trowbridge. Wilt Shire, United kingdom.
6. Gracey JF (1986) Meat hygiene. (8th ed), Bailliere Tindal, London, Britain.
7. Lin CS, Zayas J (1987) Influence of corn on yield and quality characteristics of comminuted meat products in model systems. J Food science 52: 130-138.
8. AOAC (1995) Official method of analysis. (4th ed), Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Washington DC.
9. Cross HR, Moen R, Stanfield MS (1978) Guidelines for training and testing judges for sensory analysis of meat quality. J Food technology 32: 48-54.
10. Steel RG, Torrie J H (1980) Principles and procedures of statistics, MC Grow Hill, New York, USA.
11. Ganasambanadam R, Zayas JF (1992) Functionality of wheat germ protein in comminuted meat products as compared with corn germ and soy proteins. J Food Sci 57: 829-833.
12. Ganasambanadam R, Zayas JF (1996) Frankfurters Extended with Wheat Germ Protein: Sensory Properties and Consumers Response. J Food quality 19: 423-435.
13. Judge MD, Albert ED, Forrest JC, Hedrick MB, Merkel RA (1990) Principle of meat science, (2nd ed), Kendall Hunt, 1, Owa, USA.