

THE EFFECT OF HEAT TREATMENT ON THE CHEMICAL COMPOSITION OF CANNED MEAT

C. A. ENEJI

(Received 28 April, 1999; Revision accepted 21 January, 2000)

ABSTRACT

Beef, pork and chicken meat were used in this study. Heat treatments were carried out at 115°C in stationary and rotating autoclaves, 125°C in stationary and rotating autoclaves, 125°C in stationary and 125°C but higher F_0 value in stationary and rotating autoclaves.

The results of the analysis showed higher protein values in the range of 20.54% to 23.92% (autoclaved) and 20.25% to 20.85% (raw) beef; those of pork samples were from 19.12% to 21.68% (autoclaved), 19.19% to 19.83% (raw) while chicken samples were from 22.00% to 24.76% (autoclaved) and raw samples 20.75% respectively. In the case of fat content, autoclaved beef samples showed higher values than the raw samples in the range of 3.0% to 4.5% (autoclaved), 1.0% to 1.5% (raw), while the reverse was the case with pork and chicken where the range for pork was from 2.5% to 5.0% (autoclaved), 5.0% to 5.5% (raw), and chicken from 0.5% to 2.0% (autoclaved) and 2.5% (raw) samples respectively. The ash content of autoclaved beef and pork samples showed lower values than their raw samples and were in the range of 1.13% to 1.53% (autoclaved) and 1.01% to 1.74% (raw) for beef and 1.20% to 1.62% (autoclaved), 1.14% to 1.68% for raw pork samples while autoclaved chicken samples showed higher values than the raw sample in the range of 1.20% to 1.62% (autoclaved) and 1.02% raw samples respectively. Apart from two autoclaved pork samples SA3 (stationary) and SF5 (rotating) that showed higher moisture content than their raw samples other pork samples (SA1, BF2, SA4) beef and chicken samples showed lower values. The moisture content of pork sample (SA3) was 76.5% (autoclaved) 72.0% (raw) SF5 sample was 75.0% (autoclaved) and 73.0% (raw) respectively.

Amino acid content of the sample also showed that by far a higher effect exists with the behaviour of individual amino acid of the raw material than the parameters of heat treatment. In all product samples cysteine and tryptophan contents of autoclaved samples were lower than those of the raw samples.

The amino acid range for beef were from 99.24g to 99.98g (autoclaved), 100.00g to 103.90g (raw); pork samples 102.24g (raw); chicken samples 99.99g to 100.01g (autoclaved) and 100.01g for raw samples respectively.

Thiamine retention was higher in canned beef than other canned meat. More thiamine was retained in autoclaved pork in rotation than in autoclaved stationary treatment. Thiamine in beef ranged from 0.85g to 1.20mg (autoclaved), 1.86mg to 2.50mg (raw samples); pork 0.44mg to 0.81mg (autoclaved) and 1.19mg to 1.80mg (raw); chicken 0.06mg to 0.10mg (autoclaved) and 1.25mg for raw sample respectively. The result on thiamine retention showed that, that of canned chicken was more sensitive to heat treatment than other canned meat samples.

On the whole, the results of this study showed that products heating largely by conduction-stationary heat treatment resulted in acceptable quality meat products.

KEY WORDS: Heat treatment, canned meat, chemical composition, thiamine retention.

INTRODUCTION

Heat treatment is one of the most frequently used methods in meat processing technology. The extent of heat treatment is, however, limited by the preservation of organoleptic and nutritional palatability.

The production of animal protein has been insufficient to meet the demands in developing countries (F.A.O. 1970). Specifically, livestock production in these countries is increasing at between 1.5 and 2.0% per annum while demand is growing at 4 to 5% annually. Consequently, F.A.O. (1970) called for an increase in production and

recommended intensified management of wild as well as domestic stocks.

The meat processing industry is a growing one and the few processors available concentrate on the use of beef, chicken and pork to produce fresh meat, frozen meat, bacon, sausages, sausage meat and ham.

The shortage of dietary proteins, specifically those of animal origin, is one of the greatest problems facing Nigeria today. This shortage is having adverse effect on the economic development of the country not only in terms of reduced human productivity, but also in the high incidence of infant mortality, severe

malnutrition and precipitated diseases.

The demand for meat as a component of every household diet which was on the increase in the 1970s is now showing a rapid decrease. The reasons include the high inflation rates, Structural Adjustment Programme which has resulted in a lower value for the naira and the rapid increase in human population. Educating Nigerians on better nutrition has not been able to change the downward trend. Except government intervenes, the future of meat supply in Nigeria is bleak. It becomes, therefore necessary that appropriate technology should be used during meat processing in order to preserve the protein and other valuable component.

Although a lot of meat products are being consumed, investigations into changes in their nutritive value have mostly been concentrated on household preparation. Experts in the food industry have mainly investigated those properties of meat which are important from an industrial point of view.

The effect of processing food products using high temperature heating in autoclave needs large scale investigation. A lot of interest has been demonstrated in this area by the volume of work published so far (Bender, 1966; Lawrie, 1968; Cheftel and Thomas 1963; Charm, 1971; Tarjan and Linder, 1981; Lawrie, 1966; Lund, 1977; Len and Lund 1980, Eneji 1976, 1985; Zukal, 1970.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

MATERIALS USED

Beef, pork and chicken breast from which the bones, tendons, surface connective tissues and fat had been removed were used. The beef and pork used were from the biceps femoris muscle of the animal.

Preparation of Samples

The different types of meat were washed with flowing warm tap water. The meats were later cut into cubes of 24 x 24mm through a 24mm disc. The prepared meat of each type was mixed with 10g/kg common table salt. Four hundred gram (400g) of mixed meat was filled into 500g, of internally lacquered can (Ø99 x 60mm) with Vernag filling machine and sealed hermetically.

Part of the samples were sterilized in the Research Institute for Canning and Paprika Industry while the remaining part was sterilized in the Budapest Canning Factory.

The samples without heat treatment control-were stored frozen until chemical investigations were carried out.

Heat treatment in stationary and Rotating autoclaves:

The different types of canned meat were sterilized in the STOCK PILOT ROTOR, model 900 laboratory autoclave. Rotation number can be altered between 0 and 30min⁻¹. Also LW 2002 LUBECA stationary sterilizing equipment was used under factory conditions.

All product types received five types of heat treatments at 115°C and the applied 125°C in modern equipment in stationary as well as rotational positions. Higher Fo-value at 125°C sterilization was also carried out.

Investigations for tropical stability, according to the above scheme of sterilized products in a thermostat (55 ± 1°C, 21 days) was carried out.

Chemical investigations

Samples of each sterilized meat type was minced and homogenized with moulinette model turmix machine before laboratory analysis.

Determination of crude protein

The Association of Official Analytical Chemists (A.O.A.C, 1975) method of crude protein analysis was used in the determination of crude protein content.

An aliquot part from the carefully homogenized sample was digested with sulphuric acid in the presence of selenium catalyst.

The protein content from the digested sample was determined with KJELTEC AUTO 1030 analyzer.

DETERMINATION OF MOISTURE CONTENT

A.O.A.C., (1975) method of analysis was used in moisture determination.

Determination of Ash content

The method of A.O.A.C., (1975) was used for the estimation of ash content.

Determination of Amino acids

MOORE-STEIN method was used to analyse the samples. The samples were hydrolyzed with hydrochloric acid (HCl) at 110°C (Kerese, 1975). After the distillation of the hydrochloric acid, the amino acids in the samples were determined with AA881 type amino acid analyzer. The analyzer has one ion exchange column which is filled with sulphurated polysterol resin. The eluent were different pH sodium citrate buffer solutions.

During the elution at a suitable temperature, the solutions were mixed with ninhydrin and the evolving colour intensity gave a suitable signal which was recorded with the help of the recording equipment. Suitable curves of the amino acid compositions were formed from the equipment signal. The curves' peak areas were evaluated by calculations and comparing them with known standards. To determine tryptophan, modified hydrolysing agents were used. The hydrochloric acid (HCl) was replaced with P-toluence sulphonic acid.

Determination of Fat content

The fat content was determined by the quick method-butyrrometer, (Hungarian Standard, 1972).

Determination of thiamine

The thiamine content of the samples was determined by High Pressure Liquid Chromatographic (HPLC) method. All the samples were extracted with 0.1M HCl for half an hour on a water bath. After cooling to room temperature, M sodium acetate was added and the pH was adjusted to 4.5. Ten percent (10%) takadiastase enzyme solution was added to the sample. The sample was maintained in a thermostat controlled water bath with mild intermittent mixing at 45°C for one hour. After cooling to room temperature, the sample was centrifuged, and the volume adjusted with 0.1 N hydrochloric acid.

The HPLC equipment was manufactured by WATER ASSOCIATES.

Detection: With ultra violet absorption measurement.

Flow Rate: 1Cm3/second.

Fill of pre and separating column: Partisil ODS

Stationary elution and Recorder: MTA KUTSEZ Model 175

Eluents: 0.2M triethylflamin-acetate of pH 4.5-5.5 containing 7.5-30% methanol in deionized distilled water.

Completely randomise design was used to analyse the data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

EFFECT OF HEAT TREATMENT ON CHEMICAL COMPOSITION

The results of proximate analysis of canned meat table 1 showed higher protein values in the range of 20.54% to 23.92% (autoclaved) and 20.25% to 20.85% (raw) beef; that of pork samples were from 19.12% to 21.68% (autoclaved), 19.19% 19.83% (raw); while chicken samples were from 22.00% to 24.76% (autoclaved) and raw sample was 20.75% respectively.

Table 1: Protein, Ash, Fat and Water Content of Canned Meat (%)

| Product Designation | Water Content | Protein Content | Fat Content | Ash Content |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|
| M | 75.5 | 20.25 | 1.0 | 1.74 |
| MA1 | 72.0 | 20.75 | 4.0 | 1.34 |
| MF2 | 68.0 | 22.70 | 4.0 | 1.18 |
| M | 74.0 | 20.71 | 1.5 | 1.01 |
| MA3 | 74.0 | 23.92 | 3.0 | 1.33 |
| M | 75.0 | 20.85 | 1.5 | 1.48 |
| MA4 | 72.5 | 20.54 | 4.5 | 1.53 |
| MF5 | 70.5 | 22.74 | 4.0 | 1.13 |
| S | 73.5 | 19.83 | 5.5 | 1.40 |
| SA1 | 72.5 | 21.57 | 5.0 | 1.20 |
| SF2 | 71.5 | 21.68 | 3.0 | 1.43 |
| S | 72.0 | 19.60 | 6.5 | 1.13 |
| SA3 | 76.5 | 19.12 | 2.5 | 1.50 |
| S | 73.0 | 19.19 | 6.0 | 1.68 |
| SA4 | 72.5 | 20.13 | 2.5 | 1.58 |
| SF5 | 75.0 | 19.30 | 2.5 | 1.62 |
| C | 75.0 | 20.75 | 2.5 | 1.02 |
| CA1 | 71.5 | 24.76 | 1.0 | 1.30 |
| CF2 | 72.5 | 22.71 | 0.5 | 1.48 |
| CA3 | 71.5 | 23.44 | 2.0 | 1.62 |
| CA4 | 73.0 | 22.00 | 2.0 | 1.20 |
| CF5 | 73.5 | 22.06 | 1.0 | 1.38 |

| Product | 115°C | | 125°C | 125°C | | Fresh |
|---------|------------|----------|------------|------------|----------|-------|
| | Stationary | Rotating | Stationary | Stationary | Rotating | |
| Beef | MA1 | MF2 | MA3 | MA4 | MF5 | M |
| Pork | SA1 | SF2 | SA3 | SA4 | SF5 | S |
| Chicken | CA1 | CF2 | CA3 | CA4 | CF5 | C |

Table 2: Free Amino Acid Composition of Canned Meat Related to its Protein Content

| Amino Acids | /g/ amino acid/100g protein/ | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------------------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| | M | MA1 | MF2 | M | MA3 | M | MA4 | MF5 |
| ASP | 13.20 | 11.83 | 13.72 | 13.69 | 9.99 | 10.64 | 13.90 | 10.95 |
| Thr | 5.92 | 5.92 | 5.75 | 5.62 | 5.31 | 5.57 | 6.57 | 6.12 |
| Ser | 4.29 | 4.61 | 4.58 | 4.24 | 4.62 | 4.67 | 4.79 | 4.18 |
| Glu | 18.06 | 18.22 | 17.71 | 18.02 | 19.55 | 5.62 | 17.58 | 12.40 |
| Pto | 5.97 | 5.41 | 5.33 | 6.02 | 5.69 | 5.02 | 6.05 | 7.45 |
| Gly | 3.90 | 5.39 | 4.44 | 3.95 | 5.43 | 5.76 | 4.52 | 4.26 |
| Ala | 4.99 | 5.39 | 4.96 | 4.85 | 5.82 | 9.01 | 4.69 | 4.18 |
| Cys | 0.47 | 0.40 | 0.28 | 0.59 | 0.25 | 1.34 | 0.32 | 0.78 |
| Val | 2.85 | 3.48 | 3.07 | 2.78 | 3.32 | 3.69 | 2.95 | 3.64 |
| Met | 2.40 | 2.14 | 2.11 | 2.16 | 2.13 | 2.74 | 2.08 | 3.32 |
| Ile | 3.27 | 3.19 | 2.61 | 2.88 | 2.85 | 3.19 | 2.92 | 3.36 |
| Leu | 8.34 | 6.66 | 8.25 | 7.73 | 6.69 | 4.88 | 7.99 | 5.59 |
| Tyr | 2.73 | 2.99 | 3.17 | 2.90 | 3.06 | 3.01 | 3.07 | 3.84 |
| Phe | 3.59 | 3.26 | 3.59 | 3.37 | 3.25 | 4.12 | 3.38 | 3.73 |
| Lys | 9.60 | 9.77 | 9.66 | 9.50 | 8.88 | 8.72 | 9.00 | 11.32 |
| His | 4.25 | 4.48 | 4.24 | 4.32 | 4.15 | 4.72 | 3.46 | 3.53 |
| Try | 0.64 | 0.54 | 0.61 | 0.92 | 0.86 | 1.07 | 0.63 | 0.59 |
| Arg | 5.55 | 6.30 | 5.87 | 6.47 | 7.09 | 8.13 | 6.34 | 7.92 |
| Total | 100.02 | 99.98 | 9.95 | 100.00 | 99.24 | 103.90 | 99.90 | 99.46 |

Table 2: Continued

| Amino Acids | S | SA1 | SF2 | S | SA3 | S | SA4 | SF5 |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|
| Asp | 9.72 | 8.88 | 14.85 | 9.93 | 11.03 | 10.55 | 11.18 | 12.05 |
| Thu | 4.14 | 4.44 | 56.50 | 5.12 | 7.09 | 4.42 | 5.26 | 6.16 |
| Ser | 4.09 | 3.25 | 5.76 | 4.67 | 6.16 | 3.71 | 4.08 | 4.73 |
| Glu | 11.20 | 11.48 | 10.75 | 11.24 | 13.28 | 14.21 | 12.09 | 23.25 |
| Pro | 7.89 | 8.23 | 6.93 | 8.28 | 6.91 | 5.66 | 8.18 | 6.98 |
| Gly | 5.45 | 5.17 | 4.89 | 5.38 | 4.62 | 4.98 | 5.01 | 4.88 |
| Ala | 5.61 | 5.79 | 4.56 | 5.48 | 4.96 | 6.34 | 5.45 | 5.70 |
| Cys | 1.13 | 1.46 | 1.36 | 1.50 | 1.25 | 0.87 | 0.96 | 1.00 |
| Val | 4.46 | 4.02 | 4.74 | 4.03 | 5.49 | 3.85 | 4.05 | 5.00 |
| Met | 3.58 | 4.01 | 1.78 | 3.80 | 2.36 | 2.88 | 3.94 | 2.46 |
| Ile | 3.18 | 3.26 | 1.83 | 3.16 | 2.61 | 4.00 | 3.95 | 2.29 |
| Leu | 8.03 | 7.46 | 6.60 | 7.86 | 6.73 | 8.10 | 6.11 | 6.63 |
| Tyr | 3.54 | 3.83 | 3.33 | 3.73 | 3.48 | 3.58 | 3.30 | 3.03 |
| Phe | 3.28 | 3.59 | 3.91 | 3.37 | 4.07 | 4.03 | 2.92 | 3.02 |
| Lys | 11.60 | 10.60 | 9.73 | 10.66 | 8.51 | 10.27 | 8.95 | 8.94 |
| His | 5.27 | 5.80 | 4.89 | 5.24 | 3.89 | 5.68 | 5.41 | 5.78 |
| Try | 1.01 | 0.69 | 0.68 | 0.71 | 0.80 | 1.40 | 1.28 | 0.87 |
| Arg | 6.82 | 8.08 | 6.90 | 5.87 | 6.77 | 7.71 | 7.83 | 6.27 |
| Total | 99.99 | 99.99 | 99.99 | 100.03 | 100.01 | 102.24 | 99.95 | 100.01 |

Table 2: Continued

| Amino Acids | C | CA1 | CF2 | CA3 | CA4 | CF5 |
|-------------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|
| Asp | 10.18 | 12.28 | 10.86 | 11.92 | 11.71 | 11.53 |
| Thr | 5.31 | 5.85 | 5.88 | 5.96 | 4.91 | 5.83 |
| Ser | 4.29 | 5.12 | 5.12 | 4.94 | 4.69 | 4.74 |
| Glu | 14.36 | 11.12 | 10.31 | 14.66 | 12.64 | 11.61 |
| Pro | 5.09 | 5.14 | 5.97 | 6.58 | 4.63 | 5.24 |
| Gly | 3.96 | 4.77 | 4.87 | 5.10 | 4.84 | 5.63 |
| Ala | 6.06 | 5.96 | 5.44 | 4.82 | 5.32 | 6.05 |
| Cys | 1.05 | 0.56 | 0.80 | 0.84 | 0.78 | 0.93 |
| Val | 3.62 | 4.02 | 4.07 | 3.66 | 3.77 | 4.27 |
| Met | 2.99 | 3.79 | 3.85 | 3.96 | 3.06 | 3.72 |
| Ile | 2.96 | 3.40 | 4.20 | 4.09 | 3.37 | 3.49 |
| Leu | 7.44 | 7.12 | 6.80 | 6.18 | 6.83 | 6.63 |
| Tyr | 4.08 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 3.92 | 3.88 | 3.88 |
| Phe | 4.16 | 3.59 | 3.73 | 3.63 | 4.01 | 3.60 |
| Lys | 9.31 | 10.61 | 10.63 | 10.10 | 9.86 | 10.01 |
| His | 4.87 | 4.62 | 4.52 | 4.57 | 5.36 | 4.65 |
| Try | 2.08 | 1.10 | 1.19 | 1.32 | 1.45 | 1.24 |
| Arg | 8.20 | 6.97 | 7.57 | 6.75 | 8.87 | 7.05 |
| Total | 100.01 | 100.01 | 99.99 | 100.00 | 100.01 | 100.00 |

There was no significant difference ($P > 0.05$) in fat content between the raw samples of beef but compared to the results obtained from the heat treated samples, the fat content of the heat treated samples were relatively higher in the range of 3.0% to 34.5% (autoclaved) and 1.0% to 1.5% (raw) respectively. The results of the ash content of beef samples ranged from 1.13% to 1.53% (autoclaved), and 1.01% to 1.74% (raw); while the moisture content ranged from 68.0% to

74.0% (autoclaved) and 74.0% to 75.5% respectively.

Apart from the two autoclaved pork samples SA3 (stationary) and SF5 (rotating) that showed higher moisture content than their raw samples other pork samples showed lower values. The moisture content of pork sample (SA3) was 76.5% (autoclaved), 72.0% (raw) and SF5 sample was 75.0% (autoclaved) and 73.0% (raw) respectively. There was no significant difference ($P > 0.05$) in fat content between the raw pork samples but the heat treated samples showed lower values compared to the raw samples in the range of 2.5% to 5.0% (autoclaved), 5.0% to 5.5% raw samples respectively.

The moisture content in the case of the chicken meat samples showed lower values than the raw samples. The range were from 71.5% to 73.5% (autoclaved) and 75.0% for raw samples respectively. Fat content of heat treated chicken meat samples showed low values when compared to the raw samples. That of autoclaved samples ranged from 0.5% to 2.0% while that of the raw samples was 2.5%. The ash content of the autoclaved chicken meat samples were higher in values than the raw samples in the range of 1.20% to 1.62% (autoclaved) and 1.02% for raw samples.

Amino Acid Content

The results of free amino acid and mean essential amino acid contents are summarised in Tables 2 and 3 respectively.

Effect of heat treatment on the free tryptophan content - related to the initial protein - in all the meat products with the exception of canned pork designated SA3 decreased relatively. The decrease was approximately half of the initial quantity. The tryptophan value for SA3 (stationary autoclaved pork sample) was 0.80g while that of the raw sample was 1.40g. Example the tryptophan value for MA1 autoclaved beef sample was 0.54g while that of the raw sample was 0.64g; SA1 autoclaved pork sample was 1.01g compared to the raw sample which was 1.01g; CA1 autoclaved chicken meat sample 1.10g and raw sample 2.08g.

Some of the amino acids change significantly during heat treatment. For example glutamic acid in MA4 and MA1 autoclaved beef samples had 17.58g and 12.40g respectively while the raw sample had 5.62g; Threonine in SF2 autoclaved pork sample had 56.50g while the raw sample had 4.14g; Asparagine in autoclaved chicken sample CA1 had 12.28g while the raw sample had 10.18g. With these, the decomposition reactions are usually fast at high temperature and method of heat treatment (stationary or rotational).

The most important indicator of the resulting processes during heat treatment were changes of some amino acids when compared to the initial protein. In the first place the quantity of every single amino acid is important in the case of the products because these proteins or amino acids are combined during consumption. However, in the case of ready cooked food the effective protein values is most important to human nutrition.

The best sources of essential amino acids from this study in order of quantity among the canned beef, pork and chicken meat are summarized in table 4.

Data found in literature shows that moderate heat treatment of the meat generally increases the essential amino acid in small quantity calculated on the relative value of the protein, which because of expulsion of small ammonia with reference to crude protein explains the decrease in values (Vukov, 1981). Only long sustaining autoclave treatment caused decrease in the digestible amino acid content. On the other hand, with mild heating the free amino acid content also decreased.

Generally, the effect of different heat treatment used in this study were not strong enough in all products. There was no relative difference among the

Table 3: Mean Essential Amino Acid Content of Heat treated Canned Meat With Reference to its protein content (g amino acid/100g protein)

| Product Designation | Lysine | Theonine | Valine | Methionine + Cysteine | Isoleucine | Leucine | Thyrosine + Phenylalanine | Tryptophan | Total |
|---------------------|--------|----------|--------|-----------------------|------------|---------|---------------------------|------------|-------|
| MA1 | 9.77 | 5.92 | 3.48 | 2.54 | 3.19 | 6.66 | 6.25 | 0.54 | 38.35 |
| MF2 | 9.66 | 7.75 | 3.07 | 2.39 | 2.61 | 8.25 | 6.75 | 0.61 | 39.10 |
| MA3 | 8.88 | 5.31 | 3.32 | 2.38 | 2.85 | 6.69 | 6.31 | 8.86 | 36.60 |
| MA4 | 9.0 | 6.23 | 2.95 | 2.40 | 2.92 | 7.99 | 6.45 | 0.63 | 38.57 |
| MF5 | 11.32 | 6.12 | 3.64 | 4.10 | 3.36 | 5.59 | 7.57 | 0.59 | 43.29 |

Table 3: Continued

| Product Designation | Lysine | Theonine | Valine | Methionine + Cysteine | Isoleucine | Leucine | Thyrosine + Phenylalanine | Tryptophan | Total |
|---------------------|--------|----------|--------|-----------------------|------------|---------|---------------------------|------------|-------|
| SA1 | 10.60 | 4.44 | 4.02 | 5.47 | 3.26 | 7.46 | 7.42 | 0.64 | 43.31 |
| SF2 | 9.73 | 6.50 | 4.74 | 3.14 | 1.83 | 6.60 | 7.24 | 0.68 | 40.46 |
| SA3 | 8.52 | 7.09 | 5.49 | 3.61 | 2.61 | 6.73 | 7.55 | 0.80 | 42.39 |
| SA4 | 8.95 | 5.26 | 4.05 | 4.90 | 3.95 | 6.11 | 6.22 | 1.28 | 40.72 |
| SF5 | 8.94 | 6.14 | 5.99 | 3.46 | 2.29 | 6.63 | 6.05 | 0.87 | 40.37 |
| CA1 | 10.61 | 5.85 | 4.02 | 4.35 | 3.40 | 7.12 | 7.58 | 1.10 | 44.03 |
| CF2 | 10.63 | 5.88 | 4.07 | 4.65 | 4.20 | 6.80 | 7.91 | 1.19 | 45.33 |
| CA3 | 10.10 | 5.96 | 3.66 | 4.80 | 4.09 | 6.18 | 7.55 | 1.32 | 43.66 |
| CA4 | 9.86 | 4.91 | 3.77 | 3.87 | 3.37 | 6.83 | 7.89 | 1.45 | 41.92 |
| CF5 | 10.01 | 5.81 | 4.27 | 4.65 | 3.49 | 6.63 | 7.48 | 1.24 | 43.60 |

Table 4: Best Sources of Essential Amino acid in order of quantity among canned beef, pork and chicken meat

| | Lys | Thr | Val | Met+Cys | Ile | Leu | Ty + +Phe | Try |
|------------------|-----|-----|-----|---------|-----|-----|-----------|-----|
| Products' Symbol | MF5 | MA4 | MF5 | MF5 | MF5 | MF2 | MF5 | MA3 |
| | SA1 | SA3 | SF5 | SA1 | SA4 | SA1 | SA3 | SA4 |
| | CF2 | CA3 | CF3 | CA3 | CA1 | CF2 | CA4 | |

Table 5: Thiamine Content of Different Canned Meat

| Product Designation | Thiamine Content | Product Designation | Thiamine Content | Product Designation | Thiamine Content |
|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| M | 1.86 | S | 1.19 | C | 1.25 |
| MA1 | 1.13 | SA1 | 0.44 | CA1 | 0.06 |
| MF2 | 1.20 | SF2 | 0.58 | CF2 | 0.13 |
| M | 1.99 | S | 1.33 | CA3 | 0.09 |
| MA3 | 1.03 | SA3 | 0.81 | CA4 | 0.10 |
| M | 2.50 | S | 1.80 | CF5 | 0.10 |
| MA4 | 0.90 | SA4 | 0.61 | | |
| MF5 | 0.85 | SF5 | 0.68 | | |

canned beef. In the case of canned chicken, glutamic acid and lysine showed relative difference, to be more precise lower temperature favoured their retention. With regards to the pork sample, both temperature and rotation of the cans, isoleucine showed relative differences. According to the results in table 2, heat treatment of stationary cans and at higher temperature (125°C) more amino acids were retained.

Thiamine Content:

According to the results (Table b) the beef samples were more able to withstand the different processes of heat treatment. The thiamine content of canned beef were higher than that of the other canned meat. The canned beef designated MF2 showed the highest quantity (1.20mg) and MF5 showed the lowest (0.85mg). Thiamine retention in the case of rotating heat treatment was not always favourable with canned beef.

Thiamine retention was higher in canned pork in rotating heat treatment than with stationary heat treatment. The highest thiamine content among the canned pork was found in SA3 and the lowest was in SA1.

In the case of canned pork more thiamine was retained in rotating than with stationary heat treatments. The highest thiamine content among the canned pork was found in SA3 (0.81mg) and the lowest was in SA1 (0.44mg). The autoclaved chicken meat samples contained the lowest quantity of thiamine when compared to the non-heat treated samples. The thiamine of the canned chicken meat were more sensitive to the heat treatment than the other canned meat. Among the cans of chicken meat samples, the one designated CF2 heat treated in rotating position at 115°C contained the highest value (0.13) while CA1 sample autoclaved in stationary position contained the lowest value of thiamine (0.06mg).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The prepared sample of canned meat contained relatively little of their own juice, so that sterilization of such canned meat can occur with stationary heat treatment and the heat spread is mainly by conduction.

The traditional heat treatment in stationary cans occur at a temperature of approximately 125°C. The protein, thiamine and other valuable material contents were not substantially destroyed. At a temperature lower than this (115°C) - with the exception of pork with longer time heat treatment in

stationary cans, higher heat destruction of the product is likely.

Consequently, from the aspect of quality, optimal technology of heat treatment can be considered as (with foods heated mainly by conduction) where the above conditions are realized.

On these basis and in accordance with these experimental results, the introduction of this technology of stationary sterilization of such and similar characteristic products at 115°C and 125°C is recommended.

REFERENCES

- A. O. A. C., 1975. Official Method of Analysis, (15th ed.) Association of Analytical Chemists, Washington D.C. U.S.A.
- BENDER, A. E., 1966. Nutritional effects of food processing. *Food Technol.* 1, 261.
- CHARM, S. E., 1971. Methods for thermal process evaluation. *Fundamental of Food Engineering.* 189-231. The AV Publishing Company Inc. Westport Connecticut.
- CHEFTEL, H. and THOMAS, G., 1963. Principles and methods of establishing thermal processes for canned foods. *Bull. No. 1* Israel Programme for Scientific Translation, IPST Cat. No. 138. USDA-NSE, Office of Technical Services, U.S.A. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.
- ENEJI, C. A., 1976. Determination of the heat treatment equivalent of meat products. Institute of Food Technology, University of Horticulture, Budapest, Hungary. B.Sc. Thesis.
- ENEJI, C. A., 1978. Determination of the effect of sterilization on meat products with special reference to amino acids and protein content. Institute of Food Technology, University of Horticulture, Budapest, Hungary. M.Sc. Thesis.
- ENEJI, C. A., 1985. Determination of the heat treatment equivalent and calculated biological value of canned meat. Institute of Food Technology, University of Horticulture, Budapest, Hungary. Ph.D Thesis.

- F. A. O., 1970. Amino acid content of Foods and Biological Data on Protein. Food and Agricultural Organization, Rome.
- HUNGARIAN STANDARD MSZ17-6178 1972. Tartosított élelmiszerek Zsirtartalmanak Meghatározása.
- KERESF. I. 1975. Feherje Vizsgálatai. Módszerek, Mezőgazdasági Kiadó Budapest, Hungary.
- LAWRIE, R. A., 1966. Chemical and biochemical constitution of muscle in Meat Science, Chapter 4:67p. Pergamon press, Oxford, N.Y., London, Paris.
- HERSOM and HULLAND, 1969: Canned foods. Published by J. & A. Churchill Ltd., 104 Gloucester Palace, London, 181 - 188.
- LEES, R., 1971. Laboratory Handbook on Methods of Food Analysis. Printed in Great Britain by Robert Macleose and Co. Limited.
- LEN, M. K. and LUND, D.S., 1980. Experimental procedures for determining destruction Kinetics of food components. F and D Technology, 34, 51 - 55.
- LUND, D. B., 1977. Design of thermal processes for minimising nutrient retention. Food Technology 2, 71 - 76.
- TAJAN, R. and LINDER, K., 1978. Tapanyag tablazat. Tizedik Kiadás. Medicina Könyvkiadó, Budapest, Hungary.
- Vukov, K., 1981. Hőkezelés a tartósításhoz. a kertészeti egyetem. Tártsipari Kar jegyzet, Budapest, Hungary.
- ZUKAL, E., 1970. Investigation of the effects of heating, curing and smoking on the nutritive value of meat and meat products. FAO Fellowship Central Institute for Nutrition and Food Research TN10, Netherlands and Kulmbach - Germany.

