



Improving the quality of sous-vide beef from Holstein-Friesian bulls by different marinades / Tkacz K.; Modzelewska-Kapitula M.; Petracci M.; Zdunek W.; H. M.: MEAT SCIENCE - ISSN 0309-1740. - STAMPA. - 182:December 2021(2021) pp. 108639.1-108639.9. [10.1016/j.meatsci.2021.108639]

ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA

ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE
DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Improving the quality of sous-vide beef from Holstein-Friesian bulls by different marinades

This is the submitted version (pre peer-review, preprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/829503> since: 2021-08-07

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2021.108639>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

This is the manuscript of:

Katarzyna Tkacz , Monika Modzelewska-Kapituła, Massimiliano Petracci, Weronika Zduńczyk

“Improving the quality of sous-vide beef from Holstein-Friesian bulls by different marinades”

which has been published in final form in MEAT SCIENCE 2021 Volume 182,
article number 108639

The final published version is available online at:

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2021.108639>

Improving the quality of sous-vide beef from Holstein-Friesian bulls by different marinades

Katarzyna Tkacz^{1*}, Monika Modzelewska-Kapituła¹, Massimiliano Petracci²
Weronika Zduńczyk¹

¹Department of Meat Technology and Chemistry, Faculty of Food Sciences, University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, Plac Cieszyński 1, 10-719 Olsztyn, Poland

²Department of Agricultural and Food Sciences, Alma Mater Studiorum, University of Bologna, Piazza Goidanich 60, 47521 Cesena, Italy

*corresponding author: Department of Meat Technology and Chemistry, Faculty of Food Sciences, University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, Plac Cieszyński 1, 10-719 Olsztyn, Poland, e-mail: ktkacz@uwm.edu.pl;

Abstract

The aim of the study was to determine effects of four commercial marinades on the colour, tenderness, cooking loss and sensory characteristics of *semimembranosus* beef muscles before and after sous-vide (SV) treatment. Muscles (n = 24) were marinated using Odessa (O; red pepper, garlic, onion), Mexico (M; red pepper, tomato), Old Polish (OP; pepper, garlic), and Bordeaux (B; pepper, red pepper, garlic) marinades for 24h at 4°C. Marinades uptake ranged from 3.3% (M) to 4.4% (B). Marinating and SV significantly affected all colour parameters. In SV beef, the highest values of L* were noted in OP and O samples, whereas the highest a* and b* values in M samples. Overall, marinating reduced (P<0.05) cooking loss (34.6%) and shear force (19.5%). The use of marinating prior to SV treatment beneficially affected taste, tenderness and juiciness of beef. OP marinade allowed to obtain beef steaks with the best sensory quality and the lowest shear force.

Keywords: Beef quality; Marinating; Sensory quality; Sous-vide; Taste; Texture

1. Introduction

The beef obtained from the Holstein-Friesian cattle breed, which is considered as the most important dairy breed worldwide, is predominant in the Polish market. The beef is produced mainly from heifers, which are not suitable for complementing a dairy cattle herd, and young bull's carcasses. Therefore, beef producers have difficulties in offering the meat with consistent quality traits (tenderness, juiciness and taste) to consumers. The improvement of the beef

35 quality and its repeatability is the aim of studies conducted by many research groups in Poland
36 and all over the World (Isleroglu, Kemerli, & Kaymak-Ertekin, 2015; Lizaso, Beriain, Horcada,
37 Chasco, & Purroy, 2011; Macharáčková et al., 2021; Modzelewska-Kapituła, Tkacz, Nogalski,
38 Karpińska-Tymoszczyk, & Więk, 2019; Supaphon et al., 2021; Węglarz, 2010; Wyrwicz et al.,
39 2016; Yang et al., 2021). The issue is of vital importance because of recent trends in meat
40 consumption where price will be not the most important factor for purchasing, whereas high
41 and repeatable quality (nutritional value, sensory, and hygienic quality) is going to be the most
42 important (Henchion, McCarthy, Resconi, & Troy, 2014; Listrat et.al., 2020a; Żakowska-
43 Biemans et. al., 2017).

44 The beef palatability is basically determined by three quality attributes, which are perceived
45 during meat consumption taste, tenderness and juiciness (Henchion, McCarthy, Resconi, &
46 Troy, 2014; O'Quinn, Legako, Brooks, & Miller, 2018; Pogorzelski, Woźniak, Polkinghorne,
47 Półtorak, & Wierzbicka, 2020). These attributes are known to vary and to be influenced by
48 many factors, including the animal production - breed, genetics, diet, animal age, handling
49 stress, etc.; carcass treatment - quality grade, marbling, aging, electrical stimulation, chilling
50 methods, carcass suspension method, product enhancement, etc.; final preparation and cooking
51 procedures applied to the product (Naqvi et al., 2021; O'Quinn, Legako, Brooks, & Miller,
52 2018; Pogorzelski, Woźniak, Polkinghorne, Półtorak, & Wierzbicka, 2020). Tenderness is a
53 well-known multifactorial sensory trait which is, determined by the complex interaction of ante-
54 mortem and post-mortem factors and it, has the greatest impact on consumer satisfaction
55 (Lawrence, & Lawrence, 2021; Listrat et al., 2020b; Naqvi et al., 2021; Żakowska-Biemans et
56 al., 2017). In the last years, there have been many attempts to improve it. The studies, their
57 conclusions and detailed guidelines made it possible by introducing changes in the production
58 practice and developing new technologies for improving tenderness and consumer satisfaction
59 (Liu et al. 2020; O'Quinn, Legako, Brooks, & Miller, 2018). O'Quinn, Legako, Brooks, and
60 Miller (2018) pointed out that consumers who are satisfied with the beef tenderness pay more
61 attention to the meat's taste. Indeed, it was showed that the taste accounted for 49.4% of overall
62 beef palatability, whereas the tenderness and juiciness accounted for 43.4% and 7.4,
63 respectively (O'Quinn, Legako, Brooks, & Miller, 2018). Similarly, Liu et al. (2020) showed
64 that for European consumers who evaluated beef samples originated from France, Poland,
65 Ireland and Northern Ireland, which differed in terms of cattle breed, hang method, aging time,
66 muscle cut and cooking method (to guarantee a large variation in the beef palatability and
67 consumer response), the most important attributes were taste (39%), and tenderness (31%),

68 followed by juiciness (24%). Moreover, cooking method and carcass cut affected the impact of
69 the tenderness, juiciness and flavour liking to overall liking variability.

70 The cooking method is considered the last component in the process of shaping the final
71 quality of beef. The available literature indicates that an appropriate selection of final cooking
72 method is vitally important for beef tenderness, taste and juiciness, and it should be chosen
73 individually for each (Guzek et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2020; Macharáčková et al., 2021). As it
74 was shown by Guzek et al. (2015), the most suitable cooking method for tenderloin, which
75 produced meat with the best sensory properties, was grilling, whereas Macharáčková et al.
76 (2021) reported that roasting in convection oven is the most appropriate method for striploin
77 (whole cut).

78 It should be noted that in order to improve the tenderness and juiciness of different meat
79 types (Dominguez-Hernandez, Salaseviciene, & Erbjerg, 2018), especially beef
80 (Modzelewska-Kapituła Pietrzak-Fiećko, Tkacz, Draszanowska, & Więk, 2019; Naqvi et al.,
81 2021; Supaphon et al., 2021; Uttaro & Zawadski, 2019), the use of sous-vide treatment is
82 recommended. It is a low-temperature long-time (LTLT) cooking technique, which involves
83 cooking of raw meat in vacuum-sealed heat-stable bags. The cooking is conducted at
84 temperatures ranging from 55 to 95°C for several hours to several days depending on the meat
85 type, thickness and the amount of connective tissue, followed by a rapid cooling (Ayub, &
86 Ahmad, 2019; Baldwin, 2012; Ortuno, Mateo, Rodríguez-Estrada, & Banón, 2021). The sous-
87 vide meat not only has a better sensory properties, including uniform and cohesive structure,
88 but also a better preserved nutritional quality (Naqvi et al., 2021). Therefore, the technique is
89 used in gastronomy, meat industry and even in households. It is frequently used for beef
90 preparation because it enables to limit the differences in tenderness between products obtained
91 from cattle differed in age and gender, as well as diverse aging time (Naqvi et al., 2021;
92 Botinestean, Keenan, Kerry, & Hamill, 2016; Dominguez-Hernandez, Salaseviciene,
93 & Erbjerg, 2018). However, the sous-vide treatment parameters such as temperature and time
94 should be carefully adjusted, to obtain the uniform product from an uneven raw material.

95 In our previous work (Modzelewska-Kapituła, Tkacz, & Nogalski, et al., 2021), the attempt
96 to make the eating quality of *semitendinosus* (SM) muscle (obtained from Holstein-Friesian
97 bulls) more attractive had been made. These muscles are attractive for consumers because of
98 their uniform colour and structure, however they are less tender than e.g. *longissimus lumborum*
99 (LL) when cooked in a traditional way. It was shown that SM and LL muscles after 14-d ageing
100 and sous-vide treatment (60°C, 4h) were characterized by similar eating quality, including
101 tenderness and juiciness. However, it was also noted that it would be beneficial from a

102 consumer perspective to improve taste and aroma acceptability by e.g. an appropriate selection
103 of spices. One of the possible ways to increase the sensory quality, including taste acceptability,
104 is marinating (Pérez-Juan, Kondjoyan, Picouet, & Realini, 2012; Petracci et al., 2012; Yusop,
105 O’Sullivan, & Kerry, 2011). The treatment is defined as a soaking of the raw meat in a mixture
106 of spices and different liquid food products e.g. wine, beer, vinegar, fermented dairy beverages,
107 oils with the addition of plant extracts and herbs, in order to increase meat tenderness, taste and
108 aroma, as well as to prolong the product’s shelf-life and its safety (Cordeiro et al., 2020; Goli,
109 Bohuon, Ricci, Trystram, & Collignan, 2011; Sengun et al., 2021). To meet consumers demands
110 according more natural meat products, many researchers use natural ingredients such as juices
111 from lemon, pineapple, potato, lime, berries, raspberries and strawberries in the marinades due
112 to their antioxidant properties (Khan, Busquets, & Azam, 2021; Latoch, & Libera, 2019;
113 Petracci et al., 2012). Under commercial conditions, marinades are based on water–oil
114 emulsions containing sodium chloride, polyphosphates, lactates, sugars, spices, organic acids,
115 functional additives (e.g. xanthan and guar gum), antimicrobial agents (sorbate and/or benzoate)
116 and aroma enhancers (Goli, Bohuon, Ricci, Trystram, & Collignan, 2011; Pérez-Juan,
117 Kondjoyan, Picouet, & Realini, 2012; Yusop, O’Sullivan, Kerry, & Kerry, 2010). The salt
118 increases the water holding capacity, whereas the phosphates increase pH value, water holding
119 capacity and the production yield (Goli, Bohuon, Ricci, Trystram, & Collignan, 2011; Pérez-
120 Juan, Kondjoyan, Picouet, & Realini, 2012; Sengun et al., 2021). Acid marinades increase meat
121 tenderness by lowering meat pH, which in turn results in weakening the muscle structure,
122 intensification of the proteolysis by cathepsins and elevated collagen conversion into gelatine
123 (Cordeiro et al., 2020; Sengun et al., 2021). According to the authors best knowledge there are
124 no papers describing the effect of commercially available marinades, which might be used in
125 both meat processing plants and households, on the quality of sous-vide beef from dairy breeds.
126 Therefore, to fill the gap and to continue our previous work on increasing the eating quality of
127 beef, the study was undertaken to determine the effect of different commercial marinades and
128 sous-vide treatment on the colour, tenderness, cooking loss and sensory characteristics of
129 *semimembranosus* beef muscles.

130

131 **2. Materials and methods**

132 **2.1. Raw material preparation**

133 In the study, *semimembranosus* (n = 24) muscles, obtained from carcasses of Polish
134 Holstein-Friesian bulls (20.5 ± 2 months) were used. Bulls were farmed under controlled
135 conditions in Agricultural Experiment Station in Bałcyny (Poland). The protocol for animal

136 research was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Warmia and Mazury
137 (Decision No. 8/2020). Young bulls were reared in a traditional system, using milk replacer,
138 hay and concentrate. Starting from the 6th month of age, animals were fattened semi-intensively
139 and they were fed *ad libitum* a total mixed ration (TMR) composed of maize silage plus 2 kg
140 concentrate to 15th month of age when they started to receive TMR plus 3.5 kg concentrate. The
141 concentrate composition was: rapeseed meal 15%, triticale meal 82.5% and premix 2.5%.
142 Commercial mineral-vitamin premix for fattening cattle (code of product 7619; Cargill Poland
143 Ltd., Warsaw, Poland) consisting of per kg: Ca, 235 g; Na, 79 g; P, 48 g; Mg, 28 g; Fe, 500 g;
144 Mn, 2000 mg; Cu, 375 mg; Zn, 3750 mg; J, 50 mg; Co, 12.5 mg; Se, 12.50 mg; vitamin A,
145 250,000 IU; vitamin D3, 50,000 IU; vitamin E, 1000 mg; dl-alpha-tocopherol, 909.10 mg. The
146 fattening was finished when the bulls reached 600 kg of body weight. They were then
147 transported to a meat processing plant, where they were kept in individual boxes with access to
148 water for 15 to 20 hours. Slaughter and post-slaughter processing were carried out in accordance
149 with Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 of 24 September 2009 (Council Regulation, 2009)
150 on the protection of animals at the time of killing. Muscles were removed at 24 h post-mortem
151 from left half-carcass of each animal and delivered to a laboratory in a cooling box at
152 refrigerated temperature. The muscles were kept in the refrigerated temperature ($4 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$)
153 overnight. Each cut was packed individually in a vacuum pouch (PA/PE, thickness 70 μm , Inter
154 Arma sp. z o.o., Rudawa, Poland), which were then heat-sealed. The vacuum-packaged meat
155 was stored to 14th day post-mortem at $4 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$ in a climate chamber (Memmert GmbH,
156 Schwabach, Germany). After that the muscles were split randomly into 4 groups, 6 muscle in
157 each group. From each muscle two 2.5-cm thick steaks weighing approx. 200 g were cut and a
158 sample of beef approx. 200 g for chemical analyses. One steak was subjected to marinating in
159 a particular marinade and the other represented unmarinated control (were investigated
160 immediately). In the study 4 different commercial marinades (Amco Sp. z o.o., Dybów-
161 Kolonia, Poland) were used: Odessa, Mexico, Old Polish, and Bordeaux. They were used
162 according to the producer recommendations in the quantity of 80 g per 1 kg of meat. The
163 marinade composition, colour and pH are shown in Table 1. For each sample, the appropriate
164 amount of marinade was applied (on each side) and the samples were marinated in separate
165 plastic containers with lids for 24 h at 4°C . Subsequently, the samples were weighed and
166 vacuum-packed and subjected to sous vide treatment using Fusion Chef by Julabo Diamond Z
167 (Julabo GmbH, Seelbach, Germany) at 60°C for 4 h according to a recommendation for beef
168 (Baldwin, 2012). After that, the packages were cooled down in a cold water and subjected to
169 analyses.

170

171 **2.2. Proximate composition**

172 A portion of approx. 200 g of beef after 14-d ageing was ground twice using a 3 mm mesh
173 and then thoroughly manually mixed. The proximate composition was determined – moisture
174 (PN-ISO1442, 2000), fat (AOAC no 991.36, 2006a), protein (AOAC no 992.15, 2006b) and
175 ash (PN-ISO 936, 2000) contents.

176

177 **2.3. pH measurements**

178 Values of pH were measured with a combined electrode FC 200 and pH-meter HI 8314
179 (Hanna Instruments Polska, Olsztyn, Poland) in 8% marinades solutions (concentration as in
180 marinating) and directly in beef steaks. The device was first calibrated using pH 7 and pH 4
181 buffers. The pH values were determined in triplicate for each sample.

182

183 **2.4. Colour determination**

184 The colour of the marinades was measured immediately before marinating, while the
185 colour of beef was measured before marinating (on the freshly cut surface of steaks after 60-
186 min blooming), after marinating and after sous-vide treatment according to the procedure
187 described by Modzelewska-Kapituła, Tkacz, and Nogalski (2021). The colour in CIE L*a*b*
188 system was measured using a MiniScan XE Plus device (HunterLab, Reston, USA) with
189 standard illuminant D65, a 10° standard observer angle and a 2.54-cm-diameter aperture, in
190 three different locations of the surface of each sample.

191

192 **2.5. Marinade uptake and cooking loss**

193 The beef steaks were weighed before and after marinating and after sous-vide treatment.
194 Based on the mass differences, the marinade uptake and cooking loss were calculated and
195 expressed in percentages.

196

197 **2.6. Warner-Bratzler shear force (WBSF) assessment**

198 From each sous-vide beef sample (non-marinated and marinated) the samples for WBSF
199 determination were cut parallel to the longitudinal orientation of the muscle fibres after
200 overnight chilling ($3 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$). The analysis was carried out on samples (10 mm x 10 mm, about
201 40 mm long, n = 5 from each steak) at room temperature (approx. 20°C). The samples were cut
202 perpendicular to the longitudinal orientation of the muscle with a shear blade with a triangular
203 aperture of 60° (load 500 N, head speed 200 mm/min, Instron 5942, Instron, Norwood, USA).

204

205 **2.7. Sensory analysis**

206 The sensory analysis was performed on marinated with four different commercial
207 marinades beef samples and non-marinated controls according to the procedure described in
208 Modzelewska-Kapituła et al. (2021). Briefly, the samples were cut into approx. 2-mm thick
209 slices, coded with three-digit numbers, and served to panellists (n=6, trained for 36 h, non-
210 smokers, females) at an ambient temperature randomly on white plates. The evaluation was
211 carried out in the sensory laboratory of Meat Technology and Chemistry Department at room
212 temperature of approximately 20°C, under white fluorescent lighting. Water and bread were
213 provided for cleansing the palate. In total, 8 sensory analysis sessions were performed during
214 which 6 meat samples was evaluated. Panellists scored each sample for colour uniformity (1,
215 very uneven, 10, entirely even), aroma intensity (1, imperceptible; 10, extremely intense) and
216 its acceptability (1, not acceptable; 10, very desirable), juiciness (1, extremely dry; 10,
217 extremely juicy), tenderness (1, extremely tough; 10, extremely tender), meat taste as well as
218 spicy taste intensities (1, imperceptible; 10, extremely intense), taste acceptability (1, not
219 acceptable; 10, very desirable), and overall acceptability (1, not acceptable; 10, very desirable)
220 using a structured scale.

221

222 **2.8. Data analysis**

223 The results were presented as mean values and standard error of the mean. To examine the
224 effect of marinating and marinade type on the colour, WBSF, cooking loss and sensory quality,
225 two-way Anova was applied. To determine the differences between mean values obtained for
226 different marinades, excluding sensory analysis results, an analysis of variance was conducted,
227 and Duncan's test. To compare sensory analysis results, non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test
228 was used. The significance level was set at 0.05. Cluster analysis was used to classify objects
229 into groups using data from WBSF determination, cooked meat colour (L*, a*, b*), and cooking
230 loss. The analysis was performed using a Euclidean distance as a measure of the proximity
231 between samples and a variable linkage using a k-means method. Statistical analysis was
232 performed using Statistica 13.3 (TIBCO Software Inc., Palo Alto, CA., USA) software.

233

234 **3. Results**

235 **3.1. Beef composition and marinades absorption**

236 The material for the study was *semimembranosus* muscle containing approx. 74.7%
237 moisture, 22.4% protein, 1.2% fat, 1.2% ash, and having a pH of 5.6. The chemical composition

238 was typical for lean beef and similar to that noted in previous studies (Lizaso, Beriain, Horcada,
239 Chasco, & Purroy, 2011; Modzelewska-Kapituła et al., 2018; Wyrwisz et al. 2016). The pH
240 value was typical for normal quality meat, without Dark-Firm-Dry defect (Lizaso, Beriain,
241 Horcada, Chasco, & Purroy, 2011; Yang et al., 2021). The marinade uptake ranged from 3.3 %
242 (Mexico) to 4.4% (Bordeaux), with the mean absorption yield of 3.9% and was dependent on
243 the type of functional additives in the recipe - a gel forming agent in Mexico and hydrolysed
244 plant protein in Bordeaux, the specificity of which is discussed in next part. Similar results were
245 reported by Sengun et al. (2021) for an acid marinade used for beef marinating (from 3.0% to
246 4.0%), and Yusop, O’Sullivan, Kerry, and Kerry (2012) for a Chinese marinade used for
247 chicken marinating (from 5.0% to 5.4%). A higher marinade absorption, as a result the
248 differences in the osmotic pressure exerted by different natural marinades and their quantity,
249 was noted for fermented beverage-based marinades such as acid whey and buttermilk used for
250 marinating chicken meat (6.5% and 7.7%, respectively) (Augustyńska-Prejsnar, Sokołowicz,
251 Hanus, Ormian, & Kačániová, 2020). ~~whereas lower when piri-piri marinade was used for pork
252 preparation (from 2.2% to 2.9%) (O’Neill, Cruz-Romero, Duffy, & Kerry, 2019).~~

253

254 **3.2. The influence of marinating and marinade type on the colour**

255 The colour of raw beef before and after marinating as well as the colour of marinated and
256 non-marinated beef after sous-vide treatment is shown in Table 2. As expected, processing
257 procedures such as marinating and cooking significantly affected all colour parameters ($P <$
258 0.001). Marinating of raw beef caused a decrease in L^* and a^* values, and an increase in b^*
259 values, which was likely due by marinades components especially in the Old Polish marinade,
260 in which the addition of pepper and garlic resulted in the a^* 5.63 and b^* as much as 43.39
261 (Table 1). However, after sous-vide treatment L^* increased (but still it was lower than in raw
262 beef), a^* decreased, whereas b^* remained similar compared to raw marinated steaks. The
263 influence of marinating on the colour of sous-vide beef was clearly showed – marinades
264 decreased L^* and increased b^* values as compared to beef subjected to sous-vide without
265 marinating. The differences between sous-vide and marinated sous-vide, were caused by the
266 colour of the marinades stemmed from components used in the formulations (Table 1), similarly
267 as it was noted in the raw beef. The sous-vide treatment, in both marinated and non-marinated
268 samples, affected significantly the redness of beef, and a reduction in a^* values before and after
269 sous-vide was noticed. A similar was reported by O’Neill, Cruz-Romero, Duffy, and Kerry
270 (2019) as a result of cooking piri-piri marinated pork. Changes in the redness were primary
271 caused by the denaturation of myoglobin on the surface of beef steaks resulted from heating,

272 and in the case of marinated samples additionally by spices being marinades components,
273 especially red pepper and tomato, which in the Mexico marinade resulted in an a^* of 29.93
274 (Table 1).

275 As a result of colour differences between samples, chroma and hue differed as well. It was
276 noted that marinating significantly decreased chroma, both in raw and sous-vide steaks. Chroma
277 (C^*) being an indicator of colour saturation, refers to the myoglobin concentration and its form
278 (Sánchez del Pulgar, Gazquez, & Ruiz-Carrascal, 2012). The higher C^* values, the higher
279 concentration of myoglobin and lower content of denatured myoglobin (Ledward, 1992).
280 Marinades used in this study, apart from components which directly affected beef colour such
281 as red pepper and tomato, contained also salt, which might act as a pro-oxidant by leading to
282 lower C^* values, likely caused also by denaturation of the myoglobin in a raw marinated beef.
283 All treatments differed ($P < 0.001$) in terms of hue angle (h°). Generally, sous-vide samples
284 (marinated and non-marinated) had higher values than raw samples, and marinated samples
285 (both raw and cooked) showed higher values than those non-marinated (Table 2). Hue angle
286 determines the tone of colour and depends on yellowness and redness values. As a result of
287 marinating, the colour of beef before cooking switched from red toward more orange, which
288 was further escalated by thermal treatment and as a result the highest values of hue were noted
289 in marinated sous-vide steaks.

290 Marinade type affected all of colour parameters in sous-vide beef ($P < 0.001$, Table 3). The
291 highest value of L^* was noted in Old Polish and Odessa marinated samples, whereas the highest
292 a^* and b^* values in Mexico samples. These differences resulted from a diverse composition of
293 marinades, e.g. presence of red pepper and tomato. Red pepper contains a high concentration
294 of carotenoids and is widely used in the food industry as a natural colorant in sauces, soups and
295 meat dishes. It is added also to marinades to obtain a desirable colour of meat (Yusop et al.,
296 2012). Red pepper was present in three out of four marinades used in the study: Odessa, Mexico
297 and Bordeaux, and therefore in these samples higher a^* values were noted as compared with
298 the samples treated with Old Polish marinade, which did not contain red pepper. Moreover,
299 Mexico marinade contained also tomato, which increased yellowness as demonstrated in the
300 highest b^* values in these samples. Yusop et al. (2012) reported a similar effect of paprika
301 oleoresin on a marinated poultry meat colour as noted in this study, resulting in a decrease in
302 L^* and an increase in a^* . Moreover, it was shown that the effect depended on the concentration
303 of the paprika oleoresin in a marinade.

304 Beef marinated with Bordeaux had lower chroma than the remaining samples. It was noted
305 that hue angle increased with the decrease in a^* values (Table 1, 3) and the highest hue angle

306 was noted in Old Polish marinated steaks, which had the lowest a^* values. A similar relations
307 was noted also by Sánchez del Pulgar, Gazquez, and Ruiz-Carrascal (2012).

308 The ΔE coefficient is an indicator of the colour change and here it was calculated between
309 raw non-marinated beef and the beef subjected to marinating and sous-vide. Based on values
310 obtained, ranging from 9.0 to 16.5, it can be concluded that changes in the beef colour were
311 obvious even for an unexperienced observer because values exceeded 2 (CIE 1978). The higher
312 ΔE values, the greater and more perceived by consumers changes in beef colour. The marinade
313 which caused the smallest changes was Mexico by resulting from a mixture of two intensely
314 red spices - red pepper and tomato.

315

316 **3.3. The influence of marinating and marinade type on cooking loss and WBSF values**

317 Overall, marinating reduced cooking loss ($P < 0.001$, Table 4) of 34.6% as well reduced
318 WBSF values of sous-vide beef ($P < 0.001$, Table 4) of 19.5%. The marinade which had the
319 most tenderizing effect was Old Polish, whereas the remaining marinades showed a similar
320 effect. The cooking loss noted in Odessa and Bordeaux (containing hydrolysed plant protein)
321 marinated samples was lower compared with samples marinated with Mexico and Old Polish.
322 Components of marinades such as hydrolysed plant protein, stabilizers, a gel forming agent,
323 salt and sugar, are recognized as the first category of functional ingredients of marinades, which
324 affect water holding capacity and textural properties of meat via changes in the ionic strength
325 (Yusop, O'Sullivan, & Kerry, 2011). Due to the ionic properties of salts and other compounds,
326 the number of charged sites and spaces between protein molecules increase, which beneficially
327 affects water holding capacity. Marinade compounds diffuse through sarcolemma and cause a
328 myofibrils swell, and later the extraction and solubilisation of myofibrillar proteins. The
329 mixture of solubilized proteins and sarcoplasmic fluid form a specific protein matrix which
330 after heating becomes a gel matrix which holds water and affects the meat texture (Żochowska-
331 Kujawska et al., 2012; Latoch, 2020; O'Neill, Cruz-Romero, Duffy, & Kerry, 2019). As a
332 result, up to 10% of water can be retained in the meat during the marinating process (as a
333 marinade absorption) (Yusop, O'Sullivan, & Kerry, 2011) and cooking loss is reduced - just as
334 it was noted in this study.

335 A similar cooking loss to that noted in this study (from 17% to 21%) was reported by O'Neill,
336 Cruz-Romero, Duffy, and Kerry (2019) for piri-piri marinated pork (17% to 19%) and Yusop
337 et al. (2012) for poultry meat marinated using paprika oleoresin (19% to 22%). A higher
338 cooking loss from 24% up to 29% was reported in studies where acid marinades such as
339 fermented beverages, lime juice and pineapple puree, and a Chinese marinade were used

340 (Augustyńska-Prejsnar, Sokołowicz, Hanus, Ormian, & Kačániová, 2020; Lawrence &
341 Lawrence, 2021).

342 The increase in the meat tenderness noted in this study resulted from marinades uptake by
343 muscle tissue and beneficial changes in muscle proteins and was also reported by previous
344 studies (Augustyńska-Prejsnar, Sokołowicz, Hanus, Ormian, & Kačániová, 2020; Sengun et al.,
345 2019; Pérez-Juan, Kondjoyan, Picouet, & Realini, 2012). Latoch (2020) showed that marinating
346 a meat in buttermilk or yoghurt for 6 or 9 days and then sous-vide cooking at 60°C for 6 h
347 increased its tenderness which was demonstrated by a decrease in hardness and chewiness of
348 pork loins. Similarly, Źochowska-Kujawska et al. (2012) reported a beneficial impact of
349 marinating using a wine, lemon juice, kefir and pineapple juice on a wild boar and deer meat
350 texture. As a result of 7-d marinating, the toughness of muscles treated with a wine decreased
351 about 24% to 28%, whereas using lemon and pineapple juices and kefir decreased the
352 tenderness about 30% to 36%; 44% to 50% and 35% to 41%, respectively, compared to control
353 samples. Also, Lawrence and Lawrence (2021) in their research reported that WBSF was
354 reduced by 7 to 24% via a treatment combining a blade tenderization and marination using lime
355 juice or pineapple puree. Moreover, Sengun et al. (2019) showed that, rosehip vinegar was
356 effective in reducing the hardness value of meat.

357 Based on the classification of the beef tenderness proposed by Destefanis, Brugiapaglia,
358 Barge, and Dal Molin (2008), beef is considered tender if the WBSF ranges from 32.96 to 42.77
359 N. Thus, it can be pointed out that the use of sous-vide as a method of thermal treatment enabled
360 obtaining a tender beef, which in the case of the beef produced from dairy breeds might be
361 challenging. In turn, marinated sous-vide beef, may be classified as very tender as if all
362 marinades enabled to obtain WBSF below 32.96 N (Destefanis, Brugiapaglia, Barge, & Dal
363 Molin, 2008), which shows beneficial effect of marinating on beef tenderness.

364

365 **3.4. The influence of marinating and marinade type on the sensory quality**

366 The use of marinating prior to sous-vide treatment beneficially affected all sensory quality
367 attributes, with the exception of meat aroma intensity and acceptability which were not affected
368 by marination (Table 4). Both, non-marinated and marinated sous-vide samples were scored
369 relatively high, which indicates good eating quality of beef. Interestingly, marinating increased
370 the surface colour uniformity score ($P < 0.001$), which indicates that using the treatment
371 improves not only the taste, tenderness and juiciness of beef, but also its appearance.

372 The effect of marinade type on the sensory quality of beef was noted (Table 4, $P < 0.001$), and
373 resulted from different composition of marinades used in this study. The colour uniformity was

374 scored the highest in Bordeaux marinated steaks, lower in Mexico and Old Polish samples,
375 whereas the lowest in Odessa samples. More intense and acceptable aroma was noted in
376 Mexico, Old Polish and Bordeaux than in Odessa samples. Using Old Polish and Bordeaux
377 marinades increased the juiciness of beef as compared with Odessa and Mexico. Differences in
378 the tenderness were noted only between Mexico and Bordeaux marinades, with the latter
379 producing steaks less tender. Marinating using Old Polish resulted in higher meat taste intensity
380 than Odessa and Bordeaux, whereas spice taste intensity was scored higher in Mexico and
381 Bordeaux samples than Old Polish and Odessa, with the latter being the least spicy.

382 An improvement in selected sensory attributes of marinated sous-vide beef in respect to non-
383 marinated sous-vide samples is shown in Fig. 1. It is clearly shown that not all of tested
384 marinades increased the taste acceptability. The Odessa marinade, which contained apart from
385 red pepper and garlic (these components were in all marinades used) also onion, did not enhance
386 the colour, taste nor juiciness and affected beneficially only the tenderness of beef steaks.
387 However, the remaining three marinades, enhanced all of sensory attributes, but to a different
388 extend. Bordeaux marinade improved the colour about 31%, Mexico improved the tenderness
389 about 14.4%, whereas Old Polish enhanced the meat taste intensity about 17.3%, the juiciness
390 about 17.2% and the taste acceptability about 11.5%. The most acceptable taste and the highest
391 score for overall acceptability had Old Polish and Bordeaux marinated beef. The beneficial
392 impact of marinades on sensory quality resulted from the presences of spices such as pepper,
393 red pepper, garlic, onion, spices extract and aromas, which belong to the second category of
394 functional ingredients in marinades and improve the attractiveness of the marinated meat
395 (Yusop, O'Sullivan, & Kerry, 2011; O'Neill, Cruz-Romero, Duffy, & Kerry, 2019). Moreover,
396 these additives exhibit a strong anti-oxidant property, so they are beneficial from the product
397 quality and an impact on the human health perspectives (Aguirrezábal, Mateo, Domínguez, &
398 Zumalacárregui, 2000; Martini, Cattivelli, Conte, & Tagliazucchi, 2021; Ren, Nian, &
399 Perussello, 2020; Zhang et al., 2021).

400 However, consumers differ in their preferences in terms of taste and aroma. Nevertheless, in
401 the majority of studies a beneficial impact of marinades on the eating quality of meat was
402 proved. O'Neill, Cruz-Romero, Duffy, and Kerry (2019) used piri-piri marinade (which
403 contained rapeseed oil 60%, spices and flavourings 36% such as chili, garlic, jalapeno, black
404 pepper, onion, paprika, lovage root, fenugreek seed, bird clover, onion leek, coriander, turmeric,
405 ginger, cumin seed, fennel, sugar, grapefruit, passion fruit, papaya, mango, palm fat; and salt
406 4%) and reported that it enhanced the flavour acceptability of marinated pork chops subjected
407 to high pressure processing. As expected, each marinade components exhibited a different

408 impact on the eating quality of marinated meat in agreement with Sengun et al. (2019). They
409 studied effects of organic fruit vinegars used in marinades for beef and reported that the highest
410 scores in terms of flavour were noted in meat samples marinated with grape vinegar ($P > 0.05$).
411 Additionally, it was pointed out that using vinegars as marinade components increases meat
412 safety and quality (Sengun et al., 2019). Osaili et al. (2021) investigated an influence of
413 marinating using yoghurt with an addition of active essential oils containing thymol, carvacrol,
414 and cinnamaldehyde on the quality of camel meat and found that the highest scores of all
415 examined sensory attributes were noted in samples with 1% and 2% cinnamon essential oil,
416 which might be also used as an effective tool to decrease populations of *E. coli* O157:H7 and
417 *Salmonella* spp. The marinating might be useful in improving the quality of meat obtained from
418 older animals which might suffer from inadequate tenderness. As it was shown by
419 Augustyńska-Prejsnar, Sokołowicz, Hanus, Ormian, and Kačániová (2020) marinating of breast
420 muscles originated from carcasses of laying hens after the termination of the laying period,
421 using buttermilk and whey enhanced ($P < 0.05$) the taste intensity and acceptability, aroma, and
422 tenderness as compared with the control, and moreover, buttermilk-marinated meat showed the
423 highest taste acceptability.

424

425 **3.5. Cluster analysis**

426 To determine similarities between sous-vide beef marinated with different commercial
427 marinades, a cluster analysis was performed, using colour parameters: L^* , a^* , b^* , cooking loss
428 and WBSF values. As a result, a dendrogram was obtained (Fig. 2), in which clusters are visible
429 - one connecting samples Odessa and Bordeaux, the next connecting this cluster with Mexico
430 marinade. Further analysis revealed that samples marinated with Odessa, Bordeaux, and
431 Mexico constituted one cluster (cluster 2), whereas beef marinated with Old Polish was
432 identified as a separate cluster 1 (Fig. 3). The attribute which differentiated clusters, was WBSF,
433 which was significantly lower for cluster 1 (Old Polish) thus indicating the best tenderness of
434 Old Polish marinated samples.

435

436 **4. Conclusions**

437 Marinating *semimembranosus* muscle using commercial marinades containing red pepper,
438 garlic, pepper, onion and tomato, beneficially affected the quality of sous-vide beef by
439 improving the eating quality, including tenderness, and reducing cooking loss. The marinade
440 which produced sous-vide beef with the best quality (the lowest WBSF and high scores for the
441 juiciness, tenderness, meat taste acceptability and overall quality) was Old Polish. It was the

442 only marinade used in this study which contained only garlic and pepper and on the contrary to
443 the remaining marinades did not contain red pepper. The simple spices turned out to work the
444 best in sous-vide beef. The results of this study have a potential for a practical application in
445 terms of providing consumers guidelines for beef preparation using marinating and sous-vide
446 to obtain highly acceptable products. The described way of preparing the beef using marinating
447 and sous-vide cooking, might be used to make dishes also for elderly people due to the fact that
448 these treatments decrease an initial bite effort. Moreover, introducing marinated sous-vide beef
449 as a ready-to-eat dish which would require only short heating before the consumption, would
450 broaden the diversity of beef products in the market according to the assumption that the beef
451 industry should ensure that the textural preferences of all population cohorts are provided for.
452 Low cooking losses noted in this study in marinated sous-vide beef favourable affect the
453 profitability of the production on the industrial scale.

454

455 **Acknowledgements**

456 The publication was written as a result of the authors' (K. Tkacz) internship in Department of
457 Agricultural and Food Sciences (Alma Mater Studiorum, University of Bologna, Piazza
458 Goidanich 60, 47521 Cesena, Italy), co-financed by the European Union under the European
459 Social Fund (Operational Program Knowledge Education Development), carried out in the
460 project Development Program at the University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn
461 (POWR.03.05. 00-00-Z310/17).

462

463 **References**

- 464 AOAC (2006a) Official Method of Analysis Method 991.36. *Fat (Crude) in meat and meat*
465 *products*. (18th ed.). Gaithersburg: Association of Analytical Communities.
- 466 AOAC (2006b) Official methods of analysis Method 992.15. *Proximate Analysis and*
467 *Calculations Crude Protein Meat and Meat Products Including Pet Foods*. (17th ed.).
468 Gaithersburg: Association of Analytical Communities.
- 469 Augustyńska-Prejsnar, A., Sokołowicz, Z., Hanus, P., Ormian, M., & Kačániová, M. (2020).
470 Quality and Safety of Marinating Breast Muscles of Hens from Organic Farming after the
471 Laying Period with Buttermilk and Whey. *Animals*, 10, 2393.
472 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10122393>
- 473 Aguirrezábal, M. M., Mateo, J., Domínguez, M. C., & Zumalacárregui J. M. (2000). The effect
474 of paprika, garlic and salt on rancidity in dry sausages, *Meat Science*, 54, 77-81.
475 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0309-1740\(99\)00074-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0309-1740(99)00074-1)

476 Ayub, H., & Ahmad, A. (2019). Physiochemical changes in sous-vide and conventionally
477 cooked meat. *International Journal of Gastronomy and Food Science*, *17*, 100145.
478 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijgfs.2019.100145>

479 Baldwin, D. E. (2012). Sous vide cooking: A review. *International Journal of Gastronomy and*
480 *Food Science*, *1*, 15-30.

481 Botinestean, C., Keenan, D. F., Kerry, J. P., & Hamill, R. M. (2016). The effect of thermal
482 treatments including sous-vide, blast freezing and their combinations on beef tenderness
483 of *M. semitendinosus* steaks targeted at elderly consumers. *LWT - Food Science and*
484 *Technology*, *74*, 154-159.

485 CIE, Commission Internationale l'Eclairage. (1978). Recommendations on uniform color
486 spaces-color difference equations. Psychometric color terms. Supplement no. 2 to CIE
487 publication no. 15 (E-1.3.1.), 1971/(TC-1-3). Paris: Commission Internationale de l'E Â
488 clairage.

489 Cordeiro, T., Viegas, O., Silva, M., Martins, Z. E., Fernandes, I., Ferreira, I. M. L. P. V. O.,
490 Pinho, O., Mateus, N., & Calhau, C. (2020). Inhibitory effect of vinegars on the formation
491 of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in charcoal-grilled pork. *Meat Science*, *167*, 108083.
492 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2020.108083>

493 Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 of 24 September 2009 on the protection of animals at
494 the time of killing. *Official Journal of European Union L*, *303*, 1–30.

495 Destefanis, G., Brugiapaglia, A., Barge, M. T., & Dal Molin, E. (2008). Relationship between
496 beef consumer tenderness perception and Warner-Bratzler shear force. *Meat Science* *78*,
497 153–156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2007.05.031>.

498 Dominguez-Hernandez, E., Salaseviciene, A., & Ertbjerg, P. (2018). Low-temperature long-
499 time cooking of meat: Eating quality and underlying mechanisms. *Meat Science*, *143*, 104-
500 113.

501 Goli, T., Bohuon, P., Ricci, J., Trystram, G., & Collignan, A. (2011). Mass transfer dynamics
502 during the acidic marination of turkey meat. *Journal of Food Engineering*, *104*, 161-168.
503 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfoodeng.2010.12.010>

504 Guzek, D., Głabska D., Gutkowska, K., Wierzbicki, J., Wozniak, A., & Wierzbicka, A. (2015).
505 Influence of cut and thermal treatment on consumer perception of beef in Polish trials.
506 *Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, *52*, 533-538.

507 Henchion, M., McCarthy, M., Resconi, V. C., & Troy, D. (2014). Meat consumption: Trends
508 and quality matters. *Meat Science*, *98*, 561-568. [10.1016/j.meatsci.2014.06.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2014.06.007)

509 Isleroglu, H., Kemerli, T., & Kaymak-Ertekin, F. (2015). Effect of steam-assisted hybrid
510 cooking on textural quality characteristics, cooking loss, and free moisture content of beef.
511 *International Journal of Food Properties*, 18, 403–414.
512 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10942912.2013.833219>

513 Khan, M. R., Busquets, R., & Azam, M. (2021). Blueberry, raspberry, and strawberry extracts
514 reduce the formation of carcinogenic heterocyclic amines in fried camel, beef and chicken
515 meats, *Food Control*, 123, 107852. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2020.107852>

516 Latoch, A. (2020). Effect of meat marinating in kefir, yoghurt and buttermilk on the texture and
517 color of pork steaks cooked sous-vide. *Annals of Agricultural Sciences*, 65, 129-136.
518 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aogas.2020.07.003>

519 Latoch, A., & Libera, J. (2019). Quality and safety of pork steak marinated in fermented dairy
520 products and sous-vide cooked. *Sustainability*, 11, 5644.

521 Lawrence, M. T., & Lawrence T. E. (2021). At-home methods for tenderizing meat using blade
522 tenderization, lime juice and pineapple puree. *Meat Science*, 176, 108487.
523 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2021.108487>

524 Ledward, D. A. (1992). Colour of raw and cooked meat. In: *Ledward, D.A., Johnston, D.E.,*
525 *Knight, M.K. (Eds.). Chemistry of Muscle-based Foods.* Royal Society of Chemistry,
526 London (pp. 128–144).

527 Listrat A., Gagaoua, M., Andueza, D., Gruffat, D., Normand, J., Mairesse, G., Picard, B., &
528 Hocquette, J-F. (2020a). What are the drivers of beef sensory quality using metadata of
529 intramuscular connective tissue, fatty acids and muscle fiber characteristics? *Livestock*
530 *Science*, 240, 104209. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2020.104209>

531 Listrat, A., Gagaoua, M., Normand, J., Gruffat, D., Andueza, D., Mairesse, G., Mouro, B. P.,
532 Chesneau, G., Gobert, C., & Picard, B. (2020b). Contribution of connective tissue
533 components, muscle fibres and marbling to beef tenderness variability in longissimus
534 thoracis, rectus abdominis, semimembranosus and semitendinosus muscles. *Journal of the*
535 *Science of Food and Agriculture*, 100, 2502-2511. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.10275>

536 Liu, J., Ellies-Oury, M-P., Chriki, S., Legrand, I., Pogorzelski, G., Wierzbicki, J., Farmer, L.,
537 Troy, D. Rod Polkinghorne, R., & Hocquette, J-F. (2020). Contributions of tenderness,
538 juiciness and flavor liking to overall liking of beef in Europe. *Meat Science*, 168, 108190.
539 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2020.108190>

540 Lizaso, G., Beriain, M. J., Horcada, A., Chasco, J., & Purroy, A. (2011). Effect of intended
541 purpose (dairy/beef production) on beef quality. *Canadian Journal of Animal Science*, 91,
542 97-102. <https://doi.org/10.4141/CJAS10078>

543 Macharáčková, B., Kateřina Bogdanovičová, K., František Ježek, F., Jiří Bednář, J., Danka
544 Haruštiaková, D., & Josef Kameník, J. (2021). Cooking loss in retail beef cuts: The effect of
545 muscle type, sex, ageing, pH, salt and cooking method. *Meat Science*, *171*, 108270.
546 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2020.108270>.

547 Martini, S., Cattivelli, A., Conte, A., & Tagliazucchi, D. (2021). Black, green, and pink pepper
548 affect differently lipid oxidation during cooking and in vitro digestion of meat. *Food*
549 *Chemistry*, 129246. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2021.129246>

550 Modzelewska-Kapituła, M., Tkacz, K., Nogalski, Z., Karpińska-Tymoszczyk, M.,
551 Draszanowska, A., Pietrzak-Fiećko, R., Purwin C., & Lipiński, K. (2018). Addition of herbal
552 extracts to the Holstein-Friesian bulls' diet changes the quality of beef. *Meat Science*, *145*,
553 163–170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2018.06.033>

554 Modzelewska-Kapituła, M., Pietrzak-Fiećko, R., Tkacz, K., Draszanowska, A., & Więk, A.
555 (2019). Influence of sous vide and steam cooking on mineral contents, fatty acid composition
556 and tenderness of semimembranosus muscle from Holstein-Friesian bulls. *Meat Science*,
557 *157*, 107877. DOI: [10.1016/j.meatsci.2019.107877](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2019.107877).

558 Modzelewska-Kapituła, M., Tkacz, K., Nogalski, Z., Karpińska-Tymoszczyk, M., & Więk A.
559 (2019). Influence of ageing on longissimus lumborum quality from Holstein-Friesian young
560 bulls fed different diets. *Journal of Food Science and Technology*, *56*, 3215–3224.
561 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13197-019-03778-7>

562 Modzelewska-Kapituła, M., Tkacz, K., & Nogalski, Z. (2021). The influence of muscle, ageing
563 and thermal treatment method on the quality of cooked beef. *Journal of Food Science and*
564 *Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-021-04993-x>

565 Naqvi, Z. B., Thomson, P. C., Ha, M., Campbell, M. A., McGill, D. M., Friend, M. A., &
566 Warner, R. D. (2021). Effect of sous vide cooking and ageing on tenderness and water-
567 holding capacity of low-value beef muscles from young and older animals. *Meat Science*,
568 *175*, 108435. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2021.108435>.

569 O'Neill, C. M., Cruz-Romero, M. C., Duffy, G., & Kerry, J. P. (2019). Improving marinade
570 absorption and shelf life of vacuum packed marinated pork chops through the application of
571 high pressure processing as a hurdle. *Food Packaging and Shelf Life*, *21*, 100350.
572 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fpsl.2019.100350>

573 O'Quinn, T. G., Legako, J. F., Brooks, J. C., & Miller, M. F. (2018). Evaluation of the
574 contribution of tenderness, juiciness, and flavor to the overall consumer beef eating
575 experience. *Translational Animal Science*, *2*, 26-36. <https://doi.org/10.1093/tas/txx008>

576 Ortuno, J., Mateo, L., Rodríguez-Estrada, M. T., & Banón, S. (2021). Effects of sous vide vs
577 grilling methods on lamb meat colour and lipid stability during cooking and heated display.
578 *Meat Science*, 171, 108287. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2020.108287>

579 Osaili, T. M., Hasan, F., Dhanasekaran, D. K., Obaid, R. S., Al-Nabulsi, A. A., Karam, L.,
580 Savvaidis, I. N., Olaimat, A. N., Ayyash, M., Al-Holy, M., & Holley, R. (2021). Effect of
581 yogurt-based marinade combined with essential oils on the behavior of *Listeria*
582 *monocytogenes*, *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 and *Salmonella* spp. in camel meat chunks during
583 storage. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 343, 109106.
584 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2021.109106>

585 Pérez-Juan, M., Kondjoyan, A., Picouet, P., & Realini, C. E. (2012). Effect of marination and
586 microwave heating on the quality of Semimembranosus and Semitendinosus muscles from
587 Friesian mature cows. *Meat Science*, 92, 107-114.
588 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2012.04.020>

589 Petracci, M., Laghi, L., Rocculi, P., Rimini, S., Panarese, V., Cremonini, M.A., & Cavani, C.
590 (2000). The use of sodium bicarbonate for marination of broiler breast meat. *Poultry Science*,
591 91, 526-534. <https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.2011-01753>

592 PN-ISO 936 (2000). Meat and meat products - Determination of total ash. Warsaw: Polish
593 Committee for Standardization.

594 PN-ISO1442 (2000). Meat and meat products. Determination of water content (reference
595 method). Warsaw: Polish Committee for Standardization.

596 Pogorzelski, G., Woźniak, K., Polkinghorne, R., Póltorak, A., & Wierzbicka, A. (2020). Polish
597 consumer categorisation of grilled beef at 6 mm and 25 mm thickness into quality grades,
598 based on meat standards Australia methodology. *Meat Science*, 161, 107953.
599 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2019.107953>

600 Ren, F, Nian, Y., & Perussello, C. A. (2020). Effect of storage, food processing and novel
601 extraction technologies on onions flavonoid content: A review. *Food Research International*,
602 132, 108953. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2019.108953>

603 Sánchez del Pulgar, J., Gazquez, A., & Ruiz-Carrascal, J. (2012). Physico-chemical, textural
604 and structural characteristic of sous-vide cooked pork cheeks as affected by vacuum, cooking
605 temperature and cooking time. *Meat Science*, 90, 828–835.
606 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2011.11.024>

607 Sengun, I. Y., Turp, G. Y., Cicek, S. N., Avci, T., Ozturk, B., Kilic, G. (2021). Assessment of
608 the effect of marination with organic fruit vinegars on safety and quality of beef.

609 *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 336, 108904.
610 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2020.108904>

611 Supaphon, P., Kerdpi boon, S., Vénien, A., Loison, O., Sicard, J., Rouel, J., & Astruc, T. (2021).
612 Structural changes in local Thai beef during sous-vide cooking. *Meat Science*, 175, 108442.
613 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2021.108442>

614 Uttaro, B., Zawadski, S., & McLeod B. (2019). Efficacy of multi-stage sous-vide cooking on
615 tenderness of low value beef muscles. *Meat Science*, 149, 40-46.
616 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2018.11.008>

617 Węglarz, A. (2010). Quality of beef from semi-intensively fattened heifers and bulls. *Animal*
618 *Science Papers and Reports*, 28, 207–218.

619 Wyrwisz, J., Moczowska, M., Kurek, M., Stelmasiak, A., Półtorak, A., Wierzbicka A. (2016).
620 Influence of 21 days of vacuum-aging on color, bloom development, and WBSF of beef
621 semimembranosus. *Meat Science*, 122, 48-54.
622 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2016.07.018>

623 Yang, X., Wang, J., Holman, B. W. B., Liang, R., Chen, X., Luo, X., Zhu, L., Hopkins, D. L.,
624 & Zhang, Y. (2021). Investigation of the physicochemical, bacteriological, and sensory
625 quality of beef steaks held under modified atmosphere packaging and representative of
626 different ultimate pH values. *Meat Science*, 174,
627 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2020.108416>

628 Yusop, S. M., O’Sullivan, M. G., Kerry, J. F., & Kerry, J. P. (2010). Effect of marinating time
629 and low pH on marinade performance and sensory acceptability of poultry meat. *Meat*
630 *Science*, 03091740, 85, 657-663. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2010.03.020>

631 Yusop, S. M., O’Sullivan, M. G., & Kerry, J. P. (2011). Marinating and enhancement of the
632 nutritional content of processed meat products. In: *Processed Meats. Improving Safety,*
633 *Nutrition and Quality. A volume in Woodhead Publishing Series in Food Science,*
634 *Technology and Nutrition* pp. 421–449.

635 Yusop, S. M., O’Sullivan, M. G., Kerry, J. F., & Kerry, J. P. (2012). Influence of processing
636 method and holding time on the physical and sensory qualities of cooked marinated chicken
637 breast fillets. *LWT - Food Science and Technology*, 46, 363-370.
638 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2011.08.007>

639 Yusop, S. M., O’Sullivan, M. G., Preuß, M., Weber, H., Kerry, J. F., & Kerry, J. P. (2012).
640 Assessment of nanoparticle paprika oleoresin on marinating performance and sensory
641 acceptance of poultry meat. *LWT - Food Science and Technology*, 46, 349-355.
642 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2011.08.014>

643 Zhang, D., Sun, X., Battino, M., Wei, X., Shi, J., Zhao, L., Liu, S., Xiao, J., Shi, B., & Zou, X.
644 (2021). A comparative overview on chili pepper (capsicum genus) and sichuan pepper
645 (zanthoxylum genus): From pungent spices to pharma-foods. *Trends in Food Science &*
646 *Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2021.03.004>

647 Żakowska-Biemans, S., Pieniak, Z., Gutkowska, K., Wierzbicki, J., Cieszyńska, K.,
648 Sajdakowska, M., & Kosicka-Gębska, M. (2017). Beef consumer segment profiles based on
649 information source usage in Poland. *Meat Science*, 124, 105–
650 113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2016.11.001>

651 Żochowska-Kujawska, J., Lachowicz, K., Sobczak, M. (2012). Effects of fibre type and kefir,
652 wine lemon, and pineapple marinades on texture and sensory properties of wild boar and
653 deer longissimus muscle. *Meat Science*, 92, 675-680.
654 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2012.06.020>

655

656