Relationships among glycolytic potential, dark cutting (dark, firm, and dry) beef, and cooked beef palatability¹

*		, ,			, ,	00 43210)
ABSTRACT:		-	r		,	ı ,	-
, ,	, , ,	()))		(2.3), (4 %
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	·	r	(3 %	. (33 %))	- -
,	- £	- - -	- ,	(3 %)		
, , (2 - +	2× + ,) -	, + , - , , -					
	, , . 100 μ	/,					

D. M. Wulf^{*2}, R. S. Emnett[†], J. M. Leheska^{*}, and S. J. Moeller[†]

-



Material and Methods

•

. . (= , 20, 1 ,). ı 100 (2000). (4%) . . J. (., 199). -.(199) (% • % % , 24-4 _ 24-9 -*) * (1 0 () 40 /2 , _ -. L). 90 1213* (*

13 . (*, *, *) -310 (., ,) 0- -

ı.

-

ı

(, 199). - . . 1897

•

Table 1. Carcass characteristics for normal
and dark cutting (DFD) carcasses

	(= 3)	(= 11)		P
	0.0	1.07		0. 4
	2% 20%	${}^{4\%}_{2\%}$		
	%	9%		0
	2%	4%		0.
	2 %	3 %		0.9 3
	%	%		
.,	329	4 % 33	39	0. 20
·,	0. 9 3 4	0. 1	0.3 11.3	0.09 3
, %	2.2	2.0	0.	0.2340
	2.3 1	2.0 1 2	0. 1	$0.14 \ 3 \\ 0.34 \ 0$
	1		1	0.000
ĩ	$\begin{array}{c}1 & 4\\ 40\end{array}$	1 2 410	$\frac{1}{4}$	0. 0 3 0. 2 9 2
1 (7)	9 0	30	40	0.0001
* , %	41.1	34.	1.5 2.9	0.0009
*	2.0	1.	1. 1 3	0.0001
1	.4	.0	0.1	0.0001
,μ /	122	1	23	0.0001
100 = 00, 200 = 00, 300 = 00, 400	= ⁰⁰ , . 400 =	00, .		
*. 0 = . 100 =	= ⁰⁰ ,	00 =	00, .	
* =	,		=	
(· ,	1		·
,) .				
L	•	د		1 1
, (1001)			•	
. (1994)		2. %		
	L	()	14.
1,1 0	,		1	2-
			,	
	, 11.3	. /	1	-
	11.0 p	· · ,		-
(, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		L	0.0	90%
		C	a = 0.0).
1.			1	
, (D. 0.0.)	,			
(P > 0.0)		3		-
1		,		,
L		11		•
,			(P > 0.	0) -

	L	•	,	4	-
L					
	,				
د ,				L	-
, 199).	L		2	3%	(P

(, 199). 23% = 0.0)

> , (__)9 (*(___)- 2()- 2(

,

Wulf et al.

Table 3. Palatability	y characteristics for norm	mal and dark cutting (DFD) carcasses
-----------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------------------

,

((= 3)	(=11)	<i>P</i> -	ı

	(= 3)	(= 11)		<i>P</i> - ,
	0. 4	1.4	0.4	0.0003
	0. 3	0.4	0.	0. 49
, -	0.	1.2	0.9	

Table 4. Off-flavor characteristics (average number of flavor comments per carcass summed over nine panelists) for normal and dark cutting (DFD) carcasses

=

Wulf et al.

Table 6. Effect of glycolytic potential on beef ultimate muscle pH, muscle color, and palatability

		,	μ /	
0	0 99.9	100 11 9 .9	120	140

- . 199 0.3 9 393. .
- , , . .199 . . ., , .
- . 199 . . . , •• . , . . , . . .
- 1.11 , 124. •• , . 19 1. . , . . 10. 3 . . .
- . . L . 2001. ٠, 9. ,
- . 1990. . . ,
 - . 2 .129, 140. .
 - . ., , . 1994. . .
 - , , . 2.33, 343. , . . L ., . • .
 - , , • , .199 . ı.
 - / (,) _ J. 199 . ·, · 1 . ,

- . 19 0. , . . ., . . . 2 . -. ••
- . 199 . -
- , 2001. L 9.392, 39 .
- , . . . , ., . . . 199 . Bos indicus-
 - .
 - .4.3,3. .1**99**. ,
- 42.
- ., . . , .199 , . . , .
 - **4 9**2. . . .