

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**EFFECTS OF HIGH PRESSURE PROCESSING AND  
ETHYL LAUROYL ARGINATE ON THE SHELF-LIFE OF  
READY-TO-EAT SLICED CHICKEN BREAST ROAST**

A Thesis

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Food Technology

Massey University

Albany, New Zealand

Sadia Seemeen

August 2011

## ABSTRACT

**Title: Effects of high pressure processing and ethyl lauroyl arginate on the shelf-life of ready-to-eat sliced chicken breast roast.**

High pressure processing (HPP) is becoming increasingly popular in commercial food processing as it offers great potential within the food industry. The popularity of the technology is driven by the need to provide minimally processed foods which are safe, wholesome and have extended shelf-life that challenge traditional methods of food processing. High pressures of upto 900 MPa can be used to kill or inhibit microorganisms without changing the nutritional and sensory properties of the food. However, the inherent high resistances of bacterial endospores and food enzymes are the major challenges for the broader application of HPP. Therefore, a hurdle approach is almost axiomatic for significant widespread use of HPP in commercial food processing. Therefore, several antimicrobial compounds have been used in conjunction with HPP in a hurdle approach to improve the overall quality of the products. Ethyl lauroyl arginate (LAE) has not been investigated in combination with HPP. LAE is a novel antimicrobial compound derivative of lauric acid, L-arginine and ethanol, all of which are naturally occurring substances. LAE can extend the shelf-life of products due to its antimicrobial action on spoilage microorganisms during refrigerated storage. Therefore, the objective of this study was to investigate the effects of HPP and LAE on the shelf-life of ready-to-eat (RTE) cooked chicken breast roast during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks. The RTE cooked chicken breast roast was prepared using portions (samples) of freshly marinated chicken breasts, which were cooked to an internal temperature of 75°C for 5 minutes, and then cooled (4°C), sliced (60 mm) and vacuum-packaged. The study was conducted in two phases, each carried out for 16 weeks. The first phase comprised of fourteen unique treatments which were screened by microbial and instrumental analysis. Based on the results of the first phase, five treatments were selected for further work. Similar tests were carried on these treatments, in addition to sensory evaluation.

The effects of HPP at 450 MPa and 600 MPa pressures at 1 min, 3.5 min and 5 min hold times respectively, on the shelf-life of RTE sliced chicken breast roast were studied for 16 weeks during storage at 4°C. HPP in combination with LAE (200 ppm) was also investigated using similar treatment pressures, hold times and storage conditions. The effects of LAE (200 ppm & 315 ppm) alone on the shelf life of RTE sliced chicken breast roast was studied for 16 weeks when stored at 4°C. RTE sliced chicken breast roast samples without any preservative and/or HPP treatment served as the controls. Aerobic plate counts (APCs), lactic acid bacteria (LAB) and yeasts and moulds (Y&M) were analyzed in five samples from each of the treatments at regular intervals for upto 16 weeks. Instrumental analyses of color and texture were also conducted on the samples to determine any significant changes during storage at 4°C. Five sample treatments were selected after screening and evaluated by consumer sensory analysis using a 9-point hedonic scale. Analyses for APCs, LAB, Y&M, color and texture were also conducted on the selected samples during refrigerated storage. Survival analysis methodology was used to estimate the consumer sensory shelf-life of the selected treatments at 25% and 50% rejection probability.

The results showed the potential of using HPP to extend the microbiological and consumer sensory quality of the products. Samples treated with HPP alone, and HPP in combination with LAE (200 ppm) at 600 MPa inhibited the growth of APCs for 16 weeks when stored at 4°C. However, there was no significant ( $P>0.05$ ) difference in the microbial shelf-life of samples treated with 200 ppm or 315 ppm LAE. No significant ( $P>0.05$ ) changes in color and texture were detected in all the treatments. Further, no LAB or Y&M were detected in all the sample treatments for the entire storage period at 4°C. Samples treated with HP at 600 MPa for 1 min and 5 min, HPP+LAE (200 ppm) at 600 MPa for 1 min, LAE at 200 and 315 ppm were evaluated by a consumer sensory panel at different storage times. The results of the consumer sensory analysis showed no changes in color, texture, flavour and freshness of the HP-treated and HPP+LAE (200 ppm)-treated samples. LAE-treated (200 and 315 ppm) samples were not acceptable by a consumer panel at week 12. A maximum sensory shelf-life of >16 weeks at 50% and 13.8 weeks at 25% rejection probability was obtained for samples treated with HPP at 600

MPa for 1 min. Therefore, samples treated at 600 MPa for 1 min had stable sensory properties and were well-accepted by a consumer panel. Also, the samples had good microbiological quality.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are several people and organizations I would like to thank for their help when I pursued the Master's in Food Technology at Massey University. Without their support, my stay in New Zealand would not have been fruitful.

I would like to thank God for gifting me this beautiful life and giving me the ability to reason, judge and be a good human being.

I would like to acknowledge the financial support given by Tegel Foods Ltd to conduct this project and I would like to thank Roy Biggs, Food Safety and Quality Assurance Manager at Tegel Foods Limited, who gave me this wonderful opportunity to work on a commercial project. Also, I would like to specially thank Robyn Marshall for sharing her technical skills, supervision and invaluable contribution. I would like to acknowledge the full team at Tegel Foods Ltd, Christchurch, who contributed towards the physical completion my project.

I would like to express my deepest appreciation and gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Tony Mutukumira, who continually and convincingly conveyed a spirit of adventure in regard to research. Without his guidance and persistent help this project report would not have been possible. Thank you for believing in me and supporting me throughout my post-graduate studies and life.

I would also like to thank Rachel Liu, Jarod Young and Marjan Asgarlou for their assistance in the laboratory during the course of the project. I would also like to immensely thank Daniel Walsh for his help with the statistics in this project.

Finally, I would like to thank the people who make my life worth living. I would like to express my love and gratitude to my loving family for their endless love and support. I would like to specially thank my best friend Sneha Prakash for her help and support throughout the project. I am very grateful to have Deepak Menon as my partner, who is my source of strength and inspiration.

## Table of Contents

<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES.....</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES.....</b>	<b>xiv</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>xvi</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Objective .....	4
1.2 Specific objectives.....	4
<b>2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	6
2.2 Principles of High Pressure Processing.....	7
2.2.1 Description of the process .....	8
2.2.2 Process principles .....	11
2.2.3 General equipment for HPP treatment.....	18
2.3 Effects of pressure on microorganisms .....	22
2.3.1 Bacteria.....	23
2.3.2 Bacterial spores .....	25
2.3.3 Fungi.....	26
2.3.4 Viruses.....	27
2.4 Factors influencing microbial sensitivity to high pressure .....	27
2.4.1 Intrinsic Factors .....	28
2.4.3 Extrinsic factors.....	29
2.5 Effects of high pressure on food quality.....	30
2.5.1 Effect of high pressure on food color .....	31
2.5.2 Effect of high pressure on food texture .....	31

2.5.3 Effect of high pressure on food sensory quality .....	32
2.5.4 Effect of high pressure on enzyme activity in meats .....	34
2.5.5 Effect of high pressure on food yield and cost of processing.....	35
2.6 High pressure regulations .....	37
2.7 HPP in combination with other processing technologies .....	38
2.7.1 Ethyl lauroyl arginate .....	42
2.7.2 Mode of action of Ethyl Lauroyl Arginate (LAE).....	44
2.7.3 Metabolism of Ethyl Lauroyl Arginate (LAE) in humans.....	45
2.7.4 International Regulatory Status of Ethyl Lauroyl Arginate (LAE) .....	47
<b>3.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS.....</b>	<b>49</b>
3.1 Experimental Plan .....	49
3.1.1 Description of process factors .....	52
3.2 Industrial preparation of RTE chicken breast roast .....	53
3.3 High Pressure Processing .....	57
3.3.1 Description of the Avure™ High Pressure Processing Unit.....	57
3.3.2 Sample loading and processing .....	57
3.4 Analyses of the samples .....	61
3.4.1 Microbiological analysis .....	61
3.4.2 Color Measurement .....	62
3.4.3 Texture measurement .....	63
3.4.4 Consumer sensory evaluation.....	64
<b>4.0 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>5.0 RESULTS .....</b>	<b>68</b>
5.1 Screening of treatments .....	68
5.1.1 Microbiological Results.....	68
5.1.2 Instrumental color.....	77
5.1.3 Instrumental texture.....	85



5.2 Selection of treatments for processing in Phase 2 .....	87
5.2.1 Microbiological quality of the selected? samples processed in Phase 2.....	87
5.2.2 Instrumental color of selected treatments .....	90
5.2.3 Instrumental texture of the selected treatments .....	93
5.2.4 Sensory analysis of selected treatments processed in Phase 2 .....	94
5.2.5 Sensory shelf life estimation using survival analysis .....	99
<b>6.0 DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>102</b>
6.1 Microbiological quality .....	102
6.1.1 Effect of HPP (450 MPa and 600 MPa) on the microbiological quality of RTE sliced chicken breast roast .....	102
6.1.2 Effect of HPP+LAE on the microbiological quality of RTE sliced chicken breast roast.....	105
6.1.3 Effect of LAE on the microbiological quality of RTE sliced chicken breast roast .....	107
6.2 Instrumental analysis of color .....	108
6.3 Instrumental analysis of texture.....	111
6.4 Consumer sensory analysis.....	112
6.5 Estimation of sensory shelf-life of RTE sliced chicken breast roast.....	114
<b>7.0 CONCLUSION:.....</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>119</b>
<b>9.0 REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>121</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1 .....</b>	<b>142</b>
1.1 Specifications for product preparation (screening phase) .....	142
1.2 Specifications for product preparation (selection phase).....	144
<b>APPENDIX 2 .....</b>	<b>146</b>
2.1 Distribution temperature of the screened treatments during transport .....	146
2.2 Distribution temperature of the selected treatments during transport .....	153
<b>APPENDIX 3 .....</b>	<b>158</b>
3.1 Raw data for microbial counts (APCs) during screening of treatments .....	158

3.2 Raw data for microbial counts (APCs) in the selected treatments .....	169
<b>APPENDIX 4 .....</b>	<b>171</b>
4.1 Mean data for instrumental color during screening of treatments .....	171
<b>APPENDIX 5 .....</b>	<b>182</b>
5.1 Mean data for instrumental texture during screening of treatments .....	182
<b>APPENDIX 6 .....</b>	<b>185</b>
6.1 Consumer Consent Form .....	185
6.2 Sensory Evaluation Form .....	186
<b>APPENDIX 7 .....</b>	<b>187</b>
7.1 Consumer sensory results for the selected treatments .....	187
<b>APPENDIX 8 .....</b>	<b>214</b>
8.1 Minitab output for the growth of APCs in the screening phase .....	214
8.2 Minitab output for the growth of APCs in the selected treatments .....	221
8.3 Minitab output for the sensory evaluation of selected treatments .....	223
8.4 Survival analysis for shelf-life estimation of the selected treatments using R .....	278
<b>APPENDIX 9 .....</b>	<b>283</b>
9.1 Material Specifications .....	283

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page no.
1	Finite element model of yeast cell under compression.....	14
2	Temperature distributions in an HP chamber with a large filling ratio.....	16
3	Temperature evolution in big Tylose sample calculated from the model: the initial temperature of both the Tylose sample and the pressure medium is (a) 40°C and (b) 24°C, i.e., showing the benefits of anticipating the adiabatic temperature rise.....	17
4	Proposed pathway for the <i>in vivo</i> mammalian metabolism of LAE.....	46
5	Donor and marinade loaded into the tumbler prior to tumbling.....	54
6	Cutting slices of cooked chicken for vacuum-packaging.....	55
7	Sample layout in the vacuum-packaging machine (R240, Multivac ®, Wolfertschwenden, Germany).....	55
8	Industrial production process of RTE sliced chicken breast roast.....	56
9	Samples being packed into the 2L HPP equipment cylinder.....	58
10	Securing the 2L cylinder by screwing to the upper closure of the pneumatic lifting device.....	58
11	2L cylinder being lowered to close the frame of the vessel for processing. (a) lowering of the cylinder into the pressure vessel (b) Rail mounted yoke frame showing closure of the equipment prior to pressurization.....	58

<b>Figure</b>		<b>Page no.</b>
12	Flow schematic diagram of the Avure™ High Pressure Unit.....	60
13	Change in log APCs of RTE sliced chicken breast roast samples treated with HP at 450 MPa during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	69
14	Change in log APCs of RTE sliced chicken breast roast samples treated with HP at 600 MPa during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	70
15	Change in log APCs of RTE sliced chicken breast roast samples treated with HP at 450 MPa in combination with LAE (200 ppm) when stored at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	73
16	Change in log APCs of RTE sliced chicken breast roast samples treated with HP at 600 MPa in combination with LAE (200 ppm) during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	75
17	Change in log APCs of RTE sliced chicken breast roast samples treated with LAE (200 ppm) during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	76
18a	Change in Hunter's L* values of the HP-treated RTE sliced chicken breast roast during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	78
18b	Change in Hunter's L* values of the HPP+LAE (200 ppm)-treated RTE sliced chicken breast roast samples during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	79
18c	Change in Hunter's L* values of LAE (200 ppm)-treated RTE sliced chicken breast roast samples during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	79
19a	Change in Hunter's a* values of the HP-treated RTE sliced chicken breast roast samples during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	81

<b>Figure</b>		<b>Page no.</b>
19b	Change in Hunter's a* values of HPP+LAE (200 ppm)-treated RTE sliced chicken breast roast samples during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	81
19c	Change in the Hunter's a* values of LAE (200 ppm)-treated RTE sliced chicken breast roast samples during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	82
20a	Change in Hunter's b* values of the HP-treated RTE sliced chicken breast roast samples during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	83
20b	Change in Hunter's b* values of the HPP+LAE (200 ppm)-treated RTE sliced chicken breast roast samples during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	84
20c	Change in Hunter's b* values of LAE (200 ppm)-treated RTE sliced chicken breast roast samples during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	84
21a	Change in shear force of HPP-treated RTE sliced chicken breast roast samples during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	85
21b	Change in shear force of HPP+LAE (200 ppm)-treated RTE sliced chicken breast roast samples during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	86
21c	Change in shear force of LAE (200 ppm)-treated RTE sliced chicken breast roast samples during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	86
22	Change in the APCs of the selected treatments during storage of RTE sliced chicken breast roast during storage at 4°C.....	88
23	Change in Hunter's L* values of the selected treatments over storage period.....	91

<b>Figure</b>	<b>Page no.</b>
24	Change in Hunter's a* values for the selected treatments over storage time..... 92
25	Change in Hunter's b* values of the selected treatments over storage period.. 93
26	Change in the shear force of selected treatments over storage time..... 94
27	Overall acceptability score of selected treatments for RTE sliced chicken breast roast during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks..... 99
28	Consumer rejection probability of the samples as a function of storage time... 100

## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page no.
1	Predicted treatment pressures required at various temperatures for a 5-log inactivation of <i>Escherichia coli</i> and <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> in poultry meat and milk, for a treatment time of 15 mins.....	24
2	Results from a comparative sensory study of heat-treated (80-85°C for 40 min) and high pressure-treated (500 MPa at 65°C) sausages.....	33
3	Shelf-life comparison of juice based on sensory evaluation.....	34
4	Factorial design of treatments for the shelf-life extension of RTE cooked chicken breast roast.....	50
5	Block design of the nested experiment showing the multiple factors within the treatments.....	51
6	Levels of APCs* ( $\log_{10}$ cfu $g^{-1}$ ) during storage in samples treated with HPP at 450 MPa and 600 MPa for 1 min, 3.5 min and 5 min respectively during storage, respectively at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	71
7	Levels of APCs ( $\log_{10}$ cfu $g^{-1}$ ) during storage in samples treated with HPP + LAE (200 ppm) at 450 MPa and 600 MPa for 1 min, 3.5 min and 5 min, respectively during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	74
8	Levels of APCs ( $\log_{10}$ cfu $g^{-1}$ ) during storage of LAE (200 ppm)-treated RTE chicken breast roast against during storage at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	77
9	Change in the level of APCs ( $\log_{10}$ cfu $g^{-1}$ ) of selected treatments when stored at 4°C for 16 weeks.....	89

<b>Table</b>		<b>Page no.</b>
10	Comparison of the mean consumer sensory scores of the selected treatments.....	97
11	$\mu$ and $\sigma$ values of the Weibull distribution.....	100
12	Estimated shelf lives of RTE sliced chicken breast roast based on selected treatments.....	101



## ABBREVIATIONS

ANOVA	=	Analysis of variance
APCs	=	Aerobic plate counts
CFD	=	Computational fluid dynamics
FDA	=	Food and drug administration
FE	=	Finite Element
GRAS	=	Generally recognized as safe
HP	=	High pressure
HPP	=	High pressure processing
KPa	=	Kilo pascals
LAB	=	Lactic acid bacteria
LAE	=	Lauric arginate
MPa	=	Mega pascals
RTE	=	Ready-to-eat
SD	=	Standard deviation
Y&M	=	Yeasts and mould