

EFFECT OF SUPPLEMENTAL RED GRAPE POMACE ON TECHNOLOGICAL PROPERTIES OF ROSS 308 BROILER CHICKENS MEAT

Matej Čech^{*1}, Peter Haščík¹, Peter Herc¹, Juraj Čuboň¹, Lukáš Jurčaga¹, Andrea Mesárošová¹, Ondřej Bučko², Miroslav Kročko¹

Address(es): Matej Čech,

¹Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra, Faculty of Biotechnology and Food Sciences, Institute of Food Sciences, Tr. Andreja Hlinku 2, 94976 Nitra, Slovakia. ²Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra, Faculty of Agrobiology and Food Resources, Institute of Animal Husbandry, Tr. Andreja Hlinku 2, 949 76 Nitra, Slovakia.

*Corresponding author: xcech@uniag.sk

https://doi.org/10.55251/jmbfs.9915

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Received 21. 2. 2023 Revised 20. 4. 2023 Accepted 3. 5. 2023 Published 1. 6. 2023 Regular article	The purpose of this study was to ascertain the effects of adding red grape pomace (RGP) of variety Alibernet to the diet of broiler chickens Ross 308 on the technological properties of their meat. 200 one-day Ross 308 broiler chicks of mixed gender were initially split into 4 groups at random (n = 50). The control group (Group C) did not get any extra supplements. The feed for experimental group E1 was enhanced with 1% RGP per 1 kg of feed mixture (FM), 2% RGP per 1 kg of FM in group E2, and 3% RGP per 1 kg of FM in group E3, respectively. The 42-day fattening period was conducted without the use of any coccidiostats or antibiotics in FMs. After slaughter and processing, chicken halves were tested for weight losses by cooling, freezing, respectively defreezing and cooking. Breast and thigh meat was subjected for analysis – pH of fresh meat 45 and 120 minutes <i>postmortem</i> , its color by CIEL*a*b* system and shear force after cooking. Based on the results, we can conclude that the addition of GPA negatively affected weight loss after freezing, as these were the lowest (P \leq 0.05) in the control group – 2.74% compared to groups E1 – 3.64 and E2 – 3.94%. Losses by cooling and baking were similar in all groups (P \geq 0.05). pH values in breast muscle were not significantly affected by selected feed supplement, what is in the contrary with pH of thigh muscle, where we detected significant differences after 45 and also 120 minutes <i>postmortem</i> (P \leq 0.05). The highest shear force (P \leq 0.05) was recorded in control group (breast – 4.40, thigh – 3.68 kg.cm ⁻²), while the lowest and therefore softest meat was found after application of 2% RGP (breast – 3.63, thigh – 2.52 kg.cm ⁻²). Color characteristics were the most influenced by selected feed supplement, as we did not detect significant differences (P \leq 0.05) only in L* of thigh meat. The highest differences were observed in a* and b* in both breast and thigh muscle (P \leq 0.05) – highest values were found in group with 3% of supplemental RGP (breast – -0.88 and 9.78, resp

Keywords: feed supplements, meat colour, weight losses, pH, shear force

INTRODUCTION

The amount of meat produced worldwide is anticipated to increase by 1.4% in 2022 to reach 361 million tonnes (carcass weight equivalent), however at a slower rate than the 4.5% rise experienced in 2021. As expected, increases in the Americas, Asia, Africa, and Oceania are likely to be offset by declines anticipated in Europe. The world's output of poultry meat is predicted to reach 139 million tonnes in 2022, rising at a moderate rate of 0.8%. However, the war's commencement in late February 2022 caused exports of poultry meat from Ukraine to be disrupted, which increased market instability (FAO, 2022).

Poultry consumption has been on the rise, thanks to two major reasons. In highincome countries, poultry meats are regarded as easier to cook, perceived as a healthier food option with a reduced risk of cardiovascular illnesses, and are less expensive in low-income developing nations than other meats (Marangoni et al., 2015; Falkovskaya and Gowen, 2020; OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2021–2030).

An increasing number of consumers are interested in poultry goods such as sausages, patties, and hamburgers because they are easy to prepare (ready to cook), handle, and store. Poultry meat is mainly the meat of domesticated birds such as turkey and chicken (Kennedy et al., 2004; Barbut, 2012).

Because they are an affordable and reliable source of high-quality protein, broilers have been the most common type of poultry consumed worldwide. However, several buyers also desire various poultry types and their products (**U-chupaj et al., 2017**).

It has been said that consumers' acceptance of cooked meat is most strongly influenced by texture (Szczesniak et al., 1963). Meat texture can be judged using instrumental analysis, sensory evaluation, or a combination of the two. Although descriptive sensory analysis uses either a large group of untrained consumers or a panel of expert assessors, it directly represents human perception of the samples (U-chupaj et al., 2017).

Meat from poultry is more perishable than meat from other animals, such beef or hogs. As a result, gauging freshness is crucial for ensuring the quality of the meat in chicken processing plants. A vital component of the contemporary chicken processing sector is high quality. The way that poultry meat is stored and prepared has a direct impact on its functional and sensory qualities. It is necessary to adopt meat quality control to enhance the functional and sensory qualities of meat samples, reduce financial losses, and increase the efficiency of the poultry business (Lee et al., 2022).

Consumers are much more aware of certain meat attributes, such as color, texture (tenderness), and drip loss, which were formerly mostly inconsequential when most chickens were sold as whole carcasses, as a result of the dramatic growth in the consumption of processed goods (**Barbut et al., 2008**). An increasing worry in the poultry business is pale, soft, and exudative meat (PSE), which relates to rapid breeding and high demand for chicken meat (**Woelfel et al., 2002**). Paleness, low water holding capacity (WHC), and enhanced cook and drip loss are traits of chicken breast meat that resemble PSE (**Barbut et al., 2005**). Higher lightness (L*) levels are apparently linked to lower muscle pH and WHC, which causes more cook and drip loss and less softness in the meat (**Qiao et al., 2001; Petracci et al., 2004**).

Animals must be fed grains and soybean meal as their primary sources of energy and crude protein, respectively, to produce meat. Due to increased food competition, the reliance of monogastric animals on these feed crops has become problematic. Additionally, the agro-industrial sectors generate about 1.3 billion tons of processing waste and postharvest losses each year, which has significant negative effects on the environment, society, and the economy (Kumar and Kalita, 2017). Although most of these agro-industrial byproducts are frequently underutilized, they have the potential to serve as a promising substitute feed ingredient for the partial replacement of maize-soybean in monogastric nutrition (Alfaia et al., 2022).

In order to lower the cost of feeding monogastric animals with traditional crops (such maize and soybean meals) and enhance the quality of their meat, grape by-products may be included in their diet. Grape pomace, grape seed, grape seed oil, and grape skins are the principal grape by-products with the greatest global expression (Alfaia et al., 2022).

Grape pomace is thought to make up 20–25% of the weight of the total grapes crushed for wine production (**Yu and Ahmedna, 2012; Romero et al., 2021**). Even though they are used the least, grape stems are removed prior to winemaking and account for about 5% of wine by-products (**Ruiz-Moreno et al., 2015**). Grape

seed oil is occasionally extracted from stem (González-Centeno et al., 2013; Brenes et al., 2016). Even though grape by-products are environmentally unfriendly, they are a rich source of bioactive chemicals such polyphenols, which are well known for their anti-inflammatory, anticarcinogenic, cardioprotective, and vasodilatory effects. Due to the inclusion of oil-rich seeds, the protein content of GP is approximately 14% and the lipid content is 4% - 11% (González-Centeno et al., 2013; Teixeira et al., 2014; Averilla et al., 2019).

Since 2006, feed antibiotics and other growth hormones were forbidden in livestock production. Thereafter, many authors began investigating effects of natural feed supplements in broiler chickens' production. Thanks to the rich composition of grape pomace, authors aimed at its effect on broiler chickens' meat performance (**Tekeli, RuStu Kutlu and Celik, 2014; Ebrahimzadeh et al., 2018; Kumanda, Mlambo and Mnisi, 2019; Turcu et al., 2020**), meat quality (**Turcu et al., 2019; Bennato et al., 2020; Reyes et al., 2020**) or its storage stability (**Jurčaga et al., 2021**). For example, **Aditya et al.** (**2018**) reported, that without negative effects on growth performance and carcass traits, the dietary grape pomace induced an improvement in meat quality.

In spite of our previous work and the abovementioned, the aim of this study was to explore if selected feed supplement (ARGP) has any effect on technological and sensory properties of broiler chicken meat.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Fattening process

The experiment was carried out at the Test Poultry Station at the Slovak University of Agriculture (SUA) in Nitra. The animals were housed in the same conditions during the 42-day fattening period. 200 mixed-sex one-day-old chicks (Ross 308) were used in the experiment, and they were randomly assigned to 4 groups (each containing 50 chickens). One group of chicks' pen measured 3.2×2.4 meters. The broiler chicks were raised in a temperature-controlled environment on breed litter (wood shavings); the ambient temperature in the test poultry station was kept at 33 °C for the first week, then gradually dropped by 2 °C, before being set at 23 °C going forward. Controls were in place for the temperature and relative humidity. The chickens were maintained under a consistent light schedule and allowed unlimited access to water and feed (in the form of shreds) throughout the whole fattening phase.

In accordance with the required reference values (Bulletin of MARD SR, 2005), diets were created to meet the nutritional needs of broilers. The diets consisted of starter HYD-01 (1–21 days) and grower HYD-02 (22–42 days) diets. Table 1 lists the ingredients in basal diets. The starter and grower feed combinations were made by Biofeed, Inc. (Kolárovo, Slovak Republic) without the use of antibiotics or coccidiostatics. The experimental groups were set up as follows: the control group (C) consisted of a basal diet without supplements; the first experimental group of chickens (E1) received a basal diet plus 1%.100 kg⁻¹ of RGP; the experimental group E2 received a complete FM plus 2%.100 kg⁻¹ of RGP.

Table 1 Composition of FMs

Ingredients (%)	Starter (HYD- 01) (1 st - 21 st day of age)	Grower (HYD-02) (22 nd - 42 nd day of age)		
Wheat	34.50	30.00		
Maize	28.00	39.00		
Soybean meal (48% N)	31.00	26.00		
Fodder lime	0.65	0.60		
Calcium formate	0.80	0.80		
Monocalcium phosphate	0.90	0.55		
Fodder salt	0.20	0.20		
Sodium bicarbonate	0.20	0.20		
Lysine	0.10	0.05		
Methionine	0.15	0.15		
Soybean oil	3.00	1.95		
Premix Euromix BR 0.5%*	0.50	0.50		
Nutrient content (g.kg ⁻¹)				
Linoleic acid	27.82	24.04		
Fibre	28.71	27.84		
Crude protein	209.68	189.60		
Ash	45.45	39.59		
Ca	8.12	7.27		
Р	6.04	5.13		
Na	1.61	1.58		
ME _N (MJ.kg ⁻¹)	11.92	11.92		

*active substances per kilogram of premix: vitamin A 2,500,000 IU; vitamin E 50,000 mg; vitamin D3 800,000 IU; niacin 12,000 mg; D-pantothenic acid 3,000 mg; riboflavin 1,800 mg; pyridoxine 1,200 mg; thiamine 600 mg; methadione 800 mg; ascorbic acid 50,000 mg; folic acid 400 mg; biotin 40 mg; cobalamin 10.0 mg; choline 100,000 mg; betaine 50,000 mg; Mn 20,000 mg; Zn 16,000 mg; Fe 14,000 mg; Cu 2,400 mg; Co 80 mg; 1200 mg; Se 50 mg.

Slaughter and measurements

At 42 days old, 20 mixed-sex chickens (10 of each sex) were chosen from each group based on average weight, weighed, and murdered at the Department of Technology and Quality of Animal Products' experimental slaughterhouse (SUA, Nitra). The chickens were conventionally killed by neck cutting, bleeding, plucking, and eviscerating them.

pН

Determination of pH was carried out 45 minutes after slaughter at a carcass temperature of approximately 30 °C and 2 hours after slaughter at a carcass temperature of approximately 22 °C, to determine the technological quality and maturation process of the breast and thigh meat with use of pH-meter Gryf 209 L (Gryf HP, Prague, Czech Republic) according to the methodology of **Garrido et al.** (1995).

Meat colour

Breast and thigh muscle samples instrumental color measurements were made using a spectrophotometer (Konica Minolta CM-2600d, Osaka, Japan) with the setting Specular Component Included (SCI). D65 light source and a 10° observer, with a port 8 mm in diameter was used. The white plate calibration was performed at 23 °C, as suggested by the manual. The results were coordinates in the color interface of the Commission International de l'Eclairage (CIE) L* a* b* system (L*=0, black; L*=100, white; 100 +a*=redness; -a*=greenness; +b*=yellowness; -b*=blueness). Using the optically passive glass aperture cover that came with the colorimeter to ensure a consistently level sample surface, color measurements were made at three random positions on each sample (**Bianchi, Fletcher and Smith, 2005**). A white tile was used to calibrate the colorimeter (Minolta calibration plate: C: Y = 93.66, = 0.3150, y = 0.3217).

Storage and cooking losses

Storage losses were defined as the weight loss of chicken carcass halves after they were cooled to 4 °C after 24 hours (chilling losses) and after freezing to -18 °C and storage for 2 months at this temperature. To determine cooking losses, heat treatment was chosen by baking covered carcass halves at a temperature of 200 °C for 60 minutes with the addition of 20 ml of water and another 15 minutes to finish baking the uncovered roasters as adapted and modified from the methodology of **Trembecká et al. (2017)**. Losses were calculated as a percentage loss after cooling, freezing, and baking from the original fresh weight of carcass halves.

Shear force

Four chicken halves from each group were selected and cooked at 200 °C for 60 minutes to measure the shear force. Shear force is the amount of force required to sever the fibers of a beef sample with a 1 cm² cross section. According to the method of **Goodson et al. (2002)** the Warner-Bratzler apparatus (Chatillon Brandt, USA) measured the shear force of culinary prepared breast and thigh meat.

Statistical analysis

The collected results were statistically analyzed using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) method using the XLSTAT program (Addinsoft, Paris, France, 2017), which produced baseline values that are displayed as mean standard deviation. Duncan test was employed to assess the statistical evidence between each experimental group, and differences were deemed significant at $P \leq 0.05$.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The obtained results of technological properties of chicken meat from broiler chickens fed with supplemental are divided into two parts, firstly the weight losses during storage and heat treatment and secondly selected instrumentally analyzed technological properties of meat.

Chicken meat weight losses

The results of calculated percentage losses in chicken meat weight of broiler chickens Ross 308 during its storage (cooling and freezing) and after its heat treatment (cooking) are shown in Table 2.

Based on the results of the meat weight losses of Ross 308 broiler chickens fed with the addition of 1, 2 and 3% RGP of the Alibernet variety, we can conclude that the cooling and freezing losses were not significantly affected by this feed supplement.

Cooling losses ranged from 1.06% in group P3 to 1.49% in group P2. After heat treatment by baking, we observed the lowest losses in group P1 (33.18%) and the highest weight losses in group P3 (35.33%). However, from a statistical point of view, these differences were not significant ($P \ge 0.05$).

Table 2 Storage and processing losses of chicken harves	orage and processing losses of chicken halves
--	---

Group	Cooling losses (%)	Freezing losses (%)	Baking losses (%)
С	1.131 ± 0.240	$2.739\pm0.280^{\rm c}$	34.690 ± 1.590
E1	1.346 ± 0.550	3.644 ± 0.680^{ab}	33.181 ± 3.220
E2	1.487 ± 0.770	$3.942\pm0.660^{\rm a}$	34.738 ± 1.880
E3	1.064 ± 0.460	3.246 ± 0.800^{bc}	35.327 ± 4.480
p-value	0.293	0.001	0.442

Legend: mean \pm S.D. (standard deviation); C = control group; E1, E2, E3 = experimental groups with 1, 2 and 3% RGP supplementation; a, b, c = means statistically significant differences between groups (P \leq 0.05)

We observed significant differences ($P \le 0.05$) in freezing losses, when the lowest losses were in the control group (2.74%) compared to experimental groups P1 (3.64%) and P2 (3.94%). Compared to the control group, we observed higher freezing losses in the third experimental group as well.

Authors in other studies mainly focused on drain losses during storage (ability of meat to bind water, respectively) and after heat treatment of chicken meat by its baking. Drainage loss reflects the release of intramuscular components, especially organic osmolytes from muscle tissue (**Bennato et al., 2020**). Losses after heat treatment are caused by evaporation of water and dripping of water and fat. Most of the chicken fat comes from the skin and a small amount of fat adheres as

. .

. . . .

intermuscular fat to the muscle tissue (Gunter and Peter, 2007). Losses during heat treatment of meat are also significantly influenced by the age at slaughter, on which the nutritional composition of the meat depends (Northcutt et al., 2001). In a study by Bennato et al. (2020) was investigated the effect of adding grape pomace in different concentrations (P1 - 2.5, P2 - 5 and P3 - 7%) to the FM of broiler chickens. Drainage loss was significantly lowest (P≤0.05) in the control group (2.30%) compared to experimental groups P2 (2.60%) and P3 (2.89%), which is also consistent with our losses after defreezing chicken halves. Like our results, these authors did not observe significant differences between individual groups after heat treatment. Lee et al. (2008) reported 21.4% loss after cooking fresh chicken breast fillets in a convection oven at 176 °C, which is a lesser loss compared to our defreezed whole carcass halves. Cooking losses can be reduced by special treatments such as wrapping meat with edible films, as reported in a study by Küçüközet and Uslu (2018). Wrapping chicken meat with edible films significantly (P≤0.05) reduced the loss by baking at 200 °C; in the control samples it was 35.27%, while in the coated samples it was about 24.93 - 28.65%.

Selected technological properties of chicken meat

The results of selected technological properties (pH, shear force and meat colour) of breast and thigh meat form broiler chickens fed with supplemental RGP are shown in the Table 3 and 4, respectively.

Group	рН 45min/30 °С	рН 120min/22 °С	Shear force (kg.cm ⁻²)	L*	a*	b*
С	6.352 ± 0.200	5.988 ± 0.170	4.400 ± 0.450	55.873 ± 3.834^{ab}	$\textbf{-1.769} \pm 0.606^{c}$	$8.459 \pm 1.085^{\circ}$
E1	6.166 ± 0.160	6.104 ± 0.390	4.170 ± 0.990	57.623 ± 2.749^{a}	$\text{-}1.506 \pm 0.556^{bc}$	8.820 ± 0.911^{bc}
E2	6.217 ± 0.230	$\boldsymbol{6.000 \pm 0.190}$	3.630 ± 0.910	56.601 ± 3.169^{a}	$\textbf{-1.316} \pm 0.381^{b}$	9.285 ± 0.926^{ab}
E3	6.139 ± 0.220	5.922 ± 0.230	3.950 ± 1.070	53.722 ± 4.152^{b}	$\textbf{-0.879} \pm 0.570^a$	$9.775\pm1.454^{\rm a}$
p-value	0.115	0.482	0.268	0.006	< 0.001	0.002

Legend: mean \pm S.D. (standard deviation); C = control group; E1, E2, E3 = experimental groups with 1, 2 and 3% RGP supplementation; a, b, c = means statistically significant differences between groups (P \leq 0.05)

	Table 4 Technological properties of chicken thigh meat							
рН	pН	Shear force	L*	a*	b*			
45min/30 °C	120min/22 °C	(kg.cm ⁻²)						
$6.308\pm0.120^{\text{b}}$	$6.194\pm0.150^{\text{b}}$	$3.680\pm1.130^{\rm a}$	57.573 ± 5.536^{ab}	$2.397\pm1.260^{\text{c}}$	$12.034\pm1.804^{\texttt{b}}$			
$6.472\pm0.110^{\mathrm{a}}$	$6.403\pm0.130^{\mathrm{a}}$	$3.650\pm1.060^{\mathrm{a}}$	56.814 ± 4.670^{b}	$3.185\pm1.529^{\text{b}}$	$13.272 \pm 1.937^{\rm a}$			
6.370 ± 0.130^{ab}	$6.387\pm0.130^{\mathrm{a}}$	2.520 ± 0.470^{b}	55.365 ± 2.229^{b}	2.622 ± 0.822^{bc}	$11.937 \pm 1.765^{\text{b}}$			
$6.259\pm0.130^{\text{b}}$	$6.186\pm0.140^{\text{b}}$	$3.410\pm1.060^{\rm a}$	$56.184 \pm 3.446^{\text{b}}$	$4.089\pm0.926^{\rm a}$	$13.420 \pm 1.482^{\rm a}$			
0.001	0.003	0.036	0.260	< 0.001	0.010			
	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{45min/30 °C} \\ \hline 6.308 \pm 0.120^{\rm b} \\ \hline 6.472 \pm 0.110^{\rm a} \\ \hline 6.370 \pm 0.130^{\rm ab} \\ \hline 6.259 \pm 0.130^{\rm b} \end{array}$	45min/30 °C 120min/22 °C 6.308 ± 0.120^{b} 6.194 ± 0.150^{b} 6.472 ± 0.110^{a} 6.403 ± 0.130^{a} 6.370 ± 0.130^{ab} 6.387 ± 0.130^{a} 6.259 ± 0.130^{b} 6.186 ± 0.140^{b} 0.001 0.003	45min/30 °C 120min/22 °C (kg.cm ⁻²) 6.308 ± 0.120^{b} 6.194 ± 0.150^{b} 3.680 ± 1.130^{a} 6.472 ± 0.110^{a} 6.403 ± 0.130^{a} 3.650 ± 1.060^{a} 6.370 ± 0.130^{ab} 6.387 ± 0.130^{a} 2.520 ± 0.470^{b} 6.259 ± 0.130^{b} 6.186 ± 0.140^{b} 3.410 ± 1.060^{a} 0.001 0.003 0.036	45min/30 °C 120min/22 °C (kg.cm ²) 6.308 ± 0.120^{b} 6.194 ± 0.150^{b} 3.680 ± 1.130^{a} 57.573 ± 5.536^{ab} 6.472 ± 0.110^{a} 6.403 ± 0.130^{a} 3.650 ± 1.060^{a} 56.814 ± 4.670^{b} 6.370 ± 0.130^{ab} 6.387 ± 0.130^{a} 2.520 ± 0.470^{b} 55.365 ± 2.229^{b} 6.259 ± 0.130^{b} 6.186 ± 0.140^{b} 3.410 ± 1.060^{a} 56.184 ± 3.446^{b} 0.001 0.003 0.036 0.260	45min/30 °C 120min/22 °C (kg.cm ²) 6.308 ± 0.120^{b} 6.194 ± 0.150^{b} 3.680 ± 1.130^{a} 57.573 ± 5.536^{ab} 2.397 ± 1.260^{c} 6.472 ± 0.110^{a} 6.403 ± 0.130^{a} 3.650 ± 1.060^{a} 56.814 ± 4.670^{b} 3.185 ± 1.529^{b} 6.370 ± 0.130^{ab} 6.387 ± 0.130^{a} 2.520 ± 0.470^{b} 55.365 ± 2.229^{b} 2.622 ± 0.822^{bc} 6.259 ± 0.130^{b} 6.186 ± 0.140^{b} 3.410 ± 1.060^{a} 56.184 ± 3.446^{b} 4.089 ± 0.926^{a} 0.001 0.003 0.036 0.260 <0.001			

Legend: mean \pm S.D. (standard deviation); C = control group; E1, E2, E3 = experimental groups with 1, 2 and 3% RGP supplementation; a, b, c = means statistically significant differences between groups (P \leq 0.05)

The pH values in the chicken meat of broiler chickens ranged in the breast muscle from 6.139 (experimental group E3) to 6.352 (control group) after 45 minutes *postmortem* and from 5.922 (experimental group E3) to 6.104 (experimental group E1) after 120 minutes *post mortem*. The differences in pH in the breast muscle were therefore minimal and not statistically significant ($P \ge 0.05$).

In the thigh muscle, we observed the lowest pH after 45 minutes *postmortem* ($P \le 0.05$) in the control group (6.308) and the experimental group E3 with the addition of 3% RGP to the FM (6.259). After 120 minutes *postmortem*, similar results were obtained, as we again observed significantly lower pH ($P \le 0.05$) in the control group (6.194) and group E3 (6.186) compared to the experimental groups E1 (6.403) and E2 (6.387).

The pH of meat after slaughter falls due to the degradation of glycogen and production of lactic acid. It has a profound effect on functional properties and storage quality of meat. The addition of grape industry by-products may change the pH of meat products depending on its source (Apoorva, Suman and Ahlawat 2017). According to Zhang et al. (2005), meat with a high pH (6.10-6.79) has higher functional qualities in terms of water holding capacity, protein solubility, or yield when compared to meat with a normal pH (5.40-5.79). Our breast muscle pH results at 2 h postmortem are comparable to those of Bennato et al. (2020), who added 2.5%, 5% and 7% grape pomace per 1kg of FM of broiler chickens. The authors monitored the pH in the meat samples at the level of 5.88 - 6.05, while the differences between the individual groups were not significant, as was observed in our study with RGP. The use of GP in study of Turcu et al. (2020) in broilers diets led to the significant pH (measured 24 hours postmortem) value decrease (P≤0.05) of thigh meat in experimental groups fed with (5.97 and 6.07, respectively) and 3 and 6% supplemental RGP (5.96 and 6.04, respectively), compared to the control group. Authors did not detect significant differences in pH of breast muscle after RGP supplementation what is coherent with our results. Results achieved by Hassanin et al. (2017) indicated that the minimum and the maximum values of pH in the examined chicken meat samples collected from local commercial retail shops were as follow: breast (5.7 to 5.96) and thigh (5.65 to 5.84), what is lower compared to our results of pH examined after 45 and 120 minutes *postmortem*. Among other poultry species, **Ao and Kim (2020)** observed significantly higher pH in the samples of Pekin duck meat fed with supplemental grape seeds extract.

When evaluating the shear force of roasted chicken meat, we can state that the quality of the breast muscle was not significantly affected in this respect. However, we observed the smallest shearing force and therefore the softest meat in the experimental group E2 (P \ge 0.05) after the addition of 2% RGP to the chickens' diet (3.63 kg.cm⁻²). A lower shear force compared to the control group (4.40 kg.cm⁻²) was also observed in the other experimental groups (P \ge 0.05).

When measuring the shear force in the thigh muscle of Ross 308 broiler chickens, we observed the significantly lowest value (P \leq 0.05) also in group E2 (2.52 kg.cm⁻²) compared to all other groups (C – 3.68, E1 – 3.65, E3 – 3.41 kg.cm⁻²).

Our results of shear force are comparable to cooked chickens breast meat between 12 hours (4.36 kg.cm⁻²) and 24 hours (2.57 kg.cm⁻²) *postmortem* observed by **Li**, **Xu and Zhou (2012). Kumanda et al. (2019)** observed application of differently treated RGP into broiler chickens' diet; differences between experimental groups were not significant and were slightly higher compared to our results ranging around Ø 4.93 kg.cm⁻². Lower shear force was described by **Bobko et al. (2009)** after addition of cinnamon essential oil into broiler chicken diet in amount 0.1, 0.05 and 0.025% ranging from 2.37 to 3.07 kg.cm⁻² in breast muscle and from 1.52 to 2.56 kg.cm⁻² in thigh muscle. Also, lower shear force was described by **Haščík and Kulíšek (2005)** when broilers fed with pure plant-based FM had slightly softer breast (2.71 kg.cm⁻²) and thigh (2.22 kg.cm⁻²) meat compared to those fed with nowadays forbidden FM with meat-bone meal and feed antibiotics (breasts – 2.84 kg.cm⁻² and thighs – 2.34 kg.cm⁻²). Even softer chicken meat was found by **Elimam et al. (2013)** after addition of different amounts of Slovak bee pollen in

their FM, with shear force ranging around \emptyset 1.89 kg.cm⁻² in breast muscle and \emptyset 1.18 kg.cm⁻² in thigh muscle. Other factors also affect the softness of chicken meat; for example, industrial chickens tend to have softer breasts (2.52 kg.cm⁻²) compared to free-range chickens (2.95 kg.cm⁻²) (**da Silva, de Arruda and Gonçalves, 2017**) or thawing before heat treatment, which leads to softer cooked breast fillets (3.06 kg.cm⁻²) compared to unfrozen (3.70 kg.cm⁻²) (**Zhuang and Savage, 2013**).

The color, texture, and general appearance of the meat are a few aspects that draw attention to the shift in meat quality. Meat discolouration is related to the meat's ability to sustain metmyoglobin levels through oxidation and enzymatic reduction processes (Shahidi and Wanasundara, 1996).

Color characteristics were probably the most influenced by selected feed supplement to the broiler chickens FM. In breast muscle, we observed significant differences between experimental groups in all parameters ($P \le 0.05$). Significantly highest lightness was observed in the E1 (57.623) and E2 (56.601) group compared to the E3 group (53.722). Redness of breast meat was significantly lowest in the control group (-1.769) compared to the group supplemented with 3% of RGP (-0.879) and yellowness was also significantly lowest in the control group (8.459) compared to the E3 group (9.775).

In thigh muscle, lightness was not significantly affected (P≥0.05), with minimal differences between experimental groups ranging between 55.365 (E2) and control group (57.573). However, we observed significant differences (P≤0.05) in redness and yellowness. Redness was significantly highest in the group with the 3% RGP supplementation (E3 - 4.089) compared with control group (2.397). Redness was higher also in experimental groups E1 and E2, what is probably associated with natural colorings present in RGP. Although differences in yellowness were significant ($P \le 0.05$), they were minimal, ranging from 11.937 (E2) to 13.420 (E3). Similar color values in breast and thigh muscles were observed by Turcu et al. (2020) after adding 3 and 6% of white and RGP to broiler chicken FM. Compared to our results, the authors found similar L* values. The authors clearly state the highest values of b* (18.21) in breast muscle, respectively a* (7.63) and b* (17.20) in thigh muscle after the addition of 3% RGP, which is in accordance with our results. Regarding the color characteristics of the chicken meat, a* and b* saw considerable (P<0.05) alterations, whereas L* showed no variations in study of Bennato et al. (2020). The use of grape pomace specifically caused an increase in the chromaticity coordinates a* and b*, what is in accordance also with our results. It is remarkable, nonetheless, that none of the broiler chicken groups that consumed the experimental diets (2.5, 5 and 7% of supplemental RGP) showed any appreciable color changes among them.

The samples' levels of sanity are revealed to be higher by the meat lightness decrease (**Bozkurt and Bayram**, **2006**). The most frequent component of hemoglobin, the red color in blood, haem oxidation may be responsible for the increase in meat's yellowness (Sánchez-Alonso and Borderías, 2008). When RGP (2%) was used in chicken burgers, Sáyago-Ayerdi, Brenes and Goñi (2009) analyzed the results and found that the lightness loss was related to the dilution of the meat pigment. The meat samples from the E4 group (7.16), which contained 6% RGP, had the highest value of the total color difference. This information showed that, when compared to the control samples, the meat samples from the E4 group had the most pronounced color differences, which may be related to the anthocyanins in RGP (Jongberg et al., 2011).

The breast meat samples' darker appearance is explained by the fact that the breast meat is primarily made up of white muscle fibers, which have low myoglobin levels, as opposed to red fibers, which have higher myoglobin levels, in the thigh meat (**Barbut**, **Zhang and Macrone**, **2005**). Studies of literature have revealed that the color of the meat has a favorable effect on how consumers perceive it (**Mainente et al.**, **2018**). According to reports, adding 1% of the phenols from grapes to meat improves its redness value, although this is not seen negatively (**Rojas and Brewer**, **2007**).

CONCLUSION

This study was aimed on determination of selected technological properties of meat from Ross 308 broiler chickens fed with supplemental RGP of variety Alibernet to their FM. From the weight loss results, we can conclude a negative effect of the supplementation with RGP to the FM of chickens' halves after defreezing was found, as these were significantly lowest in the control group, which was also confirmed by the study of other authors. Losses by cooling and baking were similar between individual groups and without demonstrable differences. pH of breast meat was not affected, while pH of thigh muscle was significantly different among the experimental groups. It seems like that selected supplement improved softness of muscle compared to control group, when the softest breast and thigh muscle was found after 2% of RGP (E2 group) with the lowest shear force in both breast and thigh meat. The highest observed differences were observed in meat redness and yellowness in both breast and thigh muscle, as we found significantly highest values in group fed with the highest used supplementation of 3% RGP (E3 group), what is probably associated with polyphenols and anthocyanins present in Alibernet RGP. Overall, it seems that selected feed supplement can improve some technological characteristics of chicken meat, as also discussed with other authors.

Acknowledgments: This work was supported with KEGA 034SPU-4/2021 and VEGA 1/0402/23. This work was also supported with Demand-driven research for the sustainable and innovative food, Drive4SIFood 313011V336, cofinanced by the European Regional Development Fund.

REFERENCES

Aditya, S., Ohh, S.-J., Ahammed, M., & Lohakare, J. (2018). Supplementation of grape pomace (*Vitis vinifera*) in broiler diets and its effect on growth performance, apparent total tract digestibility of nutrients, blood profile, and meat quality. *Animal Nutrition*, 4(2), 210–214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aninu.2018.01.004

Alfaia, C. M., Costa, M. M., Lopes, P. A., Pestana, J. M., & Prates, J. A. M. (2022). Use of Grape By-Products to Enhance Meat Quality and Nutritional Value in Monogastrics. *Foods*, 11(18), 2754. MDPI AG. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/foods11182754

Apoorva A., Suman B. & Ahlawat S.S. (2017). Utilization of wine industry waste (Grape pomace) in processed meat products: A review. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*, 6(12): 297-301.

Ao, X., & Kim, I. H. (2019). Effects of dietary lipid sources on growth performance and carcass traits in Pekin ducks. *Poultry Science*. http://dx.doi.org/10.3382/ps/pez558

Averilla, J. N., Oh, J., Kim, H. J., Kim, J. S., & Kim, J.-S. (2019). Potential health benefits of phenolic compounds in grape processing by-products. Food Science and Biotechnology. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10068-019-00628-2</u>

Barbut, S. (2012). Convenience breaded poultry meat products – New developments. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 26(1), 14–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2011.12.007

Barbut, S., Sosnicki, A. A., Lonergan, S. M., Knapp, T., Ciobanu, D. C., Gatcliffe, L. J., ... Wilson, E. W. (2008). Progress in reducing the pale, soft and exudative (PSE) problem in pork and poultry meat. *Meat Science*, 79(1), 46–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2007.07.031

Barbut, S., Zhang, L., & Marcone, M. (2005). Effects of pale, normal, and dark chicken breast meat on microstructure, extractable proteins, and cooking of marinated fillets. Poultry Science, 84(5), 797–802. https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/84.5.797

Bennato, F., Di Luca, A., Martino, C., Ianni, A., Marone, E., Grotta, L., Ramazzotti, S. & Martino, G. (2020). Influence of Grape Pomace Intake on Nutritional Value, Lipid Oxidation and Volatile Profile of Poultry Meat. *Foods*, 9(4), 508. https://doi.org/10.3390/foods9040508

Bianchi, M., Fletcher, D. L., & Smith, D. P. (2005). Physical and functional properties of intact and ground pale broiler breast meat. *Poultry Science*, 84(5), 803–808. <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/84.5.803</u>

Bobko, M., Lagin, L., Bobková, A., Angelovičová, M. & Haščík, P. (2009). Analysis of different cinnamon essantial oil influence on chicken meat quality. Acta fytotechnica et zootechnica, special issue 2009, 47–51.

Bozkurt, H., & Bayram, M. (2006). Colour and textural attributes of sucuk duringripening.MeatScience,73(2),344–350.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2006.01.001

Brenes, A., Viveros, A., Chamorro, S., & Arija, I. (2016). Use of polyphenol-rich grape by-products in monogastric nutrition. A review. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 211, 1–17. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2015.09.016</u>

Da Silva, D. C. F., de Arruda, A. M. V., & Gonçalves, A. A. (2017). Quality characteristics of broiler chicken meat from free-range and industrial poultry system for the consumers. *Journal of Food Science and Technology*, 54(7), 1818–1826. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-017-2612-x

Ebrahimzadeh, S. K., Navidshad, B., Farhoomand, P., & Mirzaei

Aghjehgheshlagh, F. (2018). Effects of grape pomace and vitamin E on

performance, antioxidant status, immune response, gut morphology and

histopathological responses in broiler chickens. *South African Journal of Animal Science*, 48(2), 324. https://doi.org/10.4314/sajas.v48i2.13

Elimam, I. O. E., Haščík, P., Garlík, J., Bobko, M., & Kročko, M. (2013). Sensory evaluation for broiler meat after addition Slovak bee pollen in their feed mixture. Potravinarstvo, 7(1), 107–110. https://doi.org/10.5219/280

Falkovskaya, A., & Gowen, A. (2020). Literature review: spectral imaging applied to poultry products. *Poultry Science*, 99(7), 3709–3722. doi:10.1016/j.psj.2020.04.013

FAO. 2022. Food Outlook – Biannual Report on Global Food Markets. Rome. https://doi.org/10.4060/cb9427en

Francesch, A., & Cartañà, M. (2015). The effects of grape seed in the diet of the Penedes chicken, on growth and on the chemical composition and sensory profile of meat. *British Poultry Science*, 56(4), 477–485. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071668.2015.1062842

Garrido, M. D., Pedauyé, J., Bañon, S., López, M. B., & Laencina, J. (1995). Online methods for pork quality detection. *Food Control*, 6(2), 111–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/0956-7135(95)98915-n

González-Centeno, M. R., Jourdes, M., Femenia, A., Simal, S., Rosselló, C., & Teissedre, P.-L. (2013). Characterization of Polyphenols and Antioxidant Potential of White Grape Pomace Byproducts (*Vitis vinifera* L.). *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 61(47), 11579–11587. <u>https://doi.org/10.1021/jf403168k</u>

Goodson, K. J., Morgan, W. W., Reagan, J. O., Gwartney, B. L., Courington, S. M., Wise, J. W., & Savell, J. W. (2002). Beef customer satisfaction: factors affecting consumer evaluations of clod steaks. *Journal of Animal Science*, 80(2), 401–408. <u>https://doi.org/10.2527/2002.802401x</u>

Gunter, H. & Peter, H. (2007). Meat, fat and other ediblecarcass parts. Available at: www.fao.org/docrep/010/ai407e/AI407E03.htm

Haščík, P., & Kulišek, V. (2005). Influence of different structure complete diets for chickens on tenderness meat of chickens. *Risk factors of food chain 2005. Proceedings of international conference*, 82–86.

Hassanin, F., Mohamed, H. A., Shaltout, F., Shaltout, A., Shawqy, N. & Abd-Elhameed, G. (2017). Chemical criteria of chicken meat. *Benha veterinary medical journal* 33(2). 457-464.

Jongberg, S., Skov, S. H., Tørngren, M. A., Skibsted, L. H., & Lund, M. N. (2011). Effect of white grape extract and modified atmosphere packaging on lipid and protein oxidation in chill stored beef patties. *Food Chemistry*, 128(2), 276–283. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2011.03.015

Jurčaga, L., Bobko, M., Haščík, P., Bobková, A., Demianová, B., Belej, Ľ. & Kročko, M. (2021). Effect of dietary red grape pomace on lipid oxidation in meat of broiler chickens. *Journal of Microbiology, Biotechnology and Food Sciences*, 10(5). https://doi.org/10.15414/jmbfs.3769

Kennedy, O. B., Stewart-Knox, B. J., Mitchell, P. C., & Thurnham, D. I. (2004). Consumer perceptions of poultry meat: a qualitative analysis. *Nutrition & Food Science*, 34(3), 122–129. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/00346650410536746</u>

Küçüközet, A. O., & Uslu, M. K. (2018). Cooking loss, tenderness, and sensoryevaluation of chicken meat roasted after wrapping with edible films. Food ScienceandTechnologyInternational,108201321877654.https://doi.org/10.1177/1082013218776540

Kumanda, C., Mlambo, V., & Mnisi, C. (2019). From Landfills to the Dinner Table: Red Grape Pomace Waste as a Nutraceutical for Broiler Chickens. *Sustainability*, 11(7), 1931. <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/su11071931</u>

Kumar, D., & Kalita, P. (2017). Reducing Postharvest Losses during Storage of Grain Crops to Strengthen Food Security in Developing Countries. *Foods*, 6(1), 8. https://doi.org/10.3390/foods6010008

Lee, S. K., Chon, J. W., Yun, Y. K., Lee, J. C., Jo, C., Song, K. Y., Kim, D. H., Bae, D., Kim, H., Moon, J. S., & Seo, K. H. (2022). Properties of broiler breast meat with pale color and a new approach for evaluating meat freshness in poultry processing plants. *Poultry science*, 101(3), 101627. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psj.2021.101627

Lee, Y. S., Saha, A., Xiong, R., Owens, C. M., & Meullenet, J. F. (2008). Changes in Broiler Breast Fillet Tenderness, Water-Holding Capacity, and Color Attributes during Long-Term Frozen Storage. *Journal of Food Science*, 73(4), E162–E168. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-3841.2008.00734.x

Li, S., Xu, X., & Zhou, G. (2012). The roles of the actin-myosin interaction and proteolysis in tenderization during the aging of chicken muscle. *Poultry Science*, 91(1), 150–160. <u>https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.2011-01484</u>

Mainente, F., Menin, A., Alberton, A., Zoccatelli, G., & Rizzi, C. (2018). Evaluation of the sensory and physical properties of meat and fish derivatives containing grape pomace powders. *International Journal of Food Science & Technology*. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/ijfs.13850</u>

Marangoni F., Corsello G., Cricelli C., Ferrara N., Ghiselli A., Lucchin L., & Poli A. (2015). Role of poultry meat in a balanced diet aimed at maintaining health and wellbeing: an Italian consensus document. *Food & Nutrition Research*, 59. https://doi.org/10.3402/fnr.v59.27606

Northcutt, J. K., Buhr, R. J., Young, L. L., Lyon, C. E., & Ware, G. O. (2001). Influence of Age and Postchill Carcass Aging Duration on Chicken Breast Fillet Quality. *Poultry Science*, 80(6), 808–812. d https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/80.6.808

OECD/FAO (2021), OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2021-2030, FAO, Rome/OECD Publishing, Paris.

Petracci, M., Betti, M., Bianchi, M., & Cavani, C. (2004). Color variation and characterization of broiler breast meat during processing in Italy. *Poultry Science*, 83(12), 2086–2092. https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/83.12.2086

Qiao, M., Fletcher, D. L., Smith, D. P., & Northcutt, J. K. (2001). The Effect of Broiler Breast Meat Color on pH, Moisture, Water-Holding Capacity, and Emulsification Capacity. *Poultry Science*, 80(5), 676–680. https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/80.5.676

Reyes, P., Urquiaga, I., Echeverría, G., Durán, E., Morales, M. S., & Valenzuela, C. (2020). Wine grape pomace flour in broiler diets effects growth and some meat characteristics. *Animal Production Science*, 60(9), 1210. https://doi.org/10.1071/an19385

Rojas, M. C., & Brewer, M. (2007). Effect of Natural Antioxidants on Oxidative Stability of Cooked, Refrigerated Beef and Pork. Journal of Food Science, 72(4), S282–S288. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-3841.2007.00335.x</u>

Romero, C., Nardoia, M., Brenes, A., Arija, I., Viveros, A., & Chamorro, S. (2021). Combining Grape Byproducts to Maximise Biological Activity of Polyphenols in Chickens. *Animals*, 11(11), 3111. MDPI AG. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ani11113111

Ruiz-Moreno, M. J., Raposo, R., Cayuela, J. M., Zafrilla, P., Piñeiro, Z., Moreno-Rojas, J. M., ... Cantos-Villar, E. (2015). Valorization of grape stems. *Industrial Crops and Products*, 63, 152–157. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2014.10.016</u>

Sánchez-Alonso, I., & Borderías, A. J. (2008). Technological effect of red grape antioxidant dietary fibre added to minced fish muscle. *International Journal of Food Science & Technology*, 43(6), 1009–1018. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2621.2007.01554.x</u>

Sáyago-Ayerdi, S. G., Brenes, A., & Goñi, I. (2009). Effect of grape antioxidant dietary fiber on the lipid oxidation of raw and cooked chicken hamburgers. *LWT* - *Food* Science and Technology, 42(5), 971–976. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2008.12.006

Shahidi, F., & Wanasundara, U. N. (1996). Methods for Evaluation of the Oxidative Stability of Lipid-Containing Foods. *Food Science and Technology International, Tokyo*, 2(2), 73–81. <u>https://doi.org/10.3136/fsti9596t9798.2.73</u>

Szczesniak, A. S., Brandt, M. A., & Friedman, H. H. (1963). Development of Standard Rating Scales for Mechanical Parameters of Texture and Correlation Between the Objective and the Sensory Methods of Texture Evaluation. *Journal of Food Science*, 28(4), 397–403. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-</u>2621.1963.tb00217.x

Teixeira, A., Baenas, N., Dominguez-Perles, R., Barros, A., Rosa, E., Moreno, D., & Garcia-Viguera, C. (2014). Natural Bioactive Compounds from Winery By-Products as Health Promoters: A Review. International *Journal of Molecular Sciences*, 15(9), 15638–15678. <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms150915638</u>

Tekeli, A., RuStu Kutlu, H. & L. Celik. (2014). Dietary Inclusion of Grape Seed Oil in Functional Broiler Meat Production. *Bulgarian Journal of Agricultural Science*, 20(4), 924-932.

Trembecká, L., Haščík, P., Čuboň, J., Bobko, M., Cviková, P., & Hleba, L. (2017). Chemical And Sensory Characteristics Of Chicken Breast Meat After Dietary Supplementation With Probiotic Given In Combination With Bee Pollen And Propolis. *Journal of Microbiology, Biotechnology and Food Sciences*, 7(3), 275–280. https://doi.org/10.15414/jmbfs.2017/18.7.3.275-280

Turcu, R. P., Panaite, T. D., Untea, A. E., Soica, C., Iuga, M., & Mironeasa, S. (2020). Effects of Supplementing Grape Pomace to Broilers Fed Polyunsaturated Fatty Acids Enriched Diets on Meat Quality. *Animals*, 10(6), 947. https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10060947

Turcu, R., Olteanu, M., Criste, R., Panaite, T., Ropotă, M., Vlaicu, P., & Drăgotoiu, D. (2019). Grapeseed Meal Used as Natural Antioxidant in High Fatty Acid Diets for Hubbard Broilers. *Brazilian Journal of Poultry Science*, 21(2). https://doi.org/10.1590/1806-9061-2018-0886

U-chupaj, J., Malila, Y., Gamonpilas, C., Kijroongrojana, K., Petracci, M., Benjakul, S., & Visessanguan, W. (2017). Differences in textural properties of cooked caponized and broiler chicken breast meat. *Poultry Science*, 96(7), 2491–2500. <u>https://doi.org/10.3382/ps/pex006</u>

Woelfel, R. L., Owens, C. M., Hirschler, E. M., Martinez-Dawson, R., & Sams, A. R. (2002). The characterization and incidence of pale, soft, and exudative broiler meat in a commercial processing plant. *Poultry Science*, 81(4), 579–584. https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/81.4.579

Yu, J., & Ahmedna, M. (2012). Functional components of grape pomace: their composition, biological properties and potential applications. International Journal of Food Science & Technology, 48(2), 221–237. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2621.2012.03197.x</u>

Zhang, S. X., Farouk, M. M., Young, O. A., Wieliczko, K. J., & Podmore, C. (2005). Functional stability of frozen normal and high pH beef. *Meat Science*, 69(4), 765–772. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2004.11.009</u>

Zhuang, H., & Savage, E. M. (2013). Comparison of cook loss, shear force, and sensory descriptive profiles of boneless skinless white meat cooked from a frozen or thawed state. *Poultry Science*, 92(11), 3003–3009. https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.2012-02801