

()

10

16 12

()

90 75 60 45 30 15 0

2 ± 18-

(R.L.S.D)

(p<0.05)

(p<0.05)

(F.F.A)

(TVN)

30 15 0

(p<0.05)

90 75 60 45

)

()

(

(%6)

.(Bessei & Nyword, 2002)

(1982)

)

(1989

(Pingel *et al.*, 1992)

.(Willenberg & Hughen, 1997)

.(1986)

(Penner, 1990) (6)

(Inoue & Ishikawa, 2000)

.(Schmutz & Hoyle, 1999)

()

20

10 16 12

- . - -

()

10

90 75 60 45 30 15

()

2± 18-

(90 75 60 45 30 15 ())

(TVN) (Total Volatile Nitrogen TVN)

.Egan *et al.*(1988)

()

5

pye-Unicum

pH-Meter

5

100

.Attken *et al.* (1962)

(WHC) Water Holding Capacity :

()

.A.O.A.C (1980)

Acid Value

2 /

() (.F.F.A)

.Egan *et al.* (1988)

(SPSS)

(p<0.05)

R.L.S.D

.(2000)

(TVN) (Total Volatil Nitrogen)

(1)

P<0.05

100 /

13.77

100 /

10.02

()

P<0.05

(TVN)

100 /

9.8 8.8

10.5 9.8

14 11.5 16.8 13

100/

P<0.05

/

9.72

0

100 /

13.82

100

90

(1)

(TVN)

9.72	9.8	8.8	10.5	9.8	() (0)
10.32	10	9	11.9	10.4	(15)
11.17	10.4	9.5	13.3	11.5	(30)
11.82	11.4	10	14	11.9	(45)
12.67	13.3	10.5	14.05	12.4	(60)
13.22	13.8	10.9	15.4	12.8	(75)
13.82	14	11.5	16.8	13	(90)
11.82	11,81	10.02	13.77	11.68	

R.L.S.D

(P>0.05) 0.0033 =

(P>0.05) 0.0033 =

.(P>0.05) 0.0033=

(2)

5.9 6.1 5.63 6.17

P<0.05

15 0 P<0.05

30

5.55 5.85 5.4 5.8

90

45 30 :

75 60 45 30 15 0) 90 75 60

90 15 P<0.05

90 0

(2)

5.93	5.85	6.07	5.62	6.2	(0)
5.81	5.75	5.9	5.45	6.15	(15)
5.65	5.55	5.85	5.4	5.8	(30)
5.93	5.9	6.15	5.5	6.2	(45)
6.03	6	6.17	5.75	6.21	(60)
6.09	6.1	6.25	5.8	6.22	(75)
6.2	6.15	6.3	5.9	6.45	(90)
5.95	5.9	6.1	5.63	6.17	

R.L.S.D

(N.S) =

(P>0.05) 0.321=

(P>0.05) 0.33 =

(3)

P<0.05

%6.89 6.99 6.62 6.66

P<0.05

90

% 8.05 8.2 8 7.6

30 % 6.2 6 5.4 6.15

5

.P<0.05

90 75

.P<0.05

(3)

()

6.3	6	6.15	6.05	7	() (0)
6.28	6.4	6.26	6.1	6.37	(15)
6.93	6.2	6	5.4	6.15	(30)
6.38	6.82	7.05	6.5	5.15	(45)
7.06	7.02	7.2	7.05	7	(60)
7.6	7.75	8.07	7.25	7.35	(75)
7.96	8.05	8.2	8	7.6	(90)
6.79	6.89	6.99	6.62	6.66	

R.L.S.D

(N.S) =

(P>0.05) 0.495 =

(P>0.05) 0.52 =

(5)

% 0.124

P<0.05

% 0.08

(1986)

P<0.05

0.08 0.14

90 % 0.09 0.17

% 0.11 P<0.05

% 0.1 0

75

90

30 15 0

(4)

0.08	0.08	0.09	0.07	0.08	() (0)
0.08	0.08	0.10	0.07	0.08	(15)
0.09	0.08	0.11	0.07	0.09	(30)
0.09	0.09	0.12	0.08	0.09	(45)
0.08	0.09	0.13	0.08	0.11	(60)
0.16	0.09	0.15	0.08	0.13	(75)
0.11	0.09	0.17	0.08	0.14	(90)
0.10	0.09	0.12	0.08	0.10	

R.L.S.D

(P>0.05) 0.0099 =

(P>0.05) 0.0099 =

(P>0.05) 0.0099=

- (1982)
- (2000)
- (1986)
- (1989)
- A.O.A.C. (Association of Official Analytical Chemists) 1980. Official methods of analysis, 13th ed. Washington.
- Attkin, A., Casey, C.J., penny, I.F. and Volye, C.A. 1962. Effect of drying temperature in the accelerated freeze-dried pork. *J. Agric.* 13: 439.
- Bessie, B. and Nyword, A. 2002. Waterfowl production some general aspect proc. Of the FAO Eperp con sultion. *Bigium*, 25-32.
- Egan, H., Kirk, R. and Sawger, R. 1988. Pearson's chemical analysis of foods-8th ed., Longman scientific and technical, 591p.
- Inoue, C. and Ishikawa, M. 2000. The contribution of water to the specific heat change at the glass to-Rubber transition of the ternary system BSA- water- NaCl. *J. Food Sci.*, 65: 1-7.
- Penner, K. 1990. Refrigerator /F. Kansas state University cooperative Extension\ service\ and U.S.\ reezing-Approximate\ storage\ times Department of Agriculture. Publication. In Kendal, P and Diamond, N. 2003. Food storage for safety and quality. No. 9.310. Food and Nutrition series, Colorado state University cooperative Extension. Reviewed 1/2003. File from Internet www.ext.colostate.edu.
- Pingel, H., Schneider, K.H., Klemmr and Knustv. 1992. Recent problem of breeding and production of waterfowl with high carcass and meat quality qth Inter. Symp. On water fouhpisa, Italy, 17-32.

-
- Schmutz, P.H. and Hoyle, E.H. 1999. Freezing meat and seafood Clemson University, Extension Bulletin HGIC 3064. File from Internet on 25 / 9 / 2003. File: //A:\ HGLC, 3064.
- Willenberg, B.J. and Hughes, K.V. 1997. Quality for keeps- freezing, poultry, fish, eggs, and dairy products. Human environmental sciences publication GH1504- Reviewed 15/7/ 1997. File from Internet on 14/ 9/ 2003. File : //A:\ GH 1504 %20 Quality %20 For %20 Keeps %20 %20 Freezing %20 Meat %20 poultry.

The effect of freezing Storage on TheChemical and physical composition of meat of Male Duck and Goose

Saher Sabih George

Munir A. Jasim

Food Science and Biotechnology-Coll. of Agr. –Univ. of Basrah-Iraq

Abstract

A Study was carried out on male Duck and Geese at age 12 and 16 weeks respectively carcasses were slaughtered and the feathers were removed and intestines were taken off, then they were cut in to main cuttings leg and breast and warpped by polyethylen.A study was then made on the chemical and physical properties were followed for frozen meat leg and Goose in both ducks and geese at - 18 ± 2 C° for 0.15, 30.45, 60, 75, and 90 days and the results were analyzed statistically to determine the effect of meat type (source), period of storage and the interference among them on the a mean value by adapting R.L.S.D. at $P < 0.05$. there was a significant increase at level $P < 0.05$ in total volatile nitrogen and free fatty acid with increasing the frozen storage period the means dropped significantly at level $P < 0.05$ through out these periods 0.15 and 30 days of frozen storage then they storted to increase significantly at level $P < 0.05$ at periods 45, 60, 75 and 90 days by freezing storage for both pH and Water Holding Capacity, while there were no significant differences on pH and Water Holding Capacity depending on the meat type for leg and breast for duck and geese.