

Modelling the effects of pecan nut [*Carya illinoinensis* (Wangenh.) K.Koch], roselle (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* L.), and salt on the quality characteristics of beef patties

¹Pérez-Báez, A. J., ¹*Valenzuela-Melendres, M., ¹Camou, J. P., ²Viuda-Martos, M., ¹González-Ríos, H., ³Ayala-Zavala, J. F., ³González-Aguilar, G. and ¹Peña-Ramos, A.

 ¹Centro de Investigación en Alimentación y Desarrollo, A.C. Coordinación de Tecnología de Alimentos de Origen Animal, Carretera Gustavo Enrique Astiazarán Rosas No. 46, Hermosillo, Sonora, 83304, México
 ²IPOA Research Group, AgroFood Technology Department, Miguel Hernandez University, Orihuela, Spain
 ³Centro de Investigación en Alimentación y Desarrollo, A.C. Coordinación de Tecnología de Alimentos de Origen Vegetal, Carretera Gustavo Enrique Astiazarán Rosas No. 46, Hermosillo, Sonora, 83304, México

Article history

<u>Abstract</u>

Received: 9 April 2021 Received in revised form: 14 February 2022 Accepted: 12 March 2022

Keywords

functional meat product, non-conventional ingredient, meat product quality The meat industry has become increasingly interested in developing products containing new ingredients oriented to consumers' health. Health benefits are gained from frequent consumption of pecan nut and roselle, which can therefore be used as ingredients in meat product formulations. However, incorporating novel ingredients or reducing the content of traditional ingredients might affect meat product quality, thus needs to be evaluated and optimised for the development of functional foods. The objective of the present work was to assess how pecan nut (0 to 10%), roselle (0 to 2%), and salt (0 to 2%) affect the physicochemical properties, antioxidant, and sensory characteristics of beef patties, and use response surface methodology to optimise the content of these ingredients in a meat product formulation. Regression models were developed to predict quality properties. All models were significant (p < 0.05) with an $R^2 > 0.85$ and a nonsignificant lack of fit (p >0.05), thus indicating that these models could adequately predict response variables. The optimised formulation was 7.97% pecan nut, 1.59% roselle, and 1.08% salt. The predicted physicochemical properties were $L^* = 42.88$, $a^* = 12.29$, $b^* = 8.51$, pH = 5.10, and cooking loss = 24.66%; the antioxidant properties were DPPH = 0.53 mg TE/g fp, ABTS = 0.65 mg TE/g fp, and total phenolic content = 0.46 mg GA/g fp; and the sensory properties were flavour = 7.03, tenderness = 6.98, and juiciness = 7.01. Pecan nut and roselle are promising natural ingredients that can be used to prepare low-salt beef patties.

DOI

https://doi.org/10.47836/ifrj.29.5.16

Introduction

Modern life has facilitated changes in human activities that have resulted in increased levels of stress and sedentarism, as well as changes in traditional patterns of healthy food consumption (Chaput *et al.*, 2011). These changes have considerably affected health status, causing an increase in several diseases such as obesity, cardiovascular diseases, diabetes, and cancers (Lacombe *et al.*, 2019). The increase in the prevalence of these diseases has alarmed individuals who are concerned about their health, and who are willing to modify their present lifestyle. Health awareness motivates consumers to take care of their eating habits through the effective selection of © All Rights Reserved

traditional foods and to seek novel products containing ingredients that could promote health (Tuorila and Hartmann, 2020).

Beef patties are an excellent source of proteins with high biological value, essential fatty acids, vitamins, and minerals. Increased use in fast food establishments, along with convenience and low price have made beef patties one of the most popular processed meat products (Van Loo et al., 2020). In addition, beef patties have become a primary product for supermarkets, fast food distributors, and restaurants worldwide. However, as beef patties are a processed meat product, their consumption has been with cardiovascular diseases associated and colorectal cancer, mainly due to the saturated fat, cholesterol, and salt content of beef patties (Richi et

al., 2015). The meat industry, in an effort to respond to new health-oriented markets, has been seeking bioactive ingredients that can be integrated into traditional formulations (Calderón-Oliver and López-Hernández, 2020). This direction represents a challenge for the meat industry because novel products must comply with all the quality aspects demanded by consumers. The incorporation of nonconventional ingredients into a meat formulation affects the physicochemical, sensory, and nutritional qualities of the new product. Maintaining the quality aspects of a novel product close to those of the traditional counterparts is the first step in developing alternative foods to improve nutrition. The incorporation of bioactive ingredients or the reduction of saturated fats and salt in a meat formulation are the most common strategies for developing functional meat products. Other strategies include the incorporation of fibre (Park et al., 2020), natural antioxidants (Antonini et al., 2020), and polyunsaturated fatty acids (Pintado and Cofrades, 2020) or the reduction of saturated fats and sodium (de Sousa et al., 2020).

Pecan nut [Carya illinoinensis (Wangenh.) K.Koch] and roselle (Hibiscus sabdariffa L.) are among the ingredients having potential application in meat products. The consumption of these ingredients has been widely demonstrated in the scientific literature to provide several health benefits (Tazoho et al., 2016; McKay et al., 2018). Pecan nut is rich in unsaturated fatty acids, phenols, flavonoids, isoflavones, terpenes, and vitamins (Alasalvar and Bolling, 2015). Epidemiological studies show that frequent consumption of dry fruits, especially pecan nuts, is inversely correlated with cardiovascular diseases (Aune et al., 2016). Reyes-Padilla et al. (2018) evaluated the quality of a bologna-type meat product designed for elderly individuals which incorporated pecan nut as a source of unsaturated fatty acids in combination with prunes or cranberries. The product contained high quantity of proteins, low total fat content with high monounsaturated fatty acid contents, and bioactive compounds with antioxidant effects.

Roselle is an excellent source of antioxidants, fibres, vitamins, minerals, and phytochemicals (Jabeur *et al.*, 2017). However, there have been few reports on the application of roselle in meat products. Jung and Joo (2013) optimised a combination of soybean oil and roselle extract to create a low-fat functional patty intended for industrial application.

Incorporating 0.85% roselle extract into a pork patty resulted in a product with a high sensory acceptance, and suitable physicochemical properties. Similarly, Babatunde and Adewumi (2015) evaluated the quality attributes of chicken patties by adding ethanolic extracts of garlic, ginger, and roselle. The extracts provided antioxidant and antimicrobial benefits during cold storage.

Before pecan nut and roselle can be used as non-conventional ingredients in novel meat products, it is necessary to determine how these substances affect the final product quality. Response surface methodology (RSM) is a common technique used to assess the impact of using novel ingredients in meat formulations. This tool can be used to simultaneously evaluate several factors and assess linear, quadratic, and interaction effects. RSM has been used successfully in the development of novel meat products. Pérez-Báez et al. (2020) optimised the incorporation of roselle, potato peel flour, and beef fat into beef patties using RSM. Romero et al. (2019) used RSM to optimise the contents of corn starch and whey protein concentrate in a beef patty to improve the lipid profile and cooking properties. Therefore, the objectives of the present work were to evaluate the effects of pecan nut, roselle, and salt incorporation on the quality of beef patties, and to use RSM to determine the optimal combination of these components.

Materials and methods

Raw materials

Beef inside round muscle (semimembranosus) from commercial crossbred steer (3/4 *Bos taurus*) carcasses (pH 5.6 - 5.8) were purchased 48 h post-slaughter from a local market. The fresh meat (73% moisture, 5% lipids, 20% protein, and 1% ash) was transported to the laboratory under refrigerated conditions within 15 min of purchase, cut into 5×5 pieces, and ground in a Hobart meat grinder (Model 4152, Troy, Ohio, USA) using a 4.8-mm plate.

Roselle, pecan nut (Kirkland Signature, Costco Wholesale Corporation, Issaquah, WA, USA), and salt (Salt Bay®, Mexico) were acquired from a local market. The whole dry flower of roselle was used to preserve the active ingredients in as natural a state as possible, and eliminate further processing steps. Roselle (13% moisture, 0.3% lipids, 4.6% protein, 10.2% ash, and 71.9% carbohydrates by difference) and pecan nut (2.8% moisture, 81.8% lipids, 8.5% protein, 1.4% ash, and 5.5% carbohydrates by difference) were ground separately in a food processor (NutriBullet NUBPT0101, Los Angeles, CA, USA), vacuum packed, and stored at -20°C until further use.

Experimental design

The effects and interactions of pecan nut (0.0, 2.03, 5.0, 7.97, and 10.0%), roselle (0.0, 0.41, 1.0, 1.59, and 2.0%), and salt (0.0, 0.41, 1.0, 1.59, and 2.0%) on the beef patty quality were evaluated using a central composite design (CCD) matrix. The maximum levels of the independent variables were determined by preliminary studies. The experimental design consisted of 20 formulations as specified in Table 1. The quality was evaluated in terms of (a) physicochemical indexes (L^* , a^* , b^* , pH, and the cooking loss), (b) the antioxidant capacity (DPPH, ABTS) and total phenolic content, and (c) sensory properties (flavour, tenderness, and juiciness). All assessments were performed on fresh patties, except for the cooking loss and sensory analyses. Two replicates of the complete experimental set were conducted, where three patties were analysed per formulation for each replicate, such that a total of six patties were used for each evaluation.

Beef patty preparation

The ground meat was divided into 20 experimental batches. Roselle, pecan nut, and salt were separately added to each batch based on the percentages specified in Table 1. Each batch was homogenised in a manual mixer (LEM Products, West Chester, OH, USA) for 3 min in a 10°C cold room. Portions weighing 70 g were formed into patties using a manual patty-forming machine. The patties were cooked following a standard procedure (AMSA, 1995) in an electric pan set at 150°C (George Foreman, Model GR2121P, Florida, USA) until the temperature in the centre of the patty reached 71°C (monitored through a thermocouple inserted into the centre of the sample).

Physicochemical properties

Instrumental colour was analysed in triplicate on the surface of the fresh patties using a Minolta spectrophotometer (Model CR-400, D65 illuminate, 10° observer angle and 11-mm aperture; Konica Minolta Sensing, Inc., Tokyo, Japan). The lightness (L^*) , redness (a^*) , and yellowness (b^*) were determined following CIE (Commission Internationals de l'Eclairage) colour coordinates. The pH (Hanna, Model HI 98140, and Woonsocket, RI, USA) was determined at room temperature for a 5-g uncooked patty sample homogenised in 45 mL of distilled water.

To measure the cooking loss (CL), the beef patties were cooked, cooled at room temperature $(25^{\circ}C)$, dried with a paper towel to remove excess moisture and fat, and the percentage of CL was calculated using Eq. 1:

%
$$CL = \frac{(Raw weight-Cooked weight)}{(Raw weight)} \times 100$$
 (Eq. 1)

Antioxidant capacity and total phenolics Extract preparation

Beef-patty extracts were prepared according to Pérez-Báez *et al.* (2020). Briefly, 10 g of each sample were homogenised with 20 mL of 80% ethanol solution (Ultra Tura® T25 basic homogenizer, IKA Works, Wilmington, NC), sonicated for 15 min (Bransonic Ultrasonic Co., Danbury, CT), and centrifuged at 10,000 g for 15 min at 4°C (Thermo ScientificTM SorvallTM LegendTM X1 Thermo, MA, USA). The supernatant was collected, adjusted to a volume of 50 mL with 80% ethanol solution, and stored at -35°C until use.

1,1-Diphenyl-2-picrylhydrazyl radical (DPPH) radical scavenging assay

A DPPH assay was performed following the method reported by Palafox-Carlos *et al.* (2012) with some modifications. Briefly, an aliquot of the rawbeef-patty extract (20 μ L) was mixed with 280 μ L of a DPPH solution (0.0634 mM in methanol), and vortexed vigorously for 1 min. The mixture was stored in the dark at 25°C for 30 min. The absorbance was measured at 515 nm using a Fluorstar Omega UV/Visible microplate reader spectrophotometer (BMG Labtech Inc., Durham, NC, USA). A standard Trolox curve was prepared for quantification, and the results were expressed as mg of Trolox equivalent (TE) per gram of uncooked (fresh) patty (mg TE/g fp).

2,2'-Azino-bis-3-ethylbenzthiazoline-6-sulfonic acid (ABTS) assay

An ABTS assay was performed following the method reported by Re *et al.* (1999) with some modifications. Briefly, 5 mL of ABTS solution (7 mM) were mixed with 88 μ L of K₂S₂O₈ (0.139 mM),

Runs Combination Antioxidant property Sensory property X X X X Lightness Refiness Veloce Physicochemical determination Antioxidant property Sensory property 1 203 0.41 0.41 42.34 14.99 10.49 5.53 23.16 0.260 0.341 7.41 7.97 8" 2 7.97 0.41 0.41 13.31 9.27 5.48 0.46 0.218 0.41 7.97 8" 7.99 7.99 7.93 8" 5.50 5.53 2.312 0.46 0.571 7.99 8.8 5.50 0.536 0.41 7.97 8.8 5.50 0.500 0.537 5.59 5.50		L	Treatment	t					Exper	Experimental response	esponse				
Xi Xo Xi Lightness Redness Velowness pH CL DPH AFTS TPC Flavour Tenderness 2.03 0.41 0.41 37.07 13.31 9.27 5.45 19.64 0.397 0.397 0.397 7.09 7.97 0.41 0.41 37.07 13.31 9.277 5.45 19.64 0.260 0.341 7.41 7.97 2.03 0.41 1.59 3.927 11.67 6.94 5.15 31.27 0.409 7.09 5.69 7.13 7.97 7.97 1.59 1.59 1.54 1.53 5.42 20.66 0.414 5.91 6.57 7.97 1.59 1.59 1.59 1.167 6.94 5.15 3.23 0.498 7.33 7.99 6.56 6.56 6.56 6.56 6.56 6.56 6.56 6.56 6.56 6.56 6.56 6.56 6.56 6.56 6.56 6.56<	Run*	CO	mbinatic	ų	PI	hysicochemi	cal determina	tion		Antiox	dant pro	perty		ensory proper	ty
2.03 0.41 0.41 4.234 14.90 10.49 5.53 2.316 0.246 0.397 0.359 7.15 7.09 7.97 0.41 0.41 37.07 13.31 9.27 5.45 19.64 0.218 0.260 0.341 7.41 7.97 2.03 0.41 1.59 0.41 1.59 0.41 5.05 0.414 5.91 6.26 7.97 159 0.41 1.59 0.426 1.157 0.461 0.502 0.414 5.91 6.59 7.97 159 0.41 1.59 0.426 11.123 5.42 20.65 0.260 0.517 0.393 6.46 7.13 7.97 159 1.59 42.52 12.31 8.16 5.36 0.560 0.446 7.28 6.83 6.83 6.83 6.83 6.83 6.83 6.83 6.83 6.83 6.83 6.83 6.83 6.83 6.83 6.83 6.83 6.83		\mathbf{X}_{1}	\mathbf{X}_2	X ₃	Lightness	Redness	Yellowness	μd	CL	HddQ	ABTS	TPC	Flavour	Tenderness	Juiciness
7.970.410.4137.0713.319.275.4519.640.2180.2600.3417.417.972.031.590.411.5939.2711.676.945.1531.270.4610.5020.4145.916.272.030.411.5939.2711.676.945.1531.270.4610.5020.4145.916.297.970.411.5942.6814.6211.235.4220.650.2600.5170.3998.077.417.970.411.591.591.591.591.591.591.596.826.827.970.411.591.591.591.598.485.0326.400.5170.3998.077.417.971.591.591.591.598.485.032.640.7050.4467.286.827.971.01.01.01.01.01.01.01.01.01.07.318.155.162.370.3386.366.827.971.991.591.591.598.465.112.3550.4070.4467.286.417.971.01.01.01.04.30617.065.350.4400.3826.666.827.971.01.01.01.061.061.0670.4467.386.417.085.01.01.01.1665.16 <t< td=""><td>1</td><td>2.03</td><td>0.41</td><td>0.41</td><td>42.34</td><td>14.99</td><td>10.49</td><td>5.53</td><td>23.16</td><td>0.246</td><td>0.397</td><td>0.359</td><td>7.15</td><td>7.09</td><td>7.49</td></t<>	1	2.03	0.41	0.41	42.34	14.99	10.49	5.53	23.16	0.246	0.397	0.359	7.15	7.09	7.49
2.031.590.4140.651.2377.035.0534.410.4500.5060.4145.916.272.030.411.5939.2711.676.945.1531.270.4610.5020.4156.867.137.971.590.4147.0913.8611.595.592.2370.3380.4988.077.417.970.411.594.4.6211.235.4220.650.5070.5370.3988.077.412.031.591.591.591.591.591.591.591.595.360.5670.5670.5370.5686.827.971.591.591.591.591.591.538.165.165.360.5610.4137.417.971.591.591.591.591.539.765.232.9460.5610.6676.827.971.01.04.3.9113.319.765.232.9460.5676.396.417.001.01.04.3.9113.319.765.722.3350.4070.6677.326.417.001.01.04.3.9113.319.765.732.3950.4400.5877.326.417.011.01.04.1.0711.627.755.390.5686.386.495.01.01.00.4411.04.1.0711.627.570.3600.440	7	7.97	0.41	0.41	37.07	13.31	9.27	5.45	19.64	0.218	0.260	0.341	7.41	7.97	8.15
2.03 0.41 1.59 39.27 11.67 6.94 5.15 31.27 0.461 0.502 0.415 6.86 7.13 7.97 1.59 0.41 47.09 13.86 11.59 5.59 2.537 0.338 0.498 0.409 7.09 6.59 7.97 0.41 1.59 4.268 14.62 11.23 5.42 20.65 0.260 0.517 0.399 8.07 7.41 2.03 1.59 1.59 4.52 12.89 8.48 5.03 26.34 0.530 0.603 0.368 6.36 6.82 7.97 1.59 1.59 4.26 12.31 8.16 5.16 23.68 0.540 0.705 0.446 7.28 6.9 0 1.0 1.0 1.0 36.34 11.62 6.72 5.26 29.46 0.281 0.402 0.367 6.39 6.82 10.0 1.0 1.0 4.3.91 13.31 9.76 5.27 23.95 0.407 0.617 0.442 7.32 6.41 5.0 0 1.0 4.107 11.62 7.57 5.07 25.59 0.771 0.687 0.565 6.8 6.99 5.0 1.0 0 4.4.75 12.90 8.85 5.40 25.0 0.440 0.387 6.39 6.83 6.46 5.0 1.0 2.0 4.048 12.70 8.55 5.20 23.72 0.360 0.451 7.32 7.5 5.0 1.0 1.0 4.1.97 11.62 7.57 5.07 25.59 0.771 0.687 0.565 6.8 6.99 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.30 13.65 9.57 5.07 25.03 0.341 7.77 7.73 7.75 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.30 13.65 9.57 5.02 23.72 0.360 0.441 7.77 7.73 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.30 13.65 9.57 5.20 23.72 0.360 0.411 7.77 7.73 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.30 13.65 9.57 5.22 23.47 0.381 0.367 0.302 7.37 7.46 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.30 13.65 9.57 5.22 23.47 0.381 0.367 0.327 7.46 7.19 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.30 13.65 9.57 5.22 23.47 0.381 0.376 0.327 7.45 7.46 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.30 13.65 9.57 2.32 23.47 0.318 0.376 0.327 7.45 7.46 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.30 13.65 9.57 2.32 23.47 0.318 0.376 0.327 7.45 7.45 7.46 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.30 13.65 9.57 2.32 23.47 0.318 0.376 0.327 7.45 7.46 7.19 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.30 13.65 9.57 2.32 23.47 0.338 0.340 7.3 7.45 7.46 7.19 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.30 13.65 9.57 2.32 23.47 0.338 0.340 7.3 7.45 7.46 7.19 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.30 13.65 9.57 2.32 24.79 0.318 0.376 0.327 7.45 7.46 7.19 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.30 13.65 9.57 2.32 24.70 0.318 0.368 0.390 7.3 7.45 7.46 7.19 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.30 13.65 9.57 2.32 24.70 0.318 0.376 0.327 7.35 7.46 7.19 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.30 13.65 9.57 2.32 24.70 0.318 0.376 0.327 7.46 7.19 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.30 13.65 9.57 2.32 24.70 0.318 0.376 0.327 7.46 7.19 7.34 7.46 7.19 7.34 7.46 7.19 7.34 7.46 7.46 7.46 7.46 7.46 7.46 7.46 7.4	ю	2.03	1.59	0.41	40.65	12.37	7.03	5.05	34.41	0.459	0.506	0.414	5.91	6.27	5.78
7.97 1.59 0.41 47.09 13.86 11.59 5.59 2.2.37 0.338 0.409 7.09 6.59 7.97 0.41 1.59 42.68 14.62 11.23 5.42 20.65 0.260 0.517 0.399 8.07 7.41 2.03 1.59 1.59 42.66 12.31 8.16 5.16 23.68 0.540 0.705 0.446 7.28 6.9 7.97 1.59 1.59 42.50 11.62 6.72 5.52 29.46 0.281 0.402 0.367 6.39 6.82 0 1.0 1.0 43.91 13.31 9.76 5.23 0.407 0.617 0.442 7.32 6.41 5.0 1.0 1.0 13.31 9.76 5.23 0.407 0.617 0.42 7.3 6.41 7.73 5.0 0 1.0 1.0 13.16 5.50 0.530 0.403 7.53 6.41 7.73	4	2.03	0.41	1.59	39.27	11.67	6.94	5.15	31.27	0.461	0.502	0.415	6.86	7.13	7.17
7.970.411.5942.6814.6211.235.4220.650.2600.5170.3998.077.412.031.591.591.5944.5212.898.485.0326.340.5300.6030.3886.366.827.971.591.591.591.5942.5612.318.165.1623.680.5400.7050.4467.286.901.01.01.036.3411.626.725.2723.950.4070.6170.4427.326.415.001.01.043.9113.319.765.2723.950.4070.6170.4427.326.415.01.01.01.044.7512.908.855.4025.680.5686.86.995.01.001.01.044.7512.708.855.4023.600.4117.777.735.01.001.01.044.9512.708.855.400.5666.86.996.895.01.01.02.00.44711.627.5723.050.4407.327.555.01.001.01.02.044.7512.738.647.327.457.765.01.01.01.02.01.01.02.00.4417.327.457.765.01.01.01.01.01.01.2	5	7.97	1.59	0.41	47.09	13.86	11.59	5.59	22.37	0.338	0.498	0.409	7.09	6.59	6.14
2.031.591.594.5.212.898.485.0326.340.5300.6030.3886.366.827.971.591.591.594.2.2612.318.165.1623.680.5400.7050.4467.286.901.01.01.01.036.3411.626.725.2629.460.2810.4070.6176.496.825.001.01.01.043.9017.0613.165.6919.210.1490.2000.4617.326.415.0001.044.7512.908.855.4025.590.7710.6870.5656.86.995.01.0044.7512.908.855.4025.680.4400.3826.467.736.465.01.01.01.01.041.9711.627.575.0725.590.7710.6870.5656.86.995.01.0044.7512.908.855.4025.680.3400.3826.467.737.735.01.01.01.01.041.9711.627.575.010.4030.4307.457.665.01.01.01.01.041.9711.627.575.010.4307.457.665.01.01.01.041.9711.627.575.020.4310.4307.457.66<	9	7.97	0.41	1.59	42.68	14.62	11.23	5.42	20.65	0.260	0.517	0.399	8.07	7.41	7.77
7.971.591.591.591.591.591.591.591.591.501.501.500.5460.5160.5360.6467.286.901.01.036.3411.626.725.2692.460.2810.4020.3676.396.825.001.01.043.6017.0613.165.6919.210.1490.2000.4617.327.55.001.041.0711.627.575.0725.590.7710.6870.5656.86.995.01.0044.7512.908.855.4025.080.3600.4730.4117.777.735.01.01.041.9711.627.575.0725.580.3600.4730.4117.777.735.01.01.041.9712.778.855.2023.720.3600.4730.4117.777.735.01.01.041.9712.738.645.1926.540.2800.4057.277.465.01.01.042.5013.659.575.222.7460.2330.4057.277.465.01.01.042.3013.659.155.222.4790.4057.277.465.01.01.042.3013.659.155.222.4790.4137.37.755.01.01.042.3013.63	٢	2.03	1.59	1.59	44.52	12.89	8.48	5.03	26.34	0.530	0.603	0.388	6.36	6.82	6.33
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	8	7.97	1.59	1.59	42.26	12.31	8.16	5.16	23.68	0.540	0.705	0.446	7.28	6.9	7.81
10.01.01.043.9113.319.765.2723.950.4070.6170.4427.326.415.001.043.6017.0613.165.6919.210.1490.2000.4617.327.55.02.01.041.0711.627.575.0725.590.7710.6870.5656.86.995.01.0044.7512.908.855.4025.080.3630.4400.3826.336.465.01.01.01.041.9712.738.645.1925.540.2800.4730.4117.777.735.01.01.01.042.5013.659.575.2525.720.1980.4287.457.665.01.01.01.042.3113.519.155.2525.460.2270.4390.4307.377.755.01.01.01.042.3013.639.555.2225.460.2370.4397.377.467.195.01.01.042.3113.519.155.2225.460.2370.4397.377.467.165.01.01.01.042.3013.639.595.2724.790.3180.3760.3927.467.195.01.01.01.042.3313.539.595.270.3380.3770.4187.057.14	6	0	1.0	1.0	36.34	11.62	6.72	5.26	29.46	0.281	0.402	0.367	6.39	6.82	6.57
5.0 0 1.0 43.60 17.06 13.16 5.69 19.21 0.149 0.200 0.461 7.32 7.5 5.0 2.0 1.0 41.07 11.62 7.57 5.07 25.59 0.771 0.687 0.565 6.8 6.99 5.0 1.0 0 44.75 12.90 8.85 5.40 25.08 0.363 0.440 0.382 6.33 6.46 5.0 1.0 1.0 4.1.97 12.73 8.64 5.19 26.54 0.280 0.473 0.411 7.77 7.73 5.0 1.0 1.0 4.2.50 13.65 9.57 5.22 25.46 0.280 0.431 0.428 7.45 7.66 5.0 1.0 1.0 4.2.30 13.65 9.57 5.22 25.46 0.227 0.439 0.430 7.3 7.76 5.0 1.0 1.0 4.2.30 13.65 9.57 5.22 25.46 0.227 0.439 0.430 7.3 7.75 5.0 1.0 1.0 4.2.30 13.65 9.57 5.22 25.46 0.227 0.439 0.430 7.3 7.75 5.0 1.0 1.0 4.2.30 13.65 9.57 5.22 25.46 0.227 0.439 0.436 7.37 7.46 5.0 1.0 1.0 4.2.30 13.65 9.57 5.22 25.46 0.227 0.439 7.3 7.75 5.0 1.0 1.0 4.2.30 13.63 9.59 5.27 24.79 0.318 0.376 0.392 7.46 7.19 5.0 1.0 1.0 4.2.30 13.65 9.57 2.4.79 0.318 0.376 0.392 7.46 7.19 5.0 1.0 1.0 4.2.03 13.65 9.57 2.4.79 0.318 0.376 0.392 7.46 7.19 5.0 1.0 1.0 4.2.03 13.65 9.54 5.22 25.46 0.227 0.418 7.05 7.14 5.0 1.0 1.0 4.2.03 13.65 9.59 5.27 24.79 0.318 0.376 0.392 7.46 7.19 5.0 1.0 1.0 4.2.03 13.65 9.54 5.24 23.88 0.286 0.471 7.41 7.34 7.41 5.0 1.0 1.0 4.3.59 13.38 9.84 5.24 23.88 0.286 0.471 7.34 7.41 7.34 7.41 7.34 7.41 5.0 1.0 1.0 4.3.59 13.38 9.84 5.24 23.88 0.286 0.471 7.44 7.41 7.34 7.41 5.0 1.0 1.0 4.3.59 13.38 9.84 5.24 23.88 0.286 0.471 7.44 7.41 7.34 7.41 5.00king loss (g/100 g meat); DPPH, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/g fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent may for the obstice). Soncent monotation the obstice to the obstice obstice obstice to the obstice to the obstice	10	10.0	1.0	1.0	43.91	13.31	9.76	5.27	23.95	0.407	0.617	0.442	7.32	6.41	6.88
5.0 2.0 1.0 41.07 11.62 7.57 5.07 25.59 0.771 0.687 0.565 6.8 6.99 5.0 1.0 0 44.75 12.90 8.85 5.40 25.08 0.363 0.440 0.382 6.33 6.46 5.0 1.0 2.0 40.48 12.70 8.55 5.20 23.72 0.360 0.473 0.411 7.77 7.73 5.0 1.0 1.0 41.97 12.73 8.64 5.19 26.54 0.280 0.473 0.411 7.77 7.73 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.50 13.65 9.57 5.25 27.27 0.198 0.428 7.45 7.66 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.30 13.65 9.57 5.22 25.46 0.227 0.439 0.430 7.3 7.75 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.30 13.63 9.59 5.27 24.79 0.318 0.376 0.392 7.46 7.19 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.03 13.63 9.59 5.27 24.79 0.318 0.376 0.392 7.46 7.19 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.03 13.63 9.59 5.27 24.79 0.318 0.376 0.392 7.46 7.19 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.03 13.63 9.59 5.27 24.79 0.318 0.376 0.392 7.46 7.19 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.03 13.65 9.54 5.22 25.46 0.227 0.333 0.397 0.418 7.05 7.14 * Runs 1 - 8 = factorial points, 9 - 14 = axial points, and 15 - 20 = central points. X ₁ = pecan nut (%); X ₂ = roselle (%); X ₃ = salt (%); C = cooking loss (g/100 g meat); DPPH, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/g fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/d fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/d fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/d fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/d fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/d fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/d fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/d fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/d fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/d fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/d fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/d fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/d fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/d fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/d fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/d fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/d fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/d fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/d fresh	11	5.0	0	1.0	43.60	17.06	13.16	5.69	19.21	0.149	0.200	0.461	7.32	7.5	7.26
5.0 1.0 0 44.75 12.90 8.85 5.40 25.08 0.363 0.440 0.382 6.33 6.46 5.0 1.0 2.0 40.48 12.70 8.55 5.20 23.72 0.360 0.473 0.411 7.77 7.73 5.0 1.0 1.0 41.97 12.73 8.64 5.19 26.54 0.280 0.431 0.428 7.45 7.66 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.31 13.51 9.15 5.22 25.46 0.227 0.439 0.405 7.27 7.46 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.31 13.51 9.15 5.22 25.46 0.227 0.439 0.430 7.3 7.75 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.03 13.63 9.59 5.27 24.79 0.318 0.376 0.392 7.46 7.19 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.03 12.55 8.98 5.26 25.27 0.333 0.397 0.418 7.05 7.14 5.0 1.0 1.0 43.59 13.38 9.84 5.24 23.88 0.286 0.471 0.441 7.34 7.14 * Runs 1 - 8 = factorial points, 9 - 14 = axial points, and 15 - 20 = central points. X ₁ = pecan nut (%); X_2 = roselle (%); X_3 = salt (%); C = cooking loss (g/100 g meat); DPPH, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/g fresh pattics); ABTS, mg TE/g fp	12	5.0	2.0	1.0	41.07	11.62	7.57	5.07	25.59	0.771	0.687	0.565	6.8	6.99	7.66
5.01.02.040.4812.708.555.2023.720.3600.4730.4117.777.735.01.01.01.041.9712.738.645.1926.540.2800.4310.4287.457.665.01.01.01.042.5013.659.575.2527.270.1980.4267.277.465.01.01.01.042.3113.519.155.2225.460.2270.4390.4307.37.755.01.01.01.042.3013.639.595.2724.790.3180.3760.3927.467.195.01.01.01.042.0312.558.985.2625.270.3330.3970.4187.057.145.01.01.01.043.5913.389.845.2423.880.2860.4710.4187.057.14 5.0 1.01.01.043.5913.389.845.2423.880.2860.4717.047.14 5.0 1.01.01.043.5913.389.845.2423.880.2860.4717.057.46 7.05 1.01.01.043.5913.389.845.2423.880.2860.4717.057.46 5.0 1.01.01.043.5913.389.845.2423.880.2860.4717.417.	13	5.0	1.0	0	44.75	12.90	8.85	5.40	25.08	0.363	0.440	0.382	6.33	6.46	6.21
5.0 1.0 1.0 41.97 12.73 8.64 5.19 26.54 0.280 0.431 0.428 7.45 7.66 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.50 13.65 9.57 5.25 27.27 0.198 0.428 0.405 7.27 7.46 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.31 13.51 9.15 5.22 25.46 0.227 0.439 0.430 7.3 7.75 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.30 13.63 9.59 5.27 24.79 0.318 0.376 0.392 7.46 7.19 5.0 1.0 1.0 42.03 12.55 8.98 5.26 25.27 0.333 0.397 0.418 7.05 7.14 * Runs 1 - 8 = factorial points, 9 - 14 = axial points, and 15 - 20 = central points. X1 = pecan nut (%); X2 = roselle (%); X3 = salt (%); C= cooking loss (g/100 g meat); DPPH, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/g fresh patities); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/g fresh patities); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivale	14	5.0	1.0	2.0	40.48	12.70	8.55	5.20	23.72	0.360	0.473	0.411	7.77	7.73	7.21
5.01.01.042.5013.659.575.2527.270.1980.4280.4057.277.465.01.01.042.3113.519.155.2225.460.2270.4390.4307.37.755.01.01.042.3013.639.595.2724.790.3180.3760.3927.467.195.01.01.042.0312.558.985.2625.270.3330.3970.4187.057.145.01.01.043.5913.389.845.2625.270.3330.3970.4417.347.41* Runs 1 - 8 = factorial points, 9 - 14 = axial points, and 15 - 20 = central points. X_1 = pecan nut (%); X_2 = roselle (%); X_3 = salt (%); Ce cooking loss (g/100 g meat); DPPH, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/g fresh patities); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/g fresh patities); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/g fresh patities); Succent protection for the following the tracter patient (mg/g fresh patities); Succent protection for the following the tracter patient (mg/g fresh patities).	15	5.0	1.0	1.0	41.97	12.73	8.64	5.19	26.54	0.280	0.431	0.428	7.45	7.66	7.45
5.01.01.042.3113.519.155.2225.46 0.227 0.439 0.430 7.3 7.75 5.01.01.042.3013.639.595.2724.79 0.318 0.376 0.392 7.46 7.19 5.01.01.042.0312.558.985.26 25.27 0.333 0.397 0.418 7.05 7.14 5.01.01.043.5913.38 9.84 5.24 23.88 0.286 0.471 0.441 7.34 7.41 * Runs 1 - 8 = factorial points, 9 - 14 = axial points, and 15 - 20 = central points. X ₁ = pecan nut (%); X ₂ = roselle (%); X ₃ = salt (%); C= cooking loss (g/100 g meat); DPPH, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/g fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivale $Mode freeh batties): and total phanolic contant and CAF/d fb = and collic acid activaleMode freeh batties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivale$	16	5.0	1.0	1.0	42.50	13.65	9.57	5.25	27.27	0.198	0.428	0.405	7.27	7.46	7.13
5.01.01.042.3013.639.595.2724.790.3180.3760.3927.467.195.01.01.01.042.0312.558.985.2625.270.3330.3970.4187.057.14 5.0 1.01.01.043.5913.389.845.2423.880.2860.4710.4417.347.41* Runs 1 - 8 = factorial points, 9 - 14 = axial points, and 15 - 20 = central points. X ₁ = pecan nut (%); X ₂ = roselle (%); X ₃ = salt (%); C= cooking loss (g/100 g meat); DPPH, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/g fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/g fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/g fresh patties); Safetar protection for the set patties).	17	5.0	1.0	1.0	42.31	13.51	9.15	5.22	25.46	0.227	0.439	0.430	7.3	7.75	7.37
5.0 1.0 1.0 42.03 12.55 8.98 5.26 25.27 0.333 0.397 0.418 7.05 7.14 5.0 1.0 1.0 43.59 13.38 9.84 5.24 23.88 0.286 0.471 0.441 7.34 7.41 * Runs 1 - 8 = factorial points, 9 - 14 = axial points, and 15 - 20 = central points. X ₁ = pecan nut (%); X ₂ = roselle (%); X ₃ = salt (%); C = cooking loss (g/100 g meat); DPPH, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/g fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivale	18	5.0	1.0	1.0	42.30	13.63	9.59	5.27	24.79	0.318	0.376	0.392	7.46	7.19	6.94
5.01.01.043.5913.389.845.2423.880.2860.4710.4417.347.41* Runs 1 - 8 = factorial points, 9 - 14 = axial points, and 15 - 20 = central points. X_1 = pecan nut (%); X_2 = roselle (%); X_3 = salt (%); C= cooking loss (g/100 g meat); DPPH, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/g fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/g fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg TE/g f	19	5.0	1.0	1.0	42.03	12.55	8.98	5.26	25.27	0.333	0.397	0.418	7.05	7.14	6.63
I points, and 15 - 20 = central points. X_1 = pecan nut (%); X_2 = roselle (%); TE/g fp = Trolox equivalent (mg/g fresh patties); ABTS, mg TE/g fp =	20	5.0	1.0	1.0	43.59	13.38	9.84	5.24	23.88	0.286	0.471	0.441	7.34	7.41	7.59
	* F	tuns 1 - { ooking 1 3/σ fresh	s = factor oss (g/1 natties)	rial poir 00 g me · and to	tts, 9 - $14 = a$ sat); DPPH, 1 stal phenolic	xial points, mg TE/g fp	and 15 - $20 =$ = Trolox eq		l points tt (mg/g	$X_1 = pe_1$ (fresh pa	can nut (⁵ tties); Al	%); X ₂ = BTS, mg	roselle (% ; TE/g fp = ies) Sens); X ₃ = salt (% = Trolox equi	(); CL valent

Pérez-Báez, A. J., et al./IFRJ 29(5): 1143 - 1154

and allowed to rest for 16 h in the dark at room temperature. Afterward, 1 mL of the mixture was diluted with ethanol (50%) to an absorbance of $0.7 \pm$ 0.02 at 741 nm as the working solution. A 245-µL aliquot of the ABTS working solution was vortexed with either 5 µL of a Trolox standard solution or 5 µL of sample extract in methanol. Subsequently, the absorbance (734 nm) was measured at 1 and 6 min. The ABTS radical scavenging ability was calculated based on the Trolox standard curve, and expressed in mg of Trolox equivalent (TE) per gram of uncooked (fresh) patty (mg TE/g fp).

Total phenolic content

The total phenolic content (TPC) for the methanol-extracted samples was determined using a Folin-Ciocalteu assay (Singleton and Rossi, 1965). A 30-µL aliquot of raw-beef extract was mixed with 150 µL of Folin-Ciocalteu reagent. The mixture was allowed to stand for 5 min at 25°C, 120 µL of a Na_2CO_3 (7.5%) solution was added, and the resulting mixture was vortexed for 1 min. Afterward, the mixture was allowed to rest in the dark for 30 min at 25°C. Absorbance readings were recorded at 765 nm using a Fluorstar Omega UV/Visible microplate reader spectrophotometer (BMG Labtech Inc., Durham, NC, USA). The TPC was calculated based on a gallic acid (GA) standard curve, and expressed in milligrams of gallic acid equivalent per gram of uncooked (fresh) patty (mg GAE/g fp).

Sensory analysis

A 15-member sensory panel evaluated all the samples in separate environmentally-controlled booths (25°C and 55% RH) under red lighting. The panellists were frequent meat consumers selected from the institution's staff (8 men and 7 women aged between 25 and 38 years). Before the evaluation, two briefing sessions were conducted to acquaint the panellists with the product and terminology used. Beef were cooked following patties the aforementioned procedure, and 1.5×1.5 cm square pieces were cut from the centre of patties, and kept warm until tested. Twenty different formulations were evaluated over three different sessions. Each panellist randomly evaluated all the beef patties samples for sensory properties (flavour, tenderness, and juiciness) on unstructured scales of 10 cm with descriptors at either end. Each marked point was converted to a numerical value from 0 to 10 based on the location of the point. Flavour, tenderness, and

juiciness were ranked from 0 = not intense/very hard/dry to 10 = intense/very tender/moist. Panellists cleansed and rinsed their palates with unsalted crackers and water between samples.

Statistical analysis

Design Expert software (V.7.6.1, Stat-Ease, Inc., Minneapolis, MN, USA) was used to determine the analysis of variance (ANOVA), determination coefficient (R^2), and lack of fit of the predictive models. The mathematical equation (Eq. 2.) corresponding to the central composite design was:

$$y = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \beta_i X_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \beta_{ii} X_i^2 + \sum_{i< j} \beta_{ij} X_i X_j + \varepsilon$$
(Eq. 2)

where, y = response variable (physicochemical, antioxidant, and sensory properties); β_0 , β_i , β_{ii} , and β_{ij} = intercept, linear, quadratic, and interaction coefficients, respectively; and $X_{i\cdot j}$ = independent variables (pecan nut, roselle, and salt contents). Models were generated using an average of six measurements of the response variables.

A numerical multi response optimisation technique (Design Expert software) was used to determine the combination of pecan nut, roselle, and salt contents that maximised the beef-patty quality. The values of the independent variables were maintained within the experimental range. The dependent variables of the instrumental colour $(L^*,$ a^* , b^*) and pH were maintained with prescribed limits; the antioxidant capacity (DPPH and ABTS), TPC, and sensory properties (flavour, tenderness, and juiciness) were maintained at the maximum target values, and the cooking loss was maintained at the minimum target value. A batch of optimum formulations produced using RSM was prepared, and the physicochemical, antioxidant, and sensory properties were evaluated as previously described. A statistical comparative analysis of the predicted and experimental values was performed.

Results and discussion

Physicochemical properties

Table 1 shows the experimental data for the instrumental colour (L^* , a^* , b^*), pH, and CL of the beef patties. The models for the physicochemical properties are shown in Table 2. L^* ranged between 36.34 and 47.09, where the lowest and highest values were obtained for Formulations 9 (0% pecan nut, 1%

roselle, and 1% salt) and 5 (8% pecan nut, 0.4% roselle, and 0.4% salt), respectively. The lowest a^* and b^* values of 11.62 and 7.03, respectively, were obtained for Formulation 9, and the highest a^* and b^* values of 17.06 and 13.16, respectively, were obtained for Formulation 11 (5% pecan nut, 0% roselle, and 1% salt).

All the models used to estimate the instrumental colour were statistically significant (p < 0.05), none of the models exhibited a lack of fit (p > 0.05), and R^2 ranged between 0.87 and 0.97 (Table 2). These results indicated that the models were suitable for predicting the changes in the response variables to the pecan nut, roselle, and salt contents.

The colour of fresh beef patties can be altered by the type and proportion of non-conventional ingredients in the formulation (King and Whyte, 2006; Yıldız-Turp and Serdaroglu, 2010). L* was affected (p < 0.05) by pecan nut, salt, and roselle incorporation, whereas a^* was only affected by roselle incorporation. The incorporation of pecan nut increased L^* and b^* , but had no effect on a^* . A similar trend was reported by Jimenez-Colmenero et al. (2003) for restructured beef steaks supplemented with up to 15% walnut. The increase in L^* could have been attributed to the light colour of pecan nut paste $(L^* = 50.8)$. By contrast, roselle incorporation decreased L^* , resulting in patties with darker hues. Our results are consistent with those reported by Jung and Joo (2013) for pork patties supplemented with roselle extract (0.1 to 1.3%). Roselle incorporation had a linear negative effect and a quadratic positive effect on a^* (Table 2). This decrease in instrumental colour could have been attributed to the oxidation of the iron group of myoglobin (Salueña et al., 2019) caused by the acidic nature (pH = 2.4) and high solids content of roselle. Jung and Joo (2013) reported that increasing the roselle extract concentration in pork patties caused an increase in a^* but a decrease in b^* .

The pH and CL of the beef patties ranged between 5.03 and 5.69% and 19.21 and 34.41%, respectively. The highest pH and lowest CL percentages were observed in Formulation 11 (5% pecan nut, 0% roselle, and 1% salt). The lowest pH was observed in Formulation 7 (8% pecan nut, 1.6% roselle, and 0.4% salt), and the highest CL was observed in Formulation 3 (2% pecan nut, 1.6% roselle, and 0.4% salt). Therefore, patties with lower pHs had higher CLs.

The regression models for the pH and CL were

significant (p < 0.05), did not exhibit a lack of fit (p >0.05), and yielded R^2 higher than 0.91 (Table 2); these indicators provided sufficient evidence of the suitability of the generated models for predicting these variables. The roselle content was the variable that most affected the product pH followed by the salt content, while the pecan nut content had no effect on the product pH. Roselle incorporation had a negative linear effect and a positive quadratic effect on the pH. As the roselle content in the formulation increased, the pH decreased to near the isoelectric point of the meat protein. Similar results were reported by Jung and Joo (2013) for pork patties supplemented with up to 1.3% roselle. This pH decrease was due to the acidic nature of roselle (pH = 2.4), which mainly resulted from the presence of oxalic, tartaric, and citric acids (Juhari et al., 2018). It is important to consider the final product pH because of its effect on the CL (Santos et al., 2016).

Roselle was the ingredient that most affected the CL of the patties (corresponding to a positive linear effect), followed by pecan nut and salt (which had a negative linear effect), and there was a negative interaction between roselle and pecan nut. The CL increased with roselle incorporation, and decreased with pecan nut incorporation. The effect of roselle incorporation could have led to the decrease in pH, whereas the effect of pecan nut incorporation could have led to the low moisture content and stabilisation of the beef patty pH. A similar trend was reported by Cofrades et al. (2004) for restructured beef with different walnut contents. The incorporation of walnut decreased exudate loss during heating due to a decrease in moisture and an increase in the fat content with no changes in the pH. In the present work, the increase in CL from roselle incorporation was decreased by the incorporation of pecan nut due to the negative interaction between roselle and pecan nut (Table 2). Likewise, salt incorporation decreased the CL. A similar trend in the CL was reported by Szerman et al. (2019) for beef patties supplemented with NaCl (0 - 2%). Salt incorporation increases the ionic strength, and causes repulsion between myofibrillar proteins, which results in the swelling of myofibrils and the partial solubilisation of filaments, thus increasing the water-holding capacity (Tornberg, 2005).

Antioxidant activity and total phenolic content

Table 1 shows the experimentally determined

		Physicoch	Physicochemical determinati	ation		Antio	Antioxidant property	perty		Sensory property	y
Model	Lightness	Redness	Yellowness	рН	CL	HAAU	ABTS	TPC	Flavour	Tenderness	Juiciness
Intercept	42.44	13.24	9.29	5.24	25.51	0.27	0.42	0.42	7.31	7.43	7.00
$\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{l}}$	2.19^{*}	0.31	0.79*	0.003	-1.81*	0.04^{*}	0.075*	0.025*	0.34^{*}	-0.13*	0.021
\mathbf{X}_2	-0.49*	-1.22*	-1.56*	-0.19*	2.97*	0.14^{*}	0.11^{*}	0.031^{*}	-0.31*	-0.23*	-0.33*
\mathbf{X}_3	-1.50*	-0.19	-0.18	-0.026*	-0.98*	-0.007	0.001	-0.001	0.28*	0.37*	0.53*
X_1X_2	-0.44	0.12	-0.05	-0.004	-1.98*	0.002	0.007	-0.001	0.079	0.14	0.23*
X_1X_3	-0.002	0.32	0.08	-0.007	0.29	-0.005	0.033	-0.004	0.086	-0.067	0.02
X_2X_3	0.75*	-0.04	0.15	0.06*	-0.07	0.015	0.027	-0.001	0.034	-0.057	0.035
$\mathbf{X_{l}}^{2}$	-0.75*	-0.26	-0.36*	0.004	0.57	0.022	0.037*	-0.012	-0.15*	-0.28*	-0.075
$\mathbf{X}_2{}^2$	0.03	0.40*	0.39*	0.04^{*}	-0.95*	0.063^{*}	0.013	0.026^{*}	-0.079	-0.061	0.079
${ m X_{3}}^{2}$	0.13	-0.15	0.20	0.02	-0.24	0.028	0.014	-0.013	-0.082	-0.11*	-0.027
P-Value	<0.0001	0.0018	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.0005	0.0002	0.0002	0.004	0.002	0.0002	0.0012
Lack of fit	0.46	0.18	0.81	0.10	0.19	0.41	0.11	0.11	0.055	0.91	0.66
R^2	0.97	0.87	0.97	0.97	0.91	0.92	0.92	0.85	0.87	0.92	0.88

antioxidant capacity (AC) and TPC. Table 2 shows the regression models for the AC and TPC, and the corresponding significance, lack of fit, and R^2 . The DPPH and ABTS values ranged between 0.15 and 0.77 and 0.2 to 0.7 mg TE/g fp, respectively. The lowest ACs were observed in Formulation 11 (5% pecan nut, 0% roselle, and 1% salt), and the highest ACs were observed in Formulation 12 (5% pecan nut, 2% roselle, and 1% salt) because of the high roselle content. The regression models for DPPH and ABTS were significant (p < 0.05), exhibited no lack of fit (p> 0.05), and yielded R^2 higher than 0.92.

Roselle was the non-meat ingredient that most affected the AC, followed by pecan nut, and both ingredients had positive linear effects (p < 0.05). Roselle incorporation increased the ACs of the beef patties. Similar findings were reported by Jamhari *et al.* (2019) in chicken sausage supplemented with roselle extract (0 - 8%). This effect on the AC is related to the content of antioxidants such as organic acids, flavonoids, and anthocyanins (Borrás-Linares *et al.*, 2015).

The incorporation of pecan nut also resulted in an increase in the antioxidant capacity, as was observed by comparing the results for Formulations 9 and 10, between which the pecan nut content was increased from 0 to 10%, while maintaining the roselle (1%) and salt (1%) contents unchanged. Pecan nut is a dried fruit containing many polyphenolic compounds with significant antioxidant capacities (Medina-Juárez et al., 2018). Pecan nut has been reported to be rich in total phenolics, proanthocyanidins, gallic and ellagic acids, and flavonoids (Alasalvar and Bolling, 2015). Reyes-Padilla et al. (2018) evaluated the quality of a bologna-type meat product designed for the elderly that incorporated pecan nut as a source of antioxidants and unsaturated fatty acids. The antioxidant activity (DPPH) increased from 39 in the control to 60 µM TE/100 g of fresh sample in a cooked product with 5% added pecan nut.

TPC ranged from 0.34 to 0.56 mg GAE/g fp (Table 1), where the lowest value was observed in Formulation 2 (2.03% pecan nut, 0.41% roselle, and 1.59% salt), and the highest value was observed in Formulation 12 (5% pecan nut, 2% roselle, and 1% salt). The regression model was significant (p < 0.05), did not exhibit a lack of fit (p > 0.05), and yielded R^2 of 0.85; these indicators provided sufficient evidence that the obtained model was suitable for prediction of the response variable. Roselle was the component that

most affected the TPC followed by pecan nut, and both components had a positive linear effect. The incorporation of roselle and pecan nut increased the TPC of the beef patties (p < 0.05). It has been reported in several studies that both roselle and pecan nut are rich in phenolic compounds (Fukuda *et al.*, 2003; Borrás-Linares *et al.*, 2015). Reyes-Padilla *et al.* (2018) reported an increase in TPC (μ M GAE/100 g of fresh sample) from 14 in a control product to 28 in a bologna-type meat product (5% pecan nut).

The shelf life of the beef patty product incorporated with pecan nut and roselle was not evaluated in the present work. However, pecan nut and roselle are rich in antioxidant and antimicrobial compounds (Alasalvar and Bolling, 2015; Jabeur et al., 2017), the incorporation of which has been demonstrated to extend the shelf life of meat products (Villasante et al., 2020). Phenolics are phytochemical compounds that can inactivate and reduce the formation of free radicals in the body (Parr and Bolwell, 2000). Therefore, the incorporation of roselle and pecan nut into meat products is expected to provide nutritional and health benefits (Alasalvar and Bolling, 2015; Cid-Ortega and Guerrero-Beltrán, 2015). However, bioaccessibility and bioavailability studies need to be performed to demonstrate that roselle and pecan nut have a positive effect on human health.

Sensory analysis

Tables 1 and 2 show the experimental measurements and regression models, respectively, for the sensory properties of beef patties with added pecan nut, roselle, and salt. The sensory scores for all formulations ranged from 5.78 to 8.15, which can be considered acceptable values. All the regression models were significant (p < 0.05), did not exhibit a lack of fit (p > 0.05), and yielded $R^2 > 0.87$ (Table 2). Pecan nut was the ingredient that most affected the flavour, followed by roselle and salt (p < 0.05). Pecan nut and salt had a positive linear effect on the flavour, whereas roselle had a negative linear effect. The incorporation of pecan nut and salt to the beef patty formulation improved the flavour. A similar effect was observed by Jimenez-Colmenero et al. (2003) for a restructured meat product supplemented with 5% walnut. The incorporation of roselle to the beef patties decreased the flavour (p < 0.05). The negative effect of roselle on the flavour may be associated with the acidity of oxalic, tartaric, and citric acids (Juhari et al., 2018).

Salt was the ingredient that most affected juiciness and tenderness, followed by roselle and pecan nut. Salt had a positive linear effect on juiciness, whereas roselle had a negative linear effect. Additionally, there was a positive interaction effect between pecan nut and roselle. That is, the effect of roselle on reducing juiciness could be improved by the incorporation of pecan nut, as shown by the positive interaction between these two ingredients (Table 2). The incorporation of pecan nut decreased the cooking loss during heating due to a decrease in moisture and an increase in the fat content, thus enhancing juiciness. Cofrades et al. (2004) reported that the sensory properties of restructured beef were improved by up to 10% walnut incorporation. In the present work, salt increased both juiciness and all sensory properties. Salt in meat products improves general sensory acceptance by enhancing water and fat retention, and promoting the stability of the meat matrix (Pietrasik and Gaudette, 2014).

Optimisation of the beef patty formulation

The desirability function approach is one of the most widely used methods for the optimisation of a multiple response process. In the present work, the beef patty formulation was optimised using Design Expert. The optimal beef patty formulation that maximised desirability contained 7.97% pecan nut, 1.59% roselle, and 1.08% salt. The predicted and experimental values of the physicochemical, antioxidant, and sensory properties of the optimal formulation are shown in Table 3. The experimental and predicted values were not significantly different (p > 0.05). Therefore, the chosen mathematical procedure adequately predicted the studied quality characteristics.

Table 3. Predicted and experimental values of physicochemical, antioxidant, and sensory properties for	r
optimal combination* of pecan nut, roselle, and salt in beef patties.	

Response variable	Predicted value	95% CI	Experimental value**
Physicochemical property			
Lightness	42.88	42.07 - 43.70	42.80 ± 1.14
Redness	12.29	11.59 - 12.99	12.26 ± 0.43
Yellowness	8.51	7.99 - 9.02	8.29 ± 0.40
pH	5.10	5.03 - 5.16	5.13 ± 0.01
Cooking loss (%)	24.66	21.88 - 26.44	23.06 ± 2.69
Antioxidant property			
DPPH (mg TE/g fp)	0.53	0.46 - 0.61	0.57 ± 0.01
ABTS (mg TE/g fp)	0.65	0.59 - 0.71	0.64 ± 0.04
Total phenolic content (mg GA/g fp)	0.46	0.42 - 0.50	0.92 ± 0.05
Sensory property***			
Flavour	7.03	6.79 - 7.27	7.90 ± 0.50
Tenderness	6.98	6.71 - 7.26	7.06 ± 0.77
Juiciness	7.01	6.54 - 7.48	7.12 ± 1.41

* Optimal combination: 7.97% pecan nut, 1.59% roselle, 1.08% salt. ** Average \pm SD of five determinations (n = 5). *** Sensory properties evaluated by means of a 10 cm line scale, where flavour, tenderness, and juiciness were ranked from 0 = not intense/very hard/dry to 10 = intense/very tender/moist.

Conclusion

Models were developed in the present work which could be used to predict the quality characteristics of beef patties incorporated with pecan nut up to 10%, and roselle and salt up to 2%. The optimum formulation was 7.97% pecan nut, 1.59% roselle, and 1.08% salt. The beef patty formulation was optimised using RSM to obtain a meat product with good sensory properties (score > 7). The effects of non-traditional ingredients on the beef patty quality were evaluated as a first step toward developing functional meat products. Studies on cold storage, bioaccessibility, and bioavailability of bioactive compounds are ongoing. Low-salt beef patties containing pecan nut and roselle could become an alternative food for health-conscious consumers.

Acknowledgement

Authors are grateful to Monica Villegas-Ochoa and Luis German Cumplido-Barbeitia for their technical support. Anna Judith Pérez-Báez thanks CONACYT (National Council of Science and Technology) for the Master of Science fellowship.

References

- Alasalvar, C. and Bolling, B. W. 2015. Review of nut phytochemicals, fat-soluble bioactives, antioxidant components and health effects.
 British Journal of Nutrition 113(S2): S68-S78.
- American Meat Science Association (AMSA). 1995. Research guidelines for cookery, sensory evaluation, and tenderness measurements of fresh meat. United States: AMSA.
- Antonini, E., Torri, L., Piochi, M., Cabrino, G., Meli, M. A. and De Bellis, R. 2020. Nutritional, antioxidant and sensory properties of functional beef burgers formulated with chia seeds and goji puree, before and after *in vitro* digestion. Meat Science 161: 108021.
- Aune, D., Keum, N., Giovannucci, E., Fadnes, L. T., Boffetta, P., Greenwood, D. C., ... and Norat, T. 2016. Nut consumption and risk of cardiovascular disease, total cancer, all-cause and cause-specific mortality: A systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective studies. BMC Medicine 14(1): 207.
- Babatunde, O. A. and Adewumi, A. O. 2015. Effects of ethanolic extract of garlic, roselle and ginger on quality attributes of chicken patties. African Journal of Biotechnology 14(8): 688-694.
- Borrás-Linares, I., Fernández-Arroyo, S., Arráez-Roman, D., Palmeros-Suárez, P., Del Val-Díaz, R., Andrade-Gonzáles, I., ... and Segura-Carretero, A. 2015. Characterization of phenolic compounds, anthocyanidin, antioxidant and antimicrobial activity of 25 varieties of Mexican roselle (*Hibiscus* sabdariffa). Industrial Crops and Products 69: 385-394.
- Calderón-Oliver, M. and López-Hernández, L. H. 2020. Food vegetable and fruit waste used in

meat products. Food Reviews International 38(4): 628-654.

- Chaput, J. P., Klingenberg, L., Astrup, A. and Sjödin, A. M. 2011. Modern sedentary activities promote overconsumption of food in our current obesogenic environment. Obesity Reviews 12(5): e12-e20.
- Cid-Ortega, S. and Guerrero-Beltrán, J. 2015. Roselle calyces (*Hibiscus sabdariffa*), an alternative to the food and beverages industries: A review. Journal of Food Science and Technology 52(11): 6859-6869.
- Cofrades, S., Serrano, A., Ayo, J., Solas, M. T., Carballo, J. and Colmenero, F. J. 2004.
 Restructured beef with different proportions of walnut as affected by meat particle size.
 European Food Research and Technology 218(3): 230-236.
- de Sousa, A. M. B., de Araujo Alves, R., Madeira, D. S. S., Santos, R. M., Pereira, A. L. F., de Oliveira Lemos, T. and Abreu, V. K. G. 2020. Storage of beef burgers containing fructooligosaccharides as fat replacer and potassium chloride as replacing sodium chloride. Journal of Food Science and Technology 57(9): 3232-3243.
- Fukuda, T., Ito, H. and Yoshida, T. 2003. Antioxidative polyphenols from walnuts (*Juglans regia* L.). Phytochemistry 63(7): 795-801.
- Jabeur, I., Pereira, E., Barros, L., Calhelha, R. C., Soković, M., Oliveira, M. B. P. and Ferreira, I. C. 2017. *Hibiscus sabdariffa* L. as a source of nutrients, bioactive compounds and colouring agents. Food Research International 100: 717-723.
- Jamhari, J., Dewi, A. C. and Setiyono, S. 2019. Physicochemical properties and antioxidant activity of chicken sausage with addition of roselle extract (*Hibiscus sabdariffa*) and different filler ratio. Buletin Peternakan 43(1): 46-51.
- Jimenez-Colmenero, F., Serrano, A., Ayo, J., Solas, M. T., Cofrades, S. and Carballo, J. 2003. Physicochemical and sensory characteristics of restructured beef steak with added walnuts. Meat Science 65(4): 1391-1397.
- Juhari, N. H., Bredie, W. L., Toldam-Andersen, T. B. and Petersen, M. A. 2018. Characterization of roselle calyx from different geographical

origins. Food Research International 112: 378-389.

- Jung, E. and Joo, N. 2013. Roselle (*Hibiscus* sabdariffa L.) and soybean oil effects on quality characteristics of pork patties studied by response surface methodology. Meat Science 94(3): 391-401.
- King, N. J. and Whyte, R. 2006. Does it look cooked? A review of factors that influence cooked meat color. Journal of Food Science 71(4): R31-R40.
- Lacombe, J., Armstrong, M. E., Wright, F. L. and Foster, C. 2019. The impact of physical activity and an additional behavioural risk factor on cardiovascular disease, cancer and all-cause mortality: A systematic review. BMC Public Health 19(1): 1-16.
- McKay, D. L., Eliasziw, M., Chen, C. and Blumberg, J. B. 2018. A pecan-rich diet improves cardiometabolic risk factors in overweight and obese adults: A randomized controlled trial. Nutrients 10(3): 1-17.
- Medina-Juárez, L., Molina-Quijada, D., Agustin-Salazar, S., Valenzuela, L. R., Molina-Domínguez, C. and Gámez-Meza, N. 2018. Chemical evaluation and antioxidant capacity of Western and Wichita pecan nut cultivars [*Carya illinoinensis* (Wangenh.) K. Koch]. Rivista Italiana delle Sostanze Grasse 95(2): 111-118.
- Palafox-Carlos, H., Yahia, E. and González-Aguilar,
 G. 2012. Identification and quantification of major phenolic compounds from mango (*Mangifera indica*, cv. Ataulfo) fruit by HPLC-DAD-MS/MS-ESI and their individual contribution to the antioxidant activity during ripening. Food Chemistry 135(1): 105-111.
- Park, S.-Y., Oh, T.-S., Kim, G.-W. and Kim, H.-Y. 2020. Quality properties of various dietary fibers as isolated soy protein (ISP) replacements in pork emulsion systems. Journal of Animal Science and Technology 62(1): 94-102.
- Parr, A. J. and Bolwell, G. P. 2000. Phenols in the plant and in man. The potential for possible nutritional enhancement of the diet by modifying the phenols content or profile. Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture 80(7): 985-1012.
- Pérez-Báez, A. J., Camou, J. P., Valenzuela-Melendres, M., González-Aguilar, G., Viuda-

Martos, M., Sebranek, J. G. and Tortoledo-Ortiz, O. 2020. Effects and interactions of roselle (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* L.), potato peel flour, and beef fat on quality characteristics of beef patties studied by response surface methodology. Journal of Food Processing and Preservation 44(9): e14659.

- Pietrasik, Z. and Gaudette, N. 2014. The impact of salt replacers and flavor enhancer on the processing characteristics and consumer acceptance of restructured cooked hams. Meat Science 96(3): 1165-1170.
- Pintado, T. and Cofrades, S. 2020. Quality characteristics of healthy dry fermented sausages formulated with a mixture of olive and chia oil structured in oleogel or emulsion gel as animal fat replacer. Foods 9(6): 1-15.
- Re, R., Pellegrini, N., Proteggente, A., Pannala, A., Yang, M. and Rice-Evans, C. 1999. Antioxidant activity applying an improved ABTS radical cation decolorization assay. Free Radical Biology and Medicine 26(9-10): 1231-1237.
- Reyes-Padilla, E., Valenzuela-Melendres, M., Camou, J. P., Sebranek, J. G., Alemán-Mateo, H., Dávila-Ramírez, J. L., ... and González-Ríos, H. 2018. Quality evaluation of low fat bologna-type meat product with a nutritional profile designed for the elderly. Meat Science 135: 115-122.
- Richi, E. B., Baumer, B., Conrad, B., Darioli, R., Schmid, A. and Keller, U. 2015. Health risks associated with meat consumption: A review of epidemiological studies. International Journal for Vitamin and Nutrition Research 85(1-2): 70-78.
- Romero, M. C., Fogar, R. A., Doval, M. M., Romero,
 A. M. and Judis, M. A. 2019. Optimisation of cooking properties of healthier beef patties and quality evaluation during frozen storage.
 Journal of Food Measurement and Characterization 13(3): 1907-1916.
- Salueña, B. H., Gamasa, C. S., Rubial, J. M. D. and Odriozola, C. A. 2019. CIELAB color paths during meat shelf life. Meat Science 157: 10889.
- Santos, C., Moniz, C., Roseiro, C., Tavares, M., Medeiros, V., Afonso, I., ... and Portugal, L. 2016. Effects of early *post-mortem* rate of pH fall and aging on tenderness and water holding capacity of meat from cull dairy Holstein-

Friesian cows. Journal of Food Research 5(2): 1-12.

- Singleton, V. L. and Rossi, J. A. 1965. Colorimetry of total phenolics with phosphomolybdicphosphotungstic acid reagents. American Journal of Enology and Viticulture 16(3): 144-158.
- Szerman, N., Ferrari, R., Sancho, A. M. and Vaudagna, S. 2019. Response surface methodology study on the effects of sodium chloride and sodium tripolyphosphate concentrations, pressure level and holding time on beef patties properties. LWT - Food Science and Technology 109: 93-100.
- Tazoho, G. M., Gouado, I., Ndomou, M., Bonsi, S. T., Wamba, Y. M. and Agbor, E. E. 2016. Clinical, hematological and biochemical health benefit effects of *Hibiscus sabdariffa* Lin dried calyces beverage in human. Food and Nutrition Sciences 7(5): 383-395.
- Tornberg, E. 2005. Effects of heat on meat proteins– Implications on structure and quality of meat products. Meat Science 70(3): 493-508.
- Tuorila, H. and Hartmann, C. 2020. Consumer responses to novel and unfamiliar foods. Current Opinion in Food Science 33: 1-8.
- Van Loo, E. J., Caputo, V. and Lusk, J. L. 2020. Consumer preferences for farm-raised meat, lab-grown meat, and plant-based meat alternatives: Does information or brand matter? Food Policy 95: 101931.
- Villasante, J., Ouerfelli, M., Bobet, A., Metón, I. and Almajano, M. P. 2020. The effects of pecan shell, roselle flower and red pepper on the quality of beef patties during chilled storage. Foods 9(11): 1692.
- Yıldız-Turp, G. and Serdaroglu, M. 2010. Effects of using plum puree on some properties of low fat beef patties. Meat Science 86(4): 896-900.