

## Comparison of Carcass Characteristics and Meat Quality between Duroc and Crossbred Pigs

Jung-Seok Choi<sup>1,2</sup>, Hyun-Jin Lee<sup>1</sup>, Sang-Keun Jin<sup>2</sup>, Yang-Il Choi<sup>1</sup>, and Jae-Joon Lee\*

*Department of Food and Nutrition, Chosun University, Gwangju 500-759, Korea*

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Animal Science, Chungbuk National University, Cheongju 361-763, Korea*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Animal Resources Technology and Swine Science & Technology Center, Gyeongnam National University of Science and Technology, Jinju 660-758, Korea*

### Abstract

This study was conducted to compare the carcass characteristics and meat quality characteristics of Duroc breed and crossbred pigs (Landrace × Yorkshire × Duroc, LYD). Duroc and crossbred pigs did not show differences in carcass characteristics. Crossbred pigs had higher moisture and protein content than Duroc breeds. However, Duroc breeds had a higher fat content than the crossbred pigs. In meat quality characteristics, crossbred pigs showed higher values of drip loss and cooking loss over Duroc breeds, while Duroc breeds showed higher ultimate pH value compared to that of crossbred pigs. However, there were no differences in water holding capacity and shear force value. In myoglobin content, crossbred pigs had higher content compared to that in the Duroc population. In subjective evaluation and sensory characteristics, Duroc breeds showed significantly higher scores in all categories except for tenderness over the crossbred pigs. However, in storage characteristics, Duroc breeds showed reduced tendency relative to crossbred pigs. Crossbred pigs had higher unsaturated fatty acid content than Duroc breeds did. In these results, Duroc breeds showed excellent meat quality characteristics with its higher intramuscular fat content and pH value, lower drip loss and cooking loss and higher juiciness and flavor, compared to the crossbred pigs.

**Key words:** Duroc, crossbred pigs, carcass characteristics, meat quality, USFA

### Introduction

Pigs have been domesticated as a source of food for intake about 9,000 years ago. There are 30-40 species of domesticated pigs today (Rothschilds and Ruvinsky, 2010). In Korea, consumers prefer high marbled meat. Because marbled meat contains high lipid content, many sensory properties such as flavor and aroma volatiles and essential fatty acids. Tenderness and juiciness of meat are increased by those factors. It is clear that increase of fat in meat has a most significant effect on meat quality, though there are other factor (sex, species, age, feed, and environmental conditions) that affect meat quality. These factors include water holding capacity (WHC), color, pH, shear force, sensory attributes, and storage characteristics in meat. So, quality characteristics in meat have been

improved by studies of researchers at livestock research institutes and universities (Knap *et al.*, 2001; Kolstad *et al.*, 1996; Tizioto *et al.*, 2012).

The pig breeding stock industry is at the top of the pyramid structure of pig farms and plays an important role in providing superior genes to improve the pork industry. Thus, the ability to breed pig stock is the most important factor that influences the success or failure in the pig industry (Lee, 1996; Seo *et al.*, 2012). Currently, consumers prefer meat with excellent quality. Thus, in the three-way crossbreds, Landrace and Yorkshire are highly prolific and have a good mothering ability, and Duroc has good meat quality (Kim *et al.*, 2002; Kim *et al.*, 2006a; Seo *et al.*, 2011). Also, fertility and litter size are inherited through the maternal line, and meat productivity and meat quality are inherited through the paternal (Kim *et al.*, 2006b; Lee *et al.*, 2011). Therefore, the improvement of pig breeding stock is essential. On the other hand, Johnson *et al.* (2002) stated that average daily gain (ADG) is highest in Duroc. Among Hampshire, Landrace, Yorkshire and Duroc, respectively, ADG values of 0.83±0.13 kg, 0.85±0.15

\*Corresponding author: Jae-Joon Lee, Department of Food and Nutrition, Chosun University, Gwangju 500-759, Korea. Tel: 82-62-230-7725, Fax: 82-62-234-7452, E-mail: [leejj80@chosun.ac.kr](mailto:leejj80@chosun.ac.kr)

kg,  $0.87 \pm 0.14$  kg, and  $0.88 \pm 0.13$  kg were found during 100-177 d of age. Oh (2005) reported that the EMA (eye muscle area)'s heritability of Landrace, Yorkshire and Duroc were estimated to be 0.33, 0.18 and 0.37, respectively.

Three way crossbred pigs (Landrace  $\times$  Yorkshire  $\times$  Duroc) are mainly utilized for production of commercial pork and have more great production efficiency than pure or two-way crossbreds (Nelson and Robison, 1976). The Duroc breed is used as a terminal sire when commercial pigs are produced. Also, this breed has used for fattening of commercial pigs (Suzuki *et al.*, 2003). Therefore the objective of this study is to determine the carcass characteristics and meat quality characteristics between Duroc and crossbred pigs and to help pork industry in Korea.

## Materials and Methods

### Animals and sampling

A total of 620 pigs used in this study were comprised of 1) 200 purebred Duroc gilts, 2) 420 crossbred pigs in Korea. Duroc pigs were a part of pig improvement network program (Korea Animal Improvement Association, KAIA) at November 2010 to December 2011. Crossbred pigs (Landrace  $\times$  Yorkshire  $\times$  Duroc) were provided by Cheongwon Pig Farmers Corporation (CPFC) at March 2008 to February 2009. Pigs were raised by Korean Feeding Standard for Swine (KFSS) in the each farm. The basal diet was formulated to meet nutrient requirements of pigs and made of 51.43% corn, 18.72% wheat and wheat bran, 19.08% soybean meal, and 10.77% other feedstuffs and additives (Table 1). When the mean weight of pigs in a pen reached market weight, pigs were conventionally slaughtered and then chilled overnight. At 24 h postmortem, carcass measurements including backfat thickness, carcass length and carcass grading evaluated by Animal Products Grading Service (2001) were collected. Then, the *longissimus* muscle from left side between the 5<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> rib was removed and meat qualities were evaluated at meat science laboratory of Chungbuk National University.

### Carcass characteristics

Carcass grade, carcass weight and backfat thickness were used from the data which was measured based on cold carcass grading system in the Korea institute for animal products quality evaluation (KAPE). Carcass length was measured from the 6<sup>th</sup> cervical vertebral to H-bone on the left side.

**Table 1. Formula of basal diets**

Ingredients	Finisher
Corn	51.43
Wheat	15.00
Wheat bran	3.72
Soybean meal	19.08
Molasses	4.00
Animal fat	4.00
C. Phosphate	1.16
Limestone	0.48
Salt	0.32
CuSO <sub>4</sub>	0.08
Methionine	0.03
Lysine	0.15
Antibiotic	0.20
Mix-Vitamin <sup>1)</sup>	0.11
Mix-Meneral <sup>2)</sup>	0.10
Etc	0.14
Total	100.00
Calculated analysis (%)	
Crude protein	15.34
Crude fat	6.41
Crude ash	4.78
Crude fiber	2.98
ME (kcal/kg)	3,277

<sup>1)</sup>Supplied per kg diets: Vitamin A, 8,000,000 IU; Vitamin D, 1,500,000 IU; Vitamin E, 40,000 ppm; Vitamin K 1,500 ppm; Thiamin, 1,000 ppm; Riboflavin, 4,000 ppm; Vitamin B<sub>12</sub>, 20 ppb; Pyridoxine, 2,000 ppm; Niacin 20,000 ppm; Biotin, 30 ppm; Folic acid, 600 ppm

<sup>2)</sup>Supplied per kg diet: Se, 250 mg; I, 200 mg; Fe, 60,000 mg; Mn, 25,000 mg; Zn, 60,000 mg; Cu, 15,000 mg

### pH

Using a homogenizer (Nihonseiki, Japan), 10 g of samples was homogenized in 100 ml of distilled water for 30 s at 7,000 rpm. The pH levels of the homogenate was determined using a pH meter (Mteeler Delta 340, Mettler-tolede, Ltd, UK).

### Meat color

The L\*, a\* and b\* values were determined on the surface of freshly cut meat after 20 min bloom time using a Spectro Colormeter (Model JX-777, Color Techno. System Co., Japan) calibrated to the white plate (L\*, 89.39; a\*, 0.13; b\*, -0.51). L\*, a\*, b\* values described Hunter lab color system (L\*=lightness, a\*=redness, b\*=yellowness) using a white fluorescent light (D65) as light source. Each measurement was performed in 6 replicates, taking the mean value as the assay result.

### Water holding capacity (WHC)

The centrifugation method described by Laakkonen *et*

*al.* (1970) was used to measure WHC. *Logissimus* muscle sample ( $0.5 \pm 0.05$  g) from each line were placed in centrifugation tube with filter units, heated for 20 min at  $80^\circ\text{C}$ , and then cooled for 10 min. Samples were centrifuged at 2,000 g for 10 min  $4^\circ\text{C}$  and WHC calculated as the difference of sample weight.

#### Drip loss

A 2 cm thick slice (weight  $100 \pm 5$  g) cut from *logissimus* muscle was placed into polypropylene bag and then vacuum packaged and stored for 24 h at  $4^\circ\text{C}$ . Drip loss was calculated by weight difference of samples.

#### Proximal analysis

Moisture, protein, lipid and ash were assayed according to the AOAC methods (1995).

#### Cooking loss

A 3 cm thick slice (weight  $100 \pm 5$  g) cut from *logissimus* muscle was placed into polypropylene bag and then cooked for 40 min at  $70^\circ\text{C}$  in the water-bath and then cooled down to room temperature. Cooking loss was calculated by weight difference of samples.

#### Shear force test

A 3 cm thick slice (weight  $100 \pm 5$  g) cut from *logissimus* muscle was placed into polypropylene bag and then cooked for 40 min at  $70^\circ\text{C}$  in the water-bath and then cooled for 30 min. Samples were cut into  $1 \times 2 \times 1$  cm (width  $\times$  length  $\times$  height) pieces and max weight were measured by a shearing, and cutting test using a Rheo meter (Model Compac-100, SUN SCIENTIFIC Co., Japan) under the following operational conditions: table speed of 110 mm/min, graph interval of 20 m/sec and load cell (max.) of 10 kg using the R.D.S (Rheology Data System) Ver 2.01.

#### Cholesterol

Freeze dried samples of 0.3 g were homogenized with 12 ml of chloroform:methanol (2:1) Folch solution and then placed for 24 h at  $4^\circ\text{C}$ . Ten ml of deionized water was added. After well mixed, samples were centrifuged at  $3,000 \times g$  for 20 min  $4^\circ\text{C}$ . Lower phase of centrifuged samples were taken using a syringe and then placed in fume hood for 24 h, after completely evaporation, 1 ml of glacial acetic acid was added to the samples and vortexed for 30 s. Two ml of O-phthaldehyde reagent and 1 ml of  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$  were added to 0.1 ml of vortexed samples and then vortexed for 30 s. After 10 min, the absorbance was measured with a spectrophotometer (Optizen-3220UV, Meca-

sys, Korea) at 530 nm. Standard curve was described through that 10, 20, 30, 40, and 50 ml of cholesterol standard stock solution and 40, 30, 20, 10, 0 ml of glacial acetic acid mixed solution were measured by above procedure, respectively. And regression equation was obtained. Cholesterol content (mg/100g, dry wt.) was calculated following equation: measured amount by standard curve  $\times$  addition of glacial acetic acid  $\times$  diluted rate  $\times$  total lipid weight (mg) / sample weight.

#### Sensory characteristics

Well-trained in-house tasting panelists ( $n=5$ ) evaluated sensory attributes of tenderness, juiciness, flavor and overall acceptability, using on a 5-point scale: 1-very tough, very dry, very mild, very unacceptable, 5-very tender, very juicy, very intense, very acceptable. The sample was evaluated independently by the panelists 3 different times.

#### Subjective evaluation

Well-trained in-house tasting panelists ( $n=5$ ) evaluated subjective characteristics attributes of marbling, texture, meat color and total attribute, using on a 5-point scale: 1-extremely low in intramuscular fat, extremely bed in texture, very pale in meat color, extremely pale soft exudative (PSE), 5-very abundant in intramuscular fat, very good in texture, very dark in meat color, extremely dark firm dry (DFD). The samples were evaluated independently by the panelists 3 different times.

#### Myoglobin

Myoglobin content was measured by method of Krzywicki (1982) with modification. Two g of sample was homogenized by polytron (PT 3100, Kinematica AG, USA) with 18 ml of ( $4^\circ\text{C}$ ) 40 mM phosphate buffer (pH 6.8) for 30 s. After centrifuging the slurry at 5,200 rpm for 10 min, the fluid was filtered with Whatman No. 2  $\phi 150$  mm. Filtered fluid was measured by spectrophotometer (Optizen-3220UV, Mecasys, Korea) at 700 nm and 525 nm, respectively. The content of myoglobin was calculated using the equation:

$$\text{Myoglobin} = (A_{525} - A_{700}) \times 2.303 \times (18/\text{sample weight})$$

where  $A_\lambda$  = absorbance at  $\lambda$  nm.

#### Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses were carried out using the Generalized Linear Model (GLM) procedure of the SAS package (Statistical analysis system: The SAS system Release

9.01, 2002), Means were compared using the Duncan's multiple range test at a level of significance of  $p < 0.05$ . And the following model:

### Comparison of Duroc and LYD pigs

$$y_i = \mu + \tau_i + \varepsilon$$

where,

y = observed value of the trait

$\mu$  = mean

$\tau$  = breeds effect (Duroc and LYD)

$\varepsilon$  = random error

## Results and Discussion

### Comparison of carcass characteristics between Duroc and crossbred pigs

The results from comparing the carcass characteristics and grades between Duroc and crossbred pig are shown in Table 2. All carcass characteristics were not significantly different. Carcass weight, carcass length, and backfat thickness of Duroc and crossbred pigs were 87.76, 86.96, 81.10, 80.87, 22.49, and 22.17 respectively. In carcass grade, the incidences of grade 1+ and 1 were higher in the Duroc population than in LYD. In contrast, the incidences of grade A and B were higher in the LYD population. According to Huff-lonergan *et al.* (2002), carcass weight was significantly correlated with marbling, juiciness and off-flavor, and backfat thickness was correlated with marbling, firmness, tenderness, flavor and off-flavor. In addition, heavier and leaner carcasses are prone to show less marbling, are less firm, less tender and have reduced characteristics in pork flavor than carcasses that have smaller loin eye and thick backfat. According to the research result of Franco *et al.* (2014), crossbreeding imp-

**Table 2. Comparison of carcass characteristics and carcass grade between Duroc and crossbred pigs (LYD)**

Items	Duroc (n=200)	LYD (n=420)	
Carcass weight (kg)	87.76±8.46 <sup>1)</sup>	86.96±7.49	
Carcass length (cm)	81.10±4.91	80.87±2.97	
Backfat thickness (mm)	22.49±4.86	22.17±4.68	
Quality grade (%)	Grade 1+	23.84	7.69
	Grade 1	33.45	42.10
	Grade 2	42.70	50.20
Yield grade (%)	Grade A	39.16	44.00
	Grade B	27.27	34.66
	Grade C	32.86	14.00
	Grade D	0.69	7.33

LYD, Landrace × Yorkshire × Duroc, <sup>1)</sup>Mean±SE

proved the growth, carcass yield and percentage of lean meat because of higher ham development in the comparison of pure Celta pig and Celta pig crossed with Duroc. Also, Duroc breed tended to have thicker backfat and fat in muscle compared to Yorkshire breed (Enfalt *et al.*, 1997). Consistent with the results of this study, these results indicate that Duroc breed is good at production of high quality pork and crossbred breed is good at production of better yield.

### Comparison of meat quality characteristics between Duroc and crossbred pigs

The comparison of meat quality characteristics of Duroc and crossbred pig are shown in Table 3. In chemical composition, moisture and protein contents were higher in crossbred pigs than in the Duroc population ( $p < 0.05$ ). However, in fat content, the Duroc population showed a higher value than commercial pigs did ( $p < 0.05$ ). No significant difference was observed in the ash content between the two species. In the comparison of meat quality from Duroc population and crossbred pigs, drip loss and cooking loss of *longissimus* muscle in the Duroc population were lower than in the crossbred pigs. Also, a higher pH<sub>24h</sub> value was detected in Duroc population than in crossbred pigs. However, there were no differences in WHC and shear force value. In Hunter color, the Duroc population showed significantly higher yellowness compared to that in the crossbred pigs which in turn showed a higher value in redness ( $p < 0.05$ ). In lightness, no signifi-

**Table 3. Comparison of meat quality characteristics of the *longissimus* muscle between Duroc and crossbred pigs (LYD)**

Items	Duroc (n=200)	LYD (n=420)	
Moisture (%)	73.09±1.06 <sup>b</sup>	73.75±1.16 <sup>a</sup>	
Protein (%)	22.79±0.78 <sup>b</sup>	22.99±1.22 <sup>a</sup>	
Fat (%)	2.98±0.97 <sup>a</sup>	2.19±0.81 <sup>b</sup>	
Ash (%)	1.09±0.28	1.10±0.37	
pH <sub>24h</sub>	5.73±0.15 <sup>a</sup>	5.58±0.20 <sup>b</sup>	
WHC (%)	58.64±4.13	59.50±5.99	
Drip loss (%)	3.74±1.24 <sup>b</sup>	5.42±2.08 <sup>a</sup>	
Cooking loss (%)	27.84±3.29 <sup>b</sup>	30.29±3.33 <sup>a</sup>	
Shear force (kg)	1.49±0.33	1.44±0.39	
	L	55.80±2.76	55.05±5.61
Hunter color <sup>1)</sup>	a	4.85±1.00 <sup>b</sup>	5.19±1.47 <sup>a</sup>
	b	8.21±0.93 <sup>a</sup>	6.80±1.38 <sup>b</sup>
	Total cholesterol (mg/100 g)	96.61±44.43	97.32±43.00
Myoglobin (mg/100 g)	3.94±0.90 <sup>b</sup>	4.11±0.50 <sup>a</sup>	

<sup>1)</sup>L, lightness; a, redness; b, yellowness

\*LYD, Landrace × Yorkshire × Duroc

<sup>a,b</sup>Means±SE with different superscription within the same row differ ( $p < 0.05$ ).

cant ( $p>0.05$ ) differences were observed between the two species. Total cholesterol content of Duroc and crossbred pigs did not show significant differences. In myoglobin content, crossbred pigs had higher content compared to that in the Duroc population ( $p<0.05$ ). Kim *et al.* (2008) investigated the effects of pig breed on meat quality of the *longissimus* muscle. LYD showed significantly higher lightness values compared to (Yorkshire  $\times$  Berkshire)  $\times$  Berkshire, British Berkshire, Kagoshima Berkshire, and Korean native black pig  $\times$  wild boars. Lloveras *et al.* (2008) reported a comparison of meat quality of offspring from sows (50% Landrace, 25% Yorkshire, and 25% Duroc) crossed with Duroc or Yorkshire pure breed boars. The offspring sired by Duroc showed better meat quality in WHC, shear force, tenderness, juiciness, and intramuscular fat content. After slaughter the pH and intramuscular fat content in the muscle is important values to evaluate the meat quality. Pork could be determined to normal or abnormal (pale soft exudative and dark firm dry meat) according to the pH in meat. So, pH is related to meat quality like as drip loss, color, WHC and palatability (Joo *et al.*, 1995; Kauffman *et al.*, 1993; Warner *et al.*, 1993; Van Laack and Smulders, 1992). Also, the intramuscular fat has an impact on meat quality including juiciness, tenderness, flavor and shelf-life in meat (Channon *et al.*, 2004; Garmyn *et al.*, 2011; Ramirez and Cava, 2007). Within this context, Duroc in the present study was better in meat quality (intramuscular fat, ultimate pH<sub>24h</sub>, drip loss and cooking loss) than crossbred pigs as well.

#### Comparison of subjective evaluation and sensory characteristics of the *longissimus* muscle between Duroc and crossbred pigs

Table 4 shows the comparison of a subjective evaluation and sensory characteristics of *longissimus* muscle from Duroc and crossbred pigs. All items of the subjective evaluation were significantly higher in the Duroc population ( $p<0.05$ ) than in the crossbred pigs. Furthermore, juiciness, flavor and overall acceptability, included in the sensory characteristics, were significantly different except for tenderness ( $p<0.05$ ). According to Blanchard *et al.* (2000), eating quality (such as juiciness, tenderness, pork flavor, abnormal flavor and overall acceptability) was not affected by intramuscular fat from the loin of hybrid pigs sired by Duroc or Large white boars because other factors (such as proteolysis, sarcomere length and collagen content) may affect the tenderness of meats (Wheeler *et al.*, 2000).

**Table 4. Comparison of subjective evaluation<sup>1)</sup> and sensory characteristics<sup>2)</sup> of the *longissimus* muscle between Duroc and crossbred pigs (LYD)**

Items	Duroc (n=200)	LYD (n=420)
Marbling	3.21±0.95 <sup>a</sup>	2.65±1.11 <sup>b</sup>
Texture	3.07±0.30 <sup>a</sup>	2.86±0.63 <sup>b</sup>
Color	3.13±0.29 <sup>a</sup>	3.01±0.61 <sup>b</sup>
Total attribute	3.03±0.17 <sup>a</sup>	2.85±0.44 <sup>b</sup>
Tenderness	3.10±0.55	2.99±0.78
Juiciness	3.08±0.43 <sup>a</sup>	2.97±0.63 <sup>b</sup>
Flavor	3.09±0.37 <sup>a</sup>	2.91±0.63 <sup>b</sup>
Overall acceptability	3.10±0.43 <sup>a</sup>	2.92±0.65 <sup>b</sup>

LYD, Landrace  $\times$  Yorkshire  $\times$  Duroc

<sup>a,b</sup>Means±SE with different superscription within the same row differ ( $p<0.05$ ).

<sup>1)</sup>Marbling: 1, extremely low in intramuscular fat; 5, very abundant in intramuscular fat, Texture: 1, extremely bad in texture; 5, very good in texture, Meat color: 1, very pale in meat color, 5, very dark in meat color, Total attribute: 1, extremely PSE; 5, extremely DFD

<sup>2)</sup>1: very tough, very dry, very mild, very unacceptable, 5: very tender, very juicy, very intense, very acceptable

**Table 5. Comparison of fatty acid compositions of the *longissimus* muscle between Duroc and crossbred pigs (LYD)**

Items	Duroc (n=200)	LYD (n=420)
Myristic acid (C14:0)	1.45±0.12	1.44±0.13
Palmitic acid (C16:0)	25.29±0.97 <sup>a</sup>	24.57±0.97 <sup>b</sup>
Palmitoleic acid (C16:1)	2.86±0.47	3.00±0.31
Stearic acid (C18:0)	14.72±1.37	13.78±1.32
Oleic acid (C18:1)	44.40±2.38	46.00±1.70
Linoleic acid (C18:2)	9.50±2.33	9.26±3.27
Linolenic acid (C18:3)	0.47±0.12	0.52±0.19
Eicosenoic acid (C20:1)	0.85±0.09 <sup>b</sup>	0.95±0.06 <sup>a</sup>
Arachidonic acid (C20:4)	0.43±0.23	0.44±0.09
Total saturated fatty acids	41.46±2.04 <sup>a</sup>	39.79±2.04 <sup>b</sup>
Mono-unsaturated fatty acids	10.41±2.39	10.23±3.49
Poly-unsaturated fatty acids	48.11±2.73	49.96±1.84
Total unsaturated fatty acids	58.53±2.04 <sup>b</sup>	60.20±2.04 <sup>a</sup>
USFA/SFA	1.41±0.11 <sup>b</sup>	1.51±0.13 <sup>a</sup>

LYD, Landrace  $\times$  Yorkshire  $\times$  Duroc

<sup>a,b</sup>Means±SE with different superscription within the same row differ ( $p<0.05$ ).

#### Comparison of fatty acid composition between Duroc and crossbred pigs

The comparison of fatty acid composition of *longissimus* muscle from Duroc and crossbred pigs is shown in Table 5. Significant differences were found in palmitic acid (C16:0) and eicosenoic acid (C20:1) contents. Palmitic acid (C16:0) content was significantly higher in the Duroc population than in the crossbred pigs. On the other hand, eicosenoic acid content (C20:1) was significantly higher in the crossbred pigs ( $p<0.05$ ). Total saturated fatty acids of the Duroc population were higher than those in crossbred pigs. Total unsaturated fatty acids were higher

in crossbred pigs ( $p < 0.05$ ). In addition, the ratio of unsaturated fatty acid to saturated fatty acid (USFA/SFA) showed significantly higher values crossbred pigs than in the Duroc population ( $p < 0.05$ ). According to Raj *et al.* (2010), in a comparison of different breeds (Landrace, Duroc, Hampshire, and Pietrain) of pig, heavier pigs (130 kg body weight) showed higher saturated fatty acid content than did lighter pigs (90 and 110 kg body weight). Also, the content of saturated fatty acids was positively correlated with intramuscular fat and backfat. On the contrary, content of poly unsaturated fatty acid was negatively correlated with the presence of intramuscular fat and backfat. In addition, according to Lo Fiego *et al.* (2005), Pascual *et al.* (2006), and Bermudez *et al.* (2012), fatty acid composition in pigs could change according to nutritional components of the feed. In this study, there was no significant difference in carcass weight between Duroc and crossbred pigs ( $p > 0.05$ ). Furthermore, Duroc with intramuscular fat content higher than that of crossbred pigs showed a higher saturated fatty acid content.

### Conclusion

Duroc pigs are widely used as terminal sires in the pork industry. Therefore, we compared the carcass characteristics and meat quality characteristics between Duroc and crossbred pigs. Duroc and crossbred pigs did not show difference in carcass characteristics. Crossbred pigs had higher moisture and protein content than did Duroc breeds. However, Duroc breeds had a higher fat content than crossbred pigs. In meat quality characteristics, crossbred pigs showed higher values of drip loss and cooking loss than did Duroc breeds while Duroc breeds showed higher ultimate pH value compared to that of crossbred pigs. In a subjective evaluation and sensory characteristics, Duroc breeds showed significantly higher scores in all categories except for tenderness relative to crossbred pigs. However, crossbred pigs had higher USFA content of fatty acid composition than did Duroc breeds. As a result, Duroc breed were desirable in the meat quality characteristics due to higher intramuscular fat content and pH value, lower drip loss and cooking loss, even higher juiciness and flavor compared to crossbred pigs.

### Acknowledgements

This study was supported by research funding of Korea Animal Improvement Association. This study was also partially supported by Priority Research Centers Program

through the national research foundation of Korea (FRF) funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology.

### References

1. AOAC. (1995) Official methods of analysis. 13th ed. Association of Official Analytical Chemists. Washington, D.C.
2. Blanchard, J. P., Willis, M. B., Warkup, C. C., and Ellis, M. (2000) The influence of carcass backfat and intramuscular fat level on pork eating quality. *J. Sci. Food Agric.* **80**, 145-151.
3. Bermudez, R., Franco, I., Franco, D., Carballo, J., and Lorenzo, J. M. (2012) Influence of inclusion of chestnut in the finishing diet on fatty acid profile of dry-cured ham from Celta pig breed. *Meat Sci.* **92**, 394-399.
4. Channon, H. A., Kerr, M. G., and Walker, P. J. (2004) Effect of Duroc content, sex and ageing period on meat and eating quality attributes of pork loin. *Meat Sci.* **66**, 881-888.
5. Franco, D., Vazquez, J. A., and Lorenzo, J. M. (2014) Growth performance, carcass and meat quality of the Celta pig crossbred with Duroc and Landrace genotypes. *Meat Sci.* **96**, 195-202.
6. Enfalt, A. C., Lundstrom, K., Hannson, I., Lundeheim, N., and Nystrom, P. E. (1997) Effects of outdoor rearing and sire breed (Duroc or Yorkshire) on carcass composition and sensory and technological meat quality. *Meat Sci.* **45**, 1-15.
7. Garmyn, A. J., Hilton, G. G., Mateescu, R. G., Morgan, J. B., Reecy, J. M., Tait, Jr., R. G., Beitz, D. C., Duan, Q., Schoonmaker, J. P., Mayes, M. S., Drewnoski, M. E., Liu, Q., and VanOverbeke, D. L. (2011) Estimation of relationships between mineral concentration and fatty acid composition of longissimus muscle and beef palatability traits. *J. Anim. Sci.* **89**, 2849-2858.
8. Huff-Lonergan, E., Baas, T. J., Malek, M., Dekkers, J. C. M., Prusa, K., and Rothschild, M. F. (2002) Correlations among selected pork quality traits. *J. Anim. Sci.* **80**, 617-627.
9. Johnson, Z. B., Chewning, J. J., and Nugent, R. A. (2002) Maternal effects on traits measured during postweaning performance test of swine from four breeds. *J. Anim. Sci.* **80**, 1470-1477.
10. Joo, S. T., Kauffman, R. G., Kim, B. C., and Kim, C. J. (1995) The relationship between color and water-holding capacity in post-rigor porcine *longissimus* Muscle. *J. Muscle Foods* **6**, 211-226.
11. Kim, J. H., Park, B. Y., Yoo, Y. M., Cho, S. H., Hwang, I. H., Seong, P. N., Hah, K. H., and Lee, J. M. (2006a) Characteristics of carcass and meat quality for Landrace, Yorkshire, Duroc and their crossbreeds. *J. Anim. Sci. Technol.* **48**, 101-106.
12. Kim, I. S., Jin, S. K., Song, Y. M., Park, K. H., Kang, S. M., Ha, J. H., Kim, I. J., Park, Y. S., and Kim, J. H. (2006b) Quality characteristics of pork by sex on crossbred pigs. *Korean J. Intl. Agri.* **18**, 34-39.
13. Kim, J. H., Park, B. Y., Yoo, Y. M., Cho, S. H., Kim, Y. K., Lee, J. M., Yun, H. J., and Kim, K. N. (2002) Characteristics of carcass and meat yield of fattening pigs by production step. *J. Anim. Sci. Technol.* **44**, 793-800.

14. Kim, I. S., Jin, S. K., Kim, C. W., Song, Y. M., Cho, K. K., and Chung, K. H. (2008) The effect of pig breeds on proximate, physicochemical, cholesterol, amino acid and sensory properties of loins. *J. Anim. Technol.* **50**, 121-132.
15. Knap, P. W., van der Steen, H. A. M., and Plastow, G. S. (2001) Developments in pig breeding and the role of research. *Livest. Prod. Sci.* **72**, 43-48.
16. Kolstad, K. and Vangen, O. (1996) Breed differences in maintenance requirements of growing pigs when accounting for changes in body composition. *Livest. Prod. Sci.* **47**, 23-32.
17. Kauffman, R. G., Sybesma, W., Smulders, F. J. M., Eikelenboom, G., Engeld, B., van Laack, R. L. J. M., Hoving-Bolink, A. H., Sterrenburg, P., Nordheim, E. V., Walstra, P., and van der Wal, P. G. (1993) The effectiveness of examining early post-mortem musculature to predict ultimate pork quality. *Meat Sci.* **34**, 283-300.
18. Krzywicki, K. (1982) The determination of haem pigments in meat. *Meat Sci.* **7**, 29-36.
19. Laakkonen, E., Wellington, G. H., and Skerbon, J. W. (1970) Low temperature longtime heating of bovine. I. Changes in tenderness, water binding capacity, pH and amount of water-soluble component. *J. Food. Sci.* **35**, 175-177.
20. Lee, Y. H., Kwon, S. G., Park, D. H., Kwon, E. J., Cho, E. S., Bang, W. Y., Park, H. C. Park, B. Y., Choi, J. S., and Kim, C. W. (2011) Development of high meat quality using microsatellite markers in Berkshire pigs. *J. Anim. Sci. Tech.* **52**, 89-97.
21. Lee W. (1996) Problems and countermeasures of pig husbandry industry in Korea. *Livest. Technol. Ind.* **4**, 1016-1028.
22. Lloveras, M. R., Goenaga, P. R., Irurueta, M., Carduza, F., Grigioni, G., Garcya, P. T., and Amendola, A. (2008) Meat quality traits of commercial hybrid pigs in Argentina. *Meat Sci.* **79**, 458-462.
23. Lo Fiego, D. P., Macchioni, P., Santoro, P., Pastorelli, G., and Corino, C. (2005) Effect of dietary conjugated linoleic acid (CLA) supplementation on CLA isomers content and fatty acid composition of dry-cured parma ham. *Meat Sci.* **70**, 285-291.
24. Nelson, R. E. and Robison, O. W. (1976) Comparisons of specific two- and three-way crosses of swine. *J. Anim. Sci.* **42**, 1150-1157.
25. Ngapo, T. M., Riendeau, L., Laberge, C., and Fortin, J. (2012) Marbling and ageing - Part 2. Consumer perception of sensory quality. *Food Res. Intl.* **51**, 985-991.
26. Ngapo, T. M., Riendeau, L., Laberge, C., and Fortin, J. (2012a) Marbling and ageing - Part I. Sensory quality of pork. *Food Res. Intl.* **49**, 396-405.
27. Oh, H. S. (2005) Estimation of genetic trend for economic traits of the integrated swine group led by kaya GGP in Gyeongsangnamdo, Korea, Gyeongsang Univ., Doctorate Thesis.
28. Pascual, J. V., Rafecas, M., Canela, M. A., Boatella, J., Bou, R., Baucells, M. D., and Codony, R. (2006) Effect of increasing amounts of a linoleic-rich dietary fat on the fat composition of four pig breeds. Part I: backfat fatty acid evolution. *Food Chem.* **96**, 538-548.
29. Ramirez, R., and Cava, R. (2007) Carcass composition and meat quality of three different Iberian x Duroc genotype pigs. *Meat Sci.* **75**, 388-396.
30. Raj, St., Skiba, G., Weremko, D., Fandrejowski, H., Migdal, W., Borowiec, F., and Polawska, E. (2010) The relationship between the chemical composition of the carcass and the fatty acid composition of intramuscular fat and backfat of several pig breeds slaughtered at different weights. *Meat Sci.* **86**, 324-330.
31. Rothschild, M. F., and Ruvinsky, A. (2010) The genetics of pigs, Cambridge, MA: CABI.
32. SAS. (2002) The SAS System Release 9.1, SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC.
33. Seo, J. H., Shin, J. S., Noh, J. K., Song, C. E., and Do, C. H. (2011) The situation of genetic exchange in Duroc breed and impacts on genetic evaluation. *J. Anim. Sci. Tech.* **53**, 397-408.
34. Seo, K. S. (2012) Activation of the system of the domestic pig husbandry business network and export competitiveness suggestions for pig husbandry. *Pig & Pork*, 173-177.
35. Suzuki, K., Shibata, T., Kadowaki, H., Abe, H., and Toyoshima, T. (2003) Meat quality comparison of Berkshire, Duroc and crossbred pigs sired by Berkshire and Duroc. *Meat Sci.* **64**, 35-42.
36. Tizioto, P. C., Meirelles, S. L., Veneroni, G. B., Tullio, R. R., Rosa, A. N., Alencar, M. M., Medeiros, S. R., Siqueira, F., Feijo, G. L., Silva, L. O., Jr. Torres, R. A., and Regitano, L. C. (2012) A SNP in ASAP1 gene is associated with meat quality and production traits in Nelore breed. *Meat Sci.* **92**, 855-857.
37. Van Laack, R. L. J. M. and Smulders, F. J. M. (1992) On the assessment of water-holding capacity of hot- vs cold-boned pork. *Meat Sci.* **32**, 139-147.
38. Warner, R. D., Kauffman, R. G., and Russel, R. L. (1993) Quality attributes of major porcine muscles: A comparison with the *longissimus lumborum*. *Meat Sci.* **33**, 359-372.
39. Wheeler, T. L., Shackelford, S. D., and Koohmaraie, M. (2000) Variation in proteolysis, sarcomere length, collagen content, and tenderness among major pork muscles. *J. Anim. Sci.* **78**, 958-965.

---

(Received 2014.2.26/Revised 2014.3.31/Accepted 2014.4.2)