

1 **Effect of balanced dietary protein on the physico-chemical quality and sensory**  
2 **attributes of rabbit meat from New Zealand White and Californian rabbits**

---

3 **By**

4 **Anela Makebe**

5 BSc. Agric. (Hons) Animal Science

6 (University of Fort Hare)

7 A dissertation submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

8 **Master of Science in Agriculture (Animal Science)**

9 In the

10 Discipline of Animal & Poultry Science

11 School of Agriculture, Earth & Environmental Sciences

12 College of Agriculture, Engineering & Science



17 Pietermaritzburg

Republic of South Africa

2023

**Supervisor:** Dr Z.T. Rani

18 Declaration

19 I, Anela Makebe, declare that this dissertation has not been submitted to any University and  
20 that it is my original work conducted under the supervision of Dr Z.T. Rani. All assistance  
21 towards the production of this work and all references contained herein have been accordingly  
22 acknowledged.

23 

11 January 2023

24 \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

25 Anela Makebe

Date

26 **Approved as style and content by:**

27 

28 \_\_\_\_\_

29 **Dr Z.T. Rani**

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43 List of abbreviations

WBSF	Warner Bratzler Shear force
L*	Lightness
a*	Redness
b*	Yellowness
CL	Cooking loss
WHC	Water holding capacity
NZW	New Zealand white
CAL	Californian
AI	Aroma intensity
NS	Not Significant
OF	Overall flavour intensity
MFT	Muscle fibre and overall tenderness

44

45

46

47

48 General Abstract

49 The study was conducted at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Ukulinga Research farm  
50 Pietermaritzburg, South Africa (SA) with the aim of investigating the effect of balanced dietary  
51 protein on physico-chemical quality and sensory attributes of New Zealand white (NZW) and  
52 Californian (CAL) rabbits. A total of eighty (80) NZW and CAL rabbits were allocated to a  
53 diet composed of six balanced dietary protein levels (T1 = 126g/kg, T2 = 143g/kg, T3 =  
54 161g/kg, T4 = 178g/kg, T5 = 196g/kg and T6 = 213g/kg) at weaning age (35 days) for a period  
55 of 56 days. The rabbits were fed twice a day at 08:00 am and t 16:00 pm with water provided  
56 *ad libitum*. Meat quality traits which include pH, colour (L\*, a\* and b\*), water holding  
57 capacity, cooking loss, shear force and drip loss were measured. No significant effects were  
58 found for pH values between the two breeds at pH<sub>45</sub> and pH<sub>24</sub>. No significant differences were  
59 observed in colour (L\*, a\* and b\*), water holding capacity (WHC), drip loss (DL), cooking  
60 loss (CL) and shear force values of meat. Sensory attributes of the meat from New Zealand  
61 (NZW) and Californian (CAL) were also evaluated using different tribes (Xhosa, Zulu and  
62 Shona), gender and ages with different cooking methods (cooking and frying). In this study,  
63 the first bite was rated superior (P < 0.05) in NZW breed for cooked meat. High scores were  
64 observed in overall flavour intensity for fried meat in NZW breed (P < 0.05). In relation to  
65 tribes, Shona tribe gave higher scores (P < 0.05) for both cooked and fried meat for all sensory  
66 properties. Age was observed to have a significant impact whereby the highest scores (P <  
67 0.05) for sustained impression of juiciness from fried meat were given by respondents in age  
68 group 26-30 years. High sensory evaluation scores (P < 0.05) were observed in both females  
69 and males in fried meat than cooked meat for all sensory characteristics. Highest scores (P <  
70 0.05) were detected in overall flavour intensity of fried meat in all tribes. The sensory scores  
71 for fried meat were significantly higher (P < 0.05) than cooked meat across age group between  
72 21-25 and 26-30 years of age. It was concluded that the physico-chemical quality of NZW and

73 CAL rabbits was not altered by the balanced dietary protein, and consumer's demonstrated to  
74 have a higher preferred fried meat than cooked meat based on the scores given by the  
75 respondents.

76 **Key words:** Rabbit Meat, Consumer sensory evaluation, Colour, Age, Gender, Cooking  
77 method, Tribe.

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92 Acknowledgements

93 My honest acknowledgements go to my supervisor, **Dr Z.T. Rani** and project funder **Prof**  
94 **R.M. Gous**, who have both encouraged and supported me in wonderful ways during my  
95 studies.

96 My sincere gratitude also goes to all the Ukulinga Research farm staff who assisted me during  
97 the data collection. I would also love to give special thanks to Lwando Mbambalala and Mr  
98 Samkelo Saho for their valuable input in proof-reading my work and their assistance towards  
99 the final document.

100 I would like to express a word of appreciation to my family for their support and prayers  
101 throughout this journey. A special word of appreciation goes to my fellow colleagues for their  
102 moral support and assistance. This project would have not been a success without the financial  
103 support of National Research Foundation (NRF). I would also love to give thanks to my friends  
104 for emotional support and for believing in me. I thank God for every step in this work.

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112 Dedication

113 I dedicate this work to my parents Mr S. Makebe and Mrs N.L Makebe and the entire Makebe

114 Family, ooZikhali!

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140		
141	Table of Contents	
142	Declaration .....	2
143	List of abbreviations .....	3
144	General Abstract .....	4
145	Acknowledgements.....	6
146	Dedication.....	7
147	Table of Contents.....	8
148	List of tables.....	12
149	CHAPTER 1 .....	14
150	General introduction.....	14
151	1.1 Background .....	14
152	1.2 Problem statement .....	15
153	1.3 Justification .....	15
154	1.4 Study Aim .....	16
155	1.5 Hypothesis.....	16
156	References.....	17
157	CHAPTER 2 .....	19
158	Review of literature.....	19
159	2.1 Introduction .....	19
160	2.2 Rabbit farming.....	20

161	2.2.1 Significance of rabbit production .....	20
162	2.2.2 Challenges of rabbit production .....	21
163	2.3 Rabbit breeds.....	21
164	2.4 Nutritional composition of rabbit meat .....	22
165	2.5 Meat quality as influenced by dietary protein.....	24
166	2.6 Meat quality parameters.....	24
167	2.6.1 Meat pH.....	24
168	2.6.2 Meat colour .....	25
169	2.6.3 Cooking loss.....	25
170	2.6.4 Tenderness.....	26
171	2.6.5 Water holding capacity.....	26
172	2.6.6 Drip loss .....	26
173	2.7 Sensory evaluation .....	27
174	2.7.1 Aroma and flavour .....	27
175	2.7.2 Meat juiciness.....	27
176	2.7.3 Tenderness.....	28
177	2.8 Summary .....	28
178	References.....	29
179	CHAPTER 3 .....	36
180	Abstract .....	36
181	3.1 Introduction .....	37

182	3.1.2 Animal housing .....	39
183	3.1.3 Experimental diets.....	39
184	3.2 Slaughter .....	45
185	3.3 Meat sample preparation.....	45
186	3.4 Physicochemical analysis.....	45
187	3.4.1 pH determination.....	45
188	3.4.2 Determination of meat colour .....	45
189	3.4.3 Water holding capacity.....	46
190	3.4.4 Drip loss .....	46
191	3.4.5 Warner-Bratzler shear force and cooking losses determination.....	46
192	3.5 Statistical analysis.....	47
193	3.7 Results.....	47
194	3.8 Discussion.....	62
195	3.9 Conclusion .....	64
196	References.....	65
197	CHAPTER 4 .....	68
198	Abstract .....	68
199	4.1 Introduction.....	69
200	4.2 Materials and methods .....	70
201	4.3 Sensory evaluation .....	70
202	4.4 Statistical analysis.....	72

203	4.5 Results.....	73
204	4.6 Discussion.....	81
205	4.7 Conclusion.....	83
206	CHAPTER 5.....	84
207	5.1 General discussion.....	84
208	5.2 Conclusion.....	85
209	5.3 Recommendations.....	85
210	6. References.....	86
211	<b>Appendix 1: Meat sensory evaluation sheet of rabbit.....</b>	<b>99</b>
212		
213		
214		
215		
216		
217		
218		
219		
220		
221		
222		
223		
224		

225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232

233 [List of tables](#)

234 Table 2. 1 Nutritional composition (% unless stated otherwise) of meat .....23  
235  
236 Table 3. 1 Ingredients and nutrient composition in the low and high basal protein feeds.....41  
237 Table 3. 2 Proportions of high and low protein basal feeds used for each dietary treatment and  
238 feeding period .....42  
239 Table 3. 3 Proximate chemical analysis of the six experimental diets for period 1 (g/kg).....43  
240 Table 3. 4 Proximate chemical analysis of the six experimental diets for period 2 (g/kg).....44  
241 Table 3. 5 Mean values for meat pH of NZW and CAL as influenced by balanced dietary  
242 protein .....48  
243 Table 3. 6 The effect of balanced dietary protein on the pH of meat of New Zealand White  
244 (NZW) and Californian (CAL) rabbits using linear regression with groups1 .....49  
245 Table 3. 7 Mean values for meat colour co-ordinates of NZW and CAL as influenced by  
246 balanced dietary protein .....51  
247 Table 3. 8 The effect of balanced dietary protein on the colour coordinates of meat of New  
248 Zealand White (NZW) and Californian (CAL) rabbits using linear regression with groups<sup>1</sup> .52  
249 Table 3. 9 Mean values for water holding capacity of NZW and CAL as influenced by balanced  
250 dietary protein .....54  
251 Table 3. 10 The effect of balanced dietary protein on the water holding capacity of meat of  
252 New Zealand White (NZW) and Californian (CAL) rabbits using linear regression with  
253 groups1 .....54  
254 Table 3. 11 Mean values for cooking loss of NZW and CAL as influenced by balanced dietary  
255 protein .....55  
256 Table 3. 12 The effect of balanced dietary protein on the cooking loss of meat of New Zealand  
257 White (NZW) and Californian (CAL) rabbits using linear regression with groups1 .....56  
258 Table 3. 13 Mean values for Shear force values of NZW and CAL as influenced by balanced  
259 dietary protein .....58

260	Table 3. 14 The effect of balanced dietary protein on the shear force (tenderness) of meat of	
261	New Zealand White (NZW) and Californian (CAL) rabbits using linear regression with	
262	groups1.....	59
263	Table 3. 15 Mean values for drip loss of NZW and CAL as influenced by balanced dietary	
264	protein .....	60
265	Table 3. 16 The effect of balanced dietary protein on the drip loss of meat of New Zealand	
266	White (NZW) and Californian (CAL) rabbits using linear regression with groups1 .....	61
267		
268	Table 4. 1: Meat sensory evaluation characteristics .....	71
269	Table 4. 2: Influence of breed, diet and thermal treatment on aroma intensity, initial impression	
270	of juiciness and sustained impression of juiciness.....	75
271	Table 4. 3: Influence of breed, diet and thermal treatment on muscle fibre & overall tenderness,	
272	amount of connective tissue and overall flavour intensity.....	76
273	Table 4. 4: Influence of gender and thermal treatment on sensory characteristics.....	77
274	Table 4. 5: Influence of tribe and thermal treatment on sensory characteristics .....	78
275	Table 4. 6: Effect of age and thermal treatment on sensory characteristics .....	79
276		
277		
278		
279		
280		
281		
282		
283		
284		
285		
286		

## CHAPTER 1

### General introduction

#### 1.1 Background

Nowadays, modern animal production including rabbits have gained more emphasis and attention in the area of research. Their early sexual maturity, high productivity rate, and short pregnancy period as well the ability to breed at any time of the year has brought rabbit production system into fame (Bhattacharjya *et al.*, 2020). In comparison to other species, rabbits pose biological advantages as they can play a significant role in enhancing animal protein production, especially in developing countries, including South Africa (Foster *et al.*, 2019). Unlike poultry, rabbits have economic advantages due the fact that these animals can be successfully grown on high forage diets and low-grain (Bharathy *et al.*, 2022), thus reducing ongoing competition between animals and humans for grains.

The meat from rabbits is found to be nutritive and healthy as compared to other kinds of meat such as beef, mutton and pork (Dalle Zotte, 2014). Recently, customers are becoming more concerned in healthy living habits like balancing diet by choosing nutritional foods that are low in cholesterol and high protein (Crovato *et al.*, 2022). Rabbit meat has low concentration of fat as well as low cholesterol (Kallas, and Gil, 2012). Apart from this, rabbit meat is easily digested, flavourful and has no religious rules prohibit (Bhattacharjya *et al.*, 2020). Given that rabbit is nutritious compared to other species, it is then suggested for consumption especially for humans suffering with heart related diseases (Para *et al.*, 2015).

The most common rabbit breeds mainly used for meat worldwide include New Zealand White (NZW) and Californian (CAL) due to their good growth characteristics and high meat-to-bone ratio (Salihu, 2021). Despite the fact that NZW and CAL are capitalizing in terms of the above-mentioned traits, few studies have been conducted in attempt to investigate the effect of balanced dietary protein on their meat quality , especially in South Africa (SA). Balanced

312 dietary protein is important due to the reason that it reduces or inhibit factors such as heat stress  
313 conditions (Maharjan *et al.* 2021). Proteins are composed of amino acids that a rabbit's body  
314 utilizes to function efficiently, build muscle and gain weight (Singh *et al.* 2021). Feeding with  
315 dietary protein improves animal performance, maintain well-being and enhance meat quality  
316 (Wang *et al.* 2021). Various studies have been conducted on examining meat quality of other  
317 species such as broilers and pigs as affected by the dietary protein (Sterling *et al.* 2006 and  
318 Wang *et al.* 2022). Furthermore, a study by Liu *et al.* (2015) confirmed that dietary protein  
319 content positively affected meat quality in pigs. This current study was then proposed to  
320 investigate the effect of balanced dietary protein on the physico-chemical properties and  
321 sensory attributes of rabbit meat from NZW and CAL rabbits.

### 322 1.2 Problem statement

323 Several researchers have anticipated that white meat consumption will increase by 35.4 kg in  
324 2024, due to an ever-increasing human population in the world (Delpont *et al.* 2017). Livestock  
325 species experience health-related issues that affect their meat and products. For example, pork  
326 products were removed from the market due to the outbreak of Listeriosis (Fasanmi *et al.*,  
327 2017). The possible options such as prioritizing rabbit farming have to be considered so as to  
328 meet protein needs of consumers (Śmiecińska *et al.* 2022). In this regard, there is an urgent  
329 need to find alternative protein sources representing white meat. Rabbit could be then a  
330 potential alternative species as its meat pose nutritional health benefits compared to other  
331 species (Para *et al.* 2015).

### 332 1.3 Justification

333 Protein is very essential in rabbit's diet to support healthy growth more especially when in  
334 growing phase and supply source of energy (Birolo *et al.* 2022). Proteins comprise amino acids,  
335 which a rabbit's body requires to function properly, build muscle and put on weight (Singh *et*  
336 *al.* 2021). The effect of balanced dietary protein on meat quality of NZW and CAL rabbits is

337 not fully understood. Such information is critical in making recommendations on which breed  
338 respond positively when fed balanced dietary proteins. In general, rabbit's meat is healthy  
339 compared to other species, due to its low concentration of fat, low levels of cholesterol and  
340 high protein (Para *et al.*, 2015). Owing to its nutritional health benefits, rabbit meat is thus  
341 recommended for consumption by people with hypertension and diabetes (Para *et al.*, 2015).  
342 Provided that poultry industry is mostly affected by disease outbreak like Avian Influenza  
343 (Fasanmi *et al.*, 2017), rabbit meat can be the potential alternative protein source which possess  
344 similar health beneficial effects of white meat. Hence, SA stands to gain a significantly greater  
345 market share in the commodity by improving rural families' diets as well as creating a stable  
346 source of income through rabbit production.

#### 347 1.4 Study Aim

348 The overall aim of the study was to investigate the effect of balanced dietary protein on the  
349 physicochemical quality and sensory attributes of rabbit meat from New Zealand White and  
350 Californian Rabbits. The specific objectives were;

- 351 1. To determine the effect of balanced dietary protein on physicochemical quality of New  
352 Zealand White and Californian rabbits;
- 353 2. To assess the sensory attributes of New Zealand white and Californian rabbit meat fed  
354 a balanced dietary protein

#### 355 1.5 Hypothesis

- 356 1. There is no effect of balanced dietary protein on physico-chemical quality of New  
357 Zealand white and Californian rabbits;
- 358 2. There is no effect of balanced dietary protein on sensory attributes of meat from New  
359 Zealand white and Californian rabbits.

360

361

362

363

364

365 References

366 **Dalle Zotte, A.** (2014). Perception of rabbit meat quality and major factors influencing the  
367 rabbit carcass and meat quality. *Livest. Prod. Sci.*, 75(1):11-32.

368 **Delport, M., Louw, M., Davids, T., Vermeulen, H. and Meyer, F.** (2017). Evaluating  
369 the demand for meat in South Africa: an econometric estimation of short term demand  
370 elasticities. *Agrekon*, 56(1), 13-27.

371 **Fasanmi, O.G., Odetokun, I.A., Balogun, F.A. and Fasina, F.O.** (2017). Public health  
372 concerns of highly pathogenic avian influenza H5N1 endemicity in Africa. *Veterinary*  
373 *world*, 10(10), p.1194.

374 **Birolo, M., Xiccato, G., Bordignon, F., Dabbou, S., Zuffellato, A. and Trocino, A.**  
375 (2022). Growth Performance, Digestive Efficiency, and Meat Quality of Two Commercial  
376 Crossbred Rabbits Fed Diets Differing in Energy and Protein Levels. *Animals*, 12(18),  
377 p.2427.

378 **Crovato, S., Pinto, A., Di Martino, G., Mascarello, G., Rizzoli, V., Marcolin, S. and**  
379 **Ravarotto, L.** (2022). Purchasing Habits, Sustainability Perceptions, and Welfare  
380 Concerns of Italian Consumers Regarding Rabbit Meat. *Foods*, 11(9), p.1205.

381 **Maharjan, P., Martinez, D.A., Weil, J., Suesuttajit, N., Umberson, C., Mullenix, G.,**  
382 **Hilton, K.M., Beitia, A. and Coon, C.N.** (2021). Physiological growth trend of current

383 meat broilers and dietary protein and energy management approaches for sustainable  
384 broiler production. *Animal*, p.100284.

385 **Para, P.A., Ganguly, S., Wakchaure, R., Sharma, R., Mahajan, T. and Praveen, P.K.**  
386 (2015). Rabbit meat has the potential of being a possible alternative to other meats as a  
387 protein source: A brief review. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical*  
388 *Research*, 2, pp.17-19.

389 **Singh, A.S., Alagbe, J.O., Sharma, S., Oluwafemi, R.A. and Agubosi, O.C.P.** (2021).  
390 Effect of dietary supplementation of melon (*Citrullus lanatus*) seed oil on the growth  
391 performance and antioxidant status of growing rabbits. *Indonesian Journal of Innovation*  
392 *and Applied Sciences (IJIAS)*, 1(2), pp.134-143.

393 **Śmiecińska, K., Gugolek, A. and Kowalska, D.** (2022). Effects of Garlic (*Allium sativum*  
394 L.) and Ramsons (*Allium ursinum* L.) on Lipid Oxidation and the Microbiological Quality,  
395 Physicochemical Properties and Sensory Attributes of Rabbit Meat  
396 Burgers. *Animals*, 12(15), p.1905.

397 **Wang, J., Yang, B.Y., Zhang, S.J., Amar, A., Chaudhry, A.S., Cheng, L., Abbasi,**  
398 **I.H.R., Al-Mamun, M., Guo, X.F. and Shan, A.S.** (2021). Using mixed silages of sweet  
399 sorghum and alfalfa in total mixed rations to improve growth performance, nutrient  
400 digestibility, carcass traits and meat quality of sheep. *Animal*, 15(7), p.100246.

401 **Wang, Y., Wang, Q., Dai, C., Li, J., Huang, P., Li, Y., Ding, X., Huang, J., Hussain, T.**  
402 **and Yang, H.** (2022). Effect of dietary protein level on growth, carcass characteristics,  
403 serum biochemical index, and meat quality of Hu male lambs. *Small Ruminant Research*,  
404 194, p.106294.

405

406

407

408

## CHAPTER 2

409

### Review of literature

410 2.1 Introduction

411 Rabbit meat production is becoming increasingly popular as an alternative to food shortages in  
412 developing countries like India and South Africa (Chakrabarti *et al.*, 2017). Rabbits have the  
413 ability to consume high-fibre, low-grain diets that minimise competition with humans for feed  
414 ingredients, rabbits are assumed to reach maturity weight quickly (Finzi, 2000; Abu *et al.*,  
415 2008). According to (Öztürk and Kose, 2017), increasing household incomes and human  
416 population growth in both emerging and developed regions, as well as Sub-Saharan Africa  
417 (SSA), are contributing to an increase in the need for inexpensive animal protein. This increase  
418 is restricted by challenges of animal feed scarcity and urban settlements hence it is necessary  
419 to discover different feed resources and other species to meet human demands (Rust and Rust,  
420 2013).

421 Globally, red meat consumption has decreased and is partially replaced by white meat products  
422 that are leaner (Merlino *et al.*, 2017). Rabbit meat is highly desirable due to its nutritional  
423 qualities. In comparison to beef, pork, and poultry meat, rabbit meat is lower in sodium, fat and  
424 cholesterol (Hernandez and Gondret, 2006). As a result, rabbit meat is becoming more  
425 acknowledged as a "functional food" (Petrescu and Petrescu-Mag, 2018). Its consumption, for  
426 instance, lowers the risk of metabolic syndrome (Becerra-Tomas *et al.*, 2016). Consumers are  
427 reluctant to consume rabbit meat since it is an unfamiliar and distinct meat, which leads to a  
428 low demand and a poor supply (Duarte, 2011).

429 Meat quality refers to the qualities of meat that may be measured scientifically for research  
430 purposes, such as its physical and chemical attributes (Joo *et al.*, 2013). Consumers define meat  
431 quality in different ways and at time this may differ with culture (Borgaard and Anderson,  
432 2004; Monin, 2004; Xazela *et al.*, 2011). The current review discusses the physicochemical  
433 quality and sensory attributes of NZW and CAL rabbits fed a balanced dietary protein.

## 434 2.2 Rabbit farming

435 Rabbit farming is a satisfying and profitable business with high returns on investment  
436 (Onebunne, 2013). Domestic rabbits (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*) are abundant, providing protein,  
437 fibre, research models, and companionship. The rabbit has a rapid growth rate and high  
438 reproductive potential (Hassan *et al.*, 2012), which consume low grain and high roughage diets  
439 throughout the year (Irlbeck, 2001) and breeds all throughout the year (Hassan *et al.*, 2012). In  
440 addition to short gestation periods and early sexual maturation, Hassan *et al.* (2012) reported  
441 that the species can rebreed shortly following kindling and that generation intervals are short  
442 as well.

### 443 2.2.1 Significance of rabbit production

444 It is recommended that rabbits be used as a protein source as the reproductive rate of other  
445 livestock breeds is slower, and poultry is prone to Avian Influenza (Plague, 2010).  
446 Furthermore, rabbit production has many advantages which includes generation of  
447 employment, increase in farmer's income, producing meat with high quality and increasing  
448 food security (Mailafia *et al.* 2010). In addition, (Hecimovich, 2010; Local Harvest, 2011)  
449 reported that rabbits produce a white meat that is rich in protein, most appealing, low  
450 cholesterol and fat content. The majority of the world's producers of rabbits are small-scale  
451 farmers with limited resources who maintain their operations in order to increase their  
452 production of meat and profit (Lukefahr, 2007; Moreki, *et al.* 2011). Rabbits have several  
453 benefits, including high prolificacy, early maturity, fast growth, efficient feed conversion, and

454 efficient use of space (Mailafia *et al.*, 2010). Moreover, considering the increasing grain prices,  
455 rabbits are the preferred livestock species to raise due to their low grain requirements compared  
456 to other livestock species (Ruhul, Taleb, and Rahim, 2011). The droppings of rabbits are rich  
457 in nitrogen and phosphorus, which helps to fertilize the soil. Small rural-based industries can  
458 be created through the sale of quality pelts used in the fur garment industry and for making art  
459 crafts (Wambugu, 2015).

### 460 2.2.2 Challenges of rabbit production

461 One of the major problems in rabbit farming, according to (Oseni *et al.* 2008), is the insufficient  
462 information on rabbit management in smallholder units. Lack of stable and established markets  
463 is one of the factors contributing to the rabbit production industry to lag, unsatisfactory  
464 promotion, inconsistent product supply, unjustified costs, and competition from other meats  
465 (Mailu, 2012). According to Adu(2005), banks are willing to lend money for the construction  
466 of rabbit hatchets, but the requirements for the loans are tight and make them best suited for  
467 individuals who are already stable financially. Farmers' lack of market knowledge and  
468 marketing skills is a contributing factor to their decision to begin rabbit farming (Gono *et al.*  
469 2013 ; Kabir, 2005). Religious beliefs can either restrict or promote the development of a  
470 potential business such as rabbit farming (Appiah and Tracoh, 2011). According to Gono *et al.*  
471 (2013), one of the major constraints to commercial rabbit keeping in the tropical regions is  
472 insufficient nutrition due to a lack of feed. Ramodisa (2007) noted that farmers and advisors  
473 lack technical knowledge about rabbit farming.

### 474 2.3 Rabbit breeds

475 There is great potential for rabbits in South Africa, both for large-scale commercial meat  
476 production and rural development (Oseni, 2012). They can be reared intensively on small areas  
477 of land, reach slaughter weight early, resulting in quick returns on financial investment (Abu,  
478 Onifade, Abanikannda and Obiyan, 2008; Oseni, 2012). New Zealand White rabbits have been

479 regarded as the best breed for meat production, followed by Californian rabbits. In comparison  
480 to other meat breeds, these breeds have large litters, excellent mothering abilities, carcass  
481 characteristics, and the best bone-to-meat ratio (Dairo *et al.*, 2012).

#### 482 2.4 Nutritional composition of rabbit meat

483 Castellini *et al.* (1998), suggested that rabbit meat can be a potential alternative source of meat  
484 because of its high protein, low fat, and low cholesterol content, compared to red meat.  
485 Considering that rabbit meat contains bioactive properties that can benefit human health, it is  
486 regarded as a functional food (Maria *et al.* 2006). Rabbit meat has been regarded as one of the  
487 greatest white lean meats on market which is juicy and tender. According to Hernandez *et al.*,  
488 (2007), rabbit meat has a low purine concentration and no uric acid. According to  
489 Pla *et al.* (2004), rabbit meat is almost cholesterol free and has lower salt content it is therefore  
490 ideal for people with heart disease.

491

492 **Table 2. 1:** Nutritional composition (% unless stated otherwise) of meat

Meat composition		Moisture (%)	Dry matter (%)	Protein (%)	Fat (%)	Energy (1 MJ/kg and 2cal/kg)	Reference
Rabbit	1	-	20-23	20-22	10-12	7-8	Crovato <i>et al.</i> (2022);
	2	67.9	-	20.8	10.2	1749	
Chicken	1	-	20-23	19-21	11-13	7-8	Munyaneza <i>et al.</i> (2022)
	2	67.6	-	20.0	11.0	1782	
Turkey	1	-	38-42	19-21	20-22	10-12	Ayadi <i>et al.</i> (2009)
	2	58.3	-	20.1	20.2	2618	
Beef	1	-	40-50	15-17	27-29	11-14	USDA (1963)
	2	55.0	-	16.3	28.0	3168	
Lamb	1	-	40-50	14-18	26-30	11-14	Fielding (1991); Rajic <i>et al.</i> (2022)
	2	55.8	-	15.7	27.7	3124	
Pork	1	-	50-55	10-12	42-48	17-20	Rajic <i>et al.</i> (2022)
	2	42.0	-	11.9	45.0	4510	

493

494 2.5 Meat quality as influenced by dietary protein

495 Usually, the quality of feed is determined from its protein content, protein function as to  
496 improve the growth of the animal. When metabolizable protein supply of the basal diet can  
497 fulfil the protein requirements (NRC, 2007) therefore, the growth performance will increase as  
498 well (Barajas *et al.* 2011; Ortiz, 2013). Increase of the growth efficiency will affect the meat  
499 and fat production (Owens, 1993; Mansos, 1998). Numerous studies have been conducted to  
500 find the optimal feed protein level to get high meat production and low-fat meat. According to  
501 (Wang *et al.*, 2020a, 2020b), dietary protein levels should be adjusted to meet the protein needs  
502 of animals and these levels should provide proper protein delivery, and promote efficient  
503 protein absorption and utilization.

504 In a study conducted by Khatun *et al.* (2021), dietary protein levels showed a non-significant  
505 effect on pH of breast meat of hilly chicken. In contrary, Min *et al.* (2012) reported a significant  
506 effect of dietary protein on pH of leg muscle of broilers. Khatun *et al.* (2021), observed that  
507 dietary protein levels did not influence drip loss and cooking loss of breast meat. Yang *et al.*  
508 (2007); Widyaratne and Drew; (2011) found a non-significant effect of dietary protein on water  
509 holding capacity and shear force in both leg and breast muscle of broilers. These results  
510 disagree with Niu *et al.* (2009) who stated that dietary protein content increased the water  
511 holding capacity of broilers. In addition, Niu *et al.* (2009) found different dietary protein levels  
512 not affecting L\* and b\* but increased a\* with increasing dietary protein levels

513 2.6 Meat quality parameters

514 2.6.1 Meat pH

515 Muscle pH is considered a significant contributor to meat quality parameters such as colour,  
516 tenderness, water-holding capacity, and shelf life by (Kim *et al.* 2014). Anaerobic glycolysis  
517 and pre-slaughter stress have an impact on muscle metabolism (Frizzell *et al.* 2017; Chauhan

518 and England, 2018). Poor carriage to slaughter, poor lairage circumstances and slaughter  
519 protocol are main determinants of pre-slaughter stress (Frizzell *et al.* 2017). Dark, firm, and  
520 dry meat (DFD) is normally associated with high meat pH, while pale, soft, and exudative  
521 (PSE) meat is associated with low meat pH (Wattanachant, 2008). In addition, a high ultimate  
522 pH stimulates the development of microorganisms consequently reducing the shelf-life of  
523 meat, through development of bad odours (Gallo *et al.* 2003). Such meat is undesirable to  
524 consumers thus resulting in economic losses. If the pH value is higher than (5.8 and 6) then it  
525 is possible to be rejected by consumers since it has a dark appearance, tough, and is indigestible  
526 to consume (Viljoen *et al.* 2002).

#### 527 2.6.2 Meat colour

528 Colour has been reported as one of the most contributors to appearance (Fletcher *et al.* 2000).  
529 Moreover, Hutchings (2003), highlighted that meat colour determines freshness and  
530 healthiness that is pleasing to the consumers. Pre-slaughter stress has an effect on muscle  
531 metabolism (Frizzell *et al.* 2017) as well as anaerobic glycolysis (Chauhan and England, 2018).  
532 Furthermore, poor lairage conditions and slaughter procedure are main determinants of pre-  
533 slaughter stress (Frizzell *et al.* 2017). The most important pigments responsible for meat colour  
534 are myoglobin and haemoglobin. Meat translates its colour due to chemical reactions  
535 concerning myoglobin, such as oxygenation, oxidation or the addition of a carbon monoxide  
536 molecule, and reduction, which plays a crucial part in sustaining the colour of meat after  
537 slaughter.

#### 538 2.6.3 Cooking loss

539 Jama *et al.* (2008) defined cooking loss as the weight loss of meat throughout the cooking  
540 process and is considered as one of the variables used to evaluate the quality of meat. Higher  
541 cooking losses specify a reduction in water holding capacity. Cooking loss has an impact on  
542 the appearance of the meat and is of importance due to its accountability on the variation of in

543 juiciness. A high cooking loss is associated with less optimum eating quality. Sebsibe, (2006)  
544 reported that lower cooking losses, shows improved juiciness of the meat.

#### 545 2.6.4 Tenderness

546 Tenderness is one of the eating qualities characteristics that determines most consumers'  
547 choices (Polkinghorne and Thompson, 2010). According to Pannier *et al.* (2014), tenderness is  
548 positively correlated with juiciness. Shear force is used to evaluate meat tenderness, and its  
549 high value is associated with tougher meat (Cavitt *et al.* 2004). The outcome of shear force  
550 demonstrates the hardness of meat. For the Warner-Bratzler Shear Force test, the meat samples  
551 should be evenly round and of the same diameter. Muchenje *et al.* (2009a), reported other  
552 factors that have an influence on tenderness which include the age of an animal, muscle  
553 location, sex, breed and ante-mortem stress.

#### 554 2.6.5 Water holding capacity

555 Water holding capacity refers to the ability of meat to retain water through processing and  
556 storage (Bowker and Zhuang, 2015). It is one of the most essential factors influencing the value  
557 and price of meat and its products, according to (Barbera, 2019). This attribute is determined  
558 using filter papers to determine water loss (Grau and Hamm, 1956). Wright *et al.* (2005) added  
559 that consumers criticize fresh meat because of abnormalities in palatability, a sensory quality  
560 of meat, caused by fluid lost during processing and packing of meat.

#### 561 2.6.6 Drip loss

562 The term drip loss refers to the fluids that are lost without mechanical force from a piece of  
563 meat, mainly water and protein (Fischer, 2007). It is related with sensory qualities such as  
564 firmness and juiciness, according to Gil *et al.* (2008). Warner Bratzler shear force is considered  
565 to be high in muscles with a high drip loss. Logan *et al.* (2019) reported that meat freshness is

566 highly dependent on WHC, which is affected by drip loss. Otto *et al.* (2004) confirmed that  
567 drip loss is of high financial importance as it impacts economic revenues.

## 568 2.7 Sensory evaluation

569 Sensory evaluation is a scientific method for measuring, analyzing, and interpreting the quality  
570 of meat. Several methods can be used in meat sensory evaluation such as instrumental. Ngambu  
571 *et al.* (2012) reported that meat value is determined by consumer opinion, which justifies their  
572 purchase decisions. When sensory evaluations of meat are being done, consumers from  
573 different countries and segments of affluence are encouraged to participate, since they all have  
574 different preferences and motives (Sveinsdóttir *et al.*, 2009).

### 575 2.7.1 Aroma and flavour

576 Flavour can be defined as the taste and aroma of meat experienced throughout chewing  
577 (Moody, 1983). Aroma properties and flavour enhancers are considered taste-active  
578 compounds that determine meat flavour (Stelzleni and Johnson, 2007). Natural flavour of meat  
579 varies between animal species (Lee *et al.* 2004), lipid concentration (Miller, Moeller, Goodwin,  
580 Lorenzen, and Savell, 2000), meat pH (Calkins and Hodgen, 2007) and the cooking method  
581 used (Webb *et al.* 2005). According to Ngambu *et al.* (2012) flavour development is highly  
582 influenced by lipids. Moody, (1983) stated that during production, handling, and cooking  
583 process, lipids act as solvents for volatile compounds. Despite reports disagreeing on what age  
584 group is the most acceptable for flavour intensity, the intensity increases with animal age  
585 (Simela *et al.* 2003).

### 586 2.7.2 Meat juiciness

587 Meat juiciness is the dampness during the first bite and sustained juiciness due to the fat present  
588 in the meat. According to Muchenje *et al.* (2008), well-marbled carcasses have a high level of  
589 meat juiciness. This is in agreement with Webb *et al.* (2005) who stipulated that intramuscular

590 lipids and moisture level of the meat determine meat juiciness. Lawrie (2006) reported that  
591 young animals' meat gave an initial impression of juiciness but subsequently became dry since  
592 they did not have much fat.

### 593 2.7.3 Tenderness

594 Tenderness is a vital sensory characteristic of meat and a major quality factor (Sebsibe, 2006).  
595 Several factors influence the tenderness of meat during cooking, including collagen content  
596 and heat stability (Muchenje *et al.* 2009). Consumers' overall satisfaction, purchasing  
597 decisions, and willingness to pay are all influenced by the tenderness and juiciness of the meat  
598 (Banović *et al.* 2009). Meat tenderness is affected by animal type, genotype, diet, age of the  
599 animal, degree of fatness, and muscle position (Muchenje *et al.* 2008). Tenderness improves  
600 with muscle ageing (Simela, 2005). Muchenje *et al.* (2009) reported that myofibrillar protein  
601 proteolysis and sarcomere length are responsible for the majority of the difference in tenderness  
602 between aged and young meat.

### 603 2.8 Summary

604 The increasing human population in developing and developed countries has resulted in  
605 increased demand for animal protein. Rabbit farming has a potential in filling the gap in  
606 shortages of animal protein supply and this can assure food and nutrition security as well as  
607 economic growth of the country. There is little knowledge about rabbit production and the  
608 majority of people are not familiar with rabbit meat and its health benefits. Rabbits are easy to  
609 be managed, have short generation interval and high prolificacy in that case small holder famers  
610 could gain more profit, job creation and ensuring of food security.

611

612

613

614

615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636

References

**Becerra-Tomas, N., Babio, N., Gonzales, M. A., Corella, D., Estruch, R., Ros, E.,Jordi, S.-S. J.** (2016). Replacing red meat and processed red meat for white meat, fish, legumes or eggs is associated with lower risk of incidence of metabolic syndrome. *Clinical Nutrition*, 35, 1442-1449.

**Hassan HE, Elamin KM, Yousif IA, Musa AM and Elkhairey M.A.** (2012). Evaluation of body weight and some morphometric traits at various ages in local rabbits of Sudan. *Journal of Animal Science Advances*, 2(4): 407-415.

**Hernandez, P. and Gondret, F.** (2006). 5.1. Rabbit meat quality. Recent advances in rabbit sciences, p.269.

**Irlbeck N.A** (2001). How to feed the rabbit (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*) gastrointestinal tract. *Journal of Animal Science*, 79(E. Suppl.): 343–346.

**Hecimovich D.** (2010). Raising Rabbits in Alaska. Alaska Livestock Series, LPM-00745.

**Joo, S., Kim, G., Hwang, Y., and Ryu, Y.** 2013. Control of fresh meat quality through manipulation of muscle fiber characteristics. *Meat Science* 95: 828-836.

**Local Harvest** (2011). Local farm profile: top market rabbitry. Foodlink Waterloo Region Issue 48.

637 **Lukefahr, S.D.** (2007). Strategies for the development of small- and medium-scale rabbit  
638 farming in South-East Asia. *Livest. Res. Rural Dev.*19(9),1-12. (PDF) Growth, carcass and  
639 meat quality traits of two South African meat rabbit breeds.

640 **Mailafia S, Onakpa MM and Owoleke O.E.** (2010). Problems and prospects of rabbit  
641 production in Nigeria – A review. *Bayero Journal of Pure and Applied Sciences*, 3(2): 20–25.

642 **Moreki, J. C., Sentle, M. M., Chiripasi, S. C., Seabo, D. & Bagwasi, N.** (2011). Prevalence  
643 of diseases and parasites of rabbits in Botswana; *Research opinions in animal & veterinary*  
644 *sciences*.

645 **Petrescu, D.C. and Petrescu-Mag, R.M.** (2018). Consumer behaviour related to rabbit meat  
646 as functional food. *World Rabbit Science*, 26(4), 321-333.

647 **Plague, F.** (2010). High pathogenicity avian influenza.fowl plague, grippe aviaire.

648 **Ruhul, A., Taleb, A. and Rahim, J.** (2011). Rabbit farming: a potential approach towards  
649 rural poverty alleviation.

650 **Wambugu, S.G.** (2015). Influence of selected factors on rabbit production among smallholder  
651 farmers in Subukia, Nakuru County, Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, Egerton University).

652 **Abu, O.A., Onifade, A.A., Abanikannda, O.T.F. and Obiyan, R.I.** (2008). Status and  
653 promotional strategies for rabbit production in Nigeria. *In 9th World Rabbit congress* (pp. 10-  
654 13).

655 **Adu A.** (2005). Socio-Economic Impact of Forestry-Related Technologies Utilization among  
656 Farmers in South West Nigeria. Published Seminar Paper in the Department of Agricultural  
657 Extension and Rural Development. University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

658 **Dairo F.A.S., Abi H.M., and Oluwatusin F.M.** (2012). Social acceptability of rabbit meat  
659 and strategies for improving its consumption in Ekiti State Southwestern Nigeria. *Livestock*  
660 *Research for Rural Development.*, 24:94.

661 **Appiah P., Nimoh F., Tham-Agyekum E. K., and Tracoh L.Y.** (2011). Rabbit technologies:  
662 adoption studies in the Ashanti region of Ghana. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*,  
663 6(11), 2539-2544.

664 **Fletcher, D.L., Qiao, M. and Smith, D.P.** (2000). The raw broiler breast meat colour and pH  
665 to cooked pH. *Poult. Sci.* 79, 784 - 788.

666 **Frizzell, K.M., Lynch, E., Rathgeber, B.M., Dixon, W.T., Putman, C.T. and Jendral, M.J.**  
667 (2017). 'Effect of housing environment on laying hen meat quality: Assessing Pectoralis major  
668 pH, colour and tenderness in three strains of 80–81 week-old layers housed in conventional  
669 and furnished cages', *British Poultry Science*, 58(1), pp. 50–58.

670 **Gallo, C., Lizondo, G., & Knowles, T. G.** (2003). Effects of journey and lairage time on steers  
671 transported to slaughter in Chile. *Veterinary Record*, 152(12), 361–364.

672 **Gono, R. K., Dube, J., Petronillah, R. S., and Muzondiwa, J. V.** (2013). Constraints and  
673 opportunities to rabbit production in Zimbabwe: A case study of the Midlands Province,  
674 Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 2(9), 365-369.

675 **Hernández P., Cesari V, and Pla M.** (2007). Effect of the dietary fat on fatty acid composition  
676 and oxidative stability of rabbit meat. In: Proceedings of the 53rd International Congress of  
677 Meat Science and Technology (August 2007, Beijing, China), pp. 367–370.

678 **Hutchings, J.B.** (2003). Expectations and the food industry. The impact of colour and  
679 appearance. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York, USA.

680 **Mailu, S. K., Muhammad, L., Wanyoike, M. and Mwanza, R. N.** (2012). Rabbit meat  
681 consumption in Kenya. Management and Economy presented at the 9th World Rabbit Congress  
682 Verona Italy. Pages 1597-1601.

683 **Maria, G., Buil, T., Liste, G., Villarroel, M., Sanudo, C. and Olletta, J. J. M. S.** 2006.  
684 Effects of transport time and season on aspects of rabbit meat quality. *Meat Sci.*, 72(4):773-  
685 777.

686 **Min Y.N, J.S Shi, F.X Wei, H.Y Wang, X.F Hou, Z.Y Niu and FZ Liu** (2012). Effects of  
687 dietary energy and protein on growth performance and carcass quality of broilers during  
688 finishing phase. *Journal of Animal and Veterinary Advances*, 11: 3652-3657.

689 **Niu ZY, SJ Shi, ZF Liu, HX Eang, QC Gao, KL Yao.** (2009). Effects of dietary energy and  
690 protein on growth performance and carcass quality of broiler during starter phase. *Int. J. Poult.*  
691 *Sci.*, 8: 508-511.

692 **Oseni S.O, Ajayi B.A, Komolafe S.O, Siyanbola O., Ishola M. and Madamidola G.** (2008).  
693 Smallholder rabbit production in Southwestern Nigeria: Current status, emerging issues and  
694 ways forward. *9th World Rabbit Congress – June 10-13, 2008 – Verona – Italy.* 1597-1601.

695 **Oseni, S.** 2012. Rabbit production in low-input systems in Africa—prospects, challenges and  
696 opportunities. Proceedings of the 10th World Rabbit Congress. *World Rabbit Sci.*, 3-6.

697 **Pla, M., M. Pascual and B. Ariño** (2004). Protein, fat and moisture content of retail cuts of  
698 rabbit meat evaluated with the NIRS methodology. *World Rabbit Sci.* 12: 149-158.

699 **Ramodisa, J.** (2007). Rabbit production. *Agrinews Magazine*, 38(2): 11.

700 **Viljoen, H. F., De Kock, H. L. and Webb, E. C.** 2002. Consumer acceptability of dark, firm  
701 and dry (DFD) and normal pH beef steaks. *Meat Science*, 61: 181-185.

702 **Wang D., Chen G.S, Chai M.J, Wang Y.F, Yao Y.Y, and Zhang X.** (2020). Effects of  
703 lowprotein diet on growth performance and meat quality of Du×Min hybrid finishing pigs.  
704 *Chin J Anim Sci.* 56:146–9.

705 **Wattanachant, S.** (2008). Factors affecting the quality characteristics of Thai indigenous  
706 chicken meat. *Suranaree J. Sci. Technol.*, 15: 317-322.

707 **Widyaratne GP and M.D. Drew** (2011). Effects of protein level and digestibility on the  
708 growth and carcass characteristic of broiler chickens. *Poult. Sci.*, 90: 595-603.

709 **Bowker, B. and Zhuang, H.** (2015). Relationship between water-holding capacity and protein  
710 denaturation in broiler breast meat. *J. Poult. Sci.* 94(7), 1657 - 1664.

711 **Barbera, S.** (2019). WHC trend, an up-to-date method to measure water holding capacity in  
712 meat. Department of Science Agriculture, Forestry and food, University of Torino, Largo Paolo  
713 Braccini 2, 10095, Grugliasco, Italy.

714 **Banović, M., Grunert, K.G., Barreira, M.M. and Fontes, M.A.** (2009). Beef quality  
715 perception at the point of purchase: A study from Portugal. *Food quality and preference*, 20(4),  
716 pp.335-342.

717 **Calkins, C. R., and Hodgen, J. M.** (2007). A fresh look at meat flavour. *Meat Science*, 77(1),  
718 63-80.

719 **Cavitt, L.C., Owens, C.M., Meullenet, J.F., Gandhapuneni, R.K. and Youm, G.Y.** (2001).  
720 Rigor development and meat quality of large and small broilers and the use of Allo-kramer  
721 shear, needle puncture, and razor blade shear to measure texture. *J. Poult. Sci.* 80(1), 138.

722 **Fischer, K.** (2007). Drip loss in pork: influencing factors and relation to further meat quality  
723 traits. *Journal of Animal Breeding and Genetics* 124: 12-18.

724 **Jama, N., Muchenje, V., Chimonyo, M., Strydom, P. E., Dzama, K. and Raats, J. G.**  
725 (2008). Cooking loss components of beef from Nguni, Bonsmara and Angus steers. *African*  
726 *Journal of Agricultural Research*, 3 (6), 416-420.

727 **Logan, B.G., Bush, R.D., Biffin, T.E., Hopkins, D.L. and Smith, M.A.** (2019). Measurement  
728 of drip loss in alpaca (*Vicugna pacos*) meat using different techniques and sample weights.  
729 University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.

730 **Ngambu, S., Muchenje, V. and Marume, U.** 2012. The effect of *Acacia karroo*  
731 supplementation and thermal preparation on meat sensory characteristics of the indigenous  
732 Xhosa lop-eared goat genotype. *African Journal of Biotechnology*, 11(65), pp.12878-12884.

733 **Muchenje, V., Dzama, K., Chimonyo, M., Raats, J.G. and Strydom, P.E.** (2008). Meat  
734 quality of Nguni, Bonsmara and Aberdeen Angus steers raised on natural pasture in the Eastern  
735 Cape, South Africa. *Meat Sci.* 79, 20-28.

736 **Muchenje, V., Dzama K., Chimonyo, M., Strydom, P.E., Hugo, A. and Raats, J.G.** (2009a).  
737 Some biochemical aspects pertaining to beef eating quality and consumer health: A review.  
738 *Food Chemistry*, 112, 279 - 289.

739 **Miller, R. K., Moeller, S. J., Goodwin, R. N., Lorenzen, C. L., and Savell, J. W.** (2000).  
740 Consistency in meat quality. In Proceedings of the 46th international congress of meat science  
741 & technology, Buenos Aires, Argentina, 566–580).

742 **Sebsibe, A.** (2006). Sheep and Goat Meat Characteristics and Quality. Ph.D. Thesis. University  
743 of Pretoria. South Africa.

744 **Simela, L., Webb, E.C. and Bosman, M.J.C.** (2003). Retailer and consumer perceptions of  
745 chevon and its quality in Zimbabwe and South Africa. In Consistency of quality: abstracts and

746 proceedings of the 11th International Meat Symposium, Centurion, South Africa, 29-30  
747 January, 2003 (pp. 56-73). *Agricultural Research Council (ARC)*.

748 **Stelzleni, A. M., and Johnson, D. D.** (2007). Effect of days on concentrate feed on sensory  
749 off-flavour score, off-flavour descriptor and fatty acid profiles for selected muscles from cull  
750 beef cows. *Meat Science*, 79, 382-393.

751 **Sveinsdóttir, K., Martinsdóttir, E., Green-Petersen, D., Hyldig, G., Schelvis, R., and**  
752 **Delahunty, C.** (2009). Sensory characteristics of different cod products related to consumer  
753 preferences and attitudes. *Food Quality and Preference*, 20, 120–132.

754 **Otto, G., Roehle, R., Looft, H., Thielking, L. and Kalm, E.** (2004). Comparison of different  
755 methods for determination of drip loss and their relationships to meat quality and carcass  
756 characteristics in pigs. *Meat Sci.* 68(3), 401-409.

757 **Webb EC, Casey N.H, and Simela L.** (2005). Goat meat quality. *Small. Rum. Res.* 60:153–  
758 166.

759 **Wright, L.I., Scanga, J.A., Belk, K.E., Engle, T.E., Tatum, J.D., Person, R.C., McKenna,**  
760 **D.R., Griffin, D.B., McKeith, F.K., Savell, J.W. and Smith, G.C.** (2005) ‘Benchmarking  
761 value in the pork supply chain: Characterization of US pork in the retail market place’, *Meat*  
762 *Science*, 71(3), pp. 451–463.

763 **Xazela, N. M., Chimonyo, M., Muchenje, V., and Marume, U.** (2011). Consumer sensory  
764 evaluation of meat from South African goat genotypes fed on a dietary supplement. *African*  
765 *Journal of Biotechnology*, 10(20), 4436-4443.

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

## CHAPTER 3

773

### **Effect of balanced dietary protein on physicochemical meat quality of New Zealand**

774

### **White and Californian rabbits**

---

775

#### Abstract

776

The objective of the study was to investigate the effect of balanced dietary protein on physico-

777

chemical meat quality of different sexes and breeds of New Zealand White (NZW) and

778

Californian (CAL) rabbits. A total of eighty (80) NZW and CAL rabbits were allocated to six

779

balanced dietary protein levels (T1=126g/kg, T2= 143g/kg, T3= 161g/kg, T4=178g/kg, T5=

780

196g/kg and T6= 213g/kg) at weaning age (35 days). The diets were formulated to meet the

781

rabbit's nutritional requirements, complete and balanced. The rabbits were fed twice a day at

782

08:00 am and 16:00 pm with water provided *ad libitum*. The rabbits were then slaughtered after

783

a period of 56 days and 8 hours of fasting at Rota master farm located 100 km from UKZN.

784

Meat quality traits including pH, colour (L\*, a\* and b\*), water holding capacity, cooking loss,

785

shear force and drip loss were measured. The results of the current study showed no effects of

786

balanced dietary protein on pH, colour, WHC, cooking loss, tenderness and drip loss on meat

787

quality of New Zealand White and Californian rabbits. It was therefore concluded that the

788

physicochemical quality of NZW and CAL rabbits was not affected by the balanced dietary

789

protein.

790

**Key words:** Rabbit meat, Colour, pH, Drip loss, Cooking loss, Tenderness.

### 791 3.1 Introduction

792 Demand for meat products is expected to increase across the globe as the world population  
793 rises, particularly in developing countries (Romanov *et al.*, 2022). In South Africa, meat is  
794 considered as one of the most expensive food commodity, thus creating financial pressure to  
795 most consumers in the country (Delpont *et al.*, 2017). South Africa is faced with increasing  
796 population growth, with its most people living below the poverty line and unable to meet the  
797 minimum requirement or daily recommended minimum protein of 70g by FAO (1987). The  
798 FAO recommends that at least 50% of that protein should be animal protein. Despite this,  
799 poultry farming is however faced by number of challenges such as import penetration, disease  
800 outbreaks and harsh environmental conditions with respect to heat stress (Maqsood *et al.*,  
801 2021). In this regard, there is a need to find alternative animal protein sources that have a fast  
802 growth rate such as rabbit.

803 A study by Dalle Zotte (2014) revealed that meat from rabbits is nutritious and healthy  
804 compared to beef, mutton and pork. Rabbit meat poses excellent dietary properties and nutritive  
805 value (Petrescu and Petrescu-Mag, 2018). It is low in fat content with a favourable proportion  
806 of saturated, monosaturated polyunsaturated and fatty acid (Bouzaida *et al.*, 2021). Rabbit meat  
807 is rich in protein with excellent essential amino acid (Sayed and Ali, 2022). According to  
808 Castrica *et al.* (2022), rabbit meat has been reported to have low cholesterol and sodium  
809 contents on average of 47 mg/100 g and 42 mg /100 g, respectively. In addition, rabbit meat is  
810 also a significant source of high micronutrients and it does not contain uric acid unlike red meat  
811 (Petracci and Leroy, 2018).

812 Amongst the physicochemical properties, pH, colour, water holding capacity (WHC), drip loss,  
813 cooking loss (CL) and tenderness are known as the key measures of meat quality (Simonová  
814 *et al.*, 2009). The above-mentioned meat quality traits are largely influenced by type of feed  
815 which is fed and consumed by the animals. Dietary protein has been reported to have an effect

816 on meat quality of broilers as it changes carcass composition, lowers muscle pH and increase  
817 meat yield (Tesseraud *et al.*, 2003; Sterling *et al.*, 2006). Wang *et al.* (2022), observed an  
818 improvement in meat quality attributes such as tenderness, drip loss and colour in pigs fed  
819 different dietary protein levels. It is, however, not clear whether dietary protein  
820 supplementation have an influence in different breeds of rabbits. NZW and CAL are the most  
821 popular rabbit breeds that are commercially used worldwide especially for meat production  
822 purposes (El-Badry *et al.*, 2019; Daszkiewicz and Gugolek, 2020). The commercial rabbit  
823 meat production industry in South Africa has been non-existent, however recently rabbit meat  
824 has gained more emphasis and attention in the area of research. September (2021) and Hoffman  
825 (2005) reported low consumption patterns of rabbit meat in South Africa. Furthermore, the  
826 quality of meat is influenced by type of breed as well as type of feed offered to animals (Xazela  
827 *et al.*, 2011). Understanding the physicochemical properties of NZW and CAL as influenced  
828 by balance dietary protein will help in making decisions on which breed will be desired for  
829 meat production. The objective of the study was, therefore, to determine the effect of balanced  
830 dietary protein on physico-chemical quality of NZW and CAL rabbits. The null hypothesis  
831 states that a balanced dietary protein will have no adverse effect on the physico-chemical  
832 quality of NZW and Cal rabbits.

### 833 **3.1 Materials and Methods**

#### 834 **3.1.1 Study Site**

835 The study was conducted at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN), Ukulinga Research  
836 farm Pietermaritzburg, South Africa which is positioned at 30° 24'S, 29° 24'E and altitude  
837 ranges from 80 700 to 775m above sea level. The mean annual rainfall is 735mm, which mostly  
838 occurs between October and April. All experimental measures were accepted and approved by

839 the Animal Research Ethics committee at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa  
840 (Reference number: AREC/00002707/2021).

### 841 3.1.2 Animal housing

842 A total of eighty (80) rabbits from two commercial rabbit strains (New Zealand White and  
843 Californian) were used for this study. 56 rabbits were from NZW, 8 rabbits were slaughtered  
844 before feeding trial, the remaining 48 rabbits were allocated to 6 dietary treatments, Californian  
845 rabbits were 24 and allocated to 6 dietary treatments. They were obtained from Future Farmers  
846 Farm which is located in Howick, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa 29, 8 km apart from UKZN.  
847 The rabbits were chosen randomly at the weaning stage at 35 days of age and were delivered  
848 to the farm in plastic crates in a closed vehicle suitable aerated early hours of the morning to  
849 avoid heat stress. At the outset of the trial, each rabbit was labelled, and its body weight was  
850 recorded. The rabbits were allocated randomly to individual cages inside the rabbit house. The  
851 housing had a concrete floor with wood shavings below the cages that were used to absorb  
852 urine. Rabbits were kept at optimum room temperature (22° C).

### 853 3.1.3 Experimental diets

854 The feeding program was divided into two four-week phases starting at weaning, with dietary  
855 protein levels being reduced in each subsequent period sustaining the same relative difference  
856 between levels. Within each period, six levels of balanced protein were applied (T1=126g/kg,  
857 T2= 143g/kg, T3= 161g/kg, T4=178g/kg, T5= 196g/kg and T6= 213g/kg) with 8 rabbits under  
858 each dietary treatment. The experimental feeds were produced using the Winfeed 3 to ensure  
859 that the diets were properly. Win feed is a software program used to formulate animal feed  
860 according to animal nutrient requirements at the lowest cost (Kasima, 2019). These feeds were  
861 mixed and then blended on the farm. The two basal feeds contained 4.9 and 8.1 g digestible  
862 lysine (dLys)/kg, respectively, each feed containing 10.0 MJ DE/kg. The amino acid levels  
863 used were the same in both basal feeds, were based on those recommended by De Blas *et al.*

864 (1998) as were the major and minor mineral contents, and energy. After all the ingredients  
865 were mixed, all feeds were pelleted by a commercial company. Ingredients and nutrient  
866 composition are presented in Table 3.1. The chemical composition of these diets is presented  
867 in Table 3.3 and Table 3.4.

868

869

870

871

872

873

874

875

876

877

878

879

880

881

882

883

884

885

886

887 **Table 3. 1:** Ingredients and nutrient composition in the low and high basal protein feeds

Ingredients	Low protein basal (kg)	High protein basal (kg)
Barley	114	68.3
Oats	150	50
Wheat bran	62.7	-
Molasses	0.75	2.5
Sunflower hulls	-	60
Soy bean 46	-	67.4
Sunflower 37	-	82.3
Lucerne meal 15%	165	165
Limestone	2.4	1.3
Salt	1.7	1.85
Monocalcium phosphate	0.1	0.1
Oil sunflower	0	4.05
Robenidine	0.05	0.05
L-lysine HCL	0.25	0.15
L-threonine	0.1	0.5
DL Methionine	0.3	0.75
Vit+min premix	0.75	0.75
Crude protein	117	170
Crude fibre	9.38	12.63
Gross energy (MJ/KJ)	14	17

---

Metabolizable energy (MJ/KJ)

14

17

---

888

889 **Table 3. 2:** Proportions of high and low protein basal feeds used for each dietary treatment and

890 feeding period

---

Protein	Period 1		Period 2	
	HP	LP	HP	LP
1	20	80	0	100
2	36	64	16	84
3	52	48	32	68
4	68	32	48	52
5	84	16	64	36
6	100	0	80	20

---

891

892

893

894

895

896

897

898

899

900

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923

**Table 3. 3:** Proximate chemical analysis of the six experimental diets for period 1 (g/kg)

Experimental diets	Crude protein	Crude Fiber	Gross Energy (MJ/KJ)	ME <sup>1</sup> (MJ/KJ)
1	127	10.1	17.5	14.4
2	137	12.3	16.8	13.8
3	144	10.3	17.6	14.4
4	153	10.8	17	13.9
5	161	15.4	16.9	13.9
6	170	10	17	13.9

<sup>1</sup> estimated as GE \* 0.82

924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937

**Table 3. 4:** Proximate chemical analysis of the six experimental diets for period 2 (g/kg)

Experimental diets	Crude Protein	Crude Fiber	Gross Energy (MJ/KJ)	ME <sup>1</sup> (MJ/KJ)
1	117	8.9	17.2	14.1
2	125	10.1	16.7	13.7
3	134	9.6	16.8	13.8
4	142	9.5	16.9	13.9
5	151	12.9	17.6	14.4
6	159	12.2	17.1	14

<sup>1</sup> estimated as GE \* 0.82

938 3.2 Slaughter

939 At the end of the trial after 56 days , rabbits were subjected to 8 hours of fasting, six rabbits  
940 from each treatment were randomly picked for slaughter. The rabbits were transported by a  
941 bakkie in plastic crates on a closed vehicle suitable aerated to the Rota master farm abattoir  
942 which is 100 km away from the research farm. The rabbits were fasted for 8 hours and were  
943 given clean water. They were electrically stunned and bled immediately. Carcasses were stored  
944 in a cold room for 15-30 minutes and chilled at 3-4°C.

945 3.3 Meat sample preparation

946 Samples were randomly taken from *longissimus dorsi* muscle, labelled and kept in a cooler box  
947 filled with ice at 4°C. Samples were then conveyed using the same bakkie to Dietetics Human  
948 nutrition laboratory (UKZN-PMB) Campus for meat quality analysis.

949 3.4 Physicochemical analysis

950 3.4.1 pH determination

951 Meat pH was measured at 45 minutes and 24 hours *post mortem* on *Longissimus* muscle using  
952 a pH meter that has a sharp electrode (Crison pH 25 Instruments S.A., Alella, Spain). Standard  
953 pH solutions of pH 4, pH 7, and pH 9 were used to calibrate the pH meter before taking  
954 measurements.

955 3.4.2 Determination of meat colour

956 Meat colour (Lightness; L\*, redness; a\*, yellowness; b\*) was measured 45 minutes after  
957 slaughter from the longissimus muscle using a Minolta colour guide 45/0 BYK-Gardner GmbH  
958 machine. The mean of the replicates was used for analysis. Chroma and Hue angle were  
959 calculated as follows: Chroma=  $(a^2+b^2) *0.5$  and Hue angle=  $[\tan^{-1}(b^*)/(a^*)]$ .

960 3.4.3 Water holding capacity

961 Water holding capacity was assessed using the texture analyser technique by pre-weighing (8  
962 g) of samples which were inserted in-between filter-papers and pressed under a texture analyzer  
963 with a pressure of 30 kg for 5 min. Water holding capacity was calculated as: **WHC** = (water  
964 content -water loss) / water content) \* 100.

965 3.4.4 Drip loss

966 Drip loss analysis was conducted using a method adapted from Zhang *et al.* (2009). The  
967 samples were quickly cut into blocks weighing between 2-3 grams using a knife. Initial weights  
968 were recorded for the sample weights (W1). The samples were hooked and hung in a plastic  
969 container using wire steel, and the container was properly sealed to prevent the samples from  
970 touching the bottle's sides. After 72 hours in a cold room (4°C), samples were taken, carefully  
971 dried to remove excess moisture from the meat's surface, and reweighed (W2).

972 ***Drip loss (%) = [(W1 – W2)/ W1] × 100***

973 3.4.5 Warner-Bratzler shear force and cooking losses determination

974 Samples were first weighed (W1) then cooked in a water bath for 45 minutes at 85°C, cooled  
975 and were reweighed (W2) for determination of cooking loss. Cooking loss was estimated as  
976 **Cooking loss (%) = [(W1 –W2)/W1] × 100** Yang *et al.* (2010).

977 The samples were then used to determine WBSF values after cooking loss was measured. Three  
978 10 mm-width subsamples were cored parallel to the meat's grain. Using a Warner Bratzler  
979 (WB) shear device mounted on an Instron (Model 3344) Universal testing apparatus (cross  
980 head speed at 400mm/min, one shear in the center of each core), the samples were sliced  
981 parallel to the direction of the fibers.

982 3.5 Statistical analysis

983 Physicochemical properties were analysed using the General linear models' procedure  
984 (GenStat 20th edition, VSN International, 2022). Analysis of variance was used to evaluate  
985 treatment means, and simple linear regression with groups was used to analyse the response of  
986 the variables of interest to dietary protein. Tukey's significant difference test was used to  
987 compare means at  $P < 0.05$ . The Model used was:

988  $Y = a \pm bx$

989 Where:

990  $Y$  = Variate being regressed

991  $a$  = Constant term

992  $b$  = Regression coefficient

993  $x$  = dietary protein level

994 3.7 Results

995 **3.7.2 Physico-chemical properties**

996 Table 3.5 and Table 3.6 illustrate that the balanced dietary protein did not have an influence ( $P$   
997  $> 0.05$ ) on pH. However, pH<sub>45</sub> ranged from 6.35 to 6.73 and pH<sub>24</sub> ranged from 5.60 to 5.93.  
998 Same applies with the regression results there was no linear effect observed between pH and  
999 the experimental diets.

1000

1001

1002

1003

1004  
1005  
1006  
1007  
1008  
1009  
1010  
1011  
1012  
1013  
1014  
1015  
1016  
1017  
1018  
1019  
1020  
1021

**Table 3. 5:** Mean values for meat pH of NZW and CAL as influenced by balanced dietary protein

Parameter	Breed	126	143	161	178	196	213	SEM
pH <sub>45</sub>	NZW	6.730 <sup>a</sup>	6.420 <sup>a</sup>	6.650 <sup>a</sup>	6.610 <sup>a</sup>	6.660 <sup>a</sup>	6.570 <sup>a</sup>	0.04372
	CAL	6.600 <sup>a</sup>	6.350 <sup>a</sup>	6.400 <sup>a</sup>	6.650 <sup>a</sup>	6.400 <sup>a</sup>	6.650 <sup>a</sup>	0.0583
pH <sub>24</sub>	NZW	5.930 <sup>a</sup>	5.990 <sup>a</sup>	5.970 <sup>a</sup>	5.910 <sup>a</sup>	5.980 <sup>a</sup>	5.900 <sup>a</sup>	0.03619
	CAL	5.750 <sup>a</sup>	5.700 <sup>a</sup>	5.650 <sup>a</sup>	5.850 <sup>a</sup>	5.600 <sup>a</sup>	5.850 <sup>a</sup>	0.04323

**List of abbreviations:** NZW= New Zealand White, CAL= Californian, SEM= standard error of means

1022  
 1023  
 1024  
 1025  
 1026  
 1027  
 1028  
 1029  
 1030  
 1031  
 1032  
 1033  
 1034  
 1035

**Table 3. 6:** The effect of balanced dietary protein on the pH of meat from NZW and CAL rabbits using linear regression with groups<sup>1</sup>

Parameter	Estimate	SE	t(20 df)	t pr.	R <sup>2</sup>
					0.907
pH <sub>45</sub>					
Constant	6.443	0.122	52.74	<.001	
Protein	0.0186	0.0314	0.59	0.561	
Breed NZW	0.175	0.173	1.01	0.322	
Protein*Breed NZW	-0.0220	0.0444	-0.50	0.625	
					0.597
pH <sub>24</sub>					
Constant	5.6933	0.0946	60.16	<.001	
Protein	0.0114	0.0243	0.47	0.643	
Breed NZW	0.277	0.134	2.07	0.051	
Protein*Breed NZW	-0.0183	0.0344	-0.53	0.601	

<sup>1</sup> Reference breed was CAL

1036

1037

1038

1039

1040 Table 3.7 and Table 3.8 indicate that the experimental diets had no effect on colour coordinates  
1041 ( $P > 0.05$ ). Lightness ( $L^*$ ) ranged from (40.92 to 52.90, redness ( $a^*$ ) ranged from 3.06 to 10.85,  
1042 yellowness ( $b^*$ ) ranged from 10.90 to 13.33, Chroma (9.07 – 16.94) and Hue angle (50.62 to  
1043 66.73).

1044

1045

1046

1047

1048

1049

1050

1051

1052

1053

1054

1055

1056

1057

1058

1059

1060 **Table 3. 7:** Mean values for meat colour co-ordinates of NZW and CAL as influenced by  
 1061 balanced dietary protein

Parameter	Breed	126	143	161	178	196	213	SEM
L*	NZW	49.44 <sup>a</sup>	49.95 <sup>a</sup>	52.40 <sup>a</sup>	49.73 <sup>a</sup>	51.71 <sup>a</sup>	49.97 <sup>a</sup>	0.6482
	CAL	43.69 <sup>a</sup>	47.19 <sup>a</sup>	40.92 <sup>a</sup>	42.99 <sup>a</sup>	43.78 <sup>a</sup>	43.45 <sup>a</sup>	1.399
a*	NZW	8.715 <sup>a</sup>	6.995 <sup>a</sup>	5.350 <sup>a</sup>	5.590 <sup>a</sup>	3.060 <sup>a</sup>	5.875 <sup>a</sup>	0.7502
	CAL	9.300 <sup>a</sup>	9.150 <sup>a</sup>	9.600 <sup>a</sup>	10.855 <sup>a</sup>	9.445 <sup>a</sup>	9.370 <sup>a</sup>	0.6895
b*	NZW	12.43 <sup>a</sup>	11.34 <sup>a</sup>	10.26 <sup>a</sup>	10.90 <sup>a</sup>	8.38 <sup>a</sup>	11.65 <sup>a</sup>	0.5871
	CAL	12.32 <sup>a</sup>	13.14 <sup>a</sup>	11.97 <sup>a</sup>	12.80 <sup>a</sup>	12.79 <sup>a</sup>	12.04 <sup>a</sup>	0.4978
Chroma	NZW	15.19 <sup>a</sup>	13.33 <sup>a</sup>	11.58 <sup>a</sup>	12.59 <sup>a</sup>	9.07 <sup>a</sup>	13.07 <sup>a</sup>	0.7856
	CAL	15.50 <sup>a</sup>	16.08 <sup>a</sup>	15.36 <sup>a</sup>	16.94 <sup>a</sup>	16.03 <sup>a</sup>	15.32 <sup>a</sup>	0.6841
Hue angle	NZW	55.13 <sup>a</sup>	58.46 <sup>a</sup>	62.54 <sup>a</sup>	66.00 <sup>a</sup>	66.73 <sup>a</sup>	63.63 <sup>a</sup>	2.2569
	CAL	53.41 <sup>a</sup>	55.20 <sup>a</sup>	53.06 <sup>a</sup>	50.62 <sup>a</sup>	53.27 <sup>a</sup>	52.14 <sup>a</sup>	1.820

1062 **List of abbreviations:** L\*= Lightness, a\*= redness, b\*= yellowness, NZW= New Zealand  
 1063 White, CAL= Californian, SEM= standard error of means.

1064

1065

1066

1067

1068

1069

1070  
 1071  
 1072  
 1073  
 1074  
 1075  
 1076  
 1077

**Table 3. 8:** The effect of balanced dietary protein on the colour coordinates of meat from NZW and CAL rabbits using linear regression with groups<sup>1</sup>

Parameter	Estimate	SE	T (20 df)	t pr.	R <sup>2</sup>
<b>a* (redness)</b>					-2.534
Constant	9.37	1.60	5.86	<.001	
Protein	0.071	0.410	0.17	0.864	
Breed NZW	-0.86	2.26	-0.38	0.706	
Protein*Breed NZW	-0.807	0.580	-1.39	0.180	
<b>b* (yellowness)</b>					-0.713
Constant	12.7	1.27	10.01	<.001	
Protein	-0.045	0.325	-0.14	0.891	
Breed NZW	-0.63	1.79	-0.35	0.728	
Protein*Breed NZW	-0.301	0.460	-0.65	0.520	
<b>L* (Lightness)</b>					-2.677
Constant	44.6	2.59	17.20	<.001	
Protein	-0.267	0.666	-0.40	0.693	
Breed NZW	5.41	3.67	1.47	0.156	
Protein*Breed NZW	0.417	0.942	0.44	0.662	
<b>Hue angle</b>					-1.753
Constant	54.4	5.01	10.86	<.001	
Protein	-0.42	1.25	-0.32	0.750	
Breed NZW	0.60	7.09	0.08	0.934	
Protein*Breed NZW	2.44	1.82	1.34	0.195	
<b>Chroma</b>					0.607
Constant	15.8	1.67	9.46	<.001	
Protein	0.017	0.429	0.04	0.969	

Breed NZW	-1.11	2.36	-0.47	0.645
Protein*Breed NZW	-0.655	0.607	-1.08	0.293

1078 <sup>1</sup> Reference breed was CAL

1079

1080

1081

1082 Table 3.9 and Table 3.10 show no differences on water holding capacity of meat from New

1083 Zealand White and Californian rabbits fed balanced dietary. WHC values ranged from 10.06

1084 to 18.59% for NZW and 16.57 to 19.89 % or CAL rabbits.

1085

1086

1087

1088

1089

1090

1091

1092

1093

1094

1095

1096

1097

1098

1099

1100

1101 **Table 3. 9:** Mean values for water holding capacity of NZW and CAL as influenced by

1102 balanced dietary protein

Parameter	Breed	126	143	161	178	196	213	SEM
WHC (%)	NZW	10.47 <sup>a</sup>	13.62 <sup>a</sup>	11.11 <sup>a</sup>	18.59 <sup>a</sup>	14.41 <sup>a</sup>	10.06	1.129
	CAL	18.90 <sup>a</sup>	16.57 <sup>a</sup>	20.46 <sup>a</sup>	19.89 <sup>a</sup>	19.44 <sup>a</sup>	19.60	1.094

1103 **List of abbreviations:** WHC= water holding capacity, NZW= New Zealand White, CAL=  
 1104 Californian, SEM standard error of means.

1105

1106 **Table 3. 10:** The effect of balanced dietary protein on the water holding capacity of meat of

1107 NZW and CAL rabbits using linear regression with groups1

Parameter	Estimate	SE	t(20)	tpr.	R <sup>2</sup>
Water holding capacity					0.584
Constant	17.99	2.64	6.82	<.001	
Protein	0.330	0.677	0.49	0.631	
Breed NZW	-5.72	3.73	-1.53	0.140	
Protein*Breed NZW	-0.107	0.957	-0.11	0.912	

1108 <sup>1</sup> Reference breed was CAL

1109

1110

1111

1112

1113

1114 Table 3.11 and Table 3.12 indicate that the balanced dietary protein did not have a significant  
1115 effect ( $P > 0.05$ ) on the cooking losses of meat from the two rabbit strains. The results ranged  
1116 (25.23 – 31.95%) for New Zealand White and (10.78 – 15.86%) for Californian rabbits. No  
1117 linear trends were found for the experimental diets and cooking losses.

1118 **Table 3. 11:** Mean values for cooking loss of NZW and CAL as influenced by balanced  
1119 dietary protein

Parameter	Breed	126	143	161	178	196	213	SEM
Cooking loss (%)	NZW	29.93 <sup>a</sup>	25.23 <sup>a</sup>	30.15 <sup>a</sup>	31.95 <sup>a</sup>	28.85 <sup>a</sup>	27.48 <sup>a</sup>	1.018
	CAL	12.98 <sup>a</sup>	11.02 <sup>a</sup>	10.78 <sup>a</sup>	10.85 <sup>a</sup>	15.86 <sup>a</sup>	12.64 <sup>a</sup>	0.7651

1120 **List of abbreviations;** NZW= New Zealand White, CAL= Californian, SEM= standard error  
1121 of means.

1122

1123

1124

1125

1126

1127

1128

1129

1130

1131

1132  
1133  
1134  
1135  
1136  
1137  
1138  
1139  
1140  
1141  
1142  
1143  
1144  
1145  
1146  
1147  
1148  
1149  
1150  
1151

**Table 3. 12:** The effect of balanced dietary protein on the cooking loss of meat of NZW and CAL rabbits using linear regression with groups<sup>1</sup>

Parameter	Estimate	SE	t(20)	t pr.	R <sup>2</sup>
<b>Cooking loss</b>					0.112
Constant	11.07	2.13	5.20	<.001	
Protein	0.368	0.547	0.67	0.509	
Breed NZW	17.82	3.01	5.92	<.001	
Protein*Breed NZW	-0.355	0.773	-0.46	0.651	

<sup>1</sup> Reference breed was CAL

1152  
1153  
1154  
1155  
1156  
1157  
1158  
1159  
1160  
1161  
1162  
1163  
1164  
1165  
1166  
1167  
1168  
1169  
1170  
1171  
1172  
1173  
1174  
1175  
1176  
1177  
1178  
1179  
1180

Table 3.13 and Table 3.14 illustrated that there was no significant dietary effect on shear force values of New Zealand White and Californian rabbits. Higher shear force values were observed on Californian rabbits.

1181  
1182  
1183  
1184  
1185  
1186  
1187  
  
1188  
1189  
1190  
1191  
1192  
1193  
1194  
1195  
1196  
1197  
1198  
1199  
1200  
1201  
1202  
1203

**Table 3. 13:** Mean values for Shear force values of NZW and CAL as influenced by balanced dietary protein

Parameter	Breed	126	143	161	178	196	213	SEM
Shear force (N)	NZW	66.82 <sup>a</sup>	56.94 <sup>a</sup>	41.55 <sup>a</sup>	52.51 <sup>a</sup>	52.02 <sup>a</sup>	53.44 <sup>a</sup>	3.465
	CAL	100.35 <sup>a</sup>	93.02 <sup>a</sup>	58.38 <sup>a</sup>	99.01 <sup>a</sup>	72.06 <sup>a</sup>	73.49 <sup>a</sup>	7.21

**List of abbreviations;** NZW= New Zealand White, CAL= Californian, SEM= standard error of means.

1204  
1205  
1206  
1207  
1208  
1209  
1210  
1211  
1212  
1213  
1214  
1215  
1216  
1217  
1218  
1219  
1220  
1221  
1222  
1223

**Table 3. 14:** The effect of balanced dietary protein on the shear force of meat of NZW and CAL rabbits using linear regression with groups<sup>1</sup>

Parameter	Estimate	SE	t(20 df)	t pr.	R <sup>2</sup>
Shear force					0.596
Constant	98.4	12.9	7.61	<.001	
Protein	-4.47	3.32	-1.35	0.193	
Breed NZW	-37.4	18.3	-2.05	0.054	
Protein*Breed NZW	2.45	4.70	0.52	0.607	

<sup>1</sup> Reference breed was CAL

1224  
1225  
1226  
1227  
1228  
1229  
1230  
1231  
1232  
1233  
1234  
1235  
1236  
1237  
1238  
1239  
1240  
1241  
1242  
1243  
1244  
1245

There was no significant dietary effect on drip loss of NZW and CAL rabbits as shown in table 3.15 and table 3.16. The results ranged from 6.245 to 8.165%.

**Table 3. 15:** Mean values for drip loss of NZW and CAL as influenced by balanced dietary protein

Parameter	Breed	126	143	161	178	196	213	SEM
Drip loss (%)	NZW	7.725 <sup>a</sup>	6.920 <sup>a</sup>	6.245 <sup>a</sup>	8.165 <sup>a</sup>	6.830 <sup>a</sup>	7.450 <sup>a</sup>	0.3810
	CAL	8.120 <sup>a</sup>	7.550 <sup>a</sup>	7.560 <sup>a</sup>	6.355 <sup>a</sup>	7.415 <sup>a</sup>	7.415 <sup>a</sup>	0.2909

**List of abbreviations;** NZW= New Zealand White, CAL= Californian, SEM= standard error of means.

1246  
1247  
1248  
1249  
1250  
1251  
1252  
1253  
1254  
1255  
1256  
1257  
1258  
1259  
1260  
1261  
1262  
1263  
1264  
1265  
1266

**Table 3. 16:** The effect of balanced dietary protein on the drip loss of meat of NZW and CAL rabbits using linear regression with groups1

Parameter	Estimate	SE	t(20)	t pr.	R <sup>2</sup>
Drip loss					0.957
Constant	8.006	0.794	10.08	<.001	
Protein	-0.185	0.204	-0.91	0.375	
Breed NZW	-0.8	1.12	-0.72	0.479	
Protein*Breed NZW	0.19	0.88	0.67	0.511	

<sup>1</sup> Reference breed was CAL

1267

1268

1269

### 1270 3.8 Discussion

1271 Several meat quality attributes are affected by pH, including tenderness, water-holding  
1272 capacity, colour and juiciness (Mir *et al.* 2017). Husak *et al.* (2008) stated that meat with a  
1273 higher pH maintains better colour and improves moisture retention. Bai *et al.* (2013),  
1274 highlighted that post-mortem glycolysis reduces lactic acid in muscle, resulting in a substantial  
1275 increase in meat pH.

1276 The current study found no linear trends for pH values between the two breeds at pH 45 and  
1277 pH 24. There is inadequate evidence published on the effect of balanced dietary protein on  
1278 physicochemical of NZW and CAL rabbits. However, a study by Ribeiro *et al.* (2014) found  
1279 that dietary protein content also had no influence on pH of breast meat in broilers. These results  
1280 are in line with Sirtori *et al.* (2014), who found that dietary protein did not influence pH 45 and  
1281 pH 24 on pigs. In addition, Alonso *et al.* (2010) reported no dietary protein influence on pH 24  
1282 of pork. A study by Wang *et al.* (2021) also observed non-significant levels of dietary protein  
1283 in both pH 45 and pH 24 of lambs. In general, at 24 hours post slaughter pH values declined  
1284 significantly. In the present study the ultimate pH fell within the normal range (5.6 and 5.85),  
1285 which is accepted in rabbit meat. A pH which is below the normal range is associated with  
1286 meat that is firm and dry due to the myofibrillar network shrinkage and the reduction of water  
1287 holding capacity (Morshdy *et al.*, 2002).

1288 Colour of meat affects consumer acceptance of meat and is an influential factor when  
1289 purchasing meat (Muchenje, 2009; Xazela, 2012). Ribarski and Genchev (2013), stated that  
1290 colour of the meat is indicative of tenderness and freshness of the meat and it differs with  
1291 species. However, Joo *et al.* (2013) reported that the substantial variations in the range of meat

1292 colour among various animals are primarily caused by the amount of myoglobin in muscle.  
1293 Moreover, the redness and desired appeal of meat are highly correlated with the myoglobin  
1294 concentration of the meat (Khliji *et al.*, 2010). In the current, study there was no significant  
1295 difference ( $P > 0.05$ ) in the colour Lightness, redness and yellowness of meat across the dietary  
1296 treatments. this could have been attributed These results correspond with the findings by Bidner  
1297 *et al.*, (2004) who found no differences in colour of pork. Tarasewicz *et al.* (2007) also found  
1298 no effect of protein levels on colour coordinates  $L^*$ ,  $a^*$  and  $b^*$  of quail breast meat.  
1299 Additionally, Wang *et al.* (2021) also reported no significant differences in colour coordinates  
1300 of lambs fed levels of dietary protein. According to Piolo *et al.* (2002), when the hue angle is  
1301 close to  $90^\circ$  the colour become yellowish. However, the results of hue angle in the current study  
1302 were below  $90^\circ$ . Yellow meat appears to be undesirable to consumers which can affect their  
1303 meat acceptance and purchasing decisions (Altmann *et al.*, 2022).

1304 In the present study the balanced dietary protein content did not influence shear force and these  
1305 results agree with Teye *et al.* (2006) who reported no effect of protein content on shear force.  
1306 However, this lack of effect could be due to a negative relationship between the dietary protein  
1307 levels and the shear force parameter. There was no significant effect of dietary protein levels  
1308 on drip loss. A study by See and Odle (2000) also revealed that balanced dietary protein had  
1309 no influence on drip loss in broilers. The results of the current study are in line with the findings  
1310 from other studies which found no significant effect of dietary protein on drip loss of pork  
1311 (Witte *et al.*, 2000). Furthermore, Alonso *et al.* (2010) also did not find a dietary effect of  
1312 protein content on drip loss in pigs.

1313 Consumers are less likely to choose meat when there are high cooking losses as stated by  
1314 Aaslyng *et al.* (2003). A reduction in carcass juiciness is associated with an increase in cooking  
1315 loss (Schonfeldt and Strydom, 2011). However, in the current study no differences were

1316 observed in cooking loss which corresponds with the observations by (Ribeiro *et al.*, 2014)  
1317 who found no significant effect of dietary protein on cooking loss of breast meat from broilers.

1318 Although the study did not show a significant impact of a balanced dietary protein on meat  
1319 quality attributes of rabbits, it does not necessarily imply that feeding such protein is  
1320 detrimental to rabbits. The absence of significant results merely indicates a negative correlation  
1321 between balanced dietary protein and specific measures of meat quality. Therefore, it is  
1322 imperative to undertake further research to identify the dietary protein levels that can affect the  
1323 meat quality of rabbits positively.

1324 The study's findings suggest that there is a need for more comprehensive studies to establish  
1325 the optimum dietary protein levels for rabbits. These studies can explore the influence of  
1326 different dietary protein levels on rabbit's growth, metabolism, and ultimately, meat quality.  
1327 The results of these studies would help rabbit farmers make informed decisions when selecting  
1328 a dietary protein level for their rabbits. Furthermore, this information would contribute to the  
1329 development of better feeding practices for rabbits, ultimately improving the quality of their  
1330 meat for human consumption.

### 1331 3.9 Conclusion

1332 Results from this study showed that balanced dietary protein levels no effect on the meat  
1333 quality attributes. We concluded that the balanced dietary protein has the potential to be used  
1334 in rabbits diets without compromising their performance and health status. An optimum dietary  
1335 protein inclusion level could not be determined suggesting a need to further investigate the  
1336 effect of balanced dietary protein at higher inclusion levels.

1337

1338

1339 References

- 1340 **Alonso, V., del Mar Campo, M., Provincial, L., Roncalés, P. and Beltrán, J.A.** (2010).  
1341 Effect of protein level in commercial diets on pork meat quality. *Meat Science*, 85(1).7-14.
- 1342 **Bidner, B. S., Ellis, M., Witte, D. P., Carr, S. N., and McKeith, F. K.** (2004). Influence of  
1343 dietary lysine level, pre-slaughter fasting, and rendement napole genotype on fresh pork  
1344 quality. *Meat Science*, 68, 53–60.
- 1345 **Bouzaida, M.D., Resconi, V.C., Gimeno, D., Romero, J.V., Calanche, J.B., Barahona, M.,**  
1346 **Olleta, J.L. and María, G.A.** (2021). Effect of dietary grape pomace on fattening rabbit  
1347 performance, fatty acid composition, and shelf life of meat. *Antioxidants*, 10(5), p.795.
- 1348 **El-Badry, A.S.O., Hassanane, M.M., Mosalm, G.A.G., Ahmed, E.S. and El-Aasar, T.A.**  
1349 (2019). Influence of ingestion of nano-selenium on growth performance, antioxidative and  
1350 mutagenicity status in somatic cells of New Zealand White rabbits. *Egyptian Journal of Rabbit*  
1351 *Science*, 29(1), pp.1-21.
- 1352 **Daszkiewicz, T. and Gugolek, A.** (2020). A Comparison of the Quality of Meat from Female  
1353 and Male Californian and Flemish Giant Gray Rabbits. *Animals*, 10(12), p.2216.
- 1354 **Castrica, M., Menchetti, L., Agradi, S., Curone, G., Vigo, D., Pastorelli, G., Di**  
1355 **Giancamillo, A., Modina, S.C., Riva, F., Serra, V. and Miraglia, D.** (2022). Effect of Bovine  
1356 Colostrum Dietary Supplementation on Rabbit Meat Quality. *Foods*, 11(21), 3433.
- 1357 **Joo, S., Kim, G., Hwang, Y., and Ryu, Y.** 2013. Control of fresh meat quality through  
1358 manipulation of muscle fiber characteristics. *Meat Science* 95: 828-836.
- 1359 **Maqsood, R., Khan, A., Mushtaq, M.H., Yaqub, T., Aslam, M.A., Rashid, H.B., Gill, S.S.,**  
1360 **Akram, R., Rehman, A. and Chaudhry, M.** 2021. Risk factors for outbreaks caused by

1361 variant strain of Newcastle disease on environmentally controlled broiler chicken farms in  
1362 Lahore, Pakistan. *Polish Journal of Veterinary Sciences*, 24(4), 124.

1363 **Morshdy, A.E.M., Mohieldeen, H., Shymaa, G., Mohamed, M.E. and Darwish, W. (2022).**  
1364 Microbiological Quality of Rabbit Meat in Egypt and Worldwide: A Review. *Journal of*  
1365 *Advanced Veterinary Research*, 12(6), 807-810.

1366 **Petracci, M., Soglia, F. and Leroy, F. (2018).** Rabbit meat in need of a hat-trick: from  
1367 tradition to innovation (and back). *Meat Science*, 146, 93-100.

1368 **See, M. T., and Odle, J. (2000).** Effect of dietary fat source, level and feeding interval on pork  
1369 fatty acid composition. Departmental report. 248. Department of Animal Science, Research  
1370 report, NC State University College of Agricultural, USA, 6pp.

1371 **Teye, G. A., Sheard, P. R., Whittington, F. M., Nute, G. R., Stewart, A., & Wood, J. D.**  
1372 (2006a). Influence of dietary oils and protein level on pork quality. 1. Effects on muscle fatty  
1373 acid composition, carcass, meat and eating quality. *Meat Science*, 73, 157–165.

1374 **Witte, D. P., Ellis, M., McKeith, F. K., and Wilson, E. R. (2000).** Effect of dietary lysine  
1375 level and environmental temperature during the finishing phase on the intramuscular fat content  
1376 of pork. *Journal of Animal Science*, 78, 1272–1276.

1377 **Tarasewicz, Z., Gardzielewska, J., Szczerbińska, D.A.N.U.T.A., Ligocki, M.,**  
1378 **Jakubowska, M. and Majewska, D. (2007).** The effect of feeding with low-protein feed mixes  
1379 on the growth and slaughter value of young male Pharaoh quails. *Archives Animal Breeding*,  
1380 50(5), pp.520-530.

1381 **Ribeiro, T., M. M. Lordelo, P. Costa, S. P. Alves, W. S. Benevides, R. J. B. Bessa, J. P. C.**  
1382 **Lemos, R. M. A. Pinto, L. M. A. Ferreira, C. M. G. A. Fontes and J. A. M. Prates (2014)**

1383 Effect of reduced dietary protein and supplementation with a docosahexaenoic acid product on  
1384 broiler performance and meat quality, *British Poultry Science*, 55:6, 752-765,

1385 **Wang D., Chen G.S, Chai M.J, Wang Y.F, Yao Y.Y, and Zhang X.** (2020). Effects of  
1386 lowprotein diet on growth performance and meat quality of Du×Min hybrid finishing pigs.  
1387 *Chin J Anim Sci.* 56:146–9.

1388 **Strydom, P. E., Naude, R. T., Smith, M. F., Scholtz, M. M., and van Wyk, J. B.** (2000).  
1389 Characterisation of indigenous African cattle breeds in relation to meat quality traits. *Meat*  
1390 *Science*, 55, 79–88.

1391 **Sirtori, F., Crovetto, A., Acciaioli, A., Pugliese, C., Bozzi, R., Campodoni, G. and Franci,**  
1392 **O.** (2014). Effect of dietary protein level on carcass traits and meat properties of Cinta Senese  
1393 pigs. *Animal*, 8(12), pp.1987-1995.

1394 **Xazela, N. M., Chimonyo, M., Muchenje, V., and Marume, U.** (2011). Consumer sensory  
1395 evaluation of meat from South African goat genotypes fed on a dietary supplement. *African*  
1396 *Journal of Biotechnology*, 10(20), 4436-4443.

1397 **Petrescu, D.C. and Petrescu-Mag, R.M.** (2018). Consumer behaviour related to rabbit meat  
1398 as functional food. *World Rabbit Science*, 26(4), 321-333.

1399

1400

1401

1402

1403

1404

1405 CHAPTER 4

1406 **Consumer sensory evaluation of New Zealand White and Californian Rabbit Meat Fed**

1407 **Balanced Dietary Protein**

---

1408 **Abstract**

1409 The objective of the current study was to determine the effect of balanced dietary protein (BDP)  
1410 on sensory attributes of different sexes, breeds New Zealand (NZW) and Californian (CAL)  
1411 rabbits. A total of eighty rabbits (80) NZW and CAL were used. Rabbits were grown under the  
1412 same conditions, fed the same diet and slaughtered after a period of 56 days. Rabbit meat was  
1413 prepared by using different thermal treatments (boiling and frying). The sensory analysis of  
1414 rabbit's meat was carried out on the *Longissimus* muscle. A total of three different tribes, which  
1415 include Shona, Zulu and Xhosa composed of different age groups were used to study sensory  
1416 evaluation of rabbit's meat. In this study, the first bite was rated superior ( $P < 0.05$ ) in NZW  
1417 breed for cooked meat. Higher scores were observed in overall flavour intensity for fried meat  
1418 in NZW breed ( $P < 0.05$ ). Shona tribe gave higher scores ( $P < 0.05$ ) in both cooked and fried  
1419 meat for all sensory properties. Xhosa tribe gave highest scores ( $P < 0.05$ ) in First bite, muscle  
1420 fibre and overall tenderness in cooked meat. With regards to age, the highest scores ( $P < 0.05$ )  
1421 for sustained impression of juiciness from fried meat were given by respondents in age group  
1422 26-30 years of age. High scores ( $P < 0.05$ ) were observed in both females and males for fried  
1423 meat than cooked meat for all sensory characteristics. Highest scores ( $P < 0.05$ ) were detected  
1424 in overall flavour intensity of fried meat in all tribes. It was therefore concluded that consumers  
1425 prefer fried meat than cooked meat based on the scores given by the respondents.

1426 **Key words:** Sensory evaluation, Rabbit meat, Cooked meat, Fried meat, Gender, Age, dietary  
1427 protein.

## 1428 4.1 Introduction

1429 Globally, meat from rabbits is typically a popular food source (Abdel-Naeem *et al.*, 2021). Its  
1430 consumption is mainly an eating habit across European (EU) countries, North Africa, in  
1431 particular Egypt and Middle East (Cullere and Dalle Zotte, 2018). The meat from rabbits is rich  
1432 protein of high biological value, low levels of cholesterol (almost free) and low levels of fat  
1433 (Para *et al.*, 2015). Several studies revealed that meat from rabbits contain both macro and  
1434 micro elements, including phosphorus, potassium and selenium (Dalle Zotte and Szendrő,  
1435 2011), thus it is regarded as an ideal healthy diet for human nutrition. Zalton (2017) denoted  
1436 that rabbit meat is classified as a white meat with a tender taste.

1437 Rabbit meat is suggested to be included amongst other meat to be in the nutritional regime of  
1438 patients suffering from certain illnesses, including cardiovascular diseases (Khan *et al.*, 2016).  
1439 According to Rasinska *et al.* (2018), ions and hind legs are considered as the most valuable  
1440 cuts, merely because of their high lean content. Meat sensory evaluation are crucial for the  
1441 consumer's choice and can be made using a trained taste panel. Furthermore, (Das *et al.*, 2020)  
1442 revealed that sensory evaluation also has a great impact on the willingness of a consumer to  
1443 reject or accept the meat. A number of studies from the literature highlighted that cooking of  
1444 rabbit meat is considered as a vital process (Rasinska *et al.*, 2013), which allow its consumption  
1445 as it is usually not subjected for salting, as well as aging unlike other species (Crovato *et al.*,  
1446 2022).

1447 Cooking generally helps in the creation of pleasant characteristics, tenderness, flavour and  
1448 taste. Furthermore, cooking also decrease production of microbial loads, thus prolonged meat  
1449 shelf life (Đorđević and Đurović-Pejčev, 2015). Earlier study by Combes *et al.* (2004) found  
1450 that sensory attributes differ according to the method of cooking, such as boiling or frying.  
1451 Apart from this, age, sex, nutrition and breed might affect the final quality of rabbit meat,  
1452 namely sensory attributes. Therefore, understanding the mechanism involved in sensory

1453 attributes as it is affected by aforementioned factors is of paramount importance. Interestingly,  
1454 to our knowledge, few studies, if any, have focused on examining the balanced dietary protein  
1455 in terms of sensory quality of NZW and CAL rabbit meat. Hence, the current study aimed at  
1456 extending current knowledge by assessing the effect of Balanced dietary protein on sensory  
1457 evaluation (sensory panel) of NZW and CAL rabbit meat.

#### 1458 4.2 Materials and methods

1459 The same material and methods were used as explained in Chapter 3.

#### 1460 4.3 Sensory evaluation

1461 The analysis of sensory evaluation was done randomly by a consumer panel composed of 15  
1462 students and staff from University of KwaZulu Natal based on seven descriptors, which are  
1463 illustrated in Table 4.1. Two thermal treatments were used in this study, namely boiling and  
1464 cooking. The meat samples were first deboned and cut into smaller pieces approximately of  
1465 2cm x 2cm boiled and fried for 30 minutes, salt was added to taste. Meat from each cooking  
1466 method was randomly distributed to the tasting panel. Different ages (21-25, 26-30 and >30),  
1467 gender (male and female) and tribes (Xhosa, Zulu and Shona) were used for the meat tasting.  
1468 The panellist was trained on how to record the scores for each sample and were told to rinse  
1469 their mouths with water prior tasting the next sample.

1470 Table 4. 1: Meat sensory evaluation characteristics

Items	Description	Scores
AI	The intensity of an odour as perceived at first	1 = extremely dry and 8 = extremely juicy
IJ	The amount of liquid that drips from the cut surface when the thumb and forefinger are pressed together	1 = extremely dry and 8 = extremely juicy
FB	The impression that you form on the first bite	1 = extremely tough, and 8 = extremely tender
SJ	Sensation of juiciness you get when you begin chewing	1= extremely dry and 8 = extremely juicy
MFT	Chew the sample with a light chewing action	1 = extremely tough, and 8 = extremely tender
ACT	The chewiness of the meat	1 = extremely and 8 = none
OFI	The interaction of flavour while chewing and swallowing referring to the typical beef flavour	1 = extremely bland and 5 = slightly intense

1471 **Abbreviations:** AI, Aroma intensity; IJ, Initial impression of juiciness; SJ, sustained impression of juiciness; FB, first bite; MFT, muscle fibre

1472 and overall tenderness; Amount of connective tissue (Residue), ACT; OFI, overall flavour intensity

1473 4.4 Statistical analysis

1474 The general analysis of variance procedure of GenStat 20<sup>th</sup> edition, VSN International (2016)  
1475 was used to determine the effects of diet, genotype and thermal preparation on meat sensory  
1476 characteristics of rabbits. Turkey's test was used to compare means and considered significant  
1477 at  $P < 0.05$ .

1478 The following model was:

$$1479 Y_{ijkl} = \mu + C_i + G_j + D_k + (G \times D)_{jk} + (G \times C)_{ij} + (D \times C)_{ik} + (G \times D \times C)_{ijk} + E_{ijkl}$$

1480 Where  $Y_{ijkl}$  = response variable (aroma intensity, initial impression of juiciness, first bite,  
1481 sustained impression of juiciness, fibre and overall tenderness, amount of connective tissue and  
1482 overall flavour intensity)

1483  $\mu$  = overall mean common to all observations

1484  $C_i$  = effect of thermal treatment (boiled, fried)

1485  $G_j$  = effect of genotype (NZW and CAL)

1486  $D_k$  = effect of diet

1487  $(G \times D)_{jk}$  = interaction between diet and genotype

1488  $(G \times C)_{ij}$  = interaction between thermal treatment and genotype

1489  $(D \times C)_{ik}$  = interaction between diet and thermal treatment

1490  $(G \times D \times C)_{ijk}$  = interaction between diet, genotype and thermal treatment

1491  $E_{ijkl}$  = random error distribution as  $N(0, I \delta^2)$

1492 A separate model was used to test for the effects of cooking method, gender, tribe and sex of  
1493 panelist on the sensory scores. Turkey's test was used to compare means and considered  
1494 significant at  $P < 0.05$ .

#### 1495 4.5 Results

1496 Table 4.2 and Table 4.3 represent the influence of breed, diet and thermal treatment on sensory  
1497 characteristics. Thermal treatment and breed had a significant influence ( $P < 0.05$ ) on aroma  
1498 intensity. Diet, however, had no significant influence ( $P > 0.05$ ) on aroma intensity. Cooked  
1499 meat from New Zealand white (NZW) had a stronger aroma intensity ( $P < 0.05$ ). Thermal  
1500 treatment, breed and diet significantly influenced ( $P < 0.05$ ) initial impression of juiciness.  
1501 Fried meat for both breeds was juicier in protein level 178g/kg. Thermal treatment had no  
1502 significant effect ( $P > 0.05$ ) on first bite. However, breed or genotype had a significant influence  
1503 ( $P < 0.05$ ) on first bite. Higher scores for first bite were observed in cooked meat of NZW.  
1504 Thermal treatment and genotype had a significant influence ( $P < 0.05$ ) on sustained impression  
1505 of juiciness. Diet did not influence ( $P > 0.05$ ) sustained impression of juiciness. Sustained  
1506 impression of juiciness was rated higher for fried meat from NZW.

1507 Thermal treatment and breed had a significant influence ( $P < 0.05$ ) on muscle fibre and overall  
1508 tenderness. Muscle fibre and overall tenderness scores showed that panelists regarded both  
1509 cooked and fried meat tender from both breeds. Amount of connective tissue was influenced  
1510 ( $P < 0.05$ ) by thermal treatment and breed. Diet had a significant influence on the amount of  
1511 connective tissue scores. Fried meat had higher amount of connective tissue scores than cooked  
1512 meat. Overall flavour intensity was influenced by ( $P < 0.05$ ) by thermal treatment and breed.  
1513 Overall flavour intensity was observed to be higher in fried meat than cooked meat.

1514 Tables 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 show the influences of tribe, gender and age on sensory attributes of  
1515 rabbit meat. Gender was observed to have a significant influence ( $P < 0.05$ ) across all the

1516 sensory characteristics. Both genders gave higher scores ( $P<0.05$ ) in aroma intensity of fried  
1517 meat. For the initial impression of juiciness, males gave high values ( $P<0.05$ ) for fried meat.  
1518 Higher scores have been observed from male respondents for first bite in cooked meat. In  
1519 contrary, females gave higher scores for first bite in fried meat. Sustained impression of  
1520 juiciness was rated superior in fried meat by males compared to females. Males gave higher  
1521 scores in muscle fibre and overall tenderness in fried meat. However, higher scores were  
1522 observed in amount of connective tissue and overall flavour intensity for both genders and  
1523 thermal preparations ( $P<0.05$ ). Tribe and thermal treatment had a significant effect on all the  
1524 sensory characteristics except for first bite ( $P<0.05$ ). Zulu and Shona participants rated aroma  
1525 intensity superior ( $P<0.05$ ) in both cooking methods. Xhosa respondents gave high scores for  
1526 first bite in cooked meat. Moreover, Zulu and Shona participants gave higher values for  
1527 sustained impression of juiciness for fried meat. However, all tribes gave higher values for  
1528 muscle fibre and overall tenderness for both cooked and fried meat. Participants from the Zulu  
1529 tribe gave highest scores in amount of connective tissue in fried meat. Highest scores were  
1530 observed in overall flavour intensity of fried meat in all tribes.

1531 Consumer age group had a significant influence ( $P<0.05$ ) on meat sensory scores across  
1532 thermal treatments. Age had a significant influence in aroma intensity. Fried meat was rated  
1533 superior for aroma intensity by age group 21-25 years of age. However, age group 26-30 years  
1534 of age gave higher scores for both cooking methods in aroma intensity. No differences were  
1535 observed between the scores given by age group  $\geq 30$  for aroma intensity. Age group 26-30  
1536 considered fried meat juicier than cooked meat due to high values for initial impression of  
1537 juiciness. Age group 21-25 rated first bite superior in both thermal treatments, however age  
1538 group  $\geq 30$  gave higher values for first bite in cooked meat. Sustained impression of juiciness  
1539 had higher values in fried meat from age groups 21-25 and 26-30. All age groups rated amount

1540 of connective tissue higher in fried meat. Higher scores for overall flavour intensity were  
1541 observed in both thermal treatments.

1542

1543

1544

1545

1546

1547

1548

1549

1550

1551

1552

1553

1554

1555

1556

1557

1558

1559

1560 **Table 4. 2:** Influence of breed, diet and thermal treatment on aroma intensity, initial  
1561 impression of juiciness and sustained impression of juiciness

<b>Breed</b>		<b>126</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>213</b>
<b>AI</b>							
CAL	C	4.179 <sup>abc</sup>	3.893 <sup>a</sup>	4.071 <sup>ab</sup>	4.714 <sup>abcd</sup>	4.643 <sup>abcd</sup>	4.393 <sup>abcd</sup>
NZW	C	5.036 <sup>abcd</sup>	5.321 <sup>cd</sup>	4.857 <sup>abcd</sup>	5.250 <sup>bcd</sup>	4.821 <sup>abcd</sup>	5.071 <sup>abcd</sup>
CAL	F	5.036 <sup>abcd</sup>	4.893 <sup>abcd</sup>	4.571 <sup>abcd</sup>	4.929 <sup>abcd</sup>	5.071 <sup>abcd</sup>	5.036 <sup>abcd</sup>
NZW	F	4.714 <sup>abcd</sup>	5.286 <sup>cd</sup>	4.679 <sup>abcd</sup>	5.250 <sup>bcd</sup>	5.500 <sup>d</sup>	5.107 <sup>bcd</sup>
<b>IJ</b>							
CAL	C	3.321 <sup>ab</sup>	3.893 <sup>abcd</sup>	3.500 <sup>abc</sup>	4.000 <sup>abcd</sup>	3.821 <sup>abcd</sup>	3.036 <sup>a</sup>
NZW	C	3.56 <sup>abc</sup>	4.857 <sup>cd</sup>	4.500 <sup>bcd</sup>	4.429 <sup>abcd</sup>	4.571 <sup>bcd</sup>	4.071 <sup>abcd</sup>
CAL	F	4.536 <sup>bcd</sup>	4.679 <sup>bcd</sup>	4.500 <sup>bcd</sup>	5.036 <sup>d</sup>	4.786 <sup>cd</sup>	4.429 <sup>abcd</sup>
NZW	F	4.857 <sup>cd</sup>	4.571 <sup>bcd</sup>	4.714 <sup>bcd</sup>	5.214 <sup>d</sup>	5.000 <sup>d</sup>	4.821 <sup>cd</sup>
<b>FB</b>							
CAL	C	4.679 <sup>a</sup>	4.321 <sup>a</sup>	4.536 <sup>a</sup>	4.750 <sup>a</sup>	5.000 <sup>a</sup>	4.429 <sup>a</sup>
NZW	C	5.250 <sup>a</sup>	5.556 <sup>a</sup>	5.357 <sup>a</sup>	5.179 <sup>a</sup>	5.250 <sup>a</sup>	5.071 <sup>a</sup>
CAL	F	4.821 <sup>a</sup>	4.679 <sup>a</sup>	4.821 <sup>a</sup>	5.036 <sup>a</sup>	4.821 <sup>a</sup>	4.964 <sup>a</sup>
NZW	F	5.286 <sup>a</sup>	5.286 <sup>a</sup>	5.286 <sup>a</sup>	4.857 <sup>a</sup>	5.286 <sup>a</sup>	5.000 <sup>a</sup>
<b>SJ</b>							
CAL	C	4.607 <sup>abcd</sup>	3.571 <sup>a</sup>	4.107 <sup>ab</sup>	4.143 <sup>abc</sup>	4.143 <sup>abc</sup>	4.286 <sup>abcd</sup>
NZW	C	4.321 <sup>abcd</sup>	5.143 <sup>bcd</sup>	4.643 <sup>abcd</sup>	4.536 <sup>abcd</sup>	5.000 <sup>bcd</sup>	4.893 <sup>bcd</sup>
CAL	F	4.429 <sup>abcd</sup>	4.643 <sup>abcd</sup>	4.714 <sup>abcd</sup>	5.0741 <sup>bcd</sup>	4.714 <sup>abcd</sup>	4.786 <sup>bcd</sup>
NZW	F	5.393 <sup>d</sup>	5.071 <sup>bcd</sup>	5.071 <sup>bcd</sup>	4.964 <sup>bcd</sup>	5.250 <sup>bcd</sup>	5.268 <sup>cd</sup>

1562 **Abbreviations:** CAL; Californian, NZW; New Zealand white, C =, Cooked and F =, Fried AI,  
1563 Aroma intensity; IJ, Initial impression of juiciness; SJ, sustained impression of juiciness.  
1564 Values within column with different superscript are significant different (P < 0.05).

1565

1566

1567

1568

1569

1570 **Table 4. 3:** Influence of breed, diet and thermal treatment on muscle fibre and overall

1571 tenderness, amount of connective tissue and overall flavour intensity.

Breed	Sex	126	143	161	178	196	213
<b>MFT</b>							
CAL	C	4.393 <sup>ab</sup>	4.250 <sup>a</sup>	4.536 <sup>ab</sup>	4.714 <sup>ab</sup>	4.714 <sup>ab</sup>	4.393 <sup>ab</sup>
NZW	C	5.036 <sup>ab</sup>	5.250 <sup>ab</sup>	5.429 <sup>ab</sup>	4.893 <sup>ab</sup>	5.071 <sup>ab</sup>	5.179 <sup>ab</sup>
CAL	F	4.857 <sup>ab</sup>	4.964 <sup>ab</sup>	4.929 <sup>ab</sup>	5.143 <sup>ab</sup>	5.143 <sup>ab</sup>	5.071 <sup>ab</sup>
NZW	F	5.536 <sup>b</sup>	5.250 <sup>ab</sup>	5.393 <sup>ab</sup>	5.286 <sup>ab</sup>	5.250 <sup>ab</sup>	5.036 <sup>ab</sup>
<b>ACT</b>							
CAL	C	4.179 <sup>abc</sup>	3.893 <sup>a</sup>	4.071 <sup>ab</sup>	4.174 <sup>abcd</sup>	4.643 <sup>abcd</sup>	4.393 <sup>abcd</sup>
NZW	C	5.036 <sup>abcd</sup>	5.321 <sup>cd</sup>	4.857 <sup>abcd</sup>	5.250 <sup>bcd</sup>	4.821 <sup>abcd</sup>	5.071 <sup>abcd</sup>
CAL	F	5.036 <sup>abcd</sup>	4.893 <sup>abcd</sup>	4.571 <sup>abcd</sup>	4.429 <sup>abcd</sup>	5.071 <sup>abcd</sup>	5.036 <sup>abcd</sup>
NZW	F	4.714 <sup>abcd</sup>	5.286 <sup>cd</sup>	4.679 <sup>abcd</sup>	5.250 <sup>bcd</sup>	5.500 <sup>d</sup>	5.107 <sup>bcd</sup>
<b>OFI</b>							
CAL	C	4.321 <sup>ab</sup>	4.107 <sup>a</sup>	4.321 <sup>ab</sup>	4.429 <sup>abc</sup>	4.607 <sup>abcde</sup>	4.464 <sup>abcd</sup>
NZW	C	4.429 <sup>abcde</sup>	5.286 <sup>bcde</sup>	5.071 <sup>abcde</sup>	4.964 <sup>abcde</sup>	5.607 <sup>de</sup>	5.429 <sup>bcde</sup>
CAL	F	4.679 <sup>abcde</sup>	4.964 <sup>abcde</sup>	4.893 <sup>abcde</sup>	4.929 <sup>abcde</sup>	4.893 <sup>abcde</sup>	5.143 <sup>abcde</sup>
NZW	F	5.536 <sup>cde</sup>	5.393 <sup>bcde</sup>	5.321 <sup>bcde</sup>	5.429 <sup>bcde</sup>	5.679 <sup>e</sup>	5.393 <sup>bcde</sup>

1572 **Abbreviations:** CAL; Californian, NZW; New Zealand white, C = Cooked and F = Fried.  
1573 MFT, muscle fibre and overall tenderness; Amount of connective tissue (Residue), ACT; OFI,  
1574 overall flavour intensity. Values within column with different superscript are significant  
1575 different ( $P < 0.05$ ).

1576 **Table 4. 4:** Influence of gender and thermal treatment on sensory characteristics

Gender	Cooked	Fried
<b>AI</b>		
<b>F</b>	4.614 <sup>a</sup>	5.045 <sup>b</sup>
<b>M</b>	4.873 <sup>ab</sup>	5.069 <sup>b</sup>
<b>IJ</b>		
<b>F</b>	3.621 <sup>a</sup>	4.364 <sup>b</sup>
<b>M</b>	4.181 <sup>b</sup>	5.020 <sup>c</sup>
<b>FB</b>		
<b>F</b>	4.817 <sup>a</sup>	5.159 <sup>a</sup>
<b>M</b>	5.029 <sup>a</sup>	4.917 <sup>a</sup>
<b>SJ</b>		

<b>F</b>	4.205 <sup>a</sup>	4.826 <sup>bc</sup>
<b>M</b>	4.608 <sup>b</sup>	5.029 <sup>c</sup>
<b>MFT</b>		
<b>F</b>	4.636 <sup>a</sup>	5.295 <sup>b</sup>
<b>M</b>	4.941 <sup>ab</sup>	5.064 <sup>b</sup>
<b>ACT</b>		
<b>F</b>	4.523 <sup>a</sup>	5.167 <sup>c</sup>
<b>M</b>	4.794 <sup>ab</sup>	4.902 <sup>bc</sup>
<b>OFI</b>		
<b>F</b>	4.902 <sup>ab</sup>	5.220 <sup>b</sup>
<b>M</b>	4.725 <sup>a</sup>	5.167 <sup>b</sup>

1577 **Abbreviations:** F, female; M, male; AI, Aroma intensity; IJ, Initial impression of juiciness; SJ,  
1578 sustained impression of juiciness. Values within a row with different superscript are significant  
1579 different (P < 0.05).

1580

1581

1582

1583

1584

1585

1586

1587

1588

1589

1590

1591

1592

1593

1594 **Table 4. 5:** Influence of tribe and thermal treatment on sensory characteristics

<b>Thermal treatment</b>	<b>Xhosa</b>	<b>Zulu</b>	<b>Shona</b>
--------------------------	--------------	-------------	--------------

<b>AI</b>			
Cooked	4.817 <sup>ab</sup>	4.676 <sup>a</sup>	5.917 <sup>cd</sup>
Fried	4.892 <sup>abc</sup>	5.078 <sup>bc</sup>	6.417 <sup>d</sup>
<b>IJ</b>			
Cooked	4.125 <sup>ab</sup>	3.784 <sup>a</sup>	5.333 <sup>bcd</sup>
Fried	4.558 <sup>bc</sup>	4.794 <sup>c</sup>	6.250 <sup>d</sup>
<b>FB</b>			
Cooked	5.167 <sup>bc</sup>	4.709 <sup>a</sup>	6.750 <sup>d</sup>
Fried	4.975 <sup>ab</sup>	4.966 <sup>ab</sup>	6.167 <sup>cd</sup>
<b>SJ</b>			
Cooked	4.717 <sup>b</sup>	4.245 <sup>a</sup>	5.250 <sup>abc</sup>
Fried	4.767 <sup>b</sup>	4.980 <sup>b</sup>	6.250 <sup>c</sup>
<b>MFT</b>			
Cooked	5.092 <sup>b</sup>	4.559 <sup>a</sup>	6.583 <sup>c</sup>
Fried	4.975 <sup>b</sup>	5.172 <sup>b</sup>	6.667 <sup>c</sup>
<b>ACT</b>			
Cooked	4.675 <sup>a</sup>	4.554 <sup>a</sup>	7.083 <sup>c</sup>
Fried	4.508 <sup>a</sup>	5.167 <sup>b</sup>	7.250 <sup>c</sup>
<b>OFI</b>			
Cooked	4.992 <sup>ab</sup>	4.627 <sup>a</sup>	5.667 <sup>bc</sup>
Fried	5.067 <sup>b</sup>	5.191 <sup>b</sup>	6.333 <sup>c</sup>

1595 **Abbreviations:** Values within a row with different superscript are significant different (P <  
1596 0.05). AI, Aroma intensity; IJ, Initial impression of juiciness; SJ, sustained impression of  
1597 juiciness. MFT, muscle fibre and overall tenderness; Amount of connective tissue (Residue),  
1598 ACT; OFI, overall flavour intensity. Values within a row with different superscript are  
1599 significant different (P < 0.05).

1600

1601

1602

1603 **Table 4. 6:** Effect of age and thermal treatment on sensory characteristics

Sensory characteristics	Age					
	21-25		26-30		≥30	
	C	F	C	F	C	F
<b>AI</b>	4.590 <sup>a</sup>	5.090 <sup>b</sup>	5.038 <sup>b</sup>	5.174 <sup>b</sup>	4.625 <sup>ab</sup>	4.646 <sup>ab</sup>
<b>IJ</b>	3.878 <sup>a</sup>	4.647 <sup>b</sup>	4.152 <sup>abc</sup>	5.152 <sup>d</sup>	3.708 <sup>a</sup>	4.062 <sup>ab</sup>
<b>FB</b>	4.948 <sup>ab</sup>	5.218 <sup>b</sup>	4.947 <sup>ab</sup>	4.947 <sup>ab</sup>	4.938 <sup>ab</sup>	4.521 <sup>a</sup>
<b>SJ</b>	4.327 <sup>a</sup>	4.968 <sup>bc</sup>	4.664 <sup>ab</sup>	5.098 <sup>c</sup>	4.312 <sup>a</sup>	4.479 <sup>ab</sup>
<b>MFT</b>	4.737 <sup>a</sup>	5.276 <sup>b</sup>	4.947 <sup>ab</sup>	5.227 <sup>b</sup>	4.750 <sup>ab</sup>	4.563 <sup>a</sup>
<b>AT</b>	4.737 <sup>ab</sup>	5.058 <sup>b</sup>	4.773 <sup>ab</sup>	5.000 <sup>b</sup>	4.292 <sup>a</sup>	4.854 <sup>ab</sup>
<b>OI</b>	4.846 <sup>a</sup>	5.244 <sup>bc</sup>	4.864 <sup>ab</sup>	5.333 <sup>c</sup>	4.438 <sup>a</sup>	4.604 <sup>a</sup>

1604 **Abbreviations:** AI, Aroma intensity; IJ, Initial impression of juiciness; SJ, sustained  
1605 impression of juiciness. MFT, muscle fibre and overall tenderness; Amount of connective  
1606 tissue (Residue), ACT; OFI, overall flavour intensity. Values within a row with different  
1607 superscript are significant different ( $P < 0.05$ ).

1608

1609

1610

1611

1612

1613

1614

1615

1616

1617

#### 1618 4.6 Discussion

1619 In the present study an influence of genotype on sensory characteristics was observed. The  
1620 results are similar to the observations by Muchenje *et al.* (2008a) and Tshabalala *et al.* (2003)  
1621 who reported variations among breeds in aroma intensity and tenderness. The significant  
1622 influence of thermal treatment on aroma intensity agrees with the findings by (Tornberg, 2005)  
1623 that cooking usually alters the structure of animal fat and increase meat's energy level thus  
1624 affecting sensory characteristics. It has been shown that aroma and flavour of meat vary  
1625 depending on several factors, including species, age, fatness, type of tissue, location, gender,  
1626 diet, and method of cooking (Calkins and Hodgen, 2007; Muchenje *et al.* 2009).

1627 Irrespective of genotype, the initial and sustained impression of juiciness for the fried meat was  
1628 significantly higher across the increasing protein diet levels. Webb *et al.* (2005), reported that  
1629 meat juiciness is determined by intramuscular fat content, however, it is significantly  
1630 influenced by animal species (Tshabalala *et al.* 2003; Muchenje *et al.* 2008). It appears,  
1631 therefore, that the dietary protein was able to enhance the intramuscular fat thereby increasing  
1632 the marbling of the meat. Overall flavour intensity was significantly influenced by the diet  
1633 judging from the high scores across the dietary treatments given by respondents in both cooking  
1634 methods and breed. Both breeds had higher scores with slight differences in flavour. According  
1635 to Muchenje *et al.* (2008a), amount and composition of fat in meat has an influence on flavour  
1636 such that meat with pleasant flavour is associated with higher levels of intramuscular fat and  
1637 more intense marbling. Furthermore, Dzudie *et al.* (2000) reported that flavour is influenced  
1638 by different cooking methods through the changes in the fat composition and level of saturation  
1639 of fats.

1640 Cooking method had a significant effect on meat sensory characteristics. According to Xazela  
1641 *et al.* (2011), consumers evaluate the quality of cooked meat by its flavour, aroma, and  
1642 juiciness. Different scores on sensory characteristics among the cooking methods may be

1643 attributed to consumer familiarity and experience with a particular cooking method of meat.  
1644 In the current study, higher sensory scores were observed in fried meat compared to the cooked  
1645 meat. Similarly, Dyubele *et al.* (2010) found a significant effect of thermal treatment on  
1646 chicken sensory scores, with roasted chicken scoring higher than cooked chicken. However,  
1647 this could be influenced by the cooking losses due to the different thermal treatments used.  
1648 Usually in our community's meat is prepared through cooking more than frying. Thus,  
1649 consumers may not recognize the differences in sensory characteristics of fried meat due to  
1650 their unfamiliarity with frying meat. In addition, cooking oil used in the preparation of fried  
1651 meat might have increased the flavour hence the higher scores representing higher preference  
1652 for fried meat.

1653 Consumer age, gender and thermal preparation had a significant influence on meat sensory  
1654 scores. Highest scores were observed in male respondents compared to female participants for  
1655 meat juiciness. However, the results are inconsistent with the findings by Simela (2005),  
1656 Dyubele *et al.* (2010), and Xazela *et al.* (2011) who observed that females had higher scores  
1657 in meat juiciness than males. The inconsistency between the results could be the different  
1658 animal species used and that females are likely not to be familiar with rabbit meat. In most  
1659 communal areas, males usually consume rabbit meat through hunting especially young boys.

1660 Tribe and thermal treatment had a significant effect on meat sensory characteristics. In African  
1661 countries, socio-cultural factors usually affect how consumers perceive meat acceptability  
1662 (Xazela *et al.*, 2011). In all the observed sensory attributes, significant differences were  
1663 observed among different tribes. Shona and Zulu consumers gave higher scores in both cooked  
1664 and fried meat in all meat sensory characteristics compared to the Xhosa tribe. Lower scores  
1665 for Xhosa consumers could be attributed by unpleasant appearance of rabbit carcass and lack  
1666 of familiarity by consumers to rabbit meat due to location and cultural beliefs. Rabbit carcasses  
1667 are perceived by consumers as human infants or cats, thus labelled as unappealing.

1668 4.7 Conclusion

1669 From the scores given by consumers, it was observed that they have a high preference for fried  
1670 meat than cooked meat. Cooking method had a significant influence on meat sensory  
1671 characteristics. There was an interaction between thermal treatment, breed and diet in some of  
1672 sensory characteristics. Dietary protein significantly improved tenderness and juiciness of  
1673 rabbit meat. Gender and tribe significantly influenced meat sensory parameters where Shona  
1674 respondents gave higher scores than other breeds. In conclusion, consumers from different  
1675 tribes showed significant positive interest in consuming rabbit meat hence differences on the  
1676 two cooking methods were observed.

1677

1678

1679

1680

1681

1682

1683

1684

1685

1686

1687

1688

1689

1690

1691

1692

1693

1694

1695

## CHAPTER 5

1696

### **General discussion, knowledge gaps and recommendations**

---

1697

#### 5.1 General discussion

1698

The objective of the current study was to investigate the effect of balanced dietary protein on physicochemical quality and sensory attributes of rabbit meat from two commercial breeds.

1699

1700

The effect of balanced dietary protein on physicochemical quality was determined in Chapter 3. In chapter 4, effects of two breeds and dietary protein on sensory scores of rabbit meat prepared using different cooking methods were determined.

1701

1702

1703

In chapter 3, physicochemical quality of the two rabbit breeds were evaluated. Both breeds had lower muscle pH<sub>24</sub> meaning the rabbits did not experience pre-slaughter stress. Higher L\* values were found in NZW breed as compared to CAL in all the protein levels. Contrary, CAL had higher values for a\* than NZW rabbits. No significant differences were observed for drip loss, cooking loss, water holding capacity and Warner-Bratzler shear force values.

1704

1705

1706

1707

1708

The effects of balanced dietary protein on sensory scores of rabbit meat prepared using thermal treatment methods was evaluated in Chapter 4.

1709

1710

Genotype significantly affected sensory characteristics the variation between breeds on sensory attributes. Thermal treatment had a significant influence on aroma intensity. Consumers evaluate the quality of cooked meat by its flavour, aroma, and juiciness. Different scores on

1711

1712

1713 sensory characteristics among the cooking methods may be attributed to consumer familiarity  
1714 and experience with a particular cooking method of meat. In the current study, higher sensory  
1715 scores were observed in fried meat compared to the cooked meat. Consumer age, gender and  
1716 thermal preparation had a significant influence on meat sensory scores. Highest scores were  
1717 found in male respondents compared to female contestants for meat juiciness. Tribe and  
1718 thermal treatment had a significant effect on meat sensory characteristics. Shona and Zulu  
1719 consumers gave higher scores in both cooked and fried meat in all meat sensory characteristics  
1720 compared to the Xhosa tribe reason for this could be the familiarity due to the type of location,  
1721 preference and cultural beliefs .

## 1722 5.2 Conclusion

1723 Rabbit meat has been reported to be healthier as compared to other meat types since it contains  
1724 low levels of cholesterol. However, the diet did not have a positive nor negative influence on  
1725 meat quality attributes of rabbits. Fried meat was the most preferred by the sensory panellist as  
1726 compared to the cooked meat. It has been observed that consumers of different tribes, gender  
1727 and ages had different preferences of meat sensory attributes among the cooking methods for  
1728 New Zealand white rabbits.

## 1729 5.3 Recommendations

1730 It may be recommended that the effect of balanced dietary protein can be used to assess the  
1731 fatty acid composition of different rabbit strains. A study on balanced dietary protein is  
1732 recommended to evaluate the haematological and serum biochemical indices of rabbits using  
1733 different strains.

1734

1735

1736

1737 6. References

- 1738 **Abdel-Naeem, H.H., Sallam, K.I. and Zaki, H.M.** (2021). Effect of different cooking  
1739 methods of rabbit meat on topographical changes, physicochemical characteristics, fatty acids  
1740 profile, microbial quality and sensory attributes. *Meat Science*, 181, p.108612.
- 1741 **Agina, O.A., Ezema, W.S. and Iwuoha, E.M.** (2017). The haematology and serum  
1742 biochemistry
- 1743 **Altmann, B.A., Anders, S., Risius, A. and Mörlein, D.** (2022). Information effects on  
1744 consumer preferences for alternative animal feedstuffs. *Food Policy*, 106,102192.
- 1745 **Ambrosiadis, I.; Theodorakakos, N.; Georgakis, S.; Lekas, S.** (1994). Influence of thawing  
1746 methods on the quality of frozen meat and drip loss. *Fleishwirtschaft*, 74, 284–286.
- 1747 **AMSA.** (1995). Research guidelines for cookery, sensory evaluation and instrumental  
1748 tenderness measurements of fresh meat. Chicago, Illinois: American Meat Science,  
1749 Association in cooperation with National Live Stock and Meat Board.
- 1750 **Apori, S.O., Osei, D. and Hagan, J.K.** (2014). The growth and reproductive performance of  
1751 different breeds of rabbits kept under warm and humid environments in Ghana.
- 1752 **Arsenos, G., Fortomaris, P., Papadopoulos, E., Sotiraki, S., Stamataris, C., and**  
1753 **Zygoiannis, D.** (2009). Growth and meat quality of kids of indigenous Greek goats (*Capra*  
1754 *prisca*) as influenced by dietary protein and gastrointestinal nematode challenge. *Meat Science*,  
1755 82(3), 317-323.
- 1756 **Arsenos, G., Fortomaris, P., Papadopoulos, E., Sotiraki, S., Stamataris, C., and**  
1757 **Zygoiannis, D.** (2009). Growth and meat quality of kids of indigenous Greek goats (*Capra*  
1758 *prisca*) as influenced by dietary protein and gastrointestinal nematode challenge. *Meat Science*,  
1759 82(3), 317-323.

1760 **Ayadi, M.A., Kechaou, A., Makni, I. and Attia, H.** (2009). Influence of carrageenan addition  
1761 on turkey meat sausages properties. *Journal of food Engineering*, 93(3), pp.278-283.

1762 **Berhe, E.T.** (2008). Modelling broiler populations for purposes of optimisation (Doctoral  
1763 dissertation).

1764 **Birolo, M., Xiccato, G., Bordignon, F., Dabbou, S., Zuffellato, A. and Trocino, A.** (2022).  
1765 Growth Performance, Digestive Efficiency, and Meat Quality of Two Commercial Crossbred  
1766 Rabbits Fed Diets Differing in Energy and Protein Levels. *Animals*, 12(18), p.2427.

1767 **Cabel, M. C. and Waldroup, P. W.** (1991) Effect of dietary protein level and length of feeding  
1768 on performance feeding on performance and abdominal fat content of broiler chickens. *Poultry*  
1769 *Science* 70: 1550 – 1558.

1770 **Calder, P.C.** (1998). Dietary fatty acids and the immune system. *Nutrition Reviews*  
1771 (supplement) 56, 70–73.

1772 **Castellini, C., Dal Bosco, A., Bernardini, M. and Cyril, H.W.** (1998). Effect of dietary  
1773 vitamin E on the oxidative stability of raw and cooked rabbit meat. *Meat Science.*, 50(2):153-  
1774 161.

1775 **Cavani, C., Petracci, M., Trocino, A. and Xiccato, G.** 2009. Advances in research on poultry  
1776 and rabbit meat quality. *Italian J. Anim. Sc.*, 8(2):741-750.

1777 **Chauhan, S.S. and England, E.M.** (2018) ‘Postmortem glycolysis and glycogenolysis:  
1778 insights from species comparisons’, *Meat Science*, 144(6), pp. 118–126.

1779 **Cheeke, P. R.** (2004). Contemporary issues in animal agriculture. New Jersey, Upper Saddle  
1780 River: Pearson Education.

1781 **Costell, E., Tarrega, A. and Bayarri, S.** (2010). Food acceptance: the role of consumer  
1782 perception and attitudes. *Chemosensory perception*, 3:42-50.

1783 **Crovato, S., Pinto, A., Di Martino, G., Mascarello, G., Rizzoli, V., Marcolin, S. and**  
1784 **Ravarotto, L.** (2022). Purchasing Habits, Sustainability Perceptions, and Welfare Concerns of  
1785 Italian Consumers Regarding Rabbit Meat. *Foods*, 11(9), p.1205.

1786 **Crovato, S., Pinto, A., Di Martino, G., Mascarello, G., Rizzoli, V., Marcolin, S. and**  
1787 **Ravarotto, L.** (2022). Purchasing Habits, Sustainability Perceptions, and Welfare Concerns of  
1788 Italian Consumers Regarding Rabbit Meat. *Foods*, 11(9), p.1205.

1789 **Cullere M, and Dalle Zotte A.** (2018). Rabbit meat production and consumption: State of  
1790 knowledge and future perspectives. *Meat Science.*, 143:137-146.

1791 **Cullere, M., Tasoniero, G., Giaccone, V., Miotti-Scapin, R., Claeys, E., De Smet, S. and**  
1792 **Dalle Zotte, A.** (2016). Black soldier fly as dietary protein source for broiler quails: apparent  
1793 digestibility, excreta microbial load, feed choice, performance, carcass and meat traits. *Animal*,  
1794 10(12), pp.1923-1930.

1795 **Da Costa, N., McGillivray, C., Bai, Q., Wood, J.D., Evans, G., Chang, K.C.** ( 2004).  
1796 Restriction of dietary energy and protein induces molecular changes in young porcine skeletal  
1797 muscles. *Journal of Nutrition*. 134 (9), 2191–2199. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/134.9.2191>.

1798 **DAFF** (2017). A Profile of the South African Broiler Market Value Chain, Department of  
1799 Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Pretoria, South Africa.

1800 **Dalle Zotte, A. and Szendrő, Z.** (2011). The role of rabbit meat as functional food. *Meat*  
1801 *Science*, 88(3), pp.319-331.

1802 **Dalle Zotte, A. and Szendrő, Z.** (2011). The role of rabbit meat as functional food. *Meat Sci.*  
1803 88, 319-331. development workshop: March 2-4, 2004, Hanoi. Agricultural publishing house,  
1804 Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam, pp. 131-133.

1805 **Dalle Zotte, A.** (2002). Perception of rabbit meat quality and major factors influencing the  
1806 rabbit carcass and meat quality. *Livestock Production Science*, 75(1), 11–32. doi  
1807 10.1016/S0301-6226(01)00308-6.

1808 **Das, A.K., Nanda, P.K., Madane, P., Biswas, S., Das, A., Zhang, W. and Lorenzo, J.M.**  
1809 (2020). A comprehensive review on antioxidant dietary fibre enriched meat-based functional  
1810 foods. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 99, pp.323-336.

1811 **Delday, M.I., Gispert, M., Font, I., Furnols, M., Maltin, C.M., Plastow, G.S., Klont, R.,**  
1812 **Sosnicki, A.A. and Carrión, D.** (2008). Relationships between biochemical characteristics  
1813 and meat quality of Longissimus thoracis and Semi membranous muscles in five porcine lines.  
1814 *Meat. Sci.* 80, 927 - 933.

1815 **Dorđević, T.M. and Đurović-Pejčev, R.D.** (2015). Dissipation of chlorpyrifos-methyl by  
1816 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* during wheat fermentation. *LWT-Food Science and Technology*,  
1817 61(2), pp.516-523.

1818 **Dyubele, N. L., Muchenje, V., Nkukwana, T. T., and Chimonyo, M.** (2010). Consumer  
1819 sensory characteristics of broiler and indigenous chicken meat: A South African example. *Food*  
1820 *Quality and Preference*, 21, 815–819.

1821 **Dzudie, T., Ndjouenkeu, R. and Okubanjo, A.** (2000). Effect of cooking methods and rigor  
1822 state on cooking methods and rigor state on the composition, tenderness and eating quality of  
1823 cured goat loins. *Journal of Food Engineering*, 44(3), 149- 153.

1824 **Effiong, O. and Wogar, G.** (2007). Litter performance traits of rabbits under mixed feeding  
1825 regime. Paper presented at the Proceeding 32th Annual Conference of the Nigerian Society of  
1826 Animal Production. Calabar, Maret.

1827 **El Sayed, S. and Ali, S.M. (2022).** Amino acid profile of rabbit meat: dietary intake and the  
1828 effect of freezing on the amino acid composition. *Thai J Vet Med*, 52(2), pp.251-258.

1829 **Ferguson, N.S., R.S. Gates, J.I. Taraba, A.H. Cantor, A.J. Pescatore, M.J. Ford and D.J.**  
1830 **Burnham (1998).** The effect of dietary crude protein on growth, ammonia concentration and  
1831 litter composition in broiler. *Poult. Sci.*, 71: 1481-1487.

1832 **Fletcher, D. L.1. (1995).** Relationship of breast meat colour variation to muscle pH and  
1833 texture. *J. Poult. Sci.* 74(1), 120.

1834 **Fletcher, D.L. (1999).** Colour Variation in commercially packaged broiler breast fillets. *J.*  
1835 *Appl. Poult. Res.*8, 67-68.

1836 **Hassan, F.A., Shalaby, A.G., Elkassas, N.E.M., El-Medany, S.A., Hamdi Rabie, A.,**  
1837 **Mahrose, K., Abd El-Aziz, A. and Bassiony, S. (2022).** Efficacy of ascorbic acid and  
1838 different sources of orange peel on growth performance, gene expression, anti-oxidant status  
1839 and microbial activity of growing rabbits under hot conditions. *Animal Biotechnology*, pp.1-  
1840 12.

1841 **Hedji, C. C., Houndonougbo, F. M., Tougan, U. P., Houinato, M. R., and Fiogbe, D. E.,**  
1842 (2015). Technological, Sensorial and Nutritional Meat Quality Traits from Pig Fed with  
1843 Conventional and Unconventional Diets. *Food and Nutrition Sciences* 6: 1514-1521.

1844 **Herbert, U. (2011).** Unending seeds and waters of animal life. 12th Inaugural lecture series of  
1845 Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike, Nigeria, Nov. 9, pp. 1–41 *International*  
1846 *Journal of Agricultural Biology*, 7: 975 - 978.

1847 **Hoffman, L.C., Nkhabutlane, P., Schutte, D.W. and Vosloo, C. (2004).** Factors affecting  
1848 the purchasing of rabbit meat: A study of ethnic groups in the Western Cape. *J. Consum. Sci.*,  
1849 32(1).

1850 **Hong, G.-P.; Park, S.-H.; Kim, J.-Y.; Lee, C.-H.; Lee, S.; Min, S.-G.** (2005). The effect of  
1851 thawing rate on the physiochemical properties of frozen ostrich meat. *Food Sci. Biotechnol.*,  
1852 14, 676–680

1853 **Jabbar, A., Tahir, M., Alhidary, I.A., Abdelrahman, M.A., Albadani, H., Khan, R.U.,**  
1854 **Selvaggi, M., Laudadio, V. and Tufarelli, V.** 2021. Impact of microbial protease enzyme and  
1855 dietary crude protein levels on growth and nutrients digestibility in broilers over 15–28 days.  
1856 *Animals*, 11(9), p.2499.

1857 **Karlsson, A., Enfalt, A.-C., Essen-Gustavsson, B., Lundstrom, K., Rydhmer, L. and**  
1858 **Stern, S.** (1993). Muscle histochemical and biochemical properties in relation to meat quality  
1859 during selection for increased lean tissue growth rate in pigs. *Journal of Animal Science*, 71:  
1860 930–938.

1861 **Kasima, J.** (2019). *Comparative assessment of feed formulation among livestock farmers in*  
1862 *Kakiri sub-county Wakiso district* (Doctoral dissertation, Makerere University).

1863 **Khan, K., Khan, S., Khan, R., Sultan, A., Khan, N.A. and Ahmad, N.** (2016). Growth  
1864 performance and meat quality of rabbits under different feeding regimes. *Tropical Animal*  
1865 *Health and Production*, 48(8), pp.1661-1666.

1866 **Kim, Y.H.B., Warner, R.D. and Rosenvold, K.** (2014) ‘Influence of high pre-rigor  
1867 temperature and fast pH fall on muscle proteins and meat quality: A review’, *Animal*  
1868 *Production Science*, 54(4), pp. 375–395.

1869 **Kumar, Y., Soni, A. and Sahoo, A.** (2022). Dietary intervention and feeding regime for  
1870 enhanced production in sheep and rabbit. *Processing and Quality Evaluation of Postharvest*  
1871 *products of Sheep and Rabbits [E-book] Hyderabad: CSWRI, p.24.*

1872 **Kvartnikov, M.P. and Kvartnikova, E.G.** (2021). Influence of nutritional value of complete  
1873 feed on the chemical composition of rabbit meat. In IOP Conference Series: *Earth and*  
1874 *Environmental Science* (Vol. 848, No. 1, p. 012037). IOP Publishing.

1875 **Lawrie, R. A., and Ledward, D. A.** (2006). *Lawrie's meat science*, Woodhead Publishing  
1876 Ltd, Cambridge, England.

1877 **Lee, J.A., Jung, S.H., Seol, K.H., Kim, H.W., Cho, S. and Kang, S.M.** (2022.) Evaluation  
1878 of the Nutritional Composition and Quality Traits of Rabbit Meat. *Journal of the Korean*  
1879 *Society of Food Culture*, 37(2), pp.171-177.

1880 **Lee, M. R. F., Winters, A. L., Scollan, N. D., Dewhurst, R. J., Theodorou, M. K. and(**  
1881 **Minchin, F. R.** (2004). Plant-mediated lipolysis and proteolysis in red clover with different  
1882 polyphenol oxidase activities. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, 84(13), 1639–  
1883 1645.

1884 **Li N, Xie CY, Zeng XF, Wang DH, Qiao SY.** (2018) . Effects of dietary crude protein level  
1885 and amino acid balance on growth performance, carcass traits and meat quality of finishing  
1886 pigs. *J Anim Nutr.* 30:498–506.

1887 **Liu, J., Ellies-Oury, M.P., Stoyanchev, T. and Hocquette, J.F.** (2022). Consumer Perception  
1888 of Beef Quality and How to Control, Improve and Predict It? Focus on Eating Quality. *Foods*,  
1889 11(12), p.1732.

1890 **Maharjan, P., Martinez, D.A., Weil, J., Suesuttajit, N., Umberson, C., Mullenix, G.,**  
1891 **Hilton, K.M., Beitia, A. and Coon, C.N.** (2021). Physiological growth trend of current meat  
1892 broilers and dietary protein and energy management approaches for sustainable broiler  
1893 production. *Animal*, p.100284.

1894 **Mahmoudi, S., Mahmoudi, N., Benamirouche, K., Estévez, M., Abou Mustapha, M.,**  
1895 **Bougoutaia, K. and Djoudi, N.E.H.B. (2022).** Effect of feeding carob (*Ceratonia siliqua* L.)  
1896 pulp powder to broiler chicken on growth performance, intestinal microbiota, carcass traits,  
1897 and meat quality. *Poultry Science*, 101(12), p.102186.

1898 **Mancini R. A. and Hunt M. C. (2005).** Current research in meat colour. *Meat Sci.*, 71, 100-  
1899 121. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2005.03.003>

1900 **Meinert, L., Andersen, L.T., Bredie, W. L.P., Bjerregaard, C. and Aaslyng, M. D. (2007).**  
1901 Chemical and sensory characterisation of pan-fried pork flavour: Interactions between raw  
1902 meat quality, ageing and frying temperature. *Meat Science*, 75 (2), 229-242.

1903 **Moholisa, E., Strydom, P. and Hugo, A. 2018.** The effect of beef production system on  
1904 proximate composition and fatty acid profile of three beef muscles. *South African Journal of*  
1905 *Animal Science* 48: 295-306.

1906 **Monin, G. 2004.** Conversion of Muscle to Meat| Colour and Texture Deviations.

1907 **Monson, F., Sanudo, C. and Sierra, I. (2005).** Influence of breed and ageing time on the  
1908 sensory meat quality and consumer acceptability in intensively reared beef. *Meat Science*, 71,  
1909 471-479.

1910 **Muchenje V, Chimonyo M, Dzama K, Strydom P.E, Ndlovu T., and Raats J.G. (2010).**  
1911 Relationship between off-flavour descriptors and flavour scores in beef from cattle raised on  
1912 natural pasture. *J.Muscle Foods* 21:424-432.

1913 **Muchenje V., Dzama K., Chimonyo M., Raats J.G, Hugo A., and Strydom P.E (2008a).**  
1914 Sensory evaluation and its relationship to physical meat quality attributes of beef from Nguni  
1915 and Bonsmara steers raised on natural pasture. *Animal* 2:1700-1706.

- 1916 **Muchenje, V., Dzama, K., Chimonyo, M., Strydom, P.E. and Raats, J.G.** (2009b).  
1917 Relationship between stress responsiveness and meat quality in three cattle breeds. *Meat*  
1918 *Science*, 81, 653-657.
- 1919 **Muchenje, V., Hugo, A., Dzama, K., Chimonyo, M., Strydom, P. E., and Raats J. G.**  
1920 (2009). Cholesterol levels and fatty acid profiles of beef from three cattle breeds raised on  
1921 natural pasture. *Journal of Food Composition and Analysis*, 22,354–358.
- 1922 **Munyaneza, J.P., Ediriweera, T.K., Kim, M., Cho, E., Jang, A., Choo, H.J. and Lee, J.H.**  
1923 (2022). Genome-wide association studies of meat quality traits in chickens: a review. *Korean*  
1924 *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 49, pp.407-420.
- 1925 **Nayohan, S., Susanto, I., Permata, D., Pangesti, R.T., Rahmadani, M. and Jayanegara, A.**  
1926 (2022). Effect of dietary inclusion of black soldier fly larvae (*Hermetia illucens*) on broiler  
1927 performance: A meta-analysis. In E3S Web of Conferences (Vol. 335, p. 00013). EDP  
1928 Sciences.
- 1929 **Nistor, E., Bampidis, V. A., Păcală, N., Pentea, M., Tozer, J., and Prundeanu, H.** (2013).  
1930 Nutrient content of rabbit meat as compared to chicken, beef and pork meat. *Journal of Animal*  
1931 *Production*, 3, 172–176.
- 1932 **Nogalski, Z., Pogorzelska-Przybyłek, P., Sobczuk-Szul, M., Nogalska, A., Modzelewska-**  
1933 **Kapituła, M., and Purwin, C.** (2018). Carcass characteristics and meat quality of bulls and  
1934 steers slaughtered at two different ages. *Italian Journal of Animal Science* 17: 279-288.
- 1935 **Olanya O.M., Hoshide A.K., Ijabadeniyi O.A., Ukuku D.O.,Mukhopadhyay S., Niemira**  
1936 **B.A., & Ayeni O.** 2019. Cost estimation of listeriosis (*Listeria monocytogenes*) occurrence in  
1937 South Africa in 2017 and its food safety implications. *Food Control*, 102:231-239.

- 1938 **Ortiz Hernández, J.A. and Rubio Lozano, M.S.** 2001. Effect of breed and sex on rabbit  
1939 carcass yield and meat quality. *World Rabbit Sci.* 9(2), 51-56.
- 1940 **Ozimba C. E., Lukefahr S. D.** (1991): Comparison of rabbit breed types for post weaning  
1941 litter growth, feed efficiency and survival performance traits. *Journal of Animal Science* 69:  
1942 3494 – 500.
- 1943 **Pannier, L., Gardner, G., Pearce, K., McDonagh, M., Ball, A., Jacob, R., and Pethick, D.**  
1944 (2014). Associations of sire estimated breeding values and objective meat quality  
1945 measurements with sensory scores in Australian lamb. *Meat Science* 96: 1076-1087.
- 1946 **Peña, F., Bonvillani, A., Freire, B., Juárez, M., Perea, J. and Gómez, G.** (2009). Effects of  
1947 genotype and slaughter weight on the meat quality of Criollo Cordobes and Anglonubian kids  
1948 produced under extensive feeding conditions. *Meat Science*, 83, 417- 422.
- 1949 **Pla, M.** (2008). A comparison of the carcass traits and meat quality of conventionally and  
1950 organically produced rabbits. *Livestock Science*, 115(1), pp.1-12.
- 1951 **Polkinghorne, R., and Thompson, J.** 2010. Meat standards and grading: a world view. *Meat*  
1952 *Science* 86: 227-235.
- 1953 **Ponnampalam, E.N., Hopkins, D.L., Bruce, H., Li, D., Baldi, G. and Bekhit, A.E. din**  
1954 (2017) ‘Causes and Contributing Factors to “Dark Cutting” Meat: Current Trends and Future  
1955 Directions: A Review’, *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*, 16(3), pp.  
1956 400–430.
- 1957 **Radu, C.V. and Popescu-Miclosanu, E.** (2012) ‘Influence of Pre-Slaughtering Factors on  
1958 Carcass and Poultry Meat Quality Produced in an Integrated Sistem’, *Scientific Papers, Animal*  
1959 *Science Series*, 58, pp. 351–356.

- 1960 **Rajic, S., Simunovic, S., Djordjevic, V., Raseta, M., Tomasevic, I. and Djekic, I.** 2022.  
1961 Quality multiverse of beef and pork meat in a single score. *Foods*, 11(8), p.1154.
- 1962 **Rasinska, E., Rutkowska, J., Czarniecka-Skubina, E. and Tambor, K.** (2019). Effects of  
1963 cooking methods on changes in fatty acids contents, lipid oxidation and volatile compounds of  
1964 rabbit meat. *Lwt*, 110, pp.64-70.
- 1965 **Rezaei, M., Nassiri, H., Moghaddam, Pour Reza, J. and Kermanshahi, H.** (2004) The  
1966 effect of dietary protein and lysine levels on broiler performance, carcass characteristics and  
1967 N. excretion. *International Journal of Poultry Science* 3 (2): 148-152.
- 1968 **Riediger N.D., Othman R.A., Suh M., Moghadasian M.H.** (2009). A systemic review of the  
1969 roles of n-3 fatty acids in health and disease. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*,  
1970 109: 668–679.
- 1971 **Romanov, D., Korostynska, O., Lekang, O.I. and Mason, A.** 2022. Towards human-robot  
1972 collaboration in meat processing: Challenges and possibilities. *Journal of Food Engineering*,  
1973 111117.
- 1974 **Rust, J. and Rust, T.** (2013) ‘Climate change and livestock production: A review with  
1975 emphasis on Africa’, *South African Journal of Animal Science*, 43(3), pp. 255–266.
- 1976 **Rybarczyk A., Łupkowska A.** (2016). Meat quality of mongrel rabbits and the crosses of the  
1977 California and New Zealand White breeds (in Polish), *Nauka Przyroda Technologie*, 10, 1-  
1978 10.doi:10.17306/J.NPT.2016.1.2.
- 1979 **Scollan, N. D., Dhanoa, M. S., Choi, N. J., Maeng, W. J., Enser, M., and Wood, J. D.**  
1980 (2010). Bio hydrogenation and digestion of long chain fatty acids in steers’ fen on different  
1981 sources of lipid. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 136: 345–355.

- 1982 **Simela, L.** (2005). Meat characteristics and acceptability of chevon from South African  
1983 indigenous goats. Ph.D. Thesis. University of Pretoria. South Africa.
- 1984 **Simonová, M.P., ChraStiNoVá, E., MoJto, J., Laukova, A., Szabova, R. and Rafay, J.**  
1985 (2010). Quality of rabbit meat and phyto-additives. *Czech Journal of Food Sciences*, 28(3),  
1986 161-167.
- 1987 **Singh, A.S., Alagbe, J.O., Sharma, S., Oluwafemi, R.A. and Agubosi, O.C.P.** (2021). Effect  
1988 of dietary supplementation of melon (*Citrallus lanatus*) seed oil on the growth performance and  
1989 antioxidant status of growing rabbits. *Indonesian Journal of Innovation and Applied Sciences*  
1990 (*IJIAS*), 1(2), pp.134-143.
- 1991 **Singh, P.N.; Sabaté, J. and Fraser, G.E.** (2003). Does low meat consumption increase life  
1992 expectancy in humans? *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.*, 78, 526S–532S. [PubMed].
- 1993 **Stone, H and J.L Sidel** (1993). “Sensory Evaluation Practices”. 2nd edition Academic Press,  
1994 Inc. New York, NY.
- 1995 **Szendró, Z. and Dalle Zotte, A.** (2011). Effect of housing conditions on production and  
1996 behaviour of growing meat rabbits: A review. *Livest. Sci.*137,296-303. (PDF) Growth, carcass  
1997 and meat quality traits of two South African meat rabbit breeds.
- 1998 **Taljaard, P. R., Jooste, A. and Afsaha, T. A.** (2006). Towards a broader understanding of  
1999 South African consumer spending on meat. *Agrekon*, 45: 214–224.
- 2000 **Tavani, A., Pelucchi, C., Negril, E., Bertuzzi, M., La Vecchia, C.** (2001). N-3  
2001 polyunsaturated fatty acids, fish, and non-fatal myocardial infarction. *Circulation* 104, 2269–  
2002 2272.
- 2003 **Tornberg, E.** (2005). Effects of heat on meat proteins- Implications on structure and quality  
2004 of meat products. *Meat Science*, 70, 493-508.

2005 **Tougan, P.U., Dahouda, M., Salifou, C.F.A., Ahounou Ahounou, S.G., Kpodekon, M.T.,**  
2006 **Mensah, G.A., Thewis, A. and Abdou Karim, I.Y.** (2013) ‘Conversion of chicken muscle to  
2007 meat and factors affecting chicken meat quality: a review’, *International Journal of Agronomy*  
2008 *and Agricultural Research*, 3(8), pp. 1–20.

2009 **Tshabalala, P. A., Strydom, P. E., Webb, E. C. and de Kock, H. L.** (2003). Meat quality of  
2010 designated South African indigenous goat and sheep breeds. *Meat Science*, 65 (1), 563-570.

2011 **Warren, H.E., Scollan, N.D., Nute, G.R., Hughes, S.I., Wood, J.D. and Richardson, R.I.**  
2012 (2008). Effects of breed and a concentrate or grass silage diet on beef quality in cattle of 3 ages.  
2013 II: Meat stability and flavour. *Meat Science*, 78, 270–278.

2014 **Wattanachant, S., Benjakul, S. and Ledward, D.A.** 2005. Microstructure and thermal  
2015 characteristics of Thai indigenous and broiler chicken muscles. *Poult. Sci.* 84, 328 - 336.

2016 **Williams C.M.** 2000. Dietary fatty acids and human health. *Annales de Zootechnie*, 49: 165–  
2017 180.

2018 **Worch, T., Lê, S., Punter, P.** (2010). How reliable are the consumers? Comparison of sensory  
2019 profiles from consumers and experts. *Food Quality and Preference*, 21, 309-318.

2020 **Wulf, D. M. and Page, J. K.** (2000). Using measurements of muscle colour, pH, and electrical  
2021 impedance to augment the current USDA beef quality grading standards and improve the  
2022 accuracy and precision of sorting carcasses into palatability groups. *Journal of Animal Science*,  
2023 78: 2595-2607.

2024 **Yan, T., Hou, C., Wang, Z., Li, X., Chen, L., Liang, C., Xu, Y. and Zhang, D.** (2022).  
2025 Effects of chilling rate on progression of rigor mortis in postmortem lamb meat. *Food*  
2026 *Chemistry*, 373, p.131463.

2027 **Yang, J.P, J.H Yao and Y.R Liu** (2007). Effect of feed restriction on growth performance  
 2028 and carcass characteristics of broiler chickens. *Acta Agric. Boreali- Occidentalis Sinica*, 16:51-  
 2029 56.

2030 **Yu, L. H., Lee, E. S., Jeong, J. Y., Paik, H. D., Choi, J. H. and Kim, C. J.** (2005). Effects  
 2031 of thawing temperature on the physicochemical properties of pre-rigor frozen chicken breast  
 2032 and leg muscles. *Meat Science*, 71, 375- 382.

2033 **Zoltan, J., Karoly, B.O.D.N.A.R., Marta, P.A.R.A.S.Z.T., Istvan, P.Z. and Laszlo,**  
 2034 **M.A.K.R.A** (2017). Global rabbit meat production with a special focus on the role of China.  
 2035 *Lucrări Științifice*, 19(3), pp.31-36.

2036

2037

2038 **Appendix 1: Meat sensory evaluation sheet of rabbit**

2039

2040 Meat sensory evaluation form

2041

2042 Sensory analysis of rabbit meat

2043

2044 **Age: 21-25-----, 26-30-----, ≥ 30-----.**

2045

2046 **Tribe: Xhosa-----, Zulu-----, Shona-----, Other-----.**

2047

2048 **Gender: Male-----, Female-----.**

2049

2050 **Name:..... Date:.....**

2051

2052 **Please evaluate the following samples of rabbit meat for the designated characteristics.**

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Rating scale</b>	<b>Sample ID</b>	<b>Fried</b>	<b>Cooked</b>
<b>1.Aroma intensity</b> Take a few short sniffs Typical rabbit meat aroma	1=Extremely bland 2= Very bland 3= Fairly bland 4= Slightly bland	P3		
		P47		
		P44		
		P42		
		P12		
		P40		
		P16		

	5=Slightly intense 6= Fairly intense 7= Very intense 8=Extremely intense	P13 P18 P31 P25 P27		
<b>2.Initial impression of juiciness</b> The amount of fluid exuded on the cut surface when pressed between the thumb and forefinger	1= Extremely dry	P3 P47		
	2= Very dry	P44		
	3= Fairly dry	P42		
	4= Slightly dry	P12		
	5=Slightly juicy	P40		
	6= Fairly juicy	P16		
	7= Very juicy	P13		
	8=Extremely juicy	P18		
		P31		
		P25		
	P27			
<b>3.First bite</b> The impression that you form on the first bite	1=Extremely tough	P3 P47		
	2= Very tough	P44		
	3= Fairly tough	P42		
	4= Slightly tough	P12		
	5=Slightly tender	P40		
	6= Fairly tender	P16		
	7= Very tender	P13		
	8=Extremely tender	P18		
		P31		
		P25		
	P27			
<b>4.Sustained impression of juiciness</b> The impression of juiciness that you form as you start chewing	1= Extremely dry	P3 P47		
	2= Very dry	P44		
	3= Fairly dry	P42		
	4= Slightly dry	P12		
	5=Slightly juicy	P40		
	6= Fairly juicy	P16		
	7= Very juicy	P13		
	8=Extremely juicy	P18		
		P31		
		P25		
	P27			
	P3			

<b>5. Muscle fibre &amp; overall tenderness</b> Chew sample with a light chewing action	1=Extremely tough	P47		
		P44		
	2= Very tough	P42		
	3= Fairly tough	P12		
	4= Slightly tough	P40		
		P16		
	5=Slightly tender	P13		
		P18		
	6= Fairly tender	P31		
		P25		
7= Very tender	P27			
8=Extremely tender				
<b>6.Amount of connective tissue (Residue)</b> The chewiness of the meat	1=Extremely abundant	P3		
		P47		
	2= Very abundant	P44		
	3=Excessive amount	P42		
	4= Moderate	P12		
	5= Slight	P40		
	6= Traces	P16		
	7= Practically none	P13		
		P18		
	8= None	P31		
	P25			
	P27			
<b>7.Overall flavour intensity</b> This is the combination of taste while chewing and swallowing-referring to the typical beef flavour	1=Extremely bland	P3		
		P47		
	2= Very bland	P44		
	3= Fairly bland	P42		
	4= Slightly bland	P12		
	5=Slightly intense	P40		
	6= Fairly intense	P16		
	7= Very intense	P13		
		P18		
	8=Extremely intense	P31		
	P25			
	P27			

2053

2054