THE USDA NUTRIENT DATABASE FOR BEEF RETAIL CUTS TRIMMED TO 1/8" EXTERNAL FAT

Juhi R. Williams¹, Juliette C. Howe¹, Joanne M. Holden¹, Larry W. Douglass², Philip A. Lofgren³ ¹US Department of Agriculture, Beltsville, MD, ²University of Maryland, College Park, MD, ³National Cattlemen's Beef Association, Chicago, IL

Abstract

A study was conducted to validate the use of regression algorithms for estimating the nutrient content of beef retail cuts trimmed to 1/8-inch external fat. Ten USDA Choice and ter USDA Select beef carcasses were selected from two commercial packing plants (Texas and Nebraska). The carcasses were selected for physical characteristics, yield grade and marbling, which reflect the approximate distribution found in the US beef supply. Subprimals from each carcass were fabricated into retail cuts, trimmed to 1/8-inch external fat, and cooked prior to analysis. Each cut was analyzed for fat, protein, moisture, ash, amino acids, vitamins and minerals. Results from the current study were compared to predicted values for fat calculated from a 1993 market basket study using regression techniques. When compared to the previous study, results indicated that the regression algorithms were statistically consistent for five out of seven retail cuts: arm roast, bottom round, top round, top loin and top sirloin steaks. However, the results from two retail cuts (bottom round roast and eye of round roast) were inconsistent with the values derived by previous regression equations. New vitamin and mineral data on a variety of beef retail cuts trimmed to 1/8 inch external fat will also be presented. This study has validated the use of regression algorithms for predicting nutrient content for most beef retail cuts following changes in market trends as related to thickness of external fat trim. This current study also provides updated analytical nutrient data on beef retail cuts at 1/8 inch external fat trim, the prevalent trim dimension used in the market today. Improved breeding practices and meat product preparations have resulted in leaner retail cuts. The release of new beef composition data will allow consumers to make healthful choices in their diets. This analytical data would also provide researchers, consumers, nutrition professionals and government agencies the necessary information for establishing nutrition policy and in making diet and health recommendations.

Introduction

Consumer demand in the last twenty years has reflected a growing concern for food products providing lower fat levels. The beef industry has strived to lower beef fat levels through improved breeding practices and meat product preparation. In 1988, a Market Basket Survey was conducted nationwide to determine the amount of subcutaneous fat trim present in beef retail cuts. Seven retail cuts were sampled nationally: chuck arm roast, bottom round steak, bottom round roast, eye of round roast, top round steak, top loin steak, top sirloin steak. The subcutaneous fat thickness was measured and weighed for each retail cut. It was found that the subcutaneous fat thickness was ingificantly less in the retail cuts than the 1/2" fat trim reported by the USDA National Nutrient Database for Standard Reference (SR). As a result of this study, new analytical 1/4" data was entered into SR.

Over time, external fat trim of retail cuts continued to decrease. In 1993, weight and thickness values from the Market Basket Study were used to develop regression algorithms for predicting the reduction in subcutaneous fat for beef retail cuts trimmed to 1/8" external fat (See Figure 1). These reductions in subcutaneous fat were used to estimate the nutrient content of the 1/8" beef retail cuts. In 1999, the present analytical study was undertaken to verify and evaluate the accuracy of the algorithms and nutrient estimates predicted in the 1993 study.

Objectives

•To validate the use of regression techniques for estimating the nutrient content of beef retail cuts varying in subcutaneous fat trim.

•To provide accurate and updated analytical nutrient data for beef retail cuts with 1/8" external fat trim.

Methods and Materials	Retail cut/ Study			
	Chuck Arm Pot Roast			
beef carcasses (10 Choice, 10 Select) reflecting the distribution of the	1993 1999			
US beef supply were obtained from two packing plants (Texas and ka).	Bottom Round Steak 1993 1999			
nale from each carcase were fabricated into retail cute and trimmed to 1/8"	Top Round Steak 1993			

or 1/4" external fat.

Twenty

current

Nebras

Subprir

 The subcutaneous fat for the 1/8" and 1/4" trim cuts were removed and weight As in 1993, the fat weight and trim thickness were used to compute regression equations for estimating subcutaneous fat reduction (See figure 2).

Estimates for subcutaneous fat reduction, percent separable lean, and percent separable fat were compared between both studies.

Furthermore, each cut was analyzed for fat, protein, moisture, ash, vitamins minerals for cuts trimmed to 1/8" external fat.



Fat Thickness (in)

Figure 1: Development of regression algorithms for estimating reduction in subcutaneous fat using data from the 1993 Market Basket Study. Data Points and Regression Line in this example are from Bottom Round Steak.



Figure 2: Development of regression algorithms for estimating reduction in subcutaneous fat using data from the 1999 Analytical Study. Data Points and Regression Line in this example are from Bottom Round Steak.

samples 1/4" trim 1.8" trim Chuck Arm Pot Roast (g) (g) (g) 1993 28 2.61 2.57 0 1999 20 8.21 2.61 2.57 0 Bottom Round Steak 19 7.06 3.47 3 1999 20 8.21 4.62 3 Top Round Steak 1993 20 5.82 3.69 2 Top Loin Steak 1993 48 7.99 4.86 3 1999 20 9.13 5.60 3 Top Loin Steak 199 20 6.00 4.10 1 1993 39 6.00 4.10 1 1 1993 20 6.00 4.35 1 1993 8 9.48 9.10 0	reduction (g) 04 ± 0.90 0 49 ± 0.96 59 ± 0.78 (0.04 0.970
(c) (c) Chuck Arm Pot Roast 1993 28 2.61 2.57 0 1993 28 2.61 2.57 0 1999 20 4.68 4.69 1993 Bottom Round Steak 19 7.06 3.47 3 19 7.06 3.47 3 1999 20 6.21 4.62 3 3 19 7.06 3.47 3 1999 20 6.21 4.62 3 3 14 4.62 3 1993 29 4.45 2.81 1 1 1999 20 5.82 3.69 2 193 48 7.99 4.86 3 3 19 10 3 3 10 3 10 10 3 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	(g) 04 ± 0.90 0 (49 ± 0.96 59 ± 0.78 (0.04 0.970
Chuck Arm Pot Roast 1993 28 2.61 2.57 0 1999 20 4.68 4.69 0 Bottom Round Steak 19 7.06 3.47 3 1993 19 7.06 3.47 3 1999 20 8.21 4.62 3 Top Round Steak 19 20 5.82 3.69 2 Top Loin Steak 1993 20 5.82 3.69 2 Top Loin Steak 1993 4.8 7.99 4.86 3 1999 20 6.00 4.10 1 1999 20 6.00 4.35 1 Bottom Round Roast 1993 8 9.48 9.10 0	$\begin{array}{c} 04 \pm 0.90 \\ 0 \end{array} \tag{6}$	0.04 0.970
1993 28 2.61 2.57 0 1999 20 4.68 4.69 Bottom Round Steak 19 7.06 3.47 3 1999 20 8.21 4.62 3 Top Round Steak 19 7.06 3.47 3 1999 20 8.21 4.62 3 Top Round Steak 1993 29 4.45 2.81 1 1999 20 5.82 3.69 2 2 Top Loin Steak 1999 20 9.13 5.60 3 1999 20 6.00 4.10 1 1 1999 20 6.00 4.35 1 1999 20 6.00 4.35 1	$\begin{array}{c} 04 \pm 0.90 \\ 0 \end{array} \qquad (0 \\ 49 \pm 0.96 \\ 59 \pm 0.78 \end{array} \qquad (0 \\ \end{array}$	0.04 0.970
1999 20 4.68 4.69 Bottom Round Steak 19 7.06 3.47 3 1993 20 8.21 4.62 3 Top Round Steak 19 20 8.21 4.62 3 Top Round Steak 1993 29 4.45 2.81 1 1999 20 5.60 3 6 2 Top Loin Steak 1 1999 20 9.13 5.60 3 Top Sirloin Steak 1 1999 20 6.00 4.10 1 1999 20 6.00 4.35 1 1 1999 20 6.00 4.35 1 Bottom Round Roast 1 910 0 1	0 (49 ± 0.96 59 ± 0.78 (0.04 0.970
Bottom Round Steak 19 7.06 3.47 3 1993 19 7.06 3.47 3 Top Round Steak 20 8.21 4.62 3 1993 29 4.45 2.81 1 1999 20 5.82 3.69 2 Top Loin Steak 1993 48 7.99 4.86 3 1999 20 9.13 5.60 3 Top Sirloin Steak 1999 20 6.00 4.10 1 1999 20 6.00 4.35 1 Bottom Round Roast 1 9.48 9.10 0	49 ± 0.96 59 ± 0.78	0.00
1993 19 7.06 3.47 3 1999 20 8.21 4.62 3 Top Round Steak 1 1993 29 4.45 2.81 1 1993 20 5.82 3.69 2 3 3 2 3 3 3 3 5 6 3 3 3 5 6 3 3 1 1999 20 6.00 4.10 1<	49 ± 0.96 59 ± 0.78	0.00
1999 20 8.21 4.62 3 Top Round Steak 1993 29 4.45 2.81 1 1993 29 4.45 2.81 1 1 1999 20 5.82 3.69 2 Top Loin Steak 1 <td< td=""><td>59 ± 0.78 (</td><td>0.00 0.02/</td></td<>	59 ± 0.78 (0.00 0.02/
Top Round Steak 29 4.45 2.81 1 1993 29 2.45 2.81 1 1999 20 5.82 3.69 2 Top Loin Steak 1 1993 4.8 7.99 4.86 3 1999 20 9.13 5.60 3 Top Sirloin Steak 1 1999 20 6.00 4.10 1 1999 20 6.00 4.35 1		0.08 0.936
1993 29 4.45 2.81 1 1999 20 5.82 3.69 2 Top Loin Steak 1 1 1993 4.8 7.99 4.86 3 1999 20 9.13 5.60 3 3 1		
1999 20 5.82 3.69 2 Top Loin Steak 1993 48 7.99 4.86 3 1999 20 9.13 5.60 3 Top Sirloin Steak 1993 39 6.00 4.10 1 1999 20 6.00 4.35 1 Bottom Round Roast 1 190 0 0	$.64 \pm 0.59$	
Top Loin Steak 48 7.99 4.86 3 1993 48 7.99 4.86 3 1999 20 9.13 5.60 3 Top Sirloin Steak 1993 39 6.00 4.10 1 1993 20 6.00 4.35 1 Bottom Round Roast 1	13 ± 0.65 0	0.55 0.586
1993 48 7.99 4.86 3 1999 20 9.13 5.60 3 Top Sirloin Steak 1993 39 6.00 4.10 1 1999 20 6.00 4.35 1 Bottom Round Roast 1		
1999 20 9.13 5.60 3 Top Sirloin Steak 1993 39 6.00 4.10 1 1999 20 6.00 4.35 1 Bottom Round Roast 1 1993 8 9.48 9.10 0	14 ± 0.88	
Top Sirloin Steak 1993 39 6.00 4.10 1 1999 20 6.00 4.35 1 Bottom Round Roast 1993 8 9.48 9.10 0	53 ± 0.79 (0.27 0.790
1993 39 6.00 4.10 1 1999 20 6.00 4.35 1 Bottom Round Roast 1993 8 9.48 9.10 0		
1999 20 6.00 4.35 1. Bottom Round Roast 1993 8 9.48 9.10 0	90 ± 0.77	
Bottom Round Roast	.65 ± 0.79 0	0.21 0.838
1993 8 948 910 0		
0 110 110	$.37 \pm 2.31$	
1999 20 9.07 6.19 2	88 ± 1.04 -1	.15 0.261
Eye of Round Roast		
1993 12 8.89 3.45 5.	45 ± 1.35 1.	.09 0.283

R² =0.986 for 5 cuts D 50 R² =0.465 for 7 cuts a 40 30 20 10 0 10 20 30 40 50 Reduction in subcutaneous fat -1993 study B. 100 R² = 0.970 for 5 cuts 90 lean %) R² = 0.967 for 7 cuts : 80 <u>එ 70</u> 60 50 50 100 Separable lean - 1993 (%)



Separable fat - 1993 (%)

Figure 3. Agreement in the estimates of fat reduction (A.), separable lean (B.), and separable fat (C.) between the 1993 Market Basket Study and the 1999 Analytical Study. The five cuts denoted in blue are arm roast, bottom round steak, top round steak, top loin steak and sirloin steak. The two retail cuts with large inconsistencies are denoted in pink: bottom round roast and eye of round roast. The line of unity denotes nerfect agreement.

Table 2: Nutrient content per 100 g of food for selected beef retail cuts trimmed to 1/8" external fat ¹

Water	Protein	Fat	Copper	Sodium	Iron	Zinc	Selenium	Niaci	Thiamin	
g	g	g	mg	mg	mg	mg	mcg	nmg	mg	
62.33	19.23	17.74	0.08	62.4	1.63	4.54	20.33	4.33	0.06	
±0.47	± 0.17	±0.47	± 0.017	± 3.89	± 0.10	± 0.26	± 5.57	± 0.15	± 0.06	
66.88	20.69	11.54	0.09	56.2	1.7	3.82	24.84	6.18	0.08	
± 0.57	± 0.19	± 0.68	± 0.04	± 2.27	± 1.08	± 0.07	± 4.7	± 0.33	± 0.04	
69.04	22.05	7.93	0.09	59.98	1.85	4.07	26.50	6.58	0.08	
± 0.32	± 0.15	± 0.38								
63.42	20.60	15.49	0.06	51.64	1.47	3.5	22.81	6.07	0.06	
±0.48	± 0.13	± 0.32	± 0.04	± 0.84	± 0.08	± 0.14	± 3.7	± 0.38	± 0.09	
66.00	20.20	12 70	0.06	51.04	1.49	3 55	22.04	5.09	0.06	
00.09	20.30	12.70	0.00	51.94	1.40	3.55	22.94	5.96	0.00	
± 0.47	± 0.17	± 0.63								
¹ Values are means ⁻ SEM ; For proximates, N=20; for vitamins and minerals, N=4.										
² Vitamin and mineral data were imputed from values for the bottom round steak.										
	Water g 62.33 ±0.47 66.88 ±0.57 69.04 ±0.32 63.42 ±0.48 66.09 ±0.47 cans Si mineral	Water Protein g g g 62.33 19.23 ±0.47 ±0.17 66.88 20.69 ±0.57 ±0.19 69.04 22.05 ±0.32 ±0.15 63.42 20.60 ±0.48 ±0.13 66.09 20.30 ±0.47 ±0.17 ceans * SEM ; For J	Water Protein Fat g g g 62.33 19.23 17.74 ±0.47 ±0.17 ±0.47 66.88 20.69 11.54 ±0.57 ±0.19 ±0.68 69.04 22.05 7.93 ±0.32 ±0.15 ±0.38 63.42 20.60 15.49 ±0.48 ±0.13 ±0.22 66.09 20.30 12.70 ±0.47 ±0.17 ±0.63	Water Protein Fat Copper g g mg 62.33 19.23 17.74 0.08 ±0.47 ±0.17 ±0.47 ±0.017 66.88 20.69 11.54 0.09 ±0.57 ±0.19 ±0.68 ±0.04 69.04 22.05 7.93 0.09 ±0.32 ±0.15 ±0.38 63.42 20.60 15.49 0.06 ±0.48 ±0.13 ±0.32 ±0.04 66.09 20.30 12.70 0.06 ±0.47 ±0.17 ±0.63 =	Water Protein Fat Copper Sodium g g ng ng ng 62.33 19.23 17.74 0.08 62.4 ±0.47 ±0.17 ±0.47 ±0.017 ±3.89 66.88 20.69 11.54 0.09 56.2 ±0.57 ±0.19 ±0.68 ±0.04 ±2.27 69.04 22.05 7.93 0.09 59.98 ±0.32 ±0.15 ±0.38 63.42 20.60 15.49 0.06 51.64 ±0.48 ±0.13 ±0.32 ±0.04 ±0.84 66.09 20.30 12.70 0.06 51.94 ±0.47 ±0.17 ±0.63 ±0.44 ±0.84 66.09 20.30 12.70 0.06 51.94 ±0.47 ±0.17 ±0.63 ±0.44 ±0.84	Water Protein Fat Copper Sodium Iron g g ng ng ng ng 62.33 19.23 17.74 0.08 62.4 1.63 ± 0.47 ± 0.47 ± 0.017 ± 3.89 ± 0.10 66.88 20.69 11.54 0.09 56.2 1.7 ± 0.57 ± 0.19 ± 0.68 ± 0.04 ± 2.27 ± 1.08 69.04 22.05 7.93 0.09 59.98 1.85 ± 0.32 ± 0.13 ± 0.32 ± 0.44 ± 0.84 ± 0.84 63.42 20.60 15.49 0.06 51.64 1.47 ± 0.48 ± 0.32 ± 0.04 ± 0.84 ± 0.08 66.09 20.30 12.70 0.06 51.94 1.48 ± 0.47 ± 0.17 ± 0.63 ± 0.47	Water Protein Fat g Copper g Sodium mg Iron mg Zinc mg 62.33 19.23 17.74 0.08 62.4 1.63 4.54 ± 0.47 ± 0.17 ± 0.47 ± 0.017 ± 3.89 ± 0.10 ± 0.26 66.88 20.69 11.54 0.09 56.2 1.7 3.82 ± 0.57 ± 0.19 ± 0.68 ± 0.04 ± 2.27 ± 1.08 ± 0.07 69.04 22.05 7.93 0.09 59.98 1.85 4.07 ± 0.32 ± 0.13 ± 0.32 ± 0.44 ± 0.84 ± 0.08 ± 0.44 63.42 20.60 15.49 0.06 51.64 1.47 3.5 ± 0.48 ± 0.32 ± 0.33 ± 0.34 ± 0.84 ± 0.08 ± 0.14 66.09 20.30 12.70 0.06 51.94 1.48 3.55 ± 0.47 ± 0.17 ± 0.63 ± 0.21 (or vitamins and minerals, N=4.	$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	

³Vitamin and mineral data were imputed from top loin steak.

Results

 Estimates of subcutaneous fat obtained by regression equations between the 1993 Market Basket Study and the 1999 Analytical Study were in good agreement for five retail cuts (R²=0.986).

· Estimates of subcutaneous fat reduction for the bottom round roast and eye of round roast were in poor agreement

between the two studies. When the data for all seven cuts were included in the regression analysis the R^2 dropped to .465.

• Small sample size in the 1993 study (n=8) and poor fit of data, as indicated by the large standard error, may account for the poor agreement noted for the bottom round roast

• The 61% estimated reduction of subcutaneous fat for eye of round roast in the 1993 study exceeded the maximum expected thickness reduction of 50%.

Estimates of separable lean (%) and separable fat (%) for 1/8" cuts between the 1993 Market Basket Study and 1999
Analytical Study were in good agreement for all cuts (R² = 0.967, R² = 0.945, respectively).

Conclusions

 This study has validated the use of regression algorithms for predicting nutrient content for most retail cuts following changes in market trends as related to external fat trim.

New analytical nutrient data for beef retail cuts at 1/8" external fat trim, the prevalent trim dimension
used in the market today, will be released in SR – 16 (June 2003).

References

Savell, J.W., Harris, J.J., Cross, H.R., Hale, D.S., and Beasley, L.C. 1991. National Beef Market Basket Survey. J. Anim. Sci. 69:2883-2893.

Wahrmund-Wyle, J.L., Harris, K.B., and Savell, J.W. Beef Retail Cut Composition: 1. Separable Tissue Components. J. Food Comp. Anal. 13:233-242

Wahrmund-Wyle, J.L., Harris, K.B., and Savell, J.W. 2000. 2. Proximate Analysis. J. Food Comp. Anal. 13:243-241.