RUNNING HEAD: Breed effect on nutritional value of beef

Fatty acid profile, mineral content and palatability of beef from a multibreed Angus-Brahman population

S. Flowers, H. Hamblen, J.D. Leal-Gutiérrez, M. A. Elzo, D. D. Johnson, and R. G. Mateescu*[2]

*Department of Animal Sciences, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32608, USA

[1]This research was supported by Florida Agricultural Experiment Station Hatch FLA-ANS-005548.

[2]Correspondence: R. G. Mateescu, University of Florida, 100B Animal Sciences, Gainesville, FL 32608, USA. Phone: 352-392-2367 E-mail: raluca@ufl.edu

ABSTRACT:

Consumers demand meat that is both healthy and palatable, two attributes of meat that are affected by lipid content. Many cattle in the southern US are *Bos indicus* influenced, as this improves the ability to survive and thrive in these subtropical regions. However, these animals tend to have leaner carcasses and less marbled meat products. Thus, the objective of this study was to examine the effect of percent Brahman genetics on carcass characteristics, palatability, fatty acids profile and minerals content in LM of steers from a multibreed population ranging from 100% Angus to 100% Brahman. Breed effect was significant for birth weight (P = 0.0003), weaning weight (P < 0.0001), HCW (P < 0.0001), dressing percentage (P = 0.0008), ribeye area (P = 0.002), quality grade (P < 0.0001), and marbling score (P < 0.0001), and all these traits except dressing percentage decreased as the percentage of Brahman increased. Among palatability traits, breed group had a significant effect only on tenderness (TEND) and connective tissue (CT) scores (P < 0.0001). Least squares means decreased from Angus (5.75 ± 0.13 TEND score and 6.29 ± 0.14 CT score, respectively) to Brahman (4.84 ± 0.10 TEND score and 5.49 ± 0.11 CT score, respectively) as indicated by a significant linear affect. Breed group significantly affected the percentage of several individual fatty acids, saturated fatty acids (**SFA**) and polyunsaturated fatty acids (**PUFA**), but not monounsaturated fatty acids (**MUFA**). The 100% Angus group had the highest percentage of SFA at 49.92%, which was significantly higher (P < 0.05) than the SFA percentage in the 50%, 75%, and 100% Brahman breed groups. Brangus animals also had an increased SFA percentage compared to the 100% Brahman animals (P < 0.05). No significant effect was identified for the concentration of PUFA across the six breed groups (P = 0.14). Least squares means decreased from 100% Angus to 100% Brahman for concentration of total fat, SFA and MUFA (g/mg meat). The concentration of magnesium (P <

0.0001), phosphorus (*P* = 0.06) and potassium (*P* = 0.06) increased as the percentage of Brahman increased. Our study shows that breed has a significant effect on the fatty acid profile of beef. Cattle with high Brahman percentage, which are characterized by lower marbled meat, will present a more favorable healthfulness profile with reduced content of SFA and MUFA but the same content of PUFA as purebred Angus animals.

Key words: beef cattle, *Bos indicus*, healthfulness, mineral content

INTRODUCTION

Brahman genetics are extensively used in crossbreeding programs in the southeastern regions of the United States (Cundiff et al., 2012; Lamy et al., 2012), characterized by hot and humid conditions typical of tropical and subtropical environments. While Brahman cattle are well known for their adaptability in subtropical climates (Hansen, 2004), they tend to produce less marbling within the final beef product (Johnson et al., 1990; Pringle et al., 1997; Elzo et al., 2012). Several studies addressing relevant economic traits such as growth, carcass and reproduction in *Bos indicus* influenced cattle prevalent in the southern US have been published (Riley, 2002; Riley et al., 2012; Elzo et al., 2014; Elzo et al., 2016; Elzo et al., 2017; Leal-Gutiérrez et al., 2018), but information regarding fatty acid composition and mineral content are scarce.

A recent Beef Demand study (2013, Schroder et al.) identified seven factors as consequential for driving beef demand. Ranked in the order of their relevance to consumers these factors are beef price, food safety, product quality, health, nutrition, social aspects, and sustainability. Given that the industry cannot control price, the report identified food safety, product quality, nutritional value and healthfulness as the key attributes that the industry can and should focus on. Beef consumption helps Americans fulfill their daily-recommended dietary intake of protein, by providing 20g of protein per 100g of beef consumed, while also providing many nutrients with positive effects on human health (mono (MUFA) and polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFA), such as omega-3 and conjugated linoleic acid (CLA), iron, zinc, vitamin B6, etc.). However, beef is also associated with characteristics that are often perceived as negative, such as high levels of saturated fatty acids (SFA) and high caloric content. Knowledge of the role of *Bos indicus* influenced cattle concerning these areas is essential for the prosperity of the beef industry in the southern US.

Intramuscular fat depot or "marbling" is a key factor in determining carcass value. While *Bos taurus* breeds of cattle, such as Angus, are known for their superior marbling potential, *Bos indicus* breeds have the tendency to produce less marbled beef products. The amount of intramuscular fat described by marbling and the fatty acid composition determines the healthfulness value of the beef product. Polyunsaturated (**PUFA**) and monounsaturated fatty acids (**MUFA**) are known to have cholesterol-lowering properties, and reduce the risk of coronary vascular disease among other healthful attributes. On the contrary, several short chain saturated fatty acids (**SFA**) are associated with increased risk of coronary vascular disease (Bonanome and Grundy, 1988; Derr et al., 1993; Judd et al., 2002; Brouwer et al., 2010).

Breed, along with other factors such as sex, age and diet (Wood et al., 2008; Mateescu, 2015), has an impact on both the amount of marbling and the fatty acid composition. Numerous recent reports are available regarding the fatty acid composition of *Bos taurus* breeds (Nogi et al., 2011; Xu et al., 2013; Buchanan et al., 2015; Ekine-Dzivenu et al., 2017; Zhu et al., 2017), but information on the quality of fat and the healthfulness and nutritional value of beef from *Bos* *indicus* influenced cattle, in particular Brahman, is scarce (Dinh et al., 2010; Campbell et al., 2016).

The objective of this study was to characterize the carcass and palatability traits, fatty acid composition, and mineral content in a multibreed cattle population typical to the southern US and estimate the effect of breed composition on nutritional and healthfulness value of beef.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Animals and Management

The research protocol was approved by the University of Florida Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee number 201003744. Cattle used in this study were from the University of Florida multibreed Angus-Brahman herd (Elzo et al., 2014). A total of 230 steers across six breed groups based on the percentages of Angus breed composition were used from this herd: Angus = 100 to 80% (n = 39); 75% Angus = 79 to 65% (n = 33); Brangus = 62.5% (n = 30); 50% Angus = 59 to 40% (n = 42); 25% Angus = 39 to 20% (n = 27); Brahman = 19 to 0% (n = 59). Steers born in 2014 and 2015 were transported to a contract feeder (Quincey Farms, Chiefland, FL) where they were provided a standard feedlot diet consisting of corn, protein, vitamins, and minerals until they reached a subcutaneous fat thickness over the ribeye of approximately 1.27 cm assessed thorough ultrasound. The concentrate diet had, on the average, 89.7% of DM, 14.4% of CP, 1.5 Mcal/kg DM of NEm, and 1.1 Mcal/kg DM of NEg. As cattle achieved appropriate degree of back fat thickness, they were transported to a commercial packing plant where they were harvested under USDA FSIS inspection. Steers were harvested in groups of 15-25 animals and the average slaughter age was 18.76±1.13 mo.

Carcass Evaluation and Sample Collection

At 24 hours postmortem, carcasses were ribbed between the 12th and 13th rib, per industry standard and carcass measurements were evaluated for each animal: HCW, dressing percentage (**DP**), marbling score (**MS**; 100 to 199 = practically devoid, 200 to 299 = traces, 300 to 399=slight, 400 to 499=small, 500 to 599=modest, 600 to 699=moderate, 700 to 799=slightly abundant, 800 to 899=moderately abundant, and 900 to 999=abundant), ribeye area (**REA**), and fat over the eye (**FOE**). USDA quality grades and yield grades were calculated according to industry standards. Following carcass evaluation, two 2.54cm thick steaks were removed from the anterior end of the carcass ribbing and transferred to the University of Florida Meat Processing Center (Gainesville, FL). Steaks were wet aged for 14 days, then frozen (-20 °C) until subsequent fatty acid, mineral, tenderness, and sensory analysis.

Warner-Bratzler Shear Force and Sensory Panel Analysis

One of the two frozen steaks from each animal was thawed at 3°C for 24 hours and cooked on an open-top, electric grill. Steaks were cooked to an internal temperature of 71°C, equivalent to a medium degree of doneness. Internal temperature was monitored using copper-constant thermocouples (Omega Engineering Inc., Stamford, CT) located in the geometric center of each steak. Temperature was recorded by a 1100 Labtech Notebook Pro Software version 12.1 (Computer Boards Inc., Middleboro, MA). Once cooked, steaks were chilled at 3°C for 24 hours. After chilling, six 1.27 cm cores were removed from each steak parallel to the muscle fibers. Each of the six cores were sheared through the center (crosshead speed of 200 mm/min) with a Warner-Bratzler shear force (**WBSF**) head attached to a 490 N load cell using an Instron Universal Testing Machine (Instron Corporation, Canton, Massachusetts, USA).

The other frozen steak from each animal was handled and cooked in the same manner as the WBSF samples. Once cooked, steaks were cut into 1.27 cm cubes and served warm to trained sensory panelists. The sensory panel consisted of 7 to 11 trained members (AMSA, 1995) who evaluated each sample for various meat palatability traits. Sensory panel measurements analyzed by the sensory panelists included: tenderness score (**TEND**; 1=extremely tough to 8=extremely tender), connective tissue score (**CT**; 1=abundant amount to 8=none detected), juiciness score (**JUIC**; 1=extremely dry to 8=extremely juicy), beef flavor score (**FLAV**; 1=extremely bland to 8=extremely intense), and off-flavor score (**OFLAV**; 1=extreme off- flavor to 6=none detected).

Fatty Acid Extraction and Gas Chromatography Analysis

After trimming external fat and connective tissue, a thin shaving across the entire steak surface was removed from each steak sample and powdered in liquid nitrogen to obtain a homogenized sample of the steak. Fatty acid extraction and analysis was performed at the W. M. Keck Metabolomics Research Laboratory, Iowa State University (Ames, IA). About 200 mg of finely ground steak samples was extracted into 1mL of 2:1 Chloroform: Methanol mixture. The extracted fats were trans-esterified with 25% Sodium Methoxide in methanol. The resulting Fatty Acid Methyl Esters (FAMES) were extracted into hexane and detected on Agilent 7890A GC-FID instrument. One microliter of the sample was injected into an Agilent 7890. A Gas Chromatograph equipped with a flame ionization detector was used for separation and quantification of the FAMEs. The analysis was performed on Agilent CP-Wax 52CB column (15m, 0.32mm, 0.5um). The oven temperature program was as follows. Initial temperature of 100°C, increased to 170°C with a ramp of 2°C/min, increased to 180°C with a ramp of 0.5°C/min, to a final temperature of 250°C with a ramp of 1°C/min and held for 3min. The inlet temperature was 250°C and detector temperatures were 220°C. Helium was used as the carrier gas. Supelco 37 FAME mix (Catalog # CRM47885 SUPELCO) was used to generate the calibration curve for identification and quantification of FAMES.

Twenty eight individual fatty acids and three groups of fatty acids based on saturation level (SFA, MUFA, PUFA) were calculated and expressed as percentage of the total fatty acids and as mg/g of tissue.

Mineral concentrations

Mineral content of LM samples were determined by inductively coupled plasma-optical emission spectroscopy (ICP-OES, SPECTRO Analytical Instruments, Mahwah, NJ). The samples were dried at 105ºC for 18 to 20 h according to AOAC official method 934.01 (Davis and Lin, 2005), and moisture content was calculated. Dried samples were subjected to a closed-vessel microwave digestion process (CEM, MDS-2000, Matthews, NC) with 5 mL concentrated nitric acid and 2 mL 30% hydrogen peroxide according to AOAC official methods 999.10 (Jorhem and Engman, 2000). The microwave was programmed as follows: 250 watts for 5 min, 630 watts for 5 min, 500 watts for 20 min, and 0 watts for 15 min. Digested samples were transferred to 25 mL volumetric flasks and diluted with deionized water. The concentrations of iron, phosphorus, potassium, sodium, magnesium and zinc were then measured by ICP-OES.

Statistical Analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using SAS 9.4 (SAS Inst. Inc., Cary, NC). The MEANS procedure was used to produce descriptive statistics for fatty acid composition data. Traits were analyzed using the MIXED procedure of SAS. Models for all traits included year of birth as a random effect and breed as fixed effects. Breed-group least squares means were separated using LSMEANS with the PDIFF option. To estimate the linear and quadratic effect of percent Brahman genetics, the breed groups were recoded as 0, 1, 1.5, 2, 3 and 4 indicating 0%, 25%, 37.25%, 50%, 75%, and 100% Brahman genetics. The model included year of birth as a random effect and the linear and quadratic breed as a covariate. When the quadratic effect was not significant, it was dropped and a model including just the linear effect was used. The intercept from this model estimates the effect of 100% Angus genes (adjusted for random year of birth effect) and the estimated regression coefficients represent the effect of replacing 25% of Angus genes by Brahman genes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 presents summary statistics for traits evaluated in this study in a population of 230 animals with breed composition ranging from 100% Angus to 100% Brahman.

Carcass Characteristics

Least squares means of carcass measurements for the six breed groups in this study are presented in Table 2. The carcass data for the total 230 animals is representative of industry average quality and yield grades (Shackelford et al., 2012) and similar to previously reported data on this multibreed population (Elzo et al., 2012; Elzo et al., 2014; Elzo et al., 2016). Breed effect was significant for BWT (P = 0.0003), WWT (P < 0.0001), HCW (P < 0.0001), DP (P = 0.0008), REA (P = 0.002), QG (P < 0.0001), and MS (P < 0.0001). No breed differences were identified for FOE which was expected as a direct consequence of animals slaughtered at a similar fat thickness end point. Cattle with the highest percent Brahman (Brahman breed group) had the lowest HCW and REA compared to all other breed groups. This is in agreement with previous studies which reported Angus cattle had heavier HCW and greater REA than Brahman (Peacock et al., 1979; Lunt et al., 1985; Williams et al., 2010, Elzo et al., 2012).

Marbling score decreased from Angus (464.12 ± 13.12 units) to Brahman (352.85 ± 10.34 units), with the highest percentage Brahman animals having statistically lower marbling scores than all the other breed groups (P < 0.0001). This was also reflected in the QG which followed the same trend across breed groups with Brahman having the lowest QG (547.37 ± 5.6) compared to all other breed compositions. It is important to point out that the Angus, 75% Angus and Brangus breed groups had a marbling score higher than the industry average (449 ± 94.8), and the Brahman breed group was within one standard deviation of this average (Shackelford et al., 2012).

Table 2 also contains least squares means for the six breed groups for meat palatability traits. No significant differences were found for beef flavor or off flavor across the breed groups. Breed group had a significant effect only on TEND and CT traits recorded during the trained sensory panel ($P < 0.0001$). A negative linear effect was significant with least squares means decreasing from Angus (5.75 ± 0.13 TEND score and 6.29 ± 0.14 CT score, respectively) to Brahman (4.84 ± 0.10 TEND score and 5.49 ± 0.11 CT score, respectively). Previous reports consistently identified animals with high Brahman influence to have lower sensory tenderness scores and higher connective tissue scores (Johnson et al., 1990; Pringle et al., 1997; Elzo et al., 2012). The lower tenderness of Brahman cattle has been attributed to increased postmortem calpastatin activity (Wheeler et al., 1990; Shackelford et al., 1991; Pringle et al., 1997) which results in a reduction in desmin and troponin-T degradation (Phelps et al., 2017). There are two important points related to the tenderness qualities of steaks from Angus, Brahman and their crossbreds evaluated by WBSF or through the sensory panel. When using the WBSF, considered an objective measure of tenderness, no significant differences were detected along the breed composition continuum from purebred Angus to purebred Brahman. The coefficient of variation obtained from a regression analysis of sensory tenderness using WBSF values was 13.34 indicating variation in the sensory tenderness which is not captured by the WBSF. However, a statistically significant difference was found when tenderness was evaluated either by the TEND or CT score during the trained sensory panel. Among other factors, tenderness as perceived by consumers is determined by the amount and solubility of the connective tissue and the amount of marbling. Marbling has a major effect on the perceived juiciness and a high correlation was reported between tenderness and juiciness (Mateescu et al., 2015), where steaks with high marbling score have superior juiciness and overall liking (Killinger et al., 2004; Okumura et al., 2007; Legako et al., 2015). It is however important to highlight the fact that although statistically significant, these differences are insignificant in terms of changes in tenderness that can be perceived by regular, untrained consumers (Watson et al., 2008). These results indicate that meat from *Bos indicus* influenced cattle tends to be less tender compared to meat from Angus animals, but these differences, when measured objectively using WBSF, are not statistically significant. Moreover, when considering that the minimum difference the average consumer can detect is a 0.5 kg difference in WBSF when consuming meat at home (Miller et al., 1995), the differences found in this study are not sufficiently large to be detectable by consumers. These results suggest that selection programs aimed at improving tenderness in these *Bos indicus* populations are producing the intended results and the historical perception of tougher beef associated with *indicine* influenced cattle needs to be reevaluated.

Breed Effect on Fatty Acid Composition

Percentages of the three main fatty acids categories in the overall population were as expected, with approximately 47.52 to 49.92% of the total lipid content being represented by SFA, 45.10 to 46.10% by MUFA, and 3.98 to 7.38% PUFA (Pitchford et al., 2002; Daley et al., 2010; Garmyn et al., 2011). The fatty acid composition in steers from six breed groups, expressed both as percentage of total fatty acids and as mg/100 g muscle, is presented in Tables 3 and 4, respectively.

Breed group significantly affected the percentage of several individual fatty acids, SFA, and PUFA, but not MUFA. The Angus group had the highest percentage of SFA at 49.92%, which was significantly higher than the SFA percentage in the 50%, 75% and 100% Brahman breed groups (P = 0.006, 0.008 and 0.002, respectively). Brangus animals also had a significantly (P = 0.04) higher SFA percentage compared to the 100% Brahman animals. These differences were mainly a consequence of higher percentages of C16:0 and C18:0 in Angus or Brangus compared to animals with higher Brahman composition.

The opposite relationship was observed for PUFA, with the percentage of these class of fatty acids increasing as the percentage of Brahman genetics increased. Meat from Brahman steers had the highest percentage of PUFA (7.38 ± 0.39) compared to all other breed groups, while steers from the Angus group had a significantly lower percentage of PUFA compared to the 50%, 75% and 100% Brahman breed groups.

The fatty acid concentration (mg/g meat) showed a significant breed group effect for most of the individual fatty acids and for total fat, SFA, and MUFA. No significant effect was identified for the concentration of PUFA across the six breed groups (P = 0.14). Least squares means showed a downward trend from Angus to Brahman for concentration of total fat, SFA and MUFA. For all three fatty acid categories, Angus concentrations were significantly higher than the concentrations in the 50%, 75%, and 100% Brahman breed groups, and the concentration in the 100% Brahman steers was significantly lower than steers from any other breed group.

In this study, the LM from Angus cattle was found to have 50% greater amount of intramuscular fat than Brahman cattle. The lower fat content of animals from the Brahman breed group is in agreement with many previous reports (Wood et al., 2008; Mateescu, 2015) describing a lower intramuscular fat content of *Bos indicus* animals. This greater accumulation of fat in Angus animals was achieved by approximately 50% increase in total SFA and MUFA concentration compared to Brahman. This is to be expected, as triacylglycerols deposited into adipocytes are mostly SFA and MUFA from dietary sources and de novo synthesis (Jenkins, 1994; Scollan et al., 2014), while the concentration of phospholipids which are rich in PUFA remains constant and relatively independent from the total fat amount. However, several important trends with respect to the healthfulness of the beef products from different breed groups are emerging. On a percentage basis, steaks from animals with a high Brahman percentage had significantly lower SFA and significantly higher PUFA, which suggests a higher healthfulness value of steaks from Brahman cattle. More importantly, the lower SFA is due mostly to a decrease in the percent of short chain SFA (C10:0, C11:0, C12:0 and C16:0) while C18:0 showed no significant difference among breed groups. Palmitic acid (C16:0) is a saturated fatty acid accounting for about 27% of the fatty acids in beef and has been shown to raise serum cholesterol levels (Grundy, 1994) predominantly by increasing the LDL cholesterol levels. This fatty acid accounts for most of the cholesterol-raising activity from beef, thereby increasing the risk of atherosclerosis, cardiovascular disease, and stroke (Brouwer et al., 2010). On the other hand, stearic acid (C18:0) accounts for about 18% of the fatty acid in beef. Its effect on total cholesterol is minimal and not detrimental to human health (Bonanome and Grundy, 1988; Zock and Katan, 1992; Derr et al., 1993; Judd et al., 2002). For practical purposes, stearic acid is essentially neutral in its effects on serum total cholesterol, similar to C18:1 or oleic acid (Grundy, 1994).

The second and more important finding is related to the fatty acid concentration on a mg/g meat basis. Most studies on fatty acid composition in beef cattle have reported the normalized percentage of total fatty acids, which describes the lipid quality and is driven by strong relationships among fatty acids. Steers with a high Brahman breed composition have leaner meat compared to purebred or high Angus percentage steers and this is accompanied by a high ratio of phospholipid to triacylglycerol in the fat fraction (Scollan et al., 2007; Buchanan et al., 2015). This is expected and it is reflected in the significantly lower total fat content, which is a consequence of significantly lower SFA and MUFA content. However, the amount of PUFA shows no significant difference across the six breed groups, suggesting that meat from Brahman animals would be closely aligned with the international recommendation of lean red meat to be included in a healthy balanced diet (Wyness et al., 2011; McNeill and Van Elswyk, 2012; Cashman and Hayes, 2017). There is an increasing segment of consumers interested in the taste and health benefits of products they consume (Lusk and Parker, 2009; Cashman and Hayes, 2017). Recent focus of consumer interest is on weight loss and childhood obesity and the emphasis is on including protein in their diet while looking for lighter options. Leaner beef from Brahman animals could be better-fitted product for this type of consumer. In this study, steaks from Brahman steers had about half of total fat content (6.92 ± 1.01 mg/100 g meat) compared to steaks from Angus cattle (14.06 ± 1.01 mg/100 g meat) as a result of decreased SFA and MUFA concentrations, while the PUFA concentration was not significantly changed.

Breed Effect on Mineral Composition

Least squares means of minerals concentration (μg/g muscle) are presented in Table 5. The mineral concentration in our study agrees with those of several other studies (Biesalski, 2005; O'Neil et al., 2011) documenting the role of beef in providing essential minerals to the human diet, particularly iron, magnesium, phosphorus, potassium, and zinc. When bio-availability from other food sources is considered, the amount of iron and zinc provided through consumption of lean beef plays a critical role toward meeting the nutritional requirements of these two nutrients and may provide major health benefits (Nicklas et al., 2012). The concentration of these two nutritionally critical minerals is essentially unchanged across breed groups, all having substantial nutritive value.

Breed effect was significant for magnesium ($P < 0.0001$), phosphorus ($P = 0.06$) and potassium ($P = 0.06$). The concentration of these three minerals increased with the Brahman percentage in our population as indicated by a significant linear effect. The magnesium concentration in steers from the 100% Angus breed group was significantly lower compared to steers from the 50%, 75%, and 100% Brahman groups, while 75% Angus and Brangus steers had significantly different magnesium concentrations compared to 75% and 100% Brahman steers. Steers from the Brahman breed group had significantly higher phosphorus and potassium concentrations compared to 100% Angus, 75% Angus and Brangus steers. The identical direction of variation for these minerals is supported by the strong and positive genetic correlations reported between magnesium and phosphorus (0.88), magnesium and potassium (0.68), and phosphorus and potassium (0.69) (Mateescu et al., 2013). Magnesium is an essential mineral with important and extensive roles in human health including muscle and nerve function, immune system function, and bone health (Clarkson and Haymes, 1995; Genuis and Bouchard, 2012; Saris et al., 2000; Spiegel, 2011; Tam et al., 2003; Orchard et al., 2014). There is an increased interest in the role of magnesium in preventing and managing disorders such as hypertension, cardiovascular disease, and diabetes (Bo and Pisu, 2008; Champagne, 2008; Houston, 2011). However, although statistically significant, the differences reported in the present study are negligible from a practical standpoint when taking into consideration the average content of these minerals and the range for their natural variation presented in this study. Irrespective of the differences found, the current study confirms previous reports on the nutritionally beneficial amounts of minerals, particularly iron and zinc, in beef cattle (Mateescu et al., 2013; Ahlberg et al., 2014). Large variation ion the content of these minerals was found within each breed group in the present study.

CONCLUSION

One of the greatest marketing advantages of beef is that it provides a superior eating experience/taste over other protein sources. Over and above this eating experience, beef is a nutrient rich foodstuff. However, it also is perceived to have an unhealthful fatty acid composition. This study confirms that nutrient and fatty acid profiles are not uniform across cattle and variations in fatty acid composition and mineral content is partially attributable to breed composition and other genetic and management factors. As the percentage of Brahman increases, the percent of SFA out of the total fatty acids decreases and the percent of PUFA increases. These observed differences result in a more nutritionally desirable beef product, especially when we consider that the decrease in percent of SFA is mainly due to a decrease in short-chain SFA, which might have a detrimental effect on human health. Probably even more important, the relatively leaner meat of high percent Brahman steers have reduced content of SFA and MUFA but the same content of PUFA as purebred Angus, suggesting this beef product would be of interest for those consumers seeking a low fat, healthy diet.

LITERATURE CITED

Ahlberg, C. M., L. N. Schiermiester, J. T., C. R. Calkins, and M. L. Spangler. 2014. Genome wide association study of cholesterol and poly- and monounsaturated fatty acids, protein, and mineral content of beef from crossbred cattle. Meat Sci. 98:804–814.

doi:10.1016/j.meatsci.2014.07.030.

AMSA. 1995. Research Guidelines for Cookery, Sensory Evaluation and Instrumental Tenderness Measurements of Fresh Meat. American Meat Science Association, Chicago.

Biesalski, H.-K. 2005. Meat as a component of a healthy diet - are there any risks or benefits if meat is avoided in the diet? Meat Sci. 70:509–24. doi:10.1016/j.meatsci.2004.07.017.

Bonanome, A., and S. M. Grundy. 1988. Effect of Dietary Stearic Acid on Plasma Cholesterol and Lipoprotein Levels. N. Engl. J. Med. 318:1244–1248. doi:10.1056/NEJM198805123181905.

Brouwer, I. A., A. J. Wanders, and M. B. Katan. 2010. Effect of animal and industrial Trans fatty acids on HDL and LDL cholesterol levels in humans - A quantitative review. P. H. Reitsma, editor. PLoS One. 5:e9434. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0009434.

Buchanan, J. W., J. M. Reecy, D. J. Garrick, Q. Duan, D. C. Beitz, and R. G. Mateescu. 2015. Genetic parameters and genetic correlations among triacylglycerol and phospholipid fractions in Angus cattle. J. Anim. Sci. 93:522–528. doi:10.2527/jas.2014-8418.

Campbell, E. M. G., J. O. Sanders, D. K. Lunt, C. A. Gill, J. F. Taylor, S. K. Davis, D. G. Riley, and S. B. Smith. 2016. Adiposity, lipogenesis, and fatty acid composition of subcutaneous and intramuscular adipose tissues of Brahman and Angus crossbred cattle. J. Anim. Sci. 94:1415–1425. doi:10.2527/jas2015-9954.

Cashman, K. D., and A. Hayes. 2017. Red meat’s role in addressing ‘nutrients of public health concern.’ Meat Sci. 132:196–203. doi:10.1016/j.meatsci.2017.04.011.

Cundiff, L. V., R. M. Thallman, and L. A. Kuehn. 2012. Impact of Bos indicus Genetics on the Global Beef Industry. In: Beef Improvement Federation 44th Annual Research Symposium and Annual Meeting, Houston, TX, April 18, 2012. p. 147–151.

Daley, C. A., A. Abbott, P. S. Doyle, G. A. Nader, and S. Larson. 2010. A review of fatty acid profiles and antioxidant content in grass-fed and grain-fed beef. Nutr. J. 9:10. doi:10.1186/1475-2891-9-10.

Derr, J., P. M. Kris-Etherton, T. A. Pearson, and F. H. Seligson. 1993. The role of fatty acid saturation on plasma lipids, lipoproteins, and apolipoproteins: II. The plasma total and low-density lipoprotein cholesterol response of individual fatty acids. Metabolism. 42:130–134. doi:0026-0495(93)90183-O [pii].

Dinh, T. T. N., J. R. Blanton, D. G. Riley, C. C. Chase, S. W. Coleman, W. A. Phillips, J. C. Brooks, M. F. Miller, and L. D. Thompson. 2010. Intramuscular fat and fatty acid composition of longissimus muscle from divergent pure breeds of cattle. J. Anim. Sci. 88:756–766. doi:10.2527/jas.2009-1951.

Ekine-Dzivenu, C., M. Vinsky, J. A. Basarab, J. L. Aalhus, M. E. R. Dugan, and C. Li. 2017. Phenotypic and genetic correlations of fatty acid composition in subcutaneous adipose tissue with carcass merit and meat tenderness traits in Canadian beef cattle1. J. Anim. Sci. 95:5184–5196. doi:10.2527/jas2017.1966.

Elzo, M. A., D. D. Johnson, J. G. Wasdin, and J. D. Driver. 2012. Carcass and meat palatability breed differences and heterosis effects in an Angus-Brahman multibreed population. Meat Sci. 90:87–92. doi:10.1016/j.meatsci.2011.06.010.

Elzo, M. A., R. G. Mateescu, D. D. Johnson, T. L. Scheffler, J. M. Scheffler, C. Carr, D. O. Rae, J. G. Wasdin, M. D. Driver, and J. D. Driver. 2017. Genomic-polygenic and polygenic predictions for nine ultrasound and carcass traits in Angus-Brahman multibreed cattle using three sets of genotypes. Livest. Sci. 202:58–66. doi:10.1016/j.livsci.2017.05.027.

Elzo, M. A., R. Mateescu, M. G. Thomas, D. D. Johnson, C. A. Martinez, D. O. Rae, J. G.

Wasdin, M. D. Driver, and J. D. Driver. 2016. Growth and reproduction genomic-polygenic and polygenic parameters and prediction trends as Brahman fraction increases in an Angus-Brahman multibreed population. Livest. Sci. 190:104–112. doi:10.1016/j.livsci.2016.06.011.

Elzo, M. A., M. G. Thomas, C. A. Martinez, G. C. Lamb, D. D. Johnson, D. O. Rae, J. G. Wasdin, and J. D. Driver. 2014. Genomic-polygenic evaluation of multibreed Angus-Brahman cattle for postweaning feed efficiency and growth using actual and imputed Illumina50k SNP genotypes. Livest. Sci. 159:1–10. doi:10.1016/j.livsci.2013.11.005.

Garmyn, A. J., G. G. Hilton, R. G. Mateescu, J. B. Morgan, J. M. Reecy, J. G. Tait, D. C. Beitz, Q. Duan, J. P. Schoonmaker, M. S. Mayes, M. E. Drewnoski, Q. Liu, D. L. Vanoverbeke, R. G. Tait, D. C. Beitz, Q. Duan, J. P. Schoonmaker, M. S. Mayes, M. E. Drewnoski, Q. Liu, and D. L. Vanoverbeke. 2011. Estimation of relationships between mineral concentration and fatty acid composition of longissimus muscle and beef palatability traits. J. Anim. Sci. 89:2849–58. doi:10.2527/jas.2010-3497.

Grundy, S. M. 1994. Influence of stearic acid on cholesterol metabolism relative to other long-chain fatty acids. Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 60:986S–990S.

Hansen, P. . 2004. Physiological and cellular adaptations of zebu cattle to thermal stress. Anim. Reprod. Sci. 82–83:349–360. doi:10.1016/j.anireprosci.2004.04.011.

Jenkins, T. C. 1994. Regulation of Lipid Metabolism in the Rumen. J. Nutr. 124:1372S–1376. doi:10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(93)77727-9.

Johnson, D. D., R. D. Huffman, S. E. Williams, and D. D. Hargrove. 1990. Effects of percentage Brahman and Angus breeding, age-season of feeding and slaughter end point on feedlot performance and carcass characteristics. J. Anim. Sci. 68:2243–2252.

doi:10.2527/1990.6871980x.

Judd, J. T., D. J. Baer, B. A. Clevidence, P. Kris-Etherton, R. A. Muesing, and M. Iwane. 2002. Dietary cis and trans monounsaturated and saturated FA and plasma lipids and lipoproteins in men. Lipids. 37:123–131. doi:10.1007/s11745-002-0871-9.

Killinger, K. M., C. R. Calkins, W. J. Umberger, D. M. Feuz, and K. M. Eskridge. 2004. Consumer sensory acceptance and value for beef steaks of similar tenderness, but differing in marbling level. J. Anim. Sci. 82:3294–3301. doi:/2004.82113294x.

Lamy, E., S. Van Harten, E. Sales-baptista, M. M. M. Guerra, A. M. De Almeida, S. Van Harten, E. Sales-baptista, and M. Manuela. 2012. Factors Influencing Livestock Productivity. In: V. Sejian, editor. Environmental Stress and Amelioration in Livestock Production. Vol. 9783642292. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg. p. 19–51.

Leal-Gutiérrez, J. D., M. Elzo, D. Johnson, and R. Mateescu. 2018. Genome-wide association and gene enrichment analyses of meat tenderness in an Angus-Brahman cattle population. In: 11th World Congress on Genetics Applied to Livestock Production. Auckland, New Zealand.

Legako, J. F., J. C. Brooks, T. G. O'Quinn, T. D. J. Hagan, R. Polkinghorne, L. J. Farmer, and M. F. Miller. 2015. Consumer palatability scores and volatile beef flavor compounds of five USDA quality grades and four muscles. Meat Sci. 100:291–300. doi:10.1016/j.meatsci.2014.10.026.

Lunt, D. K., G. C. Smith, C. E. Murphey, J. W. Savell, Z. L. Carpenter, and H. D. Petersen. 1985. Carcass characteristics and composition of Brahman, angus and Brahman x Angus steers fed for different times-on-feed. Meat Sci. 14:137–152. doi:10.1016/0309-1740(85)90060-9.

Lusk, J. L., and N. Parker. 2009. Consumer Preferences for Amount and Type of Fat in Ground Beef. Agric. Appl. Econ. 41:75–90.

Mateescu, R. G. 2015. Genetics of meat quality. In: The genetics of cattle. CABI, Wallingford. p. 544–571.

Mateescu, R. G., A. J. Garmyn, J. G. Tait, Q. Duan, Q. Liu, M. S. Mayes, D. J. Garrick, A. L. Van Eenennaam, D. L. VanOverbeke, G. G. Hilton, D. C. Beitz, and J. M. Reecy. 2013. Genetic parameters for concentrations of minerals in longissimus muscle and their associations with palatability traits in angus cattle. J. Anim. Sci. 91:1067–1075. doi:10.2527/jas.2012-5744.

Mateescu, R. G., D. J. Garrick, a. J. Garmyn, D. L. Vanoverbeke, G. G. Mafi, and J. M. Reecy. 2015. Genetic parameters for sensory traits in longissimus muscle and their associations with tenderness, marbling score, and intramuscular fat in Angus cattle. J. Anim. Sci. 93:21–27. doi:10.2527/jas2014-8405.

McNeill, S., and M. E. Van Elswyk. 2012. Red meat in global nutrition. Meat Sci. 92:166–73. doi:10.1016/j.meatsci.2012.03.014.

Miller, M. F., L. C. Hoover, K. D. Cook, A. L. Guerra, K. L. Huffman, K. S. Tinney, C. B. Ramsey, H. C. Brittin, and L. M. Huffman. 1995. Consumer Acceptability of Beef Steak Tenderness in the Home and Restaurant. J. Food Sci. 60:963–965.

Nicklas, T. A., C. E. O’Neil, M. Zanovec, D. R. Keast, and V. L. Fulgoni. 2012. Contribution of beef consumption to nutrient intake, diet quality, and food patterns in the diets of the US population. Meat Sci. 90:359–363. doi:10.1016/j.meatsci.2011.06.021.

Nogi, T., T. Honda, F. Mukai, T. Okagaki, and K. Oyama. 2011. Heritabilities and genetic correlations of fatty acid compositions in longissimus muscle lipid with carcass traits in

Japanese Black cattle. J. Anim. Sci. 89:615–21. doi:10.2527/jas.2009-2300.
O'Neil, C. E., M. Zanovec, D. R. Keast, V. L. Fulgoni, and T. A. Nicklas. 2011. Nutrient contribution of total and lean beef in diets of US children and adolescents: National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 1999-2004. Meat Sci. 87:250–6. doi:10.1016/j.meatsci.2010.10.020.
Okumura, T., K. Saito, T. Nade, S. Misumi, Y. Masuda, H. Sakuma, S. Nakayama, K. Fujita, and T. Kawamura. 2007. Effects of intramuscular fat on the sensory characteristics of M. longissimus dorsi in Japanese Black steers as judged by a trained analytical panel. Asian-Australasian J. Anim. Sci. 20:577–581. doi:10.5713/ajas.2007.577.
Orchard, T. S., J. C. Larson, N. Alghothani, S. Bout-tabaku, J. A. Cauley, Z. Chen, A. Z. Lacroix, J. Wactawski-wende, and R. D. Jackson. 2014. Magnesium intake , bone mineral density , and fractures : results from the Women ' s Health Initiative Observational Study. Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 99:926–933. doi:10.3945/ajcn.113.067488.1.
Peacock, F. M., A. Z. Palmer, J. W. Carpenter, and M. Koger. 1979. Breed and Heterosis Effects on Carcass Charateristics of Angus, Brahman, Charolais and Crossbred Steers. J. Anim. Sci. 49:391–395. doi:10.2527/jas1979.492391x.
Phelps, K. J., D. D. Johnson, M. A. Elzo, C. B. Paulk, and J. M. Gonzalez. 2017. Effect of Brahman genetics on myofibrillar protein degradation, collagen crosslinking, and tenderness of the longissimus lumborum. J. Anim. Sci. 95:5397–5406.
Pitchford, W. S., M. P. B. Deland, B. D. Siebert, A. E. O. Malau-Aduli, and C. D. K. Bottema. 2002. Genetic variation in fatty acid composition of subcutaneous fat in cattle. J. Anim. Sci. 80:2825–2832.
Pringle, T. D., S. E. Williams, B. S. Lamb, D. D. Johnson, and R. L. West. 1997. Carcass

characteristics, the Calpain proteinase system, and aged tenderness of Angus and Brahman crossbred steers. J. Anim. Sci. 75:2955–2961.

Riley, D. 2002. Estimated genetic parameters for carcass traits of Brahman cattle. J. Anim. …. 80:955–962.

Riley, D. G. D., C. C. Chase, S. W. Coleman, W. a. Phillips, M. F. Miller, J. C. Brooks, D. D. Johnson, and T. a. Olson. 2012. Genetic effects on carcass quantity, quality, and palatability traits in straightbred and crossbred Romosinuano steers. J. Anim. …. 90:2159–2166. doi:10.2527/jas2011-4471.

Scollan, N. D., N.-J. Choi, E. Kurt, A. V. Fisher, M. Enser, and J. D. Wood. 2007. Manipulating the fatty acid composition of muscle and adipose tissue in beef cattle. Br. J. Nutr. 85:115. doi:10.1079/BJN2000223.

Scollan, N. D., D. Dannenberger, K. Nuernberg, I. Richardson, S. MacKintosh, J. F. Hocquette, and A. P. Moloney. 2014. Enhancing the nutritional and health value of beef lipids and their relationship with meat quality. Meat Sci. 97:384–394. doi:10.1016/j.meatsci.2014.02.015.

Shackelford, S. D., D. a King, T. L. Wheeler, L. R. Meadows, and M. E. O. Connor. 2012. National Beef Quality Audit – 2011 : Survey of instrument grading assessments of. 5152–5158. doi:10.2527/jas2012-5551.

Shackelford, S. D., M. Koohmaraie, M. F. Miller, J. D. Crouse, and J. O. Reagan. 1991. An evaluation of tenderness of the longissimus muscle of Angus by Hereford versus Brahman crossbred heifers. J. Anim. Sci. 69:171–177. doi:10.2527/1991.691171x.

Watson, R., a. Gee, R. Polkinghorne, and M. Porter. 2008. Consumer assessment of eating quality - Development of protocols for Meat Standards Australia (MSA) testing. Aust. J.

Exp. Agric. 48:1360–1367. doi:10.1071/EA07176.

Wheeler, T. L., J. W. Savell, H. R. Cross, D. K. Lunt, and S. B. Smith. 1990. Mechanisms associated with the variation in tenderness of meat from Brahman and Hereford cattle. J. Anim. Sci. 68:4206–4220. doi:/1990.68113677x.

Williams, J. L., I. Aguilar, R. Rekaya, and J. K. Bertrand. 2010. Estimation of breed and heterosis effects for growth and carcass traits in cattle using published crossbreeding studies. J. Anim. Sci. 88:460–466. doi:10.2527/jas.2008-1628.

Wood, J. D., M. Enser, A. V. Fisher, G. R. Nute, P. R. Sheard, R. I. Richardson, S. I. Hughes, and F. M. Whittington. 2008. Fat deposition, fatty acid composition and meat quality: A review. Meat Sci. 78:343–58. doi:10.1016/j.meatsci.2007.07.019.

Wyness, L., E. Weichselbaum, A. O'Connor, E. B. Williams, B. Benelam, H. Riley, and S. Stanner. 2011. Red meat in the diet: An update. Nutr. Bull. 36:34–77. doi:10.1111/j.1467-3010.2010.01871.x.

Xu, L., L. P. Zhang, Z. R. Yuan, L. P. Guo, M. Zhu, X. Gao, H. J. Gao, J. Y. Li, and S. Z. Xu. 2013. Polymorphism of SREBP1 is associated with beef fatty acid composition in Simmental bulls. Genet. Mol. Res. 12:5802–5809. doi:10.4238/2013.November.22.7.

Zhu, B., H. Niu, W. Zhang, Z. Wang, Y. Liang, L. Guan, P. Guo, Y. Chen, L. Zhang, Y. Guo, H. Ni, X. Gao, H. Gao, L. Xu, and J. Li. 2017. Genome wide association study and genomic prediction for fatty acid composition in Chinese Simmental beef cattle using high density SNP array. BMC Genomics. 18:464. doi:10.1186/s12864-017-3847-7.

Zock, P. L., and M. B. Katan. 1992. Hydrogenation alternatives: effects of trans fatty acids and stearic acid versus linoleic acid on serum lipids and lipoproteins in humans. J. Lipid Res. 33:399–410.

Table 1. Summary statistics for carcass quality, meat quality, mineral content and fatty acid composition of animals available for this study.

Trait	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Carcass quality					
BW, kg	230	34.07	6.04	18.14	50.80
WW, kg	230	238.36	40.73	120.20	353.80
HCW, kg	230	333.58	42.15	215	467.65
Dressing Percentage, %	230	60.15	2.94	53.3	70.90
Fat Thickness, cm	230	1.46	0.64	0.28	4.06
Yield Grade	230	3.43	0.80	0.60	8.10
Quality Grade	230	587.77	50.00	490.00	700.00
Meat quality					
LM area, cm^2	230	77.81	12.09	47.74	129.03
Marbling Score[1]	230	416.78	89.54	280.00	700.00
WBSF, kg	230	4.52	1.18	2.10	7.90
Tenderness[2]	230	5.25	0.83	3.00	7.50
Juiciness[2]	230	4.99	0.66	3.40	6.60
Connective Tissue[2]	230	5.80	0.88	3.50	7.60
Flavor[2]	230	5.54	0.46	4.20	6.70
Off Flavor[2]	230	5.69	0.26	4.60	60.00
Mineral content					
Ca, µg/g	230	88.26	43.91	33.14	215.95
Fe, µg/g	230	14.57	3.75	4.76	27.44
K, µg/g	230	3158.86	513.79	1033.66	4658.84
Mg, µg/g	230	210.39	36.13	81.98	347.71
Na, µg/g	230	351.81	59.72	127.35	520.30
P, µg/g	230	1727.31	282.75	559.59	2796.58
Zn, µg/g	230	32.69	7.42	9.19	64.08
Fatty Acid composition					
SFA, %	230	48.51	3.85	38.66	64.77
MUFA,%	230	45.79	5.08	36.27	54.66
PUFA, %	230	5.70	2.58	2.69	17.39
SFA, mg/100g meat	230	4.91	3.39	0.46	15.65
MUFA, mg/100g meat	230	4.64	3.13	0.09	13.93
PUFA, mg/100g meat	230	0.49	0.25	0.05	1.85
Total Fat	230	10.04	6.71	1.34	38.26

[1]Marbling score: 100-199=Devoid, 200-299=traces, 300-399=Slight, 400-499=Small, 500-599=Modest, 600-699=Moderate, 700-799=Slightly abundant.

[2]Sensory traits: tenderness, connective tissue, beef flavor intensity, and juiciness on scales form 1-8 (1=extremely tough, abundant amount, extremely bland, extremely dry; 8=extremely tender, none detected, extremely intense, extremely juicy). Off flavor was evaluated on a scale from 1-6 (1=extreme off- flavor to 6=none detected).

Table 2. Least squares means and SE for carcass and meat quality characteristics in Angus (n = 39), 75% Angus (n = 33), Brangus (n = 30), 50% Angus (n = 42), 25% Angus (n = 27), and Brahman (n = 59) cattle[1].

Trait	Breed Group						SE[2]	i[3]	b$_1$[3]	b$_2$[3]
	Angus	75% A	Brangus	50% A	25% A	Brahman				
Birth Weight, kg	33.40^{bc}	33.79^{bc}	35.99^{ab}	34.69^{ab}	37.52^{a}	31.51^{c}	0.97	32.96	3.174^{S}	-0.852^{S}
Weaning Weight, kg	254.25^{a}	246.88^{a}	251.14^{a}	243.65^{a}	238.64^{a}	206.68^{b}	5.73	268.69	4.862	-3.998^{S}
HCW, kg	339.61^{a}	349.00^{a}	350.48^{a}	338.92^{a}	341.30^{a}	304.90^{b}	5.48	368.09	13.654^{S}	-5.591^{S}
Dressing Percentage, %	58.88^{b}	60.59^{a}	60.90^{a}	60.27^{a}	61.23^{a}	60.20^{a}	0.38	61.242	1.443^{S}	-0.291^{S}
Fat over the eye, cm	1.64	1.42	1.45	1.4	1.44	1.4	0.11	1.676	-0.042	-
Ribeye area, cm^2	79.41^{a}	80.77^{a}	81.14^{a}	77.07^{ab}	77.98^{a}	73.23^{b}	1.66	89.766	-1.769^{S}	-
Yield Grade	3.57	3.39	3.44	3.54	3.46	3.25	0.13	3.536	-0.066	-
Quality Grade	613.80^{a}	604.24^{ab}	612.20^{a}	590.82^{b}	582.58^{b}	547.37^{c}	7.21	619.59	0.597	-4.255^{S}
Marbling Score[4]	464.12^{a}	443.02^{ab}	456.48^{ab}	422.95^{bc}	399.01^{c}	352.85^{d}	13.31	486.02	-28.79^{S}	-
WBSF, kg	4.38	4.78	4.58	4.63	4.94	4.7	0.17	3.927	0.069	-
Juiciness[5]	5.15^{a}	5.12^{a}	5.13^{a}	5.04^{ab}	4.87^{ab}	4.80^{b}	0.11	5.049	-0.095^{S}	-
Flavor[5]	5.62	5.59	5.6	5.53	5.45	5.41	0.07	5.427	-0.057^{S}	-
Tenderness[5]	5.75^{a}	5.53^{ab}	5.51^{ab}	5.21^{bc}	5.07^{cd}	4.84^{d}	0.13	5.554	-0.231^{S}	-
Connective Tissue[5]	6.29^{a}	6.00^{ab}	6.02^{ab}	5.84^{bc}	5.49^{cd}	5.49^{d}	0.14	76.19	-0.205^{S}	-
Off-flavor[5]	5.74	5.72	5.73	5.66	5.71	5.7	0.05	5.631	-0.009	-

[1]Within each row, means without common letters differ ($P < 0.05$)
[2]Average SE across the breed groups
[3]Intercept (i), linear (b_1) and quadratic (b_2) effect of percent Brahman genetics.
[S]Linear or quadratic effect significant at $P < 0.05$
[4]Marbling score: 100-199=Devoid, 200-299=traces, 300-399=Slight, 400-499=Small, 500-599=Modest, 600-699=Moderate, 700-799=Slightly abundant.
[5]Sensory traits: tenderness, connective tissue, beef flavor intensity, and juiciness on scales form 1-8 (1=extremely tough, abundant amount, extremely bland, extremely dry; 8=extremely tender, none detected, extremely intense, extremely juicy). Off flavor was evaluated on a scale from 1-6 (1=extreme off- flavor to 6=none detected).

Table 3. Least squares means and SE for fatty acid proportion (g/100 g of total fatty acids) in Angus (n = 39), 75% Angus (n = 33), Brangus (n = 30), 50% Angus (n = 42), 25% Angus (n = 27), and Brahman (n = 59) cattle[1].

	Breed Group									
Trait	Angus	75% A	Brangus	50% A	25% A	Brahman	SE[2]	i[3]	b_1[3]	b_2[3]
C10:0	0.05^{c}	0.06^{bc}	0.06^{bc}	0.05^{bc}	0.06^{b}	0.07^{a}	0.003	0.053	-0.001	0.001^{S}
C11:0	0.01^{b}	0.02^{b}	0.02^{b}	0.02^{b}	0.02^{b}	0.04^{a}	0.003	0.024	-0.002	0.002^{S}
C12:0	0.07^{c}	0.08^{b}	0.08^{b}	0.07^{bc}	0.08^{b}	0.09^{a}	0.003	0.069	0.006^{S}	-
C13:0	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.002	0.014	0.001^{S}	-
C14:0	3.15	3.33	3.52	3.21	3.39	3.26	0.104	3.931	0.011	-
C14:1	0.70	0.82	0.87	0.81	0.83	0.86	0.046	0.833	0.029^{S}	-
C15:0	0.39	0.40	0.41	0.38	0.39	0.40	0.013	0.558	0.0008	-
C16:0	30.39^{a}	29.82^{a}	30.03^{a}	28.6^{b}	28.48^{b}	28.51^{b}	0.365	28.751	-0.496^{S}	-
C16:1	3.35^{c}	3.67^{ab}	3.73^{ab}	3.56^{abc}	3.41^{bc}	3.76^{a}	0.114	3.736	0.063	-
C17:0	1.16^{a}	1.12^{a}	1.10^{a}	1.10^{a}	1.15^{a}	1.14^{a}	0.038	1.541	-0.0008	-
C17:1	0.70^{abc}	0.79^{ab}	0.62^{bc}	0.61^{c}	0.72^{abc}	0.82^{a}	0.062	0.919	-0.112	0.033^{S}
C18:0	14.47	13.91	13.80	14.00	14.45	13.71	0.326	13.451	-0.115	-
C18:1	41.02	40.30	40.24	41.68	40.73	39.28	0.865	41.768	-0.359	-
C18:2n-6 *cis*	2.51^{c}	3.37^{b}	3.17^{bc}	3.43^{b}	3.73^{b}	4.8^{a}	0.270	3.298	0.530^{S}	-
C18:2n-6 *trans*	0.29^{c}	0.30^{bc}	0.32^{ab}	0.32^{a}	0.31^{abc}	0.31^{ab}	0.008	0.265	0.023^{S}	-0.005^{S}
C18:3n-6	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.009	0.044	0.006^{S}	-
C18:3n-3	0.23^{c}	0.25^{bc}	0.26^{bc}	0.27^{b}	0.27^{b}	0.31^{a}	0.008	0.202	0.019^{S}	-
C20:0	0.11^{a}	0.11^{a}	0.10^{ab}	0.11^{a}	0.10^{ab}	0.10^{b}	0.003	0.084	-0.003^{S}	-
C20:1n-9	0.28	0.30	0.29	0.03	0.27	0.28	0.010	0.319	-0.004	-
C20:2	0.08^{d}	0.08^{cd}	0.08^{cd}	0.09^{bc}	0.10^{b}	0.14^{a}	0.006	0.052	-0.0003	0.004^{S}
C20:3n-6	0.17^{c}	0.21^{bc}	0.23^{bc}	0.23^{bc}	0.26^{b}	0.34^{a}	0.026	0.161	0.039^{S}	-
C20:3n-3	0.55^{c}	0.67^{bc}	0.61^{bc}	0.75^{bc}	0.85^{b}	1.18^{a}	0.079	0.443	-0.002	0.039^{S}
C20:5n-3	0.05^{c}	0.05^{bc}	0.06^{bc}	0.06^{bc}	0.07^{b}	0.10^{a}	0.007	0.016	-0.001	0.004^{S}
C22:0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.002	0.017	0.002^{S}	-
C22:2	0.01^{c}	0.01^{bc}	0.02^{ab}	0.02^{abc}	0.02^{abc}	0.02^{a}	0.003	0.034	0.002^{S}	-
C23:0	0.10^{bc}	0.13^{bc}	0.09^{c}	0.11^{bc}	0.14^{ab}	0.17^{a}	0.015	0.083	0.017^{S}	-
C22:6n-3	0.05^{c}	0.06^{bc}	0.11^{ab}	0.08^{abc}	0.05^{c}	0.12^{a}	0.020	0.009	0.012^{S}	-
C24:1n-9	0.05^{c}	0.05^{c}	0.10^{ab}	0.06^{bc}	0.04^{c}	0.10^{a}	0.014	0.025	0.009^{S}	-
SFA	49.92^{a}	49^{abc}	49.23^{ab}	47.69^{bc}	48.29^{abc}	47.52^{c}	0.602	48.031	-0.566^{S}	-
MUFA	46.10	45.93	45.84	47.02	45.99	45.10	0.830	47.531	-0.235	-
PUFA	3.98^{c}	5.06^{bc}	4.93^{bc}	5.29^{b}	5.72^{b}	7.38^{a}	0.391	4.438	0.802^{S}	-

[1]Within each row, means without common letters differ ($P < 0.05$)
[2]Average SE across the breed groups
[3]Intercept (i), linear (b_1) and quadratic (b_2) effect of percent Brahman genetics.
[S]Linear or quadratic effect significant at $P < 0.05$

Table 4. Least squares means and SE for fatty acid concentration (mg/100 g meat) in Angus (n = 39), 75% Angus (n = 33), Brangus (n = 30), 50% Angus (n = 42), 25% Angus (n = 27), and Brahman (n = 59) cattle[1].

	Breed Group									
Trait	Angus	75% A	Brangus	50% A	25% A	Brahman	SE[2]	i[3]	b_1[3]	b_2[3]
C10:0	0.007^{a}	0.006^{ab}	0.006^{ab}	0.006^{ab}	0.006^{ab}	0.005^{b}	0.0012	0.005	-0.0006^{S}	-
C11:0	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.0002	0.001	$5.68x10^{-6}$	-
C12:0	0.009	0.008	0.009	0.008	0.008	0.006	0.0011	0.007	-0.0007^{S}	-
C13:0	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.0002	0.001	-0.0001^{S}	-
C14:0	0.446^{a}	0.380^{a}	0.401^{a}	0.352^{a}	0.336^{a}	0.230^{b}	0.0672	0.354	-0.052^{S}	-
C14:1	0.103^{a}	0.095^{a}	0.096^{a}	0.090^{a}	0.079^{ab}	0.056^{b}	0.0168	0.086	-0.012^{S}	-
C15:0	0.054^{a}	0.044^{ab}	0.047^{ab}	0.040^{b}	0.034^{bc}	0.025^{c}	0.0054	0.055	-0.007^{S}	-
C16:0	4.301^{a}	3.468^{ab}	3.481^{ab}	3.129^{b}	2.814^{bc}	1.967^{c}	0.6962	3.111	-0.556^{S}	-
C16:1	0.475^{a}	0.421^{ab}	0.417^{ab}	0.391^{ab}	0.321^{bc}	0.250^{c}	0.0682	0.387	-0.058^{S}	-
C17:0	0.156^{a}	0.123^{b}	0.126^{ab}	0.115^{b}	0.101^{bc}	0.073^{c}	0.0147	0.154	-0.019^{S}	-
C17:1	0.095^{a}	0.089^{ab}	0.073^{ab}	0.068^{bc}	0.063^{bc}	0.048^{c}	0.0121	0.086	-0.012^{S}	-
C18:0	2.015^{a}	1.612^{ab}	1.592^{b}	1.519^{b}	1.443^{b}	0.955^{c}	0.3157	1.450	-0.243^{S}	-
C18:1	5.695^{a}	4.789^{ab}	4.629^{ab}	4.461^{b}	3.949^{bc}	2.843^{c}	0.8208	4.516	-0.686^{S}	-
C18:2n-6 *cis*	0.346	0.337	0.337	0.335	0.312	0.272	0.0404	0.296	-0.019^{S}	-
C18:2n-6 *trans*	0.043^{a}	0.037^{ab}	0.037^{ab}	0.036^{ab}	0.031^{bc}	0.021^{c}	0.0085	0.030	-0.005^{S}	-
C18:3n-6	0.007	0.005	0.006	0.005	0.005	0.004	0.0014	0.004	-0.0006^{S}	-
C18:3n-3	0.034^{a}	0.029^{ab}	0.029^{ab}	0.029^{ab}	0.026^{bc}	0.021^{c}	0.0063	0.023	-0.003^{S}	-
C20:0	0.015^{a}	0.013^{ab}	0.012^{ab}	0.012^{b}	0.011^{b}	0.007^{c}	0.0031	0.009	-0.002^{S}	-
C20:1n-9	0.040^{a}	0.037^{a}	0.034^{ab}	0.032^{ab}	0.027^{bc}	0.019^{c}	0.0061	0.034	-0.005^{S}	-
C20:2	0.010	0.009	0.009	0.010	0.009	0.009	0.0008	0.025	-0.0004	-
C20:3n-6	0.022	0.021	0.023	0.022	0.022	0.018	0.0044	0.014	-0.0007	-
C20:3n-3	0.071	0.068	0.060	0.075	0.071	0.066	0.0195	0.032	-0.0005	-
C20:5n-3	0.006	0.006	0.005	0.007	0.006	0.006	0.0024	0.001	0.00006	-
C22:0	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.0002	0.001	-0.0001^{S}	-
C22:2	0.001^{b}	0.001^{bc}	0.002^{a}	0.001^{b}	0.001^{bc}	0.001^{c}	0.0001	0.002	0.0003^{S}	-0.0001^{S}
C23:0	0.013	0.012	0.010	0.010	0.012	0.010	0.0027	0.007	-0.0006	-
C22:6n-3	0.006	0.006	0.008	0.007	0.006	0.007	0.0019	0.001	0.0002	-
C24:1n-9	0.006	0.005	0.007	0.005	0.004	0.006	0.0029	0.002	-0.0001	-
SFA	7.023^{a}	5.670^{ab}	5.688^{ab}	5.195^{b}	4.771^{b}	3.282^{c}	1.0781	5.157	-0.885^{S}	-
MUFA	6.414^{a}	5.437^{ab}	5.256^{ab}	5.048^{b}	4.443^{bc}	3.221^{c}	0.9245	5.111	-0.774^{S}	-
PUFA	0.547	0.520	0.516	0.527	0.490	0.426	0.0876	0.411	-0.030^{S}	-
Total Fat	13.985^{a}	11.627^{ab}	11.461^{ab}	10.770^{b}	9.705^{bc}	6.929^{c}	2.088	10.679	-1.686^{S}	-

[1]Within each row, means without common letters differ ($P < 0.05$)
[2]Average SE across the breed groups
[3]Intercept (i), linear (b_1) and quadratic (b_2) effect of percent Brahman genetics.
[S]Linear or quadratic effect significant at $P < 0.05$

Table 5. Least squares means and SE for minerals concentration (μg/g muscle) in Angus (n = 39), 75% Angus (n = 33), Brangus (n = 30), 50% Angus (n = 42), 25% Angus (n = 27), and Brahman (n = 59) cattle[1].

	Breed Group						SE[2]	i[3]	b_1[3]
Trait	Angus	75% A	Brangus	50% A	25% A	Brahman			
Iron	14.58	14.44	13.55	15.28	14.70	14.62	0.65	14.56	0.05
Magnesium	196.83[c]	198.88[bc]	198.94[bc]	212.79[ab]	216.42[ab]	222.86[a]	8.18	202.97	7.40[S]
Zinc	33.79	32.81	31.871	33.23	34.531	31.859	1.48	34.22	-0.30
Sodium	338.27	348.38	339.68	362.11	356.30	360.40	10.56	339.02	4.99
Phosphorus	1651.80[b]	1677.07[b]	1655.55[b]	1709.01[ab]	1748.20[ab]	1803.98[a]	58.06	1743.39	41.45[S]
Potassium	3016.29[b]	3041.87[b]	3015.07[b]	3138.67[ab]	3221.53[ab]	3273.92[a]	103.75	3157.68	74.50[S]

[1]Within each row, means without common letters differ (*P* < 0.05)
[2]Average SE across the breed groups
[3]Intercept (i) and linear (b_1) effect of percent Brahman genetics. No quadratic (b_2) effect was significant.
[S]Linear effect significant at *P* < 0.05.