CCFRA Technology Limited Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6LD, UK

Tel: +44 (0)1386 842000 Fax: +44 (0)1386 842100 www.campden.co.uk

Date: 24 May 2007

Craig Leadley Department of Food Manufacturing Technologies CCFRA Station Road Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6LD

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER & SENSORY SCIENCE

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

SENSORY QUALITY EVALUATION OF HIGH PRESSURE PROCESSED NEPHROPS

Report No. S/REP/95900/1

Prepared by : Sue Burling

Checked & authorised by :

	Na	me	:	Lucy Brown
Authorised Signatories:	L. Brown S. Purcell J. Menneer E. Allchurch	Sensory Sensory Sensory Pro Sensory Pro Sensory Tra Data Analy	rvices ojects aining st	Manager Group Manager Group Manager

This test report or certificate shall not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval of CCFRA. Confidentiality notice: The information in this document is only intended for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information that is exempt from disclosure by law and if you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this document in error, please notify CCFRA immediately by telephone.

DocRef:FMT/REP/95900/Appendix 1

Page 1 of 13

U:\2007\CEL Fish\FIFG HPP project\Reports\Phase 1 report files



ISO 9001: 2000 Certified

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

SUMMARY

The aim of the project was to understand the effect of High Pressure Processing (HPP) on the sensory quality of a variety of fish and shellfish species.

Each species was subjected to a range of pressure/time/temperature combinations and a selection of samples were then evaluated to determine the effect on the sensory quality in terms of appearance, odour, flavour and texture.

This report details the results for Nethrops.

SAMPLE INFORMATION

Date samples received:	26 th January 2007
Condition on receipt:	Good
Storage conditions:	Chiller J
Date samples tested:	26 th January 2007

FMT Label	Pressure	Time	Temp
	(MPa)	(mins)	(°C)
Control	n/a	n/a	n/a
Untreated (water)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Run 1	250	2.5	-3.3
Run 2	280	1.0	0.4
Run 3	220	1.0	0.2
Run 4	250	2.5	0.5
Run 5	220	4.0	0.1
Run 6	280	4.0	0.1

Sample Preparation

Each sample was received from the FMT department raw and evaluated uncooked. The sample was then placed in a Pyrex bowl, covered and placed in a steamer, over a litre of boiling water in the base and steamed for 6 minutes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sensory Quality Grading (TES-S-021)

For each evaluation 12 tails were assessed. All samples were presented under three-digit code to a panel of three experienced sensory assessors.

Each assessor independently described the uncooked appearance and odour and awarded an overall quality grade for the raw sample (using the scale shown below). The sample was then steamed and the assessors described the appearance, odour, flavour and texture/mouthfeel and awarded a quality grade for the cooked assessment. The consensus scores were calculated and the individual comments combined.

Assessment Scale – Sensory Quality

9	Excellent Quality
8	Very Good Quality
7	Good Quality
6	Fairly Good Quality
5	Satisfactory Quality
4	Just Acceptable Quality
3	Poor Quality
2	Very Poor Quality
1	Bad Quality

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A summary of the grades awarded are detailed in the following table:

Sample Name	Treatment Details	Uncooked Quality Grade	Cooked Quality Grade
Control	Untreated	7	7
Untreated	Placed in water	6	5
Run 1	250 MPa 2.5 min –3.3°C	4	4
Run 2	280 MPa 1.0 min 0.4°C	8	6
Run 3	220 MPa 1.0 min 0.2°C	7	4
Run 4	250 MPa 2.5 min 0.5°C	5	4
Run 5	220 MPa 4.0 min 0.1°C	6	5
Run 6	280 MPa 4.0 min 0.1°C	7	6

The following graph shows both the uncooked and cooked assessment scores for ascending pressure treatments.



Nethrops Sensory Quality Assessment

For the uncooked assessment Run 2 was graded the highest and slightly higher than the Control. This sample was brighter and slightly less translucent. Run 3 and Run 6 were graded equal to the Control, however both samples were showing signs of shape loss.

Run 5, Run 4, Run 1 and the untreated sample were graded lower than the Control, all had lost their shape.

For the cooked assessment, the Control was graded the highest followed by Run 2 and Run 6. These were both slightly less bright, had lost the slight seawater odour present in the Control and were both slightly more gritty in texture. Run 6 also has a slightly astringent mouthfeel.

All other samples were graded lower than Run 2 and Run 6 due to changes in appearance; dirty grey coloration, less bright and more shape loss, odour and flavour; off odours and sour/acid flavour, texture/mouthfeel; more fibrous and gritty, astringent notes present and one described as rubbery/chewy.

Individual Comments and Quality Grades for the Raw and Cooked Assessments

	Raw Assessment Control (no water)
	Moderately/very bright
Appearance	Moderately moist
	• Moderately pink with very slight yellow tints
	Moderately translucent
	• Plump with very little shape loss (i.e. excellent shape retention)
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour
	• Slight seawater note
Overall Quality	7 (Good)

	Cooked Assessment Control (no water)
Appearance	 Moderately/very bright Moderately pink and uniform in colour Slight shape loss
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odourSlight seawater note
Flavour	 Moderate/strong shellfish flavour Moderately sweet Slightly salty
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Moderately firm bite Moderately/very moist Slightly fibrous Very slightly gritty
Overall Quality	7 (Good)

	Raw Assessment Untreated (in water)
	Slightly bright
	Moderately moist
Appearance	• Moderate pink colour with slight yellow tints
	Moderately translucent
	• Slight shape loss
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour
	• Slight seawater note
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)

	Cooked Assessment Untreated (in water)
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately pink and uniform in colour Slight shape loss
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odourSlight seawater note
Flavour	 Moderate/strong shellfish flavour Moderately sweet Slightly salty
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Very slight firm bite Slightly/moderately moist Slightly fibrous Very slightly gritty
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)

	Raw Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min –3.3°C (Run 1)
	Slightly bright
	Moderately moist
Appearance	• Slight/moderate pink colour with moderate blue/grey tints
	Slightly/moderately translucent
	Moderate shape loss
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour
	• Slight seawater note
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)

	Cooked Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min –3.3°C (Run 1)
Appearance	 Slightly/moderately bright Moderate pink, uniform colour, but slightly dirty grey Slight shape loss
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odourSlight seawater note
Flavour	Moderate/strong shellfish flavourModerately sweetSlightly salty
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Moderately firm bite Slightly/moderately moist Moderately fibrous Slightly/moderately gritty Slightly astringent mouthfeel
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)

	Raw Assessment 280 MPa 1.0 min 0.4°C (Run 2)
	• Very bright
Appearance	Moderately moist
	• Moderately pink with very slight yellow tints blue/grey tints
	Slightly/moderately translucent
	• Plump with very little shape loss (i.e. excellent shape retention)
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour
	• Slight seawater note
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)

	Cooked Assessment 280 MPa 1.0 min 0.4°C (Run 2)				
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderate pink, uniform colour Slight shape loss 				
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour				
Flavour	Moderate/strong shellfish flavourModerately sweetSlightly salty				
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Moderately firm bite Moderately/very moist Slightly fibrous Slightly gritty 				
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)				

	Raw Assessment 220 MPa 1.0 min 0.2°C (Run 3)		
	 Moderately bright Moderately moist 		
Appearance	 Moderately most Moderate pink colour with slight yellow tints 		
	Slightly translucent		
	• Slight shape loss		
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour		
	• Slight seawater note		
Overall Quality	7 (Good)		

	Cooked Assessment 220 MPa 1.0 min 0.2°C (Run 3)				
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderate pink, uniform colour, but slightly dirty grey Moderate shape loss 				
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odourSlight seawater note				
Flavour	 Moderate/strong shellfish flavour Moderately sweet Slightly salty 				
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Moderately firm bite Slightly moist Moderately fibrous Slightly rubbery and chewy Slightly gritty Slightly astringent mouthfeel 				
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)				

	Raw Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 0.5°C (Run 4)			
	Slightly bright			
Appearance	Moderately moist			
	• Moderate pink colour with slight yellow and blue/grey tints			
	Slightly/moderately translucent			
	Moderate shape loss			
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour			
	• Slight seawater note			
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)			

	Cooked Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 0.5°C (Run 4)			
	Slightly/moderately bright			
Appearance	 Moderate pink, uniform colour, but slightly dirty grey Moderate shape loss 			
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour			
Ouour	• Slight eggy note			
	• Moderate shellfish flavour			
Flavour	• Moderately sweet			
Flavoul	• Slightly salty			
	• Very slight acidic/sour note			
	• Moderately firm bite			
	Slightly/moderately moist			
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately fibrous			
	• Slightly gritty			
	Slightly astringent mouthfeel			
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)			

	Raw Assessment 220 MPa 4.0 min 0.1°C (Run 5)			
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately moist Moderate pink colour with slight/moderate yellow and very slight blue/grey tints Slightly translucent Slight shape loss 			
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odourSlight seawater note			
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)			

	Cooked Assessment 220 MPa 4.0 min 0.1°C (Run 5)				
Appearance	 Moderately bright Slight/moderate pink, uniform colour, but very slight dirty grey Slight shape loss 				
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour				
Flavour	 Moderate/strong shellfish flavour Moderately sweet Slightly salty 				
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Moderately firm bite Moderately moist Slightly fibrous Slightly gritty 				
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)				

	Raw Assessment 280 MPa 4.0 min 0.1°C (Run 6)			
	Moderately/very bright			
Appearance	Moderately moist			
	• Moderate pink colour with very slight yellow and blue/grey tints			
	• Slightly translucent			
	• Plump with little shape loss (i.e. good shape retention)			
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour			
	• Slight seawater note			
Overall Quality	7 (Good)			

	Cooked Assessment 280 MPa 4.0 min 0.1°C (Run 6)				
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderate pink, uniform colour Slight shape loss 				
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour				
Flavour	 Moderate/strong shellfish flavour Moderately sweet Slightly salty 				
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Moderately firm bite Moderately moist Slight/moderately fibrous Slightly gritty Slightly astringent mouthfeel 				
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)				

CCFRA Technology Limited Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6LD, UK

Tel: +44 (0)1386 842000 Fax: +44 (0)1386 842100 www.campden.co.uk

Date: 24 May 2007

Craig Leadley Department of Food Manufacturing Technologies CCFRA Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6LD

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER & SENSORY SCIENCE

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

SENSORY QUALITY EVALUATION OF HIGH PRESSURE PROCESSED MUSSELS

Report No. S/REP/95900/2

Prepared by : Sue Burling

Checked & authorised by :

	N	ame	: Lucy	Brown
Authorised Signatories:	L. Brown	Sensory Services Manager		ſ
	S. Purcell	Sensory Projects Group Manager		lanager
	J. Menneer	Sensory 7	raining Group M	Ianager
	E. Allchurch	Data Ana	lyst	
		•	COCED A	

This test report or certificate shall not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval of CCFRA. Confidentiality notice: The information in this document is only intended for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information that is exempt from disclosure by law and if you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this document in error, please notify CCFRA immediately by telephone.

Report No. FMT/REP/95900/Appendix 2

Page 1 of 13

U:\2007\CEL Fish\FIFG HPP project\Reports\Phase 1 report files



ISO 9001: 2000 Certified

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

SUMMARY

The aim of the project was to understand the effect of High Pressure Processing (HPP) on the sensory quality of a variety of fish and shellfish species.

Each species was subjected to a range of pressure/time/temperature combinations and a selection of samples were then evaluated to determine the effect on the sensory quality in terms of appearance, odour, flavour and texture.

This report details the results for Mussels.

SAMPLE INFORMATION

Date samples received:	15th February 2007
Condition on receipt:	Good
Storage conditions:	Chiller J
Date samples tested:	15th February 2007

FMT Label	Pressure	Time	Temp
	(MPa)	(mins)	(°C)
Control	n/a	n/a	n/a
Untreated (water)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Run 1	250	2.5	8.7
Run 2	280	1.0	13.2
Run 3	220	1.0	9.3
Run 4	250	2.5	9.2
Run 5	220	4.0	14
Run 6	280	4.0	13.6

Sample Preparation

Each sample was received from the FMT department raw and evaluated uncooked. The sample was then placed in a Pyrex bowl, covered and placed in a steamer, over a litre of boiling water in the base and steamed for 6 minutes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sensory Quality Grading (TES-S-021)

For each evaluation 9 mussels were assessed. All samples were presented under three-digit code to a panel of three experienced sensory assessors.

Each assessor independently described the uncooked appearance and odour and awarded an overall quality grade for the raw sample (using the scale shown below). The sample was then steamed and the assessors described the appearance, odour, flavour and texture/mouthfeel and awarded a quality grade for the cooked assessment. The consensus scores were calculated and the individual comments combined.

Assessment Scale – Sensory Quality

9	Excellent Quality
8	Very Good Quality
7	Good Quality
6	Fairly Good Quality
5	Satisfactory Quality
4	Just Acceptable Quality
3	Poor Quality
2	Very Poor Quality
1	Bad Quality

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A summary of the grades awarded are detailed order in the following table:

Sample Name	Treatment Details	Uncooked Quality Grade	Cooked Quality Grade
Control	Untreated	5	6
Untreated	Placed in water	5	6
Run 1	250 MPa 2.5 min –3.3°C	8	7
Run 2	280 MPa 1.0 min 0.4°C	8	8
Run 3	220 MPa 1.0 min 0.2°C	8	7
Run 4	250 MPa 2.5 min 0.5°C	8	7
Run 5	220 MPa 4.0 min 0.1°C	9	7
Run 6	280 MPa 4.0 min 0.1°C	9	6

The following graph shows both the uncooked and cooked assessment scores for ascending pressure treatments.



Mussels Sensory Quality Assessment

For the uncooked assessment all treated samples were consistently graded higher than the Control, with Run 5 and Run 6 graded the highest. All treated samples appeared plump and retained their shape much better than the Control. Run 5 and Run 6 were graded higher as they had a brighter appearance.

For the cooked assessment, again all treated samples were graded higher than the Control with the exception of Run 6 which was graded equally. Appearance was important, along with the texture. The treated samples retained their shape better, they were brighter and were all slightly less chewy than the Control. Run 2 was graded higher as it had a retained its shape better than the other runs.

Overall Run 2 appears to be the treatment with the most consistent effect on increasing sensory quality when compared to the Control sample.

Individual Comments and Quality Grades for the Raw and Cooked Assessments

	Raw Assessment Control (no water)
Appearance	• Very bright
	• Very moist
	• Range of colours from pale to deep beige/orange
	Moderate shape loss
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)

	Cooked Assessment Control (no water)
	Very bright
Annooronoo	Range of colours from pale to deep beige/orange
Appearance	Moderately uniform in size
	• Slight shape loss
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour
	Moderate mussel flavour
Flovour	• Moderately sweet
riavour	Moderately salty
	• Very slightly bitter
Texture/Mouthfeel	• Moderately firm bite
	Moderately moist
	Moderately chewy/rubbery
	Slightly/moderately fibrous
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)

	Raw Assessment Untreated (in water)
Appearance	• Very bright
	• Very moist
	Range of colours from pale to deep beige/orange
	Moderate shape loss
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)

	Cooked Assessment Untreated (in water)
	• Very bright
Appeorance	• Range of colours from pale to deep beige/orange
Appearance	Moderately uniform in size
	Moderate shape loss
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour
	Moderate mussel flavour
Flovour	• Moderately sweet
riavour	• Moderately salty
	• Very slightly bitter
Texture/Mouthfeel	• Moderately firm bite
	Moderately moist
	Moderately chewy/rubbery
	Slightly/moderately fibrous
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)

	Raw Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min –8.7°C (Run 1)
	• Very bright
Annearance	• Very moist
Appearance	Range of colours from pale to deep beige/orange
	• Plump with very little shape loss (i.e. excellent shape retention)
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)

	Cooked Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min –8.7°C (Run 1)
	• Very bright
Appearance	• Range of colours from pale to deep beige/orange
Appearance	• Moderately/very uniform in size
	• Plump with little shape loss (i.e. good shape retention)
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour
	Moderate mussel flavour
Flovour	• Moderately sweet
riavour	Moderately salty
	• Very slightly bitter
Texture/Mouthfeel	• Moderately firm bite
	Moderately moist
	• Slightly chewy/rubbery
	• Slightly/moderately fibrous
Overall Quality	7 (Very Good)

	Raw Assessment 280 MPa 1.0 min 13.2°C (Run 2)
Appearance	Very brightVery moist
	 Range of colours from pale to deep beige/orange Plump with very little shape loss (i.e. excellent shape retention)
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)

	Cooked Assessment 280 MPa 1.0 min 13.2°C (Run 2)
	• Very bright
Appearance	• Range of colours from pale to deep beige/orange
Appearance	• Moderately/very uniform in size
	• Plump with very little shape loss (i.e. excellent shape retention)
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour
	Moderate mussel flavour
Flovour	• Moderately sweet
riavour	Moderately salty
	• Very slightly bitter
Texture/Mouthfeel	• Moderately firm bite
	Moderately moist
	• Slightly chewy/rubbery
	Slightly/moderately fibrous
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)

	Raw Assessment 220 MPa 1.0 min 9.3 °C (Run 3)
Appearance	 Very bright Very moist Range of colours from pale to deep beige/orange Plump with very little shape loss (i.e. excellent shape retention)
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)

	Cooked Assessment 220 MPa 1.0 min 9.3°C (Run 3)
Appearance	 Very bright Range of colours from pale to deep beige/orange Moderately/very uniform in size
	Plump with little shape loss (i.e. good shape retention)
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour
	Moderate mussel flavour
Flavour	• Moderately sweet
riavoui	• Moderately salty
	• Very slightly bitter
Texture/Mouthfeel	• Moderately firm bite
	Moderately moist
	• Slightly chewy/rubbery
	Slightly/moderately fibrous
Overall Quality	7 (Very Good)

	Raw Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 9.2°C (Run 4)	
Appearance	 Very bright Very moist Range of colours from pale to deep beige/orange Plump with very little shape loss (i.e. excellent shape retention) 	
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour	
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)	

	Cooked Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 9.2°C (Run 4)		
	• Very bright		
Annearance	 Range of colours from pale to deep beige/orange 		
rippeurunee	Moderate/very uniform in size		
	• Plump with little shape loss (i.e. good shape retention)		
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour		
	• Moderate mussel flavour		
Flower	• Moderately sweet		
riavour	Moderately salty		
	• Very slightly bitter		
	• Moderately firm bite		
Torreturno /Mourehfool	Moderately moist		
I exture/Mouthleef	• Slightly chewy/rubbery		
	Slightly/moderately fibrous		
Overall Quality	7 (Very Good)		

	Raw Assessment 220 MPa 4.0 min 14 °C (Run 5)	
Appearance	 Extremely bright Very moist Range of colours from pale to deep beige/orange Very plump with very little shape loss (i.e. excellent shape retention) 	
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour	
Overall Quality	9 (Excellent)	

	Cooked Assessment 220 MPa 4.0 min 14°C (Run 5)		
Appearance	Very brightRange of colours from pale to deep beige/orange		
	Moderate/very uniform in sizePlump with little shape loss (i.e. good shape retention)		
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour		
Flavour	 Moderate mussel flavour Moderately sweet Moderately salty Very slightly bitter 		
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Moderately firm bite Moderate/very moist Slightly chewy/rubbery Moderately fibrous 		
Overall Quality	7 (Very Good)		

	Raw Assessment 280 MPa 4.0 min 13.6°C (Run 6)	
Appearance	 Extremely bright Very moist Range of colours from pale to deep beige/orange Very plump with very little shape loss (i.e. excellent shape retention) 	
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour	
Overall Quality	9 (Excellent)	

	Cooked Assessment 280 MPa 4.0 min 13.6°C (Run 6)		
	Moderately bright		
Annearance	 Range of colours from pale to deep beige/orange 		
Appearance	Moderately uniform in size		
	• Little shape loss (i.e. good shape retention), some slightly shrivelled		
Odour	Moderate/strong fresh odour		
	Moderate mussel flavour		
Flower	• Moderately sweet		
riavour	Moderately salty		
	• Very slightly bitter		
	• Moderately firm bite		
Toutune Mouthfool	Moderately moist		
l exture/Mouthfeel	• Slightly chewy/rubbery		
	Moderately fibrous		
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)		

CCFRA Technology Limited Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6LD, UK

Tel: +44 (0)1386 842000 Fax: +44 (0)1386 842100 www.campden.co.uk

Date: 24 May 2007

Craig Leadley Department of Food Manufacturing Technologies CCFRA Station Road Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6LD

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER & SENSORY SCIENCE

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

SENSORY QUALITY EVALUATION OF HIGH PRESSURE PROCESSED OYSTERS

Report No. S/REP/95900/3

Prepared by : Sue Burling

Checked & authorised by :

 Name
 :
 Lucy Brown

 Authorised Signatories:
 L. Brown
 Sensory Services Manager

 S. Purcell
 Sensory Projects Group Manager

 J. Menneer
 Sensory Training Group Manager

 E. Allchurch
 Data Analyst

This test report or certificate shall not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval of CCFRA. Confidentiality notice: The information in this document is only intended for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information that is exempt from disclosure by law and if you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this document in error, please notify CCFRA immediately by telephone.

Report No. S/REP/95900/Appendix 3

Page 1 of 13

U:\2007\CEL Fish\FIFG HPP project\Reports\Phase 1 report files



ISO 9001: 2000 Certified

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

SUMMARY

The aim of the project was to understand the effect of High Pressure Processing (HPP) on the sensory quality of a variety of fish and shellfish species.

Each species was subjected to a range of pressure/time/temperature combinations and a selection of samples were then evaluated to determine the effect on the sensory quality in terms of appearance, odour, flavour and texture.

This report details the results for Oysters.

SAMPLE INFORMATION

Date samples received:	7th March 2007
Condition on receipt:	Good
Storage conditions:	Chilled
Date samples tested:	7th March 2007

FMT Label	Pressure	Time	Temp
	(MPa)	(mins)	(°C)
Control	n/a	n/a	n/a
Untreated (water)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Run 1	250	2.5	12.3
Run 2	280	1.0	12.1
Run 3	220	1.0	11.3
Run 4	250	2.5	12.4
Run 5	220	4.0	12.1
Run 6	280	4.0	13.4

Sample Preparation

Each sample was received from the FMT department raw and evaluated uncooked. The sample was then placed in a Pyrex bowl, covered and placed in a steamer, over a litre of boiling water in the base and steamed for 6 minutes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sensory Quality Grading (TES-S-021)

For each evaluation eight oysters were assessed. All samples were presented under three-digit code to a panel of three experienced sensory assessors.

Each assessor independently described the uncooked appearance and odour and awarded an overall quality grade for the raw sample (using the scale shown below). The sample was then steamed and the assessors described the appearance, odour, flavour and texture/mouthfeel and awarded a quality grade for the cooked assessment. The consensus scores were calculated and the individual comments combined.

Assessment	Scale –	Sensory	Quality	
------------	---------	---------	---------	--

.

9	Excellent Quality
8	Very Good Quality
7	Good Quality
6	Fairly Good Quality
5	Satisfactory Quality
4	Just Acceptable Quality
3	Poor Quality
2	Very Poor Quality
1	Bad Quality

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A summary of the grades awarded are detailed in the following table:

Sample Name	Treatment Details	Uncooked Quality Grade	Cooked Quality Grade
Control	Untreated	5	6
Untreated	Placed in water	5	5
Run 1	250 MPa 2.5 min 12.3°C	8	7
Run 2	280 MPa 1.0 min 12.1°C	8	6
Run 3	220 MPa 1.0 min 11.3°C	7	6
Run 4	250 MPa 2.5 min 12.4°C	9	4
Run 5	220 MPa 4.0 min 12.1°C	7	7
Run 6	280 MPa 4.0 min 13.4°C	8	7

The following graph shows both the uncooked and cooked assessment scores for ascending pressure treatments.



Oysters Sensory Quality Assessment

For the uncooked assessment all the treated samples were graded higher than the Control, with Run 4 being graded the highest. All samples were brighter than the Control, very plump with little shape loss and all had a stronger fresh odour.

For the cooked assessment, Run 1, Run 5 and Run 6 were all graded higher than the Control as they were all plump with little shape loss and all had a stronger fresh odour. Run 1 was also described as brighter than the Control and less gritty. Run 4 was graded the lowest for the cooked assessment due to the presence of an off odour.

Overall, Run 1 and Run 6 appear to be the treatments with the most consistent effect on increasing sensory quality when compared to the Control sample. It may be worth considering Run 4 also, as it was only the off odour that resulted in the downgrade of the cooked sample, this may be due to natural variation within the raw material.

Individual Comments and Quality Grades for the Raw and Cooked Assessments

	Raw Assessment Control (no water)	
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately moist Range of colours from beige to grey/brown with distinct black frilled edges Slight shape loss 	
Odour	Moderate fresh odour	
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)	

	Cooked Assessment Control (no water)
Appearance	Moderately bright
	• Moderately dark in colour
	Slightly shrivelled
	• Slight shape loss
Odour	Moderate fresh odour
Flavour	• Moderate oyster flavour
	• Slightly sweet
	• Moderately salty and savoury
	• Slightly bitter
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm bite
	Moderately moist
	Slightly fibrous
	• Slightly gritty
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)

	Raw Assessment Untreated (in water)
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately moist Range of colours from beige to grey/brown with distinct black frilled edges Slight shape loss
Odour	Moderate fresh odour
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)

	Cooked Assessment Untreated (in water)
Appearance	Moderately bright
	• Moderately dark in colour
	Slightly shrivelled
	Moderate shape loss
Odour	Moderate fresh odour
Flavour	• Moderate oyster flavour
	• Slightly sweet
	Moderately salty and savoury
	• Slightly bitter
Texture/Mouthfeel	• Moderately firm bite
	Moderately moist
	Slightly fibrous
	• Slightly gritty
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)
	Raw Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 12.3°C (Run 1)
-----------------	---
Appearance	• Very bright
	• Very moist
	• Range of colours from beige to grey/brown with distinct black frilled edges
	• Very plump with no loss of shape
Odour	• Strong fresh odour
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)

	Cooked Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 12.3°C (Run 1)
A	 Very bright Mederately dark in colour
Appearance	 Woderately dark in colour Very plump with no loss of shape
Odour	Strong fresh odour
	Moderate oyster flavour
Flavour	• Slightly sweet
Tiavoui	• Moderately salty and savoury
	• Slightly bitter
	• Moderately firm bite
	Moderately moist
I exture/wioutifieer	Slightly fibrous
	• Slightly gritty
Overall Quality	7 (Good Quality)

	Raw Assessment 280 MPa 1.0 min 12.1°C (Run 2)
Appearance	 Very bright Very moist Range of colours from beige to grey/brown with distinct black frilled edges Very plump with no loss of shape
Odour	• Strong fresh odour
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)

	Cooked Assessment 280 MPa 1.0 min 12.1°C (Run 2)
	• Very bright
Appearance	Moderately dark in colour
	• Very plump with no loss of shape
Odour	• Strong fresh odour
	Moderate oyster flavour
Flovour	• Slightly sweet
riavoui	Moderately salty and savoury
	• Slightly bitter
	• Moderately firm bite
Toyturo/Mouthfool	Moderately moist
I exture/wioutifieer	Slightly fibrous
	• Very slightly gritty
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)

	Raw Assessment220 MPa 1.0 min 11.3°C (Run 3)
Appearance	 Very bright Very moist Range of colours from beige to grey/brown with distinct black frilled edges Very plump with very slight loss of shape
Odour	Strong fresh odour
Overall Quality	7 (Good)

	Cooked Assessment 220 MPa 1.0 min 11.3°C (Run 3)
Appearance	 Very bright Slightly dark in colour Very plump with no loss of shape
Odour	Strong fresh odour
Flavour	 Moderate oyster flavour Slightly sweet Moderately salty and savoury Slightly bitter
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Moderately firm bite Moderately moist Slightly fibrous Very slightly gritty
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)

	Raw Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 12.4°C (Run 4)
Appearance	 Very bright Very moist Range of colours from beige to grey/brown with distinct black frilled edges Extremely plump with no loss of shape
Odour	Strong fresh odour
Overall Quality	9 (Excellent)

	Cooked Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 12.4°C (Run 4)
	Moderately bright
Appearance	• Moderately dark in colour
	• Very plump with no loss of shape
Odour	Slight skatole/sewage note
	• Moderate oyster flavour
Flavour	• Very slightly sweet
	• Moderately salty and savoury
	• Slightly bitter
	• Moderately firm bite
	Moderately moist
I exture/wioutifieer	Slightly fibrous
	• Very slightly gritty
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)

	Raw Assessment 220 MPa 4.0 min 12.1°C (Run 5)
Appearance	 Very bright Very moist Range of colours from pale beige to grey/brown with distinct black frilled edges Very plump with very slight loss of shape
Odour	Strong fresh odour
Overall Quality	7 (Good)

	Cooked Assessment 220 MPa 4.0 min 12.1°C (Run 5)
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately dark in colour Very plump with no loss of shape
Odour	Strong fresh odour
Flavour	 Moderate oyster flavour Slightly sweet Moderately salty and savoury Slightly bitter
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Moderately firm bite Moderately moist Slightly fibrous Slightly gritty
Overall Quality	7 (Good Quality)

	Raw Assessment 280 MPa 4.0 min 13.4°C (Run 6)
Appearance	 Very bright Very moist Range of colours from beige to grey/brown with distinct black frilled edges Very plump with no loss of shape
Odour	Strong fresh odour
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)

	Cooked Assessment 280 MPa 4.0 min 13.4°C (Run 6)
	Moderately bright
Appearance	Moderately dark in colour
	• Very plump with no loss of shape
Odour	• Strong fresh odour
	Moderate oyster flavour
Flovour	• Slightly sweet
riavoui	Moderately salty and savoury
	• Slightly bitter
	• Moderately firm bite
Toytumo/Monthfool	Moderately moist
I exture/woutineer	Slightly fibrous
	• Slightly gritty
Overall Quality	7 (Good Quality)

CCFRA Technology Limited Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6LD, UK

Tel: +44 (0)1386 842000 Fax: +44 (0)1386 842100 www.campden.co.uk

Date: 15th June 2007

Craig Leadley Department of Food Manufacturing Technologies CCFRA Station Road Chipping Campden Gloucestershire **GL55 6LD**

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER & SENSORY SCIENCE

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

SENSORY QUALITY EVALUATION **OF HIGH PRESSURE PROCESSED CRAB**

Report No. S/REP/95900/4

Prepared by : Sue Burling

Checked & authorised by :

	N	ame	:	Lucy Brown
Authorised Signatories:	L. Brown	Sensory S	Services	Manager
	S. Purcell	Sensory I	Projects	Group Manager
	J. Menneer	Sensory 7	Fraining	Group Manager
	E. Allchurch	Data Ana	lyst	

This test report or certificate shall not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval of CCFRA. Confidentiality notice: The information in this document is only intended for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information that is exempt from disclosure by law and if you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this document in error, please notify CCFRA immediately by telephone.

Page 1 of 12



U:\2007\CEL Fish\FIFG HPP project\Reports\Phase 1 report files

ISO 9001: 2000 Certified

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

SUMMARY

The aim of the project was to understand the effect of High Pressure Processing (HPP) on the sensory quality of a variety of fish and shellfish species.

Each species was subjected to a range of pressure/time/temperature combinations and a selection of samples were then evaluated to determine the effect on the sensory quality in terms of appearance, odour, flavour and texture.

This report details the results for Crab.

SAMPLE INFORMATION

Date samples received:	27th March 2007
Condition on receipt:	Good
Storage conditions:	Chilled
Date samples tested:	27th March 2007

FMT Label	Pressure (MPa)	Time (mins)	Temp (°C)
Control	n/a	n/a	n/a
Run 1	250	2.5	12.1
Run 2	280	1.0	13.3
Run 3	220	1.0	12.8
Run 4	250	2.5	13
Run 5	220	4.0	12.3
Run 6	280	4.0	12.3

Sample Preparation

Each sample was received from the FMT department raw and evaluated uncooked, except for the control sample that was received cooked by the FMT department. The sample was then placed in a Pyrex bowl, covered and placed in a steamer, over a litre of boiling water in the base and steamed for 6 minutes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sensory Quality Grading (TES-S-021)

For each evaluation four claws were assessed. All samples were presented under three-digit code to a panel of three experienced sensory assessors.

Each assessor independently described the uncooked appearance and odour and awarded an overall quality grade for the raw sample (using the scale shown below). The sample was then steamed and the assessors described the appearance, odour, flavour and texture/mouthfeel and awarded a quality grade for the cooked assessment. The consensus scores were calculated and the individual comments combined.

9	Excellent Quality
8	Very Good Quality
7	Good Quality
6	Fairly Good Quality
5	Satisfactory Quality
4	Just Acceptable Quality
3	Poor Quality
2	Very Poor Quality
1	Bad Quality

Assessment Scale – Sensory Quality

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The weights were recorded before and after cooking, and the % weight loss calculated, for runs 3 - 6.

Sample Name	Treatment Details	Weight Raw	Weight Cooked	Weight Loss	% Weight Loss
Run 3	220 MPa 1.0 min 12.8°C	65.7g	61.6g	4.1g	6.24%
Run 4	250 MPa 2.5 min 13.0°C	66.0g	61.8g	4.2g	6.36%
Run 5	220 MPa 4.0 min 12.3°C	77.7g	72.5g	5.2g	6.69%
Run 6	280 MPa 4.0 min 12.3°C	62.4g	58.6g	3.8g	6.09%

Sample Name	Treatment Details	Uncooked Quality Grade	Cooked Quality Grade
Control	Untreated	Not Assessed	8
Run 1	250 MPa 2.5 min 12.1°C	8	5
Run 2	280 MPa 1.0 min 13.3°C	5	4
Run 3	220 MPa 1.0 min 12.8°C	7	7
Run 4	250 MPa 2.5 min 13.0°C	8	6
Run 5	220 MPa 4.0 min 12.3°C	7	6
Run 6	280 MPa 4.0 min 12.3°C	6	5

A summary of the grades awarded are detailed in the following table:

The following graph shows both the uncooked and cooked assessment scores for ascending pressure treatments.



For the uncooked assessment there was no Control sample for comparison. Run 1 and Run 4 were graded the highest, with less shape loss than the other samples. Run 2 was graded the lowest, with the most noticeable shape loss.

For the cooked assessment, none of the runs was graded as high as the Control. Run 3 had the highest grade, with a very fresh odour, and strong crab notes, with only slight loss of shape. Run 2 was graded the lowest, with marked loss of shape, and very slight bitter notes.

Individual Comments and Quality Grades for the Raw and Cooked Assessments

	Raw Assessment Control
Appearance	• Not Assessed
Odour	Not Assessed

	Cooked Assessment Control
Appearance	 Moderately bright Pink/cream in colour Very slight shape loss
Odour	• Very fresh odour
Flavour	 Strong crab flavour Slightly sweet Moderately salty Very slightly bitter
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteModerately moistSlightly fibrous
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)

	Raw Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 12.1°C (Run 1)
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately moist Range of colours from grey/brown to pink/cream
	• Very slight shape loss
Odour	• Very fresh odour
	8 (Very Good)

	Cooked Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 12.1°C (Run 1)
	Moderately bright
Appearance	• Pink/cream in colour
	• Slight shape loss
Odour	Moderate fresh odour
	Moderate crab flavour
Flovour	• Slightly sweet
riavoui	Moderately salty
	• Very slightly bitter
	• Slightly firm bite
Toyturo/Monthfool	Moderately moist
l exture/Mouthleel	Slightly fibrous
	• Very slightly gritty
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)

	Raw Assessment 280 MPa 1.0 min 13.3°C (Run 2)
	Moderately bright
Appearance	Moderately moist
	Range of colours from grey/brown to pink/cream
	• High amount of shape loss
Odour	• Very fresh odour
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)

	Cooked Assessment 280 MPa 1.0 min 13.3°C (Run 2)	
Appearance	 Moderately bright Pink/cream in colour 	
rippeurunee	• High amount of shape loss	
Odour	Moderate fresh odour	
	Moderate crab flavour	
Flavour	• Slightly sweet	
Flavoul	• Moderately salty	
	• Very slightly bitter	
	• Very slightly firm bite	
Towture Mouthfool	Moderately moist	
l exture/Mouthreel	• Slightly fibrous	
	Moderately gritty	
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)	

	Raw Assessment 220 MPa 1.0 min 12.8°C (Run 3)				
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately moist Range of colours from grey/brown to pink/cream Slight shape loss 				
Odour	Very fresh odour				
Overall Quality	7 (Good)				

	Cooked Assessment 220 MPa 1.0 min 12.8°C (Run 3)					
Appearance	 Moderately bright Pink/cream in colour Slight shape loss 					
Odour	Very fresh odour					
Flavour	 Strong crab flavour Slightly sweet Moderately salty Very slightly bitter 					
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteModerately moistSlightly fibrous					
Overall Quality	7 (Good)					

	Raw Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 13°C (Run 4)					
A	Moderately bright					
	Moderately moist					
Appearance	Range of colours from grey/brown to pink/cream					
	• Very slight shape loss					
Odour	• Very fresh odour					
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)					

	Cooked Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 13°C (Run 4)					
	Moderately bright					
Appearance	• Pink/cream in colour					
	• Very slight shape loss					
Odour	Moderate fresh odour					
	Strong crab flavour					
	• Slightly sweet					
Flavour	Moderately salty					
	• Very slightly bitter					
	• Very slight eggy note					
	• Moderately firm bite					
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately moist					
	Slightly fibrous					
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)					

	Raw Assessment 220 MPa 4.0 min 12.3°C (Run 5)				
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately moist Range of colours from grey/brown to pink/cream Slight shape loss 				
Odour	Very fresh odour				
Overall Quality	7 (Good)				

	Cooked Assessment 220 MPa 4.0 min 12.3°C (Run 5)					
Appearance	 Moderately bright Pink/cream in colour Slight shape loss 					
Odour	• Very fresh odour					
Flavour	 Strong crab flavour Slightly sweet Moderately salty Very slightly bitter Very slight eggy note 					
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteModerately moistSlightly fibrous					
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)					

	Raw Assessment 280 MPa 4.0 min 12.3°C (Run 6)					
	Slightly bright					
	Moderately moist					
Appearance	Range of colours from grey/brown to pink/cream					
	• Slight amount of shape loss					
	• Slightly sticky					
Odour	• Very fresh odour					
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)					

	Cooked Assessment 280 MPa 4.0 min 12.3°C (Run 6)					
	Moderately bright					
Appearance	Pink/cream in colour					
	• High amount of shape loss					
Odour	Very fresh odour					
	Strong crab flavour					
	• Slightly sweet					
Flavour	Moderately salty					
	• Very slightly bitter					
	• Very slight eggy note					
	• Slightly firm bite					
Toxturo/Mouthfool	Moderately moist					
I exture/wioutifieer	Slightly fibrous					
	Slightly gritty					
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)					

CCFRA Technology Limited Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6LD, UK

Tel: +44 (0)1386 842000 Fax: +44 (0)1386 842100 www.campden.co.uk

Date: 15th June 2007

Craig Leadley Department of Food Manufacturing Technologies CCFRA Station Road Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6LD

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER & SENSORY SCIENCE

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

SENSORY QUALITY EVALUATION OF HIGH PRESSURE PROCESSED COLD WATER PRAWNS

Report No. S/REP/95900/5

Prepared by : Sue Burling

Checked & authorised by :

Name : Lucy Brown

Authorised Signatories:

Sensory Services Manager Sensory Projects Group Manager Sensory Training Group Manager Data Analyst

This test report or certificate shall not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval of CCFRA. Confidentiality notice: The information in this document is only intended for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information that is exempt from disclosure by law and if you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this document in error, please notify CCFRA immediately by telephone.

Page 1 of 12

L. Brown

S. Purcell

J. Menneer

E. Allchurch

U:\2007\CEL Fish\FIFG HPP project\Reports\Phase 1 report files



ISO 9001: 2000 Certified

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

SUMMARY

The aim of the project was to understand the effect of High Pressure Processing (HPP) on the sensory quality of a variety of fish and shellfish species.

Each species was subjected to a range of pressure/time/temperature combinations and a selection of samples were then evaluated to determine the effect on the sensory quality in terms of appearance, odour, flavour and texture.

This report details the results for Cold Water Prawns.

SAMPLE INFORMATION

Date samples received:	19th April 2007		
Condition on receipt:	Good		
Storage conditions:	Chilled		
Date samples tested:	19th April 2007		

FMT Label	Pressure Time		Temp	
	(MPa)	(mins)	(°C)	
Control (untreated in water)	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Run 1	250	2.5	9.8	
Run 2	280	1.0	12.7	
Run 3	220	1.0	5.2	
Run 4	250	2.5	10	
Run 5	220	4.0	11	
Run 6	280	4.0	8.7	

Sample Preparation

Each sample was received from the FMT department raw and evaluated uncooked. The sample was then directly placed in a steamer, over half a litre of boiling water in the base and steamed for 1.5 minutes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sensory Quality Grading (TES-S-021)

For each evaluation approximately 60g of prawns were assessed. All samples were presented under three-digit code to a panel of three experienced sensory assessors.

Each assessor independently described the uncooked appearance and odour and awarded an overall quality grade for the raw sample (using the scale shown below). The sample was then steamed and the assessors described the appearance, odour, flavour and texture/mouthfeel and awarded a quality grade for the cooked assessment. The consensus scores were calculated and the individual comments combined.

9	Excellent Quality
8	Very Good Quality
7	Good Quality
6	Fairly Good Quality
5	Satisfactory Quality
4	Just Acceptable Quality
3	Poor Quality
2	Very Poor Quality
1	Bad Quality

Assessment Scale – Sensory Quality

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The weights were recorded before and after cooking, and the % weight loss calculated.

Sample Name	Treatment Details	Weight Raw (g)	Weight Cooked (g)	Weight Loss (g)	% Weight Loss
Control	Placed in water	68.9	47.3	21.6	31.3
Run 1	250 MPa 2.5 min 9.8 °C	68.5	48.2	20.3	29.6
Run 2	280 MPa 1.0 min 12.7 °C	69.2	49.3	19.9	28.8
Run 3	220 MPa 1.0 min 5.2 °C	63.5	47.7	15.8	24.9
Run 4	250 MPa 2.5 min 10 °C	62.5	39.9	22.6	36.2
Run 5	220 MPa 4.0 min 11 °C	65.3	40.5	24.8	38.0
Run 6	280 MPa 4.0 min 8.7 °C	61.8	41.6	20.2	32.7

Sample Name	Treatment Details	Uncooked Quality Grade	Cooked Quality Grade
Control	Untreated placed in water	7	7
Run 1	250 MPa 2.5 min 9.8 °C	7	7
Run 2	280 MPa 1.0 min 12.7 °C	6	7
Run 3	220 MPa 1.0 min 5.2 °C	6	4
Run 4	250 MPa 2.5 min 10 °C	5	4
Run 5	220 MPa 4.0 min 11 °C	5	4
Run 6	280 MPa 4.0 min 8.7 °C	4	4

A summary of the grades awarded are detailed in the following table:

The following graph shows both the uncooked and cooked assessment scores for ascending pressure treatments.



Cold Water Prawns Sensory Quality Assessment

For the uncooked assessment none of the runs was graded higher than the Control. Run 1 was graded equal to the Control sample, and all other Runs were graded lower than the Control, with Run 6 achieving the lowest grade. This was due to less retention of the tip end, and more shape loss.

For the cooked assessment the Control, Run 1 and Run 2 were graded the highest. The other runs were all graded as 'Just Acceptable' due to some eggy notes in the odour, and less prawn flavour.

Individual Comments and Quality Grades for the Raw and Cooked Assessments

	Raw Assessment Control (in water)
	Very bright
	Moderately moist
Appearance	Moderately pink in colour
	Slightly translucent
	• High retention of tip end
	Moderate amount of retained membrane
	Slight shape loss
Odour	Very fresh odour
Overall Quality	7 (Good)

	Cooked Assessment Control (in water)
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately pink in colour
	• Slight shape loss
Odour	Very fresh odour
Flavour	Strong prawn flavour
	• Moderately sweet
	Slightly salty
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm bite
	Moderately moist
	Slightly fibrous
Overall Quality	7 (Good)

	Raw Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 9.8 °C (Run 1)
	Very bright
	Moderately moist
	• Moderately pink in colour
Appearance	Slightly translucent
	• High retention of tip end
	High amount of retained membrane
	Slight shape loss
Odour	• Very fresh odour
Overall Quality	7 (Good)

	Cooked Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 9.8 °C (Run 1)
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately pink in colour
Appearance	 Moderate shape loss
Odour	Very fresh odour
Flavour	 Strong prawn flavour Moderately sweet Slightly salty
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Moderately firm bite Moderately moist Slightly fibrous
Overall Quality	7 (Good)

	Raw Assessment 280 MPa 1.0 min 12.7 °C (Run 2)
	Moderately bright
	Moderately moist
	Moderately pink in colour
Appearance	• Slightly translucent
	• Moderate retention of tip end
	Moderate amount of retained membrane
	Moderate shape loss
Odour	• Very fresh odour
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)

	Cooked Assessment 280 MPa 1.0 min 12.7 °C (Run 2)
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately pink in colour Moderate shape loss
Odour	Very fresh odour
Flavour	 Strong prawn flavour Moderately sweet Slightly salty
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Moderately firm bite Moderately moist Slightly fibrous
Overall Quality	7 (Good)

	Raw Assessment 220 MPa 1.0 min 5.2 °C (Run 3)
	• Very bright
	Moderately moist
	• Moderately pink in colour
Appearance	Slightly translucent
	• Moderate retention of tip end
	Moderate amount of retained membrane
	Slight shape loss
Odour	• Very fresh odour
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)

	Cooked Assessment 220 MPa 1.0 min 5.2 °C (Run 3)
Appearance	 Slightly bright Moderately pink in colour.
	Moderate shape loss
Odour	Moderate fresh odour
	• Slightly gassy/eggy note
	Moderate prawn flavour
Flavour	• Slightly sweet
riavoui	• Slightly salty
	• Slight eggy note
	Moderately firm bite
Texture/Mouthfeel	Slightly moist
	Slightly fibrous
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)

	Raw Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 10 °C (Run 4)
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately moist Moderately pink in colour Slightly translucent Slight retention of tip end Moderate amount of retained membrane Moderate shape loss
Odour	Moderate fresh odour
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)

	Cooked Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 10 °C (Run 4)
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately pink in colour Moderate shape loss
Odour	Moderate fresh odour
Flavour	 Moderate prawn flavour Slightly sweet Slightly salty Slight eggy, seawater, bitter notes
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteModerately moistModerately fibrous
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)

	Raw Assessment 220 MPa 4.0 min 11 °C (Run 5)
	Moderately bright
	Moderately moist
	• Moderately pink in colour
Appearance	Slightly translucent
	• Slight retention of tip end
	Moderate amount of retained membrane
	Moderate shape loss
Odour	Moderate fresh odour
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)

	Cooked Assessment 220 MPa 4.0 min 11 °C (Run 5)			
Appearance	 Slightly bright Moderately pink in colour 			
	 High shape loss 			
Odour	Moderate fresh odour			
	• Slight eggy note			
	• Moderate prawn flavour			
Flavour	• Slightly sweet			
riavoui	Slightly salty			
	• Slight eggy note			
	• Moderately firm bite			
Texture/Mouthfeel	Slightly moist			
	Slightly fibrous			
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)			

	Raw Assessment 280 MPa 4.0 min 8.7 °C (Run 6)		
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately moist Moderately pink in colour Slightly translucent Very slight retention of tip end Slight amount of retained membrane Moderate shape loss 		
Odour	Moderate fresh odour		
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)		

	Cooked Assessment 280 MPa 4.0 min 8.7 °C (Run 6)		
Appearance	Slightly brightModerately pink in colourModerate shape loss		
Odour	Moderate fresh odour		
Flavour	 Moderate prawn flavour Slightly sweet Slightly salty Slight eggy note 		
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteSlightly moistSlightly fibrous		
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)		

CCFRA Technology Limited Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6LD, UK

Tel: +44 (0)1386 842000 Fax: +44 (0)1386 842100 www.campden.co.uk

Date: 15th June 2007

Craig Leadley Department of Food Manufacturing Technologies CCFRA Station Road Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6LD

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER & SENSORY SCIENCE

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

SENSORY QUALITY EVALUATION OF HIGH PRESSURE PROCESSED LOBSTER

Report No. S/REP/95900/6

Prepared by : Sue Burling

Checked & authorised by :

Name : Lucy Brown

Authorised Signatories:

Sensory Services Manager Sensory Projects Group Manager Data Analyst

S. Purcell Sensory J E. Allchurch Data Ana

L. Brown

This test report or certificate shall not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval of CCFRA. Confidentiality notice: The information in this document is only intended for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information that is exempt from disclosure by law and if you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this document in error, please notify CCFRA immediately by telephone.

Report No. S/REP/95900/Appendix 6

Page 1 of 13

U:\2007\CEL Fish\FIFG HPP project\Reports\Phase 1 report files



ISO 9001: 2000 Certified

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

SUMMARY

The aim of the project was to understand the effect of High Pressure Processing (HPP) on the sensory quality of a variety of fish and shellfish species.

Each species was subjected to a range of pressure/time/temperature combinations and a selection of samples were then evaluated to determine the effect on the sensory quality in terms of appearance, odour, flavour and texture.

This report details the results for Lobster.

SAMPLE INFORMATION

Date samples received:	1st May 2007
Condition on receipt:	Good
Storage conditions:	Chilled
Date samples tested:	1st May 2007

FMT Label	Pressure (MPa)	Time (mins)	Temp (°C)
Control	n/a	n/a	n/a
Run 1	250	2.5	18.1
Run 2	280	1.0	16.5
Run 3	220	1.0	6.1
Run 4	250	2.5	16.7
Run 5	220	4.0	17
Run 6	280	4.0	16

Sample Preparation

Each sample was received from the FMT department raw and evaluated uncooked except for the control sample, which was received cooked by FMT. The sample was placed in a polythene bag, sealed and placed in a steamer, over a litre of boiling water in the base and steamed for 15 minutes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sensory Quality Grading (TES-S-021)

For each evaluation one tail was assessed. All samples were presented under three-digit code to a panel of three experienced sensory assessors.

Each assessor independently described the uncooked appearance and odour and awarded an overall quality grade for the raw sample (using the scale shown below). The sample was then steamed and the assessors described the appearance, odour, flavour and texture/mouthfeel and awarded a quality grade for the cooked assessment. The consensus scores were calculated and the individual comments combined.

Assessment Scale – Sensory Quality	

9	Excellent Quality
8	Very Good Quality
7	Good Quality
6	Fairly Good Quality
5	Satisfactory Quality
4	Just Acceptable Quality
3	Poor Quality
2	Very Poor Quality
1	Bad Quality

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The weights were recorded before and after cooking and the % weight loss calculated.

Sample Name	Treatment Details	Weight Raw (g)	Weight Cooked (g)	Weight Loss (g)	% Weight Loss
Control	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Run 1	250 MPa 2.5 min 18.1 °C	126.5	111.1	15.4	12.2
Run 2	280 MPa 1.0 min 16.5 °C	119.9	101.5	18.4	15.3
Run 3	220 MPa 1.0 min 6.1 °C	110.9	93	17.9	16.1
Run 4	250 MPa 2.5 min 16.7 °C	117.3	99.2	18.1	15.4
Run 5	220 MPa 4.0 min 17 °C	100.2	85.1	15.1	15.1
Run 6	280 MPa 4.0 min 16 °C	123.7	109.8	13.9	11.2
Sample Name	Treatment Details	Uncooked Quality Grade	Cooked Quality Grade		
-------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------------		
Control	Untreated	Not Assessed	5		
Run 1	250 MPa 2.5 min 18.1 °C	8	8		
Run 2	280 MPa 1.0 min 16.5 °C	5	7		
Run 3	220 MPa 1.0 min 6.1 °C	4	4		
Run 4	250 MPa 2.5 min 16.7 °C	6	8		
Run 5	220 MPa 4.0 min 17 °C	8	6		
Run 6	280 MPa 4.0 min 16 °C	5	4		

A summary of the grades awarded are detailed in the following table:

The following graph shows both the uncooked and cooked assessment scores for ascending pressure treatments.



Lobster Sensory Quality Assessment

For the uncooked assessment there was no Control sample for comparison. Run 1 and Run 5 were graded the highest, with bright clean, white flesh and no loss of shape. Run 2, Run 3 and Run 6 were graded the lowest, with some grey tints in the flesh, and some loss of shape, which was most noticeable in Run 3, which showed complete breakdown.

For the cooked assessment, four runs were graded higher than the Control, which was found to be very fibrous, chewy and rubbery in texture. Runs 1 and Run 4 were graded the highest, with bright, clean flesh, slightly sweet fresh lobster flavour, and some fibrousness. Run 2 and Run 5 were also graded higher than the Control, with moderately bright flesh, with only slight yellow or grey tints. Run 3 and

Run 6 were graded the lowest, both with some sewage/skatole notes in the odour, and complete shape loss in Run 3.

Individual Comments and Quality Grades for the Raw and Cooked Assessments

	Raw Assessment Control
Appearance	• Not Assessed
Odour	Not Assessed

	Cooked Assessment Control
Appearance	Moderately brightFlesh grey/brown tints
	Slight shape loss
Odour	• Very fresh odour
	Strong lobster flavour
Flavour	• Slightly sweet
	• Slightly salty
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm bite
	Slightly moist
	• Very fibrous, chewy and rubbery
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)

	Raw Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 18.1 °C (Run 1)
Appearance	• Very bright
	Moderately moist
	• Flesh clean and white
	• No loss of shape
Odour	• Very fresh odour
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)

	Cooked Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 18.1°C (Run 1)
	• Very bright
Appearance	 Flesh white and clean Very slight shape loss
Odour	Moderately fresh odour
Flavour	 Strong lobster flavour Slightly sweet Slightly salty
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteModerately moistSlightly fibrous
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)

	Raw Assessment 280 MPa 1.0 min 16.5 °C (Run 2)
Appearance	Moderately bright
	Slightly moist
	• Flesh grey with yellow tints
	• Slight shape loss
Odour	Moderately fresh odour
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)

	Cooked Assessment 280 MPa 1.0 min 16.5 °C (Run 2)
Appearance	 Moderately bright Flesh white with yellow tints Very slight shape loss
Odour	Moderately fresh odour
Flavour	Moderate lobster flavourSlightly sweetSlightly salty
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Moderately firm bite Moderately moist Moderately fibrous
Overall Quality	7 (Good)

	Raw Assessment 220 MPa 1.0 min 6.1 °C (Run 3)
Appearance	Moderately bright
	Moderately moist
	• Flesh grey with yellow tints
	• Complete shape loss (broken down)
Odour	• Very fresh odour
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)

	Cooked Assessment 220 MPa 1.0 min 6.1 °C (Run 3)
Appearance	 Moderately bright Flesh grey/green tints Complete shape loss (broken down)
Odour	Slightly fresh odourSlight sewage/skatole note
Flavour	Moderate lobster flavourSlightly sweetSlightly salty
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteModerately moistModerately fibrous
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)

	Raw Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 16.7°C (Run 4)
Appearance	 Moderately bright Very moist Flesh grey with yellow tints No loss of shape
Odour	Moderate fresh odour
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)

	Cooked Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 16.7°C (Run 4)
Appearance	Very brightFlesh clean and white with slight pink tintsNo loss of shape
Odour	• Very fresh odour
Flavour	 Strong lobster flavour Moderately sweet Slightly salty
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteModerately moistModerately fibrous
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)

	Raw Assessment 220 MPa 4.0 min 17 °C (Run 5)
Appearance	Moderately bright
	Moderately moist
	• Flesh clean and white
	• No loss of shape
Odour	Moderate fresh odour
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)

	Cooked Assessment 220 MPa 4.0 min 17 °C (Run 5)		
Appearance	 Moderately bright Flesh grey tints Slight shape loss 		
Odour	Moderately fresh odour		
Flavour	Moderate lobster flavourSlightly sweetSlightly salty		
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Moderately firm bite Moderately moist Moderately fibrous 		
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)		

	Raw Assessment 280 MPa 4.0 min 16 °C (Run 6)
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately moist Flesh grey/blue tints Slight shape loss
Odour	Moderate fresh odour
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)

	Cooked Assessment 280 MPa 4.0 min 16 °C (Run 6)	
Appearance	Very brightFlesh white with pink tintsNo loss of shape	
Odour	Slightly fresh odourSlight sewage/skatole note	
Flavour	Moderate lobster flavourSlightly sweetSlightly salty	
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteModerately moistModerately fibrous	
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)	

CCFRA Technology Limited Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6LD, UK

Tel: +44 (0)1386 842000 Fax: +44 (0)1386 842100 www.campden.co.uk

Date: 15th June 2007

Craig Leadley Department of Food Manufacturing Technologies CCFRA Station Road Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6LD

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER & SENSORY SCIENCE

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

SENSORY QUALITY EVALUATION OF HIGH PRESSURE PROCESSED WARM WATER PRAWNS

Report No. S/REP/95900/7

Prepared by : Sue Burling

Checked & authorised by :

Name : Lucy Brown

Authorised Signatories:

Sensory Services Manager Sensory Projects Group Manager Sensory Training Group Manager Data Analyst

This test report or certificate shall not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval of CCFRA. Confidentiality notice: The information in this document is only intended for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information that is exempt from disclosure by law and if you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this document in error, please notify CCFRA immediately by telephone.

L. Brown

S. Purcell

J. Menneer

E. Allchurch

U:\2007\CEL Fish\FIFG HPP project\Reports\Phase 1 report files



ISO 9001: 2000 Certified

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

SUMMARY

The aim of the project was to understand the effect of High Pressure Processing (HPP) on the sensory quality of a variety of fish and shellfish species.

Each species was subjected to a range of pressure/time/temperature combinations and a selection of samples were then evaluated to determine the effect on the sensory quality in terms of appearance, odour, flavour and texture.

This report details the results for Warm Water Prawns.

SAMPLE INFORMATION

Date samples received:	17 th May 2007
Condition on receipt:	Good
Storage conditions:	Chilled
Date samples tested:	17 th May 2007

FMT Label	Pressure (MPa)	Time (mins)	Temp (°C)
Control (untreated in water)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Run 1	250	2.5	14.4
Run 2	280	1.0	11.9
Run 3	220	1.0	2.8
Run 4	250	2.5	12
Run 5	220	4.0	13.6
Run 6	280	4.0	7.4

Sample Preparation

Each sample was received from the FMT department raw and evaluated uncooked. The sample was then placed directly in a steamer, over half a litre of boiling water in the base and steamed for 1.75 minutes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sensory Quality Grading (TES-S-021)

For each evaluation 8 warm water prawns were assessed. All samples were presented under three-digit code to a panel of three experienced sensory assessors.

Each assessor independently described the uncooked appearance and odour and awarded an overall quality grade for the raw sample (using the scale shown below). The sample was then steamed and the assessors described the appearance, odour, flavour and texture/mouthfeel and awarded a quality grade for the cooked assessment. The consensus scores were calculated and the individual comments combined.

9	Excellent Quality
8	Very Good Quality
7	Good Quality
6	Fairly Good Quality
5	Satisfactory Quality
4	Just Acceptable Quality
3	Poor Quality
2	Very Poor Quality
1	Bad Quality

Assessment Scale – Sensory Quality

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The weights were recorded before and after cooking, and the % weight loss calculated.

Sample Name	Treatment Details	Weight Raw (g)	Weight Cooked (g)	Weight Loss (g)	% Weight Loss
Control	N/A	102.6	96.8	5.8	5.7
Run 1	250 MPa 2.5 min 14.4 °C	105.9	104.2	1.7	1.6
Run 2	280 MPa 1.0 min 11.9 °C	106.1	105.0	1.1	1.0
Run 3	220 MPa 1.0 min 2.8 °C	108.0	103.3	4.7	4.4
Run 4	250 MPa 2.5 min 12 °C	104.2	96.9	7.3	7.0
Run 5	220 MPa 4.0 min 13.6 °C	105.8	100.9	4.9	4.6
Run 6	280 MPa 4.0 min 7.4 °C	102.6	95.4	7.2	7.0

Sample Name	Treatment Details	Uncooked Quality Grade	Cooked Quality Grade
Control	Untreated placed in water	7	8
Run 1	250 MPa 2.5 min 14.4 °C	8	7
Run 2	280 MPa 1.0 min 11.9 °C	6	6
Run 3	220 MPa 1.0 min 2.8 °C	8	8
Run 4	250 MPa 2.5 min 12 °C	6	6
Run 5	220 MPa 4.0 min 13.6 °C	7	7
Run 6	280 MPa 4.0 min 7.4 °C	6	6

A summary of the grades awarded are detailed in the following table:

The following graph shows both the uncooked and cooked assessment scores for ascending pressure treatments.



Warm Water Prawns Sensory Quality Assessment

For the uncooked assessment Run 1 and Run 3 were both graded higher than the Control sample, both had better retention of the tips ends. Run 5 was graded equal to the Control, whereas Run 2, Run 4 and Run 6 were all graded lower. These were all less grey with green/yellow tints and they had more shape loss and less retained membrane.

For the cooked assessment the Control and Run 3 were graded the highest. The others all displayed shape loss and a woollier appearance.

Individual Comments and Quality Grades for the Raw and Cooked Assessments

	Raw Assessment Control
	Moderately bright
	Moderately moist
	Moderately grey/blue in colour
Appearance	Slightly translucent
	• Very slight retention of tip end
	High amount of retained membrane
	• Slight shape loss
Odour	• Very fresh odour
Overall Quality	7 (Good)

	Cooked Assessment Control	
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately coral pink in colour Very slight shape loss 	
Odour	• Very fresh odour	
Flavour	Strong prawn flavourModerately sweetSlightly salty	
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteModerately moistSlightly fibrous	
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)	

	Raw Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 14.4 °C (Run 1)	
	Moderately bright	
	Moderately moist	
	Moderately grey/blue in colour	
Appearance	Slightly translucent	
	• Moderate retention of tip end	
	High amount of retained membrane	
	• Slight shape loss	
Odour	• Very fresh odour	
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)	

	Cooked Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 14.4 °C (Run 1)		
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately coral pink in colour Slight shape loss with a slightly woolly appearance 		
Odour	Very fresh odour		
Flavour	Strong prawn flavourModerately sweetSlightly salty		
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteModerately moistSlightly fibrous		
Overall Quality	7 (Good)		

	Raw Assessment 280 MPa 1.0 min 11.9 °C (Run 2)		
	Moderately bright		
	Moderately moist		
	• Slightly grey/blue in colour with green/yellow		
Appearance	Slightly translucent		
	• Moderate retention of tip end		
	High amount of retained membrane		
	• Slight shape loss		
Odour	• Very fresh odour		
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)		

	Cooked Assessment 280 MPa 1.0 min 11.9 °C (Run 2)			
Appearance	Slightly brightModerately coral pink in colour with slight grey tints			
	• Very slight shape loss with a slightly woolly appearance			
Odour	Moderately fresh odour			
	Strong prawn flavour			
Flavour	• Slightly sweet and slightly savoury			
	Slightly salty			
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm bite			
	Moderately moist			
	Slightly fibrous			
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)			

	Raw Assessment 220 MPa 1.0 min 2.8 °C (Run 3)		
	Moderately bright		
	Moderately moist		
	• Moderately grey/blue in colour very slight green/yellow tints		
Appearance	Slightly translucent		
	• 100% retention of tip end		
	High amount of retained membrane		
	Slight shape loss		
Odour	• Very fresh odour		
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)		

	Cooked Assessment 220 MPa 1.0 min 2.8 °C (Run 3)			
Annosranca	 Moderately bright Moderately corpl pink in colour 			
Appearance	 Very slight shape loss 			
Odour	Very fresh odour			
	Strong prawn flavour			
Flavour	Moderately sweet			
	Slightly salty			
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm bite			
	Moderately moist			
	Slightly fibrous			
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)			

	Raw Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 12 °C (Run 4)		
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately moist Slightly grey/blue in colour with green/yellow tints Slightly translucent Moderate retention of tip end High amount of retained membrane Slight shape loss 		
Odour	Very fresh odour		
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)		

	Cooked Assessment 250 MPa 2.5 min 12 °C (Run 4)		
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately coral pink in colour Very slight shape loss with a slightly woolly appearance 		
Odour	• Very fresh odour		
Flavour	 Strong prawn flavour Moderately sweet Slightly salty 		
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteModerately moistSlightly fibrous		
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)		

	Raw Assessment 220 MPa 4.0 min 13.6 °C (Run 5)		
	Moderately bright		
	Moderately moist		
Appearance	• Moderately grey/blue in colour with very slight green/yellow tints		
	• Slightly translucent		
	• High retention of tip end		
	High amount of retained membrane		
	• Slight shape loss		
Odour	• Very fresh odour		
Overall Quality	7 (Good)		

	Cooked Assessment 220 MPa 4.0 min 13.6 °C (Run 5)			
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately coral pink in colour Slight shape loss with a slightly woolly appearance 			
Odour	Very fresh odour			
Flavour	 Strong prawn flavour Moderately sweet Slightly salty 			
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Moderately firm bite Moderately moist Slightly fibrous 			
Overall Quality	7 (Good)			

	Raw Assessment 280 MPa 4.0 min 7.4 °C (Run 6)		
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately moist Moderately grey/blue in colour with slight yellow/green tints Slightly translucent Slight retention of tip end High amount of retained membrane 		
Odour	Slight shape loss Very fresh odour		
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)		

	Cooked Assessment 280 MPa 4.0 min 7.4 °C (Run 6)		
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately coral pink in colour Slight shape loss with a slightly woolly appearance 		
Odour	• Very fresh odour		
Flavour	Strong prawn flavourModerately sweetSlightly salty		
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteModerately moistSlightly fibrous		
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)		

CCFRA Technology Limited Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6LD, UK

Tel: +44 (0)1386 842000 Fax: +44 (0)1386 842100 www.campden.co.uk

Date: 15th June 2007

Craig Leadley Department of Food Manufacturing Technologies CCFRA Station Road Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6LD

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER & SENSORY SCIENCE

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

SENSORY QUALITY EVALUATION OF HIGH PRESSURE PROCESSED SALMON

Report No. S/REP/95900/8

Prepared by : Sue Burling

Checked & authorised by :

Name : Lucy Brown

Authorised Signatories:

Sensory Services Manager Sensory Projects Group Manager Data Analyst

This test report or certificate shall not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval of CCFRA.

Confidentiality notice: The information in this document is only intended for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information that is exempt from disclosure by law and if you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this document in error, please notify CCFRA immediately by telephone.

Report No. S/REP/95900/Appendix 8

Page 1 of 12

L. Brown

S. Purcell

E. Allchurch

U:\2007\CEL Fish\FIFG HPP project\Reports\Phase 1 report files



ISO 9001: 2000 Certified

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

SUMMARY

The aim of the project was to understand the effect of High Pressure Processing (HPP) on the sensory quality of a variety of fish and shellfish species.

Each species was subjected to a range of pressure/time/temperature combinations and a selection of samples were then evaluated to determine the effect on the sensory quality in terms of appearance, odour, flavour and texture.

This report details the results for Salmon.

SAMPLE INFORMATION

Date samples received:	12th June 2007
Condition on receipt:	Good
Storage conditions:	Chilled
Date samples tested:	13th June 2007

FMT Label	Pressure (MPa)	Time (mins)	Temp (°C)
Control	n/a	n/a	n/a
Run 1	425	3	6
Run 8	250	3	12
Run 10	425	5	13
Run 11	425	3	13
Run 14	600	3	14
Run 20	425	3	17

Sample Preparation

Each sample was received from the FMT department raw and evaluated uncooked. The sample was then placed directly in a steamer, over half a litre of boiling water in the base and steamed for between 7 and 13 minutes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sensory Quality Grading (TES-S-021)

For each evaluation one fillet was assessed. All samples were presented under three-digit code to a panel of three experienced sensory assessors.

Each assessor independently described the uncooked appearance and odour and awarded an overall quality grade for the raw sample (using the scale shown below). The sample was then steamed and the assessors described the appearance, odour, flavour and texture/mouthfeel and awarded a quality grade for the cooked assessment. The consensus scores were calculated and the individual comments combined.

9	Excellent Quality
8	Very Good Quality
7	Good Quality
6	Fairly Good Quality
5	Satisfactory Quality
4	Just Acceptable Quality
3	Poor Quality
2	Very Poor Quality
1	Bad Quality

Assessment Scale – Sensory Quality

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The weights were recorded before and after cooking and the % weight loss calculated.

Sample Name	Treatment Details	Weight Raw (g)	Weight Cooked (g)	Weight Loss (g)	% Weight Loss
Control	n/a	179.2	148.8	30.4	17.0
Run 1	425 Mpa 3 min 6 °C	171.5	144.8	26.7	15.6
Run 8	250 Mpa 3 min 12 °C	242.2	201.6	40.6	16.8
Run 10	425 Mpa 5 min 13 °C	176.9	150.9	26	14.7
Run 11	425 Mpa 3 min 13 °C	146.0	124.1	21.9	15.0
Run 14	600 Mpa 3 min 14 °C	178.5	141.5	37	20.7
Run 20	425 Mpa 3 min 17 °C	129.3	108.7	20.6	15.9

Sample Name	Treatment Details	Uncooked Quality Grade	Cooked Quality Grade
Control	N/A	8	8
Run 1	425 MPa 3 min 6 °C	3	4
Run 8	250 MPa 3 min 12 °C	4	7
Run 10	425 MPa 5 min 13 °C	3	3
Run 11	425 MPa 3 min 13 °C	3	5
Run 14	600 MPa 3 min 14 °C	4	4
Run 20	425 MPa 3 min 17 °C	5	6

A summary of the grades awarded are detailed in the following table:

The following graph shows both the uncooked and cooked assessment scores for ascending pressure treatments.

9 8 -6 Quality Grade (1-9) 5 4 Uncooked 2 Cooked 1 0 Control 425 MPa 3 min 425 MPa 3 min 250 MPa 3 min 425 MPa 3 min 425 MPa 5 min 600 MPa 3 min 14 ºC (Run 14) 12 ºC (Bun 8) 6 ºC (Run 1) 13 ºC (Run 11) 17 ºC (Run 20) 13 ºC (Run 10) Sample

Salmon Sensory Quality Assessment

For the uncooked assessment none of the samples were graded as high as the Control, which was bright and moist. Run 20 was graded the highest, with dense, moderately bright flesh. Run 1 and Run 11 were graded the lowest, with very dense, compressed flesh, and no defined flake structure.

For the cooked assessment none of the samples were graded as high as the Control, which was bright and moist, with a very fresh odour. Run 8 and Run 20 were graded the highest, with moderately bright flesh, and expected balanced flavour. Run 1, Run 10 and Run 14 were graded the lowest, being pale in colour, and with a very fibrous, tough texture.

Individual Comments and Quality Grades for the Raw and Cooked Assessments

	Raw Assessment Control
Annearance	Very brightModerately moist
Appearance	Moderately pink/orange in colourWell defined flakes
Odour	• Very fresh odour
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)

	Cooked Assessment Control		
Appearance	Moderately brightSlightly pale pink in colour		
	• Slight shape loss		
Odour	• Very fresh odour		
	Moderate salmon flavour		
Flavour	• Slightly sweet		
Flavour	• Slightly salty		
	• Slightly earthy		
	• Slightly firm bite		
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately moist		
	Slightly fibrous		
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)		

	Raw Assessment 425 MPa 3 min 6 °C (Run 1)
	Moderately bright
Appearance	Moderately moist
	Pale creamy pink in colour
	• No defined flakes
	• Very dense, smooth and compressed to shape of packaging
	• Does not resemble a raw fresh salmon fillet
Odour	Moderately fresh odour
Overall Quality	3 (Poor)

	Cooked Assessment 425 MPa 3 min 6 °C (Run 1)
Appearance	Slightly brightModerately pale pink in colour with grey tintsRetained moulded packaging shape
Odour	• Very fresh odour
Flavour	 Moderate salmon flavour Slightly sweet Slightly salty Slightly earthy Slightly oily
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteModerately moistVery fibrous, moderately tough and chewy
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)

	Raw Assessment 250 MPa 3 min 12 °C (Run 8)	
	Moderately bright	
Appearance	Moderately moist	
	• Moderately creamy pink with purple tints in colour	
	Slight defined flakes	
	• Slightly dense, smooth and compressed to shape of packaging	
	• Does not resemble a raw fresh salmon fillet	
Odour	• Moderately fresh odour	
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)	

	Cooked Assessment 250 MPa 3 min 12 °C (Run 8)
	Moderately bright
Appearance	• Slightly pale pink in colour
	• Slight shape loss
Odour	Moderately fresh odour
	Moderate salmon flavour
	• Slightly sweet
Flavour	• Slightly salty
	• Slightly earthy
	• Slightly oily
	• Slightly firm bite
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately moist
	Slightly fibrous
Overall Quality	7 (Good)

	Raw Assessment 425 MPa 5 min 13 °C (Run 10)
	Moderately bright
Annosranca	Moderately moist
	 Moderately creamy pink with purple tints in colour
Appearance	• Slight defined flakes
	• Very dense, smooth and compressed to shape of packaging
	• Does not resemble a raw fresh salmon fillet
Odour	Moderately fresh odour
Overall Quality	3 (Poor)

	Cooked Assessment 425 MPa 5 min 13 °C (Run 10)
Appearance	Very slightly brightVery pale pink in colour with white patchesRetained moulded packaging shape
Odour	Moderate fresh odour
Flavour	 Moderate salmon flavour Slightly sweet Slightly salty Slightly earthy Slightly oily
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteModerately moistVery fibrous, very tough and chewy
Overall Quality	3 (Poor)

	Raw Assessment 425 MPa 3 min 14 °C (Run 11)
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately moist Moderately creamy pink with purple tints in colour No defined flakes Very dense, smooth and compressed to shape of packaging Does not resemble a raw fresh salmon fillet
Odour	Slightly fresh odour
Overall Quality	3 (Poor)

	Cooked Assessment 425 MPa 3 min 14 °C (Run 11)
Appearance	Slightly brightModerately pale pink in colour with grey tintsRetained moulded packaging shape
Odour	• Very fresh odour
Flavour	 Moderate salmon flavour Slightly sweet Slightly salty Slightly earthy Slightly oily
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Moderately firm bite Moderately moist Very fibrous, slightly tough and chewy
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)

	Raw Assessment 600 MPa 3 min 17 °C (Run 14)
Appearance	Moderately bright
	Moderately moist
	• Moderately creamy pink with purple tints in colour
	Slight defined flakes
	• Slightly dense, smooth and compressed to shape of packaging
	• Does not resemble a raw fresh salmon fillet
Odour	Moderately fresh odour
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)

	Cooked Assessment 600 MPa 3 min 17 °C (Run 14)
Appearance	 Slightly bright Moderately pale pink in colour with creamy brown curd Patained moulded packaging shape
Odour	 Moderately fresh odour
Flavour	 Moderate salmon flavour Slightly sweet Slightly salty Slightly earthy Slightly oily
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Moderately firm bite Slightly moist Very fibrous, slightly tough and chewy
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)

	Raw Assessment 425 MPa 3 min 17 °C (Run 20)
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately moist Moderately creamy pink with purple tints in colour Slight defined flakes Very slightly dense, smooth and compressed to shape of packaging Does not resemble a raw fresh salmon fillet
Odour	Moderately fresh odour
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)

	Cooked Assessment 425 MPa 3 min 17 °C (Run 20)
Appearance	Slightly brightSlightly pale creamy pink in colour with cream curdSlight shape loss
Odour	• Moderately fresh odour
Flavour	 Moderate salmon flavour Slightly sweet Slightly salty Slightly earthy Slightly oily
Texture/Mouthfeel	Slightly firm biteModerately moistSlightly fibrous
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)
CCFRA Technology Limited Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6LD, UK

Tel: +44 (0)1386 842000 Fax: +44 (0)1386 842100 www.campden.co.uk

Date: 8th August 2007

Craig Leadley Department of Food Manufacturing Technologies **CCFRA** Station Road Chipping Campden Gloucestershire **GL55 6LD**

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER & SENSORY SCIENCE

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

SENSORY QUALITY EVALUATION **OF HIGH PRESSURE PROCESSED SQUID**

Report No. S/REP/95900/10

Prepared by : Sue Burling

Checked & authorised by :

Name

: Lucy Brown

Authorised Signatories:

Sensory Services Manager

Sensory Projects Group Manager Data Analyst

This test report or certificate shall not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval of CCFRA. Confidentiality notice: The information in this document is only intended for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information that is exempt from disclosure by law and if you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this document in error, please notify CCFRA immediately by telephone.

Page 1 of 13

L. Brown

S. Purcell

E. Allchurch



U:\2007\CEL Fish\FIFG HPP project\Reports\Phase 1 report files

ISO 9001: 2000 Certified

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

SUMMARY

The aim of the project was to understand the effect of High Pressure Processing (HPP) on the sensory quality of a variety of fish and shellfish species.

Each species was subjected to a range of pressure/time/temperature combinations and a selection of samples were then evaluated to determine the effect on the sensory quality in terms of appearance, odour, flavour and texture.

This report details the results for Squid.

SAMPLE INFORMATION

Date samples received:	24th July 2007
Condition on receipt:	Good
Storage conditions:	Chilled
Date samples tested:	24th July 2007

EMT Labol	Pressure	Time	Temp
	(MPa)	(mins)	(°C)
Control	n/a	n/a	n/a
Run 1	400	5	21
Run 2	200	2.5	21.2
Run 3	600	2.5	18.7
Run 4	400	2.5	19.4
Run 5	400	2.5	22.8
Run 6	400	2.5	21.3

SAMPLE PREPARATION

Each sample was received from the FMT department raw and evaluated uncooked. The sample was then directly placed in a steamer, over a litre of boiling water in the base and steamed from 3.5 to 5 minutes according to the size of the squid.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sensory Quality Grading (TES-S-021)

For each evaluation one squid was assessed. All samples were presented under three-digit code to a panel of three experienced sensory assessors.

Each assessor independently described the uncooked appearance and odour and awarded an overall quality grade for the raw sample (using the scale shown below). The sample was then steamed and the assessors described the appearance, odour, flavour and texture/mouthfeel and awarded a quality grade for the cooked assessment. The consensus scores were calculated and the individual comments combined.

9	Excellent Quality
8	Very Good Quality
7	Good Quality
6	Fairly Good Quality
5	Satisfactory Quality
4	Just Acceptable Quality
3	Poor Quality
2	Very Poor Quality
1	Bad Quality

Assessment Scale – Sensory Quality

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Sample Name	Treatment Details	Uncooked Quality Grade	Cooked Quality Grade
Control	Untreated	8	7
Run 1	400 MPa 5.0 min 21°C	6	6
Run 2	200 MPa 2.5 min 21.2 °C	5	6
Run 3	600 MPa 2.5 min 18.7 °C	6	4
Run 4	400 MPa 2.5 min 19.4 °C	6	5
Run 5	400 MPa 2.5 min 22.8 °C	6	4
Run 6	400 MPa 2.5 min 21.3 °C	7	4

A summary of the grades awarded are detailed in the following table:

The weights were recorded before and after cooking, and the % weight loss calculated.

Sample Name	Treatment Details	Weight Raw (g)	Weight Cooked (g)	Weight Loss (g)	% Weight Loss
Control	N/A	152.6	111.1	41.5	27.2
Run 1	400 MPa 5.0 min 21°C	132.6	95.1	37.5	28.3
Run 2	200 MPa 2.5 min 21.2 °C	149.9	116.7	33.2	22.1
Run 3	600 MPa 2.5 min 18.7 °C	155.9	99.3	56.6	36.3
Run 4	400 MPa 2.5 min 19.4 °C	160.0	108	52	32.5
Run 5	400 MPa 2.5 min 22.8 °C	93.1	68.2	24.9	26.7
Run 6	400 MPa 2.5 min 21.3 °C	108.8	75.1	33.7	31.0

The following graph shows both the uncooked and cooked assessment scores for ascending pressure treatments.

Squid Sensory Quality Assessment



For the uncooked assessment none of the samples was graded as high as the Control, which was very bright and moist, with the expected milky white colour. The Run 6 sample was graded the highest, being moderately bright and moist, with very little loss of shape. The Run 2 sample was graded the lowest, with a denser, slightly dirty flesh, and slight loss of shape.

For the cooked assessment none of the samples were graded as high as the Control, which was moderately bright and moist, with very little loss of shape, and a balanced salty and sweet flavour. Run 1 and Run 2 were graded the highest, having a similar bright and moist appearance to that of the control, but with more bitterness in the flavour. Run 3, Run 5 and Run 6 were graded the lowest. Runs 3 and 5 were badly cleaned internally, and had some protein cook-out present, a moderately bitter flavour, and extremely fibrous texture. Run 6 also had an extremely fibrous texture, but a cleaner appearance, and was also very bitter.

Individual Comments and Quality Grades for the Raw and Cooked Assessments

	Raw Assessment Control
	• Very bright
	Moderately moist
Appearance	• Moderately milky white in colour with pale pink patches
	• Clean, flat and dense
	• No shape loss
Odour	• Moderate seafish odour
Overall Quality	8 (Very Good)

	Cooked Assessment Control
	Moderately bright
Appearance	Moderately moistExternal, moderately milky white in colour with pale pink patches
	• Flesh white and dense
	• Very little shape loss
Odour	Moderate seafish odour
	Moderate squid flavour
Flavour	• Slightly sweet
riavoui	• Slightly salty
	• Slightly bitter with an eggy note
	• Very firm bite
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately moist
	• Very fibrous, chewy and rubbery
Overall Quality	7 (Good)

	Raw Assessment 400 MPa 5 min 21 °C (Run 1)
	• Very bright
	Moderately moist
Appearance	• Moderately milky white in colour with pink patches
	• Slightly frothy residue, flat and dense
	• Slight shape loss
Odour	Moderate seafish odour
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)

	Cooked Assessment 400 MPa 5 min 21 °C (Run 1)	
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately moist External, moderately milky white in colour with pale pink patches Flesh white and dense Very little shape loss 	
Odour	Moderate seafish odour	
Flavour	 Moderate squid flavour Slightly sweet Slightly salty Moderately bitter with an eggy note 	
Texture/Mouthfeel	Very firm biteModerately moistVery fibrous, chewy and rubbery	
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)	

	Raw Assessment 200 MPa 2.5 min 18.7 °C (Run 2)
	Moderately bright
	Moderately moist
Appearance	• Moderately milky white in colour with pink patches
	• Slightly dirty, flat and dense
	• Slight shape loss
Odour	• Moderate seafish odour
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)

	Cooked Assessment 200 MPa 2.5 min 18.7 °C (Run 2)	
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately moist External, moderately milky white in colour with dark pink/grey patches Flesh white and dense Very little shape loss 	
Odour	Moderate seafish odour	
Flavour	 Moderate squid flavour Slightly sweet Slightly salty Moderately bitter with an eggy note 	
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Very firm bite Moderately moist Very fibrous, chewy and rubbery 	
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)	

	Raw Assessment 600 MPa 2.5 min 18.7 °C (Run 3)
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately moist Moderately milky white in colour with pink/purple patches Slightly frothy residue, flat and dense Slight shape loss
Odour	Moderate seafish odour
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)

	Cooked Assessment 600 MPa 2.5 min 18.7 °C (Run 3)			
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately moist External, moderately milky white in colour with pink/grey patches Flesh white and dense Unclean internally with protein cook out present Very little shape loss 			
Odour	Moderate seafish odour			
Flavour	 Moderate squid flavour Slightly sweet Slightly salty Moderately bitter with an eggy note 			
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Extremely firm bite Moderately moist Extremely fibrous, chewy and rubbery 			
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)			

	Raw Assessment 400 MPa 2.5 min 19.4 °C (Run 4)			
	Moderately bright			
	• Moderately moist			
Appearance	• Moderately milky white in colour with pale pink patches			
	• Clean, flat and dense with a tear to centre			
	• Very slight shape loss			
Odour	Moderate seafish odour			
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)			

	Cooked Assessment 400 MPa 2.5 min 19.4 °C (Run 4)				
	Moderately bright				
	Moderately moist				
Annoaranco	• External, moderately milky white in colour with pink/grey patches				
Appearance	• Flesh white and dense				
	• Unclean internally with protein cook out present				
	• Very little shape loss				
Odour	Moderate seafish odour				
	Moderate squid flavour				
Flowour	• Slightly sweet				
riavour	• Slightly salty				
	• Moderately bitter with an eggy note				
	• Very firm bite				
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately moist				
	• Very fibrous, chewy and rubbery				
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)				

	Raw Assessment 400 MPa 2.5 min 22.8 °C (Run 5)		
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately moist Moderately milky white in colour with pale pink/grey patches Clean, flat and dense Slight shape loss 		
Odour	Moderate seafish odour		
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)		

	Cooked Assessment 400 MPa 2.5 min 22.8 °C (Run 5)		
	Moderately bright		
	Moderately moist		
Annoaranco	• External, moderately milky white in colour with pink/grey patches		
Appearance	• Flesh white and dense		
	• Unclean internally with protein cook out present		
	• Very little shape loss		
Odour	• Moderate seafish odour		
	Moderate squid flavour		
Flamman	• Slightly sweet		
Flavour	• Slightly salty		
	• Moderately bitter and metallic with an eggy note		
	• Very firm bite		
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately moist		
	• Extremely fibrous, chewy and rubbery		
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)		

	Raw Assessment 400 MPa 2.5 min 21.3°C (Run 6)		
	Moderately bright		
	Moderately moist		
Appearance	• Moderately milky white in colour with pale pink patches		
	• Clean, flat and dense		
	• Very slight shape loss		
Odour	Moderate seafish odour		
Overall Quality	7 (Good)		

	Cooked Assessment 400 MPa 2.5 min 21.3°C (Run 6)		
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately moist External, moderately milky white in colour with pink/grey patches Flesh white and dense Very little shape loss 		
Odour	Moderate seafish odour		
Flavour	 Moderate squid flavour Slightly sweet Slightly salty Very bitter with an eggy note 		
Texture/Mouthfeel	Very firm biteModerately moistExtremely fibrous, chewy and rubbery		
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)		

CCFRA Technology Limited Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6LD, UK

Tel: +44 (0)1386 842000 Fax: +44 (0)1386 842100 www.campden.co.uk

Date: 11th October 2007

Craig Leadley Department of Food Manufacturing Technologies **CCFRA** Station Road Chipping Campden Gloucestershire **GL55 6LD**

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER & SENSORY SCIENCE

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

SENSORY QUALITY EVALUATION **OF HIGH PRESSURE PROCESSED MACKEREL**

Report No. S/REP/95900/9a

This report, Ref. No. S/REP/95900/9a, dated 11th October 2007, supersedes the previous report Ref. No. S/REP/95900/9, dated 8th August 2007. Amendments have been made to page 5 regarding correction to the Sensory Quality Assessment graph..

Prepared by : Sue Burling

Checked & authorised by :

Name : Peter Burgess

Authorised Signatories:

Head of Department Sensory Projects Group Manager E. Allchurch Data Analyst

This test report or certificate shall not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval of CCFRA. Confidentiality notice: The information in this document is only intended for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may contain or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this document in error, please notify CCFRA immediately by telephone.

Report No. S/REP/95900/Appendix 10

Page 1 of 13

P. Burgess

S. Purcell

U:\2007\CEL Fish\FIFG HPP project\Reports\Phase 1 report files



ISO 9001: 2000 Certified

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

SUMMARY

The aim of the project was to understand the effect of High Pressure Processing (HPP) on the sensory quality of a variety of fish and shellfish species.

Each species was subjected to a range of pressure/time/temperature combinations and a selection of samples were then evaluated to determine the effect on the sensory quality in terms of appearance, odour, flavour and texture.

This report details the results for Mackerel.

SAMPLE INFORMATION

Date samples received:	20th July 2007
Condition on receipt:	Good
Storage conditions:	Chilled
Date samples tested:	20th July 2007

FMT Label	Pressure (MPa)	Time (mins)	Temp (°C)
Control	n/a	n/a	n/a
Run 1	100	5	n/a
Kull I	400	3	11/ a
Run 2	200	2.5	20.5
Run 3	600	2.5	20.7
Run 4	400	2.5	21.3
Run 5	400	2.5	20.4
Run 6	400	2.5	23.3

SAMPLE PREPARATION

Each sample was received from the FMT department raw and evaluated uncooked. The sample was then directly placed in a steamer, over a litre of boiling water in the base and steamed for 4.5 minutes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sensory Quality Grading (TES-S-021)

For each evaluation one fillet was assessed. All samples were presented under three-digit code to a panel of three experienced sensory assessors.

Each assessor independently described the uncooked appearance and odour and awarded an overall quality grade for the raw sample (using the scale shown below). The sample was then steamed and the assessors described the appearance, odour, flavour and texture/mouthfeel and awarded a quality grade for the cooked assessment. The consensus scores were calculated and the individual comments combined.

arc –	Sensory Quanty	
	9	Excellent Quality
	8	Very Good Quality
	7	Good Quality
	6	Fairly Good Quality
	5	Satisfactory Quality
	4	Just Acceptable Quality
	3	Poor Quality

2

Assessment Scale – Sensory Quality

Very Poor Quality

Bad Quality

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Sample Name	Treatment Details	Uncooked Quality Grade	Cooked Quality Grade
Control	Untreated	7	7
Run 1	400 MPa 5.0 min	5	6
Run 2	200 MPa 2.5 min 20.5 °C	7	4
Run 3	600 MPa 2.5 min 20.7 °C	4	4
Run 4	400 MPa 2.5 min 21.3 °C	4	6
Run 5	400 MPa 2.5 min 20.4 °C	5	6
Run 6	400 MPa 2.5 min 23.3 °C	5	5

A summary of the grades awarded are detailed in the following table:

The weights were recorded before and after cooking, and the % weight loss calculated.

Sample Name	Treatment Details	Weight Raw (g)	Weight Cooked (g)	Weight Loss (g)	% Weight Loss
Control	N/A	91.8	76.9	14.9	16.2
Run 1	400 MPa 5.0 min	68.4	61.6	6.8	9.9
Run 2	200 MPa 2.5 min 20.5 °C	111.8	97.7	14.1	12.6
Run 3	600 MPa 2.5 min 20.7 °C	97.1	83.1	14	14.4
Run 4	400 MPa 2.5 min 21.3 °C	78.7	67	11.7	14.9
Run 5	400 MPa 2.5 min 20.4 °C	92	85.8	6.2	6.7
Run 6	400 MPa 2.5 min 23.3 °C	84.7	76.2	8.5	10.0

The following graph shows both the uncooked and cooked assessment scores for ascending pressure treatments.

Mackerel Sensory Quality Assessment



For the uncooked assessment only the Run 2 sample was graded as high as the control, being bright and moist, with very little loss of shape. Run 3 and Run 4 were graded the lowest, with very dense flesh, and little defined flake structure.

For the cooked assessment none of the samples were graded as high as the Control, which was bright and moist, with a well-balanced, typically oily flavour. Run 1, Run 4 and Run 5 were graded the highest, with moderately bright flesh, and expected balanced flavour, with only slight acidity. Run 2 and Run 3 were graded the lowest, being less bright, with some loss of shape. The Run 2 sample had a dry, open appearance, and the Run 3 sample was very dense and compressed.

Individual Comments and Quality Grades for the Raw and Cooked Assessments

	Raw Assessment Control
	Moderately bright
Appearance	Moderately moist
	• Moderately cloudy flesh, moderately pink/beige-brown in colour
	• Skin bright and shiny with high definition of markings
	Moderate flake definition, some bones visible
	• Very slight shape loss
Odour	Moderate mackerel odour
Overall Quality	7 (Good)

	Cooked Assessment Control
Appearance	 Moderately bright Moderately pink/beige with slight grey/brown tints Very slight shape loss
Odour	Moderate mackerel odour
Flavour	 Moderate mackerel flavour, slightly oily Slightly sweet Slightly salty
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteModerately moistSlightly fibrous
Overall Quality	7 (Good)

	Raw Assessment 400 MPa 5.0 min (Run 1)
	Moderately bright
	Moderately moist
	• Dense, cooked appearance
Appearance	• Moderately cloudy flesh, pale pink/beige-brown in colour
	• Skin bright and shiny with moderate definition of markings
	• Very low flake definition, no bones visible
	• Very slight shape loss
Odour	Moderate mackerel odour
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)

	Cooked Assessment 400 MPa 5.0 min (Run 1)
Appearance	 Moderately bright Slightly pink/beige with moderate grey/brown tints Very slight shape loss with a compressed appearance
Odour	Moderate mackerel odour
Flavour	Moderate mackerel flavour, moderately oilySlightly sweetSlightly salty and acidic
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteSlightly moistModerately fibrous
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)

	Raw Assessment 200 MPa 2.5 min 20.5 °C (Run 2)
	Moderately bright
Appearance	Moderately moist
	• Moderately cloudy flesh, pink/beige-brown in colour
	• Skin bright and shiny with high definition of markings
	Moderate flake definition, some bones visible
	• Very slight shape loss
Odour	Moderate mackerel odour
Overall Quality	7 (Good)

	Cooked Assessment 200 MPa 2.5 min 20.5 °C (Run 2)
Appearance	 Moderately bright Slightly pink/beige with moderate grey/brown tints Very slight shape loss with a dry open appearance
Odour	Moderate mackerel odour
Flavour	Moderate mackerel flavour, moderately oilySlightly sweetSlightly salty and acidic
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteModerately moistModerately fibrous
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)

	Raw Assessment 600 MPa 2.5 min 20.7 °C (Run 3)
	Slightly bright
	Slightly moist
	• Dense, cooked appearance with scum deposits
Appearance	Moderately cloudy flesh, orange/beige-brown in colour
	• Skin dull with low definition of markings
	• Very low flake definition, no bones visible
	• Slight shape loss
Odour	Low mackerel odour
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)

	Cooked Assessment 600 MPa 2.5 min 20.7 °C (Run 3)
Appearance	Slightly brightSlightly pink/beige with moderate grey/brown tintsModerate shape loss with a dense appearance
Odour	Moderate mackerel odour
Flavour	 Moderate mackerel flavour, moderately oily Slightly sweet Slightly salty and acidic
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteModerately moistModerately fibrous
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)

	Raw Assessment 400 MPa 2.5 min 21.3 °C (Run 4)
	Slightly bright
	Moderately moist
	• Dense, cooked appearance with scum deposits
Appearance	• Moderately cloudy flesh, pale pink/beige-brown in colour
	• Skin bright and shiny with moderate definition of markings
	• Very low flake definition, no bones visible
	• Very slight shape loss
Odour	Low mackerel odour
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)

	Cooked Assessment 400 MPa 2.5 min 21.3 °C (Run 4)
Appearance	Moderately brightSlightly pink/beige with moderate grey/brown tints
	• Very slight shape loss with a compressed appearance
Odour	Moderate mackerel odour
Flavour	 Moderate mackerel flavour, moderately oily Slightly sweet Slightly salty and acidic
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteSlightly moistModerately fibrous
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)

	Raw Assessment 400 MPa 2.5 min 20.4 °C (Run 5)
	Moderately bright
	Moderately moist
Appearance	• Dense, cooked appearance
	Moderately cloudy flesh, pale pink/beige-brown in colour
	• Skin bright and shiny with moderate definition of markings
	• Very low flake definition, no bones visible
	• Very slight shape loss
Odour	Moderate mackerel odour
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)

	Cooked Assessment 400 MPa 2.5 min 20.4 °C (Run 5)
Appearance	 Moderately bright Slightly pink/beige with moderate grey/brown tints Very slight shape loss with a compressed appearance
Odour	Moderate mackerel odour
Flavour	 Moderate mackerel flavour, moderately oily Slightly sweet Slightly salty and acidic
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteSlightly moistModerately fibrous
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)

	Raw Assessment 400 MPa 2.5 min 23.3 °C (Run 6)		
	Moderately bright		
	Moderately moist		
	Dense, cooked appearance		
Appearance	• Moderately cloudy flesh, pale pink/beige-brown in colour		
	• Skin bright and shiny with moderate definition of markings		
	• Very low flake definition, no bones visible		
	• Very slight shape loss		
Odour	Moderate mackerel odour		
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)		

	Cooked Assessment 400 MPa 2.5 min 23.3 °C (Run 6)		
Appearance	 Slightly bright Slightly pink/beige with moderate grey/brown tints Slight shape loss with a compressed appearance 		
Odour	Moderate mackerel odour		
Flavour	 Moderate mackerel flavour, moderately oily Slightly sweet Slightly salty and acidic 		
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately firm biteSlightly moistModerately fibrous		
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)		

CCFRA Technology Limited Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6LD, UK

Tel: +44 (0)1386 842000 Fax: +44 (0)1386 842100 www.campden.co.uk

Date: 12th October 2007

Craig Leadley Department of Food Manufacturing Technologies CCFRA Station Road Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6LD

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER & SENSORY SCIENCE

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT

SENSORY QUALITY EVALUATION OF HIGH PRESSURE PROCESSED COD

Report No. S/REP/95900/11

Prepared by : Sue Burling

Checked & authorised by :

Name : Peter Burgess

Authorised Signatories:

P. BurgessHead of Consumer & Sensory Science DepartmentS. PurcellSensory Projects Group ManagerE. AllchurchData Analyst

This test report or certificate shall not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval of CCFRA. Confidentiality notice: The information in this document is only intended for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information that is exempt from disclosure by law and if you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this document in error, please notify CCFRA immediately by telephone.

Report No. S/REP/95900/Appendix 11

Page 1 of 13

U:\2007\CEL Fish\FIFG HPP project\Reports\Phase 1 report files



ISO 9001: 2000 Certified

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

SUMMARY

The aim of the project was to understand the effect of High Pressure Processing (HPP) on the sensory quality of a variety of fish and shellfish species.

Each species was subjected to a range of pressure/time/temperature combinations and a selection of samples was then evaluated to determine the effect on the sensory quality in terms of appearance, odour, flavour and texture.

This report details the results for Cod.

SAMPLE INFORMATION

Date samples received:	25th September 2007
Condition on receipt:	Good
Storage conditions:	Chilled
Date samples tested:	25th September 2007

EMT Labol	Pressure	Time	Temp
	(MPa)	(mins)	(°C)
Control	n/a	n/a	n/a
Run 1	400	5	13
Run 2	200	2.5	12.8
Run 3	600	2.5	10.9
Run 4	400	2.5	12.4
Run 5	400	2.5	11.3
Run 6	400	2.5	11

SAMPLE PREPARATION

Each sample was received from the FMT department raw and evaluated uncooked. The sample was then directly placed in a steamer, over 700 ml of boiling water in the base and steamed for 5 minutes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sensory Quality Grading (TES-S-021)

For each evaluation one cod fillet was assessed. All samples were presented under three-digit code to a panel of three experienced sensory assessors.

Each assessor independently described the uncooked appearance and odour and awarded an overall quality grade for the raw sample (using the scale shown below). The sample was then steamed and the assessors described the appearance, odour, flavour and texture/mouthfeel and awarded a quality grade for the cooked assessment. The consensus scores were calculated and the individual comments combined.

9	Excellent Quality
8	Very Good Quality
7	Good Quality
6	Fairly Good Quality
5	Satisfactory Quality
4	Just Acceptable Quality
3	Poor Quality
2	Very Poor Quality
1	Bad Quality

Assessment Scale – Sensory Quality

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Sample Name	Treatment Details	Uncooked Quality Grade	Cooked Quality Grade
Control	Untreated	7	7
Run 1	400 MPa 5 min 13 °C	5	6
Run 2	200 MPa 2.5 min 12.8 °C	5	5
Run 3	600 MPa 2.5 min 10.9 °C	4	7
Run 4	400 MPa 2.5 min 12.4 °C	5	6
Run 5	400 MPa 2.5 min 11.3 °C	4	4
Run 6	400 MPa 2.5 min 11 °C	4	4

A summary of the grades awarded are detailed in the following table:

The weights were recorded before and after cooking, and the % weight loss calculated.

Sample Name	Treatment Details	Weight Raw (g)	Weight Cooked (g)	Weight Loss (g)	% Weight Loss
Control	N/A	112.5	93.9	18.6	16.5
Run 1	400 MPa 5 min 13 °C	105.2	95.3	9.9	9.4
Run 2	200 MPa 2.5 min 12.8 °C	100.1	90.2	9.9	9.9
Run 3	600 MPa 2.5 min 10.9 °C	118.6	101.9	16.7	14.1
Run 4	400 MPa 2.5 min 12.4 °C	128.0	118.7	9.3	7.3
Run 5	400 MPa 2.5 min 11.3 °C	129.4	114.6	14.8	11.4
Run 6	400 MPa 2.5 min 11 °C	134.7	123.8	10.9	8.1

The following graph shows both the uncooked and cooked assessment scores for ascending pressure treatments.



Cod Sensory Quality Assessment

NB. Data points for the Uncooked Scores of the Control, Run 2, Run 6 and Run 5 samples are hidden by those of the Cooked Scores.

For the uncooked assessment, none of the samples were graded as high as the Control which was bright and moist, with good retention of fillet shape. Run 3, Run 5 and Run 6 were graded the lowest, with moderate loss of brightness and little defined flake structure.

For the cooked assessment, only Run 3 was graded as high as the control, being moist with well defined flakes, and a well-balanced flavour and soft, moist texture. Run 5 and Run 6 were graded the lowest having a drier appearance. Run 5 also had a firm, dry, fibrous texture and Run 6 had acidic and bitter notes in the flavour.

Individual Comments and Quality Grades for the Raw and Cooked Assessments

	Raw Assessment Control
	Moderately bright
Appearance	Moderately moist
	Pale off-white flesh with grey/brown tints
	• Skin bright and shiny, silver grey with gold flecks
	• Dense flesh
	Good retention of fillet shape
Odour	Moderate fresh cod odour
Overall Quality	7 (Good)

	Cooked Assessment Control		
Appearance	 Slight loss of brightness White flesh with slight grey tints Slightly open structure Moist, flakes well 		
Odour	Moderate fresh cod odour		
Flavour	Slightly weak cod flavourSlightly sweetSlightly salty		
Texture/Mouthfeel	Slightly soft biteModerately moistSlightly fibrous		
Overall Quality	7 (Good)		
	Raw Assessment 400 MPa 5 min 13 °C (Run 1)		
-----------------	---		
	Slight loss of brightness		
	Moderately moist		
Appearance	• White flesh with slight pink tints and a cooked 'opaque' appearance		
	• Skin slightly dull with slight shrinkage		
	• Dense flesh with retained packaging shape		
Odour	Moderate fresh cod odour		
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)		

	Cooked Assessment 400 MPa 5 min 13 °C (Run 1)
Appearance	 Moderately bright White flesh
	 Slight protein cook out
	• Moist, slightly soft when separated
Odour	Moderate fresh cod odour
	• Moderate cod flavour
Flovour	• Slightly sweet
riavoui	• Slightly salty
	Slightly acidic
Texture/Mouthfeel	• Moderately firm bite
	Moderately moist
	Slightly fibrous
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)

	Raw Assessment 200 MPa 2.5 min 12.8 °C (Run 2)
	Moderate loss of brightness
	Slightly moist
Appearance	• White flesh with slight green tints and some small white spots visible
	• Skin dull and dry, with some slightly slimy and bloody patches
	Good retention of shape
Odour	Moderate fresh cod odour
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)

	Cooked Assessment 200 MPa 2.5 min 12.8 °C (Run 2)
	Slight loss of brightness
	• White flesh with slight grey tints
Appearance	Slightly open structure
	• Very moist, flakes fairly well
	• Very slight protein cook out
Odour	Moderate fresh cod odour
	Moderate cod flavour
	• Slightly sweet
Flavour	Slightly salty
	Moderately acidic/sour
	Slightly harsh/bitter
	• Moderately firm bite
Toutune Mouthfool	Moderately moist
Texture/Moutheel	Moderately fibrous
	• Slightly chewy
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)

	Raw Assessment 600 MPa 2.5 min 10.9 °C (Run 3)
Appearance	 Moderate loss of brightness Moderately moist Milly, 'see load' emperatory with moderate piply tints
	 Minky cooked appearance with inderate pink tints Skin slightly dull with slight shrinkage Dense flesh with retained packaging shape
Odour	Moderate fresh cod odour
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)

	Cooked Assessment 600 MPa 2.5 min 10.9 °C (Run 3)
Appearance	 Slight loss of brightness White flesh with slight grey tints Slightly open structure Moist, flakes fairly well
Odour	Moderate fresh cod odour
Flavour	Moderate cod flavourSlightly sweetSlightly salty
Texture/Mouthfeel	Slightly soft biteModerately moistSlightly fibrous
Overall Quality	7 (Good)

	Raw Assessment 400 MPa 2.5 min 12.4 °C (Run 4)
	Moderately bright
	Moderately moist
Appearance	• Milky 'cooked' appearance with slight yellow tints and some white spots
	• Skin slightly dull and wrinkled
	• Dense flesh with retained packaging shape
Odour	Moderate fresh cod odour
Overall Quality	5 (Satisfactory)

	Cooked Assessment 400 MPa 2.5 min 12.4 °C (Run 4)
	Moderately bright
Annearance	• White flesh
Appearance	Good shape retention
	• Moist, flakes well
Odour	• Moderate fresh cod odour
	Moderate cod flavour
Flovour	• Slightly sweet
riavour	Slightly salty
	Slightly acidic, slightly harsh
	• Slightly soft bite
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately moist
	Slightly fibrous
Overall Quality	6 (Fairly Good)

	Raw Assessment 400 MPa 2.5 min 11.3 °C (Run 5)
Appearance	Moderate loss of brightness
	• Moderately dry
	• Milky 'cooked' appearance with slight grey/green tints
	• Skin slightly dull and wrinkled
	• Dense flesh with retained packaging shape
Odour	Moderate fresh cod odour
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)

	Cooked Assessment 400 MPa 2.5 min 11.3 °C (Run 5)
Appearance	 Slight loss of brightness Creamy white flesh with beige and orange tints Good shape retention Some dry patches
Odour	Moderate fresh cod odour
Flavour	 Moderate cod flavour Slightly sweet Slightly salty Slightly savoury
Texture/Mouthfeel	 Moderately firm bite Slightly dry Moderately fibrous Slightly chewy
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)

	Raw Assessment 400 MPa 2.5 min 11 °C (Run 6)
	Moderate loss of brightness
	• Moderately dry
Appearance	• Milky 'cooked' appearance
	• Skin slightly dull and wrinkled
	• Dense flesh with retained packaging shape
Odour	Moderate fresh cod odour
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)

	Cooked Assessment 400 MPa 2.5 min 11 °C (Run 6)
	Slight loss of brightness
Annearance	• White flesh with grey tints
rippeurunce	• Slightly open structure
	• Slightly dry in patches, flakes well
Odour	• Moderate fresh cod odour
	• Moderate cod flavour
Flower	• Very slightly sweet
riavour	• Slightly salty
	• Slightly acidic and slightly bitter
	• Slightly soft bite
Texture/Mouthfeel	Moderately moist
	Moderately fibrous
Overall Quality	4 (Just Acceptable)