

Evaluation of the quality characteristics of nitrogen gas-stunned chicken meat and small intestine

Muhammad Shahbubul Alam^{1,2#}, Dong-Heon Song^{1#}, Sun-Moon Kang¹, Inho Hwang², Kuk-Hwan Seol¹, Soo-Hyun Cho¹, Jung-Hwan Jeon³, Hyoun Wook Kim^{1*}

¹Animal Products Utilization Division, National Institute of Animal Science, Rural Development Administration, Wanju 55365, Korea

²Department of Animal Science, Jeonbuk National University, Jeonju 54896, Korea

³Animal Welfare Research Team, National Institute of Animal Science, Rural Development Administration, Wanju 55365, Korea



Received: Apr 21, 2023

Revised: Jul 8, 2023

Accepted: Jul 11, 2023

#These authors contributed equally to this work.

*Corresponding author

Hyoun Wook Kim

Animal Products Utilization Division,
National Institute of Animal Science,
Rural Development Administration,
Wanju 55365, Korea.

Tel: +82-63-238-7354

E-mail: woogi78@korea.kr

Copyright © 2024 Korean Society of
Animal Sciences and Technology.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

ORCID

Muhammad Shahbubul Alam
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2697-1492>
Dong-Heon Song
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4670-3321>
Sun-Moon Kang
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3947-4337>
Inho Hwang
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2474-2733>

Abstract

This study aimed to confirm the applicability of the new nitrogen (N₂) gas stunning method in the broiler slaughtering process by comparing the meat and small intestine quality following different stunning methods (electrical, carbon dioxide (CO₂), N₂, and halal). Four treatments were compared: (i) electrical stunning (Elec), (ii) 80% CO₂ gas stunning (CO₂-gas), (iii) 98% N₂ gas stunning (N₂-gas), and (iv) the non-stunning method (halal). N₂ gas stunning (98%) and the halal method were conducted at the pilot plant abattoir of the national institute of animal science, Korea, and electrical and 80% CO₂ stunning were performed on the nearest commercial slaughter house. Meat pH_{24h}, color (lightness, redness and yellowness), proximate composition, water holding capacity (WHC), cooking loss, and Warner-Bratzler shear force (WBSF) were measured, and in the small intestine, pH_{24h}, color, thickness, and WBSF were measured. The Elec treatment showed high lightness, yellowness, and low redness in both meat and the small intestine, indicated by a pale color; the CO₂-gas treatment showed high redness, low lightness, and low yellowness, and the coloration of meat from the N₂-gas treatment was intermediate between Elec and CO₂-gas. For other quality traits, the N₂-gas showed good results and was between Elec and CO₂-gas. Additionally, severe stress (low pH in both meats), low WHC in meat, and cracked small intestine with numerous apertures were observed in the CO₂-gas, and pale colored hemorrhagic breast meat was found in the Elec. Therefore, in view of animal welfare and quality traits of meat and the small intestine, 98% N₂ gas can be considered in broiler stunning.

Keywords: Slaughtering process, Gas stun, Nitrogen-stunning, Chicken breast meat, Small intestine

Kuk-Hwan Seol
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0907-882X>
 Soo-Hyun Cho
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8073-8771>
 Jung-Hwan Jeon
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9725-547X>
 Hyoun Wook Kim
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2979-345X>

Competing interests

No potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

Funding sources

The study was funded by the "RDA Fellowship program" and "Cooperative Research Program for Agriculture Science and Technology Development (Project No. PJ01621403 and PJ 01490102)", NIAS, RDA, Korea.

And, it was accomplished through the 2024 National Institute of Animal Science, Rural Development Administration, professional researcher training course support project.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Availability of data and material

Upon reasonable request, the datasets of this study can be available from the corresponding author.

Authors' contributions

Conceptualization: Kang SM, Seol KH, Kim HW.

Data curation: Alam MS, Song DH.

Formal analysis: Alam MS, Song DH.

Methodology: Alam MS, Song DH, Hwang I, Jeon JH.

Software: Alam MS, Song DH.

Validation: Cho SH.

Investigation: Alam MS, Song DH.

Writing - original draft: Alam MS, Song DH.

Writing - review & editing: Alam MS, Song DH, Kang SM, Hwang I, Seol KH, Cho SH, Jeon JH, Kim HW.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The experiment was performed at the research of the National Institute of Animal Science of Korea (NIAS). The animal care and use committee of NIAS reviewed and approved the protocol for this study (Approval Number: NIAS20191536).

INTRODUCTION

Livestock slaughterhouses in Korea use electricity and carbon dioxide (CO₂) stunning methods during slaughter. Chicken slaughterhouses have also introduced CO₂ stunning methods due to improved animal welfare compared with the traditional electric method. Electrical stunning is the most common pre-slaughter stunning method used for animals in the meat industry. Among the different types of electrical stunning systems, electrical water bath stunning is commonly practiced in commercial poultry plants [1]. It is expedient, inexpensive, has few space users, and can be readily tailored to commercial processing plants [2]. To induce unconsciousness in a water bath system, the EU recommends a minimum current of 120 mA per chicken [3]. This recommended minimum current causes muscle contraction, broken bones, and breast muscle hemorrhage in broilers [4–6]. On the other hand, Islamic countries perform slaughtering without stunning, following religious requirements, using the halal method [7].

Gas stunning can be considered an alternative method to the pre-slaughter stunning system to maintain animal welfare and meat quality, and is widely used in traditional electric-based slaughterhouses [8]. According to Raj et al. [9], gas use as a novel method for stunning animals has increased daily. Minimizing the stressful handling of awake broilers using gas stunning prior to electrical stunning in a commercial slaughterhouse increases animal welfare and reduces the need for workers [10]. CO₂ is commonly used in pre-slaughter stunning of broiler chickens [11] and pigs [12]. CO₂ has been demonstrated to be aversive to chickens and induces suffering and pain [13,14]. Mice, rats, and pigs also have also shown an aversion to CO₂ stunning [15–20], including irritation of the nasal mucosal membranes [18], severe respiratory distress [20], and strong head shaking [21]. Additionally, meat and small intestine discoloration (dark-red colored) occurs following the CO₂ stunning method [22], so the market value of CO₂ stunned meat and by-products, especially the intestine, is low in Korea. According to KOSIS [23], ~77,000 cows, 1.5 million pigs, and 84 million chickens are slaughtered each month in Korea. The intestines of animals have been widely utilized globally for the food ingredients and production of casings [24,25]. Therefore, any deterioration in the quality of intestines due to gas stunning can render them unsuitable for sale, leading to potential economic losses. Consequently, it is necessary to study an alternative to the CO₂ stunning method that does not affect the quality of meat or animal welfare.

On the other hand, inert gases, such as argon (Ar) or nitrogen (N₂), have been used in different proportions in conjunction with CO₂ in the stunning of animals to help reduce CO₂ aversion [20,26]. Exposure to high concentrations of inert gases has been found to induce hypoxic conditions in animals [18,27]. The displacement of oxygen (O₂) in the atmosphere by a high concentration of inert gases can create hypoxic conditions with less than 2% O₂, leading to a decrease in blood oxygen levels of animals [28]. This, in turn, affects the central nervous system (CNS) and induces unconsciousness to animal [29]. N₂ is the most abundant gas in the air (78%), and can be used widely for commercial purposes due to its low price. Different concentrations of N₂ (70%–92%) can be mixed with CO₂ to maintain hypercapnic-hypoxia conditions for pig stunning [30,31]. Poultry showed less aversion to stunning with low atmospheric pressure and N₂ than CO₂, which may offer a significant welfare refinement [32]. No adverse effects on the quality traits of meat or the small intestine were observed using the high-concentration N₂ gas stunning of pigs [22]. According to the syncope method, in broilers, fewer stress hormone changes occurred following N₂ stunning than with the CO₂ and halal methods [33]. Therefore, it is expected that N₂ gas could be effective in preventing excessive discoloration and softening compared to conventional stunning methods. However, the feasibility of using only high concentrations of N₂ gas (98%) in the stunning of birds (broiler chickens) and its effects on the quality traits of meat and the small intestine have not yet

been investigated.

The objective of this study is to evaluate the impact of high-concentration N₂ (98%) stunning on the quality of meat and intestines in poultry, compared to conventional stunning methods such as electrical stunning, CO₂ stunning, and halal stunning. Additionally, the study aims to validate the industrial applicability of high-concentration N₂ stunning.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Animal care

The experiment was performed at the research of the National Institute of Animal Science of Korea (NIAS). The animal care and use committee of NIAS reviewed and approved the protocol for this study (Approval Number: NIAS20191536).

Experimental design and facilities

An experimental trial was conducted at the NIAS, RDA, Korea to assess the quality of hypoxic chicken breast meat and small intestine following N₂ gas-stunning and to compare it with meat stunned using standard electrical- and high-CO₂-based stunning and non-stunning (halal) methods. Four treatments were used: (i) electrical stunning (Elec-stun), (ii) 80% CO₂ gas stunning (CO₂-gas), (iii) 98% N₂ gas stunning (N₂-gas), and (iv) the non-stunning method (halal). An electrical- and high-CO₂-based stunning (80%) trial was conducted at the nearest contact commercial slaughter house; a high-N₂ gas stunning (98%) and a non-stunning (halal) method trial was conducted at the NIAS pilot plant abattoir. Forty Cobb-500 commercial broiler chickens were assigned to each treatment (n = 40). The chickens were collected from the nearest commercial farm. Just before the day of the experiment, broilers were transported to the institutional abattoir and stored in a commercial slaughterhouse. The chickens rested for 12 h in pens with *ad-libitum* water and finisher diet. Fasting conditions were maintained overnight before slaughter. Body weight was measured during the evening of slaughter. The body weight range was 2.51–2.68 kg at 42 days of age.

In the electrical stunning and non-stunning (halal) methods, single broilers were used, whereas gas stunning (both CO₂ and N₂) was performed on a crate containing eight broilers. Electrical stunning was performed within the contact commercial slaughterhouse, using a water bath stunner delivering a constant current of 120 mA (50 Hz in the form of sinusoidal waveform) for 4–5 s. In the case of the halal method, according to the rules of Islam, broilers were slaughtered without stunning [34]. The chickens in the CO₂ and N₂ treatment groups were stunned using specially designed gas chamber. A modern digital gas chamber (length 220 cm × width 100 cm × height 135 cm, Supreme Thermal Instrument [STI], Daegu, Korea) was used for gas stunning. The CO₂ or N₂ gases flow was continued into the pit of the chamber until the desired concentration (80% or 98%) was reached. After reaching the desired concentration level, the gas flow was stopped, and the time (s) counting was started until the stunned state was reached. It was found that within 70 s, broilers were completely stunned by 80% CO₂, and in the case of N₂ (98%), it required approximately 110 s for complete stunning.

Slaughtering and sample collection

After gas stunning, each crate of broilers was removed from the gas chamber as quickly as possible and heart activity was measured using an electrocardiogram (ECG) with two adhesive patches (Unilect, 5 cm in diameter; Unomedical, Stonehouse, UK) placed on the left and right pectoralis muscles under the wing base, and then slaughtered within 30 s. In electrical stunning, each

stunned chicken was kept on a movable table, heart activity was measured using ECG, and then the chicken was slaughtered within 15–20 s. After slaughter, for proper bleeding, one leg (hock joint) of each broiler was tied with an iron chain and hung for 2–3 min. This process was observed in all treatments, including those treated with the halal method. Subsequently, chickens from the different treatments were inserted separately in a pluckier machine for feather plucking. After 7–8 min, the chickens were removed from the pluckier and eviscerated manually. Individual carcasses were cleaned, washed with tap water, and stored in polythene bags. The small intestine (100 cm) was collected from each broiler in every treatment ($n = 40$). After cleaning and washing, each small intestine was placed in a polythene bag. All carcasses and small intestines were stored in a cold room overnight at 2°C. After chilling, all carcasses and small intestine samples were transported (after slaughter at 18 h) to the laboratory, and then the breast muscle of all carcasses were obtained for further study.

pH measurement

To determine the pH of the raw meat, 5 g of the sample was mixed with 50 ml of distilled water using a hand blender. For the small intestine, 3 g of sample was mixed with 30 ml of distilled water. The resulting sample solutions were then measured using a digital pH meter (FP 20, Mettler Toledo, Greifensee, Switzerland). The pH readings were taken four times for every sample of chicken breast meat and small intestine.

Surface color values

The measurements of the surface color was carried out samples of the raw chicken breast meat and the raw and cooked small intestine were bloomed in air at room temperature for ~40 min. The surface color were measured using a chroma meter (CR-400, Minolta Camera, Osaka, Japan). First, the chroma meter calibrated using a white plate ($Y = 86.32$, $X = 0.3165$, and $y = 0.3242$). In the chicken breast meat, for each rectangular sample (size 12×5 cm), color values were measured from 8 different sections on the surface and bone-side. For the small intestine, 100 cm of a freshly cut clean small intestine was measured from 8 different sections, and there were intervals of 10 cm minimum between different locations. The color values were reported as CIE L^* , CIE a^* , and CIE b^* .

Proximate components

The Proximate components were measured by using a Food Scan Lab 78810 (Foss Tecator Hillerød, Denmark). Approximately 100 g of raw chicken breast meat was blended using a hand mixer and used as a sample. The sample was measured in triplicates.

Water-holding capacity

In measurement the WHC of a raw chicken breast meat, the sample was ground, and subsequently, any fat, fibers, and coarse particles were removed. The fine meat (0.5 g) was inserted into an ultra-centrifugal tube. These tubes were heated at 80°C for 20 min using water-bath. The next step in determining the WHC of the meat sample involved using a centrifugal machine (Avanti(R) J-E, Beckman coulter, Brea, CA, USA). The ground samples were centrifuged for 10 min at a speed of $470 \times g$ at 4°C. After centrifugation, the tubes were allowed to stand for 10 min at room temperature. The samples were weighed, and the WHC of the chicken breast meat was calculated using a formula. The above method was performed twice for each sample, and the average value was used for the study [35].

Cooking loss and Warner-Bratzler shear force

To measure the CL of the chicken breast meat, they were weighed and placed in heat-durable plastic bags. The mouths of the bags were folded and blocked using steel clips. Then, these sample was heated using a water bath at 71.3°C. The inner temperature of each sample was evaluated using a thermorecorder. When the core temperature reached 70°C, the samples were transferred an ice water for cooling for 30 min. Next step, the surface of cooked samples remove moisture with absorbant tissue paper. The cooked samples were weighed, and the CL was determined using a formula.

The WBSF were measured using an Instron Universal Testing Machine (5543, Instron Corp., USA). The WBSF for chicken breast meat was prepared using a sample with completed CL measurements. From cooked chicken breast meat, five samples (length 2.0–2.5 cm, diameter 1.25 cm) were made using a metal corer according to the muscle fiber direction. In the small intestine, WBSF was determined in both fresh and cooked samples. For samples of fresh small intestine, each 5–7 cm of samples from the small intestine was taken and directly cut using an Instron machine. To measure the WBSF of the cooked small intestine, a clean sample of 50 cm in length was taken from each small intestine. Also, in case of the cooked sample, the fresh small intestine were cooked under the same heating conditions as meat (cooking time, ~40 min) and were then used to measure the WBSF. Machine with a speed of 200 mm/min and a load cell of 40 N; a 1 cm distance was maintained from one cut to another.

Thickness of small intestine

The thickness was measured using a digital caliper scale of both fresh and cooked small intestines. The sample was longitudinally spread on a white plastic board. Readings were obtained from six different locations of the small intestine. The minimum interval distance from one location to another was 5–7 cm. The cooking conditions used to prepare the cooked samples were equivalent to the CL of chicken breast meat, however, the cooking time was ~40 min.

Statistical analysis

The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) package was used for data analysis. The mean, standard deviation, and *p*-value were calculated for all treatments. Duncan's multiple range test was used. Differences were considered statistically significant at a *p* value of < 0.05.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

pH_{24h} and surface color of chicken breast meat and small intestine under different stunning methods

Table 1 shows the pH_{24h} for chicken breast meat and small intestine with stunned and non-stunned. The results revealed significant differences in the pH_{24h} of the chicken breast meat and small intestine among different stunning methods. Among the stunning treatments, the pH_{24h} was comparatively high in the Elec-stun and low in the CO₂-gas compared to other treatments (*p* < 0.05). The pH_{24h} of halal was also significantly higher than that of all other stunning treatments in both the chicken breast meat and the small intestine.

The pH level of the chicken breast meat and small intestine is one of the indicators that change according to stunning methods and reflects the biochemical state of the muscle following the development of rigor mortis [1,5]. Several reports imply that during stunning and exsanguination, muscular activity is elevated and glycolysis is increased, resulting in the accretion of lactic acid in at the muscle decreased the pH level [9,36,37]. The accumulation of lactic acid in the cells

Table 1. Effect of stunning (with electric, CO₂ gas and N₂ gas) and non-stunning halal method on pH_{24h} and color value of chicken meat and small intestine

Items	Treatments ¹⁾			
	Elec-stun	CO ₂ -gas	N ₂ -gas	Halal
pH _{24h}				
Meat	6.10 ± 0.08 ^b	5.88 ± 0.08 ^d	6.04 ± 0.03 ^c	6.26 ± 0.06 ^a
Small intestine (Fresh)	6.38 ± 0.06 ^b	6.20 ± 0.06 ^d	6.28 ± 0.04 ^c	6.62 ± 0.06 ^a
Color value				
Meat				
L*	55.17 ± 3.02 ^b	51.45 ± 2.26 ^c	54.62 ± 1.24 ^b	58.63 ± 0.98 ^a
a*	2.90 ± 0.35 ^c	4.12 ± 0.23 ^a	3.57 ± 0.08 ^b	1.72 ± 0.15 ^d
b*	5.89 ± 1.45 ^a	4.55 ± 0.74 ^c	5.46 ± 0.17 ^b	6.19 ± 0.06 ^a
Small intestine (Fresh)				
L*	60.11 ± 1.19 ^b	54.94 ± 0.86 ^d	58.29 ± 0.62 ^c	62.66 ± 0.73 ^a
a*	11.37 ± 0.56 ^c	16.03 ± 0.51 ^a	13.47 ± 0.11 ^b	9.8 ± 0.42 ^d
b*	13.44 ± 0.68 ^b	8.58 ± 0.56 ^d	12.55 ± 0.61 ^c	14.24 ± 0.18 ^a
Small intestine (Cooked)				
L*	69.93 ± 1.30 ^b	63.78 ± 0.75 ^d	67.64 ± 0.99 ^c	71.56 ± 0.71 ^a
a*	5.44 ± 0.22 ^c	8.61 ± 0.34 ^a	6.49 ± 0.11 ^b	4.65 ± 0.46 ^d
b*	15.27 ± 0.49 ^b	10.62 ± 0.78 ^d	14.57 ± 0.28 ^c	16.11 ± 0.19 ^a

¹⁾Treatments: Elec-stun, electrical stunning method; CO₂-gas, 80% CO₂ gas stunning method; N₂-gas, 98% N₂ gas stunning method; Halal, non-stunning method. n = 40.

^{a-d}Different superscript letters in same row means significant differences ($p < 0.05$).

of chicken muscle is closely associated with pre-slaughter stress [38]. The detection of stunning stress in animals has been attempted by some researchers through the use of blood samples [2,33]. Exposing hogs to an 80% concentration of CO₂ for 70 s results in the production of large amounts of lactic acid in the blood [39]. In pigs exposed to 80% CO₂ for 60 s, lactic acidosis, hyperglycemia, hypercapnia, and increased hematocrit levels were observed [40]. According to Channon et al. [41], the pH decline of pork loin was faster in electrically-stunned pig meat than after CO₂ stunning. However, the pH of pork meat with N₂ stunning was higher than that with CO₂ stunning, which was slightly lower than that with electrical stunning [22]. Similar to a previous study, the pH in chicken breast and small intestine was higher in N₂-stunned chickens than in CO₂-stunned chickens, and lower than in electrically-stunned chickens.

The surface color of chicken breast meat and small intestines is presented in Table 1. In chicken breast meat, the L* and b* was significantly highest in the halal treatment, while it was the lowest in the CO₂-gas treatment ($p < 0.05$). On the contrary, CO₂-gas treatment had the highest a*, while halal had the lowest a* value ($p < 0.05$). N₂-gas treatment showed higher L* and b* values and lower a* values compared to CO₂-gas treatment ($p < 0.05$). Compared to N₂-gas treatment, Elec-stun treatment showed similar L* value ($p > 0.05$), lower a* value ($p < 0.05$), and higher b* value ($p < 0.05$). In both raw and cooked intestines, halal treatment had the highest L* and b* values, while CO₂-gas treatment exhibited the lowest L* and b* values ($p < 0.05$). For a* values, CO₂-gas showed the highest, while halal had the lowest values. Elec-stun and N₂-gas treatments fell between CO₂-gas and halal treatments in terms of color. Elec-stun had higher L* and b* values compared to N₂-gas treatment ($p < 0.05$), while its a* value was lower ($p < 0.05$). The surface color of the chicken breast meat and intestines is a factor that can influence the purchasing decision of consumers. When purchasing meat and meat products, consumers prioritize physical appearance, especially color [42,43]. Discolored or dark-red meat and intestines are usually disliked by consumers, and

they tend to prefer bright-red fresh meat and intestines [42,43]. The a^* and b^* are related to the pigment concentration, oxidation, and redox conditions [44,45]. The stunning method influences the color characteristic of chicken breast meat and the small intestines. It has been reported that bright-red colored meat and small intestine were observed in highly concentrated (98%) N_2 -stunned pigs and rabbits, and dark-red colored meat was found in highly concentrated (80%) CO_2 -stunned pigs and rabbits [22,46]. Electrical stunning showed a higher L^* value in the *Longissimus thoracis* muscle of pigs than CO_2 stunning [22,41]. Also, CO_2 -stunned pigs were observed to have high a^* values and low b^* values compared to electrically stunned pigs [22]. In the case of N_2 -stunned pigs, the color characteristics was intermediate between electrically- and CO_2 -stunned pigs [22]. Additionally, in rabbits, the N_2 stunning method resulted in higher L^* and b^* values and lower a^* values compared to CO_2 and Ar stunning method [46]. In this study, the Elec-stun showed high L^* and b^* , and low a^* values of chicken breast meat and small intestine, implying a pale color, and CO_2 -gas showed lower L^* and b^* values and higher a^* , indicating a dark-red color. The color characteristics of N_2 -gas treatment was intermediate between that of Elec-stun and CO_2 -gas treatments, which implies bright-red chicken breast meat and small intestine.

Proximate components of chicken breast meat and small intestine under different stunning methods

The proximate components of the stunned and non-stunned chicken breast meat are presented in Table 2. The moisture content showed a significant difference among all treatments ($p < 0.05$). In proteins content, among the stunning treatments, a noteworthy dissimilarity was found ($p < 0.05$). The Elec-stun and N_2 -gas treatments were not significantly affected by fat content ($p > 0.05$). In terms of ash and collagen content, Elec-stun treatment showed significant higher than the other stunning treatments ($p < 0.05$). In this study, although there was a significant difference, each component showed a small difference of ~1% among all treatments. Several factors can influence the nutrient composition of meat, including feeding, genetics, age, and gender [47]. In a previous study, it was shown that the stunning method did not have an effect on the proximate composition of the meat, except for moisture [22].

Water-holding capacity and cooking loss of chicken breast meat and small intestine under different stunning methods

Fig. 1 shows the WHC for chicken breast meat and small intestine with stunned and non-stunned. There were no significant differences observed in WHC among all treatments. The WHC value of halal (60.14 ± 1.51) was higher than that of the stunning treatments ($p > 0.05$). Among the stunning

Table 2. Effect of stunning (with electric, CO_2 gas and N_2 gas) and non-stunning halal method on proximate components of chicken meat

Items	Treatments ¹⁾			
	Elec-stun	CO_2 -gas	N_2 -gas	Halal
Moisture (%)	75.23 ± 0.68^c	75.53 ± 0.47^b	74.90 ± 0.24^d	76.02 ± 0.56^a
Protein (%)	22.79 ± 0.66^b	22.34 ± 0.56^c	23.02 ± 0.37^a	22.67 ± 0.17^b
Fat (%)	1.34 ± 0.35^b	1.21 ± 0.28^c	1.36 ± 0.11^b	1.49 ± 0.13^a
Ash (%)	1.34 ± 0.51^a	1.04 ± 0.08^b	1.16 ± 0.05^b	1.11 ± 0.08^b
Collagen (%)	1.25 ± 0.24^a	1.17 ± 0.17^b	1.13 ± 0.09^{bc}	1.08 ± 0.06^c

¹⁾Treatments: Elec-stun, electrical stunning method; CO_2 -gas, 80% CO_2 gas stunning method; N_2 -gas, 98% N_2 gas stunning method; Halal, non-stunning method. n = 40.

^{a-d}Different superscript letters in same row means significant differences ($p < 0.05$).




Fig. 1. WHC of stunning and non-stunning (halal) chicken meat. ¹⁾Treatments: Elec-stun, electrical stunning method; CO₂-gas, 80% CO₂ gas stunning method; N₂-gas, 98% N₂ gas stunning method; Halal, non-stunning method.

treatments, Elec-stun (59.21 ± 2.06) had the highest WHC value and the lowest WHC value was observed in the CO₂-gas (56.22 ± 0.99 ; $p > 0.05$). The WHC value of N₂-gas (57.78 ± 1.42) was intermediate between Elec-stun and CO₂-gas ($p > 0.05$).

Meat industries are concerned with the improved WHC of meat and meat products. Meats with a lower WHC percentage may not fulfill export quality regulations, resulting in huge economic losses [48,49]. The decrease in pH causes the meat to become more acidic, which in shift causes the protein filaments in the meat to tighten and reduces the WHC of the meat [50]. Previous studies have shown that because of pre-slaughter stunning, muscle glycogen quickly breaks down and produces large amounts of lactate in the blood, resulting in a low pH and decreased WHC [51,52]. Our present study is consistent with this, where the halal stunning observed a higher WHC value than any other treatment. According to Bond et al. [53] increased amounts of adrenaline were observed in the blood due to pre-slaughter stress, which can potentially lead to water loss from meat. During exposure to CO₂, lambs inhaled a large amount of gas that severely influenced the breakdown of cells, resulting in decreased WHC of the lamb meat [54]. In previous studies, a lower WHC value was found in pigs and lambs stunned with 80% CO₂ than in those stunned with electrical stunning [22,55]. It has been reported that N₂-stunned (98%) pigs provide intermediate WHC values of meat, between those of electrical and CO₂ stunning [22]. Also in this study, the CO₂-gas treatment showed a lower WHC value and the Elec-stun demonstrated a higher value. The N₂-gas treatment provided values between Elec-stun and CO₂-gas treatments.

The CL values of the stunned and non-stunned chicken breast meat are shown in Fig. 2. There were no significant differences observed in CL among all treatments. The figure indicates that the halal treatment provided a higher value (19.45 ± 1.17) than the all stunning treatment ($p > 0.05$). Among the stunning treatments, Elec-stun showed the highest value (17.17 ± 1.59) and CO₂-gas the lowest (13.81 ± 1.06). The value of N₂-gas (15.84 ± 0.32) was intermediate in Elec-stun and CO₂-gas ($p > 0.05$).

The method of pre-slaughter stunning and slaughtering may have an impact on the CL of meat.




Fig. 2. Cooking loss of stunning and non-stunning (halal) chicken meat. ¹⁾Treatments: Elec-stun, electrical stunning method; CO₂-gas, 80% CO₂ gas stunning method; N₂-gas, 98% N₂ gas stunning method; Halal, non-stunning method.

According to Önenç and Kaya [56], stunned meat shows lower CL than non-stunned meat. Our research supports this statement, where the halal provided a higher CL than that of the stunning treatments. The quicker pH decline in electrically-stunned animals resulted in higher CL [57]. Higher CL was observed in more pale-colored broilers and turkey meat [58,59]. Electrically-stunned lambs showed significantly increased CL at 72 h postmortem than CO₂-stunned lambs [60]. Elevated CL was also found in electrically-stunned cattle [56] and lambs [60] at the 1st and 2nd weeks postmortem. The CL value of N₂-stunned pigs showed an intermediate value between that of electrical and CO₂ stunning [22]. The present study also supports these statements; Elec-stun provided a higher value of CL than CO₂-gas, and the value of N₂-gas was intermediate.

Warner-Bratzler shear force of chicken breast meat under different stunning methods

The WBSF values of the stunned and non-stunned broiler meat are shown in Fig. 3. There were no significant differences observed in WBSF among all treatments. The WBSF value of the halal treatment (1.96 ± 0.07 kg/cm²) was comparatively higher than the stunning treatments ($p > 0.05$). The highest value was found in the Elec-stun (1.80 ± 0.16 kg/cm²) and lowest value was found in the CO₂-gas (1.35 ± 0.41 kg/cm²) amongst the different stunning treatments ($p > 0.05$). The WBSF value of N₂-gas (1.67 ± 0.08 kg/cm²) was higher than CO₂-gas but lower than Elec-stun.

The WBSF of chicken breast meat depends on several factors such as stress, genes, chilling system, and cooking situation [61,62]. The method of stunning is a factor that affects the WBSF value of meat. Önenç and Kaya [56] and Vergara et al. [63] found that stunned meat provides a lower WBSF value (more tendered) than non-stunned meat. We also found a higher WBSF value in non-stunned meat compared with any stunning treatment animals in our study. An elevated WBSF value was found in electrically-stunned meat compared with CO₂-stunned suckling lamb meat [64]. Electrically-stunned animals demonstrated higher WBSF values owing to less calpain activity [65]. The muscle pH and number of enzymes present controlled the activity of calpain [66]. When animals are exposed to high levels of CO₂, a large amount of gas is absorbed in the




Fig. 3. Warner-Bratzler shear force (WBSF) of stunning and non-stunning (halal) chicken meat. ¹⁾ Treatments: Elec-stun, electrical stunning method; CO₂-gas, 80% CO₂ gas stunning method; N₂-gas, 98% N₂ gas stunning method.

animal body, which is greatly soluble in muscle tissue and remains at prominent levels in the muscle tissues as residue, resulting in a lower WBSF value [67]. CO₂ stunned pigs and lambs showed lower WBSF values than electrically-stunned meat [22,68]. One possible reason for these findings is that the gas stunning method may result in higher calpain activity compared to electrical stunning. This is a speculative hypothesis, and further analysis on the muscle calpain activity based on the stunning methods should be conducted in future studies to clarify this relationship. N₂-stunned pigs provided slightly higher WBSF values than CO₂-stunned pigs, but no statistically significant difference was found between them [22]. The findings of this study concur with these statements. We found lower WBSF values in the CO₂-gas treatment and higher values in the Elec-stun, and N₂-gas was intermediate. Therefore, it is believed that the softening phenomenon of CO₂ can be improved by using N₂ gas.

Thickness and Warner-Bratzler shear force of chicken's small intestine under different stunning methods

Table 3 shows the thickness and WBSF value for chicken small intestines with stunned and non-stunned. The thickness of both fresh and cooked small intestines was significantly higher in the halal treatment compared to the stunning treatments ($p < 0.05$). Among the stunning treatments, Elec-stun had the highest thickness value and the lowest value was found in CO₂-gas ($p < 0.05$). The thickness of N₂-gas treatment was higher than CO₂-gas but lower than Elec-stun.

The thickness value of small intestine is influenced by various factors including genetics, sex, feeding habits, disease, nutrition, age, and bacterial load etc. The stunning method and pre-slaughter stress may affect the thickness value of the small intestine in chickens post-mortem. The thickness value of N₂-stunned pigs' small intestine was higher than that of CO₂-stunned pigs, and lower than that of electrically-stunned pigs under both fresh and cooked conditions [22]. The present study demonstrates similar findings. The electrically-stunned (Elec-stun) broiler small intestine showed higher thickness values than the other treatments. The thickness value of N₂-stunning chicken

Table 3. Effect of stunning (with electric, CO₂ gas and N₂ gas) and non-stunning halal method on thickness and Warner-Bratzler shear force (WBSF) of chicken small intestine

Items	Treatments ¹⁾			
	Elec-stun	CO ₂ -gas	N ₂ -gas	Halal
Thickness (mm)				
Fresh small intestine	0.94 ± 0.06 ^b	0.69 ± 0.06 ^d	0.80 ± 0.07 ^c	1.09 ± 0.06 ^a
Cooked small intestine	1.78 ± 0.09 ^b	1.40 ± 0.07 ^d	1.54 ± 0.04 ^c	1.87 ± 0.05 ^a
WBSF (kg/cm ²)				
Fresh small intestine	1.50 ± 0.14 ^b	1.11 ± 0.08 ^d	1.30 ± 0.04 ^c	1.63 ± 0.05 ^a
Cooked small intestine	0.39 ± 0.05 ^b	0.15 ± 0.03 ^d	0.27 ± 0.02 ^c	0.47 ± 0.03 ^a

¹⁾Treatments: Elec-stun, electrical stunning method; CO₂-gas, 80% CO₂ gas stunning method; N₂-gas, 98% N₂ gas stunning method; Halal, non-stunning method. n = 40.

^{a-d}Different superscript letters in same row means significant differences ($p < 0.05$).

small intestine (N₂-gas) was higher than those of CO₂-stunning chickens (CO₂-gas).

In both fresh and cooked conditions, the WBSF in small intestine of thickness differed significantly between all treatments. The halal treatment provided higher values of WBSF than all the stunning treatments. Among the stunning treatments in both fresh and cooked conditions, the Elec-stun treatment showed the highest values of WBSF and the lowest values of WBSF were found in the CO₂-gas. The WBSF value of the N₂-gas treatment was between those of the Elec-stun and CO₂-gas.

The WBSF value of the small intestine can be influenced by pre-slaughter stunning. During exposure to high concentrations of CO₂ during stunning, an enormous amount of CO₂ is absorbed in the body. This gas was highly dissolved in the chicken breast-meat and small intestine of the animals and remained elevated as a residue [67,69]. It was reported that the WBSF value of N₂-stunned pork meat intestines was intermediate between those of electrically- and CO₂-stunned pigs [22]. Similar findings were observed in the present study; here CO₂-stunned broiler small intestine (CO₂-gas) showed a lower WBSF value than electrically-stunned (Elec-stun) small intestine, and N₂ stunning (N₂-gas) provided intermediate results.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to assess the quality attributes of N₂ gas (98%)-stunned broiler breast meat and small intestine compared with chicken breast meat stunned using conventional electrical, CO₂-gas and halal stunning. Our research findings indicate that N₂ gas stunning results in less discoloration in meat and small intestines compared to CO₂ stunning and halal stunning. Additionally, N₂ stunning exhibits color properties similar to electrical stunning and inhibits the phenomenon of softening caused by CO₂ stunning method. Therefore, high-concentration N₂ gas stunning method can be considered for new industrial applications in poultry slaughter. However, for the adoption of N₂ stunning in the industry, further research is needed on factors such as changes in stress hormones and measures regarding the toxicity/safety of meat.

REFERENCES

1. Bilgili SF. Electrical stunning of broilers - basic concepts and carcass quality implications: a review. *J Appl Poult Res.* 1992;1:135-46. <https://doi.org/10.1093/japr/1.1.135>
2. Turcsán Z, Varga L, Szigeti J, Turcsán J, Csurák I, Szalai M. Effects of electrical stunning

- frequency and voltage combinations on the presence of engorged blood vessels in goose liver. *Poult Sci.* 2003;82:1816-9. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/82.11.1816>
3. Gregory NG, Wotton SB. Effect of stunning on spontaneous physical activity and evoked activity in the brain. *Br Poult Sci.* 1990;31:215-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071669008417248>
 4. Hillebrand SJW, Lambooy E, Veerkamp CH. The effects of alternative electrical and mechanical stunning methods on hemorrhaging and meat quality of broiler breast and thigh muscles. *Poult Sci.* 1996;75:664-71. <https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.0750664>
 5. Gregory NG, Wilkins LJ. Effect of stunning current on carcass quality in chickens. *Vet Rec.* 1989;124:530-2. <https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.124.20.530>
 6. Wilkins LJ, Scott CA. The effect of stunning on poultry carcass quality. *Meat Hygien.* 1987;52:31-2.
 7. Anil MH. Effects of slaughter method on carcass and meat characteristics in the meat of cattle and sheep. Kenilworth: Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board; 2012.
 8. Berg C, Raj M. A review of different stunning methods for poultry—animal welfare aspects (stunning methods for poultry). *Animals.* 2015;5:1207-19. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani5040407>
 9. Raj ABM, Grey TC, Audsely AR, Gregory NG. Effect of electrical and gaseous stunning on the carcass and meat quality of broilers. *Br Poult Sci.* 1990;31:725-33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071669008417303>
 10. Webster AB, Fletcher DL. Reactions of laying hens and broilers to different gases used for stunning poultry. *Poult Sci.* 2001;80:1371-7. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/80.9.1371>
 11. Sandilands V, Raj ABM, Baker L, Sparks NHC. Aversion of chickens to various lethal gas mixtures. *Anim Welf.* 2011;20:253-62. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0962728600002736>
 12. Verhoeven M, Gerritzen M, Velarde A, Hellebrekers L, Kemp B. Time to loss of consciousness and its relation to behavior in slaughter pigs during stunning with 80 or 95% carbon dioxide. *Front Vet Sci.* 2016;3:38. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2016.00038>
 13. Gerritzen MA, Lambooy B, Reimert H, Stegeman A, Spruijt B. On-farm euthanasia of broiler chickens: effects of different gas mixtures on behavior and brain activity. *Poult Sci.* 2004;83:1294-301. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/83.8.1294>
 14. Raj ABM. Recent developments in stunning and slaughter of poultry. *Worlds Poult Sci J.* 2006;62:467-84. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0043933906001097>
 15. Conlee KM, Stephens ML, Rowan AN, King LA. Carbon dioxide for euthanasia: concerns regarding pain and distress, with special reference to mice and rats. *Lab Anim.* 2005;39:137-61. <https://doi.org/10.1258/0023677053739747>
 16. Smith W, Harrap SB. Behavioural and cardiovascular responses of rats to euthanasia using carbon dioxide gas. *Lab Anim.* 1997;31:337-46. <https://doi.org/10.1258/002367797780596130>
 17. Leach MC, Howell VA, Allan TF, Morton DB. Degrees of aversion shown by rats and mice to different concentrations of inhalational anaesthetics. *Vet Rec.* 2002;150:808-15. <https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.150.26.808>
 18. Raj ABM, Gregory NG. Welfare implications of the gas stunning of pigs 1. Determination of aversion to the initial inhalation of carbon dioxide or argon. *Anim Welf.* 1995;4:273-80. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s096272860001798X>
 19. Velarde A, Cruz J, Gispert M, Carrión D, Ruiz-de-la-Torre JL, Diestre A, et al. Aversion to carbon dioxide stunning in pigs: effect of carbon dioxide concentration and halothane genotype. *Anim Welf.* 2007;16:513-22. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0962728600027445>
 20. Dalmau A, Rodríguez P, Llonch P, Velarde A. Stunning pigs with different gas mixtures: aversion in pigs. *Anim Welf.* 2010;19:325-33. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s096272860000172X>

21. EFSA [European Food Safety Authority]. Opinion of the scientific panel on animal health and welfare (AHAW) on a request from the commission related to welfare aspects of the main systems of stunning and killing the main commercial species of animals. *EFSA Journal*. 2004;2:45. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2004.45>
22. Alam MS, Song DH, Lee JA, Hoa VB, Hwang I, Kim HW, et al. Effects of high concentration nitrogen gas stunning of pigs on the quality traits of meat and small intestine. *Animals*. 2022;12:2249. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani12172249>
23. KOSIS [Korean Statistical Information Service]. Livestock statistics survey, agriculture and forestry statistical database. Daejeon: KOSIS; 2022 [cited 2023 may 20]. https://kosis.kr/statHtml/statHtml.do?orgId=114&tblId=DT_114_2016_S0022&vw_cd=MT_ZTITLE&list_id=K1_21&seqNo=&lang_mode=ko&language=kor&obj_var_id=&itm_id=&conn_path=MT_ZTITLE
24. Ahn CH, Song S, Kim GD. Technology for value-addition to animal by-products. *Livest Food Sci Ind*. 2019;8:28-34.
25. Rho JO, Kim JH. A study on the recognition and preference of a chicken menu in adults in the Jeonbuk area. *J East Asian Soc Diet Life*. 2013;23:12-22.
26. Llonch P, Dalmau A, Rodríguez P, Manteca X, Velarde A. Aversion to nitrogen and carbon dioxide mixtures for stunning pigs. *Anim Welf*. 2012;21:33-9. <https://doi.org/10.7120/096272812799129475>
27. Raj ABM. Behaviour of pigs exposed to mixtures of gases and the time required to stun and kill them: welfare implications. *Vet Rec*. 1999;144:165-8. <https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.144.7.165>
28. Raj ABM, Johnson SP, Wotton SB, McInstry JL. Welfare implications of gas stunning of pigs: 3. the time to loss of somatosensory evoked potentials and spontaneous electrocorticogram of pigs during exposure to gases. *Vet J*. 1997;153:329-40. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1090-0233\(97\)80067-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1090-0233(97)80067-6)
29. Bager F, Braggins TJ, Devine CE, Graafhuis AE, Mellor DJ, Tavener A, et al. Onset of insensibility at slaughter in calves: effects of electroplectic seizure and exsanguination on spontaneous electrocortical activity and indices of cerebral metabolism. *Res Vet Sci*. 1992;52:162-73. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0034-5288\(92\)90005-m](https://doi.org/10.1016/0034-5288(92)90005-m)
30. Llonch P, Andaluz A, Rodríguez P, Dalmau A, Jensen EW, Manteca X, et al. Assessment of consciousness during propofol anaesthesia in pigs. *Vet Rec*. 2011;169:496. <https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.d5643>
31. Dalmau A, Llonch P, Rodríguez P, Ruíz-de-la-Torre JL, Manteca X, Velarde A. Stunning pigs with different gas mixtures: gas stability. *Anim Welf*. 2010;19:315-23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0962728600001718>
32. Gent TC, Gebhardt-Henrich S, Schild SLA, Rahman AA, Toscano MJ. Evaluation of poultry stunning with low atmospheric pressure, carbon dioxide or nitrogen using a single aversion testing paradigm. *Animals*. 2020;10:1308. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10081308>
33. Kim HW, Song DH, Seol KH, Kim CH, Joen JH. Changes in stress hormones concentration and meat quality according to stunning methods of broilers. In: *Proceedings of the 19th AAAP (Asian-Australian Association of Animal Production) Animal Science Congress on the Animal Production for Human and Nature; 2022; Jeju, Korea*, p. 3-55.
34. Farouk MM, Al-Mazeedi HM, Sabow AB, Bekhit AED, Adeyemi KD, Sazili AQ, et al. Halal and kosher slaughter methods and meat quality: a review. *Meat Sci*. 2014;98:505-19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2014.05.021>
35. Hur SJ, Joo ST, Oh SH, Kim YJ, Kim YH, Lee JI, et al. Effects of packaging method and storage condition on meat shelf-life and water-holding capacity of pork loin. *J Anim Sci Tech*.

- 2001;43:121-30.
36. Khan AW, Nakamura R. Effects of pre- and postmortem glycolysis on poultry tenderness. *J Food Sci.* 1970;35:266-7. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2621.1970.tb12157.x>
 37. Ngoka DA, Froning GW. Effect of free struggle and preslaughter excitement on color of turkey breast muscles. *Poult Sci.* 1982;61:2291-3. <https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.0612291>
 38. Smolinksa T, Korzeniowska M. Evaluation of the PSE and DFD abnormalities occurrence in chicken meat. In: *Proceedings of the XVIIth European Symposium on the Quality of Poultry Meat*; 2005; Doorwerth, The Netherlands. p. 190-3.
 39. Nowak B, Mueffling TV, Hartung J. Effect of different carbon dioxide concentrations and exposure times in stunning of slaughter pigs: impact on animal welfare and meat quality. *Meat Sci.* 2007;75:290-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2006.07.014>
 40. Becerril-Herrera M, Alonso-Spilsbury M, Lemus-Flores C, Guerrero-Legarreta I, Olmos-Hernández A, Ramírez-Necochea R, et al. CO₂ stunning may compromise swine welfare compared with electrical stunning. *Meat Sci.* 2009;81:233-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2008.07.025>
 41. Channon HA, Payne AM, Warner RD. Comparison of CO₂ stunning with manual electrical stunning (50 Hz) of pigs on carcass and meat quality. *Meat Sci.* 2002;60:63-8. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0309-1740\(01\)00107-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0309-1740(01)00107-3)
 42. Van Laack RLJM, Liu CH, Smith MO, Loveday HD. Characteristics of pale, soft, exudative broiler breast meat. *Poult Sci.* 2000;79:1057-61. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/79.7.1057>
 43. Díaz O, Rodríguez L, Torres A, Cobos A. Chemical composition and physico-chemical properties of meat from capons as affected by breed and age. *Span J Agric Res.* 2010;8:91-9. <https://doi.org/10.5424/sjar/2010081-1147>
 44. Waritthitham A, Lambertz C, Langholz HJ, Wicke M, Gauly M. Assessment of beef production from Brahman x Thai native and Charolais x Thai native crossbred bulls slaughtered at different weights. II: meat quality. *Meat Sci.* 2010;85:196-200. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2009.12.025>
 45. Bispo E, Monserrat L, González L, Franco D, Moreno T. Effect of weaning status on animal performance and meat quality of Rubia Gallega calves. *Meat Sci.* 2010;86:832-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2010.07.005>
 46. Alam MS, Song DH, Lee JA, Hoa VB, Kim HW, Kang SM, et al. Effect of different gas-stunning conditions on heme pigment solutions and on the color of blood, meat, and small intestine of rabbits. *Animals.* 2022;12:3155. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani12223155>
 47. Banović M, Grunert KG, Barreira MM, Fontes MA. Beef quality perception at the point of purchase: a study from Portugal. *Food Qual Prefer.* 2009;20:335-42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2009.02.009>
 48. Forrest JC, Aberle ED, Hedrick HB, Judge MD, Merkel RA. *Principles of meat science.* Reading, Berkshire: W.H. Freeman and Co.; 1975.
 49. Lawrie RA. *Meat science.* 4th ed. Oxford: Pergamon Press; 1985.
 50. Joo ST, Kauffman RG, Kim BC, Park GB. The relationship of sarcoplasmic and myofibrillar protein solubility to colour and water-holding capacity in porcine longissimus muscle. *Meat Sci.* 1999;52:291-7. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0309-1740\(99\)00005-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0309-1740(99)00005-4)
 51. Grandin T. The effect of stress on livestock and meat quality prior to and during slaughter. *Int J Study Anim Probl.* 1980;1:313-37.
 52. Gregory NG. *Animal welfare and meat science.* New York, NY: CABI; 2003.
 53. Bond JJ, Can LA, Warner RD. The effect of exercise stress, adrenaline injection and electrical stimulation on changes in quality attributes and proteins in Semimembranosus muscle of lamb.

- Meat Sci. 2004;68:469-77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2004.05.001>
54. Moore VJ, Gill CO. The pH and display life of chilled lamb after prolonged storage under vacuum or under CO₂. *N Z J Agric Res.* 1987;30:449-52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00288233.1987.10417956>
 55. Linares MB, Bórnez R, Vergara H. Effect of stunning systems on meat quality of Manchego suckling lamb packed under modified atmospheres. *Meat Sci.* 2008;78:279-87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2007.06.009>
 56. Önenç A, Kaya A. The effects of electrical stunning and percussive captive bolt stunning on meat quality of cattle processed by Turkish slaughter procedures. *Meat Sci.* 2004;66:809-15. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0309-1740\(03\)00191-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0309-1740(03)00191-8)
 57. Lyon C, Buhr R. Biochemical basis of meat texture. In: Richardson RI, Mead GC, editors. *Poultry meat science*. New York, NY: CABI; 1999. p. 99-126.
 58. Allen CD, Fletcher DL, Northcutt JK, Russell SM. The relationship of broiler breast color to meat quality and shelf-life. *Poult Sci.* 1998;77:361-6. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/77.2.361>
 59. Mckee SR, Hargis BM, Sams AR. Pale, soft and exudative meat in turkeys treated with succinylcholine. *Poult Sci.* 1998;77:356-60. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/77.2.356>
 60. Linares MB, Bórnez R, Vergara H. Effect of different stunning systems on meat quality of light lamb. *Meat Sci.* 2007;76:675-81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2007.02.007>
 61. Koch RM, Cundiff LV, Gregory KE. Heritabilities and genetic, environmental and phenotypic correlations of carcass traits in a population of diverse biological types and their implications in selection programs. *J Anim Sci.* 1982;55:1319-29. <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas1982.5561319x>
 62. Monsón F, Sañudo C, Sierra I. Influence of cattle breed and ageing time on textural meat quality. *Meat Sci.* 2004;68:595-602. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2004.05.011>
 63. Vergara H, Linares MB, Berruga MI, Gallego L. Meat quality in suckling lambs: effect of pre-slaughter handling. *Meat Sci.* 2005;69:473-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2004.09.002>
 64. Bórnez R, Linares MB, Vergara H. Effects of stunning with different carbon dioxide concentrations and exposure times on suckling lamb meat quality. *Meat Sci.* 2009;81:493-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2008.10.004>
 65. Dransfeld E. Modelling post-mortem tenderisation-V: inactivation of calpains. *Meat Sci.* 1994;37:391-409. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0309-1740\(94\)90055-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0309-1740(94)90055-8)
 66. Murachi T. Calpain and calpastatin. *Trends Biochem Sci.* 1983;8:167-9. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0968-0004\(83\)90165-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0968-0004(83)90165-2)
 67. Gill CO. Controlled atmosphere packaging of chilled meat. *Food Control.* 1990;1:74-8. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0956-7135\(90\)90088-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0956-7135(90)90088-T)
 68. Bruce HL, Wolfe FH, Jones SDM, Price MA. Porosity in cooked beef from controlled atmosphere packaging is caused by rapid CO₂ gas evolution. *Food Res Int.* 1996;29:189-93. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0963-9969\(96\)00057-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0963-9969(96)00057-9)