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## Summary

To obtain composition data and related information on boneless beef used in feeding programs of the United States Armed Services, studies were made of 4 -way boncless beef from 8 representative carcasses, raw end cooked, and including related items from preparation and cooking; of beef in plate waste in a limited number of beef roasts from general issue, cooked and served in Army messes; and of 4-way boneless beef representative of large-scale regular issue, cooked and serveci in Army messes in 5 field locations. All the beef was cut according to Army specifications, which call for the processing of the carcass to provide 7 boneless cuts for oven roasts or griddle-broiled steaks, 5 cuis for pot roasts or Swiss steaks, diced meat for stew, and ground meat for such recipes as hamburger and meat loaf.

During the cutting of the 8 carcasses, the yields by weight of the various cuts were obtained. The proximate composition of the cuts, raw and cooked, was determined by analysis; a cut from one side was used as the raw sample and the corresponding cut from the other side was cooked. On a carcass basis, food energy retention in the cooked cuts was 85 percent; protein, 94 percent; and fat, 82 percent.

At one location a stady was also made of the effect on plate waste of trimming surface fat from oven roasis before cooking. Roasts from general procurement sources of the Army were used. It was found that moderate trimming decreased fat in plate waste without apparent reduction in fat presumed eaten. Fat trimming by the meat processors would imply reduction not only of fat losses in the kitchen and during cooking but also of weight to be handled and stored in valuable freezing, space.
In the field study, the composition of boneless beef, raw, cooked, and served, and of the corresponding plate waste was determined from samples involving 52,682 pounds of raw boneless beef cooked and

[^0]scrved in 542 Army messes to 109,682 men. Plate waste increased with the amount of raw beef issited to the mess, and fat in plate waste increased with fat in the served cooked beef. The amounts of beef in plate waste were not always significantly correlated with the amounts of raw beef issued; however, the percentages of fat in the plate waste were significantly correlated with the percentages of fat in the cooked beef. It was calculated that 67 perceat of the food energy of the issued beef, 84 percent of the protein, and 51 percent of the fat were enten; 10, 6 , and 11 pereent of the issued beef food energy, protein, and fat, respectively, appeared in the plate waste. It was also calculated that 7 percent of the food energy, 9 percent of the protein, and 6 percent of the fat, in the issued beef were left as unserved edible beef at the serving table.

## Introduction

The ment servings in the feeding programs of the Armed Services furnish a large part of the reguired protein and fat and hence of the total food energy provided by the diet. To an ibceasing extent, beef procurement is shifting from carcass becf toward frozen boneless beef which offers advantages in handling and transportation.

Available data on the nutritive value of the various cuts of carcass beef are not applicable to the cuts and forms of boneless beef. This study was plamed, therefore, to obtain composition data directly on 4 -way boneless beef, cut and packed according to United States Army specifications. Analyses were made on raw beef as issued and as cooked by Army personnel with Army equipment.

While the cuts made to meet Army specifications for boneless beef are not necessarily identical with those in civilian markets, the data reported here are npplicable to houschold and institutional use. Restaurants, hospitals, and other institutions feeding large numbers of people use considerable quantities of boneless beef. Furthermore, the present study provides data which permit relating the nutritive value of bondess beef to carcass beef.

The studies here reported were carried out during 1951-53. In 1951, boncless beef was obtained from eight representative carcasses of Army grade B (equivalent to U. S. Choiec). The yields of cuts and forms of boneless beef, fat trim, waste trim, and bones were obtained from these carcasses. The cuts from one side of the carcass were analyzed raw for comparison with cuts from the other side after they were cooked according to standardized procedures and recipes. The whole of the raw beef cut and of the cooked becf cut was taken for the sample to be analyzed.

Because plate waste is a problem of those responsible for the feeding of Army personnel, a special study of plate waste from oven roasts was made during the first year. This included observations of the effect of trimming surface fat to $3 / 4$ inch before cooking on the amount of fat appearing in plate wastc. Fat discarded as waste from the table has taken up valuable freezing space and otherwise added to the costs of beef handling. Since fat is an important source of food energy, plate
waste could account for much of the difference between the number of calorics planned and issued per man and the number in the food eaten.

During the second year, 1952-53, composition data were obtained on boneless beef as actually issued, cooked, and served in Army messes. The 52,682 pounds of boneless beef used from 560,000 pounds made available at the time of the stady represented actual Army supply from 6 different processors of boneless beef in different areas. The 542 company mess meals were served to 109,128 men in 5 locations. The large-scale operation involved carloads of beef and thousands of men and was planned in great detail in order to determine not only the amounts and composition of the beef served but also the amounts of protein, fat, and food energy in the portion eaten.

## PART I

## Carcass Yields and Composition of Cuts and Forms of 4-Way Boneless Beef, Cooked by Army Procedures and Standardized Recipes

## Cuts and Forms of 4-Way Boneless Beef

Beef cut arcorsting to military specifications is known as 4 -way beef, so called because the carcass is processed to provide boneless cuts and forms for 4 different types of cooked beef-roasts or steaks cooked by dry heat, ronsts or steaks cooked by moist heat, meat for stews, and meat for such dishes as ment lonves and hamburgers. The cuts and forms comprise the following:

1. Seven cuts designated for oven ronsts or for griddle-broiled steaks, usually called "Roasts or steaks (dry heat)":
Blade roll
Inside of round
Sirloin butt
Knackle of round
Spencer roll
Loin strip
2. Five cuts designated for pot roasts or for Swiss steaks, usually called "Roasts or steaks (moist heat)":

> Chuck yoll
> Chuck tender Clod
3. Diced beef designated for stew
4. Ground beef designated for meat loaves, hamburgers, "becfburger" (see p. 21), and other similar preparations.
From standardized inspection procedures for 4-way boneless beef $(6)^{2}$ and from published information on the cuts of carcass beef more familiar to the civilian population ( $\delta$ ), a chart (fig. 1) has been prepared to show the comparative sources of cuts.

[^1]

Figure 1.-Carcass location of Army boneless beef cuts and of retail beef euts.

## Procedures

The source of beef used in part I of the study consisted of eight careasses of grade B, selected and graded by representatives in Chicago of the Veterinary Division, Office of The Surgeon General, at the plant of a large commercial packer.
Weights of carcasses and weights and identity of all forms and cuts of boncless beef and other parts were recorded by carcass number and side during the carcass cutting. The beef was wrapped and boved for freczing and subsequeat shipping to Fort Lee, Va., where the cooking was done with equipment made available by the Army and according to procedtures and recipes given in the Army and Air Force manual on recipes ( $\overline{5}$ ).

In order to control sampling of beef used for analysis, plans were made to take a cut from one side as the raw sample and the corresponding cut of the same carcass from the other side for the sample to be cooked. The distribution plan is given (table 1). For the cuts desiguated ronsts or steaks, 4 carcasses, selected at random, were used for roasts while the remaining 4 were used for steaks.

Thble 1.-Assignment of matched cuts and forms of t-way boneless beof by carcass number and side

| Cut or fartu or beef | Cartuss matuber ntme stida ${ }^{1}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Haw sample | Satupie to be caoked |
| Beercuts: |  |  |
| Owen ronsts |  | 55, 6R, $7 \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{8L}$, |
| Orkdte-brodid steak | 2[., 2R, 3L, 413 ............ | 1R, $2 \mathrm{l}+3 \mathrm{R}, 4 \mathrm{l}$. |
| Swls stenks.... | 11, 2R, 31, 4 R | 112, 25, 3R, 42, |
| Dleed beet: Stow... |  |  |
| Gromal beet; 14mburt |  | 1R, $1 \mathrm{~L}, 2 \mathrm{R}, 2 \mathrm{~F}, 3 \mathrm{R}, 3 \mathrm{~L}, 4 \mathrm{R}$, iL. |
| Meat loas. | $5 \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{SL}, \mathrm{GR}, 6 \mathrm{~L}, \mathrm{iR}, 7 \mathrm{~L}, 8 \mathrm{R},$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \mathrm{H}, 6 \mathrm{~L}, 0 \mathrm{R}, 0 \mathrm{~L}, 2 \mathrm{R}, 7 \mathrm{~L}, 8 \mathrm{R}, \\ & \mathrm{SL} . \end{aligned}$ |

i"R" man "L" signity "right" and "ieft." respectively.
To obtain comparable data on raw and cooked roasts and steaks, the usual Army cooking procedures were slightly modified. Roasts were placed in individual pans, and steaks were broiled on a griddie without added fat; stenks broiled at any one time were from the same cut. The ground beef from 4 of the 8 careasses was taken for hamburgers while the ground beef from the other 4 was used for meat loaves. The ground beef from each half carcass was divided into thits-one-third for the raw ground beef sample, one-third for the raw-recipe sample including all ingredients, and one-third for the cooked recipe. The died beef from all $S$ carcasses was used for stew.

Recipe ingredients were analyzed separately in order that their contributions toward the total protein, fat, and food energy of the finished dish could be obtained. Recipe ingredients given (5) were used in the weight percentages summarized (table 2). Recipes were standardized as to the proportion of ingredients.

TabLe 2.-Ingredients in percentages of weight of becf recipe

| Ingrediant | Pot ronst | Swiss stomk | Stew | ■amburger | Mrent loaf |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jimil bonelus, frozen | Percent ${ }^{54}$. | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Percent } \\ \text { fi. } 4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Percent } \\ 32.0 \end{array}$ | Percent $6 \mathrm{giz}^{2}$ | Percent 72.5 |
|  |  |  |  | 11.0 | 7.1 |
| Carots, cuokel, trimed (dramed) | 10.4 |  | 0.3 |  |  |
| Celers............ | 4.0 |  |  |  | ${ }^{72} \mathrm{~S}$ |
| VRgs. |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |
| Fat........ | 1.3 | 3.0 4.5 | 1.8 |  |  |
| Finur. <br> Mak, evajorated |  | 4.5 |  | 00 |  |
| Onions, dehstirutei | . 7 | . 9 | 5.9 | 1. I | . 7 |
| Peas, frozel |  |  | 5.8 |  |  |
| Tomintous, canned ' | - 28.9 | (2) ${ }^{2}$ | 7. 30.2 | 14.7 |  |

I Purem before adding to revine.
2 Varsing ammats usel to make gravy.
In the roast and steak samples taken for analysis, the Ican and the fat portions were separated; these wereground and analyzed separately. In handling gravies and licuids, the procedures were adapted to the problems of sampling. If fat layers or suspended solids could be
easily re, oved from the gravies or liquid portions of the cooked recipe, they ware analyzed separately and the data recombined. In any case, the whole portion taken for analysis was ground or mixed for subsampling. From one cut, for example, all the raw lean was ground and $\Omega$ record kept of weights so that recoveries from such operations would be quantitative.

Each subsample was placed in an cnamelware tray under infrared lamps for preliminary drying (3). All dried materials were ground in a laboratory Wiley mill to pass 20 mesh. Fatty samples difficult to grind were first extracted with ethyl ether in Soxhlet extractors.
The ground samples were analyzed, as reonired, according to the following procedures:

For residual moisture, by drying the sample in a vacuum oven at $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. and less than 25 mm . of mercury.
For residual moisture and fat, by extracting the sample in a Selas (or equivalent) crucible in a Bailey-Walker extractor, and then weighing the material in the cracible both before and after extraction, and also weighing the extracted fat.
For fat, by using either the Soxhlet apparatus ( $1, p .359$ ) or the Bailey-Walker extractor:
For nitrogen, by the Kjcldahl procedure ( $1, p, 12$ ).
For total ash, by the method described by Linnig and associates (4).
Protein was calculated on the basis of $N \times 6.25$; and total carbohydrate was obtained by calculating the difference between 100 percent and the sum of the percentages of moisture, protein, fat, and total ash contents. Physiological energy values for raw beef and for ronsts and steaks were obtained by using the factors 9.02 calories per gram of fat and 4.27 calories per gram of protein. The factors ( 7 ) used for the other cooked items depended upon the ingredients in the recipe; they are summarized in table 3.

Tarle 3.-Factors for calculating physiological energy values for beef recipes

| Recipe | Proteln | Fat | 'Total carbohydirate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pot reast. |  |  |  |
| Suiss stank. | 4. 24 4.23 | 9.62 | 3.81 |
| Staw....... | 4.23 4.18 | 9.02 | 3. 97 |
| Mamblirger | 4. 48 | 88.00 | 4.02 |
| - | 4.25 | 8.01 | 4.06 |

## Results

## Carcass Yields of 4-Way Boneless Beef

The 8 carcasses ranged in weight from 605 to 727 pounds and averaged 682 pounds. The yields of cuts and forms of boneless beef amounted to 66 percent of the carcass weight. The average weights of the individual cuts and the average percentage yields with their standard deviations are given (table 4), together with fat trimmings, waste trimmings, bones, kidney, and kidney fat. Standard deviation in each case represents the variation shown by 8 items from 8 carcasses, including the percentage yields. Fat trimmings (14 percent)
and bones ( 15 percent) made up most of the carcass other than boneless beef.

These yields of boneless beef compared well with those reported by Graf who reported the yield of boneless beef to be 68 percent of the carcass weight based on a study made in 1949 (2) and on 1951-52 data from large-scale procurement of boneless beef (personal communication from R. L. Graf). (See table 5.)

## Cooked Yields

To prepare the boncless beef for cooking, the cuts were thawed; the thaw juices yielded were not used in cooking any of this beef. These juices amounted to 4.5 percent of the raw frozen weight of the cuts assigned to oven roasts or griddle-broiled steaks, 3.8 percent of those assigned to pot ronsts or Swiss steaks, 5.0 percent of the diced meat, and 3.4 pereent of the ground meat. The average for all cuts and forms was 4.2 percent.

Table 4-Average ueights and percentage yield of cuts and forms of 4-way boneless beef and other tems from 8 beef carcasses of Army grade

| Item | Welght |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yeld |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left side |  | Right side |  | Total carcass |  |  |  | Percent of total carcass | Standara deviation |
|  | A verage | Standard deviation | A verage | Standard deviation | Aversge | Standard deviation | Aserage | Standard deviation |  |  |
| dasts or steaks (dry heat) | Kilograms 32.134 | Kilograms ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ( 917 | Nilhgrams | Kllograms | Kilograms | Kilograms | Pounds | Pounds |  |  |
| 13ade roll. . | $\xrightarrow{1.044}$ | - 2.210 | 31.922 1.616 | 3.217 .208 | 64.050 | 5.989 .392 | 141.29 7.19 |  | 20.72 1.05 | 0.93 .06 |
| Inside of round | 7. 442 | . 220 | 7.498 | -6f0 | 14.940 | 1.340 | 32.94 | 2.95 | 4.84 | :24 |
| Knuckle of round | 4.139 | . 525 | 4. 366 | . 728 | 8. 505 | +294 | 18.75 | . 65 | 2.75 | . 15 |
| Sirloin butt | 6. 691 | .64 | 6. 152 | - 761 | 12.843 | 1.364 | 25.31 | 3.01 | 3.116 4.16 | . 31 |
| Spencer roll | 4.403 | . 570 | 4. 709 | . 555 | 9,200 | . 972 | 20.25 | 2.14 | 2.97 | . 13 |
| Tenderloin-- | 2. 622 | . 246 | 2.764 | . 420 | 5. 386 | . 621 | 11.87 | 1.37 | 1.74 | - 16 |
| Roasts or steaks (moist heat) | 21,249 7.229 | $\begin{array}{r}2.158 \\ \hline .648 \\ \hline .184\end{array}$ | 21,820 7,285 | $\begin{array}{r}1.851 \\ \hline .406 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 43.078 <br> 14.515 | 3.9088 .927 | 94.97 32.00 | 8.81 2.04 8 | $\begin{array}{r}13.93 \\ 4.70 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | . 37 |
| Chuck roil. | 4.905 | . 737 | 5. 174 | . 523 | 10.079 | 1.230 | 22.22 | 2,72 | 3. 26 | . 20 |
| Chuck tonder. | 1.148 | . 154 | 1. 120 | 205 | 2.268 | , 348 | 5. 00 | . 77 | . 73 | . 02 |
| Outside of rou Rump butt | 5.713 | . 740 | 5. 783 | . 712 | 11.496 | 1.439 | 25. 34 | 3. 17 | 3.71 | . 20 |
| Dieed beef | 12.757 | 1.079 | 12.488 | 1.861 | 4.720 25.245 | -6.624 | \$5.46 | 1.38 5.31 | 8.17 | .16 |
| Forequarter | 9.908 | . 261 | 9. 632 | 1.736 | 19.590 | 2.097 | 43. 19 | 4. 612 | 0.34 | . 44 |
| Hindquarter | 2.849 | . 311 | 2.806 | . 301 | 5.665 | . 516 | 12.47 | 1.14 | 1.83 | . 12 |
| Ground beef... Forequarter. | 36.132 <br> 24.863 | 2. ${ }^{2} 111$ | 36. 24.71 | 2.910 | 72.103 | 5.320 <br> 3.712 | 159.16 | 11. 73 | - 23.37 | 48 |
| Hindquarter | 11. 269 | . 866 | 11.283 | 1.245 | 22.552 | 3.750 2.080 | 49.72 | 4.59 | 10.05 7.29 | .30 |
| Fat trimmings - | 21.759 | 2.716 | 21.830 | 1.757 | 43.589 | 5.847 | 96. 10 | 12.89 | 14.06 | 1.06 |
| Forequarter. Hindquarter. | 9.866 | $1 / 335$ | 9.625 | 1.097 | 19.491 | 2.415 | +2.97 | 5.32 | 6.29 | 44 |
| Wasto trimmings | 11.893 | (1.495 | $\begin{array}{r}12.205 \\ 3.827 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}2.182 \\ \hline .506 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}24.098 \\ 7.527 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}3.644 \\ .827 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 53.13 <br> 16.59 | 8.03 1.82 | 7.77 2 | . 3 |
| Forequarter- | 1. 446 | -. 203 | 1.432 | . 378 | 2.878 | . 945 | 6.34 | . 08 | 2.94 | . 18 |
| Hindquarter | 2. 254 | . 381 | 2.395 | . 312 | 4. 649 | 500 | 10.25 | 1.10 | 1.51 | 17 |
| Bones. Forequarter | ${ }^{23.572}$ | ' i. 669 | 22.553 | 1.397 | 46.125 | 2. 992 | 101.69 | 6. 60 | 14.95 | . 50 |
| Hindquarter | 13.891 9.681 | $\begin{array}{r}1.103 \\ .630 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 13.240 9.313 | ${ }^{1.001}$ | $\begin{array}{r}27.131 \\ 18.994 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 2.063 <br> 1.052 | 59.81 41.88 | 4.35 2.32 2.3 | 8.79 6.16 | . 36 |
| Kldney--.-. | . 439 | . 041 | -439 | . 041 | . 878 | .080 | 1.84 | -18 | ${ }^{8 .} 29$ | . 02 |
| Kldney fat | 2.901 | . 098 | 2.155 | .917 | 5.146 1.318 | 1.895 | 11.34 | 4.18 | 1.64 | . 53 |
| Hanging tender |  |  |  |  | 1.318 | . 200 | 2.91 | . 44 | . 42 | . 05 |
| Total of 10 main ltems | 154.733 | +----* | 153. 104 | $\ldots$ | 309.155 | ......... | 651.58 |  | 100. 02 | --........ |

Table 5.-Percentage yields and distribution of boneless culs and forms of beef 1

| Cut or \%orm ot beef | Percentugo ot carcuss | Percenttyue of beef | Cut or form of boof | Fercentage of carchss | Pertentsge of type of beef |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ronsts or steaks (dry hest) | ${ }^{22.604}$ | 100.05 | Ronsts br steaks (moist heat)-- | 13.592 | 93.97 |
| Blade roll......... | 1.082 | 4.91 |  | 4 | 32.49 |
| Inside of rounti. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 5.741 | 20.03 | Cruck roll-............... | ${ }^{3} .621$ | 20.64 |
| knutkle of round. | 3.960 | 14.69 | Chuck tenter.-.-.......-. | 2.827 | 20.80 |
| Sirioh butt | 4.085 | 18. 63 | Rump butt. | 1. 417 | 14.02 |
| Flenter rolt | 2.910 | 13.19 | Preed bect. | 8.437 |  |
| T'enderloin | 2.016 |  | Ground beet. | 23.015 |  |

I From chreass-cutting data ( $Z$ ), and from mpublishod 1951-52 datn on lirger-seale procuromont of boneless beef fer the Armed Sorvices (jersonal commanleation from R. L. Graf).

Yields of drained cooked beef (table 6) from the raw frozen beef were 64 percent for oven roasts, 66 percent for pot roasts, 67 percent for griddle-broiled steaks, and 77 percent for Swiss stenks. Where there were ingredients, the cooked-recipe yield from the raw recipe (beef

Tance 6.--Average weights of raw and cooked items and yields of cooked beef or beff rccipe

| Trio of beef or beef reclpe | Welight before cooking |  |  |  | Weight ntter cooking |  |  | Yield of cooked heet |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Frozen | Thaw juices | Drainet thawed beef | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rnw } \\ \text { rectpe } \\ \text { Within- } \\ \text { gredts } \end{gathered}$ | Drippings | Scrapfngs | Drained cooked beef | $\begin{aligned} & \text { From } \\ & \text { rati } \\ & \text { recipe } \end{aligned}$ | Fram beel |
|  | K?70 arnims 30. 672 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Kition } \\ \text { grams } \\ 1.310 \end{gathered}$ |  | Filagrams | $\begin{gathered} \text { Kito- } \\ \text { aramon } \\ 1.632 \end{gathered}$ | Kilo- grams <br> 0.41 | Ktio- <br> gramas <br> 10. 553 | Per- $66.6$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { cerft } \end{aligned}$ $6.7$ |
| Ore blate rol | 1.670 | . Uficio | 1.104 |  | . 0632 | . 023 | 1. 148 | 71. 0 | 68.7 |
| Inside of round | 7, 385 | . 210 | 7. 168 |  | . 321 | . 132 | 4.568 | 63.7 86 | 61.8 |
| Kruckle of rotid | 4.186 | .315 | 3. 771 |  | -086 | . 057 | 2. 4138 | 65.3 70.1 | 6 |
| Stoln strip. | 4. 6.162 | - | 4. 4.842 |  | - 58.29 | -000 | 3. 874 | 60.3 | 62.0 |
| Spencer rol | ${ }_{7}^{4.3} \mathbf{3 1 1}$ | . 132 | 4. 174 |  | . 35.5 | . 056 | 2. 784 | 66.9 | 64.1 |
| Tenderinin | 3.411 | . 188 | 2. 333 |  | + 103 | . 133 | 1.574 | 67.5 | 65.3 |
| Gridule-brollecl | 32.368 | 1. 490 | 30.73i |  | . 308 | . 404 | 2!. 770 | 70.8 | 67.3 |
| ulade roll. | 1. 538 | . 0306 | 1. 492 | - | . 029 | . 11408 | 1.030 <br> +1.710 <br> .588 | 71.0 68.6 | 63.8 |
| Inside of rot Kruekle of | \% 2.281 4.147 | . 258 | 2. 280 |  | . 064 | . 040 | 2. 558 | ¢fi. 3 | 61.7 |
| Loins stip). | 5.074 | . 220 | +.837 |  | . 035 | . 065 | 3.495 | 72.3 | 68.8 |
| Sirloin butt | 6. 14.3 | . 329 | 9.3.301 |  | . 072 | . 1033 | 4.614 | 73.0 | 69.2 |
| Spencer roll............ | 4. 735 | 090 | 4.611 | - | . 0 Off | +057 | 3.381 | 73.3 71.1 | 74. 6 |
| Pot ronasts. | 21. 4 ¢69 | OS9 | 20.472 | 38.328 | 171.417 |  | 14.097 | 36.8 | 65.7 |
| Clad. | \%. 150 | 334 | 6. 822 | 12.078 | 13.539 |  | 5. 132 | 425 | 71.7 |
| Chuck roll | 5.086 | . 237 | 4,823 | 8. 800 | 12.641 |  | 3.098 | 34.6 | 60.8 |
| Chuck tende | 1.07.4 | . 018 | 1.026 | 2. 483 | ${ }^{5} 888$ |  | - 6.31 | 25.4 | 58.8 |
| Ontside of | 5. ${ }^{\text {S. }} 370$ | 200 +140 | 5. 5.578 | 9. 3.880 | $1{ }^{1}$ |  | 3. 510 | 38.8 <br> 20.1 <br> 1 | 64. |
| Swist stanks. | 20.754 | . 830 | 20.148 | 41.416 | 117.417 |  | 16.044 | 38.7 | 77. |
| clod | T, 202 | . 218 | 6.984 | 13.336 | 14.818 |  | 3. 842 | 43.8 | 81.1 |
| Chuek roill | 4. 770 | , 16 | 4.611 | Stivo | 13.948 |  | 3. 7.64 | 41.8 | 75.5 |
| Chuck tender | 1.1.44 | . 020 | 1.115 | 3.109 | 11.504 |  |  |  | 75.3 |
| Ontside of round....-- | 5.474 <br> 2 | . 138 | 5. 5.338 | 11.659 | $1 \begin{aligned} & 15.269 \\ & 11.880\end{aligned}$ |  | 4. 1.747 | 35.2 37.3 | 75.0 |
| rump butt <br> Slow <br> Died beef. | 2188 12.788 | . 762 | 2. 12.02 | 4. 38.478 | 1. 1.80 | . 130 | 1.747 232.471 | 37.3 184.4 | \%. |
| 1ramburger: |  | 342 | 10.727 | 16.148 | . 366 | . 140 | 713.466 | 283.4 |  |
| Ateat loas: Ground | 1 | 13f | 10.688 | 14.968 | . 503 | +360 | ${ }^{2} 12.15$ | 781.3 |  |

[^2]plus ingredients) was 84 percent for stew including the liquids and vegetables, 83 percent for hamburgers, and 81 percent for meat lonves, which included the ingredients but did not include the drippings. Pan drippings amounted to 3.6 percent and pan scrapings to 1.3 percent of the raw frozen beef designated for oven roasts and griddlebroiled steaks.

## Composition of Raw and Cooked Boneless Beef

The moisture, food energy, protein, fat, total carbohydrate, and total ash of the individual raw boneless beef cuts and forms and of the cooked beef or becf recipe are given (table 7). Weighted-average values for food energy, protein, and fat are summarized (table 8). The weighting of averages was necessary so that the composition data would represent the whole group of roasts; for example, the boneless beef of inside of round would represent more than four times that of the blade roll (table 4).

Table 7.-Average composition and energy value per 100 grams of cuis and forms of 4-taay baneless beef, raw and cooked, and drippings

| Item | Water | Food emergy | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Proteln } \\ & (\mathrm{N} \times 6.25) \end{aligned}$ | Fat | Totas carbohydrato | Ash |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Oven ronsts: Bladeral: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Buw frozen beof...- | Grams 61.2 | Calories | $\mathrm{Grams}_{18}$ | Grams | Grams | Grams |
| Cooked dmined beef | \$18.8 | 328 | 24.2 | 25.0 |  | 0.8 1.3 |
| Drippinks: | 31.1 | 499 | 11.0 | 50.1 |  | 1.5 |
| Inside of round. <br> Raw frozen beef. | Af, 4 | 217 | 10.7 | 14.7 |  | 0 |
| Cooked dralned bedt | 50.8 | 291 | 28.3 | 18.7 |  | 1.4 |
| Detpplizs--1 | 27.3 | 542 | 7.4 | 56.6 |  | 2.4 |
| Knuckle of round ${ }_{\text {Raw }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked dramed bel | 70.8 | 154 | 19.8 | 7.7 |  | 1.7 |
| Dpplrings.......- | 3. 0 | 502 | 30.4 13.6 | 19.6 49.3 |  | 1.2 |
| Loln strip: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rar frozen becl.. | 5.3 | 320 | 17.4 | 27.3 |  | 8 |
| Cooked dramed bed | 41.7 | 404 | 23.6 | 33.6 |  | 1.0 |
| Sirlomb butt: | $2 \overline{7} .7$ | 386 | 5.3 | 62.5 |  | 1.6 |
| Raw crozen beet- | 57.3 | 294 | 17.1 | 24.5 |  |  |
| Cooked dmaned be | 43.1 | 331 | 23.7 | 31.0 |  | 1.2 |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\text {Li }}$ acer rolit: | 18.5 | CSI | 4.5 | 73.4 |  | 1.4 |
| Raw frozen beef | 40.3 | 375 | 15.1 | 34.4 |  | 7 |
| Cookod drained bee | 37.1 | 43 | 22.1 | 38.6 |  | 8 |
| Dripphess. | t0.4 | 760 | 2.2 | 84.0 |  | . 8 |
| Tenterion: ${ }_{\text {Rasion }}^{\text {frozen beef. }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cuoked druined beel | ${ }_{4} 10.0$ | 3181 | ${ }_{23} 16.2$ | 27.4 |  | . 8 |
| Oripuings. | 15.5 | 719 | 2.7 | 78.4 |  | 1.2 |
| Pot rowsts: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Enw frozen beer. | 60.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked dmaned beet | 48.6 | 341 | 23.4 | 26.8 |  | . 8 |
| Vegetables and juters | 80.2 | 132 | 2.4 | 11.3 | 5.0 | 1.0 |
| Chale rout |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rat frozen beet..... | 65.4 | 213 | 18.7 | 14.8 |  | 8 |
| Cooker druined beer. | 52.4 | 231 | 28.4 | 17.8 |  | 1.0 |
| vegetabies and juices Cbuck tender: | 79.7 | 138 | 3.0 | 12.0 | 4.3 | . 9 |
| Raw frozon beef- | 72.1 | 152 | 18.2 |  |  |  |
| Cooked druined bet. | 50.4 | 237 | 31.4 | 1.5 |  | 1.5 |
| Veretables and juices. | 88.0 | 50 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 3.3 | . 9 |
| Outside of round: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ray frozen beef Cooked dramed beef | 62.4 | 242 | 19.0 | 17.5 |  | . 8 |
| Cooked dramed becl | 53.0 | 29 | 27.4 | 19.2 |  | . 0 |
| Vegetables and jateos. | 71.4 | 189 | 3.8 | 17.8 | 5.6 | 1.3 |

Table 7.-Average composition and energy value per 100 grams of cuts and forms of 4 -way boneless beef, raw and cooked, and drippings-Continued

| Item | Water | Food energy | $\underset{(\mathrm{N} \times 6.25)}{\text { Protein }}$ | Fat | $\begin{gathered} \text { Totul } \\ \text { carbohy- } \\ \text { drath } \end{gathered}$ drate | Ash |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pot ronsts-Continued Rump butt: | Grams | Calories | Grams | Grams | Grams | Orams |
| Raw frozen beet | 57..15 | 300 | 17.6 | 24.9 |  | . 8 |
| Cooked dirslued beer. | 43.7 | 385 | 23.6 | 31.6 |  | 8 |
| Vegetalies and julices..................- | 81.1 | 138 | 1.13 | 13.1 | 3.4 | . 7 |
| Qritide-brolled steaks: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Blade roll: | 58.2 | 275 | 17.7 | 22.1 |  | . 8 |
| Crohed trained beef..................-- | 42.7 | 36 | 22.4 | 33.3 |  | . 9 |
| Drtppings. | 65.5 | 234 | 7.3 | 22.5 |  | 2.2 |
| Instde of roind: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ling frozon brey Cooket dmitued beet. | 65. 51.4 51.4 | 210 | 19.3 29.8 | 20.1 |  | $\underline{1.1}$ |
| Drimelmes-......... | 8.8 | 41 | 7.8 | . 0 |  | 2.7 |
| Knueklo of round: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Row frozen beer | \%99,8 | 169 | 19.6 | 13.5 |  | 1.9 |
| Cooked dramed beur | 84.4 | 52 | 8.7 | 1.7 |  | 3.0 |
| Lond strip: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ray trozen beer | 52.8 37.4 | 343 452 4 | $\xrightarrow{16.2}$ | 30.4 |  | 8 |
| Cooked drained b | 16.7 | 735 | 3.0 | 80.1 |  | 6 |
| Spencer ralt: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rnw frozen beot... | 4.6 | 400 | 14.8 | 37.4 |  | 6 |
| Conked dimined beet | 14.2 | 760 | 1.1 .3 | 83.6 |  | ${ }_{4}$ |
| Drippings-........ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raw frozen beet. | 55.4 | 314 | 15,6 | 27.4 |  | 9 |
| Conked drahed beef | 42.8 | 389 | 22.1 | 32.6 |  |  |
| Drippings--- | 35.0 | $5+3$ | 2.5 | 59.0 |  | 1.0 |
| Swiss stenks: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oloduw frozen beef | 60.2 | 2h | 18.0 | 20.8 |  | . 8 |
| Cooked dralied beel. | 53.0 | 305 | 19.4 | 23.0 | 3.9 | . 7 |
| Vegetables and jutces. | 72, 1 | 183 | 4.0 | 14.7 | 8.3 | . 8 |
| Chack rollt |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raw frosin beet hay |  | 245 |  |  |  | 8 |
| Conked drained beed. | $\underline{38}$ | $\underline{82}$ | 17.4 3.6 | 15.0 | 7.8 | . 8 |
| Ohuck tender: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raw frozen beed .... | 71.6 | 158 | 19.0 | 10.0 |  | 1.8 |
|  | 83.0 | $\stackrel{215}{108}$ | $2{ }_{2} 2.8$ | 8.1 | 5.4 | . 8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ray frozen beec. | 62.2 | 244 | 17.5 | 18.8 |  | 1.0 |
| Couked drsined beef. | 54.3 | 2386 | 21.8 | 30.2 | 3.1 | . 6 |
| Vegetables and juices. | 78.5 | 131 | 3.2 | 9.8 | 7.5 | . 8 |
| Rump butt: |  | 312 | 13.5 | 27.3 |  | 7 |
| Cax razun thed beed | $\stackrel{55.9}{19.2}$ | 352 | 18.3 | 29.2 | 2.6 | 7 |
| Veretables and julees. | 77.0 | 150 | 2.8 | 12.0 | 7.4 | . 8 |
| Dised beel: | 59.3 | 273 | 17.1 | 22.2 |  | . 8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| and water) | 74.2 |  | 3.1 | 6. 2 | 15.9 | 5 |
| Cooked recipe, stow | 75.2 | 155 | 7.5 | 11.2 | 5.6 | . 6 |
| Ground beef: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ras frozen beor. | 58.0 | 291 | 18.4 | 24.5 |  | 7 |
| Suw ricipe (totul) | $t 0.2$ | 259 | 13.0 | 18.6 | 7.3 | . 8 |
| Cooked recipe. - | 54.8 | 2 s 0 | 17.9 | 19.5 | 6.8 | 1.0 |
| Drippings-- | 1,6 | Ss2 |  | 98.0 |  |  |
| Meat ion: <br> Raw frozen beef. | 58.2 | 201 | 16,4 | 24.5 |  | 7 |
| Raw recipe (total) | 59.0 | 205 | 14.5 | 20.0 | 8.7 | . 8 |
| Conked recipe.-- | 54.8 | 200 | 17.9 | 19.5 | 0.9 | 1.0 |
| Drippings.........-- | 6. 6 | 824 | 1.2 | D. 9 |  | . |

Table: 8. Weighted-average values for food energy, protein, and fat por 100 grams of different cuts and forms of beef or recipe, raw and cooked

| Cut or form of heet | Haw |  |  | Cooked 1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Food energy | Proteln | Fat | Food energy | Proteje | Fat |
| Bexp cuts: | Catorits | Grama | Gramis | Caloriss | Orums | Grams |
| Owen roasts. | 274 |  | 21.9 | 346 | $\underline{35.7}$ | 20.2 |
| Pot ruasts.-. | 249 | 18.2 | 18.5 | 312 | $2{ }^{26.1}$ | 23.4 |
| Gradicherolded steats | 988 | 17.1 | 33.3 | 379 | 22.9 | 31.1 |
| Swlss steaks. | 247 | 17.6 | 19.1 | 257 | 21.0 | 20.0 |
| Dlerd beef: Stew (tota) | 273 | 17.1 | 29.2 | 15.5 | 7.4 | 11.8 |
| Groltid bets: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ] [nmulurger. | 291 | 15.8 | 24.8 | 203 | 15, 3 | 17.7 |
| Ment bors. | 291 | 10.4 | 34.5 | 280 | 17.0 | 19.5 |

1 Dralned solkls exeept for stew.
The distribution of protein and fat among thaw juices, pan drippings, and cooked beef is shown (table 9). The pan scrapings were small in amount and often provided an insufficient sample for the analyses. The thaw juices contained no mensurable quantity of fat and relatively small amounts of protein-only 2.3 percent of the total protein in the raw beef. Over 95 percent of the protein was found in the cooked oven roasts, griddle-broiled steaks, stew, hamburgers, and meat loaves. The amount of fat in drippings was variable, depending on cooking method and recipe. Over 20 percent of the fat was found in drippings from oven ronsts, whereas the same cuts cooked as griddle-broiled steaks contributed only 4 percent of fat to the drippings. Cuts cooked as pot roasis and Swiss steaks contributed, respectively, 31 and 39 percent of their fat content to drippings; hamburger and meat loaf contributed 18 and 12 percent.

Table 9.-Distribution of protcin and fat among thaw juices, drippings, and cooked items from various cuts and forms of beef

| Cut or form of betc | Protels |  |  | Fat |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Thaw julces | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Drip- } \\ & \text { ings- } \end{aligned}$ | Cooked <br> beef or recipe | Thaw julees | $\underset{\text { dings }}{\text { Drip- }}$ | Cooked beet or reclpe |
| Beet ents: | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent |
| Oretl roasts, |  |  | ${ }_{89} 95$ |  |  |  |
| Gridildtrolled steaks | 3.0 | 3 | 96.8 |  | 31.2 | ${ }_{85} 8.8$ |
| Swiss steaks. | 1.8 | 14.7 | 83.7 |  | 39.2 | 60.8 |
| Dleed beer: | 3.1 |  | 00.8 |  |  | 100.0 |
| Ground beel: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Itamhurger. | 2.4 | . 4 | 97.2 |  | 18.2 | 81.8 |
| Meat loar | 1.4 | 0 | 98.6 | ....-. | 12.6 | 87.4 |

The composition datia make it possible to calculate, on a carcass basis, the yield of food energy, protein, and fat in the cooked beef. The data in table 10 show the contributions of the beef only toward the food energy, protein, and fat in the cooked becf or cooked-beef recipe. For example, 21.9 gram of fat in 100 grams of raw frozen oven roast (table S) were calculated to contribute 16.7 grams of fat
in the corresponding 63.7 grams of cooked oven roast (table 6). For hamburgers, calculations took account of the ingredients, so that 15.8 grams of protein in 100 grams of raw frozen ground beef were calculated to contribute 15.5 grams of protein in the corresponding 122 grams of cooked hamburger recipe.

Tafle 10.-Weighted-average values for food energy, protein, and fat contributed per 100 grams of raw frozen beef to the cooked beef or cooked beef recipe

| Cat or fortu of beed |  | Iroteilit | Fat |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beel cuts: | Contories | Grams | Grams |
| Oven rousts.. | 220 | 10.4 | 16.7 |
|  | 206 | 17.1 | 1+7 |
| Swlss staks ........ | 29 | 16, 2 | 15.0 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Ground bid: |  |  |  |
| linmburecr. | 948 | 13.5 5 | 19.1 |
| Meas lout., | 230 | 15.8 | 18.7 |

From the data in tablo 10, logether with data on average carcass weight and yields (table 4) and average food energy, protein, and fat content of the frozen raw beef (table 8), composition data on a carcass basis were calculated (table 11). The amount of cuts designated for ronsts and stakis was assumed to be equally divided for oven roasts and griddle-broiled steaks and for pot roasts and Swiss steaks. The ground meat was assumed to be equally divided for hamburgers and meat loaves. Food-energy yield in the cooked beef amounted to 85 percent of the food energy in the ruw boneless beef; protein, 94 percent; fat, 82 percent.

Tarele 11.-Calgulated food energy, protein, and fat in the raw boncless becf in the averaff of $S$ carcasses ( 300.155 hilograms) and in the corresponding cooked drained cutls of beef or bcef recipe

| Cut or form of best | Rew |  |  | Cooked |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Food cruersy | l'rotels | Fat | Food pherey | Protelt | Fat |
| Beef culs: | Chlories | Grams | Grams | Culorics | Gmams | Grams |
| Oesmir rowsts. | 57, 57 | 5,701 | 7, 014 | T0. 462 | 5, 2582 | 5, 3169 |
| Prot rosts. | 53. 30.83 | 3,929 5,478 | $\stackrel{3}{7,465}$ | 81, | 3, 4 4.432 4 |  |
| Swlss steaks..... | $5 \mathrm{~S}, \mathrm{WOI}$ | 3,791 | 4. 14 | 45. ${ }^{\text {(4) }}$ | 3,488 | 3.424 |
| Dieed beef: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grouma beer: | 08, 919 | 4,317 | 5,604 | 68.419 | 4,168 | 3, 607 |
| liambarger | 105,030 | 5,703 | 8,952 | 85, 940 | 5,507 | f, 897 |
| Meat lonf. | 105.030 | 5,020 | 8,844 | 85. 218 | 5,705 | 6,752 |
| fotal | 564, 226 | 34, 828 | 45,975 | 481, 748 | 32, 824 | 37,038 |

Percentages of Lean and of Separable Fat
Composition data obtained from the laboratory analyses of the separabic lean and fat from 12 cuts of boneless beef are shown by cut (raw and cooked) in table 12 and are summarized in table 13. As would be expected, since both fat and lean cuts were represenied, the
yields of lean beef varied with the cut. Spencer roll, for example, was a fat cut and had only 68 percent of separable lean as compared with knuckle of round which had 95 percent. Cooking of the beef resulted in moisture soss in the lean and fat loss in the scparable fat.

Tarle 12.-Average separable lean per 100 grams roasts *and stcaks and average composition of 100 grams separable lean and separable fat

| Type of roust or stak | Welght or scruer able lean | Composition of separablo lean |  |  | Composition of separable tat |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Water | Protein | Fat | Water | Proteh | Fat |
| Oven ressts: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Grant | Grams | Grams | Grams | Grams | Gigms | Orams |
| Raw frozen | 80.1 | ${ }_{5}$ | 20.6 | 16.12 | 17.1 | 5.7 | 76.0 |
| Inste coot formil: | 84.8 | 54.1 | 27.9 | 16.1 | 17.0 | 4.7 | 76.0 |
| Rav frozen. | S5. 2 | 728 | 22.8 | 3.9 | 17.8 | 4.9 | 77.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cookethe. | 93.2 | 720 | 20.3 | 5.1 | 29.4 | 0.0 | 61.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raw frozen | 74.8 | 68.6 | 22.0 | 8.5 | [2.] | 4.4 | 83.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rave frozer | $\stackrel{75.4}{73.18}$ | 71.1 | 21.2 | 6.1 | 14.9 | 4.3 | \$0. 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6 i .6 | \&. 3 | 20.9 | 9.2 | 9.8 | 3.0 | 86.9 |
| Cooked. | 07.6 | 48.9 |  | 17.1 | 11.8 | 4.0 | 83.7 |
| Tenderioin: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raw trozen. | 72.6 | 20.5 | 31.8 | 7.4 | 13.6 | 4.1 | 80.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raw frozen. | 80.4 | 71.0 | 20.6 | 7.3 | 17,2 | 5.0 | 77,6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rav froten. | 80.9 | 70.8 | $\pm 0.2$ | 7.8 | 23.2 | \# 4 | 72.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raw frozell | 82.9 | 75.1 | 1s.: | 4.5 | 32.9 | 10.6 | 56. 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rnw (rozan-. | 88. | 76.5 | 21.6 | 5.8 | 10.8 | 6.7 | 73.3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bhate roll: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\xrightarrow{\text { Rnw iroze }}$ | 84.1 | 81.0 | 20. 2 | 11.2 | 15.4 | 5.0 | 79.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rnw rrozed.- | 36.3 | 23.1 | 21.2 | 4.4 | 17.5 | 6.8 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| fay frozen. | 33.8 | 72.6 | 20.4 | 5.9 | 20.0 | 7.7 | 62.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raw frozen | 70.0 | 69.2 | 20.3 | 8.0 | 12.8 | a 6 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cavefrozen | 75.0 | 71.0 | 19.8 | 7.2 | 13.5 | 3.8 | 82, 4 |
| Spencer roll: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raw frozen. | 64.1 | 6, 6 | 21.2 | 10.5 | 10.7 | 3.3 | 85.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooked..... | 67.7 | 52.8 | 29.8 | 14.3 | 21.8 | 3.0 | 71.0 |

See footnote at end of table.

Table 12.-Average separable lean per 100 grams roasts and steaks and average composition of 100 grams separable lean and separable fat-Continued

| Type if rowst or steak | Wexhbt of seprat ablo lean | Cotnposition of sparatile ivest |  |  | Compustelon of sephatite fit |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Wadar | Troteln | Fut | Water | Protola | Fist |
|  | Gritions | Crams | Crams | Combs | Crams | Orasis | Cirams |
| Swles stenks: Clekl: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C'mbed '.t | (10.9 | dis 2 | 20.0 | 8.0 | 27, 4 | 4.8 | 64. 7 |
| Gmuct rotl: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| law frozell. | 88.2 | 71, 2 | 19.4 | 8.1 | 30.5 | 0.8 | 71.7 |
| Cookul.... | 85.8 | 13.3 | 25. 2 | 10, 1 | 42.4 | S. 8 | 47.7 |
| Clitick Lenter: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 22. 8 | 51. | 10, 81 | 4.5 | 30.7 | 10.0 7.0 | 62.18 |
| Cuokut...... | 80.4 | 61.3 | 20.0 | 7.3 | 40.1 | 7.5 | 58.2 |
| Outstig of rotand; | ¢0, 7 | 72.3 | 20. 1 | A. 3 | 18.0 | 6. 4 | 75.1 |
|  | 吹, 8 | (k). 0 | $4 \mathrm{~m}, 7$ | 7.4 | 41.6 | fi. 4 | 43. 4 |
| Xtamp luit; |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 71.8 | 71. 8 | 10.6 | 7.8 | 18.4 | 8.8 | 7th 2 |
| Cookerl... ......... ..... | 01.0 | *0,0 | 3 | 10.9 | 33.0 | 6, 2 | 57.7 |


Tanle 13.-Percentages of separable lean in roasts and steaks and composition of sepurable lean and separable fat; raw and cooked

| 'r'ybue of minst ar stank | Progntthen ip suphar. leana | Contimestiten of samarable L, 401 |  |  | Oigmpratiton of supherable fint |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Witter | lrotetn | Fut | Wator | Protoin | Fat |
| Ocell ronsts: | Percent | Percent | J'ercent | Percent | Percent | Percent | 19rcent |
| Haw | 79. ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | 71.7 | 21.5 | 12.8 | 16, 6 | 5.7 | 78 |
|  | TV, 5 | 64.1 | 21.5 | 12.6 | 15.3 | 5.7 | 72.7 |
|  |  | 70. 7 | 21.5 | (b, 1 | t0. 5 | 5.3 | 7 ${ }^{3} \mathbf{0}$ |
| Ruw ${ }_{\text {Rooket, }}$ | 78.0 | 34.5 | (w). 2 | 13.1 | 20.0 | 6.1 | 72.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 130 | W3, 0 | 71.4 | 20.4 | 7.18 | 18.3 | 6.2 | 74.3 |
| C'twhtal | W1, 5 | 56, 6 | 30.3 | 12.5 | 24.5 | 8.6 | 64. 5 |
| Swlis sleaks: | S2, 1 | 71, 4 | ', $\downarrow$ | 7.4 | 19.3 | 6.2 | 74.3 |
| C'roked. | 73.1 | (11, 0 | 3t. 3 | 9.9 | 30. 6 | 5.7 | 34. 2 |

The average serving allowance of 6.7 ounces of raw beef for ronsts or stenks can be broken down into the food-energy contributions of the separable lean and separable fat (table 14). The food energy in tho separable lean was practically unchanged by cooking. The separable fat contributed approximately one-half of the food energy in the raw beef and somewhat less than half in the cooked beef. Thas, the sepmable fat of these cuts, on the avorage, was approximately 20 percent of the weight of the raw beef but it contributed almost one-half of the food energy in the cooked beef.

Tably 14.-Calculated weipht and food energy of separable lean and separable fat in 6.78 ounces ${ }^{1}$ of raw roasts and steaks and corresponding cuts after cooking

| Typo of roast ar steak | Wexsht |  |  | Food energy |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Scparable | Separnble | Separruble | Senareble |
| Oren rolsts: Raw. Cooker | Grams 1908 190.5 121.3 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Oramis }^{151.2} \end{gathered}$ | Grams | Calorica 230 | Calosies <br> $23!$ |
| Gridela-bronei stents: | 121.3 | 96.4 | 24.9 | 223 | $1{ }^{19} 9$ |
| Cavk- | 190.5 | 148.6 | 41.9 | 248 | 303 |
| Pot roskts: |  | 89.7 | 38.5 | 214 | 331 |
| Raw | 190.5 | 158.1 | 32.4 | 237 | 223 |
| Swiss stenks: | 123.2 | 102.0 | 23.2 | 234 | 147 |
| R3y-.at. | 100.5 147.1 | 158.4 108.0 | 34.1 30.1 | $\begin{aligned} & 235 \\ & 203 \\ & 203 \end{aligned}$ | 238 200 |

The usual jer-man mownce for these cuts.

## PART II

## Plate Waste from Oven Roasts, Trimmed and Untrimmed

## Procedures

For the study of the effect on plate waste of trimming external fat from beef, 2,076 pounds of the 7 cuts of boneless beef designated for oven roasts were used in serving 23 meals to 4,854 men in companysize messes at Fort Lee, Va. The beef was from regular procurement sources, and was prepared and served by Army mess personnel using regular equipment.

Specifications for the roasts limited external fat to $3 / 4$ inch in thickness. The 7 cuts were cooked and served without removal of any of this fat; another 5 cuts were cooked and served with the fat trimmed to approximately 4 inch. The blade roll and knuckle of round were not trimmed, since the fat layer did not exceed 3 inch.

Physical data were obtained on the following: Weights of raw frozen beef issued to the mess, thaw juices, fat trimming, cooked meat, pan drippings, pan scrapings, meat not served, and beef in plate waste; also, the number of men served. All these data were calculated to $a 100$-man basis.

In this study no representative samples of the raw meat or the cooked meat could be obtained. It was possible, however, to get samples of the fat trim, thaw juices, pan drippings, beef not served, and beef in plate waste. These were sent to the laboratories of the Human Nutrition Research Branch, Agricultural Researeh Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Beltsville, Md., where they were analyzed for moisture, nitrogen, and ether-extractable fot.

## Results

## Raw Beef, Cooked and Served Items, and Plate Waste

The data in table 15 show the amounts of beef issued per 100 men aud the percentages of this beef in the raw and cooked items. In making an overall comparison of the untrimmed-beef data with the
trimmed-beef data, the amount of beef in the individual cuts for roasts or steaks (dry heat) as given in table 5 were used as weighting factors. The summarized data (table 15) thus apply to roasts or steaks as a whole. Since the blade roll and the knuckle of round did not lend themselves to additional trimming, the data for these cuts were included in the summary data for both the untrimmed and the trimmed cuts.

The fat trim amounted to 6 percent of the average weight of the cuts. As a result of trimming, less fat was found in the beef not served and in plate waste than in these items from untrimmed cuts. Approximately two-thirds more beef not served appeared from the untrimmed cuts than from those trimmed ( 7.2 percont of the untrimmed beef as compared with 4.3 percent of the trimmed beef). The plate waste was approximately 38 percent more from the untrimmed cuts than from those trimmed ( 6.0 percent of the untrimmed beef as compared with 4.4 pereent of the trimmed beef). Other items appeared unaffected by trimming. In each instance the cooked yield from the raw drained weight before cooking averaged about 65 percent; the amounts of pan drippings and scrapings were similar for tintrimmed and trimmed cuts.

TAnle 15.-Percenfage distribution of raw and cooked ilems from untrimmed and trimmed oven roasts, based on weight of frozen becf issued per 100 men

| Type of oven roust | Welght of niw frozen ตौe! | Before roasting |  |  | After rousting |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fat trint | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Thaw } \\ & \text { Hall } \end{aligned}$ | Drained thawed bedf | Cooked trinined bee! | Drip pings | Scrap- | Not served | Plate waste |
|  | Wito17xms | Petcent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percemt | Percent | Percent | Pereent |
| Blado mill | 19.002 | 0 | 6.7 | 94.0 | 6. 2 | 7.0 | 1.1 | 10.9 | f. 5 |
| [frstede of rounti |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trimmatiol. | 10.208 | 5.1 | 8.8 0.0 | 89.7 | S6.4 | 10.8 | . 8 | 7.4 | 4.8 |
| Knuekle of round: Uutrimate | 10.697 | 0 | 7.9 | 03.2 | 55.8 | 17,3 | 7 | 5.0 | 2.4 |
| Colustrip: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trammmed... | 20.802 | 10.6 | 7.4 7.4 7.4 | 182.3 | 5 | +13.9 | $\underline{1.2}$ | 18.8 | 9.0 |
| Strion hatt: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Untrimmed | 19.Sed | 0 | 50.3 | 105.5 | 63.7 | 14.0 | . 7 | 5.4 | 4.8 |
| Trimmend... | 19,648 | 0.8 | 17.0 | 37.3 | 58.0 | 12.0 | .3 | 2.8 | 4.7 |
| Smetaer milit | 135.112 | 0 | 2.7 | 85.0 | '63.3 | 11.1 | . 8 | 3.9 | 9.9 |
| Trtmmed | 15.488 | 6.1 | 5.5 | 88.4 | 63.3 | 12.3 | . 3 | 9.4 | 7.5 |
| Tenderiofn; |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unthamed ... ....: | 15.60 | $\stackrel{0}{1.2}$ | 4.7 | 05.8 8.0 | $\begin{aligned} & 60.0 \\ & 54.16 \end{aligned}$ | 14.0 0.1 | 1.7 | 2.7 0.4 | \%.4 |
| A verase for nbove cuts. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Untrimmed.. - | 10.37 |  | 0.0 | 94.6 | 61.6 | 12.0 | , 8 | 7.2 | 6.0 |
| Trimmel ${ }^{1}$. | 10. 22 | 8.0 | 6.0 | 88.3 | 37.6 | 12.1 | . 8 | 4.3 | 4.4 |

[^3]* Inclulimk blato roll and knackle of round.

Composition of Recoverable Items, Including Plate Waste
Data on moisture, protein, and fat content obtained from the laboratery analyses of plate waste and other recoverable items from the untrimmed and trimmed roasts are shown (table 16). Resuits summarized (table 17) show that in amounts per 100 men , trimming of fat to 3 inch did not greatly affect the protein content in drippings, in beef not served, and in plate waste. In the pan drippings, the amount of fat was almost the same for untrimmed and trimmed cuts; but in beef not served and in plate waste, it was less than half as much for trimmed cuts as for untrimmed. Altogether, the fat in drippings, in beef not served, and in plate waste was ont third less for the trimmed than for the untrimmed cuts.

## Protein and Fat Consumed

The effects on amounts of protein and fat consumed, resulting from trimming fat from cuts desiguated for oven roasts, were calculated. The data (table 18) were oblained from those given in parts I and II on composition of the raw cuts, plate waste, and related items. The figures in table 18 assume that the cuts in both studies were the same. in composition and were handed and cooked under similar conditions, although it is recognized that this was not necessarily true. Protein and fat in beef presumed enten were obtained by subtracting the sum of percentages recovered in thaw juices, fat trim (if any), drippings, beef not served, and plate waste from 100 .

Table 16,-Composition per 100 grams of items resulting from the preparation, cooking, and serving of oven roasts, untrimmed and trimmed


[^4]Tanle 17.-Amount of protein and fal in fal trim, drippings, beef not served, and plate waste from oven roasts, untrimmed ard trimmed, in quantities per 100 men served

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Ontrimmed roasts | Trimmed roasts |

Tanle 18.-Distribution of protein and fat in recoverable itens in cooking and serving sven roasts, in terms of percentages of the amounts of protein and fat in raw beef

| Item | Untrimumed roasts |  | Trimmed roasts |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Protein | Fat | Protein | Fat |
| Thanw juices.. | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Percent } \\ 3.0 \end{array}$ | Perceut | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Perent } \\ & 3,2 \end{aligned}$ | Percent |
| Fut tram- |  |  | 1.2 | 24. |
| Pauz drtppiliss. | 3.4 | 25.1 | 3.8 | 18.8 |
| Beef not served.. | 0.8 | 12. | 4.7 | 0.4 |
| Beel in plate wnsta.... | 5.9 | 18.2 | 4.6 | 10.4 |
| Bed prestaued exten.. | 78.6 | 46.6 | 82.0 | 40.1 |

The data show that of the protein in the raw issued weight, approximately $S 0$ pereent was found in the beef presumed eaten. Any difference between 78 percent of protein in the untrimmed cuts and $\$ 2$ percont in the trimmed ents was probably nonsignificant. The percentage of fat in the raw issued weight appearing in beef presumed enten was 46 percent for the untrimmed cuts and 40 percent in the trimmed cuts. Because of the large quantity of fat reserved in fat trim from the trimmed cuts, the fat drippings from the trimmed cuts would probnoly be used entirely in making gravy. On the other hand, part of the fat in drippings from the undaimmed cuts woukd not be used in making gravy. The results would indicate therefore that trimming would not reduce the fat consumed if the gravies were included.

These findings indicate that further trimming of surface fat in the processing of beef at the packing plants woukl result in a saving in weight to be handled and stored in valuable freezing space, without any appreciable effect on the matrilive value of the beef eaten.

## PART III

## Composition of Boneless Beef as Cooked and Served, and the Amounts of Protein, Fat, and Food Energy in Beef or Beef Recipe Consumed

## Procedures

The study of boneless beef as regularly issued, cooked, and served in Army messes was made at 5 widely separated locations in the United States: Camp Roberts, Calif.; Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.; Fort Knox, Ky.; Camp Rucker. Ala.; and Fort Jackson, S. C. Of a total of 560,000 potinds of beef made available from 6 processors, 52,682 pounds were issued to furnish 542 meals to 109,128 men.

The plan called for 28 different combinations of cut or form of beef and cooking method. The 7 cuts designated for roasts and steaks (dry heat) and the 5 desiguated for roasts and steaks (moist heat) were propared both as roasts and as steaks; the diced beef was prepared as stew; and the grotud beef was prepared as meat loaf, hamburgers, and "beefburgers."
All kinds of Army activities were represented through a statistically random selection of the companies available in each of these locations; in this way, the companics were distributed among the different cooking methods and cuts or forms of beef. Each mess was given only 1 kind of eut to be used in a mess meal. With 56 messes participating in 112 meals at each location, any given mess was used twiec, but each time for a different eat or form of bef and cooking method. With a fow exceptions, each cut or form and cooking method was replicated 4 times-twice at noon and twice in the evening. A total of 542 meals was served out of the 560 called for by the plan. The usual Army personnel cooked and served the meals. The data were recorded and the samples procured with the least possible interference with normal operations.

Cooking methods were those designated in the manual on reeipes (5) for oven roasts, griddle-broiled stenks, pot roasts, Swiss steaks, and stew, and also for 3 ground meat recipes-meat loaf, "beefburger," and hamburger. Neat loaf and "beefburger" contained added ingredients, but the hamburger consisted of ground beef with seasoning only. In table 19, the amounts of 38 recipe ingredients are shown in average amounts per 100 men . The cooks were at liberty to prepare the beef as they normally would, and deviations from the recipe manual were not uncommon. There was a tendency to cook pot roasts as oven roasts.
For raw samples to represent the cuts designated for oven roasts and gridde-broiled steaks and those designated for pot roasts and Swiss steaks, every 10 th steak was taken. Approximately 10 percent of the diced ment and 10 percent of the ground meat were also used for the raw samples. Cooked samples as served were obtained by taking every loth serving. All of the beef in plate waste was taken as the plate-waste sample. At each location samples from the messes were pooled according to cut and cooking method. For instance, 4 samples

| Ingredtent | Pot roasts |  |  |  |  |  | Swiss steaks |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Diced } \\ & \text { meat } \\ & \text { stew } \end{aligned}$ | Ground meat |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Aver: age | Clod | $\begin{gathered} \text { Chuck } \\ \text { roll } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Outside } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { round } \end{gathered}$ | Rump | Chuck tender | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A ver- } \\ & \text { age } \end{aligned}$ | Clod | Chuck |  | Ruinp | Chuck tender |  | Meat loaf | "Beef- |
| Beel, boneless _-_................... pounds | 43.8 | 4.8 | 41.6 | 41.1 | 48,0 | 45.4 | 45.0 | 43.8 | 44.3 | 45.7 | 43.4 | 47.6 | 27.1 | 30.4 | 38.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.8 | . 4 |
|  | 1.1 |  |  | 5.3 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.6 |  |  |
|  | . 04 |  |  | .2 |  |  | . 02 | . 06 |  | . 05 |  |  | 1,8 | 1.1 3.3 | 2.2 |
| Eggs.......................................do |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  | . 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.4 | 1.6 | 9 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 1.2 | .3 | . 03 |
| Gravy ${ }_{\text {Gravy and onions }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{2}$ |  | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raw-........................do...- | . 02 |  |  | $\cdot 1$ |  |  | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.8 | 2.9 | 3.6 | 2.2 | 2.6 |
|  | . 1 | -....- | -1...- | .3 | --**** |  | . 05 |  |  | 24 |  |  | . 14 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 2.4 | 3.7 | 8.4 2.0 |  |  |
| Tomato: <br> Catsup $\qquad$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.8 | 1.6 | . 2 |  |
|  |  |  |  | - |  |  | . 7 | . 2 |  | +2 | 2.6 |  | . 4 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.8 | 11.3 | 6.8 | 0.7 | 10.6 | 10.8 | 14.8 | . 5 | 1.0 |
| Peppers, green Miseellaneous: | .-... |  |  |  |  |  | . 5 | 9 |  | . 6 |  | $\cdot 9$ | 3.1 | 4.1 | 7.2 |
| Misecllaneous: <br> Bread. $\qquad$ do. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 5.8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.4 |  |  |
| Crackers |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 1 | . 6 |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.2 |
| Grirlic $\qquad$ do. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 15 |  |
| Gravy baso <br> NHK $\qquad$ do. |  |  |  |  | ---- |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | . 45 | - |
| Pimento $\qquad$ do. |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 1 |  |  |  | . 6 |  | 3.8 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .2 |  | 18 |  |  |  |  | . 5 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .2 | 2 | 1.6 . |  | . 3 | 5 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1,4 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 03 |  |  |  |  | . 4 |  |  |  |
| Tomato juice...........................dio.... |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1.8 \\ & 1.8 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | 8.8 |  | 3.7 | --..--- |  |
| Tomato juice and paste..................do |  |  |  |  |  |  | $1.8$ |  | 9.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

of ronst tenderloin from 4 mess meals at 1 location wore gromd 3 times and a represontative stbsample taken for the daboratory analyses. Samples were stored frozen and shipped frozen.

At each installation, the data ineluded a count of the total number of men served, of men taking beef, and of men receiving second servings. Weights were obtained of tho beef as received, tho thawed dramed beef, the recipe ingredients used, the drained cooked beef, the beef not served, and the beef or beef recipe in plate waste.

Laboratory analyses of the representative subsamples which had been ground at ench location were carried out by first drying under infrared lamps as was done previously (3) and extracting the entire subsample in a Soxthlet apparatus for fat ( $1, p$. 359). The nonfat portion was then ground through 20 mosh in a Wiley mill, and amalyzed for residual moisture by drying in a vacum oven at $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. and less than 25 mm . of inercury; it was also analyzed for ash (4) and for nitrogen ( $1, p, 12$ ).

## Results

## Physical Data

The nmounts of raw beef issucd per 100 men, the amounts of cooked beef served and not served, and the amounts of plate wasto were averaged, usually for 20 messes for ench cut. These are given in table 20. The woights shown for raw beef and served cooked beef reprosent

Tarle 20.-Averaged amounts of beff per 100 men in ram issuc of boneless beff, in drained cooked beff or bef recipe served and not served, and in plate waste

| Typu of but or bief rochse | Fsturel mT | Surved cooked : | Not. served. tooked | 1'isto 썬ㄴㅇㅛ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pounds | Pounds | Puands | Poundx |
| Ovets rousts ${ }^{2}$ | 43.5 | 25.7 | 1.5 | 2.5 |
| Tonclerloin | 43, 1 | 24.8 | 1.2 | 2.6 |
| t.olts strip | 42.5 | 24.6 | 1.5 | 2.8 |
| Smbucer roll. | 40.13 | 22, 5 | 1.9 | 3.2 |
| Blate roll. - | f2. ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 23.9 | 1.7 | 1.3 |
| Inside of ronat | 42\% | $4{ }^{45} 3$ | . 8 | 2.0 |
| Kmatkio of somme | 46.1 | 25. ${ }^{3}$ | 2.8 | 2.3 |
| Sirlobn bitt. | 42.8 | 25.8 | 1.1 | 2.13 |
|  | 46.6 | 24, 5 | 2.8 | 4.8 |
| T'andertola .-. | 45.8 | 24is 1 | 3.2 | 4.6 |
| Comatrin | 14.2 | \% D | 3.2 | 3.2 |
| Sphneer moll. | 43.8 | 58.2 | 1.7 | 65. 5 |
| 13tade roll... | 10.17 | 34.0 | 2.3 | 3.2 |
| faskle of roumb. | 42.9 | 24. 4 | . 0 | 4.4 |
| Krackion foum | 49.8 | 214.0 | 4.4 | 3.0 |
| Sirlola hitth...... | 4t5. 0 | 25.3 | 4.4 | 5.2 |
| f'ot sousts ${ }^{3}$....... | 44.5 | 25.4 | 4.0 | 2.8 |
| Clodi.--- | 45, 7 | 25.3 | 4.8 | 3.2 |
| Chuck rail. | 42.8 | 22.0 | 3.3 | 2.6 |
| Gutstde of romm | $4{ }_{4} 8$ | 28.8 | 3.3 | 2.0 |
| Itamip talt... | 45.4 | 20.3 | 4.3 | 3.5 |
| Clarck tender | 47.8 | 22,0 | 1.2 | 2.3 |
| Swiss sterks ${ }^{\text {2 }}$-... | 45.3 | 48.5 | \%. 1 | 4.3 |
| Clad | 46. 1 | 48.2 | 4, 7 | 5.7 |
| Chack roll. | 45.8 | 45.7 | 0.1 | 3.1 |
| Outsido of soums | 46.13 | 52.7 | 6.1 | 4.0 |
| Rumap \%att.... | 44.3 | 48.7 | 1.3 | 4.4 |
| Chack tenker. | 48.2 | 4 | 8.4 | 2.3 |
| Stew ---------- | $\cdots 3$ | 52.1 | 0.2 | 5.1 |
| Ment loasw. | 331.4 | 20.1 | 1.0 | . 8 |
| "Beythtrger". | 30. 15 | 17. ${ }^{2}$ | 4. 5 | . 9 |
| 17atiburker = ........... | \$1.8 | 23.1 | 2.5 | 1.1 |

[^5]the amounts used for the men; amounts taken for analysis have been deducted. The averages given for roasts and steaks are weighted aceording to the occurrence of the individual cuts in beef designed for roasts or steaks, cooked by dry heat or moist heat (table 5). For example, the average issue for oven roasts, 43.5 pounds per 100 men , is a weighted value for the 7 cuts as used in 125 messes. Actually, there was a considerable range in the quantity of meat issued per 100 men , as shown in tabic 21. The issued weight of beef for oven roasts, for instance, ranged from 28.3 to 81.4 pounds per 100 men , whereas the standard of issue was 42 pounds.
The amount of plate waste was found to correlate linearly with the issted weight, except for ground meat (table 21 and fig. 2). From the


Figure 2.- Plate waste from cooked beef or beef recipe as served, expressed as a function of the issue weight of raw boneless beef per 100 men.
average slope of the lines for griddle-broiled stenks, oven roasts, and hamburger (fig. 2), it can be seen that the plate waste was a certain percentage of the raw weight regardless of the amount of beef issued per 100 men. This may be interpreted to mean that the men ate beef even when the issue was excessive, and discarded as plate waste only that portion that would be plate waste on a much smaller issue.
Table 21 and figure 2 also show the expected plate waste for a standard issue. For example, an issue of 42 pounds of beef for oven roasts would have an expected plate waste of 2.35 pounds, whereas the same issue cooked as griddle-broiled steaks would have an expected plate waste of 4.42 pounds.

Table 21.-Correlations between raw weights of beef as issued per 100 men and corresponding umounts of plate waste


[^6]
## Composition Data

The composition and energy value of the raw beef, of the cooked beef or beef recipe as served, and of the corresponding plate waste bave been summarized (table 22). The data show that for roasts, steaks, and stew the percentage of fat in the plate waste was considcrably higher than in the beef or beef recipe served, whereas for the ground meat recipes-meat loaf, hamburger, and "beefburger"-the percentages of fat in plate waste and in served portions were similar. This was to be expected because the fat could be cut from the servings of former items but not from the latter.

The percentages of fat in plate waste were correlated in all instances, with the percentages of fat in the served portion. Correlation coefficients, linear coefficients, and related data are given (table 23) ; data for stew are not included. As shown graphically in figure 3, results from the roasts and steaks were so nearly alike that all data could be pooled to obtain a common line. Statistically, the data were found to have correlation coefficients that were highly significant. The average served roasts or steaks contained 21.4 percent fat and the corresponding plate waste was 37.5 percent fat. The entire plate-waste data suggest that fat was trimmed from meat servings.


Figute 3,-Percentages of tat in plate waste expressed as a function of the percentages of fat in the cooked beef or beef recipe as served.

Table 22.-Summary of averaged data on composition and food energy per 100 grams of raw boneless beef, of becf cooked and served, and

| Type of beef or heel rectpe | Raw |  |  |  |  |  | Served, cooked |  |  |  |  |  | Plate waste |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Water | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Energy } \\ & \text { vaiue } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Prov } \\ & \text { trinn } \end{aligned}$ | Fat | Total cirbohydrate | Ash | Water | Energy value | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro- } \\ & \text { nenn } \end{aligned}$ | Fat | Total carbohydrate | Ash | Water | Energy value | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro- } \\ & \text { celi } \end{aligned}$ | Fat | Total carbohydrate | Ash |
|  | Arimat | Calorien | Cramy | Crams | Gram | Gram | Grams | Calorics | Grams | Grams | Grams | Grams | Grams | Culorics | Grams | Gramis | Grams | Grams |
| Oven roasts |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40.8 | 3304 | 23.6. | 19.9 3.8 | 0.75 | +1.10 | 40.1 | 43 | 19,0, | 38.7 39.3 | +1.25 | 1.62 |
| Blade roll..... |  |  |  |  |  |  | +16.4 | 25.4 | 30.8 | 13.3 | . 77 | 1.18 | 4.78 | 396 | 30.0 | 3.38 | 1.41 | 1.03 |
| Krueckle of rounc |  |  |  |  |  |  | 53.0 | 250 | 31.0 | 13.3 | :02 | 1.20 | 50.9 | 312 | 24.1 | 22.6 | 1.27 | 3.13 |
| Loln strin. |  |  |  |  |  |  | 46.9 | 3332 | 25.0 | 23.1 | [00 | 1.10 | 34,9 | 48. | 18.4 | 4.4 | 1.23 | 1.09 |
| Sirlotn but |  |  |  |  |  |  | 49.1 | 314 | 27.9 | 21.4 | . 610 | 1.00 | 37.5 | 468 | 17.2 | +3.2 | 1.23 | . 88 |
| Spencer roll |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.8. | 3660 | 25.4 | 38.4 | ${ }^{43}$ | - 12 | 3.5 .4 <br> 34.4 | 48 | 11.7 | 47.08 | 1.13 | -95 |
| Griddle-broiled | 81.5 | 252 | 17.8 | 19.5 | 0, 14 | 0,79 | 45.7 | 350 | 25.5 | 26.0 | 1.08 | 1.21 | 37.5 | 468 | 16.5 | 43.2 | 1.94 | . 94 |
| Blade roll. | 62.3 | 246 | 17.7 | 19.0 | .37 | . 75 | 4.1 .6 | 362 | 25,7 | 27.5 | . 05 | 1.23 | 38.3 | 454 | 18.2 | 41.0 | 1,54 | . 96 |
| Inside of round | 65.9 | 204 | 10.2 | 13.5 | . 51 | . 87 | 49.4 | 304 | 27.5 | 19.8 | 1.6 | 1.31 | 41.0 | 411 | 19.9 | 35.2 | 2.83 | . 98 |
| Knuckile of roun | 69.9 | 166 | 10.3 | ${ }^{9} 2$ | . 62 | . 71 | 53.3 41.9 | (344 | 28.9 3.0 24.0 | 14.7 <br> 30.9 | 1.80 2.06 | 1.39 1.14 | 53.17 | 5 | 22.8 13.5 | - 21.6 | 2.36 1.80 | 1.18 .77 |
| Loinstrip | \%7.3 | 293 | 177.5 | 20.9 | . 25 | . 71 | 4.48 | 303 | ${ }_{24.5}^{24.5}$ | $\begin{array}{r}120 \\ 27.9 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 1.68 | 1.20 | 3.1 | 488 | 14.6 | 46.3 | 2.09 | . 91 |
| Spuncer rol | 53.2 | 3.40 | 15.6 | 30.3 | . 21 | . 604 | 38.2 | 437 | 22.4 | 37.4 | .89 | 1.01 | 3.8 | 573 | 11.5 | 57.3 | 1.63 | . 73 |
| Tenderloin | 57.1 | 3103 | 15.7 | 26.1 | . 45 | . 70 | 42.6 | 3100 | 23.2 | 31.6 | 1.30 | 1.22 | - 28.9 .8 | [600 | 12.0 | 56.4 | 1.67 1.28 | 1.033 |
| Pot ronsts |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51.1 51.2 | 2419 | 27.4 | 10.9 | .54 | 1.17 | 4.4 .3 | 360 | 18.7 | 34.0 | 1.18 | 08 |
| Chuck roll |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50, 4 | 309 | 28.4 | 19.7 | .70 | . 95 | 48.2 | 346 | 21.7 | 27.3 | 1.33 | 05 |
| Chnek tender |  |  |  |  |  |  | 54.7 | 245 | 31.4 | 11.8 | 1.11 | 1.04 | 53.8. | 271 | 27.0 | 16i. 6 | 1.08 | 1.48 |
| Outside of roun |  |  |  |  |  |  | 53.9 | 260 | 29.1 | 15.5. | 1.32 | . 10 | 46.5 35.2 | (384 | 14.4 | 32.7 48.4 | 1.33 | $\xrightarrow{98}$ |
| Swlss staks ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 64.2 | 297 | 18.0 | 16.6. | . 43 | . 81 | 59.0 | 244 | 19.8 | 16.0 | 3.82 | 1.31 | 48.5 | 350 | 10.5 | 29,6 | 3.37 | 1.05 |
| Clod. | 04.0 | 230 | 18.0 | 17.0 | . 32 | . 80 | 61.1 | 233 | 17.1 | 15.8. | 4.74 | 1.32 | 49.7 | 354 | 14.3 | 30.6 | 4.24 | 1.06 |
| Chuck roil | 6.5.4 | 214 | 18.3 | 15.0 | + 51 | . 79 | (i0. 1 | 233 | 18.9 | 14.8 | 3.73 | 1.47 | 53.5 | 302 | 18.7 | ${ }_{2}^{23.2}$ | 3.32 2 2 | 1. 11 |
| Chuck tender | 71.3 | 158 | 19.2 | 8.4 14.7 | .41 | 8 | (i0. <br> 58.6 <br> 8.6 | ${ }_{239}^{212}$ | 24.0 <br> 2.4 <br> 2.4 | 10.7 | 3.44 3.43 | 1.20 | 6,3 48.7 | 355 | 21.0 17.9 | 21.6 20.7 | 203 | 1.80 |
| Outside of rou | 65.4. | ${ }_{212}^{212}$ | 18.5 16.5 | 14.7 24.9 | . 41 | . 87 | 58.16 52.0 | 311 | 20.4 | 23.8 | - 2.40 | 1.24 | 40.8 | 450 | 13.3 | 426 | 2.31 | +97 |
| Stew. | 59.9 | 273 | 16.5 | 22.4 | - 40 | . 74 | 73, 3 | 152 | 9.1 | 9.7 | 7. 611 | 1.30 | 6.8 .7 | 250 | 9.5 | 20,4 | 6. 62 | +84 |
| "Beefburger" | 55.7 56.1 | 315 | 116.0 | - $\begin{array}{r}27,4 \\ 8.9 \\ \hline 2.9\end{array}$ | $\stackrel{.27}{ }$ | . 67 | 57.8 5.3 5 | 245 280 | 21.0. | 15.4 18.4 | 4.40 <br> 1.30 | 1.48 | 58.8 55.2 | 241 299 | 20.0 | 15.6 | 5.04 2.13 | 1.175 |
| Meat loaf. | 55.3 | 319 | 16.0 | 27.8 | .45 | .08 | 58.2 | 239 | 17.6 | 15.3 | 6.13 | 1.29 | 56.3 | 260 | 17.9 | 17.0 | 7.56 | 1.18 |

[^7]Table 23.-Corretation between fat in beef or beef recipe served and fat in phate raste

| Tyge of buef or beetrecipe | Number of cooked sumples | A veraye [ut in surved bexel ${ }^{1}$ | Arerage Corre- <br> fat in lation <br> paste coelfi- <br> waste' elent |  | $\mathrm{t}^{2}$ | t.tneur treinelents |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | a | $b$ |
|  |  | Percent | Percent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oven ronsts | 35 | 95, 3 | 39.5 4.4 | 0.8174** | 8.0970"0 | 9.8.54 | 1. 4.506 |
| Grludte-brolled stenks. | 35 ; | 27.1 | 14.4 | . $9151{ }^{\text {cos }}$ | 13.08s** | - 4.4000 | 1.576 |
| Pot rotists, | 24 | 18.8 | 42.7 |  |  | -4. 5000 | 1. 1.4081 i. |
| Swiss sterks ... | 25 | 15. 3 | 37.5 | .7651** | 19. bl8 | 5. 727 | 1. 1.40 ks |
| All rousts and stenks | 119 | 21.33 | 37, 48 ; | .376i** |  | 5.634 5.940 | 1. t (6) |
| All gratmal melth rechues | 15 | 16. 4 | 18.6 | + $\mathrm{El17}{ }^{\text {-4 }}$ | 2.78-5* | 5. 240 | . 649 |

: Metan valutes froll himetr equation.
I i asturlak Indicates signifeant: 2 asterisks indicate highly siguificant.
'l'he fat loss as plate waste may not, however, be as great as the fat loss duting cooking. The data are summarized (table 24) to show the cooked yield of beef or beef recipe from the raw issue weight of beef, and the corresponding fat losses during cooking and in plate waste in terms of the percentage of fat in the raw issue of beef. Only for griddle-broiled stenks was fat loss greater in the plate waste than during cooking. Of course, the fat lost during cooking would be included, in part, as fat in drippings used for gravy and in this way made a vailable to the men. Fat losses during cooking of meat loaf and "beefturger," where the recipes called for bread crumbs or cracker crumbs, were about as great as fat losses during cooking of hamburger, which consisted of meat and seasoning without crumbs or other ingredients. The fat loss in phate waste from ground meat recipes was very little-only 1 to 2 percent. Altogether, the fat loss during cooking and in plate waste averuged about 50 percent of the amount of fat in the original cuts of beef.

Tanle 24.-Summary of cooked yields of bonetess beef and of fat loss during cooking and as plate tuasie

| - Thape of teel or beef reclpe | Cooked yletu | Fat loss : |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Durlng cooktrat: | Asplate wiste |
|  | Percent 62 | Persert 30 | Percent $^{12}$ |
| Grlude-brolled steris | 64 | 13 | 24 |
| Fol rousls.... . . . | $\stackrel{4}{91}$ | +20 | 13 |
| Ment loar ... | 91 | 18 5 5 | $\stackrel{2}{1}$ |
| Beetbarger....... | 80 | 58 | 2 |
| 2 mabarger . |  | 5 | 2 |

## Protein and Fat in Raw Beef From Eight Carcasses and From Field Study

A comparison of the protein and fat content of the raw beef from the 8 carcasses and from the 5 Army field installations is shown (table 25). Statistical analysis of variance of the data showed that only in the fat content of the ground meat was there a real difference between the average values. The 27.4 percent fat in the ground meat
from the field study was statistically greater than the 24.6 percent fat in the ground meat from the 8 careassus. This might be expected since the amount of fat in the ground meat of the 8 carcasses was intended to average approximately 25 percent, whereas the specifications for the ground meat at the time of the 1953 field study permitied as mueh as 30 percent fat. Exeept for the ground meat, the average composition of the raw boneless beef from the 2 studies would be considered equivalent.

Tarle 25.--Range and average percenlages of proteity and fat in boneless beef from 8 carcasses and from 5 Army field installations

| 'Type ant source of beef | Protein |  | Fat |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ramge | Areragu | Rurige | Averike |
| Ronsts or stenks (alry humb): | Percent | Percrin | Percent | Percent |
|  | 16.9-18.5 | - 13.8 | 20. $1-20.0$ | 22. 1 |
| 5 fleldt fistajlations......... | 12.1-18.4 | - 17.8 | 17.5-21.7 | 10.7 |
| dioasts or steaks (molst heat): |  |  |  |  |
| \$ bircusses.......... | 15.0-18.0 | 17.8 | 1f, 8-2L 3 | 18.8 |
| 5 flek installations. Dleed berf: | 12.3-18.6 | 18.0 | 13.0-20, ! | Lfi. 6 |
| 8 carcisses | 14.9-24.0 | [7. 1 | 17.7-20.2 | 220 |
| 5 fudd litallations.- | 15. 8-17.0 | 10.5 | 18.8-26.9 | 22.1 |
| Ground beet: |  |  |  |  |
| 8 carcisses. | 15.3-17, | 16. 1 | 22 2 20. 9 | 24. 5 |
| 5 Gedd Instaliat lobs | 15.0-16.9 | 16.0 | 23.2-34.7 | 197.1 |


The data from 8 carcasses are of value in showing the distribution of protein and fat in boneless beef on a carcass basis, and also the amounts of protein and fat in such items as thaw juices and pan drippings by cut, by cooking method, and on a carcass basis. The data from 5 installations are of value in being representative of large quantities of beef, and provide usable data on quantities of protein, fat, and calories in beef as served, in beef in plate waste, and in beef cousumed.

## Protein and Fat Content and Energy Value of Beef Consumed

The data in table 26 show the average amounts of protein, fat, and food energy per 100 men in boncless beef as issued, in the cooked beef or beef recipe, in the portion not served, in the beef presumably eaten, and in the plate waste. The amounts consumed were obtained by subtraction. In the amounts of beef in different forms eaten per 100 men, theie was a range in protein of from 1,946 granss for stew to 4,043 grams for Swiss steak; in fat, from 1,700 grams for pot ronst to 2,964 for Swiss steak; and in food energy, from 27,794 calories for hamburger to $46, \mathrm{~S} 13$ calories for Swiss steak.

For purposes of comparison between cooking methods for boneless beef, the data in table 26 on amounts of protrin, fat, and food energy in the beef consumed and related items were calculated in terms of the percentages of the amounts issued as raw beef. Percentages over 100 in the cooked recipe show that the added ingredients contributed fair amounts. Although more fat was retained by griddle broiling than by oven roasting ( 79 as compared with 60 percent),
there was twice as much fat in the plate waste from the steaks as from the roasts and consequently less difference in the amounts of fat consumed- 49 and 55 percent, respectively.

Table 26.-Average amounts of protein, fat, and food-cnergy content of cooked beef served and not served, in plate waste, and in beef presumed caten, compared with that of the raw banelnss beff as issued per 100 men

| Thy or berf or heef rectan and related tems | Prolein |  | Frat |  | Food energy |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Oren reaske | Crams | Percem | $O_{0}$ | Percemt | Culnries | Percent |
| Ismat. | 3, 524 |  | 3.828 2.313 | 30.4 | 49, 678 | 71.4 |
| Served | 3.311 198 | 04.8.8. | ${ }^{2} \mathrm{H} 183$ | ${ }_{3}$ | 2.070 | 4.2 |
| Not server wisto | ${ }_{215}^{19}$ | 6.1 | +40 | 11.5 | 4, 658 | 0.7 |
| Prestmed chati | 3. 120 | S8. 7 | 1, 1773 | 48.9 | 30.528 | 6.9 .5 |
| Orldda-brolled stenks: |  |  | 3, 160 |  | 51,390 |  |
| Served | 3, 3 , 17.1 | 8.t. 3 | 3 , 178 | 79.0 | 42, 135 | 82.8 |
| Not served | 32.5 | 8.0 | 3359 | 8.3 | 4,452 | 8.7 |
| phate wiste | 355 | 9.7 | 041 | 23.8 | 19. 185 | 19.6 |
| Presumeth enten | 2.714 | 74.6 | 2. 3 \% | 55.2 | 31.049 | 02.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Serval | 3.01 | St.0 | 2, 123 | 68.6 | 32.745 | 71.6 |
| Not seryta | $5{ }_{518}$ | 13.9 | 348 | 10.4 | 3.368 | 11.7 |
| Piate waste | 2, 佔 | fi. 7 | 1. $\frac{423}{269}$ | 58.7 | - 27.9846 | 100.8 |
| Presmmed diteo | 2, 853 | \% 2 | I. 216 | 50.9 | 27, 810 | 0.8 |
| Swis stemks: | 3, 730 |  | 3, 420 |  | [4, 831 |  |
| Serect. | $4,3+5$ | 16.7 | 3.540 | 103.5 | 52, (14) | 114.5 |
| Not sersed | 459 | 12.3 | ${ }_{\substack{372}}^{570}$ | 10.9 | 5.641 | $1 \pm .0$ |
|  | 329 | 108. ${ }^{5}$ | - ${ }_{\text {, } 2 \times 50}$ | 816.8 | 47, 813 | 14.6 90.6 |
| Stew: | 4, 043 | 108.1 | 2,063 |  | 7,813 | $\cdots$ |
| Stew: Issing! | 2. 1(0) |  | 2.388 |  | 35, 654 |  |
| Surverl... | 2.148 | 99.4 | 2.308 | 78.5 | 35.208 | 12.6 |
| Not served | 254 | 11.5 | 273 | 9.3 | 4. 288 5.78 | 12.0 |
| Plate waste | 219 | 10.1 59.3 | 1, 8198 | 62.5 | 5, 78 308 308 | 85.4 |
| $\cdots$ Issted | 2.204 |  | 3, 050 |  | 45,373 | co. |
| Served. | 2, 329 |  | 2,008 |  | 31.003 | 2.4 |
| Not seryed Tlate waste | 59 | 3.5 | 02 | 1.6 | ${ }^{+}$ | 2.1 |
| fricsumatienta | 2.263 | 100.1 | 1,946 | 40.2 | 30, 6.5 | 6.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sersued. | 2.534 | 99.0 | 1. 897 | 38.6 | 36, 135 | 33.3 |
| Not servelt | 423 | 15.8 | 315 | 6.4 | 5,004 | 8.8 |
| Finte waste | 52 | 1.8 | 63 | 1.2 | 985 | 1.2 51.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| flambaryer: |  |  | 5, 100 |  | 58, 519 |  |
| ${ }_{\text {Sustreg }}$ | 2, $6 \times 40$ | 87.0 | 1,940 | 38.0 | 29.314 | 48.1 |
| Notserved | ${ }^{238}$ | 0.4 | 210 | 4.1 | 3.178 | S. 3 |
| Plate waste |  | 3.0 |  | 1.7 36.3 | 1. 6278 | 40.5 |
| l'resumed mator | 2535 | 83.1 | 1,852 | 36.3 | 27,784 | 40.5 |

For the ground-meat recipes, hatf or less of the fat in the raw beef was found in the cooked-beet recipe. Although less than 2 percent of the fat appeared in the plate waste, the men consumed as groundment recipes less than half of the original fat. As shown by a comparison of "beefburgers" and hamburgers, the presence of bread erumbs and erackers in "beefburgers" did not affect the fat retention in the cooked recipe or it the amounts consumed. The 36 to 37 percent of fat consumed in the ground meat for hamburgers and "beefburgers" was exclusive of amounts in the gravies and cooking juices.

Table 27 shows the percentages of protein, fat, and food energy attributable to the beef in the raw recipe. The data were obtained
by calculating the amounts contributed by the average recipe ingredients (table 19) according to the published food-composition tables $(\$)$ and subtracting these amounts from the values obtained by analysis of the beef recipes. Since most of the protein, fat, and food energy was contributed by the becf, it was assumed that in the cooked recipe the beef-contributed protein, fat, and food energy were in the same proportion as in the raw, and with no appreciable error.

Tanle 27.-Percentages of prolein, fat, and food energy of the aucrage raw recipe comribuded by 4 -way boneless beef


Based on the carcass proportion of the ronsts or steaks (dry heat), roasts or staks (moist heat), diced beef, and ground beef, and an equat representation among the cooking methods used in this study for the types of bef, the percentages of protein, fat, and food cuergy in the beef consumed were calculated from those in the heef only, not including the recipe ingredients. These data showed that the beef or beef recipe eaten contained 84 percent of the beef protein, 51 percent of the heef fat, and 67 percent of the beef energy value. Also on this basis, 6 percent of the beef protein, 11 percent of the beef fat, and 10 pereent of the food energy were lound in the plate waste. Of these items, 7 percent of the food energy, 9 percent of the protein, and 6 perent of the fat in the issued beef were left as unserved edible beef at the serving table.
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[^0]:    'Submitted for publication July 1, 1955.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Italic numbers in parentheses refer to Literature Cited, p. 32.

[^2]:    I Includes liquids and vegetables.
    1 lochudes reelpe ingredfents.

[^3]:    $\$$ Shagle lean.

[^4]:    1 Based on single item.

[^5]:    ICorracterf for amounts taken for mandyteni smaples.
     (inble 8 ).

[^6]:    11 asterisk indicates significant; 2 asterisks indicate highly significant
    2 Standard error also shown

[^7]:    I Figures are averuges welghted uccording to percentage of cut in type of 4 -way boneless beef.

[^8]:    : Puhfication masy not be easily obtalned.

[^9]:    I Sec footmotes.

