



Research Repository UCD

Title	Effect of finishing diet and duration on the sensory quality and volatile profile of lamb meat
Authors(s)	Gkarane, Vasiliki, Brunton, Nigel P., Allen, Paul, Gravador, Rufielyn S., Fahey, Alan G., Murphy, P. (Patrick), Monahan, Frank J., et al.
Publication date	2019-01
Publication information	Gkarane, Vasiliki, Nigel P. Brunton, Paul Allen, Rufielyn S. Gravador, Alan G. Fahey, P. (Patrick) Murphy, Frank J. Monahan, and et al. "Effect of Finishing Diet and Duration on the Sensory Quality and Volatile Profile of Lamb Meat." Elsevier, January 2019. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2018.07.063 .
Publisher	Elsevier
Item record/more information	http://hdl.handle.net/10197/10488
Publisher's statement	This is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in Food Research International. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in Food Research International (115, (2018)) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2018.07.063
Publisher's version (DOI)	10.1016/j.foodres.2018.07.063

Downloaded 2025-12-04 22:58:39

The UCD community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters! (@ucd_oa)



© Some rights reserved. For more information

Effect of finishing diet and duration on the sensory quality and volatile profile of lamb meat

Vasiliki Gkarane^a, Nigel P. Brunton^a, Paul Allen^b, Rufielyn S. Gravador^a, Noel A. Claffey^c, Michael G. Diskin^c, Alan G. Fahey^a, Linda J. Farmer^d, Aidan P. Moloney^e, Maria J. Alcalde^f, Patrick Murphy^g, Frank J. Monahan^a

^a *University College Dublin, School of Agriculture and Food Science, Dublin 4, Ireland*

E-mail address: Vasiliki Gkarane: vasiliki.gkarane@ucdconnect.ie; Nigel P. Brunton: nigel.brunton@ucd.ie; Rufielyn S. Gravador: rufielyn.gravador@ucd.ie; Alan G. Fahey: alan.fahey@ucd.ie

^b *Teagasc, Food Research Centre, Ashtown, Dublin 15, Ireland*

E-mail address: Paul Allen: paul.allen@teagasc.ie

^c *Teagasc, Animal & Grassland Research and Innovation Centre, Athenry, Co. Galway, Ireland*

E-mail address: Noel A. Claffey: noel.claffey@teagasc.ie; Michael G. Diskin: michael.diskin@teagasc.ie

^d *Agri-Food and Biosciences Institute, Newforge Lane, Belfast, BT9 5PX; UK*

Email address: Linda J. Farmer: linda.farmer@afbini.gov.uk

^e *Teagasc, Animal & Grassland Research and Innovation Centre, Grange, Co. Meath, Ireland*

Email address: Aidan P. Moloney: aidan.moloney@teagasc.ie

^f *University of Seville, Department of Agroforestry Science, Agricultural Engineering College*

Email address: Maria J. Alcalde : aldea@us.es

^g *University College Dublin, School of Mathematics and Statistics, Dublin 4, Ireland*

Email address: Patrick Murphy patrick.murphy@ucd.ie

Corresponding author: frank.monahan@ucd.ie

Abstract

Animal production factors diet can affect the sensory quality of lamb meat. The study investigated the effect of diet composition and duration of consumption on the proximate analysis, volatile profile and sensory quality of lamb meat. Ninety-nine male Texel × Scottish Blackface lambs were raised at pasture for 10 months before being assigned in groups of 11 to one of the following treatments: 100% Silage (S) for 36 (S36), 54 (S54) or 72 (S72) days; 50% Silage 50% - 50% Concentrate (SC) for 36 (SC36), 54 (SC54) or 72 (SC72) days; 100% Concentrate (C) for 36 (C36) or 54 (C54) or 72 (C72) days. A trained sensory panel found *Intensity of Lamb Aroma*, *Dry Aftertaste* and *Astringent Aftertaste* to be higher in meat from lambs on the concentrate diet. Discriminant analysis showed that the volatile profile enabled discrimination of lamb based on dietary treatment but the volatile differences were insufficient to impact highly on sensory quality. Muscle from animals in the S54 group had higher *Manure/Faecal Aroma* and *Woolly Aroma* than the SC54 and C54 groups, possibly related to higher levels of indole and skatole. Further research is required to establish if these small differences would influence consumer acceptability.

Keywords: Animal feed, Silage, Concentrate, Discriminant analysis, Palatability, SPME/GC/MS

1 Introduction

The main feedstuffs consumed by sheep for meat production are derived from cereal grains and pasture (either grazed or ensiled grass), with combinations of both feed sources often in use over the lifetime of animal ([Almela et al., 2010](#)). The growth rates of sheep receiving solely grass-based diets are lower and ultimate carcass weights may also be lower ([Murphy, Loerch, McClure, & Solomon, 1994](#); [Priolo, Micol, Agabriel, Prache, & Dransfield, 2002](#)); thus, grain-based concentrates, which are more energy dense, are often used to shorten the time to slaughter, increase dressing percentage, and improve carcass quality ([De Brito, Ponnampalam, & Hopkins, 2017](#); [Jaborek, Zerby, Moeller, & Fluharty, 2017](#)).

In addition to the effects of diet on production parameters ([De Brito et al., 2017](#)), dietary constituents may also have a considerable effect on meat quality ([Kitessa et al., 2009](#)). There are differences in the consumer acceptability of meat from grain-fed and grass-fed sheep ([Font i Furnols et al., 2006](#); [Sanudo et al., 2007](#)) attributable to, among other factors, variation in the level of intramuscular fat (IMF) and subcutaneous fat and their fatty acid composition ([Howes, Bekhit, Burritt, & Campbell, 2015](#)). Consumer assessment of lamb meat is influenced by the taste and/or aroma deriving from volatile compounds, which are known to be affected by the relative proportions of fatty acids in the meat ([Ponnampalam, Sinclair, Egan, Ferrier, & Leury, 2002](#)). With regard to flavour specifically, the extent to which flavour intensity is altered depends on the types of both forage and grain consumed ([Duckett & Kuber, 2001](#)). Meat from sheep receiving primarily grass-based diets (pasture or grass silage) is reported to have a pastoral (grassy) flavour ([Young, Lane, Priolo, & Fraser, 2003](#)). In this context, nutritional strategies may be used to modulate the sensory quality of lamb ultimately affecting consumer preference ([Almela et al., 2010](#)); There are other instances too, in which nutritional interventions could be useful. For example, in a previous

study ([Gkarane et al., 2017](#)), we reported less favourable sensory attributes in lamb from rams compared to castrates; in this instance a modification to the diet might be useful in overcoming undesirable sensory attributes. The objective of the current study was to test the hypothesis that different proportions and durations of feeding cereal concentrate and silage-based diets would affect the sensory quality and volatile profile of lamb meat from rams.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Animal husbandry, slaughter and sampling

All animal procedures used in this study were conducted under experimental license from the Irish Health Products Regulatory Authority (HPRA) in accordance with the European Union (Protection of Animals used for Scientific Purposes) Regulations 2012 (S.I. No. 543/ 2012). Ninety-nine ram lambs (Texel × Scottish Blackface) were sourced from Irish farms in March 2015. Lambs were raised at pasture from birth (March 2015) and were weaned at 130 d of age after which they were transported to the Teagasc Sheep Research Centre, Athenry, Co. Galway, Ireland ([Claffey et al., 2018](#)). Lambs were maintained at pasture until selected for commencement of an intensive indoor finishing period. Lambs were allocated to the following nine dietary treatments consisting of three grass silage:concentrate ratios (100:0 (S), 50:50 (DM basis) (SC), 0:100 (C)) with each diet being fed for three pre-slaughter feeding durations (36, 54 and 72 d) to give the following dietary treatments: S36, S54, S72, SC36, SC54, SC72, C36, C54, C72. The grass silage was predominantly *Lolium perenne* L. and the concentrate diet consisted of 30% maize, 30% barley, 16.5% soya hulls and 15.5% soybean meal. In line with commercial practice, lambs were selected for treatment based on initial live weight and predicted growth rate on the assigned diets to yield lambs with similar weights at slaughter. Thus, the lightest lambs were assigned to the C72 treatment and the heaviest to the S36 treatment. For the indoor finishing period (36, 54 or 72 d) lambs

were individually penned in metal floor feeding pens (182 cm × 122 cm). At the end of the finishing period, lambs were transported to a commercial abattoir (Gillivan's, Moate, Co. Westmeath, Ireland) for slaughter. The mean ages in days (\pm SD) of the animals at slaughter were 252 (\pm 6.4), 260 (\pm 3.7), 273 (\pm 6.0), 248 (\pm 3.8), 254 (\pm 4.8), 271 (\pm 5.3), 248 (\pm 6.1), 258 (\pm 5.0), 266 (\pm 4.3) for the S36, S54, S72, SC36, SC54, SC72, C36, C54, C72 treatments, respectively. After slaughter, carcasses were chilled overnight and transported to Teagasc Food Research Centre, Ashtown, Dublin 15, Ireland, for dissection. Ultimate pH (pHu) of *M. longissimus thoracis et lumborum* (LTL) was measured at 25 h post slaughter at the 13th rib using a SympHony SP70P hand-held pH meter (VWR, Dublin, Ireland). Both LTL muscles were excised from each carcass, cut into 2.5 cm thick steaks, vacuum packed, aged for 8 d at 4 °C and frozen at -20 °C until required for analysis.

2.2 Compositional analysis

Samples of LTL were thawed overnight at 4 °C and homogenized using a Kenwood CH180 Compact Mini Chopper (Kenwood, Hampshire, UK). Moisture and intramuscular fat (IMF) contents were determined using the SMART Trac Rapid Fat Analyzer (CEM Corporation, NC, USA) according to AOAC Methods 985.14 and 985.26 ([AOAC, 1990](#)), respectively. Protein concentration was determined using a LECO FP328 (LECO Corp., MI, USA) protein analyzer based on the Dumas method and according to AOAC method 992.15 ([AOAC, 1990](#)). Ash was determined following incineration of samples overnight in a furnace at 540 °C.

2.3 Reagents and fibres for volatile analysis

Volatile standards, the alkane mixture (C7 - C30), methanol (for preparation of stock solutions of the standards), and sodium sulfate were supplied by Sigma-Aldrich Ireland Ltd

(Arklow, Co. Wicklow, Ireland). The volatile standards hexanoic acid and α -terpineol were supplied from VWR International Ltd (Blanchardstown, Dublin 15, Ireland) while 1-pentadecanol was supplied from Fisher Scientific Ireland Ltd (Blanchardstown, Dublin 15, Ireland). Solid phase microextraction (SPME) fibres (50/30 μ m CAR/DVB/PDMS fibre; 1 cm length) were supplied by Agilent Technology (Part Number: SU57298U; Unit 3, Euro Business House, Cork, Ireland). All reagents and chemicals were of chromatographic quality.

2.4 Sample preparation and volatile analysis

Before analysis LTL samples were thawed by immersion of frozen vacuum packed samples in water at room temperature for 20 min. Thawed steaks were grilled with the fat attached, using a clamshell grill until an internal temperature of 70 °C was reached (monitored using a hand-held digital thermometer; Eurolec, Dublin, Ireland). Subcutaneous fat was removed and 7 g from the core was weighed and homogenized with 7 g Na₂SO₄ using a Kenwood CH180 Compact Mini Chopper (Kenwood, Hampshire, UK). A 5 ± 0.05 g sample of the mixture was placed in a 20 ml glass headspace vial sealed with a polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE)-faced silicone septum (VWR, Dublin, Ireland). The vial containing the sample was equilibrated in a water bath set at 90 ± 2 °C for 20 min and the fibre was exposed to the headspace over the sample for a further 20 min. These SPME conditions (adopted based on maximizing the number of compounds detected, the total peak area and the detection of BCFAs) were considered optimum as previously described in [Gkarane et al. \(2018\)](#). After adsorption, the fibre (50/30 μ m CAR/DVB/PDMS) was removed from the vial and immediately inserted into the injection port of the GC. Analysis of the volatile compounds was carried out using a Varian 3800 GC coupled to a Varian Saturn 2000 ion trap mass spectrometer (Varian Chromatography Systems, Walnut Creek, CA, USA). Volatile extraction, adsorption and injection were performed manually. The injector,

operating in splitless mode, was set at 250 °C and the desorption time was 8 min. Helium was used as carrier gas with a constant flow rate of 1.0 ml/min. Volatile compounds were separated using an Agilent ZB-5MS column (30 m length, 0.25 mm internal diameter, 0.25 µm film thickness) (Agilent Technologies, Palo Alto, CA, USA). The GC oven temperature was programmed as follows: 40°C for 5 min, increasing to 230 °C at 4 °C/min and holding for 5 min, with a total acquisition time of 57.5 min. The GC/MS transfer line was heated at 280°C. Acquisition was performed in electron impact (EI) mode (70 eV) at 10 microscans/s, scanning the mass range 33–230 m/z. Saturated n-alkanes (C7 - C30) injected directly (1 µl) onto the column were run under the same GC-MS conditions (at split ratio of 1:50) to obtain linear retention index (LRI) values for the volatile compounds detected. Compounds were identified by comparing their mass spectra with those of spectra from the NIST/EPA/NIH Mass Spectral Database (Version 2.0 g, 2011), those of authenticated standards and linear retention indices matching those of published values ([Gkarane et al., 2018](#)). Individual animals were considered as experimental units and one meat sample from each animal was subjected to analysis using a randomized block design to avoid experimental bias. Integration of the peak areas of the volatile compounds used specific ion identification for each molecule (to deal with co-elution of some compounds). An external standard (bromobenzene (10 ppm)) was run daily under the same SPME and GC-MS conditions as the samples. For volatile analysis, the peak area (PA) of each volatile was first normalised against bromobenzene before adding a constant (+1) and being logarithmically transformed to achieve a normal distribution. The amount of each volatile was expressed as logarithmically transformed PA for that compound.

2.5 Lamb meat preparation for sensory analysis

The LTL muscle from the left side of each carcass was used for sensory analysis. On the day of sensory testing, packaged frozen steaks were thawed by immersion in water at room temperature for 45 min. Steaks were grilled, with subcutaneous fat attached, to an internal temperature of 70 °C, using a clamshell grill. On reaching 70 °C (monitored using a hand-held digital thermometer (Eurolec, Dublin, Ireland)) the steaks were removed from the grill, wrapped with aluminium foil and allowed to rest for 3 min. Each steak was unwrapped and following removal of the subcutaneous fat, cut into 8 pieces of approximately 2 cm³. Samples were re-wrapped with foil, assigned a random three-digit code, held in an oven set at 60 °C and served to the panellists within 20 min.

2.6 Panel training

Staff at Teagasc Food Research Centre, Ashtown, participated as sensory panellists in 16 training sessions prior to participating in sensory testing. Training sessions included: lamb meat tasting to generate descriptors for aroma, flavour, texture/mouthfeel, taste and aftertaste; spiking sessions using lamb flavour/aroma compounds; and training using physical and chemical reference standards. A detailed procedure for the panel training is described in [Gkarane et al. \(2017\)](#).

2.7 Quantitative descriptive analysis

Quantitative descriptive analysis (QDA) was performed on one day per week over 8 weeks with two sensory sessions per day (morning and afternoon). In each session, six samples were assessed using a balanced and randomized design. Panellists were asked to rate 38 attributes (generated during the training) for each sample, by marking a point on a 100 mm unstructured line scale. Unsalted crackers and water at room temperature were given to

panellists to cleanse the palate between samples. The sensory attribute definitions, agreed during the training sessions ([Gkarane et al., 2017](#)), were available to each panellist during tasting. Panellist evaluations were recorded using Compusense 5 (v4.4, Compusense Inc., Guelph, Ontario, Canada).

2.8 Statistical analyses

Proximate and sensory analysis data were tested for the normality of the residuals for each variable. In the case of non-normal distribution, data were transformed using the Box-Cox transformation. All data were analysed using a mixed model with diet, duration and diet x duration as fixed effects (SAS (v9.4)). For the sensory data, the sensory analysis session and carcass weight were considered as random effects. Analysis was conducted in the MIXED procedure of SAS (v9.4). All data were presented as least square means.

Principal component analysis (PCA) of the sensory and volatile data for the nine treatments was performed using XLSTAT®statistical software (Version 19.01.41647; Addinsoft, Paris, France). Associations between sensory attributes and diets, and volatile compounds and diets were also investigated using Discriminant Analysis (DA) performed using XLSTAT®statistical software (Version 19.01.41647; Addinsoft, Paris, France).

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Proximate analysis

There was no difference in muscle fat content among dietary treatments or finishing periods (Table 1). Other authors have reported that lambs receiving concentrate diets generally have higher growth rates ([Fraser & Rowarth, 1996](#)) and IMF than lambs receiving pasture-based diets ([De Brito et al., 2017](#)). However, [Crouse et al. \(1978\)](#) found no difference

in fat thickness or percentage carcass fat of lambs fed low, medium or high energy diets and slaughtered at constant weights. Similarly, [Aurousseau et al. \(2007\)](#) detected no differences in the lipid content of *M. longissimus thoracis* of lambs raised and finished on pasture only, raised on grass and finished in stalls for 22 or 41 d, or raised and finished indoors (in stalls) on concentrates and hay only. They attributed the lack of differences between treatments to similarity in energy expenditure between animals and a higher rate of gain from good quality grass.

For protein, there was a diet \times duration interaction whereby the muscle from the S group had lower protein content than that of the SC and C groups at 54 d and 72 d, but there were no differences due to diets at 36 d (Supplementary Table S1). The lower protein content of the lamb muscle from the S group may be explained by the fact that concentrate diets have higher dry matter and crude protein content than silage-based diets ([Warren et al., 2008](#)); however, this was more noticeable when the feeding duration increased to 54 and 72 days. In addition, there were differences due to duration in the C group, whereby the muscle of the 54 d and 72 d groups had higher protein content than the 36 d group. In general, concentrate-based diets favour the production of propionate leading to increased insulin secretion and stimulation of protein and fat synthesis in muscle ([Weekes, 1986](#)). Muscle from lambs receiving the experimental diets for 36 and 54 d duration had higher muscle ash content ($P < .05$) than lambs fed for the 72 d duration, although there was a diet \times duration interaction whereby the SC group at 54 d had higher ash content than the S and C groups.

3.2 Effect of diet on the sensory and volatile profiles of lamb meat

In general, a limited effect of the different dietary treatments on the 38 sensory descriptors was noted (only seven were significantly affected; $P < .05$) (Table 2). For three of these (*Animal/Farm Smell*, *Woolly Aroma* and *Fattiness*) there were diet \times duration

interactions which are discussed in the next section (3.3). *Intensity of Lamb Aroma*, *Dry Aftertaste* and *Astringent Aftertaste* scored higher ($P < .05$) in the C group compared to the S and SC groups. *Farmyard Flavour* scored lower ($P < .05$) in the SC group compared to the C group, but was similar to S group. Although significant effects on sensory descriptors were few, lamb from animals fed the SC group received lower scores ($P = .015\text{--}0.078$) for attributes that may be considered hedonically negative by some consumers (i.e. *Animal/Farm Smell*, *Woolly Aroma*, *Manure/Faecal Aroma*, *Off-flavours*) (Table 2) although no consumer evaluation was performed in this study. Similar conclusions regarding lamb meat assessed by European consumers was reported by [Font i Furnols et al. \(2009\)](#) where meat from lambs fed concentrate or a mixture of pasture and concentrate was more acceptable compared to meat from lambs at pasture. Specifically, the meat from lambs fed a mixture of pasture (6% of live weight, LW) and concentrate (1.2% of LW) was the most acceptable. [Arsenos et al. \(2002\)](#) showed that meat from lambs fed lucerne hay with low and medium levels of concentrate was preferred more than meat from lambs fed high levels of concentrates. Other studies have reported bigger differences when comparing grass-based systems with concentrate-based system ([Priolo et al., 2002](#); [Resconi, Campo, Furnols, Montossi, & Sanudo, 2009](#)), with concentrate-fed lambs having more intense lamb odour and/or flavour than grass or forage-fed lambs but also higher acceptability ([Borton, Loerch, McClure, & Wulf, 2005](#); [Resconi et al., 2009](#); [Schreurs, Lane, Tavendale, Barry, & McNabb, 2008](#)).

The volatile analysis showed that only ten volatile compounds were significantly ($P < .05$) affected by diet (Table 3), seven of which showed diet \times duration interactions (described in section 3.3). The SC and C groups had higher ($P < .05$) values for dimethyl sulphide (formed through Strecker degradation of methionine ([Bailey, Rourke, Gutheil, & Wang, 1992](#))), than the S diet. Levels of hexanal (a compound that derives from oxidation of linoleic acid in muscle (C18:2n-6) ([Elmore et al., 2005](#))), increased gradually with increasing

274 dietary concentrate although only the C and S groups were significantly different from each
275 other ($P < .05$). This could be due to the higher proportion (%) of C18:2n-6 in the C group
276 compared to the other groups ([Rowe, Macedo, Visentainer, Souza, & Matsushita, 1999](#)).
277 Muscle from lambs fed the S diet had higher values ($P < .05$) for skatole than the SC and C
278 diets. Skatole (which has a “faecal/manure aroma”) derives from the degradation of dietary
279 tryptophan and since lush pasture is a source of more readily degradable protein than cereal
280 concentrates, it is also a possible source of tryptophan ([Tavendale, Lane, Schreurs, Fraser, &](#)
281 [Meagher, 2006](#)). In addition, pasture-based diets have a high ratio of protein to readily
282 fermentable carbohydrate ([Schreurs et al., 2008](#); [Young et al., 2003](#)). This may explain the
283 higher levels of skatole in muscle from animals on the S group compared the other groups.
284 [Priolo et al. \(2004\)](#) reported differences in p-cymene and eight sesquiterpenes among lambs
285 fed either on grass or on concentrates for different periods while [Resconi et al. \(2010\)](#) found
286 that lambs fed only on pasture had lower levels of carbonyl compounds (alkanals,
287 alkadienals, ketones, strecker aldehydes) than those fed on grass with a concentrate
288 supplement, or only with concentrate.

289 Multivariate analysis techniques were applied to investigate potential differences
290 between groups and associations with the sensory and volatile data. Following discriminant
291 analysis of the sensory data, the first component (F1) explained 58.87% of the variation and
292 the second component (F2) explained 41.13% of the variation (Fig. 1). The centroids of the
293 dietary treatments were placed in different quadrants (Fig. 1a), revealing some associations
294 with some sensory attributes (Fig. 1b). The factor loadings of the sensory attributes that were
295 considered significant were higher than 0.30. In general, the overlapping of the groups
296 confirmed that the sensory profile of the lambs fed on different diets was similar. Also, the P
297 values from Wilk's Lambda test, Pillai's trace test and Roy's greatest root test showed that the
298 mean vectors only approached significance (range $P = .06$ -0.10). Nevertheless, the C group

299 (centroid located in the upper right quadrant) was more associated with *Dry Aftertaste* and
300 *Astringent Aftertaste*. The S group (centroid located in the upper left quadrant) was more
301 associated with *Fattiness*. For the SC group (centroid in the bottom left quadrant), although
302 visually it was associated with *Juiciness*, *Intensity of Roast Meat Aroma* and *Intensity of Roast*
303 *Meat Flavour*, the factor loadings of these attributes were ≤ 0.30 . However, it is clear that the
304 SC group was not associated with attributes that may be viewed as undesirable (i.e.
305 *Manure/Faecal Aroma*, *Animal/Farm Smell*, *Off-flavours*, *Farmyard Flavour*; factor loadings
306 > 0.30 for F2).

307 The discriminant analysis plot of the volatile data (Fig. 2) showed that the three
308 groups (S, SC and C) were clearly separated. The first component (F1) explained 73.04% of
309 the variation and the second component (F2) explained 26.96 % of the variation. The factor
310 loadings of the volatile compounds that were considered significant were equal or higher than
311 0.30. The P values from Wilk's Lambda test, Pillai's trace test and Roy's greatest root test (P
312 $< .001$) indicate that at least one of the groups was different from another, whereby according
313 to the Fisher distances test the C group differed from the S group (P $< .001$) and from the SC
314 group (P $= .001$). For F1, the S and SC groups (both placed on the left side of the plot) were
315 separated from the C group. The compounds that contributed to this separation were 2,5-
316 dimethylpyrazine, 2,6-dimethylpyrazine, 2-ethyl-3,6-dimethylpyrazine, (*E,Z*)-2,6-nonadienal,
317 pentadecane, hexadecane, and pentadecanol (factor loadings ≥ 0.3 for F1, data not shown).
318 The slight overlap of the S and SC groups indicated that their volatile profile had some
319 similarities. The results are in accordance with [Vasta et al. \(2011\)](#) who, through discriminant
320 analysis, showed that the volatile profile of meat from animals fed silage-based diets was
321 different from those on a concentrate-based diet suggesting that this could be due to the
322 presence of compounds in silage-based diets arising from bacterial fermentation of herbage
323 that makes the “volatile fingerprint” different. The second component separated the SC from

the C and S groups and the compounds that contributed to the variation were dimethyl sulfide and indole (factor loadings ≥ 0.3 for F2). The differences in the volatile profile (Fig. 2) show that both S and SC groups differed from the C group; however, the differences were not reflected in the sensory quality to a large extent as few differences were detected (Table 2). The explanation could be that, while the volatile analysis showed 10 compounds to be significantly affected, only seven (dimethylsulfide, hexanal, 2,6-nonadienal, indole, skatole, 2,5-dimethylpyrazine and 2-ethyl-3,6-dimethylpyrazine) have low odour thresholds and have been reported to be odour-active in previous lamb meat flavour studies ([Gkarane et al., 2018](#)). Furthermore, only three out of the seven compounds (dimethylsulfide, hexanal and skatole) had a “clear” diet effect since the others had an interaction with duration. These compounds, even if present at concentrations above the odour threshold, may not be adequate to elicit significant sensory differences among diets which could explain the similarity in the sensory profiles of the lambs on different diets. Another hypothesis is that the panellist's sensitivity was insufficient to detect the differences in the aroma or that even if they detected them they didn't score them very differently on the magnitude scale of 0-100. Thus, while the discriminant analysis separated the lamb based on diets, it seems that there are limitations that should be considered regarding the compounds that could ultimately influence flavour.

The fact that only few effects of dietary treatment on the volatile and sensory profiles of lamb were noted in the present study is surprising given that differences in the fatty acid profile of the lambs due to the different dietary treatments were present (unpublished results). For example, the C18:3 content was higher ($P < .001$) and the C18:2 content lower ($P < .001$) in LTL from the S treatment compared to the C treatment while LTL from the SC treatment had intermediate values (unpublished results). However, the lack of differences in IMF in this study could explain the lack of differences in the volatile profile due to diets. According to [Vasta, D'Alessandro, Priolo, Petrotos, and Martemucci \(2012\)](#) and [Frank, Kaczmariska,](#)

[Paterson, Piyasiri, and Warner \(2017\)](#) most of the odour-impact volatiles in meat systems are lypophilic and their accumulation in animal tissue is correlated with the level of intramuscular fat deposition. Furthermore, differences in flavour volatiles and/or fatty acid composition following diet modification do not always have a major effect on sensory quality as reported by [Kitessa et al. \(2009\)](#) and [Muir, Deaker, and Bown \(1998\)](#). It is also important to recognise that the volatiles extracted by a static method headspace such as SPME may not be representative of the headspace volatiles (considering that many factors ([Jelen, Majcher, & Dziadas, 2012](#)) influence the extracted compounds). Finally, the compounds detected by SPME may not be perceived by trained panellists and the perception of trained panellists can't be equated to the perception of consumers ([Munoz, 1998](#)).

3.3 Effect of finishing duration on the sensory and volatile profiles of lamb meat

Sensory analysis showed that only two attributes (*Animal/Farm Smell* and *Woolly Aroma*) were affected by finishing duration, both of which had a diet \times duration interaction which will be described later in this section (Table 2). A recent study ([Guerrero et al., 2018](#)) also reported that feeding duration (30, 50 or 70 d) had a minor impact on sensory attributes of dry cured ham from culled ewes.

The volatile analysis showed that seven volatile compounds were affected ($P < .05$) by the finishing duration, regardless of the finishing diet (Table 3). For four compounds (octanal, nonanal, 1-octanol, and nonanoic acid) the 54 d group had higher levels ($P < .05$) than the other two groups (36 d and 72 d) which did not differ from each other. For two compounds (dodecanal and tridecanal) the 54 d group was higher ($P < .05$) than the 72 d group but both were similar to the 36 d group. For one compound (2-pentylfuran) values for the 54 and 72 d groups were both higher ($P < .05$) than the 36 d group. This quadratic pattern (i.e. an increase to 54 d and a decrease thereafter) could be attributed to a number of factors including the

different average daily gains and feed conversion efficiencies of the lambs. In the current study the average live weights (and ages) of lambs assigned to the experimental diets (S, SC and C) were 41.9 ± 2.4 kg (214 ± 5 d), 39.0 ± 5.2 kg (204 ± 5 d) and 38.9 ± 5.9 kg (197 ± 8 d) for the 36, 54 and 72 d groups, respectively. These differences in maturity and associated differences in average daily gain (ADG) and feed conversion efficiency (FCE), on assignment to the experimental diets, may have contributed to the minor differences in sensory character and volatiles. Similarly [Arsenos et al. \(2002\)](#) reported that lambs slaughtered at similar target slaughter weights may have differences in degree of maturity which may impact on meat quality and consumer acceptability.

Studies indicate that regardless of diet there is a limit to daily intake in ruminants ([Allison, 1985](#); [Caton & Dhuyvetter, 1997](#)) after a defined period on a diet. A multitude of factors can affect feed palatability in ruminants and, thus, voluntary feed intake and rate of passage through the gut, including interactions between environmental conditions, animal requirements (physiological or metabolic demands), physical characteristics of the diet (composition, digestibility, energy density) and amount of protein which bypasses the rumen, efficiency of microbial growth and extent of methane loss ([Baumont, 1996](#); [Caton & Dhuyvetter, 1997](#); [Decruyenaere, Buldgen, & Stilmant, 2009](#); [Okine, Mathison, Kaske, Kennelly, & Christopherson, 1998](#)). These factors may in turn be influenced by feeding duration with an ultimate effect on the lamb's metabolism and meat quality.

There were some interactions between diet and duration with respect to their effects on sensory and volatile profiles. The sensory analysis showed differences among groups at 54 d, whereby *Manure/Faecal Aroma* scores for the S group were higher ($P < .05$) than the scores for the SC and C groups, but there were no differences among groups at the other two feeding durations (Supplementary Table S2). In the S group specifically, scores of *Manure/Faecal Aroma* and *Woolly Aroma* for 54 d were higher ($P < .05$) than for 36 d and 72

d ($P < .05$) whereas for *Animal /Farm Smell* scores for 54 d were higher ($P < .05$) than 36 d but similar ($P > .05$) to 72 d. For *Fattiness/Greasiness*, scores from the S group were higher ($P < .05$) than the scores of SC and C groups only at 72 d.

There were ten significant ($P < .05$) diet \times duration interactions in the volatile analysis (Supplementary Table S3). For (Z)-4-heptenal there were no differences due to duration in the S group; however, in the SC group the 54 d value was higher ($P < .05$) than the 72 d value, neither of which differed ($P > .05$) from the 36 d value, while in the C group the 36 d value was higher ($P < .05$) than both the 54 and 72 d values. In addition, there were differences due to diet in the 72 d period, with S group having higher values than the C group and similar to the values of the SC group. For (E,Z)-2,6-nonadienal there were differences due to duration only in the SC and C groups, whereby the 36 and 54 d values, which did not differ, were higher ($P < .05$) than the 72 d values. A difference due to diet was found only for the 72 d group, whereby the S group had higher ($P < .05$) values than both the SC and C groups which did not differ. These two aldehydes derive from linolenic acid (C18:3n-3) ([Elmore et al., 2005](#)), associated with grass-based diets ([Enser et al., 1998](#)), which could explain why levels were lower with inclusion of concentrates for the longer (i.e. 72 d) finishing duration.

For 1-pentadecanol, the S and SC groups had higher ($P < .05$) values at 36 and 54 d, which did not differ, compared to the C group; at 72 d values decreased ($P < .05$) from S to SC to C group. Long-chain fatty alcohols, like pentadecanol, derive from wax ester hydrolysis and are considered as diet biomarkers; notable differences in the alcohol content of wax are found mainly among grasses and legumes ([Kelman, Bugalho, & Dove, 2003](#)), which could explain the higher levels in muscle from the S and SC groups compared with the C group, regardless of the finishing duration. For 2-heptanone, differences due to diet were observed; thus, at 36 d values were lower ($P < .05$) in the S group than either the SC or C groups, which did not differ. This compound was generally present at higher levels (although

not significant) in muscle from the SC and C groups at all finishing durations, probably because it derives from C18:2n-6 ([Elmore et al., 2005](#)), which is associated with grain-based diets ([Enser et al., 1998](#)). Differences in 2-heptanone due to feeding duration were significant only in the S group, whereby values at 36 d were lower ($P < .05$) than either 54 or 72 d, which did not differ.

Indole was detected at each duration of feeding in the S group, but only detected at 54 d in the SC group and at 72 d in the C group (Supplementary Table S3). The frequency of detection was higher in muscles from the S group since it derives from tryptophan degradation in the rumen mainly of grass-fed lambs and has been identified with pastoral flavours ([Schreurs et al., 2008](#)). The higher scores for *Woolly Aroma* and *Manure/Faecal Aroma* in muscle from the S54 group could be due to the higher levels of indole and skatole (faecal, mothball-like aroma) compared to SC54 and C54 groups (although for skatole the diet \times duration effect approached significance ($P < .1$)).

For 2,5-dimethyl pyrazine, values at 36 d in the S group were higher ($P < .05$) than in the C group, neither of which differed from the SC group; there were no statistical significant differences ($P > .05$) due to dietary treatment at the other durations of feeding despite the fact that the trend was similar (Supplementary Table S3). Differences due to feeding duration were significant only in the S group, whereby values at 36 d were higher ($P < .05$) than at 72 d, neither of which differed from 54 d. For 2-ethyl-3,6-dimethylpyrazine, values at 54 d in the S group and SC groups were higher ($P < .05$) than those of the C group, while there were no differences ($P > .05$) due to dietary treatment at the other durations of feeding (although a similar trend was observed). Similar to 2,5-dimethylpyrazine, the S group, had higher ($P < .05$) values at 36 d than 72 d, neither of which differed from values at 54 d. Muscle from animals fed the S and SC diets had numerically higher levels for some pyrazines than the C diet. This could be due to a possibly higher content of specific amino acids (e.g. cysteine,

glycine), that contribute to the Maillard reaction, in muscle from animals fed silage-based diets as reported by other authors ([Farmer, 1994](#)). [Koutsidis et al. \(2008\)](#) reported a significant effect of the diet (grass silage *vs* concentrate) on the concentration of free amino acids (which can participate in the Maillard reaction) in bovine muscle, with animals fed grass silage having higher levels than animals fed a concentrate diet. In addition, [Tai and Ho \(1997\)](#) found that an oxidized cysteine/glucose reaction model produced more pyrazines and furans as opposed to a non-oxidized cysteine/glucose reaction model that produced more sulphur compounds; thus, differences in susceptibility of muscle to oxidation may contribute to differences in pyrazine formation.

For pentadecane there were differences among diets at all feeding durations whereby the S group and SC groups, which did not differ, had higher ($P < .05$) values than the C group (Supplementary Table S3). For hexadecane, differences among diets were found for all finishing durations whereby at 36 and 54 d the S group had higher levels ($P < .05$) than the C group but both were similar ($P > .05$) to the SC group, while at 72 d the S and SC groups, which did not differ, had higher values than the C group. Hydrocarbons like pentadecane and hexadecane, are lipid oxidation compounds, and have been characterised as tracers of a pasture diet in lamb ([Sivadier, Ratel, & Engel, 2010](#)); this could explain why levels were lower with concentrate feeding at all durations. For 4-methyloctanoic acid differences among diets were detected only at the 36 d of feeding duration with the S and SC groups, which did not differ, having higher values ($P < .05$) than the C group.

In general, the majority of the aroma and flavour attribute scores as well as volatile compounds followed a quadratic pattern, i.e. values increased from 36 to 54 d and decreased from 54 to 72 d, mainly in S and SC groups (Supplementary Table S2 and Table S3). The PCA plot (Supplementary Fig. S1) for all nine groups (using only the aroma and flavour attributes and selected volatiles) explained 46.55% of the variance, whereby the first

component separated the three groups of 54 days duration (located on the right side of the plot) from the other six groups (left side of the plot). The plot showed that S54 group was characterised by the attributes “*Manure/Faecal Aroma*” and “*Rancid Aroma*”, clustered with skatole, indole, p-cresol, 4-heptenal, 2-nonenal, 2,6-nonadienal 2,5-dimethylpyrazine and 2-ethyl-3,6-dimethylpyrazine (factor loadings 0.6-0.8 on PC2). Previous studies have shown that phenols and indoles (associated with animal-like odours) as well as 4-heptenal ([Young, Berdagué, Viallon, Rousset-Akrim, & Theriez, 1997](#); [Young et al., 2003](#)) and pyrazines ([Bueno et al., 2013](#)) have low odour thresholds and may be causally involved in lamb meat aromas perceived by trained panellists. The SC54 group was characterised by “*Animal/Farm Smell*”, “*Woolly Aroma*” and “*Sweaty Aroma*” (factor loadings 0.6-0.8 on PC1) (this association is more meaningful when comparing SC54 group with SC36 or SC72 groups; See supplementary Table S2). The compounds which may have contributed to these attributes (Factor loadings 0.6-0.9 on PC1) were mainly lipid oxidation compounds (heptanal, 1-hexanol, 1-heptanol, octanal, 2-octenal, 1-octanol, nonanal, decanal, 2-decenal, 2,4-decadienal, 2-octen-1-ol) and other compounds e.g. α -terpineol, 2-pentylfuran, nonanoic acid, benzaldehyde and phenylacetaldehyde, dimethyldisulfide and dimethyltrisulfide.

The results of the PCA plot could also be explained in part by the numerically higher (although not significant) proportions of C18:3n-3, eicosapentaenoic acid (EPA; C20:5n-3) and n-3 fatty acids in the S54 group compared to S36 and S72 groups, the higher proportion of arachidonic acid (C20:4n-6) of the SC54 compared to SC36 and SC72 groups and the higher level of PUFA of C54 group compared to C36 and C72 group (unpublished results).

4. Conclusion

When lambs receive different proportions of silage and concentrates for durations up to approximately ten weeks pre-slaughter, effects on the sensory quality (and flavour

volatiles) of lamb meat are relatively few. Some sensory attributes with potentially negative connotations (*Animal/Farm Smell, Manure/Faecal Aroma, Farmyard Flavour, Off-flavours*) appear to be lower when a mixed diet of silage and concentrate is fed. With regard to the duration of feeding, a diet composed of silage only, fed for an intermediate period, appears to be associated with less desirable sensory aroma attributes (*Manure/Faecal Aroma, Rancid Aroma*) which could be due to indoles or lipid oxidation compounds. Further research is required to establish if these small differences would influence consumer acceptability

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2018.07.063>.

Acknowledgements

The financial support of the Irish Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine (project 11/SF/310) and of the Teagasc Walsh Fellowship programme (award 2013058) is gratefully acknowledged. The authors also thank colleagues at the Agri-Food and Biosciences Institute for their advice on sensory panel training and for the provision of some standards used in the volatile analysis and at Teagasc, Food Research Centre for their assistance with the sensory analysis.

Conflict of interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Authors contributions

V. Gkarane conducted the experimental work, collected and statistically analysed the data and drafted the manuscript. N. Brunton contributed to the method development for volatile analysis and interpretation of the volatile results. P. Allen contributed to the study design and

sensory analysis. R. Gravador contributed to the sensory analysis and conducted the proximate analysis. N. Claffey contributed to the animal management and sample collection. M. Diskin contributed to the study design and animal management oversight. A. Fahey contributed to the study design and the univariate statistical analysis. L. Farmer contributed to the method development for volatile analysis and manuscript revision. A. Moloney contributed to the study design. M. Alcalde contributed to the sensory analysis. P. Murphy contributed to the multivariate statistical analysis. F. Monahan had overall responsibility for the project, contributed to the study design, method development and interpretation of the results. All authors read the manuscript and contributed to manuscript revisions.

- Allison, C. (1985). Factors affecting forage intake by range ruminants: A review. *Journal of Range Management*, 38(4), 305-311.
- Almela, E., Jordan, M. J., Martinez, C., Sotomayor, J. A., Bedia, M., & Bañón, S. (2010). Ewe's diet (pasture vs grain-based feed) affects volatile profile of cooked meat from light lamb. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 58(17), 9641-9646.
- AOAC. (1990). Moisture and fat in meat and poultry products *Association of Analytical Communities, Official Methods 985.14 and 985.26* Arlington, VA, United States: AOAC International.
- Arsenos, G., Banos, G., Fortomaris, P., Katsaounis, N., Stamataris, C., Tsaras, L., & Zygoyiannis, D. (2002). Eating quality of lamb meat: Effects of breed, sex, degree of maturity and nutritional management. *Meat Science*, 60(4), 379-387.
- Aurousseau, B., Bauchart, D., Faure, X., Galot, A., Prache, S., Micol, D., & Priolo, A. (2007). Indoor fattening of lambs raised on pasture. Part 1: Influence of stall finishing duration on lipid classes and fatty acids in the longissimus thoracis muscle. *Meat Science*, 76(2), 241-252.
- Bailey, M. E., Rourke, T. J., Gutheil, R. A., & Wang, C. Y.-J. (1992). Undesirable flavors of meat. In G. Charalambous (Ed.), *Off-flavors in foods and beverages (developments in food science)* (Vol. 28, pp. 127-169). Netherlands: Elsevier Science Publishers B.V.
- Baumont, R. (1996). *Palatability and feeding behaviour in ruminants. A review*. Paper presented at the Annales de zootechnie.
- Borton, R. J., Loerch, S. C., McClure, K. E., & Wulf, D. M. (2005). Comparison of characteristics of lambs fed concentrate or grazed on ryegrass to traditional or heavy slaughter weights. I. Production, carcass, and organoleptic characteristics. *Journal of Animal Science*, 83(3), 679-685.
- Bueno, M., Resconi, V. C., Campo, M. M., Cacho, J., Ferreira, V., & Escudero, A. (2013). Effect of freezing method and frozen storage duration on odor-active compounds and sensory perception of lamb. *Food Research International*, 54(1), 772-780.
- Caton, J., & Dhuyvetter, D. (1997). Influence of energy supplementation on grazing ruminants: Requirements and responses. *Journal of Animal Science*, 75(2), 533-542.
- Claffey, N., Fahey, A., Gkarane, V., Moloney, A., Monahan, F., & Diskin, M. (2018). Effect of forage to concentrate ratio and duration of feeding on growth and feed conversion efficiency of male lambs. *Translational Animal Science*.
- Crouse, J. D., Field, R. A., Chant, J. L., Ferrell, C. L., Smith, G. M., & Harrison, V. L. (1978). Effect of dietary energy intake on carcass composition and palatability of different weight carcasses from ewe and ram lambs. *Journal of Animal Science*, 47(6), 1207-1218.
- De Brito, G. F., Ponnampalam, E. N., & Hopkins, D. L. (2017). The effect of extensive feeding systems on growth rate, carcass traits, and meat quality of finishing lambs. *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*, 16(1), 23-38.
- Decruyenaere, V., Buldgen, A., & Stilmant, D. (2009). Factors affecting intake by grazing ruminants and related quantification methods: A review. *Biotechnologie, Agronomie, Société et Environnement*, 13(4), 559.
- Duckett, S. K., & Kuber, P. S. (2001). Genetic and nutritional effects on lamb flavor. *Journal of Animal Science*, 79(E), 249-254.
- Elmore, J. S., Cooper, S. L., Enser, M., Mottram, D. S., Sinclair, L. A., Wilkinson, R. G., & Wood, J. D. (2005). Dietary manipulation of fatty acid composition in lamb meat and its effect on the volatile aroma compounds of grilled lamb. *Meat Science*, 69(2), 233-242.
- Enser, M., Hallett, K. G., Hewett, B., Fursey, G. A. J., Wood, J. D., & Harrington, G. (1998). Fatty acid content and composition of UK beef and lamb muscle in relation to production system and implications for human nutrition. *Meat Science*, 49(3), 329-341.
- Farmer, L. J. (1994). The role of nutrients in meat flavour formation. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 53, 327-333.
- Font i Furnols, M., Julian, R. S., Guerrero, L., Sanudo, C., Campo, M. M., Olleta, J. L., . . . Montossi, F. (2006). Acceptability of lamb meat from different producing systems and ageing time to German, Spanish and British consumers. *Meat Science*, 72(3), 545-554.

- Font i Furnols, M., Realini, C. E., Guerrero, L., Oliver, M. A., Sanudo, C., Campo, M. M., . . . Montossi, F. (2009). Acceptability of lamb fed on pasture, concentrate or combinations of both systems by European consumers. *Meat Science*, 81(1), 196-202.
- Frank, D., Kaczmarska, K., Paterson, J., Piyasiri, U., & Warner, R. (2017). Effect of marbling on volatile generation, oral breakdown and in mouth flavor release of grilled beef. *Meat Science*, 133, 61-68.
- Fraser, T., & Rowarth, J. S. (1996). Legumes, herbs or grass for lamb performance? *Proceedings of the New Zealand Grassland Association*(58), 49-52.
- Gkarane, V., Allen, P., Gravador, R. S., Diskin, M. G., Claffey, N. A., Fahey, A. G., . . . Monahan, F. J. (2017). Effect of castration and age at slaughter on sensory perception of lamb meat. *Small Ruminant Research*, 157, 65-74.
- Gkarane, V., Brunton, N. P., Harrison, S. M., Gravador, R. S., Allen, P., Claffey, N. A., . . . Monahan, F. J. (2018). Effect of castration and age at slaughter on the volatile profile of grilled lamb in two breeds. *Journal of Food Science (in press)*.
- Guerrero, A., Sañudo, C., Campo, M., Olleta, J., Muela, E., Macedo, R., & Macedo, F. (2018). Consumer acceptability of dry cured meat from cull ewes reared with different linseed supplementation levels and feeding durations. *Foods (Basel, Switzerland)*, 7(6).
- Howes, N. L., Bekhit, A. E. D. A., Burritt, D. J., & Campbell, A. W. (2015). Opportunities and implications of pasture-based lamb fattening to enhance the long-chain fatty acid composition in meat. *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*, 14(1), 22-36.
- Jaborek, J., Zerby, H., Moeller, S., & Fluharty, F. (2017). Effect of energy source and level, and sex on growth, performance, and carcass characteristics of lambs. *Small Ruminant Research*, 151, 117-123.
- Jelen, H. H., Majcher, M., & Dziadas, M. (2012). Microextraction techniques in the analysis of food flavor compounds: A review. *Analytica Chimica Acta*, 738, 13-26.
- Kelman, W., Bugalho, M., & Dove, H. (2003). Cuticular wax alkanes and alcohols used as markers to estimate diet composition of sheep (*Ovis aries*). *Biochemical Systematics and Ecology*, 31(8), 919-927.
- Kitessa, S. M., Williams, A., Gulati, S., Boghossian, V., Reynolds, J., & Pearce, K. L. (2009). Influence of duration of supplementation with ruminally protected linseed oil on the fatty acid composition of feedlot lambs. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 151(3), 228-239.
- Koutsidis, G., Elmore, J., Oruna-Concha, M., Campo, M., Wood, J., & Mottram, D. (2008). Water-soluble precursors of beef flavour: I. Effect of diet and breed. *Meat Science*, 79(1), 124-130.
- Muir, P., Deaker, J., & Bown, M. (1998). Effects of forage-and grain-based feeding systems on beef quality: A review. *New Zealand Journal of Agricultural Research*, 41(4), 623-635.
- Munoz, A. M. (1998). Consumer perceptions of meat. Understanding these results through descriptive analysis. *Meat Science*, 49, S287-S295.
- Murphy, T., Loerch, S., McClure, K., & Solomon, M. (1994). Effects of restricted feeding on growth performance and carcass composition of lambs. *Journal of Animal Science*, 72(12), 3131-3137.
- Okine, E., Mathison, G., Kaske, M., Kennelly, J., & Christopherson, R. (1998). Current understanding of the role of the reticulum and reticulo-omasal orifice in the control of digesta passage from the ruminoreticulum of sheep and cattle. *Canadian Journal of Animal Science*, 78(1), 15-21.
- Ponnampalam, E., Sinclair, A. J., Egan, A. R., Ferrier, G. R., & Leury, B. J. (2002). Dietary manipulation of muscle long-chain omega-3 and omega-6 fatty acids and sensory properties of lamb meat. *Meat Science*, 60(2), 125-132.
- Priolo, A., Cornu, A., Prache, S., Krogmann, M., Kondjoyan, N., Micol, D., & Berdagué, J. L. (2004). Fat volatiles tracers of grass feeding in sheep. *Meat Science*, 66(2), 475-481.
- Priolo, A., Micol, D., Agabriel, J., Prache, S., & Dransfield, E. (2002). Effect of grass or concentrate feeding systems on lamb carcass and meat quality. *Meat Science*, 62(2), 179-185.
- Resconi, V. C., Campo, M. M., Furnols, M. F., Montossi, F., & Sanudo, C. (2009). Sensory evaluation of castrated lambs finished on different proportions of pasture and concentrate feeding systems. *Meat Science*, 83(1), 31-37.

- Resconi, V. C., Campo, M. M., Montossi, F., Ferreira, V., Sanudo, C., & Escudero, A. (2010). Relationship between odour-active compounds and flavour perception in meat from lambs fed different diets. *Meat Science*, 85(4), 700-706.
- Rowe, A., Macedo, F. A. F., Visentainer, J. V., Souza, N. E., & Matsushita, M. (1999). Muscle composition and fatty acid profile in lambs fattened in drylot or pasture. *Meat Science*, 51(4), 283-288.
- Sanudo, C., Alfonso, M., San Julian, R., Thorkelsson, G., Valdimarsdottir, T., Zygoiannis, D., . . . Fisher, A. V. (2007). Regional variation in the hedonic evaluation of lamb meat from diverse production systems by consumers in six European countries. *Meat Science*, 75(4), 610-621.
- Schreurs, N. M., Lane, G. A., Tavendale, M. H., Barry, T. N., & McNabb, W. C. (2008). Pastoral flavour in meat products from ruminants fed fresh forages and its amelioration by forage condensed tannins. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, 146(3-4), 193-221.
- Sivadier, G., Ratel, J., & Engel, E. (2010). Persistence of pasture feeding volatile biomarkers in lamb fats. *Food Chemistry*, 118(2), 418-425.
- Tai, C.-Y., & Ho, C.-T. (1997). Influence of cysteine oxidation on thermal formation of Maillard aromas. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 45(9), 3586-3589.
- Tavendale, M. H., Lane, G. A., Schreurs, N. M., Fraser, K., & Meagher, L. P. (2006). The effects of condensed tannins from *Dorycnium rectum* on skatole and indole ruminal biogenesis for grazing sheep. *Australian Journal of Agricultural Research*, 56(12), 1331-1337.
- Vasta, V., D'Alessandro, A. G., Priolo, A., Petrotos, K., & Martemucci, G. (2012). Volatile compound profile of ewe's milk and meat of their suckling lambs in relation to pasture vs. indoor feeding system. *Small Ruminant Research*, 105(1-3), 16-21.
- Vasta, V., Luciano, G., Dimauro, C., Rohrlé, F., Priolo, A., Monahan, F. J., & Moloney, A. P. (2011). The volatile profile of longissimus dorsi muscle of heifers fed pasture, pasture silage or cereal concentrate: Implication for dietary discrimination. *Meat Science*, 87(3), 282-289.
- Warren, H., Scollan, N., Enser, M., Hughes, S., Richardson, R., & Wood, J. (2008). Effects of breed and a concentrate or grass silage diet on beef quality in cattle of 3 ages. I: Animal performance, carcass quality and muscle fatty acid composition. *Meat Science*, 78(3), 256-269.
- Weekes, T. E. C. (1986). Insulin and growth. In P.J. Buttery, N.B. Haynes, & D. B. Lindsay (Eds.), *Control and manipulation of animal growth* (pp. 187-189). Butterworths, London.
- Young, O., Berdagué, J.-L., Viallon, C., Rousset-Akrim, S., & Theriez, M. (1997). Fat-borne volatiles and sheepmeat odour. *Meat Science*, 45(2), 183-200.
- Young, O., Lane, G. A., Priolo, A., & Fraser, K. (2003). Pastoral and species flavour in lambs raised on pasture, lucerne or maize. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, 83(2), 93-104.




Fig. 1 Discriminant analysis (DA) plot (a) and variable loadings plot (b) of the sensory attributes of lamb meat as affected by dietary treatments. Plot (a): S diet refers to the silage diet; SC diet refers to the diet consisting of 50:50 silage:concentrate; C diet refers to the concentrate diet. Plot (b): “Ar”, “Fl” and “Aft” refer to Aroma, Flavour and Aftertaste attributes, respectively.

Table 1 Least square mean values for proximate analysis and ultimate pH (pHu) in *longissimus thoracis et lumborum* (100% Silage (S); 50% Silage: 50% Concentrate (SC); 100% Concentrate (C)) for three durations of feeding (36, 54, 72 days)

	Diet			Feeding duration			SEM	Diet
	S	SC	C	36	54	72		
Moisture	73.9 ^b	73.1 ^a	73.3 ^{ab}	73.5	73.6	73.2	0.14	0.041
Protein	21.1 ^a	21.9 ^b	22.0 ^b	21.5	21.6	21.8	0.10	<0.001
Fat	3.71	3.94	3.79	3.77	3.78	3.88	0.13	
Ash	1.05	1.09	1.05	1.10 ^b	1.08 ^b	1.01 ^a	0.01	
pHu	5.73	5.71	5.78	5.69	5.78	5.76	0.02	

a,b Within row, means assigned different superscripts indicate differences among diets (S vs SC vs C) or durations (36 vs 54 vs 72 days)

697 Table 2 Least square mean scores for sensory attributes in grilled LTL muscle as affected by diet (100% Silage (S); 50%
698 100% Concentrate (C)) and duration of feeding (36, 54, 72 days).

Sensory	Diet			Duration			SEM
	Silage (S) 100%	50% (S) - 50% (C)	Concentrate (C) 100%	36	54	72	
Aroma							
Intensity of roast meat aroma	41.3	44.8	43.8	44.4	41.7	43.8	0.93
Intensity of lamb aroma	39.8 ^a	40.1 ^a	43.1 ^b	40.4	40.5	42.0	0.71
Grassy	7.5	7.6	7.9	7.8	7.3	8.0	0.28
Aromatic/herbal	11.8	12.0	13.3	13.2	11.3	12.7	0.38
Metallic/bloody	14.0	14.0	15.3	14.2	14.0	15.1	0.34
Animal/farm Smell	15.5 ^b	12.8 ^a	15.1 ^b	12.1 ^a	16.6 ^b	14.7 ^b	0.60
Woolly	14.3 ^b	12.5 ^a	14.4 ^b	11.9 ^a	16.2 ^b	13.0 ^b	0.56
Buttery	7.0	6.8	7.1	6.8	7.3	6.8	0.30
Fatty	8.2	8.0	7.9	7.6	8.2	8.3	0.33
Rancid	8.0	6.2	6.3	6.6	7.5	6.4	0.43
Manure/faecal	9.8	6.8	7.7	6.9	10.1	7.4	0.55
Sour	7.8 ^b	6.6 ^a	7.2 ^{ab}	6.0	8.7	7.0	0.43
Sweaty	14.9	14.5	16.2	14.0	16.5	15.1	0.49
Soapy	3.7	3.2	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.5	0.16
Earthy	10.5	9.9	10.0	9.8	10.2	10.4	0.27
Flavour							
Intensity of roast meat flavour	36.9	39.3	39.4	39.5	37.0	39.0	0.78
Intensity of lamb flavour	42.9	43.5	42.9	43.9	42.8	44.1	0.70
Grassy	8.3	8.4	8.0	7.8	8.2	8.6	0.24
Metallic/bloody	20.2	20.6	19.8	20.3	20.7	19.6	0.49
Aromatic/herbal	9.4	9.3	9.2	8.8	9.1	10.0	0.27

Soapy	5.2	6.2	6.3	5.3	6.6	5.9	0.28
Rancid	8.5	6.8	7.8	7.0	8.5	7.6	0.41
Farmyard	8.9 ^{ab}	7.3 ^a	9.9 ^b	8.3	8.9	8.9	0.47
Sour	7.9	8.2	9.5	9.4	8.3	7.9	0.45
Sweet	11.4	11.3	11.4	10.8	11.2	12.2	0.39
Off-flavours	19.6 ^b	15.8 ^a	19.7 ^b	18.9	18.7	17.5	0.67
Texture							
Tenderness	54.4	58.0	57.5	56.7	57.7	55.6	1.57
Juiciness	48.4	49.1	45.7	47.8	46.1	49.3	0.81
Chewiness	51.9	46.7	49.5	49.8	47.6	50.7	1.47
Fattiness/greasiness	30.7	25.5	26.4	27.1	28.4	27.2	0.65
Stringiness/fibrousness	33.8	32.5	37.7	36.7	34.1	33.3	1.29
Stickiness	26.8	25.7	27.9	27.2	27.2	25.9	0.63
Aftertaste							
Intensity of lamb aftertaste	34.1	32.9	34.7	34.6	33.5	33.7	0.43
Soapy	9.3	9.5	8.9	8.6	9.4	9.6	0.31
Metallic/ bloody	20.8	19.1	19.9	19.6	19.4	20.7	0.49
Fatty/ greasy	17.7	15.9	16.5	16.7	17.4	15.9	0.48
Dry	11.3 ^a	11.8 ^a	13.5 ^b	12.6	12.2	11.7	0.34
Astringent	7.2 ^a	7.6 ^a	9.3 ^b	7.6	8.3	8.2	0.35

a,b within row, different superscripts indicate differences among diets (S vs SC vs C) or durations (36 vs 54 vs 72 days).

¹Probability of significance for the main effects of diet, duration and diet x duration tested using the MIXED model (P < 0.05).

*P < .1.

704 Table 3 Least square mean values for logarithmically transformed peak areas of aroma compounds detected in the head
705 *lumborum* (LTL) muscle fed three different diets (100% Silage (S); 50% Silage: 50% Concentrate (SC); 100% Concentrate (C))
706 72 days).

Volatile compound	LRI ¹	Ions Used ²	Method of Identification ³	Diet			Feeding Duration (days)			SEM
				S	SC	C	36	54	72	
Sulphur compounds										
Dimethyl sulfide		63,62,61	NIST, Std, LRI	1.97 ^a	2.90 ^b	2.70 ^b	2.73	2.63	2.22	0.151
Dimethyl disulfide	719	94,79	NIST, Std, LRI	2.34	2.71	2.41	2.42	2.89	2.16	0.176
Dimethyl trisulfide	963	126	NIST, Std, LRI	4.27	4.36	4.21	4.25	4.39	4.21	0.037
Aldehydes										
2-Methylbutanal		39,41,57	NIST, Std, LRI	4.17	4.36	4.29	4.40	4.28	4.15	0.095
3-Methylbutanal		41,43,58	NIST, Std, LRI	4.33	4.47	4.47	4.57	4.47	4.24	0.097
Pentanal		43,44,58	NIST, Std, LRI	4.26	4.32	4.36	4.39	4.42	4.13	0.082
(E)-2-Hexenal	849	39,41,55	NIST, Std, LRI	3.01	2.65	2.97	3.12	2.70	2.82	0.139
Hexanal	800	39,41,56	NIST, Std, LRI	5.26 ^a	5.37 ^{ab}	5.45 ^b	5.32	5.43	5.33	0.031
Methional	905	48,104	NIST, Std, LRI	3.82	4.13	3.86	4.13	3.93	3.76	0.117
(E,E)-2,4-Heptadienal	1008	81,53	NIST, Std, LRI	2.20	2.04	1.91	2.23	2.25	1.66	0.194
(Z)-4-Heptenal	898	67,39,55	NIST, Std, LRI	4.08	4.00	3.96	4.08 ^b	4.06 ^b	3.90 ^a	0.029
Heptanal	900	39,41,70	NIST, Std, LRI	5.33	5.30	5.35	5.32	5.40	5.26	0.025
(E)-2-Octenal	1056	39,55,83	NIST, Std, LRI	4.40	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.51	4.41	0.027
Octanal	1002	41,67,69	NIST, Std, LRI	5.41	5.44	5.50	5.42 ^a	5.55 ^b	5.39 ^a	0.024
(E,Z)-2,6-Nonadienal	1150	41,69,70	NIST, Std, LRI	4.10 ^b	4.01 ^b	3.93 ^a	4.06	4.09	3.89	0.028
(E)-2-Nonenal	1158	29,41,55	NIST, Std, LRI	4.99	4.86	4.86	4.92	4.96	4.82	0.028
Nonanal	1101	69,81,57	NIST, Std, LRI	6.02	6.03	6.03	6.01 ^a	6.13 ^b	5.95 ^a	0.023
(E,E)-2,4-Decadienal	1315	81,67	NIST, Std, LRI	3.98	4.05	4.03	3.97	4.09	4.01	0.031
(E)-2-Decenal	1260	39,81,55	NIST, Std, LRI	4.47	4.40	4.46	4.42	4.53	4.37	0.029
Decanal	1204	41,67,55	NIST, Std, LRI	4.83	4.83	4.84	4.82	4.89	4.79	0.021
Undecanal	1306	41,67,81	NIST, Std, LRI	3.90	4.04	3.78	3.66	3.97	4.09	0.126
Dodecanal	1406	41,67,81	NIST, Std, LRI	4.43	4.43	4.36	4.39 ^a	4.48 ^b	4.35 ^a	0.022
Tridecanal	1510	41,67,81	NIST, LRI	4.48	4.47	4.40	4.46 ^a	4.52 ^b	4.37 ^a	0.024

Tetradecanal	1607	41,67,81	NIST, LRI	4.97	4.93	4.85	4.90	4.97	4.87	0.023
Pentadecanal	1705	41,67,81	NIST, LRI	5.07	5.05	4.96	5.02	5.09	4.97	0.026
Hexadecanal	1818	41,67,81	NIST, LRI	5.67	5.65	5.55	5.62	5.66	5.59	0.030
Alcohols										
1-Pentanol	809	41,55,70	NIST, Std, LRI	3.24	3.73	3.88	3.67	3.63	3.55	0.132
1-Hexanol	868	41,56,39	NIST, Std, LRI	4.35	4.35	4.40	4.35	4.44	4.31	0.026
1-Heptanol	969	41,55,70	NIST, Std, LRI	4.48	4.52	4.60	4.51	4.60	4.49	0.025
1-Octen-3-ol	980	43,57,69	NIST, Std, LRI	4.81	4.93	4.93	4.84	4.94	4.89	0.027
2-Octen-1-ol	1066	41,57,67	NIST, Std, LRI	3.97	4.00	4.01	3.93	4.05	4.01	0.024
2-Ethyl-1-hexanol	1027	41,55,57	NIST, Std, LRI	4.43	4.27	4.46	4.27	4.48	4.41	0.053
1-Octanol	1069	41,55,69	NIST, Std, LRI	5.11	5.12	5.14	5.10 ^{ab}	5.22 ^b	5.04 ^a	0.023
α -Terpineol	1191	93,59,121	NIST, Std, LRI	4.91	4.89	4.91	4.87	4.95	4.88	0.036
1-Pentadecanol	1766	69,83,97	NIST, Std, LRI	5.57 ^c	5.35 ^b	5.00 ^a	5.31	5.31	5.29	0.034
Ketones										
2-Pentanone		43,71,86	NIST, Std, LRI	0.70	1.42	1.59	1.24	1.45	1.02	0.166
2,3-Butanedione		43	NIST, Std, LRI	2.59	3.13	3.42	2.99	3.35	2.80	0.202
2-Heptanone	887	43,58	NIST, Std, LRI	3.73	4.04	4.03	3.74	4.07	3.99	0.062
2-Nonanone	1089	43,58	NIST, Std, LRI	3.91	4.01	4.00	3.92	4.04	3.95	0.027
γ -Octalactone	1251	85,57	NIST, Std, LRI	1.11	1.82	1.89	1.15	1.87	1.80	0.153
γ -Nonalactone	1356	85,29	NIST, Std, LRI	3.06	3.12	3.13	2.91	3.22	3.18	0.089
Terpenes										
p-cymene	1020	119,91	NIST, Std, LRI	2.81	2.80	2.82	2.51	3.06	2.87	0.122
Limonene	1024	67,68,93	NIST, Std, LRI	4.27	4.31	4.32	4.25	4.38	4.27	0.029
Phenols										
p-Cresol	1071	107,108	NIST, Std, LRI	3.32	3.19	2.99	3.46	3.17	2.88	0.171
Indoles										
Indole	1287	117,89	NIST, Std, LRI	0.64 ^b	0.09 ^a	0.07 ^a	0.09	0.54	0.17	0.086
Skatole (3-methyl indole)	1379	130,131	NIST, Std, LRI	1.11 ^b	0.51 ^{ab}	0.34 ^a	0.59	1.05	0.32	0.137
Pyrazines										
2-Methyl pyrazine	822	94,67	NIST, Std, LRI	1.09	1.07	0.65	0.94	1.23	0.64	0.183
2,5-Dimethyl pyrazine	909	108,42	NIST, Std, LRI	2.44 ^b	2.14 ^b	0.68 ^a	2.27	1.55	1.45	0.222

2,6-Dimethyl pyrazine	909	108,42	NIST, Std, LRI	4.27 ^b	4.11 ^{ab}	3.09 ^a	3.58	4.05	3.85	0.216
2-Ethyl-3,5- dimethyl-pyrazine	1071	135,134	NIST, Std, LRI	4.86	4.93	4.54	4.83	4.81	4.69	0.084
2-Ethyl-3,6- dimethyl-pyrazine	1083	135,136	NIST, Std, LRI	2.69 ^b	1.66 ^{ab}	1.03 ^a	2.45 ^b	1.92 ^{ab}	1.01 ^a	0.213
Benzenoid compounds										
Benzaldehyde	957	105,77	NIST, Std, LRI	6.19	6.25	6.12	6.15	6.29	6.12	0.034
Phenyl acetaldehyde	1039	91,92	NIST, Std, LRI	4.97	4.94	4.86	4.90	4.99	4.89	0.033
Toluene	748	91,92	NIST, Std, LRI	4.68	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.83	4.67	0.038
Furans										
2-Pentylfuran	987	81,138,53	NIST, Std, LRI	4.03	4.25	4.43	3.66 ^a	4.46 ^b	4.60 ^b	0.139
Hydrocarbons										
Tridecane		41,57,71	NIST, Std, LRI	4.52	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.57	4.47	0.028
Tetradecane		41,57,71	NIST, Std, LRI	4.57	4.54	4.44	4.48	4.60	4.47	0.025
Pentadecane		41,57,71	NIST, Std, LRI	4.88 ^b	4.84 ^b	4.62 ^a	4.77	4.82	4.75	0.023
Hexadecane		41,57,71	NIST, Std, LRI	4.57 ^b	4.46 ^b	4.33 ^a	4.47	4.49	4.41	0.021
Heneicosane		41,57,71	NIST, Std, LRI	0.98	0.59	0.58	0.52	0.96	0.67	0.122
BCFAs										
4-Methyloctanoic acid	1232	55,57,73	NIST, Std, LRI	1.31	1.58	0.76	1.18	1.44	1.04	0.157
4-Ethylloctanoic acid	1313	55,57,71	NIST, Std, LRI	1.94	2.12	1.81	2.34	1.42	2.11	0.168
4-Methylnonanoic acid	1323	55,57,71	NIST, Std, LRI	1.26	0.89	0.86	0.98	0.76	1.27	0.149
Organic acids										
Nonanoic acid	1275	60	NIST, Std, LRI	3.74	3.67	3.71	3.58 ^a	3.89 ^b	3.65 ^{ab}	0.051

^{a,b} Within row, means assigned different superscripts indicate differences among diets (S vs SC vs C) or durations (36 vs 54 vs 72 days).

¹ Linear retention indices (LRI) calculated from the n-alkanes (C7-C30) run under the same GC-MS conditions as LTL muscle samples.

² Specific ions used for volatile identification and peak area integration.

³ Method of identification: NIST (NIST library), Std (authentic standard) and LRI.

* P <.1

Supplementary Table S1 Least square mean values for proximate analysis and ultimate pH (pHu) in *longissimus thorac*
different diets (100% Silage (S); 50% Silage: 50% Concentrate (SC); 100% Concentrate(C)) for three durations of feed

	100 % S			SC			100% C				
	Feeding duration			Feeding duration			Feeding duration			SEM	
	36	54	72	36	54	72	36	54	72		
Moisture	73.4	74.3	74.1	73.4	72.9	72.9	73.7	73.6	72.8	0.14	0
Protein	21.3	20.9 ^x	21.1 ^x	21.9	21.7 ^y	22.1 ^y	21.4 ^a	22.2 ^{by}	22.3 ^{by}	0.10	<
Fat	4.04	3.48	3.6	3.51	4.32	3.98	3.75	3.54	4.07	0.13	
Ash	1.09	1.05 ^x	1.02	1.14	1.10 ^y	1.03	1.08	1.08 ^{xy}	1.00	0.01	
pHu	5.61	5.84	5.75	5.68	5.75	5.69	5.77	5.74	5.82	0.02	

^{a,b,c} Within row, means assigned different superscripts indicate differences between durations within each diet (i.e. S36 vs S54 vs S72 and C36 vs C54 vs C72) .

^{x,y,z} Within row, means assigned different superscripts indicate differences between diets with finishing duration 36 or 54 or 72 or S54 vs SC54 vs C54 or S72 vs SC72 vs C72).

721 Supplementary Table S2 Least square mean scores for sensory attributes in grilled LTL muscle as affected by (100% S
722 Concentrate (SC); 100% Concentrate (C)) and duration of feeding (36, 54, 72 days).

723

	100 % S			50% S:50% C			100% C			SE
	Feeding duration			Feeding duration			Feeding duration			
	36	54	72	36	54	72	36	54	72	
Aroma										
Intensity of roast meat aroma	43.6	41.6	38.9	46.3	43.3	44.8	43.9	39.6	47.9	0.1
Intensity of lamb aroma	39.9	39.7	39.9	40.8	39.4	40.1	41.0	42.1	46.1	0.1
Grassy	7.4	6.6	8.6	8.3	6.5	8.0	7.6	8.7	7.4	0.1
Aromatic/herbal	13.2	9.2	12.9	12.5	12.0	11.5	13.2	12.8	13.8	0.1
Metallic/bloody	14.4	13.0	14.5	13.3	13.5	15.3	14.9	15.5	15.6	0.1
Animal/farm Smell	12.7 ^a	18.9 ^b	14.9 ^{ab}	10.7	14.4	13.3	13.2	16.3	15.8	0.1
Woolly	12.7 ^a	17.3 ^b	13.0 ^a	11.4	14.6	11.5	12.0	16.6	14.6	0.1
Buttery	6.2	8.0	6.8	6.4	7.1	7.0	8.0	6.8	6.5	0.1
Fatty	7.5	8.9	8.4	7.7	8.9	7.5	7.8	6.8	9.1	0.1
Rancid	8.0	8.6	6.5	5.8	7.4	5.6	5.9	6.5	6.3	0.1
Manure/faecal	8.5 ^a	14.1 ^{by}	7.0 ^a	5.4	7.3 ^x	7.9	7.4	8.4 ^x	7.3	0.1
Sour	7.0	10.2	6.3	5.6	7.6	6.8	5.9	7.8	8.1	0.1
Sweaty	14.3	16.5	14.1	13.1	16.0	14.3	14.8	16.9	16.9	0.1
Soapy	4.1	3.3	3.6	2.9	7.6	6.8	3.4	7.8	8.1	0.1
Earthy	10.6	9.9	11.0	9.5	10.4	9.8	9.0	10.3	10.6	0.1
Flavour										
Intensity of roast meat flavour	37.4	36.7	36.7	39.9	36.8	41.2	41.8	37.5	38.9	0.1

Intensity of lamb flavour	43.5	42.1	43.1	44.4	41.5	44.5	43.8	44.8	44.7	0.
Grassy	7.8	8.1	9.0	8.1	8.1	9.1	7.7	8.2	8.3	0.
Metallic/bloody	21.8	19.3	19.5	19.8	21.5	20.5	18.9	21.2	19.3	0.
Aromatic/herbal	9.1	8.6	10.4	8.5	9.1	10.3	8.6	9.6	9.3	0.
Soapy	4.9	5.3	5.4	5.4	7.2	6.2	5.3	7.2	6.4	0.
Rancid	8.2	8.5	8.6	5.5	7.8	7.1	7.2	9.2	7.0	0.
Farmyard	7.9	10.5	8.4	7.4	7.0	7.6	10.4	9.0	10.4	0.
Sour	7.8	8.2	7.7	9.1	7.8	7.7	11.4	8.9	8.3	0.
Sweet	11.9	10.4	12.0	10.7	10.9	12.4	9.6	12.3	12.3	0.
Off-flavours	19.9	21.2	17.8	15.7	15.5	16.2	21.2	19.3	18.5	0.
Texture										
Tenderness	58.4	59.1	45.6	54.9	56.0	63.0	56.7	57.8	58.1	1.
Juiciness	49.8	45.1	50.3	50.6	46.5	50.2	43.0	46.6	47.3	0.
Chewiness	49.1	48.3	58.3	51.9	44.6	43.7	48.4	50.0	50.1	1.
Fattiness/greasiness	29.6	31.1	31.5 ^y	25.4	26.1	25.1 ^x	26.0	28.1	25.0 ^x	0.
Stringiness/ fibrousness	34.2	30.5	36.6	36.7	32.8	28.1	39.1	38.9	35.0	1.
Stickiness	27.7	27.2	25.4	26.6	23.9	26.7	27.5	30.5	25.7	0.
Aftertaste										
Intensity of lamb aftertaste	34.9	33.1	34.1	33.8	32.6	32.3	34.8	34.7	34.7	0.
Soapy	8.3	9.8	9.8	9.0	9.2	10.2	8.7	9.2	8.8	0.
Metallic/ bloody	21.8	18.0	22.4	18.3	19.6	19.3	18.0	20.7	20.7	0.
Fatty/ greasy	16.8	18.3	17.8	16.2	16.2	15.4	16.9	18.2	14.2	0.
Dry	11.7	12.2	9.9	12.0	11.6	11.9	14.6	12.7	13.4	0.

Astringent	6.3	8.1	7.3	7.0	8.0	8.0	9.7	8.8	9.3	0.
724										
725	¹ Probability of significance for the main effects of diet, duration and diet x duration tested using the MIXED model (P									
726	^{a,b,c} within row, different superscripts indicate differences between durations within each diet (i.e. S36 vs S54 vs S72, S									
727	vs C72) (P < 0.05).									
728	^{x,y,z} within row, different superscripts indicate differences among diets with finishing duration 36 or 54 or 72 days (i.e. S									
729	C54 or S72 vs SC72 vs C72) (P < 0.05).									
730										

731 Supplementary Table S3 Least square mean values for logarithmically transformed peak areas of aroma compounds
732 *longissimus thoracis et lumborum* (LTL) muscle fed three different diets (100% Silage (S); 50% Silage: 50% Concentrate (C))
733 three durations of feeding (36, 54, 72 days).

734

	LRI	100% S			50% S:50% C			100% C		
		Feeding Duration			Feeding Duration			Feeding Duration		
		36	54	72	36	54	72	36	54	72
<u>Sulphur compounds</u>										
Dimethyl sulfide		2.45	1.89	1.57	2.63	3.12	2.95	3.10	2.87	2.14
Dimethyl disulfide	719	2.67	2.39	1.97	2.60	3.55	2.00	1.99	2.73	2.50
Dimethyl trisulfide	963	4.33	4.26	4.22	4.28	4.56	4.25	4.14	4.34	4.15
<u>Aldehydes</u>										
2-Methylbutanal		4.42	4.13	3.96	4.40	4.22	4.47	4.38	4.48	4.01
3-Methylbutanal		4.60	4.37	4.02	4.53	4.36	4.53	4.58	4.67	4.16
Pentanal		4.33	4.50	3.95	4.41	4.15	4.39	4.43	4.60	4.06
(<i>E</i>)-2-Hexenal	849	3.48	2.66	2.91	2.67	2.53	2.76	3.22	2.91	2.78
Hexanal	800	5.17	5.31	5.31	5.34	5.47	5.31	5.46	5.50	5.39
Methional	905	4.05	3.93	3.49	4.30	3.94	4.16	4.04	3.93	3.63
(<i>E,E</i>)-2,4-Heptadienal	1008	1.70	2.19	2.71	2.94	2.14	1.03	2.06	2.41	1.25
(<i>Z</i>)-4-Heptenal	898	4.03	4.12	4.09 ^y	4.05 ^{ab}	4.12 ^b	3.83 ^{xya}	4.17 ^b	3.94 ^a	3.78 ^{xa}
Heptanal	900	5.26	5.40	5.32	5.31	5.43	5.18	5.38	5.37	5.29
(<i>E</i>)-2-Octenal	1056	4.36	4.43	4.41	4.44	4.54	4.33	4.39	4.55	4.48
Octanal	1002	5.36	5.50	5.38	5.40	5.60	5.32	5.48	5.55	5.46
(<i>E,Z</i>)-2,6-Nonadienal	1150	4.07	4.13	4.11 ^y	4.06 ^b	4.14 ^b	3.81 ^{xa}	4.03 ^b	3.99 ^b	3.76 ^{xa}

γ -Octalactone	1251	0.83	1.44	1.07	1.17	2.53	1.77	1.47	1.65	2.56
γ -Nonalactone	1356	2.73	3.43	3.02	2.99	3.13	3.26	3.01	3.11	3.27
<hr/>										
Terpenes										
p-cymene	1020	2.72	2.45	3.24	2.37	3.38	2.67	2.43	3.35	2.69
Limonene	1024	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.29	4.40	4.24	4.21	4.45	4.30
<hr/>										
Phenols										
p-Cresol	1071	3.84	3.15	2.98	3.27	3.36	2.95	3.27	3.00	2.71
<hr/>										
Indoles										
Indole	1287	0.27	1.36 ^y	0.28	0.00	0.26 ^x	0.00	0.00	0.00 ^x	0.22
Skatole (3-methyl indole)	1379	0.94	2.00	0.38	0.59	0.65	0.31	0.24	0.50	0.27
<hr/>										
Pyrazines										
2-Methyl pyrazine	822	1.21	1.28	0.79	0.80	1.67	0.75	0.80	0.75	0.39
2,5-Dimethyl pyrazine	909	3.60 ^y ^b	2.09 ^{ab}	1.65 ^a	2.43 ^{xy}	2.08	1.91	0.79 ^x	0.48	0.78
2,6-Dimethyl pyrazine	909	5.10	3.66	4.07	3.31	5.05	3.96	2.34	3.44	3.51
2-Ethyl-3,5-dimethyl-pyrazine	1071	3.43	3.13	1.50	1.99	2.25	0.75	1.94	0.38	0.76
2-Ethyl-3,6-dimethyl-pyrazine	1083	5.06 ^b	4.56 ^{yab}	4.97 ^a	4.87	5.09 ^y	4.83	4.55	4.80	4.27 ^x
<hr/>										
Benzenoid compounds										
Benzaldehyde	957	6.20	6.18	6.18	6.21	6.41	6.12	6.05	6.27	6.05
Phenyl acetaldehyde	1039	4.98	4.97	4.97	4.92	5.04	4.85	4.79	4.96	4.84

Toluene	748	4.69	4.69	4.65	4.77	4.95	4.72	4.69	4.85	4.65
<u>Etherocyclic compounds</u>										
2-Pentylfuran	987	3.72	3.79	4.59	3.41	4.79	4.56	3.84	4.79	4.66
<u>Hydrocarbons</u>										
Tridecane		4.48	4.49	4.59	4.59	4.65	4.42	4.40	4.58	4.39
Tetradecane		4.57	4.60	4.53	4.53	4.64	4.46	4.36	4.55	4.41
Pentadecane		4.89 ^y	4.89 ^y	4.87 ^y	4.81 ^y	4.92 ^y	4.79 ^y	4.62 ^x	4.66 ^x	4.59 ^x
Hexadecane		4.60 ^y	4.56 ^y	4.56 ^y	4.48 ^{xy}	4.52 ^{xy}	4.39 ^y	4.34 ^x	4.39 ^x	4.28 ^x
Heneicosane		1.03	0.92	0.99	0.53	0.73	0.50	0.00	1.23	0.51
<u>BCFAs</u>										
4-Methyl octanoic acid	1232	1.45 ^y	1.95	0.54	2.08 ^y	1.19	1.48	0.00 ^x	1.18	1.11
4-Ethyl octanoic acid	1313	2.21	1.20	2.42	2.98	1.91	1.47	1.81	1.16	2.45
4-Methyl nonanoic acid	1323	0.98	1.46	1.35	0.81	0.24	1.61	1.15	0.59	0.85
<u>Organic acids</u>										
Nonanoic acid	1275	3.66	3.90	3.66	3.38	3.96	3.68	3.70	3.82	3.60

735

736 ^{a,b,c} Within row, means assigned different superscripts indicate differences between durations within each diet (i.e. S36 vs C36 vs C54 vs C72).

737 and C36 vs C54 vs C72).

738 ^{x,y,z} Within row, means assigned different superscripts indicate differences among diets at finishing durations of 36 or 72 weeks.

739 or S54 vs SC54 vs C54 or S72 vs SC72 vs C72).

740 * P < .1.

741

