

TITLE PAGE
- Food Science of Animal Resources -
Upload this completed form to website with submission

ARTICLE INFORMATION	Fill in information in each box below
Article Type	Research Article
Article Title	Characterization of Imitated Hybrid Cultured Meat Patty to Compare with Beef Meat
Running Title (within 10 words)	Characterization of Imitated Hybrid Cultured Meat Patty
Author	AMM Nurul Alam ¹ , Md. Jakir Hossain ¹ , Eun-Yeong Lee ¹ , So-Hee Kim ¹ , Young-Hwa Hwang ² , and Seon-Tea Joo ^{1,2*}
Affiliation	¹ Division of Applied Life Science (BK 21 Four), Gyeongsang National University, Jinju 52828, Korea ² Institute of Agriculture & Life Science, Gyeongsang National University, Jinju 52828, Korea
Special remarks – if authors have additional information to inform the editorial office	† These authors contributed equally to this work.
ORCID (All authors must have ORCID) https://orcid.org	AMM Nurul Alam: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3153-3718 Md. Jakir Hossain: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-7663-9202 Eun-Yeong Lee: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3467-7349 So-Hee Kim https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3966-6160 Young-Hwa Hwang: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3687-3535 Seon-Tea Joo: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5483-2828
Conflicts of interest List any present or potential conflicts of interest for all authors. (This field may be published.)	The authors declare no potential conflict of interest.
Acknowledgements State funding sources (grants, funding sources, equipment, and supplies). Include name and number of grant if available. (This field may be published.)	This research was supported by a National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korean government (MSIT) (No. 2020R111A2069379 & 2023R1A2C1004867).
Author contributions (This field may be published.)	Conceptualization: AMMNA, STJoo Writing - original draft: AMMNA Writing - review & editing: AMMNA, JH, EYL, SHK, YHH, STJoo
Ethics approval (IRB/IACUC) (This field may be published.)	This article does not require IRB/IACUC approval because there are no human and animal participants.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR CONTACT INFORMATION

For the <u>corresponding</u> author (responsible for correspondence, proofreading, and reprints)	Fill in information in each box below
First name, middle initial, last name	Seon-Tea Joo
Email address – this is where your proofs will be sent	stjoo@gnu.ac.kr
Secondary Email address	

Postal address	Division of Applied Life Science (BK21 Four), Gyeongsang National University, Jinju 52828, Korea
Cell phone number	
Office phone number	+82-55-772-1943
Fax number	+82-55-772-1949

ACCEPTED

Imitation of Hybrid Cultured Meat Patty and compare the quality characteristics with Beef patty and plant-based patty

Abstract

Less quantity of cultured meat (CM) production in the laboratory limits the opportunity for product development and quality assessment. As myofibrillar protein (MFP) possesses similar characteristics to CM, this study used MFP as an imitation of CM to produce an imitated hybrid cultured meat patty (IHCMP) to compare physicochemical and sensory qualities with beef meat patty (BMP) and plant-based meat patty (PBMP). Additionally, dry-aged beef crust was added to improve the taste characteristics of IHCMP and PBMP. BMP and IHCMP had lower ($p < 0.05$) pH than PBMP in raw (5.62 & 5.74) and cooked (5.75 & 5.88) states. BMP and PBMP had higher ($p < 0.05$) moisture (62.17% & 62.20%). BMP and IHCMP were darker ($p < 0.05$) than other samples both in uncooked and cooked form. IHCMP, MFP, and BMP had lower releasing water (RW) (2.07%-2.95%). Increased ($p < 0.05$) hardness, gumminess, chewiness, and springiness were observed in BMP and IHCMP. Beef crust improved ($p < 0.05$) umami (2.21) and richness (2.67) quality in IHCMP as determined by the electronic tongue system. IHCMP and PBMP had higher monounsaturated fatty acid (MUFA) and polyunsaturated fatty acid (PUFA) content. Adding crust increased saturated fatty acid (SFA) and MUFA content, but PUFA was reduced. Hence, the present investigation revealed the probable quality characteristics of CM products through the production of IHCMP, which will help the manufacturer of CM to develop consumer-oriented product development in the future.

Keywords: Myofibrillar protein, Imitated hybrid cultured meat, Plant-based meat, Dry-aged beef crust, Electronic tongue.

Introduction

There is a need for both alternative and traditional meat production to fulfill the increasing demand of increasing population by the year 2050 (FAO 2017). Examples of meat alternatives are cultured meat (CM), made utilizing stem cells to produce basic muscle proteins like actin, myosin, and troponin, in other words, myofibrillar proteins (Post et al., 2012); hybrid meat (HBM) by replacing a portion of meat (Alam et al., 2024), hybrid cultured meat (HCM) (Alam et al., 2024a); plant-based meat analogs (Kumari et al., 2023); insect-based meat (Van der Weele et al., 2019); three dimensional printed meat with scaffolds (Alam et al., 2024b) etc. Among these alternatives, CM and HBM stand as a strong candidate to capture the global alternative meat market alongside traditional meat. Although CM research and development has spread globally through approximately 100 commercial organizations (Behera and Adhikary, 2023), the market still has a fairly restricted presence of CM products due to limited cm scale production in the laboratory.

Nevertheless, more intensive product development strategies need to be practiced to bring variation in CM products to attract consumer acceptance. As CM production is still negligible at the cm/gm scale, so, it is important to imitate CM with a similar kind of muscle till scalable production starts, with a focus on understanding the probable physicochemical characteristics of future CM products. As CM is mainly (75-90%) composed of myofibrillar proteins (MFP) (Ben-Arye and Levenberg, 2019; Post et al., 2012). Thus MFP can be easily pretended as an imitation of CM for product development purposes to understand and modify future CM product characteristics in advance.

Improvement of HBM/HCM can be achieved by adding flavor enhancers, colorants, plant proteins, etc. Products derived from postmortem Wet and dry aging can enhance the tenderness and flavor of meat, hence boosting palatability and increasing consumer preferences (Kim et al.,

2022; Tuell et al., 2022). Enhancing the umami flavor and taste (Jakir et al., 2024) could be a unique value addition to the HBM/HCM for increasing the consumer base this can be achieved by adding dry aged beef crust (Ribeiro et al., 2024), 35% of which is discarded (Lee et al., 2019). Meat crusts have proven to be efficient functional components in ground beef products (Jeong and Kim 2016; Kim et al., 2018).

Research must be conducted to imitate CM to understand the quality characteristics of future products and improvisation techniques. Thus the objective of this study was to:

1. To make an imitated CM to produce IHCMP to assess the probable quality parameters in advance.
2. To compare characteristics between IHCMP, BMP, and PBMP.
3. To incorporate dry-aged beef crust to improve the physicochemical and sensory quality of IHCMP in comparison to BMP.

Materials and methods

Production of sterilized Myofibrillar protein to imitate cultured meat tissue

The MFP extraction process is illustrated in Fig 1. The frozen hanwoo meat sample was defrosted for approximately 12 hours at a temperature of 2 °C. The hanwoo meat myofibrils were then prepared using a modified process based on previous findings (Chen et al., 2016). Visible connective tissue fat was removed from the muscles and grounded by a 3 mm fine grinding plate and 80 rpm applying an electronic mincer (KitchenAid, St. Joseph. Michigan, USA). The minced meat weighing 3.0 ± 0.05 g, underwent four rounds of rinsing using cold deionized, distilled water at a temperature of 4 °C. During each washing phase, the minced meat and water were mixed at a ratio of 1:10 (w/v). After an initial homogenization using the IKA T25 ULTRA-TURAX (IKA-

Werke, Staufen, Germany) for 2 minutes, the homogenate was left to rest for 10 minutes. The sediment from each stage was subsequently gathered using centrifuging at a velocity of 18000xg for 20 minutes, while maintaining a temperature of 4 °C. During the third round of the washing stage, the suspension before centrifuge was strained through cheesecloths (grade #90 having 44 x 36 threads per square inch, Junggeun Medical Supplies Co., Ltd.) to eliminate the connective tissue and lipid. Following the completion of the final process of washing and centrifugation myofibrillar protein (MFP) was collected as sediment. MFP was vacuum packed and sterilized at 100° C in a water bath for 30 minutes before further use.

Formulation and patty preparation

BMP (control), MFP, IHCMP, PBMP, and IHCMP_{PCR} (IHCMP with dry-aged beef crust) were produced as per the following formulation in Table 1.

The dry-aged beef crust was collected from a local beef processing company in the Republic of Korea. Preparation. The vacuum-packed beef crust was stored at -20° C until incorporation in the IHCMP. TVP, PPI, and SPI (Nutricost, Vineyard, Utah, USA) were used as PBMP/IHCMP base, methylcellulose (Pure, USA) was added as a binding agent and red beetroot powder (Charm goods, Republic of Korea) used as a color enhancer. Other ingredients were used as described in Table 1.

The flow diagram for processing control and treatment patties is illustrated in Fig. 1. For the production of PBMP, TVP, SPI, and PPI were separately mixed with double distilled water (1:2) and allowed to hydrate at 4°C for 2 hours. Hydrated TVP, SPI, PPI, and CPP were blended with the materials indicated in Table 1 using a food mixer (Kitchen Aid mixer, St. Joseph, MI, USA) and then formed into 50 g patty using a patty press in triplicate. For the preparation of PBMP and IHCMP, all ingredients as per Table 1 were mixed in a Kitchen Aid mixer and formed into a 50 g patty in triplicate. MFP was mixed thoroughly with the ingredients listed in Table 1 following the above procedure to form a 50 g patty in triplicate. Hanwoo bicep femoris steak was collected from

a hypermarket in Jinju, Republic of Korea. After removing extra fat and connective tissue beef was ground and mixed with the ingredients mentioned in Table 1 using the Kitchen Aid mixer. After proper mixing, a 50 g patty was formed in triplicate. For IHCMPCR, the same IHCMCP process was followed but replaced 15% MFP with beef crust. All the patty was formed in a round shape of approximately 6 cm and a height of 2 cm.

Determination of physicochemical qualities

the moisture content was assessed according to the AOAC (2002) standard. A sample weighing around 2 ± 0.05 g sample was subjected to dehydration on an aluminum dish at 105°C for 16 hours using a scientific oven (BioFree, BF-150C, Buchen, Korea). The sample was then transferred to a desiccator, and the moisture content was estimated using the provided formula.

$$\text{Moisture (\%)} = \frac{\text{Sample weight before drying} - \text{Sample weight after drying}}{\text{Sample weight before drying}} \times 100\%$$

The color attributes of the patties were analyzed in triplicate by applying a colorimeter (Konica Minolta CR-300, Konica Minolta, Japan). Before measuring CIE L*, CIE a*, and CIE b* at three separate regions of the samples, the colorimeter underwent calibration using a white plate yielding the following values: Y=93.5, X=0.3132, y=0.3198.

The pH of the patties was measured using a digital pH meter (Orion Star™ A211 Benchtop pH Meter, Thermo Fisher Scientific Solutions LLC, USA). Before data collection, the probe underwent calibration at a temperature of 25°C using calibration solutions with pH values of 7.00, 4.01, and 9.99. Approximately 3 ± 0.05 grams of samples were combined with 27 ml of double distilled water and subsequently homogenized using an IKA T25 Ultra-Turax homogenizer (made by IKA-Werke, Staufen, Germany) for 30 minutes.

Releasing water content (RW%) was determined in triplicate for the samples using the approach outlined by Joo et al. (2002). Around 3 ± 0.05 g of samples were deposited onto a Whatman filter paper measuring 10 cm in diameter and subsequently overlaid with two thin plastic film sheets. The patty samples were sandwiched between Plexiglass plates, together with filter paper and plastic film sheet, and put under an even pressure of 2.5 kg for 5 minutes to aid in the

release of water. Ultimately, the RW was computed using the following formula:

$$RW (\%) = \frac{\text{Damp filter paper and plastic film weight} - \text{Filter paper and plastic film weight}}{\text{Meat sample weight}} \times 100\%$$

Determination of post-cooking parameters

The cooking loss (CL) of the samples has been evaluated in triplicate by computing the proportion of diminished weight. The experiment entailed placing a patty weighing around 25 ± 0.05 g and having approximately 1.5 cm in depth, in a polypropylene bag. The samples were cooked in a hot water bath at 75°C for 30 min. Immediately, the samples were cooled at room temperature for 30 min to remove additional surface moisture. The Calculation was executed on the subsequent formula:

The shrinking of the samples was assessed by measuring the alterations in diameter and thickness immediately before and following the cooking process. To ascertain the percentage of shrinkage in the patties, arbitrary observations were taken at four different points on both the raw and cooked samples as documented by Samard et al. (2021). The measurements were performed in triplicate. The percentage of shrinkage was determined using the following formula:

$$\text{Cooking loss (\%)} = \frac{\text{Weight of the sample before cooking} - \text{Weight of the sample after cooking}}{\text{Weight of the sample before cooking}} \times 100\%$$

Analysis of textural qualities

$$\text{Diameter reduction (\%)} = \frac{\text{Raw patty diameter (mm)} - \text{Cooked patty diameter (mm)}}{\text{Raw patty diameter (mm)}} \times 100\%$$

$$\text{Thickness reduction (\%)} = \frac{\text{Raw patty thickness (mm)} - \text{Cooked patty thickness (mm)}}{\text{Raw patty thickness (mm)}} \times 100\%$$

Right after the assessment of CL, samples went through Warner-Bratzler shear force (WBSF) testing to measure the shear force of the cooked samples. The testing was conducted using the established protocol outlined by the American Meat Science Association (AMSA, 1995).

Texture profile analysis (TPA) of the patties was assessed using a Sun Rheometer (Compact-100 II, Sun Scientific Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan). The patty samples were produced with a dimension of 4cm in length, 4cm in width, and 1.5cm in depth. They were then cooked at 75°C for 30 minutes in a preheated water bath. After cooking the samples were kept for cooling for 30 minutes. For analyzing TPA patty samples were compressed using a flat pressure adaptor (No.1) in an axial orientation rheometer. The patty samples were compressed using a two-cycle arrangement in consecutive order at a crosshead speed of 60mm/min and a final strain of 60% while a 10 kg load

was applied (Ismail et al., 2019). The following characteristics of the texture were analyzed: cohesion, hardness, chewiness, gumminess, and springiness.

Crude fat and fatty acid analysis

The samples' crude fat (CF) content was determined using a modified method derived from the procedure outlined by Folch et al. (1957). To extract CF about, 3 ± 0.05 g of patty sample was blended treating with 30 mL of Folch solution (chloroform: methanol=2: 1, v/v) in a homogenizer. The homogenate was then filtered using Whatman no.1 filter paper). Subsequently, 8 mL of NaCl solution with a concentration of 0.88% was added to the filtrate and well-blended using a vortex. After a 12-hour resting time, the top layer was extracted with a glass pipette using an aspirator. The lowermost layer was transferred to an aluminum dish that had been pre-weighed, to undergo the process of dehydration at 50°C in a hot air oven. The CF content was computed with the following formula.

$$\text{Crude Fat (\%)} = \frac{(\text{Dry dish}-\text{Empty dish}) \times (\text{Height}/\text{Take})}{\text{Sample}} \times 100$$

Following the extraction of CF the aluminum dishes were heated at at 90 °C on a heat block and then 1 ml Dichloromethane was added to the dish to dilute by rotating 5 turns on the palm. Immediately 1 ml supernatant was taken into the glass tube. Then 1 ml methanolic NaOH was added to the glass tube and heated for 10 minutes and after cooling 1 ml Boron trifluoride (BF₃) and again heated for 10 minutes. Following cooling 3 ml hexane and 8 ml deionized water were added and vortexed till properly mixed. This solution was then centrifuged at 1000xg for 15 minutes and a small quantity of Na₂SO₄ was added to dehydrate extra moisture for 1 minute. Then 2.5 ml of resultant fatty acid methyl ester (FAME) was separated in a glass tube and from there 1.5 ml was taken in a gas chromatograph (GC) tube for fatty acid analysis. To analyze FAME a GC HP6890N fitted with an automatic sampler arm HP7683 (Hewlett-Packard, Santa Clara, CA, USA) was utilized. A 100-m SP2560 (Supelco, Santa Clara, CA, USA) equipped with a capillary column

(0.25 mm internal diameter and .20 µm film thickness) was used to estimate the FAME extractions. FAME from the patties was refined using a temperature catalog with nitrogen serving as the carrier gas at a flow rate of 1mL/min. A column oven temperature control was installed in the chromatograph, and it was programmed to raise the temperature over time. The GC process involved a sequence of reactions conducted at specific temperature intervals: 50-180 °C with a heating rate of 10 °C/min, 180-220 °C at 5 °C/min, and 220-240 °C at 2 °C/min. The process was then maintained at a constant temperature of 240 °C for 20 minutes. The GC-equipped automatic sampler arm was utilized to perform eleven injections of 1 µL each. An estimation was made of the retention periods of fatty acid standards (Supelco 37 Components FAME Mix, Santa Clara, CA, USA). Ultimately, the FAME results were calculated as a percentage proportion of the overall fatty acids in the total peak area for corresponding fatty acids. The analysis was conducted in duplicates. The results were quantified as a percentage of the total fatty acid identified based on the total peak area. Atherogenic indexes were calculated by dividing the sum of saturated fatty acid (SFA) by the sum of unsaturated fatty acid (MUFA + PUFA), using the formula developed by Ulbricht and Southgate (1991): $AI \text{ (atherogenic index)} = [C12:0 + 4(C14:0) + C16:0] / [MUFA + PUFA]$.

Characterization of physical appearance

The visual attributes of the samples were acquired through the use of a digital camera (Nikon D7000) and the variation in texture was observed and recorded.

Sensory evaluation

The patty was fried in a preheated oven at a temperature of 163 °C till the internal temperature reached 71 °C according to the method described by AMSA (2015). The patty temperature was assessed using a digital thermometer. The samples were cooled to ambient temperature before

conducting the sensory analysis. A group of eight skilled sensory analysts in the meat science laboratory at Gyeongsang National University assessed samples from each treatment. The panel assessed these samples based on their tenderness, juiciness, flavor, and overall acceptability using a 9-point hedonic scale (0 poor and 9 excellent). Water was provided to the panel to wash the mouth between samples. The approved consent procedure for sensory evaluation is Institutional Review Board (IRB): GIRB-G21-Y-0059.

Electronic tongue

An electronic tongue system (ETS; INSERT SA402B Electric Sensing System, Insent, Tokyo, Japan) was used to undertake the examination of the samples, implementing the technique exemplified by Ismail et al. (2020). The ETS system is primarily composed of sensor arrays, electrodes, a data analysis program, and specialized artificial lipid membranes. The ETS was employed to ascertain the attributes of sourness, bitterness, umami, and richness. The examination of each measured parameter was conducted once all membranes were stabilized in a standard meat taste (SMT) solution. The SMT solution was comprised of 0.01% lactic acid (sourness), 0.25% monosodium glutamate (umami), and 0.0005% quinine hydrochloride (bitterness). Approximately, 100 ± 0.05 g of ground sample was mixed with 400 mL of hot double distilled water (95°C ; 20 min). The blended solution was centrifuged for 15 min at $1000 \times g$, and the supernate was stored at -70°C for further analysis.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis of the revealed data was analyzed using analysis of variance for all variables using SAS software (version 9.4, SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA), followed by Duncan's multiple range test for multiple mean comparisons. The error terms used throughout this study are SE.

Results are expressed as least square mean values of three independent replications, except for WBSF, TPA, and sensory test for which the average of five measurements was obtained using repeated measurements. A p-value $\leq 5\%$ was considered significant. The data for Principal component analysis (PCA) was organized by placing the treatments in rows and all variables in separate columns using Metaboanalyst 6.0 software. The score plot demonstrated the distinction between the principal components based on the treatment effect. The biplot displayed the correlation between individual concentration correlation and their normal distribution, confirming their suitability for PCA analysis.

Results and Discussion

The physicochemical properties

The physicochemical properties of control and treatment are shown in Table 2. Higher moisture content ($p < 0.05$) was observed in the BMP and PBMP followed by IHCMCR, IHCMPC, and MFP. High moisture in PBM is due to the absorption of excess water during the rehydration process in TVP, PPI, SPI, and methylcellulose exhibits a greater water retention capacity in comparison to meat (Amboon et al., 2012). RW was lowest ($p < 0.05$) in IHCMPCR and BMP followed by MFP. Both IHCMPC and PBMP had higher RW values. The low RW in meat samples is attributed to stronger bonds between protein molecules and water molecules (Yang 2018). The low relative RW in IHCMPCR may attributed to the high rehydration potential, which enhances the affinity with water molecules in the patties (Park et al., 2020). This trait is typical of additives that have a high rehydratability.

Meat pH in raw BMP and IHCMPCR was lower ($p < 0.05$) and MFP, and IHCMPC had slightly higher pH values and PBMP showed a basic pH. These values increased after cooking in BMP,

IHCMPC, IHCMPC, and PBMP, except MFP which was reduced. Previous investigations have indicated meat pH rises when it is subjected to the external environment during heat-induced protein denaturation (Forrest et al., 1975; Lee et al., 2022). The higher pH seen in the PBMP and IHCMPC is likely a result of the increased alkalinity and variety of the plant protein utilized in the formulation (De Marchi et al., 2021). These results are in line with those reported in a recent study by Kamani et al. (2019) comparing chicken sausages to plant-based sausages made from soy protein isolate. (De Marchi et al., 2021). The patty samples were darker and reddish ($p < 0.05$) in BMP followed by IHCMPCR and IHCMPC. MFP and PBMP were lighter and lacked in redness. The yellowness was higher in the PBMP. After cooking all the samples turn darker but a similar value trend is sustained. Lightness and yellowness decreased as redness increased in beef and IHCMPCR because of the rise in the myoglobin concentration (the red-colored component) in meat products (Kim et al., 2019). The CF was higher ($p < 0.05$) in IHCMPCR and BMP than in other samples. The crust of Hanwoo beef has high fat content (Lee et al., 2022), therefore, there is a prevailing belief that a significant amount of fat is present in IHCMPCR can be obtained via the addition of crust. Huber et al. (2016) found that pea protein has a limited ability to retain fat, likely because it contains a resistant starch portion and it correlates with the present study where PBMP and IHCMPC had lower CF levels as well. This observation was supported by Park et al. (2023) on beef patty produced with mushrooms and plant protein. Our previous study on hybrid pork steaks also revealed higher pH, lightness, and yellowness in samples formulated with plant ingredients (Alam et al., 2024).

Cooking related qualities

The CL of meat products is influenced by the degree of cross-linking between salt-soluble proteins, water molecules, and fat globules (Park 2011), which are determined by the structure,

quantity, protein content, and physical qualities of meat (Mittal et al., 1985). Cooking qualities are important parameters for meat and related products and CL values in the present study are illustrated in Table 3. The CL was elevated ($p < 0.05$) in BMP followed by lower values in PBMP, IHCMPCR, IHCMF, and MFP respectively. Diameter reduction was higher ($p < 0.05$) in BMP and IHCMF, whereas thickness reduced mostly in BMP, MFP, and PBMP. The low CL of MFP is attributed to stronger bonds among protein molecules and water molecules (Yang 2018). Reduced CL in IHCMPCR may be due to high rehydration potential which strengthens the bond with water molecules in the patties which is characteristic of highly rehydratable additives (Park et al., 2020). The diameter and thickness reduction ratios of the patties are shown in Table 3. The lowest ($p < 0.05$) diameter and thickness reduction were observed in IHCMPCR and in other samples had variable shrinkage. These results were consistent with previous findings that showed that non-meat proteins, such as wheat germ and soy proteins, added to patties resulted in lower cooking loss and shrinkage (Brown et al., 1990). IHCMF and PBMP in this had smaller shrinkage, which is supported by Choi et al., (2015), where pork patties prepared with isolated soy protein increased the bond strength between water and fat, thus minimizing CL and shrinkage. Nevertheless, the addition of crust in IHCMPCR improved water retention in patties and cooking-related properties.

WBSF share force value revealed harder texture ($p < 0.05$) in BMP, IHCMPCR, and IHCMF with a much softer trend in PBMP. MFP protein in meat products undergoes gelation when heated and helps in consistent texture and water retention (Guo et al., 2015; Xia et al., 2018).

Texture profile analysis (TPA)

The TPA values are illustrated in Figure 2. The analysis revealed a harder ($p < 0.05$) BMP followed by IHCMPCR and MFP and softer in PBMP and HCM (Fig 2A). Gumminess values (Fig

2B) were higher ($p < 0.05$) in BMP followed by IHCMP, MFP, and IHCMP. In overall observation, PBMP demonstrated a softer textural pattern among all the samples. Chewiness was better in BMP and IHCMP followed by IHCMP and MFP patties. Chewiness (Fig 2D) was the least in PBMP. Springiness (Fig 2E) was higher in BMP followed by IHCMP and lowest was in PBMP followed by IHCMP and MFP. Typically, a beef patty has a higher hardness score because of the inherent strength of muscle tissue. Our previous study confirmed that PBM had lower hardness than meat-based steaks (Alam et al., 2024). A similar characteristic was observed in this study whereby the beef patty had greater hardness than PBM. Kamani et al. (2019) conducted a thorough investigation of the concept of hardness. According to their findings, sausages with more meat necessitate a greater amount of grinding force compared to sausages without meat. Furthermore, it has been proposed that the increased hardness of animal-based patties is a result of the denaturation of muscle proteins, leading to the meat becoming harder (Sakai et al., 2022). Therefore, the decreased hardness and chewiness measurements of the IHCMP and PBMP could be attributed to a less robust MFP network (Alam et al., 2023), thus the product has lower comprehensive resistance compared to BMP, MFP, and IHCMP. Similarly, a trend of noticeable decline was observed in the springiness, cohesiveness, and gumminess attributes of IHCMP and PBMP compared to BMP, IHCMP, and MFP. The present study confirms the findings of prior research conducted by Chiang et al., (2021) on meat substitutes including soy protein and wheat gluten. The study showed that these substitutes had reduced levels of chewiness, cohesiveness, and springiness compared to steam cooked chicken meat.

Physical appearance of the patties

The physical appearance of the patties is shown in Figure 3. The raw, cooked, and cross sample of the cooked samples illustrates the difference among the samples. The visual color and texture

characteristics are visible in the images.

Taste traits assessed by the sensory panel and electronic tongue system (ETS)

The result of the sensory panel evaluation of patties is illustrated in Figure 4. The panel found higher juiciness and tenderness were better in BMP and IHCMPCR compared to other samples. Considering sensory attributes IHCMPCR was closer to BMP and stood out from other samples. The sensory panel provided a higher overall acceptance ($p < 0.05$) in BMP, IHCMPCR, and IHCMP compared to MFP and PBMP. Furthermore, PBMP showed a lower score in all parameters with an overall lower acceptance. The detailed values of sensory panel evaluation are provided in supplemental table 1 for better understanding. A similar lower acceptance of PBMP was observed in our previous study (Alam et al., 2024), where pork hybrid pork steak was formulated with carrot, red cabbage, and ground chickpea.

Electronic tongue sensor response values from patties are shown in Fig 5. ETS revealed negative sourness values (Fig 5A) for BMP, and MFP and lower values persist in PBMP, IHCMP, and IHCMPCR. PBMP patties had slight bitterness (Fig 5B) followed by IHCMP and IHCMPCR. The umami intensity was considerably higher ($p < 0.05$) in IHCMPCR followed by IHCMP and BMP (Fig 5C). A tendency toward lower umami attributes was detected in MFP, PBMP, and IHCMP. IHCMPCR stands out in richness (Fig 5D) attributes followed by BMP, IHCMP, MFP, and PBMP. Sourness and bitter taste characteristics are influenced by carbohydrate metabolism and the production of acids when being stored (Chen et al., 2021). Additionally, higher levels of soy-based TVP, PPI, SPI, GCP, and some incorporated elements like red beetroot and black pepper used in the PBMP and IHCMP could be responsible for higher sourness and bitterness attributes. Previously, Kobayashi et al. (2010) reported that sourness and bitterness were linked to tannins that come from plant protein. Moreover, saponins, phenolic compounds, alkaloids, peptides, and

free amino acids in plant proteins are involved in bitterness and/or astringency (Roland et al., 2017), which is confirmed in the present observation as different plant proteins used in the formulation of PBMP and IHCMP (Table 1). The increased umami and richness intensity in IHCMPCR followed by BMP was similar to a study by Park et al. (2018), where beef patties supplemented with dry-aged crust obtained higher scores for taste, flavor, juiciness, and overall acceptability compared to the control beef patty. During the aging process, the decomposition of meat protein and fat leads to an increase in inosine 5' monophosphate that stimulates umami sensation (Lee et al., 2022). Thus, the addition of crust improved the taste and acted as an umami enhancer. Furthermore, it also provided a dry aging flavor that enhanced the sensory qualities of IHCMPCR as detected by the sensory panel.

Fatty acid analysis

The results from the fatty acid analysis of the patties are given in Table 4. Oleic acid content was higher ($p < 0.05$) in BMP and IHCMPCR, whereas linolenic acid content was higher in IHCMP and PBMP. Only BMP and IHCMPCR contained a very low quantity of omega fatty acids within the patty samples. Fatty acid analysis revealed higher ($p < 0.05$) saturated fatty acids (SFA) and monounsaturated fatty acids (MUFA) in IHCMPCR and BMP compared to IHCMP and PBMP. PBMP and IHCMP contain higher polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFA) than the other patty samples. Similar higher SFA and MUFA especially palmitic acid (C16:0) and oleic acid (C:18:1n9c) was observed in hanwoo meat (Lee and Joo, 2022). In the same study, omega 3 and 6 fatty acids were present but in very low quantities in beef. The higher concentration of palmitic (C16:0) and stearic (C18:0) acids in BMP and IHCMPCR than in PBMP and IHCMP could be attributed to the abundant presence of these fatty acids in the adipose and muscular tissues of animals (Wood et al., 2008). The main fatty acids found in plant-based meat analogs (C16:0, C18:0,

oleic acid (C18:1), C18:2, and C18:3) revealed in a study by Bohrer (2019), are quite similar to the PBMP and IHCMP in the present study. In a previous study sausages prepared with pork back fat contained the main saturated fatty acids C16:0 and C18:0, the main monounsaturated fatty acid was C18:1, and the main polyunsaturated fatty acids were C18:2 and C18:3 (Asuming-Bediako et al., 2014). The heatmap (Fig 6) created separate clusters for BMP and IHCMPCR having higher SFA, MUFA, C14:1 (myristoleic acid), C 16:1 (palmitoleic acid), and omega 3 & 6 fatty acids. The other clusters separated IHCMP and PBMP having higher quantities of PUFA, C:20:0 (Ecosenoic acid), and 18:3n3/18:3n6 (Lioleic acid). Depending on the fatty acid content the dendrogram separated MFP, BMP & IHCMPCR, IHCMP & PBMP in three separate groups for clarity in understanding the differences between the samples.

Principal component analysis (PCA)

Multivariate analysis using PCA and spectroscopic data is nowadays used for precise differentiation between samples by plotting larger data sets (Hashem et al., 2022). Samples were projected on the first two principal components (PC1 and PC2), where PC1 explained around 82.5% of the variability in the dataset. In addition, samples were colored based on their treatments (Fig. 7A). The PCA biplot (Fig 7B) indicated that sourness and bitterness were substantially negatively correlated with the principal component (PCA) 1, whereas umami, richness, hardness, cohesiveness, gumminess, and moisture showed a high positive correlation with PC1. On the other side, sourness and bitterness were highly correlated with PCA 2. The primary occurrence of sample separation was observed in PC1. Thus, as highlighted in Fig. 7A, there was a clear separation between the clusters of the BMP, IHCMP, IHCMPCR, and PBMP. The VIP score plot (Fig 7C) explains the differentiation between the samples was mainly because of the bitterness and sourness of the samples. On the other hand springiness, moisture, and cohesiveness were the less important

variables in the sample differentiation.

Conclusion

This study involved the imitation of CM using MFP having similar muscle characteristics for the production of an imitation of probable hybrid cultured meat patty termed in the future when scalable production is available. Additionally, in IHCMP dry-aged beef crust was added for taste and flavor improvement. The comparison was done between BMP, MFP, IHCMP, PBMP, and IHCMP-PCR. Using MFP gave an idea about the physicochemical and rheological quality of IHCMP and may guide us for further R&D in real CM product development. The dry-aged beef crust can be efficiently used to produce any sort of HBM product to improve quality parameters flavor and taste. It is suggested to produce hybrid products in combination with plant materials and dry-aged beef crust to fulfill the increasing demand for meat and as a healthy choice for consumers and a safe environment.

References

1. Alam AM, Lee EY, Hossain MJ, Kim SH, Kim CJ, Hwang YH, Joo ST. 2024. Physicochemical and sensory characteristics of hybrid flexitarian pork loin steak combined with different plant ingredients. *Food Sci Anim Res*. <https://doi.org/10.5851/kosfa.2024.e43>
2. Alam AM, Solberg C, Hashem MA. 2023. Muscle histology and Sensory quality changes during freeze storage of North Atlantic shrimps (*Pandulus borealis*). *Meat Res* 3(3). <https://doi.org/10.55002/mr.3.3.60>
3. Alam AN, Kim CJ, Kim SH, Kumari S, Lee EY, Hwang YH, Joo ST. 2024b. Scaffolding fundamentals and recent advances in sustainable scaffolding techniques for cultured meat development. *Food Res Int* 26:114549. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2024.114549>

4. Alam AN, Kim CJ, Kim SH, Kumari S, Lee SY, Hwang YH, Joo ST. 2024a. Trends in Hybrid Cultured Meat Manufacturing Technology to Improve Sensory Characteristics. *Food Sci Anim Res* 44(1):39. <https://doi.org/10.5851/kosfa.2023.e76>
5. Amboon W, Tulyathan V, Tattiyakul J. 2012. Effect of hydroxypropyl methylcellulose on rheological properties, coating pickup, and oil content of rice flour-based batters. *Food Bioprocess Tech* 5:601-8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11947-010-0327-3>
6. AMSA. 1995. Research guidelines for cookery. American Meat Science Association, Chicago, IL, USA. p 8.
7. AOAC. 2002. Official methods of analysis. 16th ed. Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Gaithersburg, MD, USA.
8. Armstrong M. 2023. The Growing Global Hunger For Meat. Available online at <https://www.statista.com/chart/28251/global-meat-production/>
9. Asuming-Bediako N, Jaspal MH, Hallett K, Bayntun J, Baker A, Sheard PR. 2014. Effects of replacing pork backfat with emulsified vegetable oil on fatty acid composition and quality of UK-style sausages. *Meat Sci* 96(1):187-94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2013.06.031>
10. Aykın-Dinçer E, Güngör KK, Çağlar E, Erbaş M. 2021. The use of beetroot extract and extract powder in sausages as natural food colorant. *Int J Food Eng* 17(1):75-82. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijfe-2019-0052>
11. Behera R, Adhikary L. 2023. Review on cultured meat: ethical alternative to animal industrial farming. *Food Res* 7:42–51. [https://doi.org/10.26656/fr.2017.7\(2\).772](https://doi.org/10.26656/fr.2017.7(2).772)
12. Ben-Arye T, Levenberg S. 2019. Tissue engineering for clean meat production. *Front sustain food syst* 3:46. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2019.00046>
13. Bohrer BM. 2019. An investigation of the formulation and nutritional composition of modern meat analogue products. *Food Sci Hum Wellness* 8(4):320-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fshw.2019.11.006>
14. Brown LM, Zayas JF. 1990. Corn germ protein flour as an extender in broiled beef patties. *J food Sci* 55(4):888-92. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2621.1990.tb01558.x>

15. Ceclu L, Nistor OV. 2020. Red beetroot: Composition and health effects—A review. *J Nutr Med Diet Care* 6(1):1-9. <https://doi.org/10.23937/2572-3278.1510043>
16. Chen Q, Hu Y, Wen R, Wang Y, Qin L, Kong B. 2021. Characterisation of the flavour profile of dry fermented sausages with different NaCl substitutes using HS-SPME-GC-MS combined with electronic nose and electronic tongue. *Meat Sci* 172:108338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2020.108338>
17. Chen X, Xu X, Zhou G. 2016. Potential of high pressure homogenization to solubilize chicken breast myofibrillar proteins in water. *Innov Food Sci Emerg* 33:170-9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ifset.2015.11.012>
18. Chiang JH, Tay W, Ong DS, Liebl D, Ng CP, Henry CJ. 2021. Physicochemical, textural and structural characteristics of wheat gluten-soy protein composited meat analogues prepared with the mechanical elongation method. *Food Structure*. 28:100183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foostr.2021.100183>
19. Choi YS, Jeon KH, Park JD, Sung JM, Seo DH, Ku SK, Oh NS, Kim YB. 2015. Comparison of pork patties quality characteristics with various binding agents. *Korean J Food Cook Sci* 31(5):588-95. <https://doi.org/10.9724/kfcs.2015.31.5.588>
20. Costa AP, Hermes VS, Rios AD, Flôres SH. 2017. Minimally processed beetroot waste as an alternative source to obtain functional ingredients. *J Food Sci Tech* 54:2050-8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-017-2642-4>
21. De Marchi M, Costa A, Pozza M, Goi A, Manuelian CL. 2021. Detailed characterization of plant-based burgers. *Sci Rep* 11(1):2049. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-81684-9>
22. Domínguez R, Pateiro M, Gagaoua M, Barba FJ, Zhang W, Lorenzo JM. 2019. A comprehensive review on lipid oxidation in meat and meat products. *Antioxidants* 8(10):429. <https://doi.org/10.3390/antiox8100429>
23. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). 2017. The future of food and agriculture—Trends and challenges. Annual Report, 296.
24. Forrest JC, Aberle ED, Hedrick HB, Judge MD, Merkel RA. 1975. Principles of meat science. WH Freeman and Co pp. 190–226 ISBN: 978-0-7167-0743-1

25. Guo J, Zhou Y, Yang K, Yin X, Ma J, Li Z, Sun W, Han M. 2019. Effect of low-frequency magnetic field on the gel properties of pork myofibrillar proteins. *Food Chem* 274:775-81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2018.09.028>
26. Hashem MA, Islam MR, Hossain MM, Alam AM, Khan M. 2022. Prediction of chevon quality through near infrared spectroscopy and multivariate analyses. *Meat Res* 2(6). <https://doi.org/10.55002/mr.2.6.37>
27. Heijnk V, Espey A, Schuenemann F. 2023. A comparison of influencing factors on attitudes towards plant-based, insect-based and cultured meat alternatives in Germany. *Food Qua Prefer* 110:104966. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2023.104966>
28. Hossain MJ, Alam AN, Lee EY, Hwang YH, Joo ST. 2024. Umami Characteristics and Taste Improvement Mechanism of Meat. *Food Sci of Anim Res* 44(3):515. <https://doi.org/10.5851/kosfa.2024.e29>
29. Huber E, Francio DL, Biasi V, Mezzomo N, Ferreira SR. 2016. Characterization of vegetable fiber and its use in chicken burger formulation. *J Food Sci Tech* 53:3043-52. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-016-2276-y>
30. Jeon DW, Choi IS, Jang IS. Analysis of regional economic effects of pig farming industry in Jeju. Wonju: Korea Research Institute for Local Administration; 2022.
31. Jeong HG, Kim HY. 2016. Development of Tteokgalbi added with pig skin gelatine powder. *J Korean Soc Food Sci Nutr* 45(8):1147-52. <https://doi.org/10.3746/jkfn.2016.45.8.1147>
32. Joo ST, Choi JS, Hur SJ, Kim GD, Kim CJ, Lee EY, Bakhsh A, Hwang YH. 2022. A comparative study on the taste characteristics of satellite cell cultured meat derived from chicken and cattle muscles. *Food Sci Anim Res* 42(1):175. <https://doi.org/10.5851/kosfa.2021.e72>
33. Kamani MH, Meera MS, Bhaskar N, Modi VK. 2019. Partial and total replacement of meat by plant-based proteins in chicken sausage: Evaluation of mechanical, physico-chemical and sensory characteristics. *J Food Sci Tech* 56:2660-9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-019-03754-1>

34. Kim HY, Kim GW, Jeong HG. 2016. Development of tteokgalbi added with red pepper seed powder. *J Korean Soc Food Sci Nutr* 45(2):255-60. <https://doi.org/10.3746/jkfn.2016.45.2.255>
35. Kim JH, Cho SH, Seong PN, Hah KH, Kim HK, Park BY, Lee JM, Kim DH, Ahn CN. 2007. Effect of ageing temperature and time on the meat quality of longissimus muscle from Hanwoo steer. *Food Sci Anim Res* 27(2):171-8. <https://doi.org/10.5851/kosfa.2007.27.2.171>
36. Kim S, Kim G, Moon C, Ko K, Choi Y, Choe J, Ryu Y. 2022. Effects of Aging Methods and Periods on Quality Characteristics of Beef. *Food Sci Anim Resour* 42(6):953-967. <https://doi.org/10.5851/kosfa.2022.e63>.
37. Kim YH, Ma D, Setyabrata D, Farouk MM, Lonergan SM, Huff-Lonergan E, Hunt MC. 2018. Understanding postmortem biochemical processes and post-harvest aging factors to develop novel smart-aging strategies. *Meat Sci* 144:74-90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2018.04.031>
38. Kim HE, Chin KB. 2018. Antioxidant activities of brussels sprouts powder and its application to pork patties on the physicochemical properties and antioxidant activity during refrigerated storage. *J Korean Soc Food Sci Nutr* 47, 733–741. <https://doi.org/10.3746/jkfn.2018.47.7.733>
39. Kim, M.; Choe, J.; Lee, H.J.; Yoon, Y.; Yoon, S.; Jo, C. 2019. Effects of aging and aging method on physicochemical and sensory traits of different beef cuts. *Food Sci Anim Resour* 39, 54–64. <https://doi.org/10.5851/kosfa.2019.e3>
40. Kobayashi Y, Habara M, Ikezaki H, Chen R, Naito Y, Toko K. 2010. Advanced taste sensors based on artificial lipids with global selectivity to basic taste qualities and high correlation to sensory scores. *Sensors* 10(4):3411-43. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s100403411>
41. Kumari S, Alam AN, Hossain MJ, Lee EY, Hwang YH, Joo ST. 2023. Sensory Evaluation of Plant-Based Meat: Bridging the Gap with Animal Meat, Challenges and Future Prospects. *Foods* 13(1):108. <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods13010108>
42. Laville E, Sayd T, Morzel M, Blinet S, Chambon C, Lepetit J, Renand G, Hocquette JF. 2009. Proteome changes during meat aging in tough and tender beef suggest the importance

of apoptosis and protein solubility for beef aging and tenderization. *J Agric Food Chem* 57(22):10755-64. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf901949r>

43. Lee HJ, Choe J, Kim M, Kim HC, Yoon JW, Oh SW, Jo C. 2019. Role of moisture evaporation in the taste attributes of dry-and wet-aged beef determined by chemical and electronic tongue analyses. *Meat Sci* 151:82-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2019.02.001>
44. Lee T, Joo N. 2022. Comparison of fatty acid, amino acid, and sensory properties of Chikhanwoo (Korean brindle cattle) and Hanwoo (Korean native cattle). *Culi Sci & Hos Res.* 28(2):18-27. <https://doi.org/10.20878/cshr.2022.28.2.003>
45. Lee JA, Kim HY, Seol KH. 2022. Quality Properties of Dry-Aged Beef (Hanwoo Cattle) Crust on Pork Patties. *Foods* 11(15):2191. <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods11152191>
46. Mereddy R, Chan A, Fanning K, Nirmal N, Sultanbawa Y. 2017. Betalain rich functional extract with reduced salts and nitrate content from red beetroot (*Beta vulgaris* L.) using membrane separation technology. *Food Chem* 215:311-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2016.07.132>
47. Mittal GS, Osborne WR. 1985. Meat emulsion extenders. *Food Technol* 39, 121–130.
48. Park B, Yong HI, Choe J, Jo C. 2018. Utilization of the crust from dry-aged beef to enhance flavor of beef patties. *Korean J Food Sci Anim Res* 38(5):1019. <https://doi.org/10.5851/kosfa.2018.e35>
49. Park B, Yong HI, Choe J, Jo C. Utilization of the crust from dry-aged beef to enhance flavor of beef patties. *Korean journal for food science of animal resources*. 2018 Oct;38(5):1019.
50. Park G, Oh S, Park S, Kim YA, Park Y, Kim Y, Lee J, Lee H, Choi J. 2023. Physicochemical characteristics and storage stability of hybrid beef patty using shiitake mushroom (*Lentinus edodes*). *J Food Qual* 1:7239709. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/7239709>
51. Park B, Yong HI, Choe J, Jo C. 2018. Utilization of the crust from dry-aged beef to enhance flavor of beef patties. *Korean J Food Sci Anim Res* 38, 1019–1028.

52. Park, J.W. A Study on the Quality Property of Pork Patties Supplemented by Concentrated Soy Protein (CSP). Master's Thesis, Chung-Ang University, Seoul, Korea, 2011; pp. 4–15. <https://doi.org/10.5851/kosfa.2018.e35>
53. Park SY, Seol KH, Kim HY. 2020. Effect of dry-aged beef crust levels on quality properties of brown sauce. *Food Sci Anim Resour* 40(5):699. <https://doi.org/10.5851/kosfa.2020.e45>
54. Post MJ. 2012. Cultured meat from stem cells: challenges and prospects. *Meat Sci* 92:297–301. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2012.04.008>
55. Ribeiro FA, Lau SK, Furbeck RA, Herrera NJ, Henriott ML, Bland NA, Fernando SC, Subbiah J, Pflanzler SB, Dinh TT, Miller RK. 2024. Effects of relative humidity on dry-aged beef quality. *Meat Sci* 18:109498. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2024.109498>
56. Roland WS, Pouvreau L, Curran J, van de Velde F, de Kok PM. 2017. Flavor aspects of pulse ingredients. *Cereal Chem* 94(1):58-65. <https://doi.org/10.1094/CCHEM-06-16-0161-FI>
57. Sakai K, Sato Y, Okada M, Yamaguchi S. 2022. Synergistic effects of laccase and pectin on the color changes and functional properties of meat analogs containing beet red pigment. *Sci Rep* 12(1):1168. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-05091-4>
58. Tuell JR, Nondorf MJ, Kim YH. 2022. Post-harvest strategies to improve tenderness of underutilized mature beef: a review. *Food Sci Anim Res* 42(5):723. <https://doi.org/10.5851/kosfa.2022.e33>
59. Ulbricht TL, Southgate DA. 1991. Coronary heart disease: seven dietary factors. *The lancet* 338(8773):985-92. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-6736\(91\)91846-M](https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-6736(91)91846-M)
60. Van der Weele C, Feindt P, van der Goot AJ, van Mierlo B, van Boekel M. 2019. Meat alternatives: an integrative comparison. *Trends Food Sci Technol* 88:505-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2019.04.018>
61. Wood JD, Enser M, Fisher AV, Nute GR, Sheard PR, Richardson RI, Hughes SI, Whittington FM. 2008. Fat deposition, fatty acid composition and meat quality: A review. *Meat Sci* 78(4):343-58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2007.07.019>

62. Xia W, Ma L, Chen X, Li X, Zhang Y. 2018. Physicochemical and structural properties of composite gels prepared with myofibrillar protein and lecithin at various ionic strengths. *Food Hydrocoll* 82:135-43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodhyd.2018.03.044>
63. Yang, H.D. Quality of Meat. In *Meat Science*, 1st ed.; Yang, H.D., Ed.; Sunjin Publishing: Gyeonggi-do, Korea, 2018; pp. 167–172.

ACCEPTED

Table 1. Treatment and formulation of hybrid patties.

Ingredients	Formulations %				
	BMP (Control)	MFP	IHCMP	PBMP	IHCMP CR
Hanwoo meat	98.5				
MFP		98.5	66		51
Dry aged beef crust					15
TVP			15	45	15
SPI			5	12	5
PPI			5	12	5
GCP			5	27	5
Methyl Cellulose			1.5	1.5	1.5
Red beet			1	1	1
NaCl	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Black pepper powder	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Total	100	100	100	100	100

BMP=Beef meat patty, MFP=Myofibrillar protein, IHCMP= Imitated Hybrid Cultured Meat patty, PBMP=Plant Based Meat Patty, IHCMP+CR= IHCMP+dry aged beef crust, TVP= Textured Vegetable Protein, SPI= Soy Protein Isolate, PPI= Pea Protein Isolate, GCP= Ground chickpea

Table 2. Physiochemical properties of patties

Parameters		BMP	MFP	IHCMP	PBMP	IHCMP CR	P Value	
	Moisture %	62.17±0.04 ^a	59.16±0.03 ^d	60.56±0.02 ^c	62.20±0.03 ^a	61.13±0.03 ^b	0.0001	
	RW %	2.95±0.02 ^c	2.18±0.02 ^d	4.70±0.03 ^a	4.24±0.03 ^b	2.07±0.02 ^e	0.0001	
pH	Raw sample	5.65±0.00 ^e	6.37±0.00 ^c	6.67±0.00 ^b	7.08±0.03 ^a	5.90±0.00 ^d	0.0001	
	Cooked sample	5.76±0.00 ^e	6.21±0.00 ^c	6.75±0.00 ^b	7.26±0.03 ^a	6.00±0.01 ^d	0.0001	
Color parameters	Raw sample	CIE L*	42.31±0.04 ^e	72.65±0.09 ^a	67.40±0.05 ^b	63.23±0.05 ^c	48.72±0.04 ^d	0.0001
		CIE a*	16.22±0.05 ^a	10.24±0.08 ^e	14.41±0.06 ^c	12.49±0.02 ^d	14.86±0.07 ^b	0.0001
		CIE b*	5.85±0.07 ^e	7.86±0.05 ^d	10.70±0.06 ^b	14.30±0.05 ^a	8.74±0.05 ^c	0.0001
	Cooked sample	CIE L*	36.50±0.02 ^d	56.21±0.04 ^b	54.26±0.04 ^c	57.54±0.06 ^a	32.53±0.05 ^e	0.0001
		CIE a*	11.85±0.03 ^b	11.83±0.09 ^b	12.57±0.03 ^a	10.80±0.04 ^d	11.21±0.05 ^c	0.0001
		CIE b*	4.13±0.03 ^e	7.22±0.06 ^d	12.23±0.03 ^b	14.10±0.06 ^a	8.50±0.06 ^c	0.0001
	CF %	1.95±0.00 ^b	0.10±0.01 ^d	0.50±0.00 ^c	0.48±0.00 ^c	2.42±0.02 ^a	0.0001	

^{a-e} Different superscript letters within the same row mean significantly different between treatments (p < 0.05).

MFP=Myofibrillar protein, BMP= Beef Meat Patty, IHCMP= Imitated Hybrid Cultured Meat, PBMP=Plant Based Meat Patty, IHCMP CR= IHCMP+dry aged beef crust, RW=Releasing water content, CF= Crude fiber

Table 3. Cooking quality parameters of patties

Parameters (%)	Beef	MFP	HCM	PBM	HCM CR	P Value
CL	18.66±0.02 ^a	8.54±0.02 ^e	12.04±0.02 ^d	12.75±0.02 ^b	12.16±0.02 ^c	0.0001
Diameter reduction after cooking	17.25±0.02 ^a	14.52±0.02 ^c	15.87±0.03 ^b	12.56±0.02 ^d	10.66±0.24 ^e	0.0001
Thickness reduction after cooking	15.36±0.01 ^a	15.05±0.01 ^b	11.21±0.02 ^d	14.72±0.15 ^c	9.07±0.01 ^e	0.0001
WBSF Shear force	5.15±0.05 ^a	4.10±0.04 ^d	4.21±0.03 ^c	3.81±0.05 ^e	4.46±0.03 ^b	0.0001

^{a-e} Different superscript letters within the same row mean significantly different between treatments ($p < 0.05$).

MFP=Myofibrillar protein, BMP= Beef Meat Patty, IHCMP= Imitated Hybrid Cultured Meat, PBMP=Plant Based Meat Patty, IHCMP CR= IHCMP+dry aged beef crust, CL= Cooking loss

Table 4. Fatty acid compositions (%) of hybrid patties

Fatty acids	BMP	MFP	IHCMP	PBMP	IHCMPCR	P Value
C12:0	0.07±0.00 ^b	0.04±0.00 ^c	0.07±0.00 ^b	0.05±0.01 ^c	0.11±0.01 ^a	0.0002
C14:0	2.71±0.00 ^b	0.03±0.00 ^e	0.46±0.00 ^c	0.43±0.01 ^d	2.78±0.00 ^a	0.0001
C14:1	0.83±0.01 ^a	0.02±0.00 ^e	0.06±0.00 ^c	0.04±0.00 ^d	0.71±0.01 ^b	0.0001
C16:0	24.35±0.01 ^b	0.07±0.00 ^e	18.02±0.01 ^c	17.33±0.02 ^d	26.68±0.00 ^a	0.0001
C16:1	5.53±0.01 ^a	0.06±0.00 ^d	0.43±0.08 ^c	0.48±0.00 ^c	4.59±0.01 ^b	0.0001
C18:0	9.42±0.00 ^b	0.07±0.00 ^e	5.02±0.00 ^c	4.85±0.02 ^d	9.68±0.00 ^a	0.0001
C18:1n9c	53.03±0.02 ^a	0.05±0.00 ^e	28.06±0.00 ^c	27.99±0.00 ^d	49.29±0.03 ^b	0.0001
C18:2n6c	3.49±0.01 ^d	0.07±0.01 ^e	42.06±0.01 ^a	41.94±0.01 ^b	5.16±0.03 ^a	0.0001
C18:3n3	0.17±0.01 ^d	0.02±0.00 ^e	6.55±0.00 ^a	6.19±0.01 ^b	0.40±0.01 ^c	0.0001
C20:0	0.10±0.01 ^d	0.02±0.00 ^e	0.52±0.01 ^a	0.49±0.01 ^b	0.12±0.00 ^c	0.0001
C20:4n6	0.37±0.02 ^b	0.03±0.00 ^e	0.34±0.01 ^c	0.30±0.00 ^d	0.57±0.00 ^a	0.0001
C20:5n3	0.02±0.00 ^a	-	-	-	0.02±0.00 ^a	0.0001
C22:6n3	0.03±0.00 ^a	-	-	-	0.01±0.00 ^b	0.0001
SFA	36.63±0.02 ^b	0.03±0.00 ^e	24.09±0.03 ^c	23.13±0.04 ^d	39.35±0.02 ^a	0.0001
MUFA	53.03±0.02 ^a	0.05±0.01 ^e	28.06±0.00 ^c	27.99±0.00 ^d	49.29±0.03 ^b	0.0001
PUFA	4.07±0.02 ^d	0.12±0.00 ^e	48.94±0.02 ^a	48.42±0.02 ^b	6.15±0.02 ^c	0.0001

AI	0.48±0.01 ^b	0.86±0.04 ^a	0.24±0.00 ^c	0.23±0.00 ^c	0.53±0.00 ^b	0.0001
----	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	--------

^{a-c} Different superscript letters within the same row mean significantly different between treatments ($p < 0.05$).

SEM: standard error of the mean.

MFP=Myofibrillar protein, BMP= Beef Meat Patty, IHCMF= Imitated Hybrid Cultured Meat, PBMP=Plant Based Meat Patty, IHCMF CR= IHCMF+dry aged beef crust, SFA=Saturated fatty acids, MUFA=Monounsaturated fatty acids, PUFA=Polyunsaturated fatty acids, AI=Atherogenic index.

ACCEPTED




Fig 1. Flow diagram of patty preparation

BMP=Beef meat patty, MFP=Myofibrillar protein, IHCMP= Imitated Hybrid Cultured Meat patty, PBMP=Plant Based Meat Patty, IHCMP+Crust= IHCMP+dry aged beef crust, TVP= Textured Vegetable Protein, SPI= Soy Protein Isolate, PPI= Pea Protein Isolate, GCP= Ground chickpea




Fig 2. Textural profile analysis of patties.

^{a-e} Different superscript letters within the same row mean significantly different between treatments ($p < 0.05$).

MFP=Myofibrillar protein, BMP= Beef Meat Patty, IHCMP= Imitated Hybrid Cultured Meat, PBMP=Plant Based Meat Patty, IHCMP CR= IHCMP+dry aged beef crust




Fig. 3. Physical appearance of patties.

MFP=Myofibrillar protein, BMP= Beef Meat Patty, IHCM= Imitated Hybrid Cultured Meat, PBMP=Plant Based Meat Patty, IHCMPCR= IHCM+dry aged beef crust




Fig. 4. Sensory panel feedback on the HBM patties.

MFP=Myofibrillar protein, BMP= Beef Meat Patty, IHCMP= Imitated Hybrid Cultured Meat, PBMP=Plant Based Meat Patty, IHCMP CR= IHCMP+dry aged beef crust




Fig. 5. Electronic tongue sensor response (mV) values from patties.

^{a-c} Different superscript letters within the same row mean significantly different between treatments ($p < 0.05$).

MFP=Myofibrillar protein, BMP= Beef Meat Patty, IHCMP= Imitated Hybrid Cultured Meat, PBMP=Plant Based Meat Patty, IHCMP CR= IHCMP+dry aged beef crust




Fig 6. Heat map showing correlation between patties according to fatty acid profile. MFP=Myofibrillar protein, BMP= Beef Meat Patty, IHCMP= Imitated Hybrid Cultured Meat, PBMP=Plant Based Meat Patty, IHCMP CR= IHCMP+dry aged beef crust




Fig 7. A. Principal component analysis score plot to differentiate sample groups based on the physicochemical, textural, and taste compounds.

B. PCA biplot showing the relationship among the parameters responsible for making separate clusters among the patties.

C. VIP scores showing the relative importance of the corresponding parameters

MFP=Myofibrillar protein, BMP= Beef Meat Patty, IHCMP= Imitated Hybrid Cultured Meat, PBMP=Plant Based Meat Patty, IHCMP CR= IHCMP+dry aged beef crust

ACCEPTED

Supplemental Table 1

Parameters	BMP	MFP	IHCMP	PBMP	IHCMPCR	P Value
Hardness	66.59±0.46a	52.89±0.44b	44.79±0.40c	36.30±0.92d	54.16±0.74b	0.0001
Guminess	13.47±0.08a	9.63±0.10c	9.04±0.06d	3.79±0.04e	10.57±0.09b	0.0001
Cohesiveness	0.51±0.01a	0.43±0.01b	0.41±0.01b	0.36±0.00c	0.51±0.01a	0.0001
Chewiness	6.01±0.16a	3.31±0.11d	3.86±0.04c	2.11±0.02e	4.99±0.13b	0.0001
Springiness	0.46±0.01a	0.28±0.01c	0.24±0.00d	0.19±0.02e	0.33±0.01b	0.0001

ACCEPTED