

# **Animal performance, carcass traits and meat characteristics of Assaf and Merino × Assaf growing lambs**

A.B. Rodríguez, R. Bodas<sup>\*</sup>, R. Landa, Ó. López-Campos, A.R. Mantecón, F.J.  
Giráldez

Instituto de Ganadería de Montaña (CSIC-ULE), Finca Marzanas, 24346 Grulleros, León  
(Spain)

---

\* Corresponding author: Raúl Bodas

E-mail address: raul.bodas@eae.csic.es

Tel: +34 987 317 156; Fax: +34 987 317 161

1 **Abstract**

2 This study was conducted to compare the growth, carcass and meat quality of light, intensively  
3 reared Assaf and crossbred Merino × Assaf lambs. Twelve Assaf and twelve Merino × Assaf lambs  
4 of both sexes were intensively reared from weaning until they reached 20 kg Live Body Weight  
5 (LBW). Crossbreeding improved both daily weight gain ( $P<0.01$ ) and feed conversion ( $P<0.001$ ),  
6 resulting in a reduction in accumulative dry matter consumption ( $P<0.05$ ).

7 Carcass conformation was also improved by crossbreeding, although commercial cut category  
8 differences ( $P>0.05$ ) were not observed. Carcass ( $P<0.10$ ) and shoulder fat content ( $P<0.01$ ) were  
9 breed dependent, with Assaf lambs yielding the highest values. Assaf lambs also displayed lower  
10 24h pH ( $P<0.01$ ) and greater  $L^*$  values ( $P<0.05$ ) than the Merino × Assaf crossbreeds, but other,  
11 equally important parameters, such as cooking losses or shear force, were not breed dependent.

12 Females showed smaller weight gains ( $P<0.05$ ) and higher feed conversion ( $P<0.01$ ), due to  
13 differences in gain composition. Furthermore, internal ( $P<0.01$ ) and shoulder fat ( $P<0.01$ ) weights  
14 were higher in females. Sex dependent differences in meat quality were also related to meat fat  
15 content, with females yielding the highest values ( $P<0.01$ ).

16 Raising Merino × Assaf lambs to a weight between suckling and fattening categories could avoid  
17 the seasonality problem in current suckling lamb production, by improving productive parameters  
18 such as growth or conformation.

19

20 **Keywords:** Breed, sex, light intensive lambs, carcass, meat quality, Merino, Assaf.

21

22

## 23 **1. Introduction**

24 In Mediterranean countries, dairy sheep production is based on milk breeds, and lambs are normally  
25 slaughtered between 10 and 12 kg live body weight (LBW). Suckling lamb meat is a valuable  
26 commodity, which, due to its seasonal nature, can reach elevated prices during certain periods of the  
27 year.

28 It is well known that carcass weight is the most relevant parameter influencing the value of the  
29 carcass (Beriain et al., 2000). In fact, because of its economic importance; differences in prices  
30 between weight categories fluctuate throughout the year, and are more pronounced in certain  
31 months of the year, when lamb production is scarce. As previously reported, during these months of  
32 lamb production scarcity, it is possible to slaughter lambs heavier than 10-12 kg in order to break  
33 with seasonal lamb production, without resulting in significant economic damage (Sañudo et al.,  
34 1992).

35 Intensive lamb rearing after weaning is a common practice for meat breeds, but not for dairy breeds.  
36 Generally, dairy breeds mature earlier and their precocious fatness results in slaughter at lighter  
37 weights; *i.e.* as suckling lambs. Crossing meat breeds with dairy breeds and slaughtering at heavier  
38 weights would be an attractive alternative to both complement milk production and reduce the  
39 seasonality of farm income. These crossbreeds could also enhance the added value of the carcasses,  
40 by increasing their weight and reducing fat content. Moreover, in order to ensure a high water  
41 content and enhance juiciness, suckling lamb meat is traditionally oven-roasted (Cross et al., 1979).  
42 Raising lambs past the suckling age would allow for other cooking methods to be employed, while  
43 maintaining meat juiciness and tenderness; the ability to prepare lamb meat in multiple ways could  
44 broaden its marketability.

45 To date, studies in the literature concerning Assaf lamb feed intake, growth, carcass and meat  
46 quality have involved either suckling lambs (Landa et al., 2004; Rodríguez et al., 2008) or 25 kg  
47 fattening lambs (Rodríguez et al., 2008). To the best of our knowledge, very little information exists

48 in the literature about carcass and meat quality in light, intensively reared Assaf lambs, or their  
49 crosses, at weights between suckling and fattening; *i.e.* the lamb weight Mediterranean area  
50 consumers prefer (Sañudo et al., 2007).

51 Considering these arguments, the present study was conducted to evaluate the growth, carcass and  
52 meat quality of Assaf and Merino × Assaf light lambs, when intensively reared to a weight between  
53 a suckling and fattened lamb.

## 54 **2. Material and Methods**

### 55 *2.1. Animals and diets*

56 Twenty four lambs ( $14.4 \pm 0.09$  kg LBW), 12 Assaf (6 intact males and 6 females) and 12 Merino ×  
57 Assaf (6 intact males and 6 females) were used. Lambs were distributed according to breed and sex  
58 in a 2 x 2 factorial design. All lambs were kept with their mothers until weaning (12 kg LBW and 6  
59 weeks of age). After weaning they were dewormed by Ivomec (Merial Labs., Spain) administration  
60 and vaccinated against enterotoxaemia (Miloxan, Merial Labs., Spain). All animal handling  
61 practices followed the recommendations of European Council Directive 86/609/EEC for the  
62 protection of animals used for experimental and other scientific purposes, and all animals were able  
63 to see and hear other sheep.

### 64 *2.2. Experimental procedures*

65 All animals were individually housed in 1.5 × 1.5 m floor pens, in a naturally ventilated animal  
66 house and remained there until slaughter. All animals received a pellet concentrate (70% barley,  
67 22% soybean meal, 4.8% wheat and 3.2% vitamin and mineral mixture; chemical composition: 898  
68 g DM/kg, 166 g CP/kg DM, 163 g NDF/kg DM, 99 g ash/kg DM) and barley straw (910 g DM/kg,  
69 35 g CP/kg DM, 813 g NDF/kg DM, 47 g ash/kg DM) for consumption *ad libitum*.

70 All lambs received experimental feeds *ad libitum* and separately once a day at 9:00 in the morning.  
71 The amount of feed offered permitted refusal of between 15 and 20% of the previous maximum  
72 intake. The amount of feed offered and refused was weighed daily and samples were collected for  
73 chemical analyses. LBW was recorded three times per week, before morning feeding. Lambs were

74 slaughtered when they reached 20 kg LBW. Slaughter was carried out by stunning and  
75 desanguination via the jugular vein. Lambs were then sheared, skinned and eviscerated. The body  
76 of each lamb was separated into carcass and non-carcass parts.

### 77 2.3. Carcass and non-carcass characteristics

78 Weights of the different parts of the non-carcasses were recorded. Red offal contained the heart,  
79 lungs, spleen, and either udder or penis in the case of females and males, respectively. White offal  
80 comprised the empty digestive tract. Non-carcass components, aside from wool and blood, were  
81 minced, mixed and homogenised in a commercial blender, and samples were taken and stored at -30  
82 °C, then lyophilised (FTS-Lyostar, United States) for chemical analysis.

83 Carcasses contained kidneys, thymus, testicles and the kidney knob and channel fat. The carcass  
84 was weighed before and after chilling at 4 °C for 24 h. The dressing percentage was calculated as  
85 the cold carcass weight (CCW), expressed as a proportion of the slaughter weight. Linear  
86 measurements were determined following the procedure of Colomer-Rocher *et al.* (1988). The  
87 carcass compactness index was calculated by dividing the CCW by the carcass external length and  
88 the leg compactness index was calculated by dividing the buttock width by the pelvic limb length.  
89 The left sides were separated into commercial joints as described by Colomer-Rocher *et al.* (1988).  
90 Legs, ribs and fore ribs comprised the higher priced joints; shoulders comprised the medium priced  
91 joints, and the lower priced joints included breasts, necks and tails. Shoulders were dissected as  
92 described by Fisher & De Boer (1994). The right sides containing the tail were minced, mixed, and  
93 homogenised as described for the non-carcass samples for chemical analysis.

### 94 2.4. Meat characteristics

95 Measurements for meat characteristics were conducted on the left side of the carcass. *Longissimus*  
96 *thoracis* muscle pH was measured at 24 h using a pH meter equipped with a penetrating glass  
97 electrode (Metrohm<sup>®</sup> 704 pHmeter, Switzerland). Muscle colour measurements were carried out  
98 using a chromatometer (Minolta<sup>®</sup> Croma Meter 2002, Germany) equipped with a D65 illuminant  
99 and 10° observer. Muscle areas at the 13th rib were drawn on a transparent film and their surface

100 areas were measured (AreaMeter® MK2, Holland). Muscles were then removed from the carcass,  
101 vacuum packed and stored at -30 °C until analysis. *Longissimus thoracis* were allowed to thaw for  
102 24 hours at 4 °C, and then placed in plastic bags in a 75 °C water bath until they reached an internal  
103 temperature of 70 °C. Cooking loss percentages were calculated according to the initial weight.  
104 From each lamb, eight 1×1×2 cm cores along the fibre direction were used for measuring the  
105 Warner Bratzler shear force (Texture Analyser® TA.XT2, Great Britain), with a crosshead speed of  
106 5 mm/s. *Longissimus lumborum* was lyophilised, minced and homogenised for chemical analysis.

### 107 2.5. Analytical procedures

108 Procedures outlined by the AOAC (2003) were used to measure dry matter (DM, method ID  
109 934.01), ash (method ID 942.05) and Kjeldahl N (CP, method ID 976.06) in experimental feed  
110 samples. Neutral detergent fibre (NDF) was determined as described in Van Soest *et al.* (1991),  
111 using sodium sulphite in the neutral detergent solution. Commercial concentrate NDF was assessed  
112 using alpha-amylase.

113 Non-carcass, carcass and *longissimus lumborum* samples were analysed for dry matter (DM,  
114 method ID 950.46), ash (method ID 920.153), Kjeldahl N (CP, method ID 981.10) and crude fat  
115 content (method ID 960.39).

### 116 2.6. Calculations and statistical analyses

117 Average daily gain was determined using the REG procedure (SAS, 2004). Data on dry matter  
118 intake and growth, as well as non-carcass, carcass and meat parameters were analysed using the  
119 GLM (General Linear Models) procedure implemented in the SAS package (SAS, 2004). Mean  
120 separation for statistical significance ( $P < 0.05$ ) was carried out using the PDIF procedure (SAS,  
121 2004).

## 122 3. Results

### 123 3.1. Feed intake and changes in live body weight

124 Cumulative feed intake was significantly affected by both sex and breed ( $P < 0.05$ ), averaging 16.8  
125 and 14.3 kg for Assaf vs. Merino × Assaf lambs and 17.3 and 14.1 kg for females vs. males,

126 respectively (Table 1). Nevertheless, no statistically significant breed dependence on daily feed  
127 intake was observed ( $P>0.10$ ), with mean values measured to be 703 and 667 g/day for Assaf vs.  
128 Merino  $\times$  Assaf lambs, respectively. However, average barley straw intake was affected by both  
129 breed ( $P<0.001$ ) and the interaction between sex and breed. Specifically, male Merino  $\times$  Assaf  
130 lambs had a lower average barley straw intake (12.7 g/day), whereas male Assaf lambs averaged  
131 higher values (32.7 g/day). In contrast, female lambs of both breeds displayed intermediate values  
132 (28.4 vs. 23.0 g/day for Merino  $\times$  Assaf vs. Assaf, respectively).

133 Table 1 contains mean values for daily weight gain and feed conversion ratio Daily weight gain  
134 ( $P<0.001$ ) and feed conversion ratios ( $P<0.01$ ) showed significant breed dependent differences.  
135 Higher average daily weight gains (224 vs. 299 g/d) and lower feed conversion values (3.1 vs. 2.4 g  
136 DMI/g ADG) were observed in Merino  $\times$  Assaf lamb breeds. Sex significantly affected both  
137 parameters, with males averaging higher daily weight gains ( $P>0.05$ ) and lower feed conversion  
138 values ( $P>0.01$ ) compared to females.

139 (insert Table 1 here)

### 140 3.2. *Non-carcass characteristics*

141 Non-carcass weight ( $P<0.01$ , Table 2) was also breed dependent. Specifically, head and hide  
142 weights ( $P<0.001$ ), wool ( $P<0.001$ ) and total digestive fat deposits ( $P<0.05$ ) were greater in Assaf  
143 lambs. In addition, female lambs yielded significantly greater wool weight values and digestive fat  
144 content than male lambs ( $P<0.01$ ). Non-carcass component crude fat and water content were also  
145 significantly different between Assaf and Merino  $\times$  Assaf breeds ( $P<0.01$ ); higher crude fat and  
146 lower water content was observed in the Assaf breed. Sex dependent effects were also observed for  
147 both parameters, with female lambs yielding greater crude fat and lower water content than male  
148 lambs ( $P<0.05$ ).

149 (insert Table 2 here)

### 150 3.3. *Carcass characteristics*

151 Carcass performance, linear morphology, commercial cut category percentages, shoulder tissue  
152 composition and chemical composition are presented in Tables 3 and 4. Cold carcass weight  
153 indicates a statistically significant interaction between the main effects ( $P<0.05$ ), with female Assaf  
154 lambs yielding the highest values. Sex significantly affected dressing percentages, and the greatest  
155 values were found in females (47.8 %) vs. males (46.4 %) ( $P<0.05$ ). Refrigeration losses were  
156 significantly lower in the Assaf breed than in the Merino  $\times$  Assaf breed ( $P<0.001$ ).

157 (insert Table 3 here)

158 Carcass linear measures were breed dependent. Buttocks were wider ( $P<0.05$ ) and carcasses were  
159 larger ( $P<0.01$ ) in Assaf than in Merino  $\times$  Assaf lambs. Buttocks perimeters indicate an interaction  
160 between main effects ( $P<0.05$ ). For example, female Assaf lambs yielded higher values and Merino  
161  $\times$  Assaf lambs yielded lower values. Merino  $\times$  Assaf lambs were observed to have greater  
162 compactness index values ( $P<0.05$ ).

163 Although breed does not significantly affect the proportions of the three commercial cut categories  
164 ( $P>0.05$ ), sex dependent effects appeared to be statistically significant ( $P<0.10$ ) for the medium  
165 priced joints, with male carcasses yielding slightly higher percentages than females. However,  
166 Merino  $\times$  Assaf lambs did yield more muscle ( $P<0.05$ ) and lower subcutaneous fat proportions  
167 ( $P<0.001$ ) than Assaf lambs. Sex affected tissue composition. For example, female shoulders  
168 contained higher fat content, consisting mainly of subcutaneous fat ( $P<0.01$ ) and smaller bone  
169 proportions ( $P<0.001$ ) than males. Carcass composition was found to be breed dependent. A  
170 significant trend was observed in crude fat content per kilogram of carcass fresh matter ( $P<0.10$ );  
171 Assaf carcasses yielded higher values. Crude protein and ash content were greater in Merino  $\times$   
172 Assaf carcasses ( $P<0.05$ ). The effect of sex on carcass composition was only apparent with respect  
173 to water content ( $P<0.10$ ), however, although not statistically significant, female carcass fat content  
174 was measured to be 14% higher than in male carcasses.

175 (insert Table 4 here)

176 *3.4. Meat characteristics*

177 *Longissimus* meat quality parameters are shown in Table 5. Significant differences between breeds  
178 were recorded for 24 hours *Longissimus thoracis* pH measurements, with Merino × Assaf muscles  
179 having higher pH values. *Longissimus lumborum* ash content was also breed dependent. Assaf meat  
180 had greater ash content (P<0.001) than Merino × Assaf lamb meat. Sex only affected muscle  
181 chemical composition, mainly crude fat (P<0.01), with the highest values measured in female  
182 lambs.

183 (insert Table 5 here)

#### 184 **4. Discussion**

##### 185 *4.1. Feed intake and changes in live body weight*

186 With respect to feed consumption, as expected, the proportion of concentrate intake exceeded  
187 barley straw intake, (96.4 vs. 3.6%). Consumption of concentrate and barley straw was lower than  
188 that reported in several studies on Merino (Bodas *et al.*, 2007; Manso *et al.*, 1998) and Assaf  
189 (Fernández *et al.*, 2005) lambs. These differences are fundamentally due to the young age at which  
190 the lambs in the present study were slaughtered. Although significant differences in daily dry matter  
191 intake between breeds were not observed, in terms of cumulative intake, Merino × Assaf lambs  
192 required 17% less dry matter to reach higher body weights than Assaf lambs and consequently  
193 displayed better feed conversion efficiency. Differences in feed intake, growth and efficiency can  
194 be accounted for by breed variations in gain composition.

195 In a growth study using an Assaf and Merino Booroola crossbreed, Gootwine *et al.* (1993) reported  
196 similar average daily gain values after weaning to those measured in the present study. Males of  
197 both breeds grew faster than females. This fact can only be explained by differences in gain  
198 composition, because female carcasses contained more fat content than intact male carcasses. Data  
199 from this study confirms this approach, because most of the adipose tissues were larger in female  
200 lambs.

##### 201 *4.2. Non-carcass and carcass characteristics*

202 Breed dependent differences in fat content are associated with variations in feed efficiency (Notter  
203 et al., 1984). As mentioned above, the improved average daily body weight gain values and feed to  
204 gain ratios of Merino × Assaf lambs might be due to differences in body gain composition. In fact,  
205 Assaf lambs displayed greater digestive, carcass and non-carcass fat content than Merino × Assaf  
206 lambs and, in addition, these lambs developed proportionally more muscle than adipose tissue.

207 From an economic viewpoint, the carcass is the most valuable part of the animal, and at certain  
208 weights it can be largely breed dependent (Barone et al., 2007). Carcass weight, along with dressing  
209 percentages, depends on both fat and muscle content (Geay and Robelin, 1979). In this study, breed  
210 did not significantly affect cold carcass weights and dressing percentages, but numerically, Assaf  
211 female lambs tended to yield higher carcass weights. These differences might be related to adipose  
212 content and the fact that for the same average body weight, female Assaf lambs are physically  
213 bigger than the other three experimental groups, which is characteristic for this breed (Martínez et  
214 al., 1999). Moisture evaporation during chilling is responsible for carcass weight losses, and,  
215 according to Johnson *et al.* (1988), the greater carcass fat content in Assaf lambs compared to  
216 Merino × Assaf lambs could slow down moisture losses.

217 Carcass linear measurements underscore the generally accepted fact that Merino × Assaf carcasses  
218 have preferred conformations, because the external carcass length was lower and the carcass  
219 compactness index was higher. Despite morphological differences, the main commercial cut  
220 category percentages were not significantly breed dependent. Assaf is characterised as a fatty tailed  
221 breed, because significant quantities of fat are found in the tails (Gootwine et al., 2001). In fact, tail  
222 percentages in Assaf lamb carcasses were twice that of Merino × Assaf lambs, with values between  
223 0.87 and 3.96 % of the cold carcass weight. In any case, Merino × Assaf crossbreeding did yield  
224 percentages greater than 1.2% of the carcass weight. Differences in tail fatness have been observed  
225 by Kashan *et al.* (2005), who found 50% lower tail and 25% lower subcutaneous fat weights in the  
226 carcass, resulting only from crossing a fat tailed and leaner tailed breed, in an attempt to reduce the  
227 energetic cost of fat deposition. However, in contrast with results observed in the present study,

228 these authors did not report improvements in economically important traits such as feed conversion  
229 rates, average daily gain or lean meat content.

230 However, comparing carcass quartering results from the different procedures that have been carried  
231 out by diverse authors is complex. In contrast with results obtained by Rodríguez *et al.* (2008a),  
232 differences between sexes in carcass commercial cut categories were not observed, possibly due to  
233 the lower age of the lambs used in the present study. Other authors did not report sex related  
234 differences between commercial cuts for 15 kg LBW lambs (Pérez *et al.*, 2007). In terms of  
235 shoulder dissection, our data are similar to those obtained by Miguélez *et al.* (2006) in Castellana  
236 and Churra lambs.

237 Sex related differences in the dissected shoulder bone are due to physiological factors that induce  
238 males to grow faster and develop longer bones (Wylie *et al.*, 1997). In addition, adipose tissue  
239 differences were also measured, as previously discussed.

#### 240 4.3. Meat characteristics

241 In lamb consuming countries, consumer perceptions of meat quality are associated with both lamb  
242 breed and rearing system. For consumers, meat colour is on one of the most important parameters  
243 influencing purchase decisions. Pigment accumulation and chemical status are the main factors  
244 affecting meat colour, but, in addition, meat colour depends on diet (Priolo *et al.*, 2002), animal  
245 maturity (Moon *et al.* 2006) and differences in meat pH (Mancini and Hunt, 2005). Normal pH  
246 values 24 hours postmortem are between 5.4 and 5.7 (Warriss, 1990). In our study, *Longissimus*  
247 *thoracis* pHs values were in the normal range, and slight differences could be accounted for by  
248 differences in breed response to stressful conditions before slaughter. The importance of pH on  
249 meat quality has been previously noted by other authors, however, in this study, pH changes only  
250 affected some colour variables (such as lightness and yellowness), whose values were within the  
251 range of those reported in the literature (Sañudo *et al.*, 1992, Hopkins and Fogarty, 1998; Martínez-  
252 Cerezo *et al.*, 2005). Remaining parameters, such as water holding capacity or shear force did not  
253 significantly affect the results and were comparable to those reported by Sañudo *et al.* (1996) for

254 lambs reared under similar conditions. Martínez-Cerezo *et al.* (2005) also found differences in  
255 colour variables between breeds; however these and other authors (Sañudo *et al.*, 1996) pointed out  
256 that other colour variation sources, such as feed source or the length of fattening period (which  
257 could be the case in our study) might have a larger effect on colour parameters than breed. In any  
258 case, our results are in agreement with Solomon *et al.* (1980), Sañudo *et al.* (1992) and Hopkins and  
259 Fogarty (1998), who also reported a smaller breed dependence on most lamb meat quality  
260 parameters. Sex dependent effects on meat quality parameters were also not observed, with the  
261 exception of fat content, in agreement with Rodríguez *et al.* (2008 a,b) in studies on suckling and 25  
262 kg body weight Assaf lambs.

## 263 **5. Conclusions**

264 Sex dependent differences in average daily gain, feed conversion rates or dressing percentages can  
265 be explained by differences in gain composition that lead females to develop greater adipose tissue  
266 content than males. On the other hand, by crossbreeding Merino and Assaf breeds, the average daily  
267 gain, feed conversion and carcass conformation were improved, and the carcass and non-carcass fat  
268 content was reduced. Cold carcass weight was not breed dependent. However, at such low animal  
269 body weights and a fixed slaughter weight, adipose tissues might be relevant. Although economical  
270 issues should also be considered, data obtained in this study suggest that breed has a large effect on  
271 lamb performance, carcass and meat composition, which must be taken into account when planning  
272 commercial crossbreeds.

## 273 **6. Acknowledgements**

274 This work was supported by funds from FEDER (Project 1FD1997-1898) and Junta de Castilla y  
275 León (Project GR158). Raúl Bodas has a JAE-Doc contract from the CSIC under the programme  
276 “Junta para la Ampliación de Estudios”.

277

278 **References**

- 279 Barone, C.M.A., Colatruglio, P., Girolami, A., Matassino, D., Zullo, A., 2007. Genetic type, sex,  
280 age at slaughter and feeding system effects on carcass and cut composition in lambs. *Livest. Sci.*  
281 112, 133-142.
- 282 Beriain, M.J., Horcada, A., Purroy, A., Lizaso, G., Chasco, J., Mendizábal, J.A., 2000.  
283 Characteristics of Lacha and Rasa Aragonesa lambs slaughtered at three live weights. *J. Anim. Sci.*  
284 78, 3070-3077.
- 285 Bodas, R., Giráldez, F.J., López, S., Rodríguez, A.B., Mantecón, A.R., 2007. Inclusion of sugar  
286 beet pulp in cereal based diets for fattening lambs. *Small Ruminant Res.* 71, 250-254.
- 287 Colomer-Rocher, F., Morand-Fehr, P., Kirton, A.H., Delfa, R., Sierra Alfranca, I., 1988. Métodos  
288 normalizados para el estudio de los caracteres cuantitativos y cualitativos de las canales caprinas y  
289 ovinas. *Cuadernos del INIA*, 17, 19-41.
- 290 Cross, H.R., Stanfield, M.S., Elder, R.S., Smith, S., 1979. A comparison of roasting versus broiling  
291 on the sensory characteristics of beef longissimus steaks. *J. Food Sci.* 44, 1, 310-311.
- 292 Fernández, M., Giráldez, J., Frutos, P., Hervás, G., Mantecón, A.R., 2005. Effect of undegradable  
293 protein concentration in the post-weaning diet on body growth and reproductive development of  
294 Assaf rams. *Theriogenology* 63, 2206-2218.
- 295 Fisher A.V., de Boer H., 1994. The EAAP standard method of sheep carcass assessment. Carcass  
296 measurements and dissection procedures. Report of the EAAP Working Group on Carcass  
297 Evaluation, in cooperation with the CIHEAM Instituto Agronómico Mediterraneo of Zaragoza and  
298 the CEC Directorate General for Agriculture in Brussels. *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 38, 149-159.
- 299 Geay, Y., Robelin, J., 1979. Variation of meat production capacity in cattle due to genotype and  
300 level of feeding: genotype – nutrition interaction. *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 6, 263-276.
- 301 Gootwine, E., Bor, A., Braw-Tal, R., Zenou, A., 1993. Inheritance of birthweight and growth traits  
302 in crosses between the Booroola Merino and Assaf sheep breeds. *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 33, 119-126.

303 Gootwine, E., Zenu, A., Bor, A., Yossafi, S., Rosov, A., Pollott, G. E., 2001. Genetic and economic  
304 analysis of introgression the B allele of the FecB (Booroola) gene into the Awassi and Assaf dairy  
305 breeds. *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 71, 1, 49-58.

306 Johnson, R. D., Hunt, M. C., Allen, D. M., Kastner, C. L. Danler, R. J., Schrock, C. C., 1988.  
307 Moisture uptake during washing and spray chilling of holstein and beef-type steer carcasses. *J.*  
308 *Anim. Sci.* 66, 2180-2184.

309 Kashan, N.E.J., Manafi Azar, G.H., Afzalzadeh, A., Salehi, A., 2005. Growth performance and  
310 carcass quality of fattening lambs from fat-tailed and tailed sheep breeds. *Small Ruminant Res.* 60,  
311 267-271.

312 Hopkins, D.L., Fogarty, N.M., 1998. Diverse lamb genotypes. 2. Meat, pH, colour and tenderness.  
313 *Meat Sci.* 49, 4, 477-488.

314 Landa, R., Lavín, P., Frutos, P., Mantecón, A.R., Giráldez, F.J., 2004. Animal performance and  
315 carcass quality of milk-fed Assaf lambs. *Options Méditerranéennes*, 59, 85-89.

316 Martínez, R.S., Mantecón, A.R., Chico, M.D., Anel, L., Alvarez, M.M., Jurado, J.J., Díaz, C., Pérez  
317 J., Aparicio, N., 1999. Antecedentes históricos y bases de un programa de mejora genética y  
318 selección de la raza Assaf española. Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, pp. 37

319 Martínez-Cerezo, S., Sañudo, C., Panea, B., Medel, I., Delfa, R., Sierra, I., Beltrán, J.A., Cepero, R.,  
320 Olleta, J.L., 2005. Breed, slaughter weight and ageing time effects on physico-chemical  
321 characteristics of lamb meat. *Meat Sci.* 69, 325-333.

322 Mancini, R.A., Hunt, M.C., 2005. Current research in meat color. *Meat Sci.* 71, 1, 100-121.

323 Manso, T., Mantecón, A.R., Giraldez, F.J., Lavín, P., Castro, T., 1998. Animal performance and  
324 chemical body composition of lambs fed diets with different protein supplements. *Small Ruminant*  
325 *Res.* 29, 185-191.

326 Miguélez, E. Zumalacárregui, J.M., Osorio, M.T., Beteta, O., Mateo, J., 2006. Carcass  
327 characteristics of suckling lambs protected by the PGI “Lechazo de Castilla y León” European  
328 quality label: Effect of breed, sex and carcass weight. *Meat Sci.* 73, 82-89.

329 Moon, S.S., Yang, H.S., Park, G.B., Joo, S.T., 2006. The relationship of physiological maturity and  
330 marbling judged according to Korean grading system to meat quality traits of Hanwoo beef females.  
331 Meat Sci. 74, 516-521.

332 Notter, D. R., Ferrell, C. L., Field, R. A., 1984. Effects of breed and intake level on growth and feed  
333 efficiency in ram lambs. J. Anim. Sci. 58, 560-576

334 Pérez, P., Maino, M., Morales, M.S., Köbrich, C., Bardon, C., Pokniak, J., 2007. Gender and  
335 slaughter weights effects on carcass quality traits of suckling lambs from four different genotypes.  
336 Small Ruminant Res. 70, 124-130.

337 Priolo, A., Micol, D. Agabriel, J., Prache, S., Dransfield, E., 2002. Effect of grass or concentrate  
338 feeding systems on lamb carcass and meat quality. Meat Sci. 62, 179-185.

339 Rodríguez, A.B., Bodas, R., Prieto, N., Landa, R., Mantecón, A.R., Giráldez, F.J., 2008a. Effect of  
340 sex and feeding system on feed intake, growth, and meat and carcass characteristics of fattening  
341 Assaf lambs. Livest. Sci. 116, 118-125.

342 Rodríguez, A.B., Landa, R., Bodas, R., Prieto, N., Mantecón, A.R., Giráldez, F.J., 2008b. Carcass  
343 and meat quality of Assaf milk fed lambs: effect of rearing system and sex. Meat Sci. 80, 225-230.

344 Sañudo, C., Delfa, R., González, C., Alcalde, M.J., Casas, M., Santolaria, P., Vigil, E., 1992. Meat  
345 quality of young light lambs. ITEA 88A, 3, 221-227.

346 Sañudo, C., Alfonso, M., San Julián, R., Thorkelsson, G., Valdimarsdottir, T., Zygoiannis, D.,  
347 Stamataris, C., Piasentier, E., Mills, C., Berge, P., Dransfield, E., Nute, G.R., Enser, M., Fisher,  
348 A.V., 2007. Regional variation in the hedonic evaluation of lamb meat from diverse production  
349 systems by consumers in six European countries. Meat Sci. 75, 610-621.

350 Sañudo, C., Santolaria, M.P., María, G., Osorio, M., Sierra, I., 1996. Influence of carcass weight on  
351 instrumental and sensory lamb meat quality in intensive production systems. Meat Sci. 42, 195-202.

352 SAS, 2004. SAS Institute Inc., SAS® 9.1.2 Qualification Tools User's Guide, Cary, NC: SAS  
353 Institute Inc., 2004.

354 Solomon, M.B., Kemp, J.D., Moody, W.G., Ely, D.G., Fox, J.D., 1980. Effect of breed and  
355 slaughter weight on physical, chemical and organoleptic properties of lamb carcasses. *J. Anim. Sci.*  
356 51, 5, 1102-1107.

357 Wylie, A.R.G., Chestnutt, D.M.B., Kilpatrick, D.J., 1997. Growth and carcass characteristics of  
358 heavy slaughter weight lambs: effects of sire breed and sex of lamb and relationships to serum  
359 metabolites and IGF-1. *Anim. Sci.* 64, 309-318.

360

- 1 Table 1. Mean corresponding values for initial weight (kg), daily DMI (g/d), cumulative DMI (kg),  
 2 daily weight gain (g/d) and feed conversion rate (g DMI/g ADG)

	Assaf		Merino × Assaf		RSD	Significance level		
	Females	Males	Females	Males		B	S	B × S
Initial weight	14.4	14.4	14.3	14.4	0.37	ns	ns	ns
Daily DMI	708	627	708	699	91.8	ns	ns	ns
Cummulative DMI	18.8	14.8	15.5	13.4	2.71	*	*	ns
Daily weight gain	207	241	272	326	42.7	***	*	ns
Feed conversion	3.42	2.68	2.65	2.16	0.408	**	**	ns

- 3 RSD = residual standard deviation.

- 4 B: effect due to breed; S: effect due to sex; B × S: effect due to interaction.

- 5 ns, P>0.10; \* P<0.05; \*\*, P<0.01; \*\*\*, P<0.001.

6 Table 2. Mean values for non-carcass characteristics. Non-carcass weight (kg), non-carcass  
7 components (g) and chemical composition (g/kg) in the experimental treatments.

	Assaf		Merino × Assaf		RSD	Significance level		
	Females	Males	Females	Males		B	S	B × S
<i>Non-carcass weights</i>								
Non-carcass weight	8.37	8.21	7.34	8.01	0.800	**	ns	t
Blood	928	918	1010	1091	93.9	**	ns	ns
Wool	547	455	395	291	81.3	***	**	ns
Head and hide	3907 <sup>b</sup>	3894 <sup>b</sup>	3443 <sup>a</sup>	3586 <sup>ab</sup>	355.0	***	ns	t
Red offals	1171	1178	1074	1143	99.5	ns	ns	ns
White offals	1415	1463	1484	1628	178.4	ns	ns	ns
Total digestive fat	406	306	328	274	61.1	*	**	ns
<i>Non-carcass composition</i>								
Water	646	677	683	694	21.2	**	*	ns
Crude protein	179	171	172	174	7.6	ns	ns	ns
Crude fat	129	111	104	92	16.1	**	*	ns
Ash	32.9	29.7	30.0	31.4	2.92	ns	ns	t

8 RSD = residual standard deviation.

9 B: effect due to breed; S: effect due to sex; B × S: effect due to interaction.

10 ns, P>0.10; t, P<0.10; \* P<0.05; \*\*, P<0.01; \*\*\*, P<0.001.

11 <sup>a, b</sup> Different letters in the same line show significant differences when P value for interaction is <  
12 0.10.

13 Table 3. Mean values of carcass characteristics. Cold carcass weight (kg), dressing porcentaje (%),  
 14 chilling losses (%), carcass linear measurements (cm), carcass compactness index (g/cm) and leg  
 15 compactness (cm/cm), in the experimental treatments.

	Assaf		Merino × Assaf		RSD	Significance level		
	Females	Males	Females	Males		B	S	B × S
<i>Carcass characteristics</i>								
Cold carcass weight	9.75 <sup>b</sup>	9.37 <sup>a</sup>	9.34 <sup>a</sup>	9.49 <sup>a</sup>	0.289	ns	ns	*
Dressing percentage	48.7	46.5	46.8	46.4	1.27	t	*	ns
Chilling losses	2.32	2.31	2.71	2.77	0.200	***	ns	ns
Buttock perimeter	53.9 <sup>c</sup>	52.4 <sup>b</sup>	51.0 <sup>a</sup>	51.3 <sup>ab</sup>	0.95	***	ns	*
Buttock width	19.6	19.1	18.5	18.7	0.69	*	ns	ns
Carcass ext. length	61.9 <sup>b</sup>	59.1 <sup>a</sup>	57.2 <sup>a</sup>	58.3 <sup>a</sup>	2.22	**	ns	ns
Leg internal length	32.7	32.8	33.1	33.0	1.52	ns	ns	ns
Carcass compactness	158	159	164	163	5.5	*	ns	ns
Leg compactness	0.60	0.58	0.56	0.57	0.060	ns	ns	ns

16 RSD = residual standard deviation.

17 B: effect due to breed; S: effect due to sex; B × S: effect due to interaction.

18 ns, P>0.10; t, P<0.10; \* P<0.05; \*\*, P<0.01; \*\*\*, P<0.001.

19 <sup>a, b</sup> Different letters in the same line show significant differences when P value for interaction is <  
 20 0.05.

21

22 Table 4. Mean corresponding percentages of the different commercial categories, shoulder tissular  
 23 composition and chemical composition (g/kg) of the experimental treatments.

	Assaf		Merino × Assaf		RSD	Significance level		
	Females	Males	Females	Males		B	S	B × S
<i>Carcass commercial categories</i>								
Higher priced joints	58.0	58.0	58.7	58.0	1.51	ns	ns	ns
Medium priced joint	17.8	18.0	17.8	18.9	0.85	ns	t	ns
Lower priced joints	21.2	20.7	20.6	20.1	1.39	ns	ns	ns
<i>Shoulder tissular composition</i>								
Muscle	64.1	62.5	64.7	65.1	1.80	*	ns	t
Total fat	13.7	12.4	12.7	10.1	2.20	t	*	ns
Bone	19.1	21.0	19.4	20.8	1.56	ns	**	ns
Others	3.18	4.10	3.23	3.97	1.080	ns	t	ns
<i>Carcass composition</i>								
Water	622	641	635	655	23.2	ns	t	ns
Crude protein	168	167	173	173	5.5	*	ns	ns
Crude fat	161	150	145	121	29.9	t	ns	ns
Ash	41.6	39.8	38.0	37.9	2.66	*	ns	ns

24 RSD = residual standard deviation.

25 B: effect due to breed; S: effect due to sex; B × S: effect due to interaction.

26 ns, P>0.10; t, P<0.10; \* P<0.05; \*\*, P<0.01.

27 Table 5. Mean values for the *longissimus* muscle colorimetric parameters, pH, cooking losses (%),  
 28 WB shear force (N), area (cm<sup>2</sup>) and chemical composition (g/kg) of the experimental treatments.

	Assaf		Assaf x Merino		RSD	Significance level		
	Females	Males	Females	Males		B	S	B × S
<i>Longissimus thoracis muscle</i>								
Lightness (L*)	45.0	43.0	41.7	42.4	2.17	*	ns	ns
Redness (a*)	10.6	12.2	11.0	10.6	1.68	ns	ns	ns
Yellowness (b*)	6.25	6.78	5.36	5.66	1.380	t	ns	ns
pH 24 h	5.54	5.54	5.65	5.61	0.075	**	ns	ns
Cooking losses	12.0	13.5	12.6	13.8	2.38	ns	ns	ns
WB shear force	36.4	41.4	40.9	49.0	11.43	ns	ns	ns
Area 13 <sup>th</sup> toracic	12.3	10.7	11.6	12.0	1.65	ns	ns	ns
<i>Longissimus lumborum composition</i>								
Water	742	754	736	755	17.6	ns	*	ns
Crude protein	210	205	216	205	9.7	ns	t	ns
Crude fat	28.0	18.9	26.1	19.1	7.30	ns	**	ns
Ash	18.0	15.4	12.9	12.8	2.41	***	ns	ns

29 RSD = residual standard deviation.

30 B: effect due to breed; S: effect due to sex; B × S: effect due to interaction.

31 ns, P>0.10; t, P<0.10; \* P<0.05; \*\*, P<0.01; \*\*\*, P<0.001.

32