

**NUTRITIONAL AND ORGANOLEPTIC EVALUATION OF  
PRESERVED SARDINE UNDER NOVELTY PRESERVATIVE  
TECHNIQUES**



**BY  
A.J.M.RIKAS**



**DEPARTMENT OF BIOSYSTEMS THECHNOLOGY  
FACULTY OF TECHNOLOGY  
EASTERN UNIVERSITY  
SRI LANKA  
2021**

## ABSTRACT

Fish is one of the most important animal protein sources in the tropics and sardine is the popular name of a variety of tiny, oily forage fish in the *Clupeidae* family of herring sardine is a seasonal fish. Fish spoilage after the colour, flavour, texture, odour, and chemical composition of fish and these factors affect the nutritional quality, consumer acceptability, and commercial value of fish for fish preservation can delay or stop fish spoilage there are several methods of fish preservation. Marination is the process of immersing meats in a solution to allow flavor and texture to develop the final product Marination is a semi preservation method. However, sardine is a seasonal fish. It should be preserved to keep long period and increase the commercial value. Therefore a research study was conducted, to evaluate the physicochemical and sensory quality of marinated sardine 0 minutes, 30 minutes, 1 hour, 1.30 hours, 2 hours marinated period of sardine fish was evaluated at the laboratory, faculty of technology, Eastern University Sri Lanka

In this research study, five different time periods (T1, T2, T3, T4, T5 ) 0,30, 1, 1.30, 2) with control 0 minutes control T1 prepared fish samples were tested randomly (CRD) with three replications. After the preservation technique sensory evaluation was conducted, based on the scores, the most preferred was T4 (marinated for 1 hour 30 minutes. For the crude protein test analysis T1, T2, T3, T4, T5 got (14.5±0.214g, 14.493±0.215g, 14.477±0.218g, 14.465±0.216g, 14.448±0.216g) respectively. The results reveal that there was no significant difference in crude protein content over time among the five forms of treatments. For fat content T1 (3.7875±0.0962), T2 (3.7350±0.0968), T3 (3.7200±0.0917), T4 (3.7075±0.0923), and T5 (3.6975±0.0937). There is no significant difference in the fat content. This might be due to the transmission of the fat into the marinated solution.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	ii
LIST OF TABLES .....	vii
LIST OF FIGURES .....	viii
ABBREVIATION.....	ix
CHAPTER 01 .....	1
1.0 INTRODUCTION .....	1
CHAPTER 02 .....	5
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW .....	5
2.1 Fish Biology .....	5
2.2 Fish freshness quality .....	6
2.3 Fish spoilage.....	7
2.3.1 Autolytic enzymatic spoilage: .....	7
2.3.2 Oxidative spoilage: .....	8
2.3.3 Microbial spoilage: .....	9
2.4 Different methods Preservation.....	9
2.4.1 Freezing .....	10
2.4.2 Chilling .....	11
2.4.3 Smoking.....	11
2.4.4 Salting.....	12
2.4.5 Drying.....	13

2.4.6 Irradiation .....	14
2.4.7 Canning.....	14
2.5 Marination .....	15
2.6 Fish food quality assessment.....	17
2.6.1 Sensory quality assessment .....	17
CHAPTER 03 .....	19
3.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	19
3.1 Materials needed.....	19
3.2 Material collection.....	20
3.3 Preparation of preservation .....	20
3.4 Estimation of crude protein .....	21
3.4.1 Principle.....	21
3.4.2 Procedure .....	22
3.4.3 Calculation.....	22
3.5 Estimation of fat .....	23
3.5.1 Principle.....	23
3.5.2 Procedure .....	23
3.5.3 Calculation.....	24
3.6 Organoleptic evaluation .....	24
3.7 Serving sample preparation.....	25
3.8 Serving the sample .....	26
CHAPTER 04 .....	27

4.0 DISCUSSION .....	27
4.1 Analysis of crude protein content.....	27
4.2 Analysis of fat content.....	29
4.3 Organoleptic evaluation of preservative method .....	31
4.3.1 Color .....	31
4.3.2 Smell.....	33
4.3.3 Texture.....	34
4.3.4 Taste.....	35
4.3.5 Overall eating quality .....	37
CHAPTER 05 .....	40
CONCLUSION.....	40
REFERENCES .....	42

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 4. 1: Mean value for protein content.....	27
Table 4. 2: Mean value for fat content.....	29
Table 4. 3: Mean scores for colour preference.....	32
Table 4. 4: Mean scores for smell preference .....	33
Table 4. 5: Mean scores for texture preference.....	34
Table 4. 6: Mean scores for taste preference .....	36
Table 4. 7: Mean scores for overall eating quality.....	37

## LIST OF FIGURES

Fig 3. 1: Fish preparation with marinating ingredients .....	20
Fig 3. 2: Titration unit .....	21
Fig 3. 3: Digestion and distillation units .....	21
Fig 3. 4: End point of titration .....	21
Fig 3. 6: Fixed the extraction .....	23
Fig 3. 5: Extracted fat.....	23
Fig 3. 7: Arrangements for sensory evaluation of marinated sardine fish .....	25
Fig 4. 1: Changes of protein content at preservation condition .....	28
Fig 4. 2: Changes of fat content at preservation condition .....	30
Fig 4. 3: Comparison protien and fat content at different preservation condition ....	30
Fig 4. 4: Changes of coluor on preservation condition.....	32
Fig 4. 5: Changes of smell on preservation condition .....	34
Fig 4. 6: Changes of texture on preservation condition .....	35
Fig 4. 7: Changes of taste on preservation condition.....	36
Fig 4. 8: Changes of overall acceptability at preservation condition.....	38
Fig 4. 9: Comparison of organoleptic analysis of the fish at different preservation condition .....	39