

This journal paper 'Predictive models for the shelf life of Australian vacuum-packed beef and lamb: development and evaluation' is provided under Creative Commons Licence CC-BY-SA 4.0

For more information go to [www.mla.com.au/creative-commons](http://www.mla.com.au/creative-commons)

© Meat & Livestock Australia and The University of Tasmania

1 **Predictive models for the shelf life of Australian vacuum-packed beef**  
2 **and lamb: development and evaluation**

3

4 Chawalit Kocharunchitt<sup>a</sup>, Mandeep Kaur<sup>a</sup>, John Sumner<sup>a,b</sup>, Long Huynh<sup>b</sup>, John P. Bowman<sup>a</sup>,

5 Tom Ross<sup>a</sup>

6

7 <sup>a</sup>Centre for Food Safety and Innovation, Tasmanian Institute of Agriculture, University of

8 Tasmanian, Private Bag 54, Sandy Bay, Tasmania, Australia

9 <sup>b</sup>Meat & Livestock Australia, North Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

10

11 \*Corresponding author

12 Tom Ross

13 Tasmanian Institute of Agriculture,

14 University of Tasmania

15 College Road, Sandy Bay,

16 Hobart, Tasmania, 7005, Australia

17

18 Phone +61 3 6226 6382; email: [tom.ross@utas.edu.au](mailto:tom.ross@utas.edu.au)

19

20

21 **Abstract**

22 The Australian meat industry exports vacuum packed beef and lamb to more than one  
23 hundred markets, some of them involving containerised sea voyages of 40-50 days. On  
24 occasion, product may be subjected to temperature increase due to refrigeration problems,  
25 or to extended shipping times due to strikes or to delays in clearing the destination port, as  
26 happened in 2020 due to the Coronavirus pandemic. Such deviations in temperature and  
27 time have a pronounced effect on the shelf life of the consignment which, traditionally, has  
28 required sampling of the cargo for microbiological and sensory testing prior to making a  
29 disposition - adding to the loss of shelf life. In this study, we describes a predictive tool that  
30 provides rapid and accurate assessment of the product shelf life remaining for Australian  
31 vacuum packed beef and lamb cuts, based on their initial total bacterial count, and  
32 time:temperature parameters. The models were validated by independent data and have a  
33 bias factor of 1.02 and 0.90, and an accuracy factor of 1.10 and 1.11 when used for  
34 predicting the shelf life of beef and lamb cuts, respectively packed under vacuum. This  
35 indicates a good agreement between the observed and predicted shelf lives of VP and VSP  
36 cuts. The models will allow the Australian meat industry to manage their supply chains  
37 effectively and reliably to ensure high quality meat products with excellent shelf life.

38 **1. Introduction**

39           Since its first exports in 1880, Australia has developed a reputation for producing red  
40 meat with excellent shelf life, servicing markets, especially for chilled, vacuum-packed (VP)  
41 beef and lamb, to more than 100 countries (Small et al., 2012). Supply to distant markets  
42 means that Australian exporters are constantly challenged to minimise the loss of product  
43 quality (including shelf life) along different supply chains and to meet a wide range of shelf  
44 life-related specifications imposed by intended markets. For instance, China specifies a shelf  
45 life of 120 and 80 days from slaughter for vacuum packed beef and lamb/mutton cuts,  
46 respectively, while some Middle Eastern countries require at least 50% shelf life to remain  
47 when the consignment is landed (Huynh et al., 2016).

48           It has long been known that shelf life depends upon the degree of bacterial  
49 contamination at packing and the growth conditions: temperature, pH and oxygen  
50 permeability of the packaging film, of which temperature is considered the most important  
51 factor. Gill et al., (1988a) established the optimum temperature for storage of VP meat as -  
52  $1.5\pm 0.5^{\circ}\text{C}$ , and also showed that small rises in temperature reduce shelf life significantly: at  
53 temperatures of  $0^{\circ}$ ,  $2^{\circ}$  or  $5^{\circ}\text{C}$ , the storage life was reduced by about 30, 50 or 70%,  
54 respectively, compared with storage at  $-1.5^{\circ}\text{C}$  (Gill et al., 1988b). For supply to distant  
55 markets it has become customary for exporters to specify that the shipping container set-  
56 point is  $-1.5^{\circ}\text{C}$ .

57           Temperature abuse, defined by Mills et al., (2014) as warmer than  $5^{\circ}\text{C}$  during any  
58 stage of the cold chain, is onerous for the supplier, usually involves the need to evaluate the  
59 sensory and microbiological condition of the shipment in order to decide its disposition.  
60 Further, the time taken to unload the container, select and sample representative units,  
61 then await test results increases the likelihood that the contents might be deemed unfit for  
62 human consumption or to comply with importer specifications. A container of VP meat can  
63 have an insured value of USD200,000 and, as a means of improving the timeliness with  
64 which a disposition decision can be made, we propose a predictive model that rapidly and  
65 accurately predicts the remaining shelf-life of VP beef and sheep meat.

66           Previously, we assessed the microbiological and sensory qualities of VP beef and  
67 lamb cuts sourced from several Australian abattoirs through storage at temperatures  
68 ranging from  $0^{\circ}\text{C}$  to  $8^{\circ}\text{C}$  (Kaur et al., submitted for publication) in which it was found that  
69 total bacterial count and odour of the meat were suitable indicators for determining the  
70 shelf life of VP beef and lamb. Rates of quality deterioration as indicated by odour were  
71 found to correlate strongly with TVC growth rates across the storage temperature range,

72 with beef and lamb cuts showing different but consistently parallel rate values. These  
73 findings indicated the feasibility of developing models for separately predicting the shelf-life  
74 of VP beef and lamb based on the growth of microorganisms and of presence of persistent  
75 odour as a function of temperature. To this end, we developed predictive models for the  
76 shelf life of Australian VP beef and lamb primals that encompass and extend from the results  
77 and models of Kaur et al., (submitted for publication). A number of previously published  
78 work datasets were used and supply chain trials conducted to evaluate the performance of  
79 the developed models in both simulated and real commercial supply chains.

80

## 81 **2. Materials and methods**

### 82 *2.1 Model development*

#### 83 *2.1.1 TVC growth models*

84 Data for specific growth rates of total bacterial count (TVC) on VP beef and lamb  
85 sourced from Australian abattoirs at different storage temperatures (ranging from 0°C to  
86 8°C) were obtained from Kaur et al. (submitted for publication). To describe the effects of  
87 storage temperature on the rates of TVC growth, linear regression analysis was performed  
88 for each meat type (Ratkowsky et al., 1982) and the following model derived:

$$89 \quad \sqrt{\mu_{TVC}} = (a \times T) + b \quad (1)$$

90 where  $\mu_{TVC}$  is the specific growth rate of TVC (in hours);  $a$  is the slope of the regression line;  $T$   
91 is the temperature at which meat is stored (°C); and  $b$  is the regression coefficient. From  
92 Equation (1), the theoretical minimum temperature for TVC growth on VP beef and lamb  
93 was estimated by extrapolation of the regression line to  $\sqrt{\mu_{TVC}} = 0$ .

94

#### 95 *2.1.2 Shelf life models*

96 With the parameters obtained from Equation (1), shelf life could be predicted on the  
97 basis that spoilage of VP meat is mainly caused by microorganisms (Gill & Newton, 1979).

98 Equation (1) can then be expressed as:

$$99 \quad SL = \left[ \frac{1}{a \times (T - T_{\min})} \right]^2 \quad (2)$$

100 where  $SL$  is the shelf life of VP primals (days);  $a$  is the slope of the regression line that  
101 corresponds to  $a$  in Equation (1);  $T$  is the temperature at which meat is stored (°C); and  $T_{\min}$   
102 is the minimum temperature where the rate of TVC growth is zero (*i.e.*, from Equation (1)).  
103 However, to account for the shelf life of Australian VP beef and lamb primals under ideal  
104 storage conditions as established by industry and research data (Phillips et al., 2012; Sumner

105 & Jenson, 2011) Equation (2) was modified to calibrate to the established shelf life of VP  
106 meat and is given as follows:

$$107 \quad SL = \left[ \frac{1}{a \times (T - T_{\min})} - c \right]^2 \quad (3)$$

108 where  $c$  is a factor that enables calibration to the established shelf life of VP beef and lamb.  
109 Equation (3) was further modified to predict the remaining shelf life by accounting for the  
110 observed initial TVC (at the time of packaging). This was achieved by calculating a correction  
111 factor that considers the established data for the initial TVC and the calculated TVC at the  
112 time of spoilage (Phillips et al., 2012; Sumner and Jenson, 2011). This correction factor was  
113 then incorporated to Equation (3) to predict the remaining shelf life ( $SL_{\text{remaining}}$ ; day).

$$114 \quad SL_{\text{remaining}} = \left[ \frac{N_0 - (N_{\text{obs}}) + N_s}{N_s} \right] \times \left[ \frac{1}{a \times (T - T_{\min})} - c \right]^2 \quad (4)$$

115 where  $N_0$  is the initial TVC based on the established data of Phillips et al., 2012 (log  
116 CFU/cm<sup>2</sup>);  $N_{\text{obs}}$  is the observed initial TVC (log CFU/cm<sup>2</sup>); and  $N_s$  is the nominal population  
117 level on VP beef and lamb at the time of spoilage (log CFU/cm<sup>2</sup>). The  $N_s$  value was estimated  
118 by extrapolation of the regression line of TVC data to the time at which spoilage occurs  
119 (Phillips et al., 2012; Sumner & Jenson, 2011).

120

### 121 *2.1.3 Production of a model interface*

122 Based on the developed Equations (1) and (4), a model interface was produced in  
123 MS<sup>®</sup> Excel 2016 to predict the growth of TVC and the remaining shelf life of VP beef and  
124 lamb primals.

125

## 126 *2.2 Validation of the developed models in commercial and simulated supply chains*

### 127 *2.2.1 Previous shelf-life trials*

128 Relevant data for initial TVC, average storage temperature and observed shelf-life  
129 were collated from studies previously reported by Sakai et al., (submitted for publication) for  
130 VP beef, and Kaur et al., (2017) for VP lamb. Altogether, these studies provide 11  
131 time:temperature based datasets for the shelf-life of Australian VP primals stored under  
132 either constant or dynamic temperatures.

133

### 134 *2.2.2 Lamb primals, Australia- Middle East*

135 The shelf-life of various lamb products was evaluated in a commercial supply chain.  
136 Lamb racks, boneless legs and bone-in legs were vacuum-packed, cartoned and shipped by  
137 sea from Australia to Bahrain where they were stored at approximately 0°C throughout the  
138 trials.

139 All trials were conducted with triplicate samples. The time:temperature profile of  
140 the samples was recorded by data loggers (TG-4080 Hastings Data Loggers, Australia) from  
141 an abattoir to storage in Bahrain. -

142

### 143 *2.2.3 Beef primals and cuts, simulated trial Australia*

144 A series of shelf-life trials were conducted at a beef processing plant in Brisbane,  
145 Australia to determine the shelf-life of various types of commercial products in a simulated  
146 domestic supply chain. These included VP rump roast with three ageing regimes (5, 20 and  
147 69 days), and vacuum-skin-packed (VSP) rump streaks produced from VP primals after  
148 ageing for different durations product (30 and 57 days).

149 In a simulated supply chain, rump primals or roasts were aged in VP (at  
150 approximately 0°C) for different durations. Both aged and non-aged products, except for VP  
151 rump roast were cut into steaks and packed in different packaging systems as appropriate.  
152 All products were then subjected to different steps in a simulated supply chain: transferring  
153 to and storing in a distribution centre storage, and transferring to a retail display for  
154 different durations and at different temperatures as experienced in a domestic supply chain.  
155 In addition, conditions that simulate consumer's practices e.g. consumers home journey and  
156 storage in their fridge were included.

157 Each trial was conducted with at least triplicate samples. The time:temperature  
158 profile of the samples was monitored through the trials using five data loggers (TG-4080  
159 Hastings Data Loggers, Australia).

160

### 161 *2.2.4 Quality assessment*

162 An appropriate number of packs of each product types (beef and lamb) were  
163 assessed on the day of packing and throughout the supply chain for sensory evaluation  
164 and/or microbiological analysis (total viable counts, TVC).

165

#### 166 *2.2.4.1 Sensory analysis*

167 At each sampling point, each pack of samples was evaluated for its odour attribute  
168 by a trained sensory panel comprising of at least five members. Specifically, packs were  
169 opened and left for 10 min before panellists assessed their odour sensory quality.  
170 Assessment of odour was based on a 3-point categorical hedonic scale as follows: 0 = strong  
171 sour odour/off odour; 1 = moderate sour odour/moderate off odour; and 2 = fresh meat  
172 odour/very slight sour odour.

173 *2.2.4.2 Microbiological analysis*

174 Enumeration of total bacteria was performed on cuts at the time of vacuum packing.  
175 For beef samples a surface section from the longest length of the cut was aseptically excised  
176 ( $25 \pm 2.5$  g). Meat pieces were combined with 225 ml of buffered peptone water (BPW,  
177 CM1049, Oxoid Ltd., Australia) in a sterile stomacher bag and stomached for 1 min. Serial  
178 dilutions were prepared as necessary in BPW as required and aliquots (0.1 ml) of plated onto  
179 the surface of Tryptone Soy agar (TSA, CM0129, Oxoid Ltd., Australia).

180 For lamb samples, a surface area measuring  $200 \text{ cm}^2$  was swabbed with a sterile  
181 sponge (Whirl-Pak Speci-Sponge, Nasco, USA), prewetted with 25 ml of Phosphate Buffer  
182 Saline (BR0014G, Oxoid Ltd., Australia). Swabs were hand massaged in the sample bags for  
183 30 seconds to release the bacteria into suspension. Suspension (1 ml) was serially diluted in  
184 0.1% bacteriological peptone water (LP0037, Oxoid Ltd., Australia) as required and aliquots  
185 plated onto Petrifilm aerobic count plates (3M Microbiology Products, St. Paul, MN)  
186 according to the manufacturer's instruction.

187 TSA and Petrifilm plates were incubated at  $20 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$  for 5 days aerobically, colonies  
188 were counted and reported as the mean log CFU/g or log CFU/cm<sup>2</sup> of the replicates ( $\pm$   
189 standard deviation).

190

191 *2.2.5 Determination of the shelf life*

192 The shelf-life of each product type was determined from odour assessments  
193 described above. Specifically, products that were rated as 'marginal – smell off' were  
194 considered as commercially unacceptable and the time taken to reach that endpoint was  
195 recorded as the shelf life of the product. Due to the variability of product characteristics  
196 even within the same trial, the shelf life was determined when at least one of the replicates  
197 were rated as unacceptable at any given time point and subsequent time points.

198

199 *2.2.6 Comparison between observed and predicted growth*

200 The shelf-life of each product type were estimated using the developed predictive  
201 models based on initial TVC, and time:temperature history in the supply chain.

202 The performance of the developed models to predict the shelf-lives of VP red meat was  
203 evaluated using the methods described by Ross (1996). Bias and accuracy factors for the  
204 models were calculated from observed and predicted shelf lives (days) of each meat type.

205 **3. Results and Discussion**

206           There have been several models developed to predict the shelf life of particular  
207 products, most of which have remained a research tool rather than an effective industrial  
208 application. This is mainly because: i) the models were based on observations in well-  
209 controlled laboratory environments with microbiological media rather than complex food  
210 environments such as on meat; and ii) mode models validated under static temperature  
211 conditions rather than temperature fluctuations as occur during storage and distribution of  
212 foods (McDonald & Sun, 1999).

213           To develop effective spoilage models for Australian VP primals, a comprehensive  
214 study was conducted to determine the microbiological and sensory qualities of meat as they  
215 relate to spoilage (Kaur et al., submitted for publication). That study, congruent with  
216 previous studies, indicated a robust temperature dependency of spoilage rates of VP beef  
217 and lamb primals as reflected by the different rates of microbial growth (Gill et al., 1988b;  
218 Kaur et al., 2017; Sumner & Jenson, 2011). However, due to differences in meat  
219 biochemistry (especially glycogen and lactic acid contents), beef (pH 5.5-5.8) tends to have a  
220 lower pH than lamb (pH 5.6-6.8) (Carse & Locker, 1974). Such differences affect the growth  
221 of bacteria, with growth rates being faster on VP lamb than VP beef, with consequential  
222 effects on shelf life, necessitating the development of two independent models to predict  
223 the shelf life of each through the supply chain.

224

225 *3.1 Development of predictive models for the shelf-life of Australia VP primals*

226           Using the relevant data of Kaur et al, (submitted for publication), we applied the  
227 square root model of Ratkowsky et al., (1982) to describe the effects of storage temperature  
228 on the rates of TVC growth on VP beef and lamb in accordance with Equation (1). Table 1  
229 shows the model parameters for different meat types. As expected, these parameters ( $a$  and  
230  $T_{min}$ ) differ between meat types, reflecting the differences in their biochemistry (*i.e.*, meat  
231 pH as described above).

232           With the parameters ( $a$  and  $T_{min}$ ) obtained above, predictive models for the shelf life  
233 of VP beef and lamb were developed in accordance with Equation (2). However, such  
234 models could not be used to specifically predict the remaining shelf life of Australian VP  
235 meat (*i.e.*, as defined in Equation (4)). This requires a number of factors (*i.e.*,  $N_0$ ,  $N_s$ , and  $c$ ) to  
236 be determined based on previous data for the shelf life of VP meat produced in Australia. VP  
237 beef and lamb with the initial TVC of approximately 3.0 log CFU/cm<sup>2</sup> (*i.e.*  $N_0$ , the initial TVC)  
238 typically have an acceptable shelf life of 160 and 90 days when stored at -0.5°C, respectively,

239 as determined by odour assessment (Phillips et al., 2012; Sumner & Jenson, 2011). Using  
240 these values, the extrapolated  $N_s$  value was estimated to be 11.4 log CFU/cm<sup>2</sup> for beef and  
241 11.0 log CFUcm<sup>2</sup> or lamb, whereas the  $c$  value (the factor required for calibration to  
242 established shelf lives) was 0.21448 and 0.49728 for VP beef and lamb, respectively. These,  
243 taken together, allow Equation (4) to be 'calibrated' (after inclusion of correction factors) to  
244 predict the remaining shelf life of Australian VP beef (Equation (5)) and lamb (Equation (6))  
245 as follows:

$$246 \quad SL_{\text{remaining}} = \left[ \frac{3.0 - (N_{\text{expt}}) + 11.4}{11.4} \right] \times \left[ \frac{1}{0.01964 \times (T - -4.45861)} - 0.21448 \right]^2 \quad (5)$$

$$247 \quad SL_{\text{remaining}} = \left[ \frac{3.0 - (N_{\text{expt}}) + 11.0}{11.0} \right] \times \left[ \frac{1}{0.01986 \times (T - -5.54856)} - 0.49728 \right]^2 \quad (6)$$

248

249 The developed models were incorporated into a software tool (implemented in MS  
250 <sup>®</sup>Excel) that allows prediction of the growth of TVC and calculates the remaining shelf life of  
251 VP beef and lamb primals in cold chains, (see Supplementary File 1). To use this tool, the  
252 user selects the product type (beef or lamb), enters the starting TVC, and a  
253 time:temperature profile, typically collected by a temperature datalogger. The tool then  
254 predicts the TVC growth profile and remaining shelf life of the product based on assessment  
255 of predicted growth and odour kinetic responses.

256

### 257 *3.2 Shelf-life data for model validation*

258 In Table 2 are summarised the shelf-life data (n=11) obtained for various beef and  
259 lamb products in both simulated and actual commercial supply chain (*i.e.* at fluctuating  
260 temperatures) (Kaur et al., 2017; Sakai et al., submitted for publication). These include TVC  
261 at the time of packaging, average storage temperatures and the observed shelf lives. The  
262 data were then used to evaluate the performance of the developed models.

263 A series of trials was also conducted to provide additional data for the shelf life of  
264 Australian beef and lamb products in a commercial supply chain. In Table 3 are summarised  
265 the data for all product types (n=15), including TVC at the time of packaging, average storage  
266 temperature and the observed shelf lives (ranging from 37 to 85 days).

267

### 268 *3.4 Performance of predictive models*

269 The predictive models for VP beef and lamb shelf life were evaluated for their  
270 performance by comparison with independent data not used to generate the models. The  
271 MS <sup>®</sup>Excel-based tool as described above was then used to predict the shelf life of different

272 meat products based on their time:temperature history and initial microbial counts. The  
273 observed vs. predicted shelf lives (days) of each product are shown in Tables 2 and 3.

274 The bias and accuracy factor analyses of Ross (1996) were used to assess the  
275 performance of model predictions of shelf life compared with the observed data. Ross  
276 (1996) reported that the bias factor serves as a measurement index for the average variation  
277 between the predicted and observed values, whereas the accuracy factor is used to estimate  
278 the accuracy of an established model. Bias and accuracy factor values of 1 indicate a perfect  
279 agreement between observed and predicted values. In this study, the models were found to  
280 have a bias factor of 1.02 and 0.90, and an accuracy factor of 1.10 and 1.11 when used for  
281 predicting the shelf life of beef and lamb in VP and/or VSP, respectively. These observations  
282 indicate a good agreement between the observed and predicted shelf lives of VP and VSP  
283 cuts. The models systematically underpredict the shelf life of VP meats with approximately  
284 10% deviation, providing 'fail-safe' predictions, and it is noted that an over-prediction of  
285 time to spoilage was also noted by Albrecht et al., (2019), Bruckner et al., (2013) and Tang et  
286 al., (2013) for their shelf life predictive models for poultry and pork meat.

287 Development of the models here use the square root model of Ratkowsky et al.,  
288 (1982) to predict the remaining shelf life of VP meats, consistent with other studies  
289 indicating microbial spoilage of foods can be described by the square root model  
290 (Kreyenschmidt et al., 2010; Mataragas et al., 2006). However, it should be noted that, in  
291 contrast to those studies, the developed models provide shelf life predictions based on the  
292 growth of TVC rather than that of a specific group of organisms (collectively known as  
293 'specific spoilage organisms' or SSOs). This suggests that spoilage in VP meats might be  
294 facilitated by a complex phenomenon involving interactions among growing bacteria (*i.e.*, by  
295 community effects). Further investigation involving inoculation of specific bacteria into  
296 sterile meat to test for their spoilage capability is required to elucidate this.

297 From the above, the developed models were successfully validated to provide an accurate  
298 and reliable prediction of the shelf life of beef and lamb stored under vacuum packaging  
299 conditions. Such models can be readily adopted as a reliable decision-making tool in  
300 commercial supply chains for VP beef and lamb. This tool offers a cost-effective approach for  
301 the meat exporters to optimise and better understand their supply chains. Disposition of  
302 product affected by adverse events, such as temporary loss of refrigeration on the vessel or  
303 extended delivery times can be resolved speedily by using this tool.

304

305

#### 306 4. Conclusion

307 This study provides “ready-to-use” models for predicting the shelf life of VP primals. The  
308 models were well-validated by independent data from commercially available products in  
309 both simulated and commercial supply chains. The use of the models by the Australian meat  
310 industry has already led to effective management systems for optimising and monitoring  
311 meat quality. At the time of writing the Coronavirus emergency has resulted significant  
312 volumes of product landed in many countries requiring extended storage at the port. and  
313 the tool has provided both the exporter and importer with a confident estimate of the shelf  
314 life remaining.

315

#### 316 5. Acknowledgments

317 This work was funded by Meat & Livestock Australia (MLA) and Australian Meat Processor  
318 Corporation (AMPC) (project no. G.MFS.0289). The support and guidance of Dr. Ian Jenson  
319 (MLA) is gratefully acknowledged.

320

#### 321 6. References

- 322 Albrecht, A., Ibal, R., Raab, V., Reichstein, W., Haarer, D., & Kreyenschmidt, J. (2020).  
323 Implementation of time temperature indicators to improve temperature monitoring  
324 and support dynamic shelf life in meat supply chains. *Journal of Packaging Technology  
325 and Research*, 4, 23-32.
- 326 Bruckner, S., Albrecht, A., Petersen, B., & Kreyenschmidt, J. (2013). A predictive shelf life  
327 model as a tool for the improvement of quality management in pork and poultry  
328 chains. *Food Control*, 29, 451-460.
- 329 Carse, W., & Locker, R. (1974). A survey of pH values at the surface of beef and lamb  
330 carcasses, stored in a chiller. *Journal of The Science of Food and Agriculture*, 25, 1529-  
331 1535.
- 332 Gill, C. & Newton, K. (1979). The ecology of bacterial spoilage of fresh meat at chill  
333 temperatures. *Meat Science*, 2, 207-216.
- 334 Gill, C., Phillips, D. & Harrison, J. (1988a). Product temperature criteria for shipment of  
335 chilled meats to distant markets. In: *Proceedings 1st International Refrigeration  
336 Conference: Refrigeration for Food and People*, 1988, Brisbane p 40-47.

337 Gill, C., Phillips, D. & Loeffen, M. (1988b). A computer program for assessing the remaining  
338 storage life of chilled red meats from product temperature history. In: *Proceedings 1st*  
339 *International Refrigeration Conference: Refrigeration for Food and People, 1988,*  
340 Brisbane p 35-39.

341 Huynh, L., Jenson, I., Kaur, M., Kiermeier, A., Kocharunchitt, C., Miles, D., Ross, T., Sumner, J.,  
342 & Vanderlinde, P. (2016). Shelf life of Australian red meat (2nd edition). *Meat &*  
343 *Livestock Australia, Australia, ISBN 9781740362399.*

344 Kaur, M., Shang, H., Tamplin, M., Ross, T., & Bowman, J. (2017). Culture-dependent and  
345 culture-independent assessment of spoilage community growth on VP lamb meat  
346 from packaging to past end of shelf-life. *Food Microbiology, 68, 71-80.*

347 Kaur, M., Williams, M., Bissett, A., Ross, T., & Bowman, J. (2020). Effect of abattoir, livestock  
348 species and storage temperature on bacterial community dynamics and sensory  
349 properties of vacuum packaged red meat. *Food Microbiology, submitted for*  
350 *publication.*

351 Sakai, K., Lee, J. H., Kocharunchitt, C., Ross, T., Jenson, I., Koyama, K., & Koseki, S. (2020).  
352 Development of a novel Time-Temperature Integrator/indicator (TTI) based on the  
353 Maillard reaction for visual monitoring of chilled beef during long-term storage and  
354 distribution. *Food and Bioprocess Technology, submitted for publication.*

355 Koutsoumanis, K., Stamatiou, A., Skandamis, P., Nychas, G-J. (2006). Development of a  
356 microbial model for the combined effect of temperature and pH on spoilage of ground  
357 meat, and validation of the model under dynamic temperature conditions. *Applied*  
358 *and Environmental Microbiology, 72, 124-134.*

359 Kreyenschmidt, J., Hubner, A., Beierle, E., Chonsch, L., Scherer, A., & Petersen, B. (2010).  
360 Determination of the shelf life of sliced cooked ham based on the growth of lactic acid  
361 bacteria in different steps of the chain. *Journal of Applied Microbiology, 108, 510-520.*

362 Mataragas, M., Drosinos, E. H., Vaidanis, A., & Metaxopoulos, I. (2006). Development of a  
363 predictive model for spoilage of cooked cured meat products and its validation under  
364 constant and dynamic temperature storage conditions. *Journal of Food Science, 71,*  
365 *M157-M167.*

366 McDonald, K., & Sun, D-W. (1999). Predictive food microbiology for the meat industry: a  
367 review. *International Journal of Food Microbiology, 52, 1-27.*

368 Mills, J., Donnison, A., & Brightwell, G. (2014). Factors affecting microbial spoilage and shelf  
369 life of chilled vacuum-packed lamb transported to distant markets: a review. *Meat*  
370 *Science*, 98, 71-80.

371 Phillips, D., Bridger, K., Jenson, I. and Sumner J. (2012). An Australian national survey of the  
372 microbiological quality of frozen boneless beef and beef primal cuts. *Journal of Food*  
373 *Protection*, 75:1862-1866.

374 Ratkowsky, D., Olley, J., McMeekin T., & Ball, A. (1982). Relationship between temperature  
375 and growth rate of bacterial cultures. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 149, 1–5.

376 Ross, T. (1996). Indices for performance evaluation of predictive models in food  
377 microbiology. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, 81, 501–508.

378 Small, A., Jenson, I., Kiermeier, A., & Sumner, J. (2012). Vacuum-packed beef primals with  
379 extremely long shelf life have unusual microbiological counts. *Journal of Food*  
380 *Protection*, 75, 1524-1527.

381 Sumner, J., & Jenson, I. (2011). The effect of storage temperature on shelf life of vacuum-  
382 packed lamb shoulders. *Food Australia*, 63, 251-253.

383 Tang, X., Sun, X, We, V., Xie, J., Pan, Y., Zhao, Y., & Malakar, P. (2013). Predicting shelf-life of  
384 chilled pork sold in China. *Food Control*, 32, 334-340.

385

386 **Table 1.**

387 Estimated values of the parameters of Equation (1) for the specific growth rate of TVC.

Product type	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	$T_{min}$ (°C) <sup>1</sup>
VP beef	0.01964	0.08757	-4.45861
VP lamb	0.01986	0.11021	-5.54856

388  $T_{min}$  is the theoretical minimum temperature and was estimated by extrapolation of the

389 regression line to  $\sqrt{\mu_{TVC}} = 0$ .

390 **Table 2.**  
 391 Summary of previously published data used for evaluation of the models for shelf life  
 392 predictions.

Type of meat cut	Average storage temperature <sup>a</sup>	Initial TVC (log CFU/cm <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>b</sup>	Observed shelf-life (days) <sup>c</sup>	Predicted shelf-life (days)	Study
<b>Vacuum-packed beef products</b>					
Striploin	-0.47	1.91	140	159	Sakai et al., (submitted for publication)
Striploin	-0.44	1.91	140	158	
Chuck tender	1.45	2.47	90	81	
Chuck tender	2.27	2.47	90	63	
Chuck tender	1.54	2.47	90	83	
Striploin	2.22	1.54	70	75	
Striploin	1.98	1.54	70	83	
Striploin	2.21	1.54	70	75	
Striploin	2.34	1.54	70	72	
<b>Vacuum-packed lamb products</b>					
Bone-in hind shank	8.00	3.15	13	10	Kaur et al., (2017)
Bone-in hind shank	-1.20	3.15	124	122	

393 a. Average temperature from packaging to the end of the trials  
 394 b. Average TVC at the time of packaging  
 395 c. The time taken for each product to reach its end of shelf-life based on odour attribute.

396

**Table 3**

397 Summary of the data generated for different meat products in their supply chains and its comparison with the shelf life predictive models.

Type of meat cut	Packaging types <sup>a</sup>	Average storage temperature <sup>b</sup>	Initial TVC (log CFU/cm <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>c</sup>	Observed shelf-life (days) <sup>d</sup>	Predicted shelf-life (days)
<b>Beef products</b>					
Rump roast with 5-day aging	VP	3.97	1.03	60	56
Rump roast with 20-day aging	VP	3.03	1.03	70	75
Rump roast with 69-day aging	VP	1.04	1.03	85	90
Rump steaks produced from VP primals without aging	VSP	3.25	2.30	41	43
Rump steaks produced from VP primals after aging for 30 days	VSP	3.21	3.23	38	40
Rump steaks produced from VP primals after aging for 57 days	VSP	3.16	4.00	37	38
<b>Lamb products</b>					
Boneless legs	VP	1.36	0.12	103	88
Bone-in legs	VP	1.36	0.16	97	92
Racks	VP	1.36	0.07	94	92

398 a. VP = vacuum packaging; MAP = modified atmosphere packaging (75-82% O<sub>2</sub> and 18-25% CO<sub>2</sub>); OW trays = over-wrapped trays; and VSP = vacuum skin packaging

399 b. Average temperature from packaging to the end of the trials.

400 c. Average TVC at the time of packaging.

401 d. The time taken for each product to reach its end of shelf-life based on odour attribute