



Prediction of crude fat content of longissimus muscle of beef using the ratio of fat area calculated from computer image analysis: Comparison of regression equations for prediction using different input devices at different stations

著者(英)	Kuchida Keigo, Kono S, Konishi Kazuyuki, Van Vleck L. D., Suzuki Mitsuyoshi, Miyoshi Syunzou
journal or publication title	Journal of Animal Science
volume	78
number	4
page range	799-803
year	2000-04
URL	<a href="http://id.nii.ac.jp/1588/00000151/">http://id.nii.ac.jp/1588/00000151/</a>

1 PREDICTION OF CRUDE FAT CONTENT BY IMAGE ANALYSIS

2

3 Prediction of Crude Fat Content of Longissimus Muscle of Beef Using  
4 the Ratio of Fat Area Calculated by Computer Image Analysis: Comparison  
5 of Regression Equations for Prediction using Different Input Devices  
6 at Different Stations

7

8 K. Kuchida\*, S. Konot†, K. Konishi‡, L. D. Van Vleck§, M. Suzuki\*,  
9 S. Miyoshi\*

10 \* Obihiro University of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine, Obihiro,  
11 080-8555, Japan

12 † Hiroshima Prefectural Animal Experiment Station, Shoubara, 727-0023,  
13 Japan

14 ‡ Ouu Station, National Livestock Breeding Center, Shichinohe-machi,  
15 039-2567, Japan

16 § Roman L. Hruska U.S. Meat Animal Research Center, ARS, USDA, Lincoln,  
17 NE 68583-0908

18

19 Contact author: Keigo Kuchida

20 Laboratory of Animal Breeding, Obihiro University of AVM, Obihiro-shi  
21 Hokkaido 080-8555, Japan

22 Tel +81-155-49-5412 Fax +81-155-49-5414

1 ABSTRACT Crude fat content of Longissimus dorsi (ribeye) muscle of  
2 beef cattle was predicted from a ratio of fat area (RFA) to area of  
3 ribeye muscle calculated by computer image analysis (CIA). Cross  
4 sections of 64 ribeyes taken from the 6-7<sup>th</sup> rib from cattle at  
5 experiment station A and cross sections of 94 ribeyes taken from the  
6 6-7<sup>th</sup> rib from cattle at experiment station B were used in this study.  
7 Slices (1 to 1.5 cm thickness) of just the Longissimus dorsi were  
8 homogenized and sampled for chemical estimation of crude fat content  
9 using petroleum ether. Crude fat content was estimated from each muscle  
10 sample using petroleum ether and was used as the true estimate of fat  
11 content. A CCD (Charge-Coupled Devices) camera was used as the input  
12 device at experiment station A, while a single-lens reflex camera was  
13 used at experiment station B to take photographs of ribeyes for CIA.  
14 The contour comparison method, that assigns a threshold value for each  
15 marbling particle, was used to obtain accurate binarization in this  
16 study. Minimum and maximum of chemical measurements of crude fat were  
17 2.1 and 39.8%, and for CIA calculation of the RFA were 6.1 and 56.8%,  
18 respectively. This range covered almost complete range of the Beef  
19 Marbling Standard which is used in carcass grading in Japan. The  
20 equation for the regression of the crude fat content (Y) on RFA (X)  
21 calculated by CIA for all of the data was  $Y = .793X - 3.04$  with  $r^2 = .96$ .  
22 Regression equations for prediction of crude fat percentage from RFA

1 taking into consideration the effect of experiment station were  
2  $Y = .741X - 2.22$  with  $r^2 = .91$  for experiment station A, and  $Y = .782X - 2.54$   
3 with  $r^2 = .91$  for experiment station B. Analysis of covariance showed  
4 that the effects of experiment stations on intercepts and slopes were  
5 not significant ( $p > .10$ ). The ranges of differences between actual and  
6 predicted crude fat content from the prediction equation, which was  
7 calculated without consideration of the effect of station were -6.4  
8 to 4.0%. CIA of cross sections of the ribeye muscle seems to have  
9 potential for prediction of crude fat content.

10

11 **Key words** Computer image analysis, Fat area, Crude fat, Carcass

12

13

### Introduction

14 Generally, marbling is evaluated macroscopically by a qualified  
15 grader at the time of grading. Crude fat content in beef is often  
16 measured in order to evaluate marbling more objectively in the case  
17 of feeding trials and progeny testing (Savell et al., 1986; Herring  
18 et al., 1998). However, sampling of meat for chemical analysis reduces  
19 the carcass value and requires a great deal of labor for processing.

20 There are some reports on prediction of crude fat in beef using  
21 non-destructive methods such as near-infrared reflectance  
22 spectroscopy. High accuracy of predicted crude fat content by

1 near-infrared reflectance spectroscopy was reported for minced meat  
2 and cut meat by Roberts et al. (1987) and Mitsumoto et al. (1991),  
3 respectively.

4 A digital image with high resolution can be used for computer  
5 analysis with the development of information processing equipment in  
6 recent years. This development has created an environment that allows  
7 accurate image analysis. The most important step in image analysis is  
8 to obtain a correct threshold value, which divides lean and marbling.  
9 Kuchida et al. (1997a) developed software for image analysis using the  
10 contour comparison method. This software automatically draws contours  
11 of marbling particles for a specified area on the computer screen that  
12 displays the original true color image of the ribeye area. If the  
13 contours are judged to be wrong, it is possible to adjust the contours  
14 until they agree with those on the true color image. Kuchida et al.  
15 (1998) reported that the ratio of fat area (RFA) to area of ribeye  
16 muscle obtained with this program could be used as a linear covariate  
17 to predict crude fat percentage in ribeye muscle with high precision  
18 ( $r^2=.91$ ) and accuracy (error of prediction within  $\pm 3\%$ ). However, the  
19 image data used in their study were taken by CCD camera as an input  
20 device at only one laboratory. They also did not examine prediction  
21 error when using an optical camera that is widely used to take  
22 photographs of meat. Moreover, the range of crude fat percentage of

1 their material was quite low compared to that of most Wagyu cattle.  
2 The purposes of this study were 1) to analyze image data taken from  
3 two input devices; i.e., one was a CCD camera (using micro electronics  
4 devices) and the other was an optical camera, and 2) to investigate  
5 the ability of regression equations to predict crude fat percentage  
6 from RFA in the cross section of the ribeye.

7

8

### Materials and Methods

9 *Materials and photographing method at experiment station A*

10 The materials were 64 Longissimus muscles (ribeye) and their  
11 cross sections from a cut at the 6-7<sup>th</sup> rib which is the standard location  
12 for measuring marbling in Japan. These were obtained from 35 Japanese  
13 Black, 6 Angus and 23 F<sub>1</sub> crossbred of Japanese Black sires and foreign  
14 breed dams. After slaughter, the materials (about 0.5 kg) were vacuum  
15 packaged and transported to Ouu Station, National Livestock Breeding  
16 Center (Shichinohe-machi, Japan) under low temperature storage (at  
17 0 °C, not frozen). A CCD camera (SONY: DXC930) was used to photograph  
18 the cross-section at the 6-7<sup>th</sup> rib after the sample was kept for at  
19 least 12 h in a refrigerator at 0 °C. Care was taken to ensure  
20 temperature of the meat surface did not increase during photographing.  
21 The CCD camera was mounted perpendicular to the meat surface. A zoom  
22 lens (SONY: VCL712BXEA) was used to take as large an image as possible.

1 The image resolution from this equipment was 512×480 pixels (about  
2 740 K bytes for bitmap file).

3 To determine crude fat percentage, the whole ribeye of each sample  
4 was separated and trimmed from the intermusclar fat, then each ribeye  
5 was sliced to 1 cm in thickness and minced for analysis. Chemical  
6 measurement of the crude fat percentage was performed by ether  
7 extraction method (AOAC; 1990).

8

9 *Materials and photographing method in experiment station B*

10 The materials used were 94 Longissimus muscles and their cross  
11 sections from a cut at the 6-7<sup>th</sup> rib from Japanese Black beef bought  
12 at retail markets. Photographs of the ribeye were taken using a  
13 single-lens reflex camera (Minolta: 707si) with as large an image  
14 as possible of the ribeye area at Hiroshima Prefectural Animal  
15 Experiment Station (Shoubara-shi, Japan). The sample was kept for at  
16 least 3 h in a refrigerator at 4 °C. A strobe (Minolta: Program Flash  
17 5400HS) with soft lighting (Minolta: Soft Lighting Set) was used from  
18 an angle of 45 ° to the surface to avoid irregular reflection on the  
19 surface of ribeye. Photographs were taken within 5 minutes after  
20 removing from the refrigerator to ensure temperature of the meat  
21 surface did not increase much during photographing. The camera was  
22 mounted perpendicular to the meat surface. Images were printed on

1 photographic printing papers (12 by 8 cm) and were scanned using a color  
2 image scanner (Epson: GT-8500). Resolution from this equipment was  
3 about 800×600 pixels (about 1.6 M bytes for a bitmap file). Crude fat  
4 was determined by the same method as previously described.

5

### 6 *Image analysis*

7 The program for the computer image analysis (CIA) was written in  
8 Visual C++ (Microsoft) which is the 32 bit application development  
9 language under the Windows NT operating system.

10 The greatest influence on the precision of calculation of  
11 marbling percentage is the process of converting color image to binary  
12 image (0 or 1). This process divides the color image into two values  
13 (i.e., 0 or 1 to indicate lean and fat, respectively). Discriminant  
14 analysis (Otsu, 1980), which is generally used for automatically  
15 converting the color image to a binary image, may result in over- or  
16 underestimation due to the lack of uniformity of lighting, if only one  
17 threshold value is used in the conversion for the whole ribeye area.  
18 To avoid this error, an adaptive converting method (Takagi and Shimoda,  
19 1991) has been proposed, which mechanically divides the whole image  
20 into several partitions, with calculation of threshold values for each  
21 partition. However, the brightness of the marbling particle depends  
22 not only on the illumination by reflected light, but also on size of



1 marbling particle. Thus, it is impossible to obtain accurate RFA if  
2 the calculation is done separately for each partition.

3         The contour comparing method (Kuchida et al., 1997a), which  
4 assigned a threshold value for each marbling particle (if the particle  
5 was very large with irregular contours, the particle was divided into  
6 several areas), was used to obtain accurate binarization in this study.  
7 Contours of marbling particles are automatically drawn for the  
8 specified area on the computer screen that was displaying the original  
9 true color image of the ribeye area. If the contours are judged to be  
10 wrong, it is possible to adjust them until they agree with those on  
11 the true color image. The coincidence between drawn contours and  
12 contours seen on the true color image is judged macroscopically. Each  
13 pixel has 0 to 255 signals for Red (R), Blue (B) and Green (G) components  
14 in this system. The G component is used for binarization because the  
15 variance of the G component was the largest for this photographing  
16 situation.

17         The subject of the image analysis of this study was the inside  
18 of Longissimus muscle. A contour line of Longissimus muscle was  
19 manually drawn by operator using drawing software (Adobe Photoshop,  
20 Adobe Systems Inc., Seattle, WA) before image analysis process.  
21 Particles with small areas of less than  $.01\text{cm}^2$  were excluded in the  
22 analysis for the purpose of reducing noise caused by binarization.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

*Statistical analysis*

The mathematical model used to predict crude fat content from RFA calculated by CIA is:

$$Y = aX + b \quad [\text{Model 1}]$$

where Y is crude fat content, a is the slope of the linear regression equation of crude fat content on RFA, X is RFA of each sample, and b is the intercept.

Homogeneity of slopes and intercepts of the regression equations by station was examined using the following model:

$$Y_i = a_iX_i + b_i \quad [\text{Model 2}]$$

where,  $Y_i$  is crude fat content of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  experiment station,  $a_i$  is the partial regression coefficient for the  $i^{\text{th}}$  experiment station,  $X_i$  is RFA from the  $i^{\text{th}}$  experiment station, and  $b_i$  is the intercept of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  experiment station.

The effects of breed groups were not included in the mathematical models, although several breed groups were used at station A. Effects due to breed groups have been shown to be not significant (Kuchida et al., 1998). The GLM procedure of SAS (1989) was used for statistical analysis.

Results and discussion

1 Table 1 contains unadjusted statistics for ribeye area, chemical  
2 measurements of crude fat and CIA calculations of the RFA for each  
3 station. Marbling scores in Japan are assigned by comparison to the  
4 Beef Marbling Standard (BMS), which has 12 marbling levels. Kuchida  
5 et al. (1997b) reported RFA for BMS No.1 and No.12 were about 0 and  
6 50%, respectively. The range of RFAs for beef sample from experiment  
7 stations A and B covered the range of RFA for all levels of BMS.

8 The size of the image data from experiment station A (760K bytes;  
9 bitmap file) was different from the size of the image data file from  
10 experiment station B (1.6M bytes; bitmap file). Kuchida et al. (1997a)  
11 examined the difference in calculated RFA due to resolution using image  
12 data with three different resolutions which were processed from one  
13 original image. They found no differences among the RFAs calculated  
14 from image data files of three sizes: 170 K bytes, 980 K bytes and 2.5  
15 M bytes (bitmap file).

16 The relationship between chemically measured crude fat  
17 percentage and RFA calculated by CIA is plotted in Figure 1. The  
18 regression equation (model 1) obtained for prediction of crude fat  
19 percentage from RFA without and with accounting for the effect of  
20 experiment station were:

21  $Y = .793X - 3.04$  with  $r^2 = .96$  for overall,

22  $Y = .741X - 2.22$  with  $r^2 = .91$  for experiment station A, and

1            $Y = .782X - 2.54$  with  $r^2 = .91$  for experiment station B.

2           These prediction equations indicated the relationship between  
3 chemically analyzed crude fat content and RFA by CIA was linear, as  
4 quadratic and cubic terms were not significant. Analysis of covariance  
5 using Model 2 showed effects of experiment stations on intercepts  
6 (Station A; -2.22, Station B; -2.54) and on slopes (Station A; .741,  
7 Station B; .782) were not significant ( $p > 0.10$ ).

8           Prediction errors were obtained subtracting actual crude fat  
9 content from predicted crude fat content using the prediction  
10 equations (Model 1 or Model 2) and are summarized in Table 2. The range  
11 of prediction error from Model 1, which did not consider of the effect  
12 of station, were from -2.2 to 3.0% for experiment station A, and from  
13 -6.4 to 4.0% for experiment station B, respectively. Ranges from Model  
14 2, which considered the effect of station, were -2.5 to 2.8% for  
15 experiment station A, and -6.4 to 4.0% for experiment station B.

16           The method of predicting crude fat content described in this study  
17 was not influenced by joint effect of experiment station and input  
18 devices, as differences between intercepts and slopes due to stations  
19 with Model 2 were not significant ( $P > .10$ ). Ranges of prediction errors  
20 from Model 1 and Model 2 also were similar.

21           The RFA increases about 3% for each level of the standard scale  
22 from BMS No.1 to No.10 and increases about 10% for each level from BMS

1 No.10 to No.12 (Kuchida et al,; 1997b). The proportion of prediction  
2 errors from Model 1 that were within  $\pm 3.0\%$  was .930.

3 Possible causes of prediction error were examined for the ribeyes  
4 (n=11) with prediction errors from Model 1 larger than 3%. These cross  
5 sections were found to contain large marbling particles with these  
6 areas greater than  $4.0\text{cm}^2$  and to be in contact with the periphery of  
7 ribeye for eight of the 11 samples.

8 For chemical analysis for crude fat, samples were sliced 1 cm (1  
9 to 1.5 cm for experiment station B) thick from a cross section of the  
10 ribeye area and then were minced. For prediction of crude fat from the  
11 RFA calculated by CIA, it is assumed that RFA on the surface of the  
12 ribeye is the constant through 1 cm (or 1 to 1.5 cm) thickness, in  
13 reality, the ratio is not constant. Masses of fat which could not be  
14 seen on the surface of the photographed ribeye could be seen when the  
15 material was ground, although these data were not recorded. Violation  
16 of this assumption might be one of the primary causes of prediction  
17 error. Accuracy of estimation might be improved if more thinly sliced  
18 meat was used. This factor might be one of the greatest causes of  
19 prediction error.

20 Kuchida et al. (1999) attempted to evaluate marbling score by CIA.  
21 Japanese Marbling Standard was highly correlated to RFA by image  
22 analysis with  $r^2=.47$ . They succeeded to predict Japanese Marbling

1 Standard using several parameters from CIA (fineness, distribution of  
2 marbling within Longissimus muscle, etc.). According to their results,  
3 RFA is a main effect for Japanese MS, although Japanese MS would be  
4 affected by other image analysis traits.

5

6

### Implications

7 This study showed that two combinations of input devices,  
8 photographing techniques or size of image data file were not different  
9 for prediction of fat content from ratio of fat area to total area of  
10 a cross section of the Longissimus muscle. With this method, the cross  
11 section of the carcass must be photographed in a perpendicular  
12 direction. This drawback could be solved by improvement in input  
13 devices for photographing the cross section of the ribeye. Advantages  
14 of this method are that no special device is needed and a photograph  
15 taken of the ribeye area in a past examination can be used. Differences  
16 among the results due to human carcass graders can not be removed,  
17 because marbling score is evaluated macroscopically. If CIA could be  
18 used to gather data for marbling evaluations from progeny testing and  
19 feeding trials, the crude fat content predicted by CIA could be a  
20 reference standard for level of marbling.

21

22

### Literature Cited

1 AOAC. 1990. Official methods of analysis (15<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Association of  
2 official analytical chemists. Arlington, VA.

3 Herring, W. O., L. A. Kriese, J. K. Bertrand, and J. Crouch. 1998.  
4 Comparison of four real-time ultrasound systems that predict  
5 intramuscular fat in beef cattle. J. Anim. Sci. 76:364-370.

6 Kuchida K., S. Tsuruta, L.D. Van Vleck, M. Suzuki, and S. Miyoshi. 1999.  
7 Prediction method of beef marbling standard number using parameters  
8 obtained from image analysis for beef ribeye. Anim. Sci. J.,  
9 70:107-112.

10 Kuchida K., K. Konishi, M. Suzuki, and S. Miyoshi. 1998. Prediction  
11 of the crude fat contents in ribeye muscle of beef using the fat area  
12 ratio calculated by computer image analysis. Anim. Sci. Technol.  
13 (Jpn.), 69:655-658.

14 Kuchida K., A. Kurihara, M. Suzuki, and S. Miyoshi. 1997a. Development  
15 of accurate method for measuring fat percentage on ribeye area by  
16 computer image analysis. Anim. Sci. Technol. (Jpn.), 68:853-859.

17 Kuchida K, A. Kurihara, M. Suzuki, and Miyoshi S. 1997b. Computer image  
18 analysis method for evaluation of marbling of ribeye area. Anim. Sci.  
19 Technol. (Jpn.), 68:878-882.

20 Mitsumoto M., S. Maeda, T. Mitsuhashi, and S. Ozawa. 1991.  
21 Near-infrared spectroscopy determination of physical and chemical  
22 characteristics in beef cuts. J. Food Sci. 56:1496-1496.

1 Otsu N. An automatic threshold selection method based on discriminant  
2 and least squares criteria. The transactions of the institute of  
3 Electronics and Communication Engineers of Japan.  
4 J63-D:349-356.1980.

5 Roberts C. A., P. L. Houghton, K. J. Moore, K. A. MacMillan, and R.  
6 P. Lemenager. 1987. Analysis of bovine udder, plate and viscera using  
7 near infrared reflectance spectroscopy. J. Anim. Sci. 65:278-281.

8 SAS Institute. 1989. SAS/STAT User's Guide, Version 6, Fourth Edition,  
9 SAS Institute Inc., Cary NC.

10 Savell, J. W., H. R. Cross, and G. C. Smith. 1986. Percentage ether  
11 extractable fat and moisture content of beef longissimus muscle as  
12 related to USDA marbling score. J. Food Sci.51:838-840.

13 Takagi, M., and H. Shimoda. 1991. Handbook of image analysis, 1st  
14 Edition, Tokyo univ. Press, Tokyo, Japan.



1 Table 1. Unadjusted means and standard deviations for rib-eye area, crude fat  
 2 content and ratio of fat area by experiment stations

	Station A (n=64)			Station B (n=94)		
	Mean±SD	Minimum	Maximum	Mean±SD	Minimum	Maximum
5 Rib-eye area (cm <sup>2</sup> )	41.3±8.7	21.8	69.4	50.1±6.1	37.3	66.7
6 Crude fat (%)	11.8±4.4	2.1	27.1	24.7±6.7	9.6	39.8
7 Ratio of fat area (%)	19.0±5.7	6.1	36.1	34.9±8.1	13.0	56.8

8

1 Table 2. Summary of basic statistics of errors<sup>a</sup> of prediction of crude  
2 fat content from ratio of fat area using two prediction equations

3

	Model 1 <sup>b</sup>		Model 2 <sup>c</sup>	
	Station A	Station B	Station A	Station B
6 Mean (%)	-.17	.11	.01	-.01
7 Standard deviation (%)	1.34	2.05	1.31	2.05
8 Minimum (%)	-3.02	-3.96	-2.81	-4.04
9 Maximum (%)	2.18	6.44	2.53	6.43

10 <sup>a</sup>Prediction error is the difference between predicted and actual  
11 crude fat content.

12 <sup>b</sup>Model 1 did not account for the effect of station.

13 <sup>c</sup>Model 2 was calculated taking into consideration the effects of  
14 stations.

1 Figure 1. Relationship between crude fat content measured by ether extraction method and fat  
2 area ratio calculated by computer image analysis of the rib-eye image from two different  
3 experiment stations