Title (English)	Analysis on difference of consumer's evaluation on visual features of pork cuts
Running Title (English)	Consumers' perception on appearance of different pork cuts
Author	Yee Eun Lee [first_author] [1], Hyun Jung Lee[1], Minsu Kim[1], Ji Won Yoon[1], Minkyung Ryu[1], Cheorun Jo[1,2]
Affiliation	[1] Department of Agricultural Biotechnology, Center for Food and Bioconvergence, and Research Institute of Agriculture and Life Science, Seoul 08826, Korea, Republic of [2] Institute of Green Bio Science and Technology, Seoul National University, Pyeongchang 25354, Korea, Republic of
Corresponding Author	Cheorun Jo (cheorun@snu.ac.kr, +82-2-880-4804, 010-3727-6923)
ORCID	Yee Eun Lee (https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0022-6267) Hyun Jung Lee (https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6891-8008) Minsu Kim (https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7038-1732) Ji Won Yoon (https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0233-7489) Minkyung Ryu (https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2742-1329) Cheorun Jo (https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2109-3798)
Funding information	
Conflict of interest	No potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.
IRB/IACUC approval	This article was approved by Institutional Review Board of Seoul National University (No. 1901/002-001) and obtained consent of all participants.

1

1

2 **Analysis on difference of consumer's evaluation on visual features of pork cuts**

3

4 **Abstract**

5   This study investigates how visual appearance of pork cuts affects consumer preference. Images of

6 pork belly, Boston butt, and loin were chosen on the basis of visible fattiness and used to analyze

7 consumers' perception of the appearance of each pork cut. Meat color and visible fat proportion of

8 images of pork cuts were analyzed by the researchers before conducting the survey. A total of 211 pork

9 eaters evaluated the pork cuts based on appearance (lightness of color, redness, visible fat proportion,

10 and fat distribution), preferability, and overall acceptability. Also, muscle pieces from different pork

11 cuts were taken and the relative area composition of muscle fibers was measured. Based on survey

12 results, correlation between visual traits and preferences of each pork cut was analyzed. The survey

13 results showed that preferred pork appearance varied as per each individual's favorite pork cut. Also,

14 the respondents evaluated visual characteristics and preference for each pork cut differently possibly

15 due to the different visual characteristics of each cut. Correlation analysis between visual traits and

16 preference indicated that overall acceptability of pork cuts was mainly influenced by fat preference,

17 followed by color preference. Fat and color preferences for each pork cut were affected by various

18 visual attributes including redness, lightness of color, visible fat proportion, and fat distribution, but

19 their effects were considerably varied among different pork cuts. Thus, Korean consumers perceived

20 and assessed pork appearance using various quality cues but the evaluation depended on which cut was

21 being observed.

22 **Keywords**: Pork cut, appearance, meat color, fat, consumer preference

23

24

Introduction

Worldwide population growth is the driving force behind the recent increase in total meat consumption [1]. Moreover, income growth in developing countries also has led to an increase in per capita meat consumption [2], leading to a rapid increase in total meat consumption [3] in those countries. Similarly, in Korea, meat consumption shot up as the population and per capita income dramatically increased in the last few decades [4]. Per capita consumption of meat in Korea reached 54.6 kg in 2019 [5] and, among the different types of meat, pork accounted for most of the total meat consumption as its per capita consumption was 26.8 kg. However, although meat consumption has seen accelerated growth in the recent past, it is expected to reach a plateau in the near future in Korea. For example, although 5.6 % growth in per capita meat consumption was achieved from 2013 to 2014, only 1.3 % increase was shown from 2018 to 2019 [5].

When meat consumption reaches a plateau, meat quality, other than quantity, nutrition, and/or price, would become a more influential factor in consumers' purchasing choice [3]. Those quality factors include appearance, flavor, and tenderness. Especially, appearance of meat has a considerable influence on the purchase behavior of consumers because it helps assess the meat quality [6-9]. To be specific, it turned out that color and fat cover played an important role in pork purchase decision making [8, 10] and marbling was the most important factor in consumers' perception of meat quality [6]. According to Grunert et al. [11], consumers considered intrinsic quality factors, such as marbling and color, prior to meat consumption.

In case of pork, Ngapo et al. [12] reported that color was the most important factor affecting preference, followed by fat cover, marbling, and drip. Different pork cuts have different coloration and marbling [13, 14], therefore, consumers' expectations and preferences regarding appearance may vary depending on pork cuts. In this regard, although consumers cannot use

3

49 quality traits of pork loin to predict the quality of pork belly [15, 16], which is the most popular

50 pork cut in Korea, most studies mainly used images of pork loin to investigate consumers'

51 preference regarding pork appearance for surveys [12, 17, 18]. In those previous studies,

52 consumers expressed their preferences regarding color, marbling, fat proportion, and drip while

53 looking at systematically modified images of pork loin. Those studies suggested preference

54 trends related to each visual trait of pork, but they lacked analysis on correlation among various

55 quality traits and comparison of preference trends for different pork cuts. Also, a strong

56 tendency of preference for certain visual features was shown in some countries. For instance,

57 Korean consumers showed a stronger preference for marbling than consumers from other

58 countries, while most of the consumers in Ireland and Australia tend to prefer light red and lean

59 meat without marbling [12]. As meat appearance preferences may depend on the regional or

60 cultural background of the individual, it is necessary to determine how visual traits influence

61 preferences of particular consumer groups for specific pork cuts. Therefore, the objective of

62 this study was to investigate the effect of different visual quality factors (meat color, visible fat

63 proportion, and fat distribution) on the preference of consumers for pork belly, Boston butt,

64 and loin.

65

66

Materials and Methods

Consumer survey

Subjects were randomly chosen consumers older than 20 years old residing in five major cities of Korea: Seoul, Busan, Daegu, Incheon, and Gwangju. The survey was conducted online through the company Research and Research (Seoul, Korea) and a total of 211 consumers participated. Respondents first answered questions regarding demographic characteristics and general preferences regarding pork (Tables 1 and 2). Then they were asked to evaluate each visual trait [color (lightness and redness), fat proportion, and fat distribution] of different pork cuts and express their preference for each sample using a 7-point rating scale. This survey was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Seoul National University (No. 1901/002-001) and conducted with the consent of all respondents.

Sample preparation

Belly (*Samgyeopsal*, 5th to 12th thoracic vertebra), Boston butt (*Moksim*, 1st cervical vertebra to 4th thoracic vertebra), and loin (*Deungsim*, 5th thoracic vertebra to 6th lumbar vertebra) were obtained from four different LYD pigs on the same day after the slaughter and slicing (1.5 cm in thickness). CIE coloration of all pork cuts was measured with a colorimeter (CM-5, Minolta Co., Ltd., Osaka, Japan) and photographed (iPhone 7 12 MP dual lens camera, f/1.8, Apple Inc., Cupertino, USA) in a dark box ($40 \times 41 \times 40$ cm^3, width $\times$ length x height) under a 220 lux LED light. Then, visible fat proportion of all slices from each pork cut was analyzed using a computer image program (Photoshop CC 2019, Adobe, San Jose, USA). Based on these results, three different slices of each pork cut with different visible fat proportions and ΔE of L*, a* and b* value were chosen and used for the consumer survey (Fig. 1).

For immunofluorescence analysis, *Longissimus dorsi* from 8th thoracic vertebrae of loin,

three different muscles from the center cut of whole Boston butt, and *Lattissimus dorsi* and *Rectus abdominis* from the center cut of whole belly cut were taken. The size of each piece was $1 \times 1 \times 0.5$ cm. Then, the muscle pieces were frozen in isopentane chilled with liquid nitrogen and stored until use.

Immunofluorescence analysis

Immunofluorescence analysis was performed following the method of Song et al. [19] with slight modification. Frozen muscle pieces were sectioned into 10 μm thickness using acryostat (CM1860, Leica, Wetzlar, Germany) at −20℃. The sections were blocked in 10% (v/v) normal goat serum (Cell Signaling Technology, Danvers, MA, USA) in DPBS (Welgene, Gyeongsan, Korea) for one hour at room temperature. Samples were incubated with primary antibodies (5 μg/mL in DPBS, BA-D5 for type I, SC-71 for type IIa and IIx, and BF-F3 for type IIb all from DSHB, IA, USA) overnight at 4℃. Secondary antibodies (Alexa Fluor 350, 488, and 555 from Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) were applied for one hour at room temperature. Images of samples were captured using an inverted fluorescence microscope (BX51, Olympus Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan). For analysis of relative area composition (%) of each muscle fiber type from each muscle of different cuts, approximately 500 fibers per muscle were analyzed using Photoshop CC 2019. For Boston butt and belly, the average value of different muscles from the same cut was used for analysis.

Statistical analysis

The survey results were analyzed using ANOVA in a randomized complete block design (cut replication as a block) using SAS 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, USA). Student-Newman-Keuls test was used, and level of significance used was $p < 0.05$. Pearson correlation coefficients (r^2) between pork visual characteristics and the preference shown for them were

6

116 also calculated.

117

Results and Discussion

119 **Consumer preferences regarding the appearance of three pork cuts**

120 Among 211 consumers, most of the respondents (91.5%) were found to like pork as it has

121 been the most popular meat in Korea (Table 2). Meanwhile, the most preferred pork cut among

122 consumers was belly, which accounted for 52.1%, followed by Boston butt, picnic shoulder,

123 and loin, which were at 27.5%, 9.5%, and 9.0%, respectively. This was supported by Oh and

124 See [20] who demonstrated that Korean consumers preferred pork belly and Boston butt more

125 than loin or picnic shoulder as they liked relatively fatty pork cuts. However, as to the preferred

126 appearance of pork, about 13.7% of consumers preferred pork cuts with more fat, 63.5%

127 preferred a lean appearance, and 22.7% preferred both (Table 2). This seems to be a

128 consequence of the rising health consciousness in Korea and the deliberate emphasis on eating

129 less fat for better health. [21].

130 These preferences remained uniform for each pork cut. That is, regardless of the pork cut,

131 the respondents preferred lean appearance over fattiness (Fig. 2). Among respondents who

132 preferred belly the most, 25% of them replied that they wanted more fatty appearance, and 45%

133 wanted more lean pork cuts. About 86% of the respondents who preferred Boston butt wanted

134 more lean appearance. Most of the consumers whose favorite pork cut was loin preferred

135 leanness and none of them favored a fattier appearance over leanness. While almost none of

136 the respondents who preferred Boston butt or loin wanted fattier pork, a quarter of the

137 respondents whose favorite pork cut was belly chose fattier pork. Thus, there is a definite

138 overall high preference for pork with lean appearance and low preference for fattiness.

139 However, the tolerance for fat varies for each pork cut—a fatty belly cut is welcomed by many,

7

140   but a fatty loin is liked by none (See Fig. 2). This is explained by the fact that belly cut is the

141   fattiest cut of all (see Fig 1.), and so naturally, belly cut eaters are people who enjoy fatty meat

142   and many of them do not mind eating a very fatty belly cut. Conversely, loin is the leanest pork

143   cut and those who enjoy it are likely to have a very low tolerance for fat. Thus, the fatty loin

144   had no takers. Therefore, these results indicated that preferred meat appearance differed

145   according to favorite pork cuts.

146

147   **The appearance of the three pork cuts**

148   Overall, the appearance (color and visible fat) of the three pork cuts significantly varied in

149   terms of most of the traits (Table 3). In case of color, the respondents found no significant

150   difference in lightness of pork belly, Boston butt, and loin, but they did assess that belly and

151   Boston butt were significantly redder than loin (Table 3). Meat redness is caused by myoglobin,

152   which is mainly located in skeletal muscle tissue [22]. Therefore, the significant difference in

153   redness may attributed to differences in muscle composition between belly, Boston butt, and

154   loin. In our study, the amount of red muscle fiber in belly and Boston butt (24.52% and 40.49%,

155   respectively) was significantly higher than in loin (11.16%) (Table 4). Additionally, fat

156   proportion may also have affected meat redness. Kim et al. [23] reported that a^* value of belly

157   was lower than that of shoulder loin because belly had a higher fat proportion. Regarding fat

158   proportion, the respondents stated that based on appearance they found belly to be the fattiest

159   cut, followed by Boston butt and loin, in that order, which was in accordance with the measured

160   fat proportions of pork cuts (Fig. 1). However, interestingly, consumers preferred the fat

161   proportion and distribution of Boston butt and loin rather than that of belly. Consequently, as

162   to overall acceptability, pork loin and Boston butt with less fat proportion were more preferred

163   than belly, regardless of their meat redness differences. These results may suggest that although

164   Korean consumers preferred pork belly and Boston butt due to their relatively higher fat

165   proportion [20], their expectations regarding the ideal appearance of pork has changed. This

166   attitude may be related to the health issues associated with the consumption of high-fat meat

167   and meat products [24].

168   Next, we tried to analyze the visual traits of the samples A-C from each pork cut to

169   understand the significant effect of appearance on consumers' perception (Table 5). When

170   comparing the three different Boston butt samples, the results were similar to the results in

171   Table 3. Interestingly, although sample B of Boston butt had the highest visible fat proportion,

172   consumers evaluated it as the least fatty one. This phenomenon suggests that consumers'

173   perception of the fat content in a pork cut is mostly based on the extent of visible fat distribution

174   (the total area covered by fat) rather than just the volume of visible fat. In a similar vein, the

175   consumers' evaluations of the proportions of fat in belly and loin cuts were not always

176   consistent with the values we had derived from our analysis.

177

178   **Correlation analysis between visual traits and preferences**

179   Regardless of different cuts, overall acceptability from appearance of pork belly, Boston butt,

180   and loin was principally related to fat preference, rather than color preference (Tables 6-8).

181   However, the effect of visual traits (lightness, redness, visible fat proportion, and fat

182   distribution) on fat and color preferences varied depending on the type of cuts.

183   For pork belly, both lightness and redness had similar impact on the color preference of pork

184   belly (Table 6). Color preference was positively correlated with lightness, redness, and fat

185   distribution (r^2 = 0.3, 0.4, and 0.5, respectively; $p < 0.0001$) but not affected by visible fat

186   proportion. On the other hand, fat preference for pork belly had moderate correlation with

187   redness (r^2 = 0.4, $p < 0.0001$), and was weakly correlated to lightness (r^2 = 0.1, $p < 0.05$).

188   Interestingly, visible fat proportion of pork belly had negative correlation with fat preference

189   (r^2 = -0.3, $p < 0.0001$), while its distribution had highly positive correlation both with color and

9

190 fat preferences ($r^2 = 0.5$ and 0.8 respectively; $p < 0.0001$). Pork belly is known for its excellent

191 palatability owing to its high fat proportion [14, 23] and it has been proven that, traditionally,

192 Korean consumers exceptionally preferred pork with high fat proportion, while consumers in

193 many other countries preferred lean meat [20, 21]. However, the present result shows that the

194 current consumers in Korea prefer pork belly with less fat and even fat distribution. This

195 attitude might be motivated by the desire to prevent illnesses as pork belly often contains

196 excessive fat [25] and it has been reported that the overconsumption of animal fat may lead to

197 cardiovascular disease, type 2 diabetes or cancers [26]. Therefore, Korean consumers may have

198 negative perception of excessively fatty pork belly.

199   Color preference of Boston butt was positively correlated both with lightness and redness

200 but with different values ($r^2 = 0.6$ and 0.2, respectively, $p < 0.0001$) (Table 7). Its color

201 preference was also correlated with visible fat proportion and fat distribution ($r^2 = 0.4$ for both,

202 $p < 0.0001$). Meanwhile, unlike the correlation analysis result of belly cut, the fat preference

203 of Boston butt had significantly positive correlation both with visible fat proportion and

204 distribution ($r^2 = 0.2$ and 0.6, respectively, $p < 0.0001$). Although visible fat proportion had

205 negative influence on fat preference of belly, in case of Boston butt, high fat proportion had

206 slightly positive impact on preference. This could be explained by the fact that consumers have

207 different expectations for these two different pork cuts. Since pork belly already contains a

208 relatively high amount of fat, consumers do not demand belly cuts with a higher than usual fat

209 content. However, Boston butt has less fat than belly, so consumers try to ensure that the Boston

210 butt they buy has enough fat to enhance its palatability, since fat proportion influences the

211 tenderness, juiciness, and flavor of meat [23]. Fat preference of Boston butt was correlated with

212 lightness ($r^2 = 0.4$, $p < 0.0001$) and fat distribution ($r^2 = 0.6$, $p < 0.0001$). Redness and visible

213 fat proportion had weak relationship with fat preference ($r^2 = 0.2$ and 0.3, respectively, $p <$

214 0.0001). Similar to pork belly, Boston butt was highly scored when fat was well distributed.

215   Vonada et al. [27] reported that Korean consumers preferred Boston butt with moderate or high

216   marbling score the most. Also, as to the relationship between lightness and fat distribution,

217   Hocquette et al. [28] reported that people were able to distinguish between pork cuts with

218   different amounts of intramuscular fat through meat color because high intramuscular fat

219   content leads to lighter color. Furthermore, Fiems et al. [29] confirmed that the color of meat

220   lightened as the intramuscular fat content increased.

221   In case of pork loin, its color preference had positive correlation with lightness ($r^2 = 0.5$, p

222   < 0.0001) but no significant correlation with redness (Table 8). Also, it was moderately

223   correlated with visible fat proportion and fat distribution ($r^2 = 0.4$ for both, $p < 0.0001$).

224   Although previous studies reported that consumers preferred pork loin with dark red color [12,

225   18], in this study, redness did not influence any preference of pork loin, including overall

226   acceptability. This might be due to lower type I and higher type IIb muscle fiber in relative area

227   composition of loin (11.16% and 56.84%, respectively) (Table 4). On the other hand, fat

228   preference showed weak correlation with lightness, redness, and visible fat proportion ($r^2 = 0.3$,

229   0.1, and 0.2; respectively; $p < 0.0001$) and moderate correlation with fat distribution ($r^2 = 0.5$,

230   $p < 0.0001$). Relationship between fat proportion and fat preference may reflect the usual

231   tendency of Korean consumers to choose pork cuts with high fat proportion. Since loin is the

232   least fatty among the three pork cuts, relatively fatty pork loin would be still acceptable to

233   consumers. Marbling played an important role in predicting palatability, and a previous study

234   showed that a high marbling score actually improved sensory tenderness and juiciness of pork

235   loin [30]. As to the color of the loin cut, in agreement with the findings of this study, Kim et

236   al. [31] reported that intramuscular fat content did not significantly differ depending on the

237   lightness and redness of pork loin. On the contrary, Brewer et al. [32] suggested that consumers

238   perceived more marbled meat as fattier and lighter in color.

239   In all three pork cuts, fat distribution had more influence on the overall acceptability of pork

240   appearance than meat color. Although the recent consumers prefer less fat consumption due to

241   their health concern, the fatness of pork appearance still has considerable impact on the visual

242   acceptability of meat. This may be attributed to the consumers' expectation on eating quality

243   as fat can influence tenderness, juiciness, and flavor of meat [33]. It was reported that even the

244   lean meat appearance-preferred consumers tend to prefer the eating acceptability of marbled

245   meat because of its excellent palatability [34].

246   Some of the results in this study do not agree with previous studies. Although overall

247   acceptability of all three different pork cuts was positively correlated with light color, Cho et

248   al. [18] and Ngapo et al. [12] demonstrated that Korean consumers preferred dark red meat.

249   Also, in contrast to Ngapo et al. [12] suggesting that Korean consumers did not consider fat

250   cover in their purchase decision, in this study, visible fat proportion was highly correlated with

251   overall acceptability, with a scarce preference for excessive fat.

252

Conclusion

254   In this study, respondents tended to prefer lean appearance rather than fatty appearance when

255   their favorite pork cut was originally lean. However, overall acceptability of appearance from

256   all three pork cuts was mainly influenced by preference for fat, rather than its color.

257   Interestingly, the effect of visual traits on preference was considerably different among pork

258   cuts, possibly due to varying consumer expectations for each pork cut. In pork cuts that are

259   originally fatty, such as pork belly, additional fattiness was perceived as excessive and

260   negatively affected fat preference and overall acceptability. However, in case of Boston butt

261   and loin, a fatty appearance had a positive influence on both fat preference and overall

262   acceptability. Fat distribution was a more critical factor determining the fat preference for each

263   cut, and its impact on color preference was also varied.

264 Through a consumer survey and a correlation analysis on the visual traits and preferability

265 of three pork cuts, this study demonstrated that consumers assess pork appearance based on

266 various visual characteristics. Also, pork consumption patterns in Korea have certainly been

267 shifting towards lean pork, however, the preferable amount of fat was still found to be

268 dependent on the type of cut.

269

270 # Acknowledgments

275

276

277 # References

278 1. OECD, FAO. OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2019-2028. Paris: OECD; 2019.

279 2. Bruinsma J. World agriculture: towards 2015/2030: an FAO perspective. London:

280   Earthscan; 2003. https://doi.org/10.1787/19991142

281 3. Henchion M, McCarthy M, Resconi VC, Troy D. Meat consumption: Trends and quality

282   matters. Meat Sci. 2014;98(3):561-8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2014.06.007

283 4. Nam KC, Jo C, Lee M. Meat products and consumption culture in the East. Meat Sci.

284   2010;86(1):95-102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2010.04.026

285 5. Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. Information and data of agricultural

286   statistics of Korea 2020 [cited 2020 November 15]. Available from: http://lib.mafra.go.kr/

287 6. Papanagiotou P, Tzimitra-Kalogianni I, Melfou K. Consumers' expected quality and

288   intention to purchase high quality pork meat. Meat Sci. 2013;93(3):449-54.

289   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2012.11.024

290   7. Banović M, Fontes MA, Barreira MM, Grunert KG. Impact of product familiarity on beef

291   quality perception. Agribusiness. 2012;28(2):157-72. https://doi.org/10.1002/agr.21290

292   8. Ngapo T, Lozano MR, Varela DB. Mexican consumers at the point of meat purchase. Pork

293   choice. Meat Sci. 2018;135:27-35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2017.08.005

294   9. Noidad S, Limsupavanich R, Suwonsichon S, Chaosap C. Effect of visual marbling levels

295   in pork loins on meat quality and Thai consumer acceptance and purchase intent. Asian

296   Austral J Anim. 2019;32(12):1923. https://doi.org/10.5713/ajas.19.0084

297   10. Carpenter CE, Cornforth DP, Whittier D. Consumer preferences for beef color and

298   packaging did not affect eating satisfaction. Meat Sci. 2001;57(4):359-63.

299   https://doi.org/10.1016/S0309-1740(00)00111-X

300   11. Grunert KG, Bredahl L, Brunsø K. Consumer perception of meat quality and implications

301   for product development in the meat sector—a review. Meat Sci. 2004;66(2):259-72.

302   https://doi.org/10.1016/S0309-1740(03)00130-X

303   12. Ngapo T, Martin JF, Dransfield E. International preferences for pork appearance: I.

304   Consumer choices. Food Qual Prefer. 2007;18(1):26-36.

305   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2005.07.001

306   13. Kang HS, Seo KS, Kim KT, Nam KC. Comparison of pork quality characteristics of

307   different parts from domesticated pig species. Korean J Food Sci An. 2011;31(6):921-7.

308   https://doi.org/10.5851/kosfa.2011.31.6.921

309   14. Lim DG, Jo C, Cha JS, Seo KS, Nam KC. Quality Comparison of Pork Loin and Belly

310   from Three-way Crossbred Pigs during Postmortem Storage. Korean J Food Sci An.

311   2014;34(2):185. https://doi.org/10.5851/kosfa.2014.34.2.185

312   15. Arkfeld E, Wilson K, Overholt M, Harsh B, Lowell J, Hogan E, et al. Pork loin quality is

not indicative of fresh belly or fresh and cured ham quality. J Anim Sci. 2016;94(12):5155-67. https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2016-0886

16. Knecht D, Duziński K, Jankowska-Mąkosa A. Pork ham and belly quality can be estimated from loin quality measurements? Meat Sci. 2018;145:144-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2018.06.025

17. Cho S, Park B, Byun J, Kim J, Ahn J, Yun S. Visual evaluation factors of pork loin and Korean consumer's preference choice. J Anim Sci Technol. 2004;46(3):415-26. https://doi.org/10.5187/JAST.2004.46.3.415

18. Cho S, Park B, Ngapo T, Kim J, Dransfield E, Hwang I, et al. Effect of meat appearance on South Korean consumers' choice of pork chops determined by image methodology. J Sens Stud. 2007;22(1):99-114. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-459X.2007.00098.x

19. Song S, Ahn CH, Kim GD. Muscle Fiber Typing in Bovine and Porcine Skeletal Muscles Using Immunofluorescence with Monoclonal Antibodies Specific to Myosin Heavy Chain Isoforms. Food Sci Anim Resour. 2020;40(1):132. https://doi.org/10.5851/kosfa.2019.e97

20. Oh SH, See M. Pork preference for consumers in China, Japan and South Korea. Asian Austral J Anim. 2012;25(1):143. https://doi.org/10.5713/ajas.2011.11368

21. Choe JH, Yang HS, Lee SH, Go GW. Characteristics of pork belly consumption in South Korea and their health implication. J Anim Sci Technol. 2015;57(1):22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40781-015-0057-1

22. Seideman S, Cross H, Smith G, Durland P. Factors associated with fresh meat color: a review. J Food Qual. 1984;6(3):211-37. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-4557.1984.tb00826.x

23. Kim SY, Jung EY, Yuk JS, Kim YS, Kim JM, Suh HJ. Meat quality of belly and shoulder loin according to various producing district. Korean J Food Sci An. 2007;27(2):216-21. https://doi.org/10.5851/kosfa.2007.27.2.216

338 24. Resurreccion A. Sensory aspects of consumer choices for meat and meat products. Meat
339 Sci. 2004;66(1):11-20. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0309-1740(03)00021-4

340 25. Park MJ, Park BC, Ha DM, Kim JB, Jang KS, Lee DH, et al. Effects of increasing market
341 weight of finishing pigs on backfat thickness, incidence of the'caky-fatty'belly, carcass
342 grade, and carcass quality traits. J Anim Sci Technol. 2013;55(3):195-202.
343 https://doi.org/10.5187/JAST.2013.55.3.195

344 26. Salter A. The effects of meat consumption on global health. Rev Sci Tech Oie.
345 2018;37(1):47-55. https://doi.org/10.20506/rst.37.1.2739

346 27. Vonada M, Bidner B, Belk K, McKeith F, Lloyd W, O'Connor M, et al. Quantification of
347 pork belly and Boston butt quality attribute preferences of South Korean customers. J Anim
348 Sci. 2000;78(10):2608-14. https://doi.org/10.2527/2000.78102608x

349 28. Hocquette JF, Gondret F, Baéza E, Médale F, Jurie C, Pethick D. Intramuscular fat content
350 in meat-producing animals: development, genetic and nutritional control, and identification
351 of putative markers. Animal. 2010;4(02):303. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731109991091

352 29. Fiems L, De Campeneere S, De Smet S, Van de Voorde G, Vanacker J, Boucqué CV.
353 Relationship between fat depots in carcasses of beef bulls and effect on meat colour and
354 tenderness. Meat Sci. 2000;56(1):41-7. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0309-1740(00)00017-6

355 30. Cannata S, Engle T, Moeller S, Zerby H, Radunz A, Green M, et al. Effect of visual
356 marbling on sensory properties and quality traits of pork loin. Meat Sci. 2010;85(3):428-
357 34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2010.02.011

358 31. Kim GD, Jeong JY, Hur SJ, Yang HS, Jeon JT, Joo ST. The relationship between meat color
359 (CIE L* and a*), myoglobin content, and their influence on muscle fiber characteristics and
360 pork quality. Korean J Food Sci An. 2010;30(4):626-33.
361 https://doi.org/10.5851/kosfa.2010.30.4.626

362 32. Brewer M, Zhu L, McKeith F. Marbling effects on quality characteristics of pork loin chops:

363   consumer purchase intent, visual and sensory characteristics. Meat Sci. 2001;59(2):153-63.

364   https://doi.org/10.1016/S0309-1740(01)00065-1

365 33. Troy DJ, Kerry J. Consumer perception and the role of science in the meat industry. Meat

366   Sci. 2010;86(1):214-26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2010.05.009

367 34. Font-i-Furnols M, Tous N, Esteve-Garcia E, Gispert M. Do all the consumers accept

368   marbling in the same way? The relationship between eating and visual acceptability of pork

369   with   different   intramuscular   fat   content.   Meat   Sci.   2012;91:448-53.

370   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2012.02.030

371

Tables and Figures

Fig. 1. Pictures and visual characteristics of pork samples used for consumer survey. CIE color and visible fat proportion (%) of pork samples were measured, and three pictures (A, B, and C) of belly, Boston butt, and loin were chosen for the consumer survey.

	Belly			
	A	B	C	SEM[1]
Image				
L^*	55.22	57.14	62.79	2.556
a^*	8.39	9.16	6.31	0.835
b^*	11.44[b]	13.26[a]	12.67[a]	0.368
Fat proportion (%)	37.9	46.9	56.1	
	Boston butt			
	A	B	C	
Image				
L^*	47.88	49.97	45.44	1.739
a^*	12.67	10.83	11.74	0.634
b^*	13.41	13.29	12.45	0.393
Fat proportion (%)	19.6	23.5	26.4	
	Loin			
	A	B	C	
Image				
L^*	50.39	49.51	51.78	0.717
a^*	8.55	8.50	8.77	0.495
b^*	13.9[a]	12.80[b]	14.31[a]	0.232
Fat proportion (%)	6.2	7.8	13.0	

[a,b]Different letters within the same row differ significantly ($p < 0.05$)

[1]Standard error of the mean (n = 18).

377   Fig. 2. The proportion of preferred appearance of pork cuts evaluated by respondents whose

378   favorite cuts are (a) belly, (b) Boston butt, or (c) loin.

379

380

381

382   Table 1. Basic information of respondents

Question	Response options	Number	%
Age	20	43	20.4
	30	41	19.4
	40	43	20.4
	50	43	20.4
	> 60	41	19.4
Sex	Male	104	49.3
	Female	107	50.7
Place of residence	Seoul	44	20.9
	Busan	44	20.9
	Daegu	40	19.0
	Incheon	42	19.9
	Gwangju	41	19.4

383

384

385 Table 2. Overall pork preference of respondents in Korea

Question	Response options	Number	%
Do you prefer pork?	Yes	193	91.5
	No	18	8.5
Which pork cut do you prefer?	Belly	110	52.1
	Loin	19	9.0
	Boston butt	58	27.5
	Picnic shoulder	20	9.5
	Ham	2	0.9
	Other cuts	2	0.9
Which appearance of pork do you prefer?	Fatty	29	13.7
	Lean	134	63.5
	Both	48	22.7

386

387

388 Table 3. Appearance and preference evaluation of three different pork cuts by panels

Traits	Belly	Boston butt	Loin	SEM[1]
Appearance				
Meat lightness	4.21	4.10	4.20	0.048
Meat redness	4.38[a]	4.49[a]	4.12[b]	0.048
Visible fat proportion	4.91[a]	4.62[b]	3.83[c]	0.047
Fat distribution	4.07[b]	4.41[a]	4.18[b]	0.053
Preference				
Meat color	4.35	4.48	4.49	0.047
Fat distribution	4.09[b]	4.45[a]	4.45[a]	0.051
Overall acceptability	4.24[b]	4.45[a]	4.53[a]	0.052

389 [a-c]Different letters within the same row differ significantly ($p < 0.05$).

390 Analyzed using a 7-point hedonic scale for lightness (1 = extremely dark, 7= extremely light),

391 redness (1 = extremely pinkish, 7= extremely reddish), visible fat proportion (1 = extremely

392 low, 7= extremely high), fat distribution (extremely undistributed, 7= extremely distributed),

393 and each preference/overall acceptability (1 = dislike extremely, 7= like extremely).

394 [1]Standard error of the mean (n = 633).

395

396

397

398   Table 4. Relative area composition (%) of muscle fiber types in different pork cuts

	Belly	Boston butt	Loin	SEM[1]
Type I	24.52^{bx}	40.49^{aw}	11.16^{cy}	1.590
Type IIa	11.51^{ay}	13.23^{ax}	6.41^{by}	1.470
Type IIx	41.01^{aw}	35.22^{aw}	25.58^{bx}	2.415
Type IIb	22.97^{bx}	11.07^{cx}	56.84^{aw}	2.953
SEM	2.068	2.159	2.343	

399    $^{a-c}$Different letters within the same row differ significantly ($p < 0.05$)

400    $^{w-y}$Different letters within the same column differ significantly ($p < 0.05$)

401   [1]Standard error of the mean (n = 12).

402

Table 5. Appearance evaluation on three different samples of three pork cuts by panels

Belly	A	B	C	SEM[1]
Meat lightness[2]	3.79^c	4.25^b	4.58^a	0.077
Meat redness[3]	4.71^a	4.42^b	4.00^c	0.074
Visible fat proportion[4]	4.54^b	4.59^b	5.59^a	0.079
Fat distribution[5]	4.66^a	4.53^a	3.01^b	0.095
Boston butt				SEM[1]
Meat lightness[2]	4.27^a	3.61^b	4.41^a	0.083
Meat redness[3]	4.43^b	4.72^a	4.34^b	0.076
Visible fat proportion[4]	4.71^a	4.46^b	4.70^a	0.070
Fat distribution[5]	4.26^b	4.42^{ab}	4.55^a	0.080
Loin				SEM[1]
Meat lightness[2]	4.61^b	3.02^c	4.98^a	0.077
Meat redness[3]	3.70^b	4.80^a	3.86^b	0.092
Visible fat proportion[4]	4.04^b	2.96^c	4.50^a	0.087
Fat distribution[5]	4.21	4.06	4.25	0.089

[a-c]Different letters within the same row differ significantly ($p < 0.05$)

[1]Standard error of the mean (n = 633).

Analyzed using a 7-point hedonic scale for lightness (1 = extremely dark, 7= extremely light), redness (1 = extremely pinkish, 7= extremely reddish), visible fat proportion (1 = extremely low, 7= extremely high), fat distribution (extremely undistributed, 7= extremely distributed), and each preference/overall acceptability (1 = dislike extremely, 7= like extremely).

Table 6. Correlation analysis of quality evaluation and preference for pork belly

	Meat lightness	Meat redness	Visible fat proportion	Fat distribution	Meat color preference	Fat preference	Overall acceptability
Meat lightness	1	0.1**	0.3***	NS[1]	0.3***	0.1*	0.2***
Meat redness		1	NS	0.4***	0.4***	0.4***	0.4***
Visible fat proportion			1	-0.3***	NS	-0.3***	-0.3***
Fat distribution				1	0.5***	0.8***	0.8***
Meat color preference					1	0.6***	0.6***
Fat preference						1	0.9***
Overall acceptability							1

*$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.0001$

1) Not significant.

417   Table 7. Correlation analysis of quality evaluation and preference for pork Boston butt

	Meat Lightness	Meat redness	Visible fat proportion	Fat distribution	Meat color preference	Fat preference	Overall acceptability
Meat lightness	1	NS[1]	0.2***	0.3***	0.6***	0.4***	0.5***
Meat redness		1	0.3***	0.2***	0.2***	0.2***	0.2***
Visible fat proportion			1	0.3***	0.4***	0.2***	0.3***
Fat distribution				1	0.4***	0.6***	0.5***
Meat color preference					1	0.4***	0.6***
Fat preference						1	0.7***
Overall acceptability							1

418   *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.0001$

419   1) Not significant.

420

421

422

423

424   Table 8. Correlation analysis of quality evaluation and preference for pork loin

	Meat lightness	Meat redness	Visible fat proportion	Fat distribution	Meat color preference	Fat preference	Overall acceptability
Meat lightness	1	-0.1**	0.6***	0.2***	0.5***	0.3***	0.4***
Meat redness		1	NS[1]	0.2***	NS	0.1**	NS
Visible fat proportion			1	0.3***	0.4***	0.2***	0.3***
Fat distribution				1	0.4***	0.5***	0.5***
Meat color preference					1	0.5***	0.5***
Fat preference						1	0.8***
Overall acceptability							1

425   *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.0001$

426   1) Not significant

27