

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319262413>

Evaluation of some processed cheese spreads and sauces available in the Egyptian market

Article · March 2017

CITATIONS

0

READS

55

4 authors:



Mohamed Elalfy

Benha University

22 PUBLICATIONS 37 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Mohamed Shenana

Benha University

59 PUBLICATIONS 246 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Dalia Gamal

Benha University

8 PUBLICATIONS 1 CITATION

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Sania M. Abdou

Benha University

40 PUBLICATIONS 88 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



الاستفادة من مخلفات صناعة منتجات البان ذات قيمة غذائية ووظيفية واقتصادية عالية [View project](#)



symbiotic ice cream [View project](#)

Evaluation of some processed cheese spreads and sauces available in the Egyptian market.

M. B. EL-Alfy; M. E. Shenana; Dalia G. Gemiel and Sania M. Abdou.
Dairy Dept., Fac. of Agric, Moshtohor, Benha Univ., Egypt
Corresponding author: mbeALFY@fagr.bu.edu.eg

Abstract

Eighteen samples of available processed cheese spreads were collected randomly from the local Egyptian market. These samples were classified as 15 samples full-fat, and 3 samples only were low-fat cheese spread and represented (nowadays) in brands. The samples were analysed chemically, rheologically, microbiologically and organoleptically evaluated. There were a great variations in composition among the collected samples but all were within the Egyptian Standards for processed cheeses. Wide variations were also observed among samples in all rheological tests (*i.e.* hardness, chewiness, cohesiveness, adhesiveness and gumminess) as well as sensory evaluation scores. Consequently, seven of the available processed cheese sauces were collected from different retailer's shops in Egyptian market. All the collected samples were imported. The sauce samples were analysed chemically, rheologically (*i.e.* viscosity), microbiologically as well as they were sensory evaluated. Great variations were observed among samples in all tests and properties. All of them were good from sensory side of view (there was no Egyptian standard for sauces). The great variation in processed cheese samples either for spreads or sauces were due to the different raw materials used to formulate the blends according to the manufactures.

Keywords: processed cheese, sauces, composition, rheological properties, sensory properties.

Introduction

Cheese is widely used as an ingredient in most of prepared foods to add taste, texture and nutritional quality. The high costs associated with natural cheese production and storage, however, has improved industry to research for alternatives (Kiely *et al.*, 1991).

Processed cheese is an-oil-in water emulsion in which dairy proteins play the important role of emulsifiers. The majority of the proteins are caseins (from cheese, rennet casein or other milk casein sources), the emulsification potential of which is improved by the use of chelating salts. The versatility of the system of processed cheese can be made either from a simple basic net of ingredients consisting of cheese, water and melting salts, or from a complex mix of ingredients including different types of proteins, fat, gums, stabilizers, flavourings, humectants and other added minerals. Modern technology have allowed other non-milk protein and fat percent sources to be used in processed cheese making for, replacing a portion of the natural cheeses. Casein, caseinate, whey protein concentrate, milk powder and milk protein concentrate may be used as protein source and cream, butter, milk fat fractions and vegetable oils can be used in various proportions to adjust the fat in cheese mix. Poly saccharides, gums, stabilizers and preservatives may also be added to reduce costs, improve flavour or texture, or improve the shelf-life of the final product (Tamime *et al.*, 1999).

During processed cheese manufacture, some water is added to produce a smooth and stable emulsion (Berger *et al.*, 1993). Water helps in

dissolving the calcium chelating salts, hydrating the

proteins and dispersing the components. Water is also required to achieve certain product attributes such as softness in a cheese spread and its shelf life. Commercial full-fat processed cheese spreads have a moisture content between 40 and 65% with a fat content of at least 20% (Caric & Kálab, 1993; Kosikowski & Mistry, 1997 & El-Shibiny *et al.*, 2007). However commercial low-fat 10-24%fat processed cheese spreads have been found to contain as much as 73% moisture (Lee & Klostermeyer, 2001).

Nowadays, increasing demanding convenience-type food by consumers, which take a minimum of preparation time but which are comparable to homemade foods in terms of their taste and quality. There was many attempts to produce high quality dairy based and/or cheese based sauces (Rispoli *et al.*, 1987; Hine, 1994; Lei *et al.*, 2004; Mounsey and O'Riordan, 2008 and Aly *et al.*, 2011).

Generally, processed cheese sauces like other processed cheese products comprise an oil-in-water emulsion which is stabilized by cheese protein, and more specifically by casein which is predominant protein in comprised therein. The sauces are sometimes thickened with starch, and modified starch which generally preferred for preparation of low acid heat sterilized sauces which require a serve thermal process.

The cheese sauce and meal kit including at least one pouch containing the cheese sauce. The cheese sauce exhibits desirable texture and mouth-feel, as well as desirable flavour and visual appearance. Further. the cheese sauce has a shelf life of up to

Table 1. Gross chemical composition of some processed cheese spreads available in the Egyptian market.

Samples code		%Moisture	F/DM	%Protein	%CHO	%Ash	Salt/Moisture
Full- fat processed cheese spreads							
1		55.96	48.91	14.47	2.5	2.84	2.69
2		55.73	50.44	14.26	2.4	2.63	3.04
3		54.58	49.85	14.75	2.1	2.64	3.03
4		53.85	47.60	14.14	2.3	2.77	2.76
5		53.41	48.46	14.80	2.2	2.94	2.64
6		54.86	50.46	13.86	2.7	3.48	2.74
7		54.47	56.42	17.53	1.6	3.43	3.13
8		53.16	47.26	14.63	1.2	3.25	3.06
9		53.42	48.08	14.30	1.7	3.36	3.04
10		55.51	52.55	14.83	2.0	3.51	3.04
11		55.13	53.95	14.67	2.5	3.26	3.78
12		53.21	50.15	14.71	2.9	3.61	3.80
13		53.73	53.47	14.50	2.7	3.61	3.04
14		53.69	53.40	14.85	2.8	3.11	3.97
15		54.77	59.42	17.22	2.7	3.27	3.69
Range	Max	55.93	59.42	17.53	2.9	3.61	3.97
	Mini	53.16	47.26	13.86	1.2	2.63	2.64
Average		54.54	53.34	15.54	2.05	3.12	3.30
Low- fat processed cheese spreads							
16		55.83	21.28	17.90	2.1	2.92	2.51
17		54.86	18.83	17.01	2.6	3.10	2.81
18		53.54	19.59	17.29	2.4	3.30	3.04
range	Max	54.86	21.28	17.90	2.6	3.30	3.04
	Mini	53.54	18.83	17.01	2.1	2.92	2.51
Average		54.20	20.05	17.45	2.35	3.11	2.55

Nitrogen fractions: Soluble N and N.P.N (table 2) were averaged in full-fat 0.222 and 0.148% while in low fat cheese were 0.261 and 0.136%, respectively. These differences are due to the amount and degree of cheese ripening in the blends. Also, these variations may be due to the composition of other added ingredients in the cheese blends. (Tamime *et al.*, 1999).

The pH values of full-fat spreads were ranged from 5.53 to 6.16 with an average of 5.85. Regarding to low-fat spreads the pH was ranged from 5.78 to 5.81. All the Egyptian cheese spreads were within the range of Lee & Klostermeyer (2001) who recommended that pH for processed cheese spread ranged from 5.6 to 6.2.

TVFA in full-fat and low-fat cheese spreads (table 3) averaged 25 and 23 ml 0.1N NaOH /100g cheese, respectively. The TVFA was higher in full-fat cheese than low-fat cheese due to the higher fat content in the formulas, also, the variation in TVFA may be due to the differences in the amount and ripening degree of the cheese used in making the cheese spreads and at the same time to the added flavours.

Oil Separation:

The oil separation index of full-fat spreads ranged from 0.0 to 19.0% as there was three samples free from oil separation, also one sample from low fat spreads was free from oil separation (Table 3). The

wide variation of oil separation is due to several factors i.e. (the percentage and type of the

emulsifying salts and the use of vegetable oil with different melting index to replace part of the milk fat). Generally, low-fat spreads were lower than full-fat spreads in their oil separation index. The results are in the vicinity of those of khader *et al.*, (1997) and Abd Rabo *et al.*, (2005).

Rheological properties:

Texture profile

The texture profile parameters i.e. (hardness, adhesiveness, cohesiveness, springiness, gumminess and chewiness) of some processed cheese spreads available in Egyptian market were determined by texture profile analysis using Brookfield AT3 Texture Analyzer and the results are illustrated in Table (4). Adhesiveness is described to imitate as the stickiness of sample in the mouth throughout mastication (from slippery to sticky). The Adhesiveness values clear high variation as it ranged from 0.0 to 13.53kg with an average of 6.768kg in full-fat spread cheeses. In low-fat spreads, one sample did not measured. The great variation of the adhesiveness can be attributes to the different ingredients involved in preparation of the cheese spread blends. Cohesiveness imitate by the panels as the degree to which the cheese sample deforms before rupturing. Data in Table (4) indicate the instrumental cohesiveness values of some processed cheese spreads in the local Egyptian market. There was a great variation in the values of cohesiveness ranging from 0.101 to 0.85cm with an average of 0.482cm.

Hardness considered as an important parameter for cheese quality (from soft to firm) (Lee *et al.*, 1978). The values of spreads hardness varied from 33.5 to 430.0 with an average of 231.75 in full-fat cheese spreads. In low-fat spreads one sample did not measured any results on the apparatus while the other two samples recorded 44.5 and 41.5g, respectively.

The obtained results for hardness gave high variations which attributed to the different ingredients used in the blends especially fat content and its type, emulsifiers and other substances used and the pH of the spreads (Ennis and Mulvihill, 1997).

Springiness was described to the panelists as bouncing property of sample through several consecutive liters (from plastic to elastic). Springiness values of the Egyptian cheese spreads varied between 11.02 to 29.02 with an average of 20.02cm in full-fat cheese, but in low-fat cheese it was 15.34 and 18.4cm and one sample did not measured. The variations attributed to the different ingredients used in the blends in addition to the variation of the salt or emulsifier agent, also it was found a higher correlation between springiness and

the pH and the lactose of the cheese spreads (Younis *et al.*, 1991 and Abou El-Nour 2001).

Gumminess is expressed as a result of hardness multiplied with cohesiveness. Table (4) recorded the values of gumminess of the processed cheese spreads available in the Egyptian market. It is obvious that there was a range of variation between 27.2 to 159.2 with an average of 93.20g in full-fat spreads, while it was 27.1 and 35.4 in two samples of low-fat spreads.

Chewiness described to the panelist as the number of chews required to swallow a certain amount of sample. It is described from tender to tough. It is related to primary character of hardness, cohesiveness and springiness. The results of chewiness property of some processed cheese spreads available in Egyptian market varied from 2.9 to 56.7 with an average of 29.80kg/cm for full-fat samples, while it was 4.07 and 6.29 in two samples of low-fat spreads. The great variation in this respect is due to different blends used in the cheese manufacture. These results are in the same trend found by Younis *et al.*, (1991b) who found that there are high relationship between the total nitrogen and chewiness properties of processed cheese.

Table 4. Texture analysis of some processed cheese spreads available in Egyptian market.

Samples	Adhesiveness (kg)	Cohesiveness cm	Hardness (g)	Springiness mm	Gumminess (g)	Chewiness (kg/cm)	
Full- fat processed cheese spreads							
1	1.50	0.70	49.0	12.56	30.0	2.90	
2	2.60	0.78	38.0	16.51	29.6	4.79	
3	0.00	0.85	33.5	17.51	28.5	4.90	
4	1.82	0.74	36.5	16.65	27.2	4.43	
5	3.12	0.78	39.0	16.00	30.4	4.76	
6	1.96	0.51	50.0	14.04	25.5	3.51	
7	4.88	0.89	68.0	22.25	60.7	13.25	
8	3.44	0.57	130.0	13.71	63.8	9.92	
9	1.89	0.45	121.5	11.02	54.2	5.86	
10	3.30	0.61	89.5	14.18	55.9	7.77	
11	9.97	0.66	42.0	15.01	27.7	4.08	
12	9.93	0.73	430.0	18.33	157.4	56.70	
13	9.04	0.56	280.5	16.88	156.5	25.91	
14	13.53	0.55	263.5	18.16	159.2	28.36	
15	4.54	0.101	79.5	29.02	79.0	19.12	
Range	Max	13.53	0.85	430.0	29.02	159.2	56.70
	Mini	0.00	0.101	33.5	11.02	27.2	2.90
Average	6.768	0.482	231.75	20.02	93.20	29.80	
Low- fat processed cheese spreads							
16	2.44	0.65	41.5	15.34	27.1	4.07	
17	2.80	0.80	44.5	18.14	35.4	6.29	
18	NM*	NM	NM	NM	NM	NM	
Average	2.62	0.725	43	16.74	31.25	5.18	

*Not Measured

materials used. Brand (1) recorded the highest moisture content while minimum moisture content was for cheese sauce brand (6). The average of the obtained moisture content is lower than those given by Saad, (2011).

F/DM content was averaged 57.29% which was lower than Saad, (2011). The highest value was for brand (3) and the lowest was for the sauce brand (1). The differences were attributed to the raw materials used to formulate the blends.

Protein content of the processed cheese sauces which illustrated in table (6) ranged from 3.56 to 9.34 with an average of 6.45%. It was noticed that the sample which had minimum protein content was characterized by high fat level (table 6). The same observation was recorded by Saad, (2011).

The carbohydrate (CHO) according to the data calculated by differences for processed cheese sauce (table 7) ranged from 7.30 and 10.13 with an average of 8.72%. The differences in the CHO are due to the raw materials used in formulating the processed cheese sauce blends which are especially from the skim milk or whey as they are rich in lactose. The highest carbohydrate content was for processed cheese sauce brand (4) and the lowest for sample code brand (3).

The ash content of processed cheese sauce samples collected from Egyptian market (Table 7) ranged from 2.79 and 3.84 with an average of 3.33%. All brands examined lies within the **Egyptian Legal Standard 1970** (*i.e.* not more than 8%). The results are in accordance with Saad, (2011).

Table 6. Gross chemical composition of some processed cheese sauce samples collected from Egyptian market.

Sample code	%Moisture	F/DM	Protein%	% CHO	Ash%	Salt /Moisture	
Brand 1	66.43	37.21	9.34	8.73	3.53	3.027	
Brand 2	61.63	60.07	4.20	8.36	2.90	2.767	
Brand 3	37.02	77.36	3.56	7.30	3.40	2.220	
Brand 4	47.12	27.87	7.06	10.13	2.79	2.090	
Brand 5	44.46	73.08	3.79	8.53	3.13	2.627	
Brand 6	36.18	74.76	3.67	8.15	3.84	3.537	
Brand 7	40.77	73.95	4.26	7.65	3.76	3.430	
Range	Max	66.43	77.36	9.34	10.13	3.84	3.537
	Mini	36.18	37.21	3.56	7.30	2.79	2.090
Average	51.31	57.29	6.45	8.72	3.33	2.814	

Salt/moisture ratio in the Egyptian market sauces averaged 2.814% ranging from 2.090 to 3.537%. The variation in the salt/moisture ratio may be deduced to different ratios of salt in the ingredients from which they were made. Also, the salt/moisture ratio affected by the moisture content of surveyed processed cheese sauces however, all varieties lies within **Egyptian Legal Standards (1970)** for processed cheese (*i.e.* not more than 4%). The results also agree with Saad, (2011).

Nitrogen fractions are presented in (table 7). The SN ranged from 0.231 to 0.758 with an average

of 0.495% while SN/TN ranged from 40.47 to 68.41 with an average of 54.44%. SN/TN ratio with wide variations among the tested brands suggested differences in the amount and degree of ripening in the cheeses which was used in its manufacture. The SN lies within the range given by Saad, (2011). NPN/TN also showed a wide variation among the different samples ranging from 8.53 to 20.49 with an average of 14.51%. The NPN constitutes a part from soluble nitrogen of cheese. This may be originated from the ingredients used or from the peptizing effect of emulsifying salts (Meyer, 1973).

Table 7. Nitrogen fractions of some processed cheese sauce samples collected from Egyptian market.

Sample code	TN%	SN%	SN/TN	NPN%	NPN/TN	
Brand 1	1.466	0.594	40.52	0.125	8.53	
Brand 2	0.656	0.350	53.35	0.114	17.38	
Brand 3	0.576	0.231	40.47	0.113	19.02	
Brand 4	1.108	0.758	68.41	0.114	10.29	
Brand 5	0.594	0.241	40.57	0.113	19.02	
Brand 6	0.576	0.316	54.86	0.118	20.49	
Brand 7	0.667	0.275	41.23	0.123	18.44	
Range	Max	1.466	0.758	68.41	0.125	20.49
	Mini	0.576	0.231	40.47	0.113	8.53
Average	1.020	0.495	54.44	0.117	14.51	

Acidity of the collected processed cheese sauces from the Egyptian market ranged from 0.55 to 0.90

with an average of 0.73% (table 8). While the pH values ranged from 3.88 to 4.84 with the average of

Concerning yeasts & moulds, coliforms and spore forming bacterial counts, all samples of cheese sauces were free from all the tested organisms. This may attributed to the processing conditions and that all brands contained preservatives

Sensory evaluation of sauces

The sensory evaluation of processed cheese sauce samples collected from the Egyptian market is presented in table (10).

Generally, the additives added to the base sauces formula (*i.e.* flavours, thickening agent, colours..., *etc*) affect on the properties of the final products.

The colours of cheese sauces have wide differences according to the panelists evaluation, the brand (1) and brand (4) were the best samples of

cheese sauces scored (19), while brand (6) and brand (5) got the lowest points (15). Referred to flavour, the scores (39) were given almost to all samples according to panelists opinion except the sample brand (1) as it got the lowest points (35) due to the differences of the aroma and flavour. Regarding to the inner appearance which expressed by the body and texture, the cheese sauces showed a variation among the all samples. Brand (7) cheese sauce was the lowest in body and texture score (33) as it showed an oily separated body with low emulsion viscosity. Surveyed samples of processed cheese sauce cleared that brand (2 and 3) were the most accepted samples and they got the highest total scores (95) for its good appearance and chiny, good aroma and smooth and have a good body and texture.

Table 10. Organoleptic properties of processed cheese sauce samples collected from Egyptian market.

Sample code	Characteristic			
	Outer appearance (20)	Body and Texture (40)	Flavour (40)	Total scores (100)
Brand 1	19	39	35	93
Brand 2	17	39	39	95
Brand 3	17	39	39	95
Brand 4	19	35	39	93
Brand 5	15	35	37	87
Brand 6	15	36	39	90
Brand 7	16	33	39	88
Range				
Max	19	39	39	95
Mini	15	35	35	87
Average	17	37	37	91

References

- Abd Rabo, F. H.; Abd El-Fattah, A. M.; El Sayed, M. M; and Mohamed, A.G. (2005). Improvement of nutritional value of processed cheese by using modified emulsifying salts.
- Abou El-Nour, A.; (2001). Physicochemical and rheological properties of processed cheese spreads in the Egyptian and German market. *Egyptian J. Dairy Sci.*, 29: 119-126.
- Aly, G.; (2011). Process for preparing low fat cheese products. EP2366293A1, 21.
- AOAC Association of official analytical chemists, (2005). The official method of analysis 18th ed., Inc., Allington, Virginia, USA.
- Berger, W.; Klostermeyer, H.; Merkenich, K.; & Uhlmann, G.; (1993). In: *Processed Cheese Manufacture* (edited by H.Klostermeyer). Pp. 91-92. Joha® G. Guide, BK Ladenburg GmbH. Würzburg: Universitätsdruckerei.
- (BSI) (1986). (British Standards Institution). Microbiological examination of dairy purposes. BS4285: section 2.1.
- (BSI) (1988). (British Standards Institution). Analysis of dried milk and milk products. BSI, 1743.
- (BSI) (2010). (British Standards Institution). determination of titratable acidity (Reference method) ISO. 6091.
- Caric, M.; & Kaláb, M.; (1993). Processed cheese products. In: *Cheese: Chemistry, Physics and Microbiology* (edited by P. F. Fox). Pp. 467-505. London: Chapman & Hall.
- Egyptian Standard (1970). Specification of dairy products. MKM 999. Ministry of Agriculture, Cairo, Egypt 3-5.
- Egyptian Standard (2005). Processed cheese and processed cheese spreads with vegetable oil. 1132-p2-2005.
- El-Shibiny, S.; Shenana, M. E.; El-Nagar, G. F.; Abdou, S. M.; (2007). Effect of Fat Content, Fat Replacers and Emulsifying Salts on Half and Low-Fat Processed Cheese Spreads. *Journal of Saudi Society for Food and Nutrition* 2 (1) 53-68.
- Ennis M. P. and Mulvihill D. M.; (1997). Cheese analogues. In: 5th Cheese Symposium. Cogan TM, Fox PF and Ross RP (Eds.), organized by the Dairy Products Research Centre, Moorepark, Fermoy Co., Cork and the Faculty of Food Science University College, Cork, 11-13th March, 1997, Teagasc, Dublin, PP.1-14.
- Garawany, G. A. and Abd El-Salam, M. H.; (1997). Chemical composition and some properties of market processed cheese. *Egyptian J. Dairy Sci.*, 25: 269.
- Hine, W. S.; (1994). Method of making a high moisture non-fat cheese sauce. US Patent 5,304-387.

تقييم بعض أنواع الجبن المطبوخ القابل للفرد والمشهيات الموجوده في السوق المصري

أ.د. / محمد بدير الالفى .أ.د./ محمد عيد شنانه . داليا جمال جميل أ.د./ سنيه محمود عبده

قسم الألبان كلية الزراعة بمشهور - جامعة بنها

Corresponding author: mbeALFY@fagr.bu.edu.eg

الجبن المطبوخ عبارة عن مستحلب من الدهن في الماء. حيث تلعب بروتينات اللبن دورا هاما للمستحلب. والجبن المطبوخ متعدد الانواع حيث يوجد منها اكثر من نوع ومن هذه الانواع يوجد في الاسواق الجبن المطبوخ القابل للفرد ومشهيات الجبن المطبوخ. تم تجميع ثمانية عشر عينة عشوائية من الجبن المطبوخ القابل للفرد الموجوده في السوق المصري وقد احتوت العينات علي خمسة عشر عينة كاملة الدسم وثلاثة عينات منخفضة الدسم. تم تحليل العينات جميعها كيميائيا وميكروبيولوجيا وريولوجيا وحسبا وقد وجد أنها بالنسبة للتحليل الكيميائي جميعها في حدود المواصفات القياسية المصرية بالرغم من الإختلافات الكثيرة الموجودة بين العينات. وبالنسبة للميكروبيولوجي فقد وجدت العينات جميعها خالية من بكتريا القولون والخمائر والفطريات وكذلك البكتريا المتجرثة سواء الهوائية أو الغير هوائية ولكن وجدت أجزاء قليلة جدا بالنسبة للعدد الكلي. أما عن الإختبارات الريولوجية فقد وجد كثيرا من الإختلاف بين العينات وكذلك عند التحكيم بين العينات ولكنها جميعا مقبولة. أما بالنسبة لمشهيات الجبن المطبوخ فقد تم تجميع 7 عينات من السوق المحلي وكانت جميعها مستوردة حيث انها لا تصنع في مصر. تم تحليل العينات كيميائيا وريولوجيا وميكروبيولوجيا وحسبا. وقد أظهرت جميع النتائج كثيرا من الإختلافات بين العينات ولكنها جميعا في حدود المواصفات القياسية بالنسبة للجبن المطبوخ ولكن لا يوجد مواصفات قياسية في مصر للمشهيات. الإختلافات الكثيرة الموجودة بين عينات الجبن المطبوخ سواء المفرد أو المشهيات يرجع الي الإختلاف في المواد الخام المكونة للمخلوط.