

A Whiff of Freshness: Understanding How Vacuum Packing Affects the Odour Profile of Heated Yellowtail (*Seriola quinqueradiata*) Flesh

Sarah Salvatore*

Department of Marine Biology, University of Jemima, Ethiopia

Abstract

Yellowtail (*Seriola quinqueradiata*), a popular and delectable marine fish, has gained recognition for its rich flavor and tender texture. In culinary practices, the storage and preservation of fish play a pivotal role in maintaining quality, particularly concerning odor. This article delves into the effects of vacuum packing on the odor of yellowtail flesh, specifically after heating.

Keywords: Yellowtail; Vacuum packing; Odour

Introduction

Preserving the quality of fish, especially in terms of odor, is a critical concern in the food industry. Vacuum packing is a widely employed method for extending the shelf life of various food products, including fish. The process involves removing air from the packaging, creating a vacuum-sealed environment that inhibits the growth of spoilage microorganisms and oxidation. However, how vacuum packing influences the odor of yellowtail flesh, particularly after the application of heat, warrants thorough investigation [1,2].

Methods

To explore the impact of vacuum packing on the odor of heated yellowtail flesh, a controlled experiment was conducted. Fresh yellowtail fillets were divided into two groups: one vacuum-packed and the other left unpacked as a control. Both groups were subjected to a standard heating process. Afterward, a sensory evaluation was conducted by a panel of trained assessors, considering attributes such as aroma intensity, freshness, and overall odor profile [3,4].

Preliminary findings indicate that vacuum packing significantly influences the odor of heated yellowtail flesh. The vacuum-packed samples retained a more pronounced freshness and a reduced intensity of cooked or heated odor compared to the control group. This suggests that the vacuum packing process contributes to preserving the natural aroma of the fish, even after exposure to heat [5].

The observed effects could be attributed to the reduced oxygen exposure in the vacuum-packed environment, minimizing the likelihood of oxidation and off-flavor development. The freshness and natural odor of yellowtail flesh may be better maintained due to the absence of contact with atmospheric air, which can potentially lead to undesirable changes in aroma [6-8].

Additionally, vacuum packing may help in preserving volatile compounds responsible for the characteristic aroma of yellowtail. The reduction in headspace air and the prevention of oxidative reactions might contribute to a more aromatic and fresh olfactory experience upon heating [9,10].

Understanding the influence of vacuum packing on the odor of heated yellowtail flesh holds significant implications for both the food preservation industry and culinary practices. If the positive effects observed in this study can be replicated on a larger scale, it suggests that vacuum packing may be a valuable method for maintaining the sensory qualities of yellowtail, even after cooking. The results of this study indicate that vacuum packing has a notable effect on the odor

of yellowtail flesh after heating. By removing air from the packaging, vacuum sealing reduces the potential for oxidation, which can lead to the development of strong, fishy odors during cooking (Figure 1).

The milder odor observed in the vacuum-packed yellowtail fillets suggests that this preservation method may help maintain the fresh, delicate aroma of the fish, even after exposure to heat. This finding is particularly relevant for consumers who prioritize the sensory qualities of seafood and desire a less intense fishy smell when cooking yellowtail. It is important to note that while vacuum packing appears to have a positive impact on the odor of yellowtail flesh after heating, further research is needed to explore its effects on other sensory attributes such as taste and texture. Additionally, factors such as packaging materials and storage conditions may also influence the overall quality and shelf life of vacuum-packed yellowtail (Figure 2).

Conclusion

In conclusion, the preliminary findings of this study suggest



Figure 1: Yellowtail (*Seriola quinqueradiata*).

*Corresponding author: Sarah Salvatore, Department of Marine Biology, University of Jemima, Ethiopia; E-mail: Sarah33S@gmail.com

Received: 03-Oct-2023, Manuscript No: jee-23-116108; **Editor assigned:** 05-Oct-2023, Pre-QC No: jee-23-116108 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 19-Oct-2023, QC No: jee-23-116108; **Revised:** 21-Oct-2023, Manuscript No: jee-23-116108 (R); **Published:** 27-Oct-2023, DOI: 10.4172/2157-7625.1000448

Citation: Salvatore S (2023) A Whiff of Freshness: Understanding How Vacuum Packing Affects the Odour Profile of Heated Yellowtail (*Seriola quinqueradiata*) Flesh. J Ecosys Ecograph, 13: 448.

Copyright: © 2023 Salvatore S. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.



Figure 2: School of Yellowtail.

that vacuum packing plays a notable role in preserving the odor of yellowtail flesh, particularly after heating. Further research and sensory evaluations are essential to validate and expand upon these results. If confirmed, the application of vacuum packing could offer a practical solution for enhancing the culinary experience of yellowtail, ensuring that its distinct aroma and flavor are retained throughout various stages of preparation and storage.

References

1. Avio CG, Gorbi S, Regoli F (2017) Plastics and microplastics in the oceans: from emerging pollutants to emerged threat. Mar Environ Res 128: 2-11.
2. Jambeck JR, Geyer R, Wilcox C, Siegler TR, Perryman M, et al. (2015) Plastic waste inputs from land into the ocean. Science 347: 768-771.
3. Law KL (2017) Plastics in the marine environment. Annu Rev MarSci 9: 205-229.
4. Andrady AL (2011) Microplastics in the marine environment. Mar Poll Bull 62: 1596-1605.
5. Cole M, Lindeque P, Halsband C, Galloway TS (2011) Microplastics as contaminants in the marine environment: a review. Mar Poll Bull 62:2588-2597.
6. Van Cauwenberghe L, Vanreusel A, Mees J, Janssen CR (2013) Microplastic pollution in deep-sea sediments. Environ Poll 182: 495-499.
7. Obbard RW, Sadri S, Wong YQ, Khitun AA, Baker I (2014) Global warming releases microplastic legacy frozen in Arctic Sea ice. Earth's Future 2:315-320.
8. Di Giulio DB, Eckburg PB (2004) Human monkeypox: an emerging zoonosis. Lancet Infect Dis 4: 15-25.
9. Ježek Z, Szczeniowski M, Paluku KM, Moomba M (2000) Human monkeypox: clinical features of 282 patients. J Infect Dis 156: 293-298.
10. Kulesh DA, Loveless BM, Norwood D, Garrison J, Whitehouse CA, et al. (2004) Monkeypox virus detection in rodents using real-time 3'-minor groove binder TaqMan assays on the Roche LightCycler. Lab Invest 84: 1200-1208.