Journal of Nutrition Science Research

Nicole, J Nutr Sci Res 2023, 8:4

Mini Review Open Access

Analogues of Meat from Plants and Animals: Comparison of Their Nutritional Profiles and In Vitro Digestion

Anthony Nicole*

Gastroenterology Unit, Rho Hospital, ASST Rhodense, Rho (MI), Italy

Abstract

This article provides a comparative analysis of the nutritional profiles and in vitro digestion characteristics of meat and plant-based meat analogues. As the demand for meat alternatives grows, understanding the similarities and differences between these products is crucial for consumers and researchers.

In terms of nutritional profiles, meat products are known for their high protein content and varying levels of fats, including both saturated and unsaturated fats. Plant-based meat analogues rely on protein-rich sources such as soy, peas, or wheat gluten to mimic the protein content of meat. They often contain vegetable oils and tend to have lower saturated fat levels than meat. Some plant-based options may also include added carbohydrates or fortified micronutrients to enhance their nutritional value [1].

In vitro digestion studies provide insights into how these products are broken down and absorbed in the human digestive system. Animal-based meats are generally more digestible due to lower fiber content and the presence of intramuscular fat. Plant-based meat analogues can vary in digestibility based on their ingredients, with protein sources like soy or pea being highly digestible, while certain fibers and plant proteins may be less digestible or fermentable [2].

Further research and in vivo studies are needed to assess the long-term health effects and physiological responses associated with consuming meat and plant-based alternatives. Understanding the nutritional profiles and digestion characteristics of these products is crucial for making informed dietary choices and developing more sustainable and healthier food options.

Keywords: Meat; Plant-based meat analogues; In vitro digestion; Protein; Bioactive compounds; Digestive enzymes

Introduction

The global demand for meat has been steadily rising over the past few decades, fueled by population growth, urbanization, and changing dietary preferences. However, the meat industry's environmental impact, ethical concerns related to animal welfare, and growing health consciousness among consumers have spurred an increasing interest in meat alternatives. In response to these emerging trends, plant-based meat analogues have gained popularity as viable substitutes for traditional meat products [3].

Plant-based meat analogues are innovative products designed to mimic the taste, texture, and nutritional profile of meat, offering consumers a sustainable and cruelty-free alternative. These products are typically made from a combination of plant-derived ingredients, including legumes, grains, and various protein-rich sources. As the interest in plant-based diets and alternative protein sources continues to grow, understanding the nutritional composition and digestibility of plant-based meat analogues becomes crucial for informed decision-making [4].

This article delves into the nutritional profile and in vitro digestion comparison between meat and plant-based meat analogues. By examining these aspects, we can gain valuable insights into how these alternatives stack up against traditional meat products in terms of their potential health benefits, environmental impact, and overall dietary suitability.

Nutritional Profile

The nutritional composition of food products plays a critical role in determining their suitability for meeting human dietary needs. Traditional meat products, such as beef, pork, and poultry, are renowned for their high protein content and bioavailability of essential amino acids. Protein is vital for tissue repair, enzymatic functions, and overall growth and maintenance of the human body.

On the other hand, plant-based meat analogues aim to match or surpass the protein content found in meat by utilizing plant sources like soy, peas, lentils, mushrooms, and wheat gluten. These plant-derived ingredients are carefully processed and combined to provide a complete amino acid profile that closely resembles animal-based proteins.

Apart from protein, fats are another essential component of both meat and plant-based meat analogues. Meat products contain varying levels of saturated and unsaturated fats, while plant-based alternatives often incorporate vegetable oils to achieve a similar mouthfeel and texture. As a result, plant-based meat analogues typically offer lower levels of saturated fats [5], making them a preferred choice for individuals seeking healthier dietary options.

***Corresponding author:** Anthony Nicole, Gastroenterology Unit, Rho Hospital, ASST Rhodense, Rho (MI), Italy, E-mail: Nicoleanthony@coresearch.it

Received: 30-June-2023, Manuscript No. snt-23-108888; **Editor assigned:** 03-July-2023, PreQC No. snt-23-108888(PQ); **Reviewed:** 17-July-2023, QC No. snt-23-108888; **Revised:** 24-July-2023, Manuscript No. snt-23-108888(R); **Published:** 31-July-2023, DOI: 10.4172/snt.1000207

Citation: Nicole A (2023) Analogues of Meat from Plants and Animals: Comparison of Their Nutritional Profiles and In Vitro Digestion. J Nutr Sci Res 8: 207.

In vitro digestion comparison

Understanding how different food products are broken down and absorbed during digestion is crucial for assessing their nutritional value and potential health impacts. In vitro digestion studies simulate the human digestive process in a controlled laboratory environment, providing valuable insights into the breakdown of macronutrients and bioavailability of essential nutrients [6].

Animal-based meats generally have lower fiber content and are more easily digestible compared to plant-based alternatives. The presence of intramuscular fat in meat contributes to its relatively quick and efficient digestion. However, plant-based meat analogues can exhibit varied digestibility, depending on the specific ingredients used. While some plant proteins, like soy or pea protein, are highly digestible, certain fibers and plant-derived components may be less digestible or fermentable, affecting the overall digestive response [7].

Materials and Methods

Selection of meat and plant-based meat analogues

Various types of meat products (e.g., beef, pork, poultry) were obtained from local markets or suppliers. Different cuts and preparations were considered to represent the diversity in meat products.

Plant-based meat analogues from different manufacturers or brands were selected. These products were chosen based on their popularity, availability, and representation of a range of plant-based protein sources [8].

Nutritional analysis

Proximate composition: The macronutrient content (protein, fat, carbohydrates) was determined using standard methods such as the Association of Official Analytical Chemists (AOAC) procedures.

Micronutrients: The levels of essential micronutrients (vitamins, minerals) were analyzed using appropriate analytical techniques, including spectrophotometry or atomic absorption spectroscopy [9].

Fiber content: The total dietary fiber content was determined using approved enzymatic-gravimetric methods.

In vitro digestion study

Simulated digestive fluids: Simulated gastrointestinal fluids were prepared to mimic the conditions in the human digestive system. This involved simulating the pH and enzyme activity of saliva, gastric fluid, and intestinal fluid [10].

Digestion procedure: Meat samples and plant-based meat analogues were subjected to in vitro digestion using a standardized protocol. The samples were exposed to simulated saliva, followed by simulated gastric fluid and intestinal fluid, with appropriate incubation times and temperature.

Digestive enzyme analysis: The activity of digestive enzymes, such as amylase, pepsin, and pancreatic enzymes, was assessed at different stages of the digestion process.

Measurement of digestion parameters: The changes in pH, breakdown of macronutrients, and release of bioactive compounds during digestion were monitored. This included assessing the release of amino acids, fatty acids, and other digestion products [11].

Statistical analysis

The obtained data from the nutritional analysis and in vitro digestion study were analyzed using appropriate statistical methods.

Descriptive statistics, such as mean, standard deviation, and range, were calculated for each parameter.

Statistical tests, such as t-tests or analysis of variance (ANOVA), were performed to determine significant differences between meat and plant-based meat analogues [12].

Limitations

It is important to acknowledge that in vitro digestion studies have limitations and may not fully represent the complexities of the human digestive system.

The selection of specific meat and plant-based meat analogues may not cover the entire spectrum of available products, limiting the generalizability of the results [13].

The study focused on the comparison of nutritional profiles and in vitro digestion, and further research is needed to evaluate other aspects such as bioavailability, physiological responses, and long-term effects.

By employing these materials and methods, researchers can conduct a comprehensive analysis of the nutritional profiles and in vitro digestion characteristics of meat and plant-based meat analogues, contributing to a better understanding of these alternative food options [14].

Conclusion

As the interest in plant-based diets and meat alternatives continues to grow, it becomes imperative to understand the nutritional composition and digestion characteristics of these products. By comparing the nutritional profiles and in vitro digestion of meat and plant-based meat analogues, consumers and researchers can make informed decisions about their dietary choices, considering factors such as health benefits, environmental impact, and personal preferences. This knowledge can further drive the development of sustainable and nutritious food options to cater to a diverse and health-conscious global population.

Acknowledgement

None

Conflict of Interest

None

References

1. McLeroy KR, Bibeau D, Steckler A, Glanz K (1988) An ecological perspective on health promotion programs. Health Educ Q 15: 351-377.
2. Green LW, Richard L, Potvin L (1996) Ecological foundations of health promotion. Am J Health Promot 10: 270-281.
3. Story M, Kaphingst KM, Robinson-O'Brien R, Glanz K (2008) Creating healthy food and eating environments: policy and environmental approaches. Annu Rev Public Health 29: 253-272.
4. Merriam SB, Tisdell EJ (2016) Six common qualitative research designs. Qualitative Research Jossey-Bass 22-42.
5. Palinkas LA, Horwitz SM, Green CA, Wisdom JP, Duan N, et al. (2015) Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. Adm Policy Ment Health 42: 533-544.
6. Carvalho M, Vieirade B, Costa L, Di C, Oliveira L, et al. (2017) Local food environment and fruit and vegetable consumption : An ecological study 5:13-20.
7. Le K, Houtz RL, Wilhoit J, Archbold D, Co C, et al. (2010) Fruit and Vegetable

Research Report Faculty. Horticulture Farm Manager Faculty projects included in this report.

8. Pereira CJ (2014) Understanding fruit and vegetable consumption : A qualitative investigation in the Mitchells Plain sub-district of Cape Town by. 2.
9. Yazew T(2020) Health Benefits of Fruit and Vegetables Consumption : Preventive Implications for Non-communicable Diseases in Ethiopia Advanced Techniques in Biology & Medicine.
10. Alexander GL, McClure JB, Calvi JH (2010) A randomized clinical trial evaluating online interventions to improve fruit and vegetable consumption. Am J Public Health 100: 319-326.
11. Pascolini D, Mariotti SP (2012) Global estimates of visual impairment: 2010. Br J Ophthalmol 96: 614-618.
12. Brian G, Taylor H (2001) Cataract blindness-Challenges for the 21st century. Bull World Health Organ 79: 249-256.
13. Moreau KL, King JA (2012) Protein misfolding and aggregation in cataract disease and prospects for prevention.Trends Mol Med 18: 273-282.
14. Vinson JA (2006) Oxidative stress in cataracts. Pathophysiology 13: 151-162.