EVALUATION OF PROTEINS OF SOME MARINE EDIBLE FISH FOUND AROUND KARACHI COAST

(Miss) Masarrat Riaz, (Miss) Riaz Fatima and A.H. Khan

PCSIR Laboratories, Karachi 39

S. MAQSOOD ALI and (Miss) RAZIA ISHAQUE

PCSIR Laboratories, Lahore 16

(Received March 9, 1972)

Abstract. Proteins extracted from fourteen different marine edible fish found around Karachi coast were analysed for amino acid contents and net protein utilisation (NPU) value by rat assay. When compared with FAO reference protein, the fish proteins were found to contain adequate amounts of essential amino acids except for slight deficiencies for tryptophan, sulphur, amino acids and lysine. NPU standardised values ranged from 86–100% which corroborated the results of chemical analysis. It was observed that NPU (st) values compared within $\pm 10\%$ (except for dawan and khokhar) with the protein scores calculated by using FAO 1957 Amino Acid Pattern. Protein scores calculated by FAO 1965 Pattern are consistently lower than those calculated by 1957 Pattern of NPU (st) values.

Marine edible fish have been found to be a rich source of vitamin A, protein, oil and unsaturated fatty acids. Their consumption is very high in this country, as they form a major constituent in the diet of the local population.

In a previous communication, the annual catch, consumption and distribution of vitamin A of fourteen species of fish found around the Karachi coast has been reported. Later on, a number of unsaturated fatty acids in their body oils were reported.²

The present studies have been undertaken for determining the amino acid contents of proteins from the same fourteen varieties of edible fish. Their protein value, on the basis of protein scores, calculated from amino acid make-up and from NPU value (by rat assay) was also evaluated. A comparative study of their nutritive assessment has also been undertaken.

Material and Methods

Extraction of Protein. The fourteen species of fish were procured from the fish harbour in the early morning in fresh condition. After removal of the vicera, the entire edible part (free from skin and bones) was coarsely minced, mixed well, and extracted by the following method.

The protein of the flesh was separated from nitrogenous extractives by macerating the mince with 95%, 80% and finally 60% hot alcohol. The precipitated protein was collected by filtration, air-dried and then refluxed for 4–6 hr with petroleum ether (b.p. 60–80°C). The solvent was removed and the fish meal was dried in air. It was then mixed with acetone for 24 hr to remove water from it. Acetone was decanted off and the meal was placed in a blowing oven at 45–50°C for 24 hr. The dried material obtained was powdered and sieved through 60 mesh.

Analysis. The proteins so obtained were analysed for moisture content according to A.O.A.C. method³ and for nitrogen by standard Kjeldahl technique and

converted to protein by multiplying with 6.25. The results were expressed on dry weight basis.

Amino acid composition was determined by hydrolysing protein (50 mg), with 6N HCl in a sealed-tube and keeping it at 110°C for 24 hr in an oven. After complete removal of the acid, the hydrolysate was used for estimation. Tryptophan was determined by the method of Spies and Chambers⁴ by alkaline hydrolysis. Methionine was determined according to the method of Sullivan-McCarthy.⁵

Net protein utilisation at 10% protein level¹⁰ was determined according to the method of Miller and Bender⁶ using male albino rats weighting 30–40 g. Calories were determined by means of a ballistic bomb calorimeter according to the method of Miller and Payne.⁷ NPU¹⁰ values were converted to NPU(st) or protein score according to the formula.⁸

NPU (st) =
$$\frac{\text{NPU} \times 54}{54 - \text{Protein cals } \%}$$
 -8

Protein Score (Chemical Score). Protein score is a measure of protein quality and is determined by comparing with the amino acid content of a test protein with that of a selected standard such as FAO provisional amino acid pattern of 1957.9 The amino acid showing the lowest percentage is called limiting amino acid and the percentage is the protein score. In 1965, the FAO Committee of Protein Requirements¹⁰ changed its ideal amino acid pattern in favour of egg protein. Since a good deal of data on protein scores of various proteins reported in the literature is based on FAO 1957 recommendations, we considered it worthwhile to calculate protein scores by using both FAO 19579 and 1965¹⁰ ideal amino acid patterns (Table 3).

Discussion

Amino Acid Make-Up. The FPC are generally rich in essential amino acids and are comparable to

TABLE 1. AMINO ACID CONTENT OF PAKISTANI FISHES, COMPARED WITH MILK, BEEF AND FAO 1957 PROVISIONAL AMINO ACID REFERENCE PATTERN.

| Amino acids | Category A | | | | Category B | | | | | | Category C | | | | | whole* | í | | |
|--------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|--------|------------|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|---------------|--------|--------|----------|---------------------------|---------|--------------|-------|-----|
| | White | Black t pomfre | Rawas t | Surmal | Aal | Boi | Dawan | Dhother | Hira | Palla | Sua | Khagga | Mushka | Khokhar | Range | Average | cows milk | Beef | FAO |
| Alanine | 6.394 | 6.215 | 6.693 | 6.776 | 6.474 | 6.884 | 6.259 | 6.327 | 6.934 | 6.461 | 6.793 | 6.600 | 5.934 | 6.190 | 5.93-6.93 | 6.495 | 3.50 | 5.77 | |
| Arginine | 6.210 | 7.604 | 8.897 | 7.284 | 1.828 | 5.693 | 5.010 | 6.486 | 6.900 | 5.243 | $7 \cdot 281$ | 3.177 | 3.867 | 1.548 | 1.55 - 8.90 | 5.502 | 3.72 | 6.45 | _ |
| Aspartic | 10.350 | 10.249 | 11.195 | 11.313 | 12.029 | 11.312 | 10.359 | 10.887 | 11.189 | 10.567 | 11.854 | 10.165 | 10.045 | 9.863 | 9.86 - 12.3 | 10.812 | 7.44 | 9.33 | _ |
| Methionine | 4.013 | 2.802 | 4.825 | 3.751 | 3.841 | 2.831 | 3.014 | 3.021 | 4.174 | 2.900 | 3.130 | 3.744 | 2.980 | 3.990 | 2.80-4.8 | 3.501 | 2.49 | 2.48 | |
| Cystine | 1.380 | 1.186 | 1.137 | 1.403 | 1.414 | 1.658 | 1.375 | 1.356 | 1.242 | 1.508 | 1.376 | 1.289 | 1.254 | 1.368 | $1 \cdot 19 - 1 \cdot 66$ | 1.353 | 0.91 | 1.26 | |
| Total sulphur | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| -amino acid | 5.393 | 3.988 | 5.962 | 5.154 | 5.255 | 4.489 | 4.389 | 4.377 | 5.416 | 4.408 | 4.506 | 5.033 | 4.234 | 5.358 | $4 \cdot 23 - 5 \cdot 9$ | 4.854 | 3.41 | 3.74 | 4.3 |
| Glutamic acid | 6.019 | 14.384 | 17.585 | 15.633 | 14.869 | 18.283 | 16.996 | 17.191 | 17.399 | 17.195 | 17.238 | 19.621 | 17.797 | 18.446 1 | 14.38-19.626 | 17.046 | 15.00 | 15.14 | |
| Glycine | 4.749 | 4.553 | 4.651 | 5.099 | 4.749 | 4.948 | 4.543 | 4.936 | 4.979 | 4.837 | 4.628 | 4.622 | 4.000 | 4.879 | 4.00- 4.95 | 4.720 | 2.02 | 6.19 | |
| Histidine | 2.495 | 2.791 | 2.459 | 3.521 | 3.139 | 2.584 | 2.316 | | 2.725 | 2.540 | 2.985 | 0.920 | 1.376 | 2.830 | 0.92 - 3.52 | 2.519 | 2.60 | 3.47 | |
| Isolencine | 5.324 | 5.457 | 5.950 | 6.437 | 5.658 | 6.219 | 5.680 | 5.700 | 6.175 | 5.858 | 6.515 | 6.132 | 4.950 | 5.380 | 4.95-6.18 | 5.816 | 6.51 | 4.42 | 4.3 |
| Lencine | 8.544 | 9.299 | 9.488 | 10.236 | 10.315 | 9.918 | 9.051 | 9.222 | 10.154 | 9.396 | 10.112 | 9.721 | 8.155 | 8.226 | 8.16-10.32 | 9.416 | 10.02 | 8.19 | 4.9 |
| Lysine | 9.085 | 9.944 | 9.520 | 12.910 | 4.611 | 9.231 | 8.435 | 10.328 | 10.959 | 8.723 | 11.510 | 4.333 | 5.517 | 5.999 | 4.33-10.96 | 8.650 | 7.93 | 8.74 | 4.3 |
| Phenylalanine | 3.979 | 4.109 | 4.709 | 5.130 | 5.209 | 4.999 | 4.677 | 5.073 | 4.715 | 4.779 | 5.250 | 4.896 | 4.400 | 4.518 | 3.98- 5.25 | 4.746 | 5.94 | 4.11 | 2.9 |
| Tyrosine | 3.829 | 2.745 | 3.642 | 3.400 | 3.461 | 3.740 | 3.481 | 3.363 | 2.645 | 3.538 | 3.984 | 4.131 | 3.820 | 3.925 | 2.64-4.13 | 3.550 | 5.20 | 3.40 | 2.9 |
| Total aromatic | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| amino acid | 7.808 | 6.854 | 8.351 | 8.530 | 8.670 | 8.739 | 8.158 | 8.436 | 7.360 | 8.317 | 9.234 | 9.027 | 8.420 | 8.443 | $7 \cdot 32 - 9 \cdot 23$ | 8.310 | 11.14 | 7.50 | |
| Proline | 4.174 | 4.034 | 4.373 | 4.948 | 4.508 | 4.374 | 4.020 | | 4.910 | 5.150 | 4.628 | 3.415 | 3.318 | 3.674 | $3 \cdot 32 - 5 \cdot 15$ | 4.281 | 11.34 | 4.93 | |
| Serine | 4.255 | 4.553 | 4.396 | 5.069 | 4.588 | 4.543 | 4.019 | 3.796 | 5.175 | 4.210 | 3.973 | 3.743 | 3.732 | 3.830 | 3.73 - 5.18 | 4.277 | 6.02 | 4.19 | |
| Threonine | 5.370 | 5.796 | 6.043 | 5.820 | 5.025 | 6.373 | 5.643 | 4.753 | 6.290 | 5.759 | 7.126 | 7.331 | 4.758 | 4.887 | 4.78-7.33 | 5.783 | 4.70 | 4.42 | 2.9 |
| Tryptophan | 1.449 | 1.310 | 1.600 | 1.573 | 1.299 | 1.355 | 1.243 | 1.573 | 1.242 | 1.397 | 1.332 | 1.584 | 1.542 | 1.594 | 1.24- 1.60 | 1.435 | 1.44 | 1.17 | 1.4 |
| Valine | 5.520 | 6.181 | 6.403 | 6.727 | 6.773 | 6.858 | 6.191 | 5.928 | 6.704 | 6.405 | 6.737 | 6.941 | 5.978 | | 5.52 6.86 | 6.382 | 7.01 | 5.55 | |
| Protein | 86.8 | 87.97 | 86.0 | 82.63 | 86.5 | 82.09 | 90.80 | 87.22 | 86.41 | 86.0 | 89.78 | 87.50 | 90.04 | 87.63 | | | | | |
| $(\% \times 6.25)$ | | | | | | " | | | | | ' | | | | | | | | |

*M.L. Gr and B.K. Watt, Amino Acid Content of Foods (Home Economics Research Report No. 4, Washington, 1966). †FAO Nutritional Studies No. 16(1957 b).

'surmai'

lysine

These are richer in this amino acid than either

and

dother, 'palla' and acids content ontents. Sulphur-amino acids content

Khokhar slightly lesser contents. Sulphur-amino acids content of Pakistani fish was found to be comparable or even higher than those of Indian^{II} and English^{I2}, Ish.

between 86-100 of over 95% are and 'dawan' (95.1 respectively.9

NPU and or beef NPU (st) of fish fish. Some Indian fish, e.g. Stromateus n Sardinella fimbriata and Sardinella longiceps, found to contain 0.7, 0.8 and 1.7 g histidine/16 this is not peculiar to the above-mentioned Pakistani 'mushka' (0.9 and 1.4 g/16 g N) as against normal figures of 2.46-3.52 g/16 g N in other cases. But Histidine was found to be deficient in 'khagga' -100 (Table 2). Fish 1 % are 'rawas' (101%) 'mu (95.9%), while lower v Protein Score (Chemical Score). proteins are quite high and range Fish having NPU(st) Fish having NPU(st) 'mushkas' (97.5%) ower values are given

Stromateus niger,

were 6 g N

TION (NPU) VALUES AND PROTEIN CULATED BY FAO 1957 AND COMPARISON OF NET PROTEIN **1965 AMINO** SCORES CAL-UTILISA-

White pomfret Black pomfret Khagga Mushka Palla Boi Rawas Sua Dawan Aal Surmai Fishes ACID PATTERNS. protein level at 10% 84.0 80.1 81.1 78.0 78.5 83.3 86.0 77.1 82·3 79·2 89·0 80·5 87·5 76·3 93.0 89.2 101.0 90.8 99.4 85.6 NPU standar-dised 95.9 90.3 91.5 87.7 88.3 94.2 97.5 84·6(t) 100·0 86·8(t) 96·9(t) 92·2(t) 100·0 100·0 FAO protein scores 100·0 88·8(s) 100·0 100·0 90·0(t) 94·4(t) 1957 93·5(t)†
73·1(s)
96·7(t)
80·6(t)
66·1(1)
77·7(s)
77·7(s)
77·9(s)
80·5(s)
80·5(s)
79·6(s)
79·6(s)
79·6(s)
70·9(s)
88·8(s)
100·0 1965

*Mean NPU value of 8 rats per group. †Limiting amino acids are shown in paranthesis. t, tryptophan; s, sulphur-amino acids; l, lysine.

those of other protein sources such as milk and beef (Table 1). However, a few degressions from the normal

values are Aal' and 'khokhar' a and 1.55 g/16 g \dot{N} , respectively, .90 for the remaining fish. It w are particularly low in agrinine, will as be noted agains

that all the three fish of category C are generally deficient Fish proteins are generally rich in lysine and, thereagrinine.

fore,

containing a comparable All fish proteins were found to contain appreciable quantity of sulphur-containing amino acids. Black pomfret, 'boi', dother', 'palla' and 'mushka' had Reference Protein (Table 1, last column). However, such low values are not exceptional to the above fish and lysine in Indian fish, 6 g N which mushka' and 'khokhar' very well complement cereal proteins which are found in the above fish. and 'sua' contain as low as 3.7 g/16 g this almost half the to lysine contained in is more than double the quantity of Stromateus niger. II ua' contain 12.9 a amino acid. appear to be poor in lysine normal quantity but still ained in FAO 1957 Ideal But N has been reported and As against these d 11.5 g lysine/ 'aal' 5 g lysine/ 'khagga'

by 'boi' (85.6%), 'khokhar' (86.5%) and 'pallas'

(87.7%).

Miller and Payne¹³ observed that NPU determined at the maintenance level or NPU(st) of a protein is equal to protein score calculated from amino acid make-up. Table 2 shows that our NPU(st) figures compare well with the protein score calculated by FAO 1957 method. Except for 'dawan' and 'khokar', these agree well within 10%. Protein scores calculated by FAO 1965 method are consistently lower than those obtained by the FAO 1957 method or NPU(st) values.

Acknowledgement. The authors wish to thank the Department of Biochemistry, University of Manchester (U.K.), where the amino acid analysis of pomodasid, white pomfret, black pomfret, snapper, striped meckeral and drums was carried out. They are also thankful to Mr. Helmut Maier of Nazar & Co., Karachi, for getting the amino acid analysis of 'khokhar', 'mushka' and 'khagga'.

References

 A.H. Khan and S.A. Haq, Pakistan J. Sci. Ind. Res., 1, 309 (1958).

 A.H. Khan, Q. Khalid and A. Mirza, J, Am. Oil Chemist Soc., 45, 247 (1958).

- 3. J. Assoc. Offic. Agr. Chemists, Official Methods of Analysis, ninth edition (1960).
- 4. J.R. Spies and D. Chambers, Anal. Chem., 20, 30 (1948).
- R.J. Block, D. Boilling and Sullivan-McCarthy, *Amino Acid Composition of Protein and Food* (Charles, Springfield, New York, 1951), p. 439.
- D.S. Miller and A.E. Bender, Brit. J. Nutr., 9, 382 (1955).
- 7. D.S. Miller and P.R. Payne, ibid., 13, 501 (1959).
- 8. NAS-NRC. Evaluation of Protein Quality.
 National Academy of Science, National
 Research Council, Washington, Publication
 No. 110 (1963).
- 9. F.A.O. Nutritional Studies No. 10, Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations, Rome, Italy, 1965.
- 10. FAO/WHO 'Protein Requirements' FAO Nutrition Meeting Report Series No. 37. Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations, Rome, Italy (1965).
- 11. F. Master and M. Nagar, Ind. J. Med. Res., 42, 509 (1954).
- 12. J.J. Conneland and P.F. Hordgate, J. Sci. Food Agr., 10, 241 (1959). (Appendix C).
- 13. Appendix A

Appendix A

AMINO ACIDS CALCULATED ON THE BASIS OF 16 g N.

| Fish species | Agr. | Hist. | Isolene | Leu. | Lys. | Meth. | Ph. alan | Thr. | Tryp. | Valin |
|---|------|-------|---------|------|------|-------|----------|------|-------|-------|
| Sardines (Sardinops caerulea) | 5.1 | 4.7 | 4.6 | 7.2 | 8.4 | 2.8 | 3.7 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 5.2 |
| Herring (Clupea hereugus) | 5.5 | 2.4 | 4.9 | 7.1 | 7.8 | 2.7 | 3.4 | 4.4 | 0.8 | 5.0 |
| Herring Pallassi | 5.9 | 2.0 | 6.4 | 8.0 | 8.2 | 2.2 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 0.7 | 5.1 |
| Meckerel (Scomber scombrus) | 5.8 | 3.8 | 5.2 | 7.2 | 8.1 | 2.7 | 3.5 | 4.9 | 1.0 | 5.4 |
| Pneumatophorusdego | 5.5 | 5.4 | 5.0 | 7.4 | 8.5 | 2.8 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 1.0 | 5.2 |
| Scorbermorus Maculatus | 5.3 | 1.5 | _ | _ | 6.5 | _ | _ | _ | 1.4 | _ |
| Tuna: germo (Thunnus and Meothunnus sp) | 5.3 | 5.7 | 4.7 | 7.2 | 8.3 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 1.0 | 5.1 |
| Tuna:enthynnus Pelanis | 7.8 | 3.0 | _ | 10.4 | 7.4 | _ | 4.1 | _ | | _ |
| Gaduscallaras and Melono grammus aeglefinus | 6.1 | 2.1 | 5.5 | 8.1 | 8.8 | 3.0 | 3.9 | 4.9 | 1.0 | 5.3 |
| Sebastodes sp. (Redcod) | 4.3 | 1.6 | 6.4 | 11.4 | 14.4 | 2.6 | 4.4 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 5.0 |
| S. pagus sp. | 5.1 | 2.0 | _ | 8.8 | 6.2 | _ | 4.7 | _ | _ | _ |
| Micropogun undulatus | 5.8 | 1.4 | - | _ | 6.1 | _ | _ | _ | 1.2 | _ |
| Hippoglossus hippglossis | 6.0 | 1.7 | - | 10.3 | 6.7 | | 3.0 | _ | 1.6 | |
| Lutiamus black fordii | 6.2 | 1.6 | - | _ | 6.7 | _ | _ | _ | 1.2 | _ |
| Mugil sp. | 5.8 | 1.6 | | | 6.7 | | | | 1.4 | |
| Alosa sapidissima | 4.5 | 1.1 | - | - | 6.4 | | _ | | 1.2 | _ |
| Salmon:Oncorhynchus pschawytscha | 5.8 | 2.6 | 4.9 | 7.3 | 8.0 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 4.4 | 0.9 | 5.6 |
| Salmon: keta | 5.5 | 1.3 | _ | _ | 5.7 | _ | _ | _ | 1.3 | _ |
| Salmon:Namaycush | 5.7 | 1.4 | | | 7.1 | | _ | _ | 1.2 | |
| Trout (Cynoscion regalis) | 5.9 | 1.4 | _ | | 6.8 | _ | _ | _ | 1.0 | - |
| Cristivomer namaycush | 5.7 | 1.4 | _ | | 7.1 | _ | _ | _ | 1.2 | |