

# Effect of sex, dietary glycerol or dietary fat during late fattening, on fatty acid composition and positional distribution of fatty acids within the triglyceride in pigs

J. Segura<sup>1†</sup>, M. I. Cambero<sup>2</sup>, L. Cámara<sup>3,4</sup>, C. Loriente<sup>5</sup>, G. G. Mateos<sup>3,4</sup> and C. J. López-Bote<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Departamento de Producción Animal, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 28040 Madrid, Spain; <sup>2</sup>Departamento de Nutrición y Bromatología, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 28040 Madrid, Spain; <sup>3</sup>CEI Campus Moncloa, UCM-UPM, 28040 Madrid, Spain; <sup>4</sup>Departamento de Producción Animal, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, 28040 Madrid, Spain; <sup>5</sup>Incarlopsa, Tarancón, 16400, Cuenca, Spain

(Received 26 September 2014; Accepted 17 July 2015)

The effect of sex, source of saturated fat (lard v. palm oil) and glycerol inclusion in the fattening diet on composition and fatty acid positional distribution in the triglyceride molecule was studied in pigs from 78 to 110 kg BW. Average daily gain and carcass characteristics, including ham and loin weight, were not affected by dietary treatment but sex affected backfat depth (P < 0.01). A significant interaction between sex and glycerol inclusion was observed; dietary glycerol increased lean content in gilts but not in barrows (P < 0.05 for the interaction). Individual and total saturated fatty acid (SFA) concentrations were greater in barrows than in gilts. In contrast, the concentration of total polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFA) and of C18:2n-6, C18:3n-3, C20:3n-9 and C20:4n-6 in the intramuscular fat (IMF) was higher (P < 0.05) in gilts than in barrows. Sex did not affect total monounsaturated fatty acids (MUFA) concentration in the IMF. The proportion of SFA in the subcutaneous fat (SF) was higher in barrows than in gilts (P < 0.001). Within the individual SFA, sex affected only the concentrations of C14:0 and C16:0 (P < 0.001). Dietary fat did not affect total SFA or PUFA concentrations of the IMF but the subcutaneous total MUFA and C16:0 (P < 0.001). Dietary fat did not affect total SFA or PUFA concentrations of the IMF but the subcutaneous total MUFA and C18:1n-9 concentration in the IMF and increased total MUFA and decreased C18:2n-6, C18:3n-3 and total PUFA concentrations in the SF. The data indicate that altering the fatty acid composition of the triglyceride molecule at the 2-position, by dietary intervention during the fattening phase, is very limited.

Keywords: dietary fat, glycerol, intramuscular fat, pig, positional fatty acid distribution.

#### **Implications**

The structure and composition of triglycerides affect the quality of dry-cured meat products, including the hams. The structure of the triglyceride molecule affects the incidence and development of different illnesses in humans as obesity, type 2 diabetes and hypertension. Research on modification of these variables by changing animal diets might help to improve the quality of meat products and help in the prevention of certain human diseases.

## Introduction

Modification of the fatty acid (FA) profile of pig tissues is a matter of interest in the production of high-quality meat

† E-mail: josesegu@ucm.es

products (D'Arrigo *et al.*, 2002; Candek-Potokar and Skrlep, 2012). Limiting the concentration of linoleic acid (C18:2n-6) in pig fat improves fat consistency, decreases the susceptibility to oxidation and development of undesirable flavor and reduces the incidence of technological problems, such as those related to water migration (López-Bote, 1998; López-Bote *et al.*, 2002; Isabel *et al.*, 2003). A reduction in C18:2n-6 concentration is achieved through the incorporation of saturated fats or other ingredients that enhance endogenous fat synthesis during the fattening diets period (Farnworth and Kramer, 1987; Wood *et al.*, 2004; Duran-Montgé *et al.*, 2008).

Lard and palm oil are saturated sources of fat frequently used in pig fattening because of their low C18:2n-6 and high saturated and monounsaturated FA concentration (De Blas et al., 2010). The saturated plus monounsaturated FA to polyunsaturated FA ratio is similar for both fat sources, although palm oil has a higher proportion of C16:0 (45.6% v. 24.5%)

and lower of C18:1 (39.9% v. 49.8%) than lard. In addition, these two fat sources differ markedly in the location of the individual FA within the triglyceride (TAG) molecule, a characteristic that is not usually taken into consideration by swine nutritionists. Most of the C16:0 present in lard is located in the internal (Sn-2) position whereas, in palm oil it locates in the external (Sn-1 and Sn-3) positions (Small, 1991; Innis, 2011). This difference might be relevant in further processing for the industry of dry-cured products because FA distribution within the TAG molecule modifies the physical properties of the adipose tissue (Smith et al., 1998; Segura et al., 2015) and might affect the incidence of human illnesses such as obesity, diabetes or hypertension (Ponnampalam et al., 2011; Gouk et al., 2013).

Glycerol is a co-product of the bio-fuel industry of common use in swine feeding. The inclusion of glycerol in the diet affects pH, water holding capacity and other characteristics of potential interest in the production of dry-cured hams (Mourot *et al.*, 1994). Moreover, dietary glycerol enhances FA synthesis and might reduce C18:2n-6 concentration in pig tissues, resulting in an increase in fat firmness (Schieck *et al.*, 2010).

This research studied the effects of inclusion of glycerol (which enhances *de novo* FA synthesis) and two fat sources (lard *v.* palm oil) differing in the FA distribution on the profile and positional distribution of the FA within the TAG molecule of subcutaneous fat of gilts and barrows.

## Material and methods

All the experimental procedures used in this research were approved by the Animal Ethics Committee of Universidad Politécnica de Madrid and were in compliance with the Spanish guidelines for the care and use of animals in research (Boletín Oficial del Estado, 2007).

# Husbandry, diets and experimental design

In total, 160 crossbred pigs  $(40.3 \pm 0.78 \text{ kg BW})$  obtained from a commercial farm were used in this experiment. The female line (Syra, Gene +, Erin, France) used included blood from Large White, Landrace and Duroc and the sire line was PIC L65 (PIC, Barcelona, Spain). Upon arrival at the experimental farm, pigs were housed in groups of 10 (five gilts and five barrows) in a naturally ventilated finishing barn in 16 pen replicates  $(4 \times 3 \text{ m})$ . All pigs received a common preexperimental diet containing 20 g C18:2n-6/ kg diet for 38 days  $(79.0 \pm 6.58 \text{ kg BW})$ . Then, pigs received their respective experimental diets for 32 days. The four diets used had similar nutritive value but differed in the fat source (palm oil or lard) and the concentration of glycerol (0 v. 50 g/kg). The C18:2n-6 concentration of all the experimental diets was low (10 g/kg). Diets were provided for ad libitum consumption and were formulated according to De Blas et al. (2013). The ingredient composition and the calculated (De Blas et al., 2010) nutrient content of the diets are shown in Table 1. The FA distribution within the TAG molecule, of the fat sources

used is shown in Table 2 (see analytical methodology; Perona and Ruíz-Gutiérrez, 2004).

# Growth performance

BW of the pigs and feed disappearance were recorded by pen at the beginning and at the end of the finishing period. Feed wastage was not measured. From these data, average daily gain (ADG), average daily feed intake (ADFI) and feed conversion ratio (FCR) per pen were calculated.

**Table 1** Ingredient composition and calculated analysis<sup>1</sup> of the experimental diets (g/kg diet as fed basis unless otherwise indicated)

|                                     |                   |             | 79 to 109 kg BW |               |       |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-------|--|--|--|
|                                     |                   | Glycero     | ol (0%)         | Glycerol (5%) |       |  |  |  |
|                                     | 40 to 79 kg<br>BW | Palm<br>oil | Lard            | Palm<br>oil   | Lard  |  |  |  |
| Ingredients                         |                   |             |                 |               |       |  |  |  |
| Barley                              | 300               | 300         | 300             | 342           | 342   |  |  |  |
| Wheat                               | 322               | 303         | 303             | 200.5         | 200.5 |  |  |  |
| Rye                                 | 120               | 150         | 150             | 150           | 150   |  |  |  |
| Glycerol-85                         | _                 | _           | _               | 50            | 50    |  |  |  |
| Rapeseed meal (34%)                 | 60                | 80          | 80              | 80            | 80    |  |  |  |
| Soybean meal (47%)                  | 134               | 107         | 107             | 122           | 122   |  |  |  |
| Soybean oil                         | 32                | _           | -               | _             | _     |  |  |  |
| Lard                                | _                 | _           | 32              | _             | 32    |  |  |  |
| Palm oil                            | _                 | 32          | -               | 32            | _     |  |  |  |
| Lysine (50%)                        | 6                 | 5.4         | 5.4             | 4.8           | 4.8   |  |  |  |
| DL-Methionine                       | 0.7               | 0.6         | 0.6             | 0.6           | 0.6   |  |  |  |
| L-Threonine (99%)                   | 1.1               | 1           | 1               | 0.9           | 0.9   |  |  |  |
| Choline (60%)                       | 0.2               | 0.2         | 0.2             | 0.2           | 0.2   |  |  |  |
| Calcium carbonate                   | 11.8              | 11.6        | 11.6            | 11.6          | 11.6  |  |  |  |
| Monocalcium phosphate               | 1                 | -           | -               | -             | -     |  |  |  |
| Sodium chloride                     | 4                 | 4           | 4               | 1.2           | 1.2   |  |  |  |
| Formic acid, 75% activity           | 2                 | -           | -               | -             | -     |  |  |  |
| Premix <sup>1</sup>                 | 5.2               | 5.2         | 5.2             | 5.2           | 5.2   |  |  |  |
| Calculated composition <sup>2</sup> |                   |             |                 |               |       |  |  |  |
| Net energy (MJ/kg)                  | 10.04             | 10.04       | 10.04           | 10.13         | 10.13 |  |  |  |
| СР                                  | 163               | 162         | 162             | 162           | 162   |  |  |  |
| Crude ash                           | 38                | 37          | 37              | 40            | 40    |  |  |  |
| C16:0                               | 12.4              | 15.9        | 9.7             | 15.8          | 9.6   |  |  |  |
| C18:0                               | 5.4               | 1.7         | 4.3             | 1.7           | 4.3   |  |  |  |
| C18:1                               | 22.6              | 15.1        | 16.4            | 15.0          | 16.3  |  |  |  |
| C18:2n-6                            | 26.1              | 9.5         | 9.5             | 9.2           | 9.2   |  |  |  |

 $^1$ Supplied per kg diet: 7000 IU vitamin A (trans-retinyl acetate); 1600 IU vitamin D<sub>3</sub> (cholecalciferol); 20 IU vitamin E (all-rac-tocopherol-acetate); 1.0 mg vitamin K<sub>3</sub> (bisulphate menadione complex); 0.7 mg thiamine (thiamine-mononitrate); 3.0 mg riboflavin; 9 mg of pantothenic acid (D-Ca pantothenate); 15 mg vitamin B<sub>3</sub> (niacin); 150 mg choline (choline chloride); 1 mg pyridoxine (pyridoxine HCl); 0.016 mg vitamin B<sub>12</sub> (cobalamin); 16.5 copper (CuSO<sub>4</sub>-5H<sub>2</sub>O); 75 mg iron (FeSO<sub>4</sub>-7H<sub>2</sub>O); 40 mg manganese (MnO<sub>2</sub>); 110 mg zinc (ZnO); 0.3 mg selenium Se (Na<sub>2</sub>SeO<sub>3</sub>); 0.8 mg iodine [Ca(IO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] and 125 mg ethoxiquin. Phytase (500 FTU; Natuphos 5000, Basf Española, Barcelona, Spain).

<sup>2</sup>According to Fundación Española Desarrollo Nutrición Animal (2010) (supplied per kg of diet).

**Table 2** *Total (whole triglyceride), position 2 (Sn-2) and position 1,3 (Sn-1,3) fatty acid composition of fat sources used in this experiment* 

|                     | Palm oil | Lard |
|---------------------|----------|------|
| Total <sup>1</sup>  |          |      |
| C16:0               | 45.6     | 24.5 |
| C18:0               | 4.7      | 13.2 |
| C18:1n-9            | 39.9     | 49.8 |
| C18:2n-6            | 9.8      | 12.5 |
| Sn-2 <sup>1</sup>   |          |      |
| C16:0               | 12.5     | 70.8 |
| C18:0               | 2.9      | 9.3  |
| C18:1n-9            | 65.6     | 16.5 |
| C18:2n-6            | 19.0     | 3.4  |
| Sn-1,3 <sup>2</sup> |          |      |
| C16:0               | 62.2     | 1.4  |
| C18:0               | 5.7      | 15.2 |
| C18:1n-9            | 27.0     | 66.5 |
| C18:2n-6            | 5.1      | 17.1 |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>g/100 g of total present fatty acids.

## Carcass measurements and primal cuts yield

The day before slaughter, pigs were weighed, fasted for 15 h and transported 300 km to a commercial abattoir (Incarlopsa, Cuenca, Spain) where they were allowed to rest for 4 h with full access to water but not to feed. Pigs were stunned in a 90% CO2 atmosphere and then slaughtered, exsanguinated and scalded at 65°C according to standard commercial procedures. Lean percentage, backfat depth and the weight and yield of the fresh hams of four carcasses per pen chosen at random, were measured using the Autofom classification system (Carometec Spain, SL., Barcelona, Spain) as described by Busk et al. (1999). Then, carcasses were eviscerated and split down the center of the spine. Hot carcass weight was individually recorded and used to calculate carcass yield. Carcasses were suspended in the air and refrigerated at 2°C (1 m/s; 90% relative humidity) for 2 h. At 2 h *postmortem*, the subcutaneous BF depth, between the third and fourth last ribs, including the skin, was measured at the thinnest point in the left side of each carcass, using a flexible ruler with a precision of 0.5 mm. Carcasses were processed according to standard commercial procedures. Hams were kept in the chilled room at 4°C for 24 h, and the weights of the untrimmed hams and loins were recorded (chilled weight). Then, the hams were trimmed of external fat and weighed again (trimmed weight). The trimming consisted of eliminating part of the external fat and skin to fit commercial requirements and was performed by qualified personnel as described by Serrano et al. (2009). Data on ham and loin weights were used to calculate chilled and trimmed ham yield and chilled loin yield. Because of the design of the processing line of the slaughterhouse and the method of carcass dissection, shoulder weights were not recorded.

After collection of carcass data, a 300 g sample of *Longissimus dorsi* and 150 g of subcutaneous fat (SF) were

excised at the last rib. The meat samples were stored in individual plastic bags and vacuum packaged at -20°C until subsequent meat analyses. The intramuscular fat (IMF) was quantified as proposed by Segura and López-Bote (2014). Briefly, the total lipids were extracted from the outer subcutaneous backfat layer and the TAGs were purified by thinlayer chromatography (TLC) on silica gel plates (0.25 mm thickness) that were developed with hexane/ethyl ether/acetic acid (75:25:1 by volume). The TLC plates were sprayed with primuline acetone/water (80:20 by volume) 0.05% solution to detect TAG fractions. They were scraped off the plates and eluted from silica with hexane/diethyl ether (95:5 by volume). In each case, the purified TAG samples were analyzed by gas chromatography after lipase hydrolysis. For the positional analysis of TAG Sn-2 FAs, 10 mg of purified TAGs were hydrolyzed with 2 mg of pancreatic lipase in 1 ml of 1 M Tris-HCl buffer (pH 8), 0.1 ml CaCl<sub>2</sub> (22%) and 0.25 ml deoxycholate (0.1%). The reaction was stopped by adding 0.5 ml of 6 N HCl when ~60% of the TAGs were hydrolyzed (1 to 2 min). The lipids were extracted three times with 1.5-ml aliquots of ethyl ether, and the reaction products were separated by TLC (see above). Free FA and Sn-2monoacylglycerol bands representing the positions Sn-1,3 and Sn-2 of TAG were scraped off the plate and transmethylated. The validity of the procedure was confirmed by comparing the FA composition of the original TAG and those remaining after the partial hydrolysis (Perona and Ruíz-Gutiérrez, 2004).

Fatty acid methyl esters (FAME) were obtained from isolated lipids by heating the samples at 80°C for 1 h in 3 ml of methanol/toluene/H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> (88:10:2 by volume) as indicated by Garcés and Mancha (1993). After cooling, 1 ml of hexane was added and the samples were mixed. FAME were recovered from the upper phase, separated and quantified using a gas chromatograph (HP 6890 Series GC System) equipped with flame ionization detector. Separation was performed with a J&W GC Column, HP-Innowax Polyethylene Glycol (30 m  $\times$  0.316 mm  $\times$  0.25 m). Nitrogen was used as a carrier gas. After injection at 170°C, the oven temperature was raised to 210°C at a rate 3.5°C/min, then to 250°C at a rate of 7°C/min and held constant for 1 min. The flame ionization was held at 250°C. The split ratio was 1:40. FAME peaks were identified by comparing their retention times with those of authentic standards (Sigma – Aldrich, Alcobendas, Spain).

#### Statistical analyses

All data were analyzed as a completely randomized design with dietary fat source, glycerol level and gender as main effects and their interactions, by using the GLM procedure of SAS 9.2 (SAS Institute Inc., NC, USA, 2009). A factorial arrangement was used to analyze production (2 fat sources  $\times$  2 glycerol levels) and carcass and meat quality (2 fat sources  $\times$  2 glycerol levels  $\times$  2 sexes) data. The experimental unit was the pen for growth performance traits (gilt and barrows together; n=4) and the individual pig for carcass and meat quality traits (two pigs of each gender chosen at random from each pen; n=8).

 $<sup>^2</sup>$ g/100 g of total present fatty acids calculated as Sn-1,3 = (3 × %Total – %Sn-2)/2.

#### **Results and discussion**

No interaction between fat and glycerol on growth performance was detected. As expected, ADG was not affected by dietary treatment (Table 3). Recent research has demonstrated that the inclusion of glycerol in finishing pig diets at levels of 50 (Doppenberg and Van Der Aar, 2007), 80 (Zijlstra et al., 2009) or 100 g/kg diet have not adverse effects on production (Lammers et al., 2008; Zijlstra et al., 2009). The FCR increased with the inclusion of glycerol (Table 3) in agreement with previous research. Kijora and Kupsch (1996) observed that ADFI of pigs increased by 7.5% in all groups that received glycerol compared with the control group, but no effect was observed in the finishing period. Zijlstra et al. (2009) reported that the inclusion of 80 g glycerol/kg diet in substitution of wheat, increased ADFI and ADG but had no effect on FCR. Possible reasons for the higher feed intake of the diets containing glycerol are the sweet taste, the improvement in feed structure of the diets and the lower than planned net energy content of the glycerol containing diet.

The effects of the inclusion of the fats and glycerol in the diet on the characteristics of the carcasses are shown in Table 4. As expected, sex affected backfat depth (Peinado *et al.*, 2008; Latorre *et al.*, 2009), but not the main carcass characteristics, pH or the ham and loin weights (Table 4). Published data on the effect of dietary glycerol on carcass

fatness are controversial, probably because of potential differences reported on feed intake, which may affect carcass fatness. Kijora et al. (1995) reported that the inclusion of glycerol in the diet did not affect carcass leanness. Moreover, in a second experiment, Kijora et al. (1997) reported a decrease in backfat thickness. Opposite to these findings, Zijlstra et al. (2009) reported that glycerol supplementation increased backfat depth. In the current experiment, no effect of glycerol was found on carcass fatness. Moreover, an interesting sex × glycerol interaction was observed; dietary glycerol increased lean content in gilts but had no effects in barrows. More research on the response to dietary glycerol between sexes is needed to confirm this effect and to determine if it is due to a specific effect of sex or to variable effectiveness of dietary glycerol depending on the capacity of the pig lean growth. Moreover, a possible relationship between feed intake and the response because of sex cannot be ruled out.

Dietary treatment did not affect the IMF content of the loin in agreement with data of Kijora and Kupsch (1996) who did not observed any effect of dietary glycerol on meat quality. In contrast, Kijora *et al.* (1997) reported a slight increase in backfat and marbling with glycerol inclusion. Zijlstra *et al.* (2009) reported that glycerol supplementation increased backfat depth, but decreased loin marbling and carcass leanness.

**Table 3** Effect of dietary fat source (Fat) and glycerol (Gly) inclusion on growth performance of piqs during the last 32 days of fattening<sup>1</sup>

|                 | Fat    |        | G      | ly     |               | <i>P</i> -value <sup>2</sup> |       |  |
|-----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------------|------------------------------|-------|--|
|                 | Palm   | Lard   | 0%     | 5%     | SEM $(n=4)^3$ | Fat                          | Gly   |  |
| Initial BW (kg) | 78.90  | 79.00  | 79.60  | 78.40  | 0.32          | 0.940                        | 0.472 |  |
| Final BW (kg)   | 108.50 | 109.10 | 108.80 | 108.70 | 0.87          | 0.749                        | 0.965 |  |
| ADG (kg)        | 0.92   | 0.94   | 0.91   | 0.95   | 0.01          | 0.563                        | 0.213 |  |
| ADFI (kg)       | 2.87   | 2.83   | 2.73   | 2.98   | 0.04          | 0.650                        | 0.026 |  |
| FCR             | 3.11   | 3.01   | 2.98   | 3.14   | 0.04          | 0.247                        | 0.085 |  |

 $<sup>\</sup>frac{1}{2}$ ADG = average daily gain; ADFI = average daily feed intake; FCR = feed conversion ratio.

Table 4 Effect of sex, dietary fat source (Fat) and glycerol (Gly) inclusion on carcass quality and meat composition

|                               | G     | Gly   |       | Fat   |       | Sex     |             |       | <i>P</i> -value <sup>1</sup> |       |  |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-------------|-------|------------------------------|-------|--|
|                               | 0%    | 5%    | Palm  | Lard  | Gilt  | Barrrow | SEM (n = 8) | Sex   | Fat                          | Gly   |  |
| Carcass weight (kg)           | 90.00 | 89.70 | 89.20 | 90.60 | 88.10 | 91.00   | 1.36        | 0.011 | 0.175                        | 0.960 |  |
| Fat thickness (mm)            |       |       |       |       |       |         |             |       |                              |       |  |
| Last rib                      | 25.00 | 24.50 | 24.80 | 24.80 | 23.30 | 25.70   | 1.26        | 0.015 | 0.947                        | 0.665 |  |
| Gluteus medius                | 16.20 | 16.70 | 16.50 | 16.30 | 15.10 | 17.30   | 1.10        | 0.010 | 0.973                        | 0.587 |  |
| Cascass lean (%) <sup>2</sup> | 54.00 | 54.10 | 54.00 | 54.10 | 54.80 | 53.40   | 0.80        | 0.043 | 0.658                        | 0.930 |  |
| pH 24 h                       | 5.76  | 5.77  | 5.74  | 5.79  | 5.74  | 5.78    | 0.06        | 0.505 | 0.570                        | 0.930 |  |
| Fresh ham weight (kg)         | 14.30 | 14.10 | 14.10 | 14.30 | 13.90 | 14.40   | 0.19        | 0.001 | 0.299                        | 0.399 |  |
| Trimmed ham weight (kg)       | 13.00 | 12.90 | 12.90 | 13.00 | 12.70 | 13.10   | 0.16        | 0.001 | 0.386                        | 0.639 |  |
| Loin weight (kg)              | 5.44  | 5.44  | 5.45  | 5.44  | 5.40  | 5.47    | 0.12        | 0.457 | 0.886                        | 0.924 |  |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Although otherwise stated, no significant interactions for main effects were detected (P > 0.05).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>No significant interaction Fat × Gly was detected.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Four pens per treatment of 10 pigs each.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Interaction Sex  $\times$  Gly (P = 0.055) was detected (mean values Gilt-5% Gly = 55.2, Gilt-0% Gly = 54.3, Barrow-5% Gly = 53.1, Barrow-0% Gly = 53.8).

The effects of dietary treatment and sex on FA composition of the IMF or outer SF are shown in Tables 5 and 6, respectively. The FA profile of the IMF of the Longissimus dorsi muscle was affected by sex, with all the individual and total saturated fatty acid (SFA) concentration being higher in barrows than in gilts (P < 0.001). On the contrary, the concentration of total PUFA, C18:2n-6, C18:3n-3, C20:3n-9 and C20:4n-6 in the IMF was higher in gilts than in barrows. However, sex did not affect total MUFA concentration. In the SF, a marked effect of sex on total SFA was found, with barrows showing higher values than gilts (P < 0.001). Individual SFA concentrations were affected by sex only in the case of C14:0 and C16:0 (P < 0.001). As reported for IMF, no effect of sex on total MUFA was observed but total PUFA (P = 0.099) and C18:2n-6 (P = 0.077) concentration tended to be higher in gilts than in barrows. Piedrafita et al. (2001) also reported that gender affected the proportion of FA, with gilts showing higher proportion of C18:2n-6 than barrows showing opposite effects for unsaturated FA. In addition, Alonso et al. (2009) observed that C18:2n-6, total n-6 FA and total PUFA proportions were higher in Semimembranous muscle (P < 0.05) of gilts than barrows, although the effects on C16:0, C18:1n-9, total SFA and total MUFA proportions were not significant in gilts (P > 0.05). Barea et al. (2013), Latorre et al. (2009) and Serrano et al. (2008) observed higher C16:0, C18:0 and total SFA concentrations in SF, and lower 18:2n-6 and total PUFA proportions in barrows than in gilts. Warnants et al. (1999) reported higher percentages of SFA, C14:0 and C16:0 in barrows than in gilts, with no differences for C18:1n-9 and total MUFA. Nuernberga *et al.* (2005) also observed that SF from gilts had lower total SFA and higher total PUFA proportions than SF from barrows. Generally, fatter pigs receiving the same diet have lower concentration in essential FA (C18:2n-6 and C18:3n-3) and higher in C18:1n-9 than leaner pigs. Consequently, an explanation on the sex differences reported might be due to the higher feed intake of barrows. As a result, the endogenous FA synthesis is also higher in barrows than in gilts.

No effects of dietary fat on intramuscular total SFA, MUFA or PUFA were detected. In fact, no effects of dietary fat on subcutaneous SFA or PUFA were observed. However, a tendency (P = 0.079) for higher total MUFA concentration was observed in pigs fed the lard containing diet (Table 6).

Focusing on glycerol inclusion, no significant interactions between main effects were detected. In fact, dietary glycerol tended to increase total MUFA and C18:1n-9 of the IMF, in agreement with most published research. A tendency for lower total PUFA (P=0.087) and C18:2n-6 (P=0.062) concentration was detected in pigs fed the glycerol containing diet (Table 5). Similarly, pigs fed glycerol showed an increase in total MUFA (P=0.013) and a decrease in PUFA (P=0.001) in the SF (Table 6). The concentration of C18:2n-6 and C18:3n-3 in the SF was markedly affected by dietary glycerol (P<0.001). Mourot *et al.* (1994) observed that dietary glycerol increased C18:1n-9 and reduced C18:2n-6 in the backfat and the *Semimembranosus* muscle of the pigs.

Table 5 Effect of sex, dietary fat source (Fat) and glycerol (Gly) inclusion on fatty acid profile of the IMF

|            | Sex   |        | F     | at    | G     | ily   |             | <i>P</i> -value <sup>1</sup> |       |       |  |
|------------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|------------------------------|-------|-------|--|
|            | Gilt  | Barrow | Palm  | Lard  | 0%    | 5%    | SEM (n = 8) | Sex                          | Fat   | Gly   |  |
| IMF (mg/g) | 74.65 | 82.35  | 80.28 | 76.72 | 76.09 | 80.91 | 7.22        | 0.049                        | 0.484 | 0.317 |  |
| C10:0      | 0.21  | 0.18   | 0.20  | 0.20  | 0.20  | 0.19  | 0.02        | 0.043                        | 0.835 | 0.207 |  |
| C12:0      | 0.07  | 0.06   | 0.06  | 0.07  | 0.06  | 0.07  | 0.02        | 0.319                        | 0.778 | 0.335 |  |
| C14:0      | 1.17  | 1.25   | 1.21  | 1.21  | 1.21  | 1.22  | 0.26        | 0.563                        | 0.280 | 0.259 |  |
| C16:0      | 22.93 | 23.86  | 23.51 | 23.28 | 23.39 | 23.40 | 0.44        | 0.001                        | 0.842 | 0.500 |  |
| C16:1n-9   | 0.15  | 0.06   | 0.11  | 0.10  | 0.12  | 0.08  | 0.05        | 0.001                        | 0.213 | 0.555 |  |
| C16:1n-7   | 3.08  | 3.23   | 3.12  | 3.20  | 3.10  | 3.21  | 0.14        | 0.050                        | 0.221 | 0.324 |  |
| C17:0      | 0.35  | 0.31   | 0.33  | 0.33  | 0.33  | 0.33  | 0.02        | 0.009                        | 0.806 | 0.866 |  |
| C17:1      | 0.25  | 0.23   | 0.24  | 0.24  | 0.23  | 0.25  | 0.15        | 0.178                        | 0.314 | 0.198 |  |
| C18:0      | 12.86 | 13.38  | 13.22 | 13.02 | 13.27 | 12.97 | 0.42        | 0.212                        | 0.106 | 0.721 |  |
| C18:1n-9   | 39.16 | 39.48  | 39.33 | 39.31 | 38.74 | 39.89 | 0.83        | 0.208                        | 0.587 | 0.074 |  |
| C18:1n-7   | 3.40  | 3.29   | 3.27  | 3.41  | 3.34  | 3.35  | 0.14        | 0.029                        | 0.365 | 0.308 |  |
| C18:2n-6   | 11.68 | 10.43  | 11.01 | 11.10 | 11.41 | 10.70 | 0.73        | 0.007                        | 0.686 | 0.062 |  |
| C18:3n-3   | 0.50  | 0.46   | 0.48  | 0.48  | 0.49  | 0.47  | 0.02        | 0.004                        | 0.759 | 0.144 |  |
| C18:4n-3   | 0.08  | 0.07   | 0.07  | 0.08  | 0.07  | 0.08  | 0.01        | 0.415                        | 0.361 | 0.750 |  |
| C20:0      | 0.17  | 0.20   | 0.19  | 0.19  | 0.19  | 0.18  | 0.02        | 0.023                        | 0.547 | 0.692 |  |
| C20:1n-9   | 0.70  | 0.73   | 0.71  | 0.71  | 0.71  | 0.71  | 0.03        | 0.048                        | 0.739 | 0.798 |  |
| C20:3n-9   | 0.45  | 0.41   | 0.43  | 0.44  | 0.45  | 0.41  | 0.04        | 0.007                        | 0.844 | 0.283 |  |
| C20:4n-6   | 2.78  | 2.36   | 2.51  | 2.64  | 2.66  | 2.49  | 0.49        | 0.019                        | 0.630 | 0.769 |  |
| SFA        | 37.82 | 39.27  | 38.74 | 38.34 | 38.63 | 38.45 | 0.55        | 0.001                        | 0.156 | 0.733 |  |
| MUFA       | 46.74 | 46.93  | 46.83 | 46.84 | 46.26 | 47.41 | 0.88        | 0.389                        | 0.617 | 0.099 |  |
| PUFA       | 15.44 | 13.81  | 14.43 | 14.82 | 15.11 | 14.14 | 1.03        | 0.016                        | 0.413 | 0.087 |  |

MF = intramuscular fat; SFA = total saturated fatty acids; MUFA = total monounsaturated fatty acids; PUFA = total polyunsaturated fatty acids.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>No significant interactions were detected.

**Table 6** Effect of gender (Sex), dietary fat source (Fat) and glycerol (Gly) inclusion on the subcutaneous fat in the whole triglyceride (TAG), position 2 (Sn-2) and position 1,3 (Sn-1,3) fatty acid composition

|                     | Sex   |        | F     | at    | G     | ly    |               |       | P-value <sup>1</sup> |       |
|---------------------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------------|-------|----------------------|-------|
|                     | Gilt  | Barrow | Palm  | Lard  | 0%    | 5%    | SEM $(n = 8)$ | Sex   | Fat                  | Gly   |
| TAG <sup>2</sup>    |       |        |       |       |       |       |               |       |                      |       |
| C14:0               | 1.20  | 1.31   | 1.18  | 1.13  | 1.18  | 1.15  | 0.03          | 0.001 | 0.297                | 0.185 |
| C16:0               | 21.88 | 22.54  | 22.59 | 22.57 | 22.31 | 22.85 | 0.38          | 0.001 | 0.922                | 0.584 |
| C16:1               | 2.58  | 2.54   | 2.53  | 2.58  | 2.65  | 2.46  | 0.03          | 0.001 | 0.998                | 0.434 |
| C18:0               | 10.69 | 11.72  | 11.58 | 10.83 | 11.01 | 11.40 | 0.55          | 0.459 | 0.464                | 0.429 |
| C18:1               | 43.55 | 44.31  | 43.99 | 43.86 | 43.79 | 44.09 | 0.76          | 0.818 | 0.119                | 0.075 |
| C18:2n-6            | 14.93 | 13.42  | 14.01 | 14.56 | 14.77 | 14.05 | 0.57          | 0.077 | 0.531                | 0.001 |
| C18:3n-3            | 0.13  | 0.15   | 0.14  | 0.14  | 0.25  | 0.14  | 0.05          | 0.341 | 0.897                | 0.001 |
| C20:0               | 0.32  | 0.33   | 0.23  | 0.41  | 0.41  | 0.23  | 0.01          | 0.148 | 0.623                | 0.144 |
| C20:1n-9            | 0.83  | 0.91   | 0.90  | 1.22  | 0.81  | 0.92  | 0.03          | 0.840 | 0.040                | 0.799 |
| SFA                 | 35.55 | 36.56  | 36.27 | 35.57 | 35.61 | 36.23 | 0.51          | 0.001 | 0.453                | 0.650 |
| MUFA                | 47.78 | 48.25  | 47.91 | 48.19 | 47.76 | 47.96 | 0.69          | 0.638 | 0.079                | 0.043 |
| PUFA                | 16.67 | 15.19  | 15.82 | 16.24 | 16.63 | 15.81 | 0.65          | 0.099 | 0.619                | 0.001 |
| Sn-2 <sup>2</sup>   |       |        |       |       |       |       |               |       |                      |       |
| C14:0               | 3.01  | 3.23   | 2.95  | 2.89  | 3.00  | 2.90  | 0.83          | 0.217 | 0.160                | 0.130 |
| C16:0               | 61.28 | 63.51  | 63.98 | 63.01 | 62.59 | 64.40 | 18.25         | 0.443 | 0.860                | 0.915 |
| C16:1               | 2.99  | 3.02   | 2.97  | 3.04  | 3.15  | 2.86  | 0.86          | 0.960 | 0.564                | 0.141 |
| C18:0               | 6.95  | 7.32   | 7.14  | 7.14  | 6.97  | 7.31  | 2.12          | 0.779 | 0.239                | 0.010 |
| C18:1               | 16.38 | 16.14  | 15.92 | 16.60 | 16.98 | 15.54 | 4.65          | 0.932 | 0.643                | 0.115 |
| C18:2n-6            | 3.61  | 3.50   | 3.35  | 3.76  | 3.44  | 3.66  | 0.98          | 0.217 | 0.902                | 0.752 |
| C18:3n-3            | 0.11  | 0.09   | 0.11  | 0.10  | 0.10  | 0.10  | 0.03          | 0.584 | 0.171                | 0.548 |
| C20:0               | 0.13  | 0.10   | 0.12  | 0.11  | 0.12  | 0.11  | 0.03          | 0.247 | 0.960                | 0.917 |
| C20:1n-9            | 0.57  | 0.47   | 0.51  | 0.53  | 0.51  | 0.53  | 0.17          | 0.020 | 0.169                | 0.148 |
| SFA                 | 75.56 | 75.75  | 76.13 | 75.19 | 74.73 | 76.58 | 21.82         | 0.395 | 0.548                | 0.587 |
| MUFA                | 20.38 | 20.09  | 19.84 | 20.64 | 21.12 | 19.35 | 5.92          | 0.277 | 0.481                | 0.814 |
| PUFA                | 4.05  | 4.15   | 4.03  | 4.18  | 4.14  | 4.06  | 1.13          | 0.666 | 0.960                | 0.134 |
| Sn-1,3 <sup>3</sup> |       |        |       |       |       |       |               |       |                      |       |
| C14:0               | 0.30  | 0.35   | 0.29  | 0.26  | 0.27  | 0.28  | 0.08          | 0.263 | 0.288                | 0.949 |
| C16:0               | 2.18  | 2.06   | 1.90  | 2.34  | 2.16  | 2.08  | 0.59          | 0.854 | 0.004                | 0.876 |
| C16:1               | 2.37  | 2.30   | 2.31  | 2.36  | 2.40  | 2.26  | 0.67          | 0.231 | 0.087                | 0.325 |
| C18:0               | 12.56 | 13.93  | 13.81 | 12.68 | 13.03 | 13.45 | 3.86          | 0.001 | 0.944                | 0.562 |
| C18:1               | 57.14 | 58.39  | 58.03 | 57.50 | 57.19 | 58.36 | 16.73         | 0.099 | 0.483                | 0.147 |
| C18:2n-6            | 20.60 | 18.39  | 19.34 | 19.96 | 20.43 | 19.25 | 5.46          | 0.020 | 0.179                | 0.077 |
| C18:3n-3            | 0.14  | 0.17   | 0.15  | 0.16  | 0.32  | 0.16  | 0.04          | 0.053 | 0.344                | 0.993 |
| C20:0               | 0.41  | 0.44   | 0.28  | 0.57  | 0.56  | 0.29  | 0.20          | 0.387 | 0.003                | 0.095 |
| C20:1n-9            | 0.95  | 1.12   | 1.10  | 1.57  | 0.96  | 1.12  | 0.30          | 0.003 | 0.006                | 0.105 |
| SFA                 | 15.55 | 16.96  | 16.35 | 15.76 | 16.05 | 16.06 | 4.62          | 0.001 | 0.233                | 0.683 |
| MUFA                | 61.48 | 62.33  | 61.95 | 61.96 | 61.07 | 62.26 | 17.86         | 0.129 | 0.498                | 0.094 |
| PUFA                | 22.97 | 20.70  | 21.71 | 22.28 | 22.87 | 21.68 | 6.12          | 0.026 | 0.120                | 0.098 |

SFA = saturated fatty acids; MUFA = monounsaturated fatty acids; PUFA = polyunsaturated fatty acids.

Kijora *et al.* (1997) did not observe any significant effect of glycerol on the SFA profile of the backfat but reported a moderate increase in C18:1n-9, with a decrease in C18:2n-6 and C18:3n-3 concentrations. Consequently, the PUFA to MUFA ratio in this tissue was reduced.

Schieck *et al.* (2010) compared a control diet (31 to 128 kg BW), a diet with 8% glycerol for the last 8 weeks of the fattening period (45 to 128 kg BW) and the same diet with 16% glycerol for the last 16 weeks (31 to 128 kg). The authors reported similar growth performance, with little

concomitant effect on carcass composition or pork quality for the two feeding programs. Moreover, these authors did not report any potential effect of the dietary treatment on FA composition, but observed that glycerol inclusion enhanced belly firmness when compared with pigs fed a corn-soybean meal control diet, results that are consistent with the data of the current experiment.

The effect of sex or dietary treatment on FA location within the TAG in SF is shown in Table 6. It can be observed that, in any case, C16:0 was mainly located in the Sn-2 position, whereas

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>No significant interactions were detected.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>g/100 g of total present fatty acids.

 $<sup>^{3}</sup>$ g/100 g of total present fatty acids calculated as Sn-1,3 = (3 × %Total – %Sn-2)/2.

C18:0, C18:1n-9 and C18:2n-6 occupied preponderantly the external positions (Sn-1,3) of the TAG. Similar results have been reported for various pig tissues by Christie and Moore (1970), in human milk and substitutes by Christie and Clapperton (1982) and in plasma and milk of rats and rabbits by Christie (1985). It is well known that FA are not esterified at random to the glycerol hydroxyl groups in TAG of animal fats. In pigs and human milk, as opposed to what happens in most species, the 2-position in TAGs of the adipose tissue is occupied by a SFA, mainly C16:0 (Christie and Moore, 1970).

One of the main findings of this research was the very limited effect of both sex and dietary treatment on the FAs located in the internal Sn-2 position. In fact, the only noticeable effect was the higher concentration of C18:0 in Sn-2 position in pigs fed the glycerol containing diets, a finding that agrees with the increase of the endogenous synthesis of FA induced by dietary carbohydrates (Óvilo *et al.* 2014). On the other hand, a marked effect of sex on Sn-1,3 position for C18:0, C18:2n-6 and C18:3n-3 FA concentrations was observed (Table 6). Reasonably, the reported effect of sex on FAs concentration in the TAG molecule should be also reflected in the TAG position where the FA is majority. In addition, lower concentration of C16:0 and a tendency to higher concentration of C18:0 and C20:1n-9 were observed in external positions.

As shown in Table 2, a marked difference in the FA composition of the Sn-2 position exists between dietary lard and palm oil. The composition of the Sn-2 position in stored lipids was not affected, thus suggesting a high metabolic regulation. Little information on this topic is available. In weaned piglets, Innis *et al.* (1997) observed a marked effect of diets differing in total FA content and distribution within the TAG molecule, on chylomicron FA composition (including those located in the Sn-2 position). The authors also studied the FA composition of liver lipids and reported limited effect of dietary treatment. These data suggest a high metabolic regulation of FA composition in Sn-2 position.

Dietary FA composition and positional distribution within the TAG determine at high extent the FA digestion and absorption (Mu and Hoy, 2004). The gastric and pancreatic lipases hydrolyze the FA from the 1,3 position of the TAG. Hunter (2001), Mu and Porsgaard (2005) and Innis (2011) observed that ~70% of the FAs located in Sn-2 was conserved unaltered in the chylomicrons, which might be also the case in the SF. In the current experiment, lard contained ~25% C16:0 most of it is esterified in the internal Sn-2 position (~70% of Sn-2 FA). In contrast, the C16:0 in palm oil is predominantly esterified at the 1,3 position, while C18:1n-9 and C18:2n-6 are located preferentially in the internal Sn-2 position (Table 2). As a result, the formation of free FA and 2-monoglycerides during the digestion of fat is markedly different depending on the dietary fat source (Innis and Nelson, 2013). In our case, the use of palm oil should involve higher restructuration of TAG in SF after digestion and absorption in order to keep constant the previously Sn-2 positional distribution described. Consequently, the lower availability of C16:0 and the higher of C18:0 to conform Sn-1,3 must have implications in the final TAG structure.

Dietary intervention has been proven to alter FA in the external Sn-1,3 position of the TAG rather than the Sn-2 location, in bovine tissue. Smith et al. (1998) observed that when the desaturase enzyme activity was depressed, the concentration of C18:0 located in the external Sn-1,3 position was increased in bovine adipose tissue, but limited response was observed on Sn-2 position. The possibility of altering the FA composition at the Sn-2 location of the TAG by dietary intervention during the fattening phase is very limited. This observation has important practical application, because saturated FA in the Sn-2 position might have more detrimental effect on human health than those located in the external Sn-1,3 location (Berry, 2009), thus reducing pork consumer acceptability. More research efforts are needed to elucidate the potential effect of management conditions, including genetics and more prolonged feeding regimens, on Sn-2 fatty acid composition in pig fat.

#### Acknowledgments

This project was partially supported by MEDGAN (\$2013/ABI-2913). Comunidad de Madrid and CEI Campus Moncloa UCM-UPM, 28040 Madrid, Spain and AGL2013-48121 Ministerio de economía y competitividad. Thanks are due to Isabel Martín for her skillful technical assistance.

#### References

Alonso V, Campo MM, Español S, Roncalés P and Beltrán JA 2009. Effect of crossbreeding and gender on meat quality and fatty acid composition in pork. Meat Science 81, 209–217.

Barea R, Isabel B, Nieto R, López-Bote C and Aguilera JF 2013. Evolution of the fatty acid profile of subcutaneous back-fat adipose tissue in growing Iberian and Landrace × Large White pigs. Animal 7, 688–698.

Berry SE 2009. Triacylglycerol structure and interesterification of palmitic and stearic acid-rich fat: an overview and implications for cardiovascular disease. Nutrition Research Reviews 22. 3–17.

Boletín Oficial del Estado 2007. Ley 32/2007 de 7 de Noviembre para el cuidado de los animales, en su explotación, transporte, experimentación y sacrificio. BOE 268. 45914–45920.

Busk H, Olsen EV and Brondum J 1999. Determination of lean meat in pig carcasses with the Autofom classification system. Meat Science 52, 307–314.

Candek-Potokar M and Skrlep M 2012. Factors in pig production that impact the quality of dry-cured ham: a review. Animal 6, 327–338.

Christie WW 1985. Structure of the triacyl-sn-glycerols in the plasma and milk of the rat and rabbit. Journal of Dairy Research 52, 219–222.

Christie WW and Clapperton JL 1982. Structures of the triacylglycerols of human milk and some substitutes. Journal of the Society of Dairy Technology 35, 22–24.

Christie WW and Moore JH 1970. A comparison of the structures of triglycerides from various pig tissues. Biochimica and Biophysica Acta 210, 46–56.

D'Arrigo M, Hoz L, López-Bote CJ, Cambero I, Pin C, Rey A and Ordonez JA 2002. Effect of dietary linseed oil and  $\alpha$ -tocopherol on selected properties of pig fat. Canadian Journal of Animal Science 82, 339–346.

De Blas C, Gasa J and Mateos GG 2013. Necesidades Nutricionales para Ganado Porcino. Fundación Española Desarrollo Nutrición Animal, Madrid, Spain.

De Blas C, Mateos GG and Rebollar PG 2010. Normas FEDNA de Composición y Valor Nutritivo de Alimentos para la Fabricación de Piensos Compuestos, 2nd edition. Fundación Española Desarrollo Nutrición Animal, Madrid, Spain.

Doppenberg J and Van der Aar PJ 2007. Biofuels: implications for the feed industry. Wageningen Academic Publisher, The Netherlands.

Duran-Montgé P, Realini CE, Barroeta AC, Lizardo R and Esteve-Garcia E 2008. Tissue fatty acid composition of pigs fed different fat sources. Animal 2, 1753–1762.

Farnworth ER and Kramer JKG 1987. Fat metabolism in growing swine: a review. Canadian Journal of Animal Science 67, 301–318.

Garcés R and Mancha M 1993. One-step lipid extraction and fatty-acid methyl-esters preparation from fresh plant-tissues. Analytical Biochemistry 211, 139–143.

Gouk SW, Cheng SF, Mok JSL, Ong ASH and Chuah CH 2013. Long-chain SFA at the Sn-1, 3 positions of TAG reduce body fat deposition in C57BL/6 mice. British Journal of Nutrition 110, 1987–1995.

Hunter JE 2001. Studies on effects of dietary fatty acids as related to their position on triglycerides. Lipids 36, 655–668.

Innis SM 2011. Dietary triacylglycerol structure and its role in infant nutrition. Advances in Nutrition 2, 275–283.

Innis SM, Dyer RA and Lien EL 1997. Formula containing randomized fats with palmitic acid (C16:0) in the 2-position increases C16:0 in the 2-position of plasma and chylomicron triglycerides in formula-fed piglets to levels approaching those of the piglet fed sow's milk. Journal of Nutrition 127, 1362–1370.

Innis SM and Nelson CM 2013. Dietary triacylglycerols rich in Sn-2 palmitate alter post-prandial lipoprotein and unesterified fatty acids in term infants. Prostaglandins, Leukotrienes and Essential Fatty Acids 89, 145–151.

Isabel B, López-Bote CJ, de la Hoz L, Timón M, García C and Ruiz J 2003. Effects of feeding elevated concentrations of monounsaturated fatty acids and vitamin E to swine on characteristics of dry cured hams. Meat Science 64, 475–482.

Kijora C, Bergner H, Kupsch RD and Hageman L 1995. Glycerol as feed component in diets of fattening pigs. Archives in Animal Nutrition 47, 345–360.

Kijora C and Kupsch RD 1996. Evaluation of technical glycerols from "biodiesel" production as a feed component in fattening of pigs. Fett/Lipid 98, 240–245.

Kijora C, Kupsch RD, Bergner H, Wenk C and Prabucki AL 1997. Comparative investigation on the utilization of glycerol, free fatty acids, free fatty acids in combination with glycerol and vegetable oil in fattening of pigs. Journal of Animal Physiology and Animal Nutrition 77, 127–138.

Lammers PJ, Kerr BJ, Weber TE, Bregendahl K, Lonergan SM and Prusa DU 2008. Growth performance, carcass characteristics, meat quality and tissue histology of growing pigs fed crude glycerin-supplemented diets. Journal of Animal Science 86, 2962–2970.

Latorre MA, Ripoll G, García-Belenguer E and Ariño L 2009. The increase of slaughter weight in gilts as strategy to optimize the production of Spanish high quality dry-cured ham. Journal of Animal Science 87, 1464–1471.

López-Bote CJ 1998. Sustained utilization of the Iberian pig breed. Meat Science 49, S17–S27.

López-Bote CJ, Isabel B and Daza A 2002. Partial replacement of polywith monounsaturated fatty acids and vitamin E supplementation in pig diets: effect on fatty acid composition of subcutaneous and intramuscular fat and on fat and lean firmness. Animal Science 75, 349–358.

Mourot J, Aumaitre A, Mounier A, Peiniau P and Francois AC 1994. Nutritional and physiological effects of dietary glycerol in the growing pig. Consequences on fatty tissues and post mortem muscular parameters. Livestock Production Science 38, 237–244.

Mu HL and Hoy CE 2004. The digestion of dietary triacylglycerols. Progress in Lipid Research 43, 105–133.

Mu H and Porsgaard T 2005. The metabolism of structured triacylglycerols. Progress in Lipid Research 44, 430–448.

Nuernberga K, Dannenbergera D, Nuernberga G, Endera K, Voigta J, Scollanb ND, Wood JD, Nutec GR and Richardson RI 2005. Effect of a grass-based and a concentrate feeding system on meat quality characteristics and fatty acid composition of longissimus muscle in different cattle breeds. Livestock Production Science 94, 137–147.

Óvilo C, Benítez R, Fernández A, Isabel B, Núñez Y, Fernández AI, Rodríguez C, Daza A, Silió L and López-Bote C 2014. Dietary energy source largely affects tissue fatty acid composition but has minor influence on gene transcription in Iberian pigs. Journal of Animal Science 92, 939–954.

Peinado J, Medel P, Fuentetaja A and Mateos GG 2008. Influence of sex and castration of females on growth performance and carcass and meat quality of heavy pigs destined for the dry-cured industry. Journal of Animal Science 86, 1410–1417.

Perona JS and Ruíz-Gutiérrez V 2004. Analysis of neutral lipids: triacylglycerols. In Handbook of food analysis (ed. LML Nollet), pp. 275–312. Marcel Decker, New York.

Piedrafita J, Christian LL and Lonergan SM 2001. Fatty acid profiles in three stress genotypes of swine and relationships with performance, carcass and meat quality traits. Meat Science 57, 71–77.

Ponnampalam EN, Lewandowski P, Nesaratnam K, Dunshea FR and Gill H 2011. Differential effects of natural palm oil, chemically-and enzymatically-modified palm oil on weight gain, blood lipid metabolites and fat deposition in a pediatric pig model. Nutrition Journal 10, 1–7.

Schieck SJ, Shurson GC, Kerr BJ and Johnston LJ 2010. Evaluation of glycerol, a biodiesel coproduct, in grow-finish pig diets to support growth and pork quality. Journal of Animal Science 88, 3927–3935.

Segura J, Escudero R, Romero de Ávila MD, Cambero MI and López-Bote CJ 2015. Effect of fatty acid composition and positional distribution within the triglyceride on selected physical properties of dry-cured ham subcutaneous fat. Meat Science 103, 90–95.

Segura J and López-Bote CJ 2014. A laboratory efficient method for intramuscular fat analysis. Food Chemistry 145, 821–825.

Serrano MP, Valencia DG, Fuentetaja A, Lázaro R and Mateos GG 2009. Influence of feed restriction and sex on growth performance and carcass and meat quality of Iberian pigs reared indoors. Journal of Animal Science 87, 1676–1685.

Serrano MP, Valencia DG, Nieto M, Lázaro R and Matéos GG 2008. Influence of sex and terminal sire line on performance and carcass and meat quality of Iberian pigs reared under intensive production systems. Meat Science 78, 420–428.

Small DM 1991. The effects of glyceride structure on absorption and metabolism. Annual Review of Nutrition 11, 412–434.

Smith SB, Yang A, Larsen TW and Tume RK 1998. Positional analysis of triacylglycerol from bovine adipose tissue lipids varying in degree of saturation. Lipids 33, 197–207.

Warnants N, Van Oeckel MJ and Boucque CV 1999. Incorporation of dietary polyunsaturated fatty acid into pork fatty tissues. Journal of Animal Science 77, 2478–2490.

Wood JD, Richardson RI, Nute GR, Fisher AV, Campo MM, Kasapidou E, Sheard PR and Enser M 2004. Effects of fatty acids on meat quality: a review. Meat Science 66. 21–32.

Zijlstra RT, Menjivar K, Lawrence E and Beltranena E 2009. The effect of feeding crude glycerol on growth performance and nutrient digestibility in weaned pigs. Canadian Journal of Animal Science 89. 85–89.