

## CORRECTION

[View Article Online](#)  
[View Journal](#) | [View Issue](#)


Cite this: *Food Funct.*, 2023, **14**, 9035

## Correction: Muscle characteristics comparison and targeted metabolome analysis reveal differences in carcass traits and meat quality of three pig breeds

Bo Song,<sup>a,b</sup> Yating Cheng,<sup>a,b</sup> Md. Abul Kalam Azad,<sup>a</sup> Sujuan Ding,<sup>a</sup> Kang Yao<sup>a,b</sup> and Xiangfeng Kong<sup>\*a,b</sup>

DOI: 10.1039/d3fo90080k  
[rsc.li/food-function](https://doi.org/10.1039/d3fo90080k)

Correction for 'Muscle characteristics comparison and targeted metabolome analysis reveal differences in carcass traits and meat quality of three pig breeds' by Bo Song *et al.*, *Food Funct.*, 2023, **14**, 7603–7614, <https://doi.org/10.1039/D2FO03709B>.

The authors regret the omission of a footnote from Table 1. Table 1 should read as follows:

**Table 1** Carcass traits and meat quality of Duroc, TB, and XB pigs at 185 days of age

Items	Duroc pigs	TB pigs	XB pigs	SEM	P-Values
Carcass weight, kg	38.85 <sup>a</sup>	25.82 <sup>b</sup>	25.49 <sup>b</sup>	1.43	<0.01
Loin eye area, cm <sup>2</sup>	60.46 <sup>a</sup>	31.75 <sup>b</sup>	28.52 <sup>b</sup>	3.35	<0.01
Backfat depth, mm	19.49 <sup>b</sup>	23.87 <sup>ab</sup>	26.25 <sup>a</sup>	1.16	<0.05
Fat mass, kg	5.59	5.76	6.62	0.31	0.36
Fat percentage, %	14.50 <sup>b</sup>	22.30 <sup>a</sup>	25.50 <sup>a</sup>	1.25	<0.01
Lean mass, kg	23.03 <sup>a</sup>	14.33 <sup>b</sup>	13.18 <sup>b</sup>	0.98	<0.01
Lean percentage, %	59.25 <sup>a</sup>	55.38 <sup>b</sup>	51.88 <sup>c</sup>	0.80	<0.01
pH <sub>45 min</sub>	6.82 <sup>a</sup>	6.38 <sup>b</sup>	6.56 <sup>b</sup>	0.06	<0.01
pH <sub>24 h</sub>	5.52	5.61	5.46	0.03	0.20
pH decline	1.29 <sup>a</sup>	0.76 <sup>b</sup>	1.10 <sup>a</sup>	0.08	<0.01
L*	47.13 <sup>a</sup>	44.72 <sup>b</sup>	43.10 <sup>b</sup>	0.49	<0.01
a*	14.92	15.18	15.30	0.18	0.68
b*	5.34 <sup>a</sup>	3.59 <sup>b</sup>	4.46 <sup>ab</sup>	0.22	<0.01
WHC, %	78.75 <sup>b</sup>	81.13 <sup>a</sup>	79.63 <sup>ab</sup>	0.37	0.02
Cooking loss, %	34.50	33.25	34.20	0.38	0.35
Shear force, N	89.91 <sup>a</sup>	77.41 <sup>b</sup>	69.84 <sup>b</sup>	2.76	<0.01
IMF, %	2.28 <sup>b</sup>	3.50 <sup>a</sup>	3.28 <sup>a</sup>	0.21	0.03
Dry matter, %	25.42 <sup>b</sup>	26.43 <sup>ab</sup>	27.22 <sup>a</sup>	0.26	0.01
Crude protein (dry basis), %	74.69	73.37	68.52	1.63	0.28

Data are presented as means with their pooled SEM ( $n = 8$ ). <sup>a–c</sup> Mean values with different superscript letters indicate significant differences ( $P < 0.05$ ). TB, Taoyuan black; XB, Xiangcun black; L\*, lightness; a\*, redness; b\*, yellowness; WHC, water-holding capacity; IMF, intramuscular fat. The carcass weight, lean mass, lean percentage, fat mass, and fat percentage in this study were all derived from the left half of the carcass. All carcass traits, including carcass weight, loin eye area, backfat depth, fat mass, fat percentage, lean mass, and lean percentage, were all derived from the left half of the carcass.

The Royal Society of Chemistry apologises for these errors and any consequent inconvenience to authors and readers.

<sup>a</sup>Key Laboratory of Agro-Ecological Processes in Subtropical Region, Hunan Provincial Key Laboratory of Animal Nutritional Physiology and Metabolic Process, Institute of Subtropical Agriculture, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Changsha, China. E-mail: nnkxf@isa.ac.cn

<sup>b</sup>College of Advanced Agricultural Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

