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The Meal, Ready-to-Eat, Individual is a complete meal type ration for one individual. It provides individual meals containing food components which are ready-to-eat and highly acceptable when consumed under conditions precluding preparation, except reconstituting of beverages. When completely developed, this Meal, Ready-to-Eat, Individual is scheduled to replace the Meal, Combat, Individual and therefore, will be used in combat for and under all circumstances where planned resupply is established but where it is impractical to provide for large or small group feeding. Packaging is light weight and suitable for use in lieu of mess gear. In fact, all components of the various menus of the 1966 Prototype described herein were packaged in appropriate laminate of flexible materials.

This study was undertaken to provide quality data on foods which have undergone prescribed freezing and thawing conditions, as it is a military requirement that these foods be able to withstand repeated freezing and thawing involving exposure, in the shipping cases to temperatures as high as 125°F. (52°C.) for as long as 2 hours per day and as low as -65°F. (-54°C.) without significant loss of nutritional adequacy, acceptability and utility. This study determined the effect of freeze-thaw cycling on the quality (color, odor, flavor, texture and appearance) of this 1966 Prototype, Meal, Ready-to-Eat, Individual.

Appreciation is expressed to Mary Klicka, Ration Design Specialist, Joel Sidel, formerly of Pioneering Research Laboratory, and Margaret Branagan, Food Laboratory, for their valuable assistance.

This work was conducted under Project No. 1G764713D548, Military Subsistence Systems as was Technical Report 69-86 FL, “Effect of Freeze Thaw Cycling on the Vitamin Content of the Meal, Ready-to-Eat, Individual, by M. H. Thomas, et al.”
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ABSTRACT

The effect of freezing and thawing on the 1966 Prototype of the Meal, Ready-to-Eat, Individual, was studied to determine if there were changes in 39 food items in the ration. Using six controlled freezing and thawing cycles, it was found that there was little change in ratings due to freezing and thawing when compared to control samples stored at 40°F. (4°C.). A decline in quality of chicken à la king was noted after second cycle and after fourth cycle in beef stew.
INTRODUCTION

This study was undertaken to evaluate 39 food items from the Meal, Ready-to-Eat, Individual, which were subjected to controlled freezing and thawing conditions.

Each food item was packed in polyester-foil-polyolefin (heat sealable) laminated bags or pouches. Meat and bakery items had an additional paperboard folder or carton overwrap. The foods were combined in 14 different menus (meals), each designed to provide a nutritionally balanced, 1135 calorie, acceptable combination (Table 1). The menu combination was packed in a carton measuring 4 3/4 x 2 1/2 x 7 1/4 inches (12.1 x 6.4 x 18.4 centimeters).

The fourteen menus included heat-processed foods such as meats, beans in tomato sauce, and pineapple; freeze-dehydrated foods such as pork sausage patties, beef patties, apricots, peaches and strawberries; baked dessert items; bread rolls; crackers; cereal bars; cheese spread, jelly and peanut butter; plastic spoons and accessory packets containing coffee, cream, sugar, salt and all standard non-food accessory items included with MCI.

METHODS AND MATERIALS

For testing, three food items were selected from 13 menus (see Table 1). Menu 1 was not tested because previous experience indicated that freeze-dried pork sausage patties would give results similar to freeze-dried beef patties (Menu 4). Items evaluated are described in Table 2.

Storage

Test cycle, as follows, was repeated up to six times:

a. Freezing at approximately -65°F. (-54°C.) 16 hours
b. Thawing at room temperature (approximately 70°F.) (21°C.) 24 hours
c. Holding at 125°F. (51°C.) for 2 hours
d. Cooling at room temperature

Prior to and after the test cycle, samples were held in 40°F. (4°C.) storage as were the Control samples.

Quality Evaluations

The cycled foods were then evaluated by an expert panel of 10 food technologists using a 9-point quality scale (Figure 1). For each evaluation test, the panel was drawn from a pool of 16 technologists.
The three items from each menu, stored at 6 cycles and under control, were evaluated at one time, giving 21 samples for each test. Preparation of food items is indicated in Table 2. One serving portion of each food was examined by panel members to determine any physical differences and smaller portions were served for subjective evaluations.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Averages of rating scores by the panel are shown in Table 3. A treatment by subject design was used for statistical analysis of data. Only seven food items showed any statistically significant changes at the .05 level of probability.

a. Foods showing significant changes

(1) Barbecue Beef. The average decrease in rating between control sample and cycle 6 (six freeze-thaw cycles) was not statistically significant, but there was a significant difference between the control and cycle 4. Comments by the testers indicated that changes in rating were due to a variation in the product, rather than freezing and thawing; e.g., cycle 4 was "like ground meat" and cycle 2 had a 'spicier sauce'.

Four testers found no change in rating throughout the cycles, and seven testers rated cycle 6 as high as the control sample. Comments from the testers showed that there was softening of texture beginning with cycle 1, and some breakdown of the sauce.

(2) Beef Stew. The average decrease in ratings between the control sample and cycle 6 was gradual and statistically significant for cycles 4, 5, and 6. Some changes were noted in cycle 1, such as slight separation in the sauce, softening of potatoes, lima beans and carrots. These changes were noted in all of the cycles, with cycle 6 showing darkening potatoes, some free liquid, more softness of vegetables and softening of the meat.

(3) Bread Roll. The average decrease in rating between control sample and cycle 6 was not statistically significant, but there was a significant change between control and cycle 3 and cycle 4.

Five of the testers gave no change in the rating throughout the seven samples, but the item rated low at the start. Comments from technologists were that changes in rating were due to variation in the product and not from the freezing and thawing. Five of the seven average ratings were below a rating of 5.0.

(4) Chicken a la King. Changes occurring in this product were significant statistically in cycles 2, 4, 5 and 6. Comments indicate the breakdown of the sauce began in cycle 1, with a softening in texture in cycle 2.
(5) Chicken Loaf. There was a significant decrease in rating between control and cycle 5, but no significance between control and cycle 6. Thus, it would seem that this significance was not due entirely to freezing and thawing.

Two testers noted a variety in the spiciness, which probably indicates a variation in the product. Other comments showed that the product became grainy beginning at cycle 2. Cycles 5 and 6 became softer.

(6) Orange Cereal Bar. There was a slight but significant decrease in rating between control and cycle 2, 4, 5 and 6. Seven testers showed no change in ratings of the different samples, but the item rated low at the start.

(7) Sausage Links. There was a statistically significant decrease between control and cycle 6, but samples from the other cycles received ratings of the same order of magnitude as the cycle 6 sample.

Six testers noted no change in rating through the samples, though comments noted a softening of texture with cycle 1 and more apparent in subsequent cycles.

b. Foods not showing statistically significant changes, but were of interest

(1) Beans with Tomato Sauce. Beans with tomato sauce increased slightly in rating due to the freeze-thaw cycling. The rating increase probably was due to a softening of the texture in the beans.

(2) Others. There was some variation within the cycles, but not significant over the six freeze-thaw cycles tested as shown in the averages of potato pattie, chocolate with almonds, chocolate covered brownies, peaches and apricots (some testers rated apricots and some rated peaches).

CONCLUSIONS

There was little change in the ratings of food due to the freeze-thaw cycles. Beef Stew and Chicken a la King seemed to be the most affected with a breakdown of the sauce and softening texture in the vegetables, beginning with the first freeze-thaw cycle. The average ratings of these showed that the quality remained at fair or above throughout all of the cycles.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Menu 1 a</th>
<th>Menu 2</th>
<th>Menu 3</th>
<th>Menu 4 a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Chicken loaf Peaches</td>
<td>4 - Bacon</td>
<td>7 - Ham and chicken loaf Bread roll</td>
<td>10 - Beef loaf Beans with tomato sauce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Apricot cereal bar Bread roll Jelly</td>
<td>5 - Beans with tomato sauce Apricots Bread roll Cheese spread</td>
<td>8 - Peanut butter</td>
<td>11 - Bread roll Peanut butter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Chocolate bar with almonds Coffee Cream substitute Sugar</td>
<td>6 - Cookies, chocolate covered Coffee Cream substitute Sugar</td>
<td>9 - Chocolate nut roll Peaches Coffee Cream substitute Sugar Catsup</td>
<td>12 - Raisin nut cake Coffee Cream substitute Sugar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Menu 5</th>
<th>Menu 6</th>
<th>Menu 7</th>
<th>Menu 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 - Barbecue beef Potato pattie Bread roll Peanut butter</td>
<td>16 - Chicken a la King Crackers Cheese spread</td>
<td>19 - Ground beef in pickle flavored sauce Potato pattie Bread roll</td>
<td>22 - Beef Stew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - Strawberries</td>
<td>17 - Date pudding</td>
<td>20 - Cheese spread Cookies, chocolate covered</td>
<td>23 - Crackers Peanut butter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - Fudge bar Coffee Cream substitute Sugar</td>
<td>18 - Vanilla cream bar Fruit tablets Coffee Cream substitute Sugar</td>
<td>21 - Fruit tablet Coffee Cream substitute Sugar</td>
<td>24 - Pound cake Orange cereal bar Coffee Cream substitute Sugar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbered items – foods which were tested.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Menu 9</th>
<th>Menu 10</th>
<th>Menu 11</th>
<th>Menu 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 - Frankfurters</td>
<td>28 - Sausage links</td>
<td>31 - Beef steak</td>
<td>Chicken loaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread roll</td>
<td>Bread roll</td>
<td>Bread roll</td>
<td>Potato patty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jelly</td>
<td>Cheese spread</td>
<td>Jelly</td>
<td>Bread roll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - Chocolate covered brownies</td>
<td>29 - Orange cereal bar</td>
<td>32 - Jelly</td>
<td>Jelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 - Coffee</td>
<td>30 - Peaches and apricots</td>
<td>33 - Fruitcake</td>
<td>Chocolate bar with almonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cream substitute</td>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>Catsup mix</td>
<td>Catsup substitute</td>
<td>Cream substitute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Menu 4</th>
<th>Menu 1 (Not Used)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37 - Beef patties</td>
<td><strong>Pineapple</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 - Soup and gravy base, beef beans with tomato sauce</td>
<td><strong>Pork sausage patties</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread roll</td>
<td>Apricot cereal bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheese spread</td>
<td>Bread roll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocoa</td>
<td>Jelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaches</td>
<td>Chocolate with almonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cream substitute</strong></td>
<td>Sugar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>Catsup mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 - Catsup mix</td>
<td><strong>Pineapple</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbered items - foods which were tested.
**Foods which were not tested.
Table 2
Preparation of Food Items For Serving

Three portions of each item were cut into smaller samples to serve the ten panelists.

**MEATS**

Bacon, prefried  
Barbecued beef  
Beef loaf  
Beef patties, freeze dried  
Beef steak  
Beef stew  
Chicken a la King  
Chicken loaf  
Frankfurters  
Ground beef in pickle sauce  
Ham and chicken loaf  
Sausage links

**METHOD OF SERVING**

Plastic trays, having seven compartments were used.  
Compartments were labeled c, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.  
Foods were served at room temperature.

**OTHER ITEMS USING TRAYS**

Beans with tomato sauce  
Peanut butter

**CEREAL, BAKERY PRODUCTS, CANDIES AND POTATO PATTIE**

Apricot cereal bar  
Orange cereal bar

Bread roll  
Crackers  
Chocolate covered brownies  
Chocolate nut roll  
Cookies, chocolate covered  
Date pudding

Served on sheets of paper labeled c, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.
### Table 2

**Preparation of Food Items For Serving (cont'd)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEATS</th>
<th>METHOD OF SERVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fruit cake</td>
<td>Served in individual paper souffle cups, not rehydrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange nut roll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pound cake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raisin nut cake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chocolate bar with almonds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit tablet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fudge bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanilla cream bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potato pattie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRUITS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strawberries</td>
<td>Served in individual one-ounce paper portion cups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaches and apricots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPREADS AND CATSUP</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catsup</td>
<td>Served hot at the food counter where panelists served themselves in china mugs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheese spread (kneaded in the package before serving)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jelly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIQUIDS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cocoa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup and gravy base, beef</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Averages of Overall Quality Ratings by 10 Food Technologists
On 39 Different Foods From Meal, Ready-to-Eat, Individual (1966 Prototype)
Control Through Six Freeze-Thaw Cycles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Menu</th>
<th>Meat &amp; Protein Foods</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Cycle 1</th>
<th>Cycle 2</th>
<th>Cycle 3</th>
<th>Cycle 4</th>
<th>Cycle 5</th>
<th>Cycle 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bacon, prefried</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Barbecued beef</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.3*</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Beef loaf</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Beef patties, freeze dried</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Beef steak</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Beef stew</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8*</td>
<td>5.6*</td>
<td>5.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chicken a la King</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.9*</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.7*</td>
<td>5.9*</td>
<td>5.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Chicken loaf</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.4*</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Frankfurters</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ground beef in pickle sauce</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ham and chicken loaf</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sausage links</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Beans with tomato sauce</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Peanut butter</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Overall Quality Ratings are based upon color, odor, flavor, texture and appearance of each food.
*Indicates foods showing statistically significant changes between Control Rating and Freeze-Thaw Cycle.
### Table 3

**Averages of Overall Quality Ratings by 10 Food Technologists on 39 Different Foods From Meal, Ready-to-Eat, Individual (1966 Prototype) Control Through Six Freeze-Thaw Cycles (cont’d)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Menu</th>
<th>Candies, Fruits, Spreads</th>
<th>Catsup and Beverages</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Cycle 1</th>
<th>Cycle 2</th>
<th>Cycle 3</th>
<th>Cycle 4</th>
<th>Cycle 5</th>
<th>Cycle 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Chocolate bar with almonds</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fruit tablet</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chocolate fudge bar</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vanilla cream bar</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strawberries</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Peaches and apricots</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Catsup mix</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cheese spread</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jelly</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cocoa</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Soup and gravy base, beef</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Overall Quality Ratings are based upon color, odor, flavor, texture and appearance of each food.
Table 3

Averages of Overall Quality Ratings\(^1\) by 10 Food Technologists
On 39 Different Foods From Meal, Ready-to-Eat, Individual (1966 Prototype)
Control Through Six Freeze-Thaw Cycles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Menu</th>
<th>Cereal, Bakery Products, Potato Pattie</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Cycle 1</th>
<th>Cycle 2</th>
<th>Cycle 3</th>
<th>Cycle 4</th>
<th>Cycle 5</th>
<th>Cycle 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Apricot cereal bar</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Orange cereal bar</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.6*</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6*</td>
<td>5.6*</td>
<td>5.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Bread roll</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Crackers</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Chocolate covered brownies</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chocolate nut roll</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cookies, chocolate covered</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Date pudding</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fruit cake</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Orange nut roll</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pound cake</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Raisin nut cake</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Potato pattie</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Overall Quality Ratings are based upon color, odor, flavor, texture and appearance of each food.

\(^*\)Indicates foods showing statistically significant changes between Control Rating and Freeze-Thaw Cycle.
Using the above scale, rate the overall quality of each of the products. There will be seven ratings for each food.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The effect of freezing and thawing on the 1966 Prototype of the Meal, Ready-to-Eat, Individual, was studied to determine if there were changes in 39 food items in the ration. Using six controlled freezing and thawing cycles, it was found that there was little change in ratings due to freezing and thawing, when compared to control samples stored at 40°F. (4°C.). A decline in quality of chicken à la king was noted after second cycle and after fourth cycle in beef stew.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINK A</th>
<th>LINK B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>WT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal, Ready-To-Eat, Individual</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Rations</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken A La King</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stew</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef Stew</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freezing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thawing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>