

**ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE
JOINT MEETING OF THE CHEMICALS COMMITTEE AND THE WORKING
PARTY ON CHEMICALS, PESTICIDES AND BIOTECHNOLOGY**

**CONSENSUS DOCUMENT ON COMPOSITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
FOR NEW CULTIVARS OF APPLE (*Malus × domestica* Borkh.):
Key Food and Feed Nutrients, Allergens, Toxicants and Other Metabolites**

**Series on the Safety of Novel Foods and Feeds
No. 31**

JT03449758

OECD Environment, Health and Safety Publications

Series on the Safety of Novel Foods and Feeds

No. 31

**Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations
for New Cultivars of APPLE (*Malus × domestica* Borkh.):
Key Food and Feed Nutrients, Allergens, Toxicants
and Other Metabolites**

Environment Directorate

ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Paris 2019

Also published in the Series on the Safety of Novel Foods and Feeds:

- [No. 1, Consensus Document on Key Nutrients and Key Toxicants in Low Erucic Acid Rapeseed (Canola) (2001) – ***REPLACED with revised consensus document No. 24 (2011)***]
- [No. 2, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Soybean: Key Food and Feed Nutrients and Anti-nutrients (2001) – ***REPLACED with revised consensus document No. 25 (2012)***]
- No. 3, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Sugar Beet: Key Food and Feed Nutrients and Anti-nutrients (2002)
- No. 4, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Potatoes: Key Food and Feed Nutrients, Anti-nutrients and Toxicants (2002)
- No. 5, Report of the OECD Workshop on the Nutritional Assessment of Novel Foods and Feeds, Ottawa, Canada, February 2001 (2002)
- No. 6, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Maize (Zea mays): Key Food and Feed Nutrients, Anti-nutrients and Secondary Plant Metabolites (2002)
- No. 7, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Bread Wheat (Triticum aestivum): Key Food and Feed Nutrients, Anti-nutrients and Toxicants (2003)
- No. 8, Report on the Questionnaire on Biomarkers, Research on the Safety of Novel Foods and Feasibility of Post-Market Monitoring (2003)
- No. 9, Considerations for the Safety Assessment of Animal Feedstuffs Derived from Genetically Modified Plants (2003)
- [No. 10, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Rice (Oryza sativa): Key Food and Feed Nutrients and Anti-nutrients (2004) ***REPLACED with revised consensus document No. 28 (2016)***]
- No. 11, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Cotton (Gossypium hirsutum and Gossypium barbadense): Key Food and Feed Nutrients and Anti-nutrients (2004)
- No. 12, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Barley (Hordeum vulgare L.): Key Food and Feed Nutrients and Anti-nutrients (2004)
- No. 13, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Alfalfa and Other Temperate Forage Legumes: Key Feed Nutrients, Anti-nutrients and Secondary Plant Metabolites (2005)
- No. 14, An Introduction to the Food/Feed Safety Consensus Documents of the Task Force for the Safety of Novel Foods and Feeds (2006)
- No. 15, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of the Cultivated Mushroom Agaricus Bisporus: Key Food and Feed Nutrients, Anti-nutrients and Toxicants (2007)
- No. 16, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Sunflower: Key Food and Feed Nutrients, Anti-nutrients and Toxicants (2007)
- No. 17, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Tomato: Key Food and Feed Nutrients, Anti-nutrients, Toxicants and Allergens (2008)
- No. 18, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Cassava (Manihot esculenta Crantz): Key Food and Feed Nutrients, Anti-nutrients, Toxicants and Allergens (2009)
- No. 19, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Grain Sorghum [Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench]: Key Food and Feed Nutrients and Anti-nutrients (2010)
- No. 20, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Sweet Potato [Ipomoea batatas (L.) Lam.]: Key Food and Feed Nutrients, Anti-nutrients, Toxicants and Allergens (2010)

-
- No. 21, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Papaya (*Carica papaya* L.): Key Food and Feed Nutrients, Anti-nutrients, Toxicants and Allergens (2010)
- No. 22, Consensus Document on Molecular Characterisation of Plants Derived from Modern Biotechnology (2010)
- No. 23, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Sugarcane (*Saccharum* spp. hybrids.): Key Food and Feed Nutrients, Anti-nutrients and Toxicants (2011)
- No. 24, Revised Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Low Erucic Acid Rapeseed (Canola): Key Food and Feed Nutrients, Anti-nutrients and Toxicants (2011)
- No. 25, Revised Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Soybean [*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.]: Key Food and Feed Nutrients, Anti-nutrients, Toxicants and Allergens (2012)
- No. 26, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Oyster Mushroom (*Pleurotus ostreatus*): Key Food and Feed Nutrients, Anti-nutrients and Toxicants (2013)
- No. 27, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Common Bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.): Key Food and Feed Nutrients, Anti-nutrients and Other Constituents (2015)
- No. 28, Revised Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Rice (*Oryza sativa*): Key Food and Feed Nutrients, Anti-nutrients and Other Constituents (2016)
- No. 29, High-throughput DNA Sequencing in the Safety Assessment of Genetically Engineered Plants: Proceedings of the OECD Workshop held in April 2016 (2016)
- No. 30, Consensus Document on Compositional Considerations for New Varieties of Cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata*): Key Food and Feed Nutrients, Anti-nutrients and Other Constituents (2018)

© OECD 2019

Applications for permission to reproduce or translate all or part of this material should be made to:

RIGHTS@oecd.org, Head of Publications Service, OECD, 2 rue André-Pascal, 75775 Paris Cedex 16, France.

ABOUT THE OECD

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) is an intergovernmental organisation in which representatives of 36 industrialised countries in North and South America, Europe and the Asia and Pacific region, as well as the European Commission, meet to co-ordinate and harmonise policies, discuss issues of mutual concern, and work together to respond to international problems. Most of the OECD's work is carried out by more than 200 specialised committees and working groups composed of member country delegates. Observers from several countries with special status at the OECD, and from interested international organisations, attend many of the OECD's workshops and other meetings. Committees and working groups are served by the OECD Secretariat, located in Paris, France, which is organised into directorates and divisions.

The Environment, Health and Safety Division publishes free-of-charge documents in twelve different series: **Testing and Assessment; Good Laboratory Practice and Compliance Monitoring; Pesticides; Biocides; Risk Management; Harmonisation of Regulatory Oversight in Biotechnology; Safety of Novel Foods and Feeds; Chemical Accidents; Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers; Emission Scenario Documents; Safety of Manufactured Nanomaterials;** and **Adverse Outcome Pathways**. More information about the Environment, Health and Safety Programme and EHS publications is available on the OECD's World Wide Web site (www.oecd.org/chemicalsafety/).

This publication is available electronically, at no charge.

For the complete text of this and many other Novel Foods and Feeds publications, consult the OECD's World Wide Web site (www.oecd.org/env/ehs/biotrack/)

or contact:

**OECD Environment Directorate,
Environment, Health and Safety Division
2 rue André-Pascal
75775 Paris Cedex 16
France**

E-mail: ehscont@oecd.org

FOREWORD

The OECD's Task Force for the Safety of Novel Foods and Feeds¹ decided at its first session, in 1999, to focus its work on the development of science-based *consensus documents*, which are mutually acceptable among member countries. These consensus documents contain information for use during the regulatory assessment of a particular food/feed product. In the area of food and feed safety, consensus documents are being published on the nutrients, anti-nutrients or toxicants, information of its use as a food/feed and other relevant information.

This document addresses compositional considerations for new cultivars of apple by identifying the key food and feed nutrients, allergens, toxicants and other metabolites. A general description of these components is provided. In addition, there is background material on the production, processing and uses of apple, and considerations to be taken into account when assessing new cultivars of this crop. Constituents to be analysed, related to food use and feed use, are suggested.

Canada and Germany served as the lead countries in the preparation for the document, and the draft has been revised on a number of occasions based on the input from other member countries and stakeholders.

The Working Group for the Safety of Novel Foods and Feeds¹ endorsed this document, which is published under the responsibility of the Joint Meeting of the Chemicals Committee and the Working Party on Chemicals, Pesticides and Biotechnology of the OECD.

¹ From 1st of January 2017, the Task Force for the Safety of Novel Foods and Feeds has changed denomination, becoming the Working Group for the Safety of Novel Foods and Feeds.

Table of contents

PREAMBLE	10
THE ROLE OF COMPARATIVE APPROACH AS PART OF A SAFETY ASSESSMENT	11
1. BACKGROUND.....	13
1.1. Introduction.....	13
1.2. Production of apples	14
1.2.1. World production	14
1.2.2. Cultivars	14
1.3. Uses and processing.....	15
1.3.1. Apples for human consumption	15
1.3.2. Apples for animal feed	17
1.4. Appropriate comparators for testing new cultivars.....	18
1.5. Breeding characteristics screened by developers.....	18
2. NUTRIENTS.....	20
2.1. Constituents of apple fruits	20
2.1.1. Proximate nutrient content	20
2.1.2. Carbohydrates.....	20
2.1.3. Minerals.....	20
2.1.4. Fatty acids	20
2.1.5. Amino acids.....	24
2.1.6. Vitamins	25
2.2. Constituents of products and by-products from apple processing	26
2.2.1. Nutrient composition of apple juice	26
2.2.2. Nutrient composition of apple pomace	27
2.3. Changes in chemical composition during storage.....	28
3. OTHER CONSTITUENTS	30
3.1. Allergens.....	30
3.2. Toxicants.....	30
3.3. Other metabolites: organic acids, phenolic compounds.....	31
4. SUGGESTED CONSTITUENTS TO BE ANALYSED RELATED TO FOOD USE	33
4.1. Key products consumed by humans	33
4.2. Suggested analysis for food use of new cultivars	33
5. SUGGESTED CONSTITUENTS TO BE ANALYSED RELATED TO FEED USE	34
5.1. Key products consumed by animals	34
5.2. Suggested analysis for feed use of new cultivars.....	34
6. REFERENCES	35

Tables

Table 1.	Production, exports and imports of apples in 2016 (in kilotonnes).....	14
Table 2.	Proximate and carbohydrate composition of apple fruit (% dry matter, edible portion).....	21
Table 3.	Mineral composition of apple fruit (per 100 g dry matter, edible portion).....	22
Table 4.	Fatty acid composition of apple fruit (mg per 100 g dry matter, edible portion).....	23
Table 5.	Amino acid composition of apple fruit (mg per 100 g dry matter, edible portion).....	24
Table 6.	Vitamin composition of apple fruit (per 100 g dry matter, edible portion).....	25
Table 7.	Nutrient composition of apple juice (per 100 g juice).....	26
Table 8.	Nutrient composition of apple pomace (% dry matter).....	28
Table 9.	Concentration of other metabolites in apple fruit (mg per 100 g dry matter).....	32
Table 10.	Suggested nutritional and compositional parameters to be analysed in apple fruit with peel for food use.....	33
Table 11.	Suggested nutritional and compositional parameters to be analysed in unprocessed apple or apple pomace for feed use.....	34

Figures

Figure 1.	Apple fruit and seed.....	13
Figure 2.	Fruit colour/shape diversity of some apple cultivars.....	15

PREAMBLE

Food and feed products of modern biotechnology are being commercialised and marketed in OECD member countries and elsewhere. The need has been identified for detailed technical work aimed at establishing appropriate approaches to the safety assessment of these products.

At a Workshop held in Aussois, France (OECD, 1997), it was recognised that a consistent approach to the establishment of substantial equivalence might be improved through consensus on the appropriate components (e.g. key nutrients, key toxicants and anti-nutritional compounds) on a crop-by-crop basis, which should be considered in the comparison. It is recognised that the components may differ from crop to crop. The Working Group for the Safety of Novel Foods and Feeds therefore decided to develop Consensus Documents on phenotypic characteristics and compositional data. These data are used to identify similarities and differences following a comparative approach as part of a food and feed safety assessment. They should be useful to the development of guidelines, both national and international and to encourage information sharing among OECD member countries.

These documents are a compilation of currently available information that is important in food and feed safety assessment. They provide a technical tool for regulatory officials as a general guide and reference source, and also for industry and other interested parties and will complement those of the Working Group on Harmonisation of Regulatory Oversight in Biotechnology. They are mutually acceptable to, but not legally binding on, OECD member countries. They are not intended to be a comprehensive description of all issues considered to be necessary for a safety assessment, but a base set for an individual product that supports the comparative approach. In assessing an individual product, additional components may be required depending on the specific case in question.

In order to ensure that scientific and technical developments are taken into account, member countries have agreed that these Consensus Documents will be reviewed periodically and updated as necessary. Users of these documents are invited to provide the OECD with new scientific and technical information, and to make proposals for additional areas to be considered. Comments and suggestions can be sent to:

OECD Environment Directorate,
Environment, Health and Safety Division,
2 rue André-Pascal,
75775 Paris Cedex 16, France

Email: ehscont@oecd.org

THE ROLE OF COMPARATIVE APPROACH AS PART OF A SAFETY ASSESSMENT

In 1990, a joint consultation of the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) and the World Health Organisation (WHO) established that the comparison of a final product with one having an acceptable standard of safety provides an important element of safety assessment (WHO, 1991).

In 1993, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) further elaborated this concept and advocated the approach to safety assessment based on substantial equivalence as being the most practical approach to addressing the safety of foods and food components derived through modern biotechnology (as well as other methods of modifying a host genome including tissue culture methods and chemical or radiation induced mutation) (OECD, 1993). In 2000, the Task Force for the Safety of Novel Foods and Feeds² concluded in its report to the G8 that the concept of substantial equivalence will need to be kept under review (OECD, 2000).

The Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on Foods Derived from Biotechnology in 2000 concluded that the safety assessment of genetically modified foods requires an integrated and stepwise, case-by-case approach, which can be aided by a structured series of questions (FAO/WHO, 2000). A comparative approach focusing on the determination of similarities and differences between the genetically modified food and its conventional counterpart aids in the identification of potential safety and nutritional issues and is considered the most appropriate strategy for the safety and nutritional assessment of genetically modified foods. The concept of substantial equivalence was developed as a practical approach to the safety assessment of genetically modified foods. It should be seen as a key step in the safety assessment process although it is not a safety assessment in itself; it does not characterise hazard, rather it is used to structure the safety assessment of a genetically modified food relative to a conventional counterpart. The Consultation concluded that the application of the concept of substantial equivalence contributes to a robust safety assessment framework.

A previous Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on Biotechnology and Food Safety held in 1996 elaborated on compositional comparison as an important element in the determination of substantial equivalence. A comparison of critical components can be carried out at the level of the food source (i.e. species) or the specific food product. Critical components are determined by identifying key nutrients, key toxicants and anti-nutrients for the food source in question. The comparison of key nutrients should be between the modified variety and non-modified comparators with an appropriate history of safe use. Any difference identified would then be assessed against the natural ranges published in the literature for commercial varieties or those measured levels in parental or other edible varieties of the species (FAO/WHO, 1996). The comparator used to detect unintended effects should ideally be the near isogenic parental line grown under identical conditions.

While the comparative approach is useful as part of the safety assessment of foods derived from plants developed using recombinant DNA technology, the approach could, in general,

² From 1st of January 2017, the Task Force for the Safety of Novel Foods and Feeds has changed denomination, becoming the Working Group for the Safety of Novel Foods and Feeds.

be applied to foods derived from new plant varieties that have been bred by other techniques.

1. BACKGROUND

1.1. Introduction

1. The apple *Malus x domestica* Borkh. is a widely distributed, temperate zone fruit crop (Figure 1) that has been cultivated for millennia.

Figure 1. Apple fruit and seed



Source: [Maks Narodenko/Shutterstock.com](https://www.shutterstock.com/author/maks-narodenko).

2. The apple is a member of the *Rosaceae* family, *Amygdaloideae* subfamily, *Maleae* tribe, *Malinae* subtribe, and *Malus* genus (Potter et al., 2007). The *Rosaceae* family is distributed worldwide and includes a range of economically important fruit crop species such as the pome fruit species (for example: apple, pear, and quince), the stone fruit species (for example: sweet and sour cherry, plum, prune, apricot, and peach), and the berry fruit species (for example: strawberry, blackberry, and raspberry). The genus *Malus* consists of six sections with 27 primary species (Forsline et al., 2003). Most of the species belonging to the *Malus* genus are cross-compatible, hence natural and artificial hybridisation techniques have resulted in numerous interspecific hybrids and secondary species.

3. The domestication of apple took place around 4 000 to 10 000 years ago in the Tien Shan Mountains of Central Asia. The origin of the *Malus* genus is said to be southeast of the People's Republic of China, and the species of the genus were distributed from there in all directions.

4. The presumed main ancestor of the cultivated apple is *Malus sieversii* (Ledeb.) M. Roem., which grew wild in the forests of Central Asia from Tajikistan to Western People's Republic of China (Luby, 2003; Hancock et al., 2008). Based on genomic studies performed in the last century, other species belonging to the *Malus* genus have contributed to the genome of the cultivated apple. These were mainly *Malus sylvestris* (L.) Mill. distributed from Western Asia to Europe, and *Malus orientalis* Uglitzk which grew in the forests of the Caucasus region (Hancock et al., 2008).

5. The cultivated apple belongs to the genus *Malus*. The binomial denomination of the cultivated apple *Malus x domestica* Borkh. reflects its interspecific origin and replaces the former name *M. pumila* Mill. as well as other names like *Pyrus malus* L. *Malus x domestica* is allopolyploid ($2n = 2x = 34$), gametophytic incompatible, mostly

self-unfruitful and requiring pollination. Most of the cultivars are diploid; however a number of tri- and tetraploid cultivars also exist.

6. Further description on the apple taxonomy, geographic distribution, centres of origin and diversity, reproductive biology, genetics, hybridisation and introgression, interaction with other organisms (ecology), common pests and pathogens, and biotechnological developments can be found in the OECD Consensus Document on the Biology of Apple (OECD, 2019 - *to be published*).

1.2. Production of apples

1.2.1. World production

7. Among fruit crops, apple is only exceeded in global production by total citrus fruits and banana, and is comparable to grapes. In 2016, the world apple production was around 85 million tonnes (FAOSTAT, 2019). As shown in Table 1, the main producers are the People's Republic of China and the United States, followed by Poland, Turkey, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran and Italy.

Table 1. Production, exports and imports of apples in 2016 (in kilotonnes)

Rank ¹	Country	Production ² (kilotonnes)	Exports ² (kilotonnes)	Imports ² (kilotonnes)
1	China (People's Republic of)	40 393	1 322	67
2	United States	5 161	777	193
3	Poland	3 604	1093	12
4	Turkey	2 926	140	1
5	India	2 521	13	247
6	Iran	2 470	56	1
7	Italy	2 456	1049	63
8	Russia	1 844	14	677
9	France	1 820	573	177
10	Chile	1 743	765	2
11	Ukraine	1 099	13	42
12	Brazil	1 049	31	155
13	Uzbekistan	1 034	4	0
14	Germany	1 033	89	611
15	Argentina	968	91	3
16	South Africa	913	511	0
17	Democratic People's Republic of Korea	779	-	52
18	Japan	765	32	2
19	Egypt	755	1	230
20	Mexico	717	2	213
	WORLD	85 204	9 044	8 896

Note: ¹ The countries are listed in order of production.

Source: ² FAOSTAT (2019), FAO statistics database <http://www.fao.org/faostat/>, accessed July 2019. Aggregate may include official, semi-official, estimated or calculated data.

1.2.2. Cultivars

8. It is estimated that 40 cultivars account for the bulk of commercial production worldwide. Some cultivars have given rise to many mutants, which have been selected for growth habit, fruit colour (Figure 2), ripening time and other characteristics. Economically

important mutants are especially known among the cultivars 'Delicious', 'Jonagold' and 'Gala'.

Figure.2. Fruit colour/shape diversity of some apple cultivars



Source: cynoclub/Shutterstock.com.

9. Regional differences in the relative importance of apple cultivars are evident, and the choice of cultivars varies from country to country. For instance, southern Europe produces many 'Golden Delicious' whereas 'Elstar' and 'Jonagold' are popular in northern Europe. Australia and New Zealand are major apple exporters based on 'Gala', 'Granny Smith' and 'Braeburn'. The leading cultivar in the People's Republic of China is 'Fuji'. In many regions of North America, 'McIntosh' and 'Delicious' are important cultivars; however, many others such as 'Fuji', 'Pink Lady', 'Gala', 'Braeburn' and 'Jonagold' are also popular.

1.3. Uses and processing

1.3.1. Apples for human consumption

10. The apple industry encompasses growers, packers, shippers and processors. Apples destined for the fresh market (primary market) are shipped from the orchard to a packer. The packers then distribute the product to retailers and exporters. Improvements in shipping and techniques for delaying fruit ripening allow many apple cultivars to be offered all year round in many countries. Apples may also be sold directly to consumers at the orchard or at farmers markets.

11. Apples are mainly cultivated for the fresh fruit market with the rest being processed into apple juice, apple cider, applesauce, apple butter, cider vinegar, dried apples, and canned apples. Due to their proposed use apple cultivars can be referred to as eating apples, cider apples, and cooking apples.

Fresh apples (eating apples)

12. The term "fresh apples" as used in this document refers to "eating apples" cultivars, which are consumed in their natural form ("out of hand"). Fresh apples vary in flavour, ranging from sour to sweet, and texture, from dry and mealy to crisp and juicy. Fresh apples

are sold in categories, classes or grades, which reflect their perceived quality. The quality criteria are specific to individual cultivars. Consumers often find products such as pre-washed, pre-sliced, or bagged apple slices appealing and convenient (AAFC, 2010).

Apple juice

13. Apple juice is the liquid extracted from ripe apples. Generally, the apples are ground, pressed and filtered to remove skins and pulp. The juice may or may not be pasteurised and can be sold in un-concentrated or concentrated forms. Apple juice is widely used in fruit juice blends. The apple solids remaining after juice extraction can be used for the production of pectin (a carbohydrate used as a gelling agent in the production of jams and jellies) and as animal feed.

Apple cider and cider vinegar

14. Cider is the fermented juice of the apple. It can be unfiltered, unsweetened, alcoholic or non-alcoholic. Non-alcoholic cider is unfiltered, usually unpasteurised juice from apples. In making alcoholic apple cider, the juice is inoculated with specific yeast strains that ferment sugar in the juice into ethanol and produce flavours characteristic to the apple cider. Apple cider can be further processed by inoculating it with bacterial cultures that will oxidise ethanol to acetic acid to produce apple cider vinegar.

Applesauce

15. Applesauce is a purée made of apples that are cleaned, sorted, peeled, and cooked with or without sugar. It can include a variety of spices such as cinnamon and allspice. The cooked apples can be passed through a screen to remove any undesirables and for sizing. Applesauce used as baby food goes through a screen to create a fine texture. The applesauce can then be either canned or bottled.

Apple butter

16. Apple butter is a highly concentrated form of applesauce produced by slow cooking apples with apple cider or water to a point where the sugar in the apple caramelises, turning the applesauce to a deep brown colour. The sugar concentration in this product allows it to have a longer shelf life than applesauce.

Apple pectin

17. Apples and apple pomace contain pectin at 1-1.5% and 15-20%, respectively. Pectin is a mixture of complex polysaccharides and is used as a gelling agent, thickener, stabilizer, and emulsifier in food products like jams and fruit jellies. Pectin is obtained via hot acidified water extraction and further processing of apple pomace.

Other products

18. Apples are also used to produce dehydrated apple slices, fruit leather, apple-filled snack bars, apple jelly, and appleseed oil. Leftover by-products of apple processing are used as food ingredients in, for example, baked goods, for extraction of ester flavours and other components (e.g., essences for use in food and non-food products), or for animal feed.

1.3.2. Apples for animal feed

19. Leftover by-products of apple processing, such as pomace containing peel, seeds, core, and stem tissues may be fed to livestock (NRC, 1983). In large scale apple juice processing industries, two types of waste are generated. The first is the unprocessed discarded apple fruit (culls), and the second is the pomace (the pulp, peels, seeds, and cores) which is left after juice extraction. About 250 to 350 kg wet pomace can be obtained from a tonne of apples processed for juice (Dairy Farm Guide, 2015). Apple pomace from juice extraction often contains rice hulls or husks that are added by commercial juice manufacturers to aid filtration and recovery of the juice. The residual material from canning, drying and freezing of apples is also known as pomace, and consists of the peels, cores and culled apples or pieces.

20. Apple pomace is an acceptable feedstuff, given the high level of carbohydrates, pectin and fibre. However, due to the high moisture content of fresh apple pomace, it spoils rapidly and therefore must be used quickly or be preserved by drying or ensiling. Drying to about 10% moisture content prevents spoilage and spontaneous combustion (Dairy Farm Guide, 2015). Drying often takes place in direct fired, rotary-drum driers after which the pomace is ground in hammer mills (NRC, 1983). Apple pomace ensiled alone results in a very high moisture product leading to loss of nutrients by drainage, therefore it is often mixed with alfalfa or corn prior to ensiling. Cull apples may also be preserved as silage by mixing them with about 20% alfalfa hay (NRC, 1983).

21. Pectin pulp, the residue remaining after extraction of pectin from pomace (Shalini and Gupta, 2010) may be used fresh, dried or ensiled, as feed for livestock (Dairy Farm Guide, 2015).

22. Wet, dried, or ensiled apple pomace and pectin pulp are used as energy feeds typically for ruminant animals. Apple pomace is palatable to cattle and sheep, while pectin pulp is less palatable to dairy cows. The addition of molasses was suggested to increase the palatability of pectin pulp for dairy cows (Smock and Neubert, 1950). Tiwari, Narang and Dubey (2008) showed that the inclusion of apple pomace at 12% of the ration had no adverse effects on milk yield or milk constituents of crossbred dairy cows. Rust and Buskirk (2008) indicated that about 18-27 kg of apple pomace can be fed to beef cows daily. Smith (1950) reported that cattle can be fed up to 16 kg of apple pomace silage daily, mature pigs up to 1.8 kg, and sheep up to 1 kg daily. Givens and Barber (1987) reported feeding sheep with apple pomace at 579-760 g dry matter per day, in addition to basal hay to meet the animal's metabolisable energy requirements for maintenance. Inclusion of apple pomace to up to 20% of swine rations was found to have no significant effects on daily weight gain, feed efficiency and carcass characteristics (Bowden and Berry, 1958). Matoo et al. (2001), however, reported better performance of broiler chicken fed apple pomace diets supplemented with enzymes due to the high fibre content of apple pomace.

23. Solid-state fermentation processes of apple pomace using microorganisms (e.g. *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, *Aspergillus niger*, *Phanerochaete chrysosporium*, etc.) to obtain value-added products such as higher soluble protein-enriched pomace for livestock, have also been investigated (Joshi and Attri, 2006; Ajila et al., 2015). Ajila et al. (2015) observed that the addition of 5% w/w protein enriched apple pomace increased the protein content of pig diets by 36%. This increase in protein content resulted in corresponding improvement in weight gain and performance when compared to control diets. The high organic acids, carbohydrates and soluble fibres (pectin) in apple pomace make it a good substrate to produce a value-added product such as fermented apple pomace

(high in protein) for livestock feed, as well as for the production of pectinases, ethanol and citric acid.

1.4. Appropriate comparators for testing new cultivars

24. This document suggests parameters that apple breeders should measure when developing new cultivars.

25. The data obtained in the analysis of a new apple cultivar should ideally be compared to those obtained from an appropriate near isogenic non-modified variety, grown and harvested under the same conditions³ ⁴. The comparison can also be made between values obtained from new varieties and data available in the literature, or chemical analytical data generated from commercial apple cultivars.

26. Components to be analysed include key nutrients, anti-nutrients, toxicants and allergens. Key nutrients are those which have a substantial impact in the overall diet of humans (food) and animals (feed). These may be major (fats, proteins, and structural and non-structural carbohydrates) or minor constituents (vitamins and minerals). Similarly, the levels of known metabolites and allergens should be considered. Key toxicants are those toxicologically significant compounds known to be inherently present in the species, whose toxic potency and levels may impact human and animal health. Standardised analytical methods and appropriate types of material should be used, adequately adapted to each product and by-product. The key components analysed are used as indicators of whether unintended effects of the genetic modification influencing plant metabolism have occurred or not.

1.5. Breeding characteristics screened by developers

27. Prior to 1900, apple improvement was based on finding chance seedlings with good fruit quality. Scientific breeding work began in the early 20th century as leading horticultural / agricultural experiment stations and institutes were just being established at that time worldwide. Apple breeding started to be based on controlled crosses combining the best characteristics of cultivars chosen as mother or pollen parents.

28. Apple cultivars have been developed by selection of desired fruit phenotypes (appearance, uniformity, size, firmness, juiciness, crispiness, taste), as well as for agronomic characteristics (yield, stability of yield, tree growth, pruning effort), resistance to diseases and tolerance to abiotic stress. Apple cultivars are generally propagated vegetatively on rootstocks. The rootstock can impact characteristics that are important for

³ Like many fruit trees, apple trees do not reproduce true-to-type from seed. Consequently, in production orchards, cultivars are propagated vegetatively. This is done by taking vegetative buds from a young shoot (scion) of the desired cultivar or seedling and grafting those buds onto a rootstock. All vegetatively-propagated seedlings or cultivars are genetically identical. Desirable cultivars are clonally propagated by grafting onto rootstocks. It is possible that the rootstock onto which the scion is grafted may change the characteristics of the scion. A special consideration for apples and other fruits, as opposed to many other types of crops, is that new cultivars should preferably be compared to the non-modified cultivar grown on the same rootstock and harvested and stored under the same conditions. Exceptions might be where the new variety is fitted to special environments.

⁴ For additional discussion of appropriate comparators, see the Guideline for the Conduct of Food Safety Assessment of Foods Derived from Recombinant DNA Plants CAC/GL 45-2003 of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (paragraphs 44 and 45).

commercial production, for example, vigour of vegetative growth and fruit size. The choice of the rootstock is also important for the purpose of the cultivar, e.g. commercial fruit production or landscape growing.

29. The traits of major interest for modern breeding programs include better quality or increased marketability of the fruit, improved storability, reduced production costs, as well as improved disease and pest resistance. Molecular techniques have been developed to facilitate and accelerate apple breeding. Molecular markers have been developed for several disease resistance genes, as well as for some quality traits (Costa et al., 2005; Peil et al., 2011). Marker assisted seedling selection is applied already by some breeders (Baumgartner et al., 2015). The genome of the apple has been published (Velasco et al., 2010), which will aid in developing more markers. Genomic selection, a statistical approach for estimating breeding potential, has been demonstrated as a tool that could be useful for selecting fruit quality traits (Kumar et al., 2012). Furthermore, there are continuing efforts to address some of the breeding bottlenecks using innovative breeding technologies, like cisgenesis and fast-track breeding approaches (Flachowsky et al., 2007; CFIA, 2014).

2. NUTRIENTS

2.1. Constituents of apple fruits

30. The composition of apples varies greatly among cultivars. Environmental factors such as climate, soil condition, site of cultivation, and storage conditions after harvest have an influence on the overall composition of the fruit. Sugars, organic acids and polyphenol compounds are responsible for the apple's main sensory attributes of sweetness, acidity and bitterness. The ripening process alters apple composition, which affects the consistency as well as the taste.

2.1.1. Proximate nutrient content

31. Proximate composition (including moisture, protein, fat, ash, crude fibre, and calculated carbohydrates) of fresh apples with peel is given in Table 2. The moisture content of apples generally varies between 82.5-86.2% but for some cultivars, values of as high as 88.1% have been reported (Rop et al., 2011). Carbohydrates make up the major fraction (greater than 90%) of apple dry matter. Protein ranges from 1.42 to 4.35%, total fat ranges between 0.28 and 3.62% and ash ranges between 1.32 and 2.08% on a dry matter basis.

2.1.2. Carbohydrates

32. Carbohydrate content of apples can be divided into soluble sugars, fibre (non-starch polysaccharides) and starch. The most abundant compounds within the carbohydrates are the soluble sugars at up to 83%. Fructose is the major sugar among them. In general, the concentration of sugars increases during ripening (Zhang, Li and Cheng, 2010).

33. Apples are a source of dietary fibre. The amount of dietary fibre in apple skin is about 30% higher than in the pulp (Gorinstein et al., 2001). The major non-starch polysaccharides accounting for most of the dietary fibre in apples are pectins. Values of 8 to 24 g pectin/100 g dry matter have been reported (Rop et al., 2011). Pectins are major components of the cell wall and are associated with the firmness of the fruit. As pectins undergo significant structural variations during ripening the apple texture changes and usually softens (Mangas et al., 1992).

2.1.3. Minerals

34. Potassium and phosphorus are the main minerals found in apples (Table 3). Potassium ranges between 676.91 and 843.96 mg/100 g dry matter. Phosphorus ranges from 57.97 to 120.83 mg/100 g dry matter.

2.1.4. Fatty acids

35. Linoleic acid and palmitic acid are the major fatty acids in apples (Table 4).

Table 2. Proximate and carbohydrate composition of apple fruit (% dry matter, edible portion)

Nutrient	USDA Database 2015	German Nutrient Database 2014	Danish Food Compo. Database 2019	Public Health England 2015	Swiss Food Compo. Database 2015	China Food Compo. Database 2009
	Mean value, g per 100 g fresh weight					
Moisture	85.56	82.47	84.9	86.20	85.00	85.90
	Mean value, g per 100 g dry matter¹					
Protein²	1.80	1.93	2.0	4.35	2.00	1.42
Fat²	1.18	0.28	1.3	3.62	2.00	1.42
Ash	1.32	1.82	2.0			1.42
Carbohydrate total³	95.63		94.7			95.74
Carbohydrate available⁴		81.63	80.1	83.04 ⁵	77.99 ⁵	
Fibre, total dietary	16.62	11.43	14.6	9.42	14.00	8.52
Sugars, total	71.95	58.65	72.2	83.04	77.33	
Sucrose	14.35	14.48	20.5	19.27		
Glucose (dextrose)	16.83	11.54	11.7	15.22		
Fructose	40.86	32.63	40.1	48.55		
Starch	0.35	3.41	0.00	0.00	0.67	

Notes: ¹ Mean values based on dry matter were calculated from a fresh weight basis (wet weight) using the mean moisture level reported from each source.

² Specifications given for fat and protein reflect the wording of the original source. As no additional information about the analytical method used for determination is available, no further differentiation in respect of crude vs. true (protein/fat) is made.

³ Carbohydrates total calculated by difference = 100 - protein - fat - ash - moisture

⁴ Carbohydrates available = Carbohydrates total - dietary fibre

⁵ Carbohydrates available = total sugars + starch.

Sources: Sources use different terminology in regards to apple data. The terms “fresh” and “raw” are not clearly defined. While it is assumed that they are used to describe the same trait, the following information on the sources is given in order to facilitate comprehension: **USDA Database**, Release 28, September 2015, accessed online 7/2016. 09003: Apples, raw, with skin, based on analytical data for Red Delicious, Golden Delicious, Gala, Granny Smith, and Fuji varieties; **German Nutrient Database**, version 3.02, 2014, accessed online 7/2016. F110100: Apples, raw with skin, edible portion; **Danish Food Composition Database**, version April 2019, FoodID 2, Apple, raw, all varieties; **Public Health England - McCance & Widdowson Dataset** 2015, accessed online 2/2016. Food Code 14-319: Apples, eating, raw, flesh and skin, UK grown and imported apples including Gala, Braeburn, Golden Delicious, Pink Lady, Cox and Granny Smith; **Swiss Food Composition Database**, Version 5.2, accessed online 7/2016. Food ID 378: Apples, fresh; **China Food Composition Database**, printed version 2009, Food ID 06-1-101: apple average.

Table 3. Mineral composition of apple fruit (per 100 g dry matter, edible portion)

Minerals	Unit	USDA Database 2015	German Nutrient Database 2014	Danish Food Compo. Database 2019 ¹	Public Health England 2015	Swiss Food Compo. Database 2015	China Food Compo. Database 2009
Calcium, Ca	mg	42	28.44	27.4	36.23	33.33	28.37
Iron, Fe	mg	0.83	1.41	0.80	0.65	1.33	4.26
Magnesium, Mg	mg	35	28.44	29.7	28.98	26.66	28.37
Phosphorus, P	mg	76	62.57	63.0	57.97	59.99	85.11
Potassium, K	mg	742	676.91	781.5	724.60	799.92	843.96
Sodium, Na	mg	7	5.69	4.0	7.25	26.66	11.35
Zinc, Zn	mg	0.28	0.22	0.16	trace	0.67	1.35
Copper, Cu	mg	0.187	0.30	0.21	0.22		0.43
Manganese, Mn	mg	0.243	0.24	0.40	0.29		0.21
Selenium, Se	µg				trace		0.85
Fluoride, F	µg	22.9	51.19				
Iodide, I	µg		4.55	0.65	28.98	5.33	

Note: ¹. Mean values based on dry matter were calculated from a fresh weight basis (wet weight) using the mean moisture level reported from each source.

Sources: Data from different databases refer to: **USDA Database**, Release 28, September 2015, accessed online 7/2016. 09003: Apples, raw, with skin, based on analytical data for Red Delicious, Golden Delicious, Gala, Granny Smith, and Fuji varieties; **German Nutrient Database**, version 3.02, 2014, accessed online 7/2016. F110100: Apples, raw with skin, edible portion; **Danish Food Composition. Database**, version April 2019, FoodID 2, Apple, raw, all varieties; **Public Health England - McCance & Widdowson Dataset 2015**, accessed online 2/2016. Food Code 14-319: Apples, eating, raw, flesh and skin, UK grown and imported apples including Gala, Braeburn, Golden Delicious, Pink Lady, Cox and Granny Smith; **Swiss Food Composition Database**, Version 5.2, accessed online 7/2016. Food ID 378: Apples, fresh; **China Food Composition Database**, printed version 2009, Food ID 06-1-101: apple average.

Table 4. Fatty acid composition of apple fruit (mg per 100 g dry matter, edible portion)

Fatty Acids	USDA Database 2015	German Nutrient Database 2014	Danish Food Compo. Database 2019 ¹	Public Health England 2015	Swiss Food Compo. Database 2015
Fatty acids, total saturated	194	1143	298	870	670
Palmitic - 16:0	166	711	251		
Stearic - 18:0	21	216	46		
Fatty acids, total monounsaturated	49	125	46	290	133
Palmitoleic - 16:1 undifferentiated	0	17			
Oleic - 18:1 undifferentiated	49	102	46		
Fatty acids, total polyunsaturated	353	1519	867	1449	667
Linoleic - 18:2 undifferentiated	298	1143	682		
Linolenic - 18:3 undifferentiated	62	250	185		

Note: ¹. Mean values based on dry matter were calculated from a fresh weight basis (wet weight) using the mean moisture level reported from each source.

Sources: Data from different databases refer to: **USDA Database**, Release 28, September 2015, accessed online 7/2016. 09003: Apples, raw, with skin, based on analytical data for Red Delicious, Golden Delicious, Gala, Granny Smith, and Fuji varieties; **German Nutrient Database**, version 3.02, 2014, accessed online 7/2016. F110100: Apples, raw with skin, edible portion; **Danish Food Composition Database**, version April 2019, FoodID 2, Apple, raw, all varieties; **Public Health England - McCance & Widdowson Dataset** 2015, accessed online 2/2016. Food Code 14-319: Apples, eating, raw, flesh and skin, UK grown and imported apples including Gala, Braeburn, Golden Delicious, Pink Lady, Cox and Granny Smith; **Swiss Food Composition Database**, Version 5.2, accessed online 7/2016. Food ID 378: Apples, fresh.

2.1.5. Amino acids

36. Aspartic acid is the most abundant amino acid in fresh apple fruits (Table 5).

Table 5. Amino acid composition of apple fruit (mg per 100 g dry matter, edible portion)

Amino acids	USDA Database 2015	German Nutrient Database 2014	Danish Food Compo. Database 2019 ¹	China Food Compo. Database 2009
Tryptophan	7	11	20	50
Threonine	42	46	53	50
Isoleucine	42	57	60	64
Leucine	90	91	93	85
Lysine	83	85	86	71
Methionine	7	17	20	21
Cystine	7	6	7	57
Phenylalanine	42	51	46	78
Tyrosine	7	28	26	71
Valine	83	68	66	99
Arginine	42	46	40	43
Histidine	35	34	26	21
Alanine	76	85	73	64
Aspartic acid	485	575	517	319
Glutamic acid	173	142	146	142
Glycine	62	51	53	57
Proline	42	57	53	50
Serine	69	68	73	64

Note: ¹. Mean values based on dry matter were calculated from a fresh weight basis (wet weight) using the mean moisture level reported from each source.

Sources: Data from different databases refer to: **USDA Database**, Release 28, September 2015, accessed online 7/2016. 09003: Apples, raw, with skin, based on analytical data for Red Delicious, Golden Delicious, Gala, Granny Smith, and Fuji varieties; **German Nutrient Database**, version 3.02, 2014, accessed online 7/2016. F110100: Apples, raw with skin, edible portion; **Danish Food Composition Database**, version April 2019, FoodID 2, Apple, raw, all varieties; **China Food Composition Database**, printed version 2009, Food ID 06-1-101: apple average.

2.1.6. Vitamins

37. The total vitamin C levels in fresh apples range between 31.9 and 69.44 mg/100 g dry matter. Vitamin C is sensitive to processing and degrades easily. Consequently, vitamin C intake via apples is highest in unprocessed fruits (Varming, Petersen and Toldam-Andersen, 2013). Apples do not contain significant amounts of fat-soluble vitamins, like vitamin A, D and E. Vitamin composition of apple fruit is given in Table 6.

Table 6. Vitamin composition of apple fruit (per 100 g dry matter, edible portion)

Vitamins	Unit	USDA Data-base 2015	German Nutrient Datab. 2014	Danish Food Compo. Datab. 2019	Public Health England 2015	Swiss Food Compo. Datab. 2015	China Food Compo. Datab. 2009
Vitamin C, total ascorbic acid	mg	31.9	68.26	54.70	43.48	33.33	28.37
Thiamin (Vitamin B1)	mg	0.118	0.06	0.09	0.29	0.20	0.43
Riboflavin (B2)	mg	0.18	0.05	0.05	0.29	0.13	0.14
Niacin	mg	0.631	1.71	0.81	0.72	0.67	1.42
Pantothenic acid	mg	0.423	0.57	0.48		0.67	
Pyridoxin (B6)	mg	0.284	0.24	0.30	0.51	0.33	
Biotin	µg		28.44	6.60	7.97		
Folate, total	µg	21	28.40	59.6		86.66	
Vitamin A, RE	µg		28.44		14.49		21.28
Vitamin A, RAE	µg	21		13.77		13.33	
Carotene, beta	µg	187	164.96	165.6	101.44	133.32	141.84
Cryptoxanthin, beta	µg	76					
Lutein + zeaxanthin	µg	201					
Vitamin E (alpha-tocopherol)	mg	1.25	2.78	1.68	3.81 ¹	0.65 ¹	10.85
Vitamin K (phylloquinone)	µg	15.2	34.13	19.9	36.13	40.58	

Note: ¹: total vitamin E calculated as α -Tocopherol Equivalents (α -TE)

Sources: Data from different databases refer to: **USDA Database**, Release 28, September 2015, accessed online 7/2016. 09003: Apples, raw, with skin, based on analytical data for Red Delicious, Golden Delicious, Gala, Granny Smith, and Fuji varieties; **German Nutrient Database**, version 3.02, 2014, accessed online 7/2016. F110100: Apples, raw with skin, edible portion; **Danish Food Composition Database**, version April 2019, FoodID 2, Apple, raw, all varieties; **Public Health England - McCance & Widdowson Dataset 2015**, accessed online 2/2016. Food Code 14-319: Apples, eating, raw, flesh and skin, UK grown and imported apples including Gala, Braeburn, Golden Delicious, Pink Lady, Cox and Granny Smith; **Swiss Food Composition Database**, Version 5.2, accessed online 7/2016. Food ID 378: Apples, fresh; **China Food Composition Database**, printed version 2009, Food ID 06-1-101: apple average.

2.2. Constituents of products and by-products from apple processing

2.2.1. Nutrient composition of apple juice

38. Apple juice is produced by squeezing or crushing the apple fruit (see also Section 1.1.). Subsequent processing can include filtration and pasteurisation. Fortification with vitamin C is possible and needs to be considered when comparing data in Table 7 (see Sources for Table 7).

Table 7. Nutrient composition of apple juice (per 100 g juice)

	Unit	USDA Database 2015	German Nutrient Database 2014	Danish Food Compo. Database 2019	Public Health England 2015	Swiss Food Compo. Database 2015
Moisture	g	88.2	87.9	87.9	86.6	87.7
Ash	g	0.2	0.2	0.2		
Protein	g	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Total Fat	g	0.13	0.04	0.10	trace value	0.10
Carbohydrate	g	11.3	11.1	11.7	9.6	10.8
Total dietary fibre	g	0.2	0.0	0	trace value	0.0
Total Sugars	g	9.6	10.5	10.2	9.6	10.3
Calcium, Ca	mg	8	7	9	6	7
Iron, Fe	mg	0.12	0.26	0.3	0.06	0.20
Magnesium, Mg	mg	5.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	5.5
Phosphorus, P	mg	7.0	7.0	6	6.0	8.0
Potassium, K	mg	101	116	80	89	120
Sodium, Na	mg	4.0	2.0	10	3.0	2.3
Zinc, Zn	mg	0.02	0.12	0.04	trace value	0.1
Copper, Cu	mg	0.012	0.059	0.006	0.010	
Manganese, Mn	mg	0.074	0.120	0.056	0.030	
Selenium, Se	µg	0.10		0.03	trace value	
Iodide, I	µg		1.0	0.7	trace value	2.0
Vitamin C	mg	0.9	1.4	0.9	26.0	7.4
Thiamin (Vitamin B ₁)	mg	0.021	0.020	0.021	0.050	0.020
Riboflavin (Vitamin B ₂)	mg	0.017	0.025	0.017	0.020	0.020
Niacin	mg	0.07	0.30	0.1	0.20	0.16
Pantothenic acid	mg	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.07
Pyridoxin (B ₆)	mg	0.02	0.10	0.03	0.05	0.04
Vitamin A, RAE	µg	0.00	8	0	0.00	0.00
Carotene, beta	µg	0.00	45	0	trace value	0.00
Vitamin E (α-Tocopherol)	mg	0.01	0.05	0.01	trace value	0.51

Note: ¹ total vitamin E calculated as α-Tocopherol Equivalents (α-TE)

Sources: Data from different databases refer to: **USDA Database**, Release 28, September 2015 (accessed online 1/2016). 09016: Apple juice, canned or bottled, unsweetened, without added ascorbic acid. Other apple juices in the database are available with added ascorbic, calcium, potassium and fortified with Vitamin C; **German Nutrient Database**, version 3.02 (2014), accessed online 1/2016. Lebensmittel F115600 Apfel Fruchtsaft (apple fruit juice, without added sugar). According to database manager, no additives in juices used for this data; **Danish Food Composition Database**, version April 2019 Food ID 194, Apple juice, canned or bottled. No information concerning fortification in database available. No other apple juice option available; **Public Health England - McCance & Widdowson Dataset 2015** (accessed online spreadsheet 1/2016). Food Code 14-331: Apple juice, clear, ambient and chilled. No other apple juice option available. No information about fortification; **Swiss Food Composition Database**, (Swiss Food Composition Database), V5.2 (accessed online 1/2016). ID Food 568: Apfelsaft (applejuice). No data concerning fortification available.

2.2.2. Nutrient composition of apple pomace

39. Apple pomace is a high fibre, low protein feed material with small amounts of minerals such as potassium, phosphorus, and calcium (Table 8). Fresh apple pomace contains mean values between 20-35.9% dry matter, 1.82-5% ash, 4.45-7.7% crude protein, 2.7-5.2% crude fat, 4.7-48.72% crude fibre (36-52.5 % neutral detergent fibre (NDF), 27-43.2 % acid detergent fibre (ADF)), and up to 0.23% calcium and 0.14% phosphorus. Alibes, Munoz and Rodriguez (1984) showed that ensiling the pomace did not change the dry matter and ash content, however there was an increase in the crude protein, crude fibre, NDF and ADF. Apple pomace also has a high degree of acidity (pH 3.5), and high levels of lactic acid, acetic acid, and ethanol which are increased when ensiled (Alibes, Munoz and Rodriguez, 1984).

40. Apple pomace contains a substantial amount of carbohydrates and soluble dietary fibre such as pectin, which makes it useful as an energy source in ruminant diets. It is however high in lignin (7.2-12%) with low digestibility, which contributes to its lower nutritional value as an animal feed. Ensiled apple pomace was shown to contain higher crude protein, crude fibre, NDF, ADF, and lignin compared to fresh apple pomace (Alibes, Munoz and Rodriguez, 1984).

41. Rust and Burkirk (2008) reported that unprocessed apples (culls) have an energy value (Total Digestible Nutrients (TDN) 69.7%) similar to corn silage (TDN 72%), while apple pomace has less energy content (TDN 63.4%) than corn silage and serves as an energy replacement for poor to average quality hay. They indicated that apple pomace works better in diets of beef cows with low energy demand, such as during the second trimester of pregnancy; however the total diets should be evaluated periodically to provide adequate protein. Apple pomace in animal diets therefore requires considerable protein supplementation (Givens and Barber, 1987; Rust and Burkirk, 2008). Fontenot et al. (1977) found that protein nitrogen supplementation was more acceptable than non-protein nitrogen (urea), which reduced intake of the pomace.

42. Apple pomace is rich in bioactive compounds, such as polyphenols, organic acids and other natural antioxidants (Shalini and Gupta, 2010; Parmar and Rupasinghe, 2012).

Table 8. Nutrient composition of apple pomace (% dry matter)

	Unit	Preston 2014	Givens and Barber 1987	Joshi and Attri 2006	NRC		Heuzé et al. in <i>Feedipedia</i> 2016	
					2000	2001	range	mean
<i>Dry matter (on fresh basis)</i>	g	20	23.3		22	35.9	13.9-28.6	20.8
Crude Protein	g	5	6.7	4.45-5.67	5.4	7.7	4.4-16.0	6.8
Crude Fat	g	5.2	2.7	3.49-3.90	4.7	5.0	2.3-7.0	4.2
Ash	g	3	2.3	1.82	5	2.6	1.7-2.5	2.5
Crude Fibre	g	18	38.2	4.7-48.72			14.2-32.0	20.7
Carbohydrates	g			48-62				
Total Digestible Nutrients (TDN)	g	68			68.9	57.1		
Neutral Detergent Fibre (NDF)	g	36	50.3		41	52.5	30.1-56.4	45.1
Acid Detergent Fibre (ADF)	g	27	37.8			43.2	24.5-45.6	34.2
Calcium	g	0.13	0.16	0.06	0.23	0.20	0.09-0.24	0.17
Phosphorus	g	0.12	0.14		0.11	0.14	0.01-0.16	0.11
Potassium	g	0.5	0.68	0.95	0.53	0.73	0.60-0.74	0.68
Magnesium	g		0.06	0.02	0	0.09	0.04-0.10	0.07
Sulfur	g	0.04			0.11	0.07		
Sodium	g		0.02	0.2	0	0.04	0.00-0.04	0.02

2.3. Changes in chemical composition during storage

43. Apples are still living organisms after harvest and have an active metabolism. Respiration and metabolic activity lead to degradation and transformation of apple metabolites like sugars, acids, and vitamins. For example, malic acid is the major substrate for respiration, and therefore the concentration decreases during storage (Vandendriessche et al., 2013).

44. To reduce the loss of nutrients, it is important to store apples at temperatures from 0-2°C, if the cultivars are not sensitive to chilling injuries. Low temperatures decelerate respiration and metabolic activity, resulting in slower ripening and senescence of the apples; however, it is difficult to maintain acceptable fruit quality beyond 6 to 8 months of storage. A combination of low temperature and controlled atmosphere (CA, defined as oxygen concentration held at 1-3% and carbon dioxide at 1-5%, adjusted according to cultivar) can preserve apple quality over longer storage times. Apples stored under CA at 1°C were shown to be more firm and contain higher levels of acid and vitamin C compared to apples stored at the same temperature under air (Schirmer and Trierweiler, 2005). Apple firmness strongly correlated with the pectin content of the cell wall. The expression of endogenous enzymes that modify pectin is controlled by ethylene. Apples stored under CA produce less ethylene, which results in less pectin modification over time (Gwanpua et al., 2014; Storch et al., 2015). The pectin metabolising enzymes exhibit activity even at a storage temperature of 4°C, so maintaining the appropriate temperature is important (Gwanpua et al., 2014).

45. Maintenance of vitamin levels, especially vitamin C, during long-term storage under controlled atmosphere also varies with cultivar. Vitamin C concentration stayed more or less stable in the cultivars 'Topaz' and 'Braeburn' during seven months of CA-storage at 1°C. In contrast, other cultivars like 'Jonagold' and 'Fuji' lost about 50% of their vitamin C after several months of storage (Trierweiler, Krieg and Tauschen, 2004). CA storage also

results in reduced levels of the volatile esters and other compounds that impart “Gala” apples with their aroma, due to the inhibition of precursor biosynthesis at low oxygen concentrations (Both et al., 2014). The combination of lower concentrations of volatiles and ethylene results in slower ripening of the fruit, however, amino acid and polyphenol levels were unchanged with CA storage (Amarowicz et al., 2009; Both et al., 2014).

46. Cultivars that are highly sensitive to CA storage include ‘Braeburn’ and ‘Empire’, which are very susceptible to internal browning at elevated carbon dioxide concentrations (Lee et al., 2011; Hatoum et al., 2016). In ‘Braeburn’ apples, this quality degradation is marked by biochemical changes, including higher levels of aspartate, acetaldehyde, ethanol and ethyl esters, decreased levels of glutamate, and at very high carbon dioxide levels, an increase of cellobiose, which might indicate a cell wall breakdown (Hatoum et al., 2016). Flesh browning can potentially be reduced by treating the apples with antioxidants before storage (Lee et al., 2012).

47. Other investigations to maintain the nutrient quality of apples have been carried out with 1-methylcyclopropene (1-MCP; Smartfresh®). 1-MCP is an ethylene inhibitor which slows down or inhibits the ripening of the apples by binding to the ethylene receptor and therefore influencing the metabolite profile, for example, amino acids like threonine, glutamate, ethanol, methanol, and volatiles (Lee et al., 2011; Hatoum et al., 2016). Treatment with 1-MCP improved storability by slowing down ripening and reduced flesh browning in certain apple cultivars like ‘Braeburn’ and ‘Empire’ (Fawbush, Nock and Watkins, 2008).

48. In summary, storage of apples at low temperatures and controlled atmosphere can effectively maintain nutrient quality of many apple cultivars over several months; however, other cultivars would require special treatment or conditions. Further investigation would be necessary to determine the optimal storage conditions for sensitive cultivars, both existing and new.

3. OTHER CONSTITUENTS

3.1. Allergens

49. Apple oral allergy is one of the most common fruit allergies. The prevalence of sensitisation (assessed by skin prick test) was around 4.2% in the general population (both children and adults) in Germany (Zuberbier et al., 2004) and 0.1% in children (2-14 years) in France (Rancé et al., 2005). The prevalence of a perceived allergy to apple varied from 0.9% to 8.5% in European children and was estimated to be 0.5% in adults in a study including patients from Europe, the United States, Australia and New Zealand (Woods et al., 2001).

50. Four main classes of apple allergens have been identified so far. Two major allergens, Mal d 1 and Mal d 3, are responsible for most apple allergies in the general population. The Mal d 1 protein is the main apple allergen observed in Northern Europe. It cross-reacts with Bet v1, the main allergen in birch pollen, due to its similar structure. The Mal d 3 protein is the main allergen in the Mediterranean area (Schmitz-Eiberger and Matthes, 2011). Symptoms of an allergy caused by Mal d 3 can be more severe (for example, generalised urticaria, vomiting and abdominal pain) and in rare cases are even life-threatening. The Mal d 3 protein cross reacts with the peach allergen Pru p 3. The Mal d 1 protein is unstable, so that people with an allergy often tolerate processed apple products like stewed fruit, cakes and pasteurised juices. The process of pasteurisation most likely eliminates allergenicity. In contrast, Mal d 3 is very stable and resistant to heating. In this case even processed apple products can cause an allergic reaction. The last two proteins (Mal d 2 and Mal d 4) are considered minor allergens and are also involved in the birch-apple syndrome. Even if apple allergens seem to be mainly restricted to these four families of proteins, several additional proteins located in fruit tissues have been reported as potential allergens (Savazzini, Ricci and Tartarini, 2015). Different apple cultivars cause a difference in intensity of symptoms. Scientific studies showed that apple cultivars differ in the content of internal factors involved in apple allergy (Matthes et al., 2009).

3.2. Toxicants

51. Apple seeds contain small amounts of amygdalin (D-mandelonitrile- β -D-gentiobioside), a cyanogenic glycoside. Cyanogenic glycosides are naturally occurring plant toxins and are stored in the vacuoles within plant cells to serve as important chemical defence compounds against herbivores (Bolarinwa, Orfila and Morgan, 2015). Total cyanogen content was determined to be 1.08 mg CN⁻/g apple seeds (Surleva and Drochioiu, 2013). The amygdalin levels were measured in desiccated apple seeds for fifteen apple varieties and ranged from 0.95 ± 0.22 to 3.91 ± 0.49 mg/g (Bolarinwa, Orfila and Morgan, 2015). The lethal dose for cyanide is reported to be 0.5-3.5 mg/kg body weight (bw). An acute reference dose (ARfD) was estimated to be 20 μ g/kg bw (EFSA CONTAM Panel, 2016).

52. Degradation of amygdalin by enzymes can lead to the production of cyanide (prussic acid) when the seeds are macerated or crushed. Apple seeds are generally not consumed by humans but apple juice is produced from whole apples including the seeds. Among the commercially-available apple products, one variety of pressed apple juice

had an amygdalin content of 0.09 mg/g, apple puree had 0.02 mg/g and a fruit smoothie had 0.01 mg/g. Amygdalin was not detected in cider of two brands (Bolarinwa, Orfila and Morgan, 2014). The amygdalin content of ten commercially-available apple juices ranged from 0.010 to 0.039 mg/mL (Bolarinwa, Orfila and Morgan, 2015). Although the level of amygdalin is considered low in juice in relation to the toxic level, the concentration might be higher in pomace and closer to a level with toxic effect in animals. However, due to the fact that a high level of amygdalin would only occur when the seeds are crushed, and this is not expected to be the normal situation in pomace, the level of amygdalin is expected to be well below any toxic effect level. For humans, the small amounts of amygdalin present in apple seeds, and in turn apple juice, are unlikely to present any health problems to consumers.

3.3. Other metabolites: organic acids, phenolic compounds

53. Apples are a source of phenolic compounds because of their widespread consumption in many countries and their year round availability. Phenolic compounds and organic acids are responsible for the characteristic acidic taste and astringency of the fruit (Campo et al., 2006). The most abundant organic acid in apples is malic acid (up to 90%) (Kyzlink, 1990) while citric and quinic acids are also present in substantial quantities (Fuleki, Pelayo and Palabay, 1995).

54. During ripening, there is a general tendency for a decrease in acidity (Campo et al., 2006). However, there is some disagreement concerning changes in phenolics during maturation and storage. Whether there is an increase or decrease in the amount of phenolic compounds seems to depend on the apple cultivar (Burda, Oleszek and Lee, 1990).

55. In apples, the content of phenolic compounds is represented mainly by epicatechin and procyanidin (Burda, Oleszek and Lee, 1990; Wojdyło, Oszmiański and Laskowski, 2008). Chlorogenic acid is also found in considerable amounts. It is important to note that phenolic compounds are present in the skin at a relatively higher level than in the flesh of the apples. This is especially true for the apple anthocyanins; apple cultivars with red or partially dark red peels are generally the richest sources of anthocyanins. It is also noteworthy that quercetin glycosides are essentially only located in the apple skin (Burda, Oleszek and Lee, 1990; Gorinstein et al., 2001; Veberic et al., 2005). Table 9 provides a list of 'other metabolite' levels present in apple fruits. Additional information regarding concentration levels of phenolic compounds in apples based on their fresh weight can be found in Ceyman et al. (2012), Jakobek and Barron (2016) and Stracke et al. (2009).

Table 9. Concentration of other metabolites in apple fruit (mg per 100 g dry matter)

Other metabolites	Wojdylo, Oszmianski and Laskowski 2008	Alonso- Salces et al. 2005	Liaudan- skas et al. 2015	USDA database 2015
	<i>range</i>	<i>range</i>	<i>range</i>	<i>mean</i>
Hydroxycinnamic acids	5-350	122-304		
Chlorogenic acid	1.5-296	108-293	76.2-293.4	
p-Coumaroylquinic acid	0.4-26	10-14		
Flavan-3-ol/procyanidins	462-2548	64-280	87.5-154.8	
Procyanidins B2	6.9-200	51-253	81.1-146.6	
Procyanidins C1	5.8-97			
(-)-Epicatechin	6.6-276	24-177		52.2
(-)-Epigallocatechin				1.8
(-)-Epicatechin 3-gallate				0.1
(-)-Epigallocatechin 3-gallate				1.3
(+)Catechin	1-72			8.9
Oligomeric procyanidins	137.4-1985			
Flavonols	8-166 ²	0-4 ⁵	29.2-58.4 ⁶	
Quercetin				27.7
Kaempferol				0.9
Dihydrochalcones	4.9-43.4 ¹	13-70 ⁴	7.5-15.2 ⁷	
Anthocyanins	1-55.1 ³			11
Total polyphenols	523-2724			

- Notes: ¹ Sum of phloretin 2'-xyloglucose and phloretin-2'-glucoside
² Sum of quercetin glycosides (quercetin 3-rutinoside; quercetin 3-galactoside; quercetin 3-glucoside; quercetin 3-arabinoside; quercetin 3-xyloside; quercetin 3-rhamnoside)
³ Sum of cyanidin 3-galactoside and cyanidin 3-glucoside
⁴ Sum of hydroxyphloretin diglycoside, hydroxyphloretin monoglycoside, phloridzin; phloretin-2-O-xyloglucose
⁵ Sum of quercetin 3-rhamnoside and an unknown quercetin glycoside
⁶ Phloridzin
⁷ Sum of quercetin glycosides (hyperoside, isoquercitrin, rutin, avicularin, quercitrin)

Sources: Data from different sources refer to: **Wojdylo, Oszmiański and Laskowski (2008)**: 67 cultivars, whole apple; **Alonso-Salces et al. (2005)**: 6 cultivars, apples peeled and cored; **Liaudanskas et al. (2015)**: 4 cultivars, apple slices with skin; **USDA Database**, Release 28, September 2015, accessed online 7/2016. 09003: 5 varieties, apples, raw, with skin.

4. SUGGESTED CONSTITUENTS TO BE ANALYSED RELATED TO FOOD USE

4.1. Key products consumed by humans

56. The majority of apples are consumed as fresh apples for their flavour and nutritional qualities. Apples are a source of potassium and soluble fibre, including pectin and other complex carbohydrates and phenolic antioxidants.

4.2. Suggested analysis for food use of new cultivars

57. The suggested key nutritional parameters to be analysed in apples for human food use are shown in Table 10. Demonstration that composition of a novel apple variety is as expected, i.e., similar to control and/or within reference ranges would be sufficient to extrapolate to juice and other processed apple products for food.

Table 10. Suggested nutritional and compositional parameters to be analysed in apple fruit with peel for food use

<i>Parameter</i>	Fruit (with peel)
Moisture	X
Protein	X
Fat	X
Ash	X
Carbohydrate ¹	X
Total Dietary Fibre	X
Potassium	X
Vitamin C	X

Note: ¹ Carbohydrate by calculation or by suitable analytical method

5. SUGGESTED CONSTITUENTS TO BE ANALYSED RELATED TO FEED USE

5.1. Key products consumed by animals

58. Table 11 below shows the suggested nutritional and compositional parameters to be analysed in unprocessed apples and apple pomace for feed use. As reported above, most of the use of apple processing waste for animal feed is apple pomace, and most of the apple pomace is fed to ruminants. The nutrients of major concern are crude protein, crude fat, carbohydrate and ash, and for ruminants, ADF and NDF. While calcium and phosphorus are very important minerals in animal feeds, measuring these nutrients in apple is not warranted, due to their very low concentrations relative to the dietary requirements for livestock. Total phenolics may be of importance due to their effects on protein digestibility. They are present mainly in the skin of the apple, which is concentrated in apple by-products fed to livestock.

5.2. Suggested analysis for feed use of new cultivars

59. For comparative purpose, it is suggested that analysing either the apple fruit (unprocessed) or apple pomace would suffice. The nutrient content of the pomace would not be expected to change if the nutrient content of the apple fruit does not change.

Table 11. Suggested nutritional and compositional parameters to be analysed in unprocessed apple or apple pomace for feed use

<i>Parameter</i>	Unprocessed apple	Apple pomace
Moisture	X	X
Protein ¹	X	X
Fat ²	X	X
Carbohydrate ³	X	X
Ash	X	X
Neutral Detergent Fibre (NDF)	X	X
Acid Detergent Fibre (ADF)	X	X
Total Phenolics	X	X

Notes: ¹ Derived from proximate analysis (e.g., crude protein)

² Derived from proximate analysis (e.g., crude fat)

³ Carbohydrate by calculation or by suitable analytical method

6. REFERENCES

- AAFC (2010), *A Snapshot of the Canadian Apple Industry - 2010*, Market Analysis and Information, Horticulture and Cross Sectoral Division, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, ISBN 978-1-100-20577-9, http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2012/agr/A118-45-2012-eng.pdf (accessed 26 February 2016).
- Ajila, M.C. et al. (2015), "Fermented apple pomace as a feed additive to enhance growth performance of growing pigs and its effects on emissions", *Agriculture*, Vol. 5, pp. 313-329.
- Alibes, X., F. Munoz and J. Rodriguez (1984), "Feeding value of Apple Pomace silage for sheep", *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, Vol. 11, pp. 189-197.
- Alonso-Salces, R.M. et al. (2005), "A validated solid-liquid extraction method for the HPLC determination of polyphenols in apple tissues: Comparison with pressurised liquid extraction", *Talanta*, Vol. 65, pp. 654-662.
- Amarowicz, R. et al. (2009), "Influence of postharvest processing and storage on the content of phenolic acids and flavonoids in foods", *Molecular Nutrition & Food Research*, Vol. 53, pp. 151-183.
- Baumgartner, I. et al. (2015), "Breeding of elite apple parents carrying pyramided homozygous resistance genes against apple scab and resistance against powdery mildew and fire blight." *Plant Molecular Biology Reporter*, Vol. 121, pp. 647-656.
- Bolarinwa, I.F., C. Orfila and M.R. Morgan (2015), "Determination of amygdalin in apple seeds, fresh apples and processed apple juices", *Food Chemistry*, Vol. 170, pp. 437-442.
- Bolarinwa, I.F., C. Orfila and M.R. Morgan (2014), "Amygdalin Content of Seeds, Kernels and Food Products Commercially-available in the UK", *Food Chem.*, Vol. 152, pp. 133-139.
- Both, V. et al (2014), "Effect of storage under extremely low oxygen on the volatile composition of "Royal Gala" apples", *Food Chemistry*, Vol. 156, pp. 50-57.
- Bowden, D.M. and J.C. Berry (1958), "Effects of level of dried apple pomace in swine ration on growth rate, feed efficiency, carcass quality and size of certain organs", *Canadian Journal of Animal Science*, Vol. 39, pp. 26-33.
- Burda, S., W. Oleszek and C.Y. Lee (1990), "Phenolic-compounds and their changes in apples during maturation and cold-storage", *J. of Agric. and Food Chem.*, Vol. 38, pp. 945-948.
- Campo, G. et al. (2006), "Ripening changes in chemical composition of seven cider apple varieties", *Food Science and Technology International*, Vol. 2, pp. 477-487.
- Ceymann, M. et al. (2012), "Identification of apples rich in health-promoting flavan-3-ols and phenolic acids by measuring the polyphenol profile", *Journal of Food Composition and Analysis*, Vol. 26, pp. 128-135.
- CFIA (2014), *The Biology of Malus domestica Borkh. (Apple)*, Biology Document BIO2014-01: A companion document to Directive 94-08 (Dir94-08), Assessment Criteria for Determining Environmental Safety of Plant with Novel Traits, Plant and Biotechnology Risk Assessment Unit, Plant Health Science Division, Canadian Food Inspection Agency, <http://www.inspection.gc.ca/plants/plants-with-novel-traits/applicants/directive-94-08/biology-documents/malus-domestica/eng/1404417088821/1404417158789>
- China Food Composition Database (printed version) (2009), *China Food Composition Book 1, 2nd Edition*, National Institute of Nutrition and Food Safety, China's Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), edited by Yang Yuexin, Wang Guangya, Pan Xingchang, Beijing Medical University Press, People's Republic of China.

- Codex Alimentarius Commission (2003; Annexes II and III adopted in 2008), *Guideline for the Conduct of Food Safety Assessment of Foods Derived from Recombinant DNA Plants - CAC/GL 45-2003*, available online at <http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/codex-texts/all-standards/en/>.
- Costa, F. et al. (2005), "Role of the genes Md-ACO1 and Md-ACS1 in ethylene production and shelf life of apple (*Malus domestica* Borkh.)", *Euphytica*, Vol. 141, pp. 181-190.
- Dairy Farm Guide (2015), *Fruits and vegetable Processing Residues*, available online at: <http://www.dairyfarmguide.com/fruit-and-vegetable-processing-0170.html> (accessed Dec 2015).
- Danish Food Composition Database (2019), *Danish Food Composition Database, revision 7, Apple data (Saxholt et al., 2009)*, Technical University of Denmark (DTU), DTU Food, Department of Nutrition, National Food Institute, available online at http://www.foodcomp.dk/v7/fvdb_default.asp.
- EFSA CONTAM Panel (2016), "Scientific opinion on the acute health risks related to the presence of cyanogenic glycosides in raw apricot kernels and products derived from raw apricot kernels", *EFSA Journal* 2016, Vol. 14(4):4424, doi: 10.2903/j.efsa.2016.4424, Panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain (CONTAM), European Food Safety Authority.
- FAOSTAT (2018), FAO statistics online database, "*Production / Crops - apple, Year 2016*", Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, available online at: <http://www.fao.org/faostat/> (accessed 10 July 2019).
- FAO/WHO (2000), *Safety Aspects of Genetically Modified Foods of Plant Origin*, Report of a Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on Foods Derived from Biotechnology, Geneva, 29 May-2 June 2000. Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome, http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/agns/pdf/topics/ec_june2000_en.pdf.
- FAO/WHO (1996), *Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation on Biotechnology and Food Safety, Rome, Italy, 20 Sept.-4 Oct. 1996*, Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome, <ftp://ftp.fao.org/es/esn/food/biotechnology.pdf>.
- Fawbush, F., J.F. Nock and C.B. Watkins (2008), "External carbon dioxide injury and 1-methylcyclopropene (1-MCP) in the 'Empire' apple", *Postharvest Biology and Technology*, Vol. 48, pp. 92-98.
- Flachowsky, H. et al. (2007) "Overexpression of BpMADS4 from silver birch (*Betula pendula* Roth.) induces early-flowering in apple (*Malus × domestica* Borkh.)", *Plant Breeding*, Vol. 126(2), pp.137-145 as cited in: CFIA (2014), *The Biology of Malus domestica* Borkh. (Apple), Biology Document BIO2014-01, 2014.
- Fontenot, J.P. et al. (1977), "Supplementation of apple pomace with non-protein nitrogen for gestation beef cows. I. Feed Intake and Performance", *Journal of Animal Science*, Vol. 46, pp. 513-522.
- Forsline, P.L. et al. (2003), "Collection, maintenance, characterization, and utilization of wild apples of Central Asia", *Horticultural Reviews*, Vol. 29, pp. 1-61.
- Fuleki, T., E. Pelayo and R.B. Palabay (1995), "Carboxylic-Acid Composition of Varietal Juices Produced from Fresh and Stored Apples", *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, Vol. 43, pp. 598-607.
- German Nutrient Database (2014), *German Nutrient Database, Version 3.02*. [nutritional value table on the basis of electronic data process], Bundeslebensmittelschlüssel (BLS), Max Rubner-Institut, Federal Research Institute of Nutrition and Food, Germany, available at <https://www.blsdb.de/> (accessed Jan. 2016).
- Givens, D. I. and W.P. Barber (1987), "Nutritive Value of Apple Pomace for Ruminants", *Animal Feed Science and Technology*, Vol. 16, pp. 311-315.

- Gorinstein, S. et al. (2001), Comparative contents of dietary fiber, total phenolics, and minerals in persimmons and apples, *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, Vol. 49, pp. 952-957.
- Gwanpua, S.G. et al. (2014), "Pectin modifications and the role of pectin-degrading enzymes during postharvest softening of Jonagold apples", *Food Chemistry*, Vol. 158, pp. 283-91.
- Hancock, J.F., J.J. Luby, S.K. Brown and G.A. Lobos (2008), "Apples", pp. 1-37 in: J.F. Hancock, ed., *Temperate Fruit Crop Breeding: Germplasm to Genomics*, Springer Science+Business Media B.V., New York, NY.
- Hatoum, D. et al. (2016), "Effect of browning related pre- and postharvest factors on the "Braeburn" apple metabolome during CA storage", *Postharvest Biology and Technology*, Vol. 111, pp. 106-116.
- Heuzé, V., G. Tran, P. Hassoun and F. Lebas (2016), *Apple pomace and culled apples*, available online at Feedipedia: a programme by INRA, CIRAD, AFZ and FAO, <http://www.feedipedia.org/node/20703> last update Sept. 15, 2016 (accessed 24 Nov. 2016).
- Jakobek, L. and A.R. Barron (2016), "Ancient apple varieties from Croatia as a source of bioactive polyphenolic compounds", *Journal of Food Composition and Analysis*, Vol. 45, pp. 9-15.
- Joshi, V.K. and D. Attri (2006), "Solid state fermentation of apple pomace for the production of value added products", *Natural Product Radiance*, Vol. 5, pp. 289-296.
- Kumar, S. et al. (2012), "Genomic selection for fruit quality traits in apple (*Malus × domestica* Borkh.)", *PLoS ONE* 7(5), e36674, doi:[10.1371/journal.pone.0036674](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0036674).
- Kyzlink, V. (1990), "Principles of food preservation", In: *Development in Food Science*, Vol. 22, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, Elsevier Science Publishers BV.
- Lee, J. et al. (2012), "Antioxidant treatment alters metabolism associated with internal browning in 'Braeburn' apples during controlled atmosphere storage", *Postharvest Biology and Technology*, Vol. 68, pp. 32-42.
- Lee, J. et al. (2011), "Metabolic changes in 1-methylcyclopropene (1-MCP)-treated 'Empire' apple fruit during storage", *Metabolomics*, Vol. 8, pp. 742-753.
- Liaudanskas, M. et al. (2015), "A Comparative Study of Phenolic Content in Apple Fruits", *International Journal of Food Properties*, Vol. 18, pp. 945-953.
- Luby, J.J. (2003), "Taxonomic classification and brief history", In: *Apples: Botany, production and uses*, D.C. Ferree, I.J. Warrington (eds.), CABI International, Cambridge, U.K.
- Mangas, J.J. et al. (1992), "Changes in Pectic Fractions during Ripening of Cider Apples", *Hortscience*, Vol. 27, pp. 328-330.
- Matoo, F. et al. (2001), "Performance of broilers fed an apple pomace diet supplements with enzymes", *Indian Journal of Animal Nutrition*, Vol. 18, pp. 349-352.
- Matthes, A. et al. (2009), "Effect of variety, cultivation and storage conditions on Mal d 1 protein of apple fruits", *Acta Horticulturae*, Vol. 841, pp. 563-565.
- NRC (2001), *Nutrient requirement of Dairy Cattle (7th edition)*, National Academy Press Washington, DC., U.S.A.
- NRC (2000), *Nutrient requirement of Beef Cattle (updated 2000)*, National Academy Press, Washington D.C., U.S.A.
- NRC (1983), *Underutilized Resources as Animal Feedstuffs*, National Academy Press. Washington DC, U.S.A., pp. 27-29.
- OECD (2019), "Consensus Document of the Biology of Apple (*Malus domestica* Borkh.), *Series on Harmonisation of Regulatory Oversight in Biotechnology No. 66*, Environment Directorate, OECD. (to be published)

- OECD (2000), *Report of the Task Force for the Safety of Novel Foods and Feeds* (prepared for the G8 Summit held in Okinawa, Japan, on 21-23 July 2000), C(2000)86/ADD1, OECD, Paris, <http://www.oecd.org/chemicalsafety/biotrack/REPORT-OF-THE-TASK-FORCE-FOR-THE-SAFETY-OF-NOVEL.pdf>.
- OECD (1997), *Report of the OECD Workshop on the Toxicological and Nutritional Testing of Novel Foods, held in Aussois, France, 5-8 March 1997*, final text issued in Feb. 2002 SG/ICGB(98)1/FINAL, OECD Publishing, Paris, [http://www.oecd.org/env/ehs/biotrack/SG-ICGB\(98\)1-FINAL-ENG%20-Novel-Foods-Aussois-report.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/env/ehs/biotrack/SG-ICGB(98)1-FINAL-ENG%20-Novel-Foods-Aussois-report.pdf).
- OECD (1993), *Safety Evaluation of Foods Derived by Modern Biotechnology: Concepts and Principles*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <http://www.oecd.org/env/ehs/biotrack/41036698.pdf>.
- Parmar, I. and H.P.V. Rupasinghe (2012), "Optimization of dilute acid-based pretreatment and application of laccase on apple pomace", *Bioresource Technology*, Vol. 124, pp. 433-439.
- Peil, A. et al. (2011), "Apple Breeding – From the origin to genetic engineering", *Fruit, Vegetable and Cereal Science and Biotechnology*, Vol. 5 (Special Issue 1), pp. 118-138.
- Potter, D. et al. (2007), "Phylogeny and classification of Rosaceae", *Plant Systematics and Evolution*, Vol. 266, pp. 5-43.
- Preston, R.L. (eds.) (2014), *Feed Composition Table*, available online at: <http://beefmagazine.com/datasheet/2014-feed-composition-table> (accessed Nov. 2014).
- Public Health England (2015), *McCance and Widdowson's The Composition of Foods Integrated Dataset 2015*, Public Health England, London, United Kingdom, published on 25 March 2015, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/composition-of-foods-integrated-dataset-cofid>.
- Rancé, F. et al. (2005), "Prevalence and main characteristics of schoolchildren diagnosed with food allergies in France", *Clinical & Experimental Allergy*, Vol. 35, pp. 167-72.
- Rop, O. et al. (2011), "Antioxidant Capacity, Scavenging Radical Activity and Selected Chemical Composition of Native Apple Cultivars from Central Europe", *Journal of Food Quality*, Vol. 34, pp. 187-194.
- Rust, S. and D. Buskirk (2008), "Feeding apples and apple pomace in cattle diets", *Cattle Call Vol. 13(4)*, *Beef Brief*, Michigan State University Beef Team.
- Savazzini, F., G. Ricci and S. Tartarini (2015), "Apple allergens genomics and biotechnology: Unravelling the determinants of apple allergenicity". In: *Applied Plant Genomics and Biotechnology*, Elsevier, pp. 35-54.
- Schirmer, H. and B. Trierweiler (2005), "Lagerung der Apfelsorte/Clubsorte Cameo", *Obstbau*, Vol. 10, pp. 510-512.
- Schmitz-Eiberger, M. and A. Matthes (2011), "Effect of harvest maturity, duration of storage and shelf life of apples on the allergen Mal d 1, polyphenoloxidase activity and polyphenol content". *Food Chemistry*, Vol. 127, pp. 1459-1464.
- Shalini, R. and D.K. Gupta (2010), "Utilization of pomace from apple processing industries", *Review Journal of Food Science and Technology*, Vol. 47, pp. 365-371.
- Smith, E.L. (1950), "Apple pomace Silage", *Journal of the Ministry of Agriculture*, Vol. 57, pp. 328-332.
- Smock, R.M. and A.M. Neubert (1950), *Apples and Apple Products*, New York: Interscience.
- Storch, T. et al. (2015), "Ethylene-dependent regulation of an alpha-L-arabinofuranosidase is associated to firmness loss in 'Gala' apples under long term cold storage", *Food Chemistry*, Vol. 182, pp. 111-119.
- Stracke, B.A. et al. (2009), "Three-year comparison of the polyphenol contents and antioxidant capacities in organically and conventionally produced apples (*Malus domestica* Bork.

- Cultivar 'Golden Delicious')", *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, Vol. 57, pp. 4598-4605.
- Surleva, A. and G. Drochioiu (2013), "A modified ninhydrin micro-assay for determination of total cyanogens in plants". *Food Chemistry*, Vol. 141, pp. 2788-2794.
- Swiss Food Composition Database V5.2. (2015), *Swiss Food Composition Database, Version 5.2*, Federal Food Safety and Veterinary Office (FSVO), Switzerland, available online at: <http://naehrwertdaten.ch/> (accessed Nov. 2016).
- Tiwari, S P., M.P. Narang and M. Dubey (2008), "Effect of feeding apple pomace on milk yield and milk composition in crossbred (Red Sindhi x Jersey) cow", *Livestock Research for Rural Develop.*, Vol. 20(4), Article #62, India, <http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd20/4/tiwa20062.htm>.
- Trierweiler, B., M. Krieg and B. Tauscher (2004), "Antioxidative capacity of different apple cultivars after long-time storage", *Journal of Applied Botany - Angewandte Botanik*, Vol. 78, pp. 117-119.
- USDA (2015), *USDA National Nutrient Database for Standard Reference, Release 28*, United States Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Research Service, available online at: <https://ndb.nal.usda.gov/ndb/> (accessed Nov. 2016).
- Vandendriessche, T. et al. (2013), "High-throughput NMR based metabolic profiling of Braeburn apple in relation to internal browning". *Postharvest Biology and Technology*, Vol. 80, pp. 18-24.
- Varming, C., M.A. Petersen, and T.B. Toldam-Andersen (2013), "Ascorbic acid contents in Danish apple cultivars and commercial apple juices", *Lwt-Food Science and Technology*, Vol. 54, pp. 597-599.
- Weberic, R. et al. (2005), "Phenolic compounds in some apple (*Malus domestica* Borkh) cultivars of organic and integrated production", *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, Vol. 85, pp. 1687-1694.
- Velasco, R. et al. (2010), "The genome of the domesticated apple (*Malus × domestica* Borkh.)", *Nature Genetics*, Vol. 42, pp.833-839.
- WHO (1991), *Strategies of Assessing the Safety of Foods Produced by Biotechnology*, Report of a Joint FAO/WHO Consultation, World Health Organization of the United Nations, Geneva, out of print.
- Wojdylo, A., J. Oszmiański and P. Laskowski (2008), "Polyphenolic compounds and antioxidant activity of new and old apple varieties", *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, Vol. 56, pp. 6520-6530.
- Woods, R.K. et al. (2001), "International prevalence of reported food allergies and intolerances: comparisons arising from the European Community Respiratory Health Survey (ECRHS) 1991-94", *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, Vol. 55, pp. 298-304.
- Zhang, Y. Z., P.M. Li and L.L. Cheng (2010), "Developmental changes of carbohydrates, organic acids, amino acids, and phenolic compounds in 'Honeycrisp' apple flesh", *Food Chemistry*, Vol. 123, pp. 1013-1018.
- Zuberbier, T. et al (2004), "Prevalence to adverse reactions to food in Germany – a population study", *Allergy*, Vol. 59, pp. 338-345.