



Client Report

Prepared for New Zealand Game Industry Board

August 2001

Venison Health-related Research: Iron Bioavailability and CLA's

J. Stevenson-Barry

CR 819

CONFIDENTIAL

Client Report

This report has been prepared for the New Zealand Game Industry Board and is CONFIDENTIAL to that organisation and AgResearch. AgResearch will not disclose its contents to third parties unless directed to do so by the Game Industry Board.

Every effort has been made to ensure this publication is accurate. However, because research and development can involve extrapolation and interpretation of uncertain data, AgResearch will not be responsible for any error or omission in this publication unless specifically agreed otherwise in writing. To the extent permissible by law, neither AgResearch nor any person involved in this publication accepts any liability for any loss or damage whatsoever that may directly or indirectly result from any advice, opinion, representation, statement or omission, whether negligent or otherwise, contained in this publication.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Clyde Daly', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Clyde Daly
Team Leader – Meat Science

Inquiries or requests to:
Joanne Stevenson-Barry
Email: joanne.stevenson-barry@agresearch.co.nz
Meat Science
Food Systems & Technology
AgResearch - Invermay
Private Bag 50034, Mosgiel, New Zealand

Venison Health-related Research: Iron Bioavailability and CLA's

Prepared for New Zealand Game Industry Board

August 2001

Joanne Stevenson-Barry

Contents

	Page
1 Background	1
2 Objective	1
3 Project Outline	1
4 Results	2
4.1 Iron Analyses	2
4.2 Fatty Acid Analyses.....	2
5 Conclusions	4
6 References.....	4
Appendix 1. Methods	5
Appendix 2. Data.....	7

1 Background

Iron bio-availability and conjugated linoleic acid (CLA) content are considered to be two of the hottest topics in health-related meat work in NZ. To our knowledge, CLA or iron bioavailability have not been measured for venison. Previous research at Invermay (non-GIB funded work) has shown that the total iron content of venison is approximately triple that of lamb and double that of beef (Drew & Seman, 1987; Stevenson-Barry *et al.*, 1999). However, iron is present in meat in a number of different forms and the proportion in each form is believed to dramatically effect bioavailability. The level of iron absorption for humans is appreciably greater when iron is in the haem form, and is little affected by other components of the diet. Analysis of the iron fractions in venison is much less expensive than conducting actual absorption trials and will give a very good indication as to whether venison is likely to differ in bioavailability compared to other species (particularly beef and lamb).

CLA content in venison is of particular interest since the US Dietetic Association has included red meat in a recently released list of functional foods (Meat New Zealand Meat Matters, October 21, 2000). CLA's have been shown to be anti-carcinogenic, and the functional foods designation of red meat is because it is a good source of CLAs.

VENISON
NOT A
GOOD
SOURCE
OF CLA'S

2 Objective

Determine the amount of soluble and insoluble haem and non-haem iron fractions in twelve venison samples and the fatty acid profiles for twelve venison samples.

3 Project Outline

Samples were collected from 1-2 year old animals at a commercial deer slaughter plant following standard slaughter and carcass handling procedures. Animals of known age, sex and genotype were used in this study. Samples were collected at boning time (approximately 24 hours after slaughter) and stored frozen at -80°C prior to analysis. Iron analyses were carried out at Massey University and CLA assays were carried out at the MIRINZ Centre, AgResearch, Ruakura, using the same protocol previously applied to analyses of beef and lamb (details in Appendix 1).

4 Results

4.1 Iron Analyses

The average iron concentrations of the venison samples, together with some comparative sheep and beef data (Roger Purchas, Massey University, unpublished data, *Pers. Comm.*), are shown in Table 1. Raw data is provided in Appendix 2. While the results show considerable variations between animals, on average, iron concentrations were significantly higher in venison than in the equivalent muscles in beef or sheep. These differences is particularly evident in the heam component of the total iron content of the muscle, and indicate that venison may be a superior source of bioavailable iron than beef or sheepmeat.

Table needs a title and units

Species	Venison	Sheep meat sample (rams and hoggets)			Heifer samples		
Muscle	Loin	Loin	Leg	Shoulder	Loin	Leg	Shoulder
Soluble haem	18.5	9.53	5.67	8.14	11.69	9.78	13.59
Insoluble Haem	3.6	3.83	1.69	2.83	1.91	1.98	2.4
Total haem	22.1	13.36	10.52	15.84	13.6	11.77	15.99
Soluble nonhaem	1.8	1.38	1.06	1.52	1.31	1.36	1.35
Insoluble nonhaem	5.1	2.76	2.35	2.73	1.36	1.49	1.93
Total nonhaem	6.9	4.14	3.4	4.25	2.67	2.85	3.28
Total Iron	27.5	17.5	13.92	20.09	16.27	14.61	19.28

Loin = *Longissimus dorsi*, Leg = *Semitendinosus* (pale muscle in leg), Shoulder = *Triceps brachii*

4.2 Fatty Acid Analyses

Total fatty acid analyses for each animal is provided in Appendix 2. As a percent of total FA's the CLA and *trans* vaccenic fatty acid (CLA precursor) values were 0.2 and 1.2% respectively. Similar values for lean heifers (n=50) were 0.35% CLA and 1.34% *trans* vaccenic (Terry Knight, AgResearch Grasslands, unpublished data, *Pers. comm.*).

Also, venison generally has lower concentrations of fatty acids than beef. The present samples had, on average, 5.1g lipid per 100g dry matter, which calculates to approximately 1.3 g lipid on a raw meat basis (assuming dry matter is 26% of meat). This value is normal for venison from 1-2 year old animals (Stevenson et al., 1989; Stevenson-Barry et al., 1999), but is significantly lower than other meats, especially beef. The CLA and *trans* vaccenic content per 100 mg of raw venison calculates to approximately 2 and 18 mg respectively (8 and 68.9 mg per 100 g dry matter respectively x 0.26) with maximum levels of each approximately double and triple the average, respectively 3.6 and 56 mg.

A 22% reduction in mammary cancers in mice has been found when feeding a mixed CLA at 0.05% of diet. This value equates to 750 mg per day of the c-9 t-11 CLA, which is the active anticancer CLA (Terry Knight, AgResearch Grasslands, *Pers. comm.*). Average CLA values for lean beef (2% fat content) were found to be approximately 4 mg/100 g raw beef but the maximum was 27 mg/100 g raw meat (Terry Knight, AgResearch Grasslands, *Pers. comm.*). Therefore, in the best case, beef can provide 3.6% of daily requirement, assuming a need of 750 mg/day, and as much as 34% of daily requirement if CLAs are combined with the highest values for vaccenic acid concentrations. In contrast, 1-2 year old deer provide 2.5 % of daily requirement, even when CLA and vaccenic acid are combined. Since the beef study found that CLA and vaccenic acid concentrations increase in proportion to the fat content of the meat, increasing the fat content of venison could provide a strategy for increasing its CLA-related health benefits. Older deer (5-13 years old) have been found to have double to triple the lipid concentration of 1-3 year old animals (Stevenson et al., 1989; Stevenson-Barry et al., 1999), but fat contents vary seasonally (Stevenson et al., 1992; Manley & Forss, 1979; Drew, 1985) and even higher concentrations (3.3-10.9 g/100g) have been reported for very well grown 1-3 year old red deer stags (carcass weights of 41kg at 12 months and 76 kg at 27 months; Drew and Seman; 1997). Therefore, it may be possible to select animals with higher concentrations than found here. Clearly, this strategy would need to be weighed up against the advantages of venison's low-fat associations.

fat ↑, CLA ↑

5 Conclusions

Venison has high concentrations of haem iron indicating that venison would be a good source of bioavailable iron, moreso even than beef. However, CLAs contribute less to total fatty acids in venison than in beef and, since venison also has lower fat concentrations,

Venison is not a good source of CLA.

6 References

- Drew K R and D L Seman (1987) The nutrient content of venison. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society of New Zealand*. 12: 49-55.
- Drew K R (1985) Meat Production from Farmed Deer. *Biology of Deer Production. The Royal Society of New Zealand, Bulletin 22, pp. 285-290.*
- Knight T W, S Knowles, J West, M Agnew, A F Death, C A Morris and R W Purchas (2001) Factors affecting the fatty acid concentrations in lean beef from grass fed New Zealand cattle and the implications for human health. In prep.
- Manley T R and D A Forss (1979) Fatty Acids of Meat Lipids from Young Red Deer. *Cervus elaphus. Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture, volume 30, pp. 927-931.*
- Stevenson J M, K R Drew, S J Duncan and R P Littlejohn (1989) The Relationship of Meat Quality to Age at Slaughter in Red Deer Stags and Hinds. *Report prepared for the Game Industry Board, 22p.*
- Stevenson J M, D L Seman and R P Littlejohn (1992) Seasonal Variation in Venison Quality of Mature Farmed Red Deer Stags in New Zealand. *Journal of Animal Science, volume 70, pp. 1389-1396.*
- Stevenson-Barry J M, S J Duncan and R P Littlejohn (1999) Venison Vitamin E Levels and The Relationship Between Vitamin E, Iron and Copper Levels and Display Life For Venison and Beef. *Proceedings, 45th International Congress of Meat Science & Technology, Yokohama, Japan.*
- Stevenson-Barry J M, K R Drew, S J Duncan and R P Littlejohn (1999) The Relationship of Meat Quality to Age at Slaughter in Red Deer Stags and Hinds. *Proceedings of the New Zealand Society of Animal Production, 59: 137-139.*

Appendix 1. Methods

Note: The assays are done on raw meat, since this is the procedure previously used for beef and lamb. Cooking does affect the concentrations of some of the components but the magnitude of the effect depends on the cooking temperature. Major changes do not occur until temperatures exceed 100°C which is very well done (medium rare is about 65°C).

Iron Analyses

Haem iron was measured by the method of Hornsey (1956). Haem was extracted with acidified acetone and the absorbance of the extract read at 640 nm. All samples were assayed in duplicate.

For non-haem iron, the ferrozine reaction procedure is used as described by Ahn, Wolfe and Sim (1993). The sample is suspended in 0.1M citrate-phosphate buffer, ascorbic acid added to reduce all iron to the ferrous form. Protein is then precipitated with and the sample neutralised with ammonium acetate. The ferrozine colour reagent is then added and absorbance read at 562 nm. All samples were assayed in duplicate.

For total iron analysis, samples are wet ashed using concentrated nitric acid followed by hydrogen peroxide, the ash dissolved in 2M HCl, and read against standards on an atomic absorption spectrophotometer. This method is an adaptation of the wet ashing method described by Clark, Mahoney and Carpenter (1997). All samples were assayed in triplicate.

CLA Analyses

The total lipids were extracted from freeze dried meat with chloroform /methanol (Folch *et al* 1957). An aliquot was used to determine the lipid content gravimetrically, another evaporated to dryness, and the lipids converted to methyl esters (Slover & Lanza 1979). Separation was using a HP 6890 GC with FID detection and a SGS BPX70 capillary column, quantitation was by way of an internal standard and an external reference standard mixture.

References

- Ahn, D.U., Wolfe, F.H., and Sim, J.S. (1993) Three methods for determining nonheme iron in turkey meat. *Journal of Food Science*. 58: 288-291.
- Buchowski, M.S., and Cornforth, D.P. (1988) Heating and the distribution of total and heme iron between meat and broth. *Journal of Food Science*. 53: 43-45.
- Carpenter, C. E. and Clark, E. (1995) Evaluation of methods used in meat iron analysis and iron content of raw and cooked meats. *Journal of Agricultural Food Chemistry*. 43: 1824-1827.
- Carter, P. 1971. Spectrophotometric determination of serum iron at the submicrogram level with a new reagent (Ferrozine). *Analytical Biochemistry*. 40: 450-458.
- Clark, E.M., Mahoney, A.W. and Carpenter, C.E. (1997) Heme and total iron in ready-to-eat chicken. *Journal of Agricultural Food Chemistry*. 45: 124-126.
- Hornsey, H. C. (1956) The colour of cooked cured pork, I.-Estimation of the nitric oxide-haem pigments. *Journal of the Science of Food Agriculture*. 7: 534-540.
- Folch J. , Lees M and Stanley G H S. (1957) *J. Biol. Chem.* 226; 497 and Christie W. W (1984) *CRC Handbook of Chromatography ; Lipids* p 36
- Slover H. T. and Lanza E. (1979) "Quantitative analysis of food fatty acids by capillary gas chromatography." *J. American Oil Chem. soc.* 56 933-94

Appendix 2. Data

Table A1
Iron Analyses (ppm)

Animal	1	4	5	6	8	9	12	14	18	19	20	22	2	3	11	23	Av.	sd	Range	Min.	Max.
Soluble haem	12.3	20.5	19.1	18.9	19.9	14.7	17.6	26.6	17.2	22.4	18.6	24.1	16.5	15.5	15.9	16.2	18.5	3.6	14.3	12.3	26.6
Insoluble Haem	3.9	6.3	5.7	5.1	4.4	4.1	2.6	1.9	2.4	5.0	2.5	2.4	3.3	2.4	3.9	2.3	3.6	1.4	4.4	1.9	6.3
Total haem	16.2	26.8	24.7	24.0	24.2	18.8	20.2	28.4	19.6	27.3	21.1	26.5	19.8	18.0	19.8	18.5	22.1	3.8	12.3	16.2	28.4
Soluble nonhaem	2.3	2.4	2.3	1.6	2.2	1.7	1.9	2.3	2.0	1.5	2.5	1.7	1.1	1.3	1.1	1.0	1.8	0.5	1.5	1.0	2.5
Insoluble nonhaem	5.7	5.5	6.4	4.2	3.9	4.9	3.9	3.6	4.6	6.0	7.8	5.3	5.6	5.5	4.4	5.0	5.1	1.1	4.2	3.6	7.8
Total nonhaem	7.9	7.9	8.7	5.8	6.1	6.6	5.8	5.9	6.6	7.6	10.3	6.9	6.8	6.8	5.4	6.0	6.9	1.3	4.8	5.4	10.3
Haem + Nonhaem (H+NH)	24.1	34.7	33.4	29.8	30.4	25.3	26.0	34.3	26.2	34.9	31.4	33.4	26.5	24.8	25.2	24.4	29.1	4.1	10.9	24.1	34.9
Assayed total iron	25.0	27.3	35.4	28.7	31.7	27.2	24.7	30.2	23.7	29.5	25.2	29.6	24.6	26.5	26.0	24.5	27.5	3.2	11.6	23.7	35.4
% H+NH / assayed total	96%	127%	95%	104%	96%	93%	105%	114%	110%	118%	125%	113%	108%	93%	97%	100%	106%	11%	34%	93%	127%

ID		Table A2.																		
		Fatty Acid Analyses																		
		Results as % Fatty acid																		
C12:0		C14	C15	unknown	C16	C16:1	C17	unknown	C18	<i>Trans</i> Vaccenic	C18:1	Vaccenic	C18:2	C18:3	CLA	C20:3	C20:4	C20:5	C22:5	C22:6
Hind 1	0.2	5.1	0.8	3.1	26.1	7.6	0.7	0.7	17.9	1.3	13.8	2.7	5.0	3.2	0.100	0.2	1.8	1.5	1.5	0.4
	0.2	5.1	0.8	3.3	26.1	7.4	0.7	0.8	17.9	1.3	13.6	2.7	5.0	3.2	0.070	0.2	1.9	1.6	1.5	0.4
Hind 2	0.2	3.1	0.6	6.1	23.5	7.1	0.5	1.7	12.7	1.2	13.8	3.4	8.0	4.8	0.180	0.4	3.2	2.4	2.6	0.6
	0.1	3.1	0.6	6.2	23.3	6.5	0.5	1.7	12.7	1.4	13.5	3.4	8.0	4.8	0.175	0.4	3.2	2.4	2.6	0.6
Hind 3	0.2	3.5	0.5	6.7	22.1	7.3	0.5	1.3	12.9	0.6	14.9	3.4	7.9	4.2	0.144	0.4	3.1	2.6	2.5	0.8
	0.2	3.9	0.5	5.7	23.3	7.9	0.5	1.1	13.0	0.6	15.7	3.5	6.8	3.7	0.103	0.3	2.7	2.3	2.2	0.7
Hind 4	0.1	2.5	0.4	7.7	19.2	4.3	0.5	1.2	14.8	1.4	13.4	3.0	9.9	5.0	0.200	0.6	4.3	3.3	3.2	1.3
	0.1	2.1	0.4	8.8	17.9	4.1	0.4	1.4	14.7	1.2	12.5	2.7	10.8	5.4	0.150	0.6	4.9	3.8	3.6	1.5
Hind 5	0.2	4.2	0.4	5.1	28.7	7.3	0.5	0.9	11.9	0.7	14.9	3.3	7.0	3.4	0.130	0.4	2.7	2.0	2.1	0.5
	0.2	4.0	0.4	5.3	28.0	7.0	0.5	1.1	12.2	0.7	14.6	3.1	7.2	3.6	0.075	0.4	2.8	2.1	2.2	0.5
Hind 6	0.2	5.0	0.6	5.0	26.8	7.4	0.5	1.2	13.4	0.7	14.9	2.8	5.7	3.4	0.090	0.3	2.7	1.8	1.8	0.7
	0.2	5.1	0.6	4.7	27.2	8.0	0.5	1.1	12.6	0.8	14.8	2.9	5.6	3.4	0.095	0.3	2.6	1.7	1.7	0.7
Hind 7	0.2	4.3	0.5	5.5	25.4	7.8	0.5	1.4	11.6	0.8	14.2	3.4	7.7	4.8	0.160	0.3	2.1	1.9	1.9	0.7
	0.2	4.5	0.5	5.1	26.0	8.0	0.5	1.3	11.6	0.8	14.4	3.5	7.3	4.5	0.126	0.3	2.0	1.8	1.8	0.6
Hind 8	0.2	3.4	0.7	5.3	21.7	6.0	0.6	1.0	17.0	2.4	13.2	3.2	7.6	4.3	0.196	0.4	2.6	2.3	2.4	0.4
	0.2	3.6	0.7	5.2	22.3	7.0	0.6	1.0	15.8	1.9	13.4	3.4	7.4	4.2	0.137	0.3	2.5	2.2	2.4	0.4

		Table A2. Fatty Acid Analyses																		
		Results as % Fatty acid																		
ID	C12:0	C14	C15	C16	C16:1	C17	C17 unknown	C18	Trans Vaccenic	C18:1	Vaccenic	C18:2	C18:3	CLA	C20:3	C20:4	C20:5	C22:5	C22:6	
																				C15 unknown
Hind 9	0.1	2.9	0.5	7.3	19.9	5.7	0.5	1.6	13.1	1.0	13.9	3.2	9.6	5.2	0.217	0.5	4.1	3.0	2.6	1.1
	0.1	2.9	0.5	7.1	20.0	5.9	0.5	1.6	13.0	1.0	13.9	3.2	9.3	5.1	0.179	0.5	3.9	2.9	2.5	1.1
Hind 10	0.1	3.4	0.6	5.7	22.0	7.9	0.5	1.5	12.4	1.8	14.3	3.5	8.5	4.8	0.420	0.3	2.5	2.2	2.1	0.6
	0.1	3.4	0.6	5.6	21.9	7.9	0.5	1.7	12.2	2.1	14.5	3.6	8.2	4.6	0.241	0.3	2.4	2.1	2.1	0.6
Hind 11	0.2	3.8	0.5	6.8	23.6	6.8	0.5	1.2	13.6	0.7	15.5	3.2	6.7	3.8	0.156	0.4	3.0	2.6	2.5	0.8
	0.2	3.8	0.5	6.4	23.3	6.8	0.5	1.2	13.0	0.8	15.4	3.1	6.3	3.6	0.102	0.4	2.8	2.5	2.3	0.7
Hind 12	0.1	3.2	0.7	5.6	24.2	6.4	0.6	1.5	14.7	2.0	14.5	3.1	6.3	3.9	0.356	0.3	2.7	2.1	2.2	0.5
	0.1	3.3	0.7	5.5	24.9	6.3	0.7	1.5	15.4	2.0	14.2	2.9	6.2	3.9	0.193	0.3	2.7	2.1	2.1	0.5
Average	0.2	3.7	0.6	5.8	23.6	6.8	0.5	1.3	13.8	1.2	14.3	3.2	7.4	4.2	0.166	0.4	2.9	2.3	2.3	0.7
Animal 1	0.22	5.1	0.8	3.2	26.1	7.5	0.7	0.7	17.9	1.3	13.7	2.7	5.0	3.2	0.085	0.2	1.9	1.5	1.5	0.4
Animal 2	0.15	3.1	0.6	6.2	23.4	6.8	0.5	1.7	12.7	1.3	13.7	3.4	8.0	4.8	0.178	0.4	3.2	2.4	2.6	0.6
Animal 3	0.16	3.7	0.5	6.2	22.7	7.6	0.5	1.2	12.9	0.6	15.3	3.5	7.4	4.0	0.124	0.4	2.9	2.5	2.4	0.7
Animal 4	0.10	2.3	0.4	8.2	18.6	4.2	0.5	1.3	14.8	1.3	13.0	2.9	10.4	5.2	0.175	0.6	4.6	3.5	3.4	1.4
Animal 5	0.18	4.1	0.4	5.2	28.4	7.2	0.5	1.0	12.1	0.7	14.8	3.2	7.1	3.5	0.102	0.4	2.8	2.1	2.2	0.5
Animal 6	0.19	5.1	0.6	4.9	27.0	7.7	0.5	1.1	13.0	0.7	14.9	2.8	5.7	3.4	0.093	0.3	2.6	1.8	1.8	0.7
Animal 7	0.18	4.4	0.5	5.3	25.7	7.9	0.5	1.3	11.6	0.8	14.3	3.5	7.5	4.7	0.143	0.3	2.0	1.9	1.8	0.7

Table A2.
Fatty Acid Analyses

ID	Results as % Fatty acid																		
	C12:0	C14	C15	C16	C16:1	C17	unknown	C18	<i>Trans</i> Vaccenic	C18:1	<i>Cis</i> Vaccenic	C18:2	C18:3	CLA	C20:3	C20:4	C20:5	C22:5	C22:6
Animal 8	0.15	3.5	0.7	22.0	6.5	0.6	1.0	16.4	2.1	13.3	3.3	7.5	4.3	0.167	0.4	2.5	2.2	2.4	0.4
Animal 9	0.12	2.9	0.5	20.0	5.8	0.5	1.6	13.1	1.0	13.9	3.2	9.5	5.2	0.198	0.5	4.0	2.9	2.5	1.1
Animal 10	0.14	3.4	0.6	22.0	7.9	0.5	1.6	12.3	2.0	14.4	3.6	8.3	4.7	0.331	0.3	2.5	2.2	2.1	0.6
Animal 11	0.16	3.8	0.5	23.4	6.8	0.5	1.2	13.3	0.7	15.5	3.2	6.5	3.7	0.129	0.4	2.9	2.6	2.4	0.8
Animal 12	0.15	3.3	0.7	24.6	6.3	0.6	1.5	15.1	2.0	14.4	3.0	6.2	3.9	0.275	0.3	2.7	2.1	2.2	0.5
Average	0.16	3.7	0.6	23.6	6.8	0.5	1.3	13.8	1.2	14.3	3.2	7.4	4.2	0.166	0.4	2.9	2.3	2.3	0.7
Std dev.	0.03	0.8	0.1	2.9	1.1	0.1	0.3	1.9	0.6	0.8	0.3	1.5	0.7	0.074	0.1	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.3
Minimum	0.10	2.3	0.4	18.6	4.2	0.5	0.7	11.6	0.6	13.0	2.7	5.0	3.2	0.085	0.2	1.9	1.5	1.5	0.4
Maximum	0.22	5.1	0.8	28.4	7.9	0.7	1.7	17.9	2.1	15.5	3.6	10.4	5.2	0.331	0.6	4.6	3.5	3.4	1.4
Range	0.12	2.8	0.4	9.8	3.7	0.2	1.0	6.3	1.5	2.5	0.9	5.4	2.0	0.246	0.4	2.8	2.0	1.9	1.0

Table 3A
Fatty acids as a % of dry matter.

ID	Lipid % of Dry Matter	grams fatty acid per 100g dry matter	Ratio of fatty acids to Total Lipids	mg Fatty Acid / 100g DM																								
				C12	C14	C14:1	C15	Unknown Branched	C16	C16:1	C17	Unknown	C18	<i>trans</i> Vaccenic	C18:1 oleic	<i>cis</i> Vaccenic	C18:2 <i>Trans</i>	C18:3	CLA	C20:2	C20:3 n6	C20:4 n6	C20:3 n3	C20:5 n3	C22:5 n3	C22:6 n3		
1	10.2	7.0	68.7%	15.6	388.0	7.0	60.2	237.5	16.9	1945.6	551.1	48.0	23.5	1230.6	96.8	999.3	199.7	26.6	379.1	241.9	9.3	9.3	17.4	138.6	17.4	117.8	115.5	29.2
2	7.2	4.4	60.7%	5.9	137.3	5.2	24.9	282.8	9.4	1075.5	310.2	22.8	12.2	564.2	70.5	618.9	159.8	12.6	370.2	224.1	8.8	8.4	19.4	146.7	19.4	114.2	119.4	26.1
3	8.3	5.0	60.6%	7.4	193.0	6.6	25.0	324.1	8.4	1199.7	396.7	24.1	25.3	659.4	39.0	795.2	185.7	13.2	387.4	214.1	4.9	8.5	19.6	152.0	19.6	132.5	126.1	40.1
4	6.7	3.7	56.1%	1.6	79.8	6.5	15.4	311.2	7.6	706.9	159.7	16.7	64.0	542.0	55.0	488.4	116.3	4.7	395.5	200.8	5.9	8.8	23.1	175.0	23.1	137.2	131.8	54.2
5	7.5	5.1	68.0%	8.6	215.8	2.5	21.6	271.6	8.2	1488.6	370.8	23.0	11.6	612.4	48.3	764.2	174.1	13.9	374.7	188.3	6.7	10.3	20.2	146.4	20.2	112.0	115.8	28.3
6	8.9	6.1	69.4%	11.7	333.7	8.3	37.3	301.9	11.4	1747.2	493.8	30.7	21.3	810.8	56.3	942.6	186.4	11.7	366.6	224.8	6.4	12.6	17.8	169.3	17.8	117.6	116.1	45.2
7	8.7	5.9	68.1%	10.7	277.4	7.5	28.4	330.2	10.3	1600.6	484.7	27.1	13.6	696.6	53.0	871.6	214.8	11.2	468.2	295.7	8.4	7.9	18.5	127.0	18.5	117.8	114.2	41.7
8	9.3	6.1	66.3%	8.8	224.6	8.4	41.9	336.4	12.5	1407.8	412.0	37.0	87.3	1013.0	141.7	831.9	212.4	19.4	485.2	279.3	9.0	3.7	22.1	162.9	22.1	146.2	154.5	26.4
9	6.9	4.2	62.2%	4.2	116.8	6.4	21.8	305.5	8.5	853.4	246.8	19.9	89.6	539.8	56.2	589.4	144.9	8.7	405.8	226.2	8.5	10.8	22.1	171.1	22.1	129.1	110.2	48.4
10	7.2	4.5	62.9%	5.8	155.1	2.6	26.7	288.5	11.6	1042.2	370.4	22.5	57.8	563.0	102.1	670.9	172.0	13.7	396.3	227.1	13.9	9.9	16.2	115.7	16.2	105.6	101.5	31.0
11	6.8	4.5	66.1%	6.5	173.6	5.6	23.4	307.2	7.9	1097.9	316.4	22.3	46.2	602.0	38.8	710.2	149.2	9.3	308.1	176.2	6.0	3.6	18.3	136.9	18.3	122.3	114.0	36.2
12	7.1	5.0	70.5%	7.1	169.1	5.2	34.4	291.9	11.4	1293.8	330.2	32.0	13.3	765.4	103.0	743.3	163.0	12.6	328.6	211.9	12.9	6.9	17.6	142.9	17.6	112.1	115.1	25.5
average	7.9	5.1	64.5%	7.9	208.7	6.0	29.7	297.9	10.2	1287.8	373.9	26.7	41.1	717.6	68.9	753.0	174.1	13.2	394.3	227.1	8.0	8.5	19.5	149.2	19.5	122.9	119.9	37.0
Std dev.	1.1	1.0	4.4%	3.7	89.8	1.9	12.0	28.6	2.6	365.8	109.2	8.6	29.3	226.5	32.0	148.4	28.9	5.5	49.8	34.2	2.7	2.7	2.2	18.3	2.2	11.9	13.3	9.8
Minimum	6.7	3.7	56.1%	1.6	79.8	2.5	15.4	237.5	7.6	706.9	159.7	16.7	11.6	539.8	38.8	488.4	116.3	4.7	308.1	176.2	4.9	3.6	16.2	115.7	16.2	105.6	101.5	25.5
Maximum	10.2	7.0	70.5%	15.6	388.0	8.4	60.2	336.4	16.9	1945.6	551.1	48.0	89.6	1290.6	141.7	999.3	214.8	26.6	485.2	295.7	13.9	12.6	23.1	175.0	23.1	146.2	154.5	54.2
Range	3.5	3.3	14.4%	14.0	308.2	5.9	44.8	98.8	9.3	1238.7	391.4	31.3	78.0	750.8	102.9	510.8	98.5	21.9	177.1	119.6	9.0	9.1	6.9	59.2	6.9	40.6	52.9	28.7