

(<https://www.ejfood.org/index.php/ejfood/article/view/84>)

Download

(<https://www.ejfood.org/index.php/ejfood/article/download/84/77>)

Characterization of The Nutritional Properties of Sorghum Composite Flours Using Different Food to Food Fortification Approaches

Violet K.-Mugalavai, Josiah O. Oyalo and Augustino O. Onkware

Abstract — Intervention using blended composite flours can reduce malnutrition in sub Saharan Africa. Prevalence of protein-energy malnutrition among the vulnerable children has necessitated research on cost effective food product development like food to food fortification of common staples like sorghum. An investigation was carried out on the nutritional properties of selected sorghum composite flours for the production of porridge for both home and industrial applications. In this study, composite flours V1 to V4 were made from sorghum, maize, grain amaranth, baobab and butternut at different rations; V1-(42.5:22.5:5:15:15), V2-(22.5:42.5:5:15:15), V3-(32.5:32.5:5:15:15) and V4-(65:0:5:15:15) were compared against composite flours AV1 to AV4 made from sorghum, cassava, chickpea, orange fleshed sweet potatoes (OFSP) and baobab; AV1-(42.5:22.5:5:15:15) AV2-(22.5:42.5:5:15:15), AV3-(32.5:32.5:5:15:15) and AV4-(65:0:5:15:15). Standard methods were used in determining the chemical characteristics of the composite flours. Composite flour formulations were based on Concept4® creative software. Results on proximate composition indicated a significant ($p < 0.05$) difference in moisture content of the control composite (V5) and the other composite flours with the moisture content ranging from 9.1% to 12.1% in V5 and V3 respectively. Carbohydrates were the most abundant nutrient in the composite flours 66.0 to 72.7% in V1 and V5 respectively, followed by fat 5.5% (AV3) to 9.2% (AV1), protein 5.1 (AV2) to 8.6% (AV4), crude fibre 1.5 (V2) to 4.3% (V5), and ash 1.4 (AV1) to 2.8% (AV4). The total energy ranged between 359.25 kcal (V4) to 379.94 kcal (V1) however, these values were not significantly different ($p > 0.05$). Zinc, calcium and magnesium concentration were significantly different ($p < 0.05$) between the sorghum-maize-grain amaranth-baobab-butternut, on one hand and sorghum-cassava-chickpea-OFSP-baobab composite flours on the other. The concentrations of phosphorus and Iron were not significantly different ($p > 0.05$). Correlation analysis revealed significant negative correlation between crude protein and fibre ($r = -0.512$, $p < 0.001$).

I. INTRODU

Sorghum bicolor is a cereal that is used as a food and feed, among other important staple food of the poor. However, despite its potential and sorghum has low nutritional value properties compared to other popular crops and rice [3]. This inferiority is due to its low storage protein, kafirin, is very poor in lysine, as well as poor digestibility [2]. This has therefore, led to the need for sorghum flours to improve on the bioavailability of micronutrients [4].

Most food-to-food fortification approaches use legumes; which are rich in protein and contains a relatively good complement of essential amino acids resulting in nutritional compensation [5], [6]. Sorghum flours have been applied to reduce food insecurity in Kenyan households in East Africa [7] where it is mostly used to make flatbreads. Flatbreads are widely consumed in East Africa, for example the *kisra* in Sudan, *injera* in Ethiopia, *ugali* and *uji* in Kenya. *Ugali* and *uji* relates to the amount of water used to make the products. Less flour (about 30% water) is used to make *uji* than *ugali* (about 30% water).

Sorghum is more popular in rural areas than the low income urban dwellers. In rural areas, porridges are made from unblended sorghum flours.