

Pasting Properties of Flour Blends from Water yam, Yellow maize and African yam bean

Abstract

Pasting properties of flour blends from water yam, yellow maize and African yam bean were investigated in this study. Peak viscosity ranged from 133.50 to 166.25RVU, Trough viscosity ranged from 85.08 to 135.20RVU, break down viscosity ranged from 28.17 to 50.58RVU, final viscosity ranged from 5.05 to 5.49 min and pasting temperature ranged from 80.25 to 84.15°C. Addition of yellow maize and African yam bean affected ($p < 0.05$) the peak viscosity, trough viscosity, break down viscosity, final viscosity, and setback viscosity in different trends. However, peak time and peak temperature of the flour sample were not statically ($p < 0.05$) affected by the blend ratio in this study. Amongst the flour samples investigated in this study, flour sample DIN (60%WY:10%YM:30%AYB) showed promise for value added products such as noodles among other flour products. This flour sample adjusted to be the best sample could be used as a good replacement for wheat flour and when achieved, it will reduce the cost of importation.

Key words: Pasting, flour blend, water yam, yellow maize and African yam bean.

1.0 Introduction

Water yam (*Dioscoreaalata* L) is the most widely distributed species of yam, though the total quantity produced is less than that of white yam. Water yam (*D. alata*) is grown widely in tropical and sub-tropical regions of the world. Water yams (*Dioscoreaalata* L.) are grown widely in tropical and subtropical regions of the world. They are plants yielding tubers and contain starch between 70 and 80% of dry matter (Zhang and Oates, 1999). Yams, the edible tubers of various species of the genus *Dioscorea*, are important staple foods and a potential source of ingredients for fabricated foods in many tropical countries because of their high starch content. Virtually all production of yam is used for human food. The tubers are processed into various types of food including yam slices, yam balls, mashed yams, yam chips, yam flakes and yam starches.

Root and tuber starches have unique physicochemical properties due to their amylose and amylopectin ratio.

Maize (zeamais), known in some English-speaking countries as corn. Most historians believe corn was domesticated in the Tehuacsan valley of Mexico (Bressani *et al.*, 1990). Maize is a major source of starch. Cornstarch (Maize flour) is a major ingredient in home cooking and in many industrialized food products.

African yam bean (*Sphenostylisstenocarpa*) is an industrialized tropical African tuberous legume. The utilization of African yam bean has been linked with sociocultural values in the cultures of some ethnic groups in Nigeria. There are varieties of seed color (Oshodi *et al.*, 1995) and size (Adebowale *et al.*, 2010). Protein content of AYB is up to 19% in the tubers and 29% in the seed grain.

The ratio of amylose to amylopectin, the characteristics of each fraction in terms of molecular weight, distribution and length of branching and conformation influence the viscosity of starch pasting.

Pasting properties indicate what physical changes may be expected during the processing of starchy foods. This could also enable one to modify the starches if necessary to suit product and processing demands. Therefore, the objective of the study was to evaluate the pasting characteristics of flour blends to pre-determine their potential for the manufacture of value-added products such as noodles.

42 **2.0 Materials and Methods**

43 The water yam was identified as TDA 297 and bought at National Root Crop Research Institute (NRCI), Umudike,
44 Abia State, Nigeria. The yellow maize and the cream colored African yam bean were identified and bought at
45 National Institute of Horticulture (NIHOT) Mbato sub zone, Okigwe, Imo State.

46

47 **2.1 Preparation of raw materials**

48 **2.1.1 Water yam flour**

49 Water yam was washed, peeled manually under water containing 0.20% solution of sodium metabisulphate. Slicing
50 of the water yam (3mm x 5mm) was done with a stainless knife. The sliced water yam were removed and allowed to
51 drain for 1 h under air current and dried at 60°C for 6h in a Chirana type air convection oven (Hs201A). Dried chips
52 were cooled for 2h at room temperature under air current and milled using Brabender roller mill (Model 3511A).
53 The flour sample was sieved through 0.50mm mesh size, packaged and sealed in polyethylene bag for further use.

54 **2.1.2 African yam bean flour**

55 The cream colored African yam bean seeds were sorted cleaned in an aspirator (Model: OB 125 Bindapst Hungary)
56 located at the Food Processing Laboratory of Federal Polytechnic, Mubi. Cleaned seeds were soaked for 1h at room
57 temperature. The seeds were sundried for days at (30° ± 2°C) and milled with Brabender roller mill (Model 3511A)
58 to pass through screen with 0.50mm openings. The flour was stored in an air plastic container at room temperature
59 for further use.

60 **2.1.3 Yellow maize flour**

61 The yellow maize grain were sorted, and cleaned in an aspirator (Model: OB 125 Bindapst Hungary) located at the
62 Food Processing Laboratory of Federal Polytechnic, Mubi. The cleaned maize grains were conditioned at 40°C for
63 30min in a stainless steel container. The seeds were sundried for 4 days at (30° ± 2°C) and then cracked and milled
64 with Brabender roller mill (Model 3511A). The seed coats were removed to obtain the maize flour to pass through a
65 screen with 0.50mm openings. The flour was stored in an air tight plastic container at room temperature for further
66 use.

67 **2.2 Flour blending ratio**

68 The flour from the water yam, yellow maize and African yam bean (AYB) were blended in the ratio as shown in
69 (Table 1)

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79 **Table 1: Flour blending ratio**

Coded samples	WY (%)	YM (%)	AYB (%)	Total (%)
AFK	30	40	30	100
BGL	40	30	30	100
CHM	50	20	30	100
DIN	60	10	30	100
EJO	100	0	0	100

80

81 Sample EJO = Control (100% water yam)

82 WY = Water Yam

83 YM= Yellow Maize

84 AYB= African yam bean

85 **Determination of pasting properties**

86 All determination were done in triplicates and reported as mean values. The pasting characteristics were determined
87 with a rapid viscous – analyzer (RVA), Model RVA 30+, Newport scientific, and Australia). The pasting profile was
88 read with the aid of thermocline from windows software connected to a computer (Newport Scientific, 1998).

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101 **3.0 Results**

102 The result of the pasting properties of the raw flour blends are shown in Table 2.

103

104

105

106

107 Table 2: **Pasting Properties of Water Yam, Yellow, Maize and African Yam, Bean Flour Blend**

Sample	Peak 1 (RVU)	Trough 1 (RVU)	Breakdown (RVU)	Final; Visc (RVU)	Setback (RVU)	Peak time Min	Pasting Temperature (°C)
AFK	128.50 ^b ±10.00	87.42 ^d ±0.00	41.08 ^c ±1.00	186.42 ^d ±0.00	99.00 ^d ±0.00	5.33 ^a ±5.00	82.77 ^a ±0.00
BGL	163.17 ^a ±0.00	135.00 ^a ±0.00	28.17 ^c ±0.00	243.58 ^c ±0.00	108.58 ^c ±0.00	5.48 ^a ±0.00	84.15 ^a ±0.00
CHM	166.25 ^a ±0.00	115.67 ^a ±0.00	50.58 ^a ±0.00	293.33 ^a ±0.00	177.67 ^a ±0.00	5.05 ^a ±0.00	83.60 ^a ±0.00
DIN	133.50 ^a ±0.00	133.50 ^c ±0.00	48.42 ^b ±0.00	145.25 ^c ±0.00	60.17 ^c ±10.00	5.33 ^a ±0.00	80.25 ^a ±0.00
EJO	161.17 ^a ±0.00	123.25 ^b ±1.00	37.92 ^d ±1.00	247.33 ^b ±0.00	124.08 ^b ±0.00	5.49 ^a ±0.00	80.45 ^a ±1.00

108

109 Values are mean of triplicate determination ± standard deviation. Means with the same superscript within the
 110 column are not significantly (P>0.05) different from each other.

111 Keys

112 Sample: WY: YM: AYB

113 AFK = 30: 40: 30

114 BGL = 40: 30: 30

115 CHM = 50: 20: 30

116 DIN = 60: 10: 30

117 EJO = 100% WY

118 The result showed that the peak viscosity (PV) of the flour blends ranged from 128.50 to 166.25RVU, with sample
 119 CHM having the highest value, while sample AFK had the least peak viscosity. The peak viscosity of the flour
 120 Samples BGL, CHM and EJO were not statistically (p>0.05) different from one another but were statistically
 121 (p>0.05) higher than other flour samples. Trough value ranged from 85.08 to 135.00RVU with flour sample EJO
 122 having the highest value, while flour sample DIN had the least value. All the flour samples statistically (p>0.05)
 123 different from one another in trough value. Increase in yellow maize substitution in the flour blend might have
 124 increased the trough except at 30% inclusion. The Break down viscosity values ranged from 28.17 to 50.58RVU
 125 with flour sample CHM having the highest value, while flour sample BGL had the least break down value. All the
 126 flour samples statistically (p>0.05) differed from one another in breakdown viscosity. The final viscosity values
 127 ranged 145.25 to 293.33RVU with flour sample CHM having the highest value, while flour sample DIN had the
 128 least value. All the flour samples statistically (p>0.05) differed from one another in final viscosity. Addition of
 129 yellow maize and African yam bean reduced the final viscosity except in sample CHM. The set-back values ranged
 130 from 60.17 to 177.67RVU, with flour sample CHM having the highest value, while flour sample DIN had the least
 131 value. All the flour samples statistically (p>0.05) differed from one another in setback viscosity. Addition of yellow
 132 maize and African yam bean might have reduced the setback viscosity except in sample CHM. The final viscosity,
 133 and set back viscosity of the samples appear to follow the same trend with inclusion of yellow maize and African

134 yam bean in the flour blend. The peak time setting values ranged from 5.05 to 5.49 minutes, with flour sample EJO
135 having the highest value, while sample CHM had the least value. There was no statistical ($p>0.05$) difference in the
136 peak time of the flour blends. Addition of yellow maize and African yam bean resulted in a definite but insignificant
137 ($p>0.05$) decrease in peak time. The pasting temperature values ranged from 80.25 to 84.15°C, with sample BGL
138 having the highest value (84.15), while flour sample DIN had the least value (80.25). There was no statistical
139 ($p>0.05$) difference in the pasting temperature of the flour samples.

140

141 **4.0 Discussion**

142 **4.1 Raw flour Peak viscosity (RVU)**

143 The peak viscosity of the raw water yam flour and the blends are shown in Table 2 The raw flour peak viscosity
144 ranged from 128.50 -166.17 (RVU). The observed peak viscosity value of water yam in this study was higher than
145 the earlier reported value (Adetutu, 2011) but lower than another report by Baah et al. (2009). Anuonye and Saad
146 (2015) suggested that the variation is likely due to differences in analytical viscometers and yam varieties. High
147 peak viscosity is an indication of high starch content and also related to water binding capacity of starch. Water yam
148 starches have been reported to have high peak viscosity (Anuonye and Saad, 2015). The values of peak viscosity
149 observed for the composite flours was lower in this study than that reported by (Adebowale et al. 2010). Lower
150 values of peak viscosity indicated that a greater amount of gelatinization had occurred in the initial samples or there
151 had been fortification of flours with legumes or oilseeds. The presence of African yam bean flour at 30% levels
152 therefore could have contributed to the lowering of the raw blend peak viscosity.

153 Peak viscosity is the ability of starch to swell freely before their physical breakdown. According to Baah et al.
154 (2009) peak viscosity as the name implies, is the maximum viscosity attained soon after starch slurry become
155 viscous due to starch granule swelling and leaching out of soluble component into solution.

156 Ingbiam (2004) also reported that peak viscosity indicated the water binding capacity of starch or blend, and
157 provides indication of the viscous load likely to be encountered by a mixing cooker. The lower peak viscosity
158 especially with samples AFK and DIN of the composite flour was perhaps due to the protein and fat content as a
159 result of blending. This is similar to the finding of Dautant et al. (2007).

160

161 **4.2 Raw flour trough (RVU)**

162 The trough viscosity of the raw water yam flour and the blends are shown in Table 2 The raw flour trough in this
163 study ranged from 85.08 – 135.00RVU. this was comparable to earlier work reported by Faustina (2009). However,
164 trough viscosity observed in this study for composite flour was lower than the values reported by (Idowu, 2015);
165 Adebowale et al., 2010). The trough is the minimum viscosity value at constant temperature phase of the RVA
166 profile and measure the ability of paste to withstand breakdown during cooling (Adebowale et al., 2008; Anuonye
167 and Saad, 2015). The flour with high trough value appears to be a superior quality flour sample for products like
168 noodles. However, a low trough value was recorded for yam flour and the various blends in this study. This might
169 have been as a result of denatured native starch structure and the high protein content of the composite flour

170 samples. The trough, also called, shear holding strength, hot paste viscosity or paste stability is often associated with
171 a breakdown in viscosity (Ragaee et al., 2006).

172 **4.3 Raw flour breakdown**

173 The breakdown viscosity of the raw water yam flour and the blends are shown in Table 2 The raw flour breakdown
174 viscosity in this study ranged from 28.17 – 50.58(RVU). The values observed for water yam in this study was closed
175 to the values reported earlier (Oke et al., 2013; Faustina, 2009). The observed minimal variation was probably
176 because of the difference storage period, climatic conditions, edaphic and biotic factors of water yam. Similarly, the
177 values for composite flours in this study fell within the range of earlier reported values. (Adebowale et al., 2008;
178 Onwurafor et al., 2016). Breakdown is peak viscosity minus trough viscosity in RVU and it is regarded as a measure
179 of the degree of disintegration of granules or paste stability (Dengate, 1984, Fernanadez and Berry, 1989, Newport
180 scientific, 1998, Oluwalana et al., 2011). Adebowale et al (2005) reported that the higher the breakdown in viscosity,
181 the lower sample could be target for industrial use because of hot paste stability. The composite flour developed in
182 this study appeared to have potential for hot paste stability.

183 **4.4 Raw flour final viscosity (RVU)**

184 The final viscosity of the raw water yam flour and the blends are shown in Table 2 The raw flour final viscosity
185 value in this study ranged from 145.25 – 293.3RVU. The value observed for water yam flour in this study was
186 higher than the value reported by (Adetutu, 2011, Otegbayo, 2014) but was comparable to the reported value by
187 Wireko-manu et al (2011). The values breakdown flour (Adebowale et al., 2008). Final viscosity is the most
188 commonly used parameter to define the quality of a particular starch-base sample, as it indicate the ability of the
189 material to form a viscous paste or gel after cooking and cooling as well as the resistance of the paste to shear force
190 during stirring (Adeyemi and Idowu, 1990). Lower amount of water yam flour which translates to higher inclusion
191 of yellow maize flour resulted to increase in the final viscosity of the composite flour. The marked increase observed
192 in the composite flour of sample CHM might be due to the alignment of the chains of amylase in the combined
193 starch. Shimelis et al (2006) reported that less ability of starch paste or gel after cooling is commonly accomplished
194 with high value of breakdown. This imply that composite flour of sample CHM will be less stable after cooling
195 compared to other flour sample.

196 **4.5 Raw flour Set back viscosity (RVU)**

197 The setback viscosity of the raw water yam flour and the blends are shown in Table2. The raw flour set back
198 viscosity value in this study range from 60.17 – 177.67 RVU. The value observed for water yam flour in this study
199 was within the earlier reported values (Adebowale et al., 2010; Adeowale et al 2008) and observed differences might
200 be due to differences in the research materials. Generally, the addition of maize and African yam bean “diluted” the
201 setback viscosity of the composite flour in this study. Set back viscosity is a stage where retrogradation or re-
202 ordering of starch molecule occurs (Adebowale et al, 2008). Adeyemi and Idowu (1990) reported that the higher the
203 setback value, the lower the retrogradation during cooling and the lower the staling rate of the products made from
204 the starch has a high set back as a result of retrogradationcompares with other root and tuber crops (Mali et al.,
205 2003). Generally the tendency of yam starch paste to retrograde may be a limiting factor for its use in food
206 industries.

207 However, addition of maize and African yam bean in making composite will exhibit higher resistance to
208 retrogradation. Hence the firming up of water yam flour improved the pasting profile. Set back viscosity has been
209 correlated with the texture of the various products and high setback is also associated with syneresis or weeping
210 during freeze/thaw cycles (Maziya-Dixon et al., 2007). Certain food productions, such as noodles and pounded yam
211 will require retrogradation which are characterized by high set back, high viscosity, high paste stability (lawal,
212 2004). Otegbayo, (2014) reported that implication of the high set back viscosity of stored yam is that their starched
213 will have greater tendency to retrograde tgs will be more useful as ingredients in products such as noodles where
214 starch retrogradation is desired.

215

216 **4.6 Raw flour Peak time**

217 The peak time of the raw water yam flour and their blends are shown in Table 2. The raw flour peak time value in
218 this study ranged from 5.05 – 5.49 minute. The observed time in this study for water yam flour was comparable to
219 the values reported in an earlier study by Oke et al. (2013) for different varieties of water yam flour. Similarly, the
220 observed values for composite flour in this study was comparable to the value reported earlier (Anuonye and Saad
221 2015). The peak time, which is a measure of the cooking time, was not generally influenced by the addition of other
222 materials on the water yam flour. However, this was not the case with earlier studies as reported by (Adebowale et
223 al., 2008; Anuonye and Saad, 2015).

224 **4.7 Raw flour Pasting Temperature**

225 The pasting temperature of the raw water yam flour and the blends are shown in Table 2. The raw flour pasting
226 temperature value in this study ranged from 80.25 – 85.15°C. The values observed for water yam flour in this study
227 was comparable to earlier study by Oke et al. (2010). The values observed for composite flour in this study fell
228 within earlier reported range (Idowu, 2015; Anuonye and Saad, 2015). When starch or starch-based foods are heated
229 in water beyond a critical temperature, the granules absorb a large amount of water at the critical temperature, which
230 is characteristics of a particular starch; the starch undergoes an irreversible process known as gelatinization. This is
231 characterized by enormous swelling, increased viscosity, translucency and solubility, and loss of anisotropy
232 (birefringence) Shimelis et al., 2006; Ikegwu et al., 2010). The temperature at the onset of this rise in viscosity is
233 referred to as the pasting temperature (Adebowale et al. 2008). Ikegwu et al (2009) reported that pasting temperature
234 is one of the pasting properties which provide an indication of the minimum temperature is for sample cooking,
235 energy cost involved and other components stability. For technical and economic reasons, starches/flours with lower
236 pasting time and temperature may be more preferred when all other properties are equal (Iwuoh, 2004; Baah et al.,
237 2009). Gelatinization and pasting of starch/flour are of great importance to the food industry in particular because
238 they influence the texture, stability and digestibility of starchy foods and, thus, determine the application and use of
239 starch/flour in various food products (Oke et al., 2013).

240

241

242

243

244 **5.0 Conclusion**

245 The pasting characteristics of the flour blend varied significantly. The decrease in some pasting characteristics of
246 some blends are attributed to the interaction of starch with protein fat from the added African yam bean.

247 The pasting properties obtained indicates that flour have useful technological properties for many applications in
248 food processing.

249

250

REFERENCE

251

252

253 Adebowale A. A., Sanni L. O. and Fadahunsi E. I (2010) functional and pasting characteristic of cassava sweet
254 potato stored bled pro 11th ISTRC congo 4-8 October.

255 Adebowale A. A., Snni, S. A and Oldapo, F. O (2008): Chemical, functional and sensory properties of instinct yam-
256 bread flour Nigeria food journal, Vol 26(q) 2008 Pp 2-12.

257

258 Adebowale, Y. A. Adeyemi, I. AOshodi A. (2005) Functional and Physiochemical Properties of Six Mucuna
259 Species Afri J. Biotechnol (12) 1461-68.

260 Adetutu, A. Y (2011). Development of reconstituable yam/cassava flour enriched with soybean flour for pounded
261 yam preparation. Project submitted to the department of Animal Production (Food Science and Nutrition
262 option), School of Agriculture and Agricultural Technology, Federal University of technology, mina, Niger
263 State Nigeria.

264

265 Adeyemi, A. A. and idowu, M. A (1990). Evaluation of pregelatinized Maize flour in the development of maissa- ab
266 baked product. No Food Journal, 8:63-73.

267

268 Anuonye J. C and Saad M. F (2015) Improvement of the pasting properties of yam flour/cassava starch blend
269 enriched with soybean flour for preparation of yam meal. American journal of food science and Nutrition
270 Research 2015; 2(2): 40-46.

271

272

273 Baah F. D. Maziya Dixon B, Asiedu, R. Oduro I, Ellis W. O (2009) Nutritional and Biochemical composition of D.
274 alataDiosoreaSpp) tubers J. Food Agric. Environ. Vol. 28 No 2 Pp 25-31.

275

276

277 Bressani, R. Benavides, V. Accvedo. O & Ortiz. M. A., (1990) Changes in selective nutritional content and in
278 protein quality of common and quality protein maize during tortilla preparation cereal, 67(6): 515-518

279

280 Dautant, F. J. Simancas, K, Sandoual A. J. and Muller, A. J. (2007), Effect of temperature moisture, and lipid
281 content on rheological properties of rice flour. Journal of Food Engineering 78:1159-1166.

282

283

284 Dengate, H. N. (1984). Swelling, Pasting and gelling of wheat starch. IniPomeran, Z.Y (ed) Adv Cereal Science
285 Technology AACC, USA, PP 49-82 Bewport Scientific (1998). Application manual for the Rapid Visco
286 Analyzer using thormocline for windows, Newport Scientific Pty Ltd. 1/2 Apollo stree. Warrewood Now
287 2102, Australia. Pp 2-026.

288 Faustina D. Baah (2009) Characterization of water yam (Dioscoreaalata) for existing and Potential food products. A
289 PhD. Thesis submitted to the department of Food Science and Technology Kwama Nkrumah University of
290 Science and Technology June 2009.

291

292

293 Fernandez, L. M and Berry J. W. (1989). Rheological properties of flour and sensory characteristics of bread made
294 from flour Technology 24: 103-110.

295
296
297 Idowu, Atinuke (2015) Chemical Composition, Sensory and Pasting Properties of Lends of Maize-African Yam
298 Bean Seed. *Journal of Nutritional health and Food Science* 3(3): 1-6
299
300 Ikegwu, O. J. Okoli, E. C., Odo, M. O and Ugwu, F. M. (2009). Effect of toasting time on the chemical composition
301 functional and pasting properties of “Achi” *Brachystegia eurycoma* flour. *African J. of food science and Tech.*
302 (in press).
303 Ikegwu, O. J., Okechukwu, p. E. and EkumanKaria, E. O (2010). Physio-chemical and Pasting characteristics of
304 flour and starch from Achi (*Brachystegia eurycoma*. *Seed J. Food Technology* 8 (2): 58-66.
305
306 Ingbian, E. K. (2004) characterization of physical, chemical and microbiological properties of manu, roasted maize
307 meal. Ph. D Thesis, university of Ibadan, PP: 112-193.
308
309
310 Iwuoha C. I. (2004). Comparative evaluation of physio-chemical qualities of flours from steam processed yam
311 tubers *food chem.* 85: 541-551.
312 Oke M. O. Aworinorin and T. S Worknch (2013). Effect of varieties on physiochemical; and *Biotechnology Vol.*
313 1200 Pp 1250-1258.
314 Lawal O. S (2004). Composition, Physico-chemical Properties and retrogradation characteristics native, oxidized
315 acetylated and acid-thinned new cocoyam (*xanthosomasagittifolium*) starch *food chemical* 87: 205-218.
316 Mali, S., Ferrero, C. Redigonda, V. Beleia., A. P grossman, M. V. F Zaritzky, N. E., (2003) Influence of PH and
317 hydrocolloids addition on yam (*Dioscoria alata* starch pastes stability bebesmitted. *Wissenschaft and*
318 *technologies* 36, 475-481
319 Maziya-Dixon, B., AG. O Dixon and A. AAdebowale (2007). Targetting different and uses of cassava: genotypic
320 varieties for cynogenic potentials and pasting properties. *Internation of Food Science and Technology*, 42 (8):
321 969-976.
322
323 Newport Scientific (1998). Application Manual for the rapidvisco analyzer using thernocline for windows, Australia
324 pg 2-26.
325
326
327 Oke. M. O., Awinorin S. O., Saani L. O. Asiedu R. Aiyedun, P. O (2010). Effect of extrusion variables on extrdates
328 properties of water an flours in a response surface analysis. In: *Proceeding of the 11th ISTR-AB Synoposlum*
329 *4-8th October, Kinshaba DR Congo.*
330 Oluwalana, I. B, Oluwamukomi M. O, Fagbemi, T. N. and Oluwafemi, F. I. (2011): Effects of temperature and
331 period of blanching on the pasting and functional properties of planatain (*Musa Perasidiaca*) flour. *Journal of*
332 *stored products and postharvest Research Vol.2(2), Pp. 166-169,1.*
333 Onwurafor, E. U., Onweluzo, J. C. and uzodinma, E. O. (2016). Chemical Properties of fermented maize -m-
334 ngbean melt complementary foods fortified with vegetable and crayfish powder –proceedings of the 40th
335 Conference of NIFST 24th – 26th October 2016 pp 157 Coronation Hall, Government house, Kano, Kano
336 State.
337 Oshodi, A. U., Ipiamoroti. K. O., Adoyoyo E. I and Hall G. M (1995). In vitro multiaurymdigestibility of protein of
338 food and *Agriculture* 69:373-377.
339 Otegbayo, B. O (2014) Effect of storage on the pasting characteristics of fresh yam (*Dioscoreaspp*) as indicators of
340 textural guality in a major food products pounded yam *food chemical* 99, 663-669.
341
342
343 Ragaee, E. S., and Abel and Aal. E. M. (2006). Pasting properties of starch and protein in selected cereals and
344 quality of their food product *food chemistry* 95(1) 9-18.
345 Shimelis, E. Meaza, M. and Rakshit. S. (2006) Physico-chemical Properties posting behavior and functional
346 characteristics of flour and starch from improved bean (*phascolusvugalisvarieties/crown* in EAST African A.
347 *Journal of Agricultural Engineering International.*, 8:1-8.
348
349

350 Wireko-Manu, F. D., Ellis, W. O., I, Oduro, R. Asedu and Maziya-Dixon B: (2011): Physico chemical and pasting
351 characteristics of water yam (*D. alata*) in Comparison with Pona C. (*D. rofundata*) from Ghana. European
352 Journal of Food Research and Review 1 (3): 149-158.

353

354 Zhang; T. and Oates, C. G (1999). Relationship between amylase degradation and physiochemical properties of
355 sweet potato starches. Food chemistry, 65: 157-163.

356

357

UNDER PEER REVIEW