

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

### 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 and yellow maize

### 1.0 Introduction

Water yam (*Dioscorea alata* 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 (*Dioscorea alata* 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 (*zea mays*), is known in some English-speaking countries as corn. Most historians believe corn was domesticated in the Tehuacan 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 (*Sphenostylis stenocarpa*) 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 (Zhang and Oates, 1999).

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 AFK= 30 % WY:40 % YM:30 % AYB

86 BGL=40 % WY : 30 % YM :30 % AYB

87 CHEM = 50 % WY : 20 % YM : 30 % AYB

88 DIN = 60 % WY : 10 % YM : 30 % AYB

89 **2.3 Determination of pasting properties**

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

93 **2.4 Statistical Analysis**

94 The experimental design was a 3 x 3 factorial in Complete Randomized Design (CRD) where the three flour sources  
 95 and their combination ratios were the two factors under consideration. Data generated from the study were subjected  
 96 to Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and means separated using FLsd<sub>0.05</sub> with SPSS version 22.0

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107  
 108  
 109  
 110  
 111  
 112  
 113  
 114

**3.0 Results**

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

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 <sup>b</sup> ±1.00	87.42 <sup>d</sup> ±0.00	41.08 <sup>c</sup> ±1.00	186.42 <sup>d</sup> ±0.00	99.00 <sup>d</sup> ±0.00	5.33 <sup>a</sup> ±5.00	82.77 <sup>a</sup> ±0.00
BGL	163.17 <sup>a</sup> ±0.00	135.00 <sup>a</sup> ±0.00	28.17 <sup>c</sup> ±0.00	243.58 <sup>c</sup> ±0.00	108.58 <sup>c</sup> ±0.00	5.48 <sup>a</sup> ±0.00	84.15 <sup>a</sup> ±0.00
CHM	166.25 <sup>a</sup> ±0.00	115.67 <sup>a</sup> ±0.00	50.58 <sup>a</sup> ±0.00	293.33 <sup>a</sup> ±0.00	177.67 <sup>a</sup> ±0.00	5.05 <sup>a</sup> ±0.00	83.60 <sup>a</sup> ±0.00
DIN	133.50 <sup>a</sup> ±0.00	133.50 <sup>c</sup> ±0.00	48.42 <sup>b</sup> ±0.00	145.25 <sup>c</sup> ±0.00	60.17 <sup>c</sup> ±10.00	5.33 <sup>a</sup> ±0.00	80.25 <sup>a</sup> ±0.00
EJO	161.17 <sup>a</sup> ±0.00	123.25 <sup>b</sup> ±1.00	37.92 <sup>d</sup> ±1.00	247.33 <sup>b</sup> ±0.00	124.08 <sup>b</sup> ±0.00	5.49 <sup>a</sup> ±0.00	80.45 <sup>a</sup> ±1.00

115 Where Visc = Viscosity

116 Values are mean of triplicate determination ± standard deviation. Means with the same superscript within the  
 117 column are not significantly (p<0.05) different from each other.

118 Keys

119 Sample EJO = Control (100% water yam)

120 WY = Water Yam

121 YM= Yellow Maize

122 AYB= African yam bean

123 AFK= 30 % WY:40 % YM:30 % AYB

124 BGL=40 % WY : 30 % YM :30 % AYB

125 CHEM = 50 % WY : 20 % YM : 30 % AYB

126 DIN = 60 % WY : 10 % YM : 30 % AYB

127 The result showed that the peak viscosity (PV) of the flour blends ranged from 128.50 to 166.25RVU, with sample  
 128 CHM having the highest value, while sample AFK had the least peak viscosity. The peak viscosity of the flour  
 129 Samples BGL, CHM and EJO were not significantly (p > 0.05) different from one another but were statistically (p >  
 130 0.05) higher than other flour samples. Trough value ranged from 85.08 to 135.00RVU with flour sample EJO having  
 131 the highest value, while flour sample DIN had the least value. All the flour samples statistically (p > 0.05) different  
 132 from one another in trough value. Increase in yellow maize substitution in the flour blend might have increased the  
 133 trough except at 30% inclusion. The Break down viscosity values ranged from 28.17 to 50.58RVU with flour

134 sample CHM having the highest value, while flour sample BGL had the least break down value. All the flour  
135 samples significantly ( $p > 0.05$ ) differed from one another in breakdown viscosity. The final viscosity values ranged  
136 145.25 to 293.33RVU with flour sample CHM having the highest value, while flour sample DIN had the least value.  
137 All the flour samples significantly ( $p > 0.05$ ) differed from one another in final viscosity. Addition of yellow maize  
138 and African yam bean reduced the final viscosity except in sample CHM. The set-back values ranged from 60.17 to  
139 177.67RVU, with flour sample CHM having the highest value, while flour sample DIN had the least value. All the  
140 flour samples significantly ( $p > 0.05$ ) differed from one another in setback viscosity. Addition of yellow maize and  
141 African yam bean might have reduced the setback viscosity except in sample CHM. The final viscosity, and set back  
142 viscosity of the samples appear to follow the same trend with inclusion of yellow maize and African yam bean in the  
143 flour blends. The peak time setting values ranged from 5.05 to 5.49 minutes, with flour sample EJO having the  
144 highest value, while sample CHM had the least value. There was no statistical ( $p > 0.05$ ) difference in the peak time  
145 of the flour blends. Addition of yellow maize and African yam bean resulted in a definite but insignificant ( $p > 0.05$ )  
146 decrease in peak time. The pasting temperature values ranged from 80.25 to 84.15°C, with sample BGL having the  
147 highest value (84.15), while flour sample DIN had the least value (80.25). There was no significantly ( $p > 0.05$ )  
148 difference in the pasting temperature of the flour samples.

149

## 150 **4.0 Discussion**

### 151 **4.1 Peak viscosity of raw flour (RVU)**

152 The peak viscosity of the raw water yam flour and the blends are shown in Table 2. The raw flour peak viscosity  
153 ranged from 128.50 -166.17 (RVU). The observed peak viscosity value of water yam in this study was higher than  
154 the earlier reported value of 117.45 – 124.88 RVU (Adetutu, 2011) but lower than the range of 131.56 – 178.05  
155 RVU as reported by Baah et al. (2009). Anuonye and Saad (2015) suggested that the variation is likely due to  
156 differences in analytical viscometers and yam varieties. High peak viscosity is an indication of high starch content  
157 and also related to water binding capacity of starch. Water yam starches have been reported to have high peak  
158 viscosity (Anuonye and Saad, 2015). The values of peak viscosity observed for the composite flours were lower in  
159 this study than that reported by (Adebowale et al. 2010). Lower values of peak viscosity indicated that a greater  
160 amount of gelatinization had occurred in the initial samples or there had been fortification of flours with legumes or  
161 oilseeds. The presence of African yam bean flour at 30% levels therefore could have contributed to the lowering of  
162 the raw blend peak viscosity.

163 Peak viscosity is the ability of starch to swell freely before their physical breakdown. According to Baah et al.  
164 (2009) peak viscosity as the name implies, is the maximum viscosity attained soon after starch slurry become  
165 viscous due to starch granule swelling and leaching out of soluble component into solution.

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

170

#### 171 **4.2 Trough of the raw flour (RVU)**

172 The trough viscosity of the raw water yam flour and the blends are shown in Table 2 The raw flour trough in this  
173 study ranged from 85.08 – 135.00RVU. This result is similar to earlier work by Faustina (2009), who reported  
174 RVU value of range 80.13 – 141.02. However, trough viscosity observed in this study for composite flour was lower  
175 than the values reported by (Idowu, 2015); Adebowale et al., 2010). The trough is the minimum viscosity value at  
176 constant temperature phase of the RVA profile and measure the ability of paste to withstand breakdown during  
177 cooling (Adebowale et al., 2008; Anuonye and Saad, 2015). The flour with high trough value appears to be a  
178 superior quality flour sample for products like noodles. However, a low trough value was recorded for yam flour and  
179 the various blends in this study. This might have been as a result of denatured native starch structure and the high  
180 protein content of the composite flour samples. The trough, also called, shear holding strength, hot paste viscosity or  
181 paste stability is often associated with a breakdown in viscosity (Ragae et al., 2006).

#### 182 **4.3 Breakdown viscosity of the raw flour**

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

#### 193 **4.4 Final viscosity of the raw flour (RVU)**

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

#### 205 **4.5 Setback viscosity of the raw flours (RVU)**

206 The setback viscosity of the raw water yam flour and the blends are shown in Table 2. The raw flour set back  
207 viscosity value in this study range from 60.17 – 177.67 RVU. The value observed for water yam flour in this study  
208 was within the earlier reported values (Adebowale et al., 2010; Adeowale et al 2008) and observed differences might  
209 be due to differences in the research materials. Generally, the addition of maize and African yam bean “diluted” the  
210 setback viscosity of the composite flour in this study. Set back viscosity is a stage where retrogradation or re-  
211 ordering of starch molecule occurs (Adebowale et al, 2008). Adeyemi and Idowu (1990) reported that the higher the  
212 setback value, the lower the retrogradation during cooling and the lower the staling rate of the products made from  
213 the starch has a high set back as a result of retrogradation compares with other root and tuber crops (Mali et al.,  
214 2003). Generally, the tendency of yam starch paste to retrograde may be a limiting factor for its use in food  
215 industries.

216 However, addition of maize and African yam bean in making composite will exhibit higher resistance to  
217 retrogradation. Hence the firming up of water yam flour improved the pasting profile. Set back viscosity has been  
218 correlated with the texture of the various products and high setback is also associated with syneresis or weeping  
219 during freeze/thaw cycles (Maziya-Dixon et al., 2007). Certain food productions, such as noodles and pounded yam  
220 will require retrogradation which are characterized by high set back, high viscosity, high paste stability (Lawal,  
221 2004). Otegbayo (2014) reported that implication of the high set back viscosity of stored yam is that their starched  
222 will have greater tendency to retrograde, thus will be more useful as ingredients in products such as noodles where  
223 starch retrogradation is desired.

224

#### 225 **4.6 Peak time of the raw flour samples**

226 The peak time of the raw water yam flour and their blends are shown in Table 2. The raw flour peak time value in  
227 this study ranged from 5.05 – 5.49 minutes. The observed time in this study for water yam flour was comparable to  
228 the values reported in an earlier study by Oke et al. (2013) for different varieties of water yam flour. Similarly, the  
229 observed values for composite flour in this study was comparable to the value reported earlier (Anuonye and Saad  
230 2015). The peak time, which is a measure of the cooking time, was not generally influenced by the addition of other  
231 materials on the water yam flour. However, this was not the case with earlier studies as reported by (Adebowale et  
232 al., 2008; Anuonye and Saad, 2015).

#### 233 **4.7 Pasting temperature of the raw flour samples**

234 The pasting temperature of the raw water yam flour and the blends are shown in Table 2. The values of the pasting  
235 temperature of the raw flour samples ranged from 80.25 – 85.15 °C. The values observed for water yam flour in this  
236 study was comparable to earlier study by Oke et al. (2010). The values observed for composite flour in this study  
237 fell within earlier reported range (Idowu, 2015; Anuonye and Saad, 2015). When starch or starch-based foods are  
238 heated in water beyond a critical temperature, the granules absorb a large amount of water at the critical  
239 temperature, which is characteristics of a particular starch; the starch undergoes an irreversible process known as  
240 gelatinization. This is characterized by enormous swelling, increased viscosity, translucency and solubility, and loss  
241 of anisotropy (birefringence) Shimelis et al., 2006; Ikegwu et al., 2010). The temperature at the onset of this rise in  
242 viscosity is referred to as the pasting temperature (Adebowale et al. 2008). Ikegwu et al (2009) reported that pasting

243 temperature is one of the pasting properties which provide an indication of the minimum temperature is for sample  
244 cooking, energy cost involved and other components stability. For technical and economic reasons, starches/flours  
245 with lower pasting time and temperature may be more preferred when all other properties are equal (Iwuoha, 2004;  
246 Baah et al., 2009). Gelatinization and pasting of starch/flour are of great importance to the food industry in particular  
247 because they influence the texture, stability and digestibility of starchy foods and, thus, determine the application  
248 and use of starch/flour in various food products (Oke et al., 2013).

249

250

251

252

## 253 **5.0 Conclusion**

254 The pasting characteristics of the flour blends varied significantly. The decrease in some pasting characteristics of  
255 some blends was attributed to the interaction of starch with protein, and fat from the added African yam bean seed  
256 flour. The pasting properties obtained indicated that these flour samples have useful technological properties for  
257 many applications in food processing such as noodles and other pasta products. It is therefore recommended that for  
258 profitable and cost effective pasta products productions in the tropics, different combinations of water yam, yellow  
259 maize and African yam beans should be used as viable alternative to wheat flour.

260

## 261 **REFERENCE**

262

263

264 Adebowale A. A., Sanni L. O. and Fadahunsi E. I (2010). Functional and pasting characteristic of cassava sweet  
265 potato stored blend for 11<sup>th</sup> ISTRC congo 4-8 October.

266 Adebowale A. A., Sanni, S. A and Oldapo, F. O (2008): Chemical, functional and sensory properties of instant yam-  
267 bread flour Nigeria food journal, Vol 26(q) 2008 Pp 2-12.

268

269 Adebowale, Y. A. Adeyemi, I. A. Oshodi A. (2005). Functional and Physiochemical Properties of Six Mucuna  
270 Species *Afri J. Biotechnol* (12) 1461-68.

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

275

276 Adeyemi, A. A. and idowu, M. A (1990). Evaluation of pregelatinized Maize flour in the development of maissa- ab  
277 baked product. *Nig. Food Journal*, 8:63-73.

278

279 Anuonye J. C and Saad M. F (2015) Improvement of the pasting properties of yam flour/cassava starch blend  
280 enriched with soybean flour for preparation of yam meal. *American Journal of Food Science and Nutrition  
281 Research* 2015; 2(2): 40-46.

282

283

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

286

287



288 Bressani, R. Benavides, V. Accvedo. O & Ortiz. M. A., (1990) Changes in selective nutritional content and in  
289 protein quality of common and quality protein maize during tortilla preparation. *J. Cereal*, 67(6): 515-518  
290

291 Dautant, F. J. Simancas, K, Sandoual A. J. and Muller, A. J. (2007), Effect of temperature moisture, and lipid  
292 content on rheological properties of rice flour. *Journal of Food Engineering* 78:1159-1166.  
293  
294

295 Dengate, H. N. (1984). Swelling, Pasting and gelling of wheat starch. In: Pomeroy, Z.Y (ed) *Adv Cereal Science*  
296 *Technology* AACC, USA, PP 49-82 Newport Scientific (1998). Application manual for the Rapid Visco  
297 Analyzer using thernocline for windows, Newport Scientific Pty Ltd. 1/2 Apollo stree. Warrewood Now  
298 2102, Australia. Pp 2-026.

299 Faustina D. B. (2009) Characterization of water yam (*Dioscoreaalata*) for existing and Potential food products. A  
300 PhD. Thesis submitted to the department of Food Science and Technology Kwama Nkrumah University of  
301 Science and Technology June 2009.  
302  
303

304 Fernandez, L. M and Berry J. W. (1989). Rheological properties of flour and sensory characteristics of bread made  
305 from flour, *Technology* 24: 103-110.  
306  
307

308 Idowu, A. (2015) Chemical Composition, Sensory and Pasting Properties of Lends of Maize-African Yam Bean  
309 Seed. *Journal of Nutritional health and Food Science* 3(3): 1-6  
310

311 Ikegwu, O. J. Okoli, E. C., Odo, M. O and Ugwu, F. M. (2009). Effect of toasting time on the chemical composition  
312 functional and pasting properties of "Achi" *Brachystegiaeurycoma* flour. *African J. of food science and Tech.*  
313 2(4) : 217 -226.

314 Ikegwu, O. J., Okechukwu, p. E. and EkumanKaria, E. O (2010). Physio-chemical and Pasting characteristics of  
315 flour and starch from Achi (*Brachystegiaeurycoma*. *Seed J. Food Technology* 8 (2): 58-66.  
316

317 Ingbian, E. K. (2004) characterization of physical, chemical and microbiological properties of manu, roasted maize  
318 meal. Ph. D Thesis, university of Ibadan, Pp: 112-193.  
319

320 Iwuoha C. I. (2004). Comparative evaluation of physio-chemical qualities of flours from steam processed yam  
321 tubers, *Food chem.* 85: 541-551.

322 Oke M. O. Aworinorin and T. S Worknch (2013). Effect of processing of water yam varieties on physiochemical  
323 properties. *Biotechnology Vol. 1200 Pp 1250-1258*.

324 Lawal O. S (2004). Composition, Physico-chemical Properties and retrogradation characteristics native, oxidized  
325 acctylated and acid-thinned new cocoyam (*xanthosomasagitifolium*) starch food chemical 87: 205-218.

326 Mali, S., Ferrero, C. Redigonda, V. Beleia., A. P grossman, M. V. F Zartizky, N. E., (2003) Influence of PH and  
327 hydrocosloids addition on yam (*Dioscoriaaalata* starch pastes stability bebesmitted. *Wissenschaft and*  
328 *Technologies* 36, 475-481

329 Maziya-Dixon, B., AG. O Dixon and A. AAdebowale (2007). Targetting different and uses of cassava: genotypic  
330 varieties for cynogenic potentials and pasting properties. *International Journal of Food Science and*  
331 *Technology*, 42 (8): 969-976.  
332

333 Newport Scientific (1998). Application Manual for the rapidvisco analyzer using thernocline for windows, Australia  
334 pg 2-26.  
335  
336

337 Oke. M. O., Awinorin S. O., Saani L. O. Asiedu R. Aiyedun, P. O (2010). Effect of extrusion variables on extrdates  
338 properties of water an flours in a response surface analysis. In: Proceeding of the 11<sup>th</sup> ISTR-AB Synoposlum  
339 4-8<sup>th</sup> October, Kinshaba DR Congo.

340 Oluwalana, I. B, Oluwamukomi M. O, Fagbemi, T. N. and Oluwafemi, F. I. (2011): Effects of temperature and  
341 period of blanching on the pasting and functional properties of planatain (*Musa Perasidiaca*) flour. *Journal of*  
342 *stored products and postharvest Research* Vol.2(2), Pp. 166-169,1.

343 Onwurafor, E. U., Onweluzo, J. C. and uzodinma, E. O. (2016). Chemical Properties of fermented maize -m–ngbean  
344 melt complementary foods fortified with vegetable and crayfish powder –proceedings of the 40<sup>th</sup> Conference  
345 of NIFST 24<sup>th</sup> – 26<sup>th</sup> October 2016 pp 157 Coronation Hall, Government house, Kano, Kano State.

346 Oshodi, A. U., Ipiamoroti. K. O., Adoyoyo E. I and Hall G. M (1995). In vitro multiaurymdigestibility of protein of  
347 food and Agriculture 69:373-377.

348 Otegbayo, B. O (2014) Effect of storage on the pasting characteristics of fresh yam (*Dioscorea*spp) as indicators of  
349 textural quality in a major food products pounded yam food chemical 99, 663-669.

350

351

352 Ragaae, E. S., and Abel and Aal. E. M. (2006). Pasting properties of starch and protein in selected cereals and  
353 quality of their food product. *Food Chemistry* 95(1) 9-18.

354 Shimelis, E. Meaza, M. and Rakshit. S. (2006) Physico-chemical Properties posting behavior and functional  
355 characteristics of flour and starch from improved bean (*phascolusvugalisvarities/crown*, *EAST African A.*  
356 *Journal of Agricultural Engineering International.*, 8:1-8.

357

358

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

362

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

365

366