

Original Research Article
**Evaluation of Microbial and Nutritional Quality of
Fermented Dried Roasted Thick Porridge (*Mkarango*)**

ABSTRACT

Aims: The aim of this study was to evaluate the population of lactic acid bacteria, and sensory characteristics of dried roasted thick porridge (*mkarango*).

Methodology: Five (5) products with addition of *L. plantarum* and *L. brevis* in different ratios were studied for microbial quality, mineral element content and sensory characteristics. Some physicochemical properties of the products were also determined. The microbial counts and mineral contents determinations were done following recommended standards.

Results: After 24 hours of fermentation, products with Yeast+ *L. plantarum*+ *L. brevis* (1:2) and Milk+ *L. plantarum* + *L. brevis* (1:2) had the highest pH readings value of (5.12) while products with Milk+ *L. plantarum*+ *L. brevis* (2:1) had the leastlowest pH readings value of (4.8). The population of yeast / molds, and LABs were had the highest counts in all the samples tested while *Enterobacteriaceae* had the lowest count, was the least. The overall acceptability was maximum for of the product prepared from Milk + *L. plantarum* + *L. brevis* (2:1) which had the final scored of 4.7 on the 5-point hedonic scale. The results of trace elements, zinc and iron contents ranged from The results show that the product samples were rich in trace minerals, zinc and iron contents which ranged from 2.7mg/100_g to 3.9mg/100_g and 2.7mg/100_g to 16.9_mg/100_g on product tested .

Conclusion: Fermentation improves the nutritional qualities of food by increasing the population of lactic acid bacteria thus increase in volume of lactic acid. This creates an environment that is not conducive for enteric bacterial growth thereby increasing the safety and shelf life of the products.

Key Words: Fermentation, Lactic acid Bacteria, *Mkarango*, mineral content, Sensory characteristics

1. INTRODUCTION

Fermented foods constitute diets in many African communities countries and are important means of preserving and introducing variety into the diet, which often consists of staple foods such as milk, cassava, fish and cereals [1]. Fermentation is an old form of food preservation method that is used in the world World [2]. Maize is a major source of carbohydrates, vitamins, manganese, zinc, copper, magnesium and considerable iron but which is its bio-availabile in low amounty is low [3]. Although cereals are deficient in essential amino acids and iron, fermentation of these cereals by lactic acid bacteria may improve the nutritional levelquality and sensory properties [4]. Foods can be fermented followingusing different methods through such as alcoholic, lactic acid and alkali methods [5]. Yeasts are the main organisms used in beer production as well as wine while alcoholic fermentation results in the production of ethanol. However, lactic acid fermentation is mainly done by lactic acid bacteria and acetic acid producing bacteria. Fermentation reduces loss of raw materials, and cooking time, improves protein quality and carbohydrate digestibility and also enhances availability of micronutrients and eradication of toxic and ant-nutritional factors [6]

Comment [SSR1]: I requested the author to write one or two line on *Mkaran go* in order to families the reader.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Normal, Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt

Comment [SSR2]: Mentioned those 5 products.

Comment [SSR3]: Write *L.* in full for the first time and later abbreviate.

Comment [SSR4]: Mention those physicochemical tests.

Comment [SSR5]: Replication. You will further explain on the methodology section.

Comment [SSR6]: and

Comment [SSR7]: write in full.

Comment [SSR8]: I am confused. What are the product element?

Comment [SSR9]: You mentioned some physicochemical properties, according to the results obtained you tested only the pH values. I thought may you are going to test for proximate composition

Comment [SSR10]: Redo your conclusion based on the results obtained.

Comment [SSR11]: Mention two or three African countries.

Comment [SSR12]: Rephrase this sentence.

The process of fermentation done by microorganisms is a complex process involving cultures of yeasts, bacteria and fungi [5]. Mostly used fermenting bacterial species include *Leuconostoc*, *Lactobacillus*, *Streptococcus*, *Pediococcus*, *Micrococcus* and *Bacillus* are the most fermented bacteria. Fungal include the following, the fungal genera are *Aspergillus*, *Paecilomyces*, *Cladosporium*, *Fusarium*, *Penicillium* and *Trichothecium* while the most common fermenting yeast species is *Saccharomyces*, which is involved in alcoholic fermentation [7-9]. Isolation and selection identification of specific microorganisms like lactic acid bacterial strains can be used for the improvement of nutritional and technological properties of various products [10]. Isolated strain of lactic acid bacteria have been reported to inhibit spoilage by other microorganisms, lengthen the shelf life of products and may therefore improve food safety. Lactic acid bacteria are food-grade microorganisms that are generally considered safe [11]. The study was carried out to study the growth of microorganisms in cereal based fermented products during fermentation period of 24 hours.

Comment [SSR13]: Rephrase.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Preparation of samples

The preparation of Mkarango is not clear. How did you dry and roast your thick porridge. That information is missing.

Formatted: Normal

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Four (4) hundred grams quantities of Maize maize flour were added into 1000 ml screw-capped bottles and 1000 ml of distilled water were sterilized separately by autoclaving at 121°C for 15 minutes and cooled down to 30°C then mixed to make slurry prior to inoculation. The samples were coded A1 – Yeast + *L. plantarum* + *L. brevis* (1:1), B1- Milk *L. plantarum* + *L. brevis* (2:1), C1- Yeast+ *L. Plantarum* + *L. brevis* (1:2), D1- Yeast + *L. plantarum* + *L. brevis* (2:1), E1- Milk + *L. plantarum* + *L. brevis* (1:2), F1- Flour + *L. Plantarum* + *L. brevis* (1:1) (reference).

Comment [SSR14]: What type of agar did you use at to which dilutions (10^1 - 10^6)

Comment [SSR15]: You mentioned five (5) samples on the abstract. No I found six (6) samples(A1 –F1). Where is the control sample?.

2.2 Fermentation of maize flour slurry

For spontaneous fermentation, maize flour slurry (1:2 w/v) was inoculated differently with 3% of LAB inoculum in pellet form to initiate fermentation. After thoroughly mixing the samples they were inoculated at 30°C and after zero, four, eight, 12, and 24 hour intervals of fermentation. The microbial counts within the samples were counted, pH and organic acids (Lactic acid) analysis was done. The experiments were replicated three times [12].

Comment [SSR16]: Write in full.

2.3 Chemical analyses

The titratable acidity was determined potentiometrically according to Volmer *et al* [13] by titrating 10 g of maize flour slurry against 0.1 M NaOH using phenolphalein indicator. The acidity was calculated as percent (w/w) lactic acid equivalent. The pH meter (PHM61, Radiometer, Copenhagen, Denmark) equipped with a glass electrode (Orion 9102, Orion Research, Boston, MA, USA) was used to determine pH values. The pH meter was calibrated against standard buffer solutions (Merck) at pH 4.0 and 7.0.

2.4 Enumeration of LAB, *Enterobacteriaceae* and yeasts/molds

Bacterial cultures in flour pellets were inoculated into suitable maize flour slurry. Duplicate samples of maize flour slurry (10 ml) were standardized in 90 ml sterile solution of peptone physiological saline (5 g peptone, 8.5g NaCl, 1000 ml distilled water, pH 7.0F0.2). The homogenate was decimal diluted and the relevant dilutions surface plated. Lactic acid bacteria were enumerated in plates with (LAB) MRS agar (Merck) and 0.1% (w/v) natamycin and were incubated anaerobically at 30°C for how long. *Enterobacteriaceae* was incubated at 37°C on violet red bile glucose agar (VRBGA, Oxoid) while Yeast

Comment [SSR17]: What is this?

Comment [SSR18]: At which dilution level?

Formatted: Highlight

Comment [SSR19]: Different celcius, this is the correct celcius.

Formatted: Highlight

and was incubated for 3–5 days at 25°C different celcius on potato dextrose agar (PDA, Oxoid) then enumerated. What about the mould?

Follow this logic please?

2.5 Mineral content

2.6 Sensory evaluation

2.5 Sensory evaluation

A panel consisting of 10 people were recruited to evaluated the sensory propertieevaluation of different fermented *Mkarango* samples. The panel comprised of trained staff members and semi trained students from the Department of Food Science and Technology, University of Nairobi. The parameters were evaluated on 5 point hedonic scale. The panelists evaluated on the sheet by marking the intensity perceived where 5- Like very much, 4- Like a little, 3- like nor dislike, 2- Dislike a little, 1- Dislike very much. Prior to tasting, colour, appearance and smell were evaluated. The samples were marked with a code and the products were tasted and graded for colour, taste, flavor, mouth feel texture and overall flavor. Finally, the panelists graded the overall acceptability.

2.6 Mineral content analysis

Mineral contents such as zinc and iron were analysed using Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer (Perkin Elmer, model 402). The analyses for essential minerals, zinc and iron were determined using the method of AOAC [14] method number? by Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer (Perkin Elmer, model 402) method [15].

2.7 Statistical analyses

The data of chemical analysisphysicochemical properties and microbial tests analyses were analyzed with using Genstat Version 15 and mean differences determined by Duncan's multiple range or the least square difference (LSD) test (P=0.05) while Sensory data was coded and after the evaluation, mean values were calculated for each parameter and analysis done using SPSS version 20. Interpretation of the data was made by inspection of the scores not necessary.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Chemical analysis

Significant differences ($p = 0.05$) in the pH of co-fermenting mixtures were observed after 0, 4, 12 and 24 hours (Table 1) leading to acid production. Product D1 (Yeast+ *L. plantarum* + *L. brevis* (2:1), after 0, 4, 8 hours had the highest pH readings values, what are they, mention them while treatment A1 (Yeast+ *L. plantarum* + *L. brevis* (1:1) had the least lowest pH readingvalue mention the value. However, the pH reading value rangedwas from 5.9 to 5.6 after 8 hours.

After 12 hours, product C1 (Yeast+ *L. plantarum* 0+ *L. brevis* (1:2) recorded found to have the highest pH reading value of mentioned the value while product F1 (Flour+ p *L. plantarum* + *L. brevis* (1:1) had the least lowest pH readingsvalue of.

However, after 24 hours products E1 and A1 these results are not simila, E1 – 3.75 and A1 – 3.69, which one had the highest value.had the highest pH readings values, mentioned the values while C1 recorded had thethe leastlowest pH value of readings. F1 had the lowest value of 3.26.

Comment [SSR20]: Write each enumeration methods separately:
1. Lactic acid bacteria and reference.
2. *Enterobacteriaceae* and reference.
3. Yeast and moulds plus reference

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 10 pt

Formatted: List Paragraph, Outline numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 5 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 10 pt

Comment [SSR21]: I think you low number of panelist for untrained staff. It is supposed to be consumer acceptability which consist of 60 panelists. 10 panelists is for trained panelists. i am requesting you to review and revised your sensory evaluation.

Comment [SSR22]: Elaborate the methodology as you did for sensory evaluation.

Comment [SSR23]: Did you analysed the trace elements as mentioned on the abstract. What are those trace element.

Comment [SSR24]: Which one did you use between the two. This is not a proposal where you are not sure of the method. Be specific to the method you use

Comment [SSR25]: Is this correct?

Comment [SSR26]: I think you better use the recent version 24

Comment [SSR27]: bold

Formatted: Normal, Space After: 6 pt, Line spacing: single, No bullets or numbering

Comment [SSR28]: I am not sure if this is correct.

The pH levels values in all the products significantly ($p = 0.05$) dropped as the fermentation time continued to increase such that after 24 hours, average pH for all the products was 3.5.

In general, after 24 hours of fermentation, products B1 and F1 were the best since they had the lowest pH readings values of (4.85 and 4.84, respectively) while C1 had the highest pH readings value of (5.14).

Table 1: pH values of different thick porridge (Mkarango) products conducted at different intervals during different hours of controlled fermentation of different roasted thick porridge products (mkarango)

Treatments	Fermentation Period (hours)				
	Zero time ₀	4	8	12	24
A1.Yeast+L. plantarum+L.brevis(1:1)	5.65 ^d	5.41 ^e	5.26 ^e	4.75 ^b	3.69 ^a
B1.Milk L. plantarum +L.brevis (2:1)	5.73 ^{cd}	5.62 ^d	5.22 ^e	4.21 ^c	3.47 ^a
C1.Yeast + L.Plantarum + L.brevis (1:2)	5.78 ^{bc}	5.69 ^c	5.56 ^b	5.29 ^d	3.40 ^c
D1.Yeast + L.Plantarum + L.brevis (2:1)	5.94 ^a	5.85 ^a	5.67 ^a	4.29 ^c	3.50 ^b
E1.Milk + L.Plantarum + L.brevis (1:2)	5.85 ^{ab}	5.79 ^b	5.37 ^d	4.80 ^b	3.75 ^a
F1.Flour + L.Plantarum + L.brevis (1:1)	5.78 ^{bc}	5.74 ^{bc}	5.48 ^c	3.92 ^e	3.26 ^a
Mean	5.79	5.68	5.42	4.54	3.51
LSD (P = 0.05)	0.06	0.04	0.05	0.038	0.036
CV (%)	0.50	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.6

Values followed by the same letter within the same column are not significantly different between the treatments using Fishers Protected LSD test ($p = 0.05$). There is no standard deviation or standard error, why?

3.2 Titratable acidity (TA)

Significant ($p = 0.05$) differences were observed for the products and fermentation time (Table 2). After four 4 hours of fermentation, product A1 had the highest amount of titratable acid TA while E1 had the least lowest mention the value amount. However, at eight 8 hours later product B1 had the highest amount of titratable acidity TA while E1 had the least lowest amount. Product F1 had the highest amount of titratable acid TA after 12 and 24 hours. The amount of titratable acid TA continued to increase with as the fermentation time increasing. When the fermentation reached increased fermentation time such that after 24 hours, the TAe products increased on all the products had the highest amount of titratable acid (0.46). Averagely, The TA of pproduct F1 had the highest amount of titratable acid (0.37) while C1 had the least lowest amount. You mentioned only the highest amount what about the lowest amount.

Table 2: Titratable acidity values during different roasted thick porridge at different intervals hours of controlled fermentation of different roasted thick porridge products

Treatments	Fermentation Period (Hours)				
	Zero time ₀	4	8	12	24
A1.Yeast+L.Plantarum+L.brevis(1:1)	0.19 ^a	0.24 ^a	0.31 ^c	0.34 ^d	0.39 ^c
B1.Milk+L.Plantarum+L.brevis (2:1)	0.16 ^a	0.19 ^c	0.43 ^a	0.46 ^b	0.48 ^b
C1.Yeast+L.Plantarum+L.brevis (1:2)	0.18 ^a	0.20 ^{abc}	0.25 ^d	0.28 ^e	0.34 ^c
D1.Yeast+L.Plantarum+L.brevis (2:1)	0.16 ^a	0.19 ^{bc}	0.35 ^{bc}	0.41 ^c	0.49 ^b
E1.Milk+L.Plantarum+L.brevis (1:2)	0.11 ^b	0.15 ^d	0.26 ^d	0.32 ^d	0.51 ^{ab}
F1.Flour+L.Plantarum+L.brevis (1:1)	0.18 ^a	0.23 ^{ab}	0.38 ^b	0.50 ^a	0.55 ^a
Mean	0.17	0.2	0.33	0.38	0.46
LSD (P ≤ 0.05)	0.03	0.02	0.031	0.021	0.033
CV (%)	8.90	6.6	5.2	3.0	4.0

Comment [SSR29]: I am not sure whether is $p < 0.05$ double check your significant different

Comment [SSR30]: Remove dropped and write significantly lower. Double check you table.

Comment [SSR31]: Best regarding what parameters. What about C1 because it had 3.40, B1-3.47 & F1 - 3.26. DOUBLE CHECK YOU WORK.

Formatted: Highlight

Comment [SSR32]: Where did you get those values at 24 hours, there is no such values

Comment [SSR33]: Not recorded at C1.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Values followed by the same letter within the same row are not significantly different between the treatments using Fishers Protected LSD test ($p = 0.05$). There is no standard deviation or standard error, why?

3.3 Microbial Analysis

Table 3 shows **changes the microbiological accounts of different roasted porridge at different fermentation intervals.**

in population of yeasts/molds, LABs and *Enterobacteriaceae* during the fermentation period. There were significant differences in population of microbes in the products and fermentation time ($p=0.05$). After zero hours of fermentation, the population of yeasts and molds were highest in product D1 but least in C1 while CFUs of LABs were highest in product E1. The CFUs of *Enterobacteriaceae* in product E1 was not detected compared with other product samples. After eight hours of fermentation, the populations of different microbes significantly ($p \leq 0.05$) increased. The product D1 had the highest population of yeast and molds but product F1 had the least population while product B1 had the highest population for both LABs and *Enterobacteriaceae* while products A1 was the least for LABs and D1 and C1 had the least population for *Enterobacteriaceae*.

Sixteen hours later, the population of Yeasts and molds were highest in the product A1, those of LABs were highest in B1 while those of *Enterobacteriaceae* were highest in product C1. The reason for the high counts of *Enterobacteriaceae* even at the lower pH and high titratable acidity could be the post contamination both from the environment, personnel and the equipment used for collecting the sample for analysis. It is important to note that the population of *Enterobacteriaceae* as the least in all the products while yeasts and molds were the highest.

Table 3. **Microbial counts of different roasted thick porridge at different fermentation intervals Viable cell counts during controlled fermentation of different roasted thick porridge maize products after 0, 8 and 16 hours of fermentation**

Treatments/ Fermentation time	Microbes (10^5)		
	Yeasts/ molds	LABs	<i>Enterobacteriaceae</i>
0 hours			
A1:Yeast+ <i>L. Plantarum</i> + <i>L. brevis</i> (1:1)	6.39 ^d	5.89 ^d	4.73 ^a
B1:Milk+ <i>L. Plantarum</i> + <i>L. brevis</i> (2:1)	6.00 ^c	6.00 ^c	4.10 ^{ab}
C1:Yeast+ <i>L. Plantarum</i> + <i>L. brevis</i> (1:2)	5.62 ^c	6.11 ^b	3.20 ^{cd}
D1:Yeast+ <i>L. Plantarum</i> + <i>L. brevis</i> (2:1)	6.71 ^a	5.42 ^f	0.00 ^e
E1:Milk+ <i>L. Plantarum</i> + <i>L. brevis</i> (1:2)	6.40 ^b	6.89 ^a	2.50 ^d
F1:Flour+ <i>L. Plantarum</i> + <i>L. brevis</i> (1:1)	6.03 ^c	5.54 ^e	3.51 ^{bc}
Mean	6.19	5.97	3.01
LSD ($P \leq 0.05$)	0.031	0.045	0.49
CV (%)	0.3	0.4	9.0
8 hours			
A1:Yeast+ <i>L. Plantarum</i> + <i>L. brevis</i> (1:1)	7.59 ^b	7.28 ^c	3.66 ^b
B1:Milk+ <i>L. Plantarum</i> + <i>L. brevis</i> (2:1)	7.03 ^d	8.46 ^a	5.25 ^a
C1:Yeast+ <i>L. Plantarum</i> + <i>L. brevis</i> (1:2)	7.39 ^c	6.83 ^d	3.35 ^c
D1:Yeast+ <i>L. Plantarum</i> + <i>L. brevis</i> (2:1)	7.96 ^a	7.63 ^b	2.63 ^d
E1:Milk+ <i>L. Plantarum</i> + <i>L. brevis</i> (1:2)	7.12 ^d	6.98 ^d	2.83 ^d
F1:Flour+ <i>L. Plantarum</i> + <i>L. brevis</i> (1:1)	7.04 ^d	6.47 ^e	5.10 ^a
Mean	7.35	7.27	3.8

Comment [SSR41]: Why are you using different intervals. Table 1 & 2 use 0, 4,8,12,24 now you are using 0, 8, 16. I think for you get the accurate results you need to choose to use one group not variations.

Comment [SSR42]: I am requesting the author to tabulate the results of LABs separately, followed by *Enterobacteriaceae* and lastly Yeast and mould.

Comment [SSR43]: Fr me this does not make sense. Learn to indicate the lowest and highest amounts for all the results obtained.

Comment [SSR44]:

Comment [SSR45]:

Comment [SSR46]: Remove this, not necessary for the whole document. Discuss only the major results and put the standard deviation or error for all your tables.

LSD (P ≤ 0.05)	0.11	0.11	0.102
CV (%)	0.8	0.8	1.5
16 hours			
A1:Yeast+ <i>L. Plantarum</i> + <i>L.brevis</i> (1:1)	9.85 ^a	7.27 ^d	2.83 ^e
B1:Milk+ <i>L. Plantarum</i> + <i>L.brevis</i> (2:1)	9.25 ^e	8.45 ^a	2.69 ^f
C1:Yeast+ <i>L. Plantarum</i> + <i>L.brevis</i> (1:2)	9.54 ^b	7.82 ^b	4.39 ^a
D1:Yeast+ <i>L. Plantarum</i> + <i>L.brevis</i> (2:1)	9.44 ^c	7.04 ^e	3.29 ^c
E1:Milk+ <i>L. Plantarum</i> + <i>L.brevis</i> (1:2)	9.41 ^d	6.53 ^f	3.02 ^d
F1:Flour+ <i>L. Plantarum</i> + <i>L.brevis</i> (1:1)	9.41 ^d	7.56 ^c	3.96 ^b
Mean	9.48	7.45	3.36
LSD (P ≤ 0.05)	0.011	0.034	0.021
CV (%)	0.1	0.2	0.3

Comment [SSR47]:

Values followed by the same letter within the same column are not significantly different between the treatments.

Comment [SSR48]:

3.4 Sensory evaluation

The sensory analyses results of the products with different ingredients are presented in Table 4. The addition of Milk+ *L. Plantarum*+ *L. brevis* in the ratio 2:1 impacted positively on sensory properties of the *Mkarango*. Furthermore, *Mkarango* product produced by recipe of yeast, and *L. Plantarum*+ *L. brevis* was recorded as inferior product. Overall, *Mkarango* product produced with Milk+ *L. Plantarum*+ *L. brevis* in the ratio 2:1 was accepted (4.7) by the majority of the panelist.

Comment [SSR49]:

Comment [SSR50]: This information is not enough.

Table 4: Sensory evaluation of fermented roasted maize flour (*Mkarango*) food produced after 24hrs of fermentation.

Sample Products	N	Taste	Colour	Flavor	Mouth feel	Texture	Overall Acceptability
A1:Yeast+Plantarum+Brevi(1:1)	10	4.3±0.82	3.7±0.95	3.6±1.07	3.1±1.37	3.4±1.35	3.6±0.84
B1:Milk+Plantarum+Brevi(2:1)	10	4.7±0.48	4.5±0.53	4.4±0.51	4.4±0.69	4.2±0.42	4.7±0.48
C1:Yeast+Plantarum+Brevi(1:2)	10	4.1±0.87	3.0±1.15	3.0±1.24	3.4±1.51	3.0±1.41	3.1±0.87
D1:Yeast+Plantarum+Brevi(2:1)	10	3.7±0.48	3.7±1.33	3.7±1.33	3.3±1.05	3.3±0.82	3.4±0.96
E1:Milk+Plantarum+Brevi(1:2)	10	4.2±0.63	3.3±1.33	3.5±1.43	3.2±1.22	3.6±1.17	3.6±1.35
F1:M.Flour+Plantarum+Brevi(1:1)	10	4.5±0.53	4.4±0.52	4.3±0.67	4.2±0.63	4.2±0.63	4.3±0.48
Total	60	4.3±0.70	3.7±1.12	3.75±1.15	3.6±1.19	3.6±1.09	3.7±1.01
F Value		2.758	3.31	2.267	2.41	2.246	4.566
Sig		0.027	0.011	0.061	0.048	0.063	0.002

Comment [SSR51]: Put spacing in between

Comment [SSR52]: .

Grade scale 1–5.

Comment [SSR53]: You did not show the significant different on this table. Only standard deviation or error are shown here, why not on other tables. Try to be consistence.

3.5 Mineral elements composition of the flour samples

The quantity of mineral elements varied from 2.7 mg/100 g to 3.9 mg/100 g and 2.7 mg/100 g to 16.9 mg/100g for zinc and iron respectively (Table 5). Different products had different contents of zinc and iron, product maize flour + *L. plantarum* + *L. brevis* (1:1) had the highest quantity of zinc while Milk + *L. plantarum* + *L. brevis* (1:2) had the least amount. However, for iron, yeast + *L. plantarum*+ *L. brevis* (1:2) had the largest amount of iron while Yeast + *L. plantarum* + *L. brevis* (1:1) had the least.

Comment [SSR54]: You mentioned the trace element on the abstract, where are they.

Table 5: Mineral elements composition in various products treated with various isolates in different ratios.

Sample products	Zinc (mg/100g)	Iron (mg/100g)
A1:Yeast+ <i>L.Plantarum</i> + <i>L.brevis</i> (1:1)	3.2±0.03 ^b	2.7±0.03 ^d
B1:Milk+ <i>L.Plantarum</i> + <i>L.brevis</i> (2:1)	3.2±0.05 ^b	7.5±0.08 ^c
C1:Yeast+ <i>L.Plantarum</i> + <i>L.brevis</i> (1:2)	3.4±0.05 ^b	16.9±0.81 ^a
D1:Yeast+ <i>L.Plantarum</i> + <i>L.brevis</i> (2:1)	3.2±0.005 ^b	7.6±0.17 ^c
E1:Milk+ <i>L.Plantarum</i> + <i>L.brevis</i> (1:2)	2.7±0.06 ^c	10.6±0.2 ^b
F1:Flour+ <i>L.Plantarum</i> + <i>L.brevis</i> (1:1)	3.9±0.06 ^a	8.9±0.44 ^b
Mean	3.3	9.0
LSD (P≤ 0.05)	0.2	2.2
CV (%)	0.2	19.7

Values followed by the same letter within the same row are not significantly different between the treatments using Fishers Protected LSD test ($p \leq 0.05$).

Comment [SSR55]: Do as i stated on other Tbales

3.5 Relationship between pH, titratable acid and microorganisms isolated from *Mkarango*

There was significant but negative relationship between pH and titratable acid (-0.8463 , $p = 0.05$) (Table 6). However, positive correlation was displayed between pH and *Enterobacteriaceae* (0.3977 , $p = 0.05$). Isolation frequency of yeasts and molds negatively correlated with population of LABS and *Enterobacteriaceae* (-0.4062 , -0.0639 , $p \leq 0.05$).

Table 6: Correlation analysis between pH, titratable acid and microorganisms isolated from *Mkarango*

	pH	Titratable acid	Yeast/ molds	LABS	<i>Enterobacteriaceae</i>
pH	-				
Titratable acid	-0.8463	-			
Yeast/molds	0.0607	-0.3198	-		
LABS	-0.4993	0.3413	-0.4062	-	
<i>Enterobacteriaceae</i>	0.3977	-0.4067	-0.0639	-0.1035	-

Comment [SSR56]: This results does make sense because you use different intervals for you study, why are you doing correlation.

4.3. Discussion

After 24 hours of fermentation, products Yeast+ *L. plantarum* + *L. brevis* (1:2) and Milk+ *L. plantarum*+ *L. brevis*(1:2) had the highest pH readings (5.12) while Milk+ *L. plantarum*+ *L. brevis*(2:1) had the least pH readings (4.8). The pH significantly dropped in all the products as the fermentation time continued to increase which is inhibitory to bacterial growth. These results agree with the findings by Katongole [5] who reported decrease in pH level with increased fermentation time such that after 48 hours the products had lowest pH levels of about 3.5. Lactic acid bacteria produce lactic acid that causes reduction in pH due to increased colony forming units of lactic acid bacteria during fermentation [15]. Rapid decrease in pH is accompanied by intensive increase in lactic acid [16]. The decrease in pH may be as a result of nutrients availability in the products that enhances the population of lactic acid bacteria and therefore results in increase in production of lactic acid [3]

The population of yeast/molds, and LABs were the highest in all the samples while *Enterobacteriaceae* was the least. The initial counts of the microbes were least but continued to rise overtime with prolonged fermentation time. The population of yeasts and mold were high and continued to proliferate with increase in fermentation time. However, yeast and molds are known not to play considerable role in fermentation and therefore may be considered as contaminants. However, microbial combinations between the lactic acid bacteria and yeasts may play significant role in the nutritional content and sensory characteristics of the end product [3]. According to Hama, *et al.* [17]. Lactic acid bacteria are stimulated by yeasts which act as a source of soluble nitrogen compounds and vitamin B.

The population of lactic acid bacteria was high in the dough *Mkarango*. The predominance of these acid producing bacteria may be due to secretion of lactic acid which creates an environment that is not conducive for the growth of other bacteria [3] and yeast. However, in the present study, the population of yeast was not affected by the acid producing bacteria. Lactic acid is the main microorganism involved in fermentation. The population of yeasts and molds continued to increase with increase in fermentation time while those of *Enterobacteriaceae* remained very low in all the fermentation periods. The increase in population of yeasts and molds may be due to the fact that these microorganisms utilize oxygen present and in return produce carbon dioxide which inhibits the growth of microorganisms such as *Enterobacteriaceae* involved in decay like [12] again the low population could be due to the presence of lactobacilli which produced lactic acid [18]

The overall acceptability was highest for product prepared by combining *Mkarango* and Milk+ *L. plantarum*+ *L. brevis* in the ratio 2:1 which scored 4.7 on the 5-point hedonic scale. Increase in the ratio of plantarum with corresponding reduction of brevis had positive impact on the sensory characteristics evaluated and on the overall quality of the product. Improvement of sensory parameters is due to enhanced acidification and proteolysis that arises from microbiological and physicochemical processes [19]

The results show that the product samples were rich in trace minerals, iron and zinc contents were high ranging from 2.7mg/100g to 3.9mg/100g and 2.7mg/100g to 16.9mg/100g for zinc and iron respectively and the different products had different contents of zinc and iron. There was significant difference in trace mineral contents in the sampled products. The results agree with those that were reported by Blair *et al.*, [20] who reported values between 40.0 and 84.6 mg/kg for iron and 17.7 and 42.4 mg/kg for zinc. The results of the present study contradict findings by Adeoti [21] who reported lower iron value of 0.64 mg/100g and zinc value of 1.13 mg/100g for 90% maize flour.

Comment [SSR57]: Revise your discussion based on the comment I gave you on the Table so that your discussion will flow.

5.4. CONCLUSION

It was also confirmed that increase in lactic acid bacteria results in increase of lactic acid thus creates an environment not conducive for enteric bacterial growth thereby increasing the safety and shelf life of the products. Results in this study show that fermentation produced a better product, and both bacteria produced significant improvement in nutritional and sensory quality of maize product. [What about the microorganisms, mineral content and sensory evaluation? You need to say something on the conclusion.](#)

REFERENCES

1. Rhee, S.J., Lee, J. and Lee, C. (2011). Importance of lactic acid bacteria in Asian fermented foods. *Intern J. Food Sci.* 2011;10:1–13.
2. Oyarekua, M.A (2009). Evaluation of the nutritional and microbiological status of co-fermented cereals/cowpea 'OGI'. *Agriculture and Biotechnology Journal* 2: 61-67
3. Dada, L. O and Muller, R.H.G. (1983). The fate of aflatoxin B1 in the production of 'ogi', a Nigerian sorghum porridge. *Journal of Cereal Science.* 1: 63-70
4. Katongole, Joseph Nicholas (2008). The Microbial Succession in Indigenous Fermented Maize Products. Master of Science in Agriculture, University of Free State, Bloemfontein.
5. Sindhu, S.C., Khertapaul, N. (2001). Probiotic fermentation of indigenous food mixture: effect on antinutrients and digestibility of starch and protein. *Journal of Food Composition and Analysis* 14: 601-609.
6. Nigatu A. (1998). Systematics of *Lactobacillus* and *Pediococcus* isolates from fermented Tef (*Eragrostis tef*) and Kocho (*Ensete ventricosum*) and microbiological status of baked products. Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
7. Lei, V. (2006). Probiotic potential of African fermented millet. Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University, Frederiksberg, Denmark.
8. Badarinath, V., Raghavendra, P., Halami, P., M. (2010). Characterization of lactic acid bacteria isolated from okara for probiotic properties. *International Journal of Probiotics and Prebiotics* 5: 149-156
9. Oladeji, B. S., Irinkoyenikan, O. A., Akanbi, C. T., Gbadamosi, S. O. (2018). Effect of fermentation on the physicochemical properties, pasting profile and sensory scores of normal endosperm maize and quality protein maize flours. *International Food Research Journal*, 25(3): 1101-1107
10. Jay, M.J., Loessner, M.J., Golden, A.D., (2005). *Modern Food Microbiology*, 7th Ed., Springer Science + Business Media Inc. New York, USA.
11. Zdolec, N., Iosmanovic, M. H., Kozacinski, L., Cvrtila, Z., Filipovic, I., Skrivanko, M., Leskovic, K. (2008). Microbial and physicochemical succession in fermented sausages produced with bacteriocinogenic culture of *Lactobacillus sakei* and semi-purified bacteriocinmesenterocin Y. *Meat Science* 80: 480 - 487.
12. Oguntoyinbo FA (2008) Evaluation of diversity of *Candida* species isolated from fermented cassava during traditional small scale gari production in Nigeria. *Food Control* 19: 465-469.
13. Abegaz, K. (2013). Isolation, characterization and identification of lactic acid bacteria involved in traditional fermentation of borde, An Ethiopian Cereal Beverage', *African Journal Of Food Science Research*, 1(3): 24–32.
14. AOAC 1997
15. Omemu, A.M., Oyewole, O.B and Bankole, M.O (2007). Significance of yeasts in the fermentation of 'ogi' production. *Food Microbiology.* 24(6): 571-576.

Comment [SSR58]: There is a comma.

Comment [SSR59]: You abbreviate.

Comment [SSR60]: You write in full

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Highlight

Comment [SSR61]: There is no comma

Comment [SSR62]: No full stop.

Comment [SSR63]: There is full stop.

Comment [SSR64]: italicise

Comment [SSR65]: italicise

Comment [SSR66]:

Comment [SSR67]:

Comment [SSR68]:

Comment [SSR69]: incomplete

16. Hama, F., Savadogo, A., Outara, C.A.T and Traore, S (2009). Biochemical, microbial and processing study of Degue- a fermented food (from pearl millet dough). *Pakistan Journal of Nutrition* 8 (96):759-764.
17. Nigatu A (1998). Systematics of *Lactobacillus* and *Pediococcus* isolates from fermented Tef (*Eragrostis tef*) and Kocho (*Ensete ventricosum*) and microbiological status of baked products. Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
18. Adavachi., (2014). The role of fermented maize-based products on nutrition status and morbidity of children 6-59 months old in western Kenya.
19. Annan N T, Poll L, Sefa-Dedeh S, Plahar W A and Jakobsen M. (2003). Volatile compounds produced by *Lactobacillus fermentum*, *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and *Candida krusei* in single starter culture fermentations of Ghanaian maize dough. *Journal of Applied Microbiology* 94(3): 462–474.
20. Enwa F O, Beal J and Arhewoh M I. (2011). Effect of maize and bacteria starter culture on maize fermentation process. *International Journal of Biomedical Research* 2(11): 561–567.
21. Blair J.M., Richmond G.E., Piddock L.J. 2014. Multidrug efflux pumps in gram-negative bacteria and their role in antibiotic resistance. *Future Microbiology* 9:1165–1177.
22. Halm, M., Lillie, A., Sorensen, A.K. and Jakobsen, M. (1993). Microbiological and aromatic characteristics of fermented maize dough for kenkey production in Ghana. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 19: 135-144.

Comment [SSR70]: use the recent references from 2011-2018, you have used old references on most of citation.