

Short Research Article**Effect of Processing Treatments on the Proximate, Functional and Sensory Properties of Soy-Sorghum-Roselle Complementary Food****ABSTRACT**

AIM: The objective of this work was to produce complementary foods from germinated/fermented sorghum, germinated/roasted soybean and dried roselle calyces.

METHODOLOGY: Complementary foods were formulated from sorghum, soybean and roselle calyces by varying the processing methods (fermentation, germination and roasting) applied to them. Proximate, functional, colour and sensory properties of the complementary foods were determined.

RESULTS: The protein contents for the seven formulations were significantly different ($p \leq 0.05$) from each other. SFGS had the highest protein content followed by GSGS. The ash content ranged from 2.00% to 4.50%. Fat content ranged from 4.95% to 16.35%. Fat was significantly different for all the formulations. FSRS made from fermented sorghum and roasted soybean, had the highest fat content followed by SF. The moisture content of the formulations ranged from 6.28-10.75%. From the values obtained, there were significant differences ($p \leq 0.05$) in the water absorption capacity, oil absorption capacity, loosed and packed bulk density as well as swelling capacity among the samples. Swelling capacity (SC) values ranged between 2.60% for GSRS and 6.95% for SF. Water absorption capacity (WAC) of the flour mixes ranged from 1.20 ml/g to 2.40 ml/g for FSRS and SFGS respectively. The values for oil absorption capacity (OAC) were between 0.84 mL/g for SFRS and 1.67 mL/g for SFGS. From the result obtained, there was significant difference ($P \leq 0.05$) in loosed and packed density of the complementary foods. Packed bulk density (PBD) was between 0.71 g/cm^3 for FSRS and 0.86 g/cm^3 for SF. The samples varied

significantly ($P \leq 0.05$) from one another in all the colour parameters evaluated. FSGS and FSRS scored highest in L^* (64.14 and 59.44 respectively), a^* (12.06 and 11.23 respectively) and b^* (17.88 and 14.18 respectively). There were significant differences ($p \leq 0.05$) among the complementary foods in colour, aroma, and taste, while there were no significant difference ($p \geq 0.05$) among them in mouthfeel and overall acceptability.

CONCLUSION: The results from this study showed that processing methods employed had marked effect on the proximate, functional and sensory properties of the complementary foods produced from soybean, sorghum and roselle calyces.

INTRODUCTION

In most developing countries, particularly in Africa and Asia, complementary foods are prepared locally from cereal grains which form part of the staple foods of the people [1]. Maize, sorghum, millet, rice and acha which are commonly used in Nigeria [1] are of low nutrient density and this has been engaging the attention of nutrition workers in several countries and international organizations [2]. Protein-energy malnutrition among children is the major health challenges in the developing countries [2] [3] and this is as a result of inappropriate complementary feeding practices, low nutritional quality of traditional foods, high cost of quality protein-based foods [3], low income, poor sentimental conditions and lack of education [4]. In addition, few low-income countries have failed to adopt comprehensive complementary food policies and programmes which have been developed [5]. These programmes are based on local foods that are culturally acceptable, easily prepared and affordable by the majority [5].

Several works have been done to enhance the nutritional status of cereal grains with legumes which are known to be richer in protein, certain minerals and vitamins [6] [4] [3] [7]. The use of

cereal-legume based food has long been advocated as alternative protein and energy source for infant and young children [8]. It is evident that when cereals and legumes are judiciously selected and combined, a desirable pattern of essential amino acids of high biological value is obtained [9]. Cereals are rich in sulphur containing amino acids such as methionine and cystine while legumes are rich in essential amino acids such as lysine [3]. The nutrient density of complementary foods is also enhanced through addition of other food components that are rich in vitamins and minerals [9].

Processing of cereals and legumes such as soaking, fermentation, germination, roasting etc enhance their qualities [10]. Fermentation of grain legumes before its incorporation or the co-fermentation of both cereals and grain legumes has the advantage of solubilizing the material constituents as well as reducing or eliminating the anti-nutritional factors [11]. Germination is induced by rehydration of the seed, which increases both respiration and metabolic activity that allow the mobilization of primary and secondary metabolites [12] and improves the nutritional and functional qualities of sorghum by changing chemical compositions and eliminating antinutritional factors [13]. Roasting is done to impart desirable sensory qualities, enhance palatability and reduce anti nutritional factors [14]. Egounlety [15] evaluated the sensory and nutritional qualities of *tempeh*-fortified maize based complementary food and reported improved nutrient density which compared favourably with a commercial product (Cerelac). Ijarotimi and Keshinro [3] formulated an infant formula from germinated popcorn, bambara groundnut and African locust bean flour. This present work was carried to formulate complementary food from germinated/fermented sorghum, germinated/roasted soybean, and roselle calyces.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

SOURCES OF MATERIALS

Sorghum (Red Sokoto), soybean (white cultivar), and fresh roselle calyces were purchased from Bodija market, Ibadan and were identified at the Department of Botany, University of Ibadan.. The analyses were carried out at the Department of Food Technology and the Central Laboratories of University of Ibadan.

SAMPLE PREPARATION

Preparation of Germinated Sorghum Flour

Germination was carried out according to the method described by [16]. Sorghum grains were manually cleaned to remove husks, stone, cob, damaged and coloured seeds. These were achieved through winnowing, sieving and hand picking. The grains were washed in 5% (w/v) sodium chloride solution to suppress mould growth and soaked in tap water in ratio of 1:3 (w/v) grain for 12 h at room temperature ($32\pm 2^{\circ}\text{C}$), the water drained at 4 hour interval after which the seed were drained and spread separately on a clean jute bag, covered with damp cotton and were allowed to germinate for 24 h. Water was sprinkled at 12 h interval to facilitate the germination process. At the end of germination, root hairs were removed from the germinated grains. Grains were dried at 60°C in an oven to a moisture content of 10% and ground into flour using attrition mill (globe p44 China). Flour was passed through a 0.5 mm mesh size sieve. They were packaged in an air tight polyethylene bags, stored in plastic containers with lids and then stored in cool dry place from where samples were taken for analyses.

Preparation of Fermented Sorghum Flour (*Ogi-baba*)

Fermented *Ogi-baba* was prepared using the improved method of [17] that gave higher protein recovery and better quality porridge. Sorghum was cleaned as described above sorted and steeped in tap water (1: 3 w/v) for 72 h. After decanting the steeping water, the maize was milled in a Premier Mill and wet-sieved (1:8 w/v) through a locally manufactured sieve (1mm). The

deposit was left to ferment for 12 h before decanting the water. The fresh *ogi* was dried at 60°C for 24 h and milled and sieved using mesh size 100 mm. They were packaged in an air tight polyethylene bags, stored in plastic containers with lids and then stored in cool dry place from where samples were taken for analyses.

Preparation of Sorghum Flour

The procedure described by [15] was used. Sorghum was cleaned as described above, sorted, washed and dried at 60°C for 24 h. Before double-milling in a hammer mill (Christy & Lab), sieved using 150 mm mesh size and stored as described above.

Preparation of Roselle Calyces Flour

Fresh Roselle calyces were washed, dried at 50°C for 5 hrs, milled and sieved using 100 mm mesh size [18]. The flour was packaged in an air tight polyethylene bag, stored in plastic container with lid and then stored in cool dry place from where samples were taken for analyses.

Preparation of Germinated Soybean Flour

The method described by [3] was employed. The soybean seeds were cleaned as described above. Seeds were rinsed, soaked in deionized water (1:3, w/v) for 24 hr at ambient temperature (23–25°C). Seeds were drained and placed on perforated aluminum pans lined with filter paper, then placed in a dark, temperature controlled cabinet at 30°C for germination. The seeds germinated after 4 days and the seeds were washed with distilled water manually, oven dried at 60°C (Plus11 Sanyo Gallenkamp PLC, UK) for 20 hours, milled using a Philips laboratory blender (HR2811 model) and sieved using a 60 mm mesh sieve (British Standard). The flour was stored at room temperature (27°C) in a well sealed plastic container prior to analyses.

Preparation of Roasted Soybean Flour

115 This was done according to the procedure described by [19]. Soybean seeds were cleaned as
 116 earlier discussed. The seeds were soaked, dehulled and roasted for 4 minutes in a frying pan over
 117 a gas cooker flame. The roasted beans were cooled, sorted to remove damaged ones, oven dried
 118 at 60°C (Plus11 Sanyo Gallenkamp PLC, UK) and milled using a Philips laboratory blender
 119 (HR2811 model).

120 SAMPLE FORMULATION

121 Sample formulation was done based on the specification of a joint FAO/WHO/UNU committee
 122 that recommended minimum levels of 16.7%, 6.0% and 375 Kcal/100g for protein, fat and
 123 energy respectively [15]. This was achieved using the NutriSurvey Linear Programming Package
 124 2004 version. This is shown in Table 1.

125

126 **Table 1: Formulation of Soy-Sorghum-Roselle Complementary Foods**

127

Sample Description							
	A(GSGS)	B(GSRS)	C(FSGS)	D(FSRS)	E(SFGS)	F(SFRS)	G(SF)
Ingredients							
Sorghum Flour %	-	-	-	-	58.2	58.2	100
Germinated							
Sorghum Flour %	58.2	58.2	-	-	-	-	-
Fermented							
Sorghum Flour %	-	-	58.2	58.2	-	-	-
Germinated	38.8	-	38.8	-	38.8	-	-
Soybean Flour %							

140

141								
142	Roasted							
143	Soybean Flour %	-	38.8	-	38.8	-	38.8	-
144								
145	Roselle							
146	Calyces Flour %	3	3	3	3	3	3	-
147	Key: GSGS (Germinated sorghum, germinated soybean and roselle flour), GSRS (Germinated sorghum, roasted							
148	soybean and roselle flour), FSGS (Fermented sorghum, germinated soybean and roselle flour), FSRS (Fermented							
149	sorghum, roasted soybean and roselle flour), SFGS (Sorghum flour, germinated soybean and roselle flour), SFRS							
150	(Sorghum flour, roasted soybean and roselle flour) SF (Sorghum Flour).							
151								

152

153 ANALYSIS OF SAMPLES

154 Proximate, functional, sensory and colour properties of the formulations were carried out using

155 standards methods [20], [21], [3] and [22] respectively. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) was

156 performed to determine significant differences between the means of proximate composition,

157 colour, sensory attributes, pasting properties and functional properties while the means were

158 separated using the new Duncan multiple range test at $p < 0.05$. The means and standard

159 deviations of the triplicate analyses of the samples were calculated. These were achieved using

160 the Statistical Package for the Social Scientists (SPSS) version 17.0.

161 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

162 **Effect of Processing Treatments on the Proximate Composition of Soy-Sorghum Roselle**

163 **Complementary Foods**

164 The result of proximate composition of complementary foods and effect of different processing

165 treatments like roasting, germination and fermentation is presented in Table 2. According to the

166 result, there were significant differences ($p \leq 0.05$) in the moisture content of the seven

167 formulations. However, all the samples were within the normal moisture contents of dried food

168 (flour blends), that is below 12.5% for shelf-stable storage [23]. It is believed that materials such

169 as flour and starch containing more than 12.5% moisture have less storage stability than those
 170 with lower moisture content. For this reason, a water content of not more than 12.5% is generally
 171 specified for flours and other related products. The ash content ranged from 2.00% to 4.50%.
 172 These values are similar to the values reported from the production and evaluation of breakfast
 173 cereal-based porridge mixed with sesame and pigeon peas for adults [24] but higher than results
 174 of [25] from the production of legumes-fortified weaning food. Fat content ranged from 4.95%
 175 to 16.35%. Fat was significantly different for all the formulations. FSRS made from fermented
 176 sorghum and roasted soybean, had the highest fat content followed by SF. From the results, the
 177 differences were significant ($p \leq 0.05$). Protein content ranged from 12.46% to 32.42%. The
 178 protein contents for the seven formulations were significantly different ($p \leq 0.05$) from each other.
 179 SFGS had the highest protein content followed by GSGS. The protein contents of the
 180 formulations were significantly higher than the reported results of [25] for the nutritive value of
 181 protein-energy legume-fortified weaning for *ogi* and reported results of [24] who evaluated
 182 cereal-based porridge mixed with sesame and pigeon peas for adults and the result reported for
 183 *Binni* mix [26]. Ashawe [27] reported an increase in protein content (7.28%) and ash (3.58%)
 184 when yam flour was substituted with 40% cowpea flour while [28] reported an increase in
 185 protein content from 3.5% in the control (yam flour) to 19.7% for yam flour fortified with 40%
 186 soybeans flour. The moisture (7.17%), crude protein (12.46%), fat (9.90%), ash (2.00%), and
 187 carbohydrate (49.75%) of the raw sorghum (SF) that served as the control were comparable to
 188 values reported by [29]. The relative high protein content observed in samples produced with
 189 soybean flour substitution (32.42%, 30.81%, 29.16%, 29.18%, and 33% for GSGS, GSRS,
 190 FSGS, FSRS and SFGS respectively) compared to control with 100% sorghum flour (12.46%)

191 could be as result of high protein content of soybean. Salunkhe *et al.* [30] reported protein
192 content of soybean as high as 40.4%.

193

194

Table 2: Proximate Composition of Soy-Sorghum-Roselle Food.

Sample	Crude Fat (%)	Crude Protein (%)	Ash Content (%)	Moisture Content (%)	Carbohydrate (%)
GSGS	7.00 ± 0.02^d	32.42 ± 0.01^b	4.00 ± 0.02^c	6.83 ± 0.01^e	49.75 ± 0.02^e
GSRS	6.00 ± 0.03^e	30.81 ± 0.01^c	4.00 ± 0.04^c	7.14 ± 0.02^{cd}	52.05 ± 0.04^c
FSGS	8.91 ± 0.01^c	29.16 ± 0.02^d	4.50 ± 0.04^b	10.75 ± 0.02^a	46.68 ± 0.07^f
FSRS	16.35 ± 0.02^a	29.18 ± 0.02^d	2.00 ± 0.02^e	10.52 ± 0.02^b	41.95 ± 0.04^g
SFGS	5.00 ± 0.02^f	33.93 ± 0.03^a	3.50 ± 0.02^d	7.11 ± 0.01^d	50.46 ± 0.08^d
SFRS	4.95 ± 0.05^g	24.58 ± 0.02^e	5.00 ± 0.04^a	6.28 ± 0.01^f	59.19 ± 0.02^a
SF	9.90 ± 0.02^b	12.46 ± 0.02^f	2.00 ± 0.03^e	7.17 ± 0.03^c	68.47 ± 0.06^b

195

196

197

198

Values are mean±standard deviation of triplicate scores. Column means with different superscripts are significantly different at 5% probability level ($P \leq 0.05$).
 Key: Key: GSGS (Germinated sorghum, germinated soybean and roselle flour), GSRS (Germinated sorghum, roasted soybean and roselle flour), FSGS (Fermented sorghum, germinated soybean and roselle flour), FSRS (Fermented sorghum, roasted soybean and roselle flour), SFGS (Sorghum flour, germinated soybean and roselle flour), SFRS (Sorghum flour, roasted soybean and roselle flour) SF (Sorghum Flour).

Effect of Processing Treatments on the Functional Properties of Soy-Sorghum Roselle Complementary Foods

The effect of processing methods on the functional properties of complementary foods is presented in Table 3. The functional properties of food proteins determine their behaviour in food systems during processing, storage, preparation and consumption [31]. These functional properties and the interaction of proteins with other components directly and indirectly affect processing applications, food quality and ultimate acceptance [31]. From the values obtained, there were significant differences ($p \leq 0.05$) in the water absorption capacity, oil absorption capacity, loosed and packed bulk density as well as swelling capacity among the samples. Padmashree *et al.* [32]) reported that polar amino acids of proteins had an affinity for water and denatured proteins bind less water. Fat binding capacity has been attributed to the physical entrapment of oil. This is important since fat improves taste, texture and mouth feel [33]. Swelling capacity (SC) values ranged between 2.60% for GSRS and 6.95% for SF. Complementary foods do not require high swelling index as the food would absorb more water and have less solid resulting in low nutrient density for the infant [31]. Samples with least swelling index are preferred for a complementary food thus GSRS with least swelling capacity value of 2.60% is preferred. Water absorption capacity (WAC) of the flour mixes ranged from 1.20 ml/g to 2.40 ml/g for FSRS and SFGS respectively. The WAC values followed the same trend as the swelling index. Both SC and WAC ultimately determine the sample consistency (that is solid, semi-solid or liquid). Flours with both high SC and WAC values hold large amounts of water during preparation into gruels and thus become voluminous with low energy and nutrient density [34]. FSRS with least WAC value would provide a more nutrient-dense food for an infant. The values for oil absorption capacity (OAC) were between 0.84 mL/g for SFRS and 1.67 mL/g for SFGS. From the result obtained, there was significant difference ($P \leq 0.05$) in

loosed and packed density of the complementary foods. Packed bulk density (PBD) was between 0.71g/cm³ for FSRS and 0.86g/cm³ for SF. The lower the bulk density value, the higher the amount of flour particles that can stay together and thus increasing energy content that could be derivable from such diets [35]. FSRS with lowest packed bulk density is preferable in this regard. The Loose Bulk Density (LBD) which is the lowest attainable density without compression was least for FSRS (0.38g/cm³) and highest for GSGS (0.51g/cm³) though the difference was slight. This low density values of the complementary food samples implies that more of the samples could be prepared using a small amount of water yet giving the desired energy nutrient density and semi-solid consistency which can easily be fed to an infant [36]. Observably from the results, soybean flour substitution reduced significantly ($P \leq 0.05$) the packed bulk density (PBD) and swelling capacity (SC) of the complementary foods.

241 **Table 3: Functional Properties of Soy-Sorghum-Roselle Complementary Food.**

Sample	Water Absorption Capacity (ml/g)	Oil Absorption Capacity (ml/g)	Loosed Bulk Density (l g/cm ³)	Packed Bulk Density (g/cm ³)	Swelling Power (g/g)
GSGS	1.70 ± 0.01 ^d	1.30 ± 0.01 ^b	0.51 ± 0.01 ^a	0.79 ± 0.01 ^c	3.03 ± 0.01 ^f
GSRS	1.60 ± 0.02 ^e	0.97 ± 0.02 ^d	0.41 ± 0.02 ^b	0.76 ± 0.01 ^d	2.60 ± 0.02 ^g
FSGS	1.70 ± 0.01 ^d	1.01 ± 0.02 ^c	0.40 ± 0.02 ^b	0.75 ± 0.01 ^d	5.56 ± 0.02 ^c
FSRS	1.20 ± 0.03 ^f	0.92 ± 0.02 ^e	0.38 ± 0.02 ^b	0.71 ± 0.02 ^e	5.65 ± 0.01 ^b
SFGS	2.40 ± 0.01 ^a	1.67 ± 0.03 ^a	0.39 ± 0.02 ^b	0.83 ± 0.03 ^b	4.97 ± 0.02 ^d
SFRS	2.30 ± 0.02 ^b	0.84 ± 0.01 ^f	0.48 ± 0.02 ^a	0.81 ± 0.01 ^{bc}	4.78 ± 0.01 ^e
SF	2.20 ± 0.01 ^c	1.01 ± 0.01 ^c	0.49 ± 0.02 ^a	0.86 ± 0.01 ^a	6.95 ± 0.01 ^a

242 Values are mean±starndard deviation of triplicate scores. Column means with different superscripts are significantly different at 5% probability level (P≤ 0.05).
 243 Key: Key: GSGS (Germinated sorghum, germinated soybean and roselle flour), GSRS (Germinated sorghum, roasted soybean and roselle flour), FSGS
 244 (Fermented sorghum, germinated soybean and roselle flour), FSRS (Fermented sorghum, roasted soybean and roselle flour), SFGS (Sorghum flour, germinated
 245 soybean and roselle flour), SFRS (Sorghum flour, roasted soybean and roselle flour) SF (Sorghum Flour).

246 Effect of Processing Treatments on Colour Parameters of Soy-Sorghum-Roselle**247 Complementary Food.**

248 The results of colour parameters (L, a, b, hue angle, deltachrome and colour intensity) is shown
249 in Table 4. The samples varied significantly ($P \leq 0.05$) from one another in all the colour
250 parameters evaluated. FSGS and FSRS scored highest in L^* (64.14 and 59.44 respectively), a^*
251 (12.06 and 11.23 respectively) and b^* (17.88 and 14.18 respectively). High values obtained for
252 these samples in L^* could be due to the leaching of colour pigments of sorghum and soybean
253 during soaking operation thus, making them whither [31]. GSGS, SFGS and SFRS had higher
254 'colour difference' (ΔE) (38.91, 39.62 and 39.08 respectively) while FSGS had the least (30.76).

255

256 **Table 4: Colour Parameters of Soy-Sorghum-Roselle Complementary Food**

257	Samples	L	a*	b*	b/a	Tan ⁻¹ b/a	ΔC	ΔE
258	GSGS	50.60±0.42 ^d	8.58±0.92 ^c	13.12±0.13 ^{bc}	1.53±0.00 ^a	55.82±0.14 ^b	15.23±0.16 ^{cd}	38.91±0.33 ^a
259	GSRS	54.40± 0.28 ^c	9.84±0.92 ^b	11.80±0.57 ^d	1.20±0.00 ^e	50.19±0.13 ^d	14.91±0.10 ^d	35.30±0.21 ^b
260	FSGS	64.14±3.54 ^a	12.06±0.86 ^a	17.88±1.12 ^a	1.48±0.14 ^c	56.01±0.24 ^a	21.13±1.41 ^a	30.76±1.59 ^d
261	FSRS	59.44±0.59 ^b	11.23±0.12 ^a	14.18±0.20 ^b	1.26±0.01 ^d	51.50±0.92 ^c	17.58±0.23 ^b	32.19±0.37 ^{cd}
262	SFGS	50.45±1.84 ^d	9.50±0.36 ^b	14.11±0.59 ^b	1.50±0.00 ^b	56.19±0.92 ^a	16.62±0.69 ^{bc}	39.62±1.38 ^a
263	SFRS	50.26±0.50 ^d	10.27±0.00 ^b	11.38±0.01 ^d	1.11±0.00 ^f	47.94±0.01 ^e	14.87±0.14 ^d	39.08±0.04 ^a
264	SF	57.40±0.34 ^{bc}	11.47±0.07 ^a	12.36±0.78 ^{cd}	1.08±0.00 ^g	47.13±0.01 ^f	16.41±0.11 ^{bc}	33.16±0.01 ^c

265 Values are mean±starndard deviation of triplicate scores. Column means with different superscripts are significantly different at 5% probability level (P≤ 0.05).
 266 Key: Key: GSGS (Germinated sorghum, germinated soybean and roselle flour), GSRS (Germinated sorghum, roasted soybean and roselle flour), FSGS
 267 (Fermented sorghum, germinated soybean and roselle flour), FSRS (Fermented sorghum, roasted soybean and roselle flour), SFGS (Sorghum flour, germinated
 268 soybean and roselle flour), SFRS (Sorghum flour, roasted soybean and roselle flour) SF (Sorghum Flour).
 269

Effect of Processing Treatments on the Sensory Profile of Soy-Sorghum Roselle

Complementary Foods

The effect of treatment methods (roasting, germination, and fermentation) on the consumer acceptability of the complementary foods is presented in Table 5. There were significant differences ($p \leq 0.05$) among the complementary foods in colour, aroma, and taste, while there were no significant difference ($p \geq 0.05$) among them in mouthfeel and overall acceptability. Also, there was no significant difference ($p \geq 0.05$) between the control sample and others. The complementary foods from fermented sorghum and roasted soybean flour (FSRS) had significantly ($p \leq 0.05$) higher mean score in taste, mouthfeel and overall acceptability. This relatively higher mean score of the roasted soybean and fermented sorghum flour sample could be probably due to the roasted flavour and aroma imparted on soybean during roasting coupled with astringency and aromatic compounds conferred on the sorghum by the fermentation process. Controlled roasting of grains brings about development of desirable roasted aroma in foods, which are described as nutty, burnt and coffee like, due to the formation of pyrazine compounds that also reflects the extent of browning colour development in the product [37]. Also, fermentation imparts desirable flavors esters, ketones, aldehydes and aromatic compounds as well as characteristic astringency to products. The relatively lower mean sensory scores in colour, aroma, taste, and overall acceptability recorded in the sample with untreated sorghum and germinated soybean flour (SFGS) could be probably due to the slight bitter after taste observed in untreated sorghum and germinated soybean samples. Notably, roselle flour was equally distributed among the samples and could have affected the sensory profile of the all the samples similarly and therefore could not be responsible for the differences observed among the samples and treatment. Notably, the results show that all the samples were equally acceptable by the panelists.

294 **Table 5: Sensory Evaluation of Soy-Sorghum-Roselle Complementary Food.**

Sample	Colour	Aroma	Taste	Mouth feel	Overall Acceptability
GSGS	7.07 ± 1.11^{ab}	6.60 ± 1.33^{ab}	6.40 ± 1.48^{ab}	6.30 ± 1.24^a	6.67 ± 1.45^a
GSRS	6.70 ± 1.68^{abc}	6.93 ± 1.26^a	6.20 ± 1.54^{ab}	6.37 ± 1.40^a	6.60 ± 1.48^a
FSGS	7.20 ± 1.32^{ab}	6.43 ± 1.43^{ab}	6.37 ± 1.61^{ab}	6.53 ± 1.43^a	6.77 ± 1.70^a
FSRS	6.90 ± 1.16^{abc}	6.73 ± 1.23^a	6.93 ± 1.68^a	6.67 ± 1.71^a	7.07 ± 1.70^a
SFGS	6.27 ± 1.46^c	6.00 ± 1.20^b	5.90 ± 1.54^b	6.10 ± 1.79^a	6.43 ± 1.41^a
SFRS	7.43 ± 1.19^a	6.50 ± 1.01^{ab}	6.00 ± 2.00^b	6.00 ± 1.34^a	6.73 ± 1.53^a
SF	6.63 ± 1.16^{bc}	6.33 ± 1.12^{ab}	5.53 ± 1.57^b	5.83 ± 1.49^a	6.53 ± 1.43^a

295 Values are mean±standard deviation of forty scores. Column means with different superscripts are significantly different at 5% probability level ($P \leq 0.05$). Key:
 296 Key: GSGS (Germinated sorghum, germinated soybean and roselle flour), GSRS (Germinated sorghum, roasted soybean and roselle flour), FSGS (Fermented
 297 sorghum, germinated soybean and roselle flour), FSRS (Fermented sorghum, roasted soybean and roselle flour), SFGS (Sorghum flour, germinated soybean and
 298 roselle flour), SFRS (Sorghum flour, roasted soybean and roselle flour) SF (Sorghum Flour).

299

CONCLUSION

300 The results from this study showed that processing methods have marked effect on the
 301 proximate, functional, pasting and sensory properties of the complementary foods produced from
 302 soybean, sorghum and roselle calyces. Germination resulted in increased protein content in
 303 SFGS and GSGS, roasting caused an increase in fat content and improved aroma. All the three
 304 processing methods employed (germination, fermentation and roasting) also increased the ash
 305 contents of the samples subjected to them. FSRS with least WAC and packed bulk density values
 306 would provide a more nutrient-dense food for an infant. Observably from the results, soybean
 307 flour substitution reduced significantly ($P \leq 0.05$) the packed bulk density (PBD) and swelling
 308 capacity (SC) of the complementary foods. Processing resulted in loss of pigments (as evident in
 309 loss of colour) in the raw materials as shown in the colour analysis. The complementary foods
 310 from fermented sorghum and roasted soybean flour (FSRS) had significantly ($p \leq 0.05$) higher
 311 mean score in taste, mouthfeel and overall acceptability. It is recommended therefore, that
 312 germination, fermentation and roasting methods be employed in preparation of complementary
 313 foods.

314
315

REFERENCES

- 316 1. Ugwuona, F.U., Awogbenja, M.D. and Ogara, J.I. (2012). Quality evaluation of soy-acha
 317 mixes for infant feeding. *Indian Journal of Science Research* 3(1):43-50
- 318 2. FAO (2001). Targeting for nutrition resources for advancing well being. Food and
 319 Agricultural Organization, UN. Geneva. www.fao.org/DOCREP/994/Y1329e00.htm
- 320 3. Ijarotimi, O. S. and Keshinro, O. O. (2012). Formulation and nutritional quality of infant
 321 formula produced from germinated popcorn, bambara groundnut and African locust bean
 322 flour. *Journal of Microbiology, Biotechnology and Food Sciences* 1(6): 1358-1388.
 323
- 324 4. Imtiaz, H., BurhanUddin, M. and Gulzar, M. (2011). Evaluation of weaning foods
 325 formulated from germinated wheat and mungbean from Bangladesh. *Afr. J. Food*
 326 *Sci.* 5(17): 897-903.
 327

- 328 5. Mahgoub, S.E.O. (1999). Production and evaluation of weaning foods based on sorghum
329 and legumes. *Plant Foods for human Nutrition* 54: 29-42.
- 330 6. Deshpande, S.S. (1992). Food legumes in human nutrition: A personal perspective. *Rev.*
331 *Food Sci. Nutr.*, 32: 333-363.
- 332 7. Brou, K., N'Da-Kouassi A., Kouadio, J., Guehi, T., N'Guessan K. and Gnakri, D. (2013).
333 Biochemical Characterization and Functional Properties of Weaning Food Made from
334 Cereals (Millet, Maize) and Legumes (Beans, Soybeans). *Journal of Food Chemistry*
335 *and Nutrition* 4: 11-21
- 336 8. Mensah, P. and Tomkins, A. (2003). Household level technologies to improve the
337 availability and preparation of adequate and safe complementary foods. In: *Food and*
338 *Nutrition Bulletin*, 24(1): 104-125.
- 339 9. Giugliani, R.J. and Cesar G. V. (2000). Complementary feeding. *Journal of Pediatrics*
340 76(3):253-262
- 341 10. Egounlety M (1998): La fermentation valorise les l'égumineuses. *Horizon Francophonie*
342 3:5-7.
- 343 11. Oyewole, O. and Isah, P. (2012). Locally Fermented Foods in Nigeria and their
344 Significance to National Economy: a Review. *Journal of Recent Advances in*
345 *Agriculture* 1(4)92-102.
- 346 12. Bohoua, G.L. and Yelakan, C.K. (2007). Effect of germinated sorghum flour on the
347 performance of laying hens (Warren). *Intl. J. Poultry Sci.* 6 (2):122-124
348
- 349 13. Abbas, T.E.E. and Mushara, N.A. (2008). The effect of germination of low-tannin
350 sorghum grains on its nutrient contents and broiler chick's performance. *Pakistan*
351 *J. Nutr.* 7(3): 470-474.
- 352 14. Aworh, O. C. 2008. The Role of Traditional Food Processing Technologies in National
353 Development; the West African Experience In: Robertson, G. L. and Lupien, J. R. (eds.)
354 *Using Food Science and Technology to Improve Nutrition and Promote National*
355 *Development*. International Union of Food Science and Technology.
356
- 357 15. Egounlety, M., Aworh, O. C., Akingbala, J. O., Houben, J. H. and Nago, M. C. (2002).
358 Nutritional and sensory evaluation of tempe-fortified maize-based weaning foods.
359 *International Journal of Food Sciences and Nutrition* 53: 15-27.
360
- 361 16. Ariahu CC, Ukpabi U, Mbajunwa KO (1999). Production of African Breadfruit (*Treculia*
362 *africana*) and Soyabean (*Glycine max*) based food formulations, 1: Effects of
363 germination and fermentation on nutritional and organoleptic quality. *Plant Foods*
364 *Hum. Nutr.* 54: 123-266
365
- 366 17. Akingbala, J.O., Onochie E.U., Adeyemi, I.A. and Oguntimein G.B. (1987). Steeping of
367 whole and dry milled maize kernels in Ogi preparation. *J. Food Proc. Pres.* 11:1-11.
368

- 369 18. Fasoyiro, S.B, Babalola, S.O and Owosibo, T. (2005). Chemical Composition and
370 Sensory Quality of Fruit-Flavoured Roselle (*Hibiscus sabdariffa*) Drinks.
371 *World Journal of Agricultural Sciences* 1(2):161-164
372
- 373 19. Omafuvbe, B.O., Esosuakpo, E.O., Oladejo, T.S. and Teye, A.A. (2007). Effect of
374 soaking and roasting dehulling methods of soybean on *Bacillus* fermentation of soy-
375 daddawa. *American Journal of Food Technology* 2:257-264.
376
- 377 20. AOAC (2000). Official Methods of Analysis, Washington, DC., Association of the
378 Official Analytical Chemists.
379
- 380 21. Narayana K, Narsinga Rao MS (1992). Functional properties of raw and heat processed
381 winged bean (*psophocarpus tertragonolobus*) flour. *J. Food Sci.* 47: 534-538.
382
- 383 22. Hunt, R. W. G. (1991). Measuring Colour, New York, Ellis Horwood.
384
- 385 23. Chakraverty, A. (2004). Post Harvest of Oil Seeds. Oxford and IBH Publishing
386 Company, Pvt.Ltd, New Delhi, India. Pp 339
- 387 24. Kalu, P.J Sandy E.H, B.A. Joseph Kandeh , Bahsoon J.P and Huiming, Z. (2009).
388 Production and Evaluation of Breakfast Cereal-Based Porridge Mixed with Sesame and
389 Pigeon Peas for Adults. *Pakistan Journal of Nutrition* 8 (9): 1335-1343.
390
- 391 25. Egounlety, M., (2002). Production of legume-fortified weaning food. *Food Res. Inter.* 35:
392 233-237.
- 393 26. Kanu, P.J., J.B. Kanu and Z. Huiming, (2007). Studies on physicochemical composition
394 of Bennimix: A traditional weaning food. *Am. J. Food Technol.* 2: 652-661.
- 395 27. Ashawe, M., (2001). Functional Foods: A simple scheme for establishing the scientific
396 basis for all claims. Public health nutrition. CABI Publishing Oxford, UK, 4(3): 859-862.
397
- 398 28. Achi, O.A. (1999). Quality attributes of fermented yam flour supplemented with
399 processed soy flour. *Plant Foods for Human Nutrition* 48:73-80.
400
- 401 29. Makokha AO, Oniang'o RK, Njoroge SM, Kamar O.K. (2002). Effect of traditional
402 fermentation and malting on phytic acid and mineral availability from sorghum (*Sorghum*
403 *bicolor*) and finger millet (*Eleusine coracana*) grain varieties grown in Kenya. *Food Nutr*
404 *Bull* 23: 241-245.
405
- 406 30. Salunkhe, D.K., Chavan, J.C., Adsule, R.N. and Kadam, S.S. (1992). World Oil seeds,
407 Chemistry, Technology and Utilization. Avi Publishers, New York.
408
- 409 31. Ojinnaka, M.C., Ebinyasi, C.S., Ihemeje, A. and Okorie, S.U. (2013). Nutritional
410 Evaluation of Complementary Food Gruels Formulated from Blends of Soybean Flour
411 and Ginger Modified Cocoyam Starch. *Advance Journal of Food Science and Technology*
412 5(10): 1325-1330.

- 413 32. Padmashree, S.T., Vijayalakshmi, L. and Puttarajis M. (1987). Effect of traditional
414 processing on the functional properties of cowpea flour. *Journal Food Science and*
415 *Technology* 19:221-225.
- 416 33. Kinsella, J.E. (1976). Functional properties of proteins in food. A survey. *Critical*
417 *Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition* 7:219 – 280.
- 418
- 419 34. Cameron, M. and Y. Hofvander, (1982). Manual on Feeding Infants and Young Children.
420 2nd Edn., United Nations, New York.
- 421
- 422 35. Onimawo, A.I. and K.M. Egbekun, (1998). Comprehensive Food Science and Nutrition.
423 Macmillan Press, Ibadan, pp: 228.
- 424
- 425 36. Mosha, A.C. and W.S.M. Lorri, (1987). High-Nutrient-Density Weaning Foods from
426 Germinated Cereals. In: Alnwick, D., S. Moses and O.G. Schmidt (Eds.), Improving
427 Young Child Feeding in Eastern and Southern Africa. IDRC, UNICEF, SIDA, Nairobi,
428 New York, Stockholm, pp: 288-299. Nelson, D.I and M.M. Cox, 2000. Lehninger
429 Principles of Biochemistry. Replika Press, PVT Ltd., India, pp: 117-124.
- 430
- 431 37. Powrie, W. D. and Nakai, S. (1981). Processing effects of protein systems utilization of
432 protein sources. Food and Nutrition Press Inc. West port, Connecticut, U.S.A.
- 433
- 434
- 435