

## EVALUATION OF THE FUNCTIONAL, PROXIMATE AND SENSORY PROPERTIES OF COWPEA/SOYBEAN FORTIFIED *DABUWA* (A NIGERIAN DRIED STIFF PORRIDGE) PRODUCED FROM DIFFERENT CEREALS

### ABSTRACT

*Dabuwa* is a dried stiff porridge made from fonio and maize in the ratio of 1:3, beef fat and spiced with fresh onion and caraway (black) seeds. It is a popular food indigenous to the Shuwa Arab nomads of North-eastern Nigeria. An attempt was made to modify *dabuwa* not only from maize but also from millet and rice. The cereal flours were supplemented with legume flours, the beef fat content was reduced, fresh onion and caraway seeds were replaced with a dried spice-mix of onion, ginger and cardamom. A  $3 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$  full factorial design was scaled down to a fractional factorial design of  $3 \times 2 \times 2$  which generated 12 runs. Supplementation (cowpea and soybean) was done at a constant level of 30%. Fonio was incorporated at either 12.5% ( $F_1$ ) or 22.5% ( $F_2$ ). Each formulation had the other cereal (maize, millet or rice) added at 57.5% ( $Ma_1, Mi_1, R_1$ ) or 47.5% ( $Ma_2, Mi_2, R_2$ ); while traditional *dabuwa* comprising of 25% fonio and 75% maize served as the Control. The blends and *dabuwa* were evaluated for functional and sensory properties, and proximate composition. Results indicated a general increase on water absorption capacity (216.76% to 270.34% of the blends) unlike oil absorption capacity (0.97ml/g to 1.09ml/g), and an enhanced bulk densities (0.74-0.86g/ml). *Dabuwa* samples enriched with soybean were shown to be denser in nutrients than those supplemented with cowpea, though no particular trend was observed. Moisture, ash, crude protein, crude fiber, fat, carbohydrate (by difference) and calorific contents of the blends varied significantly ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) from 7.38 to 12.18%, 1.80 to 2.96%, 4.33 to 16.29%, 1.62 to 6.59%, 2.45 to 9.57%, 53.66 to 82.90%, and 337.12-393.37kcal/100g respectively. Proximate composition of modified *dabuwa* varied thus: 4.86-10.85%, 0.92-2.48%, 10.11-16.38%, 0.96-4.65%, 2.02-10.60%, 58.55-86.54%, and 351.03-421.17kcal/100g for moisture, ash, crude protein, crude fiber, fat, carbohydrate contents and calorific value respectively. Sensory scores revealed that rice- and maize-containing *dabuwa* were liked moderately, but millet containing *dabuwa* were neither liked nor disliked by the panelists. It was concluded that *dabuwa* could be prepared not only from maize, but also from rice or millet with legume fortification for enhanced nutrient density without affecting negatively the well known traditional sensory properties of the *dabuwa*. Therefore, production and consumption of *dabuwa* should be re-popularized and its consumption patronized so as to provide macro and micro nutrients to the consumers and avoid the disappearance of a worthy age-old food product.

**Keywords:** Maize, millet, rice, fonio, cowpea, soybean, flour, *dabuwa*, proximate composition, functional properties, sensory properties.

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Cereals and grain legumes are the major providers of dietary energy worldwide (Nierenberg and Spoden, 2012), and their consumption gives these crops an important position in International Nutrition (Banu *et al.*, 2012). Cereals fill many nutritional needs, however, they lack two important amino acids; lysine and tryptophan which are higher in grain legumes. Grain legumes are low-cost sources of vegetable proteins and micronutrients when compared

47 to animal-based protein, which is very expensive (Ijarotimi *et al.*, 2017), still they are  
48 deficient in the sulphur-containing amino acids: methionine and cysteine. Thus, legume  
49 proteins are a natural complement to cereal grain proteins in providing an overall essential  
50 amino acid balance (Singh, 1988; Liener, 1989). Improvement in standards of living,  
51 knowledge about natural foods, and rise in the cost of medicine, have all led to an increased  
52 trend in consumption of healthy foods which are provided by multigrain flour blends which  
53 are excellent source of functional ingredients from natural sources in the diet (Malik *et al.*,  
54 2015).

55 *Dabuwa*, a dried stiff porridge (*tuwo*) is traditionally produced from fonio and maize, spiced  
56 and flavoured with onions, caraway (black) seeds and beef fat (*man shanu*). It is indigenous  
57 to the shuwa Arab nomads of northeastern Nigeria. *Dabuwa* can be referred to as a “five-in-  
58 one” food item as it is consumed in any of the following forms: reconstituted into the fresh  
59 porridge (*tuwo*) and eaten with stew or soup; as breakfast cereal soaked in boiled milk; or  
60 soaked in boiled water with added salt, pepper and beef fat; reconstituted and prepared as the  
61 popular jollof rice; it can also be eaten as a snack without reconstitution. *Dabuwa*, being a  
62 cereal-based food provide better nourishment to well to do consumers who can afford to  
63 consume it when reconstituted with milk or soup containing meat or fish. However, milk,  
64 meat and fish are sources of animal proteins that are expensive and therefore unaffordable to  
65 resource poor families. Moreover, taking *dabuwa* alone as a snack will not meet the  
66 recommended protein and micro nutrient requirements. Cowpea (*Vigna unguicalata*),  
67 probably due to its place in the socio-economic lives of the people, is the most suitable crop  
68 that is employed in enrichment of indigenous cereal-based foods and it is heavily cultivated  
69 in semi-arid climates of northeastern Nigeria where *dabuwa* is commonly produced and  
70 consumed at the household level.

71 **Soyabean** (*Glycine max*), the wonder crop of the world, serves both as an industrial raw  
72 material and a food crop. Borno state remains the largest producer of pearl millet in Nigeria  
73 (Nkama, 1998), and millet is the commonest cereal of the poorest households providing  
74 energy to cater for the laborious life style of resource poor populations justifying the saying  
75 that “pearl millet is the powerhouse of nutrients” with unlimited health benefits (Suneha *et*  
76 *al.*, 2019). Asian rice (*Oryza sativum*), a gluten-free cereal, is widely cultivated in all regions  
77 of Nigeria and consumed mainly when cooked. Fonio (*Digitaria exilis*), on the other hand is  
78 an easy to digest, tasty cereal with high amino acid profile, good texture and appearance, low  
79 bulk and high caloric density (Robert *et al.*, 2013), and low glycemic index (Diakite, 2012); it  
80 is equally produced in Nigeria and is a compulsory ingredient in *dabuwa* preparation. The  
81 traditional preparation of *dabuwa* is too labourous for the teaming health- and time-conscious  
82 urban dwellers, and beef fat, a saturated fat, is profusely applied in its preparation. It became  
83 necessary to improve the nutritional and sensory properties of *dabuwa* through fortification  
84 with grain legume flours and use of other cereals such as rice and millet in its preparation  
85 which has not been attempted.

86 Therefore, in this present study, *dabuwa* was prepared from blends consisting of fonio with  
87 either maize, millet or rice flour each fortified with cowpea or soyabean flour, spiced and  
88 flavoured with beef fat and a spice mix, and thereafter the proximate composition and  
89 functional and sensory properties of the modified *dabuwa* as well as the blends were  
90 evaluated.

## 91 2.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 92 2.1 Raw material collection

93 The raw materials were purchased from Gamboru market, Jere Local Government Area of  
94 Borno State. The grains were maize, pearl millet, rice, fonio, cowpea, soyabean. Other  
95 ingredients were onions, caraway (black) seeds, ginger, cardamom and beef fat (*man shanu*).  
96 Samples were processed at the Nutrition unit of the Department of Food Science and  
97 Technology, Ramat Polytechnic, Maiduguri where Sensory evaluation was conducted also.  
98 Functional properties and Proximate Composition of the flour blends and *dabuwa* were  
99 analysed at National Agency for Food and Drug Administration Control (NAFDAC),  
100 Maiduguri Area Laboratory.

## 101 2.2 Preparation of the cereal flours

102 Maize, millet and rice were separately sorted to remove foreign materials, soaked overnight,  
103 decorticated, winnowed, washed thoroughly, and then dried. All grains were milled before  
104 complete drying (which yielded finer flours). Milled grains were sieved with a 300 $\mu$ m sieve  
105 mesh and packaged inside plastic buckets with air-tight fitting covers for further use. **Fig.1**  
106 represents a flow chart for preparation of the cereal flours.




118 **Fig.1 Flow chart for processing of maize, millet and rice flours**

## 119 2.3 Preparation of the Legume Flours

120 The method of Nkama (1993) was used for both cowpea and soybean flour production with a  
121 slight modification. The cowpea and soybean after sorting and cleaning were soaked for 2  
122 hours, de-hulled manually (by lightly pounding in a mortar with a pestle), sundried slightly  
123 and the brans removed by winnowing. These were then washed, dried and toasted mildly to  
124 reduce their beany flavor and also destroy some anti-nutritional factors. The grains were  
125 allowed to cool and then milled in attrition mill. The flours obtained were sieved with a  
126 300 $\mu$ m mesh and then packaged inside plastic buckets and covered with tight-fitting lids.  
127 This process is shown in **Fig. 2**.

128

129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163



**Fig. 2. Cowpea/soybean flour production**

#### **2.4 Preparation of spice-mix and other ingredients**

A spice-mix of onions, ginger and cardamom in the ratio of 3:1:1 respectively was prepared for the modified *dabuwa*. Onions were peeled, washed, chopped and sundried. Ginger and cardamom seeds were sorted for extraneous materials and then washed and sundried. Dried spices were then milled and sieved to obtain a coarse flour.

Caraway seeds were sorted to remove foreign materials, washed and dried. Fonio grains were sorted for extraneous materials, de-hulled manually in a mortar with the use of pestle with the addition of hulls (from previously dehulled grains) to aid loosening and separation of hulls, dried slightly, winnowed to get rid of the hulls, washed severally the local way using a calabash (until all sand must have been removed), and then finally dried. Beef fat (*manshanu*) was fried with chopped onions inside **till the onions turned golden brown in colour.**

#### **2.5 Formulation and coding of samples**

***Dabuwa*, usually produced from a blend of 25% fonio and 75% maize was modified by using two levels (1=57.5%, 2=47.5%) each of maize (Ma<sub>1</sub>, Ma<sub>2</sub>), millet (Mi<sub>1</sub>, Mi<sub>2</sub>) and rice (R<sub>1</sub>, R<sub>2</sub>) and two levels (1=12.5%, 2=22.5%) of fonio (F<sub>1</sub>, F<sub>2</sub>) with constant level of cowpea (C) and soybean (S) leading to a 3×2×2×2 full factorial design but reduced to a fractional factorial design of 3×2×2 by manipulating the order of cereal addition while keeping the level of legume supplementation at a constant level of 30%. A total of 12 experimental runs and the Control (traditional *dabuwa*) were obtained and coded as follows: F<sub>1</sub>Ma<sub>1</sub>C, F<sub>2</sub>Ma<sub>2</sub>C, F<sub>1</sub>Mi<sub>1</sub>C, F<sub>2</sub>Mi<sub>2</sub>C, F<sub>1</sub>R<sub>1</sub>C, F<sub>2</sub>R<sub>2</sub>C, F<sub>1</sub>Ma<sub>1</sub>S, F<sub>2</sub>Ma<sub>2</sub>S, F<sub>1</sub>Mi<sub>1</sub>S, F<sub>2</sub>Mi<sub>2</sub>S, F<sub>1</sub>R<sub>1</sub>S, F<sub>2</sub>R<sub>2</sub>S and the Control (FMa).**

**Table 1. The formulations indicating proportion of each ingredient.**

Formulation	Fonio (g)	Maize (g)	Millet (g)	Rice (g)	Cowpea (g)	Soyabean (g)	Spicemix (g)	Fat (ml)
F <sub>1</sub> Ma <sub>1</sub> C	12.5	57.5	-	-	30	-	5	10
F <sub>2</sub> Ma <sub>2</sub> C	22.5	47.5	-	-	30	-	5	10
F <sub>1</sub> Mi <sub>1</sub> C	12.5	-	57.5	-	30	-	5	10
F <sub>2</sub> Mi <sub>2</sub> C	22.5	-	47.5	-	30	-	5	10
F <sub>1</sub> R <sub>1</sub> C	12.5	-	-	57.5	30	-	5	10
F <sub>2</sub> R <sub>2</sub> C	22.5	-	-	47.5	30	-	5	10
F <sub>1</sub> Ma <sub>1</sub> S	12.5	57.5	-	-	-	30	5	10
F <sub>2</sub> Ma <sub>2</sub> S	22.5	47.5	-	-	-	30	5	10
F <sub>1</sub> Mi <sub>1</sub> S	12.5	-	57.5	-	-	30	5	10
F <sub>2</sub> Mi <sub>2</sub> S	22.5	-	47.5	-	-	30	5	10
F <sub>1</sub> R <sub>1</sub> S	12.5	-	-	57.5	-	30	5	10
F <sub>2</sub> R <sub>2</sub> S	22.5	-	-	47.5	-	30	5	10
FMa	25	75	-	-	-	-	10	20


165 Key: F= Fonio, Ma = Maize, Mi = Millet, R = Rice, C = Cowpea, S = Soybean. The  
 166 subscripts 1 and 2 of F denote 12.5% and 22.5% respectively while those of Ma, Mi and R  
 167 denotes 57.5% and 47.5% respectively.

## 168 2.6. Preparation of traditional and modified *dabuwa*

169 Traditional *dabuwa* was prepared as shown in **Fig.3**. Water, onions and blackseeds were  
 170 brought to boil in a pot. Fonio grains were sprinkled while stirring, some part of the  
 171 *manshanu* (beef fat) was added and the pot covered and allowed to cook for 10 minutes.  
 172 Maize flour was mixed with water to obtain a thick slurry. This was poured into the pot while  
 173 stirring. The remaining part of the *manshanu* was added then stirred continuously until a stiff  
 174 and smooth porridge was obtained. This was covered and allowed to cook for another 8  
 175 minutes under low heat. The porridge was scooped out with the use of a small plastic plate  
 176 unto lightly fat-greased trays and allowed to cool. This was cut manually into thin small  
 177 pieces and oven-dried.

178


179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192



**Fig.3 Flow chart for preparation of traditional *dabuwa*.**

194  
195  
196  
197  
198

Fortified *dabuwa* using the new spice mix combination were processed the same way as traditional *dabuwa* was, but the spice mix was added much later, after the addition of slurry of flour blend. Drying was done in an oven at 55 – 65 °C for 4 - 5 hours, as required by different samples. This process is shown in **Fig. 4**.



214 **Fig. 4 Flow diagram for preparation of fortified *dabuwa*.**

215 **3.0 Physical and chemical Analysis**

216 The flour blends were evaluated for functional properties and proximate composition. Flour  
 217 blends and *dabuwa* were analyzed for proximate composition. All *dabuwa* were subjected to  
 218 sensory evaluation test.

219 **3.1. Functional Properties**

220 Bulk density (BD) of the blends were determined using the method described by Onwuka  
 221 (2005). Swelling capacity (SC) and solubility (S) of the blends were determined using the  
 222 method of Leach *et al* (1959) with slight modification, whereas water absorption capacity  
 223 (WAC) was determined using the Beuchat (1977) method and oil absorption capacity (OAC)  
 224 as described by Solsulski (1962) were determined using the flour blends.

225  
 226

227

### 228 **3.2 Proximate composition**

229 The various flour blends, as well as the *dabuwa* were analyzed for moisture, total ash, crude  
230 fat, and crude protein by the established procedures of the Association of Official Analytical  
231 Chemist, AOAC (1998) while carbohydrate contents were obtained by “difference” i.e. 100-  
232 (%protein+%fat+%ash+%moisture+%fiber).

### 233 **3.3 Sensory Evaluation**

234 Sensory evaluation test was conducted by a team of 15 panelist drawn from people  
235 conversant with *dabuwa*. Samples were rated for appearance, aroma, taste, mouthfeel and  
236 overall acceptability using the nine-point hedonic scale rating (9-like extremely, 8-like very  
237 much, 7-like moderately, 6-like slightly, 5-neither like nor dislike, 4-dislike slightly, 3-dislike  
238 moderately, 2-dislike very much and 1-dislike extremely) as described by Ihekoronye and  
239 Ngoddy (1985).

### 240 **3.4 Statistical analysis**

241 Data were expressed as Means  $\pm$  Standard Deviation. The statistical analysis was performed  
242 using the Statistical Tool for Agricultural Research (STAR) software version 2.0.1 (IRRI).  
243 New Duncan’s Multiple Range Test (nDMRT) was used to separate the means. Significance  
244 was accepted at 5% level of probability ( $p < 0.05$ ).

## 245 **4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### 246 **4.1. Functional Properties of flour blends used for the production of *dabuwa***

247 Functional properties of flour blends are shown in **Table 2**. Water absorption capacity  
248 (WAC) varied significantly ( $P \leq 0.05$ ) from 216.76% to 270.34% and were generally high and  
249 needed for higher yield of *dabuwa* and improved textural characteristics. Many factors such  
250 as higher protein and fiber content, and lower flour particle sizes might be responsible for  
251 higher WACs of the blends. F<sub>1</sub>R<sub>1</sub>C and F<sub>1</sub>Mi<sub>1</sub>S had the lowest values of WAC indicating that  
252 higher level of fonio (22.5%) had positive influence on WAC perhaps due to higher presence  
253 of pentosans in fonio flour. Solubility (S) influences other functional properties in addition to  
254 digestibility of the blends. Solubility level of the Control (FMa) was the least (4.03%) and  
255 was enhanced in the legume-supplemented blends. However, the range recorded (6.74-  
256 13.98%) for the blends was still low, perhaps mild toasting of the de-hulled legumes caused  
257 protein denaturation leading to limited solubility. The highest solubility value was observed  
258 in blends containing maize and soyabeans such as F<sub>1</sub>Ma<sub>1</sub>S and F<sub>2</sub>Ma<sub>2</sub>S which recorded  
259 13.98% and 12.98% respectively. Bulk density (BD) of the blends varied significantly from  
260 0.74g/ml (F<sub>1</sub>Mi<sub>1</sub>S) to 0.86g/ml (F<sub>2</sub>Ma<sub>2</sub>C and F<sub>1</sub>R<sub>1</sub>C). BD indirectly indicates nutrient density  
261 and is dependent on flour particle size, therefore, BD of blends influenced the textural  
262 properties of the *dabuwa* apart from handling, packaging and storage requirements (Karuna *et*  
263 *al.*, 1996; Amandikwa, 2012; Malomo *et al.*, 2012).

264 The swelling power of blends were low including the Control. Swelling capacities (SC)  
265 ranged from 1.21ml/g (F<sub>1</sub>Mi<sub>1</sub>S) to 2.17ml/g (F<sub>2</sub>R<sub>2</sub>C). SC was highest in the rice-containing  
266 blends, and rice starch is known for high swelling capacity which is related to starch granule  
267 size and the ratio of amylose to amylopectin. Millet-containing blends had the least swelling  
268 power. Both WAC and SC are desirable flour attributes for dough formation and handling  
269 for most cereal flour based products. High level of fat in blends limit swelling of starch  
270 granules, and soyabean containing blends had higher level of fat which restricted swelling in  
271 aqueous medium. Generally, OAC was low, lowest in the Control FMa (0.97ml/g) and highest  
272 in F<sub>2</sub>Ma<sub>2</sub>C (1.09ml/g). Observed values were significantly not different ( $p \geq 0.05$ ) from that of  
273 the Control. High OAC is needed in *dabuwa* preparation because traditionally beef fat is



274 needed in its preparation for softness, flavor retention (Kinsella, 1976; Amandikwa *et al.*,  
275 2012; Igbabul *et al.*, 2014), palatability (Otegbayo, *et al.*, 2013) and higher calorific values.

276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281

UNDER PEER REVIEW

**Table 2: Effect of cowpea and soybean supplementation on the functional properties of *dabuwa* composite blends produced from three different cereal grains**

Formulations	Water absorption capacity (%)	Solubility (%)	Bulk density (g/ml)	Swelling capacity (g/g)	Oil absorption capacity (ml/g)
<b><i>Cowpea supplementation</i></b>					
F <sub>1</sub> Ma <sub>1</sub> C (12.5:57.5:30)	249.75±0.36 <sup>c</sup>	9.70±0.28 <sup>de</sup>	0.85±0.01 <sup>ab</sup>	1.51±0.01 <sup>c</sup>	1.05±0.00 <sup>c</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> Ma <sub>2</sub> C (22.5:47.5:30)	270.34±0.48 <sup>a</sup>	10.02±0.03 <sup>d</sup>	0.86±0.03 <sup>a</sup>	1.60±0.01 <sup>bc</sup>	1.39±0.01 <sup>a</sup>
F <sub>1</sub> Mi <sub>1</sub> C (12.5:57.5:30)	239.29±0.33 <sup>f</sup>	6.77±0.13 <sup>g</sup>	0.80±0.01 <sup>abcde</sup>	1.49±0.01 <sup>cde</sup>	1.02±0.01 <sup>cde</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> Mi <sub>2</sub> C (22.5:47.5:30)	241.18±0.24 <sup>e</sup>	6.74±0.01 <sup>g</sup>	0.78±0.02 <sup>bcde</sup>	1.30±0.00 <sup>ef</sup>	1.10±0.01 <sup>b</sup>
F <sub>1</sub> R <sub>1</sub> C (12.5:57.5:30)	216.76±0.36 <sup>k</sup>	8.40±0.21 <sup>f</sup>	0.86±0.01 <sup>a</sup>	2.15±0.07 <sup>a</sup>	0.98±0.01 <sup>f</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> R <sub>2</sub> C (22.5:47.5:30)	234.12±0.20 <sup>h</sup>	6.81±0.04 <sup>g</sup>	0.85±0.01 <sup>ab</sup>	2.17±0.18 <sup>a</sup>	0.98±0.01 <sup>f</sup>
<b><i>Soybean supplementation</i></b>					
F <sub>1</sub> Ma <sub>1</sub> S (12.5:57.5:30)	240.06±0.08 <sup>ef</sup>	12.98±0.02 <sup>b</sup>	0.77±0.03 <sup>cde</sup>	1.50±0.00 <sup>cde</sup>	1.01±0.01 <sup>def</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> Ma <sub>2</sub> S (22.5:47.5:30)	236.31±0.46 <sup>g</sup>	13.98±0.17 <sup>a</sup>	0.84±0.01 <sup>abc</sup>	1.79±0.01 <sup>b</sup>	1.04±0.01 <sup>cd</sup>
F <sub>1</sub> Mi <sub>1</sub> S (12.5:57.5:30)	221.09±0.31 <sup>j</sup>	9.32±0.01 <sup>e</sup>	0.74±0.01 <sup>e</sup>	1.29±0.01 <sup>ef</sup>	1.07±0.01 <sup>bc</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> Mi <sub>2</sub> S (22.5:47.5:30)	223.98±0.31 <sup>i</sup>	9.96±0.08 <sup>d</sup>	0.75±0.01 <sup>de</sup>	1.21±0.01 <sup>f</sup>	1.02±0.02 <sup>cde</sup>
F <sub>1</sub> R <sub>1</sub> S (12.5:57.5:30)	265.03±0.03 <sup>b</sup>	11.68±0.04 <sup>c</sup>	0.81±0.01 <sup>abcd</sup>	1.50±0.00 <sup>cde</sup>	1.07±0.01 <sup>bc</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> R <sub>2</sub> S (22.5:47.5:30)	234.17±0.08 <sup>h</sup>	11.74±0.04 <sup>c</sup>	0.74±0.01 <sup>e</sup>	1.79±0.01 <sup>b</sup>	0.99±0.01 <sup>f</sup>
Control FMa (25:75)	245.99±0.13 <sup>d</sup>	4.03±0.16 <sup>h</sup>	0.82±0.03 <sup>abc</sup>	1.52±0.02 <sup>c</sup>	0.97±0.01 <sup>f</sup>
Mean	239.85±15.27	9.39±2.77	0.81±0.05	1.60±0.30	1.05±0.11
CV (%)	0.123	1.35	2.14	3.35	1.48

Values are mean ± standard deviation of duplicate determinations. Means in the same column with different letters are significantly different (p≤0.05).

Key: F= Fonio, Ma = Maize, Mi = Millet, R = Rice, C = Cowpea, S = Soybean. The subscripts 1 and 2 of F denotes 12.5% and 22.5% respectively while those after Ma, Mi and R denotes 57.5% and 47.5% respectively.

## 4.2 Proximate composition of flour blends used to produce *dabuwa*.

The moisture, ash, protein, fat, fiber, carbohydrate contents and calorific values of the flour blends used for *dabuwa* production varied significantly ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) from 7.38% -12.18%, 1.80% -2.96%, 4.33%-16.95%, 2.45-9.57%, 1.62-6.59%, 53.66-82.90% and 337.12-393.37kcal/100g respectively (**Table 3**). There was enhancement of protein, fat and ash contents of multi grain blends as a result of legume supplementation of the fonio- containing maize, millet, and rice flours. Malik *et al.* (2015), Kumar *et al.* (2016) and Radhika *et al.* (2019) reported a similar increase in protein, ash and fibre contents of multigrain flours. The influence of soybean flour was more prominent in enhancing the nutritive value (with the exception of crude fiber) of the blends than cowpea flour as the results revealed. Soybean is known to contain high level of protein (40%), fat (20%) and ash (4.9%) (Cheftel *et al.*, 1985). Protein content of 38-44% was reported by Synder and Kwon (1987) and 47.5% by Stein *et al.* (2008) in soyabean. The Control (F<sub>Ma</sub>) recorded the least protein content of 4.33% while the highest value of 16.95% was observed in F<sub>1R<sub>1</sub>S</sub>. Protein values observed were higher than values reported by Abdulrahman and Omoniyi (2016) for single cereal flour from maize, millet and rice but lower than 14.00 to 16.49% for multigrain flour reported by **ijarotimi *et al.*, (2017)** for a multigrain blend consisting of maize, cassava starch, defatted soybean and moringa. Moisture contents of the blends were low and this is good for shelf stability. A range of 7.38%-12.18% was observed. Blends containing rice flour had greater moisture content, especially cowpea-treated blends. A moisture content of less than 13% will ensure storage stability of well packaged and stored white flours (Kent, 1970) and at moisture contents higher than 13%, mustiness due to mould growth may develop (Paul, 2000). Results for moisture content in this investigation all fall below 13%, an indication that these blends for *dabuwa* preparation can be kept for longer periods without quality deterioration.

The ash content represents the inorganic material present, and was enhanced with supplementation with legume flours when compared with the Control. The untreated Control (F<sub>Ma</sub>) had the least ash content of 1.96%, a value not significantly different ( $P \geq 0.05$ ) from 1.97% for F<sub>1R<sub>1</sub>C</sub> and 1.98% for F<sub>2Ma<sub>2</sub>S</sub>. The ash content ranged from 1.96% (F<sub>Ma</sub>) to 2.96% (F<sub>2R<sub>2</sub>S</sub>). Higher ash content values were observed in soybean treated blends than cowpea treated expectedly.

Cereal grains are rich sources of dietary fiber which represent the indigestible material of the blends. Dietary fiber varied significantly ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) from 1.62% (F<sub>1Ma<sub>1</sub>C</sub>) to 6.59% (F<sub>2Mi<sub>2</sub>S</sub>). Higher values of dietary fibre (6.59% and 6.26%) were observed in F<sub>2Mi<sub>2</sub>S</sub> and F<sub>1Mi<sub>1</sub>C</sub> respectively.

Blends containing soybean flour had lower levels of carbohydrate expectedly since carbohydrate contents were determined by "difference". The overall mean for carbohydrate contents was 67.88% and ranged from 53.66% (F<sub>2Mi<sub>2</sub>S</sub>) to 82.90% (F<sub>Ma</sub>). Ash, fiber, protein, fat and carbohydrates were higher in blends with higher level (57.5%) of cereal flour and fortified with 30% soyabean flour.

Calorific values of soybean supplemented cereal blends were also higher than the cowpea supplemented ones, the highest was 393.37kcal/100g (F<sub>2Mi<sub>2</sub>S</sub>) which is significantly different ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) from 355.50 kcal/100g (F<sub>1R<sub>1</sub>C</sub>). This might be as a result of high fat contents of soybean compared to cowpea in the blends.

**Table 3: Effect of cowpea and soybean supplementation on the proximate composition of composite blends for *dabuwa* produced from three different cereal grains**

Formulations	Proximate composition (%)						Calorie (kcal/100g)
	Moisture	Ash	Protein	Fat	Fibre	Carbohydrate	
<b><i>Cowpea supplementation</i></b>							
F <sub>1</sub> Ma <sub>1</sub> C (12.5:57.5:30)	8.20±0.01 <sup>g</sup>	1.80±0.06 <sup>d</sup>	6.12±0.01 <sup>gh</sup>	2.49±0.01 <sup>ef</sup>	1.65±0.01 <sup>ef</sup>	82.32±0.10 <sup>ab</sup>	358.24±0.30 <sup>e</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> Ma <sub>2</sub> C (22.5:47.5:30)	8.62±0.06 <sup>f</sup>	2.50±0.03 <sup>b</sup>	7.29±0.01 <sup>g</sup>	2.88±0.01 <sup>e</sup>	1.62±0.04 <sup>ef</sup>	70.52±9.43 <sup>cd</sup>	337.12±0.61 <sup>j</sup>
F <sub>1</sub> Mi <sub>1</sub> C (12.5:57.5:30)	9.12±0.01 <sup>e</sup>	2.50±0.06 <sup>b</sup>	14.21±0.01 <sup>cd</sup>	2.45±0.01 <sup>ef</sup>	6.26±0.21 <sup>ab</sup>	65.47±0.27 <sup>cde</sup>	340.77±0.89 <sup>i</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> Mi <sub>2</sub> C (22.5:47.5:30)	9.09±0.06 <sup>c</sup>	2.00±0.01 <sup>c</sup>	13.66±0.01 <sup>d</sup>	4.82±0.02 <sup>d</sup>	4.20±0.05 <sup>b</sup>	66.23±0.15 <sup>cde</sup>	362.99±0.37 <sup>d</sup>
F <sub>1</sub> R <sub>1</sub> C (12.5:57.5:30)	12.18±0.04 <sup>a</sup>	1.97±0.02 <sup>c</sup>	9.82±0.02 <sup>e</sup>	2.95±0.02 <sup>e</sup>	1.65±0.01 <sup>ef</sup>	72.44±0.09 <sup>bc</sup>	355.50±0.22 <sup>f</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> R <sub>2</sub> C (22.5:47.5:30)	12.14±0.04 <sup>a</sup>	2.04±0.01 <sup>c</sup>	9.87±0.02 <sup>e</sup>	2.91±0.02 <sup>e</sup>	3.62±0.01 <sup>bc</sup>	69.42±0.02 <sup>cde</sup>	343.31±0.19 <sup>h</sup>
<b><i>Soybean supplementation</i></b>							
F <sub>1</sub> Ma <sub>1</sub> S (12.5:57.5:30)	7.79±0.01 <sup>h</sup>	2.49±0.01 <sup>b</sup>	16.29±0.05 <sup>ab</sup>	7.08±0.01 <sup>b</sup>	2.44±0.01 <sup>d</sup>	64.99±0.00 <sup>cde</sup>	388.77±0.26 <sup>b</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> Ma <sub>2</sub> S (22.5:47.5:30)	7.38±0.01 <sup>i</sup>	1.98±0.01 <sup>c</sup>	8.66±0.01 <sup>f</sup>	6.28±0.04 <sup>bc</sup>	2.60±0.02 <sup>cd</sup>	74.09±0.08 <sup>abc</sup>	387.51±0.04 <sup>bc</sup>
F <sub>1</sub> Mi <sub>1</sub> S (12.5:57.5:30)	8.26±0.04 <sup>g</sup>	2.93±0.03 <sup>a</sup>	14.82±0.01 <sup>c</sup>	9.57±0.01 <sup>a</sup>	4.33±0.02 <sup>b</sup>	60.08±0.12 <sup>ef</sup>	385.77±0.39 <sup>c</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> Mi <sub>2</sub> S (22.5:47.5:30)	9.20±0.02 <sup>e</sup>	2.00±0.01 <sup>c</sup>	15.68±0.01 <sup>b</sup>	8.89±0.01 <sup>ab</sup>	6.59±0.01 <sup>a</sup>	53.66±0.06 <sup>f</sup>	393.37±0.23 <sup>a</sup>
F <sub>1</sub> R <sub>1</sub> S (12.5:57.5:30)	10.99±0.01 <sup>b</sup>	2.01±0.01 <sup>c</sup>	16.95±0.01 <sup>a</sup>	5.52±0.02 <sup>c</sup>	3.77±0.01 <sup>bc</sup>	60.77±0.06 <sup>d<sup>ef</sup></sup>	360.48±0.04 <sup>de</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> R <sub>2</sub> S (22.5:47.5:30)	10.62±0.04 <sup>c</sup>	2.96±0.01 <sup>a</sup>	15.48±0.01 <sup>bc</sup>	8.54±0.02 <sup>ab</sup>	2.87±0.02 <sup>c</sup>	59.54±0.07 <sup>ef</sup>	376.88±0.06 <sup>cd</sup>
Control FMa (25:75)	9.51±0.01 <sup>d</sup>	1.96±0.01 <sup>c</sup>	4.33±0.01 <sup>h</sup>	2.49±0.02 <sup>ef</sup>	1.77±0.02 <sup>e</sup>	82.90±0.08 <sup>a</sup>	353.38±0.09 <sup>g</sup>
Mean	9.47±0.036	1.99±0.030	11.79±0.018	5.14±0.017	3.31±1.67	67.88±2.62	364.93±20.57
CV (%)	0.382	1.48	0.149	0.339	1.89	3.85	2.86

Values are mean ± standard deviation of duplicate determinations. Means in the same column with different letters are significantly different (p≤0.05).

Key: F= Fonio, Ma = Maize, Mi = Millet, R = Rice, C = Cowpea, S = Soybean. The subscripts 1 and 2 of F denotes 12.5% and 22.5% respectively while those after Ma, Mi and R denotes 57.5% and 47.5% respectively.

### 4.3. Proximate composition of modified *dabuwa* and Control.

As shown in **Table 4**, moisture, ash, protein, fat, fiber, carbohydrate and calories content of *dabuwa* ranged from 4.86-10.85%, 0.92-2.48%, 10.11-16.38%, 2.02-10.60%, 0.96-4.65%, 58.55-86.54%, and 351.00-421.17kcal/100g respectively. There was a general enhancement of nutrients in the enriched *dabuwa*, the preparation process might be responsible for the slight reduction. Results indicated an enhancement of protein and fat, and consequently, calorific contents of the enriched *dabuwa*. Fiber content was enhanced not in any particular trend while ash contents were lower compared to those of flour blends. Malik *et al.* (2015), Kumar *et al.* (2016), and Radhika *et al.* (2019) reported an enhancement of nutrients in products obtained from multigrain blend compared to flour from a single grain.

Generally, moisture contents of *dabuwa* were low; a range of 4.86% to 10.85%, and this is an indication of storage stability and longer shelf life, however, not different from those of the blends. *Dabuwa* with soybean treated blends had greater moisture contents than their cowpea treated counterparts. This may be due to high presence of hydrophobic substances in soybean treated *dabuwa*.

Results indicate a reduction in both ash and fiber contents of *dabuwa* compared to the flour blends, even though a significant difference ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) existed between the values of the Control and those of enriched *dabuwa*. Ash contents ranged from 0.92 to 2.48%, these values are lower than 4.07 to 5.01% reported by Radhika *et al.* (2019).

Fiber contents varied significantly ( $P \leq 0.05$ ) from 0.96% ( $F_1R_1C$ ) to 4.63% ( $F_1Mi_1C$ ). Millet grain is a good source of fiber and ash as shown by *dabuwa* containing millet, a desirable quality improvement compared with fiber and ash contents of the control and the legume-treated maize and rice products.

Protein content of the untreated Control FMa (25:75) was the least (10.11%) significantly not different ( $P \geq 0.05$ ) from 10.12% ( $F_1Mi_1S$ ). The overall mean for protein content was 9.68% and it ranged from 10.11% to 16.38%. *Dabuwa* produced from  $F_1Mi_1C$  and  $F_2Mi_2S$  had the highest protein contents of 16.38% and 15.43% respectively. Devi *et al.* (2015) reported millets as distinctive among cereals because of their abundance in protein along with Ca, dietary fiber and polyphenol.

Fat contents varied significantly ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) from 2.02% to 10.60% with a mean value of 5.19%. These values are higher than 1.64 – 6.72% reported by Radhika *et al.* (2019), this was expected since beef fat was part of the formulation for *dabuwa* preparation. Low moisture contents that would guarantee storage stability for *dabuwa* would not be of value if rancidity is encouraged by higher fat contents.

Values for carbohydrate and calories of *dabuwa* were generally higher than the Control. Carbohydrate values ranged from 58.55% ( $F_2Mi_2S$ ) to 86.54% ( $F_2R_2C$ ). Dietary calories ranged from 351.03kcal/100g ( $F_1R_1S$ ) to 421.17 kcal/100g ( $F_1Ma_1S$ ). Calorific contents were enhanced in soybean treated *dabuwa* expectedly compared to the cowpea treated products, especially *dabuwa* with higher amounts of cereal flours (57.5%).

**Table 4: Effect of cowpea and soybean supplementation on the proximate composition of *dabuwa* produced from three different cereal grains**

Formulations	Proximate composition (%)						Calorie (kcal/100g)
	Moisture	Ash	Protein	Fat	Fibre	Carbohydrate	
<b><i>Cowpea supplementation</i></b>							
F <sub>1</sub> Ma <sub>1</sub> C (12.5:57.5:30)	6.76±0.35 <sup>f</sup>	0.94±0.01 <sup>f</sup>	11.89±0.01 <sup>d</sup>	4.44±0.01 <sup>ef</sup>	1.21±0.01 <sup>e</sup>	77.75±0.37 <sup>c</sup>	371.54±1.44 <sup>f</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> Ma <sub>2</sub> C (22.5:47.5:30)	4.86±0.35 <sup>h</sup>	1.41±0.01 <sup>de</sup>	11.04±0.22 <sup>e</sup>	8.34±0.04 <sup>bc</sup>	1.12±0.02 <sup>e</sup>	73.22±0.54 <sup>d</sup>	412.12±1.65 <sup>b</sup>
F <sub>1</sub> Mi <sub>1</sub> C (12.5:57.5:30)	8.37±0.05 <sup>cd</sup>	2.48±0.04 <sup>a</sup>	16.38±0.39 <sup>a</sup>	7.88±0.02 <sup>c</sup>	4.63±0.07 <sup>a</sup>	60.25±0.46 <sup>f</sup>	377.49±0.09 <sup>e</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> Mi <sub>2</sub> C (22.5:47.5:30)	7.61±0.06 <sup>e</sup>	0.92±0.03 <sup>f</sup>	12.29±0.02 <sup>d</sup>	2.30±0.04 <sup>g</sup>	3.30±0.28 <sup>bc</sup>	73.59±0.30 <sup>d</sup>	364.23±1.45 <sup>g</sup>
F <sub>1</sub> R <sub>1</sub> C (12.5:57.5:30)	7.41±0.01 <sup>ef</sup>	1.50±0.07 <sup>d</sup>	11.50±0.01 <sup>g</sup>	2.54±0.23 <sup>g</sup>	0.96±0.01 <sup>e</sup>	82.11±0.29 <sup>b</sup>	373.21±0.97 <sup>f</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> R <sub>2</sub> C (22.5:47.5:30)	5.22±0.01 <sup>h</sup>	1.44±0.01 <sup>de</sup>	11.44±0.01 <sup>i</sup>	2.02±0.05 <sup>gh</sup>	3.32±0.01 <sup>bc</sup>	86.54±0.07 <sup>a</sup>	370.16±0.19 <sup>f</sup>
<b><i>Soybean supplementation</i></b>							
F <sub>1</sub> Ma <sub>1</sub> S (12.5:57.5:30)	8.57±0.02 <sup>cd</sup>	1.33±0.01 <sup>e</sup>	14.77±0.34 <sup>b</sup>	8.75±0.03 <sup>b</sup>	2.00±0.05 <sup>d</sup>	59.58±0.40 <sup>fg</sup>	421.17±0.00 <sup>a</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> Ma <sub>2</sub> S (22.5:47.5:30)	6.01±0.07 <sup>g</sup>	1.33±0.04 <sup>e</sup>	13.63±0.34 <sup>c</sup>	6.07±0.06 <sup>d</sup>	2.00±0.04 <sup>d</sup>	70.97±0.33 <sup>e</sup>	393.01±0.54 <sup>c</sup>
F <sub>1</sub> Mi <sub>1</sub> S (12.5:57.5:30)	7.96±0.06 <sup>de</sup>	1.85±0.04 <sup>c</sup>	10.12±0.02 <sup>f</sup>	8.44±0.03 <sup>bc</sup>	3.63±0.07 <sup>b</sup>	73.00±0.03 <sup>d</sup>	363.42±0.06 <sup>gh</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> Mi <sub>2</sub> S (22.5:47.5:30)	8.81±0.20 <sup>bc</sup>	1.92±0.03 <sup>c</sup>	15.43±0.09 <sup>b</sup>	10.60±0.08 <sup>a</sup>	4.65±0.33 <sup>a</sup>	58.55±0.06 <sup>g</sup>	391.32±0.88 <sup>c</sup>
F <sub>1</sub> R <sub>1</sub> S (12.5:57.5:30)	9.28±0.04 <sup>b</sup>	2.26±0.06 <sup>b</sup>	12.26±0.06 <sup>h</sup>	4.81±0.04 <sup>e</sup>	2.96±0.04 <sup>c</sup>	81.42±0.06 <sup>b</sup>	351.03±0.41 <sup>i</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> R <sub>2</sub> S (22.5:47.5:30)	10.85±0.04 <sup>a</sup>	0.94±0.01 <sup>f</sup>	10.94±0.01 <sup>i</sup>	3.17±0.03 <sup>h</sup>	2.02±0.01 <sup>d</sup>	82.06±0.09 <sup>b</sup>	360.57±0.08 <sup>h</sup>
<b>Control FMa (25:75)</b>	6.05±0.02 <sup>g</sup>	1.51±0.01 <sup>d</sup>	10.11±0.01 <sup>f</sup>	4.16±0.25 <sup>ef</sup>	1.18±0.03 <sup>e</sup>	76.99±0.48 <sup>c</sup>	385.81±0.28 <sup>d</sup>
Mean	7.52±0.16	1.53±0.033	9.68±0.185	5.19±0.102	2.54±0.124	73.54±0.321	379.62±0.84
CV (%)	2.16	2.12	1.91	1.97	4.88	0.44	0.222

Values are mean ± standard deviation of duplicate determinations. Means in the same column with different letters are significantly different (p≤0.05).

Key: F= Fonio, Ma = Maize, Mi = Millet, R = Rice, C = Cowpea, S = Soybean. The subscripts 1 and 2 of F denotes 12.5% and 22.5% respectively while those after Ma, Mi and R denotes 57.5% and 47.5% respectively.

#### 4.4 Sensory properties of *dabuwa*

Sensory scores as shown in **Table 5** were significantly different ( $p \leq 0.05$ ). The Control (F<sub>1</sub>Ma) had the highest and the millet containing *dabuwa* scored the least. The variations were as follows: appearance: 4.93 (F<sub>1</sub>Mi<sub>1</sub>S) to 8.80 (F<sub>1</sub>Ma), taste: 4.47 (F<sub>1</sub>Mi<sub>1</sub>C) to 8.53 (F<sub>1</sub>Ma), mouthfeel: 2.87 (F<sub>2</sub>Mi<sub>2</sub>C) to 8.40 (F<sub>1</sub>Ma), aroma: 6.53 (F<sub>1</sub>Mi<sub>1</sub>C and F<sub>1</sub>Mi<sub>1</sub>S) to 8.20 (F<sub>1</sub>Ma), and overall acceptability: 5.40 (F<sub>1</sub>Mi<sub>1</sub>C) to 8.40 (F<sub>1</sub>Ma). The overall mean scores were appearance 7.47, taste 7.19, mouthfeel 5.90, aroma 7.14, and overall acceptability 7.14. The sensory attributes were influenced positively by the presence of rice and maize flours mainly and the influence of legume flours were masked by the cereal flours and the presence of the spice mix. Radhika *et al.* (2019) observed lower sensory scores for millet-containing multigrain products. Products prepared from millet flour have low consumer appeal due to presence of the fibrous seed coat which renders the flour coarse in texture and imparts a greyish color that gives a bitter taste (Olatungi, *et al.*, 1982). McDonough *et al.* (2000) blamed higher presence of polyphenolic pigments in the pericarp, aleurone and endosperm regions of millet to be responsible for off colour and off taste as observed for *dabuwa*. Rice containing *dabuwa* had the highest scores for appearance (8.53, 8.60, 8.60 and 8.60) and taste (8.20, 8.47, 8.33 and 8.53), values that were not significantly different ( $p \geq 0.05$ ) from maize containing *dabuwa*. On the overall, F<sub>1</sub>Ma i.e. the Control outscored all other samples in all attributes but taste, the Control and F<sub>2</sub>R<sub>2</sub>S scored 8.53 for taste, making them the most preferred. However, the coefficient of variation for overall acceptability was the least (8.90) indicating that the various *dabuwa* were generally accepted and none was rejected.

1 **Table 5: Effect of cowpea and soybean supplementation on sensory**  
 2 **characteristics of *dabuwa* produced from three different cereal grains**

Formulation	Sensory Attributes				Overall acceptability
	Appearance	Taste	Mouth feel	Aroma	
<b>Cowpea supplementation</b>					
F <sub>1</sub> Ma <sub>1</sub> C (12.5:57.5:30)	8.47±0.74 <sup>a</sup>	8.13±1.13 <sup>a</sup>	6.80±0.86 <sup>bcd</sup>	7.27±1.03 <sup>ab</sup>	7.87±0.74 <sup>ab</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> Ma <sub>2</sub> C (22.5:47.5:30)	8.40±0.74 <sup>a</sup>	8.13±0.13 <sup>a</sup>	7.00±0.93 <sup>bcd</sup>	7.27±1.03 <sup>ab</sup>	7.67±0.62 <sup>ab</sup>
F <sub>1</sub> Mi <sub>1</sub> C (12.5:57.5:30)	5.07±1.44 <sup>b</sup>	4.47±0.92 <sup>b</sup>	3.00±1.20 <sup>e</sup>	6.53±0.92 <sup>b</sup>	5.40±0.83 <sup>c</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> Mi <sub>2</sub> C (22.5:47.5:30)	5.13±0.99 <sup>b</sup>	4.67±0.62 <sup>b</sup>	2.87±0.99 <sup>e</sup>	6.60±0.74 <sup>b</sup>	5.87±0.64 <sup>c</sup>
F <sub>1</sub> R <sub>1</sub> C (12.5:57.5:30)	8.53±0.52 <sup>a</sup>	8.20±1.01 <sup>a</sup>	6.20±0.68 <sup>d</sup>	7.13±0.74 <sup>ab</sup>	7.40±0.51 <sup>b</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> R <sub>2</sub> C (22.5:47.5:30)	8.60±0.51 <sup>a</sup>	8.47±0.52 <sup>a</sup>	6.40±0.83 <sup>cd</sup>	7.27±0.46 <sup>ab</sup>	7.67±0.49 <sup>ab</sup>
<b>Soybean supplementation</b>					
F <sub>1</sub> Ma <sub>1</sub> S (12.5:57.5:30)	8.47±0.74 <sup>a</sup>	8.27±0.88 <sup>a</sup>	7.33±0.72 <sup>bc</sup>	7.40±0.99 <sup>ab</sup>	7.80±0.68 <sup>ab</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> Ma <sub>2</sub> S (22.5:47.5:30)	8.47±0.74 <sup>a</sup>	8.27±0.88 <sup>a</sup>	7.53±0.83 <sup>ab</sup>	7.33±1.11 <sup>ab</sup>	7.80±0.56 <sup>ab</sup>
F <sub>1</sub> Mi <sub>1</sub> S (12.5:57.5:30)	4.93±1.10 <sup>b</sup>	4.60±0.91 <sup>b</sup>	3.60±0.83 <sup>e</sup>	6.53±0.99 <sup>b</sup>	5.53±0.74 <sup>c</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> Mi <sub>2</sub> S (12.5:47.5:30)	5.00±1.07 <sup>b</sup>	4.93±0.88 <sup>b</sup>	3.67±0.73 <sup>e</sup>	6.67±0.72 <sup>b</sup>	5.80±0.41 <sup>c</sup>
F <sub>1</sub> R <sub>1</sub> S (12.5:57.5:30)	8.60±0.51 <sup>a</sup>	8.33±0.90 <sup>a</sup>	6.87±0.92 <sup>bcd</sup>	7.20±0.56 <sup>ab</sup>	7.60±0.51 <sup>b</sup>
F <sub>2</sub> R <sub>2</sub> S (22.5:47.5:30)	8.60±0.51 <sup>a</sup>	8.53±0.52 <sup>a</sup>	7.00±0.93 <sup>bcd</sup>	7.47±0.83 <sup>ab</sup>	8.00±0.65 <sup>ab</sup>
Control FMa (25:75)	8.80±0.56 <sup>a</sup>	8.53±0.74 <sup>a</sup>	8.40±0.63 <sup>a</sup>	8.20±1.15 <sup>a</sup>	8.40±0.74 <sup>a</sup>
Mean	7.47±1.82	7.19±1.89	5.90±2.01	7.14±0.97	7.14±1.20
CV	11.11	12.10	14.63	12.47	8.90

3  
 4 Values are mean ± standard deviation of duplicate determinations. Means in the same column  
 5 with different letters are significantly different (p≤0.05).

6 Key: F= Fonio, Ma = Maize, Mi = Millet, R = Rice, C = Cowpea, S = Soybean. The  
 7 subscripts 1 and 2 of F denotes 12.5% and 22.5% respectively while those after Ma, Mi and R  
 8 denotes 57.5% and 47.5% respectively.

### 9 CONCLUSION

10 Within multigrain flour blends, there was enhancement of water absorption capacity which is  
 11 necessary for *dabuwa* production; and equally enhanced was the nutrient density of the  
 12 modified flour blends and *dabuwa* in terms of enhanced ash, protein, fiber, fat but slightly  
 13 decreased carbohydrate. *Dabuwa* containing maize or rice competed favorably with  
 14 traditional *dabuwa* in terms of all the tested sensory attributes however, sensory quality of  
 15 millet-containing *dabuwa* was marred by their dull color, bitter taste and coarse texture.  
 16 It is concluded that ready-to-use multigrain flour blends have lessened the labor involved in  
 17 the production of *dabuwa*. Moreover, the nutritional profile of *dabuwa*, a traditional cereal  
 18 based food of the Shuwa-Arabs of Northern Nigeria was equally enhanced without  
 19 undermining its well-known sensory properties.

20

21

### REFERENCES

22 Abdulrahman W.F. and Omoniyi A.O. (2016) Proximate analysis and mineral compositions  
 23 of different cereals available in Gwagwalada market, F.C.T., Abuja, Nigeria. *Journal*  
 24 *of Advances in Food Science & Technology*. 3(2): 50-55.



- 25 Amandikwa C. (2012). Proximate and functional properties of open air, solar and oven-dried  
26 cocoyam flour. *International Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development*. SAAT  
27 FUTO.
- 28 AOAC. (1998). Association of Official Analytical Chemists. 18th ed. Official methods of  
29 analysis. Washington DC,
- 30 Banu H, Itagi N, Singh V. (2012). Preparation, Composition, Functional Properties and  
31 Antioxidative Activities of Multigrain Composite Mixes. *J Food Sci Technol*. 49  
32 (1):74-81. Doi: 10.1007/s13197-011-0267-6
- 33 Beuchat L.R. (1997). Functional and electrophoretic characteristics of succinylated Peanut  
34 Flour Protein. *J Agric. Food Chem*. 25:258-261.
- 35 Cheftel, J.C., Cuq J-L., and Lorient D. (1985) "Proteines Alimentaires" Tec & Doc Lavoisier,  
36 Paris.
- 37 Devi, P.B., et al., Health benefits of finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* L.) polyphenols and  
38 dietary fiber: a review. *Journal of food science and technology*, 2014. 51(6): p. 1021-  
39 1040.
- 40 Diakite, S. (2010). More Fonio Less Labour. Source:www.rolex.com/footer/legal.html
- 41 Igbabul, B.D., Bello, F.A. and Ekeh C.N. (2014). Proximate composition and functional  
42 properties of wheat, sweet potato and hamburger bean flour blends. *Global Advance*  
43 *Research Journal of Food Science and Technology*. Vol. 3(4), 118-124.
- 44 Ihekoronye, A.I. and Ngoddy P.O. (1985). *Integrated Food Science and Technology for the*  
45 *Tropics*. Macmillan pub. Pp. 244-251.
- 46 Ijarotimi O.S., Ebisemiju M.O. and Oluwalana I.B. (2017). Proteins, Amino Acid Profile,  
47 Phytochemicals and Antioxidative Activities of Plant-based Food Material Blends.  
48 *American Journal of Food Technology*, 12: 285-294. DOI: 10.3923/ajft.2017.285.294
- 49 Karuna D., Noel D., Dillip K. (1996). *Food and Nutrition Bulletin*. United Nation; 17 (2).
- 50 Kent, N.L. (1970). *Technology of cereals*. Pergamon press Ltd, Oxford.
- 51 Kinsella JE (1976). Functional properties of proteins in foods: A survey. *Crit. Rev. Food Sci.*  
52 *Nut*. 7:219-232.
- 53 Kumar R., Samsher, Suresh Chandra. (2016). Studies on proximate analysis of biscuits using  
54 multigrain flours during ambient condition. *International Journal of Food Science*  
55 *and Nutrition*. Volume 1; Issue 2; Page No. 39-41.
- 56 Leach, H.W.; Mc Cowen, L.D. and Schoch, T.J. (1959). Structure of the starch granules. In;  
57 *Swelling and Solubility Patterns of various Starches*. *Cereal Chemistry*, 36; 534-544.
- 58 Liener I.E. (1989). *Legumes: Chemistry, Technology and Human Nutrition*. Marced  
59 Inc.Dekker, New York.

- 60 Malik H, Nayik GA, Dar BN. (2015), Optimisation of process for development of  
61 nutritionally enriched multigrain bread. *J Food Process Technol* 7: 544.  
62 doi:10.4172/2157110.1000544.
- 63 Malomo O., Ogunmoleya A.B., Adokoyeni O.O., Oluwa-Joba S.O., Sobanwa M.O.(2012).  
64 Rheological and Functional Properties of Soy-Poundoyam Flour. *Int. J. Food Sci.and*  
65 *Nutr. Eng.* 2(6): 101-107. DOI: 10. 5923/JFood. 20120206.01.
- 66 McDonough, C.M.; Rooney, L.W. and Serna-Saldivar, S.O. (2000). “The Millets”. Food  
67 Science and Technology: *Handbook of Cereal Science and Technology* (CRC Press).  
68 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 99: 177-210
- 69 Nierenberg D. and Spoden k. (2012). “Global Grain Production at Record High Despite  
70 Extreme Climatic Events”. In: *Global Trends that Shape our Future*. Source:  
71 Worldwatch Institute. Vital Sign.
- 72 Nkama, I. (1993). Traditional methods of production of high protein-energy foods from grain  
73 legumes in the north-eastern states of Nigeria. *Annals of Borno*. 10:138-148.
- 74 Olatungi, O., Akinrele, I.A., Edwards, C. C., Loleoso, O.A. (1982). “Sorghum and Millet  
75 Processing and Uses in Nigeria”. *Cereal Foods World*. 27:277-280.
- 76 Onwuka G.I. (2005). *Food Analysis and Instrumentation, Theory, and Practice*. Naphthali  
77 Prints. A division of HG Support Nigeria Ltd. Lagos, Nigeria.
- 78 Otegbayo, B.O.1, Samuel, F.O. and Alalade, T.1. (2013). Functional properties of soy-  
79 enriched tapioca. *African Journal of Biotechnology*. Full Length Research Paper Vol.  
80 12(22), pp. 3583-3589, 29 May, 2013. DOI: 10.5897/AJB12.2654 ISSN 1684-5315  
81 ©2013 Academic Journals <http://www.academicjournals.org/AJB>.
- 82 Paul A.F. Houssou. (2000). *Storage and Packaging Studies on Degermed Maize Flour*.  
83 M.Phil Degree Thesis. Department of Nutrition and Food Science, University of  
84 Ghana, Legon.
- 85 Radhika, V.A., Kaur M, Thakur P, Chauhan D, Rizvi Q.U.E.H., Jan S., Kumar K. (2019).  
86 Development and nutritional evaluation of multigrain gluten free cookies and pasta  
87 products. *Curr Res Nutr Food Sci*; 7(3). <https://bit.ly/2miiQY6>.
- 88 Robert H.G., Emmanuel P.L., Jack M.P., John S., Ronnee A., Yuan-Chen w., Yu-Chen C.,  
89 Lu-Te C. (2013). Fatty acid, amino acid, mineral and antioxidant contents of acha  
90 (*Digitaria exilis*) grown on the Jos Plateau, Nigeria. *Int. J. Nutr Metab*. 5(1):1-8.  
91 Doi:10.5897/IJNAM13.0137.
- 92 Singh R.B. (1988). “Trends and Prospects for Mungbean Production in South and South  
93 eastern Asia”. In: S. Shanmugasundaram and B.T. Mclean (eds) *Mungbean:*  
94 *Proceedings of the second International Symposium*, pp 552-559, AVRDC, Shanhua,  
95 Taiwan, Rep. of China.
- 96 Solsulski, F.W. (1962). The centrifuge method for determining flour water absorptivity in  
97 Hard Red Spring Wheat. *Cereal Chemist*, 39: 344.

- 98 Stein H.H., Berger L.L., Drackley J.K., Fahey G.F., Hernot D.C. and Parsons C.M. (2008).  
99 "Nutritional properties and Feeding Values of Soybeans and Their Coproducts".  
100 Department of Animal Sciences, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801.
- 101 Suneha G., Ranjeet R.K. and Shelly P. (2019). Hydrolytic and Oxidative Decay of Lipids:  
102 Biochemical Markers for Rancidity Measurement in Pearl Millet Flour. Omics meet  
103 plant biochemistry: Application in nutritional enhancement with one health  
104 perspective 221. Researchgate.net
- 105 Synder H.E. and T.W. Kwon. (1987). Soybean utilization. Von Nostrand Reinhold Co., New  
106 York.

UNDER PEER REVIEW