

**Original Research Article**  
**Application of Optimization Method in Whole  
Wheat Flour - Soybean Flour – Oyster Meat Powder  
Blends for the Production of Nutrient –  
Dense Composite Flour**

Comment [h1]: Make it shorter topic like 'Optimization Method of Whole Wheat Flour - Soybean Flour – Oyster Meat Powder for Nutrient – Dense Composite Flour'

**ABSTRACT**

**Aim:** To study the production of Nutrient – Dense Composite Flour from the blends of whole wheat flour, soybean flour (full fat) and oyster meat powder.

**Study design:** The study was design using the D-optimal combination design of Response Surface Methodology (RSM)

**Place and Duration of Study:** The study was carried out at Department of Food, Nutrition and Home Science, University of Port Harcourt (Processing of raw materials) and the Department of Food Technology, Federal Institute of industrial research Oshodi, Lagos (Analysis of raw materials) between October 2021 and August 2022.

**Methodology:** The raw materials were each processed to create wholesome flours, and then they were combined according to the matrix generated, which had ranges of 70 – 100%, 0 – 22%, and 0 – 8% for whole wheat flour (WWF), soybean flour (SBF) and oyster meat powder (OMP) respectively.

**Results:** The design was used to assess the significance (5% probability) of the moisture, fat, and protein content, which ranged from 8.09 to 11.37%, 1.80 to 8.52% and 9.70 to 19.07% respectively; the water absorption (72.00 - 79.10BU), dough stability (9.3 - 17.5BU) and mixing tolerance index (25 - 50BU); and lightness and yellowness, which ranged from 65.48 - 83.2 and 13.77 - 23.58 respectively, of the flour blends. Protein content, water absorption dough stability, and mixing tolerance index were prioritized while moisture content, fat content, and yellowness were minimized for the numerical optimization of the responses.

Comment [h2]: One statement why you study this?

**Conclusion:** The best flour combination was 72.51% whole wheat flour, 19.63% soybean flour, and 7.86% oyster meat powder.

**Keywords:** Composite flour, D-Optimal design, Proximate content, Farinograph value, Lightness, Yellowness, Numerical optimization.

**Comment [h3]:** Make it in the same page of abstract

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Globally, people are consuming more bread and other baked goods [1,2,3]. However, the low protein quantity and quality of wheat flour (- an essential component in all baked goods) when compared to protein sources (milk, soybean, pea, and lupin) has been a major concern for producers and consumers alike as it relates to the provision of essential nutrients, especially to the growing and young children [4,5,6].

**Comment [h4]:** Use the software or any reference writing methods to trace the references

In general, composite flour has been observed to give a balanced nutritional profile, making it healthier than flour made only from any one type of cereal [7]. According to Mepbaet *al.*, [8], among other things, the quantity and quality of wheat gluten as well as the nature of the product involved greatly influence the percentage of wheat flour needed to produce a certain impact in composite flour.

One of the most significant sources of protein in the world and a good supplier of all essential amino acids is soybean. It is known as "the protein hope of the future" and contains 3 percent lecithin, which is beneficial for brain development. It is also rich in calcium, phosphorus, and vitamins A, B, and D [9]. Additionally, the isoflavones found in soybeans work as powerful cancer-preventive agents to reduce the risk of developing a variety of cancers. Evidence also supports the positive effects of soy isoflavones on the prevention of cardiovascular disease [10].

As a member of the family Ostreidae, Oysters (*Crassostrea gasar*) are aquatic creatures that are one of the most well-known and frequently cultivated marine organisms. They are highly prized seafood and a delicacy everywhere in the world while in some regions of the world this resource is underutilized [11]. In general, shellfish is regarded as a low-fat, low saturated-fat, high poly unsaturated fatty acids (PUFA) (eicosapentaenoic acids, docosahexaenoic acid, and linoleic acid) and high-protein food with higher than usual amounts of stimulating minerals like selenium, zinc, iron, and magnesium, as well as B nutrients. They are excellent sources of zinc, calcium, selenium, and vitamin B-12 [12,13]. Nowadays, value-

addition to seafood products has been highlighted as one of the high priority areas for development within the industry [14], hence its inclusion in composite blends.

The formulation of foods from low lysine staples with addition of other food materials has been proposed as a practical and suitable approach to improving the protein nutritional value (quantity and quality) of foods aimed as popular carrier of nutrition to vulnerable groups like pregnant and nursing mothers, young and school age children so as to reduce the incidence of malnutrition [4,15].

In general, vegetarians and health-conscious individuals are consuming more meals enriched with proteins from plant sources [16]; however, proteins from these sources are thought to be partially incomplete since they lack some of the important amino acids. The addition of an animal-based protein source (oyster meat powder) is required to correct this alleged protein imbalance. This serves as the conceptual framework for this project, which aims to offer a composite blend with a balance of nutrients.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 Materials

Whole wheat and soybeans were purchased from NewLayout market in Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria. Raw Oysters in their shells were purchased from Okrika market square in Okrika Island, Rivers State, Nigeria.

**Comment [h5]:** How it is purchased the conditions of collection, and how it is kept after purchasing?

### 2.2 Methods

#### Preparation of Whole Wheat Flour, Soybeans Flour and Oyster Meat Flour

Whole wheat flour was produced from whole wheat grains using a modified method of Ndifeet *al.*, [17]. The whole wheat grains were sorted and cleaned of all contaminants (inclusive of spoilt grains and metals) (Fig.1). The grains were then washed, dried, milled using attrition mill and sieved through a 0.25mm mesh size screen. Whole wheat flour was cooled for six hours and then packed in air and water tight cellophane bag and stored in the refrigerator till usage.

**Comment [h6]:** How it is sorted? Is there any metals in the grain?


**Comment [h7]:** Spacing in unit? And why 25 mm mesh chosen?

Soybean flour was produced from raw soybean using modified method of Ndifeet *al.*, [17]. The soybeans were sorted and cleaned of all contaminants and spoilt seeds. The beans were then washed, oven-dried, roasted, winnowed and milled in an attrition mill. Soybean flour (full fat) was sieved to 0.25mm

**Comment [h8]:** ditto

particlesize, the soya bean flour is then cooled at room temperature for six hours and then packed in air and water tight cellophane bag and stored (Fig.1).

UNDER PEER REVIEW



Comment [h9]: Units 3 h, 20 minutes

Comment [h10]: Instead figure of the samples and powders any color change n better and this is not a figure rather a flow chart or diagram showing the production

Fig. 1: Production of Whole Wheat Flour (WWF), Soybean Flour (SBF) and Oyster Meat Powder (OMP)

Raw oysters were obtained from the market. Prior to its sales in the market, the Oyster were harvested from the mangrove tree root to which they were attached, they were scrubbed and washed with warm water to remove mud, seawater and all contaminants then rinsed with cold fresh water. The meat was shucked from the shell with knife and oven-dried at 60°C for 4hours. Dried oyster meat was ground and sieved to 0.25mm particle size (Fig.1) then packaged and stored.

**Comment [h11]:** Is it your works before purchasing? Or did you get information from the Merchant

**Comment [h12]:** ditto

### 2.3 Experimental Design for Ingredient Optimization

The experimental mixture design and statistical analysis were performed using design expert software version 6.0.8 (stat-ease Inc., Minneapolis,MN, USA).Based on preliminary experiments, the range of the 3 independent variables- Whole Wheat Flour, (WWF -  $X_1$ ), Soybean Flour (SBF -  $X_2$ ) and Oyster Meat Powder (OMP-  $X_3$ ) were  $70 \leq X_1 \leq 100$ ,  $0 \leq X_2 \leq 22$ , and  $0 \leq X_3 \leq 8$ , respectively (Table 1).

**Comment [h13]:** why you choose this range any reference or reason?

**Table 1: Parameters studied in physical optimization of Whole Wheat-Soybean-Oyster Meat Composite Flour**

Code	Parameter	Low level	High level
WWF	Whole Wheat Flour	70	100
SBF	Soybean Flour	0	22
OMP	Oyster Meat Powder	0	8

A D-optimal design consisting of 14 experimental runs including 4 replications was chosen to evaluate the combined effect of the 3 independent variables (Table 2). The dependent variables– Moisture Content ( $Y_1$ ), FatContent ( $Y_2$ ), Protein Content ( $Y_3$ ), Water Absorption ( $Y_4$ ), Dough Stability ( $Y_5$ ), Mixing Tolerance Index ( $Y_6$ ), Lightness ( $Y_7$ ) and Yellowness ( $Y_8$ ) were selected as responses for representing the main parameters of flour quality.

**Comment [h14]:** Why and how did you select? Any reference or reason?

The significance of all terms was judged statistically by a probability (p) at 0.05 (Yin *et al*, 2009) the interaction effects of ingredients on the mixture were determined using a 3-Dimension contour plots.

**Table 2: Percentage Composition of Whole Wheat-Soybean-Oyster Meat Composite Flour**

Exp Run	Sample code	X <sub>1</sub> (WWF)	X <sub>2</sub> (SBF)	X <sub>3</sub> (OMP)
1*	WWC1	78.00	22.00	0.00
2*	WWC 2	70.00	22.00	8.00
3	WWC 3	85.00	11.00	4.00
4	WWC 4	79.50	16.50	4.00
5	WWC 5	78.00	22.00	0.00
6	WWC 6	89.00	11.00	0.00
7	WWC 7	81.00	11.00	8.00
8*	WWC 8	100.00	0.00	0.00
9	WWC 9	70.00	22.00	8.00
10*	WWC10	92.00	0.00	8.00
11	WWC 11	92.00	0.00	8.00
12	WWC 12	100.00	0.00	0.00
13	WWC 13	92.50	5.50	2.00
14	WWC 14	74.00	22.00	4.00

\*Duplicated runs.

The numerical optimization was performed to bases canonical model by setting a response goal area.

Desirability was predicted using a contour plot and was calculated [19].

**Comment [h15]:** Is it predicted or calculated not clear for me.

## 2.4 Analyses

### **Proximate Analysis of Samples**

The Moisture content of flours was analyzed according to AACC.44–15.02 [20] while the protein content analysis was determined according to kjeldahl technique [21].

$$\% \text{ Protein} = \frac{(A - B) \times N \times 1.4007 \times F}{\text{Weight of Sample (g)}}$$

Where: A = volume (ml) of alkali back-titration of blank;

B = volume (ml) of alkali back-titration of sample;

N = normality of alkali; F= Factor of (6.25)

The fat composition was of the samples were determined according to method Thiexet *al.* [22].

### **Farinograph Determination**

The dough rheological properties of the blended floursamples were analyzed according to AACC (2000) using empirical rheological methods farinograph [23] using Farinograph-E equipped with a mixing container. Water absorption Capacity(WA, percentage of water required to yield dough consistency of 500 BU), dough stability time and mixing tolerance index of the samples were determined.

**Comment [h16]:** What instrument was used to determine dough?

### **Color Properties of Samples**

Color characteristics, L\* (lightness/darkness) and b\* (yellowness/blueness), of flour samples were determined with the aid of a colorimeter (ColorFlex, HunterLab, USA). The colorimeter was calibrated with a standard black and white (L\* = 93.71, a\* = - 0.84 and b\* = 1.83) plate before use[24].

### 3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Table 3: Experimental Design and Mean Value of Quality Characteristic of Whole Wheat –Soybean-Oyster Meat Composite Flour**

RUNS	Variables			Responses							
	WWF (X <sub>1</sub> )	SBF (X <sub>2</sub> )	OMP( X <sub>3</sub> )	Y <sub>1</sub>	Y <sub>2</sub>	Y <sub>3</sub>	Y <sub>4</sub>	Y <sub>5</sub>	Y <sub>6</sub>	Y <sub>7</sub>	Y <sub>8</sub>
<b>WWC<sub>1</sub></b>	78.0	22.0	0.0	9.01	7.13	15.50	75.0	15.6	42	69.80	22.67
<b>WWC<sub>2</sub></b>	70.0	22.0	8.0	8.10	8.52	19.04	79.0	17.5	49	65.48	23.38
<b>WWC<sub>3</sub></b>	85.0	11.0	4.0	9.93	5.40	14.35	73.3	13.9	38	75.00	18.73
<b>WWC<sub>4</sub></b>	79.5	16.5	4.0	8.23	6.75	15.60	74.2	14.0	41	71.02	20.61
<b>WWC<sub>5</sub></b>	78.0	22.0	0.0	8.89	7.15	15.48	74.8	15.5	42	69.84	22.00
<b>WWC<sub>6</sub></b>	89.0	11.0	0.0	9.41	4.35	13.88	73.0	12.0	34	76.52	17.21
<b>WWC<sub>7</sub></b>	81.0	11.0	8.0	9.01	6.11	16.22	74.0	13.1	39	72.05	18.00
<b>WWC<sub>8</sub></b>	100.0	0.0	0.0	11.23	1.88	9.70	72.0	9.5	26	83.00	13.87
<b>WWC<sub>9</sub></b>	70.0	22.0	8.0	8.09	8.19	19.07	79.1	17.3	50	65.53	23.58
<b>WWC<sub>10</sub></b>	92.0	0.0	8.0	8.77	3.46	13.40	72.8	10.2	30	78.05	14.66
<b>WWC<sub>11</sub></b>	92.0	0.0	8.0	8.72	3.48	13.58	72.6	10.3	30	78.16	14.38
<b>WWC<sub>12</sub></b>	100.0	0.0	0.0	11.37	1.80	9.72	72.2	9.3	26	83.20	13.77
<b>WWC<sub>13</sub></b>	92.5	5.5	2.0	9.57	3.80	12.38	73.1	10.0	31	78.53	16.91
<b>WWC<sub>14</sub></b>	74.0	22.0	4.0	8.23	7.85	17.28	76.5	16.2	44	66.60	21.13

Where: (X<sub>1</sub>) = Whole Wheat Flour, (X<sub>2</sub>) = Soybean Flour, (X<sub>3</sub>) Oyster Meat Powder, (Y<sub>1</sub>) = Moisture Content, (Y<sub>2</sub>) = Fat Content, (Y<sub>3</sub>) = Protein Content, (Y<sub>4</sub>) = Water Absorption Capacity, (Y<sub>5</sub>) = Dough Stability, (Y<sub>6</sub>) = Mixing Tolerance Index, (Y<sub>7</sub>) = Lightness, (Y<sub>8</sub>) = Yellowness

Results for the samples' moisture, fat, and protein contents ranged from 8.09 to 11.37%, 1.80 to 8.52% and 9.7 to 19.07% respectively, while the ranges for the other measured parameters for the flour samples are water absorption - 72.0 to 79.1 (BU), dough stability - 9.3 to 17.5 (BU), mixing tolerance index - 26 to 50 (BU), lightness - 65.48 to 83.20 and yellowness - 13.77 to 23.58.

### 3.1 Moisture, fat and protein content of the samples

Figure 2 (1–3) illustrate how the samples' moisture, fat, and protein contents changed as a result of effect of ingredient combinations. Moisture contents a measure the effect of how water content affects the microbial contamination and a gauge of its water activity. For example, if the moisture content of food increases, the microbial growth that results in food deterioration is accelerated [25,26]. All the flour samples had moisture contents that were within the permitted range of 12%, which is the level of moisture that has been deemed safe for use in flour and food powders [27]. The samples would likely be shelf stable based on this.

Comparing the composite samples to whole wheat flour, the percentages of fat and protein rose. Authors [28,29] found a similar pattern, stating that the amount of substitution was accompanied by an increase in protein content. The rise in protein and fat content was anticipated since whole wheat flour lacks the protein and fat that soybean and oyster meat powder do, which results in the synergistic effects of protein and fat complementation [30]. The increase in the percentage protein and fat content served as the foundation for the blend formulation since it was anticipated that the finished product would have greater protein and fat qualities in addition to a higher protein and fat content.

The effect of soybean flour on the moisture content of the flour blends was highest and the result of the ANOVA revealed that the model (cubic) terms were all significant ( $p \leq 0.05$ ). The final predictive equation model which has the  $R^2$  of 0.999 is as shown in Eqn. 1.

$$\text{Moisture Content} = +11.30*A+17.14*B-1551.58*C-23.37*A*B+2662.17*A*C+2692.23*B*C-2345.89*A*B*C+22.57*A*B*(A-B)-1165.78*A*C*(A-C)-1284.21*B*C*(B-C) \dots\dots\dots (1).$$

The ANOVA results showed that all of the models (cubic) were significant ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) with the exception of the interaction AC, which showed that soybeans flour had the greatest impact on the samples' fat content. Eqn. 2 depicts the prediction equation model, which has an  $R^2$  of 0.998.

**Comment [h17]:** How the quality is then determined?

$$\text{Fat Content} = +1.82*A + 8.89*B + 0.44*C + 0.46*A*B + 10.49*A*C + 8.88*B*C \dots\dots (2)$$

The protein content of the samples is most affected by oyster flesh powder. According to the ANOVA results, the only significant ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) model (cubic) terms were the linear mixture and the interaction AB (A-B).

Eqn. 3 illustrates the final prediction equation model, which has an  $R^2$  of 1.0.

$$\text{Protein Content} = + 9.71*A + 18.42*B + 85.63*C + 1.55*A*B - 85.55*A*C - 119.10*B*C + 61.42*A*B*C + 9.97*A*B*(A-B) + 2.90*A*C*(A-C) + 65.79*B*C*(B-C) \dots\dots\dots (3).$$

### 3.2 Rheological properties of the flour samples

The farinograph test measures the dough's resilience. It involves assessing how dough behaves when mixed at a certain constant speed with a specified amount of water addition [31]. It is one of the most often used tests for assessing the quality of flour, mostly used to determine how much water is needed to produce a dough and then anticipate the texture of the final result [32,33].

The effects of the different sample mixes on the rheological characteristics of the samples are depicted in figures 3 (1–3). The amount of water needed to reach the center of the peak area of a farinographic curve on the 500 Brabender Unit (BU) line for flour-water dough is known as the water absorption parameter, which is a significant dough parameter [34].

The biggest impact on the flour mixes' ability to absorb water was caused by oyster meat powder. This might be explained by oyster meat powder's greater protein content. The ANOVA's findings showed that only the linear mixtures of AB and AC and the model (cubic) term were significant ( $p \leq 0.05$ ).


**Comment [h18]:** Is that the only reason is the change related with the amount of cyster meat powder?

The final prediction equation model, represented by Eqn. 4, has an  $R^2$  of 0.999.

$$\text{Water Absorption} = + 72.10*A + 80.59*B + 217.61*C - 12.44*A*B - 249.08*A*C - 242.48*B *C + 211.81*A*B*C + 10.90*A*B*(A-B) + 115.14*A*C*(A-C) + 102.32*B*C*(B-C) \dots\dots (4)$$


Strong wheat flour's graph often exhibits high water absorption, quick development, and little breakdown. Although weak wheat flours also develop quickly, they break down more quickly and have a lower capacity to absorb water [32]. This can be ascribed to non-wheat flour's chemical makeup having a significant impact on the composite dough's ability to absorb water [35].

**Comment [h19]:** I can't see the differences on the three graphs?  
Explain please



(1)

(2)



(3)

Figs 2 (1-3): 3D plot showing the varying the levels inclusion of whole wheat flour, soybean flour and oyster meat powder on the moisture, fat and protein contents of flour samples

Ribotta *et al.*, [36] found that using heat-treated full-fat flour, enzyme-active defatted flour, and soy protein isolates in place of wheat flour had the same effect on the water absorption value. The interaction between soybean proteins such as globulins and wheat gluten, which was observed to happen in the composite flour, may also be the cause [37]. Authors who used protein-rich flours in a wheat composite blend reported a similar outcome [38,39,40].

Higher values of dough stability time indicate stronger dough, which could be considered a measure of the strength of the flour [41,42]. It is the interval of time between the top of the curve's initial intercept of the 500 BU line and its subsequent departure from the 500 BU line, as well as the departure time [43]. The ANOVA results showed that all of the model's (cubic) terms were significant ( $p \leq 0.05$ ), with soybean flour having the greatest impact on the dough stability time characteristics of the flour blends. The ultimate prediction equation model, represented by Eqn. 5, has an  $R^2$  of 1.0.

$$\text{Dough Stability} = +9.40*A + 26.95*B - 2491.98*C - 23.01*A*B + 4289.77*A*C + 4328.41*B*C - 3827.10*A*B*C + 24.34*A*B*(A-B) - 1873.83*A*C*(A-C) - 2019.33*B*C*(B-C) \dots\dots (5)$$

The findings showed that adding more soybeans lengthened the dough's stability duration. Both Khatinger *et al.*, [34], who reported a linear rise in dough stability time with increasing sorghum flour incorporation percentage, and Symons and Brennan, [44], who reported an increase in dough stability time with increased inclusion of rice bran, saw a similar outcome.

The amount that dough will soften over the course of mixing is measured using the Mixing Tolerance Index (MTI). It is the difference between the peak of the curve and the peak of the curve five minutes later [45].

Soybean flour has the highest effect on the mixing tolerance index of the flour samples; and the ANOVA showed that all the model (cubic) terms were significant ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) except AB and AB(A-B) terms. The final predictive equation model which has the  $R^2$  of 0.999 is as shown in Eqn. 6.

$$\text{Mixing Tolerance Index} = + 26.00*A + 46.96*B - 1819.55*C + 2.03*A*B + 3148.24*A*C + 3279.62*B*C - 2883.96*A*B*C - 2.54*A*B*(A-B) - 1309.57*A*C*(A-C) - 1545.86*B*C*(B-C) \dots\dots (6)$$

In general, it has been demonstrated that the mixing tolerance index has an impact on baking quality and an MTI value of 30 BU. Hard wheat flours are rated very good to excellent if the MTI is 50 B.U or less,

whereas a flour with an MTI higher than 50 B.U shows less tolerance and frequently suggests significant difficulties during mechanical handling and dough formulation.

### 3.3 Colour Indices of the flour samples

The acceptance of food products is significantly influenced by colour, an essential organoleptic feature of foods [46]. The results for the brightness and yellowness indices ranged from 65.48 to 83.2 and 13.77 to 23.58 correspondingly.

Figures 3 (4-5) shows the impact of the various sample blends on the samples' lightness and yellowness indexes. The ANOVA showed that all model (cubic) terms, with the exception of AB and AB (A-B) terms, were significant ( $p \leq 0.05$ ). Eqn. 7's final prediction equation model, which is depicted, has an  $R^2$  of 1.0.

$$\text{Lightness} = + 83.10*A + 63.21*B - 856.67*C + 4.38*A*B + 1556.37*A*C + 1629.06*B*C - 1431.02*A*B*C - 4.92*A*B*(A-B) - 643.71*A*C*(A-C) - 777.71*B*C*(B-C) \dots\dots\dots (7)$$

The ANOVA showed that it is only the model (cubic) term and the linear mixture terms were the only significant ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) terms. The final predictive equation model which has the  $R^2$  of 0.998 is as shown in Eqn. 8.


$$\text{Yellowness} = + 13.82*A + 18.81*B + 147.15*C + 13.31*A*B - 287.21*A*C - 168.59*B*C + 193.16*A*B*C - 24.71*A*B*(A-B) + 233.53*A*C*(A-C) + 37.44*B*C*(B-C) \dots\dots\dots (8)$$

### Optimization of Whole Wheat-Soybean-Oyster Meat Composite Flour


In order to verify the optimum level of whole wheat flour, soybean flour and oyster meat powder in producing composite flour, numerical optimization was carried out with criteria and goal for the responses set as presented in Table 4.

Whole wheat flour (72.51%), soybean flour (19.63%), and oyster meat powder (7.86%) are the experimental values from the optimized composite. The composite flour has a 0.64 calculated desirability. At these values, the maximum protein content, dough stability, water absorption, mixing tolerance index, and yellowness are, respectively, 18.06, 77.20, 16.19, 47.41, and 22.70, while the minimum moisture content and fat content are, respectively, 8.09 and 7.86, with lightness in the range at 67.33.


**Comment [h20]:** It needs some more explanation about the importance use and applicability of the optimization?




Water Absorption  
(1) (2)




Dough Stability  
(3)



Mixing Tolerance Index



Lightness  
(4)



yellowness  
(5)

Figs 3 (1-5): 3D plot showing the effect of whole wheat flour, soybean flour and oyster meat powder on the rheological properties and colour indices of flour blends

Table 4: Criteria and Goals for the Numerical Optimization of Responses for Whole Wheat Composite Flour

Category	Goal	Lower Limit	Upper Limit	Lower Weight	Upper Weight	Importance
Whole Wheat Flour	is in range	70	100	1	1	3
Soybean Flour	is in range	0	22	1	1	3
Oyster Meat Powder	is in range	0	8	1	1	3
Moisture Content	minimum	8.09	11.37	1	1	3
Fat Content	minimum	1.80	8.52	1	1	3
Protein Content	maximize	9.70	19.07	1	1	3
Water Absorption Capacity	maximize	72	79.1	1	1	3
Dough Stability	maximize	9.3	17.5	1	1	3
Mixing Tolerance Index	maximize	26	50	1	1	3
Lightness (L*)	maximize	65.48	83.2	1	1	3
Yellowness (b*)	minimize	13.77	23.58	1	1	3

The optimum level for each of the individual flour (whole wheat flour, soybean flour and oyster meat powder), the predicted values for the responses were obtained in the solution.

Table5: Solution for the Numerical Optimization of Responses for the Production of Whole Wheat Composite Flour

No	WWF	SBF	OMP	MC	FC	PC	WA	MTI	DS	L*	b*	DY	
1	72.50	19.64	7.86	8.09	7.86	18.08	77.21	47.41	16.19	67.41	22.30	0.64	Selected
2	75.08	20.55	4.37	8.45	7.66	16.91	75.83	44.13	16.13	67.91	21.19	0.58	

Where:

WWF = Whole Wheat Flour; SBF = SoyBean Flour, OMP = Oyster Meat Powder; MC = Moisture Content;

LC = Lipid Content; PC = Protein Content; WA = Water Absorption; MTI = Mixing tolerance index;

DS = Dough Stability; Lightness = L\*; b\* = Yellowness; DY = Desirability

## CONCLUSION

To optimize whole wheat flour, soybean flour, and oyster meat powder composite flour for use in both home and industrial applications with improved nutritional quality, responses surface approach was successfully utilized. The study's flour variable had a significant impact on the flour's quality.

The soybean has the greatest positive impact on the lipid content and yellowness, the whole wheat flour has the greatest positive impact on the moisture content, water absorption, and dough stability of the flour and the oyster meat powder has the greatest positive impact on the protein and mixing tolerance index.

The final results of optimization indicate that the ratio of whole wheat flour to soybean flour to oyster meat powder to optimize the nutritional density of the composite flour is 72.51% whole wheat flour, 19.63% soybean flour, and 7.86% oyster meat powder.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Suresh C, Samsheer S, Durvesh, K. Evaluation of the functional properties of composite flours and sensorial attributes of composite flour biscuits. *J. Food Sci. Technol.* 2015; 52(6): 3681-3688.
- [2] Gbenga-Fabusiwa FJ, Oladele EP, Oboh G, Adefegha SA, Oshodi AA. Nutritional Properties, Sensory Qualities and Glycemic Response of Biscuits Produced from Pigeon Pea-Wheat Composite Flour. *J. Food Biochem.* 2018; 42, 12505.
- [3] Emmanuel KO, Michael AI, Olajide PS, Bakare HA. Quality attributes and storage stability of bread from wheat-tigernut composite flour. *Journal of Culinary Science and Technology.* 2019; 17 (1), 1-14.
- [4] Young, J. Functional bakery products: current directions and future opportunities. *Food Ind. J.*, 2001; 4:136-144.
- [5] Dewettinck K, Van Bockstaele F, Kuhne B., Van de Waite D, Courtens TM, Gellynck X. Nutritional value of bread: Influence of processing, food interaction and consumer perception. *Journal of Cereal Science.* 2008; 48, 243-257. doi:10.1016/j.jcs.2008.01.003
- [6] Jideani V, Onwubali F. Optimization of wheat-sprouted soybean flour bread using response surface methodology. *African Journal of Biotechnology.* 2009; 8, 6364-6373.
- [7] Shanthi P, John Kennedy Z, Parvathi K, Malathi D, Thangavel K, Raghavan GSV. Studies on wheat based composite flour for pasta products. *Indian J. Nutr Diet.* 2005; 42: pp 503–506.
- [8] Mepba HD, Eboh L, Nwaogigwa SU. Chemical composition, function and baking properties of wheat plantain composite flours. *AJFAND.* 2007; 7: Pg 1 – 22.
- [9] Rizzo G, Baroni L. Soy, Soy Foods and Their Role in Vegetarian Diets (Review). *Nutrients.* 2018; 10, 43; doi:10.3390/nu10010043
- [10] El Gharras H. Polyphenols: food sources, properties and applications -a review. *Intl. J. Food Sci. Technol.* 2009; 44:2512-2518.

**Comment [h21]:** Some of the references are not recent, and you need to write it in consistent way for eg. Doi... For some ref and others? For page in some case you write pp?

- [11] Asha KK, Anandan R, Mathew S, Lakshmanan PT. Biochemical profile of oyster *Crassostrea madrasensis* and its nutritional attributes. *Egyptian Journal of Aquatic Research*. 2014; 1-7. DOI: 10.1016/j.ejar.2014.02.001
- [12] FNB. *Seafood Choices: Balancing Benefits and Risks*. Food and Nutrition Board, Institute of Medicine, National Academies Press, Food and Nutrition Board. 2007; Washington, D.C.
- [13] Tonkin E, Kennedy D, Hanieh S, Biggs BA, Kearns T, Gondarra V, Brimblecombe J. Dietary intake of Aboriginal Australian children aged 6–36 months in a remote community: a cross-sectional study. *Nutr J*. 2020; 19: 1–12.
- [14] He S, Chen Y, Brennan C, Young DJ, Chang K, Wadewitz P, Zeng Q, Yuan Y. Antioxidative activity of oyster protein hydrolysates Maillard reaction products. *Food Sci Nutr*. 2020; (8), 3274–3286. DOI: 10.1002/fsn3.1605.
- [15] FAO Sorghum and Millets in Human Nutrition. *FAO Food and Nutrition Series*, No. 27. Food and Agriculture Organization. 1994. Retrieved from: <http://www.fao.org/DOCREP/T0818e/T0818E00.htm#Contentsates.html>.
- [16] Wu TP, Kuo WY, Chen MC. Modern noodle based foods product range and production methods. *American Association of Cereal Chemistry*, St. Paul. MN, USA. 1998; 37–89.
- [17] Ndife J, Abdulraheem LO, Zakari UM. Evaluation of the nutritional and sensory quality of functional breads produced from whole wheat and soya bean flour blends. *Journal of Food Science*. 2011; 5(2), 466-472.
- [18] Yin H, Chen Z, Han Y. Optimization of natural fermentative medium for selenium-enriched yeast by D-optimal mixture design. *Food Sci. Technol*. 2009; 42:3727:-331.
- [19] Derringer G, Suich R. Simultaneous optimization of several response variables. *J. Qual. Technol*. 1980; 12:214-219.
- [20] AACC. Crude Protein—Improved Kjeldahl Method, Copper Catalyst Modification. 1999, AACC International Method, AACC46-11.02.
- [21] AACC. Moisture - air-oven methods. 1999, AACC approved methods of analysis, 11th Ed, Method 44-15.02
- [22] Thiex NJ, Anderson S, Gildemeister B, Boedigheimer J, Bogren E, Coffin R, Conway K, DeBaker A, Frankenius E, Gramse M, Hogan P, Knese T, MacDonald J, Ller JM, Royle R, Russell M, Shafiee F, Shreve B, Watts M. Crude fat, diethyl ether extraction, in feed, cereal grain, and forage (Randall/Soxtec/submersion method): Collaborative study. *Journal of AOAC International*. 2003; 86(5), 888–898. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jaoac/86.5.888>
- [23] AACC. American Association of Cereal Chemists (AACC), Approved Methods of the AACC 2000; 10th edition. Saint Paul, Minnesota.
- [24] Anyasi TA, Jideani AIO, Mchau GRA. Effects of Organic Acid Pretreatment on Microstructure, Functional and Thermal Properties of Unripe Banana Flour. *J. Food Meas. Charact*. 2017; 11(1), 99–110. DOI:10.1007/s11694-016-9376-2.
- [25] Adejumo BA. Some quality attributes of locally produced wheat flour in storage. *IOSR Journal of Environmental Science, Toxicology and Food Technology*. 2013; 5(2), 47–49.
- [26] Anyiam PN, Nwuke, CP, Adimuko GC, Nwamadi PC, Salvador EM, Ajibade GF, Maxwell CE. Inclusion of African winged termite (*Macrotermes nigeriensis*) improves the nutrients and quality of fermented cassava mahewu. *African Journal of Biotechnology*. 2022; (2):1-9. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJB2021.17444>

- [27] SON. Standard Organization of Nigeria. Standard for edible cassava flour (Standards No. 344) 2004. Lagos: Nigerian Industrial.
- [28] Amandikwa C. Proximate and functional properties of open air, solar and oven dried cocoyam flour. *International Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development*. 2012; 15(2): 988-994.
- [29] Iwe MO, Onyeukwu U, Agiriga AN. Proximate, functional and pasting properties of FARO 44 rice, African yam bean and brown cowpea seeds composite flour, *Cogent Food and Agriculture*. 2016; 2:1, 1142409, DOI: 10.1080/23311932.2016.1142409
- [30] Yetunde EA, Ukpong SU, Olajumoke L, Ime FA. Nutritional composition and sensory properties of cakes made from wheat and African yam bean flour blends. *Journal of Food Technology*. 2009; 7, 115–118.
- [31] ISO. Wheat flour - Physical Characteristics of doughs ISO 5530-1:2013  
<https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#iso:std:iso:5530:-1:ed-3:v1:en>.
- [32] Dobraszczuk BJ, Salmanowicz BP. Comparison of predictions of baking volume using large deformation rheological properties. *J. Cereal Sci.* 2008; 47: 292 – 301.
- [33] Amjid MR, Shehzad A, Hussain S, Shabbir MA, Khan MRA. Comprehensive review on wheat flour dough rheology. *Pak. J. Food Sci.*, 2013; 23: 105 – 123.
- [34] Khating KP, Kenghe RN, Yenge GB, Ingale VM, Shelar SD. Effect of blending sorghum flour on dough rheology of wheat Bread. *International Journal of Agricultural Engineering*. 2014; 7(1), 117 - 124.
- [35] Onyango C, Unbehend L, Unbehend G, Lindhauer M. Rheological properties of wheat-maize dough and their relationship with the quality of bread treated with ascorbic acid and Malzperle Classic bread improver. *African Journal of Food science*. 2015; 9 (2), 84-91.
- [36] Ribotta PD, Arnulphi SA, Leon AE. Effect of soybean addition on rheological properties quality of wheat flour, *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*. 2005; 85 (11) 1889-1896.
- [37] Maforimbo E, Skurray G, Uthaykumaran B, Wringly C. Incorporation of soy proteins into the wheat-gluten matrix during dough mixing, *Journal of Food Science*. 2008; 47 (2) 380-385.
- [38] Hesham, E, Hussein S, Mostafa E. Rheology properties and quality evaluation of Egyptian balady bread and biscuit supplemented with flours of ungerminated and germinated legume seeds or mushroom, *Poland Journal of Food Nutrition Science*. 2007; 57 (4) 487- 496.
- [39] Okafor C, Okafor I, Ozumba U, Elemo N. Quality characteristics of bread made from wheat and Nigerian oyster mushroom (*Pleurotus plumonarius*) powder, *Pakistan Journal of Nutrition*, 2012; 11 (1), 5-10.
- [40] Nikolic NC, Stojanovic JS, Stojanovic GS, Mastilovic JS, Karabegovic IT, Petrovic, GM, Lazic ML. The effect of some protein rich flours on farinograph properties of the wheat flour. *Advanced Technologies*. 2013; 20; 2(1), 20-25.
- [41] Rosell CM, Rojas JA, Benedito C. Influence of hydrocolloids on dough rheology and bread quality. *Food Hydrocol.* 2001; 15, 75-81.
- [42] Hallen E, Ibanoglu S, Ainsworth P. Effect of fermented/germinated cowpea flour addition on the rheological and baking properties of wheat flour. *J. Food Eng.* 2004; 63:177–184.
- [43] Sim SY, Noor Aziah AA, Cheng LH. Characteristics of wheat dough and Chinese steamed bread added with sodium alginates or konjac glucomannan. *Food Hydrocolloids*. 2011; 25(5):951-957.

[44] Symons LJ, Brennan CS. The effect of barley betaglucan fibre fractions on starch gelatinization and pasting characteristics. *J. Food Sci.*(2004; 69 (4): 257-261.

[45] Mohamed AA, Rayas-Duarte P, Shogren RL, Sessa DJ. Low carbohydrates bread: Formulation, processing and sensory quality. *Food Chemistry*. 2006; 99, 686-692.

[46] Udoro EO, Anyasi TA, Jideani AIO. Characterization of the root and flour of South African *Manihot esculenta* Crantz landraces and their potential end-use properties. *International Journal of Food Properties*. 2020; 23:1, 820-838, DOI: 10.1080/10942912.2020.1759625

Comment [h22]: ditto

UNDER PEER REVIEW