

Original Research Article

Nutrient and Anti-Nutrient Composition of Four Rice Varieties in Port Harcourt Metropolis

Abstract

This study evaluated the nutrient and anti-nutrient content of four rice varieties in Port Harcourt metropolis. Four rice varieties (Tomato gold TG, Mama's pride MP, Ultimate gold UG and daily choice DC) were used in this study. The rice varieties were purchased, milled into fine flour and evaluated for proximate, mineral and anti-nutrient analysis using standard methods. Proximate composition of the rice varieties revealed that moisture content ranged from 11.51-12.80%, ash (0.45-0.60%), fat (0.39-1.39%), crude protein (5.73-6.07%), crude fibre (0.90-6.85%) and carbohydrate (73.67-80.09%). Mama's pride rice variety contained higher ash and fat contents while Tomatoes gold had significantly higher crude fibre. On the other hand, ultimate gold rice variety contained higher protein and carbohydrate; however, ash, protein and moisture contents did not vary significantly ($p>0.05$) between the rice varieties. Mineral composition of the rice varieties also showed that magnesium content ranged from 6.28-9.63mg/100g, calcium (3.74-8.23mg/100g), potassium (5.30-6.20mg/100g) and iron (1.50-5.48mg/100g). The concentration of these mineral elements was found to be superior in ultimate gold rice variety. Phenol content of the rice varieties ranged from 9.92-14.58mg/100g, phytate (1.22-1.53g/kg), saponin (5.86-6.37%), tannin (47.03-66.89mg/100g) and flavonoid (2.29-2.80%). Ultimate gold rice variety also contained higher concentrations of phenol and tannins while saponin content was higher in daily choice rice variety. Phytate content on the other hand did not vary significantly ($p>0.05$) between the rice varieties. The result therefore revealed that ultimate gold rice variety contained a considerable amount of nutrients and should be highly recommended to consumers for derivation of the above-mentioned nutrients.

Keywords: Rice, Varietis, Proximate, Minerals, Anti-nutrient,

1. INTRODUCTION

Rice is a cereal crop which comprises of two species of food crop (*Oryza sativa* and *Oryza glaberrima*) in the family Poaceae [1]. It has gained world-wide popularity in recent years and ranks second after maize in terms of production. The rice plant is a monocarpic annual plant which grows in tropical areas and temperate zones. It grows up to 1-1.8m tall depending on the variety of the crop and soil fertility [2]. The plant has long, slender leaves which are about 50-100 cm (20-39 inch) long and 2-2.5 cm (0.79-0.98 inch) broad [3]. The rice grain consists of the endosperm, embryo and several thin layers which include the pericarp, seed coat and nucleolus.

Comment [MK1]: Recent years is not justified

Formatted: Highlight

Rice is a staple food in many parts of the world and in many African countries. According to FAO [4], rice provides 20% of the world's dietary energy supply, while wheat supplies 19% and maize 50%. It also provides 45% of calories and 40% of the total protein requirement of humans in developing countries [5]. Oko *et al.* [6] reported the grain to contain 75-80% starch, 12% water and only 7% protein with a full complement of amino acids. The authors also reported the grain to contain thiamine, riboflavin and niacin. Rice has been used commercially and industrially for the production of rice flour, starch, rice flakes, rice cakes, rice milk and other extended uses such as rice husk, rice bran for animal feed and broken rice used for the preparation of snacks and beverage [7]. Rice starch is used in making ice cream, custard powder, puddings, gel, distillation of potable alcohol, etc while Rice flour is used in confectionery products like bread, snacks, cookies and biscuits [8].

Rice is grown in all the ecological and dietary zones of Nigeria with different varieties possessing adaptational traits. The major rice varieties grown in Nigeria are the local rice namely Gboko, Abakaliki, Mokwa and Ofada; while improved domestic varieties are Faro series, Nerica 8 and ITA series. In Nigeria and other developed countries, rice is usually consumed in polished form (white rice) due to the low demand for brown rice resulting from lack of awareness of its high nutritional value and health-related beneficial effects [9]. Various varieties of polished rice are sold in the Nigerian markets. Some of these polished rice varieties are produced in the country while some are imported. Despite the strict regulations and enforcement by relevant regulatory agencies of the sale of standard commodities to consumers, at times manufacturers and importers do not comply with standards. In addition, a wide range of rice varieties are reported and their nutritional compositions vary from one another depending on variety, climate, irrigation and fertilizer application [10]. Since each variety has different nutritional composition, there is a need to compare the nutritional values of the rice varieties in order to ascertain if there is any nutritional advantage between these varieties. Knowledge of the differences in nutrient composition of the rice varieties will help in selecting the best variety for human consumption. This study therefore evaluated nutrient and anti-nutrient composition of four varieties of rice in Port Harcourt metropolis, Rivers State.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Materials

A total of four polished rice varieties (Tomato gold, Mama's pride, Ultimate gold and daily choice) were purchased from Mile three market in Diobu, Port Harcourt. Rivers State, Nigeria. Chemicals used in this study were of analytical reagent grade and were obtained from the Department of Food Science and Technology, Rivers State University, Port Harcourt. [Please include reagents used and their principal company.](#)

2.2. Sample Preparation

2.2.1. Preparation of Rice Flour Samples

Rice grains ~~obtained from~~ were sorted and cleaned before sample processing. ~~Next, Thereafter,~~ they were milled to fine powder using a laboratory blender. The flour from each rice variety were packaged in an air tight container and stored at(Temperature) until required for analysis.

2.3. Proximate Analysis

Moisture, ash, fat, crude protein and crude fibre contents of each rice flour sample was carried out according to AOAC [11] methods of analysis while carbohydrate content was evaluated by difference which involved the addition of crude protein, crude fat, ash, crude fibre and moisture, then subtracting their values expressed in percentages from 100%.

2.4. Mineral Analysis

The mineral content of the rice flour samples were determined by the AOAC [11] method. Two grams (2 g) of the flour sample was weighed into a crucible and ashed at 550°C for 2 hrs. Five milliliters (5 ml) of concentrated hydrochloric acid (HCl) was added to the ashed sample to dissolve it followed by addition of 20 ml deionized water and heated to halt its content. The solution was allowed to cool and filtered through a Whatman No. 1 filter paper and made up to 50 ml volume. Stock solution of 1000 mg/kg of Calcium, potassium, magnesium and iron were prepared using distilled water. From stock solution working standard solution of 100 mg/kg, ~~the elements~~ were prepared for each element using with distilled water. Different Dilutions comprising 0.5, 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0 mg/kg of each element were made with distilled water and together with the test sample. The mixtures were analyzed using an atomic absorption spectrophotometer while concentrations of the elements in the test samples were then calculated.

2.5. Anti-nutrient Analysis

2.5.1. Determination of Total Saponin

Total saponin of the rice varieties was determined using the method of Obdoni and Ochuko [12]. ~~Two (2.0 g)~~ (W₀) of well blended sample was weighed into a conical flask followed by the addition of 2.5 ml of 20% aqueous ethanol. The content was heated in a hot water bath for 4 hrs with continuous stirring at 50°C and filtered. ~~200 ml of 20 ml ethanol~~ was used to re-extract and both extracts combined. The volume of the extract was reduced to 20 ml by evaporating in a water bath at 90°C. The concentrate was transferred into a 250 ml separating funnel and 0.5 ml of diethyl ether (petroleum ether) added and shake vigorously. The clear ether layer was discarded and the aqueous layer kept. 50 ml of ~~buthanol~~ was added to the aqueous layer in the separating funnel. The combined butanol layer was washed twice with 10.25 ml of 5% aqueous NaCl. The remaining solution was collected in a weighed petri dish (W₁). The petri dish was kept dried in an oven at about 90°C for(please mention purpose) and re-weighed and recorded as W₂.

Comment [MK2]: Not clear, modify the sentence with meaning

Comment [MK3]: Is it butanol

$$\text{Saponin content (\%)} = \frac{W_2 - W_1}{W_0} \times 100$$

2.5.2. Flavonoid Determination

Flavonoid content was determined by the method of Bohn and Kocipal Abyazan [13]. Ten grams (10 g) of the each sample was extracted repeatedly with 100 ml of 80% aqueous methanol at room temperature. The whole solution was filtered through Whatman filter paper No 42 (125 mm). The filtrate was later transferred into a crucible and evaporated into dryness over a water bath and weighed to a constant weight.

$$\text{Flavonoid (\%)} = \frac{W_2 - W_1}{W_1} \times 100$$

Here ~~Where~~,

W = Weight of rice

W1 = Weight of empty crucible

W2 = Weight of crucible plus precipitate

2.5.3. Determination of Phenol

The phenolics in the sample were isolated according to the method of Shahidi and Naczki [14]. One gramme, of the sample was extracted thrice with 10 ml of 70% (v/v) aqueous acetone at room temperature ($30 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$). This was centrifuged at 10,000 g for 10 min. The supernatant was collected, combined and evaporated to dryness at 30°C under vacuum. The extracted phenolics were then dissolved in 25 ml methanol and re-centrifuged. To 0.5 ml of the methanolic solution was added 0.5 ml of Folin-Denis reagent (Folin-Denis reagent: To 750 ml water, 100 g sodium tungstate and 20 g phosphomolybdic acid were added in a 2 litre standard flask. Thereafter, 50 ml orthophosphoric acid was added and the mixture refluxed for 2 hrs. The mixture was allowed to stand and made up to 1 litre. The solution is stored in the dark prior to use) followed by the addition of 1 ml sodium carbonate and 8 ml of deionised water. The mixture was gently swirled and the mixture allowed standing for 45 min to allow for colour development. The absorbance was measured in a colorimeter at 725 nm, using the method of Swain and Hillis (1959). Transipanic acid was used to prepare the standard calibration curve where the concentration was extrapolated.

Formatted: Superscript

2.5.4. Determination of Phytate (Phytic acid)

Phytate content was determined using the method of Russel [15]. The sample (0.5 g) was weighed into a 250 ml conical flask followed by the addition of 25 ml of 2% concentrated HCl. This was allowed to soak for 3 hrs and filtered. The filtrate (10.5 ml) was pipetted into a 250 ml beaker followed by the addition of 25.75 ml of distilled water to improve acidity. Also, 2.5 ml of 0.35 ammonium thiocyanate solution was added as indicator. This was titrated with standard iron III chloride (FeCl_3) which contains 0.00195g iron/ml until a brownish yellow colour appeared and persists for 5min. The phytic acid content was calculated below:

$$\text{Phytic acid (g/kg)} = \frac{0.00195 \times \text{volume of FeCl}_3 \text{ consumed} \times \text{DF}}{\text{Sample weight}} \times 1000$$

DF= Dilution factor

2.5.5. Determination of Tannin

Tannin content was determined using the method of Jaffe [16]. One gram (1.0g) of dry well blended sample was weighed into a flask and 10 ml of distilled water added and agitated. The mixture was left to stand for 30 min at room temperature and thereafter centrifuged at 2500rpm for 15min. One milliliters (1.0 ml) of supernatant was measured into a 10 ml volumetric flask followed by addition of 1 ml of folin-ceocalteu reagent. One milliliters (1.0 ml) of saturated Na₂CO₃ solution was also added and the solution diluted to 10 ml with distilled water. This was incubated for 30 min at room temperature and the standard tannic acid prepared. The method was repeated for tannic acid standards 20, 40, 60, 80, 100 and 120 mg/l from a stock of 500 ppm (50mg of tannic acid standard dissolved in 100ml of distilled water) excluding centrifugation. The absorbances of the tannic acid concentrations were read off at a wavelength of 725nm. The calibration curve for the tannic acid standards was drawn i.e. absorbance against concentration. The tannic acid concentration of the sample was extrapolated by tracing the absorbance of the sample down the concentration axis.

$$\text{Tannic acid content (mg/kg)} = \frac{\text{Concentration obtained in } \frac{\text{mg}}{\text{l}} \times \text{volume of sample} \times \text{DF}}{\text{Sample weight (1000mg)}} \times 100$$

DF= Dilution factor

2.5.6. Statistical Analysis

The data obtained was subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA) using (SPSS) version 20.0 software 2007. All analysis was done in duplicate. The measure of central tendencies and dispersions was determined and Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT) was used to separate the mean.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Proximate Composition of the Rice Varieties

Table 1 shows the proximate composition of the rice varieties. Moisture content of the rice varieties ranged from 11.52 % to 12.80% with sample UG recording the lowest value (11.52%) and sample TG as the highest (12.80%). Samples MP (Mama's pride) and DC (daily choice) had moisture contents of 11.97% and 12.77%, respectively. There was no significant ($p > 0.05$) difference in the moisture content of the rice varieties. Moisture content serves as an index of flour storability [8]. Low moisture content gives better shelf life and enhanced keeping quality under storage. All the rice varieties contained less than 14% moisture which meets the moisture content requirement for safe storage of rice [17]. The moisture contents of the rice varieties from this study (11.52-12.80%) are close to the range of values (9.00-11.00%) obtained by Cameron and Wang [18], 10.52-12.26% by Maisont and Narkrugsa [19], 11.20-12.20% by Diako *et al.* [20] and 10.04-12.88% by Thomas *et al.* [21]. These values also closely correspond to the results of 11.65% to 13.43% reported by Eshun [22].

Ash content of the rice varieties recorded 0.60%, 0.45%, 0.45% and 0.50%, respectively for samples MP, UG, DC and TG. Sample UG and DC recorded the lowest values (0.45%) while sample MP had the highest (0.60%). There was no significant ($p > 0.05$) difference in the ash content of the rice varieties. Ash content in rice reflects the mineral elements [23]. Iwe *et al.* [24]

also stated that ash content indicates the composition of inorganic constituents after organic materials and moisture has been removed by incineration [24]. The content of ash in all the rice varieties studied fell below 1.00%. The range of ash values obtained in this study fell within the range of values (0.18-0.97%) obtained by Shayo *et al.* [25] but below the value (1.77%) reported by Islam *et al.* [26]. Minerals are more concentrated in the bran and thus get lost during milling and polishing when the bran is removed from the grain [27]. The low ash content of <1.0% observed in the rice varieties in this study may be due to the degree of milling/polishing which is influenced by variety as seen in daily choice and ultimate gold rice with the lowest ash content due to polishing. According to Kwarteng *et al.* [28], rice bran contains much more minerals than the actual endosperm and the tendency of rice bran to stick to the grains during milling and polishing (which is a varietal trait) influences ash content.

Fat content ranged from 0.39% in sample TG to 1.39% in sample MP. Samples UG and DC had fat contents of 0.98% and 0.99%, respectively. Fat content of sample MP was significantly ($p < 0.05$) different from others while samples UG and DC were not significantly ($p > 0.05$) different. The content of crude fat for all the rice varieties fell below 1% except for sample TG with fat content of 1.39%. The range of crude fat values obtained in this study fell below the value (2.80%) obtained by Islam *et al.* [26]. The low fat content in the rice flours studied may be due to the fact that cereals store energy in the form of starch rather than lipids [24]. The observed differences in the fat content of the rice varieties from this study may also be attributed to the degree of milling as the milling process results in a loss of rice bran (which is an excellent source of fat) thereby contributing to the low fat content of the rice varieties [29]. The low crude fat levels in the rice varieties studied may be beneficial in ensuring longer shelf life for these rice varieties because all fats and fat-containing foods contain some unsaturated fatty acids and hence are potentially susceptible to oxidative rancidity [24].

Crude protein content of the rice varieties ranged from 5.73% in samples DC and UG to 6.07% in sample UG. Samples TG and MP recorded crude protein of 5.79% and 5.73%, respectively. There was no significant ($p > 0.05$) difference in the crude protein content of the rice varieties. Protein is essential in the body as it forms the basic building blocks for cells and tissue repairs in the body [23]. Crude protein of the rice varieties studied obtained was higher than the value (8.50) obtained by Islam *et al.* [26]. The range of protein contents in the rice varieties is within the range of 5.69-8.40 reported by Wireko-Manu and Amamoo [30] for selected local Rice varieties and imported rice brands in Ghana. The differences in crude protein content might be due to varietal differences. [Include some references showing variability with variety](#)

Comment [MK4]: Clarify

Comment [MK5]: Was lower

Crude fibre content ranged from 0.90 to 6.85% with sample UG recording the lowest value (0.90%) and sample TG as the highest (6.85%). Samples MP and DC had crude fibre values of 1.69% and 1.10%, respectively. Crude fibre content of samples MP, UG and DC were not significantly ($p > 0.05$) different from each other. The content of fibre for the rice varieties (except for sample TG) fell below 1.00%. The range of crude fibre values obtained in this study for samples UG and DC fell below the value (1.23%) obtained by Islam *et al.* [26]. The range of values for crude fibre observed in this study for samples UG, MP, and DC was within the range of 0.5 - 1.95% reported by Wireko-Manu and Amamoo [30] for selected local Rice varieties and imported rice brands in Ghana. The high crude fibre content in tomato gold rice may be due to the fact that is a whole grain which contains all three components: bran, germ, and endosperm [31]. During the production of polished rice, milling generally decreases the fibre contents, hence

Comment [MK6]: Justify it

the relatively low fibre in samples MP, UG and DC over sample TG [32]. The bran is particularly rich in dietary fibre and contains significant quantities of starch [33].

Carbohydrate content of the rice varieties ranged from 73.67% to 80.09% with sample TG recording the lowest value (73.67%) and sample UG as the highest (80.09%). Carbohydrate content of samples MP and DC were 78.63% and 78.97%, respectively. Carbohydrate content of sample MP was significantly ($p < 0.05$) different from all other varieties. The rice varieties in this study had very high amounts of carbohydrates, which might mainly be starch [34]. The range of values of carbohydrates obtained in this study ~~are in accordance compare favourably~~ with the value (77.31%) obtained by Islam *et al.* [26]. The observed high carbohydrate content of the rice varieties studied affirms that rice is ~~majorly~~ a carbohydrate ~~rich food~~ source ~~of food~~.

Table 1: Percentage (%) proximate composition of the rice varieties

Rice variety	Moisture	Ash	Fat	Crude protein	Crude fibre	Carbohydrate
MP	11.97±0.43 ^a	0.60±0.14 ^a	1.39±0.01 ^a	5.73±0.49 ^a	1.69±0.71 ^b	78.63±0.62 ^b
UG	11.52±0.06 ^a	0.45±0.07 ^a	0.98±0.00 ^b	6.07±0.01 ^a	0.90±0.14 ^b	80.09±0.28 ^a
DC	12.77±0.15 ^a	0.45±0.07 ^a	0.99±0.01 ^b	5.73±0.49 ^a	1.10±0.14 ^b	78.97±0.56 ^b
TG	12.80±1.20 ^a	0.50±0.00 ^a	0.39±0.00 ^c	5.79±0.58 ^a	6.85±0.45 ^a	73.67±2.24 ^b

Mean values are of triplicate determinations. Mean values within a column with different superscripts are significantly different at ($p < 0.05$).

Key:

MP=Mama's pride

UG= Ultimate gold

DC= Daily choice

TG= Tomatoes gold

3.2. Mineral Composition of the Rice Varieties

The mineral composition of the rice varieties is shown in Table 2. Magnesium content of the rice varieties ranged from 6.28mg/100g to 9.63mg/100g with sample TG recording the lowest value (6.28mg/100g) and sample UG as the highest (9.63mg/100g). Samples MP and DC had magnesium contents of 8.68mg/100g and 7.04mg/100g, respectively. There was a significant ($p < 0.05$) difference in the magnesium content of the rice varieties. The values of magnesium obtained for the rice varieties is lower than ~~the~~ values of 67.0 mg/100 g and 82.0 mg/100 g respectively for raw 'ofada' and raw 'aroso' rice varieties reported by Ebuehi and Oyewole [35]. The observed differences in the magnesium content of the rice varieties from this study could be due to genetic factors or the mineral content of the soil on which they were grown [27]. Magnesium is essential in the body as it helps in the formation of bones and teeth and in the absorption of calcium and potassium [23].

Calcium content of the rice varieties ranged from 3.74mg/100g in sample TG to 8.23 mg/100g in sample UG. Calcium content of samples MP and DC were 5.23mg/100g and 5.23mg/100g, respectively. There was a significant ($p < 0.05$) difference in the calcium content of the rice varieties. The calcium content of the rice varieties from this study is lower when compared with the values of 83.46-84.01mg/100g for rice varieties in Ghana [36]. Differences in calcium contents among the flours may be due to differences in the rate of calcium uptake by each plant. Calcium is required in the body as it is a constituent of bones and teeth, regulation of nerve and

Comment [MK7]: Almost 10-fold change , please check units and clarify with other studies

muscle function. It is also required by children as calcium deficiency may cause rickets and in adults, it causes osteomalacia and may also contribute to osteoporosis [37].

Potassium content of the rice varieties ranged from 5.30 to 6.20mg/100g) with sample TG having the lowest value (5.30mg/100g) while sample UG had the highest (6.20mg/100g). Samples MP and DC had potassium content of 6.00±0.01 and 6.00mg/100g, respectively. There was no significant (p<0.05) difference in the potassium content of the rice varieties. Potassium content of the rice varieties studied is below the values of 113-114.25mg/100g reported by Thomas *et al.* [21] for some local and imported rice varieties. The observed difference in the potassium content of the rice varieties could be due to genetic factors or the mineral content of the soil on which they were grown [27]. Potassium is essential in fluid balance, blood clotting and muscle contraction

Comment [MK8]: Data is misleading

Iron content of the rice varieties ranged from 1.50mg/100g in sample DC to 5.48mg/100g in sample UG. There was a significant (p<0.05) difference in the iron content of the rice varieties. The value of iron obtained from this study (1.50-5.48mg/100g) is lower than the values (42.90-46.30mg/100g) obtained by Ebuechi and Oyewole [35]. The difference in the iron content among the rice varieties may also be influenced by nitrogen application and soil quality [30]. Iron is essential for the formation of haemoglobin in red blood cells [36].

Comment [MK9]: Make it clear how low iron content can affect nutritional aspect of rice.

Table 2: Mineral composition (mg/100g) of the rice varieties

Rice variety	Magnesium	Calcium	Potassium	Iron
MP	8.68±0.86 ^b	5.23±0.14 ^b	6.00±0.01 ^a	4.04±0.42 ^b
DC	7.04±0.42 ^d	5.23±0.22 ^b	6.00±0.42 ^a	1.50±0.55 ^d
TG	6.28±0.03 ^c	3.74±0.44 ^c	5.30±0.04 ^a	3.40±0.18 ^c
UG	9.63±0.88 ^a	8.23±0.13 ^a	6.20±0.57 ^a	5.48±0.13 ^a

Mean values are of triplicate determinations. Mean values within a column with different superscripts are significantly different at (p <0.05).

Key:

MP= Mama pride

UG= Ultimate gold

DC= Daily choice

TG= Tomatoes gold

3.3. Anti-nutrient content of the rice varieties

Table 3 shows the anti-nutrient composition of the rice varieties. Flavonoid content of the rice varieties observed were 2.86%, 2.29%, 2.80% and 2.77% for samples MP, UG, DC and TG, respectively. Flavonoid content of sample UG was significantly (p<0.05) different from samples MP, DC and TG. The result was within the range of 0.50-3.0% reported by Oselebe *et al.* [38] for rice varieties and hybrids grown in Ebonyi State, Nigeria. The variation of flavonoid content in the rice varieties may be affected by genotype and environmental variation. Flavonoids are a complex group of polyphenolic compounds found in a wide range of plant species. They are known to have very complex roles in plant insect interactions and may have a positive or negative role in the life of the herbivorous larvae depending on the species of pests and the type of chemical composition [39]. The result indicates that ultimate gold, daily choice and tomato gold rice varieties can provide antioxidant properties. The high quantity of flavonoid in these rice

varieties also show that they are good free radical scavenger, and will help in preventing oxidative cell damage, and protect against all stages of carcinogen in individuals whose diet is majorly on it [40] since flavonoids act as potent antioxidants and metal chelators with anti-inflammatory, anti-allergic, hepatoprotective, anti-thrombotic, anti-viral, and anti-carcinogenic activities [38].

Phenol content of the rice varieties ranged from 9.92mg/100g to 14.58mg/100g with sample MP recording the lowest value (9.92mg/100g) and sample TG as the highest (14.58mg/100g). Samples UG and DC recorded values of 13.47mg/100g and 13.41mg/100g, respectively. Sample UG was not significantly ($p>0.05$) different from sample DC while sample TG was significantly ($p<0.05$) different from sample MP. High content of phenol in tomato gold (TG) more than the other rice varieties indicate that it is a good antimicrobial agent. This is because phenols and phenolic compounds have been extensively used in disinfectant and remain the standard with which other bactericides are compared [41]. High content of phenol also suggested that the rice variety could act as anti-inflammatory, anti-clothing antioxidant, immune enhancers and hormone modulator [42].

Phytate content of the rice varieties ranged from 1.22g/kg in sample TG to 1.53g/kg in sample UG. Samples MP and DC both recorded values 1.52g/kg. There was no significant ($p>0.05$) difference in the phytate content of the rice varieties. Phytic acid is the major storage form of phosphorous in legumes, cereals, nuts, and oil seeds. Phytic acid is known as a food inhibitor which chelates micronutrient and prevents it to be bioavailable for monogastric animals, including humans, because they lack enzyme phytase in their digestive tract [43].

Saponin content of the rice varieties ranged from 5.86% to 6.37% with sample TG recording the lowest value (5.86%) while sample UG had the highest (6.37%). Samples MP and DC recorded saponin contents of 5.94% and 5.92%, respectively. Saponin content of sample MP was significantly ($p<0.05$) different from sample TG while sample UG and DC were not significantly ($p>0.05$) different from each other. Saponins exhibit a variety of biological activities such as anti-inflammatory, hypocholesterolemic and immune-stimulating properties [44]. High quantity of saponin found in ultimate gold rice variety more than the other rice varieties studied may be suggestive of their therapeutical significance, since some of the general characteristics of saponins include formation of foams in aqueous solution, haemolytic activities and cholesterol binding properties [45].

Tannin content of the rice varieties ranged from 47.03mg/100g to 66.89mg/100g with sample UG recording the lowest value (47.03mg/100g) while sample TG had the highest (66.89mg/100g). Samples MP and DC recorded tannin contents of 59.56 and 52.04mg/100g, respectively. Tannins are a complex group of polyphenolic compounds which play relevant roles in plant resistance against herbivorous insects [46]. Barbehebb *et al.* [47] reported that tannins may sometimes act as toxins for herbivorous insects but as facilitators of digestion. The results from this study revealed a significant difference among the four rice varieties in their tannins content. Thus, the fact that the contents of these compounds is higher in tomato gold rice variety leads to the supposition that they may be more resistant to herbivorous insects and ultimate gold rice variety, with the lowest content in total phenols be relatively sensitive to herbivorous insects.

Table 3: Anti-nutrient composition of the rice varieties

Rice variety	Phenol (mg/100g)	Phytate (g/kg)	Saponin (%)	Tannins (mg/kg)	Flavonoids (%)
MP	9.92±0.06 ^c	1.52±0.43 ^a	5.94±0.01 ^a	59.56±1.46 ^b	2.86±0.13 ^a
UG	13.47±0.24 ^b	1.53±0.43 ^a	6.37±0.00 ^b	47.03±0.72 ^d	2.29±0.16 ^b
DC	13.41±0.18 ^b	1.52±0.43 ^a	5.92±0.01 ^b	52.04±0.08 ^c	2.80±0.01 ^a
TG	14.58±0.20 ^a	1.22±0.00 ^a	5.86±0.00 ^c	66.89±0.16 ^a	2.77±0.01 ^a

Mean values are of triplicate determinations. Mean values within a column with different superscripts are significantly different at (p < 0.05).

Key:

MP= Mama pride

UG= Ultimate gold

DC= Daily choice

TG= Tomatoes gold

4. CONCLUSION

This study has revealed that the four rice varieties have considerable amount of nutrients such as carbohydrate, which is a good energy source, protein, crude fibre as well as fat and mineral elements. The findings of the study also showed that Mama's pride rice variety contained higher ash and fat contents while Tomatoes gold had significantly higher crude fibre. On the other hand, ultimate gold rice variety contained higher protein and carbohydrate; however, ash, protein and moisture contents did not vary significantly between the rice varieties. Furthermore, the concentration of magnesium, calcium, potassium and iron were found to be superior in ultimate gold rice variety. Ultimate gold rice variety also contained higher concentrations of phenol and tannins while saponin content was higher in daily choice rice variety. Phytate content on the other hand did not vary significantly between the rice varieties. Due to the nutritive value of the four rice varieties, the production and consumption of these rice varieties especially ultimate gold rice variety is recommended to farmers and consumers for derivation of nutrients.

COMPETING INTERESTS DISCLAIMER:

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist. The products used for this research are commonly and predominantly use products in our area of research and country. There is absolutely no conflict of interest between the authors and producers of the products because we do not intend to use these products as an avenue for any litigation but for the advancement of knowledge. Also, the research was not funded by the producing company rather it was funded by personal efforts of the authors.

REFERENCES

1. Linscombe LS. Rice Cultivar Designated Cheniere; <http://www.freepatentsonline.com/741725.html>, 2006. Accessed February 23, 2016.
2. Saka JO, Lawal BO. Determinants of adoption and productivity of improved rice varieties in southwestern Nigeria. *African Journal of Biotechnology*, 2009; 8 (19): 4923 – 4932.

3. Adeyeye SAO. Quality Evaluation and Acceptability of Cookies Produced from Rice (*Oryzaglaberrima*) and Soybeans (*Glycine max*) Flour Blends, *Journal of Culinary Science & Technology*, 2018, doi:10.1080/15428052.2018.1502113.
4. FAO. A cassava Industrial Revolution in Nigeria, 2004. www.fao.org.
5. Mendis A. Sri Lanka Grain and Feed Annual. USDA Foreign Agricultural Service, *Global Agriculture Information Network*. 2006; pp. 3-4.
6. Oko AO, Ubi BE, Efiuse AA, Dambaba N. Comparative Analysis of the Chemical Nutrient Composition of Selected Local and Newly Introduced Rice Varieties Grown in Ebonyi State of Nigeria. *International Journal of Agriculture and Forestry*, 2012; 2(2): 16-23.
7. Brennan C, Brennan M, Derbyshire E, Tiwari BK. Effects of Extrusion on the Polyphenols, Vitamins and Antioxidant Activity of Foods. *Trends in Food Science and Technology*, 2011; 22: 570-575.
8. Eke-Ejiofor J, Nwiganale L. The effect of variety and processing methods on the functional and chemical properties of rice flour. *International Journal of Nutrition and Food Sciences*, 2016; 5(1): 80-84.
9. Zubair M, Anwar F, Ali S, Iqbal T. Proximate Composition and Minerals Profile of Selected Rice (*Oryza sativa L.*) Varieties of Pakistan. *Asian Journal of Chemistry*, 2012; 24(1):417-421.
10. Fari MJM, Rajapaksa D, Ranaweera K. Quality characteristics of noodles made from selected rice with different physicochemical characteristics, *J. Natn. Sci. Foundation Sri Lanka*, 2011; 39(1): 53-60.
11. AOAC. Official Methods of Analysis of the Association of Official Analytical Chemists, 20th ed., 2012.
12. Obaoni BO, Ochuko PO. Phytochemical studies and comparative efficacy of the crude extracts of some haemostatic plants in Edo and Delta states of Nigeria, *Global Journal of Pure and Applied Sciences*, 2002; 8(2): 203-208.
13. Boham BA, Kocipal-Abyazan R. Flavonoids and condensed tannins from leaves of *Haiwalian vaccinium vaticulatum* and *V. calycinium*. *Pacific Science*, 1974; 48: 458-463.
14. Nacz M, Shahidi F. The effect of methanol ammonia-water treatment on the content of phenolic acids of canola. *Food Chemistry*, 1989; 31: 159-164.
15. Russel HS. India-New England before the May Flower. University of New England Handover, 1980.
16. Jaffe CS. Analytical chemistry of Food. Blackie Academic and Professional, New York, 2003; 1:200.
17. Deviga D, Vijayalakshmi J, Rahman AA. Determination of storage loss in rice with respect to moisture loss in Food Corporation of India. *International Journal of Latest Trends in Engineering and Technology*, Special Issue 36-41, 2016.
18. Cameron DK, Wang Y. A better understanding of factors that affect the hardness and stickiness of long-grain rice. *Cereal Chemistry*, 2005; 82(2): 113-119.
19. Maisont S, Narkrugsa W. Effect of some physicochemical properties of paddy rice varieties on puffing qualities by microwave "ORIGINAL". *Kasetsar Journal Science*, 2009; 43: 566-575.

20. Diako C, Sakyi-Dawson E, Bediako-Amoa B, Saalia FK, Manful JT. Cooking characteristics and variations in nutrient content of some new scented rice varieties in Ghana, *Annals. Food Science and Technology*, 12(1): 39-44.
21. Thomas R, Wan-Nadiah WA, Bhat R. Physicochemical properties, proximate composition, and cooking qualities of locally grown and imported rice varieties marketed in Penang, Malaysia. *International Food Research Journal*, 2013; 20(3): 1345-1351.
22. Eshun E. Baseline data on the nutrient content and physicochemical properties of selected varieties of soybean, groundnut and rice for the development of nutritious, energy-dense diets, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology. Kumasi, Ghana: Department of Biochemistry and Biotechnology, Faculty of Biosciences, College of Science, 2009.
23. Mbatchou VC, Dawda S. The nutritional composition of four rice varieties grown and used in different food preparations in Kassena-Nankana District, Ghana. *International Journal of Research in Chemistry and Environment*, 2013; 3(1): 308-315.
24. 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; 2:1142409.
25. Shayo NB, Mamiro P, Nyaruhucha CNM, Mamboleo T. Physicochemical and grain cooking characteristics of selected rice cultivars grown in Morogoro. *Tanzania Journal of Science*, 2006; 32(1): 29-35.
26. Islam MZ, Taneya MLJ, Shams-Ud-Din M, Syduzzaman M, Hosque MM. Physicochemical and functional properties of Brown Rice (*Oryza sativa*) and wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) flour and quality of composite biscuit made thereof. *The Agriculturists*, 2012; 10(2): 20-28.
27. Rivero H, Mario J, Raquel H, Lorena F, Liliana V, Elena D. Concentration of As, Ca, Cd, Cr, Cu, Fe, Hg, K, Mg, Mo, Na, N, Pb and Zn in uruguayan rice, determined by AAS " *Atomic Spectroscopy*, 2007; 27: 48-55.
28. Kwarteng EA, Ellis WO, Oduro I, Manful JT. Rice grain quality: A comparison of local varieties with new varieties under study in Ghana," *Food Control*, 2002; 14: 507-514.
29. Frei M, Becker K. Studies on the in vitro starch digestibility and the glycemic index of six different indigenous rice cultivars from the Philippines, *Food Chemistry*, 2003; 83: 395-402.
30. Wireko-Manu FD, Amamoo C. Comparative Studies on Proximate and Some Mineral Composition of Selected Local Rice Varieties and Imported Rice Brands in Ghana. *Agriculture and Food Sciences Research*, 2017; 4(1):1-7.
31. Liu S, Willett WC, Manson JE, Hu FB, Rosner B, Colditz G. "Relation between changes in intakes of dietary fiber and grain products and changes in weight and development of obesity among middle-aged women," *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 2003; 78: 920-927.
32. Oko AO, Ugwu SI. The proximate and mineral compositions of five major rice varieties in Abakaliki, South-Eastern Nigeria," *International Journal of Plant Physiology and Biochemistry*, 2010; 3: 25-27.

33. Barron J. Black rice bran, the next superfood? Baseline of Health Foundation. 21ST SEPT." Retrieved from <https://jonbarron.org/article/black-rice-bran-next-superfood>, 2010.
34. Asaduzzaman M, Haque ME, Rahman J, Hasan SMK, Ali MA, Akter MS, Ahmed M. Comparisons of physicochemical, total phenol, flavonoid content and functional properties of six cultivars of aromatic rice in Bangladesh. *African Journal of Food Science*, 2013; 7(8): 198-203.
35. Ebuehi OAT, Oyewole AC. Effect of cooking and soaking on physical characteristics, nutrient composition and sensory evaluation of indigenous and foreign rice varieties in Nigeria," *African Journal of Biotechnology*, 2007; 6: 1016-1020.
36. Eshun G, Adu Amankwah E, Barimah J. Proximate composition, mineral nutrients and functional properties of Digang, NERICA-1 and NERICA-2 rice varieties from Ghana. *Global Advanced Research Journal of Agricultural Science*, 2019; 8(6): 207-213
37. Soetan K, Oyewol O. The need for adequate processing to reduce the antinutritional factors in plants used as human foods and animal feeds: A review. *African Journal of Food Science*, 2009; 3(9):223-232.
38. Oselebe HO, Ogah O, Odo MI, Ogbu KI. Determination of Phytochemical and Antioxidant Properties of Some Rice Varieties and Hybrids Grown in Ebonyi State, Nigeria. *Nig. J. Biotech*, 2013; 26: 60-67.
39. Harborne JB. Twenty-five years of chemical ecology. *Nat. Prod. Rep.* 2001; 18:361–379.
40. Okwute SK, Yakubu MO. Anti-microbial and phytochemical screening of *Dallbergias axalilis* Hook F. Fabaccae. *ZUMA J. Pure and Applied Sci*, 1998; 1:21-24.
41. Close DC, McArthur A. Rethinking the role of many plant phenolics protection from photodamage. *Oikos*, 2002; 99: 166-172.
42. Elangovan V, Seker N, Gorindasarny K. Chemo-preventive potential of dietary bio flavonoids against 20-methy/cho/anthrene-induce tumoringences. *Cancer Lett*, 1994; 87: 107-113.
43. Wu W, Cheng FN, Liu ZN, Wei K. Difference of Phytic Acid Content and its Relation to Four Protein Composition Contents In Grains of Twenty-Nine Japonica rice varieties from Jiangsu and Zhejiang Provinces , China. *Rice Science*, 2007; 14(4):311-314.
44. Tamura Y, Miyakoshi M, Yamamoto M. Application of saponin-containing plants in foods and cosmetics. *InTech Open Science*, 2012; <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0>
45. Negi JS, Negi PS, Pant GJ, Rawat MSM, Negi SK. Naturally occurring saponins: Chemistry and biology. *Journal of Poisonous and Medicinal Plant Research*, 2013; 1(1), pp. 006-011. Available online at <http://www.apexjournal.org/JPMPR>
46. Moctezuma C, Hammerbacher A, Heil M, Gershenzon J, Méndez-Alonzo R, Oyama, K. Specific polyphenols and tannins are associated with defense against insect herbivores in the tropical Oak *Quercus oleoides*. *J. Chem. Ecol.*, 2014; 101(3):437-47.
47. Barbehenn RV, Weir Q, Salminen J.P. Oxidation of ingested phenolics in the tree-feeding caterpillar *Orygia eucostigma* depends on foliar chemical composition. *J. Chem. Ecol.* 2008; 34:748–56. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10886-008-9478-3>

UNDER PEER REVIEW

