# UTILIZATION OF NEW CULTIVAR OF SWEET POTATO FOR PREPARING WEANING FOODS

Abd-Elhady, Y. A. \*; Afaf.A.Salim\*\* and Mervat M. Anwar \*\*\*

- \* Faculty of Specific Education Home Economic Dept. Minufiya Univ.
- \*\* Horticulture Research Institute
- \*\*\*Atomic Energy Authority, Nuclear Research Center, Cairo, Egypt.

## **ABSTRACT**

The aims of this study were to evaluate the nutritional value of new hybrids sweet potato in order to raise public awareness of its potential use in nutrition and to formulate high protein quality weaning foods. The nutritional composition was determined for two new cultivar and local cultivar grown up in Horticulture Institute in El-Qanater El-Khyariya Egypt.

The cultivars namely Minufiya 2/96 and Minufiya 9/96 were compared with local cultivar (Mabrouka). The results show that protein contents of new cultivar were greater than that of local cultivar. Protein levels were 9.78, 11.27 and 5.17% for Minufiya 2/96, Minufiya 9/96 and Mabrouka respectively. The new cultivar also were higher than the local cultivar on total carbohydrates, total sugar, reducing sugar, non-reducing sugar and sucrose content .The results revealed that sweet potato might be mentioned as a source of antioxidant (Vitamin C and  $\beta$ -carotene). The concentration of  $\beta$ -carotene mg/100g F.W was 12.64, 10.20 and 6.76 for Minufiya 2/96, Minufiya 9/96 and Mabrouka respectively, and the content of Vit. C was 15.05, 20.47 and 17.59 mg/100g F.W. for Minufiya 2/96, Minufiya 9/96 and Mabrouka respectively.

Four weaning food mixture were formulated from sweet potato70%, ficus carica 10% and or peanut and chickpea or mung bean or soybean in the ratio (20%) respectively in the form of powder. Data indicate that these mixtures had higher protein quality and quantity. Formula 1 of weaning food mixture showed high acceptability for appearance, texture, odor, color and taste. Also it is cheap weaning foods, the average cost of 100 gram from .080 to 1.50L.E.

Keywords: Sweet potato- weaning - legumes - amino acids - chemical composition

## INTRODUCTION

Sweet potatoes are highly nutritious vegetables; however, sweet potato consumption is progressively declining especially in industrialized nations. Part of this decline may be attributed to the lack of sweet potato based products for consumers beyond the baked roots. Conversely, the white potato has seen a great increase in production and a large portion of this increase is due to processed products such as chips, fries, and frozen products. Thus, one way to expand sweet potato consumption is to develop appealing processed products or alternative uses for sweet potato roots (Kays, 1985; Collins & Walter, 1992). It has been commercially dried into dehydrated flakes for many years. However, the resulting product has poor solubility, unattractive brown color, and limited applications. In general, fruit and vegetable powders have been described as value added ingredients in various food systems. Both freeze dried and drum dried fruit and vegetable powders deliver numerous functional and nutritional benefits.

The characteristic flavors, colors, and nutrients as well as water

binding properties of these powders make them an ideal addition to soups, sauces, marinades, baby foods, dips, extruded cereal products, fruit purees for confections, and fillings for frozen toaster snacks (Francis & Phelps, 2003; Pszczola, 2003).

The weaning period usually start at the age of 4 to 6 months old and extended to the age of 2 to 3 years. Special foods are rarely available for these children; consequently, they have to depend on the same types of foods as those eaten by adults. (Mosha and Svanberg, 1983). In Egypt as many areas of the world, the production of milk is not sufficient to supply the needs of the population. For this reason, many efforts had been carried out to produce protein-rich food mixtures for infants and preschool age children from vegetable protein sources alone and or mixed with skim milk powder (Emam, 1996) Protein content of the diet among the low income groups in developing countries is derived mostly from foods of vegetable origin. It is important; therefore to examine the content and quality of the protein in vegetable foods such as sweet potato to determine their actual and potential role in dietary protein adequacy (Woolf, 1992) ideally, complementary foods should contain animal source foods with high biological value to foster growth and development. However, these foods may not be available to most lowincome households in developing countries (Neumann et al., 2002). Development of complementary foods is guided by the following principles: 1) high nutritional value to supplement breastfeeding, 2) acceptability, 3) low price, and 4) use of local food items (Lutter et al, 2003).

Therefore, the objectives of this study were to evaluate the nutritional value of new hybrid sweet potatoes and to formulate a high-protein weaning food based on the new variety of sweet potatoes, easy to prepare, with high protein, high energy supplementary and low price to be available for infants in different socioeconomic classes.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### 1. Plant materials:

Two field experiments were performed during the successive seasons of 2005 and 2006 on the experimental farm in Horticultural Research Station of El-Qanater El-Khirya Kalubia Government, Egypt, the coastal lines used in this study (min2/96 and ) were true seeds of complex crosses between two parental cultivars. The seeds were brought from coastal Research and Education Center, Charleston, Clemson University USA. The new hybrid of use study names Minufiya 6/96 and Mabrouka (local cultivar).

Then work RAPD to the new cultivars of study used Random Primer. The results were OPA 0.02, OPA 0.04, and OPA0.19. OPA 0.07, OPB0.03 OPB0.04, OPB0.020, OPC0.1, OPD0.19, OPE0.018 and OPO 20. At agriculture Genetic Engineering Research Institute on date 22/2/2005. The transplantation on May 7 in.

All treatments were subjected to uniform application of nitrogen fertilization (30kg/fed.) as ammonium sulphate (20.6%N), calcium super phosphate 45 kg/fed (1505%P2O5) during soil preparation and (96 kg/fed )

potassium sulphate (48% K2O) at tow equal portions i.e., at 30 and 60 days after transplanting

## 2. Methods

## A- Vegetative growth, yield and its components.

A sample consisted of 3 plants taken at random from each plot at 110 days after transplanting, in each season of study. Average length of main branch (cm), number of both branches and average number of leaves on main branch. After 150 days from transplanting in both seasons of study the tuber roots of every plot were harvested. The following data were recorded:

- Average weight of tuber root (gm), number of tuber roots per plants, total weight of tuber roots (ton/fed), average length of tuber roots (cm) and average diameter of tuber root (cm).
- Ten tubers roots were randomly chosen from each treatment to determine average length and diameter of tuber roots.

## B - Chemical analysis

Five uniform sized tuber roots of each treatment were cleaned, dried at 70  $^{\circ}$ C, grounded and analyzed to determine chemical compositions of total carbohydrates (A.O.A.C., 2000), total sugars described by Dubis et al (1956). Ascorbic acid (V.C) content and total carotene were determined (as fresh weight basis) by Both (1958) and titration with 2,6 dichlorophenel-indophenol. Protein and crude fibers were determined according to the methods of A.O.A.C (2000), whereas, fat and ash content were determined according to the methods of A.O.A.C (2000), total carbohydrates were calculated on dry weight basis by differences (100 – {protein + fat + ash}. Minerals were determined using atomic absorption according to A.O.A.C (2000), Vit. C and  $\beta$  carotene were determined according to the methods of A.O.A.C (2000)

# Preparation of weaning food mixture:

## Protein quality assessment:

Protein quality was assessed by amino acid score using amino acid contents of the weaning mixture and human amino acid requirements according to FAO (1985) and by protein Efficiency Ratio (PER) as described by Al-Smyer et al (1974) using three equations:

PER1= -0.486 + 0.454 leucine - 0.047 proline.

PER2 = 0.468 + 0.454 leucine - 0.105 tyrosine

PER3 = -1.816 + 0.435 methionine + 0.78 leucine + 0.211 histidine -0.944 tyrosine

# Organoleptic evaluation:

Sensory evaluation was done by test panel according to Notter et al (1959) for appearance, texture, color, odor and taste.

# Statistical analysis

The obtained results were statistically analyzed and least significant difference (L.S.D. at 0.05 level) as reported by Gommez (1984) was used to compare treatment means.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table (1): Evaluation of two new cultivar and local cultivar in some vegetative growth, yield and its components characters in 2005-2006

| С     | haracters | No of<br>branch<br>yield | Length of<br>main<br>branch<br>(cm) | Number of<br>leaves of<br>main<br>branch | roote/ | Average of<br>tuber root<br>fresh weight<br>(gm) | Total tuber<br>roots<br>yield(ten-<br>fed) |
|-------|-----------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------|--|--|
| New   | Min. 296  | 28.97                    | 131.60                              | 18.17                                    | 7.80   | 520.00   | 21.50                                      |
|       | Min. 296  | 27.09                    | 175.20                              | 13.76                                    | 5.92   | 618.30   | 24.37                                      |
| Local | Mabrouka  | 23.73                    | 212.40                              | 21.37                                    | 4.32   | 460.00   | 12.43                                      |
| -     | Min. 296  | 28.93                    | 129.30                              | 16.56                                    | 8.56   | 490.00   | 20.64                                      |
|       | Min. 296  | 27.20                    | 170.10                              | 12.45                                    | 6.03   | 643.30   | 23.50                                      |
|       | Mabrouka  | 23.77                    | 201.30                              | 20.61                                    | 4.33   | 450.00   | 11.40                                      |
| L.S.D | 5%        | 1.82                     | 9.353                               | 1.635                                    | 1.31   | 22.98  | 1.953                                      |

- Nutritional value

Table (2): Evaluation of two new cultivar and local cultivar in some, yield and its chemical characteristics at harvested in sweet potato.

| Characters     | carotene | Ascorbic<br>acid(V.C)<br>mg/100g<br>F.w of<br>tuber<br>roots |       | sugers | content of | Sugare | content | content |
|----------------|----------|--|-------|--------|------------|--------|---------|---------|
| NewMin. 296    | 12.64    | 15.05  | 83.80 | 6.49   | 0.76       | 6.22   | 6.62    | 9.78    |
| Min. 296       | 10.20    | 20.47  | 83.20 | 7.34   | 0.76       | 7.24   | 5.84    | 11.27   |
| Local Mabrouka | 6.76     | 17.59  | 75.95 | 4.50   | 0.75       | 4.57   | 5.80    | 5.11    |
| L .S.D5%       | 0.993    | 0.854  | 4.87  | 2.587  | 0.072      | 0.393  | 0.772   | 0.65    |

# Potato vegetative characters.

Data in Table (1) show the number of branches per plant which was found to be significantly differed between three cultivars, Min 2/96 was the highest in the number of branches per plant compared with Min 6/96 and local cultivars (Mabrouka) while in the characters length of main branches (cm) and number of leaves per plant local cultivar increasing than Min 2/96 and Min 6/96 in this trait. Data in same table show that the effect of different cultivars of seed potato yield /fed and its components (number of roots/plant, average weight of tuber root). It is clear that yield and its components increased in Min 2/96 to number of roots per plant followed by Min 6/96 then Mabrouka cultivar, while in the total yield (ton/fed) and average of tuber root fresh weight the Min 6/96 was the greater than the Min 2/96 and local cultivar.

Data presented in Table (2) reveal that the sucrose content was higher in the Min2/96 than Min6/96 and local cultivar. No significant differences were observed between Min 6/96 and Mabrouka cultivars, while in the starch content show no significant differences were observed between Min 2/96 and Min 6/96. Whatever Mabrouka cultivar (local) was higher value in this trait, concerning protein trait the new cultivar gave higher value 11.27followed the Min 2/96.

Table (3): Chemical composition of mixture ingredients Formula

I(g/100g mixture).

|              | T       | Component |                     |      |                    |  |  |  |
|--------------|---------|-----------|---------------------|------|--------------------|--|--|--|
|              | Protein | Fat       | Total carbohydrates | Ash  | Energy<br>(K Cal%) |  |  |  |
| Sweet potato | 11.27   | 0.26      | 88.23               | 3.91 | 390                |  |  |  |
| Mung bean    | 26.47   | 1.43      | 62.7                | 4.04 | 334                |  |  |  |
| Ficus carica | 6       | 1.2       | 89                  | 3.8  | 390                |  |  |  |

Chemical composition of mixtures:

The results of chemical composition of mixture ingredients (g/100g dwt) are presented in Table (3). The protein contents in formula (1) were 11.27, 26.47 and 6% for sweet potato, mung bean and ficus carica respectively. Values for fat, total carbohydrates, ash and energy were (0.26, 1.43 and 1.2%0, (88.23, 62.7 and 89%), (3.91, 4.04 and 3.8%) and (390, 334 and 390 K.cal) sweet potato, mung bean and ficus carica respectively.

Table (4) show the chemical composition (g/100g dwt) of formula (2). Protein contents were 11.27, 19.6 and 6% for sweet potato, chickpea and ficus carica respectively. On the other hand values of fat, total carbohydrates, ash and energy are (0.26, 5.4 and 1.2), (88.23, 61.4 and 89%), (3.91, 1.1 and 3.8%) and (390, 372.6 and 390 Kcal) for sweet potato, chickpea and ficus carica respectively.

Table (5) illustrates the chemical composition (g/100g dwt) of formula (3). The tabulated data indicated that, the protein contents are 11.27, 25.8 and 6% for sweet potato, peanut and ficus carica respectively. On the other hand values of fat, total carbohydrates, ash and energy are (0.26, 49.24 and 1.2), (88.23, 22.37 and 89%), (3.91, 2.33 and 3.8%) and (390. 365.84 and 390 Kcal) for sweet potato, peanut and ficus carica respectively.

Table (4): Chemical composition of mixture ingredients formula 2 (q/100g mixture).

|              |         | Component |                     |      |                    |  |  |
|--------------|---------|-----------|---------------------|------|--------------------|--|--|
|              | Protein | Fat       | Total carbohydrates | Ash  | Energy<br>(K Cal%) |  |  |
| Sweet potato | 11.27   | 0.26      | 88.23               | 3.91 | 390                |  |  |
| Chickpea     | 19.6    | 5.4       | 61.4                | 1.1  | 372.6              |  |  |
| Ficus carica | 6       | 1.2       | 89                  | 3.8  | 390                |  |  |

Table (5): chemical composition of mixture ingredients formula 3(g/100g mixture).

|              | Component |       |                     |      |                    |  |  |
|--------------|-----------|-------|---------------------|------|--------------------|--|--|
|              | Protein   | Fat   | Total carbohydrates | Ash  | Energy<br>(K Cal%) |  |  |
| Sweet potato | 11.27     | 0.26  | 88.23               | 3.91 | 390                |  |  |
| Peanut       | 25.8      | 49.24 | 22.37               | 2.33 | 635.84             |  |  |
| Ficus carica | 6         | 1.2   | 89                  | 3.8  | 390                |  |  |

Table (6) shows the chemical composition (g/100g dwt) of formula (4). The protein contents were 11.27, 36.5 and 6% for sweet potato, soybean and ficus carica respectively. On the other hand values of fat, total carbohydrates, ash and energy are (0.26, 19.9 and 1.2), (88.23, 30.2 and

89%), (3.91, 4.9 and 3.8%) and (390, 445.9 and 390 Kcal) for sweet potato, soybean and ficus carica respectively. Pallet and Young (1988) reported that the quality of sweet potato protein is lowest for the infant, but moderate to high for all other age groups suggested that an improvement in both quality and quantity of protein would be beneficial in those societies relying partly or heavily on sweet potato as a source of protein.

Table (6): chemical composition of mixture ingredients (g/100g mixture).

|              | Component |      |                     |      |                    |  |
|--------------|-----------|------|---------------------|------|--------------------|--|
|              | Protein   | Fat  | Total carbohydrates | Ash  | Energy<br>(K Cal%) |  |
| Sweet potato | 11.27     | 0.26 | 88.23               | 3.91 | 391                |  |
| Soy bean     | 36.5      | 19.9 | 30.2                | 4.9  | 445.9              |  |
| Ficus carica | 6         | 1.2  | 89                  | 3.8  | 390                |  |

Table (7) shows the chemical composition of some weaning foods mixtures prepared from sweet potato (70%), ficus carica (10%) and mung bean (20%) or chickpea (20%) or peanut or soybean (20%). The data indicate that, protein contents are 13.78, 13.49, 12.41 and 15.79 % for formula 1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively. These contents supplies about 98.4, 96.4, 88 and 112.8% of protein daily requirements according to FAOWHO/UNU (1985) the minimum level of protein was set at 14%. The same table show values of total carbohydrates were 81.33, 71.79, 87 and 73.63 for formula 1, 2,3 and 4 respectively, fat contents were 0.59, 9.84, 1.32 and 4.22 % for formula 1,2,3 and 4 respectively, while ash contents of formula 1,2,3 and 4 were 3.93, 3.60, 3.35 and 4.11 respectively. On the other hand, energy for formula 1, 2, 3 and 4 were 385.75, 429.68, 381.0 and 395.66 K cal respectively.

Table (7): Chemical composition of weaning food mixture (g/100g mixture)

| Formula (4) | Formula (3) | Formula (2) | Formula (1) | Component           |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|
| 15.79       | 12.41       | 13.49       | 13.78       | Protein             |
| 4.22        | 1.32        | 9.84        | 0.59        | Fat                 |
| 73.63       | 79.87       | 71.79       | 81.33       | Total carbohydrates |
| 4.11        | 3.35        | 3.60        | 3.93        | Ash                 |
| 395.66      | 381.0       | 429.68      | 385.75      | Energy (Kcal y)     |
|             |             |             |             | Minerals (Mg/100g)  |
| 143.74      | 120.34      | 101.83      | 130.2       | Ca                  |
| 265.05      | 210.25      | 191.45      | 360.7       | Р                   |
| 42.53       | 48.93       | 42.93       | 77.4        | Na                  |
| 1086.33     | 898.53      | 793.93      | 880.6       | К                   |
| 5.1         | 3.12        | 2.36        | 5.58        | Fe                  |
| 2.15        | 1.85        | 1.83        | 2.02        | Zn                  |

Minerals contents of all formulas were presented also in Table (7). Values (g/100g mixture) for Ca, P, Na, K, Fe and Zn were 130.2, 360.7, 77.4, and 880.6, 5.58 and 2.02), 101.83, 191.45, 42.93, 793.93. 2.36 and 1.83), (120.34, 210.25, 48.93, 898.53, 3.12 and 1.85) and (143.74, 265.05, 42.53, 1086.33, 5.1 and 2.15) for formula 1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively. Data in Table

(8) indicate the evaluation of essential amino acids composition of the mixture of formula (1). The results showed that the combination of sweet potato, mung bean and faces carica efficient complementation of the amino acids, which met the FAO (1970) reference pattern.

Table (8): Essential amino acids composition and amino acid scores of the mixture.

| tio mixture.          |  |                              |                     |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|--|------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| Essential amino acids | Sweet potato : soy bean : ficus carica | FAO Ref. Pattern<br>(g/16gN) | Amino acid scores % |  |  |  |
| Isolucine             | 6.47                                   | 4.00                         | 161.75              |  |  |  |
| Leucine               | 9.74                                   | 7.00                         | 139.14              |  |  |  |
| Lysine                | 7.54                                   | 5.50                         | 137.10              |  |  |  |
| Metionine+cystine     | 3.46                                   | 3.5                          | 99.14               |  |  |  |
| Phenylalanine         | 7.72                                   | 6.00                         | 128.67              |  |  |  |
| Theronine             | 6.82                                   | 4.00                         | 170.5               |  |  |  |
| Valine                | 8.98                                   | 6.09                         | 147.45              |  |  |  |
| Tryptophan            | 1.71                                   | 1.25                         | 136.80              |  |  |  |
| Proline               | 4.56                                   |                              |                     |  |  |  |
| Histidine             | 2.97                                   | 2.5                          | 156.31              |  |  |  |
| Tyrosine              | 4.56                                   | 2.73                         | 149.48              |  |  |  |
| RER1                  | 3.53                                   |                              |                     |  |  |  |
| PER2                  | 3.43                                   |                              |                     |  |  |  |
| PER3                  | 2.17                                   |                              |                     |  |  |  |

As indicated by A.A.S and P.E.R protein of the mixture was adequate, this reflects the high nutritive value of the mixture as a weaning food. The results of the protein efficiency ratio (PER) are present in the same table.

The protein efficiency ratio (PER) values of formula 1, 2, 3 and 4were ranged from (2.38-3.09), (2.30-3.37), (2.64-3.39) and (2.17-3.53) The obtained data were higher than that obtained by Badee et al (2004) this reflect the nutritive value and high protein quality of the prepared formulas contained sweet potato, ficus carica, and /or mung bean, chickpea, peanut and soybean.

The same results were found in tables 9, 10 and 11 for formula 2, 3 and 4

Table (9): Essential amino acids composition and amino acid scores of the mixture.

| Essential amino acids | Sweet potato : peanut: ficus carica | FAO Ref. Pattern<br>(g/16gN) | Amino acid scores % |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| Isolucine             | 5.9                                 | 4.00                         | 147.0               |
| Leucine               | 8.84                                | 7.00                         | 126.29              |
| Lysine                | 6.57                                | 5.50                         | 119.45              |
| Metionine+cystine     | 3.23                                | 3.5                          | 92.28               |
| Phenylalanine         | 7.58                                | 6.00                         | 126.33              |
| Theronine             | 6.25                                | 4.00                         | 156.25              |
| Valine                | 8.38                                | 6.09                         | 137.6               |
| Tryptophan            | 2.30                                | 1.25                         |                     |
| Proline               | 4.81                                |                              |                     |
| Histidine             | 2.67                                | 2.5                          | 140.53              |
| Tyrosine              | 4.86                                | 2.73                         | 180.02              |
| RER1                  | 3.37                                |                              |                     |
| PER2                  | 3.25                                |                              |                     |
| PER3                  | 2.30                                |                              |                     |

## Organoleptic evaluation

Organoleptic evaluation of weaning food mixture showed high acceptability for appearance, texture, odor, color and taste. Also it is cheap weaning foods, the average cost of 100 gram from .080 to 1.50L.E.

Table (10): Essential amino acids composition and amino acid scores of the mixture.

| Essential amino<br>acids | Sweet potato : chickpea: ficus carica | FAO Ref. Pattern<br>(g/16gN) | Amino acid scores % |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| Isolucine                | 6.39                                  | 4.00                         | 159.75              |
| Leucine                  | 9.36                                  | 7.00                         | 133.71              |
| Lysine                   | 7.78                                  | 5.50                         | 141.45              |
| Metionine+cystine        | 3.55                                  | 3.5                          | 101.14              |
| Phenylalanine            | 8.27                                  | 6.00                         | 137.83              |
| Theronine                | 6.72                                  | 4.00                         | 168.0               |
| Valine                   | 8.7                                   | 6.09                         | 142.86              |
| Tryptophan               | 2.41                                  | 1.25                         | 141.8               |
| Proline                  | 5.3                                   |                              |                     |
| Histidine                | 3.11                                  | 2.5                          | 163.68              |
| Tyrosine                 | 5.24                                  | 2.73                         | 191.94              |
| RER1                     | 3.39                                  |                              |                     |
| PER2                     | 3.29                                  |                              |                     |
| PER3                     | 2.64                                  |                              |                     |

Table (11): Essential amino acids composition and amino acid scores of the mixture.

| the mixture:          |  |                              |                        |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|--|------------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| Essential amino acids | Sweet potato : soy<br>bean: ficus carica | FAO Ref. Pattern<br>(g/16gN) | Amino acid<br>scores % |  |  |  |
| Isolucine             | 6.43                                     | 4.00                         | 160.75                 |  |  |  |
| Leucine               | 9.96                                     | 7.00                         | 138.43                 |  |  |  |
| Lysine                | 7.37                                     | 5.50                         | 143                    |  |  |  |
| Metionine+cystine     |  | 3.5                          |                        |  |  |  |
| Phenylalanine         | 7.97                                     | 6.00                         | 132.83                 |  |  |  |
| Theronine             | 6.65                                     | 4.00                         | 166.25                 |  |  |  |
| Valine                | 5.85                                     | 6.09                         | 95.06                  |  |  |  |
| Tryptophan            | 2.36                                     | 1.25                         | 188.8                  |  |  |  |
| Proline               | 4.31                                     |                              |                        |  |  |  |
| Histidine             | 3.63                                     | 2.5                          | 145.2                  |  |  |  |
| Tyrosine              | 4.74                                     | 2.73                         | 79.0                   |  |  |  |
| RER1                  | 3.09                                     |                              |                        |  |  |  |
| PER2                  | 3.03                                     |                              |                        |  |  |  |
| PER3                  | 2.38                                     |                              |                        |  |  |  |

## REFERENCES

- A.O.A.C (2000). Official Methods of Analysis of Associated of Official Chemists Revision I, International, I 17<sup>th</sup> Edition.
- Al-Smeyer, H.R.; Cunninghan, A.E and Wappich N.L (1974). Equations preict PER from amino acid analysis. Food Tech. 7:34-40.
- Ashworth A and Draper A. (1992): The potential of traditional technologies for increasing the energy density of weaning foods: a critical review of existing knowledge with particular reference to malting and fermentation. WHO Technical Report Series. (WHO/CDD/EDP) 92.4) Geneva: WHO, 1992.

- Badee, A.Z.; Ali, M.H; Mona, A. and Shadia, A. (2004). Preparation and Evaluation of naturally flavoured weaning foods for protein energy malnourished infants. Egypt J.Food Sci. 32, No1-2 pp 37-48.
- Both, U.H. (1958). Extraction and estimation of carotenoids. Cambridge Univ. and Medical Res. Council. National., Cambridge Eng.
- Collins, J. L., and Walter, W. M., Jr. (1992). Processing and processed products. In A. Jones, & J. C. Bouwkamp (Eds.), *Fifty years of cooperative sweet potato research*. 1939–1989 (pp. 71–87). Southern Cooperative Series Bulletin no. 369. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station.
- Dubios, M.A. Gilles, J.K.Homlition, P.A. Rebers, and P.A.Smiyh (1956). A colorimetric method for determination of sugars and related substances. Anal. Chem. 28 (3):350-356.
- Emam, W.H.(1996). Preparation and evaluation of special products for infants and babies .pH.D Thesis Food Science and Technology Dept. Faculty of Agriculture Cairo University.
- FAO (1970): Food and Agriculture Organization. Amino acid content of foods. Nutritional Studies no. 24. Rome:.
- FOA/WHO/UNU (1985). Energy and protein requirements, Report of a joint Expert consultation. Tech. Rep. Ser. No 724. WHO, Geneva.
- Francis, D. and S.K. (2003). Phelps, Fruit and vegetable juice powders add value to cereal products, *Cereal Foods World* **48** (5) (2003), pp. 244–246.
- Gommez, K.A (1984): Statistical procedure for Agric. Res.2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Johnwiley and Sons Inc. New York 680 pages.
- Kays, S.J(1985) Formulated sweet potato products. In: J.C. Bouwkamp, Editor, Sweet potato products: A natural resource for the tropics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL (1985), pp. 205–218.
- LutterC.K, Dewey. K.G and Rosado, J.L (2003). Nutrient Composition for Fortified Complementary Foods-Processing for a Technical Consultation Held at the Pan American Health Organization, Washington, DC, October4-5,2001-Foreword. J. Nutr. 133:2940s.
- Mensah EO and Sefa-Dedeh S. (1991): Traditional food-processing technology and high-protein food production. Food Nutr Bull 1991;13(1):43-9.
- Mensah P. Drasar BS, Harrison TJ, Tomkins AM. (1991): Fermented cereal gruels: towards a solution of the weanling's dilemma. Food Nutr Bull 1991;13(1):50-7.
- Moor, S; Spachman, H.and Stei, W (1958). Chromatography of amino acids on sulphanated polystyrene resins. Anal. Chem.. 30:1185-1190.
- Mosha AC and Svanberg U.(1983). Preparation of weaning foods with high nutrient density using flour of germinated cereals. Food Nutr Bull ;5(2):10-14.
- Notter, G.K.; Taaylor, P.H. and Downens, N.J (1959). Orange juice powder. Factor affecting storage stability. Food Tech.13:113-117.
- Neuman, C., Harris, D.M and Rogers, M.L (2002)Contribution of Animal Source Foods in Improving Diet Quality and Function in Children in the Developing World. *Nutr. Res.* 22:193-220.

Pellet, P.I and Young V.R. (1988). Protein and amino acids needs for adults. Ecol. Food Nutr.21:321:330.

Pszczola, D.E. (2003), Delivery systems help send the right message, *Food Technology* **57** (4) (2003), pp. 68–85.

Woolf, J.A. (1992). Sweet potato: an untapped food resource. I. sweet potato products.

استخدام أصناف جديدة من البطاطا لعمل وجبات للأطفال يحيي عبد المنعم عبد الهادى\*، عفاف سالم\* ومرفت محمد أنور \*\*\* \* قسم الافتصاد المنزلي كلية التربية النوعية - جامعة المنوفية \*\* معهد البحوث الزراعية -الجيزه - مصر

\*\*\* هيئة الطاقة الذرية - مركز البحوث النووية

أجريت هذه الدراسة بهدف تقدير القيمة الغذائية للبطاطا لامكان استخدامها في التغذية. وقد تم تقدير القيمة الغذائية لصنفين من الأصناف الجديدة وصنف من الأصناف المحلية تم زراعتها في معهد بحوث البساتين بالقناطر الخيرية. وقد سسميت هذه الأصناف باسم منوفية ١٩/٦، منوفية ١٩/٦، المبروكة (الصنف المحلي). وقد أظهرت النتائج ارتفاع محتوى الأصناف الجديدة من البروتين مقارنة بالصنف المحلى حيث كان مستوى البروتين ٩٦/٨، ١١,٢٠ ، ١١,٢٠ لكل من منوفية ١٩٦/٦، منوفية ١٩٦/٦، مبروكة بالترتيب. كما أظهرت النتائج أيسضا ارتفاع محتوى الأصناف الجديدة عن الصنف المحلى في الكربوهيدرات الكلية والسكريات الكليمة والسكريات المختزلة والسكريات غير المختزلة وسكر السكروز. كما أظهرت النتائج أن البطاطا يمكن أن المختزلة والسكريات غير المختزلة وسكر السكروز. كما أظهرت النتائج أن البطاطا يمكن أن اتكون مصدرا لمصادات الأكسدة (فيتامين ج والبيتاكاروتين) حيث كان تركيز البيتاكاروتين عنوفية ١٢,١٠ ، ١٠,٠٠ ، منوفية ١٢,٢٠ ، ١٢,٠٠ مناوزن الرطب لكل من منوفية ٢١,٠٠ والمبروكة بالترتيب.

تم عمل أربعة خلطات غذائية للأطفال مكونة من البطاطًا (٧٠%) والنين المجفف (١٠%) فول الصويا أو الفول السوداني أو العدس الصيفي أو الحمص (٢٠%) وذلك في صورة بودرة بلتحسين جودة بروتين البطاطا ، وقد أوضحت النتائج ارتفاع هذه الخلطات في محتواها من البروتين سواء من حيث النوع أو الكمية. وبعمل حسابات التكلفة اتضح ان الخلطة (١٠٠ جم) رقم (.7.%) عدس صيفي) كانت اقل تكلفة يليها الخلطة رقم (.7.%) حمص) ثم رقم (.7.%) فول صويا) وتراوحت تكلفتها من (.7.%) جنيه مصري.