QUALITY OF YOGHURT MADE FROM BUFFALO MILK AND RETENTATE AS AFFECTED WITH THE FORTIFICATION WITH SKIM MILK POWDER AND RETENTATE POWDER.

Gomaa, M. Sh.; E. Sh. El -Sokkary; M. Y. Mehanaa and M.D. Abd El-Aziz

Dairy Dept., Faculty of Agric., Mansoura University, Mansoura, Egypt

ABSTRACT

Yoghurt was made from buffalo milk in the presence of different levels of skim milk powder and retentate powder. The retentate was also used in making yoghurt by reconstituting it to obtain the same composition of buffalo milk, and by the fortification with different concentrating of skim milk powder and retentate powder, yoghurt made from buffalo milk in the presence of 1% retentate powder was the best from the chemical, microbiological and organoleptic points of view. Meanwhile, the yoghurt made from retentate in the presence of 3% retentate powder was shown to be the best among the groups made from retentate.

INTRODUCTION

There has been a phenomenal increase in the production of fermented milk in developed countries. Yoghurt is a very popular flavorful and healthful dairy product in Egypt. Its production and consumption is growing continuously due to its therapeutic properties beside its high nutritive value (Karagul et al., 2004). The health promoting properties of live lactic acid bacteria in yoghurt include protection against gastrointestinal upsets, enhancement of digestion of lactose by maldigesters, decreasing the risk of cancer, lower blood cholesterol, improving the immune response and helping the body to assimilate protein, calcium and iron (Perdigeon et al., 1998; Marona and Pedrigon, 2004).

Ultrafiltration (UF) is the most fascinating technology which have been recently introduced for application in the dairy industry, not only to improve the traditional dairy products but also to create new products.

Therefore, this work was carried out to investigate the effect of manufacturing yoghurt from UF. The resultant products were stored at 5 C for 14 days ,and all of the measurements were carried out while fresh and after 7 and 14 days.)

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Fresh buffalo's milk and cream were obtained from the Dairy Department, faculty of agriculture, Mansoura University. Skim milk powder "moisture: 4% fat: 1.25% used in this work was made in Poland by "VARIMEX". Retentate powder: { protein: 69.8% lactose:17.2% ash: 7.2% moisture: 4.4% fat: 1.4%} was used. yoghurt starter (*S. salivarius* subsb. thermophilus and *L. delbruckii* subsp. *bulgaricus*) was obtained from the Dairy Dept., Fac. of Agric., Mans. Univ.,. All portions were inculcated with 3.0% yoghurt starter. Fat and total solids (T. S) were estimated by the method described by British Standard Institution's (B. S. I) Method (1955). pH

measured by a digital pH-meter Janway 3010 - England, Total volatile fatty acids (T. V. F. A) were estimated according to Kosikowski (1982). Total nitrogen (T. N), soluble nitrogen (S. N), non-protein nitrogen (N. P. N) and titratable acidity (T. A) were estimated as described by Ling (1963). The curd tension is determined by using the method of Chandrasekhare et. Al (1957). Yoghurt stored at 4 -5 °C and examined for total bacterial count (T. C), moulds and yeasts (M & Y), coliform bacteria and staphylococci as mentioned in the Standard Methods for Examination of Dairy Products (1985).Lipolytic and Proteolytic bacterial count were carried out as described by Chalmers (1962).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table (1) The Chemical composition of buffalo milk fortified with different levels of skim milk powder or retentate powder.

Test Treatment	T.S%	Acidity%	рH	F%	T.V.F.F.A Mg/100g	T.N%	S.N%	N.P.N%
Control	15	0.13	6.6	6	1.20	0.56	0.077	0.0196
11	15.9	0.16	6.5	5.6	1.22	0.63	0.084	0.0210
T2	17.2	0.19	6.3	5.2	1.64	0.7	0.091	0.0224
T3	18.1	0.20	6.2	4.6	1.66	0.77	0.098	0.0238
T4	16.3	0.14	6.5	5.4	1.21	0.7	0.084	0.0231
15	17.8	0.17	6.4	4.8	1.23	0.84	0.084	0.0245
T6	18.9	0.18	6.3	4.3	1.25	0.98	0.105	0.028

Control: Buffalo milk

T1: Buffalo milk+1% Skim milk powder.

T2: Buffalo milk+2% Skim milk powder T3: Buffalo milk+3% Skim milk powder

T4: Buffalo milk+1% Retentate powder.

T5: Buffalo milk+2% Retentate powder. T6: Buffalo milk+3% Retentate powder

Table (2) The Microbiological properties of buffalo milk fortified with difficulties and bounds affective will a sound as and understand a sound as

				im milk pow			
T	est	T.C 10 -	Lipolytic	Protolytic	M&Y	E.coll	Staph.
Treatment		×	10°×	10 ³ ×	10 ³ ×	10°×	10°×
Control		55	8	11	3	-	
T1		46	6	10	2		
T2		54	3	6	1	-	-
T3		63	9	5	-	-	-
14		45	7	12	1	-	-
T5		34	4	16	-		-
16		35	3	13	-	-	-

Data in Table (3)showed that the acidity of yoghurt increased gradually by increasing their SNF contents. During storage, the acidity in all treatments increased gradually at reaching the maximum after 15 days of storage . Yoghurt samples prepared from UF retentate has the highest 7acidity. In all treatments and along the storage period samples of voghurt made with the addition of retentate showed higher acidity than voghurt from buffalos milk. This might be due to the competitive properties of organisms using lactose in fermentation of milk . these results disagreemed with those mentioned by ELGazzar and Marth (1991).

Table (4) showed the viscosity of yoghurt manufactured with different levels of SNF and stored at 5° C for 15 days.

Table (3)Effect of S.N.F. level on PH and acidity of fortified with different levels of skim milk powder and retentate powder yoghurt during storage.

	<u> </u>						·	St	orag	e pe	riod (d	ays)				_			
		yogh	iurt m	anufactı	ired	from bu	ffalc	milk				yog	hurt n	nanufact	urec	from re	ten	ate	
Treatments		5.N.F %	6	fres	h	7 day	/5	14 da	ys		<u>s.</u> N	T.F%		fres	h	7 day	/8	14 d	ays
	fresh	7 days	14 days	Acidity	PH	Acidity	PH	Acidity	PH		fresh	7 days	14 days	Acidity	PH	Acidity	PH	Acidity	PH
CN	10	10	11.3	0.78	4.7	1.2	4.4	1.27	4.2	CR	10	11	11.5	0.86	4.5	1.0	4.3	1.06	4.21
<u> </u>	11.5	12.4	12.9	0.85	4.5	1.6	4.2	1.65	4.0	T1"	11.5	12	12.3	1.30	4.3	1.6	4.1	1.19	3.9
Τ2	13.4	14.4	14.5	0.87	4.4	1.9	4.1	2.02	3.9	T2"	13.4	13.9	14.8	1.63	4.1	2.1	3.9	1.43	3.75
T3	14.9	15.1	15.4	0.91	4.2	2.3	3.8	2.35	3.4	T3"	14.7	15.9	17.1	1.85	3.8	2.5	3.5	1.53	3.3
74	11.9	13.5	13.4	0.83	4.6	1.3	4.3	1.57	4.1	T4"	11.8	12.4	13.1	0.94	4.2	1.6	4.0	1.15	3.91
T5	14,0	14.2	14.2	0.86	4.5	1.6	4.2	1.64	4.0	T5"	13	14	14.9	1.38	4	1.8	3.8	1.24	3.5
Γ6	15.2	15.3	15.6	0.88	4.4	2.03	4.0	1.93	3.9	76"	14.9	15.6	16.4	1.54	4.1	1.9	3.9	1.27	3.7

(CN)control: yoghurt made from buffalo milk

T1: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +1%skim milk T 4: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +1%retentate powder

T2: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +2%skim milk T5: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +2%retentate powder

T3: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +3%skim milk T6: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +3%retentate powder

(CR)control: yoghurt made from retentate

T1": yoghurt made from retentate+1%skim milk T 4": yoghurt made from retentate+1%retentate powder

T2": yoghurt made from retentate+2%skim milk T5": yoghurt made from retentate+2%retentate powder

T3": yoghurt made from retentate+3%skim milk T6": yoghurt made from retentate+3%retentate powder

Table (4) Effect of S.N.F. level on cured tension of fortified with different levels of skim milk powder and retentate powder yoghurt during storage.

						Storage	period (d	ays)					
[yo	ghurt man	ufactur	ed from	buffalo m	lk		yoghur	manufa	cture	from Re	tentate	
Treatments		S.N.F%			d tension	(gm)		S.N.F	%		Curd tension(gm		
 	fresh	7 days	14 days	fresh	7 days	14 days		fresh	7 days	14 days	fresh	7 days	14 days
CN	10	10	11.3	4.9	5.1	5.3	CR	10	11	11.5	4.6	4.9	5.2
T1	11.5	12.4	12.9	5.1	5.3	5.6	T1"	11.5	12	12.3	4.2	4.5	4.6
T2	13.4	14.4	14.5	5.3	5.4	5.8	T2"	13.4	13.9	14.8	4.8	5.1	5.3
Т3	14.9	15.1	15.4	5.3	5.5	5.9	T3"	14.7	15.9	17.1	5.2	5.5	5.7
T4	11.9	13.5	13.4	5.6	5.9	6.3	T4"	11.8	12.4	13.1	4.6	5.1	5.5
15	۱۳,۷	14.2	14.2	5.9	6.1	6.4	T5"	13	14	14.9	5.3	5.6	5.7
T6	15.2	15.3	15.6	6.5	6.8	7.5	T6"	14.9	15.6	16.4	5.6	6.2	6.4

(CN)control: yoghurt made from buffalo milk

T1: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +1%skim milk T 4: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +1%retentate powder

T2: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +2%skim milk T5: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +2%retentate powder

T3: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +3%skim milk T6: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +3%retentate powder (CR)control: yoghurt made from retentate

T1": yoghurt made from retentate+1%skim milk T 4": yoghurt made from retentate+1%retentate powder

T2": yoghurt made from retentate+2%skim milk T5": yoghurt made from retentate+2%retentate powder

T3": yoghurt made from retentate+3%skim mllk T6": yoghurt made from retentate+3%retentate powder

The results showed that in all treatments cured tension increased as SNF increased. These results are in agreement with Abrahamsen and Holmen (1980), who found that yoghurt made from ultrafiltrated milk gave the best viscosity. The high cured tension of products manufacture from UF retentate might be due to their high protein content. Proteins are capable to bind and imbibe more water, and consequently increase the cured tension.

Table (5) Effect of S.N.F. level on the organoleptic properties of fortified with different levels of skim milk powder and retentate powder yoghurt during storage.

					Stor	age per	iod (d	lays)					
Treat-	yog	nurt ma	ınufactu	red from	buffalo	milk	yogl	ourt m	anufac	tured	from U	F Rete	entate
ments		S.N.F?	6	Total	points	(100)	Ī	S.N	I,F%		Total	points	(100)
memo	fresh	7 days	14 days	fresh	7 days	14 days	fre	sh	7 days	14 days	fresh	7 days	14 days
CN	10	10	_11.3	70	84	74	CR	10	11	11.5	65	84	86
T1	11.5	12.4	12.9	69	81	82	71"	11.5	12	12.3	70	78	79
72	13.4	14.4	14.5	79	85	85	T2"	13.4	13.9	14.8	73	81	83
T3	14.9	15.1	15.4	77	89	88	T3"	14.7	15.9	17.1	79	85	85
T4	11.9	13.5	13.4	81	91	96	T4"	11.8	12.4	13.1	75	81	88
T5	13.7	14.2	14.2	77	81	90	T5"	13	14	14.9	78	83	83
T6	15.2	15.3	15.6	79	89	94	T6"	14.9	15.6	16.4	81	89	92

(CN)control: yoghurt made from buffalo milk

(CR)control: yoghurt made from retentate

Results given in table (5) show that the organoleptic- score points of yoghurt increased gradually in all treatments during the storage periods. The highest score was gained in T4 (in buffalos yoghurt)and T6(in yoghurt manufactured from UF retentate), which might be due to their high level of proteins. The obtained results are in agreement with Abrahmsen and Holmen (1980), who found that yoghurt made from ultrafiltrated milk was of acceptable and had good flavor. Also, fermented milk produced from Ultrafiltrated milk of lower lactose and calories than that produced by the traditional method. Results in Table (6)indicated that T.V.F.A in yoghurt manufactured from buffalo milk fortified by different levels of skim milk and retentate increased when fat content increased during the cold storage. But, T.V.F A in yoghurt manufactured from UF retentate fortified by different levels of skim milk and retentate decreased when fat content increased , this might be due to the higher heat treatment during drying process. It is obvious from table (7) that T.N and S.N content increased during storage, however, N.P.N content decreased in yoghurt made from buffalo milk fortified with different levels of skim milk and retentate.

T1: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +1%skim milk

T2: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +2%skim milk

T3: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +3%skim milk

T 4: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +1%retentate powder

T5: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +2%retentate powder

T6: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +3%retentate powder

	T	<u> </u>				Storage	period	(days)					
		yoghur	manufactu	red from t	ouffalo milk			yo	ghurt manuf	actured fr	om Reten	tate	
Treatments		F%		T.V	.F.F.A mg/1	00g			F%		T.V.I	.F.A mg/	100g
	fresh	7 days	14 days	fresh	7 days	14 days	fi	resh	7 days	14 days	fresh	7 days	14 days
CN	5.5	5.6	5.8	1.51	1.93	2.02	CR	5.5	5.7	5.9	0.54	0.53	0.51
T1.	4.8	4.8	5.1	1.73	1.95	2.08	T1"	4.6	5.1	5.6	0.55	0.55	0.54
T2	4.1	4.2	4.5	1.91	2.21	2.24	T2"	4	4.4	4.7	0.59	0.58	0.56
T3	3.7	4.0	4.2	2.01	2.33	3.10	T3"	3.8	3.8	4.1	0.67	0.65	0.63
T4	4.3	4.6	4.9	1.55	1.64	1.73	T4"	4.8	4.9	5.3	0.55	0.54	0.53
T5	4.4	4.7	5.3	1.63	1.74	2.14	T5"	4.5	4.5	4.9	0.58	0.56	0.55
T6	4.1	4.5	4.9	1.72	1.83	2.35	T6"	4.2	4.3	4.8	0.59	0.58	0.58

(CN)control: yoghurt made from buffalo mllk

9992

T1: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +1%skim milk T 4: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +1%retentate powder

T2: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +2%skim milk T5: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +2%retentate powder

T3: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +3%skim milk T6: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +3%retentate powder

(CR)control: yoghurt made from retentate

T1": yoghurt made from retentate+1%skim milk T 4": yoghurt made from retentate+1%retentate powder

T2": yoghurt made from retentate+2%skim milk T5": yoghurt made from retentate+2%retentate powder

T3": yoghurt made from retentate+3%skim milk T6": yoghurt made from retentate+3%retentate powder

Table (7)Effect of storage period on the Total nitrogen, Soluble nitrogen and Non- protein nitrogen contents in fortified with different levels of skim milk powder and retentate powder yoghurt during storage.

								Sto	rage p	eriod	(days)	1							
!		yo	ghurt n	anufac	tured fo	rom bu	ffalo m	ilk		[yogh	urt ma	nufactu	red fro	m UF F	Retenta	te	
Treatments	Tota	nltrog	en%	Solub	luble nitrogen% Non- protein nitrogen%					Т	otal ni	troge	n%	Solub	le nitro	gen%	Non- protein nitrogen%		
	fresh	7 days	14 days	Fresh	7 days	14 days	fresh	7 days	14 days		fresh	7 days	14 days	fresh	7 days	14 days	fresh	7 days	14 days
CN	0.7	0.81	0.83	0.079	0.111	0.118	0.0203	0.018	0.016	CR	0.989	1	1.01	0.079	0.083	0.104	0.013	0.023	0.025
31	0.672	0.69	0.71	0.085	0.113	0.121	0.0213	0.016	0.015	T1"	1.02	1.05	1.05	0.088	0.095	0.108	0.0133	0.023	0.025
T2	0.77	0.81	0.84	0.093	0.121	0.129	0.0229	0.017	0.015	T2"	1.07	1.09	1.11	0.100	0.113	0.114	0.0139	0.025	0.026
T3	0.84	1,01	1.04	0.099	0.123	0.131	0.0246	0.019	0.017	T3"	1.17	1.19	1.20	0.103	0.117	0.118	0.0143	0.026	0.028
T4	0.77	0.93	0.97	0.086	0.116	0.125	0.0235	0.018	0.017	T4"	1.21	1.23	1.24	0.090	0.097	0.111	0.015	0.026	0.029
15	0.87	1.03	1.05	0.085	0.120	0.129	0.0248	0.019	0.018	T5"	1.25	1.32	1.36	0.092					
T6	1.04	1.15	1.18	0.107	0.141	0.148	0.0336	0.026	0.023	T6"	1.40	1.45	1.45	0.111	0.128	0.135	0.020	0.035	0.039

(CN)control: yoghurt made from buffaio milk

T1: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +1%skim milk T 4: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +1%retentate powder T2: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +2%skim milk T5: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +2%retentate powder T3: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +3%skim milk T6: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +3%retentate powder

(CR)control; yoghurt made from retentate

T1": yoghurt made from retentate+1%skim mlik T 4": yoghurt made from retentate+1%retentate powder T2": yoghurt made from retentate+2%skim mlik T5": yoghurt made from retentate+2%retentate powder T3": yoghurt made from retentate+3%skim mlik T6": yoghurt made from retentate+3%retentate powder

On the other hand ,It was observed on increase in the N.P.N content of yoghurt made from retentate during storage .This could be ascribed to a limited hydrolysis of proteins during storage(EL- Shibiny *et al.*, 1979).

Table (8) Microbiological properties of Yoghurt fortified with different of skim milk powder and retentate powder.

Test	T.C 10 ⁴ ×	Lipolytic 10 ³ ×	Protolytic 10 ³ ×	M&Y 10 ³ ×	E.coll 10 ³ ×	Staph. 10 ³ ×
CN	65	18	13	1		Ì
T1	71	9	18	-	_	
T2	82	12	15		-	
13	97	8	13	-	-	
T4	55	14	36	+		
T5	40	11	44	-	-	
T6	51	12	25	-		-

(CN)control: yoghurt made from buffalo milk

T1: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +1%skim milk

T2: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +2%skim milk

T3: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +3%skim milk

T 4: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +1%retentate powder

T5: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +2%retentate powder

T6: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +3%retentate powder

Jable (9) Microbiological properties of Yoghurt fortified with skim milk powder and retentate powder after 7 days of storage in 4-5° C.

Treatment	T.C 10 ⁴ ×	Lipolytic 10 ³ ×	Protolytic 10 ³ ×	M&Y 10 ³ ×	E.coli 10 ³ ×	Staph. 10 ³ ×
CN	80	12	19		-	ľ
T1	99	3	22	_	-	
T2	109	6	25	-	-	
T3	111	4	26	-		-
T4	109	2	46	-	-	-
T5	117	1	55	-		
T6	98	2	66		-	-

From Tables (8,9 and 10) it is obvious that the total count and protolytic bacteria increased during storage, but Libolytic bacteria decreased during storage. However, coliform, Molds, yeasts and staphylococcus spp were not detected, whether in fresh or stored yoghurt made from buffalo milk fortified by different levels of skim milk and retentate.

Data presented in Tables (11,12and 13) show that total count and protolytic bacteria increased during storage, but Libolytic bacteria decreased during storage. However, coliform, molds, yeasts and staphylococcus spp were not detected, whether in fresh or stored yoghurt made from retentate fortified by different levels of skim milk and retentate.

Data presented in Tables (14,15 and 16)show that yoghurt made from buffalo milk+1% Retentate had the highest organoleptic- scoring points whether ,when it was fresh or after cold storage for 7 or 14 days. It had 81when it was fresh and 91 and 96 after 7and 14 days of storage ,respectively.

Table(10) Microbiological properties of Yoghurt fortified with skim milk powder and retentate powder after 14 days of storage in 4-5° C.

Test Treatment	T.C 10 ⁶ ×	Lipolytic 10 ³ ×	Protolytic 10 ³ ×	M&Y 10 ³ ×	E.coli 10³×	Staph. 10 ³ ×
CN	95	2	26	•	T =	
T1	101	1	24			
T2	120	3	28	-	-	-
T3	131	1	28	-	_	_
T4	118	1	52	-	-	_
T5	125	-	62	-	_	-
T6	112	<u> </u>	75			<u> </u>

Table (11) Microbiological properties of Yoghurt fortified with skim milk powder and retentate powder.

Test Treatment	T.C 10 ⁶ ×	Lipolytic 10 ³ ×	Protolytic 10 ³ ×	M&Y 10 ³ ×	E.coli 10 ³ ×	Staph.
CR	79	2	9	-	_	[
T1"	87	٣	6	-	-	
T2"	96	٦	4	-		-
T3"	97	٤	3	-	-	===
T4"	51	1	2	-		
T5"	44	-	3	-		
T6"	68	_	6			-

(CR)control: yoghurt made from retentate

T1": yoghurt made from retentate+1%skim milk

T2": yoghurt made from retentate+2%skim milk

T3": yoghurt made from retentate+3%skim milk
T 4": yoghurt made from retentate+1%retentate powder

T5": yoghurt made from retentate+2%retentate powder

T6": yoghurt made from retentate+3%retentate powder

Table (12) Microbiological properties of Yoghurt fortified with skim milk powder and retentate powder after 7 days of storage in 4-5° C.

Test	T.C 10 ⁶ ×	Lipolytic 10 ³ ×	Protolytic 10 ³ ×	M&Y 10 ³ ×	E.coli 10 ³ ×	Staph. 10 ³ ×
CR T1"	80	2	13		= =	-
T1"	99	1	11		-	-
T2"	109	3	19			=
T3"	111	1	20	-		_
T4"	109		38	-		-
T5"	117	-	45	-		-
T6"	98	-	56	-	_	•

Table (13) Microbiological properties of Yoghurt fortified with skim milk powder and retentate powder after 14 days of storage in 4-5° C.

Test Treatment	T.C 10 ⁶ ×	Lipolytic 10 ³ ×	Protolytic 10 ³ ×	M&Y 10 ³ ×	E.coli 10 ³ ×	Staph. 10 ³ ×
CR	95	2	91	-	_	
T1"	101	1	18	-		
T2"	120	3	25	-	-	
T3"	131	1	26	-	- - "	=
T4"	118	-	46			_
T5"	125		55	-		_
T6"	112	-	66			

Table (14) Organoleptic properties of yoghurt from buffalo milk fortified with skim milk powder and retentate powder.

Treatments	Appearance 10	Body &Texture 40	Flavor 50	Total 100
CN	3	32	35	70
T1 .	7	30	32	69
T2	8	30	41	79
T3	9	28	40	77
T4	7	31	43	81
T5	7	30	40	77
16	7	30	42	79

(CN)control: yoghurt made from buffalo milk

T1: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +1%skim milk

T2: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +2%skim milk

T3: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +3%skim milk

T 4: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +1%retentate powder

T5: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +2%retentate powder

T6: yoghurt made from buffalo milk +3%retentate powder

Table (15) Organoleptic properties of yoghurt from buffalo milk fortified with skim milk powder and retentate powder after 7 days of storage in 4-5° C

Storage in +-o o.					
Treatments	Appearance 10	Body &Texture 40	Flavor 50	Total points 100	
CN	7	28	49	84	
11	7	32	42	81	
T2	7	39	39	85	
13	8	39	42	89	
14 /	9	37	44	91	
15	6	36	39	81	
T6	10	39	40	89	

From Tables (17,18 and 19)show that yoghurt made from retentate +3% retentate powder had the highest organoleptic- scoring points whether ,when it was fresh or after cold storage for 7 or 14 days. It had 81when it was fresh and 89 and 92 after 7and 14 days of storage, respectively.

Table (16) Organoleptic properties of yoghurt from buffalo milk fortified with skim milk powder and retentate powder after 14 days of

storage in 4-5° C. Appearance **Body &Texture** Flavor Total points **Treatments** 10 <u>50</u> 37 100 30 74 T1 T2 37 40 82 37 40 85 73 35 45 14 38 49

Table (17) Organoleptic properties of yoghurt made from retentate fortified with skim milk powder and retentate powder.

36

38

45

47

Treatments	Appearance	Body &Texture	Flavor 50	Total points 100
CR	5	30	30	65
1"	5	30	35	70
2"	5	28	40	73
3"	5	34	40	79
4"	4	31	40	75
5"	4	30	44	78
T6"	6	32	43	81

(CR)control: yoghurt made from retentate

15

T1": yoghurt made from retentate+1%skim milk

T2": yoghurt made from retentate+2%skim milk

T3": yoghurt made from retentate+3%skim milk

T 4": yoghurt made from retentate+1%retentate powder

T5": yoghurt made from retentate+2%retentate powder

T6": yoghurt made from retentate+3%retentate powder

Table (18) Organoleptic properties of yoghurt fortified with skim milk powder and retentate powder after 7 days of storage in 4-5° C.

Treatments	Appearance 10	Body &Texture 40	Flavor 50	Total points 100
CR	8	31	45	84
71*	8	27	43	78
12"	6	36	39	81
T3*	7	29	49	85
T4*	6	31	44	81
T5"	9	29	45	83
T6*	8	38	43	89

Table (19) Organoleptic properties of yoghurt fortified with skim milk powder and retentate powder after 14 days of storage in 4-5° C.

Treatments	Appearance 10	Body & Texture 40	Flavor 50	Total points 100
CR	7	34	45	86
1.	7	32	40	79
2"	6	36	41	83
3"	7	35	43	85
4*	8	35	45	88
5"	7	33	43	83
r6"	9	37	46	92

REFERENCES

- Abrahamsen, R.K and Holmen T.B (1980) Yoghurt from hyper filtrated, Ultrafiltrated, evaporated milk and from milk with added milk powder. Milchwissenchaft;35(7)399-402.
- British Standard Institution, B. S. I.(1955): Gerber method for the determination of fat in milk and milk products. B. S. I. Publication No. 696, Parts 1 and 2.
- Chalmers, C. H. (1962): Bacteria in relation to the milk supply. 4th Ed. Edward Annold, London.
- Chandrasekhare, M.R., Bhagawan; M. Swaminathan and .Subrahman (1957).

 The use of mammalian milk and processed milk foods in the feeding of infants .Idian J.Child.Health, D70L
- El- Gazzar, F,E and Marth, E. H.(1991) Ultrafiltration and reverse Osmosis in dairy technology: A review . J.Food Protection 54(10)801-809
- El-shibing, S., :El- Dien, H. F. and Hofi, A.,A.(1979) Effect of storage on the chemical composition of Zabadi. Egypt. J. Dairy Sci. 7(1):1-8.
- Ling (1963): A text book of Dairy chemistry practical. 4th Ed. Vol. 2. Champman Hull Ltd. London.
- Karagul, Y., C. Wilson and H. Whil, (2004). Formulation and processing of yoghurt. J. Dairy Sci., 87:543-550.
- Kosikowski, F. V. (1982): Cheese and fermented milk food. 2nd Ed. 3rd printing with previous, E. V. Kosikowski and Accociates, P. O. Box 139, Brooktandatz, New York.
- Marona , D. and G.Pedrigon, (2004) Yoghurt feeding inhibits promotion and progression of cancer . med. Sci. Monit., 10:96-104.
- Perdigeon, G.J. Valdez and M.Rachid, (1998). Antitumour activitiy of yoghurt. Study of possible immune presponse. J. Dairy Re., 65:129-138.
- Standard methods for the examination of dairy products (1985): Published by the American public health association APHA.IN.C.15Th E d. New York

تأثير تدعيم الألبان المختمرة المصنعة من اللبن الجاموسي و مركز اللبن باللبن الفرز المجفف و مركز اللبن المجفف على جودة الألبان المختمرة.

محمد شبلبي جمعية ، اليسيد شوقي اليسكري، محمد يونس مهني و محمد الدسوقي عبد العزيز

قسم الأليان - كلية الزراعة - جامعة المنصورة - المنصورة - مصر

عند صناعة اللبن المختمر من اللبن الجاموسى و مركز اللبن بعد تعديله لمسنفس تركيسب اللبن الجاموسي مع تدعيمه بمستويات مختلفة من اللبن الفرز المجفف و مركز اللسبن المجفف أثبتت النتائج ارتفاع جودة الألبان المختمرة من الناحية الكيميائية و البكتريولوجية و الحسية عنسد صناعتها من اللبن الجاموسي المدعم بـ ١% مركز لبن مجفف و كذلك عند صناعتها من مركز اللبن المدعم بمركز لبن مجفف بنسبة ٣٣ .

قام بتحكيم البحث أ. د/ طه عبد الحليم نصيب أ. د/ منير محمود العبد

كلية الزراعة – جامعة المنصورة خارجي