

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Sensory Preference, Nutrients Content of Sorghum Substitute Bread with Strawberry Dadih Vla

<u>Helmizar Helmizar</u>*, Jeallyza Muthia Azra , <u>Faza Yasira Rusdi</u> , Restu Sakinah , <u>Yuliana Yuliana</u> , <u>Healthy Hidayati</u>

Posted Date: 3 December 2024

doi: 10.20944/preprints202412.0294.v1

Keywords: sorghum; bread; dadih; vla; sensory; nutrient



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license, which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Article

Sensory Preference, Nutrients Content of Sorghum Substitute Bread with Strawberry Dadih Vla

Helmizar ^{1,*}, Jeallyza Muthia Azra ¹, Faza Yasira Rusdi ¹, Restu Sakinah ¹, Yuliana ² and Healthy Hidayati ³

- ¹ Department of Nutrition, Faculty of Public Health, Andalas University, West Sumatera, Indonesia
- ² Department of pariwisata dan perhotelan, Padang State University, West Sumatera, Indonesia
- Faculty of public health, Hasanudin University, South Sulawesi, Indonesia
- * Correspondence: helmizar@ph.unand.ac.id; Tel.: +62 8126776930

Abstract: Sorghum (Sorghum bicolor (L) Moench), is a cereal crop ranked the world's fifth most important cereal grain after wheat, maize, rice and barley. sorghum grain protein varies from 4.4 to 21.1% with a mean value of 11.4%. Sorghum grain is known for its hardness compared to other food grains. The hardness of the grain is due to higher content of protein prolamin (3.6 to 5.1%). Dadih is a fermented buffalo milk with various lactic acid bacteria (LAB). Dadih could be developed into other products such as vla. This study aimed to analyze physicochemical, sensory preference, and nutrients content of dadih vla. Dadih collected from Agam District, West Sumatera. The development of sorghum and curd substitute bread products was carried out by dividing them into 3 product formulations, namely 0%, 5% and 10% sorghum substitute bread and vla with the addition of 0%, 15% and 20% strawberry. Based on the physicochemical and sensory tests that have been carried out, it was found that the best formulation was a bread formula with 5% sorghum substitution and 15% strawberry VLA. The selected formula contains 39.24% water, 48.51% carbohydrates, 0.76% ash, 5.85% carbohydrates, 5.74% fat, 1.81% crude fiber, and 43.89% vitamin C. The pH value is 4.89 with brightness 56.87, redness 5.60 and yellowness 16.97. For future research, it is recommended that product testing be carried out in accredited laboratories and testing other nutritional variables so that the resulting product is more optimal and complete

Keywords: sorghum; bread; dadih; vla; sensory; nutrient

1. Introduction

Sorghum (Sorghum bicolor (L) Moench), is a cereal crop ranked the world's fifth most important cereal grain after wheat, maize, rice and barley (Akram et al., 2007; FAO, 1999; Rashwan et al., 2021). The composition of sorghum grain and its parts is generally similar to that of corn, except for lower oil content. The grain contains 8 to 12% protein, 65 to 76% starch with approximately 2% fibre. The germ, a rich source of oil (28% of the germ) also has high levels of protein (19%) and ash (10%) (Gyan-Chand K et al., 2017).

(Mohamed et al., 2009) found that sorghum grain protein varies from 4.4 to 21.1% with a mean value of 11.4%. Sorghum grain is known for its hardness compared to other food grains. The hardness of the grain is due to higher content of protein prolamin (3.6 to 5.1%) (T Rathore, 2019). The lysine content ranges from 1.06 to 3.64% (T Rathore, 2019). The protein fractionation studies in sorghum indicated that the distribution of albumin-globulin, prolamin and glutelin is about 15, 26 and 44% respectively of total nitrogen (T Rathore, 2019). Starch is the major constituent of grain accounting for 56-75% of the total dry matter in the grain (Gyan-Chand K et al., 2017). The total content of soluble sugars of sorghum grain ranged from 0.7 to 4.2% and the reducing sugars from 0.05 to 0.53% (Sreeramulu et al., 2009). Fat content in sorghum grain varies from 2.1 to 7.6%, crude fibre from 1.0 to 3.4% and ash from 1.3 to 3.3% (T Rathore, 2019). Another study on the physico-chemical characterization of sorghum accessions showed a wide variation in protein (7.99 to 17.8%), lipids (2.52

to 4.76%), starch (51.88 to 85%), and amylose (12.30 to 28.38%) content (Hegde & Chandra, 2005). Linoleic acid (18:2) and oleic acid (18:1) were the major fatty acid constituents of sorghum lipids (Hegde & Chandra, 2005). The grain is commonly eaten with the testa which retains the majority of the nutrients. The wide range in composition of mineral and trace elements indicated that sorghum is a good source of minerals. The mineral composition however is influenced by the environmental conditions (Kumari et al., 2007). Therefore, sorghum can be used as a substitute for wheat flour in bread dough which is expected to increase the nutritional content of the bread.

Fermented food of dadih produced from buffalo milk fermented by a various of lactic acid bacteria (LAB). LAB isolates of dadih consist of three genera, namely Lactococcus, Lactobacillus, and Pediococcus [10]. LAB can be useful as a probiotic if it can survive to the human cecum and has the ability to adhesion in the intestine (Collado et al., 2007). The total colony of LAB from dadih up to 108 cfu/ml (Aritonang et al., 2022). LAB has been shown to have anti-diabetic, anti-obesity, anti-hypertensive, and immunostimulatory effects (Buziau et al., 2019), (Gizachew et al., 2023). The large number of species isolated from dadih were promoted more acidic product. LAB also produces bioactive compounds that give the product its nutrition and flavor.

Dadih can be processed into a range of products, including raw material, or fortified to improve product quality. However, traditionally, dadih had been consumed in fresh product with addition of onion and chili. Consumer perception on traditional products were more preferred, including dadih (Fibri & Frøst, 2019). The sensory of dadih should be slightly sour, white to light cream color, and texture like a tofu. Dadih processing effects of consumer preference and can change carbohydrate into lactic acid or other metabolites (Yang & Yoon, 2022). Just like yoghurt, dadih contains complete nutritional components. Yoghurt was higher vitamin A, riboflavin, calcium, magnesium, iron, zinc, iodine and selenium recommended intake for children (Hobbs et al., 2019). Besides, yoghurt contain protein, lipids, and LAB (Fernandez et al., 2017). Therefore, dadih's sensory preference and nutrients for other products should be analyzed.

Dadih vla is a dairy products like sauce. Cheese sauce has been made (Kůrová et al., 2022) that polysaccharide addition and homogenize can result different of sauce characteristics. However, characteristics of dadih vla is not analyzed in previous studies. Thus, this study aimed to identify the LAB produced by dadih and analyze sensory preference, and nutrients content of dadih vla.

2. Materials and Method

2.1. Materials

2.1.1. Sorghum Substitute Bread

The ingredient of bread was sorghum flour with high nutrient especially protein and other micronutrients with ratio 0% (FO), 5% (F1) and 10% (F2) concentrations. Others ingredient composite flour (red beans, soybeans, corn), sugar, margarine, yeast and UHT milk.

2.1.2. Stawberry dadih vla

The ingredient was dadih collected from Agam District, West Sumatera. Buffalo milk pasteurized in bamboo at room temperature for 48 hours. The ingredients used to make strawberry dadih vla are milk, corn powder, sugar, eggs, butter, dadih and strawberry to increase antioxidant. The factor was ratio of strawberry with three variations: 0% (F0), 15% (F1) and 20% (F2) concentrations. All samples were then tested with hedonic and hedonic quality test to get the best treatment in the sensory parameters. Afterwards, the best sample was analyzed proximate tests. Identification of LAB dadih analysis used 16S rRNA gene.

2.2. Method

2.2.1. Physicochemical Properties

The physicochemical analysis carried out includes testing water, ash, fat, protein, carbohydrate, vitamin C, pH, and color content (using the Hunter Lab and CIE Lab systems). This test aims to determine the nutritional composition and quality of the sample. All analyses were carried out in triplicate at the Department of Food Technology and Agricultural Products, Faculty of Agricultural Technology, Andalas University.

2.2.1.1. Proximate Analysis

Proximate analysis is carried out to measure the main components in the sample, namely water, ash, protein, fat, and carbohydrate. This testing was carried out using procedures by SNI standards. Water content is measured using the gravimetric method based on the SNI 01-2891-1992 standard, namely by drying the sample at a certain temperature until the weight is constant. Ash content was measured by burning the sample at a temperature of 550°C until ash of a constant weight was formed. This method also follows SNI 01-2891-1992. Fat content is measured by the gravimetric method using an appropriate solvent. This procedure also refers to the standards set out in SNI 01-2891-1992. Protein levels were analyzed using the titrimetric method, referring to the AOAC 2001 and SNI procedures. This process involves measuring total nitrogen and converting the results into protein levels. Carbohydrate content is calculated using the by-difference method, namely by subtracting the total value of water, ash, protein, and fat content from 100%.

2.2.1.2. Vitamin C

Vitamin C was measured using the iodometric titrimetric method. The sample is crushed and prepared in solution form, then titrated with a standard iodometric solution. Vitamin C concentration is calculated based on the volume of titrant used. This test is carried out using procedures that have been validated in the laboratory according to international standards.

2.2.1.3. pH

Sample pH measurements were carried out using a pH meter (digital pH meter). Before measurement, the sample was diluted with distilled water in a ratio of 1:10 (sample:water), then the pH was measured at room temperature.

2.2.1.4. Color

Sample color analysis was carried out using the Hunter Lab Colorimeter system which measures color parameters using the CIE Lab* model. Color is measured by 3 main parameters: L (Lightness)* which describes the brightness of the sample, a* for red-green color intensity, and b* for yellow-blue color intensity. Apart from that, b/a (ratio between yellow and red) and Hue (dominant color) are also calculated using these two systems. Measurements were carried out at three different points per sample to obtain representative results. The data obtained were used to analyze the color differences caused by the substitution of sorghum flour and the addition of strawberries, as well as to evaluate the impact on the overall color of the product.

Sensory tests were through the hedonic scoring test with criteria dislike extremely (score 1), dislike (score 2), usual (score 3), like (score 4), and like extremely (score 5). The attribute sensory were color, aroma, taste, and texture. For quality of color presented yellow pale until white, less sour to sour for aroma dan taste, watery to thicky for texture. This study involved 30 semi-trained panellists.

2.2.2. Sensory Properties

The sensory test was carried out using a hedonic scoring test to assess the level of acceptance of the sample. The panelists involved in this test were 30 semi-trained people consisting of students from the Nutrition Science Master's Study Program and the Agricultural Products Technology Study Program at Andalas University. Panelists were asked to provide an assessment of color, aroma, taste, texture, aftertaste, and overall of the sample using a 9-point scale, with rating as follows dislike

3

extremely(1), dislike very much(2), dislike moderately (3), dislike slightly (4), neither like nor dislike (5), like slightly (6), like moderately (7), like very much (8), and like extremely (9).

2.2.3. Data Analysis

Data obtained from all physicochemical and sensory analyses are presented in the form of average values along with standard deviation. Data were analyzed using two-way ANOVA with SPSS software to test differences between treatments (substitution of sorghum flour and addition of strawberries). If a significant difference is found (p-value < 0.05), a further test is carried out using the Duncan test to determine which treatment pairs are significantly different. All data were analyzed in triplicate to ensure the validity of the results.

3. Results

3.1. Physicochemical Properties

3.1.1. Moisture

The moisture content of sorghum-substituted bread samples with strawberry vla filling in this study ranged from 37.13-39.15% (Table 1). The results of the two-way ANOVA analysis provide information that there is a significant difference (P<0.05) in the water content of the bread samples which is caused independently by both the sorghum substitution treatment and the addition of strawberries (Table 1). Referring to Duncan's further test results, bread that was substituted for sorghum and added strawberry vla at all concentrations had a significantly high water content compared to bread without sorghum substitution or without the addition of vla.

Table 1. Moisture Content of Sorghum Substitute Bread with Strawberry Dadih Vla.

Sorghum substitute bread (%)	Vla strawberry (%)		
	0	15	20
0	37.13±0.29вь	38.24±0.67 ^{Ba}	37.84±0.60 ^{Ba}
5	$38.20\pm0.15^{\mathrm{Ab}}$	39.14±0.49 ^{Aa}	38.75±0.61 ^{Aa}
10	37.50±0.39Ab	38.93±0.87 ^{Aa}	39.15±0.38 ^{Aa}

Note: a-bDifferent letters in the same row indicate significantly different (P<0.05) based on the difference in strawberry vla. A-BDifferent letters in the same column indicate significant differences (P<0.05) based on differences in sorghum substitute bread—further test using Duncan.

3.1.2. Carbohydrate

The carbohydrate content of sorghum substituted bread samples with strawberry vla filling in this study ranged from 45.78-51.73% (Tabel 2). The results of the two-way ANOVA analysis showed that there were significant differences in the carbohydrate content of the bread samples (P<0.05) by both the sorghum substitution treatment and the addition of strawberry vla (Table 2). Based on Duncan's further tests, the carbohydrate content of bread substituted with 10% sorghum with the addition of 15% strawberry vla was significantly lower than other formulas. This shows that the substitution of sorghum and the addition of strawberry vla to bread can reduce the carbohydrate content of bread.

Table 2. Carbohydrate Content of Sorghum Substitute Bread with Strawberry Dadih Vla.

Sorghum substitute bread (%)	Vla strawberry (%)		
	0	15	20
0	51.73±0.13 ^{Aa}	48.55±1.24 ^{Ac}	49.73±1.51 ^{Ab}
5	51.16±0.26 ^{Aa}	48.51±0.38 ^{Ac}	49.74±0.49 ^{Ab}

10	48.32±0.55 ^{Ba}	45.78±1.08 ^{Bc}	47.85±0.18 ^{Bb}
10	46.32±0.335°	43.70±1.00bc	47.00±0.10 ⁵⁵

Note: ^{a-b}Different letters in the same row indicate significantly different (P<0.05) based on the difference in strawberry vla. ^{A-B}Different letters in the same column indicate significant differences (P<0.05) based on differences in sorghum substitute bread—further test using Duncan.

3.1.3. Ash, Protein, Fat, Crude Fiber, and Vitamin C

The ash percentage of all samples of sorghum substituted bread with strawberry filling ranged between 0.68-0.98% and did not have a significant difference (P>0.05) (Table 3).

The protein content of all samples ranged from 3.85-6.15%. The results of the two-way ANOVA analysis showed that there was a significant difference (P<0.05) in the protein levels of both samples caused by the interaction between the sorghum substitution treatment and the addition of strawberry vla (Table 3). Bread substituted for sorghum in various vla additions had significantly higher protein content than bread without sorghum substitution.

The fat content of all samples ranged from 1.15-8.33%. The results of the two-way ANOVA analysis showed that there was a significant difference (P<0.05) in the fat content of both samples which was caused by the interaction between the sorghum substitution treatment and the addition of strawberry vla (Table 3). In each sample of sorghum substitute bread, there was a tendency for the fat content of the bread to be higher with the addition of 15% strawberry vla compared to other strawberry vla formulas.

The crude fiber content of bread samples ranged from 1.15-2.19%. Bread without sorghum substitution with the addition of 20% strawberry VLA has significantly the highest crude fiber content compared to other bread formulas.

Vitamin C levels in bread samples ranged from 21.97-73.19%. Bread that was substituted for 10% sorghum and added 20% strawberry VLA had significantly higher levels of vitamin C compared to other bread formulas.

Table 3. Ash, Protein, Fat, Crude Fiber, and Vitamin C Content of Sorghum Substitute Bread with Strawberry Dadih Vla.

				Paramet	er	
	Treatment	Ash	Protein	Fat	Crude	Vitamin C
					Fiber	
0%	Shorgum,	0% 0.88±0.26	6a 3.85±0.06b	6.40±0.24°		
Straw	vberry				1.18±0.11 ^c	58.44±12.72 ^{abc}
0%	Shorgum,	15% 0.84±0.07	7a			
Straw	vberry		4.04±0.26b	8.33±0.71a	1.54±0.32bc	21.97±0.07 ^f
0%	Shorgum,	20% 0.71±0.07	7a			
Straw	vberry		4.04±0.28b	7.67±1.22a	2.19±0.12a	29.25±12.70ef
5%	Shorgum,	0% 0.68±0.19) a			
Straw	vberry		4.45±0.29b	5.51±0.75 ^{cd}	1.62 ± 0.28 bc	51.11±12.64bcd
5%	Shorgum,	15% 0.76±0.05	5a			
Straw	vberry		5.85±0.59a	5.74 ± 0.18^{c}	$1.81 {\pm} 0.38^{ab}$	$43.89 {\pm} 0.04^{cde}$
5%	Shorgum,	20% 0.98±0.35	5a			
Straw	vberry		6.02±0.38a	4.49±0.59d	1.31±0.14 ^c	51.20±12.81bcd
10%	Shorgum,	0% 0.88±0.03	3a			
Straw	berry		5.72±0.29a	7.57±0.28ab	1.27±0.17c	$36.60 \pm 12.69^{\mathrm{def}}$

10%	Shorgum,	15% 0.87±0.04 ^a
Straw	berry	6.15±0.64 ^a 8.26±0.57 ^a 1.15±0.15 ^c 73.19±12.71 ^a
10%	Shorgum,	20% 0.77±0.12 ^a
Straw	berry	5.68 ± 0.24^{a} 6.54 ± 0.02^{bc} 1.32 ± 0.35^{c} 65.74 ± 0.17^{ab}

Note: a,b.c.d.e.f = significantly different (P < 0.05)

3.1.4. Physical Properties

The pH value of the bread samples ranged between 4.83-5.38 and did not experience a significant difference (P>0.05) (Table 4). The levels of brightness (L), redness (a), and yellowness (b) of the samples ranged between 56.87-69.48, 1.19-6.12, and 13.27-19.85, respectively. The results of the two-way ANOVA analysis showed that there was a significant difference (P<0.05) due to the interaction between the sorghum substitution treatment and the addition of strawberry vla on the level of brightness (L) and yellowness (b) of the bread, but there was no significant difference (P>0.05) at the degree of redness (a) (Table 4).

Table 4. Physical Characteristics of Sorghum Substitute Bread with Strawberry Dadih Vla.

Strawberry 15.66±1.09cd 7.71±3.78a 85.55±2.45a 85.55±2							
pH L a b b/a Hue 0% Shorgum, 0% 4.99±0.64a 60.75±10.74abc 2.52±1.50a 80.67±6.11a Strawberry 15.66±1.09cd 7.71±3.78a 7.71±3.78a 0% Shorgum, 15% 5.24±0.10a 85.55±2.45a Strawberry 69.48±8.02a 1.37±0.69a 17.95±0.76abc 15.19±6.37a 84.73±2.23a Strawberry 49.00±4.55c 1.19±0.43a 13.27±1.11d 12.75±6.85a 12.75±6.85a 5% Shorgum, 0% 5.38±0.24a 64.15±6.48ab 2.13±0.28a 15.93±1.34bcd 7.53±0.40a 82.42±0.39a 82.42±0.39a Strawberry 64.15±6.48ab 2.13±0.28a 15.93±1.34bcd 7.53±0.40a 71.59±9.56a 71.59±9.56a 71.59±9.56a Strawberry 56.87±8.23bc 5.60±2.97a 16.97±2.45abc 4.08±3.15a 71.59±9.56a 76.69±11.48a 5% Shorgum, 20% 4.83±0.56a 63.41±7.64ab 4.92±0.49a 18.87±2.05ab 6.35±3.77a 6.35±3.77a 76.69±11.48a	Trackment				Parameter		
Strawberry	reatment	рН	L	a	b	b/a	Hue
0% Shorgum, 15% 5.24±0.10a 85.55±2.45a Strawberry 69.48±8.02a 1.37±0.69a 17.95±0.76abc 15.19±6.37a 0% Shorgum, 20% 5.02±0.39a 84.73±2.23a Strawberry 49.00±4.55c 1.19±0.43a 13.27±1.11a 12.75±6.85a 5% Shorgum, 0% 5.38±0.24a 82.42±0.39a Strawberry 64.15±6.48ab 2.13±0.28a 15.93±1.34bcd 7.53±0.40a 71.59±9.56a Strawberry 56.87±8.23bc 5.60±2.97a 16.97±2.45abc 4.08±3.15a 76.69±11.48a 5% Shorgum, 20% 4.83±0.56a 2.trawberry 63.41±7.64ab 4.92±0.49a 18.87±2.05ab 6.35±3.77a 76.69±11.48a	0% Shorgum, 0% 4.5	99±0.64ª	60.75±10.74abo	2.52±1.50a			80.67±6.11a
Strawberry 69.48±8.02a 1.37±0.69a 17.95±0.76abc 15.19±6.37a 84.73±2.23a 84.73±	Strawberry				15.66±1.09 ^{cd}	7.71±3.78a	
0% Shorgum, 20% 5.02±0.39a 84.73±2.23a Strawberry 49.00±4.55c 1.19±0.43a 13.27±1.11d 12.75±6.85a 82.42±0.39a 5% Shorgum, 0% 5.38±0.24a 2.13±0.28a 15.93±1.34bcd 7.53±0.40a 7.53±0.40a 5% Shorgum, 15% 4.89±0.45a 2.13±0.28a 15.93±1.34bcd 7.53±0.40a 71.59±9.56a Strawberry 56.87±8.23bc 5.60±2.97a 16.97±2.45abc 4.08±3.15a 76.69±11.48a 5% Shorgum, 20% 4.83±0.56a 4.92±0.49a 18.87±2.05ab 6.35±3.77a 76.69±11.48a	0% Shorgum, 15% 5	24±0.10a					85.55±2.45a
Strawberry 49.00±4.55° 1.19±0.43° 13.27±1.11° 12.75±6.85° 82.42±0.39° 5% Shorgum, 0% 5.38±0.24° 64.15±6.48° 2.13±0.28° 15.93±1.34°с 7.53±0.40° 71.59±9.56° 5% Shorgum, 15% 4.89±0.45° 56.87±8.23°° 5.60±2.97° 16.97±2.45°° 4.08±3.15° 76.69±11.48°° 5% Shorgum, 20% 4.83±0.56° 63.41±7.64°° 4.92±0.49° 18.87±2.05°° 6.35±3.77°° 76.69±11.48°°	Strawberry		69.48±8.02a	1.37±0.69a	17.95±0.76abc	15.19±6.37a	
5% Shorgum, 0% 5.38±0.24a 82.42±0.39a Strawberry 64.15±6.48ab 2.13±0.28a 15.93±1.34bcd 7.53±0.40a 71.59±9.56a 5% Shorgum, 15% 4.89±0.45a 56.87±8.23bc 5.60±2.97a 16.97±2.45abc 4.08±3.15a 76.69±11.48a 5% Shorgum, 20% 4.83±0.56a 4.92±0.49a 18.87±2.05ab 6.35±3.77a 4.08±3.77a	0% Shorgum, 20% 5.	02±0.39a					84.73±2.23a
Strawberry 64.15±6.48ab 2.13±0.28a 15.93±1.34bcd 7.53±0.40a 7.59±9.56a 5% Shorgum, 15% 4.89±0.45a 56.87±8.23bc 5.60±2.97a 16.97±2.45abc 4.08±3.15a 76.69±11.48abc 5% Shorgum, 20% 4.83±0.56a 63.41±7.64ab 4.92±0.49a 18.87±2.05ab 6.35±3.77a 4.08±3.77a	Strawberry		49.00±4.55c	1.19±0.43a	13.27±1.11 ^d	12.75±6.85a	
5% Shorgum, 15% 4.89±0.45a	5% Shorgum, 0% 5.5	38±0.24ª					82.42±0.39a
Strawberry 56.87±8.23bc 5.60±2.97a 16.97±2.45abc 4.08±3.15a 5% Shorgum, 20% 4.83±0.56a 76.69±11.48abc Strawberry 63.41±7.64ab 4.92±0.49a 18.87±2.05ab 6.35±3.77abc	Strawberry		64.15±6.48ab	2.13±0.28a	15.93±1.34bcd	7.53±0.40a	
5% Shorgum, 20% 4.83±0.56 ^a 76.69±11.48 ^c Strawberry 63.41±7.64 ^{ab} 4.92±0.49 ^a 18.87±2.05 ^{ab} 6.35±3.77 ^a	5% Shorgum, 15% 4.	89±0.45ª					71.59±9.56a
Strawberry 63.41±7.64 ^{ab} 4.92±0.49 ^a 18.87±2.05 ^{ab} 6.35±3.77 ^a	Strawberry		56.87±8.23bc	5.60±2.97a	16.97±2.45abc	4.08±3.15a	
	5% Shorgum, 20% 4.	83±0.56ª					76.69±11.48a
10% Shorgum, 0% 5.03±0.39 ^a 76.44±6.79 ^a	Strawberry		63.41±7.64ab	4.92±0.49a	18.87±2.05ab	6.35±3.77a	
	10% Shorgum, 0% 5.	03±0.39a					76.44±6.79a
Strawberry 60.18±1.17 ^{abc} 4.95±2.88 ^a 19.46±2.68 ^a 5.42±3.85 ^a	Strawberry		60.18±1.17abc	4.95±2.88a	19.46±2.68a	5.42±3.85a	
10% Shorgum, 15% 5.26±0.34 ^a 72.85±0.38 ^a	10% Shorgum, 15% 5.	26±0.34ª					72.85±0.38a
Strawberry 57.66±1.04abc 6.12±0.30a 19.85±0.53a 3.24±0.07a	Strawberry		57.66±1.04abc	6.12±0.30a	19.85±0.53a	3.24±0.07a	
10% Shorgum, 20% 5.06±0.41 ^a 79.29±1.79 ^a	10% Shorgum, 20% 5.	06±0.41a					79.29±1.79a
Strawberry 57.99±0.84abc 3.25±0.67a 17.09±0.85abc 5.38±0.84a	Strawberry		57.99±0.84abc	3.25±0.67a	17.09±0.85abc	5.38±0.84a	

Note: a,b.c.d.e.f = significantly different (<math>P < 0.05)

3.2. Sensory Properties

The acceptability scores of bread samples based on color, aroma, taste, and aftertaste ranged between 6.68-7.07, 6.32-7.07, 5.58-6.32, and 5.60-6.40 respectively, and did not experience significant differences (P>0.05) (Table 5) . The bread acceptability scores based on texture and overall ranged between 5.68-7.04 and 6.08-6.88 respectively. The results of the two-way ANOVA analysis showed that there were significant differences (P<0.05) in the texture of the bread samples which were caused independently by both the sorghum substitution treatment and the addition of strawberry vla (Table

6). Referring to Duncan's further test results, the acceptability based on the texture of bread without sorghum substitution which added 15% strawberry vla was significantly higher than other formulations. The results of the two-way ANOVA analysis based on overall acceptability showed that there was a significant difference (P<0.05) caused by the sorghum substitution treatment (Table 7). Panelists significantly preferred the bread texture without sorghum substitution.

Table 5. Sensory Acceptance According to Color, Aroma, Taste, and Aftertaste of Sorghum Substitute Bread with Strawberry Dadih Vla.

Treatment		Parameter				
			Color	Aroma	Taste	Aftertaste
0% Shorgum, 0% Strawberry		7.07±1.64 ^a	7.07±1.29a	6.11±1.55a	6.27±1.61 ^a	
0% Shorgum, 15% Strawberry		6.84±1.67a	6.32±1.65a	5.68±1.67a	5.60±1.82a	
0% Shorgum, 20% Strawberry		7.00±1.53a	6.64±1.89a	6.08±1.70a	6.00±1.61a	
5% Shorgum, 0% Strawberry		6.72±1.72a	6.80±1.35a	6.48±1.50a	6.40±1.41a	
5% Shorgum, 15% Strawberry		6.68±1.60a	6.68±1.49a	6.12±1.16a	6.12±1.42a	
5% Shorgum, 20% Strawberry		6.76±.145a	6.36±1.84a	5.68±1.57a	5.84±1.46a	
10% Shorgum, 0% Strawberry		6.88±1.51a	6.72±1.06a	6.08±1.49a	5.76±1.58a	
10%	Shorgum,	15%	6.72±1.62a	6.60±1.47a	6.32±1.49a	5.88±1.72a
Strawberry						
10%	Shorgum,	20%	6.68±1.34a	6.68±1.31a	5.68±1.28a	5.68±1.34a
Strawberry						

Note: a,b.c.d.e.f = significantly different (P < 0.05)

Table 6. Texture Sensory Acceptance of Sorghum Substitute Bread with Strawberry Dadih Vla.

Sorghum substitute bread (%)	Vla strawberry (%)		
	0	15	20
0	7.04±1.61 ^{Aab}	6.84±1.65 ^{Aa}	6.20±1.84 ^{Ab}
5	$5.80 \pm 1.75^{\text{Bab}}$	6.48 ± 1.23^{Ba}	5.68 ± 1.84 Bb
10	6.12±1.36 ^{Bab}	6.24±1.64 ^{Ba}	5.88±1.33 ^{Bb}

Table 7. Overall Sensory Acceptance of Sorghum Substitute Bread with Strawberry Dadih Vla.

Sorghum substitute bread (%)	Vla strawberry (%)		
	0	15	20
0	6.65±1.41 ^{Aa}	6.08±1.75 ^{Aa}	6.28±1.51 ^{Aa}
5	$6.88 \pm 1.16^{\mathrm{Ab}}$	6.36 ± 0.99 Ab	$6.08{\pm}1.28^{\mathrm{Ab}}$
10	$6.48{\pm}1.16^{\mathrm{Ab}}$	6.24±1.50 ^{Ab}	$6.16 \pm 0.98^{\mathrm{Ab}}$

4. Discussion

4.1. Physicochemical Properties

The substitution of sorghum flour to the bread significantly influenced the color parameters, especially the level of lightness (L*), yellowness (b*), and redness (a*). Increasing sorghum flour content tends to reduce brightness (L*) and yellowness (b*), while increasing redness (a*). These findings were consistent with Adzqia et al., (2023) These changes are mainly caused by natural pigments found in the sorghum pericarp, as explained by (Aguiar et al., 2020). These pigments have

a dominant role in determining the final color of the product compared to the Maillard reaction and caramelization that occur during processing (Jafari et al., 2018).

The significant correlation between the color of sorghum flour and the color of the mixture shows that the color of the raw material greatly determines the visual characteristics of the final product (Nieto-Mazzocco et al., 2020). This is in line with the consumer trend of increasingly appreciating products with darker colors because they are associated with health benefits. For example, in countries like Germany and Eastern Europe, darker colors are often considered healthier. This trend is also supported by increasing consumer interest in dark colored foods which are known to contain antioxidants and bioactive compounds with various health benefits (Jafari et al., 2018; Nieto-Mazzocco et al., 2020).

Thus, the influence of sorghum flour on color can be an additional attraction, not only for visual characteristics but also to meet market preferences that prioritize products based on natural ingredients and high health value.

4.2. Sensory Properties

According to the sensory analyses, the acceptance score for bread substituted with sorghum and added with strawberry vla showed insignificant variations for the parameters of color, aroma, taste and aftertaste (P > 0.05). Acceptance scores based on texture and overall showed a significant difference (P < 0.05) in bread texture which was influenced independently by the sorghum substitution treatment and the addition of strawberry vla. In particular, in the texture test, bread without sorghum substitution with the addition of 15% strawberry vla showed a higher acceptance score compared to other formulations, indicating that the addition of strawberry vla had a positive impact on the texture of the bread.

However, based on the overall test (overall acceptability), sorghum substitution had a significant effect (P < 0.05), where panelists preferred bread with a texture that did not use sorghum. Although sorghum provides variation in bread composition, these results suggest that the addition of strawberry vla can improve the sensory quality of bread in terms of texture, but the sorghum substitution may not be favorable in terms of overall texture.

In general, the addition of strawberry vla has a more positive impact on consumer acceptance, especially in bread formulations with 15% strawberry vla. This can explain that although sorghum has the potential to increase the nutritional value of bread, the addition of strawberry vla has a better effect on consumer preferences, especially on the texture and taste aspects of bread.

On the other hand, based on the overall perception of the panelists, it can be seen that the addition of sorghum and vla can increase the color of the bread to become browner, while vla becomes brighter and more attractive. The aroma is not that different from bread made from other nuts. The average taste of bread with the addition of strawberry curd vla was almost the same in each formula, indicating that vla did not change the flavor profile significantly. However, the aftertaste perceived by panelists became increasingly unfavorable as the percentage of sorghum substitution increased, which is in line with findings by lyArdhea et al. (2015) who reported that increasing the level of sorghum flour substitution in bread caused a decrease in taste and texture preferences. A part from that, the addition of sorghum flour and curd flour tended to reduce the panelists' preference scores for the color of the bread. Color is an important factor in determining the quality of bread because it is one of the first characteristics that attracts consumers' attention. Mixing sorghum flour with other types of flour, such as wheat flour, can produce bread with a darker color of crumb and crust, as also reported in previous research (Saeed Omer et al., 2023).

5. Conclusions

Bread substituted with sorghum and filled with strawberry vla had significantly differences in water, carbohydrate, protein, fat, crude fiber and vitamin C content compared to control bread. The water content of bread substituted with sorghum and added with strawberry is higher, while the carbohydrate content tends to be lower in bread with 10% sorghum and 15% strawberry. Sorghum substitution also increases the protein, fat and vitamin C content, especially in bread with 10%

sorghum and 20% strawberry. In terms of physical properties, these breads showed significant variations in lightness and yellowness, but no significant differences in pH or degree of redness. The results of the sensory test showed that consumer preference for the texture of bread containing 15% strawberry vla was more favorable, but overall, there was no significant difference in the acceptance of the taste, aroma or appearance of the bread.

6. Patents

This section is not mandatory but may be added if there are patents resulting from the work reported in this manuscript.

Funding: Please add: "This research received no external funding" or "This research was funded by NAME OF FUNDER, grant number XXX" and "The APC was funded by XXX". Check carefully that the details given are accurate and use the standard spelling of funding agency names at https://search.crossref.org/funding. Any errors may affect your future funding.

Data Availability Statement: We encourage all authors of articles published in MDPI journals to share their research data. In this section, please provide details regarding where data supporting reported results can be found, including links to publicly archived datasets analyzed or generated during the study. Where no new data were created, or where data is unavailable due to privacy or ethical restrictions, a statement is still required. Suggested Data Availability Statements are available in section "MDPI Research Data Policies" at https://www.mdpi.com/ethics.

Acknowledgments: In this section, you can acknowledge any support given which is not covered by the author contribution or funding sections. This may include administrative and technical support, or donations in kind (e.g., materials used for experiments).

Conflicts of Interest: Declare conflicts of interest or state "The authors declare no conflicts of interest." Authors must identify and declare any personal circumstances or interest that may be perceived as inappropriately influencing the representation or interpretation of reported research results. Any role of the funders in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results must be declared in this section. If there is no role, please state "The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results".

Appendix A

The appendix is an optional section that can contain details and data supplemental to the main text—for example, explanations of experimental details that would disrupt the flow of the main text but nonetheless remain crucial to understanding and reproducing the research shown; figures of replicates for experiments of which representative data is shown in the main text can be added here if brief, or as Supplementary data. Mathematical proofs of results not central to the paper can be added as an appendix.

Appendix B

All appendix sections must be cited in the main text. In the appendices, Figures, Tables, etc. should be labeled starting with "A" —e.g., Figure A1, Figure A2, etc.

References

- Adzqia, F., Suwonsichon, S., & Thongngam, M. (2023). Effects of White Sorghum Flour Levels on Physicochemical and Sensory Characteristics of Gluten-Free Bread. *Foods*, 12(22), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.3390/foods12224113
- Aguiar, L. A. de, Rodrigues, D. B., Queiroz, V. A. V., Melo, L., & Pineli, L. de L. de O. (2020). Comparison of two rapid descriptive sensory techniques for profiling and screening of drivers of liking of sorghum breads. *Food Research International*, 131(September 2019), 108999. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2020.108999

- Akram, A., Fatima, M., Ali, S., Jilani, G., & Asghar, R. (2007). Growth, Yield and Nutrients Uptake of Sorghum in Response To Integrated Phosphorus. *Pak. J. Bot.*, 39(4), 1083–1087.
- Aritonang, S. N., Roza, E., Yetmaneli, Sandra, A., & Rizqan. (2022). Characterization of lactic acid bacteria from buffalo dairy product (dadiah) as potential probiotics. *Biodiversitas*, 23(9), 4418–4423. https://doi.org/10.13057/biodiv/d230906
- Buziau, A. M., Soedamah-Muthu, S. S., Geleijnse, J. M., & Mishra, G. D. (2019). Total Fermented Dairy Food Intake Is Inversely Associated with Cardiovascular Disease Risk in Women. *Journal of Nutrition*, 149(10), 1797–1804. https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/nxz128
- Collado, M. C., Surono, I. S., Meriluoto, J., & Salminen, S. (2007). Potential probiotic characters of Lactobacillus and Enterococcus strains isolated from traditional dadih fermented milk against pathogen intestinal colonization. *Journal of Food Protection*, 70(3), 700–705. https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-70.3.700
- FAO. (1999). SORGHUM Post-harvest Operations-Post-harvest Compendium. 1–33. https://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/inpho/docs/Post_Harvest_Compendium_-__SORGHUM.pdf
- Fernandez, M. A., Panahi, S., Daniel, N., Tremblay, A., & Marette, A. (2017). Yogurt and cardiometabolic diseases: A critical review of potential mechanisms. *Advances in Nutrition*, 8(6), 812–829. https://doi.org/10.3945/an.116.013946
- Fibri, D. L. N., & Frøst, M. B. (2019). Consumer perception of original and modernised traditional foods of Indonesia. *Appetite*, 133(July 2017), 61–69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2018.10.026
- Gizachew, S., Van Beeck, W., Spacova, I., Dekeukeleire, M., Alemu, A., Woldemedhin, W. M., Mariam, S. H., Lebeer, S., & Engidawork, E. (2023). Antibacterial and Immunostimulatory Activity of Potential Probiotic Lactic Acid Bacteria Isolated from Ethiopian Fermented Dairy Products. *Fermentation*, 9(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/fermentation9030258
- Gyan-Chand K, V, M., HS, M., S, S., B, R., & KN, Y. (2017). Revised-ms_EJNFS_53945_v2. *International Journal of Advanced Ayurveda, Yoga, Unani, Siddha and Homeopathy, 6*(1), 447–452.
- Hegde, P. S., & Chandra, T. S. (2005). ESR spectroscopic study reveals higher free radical quenching potential in kodo millet (Paspalum scrobiculatum) compared to other millets. *Food Chemistry*, 92(1), 177–182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2004.08.002
- Hobbs, D. A., Givens, D. I., & Lovegrove, J. A. (2019). Yogurt consumption is associated with higher nutrient intake, diet quality and favourable metabolic profile in children: a cross-sectional analysis using data from years 1–4 of the National diet and Nutrition Survey, UK. *European Journal of Nutrition*, 58(1), 409–422. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00394-017-1605-x
- Jafari, M., Koocheki, A., & Milani, E. (2018). Functional effects of xanthan gum on quality attributes and microstructure of extruded sorghum-wheat composite dough and bread. *Lwt*, *89*, 551–558. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2017.11.031
- Kumari, M., Urooj, A., & Prasad, N. N. (2007). Effect of storage on resistant starch and amylose content of cereal-pulse based ready-to-eat commercial products. *Food Chemistry*, 102(4), 1425–1430. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2006.10.022
- Kůrová, V., Salek, R. N., Vašina, M., Vinklárková, K., Zálešáková, L., Gál, R., Adámek, R., & Buňka, F. (2022). The effect of homogenization and addition of polysaccharides on the viscoelastic properties of processed cheese sauce. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 105(8), 6563–6577. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2021-21520
- Mohamed, T. K., Zhu, K., Issoufou, A., Fatmata, T., & Zhou, H. (2009). Functionality, in vitro digestibility and physicochemical properties of two varieties of defatted foxtail millet protein concentrates. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, 10(12), 5224–5238. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms10125224
- Nieto-Mazzocco, E., Saldaña-Robles, A., Franco-Robles, E., Rangel-Contreras, A. K., Cerón-García, A., & Ozuna, C. (2020). Optimization of sorghum, rice, and amaranth flour levels in the development of gluten-free bakery products using response surface methodology. *Journal of Food Processing and Preservation*, 44(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1111/jfpp.14302
- Rashwan, A. K., Yones, H. A., Karim, N., Taha, E. M., & Chen, W. (2021). Potential processing technologies for developing sorghum-based food products: An update and comprehensive review. *Trends in Food Science and Technology*, 110(November 2020), 168–182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2021.01.087
- Saeed Omer, S. H., Hong, J., Zheng, X., & Khashaba, R. (2023). Sorghum Flour and Sorghum Flour Enriched Bread: Characterizations, Challenges, and Potential Improvements. *Foods*, 12(23). https://doi.org/10.3390/foods12234221
- Sreeramulu, D., Reddy, C. V. K., & Raghunath, M. (2009). Antioxidant activity of commonly consumed cereals, millets, pulses and legumes in India. *Indian Journal of Biochemistry and Biophysics*, 46(1), 112–115.
- T Rathore, R. S. D. K. (2019). Upadhyay A (2019) Review on finger millet: processing and value addition. *Pharma Innov J, 8*(April), 283–291. https://www.thepharmajournal.com/archives/2019/vol8issue4/PartE/8-4-16-516.pdf

Yang, S. Y., & Yoon, K. S. (2022). Effect of Probiotic Lactic Acid Bacteria (LAB) on the Quality and Safety of Greek Yogurt. *Foods*, *11*(23). https://doi.org/10.3390/foods11233799

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

11