DOI: 10.1111/jfpp.13381

# ORIGINAL ARTICLE

WILEY

Journal of Food Processing and Preservation

# Optimization of fermentation conditions for *ting* production using response surface methodology

Oluwafemi Ayodeji Adebo<sup>1</sup> <br/>
Patrick Berka Njobeh<sup>1</sup> |<br/>
Antoine Floribert Mulaba-Bafubiandi<sup>2</sup> | Janet Adeyinka Adebiyi<sup>1</sup> |<br/>
Zangué Steve Carly Desobgo<sup>1</sup> | Eugenie Kayitesi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biotechnology and Food Technology, Faculty of Science, University of Johannesburg, Gauteng, South Africa

<sup>2</sup>Department of Metallurgy, Mineral Processing and Technology Research Centre, Faculty of Engineering and The Built Environment, University of Johannesburg, Gauteng, South Africa

#### Correspondence

Oluwafemi Ayodeji Adebo, Department of Biotechnology and Food Technology, Faculty of Science, University of Johannesburg, P.O. Box 17011, Doornfontein Campus, Gauteng, South Africa. Email: oluwafemiadebo@gmail.com or Eugenie Kayitesi, Department of Biotechnology and Food Technology, Faculty of Science, University of Johannesburg, P.O. Box 17011, Doornfontein Campus, Gauteng, South Africa.

Email: eugeniek@uj.ac.za

#### **Funding information**

University of Johannesburg (Global Excellence and Stature Fellowship to OAA); National Research Foundation (NRF) Center of Excellence (CoE) in Food Security cohosted by the University of Pretoria (UP) and the University of the Western Cape (UWC), South Africa

# **1** | INTRODUCTION

Sorghum is an important cereal crop and major source of food for millions of people. Sorghum like other cereals is transformed into edible forms using fermentation, known to enhance nutritional qualities, shelf life, bioavailability of nutrients, palatability, beneficial health promoting components, and consumer appeal (Adebiyi, Obadina, Adebo, & Kayitesi, in press; Taylor & Duodu, 2015).

*Ting*, is a fermented sorghum product commonly consumed in Botswana, South Africa, and other neighboring countries. It is known

for its sour taste and unique flavor and it is used as a weaning food for infants as well as consumed during ceremonies (Sekwati-Monang & Gänzle, 2011). Different fermentation conditions for the preparation of *ting* have been reported in the literature (Madoroba et al., 2009; Sekwati-Monang & Gänzle, 2011), with variations in their fermentation process, which have no available standardized or optimized conditions.

A widely accepted optimization procedure is response surface methodology (RSM), which is a collection of statistical and mathematical methods for obtaining the optimum conditions of factors for desirable responses. The Doehlert design of RSM are easily applied to

# Abstract

This study investigated the effect of fermentation conditions (time and temperature) of sorghum on the composition of *ting*, using the Doehlert design of response surface methodology (RSM). Fermentation temperature and time were optimized and pH, titratable acidity (TTA), total viable bacteria count (TBC), total lactic acid bacteria count (TLABC), total fungal and yeast count (TFYC), tannin content (TNC), total phenolic content (TPC), total flavonoid content (TFC), and antioxidant activities (AA) were determined. Experimental and predicted values obtained were similar, with statistical indices indicating the validity of the models generated ( $R^2$  between 93.45 and 99.71%, AAD values close to 0,  $B_f$  and  $A_f$  values close to 1). Numerical multi-response optimization of parameters suggested optimal fermentation conditions to be 34 °C for 24 hr. Physicochemical characterization of *ting* samples using scanning electron microscopy (SEM), X-ray diffraction (XRD), and Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (FTIR) showed slight changes in morphology, similarity in diffraction patterns and presence of different functional groups, respectively. Results of this study could provide information for the commercialization of quality *ting*.

#### **Practical applications**

Response surface methodology was used to study the influence of fermentation conditions on the quality of *ting* and optimal fermentation conditions were obtained at 34 °C for 24 hr. The findings in this study will be useful for *ting* processors to obtain a product with maximal beneficial composition and traits.

<sup>2 of 10</sup> WILEY

optimize variables more effectively as they have the ability to explore the whole of an experimental domain (Ferreira, dos Santos, Quintella, Neto, & Bosque-Sendra, 2004).

Scanning electron microscopy (SEM), X-ray diffraction (XRD), and Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR) are techniques that can be used to study and understand the morphology, composition and possible structural changes during food processing. The use of such techniques can provide substantial information and have been used for fermented foods (Adebiyi, Obadina, Mulaba-Bafubiandi, Adebo, & Kayitesi, 2016; Amadou, Gounga, Shi, & Le, 2014). Few studies have been presented in the literature on characterizing the microbiota and selected chemical properties of *ting* (Madoroba et al., 2009, 2011; Sekwati-Monang & Gänzle, 2011). To our knowledge, none of these studies have optimized fermentation variables and subsequently investigated their effects on the composition and physicochemical properties of *ting*. Hence, this study focused on optimizing fermentation parameters (time and temperature) of *ting* and evaluating their physicochemical properties and microstructure.

### 2 | MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### 2.1 Raw material and sample preparation

Sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor* L.) grain cultivar (Titan) was purchased from Agricol (Pty) Ltd., Potchefstroom, South Africa. The sorghum grains were milled using a Perten Laboratory Mill 3600 (Perten Instruments, Sweden) and passed through a 2 mm aperture size sieve (Analysette 3 Spartan, Fritsch, Germany) to obtain the flour.

#### 2.2 | Fermentation of ting

Sorghum flour was processed into *ting* by mixing sterile distilled water (40 °C) and the sorghum flour (1:1, w/v). The mixture was subsequently allowed to spontaneously ferment by endogenous microflora. For each experimental run, the fermentation process was done in triplicate.

#### 2.3 Optimization of *ting* production process

A response surface methodology (RSM) using the Doehlert design was used to model and optimize the effect of fermentation parameters on the parameters investigated. The independent variables were fermentation time ( $X_1$ ) and fermentation temperature ( $X_2$ ), with intervals of 24–72 hr and 20–34 °C respectively. The selection of the parameter levels was based on other studies in the literature on the production of *ting* (Madoroba et al., 2009; Sekwati-Monang & Gänzle, 2011). The two-factor Doehlert design gave a total of eight experimental runs (Supporting Information Table 1). Nine parameters including pH ( $Y_1$ ), total titratable acidity (TTA,  $Y_2$ ), total bacteria count (TBC,  $Y_3$ ), total lactic acid bacteria count (TLABC,  $Y_4$ ), total fungal and yeast count (TFYC,  $Y_5$ ), tannin content (TNC,  $Y_6$ ), total phenolic content (TPC,  $Y_7$ ), total flavonoid content (TFC,  $Y_8$ ), and antioxidant activity (AA,  $Y_9$ ) were investigated.

Mathematical models describing the relationship between the process variables in terms of their linear, quadratic and interactive effects used were described by a second-order polynomial equation presented in Equation (1).

$$Y = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \beta_i x_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \beta_{ii} x_i^2 + \sum_{i(1)$$

where Y is the response,  $x_i$  and  $x_j$  are factors,  $\beta_0$  the constant,  $\beta_i$ ,  $\beta_{ii}$ ,  $\beta_{ii}$ , and  $\beta_{ij}$  the coefficients of linear, quadratic and interaction terms, respectively. The response surfaces were subsequently represented with model equations and respective coefficients obtained using Minitab 16 statistical software (Minitab Lt. Coventry, UK).

#### 2.4 | Model validation

The different statistical parameters utilized in validating the adequacy of the models generated, were average absolute deviation (AAD), bias factor ( $B_f$ ), and accuracy factor ( $A_f$ ) (Equations (2)–(4)), respectively, as well as the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ).

$$AAD = \frac{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\left(|Y_{i,exp} - Y_{i,cal}|\right)}{Y_{i,exp}}\right]}{N}$$
(2)

$$B_{\rm f} = 10^{\frac{1}{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \log \left( \frac{Y_{i,\rm cal}}{Y_{i,\rm exp}} \right)$$
(3)

$$A_{f} = 10^{\frac{1}{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left| \log \left( \frac{Y_{i,cal}}{Y_{i,exp}} \right) \right|$$
(4)

#### 2.5 | pH and TTA

At the end of each fermentation process, pH of the *ting* was measured using a pH meter (pH 510, Eutech Pte Ltd, Singapore). Titratable acidity was determined by titrating a mixture of 2 g of *ting* sample and 20 ml distilled water against 0.1 N NaOH, using phenolphthalein as an indicator, the TTA was expressed in g of tartaric acid/kg sample.

#### 2.6 Estimation of viable microbial counts

For viable microbial counts, 1 g of the respective *ting* sample was added to 9 ml sterile distilled water and vortexed. Counts were determined by surface plating tenfold serial dilutions of *ting* sample on plate count agar (Oxoid, South Africa), potato dextrose agar (Merck, South Africa), and MRS agar (Sigma Aldrich, Germany) in petri dishes for bacterial (TBC), fungal and yeast (TFYC) and lactic acid bacteria (LAB) counts, respectively (Madoroba et al., 2011; Njobeh et al., 2009; Nyambane, Thari, Wangoh, & Njage, 2014). Plates were incubated (IncoShake, Labotec, South Africa) at 30 °C for 72 hr for TBC, 25 °C for 120 hr for TFYC, and anaerobically at 35 °C for 72 hr for TLABC.

# 2.7 | Tannin content, total phenolic content, total flavonoid content, and antioxidant activity assay

#### 2.7.1 | Extraction

To a 0.3 g of freeze-dried milled *ting* sample, 10 ml of acidified methanol (1% HCl in methanol) was added in a centrifuge tube (Kayitesi, de Kock, Minnaar, & Duodu, 2012). The content was sealed with an aluminum foil, stirred for 2 hr and centrifuged at 3,500 rpm for 10 min (Eppendorf 5702R, Merck South Africa). The supernatant was decanted and kept while the residue was re-extracted using 10 ml acidified methanol as earlier described. The extraction process was repeated until a total of 30 ml acidified methanol (1% HCl in methanol) was used. After extraction, the supernatants were pooled together and stored at -4 °C prior to analysis.

#### 2.7.2 | Analytical procedure

#### Tannin content

Using the methods of Price, Van Scoyoc, and Butler (1978), 1 ml of extract was added to a test tube containing 5 ml of an equal volume of 8% HCl in methanol and 1% vanillin (Merck, South Africa). The resulting mixture was vortexed and incubated in a water bath ( $30^{\circ}$ C) for 20 min. A blank was also done repeating the earlier step but this time using 5 ml of 4% HCl. The absorbance of the mixture was read at 500 nm using a spectrophotometer (Biomate, Thermo Spectronic, Rochester). Catechin (Sigma Aldrich, Germany) was used as a standard and results obtained expressed in mg catechin equivalents (CE)/g.

#### Total phenolic content

The TPC of the *ting* sample was determined according to Folin–Ciocalteu method as described by Ainsworth and Gillespie (2007). To 500  $\mu$ l of distilled water, 10  $\mu$ l of the extract was added and reacted with 50  $\mu$ l of the Folin–Ciocalteu phenol reagent (Sigma Aldrich, Germany). This was allowed to stand in the dark for 3 min followed by the addition of 200  $\mu$ l of 20% Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> (g/v) and finally 245  $\mu$ l of distilled water and mixed. The mixture (300  $\mu$ l) was accurately pipetted into a 96-well microplate, wrapped in aluminum foil and further incubated in the dark for 30 min and absorbance read at 750 nm wavelength on a microplate reader (iMark, Biorad, South Africa). Gallic acid (Sigma Aldrich, Germany) was used as a standard and results obtained expressed in mg gallic acid equivalents (GAE)/g.

#### Total flavonoid content

Using the method of Ar-Farsi and Lee (2008), TFC was determined by mixing 30  $\mu$ l of the extract with 20  $\mu$ l of 36 mM NaNO<sub>2</sub> followed by incubation in the dark for 5 min. Thereafter, 20  $\mu$ l of 94 mM AlCl<sub>3</sub> was added and after incubation for another 5 min (in the dark), 100  $\mu$ l of NaOH was added. The absorbance of the mixture was read at 450 nm on a microplate reader (iMark, Biorad, South Africa). Catechin (Sigma Aldrich, Germany) was used as a standard and data obtained were expressed as mg CE/g.

#### Antioxidant activity

The free radical scavenging potential of *ting* sample was determined using the ABTS modified methods of Awika, Rooney, Wu, Prior, and Zevallos (2003) and Kayitesi et al. (2012). To 20  $\mu$ l of the extract, 180  $\mu$ l of ABTS free radical cation solution (equal volumes of 7 mM ABTS and 2.45 mM K<sub>2</sub>S<sub>2</sub>O<sub>8</sub> previously incubated for 12 hr) was added and incubated for 5 min in the dark. Absorbance of the solution was measured at 750 nm on a microplate reader (iMark, Biorad, South Africa). Trolox (Sigma Aldrich, Germany) was used as a standard solution and results obtained expressed as  $\mu$ M trolox equivalents (TE)/g sample).

#### 2.8 | Physicochemical characterization

For both SEM and XRD, representative samples were obtained by vigorously homogenizing the freeze-dried *ting* samples obtained from each experimental run prior to analysis.

#### 2.8.1 | SEM analysis of the ting samples

The *ting* samples were mounted on an aluminum stub and sprayedcoated in a carbon coater (Quorum Q150TE, Quorum Technologies, UK). The samples were then transferred to SEM specimen chamber, subjected to electron beam and viewed under a scanning electron microscope under vacuum.

#### 2.8.2 | XRD analysis of the ting samples

The *ting* samples were loaded into the XRD sample holder and pressed down using a stainless steel weight. The XRD pattern of the samples were examined using an X-ray diffractometer (Rigaku-UltimalV, Japan) equipped with a divergence slit, operating at 40 kV and 40 mA at a scan speed of 1°/min.

#### 2.9 | FTIR spectroscopy and chemometric analysis

For analysis on FTIR, spectra of each triplicate fermented *ting* sample were obtained in duplicates giving six spectra for each *ting* sample. This was done using a FTIR spectrophotometer [Thermo Scientific Smart iTR, (Attenuated Total Reflectance), Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc., United States]. Respective spectra with characteristic peaks in wave numbers from 400 to 4,000 cm<sup>-1</sup> at 32 runs per scan were subsequently recorded. All the FTIR spectra were respectively pre-treated using the following transformation techniques (i) baseline correction, (ii) normalization, (iii) standard normal variate (SNV), (iv) smoothing using Gaussian filter, (v) smoothing using Savitzky–Golay, and (vi) derivation using Savitzky–Golay first derivative on Unscrambler X statistical software version 10.4.2 (Camo software, Oslo, Norway). Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and Cluster Analysis (CA) were subsequently done on the same chemometric software.

#### 2.10 | Statistical analysis

Except for FTIR, all other analyses were done in triplicate. To determine the significance of the generated models, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on Minitab 16 (Minitab Lt. Coventry, UK) and differences were considered statistically significant if  $p \le .05$ . Response surface plots were obtained using Sigmaplot 12.5 (Systat Software Inc., California).

#### 3 | RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 3.1 Statistical models and validation

This study investigated the effects of independent process variables [fermentation time ( $X_1$ ) and fermentation temperature ( $X_2$ )] of sorghum on the production of *ting*. Parameters determined were pH ( $Y_1$ ), TTA ( $Y_2$ ), TBC ( $Y_3$ ), TLABC ( $Y_4$ ), TFYC ( $Y_5$ ), TNC ( $Y_6$ ), TPC ( $Y_7$ ), TFC ( $Y_8$ ), and

#### 4 of 10 **ILEY**

Journal of

#### Institute o Food Processing and Preservation

TABLE 1 Coefficient of regression for the different mathematical models obtained

Coefficient	pН	TTA	ТВС	TLABC	TFYC	TNC	TPC	TFC	AA
β <sub>0</sub>	6.18	0.565	2,240,000	1,415,000	706,000	9.965	16.06	8.695	1.145
β1	-0.45*	0.27833	1,150,000	1,017,000*	268,333	-1.9917	-4.44*	-1.1967*	-0.03500*
β2	-0.677552*	0.43014	2,881,062*	2,083,141*	680,716*	-5.5745*	-7.1132*	-1.9977*	-0.05485*
β <sub>11</sub>	-0.075	0.34	1,110,000	450,000	126,500	-0.5450	1.12	1.2500	-0.02
β <sub>22</sub>	-0.14834	0.36335	3,190,187*	1,391,415*	-16,168	-2.7552	0.7467	0.9567	0.01
β <sub>12</sub>	-0.24249	-0.04042	438,799	1,557,737*	138,568	-1.0335	0.4157	0.5658	-0.00577
R <sup>2</sup> (%)	98.77	93.45	97.95	99.11	98.28	98.58	99.71	96.80	99.63
AAD	0.01	0.12	0.01	0.11	0.19	0.12	0.02	0.12	0.01
B <sub>f</sub>	1.00	1.00	1.01	0.98	0.96	1.04	1.00	1.07	1.00
A <sub>f</sub>	1.01	1.13	1.10	1.12	1.23	1.11	1.02	1.10	1.00

 $\beta$  represents the coefficients of equations of the different models with  $\beta_0$  representing the constant term,  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  the linear effects of fermentation time and temperature, respectively,  $\beta_{11}$  and  $\beta_{22}$  their quadratic effects and  $\beta_{12}$  their interactions. TTA = titratable acidity; TBC = total bacteria count; TLABC = total lactic acid bacteria; TFYC = total fungal and yeast count; TNC = tannin content; TPC = total phenolic content; TFC = total flavonoid content; AA = antioxidant activity. \*Significant at p < .05.

(9)

AA  $(Y_9)$  and the different models representing each provided in Equations (5)-(13).

$$\begin{array}{l} Y_1 = 6.18 - 0.45 x_1 - 0.67552 x_2 - 0.07500 x_{1^2} - 0.14834 x_{2^2} \\ - 0.24249 x_1 x_2 \end{array} \tag{5}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} Y_2 = 0.565 + 0.27833x_1 + 0.43014x_2 + 0.34x_{1^2} + 0.36335x_{2^2} \\ -0.04042x_1x_2 \end{array} \tag{6}$$

$$\begin{split} & \chi_3 \!=\! 2,240,000 \!+\! 1,150,000 x_1 \!+\! 2,881,062 x_2 \!+\! 1,110,000 x_{1^2} \\ & + 3,190,187 x_{2^2} \!+\! 438,799 x_1 x_2 \end{split} \tag{7}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} Y_4 = 1,415,000 + 1,017,000x_1 + 2,083,141x_2 + 450,000x_{1^2} \\ + 1,391,415x_{2^2} + 1,557,737x_1x_2 \end{array} \tag{8}$$

 $Y_5 = 706,000 - 268,333x_1 + 680,716x_2 + 126,500x_{1^2} - 16,168x_{2^2}$  $+138,568x_1x_2$ 

$$Y_{6} = 9.9650 - 1.9917x_{1} - 5.5745x_{2} - 0.5450x_{1^{2}} - 2.7552x_{2^{2}} - 1.0335x_{1}x_{2}$$
(10)

$$Y_7 = 16.06 - 4.44x_1 - 7.1132x_2 + 1.12x_{1^2} + 0.7467x_{2^2} + 0.4157x_1x_2$$
(11)

 $Y_8 = 8.695 - 1.1967x_1 - 1.9977x_2 + 1.2500x_{1^2} + 0.9567x_{2^2} + 0.5658x_1x_2$ (12)

 $Y_9 = 1.145 - 0.035x_1 - 0.05485x_2 - 0.02x_{1^2} + 0.01x_{2^2} - 0.00577x_1x_2$ (13)

All calculated  $R^2$  values in this study were above 90 (93.45-99.71%) (Table 1). R<sup>2</sup> values should be at least 80% to have a good fit of the model and the closer it is to 100%, the better the empirical model fits the actual data (Filli, Nkama, Jideani, & Abubakar, 2011; Sobowale, Adebiyi, & Adebo, in press). Other parameters of predictive models in biological systems that measure the relative deviation from the observed (experimental) and predicted (calculated) parameters were determined and results presented in Table 1. As observed, the

closeness of the  $B_f$  and  $A_f$  to unity Equation (1)) and that of AAD to zero indicates reasonable agreements between the predicted and observed parameters (Desobgo, Stafford, & Metcalfe, 2015; Sobowale et al., in press).

#### 3.2 pH and TTA

The pH and TTA are important biochemical parameters peculiar to fermented foods. With increasing time and temperature, pH decreased (increased acidity) with a corresponding increase in TTA (Figure 1a,b). pH values obtained in this study were relatively higher compared with those reported by Sekwati-Monang and Gänzle (2011). This may thus be attributed to difference in sample sources, fermentation conditions, and the use of nondecorticated sorghum grains in this study. A decrease in TTA indicates an accumulation of organic acids with increase in microbial activity and metabolism of the fermenting organisms. The regression model describing the effect of fermentation time and temperature on pH and TTA is given in Equations (5) and (6), respectively, with their corresponding regression coefficient of determination values provided in Table 1. The values of AAD (0.01 and 0.12) depicted an agreement between experimental and predicted values further showing that the models adequately described the pH and TTA values (Table 2). Results also showed that the linear factors of fermentation time (X<sub>1</sub>) and temperature (X<sub>2</sub>) had a significant ( $p \le .05$ ) effect on pH of ting samples, while the quadratic effects were not significant, meanwhile these variables had no significant (p < .05) effect on TTA. A negative correlation of 0.936 (Table 3) between these parameters suggested that increased acidity resulted in increased amount of organic acids. While relatively higher TTA values were observed in other samples, lower TTA values in others suggests that the metabolic activities of the fermenting organisms at such conditions were relatively low.



**FIGURE 1** Response surface plots showing the effects of fermentation time and temperature on: (a) pH, (b) TTA, (c) TBC, (d) TLABC, (e) TFYC, (f) TNC, (g) TPC, (h) TFC, (i) AA of the ting samples

#### 3.3 | Microbial load

Counts obtained on the different selective media used in this study (Table 2), suggested a diverse microbial flora on *ting* samples. LABs dominated the fermentation microbiota (Madoroba et al., 2011; Sekwati-Monang & Gänzle, 2011), while the relatively low counts of yeasts and fungi suggests that cereal fermentation favors the growth of LABs as compared with other group of microorganisms (Meroth, Hammes, & Hertel, 2003). As indicated by Adebiyi et al. (in press) spontaneous fermentation of cereals involves the competitive action of

TABLE 2 Experimental and predicted values obtained for the parameters investigated

Variables pH			TTA (g/kg)		TBC (×10 <sup>6</sup> cfu/g)		TLABC (×10 <sup>5</sup> cfu/g)		TFYC (×10 <sup>5</sup> cfu/g)		TNC (mg CE/g)		TPC (mg GAE/g)		TFC (mg CE/g)		AA (μM TE/g)		
X1	X <sub>2</sub>	Exp P	Pre	Ехр	Pre	Ехр	Pre	Exp	Pre	Exp	Pre	Ехр	Pre	Exp	Pre	Exp	Pre	Exp	Pre
48	27	6.18	6.18	0.56	0.57	2.25	2.24	14.3	14.2	7.07	7.06	9.96	9.97	16.07	16.06	8.71	8.70	1.15	1.15
48	27	6.18	6.18	0.57	0.57	2.23	2.24	14.0	14.2	7.09	7.06	9.97	9.97	16.05	16.06	8.68	8.70	1.14	1.15
72	27	5.59	5.66	1.29	1.18	4.87	4.50	27.1	28.8	11.7	11.0	7.95	7.43	12.42	12.74	8.43	8.74	1.09	1.09
60	34	5.20	5.14	1.31	1.42	7.80	8.17	57.3	55.6	14.4	15.1	0.97	1.49	9.02	8.70	7.96	7.64	1.08	1.08
24	27	6.62	6.56	0.52	0.63	1.83	2.20	10.2	8.48	4.95	5.64	10.89	11.41	21.94	21.62	11.46	11.14	1.16	1.16
36	20	6.69	6.76	0.50	0.39	2.40	2.03	7.61	9.33	1.31	0.62	13.66	13.14	25.14	25.46	11.98	12.30	1.21	1.21
60	20	6.58	6.52	0.60	0.71	2.43	2.80	7.73	6.01	1.41	2.10	11.52	12.04	20.98	20.66	10.93	10.61	1.18	1.17
36	34	5.73	5.79	1.28	1.17	7.01	6.64	30.2	31.9	11.9	11.2	4.90	4.38	12.46	12.78	8.03	13.18	1.12	1.11

 $X_1$  = fermentation time (h);  $X_2$  = fermentation temperature (°C). TTA = titratable acidity; TBC = total bacteria count; TLABC = total lactic acid bacteria; TFYC = total fungal and yeast count; TNC = tannin content; TPC = total phenolic content; TFC = total flavonoid content; AA = antioxidant activity; Exp = Experimental value; Pre = Predicted value.

# <sup>6 of 10 |</sup> WILEY

Journal of Food Processing and Preservation



#### TABLE 3 Pearson correlation between the investigated parameters

	pН	TTA	TBC	TLABC	TFYC	TNC	TPC	TFC	AA
pН		-0.914**	-0.889**	-0.934**	-0.966**	0.930**	0.968**	0.880**	0.950**
TTA	-0.914**		0.940**	0.849**	0.886**	-0.857*	-0.846**	-0.723*	-0.860**
ТВС	-0.889**	0.940**		0.921**	0.852**	-0.928**	-0.812*	-0.682	-0.770*
TLABC	-0.934**	0.849**	0.921**		0.888**	-0.967**	-0.859**	-0.708*	-0.850**
TFYC	-0.966**	0.886**	0.852**	0.888**		-0.921**	-0.958**	-0.887**	-0.962**
TNC	0.930*	-0.857*	-0.928**	-0.967**	-0.921**		0.909**	0.788	0.877**
TPC	0.968**	-0.846**	-0.812*	-0.859**	-0.958**	0.909**		0.958**	0.955**
TFC	0.880**	-0.723*	-0.628	-0.708*	-0.887**	0.788*	0.958**		0.863**
AA	0.950**	-0.860**	-0.770*	-0.850**	-0.962**	0.877**	0.955**	0.863**	

\*\*Correlation is significant at 1%.

\*Correlation is significant at 5%.

endogenous microorganisms with LABs dominating. The presence of nutrients, organic acids and the acidic environment of the ting microbiota could have also supported the growth of other microorganisms.  $R^2$  values (close to 100%) as observed on Table 1 indicate that the proposed mathematical models of the microbial colony count (Equations (7)-(9)) can explain more than 90% experimental observations as a function of the fermentation time and temperature. Using p values to establish the significance of each coefficient and interaction strength of each parameter, the linear factors of fermentation temperature  $(X_2)$ had a significant ( $p \le .05$ ) effect on TBC, TLABC, and TFYC of the *ting* samples (Table 1), while  $X_1$  had a significant effect (p < .05) on only TLABC. The quadratic effect of both variables ( $X_1^2$  and  $X_2^2$ ) were significant (p < .05) on the TLABC of ting samples, whereas only  $X_2^2$  had a significant effect ( $p \le .05$ ) on TBC. It can be observed from Figure 1c,d that the microbial counts increased with increasing fermentation temperature, but do not strongly depend on fermentation time (X<sub>1</sub>). Nevertheless, the linear, quadratic, and interactive effect of fermentation temperature on microbial count was positive.

#### 3.4 | TNC, TPC, TFC, and AA

Sorghum grains and subsequent products from them are known to be rich in tannins, flavonoids, phenolic compounds, and antioxidants and thus considered health promoting foods (Awika & Rooney, 2004; Taylor & Duodu, 2015). Experimental and predicted values of TNC, TPC, TFC and AA of *ting* samples are presented in Table 2 and their respective mathematical models presented in Equation (10)–(13). Figure 1f–i depicts the effect of fermentation time and temperature on these parameters. As observed, the effect of fermentation time ( $X_1$ ) was significantly ( $p \le .05$ ) negative on all health promoting properties analyzed with the exception of TNC (Table 1). Similarly, the linear effect of fermentation temperature ( $X_2$ ) had a significant ( $p \le .05$ ) effect on all the health beneficial properties. This thus, indicates that at increased temperature and sufficiently longer time, the concentrations and amounts of these parameters will decrease. Since the negative linear effect of  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  were significant ( $p \le .05$ ) on the health promoting parameters, while their corresponding quadratic factors were not, it can be suggested that both variables had a cumulative negative effect on the TNC, TPC, TFC and AA of ting. A general decrease of the investigated properties with increase in fermentation time and temperature could be attributed to reduced extractability of the phenolic compounds due to self-polymerization and/or interaction of these compounds with other macromolecules (Beta, Rooney, Marovatsanga, & Taylor, 2000; Taylor & Duodu, 2015). Such reduction and degradation of phenolic compounds in ting have also been reported by Svensson, Sekwati-Monang, Lutz, Schieber, and Gänzle (2010) and attributed to the actions decarboxylases, reductases, esterases, and the ability of LABs in fermented sorghum to metabolize phenolic compounds. A strong positive correlation between the AA and TPC (Table 3) strongly suggests that the phenolic contents of the ting samples, largely contributed to the antioxidant activities.

#### 3.5 | Multiresponse numerical optimization

The surface plots (Figure 1a-i) shows the effect of different process variables (fermentation time and temperature) on the investigated parameters. A numerical optimization approach was adopted to determine the best experimental conditions for maximum release of phytochemicals accompanied by a good microbial growth, reduced pH, and high organic acid production. The numerical optimization of the process variables was done on Minitab 16 (Minitab Lt. Coventry, UK) and all parameters were investigated. The optimum derived conditions were fermentation time and temperature of 24 hr and 34°C, respectively. The corresponding predicted parameters at this condition were pH (6.09), TTA (1.31 g/kg), TBC, (6.71  $\times$  10  $^{6}$  cfu/g), TLABC (2.35  $\times$  $10^6$  cfu/g), TFYC (1.02  $\,\times\,$   $10^6$  cfu/g), TNC (5.41 mg CE/g), TPC (15.66 mg GAE/g), TFC (9.64 mg CE/g), and AA (1.13 mg TE/g). To confirm the predicted values, the theoretical value was tested in triplicate using the optimal fermentation conditions obtained. Subsequent analysis gave the following results; pH (6.00), TTA (1.34), TBC (6.19 imes

Journal of Food Processing and Preservation



FIGURE 2 Scanning electron images of ting samples: (a) 20 °C 36 hr, (b) 20 °C 60 hr, (c) 27 °C 24 hr, (d) 27 °C 48 hr, (e) 27 °C 72 hr, (f) 34 °C 36 hr, (g) 34 °C 60 hr, (h) 34 °C 24 hr

 $10^6$  cfu/g), TLABC (2.01  $\times$  10<sup>6</sup> cfu/g), TFYC (9.91  $\times$  10<sup>5</sup> cfu/g), TNC (5.36 mg CE/g), TPC (15.48 mg GAE/g), TFC (9.67 mg CE/g), and AA (1.18 mg TE/g). These obtained results are closely related to the numerical optimized data obtained, thus showing that the regression models obtained could adequately predict the parameters.

#### 3.6 | SEM and XRD of the *ting* samples

The SEM images of samples of ting were compared with investigate possible morphological changes after fermentation. It can be observed from the micrographs (Figure 2), that the granules were predominantly spherical, with fermentation causing a degradation in the granular structure. There was a gradual change from a more compact, fused and consistent structure to a more loosened, disoriented one, forming pits (Figure 2). This was more pronounced in ting samples fermented for



FIGURE 3 XRD patterns of the ting samples: 2036 (20 °C 36 hr), 2060 (20 °C 60 hr), 2724 (27 °C 24 hr), 2748 (27 °C 48 hr), 2772 (27 °C 72 hr), 3424 (34 °C 24 hr) 3436 (34 °C 36 hr), 3460 (34 °C 60 hr)

longer time and higher temperatures, suggesting increased degradation and hydrolysis of components such as starch and amino acids.

Differences in the diffraction pattern of ting samples as affected by the fermentation variables is presented in Figure 3. The diffractogram of all ting samples showed similarities and exhibited the same "A" pattern of diffraction, with significant peaks at angles of  $2\theta$  around 17.78, 21, and 27.07°. Differences in relative intensities could be attributed to the difference in the cellular and granular size (as observed with SEM) and the proportion and arrangements of the amylose and amylopectin components, which are known to have an impact on retrogradation and gelatinization.

#### 3.7 | FTIR of the ting samples

FTIR spectroscopy was used to evaluate the composition of the obtained ting samples in terms of their functional groups, while band intensities could suggest their relative abundance. A comparative evaluation of the average spectra (Supporting Information Figure 1) revealed that the ting samples all had strong absorption peaks around 3,300, 2,900, 2,850, 1,740, 1,640, 1,520, and 1,007 cm<sup>-1</sup>. Broad spectral peaks around 3,300 cm<sup>-1</sup> is associated with O—H and polyhydroxyl bearing phenolic compounds suggesting the presence of quercetin, alcohols, and phenolic compounds present in fermented foods (Adebiyi et al., 2016; Taylor & Duodu, 2015). Bands occurring at 2,900 or and diffuse ones at 2,850 cm<sup>-1</sup> could be attributed to alkanes (C-H stretching), aldehydes (H—C=O) and bound water in form of moisture, while peaks at 1,640 cm<sup>-1</sup> represent conjugated carbonyl bonds which could be from flavonoids and esterified phytosterols (Adiana & Mazura, 2011). Peaks around 1,520 cm<sup>-1</sup> represents the C=C-C signals of



FIGURE 4 Plots of multivariate data analysis of the ting samples: (a) PCA scores plot (PC-1 and PC-2); (b) PCA scores plot (PC-1 and PC-3); (c) PC-1 loadings plot; (d) PC-2 loadings plot; (e) CA dendrogram

condensed tannins, sharp peaks at 1,143 cm<sup>-1</sup> can be assigned to the –OH aromatic bond present in catechins, while the intense peaks at 1,007 and 930 cm<sup>-1</sup> suggest the presence of phenolic compounds (flavonoids, tannins, glucosyl moieties), carbohydrates and amines containing the stretching vibrations of =C–O–C, C–C, or vibrational C–O–H bonds (Duodu, Tang, Grant, Wellner, & Belton, 2001; Sinelli, Spinardi, Di Egidio, Mignani, & Casiraghi, 2008). The high intensity bands in this region can be explained by the high amounts of flavonol glycosides and a possible accumulation of proteins (in form of amino acids) in the *ting* samples.

Regions associated with these described bands were selected, pretreated and subjected to PCA using different transformation techniques (Supporting Information Figure 2). The best pretreatment technique in terms of sample grouping coupled with relatively high variation of principal components (PCs) was the SNV pretreated data set (Figure 4a). As observed from Figure 4a, the first two principal components (PCs) accounted for 88% of the total variation. While PC-1 with 73% of the total variation differentiated *ting* samples fermented at 20°C (for 36, 60 hr) and 34°C (for 24, 36 hr) on the right, PC-2 with 15% separated the samples fermented at 27°C (for 48, 72 hr), 34°C for 60 hr, and majority of samples at 20°C (for 36, 60 hr) above, from other *ting* samples below. This is also reflected on the discrete grouping formed along the PCs. The clustering as depicted in Figure 4a further confirm the observations on other parameters investigated in this study. Samples fermented for shorter fermentation times generally clustered together and the same was observed for those fermented for relative longer times, with temperature also playing a significant role. An additional PC-3 contributed 6% to the variation, bringing the total variation of the PCs to 94% and effectively differentiated samples fermented at  $27 \,^{\circ}$ C (for 48, 72 hr) from *ting* obtained at  $34 \,^{\circ}$ C for 60 hr (Figure 4b).

The loadings plot (Figure 4b) revealed that peaks at 2,900, 2,850, and 1,740 cm<sup>-1</sup> largely contributed to the grouping of *ting* fermented at 27 °C (for 48, 72 hr) and 34 °C for 60 hr (Figure 4c). As observed from Figure 4d, the peak around 3,300 cm<sup>-1</sup> was the major contributor to the discrimination of samples fermented at 20 °C, while peaks at 1,007 and 930 cm<sup>-1</sup> influenced samples fermented at 34 °C for 36 hr. The cluster analysis (CA) presented as a dendrogram in Figure 4e, shows three-defined clusters, grouped in terms of sample similarity, and followed patterns of the PCA.

# 4 | CONCLUSIONS

Using a Doehlert RSM approach, this study investigated the effects of fermentation variables on some selected parameters, that is, pH, titratable acidity, microbial count, tannin content, total phenolic content, Journal of Food Processing and Preservation

total flavonoid content, and antioxidant activity. Numerical optimization of factors for the fermentation process established that optimal processing temperature and time condition for *ting* production was 34°C for 24 hr. At these conditions, maximal phenolic, tannin, flavonoid contents, and antioxidant activity were derived, complemented with good microbial growth, reduced pH, and high production of organic acids. The reduced pH and high TTA levels at this optimal condition, would extend shelf life and preserve the *ting* better. Physicochemical characterization of *ting* first reported in this study, showed slight changes in the microstructure and similarity in the diffraction pattern of the differently obtained *ting* samples. FTIR analysis further confirmed the presence of different functional groups, while chemometric analysis effectively showed differentiation and variations in *ting* samples analyzed. Results from this study will be beneficial for the production of high quality *ting* for subsequent consumption.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was financially supported via the Global Excellence and Stature (GES) Fellowship of the University of Johannesburg (UJ) granted to the main author (Adebo, O.A). This work was also partly supported by the National Research Foundation (NRF) Center of Excellence (CoE) in Food Security co-hosted by the University of Pretoria (UP) and the University of the Western Cape (UWC), South Africa. Special thanks to Mrs. Nomsa Baloyi, Miss Patience and Mr. Edward Malenga of the Mineral Processing and Technology Research Centre, University of Johannesburg for assistance with FTIR, SEM and XRD analysis.

#### ORCID

Oluwafemi Ayodeji Adebo Dhttp://orcid.org/0000-0002-3757-5137

#### REFERENCES

- Adebiyi, J. A., Obadina, A. O., Adebo, O. A., & Kayitesi, E. (in press). Fermented and malted millet products in Africa: Expedition from traditional/ethnic foods to industrial value added products. *Critical Reviews in Food Science & Nutrition*. Retrieved from https://doi.org/ 10.1080/10408398.2016.1188056
- Adebiyi, J. A., Obadina, A. O., Mulaba-Bafubiandi, A. F., Adebo, O. A., & Kayitesi, E. (2016). Effect of fermentation and malting on the microstructure and selected physicochemical properties of pearl millet (*Pennisetum glaucum*) flour and biscuit. *Journal of Cereal Science*, 70, 132–139.
- Ainsworth, E. A., & Gillespie, K. M. (2007). Estimation of total phenolic content and other oxidation substrates in plant tissues using Folin-Ciocalteu reagent. *Nature Protocols*, 2, 875–877.
- Adiana, M. A., & Mazura, M. P. (2011). Study on Senna alata and its different extracts by Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy and twodimensional correlation infrared spectroscopy. Journal of Molecular Structures, 991, 84–91.
- Amadou, I., Gounga, M. E., Shi, Y. H., & Le, G. W. (2014). Fermentation and heat moisture treatment induced changes on the physicochemical properties of foxtail millet (*Setaria italica*) flour. *Food and Bioproducts Processing*, 92, 38–45.

- Ar-Farsi, M. A., & Lee, C. Y. (2008). Optimization of phenolics and dietary fibre extracts from date seeds. *Food Chemistry*, 108, 977–985.
- Awika, J. M., & Rooney, L. W. (2004). Sorghum phytochemicals and their potential impact on human health. *Phytochemistry*, 65, 1199–1221.
- Awika, J. M., Rooney, L. W., Wu, X., Prior, R. L., & Zevallos, L. C. (2003). Screening methods to measure antioxidant activity of sorghum (Sorghum bicolor) and sorghum products. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry, 51, 6657–6662.
- Beta, T., Rooney, L. W., Marovatsanga, L. T., & Taylor, J. R. N. (2000). Effect of chemical treatments on polyphenols and malt quality in sorghum. *Journal of Cereal Science*, 31, 295–302.
- Desobgo, Z. S. C., Stafford, R. A., & Metcalfe, D. J. A. (2015). Dimethyl sulfide stripping behavior during wort boiling using response surface methodology. *Journal of the American Society of Brewing Chemists*, 73, 84–89.
- Duodu, K. G., Tang, H., Grant, A., Wellner, N., & Belton, P. S. (2001). FTIR and solid state <sup>13</sup>C NMR spectroscopy of proteins of wet cooked and popped sorghum and maize. *Journal of Cereal Science*, 33, 261–269.
- Ferreira, S. L. C., dos Santos, W. N. L., Quintella, C. M., Neto, B. B., & Bosque-Sendra, J. M. (2004). Doehlert matrix: A chemometric tool for analytic chemistry-review. *Talanta*, 63, 1061–1067.
- Filli, K. B., Nkama, I., Jideani, V. A., & Abubakar, U. M. (2011). Application of response surface methodology for the study of composition of extruded millet-cowpea mixtures for the manufacture of fura: A Nigerian food. *African Journal of Food Science*, *5*, 884–896.
- Kayitesi, E., de Kock, H. L., Minnaar, A., & Duodu, K. G. (2012). Nutritional quality and antioxidant activity of marama-sorghum composite flours and porridges. *Food Chemistry*, 131, 837–842.
- Madoroba, E., Steenkamp, E. T., Theron, J., Huys, G., Scheirlinck, I., & Cloete, T. E. (2009). Polyphasic taxonomic characterization of lactic acid bacteria isolated from spontaneous sorghum fermentations used to produce *ting*, a traditional South African food. *African Journal of Biotechnology*, *8*, 458–463.
- Madoroba, E., Steenkamp, E. T., Theron, J., Scheirlinck, I., Cloete, T. E., & Huys, G. (2011). Diversity and dynamics of bacterial populations during spontaneous sorghum fermentations used to produce *ting*, a South African food. *Systematic and Applied Microbiology*, 34, 227–234.
- Meroth, C. B., Hammes, W. P., & Hertel, C. (2003). Identification and population dynamics of yeasts in sourdough fermentation processes by PCR-denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis. *Applied Environmen*tal Microbiology, 69, 7453–7461.
- Njobeh, P. B., Dutton, M. F., Kock, S. H., Chuturgoon, A., Stoev, S., & Seifert, K. (2009). Contamination with storage fungi of human food from Cameroon. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 135, 193–198.
- Nyambane, B., Thari, W. M., Wangoh, J., & Njage, P. M. K. (2014). Lactic acid bacteria and yeasts involved in the fermentation of *amabere amaruranu*, a Kenyan fermented milk. *Food Science & Nutrition*, *2*, 692–699.
- Price, M. L., Van Scoyoc, S., & Butler, L. G. (1978). A critical evaluation of the vanillin reaction as an assay for tannin in sorghum grain. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 26, 1214–1218.
- Sekwati-Monang, B., & Gänzle, M. G. (2011). Microbiological and chemical characterization of *ting*, a sorghum-based sourdough product from Botswana. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 150, 115–121.

<sup>10 of 10</sup> WILEY

Journal of Food Processing and Preservation

- Sinelli, N., Spinardi, A., Di Egidio, V., Mignani, I., & Casiraghi, E. (2008). Evaluation of quality and nutraceutical content of blueberries (Vaccinium corymbosum L.) by near and mid-infrared spectroscopy. Postharvest Biology and Technology, 50, 31–36.
- Sobowale, S. S., Adebiyi, J. A., & Adebo, O. A. (in press). Optimization of blanching and frying conditions of deep-fat fried bonga fish (*Ethmalosa fimbriata*). Journal of Food Process Engineering. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1111/jfpe.12551
- Svensson, L., Sekwati-Monang, B., Lutz D. L., Schieber, A., & Gänzle, M. G. (2010). Phenolic acids and flavonoids in nonfermented and fermented red sorghum (Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench). Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry, 58, 9214–9220.
- Taylor, J. R. N., & Duodu, K. G. (2015). Effects of processing sorghum and millets on their phenolic phytochemicals and the implications of this to the health-enhancing properties of sorghum and millet food and beverage products. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, 95, 225–237.

#### SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Institute of Food Science

Additional Supporting Information may be found online in the supporting information tab for this article.

How to cite this article: Adebo OA, Njobeh PB, Mulaba-Bafubiandi AF, Adebiyi JA, Desobgo ZSC, Kayitesi E. Optimization of fermentation conditions for *ting* production using response surface methodology. *J Food Process Preserv*. 2018;42:e13381. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/jfpp.13381</u>