

Print ISSN : 0972-8813  
e-ISSN : 2582-2780

[Vol. 21(2) May-August 2023]

# Pantnagar Journal of Research

(Formerly International Journal of Basic and  
Applied Agricultural Research ISSN : 2349-8765)



G.B. Pant University of Agriculture & Technology, Pantnagar



## **ADVISORYBOARD**

### **Patron**

Dr. Manmohan Singh Chauhan, Vice-Chancellor, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

### **Members**

Dr. A.S. Nain, Ph.D., Director Research, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. J.P. Jaiswal, Ph.D., Director, Extension Education, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. S.K. Kashyap, Ph.D., Dean, College of Agriculture, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. S.P. Singh, Ph.D., Dean, College of Veterinary & Animal Sciences, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. K.P. Raverkar, Ph.D., Dean, College of Post Graduate Studies, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. Sandeep Arora, Ph.D., Dean, College of Basic Sciences & Humanities, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. Alaknanda Ashok, Ph.D., Dean, College of Technology, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. Alka Goel, Ph.D., Dean, College of Home Science, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. Malobica Das Trakroo, Ph.D., Dean, College of Fisheries, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. R.S. Jadoun, Ph.D., Dean, College of Agribusiness Management, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

## **EDITORIALBOARD**

### **Members**

Prof. A.K. Misra, Ph.D., Chairman, Agricultural Scientists Recruitment Board, Krishi Anusandhan Bhavan I, New Delhi, India

Dr. Anand Shukla, Director, Reefberry Foodex Pvt. Ltd., Veraval, Gujarat, India

Dr. Anil Kumar, Ph.D., Director, Education, Rani Lakshmi Bai Central Agricultural University, Jhansi, India

Dr. Ashok K. Mishra, Ph.D., Kemper and Ethel Marley Foundation Chair, W P Carey Business School, Arizona State University, U.S.A

Dr. B.B. Singh, Ph.D., Visiting Professor and Senior Fellow, Dept. of Soil and Crop Sciences and Borlaug Institute for International Agriculture, Texas A&M University, U.S.A.

Prof. Binod Kumar Kanaujia, Ph.D., Professor, School of Computational and Integrative Sciences, Jawahar Lal Nehru University, New Delhi, India

Dr. D. Ratna Kumari, Ph.D., Associate Dean, College of Community / Home Science, PJTSAU, Hyderabad, India

Dr. Deepak Pant, Ph.D., Separation and Conversion Technology, Flemish Institute for Technological Research (VITO), Belgium

Dr. Desirazu N. Rao, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Biochemistry, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India

Dr. G.K. Garg, Ph.D., Dean (Retired), College of Basic Sciences & Humanities, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. Humnath Bhandari, Ph.D., IRRRI Representative for Bangladesh, Agricultural Economist, Agrifood Policy Platform, Philippines

Dr. Indu S Sawant, Ph.D., Director, ICAR - National Research Centre for Grapes, Pune, India

Dr. Kuldeep Singh, Ph.D., Director, ICAR - National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi, India

Dr. M.P. Pandey, Ph.D., Ex. Vice Chancellor, BAU, Ranchi & IGKV, Raipur and Director General, IAT, Allahabad, India

Dr. Martin Mortimer, Ph.D., Professor, The Centre of Excellence for Sustainable Food Systems, University of Liverpool, United Kingdom

Dr. Muneshwar Singh, Ph.D., Project Coordinator AICRP- LTFE, ICAR - Indian Institute of Soil Science, Bhopal, India

Prof. Omkar, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Zoology, University of Lucknow, India

Dr. P.C. Srivastav, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Soil Science, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

Dr. Prashant Srivastava, Ph.D., Cooperative Research Centre for Contamination Assessment and Remediation of the Environment, University of South Australia, Australia

Dr. Puneet Srivastava, Ph.D., Director, Water Resources Center, Butler-Cunningham Eminent Scholar, Professor, Biosystems Engineering, Auburn University, U.S.A.

Dr. R.C. Chaudhary, Ph.D., Chairman, Participatory Rural Development Foundation, Gorakhpur, India

Dr. R.K. Singh, Ph.D., Director & Vice Chancellor, ICAR-Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, U.P., India

Prof. Ramesh Kanwar, Ph.D., Charles F. Curtiss Distinguished Professor of Water Resources Engineering, Iowa State University, U.S.A.

Dr. S.N. Maurya, Ph.D., Professor (Retired), Department of Gynecology & Obstetrics, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. Sham S. Goyal, Ph.D., Professor (Retired), Faculty of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, University of California, Davis, U.S.A.

Prof. Umesh Varshney, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Microbiology and Cell Biology, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India

Prof. V.D. Sharma, Ph.D., Dean Academics, SAI Group of Institutions, Dehradun, India

Dr. V.K. Singh, Ph.D., Head, Division of Agronomy, ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, India

Dr. Vijay P. Singh, Ph.D., Distinguished Professor, Caroline and William N. Lehrer Distinguished Chair in Water Engineering, Department of Biological Agricultural Engineering, Texas A&M University, U.S.A.

Dr. Vinay Mehrotra, Ph.D., President, Vinlax Canada Inc., Canada

### **Editor-in-Chief**

Dr. Manoranjan Dutta, Head Crop Improvement Division (Retd.), National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi, India

### **Managing Editor**

Dr. S.N. Tiwari, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Entomology, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

### **Assistant Managing Editor**

Dr. Jyotsna Yadav, Ph.D., Research Editor, Directorate of Research, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

### **Technical Manager**

Dr. S.D. Samantray, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

# PANTNAGAR JOURNAL OF RESEARCH

Vol. 21(2)

May-August, 2023

## CONTENTS

<b>Evaluation of seed quality parameters in forage oat (<i>Avena sativa</i> L.) germplasm</b> HARSHITA NEGI, VAIBHAV BIST, AKIRTI BALLABH and BIRENDRA PRASAD	129
<b>Mepiquat Chloride: An effective plant growth regulator to improve growth and productivity of rice in North-Western Himalayan region of India</b> S. K. YADAV, D. K. SINGH, KIRTI SHARMA, PRATIMA ARYA, SUPRIYA TRIPATHI and YOGESH SHARMA	135
<b>Performance of Integrated Nutrient Management for yield and Net Income of lentil (<i>Lens culinaris Medik</i>)</b> KUMARI ANJALI and HIMANSHU VERMA	141
<b>Potential and scope of Agarwood (<i>Aquilaria malaccensis</i> lamk.) cultivation in India</b> SNEHA DOBHALL, DURGA BAHUGUNA, REETIKA BINJOLA, GARIMA BHATT, RAJ KUMAR, AYUSH JOSHI, KANICA UPADHYAY and NEELAM CHAUHAN	145
<b>Effect of transplanting date on incidence of insect pests of rice</b> R. DOGRA and A. K. PANDEY	154
<b>Measuring the antixenosis responses of <i>Spodoptera litura</i> larvae to different soybean germplasms by leaf choice method</b> ASHUTOSH and NEETA GAUR	170
<b>Long term efficacy of different herbal fumigants against <i>Rhyzopertha dominica</i> (Fabricius) and <i>Tribolium castaneum</i> (Herbst)</b> DEEPA KUMARI and S. N. TIWARI	174
<b>Screening of different combinations of <i>Trichoderma harzanium</i> and <i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> for growth promotion activity in rice plants under glass house conditions</b> SAPNA, BHUPESH CHANDRA KABDWAL and ROOPALI SHARMA	186
<b>Role of Fungal Effector Proteins for Disease Expression in Plants</b> HINA KAUSAR, GEETA SHARMA and BHAGYASHREE BHATT	191
<b>Effect of biostimulants and biofertilizer on performance of rose cv. Rose Sherbet</b> LOLLA RACHANA, V. K. RAO and D. C. DIMRI	203
<b>A Review-Tomato quality as influenced by preharvest factors</b> H.N. PRASAD, BANKEY LAL, SUNITA BHANDARI, RAKESH BHARGAVA, VIPUL PRATAP SINGH and ANSHU KAMBOJ	209
<b>Effect of ZnO Nanoparticles on Macronutrients Content of <i>Pleurotus sajor-caju</i> (Oyster Mushroom)</b> LEEMA and H. PUNETHA	218
<b>Nutritional, sensory and shelf-life analysis of pearl millet-based value-added biscuits enriched with <i>jamun</i> seed powder</b> SAVITA, AMITA BENIWAL, VEENU SANGWAN and ASHA KAWATRA	224
<b>Quality characteristics of low salt functional chicken meat patties incorporated with Barnyard Millet</b> DEEPSHIKHA SINGH, ANITA ARYA, P. PRABHAKARAN, P.K. SINGH, SHIVE KUMAR, N.C. HAHN and A.K. UPADHYAY	234



<b>Effect of supplementation of tulsi (<i>Ocimum sanctum</i>) leaf powder on growth performance in commercial broiler</b>	239
SURAJ GAJANAN MADAVI, RAJKUMAR1, KARTIK TOMAR, SHIWANSHU TIWARI, D.S. SAHU, S.P. YADAV and GULAB CHANDRA	
<b>Combating antimicrobial resistance through gene silencing</b>	246
BEENU JAIN, ANUJ TEWARI, ANUPRIYA MISRA and YASHOVARDHAN MISRA	
<b>Effect of aluminium nano particles on humoral immune response of wistar rats</b>	256
SHODHAN K.V, SEEMA AGARWAL and R S CHAUHAN	
<b>Effect of nano zinc on body weight and behaviour of Wistar rats</b>	262
ABHIVYAKTI PATHAK, SEEMA AGARWAL and R.S. CHAUHAN	
<b>The growth potential of thermophilic Campylobacters on various culture media</b>	267
NAWAL KISHOR SINGH, A. K. UPADHYAY, MAANSI, AMAN KAMBOJ and AJAY KUMAR	
<b>Meta-analysis of rabies diagnostic tests in dogs</b>	271
A. K. UPADHYAY, R. S. CHAUHAN, MAANSI and N. K. SINGH	
<b>Growth Performance of <i>Schizothorax richardsonii</i> fingerlings with different feeding strategies</b>	274
TOSHIBAA, DIKSHA ARYA, SUMIT KUMAR, H.C.S BISHT and N.N. PANDEY	
<b>Observation of fish mortality in the mudflat of Siruthalaikadu Creek, Palk Bay, Southeast Coast of India</b>	279
ABINAYA R, KANISHKAR A and SAJEEVAN MK	
<b>Physiochemical properties of pretreated tomato powder from different drying technique</b>	282
SHRADDHA SETHI and NEERAJ SETHI	
<b>A Review: Energy analysis of different fodder crop production in India</b>	290
RAHUL KUMAR YADAV, RAVI PRATAP SINGH, ANIL KUMAR and SAURABH KUMAR SINGH	
<b>A review on current scenario of paddy straw management machineries: Viable solution for in-situ residue management</b>	297
VISHNU JI AWASTHI, RAJ NARAYAN PATERIYA, ABHISHEK MISHRA, KETAN BHIBHISHAN PHALPHALE and ABHINAV KUMAR	
<b>Field evaluation of Tractor-Operated Pneumatic Planter for maize crop planting</b>	305
AMIT KUMAR, JAYAN P R and VISHNU JI AWASTHI	
<b>Assessing flood inundation for breach of Jamrani Dam, Uttarakhand using HEC-RAS 2D</b>	314
JYOTHI PRASAD, LOVEJEET SINGH and SHIVA PRASAD H.J	
<b>Attitude and constraints faced by the beneficiaries of Pradhan Mantri Krishi Sinchayee Yojana in Garhwal region of Uttarakhand</b>	320
TRIPTI KHOLIA and ARPITA SHARMA KANDPAL	
<b>Effectiveness of participatory newsletter on honey production: A study in Nainital district of Uttarakhand</b>	327
MALIK, AAFREEN, ANSARI, M.A. and AMARDEEP	
<b>Food habits of farm women and their haemoglobin level</b>	322
REETA DEVI YADAV, S.K. GANGWAR, CHELPURI RAMULU and ANUPAMA KUMARI	

## Quality characteristics of low salt functional chicken meat patties incorporated with Barnyard Millet

DEEPSHIKHA SINGH<sup>1\*</sup>, ANITA ARYA<sup>1</sup>, P. PRABHAKARAN<sup>1</sup>, P.K. SINGH<sup>1</sup>, SHIVE KUMAR<sup>2</sup>, N.C. HAH<sup>3</sup> and A.K. UPADHYAY<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Department of Livestock Products Technology, <sup>4</sup>Department of Veterinary Public Health and Epidemiology, College of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, <sup>3</sup>Department of Department of Post Harvest Process and Food Engineering, College of Technology, G B Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar-263145, (U.S. Nagar, Uttarakhand)

\*Corresponding author's email Id: deepshikhasingh46@gmail.com

**ABSTRACT:** This study has been undertaken to develop low-salt functional chicken patties(T1) incorporated with barnyard millet based on a sensory optimization trial. The developed patties were further coated with sodium alginate edible coating (T2) and compared with control patties C (patties with no functional ingredient and sodium alginate coating) and T1. The pH, protein, moisture, fat, ash, and fiber content of the 3 treatments were evaluated. The results revealed that there was no significant difference ( $p>0.05$ ) in pH and fat content among all three treatments. The protein and moisture content of T1 and T2 was significantly lower than C. The fiber content of T1 and T2 was significantly higher( $p<0.05$ ) than that of the control. There was no significant difference ( $p>0.05$ ) between T1 and T2 for all the parameters of proximate composition and pH. This study revealed that 6% barnyard millet can be successfully incorporated into chicken patties without causing any significant change in the sensory attributes, proximate composition, and pH of the product.

**Key words:** Barnyard Millet, chicken patties, functional meat products

Reformulation of meat products to a healthier and sustainable version can help meet the sustainable development goals. It is done through the reduction of harmful saturated fatty acids, salt, and cholesterol and the incorporation of functional ingredients like plant carbohydrates, fiber, plant protein, and oil sources (Pintado and Delgado-Pando, 2020). High salt (NaCl) content in processed meats is linked to deteriorating effects on health like increased blood pressure which is linked to cardiovascular diseases (Aprilia and Kim, 2022). Partial replacement of sodium chloride (NaCl) with potassium chloride (KCl) can help in minimizing the negative effects of sodium chloride on health. Millets are nourishing and have substantial health benefits, which explains why they are used in multigrain and gluten-free cereal products. In addition to their nutritional benefits, millets include several phytochemicals, especially phenolic compounds, which are helpful for treating metabolic diseases like diabetes, cancer, and cardiovascular diseases. Barnyard millet is mostly grown in India in two distinct agroecology, one in the Deccan plateau area in Tamil Nadu and

another in the Himalayan region of Uttarakhand. Barnyard millet is one of the earliest domesticated millets of Asia and Africa (Sood *et al.*, 2015). The millet had 10.5% protein 3.6% fat, 68.8% carbohydrate, and 398 kcal/100 g energy. The total dietary fiber content is high (12.6%) including soluble (4.2%) and insoluble (8.4%) fractions (Ugare *et al.*, 2014).

Meat products that are extended with millets provide a mixture of plant and animal-based proteins as well as dietary fiber, which is lacking in meat. Dietary fibre incorporated meat products can help in decreasing LDL-cholesterol, and diet-related diseases like diabetes, obesity, cardiac diseases, constipation, etc. (Angulo-López *et al.*, 2022). Dietary fiber supplementation via millets in meat products increases the bulk and reduces cooking loss by enhancing water-binding capabilities (Amadi *et al.*, 2022).

Naveena *et al.* (2006) reported that chicken patties formulated with ragi flour had less reduction in

diameter and thickness after cooking. Moreover, the fiber and calcium content of chicken cutlets prepared with finger millet flour was greater than control samples which is desirable to make food nutritious. Kumar *et al.* (2015) reported that chevon patties fortified with finger millet flour had good fibre content.

A thin layer of sodium alginate edible coating on the food surface can help increase its shelf life as it acts as a barrier between food and spoilage organisms present in the environment like bacteria, fungus, etc (Song *et al.*, 2011).

Barnyard millet is an underutilized food resource and has considerable potential to be used in human food. This study was done with the objective of preparing coated (sodium alginate edible coating) and uncoated low-salt functional chicken patties containing an optimized concentration of Barnyard Millet.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### *Location of experiment*

The experiment was conducted in the Department of Livestock Products Technology, College of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, G.B.P.U.A.T.

### *Sources of Material*

The fresh chicken meat was purchased from the Local market, Pantnagar, and brought to the lab within one hour, packaged airtight in low-density polyethylene bags (LDPE) and stored at -20 °C till further use.

### *Spices and condiments mix*

Spice mix and condiments (garlic, black pepper, chili, and ginger) were purchased from a local market. Test ingredient Barnyard Millet, Rice bran oil was purchased from local market.

### *Chemicals*

All the chemicals were of analytical grade and

procured from Hi media® Mumbai and Merck® Mumbai.

### *Preparation of chicken patties*

Low Salt Functional Chicken Meat Patties Incorporated with Barnyard Millet were prepared by sensory optimization trials with varying concentrations of the millet (Table 1).

Boneless meat was minced via a 6mm plate, all the ingredients were mixed at specific concentrations in different treatments to form meat batter. Meat batter was placed in a mould to get the desired shape after which they were cooked in an oven at 160 °C. One side was cooked for 15 minutes and the other side was cooked for 10 minutes. It was ensured that the internal temperature of the cooked patties reaches at least 70 °C (Talukder and Sharma, 2010). After the optimization trials, chicken patties with optimum content of Barnyard Millet were selected for further analysis.

### *Preparation of chicken patties with sodium alginate edible coating*

2.5 grams of sodium alginate was dissolved in 100 ml of distilled water (80°C) to form the coating solution. Chicken patties were dipped in the coating

**Table 1: Composition of chicken patties**

Ingredients (%)	C	T <sub>A</sub>	T <sub>B</sub>	T <sub>C</sub>	T <sub>D</sub>
Lean chicken meat	67.2	64.2	61.2	58.2	55.2
Refined soyabean oil	10	0	0	0	0
Rice bran oil*	0	10	10	10	10
Water	10	10	10	10	10
Ginger+ Garlic+	5	5	5	5	5
Onion(1:1:2)					
Refined wheat flour	4	4	4	4	4
Spice Mixture	2	2	2	2	2
Salt (NaCl)	1.5	0	0	0	0
Low sodium Salt	0	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
(NaCl:KCl: 1:1)*					
Sodium tripolyphosphate	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Barnyard millet*	0	3	6	9	12

\*functional ingredients; C: chicken patties, T<sub>A</sub>: chicken patties +barnyard millet 3%, T<sub>B</sub>: chicken patties +barnyard millet 6%, T<sub>C</sub>: chicken patties+ barnyard millet 9%, T<sub>D</sub>: chicken patties+ barnyard millet 12%

**Table 2: Effect of different levels of barnyard millet on the sensory score of chicken patties**

Parameter	Appearance	Texture	Juiciness	Flavor	Overall acceptability
C	7.28±0.15 <sup>a</sup>	7.28±0.17 <sup>a</sup>	7.88±0.05 <sup>a</sup>	7.48±0.07 <sup>a</sup>	7.54±0.17 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>A</sub>	7.25±0.12 <sup>a</sup>	7.25±0.18 <sup>a</sup> 505	7.85±0.02 <sup>a</sup>	7.55±0.18 <sup>a</sup>	7.55±0.18 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>B</sub>	7.62±0.02 <sup>b</sup>	7.77±0.05 <sup>b</sup>	7.56±0.04 <sup>a</sup>	7.92±0.15 <sup>b</sup>	7.9±0.05 <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>C</sub>	6.12±0.02 <sup>c</sup>	6.00±0.05 <sup>c</sup>	6.22±0.04 <sup>b</sup>	6.00±0.15 <sup>c</sup>	6.51±0.05 <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>D</sub>	5.14±0.02 <sup>d</sup>	5.64±0.09 <sup>d</sup>	5.14±0.02 <sup>c</sup>	5.04±0.19 <sup>d</sup>	5.24±0.09 <sup>d</sup>

Mean ± SE, bearing small alphabet superscripts column-wise differ significantly ( $P < 0.05$ ); C: chicken patties, T<sub>A</sub>: Chicken patties + Barnyard millet 3%, T<sub>B</sub>: Chicken patties + Barnyard millet 6%, T<sub>C</sub>: Chicken patties + Barnyard millet 9%, T<sub>D</sub>: Chicken patties + Barnyard millet 12%

solution for 1 minute followed by draining for 2 minutes. Further, the patties were dipped in a 2 % calcium carbonate solution to ensure proper bond formation (Racisi *et al.*, 2016). The final treatments include C (chicken patties without barnyard millet and edible coating), T<sub>1</sub> (chicken patties with barnyard millet), and T<sub>2</sub> (barnyard millet incorporated chicken patties coated with 2.5% sodium alginate).

### Analytical Tests

Estimation of moisture, ash, fat, crude fiber, and protein was done according to the method given in (AOAC, 2000). For pH determination, each sample was first blended with distilled water, 5 times the weight of the sample to produce a uniform suspension. The pH was recorded by a digital pH meter (Reddy *et al.*, 2023). Sensory evaluation was done based on different attributes like appearance, flavor, juiciness, texture, and overall palatability, and 8 points descriptive scale was used which ranged from extremely desirable to extremely poor (Keeton,

1983).

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3%, 6%, 9%, and 12% levels of barnyard millet were selected for final optimization in chicken patties. Mean ± SE values of sensory scores are presented in Table 2

Results revealed a significant difference ( $P < 0.05$ ) in appearance, flavor, texture, juiciness, and overall acceptability of control and treatments. T<sub>2</sub> had a better appearance, texture, flavor, and overall acceptability than C, T<sub>A</sub>, T<sub>C</sub>, and T<sub>D</sub>. There was no significant ( $P > 0.05$ ) difference between T<sub>A</sub> and C for all the sensory properties. Moreover, there was no significant ( $P > 0.05$ ) difference in the juiciness score of C, T<sub>A</sub>, and T<sub>B</sub>. The unique grainy and gritty texture of the millet helps to impart desirable sensory properties. The water-holding capacity of millet flour increases the juiciness of developed meat (Talukder and Sharma, 2015). In a study conducted by Gorachiya *et al.* (2022), it was found that the sensory properties of low-fat chicken sausage incorporated with ragi flour (millet) decreased with an increase in the concentration of millet. Gamit *et al.* (2020) reported that chicken meat cutlets with the optimized level (5%) of finger millet flour did not show a significant effect on any of the sensory parameters.

The proximate composition and pH values are given in Table 3. The results revealed that the protein content (19.22%) of C was significantly higher ( $p < 0.05$ ) than T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub>. Sharma *et al.* (2014) reported the percentage of protein in flax seed flour added restructured mutton chops, which was highest

**Table 3: Proximate composition and pH values of chicken patties**

Parameters	C	T <sub>1</sub>	T <sub>2</sub>
Protein%	19.22±0.27 <sup>a</sup>	18.42±0.095 <sup>b</sup>	18.45±0.098 <sup>b</sup>
Fat%	7.12±0.38 <sup>a</sup>	6.99 ±0.22 <sup>a</sup>	7.19±0.17 <sup>a</sup>
Moisture%	69.19±0.12 <sup>a</sup>	61.47±0.03 <sup>b</sup>	61.61±0.022 <sup>b</sup>
Ash%	2.38±0.019 <sup>a</sup>	2.8±0.016 <sup>b</sup>	2.9±0.007 <sup>b</sup>
Fibre%	0.29±0.002 <sup>a</sup>	1.79±0.011 <sup>b</sup>	1.79±0.016 <sup>b</sup>
pH	6.12±0.005 <sup>a</sup>	6.14±0.003 <sup>a</sup>	6.10±0.003 <sup>a</sup>

mean ± SE values bearing different superscript row-wise by small alphabets (a,b,c) differ significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) C- chicken patties with no barnyard millet, T<sub>1</sub> – low salt chicken patties with 6% barnyard millet, T<sub>2</sub>- low salt chicken patties with 6% barnyard millet coated with sodium alginate

in control and decreased slightly due to the replacement of lean meat with a fat-rich ingredients like palmitic, linoleic, and oleic acid (Ugare *et al.*, 2014). There was no significant difference ( $p>0.05$ ) in the fat content of the C, T1, and T2. The moisture content of T1 and T2 was significantly lower than the control. This might be due to an increment in dry matter in the patties formulation due to added barnyard millet. Dried millets are hydrophobic in nature due which leads to the decreased moisture content of functional patties. Similar findings were reported by Turhan *et al.*, (2005) for beef burgers incorporated with hazelnut pellicle. The total ash content of T1 and T2 was significantly higher ( $P<0.05$ ) than C. It is due to the addition of millet increasing the dry matter content of the patties thereby increasing the ash content. In a study conducted by Santhi *et al.* (2020) inclusion of pearl millet had enhanced the total ash content of chicken meatballs. The crude fiber content was significantly higher in T1 and T2 ( $P<0.05$ ) as compared to C. This increment might be due to the replacement of lean meat with barnyard millet, which is an excellent dietary fiber source (12.6 %) Although meat is a poor source of fibre however, a small amount of fiber content noticed in control was due to the addition of spices and condiments during the processing of patties. Chatli *et al.* (2015) developed functional emu meat nuggets incorporated with finger millet flour (FMF) at 4, 6, and 8 percent levels, the crude fiber content increased significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) with the increasing levels of incorporation. In a study conducted by Santhi *et al.* (2020) inclusion of pearl millet enhanced the fiber content of chicken meatballs. There was no significant difference ( $p>0.05$ ) in the pH value of all 3 treatments.

## CONCLUSION

Based on sensory scores, it was found that barnyard millet at a concentration of 6% can be successfully added to develop functional chicken patties. The protein content of both sodium alginate-coated and uncoated functional chicken patties was found to be less than that of control. The ash content of patties containing barnyard millet was higher than the control sample. Both coated and uncoated functional

chicken patties had significantly higher crude fiber content. However, there was non-significant difference between T1 and T2, which means that the application of sodium alginate edible coating on functional chicken patties does not cause any significant change in proximate composition. Thus, it may be concluded that the chicken patties with acceptable sensory and proximate characteristics can be prepared by incorporating 6% barnyard millet.

## REFERENCES

- Amadi, G.A., China, M.A.H., Ujong, A.E. and Christian, M. (2022). Effect of African Yam Bean Flour as an Extender on the Physicochemical and Sensory Properties of Cooked Beef Sausage. *European Journal of Nutrition and Food Safety*, 14(7): 13-23.
- Angulo-López, J.E., Flores-Gallegos, A.C., Ascacio-Valdes, J.A., Contreras Esquivel, J.C., Torres-León, C., Rúelas-Chácon, X. and Aguilar, C.N. (2022). Antioxidant dietary fiber sourced from agroindustrial byproducts and its applications. *Foods*, 12(1): 159.
- AOAC (2000) Official methods of analysis, 17th ed. Washington, DC: Association of Official Analytical Chemists.
- Aprilia, G.H.S. and Kim, H.S. (2022). Development of strategies to manufacture low-salt meat products—a review. *Journal of Animal Science and Technology*, 64(2): 218.
- Chatli, M.K., Kumar, P., Mehta, N., Verma, A.K., Kumar, D. and Malav, O.P. (2015). Quality characteristics and storage stability of emu meat nuggets formulated with finger millet (*Eleusine coracana*) flour. *Nutrition and Food Science*, 45(5): 740-752.
- Gamit, M., Gupta, S. and Savalia, C.V. (2020). Quality characteristics of chicken meat cutlets incorporated with finger millet (*Eleusine coracana*) flour. *Journal of Animal Research*, 10(1): 111-116.
- Gorachiya, P.R., Bais, B., Pathak, V. and Goswami, M. (2022). Quality Evaluation of Low Fat Chicken Sausages Fortified with Dietary Fibre. *Journal of Animal Research*, 12(3):



- 421-428.
- Keeton, J.T. (1983). Effects of fat and NaCl/phosphate levels on the chemical and sensory properties of pork patties. *Journal of Food Science*, 48(3):878-881.
- Kumar, D., Chatli, M.K., Mehta, N., Verma, A.K. and Kumar, P. (2015). Quality evaluation of chevon patties fortified with dietary fibre. *Indian Journal of Small Ruminants*, 21(1): 85-91.
- Naveena, B.M., Muthukumar, M., Sen, A.R., Babji, Y. and Murthy, T.R.K. (2006). Quality characteristics and storage stability of chicken patties formulated with finger millet flour (*Eleusine coracana*). *Journal of Muscle Foods*, 17(1): 92-104.
- Pintado, T. and Delgado-Pando, G. (2020). Towards more sustainable meat products: Extenders as a way of reducing meat content. *Foods*, 9(8): 1044.
- Racisi, M., Tabaraei, A., Hashemi, M. and Behnampour, N. (2016). Effect of sodium alginate coating incorporated with nisin, *Cinnamomum zeylanicum*, and rosemary essential oils on microbial quality of chicken meat and fate of *Listeria monocytogenes* during refrigeration. *Int. J. Food Microbiol*, 238:139-145.
- Reddy, G.B., Natha Reddy, K.V. and Amaravathi, P. (2023). Quality characteristics and ultra structural changes of restructured buffalo meat slices with flax seed flour as binder: A novel value-added technology. *Emirates Journal of Food and Agriculture*, 35:342-350.
- Santhi, D., Kalaikannan, A. and Natarajan, A. (2020). Characteristics and composition of emulsion based functional low fat chicken meat balls fortified with dietary fiber sources. *Journal of Food Process Engineering*, 43(3): 13333.
- Sharma, H., Sharma, B.D., Mendiratta, S.K., Talukder, S. and Ramasamy, G. (2014). Efficacy of flax seed flour as bind enhancing agent on the quality of extended restructured mutton chops. *Asian-Australasian Journal of Animal Sciences*, 27(2): 247.
- Song, Y., Liu, L., Shen, H., You, J. and Luo, Y. (2011). Effect of sodium alginate-based edible coating containing different antioxidants on quality and shelf life of refrigerated bream (*Megalobrama amblycephala*). *Food Control*, 22(3-4): 608-615.
- Sood, S., Khulbe, R.K., Gupta, A.K., Agrawal, P.K., Upadhyaya, H.D. and Bhatt, J.C. (2015). Barnyard millet—a potential food and feed crop of future. *Plant Breeding*, 134(2): 135-147.
- Talukder, S. and Sharma, D.P. (2010). Development of dietary fiber-rich chicken meat patties using wheat and oat bran. *Journal of Food Science and Technology*, 47: 224-229.
- Turhan, S., Sagir, I. and Ustun, N.S. (2005). Utilization of hazelnut pellicle in low-fat beefburgers. *Meat Science*, 71(2): 312-316.
- Ugare, R., Chimmad, B., Naik, R., Bharati, P. and Itagi, S. (2014). Glycemic index and significance of barnyard millet (*Echinochloa frumentacae*) in type II diabetics. *Journal of Food Science and Technology*, 51: 392-395.

Received: July 19, 2023

Accepted: August 10, 2023