



Physico-Chemical, Functional and Antioxidant Evaluation of Some Gluten-free Flours Formulas Compared with Available Commercial Formula

Mahmoud Hussein Abdelmeguid^{a*}, F. A. H. El-Soukkary^b, E. A. EL-Naggar^a
and R. R. Abdelsalam^b

¹ Food Science and Technology Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Al-Azher Assiut University, Assiut, Egypt.

² Food Science Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Minia University, Minia, Egypt.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJACR/2022/v11i130245

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/84527>

Original Research Article

Received 20 November 2021

Accepted 22 January 2022

Published 25 January 2022

ABSTRACT

Gluten-free (GF) products are made using commercial flours formulas and are poor in protein, fiber, minerals and have weak physical properties that affect the quality of the final products. These factors are responsible for hampering adherence to the GF diet and for general dissatisfaction. The aim of this work was to evaluate the physio-chemical, functional and antioxidant evaluation of some combinations of GF flours formulas that have been prepared compared with available GF commercial flour formula in the local market. The moisture content of Gluten-free flour (GFF) formula sold in the local market used in the research was 12.60%. On the other hand, the prepared formulas' moisture content ranged from 12.23% (F2) to 12.90% (F3). The highest protein content was recorded with F2 and F4 formulas with no significant difference ($p < 0.05$). Gluten-free flour formula had the lowest protein content (5.07% on a dry weight basis (DWB)). In comparison to control (GFF), the amount of ash and crude fiber recorded in F2 doubled. The ash and crude fiber contents of the various formulas differed significantly. The GFF had the lowest ash and crude fiber content (0.51 and 0.31%, respectively on DWB). The highest values of total phenolic compound and antioxidant activity was observed in the F2 formula (313.15 mg/100g and 7.95%, respectively), followed by the F4 formula (226.56 mg/100g and 7.22%, respectively), then the F1 formula (223.57

*Corresponding author: Email: dr.mahmoud88m@gmail.com;

mg/100g and 6.62%, respectively) on DWB. While, the lowest value was in the commercial flour formula sold in the local market (GFF) (75.10 mg/100g and 3.23%, respectively) on DWB. Gluten-free flours formulas exhibited high values for the water holding capacity in samples F2 (164.98%) and F1 (134.17%). While, GFF commercial flour formula showed lower water binding capacity in comparison to other GF flours formulas. Significant differences in the oil holding capacity of GF flours formulas were also observed. The mean values showed higher oil holding capacity for F2 (145.92%), followed by F4 (138.51%), F1 (130.11%) and F3 (126.64%), whereas, the lowest 75.43% was for GFF. The GF composite flour samples have close values and non-significant variations at $p \leq 0.05$ in the protein solubility. The increase in the values of emulsion stability and foam stability determined for GF flours formulas were significant at $p \leq 0.05$ as compared with those determined for the GFF commercial flour formula sample.

Keywords: Formulas; GF commercial flour; gluten-free; local market; products.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the last two decades, there has been an upsurge in the demand for gluten-free (GF) products. The main origin of the GF trend can be traced to increased diagnosis of celiac disease (CD); a genetic enteropathy characterized by the inability to digest gluten proteins that are present in certain seeds such as wheat, barley, and rye, and in minors grains like oat, triticale and spelled [1,2].

The population of the world suffering from celiac, gluten intolerance, and wheat allergy is 1-2 in every 100 people. Also, many are choosing GF diets nowadays because of the perception that it is a healthier option for them. Therefore, in the last decade, the GF market all over the world has seen significant growth. Globally, GF product sales reached 4.63 billion USD in 2017, and are expected to reach 6.47 billion USD by 2023 [3].

Despite the growth of the GF market, individuals with CD still have trouble finding GF products because they are not widely available, poor in quality and more expensive than gluten-containing products, and may lead to nutritional deficiencies in micronutrients and fiber [4].

Studies have assessed the nutritional quality and adequacy of a GF diet and the results reflected the fact that GF products are not nutritionally superior compared to than gluten-containing products. Many GF foods were found to be deficient in several nutrients, contained significantly lower protein, fiber and minerals and possess higher fat and carbohydrates content [5,6]. The findings also indicated that GF diet was associated with higher energy [7]. It has been highlighted that the ideal GF diet should be nutrient-dense with naturally GF foods, balanced with macro- and micronutrients as well as

reasonable in priced, and readily available [8]. In another study, the sensory properties of GF food were found to be effective not only for celiac patients but also for non-celiac consumers' compliance with the GF diet [9].

Between 20 and 38% of patients with CD have complications due to nutritional deficiencies, likely to be caused by GF foodstuffs having poor nutrition, or an imbalanced diet outside of GF foods [10,11].

The GF diet has a high carbohydrate and saturated fat content, but a low protein, fiber and micronutrients contents. Therefore, is not simple to stick to a GF diet for celiac patients. Consequently, most patients are more vulnerable to nutrient-related deficiencies such as osteoporosis, anemia, and failure to thrive [12].

More recently however, GF cereals have been used to develop novel bread, pasta, breakfast cereals and puffed snacks. Many of these ingredients are grain-based. Some have comparable or even better nutrient profile than traditional gluten grains like wheat and barley, and they are very rich in phytochemicals that are important to the health of consumers [13]. Alternative flours that are being researched include pseudocereals (quinoa, amaranth, buckwheat), cereals (millet, sorghum, teff, maize, rice), legumes (chickpea, soy, carob germ), among others [14].

In order to compensate for the lack of gluten protein and to counteract the technological problems, several additives such as hydrocolloids, emulsifiers, enzymes, dairy proteins, etc. have been employed in GF formulations [15]. Hydrocolloids are long-chain polymers formed by polysaccharides and proteins. Their ability to modify rheological

properties in the dough is what makes them valuable functional ingredients in making GF bread [16].

Gluten-free products can also be produced with a combination of alternative flour or flour and starch types, as starches can be used in GF products because they provide better hydrolysis and improved gelatinization behavior. Rice, corn, potato, cassava, sorghum, and tapioca have been widely used as starches types in GF formulations [15].

The aim of this work was to evaluate the physiochemical, functional and antioxidant in some combinations of GF flours formulas that have been prepared compared with available GF commercial flour formula in the local market; for overcoming the drawbacks associated with GF commercial flour formula and finding alternative sources rich in various micronutrients that has good functional properties that do not affect the quality of the final products, which can helps the consumers to adhere to a GF diet.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Materials

Sample material investigated are the most commonly used components in the composition of GF products like: rice, quinoa, buckwheat, millet, chickpeas flours and corn starch was purchased from Agricultural Research Center, Giza, Egypt. While, GF flour product (GFF) was purchased from the local market at Assiut governorate, Egypt. Xanthan gum (XG) was obtained from Sigma Company, Germany.

Gluten-free flour (GFF) formula sold in the local market consists of flour blend of brown rice, white rice, quinoa flour and corn starch, in addition to Arabic gum used in this research. While, GF flour formulas were made from rice, quinoa, buckwheat, millet, chickpeas flours and corn starch in addition to xanthan gum in various proportions (Table 1).

2.2 Analytical Methods

2.2.1 Gross chemical composition

The chemical composition of GF flours formulas made locally and commercial GF flour formula sold in the local market evaluated included moisture, protein, fat, ash, crude fiber and starch contents (on a dry weight basis) and were

determined according to official methods as described in [17]. Carbohydrate was calculated by the difference (100- (protein + fat + ash) on the dry weight. All determinations were performed in triplicates and the means and standard deviation were calculated. The caloric a value was calculated using value of 4 Kcal/g protein, carbohydrates and 9 Kcal/g fat according to [18].

2.2.2 Total phenolic compounds

Total phenolic compounds of the sample were determined using folin-ciocalteu reagent according to [19]. A 0.1 ml of the sample extract was mixed with 0.9 ml Folin–Ciocalteu reagent (previously diluted 10-fold with distilled water) and allowed to stand for 5 min before the addition of 0.75 ml of 7% sodium bicarbonate. After 90 min, absorbance was measured at 725 nm using a UV–vis spectrophotometer. The blank contains ethanol and water (1:1v/v) and the reagents. The calibration curve was prepared by measuring the absorbance of known concentrations of gallic acid. Total phenolic contents were expressed as gallic acid equivalent (mg/100g GAE) on a dry weight basis [20].

2.2.3 Determination of antioxidant activity

Samples were extracted using methods described by Zielijski et al. [21]. The 2,2-Diphenyl-1-picrylhydrazyl (DPPH) assay was carried out according to the method described by Lee et al. [22]. The stock reagent solution (10^{-3} Mol) was prepared by dissolving 22 mg of (DPPH) in 50 ml of methanol and stored at 20°C until use. The working solution (6×10^{-5} Mol) was prepared by mixing 6 ml of stock solution with 100 ml of methanol to obtain an absorbance value of 0.8 ± 0.02 at 515 nm, as measured using a spectrophotometer. Extract solution of tested samples (0.1 ml) was vortexed for 30 s with 3.9 ml of DPPH solution and left to react for 30 min, after which the absorbance was measured at 515 nm and recorded. A control with no added extract was also analyzed. Scavenging activity was calculated as follows:

DPPH radical scavenging activity (%) = $[(Ab \text{ control} - Ab \text{ sample}) / Ab \text{ control}] \times 100$. Where Ab is the absorbance at 515 nm.

2.2.4 Functional properties measurements

Water holding capacity: Method of [23] was implemented to determine the water retention

capacity of flour under a centrifugal force of 1000xg. Five grams of flour was mixed with an excess of water (25 ml) and then centrifuged at 1000xg for 15 min. The supernatant was decanted, the tube was weighed, and the absorbed water was calculated by difference (sediment weight minus sample weight).

Oil holding capacity: Oil holding capacity determination was carried out according to the method described by Sosulski et al. [24]. Zero-point five gram (0.5 g) of sample was mixed with corn oil (6 ml) in pre weighed centrifuge tubes and stirred for one minute to get a complete dispersion of the sample in the oil. After 30 min holding time, the sample was centrifuged at 3000 rpm for 25 min. The separated oil was then removed with a pipette and the tubes were then allowed to stand for 25 min to remove the remained oil prior to reweight. The oil absorption capacity was expressed as grams of oil absorbed per gram of the sample.

Solubility: Solubility was determined according to the method proposed by Morr et al. [25]. The water-soluble fraction was obtained using a simple water extraction (flour to distilled water 1:10), with constant stirring (150 rpm). The extracts were centrifuged for 10 minutes at 5,000 rpm and the supernatant was separated and filtered through filter Whatman No. 1 filter paper in a 100 ml measuring flask which was then finally diluted with distilled water to the mark. Aliquots of the extract were used for the determination of soluble protein by the semi-micro Kjeldahl method [26]. The determinations were carried out in triplicate. Soluble protein was calculated as the percent of a total protein of the sample.

Emulsion stability: Emulsion stability of GF flour formula sold in the local market as control and GF flours formulas was measured according to the method described by Yasumatsu et al. [27]. The emulsion was prepared using 2 g of samples, 20 ml distilled water and 20 ml of olive oil. The solutions were blended for 120 s to form an emulsion in a Braun Blender at 1600 rpm. The emulsion was transferred to a calibrated centrifuge tube and the total height of the liquid was measured (HT). The emulsion stability was estimated after heating the emulsion in a calibrated centrifuge tube at 80 °C for 30 min in a water bath, cooled for 15 min under running tap water then centrifuged at 2000xg for 15 min and the height of the emulsified layer (H1) recorded. Emulsion stability was calculated as follow: -

$$\text{Emulsion stability (\%)} = (H1 / HT) \times 100.$$

Foam stability: Foam stability was determined as described by Narayana and Narasinga Rao [28]. Two grams (2 g) of flour sample was mixed with 40 ml distilled water using a Braun Blender at 30°C in a 100 ml measuring cylinder. The suspension was stirred and shaken for 5 min at 1600 rpm to produce foam and the foam stability was expressed as the volume of foam over a time period from 0 to 60 min. The volume of foam was measured after 0 min (VT) and the volume of foam after 60 min (V1) and recorded. Foaming stability was expressed as, Foaming stability % = (V1 / VT) 100%.

2.3 Statistical Analysis

The data were subjected to one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and significant difference ($p < 0.05$) was determined by Duncan's test using the (SPSS 25.0 software statistical package program, Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) [29].

Table 1. Gluten-free flours formulas made locally and commercial flour formula sold in the local market

Ingredients (%)	GFF	F1	F2	F3	F4
Gluten-free flour	100	-	-	-	-
Quinoa flour	-	30	-	-	10
Buckwheat flour	-	-	30	-	10
Millet flour	-	-	-	30	10
Rice flour	-	50	50	50	50
Chickpeas flour	-	10	10	10	10
Corn starch	-	10	10	10	10
Xanthan gum	-	2	2	2	2

GFF: gluten-free flour formula sold in the local market consists of flour blend of brown rice, white rice, quinoa flour and corn starch, in addition to Arabic gum, F1: made of 30% quinoa flour + 50% rice flour + 10% chickpeas flour + 10% corn starch + 2% XG, F2: made of 30% buckwheat flour + 50% rice flour + 10% chickpeas flour + 10% corn starch + 2% XG, F3: made of 30% millet flour + 50% rice flour + 10% chickpeas flour + 10% corn starch + 2% XG, and F4: made of 10% quinoa flour + 10% buckwheat flour + 10% millet flour + 50% rice flour + 10% chickpeas flour + 10% corn starch + 2% XG

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Gross Chemical Composition and Caloric Values of GF Flours Formulas and Commercial GF Flour Formula Sold in the Local Market

The chemical compositions and caloric values of GF flours formulas made locally and commercial GF flour formula sold in the local market are shown in Table 2. The moisture content of the GFF commercial flour formula sold in the local market used in the research was 12.60%. On the other hand, the prepared formulas' moisture content ranged from 12.23% (F2) to 12.90% (F3). The low moisture content discovered suggested that it had the potential for increased storage stability as well as longer shelf life. This finding is in line with the observations of [30], who found that moisture of flour with a moisture content of up to 12% had better storage stability.

The highest protein content was recorded with F2 and F4, with no significant difference ($p < 0.05$). Gluten-free commercial flour formula (GFF) had the lowest protein content, about half the amount (5.07% on DWB) recorded in the other samples. The highest fat content (2.96% on DWB) was recorded in F1. Furthermore, no significant differences in fat content ($p < 0.05$) were found between other GF flours formulas and control.

In comparison to control, F2 flour had more than double the amount of ash and crude fiber. The ash and crude fiber contents of the various formulas differed significantly. The GFF had the lowest ash and crude fiber content (0.51 and 0.31% on DWB, respectively). High-ash samples may increase the mineral content of newly formulated flour [31]. Furthermore, there was no significant difference in starch content ($p < 0.05$) between the formulas F1 and F3, while the GFF commercial flour formula had the highest level of starch (90.02%, on DWB).

Finally, the GFF commercial flour formula had the highest carbohydrate content and caloric value (91.88% and 407.80 Kcal /100 g, respectively), while the F2 formula had the lowest values (83.25 and 401.70.43 Kcal /100 g, respectively) on DWB. Results obtained in the study were in close agreement with those previously reported [32-34].

3.2 Total Phenolic Compound and the Antioxidant Activity of GF Flours Formulas and Commercial GF Flour Formula Sold in the Local Market

The total phenolic compound and antioxidant activity of GF flours formulas made locally and commercial GF flour formula sold in the local market are shown in Table 3. The values of total phenolic compounds showed raise in GF flours formulas and the results indicated highly significant differences at $P < 0.05$ between GFF commercial flour formula and GF flours formulas. The highest values of total phenolic compound and antioxidant activity was in the F2 formula (313.15 mg/100g and 7.95%, respectively), followed by the F4 formula (226.56 mg/100g and 7.22%, respectively), then the F1 formula (223.57 mg/100g and 6.62%, respectively) on DWB.

While, the lowest value was in the commercial flour formula sold in the local market GFF (75.10 mg/100g and 3.23%, respectively) on DWB. Polyphenols have been traditionally considered undesirable components in food products because they may cause darkening due to oxidation of phenols, leading to the formation of dark pigments.

In addition, they have been considered anti-nutritional components because they can react with certain essential amino acids, limiting their availability [35]. However, in more recent studies, polyphenols in general, and flavonoids in particular, have been recognized as food components with health-promoting properties, including antioxidant and anti-proliferative activities in cells [36,37].

3.3 Functional Properties of GF Flours Formulas and Commercial GF Flour Formula Sold in the Local Market

The functional properties of GF flours formulas made locally and commercial GF flour formula sold in the local market are summarized in Table 4. The GF flours formulas exhibited higher values of functional properties compared to that observed with GFF with the exception of the soluble protein as % of total sample protein ($p \leq 0.05$). Gluten-free flours formulas exhibited high values for the water holding capacity in samples F2 (164.98%) and F1 (134.17%), which may be due to the high protein content (12.25%) in the sample F2. The ability of protein in flours to

Table 2. Gross chemical composition and caloric value of gluten-free flours formulas and gluten-free flour formula sold in the local market

Formulas	Moisture (%)	Protein (%)*	Fat (%)*	Ash (%)*	Crude fiber (%) *	Starch (%)*	Carbohydrates (%)**	Caloric Value (Kcal/100 g) *
GFF (control)	12.60±0.06 ^b	5.07±0.18 ^c	2.23±0.09 ^b	0.51±0.08 ^e	0.31±0.09 ^c	90.02±1.17 ^a	91.88±0.22 ^a	407.87±0.50 ^a
F1	12.50±0.01 ^b	11.48±0.07 ^b	2.96±0.44 ^a	1.21±0.02 ^b	0.83±0.06 ^b	80.86±2.71 ^{bcd}	83.52±0.37 ^{cd}	406.64±2.36 ^a
F2	12.23±0.08 ^c	12.25±0.16 ^a	2.19±0.06 ^b	1.30±0.02 ^a	1.01±0.10 ^a	78.34±2.27 ^d	83.25±0.12 ^d	401.71±0.43 ^c
F3	12.90±0.01 ^a	11.18±0.17 ^b	2.13±0.02 ^b	0.84±0.01 ^d	0.76±0.08 ^b	83.87±2.48 ^b	85.09±0.27 ^b	404.25±0.24 ^b
F4	12.50±0.03 ^b	12.13±0.13 ^a	2.44±0.09 ^b	1.14±0.01 ^c	0.88±0.13 ^{ab}	79.49±1.58 ^{cd}	83.41±0.22 ^d	404.12±0.84 ^b

*On dry weight basis. **Carbohydrates calculated by difference. - GFF: gluten-free flour formula sold in the local market consists of flour blend of brown rice, white rice, quinoa flour and corn starch, in addition to Arabic gum, F1: made of 30% quinoa flour + 50% rice flour + 10% chickpeas flour + 10% corn starch + 2% XG, F2: made of 30% buckwheat flour + 50% rice flour + 10% chickpeas flour + 10% corn starch + 2% XG, F3: made of 30% millet flour + 50% rice flour + 10% chickpeas flour + 10% corn starch + 2% XG, and F4: made of 10% quinoa flour + 10% buckwheat flour + 10% millet flour + 50% rice flour + 10% chickpeas flour + 10% corn starch + 2% XG. - Values are the mean of triplicate determinations with standard division.

- The different letters at the column mean significant differences at ($p \leq 0.05$), and the same letters mean no significant differences

bind water physically is a determinant of its water absorption and binding capacity [38]. Gluten-free commercial flour formula (GFF) showed lower water binding capacity in comparison to other GF flours formulas (Table 4).

Significant differences in the oil holding capacity of GF flours formulas were also observed. The mean values showed higher oil holding capacity for F2 (145.92%), followed by F4 (138.51%), F1 (130.11%) and F3 (126.64%), whereas, the lowest (75.43%) was recorded for GFF. The mechanism of fat/oil holding capacity is explained by Kinsella [39] as a physical entrapment of favor retention. Chau and Cheung [40] reported that surface area and hydrophobicity improve oil holding capacity. The

values of foam stability between the GF composite flour samples were close but were significantly different from that recorded with GFF. The solubility of a protein is usually affected by its hydrophobicity or hydrophobic balance, depending on the amino acid composition, particularly at the protein surface [41].

The increase in the values of emulsion stability and foam stability determined for GF composite flours were significant at $p \leq 0.05$ as compared with GFF commercial flour formula sample. The results obtained in this study indicated that composite flours from pseudocereals, millet and chickpea flours had good functional properties.

Table 3. Total phenolic compound and the antioxidant activity of gluten-free flours formulas and gluten-free flour formula sold in the local market

Formulas	TPC (mg/100g GAE) *	AA (%) *
GFF (control)	75.10±3.61 ^d	3.23±0.44 ^d
F1	223.57±20.38 ^b	6.62±0.26 ^b
F2	313.15±32.38 ^a	7.95±0.19 ^a
F3	151.22±9.65 ^c	4.27±0.92 ^c
F4	226.56±29.22 ^b	7.22±0.19 ^{ab}

*On dry weight basis TPC: Total phenolic compounds; AA: Antioxidant activity.

- GFF: gluten-free flour formula sold in the local market consists of flour blend of brown rice, white rice, quinoa flour and corn starch, in addition to Arabic gum, F1: made of 30% quinoa flour + 50% rice flour + 10% chickpeas flour + 10% corn starch + 2% XG, F2: made of 30% buckwheat flour + 50% rice flour + 10% chickpeas flour + 10% corn starch + 2% XG, F3: made of 30% millet flour + 50% rice flour + 10% chickpeas flour + 10% corn starch + 2% XG, and F4: made of 10% quinoa flour + 10% buckwheat flour + 10% millet flour + 50% rice flour + 10% chickpeas flour + 10% corn starch + 2% XG.

- Values are the mean of triplicate determinations with standard division.

- The different letters at the column mean significant differences at ($p \leq 0.05$), and the same letters mean no significant differences.

Table 4. Functional properties of gluten-free flours formulas and gluten-free flour formula sold in the local market

Formulas	WHC (%)	OHC (%)	SP as % of total protein	Emulsion stability (%)	Foam stability (%) *
GFF (control)	97.54±3.55 ^c	75.43±2.55 ^d	11.84±1.19 ^a	42.49±0.66 ^c	87.78±3.19 ^c
F1	134.17±6.95 ^b	130.11±6.06 ^{bc}	11.67±0.43 ^a	57.50±1.75 ^b	105.09±2.66 ^b
F2	164.98±13.85 ^a	145.92±5.04 ^a	9.33±0.42 ^b	62.50±2.25 ^a	114.23±5.48 ^a
F3	127.56±2.04 ^b	126.64±7.03 ^c	8.19±0.50 ^b	55.03±2.13 ^b	100.52±3.40 ^b
F4	139.88±4.15 ^b	138.51±3.07 ^{ab}	7.57±0.15 ^b	65.21±1.94 ^a	118.79±3.36 ^a

- WHC: Water holding capacity; OHC: Oil holding capacity; SP: Soluble protein. *Foaming stability (%) after 30 min.

- GFF: gluten-free flour formula sold in the local market consists of flour blend of brown rice, white rice, quinoa flour and corn starch, in addition to Arabic gum, F1: made of 30% quinoa flour + 50% rice flour + 10% chickpeas flour + 10% corn starch + 2% XG, F2: made of 30% buckwheat flour + 50% rice flour + 10% chickpeas flour + 10% corn starch + 2% XG, F3: made of 30% millet flour + 50% rice flour + 10% chickpeas flour + 10% corn starch + 2% XG, and F4: made of 10% quinoa flour + 10% buckwheat flour + 10% millet flour + 50% rice flour + 10% chickpeas flour + 10% corn starch + 2% XG.

- Values are the mean of triplicate determinations with standard division.

- The different letters at the column mean significant differences at ($p \leq 0.05$), and the same letters mean no significant differences

4. CONCLUSIONS

Gluten-free flours formulas made with rice, quinoa, buckwheat, millet, chickpeas flour and corn starch in addition to xanthan gum showed improvement in nutritional value with increase in protein, fiber, minerals and antioxidants, as well as improved the physical properties of the formulas compared by the GF commercial flour formula available in the local market (GFF), which is distinguished by its high content of starch and carbohydrates. The findings imply that F2, F4 and F1 were the best formulas in this study for making nutrient-dense GF foods.

DISCLAIMER

The products used for this research are commonly and predominantly use products in our area of research and country. There is absolutely no conflict of interest between the authors and producers of the products because we do not intend to use these products as an avenue for any litigation but for the advancement of knowledge. Also, the research was not funded by the producing company rather it was funded by personal efforts of the authors.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Jnawali P, Kumar V, Tanwar B. Celiac disease: Overview and considerations for development of gluten-free foods. *Food Sci. and Human Wellness*. 2016;5:169–176.
2. Ciacci C, Ciclitira P, Hadjivassiliou M, Kaukinen K, Ludvigsson JF, McGough N, Sanders DS, Woodward J, Leonard JN, Swift GL. The gluten-free diet and its current application in coeliac disease and dermatitis herpetiformis. *United Eur. Gastro. J.* 2015;3(2):121–135. DOI: 10.1177/2050640614559263.
3. Joseph S, Woomer A, Adedeji A. Current applications of gluten-free grains – a review. *Criti. Rev. in Food Sci. and Nutr*; 2020. DOI:10.1080/10408398.2020.1713724.
4. do Nascimento AB, Fiates GMR, Anjos AD, Teixeira E. Gluten-free is not enough e perception and suggestions of celiac consumers. *Inter. J. of Food Sci. and Nutr.* 2014;65(4):394-398. DOI: 10.3109/09637486.2013.879286.
5. Thompson T. Thiamin, riboflavin, and niacin contents of the gluten-free diet: Is there cause for concern? *J. Am. Dietetic Assoc.* 1999;99:858-862.
6. Thompson T. Folate, Iron, and dietary fibre contents of the gluten-free diet. *J. Am Diet Assoc.* 2000;100(11):1389–1396.
7. Taetzsch ASK, Das C, Brown A, Krauss RE, Silver, Roberts SB. Are gluten-free diets more nutritious? An evaluation of self-selected and recommended gluten-free and gluten-containing dietary patterns. *Nutrients* 2018;10(12):1881. DOI: 10.3390/nu10121881.
8. Theethira TG, Dennis M. Celiac disease and the gluten-free diet: Consequences and recommendations for improvement. *Digestive Diseases (Basel, Switzerland)* 2015;33(2):175–182. DOI: 10.1159/000369504.
9. de Magistris T, Xhakollari W, Munoz N. The effect of sensory properties on non-celiac consumers' willingness to pay for a gluten-free snack. *Economia Agro-ALIMENTARE* 2015;(1):107–114. DOI:10.3280/ECAG2015-001006.
10. Vici G, Belli L, Biondi M, Polzonetti V. Gluten free diet and nutrient deficiencies: A review. *Clini. Nutr.* 2016;35(6):1236–1241. DOI: 10.1016/j.clnu.2016.05.002.
11. Missbach B, Schwingshackl L, Billmann A, Mystek A, Hickelsberger M, Bauer G, Konig J. Gluten-free food database: The nutritional quality and cost of packaged gluten-free foods. *Peer J.* 2015;3:e1337. DOI: 10.7717/peerj.1337.
12. Elli L, Ferretti F, Orlando S, Vecchi M, Monguzzi E, Roncoroni L, Schuppan D. Management of celiac disease in daily clinical practice. *Eur. J. of Inter. Medicine.* 2019;61:15–24. DOI:10.1016/j.ejim.2018.11.012.
13. Dykes L, Rooney LW. Phenolic compounds in cereal grains and their health benefits. *Cereal Food World.* 2007; 52(3):105–111.
14. Wang K, Lu F, Li Z, Zhao LC, Han CY. Recent developments in gluten-free bread baking approaches: A review. *Food Sci. and Tech.* 2017;37 (suppl 1):1–9. DOI: 10.1590/1678-457x.01417.

15. Ilkem D, Berrin O. Recent strategies for tackling the problems in gluten-free diet and products, Criti. Rev. in Food Sci. and Nutr;2020.
DOI:10.1080/10408398.2020.1823814
16. Padalino L, Conte A, Del Nobile MA. Overview on the general approaches to improve gluten-free pasta and bread. Foods 2016;5(4):87.
DOI: 10.3390/foods5040087.
17. A. O. A. C. Official Methods of Analysis (15thEd.). Association of Official Analytical Chemists. Washington, D.C. Analytical Chem. Inter. Arligton, Virginia, U.S.A; 2010.
18. FAO Food and Nutrition, Paper 77. Food energy – Methods of analysis and conversion factors. Rome, Italy/Washington, DC, USA: Food and Agric. Organ. of the United Nation, FAO; 2003.
19. Velioglu YS, Mazza G, Gao L, Oomah BD. Antioxidant activity and total phenolics in selected fruits, vegetables, and grain products. J. Agric. Food Chem. 1998;46: 4113–4117.
20. Asami DK, Hong YJ, Barrett DM, Mitchell AE. Comparison of the total phenolic and ascorbic acid content of freeze-dried and air-dried marionberry, strawberry, and corn grown using conventional, organic, and sustainable agricultural practices. J. Agric. Food Chem. 2003;51:1237-1241.
21. Zielijski H, Michalska A, Ceglijska A, Lamparski G. Antioxidant properties and sensory quality of traditional rye bread as affected by the incorporation of flour with different extraction rates in the formulation. Eur. Food Res. and Tech. 2008;226:671-680.
22. Lee SC, Kim JH, Jeong SM, Kim DR, Ha JU, Nam KC, Ahn DU. Effect of far-infrared radiation on the antioxidant activity of rice hulls. J. of Agric. and Food Chem. 2003; 51:4400-4403.
23. A. A. C. C. Approved Methods, 8th ed. American Association of Cereal Chemists, St Paul, MN, U.S.A; 1990.
24. Sosulski FW, Humbert ES, Bui K, Jones JO. Functional properties of rapeseed flour concentrates and isolates. J. of Food Sci. 1976;41:1348-1354.
25. Morr CV, German B, Kinsella JE, Regesntein JP, Van Buren JP, Kilara A. A collaborative study to develop a standardized food protein solubility procedure. J. of Food Sci. 1985;51:1715-1718.
26. A. O. A. C. Official Methods of Analysis of the Association of Official Analytical Chemists International. 17th ed. Maryland, USA; 2000.
27. Yasumatsu K, Sawada K, Moritaka S, Misaki M, Toda J, Wada T. Whipping and emulsifying properties of soybean products. Agric. Biolog. Chem. 1972;36: 719-727.
28. Narayana K, Narasinga Rao MS. Functional properties of raw and heat processed winged bean (*Psophocarpus tetragonolobus*) flour. J. of Food Sci. 1982; 47:1534-1538.
29. SPSS. SPSS for windows. Release, 25.0., Standard Version, Armonk, NY: IBM Corp; 2011.
30. Offia-Olua BI. Chemical, Functional and Pasting Properties of Wheat (*Triticum*spp)-Walnut (*Juglansregia*) Flour. J. Food Nutr. Sci. 2014; 5:1591-1604.
31. Cotovanu I, Mironeasa S. Buckwheat Seeds: Impact of Milling Fractions and Addition Level on Wheat Bread Dough Rheology. J. Appl. Sci. 2021;11:1731.
32. Aleem ZMD, Gentha TR, Syed IH. Effects of defatted soy flour incorporation on physical, sensorial and nutritional properties of biscuits. J. Food Proc. and Tech. 2012;3(4):100-149.
33. Lopez EP. Influence of the addition of lupine protein isolate on the protein and technological characteristics of dough and fresh bread with added Brea Gum. J. Food Sci. and Tech. 2014;34(1):195-203.
34. El-Sohaimy SA, Shehata MG, Taha M, Zeitoun MA. Nutritional, Physicochemical, and Sensorial Evaluation of Flat Bread Supplemented with Quinoa Flour. J. Inter. J. of Food Sci; 2019.
Available:<https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/4686727>.
35. Crépon K, Marget P, Peyronnet C, Carrouée B, Arese P, Duc G. Nutritional value of faba bean (*Vicia faba* L.) seeds for feed and food. Field Crops Res. 2010; 115:329-339.
36. Ramos S. Effects of dietary flavonoids on apoptotic related to cancer chemoprevention. J. Nutr. Biochem. 2007; 18:427-442.
37. Saura-Calixto F, Goni I. Definition of the mediterranean diet based on bioactive compounds. Critical reviews. Food Sci. and Nutr. 2009;49:145-152.

38. Apotiola ZO, Fashakinly JF. Evaluation of cookies from wheat flour, soybean flour and cocoyam flour blends. Food Sci. and Quality Management. 2013;14:17-21.
39. Kinsella JE. Functional properties of soy protein. J. of American Oil Chem. Society 1979;56:242-249.
40. Chau CF, Cheung PCK. Functional properties of flours prepared from three Chinese indigenous legumes seed. J. of Food Chem. 1997;66:429-433.
41. Moure A, Sineiro J, Dominguez H, Parajo JC. Functionality of oilseed protein products: A review. Food Res. Inter. 2006; 39:945-963.

© 2022 Abdelmegiud et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/84527>