# SENSORY EVALUATION OF FOXTAIL MILLET INCORPORATED SUGAR FREE ICE CREAM

## G.M. Sivakumar

Assistant Professor, Department of Livestock Products Technology (Dairy Science)
Madras Veterinary College, Chennai- 600 007
Tamil Nadu Veterinary and Animal Sciences University
E-mail: drshiva06@gmail.com (\*Corresponding Author)

**Abstract:** A study was conducted to develop a nutrient rich foxtail millet incorporated sugar-free ice cream. Foxtail millet is a good source of protein, dietary fiber and low in carbohydrate content. Foxtail millet also has good thickening and water binding properties Ice cream was prepared using foxtail millet at 2%,3% and 4% levels and sugar was replaced by stevia calorie free sugar substitute at 3% level and subjected to sensory evaluation. Various sensory parameters like flavor, body and texture, color and appearance, sweetness and overall acceptability were analyzed for the samples S1, S2, S3 and S4. It was found that the sample with 4% foxtail millet (S4) gained highest scores and was liked the most when compared to other samples. The Statistical analysis of data revealed that highly significant difference (P  $\leq$ 0.01) was observed in flavor, body and texture, color and appearance and overall acceptability between samples.

**Keywords:** Foxtail millet, Ice cream, stevia, sensory analysis.

#### Introduction

Ice cream is an appealing, delicate and nourishing food which is adored by all groups of people and is a popular dessert throughout the world. Ice cream is a mixture of milk, cream, and sugar. Ice cream is a rich source of energy providing about 100-120 kcal/100 g of ice cream. The exploding popularity of ice cream has led to a number of ice cream variations including frozen custard, frozen yogurt, and even nondairy versions made with ingredients like coconut milk. Cereal based milk products are popular all over India. Cereals and milk are blended to compensate for deficiency of lysine. (Aneja *et al.* 2002).

Foxtail millet (*Setariaitalica*) is known as Thinai in southern states of India. It has good nutritional profile and is comparable to staple cereals as rice and wheat in terms of protein, fiber, minerals and vitamins but its potential role as low GI food has remain unrealized and unexploited. Foxtail millet, in particular, has good thickening and water binding properties due to its high amount of starch and fiber content. Fox tail millet is gluten-free and can be useful for people on a gluten-free diet since it promotes digestion, increases energy levels and helps in emending the cholesterol levels. Foxtail millet releases glucose steadily without *Received July 15, 2017 \* Published Aug 2, 2017 \* www.ijset.net* 

2577 G.M. Sivakumar

affecting the metabolism of the body. Foxtail millet is widely recognized as a diabetic food. Millets are also good source of energy, protein, vitamins and minerals (Ravindran, 1991). Millet foods are also known for their low glycemic index (Itagi, 2003 and Singh *et al.* 2010). Among the millets, foxtail millet is a good source of protein (12.3 g/100g) and dietary fiber (14 g/100g). The carbohydrate content is low (60.9 g/100g). Besides, it is rich in minerals (3 g/100g) and phytochemicals. Foxtail millet is a good source of ß carotene126-191 µg/100g, Goudar *et al.* (2011). This millet has been proved to be suitable for people suffering from metabolic disorders (Itagi,2003).

## Materials and methods

## Ice cream formulation and production

The milk and cream was procured from Dairy Plant, Department of Livestock Products Technology (Dairy Science), Madras Veterinary College, Chennai. The foxtail millet, stevia, sugar, skim milk powder and other ingredients were purchased from local market in Chennai. Foxtail millet is selected based on its nutritional profile such that it has a high fibre and mineral content. Ice cream was prepared by incorporating foxtail millet at 2, 3 and 4% in the ice cream mix. Sugar was replaced by stevia the natural sweetener in the treatment.

Table 1: shows the composition of ingredients for Ice cream mix Composition of Ingredients for Ice cream mix (per 1000g)

INGREDIENTS	S1	S2(2% foxtail	· • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	S4(4% foxtail	
	(Control)	millet+ stevia)	millet+ stevia)	millet+ stevia)	
Milk (in ml)	750	750	750	750	
Foxtail Millet	-	20	30	40	
Powder (in g)					
Stevia (in g)	-	30	30	30	
Sugar(in g)	150	-	-	-	
Cream (in g)	100	100	100	100	
Skimmed Milk	80	80	80	80	
Powder (in g)					
Sodium Alginate	3	3	3	3	
(in g)					
Glycerol Mono	2	2	2	2	
Sterate (in g)					
Gelatin (in g)	2	2	2	2	
Cocoa powder	15	15	15	15	
(in g)					

Figure -1 shows the steps involved in production of ice cream. Ice cream produced is subjected to sensory evaluation using 9-point hedonic scale The frozen product samples were tempered to  $-12\pm2$  °C for 1–2 h before judging. Sensory parameters including flavor, body and texture, color and appearance, sweetness were compared among the samples. Among the three millet ice creams samples (2%, 3%, 4%), one concentration was chosen the best based upon the acceptability scores obtained from sensory evaluation.

Figure -1 Schematic representation of steps involved in production of Ice Cream

Selection of ingredients

(Milk, fox tail millet, skim milk powder, cream, sugar, stevia, emulsifier and stabilizer)

Figuring the ingredients

Mixing the ingredients

Pasteurising the mix (68°C for 30 minutes)

Homogenizing the mix (2000/500 psi)

Cooling and ageing the mix overnight (4°C for 4 hours)

Flavoring the mix

Freezing of the mix (-5°C)

Packaging of the ice creams

#### **Results and Discussion**

Table 2 shows the sensory evaluation scores of the S1 control and three millet ice creams(2%,3%, and 4%) using 9 - point hedonic scale

Hardening and storage of the ice creams(-23°C to -29°C)

2579 G.M. Sivakumar

## **FLAVOR**

The flavor score of S4 was  $8.78\pm0.21$  which was ranked the highest among the variations. This was higher than the scores of S1, S2 and S3. Highly significant difference (P  $\leq$ 0.01) was found between treatments .Thus, the flavor of sample S4 was more liked than the flavors of other samples among the panelists. This is similar to the observations made by Patel *et al.* (2015) that addition of ragi millet (9 % level) in ice cream improved the flavor.

## **BODY AND TEXTURE**

The body and texture of samples S1 and S2 had a score of 6.82±0.30 and 7.00±0.26 which were ranked lowest among the variations. The score of sample S3 was 7.36±0.21 which indicated that the body and texture was moderately liked by the panelists. The sample S4 gained a score of 8.70±0.21 and thus its body and texture was liked the most by the panelists. Proper processing and mixing of ingredients are the factors responsible for better body and texture of the product.

## **COLOR AND APPEARANCE**

The color and appearance of S1, S3 and S4 was almost similar and they gained a same score of 8 which were ranked highest among the variations. S2 gained a score of 7 for color and appearance which was ranked lowest among the variations. In this parameter, the samples S1, S3 and S4 were more liked by the panelists than S2.

## **SWEETNESS**

The sample S4 had gained a score of 8.75±0.21 for its sweetness which was ranked the highest among the variations. This was higher than the scores of S1 and S3, which gained similar score of 8. Thus, the sweetness of sample S4 was extremely liked by the panelists when compared to other samples. This was due to the proper blending of stevia and a higher concentration of millet in sample S4. This is in accordance with observation made by Yogiraj *et al.* (2014) that addition of stevia improved sweetness, colour, appearance and texture

## OVERALL ACCEPTABILITY

The overall acceptability score for S4 was  $8.71\pm0.22$  which was ranked highest among the sample variations. This was higher than the scores of S1, S2 and S3. Highly significant difference (P  $\leq$ 0.01) was found between treatments. Ice cream samples with incorporation of millets at 4% was liked by the panelists than other ice cream samples. Addition of fox tail millet improved the overall acceptability of ice cream.

## Conclusion

The present study was done to develop nutrient rich foxtail millet incorporated sugar-free ice creams. In this it was concluded that addition of foxtail millet at 4 percent and stevia at 3 percent level in ice cream was found to be acceptable by sensory evaluation. Addition of millet improved the flavour, appearance, body and texture, overall acceptability of the ice cream.

#### References

- [1] Aneja R.P., B.N. Mathur, R.C. Chandan, A.K. Banerjee, 2002. Technology of Indian milk products. A Dairy India pub, New Delhi
- [2] Goudar, G., S. Hemalatha, ,R.K. Naik and M.Y. Kamatar, 2011, Evaluation of nutritional composition of foxtail millet (*Setaria italic*) grains cultivated in agro climatic zones of Karnataka by NIR. Paper presented in: National Symp. Recapturing Nutritious millets for Health and Management of Diseases, UAS Dharwad, December 16-17. p. 37
- [3] Itagi K. S, 2003, Development and evaluation of millet based composite food for diabetes II, Ph. D thesis, Uni. Agric. Sci Dharwad (India).
- [4] Patel, I.J., C.N. Dharaiya and S.V. Pinto, 2015, Development of technology for manufacture of ragi ice cream, *J. Food, Sci. Technol.*,52(7): 4015-4028.
- [5] Ravindran, G, 1991, Studies on millets proximate composition, mineral composition, and phytate and oxalate contents. *Food Chem*, 39: 99-107.
- [6] Singh, K.P., H.N. Mishra, and S. Saha, 2010, Moisture-dependent properties of barnyard millet grain and kernel. *J Food Eng*, 96: 598–606.
- [7] Yoghiraj, R., K. Destmukh, N. Anantrao, S. Pritam, K. Hande, S. Sharddhazele and K.D. More, 2014, Preparation of ice cream using natural sweetener stevia, *Food Sci. Research Journal*, 5(1):30-33.

Table 2: Sensory evaluation scores of millet ice creams using 9 - point hedonic scale

Sensory	S	'F' value			
<b>Parameters</b>	S1	S2	S3	S4	
Flavor	6.70±0.22	6.51±0.22	6.85±0.31	8.78±0.21	17.46**
<b>Body and</b>	6.82±0.30	7.00±0.26	7.36±0.21	8.70±0.21	19.96**
texture					
Colour and	8.34±0.21	6.75±0.16	8.20±0.16	8.52±0.22	15.49**
appearance					
Sweetness	8.16±0.17	7.67±0.21	8.22±0.16	8.75±0.21	4.62*
Overall	7.33±0.21	7.12±0.16	7.67±0.21	8.71±0.22	8.44**
acceptability					

.