

Production and Evaluation of New Types of Economic and Health Candy Bars for Schoolchildren

Kahlaf H.H.*; Sharoba A.M.*; EL-Desouky A.I.*; Abdul Rahim E.A.* and Kabil E. M.*

*Food Technology Dept., Fac. of Agric., Moshtohor, Benha Univ., Egypt.

*Food Research Technology Institute-Agriculture Research Center, Ministry of Agriculture, Giza, Egypt.

*Egypt Foods Company for Food Industries.

Abstract

In this study the preparation of ten types of bar candy of available local raw materials in Egypt and priced economic cheap commensurate with limited income groups in Egypt, and this highly nutritious raw materials were used grinded each of maize, rice, wheat was added nutrients with a high nutritional value frequently used in the candy industry, a raisins, peanuts, chickpeas and also alternatives to butter and cocoa powder, milk powder for the manufacture of a dozen different blends three different manufacturing methods using extrusion thermal technology (extruder) was conducted sensory tests to ten mixes with two flicks of sensory evaluation method first target group of children's product for them candy bar they are disciples of the nursery and primary school pupils The second way using sensory arbitrators selected and testers carefully in ways that the selection of sensory arbitrators. The results of sensory evaluation of all very acceptable mixtures in terms of qualities and characteristics of sensory tested were conducted to assess the nutritional value of raw materials used for chemical analysis in manufacturing and was also blends the bar ten chemically analyzed and the results showed that the samples of nutritional value and high useful and appropriate from a nutritional point of schoolchildren were conducted microbiological necessary analyzes were made counting the kidneys to the bacteria, fungi, yeasts and some bacteria pathological dominant presence strains and the results showed the absence ten samples of bacteria Sick and compliance with the microbiological limits in accordance with the Egyptian standard specifications and therefore its integrity and safety for schoolchildren and finally concludes with the recommendation Find producing candy bar the previous ten Balkhaltat at the national level in the ministries of agriculture and the Egyptian Education school feeding plant

Key words: Candy bars, School feeding, chemical composition, Sensory evaluation, Microbiological examination, Schoolchildren nutrition.

Introduction

The different dietary habits and nutritional status of Spanish school children have been analyzed. Nutrition affects health throughout the life cycle, and it is best to begin to prevent harm early on. Habits are formed early in life, and habits are a major determinant of food choice in later life.

It is relatively easy to reach children through institutions such as schools. As a society, we have the responsibility to do our best to protect young people. All of these reasons are good, and true. However, they are in stark contrast to the increasing prevalence of poor diet and obesity among young people.

In addition, many children do not have breakfast or lunch at home but rather in the school dining hall or a nearby café **Fernández San Juan (2006)**. In such circumstances, children tend to choose “portable” snacks (sweets, cakes, soft drinks, be eaten away from home, whether alone or with friend. Also, various studies have shown that children of wealthier families tend to consume more protein, meat, fish, milk, and green vegetables, whereas children of etc.) to poorer families tend to have a higher caloric intake

and to consume more processed fast food, fats, and sugar.

Schools can make important contributions to improve children meal and nutrient intake. School-aged children spend at least 6 h at school every school day and obtained up to 47% of their calories from meals and snacks consumed at school (**Gordon et al., 2009**).

School feeding programs use many different modalities to provide food to schoolchildren. There are also complementary actions that, at marginal cost and implemented as part of the program, can add to the effectiveness of school feeding programs. In addition, there are important larger contexts that affect the efficiency and outcomes of school feeding and should be included in the overall planning process. **Donald et al. (2009)** describes the main components of school feeding programs and some complementary actions, as well as explains the different program modalities and their terminology. On 2011 the national project of school feeding covered around 1 million students at the Egyptian school specially in the pre-school and primary school (**Azouz, 2011**).

Variations in tooth eruption patterns are supposed to have multifactorial reasons and etiologic

factors to explain variation in caries are unsatisfactory. Prevalence of caries is comparatively higher in the children of developing countries than that of the children of same age in developed countries. This study indicates a close relationship between nutritional status and dental caries for school children (**Chatterjee and Bandyopadhyay, 2012**).

In recent years, a growing body of evidence has helped increase the understanding of school feeding's main benefits. In 2009, Rethinking School Feeding concluded that there are two main reasons why countries may choose to implement school feeding programmes: (1) to address social needs and provide a social safety net during crises; and (2) to support child development through improved learning and enhanced nutrition. A third dimension of school feeding programmes, potentially very important but for which there was much less empirical evidence, is the link between school feeding and local agricultural production and its potential related benefits to the local economy and the incomes of farmers.

Since then, new analyses and evaluations have largely confirmed these findings and highlighted the importance of filling the gaps in the evidence base. (**Alderman and Bundy, 2012**) this reviews the practical experience in implementing school feeding in relation to the three categories of benefits mentioned above, and also provides insights into the institutional arrangements for these programmes and the challenges in managing them.

It is therefore evident that the nutritional status of the school children in the public schools needed to be improved through various interventions such as improved nutrition enlightenment, improved feeding approaches, environmental renewal etc. targeted at providing, necessary upliftment in the feeding habits/nutritional status of the children in the state (**Adegun et al., 2013**).

Extrusion, one of the most important innovations of the 20th century, is often presented as a model of scientific and technology transfer between different processing industries, such as the polymer and plastics, food and feed and paper-milling industries in particular. Although the first technical designs of screw extruders were introduced in the latter years of the 19th century, extrusion processing really established itself approximately 60 years later, with the development in the plastics industry of polymer-based materials. It was later successfully exploited by the industries that processed plant biopolymers and has developed into a widespread extrusion processing culture over the past 80 years. The purpose of this introductory chapter is to give a brief historical overview of the emergence of screw extruders and of the extrusion processing culture that owes its existence to the remarkable transfers of technology from polymer processing to food and

feed processing and to paper milling (**Bouvier and Campanella, 2014**).

The present work aims to study the chemical and nutrition values of some formulate different candy bar products formulas to use as a complementary for child foods formulas with lower cost. To develop value added extruded products with different proportions of candy bar. Also to evaluate the formulas from standpoint of or ganolytically, chemical properties of the best formulas were evaluated.

Materials and Methods

Materials:

All the raw materials were obtained from "Egypt foods Company", industrial Zone, Quesna city, Menofya, Egypt as follows:

- Yellow corn grits were obtained from De Franceschi S.P.A Monfalcone : Via S. Antonio, 17, 33170 Pordenone, Italy.
- Rice grits were obtained from Pv sons corm Milling Co. PVT. LTD., Plot No. F1, Ranjangaon Midc, Shirur, Pune-412210, India.
- Wheat flour was obtained from Flower Land Company October 6 the third industrial zone, Cairo, Egypt.
- Defatted soy grits was obtained from Al- Amerya food plus company , ruitenberg ingredient, Twello, Netherlands.
- Substitute butter (555) BY IOI Loders Croklan oils Sdn Bhd, Plo 8, 9, Jalan Timah, Pasir Gudang industrial Estate, 81700 pasir Gudang, Johor , Malaysia.
- Cocoa powder was manufactured by Cargill Coca & chocolate , Reinickendorf , flottenstresse 24 G , 13407 Berlin, Germany, imported by united oils and foods co. (Unioil), E Lsalam building number 3, 7th floor - Profs Bids of Ain shams University – Lotfy Elsayed St. EL Demerdash, Cairo, Egypt.
- Skim milk was produced by land O lakes, USA, imported by El -Eman co. for import and export, Talkha, 6th street beside Elbank Elahli, Dakhila, Egypt.
- Vitamins and Mineral Mix were obtained From Glanbia company, Germany.
- Fiber from Beneo Orafiti–Belgium, imported by Nour Egypt For International Trading, 8 Youssef Abbas St., Nasr City–Cairo, Egypt.
- Chess flavor was obtained from Quest International Egypt, 6October city, Egypt
- Palm olean oil was obtained from united oils and foods co. (Unioil), ELsalam building number 3,7th floor-Profs Bids of ain shams University – Lotfy Elsayed St. ELDemerdash, Cairo, Egypt.
- Other ingredients such as sugar, raisin, peanut and chick peas was obtained from the Egyptian local market .

- Myvacet (Monoglyceride)obtained from Kerry Ingredients & Flavours - EMEA Region, Kerry Egypt LTD., Office 14, Third floor, City star Building block 6, Central High way, 6 th of October city Egypt.
- Packing material (Propylene and metalize 20/20) was obtained from Misr Rotogravure, 6 th of October city, 3rd industrial zone, NO164, Egypt.
- Commercial school feeding samples its used as a control plan collected from The Ministry of Agriculture of the service project to feed the schools.

Preparation of raw materials:

Preparation for bar samples:

The formulation of three candy bar sample based on (peanut, rise crisp , check pea and raisin) mixed with caramel and the others three samples were covered by chocolate to prepare this sample we firstly need to do processing for (rice Crisp, caramel and Chocolate).

Preparations for bar blended:

Preparation of bar sample without chocolate coating:

All the prepared materials (rice , crisp , peanut , chick pea ,inulin ,vitamin and mineral mix) were mixed together as shown in table (4) to prepare the different blended , blend the calculated amount of each ingredient and weight it , all ingredients were mixed using an electronic mixer for 10 minutes , then it mixed with the caramel (50% raw blend with 50 % caramel) for around 10 minutes at the room temperature.The total weight of each blend was 50 Kg , each mix were shaped using Bosh Bar lines and compressed at the mixer then it cooled down and cut into pieces to achieve the required length and weight each pieces and it is collected after the cutter and packed by using the ILA Pack , Italian machines and using (propylene/metalized 20/20) packing paper.

Preparation of bar sample with chocolate coating:

Coate the pieces with chocolate by using coating chocolate line A.E Nielsen, Denmark origin. The coating percentage were 33 % chocolate and 33 % from the blended No. (1 or 2 or 3) and 33 % of caramel and from the total; weigh of each piece and coate the pieces with chocolate by using coating chocolate line A.E Nielsen, Denmark origin then the same packing machine were used for packing with propylene /metalized 20/20 packing .

Chemical analysis:

Moisture content, ash, fat and protein, were determined according to AOAC (2005). Determination of minerals was determined by Weende method in which VELD Scientifica extraction unit was used AOAC (2005), determination of total essential amino acid according to AOAC (2005).

Carbohydrates:

Total carbohydrate was calculating by the differences between one hundred and the summation of the percentage of moisture, protein, fat, fiber and ash.

Caloric value:

Total caloric for uncooked burger and sausage were calculated on the basis of a 100 g sample using atwater values for fat (9 kcalg⁻¹), protein (4.02 kcalg⁻¹) and carbohydrate (3.87 kcalg⁻¹), Garcia *et al.* (2002).

$$\text{Caloric value} = (\text{carbohydrate} \times 3.87) + (\text{protein} \times 4.02) + (\text{fat contents} \times 9).$$

Free fatty acid (FFA) :

The acid value was determined according to the method described by (AOCS 1993) . Free fatty acids (FFA) are expressed as percentage by weight of a specified fatty acid (oleic acid).

$$\text{calculation} : \text{FFA (as oleic) \%} = \frac{\text{ml of alkali xN}}{\text{sample weight}}$$

peroxide value (P.V.)

Peroxide value was determined according to the method described by the AOAC (2005) (Method No.965.33).

Calculation :

P.V = milliequivalents of active oxygen / 1 kg lipid sample.

$$P.V = \frac{(V_s - V_b) \times N \times 10}{\text{sample weight}}$$

Where; Vs = volume of sodium thiosulphate (ml) used for sample.

Vb= volume of sodium thiosulphate (ml) used for the blank.

N= normality of sodium thiosulphate solution

w= weight of lipids(g) of test portion .

Microbiological examination:

The following examinations were done for all formulas: Total viable bacterial count, moulds and yeasts, coliform group were enumerated and the presence of (*Salmonella spp.* and *Staphylococcus aureus*) was detected according to the methods established by (APHA, 1992).

Sensory evaluation:

Sensory evaluation of the different formulas was carried out by three groups of panelists .

pre school sensory evaluation :

the first group included 50 child (25 boys and 25 girls) , in the age of (4-6 years) from Ali Ahmed Ilawa School Kindergarten, in Sahel Degwa village, Qalyobia Governorate. The test was carried out as recommended by Kroll (1990) who depended on the face reaction of the baby (Figure 1) beside if the

baby asked for additional amount. Hedonic scale was used which included super good (9), really good (8), good (7), just a little good (6), may be good or bad (5), just a little bad (4), bad (3), really bad (2) and super bad (1).

School children

Sensory evaluation was carried out by a properly well trained pane of 50 school of 25 school children 25 boys and 25 girls in age (8-15 year) from Al Fatah private school, Banha city , Qalyobia .the 50 student were evaluated for different school children samples for appearance, taste, texture, odor, solubility at mouth, size and all overall acceptability .

Adults sensory evaluation:

Sensory evaluation carried out by a properly well trained pane of thirty three adults testers. the thirty three member internal panel evaluated the different school children sample for appearance, taste, texture, odor, solubility at mouth, size and all overall acceptability.

Mineral water was used by the panellists to rinse the mouth between samples. Scoring was based on a 100 point scale (10-100) where (90-100) = excellent, (70-80) = very good, (50-60) = good, (30-40) = fair and (10-20) = poor, according to **Onweluzo, et al., (1999)**.

Statistical analysis:

ANOVA was carried out on data of the sensory evaluation of baked products, rat feeding biological assays and rat blood chemistry tests (liver functions. Kidney function, Pancreatic function and lipid profile) were applied the function of two factors with replicates "Excel" Software of Microsoft Office 2003. Least significant difference (L.S.D) analysis was adapted. Data are expressed as average \pm standard error. Multiple comparisons were carried out applying L.S.D. ($P < 0.05$) according to **Gomez and Gomez (1984)**.

Results and Discussion

Chemical composition of candy bar:

Technological characteristics, such as chemical composition, physical properties and sensory properties, play an important role in the formation of the processing steps, which are necessary for the production of foods.

Starting raw materials analyzed for moisture, ash, fat, protein, fiber and total carbohydrates. Results recorded in **Table (1)** show some chemical properties of starting raw materials which were used in this study.

Table 1. Chemical composition of starting raw materials used in the preparation of blends for experimental samples.

Raw material	Moisture	Crude proteins	Crude Fat	Ash	Crude fibers	Total carbohydrates**
Corn grits	12.031 \pm 0.7	7.53 \pm 0.62	0.73 \pm 0.11	0.31 \pm 0.01	0.31 \pm 0.06	79.62 \pm 0.52
Wheat flour 72%	13.50 \pm 0.75	10.5 \pm 0.67	0.81 \pm .03	0.51 \pm 0.05	0.72 \pm 0.02	73.39 \pm 0.35
Rice flour	13.51 \pm 0.13	6.62 \pm 0.51	0.58 \pm 0.02	0.32 \pm 0.12	0.0 0 \pm 0.00	79.42 \pm 0.33
Defatted soybean	2.91 \pm 0.21	47.37 \pm 0.56	1.28 \pm 0.33	6.5 \pm 0.31	13.64 \pm 0.31	35.5 \pm 0.92
Chickpea flour	5.13 \pm 0.15	19.32 \pm 0.67	3.31 \pm 0.21	4.23 \pm 0.52	4.9 \pm 0.22	63.52 \pm 0.76
Peanut	2.45 \pm 0.15	25.21 \pm 0.76	25.3 \pm 0.92	3.7 \pm 0.32	8.51 \pm 0.53	16.65 \pm 0.21
Raisins	17.21 \pm 0.53	3.18 \pm 0.15	0.66 \pm 0.06	3.7 \pm 0.27	3.75 \pm 0.03	58.2 \pm 0.91
Skim milk powder	4.11 \pm 0.53	35.19 \pm 0.85	1.62 \pm 0.31	7.92 \pm 0.52	0.00 \pm 0.00	51.23 \pm 0.15
Fall fat milk powder	3.1 \pm 0.21	26.31 \pm 0.56	26.75 \pm 0.53	4.77 \pm 0.3	0.0 0 \pm 0.00	38.4 \pm 0.51
Coca powder	3.8 \pm 0.31	19.65 \pm 0.53	13.75 \pm 0.72	6.77 \pm 0.05	33.25 \pm 0.47	56.9 \pm 0.31

Table 2. Proximate chemical composition of experimental samples products.

Sample	Moisture	Crude proteins	Crude Fat	Ash	Crude fibers	Total carbohydrates**	
1	4.15 ± 0.21	11.47 ± 0.31	16.00 ± 0.20	1.31 ± .03	9.70 ± 0.1	55.40 ± 0.27	
2	5.81 ± 0.15	9.94 ± 0.21	10.96 ± 0.11	0.75 ± 0.02	12.10 ± 0.13	66.80 ± 0.61	
Group (A)	3	5.82 ± 0.03	10.70 ± 0.41	13.52 ± 0.31	1.02 ± 0.01	10.81 ± 0.2	61.10 ± 0.32
	4	3.12 ± 0.22	10.80 ± 0.35	20.56 ± 0.51	1.04 ± 0.06	9.42 ± 0.51	54.40 ± 0.54
	5	4.25 ± 0.31	9.75 ± 0.21	17.00 ± 0.62	1.13 ± 0.05	11.10 ± 0.22	62.40 ± 0.72
Group (B)	6	4.30 ± 0.11	10.20 ± 0.41	18.70 ± 0.71	0.70 ± 0.01	10.23 ± 0.53	58.40 ± 0.81
	7	1.92 ± 0.03	15.25 ± 0.46	15.50 ± 0.52	1.51 ± 0.12	12.50 ± 0.71	60.10 ± 0.83
	8	2.00 ± 0.05	18.30 ± 0.48	15.50 ± 0.43	1.72 ± 0.13	13.32 ± 0.32	65.80 ± 0.21
Group (C)	9	3.91 ± 0.11	10.21 ± 0.31	19.72 ± 0.56	2.23 ± 0.15	10.25 ± 0.51	62.90 ± 0.71
	10	3.26 ± 0.13	11.80 ± 0.38	19.84 ± 0.71	0.40 ± 0.01	11.80 ± 0.71	61.90 ± 0.52

Group (A) Candy bar samples, Group (B) Extruded samples, Group (C) Extruded samples

Values represent mean of three replicates ± standard deviation.

Calculated by difference.

Microbiological quality of raw material :

The total viable bacterial count is widely used as an indicator microbiological quality of food. Data in **Table (3)** indicated that, the total viable bacterial count were cannot be detected. This is more acceptable for prepared food product especially baby

foods. moulds and Yeast cannot be detected, this may that yeast and moulds cannot resist for drying. Count of pathogenic bacteria took the same trend of total viable bacterial count. Coliform group, *salmonella* and *staphylococcus* were not detected.

Table 3. Microbiological quality of raw material (CFU/g) :

Material	TVBC (Total viable bacterial count)	M&Y (Moulds and Yeasts)	Coliform group	<i>Salmonella</i>	<i>Staphylococcus</i>
Yellow corn grits	8*10	3*10	ND	ND	ND
Rice grits	27*10	9*10	ND	ND	ND
Wheat flour	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Defatted soy grits	25*10	7*10	ND	ND	ND
Substitute butter	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Cocoa powder	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Skim milk	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
raisin	47*10	23*10	ND	ND	ND
peanut	53*10	36*10	ND	ND	ND
chick peas	14*10	12*10	ND	ND	ND

ND: Not detected

Microbiological quality of experimental group products prepared from the different blends investigated:

Microbiological quality of group preparations is given in **Table (4)**. Experimental group products were examined for total bacterial counts, mold and yeast counts and coliform groups directly after processing and packaging and the obtained results were illustrated in **Table (4)**. Total bacterial counts (TBC), mold and yeast counts were absent from all tested samples. On the other hand, coliform group was not recovered also from all tested samples and the heat treatments for all products were being responsible for such absence **Kabiel (2007) and Nour El-Deen (2013)**.

They could not be detected or recovered because the starting mixtures during processing were treated with heat at high temperature (180°C). The effect of such heat treatment may be same as commercial sterilization of food. This result is in general agreement with those **Kabiel (2007); Maity et al. (2012); Vijayarani et al. (2012) and Raja et al. (2014)**. However, count of pathogenic bacteria took the same trend of total viable bacterial count. Coliform group, *salmonella* and *staphylococcus* were not detected. The same author added "although it is well known that most vegetative organisms, moulds and yeast are destroyed under typical extrusion conditions, the operating conditions under which spores are inactivated are not well understood"

Table 4. Microbiological quality of experimental group products prepared from the different blends investigated (CFU/g) :

Group	Samples	TVBC (Total viable bacterial count)	M& Y (Moulds and Yeasts)	Coliform group	<i>Salmonella</i>	<i>Staphylococcus</i>
Candy bar samples	S (1)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
	S (2)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
	S (3)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
	S (4)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
	S (5)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Extruded samples	S (6)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
	S (7)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
CO-extruded samples	S (8)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
	S (9)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
	S (10)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND

ND: Not detected

Sensory evaluation of experimental infants products prepared from the different blends investigated:

Sensory evaluation is considered one of the limiting factors of consumer acceptability for organoleptic properties including appearance and color, taste, texture, odor, solubility in mouth, volume and over all acceptability. Data indicated that a non significant ($P < 0.05$) changes were found in all properties for all experimental products.

Data in **Table (5)** showed that appearance data indicated that a non significant ($P < 0.05$) changes were found in extruded blends, but in candy bar A few significant differences ($p > 0.05$) existed

between 6 blends on the other hand CO-extruded there was no great significant differences ($p < 0.05$) between 2 blends. Tasted data indicated that a non significant ($P < 0.05$) changes were found in extruded blends but in candy bar A few significant differences ($p > 0.05$) existed between 6 blends on the other hand CO-extruded there was no great significant differences ($p < 0.05$) between 2 blends.

Texture data indicated that a non significant ($P < 0.05$) changes were found in extruded blends but in candy bar A few significant differences ($p > 0.05$) existed between 6 blends on the other hand CO-extruded there was no great significant differences ($p < 0.05$) between 2 blends.

Table 5. Sensory evaluation of experimental infants products prepared from the different blends investigated:

Group	Samples	Sensory evaluation property						
		Appearance and color (20)	Tastes (20)	Textures (20)	Odor (20)	Solubility in mouth (10)	Volume (10)	Over all acceptability (100)
Candy bar samples	S (1)	17.76 ^b ±0.38	16.98 ^b ±0.46	16.38 ^c ±0.47	18.47 ^a ±0.37	8.14 ^b ±0.28	8.18 ^a ±0.30	84.68 ^b ±1.93
	S (2)	19.41 ^a ±0.23	18.71 ^a ±0.34	18.08 ^a ±0.38	18.63 ^a ±0.34	8.17 ^b ±0.276	8.08 ^a ±0.27	91.33 ^a ±1.50
	S (3)	18.47 ^a ±0.38	17.30 ^b ±0.44	17.52 ^b ±0.47	18.65 ^a ±0.31	8.13 ^b ±0.33	7.94 ^a ±0.29	80.03 ^b ±3.01
	S (4)	18.067 ^b ±0.47	16.52 ^b ±0.44	17.60 ^b ±0.43	19.36 ^a ±0.29	8.25 ^b ±0.29	8.20 ^a ±0.27	82.57 ^b ±2.96
	S (5)	17.65 ^b ±0.47	16.62 ^b ±0.49	17.70 ^b ±0.39	17.68 ^b ±0.43	7.87 ^b ±0.33	8.73 ^a ±0.25	80.72 ^b ±3.21
	S (6)	18.91 ^a ±0.29	17.58 ^a ±0.40	17.05 ^b ±0.43	18.78 ^a ±0.30	8.25 ^b ±0.32	8.30 ^a ±0.29	80.97 ^b ±3.03
	S (7)	19.13 ^a ±0.310	18.70 ^a ±0.28	19.20 ^a 0.26	17.75 ^b 0.46	9.15 ^a ±0.21	8.03 ^a ±0.30	92.87 ^a ±1.36
	S (8)	19.41 ^a ±0.19	18.47 ^a ±0.33	18.80 ^a ±0.35	18.82 ^a ±0.31	8.69 ^a ±0.28	8.13 ^a ±0.33	91.33 ^a ±2.10
	S (9)	18.11 ^b ±0.41	17.50 ^b ±0.43	17.88 ^b ±0.43	18.00 ^b ±0.38	9.03 ^a ±0.228	8.17 ^a ±0.276	83.42 ^b ±3.14
	S (10)	18.50 ^a ±0.37	17.85 ^a ±0.44	17.93 ^b ±0.42	17.88 ^b ±0.41	8.35 ^b ±0.31	8.14 ^a ±0.28	86.90 ^a ±2.45
L.S.D.		1.016	1.139	1.131	1.007	0.807	0.802	7.091

*LSD =least significant difference at 0.05.

**Means with different superscripts are significantly different (P>0.05).

Odor data indicated that significant (P<0.05) changes were found in extruded blends but in candy bar and non significant differences (p>0.05) existed between 5 blends except blend No 5 on the other hand CO-extruded there was a non significant differences (p<0.05) between 2 blends. Solubility in mouth data indicated that a non significant (P<0.05) changes were found in extruded blends and candy bar on the other hand CO-extruded there was no great significant differences (p<0.05) between 2 blends. Volume data indicated that a non significant (P<0.05) changes were found in extruded, candy bar and co-extruded blends and over all acceptability data indicated that a non significant (P<0.05) changes were found in extruded blends but in candy bar and non significant differences (p>0.05) existed between 5 blends except blend No 2 on the other hand co-extruded there was a non significant differences (p<0.05) between 2 blends. These obtained results for organoleptic properties are in agreement with those of Hussein (2000).

Sensory evaluation of experimental adults products prepared from the different blends investigated:

Sensory evaluation is considered one of the limiting factors of consumer acceptability for organoleptic properties including appearance (color,

porosity), taste (bran flavor, bitterness, off-odor, after taste), texture (hardness, crispness, brittleness, firmness), odor (odor raw material, stink odor, undesirable odor, old odor), solubility in mouth, volume and over all acceptability. Data indicated that a non significant (P<0.05) changes were found in all properties for all experimental products.

Appearance (color and porosity):

Color scores:

Results in Table (6) showed that samples 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 had higher scores for most properties compared to the other appearance products. Besides it showed the highest score for porosity. There were significant differences (p>0.05) between all samples. In agreement to the findings of the present study, El-Sharkawi (2004) found that significant (p>0.05) changes were found in color of extruded blends.

Taste (bran flavor, bitterness, off-odor, after taste):

Data in Table (6) showed that there were non significant differences (p>0.05) between all samples.

Textures (hardness, crispness, brittleness, firmness)

Table 6. Sensory evaluation of experimental adults products prepared from the different blends investigated

Property	Experimental extruded products										LSD	
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4	Sample 5	Sample 6	Sample 7	Sample 8	Sample 9	Sample 10		
Appearance	Color	8.51 ^a ±0.33	8.87 ^a ±0.31	8.24 ^b ±0.25	8.92 ^a ±0.22	8.80 ^a ±0.25	9.06 ^a ±0.20	8.70 ^a ±0.27	8.79 ^a ±0.25	8.00 ^b ±0.31	7.88 ^b ±0.37	0.779
	Porosity	7.64 ^b ±0.31	8.05 ^a ±0.34	7.80 ^b ±0.35	7.79 ^b ±0.36	7.85 ^b ±0.34	8.51 ^a ±0.32	8.76 ^a ±0.23	8.33 ^a ±0.31	7.64 ^b ±0.33	7.55 ^b ±0.36	0.904
	Bran flavor	4.00 ^b ±0.17	4.50 ^a ±0.13	4.27 ^a ±0.16	4.61 ^a ±0.25	4.52 ^a ±0.26	4.15 ^a ±0.21	4.30 ^a ±0.16	4.23 ^a ±0.19	4.27 ^a ±0.18	4.48 ^a ±0.20	0.540
Tastes	Bitterness	4.32 ^a ±0.25	4.53 ^a ±0.17	4.24 ^a ±0.2	4.36 ^a ±0.19	4.27 ^a ±0.2	4.36 ^a ±0.19	4.52 ^a ±0.15	4.48 ^a ±0.20	4.36 ^a ±0.22	4.36 ^a ±0.19	0.547
	Off-odor	4.00 ^a ±0.26	4.21 ^a ±0.19	4.14 ^a ±0.23	4.24 ^a ±0.23	4.24 ^a ±0.23	4.33 ^a ±0.2	4.52 ^a ±0.2	4.30 ^a ±0.23	4.39 ^a ±0.18	4.30 ^a ±0.21	0.599
	After taste	4.08 ^a ±0.18	4.36 ^a ±0.14	4.33 ^a ±0.15	4.17 ^a ±0.18	4.14 ^a ±0.18	4.21 ^a ±0.17	4.14 ^a ±0.22	4.11 ^a ±0.19	3.97 ^a ±0.21	4.15 ^a ±0.19	0.504
Textures	Hardness	4.00 ^b ±0.15	4.33 ^a ±0.17	4.21 ^a ±0.16	4.44 ^a ±0.21	4.44 ^a ±0.21	4.58 ^a ±0.17	4.00 ^b ±0.18	4.09 ^a ±0.18	4.27 ^a ±0.19	4.24 ^a ±0.17	0.496
	Crispness	3.44 ^c ±0.2	3.94 ^b ±0.19	3.77 ^b ±0.19	4.03 ^b ±0.27	4.09 ^b ±0.26	3.79 ^b ±0.23	4.64 ^a ±0.1	4.82 ^a ±0.07	4.47 ^a ±0.14	4.67 ^a ±0.15	0.522
	Brittleness	3.53 ^b ±0.22	3.95 ^b ±0.23	3.76 ^b ±0.19	3.86 ^b ±0.21	3.83 ^b ±0.21	3.76 ^b ±0.23	4.30 ^a ±0.15	4.52 ^a ±0.18	3.91 ^b ±0.19	4.00 ^a ±0.17	0.556
	Firmness	3.45 ^b ±0.2	4.33 ^a ±0.17	3.91 ^a ±0.2	3.94 ^a ±0.22	3.94 ^a ±0.22	4.00 ^a ±0.21	3.70 ^b ±0.21	3.76 ^a ±0.22	3.94 ^a ±0.19	3.79 ^b ±0.2	0.567
Odor	Odor raw material	4.39 ^a ±0.14	4.27 ^a ±0.19	4.36 ^a ±0.17	4.39 ^a ±0.16	4.36 ^a ±0.16	4.48 ^a ±0.12	4.33 ^a ±0.19	4.30 ^a ±0.22	4.06 ^a ±0.23	4.18 ^a ±0.2	0.498
	Stink odor	4.85 ^a ±0.09	4.76 ^a ±0.09	4.79 ^a ±0.09	4.85 ^a ±0.08	4.61 ^a ±0.18	4.85 ^a ±0.06	4.88 ^a ±0.07	4.76 ^a ±0.14	4.64 ^a ±0.14	4.85 ^a ±0.06	0.295
	Undesirable Odor	4.35 ^a ±0.19	4.42 ^a ±0.15	4.18 ^a ±0.19	4.38 ^a ±0.17	4.41 ^a ±0.16	4.39 ^a ±0.15	4.39 ^a ±0.17	4.61 ^a ±0.15	4.33 ^a ±0.2	4.39 ^a ±0.18	0.474
	Old odor	4.55 ^a ±0.19	4.64 ^a ±0.16	4.36 ^b ±0.27	4.85 ^a ±0.15	4.67 ^a ±0.10	4.27 ^b ±0.23	4.18 ^b ±0.24	4.64 ^a ±0.17	4.36 ^b ±0.20	4.67 ^a ±0.14	0.520
Solubility in mouth	7.29 ^a ±0.40	7.79 ^a ±0.32	7.35 ^a ±0.38	8.03 ^a ±0.31	7.94 ^a ±0.31	7.58 ^a ±0.39	8.58 ^a ±0.29	8.18 ^a ±0.38	8.42 ^a ±0.32	8.52 ^a ±0.31	0.963	
Volume	9.18 ^a ±0.18	9.24 ^a ±0.16	9.00 ^a ±0.16	9.38 ^a ±0.16	9.38 ^a ±0.16	9.00 ^a ±0.25	9.00 ^a ±0.21	9.21 ^a ±0.17	9.18 ^a ±0.20	9.30 ^a ±0.13	0.509	
Over all acceptability	77.70 ^b ±2.39	86.60 ^a ±1.42	83.70 ^a ±2.01	86.70 ^a ±1.62	86.48 ^a ±1.63	86.90 ^a ±1.42	87.60 ^a ±1.42	85.60 ^a ±2.53	86.80 ^a ±1.67	82.40 ^a ±2.87	5.452	

*LSD =least significant difference at 0.05.

**Means with different superscripts are significantly different (P>0.05).

Data in **Table (6)** demonstrated that textures scores for hardness there were non significant differences (p>0.05) between all samples except sample No. 1. On the other hand crispness highest score for samples 7, 8, 9 and 10 than other samples and brittleness there were significant differences (p>0.05) between all samples but in firmness A few

significant differences (p>0.05) existed between 10 samples.

Odor (odor raw material, stink odor, undesirable odor, old odor)

Results in **Table ()** Showed that there were non significant differences (p>0.05) between all

samples in odor raw material, stink odor, undesirable odor and old odor.

Solubility in mouth and volume

Data in **Table (6)** demonstrated that there were non significant differences ($p > 0.05$) between all samples.

Over all acceptability

Regarding variation according to kind of results of **Table (6)** demonstrated that over all acceptability scores had no significant differences ($p > 0.05$) exhibited between all samples except sample No 1. The obtained results are in line with those of **Kabiel (2007)** who reported that the overall acceptability scores for both cheese and chocolate cream extrudates.

Conclusions

In the end, research concludes with the recommendation to produce candy bar the previous ten Balkhaltat at the national level in the ministries of agriculture and the Egyptian Education school feeding factories and dissemination of the importance of that among school children to improve their nutritional status.

References

- A.O.A.C. (2005)** Official methods of analysis. Association of Official Analytical Chemists 17th ed., Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
- A.O.C.S. (1993)** Official methods and recommended practices of the American Oil Chemists Society, 4th ed. published by the American Oil Chemists Society, 1608, Broadmoor, Drive, Champaign, Illinois, 61826-3489.
- Adegun J.A.; Ajayi-Vincent O.B. and Alebiosu E.O. (2013)** Differences in the nutritional status of young school children from public and private owned primary schools in ekiti state, nigeria. European Scientific Journal 9(7), ISSN: 1857 – 7881
- Alderman H. and Bundy D. (2012)** School feeding programmes and development: Are we framing the question correctly? World Bank Research Observer 27(2)204-221.
- APHA (1992)** Compendium of methods for the microbiological examination of foods. Inc. American Public Health Association Washington DC.
- Azouz A. (2011)** Nutritional evaluation of children meals at Egyptian schools: II – Amino acids, minerals and vitamins profiles. Annals of Agricultural Science 56(2)77–81.
- Bouvier J.M. and Campanella O. H. (2014)** Extrusion Processing Technology Food and Non-Food Biomaterials, This edition first published, wileyblackwell.
- Chatterjee M. and Bandyopadhyay A.R. (2012)** A Study on Nutritional Status and Dental Caries in Permanent Teeth among School Going Girl of Bengalee Population, India. Advances in Anthropology. 2(3) 112-116.
- Donald B.; Carmen B.; Margaret G.; Aulo G.; Matthew J. and Lesley D. (2009)** Rethinking School Feeding: Social Safety Nets, Child Development and the Education Sector. The World Bank Washington, D.C: World Bank.
- El-Sharkawi A.S.M. (2004)** Quality attributes of extruded high protein blends. Ph.D. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Menofia Univ., Egypt.
- Fernández San Juan P. M. (2006)** Dietary habits and nutritional status of school aged children in Spain. Nutr Hosp.; 21(3)374-378 ISSN 0212-1611
- Garcia M. L.; Dominguez R.; Galvez M. D; Casas C. and Selgas M. D. (2002)** Utilization of cereal and fruit fibers in low fat dry fermented sausages. Meat Sci., 60:227-236.
- Gomez K. A. and Gomez A. A. (1984)** Statistical Procedures for Agriculture Research. John Wiley and Sons Editor Inc. USA 2^{ed}, Chapter 3, 129-184.
- Gordon A.R.; Cohen R.; Crepinsek M.K.; Fox M.K.; Hall J. and Zeidman E. (2009)** The third School Nutrition Dietary Assessment Study : Background and study design . J Am Diet Assoc.; 109(suppl1): S20-S30.
- Hussein E.H. (2000)** Chemical and nutritional evaluation of high protein extrudates. Ph.D. Thesis, Fac. Home Economic, Minufiya Univ.
- Kabiel M. Eman (2007)** Technological and nutritional studies on some snacks. M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Menofia Univ., Egypt.
- Kroll B.J. (1990)** Sensory testing with children. J. food sci. and Technol ., 44(11) 78-86.
- Maity T.; Shah A.; Raju P.S. and Bawa A. S. (2012)** Development of ready-to-fry frozen vegetable snack and its quality evaluation. J. Food Sci. Technol. (January–February) 49(1) 42–49.
- Nour El-Deen A. Eman (2013)** Studies on some snack market meals. Ph.D. Thesis, Fac. Agric. Moshtohor, Benha Univ., Egypt.
- Onweluzo J.C.; Vijayalakshmi M.R.; Vijayanand P. and Eipeson W.E. (1999)** Detarium Microcarpum Polysaccharide as a Stabilizer in Processed Fruit Products. Lebensm.-Wiss. u.-Technol., 32: 521- 526.
- Raja W.H.; Kumar S.; Bhat Z.F. and Kumar P. (2014)** Effect of ambient storage on the quality characteristics of aerobically packaged fish curls incorporated with different flours. Springer Plus, 3(1)106-115.
- Vijayarani D.; Ponnalaghu S. and Rajathivya J. (2012)** Development of Value Added Extruded Product Using Spirulina. International Journal of Health Sciences and Research 2 (4) 42-47.

إنتاج وتقييم نوعيات جديدة من بار الحلوى الصحى والأقتصادى لتلاميذ المدارس

حسن حسن خلف* ، أشرف مهدي شروبه* ، أحمد إبراهيم الدسوقي* ، عيد أحمد عبدالرحيم* وإيمان محمد قابيل*

*قسم الصناعات الغذائية - كلية الزراعة بمشهر - جامعة بنها- مصر
*معهد بحوث تكنولوجيا الأغذية - مركز البحوث الزراعية - وزارة الزراعة - مصر
*شركة إيجيبت فودز للصناعات الغذائية

تم فى هذه الدراسة تحضير عشرة نوعيات من بار الحلوى من الخامات المحلية المتوفرة فى مصر وذات الأسعار الأقتصادية الرخيصة المتناسبة مع الفئات محدودة الدخل فى مصر، وهذه الخامات ذات قيمة غذائية عالية حيث تم إستخدام مطحون كل من الذرة الصفراء، الأرز، القمح وتم إضافة المواد الغذائية ذات القيمة الغذائية العالية والمستخدمه كثيرا فى صناعة الحلوى وهى الزبيب والفول السودانى والحمص وأيضاً بدائل الزبدة ومسحوق الكاكاو واللين المجفف لتصنيع عشرة خلطات مختلفة بثلاث طرق تصنيع مختلفة وبإستخدام تقنية البثق الحرارى (الأكسترودر) وتم إجراء الأختبارات الحسية للعشرة خلطات بطريقتين للتقييم الحسى الطريقة الأولى الفئة المستهدفة من الأطفال المنتج من أجلهم بار الحلوى وهم تلاميذ الحضانه وتلاميذ المدارس الإبتدائية والطريقة الثانية بإستخدام المحكمين الحسيين المختارين والمختبرين بعناية بطرق أختيار المحكمين الحسيين وكانت نتائج التقييم الحسى لجميع الخلطات مقبولة جداً من ناحية الصفات والخصائص الحسية المختبرة وتم إجراء التحليلات الكيمائية لتقدير القيمة الغذائية للمواد الخام المستخدمة فى التصنيع وأيضاً تم تحليل خلطات البار العشرة من الناحية الكيمائية وأظهرت النتائج أن العينات ذات قيمة غذائية عالية ومفيدة ومناسبة من الناحية التغذوية لتلاميذ المدارس وتم إجراء التحليلات الميكروبيولوجية اللازمة حيث تم إجراء العد الكلى للبكتيريا والفطريات والخمائر وبعض سلالات البكتيريا المرضية السائد تواجدها وأظهرت النتائج خلو العشرة عينات من البكتيريا المرضية ومطابقتها للحدود الميكروبيولوجية طبقاً للمواصفات القياسية المصرية وبالتالى سلامتها وأمانها بالنسبة لتلاميذ المدارس وفى النهاية يخلص البحث للتوصية بإنتاج بار الحلوى بالخلطات العشرة السابقة على المستوى القومى فى مصنع التغذية المدرسية التابعة لوزارة الزراعة والتعليم المصرية