

EFFECTS OF FERMENTATION PERIODS AND CONDITIONS ON THE QUALITY ATTRIBUTE OF *FUFU* FLOUR

Yusuf, K.A*, Ibrahim Rasheed¹, Edo O.S²

^{*, 1,2} Department of Agricultural and Bio-Environmental Engineering Technology, Auchi Polytechnic, Auchi, Edo State Nigeria

ABSTRACT: Fufu has been described as a wet paste produced from fermented cassava and it is ranked next to garri as an indigenous food of most Nigerians especially in the southern part of the country. Fermentation is a major unit operation in the production of fufu that dictate the quality attribute of the final products. In this study, the effects of fermentation period and conditions on the quality attribute of fufu flour were carried out. The freshly harvested cassava was peeled, washed, cut into chunks and soaked at different fermentation conditions (opened and closed) for a period of 4, 5 and 6 days respectively. The fermented cassava was then subjected to wet milling, de-watering, granulated, drying and milling. The experiment was considered as a factorial design in Randomized Completely Block Design (RCBD) with the fermentation condition as the blocking factor. A total of 18 samples of fufu flour were subjected to proximate analysis to determine their quality attributes. The result obtained were subjected to statistical analysis using SPSS 23 to check for the effect of the fermentation condition does not have any effect on any of the proximate composition considered. Only fermentation period has effect on the moisture and carbohydrate content of the sample but does not have a significant effect on the ash, protein, fat and fiber content of the sample at 95% confidence level. The optimum moisture content (9.67%), ash (0.69%), protein (2.54%), fat (2.21%), fiber (1.52%) and carbohydrate content (83.67%) of the flour was obtained in a closed sample for 5 days.

Keywords: Cassava, Fufu Flour, Fermentation Period, Fermentation Condition, Proximate Analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

Nigeria has been reported as one of the leading producer of cassava in the World with an annual production of about 45 million tonnes (Asante-Pok., 2013). The crop is processed into many food items such as *fufu, gari, lafun. Fufu* (also called *akpu*) is the meal of soaked fermented cassava roots which is widely consumed in Nigeria (Shittu *et al.*, 2010). It is one of the major food from cassava fermentation, which is reconstituted by stirring in boiling water to form dough and eaten with desired sauces. In some areas, low cyanide cassava roots can be boiled or steamed and pounded into *fufu* (Hahn, 2011). *Fufu* contains 6.50, 1.68, 1.32, 1.84, 1.42 and 87.24% moisture, protein, fat, ash, crude fiber and carbohydrate, respectively (Olumide, 1999).

The traditional operations involved in the production of *fufu* are peeling of cassava, washing of the peeled cassava, cutting into thick chunks and steeped in water in earthenware pots or in a slow-flowing stream for 4-5 days to ferment, before reconstitution by stirring in boiling water to form dough. *Fufu* has a characteristic sour aroma and its modern production is an improved method of *fufu* production from fresh cassava roots into *fufu* flour. (Omodamiro *et al.*, 2012). The sour taste, flavor, appearance, and texture are generally recognized as the main factors that determines the acceptability of the product (*fufu*). The consumer considers the product best when it has a smooth texture, a characteristic sour aroma, and a creamy-white color.

Traditionally, *fufu* is sold as a wet paste and this renders it highly perishable with a short shelf life. This problem can be addressed with the production of *fufu* flour that can be easily reconstituted into a paste with hot water (Tomlins *et al.*, 2007), hence the need for an investigation on the effects of processing of the quality of *fufu* flour to determine its quality attribute for both storage and consumption purposes and to help increase its market value and acceptability of the product.

Okolie *et al.*, (1992) proposed a modification of the microbiological process in order to upgrade the cassava product but in practice is yet to receive great attention. According to Oyewole and Sanni (1995), cassava processors confirmed that shorter fermentation periods (2-3 days) are required during the dry (hot) season while longer fermentation periods (3-5days) are required during the rainy (cold) season for proper retting of cassava for *fufu* production.

Akingbala *et al.*, (1991) also reported that drying of *fufu* in an oven at 60°c for 48 hours reduces the odour of *fufu* but the product is sticky thereby making it unacceptable for *fufu* flour production. Sanni *et al.*, (1991) reported that *fufu* flour is

e-ISSN: 2395-0056 p-ISSN: 2395-0072

assumed to be hygroscopic in nature and would be expected to gain or lose moisture depending on the relative humidity of the atmosphere.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Sample Preparation

100kg of TME 419 of cassava variety (Figure 1) was purchased from Leventis Farm, Weppa, Agenebode, Edo State, Nigeria. The cassava was peeled and washed in a clean bowl with a sponge was subjected into two conditions of fermentation (open and closed) and ferment period of 4, 5 and 6 days respectively.



Figure 1: Sample of freshly Harvested Cassava used for the Study

2.2. Experiment Procedure

The peeled cassava were washed, cut into chunks, and soaked in clean water for fermentation period of 4, 5 and 6 days and at fermentation conditions (open and closed) as shown on Figure 2. (a) Opened Condition sample

(b) Closed Condition sample



Figure 2: Fermentation Conditions



e-ISSN: 2395-0056 p-ISSN: 2395-0072

The samples were than sieved separately and allowed to settle in a synthetic cloth for decantation which was then dewatered with a pressing machine. The dewatered samples were granulated before drying with the aid of a rotary flash dryer and mill with hammer for particle size reduction (Figure 3).



Figure 3: Milling of Dried Fufu into Powder

2.3. Determination of proximate Composition of the Sample:

The proximate composition of the different samples produced was carried out at the Central Research Laboratory, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria. The proximate parameters considered are the moisture, ash, fat, protein, carbohydrate and fiber content of the *fufu* powder produced.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1. Statistical Analysis of the Proximate Composition of the Samples

The average values of the data obtained for proximate analysis of the *fufu* flour at different fermentation conditions and period is as presented in Table 1.

| OPEN | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| FERMENTATION | MOISTURE | ASH (%) | PROTEIN (%) | FAT (%) | FIBER (%) | CARBOHYDRATE (%) |
| PERIOD (DAYS) | CONTENT (%) | | | | | |
| 4 | 7.41 ± 0.26 | 0.92 ± 0.60 | 2.10 ± 0.74 | 1.33 ± 0.21 | 1.54 ± 0.45 | 86.54 ± 1.20 |
| 5 | 8.21 ± 0.42 | 0.95 ± 0.49 | 2.14 ± 0.20 | 2.76 ± 0.40 | 0.8 ± 0.22 | 85.14 ±1. 11 |
| 6 | 8.44 ± 0.21 | 0.83 ± 0.38 | 2.06± 0.22 | 2.04 ± 0.84 | 1.77 ± 0.38 | 84.86 ± 1.01 |
| CLOSED | | | | | | |
| 4 | 7.13 ± 0.26 | 0.50 ± 0.08 | 2.10 ± 0.10 | 2.13 ± 0.69 | 1.20 ± 0.50 | 86.76 ± 1.03 |
| 5 | 9.67 ± 0.17 | 0.69 ±0.18 | 2.54 ± 0.21 | 2.21 ± 1.03 | 1.52 ± 0.31 | 83.67 ± 1.08 |
| 6 | 7.40 ± 0.29 | 0.75 ±0.29 | 2.10 ± 0.04 | 3.39 ± 0.25 | 1.38 ± 0.43 | 85.65 ± 1.44 |
| | | | | | | |

*The average values ± standard deviation of the values

Table 4.1: average values of the data obtained for proximate analysis of the *fufu* flour

3.2. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

The ANOVA for the effects of fermentation condition and period on the proximate composition of the *fufu* flour produced is as shown on the Table 2. The Table reveals that the fermentation conditions and period and interaction between them does not have significant effects on the ash content, protein content, fat content and fiber content of the *fufu* flour produced. Only the moisture and carbohydrate content are significantly affected by the fermentation period but has no effect on the fermentation condition and their interactions at 0.05 confidence limit.

Table 2: ANOVA for the Effects of Fermentation Condition and Period on the Proximate Composition of the Fufu Flour

| Source Squares of Square F Sig. FP .037 2 .018 .083 .921 FC .286 1 .286 1.290 .278 FP * FC .083 2 .042 .188 .831 Error .2663 12 .222 .78 Octal .13.850 18 | Ash content (%) | Tumo III Cara | of | Macr | | |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------|-------------|
| Jourtes Juartes < | Source | Type III Sum |)0 مد | Mean | Б | Sia |
| rr .037 2 .016 .083 .921 FC .286 1 .286 1.290 .278 FP*FC .083 2 .042 .188 .831 Error 2.663 12 .222 .188 .831 Corrected Total 3.070 17 | | <u>o</u> 27 | <u>ui</u> | olo | <u>r</u> 002 | <u>31g.</u> |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | .037 | ۲ ۲ | .018 | .083 | .921 |
| P* Pt. .063 2 .042 .168 .851 Error 2.663 12 .222 Total 13.850 18 | ドし ED * EC | .280 | 1 | .280 | 1.290 | .278 |
| Drior 2.005 12 .222 Total 13.850 18 Corrected Total 3.070 17 Protein Content (%) | | .083 | 4 | .042 | .188 | .831 |
| Total 13.850 18 Corrected Total 3.070 17 Protein Content (%) | Error | | 12 | .222 | | |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | | 13.850 | 18 | | | |
| Protein Content (%) 043 2 021 .125 .884 FC .007 1 .007 .040 .845 FP FC .009 2 .005 .027 .974 Error 2.041 12 .170 .70 .70 Total 83.295 18 | Corrected Total | 3.070 | 17 | | | |
| PC .043 2 .021 .123 .884 FC .007 1 .007 .040 .845 FP * FC .009 2 .005 .027 .974 Error 2.041 12 .170 | FD | 042 | 2 | 0.21 | 125 | 004 |
| PC 1007 1 1007 1407 0.440 0.440 0.445 PF * FC 009 2 005 027 $.974$ Error 2.041 12 $.170$ $.040$ $.845$ Error 2.041 12 $.170$ $.027$ $.974$ Fat content (%) $.2099$ $.17$ $.027$ $.974$ FAt content (%) $.122$ $.170$ $.122$ $.122$ FC 2.099 $.177$ $.1275$ $.1275$ $.1275$ $.122$ FC 2.897 2 1.449 2.310 $.142$ Error 7.526 12 $.627$ $.627$ Total 110.949 18 $$ | | .043 | 2 | .021 | .125 | .884 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | .007 | 1 | .007 | .040 | .845 |
| Error 2.041 12 .170 Total 83.295 18 Corrected Total 2.099 17 Fat content (%) .170 .170 FP 3.155 2 1.578 2.515 .122 FC 1.275 1 1.275 2.032 .179 FP * FC 2.897 2 1.449 2.310 .142 Error 7.526 12 .627 .627 .121 Total 110.949 18 | FP * FC | .009 | 2 10 | .005 | .027 | .974 |
| Total 83.295 18 Corrected Total 2.099 17 Fat content (%) | Error | 2.041 | 12 | .170 | | |
| Lorrected rotal 2.099 17 Fat content (%) | | 83.295 | 18 | | | |
| FP 3.155 2 1.578 2.515 122 FC 1.275 1 1.275 2.032 1.79 FP * FC 2.897 2 1.449 2.310 142 Error 7.526 12 .627 | Lorrected Total | 2.099 | 17 | | | |
| FP 3.155 2 1.578 2.515 $.122$ FC 1.275 1 1.275 2.032 $.179$ FP * FC 2.897 2 1.449 2.310 $.142$ Error 7.526 12 $.627$ $.627$ Total 110.949 18 $.627$ $.504$ 2 $.252$ Free Content (%) $.2222E-5$ 1 $2.222E-5$ $.000$ $.993$ FP FC $2.222E-5$ 1 $2.222E-5$ $.000$ $.993$ FP * FC 1.186 2 $.593$ 2.458 $.127$ Error 2.895 12 $.241$ $.127$ Total 38.206 18 $$ | Fat content (%) | | | | | |
| rr 3.155 2 1.578 2.515 1.122 FC 1.275 1 1.275 2.032 1.79 FP * FC 2.897 2 1.449 2.310 $.142$ Error 7.526 12 $.627$ $.627$ Total 110.949 18 $$ | | | 2 | 1 570 | 2 5 4 5 | 100 |
| FC1.27511.2752.0321.79 $FP * FC$ 2.89721.4492.310.142Error7.52612.627.627Total110.94918 | FP | 3.155 | 2 | 1.578 | 2.515 | .122 |
| FP*FC 2.897 2 1.449 2.310 .142 Error 7.526 12 .627 .627 Total 110.949 18 .627 Gorrected Total 14.853 17 . Fiber Content (%) 7 .2222E-5 1.045 .382 FC 2.222E-5 1 2.222E-5 .000 .993 FP * FC 1.186 2 .593 2.458 .127 Error 2.895 12 .241 | | 1.275 | 1 | 1.275 | 2.032 | .1/9 |
| Error 7.526 12 .627 Total 110.949 18 | FP * FC | 2.897 | 2 | 1.449 | 2.310 | .142 |
| Total 110.949 18 Corrected Total 14.853 17 Fiber Content (%) 7 7 FP .504 2 .252 1.045 .382 FC 2.222E-5 1 2.222E-5 .000 .993 FP * FC 1.186 2 .593 2.458 .127 Error 2.895 12 .241 7 Total 38.206 18 7 7 Corrected Total 4.586 17 7 7 Carbohydrate Content (%) FP 16.593 2 8.297 4.203 .041* FC .616 1 .616 .312 .587 FP * FC 2.710 2 1.355 .687 .522 Error 2.3.685 12 1.974 .522 Total 131100.245 18 .687 .522 Corrected Total 43.604 17 .608 .008 .008 .008 .008 Corrected Total 43.604 17 | Error | 7.526 | 12 | .627 | | |
| Corrected Total 14.853 17 Fiber Content (%) .504 2 .252 1.045 .382 FC 2.222E-5 1 2.222E-5 .000 .993 FP * FC 1.186 2 .593 2.458 .127 Error 2.895 12 .241 Total 38.206 18 Corrected Total 4.586 17 FC Corrected Total 4.586 17 FP 16.593 2 8.297 4.203 .041* FC FP 16.593 2 8.297 4.203 .041* FC FP * FC 2.710 2 1.355 <th< td=""><td>Total</td><td>110.949</td><td>18</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<> | Total | 110.949 | 18 | | | |
| Fiber Content (%) P .504 2 .252 1.045 .382 FC 2.222E-5 1 2.222E-5 .000 .993 FP * FC 1.186 2 .593 2.458 .127 Error 2.895 12 .241 | Corrected Total | 14.853 | 17 | | | |
| FP .504 2 .252 1.045 .382 FC 2.222E-5 1 2.222E-5 .000 .993 FP * FC 1.186 2 .593 2.458 .127 Error 2.895 12 .241 | Fiber Content (%) | = | | | | |
| FC 2.222E-5 1 2.222E-5 .000 .993 FP * FC 1.186 2 .593 2.458 .127 Error 2.895 12 .241 .241 .27 Total 38.206 18 .221 .241 .241 .221 Corrected Total 4.586 17 .2895 .2458 .041* FP 16.593 2 8.297 4.203 .041* FC .616 1 .616 .312 .587 FP * FC 2.710 2 1.355 .687 .522 Error 23.685 12 1.974 .4203 .041* Corrected Total 131100.245 18 | FP | .504 | 2 | .252 | 1.045 | .382 |
| FP*FC 1.186 2 .593 2.458 .127 Error 2.895 12 .241 .241 .127 Total 38.206 18 .127 .241 .127 Corrected Total 4.586 17 .18 .127 Carbohydrate Content (%) FP 16.593 2 8.297 4.203 .041* FC .616 1 .616 .312 .587 FP*FC 2.710 2 1.355 .687 .522 Error 23.685 12 1.974 .1974 Total 131100.245 18 | FC | 2.222E-5 | 1 | 2.222E-5 | .000 | .993 |
| Error 2.895 12 .241 Total 38.206 18 18 Corrected Total 4.586 17 10 Error 16.593 2 8.297 4.203 .041* FP 16.593 2 8.297 4.203 .041* FC .616 1 .616 .312 .587 FP * FC 2.710 2 1.355 .687 .522 Error 23.685 12 1.974 Total 131100.245 18 Corrected Total 43.604 17 Moisture Content (%) FP 8.498 2 4.249 9.037 .004* FC FP * FC 8.498 2 4.249 9.037 .004* FP * FC FP * FC 4.968 2 2.484 5.283 .023* | FP * FC | 1.186 | 2 | .593 | 2.458 | .127 |
| Total 38.206 18 Corrected Total 4.586 17 Carbohydrate Content (%) 17 FP 16.593 2 8.297 4.203 .041* FC .616 1 .616 .312 .587 FP * FC 2.710 2 1.355 .687 .522 Error 23.685 12 1.974 .522 Corrected Total 43.604 17 . .522 Moisture Content (%) | Error | 2.895 | 12 | .241 | | |
| Corrected Total4.58617Carbohydrate Content (%)16.59328.2974.203.041*FP.6161.616.312.587FC.6161.616.312.587FP * FC2.71021.355.687.522Error23.685121.974.522Corrected Total131100.24518 | Total | 38.206 | 18 | | | |
| Carbohydrate Content (%)FP16.59328.2974.203.041*FC.6161.616.312.587FP * FC2.71021.355.687.522Error23.685121.974 | Corrected Total | 4.586 | 17 | | | |
| FP 16.593 2 8.297 4.203 .041* FC .616 1 .616 .312 .587 FP * FC 2.710 2 1.355 .687 .522 Error 23.685 12 1.974 .041* Total 131100.245 18 | Carbobydrate Content (0/) | | | | | |
| FC .616 1 .616 .312 .587 FP * FC 2.710 2 1.355 .687 .522 Error 23.685 12 1.974 .522 Corrected Total 131100.245 18 | FD | 16 502 | 2 | Q 207 | 1,202 | 0/1* |
| FC 1 .010 1 .010 .312 .587 FP * FC 2.710 2 1.355 .687 .522 Error 23.685 12 1.974 | гг БС | 10.393 | ے 1 | 0.47/ | 4.203 212 | 507 |
| PF PC 2.710 2 1.355 .687 .522 Error 23.685 12 1.974 12 1.974 Total 131100.245 18 17 18 16 17 Moisture Content (%) End 8.498 2 4.249 9.037 .004* FC .008 1 .008 .018 .896 FP * FC 4.968 2 2.484 5.283 .023* | гъ ЕD * ЕС | .010 2.710 | 1 | 1 255 | .312 | .307 E22 |
| Linon 25.065 12 1.974 Total 131100.245 18 | FF FU | ム./ 1U つつ ムロビ | ۲ ۲۵ | 1.333 | .00/ | .577 |
| Instruct of the second seco | EIIUI Total | 43.003 121100 245 | 14 | 1.9/4 | | |
| Corrected rotal43.60417Moisture Content (%)8.49824.2499.037.004*FC.0081.008.018.896FP * FC4.96822.4845.283.023* | I Uldi Corrected Total | 151100.245 | 18 | | | |
| Moisture Content (%) 6 FP 8.498 2 4.249 9.037 .004* FC .008 1 .008 .018 .896 FP * FC 4.968 2 2.484 5.283 .023* | Corrected Total | 43.604 | 17 | | | |
| FP8.49824.2499.037.004*FC.0081.008.018.896FP * FC4.96822.4845.283.023* | Moisture Content (%) | | | | | |
| FC.0081.008.018.896FP * FC4.96822.4845.283.023* | FP | 8.498 | 2 | 4.249 | 9.037 | .004* |
| FP * FC4.96822.4845.283.023* | FC | .008 | 1 | .008 | .018 | .896 |
| | FP * FC | 4.968 | 2 | 2.484 | 5.283 | .023* |

| | International Research Journal | 10logy (IRJET) | e-ISSN: 2395-0056 | | |
|-------|---------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|------|-------------------|
| IRJET | Volume: 08 Issue: 05 May 2021 | www.irjet.net | | | p-ISSN: 2395-0072 |
| | | | | | |
| | Error | 5.642 | 12 | .470 | |

18

Corrected Total19.11717*Significant at $P \le 0.05$; FC-Fermentation Condition; FP-Fermentation Period

1183.148

3.3. Duncan's New Multiple Range Test (DNMRT)

Total

Further analysis of the result using DNMRT is as presented on the Table 3. The Table shown that the proximate results obtained for the ash content, protein content, fat content and fiber content, at different fermentation period are not significantly different. In the case of carbohydrate content, the value of fermentation period obtained at fourth day is different from that obtained on the fifth day but not significantly different from that of the sixth day. Also, the moisture content obtained on the fourth day was not significantly different from that of the fifth day but was significantly different from that which was obtained on the sixth day.

| Table 3. | Duncan's | Νου | Multiple | Range | Test | (DNMRT) |
|----------|----------|-----|----------|---------|------|---------|
| Table 5: | Duncan S | new | munupi | e nange | rest | נחושותן |

| Fermentation period | Ash | Protein | Fat | fiber | Carbohydrate | Moisture content |
|---------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 4 | 0.7117ª | 2.0800 ^a | 1.7333ª | 1.1617ª | 86.6517ª | 7.2717 ^a |
| 5 | 0.8183 ^a | 2.1000ª | 2.4850 ^a | 1.3667ª | 84.4033 ^b | 7.9133 ^a |
| 6 | 0.7917 ^a | 2.1917 ^a | 2.7133 ^a | 1.5717 ^a | 84.9300 ^{ab} | 8.9400 ^b |

*means with the same letters are not significantly difference but means with different letter are significantly different at 5% confidence level.

3.4. Effects of Fermentation Period and Conditions on the Proximate Composition of the *Fufu* Flour

The effect of fermentation period and conditions on the proximate composition of the *fufu* samples is as represented on the charts below for ash content, protein content, fat content, fiber content, carbohydrate content and the moisture content respectively.



Figure 4: Effect of Fermentation Period and Conditions on the Protein (a) and ash (b) Content of the Flour



Figure 5: Effect of Fermentation Period and Conditions on the Fat (a) and Carbohydrate (b) Content of the Flour



Figure 6: Effect of Fermentation Period and Conditions on the Fiber (a) and Moisture (b) Content of the Flour

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

4.1. Conclusion

Fufu flour was produced from the freshly harvested cassava and investigation of the effects of fermentation periods and conditions on the quality characteristics of *fufu* flour was carried out. The proximate analysis result of *fufu* flour shows that the flour has an optimum value of 85.14, 8.21, 0.95, 0.8, 2.76 and 83.67, 9.67, 0.69, 1.52, 2.54, 2.54, 2.21 for open and closed conditions respectively for carbohydrate, moisture content, ash, fiber, protein and fat respectively. The proximate analysis result obtained was subjected to statistical analysis using SPSS software and the statistical result revealed that fermentation condition does not have any effect on any of the proximate composition considered. Only fermentation period that has effect

on the moisture and carbohydrate content of the sample but does not have a significant effect on the ash content, protein content ,fat content and fiber content of the sample at 95% confidence level.

4.2. Recommendation

This study revealed that Protein, fiber and fat content was very low based on the proximate analysis and can be improved upon by adding some calculated amount of soya beans or tiger nuts during milling to improve the nutrients.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was supported by grants from Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TetFUND) accessed through Centre for Research Innovation and Development (CRID) Auchi Polytechnic, Auchi, Edo State, Nigeria.

REFERENCES

- 1. Akingbala, J.O., Oguntimein, G.B. and Abass, A.B. 1991: Effect of Processing Methods on Quality and Acceptability of Fufu from Low Cyanide Cassava. Journal of The Science of Food and Agriculture, 51(1): 151-154.
- 2. Asante-Pok, A., (2013). Analysis of Incentives and Disincentives for Cassava in Nigeria. Technical notes series, MAFAP, FAO, Rome.
- 3. Hahn, S.K. (1988). An Overview of the Traditional Cassava Processing and Utilization in Africa. In: IITA/ILCA/University of Ibadan Workshop on the Potential Utilization of Cassava as Livestock Feed in Africa, Ibadan, 14-18 November, 1988. FAO
- 4. Okolie, N.P., Ibeh, I.N. and Ugochukwu, EN. (1992). Production of Improved Cassava fufu "akpu" Through Controlled Fermentation. Food Chemistry, 44:137-139.
- 5. Omodamiro, R.M., Oti, E., Etudaiye, H.A.,Egesi, C., Olasanmi, B. and Ukpabi, U.J. 2012. Production of fufu from Yellow Cassava Roots Using the Odour-less Flour Technique and the Traditional Method: Evaluation of Carotenoids Retention in the Fufu. Advances in Applied Science Research, 3(5): 2566-2572
- 6. Olagunju, O. F., Ezekiel, O. O., Ogunshe, A. O., Oyeyinka, S. A., and Ijabadeniyi, O. A. (2018).
- Effects of fermentation on proximate composition, mineral profile and antinutrients of tamarind (Tamarindus indica L.) seed in the production of daddawa-type condiment. Olumide N.D. (1999). The Africa Farmer and her Husband. Roots, Tubers and Legumes. Report of the Expert meeting. 71-93
- Oyewole, O.B. and Sanni, L.O. (1995). Constraints in Traditional Cassava Processing The Case of 'Fufu' Production -Transformation Alimentaire du Manioc. (T. Agbor Egbe, A. Brauman, D. Griffon, S. Triche (éds)) Paris, ORSTOM: 523 – 52
- 9. Shittu, T.A., Idowu, M.A. and Ademosu, O.O. (2010) Production of Dried Starch-albumen Powder: Effect of Temperature and Starch on some Functional Properties. Journal of Food Processing and Preservation, 34: 385–400.