Comparative Analysis of Physical and Functional Properties of Colored Horse Gram Varieties (*Macrotyloma uniflorum*) and Its Flour

Pallavi M B [a++*], Uma N K [a#], Hemalatha S [b#] and Vijaykumar A G [c†]

[a] *Department of Food and Nutrition, College of Community Science, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad, India.*
[b] *Department of Food Processing Technology, College of Community Science, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad, India.*
[c] *Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, Seed Unit, UAS Dharwad-580005 India.*

Authors' contributions

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

| *Original Research Article* |

ABSTRACT

Pulses has important role in contributing to food and nutritional security and replenishing soil nutrients having a huge potential in addressing needs like future global food security, nutrition and environmental sustainability. Horse gram (*Macrotyloma uniflorum*) is a minor, under-exploited

_____

[++] *Ph. D. Scholar;*
[#] *Professor and Head;*
[†] *Seed Production Officer, AICRP-NSP;*
Corresponding author: E-mail: pallubadami1@gmail.com;

legume of tropics and subtropics grown under dry-land agriculture. The present study was conducted with the objective to maximize the utilization of horse gram and its flour physical and functional properties. Hundred grain weight and density (3.33 g,1.29 g/ml) were higher in cream colored variety and it was lighter, redder (less green), yellower (less blue) than brown and black colored varieties. Thickness of varieties varied significantly, highest being in brown (2.18 mm) colored variety. Hydration capacity, hydration index, swelling capacity and percent germination (2.92 g/100 grains, 0.93, 3.83 ml/100 grains and 91.66 %) varied significantly with highest being in brown colored variety. Maximum amount of all the flours passed through 52 BSS standard sieve having 300 µ sieve opening. Loose bulk density was high in brown colored flour (0.41 g/ml) whereas tapped bulk density was high in cream colored flour (0.63 g/ml). Cream-colored horse gram flour was lighter (L* value being 78.72), redder (a* value being 5.78) and yellower (b* value being 16.84). There was significant difference in the functional properties of flour. The black colored flour had highest water absorption capacity (2.31 ml/g), oil absorption capacity (2.15 ml/g), swelling power (9.14 g/g), foaming capacity (36.23 %) and foaming stability (32.13 %) than other two flours. The wettability, flowability and cohesiveness of all three flours were good, fair and low respectively. Thus brown and black colored varieties had better physical and functional properties than cream-colored variety. The brown and black colored flour had highest loose bulk density whereas cream colored flour had highest tapped bulk density. Black colored flour had highest water and oil absorption capacity, swelling power, foaming capacity and foaming stability.

Keywords: Horse gram varieties; flour; physical properties; functional properties; particle size distribution; L*, a*, b*.

1. INTRODUCTION

Pulses are the cheap and important source of protein in the Indian diet apart from being the staple food in many parts of the world. Thus, they contribute to food and nutritional security of the country. Pulses are consumed as whole grains, split dhals, flour, animal feed etc. Horse gram (*Macrotyloma uniflorum*) is an under-exploited legume [1] whose technological potential as a foodstuff is highlighted in this study. In terms of nutrition, it is a real asset. It is a rich source of protein, iron and neutraceutical components such as polyphenols and tannins [2]. "However, its consumption is limited due to presence of several anti-nutritional factors such as phytic acid, trypsin inhibitors and saponins. Thus several processing methods like soaking, germination, boiling, pressure cooking are used to reduce the level of anti-nutritional components and increase their bioavailability. Horse gram is also used as a natural medicine to treat several ailments such as kidney stones, obesity, cold, cough, menstrual problems" etc [3]. Horse gram is commonly called as *Kutlhi* (Hindi), *Kollu* (Tamil), *Ullavalu* (Telugu),*Mudhira*(Malayalam), *Kurti-kalai* (Bengali), *Huruli* (Kannada). Physical parameters of grains are important for its physical appearance and description apart from having role in threshing operations since it allows the passage of specific size of the grains and various unwanted materials whereas functional properties reflect the complex interaction between the composition, structure and physico-chemical properties of food components [4] and also required to evaluate how different food components behave in specific systems. Thus, the present investigation was undertaken with the objective to maximize the utilization horse gram and its flour physical and functional properties.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Three colored horse gram varieties [brown (GPM-6), cream (kalaghatagi local) and black (CRHG-22)] were procured from seed unit, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad. The seeds were cleaned to remove the extraneous matter. Furtherthese grains were milled into their respective flour and kept in a cool and dry place prior to use. Physical properties and functional properties of both grains and respective flour were carried out using the standard procedure as mentioned below.

2.1 Physical Properties of Horse Gram Varieties

Physical properties like hundred-kernel weight, hundred kernel volume, bulk density, color analysis (L*, a*, b* value) length, breadth and length to breadth ratio of three horse gram varieties (Fig. 1) were assessed.

| (A) | (B) | (C) |

(A) Brown color horse gram **(B) Cream colored horse gram** **(C) Black colored horse gram**

Fig. 1. Different colored horse gram varieties

2.1.1 Hundred grain weight

"Weight of selected hundred intact grains in triplicates was recorded using electronic weighing balance and average was calculated. The mean weight was expressed in g/100 grains" [5].

2.1.2 Hundred grain volume

Volume of weighed hundred horse gram grains was measured using water displacement method. Known volume of water was taken in measuring cylinder and hundred randomly selected grains were dropped in it. "The rise in volume was recorded in ml. The volume of grains was calculated by subtracting the initial volume from final volume" [5].

2.1.3 Bulk density

Bulk density was calculated from weight and volume of horse gram using the formula

Bulk density (g/ml) = Weight (g) / Volume (ml)

Bulk density was expressed as g per ml [5].

2.1.4 Color analysis

The samples were subjected to color assessment in Konica Minolta spectrophotometer of model CM 2600/2500d All the colored horse gram varieties were selected randomly and were packed in transparent pouches and readings were taken in triplicates. The color was assessed for L* (lightness/ black to white), a* (redness/ redness to greenness) and b*(yellowness/ yellowness to blueness).

2.1.5 Thickness

The average thickness of randomly picked ten grains were measured in (mm) with the help of digital verniercalipers having least count 0.01 mm [6].

2.1.6 Length, breadth and L/B ratio

The average length and breadth of the randomly picked ten grains were measured in (mm) with a help of digital vernier calipers having least count 0.01 mm. The length/ breadth ratio was obtained by dividing the length of a single grain by the corresponding breadth to determine the size and shape [6].

2.2 Functional Properties of Horse Gram Varieties

Functional properties like hydration capacity, hydration index, swelling capacity, swelling index and per cent germination were assessed for horse gram varieties.

2.2.1 Hydration capacity

Hydration capacity was measured by soaking weighed hundred horse gram seeds overnight in beaker with 100 ml of water. Next day, water was drained off and grains were dried using filter paper to remove superfluous water and weighed [7]. Hydration capacity was calculated using the formula;

Hydration capacity of seeds (g/100 grains) = Weight after soaking (g) - Weight before soaking (g) / Number of seeds (100 grains)

2.2.2 Hydration index

Hydration index was calculated by using formula:

Hydration index = Hydration capacity / Weight of seeds

2.2.3 Swelling capacity

Hundred horse gram seeds were counted and volume was noted by water displacement method. The grains were soaked overnight. Further, water was drained off next day and volume was noted [7]. Then, the swelling capacity was measured using formula:

Swelling capacity (ml/100 grains) = volume after soaking (ml)- volume before soaking (ml) / Number of seeds (100 grains)

2.2.4 Swelling index

Swelling index was calculated using formula:

Swelling index = Swelling capacity / Volume of seeds

2.2.5 Percent germination

Hundred grains were placed in a petriplate on a filter paper dampened with water and the lid was closed, kept in incubator and allowed to germinate for 24 hrs. Further germinated grains were counted and expressed in percentage [8].

2.3 Physical Properties of Horse Gram Flour

Physical properties of flour such as particle size distribution, loose bulk density, tapped bulk density and color analysis and of three colored horse gram flour (Fig. 2) was analyzed.

2.3.1 Particle size distribution

About hundred grams of flour was weighed and passed through different meshes of BSS sieves from 25, 30, 36, 44, 52 and 60 with sieve opening of 600, 500, 420, 355, 300 and 250 microns respectively. The samples were passed from bigger to smaller mesh size. The sample above the mesh was weighed and the reading was recorded. Percentage was calculated [9].

2.3.2 Loose bulk density

Loose bulk density of flour was determined by pouring flour sample into a 10 ml graduated measuring cylinder. Weight of the sample was measured when the sample volume reached 1 ml. The loose density was calculated by dividing weight with the volume of the obtained flour [10].

2.3.3 Tapped bulk density

A standard graduated cylinder of 100 ml capacity was taken for the bulk density measurement. Initially, the empty measuring cylinder was weighed, and then 20 g of flour was added in the cylinder then tapped for 20-25 times to a vertical distance of 10 mm to pack the flour particles tightly and recorded the volume of weighed sample. The tapped bulk density (TBD) of flour was determined by following formula [10].

Tapped bulk density (g/ml) = Weight of the sample at recorded volume (g) / Volume of sample (ml)

2.3.4 Color

Color of horse gram flours was assessed by the procedure outlined in 2.1.4

2.4 Functional Properties of Horse Gram Flour

Functional properties like water absorption capacity, oil absorption capacity, swelling power, solubility, foaming capacity and stability, wettability, followability and cohesiveness was assessed for horse gram flours**.**


(A)	(B)	(C)
(A)Brown color horse gram flour	**(B) Cream color horse gram flour**	**(C) Blackcolor horse gram flour**

Fig. 2. Different colored horse gram flour

2.4.1 Water absorption capacity

Water absorption capacity was assessed by [11] method. Known volume of flour (5 g) was weighed and added to the pre-weighed centrifuge tube (W_1). To this 30 ml of water was added and stirred with a glass rod for 5 min. The contents were allowed to stand for 30 min and then centrifuged at 11,000 rpm for 25 min. The free liquid was poured off. Inner side of tube were wiped off with tissue paper. The centrifuge tube was weighed again (W_2). The water absorption capacity was calculated using the formula:

Water absorption capacity, WAC (%) = W2 – W1 / weight of sample × 100

2.4.2 Oil absorption capacity

Oil absorption capacity was assessed by using [12] method. One gram of flour was mixed with 10 ml of refined vegetable oil in pre-weighed centrifuge (W_1). The tubes were stirred for one min for complete dispersion of sample and the sample was centrifuged at 3000 rpm for 25 min. The separated oil was then removed and tubes were inverted on absorbent paper to drain off the remaining oil prior to reweighing (W_2). The oil absorption capacity was calculated using the formula:

Oil absorption capacity, OAC (%) = $W_2 - W_1$ / weight of sample × 100

2.4.3 Swelling power and solubility

Swelling power and solubility were estimated as per [13]. About five hundred mg (W_1) of the sample was weighed, placed into centrifuge tube and the centrifuge tube with sample was weighed (W_2). Twenty ml of distilled water was added (V_E) and heated for 30 min in a water bath at 100°C, with occasional stirring, the tubes were cooled and centrifuged at 5000 rpm for 10 min. Ten ml of supernatant (V_A) was decanted into a pre-weighed (W_4) petriplate dried at 105°C and weighed (W_5). The inner side of the centrifuge tube was wiped, dried and weighed (W_3). Percent swelling power and solubility were calculated using the following formulae:

Swelling power (g/g) = $W_3 - W_2 / W_1$

Solubility (%) = $W_5 - W_4$ × V_E / V_A ×100 / W_1

2.4.4 Foaming capacity and foaming stability

Foaming capacity and foaming stability were determined as described by [14]. One-gram sample was added to 50 ml distilled water in a graduated cylinder. The suspension was mixed and shaken for 5 min to form a foam. The volume of foam after whipping for 30 sec was expressed as foaming capacity. Where, AW: After whipping, BW: Before whipping the volume of foam was recorded 1h after whipping to determine foaming stability as percent of the initial foam volume.

Foaming capacity = Volume of foam (AW) – Volume of foam (BW) / Volume of foam (BW) × 100

2.4.5 Wettability

"Two grams of the sample was weighed and transferred to a beaker containing 80 ml water. The behaviour of the powder was observed on the water surface immediately after adding the sample. After 30 min observation, the material was stirred on the magnetic stirrer sufficiently fast to form a vertex which reached the bottom of the beaker and the stirring continued for one min, after which the grade describing wettability was recorded as excellent, good, fair and poor according to the time and behaviour of the dispersion" [15].

2.4.6 Flowability [Carr Index (CI)]

The flowability of flour was expressed as Carr Index (CI) in terms of tapped density (pT) and bulk density (pB) [16].

CI = pT (Tapped density) – pB (bulk density) / pT (Tapped density) × 100

Chart 1. Classification of flour flowability based on Carr Index (CI)

CI %	Flowability
< 15	Very good
15-20	Good
20-35	Fair
35-45	Bad
>45	Very bad

2.4.7 Cohesiveness (Hausner Ratio)

Cohesiveness of the flour was evaluated in terms of Hausner ratio (HR), calculated from bulk density (pB) and tapped density (pT) [16].

HR = pT/ pB

Chart 2. Classification of flour cohesiveness based on Hauser Ratio (HR)

Hauser Ratio	Cohesiveness
< 1.2	Low
1.2 – 1.4	Intermediate
>1.4	High

2.5 Statistical Analysis

The experimental results were carried out by different statistical methods in SPSS statistical packages (16.0). Mean, standard deviation was used to interpret data. One-way ANOVA (Analysis of variance) was used to know the significant difference among the different colored horse gram varieties.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Physical Properties of Colored Horsegram Varieties

Table 1 shows the physical properties of colored horsegram varieties. There was significant difference (*P= 0.01*) between the colored horsegram varieties for hundred grainweight and color values (L*, a*, b*) used in the study. Whereas there was no significant difference in hundred grain volume and bulk density between colored horsegram varieties. The hundred-grain weight and hundred grain volume of brown, cream and black colored variety were 3.14g, 3.33 g, 3.20g and 3.66ml, 2.66 ml and 2.66 ml respectively. When compared to brown (control) colored variety, black was on par whereas cream colored variety had higher hundred grain weight. Seed weight is important criterion for selecting variety for processing into different end products [17]. The difference in seed weight is attributed mainly due to environmental factors and variations in weight of cotyledon, embryo and seed coat because Seed weight is mostly contained in the kernel (Cotyledons and embryo). The cotyledons, which make up about 88.8 per cent and seed coat takes about 11.1 per cent of the seed weight [18]. The bulk density of varieties ranged from 0.87 to 1.29 g per ml. The L*, a*, b* value of cream color variety was higher (63.64, 8.25, 18.23) indicating its white, red and yellow shade followed by brown (53.23, 7.41, 14.03) and black colored variety (39.18, 0.03, -0.79) indicating its black, green and blue shade respectively. When compared to brown (control) the L*, a*, b* value for cream flour was higher and that for black color flour was lower. The

difference in color value is mainly attributed to color of seed coat. Similar results were also found by [19].

Grain dimensions are important in cleaning and also in threshing operations because it allows the passage of specific sized grains and to eliminate unwanted materials [4]. The dimensions (thickness, length, breadth, L/B ratio) of coloredhorsegram varieties is shown in Table 2. There was significant difference (*P=0.01*) between the colored horsegram varieties for thickness. Whereas there was no significant difference in length, breadth and length to breadth ratio among colored horsegram varieties. The thickness ranged from 1.98 to 2.18 mm highest being in brown and lowest in black colored variety. When compared to brown (control) the thickness of cream colored variety was on par whereas less for black colored variety. The length, breadth and length to breadth ratio among the colored horsegram varieties ranged from ranged from 5.33 to 5.50 mm, 3.81 to 3.87 mm and 1.39 to 1.44 respectively. Variation in thickness of the seeds might be attributed to drought resistant grain crops being hardy in nature, have a thick endosperm and also in the genetic variations. [7] and [20] found the similar results with slight variations.

3.2 Functional Properties of Colored Horsegram Varieties

Functional characteristics are required to evaluate hardness, permeability of seed coat and hydration ability of grains [21]. Table 3 shows the functional properties of colored horsegram varieties. There was significant difference (*P=0.01*) between the colored horsegram varieties for hydration capacity, hydration index, swelling capacity and per cent germination. Whereas there was no significant difference in swelling index between colored horsegram varieties. Brown color variety recorded highest hydration capacity (2.92 g/100 grains), hydration index (0.93), swelling capacity (3.83 ml/100 grains) and per cent germination (91.66) followed by black (2.64 g/100 grains, 0.82, 3.50 ml/ 100 grains and 89) and cream colored variety (2.51 g/100 grains, 0.75, 3.00 ml/ 100 grains, 88) respectively. When compared to brown (control) the hydration capacity, hydration index and swelling capacity was less for black colored variety followed by cream colored variety. When compared to brown (control) the percent germination for cream colored variety was less followed by black colored variety. Variation in

Table 1. Physical properties of colored horsegram varieties

Horsegram variety	100 grain weight (g)	100 grain volume (ml)	Bulk density (g/ml)	L^* (Lightness)	a^* (Redness)	b^* (Yellowness)
Brown (Control)(GPM-6)	3.14±0.01[b]	3.66±0.57	0.87±0.14	53.23±0.025 [b]	7.41±0.010 [b]	14.03±0.01 [b]
Cream (kalaghatagi local)	3.33±0.01 [a]	2.66±0.57	1.29±0.32	63.64±0.020 [a]	8.25±0.010 [a]	18.23±0.02 [a]
Black (CRHG-22)	3.20±0.05 [b]	2.66±0.57	1.24±0.29	39.18±0.025 [c]	0.03±0.010 [c]	-0.79±0.01 [c]
C.D.	0.06**	NS	NS	0.06 **	0.06**	0.06**
S. Em.±	0.01	0.33	0.15	0.08	0.08	0.08
F value	26.64	3.00	2.22	813.53	613.00	122.22

*Note: Values are mean ± S.D. of three replications, Values with same superscript in the same column are not significantly different from each other, S.Em: Standard Error of Mean, C. D: Critical Difference, *Significant @ 5%, **Significant @ 1%, NS-Non significant*

hydration and swelling capacity may be attributed to hardness of seed coat that hinders the permeability of water inside the grain and the reason for variation in percent germination among the varieties may be due the differences in other functional characteristics and physical properties [22] found similar results.

3.3 Physical Properties of Flour from Colored Horsegram Varieties

Particle size distribution of flour from colored horsegram varieties is shown in Table 4. There was significant difference (*P= 0.01*) between the flours of colored horsegram varieties for particle distribution. Particle size distribution of flour was calculated by passing the flour through various BSS standard sieve number having different pore size ranging from 600 to 180 microns. About 83 per cent of all colored horsegram flour had particle size of 300 microns followed by 250 microns (4 %), 600 microns (3.5 %), 355 and 420 microns (3 %), 500 microns (2.5 %) and 180 microns (2 %) each. Thus, it was observed that majority of the particles in all the three colored horsegram flour passed through 52 BSS standard sieve having 300 microns. There was no significant difference in particle size distribution between the varieties when compared to control. Particle size of flour depends on how fine or coarse the flour has been milled and its use in the product.

Physical properties of flour from colored horsegram varieties such as loose bulk density, tapped bulk density and color (L*, a*, b*) is shown in Table 5. There was significant difference (*P=0.01*) between the flours of colored horsegram varieties for loose bulk density, tapped bulk density and color. Density is another major criterion, which measures the heaviness of flour, and it is influenced generally by the particle size of the flour.Brown and black colored flour registered high loose bulk density (0.41 g/ ml) followed by cream colored flour (0.34 g/ ml) whereas high tapped bulk density was found in cream colored flour (0.63 g/ ml) followed by brown (0.6 g/ ml) and cream colored horsegram flour (0.57 g/ ml). When compared to brown (control) the loose bulk density of black colored flour was on par whereas it was less for cream colored variety. The tapped bulk density of cream and black colored flour was on par with brown colored flour (control). The higher tapped density may be attributed to its higher weight of seeds and hence more seed volume.High density of horse gram flour in the present study indicate that the flours are heavy in nature and thus are suitable in the preparation various foods. According to [23], higher density is desirable for greater ease of dispersibility of flours in any liquid medium. [20] and [24] also found similar results.

Color is a major criterion that directly results in the final appearance and acceptability of product.The lightness (L* value) of brown, cream and black colored flour was 78.34, 78.72 and 72.15 respectively. Thus when compared to control the lightness for cream colored flour was high whereas less for black. The redness (a* value) of brown, cream and black colored flour was 2.84, 5.78 and 0.26 respectively. Thus when compared to control the redness for cream colored flour was high whereas less for black. The yellowness (b* value) of brown, cream and black colored flour was 11.08, 16.84 and 5.25 respectively. Thus, when compared to control the yellowness for cream colored flour was high whereas less for black. The changes in color value can be attributed to the color of seed coat and bright color of flour may also be attributed to presence of higher amount of polyphenols and tannins.

Table 2. Dimensions of coloredhorsegram varieties

Horsegram variety	Thickness (mm)	Length (mm)	Breadth (mm)	L/B ratio
Brown (Control) (GPM-6)	2.18±0.12 [a]	5.41±0.24	3.87±0.17	1.40±0.08
Cream (kalaghatagi local)	2.17±0.10 [a]	5.33±0.16	3.83±0.12	1.39±0.05
Black (CRHG-22)	1.98±0.08 [b]	5.50±0.20	3.81±0.20	1.44±0.11
C.D.	0.09**	NS	NS	NS
S. Em.±	0.03	0.06	0.05	0.02
F value	11.86	1.71	0.31	1.15

*Note: Values are mean ± S.D. of three replications, Values with same superscript in the same column are not significantly different from each other, S.Em: Standard Error of Mean, C. D.: Critical Difference, **Significant @ 1%, NS-Non significant*

Table 3. Functional properties of colored horsegram varieties

Horsegram variety	Hydration Capacity (g/ 100 grains)	Hydration Index	Swelling Capacity (ml/ 100 grains)	Swelling Index	Per cent germination
Brown (Control) (GPM-6)	2.92±0.03 [a]	0.93±0.015 [a]	3.83±0.28 [a]	1.06±0.23	91.66±1.52 [a]
Cream (kalaghatagi local)	2.51±0.04 [c]	0.75±0.012 [c]	3.00±0.50 [c]	1.13±0.12	90.00±1.00 [b]
Black (CRHG-22)	2.64±0.06 [b]	0.82±0.034 [b]	3.50±0.50 [b]	1.33±0.16	88.00±1.00 [c]
C.D.	0.10**	0.03**	0.40**	NS	1.38**
S. Em.±	0.03	0.01	0.14	0.06	0.40
F value	48.61	45.38	2.71	1.67	11.38

*Note: Values are mean ± S.D. of three replications, Values with same superscript in the same column are not significantly different from each other, S.Em: Standard Error of Mean, C. D: Critical Difference, **Significant @ 1%, NS-Non significant*

Table 4. Particle size distribution of flour from colored horsegram varieties

BSS Standard Sieve Number [Sieve Opening(μ)]	Horsegram flour (%)		
	Brown (Control) (GPM-6)	Cream (kalaghatagi local)	Black (CRHG-22)
25(600)	3.46±0.04 [c]	3.44±0.08 [c]	3.49±0.09 [c]
30(500)	2.53±0.05 [f]	2.55±0.08 [f]	2.53±0.06 [f]
36(420)	2.93±0.08 [e]	2.92±0.03 [e]	2.91±0.04 [e]
44(355)	3.06±0.07 [d]	3.07±0.04 [d]	3.04±0.07 [d]
52(300)	82.23± 0.05 [a]	82.25±0.04 [a]	82.24±0.03 [a]
60(250)	3.66±0.07 [b]	3.65±0.04 [b]	3.67±0.04 [b]
85(180)	2.10±0.04 [g]	2.1±0.02 [g]	2.10±0.04 [g]
C.D.	0.09**	0.09**	0.11**
S. Em.±	0.03	0.03	0.03
F value	942.55	837.02	723.35

*Note: Values are mean ± S.D. of three replications, Values with same superscript in the same column are not significantly different from each other, S.Em: Standard Error of Mean, C. D: Critical Difference, **Significant @ 1%*

Table 5. Physical properties of flour from colored horsegram varieties

Horsegram variety	Loose bulk density (g/ml)	Tapped bulk density (g/ml)	L*(Lightness)	a *(Redness)	b *(Yellowness)
Brown (Control) (GPM-6)	0.41±0.01[a]	0.60±0.01 [ab]	78.34±0.04 [b]	2.84±0.02 [b]	11.08±0.02 [b]
Cream (kalaghatagi local)	0.34±0.01[b]	0.63 ± 0.01 [a]	78.72±0.03 [a]	5.78±0.03 [a]	16.84±0.03 [a]
Black (CRHG-22)	0.41±0.01[a]	0.57 ±0.09 [b]	72.15±0.02 [c]	0.26±0.03 [c]	5.25±0.01 [c]
C.D.	0.06**	0.06**	0.03**	0.03**	0.036**
S. Em.±	0.01	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.01
F value	505.33	14.97	333.26	260.39	161.62

*Note: Values are mean ± S. D. of three replications, Values with same superscript in the same column are not significantly different from each other, S.Em: Standard Error of Mean, C. D: Critical Difference, **Significant @ 1 %*

Table 6. Functional properties of flour from colored horsegram varieties

Horsegram variety	Water Absorption Capacity (ml/g)	Oil Absorption Capacity (ml/g)	Swelling power (g/g)	Percent solubility (%)	Foaming Capacity (%)	Foaming Stability (%)	Wettability	Followability	Cohesiveness
Brown (Control) (GPM-6)	2.16±0.03 [b]	2.09±0.03 [b]	8.15±0.02 [b]	35.21±0.13	32.18±0.12[b]	30.45±0.11[b]	Good	Fair	Low
Cream (kalaghatagi local)	2.17±0.01 [b]	2.08±0.03 [b]	6.92±0.02 [c]	35.01±0.29	31.34±0.31[c]	29.15±0.31[c]	Good	Fair	Low
Black (CRHG-22)	2.31±0.02[a]	2.15±0.01[a]	9.14±0.04 [a]	35.56±0.30	36.23±0.22[a]	32.13±0.23[a]	Good	Fair	Low
C.D.	0.06**	0.06*	0.06**	NS	0.98**	0.76*			
S. Em.±	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.14	0.45	0.28			
F value	33.55	5.33	887.98	3.49	12.28	16.64			

*Note: Values are mean ± S. D. of three replications, Values with same superscript in the same column are not significantly different from each other, S.Em: Standard Error of Mean, C. D: Critical Difference, *Significant @ 5%, **Significant @ 1%, NS-Non significant*

3.4 Functional Properties of Flour from Colored Horse Gram Varieties

Functional properties of flour from colored horsegram varieties is illustrated in Table 6. There was significant difference (*P= 0.01*) between the flours of colored horsegram varieties for water absorption capacity, swelling power and foaming capacity. The water absorption capacity of brown colored flour (control) was 2.16 ml per g which was on par with cream color flour (2.17 ml/g) whereas it was 2.31 ml per g for black colored flour. Water absorption capacity is the capacity of the flour to be associated with water molecules under limited condition [25]. Difference in the water absorption capacity may be probably due to the variation in the starch granules, inherent differences in amorphous and crystalline areas among starch and also due to protein content. The swelling power of brown color flour (control) was 8.15 g per g whereas it was 6.92 and 9.14 g per g for cream and black colored flour respectively. The difference in the swelling power and solubility may be attributed to the characteristics of amylose and amylopectin, their structure, degree, length and conformations, besides the presence of non-carbohydrate content [26] and [27]. Similar results of swelling power and solubility was reported by [28]. Foaming properties are much important in the maintenance of the texture and structure of different food products (ice creams and bakery products) during and after processing. The foaming capacity of brown color flour (control) was 32.18 per cent whereas it was 31.34 and 36.23 per cent for cream and black colored flour. There was significant difference (*P= 0.05*) between the flours of colored horsegram varieties for oil absorption capacity and foaming stability. The highest oil absorption capacity was found in black colored flour (2.15 ml/g) followed by brown (control) and cream colored flour (2.09 and 2.08 ml /g) respectively. Fat absorption capacity has been attributed to the physical entrapment of oil and it is important, since fat acts as flavour retainer and increase the mouth feel of foods. [29] revealed that the enhanced ability of flour to absorb and retain water and oil may help to improve binding of the structure, enhance flavour retention, improve mouth feel and reduce moisture and fat losses of food products. "The foam stability of the flour depends on the presence of the flexible protein molecules which may decrease the surface tension of water" [30]. The highest foaming stability was found in black colored flour (32.13 %) followed by brown (control) and cream colored flour (30.45% and 29.15%) respectively. According to [31], ability to form stable foam depends on sufficient intermolecular (protein-protein) interaction and thus degree of cohesion. There was no significant difference between the flours of colored horse gram varieties for percent solubility. The wettability for all the three flour was good whereas followability and cohesiveness was fair and low for all the three colored flour respectively.

4. CONCLUSION

There were differences in the physical as well as functional properties of both horse gram varieties and their respective flours. Hence one variety cannot be compared with other variety in terms of physical and functional properties. However brown and black colored varieties had better physical and functional properties than cream colored variety. The brown and black colored flour had highest loose bulk density whereas cream colored flour had highest tapped bulk density. Black colored flour had highest water and oil absorption capacity, swelling power, foaming capacity and foaming stability. Physical and functional properties evaluation is critical for optimizing their use in food and nutrition applications. By evaluating attributes such as hydration capacity, swelling power, and absorption capacities, the study provides a comprehensive analysis that can guide both agricultural practices and product development. The detailed comparison between varieties highlights their diverse applications and potential benefits, contributing to the broader understanding of minor legumes' roles in sustainable agriculture and nutrition.

DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Prasad SK, Singh MK. Horse gram-an underutilized nutraceutical pulse crop: a review. Journal of Food Science and Technology. 2015;52(5):2489-99.
2. Messina MJ. Legumes and soybeans: An overview of their nutritional profiles and health effects. The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition. 1999;70(3):439-450.
3. Patil CK, Bhattacharjee A. Seed potentiation of a horsegram cultivar by herbal manipulation. International Journal of Medicinal Plants Research. 2013;2(1):152-155.
4. Brennan JG, Butters JR, Cowell NB, Lilly AEV. Food engineering operations. 2nd ed., Applied Science Publication, London; 1981.
5. Mannuramath M, Yenagi N. Evaluation of little millet cultivars for physical, nutritional and processing qualities. Academic and Law Serials. 2014;10(2):131-140.
6. Yadav RB, Khatkar BS, Yadav B S. Morphological, physiochemical and cooking properties of some Indian rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) cultivars. Journal of Agriculture and Technology. 2007;3:203-210.
7. Bhokre CK, Joshi AA, Rodge AB. Determination of physico-chemical and functional properties of different genotypes of horse gram. Asian Journal of Dairy and Food Research. 2015;34(4):307-318.
8. Barakoti L, Bains K. Effect of household processing on the in-vitro bioavailability of iron in mungbean (*Vignaradiata*). Food and Nutrition Bulletin. 2007;28(1):18-22.
9. Kurahatti S. Formulation of little millet (*Panicummillare*) based composite mix and its quality evaluation. M.H. Sc. Thesis. University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad, Karnataka, India; 2010.
10. Goula AM, Karapantsios TD, Achilias DS, Adamopoulas KG. Water sorption isotherms and glass transition temperature of spray dried tomato pulp. Journal of Food Engineering. 2008;85:73-83.
11. Quin JR, Paton D. A practical measurement of water hydration capacity of protein materials. Cereal Chemistry. 1983;56:38-44.
12. Sosulski FW, Elkowicz L, Reichert RD. Oligosaccharides in eleven legumes and their air-classified protein and starch fractions. Journal of Food Science and Nutrition, 2002;47:498-502.
13. Schoch T J, Swelling power and solubility of granular starches. In: Methods in carbohydrate Chemistry, New India Publishing Agency, New Delhi; 1964.
14. Bhavsar GJ, Sawate AR, Kshirsagar RB, Chappalwar VM. Studies on physico-chemical characteristics of buckwheat and its exploration in bread as functional food. International Journal of Engineering and Research Technology. 2013;2(1):3971-3980.
15. Abdalla AA, Ahmed UM, Ahmed AR, El-TinayA H, Ibraim KA. Physicocemical characterization of traditionally extracted pearl millet starch. Journal of Applied Sciences Research. 2009;5(11): 2016-2027.
16. Jinapong N, Suphantharika M, Jamnong P. Production of instant soymilk powder by ultra-filtration spray drying and fluidized bed agglomeration. Journal of Food Engineering. 2008;84:194-205.
17. Henshaw F. Varietal differences in physical characteristics and proximate composition of cowpea (*Vignaunguiculata*). 1st ed. [ebook] IDOSI. 2015. Available:http://www. idosi.org/wjas. .
18. Sidhu JS, Gill MS, Bains GS. Milling of paddy in relation to yield and quality. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry. 1975;23(6):1183-1185
19. Herath HM, Gunathilake KG, Eashwarage IS, Sivakumaran K, Ranathunga RA. Physico-chemical and *in-vitro*glycemic indices of popular pulse varieties grown in Sri Lanka. International Journal of Food Science and Nutrition. 2018;3(5): 137-143.
20. Abhirami KG, Sashidevi G, Hemalatha K Thangaraj K. Comparison of physico-chemical, functional and cooking properties of selected horse gram varieties. International Journal of Chemical Studies. 2018;6(3):135-139.
21. Singh GD, Wani AA, Kaur D, Sogi DS. Characterization and functional properties of proteins of some Indian chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*) cultivars. Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture. 2008;10(9):3144-3156.
22. Jain S, Vishakha S, Shipra C. Chemical and physicochemical properties of horse

gram (*Macrotylomauniflorum*) and its product formulation. Journal of Dairying, Foods and Home Science. 2012; 31(3):184-190.

23. Padmashree TS, Vijayalakshmi L, Pultaraj S. Effect of traditional processing on the functional properties of cowpea (*Vignacatjany*) flour. Journal of Food Science and Technology. 1987;24: 221-224.

24. Joshi AA, Bhokre CK. Physico-chemical analysis of four varieties of horse gram. Journal of Bioinfolet. 2015;12(3 B):683-686.

25. Alfauomy GA, Ibrahmin OS, Ali MM. Physico-chemical characteristics of starches from different cereal grains. American Journal of Food Science and Technology. 2017;5(4):125-134.

26. Srichuwong S, Suharti C, Mishima T, Isono M, Hisamatsu M. Starches from different botanical sources: Contribution of starch structure of swelling and pasting properties. Carbohydrate Polymers. 2005; 62(1):25-34.

27. Ahmed AM, Zhang C, Liu Q. Comparison of physicochemical characteristics of starch isolated from sweet and grain sorghum. Journal of Chemistry. 2016. Available:http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2016/76 48639.

28. Khatun A. Nutritional composition, processing for value addition and anticalcifying properties of selected horse gram genotypes. M.Sc thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore; 2009.

29. Sreerama YN, Sasikala VB, Pratape VM. Nutritional implications and flour functionality of popped/expanded horse gram. Food chemistry. 2008;108(3):891-899.

30. Sathe SK, Desphande SS, Salunkhe DK. Functional properties of winged bean [*Psophocarpus tetragonolobus* (L.) DC] proteins. Journal of Food Science. 2002; 47:503-509.

31. Hettiarachchy NS, Griffin VK, Gnanasambandmam R. Preparation and functional properties of a protein isolate from defatted wheat germ. Cereal Chemistry. 2000;73(3):363-367.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/121067