



## Quality Changes during Storage of *Burkina* (a Millet and Milk-based) Drink

Ampofo-Asiama Jerry<sup>1\*</sup>, Mamudu Hafusatu<sup>1</sup>, Helen Oluchi Emeruwa<sup>1</sup>,  
Owusu Fokuo Kant<sup>1</sup> and Quaye Bright<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biochemistry, College of Agriculture and Natural Sciences, University of Cape Coast, Ghana.

### Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Author AAJ designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Authors MH, HOE and OFK managed the analyses of the study. Author QB managed the literature searches. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

### Article Information

DOI:10.9734/AFSJ/2020/v15i230146

#### Editor(s):

(1) Dr. Cesar Ozuna Lopez, University of Guanajuato, Mexico.

#### Reviewers:

(1) Zakaria Fouad Fawzy Hassan, National Research Centre, Egypt.

(2) Xochitl Ruelas-Chacon, Universidad Autonoma Agraria Antonio Narro, Mexico.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/55972>

Received 02 February 2020

Accepted 09 April 2020

Published 20 April 2020

Original Research Article

### ABSTRACT

*Burkina*, a drink prepared from millet and milk, is gaining economic attention in Ghana due to its perceived nutritious nature and high energy content. The drink which is produced on a small-scale is usually vended without proper control of storage conditions leading to rapid loss of quality. The objective of this study was to investigate the effect of storing *burkina* at different temperatures (4 and 30°C) on the microbial and physicochemical (pH, titratable acidity, brix and phenolic content) quality of the drink. The pH, titratable acidity, brix and phenolic content of freshly prepared *burkina* were 3.65, 0.49%, 2.05 and 0.26 mg GAE/100 g, respectively. Although, changes were observed, storage temperature did not have a significant effect on the physicochemical quality of *burkina*. The initial load of aerobic mesophiles, lactic acid bacteria, *Enterobacteriaceae*, and yeast and moulds in the freshly prepared *Burkina* were 6.45, 5.49, 2.58 and 4.45 log cfu/mL, respectively. Storage at the higher temperature resulted in an increased microbial load within 48 h, leading to faster spoilage, with only marginal increases observed at the lower storage temperature.

**Keywords:** Storage temperature; microbial quality; phenolic content; brix.

\*Corresponding author: Email: [jerry.ampofoasiama@ucc.edu.gh](mailto:jerry.ampofoasiama@ucc.edu.gh);

## 1. INTRODUCTION

*Burkina* (also called *brukina*) is a ready-to-eat drink prepared from millet, fermented (or unfermented) milk and water, with sugar or salt added to taste [1]. The consumption of *burkina* is gaining attention and it is competing favorably with other similar ready-to-eat drinks such as mashed-kenkey [2]. *Burkina* is considered a nutritionally rich drink due to the presence of milk. The drink can be used as a weaning food and a source of nutrient deficiency intervention [3].

The production of the drink takes place throughout Ghana on a small-scale. Indeed, reconstituted powdered milk is used in the production of *Burkina* due to the perceived expensive nature of fresh cow milk [2]. The drink is mainly sold on the streets without proper temperature control. Considering the increasing popularity of *burkina*, it is important to study the quality of the drink and how this changes with time. The objective of this work was to study the effect of storage temperature on the physicochemical, nutritional and microbial quality of *burkina*. Freshly prepared *burkina* was stored at 4 and 30°C and the changes in pH, brix, titratable acidity and phenolic content were determined. Additionally, changes in aerobic mesophiles, lactic acid bacteria, *Enterobacteriaceae*, and yeast and moulds, as well as the proximate composition of fresh *Burkina* were analyzed.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 Sample Collection and Preparation

Freshly prepared *burkina* were obtained from six producers in Cape Coast, Ghana. The samples were stored in incubators at 4 and 30°C. The moisture, protein, fat, and ash content of the fresh samples were determined based on the AOAC [4] method of proximate composition analyses. Sampling was carried out periodically for the determination of pH, titratable acidity, brix, phenolic content and microbial quality.

### 2.2 Determination of pH, Titratable Acidity, Brix and Total Phenolic Content

For the determination of pH, titratable acidity and brix, 100 g of the drink was homogenized in a kitchen blender and centrifuged at 4000 rpm for 15 min. A pH meter (B10P Benchtop) and digital refractometer (MA871, Milwaukee Instruments

USA) were used to determine the pH and brix of the supernatant. The supernatant (5 mL) was titrated against NaOH (0.1 N) using phenolphthalein indicator in the determination of titratable acidity [5].

Phenolic content of the samples was determined by homogenizing 10 g of the drink with 100 mL of 80% methanol solution. After centrifugation, 100  $\mu$ L of the supernatant was pipetted and Folin-Ciocalteu's (750  $\mu$ L) reagent added. The mixture was incubated for 3 h at 35°C and the absorbance measured at 725 nm. Gallic acid was used as the standard [6].

### 2.3 Microbial Analysis

Microbial analysis was carried out by vigorously shaking the drink and homogenizing 10 g in 90 mL peptone water. The mixture was serially diluted and plated on plate count agar and de Man-Rogosa-Sharpe for the enumeration of aerobic mesophiles and lactic acid bacteria, respectively. Plating on Sabouraud Dextrose Agar and Violet Red Bile Glucose agar was used to determine the levels of yeast and molds, and *Enterobacteriaceae*, respectively [6]. All microbial media were purchased from Oxoid Ltd. (UK).

### 2.4 Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis was carried out using SPSS (IBM, SPSS Statistics 20). The student's *t*-test and analysis of variance was used to determine significant differences at a *p* of 0.05.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1 Proximate Composition and Physicochemical Properties

The proximate composition of fresh *burkina* is shown in Table 1. The samples had an average moisture, protein and ash content of 70.25, 9.67 and 1.24 g/100 g, respectively. The high protein and carbohydrate content could be due to the use of milk and millet, respectively, in preparing the drink [2]. The proximate composition of the *burkina* drinks used in this study is comparable to that observed in other studies. In *Burkina* drinks vended in several parts of Accra, Ghana, moisture, protein and ash ranges of 80.76-82.40, 2.96-4.83 and 0.41-0.47 g/100 g, respectively was observed [3]. Nyarko-Mensah [2] also observed moisture, protein and ash ranges of 75.42-86.29, 4.61-7.91 and 3.11-4.91 g/100 g, respectively, in samples of *burkina*. The fat and carbohydrate content of the drinks was also

within the range of 1.31-3.44 and 5-13 g/100 g, respectively, observed by Tawiah [3] and Nyarko-Mensah [2]. The high variability in the proximate composition, characterized by the high standard deviations, could be due to the non-standardized process of preparing the drink. This is mainly due to different producers preparing their drinks to meet the taste and demands of their consumers.

The average pH, titratable acidity, brix and phenolic content of fresh *burkina* were 3.65, 0.49 %, 2.05 and 0.26 mg GAE/100 g respectively (Table 2). The low pH and the high titratable acidity could be due to fermentation of the milk, prior to its use in preparing the drink. Also, through fermentation, lactic acid bacteria could have utilized soluble sugars resulting in the low brix of the drink. Storage temperatures did not

have a significant effect on the pH of the drinks, although the pH decreased to 3.37 and 3.47 after 2 and 4 days of storage at 30 and 4 °C, respectively. Similarly, storage temperature did not have a significant effect on titratable acidity, brix and phenolic content.

**Table 1. Proximate composition of freshly prepared *Burkina* samples. The values presented are the means of four replicate experiments along with their standard deviations**

Composition	Average content
Moisture	78.68± 7.28
Crude Protein	4.84± 0.95
Ash	1.21± 0.45
Crude Fat	3.01± 0.70
Carbohydrate	12.27±7.17

**Table 2. pH, titratable acidity (TTA), brix and phenolic content of *burkina* samples. The values presented are the means of four replicate experiments along with their standard deviations**

Storage temperature	Incubation days	pH	TTA (%)	Brix	Phenolic Content (mg GAE/100 g)
30 °C	0	3.65 ± 0.18	0.49 ± 0.03	2.05 ± 0.26	0.26 ± 0.03
	0.5	3.51 ± 0.16	0.52 ± 0.04	2.05 ± 0.19	0.27 ± 0.01
	1	3.41 ± 0.18	0.54 ± 0.03	1.93 ± 0.34	0.31 ± 0.01
	1.5	3.37 ± 0.22	0.57 ± 0.03	1.95 ± 0.24	0.32 ± 0.01
	2	3.37 ± 0.21	0.58 ± 0.03	2.00 ± 0.28	0.33 ± 0.03
4 °C	0	3.65 ± 0.18	0.49 ± 0.03	2.05 ± 0.26	0.26 ± 0.03
	2	3.64 ± 0.16	0.49 ± 0.04	2.03 ± 0.25	0.28 ± 0.04
	4	3.60 ± 0.16	0.51 ± 0.02	2.00 ± 0.26	0.29 ± 0.03
	6	3.54 ± 0.14	0.51 ± 0.02	1.90 ± 0.20	1.11 ± 1.60
	8	3.53 ± 0.10	0.52 ± 0.02	1.93 ± 0.26	0.32 ± 0.02
	10	3.49 ± 0.13	0.52 ± 0.03	1.93 ± 0.13	1.11 ± 1.53
	12	3.47 ± 0.13	0.52 ± 0.02	1.88 ± 0.28	0.35 ± 0.02

**Table 3. Changes in the microbial load (log cfu/mL) of *burkina* during storage. The values presented are the means of four replicate experiments along with their standard deviations**

Storage temperature	Incubation days	Aerobic mesophiles	Lactic acid bacteria	<i>Enterobacteriaceae</i>	Yeast and moulds
30 °C	0	6.45 ± 0.79	5.50 ± 0.24	2.58 ± 0.59	4.45 ± 0.78
	0.5	7.33 ± 0.70	5.98 ± 0.36	2.80 ± 0.50	5.10 ± 1.12
	1	7.73 ± 0.67	6.52 ± 0.14	3.15 ± 0.45	5.83 ± 0.97
	1.5	7.68 ± 0.46	6.75 ± 0.12	3.40 ± 0.32	6.18 ± 0.69
	2	8.28 ± 0.30	6.73 ± 0.16	3.38 ± 0.26	6.40 ± 0.56
4 °C	0	6.45 ± 0.79	5.50 ± 0.24	2.58 ± 0.59	4.45 ± 0.78
	2	6.75 ± 0.74	5.29 ± 0.51	2.58 ± 0.54	4.45 ± 0.73
	4	6.78 ± 0.72	5.69 ± 1.09	2.70 ± 0.50	4.53 ± 0.74
	6	6.83 ± 0.69	5.78 ± 1.03	2.80 ± 0.38	4.55 ± 0.72
	8	6.90 ± 0.84	5.79 ± 1.13	2.83 ± 0.46	4.75 ± 0.70
	10	6.90 ± 0.54	5.75 ± 0.92	2.85 ± 0.33	4.80 ± 0.68
	12	7.15 ± 0.91	5.88 ± 1.08	3.00 ± 0.48	4.90 ± 0.71

### 3.2 Changes in Microbial Quality during Storage

The changes in the microbial composition of *burkina* during storage is shown Table 3. The initial load of aerobic mesophiles, lactic acid bacteria, *Enterobacteriaceae*, and yeast and moulds were 6.45, 5.49, 2.58 and 4.45 log cfu/mL, respectively. At 30°C storage, the levels of aerobic mesophiles and lactic acid bacteria increased to 8.25 and 6.72 log cfu/mL within 48 h, however, at 4°C, aerobic mesophiles and lactic acid bacteria increased to only 7.15 and 5.86 log cfu/mL after 12 days of storage. The load of *Enterobacteriaceae*, and yeast and moulds also increased to 3.38 and 6.40 during storage at 30°C, while marginal increases to 2.85 and 4.90 were observed during storage at 4°C, respectively (Table 3).

The insignificant increase in both aerobic mesophiles and lactic acid bacteria could be due to their initial high levels in the freshly prepared drink. This high initial microbial load could also have resulted in the short storage life of the drink. Indeed, signs of spoilage such as changes in flavor and emission of odors can be detected within 36 h in street vended *burkina* drinks. However, when kept refrigerated the drink can last for up to two weeks [7]. The high initial load of lactic acid bacteria could have been due to the use of previous drinks as starter culture for the production of new drinks. The presence of *Enterobacteriaceae* in the vended drinks is a public health concern and shows that these drinks might have been prepared under unacceptable conditions [8-11].

### 4. CONCLUSIONS

*Burkina* is high in carbohydrates and protein and can, therefore, be used an energy and protein source although the short storage life of the drink can limit its use and availability. Storage temperature did not affect the physicochemical properties (pH, titratable acidity, brix and phenolic content) of *burkina*, although, storage at a higher temperature accelerated microbial growth leading to faster spoilage.

### DISCLAIMER

The products used for this research are commonly and predominantly use products in our area of research and country. There is absolutely no conflict of interest between the authors and producers of the products because we do not

intend to use these products as an avenue for any litigation but for the advancement of knowledge. Also, the research was not funded by the producing company rather it was funded by personal efforts of the authors.

### COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

### REFERENCES

1. Appiah S. Burkina: Latest millet smoothie in town. Daily Graphic; 2013. Available: <http://m.modernghana.com>
2. Nyarko-Mensah. Sensory and physicochemical evaluation of “*Burkina*” made with composite (cow and tiger nut) milk. MSc. Thesis to the University of Ghana; 2018. Available: <http://ugspace.ug.edu.gh>
3. Tawiah XU. Microbiological and proximate composition of “*burkina*” drink. A case study in Accra. MSc. Thesis to the Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana (KNUST; Vol. 151); 2015.
4. AOAC, Officials Methods of Analysis. Association of Official Analytical Chemists. Washington DC USA; 2010.
5. Ampofo-Asiama J, Atsrim ES, Asiamah P. Effect of storage temperature on the microbial quality of Fura. Asian Food Science Journal. 2019;13(2):1-6.
6. Ampofo-Asiama J, Bright Q. Effect of storage temperature on the physicochemical, nutritional and microbiological quality of pasteurised soursop (*Annona muricata* L.) juice. African Journal of Food Science. 2019; 13(2):38-47.
7. Baidoo W, Parry-Hanson KA. Using low technology to improve the safety of informal-vended brukina- A fermented milk and millet smoothie in Ghana. African Journal of Food, Agriculture, Nutrition and Development. 2018;18(3):13646-13663.
8. Annan-Prah A, Amewovor DHAK, Osei-Kofi J, Amoono SE, Akorli SY, Saka E, Ndadi HA. Street foods: handling, hygiene and client expectations in a World Heritage Site Town, Cape Coast, Ghana. African Journal of Microbiology Research. 2011; 5(13):1629-1634.
9. Gadaga TH, Nyanga LK, Mutukumira AN. The occurrence, growth and control of

- pathogens in African fermented foods. African Journal Food, Agriculture, Nutrition and Development. 2004;4(1):535-5374.
10. Garode AM, Waghode SM. Bacteriological status of street-vended foods and public health significance: A case study of Buldana District, MS, India. ISCA Journal of Biological Sciences. 2012;1(3):69-71.
11. Mensah P, Yeboah-Manu D, Owusu-Darko K, Ablorde A. Street foods in Accra, Ghana: How safe are they? Bulletin of WHO. 2002;80:546-54.

---

© 2020 Ampofo-Asiama et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Peer-review history:*

*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:  
<http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/55972>*