

Original Research Article

Effect of Microbial Inoculant on Physiological and Microbiological Properties of Cassava Fermentation Process and Fufu Produced

ABSTRACT

Aim: The effects of adding a microbiological inoculant on the physicochemical and microbiological properties during the fermentation process of cassava (*Manihot esculenta* Crantz) and on the sensory characteristics of the fufu produced using a local Bambili cassava variety were examined.

Comment [PN1]: Change to Crantz and do not write in italic

Study design: Completely Randomized Design

Comment [PN2]: Add "was applied for this study"

Place and duration of study: Study was carried out at the Food Technology and Post-Harvest Programme Laboratory (FTPHL) of the Institute of Agricultural Research for Development (IRAD) Bambui, North West Region of Cameroon, between January and April 2020.

Methodology: Cassava was soaked in water and three treatments: 0%, 1% and 4% Light Matrix Organics (LMO) added to the water. The fixed submerged fermentation was used. Water samples were randomly collected daily and analysed for pH, temperature, Titratable Acidity (TA) and microbial counts. The experiment was carried out in triplicates, varying temperature each time (35°C in trial 1, 32°C in trial 2 and 21°C in trial 3). Sensory evaluation was carried out on the fufu produced.

Results: Temperature, pH, TA and microbial counts followed the same trend in all 3 treatments. TA increased from 0.01-0.15%, while pH decreased from 6.9-4.85. Temperature increased then dropped at the end of the experiment. Total bacterial counts increased from \log_{10} (3.49) to \log_{10} (6.9) CFUml⁻¹. Yeasts and moulds increased from \log_{10} (7.15) CFUml⁻¹ and then dropped to \log_{10} (5.48) CFUml⁻¹ at the end of the experiment. Coliforms decreased from \log_{10} (4.66) CFUml⁻¹ to \log_{10} (3.30) CFUml⁻¹. The above parameters did not vary significantly ($p < 0.05$) within treatments. Also, soaking temperature affected the duration of fermentation, hence the finished product. The natural fermentation process was preferred for colour, taste and flavour while the 1% LMO sample was preferred for texture. However, statistical analysis showed no significant differences ($p < 0.05$) between sensory attributes.

Comment [PN3]: Delete not important

Conclusion: Under good hygienic conditions; water fufu produced by natural fermentation will be of good quality for consumption.

Keywords: *Manihot esculenta*, fermentation, physicochemical, microbiological, sensory, microbial inoculant.

1. INTRODUCTION

Cassava (*Manihot esculenta* Crantz) is the main staple food crop in the world. Its production is ranked sixth after maize, rice, wheat, potatoes, and soybeans [1]. It plays a major role in efforts to alleviate the African food crisis because of its efficient production of food energy, year-round availability, tolerance to

Comment [PN4]: Crantz

extreme stress conditions, and suitability to present farming and food systems in Africa. Physiological deterioration of fresh cassava roots occurs 2-3 days after harvesting followed by microbial deterioration 3-5 days later. Earlier studies state that cassava should be processed immediately after harvesting to avoid loss in nutritive quality [4]. Fermentation plays a great role in cassava processing, as it brings about the release of the enzyme linamarase from the plant tissues. This enzyme is involved in the breakdown of linamarin and lotaustralin (cyanogenic glucosides), which release Hydrogen Cyanides (HCN) and thus detoxify the product.

In Cameroon, cassava is an important root crop cultivated all over the country, most especially in the Centre, North West and South West regions. The crop is mostly processed and consumed as garri, water-fufu, starch, cassava dough and boboloh. Other products include; mitumba, akara banana and bread made from cassava flour, cassava starch, and cassava spaghetti, among others. There is no limit to what can be done with cassava. More than two-thirds of the total cassava produced is used as food for humans, with a lesser amount being used for animal feed and industrial purposes. Pellets and alcohol for biofuel are also produced from cassava fermentation (add reference). The cassava leaves are also consumed as a vegetable by humans and fodder for animals. Cassava contributes 76% of the total weight of starchy foods consumed in Cameroon and it is the third largest source of carbohydrates for human food in the world. Among the starchy staples, cassava is the cheapest source of calories for both human nutrition and animal feeding [10].

Comment [PN5]: Provide the recent estimation of cassava yield in Cameroon

Today, microbial fermentation plays a vital role in food production. Some fermentation takes place with the help of laboratory-grown microbial inoculants. Cheeses for example are made by adding specific cultures of bacteria to milk at various stages of production [11]. Sometimes the fermentation relies on naturally occurring microorganisms in the food. Such is the case with cassava fermentation to produce fufu. Studies have been carried out on the microbial quality of products obtained from cassava fermentation [13]. These studies revealed that *Staphylococcus*, *Escherichia coli* and *Aspergillus* *sps* were the most common microorganisms found in fermented cassava products. Earlier studies carried out on the microbial diversity in the cooked fufu emphasized the need for improvement and maintenance of good hygienic practices by food handlers and food vendors. The biochemical and extracellular enzyme activities accompanying the fermentation process and the physiochemical and sensory analyses of cassava fermented fufu have been carried out [1]. However, little has been done concerning the improvement of this product using probiotics.

Comment [PN6]: Write "sp." Not in italic writing

Comment [PN7]: Delete space

Scarcely will one attend an occasion these days in Cameroon without water fufu and eru as one of the main meals. Many who would have loved to be part of this dish are not comfortable with some unfavourable characteristics of fufu such as poor texture, colour, smell and taste. Some consumers even complain of some malaise they get when they consume these products. Many, however, attribute these unpleasant characteristics to the fermentation process since they claim that the unfermented products of cassava do not possess these characteristics. Therefore, this study which was designed to examine the fermentation process of cassava using probiotics as a microbial inoculant was intended to improve the quality of fufu produced, so that this product could be loved by all and consumed without fear.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The probiotic used in this study is Light Matrix Organics, which is a brownish liquid, with a pH of about 3.5, an acidity of 0.82% Lactic acid, and 100% soluble in water in any proportion, not viscous and smells like "corn beer" or fermented. It is translucent in colour and composed of a cocktail of rods, yeasts, cocci and other bacteria in the ratio 1:1:5:2:1.

Comment [PN8]: Provide title "2.1"

The fermentation method used was the fixed submerged fermentation in which water remained unchanged throughout the fermentation process. The work was done in three trials, varying the temperature of the water used for soaking as follows; 35°C in the first trial, 32°C in the second trial and

room temperature (21°C) in the third trial. Cassava used in all three trials was harvested from the same farm.

Comment [PN9]: Which old have the cassava harvested?

2.2 Preparation for Fermentation

Freshly harvested cassava roots were peeled and sorted. The disease-free ones were then washed and reduced to small sizes of about 6 cm each using a knife. The cassava was then filled into nine bottles of volume 3 L each, which were previously sterilized by boiling and weighed. Water that has been boiled and allowed to cool to room temperature was used to soak the cassava. The water was boiled to get rid of any microorganisms that could have been present in the water. One percent (1%) of the microbial inoculant solution was prepared by measuring 10 ml starter culture into 1000 ml of the sterilized water. This was then poured into three of the nine bottles. These bottles were labelled T1. In the same way, 4% microbial inoculant solution was prepared by measuring 40 ml of the microbial inoculant into 1000 ml of water. This was used to fill three other bottles which were labelled T2. The three bottles remaining were left with no inoculant added. These were labelled T0. Approximately 1755 g of tubers were steeped in 1505 ml of sterilized water in each previously sterilized bottle. All these were randomly placed in two coolers at room temperature (21±2°C).

Formatted: Font color: Red

Comment [PN10]: Delete space

Comment [PN11]: Harmonize "L" and "l"

Formatted: Font color: Red

2.3. Analysis of Physicochemical Properties

2.3.1 Measurement of Temperature

The temperature was measured each day by dipping a food thermometer in each bottle and readings taken, making sure that the thermometer is sterilized before being dipped into the next bottle. The containers were observed, and readings were taken throughout the fermentation process.

Comment [PN12]: Provide references

2.3.2 Measurement of pH

Ten (10) ml of each sample was collected from two containers of the same treatment each day and pH readings were taken using a pH meter (Hanna H198150 Glp pH/orp meter). This was done for all three treatments and the average pH per treatment was recorded.

Comment [PN13]: Provide references

2.3.3 Determination of Titratable Acidity

Ten millilitres (10 ml) of solution from each container was pipetted into a beaker and 5 drops of Phenolphthalein indicator were added to each beaker using a dropper and burette. The volume of NaOH used was recorded as the titre. This procedure was repeated 3 times and the average of each three titre values was taken.

Comment [PN14]: Give space

Comment [PN15]: Give space

Comment [PN16]: Provide references

2.4. Microbiological Analysis

During the fermentation process, water samples were collected from each of the three treatments T0, T1 and T2, one of each treatment selected at random each day. These samples were used for microbiological analysis to enumerate: Total bacteria count, Yeasts and moulds, and Coliforms.

Comment [PN17]: Provide references for this methodology

Fifteen universal bottles containing 9 ml of 0.1% peptone water were collected and placed in 3 groups for T0, T1, and T2. Each group of five bottles was labelled 10^1 to 10^5 . One millilitre of the inoculum was pipetted into the first 9 ml of 0.1% peptone and mixed gently (10^1 dilutions). This serial dilution was made up of the 10^5 bottle.

Comment [PN18]: Give space

Comment [PN19]: Give space

Comment [PN20]: Give space

Aliquot (1ml) from the resulting serial dilutions in a sterile petri dish using the pour plate technique in duplicate. The standard plate count agar (SPCA) (product of CondaPronadisa) was used for the determination of bacteria, incubated at 32°C for 2-3 days while potato dextrose agar (PDA) (product of Liofilchem) was used for the determination of yeasts and moulds, incubated at 30°C for 2-5 days and violet red bile agar (VRBA) (OXOID) was used for the determination of coliforms, incubated at 37°C for one (1) day. After incubation, only plates containing between 30-300 colonies were counted using an

electric colony counter (Gallenkamp), assisted by a bold marker. Colonies counted were expressed in CFU/g.

2.5. Washing the Fufu

A sterile rod was driven into each bottle daily to access the softness of the cassava. When the cassava was soft, it was sieved using a sterile aluminium sieve and sterilized water to separate fibrous material from the fufu mash. The mash was allowed to settle after which each sample was poured into muslin clothes and allowed to drain. The product was then preserved in plastic bags which were properly checked to ensure that they possessed no holes for flies to go in and cause spoilage. The sample which was soaked with water at 21°C showed no sign of getting soft on the 6th day of fermentation. The cassava was thus drained and ground using a machine and the mash was sieved and poured into clothes. The dried fufu was cooked 3 days after and served with eru for sensory evaluation.

2.6. Cooking the Fufu

Two and a half kilograms (2.5kg) of samples T0, T1 and T2 were each mixed with 1500ml of distilled water and cooked for 20minutes in a standardized procedure common to all samples (using a gas cooker) to a solid firm consistency. A wooden spoon was used to mix the fufu thoroughly to avoid lumps formation. With the help of a saucer, the fufu was rounded into small balls, ready for consumption.

2.7. Sensory Evaluation

The cooked fufu (all three samples separately represented) and eru was shared to a panel of ten members consisting of 8 IRAD workers and 2 postgraduate students who are familiar with cassava fufu. They examined the texture, colour, smell and taste of the fufu and then filled the forms handed to them. The test was based on a hedonic scale of 1-6 with 1 being the least desirable and 6 being the most desirable.

2.8. Statistical Analysis of Data

Results were expressed as the means (\pm standard error) of triplicates (n=3) determinations. Data were subjected to one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), using the chi-square test at P<0.05 level of significance.

3. RESULTS and DISCUSSION

3.1. Observable Parameters

In the first (35°C) and second (32°C) trials, all 9 samples were soft by day 3. In the 3rd (21°C) trial, all cassava samples did not get soft up to the 6th day.

3.2. Physicochemical Parameters

3.2.1. Effect of Temperature

Temperature changes followed the same trend.

Comment [PN21]: Give space

Formatted: Font color: Red

Formatted: Font color: Red

Comment [PN22]: Change to deviation

Comment [PN23]: Provide the name of software use and this version

Comment [PN24]: Give more interpretation of results

Table 1: Effect of temperature during the fermentation of Cassava in 3 treatments (T0, T1 and T2), with time.

Comment [PN25]: delete

Number of days	Temperature per treatment (°C)		
	T0 (0% LMO)	T1 (1% LMO)	T2 (4% LMO)
0	35 ^a ±0.00	35 ^a ±0.00	35 ^a ±0.00
1	23 ^c ±0.00	23 ^a ±0.00	23 ^c ±0.00
2	24 ^b ±0.00	24 ^b ±0.00	24 ^b ±0.00
3	23.5 ^c ±0.00	23.5 ^c ±0.00	23.5 ^c ±0.00

Means with the same letter along a column are not significantly different. P= 0.05

3.2.2. Effect of pH

During cassava fermentation, pH decreased with time in all three treatments. The trend was the same in all three trials.

Comment [PN26]: give more interpretation with means

Table 2: Effect of pH on Cassava fermentation with time (days)

Number of days	pH per treatment		
	T0 (0% LMO)	T1 (1% LMO)	T2 (4% LMO)
0	6.90 ^a ±0.15	6.88 ^a ±0.15	6.40 ^a ±0.15
1	5.28 ^b ±0.15	5.18 ^b ±0.15	5.30 ^b ±0.15
2	5.26 ^b ±0.15	5.00 ^b ±0.15	5.27 ^b ±0.15
3	4.88 ^b ±0.15	4.85 ^b ±0.15	5.26 ^b ±0.15

Means with the same letter along a column are not significantly different. P=0.05

3.2.3. Effect of Titratable Acidity

During the fermentation process, titratable acidity values increased with days in all treatments. Statistical analysis, however, showed that TA values did not vary significantly (p=0.1658) with days.

Table 3: Effect of Titratable Acidity (TA) during the fermentation process of cassava in three treatments (T0, T1 and T2), with time.

Comment [PN27]: delete

Number of days	Titratable Acidity per treatment (%LA)		
	T0	T1	T2
0	0.01 ^a ±0.007	0.02 ^a ±0.007	0.03 ^a ±0.007
1	0.02 ^a ±0.007	0.05 ^a ±0.007	0.06 ^a ±0.007
2	0.03 ^a ±0.007	0.07 ^a ±0.007	0.13 ^a ±0.007
3	0.05 ^a ±0.007	0.10 ^a ±0.007	0.15 ^a ±0.007

Means with the same letter along a column are not significantly different at P=0.05

3.3. Microbiological Parameters

3.3.1. Variation in Total Bacterial Counts (TBC).

Total bacteria counts increased progressively from 3.49±0.28 cfu/ml in treatment T0 on day zero to 6.90±0.34 cfu/ml in treatment T2 on day 3. Statistical analysis showed a significant difference (p=0.0001) in total bacterial counts with days. The highest counts were recorded in treatment T2, while the least counts were recorded in treatment T0. This, however, showed no significant difference (p= 0.7359).

Table 4: Variation in TB counts during the fermentation of cassava in three treatments (T0, T1 and T2), with time.

Number of days	Total Bacteria Counts per treatment (log ₁₀ cfu/ml)		
	T0 (0%LMO)	T1 (1%LMO)	T2 (4%LMO)
0	3.49 ^a ±0.28	3.52 ^a ±0.28	4.53 ^b ±0.28
1	4.52 ^b ±0.34	5.32 ^c ±0.34	5.49 ^c ±0.34
2	5.85 ^c ±0.32	5.70 ^c ±0.32	5.88 ^c ±0.32
3	6.48 ^d ±0.34	6.60 ^d ±0.34	6.90 ^d ±0.34

Means with the same letter along a column are not significantly different at P=0.05

3.3.2. Variation in Yeasts and Mold Counts

Yeasts and mould count increased progressively from day zero to day 2, then dropped on the third day of fermentation in all three treatments. Statistical analysis showed a significant difference (p=0.05). The highest counts were recorded in treatment T2, while the least counts were recorded in treatment T0. This, however, showed no significant difference (p= 0.05).

Table 5: Variation in Yeast and Mold counts with time during the fermentation of cassava in three treatments T0, T1 and T2.

Number of days	Yeast and Mold counts per treatment (log ₁₀ cfu/ml)		
	T0	T1	T2
0	3.78 ^a ±0.42	5.28 ^c ±0.42	5.34 ^c ±0.42
1	4.00 ^b ±0.50	5.60 ^c ±0.50	6.54 ^d ±0.50
2	5.15 ^c ±0.44	6.30 ^d ±0.44	7.15 ^e ±0.44
3	4.30 ^{ab} ±0.50	4.48 ^b ±0.50	5.48 ^c ±0.50

Means with the same letter along a column are not significantly different.

3.3.3. Variation in Coliform Counts

Coliform counts decreased progressively from day zero through day 3. This showed a significant difference (p=0.0003). Averagely, there were more coliforms in treatment T2 and least in treatment T0. This, however, showed no significant difference (p= 0.5578).

Comment [PN28]: delete

Comment [PN29]: for which day The highest counts were recorded in treatment T2, while the least counts were recorded in treatment T0.?

Comment [PN30]: Delete! It is not necessary

Table 6: Variation in coliform counts during the fermentation of cassava in three treatments (T0, T1 and T2), with time.

Number of days	Coliforms per treatment (log ₁₀ cfu/ml)		
	T0	T1	T2
0	4.08 ^a ±0.35	4.66 ^a ±0.35	4.52 ^a ±0.35
1	3.50 ^b ±0.35	3.59 ^b ±0.35	4.22 ^a ±0.35
2	3.44 ^c ±0.35	3.49 ^b ±0.35	4.00 ^a ±0.35
3	3.30 ^c ±0.35	3.35 ^b ±0.35	3.48 ^b ±0.35

Means with the same letter along a column are not significantly different.

3.4. Sensory Evaluation Results.

Panellists gave attributes to smell, taste, texture and colour. Treatment T0 recorded the highest scores for smell, taste and colour while treatment T1 recorded the highest score for texture.

Table 7: Attributes by variation T0, T1 and T2 in samples of the fermentation of Cassava in three trials at 35°C, 32°C and 21°C.

Attribute	T0	T1	T2	Total
Smell	9.82	8.45	7.08	25.34
Taste	8.22	7.53	5.71	21.46
Texture	8.68	9.36	7.99	26.03
Color	10.50	9.13	7.53	25.17
Total	37.21	34.47	28.31	100

4 Discussion

The effect of the addition of 1% and 4% LMO, (a microbial inoculant), was compared with natural fermentation (no inoculant) to evaluate the effect of this inoculant on changes in the physicochemical and microbial properties during the fermentation process and the sensory characteristics of the *fufu* produced. The fact that all cassava samples in trial 1(35°C) and 2 (32°C) irrespective of treatments were soft by day 3 while all samples in trial 3 (21°C) did not get soft even on the sixth day clearly indicates that the soaking temperature affects the soaking and softening period for the cassava. There is thus a temperature range that favours cassava fermentation. It was discovered that a temperature range of 30-35°C was best for submerged fermentation. This temperature is important not only for sterilization but to kick start the fermentation process as relatively high temperatures (30-35°C) favour the growth of mesophilic microorganisms which are necessary for fermentation to take place. This explains why cassava in trial 3 (soaked at room temperature of 19-23°C) did not get soft. These results show that soaking at room temperature in the Western Highlands of Cameroon do not agree with those of Achi Akomas in Nigeria, where the room temperatures are relatively higher (26±1°C).

Cassava was soaked using water of pH near neutrality (6.9). Fermentation, an anaerobic process, involves the breakdown of starch by facultative anaerobic microorganisms such as lactic acid bacteria (LAB). These LAB produce high amounts of lactic acid and very little acetic acid. This leads to a rapid drop in pH to around 4.9 as previously found during the preparation of cassava fermented products such

Comment [PN31]: Delete

Comment [PN32]: Which years?

as *foo-foo*, “*attieke*” and *lafun* [1]. So, whatever the treatment, the trend in acidities is the same during lactic acid fermentation. However, the lowest pH values of treatment 3 (4% LMO)-the most acidic medium could be due to an additional number of microorganisms found in LMO, into the medium which led to a more rapid breakdown of starch than in other treatments. The significant difference in pH between Day 0 and Day 1 (pH falling from 6.9 to 5.18) could be as a result of the maximum accumulation of lactic acid in the bottles during fermentation after 24 hours. At the pH of about 5, the cyanohydrins formed disintegrate to form HCN which could be evaporated later from the fermented cassava. Indeed, fermentation allowed the elimination of more than 90% of endogenous cyanide compounds in the cassava roots after 48 hours. After this time, the acidity of the medium has already been attained hence changes in pH values become insignificant after Day 2. These results agree with those of Achi and Akomas, who obtained a change in pH from 6.8 through 4.3 to 3.8 after 96 hours of fermentation.

Comment [PN33]: Full stop

Titrateable acidity (TA) is the total amount of acid [H⁺] in the medium. The increase in TA within the treatments is the result of the fermentation of the cassava by the natural flora of microorganisms in the medium. Treatment 3 (4% starter culture) having the highest concentration of microorganisms showed a much rise in TA (0.09±0.008%). Other studies found out that while the pH of the fermenting cassava roots decreased, TA increased. These drop in pH and increase in TA in the fermentation water could be attributed to the accumulation of some organic acids such as lactic and acetic acids throughout the cassava fermentation process.

Comment [PN34]: Provide the years. Write correctly the reference for example Achi and Akomas [1]

Comment [PN35]: Change to TA (0.09%) no standard deviation with percentage

Comment [PN36]: Discuss with author (agree or disagree)

The concentration of microorganisms in the medium varies from one day to the next. Not all microorganisms can grow in the acidic medium. As the medium becomes more acidic, some microorganisms (acidophobes) which cannot withstand this environment die while acidophiles such as yeasts and lactic acid bacteria thrive to the end of the experiment. From this reasoning, it could be said that the progressive rise in bacteria could be lactic acid bacteria, while bacteria such as *Bacillus subtilis* died in the course of the fermentation process.

Yeasts are important in cassava fermentation. The increase in yeasts and moulds on Day 2 could be due to a favourable environment (pH of approximately 5.17, titrateable acidity of 0.08% and temperature of 24°C) for growth. Literature shows that yeast cells can tolerate a pH of 4.0 to 8.5, with optimum pH between 4.0 and 6.0. A decrease in yeasts and moulds at the end of the fermentation process could be due to the depletion of substrates and bacteria competition.

Comment [PN37]: Give the names of authors with date

Coliforms in foods are an indication of possible contamination. It has been reported that the presence of coliforms in fermented cassava could constitute a health hazard to the consumer and could also act as a potential spoilage agent of fermented cassava foods. So, improvements in hygienic conditions and in the selection of raw materials are required for *water-fufu* production.

Comment [PN38]: Use references to discuss

Lactic and acetic acids released when starch is metabolized lead to the characteristic odour of *fufu*. Treatment T0 was given the highest score (9.82) for smell by the panellists. LMO being a fermented product does not have a pleasant smell. As such, its smell could possibly affect the *fufu* produced. This was confirmed as T2 with the highest concentration of LMO, scored least (7.08) for smell. Most consumers prefer the whitish colour of *water-fufu*. *Fufu* of any other colour is most often regarded to be of doubted quality. The brown colour of LMO must have affected the colour of the LMO-inoculated *fufu*. The highest score (27.17%) was given to colour, while the lowest (21.46%) was given to taste. The taste of T0 was most preferred (8.22). The result for taste, however, might be accepted with doubts since the *fufu* was eaten with *eru*, which could influence the taste of the *fufu*. Panellists, however, could not have eaten the cooked *fufu* without a supplement. T1 had the highest score (9.36), T0 was ranked (8.68) and T2 was third (7.99) in terms of texture. This could lead to the conclusion that small amounts of LMO could be needed to produce *fufu* with good texture. Despite these scores, statistical analysis showed no significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between the attributes.

Comment [PN39]: Use references to discuss

45. CONCLUSION

From the above results obtained during the study, it could be concluded that;

The soaking temperature affects the duration of fermentation. Temperature, pH and titratable acidity follow similar trends irrespective of treatments. Microbial counts do not vary significantly from one treatment to another. LMO does not affect the fermentation process, but slightly affects the quality of the finished product. The additional microorganisms found in LMO do not play any significant role in the fermentation process. Fermentation with LMO is seen to produce fufu that is brownish, with a scent. These attributes make the fufu unattractive to the consumer. Natural fermentation with no inoculant produces better fufu based on taste, smell and colour. Hence, natural fermentation under good hygienic conditions should be encouraged for water fufu production.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Howeler, "Cassava cultivation and soil productivity," in *Achieving Sustainable cultivation of Cassava*, 2017, p. 8.
- [2] E. Okogbenin *et al.*, "Phenotypic approaches to drought in cassava: review," *Front. Physiol.*, vol. 10, no. 4, p. 93, 2013, [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2013.00093>.
- [3] F. L. Nweke, "Cassava processing in Sub-Saharan Africa: The implications for expanding cassava production," *Outlook Agric*, vol. 23, pp. 197–205, 1994.
- [4] G. Oboh, "Nutrient enrichment of cassava peels using a mixed culture of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and *Lactobacillus* spp. Solid media fermentation," *Electron. J. Biotechnol.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 46–49, 2006.
- [5] C. Ofuya and P. Akpoti, "Post-processing microflora and the shelf stability of Gari marketed in Port Harcourt," *J. Appl. Microbiol.*, vol. 64, pp. 389–394, 1988.
- [6] S. A. *et al.*, "Responding to Incidents of Low Level Chemical Contamination in Food," in *Ensuring Global Food Safety, Exploring Global Harmonization.*, 2010, pp. 411–437.
- [7] S. Mvodo, "Opportunities in the cassava sector in Cameroon. AGRO-HUB.," 2016.
- [8] S. O. Nwokoro, A. M. Orheruata, and P. I. Ordiah, "Replacement of maize with cassava sievates in cockerel starter diets: effect on performance and carcass characteristics," *Trop. Anim. Heal. Prod.*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 163–167, 2002.
- [9] L. Mennen *et al.*, "The habitual diet in rural and urban Cameroon," *Eur. J. Clin. Nutr.*, vol. 54, pp. 150–154, 2000.
- [10] N. J. Tonukari, "Cassava and the future of starch," *Biotechnol. issues Dev. Ctries.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 5–8, 2004.
- [11] M. E. Johnson, "A 100-year review: Cheese production and quality," *J. Dairy Sci.*, vol. 100, no. 12, pp. 9952–9965, 2017.
- [12] J. P. Tamang, D. Shin, S. Jung, and S. Chae, "Functional properties of microorganisms in fermented foods," *Front. Microbiol.*, vol. 7, p. 578, 2016, doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2016.00578.
- [13] A. O. Adebayo-Oyetoro, O. B. Oyewole, A. O. Obadina, and M. A. Omemu, "Microbiological Safety Assessment of Fermented Cassava Flour Lafun," *Int. J. Food Sci.*, vol. 2013, p. 5, 2013, doi: 10.1155/2013/845324.

- [14] C. O. Adetunji, S. A. Akande, A. K. Oladipo, R. A. Salawu, and A. F. Onyegbula, "Determination of the microbiological quality and proximate composition of fermented cassava food products sold in Ilorin-west local government area, Nigeria," *Ruhuna J. Sci.*, vol. 8, pp. 76–89, 2017.
- [15] B. O. Omafuvbe, A. R. Adigun, J. L. Ogunsuyi, and A. M. Asunmo, "Microbial Diversity In Ready-To eat Fufu and Lafun-Fermented Cassava Products Sold in Ile-Ife, Nigeria," *Res. J. Microbiol.*, vol. 2, pp. 831–837, 2007.
- [16] O. B. Oyewole and S. A. Odunfa, "Extracellular enzyme activities during cassava fermentation for fufu production," *World J. Microbiol. Biotechnol.*, vol. 8, pp. 71–72, 1992.
- [17] A. Brauman, S. Keleke, M. Malonga, E. Miambi, and F. Ampe, "Microbiological characterization of cassava retting, a traditional lactic acid fermentation for foo-foo cassava flour production.," *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, vol. 62, pp. 2854–2858, 1996.
- [18] O. K. Achi and N. S. Akomas, "Comparative Assessment of fermentation Techniques in the Processing of Fufu, a Traditionally Fermented Cassava Product," *Pakistan J. Nutr.*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 224–229, 2006.
- [19] E. A. Uyoh, V. O. Ntui, and N. N. Udoma, "Effect of local cassava fermentation methods on some physiochemical and sensory properties of fufu," *Pakistan J. Nutr.*, vol. 8, 2009.
- [20] O. B. Oyewole and S. A. Odunfa, "Characterization and distribution of lactic acid bacteria in cassava retting during fufu production," *J. Appl. Bacteriol.*, vol. 68, pp. 145–152, 1990.
- [21] H. Egan, S. K. Ronald, S. Ronald, and D. Pearson, *Pearson's Chemical Analysis of Foods*. Edinburgh; New York: Churchill Livingstone, 1981.
- [22] A. K. N. Tanya, D. R. Darman, A. R. Ejoh, R. Mbahe, and Hamidou, "Physiochemical and sensory analysis of fermented flour 'Kumkum' from three improved and one local cassava varieties in the Adamawa Province of Cameroon," *Pakistan J. Nutr.*, vol. 5, pp. 355–358, 2006.
- [23] O. B. Oyewole, "Optimization of cassava fermentation for fufu production: effects of single starter cultures," *J. Appl. Bacteriol.*, vol. 68, pp. 49–54, 1990.
- [24] C. P., F. Z., A. J., S. H., and P. Z., "Characterization of the microflora of attieke; a fermented cassava product, during traditional small-scale preparation," *Int. J. Food*, vol. 106, pp. 131–136, 2006.
- [25] N. Okafor, B. Ijioma, and C. Oyolu, "Studies of Microbiology of cassava retting for foo-foo production.," *J. Appl. Bacteriol.*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 1984.
- [26] O. B. Oyewole and S. A. Odunfa, "Microbiological studies on cassava fermentation for 'lafun' production," *Food Microbiol.*, vol. 5, pp. 125–133, 1988.
- [27] A. O. Obadina, O. B. Oyewole, I. O. Sanni, K. I. Tomlins, and A. Westby, "Identification of hazards and critical control points (CCP) for cassava fufu processing in South-West Nigeria," *Food Control*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 22–26, 2008.