# Characterization of red and purple-pericarp rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) based on physico-chemical and antioxidative properties of grains

# Priyadarsini Sanghamitra\*, TB Bagchi, RP Sah, SG Sharma, Sutapa Sarkar and Nabaneeta Basak

ICAR-National Rice Research Institute, Cuttack-753006, Odisha, India \*Corresponding author e-mail: p.sanghamitra1@gmail.com

Received : 18 July 2016	Accepted : 14 March 2017	Published : 19 May 2017
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------

# ABSTRACT

In the preset study range of variations in physico-chemical, cooking characteristics and antioxidant properties of six pigmented rice (four purple and two red) cultivars from north east India were evaluated. Significant variation (P<0.05) was detected among the cultivars for all the traits evaluated except for volume expansion ratio (VER). All the genotypes had long slender grain. Hulling and milling % for all the genotypes were more than 74 and 61%, respectively. Head rice recovery (HRR) was more than 50% in Manipuriblack, Kalobhat and Assambiroin. The range of amylose content (AC) varied from 2.19 to 24.87% where as Mornodoiga was found with highest AC. All the genotypes except Manipuriblack elongated more than 9mm after cooking. Most of the genotypes were found with soft gel consistency (GC). Similarly, all the genotypes except Assambiroin had water uptake (WU) value  $\leq$  100ml/100g rice. The concentration of total anthocyanin content (TAC), total phenolic content (TPC) and antioxidant activity (ABTS) differed significantly among the genotypes with highest concentration of these parameters were observed for the purple grain (Mamihunger) whereas no significant difference between the colour groups (red and purple) was observed for total flavonoid content (TFC), gammaoryzanol and phytic acid content which envisages that value of these parameters depends on genotypes and not on kernel colour. A high correlation of TAC with TPC and ABTS suggest that the major phytochemicals responsible for the tested antioxidant activities are phenolic acids and anthocyanin.

Key words: Pigmented rice, antioxidants, grain quality, physico-chemical characteristics

Rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) is consumed as a staple food by more than half of the world's population with approximately 95% of production in Asia (Bhattacharjee *et al.* 2002). It is the only cereal crop cooked and consumed mainly as whole grains, and quality considerations are much more important than for any other food crops (Hossain *et al.* 2009). Grain quality has always been an important consideration in rice variety selection and development. It is the primary determinant for market place and consumer acceptability. The Kernel appearance, size, shape, nutritional value and cooking characteristics are important for judging the quality and preference of rice from one group of consumer to another (Kanchana *et al.* 2012). In particular, the cooking and eating qualities are very important determinants of cooked rice grain quality (Ge *et al.* 2005). The content of amylose in rice is considered the principal determinant of rice quality. However, rice varieties with similar amylose content have shown to possess different rice characteristics on cooking which indicated that secondary differences exist among varieties with similar amylose content.

Most of the rice crops grown and consumed throughout the world have the white pericarp but there are many special cultivars of rice known as pigmented rice characterized by red, black and purple pericarp. This pigmentation depends on the kinds of deposition of phenolic compounds such as anthocyanin and proanthocyanidin in the aleurone layer of the grain (Finocchiaro *et al.* 2010; Pereira- Caro *et al.* 2013a, 2013b). Great interest has been shown in the polyphenols in rice for their multiple biological activities. These phenolic compounds include ferulic acid and diferulates, anthocyanins, anthocyanidins and polymeric proanthocyanidins (condensed tannins) (Chun *et al.* 2005). Phenolics have free radical scavanging activity which protect cell against oxidative damage.

Free radicals have been claimed to play an important role in affecting human health by causing many diseases (e.g., heart diseases, cancer, hypertension, diabetes and atherosclerosis). In the past decade, antioxidants have shown their relevance in the prevention of various diseases, in which free radicals are implicated. This coloured rice are known source of antioxidant compounds including flavonoid, anthocyanin, phytic acid, proanthocyanidin, tocopherols, tocotrienols,  $\gamma$ -oryzanol, and phenolic compounds (Butsat and Siriamornpun 2010; Goufo and Trindade 2014) which can decrease oxidative stress in vivo, highly effective in reducing cholesterol levels in the human body and exert beneficial effects on human health (Santos-Buelga and Scalbert 2000; Ghie and Walton 2007; Lee et al. 2008). Major anthocyanins such as peonidin, peonidin 3-glucoside and cyanidin 3-glucoside extracted from black rice, also reported to exert an inhibitory effect of cell invasion on various cancer cells (Chen et al. 2006).

Considering health protecting and promoting effect of pigmented rice, the objective of this study was to compare physico-chemical, cooking properties and antioxidant potentials of the six pigmented rice cultivars native to the North-east India *viz.*, Mamihunger, Manipuri black, Chakhao, Kalobhat, Mornodoiga and Assambiroin.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

Pigmented paddy varieties were collected from the substation of NRRI, Gerua, Assam and multiplied in the NRRI experimental field, Cuttack, India. All the paddy samples were from the recent harvest of *Kharif*, 2015. The agronomic data were collected from the field time to time. The paddy samples were sun-dried (moisture up to 12-13%) and cleaned for foreign materials, packed in polyethylene bags and kept inside cloth bags, and stored at 4°C. The samples were dehulled through laboratory rice huller, Satake, Japan make. The kernels were ground by a grinding machine (Glen mini grinder) and sheaved through 100 mesh size and then stored at  $4^{\circ}$ C for further experiments.

Anthocyanin content of rice samples was measured in UV-V is spectrophotometrically according to Swain and Hillis (1959) with alcoholic extract.

Gamma-oryzanol content (GOC) was determined with RP-HPLC.  $\gamma$  -oryzanols extraction by HPLC was performed according to Chen et al. (2005) with simplification. Briefly, 0.5 grams of samples (Brown rice flour) were mixed with 5 ml of HPLCgrade isopropanol, vortexed for 2 min at 25°C, centrifuged at 4500 g for 10 min and the supernatant was collected. After 2-3 times repetition, supernatant fractions were evaporated under hot water bath and then extracts were dissolved in 5 ml of HPLC-grade isopropanol. After filtration through a 0.45 µm membrane, 20 µl aliquots were injected into the column (C18- Phenomenex Column). It was separated by an analytical Shimadzu High Performance Liquid Chromatography (RP-HPLC) system equipped with an LC-20AT pump and PDA detector (Shimadzu, Kyoto, Japan). The composition of the mobile phase was 35% acetonitrile, 55% methanol and 10% isopropanol and operated in low pressure gradient mode.

Total phenolic content (TPC) was determined by modified protocol of Zilic et al. 2011. About 0.3 g of brown rice flour sample and 10 ml 70% acetone were mixed thoroughly in a centrifuge tube at room temperature. After centrifugation for 20 minutes at 15000g, aliquots (0.2 ml) of aqueous acetone extracts were transferred into test tubes and their volumes made up to 0.5 ml with distilled water. After addition of the Folin-Ciocalteu reagent (0.25 ml) and 20% aqueous sodium carbonate solution (1.25 ml), tubes were vortexed. After 40 min, the absorbance was recorded at 725 nm against a reagent blank. The total phenolic content of each sample was determined by means of a calibration curve prepared using catechol and expressed as mg catechol equivalents (CE) per gram of brown rice flour.

Total flavonoid content was determined according to Eberhardt *et al.* (2000). One gram rice grain was extracted in 10 ml of 40% (v/v) ethanol for 30 min at room temperature. The supernatant, after

#### Properties of red and purple-pericarp rice

centrifugation for 20 min at 15,000g was used in experiments. Briefly, 0.075 ml of 5% NaNO<sub>2</sub> was mixed with 0.5 ml of the sample (ethanolic extract diluted with 1 ml of water). After 6 min, 0.15 ml of a 10% AlCl<sub>3</sub> solution was added, and the mixture was allowed to stand for another 5 min. Then, 0.5 ml of 1 M NaOH was added, and the volume was made up to 2.5 ml with distilled water. The absorbance was measured at 510 nm immediately after mixing, against the blank containing the extraction solvent instead of a sample. The results are expressed as mg CE (catechine equivalent) per 100g of dry matter.

ABTS radical scavenging was assayed by modified protocol of Serpen et al. 2008. In this methodology, both soluble and insoluble fraction of antioxidant compounds come into contact with the ABTS radical. The ABTS+ reagent was prepared by reacting a 7 mmol/l aqueous solution of ABTS with 2.45 mmol 1<sup>-1</sup> potassium persulfate and further dissolved in the mixture of ethanol: water (50:50, v/v) so that 1: 5: 28 (V/V) ratio of ABTS, potassium persulphate and ethanol-water was maintained and final OD at 734 nm will be 0.70 + .02. Six milliliters of ABTS+ reagent was added to 10 mg of brown rice flour and the mixture was vortexed for 1.5 min to perform the surface reaction. Following centrifugation at 9200 g for 2 min, the absorbance of the optically clear supernatant was measured at 734 nm exactly 30 min and 60 min of sample mixing with the ABTS reagent. The antioxidant capacity was expressed as percent inhibition.

Phytic acid content was determined by modified protocol of Gao et al. 2007. Extraction of PA was done by taking 1g brown rice flour sample in 10ml 2.4% HCl in the 100ml conical flask and the flasks containing the samples were shaken at 220 rpm for 16h in an incubator Shaker at 50°C (Rivotek, India) and centrifuged at 10,062 g in a table-top centrifuge (Remi, India) at 25°C for 20 min. The supernatant was then collected and after adding 1g NaCl, it was shaken for 20 min at 350 rpm. After keeping for 20 min at -20°C, these tubes were again centrifuged at 3000 g for 20 min. After 25 times dilution of supernatant with double distilled water, 3 ml sample and 1 ml wade reagent (0.03% FeCl<sub>3</sub>, 6H<sub>2</sub>0+0.3% Sulpho-salicylic acid) were mixed thoroughly by vortexing and after keeping it for 1 hour OD was measured in 500nm. Standard curve was prepared by sodium phytate so

#### Sanghamitra et al.

that the blank OD will be 0.453+0.002. PA concentration was determined by using the following formula: PA% = {(0.463-OD) x 25 V} / (22.05 x M). Here OD is absorbance; V=final volume (ml); M=weight of sample (g).

For physical traits, 100 g of rice seeds were de-hulled and milled using a standard de-husker and miller, respectively and the milling, head recovery ratio (HRR), kernel length (KL), kernel breadth (KB) and length/breadth (L/B) were calculated. For the gel consistency (GC), 100 mg of rice flour was taken in test tube (13 x100 mm), 0.2 ml of ethanol containing 0.03% thymol blue and 2.0 ml of 0.2 N of KOH were added and kept in boiling water-bath for 8 min, cooled, mixed well and kept in ice bath for 20 min. Later, the test tubes were laid horizontally on the flat base, graph paper for one hour and length of gel spreading of those tubes were measured (mm).

For chemical traits, six number milled rice grains were taken in petriplates and 10 ml of 1.7% of KOH was added and kept in an incubator at 27-30 °C for 23 hours to measure alkali spreading value (ASV). Whereas, the amylose content (AC) was measured using a spectrophotometer (Thermo spectronic USA) as per Juliano *et al.* (2009).

Cooking properties were determined by taking 15 ml of water in 50 ml graduated centrifuge tubes and 5 g of rice samples were added in it. Rice samples were cooked for 20 min in a water bath. Length of ten cooked rice kernels was measured using graph paper for computing the kernel length after cooking (KLAC). Volume expansion ratio and elongation ratio were calculated after cooking as per established methods.

#### Statistical analysis

All experiments were carried out in triplicates and presented as mean±standard deviation of mean using SAS version 9.2. The data were statistically analysed by Duncan's multiple range tests at 5% significance level.

# **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

Wide variation in the physico-chemical and cooking properties were observed in the pigmented rice (Table 1). The hulling percentage was more than 74% in all the pigmented rice with higher value (78%) observed

Table 1. Physic	zo-chemical and	d cooking chara	Table 1. Physico-chemical and cooking characteristics of pigmented rice.	gmented rice.						
	HUL(%)** MIL(%)**	MIL(%)**	HRR(%)**	L/B**	AC(%)**	$ASV^*$	KLA**	VER**	GC**	WU**
Mamihunger	A78.00±2.0	$^{\rm B}69.67{\pm}1.50$	$^{D49.50\pm1.0}$	$^{B}4.22\pm0.04$	$^{\rm B}15.60\pm0.20$	$90.9^{\circ}$	<sup>B</sup> 9.27±0.11	$4.00\pm0.50$	$^{D43.00\pm1.0}$	$^{\rm E}104.67{\pm}0.57$
(purple grain) Manipuriblack	<sup>B</sup> 75.00±2.0	<sup>c</sup> 61.33±1.15	^59.50±1.00	<sup>c</sup> 3.30±0.15	<sup>F</sup> 2.19±0.10	<sup>A</sup> 6.00	<sup>c</sup> 8.47±0.12	3.75±0.05	A75.00±1.0	<sup>B</sup> 195.33±0.55
(purple grain) Chakhao	$^{\rm B}74.50{\pm}1.0$	<sup>c</sup> 62.50±1.00	<sup>D</sup> 48.83±0.57	$^{A4.36\pm0.10}$	$^{\rm D}5.84\pm\!0.05$	<sup>B</sup> 5.00	$^{AB}9.67\pm0.28$	3.77±0.07	A75.00±1.0	<sup>c</sup> 134.67±0.57
(purple grain) Kalobhat	<sup>B</sup> 75.00±2.0	A73.00±1.32	<sup>B</sup> 56.83±1.15	<sup>D</sup> 3.15±0.05	$E4.57\pm0.11$	<sup>B</sup> 5.00	<sup>АВ</sup> 9.50±0.50	3.75±0.25	<sup>B</sup> 65.33±0.57	<sup>D</sup> 110.50±0.51
(purple grain) Mornodoiga	<sup>B</sup> 75.33±0.57	<sup>B</sup> 75.33±0.57 <sup>c</sup> 61.83±1.15	$E35.50\pm1.0$	<sup>D</sup> 3.04±0.07	$^{A}24.87\pm0.57$	D3.00	<sup>B</sup> 9.33±0.26	3.75±0.25	<sup>B</sup> 66.33±1.15	F82.33±0.28
(red grain) Assambiroin	<sup>B</sup> 74.50±1.0	<sup>B</sup> 74.50±1.0 <sup>c</sup> 62.50±1.00	<sup>c</sup> 55.00±1.0	<sup>D</sup> 3.08±0.06	c11.13±0.33	c4.00	<sup>A</sup> 9.87±0.30	3.75±0.25	<sup>c</sup> 48.33±1.15	<sup>A</sup> 332.50±0.50
(red grain)										
Note- Values a	re presented as	mean ± Standaı	rd daviation (n=	3), Mean with	n different letters	s (A-F) wit	Note- Values are presented as mean $\pm$ Standard daviation (n=3), Mean with different letters (A-F) within the same column are significantly different (P < 0.05),	umn are signif	icantly differe	it (P < $0.05$ ),
* Standard day	iation in ASV is	s zero, ** no sig	phificance differ	ence among g	enotypes for VE	R, ASV-all	* Standard daviation in ASV is zero, ** no significance difference among genotypes for VER, ASV-alkali spreading value, AC-amylose content(%), GC-gel	lue, AC-amyl	ose content(%)	ı, GC-gel
consistency in 1	nm, HRR=Hea	d rice recovery(	%), HUL-hullin	ıg(%), KLA-ke	rnel length after	cooking, L	consistency in mm, HRR=Head rice recovery(%), HUL-hulling(%), KLA-kernel length after cooking, L/B-length/breadth ratio, MIL-Milling(%), VER-volume	h ratio, MIL-I	Milling(%),VE	R-volume

volume expansion ratio and kernel elongation (Vanaja and Babu 2003).

The alkali spreading value was in the range of

3-6 for all the genotypes. Mornodoiga had high intermediate ASV (3) and Assambiroin, chakhao and kalobhat had intermediate ASV (4-5) where as Mamihunger and Manipuri black had low ASV (6). It signifies that the intermediate group requires high gelatinization temperature ( $70-74^{\circ}C$ ) and low gelatinization temperature ( $<70^{\circ}C$ ) is required for mamihunger and manipuriblack. It was reported that the gelatinization temperature affects water uptake,

Length-wise expansion without a corresponding increase in girth is considered a highly

in Mamihunger. The milling percentage was in the range of 61.33 (Manipuri black) to 73.00 (Kalobhat). Head rice recovery, one of the major criteria that determine the grain quality varied from 35.50 (Mornodoiga) to 59.50% (Manipuri black). This important grain quality varies depending on variety, grain type, cultural practices and post harvest conditions (Razavi and Farahmandfar 2008; Emadzade *et al.* 2009). HRR of more than 55% was found in Manipuri black, Kalobhat and Assambiroin. In this study, HRR was found positively correlated (r=0.819;Table 3) with ASV, L/B ratio or axial ratio which provide information about the grain type. All the pigmented rice were found to have long slender grain as the axial ratio was more than 3.0 and varied from 3.04 to 4.36.

Cooking quality of rice mainly depends on amylose content and gelatinization temperature. Amylose content (AC), an important grain quality character which determines the texture of cooked rice varied from 2.19 to 24.87%. Manipuriblack was nonwaxy type (>2%), very low amylose content was observed in Chakhao and Kalobhat (within 2-9%) and low amylase content (within 10-20%) was observed in Mamihunger and Assambiroin where as Mornodoiga had moderate level (within 20-25%) and preferred amylose content. Cultivar with high amylose level are associated with lower blood glucose level and slower emptying of the human gastrointestinal tract compared to those with low levels of this macromolecule (Frei and Becker 2003). In this study, high significant negative correlation of AC with ASV (-0.961) and HRR (-0.887) was observed (Table 3).

# Properties of red and purple-pericarp rice

had desirable long grain after cooking (> 9mm). There was no significant difference among genotypes for VER which was 3.75 for all the genotypes except Mamihunger (4.0). VER was found significant positive correlation with HUL (r=0.958; Table 3).

Gel consistency (GC) ranged from 43.00 to 75.00. Based on GC classification, moderate GC was observed in Mamihunger and Assambiroin (within 41-60) where as other genotypes has soft and desirable GC (within 61-100). When cooked, rice types with hard gel consistency harden faster than those with a soft gel consistency. Rice with soft gel consistency cook more tenderly and remain soft even upon cooling (Oko *et al.* 2012). The correlation between percentage amylose and gel consistency was negative in direction though not significant (Table 3), suggesting the unlikelihood of correlated responses in selecting for these traits.

The WU value was in the range of 82.33 to 332.50. Mornodoiga required less than 100ml water / 100g rice where as for rest of the genotypes it was more than 100. Highest water uptake was observed in Assambiroin (332.50ml/100g rice). The appearance in the quality of cooked rice grains is associated with the amount of water uptake during cooking process (Tan *et al.* 2000). It is worthy to note that high water uptake ratio affects the palatability of the cooked rice negatively (Oko *et al.* 2012).

Different antioxidant parameters like, total anthocyanin content, flavonoid, gammaoryzanol, and total phenolics, phytic acid and ABTS antioxidant assay Sanghamitra *et al*.

are shown in Table 2. The phenolics, flavonoids and anthocyanins, are known to act as electron donors that are capable of reacting with free radicals and convert them to stable compounds, and thus the radical chain reaction is terminated (Laokuldilok et al. 2011). The concentration of TACs, TPC and ABTS differed significantly among the genotypes. Highest concentrations of TACs were observed for the grains with purple pericarp color (Mamihunger-96.71 and Manipuri black-96.22 mg/100g), which were more than 25 times higher than the TACs concentrations of grains with red pericarp color (Assambiroin and Mornodoiga). Similar results were also obtained by other researchers (Abdel-Aal et al. 2006; Laokuldilok et al. 2011) who reported that purple-pigmented rice having a higher level of anthocyanin than red-pigmented rice. The higher concentration of TAC in purple rice may be due to the deposition of both anthocyanin and proanthocyanidin pigment in the aleurone layer where as only proanthocyanidin present in the red rice. Highest concentration of TPC was detected in the purple grain (955.28mg/100g) and lowest in the red grain (191.35mg/ 100g). These results is in agreements with findings of Choi et al. 2007, Shen et al. 2009, Goffman and Bergman 2004 for red and black rice varieties. Significant correlation of TAC with TPC (r=0.971) envisages its higher content in the purple pericarp (Table 3). The higher total phenolics contents of purple pericarp appear to be attributable to their higher anti-oxidative activities. The evaluation of the antioxidant properties of cereals is getting more importance because of their free radical scavenging activity. Highest ABTS assay

<b>Table 2.</b> Antioxidant properties and ABTS assay in pigmented rice.	
--	--

	TAC	TFC	Gammaoryzano	ol TPC	Phyticacid	Antioxidant
	(mg/100g)	(mg CE/100g)	(mg/100g)	(mg/100g)	(g/100g)	(AAE/g)
Mamihunger ( purple grain)	<sup>A</sup> 96.71±0.98	<sup>F</sup> 146.34±0.58	<sup>A</sup> 98.10±0.74	<sup>A</sup> 955.28±0.92	<sup>c</sup> 0.11±0.01	<sup>A</sup> 3187.24±0.39
Manipuriblack (black grain)	<sup>в</sup> 96.22±0.98	<sup>D</sup> 223.76±1.16	<sup>D</sup> 65.21±1.0	<sup>в</sup> 621.25±0.85	<sup>B</sup> 0.23 ±0.02	<sup>в</sup> 3127.45±0.38
Chakhao (purple grain)	<sup>c</sup> 88.55±1.24	<sup>A</sup> 289.20±1.11	E52.65±0.86	<sup>c</sup> 555.80±0.93	<sup>B</sup> 0.20 ±0.02	<sup>c</sup> 3119.34±0.72
Kalobhat (purple grain)	<sup>c</sup> 89.21±0.98	<sup>B</sup> 284.21±0.83	<sup>c</sup> 67.46±0.98	<sup>D</sup> 491.50±0.51	<sup>B</sup> 0.23 ±0.01	E3061.91±0.27
Mornodoiga (red grain)	<sup>D</sup> 5.10±0.66	<sup>c</sup> 272.51±0.63	<sup>B</sup> 80.71±1.01	E355.27±0.97	<sup>A</sup> 0.32±0.03	F3044.22±0.60
Assambiroin (red grain)	<sup>D</sup> 3.33±0.63	E211.22±0.96	E52.92±0.68	F191.35±1.05	<sup>в</sup> 0.20±0.01	<sup>D</sup> 3105.23±0.38

Note- Values are presented as mean  $\pm$  Standard daviation (n=3); Mean with different letters (A-F) within the same column are significantly different (P < 0.05); CE- Catechine Equivalent; AAE-Ascorbic Acid Equivalent; TAC= Total anthocyanin content; TFC= Total flavonoids content; TPC= Total phenolics content

$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	67	ΜU	VER	KLA	AC	ASV	90	HUL	MIL	HRR	LB	TAC	GAM	TPC	TFC	ΥНΥ	ABTS
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<b>J</b> VER -0.304 1.000 KLA -0.215 -0.064 1.000 AC -0.298 0.208 0.235 1.000 AC -0.298 0.209 -0.445 -0.961 1.000 CC -0.267 -0.677 0.378 -0.445 0.512 1.000 CC -0.267 -0.677 0.378 -0.378 0.512 1.000 HUL -0.433 0.958 0.238 -0.231 0.0387 0.138 0.170 0.365 0.465 1.000 HUL -0.333 0.619 0.088 -0.138 0.170 -0.366 0.465 1.000 HR 0.512 -0.086 -0.234 -0.887 0.819 0.015 -0.181 0.251 1.000 HR 0.512 -0.086 -0.234 -0.887 0.819 0.015 -0.181 0.251 1.000 HR 0.512 -0.086 -0.234 -0.887 0.819 0.015 -0.180 0.047 1.000 HR 0.512 -0.086 -0.234 -0.887 0.819 0.015 -0.180 0.047 1.000 HR 0.512 -0.086 -0.234 -0.887 0.419 0.108 0.700 0.971 0.665 1.000 TAC -0.241 0.814 -0.336 -0.251 0.364 -0.236 0.735 0.547 0.008 0.700 0.971 0.665 1.000 TPC -0.530 0.819 -0.454 0.109 0.268 -0.160 0.805 0.419 0.108 0.700 0.971 0.665 1.000 TPC -0.530 0.819 -0.454 0.109 0.268 -0.160 0.805 0.419 0.108 0.700 0.971 0.665 1.000 TPC -0.241 0.780 -0.211 0.221 0.231 0.773 -0.557 -0.129 -0.197 0.242 0.537 0.557 1.000 TPC -0.530 0.819 -0.742 0.019 0.268 -0.160 0.805 0.419 0.108 0.700 0.971 0.665 1.000 TPC -0.530 0.819 -0.742 0.019 0.268 -0.160 0.805 0.419 0.108 0.700 0.971 0.665 1.000 TPC -0.546 0.790 0.216 -0.144 0.677 0.733 0.557 -0.129 0.197 0.699 0.700 0.971 0.665 1.000 TPC -0.546 0.790 0.216 -0.144 0.677 0.7436 0.436 0.436 0.437 0.068 0.333 0.717 0.569 1.000 TPC -0.546 0.772 0.211 0.211 0.2211 0.214 0.638 0.333 0.717 0.781 0.581 1.000 MBT 0.117 0.782 -0.222 0.211 0.214 0.577 -0.5567 -0.129 0.018 0.333 0.717 0.759 -0.579 1.000 KLA-kernel length ther cooking. LB-lenel (mg/Look), TPC- cotal flavonoid content (mg/CH/100g), PHY-phytic acid (g/100g), ABTS-2.2-azino-bis (3-thytebraching coling CIM-2000), PHY-phytic acid (g/100g), ABTS-2.2-azino-bis (3-thytebraching coling CIM-2000) Runber in bold indicates significance at p=0.0050, TPC- cotal flavonoid content (mg/CH/1000), PHY-phytic acid (g/1000), ABTS-2.2-a	ΜŪ	1.000															
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	J VER	I	1.000														
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	AC -0.298 0.268 0.225 1.000 ASV 0.083 -0.209 -0.445 -0.961 1.000 CC -0.267 -0.670 -0.387 -0.461 1.000 ALL -0.395 0.437 0.169 -0.387 0.387 0.512 1.000 MLL -0.395 0.437 0.169 -0.387 0.387 0.512 1.000 HRR 0.512 -0.086 -0.234 -0.887 0.819 0.015 -0.181 0.251 1.000 LB -0.313 0.619 0.088 -0.137 0.149 -0.064 0.436 0.108 -0.047 1.000 TAC -0.421 0.814 -0.336 -0.251 0.364 -0.236 0.763 0.548 0.239 0.700 0.971 0.665 TAC -0.421 0.819 -0.336 -0.251 0.364 -0.236 0.755 0.129 -0.197 0.567 1.000 TPC -0.426 -0.790 0.216 -0.164 0.167 0.773 -0.755 -0.129 -0.197 0.567 1.000 PHY -0.158 -0.752 -0.114 0.322 -0.251 0.557 -0.567 -0.4436 0.333 0.717 0.769 -0.213 -0.641 0.688 1.000 ABTS 0.117 0.782 -0.221 0.210 0.434 0.654 0.088 0.333 0.717 0.781 0.318 0.751 -0.797 -0.822 1.000 ABTS 0.117 0.782 -0.221 0.211 0.210 -0.434 0.657 -0.4476 0.968 0.333 0.717 0.781 0.318 0.751 -0.797 -0.822 1.000 ABTS 0.117 0.782 -0.221 0.211 0.210 0.434 0.657 -0.436 0.333 0.717 0.781 0.318 0.751 -0.797 0.822 1.000 ABTS 0.117 0.782 -0.221 0.211 0.210 0.434 0.657 -0.436 0.333 0.717 0.781 0.318 0.751 -0.797 0.822 1.000 ABTS 0.117 0.782 -0.222 0.211 0.210 0.434 0.657 0.9436 0.038 0.333 0.717 0.781 0.318 0.751 -0.797 0.822 1.000 ABTS 0.117 0.782 -0.222 0.211 0.210 0.434 0.657 0.436 0.333 0.717 0.781 0.318 0.751 -0.797 0.822 1.000 ABTS 0.117 0.782 -0.222 0.211 0.210 0.434 0.657 0.0480 0.088 0.333 0.717 0.781 0.318 0.751 -0.797 0.822 1.000 ABT -0.156 0.116 0.216 0.167 0.773 -0.557 -0.567 -0.436 content (%), GC-gel consistency HRR-Head rice recovery (%), HUL-hulling (%) KLA-kernel length after cooking, L/B-length/breadth ratio, MIL-Milling (%), VER-volume expansion ratio, WU-water uptake (mI/100g rice). ANTH-anthocyanin (mg/100g, FHE-phenol (mg/100g), FHZ-phenol (mg/100	KL'		-0.064	1.000													
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	ASV 0.083 -0.209 -0.445 -0.961 1.000 CC -0.267 -0.670 -0.378 -0.405 0.512 1.000 HUL -0.395 0.437 0.138 0.170 -0.535 0.465 1.000 HIR -0.395 0.437 0.169 0.088 -0.138 0.170 -0.565 0.465 1.000 HR 0.512 -0.088 -0.137 0.149 -0.064 0.436 0.108 -0.047 1.000 TAC -0.421 0.814 -0.336 -0.251 0.364 -0.236 0.763 0.548 0.278 0.703 1.000 TAC -0.421 0.819 -0.372 -0.397 0.572 -0.397 0.108 0.703 0.540 1.000 TFC -0.246 -0.109 0.268 -0.160 0.805 0.419 0.108 0.700 0.711 0.665 1.000 TFC -0.246 -0.109 0.268 -0.160 0.805 0.419 0.108 0.700 0.711 0.665 1.000 TFC -0.246 -0.109 0.268 -0.160 0.805 0.419 0.108 0.700 0.711 0.665 1.000 TFC -0.246 -0.109 0.268 -0.167 0.775 0.436 0.473 -0.669 -0.769 -0.779 -0.557 1.000 TFC -0.246 -0.791 0.216 -0.164 0.167 0.773 -0.755 -0.129 0.197 0.269 -0.713 0.709 0.711 0.665 1.000 MID -0.752 -0.114 0.322 -0.251 0.577 -0.567 -0.436 0.433 0.717 0.781 0.318 0.751 -0.797 0.882 1.000 ABTS 0.117 0.782 -0.221 0.211 0.210 -0.434 0.654 0.088 0.333 0.717 0.781 0.318 0.751 -0.797 0.882 1.000 Number in bold indicates significance at p=0.05[evel. ASV-alkali spreading value, AC-amylose content (%), GC-gel consistency, HRR=Head rice recovery (%), HUL-hulling (%) KLA-kernel length after cooking, L/B-length/breadth ratio, MIL-Milling (%), VER-volume expansion ratio, WU-water uptake (m// 100 grice). ANTH-anthocyanin (mg/100 grice).	AC		0.268	0.225	1.000												
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	ASV		-0.209	-0.445	-0.961	1.000											
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	8		-0.670	-0.378	-0.405	0.512	1.000										
$ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	MIL         -0.395         0.437         0.169         -0.138         0.170         -0.365         0.465         1.000           HR         0.512         -0.086         -0.134 <b>0.819</b> 0.015         -0.181         0.251         1.000           LB         -0.313         0.619         0.088         -0.137         0.149         -0.064         0.436         0.108         -0.047         1.000           TAC         -0.421 <b>0.814</b> -0.336         -0.251         0.364         -0.236         0.763         0.578         0.700         0.567         1.000           TAC         -0.421 <b>0.814</b> -0.336         -0.221         0.364         -0.236         0.763         0.573         0.567         1.000           TPC         -0.530 <b>0.814</b> -0.537         -0.521         0.364         0.773         -0.735         0.197         0.567         1.000           TPC         -0.530 <b>0.814</b> -0.164         0.805 <b>0.913</b> -0.521         0.371         0.557         -0.557         -0.526         1.000           TPC         -0.158         -0.114         0.322         -0.251         0.5577         -0	IUH		0.958	-0.210	0.387	-0.272	-0.623	1.000									
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	HR $0.512$ $-0.086$ $-0.234$ $-0.887$ $0.819$ $0.015$ $-0.181$ $0.251$ $1.000$ LB $-0.313$ $0.619$ $0.088$ $-0.137$ $0.149$ $-0.064$ $0.436$ $0.108$ $-0.047$ $1.000$ LB $-0.313$ $0.619$ $0.088$ $-0.137$ $0.149$ $-0.236$ $0.763$ $0.548$ $0.278$ $0.705$ $1.000$ GAM $-0.608$ $0.779$ $-0.307$ $0.572$ $-0.397$ $-0.236$ $0.705$ $0.180$ $0.567$ $1.000$ TPC $-0.530$ $0.819$ $-0.454$ $-0.109$ $0.268$ $-0.160$ $0.805$ $0.419$ $0.108$ $0.700$ $0.971$ $0.665$ $1.000$ TFC $-0.236$ $-0.790$ $0.216$ $-0.164$ $0.167$ $0.773$ $-0.755$ $-0.242$ $-0.537$ $-0.557$ $-0.526$ $1.000$ PHY $-0.158$ $-0.772$ $-0.164$ $0.167$ $0.777$ $-0.269$ $0.717$ $0.649$ $0.781$ $-0.657$ $-0.576$ $-0.797$ PHY $-0.158$ $-0.772$ $-0.124$ $0.173$ $-0.649$ $0.731$ $-0.557$ $-0.526$ $1.000$ PHY $-0.158$ $-0.722$ $-0.164$ $0.167$ $0.777$ $-0.236$ $-0.233$ $0.717$ $-0.527$ $-0.526$ $1.000$ PHY $-0.158$ $-0.722$ $-0.124$ $0.731$ $0.649$ $-0.759$ $-0.797$ $-0.797$ $-0.797$ ABTS $0.117$ $0.782$ $-0.222$ $-0.211$ </td <th>MIL</th> <td></td> <td>0.437</td> <td>0.169</td> <td>-0.138</td> <td>0.170</td> <td>-0.365</td> <td>0.465</td> <td>1.000</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	MIL		0.437	0.169	-0.138	0.170	-0.365	0.465	1.000								
$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	LB -0.313 0.619 0.088 -0.137 0.149 -0.064 0.436 0.108 -0.047 1.000 TAC -0.421 <b>0.814</b> -0.336 -0.251 0.364 -0.236 0.763 0.548 0.278 0.705 1.000 GAM -0.608 0.779 -0.307 0.572 -0.397 -0.465 <b>0.922</b> 0.420 -0.393 0.180 0.567 1.000 TFC -0.530 <b>0.819</b> -0.454 -0.1199 0.268 -0.160 0.805 0.419 0.108 0.700 <b>0.971</b> 0.665 1.000 PHY -0.158 -0.790 0.216 -0.164 0.167 0.773 -0.755 -0.129 -0.197 -0.242 -0.537 -0.557 -0.526 1.000 ABTS 0.117 0.782 -0.2114 0.322 -0.251 0.577 -0.567 -0.436 -0.473 0.669 -0.769 -0.719 -0.7797 -0.882 1.000 ABTS 0.117 0.782 -0.212 -0.211 0.210 -0.434 0.634 0.088 0.333 0.717 0.781 0.318 0.751 -0.797 -0.882 1.000 KLA-kernel length after cooking, L/B-length/breadth ratio, MIL-Milling (%), VER-volume expansion ratio, WU-water uptake (ml/100g rice). ANTH-anthocyanin (mg/100g KLA-kernel length after cooking, L/B-length/breadth ratio, MIL-Milling (%), VER-volume expansion ratio, WU-water uptake (ml/100g rice). ANTH-anthocyanin (mg/100g KLA-kernel length after cooking, L/B-length/breadth ratio, MIL-Milling (%), VER-volume expansion ratio, WU-water uptake (ml/100g rice). ANTH-anthocyanin (mg/100g KLA-kernel length after cooking, L/B-length/breadth ratio, MIL-Milling (%), VER-volume expansion ratio, WU-water uptake (ml/100g rice). ANTH-anthocyanin (mg/100g KLA-kernel length after cooking, L/B-length/breadth ratio, MIL-Milling (%), VER-volume expansion ratio, WU-water uptake (ml/100g rice). ANTH-anthocyanin (mg/100g KLA-kernel length after cooking, L/B-length/breadth ratio, MIL-Milling (%), VER-volume expansion ratio, WU-water uptake (ml/100g rice). ANTH-anthocyanin (mg/100g rice). ANTH-antho	HRF		-0.086	-0.234	-0.887	0.819	0.015	-0.181	0.251	1.000							
$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	LB		0.619	0.088	-0.137	0.149	-0.064	0.436	0.108	-0.047	1.000						
-0.608         0.779         -0.307         0.572         -0.397         -0.465 <b>0.922</b> 0.420         -0.393         0.180         0.567         1.000           -0.530 <b>0.819</b> -0.454         -0.160         0.268         -0.160         0.805         0.419         0.108         0.700 <b>0.971</b> 0.665         1.000           -0.546         -0.7790         0.216         -0.164         0.167         0.773         -0.755         -0.197         -0.242         -0.537         -0.557         -0.526           -0.158         -0.752         -0.114         0.3222         -0.251         0.577         -0.666         -0.434         0.688         0.333         0.717         0.789         -0.213         -0.641           0.117         0.782         -0.222         -0.211         0.210         -0.434         0.633         0.733         0.717         0.781         0.318         0.751	GAM         -0.608         0.779         -0.307         0.572         -0.397         -0.455         0.922         0.420         -0.393         0.180         0.567         1.000           TPC         -0.530 <b>0.819</b> -0.454         -0.109         0.268         -0.160         0.805         0.419         0.108         0.700 <b>0.971</b> 0.665         1.000           TFC         -0.246         -0.790         0.216         -0.164         0.167         0.773         -0.755         -0.197         -0.242         -0.537         -0.526         1.000           PHY         -0.158         -0.752         -0.114         0.322         -0.251         0.577         -0.567         -0.473         -0.669         -0.769         -0.791         -0.797         -0.688         1.000           ABTS         0.117         0.782         -0.114         0.322         -0.211         0.210         -0.434         0.688         0.333         0.717         0.781         -0.797         -0.782         1.000           ABTS         0.117         0.782         -0.021         0.210         -0.434         0.634         0.088         0.333         0.717         0.781         0.751         -0.797	TAC		0.814	-0.336	-0.251	0.364	-0.236	0.763	0.548	0.278	0.705	1.000					
-0.530 <b>0.819</b> -0.454         -0.109         0.268         -0.160         0.805         0.419         0.108         0.700 <b>0.971</b> 0.665         1.000           -0.246         -0.790         0.216         -0.164         0.167         0.773         -0.755         -0.129         -0.197         -0.537         -0.557         -0.526           -0.158         -0.752         -0.114         0.322         -0.251         0.577         -0.567         -0.436         -0.473         -0.769         -0.213         -0.541           -0.158         -0.772         -0.211         0.210         -0.434         0.634         0.688         0.333         0.717         0.781         0.318         0.751	TPC       -0.530 <b>0.819</b> -0.454       -0.109       0.268       -0.160       0.805       0.419       0.108       0.700 <b>0.971</b> 0.665       1.000         TFC       -0.246       -0.790       0.216       -0.164       0.167       0.773       -0.755       -0.197       -0.242       -0.557       -0.526       1.000         PHY       -0.158       -0.772       -0.164       0.167       0.773       -0.755       -0.197       -0.242       -0.557       -0.526       1.000         ABTS       0.117       0.782       -0.114       0.322       -0.211       0.210       -0.434       0.634       0.088       0.333       0.717       0.781       0.751       -0.797       -0.882       1.000         ABTS       0.117       0.782       -0.211       0.210       -0.434       0.634       0.088       0.333       0.717       0.781       0.797       -0.797       -0.792       1000         Number in bold indicates significance at p=0.05 level. ASV-alkali spreading value, AC-amylose content (%), GC-gel consistency, HRR=Head rice recovery (%), HUL-hulling (%)       KLA-kernel length after cooking, LB-length/breadth ratio, MIL-Milling (%), VER-volume expansion ratio, WU-water uptake (m1/100g rice). ANTH-anthocyanin (m2/100g forthylobacordid)       6.741       0.75	GAI		0.779	-0.307	0.572	-0.397	-0.465	0.922	0.420	-0.393	0.180	0.567	1.000				
-0.246         -0.790         0.216         -0.164         0.167         0.773         -0.755         -0.129         -0.197         -0.242         -0.557         -0.556         -0.526           -0.158         -0.752         -0.161         0.322         -0.251         0.577         -0.567         -0.436         -0.473         -0.769         -0.213         -0.561           -0.117         0.782         -0.222         -0.211         0.210         -0.434         0.634         0.088         0.333         0.717         0.781         0.318         0.751	TFC       -0.246       -0.790       0.216       -0.164       0.167       0.773       -0.755       -0.197       -0.242       -0.557       -0.557       -0.526       1.000         PHY       -0.158       -0.752       -0.114       0.322       -0.251       0.577       -0.567       -0.473       -0.669       -0.769       -0.713       -0.641       0.688       1.000         ABTS       0.117       0.782       -0.211       0.210       -0.434       0.634       0.088       0.333       0.717       0.781       0.751       -0.797       -0.882       1.000         Number in bold indicates significance at p=0.05level. ASV-alkali spreading value, AC-amylose content (%), GC-gel consistency, HRR=Head rice recovery (%), HUL-hulling (%)         Number in bold indicates significance at p=0.05level. ASV-alkali spreading value, AC-amylose content (%), GC-gel consistency, HRR=Head rice recovery (%), HUL-hulling (%)         KLA-kernel length after cooking, L/B-length/breadth ratio, MIL-Milling (%), VER-volume expansion ratio, WU-water uptake (m/100g rice). ANTH-anthocyanin (mg/100g         GAM-gammaoryzanol (mg/100g), PHE-phenol (mg/100g), TFC- total flavonoid content (mgCE/100g), PHY-phytic acid (g/100g), ABTS-2, 2-azino-bis (3-ethylbenzothiazoline coline	TPC		0.819	-0.454	-0.109	0.268	-0.160	0.805	0.419	0.108	0.700	0.971	0.665	1.000			
-0.158 -0.752 -0.114 0.322 -0.251 0.577 -0.567 -0.436 -0.473 -0.669 -0.769 -0.213 -0.641 0.117 0.782 -0.222 -0.211 0.210 -0.434 0.634 0.088 0.333 0.717 0.781 0.318 0.751	PHY       -0.158       -0.752       -0.114       0.322       -0.251       0.577       -0.567       -0.436       -0.473       -0.669       -0.769       -0.213       -0.641       0.688       1.000         ABTS       0.117       0.782       -0.222       -0.211       0.210       -0.434       0.634       0.088       0.333       0.717       0.781       0.751       -0.797       -0.882       1.000         Number in bold indicates significance at p=0.05level. ASV-alkali spreading value, AC-amylose content (%), GC-gel consistency, HRR=Head rice recovery (%), HUL-hulling (%)       KLA-kernel length after cooking, L/B-length/breadth ratio, MIL-Milling (%), VER-volume expansion ratio, WU-water uptake (m/100g rice). ANTH-anthocyanin (mg/100g KIA-kernel length after cooking, L/B-henol (mg/100g), TFC- total flavonoid content (mgCE/100g), PHY-phytic acid (g/100g), ABTS-2, 2-azino-bis (3-ethylbenzothiazoline content (mgCE/100g), PHY-phytic acid (g/100g), PHY-p	TFC		-0.790	0.216	-0.164	0.167	0.773	-0.755	-0.129	-0.197	-0.242	-0.537	-0.557	-0.526	1.000		
0.117 0.782 -0.221 0.210 -0.434 0.634 0.088 0.333 0.717 0.781 0.318 0.751	ABTS0.1170.782-0.222-0.2110.210-0.4340.6340.0880.3330.7170.7810.3180.751-0.797-0.8821.000Number in bold indicates significance at p=0.05level. ASV-alkali spreading value, AC-amylose content (%), GC-gel consistency, HRR=Head rice recovery (%), HUL-hulling (%)KLA-kernel length after cooking, L/B-length/breadth ratio, MIL-Milling (%), VER-volume expansion ratio, WU-water uptake (ml/100g rice). ANTH-anthocyanin (mg/100g GAM-gammaoryzanol (mg/100g), PHE-phenol (mg/100g), TFC- total flavonoid content (mgCE/100g), PHY-phytic acid (g/100g), ABTS-2, 2-azino-bis (3-ethylbenzothiazoline	Hd		-0.752	-0.114	0.322	-0.251	0.577	-0.567	-0.436	-0.473	-0.669	-0.769	-0.213	-0.641	0.688	1.000	
	Number in bold indicates significance at p=0.05level. ASV-alkali spreading value, AC-amylose content (%), GC-gel consistency, HRR=Head rice recovery (%), HUL-hulling (% KLA-kernel length after cooking, L/B-length/breadth ratio, MIL-Milling (%), VER-volume expansion ratio, WU-water uptake (ml/100g rice). ANTH-anthocyanin (mg/100g GAM-gammaoryzanol (mg/100g), PHE-phenol (mg/100g), TFC- total flavonoid content (mgCE/100g), PHY-phytic acid (g/100g), ABTS-2, 2-azino-bis (3-ethylbenzothiazoline	AB1	•	0.782	-0.222	-0.211	0.210	-0.434	0.634	0.088	0.333	0.717	0.781	0.318	0.751	-0.797	-0.882	1.000
		GAN	1-gammaoryza	nol (mg/100	g), PHE-ph	nenol (mg/1	00g), TFC-	total flavoi	noid conter	nt (mgCE/	(100g), PH	Y-phytic a	cid (g/100)	g), ABTS-2	2, 2-azino-l	bis (3-ethy	ylbenzoth	iazoline

Orvza Vol. 54 No. 1, 2017 (57-64)

was observed for purple rice (Mamihunger-3187.24 AAEg-1foll) and lowest ABTS value was observed for red grain (Assambiroin-3105.23 AAEg-1). Positive correlation of ABTS with TAC (r = 0.781) and TPC (r= 0.751) clarifies that higher ABTS scavanging assay in purple grain may be due to higher TAC and TPC content (Table 3). These results suggest that the major phytochemicals responsible for the tested antioxidant activities are phenolic acids and anthocyanin.

Gamma-oryzanol is another one of the phytochemicals that found at high concentration in rice bran has been reported to exhibit more antioxidant activity than vitamin E as six fold and their important bioactivities include anti- and inflammatory activity, enhancement of the immune system, heart disease, cardiovascular disease, glycemic control, diabetes and inhibit tumor promotion (Saenjum et al. 2012). Recently, polyphenolic compounds including flavonoids is known as safe and non-toxic antioxidants. Many studies have shown that a high dietary intake of natural phenolics is strongly associated with longer life expectancy, reduced risk of developing some chronic diseases, various types of cancer, diabetes, obesity, improved endothelial function and reduced blood pressure (Halliwell 2007; Yan and Asmah 2010; Jonathan and Kevin 2006). Furthermore, phytic acid which complexes with iron, zinc considered as another antioxidant as it bring about a favorable reduction in the formation of hydroxyl radicals in the colon (Graf and Eaton 1993). Total flavonoid content among the pigemted rice ranged from 146.34 to 289.20 mg/100g and the gamma-oryzanol content ranged from 52.65 to 98.10 mg/100g. Higher flavonoid and gamma-oryzanol content was observed in purple grain (Chakhao and Kalobhat; > 200 mg/100g and Mamihunger; 98.10 mg/100g, respectively. Gammaoryzanol content was found positively correlated with TAC (r=0.567) and TPC (r=0.665) though correlation is not significant (Table 3). Similarly, lowest phytic acid content was found in purple grain Mamihunger (0.11%). Though significant differences were observed among the genotypes for flavonoid, gammaoryzanol and phytic acid content but no significant difference was observed between the colours. It envisages that content of gammaoryzanol and flavonoid content accumulated in bran parts of pigmented rice grain depends on rice genotype and not on the kernel colour.

Traditional rice breeding has been mainly

# Properties of red and purple-pericarp rice

focused on improving agronomic traits, such as yield and disease and insect-resistance, as well as improvement of grain quality, such as milling quality, grain appearance, and cooking quality. Recently, there has been an interest in developing rice varieties rich in one or more phytochemical fractions to potentially contribute to improved human health and develop new market opportunities. In this study, purple rice was found with higher antioxidant properties compared to red rice and most of the pigmented rice was observed with desirable grain quality. The knowledge generated could be used in future breeding programmes for the development of a variety with high antioxidant properties combined with valuable grain quality traits. Also the correlation of variables studied will help in carefully selecting the variables.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Authors are thankful to The Director, NRRI for the facilities and encouragement.

# REFERENCES

- Abdel-Aal ESM, Young JC and Rabalski I 2006. Anthocyanin composition in black, blue, pink, purple, and red cereal grains. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry 54(13): 4696-4704
- Bhattacharjee P, Singhal RS and Kulkarni PR 2002. Basmati rice: A review. International Journal of Food Science and Technology 37(1): 1-12
- Butsat S and Siriamornpun S 2010. Antioxidant capacities and phenolic compounds of the husk, bran and endosperm of Thai rice. Food Chemistry 119: 606-613
- Chen MH and Bergman CJ 2005. A rapid procedure for analyzing rice bran tocopherol, tocotrienol and GammaOryzanol contents. Journal of Food Composition Analysis 18: 319-331
- Chen PN, Kuo WH, Chiang CL, Chiou HL, Hsieh YS and Chu SC 2006. Black rice anthocyanins inhibit cancer cells invasion via repressions of MMPs and u-PA expression. Chemico-Biological Interactions 163(3): 218-229
- Choi Y, Jeong HS and Lee J 2007. Antioxidant activity of methanolic extracts from some grains consumed in Korea. Food Chemistry 103: 130-138
- Chun OK, Kim DO, Smith N, Schroeder D, Han JT, and Lee CY 2005. Daily consumption of phenolics and total antioxidant capacity from fruit and vegetables in

the American diet. Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture 85: 1715-1724

- Emadzade B, Razavi Seyed MA and Farahmandfar R 2009. Monitoring geometrical characteristics of three rice varieties during processing by image analysis system and micrometer measurement. International Agrophysics 24(1):21-27
- Finocchiaro F, Ferrari B and Gianinetti A 2010. A study of biodiversity of flavonoid content in the rice caryopsis evidencing simultaneous accumulation of anthocyanins and proanthocyanidins in a blackgrained genotype. Journal of Cereal Science 51(1): 28-34
- Frei M and Becker K 2003. Studies on the in vitro starch digestibility and glycemic index of six different indigenous rice cultivars from the Philippines. Journal of Food Chemistry 83: 395-400
- Ge XZ, Xing YZ, XU CG and He YQ 2005. QTL analysis of cooked rice grain elongation, volume expansion, and water absorption using a recombinant inbred population. Plant Breeding 124(2):121 - 126
- Gao Y, C Shang, Maroof MAS, Biyashev RM, Grabau EA, Kwanyuen P, Burton JW and Buss GR 2007. A modified colorimetric method for phytic acid analysis in soybean. Crop Science 47: 1797-1803
- Goffman FD and Bergman CJ 2004. Rice kernel phenolic content and its relationship with antiradical efficiency. Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture 84: 1235
- Graf E and Eaton JW 1993. Suppression of colonic cancer by dietary phytic acid. Nutrition and Cancer 19:11-19
- Halliwell B 2007. Oxidative stress and cancer: have we moved forward. Biochem. J. 401: 1-11
- Juliano BO, Perez CM, Resurreccion AP 2009. Apparent amylose content and gelatinization temperature types of Philippine rice accessions in the IRRI gene bank. Philipp. Agric. Sci. 92: 106-109
- Goufo P and Trindade H 2014. Rice antioxidants: phenolic acids, flavonoids, anthocyanins, proanthocyanidins, tocopherols, tocotrienols, γoryzanol, and phytic acid. Food Science and Nutrition 2(2): 75-104
- Hossain MS, Singh AK. and Fasih-uz-Zaman 2009. Cooking and eating characteristics of some newly identified inter subspecific (*indica / japonica*) rice hybrids. Science Asia 35: 320-325

- Jonathan MH and Kevin DC 2006. Dietary flavonoids: Effects on endothelial function and blood pressure. Journal of Scientific Food and Agriculture 86: 2492-2498
- Kanchana S,Lakshmi Bharathi S Ilamaran M and Singaravadivel K 2012. Physical quality of selected rice varieties. World Journal of Agricultural Sciences 8(5): 468-472
- Laokuldilok T, Shoemaker CF, Jongkaewwattana S, Tulyathan V 2011. Antioxidants and antioxidant activity of several pigmented rice barns. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry 59:193-199
- Lee JC, Kim JD, Hsieh FH and Eun JB 2008. Production of black rice cake using ground black rice and mediumgrain brown rice. International Journal of Food Science and Technology 43(6): 1078-1082
- Mc Ghie TK and Walton MC 2007. The bioavailability and absorption of anthocyanins: towards a better understanding. Molecular Nutrition & Food Research 51: 702-713
- Oko AO, Ubi BE and Dambaba N 2012. Rice Cooking Quality and Physico-Chemical Characteristics: A comparative analysis of selected local and newly introduced rice varieties in Ebonyi State, Nigeria. Food and Public Health 2(1): 43-49
- Pereira-Caro G, Cros G, Yokota T and Crozier A 2013a. Phytochemical profiles of black, red, brown, and white rice from the Camargue region of France. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry 61(33): 7976-7986
- Pereira-Caro G, Watanabe S, Crozier A, Fujimura T, Yokota T and Ashihara H 2013b. Phytochemical profile of a Japanese black-purple rice. Food Chemistry 141(3): 2821-2827
- Razavi SMA and Farahmandfar R 2008. Effect of hulling and milling on the physical properties of rice grains. International Agrophysics 22: 353-359
- Saenjum C, Chaiyasut C, Chansakaow S, Suttajit M and Sirithunyalug B 2012. Antioxidant and antiinflammatory activities of gamma-oryzanol rich

extracts from Thai purple rice bran. Journal of Medicinal Plants Research 6 : 1070-1077

- Santos-Buelga C and Scalbert A 2000. Proanthocyanidins and tannin-like compounds nature, occurrence, dietary intake and effects on nutrition and health. Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture 80: 1094-1117
- Serpen A, Gokmen V, Pellegrini N and Fogliano V 2008. Direct measurement of the total antioxidant capacity of cereal products. Journal of Cereal Science 48: 816-820
- Shen Y, Jin L, Xiao P, Lu and Bao J 2009. Total phenolics, flavonoids, antioxidant capacity in rice grain and their relations to grain color, size and weight. Journal of Cereal Science 49(1): 106-111
- Sood GB and Sadiq EA 1979. Geographical distribution of kernel elongation gene(s) in rice. Indian Journal of Genetics and Plant Breeding 40: 439 - 342
- Swain T and Hillis WE 1959. The phenolic constituents of Primus donwstica 1.-The quantitative analysis of phenolic constituents. Journal of Science Food and Agriculture 10:63-68
- Tan YF, Xing YZ, Li JX, Yu SB, Xu CG and Zhang Q 2000. Genetic bases of appearance quality of rice grains in Shanyou 63 elite rice hybrid. Theoritical and Applied Genetics 101:823-829
- Vanaja T and Babu LC 2003. Association between physicchemical characters and cooking qualities in high yielding rice varieties of diverse origin. International Rice Research Notes 28: 28-29
- Yan S and Asmah R 2010. Comparison of total phenolic contents and antioxidant activities of turmeric leaf, pandan leaf and torch ginger flower. International Food Research Journal 17: 417-423
- ZIlic S, Miroljub Bara C, Mirjana Pesic, Dejan Dodig and Dragana Ignjatovic-Micic 2011. Characterization of proteins from grain of different bread and durum wheat genotypes sladana. International Journal of Molecular Science 12: 5878-5894