

Proceeding Paper

# Effect of Cricket (*Acheta domesticus*) Flour Addition in Mixtures Powder to Obtain a Traditional Beverage (*Chucula*) on Physicochemical Characteristics †

A. Montoro \*, L. I. Sotelo-Díaz <sup>2</sup>, A. Filomena-Ambrosio <sup>2</sup>, M. Igual \*, J. Martínez-Monzó <sup>1</sup> and P. García-Segovia <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Food Investigation and Innovation Group, Food Technology Department, Universitat Politècnica de València, Camino de Vera s/n, 46022 Valencia, Spain; xmartine@tal.upv.es (J.M.-M.); pugarse@tal.upv.es (P.G.-S.)

<sup>2</sup> Food Investigation, Process Management and Service Group, Food Science and Culture Department, Universidad de La Sabana, Campus del Puente del Común Km. 7, Autopista Norte de Bogotá, Chía, Cundinamarca, Colombia; indira.sotelo@unisabana.edu.co (L.I.S.-D.); anna.filomena@unisabana.edu.co (A.F.-A.)

\* Correspondence: ariadnamontoroc@gmail.com (A.M.); marigra@upvnet.upv.es (M.I.); Tel.: +34-676-500-394 (A.M.); +34-963-879-694 (M.I.)

† Presented at the 2nd International Electronic Conference on Foods, 15–30 October 2021; Available online: <https://foods2021.sciforum.net/>.

**Abstract:** The aim of this study was to add cricket (*Acheta domesticus*) flour to dried mixtures of *chucula* to obtain a mixture with higher protein content without altering the typical properties of the traditional product. An experimental design with 3 factors (cricket flour, cacao and other flours) was performed. From this, 27 experiments were carried out. The water and protein content, particle size, water solubility and water absorption index, and colour of samples were determined. All samples presented water content values less than or equal to 3%, typical of this type of product. Crude protein content increased significantly with increasing cricket flour content. The particle size of the samples with lower cocoa contents were higher, however those with lower cricket flour contents were lower. The water absorption and solubility indices were not affected by the 3 factors in the ranges studied. The sample with lower content of the generic flours presented lower luminosity values, that is, they were darker. The sample with the highest cocoa content in its formulation showed more orange-reddish tones compared to the rest. The addition of cricket flour could be an alternative to increase the protein content in powdered *chucula* without altering its traditional characteristics. According to results, 7% of cricket flour, 25% of cacao and 68% of general flour was recommended to improve the final product.

**Keywords:** Colombia; *chucula*; cricket; protein

**Citation:** Montoro, A.; Sotelo-Díaz, L.I.; Filomena-Ambrosio, A.; Igual, M.; Martínez-Monzó, J.; García-Segovia, P. Effect of Cricket (*Acheta domesticus*) Flour Addition in Mixtures Powder to Obtain a Traditional Beverage (*Chucula*) on Physicochemical Characteristics. *Foods* **2021**, *1*, x. <https://doi.org/10.3390/xxxxx>

Published: date

**Publisher's Note:** MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



**Copyright:** © 2021 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

At present, some traditional dishes and drinks from Cundinamarca are at risk of disappearing due to the lack of generational transmission and due to changes in sociocultural dynamics. The *chucula* may constitute an attempt to rescue traditional knowledge, while promoting a healthy diet in contexts where there is malnutrition [1]. This food is one of the most issued preparations throughout the territory of Cundinamarca [2] and results from ground cocoa with beans, barley, oats, wheat, corn, chickpeas, cocoa, cinnamon, cloves and lentils added over the years, whose traditional presentation is a ball form [1].

Entomophagy is the consumption of insects by humans and constitutes a good food alternative, as confirmed by different investigations on edible insects due to their biogeographic aspects, their biodiversity in the world, their sustainability, their importance in

the feeding of rural nucleus, to their nutritional value, having been shown to be a good source of protein, coupled with their protein quality since they are highly digestible [3].

The main purpose of this research was to obtain a product from the *chucula*, with a higher protein content by adding cricket flour. It is intended to make this a complete food without losing its original characteristics, thus being equally accepted by the population.

## 2. Materials and Methods

### 2.1. Raw Materials and Sample Preparation

The raw materials were cricket flour supplied by the company ArthroFood S.A.S. (Bogota, Colombia); pure defatted cocoa powder obtained through Chocolates Valor S.A. (Alicante, Spain); powdered panela and grains of wheat, chickpeas, peas, barley, lentils and corn, which were acquired in a local market in Bogotá. Twenty seven *chucula* samples (Table 1) were made from the experimental design obtained using Minitab 18 statistical software (Minitab Inc., USA). Three factors were considered: cricket flour, cocoa powder and total flour (which includes wheat, chickpea, pea, barley, lentil, corn and ground cinnamon flours). Finally, the *chucula* were made following the industrial method.

### 2.2. Analytical Determinations

#### 2.2.1. Humidity

For the determination of humidity ( $x_w$ ) the official method 20.013 (AOAC, 1980) was used. This method is based on the determination of the weight loss of a previously homogenized sample (Ultraturax T25, Janke & Kunkel, Germany) when placed in a vacuum oven (50 mmHg) at a constant temperature of 70 °C, until reaching a constant weight.

#### 2.2.2. Water Absorption Index and Water Solubility Index

The absorption index (WAI) and the solubility index (WSI) were determined according to the Singh and Smith method [4].

#### 2.2.3. Crude Protein

To determine the nitrogen content, the Dumas method was used through a LECO CN628 elemental analyzer (Leco Corporation, St. Joseph, MI, USA), according to the official method 990.03 (AOAC, 2002). The conversion factor used was 5.83 [5].

#### 2.2.4. Optical Properties

To determine the color, four measurements were made on each of the samples, using a spectrophotometer (Minolta, CM 3600D, Spain). The equipment was previously calibrated and the reflection spectrum of the homogenized samples was measured using the CIEL\*a\*b color space under the conditions of illumination D65 and observer 10°.

#### 2.2.5. Particle Size Distribution

The particle size of the formulated *chuculas* was determined by the laser diffraction method and the Mie theory. For this, the ISO 13320 standard was followed and a particle size analyzer (Malvern Instruments Ltd., Mastersizer 2000, UK) equipped with a dispersion unit for dry samples was used. Six repetitions were carried out per sample.

### 2.3. Statical Analysis

A three-component mixture design was carried out through an axial design that generated 27 experiences. For this, Minitab 18 Statistical Software (Minitab Inc., USA) was used. Analysis of variance (ANOVA), with a confidence level of 95% ( $p < 0.05$ ), was applied to evaluate the differences among samples, using Statgraphics Centurion XVII Software, version 17.2.04.

### 3. Results and Discussion

Table 1 shows that there is a significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) in the water content between the different *chuculas*, samples number 26 and 27 present a lower percentage of humidity however the sample 24 is the only one that exceeds the 3% humidity. The water content does not seem to be related to the amount of insect flour added to the samples, but a decrease in water content can be seen in those samples that contained a lower amount of cocoa powder. Results are similar to those reported by other studies carried out on cocoa powder [6]. On the other hand, samples with high concentration of cricket flour, such as samples number 5 and 10, marked significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) crude protein increase while samples with low concentration of cricket flour presented a significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) crude protein decrease. These values coincide with other studies where it was determined that the protein content in cricket flour is approximately 60%, but in other kinds of vegetable flour, such as corn or pea, the protein values are less to 20% [7–9].

Furthermore, the Table 1 shows that the content of cricket flour, cocoa and grain flour is not related to the difference in the WSI values of each sample. On the other hand, although no significant changes ( $p < 0.05$ ) were observed in WAI values, analyzing the data, a slight decrease in WAI values can be seen as the cocoa powder content of the *chucula* samples decreased. Moreover, WAI index and WSI index were satisfactory because most of the solid elements of the powder obtained under the experimental conditions were easily soluble in water. Similar results were observed in other studies, where the WAI and WSI values obtained were  $2.87 \pm 0.05$  for flours [10] and  $16.00 \pm 0.07$  for cocoa powder [11].

**Table 1.** Percentage (%) of cricket flour (CF), cocoa and flour used in *chuculas*. Mean values  $\pm$  standard deviation of the % of humidity, crude protein (CP), absorption index (WAI) and solubility index (WSI) of each sample. Superscript letters within columns indicate homogeneous groups according to ANOVA ( $p < 0.05$ ).

Sample	CF	Cocoa	Flour	Humidity (%)	CP (%)	WAI	WSI (%)
1	1.13	26.25	72.62	$2.962 \pm 0.004$ <sup>b</sup>	$16.55 \pm 0.16$ <sup>ihg</sup>	$2.37 \pm 0.18$ <sup>dc</sup>	$13.3 \pm 0.4$ <sup>abcde</sup>
2	0.00	30.00	70.00	$2.96 \pm 0.04$ <sup>b</sup>	$16.4 \pm 0.2$ <sup>ih</sup>	$2.51 \pm 0.07$ <sup>cba</sup>	$12.7 \pm 0.9$ <sup>efg</sup>
3	2.13	28.75	69.12	$2.888 \pm 0.002$ <sup>bcd</sup>	$17.4 \pm 0.2$ <sup>fe</sup>	$2.7 \pm 0.4$ <sup>a</sup>	$13.4 \pm 0.5$ <sup>abc</sup>
4	2.25	27.50	70.25	$2.70 \pm 0.03$ <sup>fg</sup>	$17.23 \pm 0.07$ <sup>gfe</sup>	$2.25 \pm 0.03$ <sup>a</sup>	$13.3 \pm 0.2$ <sup>abcde</sup>
5	7.00	25.00	68.00	$2.43 \pm 0.02$ <sup>k</sup>	$19.6 \pm 0.7$ <sup>a</sup>	$2.31 \pm 0.03$ <sup>dc</sup>	$13.17 \pm 0.08$ <sup>abcde</sup>
6	0.00	25.00	75.00	$2.288 \pm 0.003$ <sup>lm</sup>	$17.9 \pm 0.3$ <sup>ed</sup>	$2.206 \pm 0.006$ <sup>d</sup>	$13.29 \pm 0.13$ <sup>abcde</sup>
7	4.62	26.25	69.12	$2.316 \pm 0.106$ <sup>l</sup>	$16.110 \pm 0.014$ <sup>i</sup>	$2.520 \pm 0.006$ <sup>ba</sup>	$12.72 \pm 0.05$ <sup>defg</sup>
8	0.00	25.00	75.00	$2.21 \pm 0.02$ <sup>m</sup>	$15.94 \pm 0.12$ <sup>i</sup>	$2.485 \pm 0.015$ <sup>cba</sup>	$12.554 \pm 0.004$ <sup>fg</sup>
9	0.00	25.00	75.00	$2.21 \pm 0.02$ <sup>m</sup>	$15.9 \pm 0.4$ <sup>i</sup>	$2.2 \pm 0.2$ <sup>d</sup>	$12.4 \pm 0.5$ <sup>g</sup>
10	7.00	25.00	68.00	$2.62 \pm 0.02$ <sup>h</sup>	$19.7 \pm 0.3$ <sup>a</sup>	$2.26 \pm 0.03$ <sup>d</sup>	$13.04 \pm 0.13$ <sup>bcdef</sup>
11	2.25	27.50	70.25	$2.8709 \pm 0.0003$ <sup>cd</sup>	$17.5 \pm 0.3$ <sup>fe</sup>	$2.292 \pm 0.015$ <sup>dc</sup>	$13.3 \pm 0.3$ <sup>abcde</sup>
12	1.13	28.75	70.12	$2.719 \pm 0.017$ <sup>f</sup>	$16.3 \pm 0.7$ <sup>ih</sup>	$2.33 \pm 0.03$ <sup>dc</sup>	$12.9 \pm 0.2$ <sup>bcdefg</sup>
13	0.00	30.00	70.00	$2.861 \pm 0.017$ <sup>cd</sup>	$16.9 \pm 0.3$ <sup>hgf</sup>	$2.42 \pm 0.03$ <sup>dc</sup>	$12.9 \pm 0.4$ <sup>cdefg</sup>
14	1.13	28.75	70.12	$2.53 \pm 0.05$ <sup>ij</sup>	$16.943 \pm 0.019$ <sup>hgf</sup>	$2.2612 \pm 0.0105$ <sup>d</sup>	$13.25 \pm 0.09$ <sup>abcde</sup>
15	2.13	28.75	69.12	$2.61 \pm 0.06$ <sup>hi</sup>	$17.36 \pm 0.05$ <sup>fe</sup>	$2.30 \pm 0.05$ <sup>dc</sup>	$13.011 \pm 0.118$ <sup>bcdefg</sup>
16	2.13	28.75	69.12	$2.83 \pm 0.05$ <sup>de</sup>	$17.34 \pm 0.06$ <sup>fe</sup>	$2.34 \pm 0.05$ <sup>dc</sup>	$13.56 \pm 0.07$ <sup>ab</sup>
17	4.62	26.25	69.12	$2.51 \pm 0.03$ <sup>jk</sup>	$17.462 \pm 0.002$ <sup>fe</sup>	$2.36 \pm 0.18$ <sup>dc</sup>	$13.1 \pm 0.7$ <sup>abcdef</sup>
18	2.25	27.50	70.25	$2.64 \pm 0.02$ <sup>gh</sup>	$17.5 \pm 0.3$ <sup>fe</sup>	$2.31 \pm 0.07$ <sup>dc</sup>	$13.1 \pm 0.3$ <sup>bcdef</sup>
19	1.13	26.25	72.62	$2.74 \pm 0.06$ <sup>f</sup>	$17.72 \pm 0.14$ <sup>ed</sup>	$2.29 \pm 0.09$ <sup>dc</sup>	$13.10 \pm 0.18$ <sup>bcdef</sup>
20	1.13	28.75	70.12	$2.87 \pm 0.07$ <sup>cd</sup>	$17.6 \pm 0.2$ <sup>fed</sup>	$2.331 \pm 0.019$ <sup>dc</sup>	$13.41 \pm 0.06$ <sup>abc</sup>
21	2.00	30.00	68.00	$2.82 \pm 0.05$ <sup>de</sup>	$17.544 \pm 0.119$ <sup>fe</sup>	$2.32 \pm 0.05$ <sup>dc</sup>	$13.38 \pm 0.04$ <sup>abcd</sup>

22	1.13	26.25	72.62	2.761 ± 0.013 <sup>ef</sup>	16.5 ± 0.5 <sup>ih</sup>	2.213 ± 0.006 <sup>d</sup>	13.77 ± 0.04 <sup>a</sup>
23	2.00	30.00	68.00	2.96 ± 0.02 <sup>b</sup>	17.6 ± 0.6 <sup>fed</sup>	2.41 ± 0.02 <sup>dcb</sup>	12.95 ± 0.19 <sup>bcdefg</sup>
24	0.00	30.00	70.00	3.043 ± 0.019 <sup>a</sup>	16.5 ± 0.4 <sup>ih</sup>	2.34 ± 0.07 <sup>dcb</sup>	12.9 ± 0.9 <sup>bcdefg</sup>
25	7.00	25.00	68.00	2.938 ± 0.015 <sup>bc</sup>	19.5 ± 0.2 <sup>ba</sup>	2.31 ± 0.06 <sup>dcb</sup>	13.2 ± 0.9 <sup>abcdef</sup>
26	2.00	30.00	68.00	1.33 ± 0.05 <sup>n</sup>	18.3 ± 0.9 <sup>dc</sup>	2.35 ± 0.03 <sup>dcb</sup>	12.8 ± 0.2 <sup>cdefg</sup>
27	4.62	26.25	69.12	0.941 ± 0.003 <sup>n̄</sup>	18.74 ± 0.14 <sup>cb</sup>	2.32 ± 0.02 <sup>dcb</sup>	12.7 ± 0.2 <sup>efg</sup>

The particle size distribution curves show a very similar trend (Figure 1), which represents that they are mixtures with a distribution of practically equal sizes. However, it can be seen how the distribution curve of sample number 5 has a slight shift to the left, which indicates that it has smaller particle sizes. The opposite case occurs in sample 25, which shows a slight shift to the right, indicating that the particle sizes have increased. This heterogeneity of particle distribution between the samples could depend on the nature of the raw materials, and as a traditional product, the ingredients were mixed hand made.




Figure 1. Volume particle size distribution (representative curves) of *chuculas* studied.

In Table 2, the values of D [4,3] showed that when the concentration of cocoa powder in the samples decreased, the particle size increased significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ), obtaining the smallest particle sizes for sample 5, which has a higher cocoa content. A similar situation appears in the samples with low concentrations in cricket flour, which present the lowest D [4,3] values, thus obtaining smaller particle sizes. The percentile d (0.9) is significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) different among all samples; 90% of the particles of the *chucula* samples that did not contain insect flour, such as samples 6 and 24 presented a particle size smaller than 530.35 µm and 575.83 µm, respectively. The results are like those reported by other studies where cricket flour was added to a traditional product [7].

Table 2. Mean values ± standard deviation of the volumetric mean diameter (µm) D [4,3] and the standard percentiles (µm) d (0.01), d (0.05) and d (0.09) of each of the samples obtained. Superscript letters within columns indicate homogeneous groups according to ANOVA ( $p < 0.05$ ).

Sample	D (4.3)	d (0.1)	d (0.5)	d (0.9)
1	209 ± 8 <sup>fg hij</sup>	8.32 ± 0.09 <sup>ef</sup>	119 ± 8 <sup>efgh</sup>	552 ± 22 <sup>fg hi</sup>
2	200 ± 13 <sup>hij</sup>	7.58 ± 0.16 <sup>jk</sup>	105 ± 9 <sup>h</sup>	543 ± 37 <sup>fg hi</sup>
3	220 ± 27 <sup>defghij</sup>	7.8 ± 0.4 <sup>ijk</sup>	117 ± 21 <sup>efgh</sup>	593 ± 69 <sup>cdefgh</sup>
4	220 ± 20 <sup>defghij</sup>	8.24 ± 0.17 <sup>efg</sup>	124 ± 18 <sup>cdefgh</sup>	584 ± 47 <sup>cdefgh</sup>
5	195.7 ± 10.2 <sup>i</sup>	8.8 ± 0.4 <sup>c</sup>	127 ± 17 <sup>bcdefg</sup>	500 ± 20 <sup>i</sup>

6	207 ± 14 <sup>efghij</sup>	9.2 ± 0.4 <sup>ab</sup>	133.1 ± 11.3 <sup>bcdef</sup>	530 ± 36 <sup>ghi</sup>
7	219 ± 7 <sup>defghij</sup>	8.15 ± 0.13 <sup>efgh</sup>	126 ± 6 <sup>bcdefgh</sup>	578 ± 21 <sup>defghi</sup>
8	223 ± 17 <sup>cdefghij</sup>	8.4 ± 0.3 <sup>de</sup>	132 ± 16 <sup>bcdef</sup>	581 ± 39 <sup>cdefgh</sup>
9	243 ± 25 <sup>bcd</sup>	8.8 ± 0.3 <sup>c</sup>	146 ± 12 <sup>bc</sup>	628 ± 66 <sup>bcde</sup>
10	208 ± 32 <sup>efghij</sup>	8.8 ± 0.5 <sup>c</sup>	119 ± 22 <sup>defgh</sup>	547 ± 81 <sup>fghi</sup>
11	230 ± 26 <sup>bcdefgh</sup>	8.4 ± 0.2 <sup>ef</sup>	124 ± 14 <sup>cdefgh</sup>	605 ± 69 <sup>bcdefg</sup>
12	228 ± 31 <sup>bcdefghi</sup>	8.4 ± 0.4 <sup>de</sup>	129 ± 22 <sup>bcdefg</sup>	591 ± 79 <sup>cdefgh</sup>
13	224 ± 32 <sup>cdefghij</sup>	8.0 ± 0.3 <sup>fghi</sup>	119 ± 28 <sup>defgh</sup>	593 ± 70 <sup>cdefgh</sup>
14	237 ± 13 <sup>bcdef</sup>	8.25 ± 0.13 <sup>efg</sup>	129 ± 7 <sup>bcdefg</sup>	614 ± 33 <sup>bcdef</sup>
15	236 ± 27 <sup>bcdef</sup>	8.4 ± 0.3 <sup>de</sup>	140 ± 19 <sup>bcd</sup>	601 ± 70 <sup>bcdefg</sup>
16	224 ± 29 <sup>cdefghij</sup>	8.2 ± 0.3 <sup>efgh</sup>	125 ± 29 <sup>bcdefgh</sup>	581 ± 75 <sup>cdefgh</sup>
17	222 ± 30 <sup>defghij</sup>	8.9 ± 0.5 <sup>bc</sup>	138 ± 25 <sup>bcde</sup>	558 ± 63 <sup>efghi</sup>
18	204 ± 28 <sup>ghij</sup>	8.3 ± 0.3 <sup>efg</sup>	114 ± 16 <sup>fgh</sup>	540 ± 70 <sup>fghi</sup>
19	230 ± 37 <sup>bcdefg</sup>	8.3 ± 0.2 <sup>ef</sup>	136 ± 24 <sup>bcde</sup>	600 ± 102 <sup>bcdefg</sup>
20	237 ± 36 <sup>bcde</sup>	8.05 ± 0.18 <sup>fghi</sup>	135 ± 12 <sup>bcdef</sup>	612 ± 98 <sup>bcdef</sup>
21	256 ± 23 <sup>b</sup>	7.9 ± 0.2 <sup>hij</sup>	126 ± 13 <sup>bcdefgh</sup>	672 ± 78 <sup>b</sup>
22	209 ± 23 <sup>efghij</sup>	8.1 ± 0.2 <sup>efgh</sup>	125 ± 17 <sup>cdefgh</sup>	542 ± 52 <sup>fghi</sup>
23	248 ± 39 <sup>bcd</sup>	8.0 ± 0.3 <sup>ghi</sup>	143 ± 31 <sup>bc</sup>	655 ± 100 <sup>bcd</sup>
24	219 ± 40 <sup>defghij</sup>	7.5 ± 0.2 <sup>k</sup>	109 ± 25 <sup>gh</sup>	576 ± 99 <sup>defghi</sup>
25	315 ± 34 <sup>a</sup>	9.5 ± 0.4 <sup>a</sup>	187 ± 32 <sup>a</sup>	833 ± 91 <sup>a</sup>
26	198 ± 27 <sup>ij</sup>	7.80 ± 0.14 <sup>ijk</sup>	109 ± 14 <sup>gh</sup>	519 ± 61 <sup>hi</sup>
27	253 ± 35 <sup>bc</sup>	8.7 ± 0.2 <sup>cd</sup>	147 ± 17 <sup>b</sup>	658 ± 103 <sup>bc</sup>

The samples with higher concentrations of total flour presented a significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) luminosity increase and, therefore, resulting in a less dark appearance (Table 3). These values coincide with those reported by other studies, coincides with other studies where corn flour was replaced by cricket flour [7]. Sample 3 showed a more orange and saturated color than the rest of the *chucula*. This is due to its high cocoa content, which gave it higher values for the coordinates  $a^*$ ,  $b^*$  and Chroma ( $C^*_{ab}$ ). The opposite case occurred with samples with a lower percentage of this ingredient, such as sample 1, which presented the lowest values for the coordinates  $a^*$ ,  $b^*$  and Chroma ( $C^*_{ab}$ ), giving place to a more bluish colored *chucula* and less saturated than sample 3. The Hue ( $h^*_{ab}$ ) indicates the relative orientation of the color with respect to the  $0^\circ$  origin [12]. *Chucula* formulations with a lower content of cricket flour and higher values of cocoa presented significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) lower tone values than those with a higher content of insect flour and lower content in cocoa.

**Table 3.** Mean ± and standard deviation of the color coordinates ( $L^*$ ,  $a^*$ ,  $b^*$ ,  $h^*_{ab}$  and  $C^*_{ab}$ ) of each of the samples obtained. Superscript letters within columns indicate homogeneous groups according to ANOVA ( $p < 0.05$ ).

Sample	$L^*$	$a^*$	$b^*$	$h^*_{ab}$	$C^*_{ab}$
1	50.375 ± 0.107 <sup>g</sup>	10.94 ± 0.04 <sup>mn</sup>	16.10 ± 0.03 <sup>q</sup>	55.80 ± 0.08 <sup>ikl</sup>	19.46 ± 0.04 <sup>p</sup>
2	48.3 ± 0.3 <sup>n</sup>	12.28 ± 0.16 <sup>b</sup>	17.91 ± 0.16 <sup>c</sup>	55.58 ± 0.12 <sup>n</sup>	21.71 ± 0.2 <sup>b</sup>
3	44.24 ± 0.15 <sup>o</sup>	13.47 ± 0.04 <sup>a</sup>	18.675 ± 0.017 <sup>a</sup>	54.20 ± 0.06 <sup>n</sup>	23.03 ± 0.04 <sup>a</sup>
4	50.65 ± 0.13 <sup>f</sup>	11.37 ± 0.04 <sup>i</sup>	17.32 ± 0.02 <sup>jk</sup>	56.72 ± 0.09 <sup>cd</sup>	20.72 ± 0.03 <sup>jk</sup>
5	49.97 ± 0.05 <sup>i</sup>	11.22 ± 0.04 <sup>jk</sup>	17.13 ± 0.08 <sup>m</sup>	56.77 ± 0.19 <sup>c</sup>	20.48 ± 0.05 <sup>m</sup>
6	50.793 ± 0.019 <sup>ef</sup>	11.348 ± 0.005 <sup>i</sup>	17.195 ± 0.010 <sup>lm</sup>	56.58 ± 0.02 <sup>e</sup>	20.602 ± 0.008 <sup>l</sup>
7	51.73 ± 0.07 <sup>b</sup>	11.01 ± 0.04 <sup>m</sup>	16.460 ± 0.016 <sup>p</sup>	56.23 ± 0.08 <sup>gh</sup>	19.80 ± 0.03 <sup>o</sup>
8	51.5 ± 0.4 <sup>c</sup>	10.88 ± 0.09 <sup>n</sup>	16.57 ± 0.14 <sup>o</sup>	56.71 ± 0.04 <sup>cde</sup>	19.83 ± 0.17 <sup>o</sup>

9	51.46 ± 0.04 <sup>c</sup>	11.080 ± 0.008 <sup>l</sup>	16.90 ± 0.05 <sup>n̄</sup>	56.74 ± 0.08 <sup>cd</sup>	20.20 ± 0.04 <sup>n</sup>
10	49.76 ± 0.03 <sup>jk</sup>	11.615 ± 0.013 <sup>h</sup>	17.643 ± 0.013 <sup>ef</sup>	56.64 ± 0.03 <sup>cde</sup>	21.122 ± 0.015 <sup>fg</sup>
11	49.95 ± 0.03 <sup>i</sup>	11.68 ± 0.02 <sup>gh</sup>	17.387 ± 0.006 <sup>ij</sup>	56.10 ± 0.05 <sup>hi</sup>	20.947 ± 0.009 <sup>i</sup>
12	49.62 ± 0.06 <sup>kl</sup>	11.820 ± 0.008 <sup>ef</sup>	17.31 ± 0.02 <sup>jk</sup>	55.68 ± 0.03 <sup>lmn</sup>	20.96 ± 0.02 <sup>hi</sup>
13	49.428 ± 0.013 <sup>m</sup>	11.9500 ± 0.0115 <sup>c</sup>	17.45 ± 0.08 <sup>i</sup>	55.60 ± 0.10 <sup>mn</sup>	21.15 ± 0.07 <sup>efg</sup>
14	49.588 ± 0.102 <sup>klm</sup>	11.958 ± 0.019 <sup>c</sup>	17.55 ± 0.04 <sup>gh</sup>	55.724 ± 0.018 <sup>klm</sup>	21.23 ± 0.04 <sup>cde</sup>
15	49.50 ± 0.10 <sup>lm</sup>	11.89 ± 0.04 <sup>cde</sup>	17.390 ± 0.010 <sup>ij</sup>	55.638 ± 0.112 <sup>mn</sup>	21.066 ± 0.017 <sup>gh</sup>
16	49.93 ± 0.05 <sup>ij</sup>	11.69 ± 0.07 <sup>gh</sup>	17.81 ± 0.04 <sup>d</sup>	56.728 ± 0.105 <sup>cd</sup>	21.30 ± 0.06 <sup>c</sup>
17	51.12 ± 0.15 <sup>d</sup>	11.17 ± 0.04 <sup>k</sup>	17.56 ± 0.03 <sup>fgh</sup>	57.55 ± 0.12 <sup>a</sup>	20.81 ± 0.02 <sup>i</sup>
18	50.19 ± 0.16 <sup>h</sup>	11.72 ± 0.07 <sup>g</sup>	17.62 ± 0.05 <sup>efgh</sup>	56.36 ± 0.08 <sup>fg</sup>	21.16 ± 0.08 <sup>efg</sup>
19	50.39 ± 0.02 <sup>g</sup>	11.795 ± 0.013 <sup>f</sup>	17.628 ± 0.017 <sup>efg</sup>	56.21 ± 0.03 <sup>hi</sup>	21.209 ± 0.019 <sup>cdef</sup>
20	50.42 ± 0.08 <sup>g</sup>	11.635 ± 0.018 <sup>h</sup>	17.17 ± 0.07 <sup>lm</sup>	55.88 ± 0.10 <sup>j</sup>	20.74 ± 0.06 <sup>jk</sup>
21	49.11 ± 0.05 <sup>n</sup>	11.89 ± 0.02 <sup>cd</sup>	17.54 ± 0.14 <sup>h</sup>	55.86 ± 0.25 <sup>jk</sup>	21.189 ± 0.104 <sup>def</sup>
22	50.82 ± 0.06 <sup>ef</sup>	11.37 ± 0.09 <sup>i</sup>	17.24 ± 0.07 <sup>kl</sup>	56.610 ± 0.115 <sup>de</sup>	20.651 ± 0.105 <sup>kl</sup>
23	49.76 ± 0.08 <sup>jk</sup>	11.95 ± 0.06 <sup>c</sup>	18.010 ± 0.014 <sup>b</sup>	56.44 ± 0.13 <sup>f</sup>	21.61 ± 0.04 <sup>b</sup>
24	50.4000 ± 0.1003 <sup>g</sup>	11.870 ± 0.014 <sup>de</sup>	17.65 ± 0.04 <sup>e</sup>	56.08 ± 0.04 <sup>i</sup>	21.27 ± 0.04 <sup>cd</sup>
25	50.93 ± 0.08 <sup>e</sup>	11.24 ± 0.03 <sup>i</sup>	17.39 ± 0.03 <sup>ij</sup>	57.12 ± 0.07 <sup>b</sup>	20.70 ± 0.04 <sup>kl</sup>
26	50.258 ± 0.013 <sup>gh</sup>	11.325 ± 0.006 <sup>i</sup>	17 ± 0 <sup>n</sup>	56.360 ± 0.013 <sup>fg</sup>	20.443 ± 0.004 <sup>m</sup>
27	51.938 ± 0.010 <sup>a</sup>	10.768 ± 0.010 <sup>n̄</sup>	16.873 ± 0.005 <sup>n̄</sup>	57.455 ± 0.017 <sup>a</sup>	20.015 ± 0.009 <sup>n̄</sup>

As a conclusion of this work, cricket flour addition in mixture powder has shown adequate behavior to obtain a new product with higher protein content. Therefore, we demonstrated that the addition of cricket flour in the *chucula* could have interesting applications in the food technology field because it generates new foods with a high nutritional value, with the consequent improvement of the nutritional status of populations.

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualisation, A.M., L.I.S.-D., A.F.-A., M.I., J.M.-M. and P.G.-S.; methodology, L.I.S.-D. and M.I.; formal analysis, A.M., L.I.S.-D. and M.I.; investigation, A.M., L.I.S.-D., A.F.-A. and M.I.; resources, L.I.S.-D., J.M.-M. and P.G.-S.; data curation, L.I.S.-D., A.F.-A., M.I. and P.G.-S.; writing—original draft preparation and editing, A.M. and M.I.; writing—review, M.I., P.G.-S. and J.M.-M.; supervision, M.I. and P.G.-S.; project administration, J.M.-M.; funding acquisition, P.G.-S. and J.M.-M. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This research was supported by ADSIDEO 2018–2020 projects and Development Cooperation Program 2020–2021 UPV.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:**

**Informed Consent Statement:**

**Data Availability Statement:** The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

- Bustos, J. Mezcla de tradición y vanguardia en la sostenibilidad de la cadena de valor de la chucula. Master's Thesis, Biotrade and Sustainable Development, Catholic University of Perú, Peru, 2019.
- Rincón, S. *Cocinas tradicionales en riesgo del departamento de Cundinamarca*; Bogotá Workshop School Foundation: Colombia, 2012.
- Van Huis, A.; Van Itterbeek, J.; Klunder, H.; Mertens, E.; Halloran, A.; Muir, G.; Vantomme, P. *Edible Insects: Future Prospects for Food and Feed Security*, 1st ed.; FAO Forestry Paper: Rome, Italy, 2013; p. 201.
- Singh, N.; Smith, A.C. A comparison of wheat starch, whole wheat meal and oat flour in the extrusion cooking process. *J. Food Eng.* **1997**, *34*, 15–32.
- Müller, J.; González-Martínez, C.; Chiralt, A. Poly (lactic) acid (PLA) and starch bilayer films, containing cinnamaldehyde, obtained by compression moulding. *Eur. Polym. J.* **2019**, *95*, 56–70.
- Durá, S. Estudio del valor nutricional y funcional del cacao en polvo con diferentes grados de alcalinización. Master's Thesis, Food Science and Technology, Polytechnic University of Valencia, Spain, 2016.

7. Barrios, K.B. Desarrollo de un prototipo de tortilla funcional de maíz (*Zea mays*) y harina de grillo (*Acheta domesticus*) como fuente de proteína para dieta humana. Ph.D. Thesis, Food Agroindustry, Panamerican Agricultural School, Honduras, 2017.
8. Johansson, M.; Xanthais, E.; Langton, M.; Menzel, C.; Vilaplana, F.; Johansson, D.P.; Lopez-Sánchez, P. Mixed legume systems of pea protein and unrefined lentil fraction: Textural properties and microstructure. *LWT Food Sci. Technol.* **2021**, *144*, 111212.
9. Boukid, F.; Rosell, C.M.; Castellari, M. Pea protein ingredients: A mainstream ingredient to (re)formulate innovative foods beverages. *Trends Food Sci. Technol.* **2021**, *110*, 729–742.
10. Meza, C.D. Elaboración, evaluación nutrimental y nutracéutica de una botana a partir de harina extruidas maíz/frijol. Ph.D. Thesis, Food Science and Technology, Autonomous University of Queretaro, Mexico, 2011.
11. Margalef, A.; Bonomo, A.; Ggottifredi, J.C. Formulación y desarrollo de mezclas extruidas de maíz y soja. Thesis, Research Institute for the Chemical Industry, National University of Salta, Argentina, 1998.
12. Talens, P. Evaluación del color y tolerancia de color en alimentos a través del espacio CIELAB. Thesis, Department of Food Technology, Polytechnic University of Valencia, Spain, 2017.