



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_14606
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Coconut Milk Substitution with Soymilk on the Shelf Life of 'Nasi Lemak'
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In general, the results are interesting. However, the article needs to be revised. I strongly recommend to increase the number of samples. See comments line by line at the end of this document. Reviewer general comments: The article addressed the issue whether the coconut milk substitution with soymilk may affect the shelf life of Nasi Lemak, a traditional Malaysian food. In general, the research is well conducted and the results are interesting. However, the article needs to be revised by a native English speaker because there are many grammatical and spelling mistakes. Also, all the statistical analyses were performed with $n=2$. I	The article has been revised extensively to improve the grammatical errors and style of writing. The statistical analyses were performed using one-way ANOVA and followed by Tukey test.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	strongly recommend to work with a higher n to draw appropriate conclusions. Please find here below my comments line by line. In abstract: In results section it should read “significant differences” instead of “significant different”. This appears twice. Change “of” for “for” before Aerobic plate count. This appears twice. In conclusion section: it should indicate the ratio of soymilk that might be a good candidate to take into account for substitution based on the obtained results. Line 16: rewrite first sentence. Line 20: change “contributed” by “contribute”. Line 25: change “are” by “is”.	Has changed to significant difference Has changed ‘of’ to ‘for’ The sample B with 75% coconut milk ratio with 25% soymilk is highly recommended to obtain good acceptance test with control (100% coconut milk) with acceptable shelf life (21 h) at ambient temperature and 6-days at chilling temperature. Malaysia is famous with variety of food. Contributes Is
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 27: add “are” after milk. Line 27: add “a” after has. Line 28: change “higher” by “high”. Line 31: products, not product. Line 32: remove “of methods”. Line 33: add “with respect” before “to”. Line 35: add “a” before “food product”. Line 45: change “sample preparation by “ingredients”. Line 48: University of Malaysia, not Universitii Malaysia. Table 1: check formulations. Should not be 49.7 rice in sample E? Should not be 4.15 thick soy milk in sample D? Line 63: remove “a” before “100”. Line 65: remove “an” and “of” before “soaking”; move “overnight” after “water”. Line 66: add “a” before steamer.	Not relevant Not relevant High-fat and high-calorie Not relevant Remove already Rewrite already Rewrite already **From line 27 to line 35 (Rewrite- see in yellow text) Not agree – Sample preparation is more appropriate in the contxt Change already The rice for all samples were similar. The changes of formulation only on the percentage of coconut milk and soymilk. The value thick soymilk in sample D is change to 4.14. Already removed Already removed A is added
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 88: remove “overnight”. Line 89: add “a” before blender. Line 95: it should read: making 10-fold dilutions in peptone water solution. Line 95: remove “one millilitre of.....” until “10⁻² dilution”. Line 100: dilution, not diluent. Lines 101-105: please move the names of the media, along with their appropriate abbreviations, to the place where they appear the first time (line 101). MYP: mannitol-yolk-polymyxin. Line 101: remove “this method is known as spread plate method”. Lines 103-105: °C, not °C. Line 104: “in” a dark place.	Already removed A is added before blende The change has made Already deleted Has change to dilution The full name of media is provided Already removed The right symbol of ° is used Has changed as suggested ***Line 121-139 was newly inserted 3.1 Sensory acceptance of ‘nasi lemak’ is new section to highlight the sensory preference of all samples studied
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 123: add “that” after “shows”. Line 132: change “was” by “is $\geq$”. Line 133: remove “and above”. Line 135: change “was” by “is”. Table 2 and others: add “(CFU/g)” after “APC”. This needs to be done also in Tables 3-5. Table 2-7: I strongly suggest to work with a higher <i>n</i>. Line 148: remove ‘that’. Line 150: remove ‘while’ and re-phrase the sentence. Line 160: if should read “the safety of the products”. Line 164: “In” a study... Lines 160-182: please reorganize the information discussed. Same type of information should appear together.	That is added Already changed Already removed Already changed Already changed n is more than 2 Has changed Has changed Has changed Has changed Has changed
--	--	---

	Line 190: add “were” before “stored”. Line 192: which “is” below... Line 215: add “stored” after “samples”. Line 220: add “such as” after “ingredients”. Line 222: foods that “have” high acidity... Line 222: remove “while during” and start sentence with “Freezing”. Line 224: add “and” before “can cause”. Line 246: remove “the common microbes that can be found in rice product is <i>B. cereus</i>”. It was already mentioned in lines 235-235. Line 250: change “because” by “and”. Line 256: add “were” before “stored”. Line 261: it should read: “which states that samples with....”. Line 262: remove “based on the Food Standards Australia/New Zealand, 2001”. It was mentioned at the beginning of the sentence. Line 268: it should be explained the principle of MYP medium to select <i>B. cereus</i> since the other	Has changed Has changed Has changed Has changed Has changed Has changed Has changed Has changed Has changed Has changed Already put the explanation of MYP agar
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	two media were explained in their corresponding section. Line 271-277: conclusion needs to be improved by suggesting the best formulation (ratio of coconut milk/soymilk) that will suits the shelf life requirements and the microbiological quality.	Already put the suggestion. Sample B is the best considering having both sensory preference and acceptable range of shelf life
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		