



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	- In the abstract, the product "Nasi lemak" should be explained that it's made of rice as it appears in the introduction. - Although it's the main ingredient, the Method does not show when the soy milk is added in the product. This should clearly be shown in the method and should reflect the how the percentages were added. - The method does not show how the final product was packed before the storage in the controlled conditions - The author did not explain the possible reasons of why some of the findings appear that way. E.g. Why sample C is safe than other product (line 150 to 151); Why there was a significance difference on the growth of yeast and mould stored at chilled temperatures (line 217 – 219); Why bacteria outgrow fungi in chilled conditions and in this product in particular? It should be improved throughout the text. - Line 259 -262: The author should state clearly if the level of 10^4 cfu of <i>B. cereus</i> is safe for consumption of the RTE food.	It has changed. 'Nasi lemak' is one of the most favourite rice-based products for Malaysians. This section has been improved. See changes in yellow text. The samples were packed in appropriate sterile container. The explanation of this section has been improved This section has been revised.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• Most of the references seem to be old, more new references may be obtained to support the findings as suggested above. • The reference Gibbons et al., 2006 (line 105) does not appear in the list of references.	Not many published work on this food in the literature Gibbons et al 2006 has been removed as all methods in microbiology can be refer to BAM Online
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• The temperature range should be provided in the abstract e.g. 28 °C is given as $28 \pm 2^{\circ}\text{C}$ in line 125; 4 °C is given as $4 \pm 1^{\circ}\text{C}$ in line 148. • Line 58 should perhaps read as follows; source: Modified from Baybook [5] and line 63 it should read as follows; 'Nasi lamek' samples were prepared using the modified method from Baybook [5]. This way of presentation should be changed throughout the document e.g. line 81, 178 etc. • Line 77-78: The last sentence is not very clear. It should be modified or removed. • Line 105-107: The last sentence is not very clear. It should be modified or removed. • The media should appear with the city/town and the country where they were made e.g. Plate Count agar (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany). It should be changed throughout the text. • Line 132: It should be corrected to 10^6 cfu/g instead of 10^6 log cfu/g (Note: $10^6 = 6.0$ log) • Line 111-112: The second sentence should perhaps come first. • Line 167: The word Read-to-eat should appear as RTE	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	• The paper is good and is worthy publishing after some improvements in the document. • Some grammatical errors and spelling mistakes should be corrected.	