

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125916
Title of the Manuscript:	PROCESSING AND EVALUATION OF FUNCTIONAL PANEER FROM COCONUT MILK (COCOS NUCIFERA L.) AND COW MILK BLENDS
Type of the Article	Research article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I have already indicated four (4) References which have dealt with similar aspect studied by these authors; more survey will fetch still more pertinent references. They have not reviewed their manuscripts at all. The aim of the author was to develop "functional" paneer; however, they did not study any aspect of "functional traits" that can be provided by developed product (i.e. Antioxidative potential of product, Glycemic index, etc.) – only nutritive value (such aspect does not come under purview of "functional food") and two mineral content (Ca, Fe) has been analysed and reported by them.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title has to be changed since none of "functional attribute" of resultant paneer-like product has been studied. Suggested Title: Feasibility study in incorporating coconut milk with cow milk in producing acceptable quality paneer-like product and its characterization	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is too lengthy (about 500 words; should be about ≤ 250 words) Lot of information that should not appear under Abstract has been kept. Abstract has to be rewritten entirely.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	There is a need to remove few Tables and delete portions that have been repeated once again in the manuscript under different headings.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This scientific manuscript is technically unsound. They mentioned one subtopic as Selection of coconut variety – There was no selection criteria at all. Only "Tall" variety of coconut was chosen – without indicating why such variety was their choice for study! Why untrained sensory panel members were included along with trained ones? Such type of panel I have not come across as yet. Storage study was put to end just by seeing visual mold growth. Sensory evaluation of paneer during storage was necessary to know whether the sample deteriorated sensorily, even before mold growth could be visible. Table 1 was repeat of what was already put in Materials and Methods section. Ash content has not been included under proximate composition. Just by adding 10% of coconut milk (to 90% cow milk) how ash content decreased drastically to 1.85% vs. 4.63% in control made from 100% cow milk?? With Reference AOAC – discussion on paneer has been made by the authors (AOAC is related to giving procedures for analysis of dairy products – not carry out research!!) Sensory evaluation of paneer was not carried out during storage study by the authors	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	References quoted are inadequate. I have already mentioned 4 pertinent references. Moreover, regarding reference for analytical methods some References quoted (e.g. Cohen, 1917) are too old to be referred to in 2024 fag end. Kwok et al. (2000) pertains to soymilk processing – its relevance with coconut milk is not perceived at all (such reference is not necessary) References quoted in manuscript, but missing under References Ganguly (2014); Manual in Dairy Chemistry, ICAR (1972); AOAC (1980) and AOAC (1995)	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	At quite some places, English language used is inadequate. Needs thorough editing by English professional. The authors have used word “respectively” at several places, where it was unwarranted (since they had mentioned the parameter relevant to a specific treatment individually)	
Optional/General comments	Out of 4 paneer product, composition and other aspect (i.e. microbial) has been provided only for P0 (control) and P1 products only. Second objective was to standardize the protocol of paneer making – I could not find any such treatment – i.e. varied temp. of milk for coagulation, prior heat treatment to milk/milk blend; use of different acids, etc. In flow chart (Chart 1) lime juice and citric acid have been quoted (both are different entities – lime juice does contain citric acid; but citric acid is an acid by itself); pH of coagulation in paneer making is missing in Chart 1. Since the proportion of cow milk was greater than that of coconut milk used in “milk blend” (P1 selected had cow milk: coconut milk of 90:10 w/w only) the paneer cannot be termed as coconut paneer. When milk blend containing coconut milk at varied levels are used, the quantity of acid (lime juice) required should ideally vary – that is not the case in their manuscript. Proportion of total milk used in paneer making in India – two different data 5% and 7% has been quoted by them at two places (for same aspect) – the data given in one such reference is very old (1995). No Statistical analysis has been performed on the data generated by them. In protein estimation – principle is not required to be mentioned. Determination of ash in milk/paneer is probably not mentioned (using Muffle furnace at 550°C for several hours) The count of bacteria/Yeast and Mold/coliform has not been expressed in proper units The yield of paneer should have been expressed per unit quantity (weight) of milk taken – they have used volume (litre) At one place particulars of yoghurt has been used to compare their result on paneer – absolutely incorrect. There are few references very much related to the research carried out by these authors (i.e. David 2012; Gupta and Gita 2019; Sughanaya and Ramaswamy 2017, Subhash et al. 2024; even more would be available...); these have not been reviewed nor cited in discussion part. Latest Rupee symbol is to be used (vs. older Rs.) Contradictory statements were made by authors for influence of coconut fat on human health – once derogatory, next advantageous on human health BIS standard has been dealt (which is not compulsory) rather FSSAI standard should be dealt for conformity. Yield was mentioned under “chemical quality” Conclusion part is missing altogether	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Atanu Jana
Department, University & Country	SMC College of Dairy Science, Kamdhenu University, India