Development of Dietetic*MistiDahi*Using Natural and Artificial Sweeteners

ABSTRACT

Dairy based sweetmeats usually contains high sugar with a high calorific value which in turn is linked to various non-communicable diseases.To reduce this high calorie content, sugarcan be replaced in part or wholly by non-nutritive artificial sweeteners, as well as natural sweetener like honey. In the present study natural and artificial sweetener sources(honey and sucralose, respectively)were used to replace sucrose in part or completelyto develop low calorie fat reduced *mistidahi*.Effect of sweeteners on setting time, proximate composition, microbiological quality and calorific value of *mistidahi*, and sensory quality wereanalysed as per the standard methods.Protein and total solids(TS)content decreasedwith increase in honey or sucralose used to replace sucrose in*mistidahi*, while fat content was variable.Microbiological analysis revealed that with anincrease in the content of honey,the total aerobic plate count (TAPC) of *mistidahi* tended to show an increase, while for sucralose containing samples a decreasing trend in TAPC in *mistidahi*was noted.

Keywords: Bovine milk, artificial sweetener, lactic acid bacteria, low fat, low calorie

INDRODUCTION

Sweetener is a substance that occurs naturally or is syntheticallyproducedand providessweet taste to food or beverages; it maybenutritive (caloric) or non-nutritive(non-caloric). The most common nutritive sweetener used in the food industry is sucrose, chemically consist of fructose and

glucose.Consumption of the sucrose or sugar has beenfound to link to various non-communicable diseases like diabetes(Lustig *et al.* 2012).So, nutritionists and health professionals around the world are increasingly focusing on the development of healthier foods by reducing the calorie and fat content and thus helping in the management of various health conditions. Indians have a strong preference for dairy based sweetmeats. Nevertheless, these dairy products are not free from sucrose whose energy value is quite high. One of the most popular traditional fermented milk products of India which finds its place even in ancient scriptures is *Dahi* or Indian Yoghurt due to its health beneficial properties (Yadav *etal.* 2008). A sweetened variety of *dahi*, popularly known as *mistidahi*, is popular in Eastern India. However, *mistidahi*contains a high level of sugar (6-25%) and its fat content ranges between 1-12% (Sarkar *et al.* 1996). In order to reduce the calorie content, sugar is usually replaced in part or wholly by non-nutritive artificial sweeteners, as well as natural sweetener like honey.

Honey, a natural sweetener from the nectar of plants, may be used as an alternative to sucrose as it containshigh level of fructose and small amount of glucose. Since fructose is sweeter than glucose, so less amount of honeyis required to obtain the same sweetness of sugar.On average honey is 1.0-1.5 times sweeter than sugar on dry matter basis, while liquid honey is dense and approximately as sweet as sugar.Honey contains only 82.4g carbohydrates/100g while sugar has 100g carbohydratesand provides energy of 304 Kcal/100g and 400 Kcal/100g, respectively (National Honey Board 2011). Nevertheless, honey possesses several health beneficial properties (Samarghandian*et al.* 2017).

Artificial sweeteners, like sucralose, may also be used as a substitute of sucrose in preparing low calorie sweetmeats. Sucralose is a chemically synthesised non-nutritive potent sweetener and is cost effective. It is 450-650 times sweeter than sucrose and provides desirable

sweetness withoutgetting metabolized in the body and hence, it adds no calorie (Chattopadhyay *et al.*2014). U.S. Food and Drug Administration approved sucralose as general-purpose sweetener with an acceptable daily intake of 5mg/kg body weight/day. Considering the above facts, an attempt has been made in the present study to develop a low calorie, reduced fat fermented *mistidahi*with replacement of sugar withhoney or sucralose, in part or completely.

METHODOLOGY

The study was undertaken in the laboratories of the Department of Livestock Products Technology, College of Veterinary Science, Assam Agricultural University, Khanapara Campus, Guwahati.

Procurement of Raw Materials

Fresh raw cow's milk was procured fromtheinstitution's cattle farm.Sugar,Honey(Dabur, India) and food grade sucralose tablets ('Zero' from M/s.Alembic Ltd, Ahmedabad, India) were purchased locally. Yoghurt culture NCDC 263 (National Collection of Dairy Cultures) comprising of mixed culture of *Lactobacillus delbrueckeii* ssp. *bulgaricus* and *Streptococcus thermophilus*wasobtained from the National Dairy Research Institute, Karnal, India.

Starter Culture

Freeze dried yoghurt culture was inoculated in reconstituted and sterilized skim milk (12%). Working cultures were maintained in skim milk, sub-cultured at weekly interval and stock cultures were maintained in nutrient agar slants (-) 20^{o}C and sub-cultured at 3 month's interval.Sixteen to eighteen hour active culture was prepared in sterilized skim milk (12% w/v)

by inoculating the stock culture at 2% level. Repeated sub-culturing, at least three times, was done before using it as starter culture for preparation of *mistidahi*.

Quality Judging and Pre-treatment of Raw Milk

Rapid judgingof milk was done by subjecting it to various physico-chemical and bacteriological tests like pH, acidity, Rapid Platform Test (RPT) and Methylene Blue Reduction Test (MBRT). The pH was determined using a digital pH meter Model 780 (Metrohm, Switzerland). Titratable acidity, RPT and MBRT were doneas per method of Artherton and Newlander (1977).Composition of the raw milkanalysed in Ultrasonic Milk Analyser (Master Classic,Bengaluru, India)was found tocontain 4.46% milk fat, whichwas pre-treated to reduce the fat content to 4.04% by removing the scum formed afterboilingand subsequently cooling down the milk to room temperature several times. Solids-not-fat content calculatedusing Richmond's formula was standardized to 12% using skim milk powder (HiMedia, India).Milk wassterilizedby autoclaving at 115^0C for 20min.

Product Preparation

Misti dahi was prepared by using fat reduced standardized milk.Only sucrose in control, and sucrose with honey and sucralose in different combinations were added to the treatment groups of standardized milk. Followed by inoculating the milk with active culture of NCDC 263 (2%) and incubated at 42±1^{o}C for 4–5h or till formation of curd. After proper setting, the products werestored at 4±1^{o}C for 3–4h.Immediately after setting, the products were analyzed for their microbiological quality and proximate composition. Allotted treatment areshown in Table 1.

Table 1: Sweeteners used for part or full substitution of sucrose in *Misti dahi*

Treatments	Sucrose %	Honey %	Sucralose %
Control	100	-	-
T_1	75	25	-
T_2	50	50	-
T_3	25	75	
T_4	-	100	-
T_5	75	-	25
T_6	50	-	50
T_7	25	-	75
T_8	-	-	100

Setting time of *Misti Dahi*

Setting time (min) was noted from the time of starter culture inoculation in milktill formation of set curd. This was recorded for all the treatment groups. A total of five replications were done for each treatment group.

Proximate Analysis

Fat content of the set products was determined by the Gerber's method(Food Safety and Standards Authority of India2016).Protein content of the set milk productwas determined by following Kjeldahl method.Moisture**,** Total solidsand ash content of the set products were estimated by the method as per AOAC(2007).

Microbiological Analysis

Total viable count and yeast and moldscounts of the products wereanalyzedby following pour plate technique(Wang *et al.,* 2010).Colonies were then counted in a bacteriological colony

counter.For Colititre, a set of nine tubes containing 9 ml of Brilliant Green Lactose Bile broth, with inverted Durham's tube were inoculated with 1ml of the inoculum from the required dilutions of the set products of all treated groups. Tubes were incubated at 37^{o}C for 24h. After which, tubes were checked for production of gas, change of colour and development of turbidity and the Most Probable Number (MPN) was calculated as per AOAC (1995) guidelines.

Calorific Value of the Product

The calorific value of the set products was calculatedusing Atwater system. The total calorie value was calculated by adding up the calories provided by the energy-containing nutrients *i.e.*, protein, carbohydrate and fat which were taken as 4, 4 and 9kcal/g,respectively to get the calorie value (Painter 2006).Thetotal carbohydrate content in *mistidahi*was determined by difference (fibre is included) (Food and Agriculture Organization 2003).

Sensory Evaluation

After proper setting, the products were brought to 4±1^{o}C before serving to the 9-membered semi trained panel for sensory evaluation. The products were rated for appearance, colour, body and texture, flavour and taste through a 9-point hedonic scale. Overall acceptability of the products was calculated out by taking the mean score of the different sensory parameters stated above.

Statistical Analysis

Experimental data obtained were expressed as the average of mean values ± standard error. To highlight significant differences among the samples Analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Honest Significant Difference (HSD) test for mean comparison were used. Statistical tests were

performed with a 5% or 1% significance level using the SPSS program version 20 (IBM Corp 2011). A total of five batches were studied for proper statistical analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Composition of Raw Milk

The average chemical composition of the raw cow's milk is given in Table 2. Variations in the composition might be due to the variation in lactation period, feeds, etc.ThepH and acidity of the freshly drawn cow's milk were 6.6-6.8 and 0.16-0.17%lactic acid, respectively. These findings are in accordance with the findings of Aneja*et al*. (2002).RPT including organoleptic, Clot on Boiling (COB) and alcohol test results indicate suitability of raw milk for heat processing. Resazurin and MBRT test results were also indicative of good quality milk and, hence, was found to be suitable for preparation of *mistidahi*.

Table 2:Physico-Chemical Properties of Raw Cow's Milk

Batch No.	**pH**	**Acidity (%LA)**	**Fat (%)**		**SNF (%)**	**RPT**				**MBRT**
			Raw	**Defatted**		**Organoleptic**	**COB**	**Alcohol**	**Resazurin**	
1	6.6	0.16	4.6	4.1	8.40	Pale yellow colour, normal sweet taste	-ve	-ve	Good	Good
2.	6.7	0.17	4.3	3.8	9.64	-do-	-do-	-do-	-do-	-do-

3.	6.6	0.16	4.7	5.2	8.73	-do-	-do-	-do-	-do-	-do-
4.	6.6	0.16	4.5	3.7	9.65	-do-	-do-	-do-	-do-	-do-
5.	6.7	0.18	4.2	3.4	8.74	-do-	-do-	-do-	-do-	-do-

Setting Time

In treatment where sugar was replaced by varying levelsof honey (i.e., T_1 to T_4), the setting time decreased with an increase in the replacement level of sucrose with honey. This might be due to thick consistency of honey which might have thickened the consistency of the milk resulting in reduced setting time of the product.Contrary to the results of honey added products, the setting time of sucralose added *mistidahi* products increased as the level of sucralose was increased to replace sucrose.

Effect of Honey and Sucralose on Proximate Composition of *Misti Dahi*

Fat

Effect of sweeteners on fat content of the *mistidahi* showed highly significant differenceamong the groups. Fat content of honey added products were found to gradually decrease from a mean of 2.96to 2.52%however, at 75% sugar replacement (T_3), a higherfat level was noted(Table 3). The findings of lesser mean fat content of honey treatedsamples than that of control, is in disagreement with the findings of Islam *et al*. (2015) who reported anincrease in themean fat content in honey containingbioyoghurt.Sucralose added sample exhibited an

increasing trend in the fat content which was also in harmony with the findings of Chethana *et al*. (2014)on gulabjamun made with sugar substitutes.

Protein

The mean protein content of the *Misti dahi*samples showed highly significant (*P*<0.01)difference. As the proportion of honey to replace sucrosein the different treatment groups increased, there was a gradual decrease in the mean protein content from 4.22% (T_1)to 3.96 % (T_4). The lowest mean protein value of 3.87 %was found inT_2 group (why group?) of *mistidahi*(Table 3). This might be generally due toabsent of protein content of honey which used in the experiments was 0.1-3.3%(Silva *et al*., 2016) and particularly for *Dabur* honey the protein was absent(Open Food Facts 2017). These findings were also supported by the findings of Bakr *et al*. (2015).

Mean protein content of sucralose containing *Misti dahi*samples decreased from 4.39±0.15 to 4.23±0.16% as the sugar replacement was increased from 25 to 100%. This might be due to very less proteincontent of sucralose. The findings were supported by that of Chethana *et al*. (2014) in *dahi*containing sucralose.

Ash

Ash content of the sugar replaced *mistidahi* showed an increase in the mean value as the level ofsugar replacerswas raised.Ash content differed (*P*<0.01) significantly among the groups. The highest ash value (i.e. 6.74 %)was recorded for 100% sucralose added group while the least value(i.e. 3.90 %) was associated with *Misti dahi* utilizing 25% honey. Similar findings have

been reported by Bakr *et al*. (2015) with a maximum ash content of 8.43g/kg of *dahi* in both sac-sweetand sucrolcontainingproducts.

The honey also contained higheramount of minerals (0.04-0.2%, Silva *et al*. 2016) (Dabur honey contain 0.1-0.2% minerals) and this might be the main factor for the increasing ash contentof the honey added products. Metry and Owayss (2009) and Bakr *et al*. (2015) reported a decrease in the ash content of *dahi*prepared when fennel honeywas used at incremental higher levelswhich they attributed to the lesser contentof ash in fennel honey.

Total Solids

A highly significant (P<0.01) difference was found for TScontent of *mistidahi* samples. When either of honey or sucralose was used at incremental higher levels to replace sucrose, a decrease in the TS contentwas noted. This might be due to the gradual reduction in the sugar content of *mistidahi* from 25 to 100%. Highest TScontent was recorded in the control sample and the leastvalue wasassociated with product containing100% sucralose. Islam *et al*. (2010) also reported lower TS contentof*dahi*prepared utilizing sac-sweet (149.73 g/kg) and sucrol (149.83 g/kg) versus use of 8 % sucrose in*dahi*. Metry and Owayss (2009), Rashid and Thakur (2012), Bakr *et al*. (2015) have reported an increasing trend in the TS content of bioyoghurt or *dahi*when sugar content was added at incremental levels.

Table 3: Effect of Honey and Sucralose on Proximate Composition of *Misti Dahi*

TreatmentGroups	**Proximate Composition (%) (Mean±SE)**			
	Fat	**Protein**	**Ash**	**Total solids**
CONTROL	3.40±0.23e	3.83±0.08a	4.08±0.06a	24.55±0.32e

T_1	2.96±0.22c	4.22±0.14ab	3.90±0.23a	24.20±0.81de
T_2	2.52±0.23b	3.87±0.05ab	4.02±0.18a	23.98±0.73de
T_3	3.16±0.27cde	3.86±0.21ab	4.38±0.28a	22.80±0.63cd
T_4	2.52±0.23b	3.96±0.23ab	4.20±0.23a	21.99±0.53c
T_5	1.98±0.17a	4.39±0.15b	4.72±0.20a	21.57±0.20c
T_6	3.04±0.21cd	4.29±0.12ab	4.42±0.18a	21.70±0.48c
T_7	2.92±0.21c	4.22±0.13ab	5.80±0.15b	19.00±0.27b
T_8	3.26±0.25de	4.23±0.16ab	6.74±0.19c	16.70±0.28a

Figures with differing alphabets are significantly (P<0.05) different

Effect ofHoney and Sucralose on Microbiological Quality of *Misti Dahi*

Total Viable Count (TVC)

Highly significant (*P*<0.01) difference was found for TVC among the *mistidahi*samples. TVC of the treatment groups, containing honey increasedfrom 4.34 to 4.52 $\log_{10}$cfu/ml as the concentration of honeyincreased from 25 to 100% (Fig. 1). TVC of the honey added groups were found to be than the control group (4.70 $\log_{10}$cfu/ml). The antibacterial effect of honey has beenreported by severalresearchers (Bogdanov *et al.* 2008;Estevinho*et al.* 2008).

Islam *et al*. (2010) reported higher count of TVC (i.e. 7.63$\log_{10}$cfu/g in *dahi* samples containing sucrolas against the one containing sac-sweet (5.77 – $\log_{10}$cfu/g)as sugar replacerand Chethana *et al*. (2014) enumerated a lower count of 1×10^7cfu/ml in 1.5% sucralose containing low calorie *mistidahi* compared to samples containing 0.5 and 1.5%sucralose.

In the present study, TVC was found to be lower significantly in 100% sucralose added sample, which had the least TVC(i.e. 4.02 logcfu/ml). The antibacterial propertyof sucralose (Viberg and Fredriksson 2011) may be a major factor towards this decreasing trend in TVC, besides the 'no carbohydrate factor'.

Coliform Count

None of the samples of the present study revealed presence of coliform organismsper ml or g of product. This might be due to using good quality raw milk and hygienic procedures followed in thepreparation of *mistidahi* as well as due to the probable production of bacteriocinsby starter cultures as reported by Rashid and Thakur (2012)andBakr *et al*. (2015).

Yeast and Mould Count

In the present study, yeast and mould count was found to be less than the minimum countable number of 25 per plate. Bogdanov *et al*. (2008) opined that lesser yeast and mould count in control and treatment groups might be due to hygienic practices followed during manufacturing of the productas well as to the antifungal property of honey.

Calorific Value of *Misti Dahi*

Reduction in the calorific value from 97.33 in control group to 81.25 in T_4 group is evident since the calorie value of honey (304 Kcal/100g) is less than that of sugar (400 Kcal/100g) (Table 4)(National Honey Board 2011), so honeyadded groups showed lower calorific value than control product. The energy value of the honey brand (Dabur, India) used in the study was printed to be320 Kcal/100g (Open Food Facts, 2017).The drastic reduction in the calorific value in T_8 group (56.26k.cal./100 g) wasattributed to the type of

artificial sweetenerused. Sucralose has been grouped as ‘no calorie’ sweetener (Chattopadhyay *et al.* 2014). The decrease in the calorific value of sugar replaced *mistidahi* was supported by the findings of Hussein *et al*. (2016)andMittal and Bajwa, (2012).

Table 4: Effect of Replacing Sucrose with Honey orSucralose on the Calorific Value of *Misti Dahi*

TREATMENT	**Calorific Value** **(Kcal/100g)** (Mean ± SE)
CONTROL	97.33±1.33a
T_1	94.80±3.63a
T_2	91.18±2.85ab
T_3	82.39±0.82c
T_4	81.25±1.51c
T_5	83.54±2.37c
T_6	85.12±2.23bc
T_7	67.13±1.93d
T_8	56.26±2.07e

Dissimilar supercripted alphabets in columnwise are significantly (P<0.05) different from each other

Sensory Evaluation

Appearance From the findings of the present experiment, it could be seen that the amount of sugar in *mistidahi* replaced by honey or sucralose greatly influenced the eating quality characteristics of the *mistidahi*. There was no significant difference among the samples for appearance. The highest mean value for the parameter was found in T7 group with 7.44 ± 0.12 score and the lowest was found in T5 with 6.39 ± 0.21 score.

ColourThe scores for colour of *mistidahi*donot differ significantly between the samples. The highest and lowest mean values were found in T6 (7.44 ± 0.15) and T8 (6.96 ± 0.19).

Body and Texture The score for body and texture of the product differ highly significantly between (*P*<0.01) the groups. The control sample enjoyed superior ratings for body and texture (7.38±0.19) followed by T_6 (7.24±0.16) which had highest rating for colour attribute too.

FlavourFlavour score differ significantly between the samples (*P*<0.01) with the highest score in T1 (7.29 ± 0.19) and lowest in T8 (7.02 ± 0.19**).** Starter culture was also reported to contribute to the flavour of dahi.

Taste Study revealed a highly significant differenve for taste score among the samples of*mistidahi***.** Scores ranges between7.04 ± 0.15 to 7.33 ± 0.20.

Overall Aceptibility Overall aceptibility was found to be differ significantly (*P*<0.01) among the groups. Panel members rated T_1*mistidahi* samples the best while T_8 was rated the poorest (6.96±0.17) for overall acceptability. T_1 enjoyed superior ratings not only for overall

acceptability but also for other sensory attributes like flavour and taste followed by T_4 which was rated superior for appearance and taste.

Table 5: Effect of addition of honey and sucralose on the organoleptic properties of *Misti dahi**

Treatment	Appearance	Colour	Body & Texture	Flavour	Taste	Overall acceptability
CONTROL	7.29 ± 0.20	7.42 ± 0.19	7.38 ± 0.19ab	7.18 ± 0.17b	7.18 ± 0.18b	7.11 ± 0.19b
T_1	7.24 ± 0.17	7.42 ± 0.18	7.09 ± 0.21b	7.29 ± 0.19b	7.33 ± 0.20b	7.42 ± 0.15b
T_2	7.11 ± 0.20	7.22 ± 0.16	7.22 ± 0.16ab	7.22 ± 0.15b	7.24 ± 0.18ab	7.24 ± 0.14ab
T_3	7.13 ± 0.17	7.36 ± 0.18	7.09 ± 0.18b	7.24 ± 0.17b	7.20 ± 0.18b	7.27 ± 0.15b
T_4	7.36 ± 0.13	7.42 ± 0.14	7.11 ± 0.18b	7.20 ± 0.15ab	7.33 ± 0.17b	7.40 ± 0.12b
T_5	6.39 ± 0.21	7.42 ± 0.20	7.24 ± 0.19ab	7.22 ± 0.19ab	7.16 ± 0.20ab	7.16 ± 0.19ab

T_6	7.24 ± 0.18	7.44 ± 0.15	7.24 ± 0.16ab	7.13 ± 0.15ab	7.04 ± 0.15ab	7.20 ± 0.13ab
T_7	7.44 ± 0.12	7.29 ± 0.10	7.09 ± 0.16b	7.11 ± 0.14ab	7.18 ± 0.15b	7.11 ± 0.12b
T_8	7.02 ± 0.19	6.96 ± 0.19	6.91 ± 0.18a	7.02 ± 0.19a	7.13 ± 0.19a	6.96 ± 0.17a

*Mean ± SE;

Letters not similar are significantly different

CONCLUSION

Study on the proximate composition of *mistidahi* showed variable results for fat content. Protein and TS content of product tended todecrease, while a gradual increase inthe ash and moisture content was noted as the level ofhoney or sucralose was raised in the formulation. Microbiological analysis of the products revealed that with anincrease in the usage level of honey in, the total aerobic plate count (TAPC)of *mistidahi* increased. However, in samples T_5 to T_8 groups, a decreasing trend in TAPCwas noted with an increase in the level of sucralose. Based on sensory evaluation, low fat content, higher protein and TS content, treatment group $T_1$is recommended for producinglow-calorie fat reduced *mistidahi*. Honey was preferred over sucralose as sweetener; the former being natural ingredient too.

REFERENCES

Aneja, R. P., Mathur, B. N., Chandan, R. C. and Banerjee, A. K. (2002).*Technology of Indian Milk Products,*New Delhi, India: Dairy India Year Book Publication.

AOAC (1995). Official Methods of Analysis. 16th edn. Washington, DC: Association of Official and Analytical Chemists.

AOAC (2007).Official Methods of Analysis. 18th edn. Gaithersburg: Association of Official Analytical Chemist.

Artherton, H. V. and Newlander,J.A.(1977). Chemistry and Testing of Dairy Products, 4thedn. Westport, Connecticut: AVI Publishing Co.

Bakr, I.A., Mohamed, T. H., Tammam, A. A. and El- Gazzar, F. (2015). Characteristics of Bioyoghurt Fortified with Fennel Honey. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Appllied Science*.**4:** 959-970.

Bogdanov, S., Jurendic, T., Sieber, R. and Gallmann, P. (2008). Honey for Nutrition and Health: A Review. *Journal of the American College of Nutrition*.**27:** 677-689.

Chattopadhyay, S., Raychaudhuri, U. and Chakraborty, R. (2014). Artificial sweeteners-a review. *Journal of Food science and Technology*.**51:** 611-621.

Chetana, R., Manohar, B. and Reddy, S. R. Y. (2004). Process optimization of gulabjamun, an Indian traditional sweet, using sugar substitutes. *European Food Research Technology*.**219:** 386-392.

Chethana, B., Sowmya, V., Poornima, S., Devi, V.M., Natarajan A. M., Bharathi, S. and Pramod, T. (2014). Effect and use of different low calorie intense sweeteners and the overall quality of

yoghurt, bioyoghurt and Probiotic *mistidahi*. *International Journal of Comprehensive Research in Biological Science*.**1:** 33-40.

Estevinho, L., Pereira, A. P., Moreira, L., Dias, L. G. and Pereira, E. (2008). Antioxidant and antimicrobial effects of phenolic compounds extracts of northeast Portugal honey. *Food and Chemical Toxicol*ogy.**46:** 3774-3779.

Food and Agriculture Organization (2003). Food energy-Methods of analysis and conversion factors. FAO Food and Nutrition Paper 77.

Food Safety and Standards Authority of India (2016).*Manual of Methods of Analysis of Foods: Milk and Milk Products,*pp. 37. New Delhi: Ministry of Health and Family Welfare Government of India.

Hussein, A. M. S., Hegazy, N. A., Kamil, M. M. and Ola, S. S. M. (2016). Utilization of yoghurt and sucralose to produce low-calorie cakes. *Journal of Nutrition and Food Sciences*.**6**: 1-6.

IBM Corp (2011). IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows Version 20.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.

Islam, M. N., Akhter, A. K., Masum, A. K. M., Khan, M. A. S. and Asaduzzaman, M. (2010). Preparation of *dahi* for diabetic patient. *Bangladesh Journal of Animal Science*.**39**: 144-150.

Lustig, R. H., Schmidt, L. A. and Brindis, C. D. (2012).The toxic truth about sugar. *Nature*.**482**:27-29.

Metry, A. W. and Owayss, A. A. (2009). Influence of incorporating honey and royal jelly on the quality of yoghurt during storage. *Egyptian Journal of Food Science*.**37:** 115-131.

Mittal, S. and Bajwa, U. (2012). Effect of fat and sugar substitution on the quality characteristics of low calorie milk drinks. *Journal of Food Science and Technol*ogy. **29:** 704-712.

National Honey Board (2011).Charbohydrates and the sweetnes of honey. **303:** 776-2337. www.honey.com

Open Foods Facts (2017). Honey-Dabur-250g. https://world.openfoodfacts.org/product/8901207035364/honey-dabur.

Painter, J. (2006). How do food manufacturers calculate the calorie count of packaged foods? https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-do-food-manufacturers/

Rashid, A. and Thakur, Er S.N. (2012). Studies on quality parameters of set yoghurt prepared by addition of honey. *International Journal of Scientific Research Publications*.**2:** 1-10.

Samarghandian, S., Farkhondeh, T. and Samini, F. (2017). Honey and health: A review of recent clinical research. *Pharmacognosy Research*. **9 :**121-127.

Sardarodiyan, M. and Hakimzadeh, V. (2016). Low-calorie sweeteners: Science and energy balance. *BioChemistry: An Indian Journal*. **10:** 104-116.

Sarkar, S. P., Kulia, R. K. and Mishra, A. K. (1996). Organoleptic, chemical and microbiological quality of *mistidahi*sold in different districts of West Bengal. *Indian Journal of Dairy Science*.**49:** 54-61.

Silvia, P. M. S., Gonzaga, C. G. L. V., Costa, A. C. O. and Fett, R. (2016). Honey: Chemical composition, stability and authenticity. *Food Chemistry*. **196:** 309-323.

Wang, J., Guo, Z., Zhang, Q., Yan, L., Chen, Y., Chen, X., Liu, X. M., Chen, W. and Zhang, H. P. (2010). Effect of probiotic *Lactobacillus casei*Zhangon fermentation characteristics of set yoghurt. *International Journal of Dairy Technology*. **63:** 105-112.

Viberg, H. and Fredriksson, A. (2011). A Neonatal exposure to sucralose does not alter biochemical markers of neuronal development or adult behaviour. *Nutrition.***27:** 81-85.

Yadav, H., Jain, S. and Sinha, P. R. (2008). Oral administration of *dahi*containingprobiotic *Lactobacillus acidophilus* and *Lactobacillus casei* delayed the progression of streptozotocin-induced diabetes in rats. *The Journal of Dairy Research,***75:** 189.