

## Development of Dietetic *MistiDahi* Using Natural and Artificial Sweeteners

### ABSTRACT

Dairy-based sweetmeats usually contain high sugar with a high calorific value, which is linked to various non-communicable diseases. To reduce this high-calorie content, sugar can be replaced in part or wholly by non-nutritive artificial sweeteners and natural sweeteners like honey. In the present study, natural and artificial sweetener sources (honey and sucralose, respectively) were used to replace sucrose in part or completely to develop low-calorie fat-reduced *mistidahi*. The effect of sweeteners on setting time, proximate composition, microbiological quality, calorific value of *mistidahi*, and sensory quality were analysed as per the standard methods. Protein and total solids (TS) content decreased with an increase in honey or sucralose used to replace sucrose in *mistidahi*, while fat content was variable. Microbiological analysis revealed that with an increase 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

### INTRODUCTION

Sweetener is a substance that occurs naturally or is synthetically produced and provides a sweet taste to food or beverages; it may be nutritive (caloric) or non-nutritive (non-caloric). The most common nutritive sweetener used in the food industry is sucrose, which chemically consists of fructose and glucose. Consumption of sucrose or sugar is linked 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 *et al.* 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). To reduce the calorie content, sugar is usually replaced in part or wholly by non-nutritive artificial sweeteners and natural sweeteners like honey.

Honey, a natural sweetener from the nectar of plants, may be used as an alternative to sucrose as it contains a high level of fructose and a small amount of glucose. Since fructose is sweeter than glucose, so less amount of honey is required to obtain the same sweetness of sugar. On average honey is 1.0-1.5 times sweeter than sugar on a 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 carbohydrates and 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 synthesized non-nutritive potent sweetener and is cost-effective. It is 450-650 times sweeter than sucrose and provides desirable sweetness without getting metabolized in the body hence, it adds no calories (Chattopadhyay *et*

al.2014). U.S. Food and Drug Administration approved sucralose as a 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 the replacement of sugar with honey 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 from the institution'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 delbrueckii* ssp. *bulgaricus* and *Streptococcus thermophilus* were obtained 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, and subcultured at weekly intervals and stock cultures were maintained in nutrient agar slants (-) 20°C and subcultured at 3-month intervals. 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 a starter culture for the preparation of *mistidahi*.

## Quality Judging and Pre-treatment of Raw Milk

Rapid judging of 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 done as per the method of Artherton and Newlander (1977). The composition of the raw milk analysed in an Ultrasonic Milk Analyser (Master Classic, Bengaluru, India) was found to contain 4.46% milk fat, which was pre-treated to reduce the fat content to 4.04% by removing the scum formed after boiling and subsequently cooling down the milk to room temperature several times. Solids-not-fat content calculated using Richmond's formula was standardized to 12% using skim milk powder (HiMedia, India). Milk was sterilized by autoclaving at 115°C for 20 minutes.

## 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 an active culture of NCDC 263 (2%) and incubating at 42±1°C for 4–5h or till the formation of curd. After proper setting, the products were stored at 4±1°C for 3–4h. Immediately after setting, the products were analyzed for their microbiological quality and proximate composition. Allotted treatments are shown in Table 1.

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

Treatments	Sucrose %	Honey %	Sucralose %
------------	-----------	---------	-------------

Control	100	-	-
T <sub>1</sub>	75	25	-
T <sub>2</sub>	50	50	-
T <sub>3</sub>	25	75	-
T <sub>4</sub>	-	100	-
T <sub>5</sub>	75	-	25
T <sub>6</sub>	50	-	50
T <sub>7</sub>	25	-	75
T <sub>8</sub>	-	-	100

### **Setting time of *Misti Dahi***

Setting time (min) was noted from the time of starter culture inoculation in milk till the 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 Gerber's method (Food Safety and Standards Authority of India 2016). The protein content of the set milk product was determined by following Kjeldahl method. Moisture, Total solids and ash content of the set products were estimated by the method as per AOAC (2007).

### **Microbiological Analysis**

The total viable count and yeast and mould counts of the products were analyzed by 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°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 calculated using 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). The total 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  $4\pm 1^\circ\text{C}$  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. The 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  $\pm$  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.* The pH 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 the suitability of raw milk for heat processing. Resazurin and MBRT test results were also indicative of good quality milk and, hence, were found to be suitable for the 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 levels of honey (i.e., T<sub>1</sub> to T<sub>4</sub>), the setting time decreased with an increase in the replacement level of sucrose with honey. This might be due to the 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

The effect of sweeteners on fat content of the *mistidahi* showed a highly significant difference among the groups. The fat content of honey-added products was found to gradually decrease from a mean of 2.96 to 2.52% however, at 75% sugar replacement (T<sub>3</sub>), a higher fat level was noted (Table 3). The findings of the lesser mean fat content of honey-treated samples than that of control is in disagreement with the findings of Islam *et al.* (2015) who reported an increase in the mean fat content in honey-containing bioyoghurt. 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 Gulab Jamun made with sugar substitutes.

## Protein

The mean protein content of the *Misti dahi* samples showed a highly significant ( $P < 0.01$ ) difference. As the proportion of honey to replace sucrose in 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 in  $T_2$  group (why group?) of *mistidahi* (Table 3). This might be generally due to the absence of protein content of honey which was used in the experiments 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).

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

## Ash

The Ash content of the sugar-replaced *mistidahi* showed an increase in the mean value as the level of sugar replacers was 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 lowest 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-sweet and sucrol-containing products.

The honey also contains a higher amount of minerals (0.04-0.2%, Silva *et al.* 2016) (Dabur honey contains 0.1-0.2% minerals) and this might be the main factor for the increasing ash content of the honey-added products. Metry and Oways (2009) and Bakr *et al.* (2015) reported a decrease in the ash content of *dahi* prepared when fennel honey was used at incrementally higher levels which they attributed to the lesser content of ash in fennel honey.

### Total Solids

A highly significant ( $P < 0.01$ ) difference was found for TS content of *misti dahi* samples. When either of honey or sucralose was used at incremental higher levels to replace sucrose, a decrease in the TS content was noted. This might be due to the gradual reduction in the sugar content of *misti dahi* from 25 to 100%. The highest TS content was recorded in the control sample and the lowest value was associated with a product containing 100% sucralose. Islam *et al.* (2010) also reported lower TS content of *dahi* prepared utilizing sac-sweet (149.73 g/kg) and sucrol (149.83 g/kg) versus use of 8 % sucrose in *dahi*. Metry and Oways (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***

Treatment Groups	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 <sub>1</sub>	2.96±0.22c	4.22±0.14ab	3.90±0.23a	24.20±0.81de
T <sub>2</sub>	2.52±0.23b	3.87±0.05ab	4.02±0.18a	23.98±0.73de

T <sub>3</sub>	3.16±0.27cde	3.86±0.21ab	4.38±0.28a	22.80±0.63cd
T <sub>4</sub>	2.52±0.23b	3.96±0.23ab	4.20±0.23a	21.99±0.53c
T <sub>5</sub>	1.98±0.17a	4.39±0.15b	4.72±0.20a	21.57±0.20c
T <sub>6</sub>	3.04±0.21cd	4.29±0.12ab	4.42±0.18a	21.70±0.48c
T <sub>7</sub>	2.92±0.21c	4.22±0.13ab	5.80±0.15b	19.00±0.27b
T <sub>8</sub>	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 of Honey and Sucralose on Microbiological Quality of *Misti Dahi***

#### ***Total Viable Count (TVC)***

A highly significant ( $P<0.01$ ) difference was found for TVC among the *mistidahi* samples. TVC of the treatment groups, containing honey increased from 4.34 to 4.52  $\log_{10}$ cfu/ml as the concentration of honey increased 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 been reported by several researchers (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 replacer and Chethana *et al.* (2014) enumerated a lower count of  $1 \times 10^7$ cfu/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  $\log_{10}$ cfu/ml). The antibacterial property of 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 the presence of coliform organisms per ml or g of product. This might be due to using good quality raw milk and hygienic procedures followed in the preparation of *mistidahi* as well as due to the probable production of bacteriocins by starter cultures as reported by Rashid and Thakur (2012) and Bakr *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 the manufacturing of the product as well as to the antifungal properties of honey.

### ***Calorific Value of Misti Dahi***

Reduction in the calorific value from 97.33 in the control group to 81.25 in T<sub>4</sub> 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 honey added groups showed lower calorific value than control product. The energy value of the Honey brand (Dabur, India) used in the study was printed to be 320 Kcal/100g (Open Food Facts,

2017). The drastic reduction in the calorific value in T<sub>8</sub> group (56.26k.cal./100 g) was attributed to the type of artificial sweetener used. Sucralose has been grouped as a '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) and Mittal and Bajwa, (2012).

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

TREATMENT	Calorific Value (Kcal/100g) (Mean ± SE)
CONTROL	97.33±1.33a
T <sub>1</sub>	94.80±3.63a
T <sub>2</sub>	91.18±2.85ab
T <sub>3</sub>	82.39±0.82c
T <sub>4</sub>	81.25±1.51c
T <sub>5</sub>	83.54±2.37c
T <sub>6</sub>	85.12±2.23bc
T <sub>7</sub>	67.13±1.93d

$T_8$	$56.26 \pm 2.07e$
Dissimilar superscripted 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  $T_7$  group with  $7.44 \pm 0.12$  score and the lowest was found in  $T_5$  with a  $6.39 \pm 0.21$  score.

**Colour** The scores for the colour of *mistidahi* do not differ significantly between the samples. The highest and lowest mean values were found in  $T_6$  ( $7.44 \pm 0.15$ ) and  $T_8$  ( $6.96 \pm 0.19$ ).

**Body and Texture** The score for the 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 ( $7.38 \pm 0.19$ ) followed by  $T_6$  ( $7.24 \pm 0.16$ ) which had the highest rating for colour attribute too.

**Flavour** Flavour scores differ significantly between the samples ( $P < 0.01$ ) with the highest score in  $T_1$  ( $7.29 \pm 0.19$ ) and the lowest in  $T_8$  ( $7.02 \pm 0.19$ ). Starter culture was also reported to contribute to the flavour of dahi.

**Taste** Study revealed a highly significant difference in taste scores among the samples of *mistidahi*. Scores range between  $7.04 \pm 0.15$  to  $7.33 \pm 0.20$ .

**Overall Acceptability** Overall acceptability was found to differ significantly ( $P<0.01$ ) among the groups. Panel members rated  $T_1$  *mistidahi* samples the best while  $T_8$  was rated the poorest ( $6.96\pm 0.17$ ) 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 *Mistidahi*\***

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

T <sub>5</sub>	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 <sub>6</sub>	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 <sub>7</sub>	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 <sub>8</sub>	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

A study on the proximate composition of *mistidahi* showed variable results for fat content. The protein and TS content of the product tended to decrease, while a gradual increase in the ash and moisture content was noted as the level of honey or sucralose was raised in the formulation. Microbiological analysis of the products revealed that with an increase in the usage level of honey, the total aerobic plate count (TAPC) of *mistidahi* increased. However, in samples T<sub>5</sub> to T<sub>8</sub> groups, a decreasing trend in TAPC was noted with an increase in the level of sucralose. Based on sensory evaluation, low-fat content, higher protein and TS content, treatment group T<sub>1</sub> is recommended for producing low-calorie fat-reduced *mistidahi*. Honey was preferred over sucralose as a sweetener; the former being a 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*. 16<sup>th</sup> edn. Washington, DC: Association of Official and Analytical Chemists.

AOAC (2007). *Official Methods of Analysis*. 18<sup>th</sup> edn. Gaithersburg: Association of Official Analytical Chemists.

Artherton, H. V. and Newlander, J.A.(1977). *Chemistry and Testing of Dairy Products*, 4<sup>th</sup> edn. 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 Applied 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.

Chethana, R., Manohar, B. and Reddy, S. R. Y. (2004). Process optimization of Gulab Jamun, 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 Toxicology*.**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 Technology*. **29**: 704-712.

National Honey Board (2011). Carbohydrates and the sweetness 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.

Sardarodiyani, 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 *mistidahisold* 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* Zhongon 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* containing probiotic *Lactobacillus acidophilus* and *Lactobacillus casei* delayed the progression of streptozotocin-induced diabetes in rats. *The Journal of Dairy Research*, **75**: 189.

UNDER PEER REVIEW