

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-51234

Date: 25/04/2025

**Title: Substitution of Rice Flour Components with Sago Flour in Yeast Carrier Media on the Growth of *Sacharomyces cerevisiae* FNCC3049**

### Recommendation:

Accept as it is .....  
**Accept after minor revision**.....Yes.....  
 Accept after major revision .....  
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	•			
Techn. Quality	•			
Clarity		•		
Significance		•		

Reviewer Name: Dr. Sireesha Kuruganti

Date: 25/04/2025

### Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

*(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)*

*The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.*

The research is well-structured, with a clear progression from introduction to conclusion.

### Detailed Reviewer's Report

Detailed Review of Manuscript: Substitution of Rice Flour Components with Sago Flour in Yeast Carrier Media on the Growth of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* FNCC3049

#### I. General Comments

This manuscript investigates the potential of using sago flour as a substitute for rice flour in the carrier media for the yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. The study is relevant due to the potential of sago flour as a locally available and cost-effective alternative to rice flour, particularly in regions like Papua (as highlighted in the text). The research is generally well-structured, with a clear progression from introduction to conclusion. However, some areas need improvement in terms of clarity, data presentation, and discussion.

#### II. Specific Comments

##### A. Abstract (Lines 2-10)

\* The abstract provides a good overview of the study's purpose, methods, and key findings.

### REVIEWER'S REPORT

\* Line 9: The phrase "shoved better growth" should be replaced with more formal scientific terminology, such as "exhibited greater growth" or "supported higher growth rates."

\* Line 10: The use of "shoved dense yeast colony growth" is informal and should be rephrased (e.g., "exhibited substantial yeast colony growth").

#### B. Introduction (Lines 11-55)

\* The introduction effectively establishes the context of the study, explaining the use of yeast carrier media and the potential of sago flour.

\* Lines 20-24: The rationale for using sago flour as an alternative to rice flour is clearly presented, highlighting its local availability and potential to increase economic value.

\* Line 27: The claim about sago flour having a low glycemic index is interesting but requires a citation to support this statement.

\* The literature review could be expanded to provide more in-depth information on:

\* The specific nutritional composition of sago flour compared to rice flour.

\* The challenges and benefits of using sago flour in food fermentation.

\* Previous research on the use of sago flour in yeast cultivation or similar applications.

#### C. Materials and Methods (Lines 56-96)

\* The materials and methods section is generally well-described, providing sufficient detail for replication.

\* Line 69: It would be helpful to provide the full name and location of Food and Nutrition Culture Collection (FNCC).

\* Line 85: Specify the method used to determine the number of cells in ml of medium (e.g., hemocytometer counting).

\* Line 86: The starter cell density should include units (e.g., cells/mL).

\* Line 88: The experimental design is clearly outlined, with a good description of the different media compositions.

\* Line 89: The parameters measured are clearly defined.

#### D. Results and Discussion (Lines 97-189)

\* The results are presented clearly, with appropriate references to figures.

\* Figure 2 (Line 107-110): The figure is mentioned in the text, and helps visualize the growth of *S. cerevisiae* on different media.

\* Figure 3 (Lines 111-118): It would be beneficial to add error bars to Figure 3 to show the variability in the data.

\* Figure 4 (Lines 119-129): The discussion of the drying process and the effect of fiber in sago flour is relevant.

\* Figure 5 (Lines 134-139): The description of the color differences in the media is clear.

\* Figure 6 (Lines 134-145): The morphological observation of yeast cells is a valuable addition.

\* Figure 7 (Lines 140-145): It is essential to explain the unit of measurement for yeast cell density (CFU/gram) in the figure caption or the text.

#### \* Discussion:

\* The discussion effectively interprets the results and relates them to existing literature.

\* Line 157: The citation "(Dabija et al., 2017)" should be included in the references.

\* Lines 158-160: The explanation of the weight changes in the medium is clear.

\* Lines 161-169: The description of yeast cell morphology is detailed and supported by a reference to SEM studies.

\* Lines 170-174: The discussion of the impact of sago flour composition on yeast growth is insightful.

\* The discussion could be strengthened by:

\* A more detailed comparison of the nutritional composition of rice flour and sago flour and how these differences might affect yeast growth.

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

\* Further exploration of the "optimal conditions" mentioned in line 174. What specific factors (e.g., pH, temperature, aeration) might be optimized to improve yeast growth on sago flour-based media?

\* Addressing the limitations of the study (e.g., sample size, specific sago flour variety used).

### E. Conclusion (Lines 184-187)

\* The conclusion accurately summarizes the main findings of the study.

\* Line 185 and 186: To maintain consistency, use the same phrasing as in the results section (e.g., "media with 50 grams of sago flour substitution").

### F. Acknowledgments (Lines 188-189)

\* The acknowledgment is appropriate.

### G. References (Lines 190-266)

\* The reference list appears to be comprehensive.

\* Ensure all references are formatted consistently and accurately.

\* Double-check for any missing references mentioned in the text.

## III. Recommendations for Revision

\* Refine Language: Replace informal language with more appropriate scientific terminology (e.g., "shoved" to "exhibited").

\* Provide Additional Citations: Support claims with appropriate citations, especially for the low glycemic index of sago flour (line 27) and any factual information.

\* Enhance Literature Review: Expand the introduction to include a more in-depth review of relevant literature.

\* Clarify Methodology: Provide additional details on specific methods, such as cell counting and starter cell density units.

\* Improve Data Presentation: Add error bars to Figure 3 to represent data variability and explain the units in Figure 7.

\* Strengthen Discussion: Provide a more detailed comparative analysis of rice flour and sago flour, discuss optimal growth conditions, and address study limitations.

\* Ensure Consistency: Maintain consistent phrasing throughout the manuscript.

\* Review References: Carefully review and format the reference list.

By addressing these points, the authors can significantly improve the clarity, rigor, and impact of their manuscript.