



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_40565
Title of the Manuscript:	Various brewing methods for green coffee Coffea arabica and Coffea canephora (robusta) with effect on Polyphenolic contents and Effect of Brewing time on Phytochemicals, Total Flavonoid and Phenolic Content on Green and Roasted coffee Arabica, Robusta and Monsooned Malabar.
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>)

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	Dear Colleague, Kindly check the following comments that may help: 1. Kindly use larger font for writing. 2. In sample collection, who identified and authenticated the species? 3. Statistical evaluation part is written in different font. 4. In phytochemical screening part, why you screened 1min. and 16 min. only?? 5. In discussion part tables and figures should be in order of smallest to largest but here they are mixed up. 6. For tubes photos, write under each photo which test it represent. 7. In phytochemical screening tables, a and p stands for what? And why pp?? 8. You may just add phytochemical screening results in tables without these too much photos. 9. Table style is not as in author guidelines. 10. In references part, kindly abbreviate used journal names.	• The identification and authentication of species is now written in the paper under the part 'Collection of Sample'. • The font for statistical evaluation part has been corrected. • The minimum brewing time (1min) and the maximum brewing time (16 min) were screened phytochemically just to detect the presence of secondary metabolites, as if time is too short all flavors will not dissolve and if too long it may dissolve undesirable components and later quantitative analysis was done for other selected times as well. • The tables are now aligned according to author guidelines. • The abbreviations used are now written next to conclusion and before references. • Journal names are abbreviated.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		