



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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Abstract The title is too long and it is not understandable. It should be more focused. Green coffee should be written with lowercase throughout the manuscript, as well as the words phenolics, flavonoids, the name of the methods. The abstract should be rewritten with more focused on the obtained results. Material and methods It is hard to follow the research protocol. Try to write more clearly or more schematic. Results Table 1 and figure 2 present the same results. Please choose one. The results from table and figure must not be repeated in text, but their interpretation/significance should be discussed. Same goes for table 2 and figure 4. There are too many photos that are not relevant for the readers. Why were the secondary metabolites determined? I think a table gathering all the results for all tested sample in the case of secondary metabolites would be more appropriate. Figure 11 – Is the calibration curve for flavonoids? If yes, It is not necessary. Figure 12 – Is that the calibration curve for polyphenols? It has a very low regression coefficient and should be repeated. There are too many figures and tables and the results and discussions are not well structured. Conclusion Which is the purpose? To find the best parameters for brewing and obtaining an infusion rich in bioactive compounds? If yes, how ethanol can represent a good solution?	• Abstract has been re-written mentioning all the necessary details and elaborating it better. • The standardization of words has been done. • The figures and tables mesh is now sorted and tables are aligned according to author guidelines. • Unnecessary photos are removed. • Yes, the purpose is to find the best parameters for brewing and obtaining an infusion rich in flavonoids (antioxidants). • Ethanol proves to be a good solvent as in green coffee the TFC and TPC are found to be present more as compared to when brewed in water. But for roasted coffee it was absolutely opposite, as water was found to be better solvent than alcohol.
<u>mesh Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		