



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_44717
Title of the Manuscript:	Change of main components and physiological functions of post-fermented green tea with reduced caffeine.
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In this article, green tea leaves were treated to remove caffeine, and then fermented with Lactobacillus plantarum. This post-fermented, reduced caffeine green tea seemed to maintain the same antioxidant activity and other properties of green tea, including adipogenesis inhibition. In general the manuscript is concise but well written, however it does not mention the statistical analyses used to evaluate significant differences between treatments. This is important because without statistics it is difficult to know if the evidence is strong. Therefore, it will be necessary to indicate all statistical analyses in the Material and Methods section, including number of replicates and sample size for each analysis. The figures should indicate significant differences (whenever they were detected) with letters or asterisks, and the P value in the figure legend.	Statistical analyses were described in the materials and methods section, and statistical information of each figure was added in the manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I do not have minor revision comments at the moment.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	