

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JSRR_118027
Title of the Manuscript:	Significance of different drying techniques on quality attributes of Ready to reconstitute coffee mix.
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

		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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Reviewer's comment</p> <p>Coffee is one of the most consumed drinks in the world and the search for new aromas and flavors through blends of different varieties of coffee beans and Arabica and Robusta. Ways of producing instant coffee were tested by testing: a) forms of coffee decoction; b) Drying methods (lyophilization, vacuum tray drying and tray drying); c) Physicochemical analysis; d) Microbial analysis; e) Rheological Analysis; f) Evaporation rate and energy consumption to remove moisture from coffee fruits.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community, but I believe that this manuscript does not meet the profile of the journal. It would be more appropriate for the authors to send it to a Journal that works in the food industry. 2. The title: Importance of different drying techniques on the quality attributes of the ready-to-reconstitute coffee blend, should be changed, as the research does not just focus on "different drying techniques". Other methods are used to alter the quality of the Ready-to-reconstitute (RTR) coffee mixture. 3. The Summary lacks more information about the results (Drying methods; Physicochemical analysis; Microbial analysis; Evaporation rate and Energy consumption). The authors do not describe the results obtained. 4. Yes, the sections and structures are appropriate in the text. 5. I believe that the Title is not appropriate and the summary lacks more information. 6. References contain 46% less than 10 years old! <p>I believe that the manuscript can be improved and the authors should insert a more appropriate Title, insert more information in the abstract and seek more up-to-date references.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Given this, my opinion is that the manuscript be REJECTED, and that it meets the evaluator's suggestions for possible publication! 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Guido Laércio Bragança Castagnino
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal da Bahia, Brasil