

Thank you for your comments on my review. My review contained many examples of grammar or typo issues because that was mostly what I found to be the issue with the manuscript. However, I will be sure to not focus on these types of edits in future reviews, knowing that all manuscripts will undergo copyediting and proofreading. I apologize if the few more substantial points of my review are hard to identify among all of the grammar suggestions.

I noted in my review that while this manuscript is a bit limited by the lack of much toxicity data to undertake a risk assessment, it is still good to get this information in the published literature. I found no major issues with the methodology (given that there was little information to work with) or the conclusions, as the authors acknowledged the limitations of the evaluation in an appropriate manner. My only additional comment upon looking at the paper again is that the Introduction should be shortened. It currently has a lot of information and some of this is not directly relevant to the evaluation in the paper and can confuse the reader about the point of the paper. For example, the information about trigonelline's discovery and synthesis in lines 40-50 and Figure 1 is extraneous and can be deleted. Similarly, the function of trigonelline in plants described in lines 55-59 is also not necessary as this paper is focused on human risk assessment and not plants. I had already provided comments on removing some text to streamline the paragraph in lines 82-94, but I think that this paragraph could use even further shortening to just note which are the two most economically important species of coffee plant (since they are the focus of the risk assessment).