For research article

Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

1. Summary

Thank you very much for taking your time to review this manuscript. We also highly appreciate your carefulness, conscientious, and the broad knowledge on the relevant research fields, since you have given us a number of beneficial suggestions. Those comments are very valuable and helpful for improving the quality and readability of our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our future researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. The revised places have been marked out with the red font in the current manuscript.

2. Questions for General Evaluation	**Reviewer's Evaluation**	**Response and Revisions**
Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references?	Can be improved	
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	Yes	
Is the research design appropriate?	Yes	Please find the detailed responses below and corrections highlighted in the re-submitted files.
Are the methods adequately described?	Must be improved	
Are the results clearly presented?	Can be improved	
Are the conclusions supported by the results?	Can be improved	

3. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Comments 1: The sensory analysis section in the materials and methods must be re-written as it is somewhat confusing. The SCA cupping protocol is typically used for the evaluation of the coffee's quality on a 100-point scale. What the researchers did looks more like a descriptive analysis (the rating of the intensity of select attributes). And cupping is not ususally done in clear glasses... Please provide a detailed description of the actual evaluation protocols, the training of the judges, how many replicates, measures of their performance (how well did they discriminate among the coffees, were they reproducible, assuming there were replicate tastings of the coffees, and how good was their alignment - did they rate the coffees the same way? Analysis of variance of their ratings would provide that information). A panel of 6 judges is very small...

Response 1: Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have

re-written the sensory analysis section in the materials and methods. This experiment only refers to the experimental operation of the SCA cupping protocol, the sensory vocabulary selected and its intensities score were referred to the World Coffee Research Sensory Lexicon. All referees had extensive experience and were trained in the cupping process, a detailed description of the actual evaluation protocols have been revised in lines 175-190. In addition, all six judges are Q-grader certified, making sensory results are more consistent and reliable. The judges' high level of professionalism can reduce deviation in the experimental results. Therefore, the panel of 6 judges with Q-grader is proper.

"Following the methodology of the Specialty Coffee Association (SCA), a trained team of 6 members, who were certified as Arabica Q-Grader by the Coffee Quality Institute (CQI), conducted the sensory evaluation in the sensory analysis room. Two sessions (2 h each) were conducted to familiarize the panel with the sensory vocabulary selected, and its definition and intensities (World Coffee Research, 2017). All referees had extensive experience and were trained in the cupping process. They had provided informed consent for the attributes of the test sample. All samples were served at room temperature (20°C ±3°C) and randomly evaluated in triplicate. A trained member sipped each sample and rated the odor intensity perceived retronasally. Then, the members could take a second sip to rate the taste and mouthfeel attributes. Before sipping different samples, they had to gargle with warm water to minimize the carry-over effect. A list of specific descriptors and constants was selected and used for the sensory analysis. Flavor attributes included were as follows: floral, fruity, nutty, spices, caramel, astringency, flavor, sweetness, sourness, bitterness, body, aftertaste, and overall intensity. The intensity of these flavor attributes was determined using a 0- to 15-point scale with 0.5 increments (0 = none; 15 = extremely intense) [23]."

Comments 2: Please rephrase "... softer taste" in the abstract as it was not one of the attributes evaluated?

Response 2: Thank you for pointing this out. "Softer taste" is a comprehensive evaluation, which refers to the taste of UHP cold brew coffee is less sharp and intense than the control group.

Comments 3: Include the cold brew research of the Ohio State (i.e., Peterson, Simmons) and UC Davis (i.e., Batali et al., Foods, 2022) groups, as they detail differences in sensory attributes between cold brew and hot brew, in your introduction (and possibly discussion).

Response 3: Thank you for your suggestion. we have revised in Line 46-47 and added the bibliographic reference.

"Cold brew coffee is often described as sweeter or less acidic than hot brew coffee[3]."

4. Response to Comments on the Quality of English Language

Point 1: Reasonably good, but please proof read one more time.

Response 1: We have carefully revised the manuscript according to your comments, and further polished the revised manuscript. The certificate of English-language editing service is as follows:

https://www.mjeditor.com

EDITORIAL CERTIFICATE

This document certifies that the manuscript listed below was edited for grammar,punctuation,spelling,and overall style by one or more expert native English speaking editors with a PhD degree.

Manuscript information

ID：MJ35086

Editing date：02/10/2023

Title : Evaluation of physicochemical characteristics and sensory properties of cold brew coffees by using ultra-high pressure under different extraction conditions.

Author(s) :Shiyu Chen , Ying Xiao, Wenxiao Tang，Feng Jiang， Jing Zhu， Yiming Zhou, Lin Ye， Ling Yu， Junli Miao.

Language writing before editing: ☐Very poor ☐Poor ☑Fair ☐Good ☐Very good ☐Excellent

Recommendation after language editing
☑Submitting to target journal directly
☐Submitting to target journal after minor revision
☐Re-editing required after major revision
☐Not suitable for publication

Certificate by

Sophiya. K

Editor in Chief
MJ Language Editing Services,Shenzhen,China

Disclaimer:Our service does not involve authenticity review or ethical review on the data(including images)presented in the manuscript.Neither the research content nor the author's intentions were altered in any way during the editing process.Documents receiving this certification should be English-ready for publication.The authors have the option to accept or reject our suggestions and changes in the edited document.However,we do not bear responsibility for revisions made to the document after our editing.If the manuscript is suspected of plagiarism,please contact the authors in time.

MJ Language Editing Services
Diwang Building, No. 5002 Shennan Road, Luohu District, Shenzhen, China
Tel:+086 0755 25100506