For research article

Response to Reviewer 2 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?	Yes	
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?	Yes	
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: What was used to cleanse the palate and minimize the carry-over effect?

Response 1: Thank you very much for your suggestion. The warm water was used to cleanse the palate and minimize the carry-over effect. We have added this detail description in Lines 184-185.

"Before sipping different samples, they had to gargle with warm water to minimize the carry-over effect."

Comments 2: Considering that these are "nerve drinks" and was informed consent obtained from the participants?

Response 2: Thank you very much for your suggestion. Yes, the participants were informed. We have added this detail description in Lines 180-181.

"They had provided informed consent for the attributes of the test sample."

Comments 3: Did the samples have significantly different sensory attribute scores

compared to the control? You can indicate in the caption which attributes are significantly different in according post hoc analysis.

Response 3: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We introduced an ANOVA analysis and significance analysis for the results of sensory evaluation, Table 4 and 5 are supplemented. The tables can more clearly show the significant differences of various attributes between different samples.

Table 4. Sensory evaluation of UHP-assisted cold brew coffee under different pressures

Extraction conditions		Fruity	Nutty	Sourness	Sweetness	Caramelly	Bitterness	Aftertaste	Floral
Pressure /(MPa) 20min	100	3.25±0.56^{b}	4.30±0.60^{c}	4.20±0.42^{c}	5.20±0.61^{a}	4.75±0.50^{d}	6.00±0.66^{ab}	4.50±0.38^{c}	2.00±0.50^{c}
	200	3.88±0.58^{ab}	5.15±0.51^{bc}	4.88±0.56^{bc}	5.00±0.45^{ab}	5.00±0.47^{d}	5.88±0.41^{ab}	5.00±0.65^{bc}	2.25±0.57^{bc}
	300	3.88±0.64^{ab}	5.63±0.60^{ab}	5.50±0.48^{ab}	4.70±0.55^{ab}	5.38±0.47^{cd}	5.38±0.51^{b}	5.63±0.60^{bc}	2.88±0.50^{abc}
	400	4.25±0.51^{ab}	5.75±0.62^{ab}	5.68±0.60^{ab}	4.00±0.50^{bc}	6.25±0.64^{bc}	5.25±0.63^{b}	5.75±0.59^{ab}	3.00±0.50^{abc}
	500	4.50±0.49^{a}	6.00±0.65^{ab}	5.85±0.66^{ab}	3.50±0.52^{c}	6.63±0.62^{ab}	5.20±0.48^{b}	6.13±0.66^{ab}	3.50±0.48^{a}
Control group	0.1MPa 12h	4.80±0.62^{a}	6.63±0.36^{a}	6.50±0.50^{a}	4.90±0.67^{ab}	7.50±0.45^{a}	6.75±0.53^{a}	6.85±0.57^{a}	3.25±0.53^{ab}

* Values are expressed as mean ± standard deviation. The superscript letters (a, b, c and d) represent statistically significant differences between extraction conditions, as determined through one-way analysis of variance ($P < 0.05$). Control group: conventional cold brew (0.1 MPa, 12 h, 5°C)

Table 5. Sensory evaluation of UHP-assisted cold brew coffee at different times

Extraction conditions		Fruity	Nutty	Sourness	Sweetness	Caramelly	Bitterness	Aftertaste	Floral
Holding time /(min) 300MPa	10	3.13±0.41^{b}	5.25±0.39^{b}	5.00±0.52^{b}	4.00±0.46^{b}	5.13±0.47^{c}	4.25±0.68^{c}	5.20±0.68^{c}	2.00±0.50^{c}
	15	3.25±0.62^{b}	5.63±0.62^{ab}	5.00±0.49^{b}	4.30±0.53^{ab}	5.25±0.52^{c}	4.85±0.75^{bc}	5.50±0.50^{bc}	2.20±0.50^{bc}
	20	3.88±0.50^{ab}	5.63±0.58^{ab}	5.50±0.48^{ab}	4.70±0.72^{ab}	5.38±0.81^{c}	5.38±0.59^{bc}	5.63±0.66^{bc}	2.88±0.57^{abc}
	25	3.88±0.68^{ab}	6.13±0.38^{ab}	5.75±0.53^{ab}	5.13±0.36^{ab}	5.88±0.45^{bc}	5.50±0.52^{abc}	6.13±0.62^{abc}	3.13±0.26^{ab}
	30	4.50±0.50^{a}	6.38±0.60^{a}	6.25±0.56^{a}	5.25±0.50^{a}	6.50±0.50^{ab}	5.88±0.72^{ab}	6.50±0.37^{ab}	3.50±0.50^{a}
Control group	0.1MPa 12h	4.80±0.62^{a}	6.63±0.36^{a}	6.50±0.50^{a}	4.90±0.67^{ab}	7.50±0.45^{a}	6.75±0.53^{a}	6.85±0.57^{a}	3.25±0.53^{a}

* Values are expressed as mean ± standard deviation. The superscript letters (a, b and c) represent statistically significant differences between extraction conditions, as determined through one-way analysis of variance ($P < 0.05$). Control group: conventional cold brew (0.1 MPa, 12 h, 5°C)

Comments 4: This statement "UHP method has the advantages of a short extraction time, high extraction rate, and low energy consumption "requires a bibliographic reference

Response 4: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We have added a bibliographic reference in Line 84.

"12. Hu, W.; Guo, T.; Jiang, W. J.; Dong, G. L.; Chen, D. W.; Yang, S. L.; Li, H. R. Effects of ultrahigh pressure extraction on yield and antioxidant activity of chlorogenic acid and cynaroside extracted from flower buds of Lonicera japonica. Chinese Journal of Natural Medicines 2015, 13(6), 445–453."

5. Additional clarifications

For 10 pages of tables, we have simplified them, and the complete tables are placed in supplementary materials. Thank you very much for your suggestion.