

EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT’S on revised paper (if any)	Authors’ response to editor’s comments
<p>1. Unfortunately, I cannot agree with the reviewers on the scientific value of the work.</p> <p>The authors study what has already been studied.</p> <p>The authors cite previous studies and contentedly conclude that their results are consistent with previously published ones.</p> <p>The paper contains very poor experimental material. The methodology is written in very general terms. One reviewer wrote that - I am full of admiration where he found this information on the methods used ? In the abstract they gave the information that they used standard methods - but maybe they would list these standard methods ?</p> <p>The authors write “A standardized formulation of mulberry leaf herbal tea was developed.” What did this optimization consist of - was it just the quantitative relationship of mulberry leaves to additives or something else?</p> <p>Surprisingly, there are the same proportions for all three additives. Maybe they are , but what are the criteria ?</p> <p>The authors write that “its blend was developed after testing various combinations to ensure an optimal balance of taste and health benefits” - what criteria were taken into account - this is not a popular science article but a scientific one, and any statement should be supported by the research presented.</p> <p>Discussing with the authors - they write that regardless of the type of additive the physical and chemical properties of the blends are the same - then what is the optimization about? Do additives affect the health properties of blends or are they just an additive that makes consumption more convenient?</p> <p>In my opinion, the authors are not very precise in providing data. They write that “The total protein content of the herbal mulberry tea powder flavour blend was 23g.” - and it should be 23g/100g of powder (as in Table 3(why don't the authors give this figure in % when others do?).</p> <p>In Table 4 on tannin and protein content, the authors give these quantities in mg (substance)/g of leaves - why in different units than in Table 3?</p> <p>To sum up - the paper, in my opinion, does not bring anything new (maybe the authors will convince me what new things they discovered in their broadcasts in relation to those previously published?). The research is standard, the procedures described very inaccurately, the conclusions very school boyish.</p>	<p>I have corrected</p>