



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_47247
Title of the Manuscript:	Extraction and Determination of Caffeine Concentrations in Coffee, tea and chocolate milk available in Saudi markets
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>In my opinion the UV/Vis spectrophotometer did not show sufficient selectivity because several other constituents could also absorb at the same wavelengths of UV/Vis range. For the accurate and selective quantification of caffeine should be used a method of high-performance liquid chromatography.</p> <p>The authors should present a scanning between 200-600 nm of the standard solution of caffeine and also from the samples of coffee, tea and milk.</p> <p>In the first paragraph the authors referred that HPLC coupled to mass spectrometry was previously used for the determination of the caffeine. However, as the authors did not present the title of the reference after looking for the paper the title I found that was the following: "Background-correction methods for the determination of caffeine in beverages, coffee and tea by using second-derivative ultraviolet spectrophotometry". Probably there was a mistake in the phrase or in the reference. On the other hand, there are several techniques in which was used UV/Vis spectrophotometry that are not cited in the first paragraph.</p> <p>Relatively to figure 1, how it was guaranteed the linearity with values of absorbance higher than 1 according to the Lambert-beer law?</p> <p>Regarding table 1, the range of caffeine described as present in reference 15 would be wrong because I did not find none of these values. In particular, it was missing a robust comparison with caffeine values found by other authors.</p> <p>In addition, should be revised the language (e.g. in figure 2 "caffe" should be "coffee"; "US Food and Drugs Administration" should be "US Food and Drug Administration").</p> <p>Why only in some references was presented the title of the articles?</p> <p>The Food and Drug Administration (2006) also should be presented in the references list.</p> <p>Globally which are the main advantages of the developed method in comparison with the previously published?</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<b>Optional/General</b> comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Márcio Rodrigues</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Beira Interior, Portugal</b>