



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	2014_EJMP_11250
Title of the Manuscript:	Stability of Active Constituents of Hops (<i>Humulus lupulus</i>) Strobiles and their Ethanolic Extracts during Storage
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Language of the manuscript is okay. Design of the experiment, evaluation of the data and presentation is well.	Thank you.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	On table one whole strobiles amount of alpha and beta acid was decreased in first year but the increased even over the initial amount why? Reason of this should be discussed.	The reason this may have occurred is that composition of the hops strobiles from different plants may contain slightly different amounts of constituents. When taking samples, after two year period, dried strobiles from different plants may have been taken and caused the increase. Since this increase was not observed in ground samples, we strongly suspect that the difference is due to the lot taken for analysis. The reason was added to the manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		