RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

**Reviewer J:**

Thank you for your effort to rewiev our manuscript. We have corrected the manuscript according to the reviewers comments for improving it hoping that you will reconsider your decision.

Please note that all changes are marked in red letters throughout the manuscript.

**Reviewer K:**

Thank you for your time and effort to review our manuscript. Your suggestions are very valuable for improvement of the quality of our paper, and our future research as well.

We have read all your comments and agree with your suggestions for amendments. We have included them in our revised manuscript and hope that you will recommend it for publication.

Please note that all changes are marked in red letters throughout the manuscript.

These are the responses on specific points you addressed in your review:

Q: page 4 after line 118: Compare the obtained results with the results from the reference Mustafa, A.; Trevino, L.M.; Turner, C. Pressurized Hot Ethanol Extraction of Carotenoids from Carrot By-Products. Molecules 2012, 17, 1809-1818.

A: Unfortunately, I don’t have the version that was sent to you with line numbering. However, the comparison of the results from our study and Mustafa et al. study was added as suggested.

Q: A very important reference concerning the extraction of carrot (Mustafa, A.; Trevino, L.M.; Turner, C. Pressurized Hot Ethanol Extraction of Carotenoids from Carrot By-Products. Molecules 2012, 17, 1809-1818.) intentionally or unintentionally not mentioned in the MS. Only after the consideration of a reference in the Introduction and Discussion the manuscript can be accepted.

A: Thank you for the suggestion for improvement of the manuscript content. Requested reference was included in the Introduction as well as in Discussion.

**Reviewer L:**

Thank you for your effort to rewiev our manuscript and well-intentioned comments which helped us to improve the quality of our paper. We have prepared a detalied response to your review hoping that you will reconsider your decision.

Please note that all changes are marked in red letters throughout the manuscript.

Q: Improve the english language of the manuscript.

A: Native English speaking colleague has read and corrected the manuscript.

Q: The references of Response Surface Methodology should be added, as well as references up on carrot extraction yield compared to previous research. These research approach should be compared to previous one in literature.

A: References on RSM and extraction yield were added. Extensive comparison with previous research would not be possible due to page restriction for this type of publication (Short communication), which is already exceeded by these changes.

Q: Axes labelling should be done as instead X1, X2, X3, should be time, temperature, number of cycles, as more clear to observe 3D plot response surface.

A: Figures are corrected as suggested.

Q: Evaluation of the model's fitness using statistical tests as analysis of variance (ANOVA), should be presented as validation of applied optimization.

A: Thank you for the suggestion. Table with ANOVA results is given as a supplementary file.