**Response to the reviewers:**

**Reviewer B:**

*More details about the LDA method should be added by the authors. The validation methodology and the validation of the method must be added and explained. Only 13 samples were used. The number of samples is too lo to guarantee the use of chemometrics.*

Certainly our omission was not emphasized and clarified by certain segments of modelling. The initial data matrix consisted of 42 rows (4 per same sample, 3 repetitions and the average) and 815 columns (796 NIR data and 10 physicochemical parameters and 9 phenolic parameters).

Chemometric was used to reduce the column number- what was effective because the NIR data were reduced on 336 data and physicochemical parameters on 5. So we consider a data matrix of 42 rows with 355 columns appropriate input for conducted multivariate analyses (PCA, PLS and LDA). This part is added to the manuscript. Which data set was used for the LDA is explained in the manuscript – *yellow*.

The statistical methods are now further explained, and for the physico-chemical analysis common methods have been used. A description of their validation would unnecessarily burden the manuscript.

**Reviewer E:**

He hed not any comments and suggested this manuscript should be published unchanged as original scientific paper.

**Reviewer F** indicated required corrections in the article. All requests are accepted and noted red.

**NOTE FROM TECHNICAL EDITOR:**

1. TITLE PAGE SHOULD BE WITHIN A TEXT FILE: Title page is included in the main text.
2. THERE MUST BE JUST ONE SUPPL. FILE: Two suppl.file have been combined in one file.
3. DOI FORMAT IN THE REFERENCES IS NOT PROPER: The DOI format has been corrected according to the instructions for authors. Additionally, identified errors in references have been corrected.