Response to Reviewers

Reviewer D:

1. Is the manuscript clearly and concisely written?:

 No

This remark by Reviewer D is related to remark 2, 3 and 4, so the authors gave the response in the next steps (point 3 and 4).

2. Is the length of the manuscript appropriate?:

 No

3. The separation of the information in supplementary information and in the main paper does not seem appropriate, since some aspects of the discussion raised in the supplementary information **would be better** incorporated in the main work, as is the part of the statistical analysis with the comments of the sensory part (lines 119-171 of document 7936-43453-1-SP). In my opinion it would have to make a synthesis between the two documents in order to improve the work for the future reader.

Cluster analysis (previously in the Supplementary material – lines 119-171) is incorporated into the main work (lines 207-243).

4. The explanation of materials and methods **should be** incorporated into the main work, and better explain the method of sensory analysis used.

The original scientific paper in this journal should be up to 15 typewritten pages, including figures, tables and references. The size of the tables and figures in the Results and Discussion section does not allow the authors to describe in details used material and methods.

Within the Materials and Method section, only a brief overview of the used methods is given. According to the journal's propositions, the authors used the opportunity to present in details characteristics of the raw material, the method of processing plums into spirits and the methods of analysis in the Supplementary material section. Some of the more important characteristics of plums for spirit production, as well as the literature overview of the origin and influence of important volatile components on the sensory quality of plum spirit are also presented in the Supplementary material section.

Explanations for the Buxbaum method of sensory analysis were added in the Sensory analysis section of the Supplementary Material (lines 195-198).

5. In the part of the supplementary information, regarding the distillation procedure (lines 79-88), it would have to be better explained, and indicate the range of concentrations in which the heart fraction was collected in the second distillation (indicated only average value of 60.0% v / v).

The distillation procedure is better explained, in particular with respect to the points in which the individual fractions are separated during re-distillation (lines 147-159 in the Supplementary material,)

6. Finally indicate a small mistake, in line 96 correct 1-heksanol for 1-hexanol

The name of the compound 1-heksanol in line 100 has been corrected for 1-hexanol.

Reviewer E:

1. Are the references appropriate and free of important omissions?:

 No

This remark by Reviewer E is related to remark 2, so the authors gave the response in the next step (point 2).

2. Dear Editor, Dear Authors,

It is not ethical do not quote previously published results.

Assuming that it was not intentional, I think that Editor should give opportunity to authors to insert these facts into the manuscript.

Forgotten references:

Major Volatile Components and Sensory Characteristics of Plum Brandies Produced from Plum Cultivars Developed in Cacak (Proceedings Paper)

Autori Popovic Branko Gavrilovic-Damjanovic Jelica Mitrovic Olga V

Ogasanovic Dobrivoje Nikicevic Ninoslav J Tesevic Vele V I BALKAN SYMPOSIUM ON FRUIT GROWING, (2009), vol. 825 br. , str. 575-58 Standard and Sensory Quality of Plum Brandies Produced from Top-Quality Fruits of 'Cacanska Rodna' (Proceedings Paper)

Autori Popovic Branko Paunovic Svetlana A Mitrovic Olga V Kandic Miodrag

Nikicevic Ninoslav M Tesevic Vele V

II BALKAN SYMPOSIUM ON FRUIT GROWING, (2013), vol. 981 br. , str. 755-760 Modify the introduction in accordance with these facts (line 54).

Also, improve the results and discussion with the paragraph in which Čačanska rodna brandy composition from the two previous work and present manuscript is compared. Histogram should be added in additional material. Do the same with Požegača brandy, previous paper and current ms.

Reviewer E is right in terms of omissions. In omissioned references, suitability of the plum cultivar Čačanska rodna for processing into plum spirit was given in completely different context. The authors, as suggested by Reviewer E, included these references in the manuscript (in INTRODUCTION and also in RESULTS AND DISCUSSION, and REFERENCES) and commented on them (lines 54-58, 91-92, 94, 96-97, 106-108, 123, 155, 166-167, 302-305). The authors consider that, based on the results in this manuscript, it is possible to clearly notice the similarities, differences and particular specificity of the plum spirit from the Čačanska Rodna and its parent cultivars. This is important for both processors and breeders who are working on

the creation of new plum cultivars, especially those intended for the production of plum spirit. Especially when considering that plum breeding programs in the world rarely have the goal to develop new cultivars that would be a suitable raw material for the production of plum spirit. The aim of the author was not to compare the content of certain volatile components in the obtained monovarietal pum spirits with the content in other spirit drinks or plum spirits of the same plum cultivars, reported in numerous studies. We considered that, in our work, we should exclude all variables that could affect the composition of spirit, such as year, locality and way of processing. We used the variety only as a source of variations. Therefore, only plum spirits produced from 3 cultivars from the same locality, same year of harvest and processed in the same way were compared. In this way, we wanted to compare only monovarietal plum spirits, excluding other factors of variation. Therefore, we did not include the histogram in the Supplementary material in which we would compare the monovarietal plum spirits with the results from the previous works, but we emphasized possible similarities and differences in the Results and discussion section (line 91-92, 94, 96-97, 106-108, 123, 155, 166-167).

Other corrections

1. In the Table I: names 2-Metyl-1-butanol and 3-Metyl-1-butanol have been corrected for 2 Methyl-1-butanol and 3-Methyl-1-butanol.

3. line 278: „and“ has been corrected for „и“

2. line 193 in Supplementary material: 60.0±0.3 vol.% to 45.0±0.3 vol.% have been corrected for 60.0 ± 0.3 % (v/v) and 45.0 ± 0.3 % (v/v).