**Editor’s Comment:**

1. It is necessary that at the end of the introductory part, the authors highlight this study in comparison with already implemented and published research (or their contribution to scientific discipline, or technical or social practice).
2. The experimental conditions need to be described in much more detail including:
   * Where was the cassava grown and whether there were pieces, and how were the pieces of cassava from which the samples were taken (i.e., for example, whether the fruit was healthy, whether the pieces were approximately the same size - since all this affects the amount of water retained in the fruit).
   * What type of oven was used for drying? Did the air circulate in the oven or not?
   * How many identical pieces were dried at the same temperature due to repeated measurements and how were the data statistically processed?
   * How were pieces of the same characteristics (dimensions) dried: individually or in larger quantities at once? How were they distributed on the mat: randomly or evenly (if larger quantity is used)?
   * How were the pieces placed/positioned on the mat during oven drying (i.e. which surface was in contact with the mat)? Can the position/orientation of the 2 x 1.5 x 1 cm samples affect the result? Was the mat perforated or not, i.e. did warm air have access to the samples also from the bottom? ...
3. Overall, the connection between the weight (weight change) of the product during drying is not entirely clear, since the authors do not state either the basic weight of the individual cassava pieces, or the method of weighing them during oven drying (they state measurement with a micrometer), or the duration of weighing, or thickness measurement.
4. Why is the unit for X(t): water content of the product in equation (5) the same as for drying rate in equation (4)?
5. It is necessary that the axes in the graphs in Figures 2-4 show the marks where the given values are located, because this makes the values confusing with regard the values mentioned in the text.
6. The graphs in Figure 2 seem to be almost identical, ... and if the authors talk about the times for the end of drying of 620, 540, 520 and 460 minutes for samples of 2 x 1.5 x 1 cm, or 640, 600, 540 and 480 minutes for samples of dimensions 2 x 1.5 x

1.5 cm, ... when looking at the graphs, it seems that the times do not correspond to their statements.

* It seems as if the value for X/X0 at 40 deg. C was not measured, it is not visible for X/X0 = 0.
* At temperatures of 50 and 60 deg. C, it seems that zero values of the X/X0 ratio are both reached approximately at 600 min, while in the graph in Fig. 2a these values should be 540 and 520 min, ...
* It is also necessary for the authors to use the same "sampling" on the *y*-axis in the graphs in Fig. 2a and 2b and the same image display size.

1. What is "V" on the y-axis in the graph in Fig. 3? The designation „V“ is not explained anywhere in the text, the unit is the same as e.g. for X(t) in chapter 2.2.1 ...
2. From a formal point of view, the article needs to be improved in connection with the following shortcomings:

* writing variables - the text should use the same formatting for writing variables (ittalic) as in equations (e.g. m0, ms, m(t), t, ...);
* there should be a space between the number and the unit;
* the difference "d" in formulas is not written in italics, but e.g. d*X*;
* writing the unit kilogram is kg, not Kg.
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