To Reviewer 3

Dear Reviewer,

We would like to thank for valuable comments and suggestions. They will definitely help improve the quality of the manuscript. All of them have been taken into consideration. Please find enclosed point by point answers to these comments:

Reviewer 3:

- **Lines 68-70 and 89-90 repeats the same information.**
  
  **Answer:** We fully agree with the Reviewer, so the same information was removed from lines 89-90 in Section 2.

- **Lines 139-140: do not put in different lines value and units (50 ºC)**
  
  **Answer:** The value and unit are in the same line.

- **Figure 2: The y scale should start at zero, the inner legend of the graphs should be improved.**
  
  **Answer:** In both graphs in Figure 2 y scale was corrected and now is started at zero. The inner legend of the graphs were improved according to the Reviewer suggestion.

- **Table 2: Verify the number of significant digits in the equations of the calibration curves.**
  
  **Answer:** According to the Reviewer’s suggestion the number of the significant digits in the equations was verified and corrected.

- **Line 193: Don’t separate the value and its SD on two different lines.**
  
  **Answer:** The value and SD are now in the same lines in this case and in the whole manuscript.

- **Personally I prefer the SD to be expressed in % and as relative SD, RSD.**
Answer: We have decided to present the SD values in this style because it is recommended in Vocabulary of Metrology. However, we fully agree with the Reviewer that both forms of the SD presentation are correct. If the expression of SD as relative SD, RSD will be crucial for publication we will modify the SD values into the RSD ones.

- The Sochaczew treatment plant should be better described by indicating the size of the various treatments and the equivalent number of inhabitants for which it is planned.

Answer: The missing information was added to the Section 3.2.

- After absorption of the compounds by the plants, they become contaminated with the studied compounds and their metabolites. What solution do the authors foresee for contaminated plants? From the perspective of the circular economy in the EU this solution must be planned.

Answer: We are fully agree with the Reviewer that from the perspective of the circular economy in the EU the solution for contaminated plants must be planned. Fortunately, many scientists are working on this solution. One of the option is production of biochar which could be used - for example - as a sorbent. This process involves pyrolysis of contaminated material (here plants) at very high temperature (up to 700 °C). We have also published paper concerning on biochar titled Valuable polar moieties on cereal-derived biochars, in: Colloids and Surfaces A-Physicochemical and Engineering Aspects, vol. 561, 2019, ss. 275-282, DOI:10.1016/j.colsurfa.2018.11.008.

- Table A2 - The CAS number must be indicated for each compound.

Answer: Now, the CAS number for each target compound is included in Table A2 in Appendix A.

We hope that our explanations will be satisfactory for you and the revised manuscript could be accepted for publication in Molecules.

Yours sincerely,

Jolanta Kumirska