

Response to comments

Manuscript: 1954415 "Optimization of airflow for biodrying of gardening wastes in reactors"

Reviewer #1:

Answer to comments presented by Reviewer #1: The authors would like to thank for the opportunity to improve the quality of the article. Reviewer #1 presented several important recommendations and suggestions that helped to remove errors and improve the level of the article, comments and responses are shown in the following table:

Corrections/comments	Response
1. Add information in the Abstract for an introduction to the topic.	Information was added in the Abstract as an introduction to the topic (see text colored in yellow)
2. What is the purpose of the first paragraph in Abstract?	The Abstract was changed to a single paragraph, as indicated in the authors' guide
3. "50 ° C" - Remove spaces. Please apply throughout the work.	Spaces were removed as requested
4. I suggest to add more keywords	In the keywords we added "three-dimensional modeling"
5. I suggest to not include Figures in the Introduction.	Figures 1 and 2 were changed to Materials and Methods
6. At the end of the Introduction, please indicate the aim of the article.	Now the aim of the article is presented at the end of Introduction.
7. " Materials and Methods "- The chapter is not prepared properly. Please divide it into smaller elements and describe it precisely.	Materials and Methods was divided into smaller elements.
8. Please provide more information about organic solid waste and biodrying.	Information about organic solid waste and biodrying was provided in the first paragraph of Introduction.

Different fragments of the text were added and/or modified to address the comments of both reviewers and improve the document (Text highlighted in yellow).