

In their Manuscript « foods-2076027» entitled "**Could collected chemical parameters be utilized to build soft sensors capable of predicting the provenance, vintages, and price points of New Zealand Pinot noir wines simultaneously?**" for *Foods*(journal), authors have reported somewhat original data and I think that the study is very interesting.

However, one mayor point and some minor points of criticism and questions have to be clarified:

#### **MAYOR REVISION:**

In my opinion, authors don't give good reasons or present good objectives to do this work. I don't arrive to understand at the end of my read why this work could be useful, even if I find it interesting. Lost wine labels or providing wine prices (lines 40-41) don't seem me enough good reasons. Maybe mention some aspects about legislation/laws and origin of wines, or permitted grape varieties could help. But I think this point must be really reinforced.

#### **MINOR REVISION:**

Lines 22-28: too much long sentence, it should be divided into two sentences.

Lines 61: really is the third greatest component of wines? Always? Not acids or glycerol?

Lines 77: I would replace this reference by other more recent.

Line 144 (and others...): The word "Naïve" appears not well written. This point should be corrected.

Lines 176-178: good comment! :)

Figure 1: "Predicted class" mention is not clear, it should be corrected.

Line 261: Naïve (and not Nave): typing mistake.

Figure 5b: I think it would be better include in X axe the name of predicted class (and not the codes 10-80).

Lines 333 and 339: I don't know where de "four" and "six" (bottles of) numbers come from.

This point must be clarified.

Line 444: Typing mistake: ...

Lines 415-418 and lines 427-430 should be included in Conclusions fourth section.