

The manuscript entitled “Pyrrolizidine Alkaloids in Food on the Italian Market” was well designed and with some readability and informative conclusions, however, there are several issues that need to be addressed, which make the mistakes not suitable for publication in its current form.

Results and Discussion

1. Please enhance the image quality of Figure 1 and Figure 2. Furthermore, I would like to inquire about the representation of data in Figure 2. Both "% Samples $\geq$ maximum levels" and "% PAs samples contaminated" are expressed as percentages, which is appropriate for illustrating the extent of contamination. However, I noticed that the uncontaminated samples are not presented using a percentage value. Could you provide an explanation as to why the uncontaminated samples are not depicted in percentage form?
2. In the analysis of the Honey Samples, I kindly request the authors to provide a detailed analysis of the PAs-subtype and PAs-group for the positive samples. If it is not feasible to present these results in the form of figures within the manuscript, I recommend that the authors consider uploading the relevant results as supplementary material or attachments. This would greatly enhance the readers' understanding of the data and facilitate further examination and interpretation of the findings.
3. The authors have included chromatograms for APs in only two samples within the manuscript, while for the remaining samples, they have described the positivity rate and various detected analytes. To ensure the reproducibility of the study and enable readers to examine the results in more detail, I highly recommend that the authors organize the relevant raw data and upload them as supplementary material or attachments to the system. Alternatively, it would be beneficial if the authors could provide at least one chromatogram for each sample, highlighting the specific analysis results. This would provide more meaningful information compared to including images of the samples themselves.

Material and Methods

1. The authors employed different methods for extracting homogenized honey and dried herbs, herbal infusions. It is requested to provide the references for these extraction methods.
2. Figure 7 displayed 11 peaks corresponding to PAs, and Figure 8 displayed 14 peaks corresponding to PANOs. However, the figures should exhibit 18 peaks of PAs and 17 peaks of PANOs. Can you please explain the reason for this discrepancy? If the method cannot differentiate between the two analytes, should authors continue to optimize the detection method?
3. The authors should provide individual images that include a comparison between the peak chromatograms of standard solutions and blank samples spiked with the same dose of the standard. This will better demonstrate the effectiveness of the

detection method. Alternatively, the authors can consider uploading the mentioned figure as a supplementary attachment.

4. In the second chromatogram of Figure 8, it appears that the four peak profiles representing RnNO, EnNO, ImNO-IdNO, and LyNO are not well separated. This could potentially impact the accuracy of the method. I kindly request the authors to provide an explanation for this issue. Additionally, it would be valuable if the authors could discuss any potential strategies or methods employed to mitigate the risk of detection errors in such cases.

Conclusion:

The conclusion of this study should be condensed to effectively communicate the results and significance of the research. Furthermore, it is important to note that references should not be included in the conclusion section of a typical scientific paper. Thank you for your attention to this matter