Article title: **Interlayer adhesion of coating system in the analog and digital printing technologies formed on lightweight wood-based honeycomb furniture panels with discreetly located strenghtening blocks**

Reviewed: **29. 7. 2024**

1. On the page 2 in line 67: "… types of radiators [7,11]. Do express also the moisture content which is of great importance in these cases.
2. On the page 2 in line 78: "…(W/cm2)…" It should be written (W/cm^2).
3. On the page 3 in line 98: "… literature studies …" Literature citation missing upon the authors were referring with "literature studies".
4. On the page 3 in line 107: "For the study used a lightweight cellular board …" Redefine the sentence, because it is unclear, what did the authors tried to explain.
5. On the page 4 in line 138: "…of 40 m/min" The dot on the end of the sentence is missing.
6. On the page 5 in line 147: "…Figure 5 …" The page layout. The Figure 5 is supposed to be on the page 4 and the same refers to the Table 2, which is supposed to be on page 6.
7. On the page 5 in line 164: "Table 1 …" 95.3 ± 3, 97.6 ± 3, etc. should be written without the space between the ±, i.e. 95.3±3, … and the same goes for all the expressed numbers in the table.
8. On the page 7 in line 172: "After that, …" After what does the THAT refers to? Not clear.
9. On the page 7 in line 184: "… 60 seconds …" Only 60 s, as it is written in the line 186 (10 s).
10. On the page 8 in line 214: "The resulting systems were of high quality, with no …" Redefine the sentence, because it is unclear, what did the authors tried to explain.
11. On the page 9 in line 235: "Table 4 …" Standard deviation should be written on only 1 decimal place and not on 2, since the mean value, min and max are expressed on 1 decimal place accuracy.
12. On the page 10 in line 240: "…printing creation, …" It can only be written as printouts. Printing creations does not exist as a professional term in printing science.
13. On the page 10 in line 247: "…higher contact angle, lower values (p.10, l.251), no icrease was obtained (p.10, l.259), at the highest energy (p.12, l.284), significant increase (p.12, l.284–285), the contact angle was highest at maximum does for both (p.12, l.287–288), a clear influence of the radiation (p.14, l.299–300), The highest surface free energy was (p.14, l.302), at the lowest energy (p.14, l.303), to the highest radiation does (p.14, l.305), exhibited the lowest γs value (p.14, l.305), significantly lower values compared (p.14, l.307), Greater variation (p.14, l.308–309), The highest (p.15, l.327)." In the presented results and comments, not only the comparison in high/low, etc. is sufficient. All the arguments should be expressed also with the numbers. That is why the measurements are usually performed, so that we overcome the argumentation, higher/lower, bigger/smaller, etc. What is significant?

14. On the page 10 in line 251: "…and properties." Porosity and the surface topography are supposed to be taken into a consideration.
15. On the page 11 in line 275: "…(LED + mercury lamps)…" Missing T [°C], RH [%] and a distance between the lamp and the substrate.
16. On the page 14 in line 316: "…in the table." Missing number 6.
17. On the page 15 in line 333: "…In Table 7 summarized…" In Table 7 **are** summarized …
18. On the page 19 in line 393: "…35mJ/m2…" 35mJ/m^2
19. On the page 19 on the end: "…Missing a conclusion on the sustainability, i.e. how does the end products influence on the sustainability of the product, since it is cured under the LED lamps?

With kind regards