The manuscript addresses an interesting topic and contains useful analytical data. However, several points should be clarified or revised before the manuscript can be considered for publication.

1. **Title** – The term "Physicochemical Drivers" appears too strong for the present study design. The analyses identify associations between physicochemical parameters and radionuclide concentrations, but do not establish that these parameters are causal drivers. Please consider replacing "Drivers" with "Associations" or similar wording.
2. **Abstract** – Please revise the statement that significant regional differences were observed for ^90Sr. Only a very small second-stage subset was analyzed for this radionuclide, and the corresponding statistical evidence should be interpreted cautiously. The Abstract should reflect the exploratory nature of these comparisons.
3. **Introduction/Objectives** – Please clarify the novelty of the present study in relation to your previous publication on ^40K and ^137Cs transfer during cheese production. It should also be stated whether the samples/data used in the present study are entirely independent from those previously published.
4. **Section 2 – Study design** – The design does not allow the effects of geographical origin and cheese technology to be separated because milk from Central Bosnia was used for cottage cheese, whereas milk from the Livno region was used for Livno cheese. Please acknowledge this limitation clearly and avoid attributing differences between cheeses exclusively to either region or processing technology.
5. **Section 2.2.2 – ^90Sr determination** – Please report more clearly the exact number of samples selected from each region and cheese type and indicate which milk and cheese samples were paired. Table 6 shows only 3 vs. 2 milk samples and 2 vs. 3 cheese samples for the two production systems, respectively.
6. **Section 2.3 – Processing factors** – Please check the calculation and dimensional interpretation of Pf, Pe and Fr. Milk activity is reported in Bq/L, whereas cheese activity is reported in Bq/kg, although the resulting factors are described as dimensionless. Please explain the conversion used or revise the calculations accordingly.
7. **Section 2.4 – Statistical analysis** – The inferential analysis of ^90Sr requires revision because of the very small sample size. Please report the result of the exact permutation test mentioned in the Methods and distinguish it from the t-test result. The ^90Sr comparisons should be presented as exploratory unless supported by the exact test. Pearson correlations based on n = 5 should also be described as exploratory.
8. **Section 3.2 – ^90Sr results** – Please reconsider the statements that ^90Sr differed significantly between the two milk and cheese groups. The reported p-values should be checked against the exact permutation analysis and revised if necessary.
9. **Section 3.3 – ^90Sr retention** – The reported retention values of 94.8% and 97.6% should be presented as estimates. They were calculated from a small and not fully paired subset together with general milk-to-cheese yield values rather than batch-specific yields. This limitation should be stated when interpreting these results.

10. **Table 10** – Please recheck all calculations. For Livno cheese and ^90Sr, the reported value of 9.06 Bq/kg does not appear consistent with the stated Pe and Fr values; using the values provided in the manuscript gives approximately 9.86. The unit used for milk should also be checked because milk activity is otherwise reported in Bq/L.
11. **Discussion** – Please distinguish more clearly between effects associated with geographical origin and those associated with cheese technology. Because the two factors are confounded in the present design, statements attributing radionuclide distribution simultaneously to processing technology and regional exposure should be moderated.
12. **Discussion – radiological safety** – Please clarify that the maximum levels from Council Regulation (Euratom) 2016/52 refer to nuclear or radiological emergency conditions. Therefore, the comparison demonstrates that the measured activities were far below these emergency regulatory levels, but does not by itself constitute a complete radiological risk assessment.
13. **Conclusions** – Please revise the conclusions in line with the study design and the limited ^90Sr dataset. The regional and technological effects should not be presented as independently demonstrated, and the ^90Sr findings should be described as preliminary or exploratory. The recommendation for a future fully crossed design is appropriate and should be retained.