Review no. 2:

Comment 1: "…In my opinion, this is not true, since according to the Plants origin section they were collected at the time of cultivation, so how is possible to study harvest time?.…"

Authors' response: Authors agree with the opinion of the Reviewer. It was a mistake of authors. The plant materials were collected in time of harvest in 2013, only one time. So of course it is not possible to measure the effect of harvest time on the bioactive compounds content in the raspberry leaves. According to the main aim of the experiment, the authors examined only the effect of farm management and cultivars on the bioactive compounds content and antioxidant status of the raspberry leaves. This now has been corrected in the text of the manuscript.

Comment 2: "…Moreover, for this purpose more sampling at different periods should be performed. The authors should rewrite the aims of this study…"

Authors' response: Authors agree with the opinion of the Reviewer. The aim of the study was rewritten accordingly.

Comment 3: "…A special attention should be given to formation, since sometimes the authors used mL other ml, sometimes the references appear [19] another 19, sometimes appear figures other fig…"

Authors' response: Authors agree with the opinion of the Reviewer. All technical errors and formatting issues were carefully checked and corrected in the manuscript text.

Comment 4: "…All abbreviations should be described when mentioned for the first time…"

Authors' response: Authors agree with the Reviewer's suggestion. In each place where the abbreviation appeared for the first time its full name was as well given.

Comment 5: "…Abstract is too confusing, the authors should rewritte and this section should contain the main purpose of the study, results and main conclusions, not the information related to sampling…"

Authors' response: The abstract was rewritten according to the Reviewer's suggestions.

Comment 6: "…Discussion: The authors should add references to support the information in lines 205-209…"

Authors' response: Following the Reviewer's suggestion relevant references have been added to support the given information.

Comment 7: "…Table 1….cultivation in (2013-2014)? According abstract and material and methods section, the experimental was carried out in 2013.

Authors' response: Authors agree with the Reviewer's suggestion. It was an error. It has been corrected in the title of Table 1.

Comment 8: "…Tables 2 to 4. The information in point 1 should be added in title of tables, instead of notes…"

Authors' response: Following the Reviewer's suggestion the information in point 1 of the footnotes was added to the titles of both tables.

Comment 9: "…Point 2. The authors must use either uppercase or lowercase letters, not both types at the same time, is too confuse. In my opinion, the authors should present the total content in a table, and the individual content in another…"

Authors' response: Following the Reviewer's suggestion authors used only lowercase letters for homogenous groups identification. And data from Tables 2 and 3 were separated. The effect of cultivation system (organic and conventional) on the concentrations of polyphenols and carotenoids is presented in Tables 2 and 4. The data for individual cultivars are now presented in Tables 3 and 5. This data presentation system is more clear to the Reader.

Comment 10: "…Figure 5. The y axis should range from 0 to 100…"

Authors' response: Following the Reviewer's suggestion the range of Y axis was changed from to 0-100.

Comment 11: "…Figures 6 and 7. In my opinion, the authors have few samples to make corrections. Moreover, the axes must be adjusted to the data, as example the x axis should range from 40 to 80 or 100, as appropriate…"

Authors' response: Following the Reviewer's concern about too low number of samples included in the correlation analysis performed separately for each cultivar, authors decided to remove Figure 7 from the manuscript. The main aim of the correlation analysis was to check if there was an association between the antioxidant activity and the total polyphenols content in the samples. This has been shown for all organic and conventional samples (Figure 6), based n=20 for organic system and n=24 for conventional system.