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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor,

The authors have tried to address all the comments raised by the esteemed reviewer in the point-by-point response below.

The changes made in the revised manuscript have been represented in red font while the changes that had been made in the first revision have been left in blue.

We look forward to hearing back from you soon,

Regards

Riti Sharan

Reviewer's report:

The sub-lethality or the injury to the test bacterial representatives are not well addressed by experiments. It remains a qualitative analyses and that is on their viability. Viable but not culturable (injured!) bacteria were not taken into consideration. Dead-live cell assay would have been a good addition.

The author thanks the reviewer for the positive comment. The authors have now added text in context of viable-but-non-culturable bacteria in introduction (lines 98-104) and in the discussion (lines 259-270) with additional references.

I could not avoid to raise the following querrries to strengthen the quality of the article:

1. Line no 145:NB is not a suitable medium to CLAIM such comment; it cannot differentiate the test bacteria and contaminants. No selective media used; major methodological problems remain in enumeration procedure....

2. 148: A work flow chart is warrented following US-EPA methods

Thank you for the comment. The text has now been modified at various places (the changes are in red font) and the authors hope the changes made are comprehensive for a better understanding.

3. 156: not good writing; a drop=20 ul; 3drops=60ul.........(difficult to understand, make it simple: a drop of 60 ul was used (equivalent to ----cfu/ml).
The text had now been inserted on page 8, lines 167-168.

4. 171: How equivalence was drawn (16.7 cfu/ml)?

The authors thank the reviewer for pointing this out. The explanation has now been added on Page 9, lines 184-186.

5. 364: Figs- there are three marker (square, two rounds)-no explanation in the legends given for the third?/????????????????????/?

The figure legends have now been expanded for a comprehensive understanding on page 20. The authors apologize for the difficulty caused in understanding the legends before.

6.374: Line drawings did not reach to zero or near to zero. It appears, no observation was cared after 12h or so. Therefor, claims like NO GROWTH –not acceptable - explain........

The authors have now explained in detail the representation and interpretation of the graphs on page 9, lines 187-194.

The manuscript needs further improvement before acceptance for publication.

The above points have all tried to provide improvement to all of the points raised. The authors hope this has improved the manuscript for a better understanding.