


between the H&E and NF sections, would have the same density of neurons. In brainstem and spinal cord regions, rabies antigen positive neurons were numerous (mostly 3 or 4+). This was in contrast with cytochrome c positive neurons in the same region (0 or 1+). We then had the conclusion that many of the rabies positive neurons were actually cytochrome c negative.

2. The paper would greatly benefit from the presentation of figures showing immunostained sections obtained from representative regions of the CNS. Figures of rabies positive-, cytochrome c positive- neurons and TUNEL staining were included.

3. Instead of the subjective plus/minus scoring of stained section shown tables 1 and 2, a morphometric analysis (e.g., cell counts/mm2 plus statistical analysis) would be more appropriate to support the conclusions drawn in this paper. We did not perform a morphometric analysis. Scale measurements of 0 - 4 were based on the followings:
   0- no antigen positive neuron in all fields
   1- 1 - 25 % antigen positive neuron(s) in the whole section
   2- 26 - 50% antigen positive neurons in the whole section.
   3- 51 - 75% antigen positive neurons in the whole section.
   4- 76 - 100 % antigen positive neurons in the whole section.
Although we realized that this measurement might not be of highest accuracy, the results obtained were striking in terms of density of cytochrome c and rabies antigen positive neurons in brainstem and spinal cord, thus, should be sufficient to draw the conclusion.

All inserted contents were underlined in the revised manuscript.
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