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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has been improved but the authors still have to respond to certain of the comments given previously.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Background
- the authors should state:
  o What is the problematic (why they are turning to honey?)
  o what others have done to solve this problematic (conventional dressings)
  o what is their contribution
  o why their contribution is important and what are the expectations

Methods
- Authors should explain why dressings were limited to tualang honey only. Why they did not compare its effectiveness in vivo with manuka honey. The argument of cost is not sufficient. Affordability comes after effectiveness, safety and easiness to use.

Minor Essential Revisions

Methods
- Why 200 ul of tualang honey represents 276.4 mg whereas 200 ul of manuka honey represents 298.2 mg? Better to say 200 ul of each type of honey without reference to weight.

Results
- The Figure is confusing and making no sense. It should stand by itself without reference to the text. I am suggesting removing it.
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