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Author's response to reviews
First we would like to express again our sincere gratitude to the reviewers for their prompt review and helpful comments with regards to our paper. We are respectfully re-submitting the revised manuscript “Pleurotus giganteus (Berk.) Karunarathna & K.D. Hyde: Nutritional values and in vitro neurite outgrowth activity in rat pheochromocytoma cells” (MS: 1839258160658554). The changes we have made on manuscript text are in red. Please see over the enclosed detailed explanations to the comments from editor and reviewers.

We would be happy to hear from the reviewers or further comments on our manuscript.

Yours sincerely,

Chia-Wei Phan (MSc) 
phanchiawei@gmail.com

Wei-Lun Wong (BSc)
weilun1986@gmail.com

Pamela David (PhD)
rosiepamela@um.edu.my

Murali Naidu (PhD)
murali_naidu@um.edu.my

Vikineswary Sabaratnam (PhD)
viki@um.edu.my
Detailed explanation to changes made:

**Reviewer 1**
The additional changes and works in revised version were appropriately done according to reviewer's comments.

Many thanks to the reviewer for his constructive comments.

**Reviewer 2**
This is a carefully done study and the findings are of interesting. A minor revision is as follows. Please keep one way when you describe the species name. In Background, Methods, and Results, you described the species name as *P. giganteus* from the second time of the description, but not in Discussion (you described it always as *Pleurotus giganteus* even when you described it the second time and so on).

The remark is taken into account. We have updated it according to reviewer’s suggestion.