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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

I have revised my manuscript entitled “Wound healing activities of different extracts of Centella asiatica in incision and burn wound models: an experimental animal study” in light of the reviewers’ comments as follows:

REFEREE 1:
SYG1: replace with “We hereby reported”
SYG2: report histopathological findings instead
SYG3&4: replace the sentence with “Analysis by thin layer chromatography demonstrated that the phyto-constituents, #-sitosterol, asiatic acid, and asiaticoside and madecassocide were present in hexane, ethyl acetate and methanol extracts, respectively.”
SYG5: The reason for the need to search for new drugs for wound healing is given.
SYG6: Reference is provided.
SYG7: Sentences are rewritten without authors’ names.
SYG8: replace CA with C. asiatica
SYG9: The sentences are deleted in this part.
SYG10: Methods are sent here as suggested. At the time of first submission, METHODS came after conclusions according to Instructions to Authors.
SYG11: abbreviate the extract fractions as suggested.
SYG12: Sentences are rewritten.
SYG13: quantify this reduction of wound size in percentage by adding “.,
resulting in a significant increase (P<0.05) of 18.13 ± 2.29% in wound healing.”

SYG14: delete the phrase “smaller in size compared with those in control group” because it has already been reported in the part “degree of wound healing”.

SYG15: The whole results are now summarized and discussed in the first half of the discussion section. To quantify the observations, degree of wound healing is used in this study, as done by most of the previous studies.

SYG16: Discussion section is rewritten.

SYG17: This paragraph is rearranged and rewritten.

The METHODS is included in abstract. I also have the language in my manuscript edited by a fluent English speaking colleague.

REFEREE 2:
- C.asiatica is used throughout the manuscript after defining its full name for the first time.
- Use “residue” instead of “rubbish” as suggested.
- The concentration is 10%. Actually we add “10 g” of the extract, not “1 mg”. I do apologize for mistyping.
- In discussion section, the paper is rewritten in the first part, with emphasis on discussion about the differences of the contents of the extracts and comparing the findings with previous reports.

The changes to the manuscript are highlighted by using colored text. Reviewers’ comments and suggestions are truly appreciated.

Regards,
Dr.Juraiporn Somboonwong