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Author's response to reviews:

Dera Editor,
We have carried out the corrections you suggested to us.

1. In the Abstract Methods section, change "The plant extract as prepared..." to "The plant extract was prepared...". done
2. In the Abstract Results section, change "P. Aurantiacum" to "P. aurantiacum". done
3. In the Abstract Results section, change "L-ascobic" to "L-ascorbic". done
4. In the second last paragraph of the Introduction, change "plants extracts" to "plant extracts". done
5. In the first paragraph of the Results and Discussion, change "formally" to "formerly". done
6. In the second paragraph of the Results and Discussion, change "kwon" to "known". done
7. In the last paragraph of the Results and Discussion, change "P. Aurantiacum" to "P. aurantiacum". done

Another minor query I have was that the authors have not explained why they used two different extracting solvents for the two plant species (ethyl acetate and methanol, described in section 2.2). If they can add in a sentence explaining why this was done that would help to clarify the methods a little more.

The two solvents were selected based on their extraction yields from preliminary extractions studies.

Also, the positive controls could be mentioned in section 2.4.3.
Ciprofloxacin for bacteria, nystatin for yeast and griseofulvin for dermatophytes were used as positives controls.