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Dear Sir,

SUBMISSION OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

I wish to re-submit our revised manuscript titled “Immunomodulatory effects of Stachytarpheta cayennensis leaf extract and its synergistic effect with artemesunate”. The authors sincerely appreciate the editor’s and the reviewers’ efforts towards making the manuscript better. We therefore, present our sincere comments to the following issues raised by the reviewers.

Reviewer: Edwin Omeje

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Under Abstract, ‘100 mg/kg’ has been corrected to ‘100 µg/ml’. It was a typing error.

2. Under background, the word ‘becoming’ has been deleted.

3. Page 3 line 16; the word ‘with’ has been replaced.

4. Page 6, under protocol for antigen, the exact ‘volume of sterile normal saline’ used in the washings has been stated.

5. Page 9, the correct symbols have been inserted.

6. Under the section, Extraction of the Plant materials, a brief description of how we prepared solution of the extract was added.

7. Under discussion, the use of DTHR as if it means same as cellular-mediated response has been corrected.

8. We have critically assessed the two figures and maintain that both figures be retained, for in-depth understanding of the study.
Reviewer: Charles Okoli

1. Major compulsory revision: The authors have extensively and painstakingly read through the entire Manuscript especially the discussion section again, both the language structure and grammar have greatly been revised and appropriate corrections made. Furthermore, a colleague/lecturer with a good command of English Language also reviewed the language structure of the manuscript, since it was not possible to get the services of a native speaker. We therefore, hope that the manuscript at this stage has met the high standard grammatical requirements of the Journal.

2. Minor essential revision:

a. Under Discussion, page 14, ‘implied’ has been corrected to ‘implies’.

b. Table 1; the authors still believe that this table is vital to the manuscript for sharper presentation of results.

c. Table 2; the data on the DTH (%) column have been corrected and have never been subjected to any multiple comparisons, it’s a typing error.

d. Table 4; the note at the end of table on the level of significance has been removed since none of the figures was significant.

Finally, the authors wish to sincerely appreciate the efforts, time and concerns of the reviewers and editorial crew towards making the manuscript a master piece.

Warmest regards

Theophine Okoye, PhD.