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Responses to the Associate Editor’s and the Reviewer’s Comments (Re: MS: 8527035085181997)

Authors: We appreciate your constructive comments and suggestions. We have considered all the comments carefully and revised our manuscript accordingly. Our responses to each comment are as follows.

Associate Editor:  
*I think the reviewer is positive and, therefore, I would accept this m/s with minor revision. Please let the authors know that they need to incorporate all of the comments of this reviewer and submit it back.*

Authors: We completely agreed with the Associate Editor and incorporated all of the comments of the reviewer 1. Please see the responses and revised manuscript.

Reviewer 1:  
*General comment*  
The reviewer is still not convincing how much impact does the chlorella have on mucosal immune function. Indeed, some previous studies showed increased infection rate along with decreased SIgA levels. It does make sense, for instance if you have insufficient antibodies against pathogen, you will have symptoms. On the other hand, if you have sufficient antibodies and you will have additional antibodies by supplement, do you think you will get additional decrease in infection rate? Indeed, absolute level of SIgA even in the control group in the manuscript is much higher than that reported in the paper form Yamauchi et al. (2011). How do you explain this?
The reviewer understands it is not easy of clarify this issue. However, the reviewer thinks this manuscript needs adequate discussion on this issue, which is lacking in the current version of the manuscript.

Authors: We agreed with the reviewer that addition of antibodies by dietary supplement to humans with sufficient antibodies may not make additional decrease of infection rate. However, it is possible that the additional antibodies to healthy humans elevate a reserve of immune function. To test this hypothesis, we are currently preparing a manuscript regarding an effect of chlorella-derived supplement on immunological depression during a training camp of competitive sport. Also, a similar intervention study in older humans with lower immune function would be of significance. We consider this study is valid as an initial step to clarify the effect of chlorella-derived supplement on mucosal immune function. This issue was included in the ‘Discussion’ section (Page 3, Lines 15-18).
Specific comments
There are still some grammatical errors in the manuscript.

Authors: According to your request, we revised our manuscript from the viewpoint of English syntax. Please see the revised manuscript.

The reviewer could not follow the meaning of the added sentences on page 3, line 15-19.

Authors: Following the reviewer’s suggestion, these sentences were revised (Page 3, Lines 15-18).

The added sentences do not make any sense to the reviewer (page 7, the last to page 8, line 7).

Authors: In agreement with the reviewer, these sentences were shortened (Page 7 Line 28-Page 8, line 4).

Authors: We would like to express our appreciation to the associate editor and the reviewers for taking the time to make suggestions for improving our manuscript.