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Response to the reviewers

Reviewer:Nitesh Kumar
Reviewer's report:
I found, this study is well designed and interesting. However, I found few errors in the manuscript writing
1. Line No. 74, sentence need to be modified
   Response: Thank the reviewer for this notice. We have revised the MS accordingly.
2. Typing error in line no. 19 and 166
   Response: Thank the reviewer for this notice. We have revised the MS accordingly.
3. Line No. 186, uM should be replaced by µM
   Response: Thank the reviewer for this notice. We have revised the MS accordingly.
4. Method of isolation of paeonolum should be mentioned or proper reference should be given.
   Response: Thank the reviewer for this notice. We have revised the MS accordingly.
5. Name of statistics software is missing
   Response: Thank the reviewer for this notice. We have revised the MS accordingly.
6. In figure 1, mention the concentration of paeonolum
   Response: Thank the reviewer for this notice. We have revised the MS accordingly.
7. In Figure3 and 4 which concentration of paeonolum is shown in figure. Table shows many concentrations of paeonolum.
   Response: Thank the reviewer for this notice. We have revised the MS accordingly.
Level of interest:An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English:Acceptable
Statistical review:No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.

Reviewer:Jesil Aranjani
Reviewer's report:
Major Compulsory Revisions
1. Isolation and identification of Paeonolum and its original source is not mentioned in the manuscript. A detailed description of the isolation and identification of the molecule is essential.
   Response: We have revised our manuscript accordingly by adding the following text in method section “The root bark of *Paeonia suffruticosa* belongs to Ranunculaceae. Paeonolum was isolated and purified by the State Key Laboratory of Quality Research in Chinese Medicine, Institute of Chinese Medical Sciences, University of Macau, China, according to a published method [18]. The purity of the compound was >98%.” (Page 4 Line 82)
   Response: We have revised our manuscript accordingly by adding the cell density in MTT assay and DCFH-DA assay in method section.
3. Discussion part of the article is poorly written which needs to be rewritten.
Response: We have revised our manuscript accordingly by rewriting several paragraphs in discussion.

4. Figure legends are not adequate.
Response: We have revised our manuscript accordingly.

5. Prefer to see the original images
Response: We have revised our manuscript accordingly.

Minor Essential Revisions:
1. Figure legends are not adequate.
Response: We have revised our manuscript accordingly.
2. Lot of spelling and grammatical errors.
Response: We have revised our manuscript accordingly.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Response: We have revised our manuscript accordingly.

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.