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Dear Editors:

**RE:** Re-submission of revised version of manuscript (MS: 5679874201702748)

We are pleased to resubmit for publication the revised version of our manuscript. We appreciated the editors and the reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions. We have addressed each of their concerns, and believe that the revised version can meet the journal publication requirements.

Kind regards,

Alemtshay Teka
Reviewer comments and responses

Reviewer 1: (Ambrose Okem)

Reviewer's report

Title: In vitro antimicrobial activity of plants used in traditional medicine in Gurage and Silti Zones, south central Ethiopia.

Reviewer's report: Discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

RESPONSE: We greatly appreciate the reviewer’s efforts to carefully review the paper and the valuable suggestions offered.
Reviewer 2 (Patricia Combarros-Fuertes)

Reviewer's report

Title: In vitro antimicrobial activity of plants used in traditional medicine in Gurage and Silti Zones, south central Ethiopia.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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's report: Discretionary Revisions

1. Abstract

In “Conclusions”: I recommend you to put “The study revealed in vitro antibacterial activity…”

2. Results

Paragraph 1

I think that it is better to put:

“The extracts were active against C. albicans, E. faecalis and S. aureus at a concentration between 128 and 512 µg/mL. Guizotia schimperi, L. adoensis var. adoensis and P. schimperi showed activity against E. faecalis and S. aureus (MIC ranged from 128 to 512 µg/mL), whereas...“.

“Candida albicans was susceptible to G. schimperi and L. adoensis var. adoensis at highest concentrations only (MIC = 512 µg/ml). Gram-negative bacteria (E. coli and P. aeruginosa) were resistant to all ethanol extracts tested in this study.

3. Table 1

Please, standardize the format (e.g. In “No 2” in “Voucher no.” At-176)

RESPONSE: We greatly appreciate the reviewer’s efforts to carefully review the paper. The comments are well taken and texts are edited as suggested.