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Dear Reviewer,

Please accept our apologies as the modifications that we made were not evident in the manuscript. We have now indicated the changes made on the revised manuscript either by highlighting them in yellow. We also indicated on what line number changes were made in our responses below.

Kindly note that the manuscript was also proofread by a Faculty member who teaches English at our institution.

1. In abstract in result section please the result of study mention with numbers according to tables.

   *Numbers were added (and highlighted in yellow) in the results section of the abstract*

2. Please the mechanism of the Salvia libanotica effect mention briefly in introduction.

   *Proposed mechanisms of action were added to the introduction lines 65-68 (highlighted in yellow) based on the only previous study conducted on S. Libanotica (Perfumi et al, 1991)*


3. In methods the plant water extract preparing is incomplete. Please mention with extra details.

   *Extra details about the plant preparation were added in the methods lines 92-96 (highlighted in yellow)*

4. Method of LDL-C estimation is not correct.

   *Apologies for the mistake, LDL was calculated using the Friedwald equation (LDL = total cholesterol – HDL – (triglycerides/5)). This is now mentioned in the methods section of the revised manuscript and highlighted in yellow.*

5. Did in statistical analysis, confounding factors consider?

   *There was no need to control for confounding factors, since it is a well-controlled animal study, whereby groups were matched at baseline for all potential confounders like age, sex and weight.*
6. The mechanism of the Salvia libanotica effect on study parameters mention complete in discussion.

   Suggested mechanisms based on the study results were added in the revised manuscript discussion lines 200-205 (highlighted in yellow)

7. According to results, discussion section can be written better.

   Discussion (highlighted in yellow) was revised and rewritten to be in line with the results and aims of the study

8. In statistic analysis, Tukey–Kramer’s post hoc test was mentioned but in results and tables comparison of the two groups according to tukey test was not present.

   In the revised manuscript results section, as well as in the legends of tables and figures, we added that ANOVA and Tukey post hoc test were used to test for significance. Additions are highlighted in yellow