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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor

Thank you for your comments and patience. We have revised the manuscript per the comments below. Please see our point-by-point responses attached here.

Sincerely,

Myungsoo Joo
Comment I

1. As your study includes the use of animals, please include an ethics statement in the Ethics approval section of your Declarations. A statement detailing compliance with relevant guidelines and/or ethical approval (including the name of the ethics committee and the reference number where appropriate) must be included in the manuscript. If a study has been granted an exemption from requiring ethics approval, this should also be detailed in the manuscript (including the name of the ethics committee that granted the exemption and the reasons for the exemption).

√Response: We stated the Ethics approval in the M&M section. But we moved the statement to the Ethics approval section of declarations in the revised manuscript.

2. While assessing your manuscript in-house, we found several instances where the text displayed similarities to text found in other previously published sources. While we understand that you may wish to express some of the same ideas contained in these publications, please be aware that we cannot condone the use of text from previously published work. We would therefore be grateful if you could reformulate the sections listed below to resolve the overlap between your manuscript and other sources. Please ensure that, where relevant, these sources are also referenced as appropriate:

   - Methods, with the following source:

√Response: Thanks for your understanding and the comments. We reformulated the manuscript according and include the reference that is our publication. It is always difficult for me to write a Materials and Materials section without overlapping our previous publication. As you know well, we mostly used similar experiments and I feel it hard not to clearly avoid similar expression in describing methods and materials used in the study.

2. At present, we do not feel that there is sufficient evidence presented in your Background section to justify the testing of eCS in an animal model of mice. We would therefore ask you to expand this section to include as much referenced evidence as possible to explain why you would expect this treatment to have an effect in this model. This evidence should come from previous in vitro or animal work. Please note that we are unable to accept traditional medical use as sufficient justification for animal studies.

√Response: Thanks for the comments. We rewrote the last two sections of introduction and added one section in discussion section. Please let us know if this revision is sufficient to meet your criteria.

3. Multi-panel figures (those with parts a, b, c, d etc.) should be submitted as a single composite file that contains all parts of the figure on a single page.
4. In the methods section please clarify where the herbs used to make the eCS were obtained from. If they were collected from the wild or cultivated, voucher specimens should be deposited in a public herbarium or other public collection providing access to deposited material. Information on the voucher specimen and who identified it must be included in the manuscript. If they were purchased, please indicate where they were purchased from.

✓Response: We corrected them.