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Author’s response to reviews:

Editor's comments:

1. Abstract: Please revise the “methods” in Abstract. The present “methods” in Abstract sounds more like the “results”.

Resp- We would like to thank the distinguished editor for providing detailed and constructive review. We have carefully revised the manuscript in view of the constructive and helpful editorial comments as outlined in the text. In addition to the comments, we included the new text and reference:

2. Methods: Please follow the Journal submission guidelines and provide a clear description of all the methodologies used in the present study.

Resp- we included all the methodologies

3. The authors mentioned in the methodology that lipid composition and malonic dialdehyde were determined in the present study. The associate editor observed that the lipid
composition result was just mentioned briefly whereby the result for malonic dialdehyde went missing. Please include the results for both TLC-lipid composition and malonic dialdehyde assay.

Resp- We fully agree and this has now been explicitly stated in the text.

4. If possible, please include results of statistical analysis in the graphs. How many replications were used in all the different assays for statistical analysis? Was each point in the graph representing mean and standard deviation? It appears that all points in the different graphs shared the same standard deviation? Please clarify.

Resp-We agree with the editor and we have fully described the analysis and included standard deviation.

5. For Figure 4, please standardise the use of number and colour. The present graph appears to be bit confusing.

Resp- We provide new homochromous graphs.

6. The authors mentioned in the Introduction that the present work aimed to isolate the fraction of native “suprol” from Stevia leaves to determine the effect of “suprol” in the process of adrenaline oxidation. However, the associate editor observed that stevia leaves (SL) was used in the reduction of potassium permanganate, nitrotetrazolium blue, coomassie brilliant blue and the oxidation of adrenaline assays instead. Please clarify.

Resp- New supportive text is included in the text.

7. The authors concluded that the oxidation of adrenaline may be a new mechanism that contributes to the antidiabetic effect of SL. However, it seems that the present methodologies used may not be enough to support the conclusion made by the authors. Please further discuss the rationale and justify the conclusion made.

Resp- New conclusion is included in the new version of the text.