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Author’s response to reviews:

RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS COMMNETS (PHAT-D-17-00126R3)

We wish to gratefully acknowledge the outstanding contributions of the Editor and Reviewers towards ensuring an improved manuscript. Please, find below the corrections we have made so far. Thank you.

1) The reporting of your statistics are not possible. Degrees of freedom can only be whole numbers. Also, p-values cannot be ranges. You also do not present your post-hoc test results with t-test values, degrees of freedom and p-values

Answer:

Authors wish to sincerely apologise for errors due to interpretation of statistics. We thought we could reduce word length by merging information and reporting their “mean values”. However, the Degrees of freedom as well as p-value numbers have been corrected throughout the manuscript.
2) Your statistical analysis are unclear. Are you doing two separate analysis with one comparing controls to therapeutic doses and another analysis comparing controls to supra-therapeutic doses or are you comparing all 6 conditions? Are you post-hoc comparisons only to control or also to the other conditions? You need to describe your statistical analyses in much greater detail.

Answer:
We used one-way ANOVA to compare our means. Also, Post-hoc test comparison was done to the controls.

3) I cannot find where you report your intra- and inter-assay CVs. Please give me the page number and line.

Answer:
We are sorry for this error of omission, intra- and inter-assay CVs are shown in RED in the manuscript.

4) The table legends are confusing. You state that *p< 0.05. What is the comparison that is significant?

Answer:
All *p< 0.05 or **p< 0.001 were considered significant and have been corrected both in Tables and Figures respectively.
5) There are times that you refer to the high doses as therapeutic doses. Ex. paragraph 3 and 4 in the results.

Answer:
We have included statements regarding “therapeutic and supra-therapeutic” appropriately in the manuscript.
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