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Author’s response to reviews:

1st February 2019

Dr. Simone Brogi,

Thank you for the very helpful reviewers’ comments on our manuscript. We have carefully modified the manuscript to fully address all comments. Please find below our point to point reply to the comments of reviewers. We hope that these changes meet both yours and the reviewer’s expectations. Please do not hesitate to contact us for further clarifications.

Thank you in advance for your kind consideration.

Sincerely Yours,

Kamelia Saremi,

(Corresponding Author)
Dr. Neil Henney

Reviewer #1

Comment # 1
The manuscript language and writing is in much better shape, but there remain a (smaller) number of spelling and grammar problems which do still detract from the flow of the work. The abstract in particular needs some attention.
Reply:
Thank you for your comment. The language is polished by a Professor who graduated from USA.

Comment # 2
I previously suggested you should include the actual p values, rather than stating greater or smaller than 0.05. This gives no indication of the confidence or extent of the significance, and I would always encourage the actual p-values to be reported for the reader to interpret the data (especially if you aren't able to provide CIs).
Reply:
Thank you for your helpful comment. We rechecked and recalculated the all p-values carefully and reevaluated the actual P values with SPSS version 24 again and inserted the wright values in the related figures. However, there is a small difference between the recalculated values and the previous one; we made sure that the final results have not been affected by the new P values.

Comment # 3
I previously said "please check you have shown the correct SEM bars on figures 2 and 3 as these look remarkably similar across all data values shown", and you responded to say this was revised in the MS. The error bars look exactly the same, so it is difficult to know what has been revised. Are the error bars correct as shown?
Reply:
It was revised in the Figures.

Dr. Marina Galvez-Peralta

Reviewer #2

Comment # 1
The experimental design still seems confusing.
Reply:
It's not clear for us your meaning in confusion of experimental design. We have made some changes in order of material and methods parts for better understanding to work process (e.g: the experimental design should be started by MTT and FRAP assays for confirming non toxicity and antioxidant effects of the compound, respectively).

Comment # 2
P values are not shown (just p <0.05, but which raw value)?
Reply:
Thank you for your helpful comments. We rechecked the all p values carefully and re-evaluated the
actual P values with “SPSS version 24” again and inserted the right values in the related figures. However, there is a small difference between the recalculated values and the previous one; we made sure that the final results have not been affected by the new P values.

Comment # 3
The lab results on the first figure, what are the limits of detection for each assay (some values are 1.00 +/- 0.00). It is unclear if the difference is not present or it is not detectable.
Reply:
Thank you for your sharp comment. We rechecked and recalculated the all values carefully which has been mentioned and the right results have been inserted in the related table.

Comment # 4
Although the authors added a paragraph regarding MTT assay, it is lacking clarification of how that can be used for measurement of wound healing.
Reply:
Thank you for your helpful comment. We should note here that the aim of doing MTT assay on the fibroblast cells was not to investigate the effect of the studied compound on the wound healing process at all. In fact, as suggested by previous studies, the MTT should be done before the main experiments with a novel compound to find out that the new synthetic compound is toxic or not on human cells. It means with the results of MTT assay, the maximum safe dose which is not toxic for human can be detected.

Comment # 5
Error bars on the first graphs are still very similar to each other.
Reply:
It has been revised accordingly on the first graphs.