

## Dear Reviewer 1

**Thank you very much indeed for your kind comments and the time spent on the revision of our manuscript. Here below we present a point-by-point list of the responses to the obtained comments, in red.**

This article is somewhat innovative and important for controlling fungal infections. However, there are still some small problems that need to be further modified in the text.

1. Line 59, The horizontal lines in "geraniol" should be deleted.

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript.

2. Line 65, "(C<sub>10</sub>H<sub>18</sub>O)" should be followed with a comma.

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript.

3. Line 77, "LINexhibit" should be two words.

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript.

4. Line 92, More comma in the "investigated.. In".

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript.

5. Line 144, More comma in the "standard. . Next"

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript.

6. Line 127, Fungi were grown at 35 °C, but in the 2.2.1 section, the temperature was 37°C. Why?

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript.

The fungi in our research were incubated at 37°C. The temperature was standardized in all sections.

7. Line 168, "incubated" in the "the microplates were incubated at 37°C" should be "placed".

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript.

8. Line 173, "To evaluate if LIN bind to the fungal membrane sterols" is not smooth.

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript.

We hope that the following sentence better shows the purpose of the study: „Another study was the evaluation of LIN binding to fungal membrane sterols using the exogenous ergosterol assay."

9. Line 230, The expression mode of "0.5 mg/mL to 8 mg/mL" is consistent with the previous, it should change to "0.5-8 mg/mL".

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript.

10. In the Methods section, the calculation methods of MIC<sub>50</sub>, MIC<sub>90</sub>, MFC<sub>50</sub>, and MFC<sub>90</sub> are not introduced.

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript.

MIC<sub>50</sub> and MIC<sub>90</sub> values as well as the range of values obtained are important parameters for reporting results of susceptibility testing when multiple isolates of a given species are tested. The MIC<sub>50</sub> represents the MIC value at which ≥50% of the isolates in a test population are inhibited; it is equivalent to the median MIC value. Given  $n$  test strains and the values  $y_1, y_2 \dots y_n$  representing a graded series of MICs starting with the lowest value, the MIC<sub>50</sub> is the value at position  $n \times 0.5$ , as long as  $n$  is an even number of test strains. If  $n$  is an odd number of test strains, the value at position  $(n+1) \times 0.5$  represents the MIC<sub>50</sub> value. The MIC<sub>90</sub> represents the MIC value at which ≥90% of the strains within a test population are inhibited; the 90th percentile. The MIC<sub>90</sub> is calculated accordingly, using  $n \times 0.9$ . If the resulting number is an integer, this number represents the MIC<sub>90</sub>; if the resulting number is not an integer, the next integer following the respective value represents the MIC<sub>90</sub>. A similar calculation applies to the MFC<sub>50</sub> and MFC<sub>90</sub> values [Schwarz et al., 2010].

[Schwarz, S.; Silley P.; Simjee, S.; Woodford, N.; van Duijkeren, E.; Johnson, A.P.; Gastra, W. Editorial: assessing the antimicrobial susceptibility of bacteria obtained from animals. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* **2010**, 65 (4), 601-604. doi: 10.1093/jac/dkq037]

11. In Table 2 and Figure 1, the number of isolates did not correspond with the data in the material section.

Response: Thank you for this comment. In Table 2 and Figure 1, the number of isolates corresponds to the data in the material section. We hope to show below that these numbers match.

## 2. Materials and Methods:

### 2.1.2. Microorganisms

„Additionally, 40 clinical isolates of *Candida* spp.: *C. albicans* (**20 isolates**) and non-*albicans Candida* spp. (NAC) (**20 isolates**: *C. glabrata*, *C. tropicalis*, *C. parapsilosis*, *C. famata*, *C. krusei*, *C. lusitaniae*, and *C. guilliermondii*) were used.”

## 3. Results

### 3.1. The Antifungal Activity Assessment of LIN

Table 2:

Number of clinical isolates of *C. albicans*:

*C. albicans* = 8 (40%) isolates + 9 (45%) isolates + 3 (15%) isolates = **20 (100%) isolates**

Number of clinical isolates of NAC:

NAC = 2 (10%) isolates + 11 (55%) isolates + 7 (35%) isolates = **20 (100%) isolates**

Figure 1:

- ✓ at MIC value: *C. albicans* = 2 (10%) isolates + 3 (15%) isolates + 7 (35%) isolates + 5 (25%) isolates + 3 (15%) isolates + 0 (0%) isolates = **20 (100%) isolates**
- ✓ at MFC value: *C. albicans* = 0 (0%) isolates + 3 (15%) isolates + 4 (20%) isolates + 5 (25%) isolates + 7 (35%) isolates + 1 (5%) isolates = **20 (100%) isolates**
- ✓ at MIC value: NAC = 1 (5%) isolates + 5 (25%) isolates + 6 (30%) isolates + 6 (30%) isolates + 2 (10%) isolates + 0 (0%) isolates = **20 (100%) isolates**
- ✓ at MFC value: NAC = 0 (0%) isolates + 2 (10%) isolates + 5 (25%) isolates + 4 (20%) isolates + 7 (35%) isolates + 2 (10%) isolates = **20 (100%) isolates**

11. Line 260, "protectstheir" should be divided into two words.

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript.

12. Line 264 and 275, Figure 1 should be Figure 2.

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript.

13. Line 308-309 and line 315-316, 3.91, 7.81, 0.98 and 7.81 should add µg/mL.

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript.

14. In figure 3, (a) and (b) is different from the text description.

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript.

16. There are many kinds of units in the article, such as mM, M, mg/mL, µg/ mL, µl/ mL. The whole text should be unified.

Response: Thank you for this comment. We fully agree with this suggestion. According to EUCAST guidelines: „Results are recorded as ... the Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC), expressed in mg/L or µg/mL." Therefore, we used the following units: mg/mL and µg/mL for high and low concentration values, respectively. Our results show the antifungal activity of LIN in mg/mL and the studied antifungals in µg/mL. For high MIC and MFC values, it is more convenient to use the mg/mL unit. The result is then more readable. However, some authors reported the antifungal activity of LIN (both MIC and/or MFC values) also in various types of units, such as µM, mM, M, µl/mL, % (v/v). We presented their data in our discussion. Therefore, we would like to request that the original MIC and MFC units of LIN of these researchers be retained.

17. Line 410, "0.5 to 1% shuld be "0.5% to 1%". line 414, "0.12–0.25%" should be "0.12%–0.25%".

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript.

18. Line 416-440, Font is different from that found elsewhere.

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript.

19. Line 504, "(" in "(of" should be deleted.

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript.

20. Line 534, More comma in the "indifference..".

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript.

21. Some of the literature is not followed by a DOI. Different presentation formats are also used for the DOI.

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript. The DOI were added and corrected. Only 4 references below do not have DOI, so websites are included:

Pandurang, M.S.; Devrao, H.S.; Ganpatrao, B.R.; Mohan, K.S. Lemongrass oil components synergistically activates fluconazole against biofilm forms of *Candida albicans*. *J. Bacteriol.*

*Mycol.* **2018**, 5 (3), 1069. <https://austinpublishinggroup.com/bacteriology/fulltext/bacteriology-v5-id1069.php>

European Committee for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing (EUCAST). Determination of minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) of antibacterial agents by broth dilution. EUCAST discussion document E. Dis 5.1 *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* **2003**, 9, 1–7. [https://clinicalmicrobiologyandinfection.com/article/S1198-743X\(14\)64063-5/pdf](https://clinicalmicrobiologyandinfection.com/article/S1198-743X(14)64063-5/pdf)

CLSI. *Reference Method for Broth Dilution Antifungal Susceptibility Testing of Yeasts*; M27-S4; Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute: Wayne, PA, USA, **2017**. [https://clsi.org/media/1897/m27ed4\\_sample.pdf](https://clsi.org/media/1897/m27ed4_sample.pdf)

Carrillo-Muñoz, A.J.; Giusiano, G.; Ezkurra, P.A.; Quindós, G. Antifungal agents: mode of action in yeast cells. *Rev. Esp. Quimioter.* **2006**, 19 (2), 130–129. [www.seq.es/seq/0214-3429/19/2/130.pdf](http://www.seq.es/seq/0214-3429/19/2/130.pdf)

22. In some places, the language still needs to be reprocessed. Simplify the language even further.

Response: Thank you for this comment. The correction was introduced to the manuscript. We hope that the language has been properly processed and simplified more.

On behalf of the Authors,  
Anna Biernasiuk