Dear Reviewer,

Thank you very much for the suggestions. We have revised the manuscript as suggested. Below are our itemized responses to the assistant editor's comments on our revised manuscript entitled, “Combinations of lemongrass and star anise essential oils and their main constituent: synergistic housefly repellency and safety against non-target organisms” Manuscript: ID: insects-2855137”. We thank you, the reviewers, for making our paper more readable and useful for readers. If you need us to do anything further, please let us know immediately. Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Mayura Soonwera
Professor, School of Agricultural Technology, King Mongkut’s Institute of Technology Ladkrabang (KMITL), Ladkrabang, Bangkok 10520, Thailand.

Comments from Author's Reply to the Review Report (Reviewer 3)	Our response to the comment
1. The authors' responses to my questions are good as long as they incorporate the clarifications into the new version of the manuscript. There are a few remaining items that need to be clarified: On line 266, it should be stated that an SI > 1 is safer than DEET, which is different than saying it is safe or benign. My original comment was that DEET was presumed to be safe, which authors say is not the case. This makes it even more important to clarify and clearly say that SI is a relative measure compared to DEET, and that an SI > 1 simply means the substance is relatively safer compared to DEET.	1.Those clarifying responses have been incorporated in the final manuscript. Regarding the definition of SI, you are right. We thank you. Now, it has been written so in Lines 266-268 and in the notes of Figs. 5 and 6.
2. The count of fly landings is still unclear in lines 200-202. You now say "The number of landings for at most 5 minutes after the end of each period 200 were counted..." Why "at most 5 minutes"? It sounds very arbitrary, and counts for varying amounts of time up to 5 minutes will produce different results. Clarify or omit these data, as they sound quite unreliable.	2. ‘The number of landings for at most 5 minutes after the end of each period was counted’ is featured in the protocol for repellency bioassay (Thai Industrial Standards Institute, Ministry of Industry [26]). We have clarified this in the final manuscript.
3. My original question for line 240 was how an aqueous concentration of 10,000 ppm can be equated to the concentration tested in cages. Is it the concentration of the solution applied to filter paper in cages that is 10,000 ppm? If so a simple clarification would be good. Assuming these changes and clarifications are made, I think the manuscript should move on to final review by editors.	3. Thank you very much for your kind suggestion. We are sorry for the mistake. The concentration of the solution applied to filter paper is 2 mg/cm^3 (2,000 ppm) following Thai Industrial Standards Institute, Ministry of Industry [26]. The concentration of the non-target species was 10,000 ppm following Moungthipmalai *et al*. [19]. This message has been clarified in the final manuscript in Lines 257-258.