Point-by-point responses to the comments of the Editor and reviewers, and a list of changes are:

Editor and Reviewer comments:

Thank you for the evaluation of our manuscript and we appreciate the reviewers' constructive criticism that helped us significantly improve the quality of our manuscript.

Please find below our point-by-point response to the comments.

Reviewer #1:

1. The title of the manuscript should not contain abbreviations and acronyms, so the full name neuraminidase inhibitors should be given.


Response: Thank you for your kind reminder. As suggested by the reviewer, the full name of neuraminidase inhibitors has been given, please refer to the title in the revised manuscript.

2. The introduction is written quite clearly, but some sentences are not clear from the point of view of the English language. For example, In 2018, baloxavir was approved for influenza A and B [10].

Response: We sincerely thank the reviewer for their valuable feedback and have revised the sentences in the manuscript where they are not clear enough. Please refer to page 2, lines 6-7.

3. The manuscript content needs to be checked by a native English speaker to improve the quality of the article.

Response: Professional English language agencies have checked. The manuscript's content. The certificate of language editing is included with this submission.



We certify that the following article

The synergistic effect of baloxavir and NAIs against influenza viruses in vitro

Guo Xiaojia

has undergone English language editing by MDPI. The text has been checked for correct use of grammar and common technical terms, and edited to a level suitable for reporting research in a scholarly journal.
MDPI uses experienced, native English speaking editors. Full details of the editing service can be found at
‣ https://www.mdpi.com/authors/english.

MDPI Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute
Basel, Switzerland
August 2024

AUTHORservices
english-81594

4. In addition, the manuscript, in particular the discussion of the results, contains some grammatical and technical errors, such as incorrect sentence hyphenation, dashes, which should be eliminated.

Response: Thank you for highlighting the grammatical and technical errors in our manuscript. We have corrected these errors in our revised manuscript. Please refer to pages 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

5. The discussion and the main conclusion need to be improved by adding the authors' assumptions about why such results were obtained, supporting their conclusions with literary references if possible.

Response: Thank you for your valuable suggestions. As suggested, we have added our assumptions and some literary references to improve the main conclusion and discussion. Please refer to page 9, lines 14-18.

6. In addition, the conclusion should contain some generalization of the results, as well as prospects for the results obtained for further application.

Response: As suggested, we added the generalization of the results to conclusion, please refer to page 9, lines 30-36.