Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

Summary

The authors studied the "Chemical analysis and biological potential of cotton lavender ethanolic extract (Santolina chamaecyparissus L., Asteraceae)". Their approach is interesting but it has flaws that make this version unacceptable for publication. While I have no objection against publishing the data, I have some issues that need addressing:

Thank you very much for taking the time to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the corresponding revisions. All corrections are highlighted yellow in the re-submitted files.

Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Comments 1: Statistical methods in results are needed. Information about statistical methods obtained in the experiments must be provided and detailed in methods section.
Response 1: Corrected.

Comments 2: In results, chemical analysis of plant extract needs to be checked by qualitative methods using HLPC/DAD (Authors do not explain how plant compounds were identified).
Response 2: The corresponding details are now provided within the manuscript.

Comments 3: I am concerned about the poorly elements in the discussion; authors must be provided a good debate for results interpretation. A few points:

Point 1: L.30: Keywords should be in alphabetic order. Also, keywords serve to widen the opportunity to be retrieved from a database. To put words that already are into title and abstracts makes KW not useful. Please choose terms that are neither in the title nor in abstract.
Response 1: Thank you for this suggestion. We arranged the keywords in alphabetical order and added new ones: *in silico* and phenolic compounds.

Point 2: Ls.34-35: Revise this sentence to eliminate rewordiness.
Response 2: Done.

Point 3: Ls.53-65: Revise this sentence to eliminate rewordiness.
Response 3: The requested corrections have been accepted, the text has been revised.

Point 4: L.65: Also, a hypothesis in needed.
Response 4: Thank you for this suggestion. We added a hypothesis.

Point 5: Ls.82-102: How do you identify the compounds? Did you do a qualitative analysis?
Response 5: The corresponding details are now provided within the manuscript.

Point 6: L.102: Define "d.e."
Response 6: d.e. is an abbreviation for dry extract, which is stated in section 2.2. "The results were expressed as milligrams of gallic acid equivalents per gram of dry extract (mg GAE/g d.e.)" and "The results were expressed as milligrams of quercetin equivalents per gram of dry extract (mg QE/ g d.e.)" as in the legend of table 1.

Point 7: Ls.137-139: What statistical methods do I use to analyze the data from each experiment?
Response 7: The details regarding statistical data processing are now added to M&M section.

Point 8: Ls.172-178: The IC50 values should be estimated by probit analysis.
Response 8: We must disagree with the reviewer since probit analysis is applied to binomial response variables (https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.acc.2019.01.006), whereas in our study concentration dependent effect (expressed in percentages and measured on continuous scale) is not of binomial nature, nor discrete. Therefore, linear regression was applied for determination of IC50 values, while the details are now presented in M&M section.

Point 9: This information should be in results section (in annex) or delete.
Response 9: We do not agree that this part should go in the annex or delete, because this is a comprehensive review of issues directly related to research. We emphasized this in the hypothesis.