Dear Professor:

On behalf of my co-authors, we thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript. We appreciate editors and reviewers very much for their constructive comments and suggestions on our manuscript entitled “Five new cucurbitane-type triterpenoids glycosides from the rhizomes of Hemsleya penxianensis with cytotoxic activities” (Manuscript ID: molecules-575530).

We have studied reviewer’s comments carefully and have made revisions in the paper. We have tried our best to revise our manuscript according to the comments. If the language is needed further improvement, we could continue our efforts. The main corrections in the paper and the response to the reviewer’s comments are as flowing:

**Respond to the reviewer 1’s comments:**

1. Response to comment: (In the abstract, language polishing is needed, since the authors only added information without language concerns.)
   
   Response: The abstract has been modified. We could continue our efforts if it need further improvement.

2. Response to comment: ( “triterpenoids glycosides” should be replaced by “triterpenoid glycosides”.)
   
   Response: We have revised the words in the paper.

3. Response to comment: (The last sentence of the abstract should be split into two. Rather than just telling that compound 5 was the most active one, which, by just reading the abstract, does not give any information about the compound’s structure or its activity, the effect of this compound should be highlighted, e.g. by mentioning that it showed IC\textsubscript{50} values in the single digit micromolar concentration against all cancer cells. “especially” in the end of the sentence should be deleted.)
   
   Response: The last sentence of the abstract has been split into two. The IC\textsubscript{50} values of compound 5 against three cancer cell lines have been shown in the manuscript. The word “especially” in the end of the sentence has been deleted in the abstract.

4. Response to comment: (Since the results on the cytotoxicity evaluation revealed a higher activity of the compounds to cancer cells relatively to normal ones,
with selectivity indexes comparable or higher than those of doxorubicin, rather than just mentioning “that tested compounds had moderate cytotoxic activity in human normal liver L-02 cells”, the selectivity to cancer cells should be highlighted in the abstract as well as in the results and discussion. Moreover, rather than moderate, the cytotoxicity to normal cells can be considered low.)

Response: We have modified the expression in the sentence.

**Respond to the reviewer 2’s comments:**

1. Response to comment: (The authors addressed most of the comments but they need to add only the 24 hr treatment results if possible.)

Response: We have supplemented the experiment, and added the results of cytotoxicity after 24 hr treatment according to the procedure.

Above is our reply to editors’ and reviewer’s comments.

We earnestly appreciate for Editors/Reviewer’s warm work, hoping that the corrections will meet with your approval.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

De-Li  Chen