Dear Editor,

I appreciate the time you are taking to review my revised version of the newspaper article manuscript, “Plant Research to Solve Mystery of the Human Body.” After receiving the three peer reviews, I made revisions to a few grammatical errors and improved sentence structure. I had initially made the manuscript into two columns. For some reason, this mixed up the order of a few sentences, making the article confusing. After receiving feedback from my reviewers, I fixed this as well. I hope that these changes have improved my manuscript, making it eligible for publication in Microreviews in Cell and Molecular Biology. I would like to thank you again for your time in considering this manuscript.

Sincerely,

Allie Brown

**Reviewer 1:**

1. Briefly state if you found the comments of Reviewer 1 helpful or not.

The comments made by Reviewer 1 were encouraging, as many positive things were said about my manuscript. Not many negative things were said, so the review could have been more helpful if it included some negative feedback.

2. What changes did you make to your manuscript as a result of the comments of Reviewer 1?

In response to the Reviewer’s comment that the manuscript could benefit from some simplification, I attempted to condense some of the more complicated sentences, with the goal of making this manuscript more appropriate for its audience.

**Reviewer 2:**

1. Briefly state if you found the comments of Reviewer 2 helpful or not.

The comments from Reviewer 2 were encouraging, but like Reviewer 1, they would have been more helpful if more negative feedback was provided.

2. What changes did you make to your manuscript as a result of the comments of Reviewer 2?

Reviewer 2 also commented on the intricacy of the manuscript, and how my paper would benefit from simplification. As mentioned previously, I made efforts to condense and simplify my manuscript by shortening some longer sentences and providing more explanation.

**Reviewer 3:**

1. Briefly state if you found the comments of Reviewer 3 helpful or not.

Much like the other two Reviewers, Reviewer 3 did not provide much negative feedback. However, I did find their specificity in areas needing simplification to be very helpful.

2. What changes did you make to your manuscript as a result of the comments of Reviewer 3?

As I did in the response to Reviewers 1 and 2, I further simplified the manuscript, making it more enjoyable and understandable for its audience.