

### **Editorial Comments:**

The authors attempted addressing issues raised by the reviewers and have therefore improved the originally submitted manuscript to some extent. Meanwhile, there still exist major flaws in the current revised version which cannot be over looked.

1. The authors did not pay critical attention to the general write-up of the manuscript. The manuscript still contains a lot of grammatical errors, including errors in spellings, spacing, punctuations, capitalization, omissions and italicization that needed to be corrected. Some words have been misused, some incomplete statements and ambiguous statements were also made.

Generally, English quality is very poor. The language in the article is not clear and mostly ambiguous. It is author's responsibility to improve the English quality. I therefore recommend that the manuscript should be thoroughly proof-read (by the authors or they could seek any other third party service) in order to meet the required standard.

2. Statistical analyses of the data was not appropriately describe and some statistical statements made by the authors were not correct. It could be discerned from the write up that, a P value less than 0.05 was regarded as an acceptable level of significance by the authors. Meanwhile, the authors made the following statements in the manuscript implying that  $P=0.05$  is significant and at the same time not significant, which can never be the case.

a. Significant antifungal activity ( $P=0.05$ ) was observed in the checkerboard assay than in the Time Kill assay.

b. In this study, *Coleus species* extracts, one of the single components used in the interaction study, showed a significantly level of activity ( $P=0.05$ )

c. However, in comparison, the Checkerboard assay showed a more significant sensitivity pattern ( $P=0.05$ ) in this study than the Time kill Assay.

d. There was no observable significant difference ( $P=0.05$ ) in the response pattern seen with the different fungal strains used in the study.

3. It was indicated by one of the reviewers that the authors need to give more explanation about the figures because the figures have many interpretations, making the result very poor. Also it was indicated that, the figures were unclear to be understood in a simple way. This statements still stands out in the current form of the manuscript. The authors could therefore look into how to use clearer figures to present the data.

### **Author's Feedback:**

1) The manuscript has been proof-read by a third party service and more corrections made.

2) The description of the statistical analysis has also been revised e.g.

In this study, *Coleus species* extracts, one of the single components used in the interaction study, showed a significantly higher level of activity ( $P=0.05$ ), with mean of 3.2581, more than the second plant (*Euphorbia abyssinica* extract) with mean of 5.460.

However, in the Combination study, the Checkerboard assay showed a more significant sensitivity pattern ( $P=0.05$ ) than the Time kill Assay.

Some of the graphs figures have also been re- presented as bar chat; figure 5,6,7and 8, for more clarification.