

ResponseLetter

The paper was revised considering all points addressed by the reviewer. Changes in the text are indicated in red.

Our answers (in blue) to the reviewers' comments (in red) are given below.

Reviewer 1

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The letter is interesting

Response

We thank the Reviewer for the positive evaluation of our paper.

Reviewer 2

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear colleagues, I would not want to go into the role of the authors of the publication that you critically discuss, hoping they will find time to respond to your well-grounded criticism. I have nothing to add about the information included in your material. I only allow you to use the terms suprapharmacological, pharmacological "concentrations" more carefully. The effect as you know will depend from the dose, biological object and time of exposure.

Response

We thank the Reviewer for the positive evaluation of our paper and the suggestions. We agree with the reviewer on the issue concerning the use of the terms "suprapharmacological, pharmacological concentrations". We avoided the use of these terms.

We improved the language in many places.