Dear Editor;

Thank you so much to you and the reviewers for your valuable comments on our manuscript. The manuscript has revised in accordance with reviewers' comments. The article was checked in detail. Writing mistakes in the article, impairment of expression and corrections requested by the referees were made. The lists of changes or rebuttals against each point are appended below.

REVIEW A

1. The english language must be corrected.

The language was corrected.

2. NMR data:
- All signals of aromatic protons, which are well separated, should be
listed separately (compounds 3a-c). I had the same comment in the first
version.
- There is no signal at 1.15 ppm in the 1H NMR spectrum of 3b, as is given
in the Experimental Section.
-  Compound 3c, signal at 2.68 ppm should not be triplet.
- Signal at 1.84 ppm for 5a should be at 1.18 ppm (there is no signal at
1.84 ppm).

We have checked in the Experimental Section and the necessary corrections were made. You should look manuscript.

3. Thionyl chloride is still not mentioned in the Experimental part,
synthesis of compound 4.

It was corrected.

4. IR data: correct the number 292 for compound 5a.

It was corrected.

5. Table 1: Why are doses for investigated compounds expressed as mg/mL and
those for standards as mg?

We have checked Table 1 and correspoinding in maintext and the necessary corrections were made. You should look manuscript.

6. What is S. aeureous? (p. 14)

It was corrected.

7. Discussion about antimicrobial activity is poor. A simple listing of
activities, given in Table 1, is a bit boring for a reader. Try to discuss
the results in a more systematic way.

It was revised. You should look manuscript.

8. The SAR section:
- "amide" instead of "(R)-aminoalcohols" for 3a-c
- "substituted thiourea" instead of "thiourea-(R)-aminoalcohols

It was corrected.

REVIEW B

**1. My request:** All new compounds must be completely characterized. In the case of this manuscript, mass spectra should be recorded and corresponding data provided.

We added mass spectra in our manuscript.

**2.** **My request:** All multiplets should be given in the range of chemical shifts. In the submitted version that is not the case, i.e. some multiplets are properly written and some not.

We checked datas for all compounds in experimental part. And experimental part was again written and completely revised.

**3.** My request: All MIC values must be expressed in the same mode. Since ranges of activities are in µg/mL all MIC values should be expressed in the same manner (concentration could not be expressed in µL!!).

All concentrations were corrected as in same values. We preserved µg/mL im maintext.