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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor,

First of all, thanks to all reviewers very much for their criticisms. All the questions are answered one by one and the suitable changes are performed in the article as you suggested. You can make the necessary adjustments.

Title: Peroxisome Proliferators-Activated Alpha Agonist Treatment Improves Hepatic Damage in Rats with Obstructive Jaundice: An Experimental Study

C: criticism
A: author’s reply

**R: revision provided**

**Reviewer 1**

The manuscript has been greatly improved, and I have only minor comments:

*C: p7, 23rd paragraph: "between BDL and BDL-vehicle"; the term control is confusing with the sham controls
R: revision provided*

*C: pp 7,8,9,10: The term “PPARα induced or induction” is inappropriate. It would be better to mention PPARα activated or activation. Induction relates to the PPARα gene expression, which is not concern in the present study.
R: revision provided*

*C: p7: total in bold in the first paragraph of the result section.
R: revision provided*

*C:p8: It would have been interesting that the authors further discussed their observation that “fenofibrate has regenerative effects”.
A:This subject was mentioned in the last sentences of p9.

*C: p9: "PPARα agonists activate..."
R: revision provided*

*C:p10: "obstructive jaundice affect..."
R: revision provided*
Reviewer 2

C: “Statistics” section is ambiguous. They talk about post hoc test about equality of variances. Actually this has to be performed before one can use ANOVA. It is not clear in what context “Bonferroni’s test” and “Duncan’s test” are being used. These two tests are “multiple comparisons” tests. They don’t have to do anything with “equality or unequality of variances” as quoted in this section.
A: All statistical of the study was re-evaluated.
R: Revised Provided.

C: Sample size is small in each group, ANOVA is to be used very carefully. Actually the assumptions of ANOVA (normality and homogeneity of variances among four groups) may not be valid here. In that case, non-parametric test (Kruskal-Wallis test) would be more appropriate.
A: Revised Provided.
R: Revised Provided.

C: It is not clear whether ANOVA is performed on all four groups or three groups (BDL groups).
R: Revised Provided.

C: Once hypothesis is rejected in ANOVA test, multiple comparison (pair wise comparison) have to be performed. This is not done here.
R: Revised Provided.

C: The most important pair wise comparison is among the two groups: (i) Sham and (ii) BDL + ferofibrate. This is not clear whether this is done here. See remark 4 also.
R: Revised Provided.

C: In my view, ultimate aim of the study should be whether the subjects recovered fully after treatment. This can be answered by pair wise comparison mentioned above in remark 5. A scant comparison between the two groups show that the two groups are significantly different, a fact contradicting the recovery of rats.
R: Revised Provided.

C: The value p < 0.001 is O.K. But wherever, they have mentioned p < 0.05, the exact p-value should be given to express the strength of “significance difference”. The above remarks should be considered before any decision is taken on the paper.
A: Exact p values in the text were given.
R: Revised Provided.