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Author's response to reviews: see over
Response to reviewers

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to revise our MS for the second time and we thank the referees once again for their valuable comments. We have addressed comments of the reviewers as shown below and hope that the MS is now in an acceptable form for publication.

Kind regards.

Ephrem Engidawork (PhD)

Referee 1

- Authors used ml instead of mL and this mistake should be corrected: we beg to differ with the referee in this respect. Both ml and mL are used as symbol for the milliliter in the SI metric system. We changed ml to mL thinking that the referee prefers mL over ml.
- In the Method section only p<0.05 was mentioned but different levels of significance were mentioned in the results section. Authors need to cite the different P-values in the method section: this view is not correct because in the method section you mention only one level of significance and that level is the maximum, above which the null hypothesis is rejected. If the p-value is below that maximum value, the null hypothesis is considered to be statistically significant. Different values such as p<0.05, p<0.01 and p<0.001 are used in the results section to show the degree of significance as significant, very significant and extremely significant, respectively.
- In Table 4, authors cannot compare 0 with 30 min and show what time “c” and ‘d” representing: well, 0 min in Table 4 refers to time before administration of the extract but 30 min had elapsed since the animals were loaded with oral glucose. We have measured both fasting (baseline) BGL as well as BGL prior to extract administration. But we used fasting BGL as 0 min BGL. The referee is right and now we have used BGL measured prior to extract administration as 0 min and comparison was made with this value. This comparison will show the reader that oral glucose loading indeed is associated with increase in BGL and to know what happens with BGL 30 min after extract administration. You do not need to specify the time points for ‘c” and ‘d”, as they show between group comparisons at each time point.
- In the test of antidiabetic activity BGL at 0 time was not measured: In this model, BGL at time 0 was measured as shown in Table 3. This has been corrected in the method section.
- Preliminary phytochemistry screening is changed to preliminary phytochemical screening. It is just an oversight and we thank the referee for spotting that.
• Appropriate Tables need to be cited in the discussion section: accommodated.
• P<0.001 in Table 3 not mentioned in the legend: accommodated.

Referee 2

• Include more specific key words: we thought of that while we were writing the MS. However, we found it very difficult to pick a specific keyword, as the study is general in nature. We have therefore attempted to reduce the redundancy by eliminating some of the key words.
• Include reference: We initially thought that the referee picked up a reference we cited in the text but missed to include in the list of references. However, we later noted that the referee is suggesting including that specific reference. When a referee suggests a specific reference to be included, it is customary to justify why it should be included. We included the reference because we found it to be appropriate.
• Discussion still long: revised.
• Conclusion not specific: revised.

Editor’s comment

• MS format prepared according to the Journal’s requirement.