Author's response to reviews

Title: Evaluation of anxiolytic activity of compound Valeriana jatamansi Jones in mice

Authors:

Jie-Shu You (youying@163.com)
Min Peng (zjgjy@yahoo.com.cn)
Jin-Li Shi (shil@vip.sina.com)
Hu-Zhan Zheng (bjoyou@126.com)
Yong Liu (ylju0126@yahoo.com.cn)
Bao-Sheng Zhao (zhaobs1973@163.com)
Jian-You Guo (guojianyou@126.com)

Version: 4 Date: 20 August 2012

Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Prof. Carmela S. Quidoles

Thank you very much for your email of July 27, 2012, with regard to our manuscript (Ms. No. 1742498216705347) together with the comments from the reviewers. According to the comments, we have revised the relevant part in the original manuscript. We also responded point by point to each reviewer’s and editorial comment as listed below, and the revised portion is marked with underline. I hope this will make it more acceptable for publication.

Thank you and all the reviewers for the kind advice.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Jian-You Guo

Key Laboratory of Mental Health
Institute of Psychology, Chinese Academy of Sciences Beijing 100101, P.R .China
Tel.: +86 10 64852787
Fax: +86 10 64832070
E-mail address: guojy@psych.ac.cn

Here below are our responses to the reviewers’ comments.

Reviewer: 1
Comments to the Author
The revised manuscript submitted by You et al. includes significant changes and clarifications that address the issues that the reviewers raised. I support publication of the
manuscript after careful consideration of the diction which has been improved but at times still misses correct spelling and grammar (there are a number of sentences where the word "been" has been used more than once). This is a minor but essential revision before publication.

**Answer:** We have carefully proofread the manuscript. As the reviewer suggested, there were two sentences where the word “been” has been used more than once and these all have been corrected in the revised manuscript (The sentence in the Abstract was deleted and another in Background: page 3, line 22)

Reviewer: 2
Comments to the Author
Authors explained that they used compound of 4 different herbal drugs including VJ not as an extract. However in methods, author explained that they used ethanol extracts. It is not clear that they use powder or extract. If they use extract, 4.8g/kg is too high dose.

**Answer:** Three doses tested (1.2, 2.4 and 4.8 g/kg) are related to the original formulation but not to the extract, which are equal to 233.5, 467 and 934 mg/kg extract of compound *Valeriana jatamansi* Jones. These have been added in the revised manuscript (page 12 lines 14-20).

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited.

**Answer:** We have carefully proofread the manuscript. The sections of Abstract, Background, Discussion and Conclusions were all edited extensively in the revised manuscript (marked with underline).

Field Editor
Comments to the Author:

1. **Question:**
   1. Abstract

Please ensure that your abstract is in accordance to the guidelines for authors &lt;http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/ifora/abstracts&gt;. Please make sure it is identical to the one in the submission system.
Answer: Yes, the Abstract of the revised manuscript is in accordance to the guidelines for authors.

2. Structure
Please check the instructions for authors on the journal website to ensure that your manuscript follows the correct structure for this journal and article type.
Answer: Yes, the revised manuscript follows the correct structure for this journal and article type.