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Tom Rowles,

Executive Editor

BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine

23 Jun 2013

Dear, Rowles

We are pleased to know that our manuscript “Spermicidal and anti-Trichomonas vaginalis activity of Brazilian Sapindus saponaria” was invited for revision.

All the amendments suggested by reviewers have been made and justified. We are sending the revised manuscript including the suggestions and corrections (yellow color in the text) proposed by the reviewer’s. Please let me know if you need anything else from me.

We look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Professor Marcia Edilaine Lopes Consolaro/ PhD.
POINT-BY-POINT RESPONSES TO REVIEWERS

REVIEWER: Zehra Safi Oz

Reviewer's report:

Minor Revisions:

1. Is the question posed original, important and well defined?

The study is lucid and well written. The methodology of the study is clearly explained and presents original ideas. The article title is appropriate.

- Thanks for your comments.

2. Are the data sound and well controlled?

The study methods are appropriate. The data are well designed and controlled.

- Thanks for your comments.

3. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the data?

The discussion and conclusion are well balanced and supported by the data. The references seem to be enough and appropriate but some of which ought to be updated with current ones, such as ref. 20. Sander et al., Hum Fertil 1941, 6:134–7. Ref. 5. Setty et al., Indian J Exp Biol 1977, 15:231–2.

- The change was made (see text).

4. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to allow others to evaluate and/or replicate the work?

The study methods are suitable. The data are well designed and clearly described. This study is reproducible by peer in the field. The statistical analyse is appropriate.

- Thanks for your comments.
5. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the methods?

The method of the study is suitable.

- Thanks for your comments.

6. Can the writing, organization, tables and figures be improved?

The authors need to either indicate the zoom ratio or put a scale bar on the Figure 1 so that the readers can visualize real size of the picture.

- The zoom ratio was included (see figure legend).

7. When revisions are requested.

Minor revisions are needed. Healthy male donors’ age range and the average age should be added. Besides, the readers might want to know the name of the optical microscope the authors used.

- This information was included (see text).

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the Statistics
Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Methodology:

1. What is given here is not the methodology. Briefly describe the method you use to study the spermicidal activity and who the different extracts were obtained.

- These information were included (see text).

2. Which method was used for MIC determination?

- The information was included (see text).

Results:

3. 2.5 (gram %): what is this unit? Gram % of a volume or what?

- Gram% is represented by w/v. (See Methods)

4. In all concentrations tested, the growth of L. acidophilus was not reduced. It may be better to write: ….. of L. acidophilus was not affected by the two extracts.

- The change was made (see text).

5. In smaller concentrations, the compounds were effective against T. vaginalis (MIC= 0.156 mg/mL for WE and BE, and 0.078 mg/mL for SP against the CS strain; and 0.312, 0.156 and 0.078 mg/mL for WE, BE and SP, respectively, against the ATCC strain). These concentrations are no small. It will have been necessary to use reference drug to be able to use this type of words.

- The change was made (see text).
Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract

Background: what is the plant used traditionally for?

• The information was included (see text).

Methods:

1. The maceration was done in an amber flask while the lyophilized extract was stored in a closed plastic flask with no indication (amber or not). Why??

• The lyophilized extract was stored in a closed amber plastic flask and kept frozen. This information was included (see text).

2. The lyophilized dichloromethane, hexane, ethyl acetate, and methanol fractions were stored in closed containers and kept frozen. Does this means that there was not solvent mixture used?

• After lyophilization, in which the solvent mixture no longer remain, and the fractions were stored in closed containers and kept frozen.

3. The methanol extract was suspended in H2O. I think should be methanol fraction.

• After lyophilization, the solvent mixture no longer remain, and the lyophilizate is water soluble.

4. T. vaginalis culture: please give reference if a standard method or describe briefly what you did.

• The information was included (see text).

Discussion

5. The first part of the discussion look like results comment and should be change.

• The change was made (see text)
6. *S. saponaria* is a tree that occurs in Brazil,… only in Brazil???

- The information was included (see text).

7. Figure 1: Chemical components isolated in dry pericarps of the fruits of *S. saponaria*.

- The change was made (see figure).

8. Figure 3: Effects of water-ethanol (WE) and butanolic (BE) extracts, and individual saponins (SP) of *Sapindus saponaria* on sperm motility in human semen

- The change was made (see figure).

9. Figure 4: EC50 determination of the water-ethanol (WE- panel A) and butanolic (BE- panel B) extracts, and saponins (SP- panel C) of *Sapindus saponaria* in human semen. I do not think these figures are useful.

- Was accepted the suggestion of another reviewer.

Figure 5: a table may be more expressive

- Was accepted the suggestion of another reviewer.

11. Figure 5: In vitro Effect the presence of different concentrations of water-ethanol (WE) and butanolic (BE) extracts, and saponins (SP) of *Sapindus saponaria* on *Lactobacillus acidophilus* growth (CFU/mL)

- The change was made (see figure)

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

- English corrections were made.

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.