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COVER LETTER FOR REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Douala, the 25/11/2012

MS: 1373889339731710

Subject: SUBMISSION OF THE REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Dear Editor,

I am enclosing herewith the revised manuscript entitled “Acute and chronic antihypertensive effects of Cinnamomum zeylanicum stem bark methanol extract in L-NAME-induced hypertensive rats.” for reevaluation and publication in Journal BMC.

We are waiting for the decision that will be reserved to it.

Sincerely yours.

ANSWER TO THE QUERIES

The modification has been added in Blue colour in the manuscript.

Reviewer report:

Reviewer: Chao-Yin Chen

1. Please include this information in the Method section “The intubation was done daily, on non-anesthetized animals”.

   Answer: This sentence has been included in the methods section.
   See the paragraph entitled experimental procedure, page 6, line 12-13

2. Were the procedures/protocols used in this study reviewed and approved by Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee?

   Answer: This work was carried out while the institutional guidelines for laboratory animal use and care were in creation. Thus the procedures /protocols has been validated by the Laboratory committee according to the standard ethical guidelines for laboratory animal use and care as described in the European Community guidelines; EEC Directive 86/609/EEC, of the 24th November 1986. We have already explained it on our previous revised manuscript and cover letter.

3. The Y axis in figure 1 still has the label from -80 (top) to +100 (bottom) – which shows that 1) control treatment (L-NAME) decreased MABP by 60% and MECZ increased MABP by 40-60%. This is in conflict with the text in the Results section.

   Answer: The figure 1 has been reviewed and there no conflict yet between it and the text in the Results.