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Author's response to reviews: see over
Responses to the concerns raised by the Associate Editor report:

ABSTRACT/Results = There are two repeated terms: ?Our results showed that??. They should be reviewed.

We changed one set of “our results showed that” to “The data indicated”.

INTRODUCTION = Paragraph describing the uses of Gladiolus plant states that is used both as a laxative and also treats diarrhoea which seems ambiguous (?!).

The use of Gladiolus plant both as a laxative and also to treat diarrhea was according to Burkill, 1985. We agree with the Editor’s comment that it seems ambiguous. We subsequently removed this statement from the text.

METHODS

- We still do not understand the total number of the animals used in this research. You mention in Animal ?45 male Wistar rats??; Drug and treatment ?Fifteen rats that displayed epileptic seizures??. In Induction of TLE, the authors mention ?At the end of the experiment 20 rats were selected??. In Author´s response to review the total is 25 animals.

To improve the understanding of our animal usage, we have re-written this section.

For clarity to the Associate Editor’s concern:

1. We started off with 45 animals
2. 5 were only handled, the rest (40) were given atropine and pilocarpine to induce epileptic behaviour
3. Of the 40 only 20 animals unequivocally displayed seizure activity. These 20 animals were used in subsequent experiments, while the other 20 were handed back to the animal facility for euthanasia.
4. Of the 20 animals, 5 were used in comparative studies together with the 5 animals described in point 1.
5. Of the remaining 15 animals that displayed seizures, 5 each were used for saline, fluoxetine and G. dalenii treatment respectively.

As this is a long-winded explanation, we chose to describe only the use of the 25 animals that eventually were part of the reported experiments.

You did not used mice. Check again and replace with rats.

We have changed mice into rats as correctly recommended by the Associate Editor.

RESULTS

- Include ?F? value in Fig. 1, before ?p?

As the statistical test that we used (Mann Whitney U test) is a non parametric test, there is no F value given. We just have a p value.

in Figure 2, the authors commented that 'n' of the animals was 5 animals/group. Thus, the "F" should be "[F (2,14) = ...]" not (F (2,11) = ...). Reanalyze all "F" based on the total number of animals and groups. By the way, receive our apologies regarding ´change "[ ]" with "( )". Please return "[ ]". We do not express ourselves properly about the symbols changing.
We have added F values where appropriate as suggested by the Associate Editor report.

Show $F$ for Decrease in locomotor activity in the open field?

We made the correction in the text as recommended by the Associate Editor report.

- In Neurochemical assays, change ?Assessment of the activity of the HPA axis?? with ?Assessment of the HPA axis activity??

The change to HPA axis activity has been made.

- Figure 3 legend? post hoc followed KW test was missed –

We have included the statistical tests used to generate the p value as suggested by the Associate Editor.

DISCUSSION = Paragraph 7 ? ?Studies by Mazarati et al. in 2008 [41]? change with ?Studies by Mazarati et al. [41]?  

We made the correction in the text as recommended by the Associate Editor report.

REFERENCES = Standardize the references according to the norms of the BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine.

We made the correction in the text as recommended by the Associate Editor report.