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Author's response to reviews: see over
ANSWER TO REVIEWER QUESTIONS

Dear Editor

On behalf of the co-authors, I am very pleased to submit the revised form of our MS. I seize this opportunity to immensely thank all Reviewers and especially Dra Gabriella who permitted us to better ameliorate the paper. Changes are made in the text using yellow colour. Here are our answers to questions rose by referees.

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS

1) The background section should include general information on the two plants tested in this work as well as some information on their anecdotal “aphrodisiac properties”. Also, authors refer to previous results from their research group demonstrating “inhibitory activities” of two other medicinal plant extracts, without describing those activities and the sexual responses evaluated.
ANSWER: Taking into consideration the critics of the reviewer, the introduction has been seriously improved.

2) The hypothesis should be clearly stated, since the one appearing in the background section does not correspond to the one mentioned in the discussion section.
ANSWER: the hypothesis in the background now corroborates with the one states in the discussion and can be read as follows: With the hypothesis that the bioactive compounds present in Mondia whitei and Guibourtia tessmannii possess an aphrodisiac effect acting upon sexual potency by interfering or promoting the expression of ejaculation, the present study was undertaken to evaluate the ejaculatory properties of aqueous and organic extracts of Mondia whitei and Guibourtia tessmannii in spinal cord transected and urethane-anesthetized rats.

3) The methods section does not include a description of the plant’s elements used to obtain the powders, the time of the year and place of collection, the authentication of the specimens, the preparation of the extracts for i.v. administration (i.e. vehicles used to dissolve them, the volume administered, infusion duration…).
ANSWER: All the requested information have been provided in the text.
4) A brief description of the phytochemical screening method is needed; the statement that it was conducted using “standard techniques” is insufficient. A definition of sexually experienced rats is needed (what criterion did the authors use to consider a male sexually experienced?).

**ANSWER:** Changes done for sexually experienced criteria. Additive comments have been added concerning the description of the phytochemical techniques used in the study.

5) **Essential information on drug administration is lacking** (vehicles, volumes, latencies, etc).

**ANSWER:** modification done. See the section concerned.

6) The rationale for dopamine and haloperidol administration, alone and in combination with the extracts, as well as the basis for the selection of the doses used, is missing. These experimental series cannot be anticipated from the hypothesis posed in this work, thus a justification should be included.

Answer: change done.

7) The results of the phytochemical screening are not described. There is no graph, figure, table or any type of data supporting the statement that “sugars, triterpenes, steroids and phenolic acids were found in the plant extracts”. Some type of data must be provided.

Answer: Table 1 now describes the results of the phytochemical analysis. Also, a short description of each phytochemical technique is now available in the methodology section.
8) A description of the effects of dopamine and haloperidol per se on the fictive ejaculation motor response parameters should be provided in addition to describing those obtained when combined with the plant extracts.

Answer: change done

9) The Fisher LSD test is no longer used as post hoc test, since it does not correct for multiple comparisons very well. Bonferroni or Tukey tests are the best options.

Answer: Statistical anaylsis has been redone using Tukey HSD test.

10) The discussion is superficial; the concept “aphrodisiac” changes from one section to the other. Authors do not confront the obtained results with other published data and give no theoretical mechanistic explanation for the results obtained with the dopaminergic drugs.

Answer: the discussion has been rewritten according to the suggestion of the reviewer.

11) The conclusion of the abstract “The present findings further justify the ethno-medicinal claims of Mondia whitei and Guibourtia tessmannii” is not sustained in the manuscript, since those claims are never described.

Answer: change adequately done

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS
1) The manuscript needs some language corrections

   ANSWER: The level of English has been improved.

2) In the background section, include references supporting the use of the mentioned pharmaceutical drugs to control the ejaculatory response (fluoxetine, paroxetine,
haloperidol and serotonin) as well as references documenting the induction of side effects by these drugs.

ANSWER: References have been added to support the statements.

3) Specify the “ethnomedicinal claim” for Guibourtia tessmannii mentioned at the end of the background section.

ANSWER: Changes have been made accordingly

4) Add at the end of the last sentence of the background section the word “extracts”, i.e. medicinal plants’ extracts

ANSWER: Change done

5) Under the heading “Activation and recording of the rhythmic genital motor pattern of ejaculation”, in the 4th line specify that the injection of saline solution was directed to increase the intraurethral pressure to simulate the urethral distention produced by the emptying of accessory glands’ contents into the posterior urethra. In this same section explain what is meant by “additive” urethral stimulations, do you mean “consecutive”?

ANSWER: changes are well done

6) Check the concept “an inverse non inducer aphrodisiac” in the last line of the discussion section; it is not clear what is meant.

ANSWER: Corrections have been done.
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