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Dear Dr. Tom Rowles:

Thank you for inviting us to re-submit our revised manuscript entitled “An-jun-ning, a traditional herbal formula, attenuates spontaneous withdrawal symptoms via modulation of the dopamine system in morphine-dependent rats” (MS: 8490900141129929) to be considered for publication in the journal *BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine*.

Reviewers raised a few of new minor concerns this time, and all of them have been addressed in the new revision. We appreciate the comments by the reviewers and hereby enclose a point-to-point response to their comments. All changes are shown in red in the revised manuscript. All the authors wish our entire endeavor to make the manuscript a better one. And we hope that you find the revised manuscript acceptable for publication.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Mei Han

College of Chemistry, Beijing Normal University
Corresponding Author
Replies to the reviewers comments:

Reviewer: Reinaldo Takahashi

Reviewer’s report:

Authors have attempted to address the concerns expressed by this reviewer, but little of the suggested changes have been incorporated in the text. One major problem that stands out is the English used in the text. Also, new issues have arise, for example in Fig1, panels A-D the x line should start at point zero; panel D, what is the meaning of starting point -0.4 for this axis? In the legend to the figures, authors should clearly state the statistical analysis used.

I encourage the authors to provide these minor essential revisions before considering this Ms. acceptable.

Answer:

We appreciate the comment and the relevant revision has been made according to the new concerns.

1) As for the major problem mentioned in the new comments, we had the manuscript edited by native speakers, on account of the English used in the manuscript. All the authors have spent much time to double check the use of English throughout the manuscript.

2) The Figure 1 was recomposed. In the panels A and B, the x line starts at point zero now. While the x line in panels C and D (for episodes of writhing) was kept to a minus starting point in panels C and D, because the episodes of writhing in many groups are just zero at Day 5 and 10. With a starting point below zero, the graph may be easy to understood, and this plotting method in graph on behavioral test can be seen in many literatures [1, 2].

3) The method of statistical analysis was added in the figure legends.

Also, authors have read the manuscript carefully, checked and corrected other minor errors, to make the revision more idiomatic and logical.
References:


Reviewer: Fabricio Pamplona

Reviewer's report:
Apart from language issues, the paper was not substantially improved after the first revision round.

Answer:

Thanks for your kind comments. This time, concerning the language issues, we managed to have this manuscript edited by the language service of WebShop again. All the authors have read the manuscript and checked the language errors.

We have tried our best to make the relevant correction and revision in the light of the comments, both in the first review round and the second. With this painstaking process, we believe the manuscript may have been improved as more as we can.