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Reviewer's report:

The authors did some revisions in the manuscript. However, I think the paper should be rejected. I have the following reasons.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. I can't agree "An increase in apoptosis is often associated with an increase in proliferation". In the final stage, it should be not happened at the same time.

2. I still have a concern for the data, which are not consistent. The biphasic and wave-like (not linear) effects need more evidence to prove.

3. "95% alkaloids", in general, it will appear in some special extract, not from the original materials. For example, a plant have 70% water, carbohydrates, proteins, lipid... How about the % of extracts? Even extra dried plant materials may have 10-14% water for preservation. How can the authors do the filter process? extract dry process? 50% extraction rate is really abnormal.
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