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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Rowles

On behalf of my co-authors, we thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to minor revise our manuscript. We deeply appreciate you and reviewers for the positive and constructive comments and suggestions on our manuscript entitled “Angelica sinensis Extract Inhibits RANKL-mediated Osteoclastogenesis by Down-regulated the Expression of NFATc1 in Mouse Bone Marrow Cells” (#MS: 6966274612966216).

We have studied the “Editorial comments” carefully and we have tried our best to revise our manuscript according to the comments, and these changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. We are confident that the final version of the manuscript is easier to understand and has a more fluent scientific discourse. The point-by-point responses for all these comments are as following:

Editorial comments:

1. “We note that your study used primary cells harvested from mice. We would therefore ask you to confirm whether your study was submitted to, and approved by, your institutional ethics committee. Please include a statement to this effect in your manuscript.”

Response: We appreciate this constructive comment and we authors are so sorry for some of the part “Materials and methods” were poorly presented in our manuscript, and we have included the statement in the “Materials and methods” from line “112-115”: as: “All the animal work and approach have been approved by the IACUC of the Hong-Hui Hospital, Xi’an Jiaotong University College of Medicine and conducted strictly followed by “the institutional...
guidelines for the care and use of laboratory animals at the Jiaotong University College of Medicine.”

2. “It appears that the Authors’ Contributions, Competing Interests and Conclusions sections have been removed from your manuscript during the review process. We would therefore ask you to ensure that these sections are included again.”

Response: To address this concern, we have double checked and proofread our manuscript very closely, and we included all these sections in the manuscript from line “296-317”.

Furthermore, we also declare: No conflict of interest exits in the submission of this manuscript, and manuscript is approved by all authors for publication. I would like to declare on behalf of my co-authors that the work described was original research that has not been published previously, and not under consideration for publication elsewhere, in whole or in part.

Again we would like to express our great appreciation to you and reviewers for comments on our paper, and we would like resubmit this revised manuscript to “BMC”, and we hope it is acceptable for publication in the journal.

Looking forward to hearing from you soon.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours

JHao