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First of all, I thank for sending the Referee's Report. We have moderated our paper according to the suggestion of the referee except at two points:

1. How could one explain the drug as Opioid Antagonist when the results in group 5 shows the maximum significant reading. On the other hand, Opioid Antagonists like Naloxone always precipitate signs of physical dependence before expected dose of morphine (A transient, explosive abstinence syndrome - antagonist-precipitated withdrawal - can be induced in a subject physically dependent on opioids by administering naloxone or another antagonist). Our finding is opposite to this phenomenon. Secondly, reduction of signs (physical dependence) is observed in all groups, even in group 6 where the test drug was given 8 days before the observation of physical signs. Similarly the reduction was also observed in group 4 (more in comparison to group 6). Explanation of all these findings have already been written. Moreover, no previous literature prove that extract of Delphinium denudatum (D. d) or its alkaloid are opioid antagonist.

2. Regarding, citation of previous works in introduction, we have already provided 8 references (1-8). Reference 6, 7 & 8 are particularly related with pharmacological studies of D. d.. The references suggested are not worth to be mentioned.

However, other suggestions of the referee have been incorporated.

A) Discretionary Revisions: All the data has now been analysed using ANOVA followed by post-test.

B) Compulsory Revisions:
i. Summary:
Method & Conclusion: have been re-written as pointed out.

ii. Introduction:
Relevant references are already been quoted.

iii. Material & Methods:
This part has majorly been corrected as suggested.
Drugs detail has been provided. Dosage regimen has been corrected and re-written. Similarly, information on how the observation was recorded has been provided.

iv. Statistical Analysis: ANOVA has now been applied for multiple
comparison.
v. Results: Corrected as suggested. Fig. 1 has been clarified more elaboratively.
vi. Discussion: Re-written as suggested except those points as remarked above in the first paragraph of this letter.
vii. References: Corrected.
viii. Table 3: Legend has been re-written.

Regards,
S. Z. Rahman
(Corresponding Author)