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Reviewer's report:

General
In the present report, the authors examined possible toxicity by administration of Bauhinia Forficata (BF) decoction which has been reported to be effective as an anti-diabetic remedy in their previous publication. They demonstrated a parallel alteration of lactate dehydrogenase (LDH), creatine kinase (CK), amylase (AMS) and angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE), and serum bilirubin levels in streptozotocin-induced diabetic rats with or without BF treatment. Although their results are of interest, a couple of major concerns raised should be cleared prior to publication.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1. The authors’ conclusion “absence of toxicity” is very presumptive. They just showed changes in a narrow spectrum of biomarkers representing hepatic, renal and muscular cytotoxicity. Serum levels of LD and CK does not stand for liver toxicity, since they can be less specific than AST and ALT as marker of hepatic injury. It could be true in the case of ACE in kidney.
2. The experimental data shown in this paper do not provide the values of non-diabetic control fed with BF, which can give an important parameter for comparison with the values of diabetic groups.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
1. In title(Bauhinia forficata: absence of toxicity during long term treatment of experimental diabetes)”Absence of toxicity” is too conclusive. Their results could not support such an affirmation.
2. In the section of Background, the final aim of this study is not clearly revealed to the reader, whereas it can be assumed in the Abstract and the last paragraph of the Discussion.
3. Many sentences of this paper are too long and sophisticated to be followed. The author also should refine English spelling used.
   - P2, last L, serum glucose and urinary glucose: words repeated
   - P5L5, all serum enzymes: unnecessary word
   - P5L7, CK alone: unnecessary word
   - P8L2, no higher: wrong word
   - Reference 4, Pepato Mt (?)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No
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