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Reviewer's report:

General
The present manuscript by Tajuddin et al. entitled: An experimental study of sexual function improving effects of Myristica fragrans Houtt. (nutmeg), is informative and providing scientific basis for the aphrodisiac activity of nutmeg. The results seem to be interesting and comparable with sildenafil. The paper is acceptable for publication but needs to be revised addressing the following comments.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

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. Indicate for how many days the treatment is continued (in your case, 7 days), under the methods section of the abstract.
2. Italicize all the second level headings.
3. The authors must explain on what basis the doses of the extract were selected as 100, 250 and 500 mg/kg.
4. The authors must also explain whether the toxicity studies were conducted prior to or after the main experiments.
5. Explain the basis of dose selection for acute toxicity testing. Why they have selected from 500 mg/kg and went upto 4000 mg/kg. Is that 4 g/kg is too high to administer?
6. Why the doses of the two hormones were not given in terms of body weight.
7. It is necessary to talk about all the parameters studied during the results section and should be discussed further correlating with previous literature.
8. There are numerous typographical and grammatical errors throughout the manuscript. The authors must go through the entire manuscript again during the revisions.
9. If the authors consider the results with P<0.05 as significant, why they have indicated so many P values which are P>0.05. If this is the case, what is not significant (NS) as indicated in the tables.
10. The probability of error upto 0.001 is sufficient to indicate the significance and those results with P>0.05 should be indicated as not significant (NS). Use * for P<0.05; ** for P<0.01; *** for P<0.001. Consider all other values with P>0.05 as not significant. The authors should discuss with an expert statistician during revision of the article.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes
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