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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear editor,

We write this letter to thank you and reviewers for your careful and comprehensive review on our paper (MS: 1384826660153299). We would also like to thank you for your informative and useful advice to us. Now we submitted the revised manuscript to *BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine*.

According to your suggestions we have revised our manuscript. Thanks for your hard work.

**Answers to comments of Reviewer: James Adams**

Thanks for your careful review, and we have revised it according to your suggestions.

**Comment #1:** Did the authors notice any pathology in the mice tested for toxicity?

**Answer #1:** Thanks for your suggestion, and we did not notice any pathology changes in the mice tested for toxicity. The pathology research systematically will be developed at the further research, such as the pathological section of tissue, thank you!
Answers to comments of Reviewer: Giuseppina Negri

Thanks for your careful review, and we have revised it according to your suggestions.

Comment #1: Page 5, line 73 – The mechanism of action was elucidated?

Answer #1: Thanks for your suggestion, and we are sorry for the mistake. We have deleted it.

Comment #2: Page 9, line 158 – with drugs (explain better, which?)

Answer #2: Thanks for your suggestion, and we have replaced drugs with EEM and positive drugs.

Comment #3: Page 9, line 170 – with drugs (explain better, which?)

Answer #3: Thanks for your suggestion, and we have replaced drugs with normal saline, EEM and codeine phosphate.

Comment #4: Page 10, line 178 – administered as in 2.5.1. (which is this number)? Page 10, line 179 – with drugs (explain better, which?)

Answer #4: We are sorry for the mistakes, and we have revised it. Thank you!

`Mice were randomly divided into five groups. After treatment for 30 min with normal saline, EEM and codeine phosphate` 

Comment #5: Page 10, line 188–with drugs (explain better, which?), administered as in 2.5.1. (which is this number)

Answer #5: We are sorry for the mistakes, and we have revised it. Thank you!

`Mice were randomly divided into five groups. After treatment for 30 min with normal saline, EEM and NH₄Cl`

Comment #6: Page 11, line 215 - …..alkaloids and flavonoids were the main constituents? It is correct. There are others significant peaks in the chromatogram
Answer #6: Firstly, thanks for your suggestions. Then, in HPLC analysis, except three marked compounds, there are others significant peaks in the chromatogram. According to the published references, karachine, valachine, (−)-mecambridine, berberine, etc. were the main alkaloids. But because references about the studies on the chemical compounds of this plant are only three, we could not obtain and buy other main alkaloids used as marker compounds. Based on the principle of the dissolution in the similar material structure, we thought that in HPLC-DAD chromatogram, some significant peaks around the peak of berberine maybe represent other main alkaloids. If you have any questions, please tell us, we will try solving the question at the further study. Thanks again!

Comment #7: Figure 2. HPLC_DAD chromatogram of the ethanol extract of M. punicea.

Answer #7: Thanks for your suggestion, and we have revised the legend of Figure 2. Thanks

Thank you much for your attention to our paper. I look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible.

Correspondence regarding the paper should be directed to Hu Pan at the following address, phone and e-mail:

Sincerely yours,

Hu Pan
E-mail: shangxf928@126.com

Xiaofei Shang