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Author's response to reviews: see over
RESPONSE TO REVIEWER’S COMMENTS ON MANUSCRIPT

Antioxidant, antidiabetic and hypolipidemic effects of Tulbaghia violacea Harv. (wild garlic) rhizome methanolic extract in a diabetic rat model

Our response to the reviewer’s comments will be addressed as follows:

1. Reviewer comment /Query
2. Authors response
3. Change in manuscript

Reviewer 1

Comment 1- The whole manuscript has to be edited as there are a few typos. Some of these will be find highlighted in yellow in the attached file. Many of them are related to citations. Square brackets [ ] should be used and not brackets ( ).

Author’s response

We agree with reviewers comments

Change in manuscript

We have edited the manuscript and have replaced the () brackets with [] brackets.

Comment 2- Title: “extracts” should without ‘s’ as I believe only one extract were studied

Author’s response

We have edited the manuscript

Change in manuscript

The “s” has been removed from extracts

Comment 3

Page 5: Line 11: add space between “-4°C” and “for later”

Author’s response

We apologise for the oversight

Change in manuscript

The space has been added between “-4°C” and “for later”. (line 22, Page 6)
**Comment 4**  
Page 5 : Line 28 : “for the 7 week” add s at week  
**Author’s response**  
We have edited the manuscript

**Change in manuscript**  
We have changed week to weeks. (Line 9, Page 7)

**Comment 5**  
Page 6 : Line 2 : add space between “number” and “045/13/Animal”  
**Author’s response**  
We apologise for the oversight

**Change in manuscript**  
We have added the space between “number” and “045/13/Animal” (Line 12 Page 7)

**Comment 6**  
Page 6 : 2.7. Study design : precision should be gived on the number of rats included in each group  
**Author’s response**  
We agree with the reviewer, the number of rats per group is included.

**Change in manuscript**  
“The rats were divided into 5 groups (n=7) as follows:” (Line 27 Page 7)
Comment 7
Page 6 : Line 9-10 : Change “Animals with a fasting blood glucose concentration >25mmol/L were considered to be diabetic and included in this study” into “Animals with a fasting blood glucose concentration >25mmol/L were included in this study as diabetic rat.”

Author’s response
We have edited the manuscript

Change in manuscript
We have amended the manuscript as follows: “Animals with a fasting blood glucose concentration >25mmol/L were included in this study as diabetic rat.” (Page 7, Line 21-22)

Comment 8
Page 6 : Line 31- Page 7 : Line 1: were the samples stored at 70, -70°C or … ?

Author’s response
We apologise for the oversight

Change in manuscript
We have inserted the “-“ (Page 8, line 16) and have added the name of the author before (28), (29) and (30). (Page 8, Line 28-29), (Page 9, line 3), (Page 9, line 14-15)

Comment 9
Page 8 : Line 22 : Replace “ was used as a standard” by was used as standard
Author’s response
We apologise for the oversight

Change in manuscript
We have replaced “was used as a standard” by was used as standard. (Page 10, line 10)

Comment 10
Page 9 : Line 16 : add space between “p<0.05.” and “D+TVL120”

Author’s response
We apologise for the oversight

Change in manuscript
We have inserted a space as follows: p <0.05. D+TVL120. (Page 11, Line 18)

Comment 11
Page 10 : Line 11-12 : add space between “35%,” and “p<0.05” as well as between “40 %,” and “p<0.01”

Author’s response
We apologise for the oversight

Change in manuscript
We have added a space between “35%,” and “p<0.05” as well as between “40 %,” and “p<0.01”. (Page 12, Line 39)

Comment 12
Page 10 : Line 23-25 change « although there was a tendency towards a reduction in AUCglucose in both TVL treated groups compared to the diabetic control group ». into although there was a tendency towards a reduction in AUCglucose in both TVL treated groups compared to the diabetic control group after 100 minutes. Or delete completely this assertion

Author’s response
We agree with reviewer’s suggestion

Change in manuscript
We have amended by inserting “after 100 minutes”. (Page 13, Line 2)
Comment 13
Page 12 : Line 11-12. It is claimed that “Treatment with 60 mg dose of TVL significantly enhanced the activity of …. GPx (p<0.05)”, but in table 3, there is no sign to show this significativity. Reconsider that.

Author’s response
We apologise for the oversight

Change in manuscript
Significant difference (#) is indicated in table 3 as follows: 4.03±0.75#. (Page 24, Line 13)

Comment 14
Page 14 : Line 24-25. Rephrase “Liver hypertrophy could be attributed to hypoinsulinaemia induced influx of fatty acids”

Author’s response
We agree with reviewer’s suggestion

Change in manuscript
We have amended the manuscript “Liver hypertrophy could be attributed to hypoinsulinaemia-induced influx of fatty acids, and decreased lipoprotein secretion from the liver, leading to triglyceride accumulation [34]” (Page 17, Line 1-3).

Comment 15
Page 33 delete “Figure 6” which appears at the beginning of the page

Author’s response
We apologise for the oversight

Change in manuscript
Figure 6 has been removed from the page.
Comment 16

Page 9, line 16: “There were no significant differences between the pre-treated body weights of the various experimental groups”. Please repeat the statistical analysis to make sure that this assertion is true since the body weight of NDC group seems really high. This difference (significant or not) should be considered in the discussion of this manuscript.

Author’s response

We apologize for the oversight.

Change in manuscript

“There were no significant differences between the pre-treated body weights of the various experimental groups” is incorrect has been amended to “There were no significant differences between the pre-treated body weights of the various diabetic experimental groups”. “The pre-treated body weights of the diabetic, TVL 60 and TVL 120 experimental groups differed significantly from the non-diabetic control group, p<0.05” has been included in the manuscript. (Page 11, Line 13-18)

Comment 17

Table 2: The % HW of D+TVL60 and D+glibenclamide have exactly the same value. Is there any explanation why one of these values, should be significantly different from DC and not the other? If not, reconsider the statistical analysis.

Author’s response

We apologize for the oversight.

Change in manuscript

Significant difference (#) is indicated in table 2 as follows: 0.32±0.01#. (Page 22, Line 11)