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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor

BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine

I have revised the manuscript according the suggestions of reviewers and the text edited is mentioned in red color in attached manuscript. Point to point comments in response to reviewers is given below.

Thanks for addressing some of the points rose by the reviewers and for the improvement of the original manuscript.

However, the manuscript still needs some English language editing and should pay more attention as when to use comma, semicolon, …

English language is edited from a native speaker who also has biological background.

- Authors say that the CCl4-induced nephrotoxicity in rats is a well established assay, however, did not cite enough references to convince the reviewers of such adopted assay. Authors must site more references.

References are added

- Reference 5: Ustyol L, Demirören K, Kandemir I, Erten R, Bulan K, Kaba S, Demir N, Basunlu MT: Comparative Nephroprotective Effects of Silymarin, N-Acetylcysteine, and
Thymoquinone Against Carbon Tetrachloride-Induced Nephrotoxicity in Rats. Iranian Red Crescent Medical Journal 2016 (inpress).

How could the authors cite a reference which is still in press, while none of them is listed among the authors of that reference?

This reference has been replaced

- Page 4, line 26-31: Authors used only one reference in support of “Plant-derived natural antioxidants for nephroprotection”. They need to cite more articles.

6 references have been added.

- Page 5, line 52: authors must show % yield of extraction

Added

- Results and discussion section is still very long and must be cut down to about half.

Recommendation was followed and maximum irreverent material has been deleted.

- Page 15, line 7: do the authors mean urine profile

Corrected

- Reference 27 talks only about “Caffeic acid phenethyl ester” and not different plant extracts!!! Authors should use different reference.

Replaced with plant extract reference.

- Page 20, lines 56-57: “In the present study, the kidneys of CCl4 treated animal model have showed indicated morphological changes findings, ……”

Corrected
- Conclusion:

the conclusion should support the manuscript title or objective, nephroprotection

Modified

also attached is the pdf manuscript with few correction
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