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To the Editorial Officer:

BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine

• Thank you for your advice. We have revised the manuscript in accordance with the suggestions provided by the reviewers.

Lyndy Megaw (Reviewer 1)

Comments
1. It is mentioned that the plant name has been checked in www.theplantlist.org but the authority does not match with the authority recommended by this website.

We have deleted that sentence on page 6 as follows: “This plant name has been checked with the plant list (http://www.theplantlist.org/tpl1.1/record/kew-2639051).”

2. What was the positive control used in the vasorelaxant experiments? A "control group" is mentioned but this is assumed to be the negative untreated (or not pre-treated) control and needs to be clarified.

We have clarified untreated (or not pre-treated) control group on page 13, 14, and 21. All figure legends were modified.

“vs. the not pre-treated control group 55.2 ± 3.1% at the concentration of 200 μg/ml (Fig. 3).”

“compare to the not pre-treated control group 1.53 ± 0.12 g and 1.23 ± 0.09 g, in cells pre-contracted by PE and KCl, respectively (Fig. 4).”

Rupesh Gautam, Ph.D (Reviewer 2)

Comments

1. Check references.

We have corrected references according to the policy of this journal.
Enitome Bafor, PhD (Reviewer 3)

Comments

1. Remove 'The' from the opening statements of the abstract and background sections.

   We have removed a word ‘The’ from the opening statements on page 2–5.

2. The authors provided reasons for the study of the plant in this study as being to search for efficient drugs from natural products with limited or no side effects. Yet a toxicity study/evaluation was not done to support the safety or otherwise of the proposed plant.

   The root of the A. decursiva has long been used as Korean traditional medicine. However, in this study, a toxicity study/evaluation was not done. Hence further investigation is needed to ensure safety.

3. Page 6, line 16, the plant was identified by….

Page 8, line 7, you are missing a parenthesis.

Page 8, line 29, use lower case letters for endothelium

Page 8, line 31, always insert a space between numbers and corresponding units and ensure that this is done throughout the manuscript.

Page 9, line 43, change 'grams' to 'gram'.

For the figure legends, there are no indications as to if n = number of animals or number of experiments. This must be clearly stated.
We have made the following revisions at all instances throughout the manuscript.

We have stated the experimental protocol on page 8. This study was performed ex vivo. ‘n’ means number of aortic rings. All figure legends were modified.

Maria Bonfleur (Reviewer 4):

Comments

1. The authors failed in described the aim of this study. There is no purpose in the abstract. Also, in the end of introduction the authors tried to describe an aim, but is confusing. What is the exactly the aim of the study? Please rewrite.

   We have rewritten the abstract, background, and discussion sections including aim.

2. There are a lot of figures in the manuscript. The authors should join same similar figures in a panel. For example: Fig 1 and 2; Fig 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 and Fig 8 and 9. In this way, the description of results could be rewritten in according with the new figures, because now the results are very repetitive.

   We have joined similar figures in each panel and rewritten the description of results.

3. The manuscript needs a review of writing. We can easily identify some errors, such as lack of punctuation among others. For example, one dot is missing at the end of the background in the abstract.

   We have corrected some errors in writing and reviewed this manuscript carefully.
4. Minor Concerns

Abstract

- The background and the conclusion are confusing.

\ We have rewritten the background on page 2.

Background

Line 1 to 19 - Confusing paragraph with loose information, please rewrite.

\ We have rewritten the background on page 4.

Line 19 - The World Health Organization (WHO) - Add Reference

\ We have added WHO reference 2 on page 4.

Line 36 - Hypertension was defined - change for "is defined"

\ We have changed as "is defined" on page 4.

“Hypertension is defined as blood pressure higher”

Methods

- It would be interesting to describe the total number of animals used in the study.

\ We have described the total number of animals on page 8.

“Forty four male Sprague-Dawley rats (240–260 g; Raonbio, Gyeonggi province, Korea) were maintained”

- Some words in the middle of the phrases not need to start with uppercase. For example, line 29
- Endothelium. This in all manuscript.
  \ We have corrected lower case letters for endothelium on page 8.

“The aortic rings with endothelium were pre-contracted”

- Line 43 - One grams? Correct to One gram.
  \ We have corrected the word on page 9.

“One gram of ADE was dissolved in 10 ml of methanol”

Results and Discussion
- The reference 24 cited in line 34 is not make sense.
  \ We have stated this on page 13.

- Line 36 to 56 - The information needs more references.
  \ We have stated this on page 14.