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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to Reviewer’s Comments

Dear Editor in Chief,

BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine

Ms. Ref. No.: BCAM-D-17-00846
Title: Genoprotective, antioxidant, antifungal and anti-inflammatory evaluation of hydroalcoholic extract of wild-growing Juniperus communis L. (Cupressaceae) native to Romanian southern sub-Carpathian hills

We thank the reviewers for their thoughtful comments regarding our manuscript. We took into account all of the comments and corrected our paper accordingly; all the changes are highlighted in yellow.

Reviewer #1:
Comment: Accept without revision
Answer: we thank the reviewer for his opinion regarding our manuscript

Reviewer #2:
Comment: Rewrite abstract
Answer: the Abstract was revised, also considering the comments of R3 and the word limit imposed by the journal

Need to revise English language in manuscript
Answer: The manuscript was checked by a native English speaker

Comment: Need to provide HPLC chromatogram
Answer: The HPLC chromatogram is now provided as figure 3 (page 17, r.12).

Animal ethical committee approval number to be mentioned in the manuscript.
Answer: The animal ethical committee approval number is now provided (page 13, r.12).

Conclusion need to be more informative
Answer: the Conclusions chapter was revised

References need to be corrected as per journal guidelines.
Answer: the References were corrected.

Reviewer #2:
Comment: The quality of the manuscript is acceptable for publication with minor corrections, mainly focus on improving the redaction, results and discussion of the manuscript.

All comments and suggestions are highlighted in the manuscript.

Answer: The manuscript was checked for spelling and grammar errors. The comments and suggestions highlighted in the manuscript were also considered:

- Page 2 – the results of the phytochemical assays were checked and corrected
- Keywords were modified
- Page 4, rows 5-6 – the other applications were detailed
- Page 5, r. 21-23 – the suggested correction was made
- Page 6, r. 5, 10, 14-15 – all the suggestions were answered.
- Page 12 – spaces were checked
- Page 14, rows 6-10 – the first paragraph from the Results was changed. Also, the suggested references (numbers 40 and 41) were inserted;
- Page 18 – the suggestions were answered in the manuscript

Thank you very much for your appreciations and for your suggestions!

With regards

The authors