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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Reviewers,

We are grateful for the prompt and thorough review of the original manuscript with the topic “phytochemical, antioxidant and anti-inflammatory potential of Feretia apodanthera root bark extracts” by Owolabi O.O., James, D.B., Ibrahim, S., Andongma, B.T. and Kure, B. which was submitted for publication consideration in the BMC Complementary & Alternative Medicine. We appreciate the effectiveness of every reviewer in noting the actions needed to be taken to improve this manuscript. We are writing in response to the remarks made by the reviewers.

The ratio 10:1 stated in the manuscript meant 10ml of solvent was used to exhaustively extract 1mg of the powdered sample. However, a better term has been used to describe this method in the newly submitted manuscript. The results for the positive control, which is the standard ketoprofen, has been added to the carrageenan induced inflammation test. The SEM and P value showed expected deviation from the mean recorded in table 1.1 and 1.3 for the extraction and the antioxidant test respectively. This was derived when the tests were repeated. It can however be removed if not clear. The values for the negative control in carrageenan induced inflammation test is actively used in every calculations for each group as seen in the formula written in the later part of the Methods section 1.3.4.
In response to the reports by Wissam Faour, Ph.D. (Reviewer 1); Ketoprofen, a known NSAID was used to compare the effectiveness of the extracts on carrageenan induced inflammation. The quantitative determination for some important phytochemical the extracts was not reported in this study because the results were inconclusive and the natural habitat for this plant was not accessible to produce more of the extract for a repeat of the studies due to some reasons. However, the plant is now being cultivated for further research. We will work towards reporting the quantitative analysis of the phytochemicals in future studies.

In response to the reports by Chandrashekara Shreedhara (Reviewer 3), the conclusion has been edited to suit this manuscript better.

In response to the reports by Afaf Mohammed Weli (Reviewer 4), the antioxidant activity was done twice in triplicates within the space of a week to ascertain this result submitted. The results for each antioxidant activity were similar, thereby showing that this result represents the antioxidant activity of the extracts. The spelling and grammar mistakes have also been looked upon.

Thank you for your consideration, we look forward to your favourable response.