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Reviewer's report:

1. Generally well-written. There are a few typo and grammatical errors. Avoid adding discussion or references in Results section.

2. Methodology: should include description on the different concentrations used for all the herbs. Describe the preparations of the different concentration of the herbs.

3. For some of the analysis, dose used was 0.3mg/mL however this selection was not explained anywhere.

4. Statistical analysis: t test was used, which compare between two groups. I suggest to compare among the tested herbs by using Anova or its equivalents.

5. Results: A few times authors mentioned that some herbs gave better inhibitory effects than others. Without the statistical evidence, this statement is meaningless.

6. Discussion very brief. Please elaborate on the different doses, different herbs. In results section, there were mentions of some herbs to be superior to the other. But in discussion, this was not mentioned at all.

7. Figure legends: please revise. No need to repeat those which have been mentioned in Methods.

8. Figures, where applicable, please provide label or arrow showing important structures.

9. Check the label indicators. Must tally with figure descriptions.

10. Figure 4 c: Why did the Bay group had higher level of NFATc1 compared to RANKL group?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
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