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Author’s response to reviews:

March 06, 2020.

Dear the Editor,

Please find attached a revised version of our manuscript “Water extract from processed Polygonum multiflorum modulate gut microbiota and glucose metabolism on insulin resistant rats”, which we would like to resubmit for publication in the journal of BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine.

Your comments and those of the reviewers were highly insightful and enabled us to greatly improve the quality of our manuscript. In the following pages are our point-by-point responses to each of the comments of the reviewers. The modified parts of the article are marked in red font for easy viewing.
We hope that the revisions in the manuscript and our accompanying responses will be sufficient to make our manuscript suitable for publication in the journal of BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine.

We shall look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely, Jie Yu

Response to Peer-reviewers’s Comments

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 4):

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: The author have adequately addressed my comments. However, the new data provided appears to be inconsistent with the data included in the original submission. Specifically, The fasting blood glucose reported in Figure 3B does not appear to match the one presented in the new figure S2A. In figure 3B FBG is reported in the order CON<met<ppm-h<ppm-l<mod. however, in figure s2a the order of fbg is con<pmrp-h<met<mod<pmrp-l (it doesn't help that different colors and group names are used.) also, figure s2a the error bars are missing.

I can understand that my nitpicking can be frustrating for the authors but I am sure that they will also appreciate the necessity for having a stringent peer-review process.

Responds: Thank you so much for your academic guidance and advice. We have corrected the problem with group names in figure S2. In addition, the mismatch between the FBG and OGTT data in the experiment was due to different time points. This experimental has a large animal sample size, and the OGTT procedure is complicated and takes a long time. In order to ensure the smooth running of the experiment, we chose to perform OGTT one day before the end of the experiment. Moreover, in order to reflect the data of the experimental termination point, we measured the rat FBG data on the day of the end of the experiment once again. Thanks to your careful guidance, we noticed that the sampling time may affect the experimental data, and we will pay more attention to the later experimental design.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Please recheck FBG and OGTT data and ensure they are consistently reported.

Responds: Thanks to the reviewer's precious advice. Based on the comments, we have re-reviewed the data to ensure its authenticity and reliability.
Add error bars to figure S2A.

Responds: Thanks to the reviewer's precious advice. Based on the comments, we have supplemented the data.

The revised parts in the body (in red) could also benefit from a language edit.

Responds: Thanks to the reviewer's precious advice. Based on the comments, we invited people with good language skills to revise the article.