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Author’s response to reviews:

BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine
19 March 2020

Dear Anne Menard,

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers’ comments on our manuscript entitled “Prevention of Acute Radiation-Induced Proctitis by Aloe vera: A Prospective Randomized, Double-blind, Placebo Controlled Clinical Trial in Pelvic Cancer Patients”, BCAM-D-18-01407. We would like to express our great appreciation to you and the reviewers for the comments on our paper. All of these comments were very helpful for revising and improving our paper. We have made corresponding corrections to these comments carefully. Our responses are given in a point-by-point manner below.

Kind regards,

Ebrahim Salehifar
Reviewers’ Comments:
Ranjeet Dash, Ph.D. (Reviewer 2)

The authors have addressed the comment satisfactorily.
We really appreciate the reviewer’s comment.

Ferran Torres (Reviewer 4)

I think that most of my previous concerns have been adequately addressed and that only very
minor points are still pending. My view is that if the authors accept my 2 minor suggestions and
apply them to the text, then there is no new reviews will be needed.

The suggestions/comments are:

1) In abstract a p&lt;0.05 is stated. Please substitute p&lt;0.05 with the actual p-value using the
same rule for rounding decimals as for the other p-values shown (3 decimals is fine).
As suggested by the reviewer, we modified according to reviewer comment (page 3, lines 13-14)

2) The excess of precision for the decimals used to describe Median (Q1,Q3) in Table 2 make it
difficult to be read. Please use only 1 or 2 decimals when needed, the values like &lt;0.000001
are not more informative than &lt;0.01 or &lt;0.1...
As suggested by the reviewer, we modified according to reviewer comment (page 13, Table 2)