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Reviewer's report:

Since the authors do not have any data regarding the mechanism, I still do not agree with their text in the conclusion of the manuscript:

"Cola nitida produced a reduction in the oral exposure/bioavailability of metoclopramide. This reduction strongly suggests an increased catalytic activity of CYP2D6 and SULT2A1 and/or efflux function of P-gp in the intestine and/or liver by Cola nitida."

The data presented do not suggest anything regarding CYP activity changes. It should be emphasized, instead, that these could be potential mechanisms that were NOT investigated in the present work.

Also, a similar conclusion should be removed from the Abstract. The abstract conclusion should just contain the text in black print, indicating a possible interaction.

In addition, I do not know why the authors say in their response to Reviewer 4 that the animals received paracetamol - it was never mentioned in previous versions of the manuscript?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

I am able to assess the statistics
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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