

Editor's comment:

The submitted manuscript was perilously evaluated by two independent reviewers, receiving high marks. However, from the editorial point of view, it still needs revision before publication. The main problem is combination of results and discussion. Both sections should be presented separately.

Other comments:

- 1.) Declaration of Helsinki is related to human/clinical studies, not animal ones.
- 2.) The strain code of the S-D(?) rats and type of the diet should be mentioned.
- 3.) The full botanical characterization (including kind, vegetation stages, cultivation conditions, etc.) of the examined plant is necessary, especially since information about chemical contents of the seed extraction was not presented. Was any instrumental analysis (e.g., HPLC) done for the studied extract? Without such data the reader could only speculate about active compounds that are responsible for the final therapeutical and toxicological effect of the extract.
- 4.) Some explanation concerning selection of doses is necessary.
- 5.) Group codes (A-G), presented in Material and method section, are unnecessary, since they are not used in remaining part of the manuscript and should be omitted.
- 6.) Name of the evaluated hormones should be presented in subchapter 2.5. Their unit is unknown (see table 3).
- 7.) All tables should be reedited.
- 8.) Information from Material and method section should not be repeated in remaining parts of the text (e.g., line 135.).
- 9.) All the limitations of the study and its clinical implications should be presented in details in the Discussion.
- 10.) The list of references should be uniformed. Present version does not pass criteria and instruction for authors of BJMMR.
- 11.) Some references should be combined in the text, e.g., (4-6) instead of (4), (5), (6). Moreover, 50, 10 and 200 mg/kg instead of 50 mg, 10 mg and 200 mg/kg.
- 12.) The language of the manuscript should be also improved.

13.) All acronyms should be described at the end of the manuscript. Their spelling should be uniformed in the text. Presently, both forms of the term e.g., l-dopa and L-Dopa were applied. Furthermore, acronyms should be removed from the title of subchapter and tables.

I hope that my review will be helpful for you and for the authors.

Author's Feedback:-

Thank you for your interest in our manuscript. The comments you raised in your review have been attended you. However, we have the following comments.

We did not perform the pytochemical analysis because it has been performed already by other authors who have already presented the information we needed so we cited them in the study (6-9).