

Editor's comment:

The submitted manuscript was largely improved. However, some queries have not been properly addressed.

Other comments:

- 1.) Explanation concerning selection of doses is necessary. Why did you used selected does (50, 100 and 200 mg/kg) not 20, 50, 75 mg/kg or 1000 mg/kg?
- 2.) All the limitations of the study and its clinical implications should be presented in details in the Discussion.
- 3.) The list of references should be uniformed. Present version does not pass criteria and instruction for authors of BJMMR (see references: 9, 10, 14, 18, 19, 20, 26, 41).
- 4.) Some references should be combined in the text, e.g., (6, 11, 12) instead of (6), (11), (12). Moreover, 50, 100 and 200 mg/kg instead of 50 mg, 100 mg and 200 mg/kg (line 139) as well as 25°C instead 25 °C, and H₂O₂ not H2O2.

After such editorial changes the manuscript could be publish in BJMMR.

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

Author's Feedback:

Thank you so much for the comments you have raised to make this manuscript acceptable for publication. We have made the corrections but have the following to say:

1. Our choice of dosage selection was borne out of a previous study by Jayanthi (2011). I wouldn't know what informed his choice; why he chose 50, 100 and 200 mg/kg and not 20, 50 and 75 mg/kg. However, he got excellent results from his study on male rats and so we decided to use the same dosages on female rats in our study perhaps, it might produce the same effect on fertility.
2. The limitations we encountered in the study and their clinical implications are found in the discussion: lines- 213-217 and 276-281.