



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	2012/IBRR/1812
Title of the Manuscript:	ERYTHROPOIETIC AND BONE MARROW STIMULATING ACTIVITY OF TERMINALIA CATAPPA EXTRACT: POSSIBLE ROLE OF NITRIC OXIDE SIGNALING

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected' if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	I reviewed the manuscript with the first document. The author(s) should check their first post for re-alignments.	
Specific comments:	The references cited in the text were put in [] instead of ()	Corrected
Title and abstract	TITLE CHANGE TO: ERYTHROPOIETIC AND BONE MARROW STIMULATING ACTIVITY OF <i>TERMINALIA CATAPPA</i> METHANOL-WATER LEAF EXTRACT: POSSIBLE ROLE OF NITRIC OXIDE SIGNALING ABSTRACT: Line 8, use <i>catappa</i> not Catappa. Line 9, put hyphen after phenylhydrazine. Lines 10-11, do the values stand for the concentration of Hb or rate of synthesis? Either way, they are better put in brackets. Line 12, the value should come after anhydrase activity and in brackets. Same as that in line 13. Line 15, italicize in vivo.	I do not completely agree with the title change. I think the title as it is quite reflects that the work involved the use of extracts of TC and hence the use of the new suggested title would make it long and cumbersome without adding any significant scientific context to the paper Line 8, 9 corrected I believe the values in line 12 and 13 makes more meaning where it is since the sentence is referring to two different values Line 15 corrected
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	Line 27, Combrataceae not combrataceae. Check spelling of originiare. Line 29, : instead of ; Line 31-32, insert reference(s). Line 34-35, references in text should be in () not []. Line 49, insert comma after plasma arginine. Line 57, is it phenylhydrazine or phenyl hydrazine, check lines 9 and 22, insert hyphen after phenylhydrazine.	Line 27 corrected Line 29 corrected Line 31-32, 34-35, 49, 57 corrected
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	See Introduction above.	
Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the	Line 63, insert 'the' before Botanical, change garden to Garden. Line 64, insert 'and' after 7.72518. Line 66, undo	Line 63, 64, 66 corrected Line 67 corrected drying was carried out



SDI Review Form 1.5

work)	italicizing of L. Line 67, 27°C is almost like room temperature. Could the leaves have at that temperature in 24 h. Line 68, put full stop after pulverized. Line 69, what was the ratio of methanol to distilled water. Line 70, what did you use in concentrating the filtrate at 40°C? Line 78, insert a reference after animal studies. Use thirty-six not thirty six. You can use mean $\pm$ SD of the weights instead of the range. Line 79, well-ventilated not well ventilated. Animal House not Animal house. Line 80, insert comma after Zaria, delete 'and', insert 'and' after weeks. Line 83, re-construct to say... administered to groups ----, ----, ----, ---- and ---- because the sentence, as it is, means Groups B and C were also treated with phenylhydrazine. If you meant that anaemia was induced using phenylhydrazine, you can re-construct the sentence to reflect that. Line 86, what was the vehicle used in administering the TC fractions, since you dried? Move lines 90-91, and insert before Bone marrow was.... lines 101-108, highlight the modifications. Line 111, reference [29] is inconsistent with the others used. Insert comma after Briefly. Line 112, re-constituted inconsistent with that used in line 71. Line 113, delete 'then' after was. Line 114, insert 'the' before pH.	for 72hrs at 27°C line 69; the extraction was not carried out with a mixture of methanol and water rather they were separate independent extraction processes. Line 70, 78, 79, 83, 86, 111 corrected
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	Results There should be no discussions, just presentation of the results and signs for statistical analysis. Delete lines 119-123, 134-137, 146 and 150-153. Re-construct sentences. Insert ($p < 0.05$) or ($p > 0.05$) where appropriate. Discussion Delete lines 158-160. Re-construct the rest. Line 162, insert comma after Herein then re-construct the sentence. There is some level of arrogance in it. Line 164, italicize	In my opinion these lines suggested are not discussions per se but rather just to introduce and present the results in the scientific context of its significance.



SDI Review Form 1.5

	Terminalia catappa. In fact, use <i>T. Catappa</i>. Break lines 164-168 into 2-3 sentences. Line 170, insert comma after consequently. Re-construct lines 171-172. Line 173, insert ‘that’ after observed. Line 174, insert comma after non anemic. Lines 173-178, break into 3 sentences to bring out the meaning. Line 179, insert comma after mechanism. Lines 180-184, re-construct sentence. Break into two. Line 186, insert comma after In addition. Line 187, insert comma after L-Arginine. Line 188, insert ‘the’ after that. Line 192, italicize in vivo. Line 205, insert comma after ‘required’ and after ‘though’.	Line 164-168, 170 corrected I feel very strongly that line 171-172 is in context of the paper, the sentence is just reflecting the role of CA as a biomarker of the later stages of erythroid development from early stages of the progenitor cellular development. Line 173, 174, 180-184 corrected
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	No mentioned.	
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	No conclusion	
References	Adequate, but, should be re-aligned to that of IBRR	