

REVIEW COMMENTS FOR 2012/IBRR/1812

This manuscript evaluates the erythropoietic and bone marrow stimulating activity of *Terminalia catappa* extract and the possible role of nitric oxide signaling. The work has been carried out systematically and presented well with the described work showing good-fit to the scope of the journal, good novelty, good technical quality and good English quality.

1. L8-10 – Units should be provided for the values mentioned.
2. Throughout the text, the words “*Terminalia catappa*”, “*in vivo*” should be italicized. Also, except for first use, in all subsequent mentioning of *Terminalia catappa*, “*T. catappa*” should be used throughout.

Corrected

3. Please make sure to give the full form of all abbreviations used in the first instance.
Corrected
4. “Statistical analysis” section should be included at the end of the “Materials and Methods” section. corrected

5. L104 – Please correct “none anemic” as “non anemic”

Corrected

6. Captions of all the figures are not clear and the authors should retype them for clarity.

Corrected

7. Incorporate the appropriate y-axis label for Figure 3.

The correct y-axis label is already inserted (units/ml). This is based on the carbonic anhydrase assay technique employed.

Recommendation: Requires Minor Revision

Declarations: (1) No ethical or competing interest issues to declare

(2) I declare that no competing interest exists

Title and abstract: Title and abstract are clear and concise with the content sufficiently describing the work described.

Introduction: All the problem/ objective of this study are original, important and well defined. All the references cited are relevant and adequate.

Materials and methods: All the methods are sufficiently described enabling replication.

Results and discussion: Though statistical analysis was performed on the results, a description with the heading “Statistical Analysis” is missing under the “Material and Methods” section.

Corrected

Conclusion: No conclusion is provided, yet the results are discussed under the discussion part. If the journal style demands a separate conclusion section, the editor may ask the authors to provide a separate conclusion part. **Corrected**