



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

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

PART B:

	FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
For comments of WD and author's feed back		
For comments of BSI and author's feed back		
For comments of COI and author's feed back		
For comments of Reviewer 4 and author's feed back		
For comments of Reviewer 5 and author's feed back		
For comments of Reviewer 6 and author's feed back		
	The authors have appropriately addressed many of the concerns raised by the reviewers. However, some issues remain. Since nitric oxide synthase activity was not measured in this study, the last sentence of the Results section of the Abstract should be replaced with "TC inhibited arginase activity significantly..." Similarly, the conclusion that TC enhances nitric oxide synthase activity needs to be tempered since changes in substrate availability caused by arginase may not directly affect nitric oxide synthase activity. There are several concerns with the statistical analyses. The use of a t-test is not appropriate when comparing means from multiple groups. In addition, $P < 0.05$ rather than $P = 0.05$ should be used when determining statistical significance. Finally, in all figure legends, $n=3$ is stated but this is followed by the statement that "The results are presented as mean and SD of four independent experiments." This contradiction needs to be resolved. The manuscript should undergo a thorough editorial review for grammar, typos, and inappropriate use of capitalisation. In the figure legends the word "alphabet" should read "letter".	Corrected in result section of abstract and line 241 of conclusion section. Corrected in line 102-103 On the issue of $n=3$. 3 represents the number of mice in each group/experiment, while the statement mean and SD of four different experiments actually tells that we repeated the experiment four to arrive at those mean values presented. Hence i see no contradictions in all the figure legends. In addition every occurrence of $P=$ has been modified to $P <$ Line 84 Riley et al 2001 changed to Hafid-Medheb et al., 2003 Line 89 Zhang et al., 2011 used to replace Hafid-Medheb et al., 2003 Different alphabets changed to different letters in all the figure legends Capitalization of Group in all the figure legends Un-capitalization of catappa and italization of Terminalia catappa in the abstracts