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Dear Editor,

“BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine”

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript (MS: 1128487373692068) entitled “Evaluation of gut modulatory and bronchodilator activities of Amaranthus spinosus Linn.” Please find enclosed the revised manuscript after incorporation of the changes and the reply to reviewer’s comments as described below. We feel that the manuscript after revision is considerably improved and we hope to hear a positive decision on it soon.

With kind regards

Sincerely

Dr. Samra Bashir, PhD
Assistant Professor
Dept of Biological and Biomedical Sciences
Tel: (+92) 21-34864564
Fax: (+92) 21-493 4294, 493 2095
E.mail: samra.bashir@aku.edu

Answers to reviewer’s comments

Please find below answers to the reviewer’s comments.

Referee 1:

Title: Pharmacological studies on gut modulatory and bronchodilator activities of Amaranthus spinosis Linn.

Version: 1 Date: 6 April 2012
Reviewer: Jacques Y Datte

EC50 values and DL 50 doses must be well defined

Reply: We have rechecked the EC50 values mentioned in our manuscript and found them correct. We did not assess the DL50 doses. However, the plant has also been tested safe up to around 4 times higher doses (Kumar et al., 2010; 2011) than the highest dose found effective in this study. We have added this piece of information in the revised manuscript accordingly. (Page#15, subtitle “Discussion”, line# 4-6).

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Referee 2:

Title: Pharmacological studies on gut modulatory and bronchodilator activities of *Amaranthus spinosis* Linn.

Version: 1 Date: 14 April 2012
Reviewer: Gabriel Agbor

Manuscript is well written with few corrections to be made.

**Reply:** We appreciate the reviewer’s positive comments.

**Minor corrections**

Page 7: Laxative activity

-All five groups........18? Is it seconds, minutes, hours or days?

**Reply:** We are sorry for such a type mistake. It is 18 hours, which is represented as “18 h”. (“18 h” has been incorporated in the revised text at page#7, subtitle “Laxative activity”, line#9).

Page 13

-1st line: K+ and and?

**Reply:** It was also a typo mistake, we have removed an extra “and” in the revised manuscript (Page#13, subtitle “Effect on rabbit trachea”, line#1).

Discussion page 18

-Last paragraph: Check the spelling of Amaranthus

**Reply:** It was a spelling mistake. The plant name “*Amarasnt hus*” was corrected as “*Amaranthus*” in the revised manuscript (Page#18, subtitle “Discussion”, line#18).

**Major corrections**

General: The abbreviation As. Cr for *Amaranthus spinosis* crud extract is not representative, it is instead confusing because author use both in the same paragraph. I suggest authors should avoid using the abbreviation.
Reply: As per reviewer’s suggestion, “As.Cr” has been replaced with “the crude extract of *Amaranthus spinosisus*” through the text in the revised manuscript.

Page 11: Laxative effect

-Range of 100-300 mg/kg. Since there are only two doses it should be better written as dose level of 100 and 300 mg/kg.

**Reply:** It has been corrected as “at the dose level of 100 and 300 mg/kg” in the revised manuscript (Page#11, subtitle “Laxative activity”, line#2-3).

-Number of stool counted is presented. But the authors need to mention what the quality of stool was (were the stool watery or solid; did the authors weigh the paper before and after the laxative experiment because watery stool will weigh more and this can give the degree of wetness of the stool).

**Reply:** The reviewer has rightly mentioned, there are different protocols used in many studies to evaluate the laxative effect of test materials such as; (1) by weighing the wet as well as dry feces (Kane et al., 2009; Meite et al., 2010; Sharma et al., 2011) or (2) by counting total number of feces as fecal output (Haruna, 1997; Mehmood et al., 2011; Rehman et al., 2012) or (3) by assessing the consistency of stool (Rush et al., 2002).

In this study, we have followed the previous described method of Haruna (1997) which involve the assessment of laxative effect of test material by counting the total number of feces. This has also been mentioned in the revised text (Page#7, subtitle “Laxative activity”, line#2).

Figures

-Lack of tiles making it difficult to know which of them is figure1, 2.... etc. Authors should include titles to each figure.

**Reply:** Titles has been provided to all the figures in the revised manuscript.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

**Referee 3:**

Title: Pharmacological studies on gut modulatory and bronchodilator activities of *Amaranthus spinosis* Linn.

Version: 1 Date: 23 April 2012

Reviewer: Shaikh Uddin

Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript entitled "Pharmacological studies on gut modulatory and bronchodilator activities of *Amaranthus spinosis* Linn." is an interesting article which evaluated traditional uses of *A. spinosis* for gut modulatory and bronchodilatory activity on animal model. The manuscript has sufficient merits and
scientific outcome in terms of entopharmacological and complementary medicine research. The manuscript can be accepted in this journal. However, I have some minor comments which should be addressed before publication:

**Reply:** We appreciate the reviewer’s encouraging comments.

**Minor comments:**

1. The title need to be changed as "Evaluation of gut modulatory and bronchodilator activities of Amaranthus spinosis Linn." Because author evaluated its traditional uses and confirmed its mechanism of action.

**Reply:** According to the reviewer’s suggestion, title of the manuscript has been changed as “Evaluation of gut modulatory and bronchodilator activities of *Amaranthus spinosis* Linn.” in the revised manuscript.

2. In page 4, 3rd paragraph, line 3, needs a reference of the constituents

**Reply:** As per suggestion, respective reference has been provided in the revised manuscript (Page#4, subtitle “Background”, line#16).

3. In page 5, the title should be "Materials and Methods" and the sub-title should be divided in to "Plant materials" and "Preparation of crude extracts and fractions" separately

**Reply:** The title have been revised as “Materials and Methods” and sub titles has been divided separately into “Plant materials” and “Preparation of crude extract and fractions”, as suggested.

4. In page 5, line 15, please mention original yield as gm with % and same as in fractions yields

**Reply:** Original yield in “gm” of the crude extract and fractions has been mentioned in the revised manuscript (Page#5, subtitle “Preparation of crude extract and fractions”, line#9, and page#6, line#1 and 2).

5. The sub-heading "Drugs and Animals" should be separated as "Drugs and reagents" and "Animals"

**Reply:** The sub-heading "Drugs and Animals" has been separated as "Drugs and reagents" and "Animals" in the revised manuscript, as was suggested.

6. The reference section should get more attention because it has lots of formatting issues, example, books reference (ref. no. 1 and 14) are different.

**Reply:** We have reviewed the references and formatted them as per journal style.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:** I declare that I have no competing interests.

**Editorial comments:**
We recommend that you ask a native English speaking colleague to help you copyedit the paper. If this is not possible, you may need to use a professional language editing service. For authors who wish to have the language in their manuscript edited by a native-English speaker with scientific expertise, BioMed Central recommends Edanz (www.edanzediting.com/bmc1). BioMed Central has negotiated a 10% discount to the fee charged to BioMed Central authors by Edanz. Use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of acceptance for publication. For more information, see our FAQ on language editing services at http://www.biomedcentral.com/authors/authorfaq/editing.

Reply: We have reviewed the manuscript critically for English language corrections and made necessary changes where needed.

References:


