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Author's response to reviews: see over
To,
The Editor
BMC Research notes

We have revised the manuscript according to the guidelines of reviewers. We also checked the manuscript by Edanz Group Global Ltd. The name of the ethics committee who gave approval in the main manuscript was added in Methods-Animal section, line 14. I have also given point by point response to reviewers.

Thank you very much.

Trusting in your good judgments and fairness.

Sincerely yours,

Md. Rafikul Islam
Department of Pharmacy
International Islamic University Chittagong
Chittagong-4203, Bangladesh
Response to Reviewer 1

Reviewer's report

Title: Antibacterial, antidiarrhoeal and cytotoxic activities of methanol extract and its fractions of Caesalpinia bonducuela (L.) Roxb leaves

Version: 2 Date: 19 January 2013

Reviewer: Veeramuthu Duraipandiyan

Reviewer's report:
Still there is need more corrections in the manuscript. I am not satisfied that author revision.
The Author has mentioned chloroform extract showed maximum antidiarrheal activity, but in abstract, conclusion section it is wrongly mentioned as methanol fraction showed significant antidiarrhoeal activity. It should be corrected.

Response: Actually data presented in table 3, showed ethyl acetate fraction has the highest activity. Therefore, it has been corrected in Abstract, conclusion section as ethyl acetate fraction instead of methanol extract.

Throughout the manuscript the cited references should be followed as journal format. The Author has given numbers for cited references in text and also given full name, it should be corrected. For example in the background section mentioned ‘DeviRA et al., (2008)’. The year should be removed. Initials should be removed.

Response: Now all the cited references in text have been followed as journal format. ‘DeviRA et al., (2008)’ was written as “Devi et al.” Ahmed F et al., as Ahmed et al.; Ahsan et al., (2010) as Ahsan et al.

Antibacterial assay
The sentences ‘B. megaterium and Klebsiella sp’ should be corrected as ‘B. megaterium and Klebsiella spp.

Response: Corrected as Bacillus megaterium and Klebsiella spp. in the whole manuscript.

The references are not formatted in the journal format. It should be corrected in the journal format

Response: All the references are now corrected according to journal format.

Throughout the references, the name plant scientific names should be italicized

Response: In References No. 2, 23, 42, 44, the plants names are now italicized.
Discussion part should be improved with suitable related work

**Response:** More data are added like mechanism of castor oil induced diarrhea and function of phytoconstituents to stop the diarrhea. For detailed please see in discussion section in the 2nd para followed by references no. [54, 55].

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Response:** The manuscript has been checked by BMC recommended Edanz Group Global Ltd; Ref no.G1302-3028-Islam

**Response to Reviewer 2**

**Reviewer's report**

**Title:** Antibacterial, antidiarrhoeal and cytotoxic activities of methanol extract and its fractions of Caesalpinia bonducella (L.) Roxb leaves

**Version:** 2  **Date:** 19 January 2013

**Reviewer:** GERALD NGO T TEKE

**Reviewer's report:**
After re-reviewing the manuscript, i noticed that none of my suggestions was taken into consideration. Is it that the authors ignored my report or they did not see it? the same report i made previously.

**Comments**

Minor

**Response:** *C. bonducella* is the scientific name of the plant. So it is italicized.

2. Abstract-results-line 4: What is pet? If petroleum, then you should indicate in brackets before this point.

**Response:** Pet is petroleum ether. Now it has been corrected as Petroleum ether (Pet. ether) in Abstract-results and through out the manuscript as pet. ether

3. Abstract-results-line 4: …bacteria among nine that showed…. Insert highlight.

**Response:** have done (*Bacillus megaterium* and *Klebsiella* spp.)

4. Introduction-background-line 2: triterpinoids or triterpenoids?
Response: It will be triterpenoids and has been corrected.


Response: It has been corrected…..(and was concentrated to obtain the methanol crude extract…..)


Response: Written as…. These plates were then kept at 4°C for a 1-h diffusion of the test material.


Response: Adjusted as ….There was a gradual change in concentration surrounding the discs.

8. Materials & methods-castor oil induced diarrhoea-line 15: … placed in individual cages? Or What?

Response: Corrected as ……..(they were individually placed in cages)

9. Results –antimicrobial-line 4: … (Table). Remove brackets. Or is it journal format?

Response: Yes, (Table).. is a journal format.

Major

10. The title of the manuscript does not exactly match what was done. The methanol extract was first prepared as crude extract. Then later partitioned into ethyl acetate, chloroform and petroleum ether fractions. The title should read… activities of the methanol extract and its fractions of Caesalpinia bonducella (L.) Roxb leaves. Or you adjust it better.

Response: Antibacterial, antidiarrhoeal, and cytotoxic activities of methanol extract and its fractions of Caesalpinia bonducella (L.) Roxb leaves

11. Proper language checks throughout the manuscript especially usage of ‘the’ as article and conjugation of verbs. Meeting a native of the language is recommended.
Response: The manuscript has been checked by Edanz Group Global Ltd; Ref no.G1302-3028-Islam

12. The methanol extract is not a fraction like ethyl acetate for example. Readjust this throughout the manuscript.

Response: Now written as methanol extract throughout the manuscript

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare
Response to Reviewer 3

Reviewer's report

Title: Antibacterial, antidiarrhoeal and cytotoxic activities of methanol extract and its fractions of Caesalpinia bonducella (L.) Roxb leaves

Version: 2 Date: 22 January 2013

Reviewer: Richard Cimanga Kanyanga

Reviewer's report:
Minor essential revisions
Abstract:
The authors must be reported the inhibition diameter of the most active fraction

Response: Now diameter of the zone of inhibition was added (Maximum zone of inhibition (25mm) was obtained by the methanol extract at an 800 µg/disc concentration against S. aureus.)

Background
Column 1: L12 write seeds ....possess instead of seed......possesses Column 2: write L4-L5: antifendant instead of Antifedant, other words written with a first letter in capital must be corrected in the same sens

Response: We have corrected all. (It has been reported that seeds of the plant possess antidiarrhoeal, antiviral, antibacterial, antimicrobial, antifungal, antidiabetic, antitumor, antipyretic and analgesic, antifilarial, anxiolytic, anti-inflammatory, antioxidant, immunomodulatory, adaptogenic, anticonvulsant, antispasmodic, nootropic, antifeedant, antiamoebic, antioestrogenic, diuretic, insecticidal)

Methods
- Give de code of the voucher specimen

Response: We added the specimen no. in Page 2, Section : method/plant material..line 6

- Give the amount of the each methanol extract (two portions) and those of the evaporated fractions

Response: Amounts of methanol fraction (two portions) and concentrated fractions are added in Extract preparation section; Page 2; [One portion (1.5g) was poured into glass vials to be tested as crude methanol extract, whereas the second portion (8 g) was dissolved in 100 mL methanol and partitioned successively with ethyl acetate, chloroform, and pet. ether. The fractions were then concentrated using a rotary evaporator to give ethyl acetate fraction (yield weight 2.50g), chloroform fraction (yield weight 1.25g), and pet. ether fraction (yield weight 2.15g)]

Antibacterial assay
Why have you used the high concentration to evaluate the antimicrobial activity (300 to 800 µg/ml)? I think that this was possible because all assays for antibacterial activity by the disc method (diffusion methods) always need high concentrations. It was better for me to use concentration between 10 to 50 µg/ml. The used method is a qualitative method and does not give the just antiabctrail potency of the extract. In general, the test can be accepted because other scientists who use this method also use high concentration.

Response: Yes, there are many reports, used this high concentrations.

Results
-Give the inhibition diameter off all tested fraction or do the reference to the table of the results

Response: Already included in table 2.

Castor-oil
L5: write ethyl acetate and chloroform fractions produced 51 and 50% inhibition......because the first fraction is almost more active than the second one. In general, the names of the plants must be written in italic in the text.

Response: Now we have corrected it and names of the plants are italicized.

References
Some journals are written with the volume and the number and other not, why? Thus this section must be written according to the instruction of the journal.

Response: We have removed the number. According to journal format only volume should be shown. All references are corrected uniquely.