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Dear Editor,

I refer to your evaluation of our manuscript “Vitamin B6 deficiency and diseases in elderly – a study in nursing homes”. Hereby follows our response to the comments.

**Comments to reviewer 2: Jessica Sautter**

I do not understand the comment from the reviewer. In the comments from the reviewer dated 31 October 2012, the reviewer had written:

*There is still one instance of using "predictor" that can imply cause and effect: Discussion, main findings, first paragraph, last sentence. It would be better for the authors to use more benign "were associated with."*

In the revised manuscript I replaced “predictor” with “were associated with” exactly as recommended.

In the new comments from the reviewer, the reviewer wants me to replace “predictor” with “are associated with” not only once, but each time (on pages 2, 3 and 10) the word predictor has been used.

On page 10, I have revised the paper according to the comment. I kindly ask the Editor to allow me to use the word “predictor” on pages 2 and 3. One of the aims of the study was to find predictors of B6 deficiency. To rewrite the aims of the study is not correct, and I still claim that this use of the word “predictor” is correct.

Sincerely yours
On behalf of the authors

Per G Farup MD, Ph.D
Professor, Faculty of Medicine, Norwegian University of Science and Technology.