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Miss Iratxe Puebla  
The BioMed Central Editorial Team  
*BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine*  

MS: 2014234646465336  

Dear Miss Iratxe Puebla  
The BioMed Central Editorial Team:  

Thank you very much for your e-mail of January 28th concerning our manuscript (MS # 2014234646465336 - Effects of Green Tea Catechins and Theanine on Preventing Influenza Infection among Healthcare Workers: A Randomized Controlled Trial) consideration as a "Research Article" to the *BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine*. We are happy that the manuscript might be acceptable with some revisions and we are grateful to you and the referees who have made valuable comments.  

With regard to your comments, we would like to respond as the following comments, highlighting with yellow markers in the revised manuscript.  

We have done our best to take advantage of all of the valuable comments of the referees, for whose guidance we are most grateful. We hope that we have succeeded in offering you an acceptable paper.  

Very truly yours,  

Hiroshi Yamada, MD, PhD, FACP  

Please address all correspondence to:  
Hiroshi Yamada, MD, PhD,  
Department of Drug Evaluation & Informatics,  
Graduate School of Pharmaceutical Sciences,  
University of Shizuoka,  
52-1 Yada, Suruga-ku,  
Shizuoka 422-8526, Japan  
Tel & Fax: +81-54-264-5762  
E-mail: hyamada@u-shizuoka-ken.ac.jp
Response to the reviewer 1:

With regard to your comments, we would like to make the corrections as follows, highlighting with yellow markers in the revised manuscript.

- We don’t deny the effectiveness of vaccination. However, the participants in the study were healthcare workers with a high rate of vaccination, which is the reason that the effectiveness of vaccination was not proved. Therefore, we have added the rate of vaccination in the Discussion section as follows:
  “the participants were healthcare workers with a high rate (94.9%) of vaccination”

We have also added the suggested change in the Results section as follows:
“age was the only significant variable and younger age was correlated with the high incidence of influenza infection (P = 0.027).

- We have already shown the main study results in table 2, comparing verum and placebo. Therefore, we did not add a figure with bars of the main study results because of the duplication.
Response to the reviewer 2:

With regard to your comments, we would like to make the corrections as follows, highlighting with yellow markers in the revised manuscript.

1. We have provided the figure of the time to the first influenza infection as the Kaplan-Meier curves of clinically defined influenza (Figure 2).
Response to the reviewer 3:

With regard to your statistical comments, we would like to make the corrections as follows, highlighting with yellow markers in the revised manuscript.

1. In the study, each participant was observed for the same time. We have added the suggested change in the Methods section as follows:
   “Each participant was observed for the same time”

2. In the study, no participants had more than one influenza infection during the observation time. Therefore, we have added the suggested change in the Results section as follows:
   “No participants had more than one influenza infection during the observation time.”

3. We have added the suggested change in the Methods section as follows:
   “The cases taken the influenza-free time to be censored were the occurrence of primary outcome and discontinue.”

4. We have added the suggested change in the Methods section as follows:
   “They were defined on multiple logistic regression analysis and transferred to the Cox proportional hazard model.”

We have added the suggested change in the Results section as follows:
“BMI ($P = 0.010$). Therefore, BMI was considered as a potential confounding variable and was included in the variables of multivariate analyses.”