Author’s response to reviews

Title: Antihyperlipidemic Effects of Pleurotus Ostreatus (Oyster Mushrooms) in HIV-Infected Individuals Taking Antiretroviral Therapy

Authors:

Donald I Abrams (dabrams@hemeonc.ucsf.edu)
Paul Couey (pcouey@hemeonc.ucsf.edu)
Starley B Shade (starley.shade@ucsf.edu)
Mary Ellen Kelly (mkelly@hemeonc.ucsf.edu)
Nnemdi Kamanu-Elias (nnemdi@gmail.com)
Paul Stamets (paulstamets@gmail.com)

Version: 3 Date: 9 July 2011

Author’s response to reviews:

July 9, 2011

Jigisha Patel, MRCP, PhD
Iratxe Puebla
The BioMed Central Editorial Team
BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine

Dear Colleagues:

RE: MS: 1874349390500250

Antihyperlipidemic Effects of Pleurotus Ostreatus (Oyster Mushrooms) in HIV-Infected Individuals Taking Antiretroviral Therapy

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the reviewers’ thoughtful comments and to resubmit our manuscript. We have made most of the suggested changes in our analysis and in the manuscript and have highlighted the changes in the document. Allow me to discuss these changes point by point from Reviewer 2’s comments.

1. Abstract. Results. The statement about increased HDL and decreased triglycerides should be modified with a statement of a lack of consistent trend over time.

We presented the data in the results section and expanded on the reviewer’s comments in the manuscript.

2. Abstract. Conclusion. The final statement does not reflect that from the paper itself and is too strong.
The sentence was removed and replaced.

   Done

4. Results. Give more information about at what stage the 5 participants withdrew. Was data recorded at any time points for them? If so this should be reported too.

   This information was given on page 9. We re-ran the analyses including data from these 5 patients who did not complete the trial in an intent-to-treat analysis. The findings were not particularly different from what was presented in the original reporting.

5. Statistical methods state that the repeated measure of the outcomes over time will be modelled to estimate the change over time. However the results only report summary means which do not take into account the within person changes over time. If this analysis, allowing for the within person correlation of measures showed at least weak evidence of a real change there would be more justification for putting weight on the differences discussed at the final time point.

   We have changed the analyses to include within-person changes using the repeated measures model and appreciate the Reviewer’s recommendation to do so.

6. As the statistical methods clearly describe the method to be used to determine whether it would be worth conducting an RCT it would be good to make this outcome and how it compared to this a little clearer in the discussion.

   We added discussion on page 10 that hopefully addresses this comment.

7. Discussion. Again when referring to the possible changes in HDL cholesterol and triglycerides some comment about the pattern over time should be included, preferably based on a formal analysis incorporating the repeat measures.

   Thank you again. We added comments about a forced linear relationship in the results section and modified the discussion in the first and second paragraphs.

   Again, thank you for the opportunity to re-analyze our data, revise and resubmit the manuscript for your further consideration.

   We look forward to hearing your decision.

   Sincerely yours,