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To, The Editor in Chief
BMC Complementary & Alternative Medicine

3rd Dec 2012

Sub: Submission of revised manuscript/justification of ID 1620577892776062

Dear Sir / Madam,

We thank the reviewers for the acceptance of our answers and changes made in revised manuscript. Hereby we are submitting the rationalization/justification of the query raised by the Editor for ID No. 1620577892776062 entitled “Evaluation of Pharmacological Activities and Assessment of Intraocular Penetration of an Ayurvedic Polyherbal Eye Drop (ITONE™) in Experimental Models”.

We look forward for the comments/suggestions of the Editor towards our justification.

Thanking you

Yours sincerely

Dr. T. Velpandian
Corresponding author
**Editor’s query**
You state that the manufacturers of Itone played no part in the design, implementation or interpretation of your study. However, you also acknowledge Dey's Medical Store for their financial involvement in your study. By our understanding, Dey's Medical Store is the manufacturer of Itone, and we would therefore consider this funding to constitute a potential competing interest. Could you please clarify whether we are correct in our understanding of this? We would also ask that you revise your Competing Interests section so that it clearly states any role that the manufacturers of Itone had in your study or, alternatively, states that they played no role.

**Justification**
Many Ayurvedic formulations are in the current use in India have been reported to have very good efficacy for certain indications however, the scientific rationale behind such claims have not been explored adequately. Our lab undertakes such exploratory studies to document many such traditional medicines. As a part of such ongoing efforts, ITONE was identified as a potential candidate. This product ITONE is there in the national and international market for the last 25 years and has been extensively used for various ocular conditions. When Dey’s Medical Store (Manufacturer of ITONE) was approached with the protocol to provide the formulation required for this study, Dey’s medical store agreed to provide the formulation and also extended a grant of $6500 through the Scheme section of our Institute. The grant was utilized towards the scientific study as per norms of the Institute to meet the expenses. Neither the principal investigator nor the co-investigator received any monitory benefit from this grant. Except as aforesaid, the manufacturer of the formulation did not have any role in planning, execution and interpretation of the study. Although, there is no existing competing
interest in the study, presence of competing interest can only be implied seemingly. I am hereby clarifying our role and looking forward for your suggestion to correct our study status with regard to the aspect of potential competing interest.