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January 12, 2014

Mr James Prozenko, Associate Editor

*BMC complementary and alternative medicine*

Dear James,

I am sorry for the delay in getting back to you with a decision. It is with excitement that I resubmit to you a revised version of manuscript 5718954999889965, Dyadic Perceptions of Goals, Conflict Strategies, and Perceived Resolvability in Serial Arguments for the *BMC complementary and alternative medicine*. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to revise and resubmit this manuscript. In keeping with my last communication with you, I am resubmitting this revision before the agreed upon deadline, January 13, 2014. I appreciate the time and detail provided by each reviewer and by you and have incorporated the suggested changes into the manuscript to the best of my ability. The manuscript has certainly benefited from these insightful revision suggestions. Also, we are ended the correction of written English as required by the editor. I look forward to working with you and the reviewers to move this manuscript closer to publication in the *BMC complementary and alternative medicine*.

I have responded specifically to each suggestion below, beginning with your own. To make the changes easier to identify where necessary, I have numbered them.

**Point-by-Point response to the reviewers’ comments:**

We wish to thank the reviewers for their useful comments that greatly helped us improve the quality of our study. In this revised manuscript, we provide a new data that we believe strengthen the manuscript.

**# Review**

**Results:**

Growth inhibition by Anthocyanins: The response to the specific comment is not adequate and lacks clarity. The original recommendation was to change the use of the term ?chemo-prevention?. Since the experiments have used the tumor derived cell line
Hep3B, the authors should use the statement "in vitro and in vivo effects on the tumor cell phenotype? instead of chemo-prevention.

- We were used Hep3B hepatocarcinoma cells in the in vivo xenograft model. Anthocyanins inhibit the growth both in vitro and in vivo. However, we were not observed different phenotype on in vivo tumor cells vs in vitro cells. Anthocyanins exhibited the same effects.

Fig. 1B, 1C: Authors response to original concern does not adequately clarify the status of apoptosis at the dose of 400 μg/ml. Since this is the only dose that induces substantial decrease in cell survival, it is important to report the data on cellular apoptosis at this dose.

- We are changed the figure 1C that added the apoptotic effects of 400 μg/ml anthocyanins.