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Analysis of the effect of the active compound of green tea (EGCG) on the proliferation of peripheral blood mononuclear cells.

Farid Saleh, Raj Raghupathy, Sami Asfar, Medhat Oteifa and Noha Al-Saleh.

Third Revision July 14, 2014: Response to reviewers’ comments

**Reviewer #2:**

**Reviewer's report:**
The authors have answered my questions.

**Our reply:** We thank the respected reviewer for being satisfied with our answers to the comments raised in the first revision of the manuscript.

**Reviewer #3:**

**Reviewer's report:**
Minor Essential Revisions
1: The issue of cancer insurgence is very important and authors should work accordingly. The authors should refer the work of scientists at appropriate places.

**Our reply:**
We thank the respected reviewer for the comment, and we agree with it. We have tried our best to accommodate in our manuscript as many related studies as possible. We have now referred to seven more studies in our manuscript (references 43 to 49).

2. The authors should check the reference data and how they are cited in the text. References No. 38 & 39. "Similarly, Wilasrusmee and co-workers and Zvetkova and colleagues reported that EGCG inhibited the proliferation of murine lymphocytes in vitro, and the production of neopterin, a marker for cellular immunity by human PBMC, respectively [38, 39]" I think these two scientists didn't reported such results for EGCG. Please check these mistakes for meticulousness.

**Our reply:**
This reviewer is indeed correct. We have checked both publications, and the word “EGCG” is now replaced with “green tea extract” on page 11 of the manuscript (highlighted in yellow), as suggested by the respected reviewer.

3: The authors should update the reference database. No reference from the 2011-2014 has been cited in the paper. Its mean that no scientists worked on green tea and cancer.

**Our reply:**
We agree with the respected reviewer, and, accordingly a new paragraph (highlighted in yellow) containing seven new references is now added on page 11 of the manuscript. These new seven references are now listed in the Reference section of the manuscript on page 18 (highlighted in yellow).
Discretionary Revisions
The English language should be improved.

**Our reply:**
We respect the reviewer’s comment, but the manuscript has already been edited for the English language by two professors and one senior journal editor.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field.

**Our reply:**
We sincerely thank the respected reviewer for considering the research work and the related manuscript as being of outstanding merit and interest in its field.

Quality of written English: Acceptable.

**Our reply:**
We thank the reviewer for his comment.

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

**Our reply:**
With all due respect to the reviewer, the statistical analysis for the data presented in the manuscript has been reviewed by a senior statistician and epidemiologist. If necessary, a letter confirming that the statistical method used is appropriate and accurate can be provided by the statistician upon request.