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November 2, 2014

Dear Academic Editor,

We would like to sincerely thank you for your response and reviewers comments, and the opportunity to revise our manuscript entitled “Characterization of Hypersensitivity Reactions Reported among Andrographis paniculata Users in Thailand Using Health Product Vigilance Center (HPVC) Database”.

We have made revisions in response to the insightful reviewers’ comments. On the next several pages, we provide point-by-point responses to three Reviewers’ comments and extra revisions and indicated where in the manuscript that we have made the changes.

We have no financial and non-financial conflicts of interest. All authors have contribution met criteria for authorship. We attest that this work is original and has not been published and is not being considered for publication elsewhere. Please feel free to contact me with additional questions or concerns.

Corresponding author:
Nathorn Chaiyakunapruk, PharmD, PhD
School of Pharmacy, Monash University Malaysia
Jalan Lagoon Selatan, 47500 Bandar Sunway, Selangor, Malaysia
Tel: (+603) 5514-4413 Fax: (+603) 5514-6326
E-mail: nathorn.chaiyakunapruk@monash.edu

Yours sincerely,

Nathorn Chaiyakunapruk, PharmD, PhD
Response to Reviews’ comments of the manuscript entitled
“Characterization of Hypersensitivity Reactions Reported among Andrographis paniculata
Users in Thailand Using Health Product Vigilance Center (HPVC) Database”

Reviewer #1 Samantha Coulson

Comment #1:
I am happy with the edits the authors have provided to the manuscript
Response #1
Thanks.

Reviewer #2 Matthew Bambling

Comment #2
In response to the points raised in the initial review, the authors submitted a revised
manuscript and letter of changes. The authors have addressed my original criticisms have
answered the questions raised. The paper is now acceptable for publication.
Response #2
Thanks.

Reviewer #3 Avni Sali

Comment #3
1 As this is a retrospective study it would appear that there has not been information about
use of antibiotics or probiotics.
Response #3
We agreed with reviewer that the data from a retrospective study is limited. Based on the
documented reports, none of the subjects reported the use of antibiotics or probiotics.

Comment 4
2 No information is given about possible contamination of this herb
Response #4
The issue of contamination of this herb was mentioned in the discussion part as shown
below (Page 8 of the submitted manuscript, the last paragraph of the discussion part)
An important limitation of current evidence is the lack of direct causation. Our study cannot eliminate a possibility that hypersensitivity reaction might be related to product contamination and its lack of standardization across brands. Even though the evidence presented in this article is substantiated with a large number of case reports submitted from various settings with differing brand products, there remains no direct causation study that can make such a conclusive remark.