Dear Editorial Director

Thank you very much for your e-mail message of December 22, 2004 concerning our manuscript. We sincerely appreciate the very constructive suggestions made by you and the reviewers. We have revised our manuscript in accordance with the comments sent to us. We trust that the revisions we have made are satisfactory and that our revised manuscript is now suitable for publication in BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine.

Our point-by-point answers to the reviewers’ comments are described. We are looking forward to hearing from you soon.

With best regards

Sincerely yours

Haruo Sugiura, Ph. D.
Laboratory of Exercise Physiology and Health Education, Gifu Pharmaceutical University, 5-6-1 Mitahora-higashi, Gifu 502-8585, Japan
e-mail: sugiura@gifu-pu.ac.jp

Response to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewer: Dr. Takuji Tanaka

Thank you so much for your helpful comments, suggestion, and advice. We tried to revise the manuscript according to your comments.

Detailed comments:
1. Change the TITLE: The title has been changed as: “Effects of Maharishi Amrit Kalash 5 as an Ayurvedic herbal food supplement on immune functions in aged mice”.

2. The comment on "Introduction" section was considered and consequently the essential part according to the comment was inserted. page 4, lines 12~14 (revised manuscript).
3. "The authors should discuss the reason for lack of dose-dependency." The lack of dose-dependency was discussed and revised part was inserted. page 15, lines 1-3 (revised manuscript).

4. "In the Discussion section, the authors can compare........" Six sentences have been added. page 14, lines 15 from the bottom and page 13, lines 18 from the bottom (revised manuscript).

The following reference has been added:

Minor comments:
1. Page 2, Abstract, Background: The sentences have been revised. page 2, lines 2-4 (revised manuscript).
2. Page 2, Abstract, Results: line 2 from the bottom (the first draft): The sentences have been revised. page 2, line 5 from the bottom (revised manuscript).
3. Page 4, lines 11-12: The references have been added. page 4, line 11 (revised manuscript).
4. Page 14, line 8: "aged mice" has been inserted. page 15, line 5 (revised manuscript).
5. Figure 2: Results section has been revised. page 10, lines 5-7 from the bottom (revised manuscript).
6. As for the written style of the manuscript: the revised one was carefully checked by a native speaker who has quite a long currier in the field of Medicine and Biology. We believe the revised manuscript has now well improved.

Reviewer: Dr. Mark Miller

Thank you so much for your helpful comments, suggestion, and advice. We tried to revise the manuscript according to your comments.

Specific comment:
Correction made.
1. The abstract (page 2, lines 10-12): The unnecessary sentences have been deleted. (the first draft).
2. Conclusion: The sentences have been revised. page 3, lines 1-2 (revised manuscript).
3. "Dosing is strange...": A few sentences as a part of the revised manuscript have been inserted. page 6, lines 10-14 (revised manuscript).
4. Page 12 last paragraph....: "Recent reports" have been deleted. page 12, line 6 from the bottom (the first draft). "Some researches" have been inserted. page 13, line 1 (revised manuscript).
5. Page 14, dose-response effects: The related sentences have been inserted. page 15, lines 1-3 (revised manuscript).
6. Re-define the conclusion.......: This part was revised and some sentences have been added to the text. page 15, lines 9-10 (revised manuscript).