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October 26, 2011

Dr. Nehme Gabriel
Editor in Chief of Nutrition Journal

Dear Dr. Gabriel,

Please find another revision of our manuscript entitled “Effects of acute ingestion of different fats on oxidative stress and inflammation in overweight and obese adults” uploaded for continued consideration by the Nutrition Journal. We are pleased to hear that the reviewers were satisfied with the adjustments that we made to our manuscript based on their insightful suggestions. We have made the additional adjustments recommended and look forward to hearing back from you regarding the acceptability of the manuscript.

We do not have any potential competing interests. All authors contributed to the experimental design, interpretation of results, and manuscript preparation and all have seen and approved the final version of this manuscript.

We have responded to the reviewers’ most recent suggestions/comments following this letter and the revision has been modified in the highlighted sections. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Abigail Peairs, PhD
Assistant Professor
Department of Nutritional Sciences
University of Cincinnati
Abigail.peairs@uc.edu
Response to reviewers
We would once again like to thank these reviewers for their time and review of our manuscript and modifications. We have adjusted the manuscript accordingly and have responded to specific concerns below with reference to changes in the text.

Reviewer #1:
1. the second concluding statement, "SFA negatively impacted postprandial ICAM-1..." seems bias against SFAs unless also indicating that the SFA meal caused the smallest (or MFAs may cause the greatest) increase in postprandial TGs as a main conclusion...

Response: Regarding the conclusions of the study, we see the reviewer’s point based on the emphasis of this study being placed on inflammation and not blood lipids that we should not include the statement in conclusion as could seem biased based on evidence as discussed. We have modified our conclusion to reflect this change and keep the conclusion more neutral (page 13).

Reviewer #2:
1. The new data in Table 1 indicate that at least one subject had diabetes - the authors should remove diabetes from the exclusion criteria in the methods section.

Response: We have modified the methods to indicate that subjects recruited had not been “diagnosed” with diabetes or any inflammatory condition (page 5).