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Dear Dr. Nagathihalli,

Thank you very much for your review of our manuscript entitled “Effects of L-carnitine supplementation on oxidative stress and antioxidant enzymes activities in patients with coronary artery disease: a randomized, placebo-controlled trial”. We have carefully addressed the comments of the reviewers (please see the following pages) and we have incorporated their suggestions in the revised manuscript. Please review the revised version of our manuscript. If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you very much for considering our revised manuscript for publication in your journal.

Sincerely,

Ping-Ting Lin, Ph.D.
School of Nutrition,
Chung Shan Medical University, Taichung, Taiwan.
Telephone: +886-4-24730022 Ext. 12187;
Fax: +886-4-23248175
E-mail: apt810@csmu.edu.tw ( * )
Manuscript (ID: 1462232731301742) “Effects of L-carnitine supplementation on oxidative stress and antioxidant enzymes activities in patients with coronary artery disease: a randomized, placebo-controlled trial”. The answers of reviewers’ comments follow:

Reviewer #1:
Reviewer's report: N/A. Quality of written English: Acceptable
A1. Thank you for the reviewer’s comments.

Reviewer #3:
After these major and minor changes, I consider that the manuscript could be now accepted for publication. Quality of written English: Acceptable. The manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
A1. Thank you for the reviewer’s comments.

Reviewer #4:
Q1. In my judgment, this is nearly ready for publication. The authors do not seem to have grasped the first suggestion of my initial review. I suggest that lines 17-19 of their abstract be revised as follows: The plasma levels of LC and malondialdehyde, and erythrocyte antioxidant activities [catalase (CAT), superoxide dismutase (SOD), glutathione peroxidase (GPx)], were measured before and after intervention. It’s important to explain to the reader where these parameters were measured.
A1. Thank you for the reviewer’s comments. We have addressed the descriptions in the Abstract section; please see page 2, lines 17-19.

Q2. Aside from this modest change, I think that the authors have adequately addressed the comments of the referees, including mine. Their study is straightforward, and the results merit publication. I would however like to comment on the concern raised by one of the reviewers regarding the claim that L-carnitine may be pro-atherogenic. A recent invited commentary in Mayo Clinic Proceedings clarifies that there is no good reason to suspect that, within the dose range used clinically, L-carnitine would promote atherosclerosis or otherwise compromise cardiovascular health. To the contrary, there is ample reason to conclude that carnitine is protective for vascular health. I append this commentary in case the concerned reviewer or the authors of the current manuscript might wish to read it.
A2. Thank you for the reviewer’s comments. We totally agree with the reviewer’s opinion and address this commentary in the Discussion section; please see page 10, lines 199-203.