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Nehme Gabriel

Editor-in-Chief, Nutrition Journal

Revision of Manuscript: MS: 1814525838401320 - Parenteral Nutrition-Drug Interactions; Antiepileptic Drugs

The authors are really grateful for the great attention that I have been paid for their manuscript previously entitled “Parenteral Nutrition-Drug Interactions; Antiepileptic Drugs” and now entitled “Selected Pharmacokinetic Issues of the use of Antiepileptic Drugs and Parenteral Nutrition in Critically Ill Patients”.

We believe that the recent and the previous comments have improved our manuscript. Therefore, we have accepted the reviewer’s recommendations and we have done the required amendments accordingly.

We provide the responses below detailing to each of your comments stating what changes have been made. Changes made in our responses to the comments are yellow – highlighted in the revised manuscript.

We hope that the revised manuscript and this response letter have addressed the issues raised by Dr. Jose Cavazos.

Thank you for your constructive comments and recommendations to improve this piece of work.

Sincerely,

Muhannad R.M.Salih
B.Sc, M.Pharm (Clinical Pharmacy),
Ph.D Candidate
Department of Clinical Pharmacy
School of Pharmaceutical Sciences
Universiti Sains Malaysia
Minden 11800, Penang, Malaysia
H/P +60143274485
Authors’ Responses to Dr. Jose Cavazos

We very appreciative to the reviewer for such productive comments which have considerably improved our manuscript previously entitled “Parenteral Nutrition-Drug Interactions; Antiepileptic Drugs” and now entitled “Selected Pharmacokinetic Issues of the use of Antiepileptic Drugs and Parenteral Nutrition in Critically Ill Patients”

We are pleased to inform you that we have accepted the changes you recommended or the comments you have made and we have revised the paper accordingly.

We provide the responses below detailing to each of your comments stating what changes have been made. Changes made in our responses to the comments are yellow – highlighted in the revised manuscript.

We hope the revised manuscript and this response letter have addressed the issues raised by the reviewer and would provide a satisfactory revision.

Thank you for your constructive comments and recommendations to improve this piece of work.

Sincerely,

The Corresponding Author
Detail Responses to Comments of Reviewer (Dr. Jose Cavazos)

1) The manuscript is improved. The authors failed to appreciate that they need to provide a careful description of the number and type of manuscripts that were found in the literature review. Their own abstract has a conclusion of lack of evidence, followed by another statement about free-level changes in the presence of TPN. Clearly, the issue has not been studied in randomized studies, but several case reports demonstrate this drug-nutrition interaction.

Authors’ response: The authors would like to thank the reviewer for his serious and constructive reviewing that has enhanced the scientific quality of this manuscript. The authors truly understand the importance of careful description of the type and the number of studies that have been mentioned in the literature, but the lack of formal research studies led the authors fail to do that.

Authors’ action:

- Amendments were done in the abstract (conclusion).
- Amendments were done in the (Critical analysis of lack of evidence) section.

2) This statement is technically incorrect: "Phenytoin is a narrow therapeutic index anticonvulsant drug that appears to follow a nonlinear kinetic as proposed by Michaelis and Menten." Michaelis and Menten described nonlinear kinetics but not of Phenytoin. Their equation was developed prior to the discovery of Phenytoin.

Authors’ response: The authors would express their thankful feelings to the reviewer regarding this comment. Yes, it is really an important issue to be highlighted.

Authors’ action: Amendments were done accordingly.