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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

we are re-submitting our changed manuscript.
We are confident that the manuscript can now be easily understood by a broad readership and that this publication will help to increase the awareness of the reader for the quality concerns associated with counterfeited medicines.

Please find below a point-to-point response to the remaining concerns.

Best regards,

Dieter Pullirsch

Reviewer’s Comment:

This paper would be of greater interests if more background information about the regulatory requirements and more explanations and interpretations of the microbiological findings could be provided. In the present format, the paper could not be easily understood by most readers.

• According to the reviewers recommendations we have included further background information concerning the regulatory requirements on microbiological quality for non-sterile medicines in the introduction and in the discussion. We have explained the potential dangers when the production conditions are not tightly controlled and we have further explained and interpreted the results in the discussion.

Reviewer’s Comment:
Editing of English would still be required.

• The manuscript was copy edited by an experienced company and several changes were included to improve the quality of written English.

Reviewer's Comment:
This paper is about microbiological contamination, not biological contamination as stated in the Abstract.

• The corresponding correction was made in the abstract.