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To the Biomed Central Editorial Team:

Thank you for consideration of our manuscript for publication in your journal. We have reviewed the above manuscript according to your reviewer’s comments.

Reviewer's report

Title: Photoallergic Reaction in a Patient Receiving Vandetanib for Metastatic Follicular Thyroid Carcinoma: A Case Report

Version: Date: 26 November 2014

Reviewer: Hoelzle Erhard

Reviewer's report:

Major revisions:
It is felt that some more comments on the diagnosis of a photoallergic reaction would be appropriate.

The eruption was thought to be most consistent with a photoallergic reaction as the patient's lesions were limited to photo-distributed areas, including sharp borders adjacent to sun-protected skin, the delayed onset of the eruption after the sun exposure and drug exposure, and the negative re-challenge when the patient was exercising strict photoprotection. The histology further supported a photoallergic versus phototoxic reaction as did the delayed onset of the eruption. Please see comment 3 below for addition to text.

A phototoxic reaction is most likely excluded by the histologic picture. The negative rechallenge with vandetanib is a strong argument against a truly photoallergic reaction.

We believe that the negative rechallenge was evidence of a photo-induced eruption as the patient was strictly photoprotecting herself upon restarting the medication. We will change the last paragraph of the case presentation to state, “The patient was re-challenged with vandetanib two weeks after resolution of the rash after completion of the steroid taper and with institution of strict photoprotection.” to the case report.

It could be well possible that brisk sun exposure one or two weeks before the skin eruption has triggered a photodistribution of a rash not directly related to a cell mediated immune response like an allergic reaction but rather to the common polymorphous skin reactions known in many patients. Meaning is was a "plain" cutaneous side effect occurring in a pattern similar to photodistribution by unspecific mechanisms like an isomorphic effect following sunburn.

We agree with the reviewer comment. This could be photoaccentuation of a typical drug eruption however, the areas that were photoprotected were completely spared and the
delayed onset and pruritus were more consistent with a photoallergy. We classified it this way because of the lack of features of phototoxicity. This will be added to the conclusion section as a possible differential diagnosis with further explanation as follows," In this patient, it is also important to consider photo accentuation of a typical drug eruption or other non-specific common polymorphous skin reactions found in many patients on experimental agents. In this case, however, the eruption was thought to be most consistent with a photoallergic reaction as the patient's lesions were limited to photo-distributed areas (including sharp borders adjacent to sun-protected skin), the delayed onset of the eruption after the sun exposure and drug exposure, and the negative re-challenge when the patient was exercising strict photoprotection. The histology further supported a photoallergic versus phototoxic reaction as did the delayed onset of the eruption.”
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**Reviewer's report:**
The paper: Photoallergic Reaction in a Patient Receiving Vandetanib for Metastatic Follicular Thyroid Carcinoma: A Case Report presents a rare adverse event. There are single reports focused on phototoxic reactions to vandetanib. Dermatologists should be aware of this cutaneous side effect of vandetanib treatment and affected patients should be counseled to use adequate sun protection. I recommend this paper for publication.
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