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Author’s response to reviews:

October 4th, 2018.

Dr. Benjamin Ragen
Editor of BMC Pharmacology and Toxicology

Dear Dr. Ragen,

Thank you very much for considering our manuscript entitled “Superior silybin bioavailability of silybin–phosphatidylcholine complex in oily-medium soft-gel capsules versus conventional silymarin tablets in healthy volunteers” for publication in BMC Pharmacology and Toxicology. At this time we are submitting the revised version of our manuscript according with the reviewer suggestions. We believe that the results of the present study are important in the field hepatology as well as gastroenterology. We have greatly benefited from you and assessors’ guidance and in my opinion the Ms is much improved.

With kind regards and anticipative thanks. We look forward to expeditious and favorable consideration.

Sincerely,

Nahum
Reviewer reports:

Ludovico Abenavoli (Reviewer 1): - Introduction section: Literature report many evidences on the clinical application of MT extracts in the treatment of different liver diseases, such as NAFLD, ALD, viral hepatitis. Please update the references with a recent publication: Abenavoli et al. Phytother Res. 2018

Answer: We have included the reference from Abenavoli et al. Phytother Res. 2018

David Biedermann (Reviewer 2): The author’s present small-scale clinical trial aimed at assessing the biological availability of silymarin-phosphatidylcholine complex. First indication of superior bioavailability of this kind of formulation appeared in scientific literature as early as 1990 (WOS) and this paper presents specific variant which appear to optimize the bioavailability.

From chemical point of view the description is adequate and data quality appears to be very high as is the language. Authors might want to use only one unit for concentration (ng/mL vs mg/L) and polish the figures some more but the paper is mostly publishable in its current form. The authors should include description of HPLC used including the column, model of instrument and the MS instrument.

Answer: We greatly appreciate the reviewer’s suggestion. We have included the description of model and we have modified this section.

Technical Comments:

1. In the Authors’ contributions section, the individual contributions of each author should be specified. Please use initials to refer to each author's contribution in this section.

Answer: We have performed the individual contributions of each author.

2. Under the heading "Authors' contributions", please confirm whether all authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Answer: Confirmed that all authors read and approved the final manuscript.
3. As this study is partly funded by the company in which some of the authors are employees, this should be stated as conflict of interest, and the authors need to clarify that this did not impact on the study or the outcome itself. Alternatively, the authors need to clarify about the role the company has played in the study design, data collection, data analyses and the write up of the study. Please note that the conflict of interests are a very important part of declarations and if you don’t disclose this, we may not be able to consider your manuscript further.

Answer: We have modified this section and all authors they have declare no competing interests.