Replies to reviewer comments on:

Title: **Zinc Lozenges May Shorten the Duration of Colds: a Systematic Review**
Journal: **Clinical Pharmacology: Advances and Applications**
Submission ID: **16567**

Replies by:

Harri Hemilä 16 Dec 2010

REVIEWER 1 EVALUATION

The Manuscript (Submission ID: 16567) entitled "Zinc Lozenges May Shorten the Duration of Colds: a Systematic Review" reviewed the possible effects of Zinc Lozenge on common cold. This lengthy article does not give the significant novel information about the Zinc Lozenge in cold symptoms. More over, the article required to be shorten for the easy understanding of the broad authorship.Also it would be appropriate to remove the most of tables and figures. Hence, the manuscript lacks novelty and does not significantly contribute to the knowledge of the existing literature. All these aspects make this paper very weak and unacceptable for publication.

Hemilä:

"...does not give the significant novel information about the Zinc Lozenge in cold symptoms."

In the Methods section I describe that I have carefully searched the literature. In the Introduction section I describe that there has been discussion about the possible role of zinc availability in explaining the variation in the trial findings. However, I am not aware of any statistical analysis which would be similar with the analysis I am reporting in this manuscript. The reviewer does not specify any previous report which has published a similar analysis, or anything that is close to this analysis. The reviewer does not give any justification for the statement "does not give novel information".

"... the article required to be shorten for the easy understanding of the broad authorship."

This article is not intended for "broad reader-ships". I consider that for original papers, the validity of the study is a much more important issue than whether all readers understand all details. Essentially all of my other papers have methodological features (in the Methods section) that are easy to understand only for a narrow proportion of potential readers. However, those details are

important as they should convince the specialists about the validity of the study.
Reviewer 1 does not point out any examples in Introduction, Discussion, Results, or Abstract that are so poorly written that the reader does not understand what the texts means.

"...remove the most of tables and figures"

What is the point of doing science, if the results cannot be shown?
Reviewer 1 does not specify any table or figure that is redundant.
This manuscript has 3 tables and 1 figure, which is less than the average in my previous papers.

In reviewer 1 comments, I do not find items that would help me in improving my manuscript.