

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS



September 30, 2013

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 4797-review_3.doc).

Title: Is hepatitis B-virucidal validation of biocides possible with the use of surrogates?

Author: Andreas Sauerbrei

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4797

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

1 Format has been updated.

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer.

Reviewer 1

1. Reviewer's recommendation to re-arrange the manuscript: The reviewer is not aware of the fact that the author was invited to write a review report and not a methodology report including introduction, methodology, results, discussion and conclusion. Four out of five reviewers accepted the format of this review report. In the opinion of the author, a methodology report would repeat only the content of previous reports (e.g. Ref. 73). That is why the author did not re-arrange the manuscript.
2. A) The references recommended by the reviewer were included in the manuscript (Ref. 11-13).
B) "Dialysis units" (page 4, line 12) were mentioned as common transmission pathways. In the opinion of the author, it is not necessary to discuss HBV in dialyses at the light of vaccination policies because this manuscript reviews HBV disinfection. The HBV vaccination was mentioned in the previous sentence.
C) The environmental resistance of HBV was discussed (page 5, lines 5-7).
D) The English language was revised.

Reviewer 2

1. Page 10, paragraph 1: The paragraph describing the method to prepare the DHBV cell culture system was shortened. However, the remaining text is absolutely necessary to explain and comment the successful cultivation of hepatocytes. This is an essential precondition for virucidal testing of biocides against DHBV.
2. Page 4, paragraph 2, sentence 1: Chemical biocides with broad-spectrum virucidal activity were added.
3. Legend of Fig. 1: This figure was characterized in more detail.
4. Fig. 2: The quality of Fig. 2 is high. The description was improved (see legend of Fig. 2).
5. Pages 6 and 7: HBV virucidal test methods were discussed extensively. In addition, the advantages

of the DHBV test methods were discussed on the pages 8 and 9. A further discussion of the test methods would repeat the text and, therefore, it is redundant. The denoted biocides of Tab. 2 were discussed in more detail (page 13).

6. As stated in the manuscript, the DHBV *in vivo* tests conflict with ethical and legal aspects of animal protection (page 9, lines 1 and 2). Thus, DHBV *in vitro* assays have been used almost exclusively since the year 2000 (page 13, line 7). That is why the author favours the *in vitro* DHBV test.
7. The English language was improved.

3 References and typesetting were corrected.

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Sincerely yours,

Prof. Dr. Andreas Sauerbrei
Institute of Virology and Antiviral Therapy
Jena University Clinic
Friedrich Schiller University of jena
Hans-Knoell-Strasse 2
D-07745 Jena
Fax: +49-3641-9395702
E-mail: Andreas.Sauerbrei@med.uni-jena.de