COMMENTS

Response to Comments by Paolo D. Pigatto and Gianpaolo Guzzi

Jie Liu*,[1], Jing-Zheng Shi,† Robert A. Goyer,* and Michael P. Waalkes*

**Inorganic Carcinogenesis Section, Laboratory of Comparative Carcinogenesis, National Cancer Institute at NIEHS, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709; and †Guiyang Traditional Medical College, Guiyang 550004, China*

Thank you for the comments on this mini-review. The comments are valuable and well conceived. The focus of this mini-review is on the comparative toxicity of cinnabar. While the forms of mercury used in vaccines are correctly stated in the text, citing the use of methyl mercury in vaccines as in table 1 should be corrected as suggested by Dr. Guzzi. Also, we agree with Dr. Guzzi's comment regarding table 3, that chelation of organic forms of mercury generally is not very effective and that administration of meso-2, 3-dimercaptosuccinic acid (DMSA) may be warranted in acute methyl mercury overexposures. However, we do want to point out that the focus of this paper is to argue that "cinnabar is toxicologically different from common mercurials". It is correct as the preliminary studies show that cinnabar is 1/5000 less toxic than MeHg and $HgCl_2$. For example, in a pilot study, 20 g/kg cinnabar did not kill mice, but 0.1 g/kg $HgCl_2$ killed mice. Also we were unaware of the "*idiosyncratic non-allergic toxic reaction*" after exposure to cinnabar.

[1] To whom correspondence should be addressed at Inorganic Carcinogenesis Section Laboratory of Comparative Carcinogenesis NCI at NIEHS Mail Drop F0-09 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709. E-mail: liu6@niehs.nih.gov

1535-3702/08/23312-1480$15.00