

Reviewer's report

Title: Translation and adaptation of an international questionnaire to measure usage of complementary and alternative medicine (I-CAM-G)

Version: 4 **Date:** 30 August 2012

Reviewer: Vinjar Fonnebo

Reviewer's report:

General:

The authors seem to be unclear as to what this paper is all about. Their emphasis is on the questionnaire results of the two samples, while the stated objectives of the study do not require any results of that kind. I recommend a thorough rethinking of what the purpose really is for this manuscript.

Abstract

1. The abstract should also mention the pretest in its Methods section.

Introduction

OK

Methods

1. This study has two objectives: Translation and assessing properties for measuring CAM usage. The last objective is, in my understanding, just another way of saying validation.

2. The methods section now lists several approaches to this validation: Translation, pretest, cognitive interviews and CAM use in two samples. Mixed in the description of the methodology they give results of this process: How they have changed the questionnaire to better measure German CAM usage. They need to separate methods description and results.

Results

1. The results given under cognitive interviews should be supplemented with the results they have presented under the methods section.

2. The results given under translation and pretest should be moved to the results section.

3. Considerable space is given to the presentation of the actual use data from the two samples. I can not see that as fulfilling any of the objectives stated for this study. They have however also given a few pieces of information that could be seen as fulfilling objective two. This last part needs to be presented more systematically and related to the objective stated.

Discussion

1. The discussion section gives a repetition of the methods and partly also the results chapter. This should be deleted.
2. On the other hand there is an extensive description of the "validation" procedure that could be seen as results.
3. I find no discussion of bias
4. The discussion should be organized according to the following template:
 - a. Brief recap of results in one sentence.
 - b. Discussion of possible bias
 - c. Comparison with other studies
 - d. Implications

Tables/figures

The tables are only descriptions of the results from the two samples. This is not related to the objectives.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

Declaration of competing interests:

My only possible competing interest would be that I am one of the authors of the I-CAM-Q.