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Reviewer's report:

General
This is a very well written paper which reads with interest.
The data appears to be 10 years old and reliant on parental reporting.
It is not entirely clear to me why the authors chose to look at homoeopathy and antibiotics. I would have thought that the number of GP visits in the preceding month/12months or the number of prescriptions issued would be of more relevance.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Reject because too small an advance to publish

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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