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Dr. Diana Steinmann  
Associate Editor  
BMC Cancer

Re: Complementary and Alternative Medicine use in oncology: a questionnaire survey of patients and health care professionals

Dear Dr. Steinmann,

Thank you for your comments and invitation to submit a revised manuscript. We have endeavoured to respond to the reviewers’ questions and concerns comprehensively and hope that they have been sufficiently addressed. We wish to submit the second revision of our manuscript for publication in BMC Cancer.

Our responses to the Reviewers’ comments are detailed below:

Reviewer 2:
Comment: My previous comments have been taken into account in this revision. A few language errors remain that need correcting before publication. I have one substantive comment that pertains to the statement in the Discussion p12: "With the assistance of nurse coordinators, the response rate of our study was 100% among consenting patients." My understanding of the term response rate is that this should represent the proportion of people who complete the survey out of all those who were invited to take part. (And so the denominator should include those who did not consent to take part.) The sentence quoted appears to be suggesting that all those who consented to take part completed the study, but does not seem to take into account the number of people who were invited but declined consent. I may have misunderstood, and it may indeed be that no-one at all declined to take part in the study, but this needs clarification as it has implications for the subsequent claim about the lack of sampling bias in this study.

Response: We have carefully proof read the manuscript and corrected grammatical errors. With regards to the response rate, it was meant to express that all patients who were approached and invited gave their consent to participate in the questionnaire survey, therefore 100% response rate. This sentence has been changed and now reads ‘With the assistance of nurse coordinators, the response rate of our study was 100% among patients who were invited to participate.’

We would like to thank the reviewers and editorial team for their time and consideration in reviewing our manuscript and we hope the revisions will be satisfactory. We trust that our revised manuscript has been rewritten in accordance the journal’s instructions. All authors have seen and approved the revised manuscript. Should there be any further concerns which we can address please do not hesitate to contact us. We look forward to hearing your response.

Yours Sincerely

_____________________
Professor Michael Kerin  
Corresponding Author  
Department of Surgery  
Galway University Hospital  
t: +353 91 524390  
e: michael.kerin@nuigalway.ie

Dr. Kah Hoong Chang  
Principal Author  
Department of Surgery  
National University of Ireland, Galway  
t: +353 91 524390  
e: kahhoong_chang@yahoo.co.uk