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Reviewer's report
Title: Use of complementary and alternative medicine by Turkish infertility patients: a descriptive study
Version: 1 Date: 26 January 2010
Reviewer: Alis OZCAKIR
Reviewer's report:
Minor Essential Revisions; as listed below:
Page 9: Discussion Part. The reference writing style, which was given in third paragraph, line 11th should be corrected.
-Reference style is corrected
Page 12: Discussion Part. Line Intimate Partner Violence should be given first, before writing the abbreviation.
-IPV abbreviation is added in the text where it is first seen

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Declaration of competing interests:
'I declare that I have no competing interests'

Reviewer's report
Title: Use of complementary and alternative medicine by Turkish infertility patients: a descriptive study
Version: 1 Date: 30 January 2010
Reviewer: Helen Skouteris
Reviewer's report:
Major Compulsory Revisions
The aim of this study was to investigate CAM use among infertile Turkish women and to determine whether there are specific demographic factors that determine whether such advice is followed. The aim of the study as stated above is not revealed in the Abstract.
The abstract is rewritten and the aim is revised.
The Introduction is limited in that a thorough literature review of CAM use by infertile women from other countries – the literature on CAM use through pregnancy is also relevant in that it reveals women are using both before and during pregnancy. Also, why is it important to understand CAM use by infertile Turkish women; what are the medical and practical implications? How much money is invested in CAM use in Turkey? The rationale for the study is not clear in the Introduction.
The introduction is revised and information relevant to the questions of the reviewer is added. The paper is largely descriptive; only group differences conducted. What analyses were performed to compare WHO Group I and WHO Group II (p 5); what p values were obtained?
Analysis of WHO I and II groups are added to Table 3.
Table 2 is not needed; this information can easily be presented in text.
Table 2 is removed and its data is added to the text.

There is no need for the expanded description of the CAM use – all this information is summarised in Table 3.
Table 3 is left as it is because it is a more understandable format in summary.

The second part of the aim was not evaluated: "whether there are specific demographic factors that determine whether such advice is followed". Only group differences were reported – a sense of what factors predict CAM use cannot be derived from these data.

**As the aim is revised, this suggestion is not applicable.**

How is the study limited by the low sample size – only 18 women in the sample did not use CAM. A qualitative arm to the research, further exploring the findings revealed (i.e., living with parents; not feeling supported, never speaking to physician about CAM) is needed to further clarify the findings and make a more meaningful contribution to the literature. At present the conclusions are highly speculative.

This is a descriptive study revealing data about CAM use and associated factors. Conclusions are made on basic questionnaire based analysis with known limitations mentioned in the discussion part.

**Level of interest:** An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare that I have no competing interests

**Reviewer’s report**
**Title:** Use of complementary and alternative medicine by Turkish infertility patients: a descriptive study

**Version:** 1 **Date:** 22 January 2010

**Reviewer:** Osman Günay

**Reviewer’s report:**

Major Compulsory Revisions:
1. Sample size of the study was limited. It should be explained how the sample size was determined. Minimum sample size should be calculated before the study begins.

**An explanation of the sample size is added to the methods.**

2. Writing style of the references should be revised totally according to the rules of the Journal (especially the numbers of the authors and the names of the journals).

**All references were revised according to the instructions.**

Minor Essential Revisions:
1. The authors have stated that the female population in the region was homogenous in terms of ethnicity, religion and language and that all patients in the study sample were speaking Turkish and Kurdish (page 4, first sentence). On the other hand, they have stated that a midwife speaking Turkish and Kurdish was ready for translation. Why the investigators needed translation, if the study group was homogenous and all patients were speaking Turkish and Kurdish.

**We have changed this sentence in that all women were speaking Kurdish and only some were speaking Turkish, which resembles a form of heterogeneity.**
Discretionary Revisions
1 Logistic regression analysis may be beneficial to investigate the effect of socio-demographic factors on using CAM

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests

Reviewer's report
Title: Use of complementary and alternative medicine by Turkish infertility patients: a descriptive study
Version: 1 Date: 4 February 2010
Reviewer: Behice Erci

Reviewer's report:
I reviewed manuscript 'Use of complementary and alternative medicine by Turkish infertility patients: a descriptive study' and suggested following comments;

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? / No
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Methods are not appropriate, is very inadequate.
3. Are the data sound? No
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? No
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? No
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? No
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? No
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? No
9. Is the writing acceptable? No, the manuscript could not acceptable.

As there are no suggestions but only comments, we were not able to answer point by point to these comments.