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Reviewer's report:
Major compulsory revisions
1. The statements about sample size calculation is not sufficient. Population parameters and the result of the calculation should be given.
2. Writing style of the references should be revised again, especially the names of the journals and the numbers of authors.
Response 1: The problem of the sample size was solved by removing the comparisons made in the study. Only descriptive data is displayed. References are revised and journal names and author numbers (6 + et al.) are corrected.

Reviewer: Helen Skouteris
Reviewer's report:
The aim of this study was “to find out which nonmedical treatments are being used by infertile women seeking assisted reproduction treatment, and also to determine whether there are specific demographic factors that are associated”.
Response 2: The aim is rewritten in that only descriptive characteristics are evaluated. Comparisons between the two groups and associations build are removed.

What does “Sample size was calculated with a 10% margin of error and 95% of Confidence Interval” mean – 115 were invited to take part and 100 did. How is the sample of 18 (non users) and 82 (users) sufficiently powered to draw the conclusions you have made? The sample of 18 non users is very low – this has not been mentioned as a limitation and the implications of this ignored. 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. Response 3: see response 2.

As noted in my previous review, there is no need for the expanded description of the CAM use in the body of the paper – all this information is summarised in Table 3 and should not be repeated in the body of the paper. Response 4: Table 3 is revised and shortened as displaying only headings.

The second part of the aim was not evaluated: “to determine whether there are specific demographic factors that are associated”. Only group differences were reported, and this is why only 18 non users is a problem – a sense of what factors are associated CAM use cannot be derived from these data. Response 5: see response 2