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Responses to reviewer’s comments

For the paper “The prevalence and experience of Australian naturopaths and Western herbalists working within community pharmacies” by Braun et al.

We have briefly listed the reviewers suggestions and our responses.

1. **Comment by Kristine A. Hirschkorn**

   - [Minor essential revision] with respect to data table 2, p. 7: the authors verified the percentages and included a note that n=100 …how this ‘n’ relates to the paragraph directly under table 1 where they report ‘of the total sample, 24% (n=111) reported they had worked in community pharmacy at some time in the past’ which I have assumed is a subset of respondents referred to in table 2. Could the authors please clarify in the text of the manuscript how/why these numbers differ or adjust if they should be the same?”

   This has been clarified in the text with the following sentence.

   ‘Of the 111 practitioners reporting they had worked in pharmacy, 100 provided further information about the experience.’.

   This was also reflected under the Table 2 results in the phrase *% of total respondents answering this question (multiple answers possible).*

   We trust this provides sufficient explanation.

2. **Comments by Anthony Zhang**

   - **Background:** What are “solidly orthodox methods...” (line 4)?

   This has been changed to ‘western medical’ to provide clarification of the term

   - **Method:** Data analysis section indicated means +/- standard errors, Wilcoxon Rank Sum tests and IQR. These have not been reflected in the result section?

   We apologise for this oversight. Whilst there were several continuous variables that were originally analysed, none have been reported on, so we have modified the data analysis section accordingly....

   Descriptive and inferential statistics were calculated using SAS version 9.1 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA). Differences in proportions between groups were compared using chi-square tests for equal proportions or Fishers Exact tests where numbers were small. A two sided p-value of 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant.

   - **References:**

     Formatting issues relate to the reference manager software used. We have removed duplications and changed the numbering accordingly.