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Reviewer’s report:

Abstract: Minor Essential Revisions
Page 2: Replace the word “clients” throughout with patient. Insert odds ratios for predictors of a positive attitude towards integrative pediatrics with the four predictors listed.

Introduction:
Very well written.

Methods: Minor Essential Revisions
Page 4: Excellent methodology and piloting. Again, replace “clients” with patients. Excellent attempts through multiple avenues to increase response rate.

Page 4: Include a separate heading for Statistical Analyses. Type of software utilized is noted (SPSS Version15.0). Analyses stated are correct and logical. Crosstabs using Chi-square followed by logistic regressions are correct.

Results: Major Compulsory Revisions
Page 6: Under the last paragraph titled “Characteristics associated with favorable attitudes towards IM and CAM”. In the first sentence replace the word “correlation” with “association”. When comparing two variables that are categorically scaled there is an association. When comparing two variables that are continuously scaled the word “correlation” is used (i.e. Pearson’s correlation coefficient.

There were several dichotomized dependent variables listed where log regressions were performed: 1) recommend CAM us or not 2) practice CAM us or not 3)have a positive attitude toward CAM or not. Each of these results should be reported in a table format, which includes the odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals of the odds ratios, along with their associated p-value. In addition, when reporting odds instead of using 3.5 or 4.5 “times” more important it is suggested to use the word “fold” when the ratios are over 100%.

Discussion section: Discretionary Revisions
It is interesting to note that the majority of responders were female (92%). In the authors opinion, would the results have changed somewhat if compared to male YHC physicians? Or are these results to be of the opinion of females YHC physicians only?
Level of interest: An exceptional article

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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