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Dear Editors,

RE: Current Challenges and Future Directions for Naturopathic Medicine in Australia: A Qualitative Examination of Perceptions and Experiences from Grassroots Practice

Thank you for the opportunity to revise the above paper. We have addressed the editor’s comments below. We have also attached a document with tracked changes.

We trust that we have satisfactorily addressed the editor’s concerns, and look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours sincerely

Dr Jonathan (Jon) Lee Wardle (on behalf of all authors)
ASSOCIATE EDITOR COMMENTS:

The authors of this manuscript have satisfied the concerns of the reviewers with one exception. The revised paragraph in relation to the first comment from reviewer 1 (p 10 para 1) needs further attention.

Authors need to re-read this paragraph (below) and revise to make it more clear, with particular attention to the wording "people participants....."

REVIEWER 1:

1. P 10 para 1 - First sentence. Please clarify.

   We agree that this sentence could elaborate on the point being made, and therefore have made the following amendments (amendments highlighted):

   Some participants perceived that the public’s confusion over naturopathic training and scope of practice, combined with the unregulated practice environment and co-option of the term naturopath people participants described as “quacks”, “charlatans” and “shonks” reinforce the conception that naturopathy was not legitimate or scientific practice.

Response:

We thank the associate editor for this comment and the opportunity to rectify. To rectify we have amended the manuscript in the following way (amendment’s highlighted):

Some participants perceived that the public’s confusion over naturopathic training and scope of practice, combined with an unregulated practice environment and co-option of the term “naturopath” by unqualified persons that participants described as “quacks”, “charlatans” and “shonks”, helped to reinforce the conception that naturopathy was not a legitimate or scientific practice. Participants discussed the frustration they felt at the “unscientific” labels often branded upon naturopaths and their practice, when they themselves thought that scientific training was integral to naturopathic practice. As one practitioner explained: