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Dear Editor,

Attached please find the second revision of our manuscript

*Internal health locus of control in users of complementary and alternative medicine: a cross-sectional survey.*

Again, the reviewers’ comments helped to improve the manuscript a lot. We changed the manuscript according to their comments, the answers to which you will find below. We also changed the paragraph regarding the question of ethical approval and hope you will find this sufficient; if not, please let us know.

Changes are highlighted using the tracked-changes feature in Word.

We hope that the paper will now be suitable for *BMC Complementary & Alternative Medicine* and are looking forward to hear from you.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Lena Schützler, Psychologist
Responses to the reviewers’ comments

Reviewer 1

Title: Internal Health Locus of Control in users of Complementary and Alternative Medicine: a cross-sectional survey

Version: 2 Date: 5 August 2014

Reviewer: Masa Sasagawa

Reviewer’s report:

Reviewer Report

---------------

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? – YES, very well-done.
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? - YES
3. Are the data sound? - YES
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? - YES
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? - YES
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? - YES
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? -YES
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? - YES
9. Is the writing acceptable? - YES

- Discretionary Revisions

“Body-efficacy expectation (BEE)” first appears in Methods section paragraph 1, then in Discussion section paragraph 5 and paragraph 10. APA format calls for spelling out the first appearance, following by the abbreviation in a parenthesis. The second and third appearances can be simply BEE. I leave this revision to the author’s discretion or to follow the reviewer #2’s suggestion.

Answer: We changed this as suggested, giving the abbreviation in parenthesis when „body-efficacy expectations” first appears in the text“ and using the abbreviation throughout the further text.

Reviewer 2

Title: Internal Health Locus of Control in users of Complementary and Alternative Medicine: a cross-sectional survey

Version: 2 Date: 31 July 2014

Reviewer: Felicity Bishop
Reviewer's report:

The authors have responded appropriately to my previous review and I am happy to recommend this paper for publication.

Minor issues not for publication

The new text at the start of the results section (IHLOC scores were missing for 3.2% of the sample....Additionally, most studies evaluating IHLOC use comparisons of means which makes comparisons between studies difficult when conducting different analyses), would be better placed in the Stats Methods section, not the results.

Answer: We decided to leave the text in the results section since we considered the amount of missing values and the results of the Q-Q-plots and following considerations regarding the normality assumption first results of the data analysis.

Page 10 line 5-6 I suggest deleting the phrase "i.e., the latter scored more toward the lower end of possible scores" as this is rather confusing and not needed.

Answer: We deleted the phrase as you suggested.

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.
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