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Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper and I wish to congratulate the authors on their research which is extremely interesting. The question is well defined and the methods appropriate. More description on recruitment, sampling techniques and how the sample size was determined would be helpful.

The discussion and conclusion are supported by the results, and well balanced. The paper is well written and easy to read.

There are however a number of issues with the paper which I feel need to be address before publication can be considered.

Minor Essential Revisions

Recruitment and sample size
How did the researchers arrive at recruiting from 10 CAM practice sites? Was this random or purposive?
How many participants did they invite overall? What was the total possible number of interviewees? Did some invitees decline participation? Why?

Data collection
How long were the interviews and were participants interviewed more than once?

Analysis
This is very briefly described? For readers who are not used to Nvivo more information would be helpful.

Discussion
Some discussion of the biomedical approach to fertility by the participants would be helpful. This is unusual as the worldview of many CAM modalities sits outside biomedicine.
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