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Dear editor

Thank you for your letter and comments to our manuscript number. 1391381910133146 entitled “Gender Differences in prevalence and associations for use of CAM in a large population study.“ Enclosed you will find a revised version of the manuscript and a list of the changes that have been made commenting on the recommendations by the reviewers. We thank you for the comments which we feel have added much to the paper. We hope the paper will be acceptable for publication in BMC complementary and alternative medicine as it now stands.

A specific response to the reviewer’s comments will follow.

Reviewer: Cynthia Peterson

Reviewer's report:

1. Consistently use either US or UK English. There is a slight mixture of both (i.e. program, behavior, behaviour)

We have now corrected the manuscript to UK English

2. ABSTRACT: Conclusions: use ‘differ’ and not ‘differs’.

This is corrected.

3. BACKGROUND: The section nicely makes the case as to why this study is relevant.

2nd paragraph: 2nd sentence: Insert the word ‘of’ between ’36.6%’ and ‘Norwegians’.

This is now corrected

3rd paragraph: 5th sentence makes no sense as written. “In the Tromso study, the use of CAM was investigated in the 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th...” what? Should the word ‘study’ follow 6th?

Yes, this is now corrected.

4. METHODS: Please write out what the abbreviation NAFKAM means. It is listed at the end under abbreviations but the first use in a manuscript should have it spelled out completely.

This is now written out.

Table 2 is the first table to be mentioned in this paper in this Methods section. It
should be renumbered. Thus tables 1 and 2 should be reversed.

Table 1 and 2 have been reversed.

Additionally the difference between CAM 1 and 2 is not that clear in the table. Does the definition of CAM 2 mean that a person saw a CAM provider between 1 and 3 times?

Currently it states “at least once”. However, CAM 1 is defined as more than 3 times.

We have added some text to better explain that the NAFKAM model is a cumulative model where the levels are included in each other.

Statistical analysis: Please provide more details as to which variables were analysed using Chi-squared and which with ANOVA.

These details are now provided.

5. RESULTS: Tables 4 and 5: There are 2 spelling errors in both tables. ‘Collage’ should be ‘College’. Both are words used in English but have drastically different meanings. ‘Ethnisity’ should be ‘Ethnicity’.

This in now corrected.

Reviewer: Upali W. Jayasinghe

Reviewer’s report:

1. No page numbers given.

Page numbers are now given, also line numbers due to the editor’s suggestion.

Abstract

2. “a total use of 13%, 17% among women” is not clear. Probably what authors mean is “13% to 17% among women.

This is now clarified further.

Method

3. Para 1: Authors have mentioned about a health screening program: more details about screening program should be given.

More details are now given.
4. Para 1: Authors say men and women completed two self-administered questionnaires, however they do not mention how reliable the questionnaires are.

Authors should give Cronbach’s # etc.

A Cronbach’s alfa is now given and one variable, ethnicity is taken out to strengthen the reliability.

Tables

6. In tables add a note to indicate how p values are computed (using what statistical analyses). Tables should stand-alone.

It is now added notes indicating which analyses that is used.

7. Presentation of Tables 4 & 5 need to be improved. For example, the word “men” is unnecessary in the table as the title of the table already indicates the table relates to male users. Therefore it is appropriate to exclude word “men” from the table and replace that with Cam 1 and then under Cam 1 show sub-headings “Non-user” and “Users”. Same could be applied to Cam 2 & Cam 3 as well. (Also modify Table 5 accordingly).

The tables are now changed according to the suggestions.

8. Authors should check the accuracy of p values. For example in Table 4, p-values for ethnicity of CAM 2 users appears to be incorrect. Further all p values for ethnicity in Table 5 seem not correct and not significant.

All p-values are now checked.

Quality of written English:

Needs some language corrections before being Published.

The manuscript has undergone a language reversion by a professional translator.