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Author's response to reviews:

The reviewer's primary comment is that we don't present the statistical breakdown regarding the systematic reviews. This is important point and obviously needs clarification within the paper. As with systematic reviews in other areas, most of the reviews in this study did not provide a definitive conclusion that could be stated as "positive" or "negative." As we note in the paper, a number of the reviews were more positive and a number were more negative in their tone toward homeopathy. We provide the data for this categorization. I believe this is, in fact, the numeric count that the reviewer is looking for. However, to ensure clarity, we have added to following to the beginning of the results section that addresses the systematic reviews.

"The most common conclusions in the reviews are that the existing evidence remains inconclusive and that more high quality research is required. The conclusions of the reviews were ambiguous enough to make it difficult to categorize them as either a strictly "positive" or "negative" finding."

Respectfully, we do not feel that the Abstract or Discussion sections need to be revised as suggested by this reviewer. We simply state that our data supports a "possible publication" bias and that there was no similar trend with respect to the reviews. As noted by the reviewer, the numbers are small (a limitation we note in the paper), but this preliminary conclusion is supported by our data and analysis.