Reviewer’s report

Title: A Systematic Review of How Homeopathy is represented in Conventional and CAM Peer Reviewed Journals

Version: 2 Date: 12 May 2005

Reviewer: Matko Marusic

Reviewer’s report:

Excuse me, but I have a serious objection. First, let me thank the authors for their effort to adapt the manuscript along the lines of my (too passionate) letter, and a sense of humor they applied throughout... Good authors, please consider submitting the next paper to me...

Objection: maybe I am wrong, BUT may I have the following explanation, please:

with papers, the authors offer as a result positive or negative RESULT, whereas with reviews they speak about tone only. What were the results of the reviews. OK, I know that the numbers are small, but - why not know this?

By the same token, the Discussion part in the Abstract (and the corresponding text in the paper) are unacceptable: the authors say that bias existed in articles, and not in reviews, which is - not true. They do not have results in the case of reviews (positive-negative), and in case of articles they do not give numbers, just a small, non-quantitative story. These things cannot be compared.

Shortly - please go symmetrically - articles (results, tone), reviews (results, tone). And stick to the numbers you get. And, PLEASE, do not misinterpret them.

I liked all other corrections, but this makes me rather nervous. Please: such good writers, so terrible analysis. You sound like my authors clinicians...