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**Reviewer's report:**

**General comments:**

The author has meticulously addressed the reviewers’ comments. While I understand that it is important to see how motivations to use CAM change over time, this design, using 1) two convenience samples of different populations, and 2) a different format for the key variable, is not optimal. In fact the point of this paper could probably have been made at the end of the 2008 paper.

It could well be that people still want efficacious treatment (p.11), but that they realize that this is better achieved using a holistic approach to treatment. The statement on page that the differences in CAM use may be an artefact of the difference in samples, is interesting as this is exactly what could also apply to the differences in motivation.

The arguments provided are reasonably convincing that motivations have changed. The author realizes that this may be due to changes in knowledge, attitudes, values and many more such as physicians’ knowledge and attitudes, the media etc. To truly understand changes in motivations such other factors would have to be addressed as well.

**Minor revision:**

Typo page 12: loner (3 lines from below) should be longer.

**What next?:** Accept without revision

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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