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April 1, 2008

Dear Editor:

We wish to express our gratitude for the positive evaluation of our manuscript entitled “Physician and Patient Attitudes towards Complementary and Alternative Medicine in Obstetrics and Gynecology.” We appreciate the constructive criticisms and recommendations from the reviewers and would like to address their specific issues raised in a point-by-point manner as follows:

Reviewer 1:

1. The reviewer requested the addition of references by Berman, Astin, and Kemper on CAM attitudes among physicians. The introduction has been revised to include the data provided in these references on pages 3 and 4.

2. The reviewer requested refocusing the paper to prioritize findings on positive attitudes by MDs and the differences/similarities among CAM modalities that physicians and patients embrace. These changes have been made to the abstract (page 2), and the discussion (pages 13-17) which has been substantially revised.

3. Minor essential revisions (eliminate unnecessary caps, insert U.S. before NIH and NCCAM) have been made in the introduction (pages 3-4) and discussion (pages 13-17).

Reviewer 2:

1. The reviewer requested discussion of “CAM prevalence use” vs. “CAM ever use” in the discussion. The manuscript was revised to include this on page 16.
2. The reviewer suggested adding practical recommendations for bringing CAM discussion to the forefront in physician-patient interactions. The manuscript was revised to include this information in the discussion (pages 14-17).

3. The reviewer suggested discussing differences in the patient-physician surveys specifically with regard to the issue of “herbal medicine” in the physician survey vs. fragmentation into various plants in the patient survey. This was added to the discussion on page 14.

We thank you for the positive review of our work, and believe that the reviewers’ suggestions have helped us to clarify and focus our manuscript.

We look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

J. Rebecca Liu