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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript reports immunization coverage of CAM users and non-CAM users for major infectious diseases in a large and representative sample of the US population.

Overall I found several elements of the report that need more specification and the following are some additional specific comments.

Major Compulsory Revisions

The sample size of the study should be given in the abstract.

Immunization coverage is not described consistently, e.g, terms such as coverage rates, vaccination rates or immunisation rates imply the number of vaccinations in a population at risk for a given time. This may not be correct in the context of the study, as the text implies the proportion of vaccinated persons among the general population. Some clarification is needed here.

What exactly means practitioner based? Are these board certified primary care or CAM providers?

Were all respondents able to differentiate between a flu shot or a pneumonia shot. How were these questions validated?

Multistage and cluster sampling does not necessarily imply the use of SAS or SUDAAN software. It would be more important to know how effects of clustering and multistage design were accounted for in the analysis; i.e. how exactly were standard errors of predictive margins calculated?

The data analysis section should provide a more specific description of the models that were used. Were all variables listed in table 2 used as explanatory variables? Some variables might be correlated or have collinear relationships. Were these issues assessed during model development?

In table 2 it is not clear what Usual source of care means and for non US readers is remains also unclear what HS and GED mean.

Vaccination coverage is obviously inversely related with insurance status. From a public health perspective, it might be important to have some knowledge about predictors of vaccination status in the population of the uninsured. There is
therefore a potential need for stratification.

Minor Essential Revisions
Results are given in the text with a +- range; what is the meaning of +- e.g. standard errors? Although the meaning of +- is given in the tables, the methods section should provide some information.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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