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Dear Editor,

Comments and Response to reviewers’ comments

Please, find below the responses to the reviewers’ responses.

Title page ? Please provide a title page. This should include the following: the manuscript title and the full names and affiliations for all authors. The corresponding author should also be indicated.
The title page has been included, and the corresponding author has been indicated

Abstract ? Please provide the abstract on the second page of the manuscript file. Abstracts must be structured into Background, Methods, Results, Conclusions. Please remember to also update the Abstract details on the submission page.
The abstract has been included and structured accordingly.

Section headings ? Please use sentence case for all headings and sub-headings in the manuscript (i.e. remove all unnecessary capitals). For example Abstract not ABSTRACT.
Sentence case has been used for section headings and sub headings.

Introduction - Please rename this section ?Background?.
The section has been renamed.

Method - Please rename this section 'Methods'.
The section has been renamed.

References - References should be cited in the text using consecutive numbers in brackets.
This has been done and corrected.

Contributions of authors - Please rename this section Authors’ contributions, please use initials to refer to each author’s contribution.
This has been renamed and initials have been used to refer to each author.

Competing interests - Please include a ?Competing interests? section between the Conclusions and Authors? contributions. If there are none to declare, please write ?The authors declare that they have no competing interests?.
The questions that are asked of authors are:

Financial competing interests

? In the past five years have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future? Is such an organization financing this manuscript (including the article-processing charge)? If so, please specify.

? Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organization that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future? If so, please specify.

? Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript? Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript? If so, please specify.

? Do you have any other financial competing interests? If so, please specify.

Non-financial competing interests

Are there any non-financial competing interests (political, personal, religious, academic, ideological, intellectual, commercial or any other) to declare in relation to this manuscript? If so, please specify.

Additional files? Please delete the additional files with the cover letter and your response to referees.

This has been done.
**Reviewer's report**

**Title:** Attitude and prevalence of use of herbal medicines among pregnant women in Nigeria  
**Version:** 3 **Date:** 4 November 2009  
**Reviewer:** Della Forster  

**Reviewer's report:**  
The manuscript is now greatly improved, and I think only minor clarifications and amendments are required. The use of 'HM' throughout is distracting - I think it would be better to simply say 'herbal medicine'.  
"HM" has been removed from the manuscript and replaced accordingly.  

There are still a few minor language issues (mainly grammatical) that need addressing - but possibly the editorial team will bring these to the authors' attention.  
These have been taken care of and corrected.  

In the methods on line 8 of the first paragraph it would be better to say "...deliveries per year, and of these over 70% of the women received at least some antenatal care".  
Thanks for the correction. It has been effected.  

Sample size - there still needs to be a sentence telling us what this sample of 577 has the ability to look at - what figures were put into EpiInfo? Why?  
A population size of 15000 based on the records and estimates obtained from the chosen centers was input at 95% confidence interval and 4% confidence level. This gave a sample size of 577 which was rounded up to 600 because of anticipation of questionnaire that may be discarded. Using a confidence interval of 5% gave a value of 300 plus, which we believed may be too low for a good representation of the studied population.  
Remove "Language" after "English"  
This has been done  

**Results**  
May be better to say "...questionnaires were completed, giving a response rate..."  
I think there needs to be a few more paragraphs in the results - i.e. not new information - just spacing to enable easier understanding  
This has been appropriately effected.  

I am still not 100% certain as I read the text, especially the last three paragraphs of the results, whether this is about only those women who were taking herbal medicine at the time of the study (so during pregnancy) or whether it was overall - I am sure it is the former - but can this be made clearer in the text.  
Thanks so much. This has been more clearly written.
Discussion - 2nd last sentence in 2nd paragraph needs a reference. 
References 37 and 38 supporting the statements have been included.

- in the 4th paragraph I think the current data does not so much corroborate the
previous local data, rather it finds a higher prevalence
The correction has been done.

Table 2 - use CM all through or not at all - needs to be consistent - maybe use
CM but asterisk it and explain in a footnote to the table. Also suggest no decimal
places in % column with such small numbers. % column should be labelled %.

“CM” has been removed and written in full in Table 2. Due to low values of three different
reasons for taking herbal medicines in pregnancy (frequency of 0.7% each), they have been
combined to give a value of 2.1%.