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Reviewer’s report:

Thanks for the oppotunity to re-review this paper. I now understand why specific herbal preparations could not be reported.

The paper has improved greatly, however I think there are still some areas that need to be revised or addressed. I consider that all these things need to be done prior to acceptance or publication of paper.

Throughout the paper there still needs to be editorial work regarding the use of English grammar.

Methods:
It is still not clear to me why 557 was chosen as the sample size. The authors say what package they used for the calculation, but not what the rationale was.

Regarding the recruitment with the "assistance of midwives"...can this be spelled out. What does this mean in reality? In what percentage of cases were interpreters required for recruitment (an approximation would be fine).

Results:
In the first paragraph it would be good to make a few comments about the main aspects of the demographics (as well as pointing us to the table).

The way the results are presented at the moment remains a little confusing. I think it would be better to restructure the section slightly so that all the results regarding gernal herbal use are first, and then the results related to pregnancy use. As it is at the moment the results are sometimes talking abut general use, then pregnancy use, then back to general use etc. This makes it difficult to understand which is being described as you read through the paper.

This also applies to the final paragraph of the results where again - the information is important, but it is not clear alwasy whether it is about general use or pregnancy use.

Discussion
This section of the paper needs revision in the same way as the results - making sure it is clear which statements refer to herbal use generally and which to pregnancy use.
Some points may also need additional references.

Tables:
Table 1
This is looking good - but formatting may be able to be improved.

Table 2: - I am not clear about this denominator - is it only the women who said yes to herbal use at all? Or is it only those who said they would use (or do use) herbal medicine in pregnancy? This needs to be clearer.

Table 3:
This table needs to be able to be read and understood as a stand alone item - but as it is now I have trouble understanding what it all means. Are the p values just each about the single variable they are next to in relation to the opinion? Or are some of these items mutually adjusted? It may be of help to have some external input into this table.

Thanks
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