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Reviewer: Dr. Andrew Vickers

To whom it may concern;

We thank Dr. Vickers for taking the time to thoroughly review the submitted article and are grateful for the comments with which we have accepted and made the necessary changes. Please find below our responses to the individual comments.

1. We have addressed the length of this paragraph and reduced it significantly, so that it is more precise. We are aware that any readers of this article would have an understanding of the current status of CAM in the general medical community.

2. We have removed the discussion of differences between traditional practice of conventional medicine and practice of CAM. We agree and have noted that CAM practitioners rely upon expert opinion and anecdotal evidence, rather than best-evidence. This is further addressed in the discussion section (page 10).

3. Please see results section and attached tables for the series of t-tests and results. We agree that an ANCOVA would be the test to use for future studies and will design any future studies to include the necessary information.

4. Please note changes.

5. Please observe that the recommendations have been incorporated and the results section now reads more precisely.

6. Confidence intervals are reported in the tables.

7. The limitations of non-randomizing this study are now listed in the Limitations paragraph of the discussion section.

8. The decision to use a crossover trial and before-and-after assessment is based on standard methods for single academic intervention trials (Norman, G. & Shannon, S, reference #10 on trial). The crossover was initiated so that all students would receive the intervention. We felt that this was fair to the students.

9. We agree wholeheartedly with the reviewer, but point out that this is has been how EBM concepts have previously been taught, at all Naturopathic colleges in North America. The outcome of this study has shown that the curriculum needs changing so that students do retain the concepts and apply them. This is now done through a multifactorial and time staged EBM curriculum. We would hope that other colleges would also follow suit.
Yours sincerely

Edward J. Mills, DPH
Kumanan R. Wilson, MD, MSc
Taras Hollyer, MSc
Ron Saranchuk, Med, PhD