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PDF covering letter
Author response to reviewer comments for article (new title) “Development and Validation of the CAM Health Belief questionnaire (CHBQ) and CAM use and Attitudes amongst Medical Students

All revisions were made in blue text to highlight the changes.

Reviewer 1 (Sheila Greenfiled) report responses
Major Compulsory revisions:
1. Description of the UCI class and the 3 student cohorts were added under ‘Study sample’ section.
2. Patient Doctor course description and the UCI College of Medicine curriculum are now given in the background section.
3. Additional data on method and scope of literature review is now given in the ‘study design’ section.
4. Details about administration are provided in the ‘data collection’ section which specifies that the entire questionnaire including the IMAQ was administered in one sitting lasting 20 minutes, for each respondent.
5. Additional details on the framing of questions on CAM use are now provided in the ‘measures’ section of the ‘study design’.
6. Under ‘results’ we have modified the description of the US medical students’ backgrounds, and explained the meaning of GPA scores. In addition, we have converted the terms ‘sophomores’ and ‘freshmen’ into MS 1 and MS 2 in the tables of results.
7. Taken care of under item 5.
8. List of information sources given to students is provided in the section ‘awareness and use of CAM resources’ which lists all the resources from the survey (Internet, books, journals, health databases, videos. Then a list of the Internet resources is detailed following this (PubMed, Cochrane Library, German Commission E Momogrpahs, Therapeutic Guide to Herbals, etc.).
9. We will be happy to have the repetition deleted and will let the editors select the deletion.
10. Additional information on study limitations and the difference in the surveys from the US population studies of Eisenberg is now added in the ‘conclusions and discussion’ section.

All discretionary suggestions were acted upon where observed. Formatting issues that we could not find could not be addressed.

Reviewer 2 ((Truis Ostbye) response to report
Major compulsory revisions
1. CAM is defined by the NCCAM criteria which are referenced (a web site for NCCAM) and in the conclusions section we now define the underlying construct as ‘attitudes towards the use of CAM in the setting of holistic health care and alternative health belief systems’. We feel that adding a too-lengthy description of the controversy over the use of the terms ‘holistic, integrative and CAM’ would detract from the core
message of the study, since these definitions are readily available from our references, particularly from *Academic Medicine* articles listed.

We now have modalities further defined and discuss possible overlap of modalities in the limitations of the study discussed in the conclusion and discussion section.

2. In the conclusion section we now add a description of the overlap between the two surveys and the questions addressed by each. However we did not itemize the IMAQ questions as this is referenced and the reader can access the BMC paper of Craig Schneider to see a list of the IMAQ questions.

All discretionary revisions were made wherever possible, e.g. IRB was defined in the text, abbreviations were explained the first time they appear. Piloting of the instrument is now described. The title of the paper was changed in response to item 4 in this reviewer’s report.

Thank you,
Desiree Lie, first author.