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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor

BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine

Subject: Response letter to the reviewers’ comments

We are very pleased being informed from the Editor himself that our manuscript, this time, regarding traditional healing practices has been ‘Potentially acceptable for publication” with some essential minor comments. We have, thoroughly, revised the whole manuscript "Traditional Healing Practices in Rural Bangladesh: A Qualitative Investigation" (BCAM-D-17-00833) and incorporated the advices provided by the Editor and Reviewers in terms of improving the methodological section and editing its English as well. We all authors made respective efforts to update each of the points raised by the reviewers on the present manuscript following some necessary modifications. Responses to the Technical Comments, Editor’s and Reviewers’ comments have been delineated below step-by-step.

We look forward to receiving your positive decision on our revised manuscript, and please inform us, if anything further you need to know in favor of our manuscript.

Kind Regards,

Imdad

Md. Imdadul Haque, MPH, MSS,
Corresponding author,
On behalf of all authors of the manuscript,
From Dhaka, Bangladesh
Response letter to reviewer reports:

Response to Technical Comments:

Technical Comments: 5/7 This is a resubmission of BCAM-D-16-00763, which we open rejected, and after advice from an AE. The aus have provided a pbp alongside this, so I think we can see what the AE makes of it now. TR

Authors’ response: Thanks for comments. Yes, our manuscript was open rejected, but we were advised by Associate Editor, then, to resubmit it with significant modification. We used its earlier manuscript number (BCAM-D-16-00763) with an intention to make a polite reminding as to our stickiness with this manuscript. Sorry, however, if any inconvenience caused.

Editor’s Comments:

We were extremely thankful to Editor’s positive impression towards our manuscripts, which inspired us to work in incorporating comments the reviewers raised. We found three basic comments from Editor:

1. Editor’s comments: Reviewer 1 raises some additional points. While I think her suggestion to separate out the patient-related data into a separate paper is not necessary

Authors’ response: As considered not necessary by Editor to separate out the patient-related data into a separate paper, we have remained unchanged here.

2. Editor’s comments: I do think she (Reviewer-1) raises some good points about adding some further details of your methods.

Authors’ response: Thanks for the useful comments. We have made necessary corrections especially in methods sections as per reviewer comments (e.g. inclusion of objectives, map of the study areas, study guideline etc.).

3. Editor’s comments: I understand that you had someone edit the version we have just reviewed. There are sections of the paper that read very well. My greatest remaining problem with your paper is that it still has serious problems with the English.

Authors’ response: Thanks for the positive remarks and necessary comments. As per Editor’s advice, we have given our level best efforts to check each of the words used in the present submission to improve its English. Since we are advised not to highlight in the manuscript, or also not to send it as track change; we sent now the clean copy of manuscript. However, we made plenty of corrections in every section to improve its English.

Reviewer #1:
We were very pleased receiving some tremendously needful comments, which really helped improve our manuscript. As per reviewer comments, the whole manuscript was restructured step-by-step with especial emphasize in methodology part, which are as follows:

Background Section

1. Reviewer Comments: In order to make the paper more focused, my suggestion is to take the data from the patients out of the manuscript and just include data obtained from the traditional healers. Data obtained from the patients should be a separate paper.

Authors’ response: Thanks for the comments. We think, separating out the patient-related data from traditional healers’ may change its original sense and Editor is agreed with it.

2. Reviewer Comments: The manuscript should have a separate paragraph where traditional healing is put into a theoretical context such as "medical pluralism" or "resilience".

Authors’ response: As per reviewer comments, we have included a short paragraph on the existence of medical pluralism in Bangladesh at end of background section.

3. Reviewer Comments: Define Complementary and Alternative Medicine and Traditional Medicine. Is Traditional Medicine understood as a part of CAM in Bangladesh?

Authors’ response: As per reviewer comments, we defined and clarified the issues of Complementary & Alternative Medicine in the manuscript.

4. Reviewer Comments: The objective and research questions are unclear, pleas revise. On page 7, first paragraph, sentence starting with The main focus of the study….. Explain the objectives. Please remove to end of page 5.

Authors’ response: Thanks for comments. As per reviewer comments, we have clarified the objectives of the study in the manuscript, and we have also rephrased and put the information of page 7 first paragraph (The main focus study……..) at the end of the background section to clarify the objectives. In addition, we removed and modified the end part of page 5 as per reviewer suggestion.

5. Reviewer Comments: Use one terminology for conventional medicine. One terminology for the patients

Authors’ response: As per reviewer comments, we have performed necessary corrections.

Methods Section
Thanks for some useful comments. As per reviewer comments, we have made some correction with following subheadings and modified the things suggested in method section.

6. Reviewer comments: Design: Explaining the rationale for using a qualitative approach in this study, include references

Authors’ response: As per reviewer comments, we have included the rationale for using qualitative approach with reference.

7. Reviewer comments: Participants and recruitment: Describe the participants according to table 2 and how the participants were recruited, including where the interviews took place. Describe in detail where the participatory observation took place and the researcher who performed these observations. Include a map in order to identify these areas.

Authors’ response: As per reviewer comments, we have described the participants according to table -2 in the results section of socio-economic information. Additionally, we have also included the information about participants’ recruitment, interviews taking places, participatory observation performing person, and a map of the study areas as well in the methods section.

8. Reviewer comments: Semi-structured interviews: Describe this method and the rationale for using the design in this study. Include references

Authors’ response: We did not use semi-structured interviews, instead we used unstructured interviews, and have justified it in the methods section.

9. Reviewer comments: Participatory observation: Describe the rationale for using this design and include the references.

Authors’ response: As per reviewer comments, we have included the rationale for using participatory observation with reference

10. Reviewer comments: Thanks for nice comments. The Interview guide: How was the interview guide developed (sources for the interview guide). Provide a table with the questions included in the guide

Authors’ response: As per reviewer comments, we have included a table as interview guideline and clarified the way of developing the interview guide accordingly.

11. Reviewer comments: Ethical considerations: How was the consent obtained from the participants?

Authors’ response: As per reviewer comments, we incorporated the process of obtaining consent from the participant.
12. Reviewer comments: Please do not include any results in the method section. Remove the following to the result section or delete: Page 6: Initially, the traditional healers perceived..... Page 7: however, some of the traditional healers were reluctant to......

Authors’ response: As per reviewer suggestion, we have removed and rephrased some results looking words from the methods section (Page 6 & 7).

13. Reviewer comments: Data analysis: Describe what kind of analysis was used in the process. Did you use direct or indirect content analysis? Include references. How was the theme, sub-them, and codes identified. At the end of this section you should state the theme identified.

Authors’ response: As per reviewer comments, we have clarified the process of content analysis with reference and have also shown them in results as per heading and sub-heading through thematic content analysis.

Result section:

14. Reviewer comments: Please organize the results according to the themes identified. Reelctions about your finding should be removed to the discussion or be deleted e.g. Prevention and illness page 26.

Authors’ response: As per reviewer suggestion, we have reorganized the results according to the theme identified, and some of the findings from the page of 26 have been moved to discussion part.

Discussion section:

15. Reviewer comments: A short summary of your findings

Authors’ response: As per reviewer comments, we have already included a short summery of key findings in the results and discussion.

16. Reviewer comments: Other studies: Discuss your findings according to other studies.

Authors’ response: We found very few studies to compare with some our findings. As per reviewer comment, we have compared our finding with other studies as much as possible.

17. Reviewer comments: Theoretical framework. Discuss your finding according to theory

Authors’ response: As per reviewer comments, we compared our study finding according to established form of traditional healing at home and abroad.
18. Reviewer comments: Methodological aspects/Limitations: Include the issues of conducting research in own culture (if this is the case) or other limitations. Describe the researchers. Include references.

Authors’ response: As per reviewer comments, we have included our study limitations in methodological and cultural aspects.

19. Reviewer comments: Implications for further research and practice.

Authors’ response: As per reviewer comments, we have already shown the implications for future research and practices.

20. Reviewer comments: Please delete 1 paragraph page 25, repetition. Please remove page 31, as it is repetitions.

Authors’ response: As per reviewer comments, we have removed and modified and removed the suggested paragraph.

Reviewer #2:

1. Reviewer comments: This is good field work report and the manuscript is written well.

Authors’ response: A house of thanks for appreciating our efforts and making some positive comments towards our manuscript.

2. Reviewer comments: To my opinion the paper could be improved by including a section "objectives", where the authors explain more in detail the aims of their research and hypotheses behind the field work and especially the unstructured interviews.

Authors’ response: Thanks for useful comments. As per reviewer advice, we have separately incorporated a part describing our study objectives.

3. Reviewer comments: Did the authors use some software to code the data? Otherwise fine!

Authors’ response: Thanks for comments. We did not use any software in our study.

Sincerely,

Thank You