Author’s response to reviews

**Title:** Alternative or complementary attitudes toward alternative and complementary medicines

**Authors:**

Fabrice Berna (fabrice.berna@chru-strasbourg.fr)

Anja Göritz (goeritz@psychologie.uni-freiburg.de)

Amaury Mengin (amaury.mengin@chru-strasbourg.fr)

Renaud Evrard (renaud.evrard@univ-lorraine.fr)

Jacques Kœferschmitt (jacques.kœferschmitt@chru-strasbourg.fr)

Steffen Moritz (moritz@uke.de)

**Version:** 5 **Date:** 18 Mar 2019

**Author’s response to reviews:**

Thank you for amending your manuscript according to our requests.

However, we note there is still overlap in the Methods section of the manuscripts. Please amend the sections highlighted in the attached report as necessary.

** the red-marked sentences related to a previous paper using the same study design (ref 1) have been reworded.

In Table 1, several sentences cannot be reworded as they refer to the exact wording of the clinical vignettes presented to the participants regarding ref 2: it only corresponds to the indication of the DFG grant, is it really needed to have an original wording for this? I have done it... regarding overlap with ref 3: again, it refers only to stereotyped sentence describing statistical analyses

Would it be now possible for you to calculate possible overlap after excluding the first page of the manuscript as well as acknowledgment, funding, consent for publications and author's contribution sections?

I hope you will consider these final changes as sufficient to accept the paper for publication.

with best regards,

FB