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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Many thanks for your June 21st email informing us about the status of our manuscript “What motivates new, established and long-term users of herbal medicine: Is there more than push and pull?”.

We would also like to thank the third reviewer for her remaining minor comments. We have implemented these remarks in addition to the editorial requests. A short discussion of the reviewer’s comments is attached below for your convenience. We believe that our paper is now ready for publication.

Sincerely,

Klaus Menrad (on behalf of all authors)

Reviewer 3:

Comment 1: "General comment: Congratulations to the authors for a well written manuscript and making an important contribution to this area of research. This is a novel approach that has elucidated some interesting findings. The authors have responded appropriately to the previous reviewer's feedback."

We thank the reviewer for her positive assessment of our work!
Comment 2: "The introduction is well written and provides solid justification for the research. I only have one criticism needing to be addressed.

Line 37, page 4. The authors state: "So far, there are no specific insights concerning the decision making process, which includes the motivation of people for choosing HM initially...". This is not the case. McIntyre et al have produced a body of work in this area and used a theoretical model of decision-making to understand herbal medicine use for anxiety. Although this research is focused on a specific population group it is a key piece of research related to HM use decision making that should be referred to. See the following for more information:


We thank the reviewer for highlighting these additional relevant papers. We gladly accept this comment and have cited these articles on page 4 of the revised article.

We thank the reviewer for highlighting these additional relevant papers. We gladly accept this comment and have cited these articles on page 4 of the revised article.

Comment 3: "The methods are appropriate and clearly described. However, there are a couple of clarifications needed. Could the authors please state which measurement scales were used within the questionnaire and what variables they were used to measure."

We gladly followed the reviewer’s advice and have expanded our discussion of the questionnaire on pages 7 and 8 of the revised article.

Comment 4: "The exploratory factor analysis is appropriate; however, there is no discussion of the theoretical approach used to determine the factor structure; i.e., what was the expected factor structure based on theory/empirical evidence? Were eigenvalues set at 1 for the analysis or was there an a priori criterion used to determine the number of factors? This information needs to be added."

We agree with the reviewer and gladly provided the relevant information on page 9 of the revised paper.
Comment 5: "Overall, the results are well presented. One minor thing to note: it is preferable to report the exact p values rather than "n.s" so the reader has all the information they need to interpret the data."

We agree again with this comment and have included it in the manuscript where needed.