

## Author's response to reviews

**Title:** Patient satisfaction and side effects in primary care: An observational study comparing homeopathy and conventional medicine

### Authors:

Florica Marian ([florence.marian@kikom.unibe.ch](mailto:florence.marian@kikom.unibe.ch))  
Kerstin Joost ([KerstinLanka@gmx.ch](mailto:KerstinLanka@gmx.ch))  
Krishan D Saini ([krishan.saini@gmail.com](mailto:krishan.saini@gmail.com))  
Klaus von Ammon ([klaus.vonammon@kikom.unibe.ch](mailto:klaus.vonammon@kikom.unibe.ch))  
Andre Thurneysen ([andre.thurneysen@kikom.unibe.ch](mailto:andre.thurneysen@kikom.unibe.ch))  
Andre Busato ([andre.busato@memcenter.unibe.ch](mailto:andre.busato@memcenter.unibe.ch))

**Version:** 3 **Date:** 1 February 2008

### Author's response to reviews:

Dear Sirs

Thank you for reviewing our paper entitled „Patient satisfaction and side effects in primary care: An observational study comparing homeopathy and conventional medicine“ for publication in BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine.

We revised the paper according to the comments of the reviewers. We extended the section „Methods“ and added a figure (fig 1) describing the sampling procedures. The section aimed at limitations was also extended considerably and all tables were supplemented with information on statistical procedures. A series of text changes were made according to the suggestions of Dr. Roblin

All document changes are listed on the following pages and all changes and corrections are made visible in an accompanying document (Marian\_07\_rev\_3.doc).

We now resubmit the article for your consideration to be evaluated by the committee of reviewers.

We look forward to your thoughts and comments regarding this article.

-

- Yours sincerely

- A. Busato

Summary of revisions

Reviewer Ruth Kalda

1. We extended the section „Methods“ and added a figure (fig 1) describing the sampling procedures.
2. We added a paragraph (No 4) describing these issues in the discussion,

3. We described the statistical in the footnotes of the respective tables
4. We are, however, reluctant to add p-values to all statistical tests in text of the article. We consider it as sufficient to state the level of significance in the M&M section as small p-values may incorrectly imply large differences between groups.
5. Table 5 was corrected
6. The type of outcome evaluation was a result of time constraints inherent to the entire project. These limitations are noted in the discussion (2).
7. The reason for not addressing specifically data of diagnoses and comorbidities as well as prevention issues is connected to the characteristic features of homeopathic treatment as explained in the discussion. Especially, the aspect of prevention represents an essential part of homeopathic consultation and treatment. According to the homeopathic approach, symptoms and diagnosis are seen within a broader perspective described at the beginning of the discussion.

Reviewer Douglas Robin

#### Major Compulsory Revisions

The study was embedded in a large HTA project and was not designed as clinical study aimed to assess the efficacy clinical interventions. However, we extended the discussion (Nos. 5 & 6) describing the problem of selection bias.

#### Minor Compulsory Revisions

A series of text changes were made according to the suggestions of the reviewer.