

Reviewer's report

Title: A Systematic Review of How Homeopathy is represented in Conventional and CAM Peer Reviewed Journals

Version: 3 **Date:** 7 June 2005

Reviewer: Matko Marusic

Reviewer's report:

General I want to praise the authors for accepting most of my suggestions and objections. Here I will give "major compulsory revisions", and say that if incorporated - I can recommend acceptance, and if not - reject.

This is the best and the most fair that I can think of. There is no need for me to see the paper again.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Abstract:

1. Please remove the third sentence "These results..."
2. In the 4th sentence ("Conversely...") replace the word "bias" with "messages" or something similar. I maybe do not know well enough, but, for me, the word !bias! means AN INTENTIONAL lining to one side.
3. Remove the last sentence (Though preliminary...")

Results:

Clinical Trials, in the second paragraph: add 1-2 sentences associating/relating the "tone" of the paper with the results of the paper.

Discussion:

Third paragraph, second sentence: replace "some evidence of a possible bias" with something like "difference in the message of the obtained results".

Fourth paragraph: Remove two last sentences, starting with that "This conclusion...."

THE REASON I AM INSISTING ON THESE CHANGES IN WORDING IS THAT - THE AUTHORS, FIRST OF ALL, SHOULD BE INPARTIAL AND BALLANCED.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No