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Reviewer's report:

The authors have carefully addressed the comments and, thus, improved the paper. A few remaining minor, mostly essential revisions include:
- P. 2, line 3: under results, add ..than non-users .. at the end of the sentence
- P. 4: definition CAM: This definition does not really fit how CAM is used in this paper, namely practitioners and practices (see for example on p. 13)
- P. 4: Rearrange sentences in first paragraph. Begin with the definition. The first sentence should precede the sentence starting with: Firstly....
- The word 'while' is not always used correctly. For example on P. 4, 5th line from below ('as' would be better), on P.5 second last paragraph (it should be deleted), P.10 middle of the page (better: .....may feel as reliable, as GPs.... Part can be deleted as it is already in the sentence).
- The authors have explained that data from 2001 are still valid. However, they refer to use of practitioners only (6-7%). Also, it does appear that CAM is slowly gaining in importance in the Netherlands, as illustrated by discussions on including CAM in health care insurance packages, professional interest groups, etc.)

P. 6, line 9: add 'trust in CAM providers' after interpersonal. Please note, Figure 1 says: Interpersonal trust in providers CAM – the order of the last two words need to be changed.

P. 8, last line: the word 'acted' is missing.

P. 11, Sirios, should be Sirois.

P. 14, last line first section – controlled rather than corrected.

P. 23. second line last section, believe rather than belief.
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