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Reviewer's report:


Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper

Discretionary revisions

Background: First paragraph, states 'little is known about the current management of patients with NC' - this is certainly true to some extent, and a reason for the study, but there is some literature detailing some conservative management approaches although not which is superior. I think the introduction and discussion would be improved with fuller reference to some of this literature.


The recognition of NC from the history items is certainly widely believed, as the survey results show, but the evidence is not so straightforward about this. Again this literature could be drawn on. Especially with reference to Katz et al. 1995, Iversen and Katz 2001, which highlight the fact that while the majority of NC
patients have the classical signs and symptoms, not everybody does (especially latter reference).

Minor essential revisions

The title does not state this was conducted in the UK.

Abstract - Conclusions - should be in past tense (NC 'was' a clearly recognised; Most therapists routinely used). Delete first based (4th line). Suggest that sentence ends: 'based on theoretical benefits, but not clinical evidence.'

A paper survey was used to gain knowledge about therapists' profile and their opinions about diagnosis and management of NC. The setting is described, but again it is not stipulated to be in the UK; the procedure, data collection and analysis were described and the questionnaire tool provided as a supplementary file.

Explain 'CATS type service'.

You have both 54 and fifty-four on methods page - standardise.

In discussion (penultimate paragraph) references 38 and 39 are referred to - these do not seem to exist in reference list.
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