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Author's response to reviews:

Thank you for the opportunity to revise and resubmit the electronically submitted manuscript, "A preliminary survey of the practice patterns of United States Guild Certified Feldenkrais Practitioners(CM)", for publication in BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine. I thank the reviewers for their reports, appreciate their comments, and have integrated their suggestions into this revision. I provide my responses to each reviewer’s comments below.

Reviewer: Peter M. Wayne

1) . . . ask respondents to characterize their interest in participating in clinical or basic research

I have added a comment about this to the Discussion section in paragraph 5.

2) . . . study limitation

I have added a paragraph about limitations to the end of the Discussion section.

Reviewer: Harald Johan Hamre

1. The response rate . . .

I performed the suggested analysis. In addition, I did similar analyses of the response rates for traditional health care provider credentials and additional CAM credentials. Please see text added to the end of the Methods section; in Results section, paragraph 2 of Practitioner locations, paragraphs 2 and 4 of Additional credentials and their usage; and the strengths and limitations paragraphs at the end of the Discussion section.

2. It would be very desirable to include some comparison of the practice patterns . . .

I added this information to the end of paragraph 4 in the Discussion section.

3. Abstract, Background, last sentence . . .

Revision completed.
4. Abstract/Results. 32.3% response rate . . .
Numbers added.

5. Abstract/Conclusions. The first 4 out of 5 sentences . . .
I reduced this to 2 sentences.

I moved the information about Dr. Feldenkrais and the training process to paragraph 2 of the Background section.

7. Background, peer-review studies . . .
I added information about study designs to paragraph 3 of the Background section.

8. Results/Client visits. Numbers are presumably means (SD). . . .
I clarified my use of SDs and added medians to this section and in the corresponding section of the abstract.

9. Discussion, first sentence: Is this the first study . . .
I clarified this.

Thank you again for your consideration of this paper. I hope we all agree this process has led to a stronger manuscript. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Patricia A. Buchanan