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RE: MS# 1513484365285956—What Rheumatologists in the United States Think of Complementary and Alternative Medicine: Results of a National Survey

We have revised our manuscript, “What Rheumatologists in the United States Think of Complementary and Alternative Medicine: Results of a National Survey,” for consideration of publication in *BioMed Central Complementary and Alternative Medicine*. We thank the reviewers again for their insightful and helpful comments, which we have addressed as follows:

**Andre Busato:**

1) The Table 2 footnote shows the 4-point scale used. Additionally, we have amended the footnotes to Table 3 to reflect analysis of composite scores.
2) The proportional odds assumption was examined using the score test and was not violated. This is now stated in the Methods section under “Data Management and Analysis.”
3) We have revised the first paragraph of the Discussion to reflect “perceived benefit” and refrained from using the term “perceived efficacy.”

**Stefanie Joos:**

1) We have added the more recent studies on physician attitudes that the reviewer has suggested. The studies by Astin and Ernst give a more global review of physician attitudes toward CAM. No recent comprehensive reviews have been published. We therefore have retained these 2 references for the reader in the Introduction.
2) The Berman study assessed use of completely different categories of CAM by definition. Furthermore, the Berman study did not report on physician characteristics such as race and geographical location that could potentially affect CAM attitudes. It is difficult to compare our 2 surveys in a meaningful way.
3) We have amended the discussion to state as follows: “This provides a comprehensive view of rheumatology specialist attitudes, whereas previous surveys have mostly focused on primary care providers.” As such, we have inserted new references.
4) The objective of this survey was determining CAM attitudes of rheumatologists in the United States because this group treats joint diseases, a frequent reason for patients to use CAM. Attitudes of internists will be the focus of another paper.

5) A potential bias could be introduced through the incorporation of questions on the use of placebo, and this has been stated in the “Limitations” section of the Discussion.

We hope these changes to the manuscript will address the reviewers’ concerns.

With very best wishes,

Nisha Manek, MD