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Reviewer’s report:

Many of the criticisms that I previously raised have been addressed by the authors, resulting in an improved paper that is clearer and easier to read. However, there are still some major revisions to be made before publication.

The authors have included the international perspective on physician attitudes in the introduction now. However they cite studies older than 10 years (Astin and Ernst). Since CAM has made a rapid development in the last 10 years, these data might be out-of-date. So, newer studies give higher proportions of physicians incorporating CAM into their own practices (Joos et al eCAM 2009, Gianelli et al BMC Fam Pract 2007 etc.).

I still miss a detailed comparison to the Berman study in the discussion section. This would be interesting to uncover the developments of the last years (see my review No 1, remark 2, discussion section).

As a strength of the study the authors write that "previous studies mostly focus on primary care providers." However, they do not cite any studies here. (In the Berman study also rheumatologists were surveyed.) Therefore, this statement should be omitted or, otherwise, underlined by references.

Furthermore –as I stated in my preceding review- it would be interesting to compare the perspectives of primary care providers and rheumatologists (see review No 1, last remark, discussion section)

Still it seems not clear to me why only responses from the rheumatologists and not from internists were analyzed (similar to the BMJ paper). Have the authors found a difference between the perspectives of rheumatologists and internists?

A possible bias through the incorporation of questions on the use of placebo into the questionnaire should be discussed in the “limitations” section of the discussion.
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