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Editor
BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine

MS -1514463964912508: "Patients visiting the complementary medicine clinic for pain: a cross sectional study"

Dear Editor:

We would like to thank the reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions and the opportunity to revise our paper accordingly.

Following is a point by point reference to these comments (additions and corrections are highlighted in the revised manuscript):

Reviewer 1:

1. **Title**: we agree with the reviewer and have changed the title accordingly:
   “Patients visiting the complementary medicine clinic for pain: a cross sectional study”

2. **Abstract**: the abstract was revised: under methods the first sentence was changed to “cross sectional study”; and the conclusions section was re-written.

3. **Background**: we have added a section at the end of the background in aim of clarifying the importance of the study.

4. **Methods**: we agree with the reviewer and under methods added a subsection "design: a cross sectional study."

5. **Results**: Table 1 was corrected as suggested.

6. **Discussion**: a summary of main findings was added at the beginning of the discussion section and a section regarding strengths and limitation at the end, ref 30 was added. The conclusion section was revised in accordance with the reviewer's comment.
Reviewer 2:

1. **Title** – was changed, as noted in reply to reviewer 1. We believe it now reflects the focus of the paper.

2. **Background**: The background section was edited, and the section regarding use of alternative medicine around the world was deleted. A section on the effectiveness of complementary medicine for treatment of pain was added (refs 12-15) as suggested by the reviewer.

3. **Results**: The issue of whether the patients are still using complementary methods or not for pain relief was not within the scope of this study as this would change the study methodology to a prospective follow-up study. We aimed to characterize the patients using CAM, and believe that the methodology used is valid. Follow up on utilization is an interesting topic for future investigation.

4. **Discussion**:
   1. The sentence: “People use complementary medicine… and in interest of participating actively in their medical process”, was moved to the Background section. Other sentences remained as they relate to the results of our study in relation to other studies and in accordance with the suggestions from Reviewer 1.
   2. The paragraph regarding the data from the Central Bureau of Statistic was deleted.
   3. The research was not confined to patients with a chronic pain complaint, we understand that this was misleading. The inclusion criteria for the study included patients visiting the CAM with a pain complaint and were not limited to a chronic pain complaint or other chronic illnesses. This was corrected in the abstract and the title section. Thus the finding that 51% of study population attending CAM due to a pain complaint, suffer in addition, from a chronic illness is in accordance with other studies. A clarification sentence to this effect was added in the results section.
   4. Throughout the text, the word “referral” was changed to “visiting” or “attending” according to the context.
We hope you find the revised manuscript acceptable for publication in the Journal of BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine

Please do not hesitate to contact me for any further questions or clarifications.

I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Roni Peleg, MD.
Corresponding Author