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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

I have few suggestion which might help readers to better understand what the purpose of your pare is. I consider the revision of the abstract, the background section and the conclusion as major compulsory revisions. All other comments are minor essential revisions.

Title
The title states that this is a prospective descriptive study. The term prospective implies that you have observed and followed patients over a certain period of time. It seems to me you have rather done a cross sectional study.

Abstract
The abstract needs to be rewritten, when the purpose of the study and the conclusions derived from the own findings are more clear.

Background
The aim of the background section is to answer the question why the research question is important. It is well explained why pain is an important problem in primary care. However the link why it is important to explore the characteristics of the patients visiting the CAM clinic is not obvious. It seems to me the question you wanted to explore the reasons why patients attended a CAM clinic. The importance of the study questioned should be better explained and the study question needs perhaps to be rephrased.

Methods
The method section should start with a sentence describing the method; in this case I suggest: This is cross-sectional study. Otherwise the method section is fine.

Results
The results are well described. In Table 1 the description of the third row is missing and percentage are not provided uniformly.

Discussion
The discussion usually starts with the summery of the main finding of the own
What is so surprising or important about the data you collected (meaning of the results)?

Comparison of the own findings with data from Israel is well done. However I am not sure how to relate your data to references 19 and 20.

I miss a section on strength and limitations of this study.

Conclusion
You should better explain what the implications of your findings are for practice in Israel and for further research.
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