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Reviewer’s report:

Dear Authors,

In the abstract in the method section it should read: ‘This is a cross-sectional study’. That half of the patients used CAM is a result, not conclusion. The conclusion in the abstract should be congruent with conclusion in the manuscript.

The conclusion could be improved. The conclusion should state implications for practice. E.g. Given the high proportion of patients with unsatisfactory pain relief using CAM, general practitioners should gain knowledge about CAM to improve communication and counsel patients.

The implication for research could be:

More clinical research to evaluate safety and efficiency of CAM for pain is needed to guide evidence based counseling.
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