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Reviewer's report:

The authors have responded to most of the concerns raised in the last review. The followings are a few outstanding or new issues that needed to be addressed:

Major Revisions

1. The authors clarified in 4.3 of their reply (to reviewer 2) that the paper is not confined to patients with a chronic pain complaint. If this is the case, the word 'chronic' in the last paragraph of the Background section: 'As conventional medicine often fails at addressing many patients with a chronic pain... for a chronic pain complaint' (p. 5) should be deleted as it gives the impression that the paper focuses on patient with chronic pain.

2. This assumption is problematic: 'Although we assume that our results are fairly representative of the situation in other areas in Israel...' (p. 11, first paragraph) as the authors admitted earlier that ‘... the population in Beer-Sheva is younger than in the rest of the country’ (p. 9, last sentence). The same problem in the Conclusion when the authors suggested that their study ‘may be representative to other areas’ (p. 11, last paragraph), which in fact is not. Instead, the authors should acknowledge this as a limitation of their study.

3. What does ‘comparisons with other studies’ mean in the title of Table 1?

Minor Revisions

4. The third paragraph of the Background section: ‘People use complementary medicine in aim of…’ (p. 4) is out of context. The relation of it to the previous paragraph is unclear. This paragraph is originally from the Discussion section. The authors may need to add a few lines of introduction (why suddenly turn to discuss CAM here) to make it fits with the flow of the discussion.

5. Same problem with the second paragraph in the Discussion section: ‘One cross-sectional survey of patients with chronic pain disorders...’ (p. 9). The relation of this paragraph to the paragraphs before and after is unclear.

6. Is ‘predictors’ better than ‘prediction points’ (p. 9 and p. 10)?

7. ‘The response rate of 81.1% was archived...’ (p. 10, second paragraph) should be ‘The response rate of 81.1% was ACHIEVED...’
8. Consider changing ‘The most common reasons for visiting the complementary medicine clinic were…’ (p. 11) in the Conclusion section to ‘The most common reasons for PATIENTS WITH A PAIN COMPLAINT visiting the complementary medicine clinic were…’
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