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Reviewer's report:

1. Does the debate present a novel argument, or a novel insight into existing work?
   its well articulated and not enough is published on the topic.
2. Does the debate address an important problem of interest to a broad biomedical audience? Yes
3. Is the piece well argued and referenced? Yes
4. Has the author used logical arguments and sound reasoning? yes
5. Is the piece written well enough for publication? Yes

minor essential revisions
The article strongly advocates for great inclusion of CM practitioners but doesn't really discuss the potential negative outcomes of this.

This is alluded to in the section recommending greater education for CM practitioners, lack of regulation or standardised education. But there may be other negatives for patients, the professions etc.

Greater utilisation potentially means more multidisciplinary teams and communciation between healthcare providers. What problems do you see with this and how might they be overcome? e.g. different philosophies, technical terms, education, funding models.

Some discretionary additions.

the article would benefit from addressssing some of the perceived and actual barriers to greater utilisation and integration of CM practitoners. e.g. the Friends of Science in Medicine debate in Australia and similar campaigns in the UK and US - what drives them? they sway professional opinion but why do they occur?

Nurse practitioners have been used by GPs to fill some of the gaps proposed by the author as suitable for CM practitioners - some discussion about this, the limitations of nurse practitioners and strengths of CM practitioners for some specific areas would be useful. Maybe exploring how the nurse-practitioner-GP relationship works or doesn't work will help formulate a strategy forward

Overall, a thought provoking article
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:
I do not have any conflict of interest