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Reviewer's report:

Chu et al. compare in there very well written and clearly structured paper factors associated with CAM use in Chinese medicine and Western medicine hospitals in Beijing. This is cross-sectional study based on 546 questionnaires.

Comments

Abstract
1. For consistency with the main text the numbers of questionnaires handed out and analyzed should be mentioned in the result section

Background
2. The authors should give a reference for their definition of CAM.
3. Page 5: To be more accurate, it should be mentioned that acupuncture and Chinese medicine is offered in almost all western medicine hospitals in China.

Materials and Methods
4. It should be stated clearly that the “Committee on Human Research” is a Research Ethic Board (Ethics Committee) and specify that verbal informed consent only was approved.
5. The term patent herbal medicine should be briefly explained.
6. If possible, the authors should state their hypothesis before initiating this study and give a justification for the sample size of 600 questionnaires.

Results
7. To avoid redundancy the authors should only report key points in the text and refer to the tables.
8. The wording around the goal of CAM use should be consistent (CAM to treat CAD vs. CAM to treat CAD symptoms)

Discussion
9. Different definitions of CAM and different populations limit the comparison of rates of CAM use around the world. The authors should focus comparisons primarily on CAM use in patients with CAD (or cardiac conditions).
10. Interestingly, in the present study CAM users were older whereas and gender and education was not associated with CAM use. In western populations younger women with higher education are more likely to use CAM. This could be included in the discussion.

Tables
11. Table 2: “Statistical value” should be explained or the whole column omitted.
12. It would be nice to see a table with predictors of CAM use (univariable and multivariable binary logistic regression for all factors studied). Currently only two ORs are given in table 2 and table 3 each.

Minor points
13. This reviewer suggests rounding all percentages (i.e. to omit all decimals) throughout the manuscript and tables.
14. In the result section the P value for angina frequency is <0.01 whereas in table 2 it is 0.01. Please check.
15. For the confidence intervals this reviewer suggests writing “ to ” or “ - “ (instead of “ ~ ”)

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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