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In response to the comments put forth regarding the above manuscript, we would first like to thank the reviewers for their time in formulating constructive criticism. We hope you will approve of the modifications made, which we believe have resulted in an improved version of our work.

Reviewer 1:

1. Current training activities should be described further.

Authors’ response: We have added some information on current training activities derived from the schools’ websites (p.11), as the electronic survey did not ask for a description of these activities in greater detail than the type of training offered, the number of hours and the teaching method (e.g. lectures, readings, case studies). The interviews also provided information on current training activities which was described in the results of the original version of the manuscript (p.12).

2. The use of the term « privileged » is not clear.

Authors’ response: We have modified the manuscript according to the reviewer’s request for each instance of the term “privileged”. We thank the reviewer for pointing that out.

3. Quality of written English.

Authors’ response: We have asked a native English speaker with experience in copy editing to review the manuscript.

Reviewer 2:

1. The title should be aligned with the content of the manuscript.

Authors’ response: We have modified the title to reflect the content of the manuscript.

2. Ultimate goal of the project/manuscript.

Authors’ response: The goal of the project has been clarified in the paragraph that precedes the methods section (p.5). The ultimate goal of this paper was to assess and describe a knowledge gap in the Canadian regulated CAM schools, which, if addressed, could favor collaborative attitudes and practice as well as communication between future biomedical and CAM healthcare practitioners.

3. Methods section.
   a. The authors should specify whether the pilot testing was integrated or excluded from the analysis.

Authors’ response: We have addressed this question in the manuscript (p.9). The pilot testing data were excluded from the analysis.
b. Specifications on the content analysis.
Authors’ response: We have added specifications about the content analysis (p.9). Emergent content analysis was performed on the interview material, i.e., themes were established following a preliminary examination of the data and discussion between the authors. The coding process was also guided by the following themes: the directors’ satisfaction, perceived need for improvement and perceived barriers to such changes as well as changes that will be made to the curriculum in the next years. The coding was then conducted independently by KTA and issues were discussed with IG.

4. Results section.
a. CAM schools surveyed should be characterized on pages 9 and 10 in an additional table.
Authors’ response: A table has been added to the manuscript to address this comment.

b. Numbers in the text and numbers in table 2 do not add up.
Authors’ response: The numbers do not add up because of missing data. Some respondents did not provide the number of hours of training offered. This has been addressed in the table footnote.

5. Discussion.
a. Comments with regards to the low response rate in the discussion section.
Authors’ response: The conclusion with regards to the content offered among the curricula’s respondents has been revised to reflect the moderate response rate obtained. Considering the current average response rate among healthcare professional surveys’ respondents, the authors argued that the response rate was rather satisfying, while moderate (Ik Cho et al, 2013). However, we have added this characteristic as a limitation of the study in the discussion section (p.16).

b. Comment on paradoxal results between the directors’ satisfaction with the curricula and the curricula improvement.
Authors’ response: We have addressed this comment in the discussion. This paradox may be explained by the fact that C/P directors acknowledged inherent barriers to training in these areas (see p.15).

c. The conclusion is weak.
Authors’ response: We have improved the conclusion according to the reviewer’s request (see p.17).

Additional requests:

We have provided the electronic survey questionnaire in an appendix.